

that the most glorious and telling virtues are not confined to the Roman people. That Romans and non-Romans both argue in speeches from the same set of moral values is also ascertained by Moore's approach. In this respect too, Livy does not differ from other Roman historians. The observation on p. 151 ff. that Livy's vocabulary of virtue reflects ancient rather than contemporary Roman ideas on the subject deserves further investigation. Early inscriptions would offer a starting-point.

Moore has not set himself an easy task. Roman morality in general is an intricate subject. Moreover, in order to reach reliable conclusions about Livy many passages had to be considered. Occasionally, the gist of a passage is missed. 3,56,11 is not an example of Livy using *aequitas* instead of *iustitia* when he wants to call attention to extraordinary and unexpected fairness (p. 55). Here Appius Claudius argues that he is entitled to legal protection. From *his* point of view it is a question of expected fairness. When he takes *modestia* in 8,4,10 as a non-praiseworthy quality (p. 76), Moore apparently has not understood the sarcasm of L. Annius. Moore p. 123 has not noticed the printing-error 3,44,4 *omni a pudore saepta* in Ogilvie's O.C.T.-edition. However, these minor flaws do not impair this valuable addition to Livian scholarship.

AMSTERDAM, Klassiek Seminarium,  
Oude Turfmarkt 129

F. AHLHEID

BRET BOYCE, *The Language of the Freedmen in Petronius' Cena Trimalchionis* (Mnemosyne Suppl. 117). Leiden, Brill, 1991. VI, 113 p. Pr. Gld 70,—/US 40,—.

In Roman literature, the section of Petronius' *Satyricon* known as the *Cena Trimalchionis* is unique in various respects. Linguistically, its most striking feature is the colloquial Latin used by a number of freedmen, including Trimalchio himself. It has made the *Cena* one of the most important sources of what is normally called 'Vulgar Latin<sup>1</sup>'. The most comprehensive investigation of the subject, H.L.W. Nelson's dissertation of 1947<sup>2</sup>), has now been reconsidered and complemented by Bret Boyce. His book has been published in the series *Supplements to Mnemosyne*, which already includes several important studies on Petronius<sup>3</sup>).

The main aim of Boyce's study is to explore the linguistical

devices by which Petronius characterizes the freedmen of the *Cena*. However, this subject is not dealt with until the final chapter (ch. 3; p. 76-102). The first three quarters of the book are devoted to preliminary investigations.

The introduction in Chapter One presents two surveys. First, a survey is given of popular language in Greek and Roman literature. It appears to be limited to the comic genres. For instance, there are a few passages in Aristophanes which may be considered as parallels to the speeches of the Petronian freedmen. However, the extent and the role of popular speech in the *Satyricon* seem unprecedented.

Second, scholarship on the *Cena* since 1664 (the year in which the editio princeps was published) is briefly reviewed. For a long time, its Vulgar Latin has posed very serious problems to scholars, not only in discussions about its authenticity, but also in the constitution of the text. While paying due respect to Nelson's standard work, Boyce raises a number of methodological objections to it (p. 26-30). In his view, Nelson has underestimated the popular element in the speeches, e.g. by assuming that vulgar forms may be due to errors of Romance-speaking copyists, by asserting that 'archaic words' and 'vulgar words' are mutually exclusive terms, or by denying the possibility of inconsistencies within the text. However, other scholars have sometimes overestimated the popular element.

Boyce wishes to steer a middle course between these two extremes. To this end, Chapter Two provides a detailed list of phonological, morphological, syntactical and lexical features of the speeches. Whereas irregular phonology is usually rather hazardous to assume, given the process of transmission of the text, more certainty can be obtained in the other areas.

Finally, in Chapter Three, an attempt is made to describe the characterization of the freedmen by means of their speech. Dama, Seleucus, Phileros, Ganymedes, Echion, Niceros, Habinnas, Hermeros and, of course, Trimalchio are all focused on in separate paragraphs. Petronius is shown to have given each of them a specific, individual character, varying from a 'vulgar' drunkard (Dama) to what appears almost like a moralist (Ganymedes). A bibliography and index of names conclude the volume.

Boyce's book rightly draws attention to the unique position of the 'realistic' freedmen's speeches in ancient literature. It proves very useful as a compendium of Vulgar Latin linguistical phenomena.

Not every reader will have Nelson or a historical grammar at hand. Boyce's methodological corrections to the works of Nelson and other scholars seem reasonable, and his book lives up to the standards it sets. It is written in an admirably lucid style and well documented, and its conclusions are, generally speaking, sound and convincing.

But some objections may be raised as well. Very often, Boyce relies rather heavily on previous scholarly literature<sup>4</sup>). In the introducing surveys and the chapter with linguistic data, this is only fair, although it sometimes produces a slightly scholastic effect<sup>5</sup>). But in the final chapter it seems to weaken the points he wants to make. Why, for instance, do we have to read what Chiaffi thinks about the character of Echion? For us as readers, Boyce's own opinions would do.

Having said this, I would like to object to Boyce's evaluations. Most of his book is terse and factual, but in the end, he regularly lapses into moralizing psychological judgements on the freedmen. For instance, they are given inferiority complexes, social frustrations and sadistic tendencies, they are accused of misogyny, 'turpissima koprolalia' or vulgarity (in the non-technical sense!), or on the contrary, in the case of Ganymedes, credited with frankness, a sense of realism and 'a refreshing sobriety and candor' (p. 81). Personally I think drunken, dishonest and immoral characters are more refreshing! However, such psychoanalytical and subjective judgements seem entirely out of place in this type of study.

It seems relevant to note that Petronius nowhere *judges* his characters, but seems to invite us to laugh at them. On several occasions, Boyce does not detect what may be instances of Petronius' humor. Must we really take Ganymedes' tirades against the corruption of politics so very seriously?<sup>6</sup>). Is there not a supreme sort of irony if a Latin author has one of his characters (Echion) say that the mind of his son has been 'polluted' by literature enough (*litteris iam satis inquinatus est*, 46,7)? But admittedly, these matters too may be said to be largely a matter of taste.

However, Boyce's descriptions and judgements are not exclusively based on specific, linguistic facts. *All* speakers employ Grecisms, popular forms, syntactical anomalies, clichés, etcetera, and there does not seem to be so much differentiation on this level<sup>7</sup>). Though some analyses are quite convincing, as in the case of Trimalchio, others, especially where less linguistic material is available, seem to be the result of Boyce's reading and interpreta-

tion of the text as a whole. Perhaps this is just as far as we can come, but after the promising first two chapters such a result is a little disappointing.

To end with a few minor points<sup>8)</sup>, it seems indeed best to exclude the Petronian verse fragments (p. 58), but diversity of scholarly opinion on their authenticity is not so wide as Boyce suggests<sup>9)</sup>. On a general note, even if a 'vulgar' element in the text seems well established, it might be wise to reckon at least with the possibility that Petronius has made his characters employ words or forms which were not common at all. There are many cases where we simply do not know if Petronius reflects real life Latin, or has somehow imitated it. Though Boyce is quite cautious throughout the book, I have not seen him make this point.

In spite of the objections made above, Boyce's book may be welcomed. Nowadays we are often confronted with fashionable books on ancient authors. Some of these books are very inspiring, but they often digress far from the actual texts to allegedly meta-linguistical, metapoetical or metatheatrical levels<sup>10)</sup>. Fortunately, in this study, Boyce has his feet firmly on the ground. By constantly calling us back to the text of Petronius, he gives us renewed access to it.

6525 HT NIJMEGEN, Erasmusplein 1

VINCENT HUNINK

1) The term seems unfortunate, because of the pejorative connotation of 'vulgar'. However, the term is widely used by scholars in a technical sense, as Boyce (p. 2-3) rightly points out. In spite of his caution concerning this point, Boyce himself takes a rather moralizing, negative view of many of the freedmen he deals with (see below).

2) H.L.W. Nelson, *Petronius en zijn 'vulgair' Latijn*, een stilistisch-grammatische studie over de zoogenaamde 'vulgaire dictie' en de Cena Trimalchionis; deel 1 Inleiding en formeel-grammatische problemen (Diss. Utrecht 1947).

3) K.F.C. Rose, *The date and author of the 'Satyricon'* (1971; nr. 16); H. van Thiel, *Petron. Überlieferung und Rekonstruktion* (1971; nr. 20); G.L. Schmeling & J.H. Stuckey, *A bibliography of Petronius* (1977; nr. 39).

4) Unfortunately, references to linguistical studies are not always up to date. To mention some points, Boyce uses Väänänen's *Introduction au latin vulgaire* in the edition of 1967 instead of the newer and fuller edition of 1981; no mention is made of Flobert's study *Les verbes déponents Latins des origines à Charlemagne* (Paris 1975) or H. Pinkster's recent article *The pragmatic motivation for the use of subject pronouns in Latin: the case of Petronius*, in: *Études... offertes... à Serbat* (Paris 1987), 369-79. Considering the prominent place given to scholarly literature in Boyce's study, such omissions seem particularly surprising.

5) Perhaps these are relics of the original version of Boyce's book, which was presented as a doctoral dissertation at Brown University in May 1989. Rather surprisingly, no mention is made at all of this previous version of the study. This would surely have been more correct, since Boyce himself drew attention to it by publishing an extensive summary in *PSN* (the *Petronian Society Newsletter*) 20,1/2, (1990), 10-12.

6) We might compare the opening chapters of the *Satyricon* (c. 1-2) where Encolpius declaims against contemporary declamation practice, or the pompous *Bellum Civile* (c. 119-124) recited by Eumolpus as an 'instructive' example of decent poetry. In both of these cases we should avoid taking the personae too seriously.

7) Cf. Niall W. Slater, *Reading Petronius* (Baltimore and London 1990), 150-1: "Some differences among the individual freedmen make themselves felt, of course, but these are expressed more often through the content and occasion than the form of their language."

8) I noticed typing errors on p. 21 (n. 72 l.3 read 'most'); 29 (l.10 read 'characteristics'); 59 (l.21 read 'devorare') and 90 (l.7 read 'coarseness').

9) See: Edward Courtney, *The poems of Petronius* (Atlanta, Georgia 1991), esp. 7-11.

10) The study of Slater (see n. 7) provides a good illustration here. In Slater's view, the continually elusive object of Encolpius' quest is 'meaning', 'the power to interpret' (p. 241). The *Satyricon* itself is said to enact the difficulties of interpretation within us as we read, remaining 'quite uninterpretable' (p. 250) and even 'reading us' instead of the other way around. Much of Slater's book represents a careful and sensitive reading and rereading of the *Satyricon*, but here his analysis becomes too *postmodern*.

EDWARD COURTNEY, *The poems of Petronius*. Atlanta, Georgia, Scholars Press, 1991. 77 p. Pr. \$ 13,95 (paper).

The poetry of Petronius may be divided into two groups: (1) some 30 poems and poetical fragments in the extant parts of his *Satyricon*, including the longer poems *Bellum Civile* (c. 119-124) and *Troiae Halosis* (c. 89); (2) a number of poems not included in the *Satyricon*, but attributed to Petronius. The number of poems in the latter group varies, due to uncertainty about their authenticity. In the case of fragments quoted by ancient grammarians or Fulgentius (6th cent.) and explicitly attributed to Petronius, authenticity seems beyond a doubt. But things are somewhat different with the other poems, quoted in two 9th century MSS from Leiden (Leid. Voss. Lat. Q. 86 and Leid. Voss. Lat. F. 111) and in a lost MS of Isidorus from Beauvais, from which Binetus has published a number of poems allegedly by Petronius in his collection of epigrams of 1579. Whereas editions of Petronius have generally included most of these poems, K. Müller in his edition of 1961 (reprinted in 1965 and 1983) has omitted no fewer than 22 of them.