

Latinising the Novel. Scholarship since Perry on Greek ‘models’ and Roman (re-)creations

MAAIKE ZIMMERMAN
Groningen

1. Introduction

This paper discusses some aspects of what I would call ‘latinising’ the novels: the ways some Latin authors, motivated and inspired—among other things—by Greek fictional material, created novels of their own.¹ These texts often proudly and self-consciously display—and no doubt expect their audience to recognize—their Greek background. At the same time these products clearly situate themselves in the tradition of Roman literature, and seem to breathe a distinctly Roman atmosphere.² In the next few pages I will look at some of the processes which may contribute to this ‘Roman flavour’. In the course of this investigation, which refers to important publications over the past decades, it will, I hope, become apparent what has happened in research on the Roman novels since Perry, and what has caused our views and insights—and, perhaps more importantly, the questions we ask—to differ from Perry’s.³ It is important to note that, although Walsh’s *The Roman*

¹ My thanks go to Gareth Schmeling, who initiated, coordinated, and presided the panel session ‘The Ancient Novel since Perry’ at the *APA* convention in New Orleans, January 2003, of which this paper originally was a part. I sincerely thank both respondents at that session, Antonio Stramaglia and Alain Billault, for their responses and suggestions. I am, moreover, very grateful to Stephen Harrison for his careful reading (and correcting of the English) of an earlier version of this paper.

² One may be reminded of Walsh 1970, 1 (on the novels of Petronius and Apuleius) “... both are endowed with an authentically Roman flavour”.

³ In this paper I will have to confine myself to pointing out only those developments that have a bearing on my subject. For more inclusive overviews I refer to the important collections of articles in Schmeling 1996 (2003: paperback edition with revised introduction and bibliography), Harrison 1999, and Hofmann 1999. Schmeling 1996, 457–551 (Schmeling, Harrison, and Schmeling) and 563–580 (Merkle) are specific essays on the

Novel was first published in 1970, only three years after Perry's *Ancient Romances*, and in parts as a strong reaction to Perry's analysis of Petronius and Apuleius, it already belongs to another world altogether. The same can be said of Sullivan's literary study (1968) of Petronius' novel.⁴ This is no doubt due to the fact that the roots of Perry's book of 1967 go back to insights developed during a much earlier period: not just to the Sather Lectures of 1951, but to his dissertation on the *Metamorphoses* (1919), and on articles both on Apuleius and on Chariton which had been published in the 1920s and '30s.⁵

With his *Ancient Romances* Perry offered first and foremost a literary-historical account of the origins of the Greek Romances, but he included important chapters on the Latin novels. In these he discussed the three Latin texts which are generally treated as the Latin 'novels proper': Petronius' *Satyrica*, Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*, and the *Historia Apollonii regis Tyri*. He also introduced his readers to a Christian Latin novel, the *Recognitiones*, as the Latin translator/adaptor of the Greek *Homiliae* called his version of the so-called *Pseudo-Clementines*. In this paper I will concentrate on the novels of Petronius and Apuleius.⁶ Numerous other Latin texts have since Perry's publications been recognized as belonging to—or at least as being enlightening for—the study of Latin fiction, but they will not occupy us here.⁷

Latin novels proper; but the book includes much information and discussion pertaining to the Latin novels as well as to the Greek novels in its first, general part (1–305). Harrison 1999, besides offering a useful collection of reprints and translations of important articles on Petronius and Apuleius, has an illuminating and very helpful assessment of the research on these Roman novels in his Introduction (Harrison 1999, xi–xxxix); Hofmann 1999, in the Introduction as well as in the original contributions to this collection, addresses a wider field of 'Latin Fiction'.

⁴ See Harrison 1999, xx and xxxi on the lasting value of Walsh's discussion of both the novels of Petronius and Apuleius, especially of the literary texture of both works; see also Schlam, Finkelppearl 2000, 48 f. and especially 203 ff.

⁵ As Bryan Reardon pointed out in his paper on 'The Ancient Novel at the Time of Perry', which opened the *APA* session (see note 1), and which will be published elsewhere.

⁶ For the developments since Perry in scholarship on the *Historia Apollonii regis Tyri* see, e.g., Schmeling 1999, with bibliography; for the Latin *Recognitiones* see Huber-Rebenich 1999, 192 f., with helpful bibliographical references in notes. Perry 1967 is mentioned there as the earliest guide to this apostolic novel (note 10 on p. 208).

⁷ For a concise and clear overview of the range of these texts see Hofmann 1999, with references to further literature.

Before coming to this paper's theme of 'latinising the novel', and thus to the specifically 'Roman connection' of the Latin novels, I will briefly consider what we have learnt in the years since Perry about their being part of the larger literary world of Greco-Roman fiction, in short, their 'Greek connection'.⁸

2. The Latin novels: the Greek connection

2.1. Greek 'palimpsests' of Roman novels; a short overview

While the existence of a Greek text as some kind of 'palimpsest' behind Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* has long been recognized (see below, 2.2), for other Latin novels the scholarly opinion is not as unequivocal. Regarding Petronius' *Satyrica*, the idea that this work somehow reacted (in a parodic way) to the Greek ideal romances, put forward by Heinze 1899, has been very influential. At the other end of the scale, scholars have emphatically claimed that Petronius' novel is a uniquely Roman creation, a one-off happening in world literature, due to the coincidence of one individual genius and the constraints of the period in which this author lived. Such is also the opinion of Perry:

... Thus the first and only truly Roman novel was born of necessity and special circumstances, springing up full grown all at once like Athena from the head of Zeus. It was merely an accident of time, place, and individual personality. It had no forebears and no descendants.⁹

The suggestion that Petronius' *Satyrica* is parodying a known set of Greek texts, commonly taken together as the 'ideal Greek love-romance', is different, of course, from assuming that behind the Latin novel of Petronius one Greek text stands as a 'palimpsest'. This latter idea, too, had been defended by Bürger 1892, and has recently been revived with new arguments.

⁸ Sandy 1994 is a helpful overview on this subject, with bibliographical references.

⁹ Perry 1967, 206. In a footnote (p. 362 f.) Perry refers to a change of opinion in this respect: he formerly had sided with those who sought to explain the *Satyrica* in terms of Milesian tale (see below, 2.3). For a very differently-oriented discussion of the radical originality of Petronius' *Satyrica* see Zeitlin 1971, repr. in Harrison 1999.

Inbetween the two extreme positions adumbrated above, stand those who have assessed and investigated the presence of various Greek subliterate genres that have been re-used and combined in Petronius' intricate and innovative Latin novel;¹⁰ this will be discussed more extensively below, in section 2.3.

The role of a Greek 'palimpsest' behind the *Historia Apollonii regis Tyri* is still a matter of intense debate. Here it must suffice to refer to the concise assessment of this problem, with bibliographical references, in the article 'Historia Apollonii regis Tyri' by Fusillo and Galli, in H. Cancik, ed., *Der Neue Pauly* 5, 1998, 635–636. It has in any case been shown that several elements of the *Historia Apollonii* can only be explained by a strong Greek connection of this text at one of its stages of development.¹¹

Of the two 'Troy romances', Latin prose texts, written in imperial times, and styled as eye-witness reports of the Trojan war, the *Ephemeris belli Troiani* by "Dictys" certainly is based on a Greek original.¹² For the other text, the *Acta diurna belli Troiani* by "Dares", there are strong indications for assuming a Greek original.¹³

The Latin *Res gestae Alexandri Magni* of the early 4th century A.D. is a translation by Iulius Valerius of the oldest version of the Greek text of Ps. Callisthenes.

2.2. Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*

As is generally accepted, Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* is a translation-adaptation-transformation of a lost, Greek text, mentioned by Photius as the Μεταμορφώσεις by 'Lucius of Patrae'.¹⁴ An epitome of that Greek work has

¹⁰ See, e.g., C. Panayotakis 1995; Barchiesi 1999; this is an English translation, with an updating afterword by the author, of Barchiesi 1986.

¹¹ Perry 1967, 320 f. strongly pronounced himself against Rohde's assumption of a Greek text behind the *Historia Apollonii*. S. Panayotakis, in his forthcoming commentary on the *Historia Apollonii regis Tyri*, will, through careful analysis of this text, show that such mutually exclusive notions as 'original', 'translation', 'pagan' 'Christian', 'Greek', 'Latin', may not be helpful for our appreciation of this text, since they may each correspond to one of various stages of development through which this text has gone. See for a case study S. Panayotakis 2000.

¹² See Merkle 1989, 113 f.; Merkle 1996, 564, with note 4.

¹³ See Beschorner 1992, 231–243; Merkle 1996, 578 with note 33.

¹⁴ Photius, *Bibliothēke* 129. As Perry already pointed out, and as has repeatedly since been acknowledged by others, Photius' identification of the author of the lost Μεταμορφώσεις

come down to us in the manuscripts of Lucian, with the title Λούκιος ἡ Ὀνος. Scholars on the whole agree that this epitome cannot be the work of Lucian. However, from studying this pseudo-Lucianic *Onos* in comparison with the Latin novel of Apuleius we can form some conclusions about the longer, lost Greek Μεταμορφώσεις, and about the Latin *Metamorphoses*' relation with it. This is what Perry, and many after him, have done. Perry had become convinced that the lost Μεταμορφώσεις indeed was a work of Lucian:

...the Lucianic peculiarities of thought and expression in the *Onos*, as in some other writings of Lucian that were once branded as spurious but now regarded as genuine, are so numerous and so striking that no one who weighs them judiciously can doubt that they originated with Lucian. Since we cannot assign the epitome to him, that is, the *Onos*, we are bound to conclude, in consideration both of the manuscript tradition and the nature of the text, its language and thought, that the original Μεταμορφώσεις was written by Lucian. No other explanation will account for the facts as we know them today.¹⁵

Perry's suggestion, first published in his dissertation of 1920, and repeated in later publications, has been very influential, and is widely accepted. Recently, however, his views have been challenged on several grounds, for instance by Mason, who raises important objections:

Perry's ... principal argument, that *Onos* is the kind of work which Lucian *might* have written, does not prove that 'Lucian was the only man known to us who wrote in that humorous or satirical spirit' (Perry 1967: 213). This claim has become less compelling as we have become more aware of the wide variety of ancient prose fiction. The linguistic character of the *Onos*, which supposedly used the same vocabulary and phraseology as the Μεταμορφώσεις, differs significantly from Lucian's clever style. It is not at all obvious that either the process of epitomisation, or

must be a mistake caused by his confusing the narrator of that story, who probably was a 'Lucius of Patrae' (as in the epitome), with the author. See e.g. Mason 1994, 1669–1671 ('Lukios of Patrae').

¹⁵ Perry 1967, 227.

the art of parodying a supposed source, can fully explain the linguistic and stylistic differences (Hall 1981: 362–364).¹⁶

Mason also points to questions of relative chronology which make Lucianic authorship of the *Μεταμορφώσεις* problematic.¹⁷

2.3. Petronius' *Satyrice*

There are widely divergent modes in which scholars define the unmistakably existing 'Greek connection' of Petronius' novel:

Barchiesi 1986 has pointed to the impact which a number of Greek papyrus finds must have on our understanding of Petronius' *Satyrice*.¹⁸ In an overview of the relevant material, Barchiesi analyses various Greek fragmentary texts belonging to what increasingly appears to have been a vast group of texts of popular entertainment literature—of an erotic and/or fantastic, or purely farcical nature—and which must have been widely read both by Greek and Roman readers. Far from positing one concrete Greek text as a 'palimpsest' behind Petronius' novel, Barchiesi remarks:

Every new finding warns us more and more clearly that we must distinguish between the nature of the model and the use Petronius makes of it. On the one hand, we must get a better understanding of the paraliterature which provided Petronius with material for his composition. On the other hand, the new fragments of Greek novels also serve as a point of contrast. They help us define what Petronius could not have found in the great pool of lost novels.¹⁹

However, also the idea of a concrete Greek text as a 'palimpsest' for Petronius' novel had been proposed long before the discovery of papyrus fragments of Greek comic-realistic novels, by Bürger 1892.²⁰ His sugges-

¹⁶ Mason 1999, 105, referring to J. Hall, *Lucian's Satire*, New York 1981.

¹⁷ Mason 1999, 105; see also Mason 1994, 1681 f.

¹⁸ See also below, section 2.4.

¹⁹ Barchiesi 1999, 139; the quotation is taken from the English translation of Barchiesi 1986, in Harrison 1999.

²⁰ Bürger 1892 proposed as a model for the *Satyrice* a Greek novelistic narrative, consisting of a main story presented by an *ego*-narrator, with various sub-narratives embedded in

tions found few adherents at that time, and were rather eclipsed by Heinze's influential thesis (mentioned above in section 2.1). Moreover, from the final decades of the 19th century onward, "Petronian scholarship—under pressure from pervasive ideologies, relating to the consolidation of national states in Europe, and the general upheaval caused by the revolutionary progress in science and technology—began to invest unstintingly in a vision of Petronius as a national writer and a great innovator. According to this interpretation, Petronius had, in the fashion of contemporary writers of Naturalist documentary novels, such as Emile Zola, invented a new form of literature for describing the daily life and manners of his ancient Italian fellow countrymen." Petronius became "the quintessential Roman or ancient Italian author, whose artistic 'originality', supposedly, was not compromised by 'foreign' Greek influence."²¹

In an as yet unpublished dissertation, Jansson 1997 has by means of an analysis of the narrative form of Petronius' *Satyrica* (applying the ancient rhetorical theory of *narratio*), argued that the *Satyrica* may be seen as the performance of one narrator (Encolpius), who presents the story as his "recollections", during which he impersonates various characters; this results in a mixture of discourse types. Jansson in this dissertation has moreover taken up Bürger's thesis, but has added an analysis of linguistic and cultural layering in the *Satyrica*, and argues that the work is most likely an adaptation of a specific Greek model, also written in a mixture of discourse types.²²

2.4. Greek fragments and the Roman novels

Papyrus fragments

Undoubtedly one of the major breakthroughs in research on the ancient novels in the last decades of the twentieth century has been the discovery and publication of a number of papyrus fragments of Greek novels (their impact has already been mentioned above in section 2.3, regarding Petronius' 'Greek connection'). Not only did these profoundly change earlier ideas on

the principal story. His article includes a thorough literary-historical investigation of the *Μιλησιακά* of Aristides, and its Roman adaptation by Sisenna.

²¹ These quotations are from Jansson 1997, 289 f. See also his contribution in this volume of *Ancient Narrative*.

²² Jansson's dissertation will be published in the series of *Supplementa of Ancient Narrative*; see also his contribution in this volume of *Ancient Narrative*.

the chronology of the Greek novels;²³ they also made it quite clear that considering the so-called ‘comic-realistic’ novels of Petronius and Apuleius as exclusively Roman type of prose fiction was wrong-headed.

‘Apuleius and Petronius are joined now by several other Greek fragments – *Phoinikika*, *Daulis*, *Iolaos*, and *Tinouphis*. These comprise what seems to be a subgenre in the field of ancient fiction ... The conventional division between Greek and Latin has now broken down, and it remains an open question which gave rise to the other.’²⁴

It is interesting to note that, as early as 1903, Bürger had foreseen exactly such an effect from further papyrus finds: “*Es wäre zu wünschen, dass der Boden Ägyptens, der unsere Kenntnis des idealistischen Romans im Altertume in den letzten Jahren so bedeutend bereichert und uns darüber ganz neue Anschauungen gebracht hat, auch für diesen seinen realistischen Vetter sich einmal fruchtbar erweise.*”²⁵ Some of the above-mentioned fragments, moreover, have shown that Petronius’ *Satyrice* was not unique in its application of prosimetrum in a novel. The fragments of both *Iolaos* and *Tinouphis* are by scholars considered prosimetric texts, but Barchiesi is more cautious on this last point.²⁶

Other fragments

Iamblichus’ *Babyloniaka*, known from an extensive summary in Photius, and from some fragments, likewise seems to have more in common with the Latin novels than with the five ‘idealistic’ Greek romances.²⁷

A very interesting set of Greek prose fragments has recently been collected from the *Etymologicum Genuinum* through careful philological and lexical research: their discoverer, Alpers (1996), has edited and discussed the

²³ Perry himself discusses the *Ninos* fragments and those of *Metiochos* and *Parthenope*; when he wrote his *Ancient Romances* the early dating for Chariton had already been firmly established thanks to the recovery of papyrus fragments of Chariton’s novel from the 2nd century A.D. (see Perry 1967, 96 f.; 153 f. on *Ninos*, and 172 with note 18 on p. 358 f. on *Metiochos* and *Parthenope*).

²⁴ Thus Stephens and Winkler 1995, 7; see also their discussions of Lollianos’ *Phoinikika* (and Apuleius: 322 f.); on *Iolaos* (358 f.); *Daulis* (375 f.), and *Tinouphis* (400 f.).

²⁵ I owe this quotation to Jensson 1997, 328, n. 541.

²⁶ See Kussl 1991, 3 f., and 171 f.; a concise and helpful discussion may be found in Relihan 1993, *Appendix A*, 199–202; Sandy 1994a, 139 f. More cautiously on prosimetric character of these texts: Barchiesi 1999, 140 f.; see also Schmeling 1996a.

²⁷ Photius’ summary and the main fragments are translated with an introduction by Sandy in Reardon 1989, 783 f.

fragments, and shown that they belong together as fragments from a lost longer fictional prose text which should be dated not later than the beginning or middle of the 2nd century A.D. He has pointed out remarkable situational and lexical parallels with Petronius' and Apuleius' novels. Alpers has proposed to refer to the lost text from which these fragments come, as the '*Protagoras* novel', after the name of one of the main characters in the fragments. It is tempting to suppose that Apuleius' *Hermagoras*, of which some fragments are preserved, and which is generally regarded as another novel by Apuleius, could be affiliated with a similar Greek text like the '*Protagoras* novel'. Perry (1927) interestingly suggests that Apuleius chose the name *Hermagoras* because he thought it appropriate to a protagonist who is, as can be inferred from the fragments, represented as a travelling professional rhetorician. Similarly, Alpers' *Protagoras* may have been represented as such a travelling 'sophist'. In connection with Alpers' 'Protagoras' Barchiesi interestingly points to the names of two characters in Petronius' novel who are named after masters of classical rhetoric: Corax and Gorgias.²⁸

From the short surveys above it is clear, then, that there exists a strong and vital 'Greek connection' for most of the Latin fictional prose texts of the imperial period, certainly not less than had been the case in earlier phases of Latin literary history. Especially regarding approaches to this aspect of Latin literature, its 'Greek connection', a great deal has changed since the productive years of Perry. From several passages of his comparison of the Latin *Metamorphoses* with the Greek (lost) *Μεταμορφώσεις*, it becomes clear that Perry is convinced that the Greek text—although we do not have it—must on many points have been superior to the Latin text – which we do have. We have now learnt to appreciate the self-conscious and creative ways in which Latin authors manage their 'Greek connection', as will become clear from the next chapter.

3. The Roman Connection

3.1. Translation and intertextuality in Roman literature

As all readers of Latin literature know, it had from its early stages developed in a dynamic interplay with Greek literature, literary interaction being only

²⁸ Barchiesi 1999, 141.

one segment of the Romans' "... entire experience in dialogue with this other culture," to use a phrase of Feeney.²⁹ It is not necessary here to expand on this theme. From recent studies on this fascinating subject we have learnt to appreciate the fact that Roman literature, in this active dialogue, has developed a highly differentiated consciousness of itself.

The writers of the Latin novels have their share in this long tradition, too, and have inherited a specific Roman attitude towards taking Greek texts as starting points for the creation of their own Latin literary productions. In transforming Greek prose fiction into Latin novels Petronius—if we accept the thesis of the Greek 'palimpsest' behind the *Satyrica* (see above, 2.3)—and Apuleius are thus connected to a long range of Latin authors who had done the same, in differing degrees of adaptation, appropriation, and transformation. That is why I find it appropriate to classify this translating activity involved in the creation of the Roman novels as part of the 'Roman connection'. In the past decades the handling of Greek 'models' in for instance Roman epic, Roman comedy, Catullus and his predecessors, the Augustan elegists, and others, has often been the subject of intense study. Many of the results reached there have revealed aspects of individual authors' practice of—and reflexion on—'translation'.³⁰ Some efforts, too, have been undertaken, for instance by Seele 1995, to go beyond just comparing individual Roman 'translations' with their Greek counterparts when the latter are still available, and to attempt at reaching a more comprehensive insight into translation in antiquity, its methods and its theories.

While variation exists between different authors in the degree of 'Romanization' of their Greek models, one permanent aspect of the Roman translations is signalled in practically all periods of the Hellenizing of Roman literature: the translating authors more often than not write for an audience that can be expected to be acquainted with the Greek models that are being adapted. This circumstance is a factor of importance in explaining the completely different attitude of Latin literary translations and adaptations of Greek originals, compared to modern literary translations and adaptations from one language into another. The audience's aesthetic pleasure in these Latin re-creations no doubt for a considerable part consisted in recognizing

²⁹ Quote from Feeney 1998, 25; his book has much pertinent discussion related to the theme of this paper.

³⁰ Traina 1970 is a perceptive study on many aspects of the practice of poetic translations from Livius Andronicus to Cicero.

the Greek ‘palimpsest’ behind it, and especially in assessing what it had become in the hands of a Roman author.

It has, moreover, often rightly been emphasized that, in the course of the development of a Roman literary tradition, Roman literature of course begets its own ‘classics’, with the result that successive literary artists are in dynamic interaction with Roman as well as Greek models.³¹ One particularly brilliant, and often-discussed, example from Petronius may suffice to illustrate the innovative force of such intricate intertextuality: in the famous Tale of the Widow of Ephesus (*Sat.* 111–112) Petronius has combined the plot of a Greek *Vorlage* with sophisticated references to Vergil’s Dido in the *Aeneid*. In Apuleius’ *Metamorphoses* the episode of Charite is one striking example out of many.³²

In view of the specific aspects of Latin literature as adumbrated above, it is quite understandable why modern theories of intertextuality have been adopted and employed with special enthusiasm in the research of Latin literature.³³ While the relationship between Greek and Latin literature, as well as the relationship between successive Latin poets has always occupied scholars, in the course of the 20th century the investigation of this phenomenon has rapidly developed from the enumeration of ‘parallels’, or ‘Quellenforschung’, into emphasizing the variety of allusive techniques with which Roman authors involve their audiences in an intricate intertextual dialogue with the literary tradition known to both author and audience.

The development sketched above has inspired many studies of the interaction of the Latin novels with Greek models as well as with the Latin literary tradition. If we accept Jansson’s arguments for assuming that Petronius in writing his novel was transforming a pre-existing Greek text, a Greek ‘Σατυρικά’,³⁴ new insights in the Roman practice of ‘translation’ could profitably be applied. And all we might infer from ancient testimonies about the translatory activities of a Sisenna and his contemporary Varro—these two must have known each other fairly well—might be revealing when looked at

³¹ Important discussion on this subject may be found in Hinds 1998, in his chapter 3 on “Diachrony: literary history and its narratives”.

³² See Finkelpearl 1998, 115 f., with bibliographical references; cf. also the ‘Phaedra Tale’ in Apuleius, *Met.* 10.2–12, with Zimmerman 2000, 417–432.

³³ Thus also Schmitz 2002, 97, after a very helpful introduction to the most important of those modern theories from p. 91 on.

³⁴ See above, section 2.3.

from new perspectives. Something might certainly be gained from such an investigation for Apuleian studies as well.³⁵

Both Hijmans 1987 and Mason 1994 have compared passages from the *Metamorphoses* with parallel passages in the Greek epitome ('the *Onos*'), and demonstrated Apuleius' independent and creative handling of his *Vorlage*.³⁶

The chapter of Walsh 1970 on the literary texture of Petronius' and Apuleius' novels has been an important starting point for further studies.³⁷ It would be superfluous to enumerate all publications since devoted to study of the interaction of Apuleius' novel and the preceding Greek and Latin literary tradition: we have excellent annotated bibliographies, on Petronius by Schmeling, Stuckey 1977 and of course in the continuous issues of the *Petronian Society Newsletter* (edited by G. Schmeling). For Apuleius we have such annotated bibliographies by Schlam 1971, and Schlam and Finkelppearl 2000.³⁸ Finkelppearl 1998 is a monograph (mainly on epic allusion in Apuleius) which exemplifies a point made above, viz. what can be gained in classical study from a judicious use of a range of modern theories of intertextuality. Harrison 2002 discusses the function of the literary allusions to epic and tragedy in a number of instances of 'literary topography' in Apuleius' novel.

Increasingly, modern commentaries on these texts, too, show themselves sensitive to intertextual interpretation of detected 'parallels' or 'borrowings'. Much more can be done and will no doubt effectuate a new understanding of

³⁵ See Lefèvre 1997, 79 ff.; Harrison 1998.

³⁶ Hijmans 1987, 399 ff., also on Apuleius as a translator of philosophical texts, with bibliographical references. Mason 1994, 1696 ff. Van Thiel 1971 had prepared such studies by publishing a synoptic edition of Apuleius' novel and the text of the Greek epitome.

³⁷ Walsh 1970, 32–66. For Petronius, the fifth chapter of Sullivan 1968, 158–213 contains many helpful observations on Petronius' use of preceding and contemporary literature. Modern approaches to literary references in Petronius are e.g.: Connors 1998; Hallett 2003.

³⁸ In 2000 Ellen Finkelppearl published the review of scholarship on Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* 1970–1998, on which she and Carl Schlam had worked together, and which she had completed after Schlam's death in 1993. For the scholarship on Literary Allusion (both to Greek and Latin literature) see Schlam and Finkelppearl 2000, 202–219. For scholarship on the relation of Apuleius' novel with the Greek ass tales as 'sources' see ib. 36 ff.

the intricate relationship between these works, their Greek ‘palimpsests’, and of their Roman connections.³⁹

3.2. The spectre of ‘contaminatio’

Apuleius’ *Metamorphoses*, and the Ps. Clementine *Recognitiones* as well as the anonymous *Historia Apollonii regis Tyri* each receives separate treatment in Perry’s book. However, Perry sometimes combines them in so far as all of them suffer from their authors’ handling of ‘contaminatio’.⁴⁰

Even in more recent literature one sometimes still encounters the term *contaminatio*, mostly used as a negative criticism, in connection with Roman authors who combine different elements in composing new texts.⁴¹ The term itself derives from some mis-understood passages in prologues of Terentius, where the speaker quotes malevolent critics who accuse him of ‘spoiling’ (*contaminare*) his Greek models.⁴² It is indeed an often described procedure in Latin literature that different elements, often moreover adapted from different sources, are combined into one poem, play, or other text. This procedure is undeniably present in many pages of Apuleius’ novel, and has puzzled scholars. It has provoked reactions like Perry’s, who disapproves of Apuleius’ “carelessly mechanical methods of composition”, denying the existence of this conscious combinatory technique, and has at the opposite end of the spectrum given rise to forced efforts to allot all disparate elements a place in an overarching thematic whole, which often implies subjective interpretation. One can trace the strong reactions to Perry’s negative judgement of careless composition by reading the annotated bibliographies mentioned above. The unity-disunity controversy in Apuleian studies has nowadays made way for the more sober establishment of the presence of different material, often in close conjunction. On the other hand, the discussion on the unity of the *Metamorphoses* has mostly concentrated on the apparently disjunctive final, “Isis book”, book 11. Finkelpearl 1998, after reviewing the

³⁹ See for instance the series of *Groningen Commentaries on Apuleius*, 1977 – ..., and the forthcoming commentary on the *Historia Apollonii regis Tyri* by S. Panayotakis.

⁴⁰ E.g. Perry 1967, 300.

⁴¹ The term is applied, and discussed, without negative implications, in Hinds 1998, 141 f.

⁴² E.g. Ter. *Andria* 9–21; *Heau.* 17. Discussions may be found at several places in West, Woodman 1979, through their index, s.v. *contaminatio*; see also A.S. Gratwick in the *Cambridge History of Classical Literature* (ed. E.J. Kenney) vol. II, 117, pleading for redefinition of *contaminatio* as a technical term.

main representatives of the unity-disunity discussion, proposes “to offer a reading that simply continues (viz. in book 11) to look at the text in terms of literary indebtedness...”.⁴³ Such a reading has the advantage of not restricting the discussion of combination technique to the eleventh book.

Without using the often negatively loaded term *contaminatio*, it is, however, clearly an aspect of the ‘Roman connection’ of the novels of Petronius, Apuleius, and of the anonymous *Historia Apollonii*, that they often show this characteristic technique of intricate interweaving or juxtaposing of various elements. In many cases this technique in an intertextual reading reveals a shift of emphasis when the author alludes to one (or even more) ‘model(s)’ by way of involving allusion to yet another (or other) ‘model(s)’. As is the case in the translating practices described above, this combinatory technique has the effect of inviting the attentive cooperation of the audience: again, these authors reckoned with an audience that could recognize the sources and their re-use in the new text. No wonder that ‘the sutures show’: they are meant to be noticed.⁴⁴

Related to the juxtaposition of different models are the jarring generic juxtapositions which in recent publications on Petronius’ *Satyricon* have been shown to be “not ... an incidental feature of the *Satyricon*, but in a sense the very reason for its existence.” This quotation is from Christesen and Torlone 2002, who in their turn quote Conte (1996, 141) “... the chief purpose of this text is precisely the accumulation of languages, the grafting of one genre upon another, the inexhaustible contamination of different literary forms”. Christesen and Torlone proceed to place this aspect of Petronius’ novel in a long-established, specifically Roman, tradition of generic experimentation.⁴⁵ A remarkable characteristic of the hybridization of genre practiced by Roman writers is, according to them, “the coherence of the final product.”⁴⁶ Although Apuleius’ approach to the Greco-Roman generic tradition is different from Petronius’,⁴⁷ interpretation of Apuleius’ *Metamorphoses*, too, has

⁴³ Finkelparl 1998, 188.

⁴⁴ An interesting case of such ‘contaminating’ practices (with a strong ‘latinising’ effect) by Apuleius is discussed by Smith and Woods in this volume of *AN*; they even handle the term ‘contaminatio’ at some point (p. 181), but without negative connotations. See also the references given above in note 32, and Jensson in this volume pp. 116–117.

⁴⁵ Christesen and Torlone 2002, 138 ff.

⁴⁶ Christesen and Torlone 2002, 142 f.

⁴⁷ Christesen and Torlone 2002, 159 ff., while rightly emphasizing the different fashions in which genre is deployed in the *Satyricon* and the *Metamorphoses*, in my opinion too easily

been shown to gain from a more creative way of looking at the characteristic experimental handling of the Greco-Roman generic tradition in the works of Roman authors. In the conclusion of her monograph on Apuleius Finkelpearl remarks: “The novel sets other texts within it in an exploratory manner, working its way toward autonomy and acceptance of its own legitimacy as a multiform and heteroglot genre.”⁴⁸

3.3. Bakhtin and the ancient novels

The wide range of other appropriated literary texts, so characteristic of these Roman novels, results in a polyphonic whole, a multiplicity of generic discourses. Today many studies of the Roman novels discuss this polyphony in the Bakhtinian sense of the novel as an ‘open’, ‘dialogic’ form, whose polyphonic language and structure cannot be reduced to a ‘monologic’ worldview.⁴⁹

Other ideas of Bakhtin have proved to be relevant in discussing aspects of the novels of Petronius and Apuleius: in his book on Dostoevsky, Bakhtin discusses among other texts Petronius’ and Apuleius’ novels as instances of ancient ‘carnavalesque’ literature.⁵⁰ These ideas would, as others since have argued, go a long way in accounting for “the unique atmosphere of mystery and surrealism”, which Perry signals after his discussion of (for instance) the

ignore the presence of literary stylization in Apuleius’ ‘realistic’ novel. Apuleius, indeed, may not make the generic system itself an object of representation in the way Petronius did. However, far from representing an experimentation with novelistic realism, Apuleius’ *Metamorphoses*, too, presents us first and foremost with a ‘world of paper’. See, e.g., Finkelpearl 1998, 147 f., and *passim*; Harrison 2000, 210–259; van Mal – Maeder 2003; Zimmerman 2003 (forthcoming).

⁴⁸ Finkelpearl 1998, 218.

⁴⁹ See Schmitz 2002, 76–90, with further bibliographic references, for a helpful discussion of Bakhtin’s theories and their importance for ancient literature; Branham 2002. Fusillo 1996, 279 ff. discusses Bakhtin’s relevance for the ancient novels. See also Slater 1990, 141 f. on the relevance of Bakhtin’s theory for Petronius and Apuleius; Branham 2002a.

⁵⁰ Bakhtin had developed his ideas on carnivalesque literature first in his dissertation on Rabelais (original edition Moskou 1965; English translation by H. Iswolsky, Bloomington 1984). But in his book on Dostoevsky (Bakhtin ²1963, German translation by A. Schramm, München 1971), on pp. 113 ff. (of the German translation) he traces the history of carnivalesque texts back to antiquity. Schmitz 2001, 88 f. briefly but clearly discusses Petronius’ novel as ‘karnevalisierte Gattung’. Teuber 1993 is a rich discussion of carnivalesque elements in Apuleius’ *Metamorphoses*. Pertinent discussion and case studies on Bakhtin’s notion of carnival laughter in connection with Petronius are to be found in Plaza 2000, 8–9, 107–110, 120–122, 186–187, 210–211.

Risus festival.⁵¹ According to him it is all due to Apuleius' negligence for structure and his carelessly joining together two or more originally independent stories (see above, section 3.2: 'the spectre of *contaminatio*').

Although Bakhtin wrote most of his works in the first half of the 20th century, they were translated into other languages (and only partially), from about 1970 onward. Perry could not have been acquainted with Bakhtin's ideas. However, in his careful reading of the Roman novels of Petronius and Apuleius Perry has often put his finger on most of the characteristics of these novels which still occupy scholars today. His explanations of those characteristics, and his overall appreciation of the Roman novels was different from today, but then, his tools were different. This appears very clearly once more from my next, and brief final point in this discussion of 'Latinising the novels':

3.4. The *ego*-narrative

In an interesting appendix,⁵² Perry addresses 'The Ego-Narrative in Comic Stories': authors of comic narrative, according to Perry, often chose an *ego*-narrator as the narrator of these comic fictions because they followed, by way of mimicry, what was the prevailing fashion in seriously meant wonder-stories. In these (Perry starts from Odysseus' first-person report at the court of Alkinoos) the use of the first person was for the author, according to Perry, a way of discharging himself of responsibility for the telling of lies. Most people will agree with Perry that comic tales, told by an *ego*-narrator, indeed often are intended as parodies of the seriously meant wonder-tales told by an "I". But in the latter, the use of the first person is probably better explained as an authentication gesture, a truth-assertion of the fantastic tale, than by Perry's hard-to-follow arguments of an author's act of discharging himself of the responsibility for what is told.⁵³

As is repeatedly emphasized in overviews on the use of literary theory in classical studies, the application of narratology in the interpretation of classical texts has been a "success story".⁵⁴ This story was yet to begin when

⁵¹ Perry 1967, 281.

⁵² Perry 1967, 325 ff.; see also 111 ff.

⁵³ See Maeder 1991, 10 f., with references to other literature. The authentication gesture would then at the same time function as a fictional signal for the informed reader.

⁵⁴ I am quoting from Harrison's *General Introduction* in Harrison 2001 (ed.), 13.

Perry's book was conceived. Here is not the place to expand on this. It must suffice to point out that, as far as analysis of the *ego*-narrative in the Roman novels concerns, the analytical tools of narratology, especially through the dichotomies of author~narrator, auctorial narrator~actorial narrator, and homodiegetic narration~heterodiegetic narration (and combinations) have been of great use.⁵⁵ They have helped to reveal more precisely the complex dialectic among author, auctorial *ego*-narrator, and actorial *ego*-narrator, with its various levels of irony and tension, in these works.⁵⁶

To end with the 'Roman atmosphere' of the Latin novels, I briefly point to an important aspect of the *ego*-narrative in the Roman novel, which in my opinion merits further exploration. When reading the *ego*-narratives of the novels by Petronius and Apuleius, and the many studies devoted in recent years to that aspect of these Latin novels, one comes to realize two things. First, the very high degree of sophistication with which these authors explore, employ, and take advantage of the homodiegetic narrative situation they have created. Second, as one of the results of this sophistication, the various nuances of distancing, of (self-)irony and self-deprecation, seriousness, or ambiguity, with which the "I" presents his(/her) narration. The question is, whether these two observations, taken together, may be regarded as contributing to that distinctive 'Roman feel' in these novels.⁵⁷ In favour of this idea one could point to distinctly Roman modes of employing the "I" as a rôle, a *persona*, in various literary genres. In a number of recent studies, this aspect has often been investigated in connection with Roman literature as a social, or a political, or even a religious performance: the *persona* is, in each text, modeled according to the intentions of that text.⁵⁸ Augustan elegy and Latin verse satire are only two pronounced examples of this ambiguous and often sophisticated use of different *personae*. As commentators have shown, both Petronius' and Apuleius' novels abound with intertextual references to these two genres, among others.⁵⁹ It might be a good theme for a future symposium, or for a future theme-oriented issue in *Ancient Narrative*,

⁵⁵ For an explanation of these terms, derived from the methodologies of Genette, combined with the typology of Lintvelt, see e.g. Hofmann 1993.

⁵⁶ For a helpful overview, with bibliographical references in notes, see Fusillo 1996, 286 ff.

⁵⁷ Beck 1982 discusses Latin literary antecedents of the *ego*-narrator in Petronius.

⁵⁸ See e.g. White 1993; Gleason 1995; Bloomer 1997; Habinek 1998.

⁵⁹ On echoes of satire in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*, see also Zimmerman 2003a (forthcoming).

to explore the Roman connection of the ever-elusive and ever-intriguing *ego*-narrator in the Roman novels.

Bibliography

- Alpers, K. 1996. 'Zwischen Athen, Abdera und Samos. Fragmente eines unbekanntes Romans aus der Zeit der Zweiten Sophistik', in M. Billerbeck, J. Schamp (eds.) *Kainotomia. Die Erneuerung der griechischen Tradition. Colloquium Pavlos Tzermias (4. XI. 1995)*, Freiburg (Swiss), 19–55.
- Bakhtin, M.M. 1971. *Probleme der Poetik Dostoevskijs*, (Russian orig. Moscou ²1963), transl. A. Schramm, München (with German spelling of Bakhtin's name: Bachtin).
- 1981. *The Dialogic Imagination. Four Essays*, ed. by M. Holquist, transl. by M. Holquist, C. Emerson, Austin.
- Barchiesi, A. 1986. 'Tracce di narrativa greca e romanzo latino: una rassegna', in: *Semiotica della novella latina*, Materiali e contributi per la storia della narrativa greco-latina 4, Rome, 219–236.
- 1999. 'Traces of Greek Narrative and the Roman Novel: A Survey', in Harrison, S.J. (ed.). 1999. *Oxford Readings in the Roman Novel*, Oxford, 124–141 (transl. of Barchiesi 1986 by B. Graziosi, with an afterword by the author).
- Beck, R. 1982. 'The *Satyricon*: Satire, Narrator and Antecedents', *MH* 39, 206–214.
- Beschorner, A. 1992. *Untersuchungen zu Dares Phrygius*. *Classica Monacensia* 4, Tübingen.
- Bloomer W.M. 1992. *Valerius Maximus and the Rhetoric of the New Nobility*, Chapel Hill – London.
- 1997. 'Schooling in Persona: Imagination and Subordination in Roman Education', *CA* 16, 57–78.
- Branham, R. Bracht (ed.). 2002. *Bakhtin and the Classics*, Evanston, Illinois.
- 2002a. 'Representing Time in Ancient Fiction', in M. Zimmerman, G. Schmeling, H. Hofmann, S. Harrison (eds.), *Ancient Narrative*, Vol. 1 (2000–2001), Groningen, 1–31.
- Bürger, K. 1892. 'Der antike Roman vor Petronius', *Hermes* 27, 345–358.
- Christesen, P. and Torlone, Z. 2002. 'Ex omnibus unum, nec hoc nec illud: Genre in Petronius', *MD* 49, 135–172.
- Connors, C. 1998. *Petronius the Poet*, Cambridge.
- Conte, G.B. 1996. *The Hidden Author: An Interpretation of Petronius' Satyricon*, transl. E. Fantham, Berkeley.
- Feeney, D. 1998. *Literature and Religion at Rome. Cultures, contexts, and beliefs*, Cambridge.
- Finkelpearl, E.D. 1998. *Metamorphoses of Language in Apuleius: A Study of Allusion in the Novel*, Ann Arbor.
- Fusillo, M. 1996. 'Modern Critical Theories and the Ancient Novel', in G. Schmeling (ed.) *The Novel in the Ancient World*, Leiden – New York – Köln (*Mnemosyne* supplement 159), 277–305.
- Gleason, M. 1995. *Making Men: Sophists and Self-Presentation in Ancient Rome*, Princeton.
- Habinek, T.N. 1998. *The Politics of Latin Literature. Writing, Identity and Empire in Ancient Rome*, Princeton.
- Hallett, J. 2003. 'Resistant (and enabling) Reading: Petronius' *Satyricon* and Latin Love Elegy', in S. Panayotakis, M. Zimmerman, W.H. Keulen (eds.) *The Ancient Novel and Beyond*, Leiden – Boston, 329–343.

- Harrison, S.J. 1998. 'The Milesian Tales and the Roman Novel', in H. Hofmann, M. Zimmerman (eds.) *Groningen Colloquia on the Novel* Vol. IX, 61–73.
- 1999 (ed.). *Oxford Readings in the Roman Novel*, Oxford.
- 2000. *Apuleius. A Latin Sophist*, Oxford.
- 2001. (ed.) *Texts, Ideas, and the Classics. Scholarship, Theory, and Classical Literature*, Oxford.
- 2002. 'Literary Topography in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*, in M. Paschalis, S. Frangoulidis (eds.), *Space in the Ancient Novel, Ancient Narrative Supplementum 1*, Groningen, 40–57.
- Heinze, R. 1899. 'Petron und der griechische Roman', *Hermes* 34, 494–519 (repr. in: R. Heinze, ed. *Vom Geist des Römertums*, Stuttgart 1960, 417–439).
- Hijmans, B.L. 1987. 'Apuleius, Philosophus Platonicus', in W. Haase, H. Temporini (eds.), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt (ANRW)* II. 36.1, Berlin – New York, 395–475.
- Hinds, S. 1998. *Allusion and intertext. Dynamics of appropriation in Roman poetry*, Cambridge.
- Hofmann, H. 1993. 'Die Flucht des Erzählers. Narrative Strategien in den Ehebruchsgeschichten von Apuleius' *Goldenem Esel*', in H. Hofmann (ed.) *Groningen Colloquia on the Novel* Vol. V, Groningen, 111–141.
- Huber – Rebenich, G. 1999. 'Hagiographic fiction as entertainment', in H. Hofmann (ed.), *Latin Fiction. The Latin Novel in Context*, London – New York, 187–212.
- Jensson, G. 1997. *"The recollections of Encolpius": A reading of the Satyrice as Greco-Roman Erotic Fiction*, diss. Univ. of Toronto.
- Kussl, R. 1991. *Papyrusfragmente griechischer Romane. Ausgewählte Untersuchungen*. Classica Monacensia 2, Tübingen.
- Lefèvre, E. 1997. *Studien zur Struktur der 'Milesischen' Novelle bei Petron und Apuleius*, Stuttgart.
- Maeder, D. 1991. 'Au Seuil des Romains Grecs: effets de réel et effets de création', in H. Hofmann (ed.), *Groningen Colloquia on the Novel* Vol. IV, 1–33.
- van Mal – Maeder, D. 2003. 'La mise en scène déclamatoire chez les romanciers Latins', in: S. Panayotakis, M. Zimmerman, W.H. Keulen, eds., *The Ancient Novel and Beyond*, Leiden – Boston, 345–355.
- Mason, H.J. 1994. 'Greek and Latin Versions of the Ass-Story', in W. Haase, H. Temporini (eds.), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt (ANRW)* II. 34.2, Berlin – New York, 1665–1707.
- 1999. 'The *Metamorphoses* of Apuleius and its Greek sources', in H. Hofmann (ed.), *Latin Fiction. The Latin Novel in Context*, London – New York, 103–112.
- Merkle, S. 1989. *Die Ephemeris belli Troiani des Diktys von Kreta*. Studien zur klassischen Philologie 44, Frankfurt.
- 1996. 'The Truth and Nothing but the Truth: Dictys and Dares', in G. Schmeling (ed.), *The Novel in the Ancient World*, Leiden – New York – Köln (*Mnemosyne* supplement 159), 563–580.
- Panayotakis, C. 1995. *Theatrum Arbitri. Theatrical Elements in the Satyrice of Petronius*, Leiden – New York – Köln (*Mnemosyne* supplement 146).
- Panayotakis, S. 2000. 'The Knot and the Hymen: A reconsideration of *nodus uirginitatis* (*Hist. Apoll.* 1)', *Mnemosyne* 53, 599–608.
- Perry, B.E. 1927. 'On Apuleius' *Hermagoras*', *AJPh* 48, 192–199.
- 1967. *The Ancient Romances. A Literary-Historical Account of their Origins*, Berkeley – Los Angeles.
- Plaza, M. 2000. *Laughter and Derision in Petronius' Satyrice. A Literary Study*, Studia Latina Stockholmiensia XLVI, Stockholm.

- Reardon, B.P. (ed.) 1989. *Collected Ancient Greek Novels*, Berkeley – Los Angeles.
- Relihan, J. 1993. *Ancient Menippean Satire*, Baltimore.
- Sandy, G.N. 1989. 'Iamblichus. *A Babylonian Story*', in B.P. Reardon (ed.) *Collected Ancient Greek Novels*, Berkeley – Los Angeles, 783–802.
- 1994. 'Apuleius' "Metamorphoses" and the Ancient Novel', in W. Haase, H. Temporini (eds.), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt (ANRW)* II. 34.2, Berlin – New York, 1512–1574.
- 1994a. 'New Pages of Greek Fiction', in J.R. Morgan, R. Stoneman (eds.) *Greek Fiction. The Greek Novel in Context*, London – New York, 130–145.
- Schlam, C. (†) and Finkelppearl, E. 2000. *A Review of Scholarship on Apuleius' Metamorphoses 1970–1998, Lustrum* 42 (eds. H. Gartner, M. Weissenberger).
- Schmeling, G. 1996 (ed.). *The Novel in the Ancient World*, Leiden – New York – Köln (*Mnemosyne* supplement 159).
- 1996a. 'Genre and the *Satyricon*: Menippean Satire and the Novel', in C. Klodt (ed.), *Satura lanx. Festschrift W. Krenkel*, Hildesheim, 105–117.
- 1999. 'The History of Apollonius King of Tyre', in H. Hofmann (ed.), *Latin Fiction. The Latin Novel in Context*, London – New York, 141–152.
- 2003 (ed.). *The Novel in the Ancient World* (revised paperback edition of Schmeling 1996), Leiden – Boston.
- and Stuckey, J. 1997. *A Bibliography of Petronius (Mnemosyne supplement 39)*.
- Schmitz, T.A. 2002. *Moderne Literaturtheorie und antike Texte. Eine Einführung*, Darmstadt.
- Seele, A. 1995. *Römische Übersetzer, Nöte, Freiheiten, Absichten: Verfahren des literarischen Übersetzens in der griechisch-römischen Antike*, Darmstadt.
- Slater, N.W. 1989. *Reading Petronius*, Baltimore.
- Stephens, S.A., Winkler, J.J. 1995. *Ancient Greek Novels: The Fragments*, Princeton.
- Sullivan, J.P. 1968. *The Satyricon of Petronius: A Literary Study*, London.
- Traina, A. 1970. *Vortit barbare. Le traduzioni poetiche da Livio Andronico a Cicerone*, Roma.
- Teuber, B. 1993. 'Zur Schreibkunst eines Zirkusreiters: Karneavaleskes Erzählen im "Goldenen Esel" und die Sorge um sich in der antiken Ethik', in S. Döpp (ed.) *Karneavaleske Phänomene in antiken und nachantiken Kulturen und Literaturen. Stätten und Formen der Kommunikation im Altertum I* (Bochumer Altertumswissenschaftl. Colloquium 13), Trier, 179–238.
- van Thiel, H. 1971. *Der Eselsroman. I: Untersuchungen. II: Synoptische Ausgabe*, München (*Zetemata* 54: 1–2).
- Walsh, P.G. 1970. *The Roman Novel*, Cambridge.
- West, D.A. and Woodman, A.J. (eds.) 1979. *Creative Imitation and Latin Literature*, Cambridge.
- White, P. 1993. *Promised Verse: Poets in the Society of Augustan Rome*, Cambridge.
- Zeitlin, F.I. 1971. 'Petronius as Paradox: Anarchy and Artistic Integrity', *TAPA* 102, 631–684; repr. in S.J. Harrison (ed.) 1999, 1–49.
- Zimmerman, M. 2000. *Apuleius Madaurensis, Metamorphoses Book X. Text, Introduction and Commentary. Groningen Commentaries on Apuleius*, Groningen.
- 2003 (forthcoming), 'Les grandes villes dans les *Métamorphoses* d' Apulée', in B. Pouderon (ed.), *Lieux, décors et paysages de l'ancien roman des origines à Byzance*, Actes du Colloque de Tours, Octobre 2002, Presses de la Maison d'Orient, 000.
- 2003a (forthcoming), 'Echoes of Roman satire in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*', in R.R. Nauta (ed.), *Genre in Apuleius' Metamorphoses and Related Texts*, Leuven, 000.