

PETRONIUS ARBITER

by A. FRED SOCHATOFF
(Carnegie-Mellon University)

<i>Fortuna.</i>	313
Bibliography.	321
I. Composite Editions.	322
1. 1585 edition.	
2. 1587 edition.	
3. 1596 edition.	
4. 1610 edition.	
5. 1629 edition.	
6. 1709 edition.	
II. <i>Satyricon.</i>	324
Commentaries.	
1. Anonymus Dresdensis Dc 141 (<i>De bello civili</i> only).	
2. Anonymus Monacensis 23713 (<i>De bello civili</i> only).	
3. Hermannus Buschius (<i>De bello civili</i> only).	
4. Johannes Alexander Brassicanus.	
5. Petrus Daniel.	
6. Claudius Binetus (<i>Epigrammata</i> only).	
7. Janus Dousa.	
8. Gulielmus Dupeyratius.	
9. Johannes Richardus.	
10. Anonymus A editionis Patissonii 1587.	
11. Anonymus B editionis Patissonii 1587.	
12. Janus Dousa Filius.	
13. Johannes a Wouweren.	
14. Gaspar Barthius.	
15. Gaspar Schoppius.	
16. Michael Caspar Lundorpius (Georgius Erhardus).	

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

chose to submerge his talents under a guise of studied lethargy and profligacy. Drawn to the attention of Nero, he became the "elegantiae arbiter" 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 testimonia, 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-

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 *volamina* (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

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. Marmorale, who sets up an Antonine date for the author and his activity (*La questione Petroniana*, Bari, 1947).

2. For the name of Petronius' composition, see, among others, E. T. Sage, Introduction to *The Satyricon* (New York, 1929), xvii; K. Müller, *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, xxiii and Notes, 210; the introduction to Franz Buecheler, *editio maior* (Berlin, 1862), vii; Richard Heinze, "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*.

4. See M. E. Grisebach, *Die Wanderung der Novelle von der treulosen Witwe durch die Weltliteratur*, Berlin, 1886.

5. The text and critical record of these appear in, among other places, Buecheler, *ed. mai.*, introduction.

6. *The Satiricon* (note 2 above), 198.

(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 Monsterolio 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 "Aufranius" verses 25 and 26 of the *De bello civili*.¹²

A friend of Joannes de Monsterolio, 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 Macrobiani principium super somnio Scipionis, ubi enumerans genera fabularum dicit, in eis esse argumenta fictis amatorum casibus referta, quibus multum se Arbitrator exercuit. Est autem homo gravis versu et prosa constans et, ut conicio, paulo post tempora Augusti".¹³

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

11. In II.4.12, II.4.19, III.3.6, and II.3.3. See Buecheler, *loc. cit.*; Collignon, 18; also Ullman (note 8 above), 21, and Antonius Thomas, *De Joannis de Monsterolio 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 *Epistolario* [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

7. The work of Heiric, of John of Salisbury, and of some others is treated by Buecheler, xi ff, and A. Collignon, *Pétrone en France* (Paris, 1905), 10 ff. An Irish text tradition has recently been postulated by Díaz y Díaz in "La tradición textual de Petronio", *Euphrosyne*, 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).

8. See B. L. Ullman, "Petronius in the Mediaeval Florilegia", *Classical Philology* 25 (1930), 11-21. See also Buecheler, *ed. mal.*, xxvi-xxxiii.

9. *The Satiricon*, 198.

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 iuvenum mores arguit atque se-
num.

quare ille praesa gaudet lasciva puella,
at quoque delicias frigida sentit anus.
nam rbter diri scripsitque Neronis amic-

tu
arbiter, arbitrio dictus et ipse 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 Latino-phile 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 Vindobonensis 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 Lundorpii Homologoumena* reproduced in the Lotichius edition of 1629, the epigram is assigned to "Gaius 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 praesa* (line 3), the Lotichius reading is *illo prae se*, and for the clearly corrupt *rbter* (line 5), the Lotichius reading is *subter*.

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 "Cumarum", 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 inter-linear 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.

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 Zarotus, about 1482 : HR 13119 ; BMC VI, 718 [undated] ; Goff P-813). For the evidence on the disputed date, see the BMC description, also Rini (Bibliography IV, below), 19-24. The editor, Puteolanus, described his "fragmentum Petronii Arbitri" as "incuria quidem temporum mancum et adeo mutilatum, ut vix cognosci possit, eiusmodi tamen, ut non rejici debeat".

2) with Dio Chrysostomus, *De Troia non capta*, Venice, Bernardinus Venetus de Vitalibus, 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 Singrenius. The 1523 Singrenius edition contains textual comments, but these are not at all extensive nor particularly noteworthy. 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 vitia Romanorum reprehenduntur". Neither edition, moreover, contains any trace of Busch's *Annotationes*, which we are informed (see p. 325 below) were "recitatae in Academia Lipsica et ex ore eius exceptae a M. P. anno 1501". These *Annotationes*, to be examined more closely in the second part of this article, are reproduced in a number of later editions, notably that of Goldast and the numerous reprintings of his edition.

The three earliest editions of the *Satyricon* were almost identical in content and text, which was of the Family II variety. The editor of the third, Reginaldus Chalderius, 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 appended 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 Pithoeus wrote his own *Adversaria*, quoting the *Satyricon* from what appears to be a Family I manuscript. Turnebus and Pithoeus were not associated, but the manuscript employed by both was conceivably one owned by Enricus Memmius, who "domi sub sera et claustra habet, ne quem foris obscoenus et lascivus scriptor impura sua petulantia contaminet".¹⁸ Family I readings were introduced by Pithoeus 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, usually 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 Nico-

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* (Orleans, 1634), 20.

raus Cippicus located at Traù (now Trogir), a town of Dalmatia, the scholar Marinus Statileus 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.¹⁹ 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.²⁰ The newly found passages were first incorporated in the Frambotto 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.²¹ 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 Traù 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

19. See A. C. Clark, "The Trau Manuscript of Petronius", *Classical Review* 22 (1908), 178 ff.

20. See p. 316 above. The Italian origin of the manuscript is discussed by Remigio Sabbadini, *Le scoperte dei codici latini e greci ne' secoli XIV e XV*, I (Firenze, 1905) 83-84, and II (1914), 240.

21. Many of the documents written during the controversy are printed in the Burmann editions of 1709 and 1743. The documents are summarized in a detailed description of the controversy by Rini, 64 ff.

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.²² 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

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 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 Pithoeus, 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 prae-fatio*, was published not only in the 1587 Pithoeus 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 Pithoeus, 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

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.

Franz Buecheler, *editio maior* (Berlin, 1862); E. T. Sage (New York, 1929), revised and expanded by B. B. Gilleland (New York, 1969); K. Müller (Muenchen, 1961); A. Ernout, 4th ed. (Paris, 1962); with an English translation by M. Heseltine, revised by E. H. Warmington, in the Loeb Classical Library (London and Cambridge, Mass., 1969).

II. Petronius and his work.

E. Auerbach, *Mimesis*, tr. W. Trask (Garden City, 1947) 20-43; G. Bagnani, *Arbiter of Elegance: A Study of the Life and Works of C. Petronius* (Toronto, 1954); G. Boissier, *L'Opposition sous les Césars* (Paris, 1892); P. B. Corbett, *Petronius* (New York, 1970); G. Highet, "Petronius the Moralist" *Transactions of the American Philological Association* LXXII (1941) 176-94; E. Klebs, "Zur Composition von Petronius' Satirae" *Philologus* XLVII (1889) 623-35; W. Kroll, in Pauly-Wissowa XIX (1938) 1201-14; T. Mommsen, "Trimalchios Heimat und Grabschrift" *Hermes*

XIII (1878) 106-21; O. Ribbeck, *Geschichte der römischen Dichtung*, Vol. III (Stuttgart, 1894) 150-69; K. P. C. Rose, *The Date and Author of the Satyricon* (Leiden, 1971); M. Schanz and C. Hosius, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*, Vol. II, 4th edition (München, 1935) 509-20; J. P. Sullivan, *The Satyricon of Petronius: A Literary Study* (London and Bloomington, 1968).

III. Textual tradition and bibliography.

Charles Beck, *The Manuscripts of the Satyricon of Petronius Arbiter Described and Collated* (Cambridge, 1863); E. Brugnoli, *Petronius* (Rome, 1961); H. Fuchs, "Zum Petrontext" *Philologus* 93 (1938) 157-75; S. Gaselee, *The Bibliography of Petronius* (Transactions of the Bibliographical Society of London, Vol. X) London, 1910; R. Helm, "Petronius. Bericht über das Schrifttum d. J. 1936-40", *Bursians Jahresbericht* 282 (1943) 5-11; E. Linkomies, "De textu Petroniano recensendo" *Arctos* 2 (1958) 64-7; E. Lommatzsch, reviews of Petronian studies in *Bursians Jahresbericht* 175 (1919) 98-103; 204 (1925) 215-18; 235 (1932) 142-48; 260 (1938) 94-100; R. Muth, "Petronius. Forschungsbericht 1941-55", *Anzeiger für die Altertumswissenschaft* 9 (1956) 1-22; *The Petronian Society Newsletter*, published by the Department of Classics, University of Florida 1970-; E. T. Sage, "The Text Tradition of Petronius" *American Journal of Philology* L (1929) 21-39; G. Schmeling "Petronian Scholarship since 1957" *Classical World* LXII (1969) 157-64; H. C. Schnurr, "Petronian Studies of 1940-56" *Classical Weekly* L (1957) 133-36; 141-43; B. L. Ullman, "The Text of Petronius in the Sixteenth Century" *Classical Philology* XXV (1930) 128-54.

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

(1962) 143-47; M. Manitius, "Beiträge zur Geschichte römischer Dichter im Mittelalter" *Philologus* LXVI (1897) 536-38; V. Pioletti, "Giovanni di Salisbury e la *Cena Trimalchionis*" *Giornale italiano di Filologia* XVII (1964) 350-58; A. Rini, *Petronius in Italy* (New York, 1937); E. T. Sage, "Giraldus Cambrensis and Petronius" *Speculum* II (1927) 203-05; idem, "Petronius, Poggio, and John of Salisbury" *Classical Philology* XI (1916) 12-24.

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.

1. 1585 EDITION AND REPRINT.

1585, Lutetiae Parisiorum (Paris): G. apud Linocerium, ed. G. Linocerus. Contains also Janus Dousa, *Praecidanea*; Johannes Richardus, *Notae*. BM; BN; (CtY).

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

2. 1587 EDITION.

1587, Lutetiae (Paris): apud M. Patissonium, 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 Raphelengium, ed. Johannes a Wouweren. Contains also: Anonymus, *Notae*; Anonymus, *Collectanea*; Varii, *Observationes*; Janus Dousa Filius, *Spicilegium*; Johannes a Wouweren, *Animadversiones*. BM; BN; (CtY).

1601, Lutetiae Parisiorum (Paris): apud Viduam Guilielmi Chaudiere, Via Iacobea,

sub signo Temporis et Hominis silvestris. (CtY).

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

(*) 1601, Lutetiae Parisiorum (Paris): apud Michaellem Sonnum. Graesse V, 238a.

(*) 1601, Lutetiae Parisiorum (Paris): apud Stephanum Valletum. Gaselee, # 18.

(*) 1601, Lutetiae Parisiorum (Paris): apud P. L. Febrevier via Septem viarum prope D. Hilarium. Gaselee, # 20.

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, Valletus (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 Wouweren's Antwerp edition, and . . . they correspond with each other word for word, and are in fact the same book, printed from the same type. . . ."

1604, Lugd. Batavorum (Leiden): Ex officina Plantiniana Raphelengii.

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 Frellon. A reprint of the 1596 edition. BM; BN; (CtY).

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

(*) 1623, Lugduni Batavorum (Leiden), ed. Ioannes Maire. A reprint of the 1604 edition. BM.

(*) 1624, [Amsterdam]: apud Julium Caesium. A reprint of the 1604 edition.

1626, Amsterodami: apud Guil. I. Caesium. A reprint of the 1604 edition. BN; (MH).

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

4. 1610 EDITION AND REPRINTS.

1610, Helenopoli (Frankfurt): pro bibliopoleo Ioannis Theodaldi Schönwetteri,

excudebat J. Bringerus. ed. Melchior Goldast and Michael Caspar Lunderpius. Contains also: Lilius Gregorius Gyraldus, *Petronii vita*; P. Guirandus Alosianus, *Epistola*; Robertus Titius, *Ex praelectione II in Catullum*; Petrus Pithoeus, *Coniectanea*; *De Petronio et eius scriptis*; Hermannus Buschius, *Annotationes... in Satyram De vitiis Romanorum*; Hadrianus Junius Hornanus, *Observationes*; Incerti auctoris *Coniecturae*; Henricus Stephanus, *Emendationes*; Innominati auctoris *Emendationes*; Johannes Sambucus, *Notae*; Franciscus Daniel, *Notae*; Anonymi auctoris *Notae*; Petrus Daniel, *Notae*; Johannes Tornaesius, *Variarum lectionum libellus*; Anonymi *variae lectiones*; Germanus Colladonius, *Notae*; Claudius Binetus, *Notulae*; Christopher Richardus, *Notae*; Franciscus Pithoeus, *Collectanea*; *Variorum in P. Arbitrum Observationes*; Janus Dousa, *Praecidaneorum libri*; Conradus Rittershusius, *Notae*; Janus Dousa Filius, *Spicilegium*; Johannes a Wouweren, *Animadversiones*; Gaspar Barthius, *Racemationes*; Georgius Erhardus Francus, *Symbolae*. BN; (MH).

Graesse (V, 238) says that the *apparatus* of this edition "est conservé dans la Bibliothèque de la ville de Brême (v. Uffenbach, *Reisen*, T. II, p. 259)". The printed catalogue of the Bremen Library (*Verzeichnis der handschriftlichen Bücher und einiger alten Drucke der bremischen öffentlichen Bibliothek*, Bremen, 1834, p. 3) lists cod. 2 a b of Schrank 1 (Folio). 'Collectanea locorum communium ad Petronii Arbitri Satyricon seu generis humani vel mundi speculum instituta et concinnata. Pro memoria locali. VV. CII. Scipioni Gentili et Conrado Rittershusio... Antecessorib. Altorfinis, doctoribus suis... S. P. D. Melchior Haimensfeldius Goldastus, Anno 1610. 2 Bde. Alle Bemerkungen sind auf Papierstreifen geschrieben und der Reihenfolge der Verse nach eingeklebt'.

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. Gaselee # 27.

1621, Francofurtis: in officina Wecheliana apud D. et D. Aubrio et C. Schleichium. BN; (MH).

5. 1629 EDITION

1629, Francofurti ad Moenum: typis exscribebat W. Hofmannus, sumptibus L. Jenisii, 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 Satyricum Notae, castigationes, emendationes, et variae lectiones clarissimorum doctissimorumque... virorum*. This fourth part contains: Michaëlis Casparis Lunderpii Francofordiani *ὈΜΟΛΟΓΟΥΜΕΝΑ*; Casparis Barthii Equitis Saxonis *Dissertatio de Petronio*; Ioannis Alexandri Brassicani *Scholia in Petronii Arbitri Satyrici Fragmenta*; Ioannis Aurati Lemovicis *Emendationes in Petronii Arbitri Satyricon*; Errici Memmii [sic] *Coniecturae in Petronium Arbitrum*; Alphonsi Delbenii *Castigationes in Petronium Arbitrum*; Claudii Puteani *Notae in Petronii Arbitri Satyricon*; Jacobi Bongarsii Bodriani *Notae in Petronii Arbitri Satyricon*; Mamerti Patissonii Parisiensis *Variantiae lectionum*; Joannis a Wouwer *Observationes in Petronii Arbitri Satyricon et Fragmenta*; Casp. Scioppii *Syrenes Petronianae*; Johannis Weitzii *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.

1709, Trajecti ad Rhenum (Utrecht): apud G. VandeWater, ed. Petrus Burmannus. Two parts in one volume. Part II contains: Janus Dousa, *Praecidaneae*; Gonsalvus de Salas, *Commenta*; Johannes Sambucus, *Praefatio et Vita Petronii*; Johannes Tornaesius, *Praefatio*; Lilius Gregorius Gyrardus, *De Petronii vita*; P. Guirandus Alosianus, *Epistola ad Arnaudum*; Robertus Titius, *Ex praelectione superiori epistolae opponenda*; M. Patissonus, *Praefatio*; *De Petronio et ejus scriptis veteres auctorum loci*; Petrus Daniel, *Praefatio*; Claudius Binetus, *Praefatio*; Goldastus, *Prolegomena*; Johannes a Wouweren, *Dedicatio Josepho Scaligero*; idem, *Praefatio*; idem, *Praefatio in observationes variorum a se digestas*; Gaspar Barthius, *Epistola ad Goldastum*; Johannes Petrus Lotichius, *Vita Petronii*; Michael Caspar Lundorpius, *OMOΛOΓΟΥΜΕΝΑ*; *Testimonia in Lundorpianis omissa*; Gaspar Barthius, *Dissertatio de Petronio*; Gonsalvus de Salas, *Praeludia*; *Praefatio Hadrianidae male Bourdelotio adscripta*; *Patavina praefatio*; Blaeuii, *Epistola ad Principem Condaeum*; Johannes Lucius, *Epistola ad Blaeuios*; Johannes Cajus Tilebomenus, *Judicium de fragmento Traguriano*; Johannes Christianus Wagenseilius, *Dissertatio de cena Trimalchionis*; Hadrianus Valesius, *Dissertatio de cena Trimalchionis*; Marinus Statileus, *Responsio ad superiores dissertationes*; idem, *Apologia ad patres conscriptos reipublicae literariae*; Johannes Schefferus, *Dissertatio de fragmenti Traguriani vero auctore*; Thomas Reinesius, *Dedicatio*; idem, *Praefatio*; *Epistolae variorum de Fragmento Traguriano ad Chr. Arnoldum*; Johannes Boschlus, *Praefatio*. BM; BN; (CtY; MH).

1743, Amstelaedami (Amsterdam): apud Janssonio-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 anecdotorum et aliorum*. BM; BN; (CtY; MH).

II. *Satyricon*

Commentaries

1. ANONYMUS DRESDENSIS Dc 141
(*De bello civili* only)

The Codex Dresdensis Dc 141 is lodged in the Saechsische 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 poete sathirici contra vicia Romanorum incipit foeliciter et nota quod.

Sathirus est teste Plinio in quinto Naturalis Historiae hominis figuram habens habitatque in recessu insulae Canopeae in confinibus Ethiopiae et ut scribit divus Jeronimus in vita Pauli ad quem cum pergeret divus Antonius vidit homunculum aduncis naribus et fronte cornibus aspera pedibusque caprinis et praemisso signo crucis cum quisnam esset interrogasset et unde respondisse fertur mortalis ego sum unus ex acolis heremi quos vano errore delusa gentilitas fanos[sic] sathirosque colit. Animal autem est libidinosum valde et petulans. Unde sathira nomen habet quia libundinem[sic], gulam, et avaritiam infehitur[sic].

Commentary:

[Inc.]: Intentio sive argumentum poetae. Petronius reprehendit in hac vicia Romanorum et praecipue avaritiam ex qua proveniunt discordiae cum exteris nationibus, deinde cum civibus. Tandem libertas rei publicae per discordiam adempta est. Incipit igitur ab indignatione ut solent sathirici invehens in eorum avritia[sic] orbem iam totum et cetera. . ./. . .[Expl.] Epidauros civitas Graeciae unde advectus est Asculapius in forma serpentis non longe a Drusio.

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

Graduate School: Abstracts of Theses, Researches in Progress, and Bibliography of Publications, University of Pittsburgh *Bulletin*, vol. 31, no. 1 (October 1, 1934), 294-301; the same, "Stephanus and the Text of Petronius' *Bellum Civile*," *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, XCIV (1963), 282-283.

Manuscript:

Dresden, Saechsische Landesbibliothek, cod. Dc 141, s. xv (1489), fol. 13v-20. Cf. F. Schnorr von Carolsfeld and L. Schmidt, *Katalog I* (1882), 321.

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 Dc 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.

Introduction. [Inc.] Titulus: Petronii Arbitri Satyrarum que ex suis extat sola integra incipit. Fuit hic poeta Claudii Neronis temporibus coetaneus Persio qui miro artificio in Romanorum avaritiam et luxuriam suis satiris invecutus est. Scripsit etiam soluta oratione sed omnia eius opera ob vetustatem et temporum malitiam interierunt. Satura vetus a Graecis primum inventa similis erat veteri comediae quam descripsit Epicharmus. Postea facta est latior quae

sales reprehensionem et vitiorum detestationem continebat; eam descripserunt Ennius, Horatius, Iuvenalis et Persius. Dicta est autem sathira a diis silvestribus quos sathiros appellant qui lascivi sunt et fugaces habentes cornua in frontibus et pedes caprinos ut scribit Plinius et divus Ironimus in vita Pauli primi heremitis.

Commentary:

[Inc.]: Intentio vel argumentum poetae. Reprehendit Petronius in hac sathira vitia Romanorum praecipue avaritiam ex qua pervenerunt discordiae primum cum exteris nationibus, deinde cum civibus. Tandem libertas rei publicae Romanis per discordiam adempta est. Incipit igitur ab indignatione ut solent satirici, invecutus in eorum avaritiam, inquiens Orbem iam totum et cetera...[Expl.]: Epidauros civitas est Graeciae unde advectus est Aesculapius in forma serpentis non longe a Racusio [?].

Finis Petronii Arbitri in Sathira Integra.

Bibl.: Sochatoff, *opera supra citata*.

Manuscript:

München, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, CLM 23713, s. xv, fol. 15-21. *Catalogus II*, 4 (1881, repr. 1969), 86.

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 Vitiis 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.

[*Inc.*]: (ed. Frankfurt, 1610) *Orbem iam totum*] Orbis olim imperium Romanum appellabatur. Sic Aurelius Victor in Diocletian. *Ubi orbis Romani potentiam cepit. . .* ./. . . [*Expl.*]: *Epidauria moenia*] Epidaurus, urbs est in Achaia, Noronico quasi marmore redimita. Aesculapii delubro praecelebris. Hinc Epidaurius, quod est cognomen tum Aesculapii. Ovidius de Ponto lib. 1.

Afferat ipse licet sacras Epidaurius
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:

See v. I, p. 230; v. III, p. 391.

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 Lotichius 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, Iohannes Bergens acquired his library from the heirs and passed on the *Scholia* to his friend Lotichius, "ut tandem aliquando ab interitu post tot annorum curricula tam variosque 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, Iuvenalis ac alii quidem eiusdem notae Poëtae; sed ad exemplum *Menippearum* Varronis, quas ex optimorum auctorum crebris testimoniisprehendimus, nunc soluta dictione, nunc vero vario carminum genere

fuisse conscriptas. . . . [*Expl.*]: Utinam omnes tanta felicitate exprimerent hoc, quod ille noster ait, *Scribendi recte sapere est principium et fons*.

Commentary. [*Inc.*]: *Cum alio gen.*] Adversus immodicum declamandi studium. *Furiarum*] *Furiis agitari* dicuntur, et qui nihil ordine faciunt, et qui flagitiorum conscientia parum apud se sunt. Festivissimum est hoc, quod in Graecis Epigrammatis dicitur, quosdam non iam a Musis sed a Furiis potius agitari. . . . Ovid. eleganter lib. 10. *Metamorph.* de Myrrha, et Suetonius Nerone. . . . [*Expl.*]: Et haec hactenus. Tu, si quid novisti rectius istis, Candidus imperti, si non, his utere mecum. Non potui praeterire, quae reperio in exemplo mire veteri.

There follow three of the better known pieces of verse associated with the *Satyricon*, those relating to Tantalus (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, *Pétrone en France* (p. 33, n. 2) cites La Porte du Theil as the authority for a 1591 edition of Brassicanus: *Petronii Arbitri Satyrici Fragmenta, ab Alexandro Brassicano emendata et annotata*, Basil. apud Oporinum et Antwerp. apud Plant. et ex ejusdem officina cum variorum 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 emisserunt, nihil dum certi de illius aetate prodidisse, ante quos Lilius Giraldus hac in re valde allucinatus est, secutus Placidum Lactantium Statii interpretem, qui Statio posteriorem facit Petronium, ut a quo sumpserit hoc hemistichium, et suis versibus inseruit: Primum in orbe Deos facit timor. (III, 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 editione 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 benigne et liberaliter in communem Reipublicae 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 sententiis exquisitis in deditionem accipitur.

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

Editions:

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:

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 *Querolus antiqua comoedia 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.

Bibl.: A. Cioranescu, *Bibliographie de la littérature française du seizième siècle*, # 7395-99; *Dictionnaire des lettres françaises*, ed. G. Grente, xvi^e Siècle p. 213; Michaud X, 103-04.

A. Dupré, "Notes historiques sur les Daniel d'Orléans et de Blois" *Bull. Société archéologique de l'Orléanais* IV (1862-67) 333-45; Hermann Hagen, *Der Jurist und Philolog Peter Daniel aus Orleans* (Bern, 1873). Reprinted in *Zur Geschichte der Philologie und der römischen Literatur* (Berlin, 1879) pp. 1-30. Pp. 30-52 contain a Beilage: Unedierte Briefe von Jos. Scaliger, El. Vinetus, Ob. Gifanius, Jo. Brodaeus, Lud. Cario, Theod. Canterus, Lamb. Danaeus, J. Gulielmus, u. Franz Daniel an Peter Daniel. The letters are taken from Bern cod. 141, described in H. Hagen, *Catalogus codicum Bernensium* (Bern, 1875) pp. 192-203. The Hagen essay has also been translated by Paul de Félice under the title *Étude littéraire et historique sur P. Daniel d'Orléans* (Orléans, 1876); L. Jarry, "Pierre Daniel et les erudits de son temps", in *Mémoires, Société archéologique et historique de l'Orléanais* XV (1876).

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 quorundam 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 *Notulae 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 épigrammes 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 arguit, qui Petronium lascivioris nequitiae auctorem Bononiensium sanctissimum Antistitem somniant. nec dissimili fere periculo hallucinantur, mea sententia, qui Ausonio Consulari cognominem quendam Burdigalensium Episcopum substituunt. . ./. . . [Expl.] : Verum et hoc aloes et absynthi bolos, si vis, ut aegrotis sit, deglubere facillimo negotio poteris, quos prius veteris elegantiae melle et priorum sapore involvas et contingas. Bene vale.

Notulae in Epigrammata [Inc.] :

Candida sideris] 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. Brochetorum, fratrum. 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 Binet 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^e siècle 108-109 ; also to be consulted are critical and biographical studies of Ronsard such as R. Largillière, *Ronsard, ses amis et*

imitateurs dans le Beauvaisis (Beauvais, 1924).

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.

1. (ed. Paris, 1585).

Janus Dousa Danieli Rogerti suo S.D. [Inc.] : Annos abhinc, ni fallor, iam factum est septem, quum tibi, meane an publica felicitas dicam nescio, eam cogitationem immisit, ut Bataviam nostram crebro revisendo de praesentia nobis tua gratiam facere et velles et posses, mi suavissime Daniel. . . . [Expl.] : Cui generi ipsius hercule iam pridem 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 fidei custo-

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

Postquam ferculum allatum est.

FINIS.

Bibl. : Roy L. Nyswaner, *The Use of the Praecidanea of Dousa in Seventeenth-Century Commentaries on Petronius*, an unpublished dissertation written at the University of Pittsburgh, 1936.

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.

Bibl.: Michaud, X, 270; *Nieuw Nederlands Biographisch 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 Linocerus at Paris (but *not* in the Pithoeus edition of 1587, as the Biontine 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 omissae Dupeyratii notae, Parisiis anno M D LXXXVII typis impressae, ex quarum tamen numero expunctae sunt, quas inde excerptas Erhardus commentario suo intexit".

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. (Linocerus edition of 1587). [*Inc.*]: Petronii satyricon non illepide quis Aetnam (ut Salviani verbis utar) impudicarum flammaram dixerit. . ./. . . [*Expl.*]: . . . qui e segete ad spicilegium reliquit stipulam.

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

Sunt multi quibus uberes maniplos

. . .
(line 24) praeterquam vitia explicante lingua.

3. Spicilegia G. Dupeyratii Lugd. pro Satyricon Petronii.

[*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 known of Gulielmus Dupeyratius (Guillaume DuPeyrat) who was born in 1563 and died in 1645. That he was a resident of Lyons is evident in the cognomen *Lugdunensis* 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 poetica*, which has the French title *Essais poétiques*, published in 1593. (Others are listed in Cioranesco, who enumerates also various *laudationes funebres* composed by Dupeyratius).

Bibl.: 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 Linocerus declares that he shared his plan of putting out the *Satyricon* with Johannes Richardus, "qui tum se diligentem,

industriū, magnique animi hominem prae-stitit. Notas paucissimis diebus elaboravit eruditas certe et elegantes". Linocerius goes on to say that he planned to append "has tum quidem solitarias" to his edition when Dousa's *Praecidaneae* 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 *Praecidaneae* 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".

[Inc.]: (ed. Paris, 1585) *Hunc et rerum tumore. Puto retinendum rerum tumore, ut hoc perstringantur qui res minimas et exiguas magni faciunt. quod genus hominum fore minime aptum, in quo res imprimis sunt ponderandae et exigendae adamusim. . ./. . . [Expl.]*: De hoc deglubendi et parentes mortuos comedendi more Divus

August. in Civitat. Dei: Immanissimum istud et belluinum.

In the catalogue of Richardus' writings which they present, both Cioranesco and Richard Papillon include *De antiqua Francorum origine, fragmentum ex Scholiis 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 Fevret, *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. Fevret calls him an excellent poet and extravagantly compares his powers with qualities of classical writers such as Virgil, Martial, Catullus, and Anacreon.

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*.

Bibl.: Cioranesco, # 19161- # 19166; C. Fevret, *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 Cioranesco, but Cioranesco 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 Biontine, where the statement is made that Pithoeus utilized "notas Richardi Biturigis et spicilegium Dupeyratii" (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. Pithoei" 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.

Introductory address: (ed. Patisson. 1587) Patissonio S. Petronii Arbitri Satyricon,

sane eruditissimum, relegi: ac tuae in primis voluntati satisfacere dum cupio, nonnulla obiter adnotavi, quae, si tibi digna prelo tuo videbuntur, excudes. Memineris tamen, me coniecturis eiusmodi non plus tribuere quam somniis; quae, neque natura sua, neque coniectoris ingenio, sed casu, aliquando vera solent evadere. Vale Cal. Decembr.

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 coniectura, conclusi; quamvis in libris Nonii legitur, conclusi, quod nec inficior 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 reprintings 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 reprintings of that edition. The entry in the *Index Interpretum* describes the commentary in this way: "Francisci Pithoei IC. Collectanea. Huic enim a plerisque Criticis publice adscribitur".

One of the scholars responsible for attributing the *Collectanea* to Franciscus Pithoeus was Bongarsius. On page 241 of his copy of the second Wouwer edition published at Paris by Beys in 1601, he has written "Fr. Pithoei" after the word *Collectanea* in the heading. The copy is in the Bibliotheca Bongarsia 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 prooemio lib. 9 *Controversiarum: Itaque velut ex umbroso et obscuro prodeuntes loco clarae lucis fulgor obcaecat. Sic istos a scholis in forum transeuntes, omnia tanquam nova et inusitata perturbant. . .* [Expl.]: *Et coli summas*) Quid si legas, *Et Cilli summas advocet auriculas?* *ἄλλος: ὄνος*; Somniarunt enim Nationes caput asininum deum fuisse 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 Dousa 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 Dousa for mention along with Pithoeus and Wouwer as making notable contributions to Petronian exegesis; the fact that Beys places the name of Dousa 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 reprintings 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.

[Inc.]: (ed. Paris, 1601) nunc et rerum tumore] alii verborum tumore. Simile in Seneca lib. 2. de Benef. quamvis dissimili notione: *Quid opus arrogantia vultus, quid tumore verborum?* . . . [Expl.]: Nulli sternuntum) Forte, sternuntur, aut tanguntur.

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 Dousa 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 *Praecidanea*. 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.

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 *Spicilegium 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 WOUWEREN

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, Aris-tippum saltare coactum in purpura dixisse scribit Laertius: . . ./. . . [*Expl.*]: Itaque ne toties ad hoc templum gratis accedam, laborem tenuem et exiguum obfero, veri legitimique muneris obsidem, quod meae quidem temeritati haud recuso accedere; tamen si non prorsus fastidias votoriam hanc tabellam nominis tui templo dicatam, in coelum abire videor. Vale Vir Illust. Lugduni Batavorum M D XCV.

2. *Variorum in P. Arbitrum Observationes Praefatio* [*Inc.*]: Anni fere XXCIV. 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 adiicere nec libuit, nec per formam libri licuit.

Observationes. [*Inc.*]: *Satyricon*] Glossae: *Excelsissimus dicitur a Petronio in 1. Satyrarum.* Unde manifestum hoc opus laborum ordine distinctum fuisse. Dusa. . ./. . . [*Expl.*]: Nam citius flammam mortales ore tenebunt] Tull II. de Orat. *Dicere aiunt Ennium flammam facilius ore inardente opprimi quam bona dicta teneat.* Ennodius: *Facilius est ignem lingua comprimere.* Symmach. *Facilius est ardentem favillam comprimere.* Iureti. Notae ad Simm. libro I. epistolar. XXV.

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

Animadversiones. [*Inc.*]: (ed. Paris, 1601) Declamatores) *Declamatio iudiciorum imago.* Quintil. lib. I. cap. X. *Forensium actionum meditatio.* lib. IV. cap. II. . ./. . . [*Expl.*]: P. 17. v. 14. Tricliniarches] V. insc. M. Ulpio. Aug. lib. Divi. Traiani. Auc a potione. Item A. LACUNA. TRICLINIARCIN.
FINIS.

Editions :

Dedicatio 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 *Observationes* without the name of the author, and separately with his name).

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

Observationes

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

Biography :

Johannes a Wouweren (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. Wouweren is singled out for greater praise than his fellows.

His maiden effort was the 1596 edition of the *Satyricon*. 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 vadam futuri favoris praemissus, infelicibus auspiciis praelusit" (*Tractatio de Polymathia*, I, edition published at Leipzig in 1665, page 10). This *Tractatio 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.

Wouweren 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.

Bibl. : 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 Nederlanden* XI (1876) 132-33.

Geverhartus Elmenhorstius, *Vita Joannis Wowerii*, in Johannes Wouweren, *Tractatus de Polymathia*, ed. Thomas (Leipzig, 1665).

14. GASPAR BARTHIUS.

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*.

Praefatio. (ed. Paris, 1615) Nobilissimo clarissimoque Meliori [sic] Goldasto ab Heimsfelt. S. P. D. [Inc.]: Petronium Arbitrum gaudeo tandem a te percensitum, V. Cl. et amicissime. Multa in eo olim ego disputavi, multa in aliorum Animadversiones animadverti. . ./. . . [Expl.]: Salve ab eo qui tibi commendatus esse cupit teque admiratur.

Racemationes. [Inc.]: num alio genere furiarum Declamatores inquietantur] a nocturnis lemurbus et Empusis traductum. Salustius: *animus impurus, diis hominibusque infestus neque vigilis, neque quietibus sedari poterat*. . ./. . . [Expl.]: *Libyae gementia* Statius, cui luget complexa suos? Lucretius, tibi rident aequora Ponti.

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 iudicii" (found in a letter to Nicolaus Helmsius in Burmann's *Sylloge epistularum*, II, ep. 469, p. 763) is both quoted and af-

firmed 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 abiicienda, 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.

Bibl.: Bursian, I, 287-290; Hallam (London, 1905), II, 377-379; Sandys, II, 364.

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 Gonsalvus 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 excellens Gaspar Schioppius negotii sui, immo Catholicae religionis, gerendi caussa apud nos ageret, valde enim mecum illum coniunxit ratio communis litterarum studiorumque consensio. . ./. . . [*Expl.*]: Ego quidem, cui laude sua fraudare quemlibet semper religio fuit, eas tibi sub eiusdem nomine fideliter exhibere malui, ut ex illis quamquam exiguis penicilli lineamentis solertem etiam artificis manum liceat agnoscere. Fruere igitur 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*.

[*Inc.*]: grandis et ut ita dicam pudica oratio] Placet quod aliis in mentem venit: poetica oratio. Cic. in Bruto: Grandis et ut ita dicam, tragicus orator. . ./. . . [*Expl.*]: Itaque ego quoque ne consuetudinem perderem] Senec. Cons. ad Helv. Cap. 15. Rediisti non ut voluptatem ex filio perciperes, sed ne consuetudinem perderes.

The commentary is followed by two indexes: an "Index scriptorum veterum quorum loca in praeludiis et commentis adducuntur" and an "Index scriptorum recentium, 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 *Verisimilia*, 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 maius* was the *Grammatica Philosophica*, published in 1628. His writings are listed in BN, 168 (1946), 899-923.

Bibl.: *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*, 33 (1891), 479-484, by R. Hoche; Bursian, I, 283-287; Hallam, II, 382-384; C. Nisard, *Les gladiateurs de la république des lettres aux xv^e, xvi^e, et xvii^e siècles*, II, Paris, 1860, 1-206; H. Korvallet, "Ueber Caspar Scioppius", in *Die Forschungen zur deutschen Geschichte*, II, Göttingen, 1871, 401-482.

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

for the statement are not spelled out. This identification is accepted by Buecheler (*ed. mai.*, xxxviii), Bursian (I, 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 Lundorpii Francofordiani”.

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] Ita legit Lambinus Comment. ad Lucret. lib. 4. in vulgatis quibusdam editionibus legitur C. PETRONII ARBITRI, apud Scalig. in Catalect. C. PETRONII ARBITRI AFRANII. 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 *Massilienses*, 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 “praeceptor in quinta classe” in his native city, but not to the

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.

Bibl. : Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie, 19 (1884), 637-638. Ernst Fischer, *Michael Caspar Lundorp, der Herausgeber der Acta publica*, Berlin, 1870.