





## THE SATYRICON AND THE APOCOLOCYNTOSIS

TITUS PETRONIUS ARBITER is reputedly the author of the *Satyricon*. Historical and literary evidence confirms that he is the same Petronius whose character and strange death in A.D. 66 are so graphically described in Tacitus' *Annals*. As governor of Bithynia and as consul he showed vigour and ability, but his chief talent lay in the pursuit of pleasures, in which he displayed such exquisite refinement that he earned the unofficial title of the emperor Nero's 'arbiter of elegance' (*arbiter elegantiae*). Court rivalry and jealousy contrived to cast on Petronius the suspicion that he was conspiring against the emperor, and he was ordered to commit suicide. His death was as stylish as his life. As he died, he passed his last hours in social amusement and the composition of a catalogue of Nero's debaucheries. Petronius was also the author of a small collection of lyric and elegiac poems.

The *Apocolocyntosis* is generally attributed to Seneca and there are good political and personal grounds for giving it a place among his more serious prose works and verse tragedies. It deals with the frustrated attempt of the unpopular emperor Claudius to claim his place among the Olympian Gods. A tissue of irony, parody and satire in a Menippean miscellany of prose and verse, it is a slight but highly artistic creation only understandable against the literary and political background of the age of Nero.

J. P. SULLIVAN held appointments in Classics or Arts and Letters at the Universities of Oxford, Cambridge, Texas, Buffalo, Minnesota and Hawaii. His last position was as Chair and Professor of Classics at the University of California, Santa Barbara. He wrote *The Satyricon of Petronius: A Literary Study*, *Propertius: A Critical Introduction*, *Literature and Politics in the Age of Nero* and *Martial: The Unexpected Classic*. He also edited, with A. J. Boyle, *Roman Poets of the Early Empire* and *Martial in English* for Penguin Classics. John Sullivan died in April 1993.





# PETRONIUS THE SATYRICON AND SENECA THE APOCOLOCYNTOSIS

*Revised edition*

TRANSLATED  
WITH INTRODUCTIONS AND NOTES BY  
J. P. SULLIVAN

PENGUIN BOOKS



Published by the Penguin Group

Penguin Books Ltd, 80 Strand, London WC2R 0RL, England

Penguin Putnam Inc., 375 Hudson Street, New York, New York 10014, USA

Penguin Books Australia Ltd, 250 Camberwell Road, Camberwell, Victoria 3124, Australia

Penguin Books Canada Ltd, 10 Alcorn Avenue, Toronto, Ontario, Canada M4V 3B2

Penguin Books India (P) Ltd, 11 Community Centre, Panchsheel Park, New Delhi – 110 017, India

Penguin Books (NZ) Ltd, Cnr Rosedale and Airborne Roads, Albany, Auckland, New Zealand

Penguin Books (South Africa) (Pty) Ltd, 24 Sturdee Avenue, Rosebank 2196, South Africa

Penguin Books Ltd, Registered Offices: 80 Strand, London WC2R 0RL, England

[www.penguin.com](http://www.penguin.com)

This translation of *The Satyricon* published 1965

Reprinted with revisions 1969

Reprinted with revisions 1974

Reprinted with *The Apocolocyntosis* 1977

Revised Edition 1986

28

This translation of *The Apocolocyntosis* first published

in the United States of America in *Arion*, University of Texas, 1966

Copyright © J. P. Sullivan, 1965, 1969, 1974, 1977, 1986

All rights reserved

Except in the United States of America, this book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form of binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser





IN MEMORIAM

BETTY RADICE

---



# CONTENTS

---

## PETRONIUS

### *Introduction*

The Authorship and Date of the *Satyriam*

The Extent of the Work and the Plot

The Literary Qualities of the *Satyricon*

On the Text and Translation

### *Acknowledgements*

## THE SATYRICON

### PUTEOLI

### DINNER WITH TRIMALCHIO

### EUMOLPUS

### THE ROAD TO CROTON

### CROTON

## THE FRAGMENTS AND THE POEMS

### List of Characters

### Notes on the *Satyricon*

### Notes on the Fragments and Poems

## SENECA

### *Introduction*

The Authorship and Date of the *Apocolocyntosis*

The Place of the Work in Seneca's Writings

---

The Literary Qualities of the *Apocolocyntosis*

On the Text and Translation

THE APOCOLOCYNTOSIS OF THE DIVINE CLAUDIUS

Notes on the *Apocolocyntosis*



## INTRODUCTION

### The Authorship and Date of the *Satyricon*

The *Satyricon* has been traditionally, and rightly, attributed to the courtier of Nero whose downfall and death in A.D. 66 are described by Tacitus (*Annals* 16.17–20):

17. So the space of a few days saw the fall, in the same bloody action, of Annaeus Mela, Cerialis Anicius, Rufrius Crispinus, and Petronius, Mela and Crispinus being Roman knights of senatorial status...

18. Gaius Petronius deserves a further brief notice. He spent his days sleeping and his nights working and enjoying himself. Industry is the usual foundation of success, but with him it was idleness. Unlike most people who throw away their money in dissipation, he was not regarded as an extravagant sensualist, but as one who made luxury a fine art. His conversation and his way of life were unconventional with a certain air of nonchalance, and they charmed people all the more by seeming so unstudied. Yet as proconsul in Bithynia and later as consul, he showed himself a vigorous and capable administrator. His subsequent return to his old habits, whether this was real or apparent, led to his admission to the small circle of Nero's intimates, as his Arbiter of Elegance. In the end Nero's jaded appetite regarded nothing as enjoyable or refined unless Petronius had given his sanction to it. Consequently the jealousy of Tigellinus was aroused against him: he saw Petronius a rival, someone superior to himself in the whole art of pleasure. So he worked upon the Emperor's cruelty, his master-passion, to which all his other lusts were subordinate. Accusing Petronius of being an intimate of Scaevinus, he bribed a slave to give evidence against him. Petronius did not have a chance to reply and Tigellinus threw most of his household into prison.

19. The Emperor at that time happened to be on a visit to Campania. Petronius got as far as Cumae and was prevented from going any further. He refused to prolong the suspense that hope or fear involved. Not that he was hasty in taking leave of his life. On the contrary, he opened his veins and then, as the fancy took him, he bound them up or re-opened them, and in the while talked with his friends, but not on serious topics or anything calculated to win admiration for his courage. He listened to their contributions – not discussions about the immortality of the soul or the opinions of philosophers, but simple gay songs and light verses. He dealt out rewards to some of his slaves and floggings to others. He began a lavish dinner and took a nap, so that his death, although forced on him, should appear natural. Even in the codicils to his will, unlike most of the victims, he refused to flatter Nero or Tigellinus or anyone else powerful. Instead he wrote out a full description of the Emperor's vicious activities, giving the names of his male and female partners, and specifying the novel forms his lust had taken. This document he sent under seal to Nero. Then he broke his signet ring in case it should be used later to endanger others.

20. Nero's puzzlement as to how his nocturnal ingenuities were known was resolved by blaming Silia. This was a not insignificant person, a senator's wife, in fact, who had been a chosen partner in all the Emperor's vices and also a close friend

of Petronius. She was exiled, an example of personal hatred, for her lack of discretion about what she had seen and experienced.

---

Plutarch, in his essay *On the Distinction Between Flattery and Friendship* (60 d-e), adds an anecdote which may throw some light on Petronius' character and the methods by which he retained for a time his position with Nero:

These are minor faults. Next, however, comes that unscrupulous practice which has such a damaging effect on silly people. This consists in accusing them of tendencies and weaknesses the very opposite of their real failings... This may take the form of sneering at reckless and extravagant spenders for their petty-minded and sordid ways – Titus Petronius did this with Nero.

Finally the elder Pliny in his *Natural History* (37.20) tells us that

T. Petronius, a consular, when he was going to die through Nero's malice and envy, broke his fluorspar wine-dipper so that the Emperor's table would not inherit it. It had cost 300,000 sesterces.

It is likely that Pliny and Plutarch are right in giving his praenomen as Titus, and that Tacitus, who occasionally slips in such matters, was wrong to call him Gaius. The name 'Arbiter' given him in the MSS was probably not his real cognomen, but a soubriquet which Tacitus too was familiar. He has been most convincingly identified with T. Petronius Niger, who was consul in July–August A.D. 62.<sup>1</sup>

However this may be, for centuries the dating of the *Satyricon* to Neronian times and the attribution of the work to Nero's courtier has been hotly disputed, and counter-suggestions range from the time of Augustus to the late second century A.D., but there has been no consensus among the opponents of a Neronian dating. It would be temerarious to consider the whole discussion closed, but for the general reader, the main arguments for accepting the dating and attribution may be summarized as follows. The historical and economic references in the work point to the first century A.D.<sup>1</sup> The language and style belong to the same period; for example, the vulgarisms introduced into the speech of Trimalchio and his circle may be paralleled not only in the Senecan *Apocolocyntosis* (a work which surely belongs to the Neronian era),<sup>2</sup> but also in the wall-inscriptions preserved at Pompeii, all of which must belong to the period before A.D. 79. The literary criticism in the work is very like the criticisms (particularly of rhetoric) that we find in other writings of the first century. And, in particular, the criticism prefacing the *Carmen de Bello Civili* (118 ff.), which seems directed at Lucan (died 30 April A.D. 65) without mentioning his name, can only be appropriate to the few years during which the *Pharsalia* was written and partially published. The literary sources of the



work, including the imitation of Senecan tragedy in c. 89, the citations from other authors, and arguably the literary intentions (which I shall discuss below), all fit this dating. The author of the work was obviously a highly literary and literate man; the court circle of Nero, with a Emperor of such literary ambitions, would be naturally interested in criticism and literature. Consequently it is difficult to believe that the courtier Petronius became *elegantiae arbitrius* (Arbiter of Elegance) simply because he knew which end of a spoon was which or how best to flavour wine, although it is perhaps significant that much of the satire directed against Trimalchio is satire of manners, not excluding table manners. The psychological similarity so frequently alleged between the man and the work, even if this is extended to the voyeurism which seems a characteristic of both, is perhaps too dubious to argue from,<sup>3</sup> but in addition to the considerations adduced above, one or two detailed arguments may be singled out from the mass of more disputable historical parallels and references.

We know from the evidence of certain glass cups and inscriptions that Petraites (or Tetrates) was a famous gladiator of the time of Nero. A gladiator Petraites is mentioned twice by Trimalchio (52.3 and 71.6): he has Petraites' fights decorating cups in his possession and he wants them depicted on his tomb. Similarly, two other Imperial entertainers, who can be dated fairly precisely, are both mentioned in the *Satyricon*: Menecrates, a lyre-playing protege of Nero's, and Apelles, a *tragoedus* (tragic actor) contemporary with Caligula. The mention of these two in the *Satyricon* fits precisely their actual chronological relationship.<sup>1</sup>

Such close coincidences as these, as well as the broad similarities between the narrative of the *Satyricon* and the linguistic, historical and economic background of the Roman world of the first century A.D., make the long-continued dispute about the dating of the work very puzzling, until one recalls the strange but not yet entirely quashed Baconian heresy of Shakespearean studies. Perhaps the identification of Tacitus' Petronius and our author, like the attribution of the *Apocolocyntosis* to the philosopher Seneca, seemed to some too good to be true.<sup>2</sup> Unfortunately the attempts to date the *Satyricon* to periods ranging from late in the reign of Augustus (Beck) to the reign of Commodus (Marmorale), a time span of about two centuries (A.D. 10 to A.D. 192), suffer from two main defects: first, the need to postulate lost literary works upon which the author of the *Satyricon* is dependent for his imitations and parodies; second, the lack of a theory about the artistic impulsion and literary ambience of the author, whoever he was. If, on the other hand, the Neronian dating is accepted, we have more insight into the circumstances and motivation of the author of the *Satyricon*.

According to Tacitus (*Annals* 14.16), in A.D. 59 Nero established a literary circle which went into session after dinner. It was made up of associates with some facility for verse whose abilities had not yet attracted public attention. Here they would revise half-complete works or offer impromptu compositions for the Emperor's criticism and revision, since Nero was supposed to have a happy knack for such things, having been taught extempore composition by Seneca. There is evidence that membership of this circle led to political advancement.<sup>1</sup> M. Cocceius Nerva, the future Emperor (A.D. 96–8) belonged to it. Born in A.D. 35, he was only two years older than Nero, who hailed him as the Tibullus of his age and had a high respect for his critical powers (Martial 8.70; 8.26). Later he played a vigorous role in the suppression of the Pisonian conspiracy and was praetor in A.D. 66. Aulus Vitellius, another future Emperor (A.D. 68), also participated in Nero's literary activities; he presided at the *Neronia*, Nero's great literary and musical festival, and even after Nero's death arranged a recital from the *liber dominicus*, a collection of Neronian verse (Suetonius *Vitellius* 4; 11).

Silius Italicus, author of the *Punica*, was also close to Nero (Pliny *Letters* 37), becoming consul in A.D. 68; his contribution to the rampant literary activity at court was presumably the *Ilias Latina*, now thought to be his work. Fabricius Veiento, a satirist whose *Codicilli* attacked the senate and the priestly colleges, also rose to high honours and influence before his exile (Tacitus *Annals* 14.3). Perhaps even Titus, another future emperor (A.D. 79–81), displayed his well-known artistic gifts in the circle.

Others could be mentioned, although the most talented was obviously the poet Lucan whose gifts, according to the *Voss Life*, promoted him to a premature quaestorship before his fatal break with the Emperor.

Into the circle, then, came T. Petronius Niger after his consulship in A.D. 62. He soon gained enormous influence over Nero, as his unofficial title of Arbiter of Elegance proves. His tastes, given Nero's enthusiasm for literature, must have been exercised in literary ways as well as in material refinements. His political power at court must have grown correspondingly; otherwise Tigellinus would not have grown jealous of him and encompassed his downfall. The *Satyricon*, so preoccupied with matters of taste, social and literary, and reflecting the growing hostility at court to the Annaean family, particularly to Seneca and Lucan, was the perfect vehicle for Petronius' talents. There was also the additional advantage that the chosen form did not constitute a challenge to Nero's own literary work, which was essentially neo-Alexandrian poetry on such topics as the Sack of Troy, Attis, and Poppaea

amber hair.

---

## The Extent of the Work and the Plot

---

There are indications in our MSS which, if they are to be trusted, indicate that the extant portions and some fragments of the *Satyricon* may belong to Books XIV, XV, and XVI of the whole; this would mean that the work was originally perhaps twenty books long (six or ten times its present length), if it was ever finished – a great but not impossible length for a work of this sort. As we have it now, the text is interpolated, corrupt and fragmentary. It is possible indeed that the market episode (c. 12 ff.) and the Quartilla episode (c. 16 ff.) are misplaced and belong to a slightly earlier part of the work (to Book XIV, if we could trust the interpolator of Fulgentius). But this has not yet been proved, and the abruptness of the transitions and the very odd sequence of meals in the earlier part of the work as we have it may be due simply to the loss of the connecting narrative. I have, therefore, left these episodes in the traditional place. I have followed the same practice with the occasional traces of a double tradition. It is tempting in the Quartilla episode to rearrange and amalgamate, as Gaselee did, the two entrances of the catamite or catamites, and elsewhere in the text to remove the brief summaries of the action which are found in our MSS as part of the actual narrative. But a translation is not the place to do this: this is an editor's work. I have therefore translated the whole text, including most of the interpolations once deleted by Müller, Fraenkel, and others, and excluding only certain obvious glosses.<sup>1</sup> After some consideration I have not interrupted the translation with summaries to bridge the gaps between the various fragments, nor have I relocated certain of the poems attributed to Petronius to those places in the main text where scholars have argued (quite plausibly) for their insertion. On the whole the plot is fairly clear in the important essentials, and the intelligent reader can easily work out what must have been happening.

A brief recapitulation of the earlier lost episodes as they can be reconstructed from allusions in the work may be worth giving. The plot seems to consist of the adventures of the narrator Encolpius: sometimes he plays a direct part and is closely involved; at other times he is merely a witness of certain events. Trimalchio's dinner-party is the best example of this. Such a loose plot obviously and deliberately allows for frequent digressions, e.g. discussions of literature, short Milesian tales like 'The Widow of Ephesus', parodies, and poems of varying length. Nevertheless what gives some tenuous continuity to Encolpius' adventures is the basic plot: the wrath of the ithyphallic deity, Priapus, against the inadequate hero. The comic motif (*gravis ira Priapi*) is patently based on the wrath of Poseidon against Odysseus

the *Odyssey*. This is not to suggest that the whole *Satyricon* was a close parody of the *Odyssey*, but merely that the unifying theme and certain subsidiary motifs were deliberately drawn from the *Odyssey*; the same may be said of several of the extant Greek novels.

So Encolpius at some point has offended Priapus (perhaps by impersonating him in some sexual ceremonies), and unfortunately, through various mishaps, he continues to offend the god. Shortly before the surviving portion of the work begins he and his two companions have witnessed and interrupted some secret Priapean rites conducted by the priestess Quartilla, perhaps near the long tunnel which links Naples and Puteoli, and still later in the work he kills a goose sacred to the god. Consequently the enmity of this powerful deity dogs him at intervals. Presumably for this reason he is still a poor exile, wandering from place to place living by his wits. There are some indications that he first fell foul of Priapus in Massilia (Marseilles); he may have been exiled from that city (after a year's entertainment at public expense) to avert a plague. If the doubtful evidence can be trusted, he then took a hazardous journey by sea to Italy. He may have been in Rome for a while. Somewhere he was providentially rescued from the gladiatorial arena. His activities, it is clear, frequently cause him to run foul of the law and account for his constant travels and his low connections.

In Italy, Encolpius takes up with various companions, still living by theft and fraud and hospitality. He seems to be moving down through Italy. At some point he is taken up by Lichas, a Tarentine ship owner, who is attracted by him. Encolpius, however, seduces his wife Hedyle, commits some terrible outrage on Lichas himself in the portico of Hercules at Baiae, the famous pleasure resort in South Italy, just above Puteoli, the *Graeca urbs* in which the surviving portion of the story opens. He also steals the robe and sacred rattle of the goddess Isis from Lichas' ship. In the same area, and no doubt about the same time, he falls in with the famous courtesan Tryphaena, who becomes his mistress. But becoming jealous of her fondness for the young and handsome Giton, whom he had at some point seduced and taken under his wing, he procures her public disgrace and runs off with Giton. Jealousy is a trait of Encolpius. Meeting Ascylltus, a young man very like himself, Encolpius tries to keep his relationship with Giton secret from him. The three of them are all involved in the murder of a certain Lycurgus, whose villa they then rob. The proceeds of this they sew up in a ragged tunic for safety, but during a temporary separation, perhaps while stealing an expensive cloak from some country people, Encolpius loses the cloak with the stolen money inside. Ascylltus plainly suspects his companion's honesty. This sort of conflict, added to the jealousy over

Giton (not the last occasion on which Encolpius suffers from it), eventually causes the break up of the trio.

From the fragments, if they are connected with the novel, we might deduce that the end of the work took place in Egypt and Encolpius finally saw the end of his misfortunes and returned safely home to peace and quiet.

It is not always easy to decide the order of the above events. As I have said, it is not impossible that some of the earlier episodes in the extant fragments are misplaced (e.g. the attempt to sell the stolen cloak). If the present ordering in the MSS is accepted, then we find the trio lodged in Puteoli and associating as men of culture with the teacher of rhetoric Agamemnon, who has a school there. Encolpius is in the middle of a discussion of the present system of rhetorical education with him, when the work as we have it abruptly opens.

# The Literary Qualities of the *Satyricon*

---

The dubious reputation of the *Satyricon* from quite early times and its unfortunate association with literary *curiosa*, privately printed editions and copies bound in black morocco, have militated against much serious discussion of the work as literature until comparatively recently. Many have recognized its value, but as one Frenchman said, ‘*On lit Pétrone, on n’y cite pas.*’ The German scholar Niebuhr (1776–1831) summarized the accepted opinion when he remarked:

The disgusting indecencies of which the remains of Petronius are full... give him so bad a name, that he who confesses an intimate acquaintance with the fiction, and expresses gratification in it, exposes himself to a severe judgement, and affords a good opportunity for the display of sanctimonious hypocrisy.

A modern reader is unlikely to have much patience with such strictures, being reared on a gamier fare than anything Petronius provides. In the words of Judge Woolsey on Joyce’s *Ulysses*, the few sections to which exception might be taken are ‘emetic’ rather than ‘aphrodisiac’, and these are ingredients inseparable from Petronius’ literary purposes. The final word on this aspect of the *Satyricon* was said by D. H. Lawrence in a letter to Lady Ottoline Morrell (dated 1 February 1916):

He startled me at first, but I liked him. He is a gentleman when all is said and done... Petronius is straight and above board. Whatever he does, he doesn’t try to degrade and dirty the pure mind in him.<sup>1</sup>

There have been many characterizations of the *Satyricon* and for most of them there is some evidence in the work. It has been seen as an early picaresque novel like *Gil Blas*, *Guzman d’Alfarache* or even *Don Quixote*, the parody on knightly romances being matched by the parody on the *Odyssey* which runs through the *Satyricon*; alternatively, it has been interpreted as a homosexual parody on the conventional Greek romance about star-crossed but faithful lovers; it has been regarded simply as a connected collection of Milesian tales and comic sketches; it has been described as an elaborate satire on the basis of Epicurean morality against the violent and frustrating passions of greed, sex and anger; or, even more frequently, it has been taken as the first realistic novel in European literature.<sup>2</sup> The disconnected nature of the fragments, the loss of so much of the work, and the diversity of what remains, all make it hard to classify, even though there is something critically inadequate about throwing up one’s hands and agreeing to regard it as something of a *beau monstre*, some unique portent like *Tristram Shandy*, *Finnegans Wake*, or Pound’s *Cantos*, works that are at once a beginning and an end.

The best way to understand its nature is to consider it organically as a development of literary tradition in the context of a certain milieu; it will be found to be, I believe, an explicable literary phenomenon whose features cease to surprise us and so cease to baffle our evaluation. In this way one may explain all the features which have led to one-sided characterizations of the work, while dispensing with those equally one-sided comparisons with single works of earlier or later literature which often serve to hide its exact nature.

Formally, the work belongs to the tradition of Menippean satire,<sup>1</sup> a moralistic and humorous *mélange* of prose and verse invented by Menippus of Gadara in the first half of the third century B.C. This was imitated and developed in Rome by M. Terentius Varro (116–27 B.C.) We know that it was an available form in Neronian times from the evidence of the extant *Apocolocyntosis* by Petronius' contemporary, the younger Seneca (see below, pp. 200 ff.), a serio-comic squib directed against the dead Emperor Claudius. Certainly a major characteristic of Menippean satire was the union of humour and philosophy (or whatever political, moral or aesthetic basis an author might substitute for this).

We cannot, however, say off-hand that Petronius' motive in writing his work was predominantly satirical in our sense, for he differs vastly from Persius, the other Neronian satirist who has survived. But what we can say with fair assurance is that, granted the continuance of a Roman tradition of Menippean satire, the very form and loose structure of Menippean satire might be attractive to the sort of genius and temperament we find in Petronius. It would require merely the enlargement of its potentialities to become an ideal vehicle of Petronius' literary abilities. As was said earlier, it would be highly unlikely that Nero's Arbiter of Elegance was not a literary arbiter as well as an arbiter of more tangible refinements. If this was so, Menippean satire was a perfect form for literary criticism, both directly and through parody, particularly as the fashion of writing books of criticism was not yet so firmly established as with us, and criticism was generally offered in satire form. It was also allowed for the exercise of Petronius' admittedly meagre verse talents, with the additional advantage that their attribution to fictional *personae* would not constitute any very high claims for their merit. The final and rather extraneous attraction of the form would be its suitability for the continuous recitals of which Nero's literary court circle was undoubtedly fond.

Yet for all its formal seductions, Menippean satire was still a branch of Roman satire whose characteristic content had gradually become – despite its earlier broadness –



- [download online Children of the Night \(Diana Tregarde, Book 1\) pdf, azw \(kindle\), epub, doc, mobi](#)
- [read online \*\*Low Carb High Fat and Paleo Slow Cooking: 60 Healthy and Delicious LCHF Recipes pdf\*\*](#)
- [La Maison Tellier pdf, azw \(kindle\)](#)
- [read online \*Unmasking the Social Engineer: The Human Element of Security\*](#)
- [download All the Essential Half-Truths about Higher Education pdf, azw \(kindle\), epub, doc, mobi](#)
- [Black House online](#)
  
- <http://www.freightunlocked.co.uk/lib/Children-of-the-Night--Diana-Tregarde--Book-1-.pdf>
- <http://creativebeard.ru/freebooks/Low-Carb-High-Fat-and-Paleo-Slow-Cooking--60-Healthy-and-Delicious-LCHF-Recipes.pdf>
- <http://drmurphreesnewsletters.com/library/Labyrinth-of-Night--Near-Space--Book-4-.pdf>
- <http://www.uverp.it/library/AfterShock--What-to-Do-When-the-Doctor-Gives-You--or-Someone-You-Love--a-Devastating-Diagnosis.pdf>
- <http://tuscalaural.com/library/All-the-Essential-Half-Truths-about-Higher-Education.pdf>
- <http://reseauplatoparis.com/library/Black-House.pdf>