

Perry, Ben Edwin, The Ancient Romances (Univ. of Calif. Press) 1967

p. 27 taste; yet all three are writing "novels." Consider too how very different in their outlook and character are the novels of Stevenson, Thackeray, Dickens, Scott, and Hardy in the nineteenth century; but they are all spokesmen of a culture that we think of/as the same, something distinct from what preceded and followed it.

p. 40 Like many others who speak about "development," with the easy feeling that the word of itself will carry conviction or pass unchallenged, Ludvikovsky does not realize what it implies in terms of actual literary practice and human behaviour. In the sense in which he uses it in explaining the origin of romance it will not bear examination.

p. 42 Although I cannot accept Ludvikovsky's theory of how the romance originated, I wish, nevertheless, to repeat that his essay contains much that is vital and stimulating . . .

Chariton and the Nature of Greek Romance

p. 96 Thanks to the recovery of fragments written on papyrus in the second century after Christ, it is now generally believed that Chariton's story of Chaereas and Callirhoe is the earliest of all our extant Greek romances. The nature of the book itself, considered from a literary-historical viewpoint in comparison with the other extant romances, is such as to confirm this belief in a positive way; so much so that the relatively early dating of Chariton which we now accept on the basis of documentary evidence was maintained on grounds of style and content alone by one scholar, Professor Wilhelm Schmid, before the papyri were discovered, and at a time when historians of literature had long been unanimous in supposing that Chariton was the latest of the ancient romancers and that he lived in the fifth or sixth century. This misconception about the date of Chariton, which prevailed throughout the nineteenth century, was largely responsible for what we now

know to have been an upside-down orientation of the whole problem of Greek romance.