THE ROMANCE OF THE NOVEL

By E. L. BOWIE AND S. J. HARRISON

In memoriam J. P. Sullivan

I. INTRODUCTION

Students of the ancient world are falling for the ancient Greek and Latin novels in increasing numbers, a state of affairs of which there were few intimations a generation ago. To be sure, the *Satyrica* of Petronius and the *Metamorphoses* of Apuleius were given standing-room on the edge of the classical canon, though few scholars and fewer students made the acquaintance of the complete texts. Encounters were usually restricted to the *Cena Trimalchionis* and *Cupid and Psyche*, and linguistic oddities were the chief topics of polite conversation (nothing evil in this, so long as other topics are not barred). There were of course exceptions, like Eduard Fraenkel's Oxford seminar on Petronius in 1958/9, where study of language was but one of many techniques harnessed to the establishment and interpretation of the whole text. The Greek novels were still wallflowers: partly, no doubt, because they constituted only a small portion of a vast Greek prose literature written in a period generally judged decadent, whereas the Latin novels were welcome and substantial contributors to the comparatively exiguous remains of Latin prose written by Romans at their imperial acme. No explosion of interest had followed Rohde's *Der griechische Roman und seine Vorläufer* of 1876, and although some important work was done on establishment and interpretation of texts and on the development of the genre, scholars active in this field were isolated from each other and their results made little impact on their colleagues. Furthermore much of that work was focused, like Rohde's, on trying to elucidate the genre's origins.

Now the ancient novel has become one of the hottest properties in town, even if its pursuit is still seen as trivial by the strait-laced. The novels are worked upon by scholars and students in many universities, even the oldest and most conservative, and conferences and newsletters allow aficionados to exchange ideas on strategies of approach. Important landmarks have been the two international conferences, the first organized by Bryan Reardon at Bangor in 1976, the second by James Tatum at Dartmouth (NH) in 1989. The subject's expansion is reflected in the growth in the number of papers (from fifty to over a hundred) and in the range of their themes: see the abstracts in Reardon (1977) and Tatum and Vernazza (1990). What factors have opened scholars' eyes to the novel's attractions, and what are the *loci amoeni* of scholarship where it basks in its fans' attentions?

Some factors that have made the novel so alluring can readily be suggested. As the 'central' texts of the classical period have become progressively over-grazed scholars have looked to new pastures. The rediscovery of the Greek novel is part of the rediscovery of imperial Greek literature as a whole. But within that literature the Greek novels, like Petronius and Apuleius in Latin literature, stand outside canonical genres, and such forbidden fruit is especially enticing to a generation that esteems the non-canonical and potentially subversive. Their subject-matter promises rewards to investigators of religion, of the place of women in society, and of perceptions of sexuality in the ancient world — all fashionable areas of research. Their form, extended prose fiction, stands much closer than (e.g.) epic, tragedy or historiography to the literary taste of a century in which its descendants constitute the major international literary currency, and they are therefore an inviting field for the application of literary theory nurtured chiefly by the studies of the modern novel. The 1976 conference was a vital dating-agency, but the novel was waiting to be taken out.

The enticing characteristics have naturally influenced the way scholars have proceeded with courtship. The most important is that they have started to take the novels seriously as literature. For the Greek novels the first mark of literary awakening might be held to be Perry's early piece 'Chariton and his romance from a literary-historical point of view' (1930). Two decades passed before in successive years Hefti published a serious study of Heliodorus' narrative technique and Perry delivered (in 1951) his Sather lectures on novels both Greek and Roman (Hefti (1950), Perry (1967)). Perry's lectures urged us to shift attention from origins to study of the novel as an autonomous genre ('its inventor . . . conceived it on a Tuesday afternoon in July': Perry (1967), 175); and in the sixteen years between their delivery and publication this message seems somehow to have been communicated. Much of the work in the last three decades on the Greek novels (as on the Latin) has been concentrated on investigation of their literary aims and techniques (see below III.2.2–4); and many classicists engaged in this work have been alert to developments made in critical theory by scholars working in modern literatures. Structuralism and especially narratology have been effectively exploited, the latter perhaps best exemplified by Winkler (1982) on Heliodorus and (1984) on Apuleius (see further below III.2.4, IV.2.2, V.2.2). The general principle that the novels merit study as literary texts has now been established and is unlikely to be overthrown.

An integral part of any such study is examination of style and of language. Here too advances have been made, and they may be claimed as more solid: a lexicon once compiled (if accurately!) or an inventory of places where hiatus is tolerated (if complete!) may outlive today's and even tomorrow's fashionable literary theory. Not that the area lacks controversy. Different views have been taken, for example, of Chariton's linguistic level, and the most recent contribution (Ruiz-Montero (1991)) forms only part of a wider investigation. More analysis remains to be done, above all on Heliodorus (see further III.2.1, IV.2.1, V.2.1). Its results may bear on several other issues.

First, the level at which the novelists write and expect to be read. Linguistic and stylistic refinement and extensive allusion to earlier and respectable literary texts mark both the Latin novels and all but Xenophon's Ἐφεσιακά among the five major Greek texts. Does this imply educated readers, or merely educated writers who are not inclined to talk down to their readership? This issue of readership is still unresolved (see further III.2.7).

Second, chronology. Readers of the Latin novels are fortunate to have relatively secure dates for their composition: Petronius under Nero, Apuleius in the second half of the second century A.D. But in the Greek novels internal indications are so sparse that Rohde arranged the sequence almost in the reverse order of that now accepted. Papyri have established *termini ante quos* for Chariton and Achilles, and Xenophon is generally agreed to follow Chariton, perhaps *c*. A.D. 125–150. But how early was Chariton writing? Papanikolaou (1973b) thought his immunity to Atticism placed him as early as the first century B.C., a view shared by Dihle (1978 and 1989), but the results of the lexical work of Ruiz-Montero (1980, 1991) would allow the late first century A.D. Unfortunately the same uncertainty affects the end of the sequence. Does Heliodorus belong in the same generation as Philostratus (*c*. A.D.220–240), or rather in the second half of the fourth century, as argued e.g. by van der Valk (1941) and Colonna (1950), cf. Perry (1967), 349 n. 13? The debate has turned on the relationship of Heliodorus' account of the siege of Syene (9.1–10) to Julian's of the siege of Nisibis (A.D. 350) in his third *oration* (A.D. 357). The arguments for Heliodorus' priority (Weinreich (1962), Szepessy (1976), Maróth (1979), Lightfoot (1988)) are persuasive but not conclusive. The bulk of our early third-century and late fourth-century Greek texts is such that it should be possible to settle the problem by systematic linguistic analysis, hitherto lacking for Heliodorus.

The fact that we are uncertain about the dates of both the earliest and what may well be the latest of the famous five undermines any attempt to assess the literary or social significance of the genre as a whole. In purely literary terms, how can we assess what Heliodorus is doing if we do not know whether he is running with a pack or revitalizing an already obsolete form? Or the bearing of the Greek novel on Petronius if we do not know what types of Greek novel already circulated by the 60s A.D.? Scholars have also attempted to identify features of the novels that catered to the needs of their early readers and so to offer some explanation of why the genre flourished when it did, e.g. Reardon (1969), or why it died. But the social and political climate of the Greek world was very different in 100 B.C. from A.D. 70, and in A.D. 230 from A.D. 360, and indeed a genre that flourished for 130 years may require different explanations from one that lasted for nearly 500.

Chronology must also be settled before we can get nearer to solving a number of important aspects of the novels' relation to other phenomena. Their relation to other Greek literature of their time is an issue of limited significance: Lucian's relation to Antonius Diogenes, or Alciphron's and Aelian's to Longus, would be clearer if we had dates for the two novelists. But chronology necessarily bears also on the use of the novels to illuminate the society of the imperial Greek world. That they can and should be so used is beyond doubt, cf. Bowie (1977). Although their characters and plots are fictional, the novelists work hard to anchor them in a world that is recognizable and plausible. The proportion of that plausible picture drawn from the contemporary world will vary, depending partly, of course, on whether the setting is in the classical period, as in Chariton, Heliodorus and in a sense Longus, or 'contemporary', as in the Latin novelists and, it would appear, Xenophon and Achilles Tatius. But the work of the last twenty-five years has disentangled much that is useful and usable on both *Realien* and *mentalité*, and it is important to be sure to what historical period these relate (see below III.2.6, IV.2.3, V.2.7).

Two issues of *mentalité* deserve special mention. One is religion. All the novels reflect pagan attitudes to the involvement of the gods in human affairs, but Longus and Book XI of the *Metamorphoses* also offer miraculous instances of divine assistance. Was Kerényi (1927) right to argue that the Greek novels were mystery texts in which names, objects and episodes had special meaning for initiates? His thesis was pushed further by Merkelbach (1959 and 1962) and three decades of scepticism have been unable to lay this ghost, or that of the more nuanced presentation of *Daphnis and Chloe*'s religiosity made by Chalk (1960). But there have been convincing rebuttals of Merkelbach's general thesis — Turcan (1963), Berti (1967), Geyer (1977) — as of the related reading of the Φοινικικά by Henrichs (1972). Merkelbach has held to his interpretation, and has carried it further for Longus in a wide-ranging examination of Dionysiac cult and symbolism in the Roman Empire, Merkelbach (1988). Enticing though many details are, the general thesis remains unconvincing, cf. Reardon (1990a). As for the Roman novels, even Merkelbach has not tried to produce a mystical or religious interpretation of Petronius' *Satyrica*, though the Quartilla-episode does seem to offer some kind of parodic initiation into

the mysteries of Priapus (*Sat.* 16–21), which could conceivably be taken as evidence of earlier Greek novels. Apuleius, on the other hand, was the first and most convincing witness in Merkelbach (1962), and Isiac religion and allegory must play a part in interpreting his narrative, though the degree of symbolism and its level of seriousness are both disputed (see v.2.6).

The second is women. It is predictable that this generation's work on novels should be concerned with their presentations of women and sexuality, and several issues are currently being pursued with profit (note some papers in Liviabella Furiani and Scarcella (1989)). Can the presentation of women in the Greek novels be brought to bear upon the issue of their readership (cf. iii.2.7)? How should we reconcile the strong characters and often dominant roles given to women in the Greek novels with their subordination to men and the limitations put on their public role in Greek society (cf. Egger (1988), Wiersma (1990); it is to be hoped Egger (1990) will soon be published)? Should any novelist be seen as questioning that subordination? Winkler (1990) noted that in Longus Chloe's initial precocity gives way to initiatives taken by Daphnis, but was probably wrong to see in this the writer's condemnation of socialization rather than the observation that girls mature earlier (which in turn rather suits his plot); and certainly wrong to see the violence of penetration as something Longus presents as belonging to 'culture', cf. Montague (1992). The presentation of women in Petronius and Apuleius also provides rich material for investigation, and much remains to be done here. Female figures in Petronius usually relate closely to satirical stereotypes of vulgarity and sexual insatiability (e.g. Quartilla, Fortunata and Circe), while those in Apuleius include more realistic types, such as the motherly *matrona* Byrrhaena, as well as the violent witch Meroe and the sexually athletic slave girl Fotis. In Apuleius there is also the question of how the various female figures in the narrative prefigure (usually by opposition) the appearance of the saving female divinity Isis at the novel's end: the material on this is best collected in Fick-Michel (1991), though many had noted, for instance, the parallels between Fotis and Isis.

The issues highlighted above are pursued further in the survey that follows. It concentrates on work since 1967 (the year of Perry's major contribution, and a convenient quarter-century ago) but mentions some significant antecedents. This and Sections ii and vi are by both authors, Section iii is by ELB, Sections iv and v by SJH.

II. BIBLIOGRAPHY AND GENERAL WORKS

Systematic bibliographies reach 1970: Mazal (1962–3, 1964) and Sandy (1974), but cf. Gärtner (1980) and, for Petronius, Schmeling and Stuckey (1977), M. S. Smith (1985). For Apuleius there is a real need for a systematic bibliography updating Schlam (1971). For the Greek novels a systematic *Bericht* in *Lustrum* by Reardon is due in 1995 or 1996. Bibliographies on diverse scales can be found in general works, monographs, editions and translations, and regular notices of recent books and articles in Schmeling (1976–). *ANRW* has reached the Latin novels (Smith (1985)) but promises only a modest coverage of the Greek. Good guides to recent trends are the abstracts of the ninety or so papers delivered at the 1989 International Conference on the Ancient Novel in Dartmouth (NH), colloquially ICAN 2 (Tatum and Vernazza (1990)); the publications of the Groningen Colloquia edited by their chief organizer (Hofmann (1988, 1989, 1990, 1992)); and of a Colloque at the École Normale Supérieure pour jeunes filles (Baslez and Trédé (1992)). Note too a conference particularly but not solely on Byzantine and Modern Greek descendants (Beaton (1988)).

Some works discuss both Greek and Latin novels. The best general introduction is that of Hägg (1983), especially interesting on ancient readers and modern European reception, discussed and illustrated more fully in the original Swedish edition, Hägg (1980). Holzberg (1986) comes a close second. Anderson (1984) is speculative in discussion of origins (see further iii.2.2 below); Heiserman (1977) is sometimes more profound and stimulating, but mixes uncomfortably chapters of summary and basic analysis with dialogues tackling fundamental theoretical issues. Thoughtful treatment of the central problems is found in the collective work whose editor and chief contributor is Kuch (1989). We have not read Miralles (1968) or Gual (1988).

III. THE GREEK NOVEL

III.1 BASIC TOOLS

III.1.1 *Texts of complete works*
Only Heliodorus lacks a recent edition; the latest to reach completion was Rattenbury, Lumb and Maillon (1935–). Chariton is now in Budé: the revision by Billault (1989) has purged some of the many errors of the first edition (Molinié (1979)), on which cf. Reardon (1982). Reardon is preparing

a Teubner. Like Chariton, Xenophon depends solely on Laur.conv.soppr. 627. The Teubner (Papanikolaou (1973a)) is some improvement on Dalmeyda's Budé. I have not seen Miralles (1967).

The Budé Longus (Vieillefond (1987)) has an introduction of 209 pages, perhaps excessive for a text of 107 pages. Reeve's Teubner (1982) offers a more radical text. He rejects the notion of author variants (Young (1968), Reeve (1969), an inadequate riposte by Young (1971)). Like Reeve and Vieillefond, Schönberger (1960) is based chiefly on the two manuscripts (Laur.conv.soppr. 627 and Vat.gr. 1348) whose importance was shown by van Thiel (1961), cf. Reeve (1979): he has a good introduction, selective notes and nice photographs of Roman paintings.

The Teubners of Xenophon and of Longus are especially valuable in having complete *indices verborum*. For Achilles Tatius Vilborg's edition (1955) is now superseded both by Garnaud's Budé (1991) which takes account of the joins between the Robinson and Cologne papyri (covering 3.17–25) established by Willis (1990) and by that of Yatromanolakis (1990) which does not (see also III.1.3).

III.1.2 *Lexica*

Although the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* CD-ROM now has texts of all the novelists, uses remain for the *Alphabetical Keyword-in-Context Concordance* to the Greek Novelists (*Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*, Irvine (1979)) issued in microfiche, and for the Italian lexicon now half-way to completion (Conca, De Carli, Zanetto (1983, 1989)). Scholars benefit from the careful classifications offered there (though reviewers have spotted inaccuracies) and in the only complete lexicon to a novelist, Achilles Tatius (O'Sullivan (1980)).

III.1.3 *Commentaries*

Vilborg's commentary on Achilles Tatius (1962) remains valuable for grammatical and textual points, but much more literary help (192 pages of introduction and almost 180 of commentary and appendices) is now offered by the more voluminous Yatromanolakis (1990). Those who do not read modern Greek may still turn to Carney (1960) on Book III or to the notes in the translation of Plepelits (1980). Good introductions and notes are attached to the German translations of Chariton by Plepelits (1976) and Lucke-Schäfer (1985). For Longus there is much acute literary exegesis in Schönberger (1960), though it falls short of a systematic commentary. For Xenophon and Heliodorus there has been nothing fuller than the footnotes in Budés and some translations. Ewen Bowie and John Morgan are preparing commentaries on Longus, John Morgan also on the last two books of Heliodorus.

III.1.4 *Translations*

Translations of single authors are numerous, of groups of texts occasional; but Reardon (1989) is the first English omnibus translation. By various expert hands, with introductions and some up-to-date basic reading, as well as the famous five it includes the Lucianic *Ass* (but not the summary of the *Metamorphoses* that Photius ascribes to Lucius of Patrae); the Alexander Romance; Apollonius King of Tyre (from the Latin version which alone survives); Photius' summaries of Antonius Diogenes' *The Wonders beyond Thule* and Iamblichus' *Babyloniaca*; and the more substantial papyrus fragments.

III.1.5 *Fragments*

The fragments have become much more accessible with their publication in a complete edition, with translation and commentary, by Stephens and Winkler (1993). For Iamblichus' *Babyloniaca* Habrich (1960) will remain valuable because it sets Photius' summary alongside quoted fragments, as does the equally durable edition of Antonius Diogenes by Fusillo (1990). Scholars will also continue to consult Kussl (1991) for his exhaustive treatment of the four Ninus fragments — setting them in the wider contexts of Ninus–Semiramis legends — and of *Herpyllis* and the two fragments of a tale close to that of Apollonius of Tyre.

Two of the Ninus fragments (A and B) have, like *Chione*, been known since 1893 and are still our earliest manifestly novelistic texts, even if their appearance on the recto of a papyrus whose verso bears documents of A.D. 100–101 and whose script can be dated between 50 B.C. and A.D. 50 gives only a very imprecise *terminus ante quem*. Other papyri add invaluable evidence for the shape and extent of the form. Thus the *Iolaus* (Parsons (1971, 1974)) backs up the evidence of Lollianus' Φοινικικά (Heinrichs (1972)) that there were forms of Greek prose fiction both more sensational and stylistically and morally cruder than the surviving 'ideal' romances. Henrich's religious interpretation (after Merkelbach, see I above) was simultaneously countered by Sandy (1979), Winkler (1980), and Jones (1980). *Iolaus'* mixture of prose and verse (bizarrely, Sotadeans!) has naturally prompted speculation about Petronius' knowledge of Greek cousins (see below IV.2.4).

Metiochus and Parthenope, of which fragments appeared in 1895, 1933 and — linking the earlier two — 1976 (Maehler (1976)) has an episode set in the court of Polycrates; this corroborates existing indications (cf. especially Chariton, with Billault (1989)) that a favoured novelistic voice was that of a historian of the classical period. Its adaptation in an eleventh-century Persian verse romance both helps us to reconstruct the plot and points to popularity, cf. Hägg (1984, 1985, 1987, 1989).

III.2   ISSUES OF INTERPRETATION

III.2.1   *Language and style*
        Style is a fundamental element of literary craft. It can guide us to the genre or to the level in a literary hierarchy in which an author expects his work to be placed, or by corollary to the sort of readers he envisages. It can also have fringe benefits for dating. Thus avoidance of hiatus examined by Reeve (1971) suggests high aspirations, even in Chariton. These are corroborated by the sophistic elements detected in his *Kunstprosa* by Hernandez Lara (1990). Even the apparently naïve and unpretentious style of Xenophon has been defended as conscious and hence literary ἀφέλεια (Turasiewicz (1990)). In this way Chariton and perhaps Xenophon are brought nearer in literary intent to the 'sophistic' novelists. A gap can still be discerned, perhaps overstressed by Zanetto (1990), who sees Longus' style as intermediate between the linear plainness of Chariton and Xenophon and the allusiveness and verbal play of Achilles and Heliodorus. Yet Chariton is not so plain, and Longus, alone of other novelists so far to have attracted such close linguistic analysis as Chariton, is plain only by art. Hunter (1983), 84–98 presents an excellent analysis of his 'prose-poetry' version of *koine* Greek (cf. Schönberger (1960), 39–41); this complements Hunter's analysis of 'literary texture' (1983), 59–83, in which he demonstrates the density and subtlety of Longus' allusion to earlier literature — prominently, of course, to pastoral poetry, a debt often discussed. Together these features locate Longus' novel among the highly imitative and allusive texts of the Second Sophistic, and join with analyses of structure and technique to help us decide *how* we should read his novel.

III.2.2   *General literary accounts*
        What sort of works are the novels, where are they to be located in relation to earlier and contemporary Greek literature, how do they handle structure, narrative and character, and what range of effects do they aim to achieve and by what means? These issues have played parts of varying importance in works offering general interpretations of the Greek novel (as they have in monographs and articles on individual novelists, cf. below III.2.3).
        Until recently general accounts of the Greek novel have not been numerous. Some books have treated them alongside the rather different Latin novels (see above II), and until recently only the slim Weinreich (1962) was solely devoted to the Greek, although in more wide-ranging literary histories there could be found a full and fundamental account by Reardon (1971) and rather thinner introductions by C. W. Müller (1981) and Bowie (1985). The best short introduction is still an article by Reardon (1969).
        The years 1989–91, however, saw the publication of three books which exemplify the subject's vigour and the range of approaches that can help us to map out its problems. Fusillo (1989) pursues three main themes, better brought out by his original Italian sub-title *Polifonia ed Eros* than by the blander *Le naissance du roman grec*: the novels' relation to earlier literature, not to understand origins (Genettics now replace genetics) but to explore the effects that novelists achieve by re-use of and allusion to earlier texts, including the sophisticated Achilles Tatius' pastiche of his novelistic predecessors (97–108); narrative voices (128–93); and the representation of love itself (195–257).
        Billault (1991) explores the novels by a number of soundings. First comes their presentation of *places* — more realistic than sometimes asserted, with aspects carefully selected to contribute just what the story requires. Next is manipulation of dramatic *time*, where Chariton's skill is brought out as clearly as Heliodorus' complexity — sub-categories of anticipations, recapitulations and digressions are joined more surprisingly by prudence, pessimism and the involvement of Fortune and divine jealousy. There follow *Les personnages*, including an important discussion of the typology of novelistic characters (151–64); *L'aventure* — its constituents and interpretation, and its exemplification of *la création romanesque*; and finally *L'œuvre*, an examination of the construction and roles of ecphrasis and digression. Billault's zeal for abstraction and categorization, with streaks of structuralism but little narratological jargon, marks his work as characteristic of a relatively traditional French approach just as Fusillo's fondness for polysyllabic terminology (*metadiégétique* and the like) aligns him with state-of-the-art Italian criticism.
        Reardon (1991) is written with a readiness to abstract and to theorize that betrays one of his *tria corda* as French, but a pragmatic clarity that marks another as Anglo-Saxon. After an introductory orientation (3–14), he takes his readers through romances (his preferred term) in a sequence offering progressive understanding — Chariton, Longus, Xenophon, Achilles, Heliodorus, then a glance at

Latin novels and fragments (15–45). The ground thus prepared, the following chapters set the novels' production fruitfully in the context of ancient literary theory. 'The Content of Romance: the Idea of Fiction' (15–45) and 'The Manner and Medium of Romance: Narrative Prose' (46–76) discuss 'the attitudes, thinking and practice already existing in the literary tradition': 'Problems and Solutions' (97–126) explores how the novelists' *praxis* might be seen as responding to this tradition. 'Context and Contacts' (127–68) ranges through other genres which have romantic elements, not to see how they contribute to our novels but to test in what ways they are similar and different. A final chapter briefly juxtaposes three general explanations of the genre — Frye's movement from alienation to identity, that offered by Perry and earlier developed by Reardon himself (1969) which sees it as a vehicle to salvation for the Hellenistic reader isolated in a vast impersonal world, and the religious explanation of Kerényi and Merkelbach — and concludes that 'romance does reflect primarily a condition of society', and that it was the change from an open to a closed society with institutionalized Christianity that prevented the romance developing into the modern form of the novel (178).

III.2.3   *Studies of single authors*

Monographs have been relatively numerous, and often aim to give a balanced account rather than press a particular thesis. The Twayne World Authors series has good introductions to Chariton (Schmeling (1974)), Xenophon (Schmeling (1980)), and Heliodorus (Sandy (1982a)). Like Gärtner's magisterial Pauly piece on Xenophon (1967) these are commissioned works, accommodated to the purpose of the series in which they appear. So far Hunter (1983) and MacQueen (1990 — a sensible introduction) are the English-speaking world's only monographs that manifestly result from scholarly investigation into specific aspects of a novelist's craft, but these are more numerous in continental Europe.

Not surprisingly in dealing with a genre whose defining characteristic is narrative prose fiction, many monographs are especially focused on structure and narrative technique (Hefti (1950), Scarcella (1968a), Hägg (1971)) as are a number of articles whose contribution makes them as important as the monographs: Scarcella (1981), Morgan (1982), Reardon (1982a), Winkler (1982), Fusillo (1988), Morgan (1989a and 1989b), Most (1989). In other monographs — as in general accounts such as that of Billault (1991), cf. III.2.2 — narrative technique still consumes a lion's share of discussion (Feuillâtre (1966), Pinheiro (1987)), with the predictable exception of works on Longus (see further III.2.4). Since the late 1970s almost all have adopted a self-consciously narratological approach and demonstrated how much this approach can contribute: contrast the titles of Scarcella (1968a) and (1981), and note the more traditional techniques of Reardon (1982).

III.2.4   *How should the novelists be read?*

How do we read the novelists once we have been intellectually prepared by these recent studies? Chariton and Xenophon are generally reckoned to have straightforward story-telling as their goal (with the exception of the religious interpretation, cf. 1) so attention has been on theme, structure, and narrative technique (Reardon (1982a), cf. Hägg (1971)). But for the 'sophistic' trinity of Longus, Achilles, and Heliodorus the issue is more complex.

In the case of Longus it seems clear that, on one level, his work should be read as a carefully crafted variant on the trite novelistic plot, allusions to which cross with those to other literature to keep well-educated readers on their toes. But at what ends does this crafty allusion aim? How does it square with the insistent naïvety of language and of the characters that Longus gives to his hero and heroine? Does the close but soft focus on adolescent sexuality convict Longus of lubricious pornography, or do this and other breaches of literary taste mark him as a humorous parodist, cf. Anderson (1982)? Or does Longus attempt to strike a balance between the serious and humorous, as suggested by Reardon (1990b)? Moreover, what message, if any, has Longus about the relation between φύσις and τέχνη? This and related issues have been explored by Zeitlin (1990), Goldhill (1990) and Teske (1991). All in some measure see Longus' preoccupation with the place of τέχνη in his story as reflecting on his own writing.

The other two 'sophistic' novelists also play off their effects against the simpler narratives and tropes of such writers as Chariton and Xenophon, types that their readers must surely be assumed to know even if they do not know the two novels which survive for us. Achilles' apparently crude and ill-judged exploitation of novelistic conventions can be countered by the argument of Anderson (1982) (in this case on firmer ground than in Longus) that it is deliberate parody (cf. Fusillo (1989) and III.2.2). The inference based on the mismatch of opening and closing location that he is clumsy or slipshod has been ingeniously countered by Most (1989). Moreover, although Heliodorus emerges as the more sophisticated writer in the elegant and telling exploration of the substantial differences between his and Achilles Tatius' uses of dreams and *ecphraseis* (in the ancient sense of descriptions of scenes and objects) presented by Bartsch (1989), nevertheless Achilles emerges as a subtle craftsman too.

But it is in Heliodorus that the Greek novelist's craft covers its widest range and reaches its greatest heights. It was with Hefti (1950) that serious study of Heliodorus' narrative technique began, to be continued by Feuillâtre (1966). Since the Bangor conference major contributions have been made by Pinheiro's book (1987) and by articles by Morgan and Winkler. A group of articles by Morgan (developing his Oxford D.Phil. thesis) explores Heliodorus' historiographic pose — how he establishes it and to what end, Morgan (1982); the importance of Cnemon's story as a foil to that of Theagenes and Charicleia and as an enhancement of Arsace's threat to Theagenes, Morgan (1989a); and the effects achieved in the ending of the Αἰθιοπικά, Morgan (1989b). Their clear marshalling of telling points makes them an excellent introduction to the novel.

I shall devote what may seem disproportionate space to Winkler (1982), partly because it is itself an article of Heliodoran complexity and subtlety that requires several readings, partly because it is a palmary example of the narratological approaches variously exploited in works already mentioned. Winkler advances several theses which converge to explain the apparent mendacity of Kalasiris in saying nothing of his earlier visit to Aithiopia in his narrative to Knemon and in denying understanding of the oracle given at Delphi. Heliodorus' alternative explanations of phenomena — either as natural or as acts of a provident or malicious divinity — are scrutinized and sub-divided to yield the conclusion that their chief role is reflexive. Thus (122) 'in the *Aithiopika* the only theology to be found is a vague and shifting set of contrasts between provident/malevolent and provident/indifferent'. These references to providence (122) 'are not meant philosophically or religiously but rather as reflexive allusions to the novel's own structure of progressive and problematic intelligibility'. The apparent contradiction between those which seem to credit providence and those which are 'cynical' is explained by a third group 'centering on the aesthetics of the romance' (127), so that the novel 'is a palimpsest, written on the tablet of naïve romance, and one of its fascinating reinterpretations of the underlying conventions is the tentative exploration of a naturalistic explanation of the romantic plot' (128). Kalasiris' adoption of both tones shows him to be 'the best single representative of the mind of the author himself', and his suspension of judgement about Charicleia's identity and about the oracles reveals him as 'the reader whom *Charikleia* the novel and Charikleia the heroine require' (136). In his final section ('What Kalasiris knew') Winkler argues that Kalasiris is not lying in claiming not to understand the oracle given at Delphi. To abbreviate and gloss his own summary (139), 'the narrative of Kalasiris to Knemon is a model, partly ironic, of how authors and readers play the game of literature together . . . Knemon is an aggressively romantic reader'. Hence the low and comic Knemon homes in on the love story of hero and heroine once touched on by Kalasiris and does not see (as the reader should) the elements which constitute Kalasiris' own story and search. 'In the final pages (x 39–41) Heliodorus reformulates what the whole plot means, in a way which corresponds to Kalasiris' primary quest for divine wisdom rather than to Knemon's desire for a smashing romance' (139). Thus, when the couple are saved by the decision that the gods want human sacrifice abolished, 'It is not the abolition of human sacrifice which makes possible the successful conclusion to the romance, it is the romance itself (complex plot, recognition, coincidences, tableaux and daring exploits) which facilitates the abolition of human sacrifice. The whole seventeen years of romantic incidents were contrived not for their own sake but to make a point' (154) . . . 'where we thought Heliodorus was writing a romance, the Real Truth is that Heliodorus is telling the story of how the gods devised a romance. He is not a romancer but a mere scribe of the divine melodramatist' (155).

In its pursuit of reflexivity this interpretative *tour de force* may underestimate sheer story-telling virtuosity — for a different view of Kalasiris, cf. Sandy (1982b) and III.2.6: but it opens up a debate that is here to stay, and further work on the literary goals of Heliodorus, if not of the other novelists too, will be seen as post-Winklerian.

III.2.5 *Origins and relation to other ancient literatures*

No consensus has emerged on how far the Greek novel was shared with or even borrowed from adjacent Near Eastern cultures, but *influence* of the Greek novel on another culture has been demonstrated for the Jewish conversion-tale of Joseph and Asenath. Of the versions in several languages the Greek is edited by Philonenko (1968) with French translation, notes and *index verborum*; the issues are discussed by West (1974). The case for some sort of borrowing from Egyptian literature (cf. already Barns (1956)) is strengthened by the vestiges of the Tefnut legend (West (1969)), the Sesonchosis romance (Rea (1967), West (1980), and — with some further references — Ruiz-Montero (1989)); and by the prosimetric Tinouphis story (Haslam (1981)).

An exception to the general shift of attention away from origins since Perry (1967) is the pursuit of links with legends of other, and especially Sumerian cultures (e.g. Dumuzi) by Anderson (1984): most reactions have been sceptical.

III.2.6 *Social and cultural realism*

Even the most deconstructive approach to the texts does not bar their use as evidence for the Greek society of the Roman Empire. In religion, for example, even if their role as mystery texts is rejected (cf. 1

M

above) they undoubtedly mirror the contemporary importance of religious ideas and modes of thought. Thus Sandy (1982b) argued that Heliodorus' Kalasiris combined images of the guru as a holy man and as a charlatan: although this contradictory blend may not exist in real life, Sandy seems to me right to seek the origins of Heliodorus' characterization and comments on the divine there rather than (as did Winkler) in a self-referential metaphor for the author.

The novels also illuminate other aspects of *mentalité*. Reardon (1969) saw the typical plot of lovers deracinated from their cities and exposed to perils as a myth about the hellenistic and imperial Greek soul — a view more persuasive for the late Hellenistic period when the novels may have begun than for the Empire when they peaked. The repeated displacement of the heroes from their city indeed calls for explanation, since the perspectives we are so often given are those of city-dwelling πεπαιδευμένοι. At the least the novels yield a presentation of the countryside as alien and (Longus apart) hostile, a point touched on by Bowie (1977) and investigated for Xenophon by Scarcella (1977) and for the other novelists, especially Longus, by Saïd (1987).

They may also be used (with *caveats* such as mentioned below) to document more tangible elements of *Realien*, as done by Bowie (1977), cf. v.2.7; and to throw light on social structures, such as the place of women in society (see 1 above). Allowance must be made for the possibility that a timeless literary topos or the novelist's dramatic purpose may have introduced a practice or perspective foreign to his contemporary world, but much of value for the social and economic historian remains. This is demonstrated by Scarcella's series of contributions (1968b, 1970, 1972, 1977), cf. Kudlien (1989) on exposure of children. Nor is it only social historians interested in disengaging nuggets of reality that such studies benefit: they help our judgement of what *sort* of world the novelist purports to offer his readers (remember Winkler on Heliodorus).

III.2.7 *Readership and reception*

Who are those readers? That question was tackled by Hägg (1983), rejecting Perry's 'women, children and poor in spirit' but seeing at least the non-sophistic novels as lower down the literary scale than suggested by Bowie (1990) and Stephens (1990). Similar conclusions but by slightly different routes were reached by Wesseling (1988). This is another problem that will not go away, but like all aspects of ancient literacy it will elicit no precise answers.

But there are readers whom we *can* document, in Byzantium and in Renaissance and modern Europe. The Byzantine novels have now a thorough and reliable treatment in English by Beaton (1989). Tatum and Vernazza (1990) has several papers on *Nachleben*, and Longus' printed editions have been put on a fascinating map by Barber (1989) with full attention to illustrations. The ground has been broken, but much ploughing and raking remains to be done before the rich harvest waiting can be reaped.

IV.   PETRONIUS' *SATYRICA*

Items on the *Satyrica* of Petronius and the *Metamorphoses* of Apuleius will be dealt with under separate headings in what follows. It is clear enough that these are both 'novels' in the sense of being extended examples of similar kinds of prose/prosimetric fiction, cf. e.g. Barchiesi (1991); Apuleius clearly knew Petronius, but borrowings and imitations are less frequent than we might expect, cf. Walsh (1978), though of course we have probably lost most of Petronius (see the hypothetical reconstruction in Sullivan (1968)). The two texts have a common approach to parodic literary allusion, especially in connection with epic and the Greek novels, e.g. Walsh (1970), and both are salacious, playful and blackly humorous, e.g. Anderson (1982). Generally, there is no doubt that both Petronius and Apuleius are more interested in the pleasures of sex, food and drink than the Greek novels, though they also pick up on low-life elements in Greek fiction, cf. Barchiesi (1986): the *Iolaus* fragment (see III.1.5 above and IV.2.4 below) clearly alludes to homosexual congress, and Longus and Achilles Tatius are highly salacious texts. This aspect would seem to derive something from their links with Roman comedy and satire and with the Hellenistic/Roman 'Milesian' tale, cf. Moreschini (1990). But it should be stressed that the two have considerable differences as well as similarities, and the number of meaningful generalizations possible is therefore restricted. Some would indeed preclude generic common ground by denying that Petronius' work is a novel at all or viewing the novel itself as a generic amalgam (see Slater (1989), Callebat (1992) and IV.2.8 below).

IV.1 BASIC TOOLS

IV.1.1 *Texts*

K. Müller (1978), the third edition of his text of Petronius, which rightly argues (following e.g. Perry (1967)) that the novel's title is *Satyrica*, is the best text available; for this and a succinct summary of

the textual tradition, cf. Reeve (1983). Müller's third edition detects fewer interpolations than his second of 1965, and many fewer than the first of 1961, which was excessive in this direction, partly under the influence of Fraenkel, cf. Nisbet (1962); more can still be said about the issue of interpolation, cf. Sullivan (1976).

IV.1.2 *Lexicon*

All previous lexica to Petronius are now superseded by the computerized concordance by von Korn and Reitzer (1986), which uses the third and best edition of Müller's text (above).

IV.1.3 *Commentaries*

A complete commentary for the whole of the *Satyrica* is still lacking, though one was promised by J. P. Sullivan and Gareth Schmeling. A number of individual episodes have recently received commentaries or detailed separate analysis, and not just the ever-popular *Cena Trimalchionis* (see the sober and useful commentary of M. S. Smith (1975)): the episodes of Quartilla and the tale of the Widow of Ephesus also have useful editions and commentaries (Aragosti, Cosci and Cotrozzi (1988), Pecere (1975)), and there is also another recent brief commentary on all the tales (Fedeli and Dimundo (1988)). The poetic *Bellum Civile* has an extensive edition of some use (Guido (1975)) and a commentary in monograph format (Grimal (1977)), which collects much useful information despite some superficiality and improbable views; the shorter poems from the *Satyrica* (i.e. not including the *Troiae Halosis* and *Bellum Civile*) have also been recently edited with a brief and useful commentary by Courtney (1991).

IV.1.4 *Translations*

The best modern English translation, which includes a selection of Petronian fragments and some useful notes, remains Sullivan (1965), still in print.

IV.2 ISSUES OF INTERPRETATION

IV.2.1 *Style and language*

The language of Petronius has always been of interest to Latinists; much work has been done here in the commentaries listed under IV.1.3 (above). Petersmann (1977) is a valuable treatment of Petronian style, especially of syntax, though not without failings, cf. George (1979). Petersmann rejects earlier attempts to draw an absolute line between stylistic levels in Petronius, showing the balance between literary style and colloquialism and the difficulty of separating out the two. This seems correct: apart from the special case of the freedmen at the *Cena* (below), Petronius' Latin appears as an artificial but elegant blend of different linguistic registers. The same author has followed this up with a further survey article on the same topic (Petersmann (1985)), which is the most useful bibliographical resource for modern research. Boyce (1991) analyses in useful detail the language of the freedmen in the *Cena* and the history of its criticism, showing the popular elements in their language and the way each is individually characterized.

IV.2.2 *General literary accounts*

Sullivan (1968), despite some idiosyncrasies such as its interests in scopophilia, and Walsh (1970), always cautious and reliable, remain the basic accounts of Petronius' novel, its possible shape, literary texture, and tone; Zeitlin (1971) remains provoking and stimulating in her account of the *Satyrica* as a subversive and anarchic text. Since these the only general overview of substantial length (apart from Rankin (1971), a somewhat disparate collection of articles) has been Slater (1989). Slater, who stresses the *Satyrica*'s capacity to intrigue and surprise, uses a reader-response approach to Petronius, appropriate enough for a demanding and highly allusive text, since it appeals to the idea of a reading community with a common repertoire of literary knowledge. The main part of his book is an intelligent critical reading of the novel: in this he detects such fruitful themes as role-playing and improvisation, or the link between reading texts and reading pictures. He goes on to make use of the views of Bakhtin (cf. Bakhtin (1981)) that the novel is essentially a parodic non-genre in order to assert the generic indeterminacy of the *Satyrica* and the improvisatory, unstable character of its narrator.

One might argue against this that we cannot reliably judge the indeterminacy of a fragmentary text: any apparent lack of interpretability in the *Satyrica* might have been dispelled had its whole text survived. Slater also seems too pessimistic in not allowing that the issue of the *Satyrica*'s genre is much eased by the discovery of the second-century *Iolaus* papyrus, which has clear novelistic links on the one hand and strong resemblances to Petronius on the other (see III.1.5 above and IV.2.4 below). Overall, however, Slater's is a thought-provoking book, and usefully brings into Petronian criticism theoretical ideas about genre and narrative, two crucial factors for the *Satyrica*.

IV.2.3   *Date, authorship, social and cultural realism*

Nothing has appeared to refute the arguments of Sullivan (1968) and Rose (1971) that the *Satyrica* is Neronian in date, and very likely the work of Petronius the *arbiter elegantiae* of Nero (Tacitus, *Ann.* XVI.17–20). The general assumption of a Neronian date has encouraged the quarrying of Petronius' fictional narrative as a source for the social, cultural, and economic life of the early Empire, though allowances must naturally be made for caricature and exaggeration. Significant here are Kennedy (1978), closely relating the Encolpius/Agamemnon scene to the practices of contemporary rhetorical schools, D'Arms (1981), which contains a persuasively detailed discussion of the socio-economic type represented by Trimalchio, and Horsfall (1989), which carefully examines the cultural horizons of the *Cena*. Grondona's book (1980) promises more than it delivers, being basically a long and mechanical article on death in the *Cena* with a few miscellanea attached. Finally, Sullivan (1985) has attempted with some success to set Petronius in the context of Neronian literature; his arguments for the use of Lucan in Petronius' *Bellum Civile*, more forcefully stated here than in his earlier writings, are particularly useful, especially as Grimal (1977) had argued the case the other way.

IV.2.4   *Sources, literary texture, tone*

The most important event since Sullivan (1968) and Walsh (1970), who otherwise remain reliable guides on the sources and literary texture of the *Satyrica*, is the publication of the *Iolaus*-fragment (see III.1.5 above). This Greek low-life prosimetric text (on its form cf. Astbury (1977) and Bettini (1982)) resembles Petronius in form and spirit, and has close links to the Greek novel, though even after this the view that the *Satyrica* is basically Menippean satire without much novelistic input can still be argued, e.g. Adamiewitz (1987). Though the papyrus containing the *Iolaus*-fragment is from the second century, its text may be from an older work or descend from an older tradition, and Petronius may therefore be deriving rather more than expected from a pre-existing Greek tradition (see especially Barchiesi (1986)).

Links with the Milesian tale, already stressed as much more relevant for Petronius and Apuleius than for the Greek novels, are discussed by Pacchieni (1978), and by C. W. Müller (1980) with particular relevance to the episode of the Widow of Ephesus, but the evidence for the nature and character of the lost Μιλησιακά of Aristides and their Latin versions by Sisenna remains relatively sparse. On other literary influences and models, few advances have been made on the material gathered by Sullivan (1968) and Walsh (1970) on the various genres used and parodied in the *Satyrica*. Perutelli (1985) has written persuasively on the comic character of the freedmen's dialogue in the *Cena*, stressed by Cameron (1969) as a parody of the speeches in Plato's *Symposium*, while the theatrical elements in the novel, previously noted by Sandy (1976), have been used by Rosati (1983) to present the *Cena*, quite persuasively, as a performance depicting Trimalchio's life. More generally, Anderson (1982) has again stressed the playful and satirical nature of the work, reacting against the influential arguments of Arrowsmith (1966) that the *Satyrica* contains elements of an Epicurean moral tale.

IV.2.5   *Structure and narrative technique*

Investigators of structure have naturally concentrated on the complete episode of the *Cena* within the fragmentary *Satyrica*. Hubbard (1986) provides an interesting if over-schematic analysis of its narrative structure, comparing it with that of the Quartilla episode, but Petronius' structure would seem to be largely naturalistic narrative flow, other than in the set speeches of the *Cena*. On narrative technique, Beck, having previously argued that the novel is narrated by an older Encolpius looking back on his younger and more naïve self (Beck (1975); cf. also his earlier ideas in Beck (1973)), has contributed an interesting view of Eumolpus as a bad poet and moral failure but consequently a good salacious raconteur (Beck (1979)). The recent modification of Beck's view of Encolpius' narrative by Jones (1987) seems over-subtle, but makes some helpful points, as does Perutelli (1990), who compares Encolpius with Eumolpus as narrator to interesting effect. There is also some good narratological analysis of the 'Widow of Ephesus' tale by Huber (1990a), and a useful account of Petronius' use of the techniques of literary closure by Schmeling (1992).

IV.2.6   *Readership and reception*

IV.2.4 (above) makes it clear that Petronius aimed his novel at least partly at readers with a high level of literary education, no doubt the (male) élite classes of the Neronian period; this does not of course exclude a less elevated readership, to whom the low-life subject-matter might naturally appeal. Readers in later antiquity clearly appreciated Petronius, notably Sidonius Apollinaris (*Carm.* 23.155–7), and Fulgentius (Ciaffi (1963)), both also readers of Apuleius. The most convenient overview of the *Nachleben* of Petronius is still the last chapter of Walsh (1970); the 'Widow of Ephesus' story has a long and interesting subsequent history which has been much investigated recently (cf. Galand (1989),

Boldrini (1989), Huber (1990a and 1990b)), and several papers of Petronian *Nachleben* are to be found in *Semiotica della novella latina* (1986) and (in abstract) in Tatum and Vernazza (1990).

V. APULEIUS, *METAMORPHOSES*

V.1 BASIC TOOLS

V.1.1 *Texts*

No better complete text than Robertson's Budé edition (1940–45) has yet emerged — see the summary of the position by Marshall (1983); the new Loeb edition (see v.1.4 below) is to be welcomed not so much for its unadventurous text as for its excellent translation. Most of the commentaries mentioned under v.1.3 below also examine textual issues afresh, and make occasional improvements on Robertson, whose restricted apparatus does not allow sufficient deployment of useful conjectures.

V.1.2 *Lexicon*

The most recent work is still the *Index Apuleianus* (Oldfather, Canter, Perry (1934)), but this is now inadequate, being based on an outdated text (Helm's Teubner) to which it refers by page and line, and a concordance-type replacement (easily generated by modern technology) is needed.

V.1.3 *Commentaries*

Recent years have been highly prolific: apart from serviceable editions of Books I and III (Scobie (1975), van der Paardt (1971)) and an extensive edition of Book XI (Gwyn Griffiths (1975), full of useful material on Isiac cult), the Groningen consortium of Apuleian scholars has produced three volumes of text and commentary since 1977, on IV.1–27 (Hijmans *et al.* (1977)), VI.25–VII (Hijmans *et al.* (1981)) and VIII (Hijmans *et al.* (1985)), and volumes on Books IX and X are expected soon. The approach of the Groningen group is often dry and technical, with a conservative approach to textual criticism, but shows some interest in more literary approaches, increasingly so in recent volumes, and these commentaries are useful tools which handily summarize much of the now extensive literature on Apuleius as well as providing basic information and aid. The Groningen group's activities have also led to a volume of essays on Apuleius (Hijmans and van der Paardt (1978)), in which a number of the studies mentioned in this article are to be found. E. J. Kenney's commentary on the *Cupid and Psyche* episode (Kenney (1990a)), published with a useful facing translation and excellent bibliography, has much to offer. The commentary is particularly useful on language and literary echoes, while the introduction gives much useful information and discussion in short compass, especially a good brief account of Apuleius' style in the *Metamorphoses*, with some careful analysis of his syntactical and rhythmical effects.

V.1.4 *Translations*

The recent Loeb version is the best available English translation of the *Metamorphoses* (for its virtues, cf. Harrison (1991)); the older version by Robert Graves, though recently much improved by Michael Grant (Graves (1990)), has sparkle but lacks accuracy.

V.2 ISSUES OF INTERPRETATION

V.2.1 *Style and language*

The style of Apuleius, like that of Petronius, has always fascinated Latinists; few now talk of African Latin, that mighty shibboleth of the nineteenth century, though a recent attempt has been made to revive it in some degree (Lancel (1987)). Callebat has followed up his important book on the colloquial element in Apuleius' style (Callebat (1968)) with an article (Callebat (1978)) which provides a broader overview of Apuleian style. For a fuller view of Apuleian Latin the older books by Koziol (1872), Médan (1926) and Bernhard (1927) are still useful. The brief summary in Kenney (1990a) is now the best starting-point for the topic.

V.2.2 *General literary accounts*

Walsh (1970) remains a sound guide to the texture and basic aspects of the novel. There are two more recent useful introductions to the *Metamorphoses*: Tatum (1979), which stresses the coherence and tale-telling qualities of the work as well as setting it usefully in the context of Apuleius' own life and

works, and Schlam (1992), a short but densely informative account which provides good thematic analysis of the novel and raises most of its important issues. Useful too are James (1987), an intelligent account of the novel's structure and narrative technique which occasionally slides into over-subtlety, and Krabbe (1989), which deals with several important themes, especially links between the *Metamorphoses* and the homonymous work of Ovid (cf. v.2.4 below), and makes interesting comparisons with modern fiction (Hesse, Kafka, Ionescu). For Fick-Michel (1991), see v.2.6 below.

The most important and influential work on Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* in the last fifteen years is clearly Winkler (1984). In a book of delightful wit and intellectual brio, Winkler suggests that the *Metamorphoses* resembles a detective story in that its whole plot turns out to need re-interpretation when the final twist of Isiac conversion is revealed in Book XI, and that even then the solution to the mystery is not really an answer: we are not sure whether the religious climax of the novel is in fact to be taken seriously — the bald-headed Isiac devotee is also the bald-headed clown. The narrating 'I' of the novel, the *auctor* who can make evaluative or omniscient comment, recedes in significance beside the narrated 'I', the *actor* who simply goes through the experiences of the story in an immediate and dramatic manner; only at a second reading can the reader put the two together, re-interpreting the narrative in terms of the final twist when the two are apparently united and coming up with (in Winkler's view) discrepancies and complexities which remain.

This ultimate indeterminacy is not deconstructive in motivation, though it seems so at times. Winkler is clear that it belongs to the authorial strategy (124); 'My ultimate assessment of the *Golden Ass* is that it is a philosophical comedy about religious knowledge. The effect of its hermeneutic playfulness, including the final book, is to raise the question whether there is a higher order that can integrate conflicting judgements. I further argue that the effect of the novel and the intent of Apuleius is to put that question but not to suggest an answer'. This seems to carry ambiguity too far: there is no doubt that the end of the novel redefines the level on which it has been told in the sense that previous elements of the plot can now be seen to have had an Isiac or initiatory significance, but surely the function of the last book, as of the revelation of the murderer's identity in a detective novel, is to pull the novel together rather than apart and to give a coherent explanation of its events, even though this is seen through the eyes of the gullible and naïve Lucius. It is true that we are apparently left (XI.27) with the paradoxical identity between Lucius the narrator and Apuleius the author, but this might provide a final twist and surprise metamorphosis rather than an undermining and toppling of the whole narrative edifice. It is also true that we are left with a serio-comic ending rather than the sudden shift into sublimity seen by many earlier critics, but this need not detract from the coherence and intention of the work as a whole (see v.2.3 below).

v.2.3   *Unity and tone*

The fundamental problems of unity in the *Metamorphoses* are the relevance of the long inserted mythological tale of *Cupid and Psyche* (and indeed of the other more realistic inserted tales) to the main plot of the novel, the connection of Book XI with the rest of the work given the apparent disjunction between its 'serious' Isiac material and the previous bawdy narrative, and the apparent 'unmasking' of the narrator Lucius as Apuleius himself at *Met.* XI.27, 'Madaurensem, sed admodum pauperem'. There are clearly narrative complexities here (see v.2.5 below). Modern scholarship tends to stress the unity of the whole work, a just reaction against Perry (1967), who sees the work as broken-backed with the last book as a vain attempt to confer intellectual credibility on a collection of frivolous stories: cf. e.g. Wlosok (1969), Walsh (1970), Sandy (1978) and Alpers (1980). Most notable here as in many other directions is Winkler (1984) (see v.2.2 above), who regards Book XI as a continuation of the novel's general playfulness and narratological complexity — one more artful transformation. The analysis of the various inserted tales, including that of Cupid and Psyche, as foreshadowing the novel's development and ending, has been important here (cf. v.2.5 below). Significant too has been the notion of *curiositas*, shared by Lucius and Psyche and providing an evident element of coherence in the work; for a convenient summary of work on this concept in the novel, cf. De Filippo (1990).

v.2.4   *Sources, literary texture*

The relationship between the *Metamorphoses* of Apuleius, the extant pseudo-Lucianic *Onos* and the lost Greek *Metamorphoses* of Lucius of Patrae, of which the *Onos* would appear to be a summary (cf. Photius, *Bibl.* cod. 129), is still controversial; the crucial passage of Photius which discusses these two Greek works contains many problems of interpretation, cf. Kussl (1990). Many now incline to think that Apuleius and the *Onos* draw from a common source rather than being directly related to each other; others see Apuleius using both the *Onos* and the text it summarizes. A particular issue is whether any of the 'inserted' tales found in Apuleius but not in the *Onos* came from the Greek *Metamorphoses*. On these points, see the useful contributions by Walsh (1974), Effe (1976), Mason (1978), Scobie (1978b), Holzberg (1984) and James (1987), following the massive work of van Thiel (1971). The *Metamorphoses'*

relation to the Milesian tales (cf. IV.2.4 above) has been usefully discussed by Moreschini (1990) and Fick-Michel (1991), though firm conclusions are hard to reach apart from that of general resemblance of tone.

In terms of literary texture, the relation of the *Metamorphoses* to other classical genres such as epic is also a matter of current debate, partly under the theoretical influence of Bakhtin (1981); much solid evidence was contributed by Walsh (1970). Recent scholarship has concentrated on the epic. Parodic imitations of particular episodes in the *Odyssey* have been detected by Harrison (1990b) and Frangoulidis (1991a and 1992), and Vergilian echoes have been sought since Forbes (1943–4) led the way; allusions to Vergil's narrative of the fall of Troy have been traced by La Penna (1985), Harrison (1988), and Frangoulidis (1991b); Finkelpearl (1990) has extended the traditional comparison between the *katabaseis* of Psyche and Aeneas, while Apuleius' lexical debt to Vergil has been investigated by Lazzarini (1985). Connections with Ovid's homonymous *Metamorphoses*, which can be plausibly linked with Apuleius' prologue (cf. Scotti (1982)) have been argued for at some length by Krabbe (1989); links of the characterization of Psyche with that of Greek tragic heroines have been established by Schiesaro (1988). The stories of the robbers have been plausibly seen as parodies of dramatic historiography (Loporcaro (1992)).

Folklore has always been popular in interpreting the fable of Cupid and Psyche (cf. Binder and Merkelbach (1968), a useful collection), but Scobie (1983) attempts to argue that all the major themes of the novel originate in a single folkloric motif, 'Following the Witch'. This thesis is surely excessive, but it stresses the closeness of some of the episodes in the *Metamorphoses* to popular culture. Scobie's book also provides illuminating material on story-telling and witchcraft in the ancient world. The issue of folklore in Apuleius had already been blown wide open by Fehling (1977), which argues with characteristic exaggerated iconoclasm that the tale of Cupid and Psyche has generated rather than used folk-tale motifs, and is literary rather than folkloric in origin. Many might prefer some intermediate position, e.g. Wright (1971), or even the notion that *Cupid and Psyche* is almost entirely a literary construct, or that it is primarily influenced by representations in art (Schlam (1976)).

v.2.5   *Narrative technique*

In general, the narratological problems of the *Metamorphoses*, an apparently autobiographical story complicated both by the main narrator Lucius' transformation into an ass and his apparent transformation into the author Apuleius at its end, are clear and evident: the main attraction of Winkler (1984) (see v.2.2 above) is that he makes a virtue of this problem (for other treatments, cf. Sandy (1978), van der Paardt (1981) and Penwill (1990), and see van der Paardt (1978) for a useful application of narratological terminology to the *Metamorphoses*). The problems of the status of narrative and narrator are immediately raised in the prologue to the *Metamorphoses*, where neither author nor narrator seems to be an appropriate speaker: W. S. Smith (1972) suggested that Apuleius uses an anonymous prologue-speaker of Plautine type, while Harrison (1990a) has argued that the speaker is the book itself (for another treatment of the prologue, cf. Harrauer and Römer (1985)). The inserted tales of the novel are also clearly relevant to the main narrative through foreshadowing and thematic similarity. Good work had been done here by Tatum (1969), an excellent article, and Dowden (1982); also worth scrutiny are the subtle examination of first-person narrative and its theoretical implications by Laird (1990), and the detailed and interesting analysis of the narrative technique of *Met.* I–III by Pennacini (1979). Several interesting narrative analyses of the tales in Apuleius are presented in *Semiotica della novella latina* (1986), the fourth volume in the series *Materiali e contributi per la storia della narrativa greco-latina*, an important ongoing collection of studies on narratological aspects of ancient texts.

v.2.6   *The* Metamorphoses, *Isis and Plato*

Modern research on the Isiac aspects of the *Metamorphoses* starts from the claim of Merkelbach (1962), following Kerényi (1927), that the episode of Cupid and Psyche is a close allegory of Isiac initiation, anticipating the events of Book XI, and that many other details in the novel have Isiac significance. Most now find this claim too strong as stated, though few would deny it entirely; it works better for Apuleius than for any of the Greek novels to which Merkelbach applied the same theory. Few would now doubt that Isiac elements are prominent in the novel before the last book, or that the ass-metamorphosis of Lucius should be linked in some way with the asinine form of Isis' enemy Seth/Typhon (cf. *Met.* XI.6.2); for a recent convenient summary, cf. Schlam (1992). Gwyn Griffiths (1975) and (1978) applies an Egyptologist's knowledge of the Isis-cult to Apuleius with salutary effect, stressing the accuracy of the Isis-material in Book XI and Isis' key role in the scheme of the novel. Fick (1987) rightly stresses the syncretistic view of Isis presented by Apuleius, and has also written usefully on magic in the *Metamorphoses* (Fick (1985)), and on Lucius' final Isiac metamorphosis and initiation (Fick (1992)).

The apparent Platonic interests of the novel may legitimately be supported from the known Platonism of its author (cf. Moreschini (1978), Hijmans (1987)). It can be closely connected with its Isiac aspect through Plutarch's *De Iside et Osiride*, a text perhaps known to Apuleius (cf. *Met.* 1.2.1), which gives a Platonizing interpretation of the Egyptian Isis-myth, suggesting a plausible intellectual background for Apuleius' novel in contemporary Middle Platonism (cf. Donini (1979) and Walsh (1981)). Platonic allusion and theory in the *Metamorphoses* are usefully pursued by Thibau (1965), Schlam (1970) and (1976), Heller (1983), Kenney (1990b), and De Filippo (1990). The last-mentioned stresses significant links between Apuleius' *curiositas* and Platonic theory. Two recent extensive studies of the *Metamorphoses* have made considerable use of Platonic theory to analyse it. Gianotti (1986) convincingly uses Platonic dualism to interpret the stress on tricks and illusion in the novel and its two worlds, the sensual world of Lucius and the ass and the divine world of Isis, neatly bringing in the Platonic notions of psychological slavery, bestial degradation and daemonic providence, and interpreting the story of Cupid and Psyche as a Platonic myth and the novel as a whole as philosophically didactic, though not all his Platonic links convince. Fick-Michel (1991) (= 'Fick' of earlier publications) uses the three levels of Platonic cognition from the *Republic*, the world of sense, the world of thought/ imagination, and the world of the divine, to match the three levels she sees in the novel (sense = primary story of Lucius, imagination = inserted tales, divine = intervention of Isis); she wishes to dissociate the novel's genuine Platonism from its merely convenient use of Isiac elements, and brings out the Platonizing contrast between appearance and reality which runs throughout. Lucius' quest is a quest for the Platonic Good/Beautiful, represented allegorically by Isis. This might again seem an overstatement, but contains considerable food for thought.

v.2.7   *Date, authorship, social and cultural realism*

There is no doubt that Apuleius the author of the *Metamorphoses* is also the Apuleius born in Roman North Africa in the mid-120s who wrote the *Apologia* and *Florida*; there is no scholarly agreement as to whether the *Metamorphoses* is a late or early work of Apuleius, though its sophistication may suggest the former (for attempts to date it accurately through *Realien*, neither conclusive, cf. Walsh (1970) and Summers (1973)). The setting of the *Metamorphoses* in a vague imperial Greece and the variety of its literary sources gives fewer opportunities than the *Satyrica* for disentangling information of a historical kind, though Lucius is a recognizably upper-class Greek of the Antonine period (cf. Mason (1983) and Gianotti (1986)). On the level of cultural history, Fick-Michel (1991) argues convincingly that the generic and linguistic innovations of the novel are a spirited response to the apparent impossibility of literary originality in the Antonine period. On the level of *Realien*, Millar (1981) has successfully analysed the novel as an account of provincial conditions of life in the second-century Empire, though one might argue, for example, that the presence of bandits has at least as much to do with the literary tradition of the Greek novel or parody of historiography (cf. v.2.4) as with the real break-down of law and order. The *Metamorphoses* may also be quarried for details of Roman law, which Apuleius surely knew (cf. Summers (1970), (1972) and (1973), Maehler (1981)), and of course for the detail of Isiac ceremonies, though one's view of the accuracy of Apuleius' reports must depend on one's view of how seriously the Isis-material is to be taken (see v.2.6 above). Finally, the *Metamorphoses* contains one of the most extensive descriptions of a pantomime in any ancient text (x.30.1ff.), which provides us with valuable and detailed information.

v.2.8   *Readership and reception*

The intended readership of the *Metamorphoses* is clearly the contemporary educated élite in an age of literary learning, given the extent of the literary allusions and stylistic refinements, though as with Petronius the low-life material would be more extensively popular. The last chapter of Walsh (1970) remains the most recent overall survey of the *Nachleben* of the *Metamorphoses*; Haight (1927) is still useful in this respect. Recent years have seen a number of specific studies such as Scobie (1978a), tracing the influence of the *Metamorphoses* in Renaissance Italy and Spain, Prete (1988), Mass (1989) and de Jong (1989), following further strands in the Renaissance, Schlam (1990) treating Apuleius in the medieval period, van der Paardt (1989) on 'Three Dutch Asses' and even Elsom (1989) on 'Apuleius and the Movies'. As in the case of Petronius, several abstracts of this kind are to be found in Tatum and Vernazza (1990).

VI.   PROSPECTS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Winkler's work on both Greek and Roman novels ensures that the application to the ancient novel of theories of narrative will be of major importance in future debate, and has indeed determined much of the current critical agenda. This enables those who work on the ancient novel to participate in more

general contemporary debates about the nature of literary texts, and is surely to be welcomed for that reason. Winkler's particular strategy of questioning and undermining the apparent seriousness and religious meaning of the end of Apuleius' novel might be thought to have serious consequences for the religious approach to Apuleius and to other novels, seen above all in the strong thesis of Merkelbach (1962) that all ancient novels except Chariton involve allegory of mystery-initiation. We, along with most scholars, would in any case be unwilling to accept that thesis as originally presented, but the effect of Winkler's kind of deconstructive narratology on such an interpretation needs to be considered: how far does Winklerian playfulness distort the possibility of serious and reliable religious content (cf. III.2.6 above)? This issue needs to be addressed in future work.

Winkler's work might also be thought to have complicated the task of those who wish to use the ancient novels as sources for social or political history; if for example the text of Apuleius is narratologically 'unreliable', what price its historical reliability as a source for contemporary *mentalité* (cf. III.2.6, V.2.7 above)? A linked topic is that of the intellectual context of the novels and their authors: this is a cultural and literary-historical mode of enquiry (cf. e.g. Tatum (1979), Sullivan (1985)), and will continue to develop, especially with the generally burgeoning study of the Second Sophistic and Greek imperial literature (e.g. Russell (1990)), which will contribute considerably to the understanding of both Greek and Roman novels.

Another aspect of the study of the ancient novels which will continue apace is that of their literary form and generic identity, particularly their relation to other literary kinds. Here again recent work has brought in literary theory to real effect, e.g. Bakhtin (1981) with its view of the novel form as a parasitic 'non-genre' formed by reference to others; the problem of generic identity is most acute in the case of Petronius (cf. Slater (1989)), but the relation of the novel to epic (most novels), historiography (especially Chariton), and pastoral (Longus) should receive further treatment, and both Fusillo (1989) and Reardon (1991) point down this fruitful path. Another recent trend, at least partly propelled by the work of Foucault on ancient sexuality (Foucault (1985) and (1986)), is an interest in the attitude of the ancient novels to sexuality and gender (cf. Winkler (1990)): feminist writing has taken this up (for an early essay, cf. Katz (1976)), and interest in women in the novel, an area of literature in which female characters have a prominence unmatched except in Greek tragedy, is growing and set fair to continue (cf. Egger (1988) and (1990), Elsom (1992), Montague (1992)). A further area of advance should be that of *Nachleben*: scrutiny of Tatum and Vernazza (1990) and Hofmann (1988–90) shows that the reception and vernacular imitation of the Greek and Roman novels is a rapidly growing industry. The converse question of the novel's origins, on the other hand, we regard as an insoluble and vain enquiry, *pace* Anderson (1982).

On a more basic level, some fundamental tools for study still need to be provided. For the Greek novel, further commentaries and linguistic studies are needed (cf. III.1.2 and III.2.4), especially on Heliodorus, which would no doubt help with the problems of dating that text. For the Roman novel, we continue to hope for the long-awaited commentary on Petronius by Sullivan and Schmeling, and for the successful completion of the Groningen commentaries on Apuleius; a new text of the *Metamorphoses* of Apuleius is also desirable, with a more helpful apparatus than that of Robertson, as is a computerized concordance to Apuleius such as already exists for Petronius. But the next twenty-five years promise at least as much scholarly excitement as the last twenty-five; we particularly hope that more new papyrus texts will be published, since such fragments have been extremely important in expanding and moulding our view of the genre as a whole.

Corpus Christi College, Oxford

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adamiewitz, J. (1987), 'Zum literarischen Charakter von Petrons *Satyrica*', *RhM* 130, 329–46.
Alpers, K. (1990), 'Innere Beziehungen und Kontraste als "hermeneutische Zeichen" in den *Metamorphosen* des Apuleius von Madauros', *WJA* 6, 197–207.
Anderson, G. (1976), *Studies in Lucian's Comic Fiction*. Leiden.
    (1982), *Eros Sophistes: Ancient Novelists at Play* (American Classical Studies IX). Chico, Ca.
    (1984), *Ancient Fiction: the Novel in the Graeco-Roman World*. London and Totowa, NJ.
Aragosti, A., Cosci, P. and Cotrozzi, A. (1988), *Petronio: l'episodio di Quartilla*. Bologna.
Arrowsmith, W. (1966), 'Luxury and death in the *Satyricon*', *Arion* 5, 304–31.
Astbury, R. (1977), 'Petronius, *P.Oxy.* 3010, and Menippean satire', *CPh* 72, 23–31.
Bakhtin, M. (1981), *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays* (trans. Emerson, C. and Holquist, M.). Austin.
Barber, G. (1989), *Daphnis and Chloe. The Markets and Metamorphoses of an Unknown Bestseller. The Panizzi Lectures 1988*. London.
Barchiesi, A. (1986), 'Tracce di narrativa greca e romanzo latino: una rassegna', in *Semiotica della novella latina*, 219–36.
    (1991), 'Il romanzo', in F. Montanari (ed.), *La Prosa Latina*, 229–48. Rome.
Barns, J. W. B. (1956), 'Egypt and the Greek romance', *Akten des viii Kongress für Papyrologie*, 29–36. Vienna.

Bartsch, S. (1989), *Decoding the Ancient Novel. The Reader and the Role of Description in Heliodorus and Achilles Tatius*. Princeton.

Baslez, M.-F. and Trédé, M. (1992), *Le monde du roman grec. Études de littérature ancienne* (Papers of a colloqium held in Paris in 1987). Paris.

Beaton, R. (ed.) (1988), *The Greek Novel A.D. 1–1985*. London and Sydney.

(1989), *The Medieval Greek Romance*. Cambridge.

Beck, R. (1973), 'Some observations on the narrative technique of Petronius', *Phoenix* 27, 42–61.

(1975), 'Encolpius at the *Cena*', *Phoenix* 29, 271–83.

(1979), '*Eumolpus poeta, Eumolpus fabulator*', *Phoenix* 33, 239–53.

Bernardo, A. and Levin, S. (eds) (1990), *The Classics in the Middle Ages*. Binghamton.

Bernhard, M. (1927), *Der Stil des Apuleius von Madaura*. Stuttgart.

Berti, M. (1967), 'Sulla interpretazione mistica del romanzo di Longo', *SCO* 16, 343–58.

Bettini, M. (1982), 'A proposito dei versi sotadei greci e latini', *MD* 9, 59–105, esp. 90–2.

Billault, A. (1989), 'De l'histoire au roman: Hermocrate de Syracuse', *REG* 102, 540–8.

(1991), *La création romanesque dans la littérature grecque à l'époque impériale*. Paris.

Binder, G. and Merkelbach, R. (eds) (1968), *Amor und Psyche* (Wege der Forschung CXXVI). Darmstadt.

Boldrini, S. (1989), 'Il pasto della vedova: cibo, vino, sesso, da Petronio a J. Amado', in Hofmann (1989), 121–32.

Bowie, E. L. (1977), 'The novels and the real world', in Reardon (1977), 91–6.

(1985), 'The Greek novel', in *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature* 1, 683–99 and 877–86 (= paperback vol. 1.4 (1989). 123–39 and 243–52). Cambridge.

(1990), 'Who read the ancient Greek novels?' in Tatum and Vernazza (1990), 150–1.

Boyce, B. C. (1991), *The Language of the Freedmen in Petronius' Cena Trimalchionis* (Mnemosyne suppl. CXVII). Leiden.

Callebat, L. (1968), Sermo Cotidianus *dans les* Métamorphoses *d'Apulée*. Caen.

(1978), 'La prose des *Metamorphoses*: genèse et spécificité', in Hijmans and van der Paardt (1978), 167–87.

(1992), *Le Satyricon de Pétrone et L'Âne d'Or d'Apulée sont-ils des romans?*', *Euphrosyne* 20, 149–64.

Cameron, Averil (1969), 'Petronius and Plato', *CQ* n.s. 19, 367–70.

Carney, T. F. (1961), *Achilles Tatius Book 3. A Commentary*. Salisbury [Harare].

Chalk, H. H. O. (1960), 'Eros and the Lesbian pastorals of Longus', *JHS* 80, 32–51.

Ciaffi, V. (1963), *Fulgenzio e Petronio*. Turin.

Colonna, A. (1950), 'L'assedio di Nisibis del 350 d.C. e la cronologia di Eliodoro Emiseno', *Athenaeum* 28, 79–87.

Conca, F., De Carli, E. and Zanetto, G. (1983), *Lessico dei romanzieri greci* I (A–Γ). Milan.

(1989), *Lessico dei romanzieri greci* II (Δ–I). Hildesheim–Zurich–N.Y.

Courtney, E. (1991), *The Poems of Petronius* (American classical studies XXV). Atlanta.

D'Arms, J. H. (1981), *Commerce and Social Standing in Ancient Rome*. Ann Arbor.

De Filippo, J. G. (1990), '*Curiositas* and the Platonism of Apuleius' *Golden Ass*', *AJP* 111, 471–92.

de Jong, J. L. (1989), 'Renaissance representations of Cupid and Psyche: Apuleius versus Fulgentius', in Hofmann (1989), 75–86.

Dihle, A. (1978), 'Zur Datierung des Metiochos-Romans', *Würzb.Jahrb. f.die Altertumsw. NF* 4. 47–55.

(1989), *Die griechische und lateinische Literatur der Kaiserzeit*. Munich.

Donini, P. (1979), 'Apuleio e il platonismo medio', in Pennacini *et al.* (1979), 103–12.

Dowden, K. (1982), 'Apuleius and the art of narration', *CQ* n.s. 32, 419–35.

Effe, B. (1976), 'Der misglückte Selbstmord des Aristomenes (Apuleius *Met.* 1.14–17): Zur Romanparodie im griechischen Eselsroman', *Hermes* 104, 362–75.

Egger, B. (1988), 'Zu den Frauenrollen im griechischen Roman: die Frau als Heldin und Leserin', in Hofmann (1988), 33–66.

(1990), *Women in the Greek Novel: Constructing the Feminine* (Ph.D. Diss. UC Irvine). Irvine.

Elsom, H. (1989), 'Apuleius and the movies', in Hofmann (1989), 141–50.

(1992), 'Callirhoe: displaying in the phallic woman', in Richlin (1992), 212–30.

Fedeli, P. and Dimundo, R. (1988), *I racconti del 'Satyricon'*. Rome.

Fehling, D. (1977), *Amor und Psyche*. Wiesbaden.

Feuillâtre, E. (1966), *Études sur les Éthiopiques d'Héliodore*. Poitiers.

Fick, N. (1985), 'La magie dans les *Métamorphoses* d'Apulée', *REL* 63, 132–47.

(1987), 'L'Isis des *Métamorphoses* d'Apulée', *RBPh* 65, 31–51.

(1992), 'La métamorphose initiatique', in Moreau (1992), 1.271–92.

Fick-Michel, N. (1991), *Art et mystique dans les* Métamorphoses *d'Apulée*. Paris.

Finkelpearl, E. (1990), 'Psyche, Aeneas and an Ass: Apuleius *Met.* 6.10–6.21', *TAPA* 120, 333–48.

Forbes, C. A. (1943/4), 'Charite and Dido', *CJ* 37, 39–40.

Foucault, M. (1985), *The History of Sexuality*. II. *The Use of Pleasure*. Harmondsworth.

(1986), *The History of Sexuality*. III. *The Care of the Self*. Harmondsworth.

Frangoulidis, S. A. (1991a), '*Charite dulcissima*: A note on the nameless Charite at Ap.*Met.* 7.12', *Mnem.* 44, 387–94.

(1991b), 'Vergil's tale of the Trojan Horse in Apuleius' robber-tale of Thrasyleon', *PP* 46, 95–111.

(1992), 'Epic inversion in Apuleius' tale of Tlepolemus/Haemus', *Mnemosyne* 45, 60–74.

Fusillo, M. (1988), 'Textual patterns and narrative situations in the Greek novel', in Hofmann (1988), 17–32.

(1989), *Il romanzo greco: Polifonia ed Eros*. Marsilio editori, Venice (translated as *Le naissance du roman grec*. Paris (1991)).

(1990) (ed.), *Antonio Diogene. Le incredibili avventure al di là di Tule*. Palermo.

Galand, P. (1989), 'Le conte de la Matrone d'Ephèse: Rhétorique de 'guidage' et réception. Pétrone lu par La Fontaine et Saint-Evremond', in Hofmann (1989), 109–20.

Garnaud, J.-P. (1991) (ed.), *Achilles Tatius d' Alexandrie. Le roman de Leucippé et Clitophon*. Paris.

Gärtner, H. (1967), 'Xenophon von Ephesos', *RE* IXA.2, 2055–89.
    (1980), 'Der antike Roman. Bestand und Möglichkeiten', in Neukam, P. (ed.), *Vorschläge und Anregungen*, 24–56. Munich.
    (1984) (ed.), *Beiträge zum griechischen Liebesroman*. Hildesheim.
George, P. A. (1979), Review of Petersmann, *CR* n.s. 29, 233–4.
Geyer, A. (1977), 'Roman und Mysterienritual', *WJA* 3, 179–96.
Gianotti, G. F. (1986), *'Romanzo' e ideologia: studi sulle Metamorfosi di Apuleio.* Naples.
Gill, C. (1973), 'The sexual episodes in the *Satyricon*', *CPh* 68, 172–85.
Goldhill, S. (1980), 'Erotic narrative: virginity and going the whole hog', in Tatum and Vernazza (1993), 114.
Graves, R. (1990), *Apuleius: The Golden Ass* (translated by Robert Graves, translation revised with new introduction by Michael Grant). Harmondsworth.
Grimal, P. (1977), *La Guerre Civile de Pétrone.* Paris.
Grondona, M. (1980), *La religione e la superstizione nella* Cena Trimalchionis. Brussels.
Gual, C. (1988), *Les origines de la novela* (2nd edn). Madrid.
Guido, G. (1975), *Petronio:* Bellum Civile. Florence.
Gwyn Griffiths, J. (1975), *Apuleius* Metamorphoses XI. Leiden.
    (1978), 'Isis in the *Metamorphoses* of Apuleius', in Hijmans and van der Paardt (1978), 141–66.
Habrich, E. (1960) (ed.), *Iamblichi Babyloniacorum reliquiae.* Leipzig.
Hägg, T. (1971), *Narrative Technique in Ancient Greek Romances: Studies of Chariton, Xenophon Ephesius and Achilles Tatius.* Stockholm.
    (1980), *Den antiken Romanen.* Uppsala.
    (1983), *The Novel in Antiquity.* Oxford.
    (1984), 'The Parthenope romance decapitated?', *Symb.Osl.* 59, 61–92.
    (1985), 'Metiochus at Polycrates' court', *Eranos* 83, 92–102.
    (1987), 'Callirhoe and Parthenope: the beginnings of the historical novel', *Class.Ant.* 6, 184–204.
    (1989), 'Hermes and the invention of the lyre: an unorthodox version', *Symb.Osl.* 64, 1–55.
Haight, E. H. (1927), *Apuleius and his Influence.* New York.
Hanson, J. A. (1989) (ed.), *Apuleius:* Metamorphoses (2 vols). Cambridge, Ma.
Harrauer, C. and Römer, F. (1985), 'Beobachtungen zum Metamorphosenprolog des Apuleius', *Mnem.* 37, 353–72.
Harrison, S. J. (1988), 'Three notes on Apuleius', *CQ* n.s. 38, 265–7.
    (1990a), 'The speaking book: The Prologue to Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*', *CQ* n.s. 40, 507–13.
    (1990b), 'Some Odyssean scenes in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*', *MD* 25, 193–201.
    (1991), Review of Hanson (1989), *CR* n.s. 41, 83–4.
Haslam, M. W. (1981), 'Narrative about Tinouphis in prosimetrum', *P. Turner* no. 8, 35–45. London.
Hefti, V. (1950), *Zur Erzählungstechnik in Heliodors Aethiopika.* Wien.
Heiserman, A. (1977), *The Novel Before the Novel.* Chicago.
Heller, S. (1983), 'Apuleius, Platonic dualism, and eleven', *AJP* 104, 321–39.
Henrichs, A. (1972) (ed.), *Lollianus Phoenicica.* Bonn.
Hernandez Lara, C. (1990), 'Rhetorical aspects of Chariton of Aphrodisias', in Tatum and Vernazza (1990), 135–6.
    (1991), 'Style and literary context in Chariton of Aphrodisias', paper read to 11th Groningen Colloquium.
Hijmans Jr., B. L. (1987), *'Apuleius Philosophus Platonicus'*, *ANRW* II.36.1, 395–475.
Hijmans Jr., B. L. and van der Paardt, R. T. (1978), *Aspects of Apuleius'* Golden Ass. Groningen.
Hijmans Jr., B. L., van der Paardt, R. T., Smits, E. R., Westendorp Boerma, R. E. H., and Westerbrink, A. G.
    (1977), *Apuleius Madaurensis* Metamorphoses *Books IV 1–27.* Groningen.
    (1981), *Apuleius Madaurensis* Metamorphoses *Books VI 25–32 and VII.* Groningen.
    (1985), *Apuleius Madaurensis* Metamorphoses *Book VIII 1–27.* Groningen.
Hofmann, H. (1988) (ed.), *Groningen Colloquia on the Novel: Volume I.* Groningen.
    (1989) (ed.), *Groningen Colloquia on the Novel: Volume II.* Groningen.
    (1990) (ed.), *Groningen Colloquia on the Novel: Volume III.* Groningen.
    (1991) (ed.), *Groningen Colloquia on the Novel: Volume IV.* Groningen.
Holzberg, N. (1984), 'Apuleius und der Verfasser des griechischen Eselromans', *WJA* 10, 161–78.
    (1986), *Der antike Roman.* Munich and Zurich.
Horsfall, N. M. (1989), 'Petronius' *Cena* and the uses of literacy', *G&R* 36, 74–89 and 194–209.
Hubbard, T. K. (1986), 'The narrative architecture of Petronius' *Satyricon*', *AC* 55, 190–212.
Huber, G. (1990a), *Das Motiv der 'Witwe von Ephesos' in lateinischen Texten der Antike und des Mittelalters.* Mannheim.
    (1990b), 'Walter Charleton's 'Ephesian Matron': Ein Zeugnis der Petron-Rezeption im England der Restauration', in Hofmann (1990), 139–57.
Hunter, R. L. (1983), *A Study of Daphnis and Chloe.* Cambridge.
James, P. (1987), *Unity in Diversity: A Study of Apuleius'* Metamorphoses. Hildesheim.
Jones, C. P. (1980), 'Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* and Lollianus' *Phoenikika*', *Phoenix* 34, 243–54.
Jones, F. (1987), 'The narrator and the narrative of the *Satyricon*', *Latomus* 46, 810–19.
Katz, P. B. (1976), 'The myth of Psyche: a definition of the nature of the feminine', *Arethusa* 9, 111–18.
Kennedy, G. A. (1978), 'Encolpius and Agamemnon in Petronius', *AJP* 99, 171–8.
Kenney, E. J. (1990a), *Apuleius: Cupid and Psyche.* Cambridge.
    (1990b), 'Psyche and her mysterious husband', in Russell (1990), 175–98.
Kerényi, K. (1927), *Die griechisch-orientalische Romanliteratur in religionsgeschichtlicher Beleuchtung.* Tübingen (repr. Darmstadt 1962).
Koziol (1872), *Der Stil des Apuleius.* Vienna.
Krabbe, J. K. (1989), *The* Metamorphoses *of Apuleius.* New York etc.

Kuch, H. et al. (1989), Der antike Roman. Untersuchungen zur literarischen Kommunikation und Gattungsgeschichte. Berlin.

Kudlien, F. (1989), 'Kindesaussetzung im antiken Roman: ein Thema zwischen Fiktionalität und Lebenswirklichkeit', in Hofmann (1989), 25–44.

Kussl, R. (1990), 'Die Metamorphosen des "Lucius von Patrai": Untersuchungen zu Photius Bibl. 129', RhM 133, 379–88.

(1991), Papyrusfragmente der griechischen Romane. Ausgewählte Untersuchungen (Classica Monacensia 11). Tübingen.

Laird, A. (1990), 'Person, persona and representation in Apuleius' Metamorphoses', MD 25, 129–64.

Lancel, S. (1987), 'Y-a-t'il une Africitas?', REL 63, 161–82.

La Penna, A. (1985), 'Una novella di Apuleio e l'Iliupersis virgiliana', Maia 37, 145–60.

Lazzarini, C. (1985), 'Il modello virgiliano nel lessico delle Metamorfosi di Apuleio', SCO 35, 131–60.

Lightfoot, C. S. (1988), 'Fact and fiction — the third siege of Nisibis (A.D. 350)', Historia 38, 107–25.

Liviabella Furiani, P. and Scarcella, A. M. (1989) (eds), Piccolo mondo antico: le donne, gli amori, i costumi, il mondo reale nel romanzo greco antico. Perugia.

Loporcaro, M. (1992), 'Eroi screditati dal testo: strutture della parodia nelle storie di briganti in Apuleio Met. IV.9–21', Maia 44, 65–78.

Lucke, C. M. and Schäfer, K.-H. (1985), Chariton: Kallirhoe (German trans.). Leipzig.

MacQueen, B. D. (1990), Myth, Rhetoric and Fiction: a Reading of Longus's Daphnis and Chloe. Lincoln, Neb. & London.

Maehler, H. (1976), 'Der Metiochus-Parthenope-Roman', ZPE 23, 1–20.

(1981), 'Lucius the donkey and Roman law', M.Phil.Lond. 4, 161–77.

Maróth, M. (1979), 'Le siège de Nisibe en 350 ap. J.-C. d'après des sources syriennes', Act.Ant.Hung. 17, 239–43.

Marshall, P. K. (1983), 'Apuleius', in Reynolds (1983), 15–16.

Mason, H. J. (1978), 'Fabula Graecanica: Apuleius and his Greek sources', in Hijmans and Van der Paardt (1978), 1–15.

(1983), 'The distinction of Lucius in Apuleius' Metamorphoses', Phoenix 37, 135–43.

Mass, E. (1989), 'Tradition und Innovation im Romanschaffen Boccaccios', in Hofmann (1989), 87–108.

Mazal, O. (1962–3), 'Der griechische und byzantinische Roman in der Forschung von 1945 bis 1960', Jahrb. d. Öst. Byz. Gesell. 11–12, 7–55.

(1964), 'Der griechische und byzantinische Roman in der Forschung von 1945 bis 1960', Jahrb. d. Öst. Byz. Gesell. 13, 29–86, and 14, 83–124.

Médan, P. (1926), La latinité d'Apulée dans les Métamorphoses. Paris.

Merkelbach, R. (1959), 'Daphnis and Chloe. Roman und Mysterium', Antaios 1, 47–60.

(1962), Roman und Mysterium in der Antike. Munich and Berlin.

(1988), Die Hirten des Dionysos. Mysterien der römischen Kaiserzeit. Munich and Berlin.

Millar, F. G. B. (1981), 'The world of the Golden Ass', JRS 71, 63–75.

Miralles, C. (1967) (ed.), Xenophon. Barcelona.

(1968), La novela en la antiguedad clásica. Barcelona.

Molinié, G. (1979) (ed.), Chariton (Budé, revised by A. Billault 1990). Paris.

Montague, H. (1992), 'Sweet and pleasant passion: Female and male fantasy in ancient romance novels', in Richlin (1992), 231–49.

Moreau, A. (1992) (ed.), L'initiation: les rites d'adolescence et les mystères (2 vols). Montpellier.

Moreschini, C. (1978), Apuleio e il Platonismo. Florence.

(1990), 'Le Metamorfosi di Apuleio, la fabula milesia e il romanzo', MD 25, 115–28.

Morgan, J. R. (1982), 'History, romance and realism in Heliodorus', Class. Ant. 1, 221–65.

(1989a), 'The story of Knemon in Heliodorus' Aithiopika', JHS 109, 99–113.

(1989b), 'A sense of the ending: the conclusion of Heliodorus' ΑΙΘΙΟΠΙΚΑ', TAPhA 119, 299–320.

Most, G. W. (1989), 'The stranger's stratagem: self-disclosure and self-sufficiency in Greek culture', JHS 109, 114–33.

Müller, C. W. (1980), 'Die Witwe von Ephesus', A&A 26, 103–21.

(1981), 'Der griechische Roman', in See, K. von (ed.), Neues Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft, 377–412. Wiesbaden.

Müller, K. (1978), Petron: Satyrica. Munich.

Nisbet, R. G. M. (1962), review of first edn of Müller, K. (1978), JRS 52, 227–32.

Oldfather, W. A., Canter, H. V. and Perry, B. E. (1934), Index Apuleianus. Middletown, Ct.

O'Sullivan, J. N. (1980), A Lexicon to Achilles Tatius. Berlin and New York.

Pacchieni, M. (1978), La novella milesia in Petronio. Lecce.

Papanikolaou, A. D. (1973a) (ed.), Xenophon Ephesius. Leipzig.

(1973b), Chariton-Studien. Göttingen.

Parsons, P. J. (1971), 'A Greek Satyricon?', BICS 8, 53–68.

(1974), 'Narrative about Iolaus', P. Oxy. 42 no. 3010, 34–41.

Pecere, O. (1975), Petronio: la novella della matrona di Efeso. Padua.

Pennacini, A. (1979), 'Tecniche del racconto nelle Metamorphosi. Analisi del libri 1, 2, 3', in Pennacini et al. (1979), 21–102.

Pennacini, A., Donini, P. L., Alimenti, T. and Monteduro Roccavini, A. (1979), Apuleio letterato, filosofo, mago. Rome.

Penwill, J. L. (1990), 'Ambages Reciprocae: Reviewing Apuleius' Metamorphoses', in Boyle, A. J., The Imperial Muse, II: Flavian Epicists to Claudian, 211–35. Berwick, Vic.

Perry, B. E. (1930), 'Chariton and his romance from a literary-historical point of view', AJP 51, 93–134.

(1967), The Ancient Romances. A Literary-historical Account of Their Origins. Berkeley and Los Angeles.

Perutelli, A. (1985), 'Le chiacchiere dei liberti: dialogo e commedia in Petronio 41–46', *Maia* 37, 103–19.
   (1990), 'Il narratore nel Satyricon', *MD* 25, 9–26.
Petersmann, H. (1977), *Petrons Urbane Prosa*. Vienna.
   (1985), 'Umwelt, Sprachsituation und Stilschichten in Petrons *Satyrica*', *ANRW* II.32.3, 1687–1705.
Philonenko, M. (1968) (ed.), *Joseph and Asenath*. Leiden.
Plepelits, K. (1976), *Chariton von Aphrodisias: Kallirhoe* (German trans.). Stuttgart.
   (1980), *Achilleus Tatios: Leukippe und Kleitophon* (German trans.). Stuttgart.
Prete, S. (1988), 'La questione della lingua latina nel Quattrocento e l'importanza dell' opera di Apuleio', in Hofmann (1988), 123–40.
Pulquério Futre Pinheiro, M. (1987), *Estruturas técnico-narrativas nas* Etiópicas *de Heliodoro*. Lisbon.
Rankin, H. D. (1971), *Petronius the Artist*. The Hague.
Rattenbury, R. M., Lumb, T. W. and Maillon, J. (1935–43, 2nd edn 1960) (eds), *Héliodore. Les Éthiopiques*. Budé.
Rea, J. (1967), 'History (?)', *P.Oxy.* 27 no. 2466, 134–6.
Reardon, B. P. (1969), 'The Greek novel', *Phoenix* 23, 55–73.
   (1971), *Courants littéraires grecs des IIe et IIIe siècles après J.-C.*, 309–403. Paris.
   (1977) (ed.), *Erotica antiqua. Acta of the International Conference on the Ancient Novel*. Bangor.
   (1982a), 'Theme, structure and narrative in Chariton', *YCS* 27, 1–27.
   (1982b), reviews Molinié (1979) in *REG*, 157–73.
   (1989) (ed.), *Collected Ancient Greek Novels*. Berkeley, Los Angeles and London.
   (1990a), reviews Merkelbach (1988) in *CR* 40, 81–2.
   (1990b), '*Mythos ou logos*: Longus' Lesbian pastorals', in Tatum and Vernazza (1990), 21.
   (1991), *The Form of Greek Romance*. Princeton.
Reeve, M. D. (1969), 'Author variants in Longus?', *PCPhS* N.S. 15, 75–85.
   (1971), 'Hiatus in the Greek novelists', *CQ* N.S. 21, 514–39.
   (1979), 'Fulvio Orsini and Longus', *JHS* 99, 165–7.
   (1982, 2nd edn 1985) (ed.), *Longus*. Leipzig.
   (1983), 'Petronius', in Reynolds (1983), 295–300.
Reynolds, L. D. (1983) (ed.), *Texts and Transmission: A Survey of the Latin Classics*. Oxford.
Richlin, A. (1992) (ed.), *Pornography and Representation in Greece and Rome*. New York and Oxford.
Robertson, D. R. and Valette, P. (1940–45), *Apulée: Les* Métamorphoses, 3 vols. Paris.
Rohde, E. (1876, 3rd edn 1913, repr. 1960), *Der griechische Roman und seine Vorläufer*. Leipzig.
Rosati, G. (1983), 'Trimalchione in scena', *Maia* 35, 213–27.
Rose, K. F. C. (1971), *The Date and Author of the* Satyricon (Mnemosyne suppl. XVI). Leiden.
Ruiz-Montero, C. (1980), 'Una observación para la cronologia di Caritón de Afrodisias', *Estudios clásicos* 24, 63–9.
   (1989a), 'P.Oxy. 2466: the Sesonchosis Romance', *ZPE* 79, 51–7.
   (1989b), 'Caritón de Afrodisias y el mundo real', in Liviabella Furiani and Scarcella (1989), 107–49.
   (1991), 'Aspects of the vocabulary of Chariton of Aphrodisias', *CQ* 41, 484–9.
Russell, D. A. (1990) (ed.), *Antonine Literature*. Oxford.
Saïd, S. (1987), 'La société dans le roman grec ou la campagne vue de la ville', in Frézouls, E. (ed.), *Sociétés urbaines, sociétés rurales dans l'Asie Mineure et la Syrie hellénistiques et romaines, Actes du colloque organisé a Strasbourg 1985*, 149–71. Strasbourg.
Sandy, G. N. (1974a), 'Recent scholarship on the prose fiction of classical Antiquity', *Classical World* 67, 321–59 (reprinted in *The Classical World Bibliography of Roman Drama and Poetry and Ancient Fiction*. N.Y. and London (1978)).
   (1974b), 'Scaenica Petroniana', *TAPA* 104, 329–46.
   (1978), 'Book XI: Ballast or Anchor?', in Hijmans and van der Paardt, 123–40.
   (1979), 'Notes on Lollianus' *Phoinicica*', *AJP* 100, 367–76.
   (1982a), *Heliodorus*. Boston.
   (1982b), 'Characterisation and philosophical décor in Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*', *TAPA* 112, 141–67.
Scarcella, A. M. (1968a), *Struttura e tecnica narrativa in Longo sofista*. Palermo.
   (1968b), *La Lesbo di Longo sofista*. Rome.
   (1970), 'Realtà e letteratura nel paesaggio sociale ed economico del romanzo di Longo sofista', *Maia* 22, 103–31.
   (1972), 'Testimonianze della crisi di un' età nel romanzo di Eliodoro', *Maia* 24, 8–41.
   (1977), 'Les structures socio-économiques du roman de Xénophon d'Éphèse', *REG* 90, 249–62.
   (1981), 'Metastasi narratologica del dato storico nel romanzo greco', in *Atti del convegno internazionale 'Letteratura classica e narratologia'*. Perugia.
Schiesaro, A. (1988), 'La tragedia di Psiche: Note ad Apuleio *Met.* 4.28–35', *Maia* 40, 141–50.
Schlam, C. C. (1970), 'Platonica in the *Metamorphoses* of Apuleius', *TAPA* 101, 477–87.
   (1971), 'The scholarship on Apuleius since 1938', *CW* 64, 285–309.
   (1976), *Apuleius and the Monuments*. University Park, Pa.
   (1990), 'Apuleius and the Middle Ages', in Bernardo and Levin (1990), 363–9.
   (1992), *The* Metamorphoses *of Apuleius: On Making An Ass of Oneself*. Chapel Hill.
Schmeling, G. L. (1974), *Chariton*. New York.
   (1976–) (ed.), *The Petronian Society Newsletter*. Gainesville.
   (1980), *Xenophon of Ephesus*. Boston.
   (1992), 'The Satyricon: the sense of an ending', *RhM* 134, 352–77.
Schmeling, G. and Stuckey, J. (1977), *A Bibliography of Petronius* (Mnemosyne suppl. XXXIX). Leiden.
Schönberger, O. (1960, 4th edn 1989) (ed.), *Longos. Hirtengeschichten von Daphnis und Chloe*. Berlin.
Scobie, A. (1975), *Apuleius* Metamorphoses I. Meisenheim.

(1978a), 'The influence of Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* in Renaissance Italy and Spain', in Hijmans and van der Paardt (1978), 211–30.

(1978b), 'The structure of Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*', in Hijmans and van der Paardt (1978), 43–61.

(1983), *Apuleius and Folklore*. London.

Scotti, M. T. (1982), 'Il proemio delle Metamorfosi tra Ovidio ed Apuleio', *GIF* 34, 43–65.

Semiotica della novella latina (1986) [Materiali e contributi per la storia della narrativa greco-latina IV]. Rome.

Slater, N. W. (1989), *Reading Petronius*. Baltimore.

Smith, M. S. (1975), *Petronius: Cena Trimalchionis*. Oxford.

(1985), 'Petronius: a bibliography 1945–82', *ANRW* II.32.3, 1628–65.

Smith, W. S. (1972), 'The narrative voice in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*', *TAPA* 103, 513–34.

Stephens, S. A. (1990), '"Popularity" of the ancient novel', in Tatum and Vernazza (1990), 148–9.

Stephens, S. A. and Winkler, J. J. (1993), *Ancient Greek Novels: The Fragments*. Princeton.

Sullivan, J. P. (1965), *Petronius: The* Satyricon *and the Fragments*. Harmondsworth.

(1968), *The* Satyricon *of Petronius*. London.

(1976), 'Interpolations in Petronius', *PCPS* n.s. 22, 90–122.

(1985), *Literature and Politics in the Age of Nero*. Ithaca, N.Y.

Summers, R. G. (1970), 'Roman justice and Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*', *TAPA* 101, 511–31.

(1972), 'Apuleius' Juridicus', *Historia* 21, 120–6.

(1973), 'A note on the date of the *Golden Ass*', *AJP* 94, 375–83.

Szepessy, T. (1976), 'Le siège de Nisibe et la chronologie d' Héliodore', *Act.Ant.Hung.* 24, 247–76.

Tatum, J. (1969), 'The tales of Apuleius' *Golden Ass*', *TAPA* 100, 487–527.

(1979), *Apuleius and the* Golden Ass. Ithaca, N.Y.

Tatum, J. and Vernazza, G. (1990) (eds), *The Ancient Novel. Classical Perspectives and Modern Paradigms. Proceedings of the (1989) International Conference on the Ancient Novel, Dartmouth, NH*. Hanover, N.H.

Tatum, J. and Vernazza, G. (1993) (eds), *The Search for the Ancient Novel*. (A selection of papers from the 1989 conference). Baltimore.

Teske, D. (1991), *Der Roman des Longus als Werk der Kunst*. Münster.

Thibau, R. (1965), 'Les *Métamorphoses* d'Apulée et la théorie platonicienne de l'Eros', *Studia Philosophica Gandensia* 3, 89–144.

Turasiewicz, R. (1990), 'The problem of the style of Xenophon of Ephesus', in Tatum and Vernazza (1990), 135–6.

Turcan, R. (1963), 'Le roman initiatique', *RHR*, 149–99.

van der Paardt, R. Th. (1971), *Apuleius: Metamorphoses Book III*. Amsterdam.

(1978), 'Various aspects of narrative technique in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*', in Hijmans and van der Paardt (1978), 75–94.

(1981), 'The unmasked 'I': Apuleius *Met.* XI.27', *Mnem.* 34, 96–106.

(1989), 'Three Dutch Asses', in Hofmann (1989), 133–44.

van der Valk, M. (1941), 'Remarques sur la date des Éthiopiques d'Héliodore', *Mnem.* 9, 97–100.

van Thiel, H. (1961), 'Über die Textüberlieferung des Longus', *RhM* 104, 356–62.

(1971), *Das Eselsroman* (2 vols). Munich.

Vieillefond, J.-R. (1987) (ed.), *Longus*. Paris.

Vilborg, E. (1955) (ed.), *Achilles Tatius*. Stockholm.

(1962), *Achilles Tatius. A Commentary*. Stockholm.

von Korn, M. and Reitzer, S. (1986), *Concordantia Petroniana*. Berlin.

Walsh, P. G. (1970), *The Roman Novel*. Cambridge.

(1974), reviews van Thiel (1971), in *CR* n.s. 24, 215–18.

(1978), 'Petronius and Apuleius', in Hijmans and van der Paardt (1978), 17–24.

(1981), 'Apuleius and Plutarch', in Blumenthal, H. J. and Markus, R. A. (eds), *Neoplatonism and Early Christian Thought*, 20–32. London.

Weinreich, O. (1962), *Der griechische Liebesroman*. Zurich.

Wesseling, B. (1988), 'The audience of the ancient novel', in Hofmann (1988), 67–80.

West, S. (1969), 'The Greek version of the legend of Tefnut', *JEA* 55, 161–83.

(1971), 'Notes on some romance papyri', *ZPE* 7, 95.

(1974), 'Joseph and Asenath', *CQ* n.s. 24, 70–81.

(1980), 'Addendum to P. Oxy. 2466: "Sesonchosis romance"', *P. Oxy.* 47, no. 3319, 11–19.

Wiersma, S. (1990), 'The ancient Greek novel and its heroines: a female paradox', *Mnemosyne* 43, 110–23.

Willis, W. H. (1990), 'The Robinson-Cologne papyrus of Achilles Tatius', *GRBS* 31, 73–102.

Winkler, J. J. (1980), 'Lollianus and the desperadoes', *JHS* 100, 155–81.

(1982), 'The mendacity of Kalasiris and the narrative strategy of Heliodoros' *Aithiopika*', *YCS* 27, 93–158.

(1984), *Auctor & Actor: A Narratological Reading of Apuleius's* The Golden Ass. Berkeley.

(1990), 'The education of Chloe: hidden injuries of sex', in *The Constraints of Desire*. N.Y. and London.

Wlosok, A. (1969), 'Zur Einheit der *Metamorphosen* des Apuleius', *Philologus* 113, 68–84.

Wright, J. R. G. (1971), 'Folk-tale and literary technique in *Cupid and Psyche*', *CQ* n.s. 21, 273–84.

Yatromanolakis, Y. (1990) (ed.), Ἀχιλλέως Ἀλεξανδρέως Τατίου Λευκίππη καὶ Κλειτοφῶν. Athens.

Young, D. (1968), 'Author variants in Longus', *PCPhS* n.s. 14, 65–74.

(1971), 'Second thoughts on Longus' second thoughts', *PCPhS* n.s. 17, 99–107.

Zanetto, G. (1990), 'Il romanzo greco: lingua e pubblico', in Tatum and Vernazza (1990), 147–8.

Zeitlin, F. (1971), 'Petronius as paradox: anarchy and artistic integrity', *TAPA* 102, 631–84.

(1990), 'The poetics of *eros*: nature, art and imitation in Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*', in Halperin, D. M., Winkler, J. J. and Zeitlin, F. (eds), *Before Sexuality*, 417–64. Princeton.