

- Consuelo Ruiz-Montero: “Between rhetoric and orality: aspects of the spread of the earliest Greek novels.”

Part Two Novels and Novelties

- Alain Billault: “Histoire, mythologie, rhétorique et récit dans le roman de Chariton.”
- Stephen M. Trzaskoma: “Citations of Xenophon in Chariton.”
- J. R. Morgan: “‘A Cast of Thousands’: the riddle of the *Antheia Romance* solved (?).”
- Ewen Bowie: “Ἀέξεις Λόγγου.”
- Christopher Gill: “Style and ethos in Longus’ *Daphnis and Chloe*.”
- Hugh J. Mason: “Hunters’ dedications: Longus and Lesbos.”
- Ken Dowden: “The plot of Iamblichos’ *Babyloniaka*: sources and influence.”
- Giuseppe Zanetto: “Love on the waves: the reversal of a *topos* in Achilles Tatius.”
- Patrizia Liviabella Furiani: “*Furit Aestus*: il meriggio in Filostrato e nei romanzi greci d’amore.”
- Tomas Häggf: “The sense of travelling: Philostratus and the novel.”

Part Three: Apographs and Atticists: Adventures of a Text

- Louis Callebat: “La prose des *Métamorphoses* d’Apulée: éléments d’une poétique.”
- Maaïke Zimmerman: “Lucianic (and ‘un-Lucianic’) moments in Apuleius’ *Metamorphoses*.”
- Gerald N. Sandy: “Filippo Beroaldo’s use of Roman Law in his Commentary (1500) on Apuleius’ *Golden Ass*.”
- Michael D. Reeve: “History of a genre: Huet’s *Origines des Romans*.”
- Kathryn Chew & Mark Benton: “Heliodorus in France: Mosnier’s seventeenth-century representations of the *Aethiopica*.”
- James Tatum: “Who’s Afraid of Andromeda?”

Cueva, Edmund, Stephen Harrison, Hugh Mason, William Owens, and Sandra Schwartz. *Re-Wiring the Ancient Novel. Volume 1: Greek Novels*. Barkhuis & Groningen University Library Groningen, 2018.

Preface

- Marília P. Futre Pinheiro: “Landmarks and Turning Points in the Study of the Ancient Novel since the Fourth International Conference on the Ancient Novel, Lisbon, 2008.”

Longus

- Anton Bierl: “Longus’ Hyperreality: *Daphnis and Chloe* as a Meta-text about Mimesis and Simulation.”
- Giulia Sara Corsino: “Progress of Erotic Customs in the Ancient Novel: Three *Parthenoi* and Chloe in Longus’ *Poimenikà*.”
- Andrea Capra: “A 19th-Century ‘Milesian Tale’: Settembrini’s *Neoplatonici*.”
- Mary Cozad: “Trent, Literary Theory, and Sixteenth-Century Adaptations of *Daphnis and Chloe*.”

Achilles Tattius

- Erik Fredericksen: “In the Mouth of the Crocodile: Interiors, Exteriors, and Problems of Penetrability in Achilles Tattius’ *Leucippe And Clitophon*.”
- Froma I. Zeitlin: “From the Neck Up: Kissing and Other Oral Obsessions in Achilles Tattius.”
- Pauline A. Leven: “Doing Philosophy in the Elephant’s Mouth: Three Readings of Two Ekphrases in Achilles Tattius, *Leucippe and Clitophon*, IV, 2–5.”
- Michel Briand: “Achilles Tattius’ *Ecphraseis* of Abused Female Bodies: Interplays of Gendered Metaphor and Intensity.”

Heliodorus

- Benedek Kruchió: “The Dynamics of Summing Up: A Metaliterary Reading of Heliodorus 10,36 and 10,39.”
- Melissa Barden Dowling: “Heliodorus and Pythagoras.”
- Emilio Capettini: “Charicleia the Bacchante: *Erōs* and Genealogy in Heliodorus’ *Aethiopica*.”

The Reception of Heliodorus between the Sixteenth and the Eighteenth Centuries

- Heinz Hofmann: “Introduction. *Heliodorus Redivivus*: From the Manuscripts to the First Editions and Translations.”
- Robert H. F. Carver: “Knowing Heliodorus: The Reception of the *Aethiopica* in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century England.”
- Corrado Confalonieri: “Tasso, the *Aethiopica*, and the Debate on Literary Genres between Renaissance and Baroque.”
- Massimo Fusillo: “The Serial Dramatization: Alexander Hardy’s Tragicomedy *Théagène et Caricléé*.”
- Laurence Plazenet: “What Did Heliodorus’ Name Stand for in the Works of Mlle De Scudéry?”
- Stefan Seeber: “A Commodified Heliodorus: The German Translation of the *Aithiopika* in Context.”

Cueva, Edmund, Gareth Schmeling, Paula James, Karen Ní Mheallaigh, Stelios Panayotakis, and Nadia Scippacercola. *Re-Wiring the Ancient Novel. Volume 2: Roman Novels and Other Important Texts*. Barkhuis & Groningen University Library Groningen, 2018.

Petronius

- Tiziana Ragno: “The Light in Troy (Petr. 89): Imitation of Archaic (and Modern) Tragedy and Discovery of Virgil’s New Epic.”
- Marilyn B. Skinner: “Social Reproduction among Petronius’ Freedmen.”

Apuleius

- Nadia Scippacercola: “*Fabulae*, Humanity, and Fortune: Towards a Reading of Apuleius’ *Metamorphoses*.”
- Geoffrey C. Benson: “*Cupid and Psyche* and the Illumination of the Unseen.”

- Leonardo Costantini: “The Entertaining Function of Magic and Mystical Silence in Apuleius’ *Metamorphoses*.”
- Paola Francesca Moretti: “‘Seeing the Truth’: Some Remarks on Color(s) and Meaning in Apuleius’ *Golden Ass*.”
- Regine May: “Magic and Continuity in Apuleius: Isis from Witchcraft to Mystery Cults.”
- Timothy M. O’Sullivan: “Human and Animal Touch in Apuleius’ *Golden Ass*.”
- Silvia Mattiacci: “Robbers, Matrons, and the Roman Identity of Haemus’ Tale in Apul. *Met.* 7,5–8.”

Antonius Diogenes

- Helena Schmedt: “Language and Style in Antonius Diogenes: Atticism and the Second Sophistic.”

Protagoras Romance

- Niall W. Slater: “Speech Acts and Genre Games in the *Protagoras Romance*.”

Phlegon

- Valentina Popescu: “Phlegon’s Marvels in Context.”

Historia Apollonii Regis Tyri

- Benjamin Wheaton: “The *Historia Apollonii Regis Tyri* and the Transformation of Civic Power in the Late Empire.”

Miscellaneous

- Susan Tower Hollis: “Late Egyptian Literary Tales.”
- Judith Perkins: “Non-Retaliatio in the *Acts of Philip*.”
- Donald Lateiner: “Olfactoring Ancient Fictions: Fair and Foul Fragrances in Ancient Novels.”

Fernández Delgado, J. A., Francisca Pordomingo Pardo, and Jesús Ureña Bracero. *La retórica escolar griega y su influencia literaria*. Salamanca: Ediciones Universidad de Salamanca, 2017.

Harrison, Stephen, and Thea S. Thorsen. *Dynamics of Ancient Prose: Biographic, Novelistic, Apologetic*. Berlin-Boston: De Gruyter, 2018. Among many excellent essays, one finds the following:

- Gareth Schmeling: “The Autobiography of Encolpius: Reading the *Satyrice* as the Confessions of the Firstperson Narrator.”
- Ken Dowden and Amanda Myers: “The Visibility of the Author in the Ancient Novel.”
- David Konstan: “Apuleius and the Idea of Taste in Classical Antiquity.”
- Tim Whitmarsh: “The Flowers of the Meadow: Intra-generic Intertextuality in Achilles Tatius 1–2.”
- Stephen Harrison: “Psyche amongst the Victorians: An Aspect of Apuleian Reception.”
- Ewen Bowie: “Captured moments: Illustrating Longus’ Prose.”

Hilton, John. “Myth and Narrative Fiction in the Works of the Roman Emperor Julian.” *Listy Filologicke* 140, no. 1–2 (2017): 39–70.

Johnson, Sara R., Rubén R. Dupertuis, and Christine Shea. *Reading and Teaching Ancient Fiction: Jewish, Christian, and Greco-Roman Narratives*. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2018.

Nagel, Svenja. “Narrations of Magical Power in Ancient Egypt or: A Counter-Narrative to ‘Witchcraft’ Concepts.” *Magic, Ritual & Witchcraft* 14, no. 1 (Spring 2019): 11–36.

Petridou, Georgia. “The Curious Case of Aelius Aristides: The Author as Sufferer and Illness as ‘Individualizing Motif.’” In *Autoren in religiösen literarischen Texten Der Späthellenistischen und der frühkaiserzeitlichen Welt: Zwölf Fallstudien*, edited by Eve-Marie Becker and Jörg Rüpke, 199–220. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck GmbH and KG, 2018.

Schlapbach, Karin. *The Anatomy of Dance Discourse: Literary and Philosophical Approaches to Dance in the Later Graeco-Roman World*. Oxford–New York: Oxford University Press, 2018. Part II, “Ekphrasis of Dances,” touches on things novel.

Scippacercola, Nadia. “From Post-Modern to Ancient Greco-Roman Horror: Some Remarks for Further Investigations.” *Interdisciplinary Humanities* 33, no. 3 (Fall 2016): 66–80.

Warren, Meredith J. C. *Food and Transformation in Ancient Mediterranean Literature*. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2019.

Greek Novels

Bértola, Julián. “Book epigrams bizantinos sobre novelas griegas antiguas.” *Anales de Filología Clásica* 31, no. 1 (2018): 25–36.

Bierl, Anton. “Lived Religion and the Construction of Meaning in Greek Literary Texts: Genre, Context, Occasion.” *RRE* 2, no. 1 (2016): 10–37.

Biraud, Michèle, and Michel Briand. *Roman grec et poésie: dialogue des genres et nouveaux enjeux du poétique: actes du colloque international, Nice, 21–22 mars 2013*. Lyon: Maison de l’Orient et de la Méditerranée-Jean Pouilloux, 2017. The volume contains the following essays:

- Michèle Biraud and Michel Briand: “Introduction. Entre le roman grec et la poésie: rencontres, correspondances, tensions.”

Images et figures poétiques / romanesques.

- Jean-Philippe Guez: “Les frontières de la prose: métaphore et comparaison chez Chariton et Achille Tatius.”

- Christophe Cusset and Claire Vieilleville: “De Moschos à Achille Tatius: l’enlèvement d’Europe comme programme poétique.”
- Magdeleine Clo: “Les instruments de musique dans le roman grec, vecteurs de la voix poétique.”
- Françoise Létoublon: “«Un feu courant sous la peau»: les métaphores poétiques dans les romans.”

Références, lectures, réécritures.

- Ewen Bowie: “Poetic elements in the Greek novelists’ prose.”
- Romain Brèthes: “Clitophon lecteur d’Ovide.”
- Alain Billault: “Achille Tatius et la poésie hellénistique.”
- Christine Kossaiï: “Jeux de perspectives et effet d’anamorphose chez Longus, Théocrite et Ovide: l’invention de la fiction.”
- Élodie Romieux-Brun: “Chairéas à la lumière d’Achille: Chariton lecteur d’Homère.”
- Gérard Rainart: “La poésie imitée des oracles de Delphes dans le roman d’Héliodore, les *Éthiopiennes*.”

Effets de rythme, jeux de structure.

- Michèle Biraud: “Les discours de Philéas (*Daphnis et Chloé*, II.3–7): rythmes anciens et rythmes modernes de la bucolique en prose.”
- Martin Steinrück: “Rythme et concomitance dans les *Éthiopiennes* d’Héliodore.”
- Anne-Iris Muñoz: “Atticisme et tragédie: conflits formels dans le roman d’Achille Tatius.”

Le roman comme poésie, la poésie comme roman.

- Jocelyne Peigney: “Les *Éthiopiennes*, roman homérique?”
- Hélène Frangoulis: “Des procédés romanesques dans l’épopée de Nonnos.”
- Dimitri Kasprzyk: “De Pindare à Héliodore: poésie épique et épique Romanesque.”
- Michel Briand: “*Poesis et historia*: les romans (sophistiques) grecs comme trans-fictions.”

Bird, Rachel. “Achilles Tatius and Chariton Reflections and Refractions.” *Mnemosyne* 72, no. 3: 471–487.

Bowie, Ewen L. *Daphnis and Chloe*. Cambridge–New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019.

Bowie, Ewen L. “The Denigration and Marginalisation of Women in Philostratus’ *Lives of the Sophists*.” In *Femmes grecques de l’Orient romain, Dialogues d’histoire ancienne Suppl. 18*, edited by Sophie Lalanne, 207–219. Besançon: Presses Universitaires de Franche-Comté, 2019.

Brèthes, Romain. “Femme explorée, femme libérée? Autonomie et soumission féminine dans le roman grec.” In *Femmes grecques de l’Orient romain, Dialogues d’histoire ancienne Suppl. 18*, edited by Sophie Lalanne, 253–273. Besançon: Presses Universitaires de Franche-Comté, 2019.

Cikán, Ondřej. “Eingegrabener Wein, gewinnbringende Syrinx. Zum Humor des Longos und einem Übersetzungsproblem (I,19 und III,29).” *Listy Filologicke* 140, no. 3/4 (December 2017): 315–341.

Couprie, Dirk L. *When the Earth Was Flat: Studies in Ancient Greek and Chinese Cosmology*. Cham, Switzerland: Springer, 2018. The text contains a subchapter titled “Xenophanes’ Text in the Interpretation of Aristotle, Achilles Tatius, Empedocles, Pseudo-Aristotle, and Simplicius.”

Cueva, Edmund P. “Love, Life, and the Seasons in Longus’ *Daphnis and Chloe*.” *Interdisciplinary Humanities* 35, no. 2 (Summer 2018): 76–92.

Danek, Georg and Ondřej Cikán. *Daphnis und Chloë: Ein poetischer Liebesroman*. Wien: Ketos, 2018.

Ehlen, Oliver. “Chariton von Aphrodisias und die Selbstkontextualisierung eines neuen Subgenres.” In *Text, Kontext, Kontextualisierung: Moderne Kontextkonzepte und antike Literatur*, edited by Ute Tischer, Alexandra Forst, and Ursula Gärtner, 339–362. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 2018.

Fernández, Tomás. “La temporalidad de la novela griega y bizantina apuntes de lectura.” *Stylos* 27 (January 2018): 102–113.

Fernández Garrido, Regla. “El ejercicio del relato (διήγημα) en la novela griega antigua: Caritón de Afrodisias.” *Synthesis* 24, no. 2 (December 2017): 1–11.

Fernández Garrido, Regla. “Novela y progymnasmata: el ejercicio del relato en *Leucipa y Clitofonte*.” *Ágora: Estudios Clásicos Em Debate* 21 (January 2019): 155–176.

Gammage, Sonja. “Atticism in Second Declension Nominal Categories in the Language of Achilles Tatius.” *AClass* 62 (2019): 40–61.

Gilhuly, Kate. *Erotic Geographies in Ancient Greek Literature and Culture*. London: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, 2018. The book contains the chapter “Lesbos and the Invention of Heterosexuality in Longus’ *Daphnis and Chloe*.”

Hernandez, Juan Pablo Sanchez. “Merchant’s Road Toward the Utopia in Heliodorus’ *Aethiopica*.” *Antichthon* 52 (2018): 143–160.

Hilton, John. “Cnemon, Crispus, and the Marriage Laws of Constantine in the *Aethiopica* of Heliodorus.” *GRBS* 59, no. 3 (2019): 437–459.

Hilton, John. “The Revolt of the *Boukoloï*, Class and Contemporary Fiction in Achilles Tatius’ *Leucippe and Clitophon*.” In *Piracy, Pillage, and Plunder in Antiquity: Appropriation and*

the Ancient World, edited by Richard Evans and Martine De Marre, chapter 8. Milton: Routledge, 2019.

Hilton, John. "Speaking Truth to Power: Julian, the Cynics, and the Ethiopian Gymnosophists of Heliodorus." In *Intellectual and Empire in Greco-Roman Antiquity*, edited by Philip Bosman, 202–215. Abingdon: Routledge, 2018.

Hutchinson, G. O. *Plutarch's Rhythmic Prose*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2018. The text contains these relevant chapters/appendices:

- "Rhythmic Prose in Imperial Greek Literature."
- "Greek Imperial Prose: A Class-List."
- "A Distraught Hero (Chariton 3.5.5–6)."
- "Bewilderments of Joy (Heliodorus 10.38.3–4)."
- "Chaereas Lives (Chariton 5.8.1–3)."
- "The King of Persia Is Put in His Place (Chariton 8.5.5–7)."
- "A Father Struggles (Heliodorus 10.16.1–2)."
- "Some Tears in Achilles Tatius (Achilles 6.7.3–7)."
- "More Tears in Achilles Tatius (7.4.3–6)."

Jarratt, Susan Carole Funderburgh. *Chain of Gold: Greek Rhetoric in the Roman Empire*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2019. The text contains the chapter "No Animals Were Harmed: Sophistic Rhetoric in Heliodorus' *Aithiopika*."

Jolowicz, Daniel. "Agathos Daimon in Chariton's *Chaereas and Callirhoe* (5.1.6, 5.7.10): Some Ramifications." *CQ* 68, no. 2 (2018): 591–602.

Jolowicz, Daniel. "The Roman Army and Greek Militarism in Chariton's *Chaereas and Callirhoe*." *CCJ* 64 (2018): 113–138.

Jolowicz, Daniel. "Sicily and Roman Republican History in Chariton's *Chaereas and Callirhoe*." *JHS* 138 (2018): 127–149.

Kanavou, Nikoletta. "The Vocabulary of Chaste Love in the *Ninus* Fragments." *CPh* 111, no. 3 (July 2016): 276–282.

Kidd, Stephen E. "Play in and around the Ancient Novel." *American Journal of Play* 9, no. 3 (Spring 2017): 356–373.

King, Daniel. *Experiencing Pain in Imperial Greek Culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018. The book contains the chapter "Viewing and Emotional Conflict in Akhilleus Tatios."

Lalanne, Sophie. "Les femmes du roman grec entre réalités et représentations." In *Femmes grecques de l'Orient romain, Dialogues d'histoire ancienne Suppl. 18*, edited by Sophie Lalanne, 221–251. Besançon: Presses Universitaires de Franche-Comté, 2019.

Lefteratou, Anna. "The Bed Canopy in Xenophon of Ephesus and the Iconography of Mars and Venus under the Empire." *Ramus* 47, no. 1 (2018): 78–107.

Lefteratou, Anna. "Gemstones, Textiles and a Princess: Precious Commodities in Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*." *CJ* 115, no. 1 (2019): 1–30.

Lefteratou, Anna. "The Visual Trademark of the Greek Novel. Novelistic Opening Ekphrases in Chariton and Heliodorus." *AC* 87 (2018): 77–107.

ni Mheallaigh, Karen. "Protean Texts: The Changing Materiality of Books in Antiquity and Today." *Material Culture* 48, no. 1 (Spring 2016): 44–54.

Montiglio, Silvia. "Wandering, Love, and Home in Apollonius of Rhodes' *Argonautica* and Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*." In *The Epic Journey in Greek and Roman Literature*, edited by Thomas Biggs and Jessica Blum, 91–107. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019.

Oppeneer, Th. "Assembly Politics and the Rhetoric of Honour in Chariton, Dio of Prusa and John Chrysostom." *Historia* 67, no. 2 (2018): 222–243.

Osek, Ewa. "Taking Revenge in the Name of Hermes: Hierocrates of Syracuse and His Anti-Athenian Politics." In *Politics and Performance in Western Greece: Essays on the Hellenic Heritage of Sicily and Southern Italy*, edited by Heather L. Reid, Davide Tanasi, and Susi Kimbell, 81–96. Iowa: Parnassos Press – Fonte Aretusa, 2017.

Papadimitropoulos, Loukas. "Charicleia's Identity and the Structure of Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*." *HSPH* 109 (2017): na.

Pattoni, Maria Pia Pattoni. "Tragic and Paratragic Elements in Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*." In *Συναγωνίζεσθαι. Studies in Honour of Guido Avezzi*, edited by Silvia Bigliuzzi, Francesco Lupi, Gherardo Ugolini, 633–652. Verona: SKENÈ Theatre and Drama Studies, 2018.

Plastira-Valkanou, Maria. "Lampon's Episode in Xenophon's *Ephesiaca*: The Reformulation of a Goatherd." *Symbolae Osloenses* 90, no. 1 (January 2016): 164–179.

Rojas Álvarez, Lourdes. "El amor en la novela griega." *Nova Tellus* 37, no. 2 (2019): 27–47.

Ruiz Montero, Consuelo. "Ghosts Stories in the Greek Novel: A Typology Attempt." In *Visitors from beyond the Grave: Ghosts in World Literature*, edited by Dámaris Romero-González, Israel Muñoz-Gallarte, and Gabriel Laguna-Mariscal, 9–32. Coimbra: Imprensa Da Universidade De Coimbra, 2019.

Savino, Christina. "Il romanzo greco tra teorie e controversie mediche: Achille Tazio, IV 9, 1–11; 15, 1–17, 5." *Medicina Nei Secoli: Arte e Scienza* 29, no. 3 (September 2017): 923–942.

Schmid-Dümmmler, Nicola Nina. *Achilleus Tatios*, Leukippe und Kleitophon: *Rhetorik im Dienst der Verführung*. *Bochumer Altertumswissenschaftliches Colloquium 101*. Trier: WVT Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier, 2018.

Skupniewicz, Patryk and Katarzyna Maksymiuk. "Persian Riders in the *Aethiopica* of Heliodorus: A Reliable Source?" *Historia i Świat* 7 (2018): 99–110.

Stoneman, Richard, Krzysztof Nawotka, and Agnieszka Wojciechowska, eds. *The Alexander Romance: History and Literature. Ancient Narrative. Supplementum, 25*. Groningen: Barkhuis & Groningen University Library, 2018.

- Richard Stoneman: "Introduction: on Using Literature for History."

I: Defining the *Alexander Romance* as Literature

- Ivan Ladynin: "Alexander – 'The New Sesonchosis': An Early Hellenistic Propagandist Fiction and Its Possible Background."
- Yvona Trnka-Amrhein: "The Fantastic Four: Alexander, Sesonchosis, Ninus and Semiramis."
- Richard Stoneman: "*The Alexander Romance* and the Rise of Paradoxography."
- Haila Manteghi: "The King and the Wizard: Apollonius of Tyana in the *Iskandarnāma* of Nizāmi Ganjavi (1141–1209)."
- Daniel Selden: "Alexander in the Indies."

II How to Read 'Bad' History

- Graham Oliver: "The *Alexander Romance* and the Hellenistic Political Economy."
- Benjamin Garstad: "Alexander's Circuit of the Mediterranean in the *Alexander Romance*."
- Krzysztof Nawotka: "History into Literature in the Account of the Campaign of Gaugamela in the *Alexander Romance*."
- Hartmut Wulfram: "Intertextuality through Translation: The Foundation of Alexandria and Virgil in Julius Valerius' *Alexander Romance*."
- Elizabeth Baynham: "'Joining the Gods': Alexander at the Euphrates; Arrian 7.27.3, *Metz Epitome* 101–102 and the *Alexander Romance*."

III Related texts: the impact of the *Alexander Romance*

- Christian Thru Djurslev: "Revisiting Alexander's Gates against 'Gog and Magog': Observations on the Testimonies before the *Alexander Romance* Tradition."
- Aleksandra Kłęczar: "The Universal Rule of Alexander in *Tamid* 32: An Overview."
- Corinne Jouanno: "*Alexander Romance* and Byzantine World Chronicles: History Cross-fertilized by Fiction and the Reverse."
- Emily Cottrell: "Alexander at the Buyid Court."

Wasdin, Katherine. "Sibling Romance in Heliodorus' *Aithiopika*." *CJ* 114, no. 4 (2019): 385–408.

Xian, Ruobing. "Habrocomes' Lament in Xenophon of Ephesus' *Ephesiaca* 5.1.12–13." *GRBS* 58, no. 1 (2018): 55–66.

Zanetto, Giuseppe. "Intertextuality and Intervisuality in Heliodorus." *Prometheus* 44 (January 2018): 209–222.

Latin Novels

Ager, Britta. "Necromancy, Divine Encounters, and Erotic Magic in Cupid and Psyche." *AJPh* 140, no. 2 (2019): 317–343.

Alonso, Griselda Esther. "La configuración del ethos en los párrafos V a XIX del libro I de *El Asno de Oro* de Apuleyo." *REC* 45 (2018): 15–32.

Ammannati, Giulia. "Congetture ai libri IV e V delle *Metamorfosi* di Apuleio." *SIFC* 16, no. 1 (2018): 43–51.

Ammannati, Giulia. "Due congetture alle *Metamorfosi* di Apuleio (4, 27 e 6, 18)." *MD* 80 (2018): 243–246.

Ammannati, Giulia. "*Lectio falsa et emendatio*. Congetture alle *Metamorfosi* di Apuleio e considerazioni sulla fisionomia filologica del Laur. 68.2 (F)." *MD* 79 (2017): 227–239.

Avila, Agustín. "Ostentación y competencia en el convivio malogrado de la *Cena Trimalchionis*." *Stylos* 27 (January 2018): 33–47.

Baker, Ashli J. E. "Appearances Can Be Deceiving: Costume and Identity in Apuleius's *Metamorphoses*, *Florida*, and *Apolo*gy." *Arethusa* 50.3 (2017): 335–367.

Benson, Geoffrey C. *Apuleius' Invisible Ass: Encounters with the Unseen in the Metamorphoses*. Cambridge–New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019.

Biefeldt, Ruth. "Candelabrus and Trimalchio: Embodied Histories of Roman Lampstands and Their Slaves." *Art History* 41, no. 3 (June 2018): 420–443.

Blythe, Barbara. "Apples to Apples: Forbidden Fruit in Petronius's *Cena Trimalchionis*." *TAPhA* 148.2 (2018): 393–419.

Bradley, Keith. *Apuleius and Antonine Rome: Historical Essays*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2017.

Branham, R. Bracht. *Inventing the Novel: Bakhtin and Petronius Face To Face*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019.

Carussi, Margherita. “On the Ship in Petronius’ *Satyrice*: Gender Roles on the Move in the Early Roman Empire.” In *Gender, Companionship, and Travel Discourses in Pre-modern and Modern Travel Literature*, edited by Floris Meens and Tom Sintobin, 17–34. London: Routledge, 2018.

Caspers, Christiaan L. “‘Sibyl, What Do You ...?’ (Petron. *Sat.* 48.8).” *CPh* 113, no. 2 (2018): 224–226.

Costantini, Leonardo. “Love Stories as a Narrative Trope in Plutarch’s *Amatoriae Narrationes* and *Mulierum Virtutes*, and Apuleius’ *Metamorphoses* 7 and 8.” *Rivista Di Filologia e Istruzione Classica* 146, no. 2 (July 2018): 489–504.

Dalbera, Joseph and Dominique Longrée, eds. *La langue d’Apulée dans les Métamorphoses*. Paris: L’Harmattan, 2019.

The text contains these essays:

- Silvia Mattiacci: “Le bi(tri)linguisme d’Apulée et ses traces dans les *Métamorphoses*.”
- Frédérique Biville: “L’univers sonore des *Métamorphoses* d’Apulée. Langage verbal et langage des émotions.”
- Frédérique Fleck: “Le marquage du discours rapporté chez Apulée: du discours direct au discours direct libre.”
- Joseph Dalbera: “Railler la voix de l’autre: polyphonie énonciative et ironie dans les *Métamorphoses*.”
- Vincent Martzloff: “*Saeva scaeva uiriosa ebriosa peruicax pertinax*. Binômes de paronymes asyndétiques dans les *Métamorphoses* d’Apulée et leur histoire littéraire.”
- Silvia Pieroni: “Incroci enunciativi e inversione di tratti: su un contesto di neutralizzazione dell’opposizione *hic vs. iste*.”
- Marie-Dominique Joffre: “Les structures pronominales dans les *Métamorphoses* d’Apulée.”
- Peggy Lecaude and Aude Morel: “Les diminutifs dans les *Métamorphoses* d’Apulée: étude lexicale et fonctionnement énonciatif.”
- Chantal Kircher: “Les adjectifs de relation dans les *Métamorphoses* d’Apulée: l’exemple des adjectifs en *-ôsus* et en *-eus*.”
- Michèle Fruyt: “Apulée et la créativité lexicale: le suffixe *-tus, -tūs M.*”
- Elisa Dal Chiele: “Il lessico di Apuleio filosofo: osservazioni a partire dal *De Platone et eius dogmate*.”
- Lucia Pasetti: “Tema e lessico del ritorno nelle *Metamorfosi*.”
- Pedro Duarte: “Le lexique relatif à la statuaire dans les *Métamorphoses* d’Apulée.”
- Joseph Dalbera and Dominique Longrée: “La langue des *Métamorphoses* à l’aune de la statistique: le projet conjoint LISA–LASLA.”
- Jean Meyers: “La proposition relative dans le livre 5 des *Métamorphoses* d’Apulée.”
- Bernard Bortolussi: “La place du verbe dans le conte de Psyché (*M.* 4,28–4,24).”
- Lara Nicolini: “Idiosincrasie di uno scrittore. L’idioletto apuleiano per una nuova edizione.”

Deroux, Carl. “Petron, *Sat.* XLIV, 5 (+ *similia sicut interioris et +*): *un locus non desperatus*.” *Latomus* 75, no. 2 (2016): 479–481.

Doroszewska, Julia. “The Liminal Space: Suburbs as a Demonic Domain in Classical Literature.” *Preternature: Critical and Historical Studies on the Preternatural* 6, no. 1 (2017): 1–30.

Gachalova, Natalia. “Cultural Identity in Apuleius’ *Metamorphoses*.” *AAnthung* 56, no. 4 (2016): 489–504.

Gardini, Nicola. *Long Live Latin: The Pleasures of a Useless Language*. Translated by Todd Portnowitz. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2019. The book contains the chapter “Deviances and Dental Care: Apuleius and Petronius.”

Graverini, Luca and Lara Nicolini. *Apuleio Metamorfosi (volume I, Libri I–III)*. Milan: Fondazione Lorenzo Valla, Arnoldo Mondadori Editore, 2019.

Habash, Martha. “*Duo Syri* in Petronius’ *Satyrice*.” *Latomus* 76, no. 4 (2017): 981–992.

Habash, Martha. “The Introduction of Characters in Petronius.” In *At the Crossroads of Greco-Roman History, Culture, and Religion: Papers in Memory of Carin M. C. Green*, edited by Sinclair W. Bell and Lora Louise Holland, 133–154. Oxford: Archaeopress Publishing Ltd, 2018.

Korenjak, Martin. “*In rutae folium conicere* (Petron, *Satyrice* 37,10 und 58,5).” *Philologus* 160, no. 1 (2016): 180–183.

Krebs, Assaf. “A Body without Borders: The Phenomenological Body in Apuleius’ *Metamorphoses* 1.5–1.19.” *G&R* 65, no. 1 (2018): 54–74.

Kronenberg, L. “A Petronian Parrot in a Neronian Cage: A New Reading of Statius’ *Silvae* 2.4.” *CQ* 67, no. 2 (2017): 558–572.

MacDougall, Byron. “The Book of Isis and the Myth of Er.” *AJPh* 137, no. 2 (2016): 251–285.

May, Regine. “Apuleius on Raising the Dead Crossing the Boundaries of Life and Death while Convincing the Audience.” In *Recognizing Miracles in Antiquity and Beyond*, edited by Maria Gerolemou, 353–380. Berlin–Boston: De Gruyter, 2018.

Nagel, Svenja. "Mittelplatonische Konzepte der Göttin Isis bei Plutarch und Apuleius im Vergleich mit ägyptischen Quellen der griechisch-römischen Zeit." In *Platonismus und spätägyptische Religion: Plutarch und die Ägyptenrezeption in der römischen Kaiserzeit*, edited by Michael Erler and Martin Andreas Stadler, 79–126. Berlin–Boston: De Gruyter, 2017.

Nicolini, Lara. "Le nozze interrotte: il mito come exemplum e un problema testuale sepolto in Apuleio, *Met.* 4.26.8." *Philologus* 160, no. 2 (2016): 372–378.

Pachis, Panayotis. "'Waves of Emotion' in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*, Book XI: An Approach according to Cognitive Historiography." In *Evolution, Cognition, and the History of Religion: A New Synthesis: Festschrift in Honour of Armin W. Geertz*, edited by Anders Klostergaard Petersen, Gilhus Ingvild Sælid, Luther H. Martin, Jeppe Sinding Jensen, and Jesper Sørensen, 490–505. Leiden–Boston: Brill, 2019.

Panoussi, Vassiliki. *Brides, Mourners, Bacchae: Women's Rituals in Roman Literature*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2019. Chapter five is titled "Quartilla's Priapic Weddings in Petronius' *Satyrice*: Female Power and Male Impotence."

Petrovićová, Katarina, and Natália Gachallová. "Improved Ass? Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* in His Novel *Metamorphoses*." *Graeco-Latina Brunensia* 21, no. 2 (July 2016): 215–228.

Rochette, Bruno. "Petron et le 'sardisme.' A propos de la langue d'Hermeros dans la *Cena Trimalchionis*." *AC* 85 (2016): 65–103.

Schwazer, Oliver. "Between Amateur Astrology and Erudite Gimmick: A Re-examination of Trimalchio's Horoscope (Petr. *Sat.* 39)." *AAntHung* 56, no. 4 (2016): 459–478.

Schwazer, Oliver. "Encolpius' *katabasis*, Trimalchio's Dog, and Vergil's *Aeneid* (Petr. *Sat.* 72.7–10)." *Mnemosyne* 71, no. 6 (2018): 1067–1073.

Schwazer, Oliver. "*nihil sine ratione facio*: Merkur in Trimalchios Wandmalereien (Petr. *Sat.* 29.3–6)." *MH* 73, no. 2 (2016): 179–191.

Setaioli, Aldo. "L'impotenza di Encolpio. Una messa a punto." *Prometheus* 44 (2018): 197–201.

Simonetti, Elsa. "L'immagine del saggio nelle opere di Apuleio." *RhM* 160 (2017): 371–392.

Sissa, Giulia. "In Touch, in Love: Apuleius on the Aesthetic Impasse of a Platonic Psyche." In *Touch and the Ancient Senses*, edited by Alex Purves, 150–166. London: Routledge, 2017.

Slater, Niall W. "Resurrection Woman: Love, Death and (After)Life in Petronius's *Widow of Ephesus*." In *Life, Love and Death in Latin Poetry*, edited by Stavros Frangoulidis and Stephen Harrison, 237–248. Berlin–Boston: De Gruyter, 2018.

Stucchi, Silvia. "Autobiografia immaginaria, riscrittura, reinvenzione: tre sentieri per la ricezione di Petronio." *Latomus* 75, no. 3 (2016): 735–756.

Thomson, Stuart. *Selections from Apuleius Metamorphoses V: An Edition for Intermediate Students*. New York–London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2018.

Tommasi, Chiara Ombretta. "Mithras between Isis and Osiris in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*: Solar Syncretism and Ritual Patterns towards a Hierarchical Ascent." In *Hierarchie und Ritual: Zur philosophischen Spiritualität in der Spätantike*, edited by Chiara Ombretta Tommasi, Gabriela Soares Santoprete, and Helmut Seng, 65–88. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 2018.

Ulrich, Jeffrey P. "Choose Your Own Adventure: An *eikon* of Socrates in the Prologue of Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*." *AJPh* 138, no. 4 (2017): 707–738.

Vannini, Angelo. "Sull'intromissione autoriale di Apuleio in *Metamorfosi* 11.27." *SIFC* 16, no. 2 (2018) 233–250.

Walvoort, Hendrik C. "Gizeria—A Gourmet's Riddle in *Petr.* 66.2." *Mnemosyne* 69, no. 1 (2016): 133–134.

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

Cobb, Christy. *Slavery, Gender, Truth, and Power in Luke-Acts and Other Ancient Narratives*. Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan, 2019.

Cosgrove, Charles H. "Banquet Ceremonies Involving Wine in the Greco-Roman World and Early Christianity." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 79, no. 2 (April 2017): 299–316.

Dinkler, Michal Beth. "Interpreting Pedagogical Acts: Acts 8.26–40 and Narrative Reflexivity as Pedagogy." *New Testament Studies* 63, no. 3 (July 2017): 411–427.

Elder, Nicholas A. "On Transcription and Oral Transmission in *Aseneth*: A Study of the Narrative's Conception." *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 47, no. 1 (January 2016): 119–142.

Elliott, J. K. "The Apocryphal Acts and the Ancient Novel: Literary Parallels to Early Non-Canonical Christian Writings1." *Expository Times* 129, no. 11 (August 2018): 495–503.

Hylen, Susan E. “Women Διάκονοι and Gendered Norms of Leadership.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 138, no. 3 (September 2019): 687–702.

Karaman, Elif Hilal. *Ephesian Women in Greco-Roman and Early Christian Perspective*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018.

Lang, Bernhard. “The Baptismal Raising of Lazarus.” *Novum Testamentum* 58, no. 3 (July 2016): 301–317.

Lieu, Judith M. “Letters and the Topography of Early Christianity.” *New Testament Studies* 62, no. 2 (April 2016): 167–182.

Litwa, M. David. “Literary Eyewitnesses: The Appeal to an Eyewitness in John and Contemporaneous Literature.” *New Testament Studies* 64, no. 3 (July 2018): 343–361.

O’Connor, M. John-Patrick. “Satan and Sitis: The Significance of Clothing Changes in the Testament of Job.” *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 26, no. 4 (June 2017): 305–319.

Pervo, Richard I. † “Can Homer Be Read with Profit?: A Delightful Response—and Then Some.” In *Christian Origins and the New Testament in the Greco-Roman Context: Essays in Honor of Dennis R. MacDonald*, edited by Froelich Margaret, Kochenash Michael, Phillips Thomas E., and Park Ilseo, 83–100. Claremont: Claremont Press, 2016.

Rosenberg, Eliza. “Weddings and the Return to Life in the Book of Revelation.” In *Coming Back to Life: The Permeability of Past and Present, Mortality and Immortality, Death and Life in the Ancient Mediterranean*, edited by Frederick S. Tappenden and Carly Daniel-Hughes, by Bradley N. Rice, 309–342. Montreal: McGill University Library, 2017.

Tripp, Jeffrey M. “Claiming Ignorance and Intimidating Witnesses: Reading John 9 in Greco-Roman Forensic Context.” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 80, no. 3 (July 2018): 470–490.

Warren, Meredith. “Equal to God: Jesus’s Crucifixion as *Scheintod*.” In *Coming Back to Life: The Permeability of Past and Present, Mortality and Immortality, Death and Life in the Ancient Mediterranean*, edited by Frederick S. Tappenden, Carly Daniel-Hughes, and Bradley N. Rice, 435–456. Montreal: McGill University Library, 2017.

Warwick, Celsiana. “Christian Martyr as Homeric Hero: A Literary Allusion in Perpetua’s *Passio*.” *CJ* 114, no. 1 (January 2018): 86–109.

Nachleben

Ardolino, Frank R. *Spenser, Kyd, and the Authorship of The Spanish Tragedy*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc., 2019. The first part of the book, “Apuleius, Kyd, and Spenser,” contains these chapters:

- “The Influence of Apuleius on Kyd’s *The Spanish Tragedy*.”
- “Comparison of the Incertitude of Apuleius’s *The Golden Ass* and *The Spanish Tragedy*.”
- “Apuleius and Spenser: Mystery Contexts and Games of Authorship.”

Atherton, Mark. “Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 201 as a Mirror for a Prince: Apollonius of Tyre, Archbishop Wulfstan and King Cnut.” *English Studies: A Journal of English Language and Literature* 97, no. 5–6 (August 2016): 451–472.

Barker, Georgina. “Polina Barskova’s *Daphnis and Chloe: A Russian Pastoral*.” *Classical Receptions Journal* 9, no. 3 (July 2017): 307–330.

Bezio, Kristin M. S. “From Rome to Tyre to London: Shakespeare’s *Pericles*, Leadership, Anti-Absolutism, and English Exceptionalism.” *Leadership* 13, no. 1 (February 2017): 48–63.

Bowles, Henry. “Psychological Realism in Early Prose Narrative: Dreams in the *1001 Nights* and the Greek Novel.” *Comparative Literature Studies* 53, no. 3 (2016): 427–453.

Braun, Lea. *Transformationen von Herrschaft und Raum in Heinrichs von Neustadt Apollonius von Tyrland*. Berlin–Boston: De Gruyter, 2018.

Breternitz, Patrick. “Was stand in Isidors Bibliothek? Zur Petronrezeption in den *Etymologiae* Isidors von Sevilla.” *RhM* 159 (2016): 99–112.

Brownlee, Marina S. “Interruption and the Fragment: Heliodorus and the *Persiles*.” In *Cervantes’ Persiles and the Travails of Romance*, edited by Marina S. Brownlee, 243–260. Toronto–Buffalo–London: University of Toronto Press, 2019.

Buchanan, Luanne and Michael H. Hoffheimer. “La traducción ‘hacia arriba’ en *Dafnis y Cloe* de Juan Valera.” *Anales Galdosianos* 51, no. 1 (2016): 25–43.

Carmignani, Marcos. “‘El Lobo’ de Petronio en la *Antología de La Literatura Fantástica* de J. L. Borges, S. Ocampo y A. Bioy Casares.” *IJCT* (19 March 2019).

Carmona, Carles Padilla. “Precedentes clásicos del conjuro del acto tercero de *La Celestina*.” *EHumanista* 36 (2017): 231–240.

- Gaál, Balázs. "Bird in a Human Lap: From Natural Observation to Moral Lesson." *IJCT* 24, no. 3 (October 2017): 262–288.
- Gillespie, Stuart. "Petronius on Dreams: 300 Years of English Translations." *Translation and Literature* 27 (2018): 195–222.
- Gómez, Jesus. "El 'artificio griego' en Lope de Vega: narrativa y teatro." *Anuario Lope de Vega* 23 (2017): 441–460.
- Ginzburg, Carlo. "Conjunctive Anomalies: A Reflection on Werewolves." *Revista de Estudios Sociales* 60 (April 2017): 110–118.
- Gray-Weale, Margaret. "Dante and Lucius Apuleius in Alex Miller's *Journey to the Stone Country*." *METaphor* 2 (April 2019): 12–14.
- Hamburger, Andreas. *Women and Images of Men in Cinema: Gender Construction in La Belle et la Bête by Jean Cocteau*. London: Taylor and Francis, 2018.
- Harrison, Stephen. "Apuleius in France: La Fontaine's Psyché and its Apuleian Model." In *Antike Erzähl- und Deutungsmuster: Zwischen Exemplarität und Transformation*, edited by Simone Finkmann, Anja Behrendt, and Anke Walter, 385–400. Berlin–Boston: De Gruyter, 2018.
- Himmelblau, Jack J. "The *Libro de Apolonio*: A Canvas of Folktale Types and Motifs." *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies* 94, no. 5 (May 2017): 457–478.
- Hurbánková, Šárka. "G.B. Basile and Apuleius: First Literary Tales. Morphological Analysis of Three Fairytales." *Graeco-Latina Brunensia* 23, no. 2 (July 2018): 75–93.
- Jovaní, Alfonso Boix. "Un *doppelte kursus* en el *Libro de Apolonio*." *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies* 94, no. 10 (November 2017): 1063–1080.
- Kanavou, Nikoletta. "New Remarks on the Panionis (P.Oxy. LXXI 4811)." *Archiv für Papyrusforschung und verwandte Gebiete* 64, no. 1 (July 2018): 13–31.
- Martin, Rene. "Le monde de l'enseignement de Petrone a Prudence: elements de modernité dans la littérature latine impériale." *LEC* 85, no. 3 (2017): 207–217.
- Min, Eun Kyung. "Master Zhuang's Wife: Translating the Ephesian Matron in Thomas Percy's *The Matrons* (1762)." *Essays and Studies* 69 (2016): 32–55.
- Miziołek, Jerzy. "Jacopo Del Sellaio's Adaptation of the *Primavera*." In *Botticelli Past and Present*, edited by Ana Debenedetti Ana and Caroline Elam, 73–90. London: UCL Press, 2019.
- Moshenska, Joe. "Sir Kenelm Digby's Interruptions: Piracy and Lived Romance in the 1620s." *Studies in Philology* 113, no. 2 (Spring 2016): 424–483.
- Ndiaye, Noémie. "'Everyone Breeds in His Own Image': Staging the *Aethiopica* across the Channel." *Renaissance Drama* 44, no. 2 (Fall 2016): 157–185.
- Nilsson, Ingela and Nikos Zagklas. "'Hurry up, reap every flower of the *logoi*!' The Use of Greek Novels in Byzantium." *GRBS* 57 (2017): 1120–1148.
- Pappas, Vasileios. "*Leucippe and Clitophon* in Latin: The Translation of Achilles Tatius' Novel by Annibal Cruceius." *Mediterranean Chronicle* 7 (January 2017): 213–226.
- Praet, Stijn. "'Se lieie la favola': Apuleian Play in Basile's *Lo cunto de li cunti*." *IJCT* 25, no. 4 (2018): 315–332.
- Rivoletti, Christian and Stefan Seeber. *Heliodorus redivivus: Vernetzung und interkultureller Kontext in der europäischen Aithiopika-Rezeption*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2018.
- Robins, William Randolph. *Historia Apollonii regis Tyri: A Fourteenth-Century Version of a Late Antique Romance*. Toronto: Medieval Studies by the Pontifical Institute for Mediaeval Studies, 2019.
- Rodríguez, Daniel Fernández. "Lope de Vega se reescribe: de la comedia bizantina a la novela corta (*La viuda, casada y doncella, Guzmán el Bravo y La prudente venganza*)." *Bulletin of the Comediantes* 70, no. 2 (July 2018): 33–48.
- Rogers, Brett M. and Benjamin Eldon Stevens, eds. *Classical Traditions in Modern Fantasy*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2017. The text contains these two relevant chapters:
 - Jeff Winkle: "C. S. Lewis's *The Voyage of the Dawn Treader* and Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*."
 - Marcus Folch: "A Time for Fantasy: Retelling Apuleius in C. S. Lewis's *Till We Have Faces*."
- Sandy, Gerald. "Guillaume Budé and the Uses of Greek." *IJCT* 25, no. 3 (September 2018): 241–261.
- Schulz, Laurenz. *Die Werte des Kitschs: Analysen historischer Modifikationen und literarischer Applikationen*. Stuttgart: J.B. Metzler, 2019. Chapter four contains a section titled "Petronius' *Satyricon* als illustrierendes Beispiel für die Spannweite der Suche nach reflexiven historischen Kitsch-Vorläufern."
- Tartamella, Suzanne. "Shakespeare the Escape Artist: Sourcing the East in *Pericles, Prince of Tyre*." *Studies in Philology* 115, no. 3 (Summer 2018): 472–504.

Tellini, Silvia Mara. "Versions and Inversions of Petronius' *Satyricon* in *The Great Gatsby*." *Todas as Letras: Revista de Língua e Literatura* 19, no. 3 (September 2017): 225–236.

Trzaskoma, Stephen M. "The Storms in Theodoros Daphnopates (*Ep.*36), Symeon Metaphrastes (*BHG*1878) and Achilles Tatius (3.1.1–5.6)." *Byzantion* 87 (December 31, 2017): 375–386.

Tyler, Elizabeth M. "Vernacular Foundations." In *England in Europe: English Royal Women and Literary Patronage, c. 1000–c. 1150*, 20–50. Toronto–Buffalo–London: University of Toronto Press, 2017.

Vajjhala, Rachana. "Telling Time: Statues and Stasis, *Daphnis et Chloé* and *L'après-Midi d'un Faune*." *Journal of the Royal Musical Association* 141, no. 2 (November 2016): 303–333.

Vivar, Francisco. "El arte de la metamorfosis y el arte de la novela: Apuleyo y Cervantes." *EHumanista* 33 (May 2016): 318–329.

Völker, Thomas. "Petron und die Reformation. Die Wiederentdeckung der *Hermannii Buschii Annotationes in Petronii*, Honorius Cubitensis und die konfessionelle Umnutzung des Originals durch Melchior Goldast." *Leipziger Jahrbuch zur Buchgeschichte* 26 (2018): 47–98.

Weiner, Jess, Benjamin Eldon Stevens, and Brett M. Rogers, eds. *Frankenstein and Its Classics: The Modern Prometheus from Antiquity to Science Fiction*. London–New York: Bloomsbury, 2018. The book contains the essay "Cupid and Psyche in *Frankenstein*: Mary Shelley's Apuleian Science Fiction?" by Benjamin Eldon Stevens.

Whiteley, Giles. "Coleridge's Quotation from Petronius in the Notebooks of 1830." *Notes and Queries* 64 [262], no. 4 (December 2017): 603–604.

Wyner, Yehudi and Helen Waddell. *Medieval Latin Lyrics (Three Medieval Songs) for Voice and Piano*. Musical Score. New York: Associated Music Publishers, Inc., 2018. One of the songs is titled "Poem of Petronius Arbitrator."

Notices

15th Congress of the Fédération internationale des associations d'études classiques and The Classical Association Annual Conference 2019, July, 4–8, 2019, London

The Unexpected in the Ancient Novel: Style, Narrative Dynamics, and Surprising Plot-motors:

- Owen Hodgkinson (University of Leeds, UK): "Metafiction in terms of the unexpected in Greek novelistic writings."
- Leonardo Costantini (Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg, Germany): "Unexpected variations in the ass-story: narrative strategies and characterisation in Ps.-Lucian's *Onos*."
- Luca Graverini (Università di Siena, Italy): "*Ut mirearis*. Micro-surprises in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*."

Who "owns" Classics? Redefining Participation and Ownership of the Field:

- Sonia Sabnis (Reed College, USA): "The *Metamorphoses* in the Maghreb: Owning Apuleius in Algeria."

115th Annual Meeting of the Classical Association of the Middle West and South, April 3–6, 2019, Lincoln, Nebraska

Heliodorus' *Aethiopia*:

- Mara Hazen: "Intersectionality of Female Sexuality, Desire, and Ethnicity in Heliodorus' *Aithiopia*."
- William M. Owens: "The Love Story of Charicleia and Theagenes: Calasiris as Non-narrator of Slavery; as Narrator of Slavery; as Clever Slave."
- Katherine Panagakos: "The Many Voices in Heliodorus' Reanimation."
- Dana Spyridakos: "What's Your Type? Stereotypical Lovers in Heliodorus' *Aethiopia*."

Greek Novel and Satire:

- Jonathan Young: "Internal and External *Erōs* in Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Clitophon*."
- Nicholas Nelson: "Τὸ Ἐρωτοῦ Ἀησιήριον: Pirates as Lovers in Xenophon of Ephesus' *Ephesiaca* and the Ancient Novel."
- Tianran Liu: "Reviving and Revising the Classical Past: Lucian's Appropriation of Aristophanic Plays in *True Histories*."
- Elizabeth Deacon: "Cultural Imperialism in the *Aethiopia*."

Apuleius:

- Rebecca F. Moorman: "Lying Eyes? Autopsy, Credibility, and the Senses in Apuleius, *Met.* 1.4."
- Evelyn Adkins: "Rhetorical Sleight-of-Hand in Apuleius' *Apology*."
- Rachel Dzigan: "Allegory, Rhetoric, and Imagination in Apuleius' *Cupid and Psyche*."

- Nathan I. Smolin: “*Vero Nomine*: The Philosophical Analysis of Cult and Divine Names as Context for Book XI of Apuleius’ *Metamorphoses*.”

Society of Biblical Literature, San Diego, November 23–26, 2019

Ancient Fiction and Early Christian and Jewish Narrative / Rhetoric and the New Testament

Joint Session With: Rhetoric and the New Testament, Ancient Fiction and Early Christian and Jewish Narrative

Theme: Ancient Fictional Letters:

- Gregory Given: “The Rhetoric of Epistolary Self-Awareness: Between ‘Fictional,’ ‘Forged,’ and ‘Real’ Letters.”
- James Petitfils: “Beauty and the Blasphemers: Appearance, Dress, and the Martyrs of Lyons.”
- Nina E Livesey: “The Rhetorical Potential of the Embedded Letters in Revelation and Acts.”
- Seth A. Bledsoe: “Missives and Mythologized Past: Narrativizing Identity and Association in Aramaic Letters.”

Ancient Fiction and Early Christian and Jewish Narrative

Theme: Women and Gender in Ancient Narratives:

- Sung Uk Lim: “Power in Eroticism: Exploring the Intersections of Gender, Ethnicity, and Empire in Josephus’ Esther (Ant.11.184–296).”
- Blaire French: “Married Women and the Contemplative Life in Ancient Jewish Novels.”
- Mark G. Bilby: “Iphigenia in Classical and Canonical Fiction.”
- R. Gillian Glass: “Burning Passion: Book VIII of the *Aethiopika* and Martyrdom Motifs.”
- Katharine Fitzgerald: “The Guise of Judith: From Insider to Outsider and Back Again.”

Ancient Fiction and Early Christian and Jewish Narrative

Theme: Novels:

- Rebecca Draughon: “‘And He Appeared, Standing before Him’: Polymorphic Depictions of Jesus in Light of the Human-Like Angels of the Jewish Novels.”
- Aryeh Amihay: “Another Sad Calamity: ‘*The Tale of Paulina*’ by Josephus as Pastiche.”
- Kirsten Marie Hartvigsen: “The Malleability of Key Identity Markers in *Joseph and Aseneth*.”
- Ian Kinman: “The Eunuch Gallus: A Character Trope Challenging Roman Procreative Power.”

Society for Classical Studies, January 2-5, 151st Annual Meeting, Washington, D. C.

Greek and Roman Novel:

- Nikola Golubovic: “Freedom and Confinement Aboard the Ship of Lichas (*Satyricon* 100–115).”
- Ashli J. E. Baker: “(Re)Reading the Roman Goddess Isis-Fortuna in Apuleius’s *Metamorphoses*.”
- T. Joseph MacDonald: “A Letter in a Land without Letters: Longus’s Intrageneric Interlocutors.”

- Christopher Cochran: “A Land without Slavery: Daphnis’s Civil Status in the Pastoral Landscape of Longus.”

God and Man in the Second Sophistic: Criticism, Innovation and Continuity:

- Barbara Blythe: “Ambiguous Epiphanies in the Novels of the Second Sophistic.”

What’s New in Ovidian Studies:

- Debra Freas: “Fabula Muta: Ovid’s Jove in Petronius *Satyricon* 126.18.”

Novel Entanglements: The Ancient Novel in New Social, Intellectual, and Material Contexts:

- Emilio Capetini: “Introduction.”
- Karen Ni-Mheallaigh: “Time-Psychology in the *Cena Trimalchionis*.”
- Emma Greensmith: “Awkward Authority: *Gnomai*, Heliodorus, and Nonnus.”
- Benedek Kruchió: “Between Skeptical Sophistry and Religious Teleology: The Multiperspectivity of Heliodorus’s *Aethiopica*.”
- Tim Whitmarsh: “The Novel and Bookspace.”

Obituaries

Edward Courtney

March 22, 1932—November 24, 2019

“Edward Courtney, Basil L. Gildersleeve Professor of Classics Emeritus at the University of Virginia, passed away peacefully on 24 November 2019. He was born in 1932 in Belfast, Northern Ireland, and retained his Belfast accent throughout his life. After an outstanding career as an undergraduate at Trinity College, Dublin, where he won medals for his translations into Greek and Latin verse, he was a Research Lecturer at Christ Church, Oxford, before being appointed in 1959 to a Lectureship at King’s College, London, eventually being promoted to Professor. In 1982 he and his family emigrated to the United States, where he was Ely Professor of Classics at Stanford University; but, when the Gildersleeve Chair of Classics was inaugurated at the University of Virginia, Ted became its first holder in 1993, retiring in 2002.

“He started publishing in 1954 with a review of A.Y. Campbell’s edition of Horace, a favourite author, and amongst his many publications, which in total amount to over 130 items, are eleven books: critical editions of Valerius Flaccus (1970), Ovid’s *Fasti* (1978, in collaboration), Juvenal (1984), the poems of Petronius (1984), and Statius’ *Silvae* (1990); commentaries on Juvenal (1980), the fragmentary Latin poets (1993), Latin verse inscriptions (1995), and archaic Latin prose (1999); in collaboration with his friend Niall Rudd he also wrote a more elementary commentary on selected satires of Juvenal for use in schools (1977). He said at the time that *A Companion to Petronius* (2001) would be his last book, and so it proved, but for the next decade and a half he continued to produce a stream of incisive articles on a wide range of Latin texts. Reviewing his

Fragmentary Latin Poets in 1999, Michael Reeve said that ‘it is hard to think of any other scholar alive today who could have tackled with such erudition and such independence of judgement the whole range from the minor works of Ennius to Tiberianus and Symmachus’. Twenty years later these words serve as an appropriate memorial of the friend and scholar we have lost.”

The notice was written by Tony Woodman, Basil L. Gildersleeve Professor of Classics Emeritus at the University of Virginia.

Reviews, Articles, and Dissertations¹

Petronian Miscellany

Barry Baldwin

Samuel Johnson & Petronius

I have twice before in *PSN* (v. 23, 1993, 10–12; v. 25, 1995, 14–15) explored this connection.

Now, I have just come across a fresh passage, thanks to the 2018 publication of the final (no. XX) volume of the Yale edition of Johnson’s collected works.

It occurs in Johnson’s review of Joseph Wharton’s 1756 *An Essay on the Writings and Genius of Pope*, published in the short-lived *Literary Magazine* (1756–1757), reproduced in this Yale volume (pp. 287–8028):

“Pope has mentioned Petronius among the great names of criticism, as the remarker justly observes without any critical merit. It is to be suspected, that Pope had never read his book, and mentioned him on the credit of two or three sentences which he had often seen quoted, imagining that where there was so much there must necessarily be more. Young men in haste to be renowned too frequently talk of books which they have scarcely seen.”

It is also to be suspected that this final barb still applies today.

Petronius For Dummies

(Modelled, though I shan’t reach beyond half his target, on Van Dyne’s ‘Twenty Rules For Writing Detective Stories’)

Pereant qui ante nos nostra dixerunt—Aelius Donatus

1. WHAT’S IN A NAME: *Satyricon* or *Satyrica*? Gertrude Stein’s A Rose is a Rose is a Rose resonates. As many *PSN* fans, I was brought up on the former. But, says Gareth Schmeling in his superlative (*verba desunt*) Commentary (2011, p. xvi, invoking that inevitable Fraenkel’s minion, Konrad Müller), “*Satyrica* has become the standard form.”

Müller’s own title, incidentally, has mutated over his six editions (*Claudite iam rivos, pueri, sat prata biberunt!*) from *Satyricon* to (thrice) *Satyrica* to (twice) *Satyricon Reliquiae*—Do make your mind up, Konrad!

Gareth (if I may be familiar—after all, he once to my delight publicly dubbed me ‘a Missouri sceptic’), wants to ‘regularize’ the title with such equivalents as *Aethiopica*, *Ethiopica*, and so on, detecting punning possibilities in this, with Petronius “in the process creating a hybrid form,” adducing Vitruvius 5. 6. 9. This architectural passage seems to me irrelevant. Reviewing the Commentary (*BMCR* 2012. 12. 52), Icelander Gottskålk Jensson—no mean warrior in the Petronian trenches—jumps on this last, rebuking ‘hybrid form’, in terms suggesting he has misread the sentence. Jensson is on firmer ground quoting Kenneth Rose’s *The Date and Authorship of the Satyricon* (1971, p. 1): “The -icon ending is common in Latin literature; it is the genitive plural of a Greek title with *libri* understood, as in Vergil’s *Georgicon*, Lucan’s *Iliacon*, Manilius’ *Astronomicon*.”

Jensson subjoins, “if we prefer the nominative only, *Saturika*, transliterated *Satyrica*, the title is simply Greek.” I am with him here, not being able to see why a Latin title has to be aligned with Greek ones. For his part, Ortwin Knorr, reviewing (H-Soz-u-Kult, November, 2007, online) Peter Habermehl’s *Petronius, Satyricon 79–141. Ein philologisch-literarischer Kommentar* (2006), deciphers the title as ‘Books of satyr stories.’

Regarding paronomasiac possibilities, Gareth thinks of “*Sáturoi* (sexual subjects) and *satura* (the various types of Roman satire).” Given the role of impotence and aphrodisiacs in Petronius, I am rather drawn to a play on *Satyrion/Saturion*, a word he actually twice uses.

According to the *Suda*, writing on Thespis and the expression ‘Nothing To Do With Dionysus,’ *Satirika* were compositions that used to be written before tragedies, mythological, and historical subjects. This might be relevant to the interpretation of Trimalchio’s Dinner as a theatrical extravaganza favoured by (above all) Gerald Sandy, ‘Scaenica Petroniana,’ *TAPA* 104, 1974, pp. 329–346, a notion actually anticipated by Marius Mercator’s who put Petronius (and Martial) in the tradition of *mimicae* and *theatrum*.

Marius Victorinus (*GLK* 6, p. 143), a mid-fourth century grammarian, our earliest titular source, calls the book *Satyricon*—I’m not sure why Gareth (p. xvii) says no title is recovered until much later than Macrobius. All other ancient testimonia introduce their quotations with authorial names (Arbiter or Petronius or Petronius Arbiter), without title, possibly implying their readers were presumed to know it. One of Fulgentius’ dubious citations begins with the comment *Nescis quantum saturam matronae formident*, possibly hinting at a titular *Satura/Satyra*. Another prefaces a quotation with *Petronius in Euscion*, wrestled (cf. Bücheler’s apparatus) into *satirico* by some early editors, taken as a proper name (“Petronius against Euscus”) by the Heseltine/Warmington Loeb; cf. my ‘Fulgentius’ Sources,’ *Traditio* 44, 1988, pp. 37–57. On the Greek side,

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

John Lydus (*De Mag.* 1. 41–42; cf. my remarks in *PSN* 33, 2003, pp. 1–3) says that the Romans dubbed Lucilius and his poetic successors *saturikous*, before cautioning that Turnus, Juvenal, and Petronius “violated the *saturikon nomon* because of their capricious abusive attacks.” Does this inclusion of Petronius in an otherwise all-poetic cast suggest Lydus was thinking exclusively of his verses (or those ascribed to him)?

Both Rose (p. 2) and Courtney (*A Companion to Petronius*, 2001, p. 7) say *Satyricon* is the title in the “best manuscripts.” Tracing editors’ titles, a task facilitated by Stephen Gaselee’s Bibliography (see my account of him and it in *PSN* 38, 2008, pp. 23–27), finds the *editio princeps* (1482, reprinted 1499), in which our hero is stuck in amongst a jumble of *Scriptores Panegyrici Latini*—what kind of thinking does this represent?—under the rubric *Petronii arbitri satirici fragmenta*. The next three all use the title *Satyra*. It was Jean de Tournes (1575) who inaugurated *Satyricon*, which held uninterrupted sway until our age, with the notable exception of Bücheler’s *Satirae*, which found few takers (cf. Rose’s puzzlement, p. 2).

Isaac Casaubon (*De Satyra* 2) may have the last word, at least on the titular question: “*Petronius Arbitr. cur opusculum suum, quo Neronis et aliorum procerum flagitia horrenda non minore flagitio publicavit, Satyricon potius quam Satyram inscribere maluerit, frustra fortasse quaesierimus; neque est tanti*”—AMEN!

2. DOES SIZE MATTER? *Vixere fortes ante Agamemnona multi* proclaimed Horace. Substitute Gareth for Agamemnon—and let’s forget Petronius’ homonymous professor—and this is not true apropos estimating the novel’s original length. Many editors and translators have ventured no speculations. John Sullivan (Penguin, p. 16)—not famous for hanging back—only went so as “perhaps twenty books.” Müller (Teubner *praefatio*) risked only the conclusion “*ut dubitari non possit quin post Cenam amplius quam trium librorum reliquiae supersint*.”

Gareth (p. xxii), combing caution with daring, suggests “For diagnostic purposes only let us assume that the original *S*, if in fact it was completed before Petronius’ death in AD 66, consisted of 24 books, the same number as the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, and twice that of the *Aeneid*. Surely, as they nowadays say, a ‘no-brainer.’ The novel’s mock epic nature plus its obvious *Odyssey* parodies and a putative desire to double Virgil all thrust us this way. And, Gareth’s literary mathematics could have been endorsed by pointing to Antonius Diogenes’ science-fiction saga *Wonders Beyond Thule* (cf. my essay in *PSN* 30, 2000, unpaginated), which Photius (*Bibliotheca* 166) says ran to 24 books—*QED*!

3. WHAT’S NEW, PRIAPUSSY CAT? Sorry, Tom Jones. Either way, *Satirica* or *Satyricon*, the title suggests an episodic structure, not one requiring a unifying theme. Most seekers after one, albeit with varying degrees of confidence, still plump for our old friend, *Ira Priapi*, conjured up in 1889 by Elimar Klebs, the same year that Hermann Dessau launched the notion

(obsessed over by Syme in his later years) that the *Historia Augusta* was a one-person work—must have been something potent floating in the German atmosphere.

To borrow Syme’s epithet for Dessau, although Klebs encountered some reservations, I am the protomartyr who argued that *Ira Priapi* should be consigned to (Trotsky’s phrase) the dustbin of history, via *Classical Philology* 68, 1973, 294–296, expanded with up-dated bibliography and full references in Gareth’s *Festschrift* (2006, pp. 37–40).

Gareth’s Commentary gives me a lone supporter, Roger Beck, ‘Some Observations on the Narrative Technique of Petronius,’ *Phoenix* 27 (1973), 42–61. *Annus mirabilis* or *horribilis*, according to taste. Our dates being concurrent, neither Baldwin nor Beck invoked the other, rising and falling like Hirtius and Pansa in the same year.

Reactions to my effort ranged from Gareth’s amiable ‘Missouri sceptic’ to Jensson’s ‘hyper-skeptic, throwing out the baby with the bath water’ (*The Recollections of Encolpius: The Satyricon of Petronius as Milesian Fiction*, 2006, p. 105, via a curt dismissal (along with Marchesi) by W. H. Parker, *Priapea: Poems for a Phallic God* (1988), whose general deficiencies allowed me an ungenerous *PSN* (18, 1988, 5–7) review, and a polite “not convincing” from Amy Richlin’s Priapic volume—the one that sent Harry Jocelyn over the edge—into which I scraped courtesy of a footnote.

But, to him who waits...Thanks to Ms Google, I came across this PhD thesis from the University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand, June 30, 2013 (hence too late for Gareth’s Commentary): Petronius’ *Satyricon*: A Commentary On Its Transmission, Pre-Plot Fragments, and Chapters 1–15.

Note the titular spelling. The author is Thomas Köntges. He (reversing Richlin) applauds my view as “convincing”—I hope he passed with flying colours.

Such big names as Courtney, Herter, Heseltine-Warmington, Hight, Smith, and Sullivan all aired reservations about the Priapus project. By and large, though, the Petronian world remains mired in mumpsimus. Hence, for the third and (I promise) last time, I rehearse my original (and some new) objections in summary form.

Hellespontiaci sequitur gravis ira Priapi (*Sat.* 139) is the passage most confidently invoked for the theory. Presumably declaimed by Encolpius, though we can’t be sure. This verse in fact proves nothing. The bulk of the poem is a register of divine angers against humans in epic themes; the speaker (I repeat, whoever it is) is merely self-canonising as an Homeric hero.

The mock literary flavour is given added spice by deliberate recollection of Virgil’s (*Georg.* 4. 111), *Hellespontiaci servet tutela Priapi*.

It’s hard to think of weaker evidence from which to construct the plot (if there is one) than the various poetic outbursts that stud the novel. What fun one could have applying this procedure to some of the flourishes of (say) Eumolpus or Trimalchio. The wrath of Priapus is an obvious conceit for a randy picaresque hero temporarily frustrated by unwonted impotence. Not a good choice, though. Outside Lampsacus, he was hardly a god at all, being essentially a mega-organic garden scarecrow

(was it Gore Vidal who called JFK ‘Our President Erect’?) bel-
lowing threats to irumate or pedicate all and sundry, but not to
threaten them with the impotence from which in some mythical
variants he too suffered.

Indeed, Priapus’ wrath was just as impotent. Throughout the
novel (cf. Courtney’s *Companion*, pp. 222–226), allowing for
textual uncertainties, Encolpius appears to have managed car-
nal relations with (at least) Circe, Giton, Hedyle, Quartilla, and
Tryphaena—hardly a sign of permanent droop.

Elsewhere (*Sat.* 23), Encolpius was assaulted *diu multumque
frustra* by a *cinaedus*, significantly or by chance an episode
also occurring in a sequence marked by textual corruption and
the hovering presence of Priapus, whilst Eumolpus (*Sat.* 86)
was almost reduced to limpness by the demands of his lusty
young catamite. It makes as much sense to say that Petronius
was parodying (or simply using) a stock erotic theme (from
Ovid, *Amores* 3. 7 to the late poet Maximianus) as to believe
that he was sustaining a parody of the wrath of Poseidon.

Were I an advocate of the theory, I’d adduce (unlike its adher-
ents) *Priapea* 68, a scabrous lampoon against Homer and his
epics, with emphasis apropos their heroes on the Size Does
Matter theme, especially the *grandia vasa* of Odysseus. Here
the champions of *Ira Priapi* would have the bonus of Petronian
ringing of the changes on hackneyed Priapean themes.

Since Lichas (*Sat.* 106) recognises Encolpius by his genitals—
a *testis* to his *testes*—we can presumably add him to the roster
of the narrator’s sex partners. Talking of size, Jonathan Pras
and Ian Redpath’s *Petronius: A Handbook* (2009 = 2012 E-
Book) interpret Sidonius Apollinaris’ (Poem 23) “Arbiter, the
equal of Hellespontine Priapus” as a tribute to the size of En-
colpius’ tackle, this being the cause of the divine wrath—they
are talking balls, but is it all balls?

Given Encolpius’ impressive amatory record on both sides of
the road—as Woody Allen said, the advantage of bisexuality is
it doubles your chances of a date on Saturday night, nor as
some used prudishly to think would Priapus have been upset
by paederastic goings-on, being himself traditionally *puerorum
amator*, it has to be said that his *Ira* was only intermittently
effective.

And, equally inept in his other role as protector of mariners,
Lichas went down with his ship, Encolpius did not. Priapus
seems to have had the wrong man drowned. Stress is often laid
on Encolpius’ presence on Lichas’ vessel being betrayed by
Priapus in a dream. It is less commonly pointed out that Try-
phaena immediately caps this by reporting her dream in which
Giton is revealed to be on board by a picture of Neptune. This
balance of apparitions obviates any assumption that Priapus be-
trayed Encolpius because of his recurrent vendetta. Petronius
is merely playing with the stock theme of revelatory visions in
epic literature, for pertinent example the rash of them in *Aeneid*
2.

Encolpius’ killing of a supposedly sacred goose of Priapus
tends to be Exhibit A in the case for *Ira*. But, this is under-
mined, if not blown out of the water, by Wade Richardson’s
demonstration (*Museum Helveticum* 37, 1980, 98–103) that
Petronius is the only evidence for this fowl blasphemy, also

noting Müller’s bracketed deletion (reasons given in his appa-
ratus) of *sacri*—so the goose is not the *anser* to our question.

Final Question: What has the wrath of Priapus got to do with
Trimalchio’s dinner party? Final Answer (no need to ask the
audience or phone a friend): NOTHING.!

4. THE DATING GAME. Gareth sets out—as always, a model
of suave and even-handed erudition—the traditional case for
the novel being written during Nero’s reign by the Petronius of
Tacitus’ famous necrology. Will any dissenters come out of the
woodwork? I don’t know of (m)any surviving Marmoraleans,
though remember as few others do that the Index to Ernst Cur-
tius’ seminal *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*
assigns (without explanation) the Arbiter to 79?—132? Were
Martin Smith still with us—*RIP*—he might still be questioning
some Neronian assumptions and prodding the novel back to Ti-
berian times. R. Martin’s *Flavianism* (“Quelques remarques
concernant la date du *Satyricon*,” *REL* 53, 1975, 182–224)
seems to have had few (any?) takers. Disregarding the literary
to- ing and fro-ing over rival Civil War poems, one major ob-
jection could be that Tacitus (*Annals* 3. 55) states that luxurious
dinner parties went out of fashion, thanks to Vespasian. Hence,
unless flogging a dead horse in Juvenalian vein—did we not
know otherwise, some of HIS gasconading could be seen as
Neronian (Don’t Worry—No chronological Juvenal delin-
quency planned)—the *Cena* does not suit this era. On the other
hand, Flavian fans might want to make something out of the
fragmentary Petronian mention of Cosmian perfumes, else-
where primarily known from Juvenal (8. 86) and various Mar-
tial epigrams.

Nor would it be entirely frivolous to subjoin the fun you could
have with Trimalchio as Trajan, given that emperor’s (so Dio
Cassius) notorious drinking and paederasty, with Fortunata
weighed in as Plotina: *Pompeia Plotina, incredibile est, quanto
auxerit gloriam Traiani* (Victor, *Epitome* 42. 21) where she is
urging him to curb fiscal agents. And, even the Antonine age
can throw up the odd louche nugget, for easy instance Antoni-
nus Pius expiring from over-eating Alpine cheese.

Apropos this Gibbonian golden age, the earliest extant testi-
mony is from grammarian (Petronius was—significantly?—a
favourite quarry for this species) Terentianus Maurus (c. AD
200). After denying that Horace employed Anacreontic verse,
he says this metre was a favourite of *Arbiter disertus* (in a cor-
ollary fragment, Maurus calls him plain Petronius), citing some
verses about Maidens of Memphis, not in our text, but since
Marius Victorinus later reproduces these same verses and at-
tribution, who knows? Maurus prefaces his quotation *Agnos-
cere haec potestis, / cantare quae solemus*. Marmorale (*Quaes-
tiones Petronianae*, pp. 288–291) seized on this as evidence for
his Antonine date. Although I’m not drawn to this, the remark
is more striking than the weak response by Rose (p. 18) sug-
gests. There is an air of contemporaneity, and Maurus was
chronologically close enough to know his literary history. The
notion (alluded to by Rose) that schoolboys stood or sat around
chanting a song from Petronius is piquant—never would have
happened in my Classical Sixth Form. On the other hand, this

is a deceptive trail to follow: nobody mentions Juvenal until the fourth century; Tacitus likewise had to wait a long time for his day in the sun.

Instinct, not knowledge, draws most of us to the Nero-Petronius-Tacitus equation. But, what if we have been misled by ANCIENT instinct? Martin Smith (pp. 213–214), another ‘Missouri sceptic’, now *post mortem* tending to be overlooked or under-countered—Gareth, p. xiv, notes his doubts *en passant*—defiantly proclaimed, “The alternatives have not been properly examined in recent years.” Having pointed out the rarity of Arbiter as a cognomen (only in three inscriptions, referring to one soldier and a couple of slaves—social levels that would speak the Latin of the *Cena*’s freedmen), as distinct from its application to Petronius by Tacitus as a nickname, Smith concludes, “It is possible that later writers, knowing only that the author was called Petronius, wrongly assumed that he was the Tacitean Petronius and hence either referred to him as Arbiter as if this was his actual name or used it as a convenient means of identification.”

Rose inventoried over 90 supposed Petronian references to Nero and his time. By now, there will have been plenty more. I am as guilty as the next of playing Spot The Allusion. Many go back to Melchior Goldast (1618), who supposed the emperor was being satirised. Not a single one is conclusive. For easy example, Trimalchio’s *depositio barbae* in a golden box (*Sat.* 29. 8) excites many because of Nero’s identical extravagance. But, Statius (*Silvae* 3.4) describes the same thing. Preserving one’s first clippings is evidenced centuries later by Paulinus of Nola and, looking the other way, I wouldn’t be surprised if Scipio Aemilianus, the Roman gentleman credited with popularising daily shaving had made a corresponding fuss. The item might discredit Marmorale’s dating, since, thanks to Hadrian’s resumption of what we now call ‘The Full Marx’, the custom probably fell into abeyance, at least at the highest social levels.

There is, of course, only one unimpeachable dating clue, an external one at that: Terentianus Maurus’ provision of a *terminus post quem non*. Also, we must reckon with the theoretical possibility that the *Satyricon* is a kind of what we’d now call an historical novel, describing a sub-Proustian remembrance of things past, a device as old as Homer and in imperial Rome most obvious in the case of Juvenal who rakes up disreputable *exempla* such as Messalina and Tigellinus from previous generations.

What about the negative one? No Petronius in Quintilian’s round-up (10. 93). His emphasis is on the Big Three poets—Lucilius, Horace, Persius—but Varro is also on show, hence Menippean (or *prosimetrum*) is not ruled out of the genre. Given his famous boast *Satura quidem tota nostra est*, we might wonder why his gallery is so small. Incidentally, I’ve never been sure what his claim means: Romans invented Satire? Romans are tops in Satire? Was Petronius left out because Quintilian deemed his novel outside the genre? Or because....?

5. WICKED WIKIPEDIA MOMENT. According to this Internet Bible, Gaius (*sic*) Petronius was born in Massilia, c. AD 27,

the key Neronian allusion being (*Sat.* 9) *Si Lucretia es, Tarquinium invenisti*. News From Nowhere, indeed. We are assured that this is a dating clue because the story was “well known at the time.” As it had been since Livy! No sign of this one in Rose’s compilation; Gareth points to several Martial epigrams for Lucretia as a paradigm of chaste virtue.

6. KINEMATIC KAPERS. The most radical re-dating of Petronius comes from movie posters advertising *Fellini Satyricon* as ‘Before Christ’, also siring this distinctly unusual description of the Arbiter’s work: “Petronious’ (*sic*) *Satyricon*, a mystical half-made poem that was written in Rome during the reign of Nero, and not discovered until the 17th Century. The poem itself is fragmented and unfinished.” The author? Why, no less than the late ‘icon’ of movie criticism, Ebert himself—Two Thumbs Down, Roger!

7. X THE UNKNOWN. Reviewing Rose (antediluvian moment), *cum adhuc servirem* (to borrow Niceros’ opening at 61. 6), I confidently proclaimed: “Were sanity to prevail, this book would justify the hope expressed by John Sullivan that the date and identity of the *Satyricon* have now been established as far as is humanly possible in the present state of knowledge.” This remains my default position. But, as Oliver Cromwell urged, “I beseech you, in the bowels of Christ, think it possible you may be mistaken.”

Who was our Petronius, assuming him to be Neronian? No need to inventory all the candidates, something done long ago by Bagnani, Rose, Sullivan, *et hoc genus omne*. I toss one more into the melting pot, the shadowy Petronius Aristocrates of Magnesia, coupled in Suetonius’ Life of Persius with the Spartan doctor Claudius Agathernus, *duorum doctissimorum et sanctissimorum virorum acriter philosophantium*, role models for that poet, with whom the novelist has sometimes been associated along with Lucan as a kind of opposition to (Sullivan’s words) “orthodox Neronian theory”—whatever that was.

Does anyone fancy Philip Corbett’s (*Petronius*, 1970, p. 11) idea that the novelist was the elder brother of Petronius Turpilianus? Rose (p. 50 n. 1) mentioned it without comment—seems not to get a look in from Gareth. Tacitus was notoriously harsh on Turpilianus’ own record as governor of Britain, an attitude (apart from the usual one of exalting Agricola’s) perhaps sharpened by Nero’s honouring of him along with Nerva and Tigellinus—a nice medley of The Good, The Bad, and The Ugly.

By contrast, ‘our’ Petronius is commended for his efficient and energetic governing of Bithynia. No huge compliment, though: Suetonius likewise praises Otho and Vitellius for their provincial stints. The latter, incidentally, had a wife, Petronia no less, daughter of an ex-consul—which one?—by whom he had a son, Petronianus, blind in one eye, presently liquidated.

On Petronius in the provinces, did the younger Pliny encounter and pass on to Tacitus any Bithynian old timers’ memories of the Arbiter’s era? A character in Anthony Powell’s (who frequently mentions him) novel *Hearing Secret Harmonies* speculates: “Didn’t Petronius serve as a magistrate in some distant

part of the Roman Empire? Think if the case of Christ had come up before him?”—gorgeous example of alternative history. When Gareth went electronic with *PSN* (2001), I fellow-travelled with a dissection of Tacitus’ necrology, from which I here borrow with embellishments. The opening I take to imply that the historian thought this particular Petronius an unimportant curiosity, also that his audience would know little or nothing of him, my cue to wonder (as often) about his absence from Suetonius (he could have provided a good *exitus* scene) as well as Quintilian. If true, this is something else that militates against Martin’s Flavian date.

The famous suicide has in our time garnered a bit of *Nachleben* courtesy of Marxist playwright Peter Hacks, who appropriated some Tacitean details for his *Seneca’s Tod* (1977). Stylish dinner-table departures from life are not uncommon in the *Annals*: Libo (2. 31), Vestinus (15. 69), above all (for nonchalance) Valerius Asiaticus (11. 3). So, why (if they are both talking about the same man) did Tacitus omit the distinctive flourspar-dipper smashing recorded (37. 20) by the elder Pliny?

The Oscar for spectacular ends must go to Pontia, said by Juvenalian scholiasts (on 6. 638) to be the daughter of a Publius Petronius who, upon conviction for poisoning her sons, ate and drank heartily, opened her veins, and danced herself to death. Heady stuff, the lady a mixture of Medea and the fairy-tale girl who committed this auto-saltation—“Father-fixation, the Freudian might say, could scarcely go further” quips Peter Green in his Penguin translation, taking her to be the novelist’s daughter. So does John Ferguson in his edition, using almost identical language. Rose (p. 54) was soberer, “Might conceivably be the daughter of the Arbiter,” a note of caution sounded long before by Friedlaender. A shame that dear old ‘2d a day’ (as John Henderson dubs him) Mayor’s sensibilities did not allow him to comment on this poem. One hates to spoil a good story, and a poisonous Pontia is thrice (2. 34. 6, 4. 43. 5, 6. 75. 3–4) alluded to by Martial, but there is no way of knowing if the details are just a scholiastic fantasy cooked up from Tacitus (there is one obvious linguistic link: *venis incisus/venas incisas*) or, if true, whether she has anything to do with the our Petronius. Still, some scope for limerick here, She Was Only A Novelist’s Daughter...

8. HE WHO ARBITRATES IS LOST. I have often puzzled during years of Petronian ponderings over exactly what the Arbiter arbitrated? On Tacitus’ own evidence, he played no part in the imperial boudoir frolics. His own choice? Excluded by others? Yet he was close (*perfamiliaris*)—what degree of propinquity is implied?—to the orgiastic Silia, a lady little known to us but *haud ignota* in her time and an opportunity to the historian for a good pun (*Silia...non siluisset*). Before his obituary, this Petronius is nowhere else in the Neronian books, notably not named amongst those who allegedly wrote or polished up the royal verses (14. 16), a task for which he, if the poet-novelist, was surely supremely fitted. It is Tigellinus’ orchestrated ‘Rave’ (15. 17—did HE apply to the Arbiter for tips on how to throw a good party?) that is Tacitus’ paradigm (*ut exemplum referam*—no sign of *elegantia* or any cognates). Before that, it

was ex-cobbler, hunchback Vatinius’ Beneventum games (15. 34); he too, as Petronius, was in the Tacitean narratives *adsumptus* by Nero.

The anecdotal T. Petronius does not impress. Owning and smashing an expensive flourspar dipper—a gesture not recorded by Tacitus, whose variant is the breaking of his signet-ring—is no less vulgar than Nero’s breaking his own costly Homeric goblets at table (Suetonius, 47. 1). Reproaching the prodigal emperor for his “sordid” stinginess was, according to Plutarch (*Moralia* 60e) the act of a flatterer, not dissimilar from the *scurra* Vatinius with his (Dio Cassius 63. 15. 1) “I hate you, Nero, because you are a senator.” This Petronius cuts a less attractive figure than the maverick consul Vestinus commended by Tacitus (15. 52, 68) for his *acre ingenium* and *asperae facitiae*.

As to those much-discussed *codicilli* that Petronius sent under seal cataloguing the imperial bedmates and their sexual specialities, they (despite some earlier efforts—do any believers still lurk?) obviously have nothing to do with the *Satyricon* and never would have been thought literary satire, had not Fabricius Veiento (14. 50) used this title for his lampoons against priests and senators. Just before his Petronian sequence, Tacitus had mentioned Mela’s use of testamentary codicils to protest against the injustice of his own fate while others survived—surely the Arbiter’s own point.

Sexual emphasis is incompatible with the *Cena* where there is only marginal erotic content, with Trimalchio (his enforced penile servitude to master and mistress long behind him) content with wife and a single catamite. A more profitable speculation: when and how did Petronius compose this offensive register? Are we to suppose that he penned it between vein-slittings and bindings during his last supper? Or, anticipating his doom, had he written it out earlier and merely sealed the document with a flourish in front of his guests? To have dictated aloud would (he must have known) have incriminated his guests, as shown by the fate of Ostorius Scapula who (*Annals* 14.48) had paid the supreme price for reciting his satiric verses over dinner.

9. THINKING THE UNTHINKABLE. *Dicta factaque eius, quanto solutiora et quandam sui negligentiam praeferebant, tanta gravius in speciem simplicitatis accipiebantur* elicited this remark from Furneaux: “This characteristic seems not unsuited to the broad humour of the *Satirae*”—his choice of title obviously influenced by Bücheler. (*En passant*, is *negligentiam* an accidental or intended pun on *elegantiam*?). An unwarranted deduction; one could on these grounds just as easily credit the novel to the unconventional Vestinus. Also, *dicta* suggest a talent for verbal epigrams rather than literary composition. No less than Syme himself was tempted by Bogner’s notion (‘Petronius bei Tacitus,’ *Hermes* 76, 1941, 223–227) that these words imply the *Satyricon*, dwelling on *novae simplicitatis opus* from the poem in chapter 132—*O sancta simplicitas* indeed!

This Symean intrusion brings me to climax. Furneaux’ surprised “It is remarkable that Tacitus gives him no credit for any literary talent” is more useful than Syme’s (p. 336 with n. 5)

“But he could not mention Seneca’s pasquinade on Divus Claudius. That was alien to the dignity of history. Likewise the *Satyricon*.” A fine, high-sounding phrase—but does it mean anything?

I still cling to my near-solitary disbelief in Seneca’s authorship of the *Apocolocyntosis*, but will not serve up any *crambe repetita* here, merely recalling Bagnani’s attribution of it to Petronius himself.² Instead, this last 64,000 denarius question: WHAT IF TACITUS DOES NOT MENTION THE *Satyricon* BECAUSE HIS PETRONIUS DID NOT WRITE IT?

10. QUO VADIS, GARETH? To your projected new *Satyricon* text, I fancy, no doubt seeing the light of day before late 2020. Meanwhile, I reflect once again on the 1951 movie, a box-office smash, earning Oscar nominations for best supporting actor both to Leo Genn for his Petronius and Peter Ustinov as Nero—an artistic travesty that the latter should play second fiddle—can’t imagine Nero doing this—to the Vinicius of Robert Taylor, that rat whose celluloid valour was negated by his real-life naming of often innocent names to the House Un-American Activities Committee, unable to claim in the *Satyricon*’s extant opening lines *haec vulnera pro publica libertate except*.

FRAGMENTA PETRONIANA: Explorations & Remarks

I don’t intend a full commentary. Such is provided by Isabel Garneau’s MA (Université Laval, 2008) thesis. *Pétrone, Testimonia et fragmenta incerta: presentation, traduction et commentaire*. Though available online, this seems not to have entered the mainstream, being (e.g.) absent from the bibliography in Gareth Schmeling’s superlative commentary (Oxford, 2011). Incidentally, it’s a pity Gareth did not choose to devote special attention to these fragments, although they do (of course) crop up in various of his notes.

Based on Ernout (Francophone chauvinism at work here, as in a mainly French bibliography that ignores much work in English and German), Garneau’s commentary is hard going, being a magpie’s nest of primary and secondary references constructed along the lines of Mayor’s Juvenal, a gallimaufry which has a parallel for everything and an explanation for nothing.

Nor am I following Müller’s trail of testimonies into the Middle Ages, confining my impressions and remarks to the twenty-five fragments assembled by Petronius’ leading modern editors. Further to conserve space, I am not reproducing lemmata and full texts of these. Readers will be presumed to have their eyes squinting at the collections of Bachelor, Müller, and Hestline’s Loeb as revised by Warmington. Bear in mind that these have discrepant opinions about the authenticity of one or two of the snippets.

I long ago (*Traditio* 44, 1988, 37–57) scrutinized those fragments preserved—or invented—by Fulgentius, and resurrect those results here, this article (‘Fulgentius and His Sources’) having probably eluded many fellow-Petronians—found no place in Gareth’s otherwise *über*-generous helping of Baldwinian references, himself mentioning Fulgentius only in his note on *Sat.* 18. 1 apropos of a passage where he may (so, Ciaffi) have been imitating Petronius.

The following impressions and remarks incorporate asking some—to myself—fundamental questions, not often, if at all, previously raised. Naturally, I do not have all the answers, so fall back on Voltaire’s (IF it was he—the attribution has been disputed) advice to judge a person not by the answers they give but by the questions they ask.

Why, for example, are so few—if any—of the fragments from extant portions of the novel?

Why do the ancient grammarians refer to its author in three different ways? Of the twenty-five passages, fifteen call him plain Petronius, four just say Arbiter, six (five of these by Fulgentius) combine both names. Arbiter gains one more entry from Macrobius’ Commentary on Scipio’s Dream (1. 2. 8), *multo se exerceuit Arbiter*.

Why do so few of these commentators refer their readers to a particular passage or title? Marius Victorinus (fr. 20, only in Müller) specifies *Arbiter Satyricon*, one reason—sentiment being the other—why I stick to this rather than the now-fashionable *Satyricon*, a form also deplored by Jenson (below).

Do these quotations imply that grammarians saw Petronius as a repository of odd words and constructions? If so, what are the consequences for our assessments of his style?

If there are misattributions, why? Carelessness? Lapses of memory? Or darker reasons?

Before getting down to my fragmentary muttens, I have to traipse over some well-tilled ground: the ever-vexed question of Petronius’ *cognomen* and how Arbiter fits in.

The Wikipedia notice of Petronius instructs us “to notice the pun” inherent in *elegantiae arbiter*, thus assuming it was his official Cognomen, a belief sanctified by the *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, albeit not Lewis & Short. Some (the latest to my knowledge being John Yardley’s annotated Penguin translation of Tacitus) see it as a self-conferred accolade, making me think in jazz terms of ‘Count’ Basie or ‘Duke’ Ellington. Others believe Nero himself might have coined it. Furneaux in his still-valuable commentary havers between self-referential and Ramsay’s notion “that the title may have been inserted by some grammarian who wished to mark the identity of the author with the person described by Tacitus.”

For good measure, Wikipedia also refers to the notion that Petronius used to be dated to the third century AD—news to me! I myself think that the only way to take Tacitus’ phraseology is not as a nickname or title but simply his own way of describing

² Editor’s note: Professor Baldwin is not alone in his disbelief; see Niklas Hozberg, “Racheakt und ‘negativer Fürstenspiegel’ oder literarisches Maskenspiel: Neuansatz zu einer Interpretation der ‘Apocolocyntosis,’” *Gymnasium* 123 (2016): 321-339.

Petronius' courtier role. It is conventional to adduce Horace's *Arbiter bibendi* (*Odes* 2. 7. 18), but the most pertinent parallel is surely Seneca's (*De vita beata* 7. 6. 2) *voluptatum arbiter*, possibly a deliberate echo here, considering Martin Smith's collation of Petronius-Seneca passages?

As everyone observes, no mention of any literary productions from Petronius; cf. my pieces on this and cognate matters in *PSN* 31 (2001) & 34 (2004). Some proclaimed that Tacitus could not mention his novel—"That was alien to the dignity of history," a verdict reproduced by Edward Courtney's *A Companion to Petronius* (Oxford, 2001, p.7), one of the unacknowledged *furta* for which he begs indulgence.

Both Syme and Schmeling wonder if Tacitus' mention of Petronian *dicta* might be a subtle allusion. But, why not say *scripta*? *Dicta* looks more like a compliment to his conversational wit.

One more onomastic point. In a Tacitean list (*Ann.* 16. 17) of Nero's victims, Petronius is the only one whose Praenomen is not spelled out, but simply initialized, a procedure repeated in the next paragraph. Why? Yardley and others amplify by adding Titus, a solution that does not solve.

Until out-manoeuvred by Tigellinus, Petronius knew how to play the courtier's game. He may have been the Arbiter of fashion, but was not otherwise a unique figure. If he was the Petronius who teased Nero for meanness, he had rivals in this style, notably the deformed ex-cobbler Vatinius who played the same game until curbed by a literary onslaught from Curvatus Maternus, and Vestinus, billed by Tacitus as an intimate friend of Nero until the latter tired of his brutal witticisms.

Had they written novels, would we be talking today about Vatinius or Vestinus Arbiter?

As Petronius, Vestinus was falsely charged with complicity in the conspiracy of Piso (a preoccupation in Tacitus, gets half a sentence in Suetonius), and himself also went out with a spectacular suicide. Vestinus had deliberately been left out of the plot by Piso. Petronius, also, one must think. Until the mopings-up, neither man had cause to see the end of Nero, under whom both had prospered.

So also had the future virtuous emperor Nerva, honoured along with Tigellinus and Petronius Turpilianus, a candidate in some modern eyes for authorship of the *Satyricon*. Whether his erotic verses—likened by Martial to those of Tibullus—amused the emperor or aroused his artistic jealousy is hard to seek. In later years, he was on close terms with another satirist who had fallen foul of Nero, the canny Fabricius Veiento, present at a dinner party where there was cynical discussion about how bad men could prosper under good emperors.

Much has been written, notably by the late lamented John Sullivan, about the literary feuds between Nero and Lucan. This is all well and good, but should be balanced by acknowledgement of the other kind of courtier games that were been played.

Tacitus, of course, can never have met Petronius. But, as seen, in his Rome there were notable survivors from Nero's time who had. Tacitus cites no source in his bird's-eye-sketch of the Arbiter. He had his literary sources for the period, of course: were they verbally supplemented by conversations with people

who had their own Petronian memories? Notorious personalities from Nero's reign could still be a 'hot topic', literally so in the case of Tigellinus, whose burnings alive of victims were still being ranted about by Juvenal (1. 155).

Petronius is not mentioned, either as courtier or author, by Suetonius: why not? Not, less surprisingly, does he feature in the reminiscences of Aulus Gellius, who does adduce both the biographer's book on gaming and Seneca. Furthermore, he gets no place in Quintilian's literary gallery. While there was no designated category for prose fiction, he might have come under that most Roman of rubrics, Satire. Might there be a hint in the great educator's remark (10. 43–45) that the moderns also deserved to be read? And, much of his very mixed verdict on Seneca (10. 125–131) might equally have been said of Petronius.

Did later grammarians and company start referring to 'Arbiter' because of Tacitus? But, who actually read the historian after his own day? Syme (twice, *Tacitus*, 503, 796) talks about "a long oblivion covering his name and writings," subjoining that he was eventually rediscovered in fourth and fifth-century Gaul."

His literary *Nachleben* were long ago traced by F. Haverfield, 'Tacitus during the later Roman Empire and the Middle Ages', *JRS* 6 (1916), 195–200. After pointing to certain or possible allusions from his own time, Haverfield drew a line after Dio Cassius and found subsequent neglect until the late resurrection. He took at face value the claim of the *Historia Augusta*—Syme rebuked him for so doing—that the emperor Tacitus ordered ten copies of his works to be made each year for the libraries, lest through readerly neglect they should fall into oblivion. Haverfield inferred from this that copies must have been in short supply, but obviously there must have been at least one from which the scribes could work.

It is usually said that the earliest author to cite Petronius was the grammarian Terentianus Maurus (frs. 19 & 20). Scheming (and almost everyone else) confidently assign him to the late second century. But, Alan Cameron in one of his characteristically trenchant articles, 'Poetae Novelli', *HSCP* 84 (1980), 127–175, observing "we must be honest," points out that there is no sure way of dating Maurus to any period. Cameron leans towards the middle or late third century. Peter Schmidt in the Brill's *New Pauly* inclines the same way, one possibility being his identification with the addressee of Longinus.

Only one thing is certain. He must pre-date the mention of him by Augustine (*De Civitate Dei* 6. 2). However, there has been daring speculation at the other chronological end by which he is equated with the Maurus mentioned by Martial (1. 86). It has to be said that there is zero evidence for this. A pity, since this equation would give us a quote from Tacitus' own time, close to the Neronian Petronius.

In fr. 19, Maurus calls him Arbiter, dubbing him—nobody else bestows any epithet—*disertus*, citing his use of as particular metric never used by Horace. Cameron made light of this, "repeated merely for metrical comparison." In fact, this is (whatever its date) the most fascinating of all the passages. Not only does the Arbiter get a unique compliment, his verses about the

girls of Memphis—also adduced by the fourth-century grammarian Marius Victorinus—he is said often to have used this metre “in his own books,” these particular lines “we used to sing.”

What were these books? Constituent volumes of the *Satyricon*? Collections of his poems? Or some other otherwise unknown works? How did they become so popular? Do we take *cantare* literally? Shall we tickle our fancy with the thought of a Petronian poem making the Roman or African hit parade?—his “Girls of Memphis” put me in mind of the Bangles’ chart-topper ‘Walk Like An Egyptian’.

The other passage from Terentianus Maurus has no such tantalizing allusions, comprising an illustrative quartet of verses to show how Petronius (thus referred to, here) “and many others” employed Anacreontic metre. Given the loss of so much of Petronius’ novel, it is perhaps ironic that these two extracts should be preserved by the man who penned the oft-quoted aphorism *habent sua fata libelli*.

So, whatever his date—if he is the earliest testimony, why is he not Number One in the modern collections?—Terentianus Maurus has at last brought us to the fragments themselves.

In the first one, Servius, to illustrate Virgil’s *aura sacra fames* (*Aen.* 3. 57), meanders off into a story about the Massilian ritual of sacred kings and scapegoats—prefiguring Frazer’s *Golden Bough*—concluding *hoc autem in Petronio lectum est*. Warrington wondered if this might have to do with Encolpius visiting Massilia, an inference drawn from fr. 4 in which Sidonius Apollinaris apostrophizes ‘Arbiter’ as being in that city; cf. Schmeling’s notes on *Sat.* 107. 15 and 117. 15. Of course, with so much of the novel lost, who can tell anything?

There’s a corollary question. Is Servius giving us an exact quotation or a paraphrase? Does the final sentence suggest an end to Petronian quotation or (as Daniel, reported only by Bücheler) an introduction to words lost from the manuscripts? Virgil’s tag is quoted by Seneca in proverbial style, also by Pliny (*NH* 33. 72). Compare also Horace, *Epist.* 1. 18. 23, *quem tenet argenti satis importuna famesque*. It is exhaustively studied by J. W. Graham, *Phoenix* 11 (1957), 112–120. One piquant quotation of it is by Karl Marx (*Kapital* 1), “Money is essentially *auri sacra fames*.”—Marx cited many classical authors in what he dubbed his ‘book-worming’, but apparently never Petronius.

Servius is back in fr. 2, again on Virgil, this time descanting on feminine endings of nouns ending in *-tor*, concluding with an alleged Petronian exception with his *balneatricem*. Both Lewis & Short and *OLD* list this as a *hapax*, but it also occurs inscriptionally of a freedwoman: *AE* 2001, no. 964, as do other such forms as *aurinectrix*, not listed in the dictionaries.

Next up is Pseudoacron, tracing Petronius’ description of a furious person as *pollice usque ad periculum roso* back to Horace’s Canidia biting her thumb in *Epodes* 5. 48. No other bitten thumbs in our extant text, but no shortage of occasions for such an expression in the novel, and, given his famous compliment to Horace’s *curiosa felicitas* (cf. my notes in *PSN* 35, 2005 & 37, 2007), no surprise in these stylistic linkages; cf. J. Karl

Schönberger, *Glotta* 31 (1948), 20–28 for this and many other examples of Petronian usages.

Sidonius’ address to ‘Arbiter’ (*Poems* 23. 156) regarding Massilia and Priapus needs no indication—it is an obvious echo from the end of the poem at *Satyricon* 139—Don’t worry, I’m not going to polemicise yet again about *Ira Priapi*...

Priscian cites *animam nostro amplexam pectore* as an example of deponent past participles with passive meaning. This could obviously be authentic Petronius. There may be some temptation to rearrange the words into the latter part of an hexameter. The following fragment (5a) was excluded by Bücheler. It is Boethius ascribing to Petronius the words *quoniam jam matutinus sol tectis arrisit*. More interesting may be how Boethius continues: “Let us get up and, if there is any other point, it shall be considered later with greater attention.” Gottskalk Jenson, *The Recollections of Encolpius: the Satyricon of Petronius as Milesian Fiction* (2004), p. 132 n. 300, suggests that as this comes at the end of Boethius’ book and looks forward to a beginning, then these words opened one the book than the *Cena*. Not discussed by Schmeling, who does list Jenson in his Bibliography. See also Jenson’s somewhat grumpy review of Gareth’s Commentary in *BMCR* 2012. 12. 52. I am tickled that Jenson (p. 105) describes myself as ‘hyper-skeptical,’ in verbal alliance with Gareth who once dubbed me (*Rheinisches Museum* 134, 1991, p. 352 n. 3) as “ever the Missouri sceptic” (apropos the on-going *Ira Priapi* saga)—I’m told this is a compliment.

Now comes the octet of extracts presented by Fulgentius. All are asterisked by Bücheler and Warrington, not by Müller or Ernout.

Fulgentius (there’s a full-scale bibliography of him online) is a funny fellow. You have to like a man who attributes a joke-book to Tacitus. The only thing that keeps me from wanting to believe this is the aggravation of it being lost.

Paul Plass (*Wit and the Writing of History*, 1988) proposed the interesting notion that this might have been a *Liber Facietiarum* containing one-liners culled from historians and/other prose writers, thus a somewhat different compilation from our one surviving ancient joke-book, the *Philogelos*; cf. my 1983 annotated translation. Many would think Plass’ idea more credible than having Tacitus as the author thereof. I have to subjoin a memory here of the Australian undergraduate who wrote in an essay, “It is said there is one joke in Tacitus but I have been unable to find it”—my heart, if not a high mark, went out to him.

If Plass is right, would Petronius have found a place in such a compilation?

As seen, some but not all of Petronius’ editors have displayed few qualms about printing these Fulgentian items as genuine. Given the suspect nature of so much of his uncorroborated material, they demand dispassionate consideration.

As said before, if they are not genuine, why would Fulgentius attribute them to Petronius? Especially as they are spread over three separate treatises, respectively on Mythologies, Old Words, and Virgil.

His first one ends a discussion of how women dread satire but fire back in anger hot enough to discombobulate lawyers with *licet Petroniana subet Albuca*. *Subet* is actually Bücheler's emendation of *subit*, printed by all editors. Given its modern 'sexy' connotation, Warmington's rendering "it is Albuca who is in heat" might be thought a little misleading.

If this is a fabrication, the most obvious source of inspiration is the Albucilla described by Tacitus (*Aen.* 6. 47) as *multorum amorum famosa*, this last word being particularly suggestive since in patristic and Byzantine Greek *famosus* is converted into a noun *phamouson* meaning libel or slanderous attack. Moreover, if it is fair to judge a Fulgentian reference by the company it keeps, this one is weakened by the immediately following confusion of the Plautine characters Saureas and Artemona.

The next fragment claims that Petronius *ad libidinis concitamentum myrrhinum se poculum bibisse refert*. There is a verbal parallel of sorts in *libidinem concitant* (*Sat.* 126). We naturally think of the goings-on at Quartilla's orgy where (*Sat.* 20) she asks, "Did Encolpius drink all our loving-cup?" Warmington worries that "The incident naturally does not occur anywhere because nowhere does Petronius speak of himself." But *se* surely belongs to the original narrative; Augustine (*De Civ. Dei* 18. 17), speaking of Lucius' metamorphosis in Apuleius, provides an exact parallel: *Apuleius in libris...sibi ipsi accidisse*. Warmington also believes that the allusion is to a myrrhine cup rather than a cup of myrrh. This is possible, in view of the famous myrrhine dipper of Titus Petronius mentioned by Pliny (*NH* 37. 20), but there is plenty of evidence for myrrh as both tincture and syrup (Pliny, 14. 92–93).

The following extract has Petronius attacking a certain Euscion with the insulting *Cerberus forensis erat causicus*. The name is far from certain; cf. Bücheler for various conjectures. The passage has no other attestation; jokes about *causicici* (the word occurs twice in *Sat.* 46) were common enough. Warmington cross-refers to fragment 11 and page 81 of his Loeb, but neither reference seems at all relevant.

In my previously-mentioned Fulgentius article, I wondered about a possible allusion to King Eurystheus who set Hercules his twelve labours and to whom the hero brought and displayed Cerberus. I am now inclined to jettison that suggestion.

In the next fragment, Fulgentius explains the meaning of *ferculum* by quoting Petronius saying *postquam ferculum allatum est*. Helm in his edition adduced *jam sublatum erat ferculum* (*Sat.* 39), reasonably enough, but there is also *ferculum est insecutum* (35) which has the requisite tense. This noun occurs about a dozen times in Petronius, always in the *Cena*. Fulgentius' quotation is too trivial to spend much time on. Suffice it to say that it could be genuinely from a lost section, a misremembering from one of the extant passages, or made up.

Explaining the meaning of *valgia* as a twisting of the lips whilst vomiting, Fulgentius illustrates with a Petronius-credited *oborto valgiter labello*. The first two words occur nowhere else in Petronius. *Valgiter* indeed seems to be unique here—Lewis & Short wrongly cite it from *Sat.* 26, *obiter labra*, a possible

source for Fulgentius if he is inventing the phrase, albeit Petronius's words connote kissing rather than vomiting. Robert Burton quoted the phrase in his *Anatomy of Melancholy*, without authorial attribution. *Labellis* occurs at *Sat.* 79, also in an osculatory connection, and in fr. 21 as part of the description of a tipsy old woman.

Up next is Fulgentius' definition of *Alucinare* as 'to dream nonsense,' hence our 'Hallucinate,' deriving it from the noun *Alucita*, said to be a synonym for *Conopes* (mosquitoes), adding a Petronian *nam centum vernali me alucitae molestabant*. Modern editors accept Bücheler's *contubernalem* for this manuscript reading. The noun seems unique to this passage. Jensson (158) suggests this passage could be fitted into the sexual episode in a garden alluded to at *Sat.* 9, a plausible, indeed attractive, though unprovable idea.

Defining *manubies* as denoting kingly ornaments, Fulgentius illustrates with Petronius' supposed *tot regum manubies penes fugitivum repertae*. I agree with Jensson (154) that this alludes to *Sat.* 79 where Encolpius and Ascytos divide their *manubias*. Finally, to illustrate *aumatium*, a word for lavatory in amphitheatres and circuses—useful evidence for the existence of such: even the vigilant Friedländer missed it in his essay on Roman latrines, Fulgentius ascribes to Petronius the words *in aumatium memet ipsum conieci*. This noun seems to occur nowhere else in classical Latin, and has been variously emended, but it does in fact occur in mediaeval Latin; cf. U. Pizzani's edition of Fulgentius (1968), p. 208. Hiding in a lavatory seems a credible Petronian incident, although he does not appear to use the suffix *-met* with *me* elsewhere. Jensson (p. 141) connects this with the *arena demisit* incident in *Sat.* 9, using it to defend the concomitant words *de ruina* which have troubled all editors. Some spell the word *aumacium* or *naumatium* or see it as a corruption of Greek *ommaton*.

Some final salencies. There is no particular pattern to the omission or supplying of 'Arbiter' when Petronius is mentioned, although it is furnished more frequently in the *SA* extracts than those in *M*. The items in *M* contain a high proportion of poetry—not discussed here—over worse and several of these (textual vagaries apart) are genuine. His knowledge of the authentic verses (details in my Fulgentius article), unless it be presumed that he had read them in some anthology of poems implies that his other citations cannot be dismissed out of hand, yet how credible is it that all his prose passages (*ferculum* may be excepted) should come from now lost sections of the novel, with none from the *Cena*? This is perhaps a matter of proportion; other late commentators adduce unique fragments also, but none on such a scale. Yet, given the subject matter of the *SA*, and Petronius' often exotic vocabulary, the high percentage of unusual words in this section of Fulgentius should not be dismissed as unduly suspicious.

On with the motley. We now have Isidore of Seville quoting (as he dubs it) Petronius' somewhat unorthodox definition of *dolus*. Michael Paschalis, *Virgil's Aeneid: Semantic Relations and Proper Names* (1997), 21, understands *dolus* as linked with *dolor*. Jensson (155), seeing it as *dolus malus*, thinks it may come either from the shipwreck episode or the Croton court

case against Eumolpus. Warmington wants some kind of connection with the previous courtroom Cerberus. The force of *aliter* inclines me to see this as a genuine bit of Petronius.

A gloss from Saint Dionysius, *petauroque iubente modo superior*, is located at *Sat.* 54. 1 to plug a lacuna. Warmington looks back at the acrobatics in 53–54; cf. Mayor on Juvenal 14. 265 for a plethora of related passages.

This same source has Petronius describing a passage through the Neapolitan grotto that requires the adventurers to be *inclinatos*. A bit of Google-clicking unearthed quotations of this sentence from various later travelogues, too lengthy to be here cited.

Another gloss weirdly beginning *suppes suppumpis*, describing how a certain Tullia, *media vel regia*, is omitted by Ernout and Müller and rejected by Warmington who thinks Pitheus wrongly ascribed it to Petronius through misunderstanding a marginal note by Scaliger. Bücheler, however, printed it without qualms. For attempts to make sense of the first two words, see Erwin Rodhe, *Neue Jahrbucher für classische philologie* 39 (1859), 848.

A mini-essay on Cosmian perfumes by Nicolaus Perottus (1513) concludes with giving Petronius *Affer nobis, inquit, alabastrum Cosmiani*. This fragment is rejected by Bücheler and Warmington, and omitted by Müller, with only Ernout evincing no doubts. I tend to be with him on this one, as was Kenneth Rose, *The Date and Author of the Satyricon* (1971), 23. Both Martial 1. 87. 2 and Juvenal 8. 86 mention these; cf. Mayor on the latter passage. If genuine, might be a pointer to Petrofina dating unless (as Rose rightly cautions) the word had simply become a generic brand name. That apart, perfumes are a plausible Petronian ingredient.

The grammarian Diomedes illustrated a use of the caesura with the lines *Anus recocta vino/ tremeantibus labellis*. All editors print this without any obtruded doubts. The lines fit perfectly into *Sat.* 79, where we have a drunken crone, *labellis*, and at least one lacuna.

Servius and Pompeius join forces in remarking on Petronius' distinctive use of the singular *hic Quirites*. Servius adduces Horace's *Quis te, Quiritem?* (*Odes* 2.7.3). Pompeius insists that nobody talks like this, but you will find it in books. Commenting on Juvenal's *ima plebe quiritem* (8. 47), Mayor claims that this noun "is not used in the singular by good prose writers," restricting it to poets and legal texts. So, is Petronius not a good prose writer? Or is this grounds for rejecting the fragment? It could, of course, come from a verse or a legal parody.

An anonymous grammarian credits Petronius with the expression *freta Nereidum*, to exemplify the noun's neuter gender. Obviously, he could have penned this; so could any other Roman poet. Valerius Flaccus (9. 297–303) has both words quite close together in a similar description.

Jerome (*Epistulae* 130.19) attributes the tag *Non bene olet qui bene semper olet* to Petronius. Editors unite in seeing this as a mistake for Martial (2. 12. 4) who has the same. Warmington thinks Martial may have been quoting Petronius—some might reverse this, sensibly adding that it may have been a common saying. Craig Williams in his *Commentary on Martial* (2004)

lists parallels from Plautus on, thinking Jerome's ascription wrong, as does David Wiesen, *St. Jerome as Satirist* (1964), 147. But, at least it shows the saint was aware of the satirist, perhaps simply misremembering *crines calamistro convertere* (*Sat.* 102), given his own *cincinnatiulos pueros et calamistratos*.

Scope here for a new TV series—PSI (Petronian Society Investigates)? Classicists spend a lot of time with fragments. They simultaneously fascinate and irritate. Still, the word 'Fragments' has high standing in various fields of other entertainments. For easy titular examples:

An episode from the BBC series *Torchwood*

An episode from the Canadian series *Sanctuary*

A play by Edward Albee

A song from The Who album *Endless Wire*

And, for grand finale, go to YouTube (How Trimalchio would have loved this, can imagine him playing 'Selfie' clips throughout the dinner) and sample Arne Gieshoff's 2015 (to say the least) unusual musical composition 'Petronius Fragments'

Whilst my Google finger was roaming through some marginal sites for a *PSN*-planned piece on the fragments of Petronius, I stumbled upon—as you do—Peter Cochran's 'Byron and Latin Culture,' in the *Selected Proceedings of the 37th International Byron Society Conference* (2014).

In a richly documented discussion (pp. 103–110), Cochran demonstrates the extent to which Byron drew upon the *Satyricon* for his *Don Juan*. These are not speculations on Cochran's part, Byron himself signalling his debts with precision in frequent letters to his publisher Murray.

These include (Letter to Murray, October 12, 1820) an acknowledgement of his use of (in standard modern editions) of fragment 6, concerning the angry lady Albucilla—expounded at length in my aforementioned paper.

Byron, of course, blazoned his view of the Arbiter elsewhere, in *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers* (1809):

Behold, the new Petronius of the day!

Our arbiter of pleasure and of play.

Cochran claims (p. 107 n. 155) to have seen the Petronius edition owned and used by Byron, describing it as "a learned 252pp duodecimo, published in 1669 by Rutgerus Hermannides."

Hard to think of a more obscure edition. And Cochran is nodding heavily here. Rutgerus Hermannides is thought, e.g. by Gaselee and Schemling-Stuckey in their Petronian bibliographies to be a pseudonym. However, there is a Dutch web page outlining the life and career of a Lithuanian-born professor of this name (1618–1687) whose many published editions included one of Petronius, said to be a revised and improved version of the one put out in 1618 by Joannes Bourdolutius, dismissed by Gaselee as "almost totally useless." This is how it was advertised, and still is on Amazon. Gaselee, however, describes Rutgerus Hermannides' text as revamping the one ("of no particular value") produced in 1654 by Simon Abbes

Gabbema. Cochran's 1669 is, of course, the year of publication of his edition by Michael Hadrianides; cf. myself, *PSN* 32 (2002).

Well before Cochran, R. W. Daniel, *Notes & Queries* 40. 1 (1993), 42–44, had already pointed out an allusion to Trimalchio's pun on Carpus in *Don Juan* 11. 681.

A few months after Cochran (October 2014), Fiona McCarthy's brobdingnagian *Byron: Life and Legend* observed (ch. 8) how Byron regularly used in abbreviated form Petronius' *coitum plenum et optabilem* (*Sat.* 86) as code to describe his paederastic pleasures.

By relevant chance, I also encountered on-line a threnody from *The Harvard Advocate* by Jack Welch on how he was maltreated academically and otherwise at that institution because of his overt homosexuality, including the claim that he was deliberately scuttled at his *viva voce* examination because of professorial objections to the content of his MA thesis which compared the respective treatments of "some gay themes."

Cochran, though, deserves the last word(s): "Byron would have been a much happier denizen of Rome as arbitrated by Petronius than he was of London as serviced by John Murray."

More (unrelated) internet tootlings (nearest I ever get to playing computer games) expiscated this gem from British classics Edith Hall's blog 'The Edithorial' (March 2, 2013).

Irritated by being mistaken for an homonymous forestry expert, and hounded to submit articles by an outfit called 'Scientific Journals International', Hall decided to get a fun revenge by sending in a piece on Karl Marx' boyhood amidst the ruins of Roman Trier. Justifiably suspicious of their constantly-trumpeted claims to 'peer review', Hall included "a long and completely irrelevant quotation in Latin of the most obscene passage in Petronius' *Satyricon*."

You can guess what's coming. Neither 'peer reviewer' commented or enquired after this extract, merely asking for re-submission after making a couple of unrelated minor revisions.

Four years later, Hall laughs, she was still receiving e-mails from SJI complaining she hadn't re-submitted. The article had in fact been published in the more respectable *European Review of History*, "minus the porn."

A rib-tickling bit of Petronian *Nachleben*. But, there's one more bit of info I'd like to have: which bit of the *Satyricon* does the usually unshockable Edith consider "the most obscene"? As they say in the British satirical magazine *Private Eye* when unmasking a new scandal, "I Think We Should Be Told."

I'm hardly a fashion-plate, but I do cherish my collection of neckties: my Old School one, my University one, my Saint Club one. Pride of place went to my Countess Mara until it was irreparably split in what may have been a unique wardrobe malfunction.

Before you get ti(e)red of this cravatian litany, I hasten to add that, thanks to yet another Google revelation, I have discovered that there is actually a Petronius Tie, created at Milan in 1926 by Luigi Wollisch. His website includes an encomium to our Petronius as 'Arbiter Elegantiarum'. A craftier who knows his Classics—what more could you ask?

Did Petronius arbitrate Nero's wardrobe? If so, his advice must usually have fallen on deaf ears. Although boasting of never wearing the same garment twice (Suetonius, *Nero* 30), he was to say the least a slovenly dresser, appearing in public in his slippers and dinner-gown, described by Dio Cassius (63. 13) as a short flowered tunic with muslin collar.

Nero—Peter Ustinov quite looks this sartorial part in *Quo Vadis?*—thus prefigures those modern barbarians who dismiss the tie as a useless piece of material, deserving oblivion. As for Petronius, well, can't imagine him flaunting a kipper tie, but an impeccably tied dicky-bow..? Take a look at the website photographs of and tributes to the elegance of Leo Genn, who memorably played Petronius to Ustinov's Nero...

In these transient reflections, I'm assuming Nero's Arbiter wrote the *Satyricon*.

Considering the offence his insulting letter to Nero must have given, did the emperor make any attempt to ban and burn the novel?

If so, clearly not 100% success, since a copy or copies survived into later ages.

Important to remember that Petronius had no monopoly on satire at Nero's court. When not singing about Troy, the latter turned out an offensive poem called *Luscio* aimed (Suetonius, *Domitian* 2) against the praetor Clodius Polio, and another (Tacitus, *Ann.* 15. 49) deriding the effeminacy of Afranius Quintianus—both squibs, and their victims, went unmentioned by Syme.

Syme, parroted by Courtney, proclaimed that to mention the *Satyricon* "would be alien to the dignity of history." Apparently, though, it was all right to single out these disobliging verses—the pasquinade against Quintianus is billed *probroso carmine*. Nor did it seem to offend Clio's dignity by mentioning the *probrosa carmina*—same terminology—aimed at Nero by the praetor Antistius, nor the satirical *libelli* of Fabricius Veiento lampooning senators and priests—you'd have thought Nero would have enjoyed these. And indeed, although banning and burning these productions, Veiento got off with exile instead of a midnight visit from the praetorians, as did Antistius. Suetonius (39) indeed marvelled at his tolerant shrugging off of personal insults.

Petronius, of course, was not so lucky. Perhaps, in addition to the machinations of Tigellinus, Nero had become jealous of the *Satyricon*—did it have immediate public *éclat*? Did Nero fear it would eclipse, or was eclipsing his own satirical efforts? Was he as jealous of Petronius the comedian as of Lucan the epicist? Or, despite his complacency, had something in the depiction of

Trimalchio as an *ersatz* Nero (as some moderns have thought, and perhaps some still do) gone too far?

As seen above, two satirists contemporary with Petronius suffered exile with concomitant banning and burning of their books.

Did the Arbiter ever meet with either of both of these characters? If so, did they discuss the writing of satire and its potential dangers? Did they dare privately to disparage Nero's own efforts in this genre, or were they restricted to public plaudits?

Since his time—were there, as asked above, any attempts to ban and burn the *Satyricon* by a Nero outraged at THAT letter?—Petronius has been no stranger to suppression.

Here, just a few memorial jottings. Amy Richlin surveyed this censorious scene via her 'Sex in Petronius' in (eds. J. R. W. Prag & Ian Redpath) *Petronius: a Handbook* (2009).

I'm not sure if the *Satyricon* made it on to the Catholic Index of Forbidden Books—it did not come up on a Google search of its data base. It was, however, banned in Mexico in 1621, by Edict of that country's Suprema.

W. C. Firebaugh (about whom it seems hard to find any personal details) set the cat amongst the pigeons with his 1922 translation, largely because he translated Marchena's 'obscene' invention, also because of the illustrations by Australian artist Norman Lindsay, already in trouble for his earlier artwork.

This was a lavish and expensive edition, published by Horace Liveright, founder of the Modern Library. Five years later, Liveright commissioned Charles Whibley to bring out a toned-down version.

The fanatic John Saxon Sumner, secretary of the New York Society for the Suppression of Vice, twice tried to get this translation banned. After a much-publicized trial, the sensible judge dismissed the case.

One New York vestige floating around the internet is a list of books 'banned or challenged', including Petronius, by the Utica Public Library. At the other side of the country and spectrum, *The Advocate* in 2013 listed the *Satyricon* as one of the 100 best gay and lesbian novels.

Liveright's chief editor, Tom Smith, was a friend of F. Scott Fitzgerald. The latter owned a 1913 translation, presumably Heseltine's Loeb. After settling on *The Great Gatsby*, Fitzgerald was heard to lament, "It should have been *Trimalchio*."

Norman Lindsay's son, Jack, brought out a 1927 translation, privately printed and sold only to subscribers. This limitation did not save it from being interdicted in his native Australia, along with Firebaugh's, but also in Britain where the police court of the City of Westminster ordered it destroyed.

Also disfavoured in Australia was the 'Oscar Wilde' translation, classified as 'Restricted' between 1935 and 1951—I'm not clear just what this meant: available to 'serious scholars' in controlled conditions similar to the British Museum's once-famous 'Private Case'?

This version was officially de-banned in 1958 by Senator Norman Henty. During my Australian years (1963–1965), while in

charge of Customs and Excise, Henry was still being paid more to tell Australians what they could not read than I was for telling students what they should. Two of his most bizarre banings were of Ian Fleming's *The Spy Who Loved Me* and the Penguin Special *The Trial of Lady Chatterly*.

I'm not aware of any formal suppressions in Canada, where there have been many book and magazine (especially feminist and homosexual ones) seizures by the ever-eager Customs officials. Recently, in a Supreme Court of Canada hearing regarding the possible literary censorships ramifying from a new law on child pornography, the *Satyricon* was cited as a possible victim because of the child sexual abuse passages therein.

Fellini-Satyricon has also had its share of tribulations, being banned in (e.g.) South Africa and Spain, and, according to a 2007 review by Dan Schneider (online), "in many parts of the country (sc. USA)." Roger Ebert's review thought that some people would find the film "bloody, disgusting, depraved," also reporting that "dozens" quit the auditorium during its showing—when I saw it in Canada, no such demonstrations, though there were at Peter Greenaway's *The Cook, The Thief, His Wife, & Her Lover*, though I'm old enough to recall English Teddy Boys dancing in the aisles during *Rock Around The Clock*, and Nottingham ladies exclaiming in horror when Albert Finney said "bloody" in *Saturday Night & Sunday Morning*.

Last words obviously must go to Tacitus (*Ann.* 14. 50) regarding the suppression of Fabricius Veiento's satires: *libros exuri iussit, conquistatos lectitatosque donec cum periculo parabantur: mox licentia habendi oblivionem attulit.*

Ecce iterum Vatinius, to adapt Juvenal. Something of a mystery man, these days. Syme was not interested, merely indexing him in *Tacitus* as "a creature of Nero," with just a triplet of desultory allusions (pp. 110, 343, 356). Furneaux spared him not a word of personal detail. And no direct link on Google, approachable only via marginal links.

No ancient place for him in Suetonius, nor modern one in the film version of *Quo Vadis?* Sienkiewicz gave him a few contemptuous mentions in the novel, e.g. he is cat-called by the populace when appearing in Nero's imperial retinue.

Tacitus (*Ann.* 15. 34) lets him have it with both barrels: *Vatinius inter foedissima eius aulae ostenta fuit, sutrinae tabernae alumnus, corpore detorto, facetiis scurrilibus; primo in contumelias adsumptus, dehinc optimi cuiusque criminatione eo usque valuit ut gratia pecunia vi nocendi etiam malos prae-mineret.*

Clearly, Vatinius was a cobbler who did not stick to his last. And a canny court operator, transforming himself from victim—Carlin Barton (*The Sorrows of the Ancient Romans*, 1995, p. 145) compared him to Rigoletto—to victimizer, not just one of a crowd, but top dog, especially delighting Nero (Dio Cassius 63.15) with his refrain "I hate you, Caesar, because you are a senator."

You almost have to feel sorry for the young Nero, caught between this Vatinian sally, the aforementioned gibes of Antistius, and the arbitrations of Petronius.

Tacitus seems particularly upset at Vatinius putting on some games for Nero's delectation at Beneventum. Martial, likewise (3. 39), mocked *sutor cerdo dedit tibi, culta Bononia, munus*. It should also be remembered that cobblers have always had a reputation for radicalism and trouble-making, right down to the nineteenth century, such later activists being well catalogued in Marxist historian Eric Hobsbawm's *Uncommon People* (1999). These were soul mates and sole-mates of their classical antecedents, whom I inventoried in a piece on Ancient Socialism (*The Spokesman* 112, 2011, 59–64), from Socrates hanging out in their workshops, denounced by Lysias as the known haunts of agitators, to Cicero (*pro Flacco* 7. 7) ridiculing a decree as merely the work of *sutores et zonarii*, to the Byzantine historian Agathias scoffing “being a cobbler he was of no social significance.” Whilst other writers castigated them as “the most stupid and ignorant” individuals in Constantinople.

Tacitus' Vatinius is also in part a literary construct. Tenney Frank, in an article overlooked by Syme ('Curiatius Maternus and His Tragedies,' *AJPh* 58, 1937, 225–229), drew attention to the fact that Nero's ancestor Domitius was a bitter enemy of the Vatinius excoriated in a speech by Cicero, pointing to the many similarities between these disreputable homonyms: both had physical deformities, both were accused of low birth and boyhood crimes, both were jeered for putting on games, both advanced through servility to the potent role of *scurrae*.

This, of course, relates to Tacitus, *Dialogus de Oratoribus* 11, where Maternus is made to say *improbam et studiorum quoque sacra profanantem Vatinii potentiam fregi*. As everyone else, I embrace Gronovius' emendation of *Vatinii* for *Vaticinii*. This passage is fraught with textual problems, well set out and analysed by Patrick Kragelund, 'Vatinius, Nero and Curiatius Maternus' (*CQ* 37, 1987, 197–202). In the preceding words, many accept Lucian Müller's *imperante Nerone* for the manuscript variants *in Nerone* or *in Neronem*. The first of these is seen by some as referring to a play entitled *Nero*.

I'm here inclined to fasten upon the *studiorum sacra*, a term also used by (e.g.) Quintilian (9. 119). How could Vatinius be a threat to the arts? He'd have to be careful when it came to Nero's poetry, though gibing at that of Lucan should have ensured imperial favour. What about Petronius? A prime target? Insisting upon *imperitante Nerone* as the correct reading, T. D. Barnes ('Curiatius Maternus,' *Hermes* 109, 1981, 382–384) declared that Vatinius must have fallen between 64 and 66. He is not mentioned anywhere else in the extant portions of the *Annals*. Obviously, he would not have been invited to join Piso's conspiracy. Was Petronius? In other words, he might have been deposed before or just after Petronius' end. Who had the chance to gloat over whom?

In *Histories* 1. 37, Otho claims that Galba's freedman (and lover) Icelus had stolen more money in seven months than Polyclitus, Vatinius, and Aegialus. We know that Galba had liquidated Polyclitus, hence a fair bet that the other two had likewise

been mopped up, although one recalls the vain efforts made to protect Tigellinus.

Always possible of course that Vatinius could have escaped and survived in self-chosen exile, though many would have recognised him by his famously long nose (cf. the scholia on Juvenal 5. 46 for his Jimmy Durante 'schnozzle') which inspired the 'Vatinian' goblets with their long spouts—the alternative view that they were Vatinius' own invention may be discounted: he was a cobbler, not a glass-blower, and would hardly have wanted to draw attention to his overblown proboscis—mentioned by Juvenal (5. 46–47) and Martial (14. 96). These allusions show that, like the aforementioned satirist Fabricius Veiento, Vatinius was still a 'buzz-name' in Flavian times. Again, we ask, what about Petronius?

And in Flavian times we shall end, after remarking that Petronius (*Sat.* 68) makes Habinnas describe a recalcitrant slave as equally fit to be a cobbler, a cook, and a confectioner, for there may be a link here that helps to solve a long-standing puzzle about the finale of Juvenal's fourth satire.

As we all know, this ends with *sed periit postquam cerdonibus esse timendus/coeperat*. At first, indeed at second, blush, this seems nonsense, a case of Juvenal delinquency. For easy examples, Hight (*Juvenal the Satirist*, p. 82) and Penguin translator Peter Green both say “the working classes” had nothing to fear from Domitian. True enough. However, apart from Domitia, his assassins were a motley crew of (details vary between Suetonius and Dio Cassius) chamberlains, stewards, a gladiator, and a soldier. Hardly top-drawer. Furthermore, it is clear from its usage by Martial and others that *cerdo* can denote either a cobbler or any menial in general. The imperatoricides fit this bill. Domitian had executed, among others, the old freedman Epaphroditus and Paris the actor.

Dio Cassius (72. 15. 3–4) recounts how the emperor had prepared a 'hit-list' of intended victims which accidentally fell into their hands, thus prompting a precautionary assassination. This is not conclusive, since the yarn is not in Suetonius and exactly the same tale is told of Commodus by Herodian (1. 17. 2–4). But, given the many previous liquidations and Domitian's chronically suspicious mind, it seems quite plausible that he was intending a palace clear-out, and this is perhaps how we should take Juvenal's conclusion.

Leo Genn had one of the two most melodious voices in cinema; the other belonged to James Mason.

We don't, of course, know how Petronius's voice sounded, whereas Nero's husky, frog-like croakings are ridiculed by (e.g.) Juvenal (8. 225; cf. notes by Courtney and Mayor), Plutarch (*De sera numinis vindicta* 567F), and Suetonius (*Nero* 20), albeit it gets a surprisingly good press from pseudo-Lucian (probably one of the Philostrati), *Nero* 6. Despite Louis Morgan's fulminations (see below), Genn's cool modulations seem ideally suited to the Arbiter.

In 1951, Genn was nominated for Best Supporting Actor for his portrayal of Petronius in *Quo Vadis?*

So was Peter Ustinov for his Nero.

Supporting Actor? Many of us thought Ustinov was the principal performer. Certainly contributed far more than the cardboard-cut-out Robert Taylor's Vinicius.

Neither won. The Oscar went to Karl Malden (he of the Vatinian-size nose) for his Mitch in *Streetcar Named Desire*.

Various critics and websites praise Genn's Petronius. He did, though, receive a broadside from one Louis Morgan (online) who (though lavish in his praise of Ustinov) ridiculed Genn's allegedly dull, off-handed manner, accusing him—as we now say—of ‘phoning in his performance.

Clearly, Morgan would not recognise ironic detachment if it hit him in the face.

Genn was doubtless helped in his understanding of Neronian atrocities by his role, after distinguished war service, of investigator into the Nazi horrors perpetrated at Belsen.

Much less remembered than *Quo Vadis?*—still frequently shown on the Turner Classic Movies channel—is the 1956 Italian romp variously known as *My Son Nero*, *Nero's Mistress*, or *Nero's Weekend*. Indeed, I sometimes feel I'm the only person who's ever seen this affair—have never met anyone else who's even heard of it. This oblivion is, on the whole, deserved. No room was found for Petronius. Nero was played by Alberto Sordi, who also was Julius Caesar in another Italian comic ‘take’ on Roman history, *Two Nights with Cleopatra*—can't compare with Sid James in *Carry On, Cleo*. Vittorio de Sica wasn't a bad Seneca. Agrippina was done by Gloria Swanson, who should have stayed on Sunset Boulevard. Still, the absence of Petronius was in another way well compensated for by the visual delights of Brigitte Bardot as Poppaea.

In Sandra Gilbert's and Robert Porter's *Eating Words: a Norton Anthology of Food Writing* (2016), Petronius is one of a quartet of classical authors included via a lengthy section from—where else?—the *Cena*, rubbing shoulders with the Bible, Horace, and Plutarch. His birthdate is confidently given as AD 27, the title *Satyricon* explained as alluding to Satyrs in the hedonistic retinue of Dionysus, and Trimalchio identified as “probably” a caricature of Nero.

In 1910, the British Roman Society celebrated its centenary. Among the tributes was a Latin poem, in sapphic metre, composed by Armand d'Angour, who (*inter plurimos alios*) has also written commissioned Greek odes for the 2004 and 2012 Olympics, the latter by invitation of classics-loving former Mayor of London and champion of Brexit, Boris Johnson.

Text and translation of the present poem is available on the Roman Society's web page, also in the *TLS* (May 28, 2010, p. 25) with concomitant article by Christopher Stray.

The first three stanzas list various Roman authors, the reader being asked if he/she relishes them. After kicking off with Catullus, Horace, and Virgil, the ode continues *Si parum cauti recitas Petroni/fabulas, cenamque Trimalchionis*.

One translation renders *parum cauti* as ‘brash,’ the other as ‘crude’. The phrase is common in both classical prose and verse (e.g. Cicero, Horace, Propertius).

The other named authors all receive compliments. Either way, the expression strikes one as somewhat watery for the Arbiter.

Quick flashback to my note in *PSN* 36 (2006), wherein I mentioned Cyril Bailey's oration, delivered in Latin hexameters, honouring P. G. Wodehouse, with its Petronian afterthought. I can here add that this *tour de force* can be approached via Frances Donaldson's biography of Wodehouse (1982), via pages 160–161 and Appendix B.

Also, in his short story, ‘Sinister Behaviour of a Yacht-Owner,’ in *Thank You, Jeeves*, Bertie's omniscient valet refers to the titular character as *arbiter elegantiarum*.

For extra stimulation, see veteran Petronian T. Wade Richardson, ‘Some shared comic features in Petronius and P. G. Wodehouse,’ *ECM/CV* 23 (1979), 64–69.

It has taken me nearly a lifetime to catch up with Alec Waugh's ‘The Loom of Youth,’ controversial at the time (1917) for its open portrayal of homosexuality at his public school.

On page 133 of the 2008 reprint, a character is made to say: “It is like this, you see; the classical education makes you imitate all the time Greek prose like Sophocles Latin Verse like Petronius.”

How often is the Arbiter invoked as paradigm of Latin Verse? And, the Greek prose of Sophocles comes as an even greater surprise.

Since the speaker goes on to say, “I don't know if I have got the names right probably not never could stick doing it,” this may be a deliberate mistake. Earlier on, another speaker holds up Virgil as the more conventional model.

Hard to believe Petronius was on the curriculum at Waugh's Sherborne School. But, in the novel, there's a local second-hand book shop where translations of the classics were on hand. Original texts too, no doubt. Heseltine's Loeb had recently come out (1913). However, the novel mentions a boy relying on his Bohn, so Kelly's Petronius in that series (1854; cf. my remarks on this, *PSN* 32, 2002) may be the most likely helpmate.

Peter Stothard's (classicist, sometime editor of the *London Times & Times Literary Supplement*) latest book, *The Senecans* (2016) takes four colleagues and himself as aspirants to the

court of Margaret Thatcher, juxtaposing with that of Nero, mediating via the life and writings of Seneca.

Petronius earns two brief appearances (pp. 25–26, 244). In the first, he compares one of his quartet to “the billionaire butt & arriviste of the *Satyricon*”, albeit not equating him exactly with “the monster Trimalchio.”

Petronius himself is characterized thus: “One of the first comic novelists, he wrote about food, drink, flattery, and defecation. He was Nero’s ‘arbiter of taste’, pet prose-master and eventual victim. Or, at least, some scholars think that he was. Some think that there was more than one Petronius. Gains may not have been the name of either. There is always uncertainty in distant history, almost always too in the kind that is close.”

In the second passage, describing archaeological discoveries of ‘a Roman sportswear beneath the site of an intended shopping mall and leisure centre in London, Stothard remarks “To take a flight of fancy, Petronius himself might have arbitrated the elegance of the decor, and deemed it charmingly provincial. Seneca could have taken lunch here.”

Of course, Trimalchio himself, the self-made millionaire from nothing (albeit grub-staked by his wife), was exactly the kind of entrepreneur beloved by Mrs Thatcher—Do a Stothard and imagine a conversational meeting between them...

In his memoir *A Small Thing—Like an Earthquake* (1983, p. 88), Ned Sherrin, impresario of BBC TV satirical programmes, a part influence on the genesis of *Saturday Night Live*, reflects: “Unlike the great satirists, we had a mass audience. It was a sobering thought that, on one Saturday night, we ‘played to’ more people than Bion, Juvenal, Lucian, Petronius, Pope, Dryden and Voltaire.”

Apart from noting with pleasure his presence in this gallery, this brings us back to one of our favourite questions: at what specific audience—if any—was the *Satyricon* aimed?—What? Whom?

Clark, Konnor Lee. *Giton’s Performance of Status in the Satyricon of Petronius*

Dissertation. University of Washington, 2019.

The character Giton in Petronius’s *Satyricon* represents one of the most multifaceted characters in this piece of literature. The thesis of this dissertation is that Giton performs slavery in various ways throughout the novel, and his interactions with others reinforce this claim. Firstly, Giton is represented as performing a variety of tasks and roles typically assigned to enslaved persons: he serves as a bath attendant, he cooks, and he guides. Giton also is sexually objectified by a variety of characters in the novel in ways that are similar to the sexual objectification of slaves. Similarly, the narrator and fellow character Encolpius denies Giton’s subjectivity by objectifying and feminizing the boy. Finally, some of the ways in which Giton performs slavery are emblematic of Roman comedy’s clever slave. This investigation into how Petronius represents Giton’s multifaceted embodiment and enactment of slavery advances

our understanding of enslaved persons and their status by analyzing Giton’s actions and interactions as social performances.

Derbew, Sarah Fente. *The Metatheater of Blackness: Looking at and through Black Skin Color in Ancient Greek Literature and Art*

Dissertation. Yale University, 2018.

This dissertation offers a reappraisal of black skin color in ancient Greek literature and visual culture. Taking into account the complex interplay of identities, ancient and modern, which are present in any interpretation of skin color, this project uncovers the rich performances of blackness in Greek tragedy, Greek historiography, the Greek novel, and Classical Greek art. This study makes use of performance theory and critical race theory in order to provide a multi-faceted interpretation of Egyptians, Aithiopians and Nubians. In Aeschylus’ *Suppliant Women*, there is an ethnographic confrontation between the Danaids and Pelasgus. The Danaids eventually convince Pelasgus to accept their intersectional performance as black Egyptian Greeks. Like the Danaids, the Aithiopian king in Herodotus’ *Histories* undermines a unidimensional reading of black people and destabilizes any perceived distance between the world within the text and the world outside of it. Diverse literary conceptions of Aithiopians extend into the fourth century CE. In Heliodorus’ *Aithiopika*, Charicleia embodies an intersectional dilemma as she manipulates the seemingly rigid relationship between black skin and an Aithiopian identity. The vivid reconciliation of her identity indicates the flexibility of blackness present in Heliodorus’ novel. Such versatile engagement is also present in an investigation of iconography of black people in Classical Greek art. A reciprocal analysis of janiform cups from the fifth century BCE counters the invisible ontologies of race that exist in modern scholarship. From all of these careful analyses, this project untangles the web of ancient Greek representations, modern scholarship, and disciplinary formations in relation to blackness. Black people in antiquity subversively encourage their audiences to scrutinize the intersection of foreignness and skin color. More broadly, this dissertation presents a cumulative and interconnected argument about the capacity for critical and self-reflexive theorizations of skin color and race in the “Greek” Mediterranean from the fifth century BCE to the fourth century CE.

Gillies, Grace. *Writing in the Street: The Development of Urban Poetics in Roman Satire*

Dissertation. University of California, Los Angeles, 2018.

My dissertation examines Roman imperial satire for its relationship with non-elite street culture in the Roman city. I begin with a lexicon of sites and terms related to Roman concepts of disgust in the city, as they appear in the satiric sources I am working with. Then, in my next four chapters, I work chronologically through the extant satires to show how each author reflects or even appropriates practices from Roman street culture. Satirists both condemn parts of the city as disgusting—the parts and people in them who ignore social and cultural boundaries—and appropriate those practices as emblematic of what

satire does. The theoretical framework for this project concerns concepts of disgust in the Roman world, and draws primarily on Mary Douglas (1966) and Julia Kristeva (1982). The significance of this work is twofold: (1) it argues that satire is, far from a self-contained elite practice, a genre that drew heavily on non-elite urban culture; (2) that it adds to a fragmentary history of Roman street culture. The introduction and lexicon establish a vocabulary and framework for examining the history of street culture, and the city in Roman satire. After the lexicon, I continue with the poet Horace, whose work shows evidence of the destruction of tenement housing and squatters' camps under Augustus (31BC–14AD). I argue that the urban poor addressed in Horace's satires had a collective memory. My third chapter focuses on the Neronian satirists Persius and Petronius (54–68AD). Both of them, I argue, display a version of street culture for an elite readership, as a form of slum tourism. Persius both condemns poor or mixed-residence parts of the city as worth of disgust (and hence satire), and at the same time compares satire to practices that make the city disgusting, like public excretion. What remains of Petronius's novel satirizes poor communities in the streets and alleyways of Roman cities. My fourth and fifth chapters work with a final pair of Roman satirists from the end of the 1st century AD, Martial and Juvenal. Both of these authors consistently visualize themselves as standing in the street, and incorporate aspects of oral street culture in their poetry, including street harassment and public sales and auctions.

Morley, Robert Kyle. *Imagining Wealth and Poverty in the Fictional Works of Petronius and Apuleius*

Dissertation. The University of Iowa, 2019.

The purpose of this study was to explore how wealthy, upper class Roman authors use the themes of wealth and poverty in their works and to assess the information that they provide us about the realities of being poor in the ancient world. The focus of the study was on the novels of Petronius and Apuleius, two authors from the first two centuries CE. I ultimately argue that while we can extract some information about the poor from these two novels, we must be cautious and consider how literary themes and traditions influenced the representation of wealth and poverty in them.

Chapter one reviews scholarship on poverty in the ancient world. This chapter moves beyond the few general studies on ancient poverty to discuss other perspectives such as legal issues involving the poor, the health and diet of the larger Roman populace, land and housing considerations, depictions of the poor in art, and views of the poor in Christian texts. The purpose of this chapter is to summarize current research on ancient poverty and to provide context for the remaining chapters.

Chapter two focuses on Petronius' *Satyrical*. This novel has a reputation for being a realistic portrayal of low-life culture. The main characters are of limited means and are liars and thieves. Trimalchio, the famous portrayal of the nouveaux-riche freedman, is perhaps the most well known character in the novel. This chapter examines Petronius' portrayal of the poor and asks why he portrays them as squalid, ugly, and immoral. Moreover,

the chapter also investigates how Petronius portrays the rich and argues that he is just as critical of the rich as he is of the poor.

Chapter three analyzes Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*, with some comparison also to his *Apology*, which contains a philosophical encomium of poverty. The *Metamorphoses* ends with the main character, Lucius, becoming a devotee to the gods Isis and Osiris. Scholars are divided on how we ought to interpret the ending of novel. This chapter argues that Apuleius' portrayal of poverty suggests a satirical intention by having Lucius become a religious devotee. The novel is not a story of redemption, as some have argued.

Sommers, Claire. *Chimeras, Centaurs, and Satyrs: Creating Mixed Genre Texts in Antiquity and the Renaissance*

Dissertation. City University of New York, 2019.

Mirroring its many definitions, the concept of hybridity has historically been a highly fraught one, with creatures such as the centaur or the satyr alternately treated as wild and wise. Defined as a "mixed entity," the English word "hybrid" derives from the ancient Greek *hybris*, a term with several connotations, including wanton violence, lust, or outrage. The word is also synonymous with "hubris," or excessive pride. *Hybris* also developed additional meanings, referring to a deed of excess, an attempt to rise above one's station, or the desire to surpass the gods. More positively, *hybris* may also be translated as transcending what is humanly possible.

In antiquity and the Renaissance, mythological hybrids were frequently deployed to represent literature itself. Plato and Aristotle both called the use of imagery and metaphor a "goat-stag." Plato positions the satyr Pan as a metaphor for language, while in the Renaissance, Philip Sidney recognizes the creation of Chimeras as the privilege of poetry. Hybrid creatures could also symbolize the mixture of genres, a use that most likely has its origins in the satyr play, which laid the foundation for the creation of tragicomedy, itself a hybrid genre. Aristotle and Lodovico Castelvetro would both use the image of the centaur to symbolize the mixture of poetry and philosophy. Sidney would call tragicomedy a "mongrel," while Lope de Vega would more positively appraise it as a minotaur.

In light of the connection between composite figures and the mixture of genres, my project examines what I have termed "hybrid texts" dating from ancient Greece and Renaissance England. I argue that these hybrid texts originate when authors find current literary forms inadequate to their craft. In response, such authors draw elements from various literary styles, genres, and conventions to create a new form: a hybrid text. The inherently multifaceted nature of these works allows their authors to critically examine not only representation but the creative process as well. As part of their consideration of their own craft, the authors of the works examined here frequently underscore the composite nature of their texts by evoking mythological images such as the satyr, the centaur, or the Chimera.

The works chosen for this study are canonically categorized in several different genres: novel, comedy, tragedy, pastoral, philosophical dialogue, and essay. Yet, such traditional classifications are far too limiting for these texts, whose authors pull stylistic conventions from two or more genres. My first chapter focuses on the hybrid imagery found in four of Plato's dialogues (*Symposium*, *Phaedrus*, *Republic*, and *Cratylus*); my second chapter examines Longus' novel *Daphnis and Chloe*; my third chapter discusses Philip Sidney's "Defence of Poesie" and the exemplification of its precepts in his romance *Arcadia*; and my fourth chapter considers the reception of these ideas in theatre by looking at William Shakespeare's *The Winter's Tale*. These works demonstrate their hybrid character through four modes: they combine multiple genres; they stress the ambiguity of language; they evoke mythological imagery; and they integrate traditionally binary concepts such as art with nature or truth with fiction.

Ultimately, my project shows that through the various types of hybridity present within a text, whether mythological allusion, linguistic, or generic, authors create works that transcend the problems inherent to traditional modes of representation.

Syfox, Chontel. *Rewriting and (Re)Negotiating Gender: A Study of the Depictions of the Matriarchs in the Book of Jubilees in Relation to Depictions of Heroines in the Greek Novel and Jewish Novella*

Dissertation. University of Notre Dame, 2019.

Whilst the matriarchs play minor roles in the Book of Genesis, in the Book of *Jubilees* they come to the fore of the literary stage. This dissertation revisits the question of the motives and priorities that led the author of *Jubilees* to embellish the characterisations of the matriarchs in his rewriting of Genesis. It also asks whether *Jubilees* was unique in its elevation of female characters or dealt with them in a manner that was typical of the then literary *Zeitgeist*. Utilising approaches drawn from the fields of gender and feminist studies, this dissertation offers a more nuanced examination of the matriarchs in *Jubilees*, that considers how attitudes towards sex and gender during the period of the author's floruit may have influenced his rewriting of female characters. This examination of the women in *Jubilees* is situated within the larger context of roughly contemporaneous literature, comparing *Jubilees*' depiction of female characters to heroines in Greco-Roman novels and ancient Jewish novellas — Chariton's *Callirhoe and Chaereas*, the Book of Esther, and the Book of Judith.

Firstly, this dissertation proffers that the author of *Jubilees* did not rewrite the matriarchs in a systematic way. There was not an overarching aim to improve the images of or elevate the statuses of the matriarchs, as some scholarly opinions hold. Some matriarchs traverse gender boundaries (Rebekah), some matriarchs are confined within them (Leah), and other matriarchs receive little attention (Sarah). These women are treated differently depending on the ideological concerns and exegetical questions the author of *Jubilees* sought to address. As a result, different types of femininity are represented in the depictions

of the matriarchs. Secondly, the author of *Jubilees* was not unusual in the way he treated female characters. Like the Greek novel and Jewish novellas, *Jubilees* simultaneously contains images of female characters who defy gender norms, as well as images of female characters who reinforce stereotypically patriarchal ideas about the performance of gender.