

ἀναφανῇ καιρός). One could think of *πρόεισι . . . καιρός*, given that there are some instances of the genitive absolute *καιροῦ προϊόντος*,<sup>7</sup> whereas *καιροῦ προσιόντος* appears only in the example of Libanius quoted above. Still, the idea of progression normally connected with *προέρχομαι* / *πρόειμι* seems in this case inferior to the idea of addition expressed by *προσέρχομαι* / *πρόσειμι*. Thus the symposium is marked as a distinctive part of the robbers' banquet, setting the scene for the narration of Chrysiôn. There remains the *καί* deleted by the earlier editors and replaced by Papanikolaou. I retain it—like Hägg—as an adverb (*too*). This would imply an asyndetic construction, which is not very surprising in Xenophon (cf. for example 3.11.5).

University of Bern

STEFAN TILG

stefan.tilg@kps.unibe.ch

doi:10.1017/S0009838806000759

<sup>7</sup> A look at *TLG* shows, however, that most of them date from very late or Byzantine authors. The only example before the fourth century A.D. is Origen, *Fragmenta in Evangelium Joannis* 128. There is a single occurrence of *πρόεισι καιρός* (Procl. *In Platonis Alcibiadem* 1, 124: ἀνωθεν γὰρ ὁ καιρός ἀπὸ τῶν θεῶν ἀρχόμενος πρόεισιν ἄχρι τῶν ἐσχάτων), which I find too specialized to be convincing.

## A GREEK MISCELLANIST AS A LIBIDINOUS THESSALIAN WITCH? PAMPHILE IN APULEIUS' *METAMORPHOSES* 2–3\*

Among the significant 'speaking' names in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* is that of Pamphile, Lucius' hostess who possesses not only an enormous taste for young lovers, but also a considerable knowledge of witchcraft. It is her transformation into a bird in Book 3 of the novel that leads to Lucius' disastrous decision to try out the magic arts himself, with the well-known consequence of his metamorphosis into an ass.

The name Pamphile—the all-lover—certainly wholly accords with the character's behaviour and could therefore be explained as one of the many speaking names within the course of the novel:<sup>1</sup> Lucius is warned explicitly by Byrrhaena, an old family friend, of Pamphile's infamous sexual appetite: *nam simul quemque conspexerit speciosae formae iuuenem, uenustate eius sumitur et ilico in eum et oculum et animum detorquet* (Apul. *Met.* 2.5).

Clearly this explanation for the name Pamphile works perfectly on the level of the narration itself. But one may wonder if Apuleius has chosen the name also for another, that is literary reason. We know that throughout the novel he either mentions

\* I am especially grateful to Katerina Oikonomopoulou (Oxford) with whom I discussed the idea of this paper and who gave me a number of helpful comments and to Stephen Harrison (Oxford) who read a draft version of this paper.

<sup>1</sup> See B. Hijmans, Jr, 'Significant names and their function in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*', in B. L. Hijmans, Jr and R. Th. van der Paardt (edd.), *Aspects of Apuleius' Golden Ass* (Groningen, 1978), 107–22, esp. 109–10. W. Keulen, 'Significant names in Apuleius: a "good contriver" and his rival in the cheese trade (*Met.* 1, 5)', *Mnemos.* 53 (2000), 310–21.

real-life figures like Sulla or Caesar (Apul. *Met.* 7.6), authors like Homer (10.30) and Pythagoras (11.1) or, as in the case of Aristomenes (1.6) and Plotina (7.6–7),<sup>2</sup> he names his characters after famous historical persons and authors, especially—with jocular connotations—Socrates in Book 1, not to forget Lucius' effort to stress his kinship with Plutarch (1.2, 2.3).<sup>3</sup> As neither Aristomenes nor Socrates come off very well in the narrative, the reader is prepared for a less than respectful treatment of Pamphile.

Indeed there is an earlier author called Pamphila of Epidauros who lived in the time of Nero<sup>4</sup> and wrote a major work entitled *Ἱστορικὰ ὑπομνήματα* in thirty-three volumes, out of which only ten fragments have survived.<sup>5</sup> Her other works were epitomes of historical and other authors, including Ctesias, and two treatises, *Περὶ ἀμφισβητήσεων* and, most important for our case, *Περὶ ἀφροδισίων*, as we learn from the *Suda*.<sup>6</sup>

Leofranc Holford-Strevens in his book on Aulus Gellius has doubted Pamphila's authorship of the *Περὶ ἀφροδισίων*: '[A] treatise on sex that a lady with her *redender Name* could have imputed to her without the trouble of writing it. . . . It cannot be believed to be hers because the women claimed as authors by such texts were prostitutes.'<sup>7</sup> As this work is completely lost, we can possibly assume that, even if Pamphila was not the original author, in antiquity it was already ascribed to her because of its content and style. But more likely no literary judgement need have been exercised at all: In the first place the treatise itself might have claimed, by its author's masculine malice, to be hers, *Παμφίλης Ἐπιδάυριος*; alternatively it may simply have claimed for author *a* Pamphila (whether in truth some ancient Anaïs Nin or Xaviera Hollander or someone usurping the name of a then-famous *hetaera* with that civil or professional name), who was subsequently identified with *the* Pamphila known to have used a pen. Still, this alleged authorship of an erotic work might be one reason why Apuleius created for her a (not very flattering) monument in the form of the libidinous character of Pamphile in his *Metamorphoses*. Pamphila's presumably eastern origin might have added to the attraction. Whereas the *Suda* says that she came from Epidauros, according to Photios she was Egyptian by birth or by descent,<sup>8</sup> so we may assume that her family came from Egypt, but she herself was born an Epidaurian.

But Apuleius quite clearly could have had another motivation for creating a monument to Pamphila in his novel. As the author of the *Hypomnemata* she is paradigmatic of the classical genre of the so-called *Buntschriftstellerei*,<sup>9</sup> itself an

<sup>2</sup> As I hope to prove in my forthcoming article '*Quaedam rarae fidei atque singularis pudicitiae femina*. The figure of Plotina in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* 7.6–7.7'.

<sup>3</sup> V. Hunink, 'Apuleius and Plutarch', in L. de Blois, J. Boms, T. Kessels, and D. M. Schenkeveld (edd.), *The Statesman in Plutarch's Works* 1 (Leiden, 2004), 251–80; W. Keulen, 'Lucius' kinship diplomacy: Plutarchan reflections in an Apuleian character', in *ibid.* 261–73.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. A. Daub, 'Kleine Beiträge zur griechischen Litteraturgeschichte', *RhM* 35 (1880), 56–68.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Müller, *FGrH* 3.520–2 [s.v. *Pamphila Epidauria*].

<sup>6</sup> s.v. *Παμφίλη* [Π 139] and *Σωτερίδας Ἐπιδάυριος* resp. *γραμματικός* [Σ 875–6].

<sup>7</sup> L. Holford-Strevens, *Aulus Gellius. An Antonine Scholar and his Achievement* (Oxford, 2000<sup>2</sup>), 29, n. 15. He also reports about other Pamphilai: 'Although the name is well attested epigraphically, and the Pamphile of Arist. *HA* 551b15 will have earned her living by weaving, other Pamphilai were in life the *hetaera* of Ath.13.591 E, in literature the addressee of Val. Aed. *fr.* 1 and the witch of Apul. *Met.* (cf. Pasiphile in [Archil.] *fr.* 331 West).' In Latin literature the most famous example is of course the character in Terence's *Eunuchus*.

<sup>8</sup> See Phot. *Bibl.* cod.175.

<sup>9</sup> The term was coined by German classical scholarship in the late nineteenth century after Aelian's *ποικίλη ἱστορία*.

intellectual source and a literary inspiration for Apuleius' own *Quaestiones convivales*, which—like Gellius' *Noctes Atticae* in some scenes—must have aimed at serious learning by writing in the format of Aristotelian *Προβλήματα* or *Quaestiones* and framing his talks as a symposium.<sup>10</sup> We only possess two testimonia to this work that give us a rough idea of its content: a *Platonico Madaurensi saltem formulas mutuare convivialium quaestionum* (Sid. Apoll. 9.13.3), and a slightly longer one from Macrobius: *suadeo in conviviis . . . magis quaestiones convivales vel proponas vel ipse dissolvas. quod genus veteres ita ludicrum non putarunt, ut et Aristoteles de ipsis aliqua conscripserit et Plutarchus et Apuleius* (Macrob. Sat. 7.3.23–4).<sup>11</sup>

What we do know is that authors engaged in the genre of *Buntschriftsteller*, who are also called miscellanists, collected a huge amount of learned material and put it together in any random order. According to Phot. Bibl. cod. 175, Pamphila herself saw in the variety of her writing the most charming element (χαρίεστατον τὸ ἀναμειγμένον), because she wanted to achieve an effect of broadening the overall knowledge of the reader (εἰς πολυμάθειαν): that is why, on the other hand, Photios is distinguishing the uniform and straightforward style (ἀφέλεια)<sup>12</sup> and ideas of her personal interventions from the more varied and ornamented diction applied to past events. The former he ungenerously associates with her sex; it may have been intended rather to contrast the epigonal present with the heroic past.

Overall the *Buntschriftstellerei* was an especially fitting genre in the time of the Second Sophistic,<sup>13</sup> when out of an ever-growing number of writings more and more knowledge had to be excerpted. Of the known Latin writings (also known as *Varia Historia*), apart from the *Naturalis Historia* by Pliny, the *Noctes Atticae* by Aulus Gellius,<sup>14</sup> and the rather late *Saturnalia* by Macrobius from the fifth century, all other works of the miscellanists are lost.<sup>15</sup>

It is still possible to reconstruct to a certain extent the content and character of Pamphila's main work, the *Hypomnemata*, by examining the eight fragments we possess from Diogenes Laertius and two from Aulus Gellius<sup>16</sup> more closely. Especially helpful is also the longer note in Photios' *Βιβλιοθήκη*.<sup>17</sup> Pamphila's work seemed to have contained anecdotes about famous people and philosophers,<sup>18</sup> as well as excerpts from learned discussions Pamphila had with her husband and their regular guests in their thirteen years of marriage. Pamphila was married to a certain Socratidas,<sup>19</sup> and

<sup>10</sup> A common source for both authors are the *Quaestiones convivales* by Plutarch.

<sup>11</sup> See S. J. Harrison, *Apuleius. A Latin Sophist* (Oxford, 2000), 30–1.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Gell. *praef.* 2–3. The term ἀφέλεια was not necessarily considered negative: a simple style usually counted as a virtue, cf. Hermog. *Id.* 5.1. See J. *Ernesti Lexicon technologiae Graecorum rhetoricae* (Leipzig, 1795; repr. Hildesheim, 1962), s.v. Ἀφέλῃς, 51–2; more recently I. Rutherford: *Canons of Style in the Antonine Age: Idea-Theory and its Literary Context* (Oxford, 1998).

<sup>13</sup> H. Krasser and E. Bowie, s.v. *Buntschriftstellerei*, in *Neue Pauly* 2 (Stuttgart, 1997), 850–3.

<sup>14</sup> For the title cf. A. Vardi, 'Why Attic nights? Or what's in a name?', *CQ* 43 (1993), 298–301.

<sup>15</sup> We know of the existence of at least *Musae* by Aurelius Opilius, *Silvae* by Valerius Probus, and *Cena* by Granus Licinianus; for more titles cf. P. Steinmetz, *Untersuchungen zur römischen Literatur des 2. Jahrhunderts nach Christi Geburt* (Wiesbaden, 1982), 275–6.

<sup>16</sup> Diog. Laert. 1. 24, 63, 76, 90, 98; 2.24; 3.23; 5.36. Gell. 15.17 and 15.23.; cf. Holford-Strevens (n. 8), 29, 34–5.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. Phot. Bibl. cod. 175. 119B16–120A4.

<sup>18</sup> See Gell. 15.17 about Alcibiades' education in playing the flute, also told differently in Plut. *Alc.* 2.

<sup>19</sup> About the contradicting sources see O. Regenbogen, s.v. Pamphila 1, in *RE* 18.3 (Stuttgart, 1949), 309–28; prejudice ascribed her work to her father or her husband, cf. Holford-Strevens (n. 7), 29, n. 15.

together with him regularly invited what was obviously a close circle of friends for discussion—a subtle hint at this tradition is possibly made in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* by Lucius' discussion with his host Milo during dinner about the Chaldean prophet Diophanes in book 2, who according to Lucius has predicted that *historiam magnam et incredulam fabulam et libros me futurum* (Apul. *Met.* 2.12). Reading Lucius' story seems to prove the prophecy correct, but Lucius' host Milo, Pamphile's husband, exposes Diophanes as a prophet who could not even foresee his own fate.

As Otto Regenbogen has stated,<sup>20</sup> the influence that Pamphila's writings had over at least eight centuries was enormous, so her *œuvre* itself must have been quite representative. From Aulus Gellius we learn that in his own—and therefore Apuleius'—time the genre of *Varia historia* was quite diversified: he names thirty titles alone, unfortunately without their respective authors.<sup>21</sup>

Aulus Gellius could also be the one from whom Apuleius learned about Pamphila the author, as Gellius and Apuleius were certainly acquainted and could have met both in Athens and Rome (Gell. 19.11.3).<sup>22</sup> They certainly belonged to the same intellectual circle and were therefore familiar with the same kind of literature which they used as a common source. There may also have existed an epitome of Pamphila's work in four volumes by Aulus Gellius' friend, the rhetor Favorinus<sup>23</sup> in the second century A.D.,<sup>24</sup> and both Favorinus' lost writings *Ἀπομνημονεύματα* in at least five volumes and *Παντοδαπή ἱστορία* in twenty-four volumes must have been quite close in character to Pamphila's work<sup>25</sup> and were, like hers, later used by Diogenes Laertius as a source.

So we may assume that Apuleius has not only chosen the name Pamphile in his novel as a speaking name, but also that by naming his character he had the opportunity to make a literary pun<sup>26</sup> on his acquaintance with an author who wrote a century earlier like himself about all things worth knowing,<sup>27</sup> and whose enormous and, as a woman writer, surely suspicious success, allegedly attached to a work about

<sup>20</sup> Cf. Regenbogen (n. 18), esp. 326 and 328.

<sup>21</sup> Gell. *praef.* 5–9; cf. Harrison (n. 11), 93: The term *ἀνθρῶν* might refer to Apuleius' *Florida*.

<sup>22</sup> Holford-Strevens (n. 8), 22–3, who strongly argues for reciprocal influence (26); see also Harrison (n. 11), 6, n. 22; 87 (also n. 22); 186.

<sup>23</sup> Gellius also revered him as his teacher. He attached himself to him on leaving the rhetorical schools. To Favorinus' circle belonged Fronto and Plutarch: the latter dedicated *De primo frigido* to Favorinus and mentions him in *Quaest. conviv.* 8.10; cf. E. L. Bowie, 'Hadrian, Favorinus, and Plutarch', in J. Mossman (ed.), *Plutarch and his Intellectual World. Essays on Plutarch* (London, 1997), 1–15 at 3.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. Steph. Byz. s.v. 'Ροπεῖς· ἔθνος· οὗ μέμνηται Φαβωρίνος ἐν ἐπιτομῇ δ' τῆς Παμφίλης [τετάρτῃ τῆς Παμφυλίας] ~ 'a people whom Favorinus mentions in the fourth Epitome of Pamphile' [inferior variant 'people . . . of Pamphylia']. The text is unclear: Meineke in his edition took that to mean in his, that is Favorinus', epitome, cf. A. Meineke, *Stephani Byzantini Ethnorum quae supersunt ex recensione* (Berlin, 1849; repr. Graz, 1956; Chicago, 1992); A. Barigazzi in his commentary on Favorinus fr. 90 objects, that the Greek would have to mean Pamphila's own epitome and posits a lacuna (e.g. 'and is mentioned'), cf. *Favorino di Arelate opere* (Florence, 1966), 239–41.

<sup>25</sup> He also influenced Aelian, cf. Ael. *VH* 2.24: Plato's appointment as legislator of Megalopolis by the Arcadians and Thebans (cf. Diog. Laert. 3.23).

<sup>26</sup> S. Swain, 'Bilingualism and biculturalism in Antonine Rome: Apuleius, Fronto, and Gellius', in L. Holford-Strevens and A. Vardi, *The Worlds of Aulus Gellius* (Oxford, 2004), 3–40, at 13: 'For Apuleius was particularly concerned to be known for his knowledge of Greek; that is, the demonstration that he commanded Greek culture was a key part of his self-presentation as a master of Latin.'

<sup>27</sup> About the theory of an Apuleian encyclopedia cf. Harrison (n. 11), 37: Surely he was 'more of a compiler of existing materials than an original investigator'.

sex, made her the perfect model for his character. As Apuleius saw himself as ‘the purveyor of Greek intellectual culture to an audience for whom he himself is the major source for such material’<sup>28</sup> he could at the same time make a reference to, and a joke about, his literary predecessor.

*St John's College, Oxford*

HENDRIK MÜLLER-REINEKE

mueller-reineke@web.de

doi:10.1017/S0009838806000760

<sup>28</sup> Cf. Harrison (n. 11), 38.

## PHILOXENUS ONCE AGAIN\*

In a short and interesting contribution published in a previous volume of this journal, Krystyna Bartol pointed to an enigmatic passage in Athenaeus' *Deipnosophistae* (1.5f–6a), containing a quotation from Clearchus (fr. 57 Wehrli) about the notorious glutton and parasite Philoxenus.<sup>1</sup> The fragment, which is also to be found in the *Suda* (Φ 395; 4.729.11–16 Adler), deals with Philoxenus' custom of intruding himself upon others and enjoying their meals. Unlike Bartol, and for reasons that will become clear below, I prefer the version of the *Suda* as point of departure:

Φιλόξενος, Λευκαδίου. ὄνομα παρασίτου. τοῦτόν φασιν προλούμενον ἐν τῇ πατρίδι κὰν ἄλλαις πόλεσι περιέρχεσθαι τὰς οἰκίας, ἀκολουθούντων αὐτῷ παίδων, φερόντων ἔλαιον, γάρον, ὄξος καὶ ἄλλα τῶν ἡδυσμάτων. εἰσιόντα δὲ εἰς τὰς ἀλλοτρίας οἰκίας τὰ ἐψόμενα τοῖς ἄλλοις ἀρτύειν, ἐμβάλλοντα ὦν ἦν χρεία, καὶ οὕτως [εἰς ἑαυτὸν] κύψαντα εὐωχεῖσθαι.

Philoxenus, of Leucas. Name of a parasite. It is told that he, having first taken a bath, went round among the houses in his own city and others as well, followed by slaves carrying oil, fish-paste, vinegar, and other relishes. And that he entered a house, albeit a stranger's, and seasoned whatever was cooking for the rest of the company, putting in what was lacking. When all was ready, he bent over [towards himself] and greedily enjoyed the feast.

(translation after C. B. Gulick)

The main problem of this passage, presented very well by Bartol, concerns the phrase καὶ οὕτως [εἰς ἑαυτὸν] κύψαντα εὐωχεῖσθαι, and more specifically the meaning of the aorist participle κύψαντα. At this point, a problem of textual criticism arises. The manuscripts that have preserved the *Epitome* of the first books of Athenaeus' *Deipnosophists* provide the reading ἀνακάμψαντα: Philoxenus first ‘walked up and down’, and then enjoyed the luxurious feast. This reading was recently defended by M. L. Gambato, who interprets the verb ἀνακάμπτειν as an ironic allusion to Peripatetic walking. In this view, Philoxenus appears as ‘una curiosa figura di

\* I am greatly indebted to Prof. L. Van der Stockt, and to the anonymous referee of the journal, whose valuable remarks and suggestions on the original draft of this article helped me to refine my position.

<sup>1</sup> K. Bartol, ‘What did he do? Clearchus on Philoxenus (ap. Ath. 1.5f–6a = Clearch. fr. 57 Wehrli)’, *CQ* NS 54 (2004), 292–6.