

ELEVEN NOTES ON THE TEXT OF APULEIUS' *METAMORPHOSES*

These notes, which are conservative more often than they are revolutionary, have originated from some reviews¹ which I have recently written of books on Apuleius. I have found that the only way to preserve any consistency in the format is to open each note by citing the text I should prefer and then following that with a Latin apparatus criticus. The aim of the notes is generally only to shed light on the individual passages, to offer conversion or conviction, but some notes serve the rather larger purpose of bolstering a general view of the editors of Apuleius against some modern misconceptions.² This concerns the relation of the *a* manuscripts to F. The editors have believed that *a*, by which I denote the lost common ancestor of A, U, E, S, was simply an apograph of F while still undamaged. Writers whom I have reviewed, however, seem to be under the impression that *a* has something to offer independent of F. The following notes should serve to remove some of their ammunition. My evidence concerning the readings of the manuscript is almost³ entirely derived from the printed reports of editors, which for my purposes show no significant deviation from one other.⁴

Book 3, ch. 11 (p. 60, line 16 Helm): in aere stet

sic dett., Helm, Giarratano: in *ere st*stet (st* inducto) F: in e*re st** et φ: mea restis et A: in ea restis et S: ea restes et E: in aere staret van der Vliet, Robertson, Frassinetti.

The verb is dependent on the preceding *decrevit*. *Decrevit* is in the perfect tense rather than the aorist⁵ and therefore quite properly takes primary sequence. Van der Paardt, although he does not read *staret*, claims that it would preserve the 'concord of tenses'. This false notion probably underlies other editors' choice of this reading.

It is known from the lacuna in Book 8 in F that *a*, if copied from F, was copied before φ was. The route by which F arrived at its 'reading' for this passage is scarcely clear, but what is clear is that it must have exhibited sufficient confusion and of an appropriate type to account for the confused readings of the *a* tradition. We should observe therefore that the readings of the *a* tradition are amply consistent with the usual hypothesis that *a* was in fact copied from F.

Book 4, ch. 6 (79.4–8): insurgit speluncae, qua margines montanae desinunt, turris ardua †caulae, firma solidis cratibus, ovili stabulatione commoda,

¹ Of G. Augello, *Studi Apuleiani* (Palermo, 1977), and B. L. Hijmans Jr. and others, *Apuleius: Metamorphoses IV. 1–27* (Groningen, 1977), both in CR 29 (1979).

² Orthodoxy: the editions of Helm (*Florida*), p. xxix, Giarratano, p. xvii and Frassinetti, pp. xlix–l, Robertson (Tome 1), p. xlii; C. C. Schlam, CW 64 (1971), 286. Modern misconceptions: see the reviews cited in n. 1 and J. Gwyn Griffiths, *The*

Isis Book, p. 66.

³ The exception is the photograph of a folio of F which is frontispiece to the Groningen *Met. IV. 1–27*, which I have used for 4.22.

⁴ Statements concerning the frequency with which Apuleius uses certain words and the like derive from the Oldfather, Canter and Perry, *Index Apuleianus*.

⁵ Callebat, *Sermo Cotidianus*, p. 361, strangely takes the verb as aorist.

porrectis undique lateribus; antes fores exigui tramites vice structi parietis attenduntur.

firma scripsi: firmas F: firmae . . . tramitis Lütjohann et graviter interpunxit post ardua non post lateribus: firmae . . . commodae . . . tramitis Helm, sicut Lütjohann interpungens.

Lütjohann's punctuation, adopted by all subsequent editors, has recently been described in the Groningen edition of Book 4 as 'an appreciable gain'. Yet it involves a significant deviation from the manuscript. Once the *s* is deleted from *firmas* in *F* as an obvious dittography, it becomes clear that neither *firma*, as it now becomes, nor *commoda* agrees with *caulae*; rather, *firma solidis cratibus* and *ovii stabulatione commodae* are chiasmically parallel phrases apparently describing the *turris*, which seems also to be the object whose *latera* are *porrecta*. The first sentence therefore in *F* has *insurgit* for verb, *turris ardua* for subject and goes at least as far as *lateribus*. The second sentence, on the other hand, has *attenduntur* for verb and can only have *exigui tramites* for subject. Given this situation, the heavy punctuation can only go where editors before Lütjohann placed it: before *ante fores*, a phrase in any case well suited to mark another point of interest to start a sentence.

How far is it possible to maintain the manuscript's view of this passage? The first problem is *caulae*. This can no longer be nominative. And genitive singular seems hardly possible: the singular is in itself extremely rare; and, quite apart from the difficulty of attaching the genitive to *ardua* ('a tower steep in wicker-work'), the sentence would be unbalanced, as a tricolon describing the *turris ardua* (*firma . . . lateribus*) would be converted into a sprawling tetracolon describing the *turris* (*ardua caulae . . . lateribus*). The solution of modern editors has been to adjust the rest of the sentences to accommodate *caulae*. But it seems at least worth exploring to see if *caulae* itself should be rehandled.

A helpful preliminary is to attempt to understand what sort of picture is being presented to us in any case through this description. The tower, for instance, has caused puzzlement: the Groningen commentary observes that 'the object of the *turris ardua* is not clear, since the *casula* to be mentioned later on serves as a look-out'. The solution to this sort of difficulty, I think, lies in the recognition that we are here confronted by the principal structural elements of Greek country estates, such as have recently been unearthed in the Chersonese, namely *pyrgos*, *aule*, and *oikia* — tower, yard, and house.⁶ The house is here constituted by the cave; and attached to the cave, as it is normally attached to the house, is the tower. There is clearly also some sort of yard in which animals, namely sheep, are being kept.

A first inclination might be to delete *caulae* altogether: perhaps it originated as a marginal note seeking to clarify *solidis cratibus*. But this still leaves a considerable problem: it is unlikely that the tower is constructed of *crates*, it may protect the sheep but is scarcely their *stabulatio*, and it should not be it but the yard whose walls are *porrecta*. Taking this together with the absence of the mention of the third structural ingredient — the yard — it seems to me that we must entertain the possibility that *caulae* (or *caule* as the manuscript writes) conceals *aula* or even, in a more Greek form,⁷ *aule* preceded by a word for 'and',

⁶ J. Pečírka in M. I. Finley (ed.), *Problèmes de la terre en Grèce ancienne* (Paris, 1973), pp. 123–9, an illuminating

reference I owe to Dr. N. R. E. Fisher.

⁷ From *ThLL* it can be seen that *aula* displays some Greek forms and that the

which, to judge from the last letter of *ardua* and the redundant *c* of *caulae*, has to be *ac*.⁸ It is then the yard which is understandably strong with solid wicker-work, with stretched out sides, and suitable to accommodate sheep. *Aula* is elsewhere too used to mean *ovilia*.

The remaining problem is then to make sense of *ante fores . . . attenduntur*. The *fores* could be the entrance either to the cave or, I think more probably, the tower and yard complex, whose close connection the *ac*, if correct, indicates. Modern editors, taking *caulae* as the subject of *attenduntur*, change *exigui tramites* into the genitive *exigui tramitis* dependent on *fores*. Yet it seems strange, even for Apuleius, to transfer the possession of the doorway from the house to the path: paths do not have doorways; houses, caves and towers do. And whilst lattice barriers can doubtless extend, it is at least equally true that paths can and that in the process they become *exigui*, like elastic bands or chewing gum. This leaves *vice structi parietis*, which I do not understand. On the reading of modern editors, we are told that lattice barriers extend like a built wall, which, as a lattice barrier is a form of built wall, seems fairly silly or pointless. On the manuscript's reading, we are invited to compare slight paths with a built wall, which quite defeats the imagination. Perhaps the sense is that the *latera* of the yard, constructed of *solidis cratibus*, are a *paries*: this *structus paries* runs, as walls do, in a thin line from the entrance. But in other directions from the entrance there is no *structus paries*: in its place and like (*vice*)⁹ one, there extend thin tracks.

I cannot pretend to have great confidence in the above suggestions, but it seems to me that they are at least as likely as the version of the modern editors, involving as they do the supposition of one area of straightforward corruption (*caulae* – *firmas* is negligible) instead of three grammatical changes at different points in the sentence (*firmae*, *commodae*, *tramitis*) in order to make it work.

Book 4, ch. 8 (80.15–16): *ac iam cetera semiferis Lapithis [Thebanis Centauris] que similia*

tebcinibus *F*: tebcinibus (*c* in a *reficit al.m.*) ϕ : euantibus *Heinsius*: cenantibus *Helm*: Thebanibus *Novák*, et alii alia: semiferis *post* Centaurisque *Heinsius*.

Semiferis in a context of Lapiths and Centaurs applies to Centaurs. It is true, as references which Robertson cites demonstrate, that the adjective is applied to uncouth beings and races and doubtless also that Lapiths are uncouth. But no amount of arguing on these lines can obscure the basic fact that whilst *semiferis* doubtless could be applied to Lapiths,¹⁰ it is regularly and for excellent reasons applied to Centaurs and is their standing epithet. It would be an example of the most singular perversity if Apuleius had here described the Lapiths with the Centaurs' epithet. Truth to tell, Apuleius does deviate from classical norms and is an ingenious sophist and accordingly has often been thought of as perverse, but some things must surely be too perverse even for him and I know of no parallel for such a wilful misapplication of an epithet.

ancients felt that the Greek and Roman words mean different things, the Latin *aula* being restricted to 'palace'. However, Apuleius' spelling of other Greek words (see Callebat, pp. 60–8) does not encourage *aule*.

⁸ *Ac* does occur before vowels, if rarely: *ThLL* s.v. *atque*.

⁹ Meaning of *vice*: Callebat, p. 232.

¹⁰ *Gentem immanem Lapithum*, Verg. *A.* 7.304–5.

A second problem, and one which has received much attention, is *tebcinibus*. In Beneventan script it is a simple passage from *a* to *ci* and an obvious first move would be to follow the alteration in ϕ (Helm even reports a deletion of the *i* together with the correction of *c* to *a*). This gives *Tebanibus*, which could easily be read as Novák's *Thebanibus*. So, with very little change we reach the name Thebans, but with a corrupt termination.

The solution I would offer to these two problems is simply to eliminate *Thebanibus Centauris* (or whatever the original form of the first word is). *Semiferis* then elegantly on its own denotes the Centaurs, as in Ovid,¹¹ and the line becomes stylistically usefully more rapid. At the same time, if it can be supposed that the deleted words are copied from an interlinear gloss mistaken as a correction to the text, pointing out that the *semiferis* are the Centaurs and the *Lapithis* the inhabitants of Thebes, then the difficulty in reading the first word may readily be understood and we may be free to suppose that what the scribe of F saw as *tebcinib*; was in fact a grammatically correct *Thebanis* or even a factually correct *Thessalis*. This is, after all, not the only place where a gloss seems to have crept into the text of F: 7.18 (168.10) *compilabat [cidit]*: and surely also 4.1 (75.6) [*protectus*] *absconditus* and 4.27 (95.19) *de thalamo [de cubiculo]*.

Book 4, ch. 12 (83.9–10): *enim vero Alcimus sollertibus coeptis [eum] saevum Fortunae nutum non potuit adducere*

Eum cannot stand as it is. Rather than emend it, the best solution is, with Giarratano (and Terzaghi and Scazzoso), to delete it. This is because, if we start reading from the *s* of *coeptis*, we have something close enough to a dittography of *seuū*.

Book 4, ch. 22 (91.14–17): *salī<ar>es se cenas . . . crederet. Ego vero qui numquam alias hordeum nisi tussum minutatim et diutina coquitatione iurulentum semper essem,*

*salies secenas***** crederet. Ego vero *** quam alias hordeo *** tus sum minutatim et diutina cogitatione iurulentum semper es serim, (in mg. iuxta ***** crederet man.prima R scripsit ut omissionem, puto, ostenderet: hordeo lit.ult. refecta; cenas in cenasse man.rec. fecit; numquam et cibatus al.man. fecit lacunis suppletis; necnon coniunctio litterarum ita mutata ut se cenas et esserim nunc legamus.) F.*

It is clear that the scribe of F was unable to read what lay in the exemplar before him because it was in some way damaged. The lacuna after *hordeo* (and indeed the scribe's troubles seem to have begun with the last letter of that word) is only a little short of one line after the lacuna after *secenas* in F and in all probability represents a single area of damage in the exemplar. Perhaps too the damage at ****quam* and the possible hesitation and maybe the misreading at *salies* are related to each other.¹² It is therefore an important question whether the insertions in F's lacunae in another or other hands are those of the corrector or conjectures. (i) the *se* making *cenasse* is described by a consensus of editors as being added by a recent hand and therefore not that of the corrector. It is in any case clearly motivated by the desire quickly to produce the infinitive that

¹¹ Ovid, *Met.* 2.633, 12.406.

above, somewhat obscured in Helm's edition.

¹² Note also the lacuna at 4.22 (91.12)

crederet needs. (ii) *ciba* is clearly not written in a Lombardic hand: it is therefore not that of the corrector. (iii) *num* appears to be written in the same hand as *ciba*.

The correction *saliarēs*¹³ is obviously right, as is *coquitatione*.

For the lacuna after *secenas* editors have on the whole adopted a surprisingly inappropriate method. First, they take too seriously the supplement of *se*. Secondly, they use that favourite emender's tool, haplography:¹⁴ yet haplographic solutions only apply where there has been an accidental omission, not where the omission has, as here, been deliberate. Typical of this confusion is Augello's 'la figura etimologica *cenās cenasse* possono aver turbato la tradizione'. We are dealing not with the confusion of a tradition by mesmerically repetitive verbiage, but with the inability of the poor scribe of F to read the damaged manuscript in front of him. The following conjectures therefore lose their impetus: *se cenasse* *cenās* van der Vliet, Terzaghi; *se cenās* *cenare* Helm, Giaratano, Robertson, Frassinetti; *cenās se cenasse* Lütjohann, which tampers unjustifiably with what F *could* read, as do Novák's *cenās se habere* and van der Paardt's *scilicet cenās se esse*. What, then, *did* lie in F's exemplar? There are too many possibilities — it could even be *saliarēs esse cenās illas*. In the nature of the case we have no way of knowing and it is useless to pretend we do.¹⁵ We do not even know that the length of the lacuna in F accurately indicates the length of the damaged word(s) in the exemplar.

Vero, disturbed only by Hildebrand (*mero*), is secure: it is the δέ corresponding to the μὲν expressed by the *quidem* after *equus*.

The word ending in *quam* can only be *numquam*. Possible alternatives, *si umquam* or *quamquam*, could only lead to the sentence possessing peculiarly asinine thought. The *alias* cries out for *numquam*. And the thought of the whole is evidently that expressed in the Ass 17, ἐπειδὴ οὐπώποτε κριθᾶς ὠμὰς ἥριστήκειν, where οὐπώποτε guarantees *numquam alias*.

Next must come *hordeum* in the accusative (which is what Robertson thinks F originally read), for unless, as Lütjohann proposed, the lacuna that follows is of a remarkable extent, *iurulentum* agrees with it. And the termination of *iurulentum*, being clearly transmitted, should if possible be preserved, whereas the termination of *hordeo* is insecure.

*****tus sum* cannot be a finite verb. Otherwise the verb at *esserim*, whose existence is strongly suggested by *semper*, if finite, would require a conjunction of some form after *sum*.¹⁶ And even if *esserim* concealed the infinitive *esse*, it is impossible to supply, say *solitus sum*, because *minutatim e.d.c.i.* requires a word meaning 'except' after *sum*. To adopt a different approach, *minutatim* seems to have no word to qualify, unless with very considerable awkwardness it be *iurulentum*. Both problems disappear if we join those who read *tussum* (i.e. *tunsum*). The scribe has had trouble with word division in this passage, witness *secenas* and *es serim*; besides, I am not entirely convinced that the scribe has written it as two separate words in any case. And from reading *tussum* results an elegant chiasmus: *tussum minutatim et diutina coquitatione iurulentum*.

¹³ Robertson claims that *sali* and *es* are not even joined.

¹⁴ Excessively used even where theoretically appropriate, e.g. 9.39 (233.18) *nibilo minus ominosus* Frassinetti.

¹⁵ The same situation as at 6.4 (131.19–

20).

¹⁶ The *et* after *minutatim* can be ruled out, as using it to connect two verbs would leave *minutatim* at the end of a clause — and the wrong one at that.

What, then, goes into the lacuna? Clearly the word meaning 'except' or 'not', so that the whole phrase from this word up to *iurulentum*, qualifying *hordeum*, may correspond to what the précis Ass describes as ὡμὰς. (This is why the attempt to introduce *crudum* is mistaken). *Haud* or *non* would be flat and render the *et* difficult. *Praeter* is to my ear, if a favourite word of Apuleius', somewhat heavy and clumsy here. Perhaps *nisi* has the edge.

There remains the verb and how it is introduced. *Esserim* would be a hapax perfect subjunctive and it is just too great a coincidence that the next word, which is secure, begins *rim*-. We require a verb meaning 'eat', either in the perfect active participle or finite, in the first person and subordinated. The verb is therefore *essem* (*essē*),¹⁷ which incidentally gives a pleasant ditrochaic flourish to the end of the clause. The subordinating word takes the subjunctive and must go into the first lacuna before *num*-. Its meaning is to correspond to ἐπεὶ in the Ass. Possibilities are *cum*, which goes badly before *num*-, *quippe qui*, which in the *Metamorphoses* is used only once (with the indicative) and needs more than *ego vero* to precede it, *ut qui* which is not found in the *Metamorphoses* and, like *quippe qui*, stretches the length of the lacuna, or simply *qui*.

Book 4, ch. 24 (93.16–17): sub incerta salutis et carnificinae laniena

lanigena (-g-.al.m. deletum) F

The Groningen commentary is undoubtedly right to translate this 'in the excruciating uncertainty of safety or torture' and not to emend. The two difficulties are: first, *laniena* is associated with *salutis* in order to provide piquancy for the literary reader, and difficulty for scholars. Secondly, the genitives are dependent on *incerta* and express the alternatives between which uncertainty exists. In itself, there is no difficulty in a genitive dependent on *certus* or *incertus* and Callebat lists other examples.¹⁸ Rather, the problem lies in the use of the genitive to express both alternatives. *Incertus consili* (Plautus and Apuleius) and *incertus sententiae* (Livy) use the genitive only to express the field within which the uncertainty lies.¹⁹ *Incertus ultionis*, on the other hand, at Tacitus, *Annals* 2.75, and the remoter Apuleian example cited by Dust²⁰ and, following him, the Dutch, namely *tu quidem salutis et pudicitiae secura* at *Met.* 4.22 (92.22), do show usages which would parallel the use of the genitive to express one of the alternatives, but not both. Instead, for examples which provide a full parallel one must turn to the use of that synonym of *incertus*, *dubius*: *dubique fugae pugnaeque* Lucan 4.156; *undarum ac terrae dubio* Statius, *Theb.* 9.493. Evidently this is one of those Silver cases where, in Summers's words, the genitive is worked hard:²¹ and the effect produced is one of savoury compression.

Book 5, ch. 13 (113.25–114.1): et tibi devotae Psychae animam gaudio recrea

devote d***** (litt. c. VI inductis²² erasisque)Ps. (supra rasuram nuperrime relatum est²³ manum anni c. MD – omnibus codicibus solitis recentiore – diateque [sic] scripsisse)F: careque φ dicatque UES: dictareque A

The importance of this crux lies in its implications for the manuscript tradition.

¹⁷ Found also at 11.23 (284.32).

¹⁸ p. 187.

¹⁹ Pl. *Rud.* 213, Apul. *Met.* 5.21 (119.12), Livy 4.57.3.

²⁰ *CJ* 64 (1968) 267.

²¹ W. C. Summers, *Seneca, Select Letters*, p. lv.

²² Denied by Robertson, but restated by Augello after inspection.

²³ ap. Augello, p. 115 n. 10.

If, as most editors maintain, the correct reading were *devotae dicataeque*, then it would seem that *a*, as most editors do not maintain, was independent of F.

It is essential to note the precise circumstances in F. The scribe does not mark an omission; it is not the case that a word has become accidentally illegible. It has been deliberately crossed out, which implies a damning verdict by the first hand, and then submitted to the ultimate punishment, erasure. Such drastic treatment, without apparently any attempt at correction, implies a blatantly superfluous word and, bearing in mind that it began with *d* and that such a mistake is committed elsewhere by the scribe,²⁴ it is difficult not to believe, with Helm, that the word was simply a second *devote*.

Careque is the most obvious of stopgaps. ϕ , misinterpreting the circumstances in F, thought a word needed supplying and either invented it, as he invented *partem* at 144.15, or found it elsewhere.

However, it is the conflict within the *a* tradition which is most interesting: the *t* varies in position and suggests that what *a* read was at least *dicareque* with a *t* above and perhaps too far to the left of the *r*. The coincidence with ϕ is now alarming and it seems to me that we can only complete it by stating: *a* read *careque* and it was only altered to read *dicareque*; i.e. the reading of *a* is based on the same misconceived stopgap as ϕ 's. Why was it altered? I am tempted to think that the remaining traces of a *d* in F may have played some part. And an early conjecturer, like modern editors, knew the phrase *devotae dicataeque*, which after all has some air of authenticity. In fact, it would unbalance the sentence: *tibi devotae Psychae/animam gaudio recrea*; and it would do nothing to improve the rhythm.

We argue therefore for the reading adopted only by Helm and reject the view that *a* is independent of F. If anything, this crux demonstrates, as 3.11 suggested earlier, that *a* could well have been an apograph of F. What is, perhaps, a little more disconcerting, however is the suggestion of contamination between ϕ and *a*, a conclusion which could be avoided here only if F at some stage well before the hand of 1500 A.D. had *careque* added misguidedly above its rasura and which elsewhere cannot be avoided except by the supposition of coincidence.²⁵

Book 9, ch. 1 (203.6–8): *ut importunum atque lascivum me cuidam famulo curiose tradit certo aliquo loco clausum cohiberi*

traditum (iussit in margine sinistro al.man.scriptum iuxta cohiberi) F: *traditum* (iubet in margine man. recentiss.) ϕ

Editors read *traditum* and accept either *iubet* or *iussit*. Yet this is to take unauthoritative supplements too seriously. *Iussit* must have been added to F after ϕ was copied from it. *Iubet* shows only that part of iubeo is the most obvious stopgap. The *a* manuscripts are rightly not reported.

If, however, we look freshly at the reading of F, it surely strikes us that there are too many accusatives here and that in particular *traditum* and *clausum* go badly in the same line. *Clausum cohiberi* has the true Apuleian air of alliterative redundancy²⁶ and in any case balances *certo aliquo loco*. I therefore propose that,

²⁴ Helm cites 5.11 (112.16) and 7.27 (175.24).

²⁵ 7.12 (163.17) *parati*, 4.22 (91.12) (*et*) *enim*.

²⁶ Cf. 6.11 (136.12) *clausus cohercebatur*, Bernhard, *Der Stil des Apuleius*, p. 46. Hijmans et al., p. 27.

in the interests of elegance and to correct the sense of the sentence, we read *tradiit*. It involves no great change: the *-um* could be indicated by a mere sign, brought into existence probably by the surrounding accusatives. *Cobiberi* then becomes an infinitive of purpose. It is true that Apuleius elsewhere in the *Metamorphoses* in such circumstances employs usually the gerundive or the dative of a verbal noun after *trado*. But early Latin, from which Apuleius draws so much of his verbal resource, often favours such an infinitive after a verb of motion, which *trado* in effect is; and Apuleius does employ the infinitive of purpose after other verbs.²⁷

Book 11, ch. 2 (267.16): *udis ignibus*

sic dett. et editores plerique: undis ignibus F: sudis ignibus Blümner

Blümner's conjecture, recently adopted by Griffiths, may be debilitated by the support given to *udis* or the like by Ptolemy, *Tetr.* 1.4: ἡ δὲ σελήνη μὲν πλέον ἔχει τῆς δυνάμεως ἐν τῷ ὑγραίνειν . . . κεκονώνηκε δὲ ἡρέμα καὶ τοῦ θερμαίνειν.

Book 11, ch. 13 (276.3): *cupidissime*

sic φ: cupidus promissi ('supra vel pr- vel p- de promissi- re vera, suspicor, supra pro compendio scriptum - nuntiant editores: simulque duas in margine lineas erasas 'quarum prior in -ssime vid, desinere, alt. brevior legi nequit' (Robertson) F: cupidus cupidissime α.

The testimonies of *φ* and *α* show that the marginal note in F was concerned with *cupidissime*. Their interpretations of it vary. As *cupidissime* contains elements both of *cupidus* and of *promissi* and as *cupidus cupidissime* would be quite as fatuous as the alleged *mansuetos ac mansues* at 7.23 (171.18), we may suppose the question to be '*Cupidus promissi* or *cupidissime*?', as *φ* understands it.

Cupidissime is patently not a gloss — rather, it is an assertion that *cupidus promissi* is wrong. In itself there is nothing very objectionable about the latter and therefore the most likely ground for objection is that the writer of the marginal note could see it was not in the exemplar. The source of such corruption must, as Robertson suspected (though without following it through in his text), be the *promissum* amongst the following words, which indeed must not have been far from directly underneath *-issime* in the exemplar (cf. on 4.22 above). Further *cupidissime* will lighten the rhythm, otherwise clumsily ponderous.

Book 11, ch. 26 (287.23–24): *Augusti portum celerrime ac dehinc carpento pervolavi*

Editors supply a verb meaning 'reach' or 'arrive' after *celerrime*. However, the emphasis is on miraculous speed: thanks doubtless to Isis Euploia (and it is *deae potentis instinctu* that he is travelling) he is *tutus* . . . *prosperitate ventorum ferentium*; *celerrime* and *pervolavi* maintain the impetus. Stylistically consonant with this speed is the ellipse of the verb of arriving after *portum celerrime*. Ellipse of verbs of motion when the direction of the motion is already sufficiently indicated is well enough known in the rapid epistolary style of Cicero — one

²⁷ Woodcock, *A New Latin Syntax*, pp. 18–19; Médan, *La Latinité d'Apulée*, p. 76, Callebat, p. 305. For the sort of

usage I am postulating, cf. Hor. *Odes* 1.26. 1–3, Verg. *A.* 9.362, *TbLL* s.v. *do* col. 1688.

thinks, for instance, of *Rhodum volo puerorum causa, inde quam primum Athenas*²⁸ — and this paragraph reads rather as a traveller's letter home. Ellipse is perhaps too an insufficiently recognized device in the text of Apuleius: supplement seems to me the wrong way to handle 4.26 (95.9) *cum inruptionis subitae gladiatorum impetus* [sc. *fit*],²⁹ 4.23 (92.20) *eam simul intra speluncam* [sc. *ducunt*], 11.13 (276.11) *cauda nusquam* [sc. *comparuit*].³⁰

University College, Cardiff

KEN DOWDEN

²⁸ Att. VI.7.2.

²⁹ This is one to add to the 'seul exemple' of the ellipse of *fio* in Callebat 117; Callebat does not discuss any of these cases, in conformity with Bernhard 159 'Die Ellipse anderer als der genannten Verba, der verba dicendi und der Kopula *esse*, finden sich bei

Apulejus nicht'.

³⁰ Cf. Cic. Att. IV.8a.2 *virī boni nusquam*, where Shackleton Bailey understands *apparuerunt*. In the preparation of this article, I have been much aided by my colleague Mr. D. E. Hill and by the reader.