

taken into consideration.⁶ The reasoning, accordingly, is based not on syntax but on meaning: *nutum* is generally considered in abstract terms—the consent of Fortune—while *eum* must refer to something more concrete. In fact, I believe that it is very specific and that the context must be taken into account. Immediately before, we have:

Et ille quidem dignum uirtutibus suis uitae terminum posuit.

That is to say, Fortune has allowed Lamachus to end his days with dignity, killing himself heroically by thrusting a sword into his breast, whereas Alcimus was not granted this cruel consent to his wishes, for she did not even let him carry out his ingenious plans for a dignified death, as he ended up smashed against a stone after being thrown out of a window by an old woman. Thus *eum*, used as an adjective, is clearly anaphoric and has a very specific meaning: *eum saeuum Fortunae nutum, quem antea Lamachus adduxerat, Alcimus non adducere potuit*. Finally, it may be that *saeuum* should be corrected to *saeuae*, the ending having been easily corrupted under the influence of *eum* and *nutum*.⁷ *saeua* is the commonest epithet for *Fortuna* in the *Metamorphoses*. But *saeuum* can be maintained: it must actually refer to Fortune by enallage, but it may also be considered that it really qualifies *nutum*, given that this consent, though it may offer him some consolation, is, after all, consent for him to die. There is a very close parallel: *Fortunae nutus hilarior* (7.20.1 [169.8–9]).

Universidad de Sevilla

JUAN MARTOS

⁶ L. Callebat, *Sermo cotidianus dans les Métamorphoses d'Apulée* (Caen, 1968), 266. Cf. e.g.: *eum numerum* (11.1.4 [267.1]); *id ipsum commentum* (9.1.6 [203.15]); *ea bestia* (1.9.2 [8.21]); *ea nocte* (5.5.1 [106.12]); *ea scilicet iretur uia* (6.29.6 [151.15]); *de ea potione* (10.27.2 [258.16]); *ee litterae* (11.16.7 [278.23]); *is finis* (1.21.1 [19.6]).

⁷ The conjecture *saeuae* was made by the journal's anonymous referee.

THE NAMING OF THRASYLLUS IN APULEIUS' *METAMORPHOSES*¹

It is usually assumed that Apuleius gave one of his characters the name 'Thrasyllus' because of its etymological connection with *θρασύς*.² Indeed it is singularly appropriate and Apuleius himself draws attention to the fact: *Thrasyllus, praeceps alioquin et de ipso nomine temerarius* . . . (*Met.* 8.8). However, it does not follow that a name with such an etymological significance can have no other connotations:³ in this note I suggest that there is a further frame of reference behind 'Thrasyllus' and that Apuleius may have expected his readers to realize this.

The episode in which this character appears (8.1–14) contains storylines adapted from, allusions to, and verbal echoes of several literary forebears. To mention the most obvious examples: Charite's concern for her husband Tlepolemus' safety while he is hunting (8.4) and his subsequent death recall the warning that Venus gives to her

¹ I should like to thank Dr S. C. R. Swain and Dr J. H. Hordern, both of whom made helpful suggestions, and the anonymous referee, whose astute criticisms concentrated my argument.

² J. A. Hanson, *Apuleius Metamorphoses II* (Cambridge, MA, 1989), 60, n. 1; P. G. Walsh, *The Golden Ass* (Oxford, 1995), 258, n. 8.1.

³ Besides, given the plethora of other, more common, names with this particular etymological significance, e.g. *Θρασύβουλος*, *Θρασυκλῆς*, *Θρασύμαχος*, and *Θρασυμήδης* (see P. M. Fraser and E. Matthews [edd.], *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names* [Oxford, I 1987, II 1994, III 1997]), it is pertinent to ask, 'Why Thrasyllus?'

beloved Adonis and his fate at Ovid, *Met.* 10.542ff.; Charite's reaction to the news of her husband's death (8.6) evokes Dido's distress when the rumour of the Trojans' imminent departure reaches her ears (Verg. *Aen.* 4.298ff.); and the paradigm of the overall story of Charite, Tlepolemus, and Thrasyllus can be found at Plutarch, *Mul. Virt.* 257e–258c in the story of Camma, her husband Sinatus' murder at the hands of his rival Sinorix, his attempt to woo Camma, her revenge on him, and her suicide.⁴ While Plutarch only mentions the fact that the murder took place, Apuleius inserts the hunting episode in which Thrasyllus kills his rival, an allusion to the Adrastus story of Hdt. 1.34–45. The differences and similarities between the two tales, and especially the respective boar hunts, have been listed⁵ and it is sufficient here to note the most important. Adrastus is introduced as Phrygian royalty, but οὐ καθαρὸς χεῖρας. Thrasyllus is introduced as noble, but with *manus infectus humano cruore* (8.1). Their victims, Atys and Tlepolemus respectively, are both recently married and both want to go hunting. Atys persuades his father, Croesus, that he will come to no harm if he hunts a boar, as Croesus' dream foretold that he would die αἰχμῇ σιδηρῇ (1.34). Tlepolemus' wife shows similar concern for him, forbidding him to hunt *bestias armatas dente vel cornu* (8.4). He encounters a boar nevertheless. Atys is unintentionally killed by Adrastus, who misses the boar with his spear and hits him (1.43), whereas Tlepolemus is deliberately finished off by Thrasyllus, who drives his lance into his right thigh in order to make it look like a wound inflicted by a boar's tusk (8.6). Adrastus had previously killed his own brother (1.35), and Apuleius may have this in mind in making Thrasyllus an honorary brother of Tlepolemus when at 8.7 Thrasyllus mourns Tlepolemus as *fratrem denique* and at 8.9 Charite, in attempting to put Thrasyllus off his suit, describes her late husband as *tui fratris*. He would thus combine Adrastus' two victims, brother and huntsman, into one. Finally, both stories end with the suicide of the killer at the grave of his victim.⁶ Apuleius, then, can be seen to be using his source in a way which would have led his readers to recognize his clever manipulation of the material without losing sight of the original story.⁷

In Apuleius' tale Thrasyllus plays the Adrastus-figure, albeit a warped one. A connection can also be discerned between Thrasyllus, the Platonist/Pythagorean philosopher who was astrologer to Tiberius and who died in A.D. 36, and Adrastus the Peripatetic, whose dates are not as easy to establish.⁸ In his elementary work on arithmetic, the theory of musical harmony, and astronomy, the *Expositio Rerum Mathematicarum ad Legendum Platonem Utilium*, Theon of Smyrna, who is given a floruit of A.D. 115–40, quotes both Thrasyllus and Adrastus *verbatim*, at length and with acknowledgement.⁹ The work of Adrastus to which he refers, some fragments of

⁴ For a fuller exposition of the extent of Apuleius' debt to his literary predecessors, especially Vergil, see E. D. Finkelpearl, *Metamorphosis of Language in Apuleius* (Michigan, 1998), ch. 6.

⁵ By Finkelpearl (n. 4), 117, and by A. G. Westerbrink, 'Some parodies in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*', in B. L. Hijmans and R. Th. van der Paardt (edd.), *Aspects of Apuleius' Golden Ass* (Groningen, 1978), 70, where he provides a useful table comparing the elements of the respective stories. However, neither is entirely accurate.

⁶ Another element of Apuleius' game of allusion is possibly the fact that, while it is not clear in the Herodotean tale what happens to the boar after Adrastus has failed to hit it, Apuleius has Thrasyllus kill his boar *facili manu* (8.5).

⁷ We can infer from Lucian, *Iupp. Conf.* 12 that Second Sophistic readers were expected to be familiar with the story of Adrastus. It also seems to have been used by Achilles Tatius at *Leucippe and Cleitophon* 2.34 where Menelaus explains the reason for his exile.

⁸ For what we know of Adrastus, his dates, his works, and his considerable influence, see P. Moraux, *Der Aristotelismus bei den Griechen* 2 (Berlin, 1984), 294–332.

⁹ As J. M. Dillon, *The Middle Platonists* (London, 1996²), 397, puts it: 'the whole work is

which survive, discussed the mathematical and astronomical sections of Plato's *Timaeus*, relating Pythagorean and Aristoxenian harmonics and contemporary astronomy to Platonic cosmology.¹⁰ Thrasyllus is quoted by Theon on the subjects of harmonics and astronomy and according to Porphyry (*Ad Ptolem. Harmon.* 266) he wrote a work entitled *Περὶ τῶν ἑπτὰ τόνων*, and a Byzantine epitome of a compendium on astrology is extant under the title *Συγκεφαλαίωσις τοῦ πρὸς Ἱεροκλέα Θρασύλλου πίνακος*. Although Thrasyllus and Adrastus are mostly cited in isolation from each other, they are the latest writers to be quoted by Theon, and the lack of other recent authorities mentioned suggests that they were regarded as the most important figures to have written recently in these fields.

Two fragments from the *Introduction to Aratus' Phaenomena*, one of the numerous commentaries to Aratus, point more obviously to a link between the two:

περὶ δὲ τῆς ἐναρμονίου κινήσεως αὐτῶν εἶπεν, ὡς ἔφην, Ἄρατος ἐν τῷ Κανόνι καὶ Ἐρατοσθένης ἐν τῷ Ἑρμῇ καὶ Ὑψικλῆς καὶ Θράσυλλος καὶ Ἀδραστος Ἀφροδισιεύς.
(Achilles [Tatius?], *Intr. ad Aratum*, 43.7–10 Maass)¹¹

σχῆμα δὲ αὐτοῦ (sc. τοῦ ἡλίου) οἱ μὲν δυσκοειδές, Ἡράκλειτος δὲ σκαφοειδές, Στωικοὶ δὲ σφαιροειδές εἶναι λέγουσιν. πολλοῖς δὲ περὶ τούτου πραγματεῖαι γεγόνασιν, ὥσπερ Θρασύλλω καὶ Ἀδράστῃ τῷ ἀπὸ τοῦ Περιπάτου τῷ Ἀφροδισιεῖ. (Ibid., 46.27–31)

The authorship of this work is debated, the candidates being Achilles Tatius, the novelist, on the evidence of the *Suda*,¹² or someone else named Achilles. There are two main problems for the identification with the novelist. The first is that on the usual interpretation the last sentence of the *Suda* entry claims that Achilles Tatius' style is the same in all his other works as in his love stories. But the styles of *Leucippe and Cleitophon* and the *Intr. ad Aratum* are, unsurprisingly, very dissimilar. However, a more natural reading of the last sentence, and one which makes better sense of *κατὰ πάντα*, is: 'His style is in every respect similar to that of the erotic writers.' This is at least a more plausible statement, especially if it could be taken to refer to subject matter. The second problem is that of dating. But this evaporates when one considers (i) that the novel can hardly antedate the middle of the second century,¹³ but must have been written early enough for it to have been copied in *POxy* 3836; and (ii) that Ptolemy is the latest authority referred to in the *Intr. ad Aratum* and is mentioned only once. Ptolemy was producing work from roughly A.D. 146 to 170, so the *Intr. ad Aratum* cannot antedate this period,¹⁴ but since the canonical *Almagest* was published

essentially a compilation from these two immediate sources'. See T. Heath, *A History of Greek Mathematics* 2 (Oxford, 1921), 238–44 *passim*, and A. Barker, *Greek Musical Writings* 2 (Cambridge, 1989), 209–29, for the nature of Theon's debt to them.

¹⁰ See E. Hiller, 'De Adrasti Peripatetici in Platonis Timaeum commentario', *RhM* 26 (1871), 582–9.

¹¹ E. Maass (ed.), *Commentariorum in Aratum Reliquiae* (Berlin, 1898).

¹² s.v. A 4695 (1.439 Adler): Ἀχιλλεύς Στάτιος, Ἀλεξανδρεὺς, ὁ γράψας τὰ κατὰ Λευκίππην καὶ Κλειτοφῶντα καὶ ἄλλα ἔρωτικά ἐν βιβλίοις ἧ' γέγονεν ἔσχατον χριστιανὸς καὶ ἐπίσκοπος· ἔγραψε δὲ περὶ σφαίρας καὶ ἐτυμολογίας καὶ ἱστορίαν σύμμικτον, πολλῶν καὶ μεγάλων καὶ θαυμασιῶν ἀνδρῶν μνημονεύουσιν. ὁ δὲ λόγος αὐτοῦ κατὰ πάντα ὅμοιος τοῖς ἔρωτικοῖς. For an analysis, see E. Vilborg, *Achilles Tatius; Leucippe and Clitophon. A Commentary*. *Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia* XV (Göteborg, 1962), 7–9. It is not doubted that the *περὶ σφαίρας* and the *Intr. ad Aratum* are the same work. See H. Diels, *Doxographi Graeci* (Berlin, 1879), 18.

¹³ See K. Plepeltis, 'Achilles Tatius', in G. Schmeling (ed.), *The Novel in the Ancient World* (Leiden, 1996), 388–90.

¹⁴ Unless Achilles, who may have come from the same city as Ptolemy (see n. 15 with text), knew of his work before it was published.

in or around A.D. 150, it seems unlikely that Ptolemy would only have merited one mention, if the work which included him was written much later. The temptation to identify the writers is increased by the possibility that they both came from Alexandria.¹⁵ It is very unlikely that Apuleius wrote the *Metamorphoses* earlier than A.D. 158/9¹⁶ and he may well have written it a good deal later. If the above chronology is correct, both *Leucippe and Cleitophon* and the *Intr. ad Aratum* preceded the *Metamorphoses*. Moreover, if the identification is correct, we are left with the tantalizing possibility that Achilles Tatius provided the inspiration both for the Adrastus-tale (see n. 7 ad fin.) and for naming the Adrastus-figure 'Thrasyllus'.

Perhaps Thrasyllus was best known, apart from for his association with Tiberius, for ordering the Platonic corpus into tetralogies. Yet even here a point of contact between him and Adrastus can be seen. For although the extent of Thrasyllus' influence in this area is negotiable,¹⁷ he was well known as an arranger and interpreter, as we can tell from Diogenes Laertius 3.47–66 and from Albinus' *Prologus*.¹⁸ Adrastus too wrote a work about the corpus of his master entitled *Περὶ τῆς τάξεως τῶν Ἀριστοτέλους συγγραμμάτων* (Simpl. in *Ph.* 1, b; in *Cat.* 4, ζ.). (Cf. in *Cat.* 4, γ, where the designation is less specific: *Περὶ τῆς τάξεως τῆς Ἀριστοτέλους φιλοσοφίας*.)

Apuleius, a Platonist like Thrasyllus, would surely have been both familiar with his predecessor's works and aware of his importance in the tradition of which he himself was part. He also showed considerable interest, as any respectable Middle Platonist had to, in the works and doctrines of the Peripatetics¹⁹ and would no doubt have been conscious of Adrastus' influence as a Peripatetic and Platonic commentator. Apuleius himself wrote works, which are now lost, on astrology,²⁰ harmonics, and arithmetic,²¹ and he would surely have read the sources already mentioned. He may also have linked Thrasyllus and Adrastus himself in his works. In any case it seems that the name 'Thrasyllus', as well as being etymologically suitable for the character it is given to, was suggested to Apuleius by the connection discerned above. It might also have been the case that he would have expected his readers to realize the link between them and so find it humorous when they came across a Thrasyllus who was playing the role of an evil Adrastus.

University of Warwick

I. D. REPATH

¹⁵ Compare Maass (n. 11), xvii–xviii, with the unanimous testimony of the *Suda* and the MSS.

¹⁶ See S. J. Harrison, 'Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*', in Schmeling (n. 13), 493.

¹⁷ See, for instance, H. Tarrant, *Thrasyllan Platonism* (Ithaca, NY, 1993).

¹⁸ In C. F. Hermann, *Platonis Dialogi* 6 (Leipzig, 1853). Thrasyllus was also credited with arranging the works of Democritus into tetralogies (D.L. 9.45).

¹⁹ See *Apol.* 36, for example, where Apuleius reveals a wide knowledge of the learned literature of Aristotle, Theophrastus, Eudemus, and Lycon on fish.

²⁰ John Lydus (*Mens.* 73; *Ost.* 3, 4, 7, 10, 44, 54) refers to Apuleius on astronomical matters, some of which passages are collected in J. Beaujeu, *Apulée: Opusculs philosophiques et fragments* (Paris, 1973).

²¹ Cassiodorus records a treatise *De Musica* (*Inst.* 2.5.10 = *De Musica* 10). The same writer also records a translation of Nicomachus of Gerasa's *Ἀριθμητικὴ εἰσαγωγή* by Apuleius (*Inst.* 2.4.7 = *De Arithm.* 7), as does Isidorus of Seville (*Etym.* 3.2). Nicomachus' work shows marked similarities to that of Theon (documented in M. L. D'Ooge et al., *Nicomachus of Gerasa, Introduction to Arithmetic* [New York, 1926], ch. 2), and the translation of the former indicates an interest on Apuleius' part in such handbooks and can only increase the probability that he read the latter.