

THE PETRONIAN SOCIETY NEWSLETTER

Editor:

GARETH SCHMELING
Department of Classics
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida

Vol. 17 Nos. 1 & 2
February 1987

Associate Editors:

Raymond Astbury
B.P. Reardon
Gerald Sandy
J.P. Sullivan

CORRECTIONS FROM VOL. 16, FEBRUARY 1986

Page 7, column 2, line 50, read Huet, not Heut.

Page 13, column 2, last 3 lines in the column should be placed after line 17, and the entry should read:

Wilson, N.G., *Scholars in Byzantium*, Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1981. Contains a number of interesting passages of Byzantine Nachleben of the novels (see Index), and on their manuscript tradition: p. 225 for the notorious Conv. Soppr. 627 (cf. Longus, Vieillefond, above), which W. dates with confidence around 1270 + 10 (early 14th c. has also been suggested, but is out of court now).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ampolo, C., "Note minime di storia dell' alimentazione," *Opus* 3 (1984) 115-120. *Sat.* 44. 11-12.

Baldwin, B., "Careless Boys in the Satyricon," *Latomus* 44 (1985) 847-848. Baldwin suggests that at *Sat.* 54.1 we might read Trimalchioni and that the puer who fell on Trimalchio need not be one of the previously mentioned acrobats. Baldwin also calls attention to the similarity between this scene and one in Seneca *De Ira* 3.40.2-4, where a slave of Vedius Pollio broke a cup, appealed to the guests, and received pardon.

Baldwin, B., *Studies on Greek and Roman History and Literature* (Amsterdam: Gieben, 1985). Among other pieces, 14 articles on Petronius and the Satyricon: "Trimalchio's Domestic Staff," *AClass* 21 (1978) 87-97 (pp. 133-143); "Ira Priapi," *CP* 68 (1973) 294-296 (pp. 144-146); "Petronius and the Fire of Rome," *Maia* 28 (1976) 35-36 (pp. 147-148); "Opimian Wine," *AJP* 88(1967) 173-175 (pp. 149-151); "A Note on Trimalchio's Zodiac Dish," *CQ* 20 (1970) 363 (p. 152); "Trimalchio's Corinthian Plate," *CP* 68 (1973) 46-47 (pp. 153-154); "Petronius 34.10," *Maia* 31 (1979) 145 (p. 155); "Trimalchio and Maecenas," *Latomus* 43 (1984) 402-403 (pp. 156-157); "Petronius' Tryphaena," *Eranos* 74 (1976) 53-57 (pp. 158-162); "Two Notes on Petronius," *CW* 69 (1976) 377-378 (pp. 163-164); "Echion's Profession in the Satyricon," *RFIC* 104 (1976) 327-328 (pp. 165-166); "Pax Palamedes," *CP* 69(1974) 293-294 (pp. 167-168); "Pigiciaca Sacra. A Fundamental Problem in Petronius?" *Maia* 30 (1978) 119-121 (pp. 169-171); "Penthiacum: A Culinary term in Petronius," *Glotta* 55 (1977) 252-253 (pp. 172-173).

Barbieri, A., *Gli Inserti Poetici nel Satyricon di Petronio* (Milan: CELUC, 1974) 63 pp. "Non si tratta di un' antologia, ma di una integrale presentazione di tutti i passi poetici del Satyricon" p. 7. Superficial study. My thanks to Dr. Christoph Stöcker for sending me a photocopy of this monograph.

Billault, A., "Hecate Romanesques," *Mort et fecondite dans les mythologies* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1986) 109-116.

Boyle, A., "The Broken Reed. Virgil, Petronius, Tacitus," *Classicum* 10 (1984) 26-34. Conception of the role of the artist.

Canali, L., *L'Erotico e il grottesco nel Satyricon* (Rome/Bari: Laterza, 1986). (Astbury)

Capponi, P., "De olopetra ad Petr. *Sat.* 35, 4," *Latomus* 45 (1986) 407-408.

Corbett, P.B., *The Scurra*. Scottish Classical Studies 2 (Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press, 1986) 89 pp. Corbett traces the history of the *scurra* from Plautus to the medieval

church councils, from malicious busybody to professional entertainer. On pp. 55-56 he equates the *scurra* with the circulator at *Sat.* 68.6-7.

Dimundo, R., "Marginalia e Petronio 85-87," *CL* 3 (1983) 33-41. (CL = Corolla Londiniensis)

Ebersbach, Volker, *Titus Petronius Arbitrator, Satyrgeschichten*. Aus dem Lateinischen. Übertragung, Anmerkungen und Essay "Petronius oder ein Streit über Geschmacksfragen" von Volker Ebersbach (Leipzig: Reclam, 1984).

Edwards, Douglas, *Acts of the Apostles and Chariton's Chaereas and Callirhoe: A Literary and Sociohistorical Study* (Dissertation, Boston University, 1987).

Fischer, C., *Petron, Satyricon* in Kytzler, B., ed. *Im Reiche des Eros*, Band II (Munich: Winkler, 1983) 5-173. [Munich 1962]

Guillaume-Coirier, G., "L'Ornement mis à mal: couronnes de jantes, couronnes de tête dans le Festin de Trimalchion," *Hommages à Henry Bardon*. Collection Latomus 187 (Bruxelles: Latomus, 1985) 194-211.

Hägg, T., "The Oriental Reception of Greek Novels: A Survey with Some Preliminary Considerations," *SO* 61 (1986) 99-131.

Heinse, W., tr., *Petronius Satyricon oder das Gastmahl des Trimalcion* (Frankfurt/Main: Insel Verlag, 1986). Text is identical to the pocket edition (Insel Taschenbuch 189, 1980) but enriched by 13 woodcuts by Marcus Behmer. (Stöcker)

Holzberg, Niklas, *Der antike Roman* (Munich: Artemis: 1986) 135 pp.

Jenkyns, R., "Silver Latin Poetry and the Latin Novel," *The Oxford History of the Classical World*, ed. by J. Boardman et al. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986) 677-697. One wonders for whom this book was written; even the literate public will be disappointed by the depth of this volume. The pictures, however, are nice. Petronius has not fared well in recent survey books of antiquity. Arrowsmith ["Petronius," *Ancient Writers: Greece and Rome*, ed. T. James Luce (New York: Scribner's, 1986) 2 vols., pp. 883-853] did not bother to submit even a new contribution but simply patched together two old war horses of his published previously, passed them off as new, and hoped that no one would notice the result was Trojan. Goodyear ["Petronius," *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature*, II (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982) 635-638] struggled to produce four pages of literary criticism and failed. Jenkyns piece on the novel (pp. 689-697) is relieved by six pretty pictures.

Korn, M. and Reitzer, S., *Concordantia Petroniana*. Computer-Konkordanz zu den Satyricon des Petronius. Hrsg. von M. Korn und S. Reitzer, 1986. (Astbury)

Kytzler, B., ed., *Im Reiche des Eros*. Sämtliche Liebes- und Abenteuerromane der Antike, 2 Bd., (Munich: Winkler, 1983), Band I has 15 illustrations, Band II has 16 illustrations. Band I contains an Einleitung von Bernard Kytzler (pp. 5-20), translations of Longus, *Daphnis und Chloe* (pp. 21-99) by Friedrich Jacobs, Stuttgart 1823; Xenophon von Ephesos, *Die Waffen des Eros* (pp. 100-163) by B. Kytzler, 1988; *Die Geschichte von Apollonius, dem König von Tyrus* (pp. 167-223) by B. Kytzler, 1983; *Hellodor, Die Abenteuer der schönen Charikleä* (pp. 224-512) by Rudolf Reymer, Zürich, 1950; *Chariton, Kallirhoe* (pp. 513-672) by Heinz Werhahn, 1983; *Anmerkungen* (pp. 675-680); *Verzeichnis der wichtigsten Namen und Begriffe* (pp. 681-687); *Zu dieser Ausgabe* (p. 688).

Band II contains translations of Petron, *Satyrikon* (pp. 5-173) by Carl Fischer, Munich, 1962; Achilleus Tatios, *Leukippe und Kleitophon* (pp. 174-332) by Friedrich Ast, Leipzig, 1802; Lucius Apuleius, *Der goldene Esel* (pp. 333-575) by Carl Fischer, Munich, 1965; Lukian, *Lukios oder Der Esel* (pp. 576-619) by Christoph Wieland, Leipzig, 1788; Lukian, *Wahre Geschichte* (pp. 620-666) by Karl Mraz, Munich, 1980; *Nacherzählungen und Einzelszenen, Auszüge aus utopischen Romanen*, translated by B. Kytzler, 1983, *Euhemerios, Theopomp, Hekataios, Iambulos, Erklärung der ganzen Welt und der Völker*, Antonius Diogenes *Die Wunder jenseits von Thule*, *Iamblich Babylonische Geschichten* (pp. 667-714); *Fragmente aus Liebesromanen* translated by H. Maehler, *Ninos und Semiramis*, *Parthenope und Metiochos*, *Chione*, *Ioalos*, *Antonius Diogenes Die Wunder jenseits von Thule*, *Kalligone*, *Herypyllis*, *Lollianios Phoinikika* (pp. 715-750); *Anmerkungen, Verzeichnis der wichtigsten Namen und Begriffe*, Zu dieser Ausgabe (pp. 753-784).

Leeman, A.D., *Form und Sinn. Studien zur römischen Literatur* [1954-1984] (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1985). This collection of previously printed essays contains two items of interest: "Petron und die Literatur seiner Zeit," pp. 281-292 (in German) ["Petronius en de literatuur van zijn tijd," *Hermeneus* 54 (1982) 52-61 (in Dutch)]; "Tacite sur Pétrone: Mort et Liberté," pp. 293-301 [*Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa Series 3*, Vol. 8 (1978) 421-434].

Löfstedt, B., "Nochmals zu Petron 43,4," *Eranos* 83 (1985) 141. A reply to Neumann, *Glotta* 61 (1983) 145ff. on *parram pilavit* ... *vindemia*. Neumann saw *parram* as a bird of prey and read the clause *mala[m] parram[m] <eum> pilavit*. Löfstedt follows MS H and translates *parram* as "goat-sucker". *recorrexat costas* ... *vindemia* Löfstedt would translate as "his first wine sale put meat on his bones".

Neumann, G., "Weitere Konjekturen zu Petrons Satyricon," *Glotta* 63 (1985) 251-257. At 21.2 read <g>all<i>naceam (for ballaenaceam) which would then mean "wilder Majoran". At 135.6 read *mus<eo>rum imagines* = Mosaikbilder. It is impossible to understand *imagines* in the phrase *muscarum imagines*. Pliny NH 36.184 speaks of the *asaroton ocon*, *quoniam purgamenta cenae*, and Neumann contends that *Encolpius* refers to the mosaic floor style (*asarotos oecos*) with its *purgamenta* when he says *museorum imagines* (cf. also CIL 8.1323 *opere museo exornavit*).

O'Sullivan, J.N., "Notes on Xenophon of Ephesus Books III and IV," *RhM* 129 (1986) 77-89.

Pandiri, T., "Daphnis and Chloe: The Art of Pastoral Play," *Ramus* 14 (1985) 116-141.

Pellegrino, C., ed., T. Petronius Arbiter, *Satyricon*. Introduzione, Testo Critico, Commento, Vol. 1, I Capitoli della Retorica (Rome: Edizioni dell'Ateneo, 1986). *Bibliotheca Athena* 26, paper covers, 223 pp., 2 figures, DM 45.

Petersmann, H., "Petrons Satyricon," in *Die römische Satire*, hrsg. von J. Adamietz (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1986) 383-426. (Astbury)

Petronius Arbiter, *Satyricon* (Pisa: Giardini, 1985). In the series *Scriptorum Romanorum Quae Extant*. Reissue of earlier edition? (Astbury)

Reeve, M.D., "A Change in Trimalchio's Life," *Phoenix* 39 (1985) 378-379. Translators have uniformly rendered *annos quattuordecim fui*: "for 14 years I was". Reeve demonstrates (1) that this is a silly translation because Trimalchio would have been too old and (2) that the accusative of time was used colloquially for the ablative of time. Translate: "at age 14 I was...."

Roncali, R., "La Cintura di Venere (Petronio, *Satyricon*, 126-131)," *SIFC Terza Serie* 3 (1986) 106-110. The episode in the Sat. is similar in many ways to the one in the *Iliad* 14.346-349. The verses at 126.18 recall 14.317-327; 127.7-8 recalls 332-335; la cintura incantata di Venere of Homer finds its Petronian echo in *licium* ... *varii coloris* (131.4).

Sakellariou, A., "Πετρώνιος καὶ νεοελληνική," *ΑΠΟΡΡΕΤΕΣ* 3 (1986) 108-119

Sandy, G., "Jacques Amyot and the Manuscript Tradition of Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*," *Revue d'Histoire des Textes* 14-15 (1984-1985) 1-22.

Sbordone, F., "Contributo epigrafico e onomastico alla questione petroniana," in *La Regione sotterrata dal Vesuvio - Studi e prospettive. Atti del Convegno Internazionale, 11-15 Novembre 1979* (Naples: Università degli Studi, 1982) 255-264. The *Graeca urbs* of Sat. 81.3 is Puteoli.

Scarcella, A., "Morfologia e ideologia dionisiaca, nel romanzo greco d'amore," *Filosofia della Natura e Pensiero Religioso. Quaderni dell'Istituto di Filosofia* 3 (1986) 11-23.

Scarcella, A., "Gli amori di Fedra fra tragedia e romanzo," *Atti delle Giornate di Studio su Fedra* (Torino 7-8-9 Maggio 1984) a cura di Renato Uglione (Turin: Associazione Italiana di Cultura Classica, Delegazione di Torino, 1986) 213-239.

Slater, N., "Satyricon 60.7: which Augustus?" *LCM* 11 (1986) 43. Augustus, *patri patriae, feliciter!*: if Nero is the Augustus cited here, is he also the Priapus here who caused the exclamation *feliciter*? Would Nero be offended if called Priapus?

Sommariva, G., "Rotundum Horti Tuber (Petr. *Satyr.* 109, 10)," *A&R* 30 (1985) 45-52.

Spallone, Maddalena, "Tradizioni insulari e letteratura scolastica: il ms. Angelicanus 1515 e gli *Aenigmata* di Simposio," *SCO* 35 (1985) 185-228.

Sullivan, J.P., "Appropriating Petronius," *The Translator's Art. Essays in Memory of Betty Radice* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1987) 187-196. On translating the *Satyricon*.

Tessmer, R., "Beiträge aus der Thesaurus-Arbeit XXII: oxycomium," *MH* 41 (1984) 31-33. Sat. 66.7 *oxycomina* is a substance made of vinegar and cumin.

Watt, W.S., "Notes on Petronius," *C&M* 37 (1986) 173-184. Notes on 38 readings.

NACHLEBEN

J.P. Sullivan notes the following contemporary reference to Petronius in Anthony Burgess, *The Kingdom of the Wicked* (New York, 1985) p. 3: "Latin itself is too cold and legalistic: even the pornography of Petronius reads like a series of court depositions."

Geschichten rund ums Mittelmeer. Griechenland, Türkei, Zypern, Malta - Auf den Spuren der Dichter, gesammelt und herausgegeben von Manfred Barthel (Munich: Lübbe, 1985) 285 pp. Widow of Ephesus in W. Heinze's German translation with some alterations is found on pp. 178-182. This book is to be understood as "... kein Reiseführer, eher schon ein Reise-Verführer ..." p. 11. (Alex Sütterlin)

Scarcella, A., "Tradizione e invenzione nel romanzo di Costantino Manasse," *Atti dell'Accademia di Scienze Lettere e Arti di Palermo Ser. 5*, Vol. 3 (1982-83 [1985, published 1986]) 31-64.

Olsen, B. Munk, *L'Etude des auteurs classiques latins aux XI^e et XII^e siècles*, Tome II. *Catalogue des manuscrits classiques latins copies du IX^e au XII^e siècles*. Livius-Vitruvius. Florileges. Essais de plume. Petronius is included in the volume.

NOTICES

First Groningen Colloquium on the Novel, 25 April 1986, organized by Prof. H. Hofmann at the Rijksuniversiteit Groningen. The speakers were Dr. B. Kytzler, "Der utopische Roman in der Antike"; B. Egger, "Zu den Frauenrollen im griechischen Roman"; Dr. Rudi van der Paardt, "Playing the Game: Winkler's Auctor and Actor"; Dr. S. Prete, "Apuleius and the Archaists in the Humanistic Period".

Second Groningen Colloquium on the Novel, 31 October 1986, organized by Prof. H. Hofmann at the Rijksuniversiteit Groningen. The speakers were Dr. P. James, "Cupid at Work and at Play: Apuleius, *Metamorphoses* 4-8"; Dr. K. Sallmann, "Irritation als produktionsästhetisches Prinzip der *Metamorphosen* des Apuleius"; Drs. Berber Klugkist-Wesseling, "The Readers of the Ancient Novel"; Dr. Massimo Fusillo, "Modelli testuali e voci narrative del romanzo greco"; Dr. Günter Berger, "Longo volgarizzato: Annibale Caro und Gasparo Gozzi als Uebersetzer eines problematischen Klassikers". The Third Groningen Colloquium on the novel is planned for 1 May 1987.

The Greek Novel A.D. 1-1985, An International Symposium, 24-26 March 1986. The good stuff came last in the program on the 26th: Tomas Hägg, "Callirhoe and Parthenope: the Beginnings of the Historical Novel"; Stamatis Philippides, "Lovers' Fate: Providence in Chariton's novel *Chaireas and Callirhoe*"; Graham Anderson, "Achilles Tatius: A Re-interpretation"; Yoryis Yatromanolakis, "Magic and Witchcraft in the Ancient Novel"; B.P. Reardon, "The Form of the Ancient Greek Romance". This conference was reported in *Athena Magazine* (May 1986) 136-137.

The Ancient Novel, a series of lectures at the Institute of Classical Studies, London (organized by Dr. D.W.T. Vessey) from 12 January to 16 March 1987. Vessey will give two lectures, "What Ancients? What Novels?" and "Having the Last Laugh: the Future of the Ancient Novel"; Dr. G. Anderson will give two lectures, "Putting the Satyr back into the *Satyricon*: an Approach to Reconstructing Petronius" and "Longus and the Cinderella - Cycle"; Dr. R.L. Hunter, "Chariton: History and Fiction"; Prof. H. MacL. Currie, "Petronius and Ovid"; Mr. E.L. Bowie, "Longus' Daphnis and Chloe: Readership and Reception"; Prof. E.J. Kenney, "The Literary Texture of Cupid and Psyche"; Mr. K. Dowden, "How Good is Apuleius' *Golden Ass*?"; Dr. Paula James, "Divine Encounters in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*".

FORUM

A propos de Chariton, *Chaireas et Callirhoe*,
édition "Budé"

Georges Molinié

Quelques mots sur les principes qui m'ont guidé pour l'élaboration de cette édition, destinés aux amis de la Petronian Society. D'abord, à quel public s'adresse-t-elle? aux "honnêtes gens", aux amateurs cultivés. Les usages de la collection sont si clairs à cet égard que je n'ai même pas pu utiliser les blancs laissés au bas d'assez nombreuses pages pour discuter mes choix. Et justement, en ce qui concerne le texte, aucune explication des leçons adoptées, sur les points litigieux, n'a pu être donnée. Ce texte, par rapport au travail de Blake, est beaucoup moins imaginaire; il a été établi, avec en tête l'homogénéité et la simplicité du discours charitonien, en suivant le plus rigoureusement possible ce qu'il est permis de constater dans la tradition. C'est le premier à avoir pris en compte, de manière significative, les papyrus. Il faut s'en féliciter enfin que l'ensemble du livre était fini en 1973; n'ont pu être rajoutées sur épreuves que très peu d'indications (Gersmann, Plepelits, Haegg et Schmeling): avait donc été utilisée la totalité des recherches philologiques connues en France à cette date-là. J'ai ainsi mis à la disposition des personnes éclairées un texte, alors, nouveau, et raisonnable. Je souhaite vivement que mon éminent collègue B.P. Reardon nous donne, sur nouveaux frais, la grande édition savante établie sur les nouvelles recherches et découvertes de cette décennie.

Le seul but de la traduction, puisque les francophones disposaient déjà de l'élégante version de Pierre Grimal ("Pléiade"), fut d'aider le lecteur à suivre fidèlement le grec. En revanche, le gros index final et la carte des principaux déplacements constituent une innovation utile et d'intérêt général. Surtout, comme l'auront noté tous les esprits ouverts et dépourvus de parti pris, la visée essentielle de ce livre apparaît clairement dans la notice (1): il s'agit d'une orientation vers les investigations structurales d'histoire des genres et de portée des pratiques romanesques, à travers l'antiquité, vers la culture moderne (2). Les analyses d'histoire littéraire et des *realia*, l'étude psychologique (qui a d'ailleurs été amputée de celle des personnages secondaires) renvoient sans doute à des réflexions à la fois nécessaires et banales. Mais j'insiste beaucoup sur l'archéologie du genre (le modèle de la *katha*), les constructions narratives telles qu'elles sont figurées, avec leurs reprises, dans l'Analyse (3), l'importance des symétries et des échos, la qualité d'harmonie et d'écoute, du point de vue idéologique, entre ce type de production et le vaste public qui en constitue le récepteur. S'ouvre ainsi la voie d'une sémiotique romanesque large, point de liaison entre les antiquisants et les modernistes, et base féconde de renouvellement des études anciennes.

Je suis très reconnaissant aux responsables de notre chère *Newsletter* de m'avoir permis ainsi de m'exprimer.

NOTES

1. Si on met à part quelques naïvetés d'expression que je n'écrirais plus aujourd'hui.
2. Comme je l'ai illustré dans mon livre *Du roman grec au roman baroque* (Toulouse, 1982), que la *Newsletter* a déjà signalé deux fois.
3. Ce qui correspond à la très belle étude de Gareth L. Schmeling (*Chariton*, New York, 1974).

John J. Winkler. *AUCTOR and ACTOR. A Narratological Reading of Apuleius' Golden Ass.* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1985). pp. xiii + 340.

review by William R. Nethercut

This is a winning book. At the start Winkler states his hope to build a bridge between traditional classicists and others eager to test the structuralism of Barthes and more recent narratological approaches against the ancient text. From the former class -- a majority -- have come five readings of Apuleius: the *Metamorphoses* represent a spiritual autobiography of their author; they are a religious narrative for which the Egyptian background of Book 11 holds a key; they are a philosophic and especially a "Platonic" text; they exemplify Sophistic virtuosity -- a "showcase" for a variety of styles of speech; they are a translation of the Greek *Lucius*, or the *Ass*. Each of these readings assumes a privileged text or background which becomes, ultimately, more important than the Latin itself. For narratologists, on the other hand, the instruction of Barthes and other French analysts urges a greater tolerance for the text and a willingness to grant each reader his own freedom to let the story develop for him as it will. According to this view, the reader is primary and "creates" the text.

We are to keep before us two readers. One will be more familiar -- he who, like most of us, has already stumbled at 11.15 where Mithras implies that the first ten books can be reread with the higher plot of *Lucius'* spiritual conversion in mind. This will be the literary archaeologist, plumbing every paragraph for clues. The other (Can we recapture this in ourselves?) is a newcomer to Apuleius who is led, like *Lucius'* mount at the beginning, by the sheer pleasure of his ears in the story-telling. For this new, or first reader, there is no compulsion to find "meaning"; whatever outlandish turns the tales may take, these are, simply, for his delight and amazement. *Laetaberis*, the prologue concludes. It belongs to the second reader (the re-reader of Apuleius who is trying to make sense out of Book 11) to notice the placement, close to the near-death *Lucius* suffered from choking down soft cheese, of the sword-swallower upward from whose throat a supple acrobat emerges to wind along the sword like the serpent of Aesculapius along his staff. This second reader will ponder the echo of the cheese's stickiness (*mollitie*) in the virtually boneless flow of the acrobat (in *mollitium decorus*) in 1.4. May not the juxtaposition of these two scenes serve as an *Einleitungssymbol* for the close approach to death which *Lucius* will experience so often, only to be lifted at last by a saving god? Or, Winkler quickly asks, may we not take this sequence just the opposite: superstitious fools can find a god's image anywhere?

Winkler is not radically deconstructive. He seeks only to regain balance in what has become the practice of reading the *Metamorphoses* for almost any ulterior aim other than for the enjoyment and humor they present at the first level. The first reader of the novel, we find, is much more open to what happens as it happens throughout the book; the second reader skips over the text, seizing upon selected and favorite mysteries. Not only does our first reader offer a salubrious counter-view, helping us toward greater honesty, but -- as I indicated a moment ago -- even in the apparently genuinely allusive moments, such as the choking on cheese and the sword-swallower's failure to choke on a sword and magical acrobat, we may be mistaken to read only a serious impulse on the part of the author. Not only does Apuleius start, as Plautus did, with a prologue promising pleasure to the new reader, but where he works in suggestive scenes that may well be seen to point ahead, even here he leaves room for whimsical subversion. Thus, his apparent strengthening of a basis for comparison between *Lucius'* swallowing of the cheese and the sword-swallower's act by the echo *mollitie . . . mollitium* may be, after all, only a "misdirection" (Winkler) intended to encourage the gullible to discover a connection when there is really none to find. Winkler writes of "asymptotic" convergence in the present instance (the two scenes seem like they should mean something when they are read together, but they do not quite fit to create a coherent coding), and he elsewhere characterizes such misleading conjunctions as "asymmetric syzygies" -- a precise, if perhaps too wonderfully rich vocabulary. He interprets these, in support of the prologue's *laetaberis*, as evidence of hermeneutic playfulness.

A closer study of the "grammar" Apuleius employs in such groupings would now be valuable in ascertaining more surely just how the narrative proceeds. Winkler has done a good job in providing a general impression of duality or "duplicité" in the novel; needed now is tight analysis. For an example, we have already noticed the clarity with which the sword-swallower's story is set to rebut *Lucius'* own choking on cheese: near-death is countered by the appearance of a living symbol of salvation; the downward direction of *Lucius'* food is reversed by the upward emergence of the acrobat. The echo *mollitie . . . mollitium* fights within itself, if we go beyond this as a "misdirection" (a description which implies that we are to notice the iteration principally for its implied similarity). I would rather see this resonance as focussing sharply the antithetical postures of *Lucius* and the sword-climber: *mollitie* is the choking quality of the cheese; *mollitium* is the smoothness of the acrobat who does not choke the performer. Such reversals are familiar in *Callimachus* and in the poetry of his successors at Rome (for instance, we may remember *Horace*, *Epode* 2, in which the *faenus* from which the country-dweller is free in verse 4 is humorously undercut by the discovery four lines before the end that a *faenerator* has been speaking, praising a life free from financial encumbrance).

According to this technique, repetition leads to the expectation of equivalence between the subjects associated; then liveliness and energy are generated when the presumed equation is found suddenly overturned. It may not, then, be so much of importance that we are led to set the two scenes together as it is that, having done so, we carry off the impression that *Lucius* is separate from the sword-swallower. While his difficulties indeed set the stage for a magical release, he and his experiences stand counterpoised to the tonality of rebirth implicit in the acrobat's issuance, *ex profundis*, from the sword-swallower's insides. Such an emphasis on verbal play intended to distinguish and clarify, rather than to confuse and conceal (Winkler), could indeed serve well the argument for Book 11 that a skeptical tone colors the high moment of initiation. Right here at the start we shall be able to notice how Apuleius holds *Lucius* aside from a magic in which he does not participate and which, therefore, must remain for us all incomprehensible.

If we imagine Apuleius' strategy to be one of deflation, we shall seek more exactly the proportioning and especially the sequencing between high and low, between *Aristomenes'* stringing of himself aloft with tragic gesture and his collapse back into the urine-soaked tangle underneath, between the "Gadzooks" and "Godammit" (Winkler) of the *elocutio novella*. Remembering the inversions at the end of so many major works in Latin (*Venus* and the tribes' regeneration, *generatim*, as against the Plague and their ruin *cateruatim* in *Lucretius*; *Aeneas'* limbs first, but then at the end his adversary's, loose with the chill of death *solvuntur frigore membra*; the manipulators of language who are like cooks at the beginning of *Petronius*, with "Gorgias", famed for mastery of speech, about to eat a corpse at the end, cf. H. Shey, *CB* 47 [1971] 81-84), we shall not find the last chapter of *Lucius'* adventures so anomalous. The change from *Lucius*, a human, making love to *Fotis* in bestial crouch just before his metamorphosis, to *Lucius*, the *Ass*, expressing concern for the matrona whom he addresses in human pose, it seems, shortly before his flight to *Isis*, toward the end of Book 10, will be one more example of such turning around. And the implicit contrast between *Lucius* who worships *Fotis'* hair (*Fotis* is likened to *Venus* emerging from the sea) but who then appears at the last quite bald after seeing *Isis* -- herself fully-tressed -- coming to him across the water, will appear apposite to this same style of organization. The ruling impulse in this case would be rhetorical, just what we would expect from a Latin writer and especially from one well-known for public speaking, but a dimension not central to Winkler's narratology.

For Winkler, Apuleius has offered us an opportunity to engage ourselves in analyzing how the characters in the *Metamorphoses*, and how we, too, proceed to interpret anything. This critical position does not expect any single direction to become clear at the end, nor would it welcome resolution. Apuleius himself, Winkler would claim, declares this to be his dialectical principle at the onset, when he sets out a comic prologue who, dressed in one costume, will later enter the play and assume a role with its own colors; and then

thrusts upon us, objective to the illusions of the performance, an interlocutor who points his finger across the distance, and interrupts: "Quis ille?" Apuleius thereafter establishes opposed positions of interpretation: Lucius, in *verba fidentior*, and the cynic who pleads with the storyteller to let off dealing out such absurd nonsense about witches and magic (*Parce!*). At the end, Lucius' baldness evokes two contradictory identifications -- recognizable as Isis' priest, he simultaneously appears as the stock figure of fun, the standard *stupidus*, a mime-comedian. Mithras, at 11.15, summarizes the exoteric significance of Lucius' path of error, only to be countered by popular interpretation which imagines that for Lucius now to be so received, he must have lived a very holy life indeed. Every moment where an authoritative interpretation tells us how we are to think about Lucius' story, we find humor to unbalance the pronouncement. Winkler adds perhaps the finest set of leaves to his garland for humor when he reminds us that to have a high priest of Isis named MITHRAS is "like introducing the Pope in the last chapter of a detective novel and calling him Martin Luther!" (p. 245). Reitzenstein has influenced many to see here only an instance of syncretism; Winkler defends himself convincingly when he counters that in syncretism some lines remain drawn -- we should not find the Egyptian Venus/Moon-centered figure of Isis melded with the Persian Sun-diety. The concluding chapters of *Auctor* and *Actor* are extremely valuable for their detailed investigation into relevant religious and literary parallels from Apuleius' own century. In general, the literary tradition (the *Life of Aesop* is notable) would have led a contemporary audience to receive, above all, the humor in Lucius' self-portrayal.

However, to remain true to his own characterization of *Auctor* as a set of *prolegomena* to the reading of Apuleius, offered to loosen up and to free scholars from too fixed a line of response, Winkler, favoring a humorous interpretation in sum (a philosophical comedy in which a Platonic vantage embodies the skepticism of Cicero's Academics, not the Neo-Platonism of Iamblichus), concludes from an entirely opposite direction. Just as Apuleius' Eleventh Book is turned toward Egypt and is for the adept, so -- delightfully -- does Winkler's eleventh chapter delve into the arcane. The novel, he urges, was originally entitled *Asinus Aureus* with an added name in Greek (*peri Metamorphoseōn*). Such a combination of names is easily documented. The adjective *Aureus* may contain an occult sense if we, remembering (1) the enmity of SETH to Isis, (2) the popular representation of Seth as an Ass, (3) the cult center of Seth -- modern Kom Ombo, remember also (4) that the Egyptian name for Kom Ombo was NBT Y = "GOLD (en) City". That is, through a transformation of language that in turn produced a transformation of identity, SETH NBT [Y] became SETH AUREUS ("Golden Seth"), and then, in turn, since Seth and the Ass were linked, ASINUS AUREUS. The title would alert *cognoscenti* to the mythology of Egypt and Isis from the beginning, and Book 11 would bring the story of Lucius' journey to an appropriate conclusion. To whatever extent this may come near to the truth, the added "mystery" of these arcana will not change the essential dualism of Apuleius' text as it draws us paradoxically and at the same time toward both the serious and comic.

New questions, however, will spring up. If we remember how Isis hid Osiris in the Nile reeds where Seth later found him and cut him apart, how piquant for Apuleius to have had his prologue mention Nile reeds, precisely. If, once more, we recall that in the Old Kingdom Seth was the strong supporter of Ra and wielded the "Eye of Ra" when he had descended below the horizon into the twelve chambers of night, riding in the solar barque, are we to find a deeper identification when Lucius says that he beheld the Sun blazing at midnight, in his initiation? In the latter case, we shall do better to remember the four stations of the Sun's diurnal passage (as in the initiation for DeMolay) and to recall that Tamino, in Mozart's *Magic Flute*, is said to wait by the "North Gate": the new cycle of ascent begins at the "North" -- i.e. when the Sun has reached the *Imum Caeli*, opposite the Midheaven, and now passes upward into the East and a new dawning. However we may attempt to flesh out the equation LUCIUS = SETH, we still must wonder what purpose it would have served Apuleius to conceive of his narrator in this way.

In sum: I find the self-confessed aporetic mode of *Auctor* most engaging ("my *Auctor* and *Actor*, in its own ludicrous way . . ."), the aim of bringing closer together the newer readings of narratologists and structuralists with those of traditional classicists warmly human and praiseworthy, the structure

of this book helpful and considerate (after three chapters on the difficulties attendant upon interpretation, we are given a chapter which rests the reader and allows him to see plainly just what the author's own sense of things is, after all), the rich research cited throughout the last third of the book most helpful and certain to serve as a resource for future laborers along these banks, and the perception of numerous individual matters of art (and their elucidation) most informative and welcome. Among the last, the programmatic and self-deprecating *rudis locutor* which Winkler feels can contain a pun on *rudere*, "to bray", in 1.1; the insightful study of the *Odyssey* and of Actaeon as opposite models for Lucius, of wandering and of immobilization. A feature of the work which will attract much interest is Winkler's comparison of the *Metamorphoses* to detective stories as a genre. This parallel concerns itself with our attempts as readers to understand just what the "secret" to the story is; Apuleius' own intent, as evidenced from his polarization of equally viable readings -- the serious and comic -- seems less to have been that of the writer of a roman a *clé*. It is we ourselves who may make of this work a mystery.

Small notes: (1) as I have tried to indicate above, it may be helpful now to chart quite precisely the relationship and order of the quasi-tragic or serious to the comic deflations they encounter, and to bring together Apuleius' rhetorical appreciation of structure and subversion to add a literary perspective to the narratological one. (2) Winkler argues that Lucius is an *Odysseus manqué*, as he confesses himself less prudent than the hero *summae prudentiae* (p. 166, Met. 9.13). Lucius credits himself with being *multiscius*, which Winkler takes as a deflation of the *Odyssey*; but what relationship does *multiscius* bear to verse 3 of the *Odyssey*:

pollōn d'anthrōpōn idēn astea kai noon egno?
(3) I am grateful for having my attention drawn to the language in Apuleius' prologue: *figuras fortunasque hominum in alias imagines conversas et in se rursum mutuo nexu refectas*. Winkler relates *mutuo nexu* to the shifting of identity but also with specifically pecuniary or commercial color -- "bonding, borrowing". He takes these words as a virtual admission by Apuleius of what he is about throughout his narrative: wineskins, for example, will "borrow" or take on the identity of criminals or muggers. I now wonder what it may mean that *mutuo nexu* is set to modify *refectas* and that these words therefore may not serve most generally to characterize all the change and transformations as these are set in motion [*conversas*], but instead, specifically, tell us something about the moment of re-integration and return to the original state? What is Apuleius telling us that we can see or understand when one has returned to what one was? Is this reflective emphasis actually a support for the assumption that Lucius' position before "Mithras" in Book 11 does bear some expressible relationship to everything through Book 10?

Hannibal at Troy: The Sources of Trimalchio's Confusion

Barry Baldwin

As with many of his excursions into erudition, Trimalchio's rignarole (Sat. 50. 5-7) about Hannibal's melting down of Trojan valuables as the source of Corinthian bronze provokes a good belly laugh, perhaps tempered by wry recognition on the part of modern lecturers who have to mark first-year mythology papers. A simple and pertinent analogy might be anyone who appealed to Ilium as the origin of modern Troy weight in ignorance of its standard connection with Troyes in France. Yet the jest has not fared well in recent years with scholars. Smith, the latest and in many ways best commentator (Oxford, 1975, 135), dismissively observes "Trimalchio gives a garbled account of the conventional view, itself incredible, which claimed that Corinthian bronze was first produced as an accidental consequence of the burning of Corinth after its capture by the Romans in 146 B.C." whilst another savant, disavowing knowledge of any predecessor, complains that "the odd thing about this passage is not that it is absurd - we would expect this from Trimalchio - but that it seems to have no point whatsoever." (G.G. Betts, 'Petronius C. 50 and a gloss in Hesychius,' *Glotta* 49 (1971), 259-60; his own solution is to connect Trimalchio's etymology with the Hesychian gloss κόρυμβος· μάχης φωνός, a sharp-eyed observation and not incompatible with the general tenor of the explanation here offered). Obviously, Smith and Betts are not wrong in their basics, but they do the art and humour of Petronius far less than full justice.

First, Trimalchio's lecture: cum Ilium captum est, Hannibal, homo vafer et magnus stelo, omnes statuas aeneas et aureas et argenteas in unum rogam congesit et eas incendit; factae sunt in unum aera miscellanea. ita ex hac massa fabri sustulerunt et fecerunt catilla et paropsides et statuncula. sic Corinthia nata sunt, ex omnibus in unum, nec hoc nec illud.

So far as I am aware (In his edition of Petronius [Turin, 1967], 148; n. 106, V. Ciaffi alludes to this passage as a source for Corinthian ware, but offers not a word of discussion), no one has confronted this text with the account presented by the second century epitomator of Roman history, Florus: quid signorum, quid vetustium quidve tabularum raptum incensumque atque proietum est! quantas opes et abstulerit et cremaverit, hinc scias, quod quidquid Corinthii aeris toto orbe laudatur incendio superfuisse comperimus, nam et aeris notam pretiosiorum ipsa opulentissimae urbis fecit iniuria, quia incendio permixtis plurimis statuatis atque simulacris aeris auri argenteque venae in commune fluxerunt (l. 32. 6-7).

Concordances of language and sense are striking: incensum/incendit/incendit: permixtis pluribus/omnes...congesit; statuati/statuas; aeris auri argenteque/aeneas et aureas et argenteas (the identical sequence of metals will be observed; does the often-punning Trimalchio intend a play on aeneas/Aeneas in this Trojan context?); in commune/in unum.

I am not suggesting that Florus is directly using Petronius, much less any Marmoralean notion of an Antonine Arbiter mimicking Florus! That old standby, the lost common source, had better be invoked. Possibly Livy; though there is no such description in the relevant epitome (Perioch. 52), Mummus is commended for keeping his hands off his operibus ornamentisque quae praedives Corinthos habuit (a stock theme in, e.g., Polybius, Cicero, Strabo). But, despite the ms. title *Epitomae de Tito Livio*, Florus also exploited other sources. One may diffidently propose the elder Seneca's chronicle of Roman history ab initio bellorum civilium paene usque ad mortis suae diem, published by his son (cf. Syme, *Tacitus* 277). Such a starting point might imply, as by Florus himself (l. 47, the recapitulatory transition between his two books), use of the terminus of 146 with that year's witnessing of the epochal destruction of Carthage and Corinth. Florus' notorius quadripartition of the ages of Rome into infancy, youth, manhood, and senility (Pref. 4-8) is generally credited to the elder Seneca, whose use of this conceit is confirmed by Lactantius, *Inst. Div.* 7. 15. 14 (cf. the discussions of Forster and Jal in, respectively, the Loeb and Budé editions of Florus, also W. Den Boer, *Some Minor Roman Historians* [Leiden, 1972], 3). However, animadversions on the mania for Corinthian bronze could easily have played a role in denigration of contemporary Roman mores, as witness Velleius, the elder Pliny, Martial - and Seneca's own son, *De brev. vit.* 12.2.

Pliny's notice (NH 34. 3.6-8) is too long to be quoted in full, but its exordial *Ex illa autem antiqua gloria Corinthium maxime laudatur, hoc casus miscuit Corintho, cum caperetur, incensa* commands attention for some similarity to the language of Petronius and Florus: *miscuit/permixtis; laudatur/laudatur; caperetur/captum est; incensa/incensum/incendio*. Also noteworthy is his generalising *sunt ergo vasa tantum Corinthia, quae isti elegantiores modo ad esculentia transferunt, modo in lucernas aut trulleos nullo munditiarum dispectu*. Dishes for food consort with the Petronian *catilla et paropsides*. Trimalchio is not credited with any silver lamps, but he does use silver chamberpots, which Pliny might mean by *trulleos* (this sense, also claimed by some - not all - editors of Juvenal, Sat. 3. 108, for *trulla*, may best suit Pliny's *nullo munditiarum dispectu*, albeit both text and meaning here are disputed); Martial 1. 37 mocks the owner and user of a golden chamberpot. Incidentally, will anyone go the whole hog and claim Pliny's *isti elegantiores modo* as an allusion to a contemporary Arbiter?!

There is, then, more in Trimalchio's language than has hitherto been surmised. It might be added that *vafer*, only here in Petronius, is actually used of Hannibal by Valerius Maximus 7.3. ex. 8 in the context of his devastation of Italy *ferro atque igni* (cf. Martial 11. 31. 16-18), *ut condant vario vafer sapore...paropsides*. Hannibal, like Mummus, is a destroyer rather than a plunderer. Could his name betoken a doubly confused memory on Trimalchio's part of Carthage's destruction in 146? The latter burning comes immediately before that of Corinth in Florus (1. 31. 18), and there is of course the famous story of Scipio Aemilianus quoting Homer on the burning of Troy (cf. A.E. Astin, *Scipio Aemilianus* [Oxford, 1967], 282-7; some may wish to think also of Nero's *Halosis Ilii*, Suetonius, *Nero* 38.3, still an exemplum in Juvenal's day [8.221], which was also Florus' day).

All of this conduces to the belief that Petronius is very neatly parodying Roman history books, perhaps in particular schoolboy texts of which Florus is an early example and schoolboyish confusion, beyond neither of which Trimalchio had progressed (Accepting Scheffer's Tarentini for Parentini of H, a comparable gem is achieved at 59. 4, *ita nunc Homeros dicunt quemadmodum inter se pugnent Troiani et Tarentini*).

The Romance of Encolpius and Circe

Daniel Blickman

In a well known essay on "Luxury and Death in the Satyricon," (Arion 5 [1966] 304ff.), Arrowsmith shows that these two themes loom large in the surviving parts of the work. Recognition of this fact does not entail that Petronius is a "moralist", however such a term is to be defined, and the debate on this issue continues (recently, R. Beck, "The Satyricon...", *MH* 39 (1982) 206ff., with references). But Arrowsmith's evidence does demand that we reconsider the possible connections among the repeated appearances of these topics (cf. A. Cameron, "Myth and Meaning...", *Latomus* 29 [1970] 397), and in fact Zeitlin has extended his discussion to the study of the *Troiae Halosis* and *Bellum Civile* ("Romanus Petronius...", *Latomus* 30 [1971] 56ff.). Her interpretation of the *Bellum Civile* does not focus on its relationship to Lucan, but Vergil, Ovid, and the Satyricon's own scenes in Croton. Arrowsmith's luxury and death are found to pervade and unite Eumolpus' poem and the narrative that follows, including the ill-fated romance with Circe. Thus an appreciation of the Circe episode, which it is the purpose of this paper to sketch, should treat not only the literary technique of the chapters directly concerned with her but at least pose as well the question of its relationship to the surrounding parts of the Satyricon.

The image for Croton is a land of the dead. *Adibitis, says the vilicis, oppidum tanquam in pestilentia campos, in quibus nihil aliud est nisi cadavera quae lacerantur aut corvi qui lacerant* (116.9). Then comes the *Bellum Civile*, much of which takes place at the gates of the underworld. "Encolpius' poet-guide in the role of a father who has lost his only son is a perfect inversion of Anchises" (ibid., 70). Vergil's message is likewise subverted. Unlike Aeneas, who in the underworld saw Rome's future greatness, Encolpius is witness to its degeneration in the assault of Caesar which

Eumolpus narrates. There is also contrast with Ovid, since the Croton of the *Satyricon* is quite different from the Croton in *Metamorphoses* 15. For there, "the theme is the exaltation of Augustus and Rome. This is Ovid's parallel formulation of Vergil's message, as Pythagoras' discourse is meant to rival the philosophical exposition of Anchises in Book 6" (*ibid.*, 73). Ovid's Croton, the home of vegetarianism from which Numa derived the religious ordinances guiding Rome's *pietas*, becomes in the *Satyricon* a seat of cannibalism and image of Rome's living death. The vilicus' description is realized in our closing scene with Eumolpus' will. Moreover, as will be seen, there are a number of references to death and Vergil's underworld in the scenes with Circe (*ibid.*, 70-2).

In considering this motif from the point of view of the episode itself, it is necessary to emphasize that Encolpius' impotence becomes the focus of almost all our narrative in Croton. Impotence is hardly typical of Encolpius. His difficulty with Quartilla at first is owing to fright (19.3-20.2), but this clearly is overcome whether in 20 or later, as is shown by her remark, *hodie enim post asellum diaria non sumo* (24.7). Nor is there any sign of trouble upon his reunion with Giton (91), and Encolpius had apparently once been in good standing with Lichas (105.9) and perhaps his wife (106.2). It is not true, then, that Encolpius has problems with women, but not men (cf. his failure with Giton [128.7] and Philomela's son [140.11; 129 for his prowess]). Rather his impotence with Circe is what one would expect in a city where *nemo liberos tollit* and the most honored *nec uxores umquam duxerunt nec proximas necessitudines habent* (116.7-8). Encolpius feels as if he has died: *funerata est illa pars corporis qua quondam Achilles eram* (to Giton, 129.1); *hoc de te merui ut me in caelo positum ad inferos traheres?* (to his offending member, 132.10). Circe taunts him in the same terms: *medius fidius iam peristi*, etc. (129.6f.), and there is the outrageous use of Vergil's lines describing the embracing of ghosts (*Aen.* 2.791-2, 6.700-1) and the turning away of Dido's ghost in the underworld (6.469-70); cf. *Ecl.* 3.83, 5.16; *Aen.* 9.436) in Encolpius' poetic account of his woeful attempt at castration (132.8, 11). Finally, the restoration of his potency is a return from the dead (140.12).

These references to Vergil and Ovid which can be connected to the theme of impotence and its associations with death by no means exhaust the literary allusions in the episode (E. Courtney, "Parody and Literary Allusion...", *Philologus* 106 (1962) 99-100; P.G. Walsh, *The Roman Novel* (Cambridge 1970) 42, 106). Petronius exuberantly plays off every sort of earlier literature. But the tone of the highly stylized narrative thus produced, together with the brilliant surfaces of Petronius' prose, is elusive and ambiguous. Nor is it uniform. The *Cena* as a whole is more realistic than the scenes with Circe. The latter is closer to the adventures on board the ship in the extent of its literary conceits. This quality does not prevent us from feeling the danger of the stowaways or the unhappiness of the impotent Encolpius, but each scene is a bit different.

The somewhat less realistic tone in the stories from Croton is in keeping with the surrealist introduction provided by the vilicus and Eumolpus. The old scoundrel's will at the end develops this tendency to its furthest point. Likewise, the alacrity with which Eumolpus proceeds to bed with Philomela's daughter is more burlesque than the aggressiveness of Quartilla, who has an elaborate introductory act. Something of an exception are the chapters (134-8) spent in the company of Oenothea and Proselene, though I do not mean to suggest that there is an unhappy clash between any of these scenes. It is a matter of lesser modulations. Indeed, chapters 134-8 are of a piece with those preceding in the unusual amount of poetry that they contain. Nor do they relinquish literary allusions and the mock heroic style. The battle with the sacred geese is a fine example of these techniques. But it may be that these scenes provide from the point of view of tone a certain ballast for the surrounding narrative in Croton. To complete this background, then, before turning to the episode with Circe, some features of 134-8 which contribute to the more realistic effect can be noted. One is the detailed description of mundane objects and activities (135.3-6, 136.1-3, 137.10-2). This element is reminiscent of the *Cena* and offers a contrast to Circe's grove of plane trees. Likewise the sexual language with

Circe is all circumlocutions: compare *voluptatem robustam* (127.10), *implicitae omne genus amoris* (132.1), *illa pars corporis* (129.1), *nervos* (129.8), *instrumenta* (130.4), with *inguinum vires* (131.6; cf. C. Gill, "The Sexual Episodes...", *CP* 68 [1973] 172ff.). Characteristically this *inguinum* is the most explicit sexual language of the section and is used in the scene with Proselene, which foreshadows what is to follow, since even in our fragmentary text, clearly the description of Oenothea's "cure" replaced this florid brush with some graphic detail (138.1-2). Encolpius' attitude is also to be noted, which as usual is sometimes fearful or ingenuous. He shrinks in horror from Oenothea's promised miracles (*inhorruerit ego tam fabulosa pollicitatione conterritus*, 135.1) and is astonished and shocked when accused (*confusus itaque et novitate facinoris attonitus quarebam*, 136.14); he marvels at the resources of poverty (*mirabar equidem pauperitatis ingenium*, 135.7) and is proud of his victory over the geese (*vindicta gaudens*, 136.7). But sometimes he is detached and more sophisticated (*non sine risu*, 136.3, 137). The humor and perspective of this detachment prevents the tone from becoming too strained, and herein lies another antithesis with the preceding episode with Circe. (In some important articles, Beck discusses the function of these two sides of Encolpius in the *Cena* ["Encolpius at the Cena," *Phoenix* 29 (1975) 271ff.] and in the work generally ["Some Observations...", *Phoenix* 27 (1973) 42ff.].)

The adventure of Polyaenos and Circe begins with the visit of the maid Chrysis to Encolpius. George has made some acute observations about Chrysis' incongruous style of speaking ("Style and Character...", *Arion* 5 [1966] 344 for quotations below). Only her reply to Encolpius (126.8-10) is in language expected from a slave. "This is undisguised freedman language, both in its idiom (several of the expression which Chrysis uses reappear round Trimalchio's dinner table) and even more so in its short, choppy, and inelegant sentences." But her opening speech (126.1-7), "while by no means a triumph of the rhetorical art," has been composed with some care. "The sentences are longer, the syntax more elaborate, the rhythmic flow smoother and more continued." Thus there is "the careful gradation of the clauses beginning with *quo...* a well-known rhetorical device, whereby the emotional tension is prevented from flagging by making each successive clause longer and weightier than the last" (cf. Pacchiani, "Nota Petroniana...", *Boll. di Studi Lat.* 6 [1976] 81-2). There is also the lofty tone of sections 126.3-5, e.g., *effice ut beneficium debeam*.

Encolpius, confronted with this eloquence, tries to reciprocate. *Itaque oratione blandissima plenus, "rogo, inquam, numquid illa quae me amat tu es?"* (126.8). The ingenuous narrator reports that Chrysis laughed much at this extraordinarily stilted expression (*multum risit ancilla post tam frigidum schema...*). She is pleased no doubt at Encolpius' falling for her act, which is revealed as such by her next words. The perception of George that her rhetorical style is linked to her elevated tastes in men is surely correct. "Her linguistic pretensions are the natural corollary of her social pretensions" (*op. cit.*, 345-6). In 139, her speech is again rhetorical.

A comparison of the sequence here to that in 136.14-137.5 reveals the different direction that the first episode will take. In 136.14 Encolpius is *confusus et attonitus*, but the words of Oenothea (137.1-3) provide the opening for Encolpius to become a bit wry about the whole matter (*pro ansere struthocamelum reddam*). In 126, however, Chrysis' reply, though it betrays her act to the reader, impresses Encolpius not only in style, but through its content as well (*mirari equidem tam discordem libidinem coepi atque inter monstra numerare, quod ancilla haberet matronae superbiam et matrona ancillae humilitatem*, 126.11). Thus our first developed scene in Croton presents Encolpius with a strange and topsyturvy situation (*inter monstra*). It will get worse, but for the moment is elegant and witty (*procedentibus deinde longius iocis rogavi ancillam ut in platona perduceret dominam*). Indeed Chrysis' urbanity is another characteristic which establishes a foil for the manners of Circe.

The entrance into the *locus amoenus* (126.12) where Circe is met takes us into the most literary landscape of the *Satyricon*. Chrysis' stylized pretensions have prepared the way, since, unlike those of some other characters, they have in a sense been pointedly accepted rather than undermined.

Yet the grove of plane or laurel trees is only the setting, and, being common to all genres, by no means determines what sort of love scene will ensue. The seduction in the Cologne Epode of Archilochus, for example, occurs in the traditional meadow, and is anything but unrealistic (see J. Henderson, "The Cologne Epode...", *Arethusa* 9 [1976] 159ff.). Petronius' *mulierem omnibus simulacris emendatiorem* (126.13), however, suggests where we are: in a romance. The comparison to statues is found in Euripides (fr. 125 Nauck², of Andromeda, presumably spoken by Perseus) and was surely a commonplace in the romances and other romantic writing. It is thus that Chariton introduces Chaereas: *Χαιρέας γὰρ τις ἦν μενράκιον εὐμορφον, πάντων ὑπερέχον, οὗον Ἀχιλλεῖα καὶ Νυρέα καὶ Ἰππόλυτον καὶ Ἀλκιβιάδην πλάσσει τε καὶ γραφεῖς <ἀπο>-δεικνύουσι* (1.3, Blake's text). Petronius parodies this idealizing topos in what is possibly the most contrived prose of the *Satyricon* (126.15-8; Pacchioni, *op. cit.*, 83-4; H.J. Zumsande, *Varros Menippea Papia Papae* *περὶ ἐγκομίων* [Köln 1970] 35-8).

Circe's laugh (127.1) suggests that the flattering poem was improvised by Encolpius on the spot, and she propositions him in return. Her words are tactful, smooth, and hardly as innocent as they claim to be. "... hoc primum anno virum expertam" appears ridiculous after Chrysis' characterization, *usque ab orchestra quattordecim transilit et in extrema plebe quaerit quod diligit*. Moreover she proposes a part-time affair which falls slightly short of love unto death. Besides her original proposition, she gives cool reassurance about Giton (127.7, and even 128.1 may suggest that Encolpius should not worry about him since she does not. Encolpius had readily renounced him, but is not, apparently, believed, 129.8). "It seems certain that Petronius intends his nymphomaniac Circe to be viewed as a grotesque reflection of the innocent heroines of earlier Greek romances" (Walsh, *op. cit.*, 107), and some evidence for this view will be adduced. Encolpius, however, is carried away and responds as to a goddess. She is pleased, and Encolpius turns, or returns, to poetic language and comparisons (127.5; Pacchioni, *op. cit.*, 86). The mention of the Sirens introduces the first Odyssean allusion of the episode, and the lady's name is now found to be Circe, a match for Polyaeus.

The name fits her character: beautiful, openly sexual, and dangerous. In the *Odyssey* Hermes predicts to Odysseus how as soon as he withstands her drug and pulls his sword, Circe will propose that Odysseus sleep with her (10.296, 333-5). Interestingly enough Homer's Circe poses a threat of emasculation (10.301, 341, and the transformation of Odysseus' men smacks of this). But in the *Odyssey* she really does not mind Odysseus' successful resistance to her magic and, although not wanting him to leave, has had him for a year and even retains her dignity throughout. Later, however, she was regarded as a serious symbol and lesson of immoderate sensuality (Xen. *Mem.* 1.37, Athenaeus 1.10e, Plut. *de esu carnium* 996d-e, *Anth. Pal.* 10.50, 15.12). Parody of her incontinence presumably goes back at least to Aeschylus' satyr-play under her name (frs. 114-5 Nauck²). In the *Metamorphoses* she no longer retains her dignity in the face of frustration, but spitefully transforms Scylla when her love for Gallus is thwarted (13.898-14.74, cf. 14.25 *neque enim flammis habet aptius ulla talibus ingenium*) and Pegasus when rejected by him (14.320-96). The crass promiscuity and cruelty of Petronius' Circe owes more to this later view than to Homer's.

The result is a criss-crossing burlesque of genres and persons. The introduction and setting hint of the ideal love of two blooming virgins, as in a romance. This pattern is parodied in the first instance by the stilted and hyperbolic language of Encolpius. In addition Circe is introduced, a character who, though beautiful, has difficulty posing as a virgin, or nearly one. The exaggeration of the style makes the content of her actions appear even more absurd. Moreover one might say that the person of Circe is the victim of some dramatic irony in her own right. As noted above, she has been satirized before, but Petronius' treatment is the most splendid that we have. Her libidinous nature is a joke on herself as well as on a romantic heroine. Petronius shows no mercy to the frustration Circe faces in her affairs, which though perhaps a growing problem from the time of Odysseus, has now become rather embarrassing. She admits, *non sum quidem solis progenies* (127.6), but her powers are supposed to be considerable (cf. 129.9, 134.9-10). Walsh (*op. cit.*, 24-8, 106) has discussed the *Satyricon's* similarities to the mime, and the insulted Circe may owe something to a woman

with the same experience on stage. The vivid language (132.2-5, e.g., *eicitur et Proselenos...*) makes it easy to picture the scene. One thinks, too, of the Oxyrhynchus mime.

As Circe and Polyaeus embrace for a proverbial roll in the grass (127.8), the course of the narrative replaces the characters as that aspect of the content which is ludicrously inappropriate to the traditional erotic setting. After this long and elaborate preparation, culminating in an imitation (127.9) of Homer's description of that "most fructiferous of unions" between Zeus and Hera, Encolpius fails to perform. Zeitlin observes that Encolpius' impotence in the garden inverts the Widow of Ephesus' renewal in the tomb. "The failure of Circe and Encolpius-Polyaeus, set within the bleak surroundings of Croton but in an immediate landscape of lush poetic images of fertility, contrasts with the potency of nature which prevails in the funeral setting of the Widow of Ephesus. It is significant that the Vergilian quotations there allude to the happy beginning of love, while those in Croton evoke the tragic aftermath in the underworld" (*op. cit.*, 72. In the *Odyssey* Circe sends Odysseus to the underworld, too).

Now it is Circe's turn to declaim hysterically, and absurdly (128.1,3, with numquid seven times; *Ov. Am.* 3.7.27f., 49f.). Her worries about bad breath and body order, not to mention making faces at herself in the mirror, bring us down with a thump from the peaks of Ida. Encolpius is not sure whether he is in a dream or not (128.5-6).

Will the romance revive? The unhappy youth seeks help from Giton, but only secures his back-handed praise (128.7). Circe starts her letter with some of the same (129.4) and then proceeds to give Encolpius a hilarious thrashing. But at least she has written, and Chrysis directs the willing (*libenter quidem*, 129.12) Encolpius to write an apology. We should have known. These are the earliest surviving love letters in Latin prose, and derive from the Greek romance (asserted, but not argued, by Pacchioni *op. cit.*, 79; cf. R. Heinze, "Petron und der griech. Roman," *Hermes* 34 [1899] 516).

Although the situation of a lover trying to make amends to his mistress may itself tend to produce recurring expressions, it is worth noting a few similarities between Encolpius' letter (130.1-7) and that of Chaereas to Callirhoe in Chariton's romance (4.4.7-10). We may leave aside the first few sentences of Chaereas' letter which are necessary to explain that he is still alive and where he is. Then, as his letter moves into its argument that Callirhoe should forgive him and not marry, he begins with the same topos as does Encolpius: "I am a man, and so...; but never did I..." Chaereas says, *θάνατον μὲν γὰρ ἀνθρώπος ὡν προσεδόκων, τὸν δὲ σὸν γάμον οὐκ ἤλπισα* (4.4.8). Encolpius begins, *fateor me, domina, saepe peccasse, nam et homo sum et adhuc iuvenis. numquam tamen ante hunc diem usque ad mortem deliqui* (130.1). As each develops his case, he employs a succession of three first-person verbs. Chaereas claims that he has paid his penalties: *ἐδωκά σοι δίκας, ἐπράθην, ἐδούλευσα; ἐδέσθην*. Encolpius names the crimes for which he is willing to suffer the punishments: *proditionem feci, hominem occidi, templum violavi; in haec facinora quare supplicium*. Both conclude with the sentiment that losing their beloved would be worse than death: *εἰ μὲν οὖν ἔτι μνημονεύσεις, οὐδὲν ἔπαυον· εἰ δὲ ἄλλο τι φρονεῖς, θανάτου μοι δώσεις ἀσφάσειν; paralytin tamen caveere iubes, tamquam [iam] maior fieri possit quae abstulit mihi per quod etiam te habere potui*. This noteworthy resemblance between Petronius and Chariton does not seem to have been appreciated, though it is one of our clearest allusions to the Greek romances in Petronius.

The case can be strengthened, since Achilles Tatius in a love letter employs an even more dramatic anaphora of first-person verbs to describe what Leucippe has gone through for Clitophon: *διὰ σὲ πέπονθα ναυαγίαν καὶ ληστῶν ἡνεσχόμην· διὰ σὲ ἱερεῖον γέγονα καὶ καθαρμὸς καὶ τέθνηκα ἤδη δευτερον· διὰ σὲ κέκραμαι καὶ ἐδέσθην σιδήρῳ καὶ δούκλαν ἐβάστασα, καὶ ἔσφαγα γῆν καὶ ἐμαστιγώθην* (5.18.4). Moreover, by chance, a fragment of Ctesias' *Persica*, a work which has long been considered a major inspiration for the novelists, contains traces of the same topos. Struanguaius writes to Zarinaia: *ἐγὼ μὲν σὲ ἔσφαγα καὶ σὺ δὲ ἐπὶ ἐσ[θ]ῆς· ἐγὼ δὲ διὰ σὲ ἀπ[η]λ[λ]ομένη καὶ ἀπέκτελνα αὐτὸς ἐμαυτὸν· οὐ γὰρ μοι σὺ ἐβούλου χαρ[ί]σασθαι* (P. Oxy. 2330.7-11; Struanguaius also seeks to kill himself, 23-4). Hitherto Petronius' knowledge of Chariton had been surmised on the basis of Persius' reference to a "Callirhoe" (*Sat.* 1.134; K. Plepeltis, *Kallirhoe* [Stuttgart 1976] 29-30, 4-9). Now the similarities between Petronius and Chariton are more substantial than any two of these four

texts and thus make it likely that Petronius is using Chariton. Petronius' parody of the romantic-epistolographic style is in any case confirmed.

After writing his letter, Encolpius tries to cure himself by eating light and sleeping alone (130.7-8). Along with Proselenos' charms (131.4-7), this regimen produces signs of health. Again the trees and flowers shelter the beautiful Circe (131.8-9, cf. *marmoreis cervicibus* for the comparison to statues; though her language is a deliberate echo of the crass *sermo familiaris* of Proselenos, cf. 131.10-11 with 131.3-4). Again they play with 1000 kisses (cf. 127.10). But the repeated *iam* of 132.1 does not lead to the desired climax. Surely a brief (anticlimactic) statement of failure is what originally followed in the text. The devil has no fury like that which breaks upon Encolpius now, as he is beaten, spat upon, and thrown out. It is humorous to us, but Encolpius believes that he deserves it (132.4). Then comes his culmination at the *causa omnium malorum* (132.7-11). He has touched bottom in his despair, and the sad allusions to Vergil show him to be at death's door. This passage is in one sense the culmination of the Circe episode, as the self-absorption of Encolpius, both euphoric and hysterical, which has been a leading characteristic throughout, now reaches its peak. This extravagance must be relieved, however, and Encolpius' self-reproach and then justification (132.12-6) change the tone and provide a transition to renewed attempts at a cure (133.2ff.). 132.12 introduces that detachment which has been so lacking in the pages before.

If for the sake of exposition a line is drawn at this point in the text, one can see how carefully Petronius has crafted the flow of his narrative. The scenes with Proselenos and Oenoea to come have been foreshadowed in 131.2-7, and the transitional passage (132.12f.) follows through on the previous Odyssean illusions with a delightful comparison of Encolpius' outburst to Odysseus' famous words to his heart (*non et Ulixes cum corde litigat sua...*, cf. 134.12 vv. 12-5 for Circe, Odysseus, and the flora of Mt. Ida [=127.9], also 136.6, 139.2 for other epic allusions). As mentioned before, the unusual amount of poetry in both the Circe episode and what follows also serves to unite the scenes. If all these devices were removed, one can see how the adventure with Oenoea might follow somewhat abruptly, even for the *Satyricon*, the romance with Circe.

Can we draw any general interpretation from the episode? It would be more feasible if we knew whether or not Encolpius and Circe ever consummated their love. The passion of Encolpius for her certainly seems to continue (138.6-139.3, where 138.8 refers to 132.2-4). But even if they were united, one can feel confident that it did not last long. This is not the fate of Encolpius. In fact, Circe may well have renounced her desire for him if she learned of his true status. This information is probably the cause of Chrysis' declaration of her love (*quae priorem fortunam tuam oderat*, 138.5; 139.4). Such a dramatic confirmation of their upside-down and artificial passions, thus revealed as quite dependent on status, would suit Croton very well. The irony again cuts several ways. When the scene opens, it is the *inversion* of upper- and lower-class tastes which is emphasized as unnatural (126.11). But if Circe as well as Chrysis reverses her feelings simply upon learning of Encolpius' true status, it is the *artificiality* of the desires of both which is highlighted and satirized (cf. the artificiality of the scene with Philomela's daughter, where there is not even the pretense of genuine passion. But this elimination of passion is the next logical step from the caricatured version of Circe and Chrysis. Admittedly the ancients, not to mention ourselves, would not always consider regard for status as an irrelevant or completely artificial ingredient in passion, but the presentation of these issues here finds room for satire.).

Given that, in the preserved text, Circe is our hero's main heterosexual desire (cf. 126.18; the immediate and unasked for sacrifice of Giton, 127.3; and the continued hysteria of 138.6f.), it is reasonable to focus on the long scenes depicting the stylized and stagnant affair with her in regard to sex and love in the *Satyricon*. The very fact that Encolpius can fall in love with a Circe figure in his modern odyssey highlights, in Cameron's words, that "it is an epic with an anti-hero and without a Penelope" (op. cit., 425).

But, and here we are brought back to Arrowsmith, Petronius does not of course expect us to dislike Encolpius or the other characters (see now J.P. Sullivan, "Petronius' 'Satyricon'...", *ANRW* II.32.3 [Berlin 1985] 1671, 1675 for sympathy

with Trimalchio). That is, for one thing, a bad way to keep your reader entertained. It is precisely this paradox which Arrowsmith's work reveals. Encolpius' life in Croton, though consisting of perfectly awful experiences, is still extremely funny. One may demure when Arrowsmith goes to the point of saying, "Every whore, every woman in love, recalls Circe" (op. cit., 329). But to shy away from his questions, from confronting how the *Satyricon* maintains "that atmosphere of humour and moral sanity" amidst such unedifying events [Beck, *Phoenix* 27 (1973) 61], would be a loss. I suspect that Arrowsmith in encouraging us to see a broad and impressive humanity in the work is closer to the truth than Walsh who can see nothing except cynicism in the wit (G&R 21 [1974] 181ff.; cf. Sullivan's dismissal of Arrowsmith with the overly simplified argument that the characters are "undercut", op. cit. 1675). H.D. Rankin, who recognizes the importance of these themes (Petronius the Artist [The Hague 1971] 19), contemplates the possibility of interpreting the impotence as a symbol, possibly unconscious, of the powerlessness of an intellectual like Petronius in what "was in an important sense, the age of Trimalchio." Yet if we are to speak figuratively, we might say that Petronius' dazzling wit did make itself master of his age and that this was in fact not primarily the intellectual feat of an individual mind over insentient matter. Men, in any age, are what they are. Trimalchio is a most amiable buffoon, and Petronius loved him.*

*I would like to thank Gareth Schmeling and Jack Winkler for reading and criticizing an earlier draft of this paper.

The New Testament and the Ancient Romance: A Survey of Recent Research

Douglas R. Edwards

Forty years ago the noted New Testament scholar Henry J. Cadbury observed that no work had more 'idioms and ideas' in common with the canonical Acts of the Apostles than the ancient romance written by Chariton of Aphrodisias (Cadbury: 8). Until the past decade few scholars, including Cadbury, ventured to mine those parallel features for common literary, social, and cultural connections. A resurgence of interest in the social and cultural environment of the New Testament and a proliferation of dialogue with other disciplines have led scholars to take seriously the relationship between the prolific genre, ancient romance, and the New Testament. Recent works have recorded and evaluated studies that compare the ancient romance to works on the periphery of the New Testament, most notably the Jewish romance *Joseph and Aseneth* (Burchard), the Christian Apocryphal Acts (Plümacher (1978); Hagg: 246-247), and Pseudo-Clementine (see Hagg: 247). No survey, however, has discussed efforts to compare the genre to the New Testament. This essay hopes to alleviate that lacuna as well as to suggest avenues for continued research. It concentrates on the ancient Greek romances and related works; however, it does not address in detail the significant role that important books such as Philostratus' *Apollonius of Tyana* or Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* have played in New Testament research (cf. F.C. Bauer; Kee (1983): 252-289; Tiede: 1725-1728; Perkins).

Prior to the past decade, scholars compared the New Testament and the ancient romances primarily for lexical or philological purposes (Walter Bauer, s.v. *stauros*, *kleptein*; cf. Van der Horst (1983.1): 349). Scholars continue to find numerous lexical, stylistic, and conceptual parallels that illuminate the language field of the New Testament writers; the early romances, like the New Testament corpus, are considered representative of the vernacular of the day (Van der Horst (1983.1; 1983.2); Reiser (1984.1; 1984.2); cf. Derrett, p. 55). Those who take this approach typically assume that no significant parallels exist between the New Testament and the romances as a whole; rather "there are several scenes, ideas, phrases, and stylistic devices that may illuminate scenes and usages in the N.T., especially in the book of Acts" (Van der Horst, (1983.1): p. 349).

Several common themes and motifs in the New Testament (especially Acts of the Apostles) and the ancient romances have attracted attention, most notably the prominent role of travel; trial scenes; narrow escapes; and a sea voyage with a

shipwreck (e.g., Beardslee; 48f.; Robinson: 6; Pokorny; Conzelmann: 6-7; Schierlings: 81-88). The sea voyage with subsequent shipwreck in Acts 27:1-28:16 has received particular attention. Martin Dibelius concluded that a secular description of the voyage and shipwreck served as a pattern, making the sea-voyage in Acts 27:1ff. "one of the most literary sections of Acts" (Dibelius: 205). Klaus Berger argues further that the sea voyage/shipwreck without loss of life is part of the classic *topoi* of the ancient romance and that Acts 27-28 completely corresponds to this *gattung*. Survival of a shipwreck in antiquity indicates innocence and in that regard parallel features exist. The heroes of the novel withstand the test, according to Berger, and become worthy of achieving a satisfactory end. Likewise, Luke has the apostle Paul complete his mission to Rome following his journey (Berger: 1267; cf. Pokorny: 233-244; Conzelmann: 6-7; Kee (1980): 147; Pervo: 203-244).

In contrast, Ernst Haenchen cites certain affinities with the ancient romances but argues that no standard of sea voyage served the author's purposes (Haenchen: 710-711). Susan Praeder has sharpened the debate in suggesting that the Greek romance need not be the only genre which influenced the author of Acts' sea voyage narrative. She draws parallels from other genres which suggest that the convention cannot be equated with any one genre. Praeder suggests that the rhetorical and epic tradition played no small part in the two volume work Luke-Acts. She correctly concludes that a single feature, the sea voyage/shipwreck, does not support nor deny the use of a specific genre by the author (1984: 693ff.).

Other parallels in content occur, especially in Acts 13-28 (Berger: 1264-65). Berger argues that Acts and the ancient romances draw from a popular conception of Stoic philosophy: the master (*Beherrschung*) of emotions, the rule of *pronoia* which leads everything to a good and fortunate end, the valiant endurance of dangers by the protagonists, and the interest in the psychology of the individual in the narrative (Berger: 1266; cf. Pervo: 313-318; Koester (1982.1): 137; contra Kany: 90). Indeed, Luke, according to Berger, more than any of the New Testament writers shows popularized Stoic terminology in his depiction of God's providence. In particular, the constant use of *dei* by the author of Luke-Acts indicates that travel, persecution, and expansion of the movement by Jesus and later the disciples were necessary features in God's plan.

Yet Berger notes that differences with the ancient romances are apparent. Certain romances include a *Peristasis* catalogue similar to the list of virtues and vices found in Stoic catalogues (e.g. Chariton VIII.1.4) that serve to summarize and highlight the preceding narrative. In contrast, brief summaries play this role in Acts especially in regards to Paul's missionary journeys (cf. Praeder (1981): 287). Berger argues that the *Peristasis* catalogue and the journey narrative, found together in the romances, are found separately in the New Testament; the first in the letters of Paul, the second in the journey narrative in Acts of the Apostles. Finally, Berger notes, Acts has no erotic motif nor a hero and heroine (cf. Koester (1982.1): 138).

Perhaps the work which epitomizes the search for literary parallels in content between the ancient romances and Acts of the Apostles is a short essay by S.P. Schierling and M.J. Schierling. The essay cites twelve characteristics which typify the ancient romances (travel, hero and heroines who are the image of perfection, who are faithful, and who are mistaken for deities, miracles and miraculous rescues, apparent deaths, suicides and suicidal tendencies, dreams and oracles, trial scenes, storm at sea or shipwreck, villains such as pirates, robbers, and witches, and a happy ending). Acts, the essay concludes, contains nine of these twelve features. For example, Acts has a number of heroes (rather than two) who encounter "riots, tumults, plots, dreams, visions, a shipwreck, and even a murder" (Schierlings: 85). Even though the participants' love of God, the strongest theme in Acts, displays no hint of passion or love story, fidelity toward the one loved remains as a common feature in both the ancient romances and Acts (Schierlings: 86). Other common features include: Paul viewed as a god (Acts 14:8-13; 28:3,6); numerous miracles (Acts 12:6); apparent deaths (Acts 9; 14:19-20; 20:9-12); a death-wish (Acts 7); dreams and visions which create action and serve as warning devices (Acts 10; 16:9-12); continuous trials; witchcraft (Acts 8); and villains (Jews and city magistrates rather than pirates or robbers). The Schierlings conclude, however, that Luke did not copy the Greek romances or create pure fiction.

Rather, the author sought to write a fluid piece that would appeal to his audience in a popular style. "There are too many items that Luke omits if this book were to be termed a romance" (Schierlings: 88).

Scholars, therefore, tend to stress similar content between the ancient Greek romances and the New Testament (especially Acts of the Apostles). Most cite the lack of some motif or theme such as a recognition scene between hero and heroine or lack of an erotic motif as evidence that parallels are relevant for parts of Acts but not for Acts as a whole (Conzelmann: 6-7; Pokorny: 233f., 242-244; Plümacher: (1984), 150-151; Robinson: 7). The nature of the ancient romances from this perspective appears as an accumulation of motifs. Thus, stock features such as travel, sea voyage/shipwreck, an erotic motif, or recognition scenes illustrate the 'essence' of the genre romance. Texts included in the genre have the right mix of motifs; texts excluded from the genre miss the 'essential' features. Such efforts highlight significant similarities and dissimilarities in theme and content; nevertheless, they force texts into a rigid pattern dominated by a checklist of prominent motifs. The approach proves inadequate to measure the potential social and cultural links between the texts. Nor does it allow for adaptation by the respective authors in the composition of their texts.

Related, less rigid efforts have drawn on recent work in narrative analysis and reader-response criticism to elucidate textual and contextual 'meanings'. Susan Praeder argues that content is simply too narrow a criterion for comparison between texts. She compares the ancient novels (the Greek romances are a sub-genre) and then Luke-Acts according to seven narrative categories: events and existence; structure and sequence; time and space; language and style, situations; experience and imagination; and creation and reading; the first five areas are textual comparisons, the remaining two contextual. She compares textual relationships but distinguishes between real authors and audiences and implied authors and reader(s). Real audiences, Praeder argues, may incorporate, reject, or remain indifferent to the role intended (or not intended) by the real author. The implied author and implied audience, on the other hand, represent "the identities of authors and audiences implied by narrative texts but not necessarily those of the real authors and real audiences outside narrative texts" (1981: 275). Her analysis attempts to reconstruct "the shared literary and cultural heritage of implied authors and implied audiences" (1981: 275).

Praeder corrects a common assumption of New Testament scholars, that the narrative world of the ancient novels is 'fictional,' whereas the ancient histories or biographies are 'historically true'. Ancient novels, she argues, tend to fictionalize but can include historical characters, events, and stylistic devices. No particular features are uniquely novelistic (except the heroes and heroines in the Greek romances). In turn, both ancient histories and biographies present fictional information. In addition, novels have more personal participants; these include persons from every age, sexual preference, occupation, and religious persuasion. Although most novels make no effort to develop biographical character or historical perspective, they have a biographical sequence with significant aspects placed in a succession of events. Indeed, the novel, like historiography, moves forward by chronological expressions, a contrast to the biography which develops along the line of anecdotes and topical arrangement (1981: 279).

Textually, Praeder argues, the ancient novel and Acts of the Apostles compare closely in the selection of events, characters, places and objects in the story, the propensity of direct discourse (scenic narrative time) and third person narration. The plot of Acts and the ancient novels have similar sequences in that the heroes or heroines in both participate in a series of adventures that result in penultimate scenes of trials or recognition (1981: 269). Likewise, Acts contains a mix of historical and fictional events, set within a fictional sequence; this includes the literary device of portraying Jesus' ministry as leading to a culmination at Jerusalem (Luke 9:51-19:44/48), a mission to Antioch (Acts 13:1-15:35), and Paul's various missions (15:36-19:40).

Praeder presents several parallel events shared by the Gospel of Luke and the ancient novels: infancy narratives (Luke 1-2; Alexander Romance; Daphnis and Chloe); presentation scenes (Mary and Joseph present Jesus in the temple of Jerusalem; Dionysius and Callirhoe present the child of

Chaereas and Callirhoe in a temple of Aphrodite); dinner parties which set the stage for teaching or story telling (Luke 5, 7, 11, 14; *The Life of Aesop*; *The Satyricon*); crucifixions (Luke 23; *Chaereas and Callirhoe*; *Ephesiaca*); and the discovery of an empty tomb (Luke 24; *Chaereas and Callirhoe*). Praeder notes also the biographical sequence in Luke which begins just before Jesus' birth and ends shortly after his death; however, the writer retains the impression of chronological movement thus appearing as historical information.

Stylistically, Luke-Acts and the ancient novels display the technique of backward references; however, the referents are often different. For example, allusions and quotes in the ancient novels generally come from such classics as Homer, Xenophon of Athens, and Thucydides; Luke-Acts draws primarily on the Greek Old Testament. Nevertheless, the writer of Luke-Acts drew on mainstream Graeco-Roman civilization; he refers to Zeus, Hermes, the goddess Artemis of Ephesus, the emperors Augustus and Claudius and the popular conventions of a prologue and sea journey (1981: 287f.). Praeder concludes:

As an ancient novel Luke-Acts exhibits historical and fictional events and existents, a tendency toward representation in fictional sequences of events, a variety of personal participants, a setting in the eastern Mediterranean, biographical sequence, chronological order, literary references, preference for scenic expression in the alternation between summary and scene, first person and third person narration, a narrative voice not attuned to verification, Roman imperial experience and imagination, and a religiously-motivated intention in pleasurable communication (1981: 288-289).

The agenda, however, differ. The writer of Luke-Acts addresses "a circle of readers versed in Scripture and in the story of 'the things that have come to fulfillment in our company'" (1981: 270; cf. 284); the ancient novels address those who seek "pleasurable communication" (1981: 270f.).

Praeder rightly notes that variation within a given genre will occur, presenting an important corrective to the stress on content and lists of motifs. Indeed, she notes significant literary features which highlight both the unique and common features in the ancient novels and Luke-Acts. Yet, several problems arise with her method. Her extensive list of typical features forces her to create a morasse of sub-genres (Greek romances are a sub-genre of the ancient novel; Luke-Acts is in a different sub-genre). It is not clear, for example, how one should compare Luke-Acts and the ancient novels when both exist in different sub-genres. In addition, Praeder rightly acknowledges the need to look at the social and cultural situation and observes that any "study of genre or genres must ultimately move 'beyond genre' to put genre in the context of additional literary, cultural, and communicative contexts" (1981: 278). Her failure to do so, however, limits the value of her observations. For example, Praeder assumes that the ancient novels existed merely for 'pleasurable communication' or entertainment. The debate over the potential role of religion in the genre should at least be acknowledged. B.E. Perry's interpretation, which seems to carry such weight with New Testament scholars, needs reevaluation.

A related approach uses reader-response criticism to investigate the literary environment against which a reading of the Gospel of Luke may have occurred (Kany). To determine how one might read this gospel at a particular time and place, Ronald Kany develops the heuristic fiction that a citizen and merchant of Ephesus, the same social class from which many Christians were drawn at this time, receives a copy of the Gospel of Luke around 170 C.E. (Kany: 75-77). This merchant, Kany assumes, would be familiar with the popular narrative romances by Chariton, Xenophon of Ephesus, Achilles Tatius, and the Greek original of *Apollonius of Tyre*. In addition, he would have read texts by orators such as Aelius Aristides and mythological anthologies such as that by Apollodorus.

Kany confines his remarks to the imaginary reader's reaction to the Lukan account of Jesus' death, burial, resurrection and appearances (Kany: 78). The reader, Kany argues, would notice an immediate difference. Luke has no separation of lovers whose continual search for one another over the breadth of the Mediterranean Sea dominates the narrative. Yet the merchant would be struck by the similarity in the language of the gospel, which fluctuates between the literary koine of Chariton (cf. Reiser (1984.2): 37; Pervo: 350f.)

and the more vulgar koine of Xenophon which comes close to Volkliteratur (Kany: 79). The conspicuous use of direct speech in the gospels, more characteristic of fictional material than, for example, of pure biographies would also strike the reader. Both also contain the constant appearance of multitudes who register admiration, adulation, and sympathy for the major characters.

Kany concludes, however, that the hellenistic reader would recognize that the gospel of Luke fit neither the novels, pure historiography, or biography (Kany: 89). Indeed, he argues, a naive reader of the second century would be surprised to find that the Gospel of Luke does not depict events from good Friday until Easter as an adventure. The reader, used to the plot of the ancient romance, anticipates that crucifixions and resurrections will be outrageous incidents that become the occasion for public debates, pathetic speeches, and thrilling entanglements (Kany: 90).

Kany offers important parallels to the narrative structures of these texts. In addition, his attempt to construct a particular pagan reading audience which may have come into contact with the Gospel of Luke in the second century represents a useful and potentially significant approach. Nevertheless, Kany like Praeder, assumes that religion in the ancient romances only occurs to entertain which limits the force of his narrative analysis. In addition, his reconstruction of second century Ephesus is quite inadequate. It is ironic that Kany, who seeks to describe a reader of second century Ephesus, never draws on the vast amount of archaeological, epigraphical, and numismatic information that has come from Ephesus over the past 100 years. Literary texts should no longer be seen as the sole source for the explication of the readership in specific social and cultural environments.

Significantly, several scholars combine detailed narrative comparisons of the ancient romances and the New Testament with an analysis of the social and cultural environment. This approach assumes that careful attention to the latter illuminates the contours of the world of these texts and offers clues to the role the texts played in their respective worlds. Richard Pervo, for example, defines the ancient romance according to three categories: 1) a prescriptive definition, 2) typical features found in a number of works considered as romances, and 3) a description of the cultural setting and social function (Pervo: 430ff.).

Prescriptively, Pervo argues, the ancient romance is an extensive work of prose fiction with complex plot and content. It addresses the 'personal and social aspirations' of an audience that identifies with the protagonists' struggle, vindication, and triumph over the mundane realities of life (Pervo: 434). Pervo catalogues typical features of the ancient novel under three headings: themes, motifs, and modes. Themes include politics (utopian schemes, ideal rulers), patriotism (an appeal to group consciousness), religion (the most extensive theme), wisdom, fidelity (love/sex, private/family loyalty), status (wealth, rank, education) (Pervo: 434f.). Motifs include most of the features addressed earlier: travel with the primary purpose the recovery of one's true identity; adventure/excitement including danger of death, suicide, failure/loss, trials, shipwreck, piracy, riots, imprisonment, execution, apparent death; warfare; aretology such as explicit miracles, deliverance by divine intervention, dreams, oracles and most major actions dictated by divine action; teratology including exotic and bizarre events, natural history, science, geography, anthropology, ethnography and all that is alien and unusual; court life and intrigue; rhetoric including speeches, sermons, and dialogues (Pervo: 438f.). The modes of presentation include the historical novel that has real persons in important roles, a historiographical style, and historical events; sentimental novels that evoke sympathy and a sentimental view of life; comic/satire that are realistic; missionary novels that are largely Christian works or works about teachers and cultic leaders that are propagandistic in tone (pp. 441f.).

According to Pervo, the authors of romances are intent to compose fiction for the principal reason of telling a "pleasing story that corresponds to some conventions of credibility" (Pervo: 442). The provenance of these works becomes clear in the creation of idealized characters who "edify the readership" and present "an inspirational message" (Pervo: 432-433). The romances are aretological because the plots of the novels display the god affecting the final victory of heroes and heroines and the ideals which they represent. Religion in the romances does not portray cult practices in mystery cults nor was it written simply to entertain.

Rather, it edifies by addressing the social and personal aspirations of individuals in society, esp. the bourgeoisie. The ancient novels are addressed to the individual who "powerless, friendless and frustrated in a vast and possible hostile world" could escape from the anxiety of this vastly enlarged cosmopolis with the "reassurance that things were really all right" (Pervo: 452). The ancient novels, read by social climbers (Pervo: 454), show how traditional values can work (Pervo: 453).

Pervo draws numerous parallels between the literary features of ancient novels and Acts of the Apostles. Dramatic speeches, miraculous prison escapes, the role of crowds, and public assemblies indicate that the author of Luke-Acts, like the ancient writers of novels, wrote his work primarily for entertainment (Pervo: 41f., 52, 82f.). Arrests, for example, are a literary device and not occasions to show how Christianity had to struggle for recognition (Pervo: 57). Likewise, the prison escapes in Acts 4, 5, 12, and 16 may formally show a new religion's triumph over opposition making it "edifying religious propaganda;" literally, however, these features are meant to amuse, entertain, and frighten (Pervo: 82). Adventure functions to entertain readers and communicate ideas. The Christian audience "could read of the thrilling escapades of their own heroes and breathe at ease as each one came to a happy ending" (Pervo: 90). This seems an odd statement in light of the stoning and death of Stephen in Acts 7.

Acts, according to Pervo, falls into the category of a religious historical novel. He sees Chariton's *Chaereas and Callirhoe* and Lucian's *Onos* as the best pagan parallels in style and social-cultural milieu (Pervo: 127; 394f; 553). Pervo suggests that an analysis of the literature and religions in the Roman era will illuminate the way persons addressed the issues of salvation (Pervo: 415). Indeed, he argues, the religious features of the novels have been under-rated and provide "important sources for our understanding of the feelings of common people in antiquity, not least for their religious feelings" (Pervo: 416). The happy ending of the romances, for example, exhibits a type of salvation as the protagonists in the historical novels, like the disciples in Acts, triumph with divine aid over disruptive external forces (Pervo: 445-454). Pervo concludes that as a popular writer, Luke stood "at the beginning of a type of Christian light reading that will flourish for fifteen centuries and survive into the present day" (Pervo: 108). Indeed, "popular entertainment, not church history, community life, unwillingness to repress unpleasant facts or other ideas, explain the stories of persecution in Acts" (Pervo: 103). Luke-Acts as a historical novel provided a means for the church to associate in a non-belligerent fashion with the Roman empire (Pervo: 127; 553-556). In effect, the author of Luke-Acts co-opted the strategy of the historical novel to present an alternative to the other-worldly concerns reflected in the gospel of Mark or gnostic writings of the period. The author lifts up traditional social values to the church and suggests that its readership work within the empire (Pervo: 555f.). "The worldly fortune of the Apostles provides the model for a new set of values that can make the good Christian and the good citizen one and the same" (Pervo: 334).

Clearly, Pervo has shown marked similarities in motifs and themes between Luke-Acts and the ancient novels. His three-fold approach moves toward greater clarification of the genre novel and provides an important model with which to compare the New Testament material. Pervo also acknowledges the complexity surrounding the role of religion in the ancient romance and even suggests that certain works operated as aretalogies (e.g., he views *Chaereas and Callirhoe* as a secular (?) aretalogy). In addition, his argument that Luke wrote to the community (or Church) offers an important corrective to the traditional New Testament position that the author wrote an 'apologetic' to Roman officials (e.g. Koester (1982.1): 323). Finally, he firmly shows that a relationship exists between the ancient novels and the New Testament corpus and illustrates in copious fashion the advantages of such a comparison.

Several cautionary remarks, however, must be made. Pervo tends to stress typical features and lists of parallels without explication of the unique application of these similarities in the respective texts. In addition, he uses a great variety of works, classified as ancient romances and novels written in Latin and Greek across a five hundred year span to create a "prescriptive" definition. He fails to take into careful consideration the literary epochs (presophistic and

sophistic) as well as the social and cultural conditions of each epoch and, indeed, each work. Five hundred years of history and literary tradition rolled into one common mass render a definition hopelessly broad. Paucity of texts during a particular epoch should not obviate a careful consideration of each text within its own social, cultural, and temporal context.

Pervo appears uncertain where the true nature of the romances (and Acts) lies. At several points he dismisses any equation of the ancient novels with religious propaganda and stresses the role of entertainment; elsewhere, he stresses that the ancient novels edified the social and personal aspirations of individuals. His conclusion that the primary function of the ancient romances is entertainment remains paradoxical in light of statements which describe them as 'edifying' with an 'inspirational message'. In addition, Pervo uses an incomplete model of the social and cultural conditions existing in the Graeco-Roman period. He argues that anxiety occurred for persons confronted with a plethora of religious options and a wide-open society. In this he agrees with Koester who sees the tremendous geographical terrain covered by the ancient romances reflecting the conditions created by the vast far-flung empire of Alexander the Great. Readers, Koester argues, take consolation in heroes and heroines who successfully navigate this vast terrain and are reconciled "with the powers of fate which often seem to render life meaningless" (Koester (1982.1): 137). S.R.F. Price has shown that a model of Graeco-Roman society which only assumes that persons felt "adrift in a world they could not comprehend or control" fails to account for the significant role that Greek cities in Asia Minor played for the political, social, and religious identity of their inhabitants (Price: 15f.; cf. Edwards: 176-177; 180). This carries special importance for work in the ancient romances because some writers, most notably Chariton of Aphrodisias, wrote their works amidst this socio-cultural context.

Finally, Pervo assumes that similarities in form and content between Acts and the ancient romance dictate that the message of Acts is the same, that is, edificatory but written primarily to entertain. This leaves out of consideration the adaptation and influence of Jewish tradition, differing literary sources, and a specific theological agenda by the author of Acts (cf. Praeder (1983): 288; Kee (1980: 146f.).

Howard Kee employs the tools of sociology of knowledge and cultural anthropology to ascertain the life-world of the ancient romances, that is, the "values, aspirations, views of God, world, evil, the nature of the group in which the author and his sympathetic readers find their personal identity" (Kee (1982): 396). Kee modifies the work of Merkelbach and Perry to set forth 'typical' features of the ancient romance, especially its form, content, and function. The subsequent 'ideal' romance which emerges has no independent life but serves as a heuristic model which highlights specific texts.

Kee's 'ideal' romance serves as propaganda for a cult and depicts a conversion experience. It uses a literary style which shifts between narrative and poetic form. Inner and external conflicts of the hero or heroine move the plot until deliverance occurs through divine action (cf. Koester (1982.1): 323). The story reaches a climax with the symbolic "death and re-birth of the hero or heroine, a theophany, and the self-dedication of the hero or heroine to the god" (Kee, (1982): 398). Kee argues that not all these 'typical' features in this 'ideal' romance appear in every romance. Yet, the thread which links such diverse texts as Philostratus' *Apollonius of Tyana*, Acts of the Apostles, Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* and the Greek romances, according to Kee, is not a few common motifs but a propagandistic function for a cult (e.g. Xenophon's *Ephesiaca* and Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*) or a philosophical view (*Apollonius of Tyana*) (Kee (1983): 252ff.). The particular propagandistic role played by the ancient romance depended on the outlook of a particular author who adopted and adapted the material and function of the ancient romance to suit a particular time and situation.

The author of Luke-Acts, Kee believes, employs the tradition and the techniques of the ancient romance, the most dramatic of his literary strategies, for his own propagandistic aims (Kee (1983): 192). The basic myth of Jesus and the narratives of his followers "demonstrate in a currently popular mode of religious propaganda the basis for a Christian faith and the ground of its efficacy as a way of life" (Kee (1983): 194). The use of this genre reflects the author of

Luke-Acts' open, inclusive attitude toward the Hellenistic-Roman culture. Kee concludes:

In the process of this portrayal of cosmic redemption Luke comes to terms with contemporary culture: in its popular philosophical concepts, its popular literary modes (both prose and poetry), and with such widespread phenomena as magic, with which the Christians will be in competition, and against which they must defend themselves. Further, Luke-Acts displays a central feature of religion in the Antonine period, ..., the importance of personal, life-transforming encounter with the divine (Kee (1983): 219).

No consensus in New Testament scholarship exists as to the extent, content, or function of the ancient romances. Research in the last decade, however, has clearly rendered false the still prevalent assumption of Dobschütz that one need only compare Luke-Acts to historiography and the apocryphal Acts to the ancient romances. Clearly how parallels are established distinguishes one's approach. The stress on parallels in content runs the danger of classifying the genre romance according to a set of motifs; the focus becomes the extent a work includes or omits select features that indicate the 'essence' of a genre. The use of narrative analysis presents significant observations on content, narrative scheme, and style but the tendency to downplay the socio-cultural environment of specific texts and genres severely limits their contribution. The effort to consider the initial (and subsequent) social and cultural contexts illuminates more fully the character and development of particular texts.

Future studies should continue to compare the ancient romances and the New Testament in theme, style, idiom, and readership. Content analysis, narrative criticism and reader-response criticism highlight narrative features and parallel content between texts. Scholars, however, must pay careful attention to the social and cultural contexts in which the material was read and understood. The creation of broad classificatory schemes of the genre which include content, form, and 'typical' function should also continue because they display important patterns that continue over a specific period of time. The heuristic role, however, of such schemes must be recognized. In addition, comparison between the New Testament and contemporary romances should merit attention. For example, Acts of the Apostles and *Chaereas and Callirhoe* are roughly contemporary; comparative analysis of their narratives within the early second century of the Graeco-Roman world should enhance our understanding of both texts.

The role of religion in the ancient romances remains a crux. Many New Testament scholars assume that the romances were written for entertainment. The role of the romances as propaganda for a cult or a philosophical position seems more on the right track although any easy equation with mystery cults should be considered with care; commentators on the ancient romances have shown how difficult this proposition is to prove (Hägg: 103-104; Reardon: 394f.). Whether one argues that religion is simply a literary device, an aretology, or a mark of the propagandistic character of a particular work makes a significant difference as to how one understands the meaning of these works. Careful analysis of the narrative and the socio-cultural environment should accompany whichever perspective one advocates. In addition, New Testament scholars tend to evaluate the role of religion in the ancient romances and in the New Testament from a particular Christian perspective that assumes religion must display some salvific quality (e.g., the conversion of persons). A broader definition of religion which takes into account the integrated relationship between the social, political, and religious elements of these works is necessary (Price, Edwards).

One thing is clear. Research should continue to cut across the boundaries of classics, biblical studies, archaeology, and anthropology, to bring a variety of approaches and disciplines to bear on the illumination of ancient texts amidst their social and cultural contexts. The eclectic nature of the texts demands nothing less.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Barrett, Charles K.
1961. *Luke the Historian in Recent Study*. London: Epworth Press.
- Bauer, F.C.,
1832. *Apollonius von Tyana und Christus*. Tübingen.
- Bauer, Walter
1979. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Second edition revised and augmented by F. Wilbur Gingrich and Frederick W. Danker from Bauer's fifth edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Beardslee, William A.
1970. *Literary Criticism of the New Testament*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- Berger, Klaus
1984. "Hellenistische Gattungen im Neuen Testament." in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt. Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung* 25.2. Ed. H. Temporini and W. Haase: 1031-1432; 1831-1885.
- Burchard, Christoph
1985. "Joseph and Aseneth: A New Translation and Introduction." In *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. volume 2. Ed. by James H. Charlesworth. Garden City, New York: Doubleday: 177-247.
- Cadbury, Henry J.
1955. *The Book of Acts in History*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Conzelmann, Hans
1963. *Die Apostelgeschichte*. Handbuch zum Neuen Testament 7 Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr.
- Derrett, J. Duncan M.
1984. "Palingenesia (Matthew 19:28)." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 20: 51-58.
- Dibelius, Martin
1956. "The Act of the Apostles in the Setting of the History of Early Christian Literature." In *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles*. Ed. Heinrich Greeven. London: SCM Press LTD.
- Dobschütz, E. von,
1901. "Der Roman in der altchristlichen Literatur." *Deutsche Rundschau*: 46-65.
- Doerr, H.
1938. "Die griechischen Romane und das Christentum." *Philologus* 93 (1938): 273-276.
- Edwards, Douglas R.
1985. "Chariton's *Chaereas and Callirhoe*: Religions and Politics Do Mix." *Society of Biblical Literature 1985 Seminar Papers* 24. Ed. Kent Harold Richards. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press: 175-181.
- Hägg, Tomas
1983. *The Novel in Antiquity*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Haenchen, Ernst
1971. *The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Kany, Roland
1986. "Der Lukanische Bericht von Tod und Auferstehung Jesu aus der Sicht eines hellenistischen Romanlesers." *Novum Testamentum XXVIII*. 1: 75-90.

- Kee, Howard C.
1980 Christian Origins in Sociological Perspectives: Methods and Resources. Philadelphia: Westminster Press.
- 1982 "The Socio-cultural Setting of Joseph and Aseneth." New Testament Studies 29: 394-413.
- 1983 Miracle in the Early Christian World: A Study in Sociohistorical Methods New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Koester, Helmut
1972 "Romance, Biography, and Gospel. The Genre of the Gospels." Working Papers of the Task Group in the Genre of the Gospels. Missoula: Scholars Press: 120-148.
- 1982.1 History, Culture, and Religion of the Hellenistic Age. Volume I. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- 1982.2 History and Literature of Early Christianity. Volume II. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- Perkins, Pheme
1972 "Ut Mireris: Origins, Traditions and Ideologies in the Study of Ancient Literary Genres (Mark and Apuleius)." Working Papers of the Task Group in the Genre of the Gospels. Missoula: 149-173.
- Pervo, Richard I.
1979 "The Literary Genre of the Acts of the Apostles." Th. D. Dissertation. Harvard Divinity School.
- Plümacher, Eckhard
1972 Lukas als hellenistischer Schriftsteller. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht.
- 1978 "Apocrypha Apostelakten." In Pauly-Wissowa's Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft. Supplement XV: 11-70.
- 1984 "Acta-Forschung 1974-1982." Theologische Rundschau 49.2: 138-153.
- Pokorny, P.
1973 "Die Romfahrt des Paulus und der antike Roman." Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 64: 233-244.
- Praeder, Susan M.
1981 "Luke-Acts and the Ancient Novel." in Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers 20. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 269-292.
- 1984 "Acts 27:1-28:16: Sea Voyages in Ancient Literature and the Theology of Luke-Acts." Catholic Biblical Quarterly 46.4: 683-706.
- Price, Simon R.F.
1984 Rituals and Power: The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Radl, Walter
1975 Paulus und Jesus im lukanischen Doppelwerk: Untersuchungen zu Parallelmotiven im Lukasevangelium und in der Apostelgeschichte. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Reardon, B.P.
1971 Courants littéraires grecs des II^e et III^e siècles après J. -C. Annales littéraires de l'Université de Nantes 3. Paris: 309-412.
- Reiser, Marius
1984.1 "Der Alexanderroman und das Markusevangelium." Ed. H. Cancik. Markus-Philologie. Historische, literargeschichtliche und stilistische Untersuchungen zum zweiten Evangelium. WUNT 33. Tübingen: 131-163.
- 1984.2 Syntax und Stil de Markusevangeliums im Licht der hellenistischen Volksliteratur. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr.
- Robinson, William C., Jr.
1976 s.v. "Acts, Genre." International Dictionary of the Bible Supplement: 6-7.
- Sandy, Gerald N.
1974 "Recent Scholarship on the Prose Fiction of Classical Antiquity." The Classical World: 321-359.
- Schierling S.P., Schierling, M.J.
1978 "The Influence of the Ancient Romances on Acts of the Apostles." Classical Bulletin 54: 81-88.
- Tiede, David L.
1984 "Religious Propaganda and the Gospel Literature of the Early Christian Mission." Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt. Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung 25.2. Ed. H. Temporini and W. Haase: 1705-1729.
- Van der Horst, P.W.,
1983.1 "Chariton and the New Testament." Novum Testamentum 25.4: 348-355.
- 1983.2 "Hellenistic Parallels to the Acts of the Apostles 1: 1-26." Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 74: 17-26.