Those who share my view that Apuleius was a better Latinist than Professor Martos appears willing to allow may prefer to continue reading him in Robertson's or Hanson's editions, keeping M. handy for reference.

Peterhouse, Cambridge E. J. KENNEY
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni084

APULEIAN PAPERS

O. PECERE, A. STRAMAGLIA: *Studi apuleiani*. Note di aggiornamento di L. Graverini. Pp. 300, pls. Cassino: Edizioni dell' Università degli Studi di Cassino, 2003. Paper. ISBN: 88-8317-012-1.

This volume gathers the published Apuleian papers of Professors Pecere and Stramaglia along with some 'Note di aggiornamento' added by Luca Graverini. Introducing the book, the authors justify the reprint of these articles mainly on the basis that they would now be difficult to find. Although it is true that they were originally published in miscellaneous volumes or journals not easily available, the weightiest works in the collection are in fact well known and have long been discussed by scholars. This reissue does not incorporate a thorough revision of the texts; only minor additions have been made, and the reader who wishes to see how criticism in this field has developed must be referred to Graverini's notes.

The book begins with two articles by Pecere: the first, 'Esemplari con *subscriptiones* e tradizione dei testi latini. L' Apuleio Laur. 68, 2' (first published in C. Questa, R. Raffaelli [edd.], *Atti del convegno internazionale "Il libro e il testo" (Urbino, 20–23 settembre 1982)* [Urbino, 1984], pp. 111–37), re-examines the most important manuscript for the major works of Apuleius (Laurentianus 68.2, the source of *Metamorphoses*, *Apology*, and *Florida*) and analyzes its subscriptions, which are shown to provide outstanding evidence for the history of these works; concerning both this fact and the identity of Sallustius, the fourth-century revisor of our text, this paper is still relevant. Pecere's second article, 'Qualche riflessione sulla tradizione di Apuleio a Montecassino' (from G. Cavallo [ed.], *Le strade del testo* [Bari, 1987], pp. 99–124), remains one of the most influential contributions on the manuscript tradition of Apuleius' major works; since it challenges the established stemma, based on Laurentianus 68.2, introducing the possibility of an independent transmission, it must be cited in any study or edition of Apuleius' text: see the discussion of its great impact by Graverini (pp. 183–5) and e.g. V. Hunink, *Apuleius of Madauros. Florida. Edited with Commentary* (Amsterdam, 2001), p. 19.

The next chapter, 'Aspetti di letteratura fantastica in Apuleio. *Zatchlas Aegyptius propheta primarius* e la scena di necromanzia nella novella di Telifrone (*met.* 2,27–30)', first published in *AFLB* 33 (1990), 159–220, has also been widely recognized: see D. van Mal-Maeder, *Apuleius Madaurensis. Les Métamorphoses, livre II. Introduction, texte, traduction et commentaire* (Groningen, 2001), p. 367. It comprises a study of this episode and the narrative technique employed with special attention to its main character, the Egyptian Zatchlas.

All the other papers are partial approaches to secondary aspects: among them, 'Otri e proverbi in Apuleio, *met.* 2,32–3,18', by Stramaglia and Francesca Brancaleone (*ZPE* 99 [1993], 37–40), deals with the possible use of proverbs in the struggle against the wineskins; 'Apuleio come *auctor*' (*Studi Umanistici Piceni* 16 [1996], 137–61), by

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni085 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Stramaglia, studies the value placed on Apuleius as an exemplary author before the Renaissance; Priscian, one of the writers that preserve evidence for Apuleius' lost works, is examined by Stramaglia in 'Prisciano e l'*Epitoma historiarum* di Apuleio' (*RFIC* 124 [1996], 192–8); and finally, Annamaria di Piro, in 'Le Metamorfosi di Apuleio nella tradizione indiretta. I testi' (*InvLuc* 17 [1995], 55–76), lists texts quoting narrative fragments of Apuleius.

The book concludes with a valuable bibliography, helpful indexes, and some fine photographs of the most crucial passages in manuscripts. In sum, as these papers have largely not been superseded and are now presented adequately and, above all, supplemented by Graverini's addendum, this book may be practically useful for scholars generally interested in Apuleius.

Universidad de Sevilla JUAN MARTOS
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni085

THE VIGIL OF VENUS

A. CUCCHIARELLI: *La veglia di Venere. Pervigilium Veneris*. Introduzione, traduzione e note. Pp. 167, ills. Milan: Biblioteca Universale Rizzoli, 2003. Paper, €10. ISBN: 88-17-10635-6.

This little late-antique poem has received considerable attention recently, with several editions appearing over the course of the twentieth century, the latest by Formicola in 1998. Cucchiarelli's new edition thus has a lot of competition, and a lot of work to do to advance the scholarship on the *Pervigilium Veneris*. In this C. succeeds admirably by producing a very thorough and scholarly pocket edition, which at just 167 pages achieves considerably more than could reasonably be expected, including in particular a highly detailed commentary.

The dramatic setting of the *Pervigilium Veneris* is on the day before the festival of Venus, and the poem is a combination of a hymn to Venus, to spring, to creation and the recreation of life in spring, and an epithalamium. The anonymous poet, eagerly awaiting the arrival of the goddess, predicts the glories of her coming, moving easily from cosmological themes—the birth of the world in spring, the *hieros gamos* of earth and sky, the birth of the goddess from the foam—through the glories of the natural world—birdsong, the flowery meadows of spring, the green woods—to human life and love, with the repeated refrain 'Cras amet qui nunquam amavit, quique amavit cras amet'. However, in contrast to the entirely positive development of the poem, the ending is sudden and dark, with the poet's plaintive question 'Quando ver venit meum?', and the comparison of the destruction of the poet's Muse through his own silence with the destruction of the silent city of *Amyclae*.

C. begins with an introduction 'la dea, il poeta, la città muta', which looks at the central themes of the *Pervigilium*, the style of the poem, and its public, then moves on to discuss the difficult problem of the poem's date. Arguments have tended to cluster around the second century A.D. (sometimes with attribution to Florus) and the fourth century A.D. (sometimes with attribution to Tiberianus). C., probably rightly, favours the fourth-century dating, but wisely refrains from naming the author. There follow brief but useful studies of the metre and language, poetic models, structure, the putative festival of Venus for which the poem may (just possibly) have been written, its philosophical thought, the manuscript tradition, and the reception of the poem. C.

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni085 Published online by Cambridge University Press