Gendered and Gendering Insults and Compliments in the Latin Novels

Donald Lateiner
Ohio Wesleyan University
dglatein@owu.edu

I. Introduction

To 'insult' or 'jump on' someone (*insultare, contemnere, maledicere, irridere, etc*.) requires the target (free, freed, or even slave) to have some notional repute (*existimatio*). She or he must also recognize at least some sense of shame (*pudor*), although some insulted parties are rhetorically denied any[1]. Common human expressions of that shame were (and are)

1 — Dickey (2002: 129-85) reviews the history of scholarship devoted to the Latin address system. She examines address-relevant Latin insults and terms of endearment and esteem. She lists examples and provides a glossary (305-65). Müller 1913 supplies a categorized list for Plautus (and Terence): slaves, moral or mental capacities, courtesans, pimps and procuresses, parasites, youth and the elderly, wives (499-501). Opelt (1965) provides a typology of *Schimpfwörter* in literature and epigraphical locations and includes a superior index (266-83); most relevant to the novels is chapter I, *Bereich der Liebe*. Even slaves and procurers in pre-classical comedy have a sense of self-worth and shame that, although others can deny it with impunity, keeps them in play socially and amuses the audience, safe at a distance from their nasty ploys and potential pollution. For the Irish of yore (Kelly 1976: 94 n.3), there were eight deadly categories of imputed insults: impotence, cuckoldry, bastardy; epilepsy and leprosy; deafness, lameness, and blindness. The first two gender-applicable categories frequently occupy our two ancient authors.

to speak incoherently, fall silent, blush, and/or lower the head[2]. Since the mirror of the Roman spirit was the face (*imago animi*), the nearly uncontrollable blush of modesty (*verecundia*) often "leaked" a secret embarrassment or betrayed a palpable hit. Interactants, internal audiences, and external readers perceive(d) damaged "face"[3]. Youths develop at different speeds and to different degrees effective verbal retorts and nonverbal screens to hide behind and, even when flustered, to keep their social selves "in play"[4]. These masks of composure keep the disconcerted individual in countenance and obscure the chagrin caused by tests and taunts (*voces contumeliosae*, Cic. *Cael*. 30). This study examines insults and compliments in the two principal Latin novels in order to analyze the etiquette of verbal impoliteness and nonverbal aggression and kind words.

Norms of gendered behaviors – for elites, proper folk, and the unwashed – have changed less than academics may think[5]. Erving Goffman astutely asserted of mid-century North America, "Gender, not religion, is the opiate of the masses" (1977: 653). His descriptions of the subordinating "courtship complex" and the gendered "courtesy system", in which women are deemed inferior, apply to earlier (if not current) assumptions about women's physical, mental, emotional, and, therefore, to their social envelopes, personal space, verbal and haptic (touching) boundaries. Women's presumed frailties and delicacy provided men with some hampering obligations but more licenses to contact women unknown or of another class[6]. Asymmetrical license to address and accost the other sex put Roman women at an analogous disadvantage in institutionalized competitions for social status. Depending on class, pro-

2 — *Met*. 2.2, 3.2, 4.24, 9.13: Lucius conveys despair by his *summiso capite* – even when an ass.

3 — Sen. *Ep*. 11; Apul. *de Plat*. 1.13; Lateiner 1998: 177-9; Barton 1999: 212-24. Barton assembles reff. to Roman *social* policing of women, verbal and nonverbal, starting from Plaut. *Merc*. 405-8. This catalogue provides verbal, non-verbal, and written embarrassments to which a Roman, but especially a respectable Roman woman, could be subjected.

4 — 3.12: *sic pudenter allocutus et paulisper hilaro vultu renidens quantumque poteram laetiorem me refingens comiter abeuntes magistratus appello*. He seeks inconspicuous routes to avoid eyes and fingers: *ego vitans oculos omnium et ... risum obviorum declinans* (3.12). When Roman "face" was destroyed, a male might veil himself to hide his embarrassment and shame: 1.6-7 Aristomenes, 10. 3 (the anonymous Phaedra-do-alike step-mother); cf. *Sat*. 7, 20, 90, 122 v.128, and, historically, Caesar and Pompey (Suet. *Caes*. 82; Plut. *Pomp*. 79, cf. Lucan's Pompey: *Phars*. 8.613-15).

5 — The pugnacious, aristocratic twentieth-century author and British politician, Winston Churchill, is alleged once to have retorted cleverly to a contentious female symposiast, Bessie Braddock. When she said: "Sir, you are drunk", the wit replied: "Madam, you are ugly. In the morning, I shall be sober". Another bold and noble conversationalist, Nancy Astor, allegedly taunted him, saying: "Sir, if you were my husband, I would give you poison". Churchill replied: "If I were your husband, I would take it". Petronius would gladly have incorporated these sexist slurs.

6 — Lucius notably hesitates to greet directly a grand lady, his aunt Byrrhaena, even when prompted (2.1). *Vereor ignotae mihi feminae* [*accedere et salutare*] says he, then blushes and drops his head (*statim rubore suffuses deiecto capite restiti*). Ascyltus in shame or despair buries his head in his cloak (20), although Encolpius characteristically misinterprets his action as respect for religious mysteries.

vince, and period, Roman women in some situations escaped seclusion[7]. Female courtship and courtesy protocols, however, have a second, darker side – namely, women's constructed defenselessness before male abuse, especially insinuations of sexual laxity. Their gendered legal status (including financial dependency and subordination in most forms of marriage), their dress, and their limited options for defending themselves in public increased discrimination, perceptible gender asymmetry. Women's official inferiority only formalized and increased their vulnerability to informal verbal, nonverbal, and physical threats to their repute, not to mention casual presumptions on their bodies[8]. To feminize a man, to animalize a woman, to barbarize or de-animate either sex to a thing (e.g., a rock, a turd) disesteemed the person and his or her status and due respect. Thus, to call a man a woman (or whore, Petr. *Sat*. 9.6), or a dog-fucker (43.8), or to insult a woman as snake or blockhead (74.13, 77.1) insulted their sex, changed their gendered attributes, and thus degraded them both face-to-face and damaged any social or economic claims they make.

Banter and joshing presented low-level insults offensive to the Roman target's sense of self, including his or her sex and associated gendered behaviors[9]. Blunt "name-calling" insults display a more derogatory and aggressive form of "impression management", as Erving Goffman calls it. Both levels of hostility reposition the players' "presentation of self". "Kidding" and mortal insults deserve attention in any typology of status competition. Interlocutors in the Latin novels often mean to embarrass or put down others who threaten their territory[10]. Heroes, villains, and admitted deviants on the fringes find occasion to attack or defend "face", to manage others' impressions of their good standing with respect to gen-

7 — Lower-class occupations, such as grocers and fish-sellers, upper-class activities, such as symposia, for example, gave Roman women and Greek women in the Roman period more visibility than they apparently had enjoyed in Pericles' "woman least spoken of" Athens.

8 — Women's vulnerability at Trimalchio's *cena* seems clear. For examples, *Sat*. 67: Habinnas' horseplay, turning his freedman host's wife Fortunata upside-down and Trimalchio's abuse of this hostess, his own wife¸ in public. Hostess matron Byrrhena's unassailably superior position at her *cena* reflects her elite position in a provincial town.

9 — But the high eloquence of Cicero never disdained the production of *odium, invidia*, and *contemptio* for adversaries, whether or not gendered abuse provides the material of the insult. He describes the litigator's activity of *reprehensio vitae* as a *lex quaedam accusatoria*. See *de invent*. 1.22; *pro Mur*. 11. His practice conforms to this theory; see, for examples, his abuse of his clients' opponents in *pro Quinct*. 5, 9, 11, 12, 14, 21, 26, 38, 46, 56, etc.; *pro Rosc. Com*. 4, 20; *pro Caec*. 14, 23, 93. Edwards (1997: 69) discusses *infamia*, the opposite of honor and its production of exclusion from the male elite (68). Sexual deviance marginalizes male and females not only socially but legally (77). The prostitute, the actor, and the gladiator are exposed to corporal punishments and other humiliations that free men need not fear (73). Thus, these professions furnish material for insulting and threatening one's competitors.

10 — Many of the casual terms of insult (*sermo contumeliosus*) and endearment (*sermo amatorius*) can already be found in Roman comedy: Duckworth (1952: 290, 333-4, e.g., *Poen*. 365 ff.); also in Roman lyric and elegy.

der, race, cultural competency, and maturity. Both verbal and nonverbal expressions of mockery and esteem manipulated one's own and others' status, as we show below. This paper examines in the Latin novels both hostile and ingratiating face-to-face behaviors arising from explicit and implicit references to (biological) sex and (social) gender[11].

Male and female expectations, behaviors, and perceptions of gender presentation are important elements of "impression management"[12]. The successful interactant must enhance the impression s/he makes on others while s/he controls or subtly depresses the impression that other competitors can produce in a zero-sum competition. Playing the man or playing the woman, in life and literature, results in many arresting and successful performances, but literary texts, comic and tragic, prefer the miscues, unmaskings, instances of severe offensiveness, embarrassing silences, loss of face, mockery, and humiliations. Therefore, the derogatory instances and challenging vocabulary outweigh the flattering ones.

The two imperial Latin novels are satirical in theme and incident[13]. These cultural productions are both male-authored and presumably directed at male readers. Not surprisingly, then, women fare badly – individually and as a Roman gender. Nevertheless, these entertainments feature stumbling anti-heroes – Encolpius and Lucius – men (by sex, not necessarily gender) who repeatedly resemble Woody Allen's clumsier, equally egocentric characters. They theatrically **mis-perform** their virility. They adhere inadequately to gender ideology, that is, to long-established Roman and Greek customs and ideals of masculine self-presentation and sexual performance, but these effeminate protagonists repeatedly collapse

11 — The quondam California Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger's demeaning, sexist and homophobic, references to "Girlie-Men," for instance, have rich sexist precedents in civilized ancient Europe (e.g., γυναικάνηρ, γυναικίζω, *muliebriter, muliero*) in formal Latin oratory, e.g., Cicero's speeches especially for the prosecution (Edwards 1992) and in his vituperative letters (J. Hall 2009, ch. 4).

12 — The establishment and terminology of the study of micro-impression management and face-to-face situational behaviors in ordinary and difficult encounters belong to Erving Goffman, the Canadian-American sociologist and author of the elegant *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* (orig. 1959). The carefully devised slippage in drama between appearances and realities, often realities known to select players and audiences, favors his ubiquitous use of metaphors from conscious stage performances in describing daily social interaction, rituals and ordinary exchanges.

13 — The rich antecedents for [gendered] insults in Plautus' proto-novel genre, and in Anon. *Apollonius Rex Tyrii*, in an arguably post-novel genre, require further attention. Good examples can be found in Plautus' dialogues (*flagitium*, e.g., *Merc*. 405-8) and in Ciceronian invective monologues. One might focus on remarks about Mark Antony's paradigmatic *mollitia* (*Phil*. 2. 44-5, 55), and little Clodius' effeminacy in *pro Caelio*; e.g., 36: *pusio*; *pro Mil*. 55. Cicero's insults drawn forth by the behavior of Verres, Gabinius, and Curio may be fruitful for the novels. See Edwards (1993: 64-75), Gleason (1995: 60-64), Corbeill (2004: 117-23), and O'Sullivan (2011). The last three analyze how minutely (Greeks and) Romans observe gait, *incessus*, that reveals character and sexual inclinations. Sly Chrysis, Circe's servile go-between (*Sat*. 126), comments on Encolpius' self-conscious studied walk and on his hair-do, make-up, and sulky eyes.

in manliness before violence and gendering insults, both verbal and gestural. Petronius' protagonist loses his male lover and, soon after, successfully intimidated, his heroic sword and his basic capacity for sexual intercourse (82, 128, 130-132). Apuleius' protagonist loses his presumed elite self-control, publicly breaks down in fear and tears in the Thessalian town Hypata's crowded theater, and loses even his human *genus* (while gaining the bigger *penis* of a lowly ass). Soon after transformed into a four-footed beast, he faces imminent brutal emasculation, actual castration by knife and hot iron. Ultimately he renounces his Roman sexuality and masculinity – a spiritual castration. He voluntarily, after many traumas, accepts the garb, hairlessness, and celibacy demanded by a jealous African goddess, Isis, who demands a monotheistic fealty (3.10, 24; 7.26, 28; 11.6: *in mea tutela*, 19: *castimoniorum abstinentiam*).

The men in these two novels, paradigms of inverted male protocols, rarely retaliate[14], or restrain expressions of their emotions as victims, in situations where men "should" hide their pain and react with force[15]. They passively suffer insulting words and deeds – consistently rather than episodically. Their creators, in a largely gender-segregated world, pledge allegiance to the hegemonic masculine ideal of assertiveness and sexual prowess known to us from Catullus' lyrics, Cicero, Livy, Plutarch, Quintilian, Lucian, and the rest, and analyzed in recent work on Roman manhood[16]. The novelists align themselves by *inverting* long-standing ideals of *paideia* and *andreia*, of *humanitas* and *virtus*[17]. That is, these men show us how "real" men should *not* behave.

Feminine norms of fearful self-effacement and docility thus frequently replace expectations of male self-assertion and massive retaliation against insults for these two novels' **male** protagonists. The feminized Petronian gad-about suffers passively, and the Apuleian socially neutered aristocrat loses his status and even his human identity – when transformed into a beast of burden, low as a slave, and, later, when retransformed into a

14 — The ass/man Lucius comments to his audience on his inability to defend himself with hands or words (7.28): *solo quod restabat nisus praesidio*, a prolepsis for his squirting out excrement on the vicious tradeswoman who intends to emasculate him.

15 — Fisher (1998: 70, 82) discusses the parallel classical Athenian requirement that males respond adequately to a perceived insult. van Wees (1998) points out that the Athenian Sokrates (the inverse personality to Apuleius' Socrates) serves then and now as the paradigm of self-control in the face of sexual, physical, and verbal threats.

16 — Consider the constructedness implied in titles such as: Maud Gleason (1995) *Making Men*; Eric Gunderson (2000) *Staging Masculinity*, Anthony Corbeill (2004), *Nature Embodied*, etc.

17 — Jones 2012 investigates the Greek performances of these qualities in the Greek novels. Haynes (2003: 72) observes that the "counter-cultural anomaly [of bold female heroines results in] ... ultimately conventional" wives. Similarly (as Shelton 2005: 328 notes), Lucius the adventurer in sex and magic never condemns the hierarchical system that oppresses with violence both exploited humans and animals. He notes many injustices, but he wishes only to regain his human form and (privileged) human male status.

human Isiac initiate, tonsured and faced with myriad taboos affecting his sexual, gustatory, and dress codes. The Latin novels' **women**, on the other hand, are both less spunky and norm-resistant than the adventurous heroines of the Greek novels. They largely conform to negative ancient stereotypes of excessive female appetites and evil intent: gossip, greed, gauche gluttony, spitefulness, and, especially, lust[18].

Gender-specific *argumenta ad feminam et marem*, Petronius' and Apuleius' ignominy-producing insults and flattering compliments, in particular, illustrate these claims[19]. Polite and impolite "manners" inflect their social encounters: pompous and absurd public behaviors of Roman magistrates (Hypata's lictor, Venus' imperious treatment of "her" runaway slave, Corinthian trials and fatal amusements), of arrogant Greek women (Byrrhena, Psyche's noble sisters, Circe), and of Greek-descended freedman communities and slaves enjoying themselves or pursuing advancement (Trimalchio and friends, Chrysis, Myrmex, Thiasus' cooks). Gender-specific abuse will crowd the interchanges that we examine and thus provide a window on gender roles in Latin novels[20]. Expressions of contempt may contain logically incompatible suggestions that also animalize, vegetalize, infantilize, and barbarize others. Given the novels' insecurely masculine protagonists, this paper focuses on insults that feminize male targets[21]. Compliments, like insults, may be sent and received face-to-face or may characterize an absent third party, as when Proculus

18 — Apuleius' bold Charite, the exceptional heroine of an inset story, a legend in her own time (8.1: *historia*) seems to prove the rule, but see below, IIIB3. Commentators (e.g., *GCA* VIII (1985) 6-8) have recognized that her actions closely resemble the perils to *pudicitia* and nick-of-time escapes experienced by female protagonists in the Greek romances. A case can be made for Photis as well, but her role is only partly developed.

19 — Citations come from the Teubner editions of Müller[4] and Helm[3]. J. Hall (2009: 135-68) explains Latin techniques for dealing with conflict in epistolary communications.

20 — The opening scene in which the manic drop-out Encolpius rages against rhetoric – rhetorically – happens to attack men only – but not *because* of their gender. Teachers, students, and their bill-paying fathers will have been males (1-4, 6). Encolpius, *laudator temporis acti*, values current teachers' useless products only as *ventosa loquacitas*, the students as *stultissimi*, and their parents deserving of *obiurgatio*. The market scene with the contested cloak contains another genderless, insulting gesture of rejection (15): the peasant throws the disputed cloak in Ascyltus' face, because he thinks it is worthless, not because Ascyltus is male. One should note early an obvious fact: the two authors frequently offer insults that lack a gender-specific element. For example, to inform your guest that you are not the "dolt", "numskull", or "nincompoop" that he might judge you is not a gendered response to a gendered affront. *Met*. 1.15 and *Sat*. 39.13 both wield the insult *cucurbita*, lit. "gourd", perhaps "soft-brained", but stupidity is not limited to any gender. The abuse offends rules of friendly conversation, but the opprobrious metaphor, like many others, carries no obvious marker of gender.

21 — From Latin's vast riches, consider Iarbas' contemptuous and alliterative, gendered description of Aeneas (Verg. *Aen*. 4.215-17; and cf. Turnus, 12.97): *ille Paris cum semiuiro comitatu, Maeonia mentum mitra crinemque madentem subnexus*, "that famous Casanova with his eunuch buddies, wearing a Parisian bonnet bound around his sweaty chin and curls". Adams (1983: 217-25) discusses generic variations in literature, not in epic or the novel, but in comedy, epigram, satire, oratory, and elegy.

is described as a fairy-prince or deceptive dream (*phantasia*), or Melissa as a superb "piece of ass", *pulcherrimum bacciballum* (38, 61.7: whatever that *hapax* means). Such words may equally well be sincere or designedly self-interested[22].

*II. Insults (*contumeliae, convicia, acerbitas, etc.*)*

Observers first distinguish gendering slurs by noting the biological sex and status of the aggressor and the target when a character in the Latin novels, or a narrator within, casts gendered aspersions on a male or female. The reader's evaluation of derogatory or mocking statements about someone's nature, appearance, or behavior is shaped by awareness of the gender of the source and that source's presumed or identified bias, motives, and situation. Expressions of gendered ill will – including blunt name-calling, extended descriptions of deviant behavior, insolent gestures and postures – often meet verbal, gestural, or violently physical retaliation. Apuleius' fictional intellectual wimp Socrates reports of his masterful mistress: *in eam [Meroën] dicacule probrum dixerat [uxor alius viri]*. The witch punished the anonymous wife's imprudent and nasty disparagement – tit for tat with vicious compounded interest (*Met*. 1.9).

A. Petronius

Gendering and gendered abuse in *Satyrica* climaxes in Encolpius' invective against his penis. After a new girlfriend whips him for impotence, the vagabond, leaning "erect" on one elbow, verbally assaults his unnamed **male** organ. He abuses his (unspecified) *mentula*, female in grammatical gender, with the otherwise unattested *feminine* form *furcifera*, "worthy of humiliating execution" (132v)[23]. Encolpius personifies and addresses his uncooperative, literally shameless but shameful (n.b., his vocative *Pudor*), indeed dysfunctional, member. He asks it/her *quid dicis...? Rogo te...* His elegant, allusive *oratio*, and *obiurgatio* (132.9), allegedly embarrasses his limp penis so much that, cold and wrinkled, it/she silently turns aside, averts its/her "gaze". Crossing genders and genres[24], he quotes verbatim to his inanimate penis Vergil's hexameter description

22 — A third possibility, present in both these vignettes, is that a denigrating insult may be kernelled into an apparent compliment: Proculus is a fraud about his bankrupt state and Tarentine (a city famous for sensuality) Melissa is comitting adultery with the narrator.

23 — Since *ne nominare quidem te inter res serias fas est*, even Encolpius never utters the low word that specifies his organ.

24 — He speaks, forgetting his natural modesty, to that *nefanda* part of his body that reserved and respectable men do not even acknowledge: *secreto rubore perfundi ... quod oblitus verecundiae meae cum ea parte corporis verba contulerim, quam ne ad cognitionem quidem admittere severioris notae homines solerent*. Richlin (1983: 116-24) notes that similar addresses to one's penis amount to an ancient literary *topos*. See Hallett 2003 on elegiac antecedents of and parallels to Encolpius' impotence.

of the once lustful Queen Dido's tragic nonverbal response to her lover who quickly deserted her, Aeneas (*A*. 4.331-3, 397-401). After having encountered the Trojan hero again, unexpectedly in Vergil's underworld (*A*. 6.450-72, esp. 469)[25], she had "replied" nonverbally to his self-justifying excuses for unannounced departure and permanent desertion. Her answer, anticipating that of Encolpius' penis, had presented gaze aversion, fixed features, and silent shunning: *illa solo fixos oculos aversa tenebat*[26]. Her justifiably haughty, more than "unresponsive" body-language (and proxemics) exhibits total rejection and dissociation from the man that she had once saved. Encolpius' penis grotesquely echoes and deflates by its "gesture" Vergil's epic grandeur as it self-deflates further Encolpius' half-baked ego. He blushes and rubs his brow(132.12: *rubor*; 13: *perfricata frons*)[27]. The markedly defective body part (the feminine noun *mentula* to be supplied) and his shameless allusion to an epic female (Queen Dido) "betray" and ignore wishes of their male "superiors".

Men in *Satyrica* who think themselves cheated or robbed abuse each other with *latro* and *leno* (male occupations) for perceived predations. Thus, Eumolpus assaults opponents with "thief" and "pimp" (84, 98, 107). Giton assaults the absent Ascyltus with words alone when defending his calculated desertion of Encolpius (91)[28]. The slanging matches among the three indigent vagabonds, all young males – Encolpius, Ascyltus and Giton (9-11) – bandy about a wealth of taunting terms: *frater, frater sanctissime, comes, muliebris patientiae scortum, gladiator obscene, nocturne percussor, homo stultissime*. Most of these have an assured or probable sexual connotation. The joshing sexual euphemism[29] "*Frater*" in *Satyrica* plainly recognizes a homosexual partner[30]. The "sword" that the rapist Ascyltus draws when addressing Giton, should the boy play the part of a noble woman and mimic legendarily chaste Lucretia, stands as a double-entendre for his penis[31]. Tryphaena's woman servant insults Giton

25 — Aeneas had been guided maladroitly by the Sibyl to this grim realm of "love-consumed" unfortunates.

26 — Her feminine body language should be instructively compared to the warrior Aias' gestures and expressive movements when Odysseus encounters him in *Ody*. 11.

27 — The participle elsewhere implies laying aside one's sense of shame, e.g., Cic. *Tusc*. 3.41, Mart. 11.27.7.

28 — More literally, the peasant woman with the shirt cries "thieves" (14) to raise the hue and cry in the market-place agitating for the arrest of Ascyltus and Encolpius. In Eumolpus' Ephesian narration, the word is applied neutrally to the crucified thieves whose hanging, dying bodies the soldier was assigned to guard (111).

29 — *OLD* s.v. 3b: euphemism for "an irregular sexual union: [Tib.] 3.1.23; Petr. 10.6, 127.2, 129.8".

30 — 80.4: Giton in the low *taberna* refers to his friends as a different, more elevated, and murderous, kind of *fratres*, the mythical *Thebanum par* – Oedipus' tragic sons, who quarreled to their mutual deaths.

31 — Schmeling *ad loc*. (9.3: *gladio*) cites *arma* (130.3) as a parallel weapons metaphor for

as a male whore and paid catamite (113: *scortum* ... *spintriam*) and, given his jealous concern for his *frater* Giton, questions Encolpius' heterosexual virility (*si vir fueris*...). Trimalchio the freedman asserts without irony that he was his master's love and "equal": *delicias [femina] ipsimi*[32]. He is proud of his passive sexual services enthusiastically rendered to his male owner and liberally rewarded with half of that man's estate (75-6).

Before the confrontation followed by rapist orgy organized by Priapic Quartilla, Encolpius, the self-deluded narrator, tells us that women are weak fighters (19), but his expectations of easy male triumph are soon foiled. The women and their homosexual associates (21 and 23, foul-mouthed and singing eunuchs) immobilize, tie up, and torture the three helpless men. Among other humiliations, the homosexual associates of the priestess slobber kisses on the men, grind their buttocks on the trussed men's unresponsive genitals, and fellate their bound victims[33]. A rejected female sex-partner, Quartilla's *ancilla*, mockingly paints phallic images (*sopionibus*) on Ascyltus' helpless body and feminized body. Now she controls the scepter-like phallic brush. She ridicules his helplessness by blacking his face (22: *fuligine*). The socially powerless woman's odd visual insults (*flagitium*) comically anticipate another gendered, woman-on-top revenge on Encolpius for sexual incapacity. Circe's perverse taste for ass drivers, slaves, actors, and gladiators (126: *mulio aut histrio, etc*.) corresponds to Juvenal's (*Sat*. 6) misogynistic mockery of aristocratic women who enjoy "glamorous" gladiators and their ilk, but Circe takes hierarchy-violation to new depths, jumping fourteen rows in the amphitheater to seek sordid sex-partners (*extrema plebe*). As Chrysis observes: *Quaedam enim feminae sordibus calent nec libidinem concitant nisi*... Encolpius subsequently addresses the attractive and empowered woman, a predatory aristocrat, with typical elegiac flattering words as *domina* and *regina*. In revenge, however, for his having destroyed her composure and confident sense of sexual attractiveness (132: *hilaritatem*), she physically humiliates her impotent partner (see below).

Petronius' often befuddled narrator has a narrow range of insults for the men who persecute him, but the freedman Hermeros at Trimalchio's *cena* lets loose a furious barrage against the party-crashing, alien males. Hermeros' lexicon of *convicia* consists of blunt "names" and clichéd insults, low forms of speech that Trimalchio considers *eloquentia* (or so

sexual equipment, while Adams (1982: 19-22) furnishes many more risqué examples. See also Giton's genital assemblage (24: *pertractato vasculo tam rudi*) that will "fight" (*militabit*) with Quartilla on the morrow. Neither novelist traffics much in obscene language (e.g., *mentula* appears in neither text), but both richly metaphorize sexual acts.

32 — 75, del. Buecheler. Trimalchio claims that he sexually serviced his mistress as well (*ipsimae [dominae]*) as his master; he presents himself as "AC-DC" in more recent electrical, sexual slang.

33 — 21, 23: *cinaedus, mollis, immundissimo* ... *basio*. The last phrase, at least, implies oral sex.

Encolpius thinks that his host appreciates his guest's disparagements). In packed bursts of abuse, Hermeros animalizes Ascyltus as a stupid and castrated sheep, a bellwether, a worm, and a "goat in clover" (57: *vervex, vermes, hircus in ervilia*). Further, he infantilizes Ascyltus as a "baby" (*laticulosus*), demeans him *qua* man as a "night-time" "runaway", and not "worth his own piss". Worse judgments follow – Ascyltus is a "limp piece of leather", a "broken-down pot" – clearly gendered insults to his virility[34]. Ascyltus' sex-slave Giton (58), Hermeros continues, is a vegetable: a curly-headed onion, a subterranean tuber; or an animal: a mouse (*mus*, or, as we say, a rat; cf. 58.9: *mus in matella*); or he is dead meat: gallow's garbage (*offla cruces*), food for crows (*corvorum cibaria*). Their teacher is a "blockhead" (*mufrius? hapax*). None of these males, he suggests, are really "men". The spectrum of abuse, allied to his self-puffery, reflects Hermeros' social, even sexual, insecurity with strangers, and his limited armory of self-aggrandizement in the freedmen's usually closed, convivial setting.

Women are denigrated as madams and whores, *meretrices* and *scortae* (7, 8, 9 [Encolpius himself], 88, 113, 119 v25). The married ones are all assumed to be fickle adulteresses (110: *nullam ... esse ... pudicam*)[35]. The analogue of Hermeros' irritated, gendered, and dehumanizing vituperation in response to two posturing males' derisive laughter[36] appears in Trimalchio's[37] irritated contumely responding to a female, his wife Fortunata's maledictions (74). He implies that she, having risen from flute-girl (= prostitute) to a frog-like and pretentiously bejeweled *domina*, is both a sterile woman[38] and a clawed animal (*unguibus*). Aside from the animalization and objectification, he specifically denies her both her female and animate identity calling her a "blockhead, not a woman", *codex, non mulier*[39].

34 — Schmeling 2011: *ad loc*. Many of the gendered insults present in Apuleius' novel do not appear in the surviving text of Petronius, such as *lamia, lena, lupa, lupula, semivir, stuprator, succubae, verbero*. Many other gendered insults, we see, do appear in both.

35 — Cf. F43 v14 [Müller]. *Pudicitia, pudicus* (Catullus x6) and their opposites, *impudicitia* and *impudicus* are central assertions for Roman sexual abuse. See Adams (1983: 128, 132, 195-6), Langlands (2006, esp. 226-46), and Williams in this collection on *pudicitia*, *mollitia*, and related terms.

36 — 57: Ascyltus' *intemperantis licentiae, sublatis manibus eluderet et usque ad lacrimas rideret...* 58: Giton *risum iam diu compressum etiam indecenter effudit*.

37 — Other men have opportunities for abusing individual or women in general, e.g., Hermeros (37: *lupatria*), Echion (45: *matella*). Habinnas dreams of a womanless world and flips his hostess upside down to her embarrassment (67). Eumolpus castigates that half of the human race (110-11). Fortunata and Tryphaena produce suitable blushes for their gender-based embarrassments but they cannot easily – given their gendered roles – retaliate in kind.

38 — His friend Agatho urges him not to let his line die out (*genus tuum interire*).

39 — Cf. Opelt 1965: 39: *ein Klotz*. Note also this intentionally missed opportunity to employ the "classy" *femina*.

Chrysis characterizes the rich and beautiful Circe's womanhood in four ways: as a powerful *matrona* and attractive *domina* (positive), one of the *feminae* (relatively neutral sex identifier) who seek plebeian partners (126), and negatively as one of the loose and uncontrollable *mulieres*[40] in those eccentric parts of South Italy (129) who fuck any man and, as the basic witch's trope holds, "even draw down the moon", *etiam lunam deducunt*. From Encolpius' viewpoint, one of repeatedly bad judgment[41], the rich *matrona* seems but another difficult *mulier* (132.2-4). This aristocratic woman, however, can and does have her servants (*cubicularii*) spit upon and whip (*catomizari*) her sexually incompetent partner, Encolpius, then otherwise abuse and humiliate him for his impotence. Finally, they eject him from the domina's territorial domain (132: *verberibus sputisque ... eiectus sum*).

Between Quartilla and Circe, two episodes of women literally on top – of him (20-22, 127-32), cowardly Encolpius, once having set aside his shaven, pseudo-tattooed appearance of a slave disguise aboard Lichas' ship (103), loudly threatens the fickle, unladylike lady Tryphaena, his rival for bisexual Giton's affections. Encolpius the man bravely raises his fists in her face and threatens to beat her[42]. That exemplar of manners and manhood demeans all women as "squawkers", elsewhere as "easy drunks", and giggling, undignified gossips who boast, whine, and complain[43]. Worse, from the usual patriarchal perspective (ironized by Petronius, to be sure, when Encolpius voices it), they are promiscuous and fickle – even, or especially when, they are already married (69, 110). The randy poet Eumolpus, in the peace-making interlude aboard ship that follows, produces a naughty Ephesian/Milesian heterosexual, male-paranoid fantasy of women's untrustworthiness – their incurable un-chastity. His story (see below) appeals to the male section of the audience, because "he started hurling much abuse against womanly undependability", *multa in muliebrem levitatem coepit iactare*[44].

Petronius brandishes the usual weapons of insult (gendered and otherwise) satirizing the attitudes and gender-joshing language of low society,

40 — Whatever the connotations of these four words for "woman", we note (contra Santoro L'Hoir) that here all four denote the same woman. Petronius has Chrysis characterize her mistress Circe's liminal socio-sexual preferences and status by anomalous and promiscuous use of class-coded vocabulary.

41 — A moment earlier, he had asked to be whipped, if not executed.

42 — 108.5: *manus usurum me viribus meis ... verberanda*; cf. 9, where he threatens to do the same, "man to man", to his love-rival Ascyltus.

43 — 108: *ancillarum clamor*, 67: *sauciae [sc. vino] inter se riserunt ebriaque iunxerunt oscula ... altera ... iactat, altera indiligentiam viri*; 75: *sterteia*.

44 — 110; Ephesian, since that is the inset story's location; Milesian, because that is the name of the genre; cf. Schmeling 2012: 427 ad 111. The two cities are not far apart¸ especially from a Roman point of view.

freedmen (but not their women), and half-time students[45]. Characters are branded as women (when men, 9.5, 6)[46], children (57, 58), animals[47], or barbarians, and as inanimate objects such as piss-bottles[48]. Shamed by her husband's roving eye, Fortunata calls him, at his own celebratory party *purgamentum, dedecusque* and – anticlimactically – *canis* (74)[49]. Trimalchio retorts more elegantly on his whining wife, abusively describing her as a Cassandra Caligaria[50]. A fortune-teller authenticated his nastiest gendered and animalizing insult: "you nurse a viper in your armpit" (77: *tu viperam sub ala nutricas*). This proverbial phrase provides a "kernelled insult". Fouler abuse nests in an already offensive remark[51]. In this instance, vipers are not only snakes, but a] they are poisonous, b] the females unexpectedly kill their male mates¸ and c] 'viper' provides one of many slang terms for female prostitutes or sex-addicted adulteresses[52].

Francesca Santoro L'Hoir (1992: 175-84) claims of Petronius' ventriloquistic prose that *femina* designates a respectable woman – at least momentarily, one with the female equivalents of *dignitas* and *gravitas*, while *mulier* designates all other females: freedwoman, slave, or casual sexual partner, e.g., the yokel's wife in the opening scene of the stolen cloak (15)[53]. While it need not be derogatory, it often has no positive

45 — Boyce (1991: 76-102) treats the Cena's freedmen's speech one by one. Petronius also mocks a hidden target of high society, Nero and his court. In the next generation, the equestrian courtier Suetonius catalogued Hellenic insults, but the work survives only in Byzantine excerpts (Taillardat 1967: 48-63). The first sections address gender: "misbehaving men, women, men who have gone astray". Note that the women of his study need no pejorative adjectives to prompt their uncomfortable status as targets.

46 — Oenothea with a peppered and nettled leather dildo penetrates the anus of the un-virile, effeminate Encolpius (138.1, cf. 23), a Priapic punishment and cure!

47 — Schmeling (2012: 602) provides an index of animals, most of them mentioned in connection with abuse of people. Men are (of course, unfavorably) compared to magpies, mice, sheep; women, to raptorial birds, vipers, etc. (75, 77). Schmeling (29) offers a brief excursus on Petronius' terms of abuse; Dickey provides chapters on Roman terms of endearment and esteem as well as insult. She prints a table for her terminology (2002: 173-6) graded by class ("register"). She notes that animal insults are the purview of the lower classes.

48 — 45: Echion deems Glyco's wife a *matella*.

49 — Calling one's husband a "dog" at his own party is clearly offensive, and Trimalchio loses his self-control after this wound to his self-esteem. Nevertheless, this abuse sounds anti-climactic and clumsy, after *purgamentum* ("piece of shit"), given Trimalchio's various vulnerabilities. (Schmeling, *inter alios/alias*, translates it as "prick", following Opelt (1965 234-5) and Hesykhios' hint. Perhaps the tamer insult obliquely characterizes the ingrate and barren Fortunata as afraid of her husband, or ineptly botching her opportunities, or both.

50 — 74: "Jackbooted Bitch"; 75: a flute-girl, a kite, a frog, a wood plank, a snorer. Alternatively, this reference to an ignored prophet might be another mythological *faux pas*, if Trimalchio intends to refer to man-minded Klytemnestra. There may be a recondite reference to the womanish emperor Caligula.

51 — Labov 1972 explains "ritual insults" in the American, black urban male community. Often the "dozens" command a large audience, like Trimalchio at his fête.

52 — Schmeling ad loc. cites Borthwick 1967: 251-2. See also Cicero. *Har*. 50, Apul. *Met*. 5.12. Adams 1983 missed this usage.

53 — Axelson 1945: 53-7 found *femina* to be rare in republican Latin but predominant in the

valence. Like other relatively neutral denotative terms, however, such as *puella* and *amica*[54], it may acquire negative connotations by associated adjectives or the social context. When angered, Lichas arraigns Tryphaena as "*femina simplex*", a phrase in which her alleged mental inferiority is multiplied by her inferior sex: "an idiot even for a woman" (106).

The freedmen always refer to women as *mulieres*[55], since their low type constitutes all the women that they know, and, obsessed with material gain, their stunted emotional affections are soured by distrust (75). Alluding to women's alleged acquisitiveness, Habinnas declares: "If there were no *mulieres*, we would have everything dirt-cheap". *Mulier* identifies the standing of Fortunata and Scintilla (37, 74, 67), and later also the female object of Encolpius' jealousy, Tryphaena. This woman, rich but/and driven by sexual needs, is ready to do battle to gain possession of everyone's sex-toy, Giton (101, 108, 113). Her currently politically impotent male rival Encolpius – sometimes unreliable – describes her as *damnata* and *libidinosa*. Earlier, after Encolpius recognizes the priestess Quartilla as his captor and sexual tormentor, he revises her gendered status, downgrading her from *femina* to *mulier* (16.3, 19.1). Trimalchio likewise terms the frightful witches of his included tale as *mulieres* (63). Diminutive forms double the insult: a maid or prostitute is described as a *muliercula* (12, 111). Nevertheless, the misogyny is general. Chrysanthus' *uxor* remains dry-eyed when she is widowed, and women as a *genus* (at least to the freedman symposiast Seleucus) are less than human, mere vultures: *sed mulier quae mulier milvinum genus* (42, cf. 75, 106).

Petronius' most compelling example of incurable female lability and (perhaps) hypocrisy is Eumolpus' at first most modest and virtuous female, the *pudicissima* widow of Ephesus, a *matrona* lauded by all as the superlative paradigm of chaste womanhood and exceptional spousal grief. Five times the bereaved wife is denominated *pudica femina*, devoted spouse and preternaturally loyal widow[56]. Described specifically as a *matrona* (111 *bis*, 112), the narrator elevates her further on the social scale. When the vigilant soldier sees a light and hears a groan, he investigates, prompted by the *vitio gentis humanae* – desire to know. He discovers that night a different sort of creature, a *mulier pulcherrima*, inhabiting a tomb. She is

poets (10:1 is the proportion to *mulier* in Vergil). Prof. Weber directed me to *Aen*. 4.569-70 and perhaps 1.364 as examples of contemptuous *femina*, but Petronius' and Tacitus' practice may differ on occasion from that of the poets'.

54 — See Adams 1983: 344-50 for meanings that "deteriorated" from Plautine usages to Pompeian.

55 — Axelson 1945: 53-5 at 55 reports the Petronian proportion *mulier: femina* = 33 : 10.

56 — The ideal tombstone and philosophical compliment, *univira*, is applied to no woman in either novel; cf. Richlin 1983: 195. *Uxor pudicissima* (112.4), with its rare superlative modifier, is mordantly sarcastic, another echo of tombstone Latin for the supposedly entombed, widowed *matrona*. The last word (37, 61, 65, 67, 115, 116) also provides a legal description.

not a dangerous ghost, only a weeping beauty[57]. He reasonably but wrongly might have first imagined, from her graveyard location and the time of night, that she was a prostitute, because there and then the ancient sex workers plied their trade. He would have been wrong in his perception and hope, but somehow right about her female nature, as the bawdy tale concludes that all women's sexual compliance can be bought one way or another. The sleazy sexual opportunist Eumolpus soon inverts the genders of pursuer and the pursued: the noble woman seeks the soldier's sexual companionship. She unhesitatingly pays the sacrilegious price of desecrating her husband's corpse, nailing him to the degrading cross on behalf of her lover[58]. That is, the unnamed (because generic) *matrona*/*femina* reveals her true, sluttish character and becomes just another sex-crazed *mulier* (five times) dishonoring her deceased husband and protecting her current, random lover from the wrath of the military, enjoying sex in the tomb, night after night (112.3).

One then should not expect to find a respectable *femina*, much less a "lady" (*matrona*) who deserves the name, in *Satyrica*. Quartilla, and three Greeks – the Ephesian widow[59], the Pergamene fortune-hunting mother, and the South Italian Circe[60] – briefly enjoy this neutral descriptor, *femina*. Despite their status, wealth, and appearance (posture, garb, jeweled and golden accessories, attendants), the women are soon exposed as frauds seeking illicit sexual thrills or the material fortunes of men unrelated by blood or marriage (124, 141 for male *captatores, heredipetae*). Hermeros, Trimalchio's boon companion, describes his host's social-climbing wife, Fortunata, as formerly too filthy to hand a man a piece of bread. With a somewhat more flattering but animalizing description, since he admires her money-management skills, he now labels her as *lupatria*, a "foxy whore"[61].

Do *viri*, the manly types both strong and brave, exist? *Vir* designates a respectable man, a possessor of *vir-tus* – courage – and usually a Roman,

57 — Eumolpus' account of the *miles*' focalization and sexual impulse determines his demeaned diction for this female, now reduced in respect from *matrona* to *mulier* (111.7).

58 — One may recall the very different behaviors of Homer's Andromache, Sophocles' Antigone, Apuleius' Charite.

59 — Some have seen her character more charitably: she chooses to continue her life rather than commit suttee, but the internal audience (of grifters and scammers) clearly judges her choice negatively, at least not charitably.

60 — Whispering Fortunata is supposed to know better about maintaining station – not descending to *tam humiles ineptias* (37, 52), but we never hear her sound any different from her boastful [*non sum de gloriosus*, says he], arrogant, boorish, and vaporous husband. According to others, at least, she farts frequently, best dances the lewd Cordax (37, 47, 52; cf. 70). She is animalized as lynx and magpie by Trimalchio's own slave – a male, of course.

61 — 37: *lupatria* – *hapax* indicating a (wolfish) prostitute; cf. *pica pulvinaris*, "couch vulture"? I describe this appellation as "more flattering", because a smart animal is superior to inert, polluting filth.

while *homo* designates any other male, especially of the lower orders, a vulgar "fellow" for example, a poor freedman[62], a foreigner, or slave (Santoro L'Hoir 1992: 172-5, McDonnnell 2009 *passim*). Petronius' narrators and characters reserve *vir* – for praise of themselves (54, 76). They often denigrate enemies, peers, and others with the contextually dismissive *homo*, pejorative adjectives, and ethnic slurs (*peregrinus, Cappadox, servus*: 45, 54, 127, 63, 73, 71)[63]. Trimalchio characterizes himself as *vir*, part of the Petronian parody of his social insecurity (54; *or. obliq*., 76), but one of Agamemnon's slaves considers him only a (26) *lautissimus homo*, an ambiguous compliment at best, several steps below *elegans*[64]. Seleucus, a freedman, philosophically considers all humans to be "walking bags of wind, empty bubbles, less than flies" (42: *utres inflati ambulamus, minores quam muscae ... bullae*).

Self-pitying Encolpius abuses the clown Giton for his passive and perverse sexual inclinations, and then he claims that *he* is a *vir* and prepares an epic revenge with his sword for Ascyltus' sexual misdeeds (81). Elaborate plans for revenge contribute here to the parody of epic (cf. Verg. *Aen*. 9.44). Like his other grandiose plans, this one is soon completely deflated. Encolpius has no honor and hence no genuine shame-ability, although he briefly simulates courage (80, 82, 108) and he pretends to possess both[65]. His anger (*ira*) at violation and rejection leads him repeatedly to rage and feckless, soliloquizing self-pity[66]. The sneering, sex-hungry, golden handmaid Chrysis addresses him as "Mr. Picky" and "Cripple-Dick", ("Fastose" and "Paralytice": 131, both *hapax* in Petronius).

The insults of the angry guest Hermeros (57-8) feminize, animalize, and infantilize the party-crashers, who are rightly perceived as looking down on his base-born, self-made companions. His fellow symposiasts pride themselves on their squalid origins and their entrepreneurial willingness, earlier in life as *delicati*, to please sexually both their mistress and master (45). Their self-fashioning depends on their previous, flexible,

62 — "Not worth a dime": *Sestertiarius* Glyco, *lautissimus* and *dupondiarius* Trimalchio (45; 26, 74).

63 — Trimalchio in this last passage employs *homines* pseudo-philosophically: 'slaves too are humans'. See Schmeling ad loc. on this widespread platitude.

64 — Cf. Santoro L'Hoir 1992: 174 with Ciceronian evidence. The adjective *putidus*, stinky, is reserved for the slave boy who falls on Trimalchio, smelly table slaves, and metaphorically for Trimalchio's blathering and vulgar ostentation (54, 34, 73).

65 — *Pudet referre quae secuntur*, says the self-revealing narrator, but he goes on tell all (70), one of his typically self-deprecatory devices. Cf. Eumolpus as narrator: 119v19.

66 — 81.5: he abuses the faithless Giton (recently an Ariadne, 79) comparing him to a *mulier secuteleia* [*hapax*, and somewhat mysterious]; cf. Opelt (1965, 32): einer jedem Mann gehorsam nachfolgenden Frau; Makowski 2012, 229: "utterly degrading". This is only one of his gender-inverting insults to his boyfriend, whom he elsewhere, in the shipboard battle (108), describes as *fortissimus*, "bravest". Giton, for his part, in recounting Ascyltus' attempted (?) rape, refers to his own *pudor* or chastity.

gender-bending and their current self-sufficiency in money. In their male rivalry for esteem, their self-presentations exhibit the typical insecurities of *nouveaux riches*.

Encolpius' impotence alone truly shames him, impotence experienced with both males and females. His sexual capacity defines his identity (not his gender). The lovely, high-class *matrona* (126) Circe[67], failing sexually to arouse the limp protagonist, humiliates him to the point where he feels himself socially condemned (128: *perfusus ego rubore ... damnatus*). As he alleges of another well-endowed man, he finds his personal identity in his genital equipment: a penis attached to a body[68]. Fluidity of substances, statuses, genders[69], fortunes, and reputations typify *Satyrica*'s characters and objects. Lability and false surfaces are thematic for the novel genre[70]. The banquet, for example, produces trompe l'œil dishes that never correspond to what they pretend to be, and they are served to guests who painfully ape their "betters" education, chatter, and manners. Eumolpus poses as accomplished poet, tutor, tourist, slave-owner, and wealthy but terminally ill millionaire, an aristocrat who has just buried his only son and heir (83, 85, 117). His claims contrast starkly to the known truth.

B. Apuleius

Gendering censorious judgments are plentiful in Apuleius' novel, but men as a sex are never condemned. Many characters are angry, Lucius suffers impatiently, but (as a limited *solacium*) the ass narrator gets to observe other people's foul plans motivated by greed, malice, and cruelty – often wife-initiated[71]. The baker's wife, a married and evil adulteress[72], hypocritically condemns another cheating wife as the "signal shame of her entire sex" (*universi sexus grande dedecus*) while hiding her own lover under a tub (*alveum*). The male inclination to condemn all women – rather than only guilty individuals – for their excessive sexual

67 — Her maid Chrysis also describes her as a *femina*, one of those who seek plebeian partners (or worse), but elsewhere as a moon-drawing witch (126, 129). She and Encolpius, then, both term her a *mulier* (129, 132).

68 — 92; cf. 105: Lichas identifies Encolpius (tragicomic *anagnorisis* of the hero!) by touching his large (?) *inguina*, genitals.

69 — Trimalchio, more generous than most characters in Petronius' novel, condemns all women (67-8) but he also demeans all men as fools who are looted by their women: *barcalae despoliamur*. Habinnas, his monument-carver, says in defense of both sexes (75): *homines sumus, non dei*.

70 — Makowski 2012: 224. Richlin (1983: 193) acutely notes that the imperceptive Encolpius "is always out of step or out of place" – lost.

71 — A human being would not have been privy to these concealed criminal plans (9.13), but disguised and therefore protected by his bestial hide, Lucius sees malevolent snares and deeds of many women and a few men.

72 — 9.14: *nequissima femina, quaedam caenosa latrina*; 9.15: *pervicax, pertinax, pessimae feminae flagitia*.

desire is a gendered prejudice found elsewhere in the text. Here, however, the condemnation gains credibility, since it is spoken by a woman[73].

The entire female sex meets with ill repute for each (expected) violation of men's asymmetrical gender-based rules. Men are adulterers, too, of course (2.27, 9.5, 9.22, 10.9), and a few are caught. For example, the handsome adolescent revealed as a *stuprator* (9.26) is the determined boy-lover (*intempestivum tibi nomen adulteri*) of well-guarded Arete as well as of that paragon of purity, the wife of the miller/baker who meets the rarely superlative but entirely sarcastic epithet *pudicissima* (!)[74]. As fitting and briefly comforting talionic punishment (*gratissima corruptarum nuptiarum vindicta perfruebatur*), the latter husband, once he has found his marriage violated by his *pudica egregia uxor* (9.22-3), locks his wife away and anally rapes her boy-toy (9.28: *solus ipse cum puero cubans*), the good-looking, not yet bearded *adulescens*, a *mollis ac tener* youth[75]. The next morning, while his slaves (*familia*) hoist the boy in the air (*altissime*), he semi-publicly whips the buttocks of this precociously heterosexual, adulterous lad, as if a master rebuking a schoolboy (9.28: *ferula natis eius obverberans, plagis castigatum forinsecus abicit*). An exception to the rule! – a rare and temporary exception to "getting away with murder", but only a temporary vindication, however, since the aggrieved wife soon has the baker himself bewitched and killed by foul play.

Careful readers recall that men are nowhere condemned as a sex for their sexual escapades. The (male) slave (*dotalis servulus*) who provides his lustful mistress with poison for the murder of her stepson (10.2: *nefarium facinus*) is described as (10.4, 9) *furcifer iste*, "pillory worthy"[76],

73 — May (2005: 146) makes this argument, although the foul nature of this female narrator undercuts anything she says.

74 — 9.27: He is a *pulchellum puellum*; *n.b.* the doubly hypocoristic and gender-bending descriptors; cf. 5.16, 7.21, 10.32.

75 — 9.22-31. Fehling in "Phallische Demonstration" (1988: 300-2) emphasizes ethological elements of territoriality in anal rape of males as punishment and dominance assertion. He cites parallels such as Catul. 56, Hor. *Sat*. 1.2.44, *CIL* 4. 1261. The penalty is a legally appropriate revenge, as Schmidt (1989: 63, 65-6) notes of this *supplicium puerile* (Mart. 2.60). The miller explicitly gripes that the *puer*/*adulescens*/*puellum* should still be sexually accommodating older males, not committing adultery with other men's wives. The bizarre anal rape of Ascyltus by Quartilla's gang of "queers" (*Sat*. 21: *cinaedi, extortis nos clunibus cecidit*) fits this pattern of revenge for the violators of the shrine of the Phallic god Priapus. In context, a controlling and injured party (the Priestess) employs her minions to humiliate the novel's involuntarily passive male protagonists.

76 — *Furcifer* (inherited from Plautus, Terence, and Cicero, at least) is difficult to translate idiomatically because of the absence of recent equivalents to such humiliating punishments, lethal or temporary. "Gallows' bait" preserves some of the shame, but little of the "yoke" image. Colonial Americans observed with satisfaction when convicted miscreants were subjected temporarily to stocks, pillory, whipping post, and ducking stools. References to hanging from a cross (*Sat*. 126.9) double modern lay reader's perplexity, since the punishment of crucifixion is obsolete, but the Roman application of it (to Jesus) hallowed it.

and *verbero*, "whipping boy" or "scoundrel"[77]. The generic literary histories of these terms strike readers as familiar from Roman comedy. The plays often depict a *servus currens* who survives and prospers to another day (Opelt 1965: 60-9). Thus, they flag for an attentive reader that the pseudo-dreadful story will furnish another included narrative likely to reach a happier, comic ending[78]. Apuleius' inset story here is the happiest in the book, happier for three: the intended youthful victim of poison, the accidental victim who survives (his step-brother), and their father, a miserable man in peril of losing both sons but who regains them (10.12 *fin*).

Lucius as man and ass expresses common Roman male attitudes of curiosity and disgust towards gender deviants. He refers neutrally to a tender lad as effeminate (1.4: *puer in mollitiem decorus*), a boy whom he saw in Athens performing a lubricious dance with a sword and magic trick. He refers with disapproval, however, to the entrepreneurial eunuch devotees of the Syrian goddess. These "half-men" who address each other as "*puellae*" (8.26)[79]. They wear women's clothing to complement their painted faces and mincing gait while they beg for and collect alms (and steal precious votives) and tour the Thessalian countryside. The disgusted ass terms them and their leader Philebus to himself (since he cannot talk) "*cinaedi*" (and *semiviri*, 8.28). Their employment of a cheaply purchased slave, a flute-blowing and strong peasant youth, obtained to service their perverse sexual cravings, repels him[80]. He refers to the filthy blood-rituals of the men become women: *solum spurcitia sanguinis effeminati madescere*[81]. Their alien rites and base pleasures offend the ass's conven-

77 — 10. 4, 7, 9; 8.31: a cook-slave, as in comedy (*GCA* 10 [2000] 107).

78 — Apuleius likes to misdirect readers with inappropriate generic labels, here a tragedy is promised (10.2: *scito te tragoediam, non fabulam legere et a socco ad cothurnum ascendere*). Cf. the *specimen historiae* (8.1) offered by a runaway slave to his audience of fellow, scattered servants of Charite's destroyed household.

79 — Philebus the eunuch describes himself with feminine-gendered forms: *misera, mercata* (8.25-6; cf. Catullus' Attis).

80 — 1.4, 8.24-7. The Syrian priest purchased the poor ass expecting sufficient capacity for frictioned anal penetration of his *cinaedi* friends! Men and women both seriously abuse animals, intent on verbal and physical harm. One adulteress gossips about sex with her confidant and go-between (*adulterorum internuntia*) in the presence of what she calls the "scurvy" ass (9.22: *scabiosus*). The ass himself applies the same term to his fellow putrid, scabbed (*scabiosa macie*) and debilitated, mill-turning slaves – both the emaciated *homunculi*, "shrunken humans", and the four-footed creatures – all barely animate machines (9.22, 13; cf. 6.28). While not all abused comic slaves gain rewards at comedy's dramatic dénouements, the tortures with which they are severely threatened are rarely administered, much less often than the insults that they suffer (or themselves deliver in whispers).

81 — Philebus, the unsympathetic head priest of the Syrian Goddess devotees, angrily realizes that even the low-grade, profit-seeking auctioneer is mocking him (8.25: *cognito cavillatu, scurrilibus contra me velitaris iocis*).

tional views of sexual behaviors and he comfortably insults their immoral **un**manliness.

Aristomenes' opening inset tale in *Met*. 1 (fifteen of Book I's twenty-six chapters) relates Socrates' sexual enchantment by the witch Meroë. It contains many sexist insults typically leveled against powerless victims. Since Socrates reportedly cannot escape sexual intercourse with Meroë, his friend Aristomenes refers to her sarcastically as a *bona uxor*, although she is neither, and asks in his puzzlement about the paradoxical nature of her sex and status: "What kind of woman is she?" (7-8: *potens illa et regina caupona, quid mulieris est?*). More directly, he punningly terms her a *scortum scorteum* (8: a "leathery whore", with reference to her advanced age for sexual agitation). Her fearsome insults to the men, after breaking down the hostelry's door, produce ferocious acts going well beyond abusive and taunting words. She sweetly (if sarcastically) refers to sleeping Socrates as her "dear Endymion, my catamite" (12, both terms imply status inferiority and passivity). More forcefully and relevantly to his intended escape plan, Socrates knows that she has violently punished unfaithful lovers. Meroë changed one unfaithful lover into a male beaver, an animal that allegedly bites off its own genitals – desexing itself[82]. She afflicted with perpetual pregnancy (*perpetua praegnatione damnavit*) the pregnant wife of another seduced lover. This bold-talking woman had insulted her with witty vituperation (*dicacule*[83] *probrum dixerat*) and suffers what only a woman could, endless (eight years so far) and growing pregnancy: "she is ballooning just like an elephant about to give birth" – *velut elephantum paritura distenditur*. Then, irritated Meroë the witch and her female accomplice advance to heart-surgery, removal of the vital organ. Thus, they doom Socrates to an early death and Aristomenes, his well-intentioned savior, to indefinite fear and Aetolian exile far from home in Aegeum (1.19).

For Aristomenes (who originally fails to appreciate womanly witch-power)[84], Meroë ponders whether she and Panthia, her fellow *saga*, should rip him apart or chop off his genitals[85]. Her dilemma offers two drastic male punishments at the hands of unbridled women, evilly

82 — 1.9: Self-mutilation produces a metamorphosis into a third gender, a social and sexual death (of maleness), an irreversible sexual insult whether inflicted by oneself or others.

83 — This mildly pejorative Plautine stem describes witty put-downs. The adverb (1.9 and 8.25) denotes banter that insults an "uppity" woman and a womanish Syrian. Lucius in his besotted state employs the adjective pleasantly to characterize the saucy repartee of Photis (2.7, 3.13). The noun is applied to bantering male victims facing female sorcery (1.7 and 12).

84 — This unwise underestimation of powerful women parallels Encolpius' expectation of easy victory against Quartilla's female and unmaled minions (19).

85 — 12: *bacchatum discerpimus vel ... virilia desecamus? Sparagmos* would mimic the mythic and tragic Bacchants who destroy improperly peeking Pentheus and other gender-underestimating men.

empowered females of the species not always subject to male surveillance. In the end, they humiliate and unman the frightened and flattened would-be hero sprawled on the inn floor trying to hide under his bed. They squat over him and empty their bladders on him (13: *me urinae spurcissimae perluerent*)[86]. In a subsequent soliloquy offered by the still smelly Aristomenes, he worries anticipating his legal prosecution. His failure as a muscular man physically to resist the old women's assault will sound incredible to a male jury in a court of law, whenever faces trial for his friend's murder. His use of *hypophora* – expected allegations of unmanliness – insults himself, much as Lucius later also indicts himself for asininity (14: *si resistere* ***vir tantus*** *mulieri nequibas*...; cf. 7.10-12).

Apuleius, in conformity with Roman mores, describes as *viri* all mature men of wealth and standing (*e primoribus*), but his sarcasm often is plain to see, given these male characters' frequently ungentlemanly activities[87]. Democharés (4.15) and the provincial *vir principalis* (8.30) – landed, entertainment-providing aristocrats – may have earned this honorific designation by their civic services and benefactions, but other non-euergetistic but wealthy men gain the same honorific title of *vir*, for example Milo, the rich miser and misanthropic usurer[88]. After Lucius the visitor has disappeared (because morphed into an ass), he becomes the number one suspect in the investigation of the robbery of Milo's house. The defenseless soul is alleged to have written fraudulent letters of recommendation for himself in order to be welcomed as a *vir bonus* by a fellow member of the elite (7.1: *fictis commendaticiis litteris ... commentitus*). Thus, *vir* easily and politely flatters, as also when the stranger walking to Hypata with Lucius (1.20) deems him such a one, appealing in their dialogue to his intellectual discernment. This honor flows from markers of rank and culture that are always visible – namely bodily poise, appearance, and garb[89].

Sometimes the narrator and sometimes the characters pass judgments on manliness by this gendered compliment. The fearless bandit chief

86 — The entire scene recalls another sexually domineering woman with supernatural associations: Quartilla punishes men who have viewed the forbidden, the mystery rites of Priapus in Petronius (*Sat*. 16-17). *Sat*. 57 and 62 also suggests that urine magic, not a rare variety, may be in play.

87 — *Clarissimus*, however, provides more than a flattering descriptor. Like his mother's marriage (2.3), the imperial legal terminology identifies Lucius as born of senatorial rank and distinguished stock (cf. 1.1). Lucius will ironically apply positive superlatives to his worst villains, such as the Baker's wife (9.28): *pudicissima*. An ironic bandit labels Charite (6.30) *probissima*. *Nequissimus/a/um* appears 22 times.

88 — 1.21: Milo is described as *tali viro* in terms of wealth and social standing but *sordis infimae infamis homo* in terms of public services. At 9.36 the narrator labels the greedy landowner *homo*; and slaves are merely *homines* (8.22, 26: *servulus homo* tortured to death).

89 — When the murderess of five wheedles her poison-source, addressing her humble apothecary partner in crime as a *tam prudens ... doctus vir* (10.26), the flattery is blatant.

Lamachus, a man of proven piratical *vir-tus*, seems "manly" to his fellow thieves (*virtus, vir, vir praecipuus*, etc.). The pseudo-bandit Haemus likewise calls himself a *virum magnanimae vivacitatis* to the discouraged bandit survivors of a botched Boeotian raid (4.8, 10-11; 7.5). Chryseros ("Goldlover", another miser), who has sneakily ambushed and killed the morally offended bandit's captain, is not a man, indeed he is but a *bipedum nequissimus*[90], "most vile of two-footers" (4.10). Perhaps this phrase is thieves' cant, but the animalizing word denies his manliness. At the other end of the bipedal spectrum, Psyche's lover, predicted by her ignorant sisters to be a bum, *extremus homo* (4.31, 5.24), actually has an existential status different from *viri*, since his epiphany proves him the god Cupid, great deity of sexual desire. Thieves and gods pronounce and observe standards of male achievement and female worth that differ from mere mortals'.

On trial for his life, Lucius, the rich tourist and pompous orator, quickly becomes the butt of Thessalian *hoi polloi*'s laughter – as well as that of his hosts' (3.4-6). In the Thesssalian courtroom, fittingly an open-air theater, the autodidact orator[91] claims macho and Herculean acts of bravery. He soon endures the ridicule of the entire theatrical crowd, aware of the game and hanging from the "rafters". The goatskins under the shrouds reveal him to all Hypata's denizens to be a drunkard, dupe, and braggart. Poor Lucius then weeps, blushes, and, once so traumatized, becomes immobilized. The insecure aristocrat has been mortally insulted (*contumelia*) by the guffaws of all social levels in the hilarity-filled town (3.7: *totum populum – risu cachinnabili diffluebant*, 10-12)[92].

After Lucius unveils his alleged murder victims by drawing back the pall from the alleged human corpses, actually only goatskins, he cringes at the crowd's unconstrained amusement. Stunned by his public embarrassment, he tries to prevent eye – and word-contact with the by-standing community (3.9-12). He endures in frozen shame (3.10: *fixus in lapidem steti gelidus*) the prying eyes, nods (*nutus*), and fingers pointed towards him[93]. Finally, he starts sobbing. Self-control and the ability to simu-

90 — Men are described by this superlative adjective, indeclinable in the positive degree, 11 times; women too, 11 times in Apuleius' novel. To condemn one woman beyond *nequissima*, Lucius terms her (10.12) "more wicked than the wickedest".

91 — Cf. the narrator of the entire novel, perhaps the same *person(a)* (1.1): *sermonem ... nullo magistro praeeunte agressus excolui*.

92 — Lateiner (2001: 221-30) discusses the Latin vocabulary and presentation of personal humiliation and its frequent employment by Apuleius.

93 — *oculis, nutibus ac denique manibus denotatus*; cf. 2.30 for Thelyphron's parallel embarrassment amidst first a public crowd and then a private party. He crawls away in a sweat from the guffawing witnesses of his boastful mistakes and facial disfigurement: *inter pedes circumstantium frigido sudore defluens evado*.

late it require practiced facial skills[94]. Rigidity of features, a calm gaze and postural self-possession, lay beyond innocent Lucius' slim capacity to shrug off his embarrassment and to withstand public amusement[95]. Lucius could not yet – assuming any of us ever can! – reach this advanced and ambivalently admirable level of feigning. Catiline, Trimalchio, or the Murderess of Five could do it[96]. It perhaps redounds to Lucius' credit as a decently raised, elite young Roman that facial forgery is foreign to his candid nature.

Soon after the Laughter Festival, the town authorities of Hypata offer Lucius the shaken victim an honorific statue, as a heroizing compensation for his abject public humiliation. No recompense, however, can equal his social loss. The still incautious protagonist, moreover, becomes an unwitting victim again. Flattering and being flattered by Photis[97], his casual sex-partner's clumsiness morphs him into a quadruped. Choosing the wrong medicament, the inexperienced magician (3.24) turns him into an inept ass, not a wise owl. Public mockery and shaming at Hypata has preceded his dehumanizing and debilitating transformation into a speechless but highly sexed beast of burden. Now, the man inside the ass meets further insult and shame. Lucius having disappeared, urban Hypatans falsely allege that he aided in the robbery of his personal host Milo, and subsequently the members of the region's farm community believe that the asinine Lucius desires to "bestialize" young women. Finally, the quadruped is thought to have murdered his wood-gathering master, the sadistic boy whom in fact a bear savaged (3.1-3, 20-4). Lucius' mind understands the charges, but his voice and tongue cannot refute them. His attempts at defending himself fail; his Latin (or Greek) utterances are entirely blocked. Robber, rapist, and murderer are serious insults, indeed.

Apuleius varies gender-specific insults for **women** more than for men, perhaps because he is quicker to find fault with all but one of the female characters (Charite). Gendered abuse for the Thessalian witches and Psyche's wicked sisters includes *lupulae*, "wolf bitchlets", sex-starved wives or whores, and *lamiae* (3.22, 5.11, 1.17: "bogey-women"). *Scelerata* and *scelesta* describe women seven times but men – never (although many are

94 — Corbeill (2004: 140-67), "Face Facts", discusses the ideology of Roman facial comportment – facial simulation and dissimulation of motives and intentions.

95 — *Expudoratus* designates inappropriate and shameless maintenance of "face" (Trimalchio's sign of the ram, Petr. 39.5: *caput praeterea durum, frontem expudoratam, cornum acutum*). Encolpius' slave "tattoo", not burned but only painted on his forehead (107), would shield him from worrying about or feeling shame, since a slave has no social status to protect. Trimalchio's sexual services (75-6) for his master as available servile *puer* cause the freedman no embarrassment – for the same reason.

96 — Sal. *Cat*. 10.5: *fidei supprimens faciem*, Apul. *Met*. 10.27.

97 — Even servile Photis insults the substantial and well-connected citizen Lucius, although in playful banter (*obgannitis sermonibus*): *tu solas ignoras...?*, *miselle, scolastice...*, *cave ne, si vir es* (1.22, 2.8, 10, 17).

reprehended). The sharp eye of the bandits' crone is compared to an avian kite's (6.27: *milvinos oculos*). The offensive *scortum* appears as abuse for Meröe, Socrates' witch-mistress (1.8.3), and for Charite when the male-opinionated ass misapprehends her as sex-crazed and eager for brothel service (7.11; see below). Venus indignantly wonders to herself and the chatterbox bird whether she has played *lena*, procuress, to her young and innocent but "whoring" son[98]. She had directed him to punish Psyche, her offensive *succuba*, the one who challenged her divine beauty and became her "supplanter in bed", but Venus' intent was to humiliate and destroy Psyche, not to provide her son Cupid with an attractive mate[99].

The decent baker's *procax* and evil wife herself provides the extreme example of gender condemnation of a woman, but the irony here is amusingly apparent. The behavior of this promiscuous wife is even worse than that of the laundryman's wife, whose offensive adultery story she hears from her unwary husband with feigned horror[100]. The baker's wife has heard this story of the fuller's wife's adultery, while she is hiding her own young lover nearby in a flour bin (9.23). Now, sarcastically described as *uxor egregia* (9.23), she indignantly curses that other woman with appropriate insults as a disloyal, shameless whore. Her betrayal of marriage, deceit, and gross hypocrisy has blackened the reputation (*maculasset infamia*) of the entire female sex (*universi sexus grande dedecus*). She declares that such adulteresses should be burned alive (9.26: *addebat et talis oportere vivas exuri feminas*)[101]. Her own exposure as an adulteress, humiliating imprisonment in a closet, and insulting but legally proper expulsion from her marital home soon follow. The woman now described as *audacissima uxor* (9.23) reverts to "her old tricks and to women's usual wiles" (9.29, another black mark against an entire sex: *ad armillum revertitur et ad familiares* ***feminarum artes***). Seeking vengeance for her ignominious exit from her household (*contumelia ... exasperata*), the miller's embittered second wife hires a witch (*familiares feminarum artes accenditur*) to mollify or destroy the life of her husband by ghoul or other criminal power (19.29: *larva vel aliquo diro numine immisso ... facinerosae disciplinae suae*). She has earned the very imprecations against women that she hypocritically hurled.

98 — 5.28: the delightful phrase, *montano scortatu*, "whoring in the mountains"; cf. the villain Thrasyllus' life of debauchery (8.1, *popinalis scortisque*).

99 — 5.28, but see also 10.24, the murderess of five who suspects her innocent sister-in-law of serving as her husband's sex-partner.

100 — 9.14: *pistor... bonus alioquin vir et adprime modestus*, while for the wife: *longe deterrimam... coniugam,* also *caenosa latrina ... continuo stupor, etc*.

101 — The fraud bursts out with the attractive Ciceronian tricolon: "*illam perfidam, illam impudicam, denique universi sexus grande dedecus*... And she rhetorically adds: *lupanari maculasset infamia... nuptae prostitutae nomen*", etc.!

The closest parallel, condemnation of males as a gender, appears when Lucius indignantly condemns all jurymen – from Paris, through Odysseus at Troy, to Socrates' Athenian jury. Some former judges and *toti nunc iudices* market their verdicts to satisfy their greed (10.33: *sententias suas pretio nundinantur*), but the entire male sex is not vilified and castigated for that reason. Lucius' denigration of specific men contrasts sharply with his gender-specific criticisms against women in general.

Lucius maintains human self-awareness while encapsulated in the despised body of an ass (6.25-9, 7.10-12, 10.33)[102]. After many more undeserved accusations, the man's spirit, although locked in the beast's body, revolts against a culminating, death-sentence insult to his innocent "person" and his masculinity. The province's imperial judicial decision condemns and compels the hugely penised creature to participate in the final public insult to a woman's honor and in the death of the murderess. He must copulate before thousands with the depraved but once high-status (10.23: *venerabilis domus*) Corinthian criminal. She has been sanctioned by the state to the humiliating and painful torture of bestial sex with an ass before she dies in an amphitheater packed with amused spectators (10.23-8)[103]. This unwifely wife[104] nearly escaped legal process (accusation, trial, and conviction) for five serial, unspeakable murders. The greedy psychopath had insulted and savagely killed her clueless, innocent sister-in-law, wrongly inferring and alleging that the innocent girl, maintained for her safety in a distant *villulam*, had been her husband's mistress (*aemula tori succubaque*). She had poisoned her husband, a lethal insult (in the medical sense), mistakenly thinking him an unfaithful spouse rather than a respectful fraternal guardian of his otherwise unprotected, virginal sister. The widowed wife then poisoned her baby daughter (*filia parvula*) for her husband's inheritance, and tricked into suicide both the poison-providing doctor (*medicus ... notae perfidiae*) and his complicit wife[105]. Following her women servants' (*cubiculariis mulieris*) eyewitness

102 — The decent if opportunistic youngster's innocence of the imputed crimes and his inept but non-injurious intentions shield him from many modern readers' censure. But silence on greeting can be construed as a rude insult (2.2, 9.39). The interchange between the market gardener and the Roman soldier exhibits the tension and friction between Greeks and Romans, or between any strangers meeting outside town walls, beyond any decent, reassuring police authority.

103 — This ass's high-class (19: *matrona quaedam pollens et opulens*) and high-paying bedmate (19: *grandi praemio*; 23: *egregia illa uxor mea*) could not be booked for the *spectaculo publico ... propter dignitatem*. No other woman would volunteer for the pornographic display even for a *grandi praemio* (again !), so his master obtained *vilis ... aliqua [mulier] ... bestiis addicta*.

104 — 10.25: *uxor quae iam pridem nomen uxoris cum fide perdiderat*... Lucius describes her as an *excetra venenata* (10.28, Elmenhorst emend., "poisonous serpent"), a gendered insult already to be found in Plautus *Cas*. 644, *Pseud*. 218. Müller 1913 collects Roman comedy's insults such as *asine, homo putide, cana culex*, etc., even (p. 500) *probriperlecebrae et persuastrices* (*Bacch*. 1167: Schmeichelkätzchen und Verführerinnen).

105 — The (incorrectly deducing) jealous wife killed this woman with lethal, intentionally

testimony, extracted by judicial torture, the governor had condemned this vile and fierce (*vilis, truculenta*) female to talionic sexual punishment and violent destruction (*sententia praesidis bestiis addicta*, 10.23-8). State-enforced degradation, common in most advanced societies, remains crushing insult.

This unexpected death sentence on the feasting ass, unmerited by Lucius who was entirely innocent of the murderess's crimes[106], further insults his arguably limited *pudor*. He anticipates *contagium scelestae pollutaeque feminae*, and that fear exceeds his logical expectation that the predatory and hungry wild beasts, let loose in the arena for the purpose of devouring the foul convict, will also eat him, additional fresh meat (10.34). He is sorely afflicted with *ingens angor*, fear of *scelerosae mulieris contagio*, and *pudor* (10.29, 34). In an ironic twist, the assembled and amused Corinthian crowd would not mock the ass, as the earlier Hypatan audience had mocked the inept but (legally) innocent Lucius. Indeed, the Corinthians would ignore him, in their bloodthirsty interest in and pleasure at the sexual insults and lethal assault on the naked condemned woman. The sentence damning her *ad bestias* provides entertainment, a cautionary example for the masses, and fatal punishment for the perpetrator. She will suffer cruel exposure of her entire body to her fellow citizens' gaze, her humiliating sexual penetration, rape by an herbivorous ass, and finally the hungry carnivores' unimaginably horrifying destruction of her already twice violated body. Women, summed up by this one example in the narrating ass's view, are vicious, universally depraved, and never as good as they seem. Adultery is their "common... denominator" (May 2005: 147).

*III. Compliments (***laudes***)*[107]

Manly men are few in the ancient novels. Not "behaving like a man", i.e., not living up to one's male gender, frequently insults and stigma-

gendered insults. First she stripped her naked at a secluded location, then she whipped her, and she finished her off by stuffing a hot poker into her vagina (24: *titione candenti inter media femina detrusor crudelissime necavit*), because she thought she was the secret inamorata of her husband.

106 — Lucius while still an ass has enjoyed anxious but voluntary sex with another rich *matrona*. The spectacle inspired his new private master to inform in turn *his* civic master – Thiasus the Corinthian magistrate – of the private *novum spectaculum* available (10.23, also *scaena*). The official, in turn, "booked" (Walsh's transl.) the ass for his next public show (*spectaculum* again). Lucius therefore is not nexperienced in inter-species intercourse, despite various protestations against it.

107 — In any language and literary tradition (not only Latin and Anglo-Saxon), curses, put-downs, abusive gestures, and other kinds of disparagement probably appear more frequently than praise or commendation, as, e.g., Rawson observes (1989: 12-15). He quotes the nineteenth-century divine and philologist R. C. Trench "how much richer is every vocabulary in words that set forth sins than in those that set forth graces". Plutarch, the character Lucius' putative ancestor, wrote an extant essay for distinguishing friends from mere flatterers. J. Hall (2009: 3-27) discusses sociologi-

tizes "girlie-men"[108]. Behaving like a woman¸ accordingly, provides the inverse gender-specific insult for men, but perversely, the asseveration insults women also. The logical alternative, women behaving like men, only gains unqualified praise if the behavior conforms to conventional Roman gender ideals – permissible courage, that is, bravery that protects a family's honor.

Women, however, never protect their spouses' vital interests in *Satyrica*, and very few do so in *Metamorphoses*. Women doing women's usual business in these two texts are more likely to be perceived as sex-crazy, unsatisfied wives than as chaste virgins or faithful spouses. The included tale of the workman's wife has her pose as a wool-weaving, Lucretia-like housekeeper busy preserving her *pudicitia* and increasing her husband's stores and honor[109], but she enjoys her jolly adultery over a barrel while this cuckold is present cleaning it out. *Virgo* describes an age-group but rarely denotes pre-marital sexual "purity," i.e., inexperience of genital sex.

A. Petronius

Real virgins (three or more!), paraded to sacrifice in order to avert a plague, appear fortuitously and uniquely already in the extant first scene (*Sat*. 1). These virgins in peril, however, present one derided example of the make-believe of rhetorical school declamations. Such doubts and proofs of female "virtue" (i.e., chastity, fidelity, abstinence from sexual adventuring) populate the truth-test motif found in many extant Greek novels[110]. Those fictional girls offer themselves (or are offered by their patriarchal masters) as expiatory victims – the mocked, ridiculous stuff of Petronius' Professor of Prose and sweaty (*sudaverat*) Parasite Agamemnon[111]. The honorable term *virgo*, if not the derisory diminutive

cal theories of "politeness" and (passim) their application to Cicero's letters, not only respect, but hypocrisy, conflict, and negotiation.

108 — Haemus' cross-dressing (*sumpta veste muliebri* in a fiction) was a temporary survival expedient; the Isiac parade participant with a silk dress, wig, and "flowing step" (*incessu perfluo*) was playing a woman (*feminam mentiebatur*; 7.8 & 11.8). McCullough (2012: 246) overstates her otherwise excellent argument when she writes "men do not or are unable to change their gender identities"; in fact, they never wish to. Similarly problematic are her claims that certain women "change their gender identities from female to male", and they are "successful as true transformations". Rather, we see that extraordinary uxorial fidelity is awarded ironic praise by men (if not the author) – despite their sex's (perceived) weaker and disloyal character. Neither sex nor gender changes, even temporarily.

109 — 9.6: She asserts: *pernox et per diem lanificio nervos meos contorqueo, ut intra cellulam nostram saltem lucerna luceat*. She compares herself favorably to her voluptuary neighbor Daphne.

110 — *Sat*. 1; cf. Apuleius' old wives' tale of Psyche: 4.28 and 35; Tac. *Agr*. 35; Quint. 2.10, 7.2; Sen. *Controv*. 1.2 (a different cliché). Hellenic virginity tests: Ach. Tat. *Leuk*. 8.11-14, Heliod. *Aith*. 10.7-9.

111 — He offers training in unreal prose rhetoric, the stuff that parents and students demand

virguncula, is clearly ironic for the sexually adept maid Psyche, servant of the Priapic priestess Quartilla, and for Psyche's companion, the seven-year old Pannychis. Her very name, "All-Night-Long", a telltale *nomen-omen*, sarcastically suggests an already debauched sexual status (17, 19, 25)[112].

Terms of affection, honor, and endearment are suspect in this novel describing a world driven by fraud, selfishness, and exploitation. Encolpius greets an old woman, as "Mother", *Mater*, like American "Ma'am", in order to obtain some basic town directions from her. To himself he thinks the unexceptional, deferential address to an elderly female is only "naive good manners" (7: *delectata, urbanitas tam stulta*)[113], but she, a bawd or a pimp's assistant, leads him to a brothel, and so she found the conventionally polite fictive kin term to be flatteringly elegant.

Other respectful gendered vocatives include "friends", "young man", "mistress", and the hyperbolic, amatory exaggerations "mistress" and even "queen"[114]. Latin terms of address for lovers in these fictions express appreciation of physical and financial attractions and possessiveness, often in diminutives and superlatives[115], and not rarely employing elegy and lyric's artificial patter of female dominance and male servitude, known as *sermo amatorius*, e.g., *Domina* (20, 24, 105, 130).

Quartilla's maid, on entering the young men's temporary quarters in a cheap *taberna*, deceptively refers to the sacrilegious violators of Priapus[116] as "elegant youths" (16: *iuvenes tam urbanos*). The Priapic priestess, randy Quartilla herself, appears to (Enclopius, at least) to compliment the mental capacity of Encolpius, exclaiming "*o hominem acutum atque urbanitatis vern<ac>ulae fontem*" (24), but the comment is toying sarcasm, as was her maid's ironic flattery, and she delivers the oxymoron while she – here, a true *domina* brandishing a whip (*tenens virgam*) – smirks at her hapless male prisoners while her staff sexually abuses them.

---

when he fishes for tuition (*Sat*. 3-4), while Eumolpus, his poetic counterpart in fraudulent and "platitudinous sermons" (Schmeling ad loc.), claims to exclude mediocre materials from his poetry and thus can barely sustain himself. *Insectantur itaque ... litterarum amatores* (83-4).

112 — Irony holds true for all the word's nine appearances, except for the zodiacal example (*Sat*. 35, 39).

113 — *Pater*, as a respectful appellation, occurs twice, when Giton and Encolpius address their unfatherly elder, Eumolpus: 98, 100. Cf. Dickey (2002 119-26) on kinship terms applied to non-kin.

114 — 33: *amici*; 3, 127, 129: *iuvenis*; 130 bis: *domina*; 128, 130: *regina*, when impotent Encolpius supplicates his furiously insulted, noble and rich, wanna-be lover Circe.

115 — Abstractions unfamiliar in English repeatedly surface, such as Lucius' *mea festivitas*, [*tuae Psychae*] *dulcis anima*, etc.

116 — The thematic anger of the god Priapus against Encolpius drives the entire plot and repeatedly exhibits itself in Encolpius' impotence. His telltale name itself ("Crotch-Man", not "Bosom-Man", though the latter is etymologically possible) nails his focus of attention. Priapus, the God of the Erect Penis, is invoked or referred to, usually in frustration, in different scenes, indeed passim, 17, 21, 60, 104, 137, 139, fr. iv.

In an earlier, better mood, Ascyltus had employed the euphemistic homosexual vocative "brother", *frater* (13), just as his sex-partners Giton (91) and Encolpius (129, 133) also do. The moderately respectful addresses *Domine* and *Domina* come to the lips of suspiciously needy and greedy, non-slave characters (20: Encolpius to Quartilla; 86: the Pergamene boy to Eumolpus when in bed together; 130: Encolpius to Circe)[117]. In addition to respectful and affectionate diction, nonverbal analogues reinforce positive sentiments. Kissing constituted the commonest Roman gesture of greeting, affection, and respect (60, 74)[118]. Non-sexual osculation (in Roman life and, consequently, Latin novels) ingratiates strangers and greases familiars' social encounters: to greet, bid farewell (67, 115), and convey effusive gratitude (31)[119].

Encolpius' flowery and flattering addresses to Circe as if the goddess (*cultores, si te adorari permiseris*) and to her maid Chrysis selfishly aim at obtaining their material aid, their indulgence of his ineptitude, or their sexual compliance (126, 130). Chrysis' cross-gendered expressions of passion to bisexual Encolpius (139) provide the usual elegiac clichés, verbal inducements to sexual pleasure: *si qua est amantibus fides* (79): "*tu desiderium meum, tu voluptas mea, numquam finies hunc ignem*..."[120].

Giton alleges to Encolpius (9) that Ascyltus had threatened to rape him [Giton]. Ascyltus asserted sardonically that with his "sword" [i.e., penis] he would play the rapist Tarquin, if Giton, imitating fabled Lucretia, were to play the faithful spouse role (as if Encolpius'). This jocularly lethal threat feminizes and mocks the alleged sexual fidelity of the wily, opportunistic catamite. Similarly but now inexplicitly, Eumolpus' tale of the Ephesian wife at first presents a Hellenized version of Lucretia's exemplary, extreme *pudicitia*, but soon that chaste, widowed saint – like Dido, sworn to fidelity to her dead husband (*Aen*. 4.15-17, 27-9) becomes another unfaithful wife, the lover of a soldier nearby. In sum, *Satyrica* infrequently flatters women with admiring terms, images, or portraits in any way positive. Petronius' mistresses, wives, and daughters provide opportunistic objects and instruments for cynical men seeking sexual satisfaction. Alternatively, they set a trap, since Petronius' narrators

117 — The married couple Habinnas and Scintilla employ the terms of each other (66.5, 67.9). Dickey (2002: 77-99) asserts that *dominus*/*domina* had already lost any implication of servitude, but it sometimes retains its erotic/elegiac, flattering valance.

118 — Lateiner (2009: 17-18) briefly surveys ancient habits and beliefs about kissing.

119 — Kisses in hetero- and homo-sexual foreplay situations, of course, serve a different purpose (*basia*: 18, 20, 110, 113, 127-8; *oscula*: 21, 23, 24, 74, 85).

120 — No homosexual flattery or slang emerges, beyond the standard friendly, coded "in-crowd" greeting, breezy *frater* (nearly twenty times, e.g., 9, 129). Once the besotted unreliable narrator describes the calculating Giton as *mitissimus puer* (93), but this adjective conveys its secondary meaning of passive, homosexual partner.

quickly expose any briefly lauded women as phony, flighty, and lecherous creatures – primarily motivated by lust, secondarily by greed.

B. Apuleius

Gender-specific compliments are unsurprisingly rare. Individuals beseeching strangers for a favor – information or aid – casually employ flattering forms of address. Thus, when Lucius the tourist inquires of an accessible old woman about Milo's residence, he ingratiatingly calls her *Mater*, the deferential form of address noted already in *Satyrica* and conventional politesse for older female strangers[121]. Standard procedures, however, are not the excitement that fictions offer.

Men. A stranger attempts to gain Lucius' support for judging their fellow-traveler Aristomenes' story to be absurd. He "butters him up" to his face with flattering, gendered descriptors. To this stranger, seeking to persuade, Lucius seems "a respectable man [i.e., of good morals, *urbanitas*, culture, and reputation], as your appearance and bearing show" (20: *vir ut habitus et habitudo demonstrat ornatus*). His new acquaintance, the rich miser Milo, echoes this judgment and adds physical details, as do Byrrhena and her elderly male escort in Hypata (1.23, 2.2). Milo also mentions the manly appearance, adolescent "virgin" modesty, and noble family of the visiting youngster (23: *te ... etiam de ista corporis speciosa habitudine deque hac virginali prorsus verecundia, generosa stirpe proditum et recte coniecerem*). The gender inversion of the typically female modifier *virginalis* suggests an effeminate element in the young Lucius, or at least an incomplete rendering of a fully grown-up, Roman male.

Relieved that his old friend is not dead, as he had feared, Aristomenes (soaked in urine) warmly greets, hugs, and kisses Socrates. Pythias the magistrate similarly greets his old college friend Lucius nonverbally as well as verbally. The reunited robbers also kiss each other[122]. Byrrhena's male escort kisses Lucius (2.2). These are Mediterranean, un-gendered salutations expressing egalitarian respect between parties barely or not at all acquainted.

---

121 — 1.21; also 2.3, 3.12, 4.26, 9.l7. The male equivalent honorific term *Pater* does not occur in Apuleius' novel but surfaces twice in Petronius': Giton and Encolpius so address Eumolpus (98, 100). *Parens* provides another flattering pseudo-kinship honorific (1.21, 2.3, 4.26).

122 — 1.17: *deosculabar amplexus*: inopportunely, given his reek; 24: *amplexusque ac comiter deosculatus: 'mi Luci'*; 4.1: *oscula mutua*. This common Mediterranean salutation is much rarer in Anglo-American greetings. Extravagant modes of address, especially superlatives, also pepper the Latin system. For example, Aristomenes (relieved to find Socrates still alive) in his momentary happiness greets the grumpy night hotel clerk with "*Ianitor fidelissime, comes et frater meus*", Even more amusing is his wheedling address to the inanimate hotel bed: "*Grabattule animo meo carissime*" (16-17). Charite's hand-kiss of the robbers' *anus* begs forgiveness for her emotional display (4.26; cf. 2.28, 11.6: kisses of respect for priests).

Blatant grotesque satire of Latin's complimentary erotic clichés that saturate elegiac love-talk pervades the sincere but banal, foreplay chatter (*voculae*) voiced by the sexually voracious *matrona* arousing Lucius, but he is not the usual man to whom a woman might speak such sweet-talk but the well-endowed hairy, big-toothed Ass (e.g., 10.21-2: *amo, cupio, te solum diligo, sine te iam vivere nequeo, palumbulus*[123], *passer*). In a sequestered boudoir, she rouses the ass to mount her by verbal and physical means, such as a full-body rubdown, deep kisses and devouring gaze (*assidua savia et commorsicantibus oculis*). This extremely abnormal sexual encounter[124] parodies intimately mutual praise and expressions of desire between humans[125]. Then, despite Lucius' fears about possible bodily harm to the woman from his large penis, she grabs him and pulls him (i.e., his penis) to her, emphatically all the way in: *complexa totum me prorsus, sed totum recepit*[126]. Women's sexual voracity and capacity find expression in this variation on the folkloric *vagina dentata* motif. Her dialogic compliments belong to human sexual foreplay, not interspecies copulation.

Vir underlines behavior suitable for sexually active and socially aggressive males. As a term of between-the-sheets exhortation, Photis teases Lucius with it: "if you are a man" (2.17: *si vir es*). The castrates of the

123 — The Syriac priests mock sexual terms of endearment at 8.26 with this same term: "dovelets".

124 — Prof. Weber reminds me here of Ovid's scene of bestial intercourse, *Ars* 1.289-326, esp. 303, 325: Pasiphaë dresses up (?) for congress with her beloved white bull. Lucius the ass twice (10.19, 22) here alludes to *Minotauri mater*, a mythological exemplum for his anxiety arising from this dubious sexual adventure. In *Am.* 1.5, Ovid's retelling of a sexual conquest breaks off, coyly before sexual penetration, with *cetera quis nescit*?

125 — After many intervening scenes (*post tantum temporis*) describing Lucius' sexual and digestive frustrations (hunting down roses and mares), the tender copulation carefully mirrors the relatively normal success of his long-past, human-to-human, lubricious congress with the equally aroused Photis (cf. *GCA* 10 (2000) 26). We leave aside the vexed question of the *spurcum additamentum* (whether the sex be bestial, as there, or entirely human, as is the rule, elsewhere). If it is genuine, it constitutes one of the most explicit sexual passages in ancient literature. See, recently, Lytle 2003, in favor of authenticity, and Hunink's strong rejoinder (2006). In the pseudo-Lucianic version, the hero's return to human genital dimensions leads his former inamorata to call him a monkey (56) before her servants pitch him out of the house naked, reminiscent of the multiple insults that Encolpius has experienced.

126 — In the genre of the "novel", both Apuleian scenes are more detailed and explicit about physical pleasure than those inscribed in the "Big Five" Greek novels. Khariton elides the deed itself on the wedding night (1.1), as do Xenophon (1.8-9) and Longos (4.40; cf. the oblique but detailed encounter with the experienced woman Lykainion 3.18). Heliodoros – displaying his Barthian *jouissance* – never advances any one of his lovers to sexual penetration. The involuted plot of Akhilles Tatios presents a sexual climax, but not an act of the two protagonists and one obscured with euphemistic periphrases: 5.27. Cf. 5.20, 8.5 (male virginity), 5.25 (Klitophon like a eunuch for Melite); 2.37-8: the debate concerning boy- versus girl-love and its pleasures; 8.19: one clause in the last chapter summarizes the heroes' long delayed wedding and its consummation. May (2005: 150) concludes that the creators of the ideal chaste heroines (fiancée or wife) found in the Greek novels conceived them as a total contrast to the earlier Roman novels' satires of promiscuous adulteresses.

Dea Syria are only *semiviri* (8.28, *hapax* in Apuleius). Genitally complete priests, poets, and philosophers receive his genuine compliments of *viri* as well as "wise" (11.21, 9.13, 7.2)[127]. In the inset tale of the large if dirty vat[128], the nasty little lustful wife (*postrema lascivia famigerabilis*, *uxorcula ... lasciva*) repeatedly mocks (*tractabat ludicre*) her poor (*is gracili pauperie laborans*), cuckolded husband. The saucy wife addresses her spouse directly as *inepte*. She sarcastically insults him as *magnum istum virum ac strenuum negotiatorem*, belittling both his masculinity and business skills. After her bamboozled spouse climbs into the vat to clean the inside, the adulterous lovers fearlessly return to their *coitus interruptus*, their verbally heightened, impromptu, doggy-style sex on top of storage vat (*adulter bellissimus ille pusio inclinatam dolio pronam uxorem ... secure dedolabat*).

Apuleius' Lucius seems *ingenuus*, an ambivalent descriptor bearing a positive and a negative sense: noble birth and social naïveté[129]. His interlocutors remark his innocent mien and bashfulness. He is shy – modest with a youngster's blushes before a woman of rank[130]. Byrrhena remarks in his presence on his good looks[131], his refined manner, and his "natural" gait: *generosa probitas ... gracilitas ... speciosus et immeditatus incessus*[132]. However, these positive qualities invite exploitation in the highly hierarchical, yet dangerous and competitive, world of Roman imperial Thessaly. An involuntary blush reveals commitment to societal bonds, "a confession of subordination" (Barton 1999: 215) that signals consent to censure and, here, to some pushy teasing – the unpleasant bullying of Thelyphron II and of Lucius, the new scapegoat[133]. His friend the aedile, Pythias, his socially prominent relative, Byrrhena, and sundry strangers find him fair game for pushing around. His limited ability to recover

127 — *Sapientia* appears only once and for Socrates, when the ass absurdly philosophizes (10.33: *ecce nunc patiemur*...?); *sapiens* never occurs.

128 — 9.5-7. The vessel itself suggests, by its size and context, Pandora's infamous *pithos*. In both cases hollow and rounded shape is analogous in function to the receptive, untrustworthy woman.

129 — Notably, only beardless Cupid receives this descriptor in the novel, where (5.28) his over-protective, neurotic mother Venus describes him thus in her rant.

130 — 2.2-3: *rubore suffusus deiecto capite restiti*; parallel to Lucilius' young friend; Sen. *Ep*. 11.3, 7.

131 — She also mentions his *proceritas, rubor* (ruddiness, here), *capillitium, oculi micantes, os floridum*, etc.

132 — Gleason 1995: 60-2, Corbeill 2004: 117-23, and O'Sullivan 2011: 17-21 *et passim* discuss detailed ancient analyses of gait and its information about character and sexual inclinations.

133 — Spontaneous blushing (like pale Socrates: 1.6: *faciem punicantem prae pudore*) signals genuine contrition. Feigned blushing for advantage, however, signals fraud and deception. Strategic weeping and blushing appear among dissemblers' tricks in the rhetors (Cic. *de orat*. 2.47, 196, Sen. *Contr*. 7.4.6, Sen. *Ep*. 11.6-7 denies the existence of false blushes). Cf. further, Ov. *Am*. 1.8.35-6, Cic. *de leg*. 1.19.50). Merely pretended vulnerability invites a superior's *captatio benevolentiae* and lowered guard, as Lucius' pretending to be exhausted, acceptable behavior with Milo, shows. Blushing is common in Plato's dialogues, but Sokrates is not the blusher.

himself, to collect his thoughts, and to reframe the message of his blushes, signals Lucius' retarded but developing semi-adult self[134].

The isolated miser Milo and the market magistrate Pythias enjoy Lucius' boyish naiveté and exploit his inability to escape providing them with an audience for their boring blather (1.23-4, 26, 2.12-13). The former's skimpy hospitality insults the tourist Lucius and his patron, Demeas, while the latter's total destruction of his fish dinner on his first night in town renders him a fool to the tradesmen of Hypata. The young man's delight in and stupefaction at his aunt Byrrhena's semi-nude statue of the lovely goddess Diana (*veste reflatum*) resemble and reflect the overly curious Actaeon (*curioso optatu*), his predecessor in humiliation earned by inappropriate curiosity. Both young men show susceptibility to entrancement by attention-getting performances – most of them sexual[135]. Lucius fails to perceive, standing in the entrance of Byrrhena's house, the central statue's cautionary *de te loquitur* nature (2.4). Photis arguably achieves the same end of arresting the youth's immediate goals in Thessaly (1.2) by flaunting her feminine charms. Self-awareness might caution a wiser lad, despite sexual exuberance, against enjoying additional lascivious nights with his host's servant (2.6, 10, 17; 3.20). The imperial *matrona* Byrrhena warns him against dalliance and then hosts a *cena*, one to which all high Hypatan society has been invited[136]. Before he departs the party, Lucius has promised to cooperate with the Laugh God Risus. He has been set up to serve as their holiday scapegoat, to be insulted spectacularly by an entire community. He will provide Hypata's victim of humiliating laughter in the next day's capital trial, a theatrical farce[137]. With Byrrhena's apparent cooperation (2.31), the young guest, flattered by all local interlocutors, becomes the protagonist, a rattled defendant in a mock murder-trial drama. Later, after Lucius has been laughed at by all and sundry for his hyperbolic rhetorical and emotional performance, the local magistrates propose to the Roman citizen and socially distinguished

134 — 2.3: *iam sermonis ipsius mora rubore digesto*. He then respectfully addresses the *matrona* as *parens*.

135 — The sword-swallower, Fotis when flirting, the Chaldaean astrologer, the Venus pantomime at Corinth, etc. (1.4, 2.7, 2.12, 10.29-34). Apuleius seems to allude to the "intentional voyeur" version of the Actaeon tale, one that Ovid had emphatically rejected (in his *Met*. 3.142, 175: *error*).

136 — *Utpote apud primate feminam, flos ipse civitatis*. The superior nobility of Lucius' family has been acknowledged (3.10). This *cena* begins as a mirror of Petronius' Trimalchio's vulgar banquet, but Milesian Thelyphron's eagerly awaited performance serves the Laugh god Risus with an intriguing, terrifying, and self-humiliating tale. His gender-damning "Milesian" tale condemns an adulterous wife who poisons her new husband to seize his wealth and accommodate her lover. Meanwhile she hypocritically mourns her young groom before his corpse has been carried out for burial (2.21-30).

137 — *Met*. 2.31-2: Byrrhena invites Lucius to entertain the town on the Risus feast-day, and Lucius wishes to oblige her, ignorant of what will soon befall him. His host and hostess are pleasantly amused at his ordeal (3.7, 10, 12).

visitor (1.2., 2.2-3) an honorary statue (3.11: *honores egregios*). Seething inwardly in fury, he nevertheless politely refuses the commemoration of his embarrassment, hoping to recoup some of his stolen dignity[138]. Within a few days, he again falls into ill repute as an ingrate and thief who robbed his host and disappeared (3.21, 7.1-2). More injuries as well as insults are in store.

Women. Can one then find a respectable "lady" in Apuleius' novel? A few, at best. The word *femina* is ubiquitous and unspecific in imperial Latin, usually neutrally specifying sex but sometimes specifying status, sometimes sardonic. Both royal Psyche and her wicked sisters are *feminae*, although her malevolent princess sisters deserve their damning modifiers *scelestae* and *pessimae* (4.28, 5.12, 15, 16). Although other females obtain this descriptor, Photis never does, since she is only a lowly *amicula*/*ancilla*/*ancillula*/*famula* – a living tool (in the Aristotelian view)[139].

Lucius, hoping to seduce his host's willing servant Photis, praises her comely body in terms familiar from Ovidian elegy[140]. He compliments her flashing (*micantes*) eyes and further catalogues ravishing elements of her charming sexiness: her cheeks, hair, and kisses. His praise climaxes with her perfumed breasts (3.19: *fraglantibus papillis ... addictum*; cf. Ov. *Am*. 1.5). This lover's gendered flattery – with typical elegiac topoi describing her anatomy – attests his beloved's power and his desire – something of an inept joke considering that the maid is equally aroused. He flatters his casually seduced, nonce bedmate as *Photis mea, mea festivitas*, and *mea mellitula* ("my little honey")[141] in the days before her mistake and his transformation[142].

The grand lady Byrrhena accompanied by her retinue; the ideal of beauty that Photis approaches; bourgeois Thelyphron I's poisoner wife; grumpy Venus' allegorical enemy *Sobrietas*; and brave Charitê – these five gain the relatively neutral descriptor *femina*, while few others are

138 — The town council's face-to-face offer to erect a statue in honor of the butt of their joke seems only another spectacular insult to Lucius (3.11-12), but showing his true feelings will only sink his self-regard deeper.

139 — Lucius the noble does address humble Fotis as *Domina* when they are alone – but this too is comical paradox, a conventional honorific blurted out in erotic frenzy (2.16).

140 — Hindermann (2009: 77, 82) well argues that Lucius with Fotis follows Ovid's self-serving version of *servitium amoris* here, "love lite" rather than the true erotic *domina* model found in Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius. Unconditional love may perhaps be glimpsed later in the zealot Lucius' attachment to Isis.

141 — Hypocorisms can provide affectionate or hostile language. Unique *uxorcula* in its context must be sardonic "sweet-talk" for a saucy wife otherwise described as *mulier callida ... et perastutela* (9.5, also *hapax*). For other gendered and hostile diminutives, such as *scortillum, lupula, meretricula, muliercula, amicula*, see Adams (1983: 353-5) who oddly does not comment on the obscene possibilities of the latter diminutive suffix – only different from *culus* by the length of the first vowel.

142 — 2.7, 10; 3.22; cf. 5.6: besotted Psyche and lovesick Cupid sweet-talk each other in comparable fashion.

so described[143]. Many superficially positive terms for men and women in Apuleius are blatantly ironic. Milesian Thelyphron ("Girly-Minded") II, once in a manly mood, stepped up to guard for a night's good pay a local Thessalian corpse (2.23: *commasculo*). In his own self-deprecating telling, he addresses respectfully the disingenuously weeping widow so that she will hire this inept stranger for gold coins to guard her spouse's corpse all night long (2.23-4, 26: *matrona flebilis, Domina [bis]*). His self-presentation appears less heroic after his verbal gaffes, his insulting physical manhandling out the door by house-slaves[144], the discovery of his severe facial disfigurement by the witch-weasels (loss of protruding nose and ears), and his consequent total public humiliation. The deflated hero, now the notoriously mutilated parasite at the matron's party years later, also addresses Byrrhena as *Domina* (2.20). The term acknowledges her position as hostess and social luminary. Byrrhena first appears to observant Lucius to be just another unknown (and unrelated) rich woman surrounded by a retinue of influential hangers-on (***mulierem*** *quempiam, frequenti stipatam famulitione* and *flos ipse civitatis*), but he addresses her politely as ***femina*** and later, when her relatedness is clear, as *parens* (2.2, 3, 19)[145]. In the course of recounting the deeds of the murderess of five, Lucius in an aside refers to her mother-in-law's "natural maternal feelings" in keeping her newborn girl alive, disobeying her husband desire for infanticide (10.23: *insita matribus pietate*).

Socrates, knowing what his dominatrix witch can do, describes Meroë to his friend as a *femina divina*[146]. Lucius the ass sardonically refers to several scary and powerful females of the included tales as if they were respectable *feminae* (1.8; 9.14-15, 24; 10.5, 26, 34: *scelestae pollutaeque*). Nevertheless, the same or similar women are also denominated *mulieres* –

143 — E.g., *eximia pulcherrima femina*, but *rustica squalensque femina, miserrima femina, etc.* (2.2, 2.8, 2.27 & 29, 5.30, 8.9). Charite, after all, is modeled on desirable but usually self-controlled Dido, both of whose hospitality is misinterpreted (Harrison 1997: 60). Both Charite and Psyche exhibit frenzy in pursuing their justified revenge, and both, again like Dido, attempt suicide (62-5; May [2005 nn. 39 and 59] also notes the Ephesian matron's Dido-ish characteristics in spousal dedication, willingness to die, and transfer of affections to another man). High female passion leads to the Underworld in all three cases, as Apuleius, like Petronius, burlesque's Vergilian diction and action.

144 — For his *omen nefarium*, Thelyphron is cursed and beaten by the *matrona's* household: *exsecrati ... pugnis ... cubitis, palmis infestis ... suffodere, calcibus insultare, capillos distrahere, vestem discindere ... laceratus atque discerptus domo proturbor*.

145 — The nameless adulterer in the *dolium* tale addresses the shameless wife with the dignified, respectful title of *materfamilias* (9.7) after her husband unexpectedly comes home early. She adds insult to his injury when, after illicit sex in her husband's presence, she bullies her cuckolded husband into carrying the cheaply sold vat (7 *denarii*) to her lover's house. May (2005: 145) analyzes the novel's increasing misogyny.

146 — Santoro L'Hoir 1992: 191-5. The honorific adjective seems apotropaic rather than sarcastic, and in any case reflects Socrates' loss of a perspective that can conceive of a stable or fixed order in nature and culture.

when – as usual – they turn out badly, reveal themselves as sex-hungry vamps or worse criminals (9.19, 26-7; 10.2, 29, 34).

Arete – *generosa, formosa, pudica, famosa castitate* (9.17-18) as her name implies – like Petronius' Ephesian *matrona*, has her status described as *domina* (for her slave Myrmex, 4x), as *uxor* for her husband Barbarus, 3x). The *coniunx* possesses local *matrona* status (18), at least until Philesitherus' money bribe conquers her *pudicitia*. Then the narrator reduces her status to that of another unchaste *mulier*. "True to her fickle sex, the woman sold her [sexual] honor..." (9.19: *nec a genuina levitate descivit mulier, sed ... pudicitiam suam ... auctorata est*)[147]. So, not even the woman of virtue (Arete) can be trusted, although one learns that her husband, male chaperone, and young seducer are also fools themselves. Several other women, like Arete, are well enough off, clearly upper-class and not plebeian. They meet respect as *matronae*, even if they are not *optima* or *sanctissima* like the distant Salvia, Lucius' well-married mother, or like Haemus' fabled, indeed fabulous and fictional heroine, Plotina (2.2, 7.7)[148].

Plotina invites consideration of three women in Apuleius' novel who gain praise for their "masculine" courage, albeit their undoubted bravery is praised only in a way that does not honor the female sex in the highest terms[149]. These females show a "manly spirit", briefly active to protect their marriage, a gendered trope with a noble history in Roman legend, historiography, and comedy[150]. Most such heroines – resourceful, initia-

147 — Note that a female bawd delivers this condemnation of womankind, one of the many ironies that render Apuleius' male-authored novel something of a gender conundrum. Despite having six descriptor nouns of her sex/gender, no one calls Arete a *femina*. The status-degrading word *puella* (degrading for a married woman) appears only when the two men (the adulterer and the go-between slave) are negotiating the price of the female's "virtue".

148 — The conclusion reveals that her heroism also, partly of a monitory not physical sort, is qualified as the conjugal sort befitting a woman. Langlands (2006: 231) considers Charite and Plotina as "strange androgynous creatures", but I think that she misconceives the power of their feminine passion. Apuleius has created a fictional space for at least an imaginary female *vir-tus*, like Psyche's, whose relevant boldness and *pudicitia* Langlands ignores.

149 — We selectively review a few of the many unfaithful and murderous women's crimes recounted in the dark books VII-X. These tales report ugly experiences and stories heard by Lucius while in ass form. Roman authors rarely assign *virtus* to women. Cicero, however, asserts it of Tullia's and Terentia's behavior, his daughter and his wife (*Fam*. 14.11.2, *Att*. 10.8, *Fam*. 14.1). Horace (*C*. 3.24.22-3) aligns it with *castitas*, and the *Laudatio Turiae* thrice credits the deceased with manly courage. Langlands 2006 passim and McDonnell 2009: 161-8 analyze female *pudicitia* and *virtus*.

150 — Xen. *Oec*. 10.1: ἀνδρικήν γε ἐπιδεικνύεις τὴν διάνοιαν τῆς γυναικός. Dutsch 2012 discusses *animus virilis* in Plautus and Terence (e.g., *Rud*. 685 exhorts trembling women, *Eun*. 64-9 describes a distraught, i.e., unmanly, lover). See further, Sallust's masculized Sempronia (*Catil*. 25.1), Livy's Lucretia and Verginia (1.58, 3.44-50; cf. Val. Max. 6.1.1), Cato's daughter Porcia (Plut. *Brut*. 53), and Paetus' wife Arria (Plin. *Ep*. 3.16.6, aptly cited by McCullough 2012: 245); and numerous brave wives of imperial senators (Tac. *Hist*. 1.31). Images of female boldness can be positive, as for industrious Lucretia (*Fasti* 2.847), or negative, as for murderous Electra (Sen. *Ag*. 958: Clytemnestra to Electra). See conclusion, infra.

tory, courageous – will die rather than betray their honor – a quality defined for women by their virginal chastity or (if married) by their spousal fidelity (*fides, pudicitia, constantia*)[151].

1] Psyche, Apuleius' allegorical princess, is delicate of spirit (*animi tenella*, 5.18, cf. 21). She features in the extended, embedded consolation tale, the truth value of which is compromised by its irritated teller (*iratior, saevior*), an aged, drunken, semi-demented female housekeeper. Cook and maid in the cave-house fashioned by the band of robbers, the *anus* also serves as guard and comfort for the attractive female hostage. She tells her an ultimately happy story of another attractive, rich young woman's apotheosis (4.28-6.24; *anilibus fabulis*). The fabulous Psyche's greedy sisters[152] harass her, insult her intelligence and trust[153]. Evetually her own curiosity destroys her happiness. *Virgo* Psyche (4.31, 32, 33, 35, etc.) looks forward to gaining the honorable title of *mater* by her pregnancy (5.12: *materni nominis dignitate gaudebat*). Nevertheless, her jealous sisters persuade her to kill the beloved but unseen ophidian and humanoid "Beast". The weak little sister experiences understandable discomfort with her sisters' ugly plan. Psyche nearly assassinates her allegedly reptilian "husband" (5.17: *immanis coluber*). Although by nature Psyche lacks male boldness, in crisis, audacity changes Psyche's sex (5.22: *sexum audacia mutatur*)[154]. The meek and passive princess, then, briefly transforms herself into a determined (male) killer. The alcoholic spinster (6.25: *delira et temulenta*) spins this *fabellam* to cheer up her virgin prisoner, Charite. This captive audience and analogue to Psyche will also experience a happy (first) ending, despite further insults in her future.

After expulsion from Cupid's hideaway, having seen the forbidden (god), wandering Psyche fails to obtain Juno's support. In desperation, she rouses herself to approach Venus hoping for unlikely mercy. She then addresses herself with four successive rhetorical questions in a parody of

151 — Greek novel examples climax with Heliodoros' Kharikleia (e.g., 1.25). Xenophon's Anthia (e.g., 3.6, 4.5, 5.7) faces over a dozen threats of roisterers' rape, marriage, or prostitution and kills at least once attacker. Khariton's Kallirhoe (2.9-11) faces a different dilemma: save her marital fidelity or her child. On the Latin side but perhaps derived from a Greek original, see *Apol. Rex Tyr*. 27, 34, 47, etc.

152 — *Facinerosae mulieres*, older sisters suitably likened to the bloodthirsty, murderous Furies: 5.19, 21.

153 — Recall the sisters' conversations apart that mock her (5.9, 5.16: *fetu satiante, illa fatua*, etc.), although they do not insult her to her face. Her husband too deems her *simplicissima* (5.24), but this ambivalent descriptor is anxious and even flattering coming from Cupid's lips. Like Lucius, she is too trusting of others.

154 — i.e., she exceeds her female-gendered attributes, a compliment from the narrating crone. The *anus* who narrates this tale also, in a probably un-ironic echo, "takes on a man's courage beyond her sex" when Charite, the narratee, attempts escape (6.27: *capta* ***super sexum*** ... *audacia*). As the *GCA* commentators point out (2004: 271), the narrator, the female subject of the included "beauty and the beast" story, and the internal audience all transcend briefly their shared female limitations.

epic and tragic, heroic (male) self-exhortation (6.5; cf. Verg. *Aen*. 2.69; *GCA* ad loc.), of which the third runs: *quin igitur* ***masculum*** *tandem sumis* ***animum*** *et casulae speculae renuntias fortiter...?* Lucius, the non-heroic male, ass, soon echoes this heroine's desperation and self-interrogation, when confronted with the robbers' plan to throw him over a cliff (6.26): *quin igitur* ***masculum*** *tandem sumis* ***animum*** *et tuaque saluti, dum licet, consulis*[155]*?* The ass moralizing and soliloquizing, as if a reflective man (cf. 7.11; 9.26, 30; 10.33), and indeed echoing a mostly helpless woman's speech spoken in a story recently overheard, adds gender and genus elements to the humorous feared catastrophe.

2] Haemus' tells and sells the hokum story of brave Plotina to the gullible bandits. Lucius embeds it in Tlepolemus' recapture of his fiancée Charite. She overhears it and is amused. The tale clarifies the novel's assumed masculine attitudes. A woman who acts like a man is the exception that proves the rule. Plotina transforms her appearance with men's clothes (*in* ***masculinam faciem*** *reformato habitu*) and undertakes with a man's spirit the difficult life of her husband's indefinite exile (7.5: *aerumnas adsiduas* ***ingenio masculo*** *sustinebat*). The contrast with ordinary, spineless women is explicitly described, whether Haemus shared this view of women or thought it would render his fierce, new bandit community more benevolent to him. Chaste and loyal, fecund Plotina (*quaedam rarae fidei atque* ***singularis pudicitiae femina***) had borne her distinguished husband ten children, a service to his patriarchal line. To accompany him in imperial exile, she cropped her hair like a man's (*tonso capillo*)[156]. She packed all her coins and jewelry into belts, walked fearlessly (*intrepida*) through legionaries' unsheathed swords, and shared her husband's diffi-

155 — As the Groningen commentators note *ad loc*. (1981: 38), no parallel to this soliloquy is found in the Greek *Ass Tale*.

156 — Hair, for Lucius and Apuleius, marks gender (*praecipua pars in aperto et perspicuo posita*) and furnishes a Leitmotif, as one observes its lyrical significance for Lucius' "bewitchment" by Photis and its ecclesiastical signification of his new clerical status for his other mistress, Isis (2.8.2, 2.9.3, 10.31.1). In the flowery *paignion* dedicated to hair, Lucius declares that even Venus, if bald (*calva*), would not please her doting Vulcan. Englert and Long (1973: 239) found hair symbolic of bondage to lechery in the first case, total release from gendered expectations in the second – although Lucius surrenders himself to Isis' control. In *Satyrica* also, hair features as an ill omen and capital crime, when cut aboard ship (105), and as a conventional grooming gesture of mourning when the *matrona* of Ephesus lets her hang down unkempt (110: *passis crinibus*). Half- or entirely shaven slaves (cheeks and crown) are so treated to identify and humiliate them, whether or not runaways (Catull. 59.5, *Met*. 9.12: *capillum semirasi*; Petr. *Sat*. 103, Akh. T. 5.17). At 3.16-17, hair cut and surreptitiously collected from a barber's shop will provide Pamphile, with magical spells *pars pro toto*, to gain control over her intended male sexual prey. Cupid's hair gains adoring mention (5.13, 22). Venus threatens to shave her son Cupid's hair and clip his wings (5. 30); Venus grabs her alleged slave Psyche by the hair and tears it out (6.9 and 10). Beautiful Psyche's hair oddly never receives praise, perhaps because of the sex of the old woman narrator. Plotina's reduced-length hair aids her deceptive "metamorphosis" into a man (*in masculinam formam reformata habitu*), and she remained intrepid amidst hostile imperial forces brandishing bared swords.

culties. She boldly sounded the alarm when Haemus' (fictional) robber band had arrived to plunder her husband's substantial entourage[157]. That is, Haemus' fictional back-story cryptically emphasizes wifely loyalty, while he loudly urges his fellow robbers next to sell the comely prisoner to a whorehouse.

3] Charite's included tale in two acts refers to her manly spirit both in courageous desperation (6.27: *sumptaque* ***constantia virili*** *facinus audet pulcherrimum*) as a prisoner threatened with sexual violation and fatal insults. In her angry revenge as a *matrona* Charite assumes a different gender: ***masculis animis*** *impetuque duro fremens invadit ac supersistit sicarium* (8.11). Her murderous vengeance, at the behest of her husband Tlepolemus' ghost (8.8), and her suicide by sword (not by a woman's typical tools: noose or poison) lead the somewhat histrionic, young slave narrator of her dénouement to describe her as "exhaling her manly spirit"[158]. Her courage in both sections leads her to attempt escape in order to rejoin her fiancée in this world, and to avenge the same man, now her murdered husband in the other world (8.13: *deorsus ad meum Tlepolemum viam quaeram*).

These three "manly *matronae*"[159] act admirably, in their three internal narrators' opinion. They preserve their husbands' (and therefore their own) honor and the stability of patriarchal marriage within gender-demarcated parameters[160]. Nevertheless ... even Apuleius' bravest, autonomous females are compromised by their gender. 1] Psyche, the generally helpless, deceived, and deflowered girl, avenges her misguided loss of her husband on her sororal competitors – but only through similar, womanly guile, enticing her adulterous sisters to take suicidal leaps over the cliff above Cupid's palace. In despair at Venus' persecution, later she collapses repeatedly and repeatedly tries without success to commit suicide herself (the woman's exit mode) – until she is saved by her loving god despite herself and her habitual collapse into curiosity (6.21). She remains passive, reactive, and ineffective. 2] Plotina, a non-violent but canny and determined woman of *singularis pudicitia*, donned men's garb to accom-

157 — Conversely, after Haemus' imaginary robber band is broken up, he escapes capture by dressing as an "inferior" woman and riding on an ass (7.8): ***in sequiorum sexum*** *incertus et absconditus ... transabivi*.

158 — 8.14: *perefflavit* ***animam virilem***, on the model of tragic Ajax and epic Dido. The Carthaginian Queen also sought distance from an unwelcome suitor and proximity to her dead husband, but Dido's suitor was fleeing, not pursuing, like Thrasyllus (*Aen*. 4.663-5; see also Harrison 1997: 62-5).

159 — Psyche rises from mere human *virgo* princess to immortal Olympian bride, a matronly status; Plotina is eulogized as the aristocratic and fecund mother of ten; and Charite's clothes reveal her upper-class status as *matrona* (6.23, 7.6, 4.23: *matronatus* is *hapax*).

160 — Shelton 2005: 315 and McCullough 2012: 244.

pany her prominent, disgraced husband into exile and to comfort him[161]. She protects him by raising a cry, but she is a male's narrative deception, an *ad hoc* invention of Haemus, her disguised fiancé and savior[162]. In addition, 3] uncompromisingly chaste Charite wreaks havoc by blinding her would-be seducer and stalker Thrasyllus – but acts only when directed by her husband's spectral commands (8.8). She tricks, drugs, and blinds the lecherous "Mr. Bold"[163]. Emerging from a widow's isolation, after having explained her actions to her local public for revenge stopping short of homicide, like Lucretia, the grief-stricken widow kills herself for shame and to reunite with her husband (cf. Indian *purdah* and *suttee*)[164].

Plutarch may illuminate how accurately these two Latin prose fictions reflect imperial Roman self-presentations and perceptions. The *Mulierum Virtutes* (Γυναικῶν Ἀρεταί)[165] selects allegedly historical and plainly legendary stories that showcase brave, mostly Greek, women of yore. This antiquarian and philosophical essay first praises women who dare by radically equating the moral capacities and psychological excellences of men and women[166]. McInerney demonstrates[167], however, that Plutarch's actual narratives, intended as moral protreptic, deflect and narrow examples of women's courageous daring into conventionally gendered channels and bourgeois achievements. Women maintain *aidos*, the Greek equivalent of *pudor*, and defend their bodies, but they do this chiefly by spurring their men folk to employ sharp weapons – not by exercising agency and killing for themselves. Their goal is to protect their bodies' sexual integrity, and their weapons are usually deceit and lies (McInerney 2003: 339), although occasionally poison or gendering abuse serves their purpose (Aretophila's κακίζειν, 255E-57E). Women's

161 — 7.6: *procuratorem principis ... in aula Caesaris clarus atque conspicuus*.

162 — She is a fiction within a fiction. "Blood" admits (in his fiction) that as a bandit he once was so frightened that he donned women's clothing to escape capture by the police. The prominent fact that he currently speaks disguised in another career doubles the irony of his fabricated gender-inversion disguise.

163 — Widow Charite never accedes to seductive entreaties. Plutarch's cunning widow Kamma, perhaps Charite's model for a fatal love-triangle, appears to soften her resistance to her persistent suitor, Sinorix, but only to lead her husband's killer, "wickedest of all men", to share a bowl of wine containing a fatal poison (*Mor*. 258B-C; cf. Polyaenus 8.39; *GCA* VIII [1985] 6).

164 — A thorough comparison of the novelists' treatments of *vir*/*homo* or *mulier*/*femina* should start from Santoro L'Hoir's observations and requires examination of the later Anon. *Apollonius Rex Tyrii* as well as pre-Classical comedy.

165 — Plutarch wrote the Greek essay to improve a female friend, ca. 100 CE in the once proud Roman province of Greek Achaea, now under firm Roman rule.

166 — Apuleius follows assertions of his beloved philosophic master, Plato, and his contemporary, Musonius Rufus.

167 — McInerney 2003 catalogues Plutarch's categories of female bravery. Only the non-Greek Galatians in Anatolia exact violent revenge (257E-59D), he observes. Kamma, wife of Sinatus, and Khiomara somewhat resemble the agency shown by Apuleius' Charite, a woman who herself is Thessalian, questionably Greek.

courage, therefore, is undercut, a second-order compromise with real men's manly bravery. Women in the literary record who truly think and act like men, such as Aiskhylos' ferocious construct Klytemestra (*Ag*. 10-11: γυναικὸς ἀνδρόβουλον ... κέαρ), or Herodotos' Artemisia in Xerxes' infuriated exclamation of inversion (Hdt. 8.88), are aberrations. Their examples of killing, governing, and naval commanding contravene experience and thereby threaten established (male, of course) expectations and order (*εὐταξία*, 249D, McInerney 2003: 324). The precedents of such autonomous women trouble men, since these aberrant females do not subordinate themselves to male-kin directives about property and progeny. They are "good to think with", (*bonnes à penser*, in Lévi-Strauss's famous formulation).

Operating on their own, Plutarch's brave women employ trickery to disable threats to their perceived interests – which amount to their male relations' status. Plutarch cites Roman Lucretia's *arete* (250A), but her only violence turns the dagger against herself once she has decided her sexual violation by Tarquin stains her husband's family honor. The point of this comparison between Plutarch's moralizing essay and Apuleius's salacious novel is that when the two authors (rarely) admire women for transgressing womanly expectations, only two reasons justify their flattery of "masculine" courage[168]. Either the females transgress gender bounds in order to defend *their own* "virtue", i.e., their sexual purity and thus their husband's standing, or they impel male kin to fulfill *their* gendered role as protectors of sexual honor[169]. Women who exceed these narrow parameters in "virtue" and manliness (e.g., those who engage in killing, blinding, binding, and raping) are perceived and presented as monstrous threats to natural gender roles. Autonomous women living beyond (male) control regularly "act up", delve in improper sexual relations, and kill, e.g., Klytemnestra[170] and Medea, Quartilla, Petronius' and Apuleius' witches,

168 — McInerney (2003; cf. Halliday *BSA* 1909: 212-19) aptly cites the contrary example of disrespectful "bearded ladies" in Argos (Plut. 245C-F; cf. for the situation: Herodotos. 6.76, 83; Ar. *Pol.* 5.3.7). Patriotic Argive women so far exceeded gender expectations as to fight and die defending their polis against victorious Spartan attackers (ca. 500 BCE). The survivor women were allowed to erect a statue of Ares. On the anniversary of the battle, the Argives founded the transvestite festival curiously called *Hybristika*, in which men and women exchange and don each other's clothes. The licensed interval of transvestism (and artificial beards?) recalls ritual obscenities in *rites de passage* (Halliday 215-17 provides numerous examples). These women subsequently, however, seemed to behave too "uppity" in sex arrangements with their second husbands. Now they were described unflatteringly as "bearded" (as if taking on the rights that only genuine chin hairs provide). A law allegedly remanded them to their second husbands' beds.

169 — When robbers beset the couple (7.7, in Haemus' fabricated tale of inverted gender bravery and dress), even the brave Plotina raises only the hue and cry in emotional agitation. The woman never draws a weapon. It is a truism that, in English too, a woman's honor or virtue consists primarily of her chastity.

170 — Klytemnestra, as Prof. Weber noted, seeks to avenge *her* honor for her husband's

Circe, and Juvenal's sex-crazed noblewomen, Heliodoros' Persian Queen Arsake, and Apuleius' bestial *matrona*, the anonymous seductress who attempts to murder her stepson, and the hoodwinking wife who gets away with copulating in her cuckolded husband's presence in the "tale of the tub". The last recorded Apuleian murderess jams a white-hot poker up the vagina of her bound and naked, already tortured sister-in-law. Stabbing deep to strike her dead, she delivers the ultimate, retaliatory, female sexual insult[171]. Men's acceptable parameters for women responding to threats expect their passive endurance, except for suicide and other actions taken to protect male kin's honor.

IV. Conclusions

Self-control, a virtue that Cupid paradoxically recommends to Psyche (*Met*. 5.12: *religiosa continentia*), was central to the self-presentation of both sexes in nearly all situations challenging normal Roman social expectations. Republican and Imperial society, if examples from popular entertainments provide useful sources (as I think they do), stayed glued together by powerful shaming mechanisms, many of them orchestrated by gender[172]. Young and immature Roman men and women could not always control their feelings of shame, exhibited by visible blushing (e.g., Virgil's Lavinia, Ovid's Pygmalion's ivory statue) and breaking off further face-to-face connection. Social surveillance and policing gladly employs insults, stares, lampoons, and graffiti[173]. Encolpius and Lucius (and Psyche) lose control of self not only by being embarrassed and humilia-

sacrifice of their daughter, but her readiness to execute her son, as well as the perpetrator, nullifies her self-defense argument, aside from her liaison with Aigisthos and her shabby treatment of her daughter Elektra.

171 — 10.4-5, 24: *titione candenti inter media femina detrusor crudelissime necavit*. Cf. 7.28, in which another woman tries to punish the ass *mediis inguinibus* brandishing an *ardentem titionem*, but he defends himself against her attack with *caecitas atque faetor*, drenching her with a stream of excrement: *nisus praesidio liquida fimo strictim egesta faciem atque oculos eius confoedassem*.

172 — A telling pre-classical example of perceptions of *pudicitia* appears in Plaut. *Merc*. 405-8. Why is a beautiful young woman slave deemed a bad companion for a respectable matron? *Quia illa forma matrem familias flagitium sit si sequatur; quando incedat per vias, contemplent, conspiciant omnes, nutent, nictent, sibilent, vellicent, vocent, molesti sint; occentent ostium: impleantur elegeorum meae fores carbonibus*. "Because that [babe] would be a scandal, if she accompanied a respectable woman. Whenever she walked through the streets, all would look her over, ogle her, nod, wink, whistle; pinch, call out, and annoy her. They would serenade at the house entrance and scrawl love poetry on my doors with charcoal". Worse, the *paterfamilias* continues, "now that men are such snide bad-mouthers, they would accuse my wife and me of running a brothel" (*lenocinium*). Goffman would have prized this passage (cf. his 1977 article on gendered embarrassment). Pliny's silver-Latin letters to women friends and dependents reveal similar bourgeois demands that "Caesar's wife [or anyone's!] must be above suspicion". Juvenal's *Sat*. 6 savagely displays the ever popular accusations against women prevalent in the Flavian era and beyond.

173 — Lateiner (1998), Barton (1999) citing Cicero *Rep*. 4.6.6, Verg. *Aen*. 2.540-1 [Achilles], Ovid *Am*. 2.5.36, Pliny Maior *HN* 11.58, 157; Seneca *Ep*. 11.3 [similar to Euripides' Hippolytos].

ted[174] but also by suffering imprisonments, intrusive social exposures, and verbal dressings-down.

Males have domesticated select species and sub-species – cattle, dogs, donkeys, parrots, horses, monkeys – that provide them with help and comfort: labor, food, amusement, and pleasure. Women provide these same benefits – and line-propagating children, too. Species and vocations that threaten the patriarchal order – violent bears, boars, bandits, witches, prostitutes, and blandishing adulteresses[175] – violate those male-initiated codes of civilized social and legal behavior[176]. Men must control and restrain women to prevent threats to their own fragile self-esteem. Thus, they can maintain confidence in their genealogy, believing in the legitimacy of their descendants and their cherished social order. From this point of view, bald Lucius' somewhat voluntary but psychologically and financially pressured contractual submission to, and trust in, the hegemony of the female goddess Isis represents an unexpected and unflattering Victory of the Divine Feminine[177]. Gender discrimination ends only in a bad joke mocking conventional Roman markers of manhood.

Women and men in Apuleius' tale contemplate or perform with sadistic pleasure stoning, hamstringing, and throat slitting, castration, torturous testicle pricking by heavy thorns, and entombing in a dead animal to achieve a slow, painful and stinking death[178]. The bandits propose a slow, punishing execution of Charite (6.31-2). They will sew her into the ass's carcass to starve in stink and suffer a pecking death by worms, dogs, and birds, a stinking Homeric avian excarnation (*morsus ferarum ... vermes ... canes et vultures intima protrahent viscera ... faetor*). This torture and death only matches – arguably mirrors – the repulsive and sadistic ingenuity of state-sanctioned Roman penalties. The authorities arrange carnivorous,

174 — These emotions are made known to readers by the narrators' first-person accounts or, for Psyche, by the internal narrator's fairy-tale omniscience. Perhaps we should add to these uncontrollable feelings "raging hormones", since these individuals find their desires often conflict with perceived interests.

175 — These men and women have chosen, or been forced, to transgress established legal or moral rules.

176 — Meroë and Pamphile turn men into their sexual slaves; resistant males are transformed into animals and stones (2.5, 3.15-16; Shelton 2005: 314). Thelyphron's wife and Lucius' intended sex-spectacle partner poison their husbands from motives of lust, jealousy, and greed. Many of Apuleius' many additions to the Greek *Ass Tale* (cf. Walsh 1970: 71-3) feature women who latently or blatantly subvert and demolish mechanisms of male control.

177 — Shelton's incisive analysis (2005: 329) stops short of this gender paradox, noting only that "in Book ll, Isis provides Lucius *actor* with a new system of meaning". Otherwise, his submission may be part of the parody of the easily seduced convert. Attis' mythic total submission to Cybele including self-castration takes even further the decision to deny a man's sex.

178 — 7.18-19. Recall, in addition, a master's smearing of his bound bondsman, an adulterer, with honey so that he will be eaten alive by ants: 8.22.

state-sponsored and – enforced dramas designed to degrade and execute condemned criminals (10.34, cf. 4.13 and 3.9)[179].

Personal stability (psychic, sexual, and social) seems out of reach to characters in the Roman novels (analogous to Lucius' hunt for the salvific roses necessary to return him to human form). Gender roles are inverted; women by means more foul than fair achieve power and substantial wealth. Giton plays the accommodating passive role for Encolpius, Ascyltus, Eumolpus, and Lichas. Encolpius is tied up and raped by Quartilla's men and women, whipped and spat upon by Circe's retinue, and finally drugged and anally raped by a solicitous witch. Meroë controls Socrates and the fate and location of whole villages, Pamphile bewitches her young male lovers, Photis with less hocus-pocus spells the doom of the sexually opportunistic child of privilege, Lucius. The effeminate *semiviri* (8.28), devotees of the Syrian goddess, sexually exploit both their peasant slave boy-toy and their ass – unconsenting homosexual and bestial impulses to double their repulsiveness. The humble ass Lucius observes a world of exploitation, pain, and humiliation.

Examples of chaotic gender and species behavior ominously mark high imperial Roman injustice[180]. Women in the novels – *scelestae* and *nequissimae* – insult and ignore the bonds of marriage and take adulterous lovers. They may fall in lust with an ass, kill their husbands or terrorize their children[181]. When such a defendant has been convicted of murder, the state demands that the culprit suffer execution – *summa supplicia*[182]. The criminal in this instance must endure a "gender appropriate" humiliation: vaginal rape by an ungulate followed by beast-bitten death. The offenses are repulsive, but the punishments are no better and arguably worse for expecting the community to witness the gruesome spectacle.

179 — This female menace to society has violated all the rules of family solidarity: marriage, motherhood, consanguinity, and affinity (her sister-in-law), even honor among poisoners.

180 — The successful *latrones* of book IV are eccentric brigands (in their speech if not their motives), but they conform to historical evidence of civic disruption and the limited security available to Roman communities, especially in the non-border provinces (Shaw 1993: 305-11). They respect the elite woman Charite's virginity only for its monetary value – either sale to a brothel or ransom by her family and fiancé (4.23, 25; 7.9). Once detained, many bandits who once presented threats to life and property were transformed into civic entertainment, treated like disposable animals in the amphitheater when captured and convicted (10.23, cf. 4.13, 7.13, 8.17). Haemus' successfully deceived and drugged bandits are summarily executed on capture, without trial. Edith Hall (1995) explores the ubiquitous violence of the Greek *Onos* and the perverted, lucky, or lack of justice amusingly portrayed in Apuleius' anonymous Greek predecessor; Shelton (2005: 303-4) anatomizes Apuleius' pervasive theme of gender inversion.

181 — 10.19: *in mei cupidinem incidit ... vesana libido*.

182 — In the case of the attempted poisoning murder (*noxii*) by stepmother (*noverca, mulier*) and slave, the *honestior* would-be killer is only exiled perpetually, while her *humilior* slave accomplice is crucified (10.4-5, 12).

The male proclivity in Apuleius to condemn the entire female sex because of one or another "bad apple" *may* satirize universal male suspicions or merely provide another dead male author who exemplifies that distrustfulness. The ancient double standard of sexual morality disallows or at least diminishes a total condemnation of Lucius' covert affair with his host's unmarried servant Photis. At the same time, he proudly exhorts himself to respect the chastity of Milo's wife (2.6: *genialem torum religios<us> suspice*)[183]. The *castitas* of women as the marked, irresponsible sex falls under constant suspicion and patriarchal surveillance, indeed siege. Seek and ye shall find! Encolpius and Lucius' unreliable observations in their noir environments justify somewhat this male anxiety[184]. Placing trust in any woman or man is futile.

Lucius himself, the moral philosopher and prudent ass (7.12, 10.33) observes the captive Charite happily smiling (7.10: *risu laetissimo*), when she hears she will be sold to a disgusting whorehouse to supply the whoremaster with fresh merchandise, virgin flesh (*talis aetatula*) for a huge profit (*leno, fornix, lupanar spurcum sordidumque, lucrum ... nec levi pretio, magnis talentis*). He reports his outraged, gender-damning reaction: *ut mihi merito subiret vituperatio totius sexus ... et tunc quidem totarum mulierum secta moresque de asini pendebant iudicio*. Lucius, in brief, unself-consciously, but rashly and thus, in manly fashion, condemns Charite and all contemporary women's characters. He has not, however, yet perceived, as Charite has, that the pseudo-brigand Haemus is really the gentleman Tlepolemus, her fiancé and savior. Because the narrator Lucius, reporting this incident later, reflects that all women's reputation depended on an ass's (clearly faulty) judgment, perhaps he (and his creator Apuleius) now questions the appropriateness and accuracy of unrelenting male condemnations of the female sex[185].

How then does the Latin literary genre of fiction (*historia, lepidae fabulae*: no consistent term dominates) – melding as it does epic, tragedy, comedy, satire, historiographical clichés, and other respected genres[186] –

183 — Busy enchanting the handsome lads of Hypata for her sexual satisfaction, she ironically has no interest in producing babies for her miser husband Milo's family and estate. The men who trust their wives are shown to be naive fools, for example, the construction-worker with the vat, the baker, the spouse of the murderess of five.

184 — Cf., e.g., 9.17-22: the tale of Arete, a noble and beautiful wife, Barbarus the cuckolded husband, Myrmex the bribable slave chaperone, and Philesitherus the adolescent Don Juan. The word *castitas* appears only here (9.18), where the woman's celebrated fidelity (cf. Petronius' Ephesian *matrona*) and her husband's obsessive guard inflames the town lothario's lust.

185 — *GCA* VI-VII (1981) 148 argues that Lucius' experiences with women "have been far from satisfactory". This truth does not respond adequately to his similarly sour experiences with men, who are not condemned *qua* males.

186 — Mime contributed much to content and characters found in the eclectic novels (Walsh 1970: 24-8, 98-9; Panayotakis 1995), but it is hard to tell what.

differ from these other genres in its inclusion of Mediterranean habits of gendered affront and disparagement and of gendered compliments? Gendering abuse pervades warriors' flyting in Homer, heroes calling their enemies "women". Allegations of sexual deviance and infidelity populate the Greek and Latin Iambic poets, comedy, nearly all literary genres[187]. The low registers, however, of Petronian and Apuleian society and conversation, soliloquy, and frequent episodes of strenuous lower-body activities[188] amusingly multiply degrading descriptions of opponents, competitors, friends and enemies. The quantity, language, and nature of demeaning episodes distinguish the foul pleasantries of epics, tragedy, and history from those of novels, the later genre featuring comic aspects of vulgarity, while the earlier genres include them for horrific and tragic effects on heroes[189]. Repugnant bodily fluids and sounds, not only those already mentioned but also burps, farts, and vomit, allow characters in the novels to foul their opponents' person or besmirch their reputation, to inflict retributive pollution on those with whom s/he is at odds[190]. Unflattering images and vocabulary populate even the *compliments* at Trimalchio's vernacular banquet[191]. Miserable Encolpius' sexual impotence is thematic and funny to his uncharitable "friends". One or more bystanders laugh at nearly every insult to body or soul that Lucius endures as man and beast.

The sexual adventures – many adulterous scrapes – of Petronius and Apuleius' characters generate internal and external hostile judgments from both sexes. Sexual games and off-limit activities are central to both novels. Sexual anomalies emerge in fixed and shifting examples of male inadequacy and female power. Both men and women come under examination, and unwelcome discoveries and realizations about social vulnerabilities invite, or require, a few compliments but many more gender-specific insults[192].

187 — Opelt 1965 collects insults perpetuated in all genres of Latin literature; see pp. 11-22 for a systematic introduction.

188 — To wit: piss, shit, fart, vomit (by extension from the stomach), and the rich panoply of genital stimulation and satisfaction. The responsive farts and labial imitations traded by Corax and Giton "on the road" (*Sat*. 117: *strepitu obsceno simul atque odore … singulos crepitus pari clamore prosequabatur*) offer an unexpected example of non-gendered and non-hostile lower-bodies, vulgar auto-entertainment.

189 — Thersites, Dolon, Polyphemos, or the beggar Iros could have written novels but not epics.

190 — Cirillo 2009 discusses transfer of disgust in Attic courtroom contexts. He examines public descriptions of impolite conduct. A similar dynamic of revenge and retribution shapes Cicero's extremes of forensic oratory describing Antony's public vomit (e.g., *Phil*. 2.63; Edwards 1992), and perhaps our Latin fictions. In a forthcoming paper I examine evocations of disgust in Apuleius.

191 — Boyce (1991) details the *sermo plebeius vel vulgaris* and the hybrid (thus "impure") character of Trimalchio's conversational contributions. Their vulgar substance, thought, and style undercut his apparent material and personal achievements and those of his lesser friends.

192 — Gendered compliments, as noted above, generally serve ephemeral and selfish purposes. Not surprisingly, these performances of deference focus on physical attractiveness, not philosophical

Bibliography

Adams, J. N. 1982. *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary*, Baltimore.

Adams, J. N. 1983. "Words for prostitute in Latin", *Rh. M*. 126.3-4: 321-58.

Axelson, B. 1945. *Unpoetische Wörter. Ein Beitrag zur Kenntnis der lateinischen Dichter sprache*, Lund.

Barton, C. A. 1999. "The Roman blush: the delicate matter of self-control", in J. I. Porter (éd.), *Constructions of the Classical Body*, Ann Arbor. 212-34.

Borthwick, E. 1967. "A 'femme fatale' in Asclepiades", *CR* 17: 250-4.

Boyce, B. 1991. *The Language of the Freedmen in Petronius*' Cena Trimalchionis, Leiden.

Cirillo, T. 2009. "Transferable disgust in Dem. 54: *Against Conon*", *Syll. Cl*. 20: 1-30.

Corbeill, A. 2004. *Nature Embodied. Gesture in Ancient Rome*, Princeton.

Dickey, E. 2002. *Latin Forms of Address from Plautus to Apuleius*, Oxford and New York.

Duckworth, G. 1952. *The Nature of Roman Comedy*, Princeton.

Dutsch, D. 2012. "Genre, gender, and suicide threats in Roman comedy", *CW* 105.2: 187-98.

Edwards, C. 1992. *The Politics of Immorality in Ancient Rome*, Cambridge.

Edwards, C. 1997. "Unspeakable professions: Public performance and prostitution in ancient Rome", in J. Hallett and M. Skinner (éds.), *Roman Sexualities*, Princeton, 66-95.

Englert, J. and Long, T. 1973. "Functions of hair in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*", *CJ* 68: 236-9.

Fehling, D. 1988 [orig. 1974]. "Phallische Demonstration", in A. K. Siems (éd.), *Sexualität und Erotik in der Antike*, Darmstadt 1988, 282-323.

Fisher, N. 1998. "Violence, masculinity and the law in Classical Athens", in Foxhall and Salmon, 68-97.

Foxhall, L. and Salmon, J. (éds.) 1998. *When Men were Men*, London.

Futre Pinheiro, M. P., Skinner, M. B. and Zeitlin, F. I. (éds.) 2012. *Narrating Desire. Eros, Sex, and Gender in the Ancient Novel*, Berlin and New York.

Gleason, M. 1995. *Making Men. Sophists and Self-Presentation in Ancient Rome*, Princeton.

Goffman, E. 1959. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*, Garden City (Rev.).

insight or moral virtue.

Professor Cliff Weber, emeritus Professor of Classics at Kenyon College, intelligently commented on this paper. Two anonymous readers for *Eugesta* also improved my presentation. None of these helpful critics necessarily agrees with my conclusions, argument, or syntax.

Goffman, E. 1977. "The arrangement between the sexes", *Theory and Society* 4/3: 301-32, repr. in B. Clinchy and J. Norem (1998), *The Gender and Psychology Reader*, New York, 641-66.

Gunderson, E. 2000. *Staging Masculinity. The Rhetoric of Performance in the Roman World*, Ann Arbor.

Hall, E. 1995. "The Ass with double vision: Politicising an ancient Greek novel", in D. Margolies and M. Joannou (éds.), *Heart of the Heartless World. Essays in Cultural Resistance in Memory of Margot Heinemann*, London, 47-59.

Hall, J. 2009. *Politeness and Politics in Cicero's Letters*, Oxford.

Hallett, J. P. 2003. "Resistant (and enabling) reading: Petronius' *Satyricon* and Latin love elegy", in S. Panayotakis, M. Zimmerman and W. Keulen (éds.), *The Ancient Novel and Beyond*, Leiden and Boston, 328-43.

Halliday, W. R. 1909/10. "A Note on Herodotos VI. 83 and the *Hybristika*", *BSA* 16: 212-19.

Harrison, St. 1997. "From epic to novel. Apuleius as reader of Vergil", *MD* 39: 59-73.

Haynes, K. 2003. *Fashioning the Feminine in the Ancient Greek Novels*, New York.

Hindermann, J. 2009. "The elegiac ass: the concept of *servitium amoris* in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*", *Ramus* 38.1: 75-84.

Hoffman, G. 1892. *Schimpfwörter der Griechen und Römer*, Wissensch, Beilage zum Programm des Friedrichs-Realgymnasiums zu Berlin, Ostern.

Hunink, V. 2006. "The 'spurcum additamentum' (Apul. *Met*. 10,21) once again", in W. H. Keulen *et al.*, *Lectiones Scrupulosae, Essays... M. Zimmerman*, Groningen, 266-80.

Jones, M. 2012. *Playing the Man. Performing Masculinities in the Ancient Greek Novel*, Cambridge.

Kelly, J. M. 1976. "'Loss of face' as a factor inhibiting litigation", in *Studies in the Civil Judicature of the Roman Republic*, Oxford, 93-111.

Labov, W. 1972. "Rules for ritual insults", in T. Kochman (éd.), *Rappin' and Stylin' Out*, Urbana and Chicago, 265-314.

Langlands, R. 2006. *Sexual Morality in Ancient Rome*, Cambridge.

Lateiner, D. 1998. "Blushes in the ancient novels", *Helios* 25.2: 163-89.

Lateiner, D. 2001. "Humiliation and immobility in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*", *TAPA* 131: 217-55.

Lateiner, D. 2004. *Homeric Insults. Dis-Honor in Homeric Discourse*, San Diego (35th Burnett Lecture, California State University, San Diego).

Lateiner, D. 2009. "Greek and Roman kissing: Occasions, protocols, methods and mistakes", *Amphora* 8.1: 17-18.

Lytle, E. 2003. "Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* and the *Spurcum Additamentum* (10.21)", *CPh* 98: 349-65.

Makowski, J. F. 2012. "Petronius' Giton: Gender and genre in the *Satyrica*", in Futre Pinheiro *et al.*, 223-33.

May, R. 2005. "Chaste Artemis and lusty Aphrodite: the portrait of women and marriage in the Greek and Latin Novels, in W. Smith (éd.), *Satiric Advice on Women and Marriage from Plautus to Chaucer*, Ann Arbor, 129-53.

McClure, L. 1999. *Spoken like a Woman. Speech and Gender in Athenian Drama*, Princeton.

McCullough, A. 2012. "Gender transformations in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*", in Futre Pinheiro *et al.*, 235-47.

McDonnell, M. 2006. *Roman Manliness*, Cambridge.

McInerney, J. 2003. "Plutarch's manly women", in R. Rosen and I. Sluiter (éds.), *Andreia. Studies in Manliness and Courage in Classical Antiquity*, Leiden, 319-44.

Müller, A. 1913. "Die Schimpfwörter in der römischen Komödie", *Philologus* 72: 492-502.

Opelt, I. 1965. *Die lateinischen Schimpfwörter und verwandte sprachliche Erscheinungen*, Heidelberg.

O'Sullivan, T. 2011. *Walking in Roman Culture*, Cambridge and New York.

Panayotakis, C. 1995. *Theatrum Arbitri. Theatrical Elements in the Satyrica of Petronius*, Leiden.

Rawson, H. 1989. *Wicked Words*, New York.

Richlin, A. 1983/1992. *The Garden of Priapus. Sexuality and Agression in Roman Humor*, Oxford, 2nd éd.

Santoro L'Hoir, F. 1992. *The Rhetoric of Gender Terms. "Man, Woman", and the Portrayal of Character in Latin Prose*, Leiden and New York, Esp. 172-97.

Schmeling, G. 2012. *A Commentary on the Satyrica of Petronius*, Oxford.

Schmidt, V. 1989. "Ein Trio in Bett: Tema con variazioni bei Catull, Martial, Babrius, und Apuleius", *GCN* 2: 63-73.

Shaw, B. 1993. "The Bandit", in A. Giardina (éd.), *The Romans*, Chicago, 300-41.

Shelton, J.-A. 2005. "Putting women in their place: gender, species and hierarchy in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*", in W. Batstone and G. Tissol (éds.), *Defining Genre and Gender in Latin Literature. Esssays Presented to W. S. Anderson*, New York and Bern, 301-29.

Skinner, M. B. 2012. "Fortunata and the virtues of freedwomen", in Futre Pinheiro *et al.*, 199-210.

Taillardat, J. (éd.) 1967. Suetonius περὶ βλασφημίων, Paris.

Van der Paardt, R. T., Zimmerman, M. *et al.* 1971-2007. *Groningen Commentaries on Apuleius'* Metamorphoses, Amsterdam, 9 vols.

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

Wees, H. van 1998. "A brief history of tears: Gender differentiation in archaic Greece", in Foxhall *et al*., 10-53.

Williams, C. 2014?. "The Meanings of Softness: Remarks on the Semantics of *mollitia*", in this issue of *Eugesta*.

Insult websites, *inter alia*, Italian and Sicilian, German, French, and English:
http://www.vnutz.com/curse_and_swear/italian
http://nawcom.com/swearing/italian_sicilian_dialect.htm
www.schimpfwoerter.de "top 50"
francais-oral.wikispaces.com/Lexique+des+insults
www.insults.net