

NOTES ON THE *METAMORPHOSES* OF APULEIUS

1. At *Metamorphoses* 4.22.2 (91.12–15 Helm), the old woman in the robbers' cave feeds the animals:

enim nobis anus illa recens ordeum adfatim et sine ulla mensura largita est, ut equus quidem meus tanta copia et quidem solus potitus Salias¹ se cenas esse crederet.

se cenas esse *malim*: se cenasse *sic dist.* F³φς secenasse F² secenas *spatio postea relicto quinque litterarum F et R in marg. add.* scilicet cenas se esse GCA 1977 esse cenas Armini se cenas cenare Helm, Giarratano, Robertson, Frassinetti cenas se cenasse Luetjohann se cenasse cenas van der Vliet, Terzagli, Augello cenas se habere Novák

The whole passage comprising these lines raises some intricate problems in manuscript F. As for the reading *se cenasse*, the first scribe wrote only *secenas* followed by a *lacuna* and expressed his doubts about the text by writing an *R* on the margin. A second hand—*man. rec.* according to Helm and Robertson—added *se* after *secenas*; a third hand separated *se* from *cenasse*. It is uncertain whether the reading *se cenasse* by the second hand is authoritative. Nevertheless, it should be noted that it is also the reading of φ and ζ.

First of all, I agree with those scholars who read a present infinitive—*cenare* or *esse* instead of *cenasse*; see, for example, 10.22.4 (254.6–8 H): . . . *ut hercules etiam deesse mihi aliquid ad supplendam eius libidinem crederem*. . . .

Among the conjectures proposed to emend this sentence, that of GCA,² following Armini's proposal, includes a very attractive *cenās <se> esse* that could have easily generated *cenasse* in the manuscripts by haplography. As to the combination of *cenās* and *esse*, TLL lists parallels like, for example, Tert. *De spect.* 13 (*cenam dei edere*). The Groningen scholars also read *scilicet* before *cenās*, whose abbreviation (*sc.*) would have become *se*. Although *scilicet* is rarely abbreviated in Beneventan script³ and only in interlineal glosses as *·s*,⁴ it is possible that the corruption might have appeared in a previous stage. According to GCA, the importance of *scilicet* lies in its use to retain "the proper narrator's perspective" and this is the reason to include it in the text, exactly like Oudendorp's conjecture in 4.5.1 (77.25 H).⁵ But it is doubtful that this is a convincing argument to supply a new word, even in a *locus vexatus*, because some other examples may be found of places where the perspective of the narrator is not so distinctly maintained and *scilicet* or another similar expression is absent: compare, for example, 7.16.3 (166.13–14 H) or the whole 8.2.1–3.2 (177.10–

I would like to acknowledge the helpful criticism of the anonymous referee and the suggestions of Ana Pérez Vega and Rosario Moreno Soldevila.

1. For *Salias* (*salies* in F) instead of the usual correction, *Saliaries*, see G. F. Hildebrand, ed., *L. Apuleii opera omnia*, vol. 1 (1842; reprint Hildesheim, 1968), 266. A commentary on the whole text is found in B. L. Hijmans Jr. et al., eds., *Apuleius Madaurensis: "Metamorphoses," Book IV, 1–27*, Groningen Commentaries on Apuleius (GCA) (Groningen, 1977), 167–68.

2. GCA 1977, 168; it is attributed to van der Paardt on page 7.

3. In which manuscript F is written, as, according to Helm, was its *Vorlage* also: see Helm's *praefatio* in R. Helm, ed., *Apuleii Platonici Madaurensis opera quae supersunt*, vol. 2, fasc. 2: "Florida" (Leipzig, 1959), xli–xlii.

4. See E. A. Lowe, *The Beneventan Script* (Oxford, 1914), 193.

5. GCA 1977, 168, 50; for a survey of *scilicet* as a "perspective-maintainer" see K. Dowden, "Apuleius and the Art of Narration," *CQ* 32 (1982): 422–25.

78.19 H), 8.5.10 (180.10–12 H), and so on.⁶ Perhaps a comparison between 8.6.2 (180.19–21 H) and 8.7.1 (181.15 H) would be enough to see that perspective is usually retained, but not always.⁷

Therefore, if there is not complete certainty that *scilicet* is missing, I would prefer to retain the reading closest to that of the manuscripts, leave *se* in its original place, and read *se cenas esse*. As for the order of the sequence *Salias* (or *Saliaries*) *se cenas*, see, for example, *nullam se prorsus fraudem* (10.15.1, 247.27 H).⁸

2. At 5.5.1 (106.12–14 H), Cupid speaks to Psyche, who is not allowed to see him. Text of the first hand in F:

ea nocte ad suam Psychen sic inquit maritus—namque praeter oculos et manibus et auribus ius nichil sentiebatur—:

ius nichil F (*et s. alt. supra s. add. ead. man.*) φ: his nichil *al man. et deinde ille nichil man. rec. in F* his (*vel hijs*) nihil α. *secl. Helm tamquam adn. (hic deest nihil) falso in textum irreptam* <ut praesent> ius nihil Robertson coll. *Ter. An. 120, Flor. Epit. 4.7.9 eius nihil <non> Watt istius nihil <non> Beck istius nihil van der Vliet is nihilo <secius> Haupt immanius nihil Wagenvoort is <non> nihil Luetjohann is nihil <non> Traube nihil <non> Terzaghi plus nihilo Birt ille nihilo <minus> Jahn is nimis Petschenig is nimirum Koziol invisus ille Castiglioni visu nihil Beyte visibilis Leo obvisus simul Damsté*

Many conjectures have been proposed to solve the problems this passage raises, but probably, as Kenney states (*ad loc.*), the truth is irrecoverable.⁹ In any case, the context of the sentence facilitates its interpretation with an acceptable degree of certitude: “Apart from the eyes, she could feel him through her hands and her ears.” That is why most solutions attempt to add another negative element, mainly <non>. Haupt started from Jahn’s proposal—*nihilo minus*—but modified it and read *is nihilo <secius> sentiebatur* because “ita apertior est causa erroris.”¹⁰ This conjecture has gained acceptance among many scholars, such as Giarratano, Paratore, Frassinetti, and Augello. However, Robertson’s emendation fits the original *ius* perfectly. Although he based it on two quotations and offered an explanation of the paleographical mistake,¹¹ he has been followed only by Grimal, while Augello, for instance, claims that his conjecture is *piuttosto artificiosa*.¹² Taking Robertson’s reading as a starting point, I would prefer to look for parallels within *Metamorphoses* and compare this passage with 9.15.6: *auribus . . . praeditus cuncta . . . facillime sentiebam*. This could lead to another reading: <facil>*ius nihil*. In my opinion, it is close enough to textual data and fits the sense of the sentence: “For, sight aside, through her hands and her ears nothing could be

6. I am not adducing instances of “the omniscient narrator’s *Cupid and Psyche*” because this kind of “speculative” *scilicet* is hardly ever found in the whole story (see Dowden, “Apuleius” [n. 5 above], 422–23); so, its absence in 6.10.5 (135.20–22 H) or 6.15.2 (139.11–16 H), for example, is not significant.

7. See the commentary on 8.7.1 in B. L. Hijmans Jr., et al., eds., *Apuleius Madaurensis: “Metamorphoses,” Book VIII* (Groningen, 1985), 75–76 and 4–6.

8. It is also a usual order when *se* is an object; see, e.g., *concito se gradu* (4.22.5; 92.5 H), *pernici se fuga* (5.21.2; 119.7 H), *saltu se maximo* (5.27.2; 124.18 H), *ipso se solacio* (8.7.7; 182.13–14 H), *velociori se fuga* (8.21.4; 193.18 H), *turpissimo se dedecore* (9.23.4; 220.23–24 H).

9. See E. J. Kenney, ed., *Apuleius: Cupid and Psyche* (Cambridge, 1990), 144. Kenney prints Watt’s *eius nihil <non>*; a very similar opinion is found in J. A. Hanson’s Loeb: *Apuleius: “Metamorphoses,”* vol. 1 (Cambridge, Mass., 1989), 258.

10. M. Haupt, *Opuscula*, vol. 3 (1876; reprint, Hildesheim, 1967), 599–600.

11. See his edition: *Apulée. “Les Métamorphoses,”* trans. P. Vallette (Paris, 1946), 2:44.

12. G. Augello, *Studi apuleiani* (Palermo, 1977), 109.

perceived more easily”; see also *De deo Socratis* 5 (Thomas 13.11). The word order—*facilius nihil* instead of *nihil facilius*—is not the most usual, but see, for example, Cicero *Pro Balbo* 5.5, *De natura deorum* 1.77.14, *Epistulae ad Familiares* 14.3.5.9.

3. At 6.28.1 (149.22–26 H), the ass and the girl flee their captors:

Ego simul voluntariae fugae voto et liberandae virginis studio sed et plagarum suasu, quae me saepicule commovebant, equestri celeritate quadripedi cursu solum replaudens virginis delicatas voculas adhinnire temptabam.

commovebant F cf. e.g. 7.25.2: commonebant ζ edd. plerique

Most editors print *commonebant* against the codices’ reading;¹³ even the Groningen Commentaries¹⁴ and Callebat,¹⁵ usually much more respectful of the manuscript tradition, emend. The plausibility of a change of *n* into *u* is unquestionable, and *commonebant* fits perfectly in the context, as had been already pointed out by Oudendorp or Hildebrand. Nevertheless, I wonder whether it is really necessary to correct anything at all, since *commovebant* may be perfectly understood either in the sense of *stimulate* (*OLD*, s.v. 8, or even 9), following the ironic *suasu*, or in the sense of *affect* (*OLD*, s.v. 10), also ironical, or *disturb* (*OLD*, s.v. 6). Moreover, there is a very close parallel in 7.25.2 (173.2–3 H), where, as far as I know, nobody has ever proposed a correction: *Ceterum plagis non magnopere commovebar, quippe consuetus ex forma concidi fustibus*. Here, *commovebar* has been translated “I was bothered” (GCA, ad loc., 248), “I was disturbed” (Hanson), “je m’en émouvais” (Vallette), “I did not . . . mind” (Walsh). These translations suggest a slightly different sense, but not so different from those proposed above as to invalidate the proof. In my opinion, scholars have been misled by *suasu* and have tried to read a word related to it: thus, *commovebant* should be retained.

4. At 7.8.1 (160.3–5 H), the false robber, Haemus, explains to his comrades the way he disguised himself as a woman to deceive the soldiers who barred his way:

. . . per medias acies infesti militis transabivi. nam mulierem putantes asinariam concedebant liberos aditus . . .

aditus F: abitus ζ et edd. plerique aditus <et abitus> dubitanter Robertson coll. Pl. Cist. 33, *Lucr.* 1.677

The reading of the codices—*aditus*—is generally corrected to *abitus*: it seems obvious that soldiers let Haemus go away, rather than approach them. Moreover, the prefixes *ad-* and *ab-* are commonly confused, as Helm noticed,¹⁶ and it is not surprising that a much more usual word—*aditus*—replaces the other. The Groningen Commentaries do not hesitate to accept the emendation.¹⁷ However, this passage should be compared with 8.4.3 (179.2–3 H), where hunting dogs are ordered to surround some

13. Thus Hildebrand; Helm; Robertson; Giarratano; Frassinetti; Scazzoso; Hanson; Augello; et al.

14. B. L. Hijmans Jr. et al., eds., *Apuleius Madaurensis: “Metamorphoses,” Books VI 25–32 and VII* (Groningen, 1981), 47.

15. D. S. Robertson, ed., *Apulée: “Les Métamorphoses,”* vol. 2, *Livres IV–VI*, trans. P. Vallette, 7th ed., rev. and corr. with new introd. by L. Callebat (Paris, 1992), 69.

16. See his *praefatio*, xlvi.

17. GCA 1981, 135.

mountain goats: *Canes . . . immittuntur statimque sollertis disciplinae memores partitae totos praecingunt aditus. . .* As far as I know, no scholar has ever doubted this *aditus*. The Groningen Commentaries defend this reading, observing that it is said “from the hunter’s point of view” and remarking that “*aditus* has often a much broader meaning than only ‘access’ or ‘approach.’”¹⁸ I do agree with these arguments but I think that also in 7.8.1 it may be understood that *aditus* is written from the point of view of those who are in the robbers’ cave at that moment; besides, if “it is possible to leave by an *aditus*,”¹⁹ *aditus* undoubtedly has a much more general sense, and there are no reasons to correct this term in the first text.

5. At 7.14.1 (164.14–15 H), after being set free, Charite is grateful to the ass and looks after him. Text of **F**:

Exin meum sospitatores nuncupatum matrona prolixo curitabat . . .

meum **F**: me suum Beroaldus et edd. plerique

When commenting on this passage, GCA wonder if *meum sospitatores* is to be retained.²⁰ they point out that the absence of the personal pronoun cannot be an objection and “it would be a direct quotation of 150.16 f. *te meum sospitatores cotidie saginabo*.” Finally, they accept the correction of Beroaldus because there are no instances of this kind of direct quotation. As a matter of fact, there are some other instances: see J. B. Hoffman, A. Szantyr, *Lateinische Grammatik* (Munich, 1965), 2:28⁴ and especially Tacitus *Annales* 11.20.1. Accordingly, I think that Beroaldus’ conjecture, though simple and brilliant, is unnecessary and *Exin “meum sospitatores” nuncupatum . . .* should be printed.

6. At 8.2.3 (177.19–20 H), Thrasylus is trying to take revenge on Charite and Tlepolemus and, when the girl is saved by her fiancé, he finds a chance to approach them:

Nactus denique praesentiae suae tempestillam occasionem, sceleri, quod diu cogitabat, accingitur.

tempestillam **F**: tempestivam edd. plerique

Tempestillam, if retained, is a hapax, and has been traditionally corrected into *tempestivam*, the *lectio vulgata*. It is, nevertheless, the reading of **F**, and the editors of Apuleius should be very careful about rejecting words, even if they are attested nowhere else, as in this case, or seem easily changeable into well-known terms. Hildebrand²¹ has been one of the few scholars to print *tempestillam*; as for morphology, he quotes an explanation that had been already proposed: the adjective *tempestus*²² as the stem and the same formation as *tantillus*²³ or *quantillus*, though he does not seem to be completely satisfied with this. GCA (ad loc.)²⁴ rightly hesitate before accepting the

18. See GCA 1985, 50.

19. See quotations in GCA 1985, 50: Sen. *Brev.* 14.1, 14; Curt. 6.8.10.

20. GCA 1981, 169.

21. See Hildebrand, 1:640.

22. Indeed, a very rare word, with a unique instance in *OLD*, s.v. *tempestus*²: Paul. Fest. p. 362M.

23. The adjective *tantillus* and the substantive *tantillum* are frequently used by Apuleius only in the *Metamorphoses*; cf. W. A. Oldfather, H. V. Canter, and B. E. Perry, *Index Apuleianus* (1934; reprint, Hildesheim and New York, 1979), s.v.

24. GCA 1985, 37.

correction, but finally adopt it on the grounds that the studies of Abate about diminutives in the *Metamorphoses* show a “consciously applied artistic usage, as significant in its presence as in its absence,” and that “the present passage has no diminutives at all.”²⁵ In fact, Abate proves that diminutives tend to concentrate in some contexts and that this concentration is due to stylistic reasons,²⁶ but it should not be concluded that it is not possible for a diminutive to appear in isolation in some other contexts: see, for example, the position of these adjectives in contexts where there are no other diminutives: *astutulae* (6.27.1, 149.5 H), far enough from *membranulum* (6.26.7, 148.18 H) and *aniculam* (6.27.5, 149.19 H); *breviculo* (6.25.4, 147.15 H); *tantillum* (3.13.5, 62.5 H); *forticulum* (8.24.3, 196.6 H); *pauperculus* (9.31.3, 226.24 H). In my opinion, the suffix in *tempestillam* keeps its proper diminutive sense, and its meaning is very close to those of *breviculo* in 6.25.4 and *tantillus* everywhere;²⁷ therefore I would suggest the following translation: “When he finally found an opportunity, even the least suitable, for presenting himself, . . .” For that reason, and given that Apuleius offers so many hapax diminutives elsewhere,²⁸ *tempestillam* should be retained.

7. At 8.5.10 (180.10–14 H), Thrasyllus has led Tlepolemus to a hunting party, but when a terrible wild boar appears, he makes him fall off his horse and the animal attacks Tlepolemus. Text of manuscript F:

Nec coepti nefarii bonum piguit amicum vel suae saevitiae litatum saltem tanto periculo cernens potuit expleri, sed percito atque plagosa crura vulnera contegenti suumque auxiliium miseriter roganti per femus dexterum dimisit lanceam.

Many attempts have been made to emend *plagosa crura vulnera*. Most of them change one of the words in the sequence: *plagoso, cruda vulnera* (Cornelissen); <per> *plagosa crura vulnera* (Walter); *plagosa <et> cruda vulnera* (Lütjohann); *plagosa crurum vulnera* (*vir doctus apud Oudendorp*); *plagoso <ac> frustra vulnera* (Robertson); *plagosa crura ulna* (Damsté and Kronenberg). Armini proposed not to correct the reading of the codices but to interpret it as an accusative of respect,²⁹ “an exceedingly harsh construction,” as GCA have observed.³⁰ The solution adopted by most editors is to delete *vulnera* as a gloss. Although it is possibly the best theory that has been propounded to emend the text, I find two difficulties: first of all, I wonder if *vulnera* is the most natural term to gloss *plagosa* rather than, for example, *vulnerata*; more significantly, however, if *plagosa* is to be translated “much beaten”—and this seems certain³¹—both concepts are necessary: Tlepolemus’ legs were full of wounds (*vulnera*) as they had been severely beaten (*plagosa*) by the wild boar (see also Lucretius 4.1070). A simple solution would be to add <ac> between *crura* and *vulnera*, and to interpret the phrase *plagosa crura <ac> vulnera* as a hendiadys, equivalent to, for example, *crura plagis vulnerata*. The addition of <ac> instead of *et* or *-que*, for instance, is due to paleographical reasons: it is easy to suppose that *crura ac* could

25. F. R. Abate, “Diminutives in Apuleian Latinity” (Ph.D. diss., Ohio State University, 1978).

26. Abate, “Diminutives” (n. 25 above), chap. 4, 65–89.

27. Cf. Abate, “Diminutives,” 47.

28. See Abate, “Diminutives,” 29.

29. H. Armini, “Studia Apuleiana,” *Eranos* 26 (1928): 309–10.

30. GCA 1985, 63.

31. This is the translation in *OLD*. Passages quoted—Hor. *Epist.* 2.1.70 and Apul. *Met.* 9.12.[3]—prove clearly that the word must be connected with the meaning of *plaga* 1, not 2 (wound).

have been wrongly written as *crurac* and then corrected into *crura*.³² It would not be surprising to find a device like hendiadys within a passage with poetical reminiscences and in a “carefully ornamented” period;³³ besides, it is used by Apuleius in many other places.³⁴

JUAN J. MARTOS
Universidad de Sevilla

32. Another example of a transmission mistake with *ac* involved, though not exactly the same, is 8.2.5: *praesenti ac Lipsius praesentia* F.

33. GCA 1985, 63.

34. See, e.g., H. Koziol, *Der Stil des L. Apuleius* (1872; reprint, Hildesheim, Zürich, and New York, 1988), 226–27; R. T. van der Paardt, *L. Apuleius Madaurensis: “The Metamorphoses”*: A Commentary on Book III with Text and Introduction (Amsterdam, 1971), 58, 151; GCA 1985, 143, 171, 178; Kenney, *Cupid and Psyche* (n. 9 above), 132, 205; B. L. Hijmans Jr., et al., eds., *Apuleius Madaurensis “Metamorphoses,” Book IX* (Groningen, 1995), 41; M. Zimmerman, ed., *Apuleius Madaurensis: “Metamorphoses,” Book X* (Groningen, 2000), 97.

OF MICE AND EMPERORS: A NOTE ON AELIAN *DE NATURA ANIMALIUM* 6.40

Νῆσος ἐν τῷ Πόντῳ Ἡρακλεῖ ἐπόνυμος ἐκτετιμηται. οὐκοῦν ὅσον μυῶν ἐστὶν ἐνταῦθα σέβει τὸν θεόν, καὶ πᾶν ὅσον ἀνεῖται αὐτῷ τοῦτο πιστεύει τῷ θεῷ κεχαρισμένον ἀνεῖσθαι καὶ οὐκ ἂν προσάψαιτο αὐτοῦ.

There is an island in the Black Sea named after Heracles, which has been highly honored. Now all the mice there pay reverence to the god, and they believe that the god has taken pleasure in the dedication of everything that is offered to him and would not touch it. (Ael. *NA* 6.40.1–5)

The author Claudius Aelianus, more commonly known as Aelian, was born in Praeneste (modern Palestrina) around 170 C.E. He spent his life in Rome.¹ Though he was Roman, he chose to write in Greek. It is mainly for his mastery over that language that he is named as a sophist by Philostratus and in the *Suda* lexicon, which also states that Aelian was a priest, but does not say of which deity.² In *De natura animalium* Aelian regularly mentions deities, with, of course, their connection to certain animals.

I am indebted to Laurence Emmett, Jaś Elsner, Ted Kaizer, and Fergus Millar, and to Shadi Bartsch and the anonymous reader of *CP*, for reading through earlier versions of this article. Their comments have greatly improved the argument, though that does not mean they actually believe it.

1. J. F. Kindstrand, “Claudius Aelianus und sein Werk,” *ANRW* 2.34.4 (1998): 2954–96, 2957. On Aelian, see also E. Bowie, “Aelian,” in *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature*, vol. 1, *Greek Literature*, ed. P. Easterling and B. M. W. Knox (Cambridge, 1985), 680–82. Also forthcoming is A. Lukinovich, “Les *Histoires variées* d’Elie: L’Agencement de la mosaïque,” *ANRW* 2.35.4. Texts and translations used for this article are adapted from N. G. Wilson, ed. and trans., *Aelian: “Historical Miscellany”* (“*Varia Historica*”) (Cambridge, Mass., 1997); A. Schofield, ed. and trans., *Aelian: “On the Characteristics of Animals,”* 3 vols. (Cambridge, Mass., 1958–59). For the wider cultural context in which Aelian wrote, see now the numerous articles in *Athenaeus and His World: Reading Greek Culture in the Roman Empire*, ed. D. Braund and J. Wilkins (Exeter, 2000).

2. Philostr. *VS* 2.31 (= 624); *Suda* 2.168.23–25 [Adler edition]. As Kindstrand (“Claudius Aelianus” [n. 1 above], p. 2958, n. 30) argues (with references), there is no evidence for the late-nineteenth-century assumption that Aelian was priest at the Fortuna temple of Praeneste.