crucial. But I also find myself too often in disagreement with the application of the numerous methodologies H. employs to regard this as more than a tentative first step.

Victoria University of Wellington ARTHUR J. POMEROY
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni083

A CONSERVATIVE *GOLDEN ASS*

J. MARTOS: *Apuleyo de Madauros:* Las metamorfosis *o* El asno de oro. *Volumen I (Libros 1–3). Introducción, texto latino, traducción y notas*. Pp. clv + 68. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 2003. Cased. ISBN: 84-00-08188-9 (84-00-08187-0 set).

J. MARTOS: *Apuleyo de Madauros:* Las metamorfosis *o* El asno de oro. *Volumen II (Libros 4–11). Introducción, texto latino, traducción y notas*. Pp. vii + 226. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 2003. Cased. ISBN: 84-00-08189-7 (84-00-08187-0 set).

The introduction to Martos's edition of *The Golden Ass* is on an ample scale, providing full coverage of Apuleius' life and works, and judicious discussion of the problems familiar to anyone who has seriously engaged with this extraordinary book. Students of Apuleius will find the copious bibliography a valuable resource; Hispanists will be particularly interested in the pages on his reception in Spain, where his influence has been especially strong. In this review I shall concentrate on the distinctive feature of the edition, M.'s critical position and the resulting character of his text.

What he has to say about the transmission of the text essentially reproduces Robertson's conclusions. However, when it comes to the establishment of the text and the reception of conjectures, he parts company with him (I.xcviii). Starting from the indisputable premiss that the idiosyncratic character of Apuleius' language counsels caution, M. follows the post-Robertsonian trend towards conservatism most recently exemplified in the Groningen commentaries, and prints the reading of F 'wherever possible'. It is clearly with some complacency that he suggests that his text may be one of the most conservative ever published (I.xcix–c). I wonder, however, whether he and others who follow the same line have thought seriously about the logical implications of their position? That word 'possible' masks a trap.

An editor who is faced with a corrupt or suspect reading of which no clearly certain emendation has been proposed has three options: to obelize, to accept *faute de mieux* what seems to be the most plausible conjecture among those on offer, or to print what the author at best is very unlikely to have written. M. declines to obelize, and impales himself firmly on the second horn of the resulting dilemma. What comes of this can be illustrated by an instance (less trivial, given the rhetorical and literary power of proper names, than might appear) from the very beginning of the book. At 1.1.3 F offers and M. prints *Spartiaca.* How likely is it that Apuleius should have preferred this otherwise unexampled form of the word to the usual one? That, *doctus* and *philologus* as he was, he should have chosen (supposing that it existed) or coined a form that was shorter and less expressive than the orthodox *Spartiatica* (Salmasius) and could have conveyed no

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

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni084 Published online by Cambridge University Press

special effect? (Contrast his preference of *Graecanica* over *Graeca* a few lines later.) To those who hold with Paul Maas that 'the business of textual criticism is to produce a text as close as possible to the original' (*Textual criticism* [1958], p. 1), this procedure simply does not make sense.

Examples from Book I will suffice to illustrate further the results of M.'s editorial stance. **1.2.2** *emersimus* Leo (*emersime* F ϕ). Given that elsewhere in *Met*. Apuleius consistently employs the regular ablatival construction with or without *e*, and that this would appear to be the only example of transitive *emergo* (= 'quit', 'leave behind') in the entire corpus of extant Latin, what conceivable *literary* point would this most literary of writers have perceived in this deviation from normal usage? **1.2.3** *equi sudorem frontem . . . exfrico*, **1.2.6** *impertite sermones non quidem curiosum*. These are two examples of a recurrent syntactical anomaly offered by the MS tradition. B. Jacquinod, in a carefully argued article (*RPh* 66 [1992], 81–92), manages to show that this is regarded by some as *possible* Latin; but how *probable* is it that Apuleius should have made Lucius divagate suddenly into the *sermo cotidianus* like this, and what would have been the point? (On the importance of this distinction see Kenney, *The Classical Text* [1974], pp. 132–3 = *Testo e metodo* [1995], p. 172.) Cf. below on 1.13.7. **1.4.1** *cibi . . . mea gula spiritus distinentis.* M.'s rendering, 'me cortó el paso del aire por la garganta' is enough in itself to expose the impossibility of this as Latin. Cornelissen's *meacula* hardly differs from the paradosis by one letter, as a glance at pretty well any facsimile of a MS in capital script will confirm, and the word is impeccably formed and attested (Mart. Capell. 8.813). **1.4.2** *proximo*, 'hace poco'. What is the evidence either for adverbial *proximo* or the ellipse of *die*? **1.5.2** *Thessaliam*, 'de Tesalia'. This adjectival form is otherwise unattested, and Apuleius elsewhere uses *Thessalicus.* **1.5.3** *cauponorum*, a *vox nihili*. M.'s rendering, 'mercancias . . . para los taberneros', suggests *cauponiis*, but I cannot find whether that has been proposed (*cauponiorum* Hildebrand, rec. van der Vliet). **1.9.2** *quod uenerem habuit in aliam* (del. Leo). As a variant of the preceding *quod in aliam temerasset* this is superfluous; it is also ineptly expressed and ungrammatical—but, like *quod uinum deorum est* at 6.24.2, it is in F. **1.13.7** *uulnus, quam maxime patebat*, giving syntax which, *pace* Oudendorp, is defensible only if the phrase is taken as a parenthesis; M.'s translation renders *quae.* I note, however, that here M. jibs at the double accusative construction that he is prepared to swallow elsewhere and prints *spongiam* from ς. Since at 1.2.6 the simple correction *sermone* is also offered by ς, it is difficult to see much consistency of practice here. **1.14.1** *postes ad repagula redeunt.* M.'s translation renders what most editors print, *ad postes* (Floridus, Oudendorp). **1.14.2** *perlitus.* M.'s translation, 'bañado', renders what Apuleius obviously wrote, *perlutus*, 'drenched' (Colvius). **1.15.1** *et iam nunc*, which means 'and already' (*TLL* s.v. *iam* 114.4ff. 'i. ἤδη νῦν'), whereas the sense requires 'still' (*etiam* Oudendorp). Since *Met*. must at some stage have been written in *scriptura continua*, this rigid adherence to the *ductus* in F seems peculiarly perverse. **1.15.4** *euolutus*, 'volviéndose', which the word simply cannot mean; he rolls *over* (*reuolutus* Saluasius). Cf. 1.11.8 *me quoque euolutum atque excussum.* **1.24.5** *Pythias*, a woman's name. Oudendorp printed *Pytheas*, ascribing it to 'Vulc. ed. sec.', which I take to be that of 1600 edited by Scaliger. Here M. is at one with the consensus of modern editors, but the general indifference to a basic distinction is odd.

Even in cases where the choices are perhaps not as clear-cut as these seem to me to be, M.'s conservatism strikes me as excessive. **1.5.1** *uidentem*, 'este dios que nos ve'. Not impossible, I grant, but, given Apuleius' expansive style and the Sun's proverbially panoptic vision, how likely? Against it too is 11.15.3, where *uidentem* means 'sighted',

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni084 Published online by Cambridge University Press

not blind. Leo's *omniuidentem* is supported by *sol . . . omnituens* at *De mundo* 29.355. **1.12.2** *infimum*, 'a lo más bajo', surely—even if admissible Latin—a wild *and pointless* exaggeration of a fall from a bed? Helm's *in fimum* (rec. Robertson) has the merit of simplicity, but nowhere else is *fimus* found meaning anything but 'dung' (as elsewhere in *Met*.). No doubt inn floors were apt to be filthy, and colloquial English 'shit' for dirt at least offers an analogy. Hansen's 'on the floor', though dishonest, suggests *in humum*, proposed long ago by Hieronymus Groslotius Listaeus *ap*. Oudendorp, which at least deserves honourable mention. **1.13.3** *reabse.* This raises a nice point. It is not quite true that *reapse* (Beroaldus) is never found in MSS; see Cic. *Rep*. 1.2. However, it is possible that by Apuleius' time *reabse* represented the common pronunciation and was so spelled. Would a careful stylist, who can hardly have been unaware of the etymology, have used it? **1.14.1** *cardines ad foramina resident*. *OLD* s.v. *resideo* comments 'for convenience' sake, *resideo* has been assumed to denote a state, *resido* an action'. That is too defeatist; *resido* in the sense required here, 'settle back', is frequently secured by metre in the poets. **1.21.6** M. prints *cum uxorem . . . comitem habeat* (F^2), but his translation evades the difficulty of *cum*; this is taken by Vallette as concessive, but the connexion of thought is elusive. F itself offers *cum uxore . . . comite habeat*, which can be made to yield sense very simply by reading *habet* (Roaldus, Kronenberg). That *habeo* = *habito* is otherwise attested only in Republican Latin by no means disqualifies it, and *habitat* ($F^2\phi$) perhaps smells of normalization. **1.23.8** *profers*. So also at 2.6.6 *aufers*, 6.13.5 *defers*, 10.16.8 *offers*; but 5.2.3 *refer*. That this form of the imperative is apparently otherwise attested only in the Itala suggests that it is of ancient origin, but I should hesitate to attribute it to a writer who had read as widely in classical Latin literature as Apuleius. It beggars belief to think that he was not conversant with the correct form and did not appreciate the distinction between indicative and imperative.

Among the conjectures that do achieve admittance to M.'s text are a few of his own. They include at **1.7.9** *annosam ac pestilentem condicionem contraho* ($\overline{c}$ *contraho* F). That *condicio* is otherwise unattested in *Met*. (see M.'s note at *CQ* 50 [2000], 626) is less important than the fact that *consuetudinem* (van der Vliet), which M. does not mention, is *vox propria* of a relationship such as this one (*TLL* s.v. 561.46–75 '*i.q. amor, concubitus, matrimonium*') and figures in this sense elsewhere in *Met.*; cf. especially 5.9.6 *consuetudine et affectione roborata* e.q.s. and M.'s note at 6.8.5.

A useful feature is the separate discussion (I.cli–cliv) of the so-called *spurcum additamentum* found in some MSS at 10.21. What conclusively rules out Apuleian authorship is the interpolator's sciolistic howler over what he took to be the names of the fingers; as Fraenkel noted (*Eranos* 51 [1953], 151–4 = *Kl. Beitr. zur klass.* Philol. II [1964], p. 394 n. 2), Hildebrand had already rumbled him in 1842, but apparently did not think it necessary to elaborate the point explicitly.

These volumes are handsomely and accurately produced, though with one tell-tale blemish, on which I have commented before as a sign of the times (*BMCR* 2004.01.13): turned-over colons in the apparatus. I have counted eight of these in vol. I and no fewer than forty-nine (in 219 pages) in vol. II. This is what happens when books are produced by those who have never 'learned that a book [is] not merely to be read, but to be regarded' (P. Meynell, *English Printed Books* [1946], p. 10). There is also one oddity, the numbering in pairs of the pages containing the text and translation. That is, I know, the standard practice of the Budé series, but I have never seen the point of it.

M.'s edition provides much useful information, a serviceable DIY apparatus (though marred by unduly selective reporting of conjectures), and an up-to-date survey of scholarship on the *Metamorphoses*. Libraries should certainly acquire it.

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni084 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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/bni084 Published online by Cambridge University Press