

Thus this translation follows not only from the earlier words of Pamphilus but also from the emphatic reference in the words of Laches. Pamphilus stresses the pronoun in the first person singular *ego*, as it is a tie between himself and the child which he seeks to avoid (648 f.). The words *ego alam?* suggest to Laches that there is an alternative solution. But, because Laches has never considered that the child does not belong to his son, he cannot conceive that there is an alternative to *ego*. To him the alternative must be between raising and abandoning the child, although he is hardly prepared to do the latter, *prodemu' quaesio potiu'?*

The reading *ipse* has difficulties arising from the use of *neglexit* and, of more importance,

from the characterization of the young man. The reading *ipsa* is capable of two interpretations. However, if *nostrum* is taken as the antecedent of *quem*, it is even more difficult to see the precise relevance of *neglexit*. The second interpretation requires *huic* as the effective antecedent of *quem*, not the obvious solution but one easily brought out by an actor on stage. It alone provides a suitable context for *neglexit*, and it does appear to fit into the structure of the argument at this juncture. For these reasons it may be seen as a more likely reading and interpretation of what Terence wrote.

DAVID SEWART

UNIVERSITY OF HULL

"NO ART AT ALL": A NOTE ON THE PROEMIUM OF APULEIUS' *METAMORPHOSES*

Polonius: My liege, and madam, to expostulate
What majesty should be, what duty is,
Why day is day, night night, and time is time,
Were nothing but to waste night, day and time.
Therefore, since brevity is the soul of wit,
And tediousness the limbs and outward flourishes,
I will be brief; your noble son is mad:
Mad I call it; for, to define true madness,
What is't but to be nothing else but mad?
But let that go.

Gertrude: More matter, with less art.

Polonius: Madam, I swear I use no art at all.

[*Hamlet*, II, ii, 86-97]

It is perhaps a safer generalization than most that, when dealing with an Asiatic or mannerist rhetorician, such as Polonius or Apuleius, one should believe only what he does and not at all what he says he is doing. Although Polonius does not deceive Gertrude about the very florid nature of his rhetoric, Apuleius' Lucius, the narrator of the *Metamorphoses*, has baffled a number of scholars over a period of many years. The confusion about what Lucius is saying and who Lucius is has taken two major forms: the first is the identification of Lucius with Apuleius, and,

hence, the belief that Apuleius is actually apologizing for his defective Latin in the proemium of the *Metamorphoses*. This confusion has resulted in dating the *Metamorphoses* early in Apuleius' career when he was supposedly learning Latin at Rome.¹ The second type of confusion is of a more sophisticated critical nature than the first, since scholars understand that Lucius and Apuleius are two different people, but they underestimate the subtle intention of Apuleius' teasing proemium.²

In actuality, Lucius says at the beginning of the *Metamorphoses*:

1. For an expression of this view, see E. H. Haight, *Apuleius and his Influence* (New York, 1927), p. 49. For further discussion of the dating of the *Metamorphoses* during the Roman stay, see the various scholarly opinions stated in M.

Bernhard, *Der Stil des Apuleius von Madaura* (Stuttgart, 1927), pp. 357-60; and P. G. Walsh, *The Roman Novel* (Cambridge, 1970), pp. 248-51.

2. See, e.g., Walsh, *op. cit.*, pp. 64 and 149.

exordior. quis ille? paucis accipe. Hymettos Attica et Isthmos Ephyrea et Taenaros Spartiaca, glebae felices aeternum libris felicioribus conditae, mea uetus prosapia est; ibi linguam Attidem primis pueritiae stipendiis merui. mox in urbe Latia aduena studiorum Quiritium indigenam sermonem aerumnabili labore nullo magistro praeunte aggreſsus excolui. en ecce praefamur ueniam, siquid exotici ac forensis sermonis rudis locutor offendero. iam haec equidem ipsa uocis immutatio desultoriae scientiae stilo quem accessimus respondet. fabulam Graecanicam incipimus. lector intende: laetaberis.³

Thus, the narrator is not Apuleius himself, African by birth, bilingual in Greek and Latin from his youth, and an extremely successful popular lecturer in both languages, but a Greek who has learned Latin late in his life and is apologizing for his rusticity in the Latin tongue. The narrator of the *Metamorphoses* is, at this point, carefully dissociated from Apuleius himself by the opening statements of the proemium.⁴ Furthermore, late classical literature was designed to be read aloud, and the *Metamorphoses*, in particular, shows marked characteristics of being intended for oral delivery.⁵ If we then imagine Apuleius reading this passage aloud, we are forced to see that an amusing and ironic discrepancy was intended between the supposedly inept literary abilities of Lucius, the narrator, and those of the master rhetorician, Apuleius himself.⁶

Indeed, to provide further documentation

for this point, Eduard Norden pointed out that Apuleius is making use in the proemium of the standard rhetorical *topos* of affected modesty, in which the rhetorician-literary artist typically apologizes for his crudity, inexperience, and inability to deal with his subject matter. Norden also noted that the protestation of inability on the narrator's part calls attention to the fact that he is to perform some sort of stylistic and rhetorical marvel.⁷

My point, then, is that Apuleius has self-consciously set up an ironic discrepancy between himself and Lucius and between what Lucius says he is doing and what he actually does. These two kinds of discrepancy Apuleius will play with throughout the rest of the *Metamorphoses*. The proemium, thus, is not simply an "amusing introduction" or a "note of humor," as P. G. Walsh says it is,⁸ but a signal to the audience that the narrator is not reliable and that what he says throughout the *Metamorphoses* cannot be taken at face value.⁹ Lucius' unreliability as narrator will take several forms: sometimes he will tell the audience that one thing will happen in the plot, while something entirely different does actually happen; or he will conceal or reveal his meaning by giving sly clues; or he will omit telling the audience certain things which would be of extreme importance in a realistic narrative; or he will be deliberately inconsistent at the level of plot.¹⁰ The unreliability

3. *Met.* 1. 1; quoted in the edition of R. Helm (Leipzig, 1931).

4. On Apuleius' cultural milieu and the distinction between Apuleius and Lucius, see P. Grimal, "L'originalité des *Métamorphoses* d'Apulée," *L'information littéraire*, IV (1957), 156-57.

5. For an analysis of the *Metamorphoses* as designed for oral delivery, see F. J. E. Raby, *Secular Latin Poetry in the Middle Ages*² (Oxford, 1957), pp. 21-25.

6. The effect intended is much the same as that of the poet Chaucer reading to his audience and declaring himself, as narrator of his poetry, incompetent to deal with his subject matter, utterly unable to speak of love at first hand, generally able to report only what others have told him verbatim or what he has read in books, and, in short, unable to compose an original poem. For the ironic discrepancy which Chaucer intended between himself as poet and as incompetent narrator, see B. Bronson, "Chaucer's Art in Relation to his Audience," in *Five Studies in Literature* ("University of California Publications in English," VIII, No. 1 [Berkeley, 1940]), 37-39; *idem*, *In Search of Chaucer* (Toronto, 1960), pp. 29-32.

7. *Die antike Kunstprosa* (Leipzig, 1909), II, 595, and n. 1. For another estimation of the affectation of the proemium, see J. van der Vliet, "Die Vorrede der Apuleischen *Metamorphosen*," *Hermes*, XXXII (1897), 79-85.

8. Walsh, *op. cit.*, pp. 64 and 149.

9. For further discussion of the unreliability of the narrator in the mannerist or Asiatic rhetorical tradition, see my note, "On the Franklin's Prologue, 716-721, Persius, and the Continuity of the Mannerist Style," to be published in *Philological Quarterly*; E. R. Curtius, *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*, trans. Willard R. Trask (New York, 1953), pp. 273-301; and A. Løyen, *Sidoine Apollinaire et l'esprit précieux en Gaule* (Paris, 1943).

10. Since I am preparing an article on the various kinds of unreliability of the narrator in the inset Cupid and Psyche and on the various kinds of inconsistencies in the plotting, which are all keys to Apuleius' meaning, I shall mention here only two of Apuleius' deliberate inconsistencies. At 10. 2, Lucius starts to tell a story of the Phaedra-Hippolytus type and directly addresses the reader, "iam ergo, lector optime, scito te tragoediam, non fabulam legere et a socco ad coturnum ascendere." Despite this signal, the story ends happily. On

of the narrator, which is one of the hallmarks of the Asiatic or mannerist rhetorician, is a feature of the symbolic or allegorical narrative which should always be taken into account in its interpretation. Failure to recognize this

feature has, as in the case of Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*, resulted in failure to understand meaning.

CONSTANCE S. WRIGHT

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO

this point, see R. Merkelbach, *Roman und Mysterium* (Munich, 1962), pp. 82–83. Similarly, Lucius is identified as a Greek in the proemium and differentiated from Apuleius, but is inconsistently referred to in 11. 27 as a certain poor man

from Madaura, i.e., Apuleius himself. On this point, see A.-J. Festugière, *Personal Religion among the Greeks* (Berkeley, 1954), p. 76.

A NOTE ON PINDAR *NEMEAN* 1. 24–25

λέλογχε δὲ μεμφομένοις ἐ-
σλοὺς ὕδωρ καπνῷ φέρειν
ἀντίον.

Scholars have long engaged in spirited debate over the meaning of this passage. Farnell, citing the authority of Aristarchus as he is represented by the scholia, translates: "it falls to the lot of those who blame the good to be (as it were) bringing up water against smoke."¹ With Von Leutsch and Mezger he interprets ὕδωρ καπνῷ φέρειν ἀντίον as a proverb for futile effort which would be equivalent to our own "to pour oil on fire."² Even Farnell admits that the alleged proverb is a bad one: although a little water will increase smoke, a greater amount will succeed in stifling it.

Bury construes λέλογχε as personal with Chromius as subject: "But he hath won good friends to quell as with water the smoke of envious cavillers."³ The problem posed by this

interpretation is serious but not insurmountable. As Farnell has observed, the natural object of water is fire, not smoke. Thus, we have such wishful translations as "... against the smoking fire."⁴ A solution to this difficulty may be found if we consider that the point which the poet is trying to make is not at all that smoke/envy is to be quelled or extinguished, but that it is to be kept from bursting into flame. So long as envy produces only smoke, it is ineffectual, and the presence of water/friends at Chromius' side keeps it that way. This interpretation accords well with the scholium to Aristophanes *Clouds* 253: τὰ γὰρ μηδενὸς ἄξια καπνοὺς καὶ σκιὰς καὶ νεφέλας ὠνόμαζον.⁵

EDWARD D. LASKY

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

1. L. R. Farnell, *The Works of Pindar*, II (London, 1932), 246.

2. "Oel in Feuer giessen." F. Mezger, *Pindars Siegeslieder* (Leipzig, 1880), p. 105.

3. J. B. Bury, *The Nemean Odes of Pindar* (London, 1890), p. 15. Dissen with Hermann connects μεμφομένοις with λέλογχεν ἐσλοὺς and translates, "Nactus est hospitii liberalitate viros probos adversus obtretractores, ad aquam fumo

obviam ferendam, h. e. quibus uti possit ad restinguendam invidiam." See his *Explicationes ad Nemea* in Boeckh's *Pindari Opera quae supersunt* (Leipzig, 1821), p. 354.

4. P. E. Laurent (trans.), *The Odes of Pindar* (Oxford, 1824), p. 244.

5. Also cited by E. von Leutsch, *Addimentorum ad Lud. Disseni in Pindari Carmina commentarium specimen* (Göttingen, 1865), p. 4.