
THE PETRONIAN SOCIETY NEWSLETTER

Editorial Board / Colofon	1
PSN 40 years	1
Bibliography	3
Notices	13
Announcements	15
Reviews, Articles, and Dissertations	15

Vol. 39, February 2010

Editor

Edmund P. Cueva
Arts and Humanities 1009S-E
University of Houston-Downtown
One Main Street
Houston, TX 77002, USA
Tel. (713) 226-5543
email: cuevae@uhd.edu

Book Review Editor

Shannon N. Byrne
Classics Department, Xavier University
3800 Victory Parkway
Cincinnati, OH 45207-5181, USA
Tel. (513) 745-3456, Fax (513) 745-1955
email: byrn@xavier.edu

Editor Emeritus (1970-2005)

Gareth Schmeling
Dept of Classics, University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida 32611-7435, USA
Tel. (352) 392-2075, Fax (352) 846-0297
email: schmelin@classics.ufl.edu

Associate editors

Raymond Astbury, Barry Baldwin, Ewen Bowie,
Gian Biagio Conte, Niklas Holzberg, Gerald Sandy

PSN 40 Years

Forty Years On

Thanks to Alan Bennett, England's funniest and often Petronian playwright, for the title. Now, were I John Henderson, I would embark on a *Vixere forties post Agamemnona* riff...

Annis quadraginta servivi (Sat. 57.9). My own *PSN* adventures were adumbrated in "Gareth & Me: A Petronian Pilgrimage," devised for *Ancient Narrative: Authors, Authority, and Interpreters in the Ancient Novel* (Groningen 2006), the Festschrift for Our Master. I still have in my files a yellowing copy of the first *PSN*, hoping it may one day be worth as much as the first Batman comic. For the rest (I have a few *lacunae* in my collection), it was an agreeable Recherche du Something Perdu via the electronic archive elegantly presented and assiduously maintained by Jean Alvares of Montclair. This is also my cue to perpetuate the name of Martha B. McDonald for her long-time financial support of the *Newsletter*, given in the memory of her parents Sgt. Carl E. Byrd and Toyo M. Byrd—Byrds of a feather, indeed.

On reading the inaugural "Membership in the Petronian Society is open to anyone with an interest in Petronius and his *Satyricon*" (I fancy this would now read *Satyrice*), I recalled Groucho Marx' (more or less) I wouldn't want to belong to any club that lets in guys like me. Then, my native Englishness asserted itself: the point of a club is not whom it lets in but whom it keeps out. After which borborygms—I promptly joined.

Apropos of the *Newsletter*, "J. P. Sullivan's gentle urging pushed me into making it a reality." Remembering the late lamented JPS, I doubt "gentle" tells the whole story. Timing is everything. Sullivan's seminal book on Petronius features in the first Bibliography, along with his influential *TAPA* article on literary feuding between Petronius, Seneca, and Lucan. Rubbing shoulders here are Scobie on the Ancient Romances and Corbett's Petronian Twayne.

This inventory also pululated with promise. No less than three new editions of the *Satyricon/Satyrice* were promised, respectively by E. Dobroiu, Carlo Pellegrino, and Oskar Raith. Pellegrino's duly appeared (Rome 1976), but what happened to the other two? Also advertised as a 1970s treat was JPS's "large critical edition for Brill," which (eheu!) we never saw, though all hope this strange void will soon be publicly filled by Gareth's stupendous (I've read the whole thing in manuscript) version. It was hard to be impressed by

Emanuele Castorina's wraithlike entry, "A Book" (Step forward, Gertrude Stein). More lip-smackable was M. Coccia's plan to compose a monograph on the manuscripts designed to confute the ever-rolling Müller, who has yet to learn that to be immortal you do not have to be eternal.

The second issue began with **Corrections**, a feature of all magazines, whose cleaning-up left Edward Courtenay under his previous masquerade "Coureney." Signalled under **Work in Progress** was Kenneth Rose's celebrated monograph on our author's identity and date, completed after his untimely death by JPS—a Rose by any other name...Also mentioned here was H. D. Rankin's *Petronius the Artist*, destined to be broadsided in *PSN* 3.1, 3–4 by Froma Zeitlin, leniently countered (4.1, 1) by a non-rankling Rankin.

6.1 kicked off with a delightful Twainian "The announcement of the death of Prof. Ettore Paratore (sc. in 5.1) was greatly exaggerated"—was someone's wish the father to the thought? 10.2 brought dramatic news of another kind. Henceforth, the *Newsletter* would have a changed format, its mandate extended to all ancient prose fiction, with four luminaries co-opted to cope with this relaunch. Now sharing the masthead: Raymond Astbury, Bryan Reardon, Gerald Sandy, and—who else?—JPS.

18.1 brought a bit of low fun, via an editorial apology for unkind comments about William Arrowsmith embedded in a review of R. Jenkyns' "Silver Latin Poetry and the Latin Novel." Given the knockabout style of *Arion*, I imagine Arrowsmith could have looked after himself. This nonsense may serve to underline the dangers of publishing anonymous libelli, one reason why the venerable Times Literary Supplement eventually abandoned this practice. Its defenders maintain that this "Outis" policy protects younger critics from their more powerful targets' revenge—*adhuc sub iudice lis est*.

Volume 23 (1993) might well have been edged in black. Looking at it again, I hum those well-known lines from Don Maclean's "American Pie." This *annus horribilis* robbed us, far too soon, of John Sullivan, who had as much glory in front of him as behind. In North Korean style, JPS remained on the masthead for the next two years, there joined successively by Niklas Holzberg, Ewen Bowie, Gian Biagio Conte—and Yours Truly. Juxtaposed with the melancholy tidings of JPS' passing was the triumphal announcement of the *Newsletter*'s 25th anniversary: "An amazing 25 years for the study of Petronius and the other ancient novelists, and it has also been great fun chronicling the adventures of it all"—this second half perhaps not telling the whole story.

Martha McDonald's "generous support" is bannered across 26.1, an issue I must not overlook, thanks to getting it with both barrels from Michael Hendry, rightly springing to his own dogged defence of his original doggy piece against my animadversions thereon.

1994's issue comported a prophetic first, the inclusion of Gareth's e-mail address, omen of the mixed blessings of the electronic age, culminating in the transmogrification, a year after its 30th anniversary, of *PSN* into an on-line journal, in

tandem with *Ancient Narrative—sunt lacrimae rerum* (the advantages of e-mail notwithstanding)...

I dare say others will wax eloquent over those fabled Petronian Society parties. Being almost as "unclubbable" as Sir John Hawkins, I am not the person for that. Anyway, as they say about the Sixties, if you remember them, you weren't there. Best I recollect, my first one was in Boston, furnishing two memories: the publishing lady from Detroit who tagged along and afterwards remarked that it was a long time since she'd last had warm sherry, and the sight of a comatose distinguished Harvard Latinist—name withheld to protect the guilty.

Sam Goldwyn once famously urged his script-writers to "find me some new clichés." I'll sign off with a familiar one that (alas) does not fit the ancients: Life Begins at Forty, an optimism guaranteed by the new helmspersons, Shannon Byrne and Edmund Cueva.

(At the time of penning, er, processing this—April 2009—*PSN* 38 (2008) had still not appeared—*Absit Omen!* Surely not a case of *parturiunt montes*..? More scope for another cliché: *Festina lente*...)

Barry Baldwin

Petronius and the Greek Novel

I first learned of the existence of the Petronian Society at an APA meeting; I had arrived in the U.S.A. only recently from the U.K., where it was hardly known. Inevitably, it was not through any formal channel but in the bar, where the most important APA things always do happen, through the not-at-all formal, genial Gareth (and no doubt his then associate John Sullivan—he and I had been contemporaries at Cambridge, and by then we were both in California). I was invited to a party in Gareth's rooms, and in such cases my arm twists easily. There, I discovered that there was free drink and talk of Petronius; both of these suited me—not that I was particularly interested in Petronius, but the two seemed to fit well enough. In the following year or two, I made a connection with what did interest me much more, the Greek novels: were they and Petronius different species? I suppose that question has not yet been fully resolved, and never will be. One of us suggested that there might be room for the Greek novel in the Petronian Society's hunting grounds—and that was it. I needed to keep tabs on Greek novel publications for my own purposes anyway, and as well, while I was at it, add comments where appropriate (Gareth, with the assistance of other scholars, was already doing that for his contributions). One feature of the whole scene, of course, was and is that there is no entrance fee, no annual contribution: you are a member of the Petronian Society if you think you are—and that is the essence of Gareth's approach to the whole field. The field grew considerably; so did the journal, and so did the cost of producing it; but these costs were met by an enlightened and generous sponsor and, one suspects, Gareth's own pocket (certainly he never came begging to me). It wasn't until the

1982 edition (vol. 12, No. 2) that the amalgamation between Latin and Greek prose fiction actually happened. Of course, that was the time when the Greek novels were spreading their wings, presumably to some degree under the impulse of the first ICAN in 1976 (how long ago, how primitive, that must seem now to the gratifyingly large number of survivors!).

Gareth had already been including some Greek novel items in his general bibliography; given its own space, that topic could be treated more systematically (although even then, Petronius commanded much more attention than, say, Xen. Eph.—and one can see why). So I began to contribute bibliographical (and quite often critical) details on contributions to the Greek novel, though only every couple of years (sometimes three). All the same, the number grew each year. At one point (Vol. 24, June 1994, p. 7) I suggested that the whole subject of ancient fiction could mount its own specialist journal (with a mischievous name, *Roman*—which, though appropriate in itself, would fox librarians, but would also irritate users, I suppose). In practice, Gareth took to including Greek novel items pretty fully in his general bibliography anyway, so that no separate report on Greek fiction was now needed; and to my surprise and pleasure *PSN* did in practice virtually amalgamate with *Ancient Narrative* in due course in 2000 (vol. 30).

So that by now (2009) *PSN* itself is indeed forty years old. A fitting tribute to Gareth, who more than anyone else has been, from the beginning, the mainstay of bibliography and dissemination of knowledge of the novel, both Greek and Latin: where would “novelists” be now without his sustained effort? Can a journal have a *Festschrift*? Well, *PSN* has; and no-one is more glad of Gareth’s labours than I am. It is *his* journal, it is a major part of his legacy to the whole topic, and in saluting it I salute him.

Bryan Reardon

Venit iam quadragesimus annus

(With apologies to Petronius)

The 40th year of the Petronian Society has not arrived with the expectation of a free meal, but it does usher in a wealth of warm memories. I remember above all the congenial gatherings hosted amiably by Gareth Schmeling in his hotel room in the various cities in which the annual meetings of the American Philological Association were being hosted. The drinks always flowed freely but never, as I recall, with the result that the fire brigade had to break down the door, although there were complaints from neighbouring suites of elevated levels of animated conversation and above all laughter. I also remember that when I applied to my faculty for travel funds to participate in one of the sessions organized by Gareth it was not always easy to convince the dean of my faculty that the Petronian Society was a serious scholarly organization. It was and is and has provided a venue for meeting like-minded Petronian and ancient-narrative scholars from around the world.

As we charter members of the Petronian Society fade away into our dotage younger members, much in evidence at ICAN IV in Lisbon in July 2008, will undoubtedly add to the advances in scholarship on the ancient novel that the Petronian Society helped to initiate and in the collaborative spirit that it has fostered.

Hoc iuvat, iuvat, et diu iuvabit;

hoc non deficit incipitque simper.

Gerald Sandy

Bibliography

Greek and Latin Novels

Graverini, L., “Apuleio e Achille Tazio. Una scena di caccia e una ‘regola aurea,’” in *Il romanzo latino: Modelli e tradizione letteraria. Atti della VII Giornata ghisleriana di Filologia classica (Pavia, 11–12 ottobre 2007)*, ed. F. Gasti (Pavia: Collegio Ghislieri, 2009, 138 pp.) 61–95.

Fusillo, M., “Self-Reflexivity in the Ancient Novel,” *Revue internationale de philosophie* 63.248 (2009) 165–177.

Hale, D. J., “Aesthetics and the New Ethics: Theorizing the Novel in the Twenty-First Century,” *PMLA* 124.3 (2009) 895–905.

McMurrin, M., “Transnationalism and the Novel: A Call for Periodization,” *Novel: A Forum on Fiction* 42.3 (2009) 531–537.

Ní Mheallaigh, K., “Pseudo-Documentarism and the Limits of Ancient Fiction,” *AJP* 129.3 (2008) 403–431.

Paschalis, M., S. Panayotakis, and G. Schmeling, eds., *Readers and Writers in the Ancient Novel* (Eelde: Barkhuis Publishing; Groningen: Groningen University Library, 2009) xviii + 286 pp.

The collection contains these essays:

- Bowie, E., “The Uses of Bookishness.”
- Dowden, K., “Reading Diktys: The Discrete Charm of Bogosity.”
- Fletcher, R., “No Success Like Failure: The Task of the Translator in Apuleius’ *Metamorphoses*.”
- Futre Pinheiro, M., “Dialogues between Readers and Writers in Lucian’s *Verae Historiae*.”
- Graverini, L. and W. Keulen, “Roman Fiction and its Audience: Seriocomic Assertions of Authority.”
- Guez, J-P., “To Reason and to Marvel: Images of the Reader in the *Life Of Apollonius*.”
- Harrison, S., “Apuleius and Homer: Some Traces of the *Iliad* in the *Metamorphoses*.”

- Hunink, V., “Hating Homer, Fighting Virgil: Books in Augustine’s *Confessions*.”
- Hunter, R., “The Curious Incident...: *Polypragmosyne* and the Ancient Novel.”
- Konstan, D., “The Active Reader and the Ancient Novel.”
- Morgan, J., “Readers writing Readers, and Writers reading Writers: Reflections of Antonius Diogenes.”
- Nimis, S., “Cite and Sound: The Prosaics of Quotation in the Ancient Novel.”
- Paschalis, M., “Seneca’s *Apocolocyntosis* and Petronius’ *Satyricon*.”
- Slater, N., “Reading Inscription in the Ancient Novel.”
- Smith, W. S., “Eumolpus the Poet.”
- Stoneman, R., “The Author of the *Alexander Romance*.”
- Whitmarsh, T., “Divide and Rule: Segmenting *Callirhoe* and Related Works.”
- Zimmerman, Z., “‘Food for Thought’ for Readers of Apuleius’ *The Golden Ass*.”

Pouderon, B. and C. Bost-Pouderon, eds., *Passions, vertus et vices dans l’ancien roman. Actes du colloque de Tours, 19–21 octobre 2006, organisé par l’université François-Rabelais de Tours et l’UMR 5189, Histoire et Sources des Mondes Antiques. Collection de la Maison de l’Orient Méditerranéen, 42, série littéraire et philosophique 14* (Lyon: Maison de l’Orient de la Méditerranée-Jean Pouilloux, 2009) 457 pp.

The collection contains these essays:

- Billault, A., “Remarques sur la jalousie dans les romans grecs antiques.”
- Bowie, E. L., “Vertus de la campagne, vices de la cité dans *Daphnis et Chloé* de Longus.”
- Brethes, R., “Rien de trop: la recherche d’un juste milieu chez Aristote, Ménandre et Chariton.”
- Briand, M., “Le sexe des passions et des vertus: anthropologie culturelle, méta-fiction et rhétorique dans le roman d’Achille Tatius.”
- Calvet-Sebasti, M-A., “Colère et compassion dans les récits apocryphes chrétiens.”
- Crismani, D., “Notes sur le pouvoir des herbes dans le roman.”
- Daude, C., “Aspects physiques et psychiques des passions chez Achille Tatius.”
- De Temmerman, K., “Un protagoniste passionné: quelques réflexions sur l’expression incontrôlée des émotions chez Chairéas.”
- Dowden, K., “L’affirmation de soi chez les romanciers.”
- Frangoulis, H., “Passion et narration: Nonnos et le roman.”
- Garbugino, G., “La perception des passions dans le roman d’Apulée.”

- Guez, J-P., “Homme tyrannique, homme royal dans le roman de Chariton.”
- Jouanno, C., “Un roman exemplaire: l’histoire d’Abradate et de Panthée au fil des siècles.”
- Kasprzyk, D., “Morale et sophistique: sur la notion de σωφροσύνη chez Achille Tatius.”
- Konstan, D., “Le courage dans le roman grec: de Chariton à Xénophon d’Éphèse, avec une référence à Philon d’Alexandrie.”
- Lassithiotakis, M., “Τὸ εὐγενεῖας τὰ δῶρα: passion, vertu et noblesse dans *Erotocritos*.”
- Létoublon, F., “Le prince idéal de la *Cyropédie* ou l’histoire est un roman.”
- Montanari, S., “Morale et société idéale dans l’utopie d’Iamboulos.”
- Núñez, L., “Les πάθη d’un narrateur: le cas des *Éthiopiennes*.”
- Pouderon, B., “Le discours sur la chasteté dans le cycle clémentin: *Homélies clémentines* et *Martyre des saints Nérée et Achillée*.”
- Puccini-Delbey, G., “La vertu de sagesse existe-t-elle dans les *Métamorphoses* d’Apulée?”
- Ramelli, I., “Les vertus de la chasteté et de la piété dans les romans grecs et les vertus des chrétiens: le cas d’Achille Tatius et d’Héliodore.”
- Ruiz-Montero, C. and J. Fernandez Zambudio, “La doctrine morale de la *Vie d’Alexandre de Macédoine* (rec. A).”
- Tonnet, H., “Heurs et malheurs de la vertu dans trois romans grecs du xix^e siècle.”
- Wolff, E., “Vertus et vices dans *l’Historia Apollonii regis Tyri*.”
- Woronoff, M., “Leucippé ou les infortunes de la vertu: volupté et souffrance dans le roman d’Achille Tatius.”

Smith, S. D., “The Worlds of The Novel,” *IJCT* 15.4 (2008) 635–645.

Greek Novels

Anagnostou-Laoutides, E. and D. Konstan, “Daphnis and Aphrodite: A Love Affair in Theocritus *Idyll* 1,” *AJP* 129.4 (2008) 497–527.

Alexander, L. C. A., “The Passions in Galen and the Novels of Chariton and Xenophon,” in *Passions and Moral Progress in Greco-Roman Thought*, ed. J. T. Fitzgerald (London: Routledge, 2008, xxiii + 392) 251–288.

Ballengee, J. R., “The Erotic Body: Mutilation and Desire in Achilles Tatius’ *Leukippe and Kleitophon*,” in *The Wound and the Witness: the Rhetoric of Torture* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2009, ix + 190 pp.) 96–133.

- Bianchi, N., "Una testimonianza trascurata su Senofonte Efesio: Gregorio di Corinto," *Quaderni di storia* 70 (2009) 219–248.
- Bierl, A., "Der griechische Roman—ein Mythos? Gedanken zur mythischen Dimension von Longos' *Daphnis und Chloe*," in *Antike Mythen. Medien, Transformationen und Konstruktionen*, eds. U. Dill und C. Walde (Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 2009, 760 pp.) 709–739.
- Biffi, N., "Come il 'Coricio in ascolto'? (Nota a Heliod. 5, 20, 2–9)," *Invigilata Lucernis* 29 (2007) 27–36.
- Biraud, M., "Usages rhetoriques et poetiques des clausules accentuelles dans le roman de Xenophon d'Ephese," *REG* 122.1 (2009) 85–111.
- Brioso Sanchez, M., "El motivo de la muerte aparente en la novela griega antigua (II)," *Habis* 39 (2008) 245–266.
- Crewe, J., "Believing the Impossible: *Aethiopika* and Critical Romance," *Modern Philology* 106.4 (2009) 601–616.
- de Temmerman, K., "Chereas Revisited. Rhetorical Control in Chariton's 'Ideal' Novel Callirhoe," *CQ* 59.1 (2009) 247–262.
- de Temmerman, K., "A Flowery Meadow and A Hidden Metalepsis in Achilles Tatius," *CQ* 59.2 (2009) 667–670.
- de Temmerman, K., "Personages op papyrus. Een narratologische analyse van de retorische karakteriseringstechnieken in de Oudgriekse roman Characters on Papyrus. A Narratological Analysis of the Rhetorical Techniques of Characterization in the Ancient Greek Novel," *Mnemosyne* 62.1 (2009) 169–170.
- Dejardin, I., "La barbarie à l'épreuve dans *Les Éthiopiennes* d'Héliodore," in *Figures de l'étranger autour de la Méditerranée antique. Actes du Colloque International "Antiquité méditerranéenne: à la rencontre de »l'autre«."* *Perceptions et représentations de l'étranger dans les littératures antiques*, eds. M-F. Marein, P. Voisin, and J. Gallego (Paris: L' Harmattan, 2009, 607 pp.) 359–368.
- Dodson, D. S., *Reading Dreams: An Audience-Critical Approach to the Dreams in the Gospel of Matthew* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns Inc., 2009) 224 pp. This book contains the following relevant chapters:
- "Dreams in Greco-Roman Fiction."
 - "Chariton's *Chaereas and Callirhoe*."
 - "Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*."
- Elmer, D. F., "Heliodoros's 'Sources': Intertextuality, Paternity, and the Nile River in the *Aithiopika*," *TAPA* 138.2 (2008) 411–450.
- Erickson, P., "Invisibility Speaks: Servants and Portraits in Early Modern Visual Culture," *Journal for Early Modern Cultural Studies* 9.1 (2009) 23–61.
- Fernandez-Garrido, R., "Los sueños en la novela griega: Aquiles Tacio," *Habis* 40 (2009) 205–214.
- Fernandez-Garrido, R., "Stasis-Theory in Judicial Speeches of Greek Novels," *GRBS* 49.3 (2009) 453–472.
- Gärtner, T., "Die Syrinx-Erzählung im Hirtenroman des Longos und ihre mythischen Parallelversionen," *Eranos* 105.1 (2009) 22–28.
- Gasse, H., *Die Abenteuer der schönen Charikleia* (Köln: Anaconda, 2008) 302 pp.
- Gibbs, L., *Aesop's Fables in Latin: Ancient Wit and Wisdom from the Animal Kingdom* (Mundelein, IL: Bolchazy-Carducci, 2008) xxxi + 366 pp.
- Hansen, W., *Life of Aesop* (Bryn Mawr: Bryn Mawr Commentaries, 2008) 101 pp.
- Hilton, J., "Contemporary Elements in Achilles Tatius's *Leucippe And Clitophon*," *Acta Classica* 52 (2009) 101–112.
- Hubbard, T. K., "The Paradox of 'Natural' Heterosexuality with 'Unnatural' Women," *CW* 102.3 (2009) 249–258.
- Huber L., "Sexually Explicit? Re-reading Revelation's 144,000 Virgins as a Response to Roman Discourses," *Journal of Men, Masculinities & Spirituality* 2.1 (2008) 3–28.
- Hunter, R., *On Coming After: Studies in Post-Classical Greek Literature and its Reception* (de Gruyter, 2008) two volumes, 907 pp. The second volume contains a section on the ancient novel with the following essays:
- "History and Historicity in the Romance of Chariton."
 - "Longus and Plato."
 - "Growing Up in the Ancient Novels: A Response."
 - "The *Aithiopika* of Heliodorus: Beyond Interpretation?"
 - "'Philip the Philosopher' on the *Aithiopika* of Heliodorus."
 - "Plato's *Symposium* and the Traditions of Ancient Fiction."
 - "Isis and the Language of Aesop."
 - "The Curious Incident...: *Polypragmosyne* and the Ancient Novel."

Jefferson, H., *Longus: Daphnis and Chloe; Xenophon of Ephesus: Ephesiaca* (Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 2009) xiv + 370 pp.

Jennings, T. W., "Achilles Tattius," in *Plato or Paul?: the Origins of Western Homophobia* (Cleveland, OH: Pilgrim Press, 2009, vii + 244 pp.) 74–76.

Laplace, M., "Des Armes et des Mots. Reflets Contrastes de l'Ancienne Athenes dans le Roman de Chariton d'Aphrodisias," *Wiener Studien* 122 (2009) 49–87.

Lentakis, V., "Homeric Parody in Chariton," in *Antiphilesis: Studies on Classical, Byzantine and Modern Greek Literature and Culture: In Honour of John-Theophanes A. Papademetriou*, eds. E. Karamalengou, E. Makrygianni, and I-T. A. Papademetriou (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2009, 656 pp.) 435–441.

Miles, G., "The Representation of Reading in 'Philip the Philosopher's' Essay on Heliodorus," *Byzantion* 79 (2009) 292–306 pp.

Morgan, J. R., "The Emesan Connection: Philostratus and Heliodorus," in *Theios Sophistes. Essays on Flavius Philostratus' Vita Apollonii. Mnemosyne. Supplements. Monographs on Greek and Roman Language and Literature. Volume 305*, eds. K. Demoen and D. Praet (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2009, 405 pp.) 263–282.

Nakatani, S., "When Achilles Tattius Flourished," *Journal of Classical Studies* 56 (2008) 89–101.

Núñez, L., "Mythes enchassés dans un roman grec: Achille Tattius entre érudition et divertissement," in *Mythes et savoirs dans les textes grecs et latins. Actes du colloque international organisé dans le cadre du réseau européen "Le phénomène littéraire aux premiers siècles de notre ère," Université de Toulouse. Pallas. Revue d'Études Antiques*, eds. J-P. Aygon, R. Courtray, and J. Thomas (Toulouse: Presses Universitaires du Mirail, 2008, 389 pp.) 319–334.

Prince, C. K., *Chariton, Callirhoe. Book I*. (Bryn Mawr: Bryn Mawr Commentaries, 2009) 57 pp.

Redondo, J., "Sobre el erotismo en la novela griega antigua," *Pallas* 79 (2009) 323–336.

Sanz Morales, M., "Testimonio de los papirios y tradición medieval: ¿una versión diferente de la novela de Caritón?," in *Verae Lectiones. Estudios de crítica textual y edición de textos griegos*, eds. M. Sanz Morales and M. Librán Moreno (Huelva: Universidad de Huelva, 2009, 213 pp.) 203–226.

Steven D. S., *Greek Identity and the Athenian Past in Chariton. The Romance of Empire. Ancient Narrative Supplementum*, 9 (Groningen: Barkhuis and Groningen University Library, 2007) 282 pp.

Trzaskoma, S. M., "Aristophanes in Chariton (Plu. 744, Eq. 1244, Eq. 670)," *Philologus* 153.2 (2009) 351–353.

Trzaskoma, S. M., "Chariton and Tragedy: Reconsiderations and New Evidence," *AJP* 131.2 (2010) 219–231.

Vinson, S., "They-Who-Must-Be-Obedied: Arsake, Rhadopis, and Tabubue; Ihweret and Charikleia," *Comparative Literature Studies* 45.3 (2008) 289–315.

von Möllendorff, P., "Bild-Störung. Das Gemälde von Europas Entführung in Achilleus Tattios' Roman *Leukippe und Kleitophon*," in *Europa—Stier und Sternenzweig. Von der Union mit Zeus zum Staatenverbund*, ed. A. Renger, (Bonn: V&R unipress GmbH, 2009, 656 pp.) 145–164.

Latin Novels

Avila Vasconcelos, B., *Bilder der Sklaverei in den Metamorphosen des Apuleius* (Göttingen: Edition Ruprecht, 2009) 281 pp.

Bierl, A. "Antike Mysterien—ein Weg zur Vollkommenheit und die literarische Verarbeitung in Apuleius' *Metamorphosen*" in *Vollkommenheit*, eds. A. Assmann and J. Assmann (München: Fink, 2009, 296 pp.) 83–106.

Breitenstein, N., *Petronius, Satyrice, 1–15: Texte, Übersetzung, Kommentar* (Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2009) xviii + 237 pp.

Brown, A., *Satyricon* (Richmond, Surrey: Oneworld Classics, 2009) xiii + 205 pp.

Conte, G. B., "L' eredità di Eumolpo: ultime scene di un furbesco imbroglio," in *Moderno, postmoderno quasi antico. Atti del Convegno (Bari, 26–28 Ottobre 2006)*, ed. P. Fedeli (Lecce: Pensa Multimedia, 2008, 202 pp.) 107–118.

de Trane, G., *Scrittura e intertestualità nelle Metamorfosi di Apuleio* (Lecce: Pensa multimedia, 2009) 353 pp.

Duret, L., "Plaisir érotique et plaisir esthétique: l'éloge de la chevelure dans les *Métamorphoses* d'Apulée," in *Le Plaisir dans l'Antiquité et à la Renaissance*, eds. P. Galand-Hallyn, C. Lévy, and W. Verbaal (Turnhout: Brepols Publishers, 2008, 452 pp.) 171–186.

- Echalier, L., "De l'univers epique a l'univers imperial: 'L'histoire de Plotine' (Apulee, *Metamorphoses* VII, 5–9)," *Latomus* 67.3 (2008) 721–736.
- Echalier, L., "Pouvoir des mots, faiblesse des hommes. Un discours électoral dans les *Métamorphoses* d'Apulée," in *Pouvoirs des Hommes, Pouvoir des Mots, des Gracques à Trajan. Hommages au Professeur Paul Marius Martin*, eds. O. Devillers and J. Meyers, (Louvain, Paris, and Walpole, MA: Éditions Peeters, 2009, 624 pp.) 101–117.
- Fick, N., "La postérité des mythes grecs: Actéon chez Ovide et Apulée," in *Kaina pragmata. Mélanges offerts à Jean-Claude Carrière*, eds. M. Bastin-Hammou and C. Orfanos (Toulouse: Presses Universitaires du Mirail, 2009, 223 pp.) 169–178.
- Fedeli, P., "Il romanzo petroniano: bilanci e prospettive," in *Il romanzo latino: Modelli e tradizione letteraria. Atti della VII Giornata ghisleriana di Filologia classica (Pavia, 11–12 ottobre 2007)*, ed. F. Gasti (Pavia: Collegio Ghislieri, 2009, 138 pp.) 13–29.
- Ferrando, S., "Petronius arbiter homericæ elegantiae," *Maia* 61.3 (2009) 571–592.
- Finkelpearl, E., "Marsyas the Satyr and Apuleius of Ma-dauros," *Ramus* 38.1 (2009) 7–42.
- Fletcher, R., "Plato Re-Read too Late: Citation and Platonism in Apuleius' *Apologia*," *Ramus* 38.1 (2009) 43–74.
- Fortunati, V., "Apuleio e Scarron: legami intertestuali tra le *Metamorfosi* e il Roman comique," in *Il romanzo latino: Modelli e tradizione letteraria. Atti della VII Giornata ghisleriana di Filologia classica (Pavia, 11–12 ottobre 2007)*, ed. F. Gasti (Pavia: Collegio Ghislieri, 2009, 138 pp.) 115–123.
- Frischer, B., "A Textual-Critical, Archaeological, and Literary Study of the Bath Episode in Petronius, *Sat.* 73.2–5," in *Maxima Debetur Magistro Reverentia: Essays on Rome and the Roman Tradition in Honor of Russell T. Scott*, eds. P. B. Harvey and C. Conybeare (Como: New Press, 2009, 244 pp.). Page citation not available.
- Gaisser, J. H., "Picturing Apuleius: Images from Antiquity to the Nineteenth Century," in *Maxima Debetur Magistro Reverentia: Essays on Rome and the Roman Tradition in Honor of Russell T. Scott*, eds. P. B. Harvey and C. Conybeare (Como: New Press, 2009, 244 pp.). Page citation not available.
- Gamauf, R., "Petronius 97: *Quaestio lance et licio* oder Rechtspraxis des ersten Jahrhunderts?," in *Fides Hymnitas Ivs. Studii in Onore di Luigi Labruna. III*, eds. C. Cascione and C. Masi Doria (Napoli: Editoriale Scientifica, 2007, 6157 pp.) 2037–2046.
- Gärtner, T., "Die likischen Bauern bei Ovid und eine Strukturimitation dieser Geschichte bei Apuleius," *Maia* 61.3 (2009) 568–571.
- Gärtner, T., "Die petronianische Iliupersis im Munde des Poetasters Eumolpus: Ein Beispiel für exzessive Vergil-Imitation?" *Würzburger Jahrbücher für die Altertumswissenschaft* 33 (2009) 105–121.
- Gärtner, T., "Eine übersehene Parallele zwischen Petron und Statius und die Datierung des *Satyricon*," *C&M* 60 (2009) 305–309.
- Gazzarri, T., "The Meaning of 'nocte intempesta' in *Satyricon* 101, 5," *Maia* 61.2 (2009) 274–284.
- Gianotti, G. F., "Spettacoli comici, attori e spettatori in Petronio," in *La commedia latina: modelli, forme, ideologia, fortuna. Giornate siracusane sul teatro antico, Siracusa, 21 aprile 2008*, eds. M. Blancato and G. Nuzzo (Siracusa: Istituto Nazionale del Dramma, 2009, 171 pp.) 77–127.
- Goldman, M. L., "Language, Satire, and Heteroglossia in the *Cena Trimalchionis*," *Helios* 35.1 (2008) 49–65.
- Grossardt, P., "The *Cena Trimalchionis* Read as a Parody to *Ilias*," *Hermes* 137.3 (2009) 335–355.
- Guidetti, F., "La tomba di Trimalchione. Saggio di commento archeologico al *Satyricon*," in *Lo sguardo archeologico. I normalisti per Paul Zanker*, ed. F. de Angelis (Pisa: Edizioni della Normale, 2007, xx + 345 pp.) 77–96.
- Guillaume-Coirier, G., "Senteurs artificielles et senteurs naturelles: parfums et couronnes dans *Le Banquet de Trimalcion*," in *Parfums de l'antiquité. La rose et l'encens en Méditerranée; à l'occasion de l'exposition organisée du 7 juin au 30 novembre 2008 par le Musée Royal de Mariemont* (Morlanwelz-Mariemont: Musée Royal de Mariemont, 2008, 488 pp.) 277–280.
- Habash, M., "Priapic Punishments in Petronius' *Satyrica* 16–26," *SyllClass* 18 (2008) 213–224.
- Heinrich, F., "Der religiöse Intellektuelle: Apuleius und Ali Schariati als Repräsentanten eines religionswissenschaftlichen Typus," in *Religiöse Philosophie und philosophische Religion der frühen Kaiserzeit. Literaturgeschichtliche Perspektiven. Ratio Religionis Studien I*, eds. R. Hirsch-Luipold, H. Görge-manns, M. von Albrecht, and T. Thum (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, x + 418 pp.) 315–329.

- Heinse, W. and J. Knipp, *Satyricon: phantastische Abenteuer* (Köln: Anaconda, 2009) 284 pp.
- Herrmann, K., “‘Alles ist ein Märchen’: Zum Aufbau von Novalis’ Heinrich of Ofterdingen und Apuleius’ Metamorphosen,” in *Dona sunt pulcherrima. Festschrift für Rudolf Rieks*, eds. K. Herrmann, K. Geus, U. Fehn, and E. Porsch (Oberhaid: Utopica, 2008, 514 pp.) 201–212.
- Hilton, J. L., “*Furor, dementia, rabies*: Social Displacement, Madness and Religion in the *Metamorphoses* of Apuleius,” in *Mania: Madness in the Greco-Roman World*, ed. P. R. Bosman (Pretoria: Classical Association of South Africa, 2009, 140 pp.) 84–105.
- Hindermann, J., “The Elegiac Ass: the Concept of *Servitium Amoris* in Apuleius’ *Metamorphoses*,” *Ramus* 38.1 (2009) 75–84.
- Hindermann, J., *Der elegische Esel Apuleius’ Metamorphosen und Ovids Ars Amatoria* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2009) 229 pp.
- Holford-Strevens, L., “*Trimalchio dimidiatus*: Milo Gives Himself Away,” *Mnemosyne* 61.3 (2008) 477–478.
- Hummel, P. *D’Éros à Psyché: tradition antique et moderne d’un mythe* (Paris: Philologicum, 2008) 140 pp.
- Kirichenko, A., “*Lectores in fabula*: Apuleius’ *Metamorphoses* between Pleasure and Instruction,” *Prometheus* 33 (2007) 254–276.
- Kirichenko, A., “Writing like a Clown: Apuleius’ Metafiction and Plautus’ Metatheater,” *Göttinger Forum für Altertumswissenschaft* 10 (2007) 259–271.
- Kirichenko, A., “Satire, Propaganda, and the Pleasure of Reading: Apuleius’ Stories of Curiosity in Context,” *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 104 (2008) 339–373.
- Lateiner, D., “Tears in Apuleius’ *Metamorphoses*,” in *Tears in the Graeco-Roman World*, ed. T. Fögen (Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2009, vi + 491 pp.) 85–104.
- Lefèvre, E., “Petrons Kritik an dem Tragiker Seneca (*Sat.* 88–89),” in *La riflessione sul teatro nella cultura romana*, eds. G. Aricò and M. Rivoltella (Milano: Vita e Pensiero, 2008, vii + 375 pp.) 253–262.
- Levinskaia, O. L., *Antichnaia Asinaria: istoriia odnogo siuzheta* (Moskva: RGGU, 2008) 204 pp.
- Malamud, M., “Primitive Politics: Lucan and Petronius,” in *Writing Politics in Imperial Rome*, eds. W. J. Dominik, J. Garthwaite, and P. A. Roche (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2009, xii + 539 pp.) 273–306.
- Martin, R. “Petronius Arbiter et le *Satyricon*: ou en est la recherche?,” *BAGB* 2009.1 (2009) 143–168.
- May, R., “The Metamorphosis of Pantomime: Apuleius’ Judgement of Paris (*Met.* 10.3034),” in *New Directions in Ancient Pantomime*, eds. E. Hall and R. Wyles (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2008, xvii + 481 pp.) 338–362.
- Murgatroyd, P., ed., *Apuleius Metamorphoses: An Intermediate Latin Reader*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009) x + 151 pp.
- O’Sullivan, C., “Censoring these ‘Racy Morsels of the Vernacular’: Loss and Gain in the Translation of Apuleius and Catullus,” in *Translation and Censorship: Patterns of Communication and Interference*, eds. E. Ní Chuilleanáin, C. Ó Cuilleanáin, and D. L. Parris (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2009, 256 pp.) 76–92.
- Pace, N., “Nuovi documenti sulla controversia seicentesca relativa al *Fragmentum Traguriense* della *Cena Trimalchionis* di Petronio,” in *La cultura letteraria ellenistica. Persistenza, innovazione, trasmissione. Atti del Convegno COFIN 2003, Università di Roma “Tor Vergata,” 19–21 settembre 2005*, eds. R. Pretagostini and E. Dettori (Roma: Quaderni dei Seminari romani di cultura greca, 2007, 343 pp.) 305–336 pp.
- Pace, N., “Ombre e silenzi nella scoperta del frammento traurino di Petronio e nella controversia sulla sua autenticità,” in *Debita dona: studi in onore di Isabella Gualandri*, eds. P. F. Moretti, C. Torre, and G. Zanetto (Napoli: M. D’Auria Editore, 2008, 556 pp.) 373–399.
- Patimo, V. M., “Una seduta deliberante nel *Satyricon* (101, 6–103, 2),” in *Il romanzo latino: Modelli e tradizione letteraria. Atti della VII Giornata ghisleriana di Filologia classica (Pavia, 11–12 ottobre 2007)*, ed. F. Gasti (Pavia: Collegio Ghislieri, 2009, 138 pp.) 47–59.
- Penwill, J. L., “On Choosing a Life: Variations on an Epic Theme in Apuleius *Met.* 10 & 11,” *Ramus* 38.1 (2009) 85–108.
- Prag, J. R. W. and I. Repath, eds., *Petronius: a Handbook* (Chichester and Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009) xii + 256 pp.
- This text contains these essays:
- Andreau, J., “Freedmen in the *Satyricon*.”
 - Hales, S., “Freedmen’s Cribs: Domestic Vulgarly on the Bay of Naples.”

- Harrison, S., “Petronius’ *Satyricon* and the Novel in English.”
- Hope, V. M., “At Home with the Dead: Roman Funeral Traditions and Trimalchio’s Tomb.”
- Morgan, J. R., “Petronius and Greek Literature.”
- Panayotakis, C., “Petronius and the Roman Literary Tradition.”
- Paul, J., “Fellini-*Satyricon*.”
- Richlin, A., “Sex in the *Satyricon*: Outlaws in Literatureland.”
- Rimell, V., “Letting the Page run on: Poetics, Rhetoric, and Noise in the *Satyricon*.”
- Slater, N. W., “Reading the *Satyricon*.”
- Verboven, K., “A Funny Thing Happened on my Way to the Market: Reading Petronius to Write Economic History.”
- Vout, C., “*Satyricon* and Neronian Culture.”

Ragno, T., *Il teatro nel racconto: studi sulla fabula scenica della Matrona di Efeso* (Bari: Palomar, 2009) 570 pp.

Relihan, J. C., trans., *Apuleius, The Tale of Cupid and Psyche* (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing, 2009) xxiii + 102 pp.

Sanzi, E., “La trasmissione dei sistemi religiosi complessi nel secondo ellenismo. Qualche esemplificazione dal XI libro de le *Metamorfosi* di Apuleio,” in *Religioni in Contatto nel Mediterraneo Antico. Modalità di Diffusione e Processi di Interferenza. Atti del 3° Colloquio su »Le Religioni Orientali nel Mondo Greco e Romano«* Loveno di Menaggio (Como) 26–28 Maggio 2006. *Mediterranea. Quaderni Annuali dell’ Istituto di Studi sulle Civiltà Italiane e del Mediterraneo Antico*. 4, eds. C. Bonnet, S. Ribichini, and D. Steuernagel (Pisa and Roma: Fabrizio Serra Editore, 2008, 363 pp.) 33–48.

Setaioli, A., “Le poesi in Petr. *Sat.* 55. 6 e 92. 2,” *Prometheus* 35.3 (2009) 237–258.

Soler, J., “Lucius, parent de Plutarque, ou: comment lire les *Metamorphoses* d’ Apulee,” *RPh* 82.2 (2008) 385–403.

Steinberg, M. E., “De conjeturas, usus scribendi e identidades. Petronio, *Satyricon* 52. 11,” *Exemplaria Classica* 11 (2007) 105–112.

Teixeira, C., D. L. Leão, P. S. Margarido Ferreira, and M. Earl, *The Satyricon of Petronius: Genre, Wandering and Style* (Coimbra: Centro de Estudos Clássicos e Humanísticos, Universidade de Coimbra, 2008) 137 pp.

Vannini, G., “Il capitolo 5 del *Satyricon*: una proposta di lettura,” in *Il romanzo latino: Modelli e tradizione letteraria. Atti della VII Giornata ghisleriana di Filologia classica (Pavia, 11–12 ottobre 2007)*, ed. F. Gasti (Pavia: Collegio Ghislieri, 2009, 138 pp.) 31–46.

Veloso, R. B., “OCLOPETA,” *Glotta* 84 (2008) 50–51.

Wolff, E., “La reduplication et le contraste dans le *Satyricon* de Petrone,” *VL* 181 (2009) 29–36.

Zawadzka, M., “Petronius 14.7,” *Mnemosyne* 62.1 (2009) 111–112.

Zawadzka, M. and J. Kwapisz, “A Note on Petronius 79.6,” *CQ* 59 (2009) 665–667.

Recent Scholarship on the Ancient Novel and Early Jewish and Christian Narrative

Barrier, J. W., *The Acts of Paul and Thecla: A Critical Introduction and Commentary* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009) xx + 232 pp.

Bennema, C., “A Theory of Character in the Fourth Gospel with Reference to Ancient and Modern Literature,” *Biblical Interpretation* 17.4 (2009) 375–421.

Garstad, B., “Joseph as a Model for Faunus-Hermes: Myth, History, and Fiction in the Fourth Century,” *Vigiliae Christianae* 63.5 (2009) 493–521.

Nachleben

Barry Baldwin reports

According to Stuart Gillespie, “Translation & Literature” 15.1 (2006), p. 47 (electronic publication), the unpublished papers of William Popple (1700–1764, a descendant of Andrew Marvell’s sister) include a stage adaptation of Petronius’ “Ephesian Matron,” now in the British Library.

Popple also left translations of Juvenal 6 & 10, also much of Horace (his version of *Ars Poetica* was published in 1753).

Most of Popple’s work was apparently done in Bermuda, which he governed from 1745 to just before his death. Gillespie has published the Juvenal and some Horace in “Translation & Literature” 15.1 (2006), 51–96, and 16.2 (2007), 205–35.

Professor Gillespie (University of Glasgow, Scotland) has most kindly provided the following bibliographical information from the British Library ms. catalogue:

Add. 18614.

“THE EPHESIAN Matron. A Tragi-Comedy of one Act,” by William Popple; with dedication to [Philip Dormer Stanhope] Earl of Chesterfield. Paper; XVIIIth cent. Folio.

Professor Gillespie describes it as “a thin but quite lavishly done folio.”

I am further grateful to Professor Gillespie for much extra information about Popple and his works. Readers of *PSN* should consult his above-mentioned studies of Popple’s Horace and Juvenal for hitherto overlooked examples of the

influence of Roman Satire on this intriguing amateur playwright and translator.

Popple's Ephesian Matron comes about mid-way between Walter Charleton's *Matrona Ephesia, sive, Lusus serius de amore* (1659), and *The Ephesian Matron, or The Widow's Tears*, a one-act comic opera (1769) with music by Charles Dibdin and libretto by Isaac Bickerstaff. The latter, an acquaintance of Samuel Johnson, was obliged to flee England in 1772 to avoid prosecution for homosexuality. This spoof of contemporary opera was premiered at the Ranelagh Gardens in London. Thanks to Google, I found a 2005 BBC press release describing its frequent modern performances in the 20th century, down to 2002 and 2003.

How long before we see Petronius on Broadway?

The Sunday Times (London)

October 19, 2008

Lamented prophet

BYLINE: Ian Fraser ian@ianfraser.org

SECTION: BUSINESS; Scotland Business; Pg.2

LENGTH: 138 words

"There's a strange symmetry in the death last Sunday of Ian Rushbrook, the talented Edinburgh fund manager who has been predicting the crash for years.

"Ian received a lot of criticism while the debt-fuelled consumer party continued apace. More bullish investors couldn't get their heads around Ian's conviction that the party couldn't last. Now that the bust he predicted several years ago is with us, he has been utterly vindicated.

"At the Personal Assets Trust annual meeting in 2007, Ian said: 'Is the financial world sleepwalking into disaster? No. It's worse than that. It's walking into disaster, wide awake.' Charles Kindleberger, author of *Manias, Panics and Crashes*, explains this by quoting the Roman writer Petronius: 'Mundus vult decipi: ergo decipiatur'—'The world wants to be deceived, so let it be deceived.'"

The Observer (England)

February 3, 2008

OSM: SEX & SPORT: Sex gods: Sports stars have been erotic icons since the time of ancient Greece

BYLINE: Simon Goldhill

SECTION: OBSERVER SPORTS MAGAZINE; Pg. 27

LENGTH: 663 words

"The ancient Greeks thought that going to the gym regularly was a good way to prepare young men for war, and a necessary training for the body's health. It was also the place to pick up boys.

"Socrates, the philosopher, always had an eye for the cute young man, and he describes the scene at Taureas's gym when the hunk of the day walked in. 'The fellow looked absolutely amazing: his beauty, his size. Everyone seemed to me to fancy him—they were so dumb struck and confused when he came in—with a great crowd of lovers following him.' A

friend adds: 'If he took his kit off, you wouldn't bother with his face...'

"This was a familiar scene to Socrates's audience. The classical Greeks were obsessed with beautiful bodies and spent a good deal of time talking about them, honing them, and looking at each other's flesh. In the gym, men—and men only—took all their clothes off, poured oil over their bodies and then had it scraped off, and then they exercised naked, including wrestling together. In a culture that supported affectionate and erotic relations between males, it is no surprise that going to the gym was a pretty sexy affair.

"This was part of the good life. Every Greek city worth its name had a string of gymnasiums and many citizens went to the gym every day. One little poem celebrates the ideal vividly: 'He's a lucky guy, who's in love, goes to the gym, comes home and sleeps with his beautiful boy all day.' These words were written for performance by a man among his friends, drinking happily at a symposium—the evening parties at which men relaxed together. For the ancient Greek, sex and sport went together naturally.

"The professional athlete on his way to the Olympic Games was sometimes advised not to have sex before the day to save his strength. But the man who won at the Olympic Games returned home in a procession as grand as any ticker-tape parade, and, like any modern celebrity, became a sex-bomb overnight. Even the cabbage-eared boxer, sweaty from the fray, had his passionate admirers.

"Sport was where masculinity was on display—and masculinity was a turn-on for the Greek spectators. In a city such as Athens, the Greek man was surrounded by statues of beautiful heroes and warriors—naked bodies, impossibly developed, and perfectly formed. These statues are now seen as the masterpieces of classical art. But these wonderful bodies, like pictures of supermodels for women today, were a frightening ideal to live up to. The gym could also be an anxious experience.

"Men should 'glow with fabulous conditioning: neither lean nor skinny, nor excessive in weight, but etched with symmetry'. That's Lucian, a Greek satirist from the Roman Empire, spelling out what to aim for: a six-pack, good legs, to be beautifully symmetrical but not too heavy with muscles...

"Socrates was famous for wandering up to acquaintances in the street and warning them that they had got flabby and clearly weren't working out hard enough. Looking at citizens' bodies and being looked at critically was all part of the life of the gym. In the city, there was no place to hide. Your body was open to the public gaze—and revealed what sort of a man you were.

"Athenians found it disgusting that in Sparta women also exercised. For them it was an all male business. And they recognised that sport in the gym was very much like the grapplings of the bedroom. 'Before wrestling under the rules of the Goddess of Love,' wrote the novelist Achilles Tatius, 'boys get to grapple on the wrestling mat, publicly locking bodies together in the gym—and no one says that these em-

braces are immodest.’ Wrestling is a training for when ‘bodies rub firmly against one another in the athletics of pleasure’.

“Achilles Tatius is a sly and wicked writer, but he touches the heart of the issue. For ancient Greeks, going to the gym was never just about sport. It was always about sex, too.”

The Australian

August 19, 2009 Wednesday

1-All-round Country Edition

The Greeks had a blue word for it

BYLINE: Luke Slattery

SECTION: FEATURES; Pg. 34

LENGTH: 1607 words

“Harvard’s Loeb Library is removing centuries of priggery from Greek comedy, writes Luke Slattery.

“THE ancient Greeks, as every school boy and girl knows—or at least once knew—invented democracy, comedy, tragedy and philosophy. Even today many of our markers of cultivation—words such as academy, school, history, logic, grammar, poetry, rhythm, harmony, melody and music—can be traced to the Attic dialect of Athens.

“But not all gifts passed down from our esteemed ancestors are gilt, for the Athenian citizenry also made an art form of what we now call smut, dirt, or soft porn. It’s not only that phalluses adorned the streets and the surfaces of their famed black figure vases, the language of that unique Athenian contribution to Western civilisation—the theatre—was downright rude.

“In the past century the most authoritative translations from the classical tradition, preserved between the green (Greek) and red (Latin) covers of Harvard’s Loeb Classical Library, danced rather prissily around this fact. No longer. The Loeb library is rolling out a series of new translations and they shed a direct light on our literary inheritance.

“Aristophanes, the master of Old Attic Comedy, is especially unbridled. In his *Women at the Thesmophoria*, for example, two characters are discussing the tragic poet Agathon, whose effeminate looks were as legendary as his homosexuality.

“The conversation runs as follows:

“Euripides: There is Agathon.

“Kinsman: You don’t mean the sun-tanned strong one?

“Euripides: No, a different one. You’ve never seen him?

“Kinsman: Not the one with the full beard?

“Euripides: You’ve never seen him.

“Kinsman: Absolutely not, as far as I know.

“Euripides: Well, you must have f. ked him, though you might not know it.

“This replaces an earlier translation in which the final line, somewhat inexplicably, read: ‘I fear there’s much you don’t remember, sir.’

“A little later in the play Agathon, who is wearing a woman’s cloak, counsels his audience of the need to confront misfortune with submission. It’s a bit of a free kick for Euripides’ ribald kinsman. He shoots back: ‘You certainly got your wide

arsehole, you faggot, not with words but in a spirit of submission.’

“In another play by Aristophanes, the oft-staged anti-war comedy *Lysistrata*, the women of Athens refer to themselves as a frail sex, but in the new dirty realist translation they become a ‘low and horny race’.

“Something of the classical world’s dual inheritance—the noble and the vulgar; elevated and base; beautiful and ugly—is caught by Frederick Nietzsche’s famous distinction between the sublime Apolline spirit and its scary alter ego: the Dionysiac. In a sense, all Greek drama has its roots in the Dionysiac impulse, and was performed at festivals of the wine god Dionysos, called Dionysia. But where tragedy aspires to the sublime, only comedy—an ancient genre believed to have begun with rustic phallic songs—retains its attachment to communal intoxication and merriment: hallmarks of the Dionysiac.

“The Loeb editors, for at least a century, have attempted to draw a veil across the edgy Dionysos. The previous translation of Aristophanes, first published in 1924, has only just been replaced by a five-volume series edited afresh by Boston University classicist Jeffrey Henderson. It was at least a decade in the making.

“‘This is a particular kind of comedy that was meant to be transgressive,’ explains Henderson, who is also general editor of the Loeb Classical Library. ‘The characters wore outrageous costumes and had big leather phalluses. The point of the comedy was to shake people up. To expose what was normally hidden, to make fun of it, to take the important people down a peg or two and speak up for the ordinary man.’

“Harvard University Press felt the uncut Aristophanes was justified in order to meet advances in scholarship and a more liberal attitude to sexually explicit banter. As Henderson points out in his introduction to the new series, the old Aristophanes was ‘as Aristophanic as the Victorian era would allow’. Which is to say, not very.

“‘The original Loeb contract, dating from 1911, enjoined authors to alter or omit anything that might give offence,’ remarks Ian Stevenson, assistant editor at HUP.

“‘This injunction, which had as much to do with respect for the law as with prudishness, was removed in the late 1960s, as soon as the British and US obscenity laws were finally relaxed enough to allow the straightforward translation of racy authors; the first to benefit were Martial and Petronius, and since then the library has added, revised, or replaced others, such as Aristophanes, the Greek iambic poets and mime-writers, Catullus, Horace, Juvenal and Perseus, Plautus (in progress), and Terence. During this time Loeb policy has been to produce faithful translations: the nearest attainable Anglophone equivalent to the Greek or Latin without any filters.’

“In the original Loeb, obscene or explicitly sexual passages were often omitted, or sometimes translated into Latin. In the passage quoted above from Aristophanes’ *Thesmophoria*, for example, the real meaning of that pungent last line of Greek

was encoded in a Latin footnote (for the delectation of classicists).

“Some other passages were subtly altered.

“In the old translation of Aristophanes’ *Acharnians* the unlikely hero, Dicaeopolis, is first to arrive at the Athenian assembly. ‘I pass the time complaining, yawning, stretching,’ he says in the old translation. And the new: ‘I sigh, I yawn, I stretch, I fart.’

“A little later in the play we have a phallic hymn and procession which seems to capture the untamed Dionysiac spirit of archaic comedy: ‘Yes, it’s far more pleasant, Phales Phales [the personification of the phallus], to catch a budding maid with pilfered wood—Strymodorus Thracian girl from the Rocky Bottom—and grab her waist, lift her up, throw her down, and take her cherry.’

“The old Loeb version was considerably more coy: ‘Far happier ‘tis to me and sweeter, O Phales, Phales, some soft glade in, to woo the saucy, arch, deceiving, young maiden, as from my woodland fells I meet her descending with my fagots laden, and catch her up, and ill entreat her, and make her pay the fine for thieving.’

“Stevenson offers this example from the Roman poet Martial. ‘You sang badly, Aegle, while your practices were normal. Now you sing well, but you aren’t to be kissed,’ ran the old version. This has been rendered anew as: ‘You sang badly, Aegle, in the days when you were f.ked. Now you sing well, but you aren’t to be kissed.’

“Alastair Blanshard, a University of Sydney classicist with an interest in ancient erotica, notes that in the old Loeb of Greek writer Achilles Tatius’ *Leucippe and Cleitophon*, as soon as the discussion of the supremacy of same-sex love over different-sex love moves on from mythological arguments to ‘the pleasure that lies in the works of love themselves’, the translation switches from English to Latin. A close encounter with the full-blooded reality of classical language can surprise even students raised on the argot of the internet. ‘I recall one student practically turning pink in his face upon his first encounter with the new Aristophanes translation,’ says Blanshard’s university colleague Julia Kindt, a German-trained classicist and expert in Greek religion. ‘The Loeb editions, both the old and the new translations, ultimately also show how we read ourselves into the texts when we translate. The different styles superbly reflect the cultural predispositions of the time when they were produced.’

“For scholars of earlier times a classical education was part of a broader project: cultivation and elite formation. The great German scholar Theodor Mommsen, born in 1817, hoped an education in the classics would ‘prepare the child of the cultivated classes to be a professor of classical studies’. And for several centuries after the physical rediscovery of the classical world at Rome, the Vesuvian cities of Pompeii and Herculaneum, Apollo’s sanctuary of Delphi, and Athens itself, these Apollonian ideals stressing rationality, mastery and proportion held sway.

“But the late-modern classical revival is widening our aperture on the past and enlarging the term ‘classical’ to include things that might once have seemed barbaric.

“We can now detect, using Nietzsche’s terminology, a refocusing of interest in the classical world around the Dionysiac elements of that tradition. Certainly, the makers of the US miniseries *Rome* pictured the ancient capital in the colours of a latter day Mumbai: as festive, unruly, blood-stained, and aglow. Contemporary scholars, who are more interested in transgression than connoisseurship, are finding a different use for the classics. The new-look Loeb’s are meeting this challenge, and bringing the classical world home.

“The only trouble with Aristophanes is that it’s not entirely clear in which camp he seems more comfortable: the Apollonian or the Dionysiac? His plays are crammed with fart, phallus and bum jokes, and scorn is his metier, while his theatrical language is a blend of the lofty and the vulgar.

“But Aristophanic subversion had a rational end, as social critique essential for healthy democratic functioning. Dicaeopolis, it’s worth remembering, the main character of *Acharnians*, will ‘speak against everyone’ as he makes his lone case to the Athenians for a private truce with Sparta. But he will speak, nevertheless, the outrageous truth.

“As he tells the assembly, in words that transcend the fog of translation: ‘Even comedy knows about what’s right; and what I say will be shocking, but right.’”

Canali, L., *Satyricon & Satiricon* (San Cesario di Lecce: Manni, 2008) 151 pp. A novel inspired by the *Satyricon*.

Chaudhuri, S., “Lucius, thou art translated: Adlington’s Apuleius,” *Renaissance Studies* 22.5 (2008) 669–704.

Desplechin, M., *La galerie de Psyché* (Paris: N. Chaudun; Fondation pour le Domaine de Chantilly, 2009) 71 pp.

Drews, F., *Menschliche Willensfreiheit und göttliche Vorsehung bei Augustinus, Proklos, Apuleius und John Milton. Bd. 1. Augustinus und Proklos* (Frankfurt, Heusenstamm, Paris, Lancaster, and New Brunswick, NJ: Ontos-Verlag, 2009) xiv + 410 pp.

Drews, F., *Menschliche Willensfreiheit und göttliche Vorsehung bei Augustinus, Proklos, Apuleius und John Milton. 2. Apuleius, Milton, Zusammenfassungen*. (Frankfurt, Heusenstamm, Paris, Lancaster, and New Brunswick, NJ: Ontos-Verlag, 2009) 411–804 pp.

Dronke, P., “*Metamorphoses*: Allegory in Early Medieval Commentaries on Ovid And Apuleius,” *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 72 (2009) 21–41.

Eisner, M. G. and M. D. Schachter, “*Libido Sciendi*: Apuleius, Boccaccio, and the Study of the History of Sexuality,”

Publications of the Modern Language Association of America 124.3 (2009) 817–838.

Endres, N., “Petronius in West Egg: *The Satyricon* and *The Great Gatsby*,” *F. Scott Fitzgerald Review* 7 (2009) 65–79.

Häfner, R., “*Metamorphosen*: Beobachtungen zum Problem der Editionsformen in einigen Apuleius-Ausgaben von Filippo Beroaldo (1500) bis Johannes Priscaeus (1650),” in *Spätrenaissance-Philosophie in Deutschland: 1570–1650: Entwürfe zwischen Humanismus und Konfessionalisierung, okkulten Traditionen und Schulmetaphysik*, ed. M. Mulsow (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 2009, vii + 404 pp.) 123–160.

Harney, L. D., “Zarzuela and the Pastoral,” *MLN* 123.2 (2008) 252–273.

Heidmann, U., “How to Make a Modern Tale with an Ancient One. Perrault Dialogues with Apuleius and La Fontaine,” *Litterature* 153 (2009) 19–37.

Mailho, L., M. Béline, and N. Croquet, *Psyché au miroir d’Azay* (Paris: Patrimoine, Centre des monuments nationaux, 2009) 215 pp.

Mayer, E., “Notes on the *AEthiopica*, the *Lives of Homer*, and the Name ‘Don Quixote de la Mancha,’” *Cervantes: Bulletin of the Cervantes Society of America* 28.1 (2008) 167–180.

McKnight, S., “Petronius on the New Roman Woman,” in *The Blue Parakeet: Rethinking How You Read the Bible* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2008, 236 pp.) 226–227.

Neumeister, C., “Wilhelm Ehlers’ Übersetzung der Freigelassengespräche in Petrons *Cena Trimalchionis*,” in *Pontes V. Übersetzung als Vermittlerin antiker Literatur*, eds. W. Kofler, F. Schaffrath, and K. Töchterle (Innsbruck, Wien, and Bozen: StudienVerlag, 2009, 432 pp.) 309–317.

Newton, J. K., “Reading Revelation Romantically,” *Journal of Pentecostal Theology* 18.2 (2009) 194–215.

Ní Mheallaigh, K., “Ec(h)ojing the Ass-Novel: Reading and Desire in *Onos*, *Metamorphoses* and the *Name of the Rose*,” *Ramus* 38.1 (2009) 109–122.

Prestifilippo, G. *Oltre Marziano: Iside, Apuleio e la Primavera di Botticelli* (Catania: Università di Catania, Centro studi sull’antico cristianesimo, 2008) 94 pp.

Sklenar, R., “Anti-Petronian Elements in *The Great Gatsby*,” *F. Scott Fitzgerald Review* 6 (2006–2007) 121–28.

Speyer, W., “Das ‘Märchen’ von Amor und Psyche als Offenbarungstext mit einem Ausblick auf Goethes *Selige Seh-*

sucht,” *Aiakeion. Beiträge zur Klassischen Altertumswissenschaft zu Ehren von Florens Felten*, eds. C. Reinholdt, P. Scherrer, and W. Wohlmayr (Wien: Phoibos Verlag, 2009, 177 pp.) 161–170.

Voetmann, H., *Satyricon: roman* (Kbh.: Gyldendal, 2009) 183 pp.

Watanabe, A., “Apuleius in Meiji Japan: *The Golden Ass* as an Educational and Reformatory Novel,” *Ramus* 38.1 (2009) 123–144.

Notices

American Philological Association, January 6–9, 2010 141st Annual Meeting, Orange County (Anaheim), CA

Panel: Petronius’ *Satyrica*: New Readings, New Directions

- Lippman, M., “False *Fortuna*: Religious Imagery and the Painting-Gallery Episode in the *Satyrica*.”
- Makowski, J., “Petronius’ Giton: Gender and Genre.”
- McCoy, M., “Petronius’ Other Rome: The Cities of the *Satyrica* in the Roman Imaginary.”
- Skinner, M., “Fortunata and the Virtues of Freedwomen.”

Panel: Visualizing Ancient Narrative: From Manuscript to Comics

- Gaisser, J. H., “Illuminating Apuleius’ *Golden Ass*.”

Panel: One Hundred and Twenty Years of Homosexuality

- Nugent, M., “*Si vir fueris*: Sexuality and Masculine Self-Fashioning in Petronius’ *Satyrica*.”

Panel: Greek Novel and Rhetoric

- Baker, A., “The Spell of Achilles Tatius: Gorgias’ Magic and Persuasion Reconfigured.”
- Downie, J., “The God and the Emperor: Aelius Aristides’ Case for Civic Immunity in the *Hieroi Logoi*.”
- Groves, R., “Women, Sex, Bilingualism, and the *Aethiopika*.”
- Sloan, M., “The Original Locus for *moria peristaseos*.”
- Weaire, G., “Pedagogy and Politeness in Dionysius of Halicarnassus’ *De compositione verborum*.”

Classical Association of the Middle West and South, 105th Annual Meeting, Marriott City Center Hotel, Minneapolis, Minnesota, April 1–4, 2009

Panel: Petronius: Author, Identities, Reception

- Bay, S. M., “The Petronian Question within a Neronian Context.”
- Carter, M., “Petronius and Hunter S. Thompson.”
- McCoy, M. B., “The Cult of Priapus and Queer Identities in Petronius’ *Satyrica*.”

- Slater, N. W., “‘His Career as Trimalchio’: Petronian Character and Narrative in Fitzgerald’s Great American Novel.”

Panel: *Poikila Hellenika*

- Harper, K., “From Shame to Sin: Fictional Prostitutes and Greek Fiction.”

Panel: Petronius & Apuleius

- Kleijwegt, M. D., “Revisiting the City of the *Cena Trimalchionis*.”
- Nelsestuen, G. A., “*Declamator Furiosus*: Encolpius and Plato’s *Phaedrus* in Petronius’ *Satyrica*.”
- Peterson, A., “The *De Deo Socratis*: Apuleius’ Romanization of Plato and Homer.”
- Ramsby, T. R., “Inscriptions in the *Domus Trimalchionis*.”
- Wiltshire, D. C., “Intertexts between Catullus’ *Coma Berenices* and Apuleius’ *Met.* 2.6–9.”
- Wolfrom, M. K., “A Lucretian Venus: Erotic and Divine Love in Apuleius’ *Cupid and Psyche*.”

Panel: Tacitus

- Smith, E. M., “Seneca and Petronius in Tacitus’ *Annals*.”

Panel: The Nature of Horror in Classical Antiquity

- Scippacercola, N., “Horror in the Ancient Greek Novel: A Brief Review.”

Classical Association of the Middle West and South, 90th Anniversary Meeting, November 13–15, 2008, Asheville, North Carolina, University of North Carolina at Asheville

Panel: Oprah’s Book Club

- Clapp, D., “The Metamorphosis of *Fama* in Apuleius’ *Asinus Aureus*.”

Classical Association of the Middle West and South, 106th Annual Meeting, Renaissance Convention Center Hotel, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, March 24–27, 2010

Panel: Petronius and Apuleius

- Flores, S. O., “Channeling Plato: Light, Vision, and Intermediacy in Apuleius’ Demonology.”
- Garcia, L. F., “Trimalchio as Cultural Theorist: The Semiotics of Ambition in the *Cena Trimalchionis*.”
- Nguyen, J. T., “Life and Death in the *Cena Trimalchionis*.”

Panel: Greek Novel and Narrative

- Banta, J. L., “Reversing Meaning: Making Metaphor Reality in Lucian’s *True Histories*.”
- Harper, K., “Jesus, Paul, and Pagan Imposters: Narrative Imitation in the Roman Empire.”
- Makowski, J. F., “*Opsis* and *Eros*: Platonic Love in the Ancient Novel.”
- Regan, M., “Hellenistic Magic in the *Argonautica*.”
- Weiberg, E., “Narrative and Social Space in Heliodorus’ *Aethiopica*.”

“The Erotics of Narrative,” An International KYKNOS Conference, 15–17 July 2009, Gregynog Hall

- Capettini, E., “Ethiopian Andromache: *philandria* and *eros*.”
- Capra, A., “Erotic scenes, erratic narratives, ironic distances: Plato and Xenophon’s Antithetic *Symposia*.”
- Chew, K., “*Erotikoi logoi* and *sophrosune*: [self-] control in Achilles Tatius, Longus, and Heliodorus.”
- Cotton, A., “Reading, learning and desire: narrative, frustration, and philosophical progress in Plato’s *Phaedrus*.”
- King, D., “A survivor’s story: narrating painful experiences in a pleasing way.”
- Lacki, G., “Sex and sea: the temptations of narration (*Ov. Her.* 18–19).”
- McLarty, J., “Misplaced jealousy and the privileged reader: a Christian reading of a romantic motif.”
- Nimis, S., “Eros the novelist.”
- Panayotakis, S., “Desire and Storytelling in Apollonius of Tyre.”
- Pender, L., “From seduction meadow to marriage bed: reading Plato’s *Phaedrus*.”
- Sharrock, A., “The erotics of delay in Ovidian narrative.”
- Spatharas, D., “Kinky stories from the *rostrum*.”
- Webb, R., “Adultery, mime, and the novel: performance and metafiction in Apuleius and Achilles Tatius.”
- Whitmarsh, T., “The erotics of disappointment: Chariton’s *Dionysiaka*.”
- Zeitlin, F., “The Circulation of Erotic Energy in Achilles Tatius: Narrative Strategies of Deflection, Projection, and Sublimation.”

Society of Biblical Literature, 2009 Annual Meeting, New Orleans, LA

Panel: Ancient Fiction and Early Christian and Jewish Narrative

Theme: Truth and Fiction

- Pervo, R. I., “History Told by Losers: Dictys and Dares on the Trojan War.”
- Ramelli, I., “The Abgar-Tiberius Epistolary between Historical Truth and Fiction.”
- Schellenberg, R. S., “Suspense, Simultaneity, and the Providence of God: Theology and Narrative Structure in the Book of Tobit.”
- van den Heever, G., “X-Files, the Matrix, and Strange Tales of the Beyond: Truth, Fiction, and Social Discourse.”

Theme: Literary Portraits

- Amen, R., “The Protocol of the Industrious Slave in Ancient Fiction (as an Interpretive Context for Dorcas, the Female Disciple (Acts 9:36–43)).”

- Dupertuis, R. R., “Displacing the Emperor: Paul’s Journey to Rome in Acts.”
- Perkins, J., “Imagining Community in the Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles.”
- Shea, C., “Names and Games: Naming as a Means of Identifying Genre in Ancient Narratives.”
- Sigmon, B. O., “According to the Brothers: First-Person Narration in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs.”

Society of Biblical Literature, 2010 Annual Meeting, Atlanta, GA

Panel: Ancient Fiction and Early Christian and Jewish Narrative

Theme: Book Review: *Richard Pervo, Acts: A Commentary* (Fortress, 2009) and Judith Perkins, *Roman Imperial Identities in the Early Christian Era* (Routledge, 2009)

Review of Richard Pervo, *Acts: A Commentary* (Fortress, 2009)

- Carl Holladay, Emory University, Panelist
- Loveday Alexander, University of Sheffield, Panelist
- Richard Pervo, Saint Paul, MN, Respondent

Review of Judith Perkins, *Roman Imperial Identities in the Early Christian Era* (Routledge, 2009)

- Elizabeth Clark, Duke University, Panelist
- Kate Cooper, University of Manchester, Panelist
- Virginia Burrus, Drew University, Panelist
- Judith Perkins, Saint Joseph College, Respondent

Theme: The Past and Future of the Study of Ancient Fiction and Early Christian and Jewish Narrative

- Ruben Dupertuis, Trinity University, Presiding
- Charles Hedrick, Missouri State University, Emeritus, Panelist
- Judith Perkins, Saint Joseph College, Panelist
- Richard Pervo, Saint Paul, MN, Panelist
- Dennis MacDonald, Claremont School of Theology, Panelist
- Lawrence Wills, Episcopal Divinity School, Panelist
- David Konstan, Brown University, Panelist

Announcements

APA Newsletter Reports Dissertations

Brown University: John Bodel reporting

Jennifer Yates, *Tragedy and the Novels* (D. Konstan), in progress

Reviews, Articles, and Dissertations¹

Barry Baldwin reports

A Bit More Gas(elee)

Since penning my *PSN* 38 (2008) essay, I have stumbled across T. A. Layton, *Restaurant Roundabout* (London, 1944). Pages 62–144 have much on Gaselee, notably his gastronomic excesses, quite in keeping with his enthusiasm for Trimalchio and company.

Das Buechellers Buch

In 1862, at the tender age of 25, Franz Buecheler (henceforth, B) issued from Berlin his *Editio Maior* of Petronius, postluded that same year by the *Editio Minor*, the latter reissued in 1871, 1882, 1895, 1904, 1912 (augmented by W. Heraus), 1922, 1958 (refurbished by Peter Bachmann), and 1963. It is presumably this record which Konrad Müller is aspiring to beat with his (so far) quintet of Teubners (1961, 1973, 1983, 1995, 2003) plus the 1965 de luxe version equipped with Teutonic rendering by Wilhelm Ehlers—Müller should get out more. (Haven’t seen the 2008 hard & paperback English edition (Bibliophil) from India, currently being flogged by Amazon and other Internet bibliopoles).

Those still arguing the titular toss between *Satyricon* and *Satyrice*—Müller in cake-having-and-eating style has used both—might note B’s own *Satirae*, posthumously mutated to *Saturae*, a vowel movement devotees of 1950 pop music may see as a tribute to Major Lanx. For my money, whichever option you choose, their plural forms suggest a large episodic novel rather than one tightly plotted, hence my long-standing (from *Classical Philology* 68, 1973, 294–296, to ‘Gareth and Me: A Petronian Pilgrimage,’ in *Ancient Narrative*, eds. S. Byrne/ E. Cueva/ J. Alvares, Groningen 2006, 37–40), heresy that *Ira Priapi* is not the controlling theme.

Stephen Gaselee (*The Bibliography of Petronius*, London 1910, 61–62) hailed the *Editio Maior* as “a very great date in Petronian literature...there can never be one editor who will not look back on his recension as the foundation of all really scientific criticism,” words and sentiments closely echoed in Warmington’s revision of Heseltine’s Loeb, xxviii, also Gareth Schmeling and Johanna Stuckey, (*A Bibliography of Petronius*, Leiden 1977, 20–21, and 139 for B’s Petronian papers). Gaselee endorsed his own praise with lavish quotation from André Collignon’s *Pétrone en France* (Paris 1905, 118: cf. his *Etude sur Pétrone*, Paris 1892; *Pétrone au Moyen Age*, Paris & Nancy 1893): “M. Buecheler, après avoir revu avec une rare conscience les manuscrits et les éditions anciennes, a sur beaucoup de points très heureusement amendé le texte...Nul n’a donc au siècle dernier mieux que M. Buecheler

¹ The summaries of the dissertations are from the data supplied by *Pro Quest*.

préparé la voie aux études ultérieures sur le Satiricon. Nul n'est plus maître de ce sujet."

"*Criticorum facile princeps*," opined Marx (not Karl or Groucho, but Friedrich, editor of Lucilius, scathingly reviewed—no surprise there—by Housman, to whom we shall recur). Not any more. Though dutifully commended for the advance marked by his *Editio Maior*, B nowadays lives mainly in what has well been dubbed "the twilight world" of footnotes and critical apparatuses. His readings are more often rejected than accepted in Martin Smith's edition of the *Cena* (Oxford 1975)—notes on 29.9, 30.3, 38.10, 44.5, 44.16, 47.5, 53.12, 55.8, 58.14, 61.8, 62.11, 64.1, 73.5, 74.15. Müller is snide on his all-embracing critical apparatus: "*amplissimo instruxit, in quem omnes omnium coniecturas bonas malasque undique collectas congessit. Mihi aliter agendum erat...*" On the dating question, he is entirely missing from Kenneth Rose's round-up of nineteenth century views (*The Date and Author of the Satyricon*, Leiden 1971, 8). One wonders how many graduate students, even their coaches, have ever read through the Latin prose of B's introduction and apparatus? As we shall see, such delinquents are missing a lot of instructive fun.

British classicist-politician Enoch Powell remarked of Housman, "It was a big mind that chose to live in a small room." B occupied several rooms in the mansion of Housmanic *odium academicum* (see in general, without the present examples, P. G. Naiditch, 'The Slashing Style Which All Know And Few Applaud: The Invective of A. E. Housman,' *Aspects of Nineteenth-Century British Classical Scholarship*, ed. H. D. Jocelyn, Liverpool, 1996, 137–150, with my review-article in *Echos Du Monde Classique/Classical Views* 42, 1998, 709–722). At best, neutral mentions in his Letters (ed. Archie Burnett, Oxford 2007, vol. 1, 406; vol. 2, 91, 310 n. 1, 392, 406–407). And some backhanded compliments. In his first Manilian Preface, Housman classifies B with other Teutons as one who practised "the art of explaining corrupt passages instead of explaining them," also amongst "men of wide learning and no mean acuteness, but without simplicity of judgement," postluding with the jesting compliments "they know too much Latin, and they are not sufficiently obtuse...that hebetude of intellect which they, despite their assiduous and protracted efforts, have not yet succeeded in acquiring," crescendo to "Indeed, I imagine that Mr Buecheler, when he first perused Mr Sudhaus' edition of the *Aetna*, must have felt something like Sin when she gave birth to death"—I myself imagine B would have felt the same when confronted with the (to borrow a lapidary phrase from Gaselee) "ridiculous farsings" of modern literary theory. B, though, would feel sharper Housmanic stings, notably in his Juvenal Preface where B's method of recension is "a convenient substitute for mental exertion," and above all this bravura performance from his Lucan Preface:

"We arrive at evening upon a field of battle, where lie 200 corpses. 197 of them have no beards; the 198th has a beard on the chin; the 199th has a false beard slewed around under the left ear; the 200th has been decapitated and the

beard is nowhere to be found. Problem: had it a beard, a false beard, or no beard at all? Buecheler can tell you: it had a beard, a beard on the chin."

The piquant thing is, H may have been inspired to some of his "thunderbolts of poisoned invective" (W. H. Auden) by B who, as will be seen, was no slouch at that.

I am writing elsewhere on alleged interpolations in Petronius. B has twenty-two entries in the vast inventory of J. P. Sullivan, 'Interpolations in Petronius,' *Proceedings Of The Cambridge Philological Society* 202 (1976), 90–122. To his eternal credit, only one is of the *id est* variety (the favourite target of textual perverts' big-game hunting), to whit the *id est expectatio liberae cenae* that opens the *Cena* narrative. B went to town on this: *Compiler intempestive hic inseruit explementi caussa, dum meminit aliam saturarum partem in qua referebatur de suprema cena gladiatorum, damnatum enim ad ludum Encolpium fuisse*—mildly condemned by Smith as "too drastic." For the rest, the time is (Trotsky's phrase) not only ripe but rotten ripe to exorcise Fraenkel's imaginary Carolingian Interpolator along with those other fashionable phantoms, Enman's *KG* and Syme's *Ignotus*.

After a sly epigraph, *probes amesque qui vis archetypas habere nugas*, B's preamble kicks off with the reminder that Arbiter is a genuine cognomen, adducing via Mommsen a Neapolitan inscription (missed by Rose, 44) commemorating one L. Lucius L. l. Arbiter. Then, an epigraphic nugget (also neglected by Rose) from Rome's Aurelian Way (no. 1175 in Orelli, partly reproduced in Richmond Lattimore's *Themes in Greek and Latin Epitaphs* [Urbana 1962, 118], exhibiting M. Antonius Encolpus' loving dedication to "his dearest wife, eleven years together without a quarrel," Cerellia Fortunata, along with some instructions for tomb upkeep that slightly recall those of Trimalchio (*Sat.* 71.6–12). Pliny's lector Encolpius (*Epist.* 8.1) might have been added to this onomastic tally. These ordinary bearers of such names may deter us from reading too much into Petronius' choice of his characters' nomenclature. B's own conclusion admixes humour with hard-headedness: "*ceterum nominum inter hanc lapidem et Petronii satiram similitudo adeo casu evenit ut ne hoc quidem mihi persuadeam quod de Friderico Welchero audire me memini, indita hominibus illis nomina esse Fortunatam et Encolpi ex libri Petroniani memoria.*"

B's name is missing from Rose's inventory (82–86) of detectors of covert allusions to Nero in Petronius—I put my own hand up here. But, no doubts about chronology: "*De aetate Petronii diu multumque erraverunt, hodie nullum posse spero haesitare,*" a bold declaration in an age of widespread scepticism (Rose, 7–8, with mention of B's named target Niebuhr, but not B himself). B owned himself convinced by Theophilus (Gaselee, 86, awards him the initial G) Studer's 'Ueber das Zeitalter des Petronius Arbiter,' *Rheinisches Museum* 2, 50 & 202, positing Eumolpus' *Bellum Civile* effusion as a critique of Lucan, a line of argument not accepted in all modern quarters.

After an exhaustive/exhausting, indeed chalcenteric examination of manuscript pedigrees, traditions, and variants, B lets rip with an often Housmanesquely rancid review of previous Petronian connoisseurs and editors, reaching back to one Ioannes Baptista Pius, a character untypically missed by Gaselee. Not that B brags of delving into every editorial nook and cranny: “*Editiones Petronii primas neque inveni in eis bibliothecis quarum in potestate mea usus erat neque curiosius alibi inquisivi quod non ita utiles mihi videbantur esse, multo minus necessariae, et inopia illarum abunde compensatur copia deteriorum quos collatos habui codicum.*”

The first Petronian pioneers pass relatively unscathed. First to be verbally felled is Ioannes à Wouweren: despite three editions (1594, 1596, 1604), “*nihil fere novavit Ioannes Wouwerius,*” a judgement recycled without acknowledgement by Gaselee (32, “Wouweren did not particularly improve the text or exegesis of our author”). Still, Wow-Wow got off lightly, compared to the unfortunate Ioannes Petrus Lotichius (1629), his effort Greekly dismissed as “*pachu gramma kai ou toron all’ eleeinon,*” a Judge Roy Bean verdict approved by Gaselee (16), “almost useless, not ill-described by Buecheler.” Apropos of the debates over authenticity of the newly-discovered Tragurian *Cena* manuscript, B took a lofty view of Thomas Reinesius’ view (1666) that (in Gaselee’s unimprovable words) “there was a groundwork of genuine Petronian work, interpolated with ridiculous farsings by a late imitator” (36): “*Thomas Reinesius saltem ‘aliquam partem Petroniastric alicuius esse’ sibi persuasit*”—if only our literary critics could/would write like this!

When it came to the mysterious Michael Hadrianides (1669; cf. my investigation of him in *PSN* 32, 2002, 6–8), B declared “*fuse egit de novo codice p. 73 ss., de cetero tam inertem se praebuit quam inertem futilem,*” a fulmination owing something to Peter Burmann’s “*stultitia & ineptiis insignem fuisse ex notis eius facile perspexi,*” a *damnatio memoriae* approved by Gaselee (37). The latter (38) also assented to B’s crushing verdict on the production (1677) of Ioannes Boschius: “*quicquid novi habuit, habuit ex disciplina Heinsii.*”

Pride of place in B’s fools’ gallery belongs to the unfortunate Ioannes Jacobus Reiskius, introduced in the venomous contrast “*Heinsius vir optimi vel Reiskius vir pessimi,*” his editing (1743) then succumbing to “*correctoris munere abusus ita administravit, ut iuvenili licentia verba insolentissime mutaret, semel atque iterum non infeliciter, centies prorsus insane,*” words reproduced without mention of B by Gaselee (50). *Mutatis mutandis*, this could be mistaken for a Housman militancy.

After brief allusions to Anton’s (1781) edition and the Biptine (1790), the ensuing period of aridity is excoriated as one in which “*ludebant autem de corio Petronii sagati togati,*” echoing Suetonius, *Divus Julius* 48—other such flourishes include Petronius’ own (as we have him) opening *Sed num alio genere furiarum*, a remark whose “dryness” tickled Warmington’s fancy, also self-serving in that this drought would end with B himself. Not that we get a dose of Housma-

nian ego: after generous praise of his mentor Otto Jahn, B ends on a note, doubtless not altogether serious, of self-deprecation: “*itaque stupefactus profecto mediocri mea facultate, cum intueor quantulum id sit quod multos annos versatus in hoc scriptore contuli ad emendationem.*”

The fun continues throughout the critical apparatus: how often can you say that? (Parenthetical references are to Petronius) Hadrianides emended a passage “*inscite*” (45.6), Reiskius “*inepte*” (45.11). Schefferus interpreted one passage (46.7) “*prave,*” another (30.4) “*monstruose,*” also (53.1) positing a lacuna “*sine caussa.*” Jacobus tinkered with a reading (17.7) “*male Serapim intelligens.*” A neat antithetical sentence (14.5) combines praise of one editor with censure of another: “*addendum fuisse iam Douza sensit. tolli verbum Oudendorpius iussit.*” Hildebrand’s *sopitis carbonibus* (22.1; cf. my discussion in *PSN* 38, 2008, 27–30) evokes the gorgeous: “*carbonibus Petronium dedisse existimo.*” This stands comparison with a choice Housmanism (*Letters*, vol. 1, 69; reproduced by P. G. Naiditch, *A. E. Housman at University College London*, Leiden 1988, 237): “Dr Rutherford ‘would restore to Euripides the senarius *su men cheron to pneum’ ek polemion labon,*’ which Euripides, I think, would restore to Dr. Rutherford.”

There are others in the same vein. A conjecture by Sambucus (137.9) is ridiculed by quoting a verse of Menander “Pray for what you want, you’ll get it.” Rejecting calls for a lacuna (131.4, where Müller still demands one), B observes “*infarse-runt epigramma Priapeum anthologiae Burmannianae.*” Likewise, on prose fragment 2, “*videntur desiderari Petronii verba’ nescio qua de caussa Daniel.*” Housmanesque sarcasm attends B’s remarks on poetic fragment 53, “*quorum confisus auctoritate forsitan quispiam si dis placet Aetnam ignoti poetae carmen rettulerit ad Petronium,*” along with his assessment of other attributions: “*certe falso omnes adscribuntur Petronio. quarum multitudo quibus auctibus creverit.*”

Unlike Housman, B had a more homely side. “*Id coniecit I. F. Gronovius et ego probo*” (88.4); “*mihi ut emenderem non contigit*” (89.13). His mentors are not forgotten: Ribbeck is *Ribbeckius meus* (35.20), while the notions of Daniel and Goldastus on poetic fragment 22 are rejected in favour of what *probabiliter Iahnus statuit*. Reasons for postulating textual gaps are charmingly set out: “*lacunam significavi quoniam quae subsecuntur, non foris sed in cellula aguntur*” (8.9); “*lacunam posui qui miror nisi scriptor, ante quam lascivientes mulieres descripsit, in universam de ebriis convivis mentionem fecerat*” (70.9); “*mirum sane si lexicarius hoc officio fungitur quod analectae aut triclinarii fuisse putes*” (34.3; cf. my ‘Editing Petronius: Methods and Examples,’ *Acta Classica* 31, 1988, 37–50).

B’s introduction concludes “*rogo ex animi sententia Iahnium ante omnes, tum ceteros viros quibus codicum editionumque notitiam debemus, ut illos ne poeniteat negotiorum quibus mihi gratificati sunt.*” He needn’t have worried. Housman (Preface to his *Lucan*) gibed, “Buecheler died in 1908, and the troop of little dogs which trotted at his heels was scattered abroad in quest of other heels to trot at.” One of these minia-

ture canines was none other than Basil Lanneau Gildersleeve, who lamented B's untimely passing in a brief but moving necrology in *The American Journal of Philology* 29 (1908), 247:

"I never heard Buecheler lecture except once, and that was in the summer of 1880. The profound impression that lecture made on me is recorded in my *Essays and Studies*, p. 507. No name is given there, and I have been asked more than once whom I meant. As a manner of tribute to the great scholar, so suddenly called from life, I subjoin the passage here in lieu of a more elaborate expression of the sense of loss I share with the world of classical scholars."

The passage (published in 1890) follows. It is too long to quote in full. Pertinent extracts: "I attended a lecture by a great master...I was much struck with the tone in which he announced his subject (sc. the vanishing of weak vowel sounds in Latin)...As he went on and marshalled the facts and set in order the long lines that connected the disappearance of the vowel with the downfall of a nationality, and great linguistic, great moral, great historical laws marched in stately procession before the vision of the student, the airy vowels that had flitted into the Nowhere seemed to be the lost soul of Roman life; and the Latin language, Roman literature and Roman history were clothed with a new meaning."

In defiance of Housman's barking, I am happy to trot along behind the giant breeds of Buecheler and Gildersleeve.

Happier Horace

To my previous two instalments (*PSN* 35 & 37), I adduce the conversation between Boccaccio and Petrarcha in Walter Savage Landor's Pentameron. When the former brings up *curiosa felicitas*, the latter snaps: "There again! Was there ever such an unhappy (not to say absurd) expression! And this from the man who wrote the most beautiful sentence in all latinity." The prize-winning words follow: *gratias ago languori tuo, quo diutius sub umbra voluptaatis lusimus*. Unfortunately, adulation is not concomitant with accuracy, this being a misquoted version of *Satyricon* 129, 3–4: *languori tuo gratias ago: in umbra voluptatis diutius lusi*. Boccaccio's response is brisk: "Tear out this from the volume; the rest, both prose and verse, may be thrown away."

Nachleben

"Gérard threw a dinner with fifty courses. Why? Because it was his fiftieth birthday. Why else? When I first read the menu, it seemed incomprehensible to me, though there was an interior logic—the meal was designed after one described in Petronius's *Satyricon*."—Jim Harrison, *Secret Ingredients: The New Yorker Book of Food and Drink* (Random House, New York, 2007), p. 93.

"He had told himself, in his notebook, that it was no more disgraceful to fabricate a pièce d'occasion of which he knew

almost nothing than to construct a baroque palace or write Trimalchio's Feast"—Frederic Raphael, *Fame and Fortune* (JR Books, London, 2007), p.67. Raphael has himself published a translation of Petronius. (Folio Books, London, 2003).

"I don't regret my Latin—some of the writers are marvellous: Propertius, Vergil, Horace, Catullus, Tacitus, Petronius, and some of Juvenal"—Robert Lowell, *The Letters of Robert Lowell*, ed. Saskia Hamilton (New York, 2005), p. 82.

"Romans like Trimalchio's vulgar prototype might give banquets whose success depended upon the leaping of three naked virgins from a great crusted tart"—M. F. K. Fisher, *The Art of Eating* (Hoboken, 2004), p. 30 (If only..!)

"Petronius Arbiter's plump citizen could afford to boast: 'Only command him, and my cook will make you a fish out of the pig's chitterlings, a wood pigeon out of the lard, a turtle-dove out of the gammox, and a hen out of the shoulder'"—Fisher, p. 107 (she has read *Satyricon* 70—what a fine word is "gammox," not in my Shorter OED, and unknown in this sense to Google).

"Friends are always sincere partners in grief or happiness...Petronius was sensible of this truth..."—*The Female Tatler* 54, Nov. 7–11, 1709. A clear allusion to *Satyricon* 61.9, in *angustiis amici apparent*, albeit unremarked by the magazine's modern (London, 1992) editor Fidelis Morgan (p. 121).

"For it may easily be asked, in the words of the soldier to the Ephesian Matron, in Petronius, *Id cinerem aut manes credis curare sepultos?*"—Thomas Tyers, *A Biographical Sketch of Dr Samuel Johnson (Gentleman's Magazine* 54, Dec. 1784, pp. 899–911). Tyers' *curare* preserves the full Virgilian line 9 (*Aen.* 4.31), instead of *sentire*, read by modern editors. The detail is unnoticed by Tyers' modern editors, O. M. Brack & R. E. Kelley, *The Early Biographies of Samuel Johnson* (Iowa, 1974). *Curare* has some manuscript support (details in the apparatus' of Müller and Bücheler—the latter actually printed it), and may be right, *sentire* being an easy product of a verse so rich in e and s.

Petronius in Cyber Space

Just a sampling, obviously. Type "Petronius" into Google, and you are offered 1,140,000 sites. The classier "Petronius Arbiter" slumps to 129,000. "Satyricon" leaps to 2,040,000, "Satyricon" plummets to 25,4000, a clear indication of which title still prevails.

Naturally, there is much overlap between the quartet, also a great detail of repetition within each one. Much of the contents is mundane: bibliography and book-sellers jostle at the top. Plain "Petronius" is swollen by homonyms and their respective cyber camp-followers. Overall, much menu ortho-

doxy. But, also, before your clicking-finger and eyes give out, a good deal of fun, high and low.

Like any student with pressing essay deadline or mental inertia, I zoom first to the Wikipedia entry for “Petronius.” Straightforward and unexceptionable, for the most part. Some brows may shoot up at the postulated birth date of “ca. 27.” Others may wrinkle at the notion, albeit tendered only half-heartedly, that our author was born at Massilia, derived (of course) from the poetic mention of him by Sidonius Apollinaris. When it comes to explaining Tacitus’ failure to mention the *Satyricon* because it was “beneath the dignity of history,” our Wikipedian has evidently been reading Syme (Tacitus, 336) on why the historian ignored the *Apocolocyntosis* ascribed (wrongly, I think, still plowing a lonely furrow) to Seneca as “alien to the dignity of history.”

Still, I am grateful to this compiler for pointing me to the frequently-repeated intelligence that in Robert A. Heinlein’s novel *The Door into Summer* the protagonist has a ginger tom cat named “Petronius the Arbiter,” nicknamed “Pete.” Likewise for the (at the time of writing this, April 2007) first intimation of Jesse Browner’s fictional *The Uncertain Hour*, recasting Tacitus’ narrative of the famous Petronian last supper.

Such *Nachleben* are not earth-bound. A heavenly body-let discovered in 1960 by a trio of Dutch astronomers received the appellation “Asteroid 3244 Petronius.” Much lower down, in the Gulf of Mexico, the “Petronius Oilfield” found in 1995 is worked from the “Petronius Platform.”

One of the jolliest terrestrial memorials is “The Krewe of Petronius,” a New Orleans Mardi Gras gay club and ball, founded in 1961, presumably in the minds of those Sunday Morning Tellyvangelists who interpreted Katrina as God’s Revenge on the city’s “homosexual plague.” This morbid view would have been espoused by the likes of John Dunlop who, in his *History of Fiction* (1814), quoted as preface to a cyber-bibliography offered by self-styled “The Above-Average Typist,” described Petronius’ book as “perhaps the most remarkable fiction which has dishonoured the literature of any nation.”

Book? An introductory bibliographical blurb claiming to list “all e-books written by Petronius Arbiter” disappointingly turns out to be just a catalogue of various translations. An even bigger let-down is the site entitled “Satyrica: fuck, fuck, fuck”, which on inspection is just a spot for random blogging. “Petronius,” an alias for Paul Tabori who penned *London Unexpurgated* and *New York Unexpurgated*, remains a popular nom de guerre for discrete bloggers *et hoc genus omne*. One site lists the chess games played by a “Petronius” (paw-nography?). “A 26-year old Houston guy” trawls on-line for sex partners under the name. Similarly, “Peter from New Jersey” adopts the title of “Octavian Petronius” for his fantasy life as fellow-pupil of Harry Potter at Hogwarts (this might be the way to Hermione’s heart). Among the more opaque exhibits is a site that simply reads “Petronius *semper ubi sub ubi* =

always where under when”—perhaps to be added to Trimalchio’s own collection of rebuses.

The “Petronius Arbiter” rubric is largely taken up with bibliographical material, from which I was glad to learn of W. C. Firebaugh’s (Adelaide, 2007) e-book *Englishing*, with notes that pop up on cognate sites. Choice cuts off different meat include “Roman Forum II,” describing a New York City revue in which “five Romans from Nero’s time” discuss the farce of the 2000 American presidential election with one Kevin Keaney playing “Petronius Arbiter,” along with the “Radical Academy” listing of cartoons skewering Bill Clinton and (it is promised) George Bush. As a Trekkie (original series only) of long-standing, I cannot leave out the intriguing “Petronius Arbiter II,” self-billed as “Formerly space cadet, rapidly promoted to Fleet Commander,” which inter plurima alia prompts the thought that William Shatner is now adipose enough to depict Trimalchio on stage or screen.

A cognate character, “Petronius Arbiter, Time Traveller,” wins one of the Baldwin Cyber Awards for his/her detailed and fully-referenced inventory of THAT quotation, an item that does much to fatten the number of Petronian sites, suitably prefaced “Expletive, but I am sick of seeing this fake quote.” Almost immediately, though, I was tempted to cancel the award on finding the notorious text attributed to “Petronius Arbiter, 210 BC,” a date that did not tempt even Marmorale. However, “the quality of mercy is not strained,” especially when I saw how common this chronology (sometimes pushed back to 256, sometimes forwarded to a round 200) is in this particular segment (German as well as English) of the Arbiter’s afterlife. More orthodox candidates range from “1st century,” with an innovatory title, *Satyricum*, to (e.g.) “about AD 30,” “AD 57,” “60 AD.” Special mention goes to Ms Tanny Wells of the South Rosedale Ratepayers Association (Toronto) for her reconciliatory conflation “Written in 210 BC by Petronius the Arbiter, who was a famous satirist during the reign of Nero.” Petronius himself undergoes similar transmogrifications, being “a Greek admiral” in his 210 BC incarnation, “a Roman centurion” in 200 BC, a “centurion” (sic) and more loftily “a Roman general” in his Neronian postings.

Pride of place in the ‘*Satyricon*’ listings is shared between the homoerotic bibliography “*Satyricon au Go-go*,” the *Satyricon* sea-food restaurant at Ipanema in Rio de Janeiro (does THAT Ipanema Girl of song eat there?), and the Norwegian black metal band *Satyricon* (its front man answers to the sobriquet “Satyr”), which has its own lengthy illustrated Wikipedia site.

The “*Satyrica*” side is equal to this, with its 10-piece combo of the same name, formed at Edinburgh in 1995 by Messrs Carson Thirl and Sean Nolan, disbanded in 1997 after two years gigging and recording in the San Francisco Bay Area (worthy epigones of The Dead Kennedys?). More academic, though scarcely less intriguing, items include the quotation “*Satyrica* was a comedy wherein Satyrs were brought in” from Sir Thomas Eliot (1538, elsewhere famous for his book

on diet that condemned fruit and vegetables as unheathy—step forward, carnivores and zombies everywhere), and the sentence *Quid Satyrica? Sathanica, inquam, mordacitate et maledicentia in nostram scribere non erubuit, nos tamen referre piget* in Amigrinus Jones' *A British Commentary of Iceland* (ch. 29). Most tantalising is the notice posted from the 1999 San Francisco meeting of the Shakespeare Association crediting one Andrew Dalby with “a new ending for the *Satyricon*,” without actually giving it.

At this point, my murine finger failed and screen-vertigo triumphed, hence take this as but a praegustation to the rich menu of Petronian cyber-fare—To Your Google Muttons!

Marchena, José, *Fragmentum Petronii*, edición, traducción y notas de Joaquín Álvarez Barrientos (Sevilla: Renacimiento/Ediciones Espuela de Plata, 2007) 150 pp.

Reviewed by Maria Eugenia Steinberg

Jugar con la Academia y desafiar a los críticos más avezados con el pretendido hallazgo de un manuscrito parecen haber sido las intenciones de José Marchena, cuando se dedicó a escribir el pasaje que completaba una laguna del capítulo 26 del *Satyricon* de Petronio. Marchena eligió hacerse famoso no tanto por su producción convencional sino por su superchería, una de las más grandes, no por la brevedad del *Fragmentum Petronii*, de la historia de la falsificación.

Más allá de la anécdota y de las reacciones y debates que despertó el texto de Marchena, quedan por analizar las razones por las que un erudito sin filiación académica, sacerdote de la religión católica, decide engañar a la comunidad científica con un desparramo digno de libertinos de cuna. Marchena se detiene en detalles escabrosos de la relación de los personajes en la vigilia de Cuartila, cuando Encolpio, Ascilto y Gitón se encuentran sometidos a la tiranía vengativa de la sacerdotisa de Priapo.

Parece al mismo tiempo una habilidad muy particular la que se requiere para dedicar horas de estudio y afanes filológicos a la redacción de un libro como el que nos ocupa, realizado con precisión y detalle por Joaquín Álvarez Barrientos (JAB), en la medida en que ha debido prestar tanta atención a un texto falso insertado en el medio académico por error.

Hubo un tiempo en el que yo misma escribí que los falsificadores son en realidad colaboradores del texto, en tanto se introducen en el *continuum* de la transmisión de textos muy deseados pero fragmentarios.² Así como en 1650 había aparecido en la biblioteca de Niccolò Cippico un *fragmentum* que luego se determinó, tras arduos debates, que era auténticamente petroniano, las falsificaciones de Nodot y de Marchena recurrieron a un marco paratextual de gran perfección para otorgar a su impostura la posibilidad de

confundir al público erudito; éste escudriñaría la pieza con solvencia y rigor.

En el caso que nos ocupa, la idea de generar un palimpsesto de la nada debe de haber surgido—en palabras de Díaz y Díaz—de un proyecto nunca aprobado, por el que Marchena se proponía estudiar la escritura subyacente del Código de Eurico en el códice rescripto de la Biblioteca Nacional de París en 1798. No obstante lo cual, la pieza de Marchena pasó por verdadera a los ojos de los especialistas porque calzaba en detalle al final del cap 26 conservado.

Dado que una de las páginas centrales del libro de JAB ofrece los criterios de edición, vale la pena exponerlos aquí también pues pensamos que en ellos se basa la calidad del librito que tenemos entre manos. Se trata de una traducción del texto del *fragmentum Petronii* de José Marchena y de las notas que en francés preciso y de sintaxis clara produjo Marchena para poner en práctica la usanza académica en boga.

La nutrida “Introducción” de JAB da cuenta luego de una breve presentación, de la falsificación en sí, que debía llenar la laguna en el capítulo 26 luego de la palabra *verberabant*. Bajo el subtítulo de “El fragmento,” JAB reproduce la traducción del fragmento que aparecerá nuevamente más adelante cuando edita el texto a continuación del texto latino; y reproduce en nota al pie la traducción de Díaz y Díaz (1968), justificada en su duplicación “por su estilo más arcaizante.” Entre las páginas 35 y 52 se encuentra el apartado referente a “Las notas: erudición libertina y erotismo,” luego la sección “Filosofía materialista, sexualidad e historia cultural” donde JAB estudia los fundamentos filosóficos y culturales de la posición de Marchena que termina ofreciendo una historia de las costumbres sexuales hasta su propia época. Finalmente, bajo el subtítulo “Por qué el *fragmentum*” insiste JAB sobre el significado de la producción de un fragmento en el marco cultural de la comunidad académica de comienzos del siglo XIX.

Finalmente, da comienzo con una portada impactante (pág. 71) la edición del texto en sí de la interpolación de Marchena: *Fragmentum Petronii ex Bibliothecae Sti. Galli Antiquissimo MSS. Excerptum, nunc primum in lucem editum, Gallice vertit ac notis perpetuis illustravit LALLEMANDUS, S. Theologiae Doctor, 1800.*

Una dedicatoria al ejército del Rin abre la edición. Las notas al pie corresponden a JAB quien apoya las aseveraciones de Marchena en su dedicatoria al ejército del Rin. En esta dedicatoria, Marchena da cuenta de las circunstancias en las que en el marco de su impostura habría tenido lugar la aparición del *Fragmento de Petronio*, como adquisición de convento. Leyendo un pergamino con la obra de Genadio sobre las obligaciones de los sacerdotes, se percata de la existencia de otro texto cuyas incisiones habían intentado ser borradas. Afirma que no habría dudas acerca de la autenticidad, y se lo ofrece al “bravo ejército francés.” Para dar fe de su autenticidad, trae a colación el carácter fragmentario del episodio de Cuartila, más precisamente en el momento en que la sacerdotisa de Priapo y Encolpio observan

² M. E. Steinberg, “Interpolaciones en el Texto de Petronio: F. Nodot y las Traducciones del *Satyricon*,” *Anales De Filología Clásica* 18/19 (2005/2006), Ifc, Buenos Aires.

por la cerradura los escarceos amorosos de Gitón y Pániquis. El lector de este pequeño volumen de la edición de JAB queda sorprendido por la presencia de notas aclaratorias respecto por ejemplo de quién es Priapo (n.4 de JAB) junto a otras en las que el editor menciona por ejemplo la ironía de las expresiones de Marchena al referirse éste a la autenticidad del fragmento: afirma Marchena “El estilo del latín lleva de tal modo el sello de Petronio que es imposible creer que el fragmento sea falso.” Esta expresión de Marchena es complementada por JAB al pie de página con el siguiente comentario: “Marchena despliega en estas páginas, como a lo largo del texto, enorme ironía al tratar los distintos asuntos. Ahora evidencia, para quien quisiera entenderle, la falsedad de su fragmento, pues la alusión tan clara a no dudar de su autenticidad es obvia. Algo similar se encuentra también en Nodot.”

Solamente al leer el *Fragmentum Petronii*—que ocupa 36 líneas en las páginas 77 y 78 del libro y luego las páginas 79 a 81 con la traducción del latín al español—se toma conciencia de la enorme importancia que tienen en el panorama general de la falsificación de Marchena las notas sobre el fragmento de Petronio producidas en francés por Marchena, tan sólo 6 notas que ocupan sin embargo las páginas 83 a 135 de esta edición. En tal extensión quedan incluidas las notas al pie de JAB a las notas en sí de Marchena. Por otra parte, las notas de JAB a las notas de Marchena constituyen una suerte de aporte erudito acerca de hombres y dioses y sus datos básicos; tómese como ejemplo la nota 11 de JAB que comienza con el texto “Venus era la esposa de Vulcano” y a continuación aporta la consabida historia de los amores de Venus y Marte.

La primera nota de Marchena al texto “veréis que tratáis con un hombre” de su propia falsificación, consiste en una argumentación variada con ejemplos acerca de la prueba de que en época de los romanos las mujeres preferían a los militares antes que a otros hombres. Acerca del rapto en la antigüedad y de las relaciones de poder en una sociedad dividida entre los fuertes y los débiles, desarrolla Marchena sus pintorescas reflexiones antropológicas y literarias para dar rienda suelta a sus habilidades argumentativas. No le basta la antigüedad y asimila la actitud de los antiguos a la de los tiempos de la caballería en España del siglo del Quijote. Marchena concluye citando un verso de Dryden y JAB en nota al pie aclara la referencia concreta de la cita de Dryden y aporta el dato de que “más tarde Henry Purcell le puso música.” La segunda nota de Marchena versa acerca del pasaje: “sus camaradas nos cogen a mí y a Cuartila.” En el texto latino correspondiente se deslizan algunos errores que deben atribuirse a la edición que tenemos entre manos y no a Marchena: *comites artissimi vinculis me Quartillamque adligant* donde debería leerse *artissimis*; y a continuación *nec sino magno risu* donde está claro el error de *sino* por *sine*. Marchena discurre pintorescamente por el origen del oficio de las cortesanas, los tipos femeninos en Grecia y en Roma hasta finalizar en un detalle y referencia a cómo degeneran las más santas instituciones en referencia a la desaparición de las

cortesanas de los ámbitos clericales. La tercera nota corresponde al texto *Embascicoetas autem, jussu militis, olidioris foedissimis osculis totum me miserum conspurcabat* “El soldado ordena entonces al embasiceta que me colme con sus besos impuros.”

Como puede verse, la traducción al español no se ajusta claramente al texto latino. El recorrido de Marchena es esta vez por los vericuetos de la pederastia no sólo entre los paganos sino también entre los cristianos. Las notas de JAB aportan detalles de referencias concretas a la literatura mencionadas por Marchena. La nota 4 se refiere a “el embasiceta llegó en seguida a la cima de sus deseos.” *Gaudium integrum hausit* muestra el error de edición: *integrit* por *integrum*. Es la nota más breve de las seis referida al tema del onanismo y el pecado. Comprende entre otras referencias, la de una imitación del *carmen* 51 de Catulo, realizada por el propio Marchena según aclara en la nota JAB. La nota 5 bajo el título del texto relativo a “Gitón acababa de desflorarla y de conseguir una sangrienta victoria” desarrolla el tema de la virginidad, indudable preocupación del abad. Finalmente la nota 6 se detiene en el tema de la alcahueta a partir de una referencia a “Entonces una vieja...” en el que Marchena alaba a Mercurio en su papel de intermediario, y JAB trae a colación ente otros textos al Quijote y el proceso en el que Cervantes fue acusado de ser alcahuete.

El libro de JAB cumple la función de dar a conocer el texto en sí de la falsificación de Marchena y las notas que lo acompañan, las cuales según varios especialistas fueron probablemente redactadas por un grupo de amigos junto a Marchena, como testimonio de libertinos dedicados a actividades literarias de salón y tertulia. Estos habrían compuesto prácticamente un tratado de erotología clásica motivados en la erudición de las enciclopedias que circulaban por la época en Basilea, como la de Diderot y D’Alembert o las entradas del diccionario de Pierre Bayle. El texto latino, sin embargo no parece haber sido el objetivo principal de la edición de JAB puesto que se presenta con algunos errores morfológicos que dan cuenta de que su interés fue colocado en las notas de Marchena, y no tanto en el texto latino del abad.

El texto de Marchena resulta totalmente insatisfactorio para completar la laguna final del episodio de Cuartila. Nada que agregar, pues, a Petronio; en cambio, mucho que complementar para una lectura de la recepción de los textos latinos a comienzos del siglo XIX. Un texto especial para lectores interesados en curiosidades libertinas y para la historia de la sexualidad, y acerca de un abad con aspiraciones académicas que no representa la posición de la iglesia en relación con aquélla. El mérito de JAB es poner a disposición un relato fantástico de una falsificación literaria, tanto más obsesionada con aspectos culturales de la historia de la sexualidad, cuanto menos valiosa como relleno narrativo de una de las lagunas del Satiricón.

Prag, Jonathan and Ian Repath, eds., *Petronius: A Handbook* (Malden, MA and Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009) 272 pp

Reviewed by Teresa Ramsby, University of Massachusetts

This is a smart book with essays by some of the world's leading Petronian scholars, and by scholars whose experience with different genres or disciplines well inform their insights to the cultural phenomena that Petronius's work incorporates. There is a refreshing newness about this collection—it offers us Petronius for a new generation—and while the authors give ample credit to the scholarship (particularly) of the last one hundred years, the book reveals ample avenues for further discovery. It is no small feat, as I see it, that the editors have been able to encompass so much divergent material by so many scholars in a package that proceeds in such a reasonable progression of ideas. In turn, each essay helpfully includes a paragraph with recommendations for further reading.

The introduction by the editors summarizes the basic “what we know” about the work and its author: that it is identified by many as the first novelistic text in Latin, that the author is presumed by nearly all to be the Petronius mentioned in Tacitus as Nero's courtier and *elegantiae arbiter*. The authors, I suppose trying to be all-inclusive, leave open the possibility that the author's identification may not be set in stone, but anyone who thinks so will have to come up with rather compelling arguments against the evidence presented on pages 5–10 which is a neat summary of Rose and Walsh.³ The editors state that it is time that scholars broke down the “sharp divide between literary and historical studies” (2). That is the principal (and admirable) aim of this collection.

Niall Slater offers a curtain call to his splendid 1990 study,⁴ explaining how fragmentation affects our experience with the novel—a theme that will be picked up later in Chapter 12 dealing with Fellini's cinematic treatment of a fragmented text. Slater also explains the use of *Satyrica* rather than *Satyricon* for the title of Petronius's work (*Satyrica* is used throughout the collection). He provides in some detail an analysis of themes in the novel (see the section “Wrath of Priapus”), and he touches upon the issues of prosimetrum and the performative aspects of Petronius's text.

J. R. Morgan's chapter unfolds the major influences of Homer, Plato and Greek fictional narrative on Petronius's text. On Homer, Morgan suggests that a series of “meaningful resonances” should activate the educated reader to appreciate the parody and the comparative *ethoi* that underlies each author's text: (38) “The satirical and moral implications of the mythic, and specifically Homeric, intertextuality...are never drawn by

the narrator. At this level, it is a tool in the communication between author and reader.” Morgan's point is helpful, since it suggests that moralism need not be blatantly narrated to be present—the influences and models on the text provide a background of moral and ethical ideologies to which the present text responds. His discussion on Plato brings us back to Averil Cameron's study on Petronius's use of the *Symposium* in the *Cena Trimalchionis*.⁵ Morgan ends his essay with perhaps the most controversial point made in this collection: that Petronius's *Satyrica* did not set out to parody the Greek romance novel. Taking aim at Heinze,⁶ he points to evidence in recent papyrological finds that “Greek fiction was generically less restricted than had hitherto been realized. The existence in Greek of analogous fictional narratives of comic low-life weakens the explanation of the *Satyrica* as a parody of idealistic love-romance” (43). These last five pages of Morgan's essay are thus important for anyone examining “the literary texture” of the *Satyrica*.⁷

Costas Panayotakis writes on the influences of Horace, Virgil, and Ovid, noting that (52) “the lion's share of literary evocations go to Virgil.” In the Virgil section, in line with his own scholarly interests, he reads Encolpius's Aeneas-like moments as role-playing theatricality, and relegates to previous scholarship the deeper moral and philosophical interpretations as to why Encolpius might evoke Aeneas. He uses the passive voice a lot at the end of this section “[Giton's] and Encolpius's exaggerated histrionics have been interpreted...” (54) and “Petronius has been seen as an author who...” (55). I would have liked to see further acknowledgment, such as that seen in Morgan's piece, that the moral ground staked out in the *Aeneid* forces the *Satyrica* into a spotlight for comparison. Panayotakis rigorously examines two episodes in which Petronius combines allusions. One such analysis is comically entitled, “Encolpius's Penis and Dido,” and considers the relationship between *Sat.* 132, *Aeneid* 2.791–3, 6.700–1, 9.436 and *Amores* 3.7; it is definitely worth a read. The second example of combined allusions occurs on board Lichas's ship (especially *Sat.* 103–105) where aspects of Greek and Roman novels, Roman oratory, and low drama interplay. His synthesis of arguments regarding the so-called quotation of Publilius (*Sat.* 55.5–6) is especially good.

Victoria Rimmell explores the ways in which “the extreme rhetoricization of speech” and “overtly crafted narrative” combined with “a carnivalesque poetics” result in “literary language blurring into violent action and incoherent noise” (66). Her three-page survey of the styles of speech around Trimalchio's banquet-table is incredibly useful, and her study of the uses of *fundere*, *lacerare*, and *vibrare* in the extant text point to the layers of sound that Petronius creates. She also draws intriguing parallels between Eumolpus's *Bellum Civile*

³ K. F. C. Rose, *The Date and Author of the Satyricon* (Leiden: Brill, 1971); P. G. Walsh, *The Roman Novel: The “Satyricon” of Petronius and the “Metamorphoses” of Apuleius* (Cambridge, 1970; 67–68 and 244–247).

⁴ Niall Slater, *Reading Petronius* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990).

⁵ Averil Cameron, “Petronius and Plato,” *CQ* 19.2 (1969) 367–370.

⁶ R. Heinze, “Petron und der griechische roman,” *Hermes* 34 (1899) 494–519.

⁷ The phrase “The literary texture” is the title of chapter three in Walsh 1970, 32–66.

poem and the *Cena Trimalchionis*. In sum, Rimmell attributes to Petronius a new kind of artistry whereby “written representation can convey non-verbal or incoherent orality” (80). This is a particularly good piece that makes new inroads in the exploration of Petronius’s style.

Amy Richlin explores the sexual world that Petronius presents to us. She begins with a useful survey of Roman sexual norms, the phallo-centric nature of Roman society, and the treatment of slaves. She also offers a useful review of the evidence regarding the social status of the three main characters (86). She explores the Priapic theme in some detail, and she provides many examples of rhetorical or epic moments undermined by sexual connotations. She finishes with an interesting history lesson on how Petronius’s text began to overcome its taint of indecency and gain acceptance as a literary work. There are some over-generalizations or unexplained assertions, such as the suggestion that Roman slaves lived in a much different (?) sex/gender system from eastern Mediterranean slaves (83)—she offers no footnote or further explanation.

Caroline Vout’s chapter is a clever study of the overlaps or forced associations between Petronius’s text and Suetonius’s *Nero*. This phenomenon, she suggests, is not “a matter of direct impact, but one bred of diffusion” (109). She poses that the carefully crafted artificiality of Petronius’s narrative is one attempt to process the imperial period, and that same impulse finds expression in later historical treatments of Nero’s reign. As she masterfully demonstrates in a series of intratextual allusions within the *Satyricon* itself, the result is more than just parody, but a Petronian “hall of mirrors” that offers fragmented reflections of the experience of living in Nero’s Rome.

As John Bodel revealed in his seminal dissertation, the representations of freedmen, especially in the *Cena*, are fascinating portraits that have contributed to both configuring and challenging general assumptions about that class.⁸ There are two treatments of freedmen in this collection, one by Jean Andreu on the representation of freedmen in general in the *Satyricon*, and one by Shelley Hales comparing Trimalchio’s *domus* to the homes of real Romans on the Bay of Naples. Andreu traces the outlines of Trimalchio’s social status and discusses the significant treatments of this character as an economic player, as a member of the Roman “bourgeoisie,” and as a man hemmed in by the limitations of his status. Like Richlin, he offers an interesting summary of the arguments and possibilities regarding the status of the novel’s three main characters. Especially useful are his comparisons between incidents at the *Cena* and evidence on the lives of freedmen as found in the archaeological record and non-fictional literary sources. Hales examines identity as expressed in living spaces. She discusses the importance of the *domus* to Romans in general and the ways in which Trimalchio and other freedmen define their success by their home-ownership. With success, she

offers three discussions on themes relevant to theatricality in the *Cena* where nothing is what it seems and the collision of “house, space, art and behavior...create an atmosphere of confusion and disorientation” (175). As she rightly points out, a similar atmosphere is detectable in the actual Campanian houses of the period (even ones not owned by freedmen). Particularly good is her discussion (177–178) on the desire for realism among ancient (and not so ancient) art historians, and the ironic nature of Trimalchio’s penchant for naturalism.

Koenraad Verboven’s chapter contains much useful information for those interested in the imperial economy. For example, 78 percent of the extant funerary inscriptions that list the profession of the deceased belong to slaves or freedmen (129); and a recently discovered cache of Pompeian writing tablets provide detailed documentation of the private credit enterprise of the freedmen family of the Sulpicii (135).⁹ Verboven dispels some of the mythologies about enterprising freedmen but leaves room for more exploration into the vital role of freedmen in a credit-based economy. As Verboven cautiously admits, there is still a great deal that can be learned about the ancient economy from Petronius’s text.

Valerie Hope continues her insightful work on tomb inscriptions with a chapter-length treatment of Trimalchio’s tomb. She provides useful summaries of the normal attitudes and rituals regarding death, and then uses that to indicate the trespasses of Trimalchio in the *Cena*. This kind of analysis is familiar to most scholars of Petronius, but Hope, to some extent reiterating the message of Lauren Petersen,¹⁰ reminds us that we should not “set up a false polarity between the tastes of the elite and tastes of freed slaves” (158).

Stephen Harrison and Joanna Paul bring the collection to a close by examining the works that indicate the extensive influence and *nachleben* of Petronius’s work. Harrison provides us a list of the fictional works that date as far back as 1594 (Thomas Nashe’s *The Unfortunate Traveller*) and as recently as 2007 (Jesse Browner’s *The Uncertain Hour*). To those who may still question the categorization of Petronius’s work, Harrison writes (196), “novelists since the nineteenth century have had no problem in seeing the *Satyricon* as a narrative of novelistic character.” Joanna Paul presents a fascinating study on Fellini’s directorial decisions in cinematically adapting Petronius’s novel. There are many intriguing bits of information in this chapter, but one particular gem is the explanation of the film’s name, “Fellini—Satyricon.” The combined notions of fragmentation, as discussed by Slater in chapter one, and dislocation play out a great deal in Fellini’s concept of the film, as Paul demonstrates in a useful summary and analysis of the plot. Fellini himself compared his film to an unearthed object from the ancient world (214), “the images should

⁸ John Bodel. 1989. *Freedmen in the Satyricon of Petronius*. The University of Michigan: Dissertation.

⁹ These documents are published: G. Camodeca, *Tabulae Pompeianae Sulpiciorum*. Edizione critica dell’archivio puteolano dei Sulpicii (Rome, 1999).

¹⁰ Lauren Hackworth Petersen, *The Freedman in Roman Art and Art History* (Cambridge, 2006).

evoke the texture of ashes, earth, and dust.”¹¹ Fellini’s film is somewhat difficult to watch, but Paul seems to agree with the critics who praised his work for its presentation of antiquity “as simultaneously alien and timeless” (215). Both these essays raise intriguing philosophical questions about what Petronius means today.

The bibliography fills sixteen pages and is an absolutely essential addendum to the bibliography published by Schmeling and Stuckey in 1977.¹² The indices are helpful and well edited. In all this is an excellent resource for those well-versed in or newly interested in Petronius. A prior review faulted this book for the lack of Latin passages within most analyses,¹³ but the essays treat a considerable number of issues relevant to the text. The editors made the right choice to leave larger matters of Petronius’s style and language to more focused scholarship.

Ragno, Tiziana, *Il teatro nel racconto. Studi sulla fabula scenica della matrona di Efeso, con un’introduzione di Giovanni Cipriani* (Palomar: Bari, 2009) 576 pp.

Reviewed by Nadia Scippacercola

Al corposo volume della Ragno (in seguito R.), dedicato al tema della *fabula* scenica della matrona di Efeso, fa da introduzione un contributo, corredato da una propria bibliografia, di G. Cipriani (pp. 9–50). Indi segue la premessa dell’Autrice (pp. 51–54); poi l’insieme degli studi di R. si articola in tre sezioni o ampi capitoli, di differente lunghezza (pp. 55–492); chiude il volume una ricca bibliografia (pp. 493–570).

Il saggio di Cipriani, dal titolo *Passioni ‘prese in parola’. Adiuvant, mezzane, ingiunzioni all’amore (Virgilio, Seneca e Petronio)*, si sofferma su tre figure letterarie femminili non protagoniste: la nutrice di Fedra, Anna sorella di Didone e l’*ancilla* della vedova efesia; tali donne appaiono accomunate tra loro dal ruolo ‘mediano’ ricoperto, in rapporto alle proprie *fabulae* di riferimento, all’interno della costituenda coppia di amanti, e dal compito—che in sostanza esse stesse si arrogano (così è per la *nutrix* in Seneca, cf. pp. 12–16)—di parlare per persuadere all’amore un soggetto ritroso. Cipriani affronta la lettura di Sen. *Phaedr.* 431–482 e Verg. *Aen.* 4,31–53,—passaggi di cui è anche riportato il testo ed è offerta una traduzione—mediante una compita analisi retorico-contenutistica. Fra le due *suasoriae ad amandum*, il discorso di Anna, già dimostratosi efficace nell’ambito della propria *fabula*—seppur nel più agevole compito di muovere all’amore un cuore femminile (cf. p. 42)—, si conferma “ottimo modello di persuasione” (p. 41); della sua parodica ripresa intertestuale, nel discorso rivolto alla vedova dall’*ancilla* petroniana, si

tratta infine (pp. 42–44). Questo nitido e ben dosato studio di Cipriani mette in luce alcune dinamiche di un certo rilievo: se, da un lato, è riscontrabile nella tradizione letteraria greco-latina una tendenza alla mitigazione dello scandalo dell’unione sessuale consumata tra due membri dello stesso nucleo familiare o, persino di un tabù come l’incesto, mediante l’assimilazione di questi ultimi ad una, meno inquietante, relazione di tipo mercenario, dall’altro lato, le stesse adultere protagoniste delle nostre *fabulae* tenderebbero ad acquisire un’identità più marcatamente cortigiana mediante il velato slittamento del ruolo delle loro figure atanziali da ‘figure di mezzo’ a mezzane.

Il motivo della matrona di Efeso rappresenta uno degli snodi cruciali nella storia delle letterature di tutti i tempi. R. svolge un’accattivante indagine sul testo della novella di Petronio e sull’“endogena teatralità” della sua diegesi, muovendo dalla volontà di colmare un vuoto presente nel panorama degli studi del *Fortleben* dei *Satyrica*. La studiosa dedica, infatti, le felici pagine del terzo capitolo all’esame di quattro importanti ‘ipertesti’ drammatici del racconto della vedova, noti presso il grande pubblico d’Europa e risalenti al secondo quarto del XX secolo.

Nel primo capitolo (*Theatrum Arbitri. Elementi di (meta)teatralità nella ricezione dei Satyrica di Petronio*), di carattere più generale, è delineato, sulla scia degli studi di C. Panayotakis, lo *status quaestionis* relativo all’impostazione teatrale del romanzo petroniano.

Ciò comporta di necessità lo sfioramento (nel primo paragrafo) della *vexata quaestio*, nella quale la studiosa però non intende inserirsi, sul ‘genere’ cui apparterebbe il romanzo antico. R. richiama e commenta un passaggio di Macrobio (*somn.* 1,2,8) ricordando, con toni misurati, che i romanzi latini furono avvicinati, per più motivi, al genere comico-teatrale.

Ripercorrendo gli studi sui rapporti tra i *Satyrica* e il genere mimico, la studiosa si muove con destrezza su un altro “terreno minato”. R., ben documentata sulla questione, dirige l’attenzione sulle movenze ‘meta-teatrali’ del romanzo petroniano e formula delle considerazioni di un certo interesse. Proprio il ‘sentimento teatrale’ manifestato, a più riprese, dai personaggi della ‘farsa’ di Petronio, che mostrano di partecipare con cognizione, nel ruolo di attori o spettatori, alla propria recita, infirmerebbe l’idea che la relazione tra il romanzo dell’*Arbiter* e il mimo si fondi, prima di tutto, sulla comune propensione alla mimetica. La funzione della componente mimica, indubbiamente presente nell’opera petroniana, non andrebbe pertanto cercata nell’ispirazione al ‘realismo’, ma riconsiderata nell’ambito di una grottesca esibizione del ‘teatro della vita.’

Nel terzo paragrafo, “*Totus mundus agit histrionem*: Giovanni di Salisbury, il teatro di Shakespeare e due ‘falsi’ frammenti petroniani”, articolato in più sottoparagrafi, sono ricostruite, anche mediante il supporto di una nutrita serie di studi moderni, le suggestive vicende di inganni storico-filologici che hanno interessato il motto in latino nel corso dei secoli.

¹¹ The quote is originally from Fellini’s preface (p.45) in D. Zanelli, ed., *Fellini’s Satyricon* (New York, 1970).

¹² Gareth L. Schmeling and Johanna H. Stuckey, *A Bibliography of Petronius* (Leiden, 1977)

¹³ *BMCR* 2009.07.36.

Si segnala in particolare il par. 3.2, compito *excursus* sull'origine (greca), socratico-platonica, e sul fortunato sviluppo dell'antico cliché: *theatrum mundi, mimus vitae*. Se dunque la notizia—trasmessaci dagli editori shakespeariani Johnson-Steevens (1778) e Malone (1790) e risalente ad un perduto manoscritto di William Oldys—che dal 1599, sull'insegna del primo edificio del Globe Theatre (distrutto da un incendio nel 1613) avrebbe campeggiato la frase *Totus mundus agit histrionem* assieme alla figura di un *Caelifer*, appare quanto meno 'arbitraria' (Schanzer 1968; Stern 1997), e se dubbia resta la relazione della massima con il famoso verso dell'*As You Like It*: "All the world's a stage" (cf. R., p. 102–103), del tutto incorretta risulterebbe l'attribuzione della *gnome* al genio di Petronio, effettuata, a più riprese, dai vari editori dei *Satyrica* e avallata dall'illustre umanista Giusto Lipsio. Tale sentenza ed un'altra (sul 'mimo della vita') sono contenute, in realtà, nel *Policraticus* (3,8) di Giovanni di Salisbury in due *loci* di carattere 'esegetico-esplicativo' e quindi al *Saresberiensis*, in ultima istanza, andrebbe addebitata la loro paternità (R., pp. 120–131).

Il secondo capitolo ("Lo *spectaculum* della matrona. Elementi di teatralità e metateatralità nel racconto della vedova infedele") è dedicato più specificamente all'esame dell'ipotesto petroniano, di cui è riportato il testo (Petron. 110,6–113,2), corredato da una nota critica, ed è fornita una traduzione. Una 'naturale' contaminazione tra il genere novellistico-narrativo e quello mimico-teatrale, favorita anche dalla concreta prossimità di occasioni, tempi e spazi entro cui erano fruiti i due generi, è circostanza ammissibile; e il concetto potrebbe ritenersi valido anche per la *fabula Milesia*. L'indagine della R. si propone di svelare, nel frangente, i "segnali autoriflessivi" (Barchiesi 1996, pp. 200–201), disseminati nelle sedi liminari della novella petroniana, che celerebbero una "guida alla lettura" offerta dall'*implied author*. Nel *promitio* del racconto di Eumolpo, la vita reale—un suo preteso 'evento di cronaca'—è programmaticamente opposto alle mitiche vicende della tragedia; R. leggerebbe ivi pure un richiamo intratestuale agli esametri di Trifena (108,14).

Con un'analisi di ampio respiro, la studiosa ripercorre la traccia delle memorie allusive che rimandano ad una serie di figure del mito (Medea, Elena e Didone) nel cui 'cono d'ombra' si situa l'anonima matrona efesina. Un insieme di analogie dovevano, infatti, emergere in tutta la loro nettezza, al momento della ricezione dei versi dell'intertesto eneadico—che probabilmente era già di per sé oggetto di rappresentazioni pantomimiche ed istrionesche—, inducendo il lettore di Petronio ad una revisione complessiva del sistema dei personaggi della novella: la vedova e il soldato come Didone ed Enea, l'*ancilla* come *Anna soror*. Il ben noto meccanismo petroniano di straniamento delle *fabulae* epico-tragiche avrebbe denunciato, ancora una volta, "la natura precaria e relativa di una tradizione" che, soprattutto la scuola, pretendeva "di 'ingessare' in sterili dinamiche di ricezione" e in "letturalpaludate e fossili" (p. 260).

Dell'*epimitio*, R. ricorda come sia spia della propensione teatrale del testo la risata collettiva dell'*audience*, cui non può, però, prendere parte l'irato Lica, "doppio" del marito gabbato. Si segnala ancora il par. 2.2, "Il 'narratore nascosto': due note su Eumolpo *fabulator*", valido esame narratologico della novella: il racconto si avvale della focalizzazione interna e non univoca; ciò da una parte rende la voce del *fabulator* amorale, dall'altra predispone intrinsecamente la narrazione ad una ricezione di tipo 'scenico'. Inoltre la nostra vedova, aspirante suicida, è presentata come un'(ipocrita) eroina: ella riproduce e supera la "semiotica del lutto" in direzione paratragica d'ispirazione senecana (in part. *Tro.*); proprio contro i toni melodrammatici delle tragedie del filosofo si appunterebbe pure una velata polemica petroniana (p. 316). Ma ancora, la novella riprodurrebbe lo schema tipico dell'*adultery-mime*; e l'ancella petroniana, che imprime la svolta comica al racconto di Eumolpo, per la sua propensione al vino e per l'abile uso della parola, sarebbe assimilabile ad una *lena* di tradizione mimica, comica o elegiaca.

Infine, sull'abbrivo degli studi di matrice bakhtiniana, R. pone l'accento sulla presenza di una doppia *audience* che assiste allo *spectaculum* della Matrona: quella interna, rappresentata dal *populus* di Efeso e il pubblico dei *nautae*, esterno alla novella.

La terza e ultima sezione (*Una matrona in scena. Aspetti della fortuna teatrale del racconto della matrona di Efeso*) si compone di due studi; nel primo—dedicato ai secc. XVII–XVIII e già in parte edito altrove—, alla luce delle critiche espresse da G.E. Lessing (Hamb. Dram. 36. *Stück*) sugli adattamenti teatrali della novella della vedova, sono ripercorsi i problemi insiti in un'operazione di "transmodalizzazione intermodale" (Genette 1982); indi è affrontato l'esame delle due incompiute redazioni di mano lessinghiana del *Die Matrone von Ephesus*. Il secondo studio ci porta nel XX sec., soffermandosi in particolare sulla decade 1936–1946. Una brillante analisi, da tener presente negli studi futuri, è riservata all'atto unico di Jean Cocteau, dal pregnante titolo: *L'École des veuves*, al poco noto dramma breve *La Matrone d'Éphèse* di Paul Morand, ai quattro atti, con il medesimo titolo, del belga Georges Sion e quindi alla commedia in versi, *A Phoenix too frequent*, dell'inglese Christopher Fry.

È però impossibile riassumere l'intera messe di informazioni veicolate dal libro di R., che si dimostra uno studio dotto, versatile, ottimamente aggiornato e redatto con onestà intellettuale. Il volume copiosamente annotato, copre un amplissimo arco temporale e tratta pure, seppur non *ex professo*, delle versioni medievali della *fabula* (n. 95, pp. 391–393), delle varie riscritture in ambito europeo con approfondimento della ricezione delle versioni orientali, recupera il XIX sec. (p. 406) e arriva fino alla contemporaneità (cf. n. 120; p. 403).

Qui e lì, il discorso si scompone in note di tipo verbale, in dettagli storici-biografici, e in varie digressioni che approfondiscono specifiche tematiche: le testimonianze offerte dalla letteratura giuridica, le modalità storico-letterarie del compianto funebre nel mondo greco-romano, il ridicolo, la crocifis-

sione, il motivo delle ‘porte chiuse’, *etc.* Tutto ciò può apparire dispersivo nella forma ma non lo è nella sostanza; il materiale, però, proprio per la sua ricchezza, avrebbe forse meritato, nell’organizzazione, una valorizzazione più esplicita che agevolasse il compito del lettore, costretto ora, nei fatti, a ripercorrere più volte il testo, per tirare le fila della nutrita serie di discorsi che corrono paralleli tra loro.

Questo della R. non è quindi un libro facile, ma è un bel libro, dalla dizione elegante e piacevole alla lettura, ed è soprattutto un buon libro, erudito, che offre molti spunti di riflessione, e che senza dubbio si imporrà all’attenzione.

Carlisle, D. P. C. “*Kai onap kai hupar: Dreaming in the Ancient Novel.*” Dissertation, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2009.

Abstract: This dissertation is a study of dreaming as a narrative device in the eight canonical ancient novels: Chariton’s *Callirhoe*, Xenophon of Ephesus’ *Ephesiaca*, Achilles Tatius’ *Leucippe and Clitophon*, Longus’ *Daphnis and Chloe*, Heliodorus’ *Aethiopica*, Petronius’ *Satyrica*, Apuleius’ *Metamorphoses*, and the anonymous *Historia Apollonii*. It argues that the recurrent motif of dreaming in these works is best understood as a central element in a religious structure which is characteristic of the ancient novels, and concludes that religious ideas are an important part of these novels: not as part of their “message,” but as a pattern of cultural expectations upon which they draw to achieve an emotional effect upon the reader.

The first two chapters look at the way dreams operate purely within the narrative universe of the novels themselves. In the first chapter, evidence is presented to support the claim that dreams in the ancient novels are for the most part assumed to be divine in origin. The second chapter investigates the reasons these dreams are sent, and concludes that while they may have various roles, or even no role at all, in shaping the novels’ plots, the one constant is that they are sent for their beneficial emotional effect on the dreamer or protagonist.

The third and fourth chapters ask how these functions of dreams within the novels can be connected to the role of the novels in the real world. The third chapter argues that the dreams have a *metalingual* function in relation to the novels themselves: they *essentialize* the novels by providing insight into their basic structures of meaning in simplified and thus more easily comprehensible form. The emotional effect and connection with the divine provided to the protagonists through their dreams is thereby offered to the reader through the novels. The fourth chapter examines these related functions of religious meaning and emotional effect, and shows how they fit into and offer evidence for the socio-historical context of the novels. It concludes with a brief examination of the dreams in each of the novels taken individually.

Curry, S. A., “*Human Identities and Animal Others in the Second Century C.E.*” Dissertation, Indiana University, Bloomington, 2009.

Abstract: In the 2nd c. CE, Roman writers and artists compared themselves and other human beings to non-human animals. Building on the curiosity and natural-historical studies of earlier generations, Romans of the early imperial period emphasized human/animal similarities when they wished to describe themselves, their own inner lives, or other human beings, i.e. specific aspects of human identity within a human community. However, they also implicitly made use of a generic conception of the “animal,” which resulted from an emphasis on human/animal differences and was often employed rhetorically as a means of “animalizing,” or rendering outside a particular human community, human beings judged unacceptable. Using contemporary sociologists’ work on the importance of one’s identity as “human,” I discuss the use of human/animal comparisons in works of literature and art from the 1st and 2nd c. CE, focusing especially on the writings of the 2nd c. CE author Apuleius of Madauros. I also discuss the use of human/animal comparisons in 2nd c. CE practices including dream interpretation, physiognomy, and slavery and discuss the intertwining of anxieties concerning being “animal” with those concerning human bodies. In the 2nd c. CE (and today), one’s identity as “human” had real social value and also affected an individual’s own sense of self. While human beings need human/animal comparisons to establish a conception of what it means to be “human” and who or what counts as “human,” using relationships of similarity and difference as a basis for one’s treatment of human and non-human animals is ethically problematic and can negatively affect the lives of both human beings and other animals.

Davison, M. G., “*Boundary Violation and the Body Politic in Neronian Literature.*” Dissertation, University of California, Irvine, 2009.

Abstract: Within the Latin texts of the Roman writers Lucan and Petronius, there are numerous examples of important physical and social boundaries being violated. In my dissertation, I address two important questions connected to both writers’ employment of boundary violation imagery: why are these writers so preoccupied with the breakdown and disintegration of important physical and social boundaries and what contributed to the prevalence of such imagery within their texts? My dissertation focuses upon the strong influence that Nero—an emperor notorious in our ancient sources for violating traditional physical and social boundaries—exerted upon two contemporary writers, Lucan and Petronius.

My view of Nero depends on Roman historiographical tradition, as represented by the historians Dio Cassius, Suetonius, and Tacitus. They each depict Nero as a notorious boundary transgressor, especially in public environments like the theater

and arena. Lucan's *Bellum Civile* and Petronius' *Satyricon* are both filled with gladiatorial allusions and motifs which are closely connected to images involving boundary violation. Within environments such as the theater and arena, Nero transgressed important and clearly defined boundaries by performing as an actor and by encouraging other elites to perform as well. Inside the Roman arena, an elite male member of Roman society could experience a violation to his physical self and this sometimes caused him to question who he was as an individual (a Roman elite citizen being defined as impenetrable and an intact totality). As my study shows, Lucan and Petronius experienced similar concerns and anxieties about what made an individual and how he was defined. This is clearly reflected in their literary works as they present literary worlds in which physical and social boundaries are very fragile and easily violated.

Diamond, G. M., "Literary Influences and Adaptation in the Middle English 'Kyng Alisaunder.'" Dissertation, University of Kansas, 2008.

Abstract: This dissertation traces the literary influences that affect the *Kyng Alisaunder* from their origination in the decades following Alexander the Great's 323 BCE death to their expression in the fourteenth-century CE Middle English romance. This work examines the Middle English author's mediation of the intertextual influences of its immediate sources and the ancestral texts from which medieval Alexander literature descends. The *Kyng Alisaunder* resists the drift towards fantasy embraced by the overall literary Alexander tradition by grounding its narrative in human agency and in a particularized, concrete world.

Elliott, S. S. "The Son of Man goes as it is Written of Him': The Figuration of Jesus in the Gospel of Mark." Dissertation, Drew University, 2009.

Abstract: Narrative criticism, which utilizes elements of secular narratology to interpret the Gospels, has developed into a major methodological approach in Biblical Studies. Characterization is a fundamental aspect of narrative discourse. As such, it is no surprise to find the category playing host to dominant ideologies of both "literature" and "the self" while also giving rise to confusions between narrative characters and historical persons. This dissertation revisits characterization in the Gospel of Mark, which I read in conversation with two Greek novels—*Leucippe and Clitophon* by Achilles Tatius and the anonymous *Life of Aesop*. This intertextual reading attempts to problematize both implicitly modern notions of literary characters as autonomous "agents" and "naturalizing" treatments of literary characters as historical referents.

The dissertation begins with an assessment of the current state of New Testament narrative criticism that demonstrates the persistence of modernist conceptualizations of "character" in contemporary narrative-critical engagements with the New Testament, and the extent to which historical concerns continue to hold sway over efforts to analyze the narrative dynamics of the gospels. I then set out to establish a poststructuralist narratological framework for analyzing literary characters, which dislodges notions of "unity" and "coherence," jettisons categorizations of characters as "flat" and "round," and problematizes the long-standing dichotomy of story and discourse. The remaining three chapters perform readings of specific themes and episodes in Mark, *Leucippe and Clitophon*, and the *Life of Aesop*. Attending to the aspects of focalization, dialogue, and plot as they relate to characterization, these readings illustrate the inherent ambiguity of narrative discourse, particularly with regard to referentiality, human agency, and the complex relationship between literature and history. Moreover, they illustrate the diverse and complex ways that narratives always, of necessity, produce fragmented characters that refract the inherent paradoxes of narrative itself and of human experience. Human beings identify with characters most, I suggest, in the way that their lives and experiences are mediated through narratives—discourses that are never complete, subjectivities that are perpetually under construction in and through language.

Fowler, R. C., "The Platonic Rhetor in the Second Sophistic." Dissertation, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey–New Brunswick, 2008.

Abstract: This dissertation looks at four authors (all "unqualified Second Sophists") whose literary activity covers the same period in the latter half of the second century: Lucian of Samosata, Maximus of Tyre, Publius Aelius Aristides of Mysia, and Lucius Apuleius of Madaura. Though born and in general operating at the geographic periphery of the Greco-Roman world, these second-century authors wrote with profoundly acculturated voices. At the same time, there was great concern in their work to emulate the themes and language of Classical Greece, and thereby add their names to the long tradition of Greek thought. The friction between various cultural trends such as the centripetal force of Rome, the movement of the Sophists around the East, and the importance of the tradition of fifth- and fourth-century Greek letters adds a particular force to their treatment of Plato. For these authors hailing from Asia and Africa, one strategy of appealing to past Hellenic literary glory was to invoke Plato and the tradition of Platonism. This dissertation aims to describe the backbone of the Middle Platonic tradition in order to identify the significant influence Plato had on nearly all the literature from the Second Sophistic.

Haynes, K. A., "The Beast's Wife: Sexuality, Gender and the Other in Twentieth- and Twenty-First-Century Versions of 'Beauty and the Beast.'" M. A. Thesis, University of Colorado at Boulder, 2008.

Abstract: Fairy tales present an often unrecognized source for the discussion of weighty cultural and societal issues, which are matters that continue to return to the forefront of cultural consciousness throughout multiple generations. The tale of "Beauty and the Beast" deals with motifs which are universal to the human experience, and because of this it has remained relevant for hundreds of years. This paper explores the changing thematic expressions of sexuality, the encounter with the other and gender roles in different renderings of this tale. Though these issues are perceived as static, they are constantly being redefined by social and cultural consciousness, a fact which is represented in the texts. Apuleius' "Cupid and Psyche," Marie-Catherine d'Aulnoy's "The Green Serpent," provide an historical starting point for the analysis of twentieth- and twenty-first-century texts utilizing psychoanalytic, feminist and sociocultural discourses. Primary texts analyzed include: Jean Cocteau's *La Belle et La Bete*; Irina Povolotskaya's *Alenkiy Tsvetochek*; Walt Disney's *Beauty and the Beast*; Angela Carter's "The Tiger's Bride"; Pat Califia's "St. George and the Dragon"; and finally, Victor Pelevin's *The Sacred Book of the Werewolf*.

Haynes, M., "Written in Stone: Literary Representations of the Statue in the Roman Empire." Dissertation, Harvard University, 2009.

Abstract: My aim in the present study is to offer a close analysis of the ways in which statues function in the literature of the Roman Empire from the Augustan period to the highpoint of the Second Sophistic in the late 2nd and early 3rd centuries CE. In their presentation of the literary statue, Roman authors manipulate the defining criteria of the sculpted medium—fixity, materiality and silence. My analysis of the strategies employed by Imperial authors in "writing" the statue reassesses the presentation of art in a literary context and how the sculpted medium challenges simple description.

I have structured my dissertation as a series of case studies that analyze the unique features of the statue and their translation from a visual to a literary medium. In particular, I investigate the sculptural medium's negotiable relationship to an original source or model; the consequences of resemblance to and approximation of life; and the challenge posed to the primacy of text with regard to fixing permanence and effectively representing "reality." These areas of inquiry also include a consideration of the sculptor as a creator-figure, especially in the case of religious or cult images as well as the use of statues as a metaphorical field in the sexualized description of female beauty.

I begin my inquiry with an analysis of the statue in Ovid's *Metamorphoses* as a methodological introduction. I then turn

to a consideration of several related themes: resemblance and the portrait statue (Pliny the Younger), the issues of replication and substitution (Histories of Tacitus; Favorinus' *Corinthian Oration*), canonical artists and the sculpting of the divine (Propertius 4.2), the perspective that integrates viewing and reading as parallel and interrelated processes—something I term "epigrammatic viewing" (*Silvae* 1.1 and 4.6), and finally, the metaphorical complex that writes women as statues and how that affects the text through reciprocity (Petronius' *Satyricon* 126–132). In my conclusion, I analyze a fictional letter by Alciphron that puts on display the portrait statue, divine images, and the confrontation between model and image, as well as the relationship between artist, model and statue.

Howard, A. P. "Making Change Happen: The Adaptation and Transformation of Ovid's Metamorphoses in Longus' Daphnis and Chloe." M. A. Thesis, University of Texas at Austin, 2009.

Abstract: This paper aims to explore the connections and parallels between Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe* and Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. The conclusions reached should provide fertile ground for further studies in the intertextual play between novels and Latin poetry. To reach these conclusions, there will be a multi-pronged approach at analyzing the questions and implications raised by the potential connections. First Longus' novel will be situated within a context of Greek literature under the Roman Empire that consciously utilized Vergilian poetry. Having done that, I will turn to the similar methods that each author uses to play with genre and the visual worlds in his work, a process that shows that Longus was using Ovid as a definite model/kindred spirit for his novel's approach to these topics. Following that, there will be an extended examination of specific episodes in *Daphnis and Chloe* through which Longus reveals his knowledge of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. Finally, this paper will attempt to situate the arguments and conclusions that are made in the context of the current debates over the readership of the novel to present a strong case for bilingualism in the ancient world.

McGar, Z., "Viewers and Viewed in Apuleius' Metamorphoses." M. A. Thesis, University of Georgia, 2008.

Abstract: Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* is a novel singularly obsessed with sight, spectatorship, the acquisition of experience from viewing, and the permeability of social and physical boundaries created by acts of viewing. I intend to analyze the variety of changes that viewing creates and how viewing itself throughout the novel signals the permeability of boundaries between classes and states of being. An examination of the patterns of motivation and consequence in acts of viewing reveals a concern with the delineation of boundaries of status and their transgression. The patterns of sight and transgression

of boundaries unify the disparate elements of the narrative with Lucius' initiation into the worship of Isis. This study will argue that the novel is ultimately structured into a narrative of conversion by these scenes of seeing and transgression. The first chapter considers viewing in the context of tales inserted into the narrative. The second chapter covers instances in which the narrator, Lucius, is held in the gaze of others. Finally, the third chapter examines the ways in which Lucius views women, from the slave Photis to the goddess Isis.

Popescu, V., "Lucian's 'paradoxa': Fiction, Aesthetics, and Identity." Dissertation, University of Cincinnati, 2009.

Abstract: This dissertation represents a novel approach to the Lucianic corpus and studies paradox, with rhetorical, philosophical, and aesthetic implications, as Lucian's distinctive discursive mode of constructing cultural identity and literary innovation. While criticizing paradoxography—the literature of wonders—as true discourse, Lucian creates a novel, avowed false, discourse, as a form of contemplation and regeneration of the Greek literary tradition.

Paradoxography is Lucian's favorite self-referential discourse in *prolaliai*, rhetorical introductions, where he strives to earn doxa through *paradoxa*—paradigms of exoticism applied to both author and work. Lucian elevates paradox from exotic to aesthetic, from hybrid novelty to astonishing beauty, expecting his audience to sublimate the experience of *ekplexis* from bewilderment to aesthetic pleasure.

Lucian's construction of cultural identity, as an issue of tension between Greek and barbarian and between birthright and paideutic conquest, is predicated on paradoxology, a first-personal discourse based on rhetorical and philosophical paradox. While the biography of the author insinuates itself into the biography of the speaker, Lucian creates tension between macro-text and micro-text. Thus, the text becomes also its opposite and its reading represents almost an aporetic experience.