would have welcomed a map of the East, for easier explication of the Parthian and Armenian narratives. *PIR* references would also have been very useful.

What we do have is a very rich feast; M. tackles just about every problem and peculiarity of Tacitus' language and illuminates many historical problems, both of fact and interpretation. To see how widely he has cast his net, I compared the number of lemmata in his treatment of eight choice chapters (5.1–2, 6.16–17, 6.22, 6.28, 6.48, 6.51) with those of E. Koestermann's *maximum opus* (1965) and H. Furneaux (1907^2). Martin and Furneaux are almost identical, Koestermann is more extensive, but his commentary appeared in a series of *Wissenschaftliche Kommentare.* Martin has given his readers, whatever their level of interest and knowledge, very good value indeed. Although his volume is not on the scale of the Cambridge commentary begun by F. R. D. Goodyear, to which he and A. J. Woodman contributed a volume on *Annals* 3, he has satisfied the need for a learned treatment of the final book of the Tiberian hexad. All Taciteans are in his debt.

Emory University HERBERT W. BENARIO

APULEIUS' *FLORIDA*

V. J. C. Hunink (ed.): *Apuleius of Madauros.* Florida. Pp. 258. Amsterdam: J. C. Gieben, 2001. Cased Hfl. 120. ISBN: 90-5063-218-1.

H. here extends his work as a commentator on Apuleius from his successful edition of the *Apology* (Amsterdam, 1997) to the minor rhetorical pieces known as the *Florida.* In doing so, he moves away from the negative view of these exuberant texts (exemplified by a quotation from E. Norden, *De Antike Kunstprosa* [Leipzig, 1909], pp. 600–1, quoted on p. 11) towards a more appreciative assessment that sees them as 'unique examples of Second Sophistic literature' (p. 11), in line with recent publications such as G. Sandy, *The Greek World of Apuleius* (Leiden, 1997) and S. J. Harrison, *Apuleius: Latin Sophist* (Oxford, 2000).

The introduction (pp. 11–24) is short, but nevertheless includes quite extensive discussion of the technical presentation of the commentary (pp. 19–24) at the expense of fuller treatment of critical issues. Here H. reveals an overriding interest in the 'literary aspects and elements of rhetorical strategy' (p. 21) in the *Florida*, which he holds to be 'possibly . . . a dominant factor in the collection' (p. 16). H. does not avoid analysis of the thematic links between individual pieces altogether, but he is reluctant to be drawn into constructing an overall scheme of their order as was attempted by F. Opeku, *A Commentary with Introduction on the Florida of Apuleius* (diss. London, 1974), pp. 14–27, and H. Elsom, *Apuleius and the Writing of Fiction in the Second Century A.D.* (diss. Cambridge, 1984), pp. 60–96—the latter not included in H.'s bibliography. Another area that might have been given more extensive treatment is the degree to which Apuleius' African audience was familiar with the material he uses. H. does not make entirely clear whether he thinks Apuleius needed to provide rather fuller glosses to his classical allusions than would have been required in addressing a Roman audience, for example (cf. p. 17 [general comments], p. 80 [on Antigenidas, *Flor.* 4.1], and p. 151 [on Homer's 'verba . . . volantia', *Flor.* 15.23]). However, the additional information supplied in the case of Alexander ('Alexandro ille, longe omnium excellentissimo regi', *Flor.* 4.1) is not so very different from Horace's 'gratus Alexandro, regi magno, fuit ille' (Ep. 2.1.232). Finally, H. does not always pursue important intertexts fully. Although he notes that K. Mras, 'Apuleius' *Florida* im Rahmen

© Oxford University Press, 2002

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.2.303 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ähnlicher Literatur', *AAWW* 86 (1949), 216, had pointed out the Stoic background for the medical analogy in *Flor.* 23, more detailed discussion would have made the close resemblance between Apuleius' piece and Philo *De Prov.* 2.22, to which Seneca's eponymous treatise is also possibly linked, far more apparent. The indirect relationship between these three works gives an important insight into the intellectual background to the *Florida.*

In the course of the commentary, H. intentionally (p. 22) adopts a rather conservative approach to his task; he avoids entirely, to take just one example, current controversy instigated by revisionist historians concerning the 'Aegyptias disciplinas' of Pythagoras (*Flor.* 15.15)—an issue of no small importance to some Africanists. Instead, H. provides the minimum of relevant information and directs the reader to an impressively wide range of recent publications bearing on the issues raised by the text. Occasionally, one might question whether some obvious authorities (e.g. M. Dillon, *Pilgrims and Pilgrimage in Ancient Greece* [London, 1997]; W. Beare, *The Roman Stage* [London, 1964^{3}]; and R. Jackson, *Doctors and Diseases in the Roman Empire* [Norman, OK, 1988]) have not been wrongly overlooked in favour of more recherché references, but H. generally has an excellent command of current research on Apuleius and his cultural milieu.

With regard to the language of Apuleius in the *Florida*, the evidence could have been pressed rather harder. Relational textbase searches might have revealed further interesting instances of word-plays like 'lucus . . . locus', for instance (besides the cases noted by H., the collocation can be found in many texts, including Plautus *Aul.* 673–5; Virg. *Aen.* 1.441–4, a passage in which the first Punic settlement on the site of Carthage is described; Ovid *Am.* 13.7; Varro *Ling.* 5.8.49; and Rutilius Lupus *Schemata Lexeos* 1.3 [in Halm (ed.), *Rhetores Latini Minores*]—all passages worthy of comment). A further instance of specific importance for the text is 'audendum . . . audiendum', where Cic. *In Verr.* 2.1.2 would have lent additional support to the correction of Vossius at *Flor.* 18.17. On investigation, such wordplays often appear to be far more common than citation of a few specific instances would suggest: the concatenation of 'fellis . . . mellis' (*Flor.* 18.11), for example, appears to be a standard formula in the potions of Pliny the Elder, and 'ratio . . . oratio' (*Flor.* 13.3) seems at times, especially in Cicero, to have been almost a cliché.

The technical presentation of the commentary is meticulous; there is a full index of subjects and an index of passages cited, the text is clearly laid out, and abbreviations are carefully explained. However, the decision to add footnotes to the commentary to distinguish between more and less significant information (p. 22) is regrettable, since it makes an already fragmentary text even more bitty and incoherent. Occasionally, H. departs rather boldly from the text of Helm: he reads 'Crates, inquit, Crates, te manumitte[s]' for 'Crates, inquit, Crate[s]te<m> manu mittit' (*Flor.* 14.2), for example (creating an awkward repetition of the name and losing the performative force of the statement); 'Dux Cynicus in porticum' (*Flor.* 14.6) for 'dux<it> Cynicus in porticum' (missing the pun on 'ducere', 'lead in marriage'); and 'aures spiritu obseratae' (*Flor.* 17.6)—supported by Opeku (1974, ad loc.)—for Désertine's 'aures spurcitie obseratae' (here H.'s preference sits uncomfortably with 'obseratae').

Despite these criticisms, H. has provided in this volume a very serviceable and up-to-date work of reference for these brief but important pieces of evidence for Apuleius' life and rôle as a sophist. It will no doubt be the standard for some time to come.

University of Natal, Durban JOHN HILTON

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.2.303 Published online by Cambridge University Press