(especially of the Neronian era), it would be fair to stress in conclusion the value of her sophisticated study of this important topic.

University of Glasgow COSTAS PANAYOTAKIS

APULEIUS

G. Magnaldi, G. F. Gianotti (edd.): *Apuleio. Storia del testo e interpretazioni*. Pp. 332. Turin: Edizioni dell'Orso, 2000. Paper, L. 40,000. ISBN: 88-7694-445-1.

This collection of essays falls into two main parts: six deal with the history of the text of Apuleius' works, four concentrate on various literary and philosophical aspects. Only the first two were specially written for this volume: 'Codici ed edizioni' by the two editors is a useful summary of the textual history of the main Apuleian MS (**F** = Laurentianus 68.2, *saec.* XI, containing *Metamorphoses*, *Apologia*, and *Florida*), including a paleographical description, the history of scholarship in constructing the *stemma*, and finally the early editions. The other strand of the transmission, that of the philosophical works, is also treated. This paper, although offering only a few new insights into the problem, is a clear presentation of the latest views on the text of Apuleius' main works as all deriving from **F**. This view of a single transmission is also supported in the second essay, where Magnaldi collates the MSS **F** and **A** (Ambrosianus N 180 sup., *saec.* XIV) anew, with the same results.

The third essay (by M., an extended version of one in *Sileno* 22 [1996]) treats the problem of verbal repetitions in **F** (e.g. *Met.* 4.2 *in odori* or 11.1 *alacer*) as presenting both false and emended readings within the text of the same MS, confirming the theories of Oudendorp and Helm.

M. and Gianotti together publish as the fourth essay two papers they gave at the *Colloque Ad Usum Delphini*, Grenoble, 28–29 March 1997, with a thorough description and interpretation of the Delphin edition of Julien Fleury (Paris, 1688). The fifth paper is a reprint of De Biasi's emendation *udus* for *sudus* in *Met*. 4.31 (*RFIC* 118 [1990]). The sixth essay, by Donini and G., reprints their article in *RFIC* 110 (1982), which discusses Apul. *Soc.* 1.117–19 Oudendorp. The claim in n. 7 that their emendation has been adopted in the Teubner edition of Apuleius' philosophical works by Moreschini (1991) is, however, only partly true: his text differs in two instances (*sui*/*suam* and *radios*/*radiis*) from the one they offer.

The second part of the book is less coherent and sequential (papers 7–10). It starts with G.'s very basic introduction to the life and times of Apuleius, together with a summary of his main works (including fragments and short paragraphs on the debated works). G. gives a portrait of Apuleius as a child of his times, i.e. the Second Sophistic, and of how his different works form a continuous philosophical picture (a fruitful approach; cf. also S. J. Harrison, *Apuleius: a Latin Sophist* [Oxford 2000], Chapter 1). This introduction, an extended version of a paper written for I. Lana and E. V. Maltese (edd.), *Storie della civiltà letteraria greca e latina* III (Turin, 1998), would surely have served better as the introduction to the whole volume.

Donini's study (no. 8), already published in M. Vegetti and M. Abbate (edd.), *La Repubblica di Platone nella tradizione antica* (Naples, 1999), is less focused on Apuleius and literary material. He deals with the concept of justice in Middle Platonism, but mainly in Aspasius, with whom he contrasts Apuleius' philosophical approach.

The remaining two papers address very particular Apuleian issues. De Biasi's

© Oxford University Press, 2002

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.1.79 Published online by Cambridge University Press

detailed article on landscape ekphrasis in Apuleius, already published in *Memorie dell' Accademia delle Scienze di Torino: Classe di Scienze Morali* XIV (1990), argues that most ekphraseis of landscape are functional within the narrative, ranging from descriptions necessary for the plot (e.g. steep hills causing the donkey to tire) to pathetic fallacy (a term he does not use). In his second category, functional but not descriptive mentions of landscape (e.g. *fluvius* or *campus*), it is difficult to see the landscape character of some of his entries, e.g. *navigabant* 4.12 or *populos circumibat* (5.28). The instances in his third category, descriptive but not functional, are even more doubtful, since De Biasi himself provides intepretations for their functions—one of his examples, the temple of Ceres (6.1), is explained as functional in portraying a sacred landscape, but this, he argues, is non-functional within the narrative. He also applies these categories to the other works of Apuleius.

The last paper, by Fiorencis and G., deals with Phaedra and Hippolytos in *Met*. 10.2–12 (already published in *MD* 25 [1990]). The authors stress the multivalent nature of the Phaedra-story, which Apuleius has turned from a tragedy into the tale of an ordinary provincial woman, scandalous and unsympathetic. They argue that Apuleius' 'Phaedra' is the result of all her literary predecessors rather than of one particular model (not taking up the challenge offered by O. Zwierlein, *Senecas Phaedra und ihre Vorbilder* [Stuttgart, 1987], who traces it back to Sophocles), and they stress the differences with the other Phaedras, e.g. that she does not die but is sent into exile, or that her stepson is 'resurrected' since his 'deadly' potion was a sleeping drink. Since Lucius himself is the son of a Theseus, the false death of this Hippolytos prefigures the initiation–resurrection of Lucius in *Met*. 11.

The editors express the hope that the volume holds together by clarifying some textual problems as well as offering the possibility of a unifying interpretation of Apuleius' works, but ultimately it has too little unity. The book seems more held together by the authorship of the articles than by theme. Some articles are useful, and their reprint is welcome, but the volume might have been arranged differently, or even published as two different books.

Corpus Christi College, Oxford/Manchester REGINE MAY

THE LANGUAGE OF THE LATIN NOVEL

L. CALLEBAT: *Langages du roman latin*. Pp. 301. Hildesheim, Zurich, and New York: Georg Olms Verlag, 1998. Paper, DM 98. ISBN: 3-487-10772-4.

Callebat knows more than anyone about the language of Apuleius and Petronius. As long ago as 1968 he published the definitive *Sermo Cotidianus dans les Métamorphoses d'Apulée* (Caen), and in the thirty-odd years since then he has written a number of studies on the language of the Roman 'novel'. His knowledge, however, is not of a dry, merely classificatory, sort: he has increasingly understood language as discourse, absorbed the lessons of intertextuality (though he does not employ jargon), and developed a flexibility in his perception of register that contrasts markedly with the often wooden polarities by which scholars have steered their courses, be they Petronian (those vulgar-Latin-speaking freedmen and the lessons from Petronius the satirist—or immoralist) or Apuleian (so African—or so literary).

© Oxford University Press, 2002

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.1.79 Published online by Cambridge University Press