

## Introduction

The present volume is the first to be dedicated entirely to parallel readings of the Greek and the Roman novel. As a rule publications taking a comprehensive look at the ancient novel treat the Greek and the Roman novel independently of each other, or at most discuss standard thematic categories (such as the origins, chronology, women, readership, or others). A recent critical survey issued a call “to extend the margins of the study of the novels yet further”,<sup>1</sup> but did not envisage the prospect of a more systematic examination of the relations between the two main traditions of the ancient novel. There was a time when scholars were in the habit of keeping the Greek and the Roman novel in “separate watertight compartments”,<sup>2</sup> drawing a sharp distinction between the Greek idealistic and the Roman comic-realistic novel. As regards the former, it is very probable that the five canonical novels are not representative of the genre. The very survival from the Byzantine period of specimens that promote – at least on the surface – female chastity and marriage looks suspicious. The discovery, in recent years, of new papyrus fragments of Greek fiction (Lollianós’ *Phoinikika*, the *Iolaos* and the *Tinouphis* fragments)<sup>3</sup> has shown that low-life, comic, and sensational features are not the exclusive province of the Latin novel. Furthermore, a close scrutiny of the extant Greek novels has revealed ironic and subversive elements, most notably in the case of *Leukippe & Kleitophon*.<sup>4</sup>

Actually, it is intriguing that a sharp distinction between the Greek and the Latin novel should have ever existed and that it should be tacitly maintained at the present time. Looking at the issue from the Latin side, one could make in response the following two points. The first point is that, of the three surviving Latin novels, Apuleius has a Greek model (the *Onos* and/or the lost Greek *Metamorphoses*). The publication by Dirk Obbink of a 3<sup>rd</sup> century A. D. papyrus fragment (*P. Oxy.* LXX 4762) shows that the sex

---

<sup>1</sup> J. R. Morgan, “The Ancient Novel at the End of the Century: Scholarship since the Dartmouth Conference”, *CP* 91 (1996) 63–73, 70.

<sup>2</sup> Margaret A. Doody, *The True Story of the Novel*, New Brunswick, New Jersey 1996, 31.

<sup>3</sup> Susan A. Stephens & J. J. Winkler (eds.), *Ancient Greek Novels: The Fragments*, Princeton 1995, 314–325, 358–362, 400–403.

<sup>4</sup> E. Courtney, *A Companion to Petronius*, Oxford 2001, 17–18.

scene with Lucius-ass and the noble matron in the *Onos* and the *Metamorphoses* has another Greek version. As regards the *Satyrica*, Petronius' novel presents notable points of contact with the above-mentioned fragments of realistic Greek narratives. It also shares the prosimetric form with two of them (the *Iolaos* and *Tinouphis* fragments).<sup>5</sup> Furthermore, Gottskálk Jensson has recently argued that Petronius' *Satyrica* is a Roman version of a lost Greek text by the same title.<sup>6</sup> The question of whether the *Satyrica* is a 'parody of the ideal novel', an 'anti-novel', or an 'other novel'<sup>7</sup> could be viewed as an issue that concerns the evolution of the Greek novel itself and a unified Greco-Roman novelistic tradition. Finally, regarding the *Historia Apollonii* specialists in the field have already recognized that "it strongly resembles the Greek Novels, especially Xenophon's *Ephesiaka*".<sup>8</sup>

The second point is that the age of Nero and the few years before and after it have recently become important for the 'birth' of ancient fiction in general and of the ancient novel in particular. The chronology proposed by Ewen Bowie squeezes the earliest Greek novels into the period between 41 and 75 A. D.: Chariton between 41 and 62, *Ninus* between 63 and 75, Xenophon after A. D. 65, *Metiochos & Parthenope* at about the same time).<sup>9</sup> This chronology envisages the 'birth' of the Greek novel and that of the Roman *Satyrica* as *contemporary or near-contemporary events*. Regardless of whether one agrees or disagrees with these chronological revisions, the need to look at their implications, to re-examine outstanding issues and to raise new ones in the context of a unified Greco-Roman tradition, emerges today as more urgent than ever. The portrayal on the cover page of this volume of Echo and Narcissus, of self-reflection and reduplication of sound, symbolizes a pictorial challenge to look at the dialectics of the Greek and the Latin novels and appreciate their intimate relationship.

<sup>5</sup> A. Barchiesi, "Romanzo greco, romanzo latino: problemi e prospettive della ricerca attuale", in L. Graverini, W. Keulen & A. Barchiesi (eds.), *Il romanzo antico: forme, testi, problemi*, Rome 2006, 193–218; Stephens & Winkler 1995, 363–367.

<sup>6</sup> "The *Satyrica* of Petronius as a Roman Palimpsest", *AN 2* (2002) 86–122; *The Recollections of Encolpius: The Satyrica of Petronius as Milesian Fiction*, Groningen 2004.

<sup>7</sup> Gareth Schmeling, "Petronius and the *Satyrica*", in H. Hofmann (ed.) *Latin Fiction: The Latin novel in context*, London / New York 1999, 23–37.

<sup>8</sup> Thomas Hägg, *The Novel in Antiquity*, Oxford 1983, 147.

<sup>9</sup> G. W. Bowersock, *Fiction as History: Nero to Julian*, Berkeley 1994; E. Bowie, "The chronology of the earlier Greek novels since B. E. Perry: revisions and precisions", *AN 2* (2002) 47–63. For alternative suggestions regarding the dating of these novels see A. Beschoner, "Ἐρωὺς πεζός. Profili di romanzieri, 'novellisti', epistolografi erotici greci e latini", in A. Stramaglia (ed.), *Ἐρωὺς. Antiche trame greche d' Amore*, Bari 2000, 9–70.

The present collection of sixteen articles contains revised versions of most of the papers originally presented at the Third Rethymnon International Conference on the Ancient Novel of the same title (RICAN 3, 22–24 May 2005). The articles explore relations between Greek and Roman fiction on various levels: chronological, thematic, narratological, structural, cultural, and socio-political. For practical reasons, a conventional arrangement in three groups has been adopted. The first group contains general thematic studies; the second brings together chronological and narratological articles involving the Greek novel and Petronius' *Satyrica*; and the third comprises essays that discuss Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* in relation to works of Greek fiction.

In an essay entitled "The Coming of Age and Political Accommodation in the Greco-Roman Novels" Jean Alvares looks at how the protagonists in the novels of Apuleius, Chariton and Longus mature in the process of their respective narratives and how they eventually accommodate themselves to the social and political realities of their milieu. In the *Metamorphoses* Lucius abandons his homeland and culture in order to become a priest of Isis and live and work in Rome as a permanent alien. This choice would make of Apuleius' main character one of those Roman subjects who "grabbed at centers of power, safety and success, and forged those identities which could do them the most service". Accommodation to political realities is nowhere more evident than in Chariton's novel. Chaireas comes from an idealized, democratic and 'anti-imperial' Syracuse and returns home from a victorious war against the tyrannical Persian rule; and yet in the end he expresses regret for having revolted against Artaxerxes and boasts to the Syracusans of reconciling them with the Great King. Alvares reiterates the view that in many ways the Persian *imperium* recalls Rome's and argues that Chaireas' attitude "reproduces the contradictory attitudes of Greeks who enjoyed and even profited from their relationship with Rome". In the world of *Daphnis & Chloe* the urban myth of an idyllic alternative to the city preserves elements of the harsh realities of slavery, but the protagonists, in the process of maturing, show little awareness of the injustice of their social circumstances. Their effort in the end to create a more equal and harmonious society is not intended to challenge the existing social structure (there is no liberation of slaves). It is an assertion of rural values by the urban elite, or in Alvares' words: "an allegory of the superior world whose outline he [Longus] vaguely intuits, a traditional, archetypal image on which he can project his imaginative ideals".

In an article that bears the title “Narratives of Failure” Gareth Schmeling looks at character and structural failures and successes in the ancient novel, mainly Petronius, Apuleius and Achilles Tatius. Schmeling bases his discussion on the Bakhtinian tripartite structure consisting of (1) pre-adventure-time, (2) adventure-time, and (3) post-adventure-time (and aftermath). A main concern of this article is the gap created in passing from a life rich in experience of all kinds (adventure-time) to an insignificant, uneventful, and boring existence (post-adventure-time and aftermath). In Petronius’ fragmentary novel we have no pre-adventure or post-adventure time but in adventure-time Encolpius’s fictional life is a failure, probably from its very beginning. Complications arise from his personal failure as well as from the work’s design and structure, such as the existence of a destabilizing triadic structure of characters (Encolpius, Giton, Ascyltus; Schmeling adduces here the parallel of Callirhoe in Chariton) or the fact that Encolpius’ beauty is of itself a factor that invites trouble. In comparison, in Apuleius’ *Metamorphoses* Lucius may have an uneventful post-adventure time and aftermath but his pre-adventure time is exciting and successful and he is in certain respects luckier than Encolpius even at the moment and during his unlucky transformation. Schmeling concludes by looking at structural failures and successes in Achilles Tatius. As regards the former, he notes that in the last three books of *Leukippe & Kleitophon* the role of the passive protagonists is subsumed by the aggressive pair Melite and Thersander. As regards the latter, he argues that Achilles Tatius was aware that the conventional post-adventure-time and aftermath was an inherent fault of the ancient novel and hence he changed the narrative structure from linear to cyclical. He created an ending in which the reader is led almost directly from adventure-time back to the beginning of the narrative and is thus invited to rethink how he understood the novel.

Consuelo Ruiz-Montero (“Magic in the Ancient Novel”) discusses instances of magic within the *corpus* of the Greek novels (papyrus fragments, texts from indirect transmission, incidental references, episodes and tales) and in Apuleius’ *Metamorphoses* 1–3. In order to distinguish between ‘real’ and ‘fictional’ (literary) magic, she compares these texts with the language and rituals of the Greco-Egyptian magical papyri. The longest part of her article is dedicated to the ‘novella’ of Nectanebo in the *Alexander Romance*. By comparing the magical papyri Ruiz-Montero concludes that the author of the text was “a genuine connoisseur of Egyptian magic”, and speculates on the the author’s qualifications, the time of composition and the readership of the novella. Ruiz-Montero argues that the novella was written in Egypt, that

its author should be linked to Egyptian priestly circles and that the time of composition could be the early centuries A.D., although its plot must be earlier.

Niall W. Slater's article ("Posthumous Parleys: Chatting Up the Dead in the Ancient Novels") deals with necromancy in the Greek and the Roman novel, which is also treated in brief by Ruiz-Montero. He first examines the scene of the reanimation of an Egyptian killed on the battlefield in Heliodorus 6 and constructs the following necromantic typology: a necromancer, a ritual involving both words and magical substances, a difficult reanimation, a desire for knowledge available only to the dead and a testable prophecy. Slater tests this pattern in a well-known necromantic tale in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*, reported within the episode of Thelyphron in Book 2. The structural elements recur, but the words spoken by the resurrected dead person leave a number of interpretations open. Slater brings into the discussion another episode from Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* not immediately recognizable as necromantic posthumous parley with the dead. It is the exchange, at the beginning of the *Golden Ass*, between Aristomenes and Socrates after the night episode with the witches at the inn. Slater explains the whole narrative from Socrates' 'awakening' onward as a curious conversation with the dead, in which essential elements of the previous typology are missing, and argues further that this exchange with the dead has wider implications for the interpretation of the *Metamorphoses* as a whole, a novel which, *pace* Andrew Laird, could have been constructed as a posthumous parley, a conversation of the reader with a dead narrator.

Michael Paschalis' essay, entitled "The Greek and the Latin *Alexander Romance*: Comparative Readings", focuses on the most popular of the fictional biographies written in antiquity. While Ruiz-Montero was concerned with magic in the Nectanebo section, Paschalis focuses on comparing versions of episodes as they appear in the early recensions. Evaluating the present state of scholarly research, he notes that comparison among the early recensions of the *Alexander Romance* is usually made on the basis of clear-cut differences in content, while differences in style or language are treated as separate issues and minor textual omissions or changes remain almost exclusively the concern of the textual editor. By comparing versions of episodes like Alexander's visit to Troy (1.42) and the siege of Abdera (1.43), Paschalis argues that slight textual changes may affect the kind of story told and that narratives have ways to create textual or subtextual coherence where there may be a mere parataxis of self-contained stories or disconnected material or arbitrary geographical settings. His analysis points out is that it is not

always advisable to restore or correct passages of recension  $\beta$  by using material that comes from A or Valerius and vice versa.

In his essay entitled “Kleitophon and Encolpius: Achilles Tatius as Hidden Author” John Morgan follows Gian Biagio Conte’s methodological approach to the *Satyrical* and argues that, like Petronius, Achilles Tatius devised a “hidden author” behind the narrator Kleitophon. Morgan reminds the reader that the two novels share “parallels of form, content and ethos” and takes his point of departure from a conspicuous shift in Kleitophon’s function as internal narrator in book 6 of *Leukippe & Kleitophon*: while in the earlier sections Kleitophon “is allowed to narrate only what he would have known as a character at the time of the action” (or otherwise indicate the provenance of his information), his narrative in book 6 “includes material for which no provenance is supplied and no plausible channel of information can be imagined”. The function of Kleitophon as ‘hidden author’ is explained as a devious authorial strategy to guide the reader’s interpretation in narratives by means of an internal first-person narrator not identifiable with the author. The interpretation of Achilles Tatius’ novel requires that the reader should detect the ironic distance between the narrating Kleitophon and the ‘hidden author’. Morgan’s examination of scenes in Book 6 and elsewhere reveals that Kleitophon is represented as constructing a (literary and rhetorical) idealistic version of himself, which is at variance with the reality that the author allows us to glimpse. In this respect Kleitophon resembles Encolpius but is also different from him. Morgan’s account phrases the difference as follows: “whereas Encolpius seeks to elevate mundane events by accommodating them to elevated literary models, the narrating Kleitophon reaches for his mythological dictionary and *Bluffers’ Guide to Culture* at moments of extraordinary personal importance, when his emotions ought to be most directly involved”.

In discussing the chronology of the earlier Greek novels in *AN 2* (2002), Ewen Bowie tentatively dated Antonius Diogenes’ work “in the decade following A.D. 98”. In his present contribution, entitled “Links between Antonius Diogenes and Petronius”, Bowie identifies features shared between *The Incredible Things Beyond Thule* and the *Satyrical*. These are: the size and articulation of the works, the common element of comedy, location and extent of travels, types of incident, and lesser details. In order to explain these similarities, Bowie considers the following three possibilities: (1) Antonius Diogenes knew the *Satyrical*; (2) the *Satyrical* knew of Antonius Diogenes; (3) Antonius Diogenes and the *Satyrical* drew on a common source. The first option would, in Bowie’s view, presuppose for Antonius Diogenes a knowl-

edge of Latin and an “awareness of Petronius’ adaptation of a genre of prose fiction that was not simply a very recent development in the Greek world but might even have been developed precisely by a fellow-citizen of Antonius Diogenes, that is, by Chariton”. The second option would place the *Incredible Things Beyond Thule* ca A.D. 55, a few years after the publication of Chariton’s *Chaireas & Callirhoe* and before the publication of Petronius’ *Satyrica*. As regards the third option, Bowie takes into consideration Jenson’s hypothesis of a lost Greek original for the *Satyrica*. He argues that some of the shared features discussed above might derive from a Milesian-tale narrative but points out significant differences: “the pursuit of the hero and his companion by a powerful and vengeful force, the death of the arch-villain, and the location in the bay of Naples and south Italy have no parallel in any extant Greek ‘low’ narratives”.

Ken Dowden’s article (“A Lengthy Sentence: Judging the Prolixity of the Novels”) uses the length of sentences in words (‘prolixity’) to display variations in character between the preserved ancient novels and as a criterion for dating. His analysis confirms the *communis opinio* that Chariton and Heliodoros stand at the beginning and the end of an evolutionary process. It also shows that it matters little whether a text is in Greek or Latin. According to Dowden’s statistics Petronius and Chariton form a pair, and hence the author suggests that “Jenson’s predecessor of Petronius, surely a nearly contemporary text, might have been simply a slightly snappier version of Chariton in this respect”. Another pair is Apuleius and the *Onos*, and Dowden naturally assumes that they are also chronologically close. His statistics supports the traditional dating of Xenophon of Ephesos (during or after Trajan’s reign) and places Chariton towards the time of Domitian. The same statistics, however, places Achilles Tatius and Longus *before* Xenophon. Dowden attributes this impossibility to Achilles Tatius’ and Longus’ elaborate sophistic style. An analysis of prolixity of individual books within Apuleius’ *Metamorphoses* offers corroborating evidence of the novel’s structure, which matches the result reached in other ways. Dowden explains that sentence length can be used as a criterion for dating only *within the genre*. His overall statistic analysis suggests the evolution of the novelistic genre towards a more ambitious form of expression.

Andrew Laird re-examines the relationship of the *Satyrica* with the extant Greek romances and low-life papyrus fragments and advises flexibility as regards the chronology of Petronius’ novel. His article is entitled “The True Nature of the *Satyricon*?” and begins by drawing attention to the obvious ‘Greekness’ of the *Satyrica* (title, character names, locations) and to

Heinze's thesis that its scenario reverses the standard Greek story about the adventures of a devoted heterosexual couple. He further argues that in the light of papyrological discoveries conventional distinctions between the different types of ancient novels have become less clear and summarizes scholarly discussions concerning the affinity and chronological relationship of the *Satyricon* with the comic, low-life *Tinouphis* and *Iolaos* fragments (both prosimetric) and Lollianus' *Phoenikika*. Laird thinks it paradoxical that most of these discussions "accommodate, without apparent question, a date for the *Satyricon* in the 60s A.D. – a dating which has yet to be confirmed – even and especially when the same discussions apply caution and flexibility to these comparatively minute fragments of Greek novelistic texts". After taking a critical look at the orthodox view concerning the date of the *Satyricon*, he considers alternative suggestions and proposes a distinction between the dramatic date of the novel, which is probably in the mid-first century, and its date of composition, which may be later. Laird notes further that in matters of rhetorical education the *Satyricon* betrays "a remarkable precocity for the middle of the first century A.D." and evaluates the correspondences of Trimalchio with Suetonius' *Nero* "as possible evidence for the novel's composition in the second century A.D.". Finally, as regards the identification of the author of the *Satyricon* with the Tacitean Petronius Laird argues that the latter "is an oddly memorable figure whose capricious, iconoclastic attitude to death could have made enough of an impression on readers in antiquity to attract the attention and admiration of a pseudepigrapher". On the issue of the *Satyricon*'s relation to the Greek novels he believes that it is more reasonable to assume that the Latin novel had a Greek model or models unknown to us than that there were no direct Greek models at all. Laird summarizes the thrust of his argument as follows: "A richer literary history, a fuller picture of the Latin accommodation of Greek material, and, most importantly, more interpretative possibilities for future readings of the *Satyricon* require flexibility about chronology, as well as about matters of Roman cultural identity".

In his article by the title "Who Knows What? The Access to Knowledge in Ancient Novels: the Strange Cases of Chariton and Apuleius" Romain Brethes examines the quest for knowledge and truth as narrative features in the novels of Chariton and Apuleius. The two novels exhibit different narrative strategies and probably have different aims, but they display similarities as regards the issue of knowledge. Both are obsessed with knowledge; in both the acquisition of knowledge is synonymous with power but also exposes those possessing it to danger; and in both the reader's desire for



knowledge is not satisfied in the end. Brethes dwells at length on this last point. He argues that Book 8 of *Chaireas & Callirhoe*, while pretending that truth and knowledge will ‘enlighten’ every question of the previous books, proposes new riddles to the reader, all coming from Callirhoe; and that in the *Metamorphoses* the narrator Lucius breaks the original contract with his reader, by denying access to the knowledge of his initiation into the Isis-cult. The author focuses on the relationship between knowledge / truth and light in both novels: Chariton begins the last stage of his story with the assertion that the goddess Aphrodite “brought the truth to light”; and *Metamorphoses* 11 begins with the radiant epiphany of Isis (also identified with Venus / Aphrodite) who promises to dispel the darkness in which Lucius had been living. The author’s concluding point as regards the close relationship between the novels of Chariton and Apuleius is worth quoting: “If there is no direct reference to mysteries in *Callirhoe*, the remarkable association of the love-goddess, Aphrodite, with φωτίζειν and ἀλήθεια, a triple reference to love, light and truth, clearly implies that the author-narrator gives a Platonic and *mystic* coloration to his last book”.

The essay of Stavros Frangoulidis bears the title “Transforming the Genre: Apuleius’ *Metamorphoses*” and compares the plot-line of Apuleius’ *Metamorphoses* with that of the ideal Greek novel, elucidating further the former’s departure from the conventional model. He argues that Apuleius’ transformation of the norm of the ideal novel is in alignment with the novel’s central theme of metamorphosis. The framing narrative of the novel consists in Lucius’ relationship with Photis, the separation of the couple, and Lucius’ symbolic union with the goddess Isis. Frangoulidis discusses the divergences with the ideal novel as regards the meeting of Lucius with Photis, their separation and Lucius’ lengthy narrative of adventures. Apuleius has altered the dynamics of the typical romance plot by emphasizing Lucius’ pursuit of base pleasures and by introducing a model of ‘marriage’ between a mortal (Lucius) and a goddess (Isis), which replaces the conventional reunion of the couple. The last part of his essay treats the inset tale of Cupid and Psyche. Frangoulidis argues that this tale, which is embedded in the center of the novel and follows more closely the model structure of the ideal novel, offers a key to interpreting the framing narrative.

Stephen J. Harrison (“Parallel Cults? Religion and Narrative in Apuleius’ *Metamorphoses* and Some Greek Novels”) explores affiliations of the *Metamorphoses* with the Greek novels from the perspective of the narrative function of the gods, their sanctuaries and oracles. The author argues that Apuleius was probably aware of most of the extant Greek novels, all of

which could predate the *Metamorphoses* with the exception of the *Aithiopia*. The first part of his contribution, entitled “Apuleius and religious elements: the manipulation of the Greek ass-tale”, examines Apuleius’ innovations and modifications of the Greek *Metamorphoses* (the tale of Cupid and Psyche, the Isiac ending, and the story of the corrupt priests of the *Dea Syria*). In the second part, entitled “Religious and narrative patterns from the Greek novels in Apuleius”, Harrison examines the narrative pattern of beginning from and ending at the same religious location, divine plot motors and closures, and oracular responses. On the evidence of the rich comparative material between Apuleius and the Greek novels Harrison stresses the playful appropriation of religious elements in the *Metamorphoses* and concludes that religion in Apuleius is more likely to have a literary, entertaining function than a serious, proselytizing role.

In his contribution, entitled “Wonders Beyond Athens: Reading the ‘Phaedra’ Stories in Apuleius and Heliodoros”, Steven D. Smith explores the fortunes of the Hellenic, and specifically the Athenocentric, literary heritage in the complex, multicultural world in which Apuleius and Heliodoros were writing. He makes his point by taking an interpretative look at versions of the Phaedra myth embedded respectively in Book 10 of the *Metamorphoses* and Book 1 of the *Aithiopia*. Smith argues that in both novels these Attic tales on one level “signal the powerful role that the Athenian literary tradition continues to play in the production of culture”, but on another level “they also paradoxically participate in the texts’ renunciation of Athenocentrism and the expansive embrace of alternative perspectives”. As regards Apuleius, Smith argues that “Athens is tied to the thematic tension between disbelief and credulity”. The theme is programmatically introduced in Book 1 (the recollection of the sword-swallowing scene in front of the Stoa Poikile); it is reactivated in book 10 in the context of the *noverca* story and its allusive context of the Court of the Areopagos and Athenian law, and in Lucius’ later diatribe against judicial corruption; and it reaches its climax in the final book where Athens fades into the distant background and Lucius is transformed from an ass into a devoted follower of Isis and a successful lawyer at Rome. In Heliodoros the Attic tale of Demaenete / Phaedra with its historiographical and paradoxographical implications provides a model and vocabulary for thinking about power and its ethical implications in other episodes of the novel. This is done in two ways (a) through the use of power to satisfy personal erotic desire in a perverted relationship, which contrasts with the symmetrical relationship between Theagenes and Charikleia; and (b) through the evocation of Athenian hegemony and naval superiority in the

quintessential image where the celebrants of the Great Panathenaia are sending a boat overland to the temple of Athene on the Akropolis.

Kirk Freudenburg discusses the obsession with vision in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* ("Leering for the Plot: Visual Curiosity in Apuleius and Others"), expanding on Helen Morales' discussion of "vision and narrative" in Achilles Tatius, Luca Graverini's intertextual reading of *Met.* 2.6–7, and Niall Slater's articles on vision and spectacle in the *Metamorphoses*. He inserts his argument in the broader interest of the Second Sophistic in the description and theorizing of vision, and argues in this respect that Apuleius "does something unprecedented in his particular deployment of scenes of gazing as pleasure-taking". Freudenburg examines key scenes of visual curiosity bringing in parallels from Petronius and other Latin writers and arguing that watching is erotically charged even when a scene is not explicitly sexual in content. A central point of his discussion is that viewing causes the transformation of both inset viewers and the object of desire and that through the act of reading the novel's readers become complicit in Lucius' *curiositas*. Freudenburg concludes his article by looking at the Isis book and Lucius' conversion from three different angles: reader-to-narrator, reader-to-text, and reader-to-reader.

Ellen Finkelpearl ("Apuleius, the *Onos*, and Rome") examines the way that Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* "uses the Greek source as a springboard for thinking about Rome's domination of its provinces and about the complex cultural identity of its protagonist". As regards attitudes towards Roman imperial rule, Finkelpearl compares two passages in the *Onos* and the respective ones in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* and argues that the Latin novelist adopts and intensifies his source's negative view of Roman power. The change of Lucius' origins from Patras to Corinth would serve, in the light of historical and literary evidence, as a reminder of the Roman destruction not only of this city but obliquely of (Apuleius' African) Carthage. Commenting on the endings of the *Onos* and the Latin *Metamorphoses* she argues that, while Lucius settles back comfortably into the Romanized Greek culture of Patras, Lucius' life in Rome is that of an incompletely assimilated foreigner. In the final part of the essay Finkelpearl assesses Apuleius' hybrid identity and negotiation of three cultures, which is reflected in the manner in which he has changed his Greek source to create a hybridized, shifting central character.

In the last essay of the volume, entitled "Aesop, the 'Onos', *The Golden Ass*, and a Hidden Treasure", Maaike Zimmerman is also concerned with Apuleius and the Greek *Ass-tale*. Zimmerman offers a detailed treatment of

different versions of the international story motif of the stolen cup (Aarne & Thompson H 151–154: ‘Recognition by cup in sack: alleged stolen goods’, or K 2118: ‘Innocent person slandered as thief’) in the *Life of Aesop*, the Greek *Ass-tale*, and Apuleius’ *Metamorphoses*. In the course of the discussion she also brings in two related manifestations of the same motif: the Joseph story in *Genesis* 44 and its more novelistic treatment in Flavius Josephus’ *Jewish Antiquities* II.7. After tracing the motif’s presence in each of these texts, Zimmerman compares the three versions of the tale and analyzes the common features and divergences. In the *Life of Aesop* the people of Delphi secretly plant a sacred cup in Aesop’s luggage, accuse him of temple robbery, and execute him. The Greek *Ass tale* version diverges conspicuously, because the priests of the *Dea Syria* themselves steal the gold goblet from the temple of the Mother of the Gods. Finally, in the *Metamorphoses* the goblet is found in the bosom of the Syrian Goddess, but we never learn if the priests stole it from the shrine of the Mother of the Gods, or if they were the dupes of someone who wanted to incriminate them. Thus Apuleius’ way of handling the tale would be another of the elements of ‘Verunsicherung’ of the reader of the *Golden Ass*.

The authors of the Introduction would like to offer special thanks to all speakers and chairpersons for making RICAN 3 a stimulating and memorable conference. Thanks are also due to the significant number of scholars and graduate students from abroad who attended the conference and participated in lively discussions. The event was generously funded by the Department of Philology and received the support and valuable assistance of colleagues and graduate students in the Division of Classics. Publication of this volume would not have been possible without the arduous efforts of our fellow editors, Stephen J. Harrison and Maaike Zimmerman. For this reason and for their strong and continuing support since the inception of the RICAN conferences in 2001, we would like to record our warmest thanks and gratitude. Finally, thanks are due to the publisher, Dr. Roelf Barkhuis, who undertook the job of posting the various announcements for the conference on the AN website, and then producing and publishing this volume of collected essays, read at RICAN 3.

March 2007  
Michael Paschalis  
Stavros Frangoulidis