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FORTUNA*

That the author of the Satyricon is the Petronius described by Tacitus in a well-

(*) I cannot hope to give adequate expression to the appreciation I owe Professor F. Edward Cranz. He has been more than a painstaking and helpful editor; he has served beyond the call of duty in securing information and materials which have been of incalculable use to me.

known passage of the Annales (XVI, 17-20) is a widely held belief. Setting forth a list of victims of Nero's tyranny in 66 A.D., the historian feels the compulsion to devote more detailed attention to Petronius, and he proceeds to draw a character sketch amplifying the meager details of his subject's life. These biographical details delineate an individual who displayed marked efficiency as a government official but who
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chose to submerge his talents under a guise of studied lethargy and profligacy. Drawn to the attention of Nero, he became the "elegantiae arbitr" of the emperor, a post he filled with signal success — with too signal success, for he aroused the envy of Tigellinus, who would brook no rival to his position with Nero. A trumped up charge of complicity in the conspiracy of Scaevinus was the means of dooming Petronius, who did not delay committing suicide.¹

Tacitus’ account includes no mention of literary activity by his character, just as his report of the death of Seneca (Annales, XV, 60) is devoid of any reference to that prolific writer’s productivity. The account does describe as one of Petronius’ final acts the composition of a scurrilous recital of Nero’s infamous escapades and the dispatch of it as a dying gift to the emperor. With that piece some have sought to identify the Satyricon, but acceptance of that identification has not been widespread. On the other hand, virtually unanimous has been the association of Tacitus’ Petronius with the authorship of the Satyricon. No other Petronius of the early Empire — the period in which the work is believed to have been composed — could possibly have written it. Further evidence is provided by the coincidence of names: some of the manuscripts designate the author as Petronius Arbiter, and the few ancient writers who evidently refer to the author of the Satyricon call him “Petronius Arbiter”, “Petronius”, or simply “Arbiter”. The testimony, which appear in a number of editions, including that of Buecheler (see note 2 below), are all by writers of late date, who take it for granted that his composition, which they think it unnecessary to name, is well known to contemporaries. This sug-

1. The identification of the author of the Satyricon with the individual described by Tacitus has been masterfully explored by K. P. C. Rose in The Date and Author of the Satyricon (Leiden, 1971). This position by no means has unanimous acceptance. Only one of those holding different views is E. Marmorole, who sets up an Antonine date for the author and his activity (La questione Petroniana, Bari, 1947).

gests that Petronius shared in the fourth century the great and extraordinary popularity of Juvenal, with whom he is named by Johannes Lydus as an author of scurrilous satire.

Whether Petronius put his hand to any other composition is not known — certainly no other work extant at present bears his name — but there are indications that the Satyricon in its present form is but a small fragment of a much more sizable piece of writing. The title of the work is generally viewed as an abbreviated form of the expression Satyricon libri, a view sustained by a reference in the text of Marius Victorinus, the only ancient writer who mentions the title of Petronius’ work (see Keil’s edition of the Grammatici Latini, VI, 513), as well as by evidence in the manuscripts and by the reasoning of most scholars. A notation in the Trau manuscript leads to the belief that the extant composition contains excerpts from Book XIV, most or all of Book XV, and excerpts from Book XVI. If that belief is sound, there have been lost thirteen books that came before the surviving selections and an unknown number of books in which the work was presumably brought to its conclusion. Estimates of the length, all conjectural, range from sixteen and, more often, twenty books to as many as forty books. The books correspond to the volumina (no doubt quite lengthy) in which Petronius’ work was necessarily circulated before classical writings were transcribed into codices in the fourth and fifth centuries.²

The period when the text was complete probably did not extend much beyond the sixth century. In the interval until the advent of the Carolingian era the text was subject to dissolution. This process of

². For the name of Petronius’ composition, see, among others, E. T. Sage, Introduction to The Satyricon (New York, 1929), xvii; K. Möller, Petronii Arbitri Satyricon (Munich, 1961), xxx; B. E. Perry, The Ancient Romances (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1967), 192. For the length of the work, see, among others, Sage, xxii and Notes, 210; the introduction to Franz Buecheler, editio maior (Berlin, 1862), vii; Richard Helme, “Petron und der griechische Roman”, Hermes, 34 (1905), 494.
dissolution is marked by two phases, the second probably later than the first. Initially there were accidental losses, caused as much by the length of the work as by the practices of the time. As a result of these losses there emerged two pseudo-complete versions of the Satyricon, a longer and a shorter (see below). There is no evidence of systematic epitomization, and no principle can be detected which may have governed the selection of episodes for preservation.

The second phase of the process of dissolution was represented by the deliberate extraction of selections for separate presentation. This practice applied to the excerpting of short poems for inclusion in anthologies and probably accounts for the somewhat numerous verses in the Anthologia Latina that are anonymous in the manuscripts but have been attributed to Petronius. The practice operated especially in the case of three sections of the Satyricon which form unified entities: the Cena Trimalchionis, the Widow of Ephesus fabula, and the long poem De bello civili. Of the Cena, certain parts survived in the longer version of the text referred to above; but only a single chapter—a chapter having nothing to do with the banquet proper—survived in the shorter version. This extraction of the Cena may be the starting point for the differentiation between the two versions mentioned above, one attempting without success to preserve the episode and the other content to let it remain detached. (Within the longer version the Cena, it is likely, underwent further dissolution as a result of accidental losses.)3 Not until the seventeenth century, as will be seen below, was the episode restored to the text of the Satyricon.

3. The complicated record of the excerpting of the Cena is examined in detail and with care by Müller in his introduction (note 2 above), especially on XXXVI-XXXIX. I have not seen the 1972 dissertation written at Harvard University by T. Wade Richardson, Interpolations in Petronius: however, a summation of it by the author in the Newsletter of the Petronian Society (June, 1972) indicates that this work may profitably be consulted in conjunction with and as an extension of Müller’s remarks.

The fabula concerning the Widow of Ephesus was preserved in both versions and circulated independently as well, sometimes with, sometimes without the name of Petronius. The independent versions differ little from the others, but those without Petronius’ name show more variations.4 The poem De bello civili likewise was preserved in both versions and circulated independently, but under the name of its author. There may be detected some indications of independence of tradition, stemming no doubt from early attempts at emendation.

In addition to the two versions of the Satyricon (the longer of which is ordinarily designated Family I or L, the shorter Family II or O), the composition is represented by forty-odd fragments that have been preserved.5 Many of these are derived from quotations introduced by writers of the late Roman Empire, such as Terentianus Maurus and Servius, and of the early Middle Ages, including Isidore and Priscian. The writers invoke them to confirm a grammatical usage or illustrate a Roman custom.

The earliest known manuscript of the Satyricon, Bernensis 357, is assigned to the ninth century, at the latest to the tenth century. There is, in fact, reason to credit Sage’s observation, “During the middle ages, Petronius was little known outside of France. John of Salisbury is the only writer who knew the Cena as well as other portions of the text, and his acquaintance with Petronius may have been formed at Fleury”.6 That there was interest both at Fleury and at Auxerre during the ninth century is indicated by the echo of verses from the De bello civili in a poem written by Heiric on the life of St. Germain of Auxerre. Three centuries later John of Salisbury gave evidence, in his activity at Fleury, that he had an acquaintance with the Satyricon.

5. The text and critical record of these appear in, among other places, Buecheler, ed. mat., introduction.
6. The Satyricon (note 2 above), 198.
LATIN AUTHORS

(even with the Cena Trimalchionis, a manuscript of which was not found until 1650, although it is dated 1423); that acquaintance, however, produced no extant commentary. 7

The Satyricon is represented in the florilegia, the treasure-house of quotations compiled from the eleventh to the fourteenth centuries. Four manuscripts (Paris. 17903, Escorial Q. I. 14, Paris. 7647, and Arras 64) contain the Satyricon readings perpetuated in the florilegia, no one of them presenting commentary in the strict sense of the term. 8

In the captions, however, with which the citations are introduced — such captions as De avaritia, De egestate, De fortuna, De gloria, De luxuria, De amicis tantum in prosperis, Quae sequenda sint vel fugienda studere volenti — as well as in the passages selected for presentation, one detects a moralistic bias. And that predisposition, of course, is what was likely to govern the thinking and the activities of the medieval ascetics who culled from classical literature its references to the living of an untainted life and the disparagement of worldliness and wrong-doing. That the fruit of their labors is of little value to the interpretation of the Satyricon is evident; in the words of Sage, "these [the florilegia] reveal some knowledge of Petronius, but less certainly his literary influence". 9

From the florilegia came the quotations of the Satyricon introduced into two encyclopedias of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. The Speculum Historiale of Vincentius Bellovacensis or Vincent of Beauvais (d. 1264) presents parts of three of the florilegia passages in a group of Haec moralia extracted by the author "de quodam libro Petronii partim metrico partim prosaico". 10 From Vincent or directly from the florilegia, the Sophilogium (or Zophilogium) of Jacobus Magnus secured and reproduced Petronian excerpts with scarcely any variation from his source. 11 A late contemporary and correspondent of Jacobus also quotes from the Satyricon: Joannes de Monsterollo or Jean de Montreuil (1354-1418), a clergyman in the service of Charles VI of France, shows a knowledge of the Troiae Halosis poem (ch. 89) and attributes to "Afranius" verses 25 and 26 of the De bello civili. 12

A friend of Joannes de Monsterollo, Niccolò Niccoli, is indirectly responsible for a noteworthy judgment on Petronius. It stems from Poggio Bracciolini (1380-1459), who in 1420 discovered a manuscript of Petronius in England. Sending a copy of it (or, in the opinion of some, the manuscript itself) to Niccoli in Florence, Poggio wrote: "de Petronio Arbitro quod scire cupis quid tractet, lege Macrobii principium super somnio Sciponis, ubi enumerans genera fabularum dicit, in eis esse argumenta fictis aeternis casibus referita, quibus multum se Arbiter exercuit. Est autem homo gravis versu et prosa constans et, ut conicio, paulo post tempora Augusti". 13

7. The work of Heiric, of John of Salisbury, and of some others is treated by Buecheler, xi ff, and A. Collignon, Petrone en France (Paris, 1905), 10 ff. An Irish text tradition has recently been postulated by Díaz y Díaz in "La tradición textual de Petronio", Euphroigne, n.s. 1 (1967), 71-106; but, as L. Bieler remarks, "... It does not follow that Petronius was read in Ireland" (Classical Influences on European Culture A.D. 500-1500, ed. R. Bolgar, 1971, 48).


10. XXI. 25. See Buecheler, xxxiii ff and Collignon (note 7 above), 11-12; also Mantius, "Beiträge zur Geschichte römischer Dichter im Mittelalter", Philologus, 10 (1897), 536-38.

11. In II.4.12, II.4.19, III.3.6, and III.3.3. See Buecheler, loc. cit.; Collignon, 18; also Ullman (note 8 above), 21, and Antonius Thomas, De Joannis de Monsterolli Vita et Operibus (Paris, 1883), 82-83.

12. Thomas (note 11 above), 69 and 73. These Petronian echoes in the writing of Jean de Montreuil as well as others are pointed out in the most recent edition of his Epistolarium [sic], that of E. Ornato published at Turin in 1963. It may be worth noting that the name Afranius is associated with Petronius in the Codex Parisinus 8049 and the Codex Leidensis Scal. 61.

13. Quoted from Poggii Epistolae, ed. Th. de
PETRONIUS

Another judgment on Petronius, unrelated to the previous one, was made during the fifteenth century. It is set forth in three elegiac couplets:

Petroni carmen divino pondere currit, quo juvenum mores arguit atque semen.
quarè ille praesa gaudet lasciva puella, at quoque delicias frigida sentit anus.nam rbter diri scripsitque Neronis amictu
arbiter, arbitrio dictus et ipsue suo.14 Claudius Binet (c. 1553-1600) states that he had found “epigramma Iulii cuiusdam” with a fragment of Petronius in the Vatican library at Rome, and Barthold Niebuhr (1776-1831) assigned it to Iulius Pomponius Laetus, who lived from 1425 to 1498. Although Pomponius was an ardent Latinoophile and was responsible for the origin of the Roman Academy, we have no other indication of his interest in Petronius.

In the Codex Bernensis 357, mentioned above as the earliest known manuscript containing the Satyricon and, in five others, all assigned to a later period, are found scholia on the composition. The five are the Codex Parisinus 7989, the Codex Leidensis Voss. lat. Oct. 81, the Codex Vinobonensis 179, the Codex Vaticanus Lat. 1671, and the Codex Vaticanus Barb. Lat. 4, all of which are dated in the fifteenth century (the last named possibly in the sixteenth).15 The

______________

Tonellis (Florence, 1832) I, 38 by Konrad Müller, Petronii Arbitri Satyricon (Munich, 1961), IX.

14. See Buecheler, 237, where the passage appears as the concluding words of the edition. In the Michaelis Casparis Lundorpiii Homologoumena reproduced in the Lotichius edition of 1629, the epigram is assigned to “Galus Iulius Grammaticus Urbis Romae” (p. 5). Buecheler, in his notes, takes cognizance of the textual difficulties in the lines, especially prominent in line 3 and line 5. For ille praeasa (line 3), the Lotichius reading is illo prae se, and for the clearly corrupt rbter (line 5), the Lotichius reading is subtir.

15. I have had access to photostatic copies of all six manuscripts, acquired by the University of Pittsburgh many years ago through the generosity of the American Council of Learned Societies. It may well be that the six are related and that the scholia in all six manuscripts, sparse in number and irregular in presentation, sometimes take the form of glosses, as when Parthenopen and Dicarchidos (120, v. 68) are identified as “Neapolim” and “Cuma-rum”, respectively. In the main, however, they are no more than chapter headings, calling attention to the contents of the text; to the interpretation of the Satyricon their contribution is negligible.

That the poem De bello civili (119-124.1) was excerpted from the Satyricon at an early date, possibly as early as the Carolingian period, has been mentioned above. The independent tradition of the poem gains confirmation from the existence of three manuscripts containing only that selection, two of the fifteenth century (the Codex Dresdensis Dc 141 and the Codex Monacensis 23713) and the third of the sixteenth century (the Codex Leidensis Voss. Misc. 1, fasc. 6). The latter contains marginalia and interlinear glosses almost entirely textual in nature. The scholia of the first two, in contrast, constitute the first real extant commentary on the writing of Petronius.16 (See II, 1 and 2, below). Voluminous though they are, these scholia are noteworthy for their primacy more than for their influence, however, inasmuch as they are not reflected in any significant way in subsequent bodies of commentary. On the controversial issue of the purpose of the De bello civili, the position set forth in both bodies of commentary is simplistic: it is no more and no less than an attack on the vices of the Romans. (This, it may be worth adding, was the position set forth in the two editions of the poem published at Leipzig in 1500 and 1508 to be referred to shortly).

In the fifty-year period between 1475 and 1525 seven editions of Petronius’ writing were published. Three contained the entire Satyricon in the form in which it existed at the time, and four contained only the poem

______________

scholia in the margins reflect the derivation of the manuscripts from a common archetype or from cognate sources, in which the scholia originally appeared.

16. I possess photostatic copies of all three manuscripts.
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De bello civili. The complete editions were:
1) the editio princeps, edited by Franciscus Puteolanus, which contained in addition the
Panegyrici veteres and Tacitus, Agricola
(Milan, Antonius Zaratus, about 1482:
HR 13119; BMC VI, 718 [undated]; Goff
P-813). For the evidence on the disputed
date, see the BMC description, also Rini (Bib-
liography IV, below), 19-24. The editor,
Puteolanus, described his “fragmentum Pet-
ronii Arbitri” as “incuria quidem tempo-
rum mancum et adeo mutilatum, ut vix
cognosci possit, eiusmodi tamen, ut non
rejici debet”.
2) with Dio Chrysostomus, De Troia non
capta, Venice, Bernardinus Venetus de Vi-
talibus, 1499: GW 8372; HC (+ Add)
6185; Goff D 208.
3) Paris, Reginaldus Chalderius, 1520.

The four editions of the De bello civili
are associated with two names, those of
1500 and 1508 (published at Leipzig) with
Hermannus Buschius and those of 1517 and
1523 (published at Vienna) with Johannes
Singenrius. The 1523 Singenrius edition
contains textual comments, but these are
not at all extensive nor particularly note-
worthy. No commentary as such is found
in either Busch edition, but the sub-title of
the work in each may be noteworthy:
“Sathyra in qua vita Romanorum repre-
 henduntur”. Neither edition, moreover,
contains any trace of Busch’s Annotationes,
which we are informed (see p. 325 below)
were “recitatae in Academia Lipsia et ex
ore eius excerptae a M. P. anno 1501”. These
Annotationes, to be examined more closely
in the second part of this article, are repro-
duced in a number of later editions, notably
that of Goldast and the numerous reprints
of his edition.

The three earliest editions of the Satyri-
cion were almost identical in content and
text, which was of the Family II variety.
The editor of the third, Reginaldus Chalde-
rius, declared that he had published his
“fragmentum ad exemplar, quod unicum
habuit”, but the term exemplar cannot be
established as representing a manuscript or
an edition. That this 1520 edition was the
starting point for the edition issued at
Antwerp by Johannes Sambucus in 1565 is
clear, for in the castigationes which he ap-
ended to the work, Sambucus described the
difficulties that the use of the preceding
edition imposed upon him in establishing his
text. He recognized the faultiness of many
of its readings and sought to emend them
by recourse to a “vetustus codex”, which he
did not identify but which appears to have
been of the Family II variety.17 Appended
to the edition, however, were two fragments
deriving from a Family I source. These
Sambucus secured from the Adversaria of
Adrianus Turnebus, the first part of which
had appeared one year earlier, in 1564. In
that same year Petrus Pitheous wrote his
own Adversaria, quoting the Satyricon from
what appears to be a Family I manuscript.
Turnebus and Pitheous were not associated,
but the manuscript employed by both was
conceivably one owned by Enricus Mem-
mius, who “domi sub sera et claustra habet,
ne quem foris obsconuen et lascivus scripsi-
tor impura sua petulantia contaminet”.18

Family I readings were introduced by Pi-
theous into his 1577 edition of the Satyricon,
but he had been anticipated in that practice
two years earlier. In the preparation of an
edition published at Lyon in 1575, Johannes
Tornaesius drew upon two manuscripts, usu-
ally identified as the Dalecampianus and
the Cuiacianus, of Family I vintage.
As a matter of fact, there is reason to believe
that there were ten such manuscripts in
existence during the last quarter of the
sixteenth century; unfortunately, all but
one of them — the edition of Scaliger which
is in manuscript form, Codex Leidensis
Scal. 61 — have disappeared in one way or
another.

The loss is lamentable, but compensating
for it was an event that took place in the
middle of the next century: the recovery of
the Cena Trimalchionis, which, as has
been stated above, had been separated from
the text of the Satyricon possibly before the
Carolingian period. In the library of Nic-

17. See Mildred Daschbach, Sambucus and the
Text of Petronius, an unpublished dissertation
written at the University of Pittsburgh in 1931.
18. Turnebus, Adversariorum Libri XXX (Or-
leans, 1634), 20.
nus Cippicus located at Trau (now Trogir), a town of Dalmatia, the scholar Marinus Statilaeus came upon a manuscript containing the so-called "excerpta vulgaria" of Petronius and, more importantly, the Cena. The manuscript is designated Codex Parisiensis lat. 7989 olim Traguriensis, a designation that indicates its discovery at Trau and its removal later to Paris, where it is at present lodged. The earlier history of the manuscript is shrouded in doubt, although the presence of the date 1423 in it has led Konrad Müller, among others, to construct an elaborate case identifying it with a Petronian writing possessed by Poggio in the 1420-1423 period. The newly found passages were first incorporated in the Frambello edition of 1664, but the editing was far from careful so that they were sharply attacked as spurious. To that attack the peculiar Latinity of the passages lent itself. Subsequently, however, their authenticity was accepted because, as noted before, certain parts of the Cena had been preserved in Family I versions of the Satyricon and a single chapter in Family II versions. These facilitated the process of fitting the discovery into its proper place in the composition.

The importance of the discovery of the Trau manuscript cannot be overstated. One by-product was the illumination cast on the book division of the Satyricon, as has been pointed out above. Far more important was the restoring to the work of a sizable portion, one which had been detached from it for centuries. That fact is additionally significant because the portion restored is perhaps the best known selection of the entire composition. As a piece of writing, moreover, the Cena Trimalchionis provides eloquent testimony to the artistry of Petronius, artistry that is manifested in his creation of a unified narrative — unified both in itself and in its integration with the Satyricon as a whole, in his delineation of character, and in his reproduction of speech mannerisms not extensively represented in other Latin writings now extant. The Cena, furthermore, makes significant contributions to our knowledge of political, economic, and social conditions of the early Empire as well as of linguistic phenomena of both that time and an earlier period. The fact that it has been frequently anthologized testifies not only to its freedom from the obscenity which has occasioned objection to other portions of the Satyricon (see below), but also to the richness of the information contained within it, to say nothing of its worth as a literary document.

The recovery of the Cena Trimalchionis was the most important event in the record of the Satyricon until 1862 — this despite the fact that during the closing decades of the sixteenth century and during the next two centuries editions of the Satyricon came out in an unceasing stream and commentaries on the work poured forth in like abundance. Some notion of the prevalence of both these conditions may be derived from the list of composite editions and individual commentaries to be treated later. For the moment let it suffice to mention, but not discuss, the intense activity between 1583 and 1587; the preparation of the editions of 1596 (under the direction of Wouwer), of 1610 (under that of Goldast), of 1618 (under that of Bourdelot) and the multiple reprintings of each of the three; the appearance of no fewer than three editions in a single year, 1629. Gaspar Burmann is sometimes given credit for overseeing the first variorum edition of the Satyricon in 1743; but he had been anticipated in that practice by his uncle, Peter Burmann, thirty-four years earlier, and the latter had had his work prepared for him in many of the preceding editions, which had been, in fact if not in name, of this kind.

The industry that characterized the production of these works elicits from the
student of Petronius greater admiration than the scholarship displayed in them. They were marked by neglect of and indifference to the evidence of the manuscripts. Similarly unconcerned with manuscript evidence as a rule were the commentaries, whose authors were primarily intent on displaying familiarity with the activities of their predecessors and rarely, if ever, brought new insights to the interpretation of the *Satyricon*.

The year 1862 is a noteworthy one in the record of Petronian criticism. It is associated with the efforts of two scholars, one in Europe and the other in the United States, to bring to light the evidence of the manuscripts and to apply scholarly methods to the examination and interpretation of that evidence. Franz Buecheler and Charles Beck worked independently and indeed sometimes vehemently disagreed with each other, but the contributions of each were considerable and farreaching. To them a great debt is owed by every Petronian scholar who has followed, including those who employed similar methods. The activities of the two were complemented by other critical movements, notably the evolution of a sounder interpretative tendency by Otto Jahn and the emergence of a greater knowledge of colloquial Latin as a result of the studies in Plautus by Ritschl and those in inscriptions by Mommsen. In consequence more reliable conclusions in the establishment and interpretation of the text of the *Satyricon* became possible. Not to be overlooked is a condition which has proved of benefit to the entire field of scholarly study: the development and improvement of photographic processes of reproduction, as a result of which manuscripts and editions have become more readily accessible and subject to wider and more concentrated scrutiny and study.

Discussion of the record of the *Satyricon* over the centuries must take cognizance of the influence exerted by one prominent feature of the work: the fact that it has been considered by some to be an obscene composition. The point is not whether or not the judgment is valid; the point is rather that the presence of the judgment has left its mark on the *fortuna* of the *Satyricon*. For one thing, the process of dissolution suffered by the text (referred to earlier) quite likely was furthered not only by the phenomena mentioned but also by the expurgation of supposedly objectionable passages. Expurgation of this kind was consonant with the operation of the medieval mind. If it is pointed out that a number of "frank" passages are still present, one may admit that that is so without excluding the possibility that others may well have been excised.

Even beyond the Middle Ages, the obscenity issue was still a live one. A reading of the *Homologoumena*, a seventeenth-century miscellany of earlier statements about Petronius and the *Satyricon*, brings to light the large number of writings concerned with that issue. And these suggest a second effect on the *fortuna*: the reluctance to print materials, both old and new, because of their alleged scurrility. A conspicuous example involved Petrus Pitoeus, who, acquiring a new manuscript, scrupled to use it because of the lascivious nature of the contents. The ultimate decision to use it was that of his publisher Mamertus Patissonius, who, while admitting the potential danger of the composition, lauded the Latinity manifest in it and refused to countenance the expurgation of it. The composition making his position clear, which came to be known as the *Patissonii praefatio*, was published not only in the 1587 Pitoeus edition but also in many subsequent editions as well.

One is struck not only by the recurrence of the obscenity issue but also by the prominence of the persons becoming involved in it: in addition to Pitoeus, they included Scaliger, Lipsius, Barthius, and Wouwer, among others. For the most part, they took their stand on the side of permitting the *Satyricon*, in its entirety or in parts, to be printed and to be read. But

22. Buecheler's activities are largely reflected in his edition of the *Satyricon* issued in 1862 and in the reprintings of it: Beck's in *The MSS of the Satyricon of Petronius Arbiter Described and Collated* (Cambridge, 1863).
the fact remains that the opposing side must have had substantial support.

Lest one think that the problem belongs to the "Dark Ages", it is worth noting that it has arisen at least once during the present century. The classicist who edited the first collegiate textbook of the Satyricon incorporated within the volume a large number of notes helpful to students reading the work in the original; however, he carefully omitted such notes for any of the franker portions of the text. He (or, more conceivably, his publisher) thereby perpetuated the practice of taking an action which is of questionable validity from a scholarly point of view so that he might give obeisance to a supposedly moral purpose.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The following constitutes only a partial listing of the overwhelmingly large number of writings available.

I. Important modern editions.


II. Petronius and his work.


III. Textual tradition and bibliography.


IV. Petronius during the Middle Ages and the Renaissance.

A. Collognon, Pétrone en France (Paris, 1905); idem, "Pétrone en France : Additions et Corrections" Annales de l’Est XXXVIII (1924) 143-64; W. McDermott, "Isidore and Petronius" Classica et Mediaevalia XXIII

The foregoing, it should be re-emphasized, does not pretend to be complete. No mention is made, for example, of the information presented in the introductions and supplementary notes appended to many scholarly editions of the Satyricon.

I. Composite Editions.


1587, Lutetiae Parisiorum (Paris): apud Gulielmum in monte D. Hilarii, ad insigne vasis aurei. The Praecidiana of Janus Dou sa has a separate title page with the erroneous date 1535. Contains, besides the Dou sa and Richardus: G. Dupeyratius, Spicilegia; C. Binet us, Notulae. BN; (CtY).

2. 1587 Edition.

1587, Lutetiae (Paris): apud M. Patissio nium, ed. Mamertus Patissonius. Contains also: Anonymus, Notae; Anonymus, Collectanea. BM; BN; (MH).

3. 1596 Edition and Reprints.

1596, Lugd. Batavorum (Leiden): Ex officina Plantiniana, apud Franciscum Raphaelengi, ed. Johannes a Wouweren. Contains also: Anonymus, Notae; Anonymus, Collectanea; Varii, Observationes; Janus Dou sa Fillus, Spicilegium; Johannes a Wouweren, Animadversiones. BM; BN; (CtY).

1601, Lutetiae Parisiorum (Paris): apud Viduam Guillelmi Chaudiere, Via Iacobe,

sub signo Temporis et Hominis silvestris. (CtY).

(*) 1601, Lutetiae Parisiorum (Paris): Ex officina Christophori Beys, via Iacobea. BM.


Graesse (loc. cit.) seems uncertain about the distinction of the Sonnius edition from that of Beys. Gaselee (p. 148) lists four: those of the widow of Chaudiere, Beys, Val letus (which he states was printed “at the ‘Golden Bible’ near the College of Rheims”), and Febrevier. He goes on to declare, “All these [four 1601 editions] are reprints of Wouw r en’s Antwerp edition, and... they correspond with each other word for word, and are in fact the same book, printed from the same type...”


In this edition (see the letter from the Typographus on pp. 153-154), the five commentaries of the 1596 edition have been fused into a single commentary, with indication of the source of each particular comment. BM; (MH).

1608, Lugduni (Lyons): sumptibus Pauli Fre llon. A reprint of the 1596 edition. BM; BN; (CtY).

(*) 1614, [Leyden]: Ex officina Plantiniana Raphaelengii.


1634, Amsterodami: apud Ioannem Ians sonium. A reprint of the 1604 edition. BN; (CtY).

4. 1610 Edition and Reprints.

1610, Helenopolis (Frankfurt): pro bibliopoleo Ioannis Theodaldi Schönwetteri,
PETRONIUS

euidebat J. Bringerus. ed. Melchior Goltzast and Michael Caspar Lundorpens. Contains also: Lilius Gregorius Gyraldus, Petronii vita; P. Guirandus Alosianus, Epistola; Robertus Titius, Ex praelectione II in Catullum; Petrus Pithoens, Coniectanea; De Petronio et eius scriptis; Hermannus Buschius, Annotationes... in Satyrum De vitis Romanorum; Hadrianus Junius Horhnans, Observationes; Incerti auctoris Conjecturae; Henricus Stephanus, Emendationes; Innominati auctoris Emendationes; Johannes Sambucus, Notae; Franciscus Daniel, Notae; Anonymi auctoris Notae; Petrus Daniel, Notae; Johannes Tornaius, Variorum lectionum libellus; Anonymi variae lectiones; Germanus Colladonius, Notae; Claudius Binetus, Notulae; Christopher Richardus, Notae; Franciscus Pithoens, Collectanea; Variorum in P. Arbitrum Observationes; Janus Doussa, Praecidaneorum libri; Confradus Rittershusius, Notae; Janus Doussa Fillius, Spicilegium; Johannes a Wouerens, Animadversiones; Gaspar Barthius, Racemationes; Georgius Erhardus Francus, Symbolae. BN; (MH).


Professor Kristeller writes that according to a communication he received from the Library some years ago, these two volumes were lost during the last war.

1615, Lugduni (Lyons): apud Paulum Frellon. (CtY).

(*) 1618, Lugduni: apud Paulum Frellon. Gaseelee # 27.


5. 1629 Edition

1629, Francofurti ad Moenum: typis exscribabez W. Hofmannus, sumptibus L. Jenisisii, ed. Johannes Petrus Lotichius. The work contains four parts, within the first three of which are found the text of Petronius, including the Fragmenta, and the extensive commentary composed by Lotichius himself. Part IV has the title In T. Petronii Arbitri Satyricon Notae, castigationes, emendationes, et variae lectiones clarissimorum docetissimorumque... viorum. This fourth part contains: Michaeilis Casparis Lundorpiz Francofordini (OMOAQOYMEN); Casparis Barthii Equitis Saxonii Dissertatio de Petronio; Ioannis Alexandri Grassicani Scholia in Petronii Arbitri Satyrici Fragmenta; Ioannis Aurati Lemovicis Emendationes in Petronii Arbitri Satyricon; Errici Memnii [sic] Coniecturae in Petronium Arbitrum; Alphonsi Delbenii Castigationes in Petronium Arbitrum; Claudii Puteani Notae in Petronii Arbitri Satyricon; Jacobi Bongarsii Bodrianii Notae in Petronii Arbitri Satyricon; Mamerti Patisonii Parisiensis Variantiae lectionum; Ioannis a Woueris Observationes in Petronii Arbitri Satyricon et Fragmenta; Casp. Scioppili Syrenes Petronianae; Johannis Weitzzii Observationes in Petronii Arbitri Satyricon et Fragmenta; Renati Moreau Quaestiones Physico-Medicae in Petronii Satyricon et Fragmenta. BM; BN; (MH).

Manuscript: A manuscript of the Lotichius edition, possibly in revised form, exists, but it does not contain the earlier commentaries reprinted in Part IV of the edition. Hamburg, Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek, Cod. philol. 151-154 (folio) cart. s. XVI, 4 vols. now in the Deutsche Staatsbibliothek, Berlin (reported by P. O. Kristeller and Hans-Erich Teitge).
6. 1709 Edition And Reprint.

nus. Two parts in one volume. Part II contains: Janus Dousa, Prae
didae; Gonzalius de Salas, Commenta; Johannes Sam
bucus, Praefatio et Vita Petronii; Johannes Tornaesi
us, Praefatio; Liliss Gregorius Gy
raldus, De Petronio vita; P. Guirandus Alo
sianus, Epistola ad Arnaudum; Robertus Titius, Ex pra
electione superiori epistolae opponenda; M. Patissi
us, Praefatio; De Petronio et ejus scriptis veteres auctorum loci; Peterus Daniel, Praefatio; Claudius Binetus, Pra
efatio; Goldastus, Prolegomena; Johanne
s a Wouwelen, Dedicatio Josepho Scalige
ro; idem, Praefatio; idem, Praefatio in ob
servationes variorum se digestas; Gaspar Barthius, Epistola ad Goldastum; Johannes Petrus Lotichius, Vita Petronii; Michael Caspar Lundorpius, OMOAOTYOMENA; Testimonia in Lundorpians omissa; Gaspar Barthius, Dissertatio de Petronio; Gonzalius de Salas, Prae
aduria; Praefatio Hadrianidae male Bourdelotio adscripta; Patavina praefatio; Blaevii, Epistola ad Principem Con
daeum; Johannes Lucius, Epistola ad Blae
vios; Johannes Causus Tilebomenus, Judicium de fragmen
to Traguriano; Johannes Christianus Wagensellius, Dissertatio de cena Tri
calchionis; Hadrianus Valesius, Disserto
de cena Trimalchionis; Marinus Stat
tilus, Responsio ad superiores dissertationes; idem, Apologia ad patres conscriptos repu
blicaes literariae; Johannes Schefferus, Dissertatio de fragmen
to Traguriano vero auctore; Thomas Reinesius, Dedicatio; idem, Praefatio; Epistolae variorum de Fragmento Traguriano ad Chr. Arnoldum; Johannes Boschius, Praefatio. BM; BN; (CT Y; MH).

1743, Amstelaedami (Amsterdam): apud Jansonio-Waesbergios, ed. J. J. Reiske, with a Preface by Caspar Burmannus. Two volumes. Volume II, in which the notes are found, contains the same material as the 1709 edition except that it omits Johannes Petrus Lotichius, Vita Petronii, and adds at the end Mantissa anedotorum et alio
rum. BM; BN; (CT Y; MH).

II. Satyricon

Commentaries

1. ANONYMUS DRESdensIS DC 141
(De b elo civi
l only)

The Codex Dresdensis DC 141 is lodged in the Saecchische Landesbibliothek of Dresden. It is commonly assigned to 1489, one of the two dates in the manuscript (the other being “decimo Kal. Nov.”). The scholia in it, all written in the same hand in which the text is penned, consist of 1) interlinear glosses, in most cases synonyms or brief explanations of the words above which they are written, and 2) marginal comments of a more extended nature.

Introduction: Satira Petronii poeto sa
thirici contra vi
cia Romanorum incipit foeli
citer et nota quod.

Satyrus is teste Plinio in quinto Na
turalis Historiae hominis figuram habens habitatque in recessu insulae Canopeae in confinibus Ethiopiae et ut scribit divus Je
ronimus in vita Pauli ad quem cum pergeret divus Antonius vidit homunculum adn
cibus naribus et fronte cornibus aspera pedibusque caprinis et praemisso signo crucis cum quin
am esset interrogasset et unde respondisse furtur mortalis ego sum unus ex acolis he
remi quos vano errore delusa gentilitas fa
nos [sic] sathiroisque colit. Animal autem est libidinosum valide et petulans. Unde sathira nomen habet quia libundinem [sic], gulum, et avaritiam Infetitur [sic].

Commentary:

[Inc.]: Intentio sive argumentum poetae. Petronius reprehendit in hac via Romanoru
m et praecipue avaritiam ex qua prove
nerunt discordiae cum exteris nationibus, deinde cum civibus. Tandem libertas rei
publicae per discordiam adempta est. In
cipit igitur ab indignatione ut solent sathirici in
vehens in eorum avititia [sic] orbeam iam
totum et cetera... /[Exspl.] Epidaurus civitas Graeciae unde avestis est Ascula
plius in forma serpentis non longe a Drusio.

Bibli.: A. Fred Sochatoff, The Commen
tartes in the Manuscripts d k m of Petronius, an unpublished dissertation written at the University of Pittsburgh, 1934. See The

Manuscript:

2. ANONYMUS MONACENSIS 23713
(De bello civili only)

The Codex Monacensis 23713 is in the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek of Munich. The date 1408 found in the manuscript is discredited by library authorities, who assign it to the closing third of the fifteenth century. The scholia in it comprise both interlinear glosses and marginal annotations. Of the latter, some, which are written in the same black ink as the text, are merely chapter headings. The other pieces of commentary, both interlinear glosses and the more extended marginalia, are written in an ink that varies from brownish black to pale brown and in a hand different from, but contemporary with, that of the text. (Some textual emendations also are present, in a recognizably third hand).

The text and the scholia of Monacensis 23713 are related to the text and the scholia of Dresdensis De 141. Individual peculiarities are found in each, but the communion of the two is apparent. Conceivably both were drawn from a common source, one no longer extant.


Commentary:
[Inc.]: Intentio vel argumentum poetae. Reprehendit Petronius in hac sathira vitia Romanorum praeclipe avaritiam ex qua pervenerunt discordiae primum cum ex- teris nationibus, deinque cum civibus. Tandum libertas regis publicae Romanis per discordiam adempta est. Incipit igitur ab indignatione ut solent satirici, inventus in eorum avaritiam, inquiens Orbem iam totum et cetera... [Expl.]: Epidaurus civitas est Graeciae unde adventus est Aesculapius in forma serpentis non longe a Racusio [?].

Finis Petronii Arbitri in Sathira Integra.

Bibl.: Schott, opera supra citata.

Manuscript:

3. HERMANNUS BUSCHIUS
(De bello civili only)

Buschius (1468-1534) was the editor of two editions of the De bello civili published at Leipzig in the first decade of the sixteenth century (see above p. 318). The sub-title of the work as printed in both the 1500 and 1508 editions is : Petronij Arbitri Sathyra in qua vitia Romanorum reprehenduntur". Not until 1610 did there appear a published version of his Annotationes in Petronii Arbitri Satyram de Vitis Romanorum, although a footnote declares, "Recitatae in Academia Lipsica, et ex ore eius exceptae a M. P. anno 1501". A second footnote glosses Satyram as Epos.

In the Annotationes are found explanations of various expressions in the De bello civili and substantiation of the explanations by reference to passages in other Latin writings, both classical and post-classical.
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Afferat ipse liet sacras Epidaurias herbas,
Sanabit nulla vulnera cordis ope.

Editions:
1610. See above I, 4.
1615. See above I, 4.
1618. See above I, 4.
1621. See above I, 4.

Biography:

4. JOHANNES ALEXANDER BRASSICANUS

Although the Scholia of Brassicanus (1500-1539) are listed in the Goldast edition of 1610 as unpublished with the explanation that they vanished when in the hands of Oporinus, to whom Brassicanus had sent them for review, they are printed in the Lottichius edition of 1629. The editor of the latter explains that Janus Gruterus received them, "ipsius auctoris manu exarata", from Guilhelmus Canterus of Utrecht and that on the death of Gruterus, Johannes Bergens acquired his library from the heirs and passed on the Scholia to his friend Lottichius, "ut tandem aliquando ab interitu post tot annorum curricula tam variasque casus vindicarentur". A marginal note assigns them to 1540, and a later marginal note states that they refer "Ad ditionem [sic] Venetam de anno 1499".

Introduction (ed. of 1629). De Petronio Arbitro Satyrico. [Inc.]: Constat Petronium Arbitrum Satyricum, auctorem valde bonum et perveterem, Satyras scripsisse, non ad eam formulam, quam sibi praescripserunt Lucilius, Rabirius, Persius, Horatius, Juvenalis ac ali quidem eiusdem notae Poëtae; sed ad exemplum Menipparum Varronis, quas ex optiorum auctorum crebris testimoniiis reprehendimus, nunc soluta ditione, nunc vero vario carminum genere fuisse conscriptas . . . [Expl.]: Utinam omnes tanta felicitate exprimerent hoc, quod ille noster ait, Scribendi recte sapere est praeceptum et iussus.


There follow three of the better known pieces of verse associated with the Satyricon, those relating to Tantaclus (82.5), Midas and Tonsor (the last four lines of Fragment XXVIII), and Prometheus (Fragment XXV).

Editions:
1629. See I, 5 above.
1743. See I, 6 above.

Doubtful Edition:
Collignon, Pétrole en France (p. 33, n. 2) cites La Porte du Theil as the authority for a 1591 edition of Brassicanus: Petronio Arbitro Satyricon, ab Alexander Brassicano emendata et annotata, Basil. apud Oporinum et Antwerp. apud Plant. et ex ejusdem officina cum variis notis, 1591. He accepts the edition as authentic, but adds, "... serait, en tout cas, très rare". Rini, Petronius in Italy (pp. 47-48), speaks of the same edition but states that it "seems never to have been brought out".

Biography:
See v. I, p. 240.

5. PETRUS DANIEL

The Notae of Petrus Daniel (1530-1603) cannot be dated precisely. In the praefatio, referring to the fact that M. Antonius Muretus was working on an edition of Petronius "ex vetustissimo et integerrimo codice", he provides a rough approximation of the date, for Muretus (whose Annotationes are no longer extant) died in 1585. An entry in the Index Interpretum of the Goldast edition
provides the information that Daniel had intended to publish the *Notae* under the name Pierius Aurelianus. The same entry informs us that they were drawn from the library of Bongarsius. The *Notae* contain comments, sometimes quite lengthy, explicating expressions in the *Satyricon*.

*Praefatio* (ed. of 1615. See I, 4 above).

*[Inc.]*: Mirum est, qui Petronium in lucem emiserunt, nihil dum certi de illius aetate prodidisse, ante quos Lilius Giraudus hæc in re vaide alucinatus est, secutus Placidum Lactantium Stati interpretem, qui Statio posterioriæ facit Petronium, ut a quo sumpserit hoc hemistichium, et suis versibus inseruit: Primum in orbe Deos facit timor. (111, 661) (There follow a number of references to Petronius, including a verbatim quotation of the pertinent passages in the *Annales* of Tacitus). Daniel explains, “quod hac edizione a nobis praestitum sit”... /[...]

*[Expl.]*: Verum ne diutius querar, facit M. Anton. Muretus, vir undecumque doctissimus, quem audio ex vetustissimo et integerrimo codice Petronii editionem omnium absolutissimam publice parare, quo nomine studiosi omnes ille merito plurimum, ut a quo benignè et liberaliter in communem Republicae litterariae utilitatem erogatum sit, quod ab aliis invidiose suppressum fuerat.

*Introduction [Inc.]*: Satyricon. Quale sit hoc scribendi genus Fabius expressit li. 10 Institut. et sic docet... /[...]/ per satyram aedilem factum, qui legibus solvat, et Salustius in *Iugurtha*; deinde quasi per satyram sententias exquisitas in editionem accipitur.

*Commentary. [Inc.]*: *Numalio genere* Contra delicatos lectores Petronius in primo Satyrarum, et Persius in illa Satyra: Nempe hoc assidue. et Plinius lib. 19 Ex vet. Grammatico... /[...]/ *Classico* Classicum dicitur ex Vegetio de Re militari lib. 11 quod buccinatores per cornu dent, quod insigne videtur imperii, quia classicum canit Imperatore praesenti, vel cum in militem capitaliter animadvertitur: et classicæ auctore Petronio, a calando, id est vocando, sunt dicta.

*Editions:*

1618. See I, 4 above.
1621. See I, 4 above.
1709. Preface only. See I, 6 above.
1743. Preface only. See I, 6 above.

*Biography:*

Petrus Daniel was born in Orléans in 1530 and died at Paris in 1603. A distinguished attorney, he supplemented his professional activities with an interest in the classics. That interest was reflected not only in the commentaries he composed on the writings of Roman authors (Virgil, Servius, Fulgentius) but also in another service: he protected from depredation by Huguenot troops the manuscripts kept in the library of the monastery of Fleury at Saint-Benoît-sur-Loire, of which he was a legal official. His best known work was *Querulus antiqua comedia nunquam antehac edita, nunc primum... luce donata et notis illustrata* (Paris, 1564). On Daniel’s death some of his manuscripts were acquired by Bongarsius and are housed in the Burgerbibliothek Bern.

The *Opera omnia* of Daniel were published at Paris in 1599.


6. Claudius Binetus  
*(Epigrammata only)*

The part played by Binet in the coming to light of a fifteenth-century epigram on Petronius has been mentioned above (see page 317). His statements concerning the discovery of it are presented in the *praefatio* to his edition of *Petronii Arbitri itemque quorumdam veterum Epigrammata hactenus non edita*, published at Poitiers in 1579.

If the *praefatio* contained no more than the narration of the circumstances under which Binet stated that he had found the epigrams (in a manuscript belonging to the library of a church in Beauvais), its right to a place in the record of Petronian commentaries would be subject to doubt. But Binet, in addition, undertakes to clear up the identity of Petronius, refuting some false notions on that point and establishing him as the person treated in the *Annales* of Tacitus.

The *praefatio* is accompanied by a set of *Notulæ in Epigrammata*, the worth of which is tempered by the scholarly tendency to view the epigrams as doubtfully Petronian. As Collignon puts it, "Mais pour la plupart, l'attribution à Pétrone est des plus douteuses. ... Pétrequin pense même que ces épitaphes sont de la composition de Claude Binet (Pétrone en France, note 2 on 27-28).

*Praefatio. [Inc.]*: (ed. Paris, 1615) Scite Gyraldus eorum putidam opinionem arquit, qui Petronium lascivioris nequitiae sectorum Bononiensem sanctissimum Antistitem somniant. nec dissimili fere periculo halluci- nantur, mea sententia, qui Ausonio Consulari cognominem quendam Burdigalensium Episcopum substituunt. ... /[Expl.]: Verum et hoc aloes et absynthis bolos, si vis, ut aegrotis sit, deglutire facilissimo negotio poteris, quos prius veteris elegantiae melle et prorum sapore involvas et contaminas.  
Bene vale.  

Notulæ in Epigrammata [Inc.]:  
*Candida sidereis* Amatorium.  
*et credit e rinibus aurum* Leg. *e crinibus a.*  
.../[Expl.]: *Musinonem capra verbeno*  
Leg. *capra ex ver vegno.*

---

*Bibl.*: F. Buecheler, xxxvi (see Bibliography I, above); Collignon, *op. cit.* (see Bibliography IV, above).

*Editions:*

1579, Pictavii (Poitiers) ex off. Brochétorum, fratum. Adams II, 68 P-868; BM; BN.

1610. See I, 4 above.

1615. See I, 4 above.

1618. See I, 4 above.

1621. See I, 4 above.

1709. Preface only. See I, 6 above.

1743. Preface only. See I, 6 above.

*Biography:*

Claudius Binetus or Claude Binet (c. 1553-1600), a native of Beauvais, first appeared on the literary scene in Paris during the early 1570's, composing a number of hack writings which reflected the pre-occupations of the time as well as his own classical interests. The most notable of these were two poems, the first on the death of Charles IX and the other on the return of Henry III to France and his assumption of the throne. It was probably at this time that Binet first met the noted poet Pierre de Ronsard (1524-1585), but the association of the two did not grow warm until a decade later.

From 1575 to 1579 Binet devoted himself to legal studies, establishing himself at Poitiers in 1579 (Poitiers was the site of the publication in that year of the *Epigrammata* mentioned above). Both his political and literary fortunes improved thereafter. He filled a number of magistracies, apparently with efficiency and even distinction. He resumed the earlier relationship with Ronsard and was one of the two men of letters charged with handling the poet's final writings after the latter's death in 1585. Binet authored *Discours de la vie de Pierre de Ronsard, prince des poètes français* in 1586, and eight years later published *Destinées de la France* together with a fragment of a poem by Ronsard on divine law.

*Bibl.*: A. Cioranescu, *Bibliographie de la littérature française du seizième siècle* 4032-47; 5026; 7878; 8028; 8036; 19312; 19442; 19443. *Dictionnaire des lettres françaises*, xvi* siècle* 108-109; also to be consulted are critical and biographical studies of Ronsard such as R. Largillière, *Ronsard, ses amis et
7. Janus Dousa

The Praecidanea in Petronium composed by Janus Dousa the Elder (1545-1604) were first published at Leyden in 1583. They were reprinted in an edition of the Satyricon issued two years later at both Leyden and Paris; the Paris edition was reprinted in 1587. The work was drawn upon extensively in the editions that followed, as Roy L. Nyswaner has shown (see below).

The three books of Praecidanea comprise fifty-one chapters, twenty-four in Book I, eighteen in Book II, and nine in Book III. Each chapter is preceded by a headnote summarizing the content of the chapter. As Nyswaner points out, "Dousa's purpose is to interpret the Satyricon by a comparison, wherever possible, with other Latin authors, such as Plautus, Horace, and Martial... Likewise he intends to emend the text and to restore lacunae" (14-15). Comments are made on a total of 294 passages in the Satyricon; those in the first 91 chapters of Petronius' composition are treated in Book I, those in the remaining chapters in Book II, and those in the Fragmenta in Book III.


Janus Dousa Daniell Rogerti suo S.D. [Inc.]: Annos abhinc, ni fallor, iam factum est septem, quam tibi, meane an publica felicitas dicam nescio, eam cogitationem imsum, ut Bataviam cresbro revisendo de praesentia nobis tua gratiam facere et velles et posses, mi suavissime Daniel... [Expl.]: Cui generi ipsius hercule iampridem advocatus venire cupio, si qui mea opera citius addici possint, Morboniam porro ut abeant recta via. Vale ocelle noster, imo ocelle Musarum. Lugduno Batavorum.

2. Ad Juventutem, sometimes attributed to Lipsius.

3. Greek poem, attributed to Bonaventura Vulcanius.

4. Praecidanea. [Inc.]: Satyricon istud Petronii Arbitri in libros plures distributum ac dispartitum fuisse satis magno argumento est nobis veteris Glossarii fiducia, quod apud literatissimum antiquae fidel custo-

dem Petrum Danielem nostrum in publicos potius, quam privatos usus adservari intellego...[Expl.]: Ad quam Coemam etiam retrahendum autumo Fragmentum minutulum, quod a Fulgentio Grammatico sub Petronii nomine citatur his verbis:

Postquam feruculum aliatum est.

FINIS.


Editions:

1583. Lugduni Batavorum [Leyden]: Ex officina J. Patesii. BN; (CtY.)

1585. See I, 1 above.

1587. See I, 1 above.

1596. See I, 3 above.

1601. See I, 3 above.

1604. See I, 3 above.

1608. See I, 3 above.

1610. See I, 4 above.

1614. See I, 3 above.

1615. See I, 4 above.

1618. See I, 4 above.

1621. See I, 4 above.

1623. See I, 3 above.

1624. See I, 3 above.

1626. See I, 3 above.

1709. See I, 6 above.

1743. See I, 6 above.

Biography:

Janus Dousa (Johan van der Does) achieved distinction as a public official, a historian, a poet, and a scholar. He was born at Noordwyk on December 5, 1545, and died in 's Gravenhage on October 8, 1604. His services as a public official were marked by various activities, including diplomatic missions to England in 1572 and 1584, but most conspicuous was his distinguished behavior during the siege of Leyden in 1574. Named curator of the Dutch archives in 1584, he was able to engage in researches that had as their fruit the publication in 1599 of the Annales rerum a priscis Hollandiae comitibus gestarum, ten books composed in elegiac verses; a prose version, prepared with the collaborative effort of his son, appeared two years later.
Dousa took as his motto "Dulces ante omnia Musae" and proceeded to implement it in various ways. Named the first head of the University of Leyden, he brought to the school a number of scholars, including Scaliger. Between 1580 and 1582 he was responsible for critical writings on Horace, Catullus, and Tibullus; in 1587 he published a work on Plautus. On a trip to Paris in 1564, Dousa had sought out leading scholars of that city, among them Turnebus and Passeratius. This may have been the starting point for his interest in Petronius, an interest that took expression in intensive activity between 1583 and 1587.

In addition to the works already mentioned, Dousa was the author of several collections of poems and some medical works. For a fuller listing, see the BN Catalogue CC (1971), 954-962.

Bibli.: Michaud, X, 270; Nieuw Nederlands Biografisch Woordenboek, VI (1924), 428-429; Sandys, II, 301; Van der Aa, IV (1858), 214-219; Nyswaner, vide supra.

8. Gulielmus Dupeyratius

The Spicilegia Dupeyratii first appeared in the 1587 edition of the Satyricon published by Linocerius at Paris (but not in the Pithoeus edition of 1587, as the Bipontine Edition of 1790 mistakenly declares on p. xxiv). Mention of the commentary then ceases until 1743: the title page of the Burmann edition of that year contains the comment "Quibus additae DUPEYRATII et auctiores BOURDELOTII ac REINESII notae", as if the presence of these notes were a unique feature. This impression is confirmed by a statement of Burmann in his praefatio: "In hac enim conspiciuntur olim omisae Dupeyratii notae, Parisiis anno MD LXXXVII typis impresae, ex quorum tamen numero expunctae sunt, quas inde excerptas Erhardus commentario suo interexit."

The Spicilegia are a series of discursive notes on Petronius and the Satyricon displaying an acquaintance with the comments of earlier editors and adding few, if any, fresh insights.

1. Lectori B. G. Dup. L. (Linocerius edition of 1587). [Inc.]: Petronii satyricon non ille pede quis Aetnam (ut Salviani verbis utar) impudicarum flammarum dixerit. .../[Expl.]: ... qui e segete ad spicilegium relicit stipulam.

2. L. Calvimontanus Nob. Lem. in spicilegia G. Dupeyratii Lugd.

Sunt multqi quibus uberes maniplos
... 
(line 24) praeterquam vitia explicante lingua.


[Inc.]: Multa de Petronio ejusque scriptis ex editione Pithoeana habentur, quae ex veterum auctorum locis collecta sunt.../[Expl.]: Et Horatius
Tu pias laetis animas reponis
... 
(line 4) gratis et imis.
Editions:
1587. See I, 1 above.
1743. See I, 6, above.

Biography:
Little is know of Guilelmus Dupeyratius (Guillaume DuPeyrat) who was born in 1563 and died in 1645. That he was a resident of Lyons is evident in the cognomen Lugdenensis which was added to his name. He held both lay and ecclesiastical offices, the most prominent of the latter at Saint-Chapelle de Vincennes.

Similarly, his writings were both lay and ecclesiastical. The former deal with literary and historical matters. Conspicuous is the work Spicilegia poética, which has the French title Essais poétiques, published in 1593. (Others are listed in Cioranesco, who enumerates also various laudationes funebres composed by Dupeyratius).

Bibli.: Cioranesco, # 9026-# 9045; D. de Colonia, Histoire littéraire de la ville de Lyon (Lyon, 1728) 557-63; Michaud X, 660.

9. Johannes Richardus

In a letter to the Elder Dousa printed on the final page of his 1585 edition, the publisher Linocerius declares that he shared his plan of putting out the Satyricon with Johannes Richardus, "qui tum se diligentem,
industrium, magnique animi hominem praestoit. Notas paucissimis diebus elaboravit eruditias certe et elegantae". Linocerius goes on to say that he planned to append "has tum quidem solitaria" to his edition when Dousa's Praevidanea came to him from Germany. Thus the two pieces of commentary appeared in both the 1585 and 1587 editions published by Linocerius at Paris. Although the Praevidanea were reprinted frequently, as has been pointed out, the Notae of Richard are found nowhere else.

The Notae present critical comments relating to a number of passages interspersed throughout the Satyricon.

Papillon, in his article on Richardus, refers to the latter's composition of "quelques courtes Notes sur Pétrone". He correctly mentions the first appearance of these together with the commentary of the Elder Dousa in the Linocerius edition of 1585; his authority is LaCaille's Histoire de l'Imprimerie de Paris. But when he goes on to write of the subsequent fortune of these notes, Papillon proceeds to associate them with the Christophori Biturigis Notae in Petronium (see 10, below, where the independence of the two sets of commentary is made evident). He bases the association largely on stylistic qualities pointed out to be common to the two by "un Critique du premier ordre, qui ne doute en aucune façon, que Jean Richard de Dijon ne soit le véritable Auteur de ces Notes". (The critic is not identified). Papillon adds that greater conviction will be imparted by the reading of the De antiqua Francorum Origine (see below), but he does not make plain whether the conviction will arise from similarity in content or in stylistic features. The similarity, such as it may be, he declares to be responsible for the fact that Fabricius has attributed the Notae to the "faux Christophe Richard de Bourges".


In the catalogue of Richardus' writings which they present, both Cloranesco and Richard Papillon include De antiqua Francorum origine, fragmentum ex Scholis Jo. Richardi ad Petronium Arbitrum. A copy of the work, published by J. Richer at Paris in 1611, may be found in both the Bibliothèque Nationale and the Harvard University Library. The title, however, is misleading in that the work is not a commentary on Petronius. The sole echo of the Satyricon is the opening lemma on page 17: "Ego autem frigidior hyeme Gallica factus" (quoted from 19.3).

Editions:
1585. See I. 1 above.
1587. See I. 1 above.

Biography:
Johannes Richardus (Jean Richard) lived in the second half of the sixteenth century in Burgundy. What we know of him, apart from what can be found in his own works, is derived from the account in Charles Fevre, Dialogus, de claris Fori Burgundici oratoribus. (On this account Richard Papillon heavily relies in his article in the Bibliothèque des Auteurs de Bourgogne). Richardus was a distinguished jurisprudent of Burgundy, though one conspicuous for the extent of his reading and his erudition rather than for the practical attributes associated with his profession. Fevre calls him an excellent poet and extravagantly compares his powers with qualities of classical writers such as Virgil, Martial, Catullus, and Anaacreon.

Works: Poetry, partly Latin but mainly French, including French adaptations of the Psalms and his main work Amusemens Poétiques, which is no longer extant; a defense of the Catholic faith; the edition of Petronius; and De Francorum origine.

Bibli.: Cloranesco, # 19161- # 19166; C. Fevre, Dialogus, de claris Fori Burgundici oratoribus, Dijon, 1654, 77-83; R. Papillon, Bibliothèque des Auteurs de Bourgogne, II, Dijon, 1745, 202-203.

The catalogue of Richard's writings appended by Papillon largely matches the list in Cloranesco, but Cloranesco omits the
Notae of 1585 and includes two theological compositions not mentioned by Papillon ($19163$ and $19164$).

10. Anonymus A editionis Patissonii 1587.

A piece of commentary entitled *In Petronii Arbitri Satyricon Notae* is printed on pages 1-24 of the second part of the Pithoeus edition published by Patissonius at Paris in 1587. Although it opens with an introductory address "Patissonio S.," there is no indication of the identity of the author. The *Notae* with the same title and the same content appear in the Wouwer edition of 1596, but the opening address is omitted. The Goldast edition of 1610, and the reprintings of it, attribute both the preface and the commentary to Christophorus Richardus Biturix. This identification of the author is perpetuated in a number of subsequent editions, including the Bifontine, where the statement is made that Pithoeus utilized "notas Richardi Biturigis et spicilegium Dupeyralii" (p. xxiv).

The authorship of these *Notae* is complicated further by the possibility that they were composed by Pithoeus himself. That possibility rests upon the judgment of Bongarsius. On page 116 of a copy of the second Wouwer edition, published at Paris by Beys in 1601, Bongarsius has written "P. Pitheoi" between the heading and the body of the commentary, to the right of the word *Notae*. The copy is stored in the collection of Bongarsius’ holdings (the Bibliotheca Bongarsia) in the Burgerbibliothek Bern (g 272). On the basis of this evidence, Müller ascribes the *Notae* to Pithoeus (introduction to his edition of the *Satyricon*, L-LI). Finally, an eighteenth-century scholar, R. Papillon, assigns the *Notae* to Johannes Richardus (see p. 331, above).

The *Notae* present a series of comments on textual matters, setting forth considerations underlying the adoption of a given reading. In the process, matters of meaning and interpretation cannot be ignored; parallels from other classical writings are introduced.


*Notae. [Inc.]: quam id quod putant gratissimum auditoribus fore* editio Lugdunensis in vetere codice scriptum esse testatur, auribus, quod ego emendatius puto, quam auditoribus. [Expl.]: Scripsi ego de conlectura, conclusi; quamvis in libros Nonii legitur, conclusi, quod nec infizor defendi posse.

*Editions*:

1587. See I, 2 above.

1596. (without the introductory address) See I, 3 above.

1601. " " " " See I, 3 above.

1604. " " " " See I, 3 above.

1608. " " " " See I, 3 above.

1610. See I, 4 above.

1614. (without the introductory address) See I, 3 above.

1615. See I, 4 above.

1618. See I, 4 above.

1621. See I, 4 above.

1623. (without the introductory address) See I, 3 above.

1624. " " " " See I, 3 above.

1626. " " " " See I, 3 above.

11. Anonymus B editionis Patissonii 1587

Immediately following the *Notae* in the Pithoeus edition of 1587, on pages 25-78 of the second part, are the *Ad Idem Petronii Arbitri Satyricon, Collectanea*. The commentary, with the same heading and the same content, is found in the Wouwer edition of 1596 and the reprints of it. A different heading, assigning the authorship of the commentary to Franciscus Pithoeus, is introduced in the Goldast edition of 1610 and is per-
petuated in the reprints of that edition. The entry in the Index Interpretum describes the commentary in this way: "Francisci Pitheoei IC. Collectanea. Huic enim a plerisque Criticis publice adscribitur".

One of the scholars responsible for attributing the Collectanea to Franciscus Pitheoeus was Borgarsius. On page 241 of his copy of the second Wouwer edition published at Paris by Beys in 1601, he has written "Fr. Pitheol" after the word Collectanea in the heading. The copy is in the Bibliotheca Borgartia in the Burgerbibliothek Bern, g 272.

The Collectanea present quotations from other classical writers, both Greek and Roman, that parallel passages in the Satyricon. An accompanying comment involves sometimes the language employed in the passage under consideration and sometimes the content (although differentiation between language and content is not always clearcut).

[Inc.]: (ed. Patisson., 1587). Ut cum in forum venerint, putent se in alium terrarum orbem delatos) Seneca in proemio lib. 9 Controversiarum: Itaque velut ex umbroso et obscurro prodeuntes loco clarae lucis fulgor obcaecat. Sic istos a scholis in forum transeuntes, omnia lanquam nova et inuitata perturbant...[Expl.]: Et coeli summas Quid si legas, Et Cilli summas avocet auriculas? ξίλλος: δῆφος; Somniarunt enim Nationes caput asinimum deum fuisset Iudaeorum, quod refutant Iosephus, Tertullian.

Editions:
1587. See I, 2 above.
1596. See I, 3 above.
1601. See I, 3 above.
1604. See I, 3 above.
1608. See I, 3 above.
1610. See I, 4 above.
1614. See I, 3 above.
1615. See I, 4 above.
1618. See I, 4 above.
1621. See I, 4 above.
1623. See I, 3 above.
1624. See I, 3 above.
1626. See I, 3 above.

12. JANUS DOUSA FILIUS.

The Spicilegium of Janus Doussa Filius (1571-1597) was first printed in the Wouwer edition of 1596, but it appears to have been composed somewhat earlier. Christopher Beys, the printer of one of the four Wouwer editions issued in 1601, singles out the Younger Doussa for mention along with Pitheoeus and Wouwer as making notable contributions to Petronian exegesis; the fact that Beys places the name of Doussa between those of the other two may be an indication that the Spicilegium was composed between 1587 and 1596. Michaud (Biographie Universelle, XI, 274) sets the date as 1594. The commentary appeared in the Wouwer and Goldast editions as well as the reprints of each.

The Spicilegium consists of a series of notes presenting textual variants and correlating passages in the Satyricon with those of compositions in classical literature, both Greek and Roman.


FINIS.

Editions:
1596. See I, 3 above.
1601. See I, 3 above.
1604. See I, 3 above.
1608. See I, 3 above.
1610. See I, 4 above.
1614. See I, 3 above.
1615. See I, 4 above.
1618. See I, 4 above.
1621. See I, 4 above.
1623. See I, 3 above.
1624. See I, 3 above.
1626. See I, 3 above.

Biography:
Janus Doussa Filius (Johann van der Does) was born at Noordwyk on January 26, 1571, and died at 's Gravenhage on December 26, 1597. As his name implies, he was the son of the author of the Praecidianae. The two were allied in a number of literary activities; hence, the death of the young man at the age of twenty-six left the father inconsolable in his being deprived of both a dear son and an esteemed co-worker.
LATIN AUTHORS

From a very early age the young Dousa engaged in scholarly endeavors, devoting himself to Latin, Greek, and Hebrew and to Roman law and antiquities in addition to mathematics and astronomy. For two years he served as tutor of Prince Frederick-Henry, the son of William I, ruler of Holland. In 1591 he became librarian of the University of Leyden, a post he proceeded to hold for three years.

Three volumes of the Younger Dousa's poetry were published. In addition to the Specilegium in Petronii Arbitri Satyricon, he commented on Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius, as well as on Plautus. For a full listing, see BN CC (1971) 962-66.

Bibl.: Michaud XI, 274; Nieuw Nederlands Biographisch Woordenboek VI (1924) 429-30; Van der Aa IV (1858) 219-21.

13. JOHANNES a WOOWEREN

Johannes a Wouweren published an edition of the Satyricon in 1596; attached to the edition, in addition to some commentaries printed in earlier editions, were three pieces bearing the stamp of the young editor himself. The first, the dedication to Joseph Scaliger, deals at great length with the vindication of Petronius as the author of obscene and scurrilous matter. The content of the second, Variorum in P. Arbitrum Observationes, is apparent from its title; these notes, however, are prefaced by a composition in which Wouweren makes clear the rationale of the collection, namely, the deplorable condition of Petronius at the time of his "rebirth" and the devotion of unflagging effort by scholars of the sixteenth century to the remedying of that condition. Wouweren's own efforts in the interpretation and explication of the Satyricon are represented in the third, the lengthy Animadversiones; these too have a preface, a wordy address "Ad Lectorem".

Variorum in P. Arbitrum Observationes

1. Dedicatio Iosepho Scaligero
   (ed. Leiden, 1596)
   Viro Illustri
   Iosepho Scaligero
   Iul. Caesaris Fil.
   Ioan. a Wouweren
   S.D.

[Inc.]: Fama sublimis, eruditione nobilis, nobilitate Illustris Iosephe Scaliger, Aristippum saltare coactum in purpura dixisse scribit Laertius: ... [. . .] [Expl.]: Itaque ne toties ad hoc templum gratis accedam, laborem teneum et exiguum obfero, veri legitimique muneri obsidem, quod meae quidem temeritati haud recuso accedere; tamen si non prorsus fastidias votoriam hanc tabellam nominis tui templo dicatum, in coelum abire videor. Vale Vir Illust. Lugduni Batavorum M D XCV.

2. Variorum in P. Arbitrum Observationes
   Praefatio [Inc.]: Anni fere XXCV. postquam renatus Petronius, sed pro nefas tam ruptus, et multifariam truncatus, ut potius informe pecus ex matris visceribus excisum, quam legitimus foetus. . . . [. . .] [Expl.]: Selegimus autem necessaria, nam omnia adicere nec libuit, nec per formam libri licuit.


3. Animadversiones Johannis a Wouweren
   Ad Lectorem. [Inc.]: Curanti mihi novam Petroni editionem, animus principio fuit haud paucis adicere, quo nova luce hunc auctorem suffunderem, nescio qua levi ductus insanias; . . . [. . .] [Expl.]: Indubie saepius peccatum, quippe qui homo et adhuc iuvenis. Caeterum placebo tibi, si me culpam emendare permiseris. Hoc te rogo lector.


FINIS.
Editions:

Dedicaio Scaligero
1596. See I, 3 above.
1601. See I, 3 above.
1604. See I, 3 above.
1615. See I, 4 above.
1709. See I, 6 above.
1743. See I, 6 above.

[Since I have not seen the Wouwer editions beyond 1604 or the Goldast editions of 1610, 1618, 1621, I do not know whether they include the various materials. Conceivably my list is incomplete].

Praefatio
1596. See I, 3 above.
1601. See I, 3 above.
1604. See I, 3 above.
1615. See I, 4 above.

(Appears twice: once at the start of the Observatioines without the name of the author, and separately with his name).

1709. See I, 6 above.
1743. See I, 6 above.

Observatioines
1596. See I, 3 above.
1601. See I, 3 above.
1604. See I, 3 above.
1615. See I, 4 above.

(without the name of the author).

1629. See I, 5 above.

Ad Lectorem
1596. See I, 3 above.
1601. See I, 3 above.
1604. See I, 3 above.
1615. See I, 4 above.
1709. See I, 6 above.
1743. See I, 6 above.

Animadversiones
1596. See I, 3 above.
1601. See I, 3 above.
1604. See I, 3 above.
1615. See I, 4 above.
1621. See I, 4 above.

Bibliography:

Johannes a Wouwer (Jan van der Wouwer) was born on March 10, 1574, and died on March 30, 1612. He was a native of Hamburg, but travelled to Leyden, where he was a pupil of Scaliger, and Antwerp, and later to France and Italy. He was one of a group of scholars working in the Netherlands and in nearby German territories, especially in Hamburg, concerned primarily with post-classical Latin writings. Bursian pays greater tribute to the scope of their activities than to the depth of it and describes them as compilers more than perceptive critics. Wouwelen is singled out for greater praise than his fellows.

His maiden effort was the 1596 edition of the Satyricum. The prefatory remarks in which he referred to the temerity of his venture (see above) were echoed in a statement eight years later: he alluded to the "editione abortivi libelli qui mihi quasi tentanti vadum futuri favoris praeeussus, infelicibus auspiciis praesuist" (Tractatus de Polymathia, I, edition published at Leipzig in 1665, page 10). This Tractatus de Polymathia, published originally at Hamburg in 1604, is described as a fragment of a larger work on the learned studies of the ancients, the first attempt at a general survey and systematic investigation of classical learning.

Wouwelen was responsible for an edition of Apuleius published at Basel in 1606. He also devoted himself to work on the Church Fathers, among them Minucius Felix, Cyprian, and Tertullian.

Bibli.: C. Bursian, Geschichte der classischen Philologie in Deutschland I (1883) 302-03; J. E. Sandys, History of Classical Scholarship II, 306; Van der Aa, Biographisch Woordenboek der Nederlanen XI (1876) 132-33.


Although he was only twenty-three years old at the time, Gaspar Barthius (Caspar von Barth) sent his Racemationes to Goldast for inclusion in the edition issued by the latter in 1610. This he did, it appears from a statement in the prefatory address, in accordance with a promise made earlier, so that it is likely that the commentary was composed not long after 1600. This inference is supported by another statement: "Multa in eo [Petronio, i.e] olim ego disputavi".
Barthius was an omnivorous reader and a precocious writer (see below) so that his composition of the *Racemationes* at a youthful age is not to be wondered at. They were reprinted in his *Adversaria* fourteen years later, where they were incorporated in a chapter on Petronius (Chapter VI of Book XXI).

The commentary comprises a number of references to selections in other writings, mainly Latin, which bear a relationship (sometimes not too clear or overt) to passages in the *Satyricon*.


Apollinis arma] alludit Virgilius lib. 8.

_Editions:_

1610. See I, 4 above.
1615. See I, 4 above.
1618. See I, 4 above.
1621. See I, 4 above.

(*) 1624, Frankfurt. With the *Adversaria._

Ebert # 1688 ; Graesse, Vol. I 301.

_Biography:_

Gaspar Barthius (Caspar von Barth) was born at Küstrin on June 21, 1587, and died at Leipzig on September 17, 1658. Into his lifetime he crowded an overwhelming amount of both reading and writing, but critics to a man are impressed by the quantity of each much more than by its quality. He professed to have read sixteen thousand authors of every kind, but the opinion of Jean Gaspard Gevaerts that he was “multae lectionis sed exigui judicii” (found in a letter to Nicolaus Helmsius in Burmann’s *Sylloge epistularum*, II, ep. 469, p. 763) is both quoted and affirmed by a number of scholars. Hallam, for example, described him as “an immense repository of unconnected criticisms and other miscellaneous erudition” (*Introduction to the Literature of Europe in the Fifteenth, Sixteenth, Seventeenth Centuries*, II, 378).

It is Hallam who also wrote of Barthius that “ . . . he does not stand on very high ground as a critic, on account of the rapidity with which he wrote, and for the same reason has sometimes contradicted himself” (op. cit., II, note c on 379). Derogation of the same kind is found in Bursian’s judgment of Barthius’s critical writing (I, 289).

His most celebrated composition is the _Adversariorum libri LX_, published at Frankfurt in 1624 and 1658. In addition, on his death he left twice as many books in manuscript, which have not been published. In the _Adversaria_ are a number of passages concerned with the *Satyricon*, notably a “Dissertatio . . . an eius tolerabilis sit lectio, an vero abicienda, ut volunt quidam de virtute locuti”. The treatise is printed in the Lotichius edition of the *Satyricon* (I, 5 above) with the date “Anno Christi 1608”.

A complete list of Barthius’s writings is found in _BN_, volume 8 (1924), 63-66.


15. GASPAR SCHOPPIUS.

Gaspar Schoppius (1576-1649) is the author of two compositions related to the *Satyricon*. The first, _Syrenes Petronianae sive Elegantiores ex Petronii Satyrico Phrases_, was composed in the closing years of the sixteenth century. The work is a word book presenting Latin equivalents, more often German equivalents, for expressions in the *Satyricon*. (It was printed in the Lotichius edition of 1629).

The other composition, _Symbola Critica in T. Petronii Arbitri Satyricon_, is stated in the 1629 printing of the *Satyricon* edited by Gonsaluis de Salas to have been written in 1604. In an address to the reader, de Salas declares that in a meeting with Schoppius about nine years earlier, the latter mentioned notes which he had composed on Petronius at some time in the past and which he was willing to make available to de Salas.
Gonsalius de Salas Lectori. (ed. Frankfurt, 1629) [Inc.]: Novem circiter abhinc annis, quum vir ingenii doctrinaeque gloria excellentis Gaspar Schoppius negotii sui, immo Catholicae religionis, gerendi causa caud apud nos ageret, valde enim mecum illum coniuncto ratio communis litterarum studiorumque consensio... [Expl.]: Ego quidem, cui laude sua fraudare quemlibet semper religio fuit, eas tibi sub eiusdem nomine fideltatem exhibere malui, ut ex illis quamquam exiguis penicillii lineamentis solertem etiam artificis manus liceat agnoscere. Frueatur iam lector et Vale.

The *Symbola Critica* are printed on pages 449-462 of the de Salas edition. They present parallels from other classical writings for various expressions appearing in the *Satyricon*.


The commentary is followed by two indexes: an "Index scriptorum veterum quorum loca in praeludis et commentis adducuntur" and an "Index succinctum, qui in his commentis vel citantur vel notantur". Both were apparently compiled by Ioannes Schefferus Germanus Wetteravus, who explains that he undertook the task at the request of de Salas, who was too busy. In the course of his remarks, he confirms that the *Symbola Critica* were composed when Schoppius was young but later revised to some extent.

Editions:

1629. Frankfurt: W. Hoffmann. BM; BN; (MH).

Biography:

Gaspar Schoppius (Scioppius, Schoppe) drew attention to himself by both his scholarly activity and his vitriolic pen. The latter was evident in the literary feuds he carried on with Scaliger, Casaubon, Strada, and Barthius, and won for him the epithet "canis grammaticus". Although he was converted to Catholicism in 1598, he refused to affiliate himself with the Jesuits; thus he engaged in controversy both with the members of that sect and with the Protestants whom he had deserted.

Schoppius was born at Nuremberg on May 27, 1576, and died on November 19, 1649. He studied at Heidelberg, Altdorf, and Ingolstadt. When only twenty, he wrote *Verisimilla*, a work concerned with writers of Latin prose, and a year later, *Suspectae Lectiones*, conjectures on Plautus and Apuleius. Sandys describes the first as "a work evincing critical acumen and multifarious reading, as well as vanity and shameless dishonesty" (A *History of Classical Scholarship*, II, 362). In all, Schoppius produced about one hundred compositions, of which twenty-seven were on subjects related to Latin grammar. His *opus matus* was the *Grammatica Philosphica*, published in 1628. His writings are listed in BN, 168 (1946), 899-923.


16. Michael Caspar Lundorpius
(Georgius Erhardus).

The *Symbolae* (or *Sylloge*) *Annotationum et Observationum in Petronium* of "Georgius Erhardus" were first printed in the Goldast edition of 1610 and were reprinted in the three re-issues of that edition (I, 4 above). Whether "Georgius Erhardus" is the name of an actual person is a matter on which there is considerable room for doubt. The name seems to be, rather, a pseudonym adopted by the author of the *Symbolae*. Complicating the question is the presence of two persons to whom the pseudonym has been applied in connection with the authorship of the commentary.

That the pseudonym Georgius Erhardus was assumed by Goldast himself is stated in the Bipontine Edition of the *Satyricon* published in 1790 (page xxvi). The bases.
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for the statement are not spelled out. This identification is accepted by Buecheler (ed. mai., xxxviii), Bursian (1, 281), and Gaselee (The Bibliography of Petronius, 149).

The Bipontine Edition, however, goes on to mention the existence of the belief that the pseudonym was that of Michael Caspar Lundorpius — again without presenting any bases for the belief. Such a belief had been voiced as early as 1629: in listing the commentaries included in the 1621 edition of the Satyricon (Catalogus III.), Lotichius terms the Symbolae the composition "Georgii Erhardi Franci, sive potius Michaëlis Casparis Lundorpi Francofordiniani".

Lotichius is more explicit on this point in two other places in his edition. In his heading for the Homologoumena (page 1), he states: "Olim sub Georgii Erhardi Franci nomine edita, nunc recognita et aucta anno 1625". In the Catalogus entry listing the Homologoumena, he anticipates this statement: "olim sub Georgii Erhardi Franci nomine edita, nunc ab ipso auctore, paulo antequam obiret, recognita et maximam partem aucta".

Moreover, Lotichius specifically relates the dual identity situation to the Symbolae in another place. In a footnote to an item in the supplement to the Homologoumena (pages 345-346), he declares that the true author of the Symbolae was Michael Caspar Lundorpius but that he adopted the pseudonym Erhardus because of his professional position: "quod esset Praeceptor Classicus in Schola huius Urbis, invidiam Scholarcharum Collegarumque suorum veritus". The footnote adds that Lundorpius intended to clear up the true identity of the author in a reprinting of the work but was prevented by death from doing so.

The authority of Lotichius largely underlies the position of Ernst Fischer that Lundorpius is the author of both the Symbolae and the Homologoumena (Michael Caspar Lundorp, Der Herausgeber der Acta publica, Berlin, 1870, 4-8). Fischer justifies the credibility of Lotichius on the ground that the latter was a trusted friend of both Goldast and Lundorpius. The close relations of the two between early 1607 and the time of the publication of the Satyricon in 1610 (a closeness which did not extend beyond 1611) are also emphasized by Fischer; he leaves no doubt that in his mind Goldast collected the Petronian materials but Lundorpius organized and synthesized them (8-9).

The Symbolae, a voluminous body of commentary, concern a large number of critical details relating to the Satyricon and its author. To be found are interpretative and explanatory remarks, references to parallel passages in classical authors (notably the Roman writers Horace, Cicero, Virgil, Sallust, Juvenal, and Martial), and comments by later scholars and editors on comparable passages.

[Inc.]: (ed. Paris, 1615) T. PETRONII ARBITRI] Ima legit Lambinus Comment. ad Lucret. lib. 4. in vulgatis quibusdam editi- nibus legitur C. PETRONII ARBITRI, apud Scalig. in Catalect. C. PETRONII ARBITRI AFRANI. Iust. Lipsius ad li. 16. Annal. Tacit. . . . (Following this concern with the praenomen of Petronius, a lengthy discussion of Petronius and, later, of the Satyricon is presented. The final passage of the Satyricon proper elicits the comment) [Expl.]: Saguntini vide And. Schotti Not. in Auctorem de Vir. illustr. n. 42.

The next entry has to do with Massilien- ses, in the first of the Fragmenta, and passages in that supplement receive detailed attention. The final concern of the commentary is with other individuals bearing the name Petronius.

Editions:
1610. See I, 4 above.
1615. See I, 4 above.
1618. See I, 4 above.
1621. See I, 4 above.

Biography:
Michael Caspar Lundorpius (Lundorp) was born at Frankfurt on an unknown date in the 1570's or 1580's and died in the same city in 1629, probably before September. To Frankfurt he confined his activities except for university study at Marburg, which he undertook in 1601, and a brief residence in Wittenberg a few years later. From June 12, 1605, to February 17, 1607, Lundorpius served as "praecceptor in quinta classe" in his native city, but not to the
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satisfaction of his superiors: he was relieved of his responsibilities because of indolence and obstinacy. He turned to non-academic activity for a short time and later sought without success to return to teaching; he finally found his niche in the compilation of historical data.

To the lean period after the dismissal from his teaching post belongs the association of Lundorpius with Goldast referred to previously. The association did not last after 1611, the year in which Goldast transferred his activities from Frankfurt to Weimar.

Fischer, on the basis of undisclosed evidence, states that Lundorpius returned to Petronian studies shortly before his death; from these there are no extant writings.

Lundorpius' literary activity is represented by a number of editions of the Acta publica, some issued after his death in 1629. His writings are listed in BN, volume 101 (1930), pages 936-942.