

B. POUDERON, C. BOST-POUDERON (eds.): *Passions, vertus et vices dans l'ancien roman*

2009. Pp. 458. Maison de l' Orient et de la Méditerranée-Jean Pouilloux. Paperback. € 38.-

ISBN 9782356680082

Reviewed by A. Lefteratou, CRC 'Education and Religion', Universität Göttingen. E-mail: alefter@gwdg.de

This massive volume is the outcome of the Conference held in Tours on the ancient novel from the 19th to the 20th of October 2006 in collaboration with the Université François-Rabelais of Tours and the UMR 5189. The subject is the representation of passions, vices, and virtues in the ancient novel; the volume is divided into five parts, each of which focusses on a particular aspect of individual passions. All the contributions have an abstract in both French and English. The volume has a helpful index of authors and texts (pp. 419-35), of names (pp. 435-42), and a thematic index (pp. 554 ff.). Overall the volume succeeds in pointing out the ποικιλία of possible approaches to the very interesting subject of passions in ancient, medieval, and modern narrative. I note here that the term 'ancient roman' is not precise, given that the contributors to the volume discuss 'fringe' narrative texts such as the Alexander romance or Iamboulos. Moreover, the timescale of the works examined ranges from the 1st c. C.E. (Chariton) to the mid 19th century (Kalligas). A more precise definition of what 'ancient roman' is would have been helpful. Nevertheless, the interdisciplinary approach is very attractive, as it sheds light on our understanding of the reception of ancient narrative. I think that a more intertextual handling of the topic (i.e. with cross-references both to 'ancient roman' and to medieval/modern narrative) could have been of great assistance, especially to the non-specialist.

It is certainly difficult to classify the content of the book and I understand that it may have been difficult for the editors to cope with such rich material. Despite the thematic division into five parts, the volume does not achieve homogeneity. As a result the reader is inclined to read the contributions individually and not as parts of an interlinked narrative. Introductory guidelines and concluding remarks would have been helpful and welcome. It would have been easier for the reader to follow the thread of the argument in each of the papers had the volume succeeded in contextualising the interesting question of what constitutes passion in ancient narrative against the broader background of discussing passions in antiquity: e.g. the term 'pas-

sions' (πάθη) invites different interpretations: emotions, violent acts, mistakes of judgement (cf. Gill 1996 p. 100 ff, p. 227 ff, p. 229 ff). Likewise, it would have been useful to include in the discussion the account of emotions in Konstan 2006 and their interpretation as social constructions in Harris 2001 (occasionally one finds references to Braund and Most 2003).

The Preface is a very short introduction to each of the papers by B. POUADERON (pp. 9-10); I would have welcomed some guidelines on how to approach the thematic variety of the contributions on offer.

The first part is about political and social virtues: E. BOWIE's chapter ('Vertus de la campagne, vices de la cité', pp. 13-22) discusses the virtues and the vices of the countryside as opposed to those of the city. Unlike Dio's *Euboean Oration* in which the countryside is always presented positively and the city negatively, Longus' idyllic narrative is not ideal – cf. Morgan 2004 p. 16. First, Bowie differentiates between virtues of character (ἦθος) and virtues of acts (πρᾶξις); he then presents the vices and distinguishes between countryside and city. An analytical table follows. The highlight of the paper is probably the shared attitude of countrymen and city residents towards white lies (p. 16). Note that μυθολογεῖν is not always positive, as Bowie claims (p. 22): the noun μυθολογία is negative in 4.17.3 (Gnathon's homosexual mythology).

The second chapter ('Homme tyrannique, homme royal dans le roman de Chariton', pp. 23-38) by J-P. GUEZ focusses on the representation of tyrannic characters (the vicious) as the opposite of royal characters (the virtuous). Chaereas is initially portrayed as tyrannical but develops into a kingly figure. I could not see clearly how Chaereas' irritability opposes Foucault's and Konstan's 'amorous symmetry' (p. 25 and p. 36), since Callirrhoe is reunited with Chaereas only after his 'reformation' into a kingly character, i.e. when the 'symmetry' is re-established. Guez in the passage on 'le combat contre soi-même' (p. 31) omits the important self-critique of Dionysius in 2.6.3. (ἐγὼ τυραννήσω σώματος ἐλευθέρου;).

The ideal of royalty is further addressed in F. LÉTOUBLON's account ('Le prince idéale de la *Cyropédie* ou l'histoire est un roman', pp. 39-49) of Cyrus' virtues in the *Cyropaedia*. It is difficult to find any vices in Cyrus' case since he is beyond admiration. In the second part ('Eros sophistes') Létoublon discusses Cyrus' self-control towards Eros in the Araspas and Panthea episode. Létoublon re-emphasises the bonds between Xenophon's ideal prince and the ideal novel to conclude that the novel's debt to the *Cyropaedia* goes beyond its erotic *topoi* and may be found in the 'interlacement' (p. 47) of the Araspas and Panthea novella with the main narrative.

The chapter by S. MONTANARI ('Morale et société idéale dans l'utopie d'Iamboulos', pp. 51-67) discusses (without reference to secondary literature) the virtues of the ideal cities in Iamboulos. Iamboulos' utopia is a representation, not a negation, of the Hellenistic society (p. 65), argues Montanari, but his line of debate is not clear. Montanari omits the larger, and more important, discussion of the philosophical background of the *topos* of utopias, and especially 'sun-cities' in, among others, Stoicism (Bidez 1932) and Platonism (cf. Bobonich 2002).

The volume's second part examines individual, philosophical, and religious virtues. R. BRETHERS, in a very accessible and richly annotated paper ('Rien de trop: la recherche d'un juste milieu chez Aristote, Ménandre et Chariton', pp. 71-83), discusses the maxim of 'nothing too much' in Chariton. At the beginning of the novel Chaereas resembles the young heroes of epic, drama, historiography, and comedy (mainly Menandrian). However, through education he develops into a paternal, well-tempered personality, a new Hermocrates, or a new *pepaideumenos* Dionysius, who respects his wife according to the ideals of Plutarch's *Erōtikos* (p. 76). I am not convinced that Dionysius, and his literary model Demeas, are models to imitate, especially given their 'μειρακιώδεις' reactions when it comes to love, which Brethes does not fail to point out (p. 78). Rather I understand Dionysius' *paideia* as an ideal – and in Dionysius' 'real' life unattainable – virtue that only ideally passionate youths such as Chaereas may strive to imitate in an absolute (μειρακειώδεις) way. If read along these lines, *paideia* is not necessarily a positive characteristic, as presented here by Brethes. The emotional development of Chaereas is very clearly presented in Brethes' interesting comparison of Chariton's depiction of the protagonist's youth and adulthood with Aristotle's discussion of youth and adulthood in the *Nicomachean Ethics* and in the *Rhetoric*.

K. DOWDEN's chapter ('L'affirmation de soi chez les romanciers', pp. 85-96) explores 'self-assertion' and how it results in a tripartite sequence of emotional development: despair, encouragement, and *θεραπεία*/treatment of those in despair. The main lexical pivot of the chapter are the occurrences of *θαρρῆν*/*θαρσεῖν*, although, as Dowden admits (p. 90), not all the instances of the terms contribute to the above tripartite categorisation. Dowden's inadequately developed classification of the 'self-assertive' modes—passive, aggressive, and affirmative—probably deserves more emphasis. Equally undeveloped is the very interesting distinction between, on the one hand, the 'affirmative' behaviour of the heroines of the pagan novels as opposed to the

‘aggressive’ heroines of *Apollonius, King of Tyre*, and, on the other hand, the Christian martyrs (pp. 93-4).

The paper of D. KASPRZYK (‘Morale et sophistique: sur la notion de σωφροσύνη chez Achille Tatius’, pp. 97-115) is an excellent narratological study of the term σωφρων and its cognates in the five Greek novels. Far from being a literary *topos*, chastity is a notion that allows each novelist to follow a different weaving of the plot. Opposed to the strict σωφροσύνη of Anthia and of Charicleia stands the ambiguously portrayed chastity of Callirrhoe and of Leucippe. But whereas Chariton’s Callirrhoe is urged by the situation to revise her (idealistic) moral views on marriage (p. 98), Achilles Tatius, consciously and playfully, puts stronger emphasis on the παρθενία than on the σωφροσύνη of his heroine (p. 111); this makes her rather unique. In the next chapter (‘Le courage dans le roman grec: de Chariton à Xénophon d’Éphèse, avec une référence à Philon d’Alexandrie’, pp. 117-26) D. KONSTAN argues that the notion of ἀνδρεία in the Greek novels, especially in Xenophon, is shaped according to the new (Judaeo-Christian, p. 124) ideal of chastity and of symmetry between male and female protagonists; there is common ground here with Konstan’s 1994 book and his review of Lalanne 2006 (*BMCR* 1/4/2003).

In an erudite paper entitled ‘Le discours sur la chasteté dans le re cycle clémentin: *Homélies clémentines et Martyre des saints Néerée et Achillée*’ (pp. 127-47), B. POUDERON discusses the two different Christian readings of chastity as presented by the *Clementines* and by the *Martyrdom of Saints Nerea and Achillea*. It appears that, while Peter in the *Clementines* proposes a Judaeo-Hellenistic interpretation of chastity *qua* marital devotion (p. 134) and absence of adultery, the *Martyrdom* opposes this view and makes Peter, or (better) his disciples Nerea and Achillea, the fervent preachers of chastity as virginity, while emphasising martyrdom as the culmination of sexual purity. The paper closes with the contextualisation of the *Martyrdom* in the early Christian literature on Peter.

The contribution of I. RAMELLI (‘Les vertus de la chasteté et de la piété dans les romans grecs et les vertus des chrétiens’, pp. 149-68) addresses chastity and piety in Achilles Tatius and in Heliodorus. Ramelli reworks the unconvincing legend of the Christian identity of Achilles Tatius and Heliodorus. By assembling Stoic and Christian ideas about virginity and chastity, she speculates that a Christian intertext was the hypotext of Achilles Tatius (p. 157) and that Heliodorus was propagating Christian ideas behind the identification of Christ with *Sol invictus* (p. 160). However, one must distinguish between the *goût des chrétiens* (p. 165) for Achilles Tatius and Heli-

odorus, which should be discussed under the heading ‘a Christian reader’s response or interpretation’, and the narrative of these novels, which may well have been written, as Kasprzyk demonstrates elsewhere in this volume, with a totally different view of chastity in mind.

The third section is dedicated to the passions between vice and virtue: A. BILLAULT’s chapter (‘Remarques sur la jalousie dans les romans grecs antiques’, pp. 171-84) treats the terms of jealousy in the novels, ζήλοτυπία and φθόνοϛ. The novels, he argues rightly, are not an analysis of jealousy as a passion but exploit the vehemence of jealousy to set in motion their plot. I would like to have seen more emphasis put on the cases of Chariton’s Stateira, Longus’ Lycaenion, and Achilles Tatius’ Melite as subversive readings of the formulaic plot pattern ‘jealousy – adventure/misfortune’.

The chapter of C. DAUDE (‘Aspects physiques et psychiques des passions chez Achille Tatius’, pp. 185-208) is a long discussion of the medical aspects of passions in Achilles Tatius and his contemporary Galen (p. 187). C. Daude – not always convincingly – argues that the ‘*maladresse*’ (p. 188) of Achilles Tatius to follow a consistent style of presentation and his subsequent incorporation of *gnōmai* in the first-person narrative is the result of his interest in passions. More convincing than this is the parallel study of the corporeal symptoms of passions in the novel and in Galen as well as the material on the mediation of language between psychic and physical passion; it would have been useful to cite even more items of relevant secondary literature on Galen and/or Achilles Tatius.

G. GARBUGINO’s paper (‘La perception des passions dans le roman d’Apulée’, pp. 209-21) proposes two interpretations of *curiositas* in Apuleius’ *Metamorphoses*. There is, he argues, a sacrilegious *curiositas*, when the human Lucius transgresses ‘les mystères de la nature’ (p. 213), and a *curiositas* which is permissible for narrative purposes, and operates when the curious nature of the Ass becomes the main impetus of the plot. Apuleius achieves this by accumulating a series of Milesian stories that describe different passions. We are then presented with a discussion of the literary texture of the *Metamorphoses*: some of the Milesian stories, such as the tale of Charite, Garbugino argues, have a tragic ending, thus subverting the ‘traditional’ and expected comic character of the Petronian Milesian tales. I am not persuaded by the emphasis on the Dido-Charite comparison and on the ‘*Milesiae* tragiques’ (p. 217), given the broad intertextual and bilingual (Greek and Latin) palette of Apuleius.

M. LASSITHIOTAKIS’ chapter (‘Τὸ εὐγενεῖᾱς τὰ δῶρα: passion, vertu, et noblesse dans *Erotocritos*’ pp. 223-38) is an account of the form of passions

and virtues in the seventeenth-century verse romance *Erōtocritos* with reference to the relevant Italian literature, especially B. Castiglione's *Book of The Courtier* (1528). The term 'passion', Lassithiotakis notes, appears only in the plural, *πάθη*, as a general category for physiological and psychological passions; the same applies to the term virtue, *ἀρετές*, which (as a plural noun) includes the virtues of the palace and the knightly virtues; anything that transgresses these moral codes is a fault. From these virtues Lassithiotakis examines closely the development of *ἀντρείά* 'courage', which is attributed to both princes and commoners. The plot of the *Erōtocritos* reflects how the (commoner) protagonist's courage convinces the King to accept him as his son-in-law. The study of *ἀντρείά* however does not by itself replace the background of the folk-tale motif (which strongly recalls Chaereas' case in Chariton), and I would be interested in reading a closer analysis of the 'moral politique' propagated during the Cretan Renaissance – Castiglione's 'idol', after all, was Cicero, the 'self-made man' – as Lassithiotakis announced, but not really delivered, in the chapter's programmatic 'problématique' (p. 224).

The following chapter by K. DE TEMMERMAN ('Un protagoniste passionné: quelques réflexions sur l' expression incontrôlée des émotions chez Chaeréas', pp. 239-55) is a concise and clear study of Chariton's representation of *σωφροσύνη* not as a sexual virtue (as in the previous chapters), but as a social/political virtue of 'self-control' (it complements well Guez's paper; see above). Chaereas is not *σώφρων* in his general conduct, since he acts impulsively and his reactions are overwhelmed with passion. The comparison with the Homeric Achilles, Chariton's literary epic model, shows how exaggerated Chaereas' behaviour is. This interesting point refutes other similar studies of Chariton which emphasise the analogy between Chaereas and his epic/dramatic predecessors, e.g. Hirschberger 2001 p. 170 ff. (not cited by De Temmerman). The last and most attractive part of the paper opposes Chaereas' melodramatic laments to Callirrhoe's more profound ones, which are appropriate to her character. Both of these types of laments agree with the *progymnasmata* that distinguish between *ἦθοποιία ἠθική*, normally depicting male characters, and *ἦθοποιία παθητική*, normally relating to female characters. Chariton's novel thus inverts this *topos* of rhetorical theory, with Callirrhoe being the object of an *ἦθοποιία ἠθική*. The paper would have profited much from a combined study of *ἦθοποιία* in both rhetorical/*progymnasmata* and drama, especially since lament is a common feature of both (cf. Most 1989 pp. 120, 124 ff. for Achilles Tatius' first-person lamentations, between oratory and tragedy).

M. WORONOFF's chapter ('Leucippé ou les infortunes de la vertu: volupté et souffrance dans le roman d'Achille Tatius', pp. 257-67) is a collection of passages from Achilles Tatius that describe violence and horror and the pleasure that emerges from reading about them. However, it seems that the main aim of the study is to (re)-propose a post-Heliodoran date for Achilles Tatius' 'parody' of the *Aethiopica*. It is difficult to find the connection between the topic of the overall volume and Woronoff's suggestions. For sexuality and the novels one should refer to Goldhill 1995 with literature.

The fourth section approaches virtues from an ideological and didactic perspective. The chapter by M.-A. CALVET-SEBASTI ('Colère et compassion dans les récits apocryphes chrétiens', pp. 271-82) studies the motif of the love-triangle in the *Apocryphal Acts* and the *Pseudo-Clementines*. Whereas in the *Apocryphal Acts* the presence of the Apostle destroys a marriage and results in the prosecution of both the wife and the preacher by the enraged husband, Peter in the *Pseudo-Clementines* helps the couple and reunites the family. The different adaptation is due to the different didactic purposes of the *Apocryphal Acts* and the *Pseudo-Clementines*. There is not much new material here and the didactic purposes of the difference in treatment are not voiced out clearly.

The paper by G. PUCCINI-DELBEY ('La vertu de sagesse existe-t-elle dans les *Métamorphoses* d'Apulée', pp. 283-96) discusses, in an uneven essay, the question of *sapientia*, 'science des choses divines et humaines' (p. 286), and *prudentialia*, defined as 'sagesse' (p. 286), in Apuleius' philosophical works and in the *Metamorphoses*. However, Lucius' acquisition or not of wisdom is debatable and is closely related to the controversial interpretation (serious or not) of Book XI of the *Metamorphoses* (see, for example, Winkler 1985, Sandy 1997, and Harrison 2000). I do not see how this paper engages with the controversy.

The appealing contribution of C. RUIZ-MONTERO and F. ZAMBUDIO ('La doctrine morale de la *Vie d'Alexandre de Macédoine*', pp. 297-307) is a detailed analysis of the Stoic and Cynic elements, verbal and thematic, in Version A (the oldest) of the *Alexander Romance*. The first part of the paper examines Alexander's virtues and vices according to Diogenes Laertius and Chrysippus. The second part proposes a reading of the *Alexander Romance* as a mirror of the Cynic movement and compares it to the *Orations on Kingship* by Dio Chrysostom.

The chapter on the Modern Greek novel by H. TONNET ('Heurs et malheurs de la vertu dans trois romans grecs du XIX^e siècle', pp. 309-18; cf. the

French translation of Defoe's *Heurs et Malheurs de la fameuse Moll Flanders*) deals with a modern approach of characterisation. Tonnet examines the development of the ideal of virtue from Perdikaris' *Hermilos*, written in 1817, to Pitsipios' *The Orphan-girl of Chios*, 1839, and Kalligas' *Thanos Vlekas* (1855). The notion of virtue and of 'virtuous novels', according to Koraes' remarks in the preface to his 1804 translation of Heliodorus, developed from a stereotypical portrait of ἀρετή (interpreted as both chastity and morality) to a solid characterisation of virtue and vice: e.g. the philosophical virtue in Perdikaris' adaptation of the *Ass* and/or the ideal-novel-like chastity of the heroine in Pitsipios, as opposed to the more in-depth characterisation of the protagonists in Kalligas. The discussion of 'innocence', ἀθωότητα, as an alternative term for the hero's and especially the heroine's ἀρετή, (pp. 312, 315), is probably the high point of the paper.

The next chapter by E. WOLFF ('Vertus et vices dans *l'Historia Apollonii regis Tyri*', pp. 319-26) discusses the *History of Apollonius, King of Tyre*. Both male and female characters in the novel, Wolff argues, are characterised as 'good' or 'bad', although there is some ambiguity regarding the hero, Apollonius, and Athenagoras. Despite the attempt at subtle characterisation Wolff's conclusion is predictable: in the *History*, just as in folk-tale, the 'good' characters are rewarded and reunited, and the 'bad' are punished (p. 325). The interesting topic of the 'Christianisation' of a pagan (incestuous) text is not discussed thoroughly, and the detailed commentary of Kortekaas 2007 is not mentioned.

The fifth section covers virtues in various narratives. M. BRIAND's contribution ('Le sexe des passions et des vertus: anthropologie culturelle, métafiction et rhétorique dans le roman d' Achilles Tatius', pp. 329-53) is rich in secondary literature and a good starting point for a discussion of 'gendered passions' in Achilles Tatius. Rhetoric, argues Briand, could bridge the gap between the anthropological and the literary approaches to passions in the novel, since speech is 'gendered' (p. 332). The novel is presented by the male protagonist, Cleitophon, and is an example of Asianist discourse, hence by definition effeminate and morally inappropriate. The narrator presents himself and his female characters (whose words and emotions he voices) in a similar way and occasionally, in an ironic narratological twist, he portrays himself as a woman. Thus, the novel becomes a subversive revision of its 'ideal' predecessors, e.g. Xenophon (p. 348) is here classified as the 'archetypical' novel. There seems to be an 'idealised' and 'stereotypical' understanding of what the Greek love novel is, although the ideal texts are

more flexible in this respect: e.g. Xenophon's predecessor, Chariton, depicts another 'subversive' plot of chastity in the double marriage of Callirrhoe.

The chapter by D. CRISMANI ('Notes sur le pouvoir des herbes dans le roman', pp. 354-66) is a lyrically presented but sketchily argued and under-referenced essay on love and love potions, as well as on the pathology of love. After reviewing the prehistory of love and/or potions from the Odyssean Helen and the Sophoclean Deianeira, Crismani discusses the manifestations of love as *pathos* and as *pathēma* (p. 365) in the Greek novels, and how the novels, as narratives of *erōtica pathēmata*, become the *pharmakon* for desire (p. 366).

The contribution by H. FRANGOULIS ('Passion et narration: Nonnos et le roman', pp. 367-76) is a close reading of the 'tale of Hymnos and Nicaea' from Nonnos' *Dionysiaca* 15 and 16 in the light of Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe*. The comparison seems to be largely influenced by the classification of love-*topoi* in Létoublon 1993. Indeed a connection of Nonnos with the novel would have been interesting by definition but the results we have in this paper are controversial: in it Hymnos is compared to Longus' Dorcon and Nicaea's rape by Dionysus is compared to the near-rape of Chloe by Dorcon (p. 372). Frangoulis continues with a comparison of the rhetoric of love in Nonnos and the novel. Love in Nonnos, unlike love in the novel, is non-reciprocal, as Frangoulis observes (p. 370). Morgan 2004 p. 172 emphasises the opposition between the inset traditional metamorphosis myths and the 'myth of Chloe': Greek mythology offers hundreds of examples of raped and/or transformed virgin nymphs and/or shepherdesses (cf. Ovid and Parthenius). Even if Nonnos' knowledge of Latin is disputable (see Otis 2011 (1966) and Shorrock (2005) p. 380; this is a point that Frangoulis does not touch upon), one cannot deny that the influence of classical mythology in the *Dionysiaca* is more evident than its adaptation of Longus.

C. JOUANNO's interesting communication ('L'histoire d' Abradate et de Panthée au fil des siècles', pp. 377-92) focusses on the *Nachleben* of Xenophon's tale of 'Abradates and Panthea' in late antiquity and Byzantium. Xenophon's tale is one of emotion, pity, and didacticism. The highlight of the tale, namely Cyrus' temperance vis-à-vis Panthea's beauty (he refuses to see her), becomes a literary *topos* for self-restraint, from Plutarch to the fifth-century Isidorus of Pelusium. Panthea on the other hand is remembered as an example of conjugal love and fidelity: Penelope-like in Plutarch and σῶφρων from Lucian to Choniatis. The detail of Abradates' severed arm is also a *topos* of pity in rhetorical handbooks from Hermogenes to Maximus Planoudes. However, in the twelfth century Tzetzes and Zonaras down-

played the charismatic Xenophontic characterisation of virile-minded Panthea and emphasised the portrait of Abradates, since times no longer approved these ‘femmes de tête’ (p. 390).

The central idea of L. NÚÑEZ’s paper (‘Les πάθη d’un narrateur: le cas des *Éthiopiennes*’, pp. 393-416) is witty but not wholly clear. Heliodorus, Núñez argues, applies Aristotle’s idea that the *ēthos* of a narrator shapes the passions-*pathos* of his audience and she applies this view to the narrative digressions in Heliodorus: therefore, there is a narrative mask of a narrator-zoologist (description of the giraffe), a narrative mask of a narrator-geologist (the amethyst ring), and so on. It is hard for me to see where the *ēthos* of the above scientific (therefore, ‘quasi-objective’) narrator-masks lie, given the novel’s ‘polyphonic’ ‘tentative d’ encyclopédisme’, as described by Fusillo (1989/1991) p. 67 ff. Is the account of the *ēthos* of the narrator-*periēgētēs* of the Syene festivities (p. 402) different from Calasiris’ account of the Delphic festival in 23.1.1 ff.? An alternative approach could start from Aristotle’s *Poetics*, in which πάθη are an ingredient of the plot (1452b, πάθος δέ ἐστὶ πρῶξις) that influences the audience’s response (1453b φρίττειν καὶ ἐλεεῖν); Núñez’s description of the ‘Syene Suppliants’ (pp. 403-5) could be read in this context.

Some final remarks. There is discrepancy in the citation of Greek and/or Latin (with or without translation) and in the reference system: in some chapters references to secondary sources are made by author and year of publication, with a bibliography at the end, while in others there are full citations of secondary sources with or without a bibliography at the end; a collective final bibliography would have been much appreciated. Often there are problems with the French in papers that do not seem to have been proof-read thoroughly: e.g. p. 18 ‘mais nous rions...innaproprié’. Anglicisms include ‘tracer’ (p. 117) and ‘approximativement’ (p. 118). Misprints in Greek: p. 25 ὦ (ῶ) τυραννίδος, p. 33 full stop missing after Ἰωνίας.

Bibliographical notes

- Bidez, J. 1932, 'La cité du monde et la cité du soleil chez les Stoïciens', *Académie royale de Belgique. Bulletin de la classe des lettres et des sciences morales et politiques*, 5, 18, 244-294.
- Bobonich, C. 2002, *Plato's utopia recast: his later ethics and politics*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Braund, S. M. and Most, G. W. 2003, *Ancient anger: perspectives from Homer to Galen*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Eitrem, S. 1941, 'La magie comme motif littéraire chez les Grecs et les Romains', *Symbolae Osloenses*, 21, 39-83.
- Faraone, C. A. 1999, *Ancient Greek love magic*, Harvard: Harvard University Press.
- Fusillo, M. 1989/1991, *Naissance du roman*, Paris: Éditions du Seuil.
- Gill, C. 1996, *Personality in Greek epic, tragedy, and philosophy: the self in dialogue*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Goldhill, S. 1995, *Foucault's virginity: ancient erotic fiction and the history of sexuality*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Harré, R. 1986, *The social construction of emotions*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Harris, W. V. 2001, *Restraining rage: the ideology of anger control in classical antiquity*, Cambridge, Mass., London: Harvard University Press.
- Harrison, S. J. 2000, *Apuleius: a Latin sophist*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hirschberger, M. 2001, 'Epos und Tragödie in Charitons *Kallirhoe*: Ein Beitrag zu Intertextualität des griechischen Romans', *Würzburger Jahrbücher für die Altertumswissenschaft*, Band 25, 157-186.
- Konstan, D. 1994, *Sexual symmetry: Love in the ancient novel and related genres*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- 2006, *The emotions of the Ancient Greeks: studies in Aristotle and classical literature*, Toronto, London: University of Toronto Press.
- Kortekaas, G. A. A. 2007, *Commentary on the Historia Apollonii Regis Tyri*, Leiden: Brill.
- Lalanne, S. 2006, *Une éducation grecque*, Paris: Éditions La Découverte.
- Létoublon, F. 1993, *Les lieux communs du roman: stéréotypes grecs d'aventure et d'amour*, Leiden: Brill.
- Morgan, J. 2004, *Longus: Daphnis and Chloe*, Oxford: Aris and Phillips.
- Most, G. 1989, 'The stranger's stratagem: self-disclosure and self-sufficiency in Greek culture', *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 109, 114-133.
- Otis, B. 1966/2011, *Ovid as an epic poet*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sandy, G. N. 1997, *The Greek world of Apuleius: Apuleius and the second sophistic*, Leiden/Boston/NY: Brill.
- Shorrock, R. 2005, 'Nonnos', in Foley, J. M. (ed.), *A Companion to Ancient Epic*, Oxford: 374-385.
- Winkler, J. J. 1985, *Auctor & actor: a narratological reading of Apuleius' Golden ass*, Berkeley: University of California Press.