

J. MARTOS: *Las Metamorfosis o El Asno de Oro. Introducción, Texto Latino, Traducción y Notas*. Vol. I (Books 1–3) and II (Books 4–11). Pp. CLV + 68 (Vol. I) and 226 (Vol. II). Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 2003. Hardback, € 42,39  
ISBN 84-00-08187-0

Reviewed by Maaïke Zimmerman, Groningen.

Unlike most Spanish translations of Apuleius' novel which almost without exception are entitled 'El Asno de Oro', the edition/translation of Juan Martos (henceforth M.) is deliberately given the double title 'Las Metamorfosis o El Asno de Oro'. This is explained and discussed in part 3.2 of M.'s extensive (155 pages) introduction; his detailed discussion is only one of many instances which testify to M.'s thorough knowledge and processing of the vast secondary literature concerning Apuleius' novel. On the whole, M.'s introduction gives a clear overview of the scholarly discussion and the present state of investigation of all aspects of the *Metamorphoses* (henceforth: *Met.*). After the first chapters on Apuleius (*Vida*: xii–xvii) and his works (*Obras*: xvii–xxxvi), in ch. 3 of the introduction M. discusses the *Met.* under the following headings: 3.1 *Once libros de metamorfosis*: a brief discussion of the structure of the eleven books of the novel; 3.2 *Dos títulos*: more extensive discussion of the double title; 3.3 *Cronología*: a survey of the current opinions on the date of composition of the *Met.* leading to M.'s conclusion; more arguments can be adduced for a late date (after ca. 180) than for an early date, but M. rightly states that the question must remain open. 3.4 *El género*: the 'obligatory' discussion of the anachronistic term *novela* applied to the *Met.*, and of the use of the words *fabula* and *sermo Milesius* in the *Met.* itself. The work is then briefly compared to other prose fiction, Greek and Roman, with references to relevant bibliography in footnotes. 3.5 *Las fuentes: Las tres historias del asno*: a doxographical exposition of the question of the relationship between the lost Greek Μεταμορφώσεις, known to Photius, the pseudo-Lucianic Ass and the Latin *Metamorphoses*. The related questions of which of the inserted tales was added by Apuleius, and which was in the lost Greek Μεταμορφώσεις are also touched upon. In sum, M. rightly emphasises Apuleius' original handling of his *Vorlage*, which makes his novel a re-creation rather than an adaptation. This is illustrated by a short discussion of the use of meaningful names and of characterisation in the *Met.*

After the extensive presentation of the Greek literary tradition of asstales, M. mentions briefly the folkloric antecedents of the motif of a man who changes into an ass, and the Isiac connotations of the ass (Seth). In 3.6, *Las Metamorfosis y otras obras de Apuleyo*, it is shown that parts of the *Met.* clearly reveal themselves as the work of a 'Latin sophist', the author of the *Florida*, the *Apology* and other rhetorical and philosophical works. 3.7 is a concise but clear discussion with up-to-date bibliographical references to the current scholarly opinions on the tale of Cupid and Psyche; the connection of this tale with the narrative context, its various allegorical interpretations, and its possible literary backgrounds are all touched upon. M. disagrees with Fehling's dismissal of a folkloric 'fairy-tale' background,<sup>1</sup> and thinks that the origins of the tale must be sought "in the diffuse borderland between myth and folklore" (p. lviii). 3.8, *Los relatos y la unidad de la novela*, describes, with bibliographical references, how scholarly views on Apuleius' novel developed from the theory that there is no narrative unity in the text to the currently prevailing view that there is a deeper coherence of the seemingly disparate episodes and inserted tales with the main story, realized by means of thematic and structural correspondences and guiding narrative motifs. 3.9 *Platón en las Metamorfosis*: a survey of the diverging opinions on direct or indirect (e.g. through Plutarch) Platonic influences in the *Met.*, and on the function of allusions to Platonic dialogues in the novel. 3.10, *Las alusiones literarias en las Metamorfosis*: a rather tedious and confused summing up of the literary texture of the *Met.* No distinction is made between allusion, parody, inversion, or references to a specific linguistic register. It is of course impossible to treat this complex subject in slightly more than two pages (lxi ff.). Anyhow, the reader of this introduction is alerted to the existence of a dense intertextuality in Apuleius' novel, and is guided towards the relevant secondary literature.

3.11, *Lucio, el protagonista, y su mundo*: the idea of a moral development of the protagonist of the novel is shown to be untenable; the *Met.* is not a *Bildungsroman*. The protagonist is a distinguished Greek young man, probably with Roman citizenship, who has received a proper education; his naive credulity and curiosity are the causes of his misadventures. The world

---

<sup>1</sup> D. Fehling, *Amor und Psyche: Die Schöpfung des Apuleius und ihre Einwirkung auf das Märchen, eine Kritik der romantischen Märchentheorie*, Wiesbaden 1977. Fehling argues that the Apuleian tale itself is the origin of later fairy tales.

of the *Met.* is roughly recognisable as the Greek provinces of the Roman Empire of the second century (and in the eleventh book: Rome). Although some social and cultural elements no doubt reflect historical realities of the period, the presence of e.g. Romanising elements, anachronisms, literary topoi, and further signals of fictionality, clearly make the reader aware that Lucius' adventures take place in a fictional world.<sup>2</sup> 3.12, *La técnica de la narración*: presentation of current insights into the narrative techniques of the *Met.*, and the complexities of the first-person-narrative. The development of the narratological investigations since the pioneering work of Junghanns, Riefstahl, and Paratore, which enhanced the appreciation of Apuleius' novel as a whole, is described in a succinct and clear manner. Two passages in which the narrative complexities of the *Met.* are especially manifest, are singled out for extensive discussion: the 'Prologue' and the famous *Madaurensis* passage in 11.27.9. It is shown that the interpretation of such enigmatic passages is closely connected with the interpretation of the *Met.* as a whole. This is the subject of 3.13, *La interpretación*: in slightly over 4 pages, M. analyses the problems which confront scholars who try to come to terms with the question of interpretation: is Apuleius' novel intended only to entertain, or does it convey a philosophical, moral or religious message? The various answers proposed by scholars are all presented in a fair discussion, and with the necessary bibliographical references. M. welcomes recent approaches that situate the work in its cultural context of the Second Sophistic, but denies that this would imply an interpretation in terms of pure entertainment. 3.14, *La lengua de Apuleyo*: about 6 pages (lxxii ff.) are devoted to a detailed discussion of the language and style of the novel with relevant bibliography in the notes. Well-chosen examples from the text and references to further reading accompany this survey. The fourth chapter presents in summary the influence of the *Met.* on posterity, especially from the Renaissance onward, with full bibliographical references for those who want to read more. The chapter (4.2) on *Apuleyo en España* in particular supplies the reader with a wealth of information, revealing the intense and decisive influence of Apuleius' novel in Spanish literature from medieval times (twelfth

---

<sup>2</sup> In footnote 276, one misses a reference to W. Riess, 'Between Fiction and Reality: Robbers in Apuleius' Golden Ass', *Ancient Narrative* 1 (2000–2001), 260–282; and idem, *Apuleius und die Räuber. Ein Beitrag zur historischen Kriminalitätsforschung*, Stuttgart 2001.

century) and, in more detail, from the first Spanish translations (early sixteenth century) onward. Chapter 4.3 discusses the merits of the various Spanish translations, from the famous translation by López de Cortegana (1584) to the most recent ones.

Chapter 5 deals first with the manuscript transmission of the text (5.1, *El texto de las Metamorfosis*). M. on the whole reproduces and adheres to the generally accepted conclusions of Robertson:<sup>3</sup> of the approximately 40 manuscripts of the *Met.* that have come down to us, all ‘recentiores’ are considered descendants of the earliest, Beneventan codex produced at Monte Cassino in the eleventh century: Laur. 68.2, known as **F**. This ms. is our single important source for the constitution of a legible text of the *Met.* Where **F** is illegible, its oldest apograph, Laur. 29.2 (**φ**, a Beneventan codex too, produced *ca.* 1200), and the mss. of Class I,<sup>4</sup> of which the most important representative is Ambros. N 180 sup., known as **A**., are the most useful witnesses for constituting the text. M. briefly mentions, but dismisses (and, in my opinion, undervalues) recent scholarly publications in which it is argued that **A** (and other mss. of Class I) may possibly represent a more independent tradition: according to this view, at Monte Cassino in the eleventh century the exemplar that contained Apuleius’ *Apology*, *Metamorphoses*, and *Florida* was used, before it was lost, as the source of more than one copies: C (10 folia of a Beneventan codex found at Assisi, containing fragments of the *Apology*), **F**, and the ancestor of **A**.<sup>5</sup>

5.2. offers a survey of the editions of the *Met.* since the *editio princeps* (Rome 1469) up to Hanson’s Loeb edition of 1989, and Callebat’s revised

<sup>3</sup> D.S. Robertson, ‘The Manuscripts of the *Metamorphoses* of Apuleius’, *CQ* 18 (1924), 27–42 and 85–99. See also P.K. Marshall, ‘Apuleius. *Apologia*, *Metamorphoses*, *Florida*’, in: L. D. Reynolds (ed.), *Texts and Transmission. A Survey of the Latin Classics*, Oxford 1983, 15–16.

<sup>4</sup> For the division of the manuscripts in 4 classes, and their presentation, see Robertson 1924 (previous note), and Robertson’s Introd. to the Budé edition of the *Met.* (Robertson-Vallette 1940–45), pp. xlvi–xlviii.

<sup>5</sup> O. Pecere, ‘Qualche riflessione sulla tradizione di Apuleio a Montecassino’, in G. Cavallo (ed.), *Le strade del testo*, Bari 1987, 97–124 (repr. in: O. Pecere, A. Stramaglia, eds., *Studi Apuleiani*, Cassino 2003, 37–60). Pecere argues that a new edition of the *Met.* should be based on new and complete collations of **A** and other mss. of its class. Already Robertson and Giarratano had attributed to **A** and other mss. of Class I a different and more important role than to the other ‘deteriores’, but they had not done this in a systematic manner. See G. Magnaldi, G.F. Gianotti, ‘Codici e Edizioni’, in: Id. (eds.), *Apuleio. Studi del testo e interpretazioni*, Alessandria 2000, 9–16.

edition (1992) of the middle volume of the Budé edition (Robertson-Vallette 1940–1945). The revised edition by Callebat, however highly praised by M. on p. xcix, seems not to have been systematically consulted by him in his constitution of the text of *Met.* IV.28, V, and VI.1–24 (see, e.g., below, my remarks on V.17.1 and VI.1.1). This section concludes with the observation that the scholarly commentaries on individual books or sections of the *Met.* that have appeared in the past years are an indispensable tool for a critical edition of the text.

In 5.3 M. presents in a few lines, and rather vaguely, the leading principles of his own edition: since the principal manuscripts have been collated by Helm, Giarratano and Robertson, there remained, according to M., not much to discover by new collations. As has been reported above, M. agrees with those who tend to dismiss the possibility that the mss. of Class I with its principal representative (**A**) form a tradition which stems from a ‘sister’ of the source of **F** (see above, my remarks on 5.1). M. apparently has not followed the advice of Magnaldi.<sup>6</sup> Magnaldi refutes the idea that **A** and Class I represent a completely independent ms. tradition from **F**. Nonetheless, she emphasizes that for the *constitutio textus* one should always verify the readings not only of **F** (and  $\phi$ ) but also of **A**: this is the ms. of Class I that reflects best the physiognomy of the lost ancestor of that group; according to Magnaldi this ancestor (indicated by her as **a**) was of the same status as the other important – preserved – apograph of **F**:  $\phi$ .

Martos reports: ‘he manejado sistemáticamente copias de los códices más importantes’: he does not make clear either to which mss. he refers, or what kind of copies he has acquired (microfilms? facsimiles?). In view of M.’s doubts regarding the importance of **A** and the other mss. of Class I, it is most likely that by ‘los códices más importantes’ M. means only **F** and  $\phi$ . Consultation of the apparatus criticus of M. reveals that he himself has not collated the readings of **F** with those of the mss. of Class I, especially **A**. In this respect he appears to copy the readings as reported by other editors.

M. declares that he has always compared the readings of **F** with the editions of Helm, Robertson, and Giarratano-Frassinetti. In his constitution of the text, M. has continued the tendency of the majority of modern editions

---

<sup>6</sup> G. Magnaldi, ‘Apologia: Per una nuova collazione del Laur. 68.2 e dell’ Ambros. N 180 Sup.’, in: G. Magnaldi, G.F. Gianotti (eds.), *Apuleio. Studi del testo e interpretazioni*, Alessandria 2000, 27–36.

and commentaries to prefer, where possible, **F**'s readings to conjectures. As M. confesses, the result is probably the most conservative text ever published.

The orthography of **F** has been maintained, except in those cases where **F**'s variant spellings seemed inexcusably wrong. M. has chosen to keep his printed text as free as possible from diacritical signs. Apart from the usual division in books and chapters, the text is divided according to the paragraphs of Robertson's edition, a method which clearly is to be preferred to the older method of quoting according to the page and line numbers of Helm's edition.

An impressive and well-ordered Bibliography forms part 6 of the introduction. After the introduction, a special Appendix presents and discusses the so-called *spurcum additamentum*, a fragment which is transmitted in the margin of  $\phi$  and **L**<sup>1</sup> and in some less important mss. M. follows the general opinion that this fragment is not the work of Apuleius, but of a medieval *vir doctus*.

Then follow, in M.'s first volume, the text and Spanish translation of Books I, II, and III. Volume 2 contains the text and translation of Books IV – XI. The second volume concludes with a carefully produced *Index Nominum*.

M.'s apparatus criticus is conceived so as to reflect as clearly as possible the situation of the main manuscript, **F**, with its various stages differentiated according to the following system: **F** indicates the reading of the first hand; **F**<sup>1</sup> a correction by the first hand; **F**<sup>2</sup> a correction by any other hand than the first hand, and **F**<sup>x</sup> a reading of a *scriba* whose identity cannot be distinguished. The same is applied to the reporting of the readings of **F**'s most important apograph,  $\phi$  ( $\phi$ ,  $\phi$ <sup>1</sup>,  $\phi$ <sup>2</sup> and  $\phi$ <sup>x</sup>). As is seen above, M. discards the possibility that the mss. of Class I in general and its main representative **A** in particular may represent an independent ms. tradition. Therefore, like many other editors, M. in his apparatus criticus sometimes subsumes readings of **A** (and/or **U**, **E**, **S**;  $\alpha$ ; the latter *siglum* indicates agreement of all or most of the codices **AUES**) under  $\zeta$ , which strictly speaking is a collective *siglum* indicating the readings of 'codices deteriores' and of early printed editions.<sup>7</sup> On

<sup>7</sup> To mention but a few instances: in III.8.1 the emendation *decurrit* for **F**'s *decussit* is found in **A**, but M. ascribes it to  $\zeta$ ; in VI.2.5 the emendation *Eleusinis*, adopted by all edd. instead of **F**'s *eleus in his*, is found in **A**, but M. ascribes it to  $\zeta$ ; in X.14.7

other occasions, the readings of the mss. of Class I (**A**, **U**, **E**, **S**; **α**) are mentioned separately.

The notes to the translation clarify words or passages which might not be immediately understood, explaining for instance significant names, ancient customs, geographical indications, and so on; they are helpful without overburdening the reader who is often given further bibliographical information.

Not being a native speaker of Spanish, I do not feel qualified to comment in detail on M.'s translation. However, as far as I can judge, the translation reads fluently and keeps close to the Latin text. Sometimes, however, M.'s translation does not seem to be consistent with his textual choices (see below, my remarks on V.18.2, V.19.4, and VI.1.5 *remota*).

Following the principles described above, M. often retains a reading of **F** while most other editors have adopted emendations. In many of these cases, I fully agree with M.'s choices, often based on our insight in Apuleian style and diction which has been greatly increased because of the important studies of Callebat, Augello, Facchini Tosi and other scholars. In other cases, however, the rule of preserving **F** wherever possible is, in my opinion, applied too rigidly and leads to problematic readings (see below, on I.17.4 and II.29.2 *salubris*). There are also some cases where M. prefers an emendation while other editors have seen fit to retain **F**'s readings (see below, on II.16.2–3 and V.18.2).

M.'s apparatus criticus is clearly meant in the first place to give as complete an insight as possible in the situation of **F** and **φ** and of the various stages these two mss. have gone through. This leading principle sometimes results in unnecessarily extensive reports of the working of various hands in the mss., especially in cases of spelling variants.

Thus, to mention only one instance, on p. 144 we are informed that **F**<sup>x</sup>**φ**<sup>x</sup> (IX.26.4) have *alueum*, while **F** and **φ** have *albeum*, and, on the same page, again, that **F**<sup>x</sup>**φ**<sup>x</sup> (IX.27.2) have *alueo*, where **F** and **φ** have *albeo*. Not always, however, are such extensive reports about a spelling variant: on p. 114, for instance, one reads in the apparatus on the undisputed reading *longe* (VIII.21.1): *longe φ : lōge in F, sed ðg rescr., ut mihi quidem uid., F<sup>2</sup>; g scripsisse F<sup>1</sup>, lote ante correctionem fuisse putat Robertson.*

---

*contentiones*, adopted by all edd. instead of **F**'s *contentionibus*, is found in **A**, but M. ascribes it to **ς**. See also my remarks below, on III.9.1 *flagitiorum* and on VIII.9.4 *improuide*.

At other times, the restricted focus of the apparatus on **F** and **φ** leads to very fragmentary information (see below, on VI.1.1 *uxoris*). To give an impression of M.'s dealing with the text and his presentation of the ms. situation, I will conclude with more detailed discussion of a few randomly chosen passages.

## I.7.9

... *et statim miser ut cum illa adqueiui, ab unico congressu annosam ac pestilentem con<dicionem> contraho et ipsas etiam lacinias, quas boni latrones contendo mihi concesserant, in eam contuli...*

M. here prints a conjecture of his own; it is one of the very few occasions where he adopts diacritical signs in his Latin text. **F** and **φ** have ... *annosam ac pestilentem c~ contraho*. M. here joins most scholars and editors in presuming that in **F** and **φ** *c~* must refer to some object governed by *contraho*. In M.'s apparatus a selection of the proposed emendations is given. It is not mentioned there, however, that **A** here simply has *contraho*, without a preceding *c~*. Magnaldi (2000, 50 f.) discusses this problem at length. She proposes that the scribe of **F**'s *Vorlage* first erroneously wrote *c~* (the abbreviation for *cum*), and then correctly wrote *contraho* (he may have indicated the error with dots which became too vague to be noticed by subsequent scribes). Since both *illa* and *eam* clearly refer to Meroe, Magnaldi argues that Meroe must also be the object of *contraho*: Apuleius has here wittily used *contrahere illam (annosam et pestilentem)* instead of the expressions *contrahere matrimonium* and *contrahere pestilentiam* 'Meroe, infatti, è annosa come un matrimonio e pestilente come una pestilenza'. **A** and the *editio princeps*, both deriving from **a** (see above, my discussion of introd. 5.3), have transmitted the correct reading.

## I.17.4

*Emergo laetus atque alacer in sperato gaudio perfusus et: 'ecce, ianitor fidelissime, comes et pater meus et frater meus, quem nocte ebrius occisum a me calumniabaris.'*

M. here (following the defence of, among others, Bernhard and Armini) retains **F**'s *et pater meus*, which was deleted by Salmasius as a dittography with *et frater meus*. Helm and Robertson followed Salmasius. Giarratano, Frassinetti and Hanson retain **F** (defended also by Keulen 2003 ad loc.). M. does not refer to Magnaldi 1996, 206 f. (= Magnaldi 2000, 46 f.), who approves of the deletion, discussing this passage as one of several examples where the scribe of **F** first wrote a partial error and then the correction of that error side by side.

## II.7.2

*suis parabat uiscum fartim concisum et pulpam frustatim consectam ambo compascue iurulenta ...*

app. cr. Martos:

suis **F<sup>x</sup>φa** : sui **F** · uiscum **F** : isicium *Stewech* uiscus *Salmasius* · ambo compascue *Frassinetti coll. 4.1.4* : amba cu pa | scuae **F** ambacti pascuae *Colin* lumbumque (*uel* lumbosque) pascua *Capponi*; [ambacti pascua iurulenta] *del. tamquam schol. ad* tucetum *Helm, alii alia*



Concerning *suis*, M. and all other editors adopt the corrected reading of **F**<sup>x</sup>, which has strong support from **ϕ** and **α**. Further, the variant accusative *uiscum* of **F** (and **ϕ**) is rightly retained with most editors (against Salmasius' correction *uiscus*). As to the third problem, Hanson ad loc. remarks: 'The correct reading behind **F**'s corrupt *ambacupascuae* is probably irrecoverable'. However, M. adopts Frassinetti's conjecture, strongly favoured by Augello 1977, 45. In this way, M. quite satisfactorily avoids printing *cruces* in his text, as most editors have done. His translation rather flatly but correctly renders the figurative expression created by Frassinetti's emendation ('both sharing the same pasture' > 'prepared together in one sauce'): 'estaba cocinando entrañas finamente picadas y carne cortada en trozos preparadas las dos con la misma salsa ...'. In M.'s translation, by the way, *suis* is neglected: most translators take it to be the genitive of *sus* (cf. e.g. Hanson: 'pork innards'), but others take it as the dative of *suus* (Vallette: 'pour ses maîtres'). M. does not translate it at all.

II.16.2–3:

*Photis mea ... me adripit poculum ac ... porrigit bibam, idque modico prius quam totum exsorberem clementer inuadit ...*

app. cr. Martos:

modico *Brantius*, cf. 1.7.6, 1.22.5, *Apol.* 17.2, *Fl.* 16,22 : modicum **F** def. *Armini et van Mal-Maeder coll.* 6.19.1, 8.21.3 et *GCA* 1985, 182 fort. recte

Here, M. has preferred adopting, with most editors, the emendation *modico*, in view of a typically Apuleian phrase *modico prius* (attested only in Apul.). M. could have been consistent, I believe, in his self-professed conservative attitude of retaining **F** wherever possible. The reading of **F**, *modicum*, has been very well defended by van Mal-Maeder (following Armini), taking *modicum* as an adverbial accusative, and quoting examples in Apuleius for this use. M. qualifies their defence of this reading with 'fortasse recte'. In fact, both readings render the same sense. Cf. van Mal-Maeder (reading *modicum*) 'peu avant que je ne l'aie ... bue ...', Martos (reading *modico*): 'poco antes de que la acabe de apurar, ...'.

II.29.2:

*Iam tumore pectus extolli, iam salubris uena pulsari, iam spiritu corpus impleri ...*

Not only is the combination *salubris uena* nowhere else attested (M. translates 'la vena de la vida'; cf. Hanson: 'health-giving artery', and, in a note ad loc.: 'Some specific artery must be meant'), but the symmetrical and isosyllabic tricolon, with three times an ablat. + nomin. + passive infin. tumore pectus extolli, salubris uena pulsari, spiritu corpus impleri, underlined by the anaphora of *iam*, is disturbed by the nominative of the adj. *salubris*. Therefore, most editors adopt the 'emendamento assolutamente sicuro' of Prescott and Collins (Augello 1977, 56): *salebris* instead of *salubris*. Collins adduced fine parallels for the emendation (see Augello 1977, 56 f.; also *GCA* = Van Mal-Maeder 2001, 378 ad loc.). The noun *salebra* would here indicate the difficult throbbing of the vein (*salebris*: 'with jolts'; cf. Brandt-Ehlers: 'jetzt schlägt pochend der Puls'; Grimal: 'la veine du bras se met à battre convulsivement'). M. here retains **F**'s *salubris* (with Helm, Giarratano, and Van Mal-Maeder, whose note ad loc., however, reveals her strong liking for the emendation adopted by most editors).

## III.9.1:

*Nec mora cum ritu Graeciensi ignis et rota, cum omne flagitorium genus inferuntur.*

app. cr. Martos:

cum ante omne **F** : tum  $\zeta$  · flagitorium  $\phi$  cf. van der Paardt ad loc. 76–77 (flagiciorum iam **F**<sup>1</sup> ut uid.; i s.l. add.) : flagicorum **F** flagrorum Beroaldus flagellorum Oudendorp Hildebrand flagitorium dubitanter Helm

Against Robertson and Giarratano-Frassinetti, who follow the reading of  $\zeta$  (*tum*), M. here preserves **F**'s *cum*, which was defended by van der Paardt in his comm. ad loc., and retained by Hanson as well.

The reading *flagitorium* of **F** after correction is difficult, and not retained by any editor before M. All editors prefer *flagrorum* (an emendation by Beroaldus, also found in  $\zeta$ ); M. has a good case for preserving the ms. reading. It is defended by van der Paardt ad loc. (who, however, adopts  $\zeta$ 's *flagrorum* in his text), and with different arguments by Frassinetti 1972, 448 and Augello 1977, 68.<sup>8</sup> If retained, **F**'s *flagitorium* should probably be taken in a figurative sense: 'shameful devices' (Hanson prints *flagrorum* and translates 'whips', but in a footnote considers the possibility of reading *flagitorium*, meaning 'shameful devices'; cf. 'accidenti, brutture', proposed by Frassinetti in his review of van der Paardt). But Martos translates as if he had printed *flagrorum*: 'instrumentos de ultraje'. His apparatus criticus is not very helpful here; a better case would have been made for his choice of **F**<sup>1</sup>'s reading if he had reported that it is confirmed not only by  $\phi$  but also by  $\alpha$ , and if he had added a reference to Augello 1977, 68. We could have done without the reference to Helm's proposal *flagitorium*, which is printed by no one, not even by Helm himself.

## V.17.1:

*Sic inflammatae, parentibus fastidienter appellatis et nocte turbatis uigiliis, perditae matutino scopulum peruolant ...*

app. cr. Martos:

turbatis ... perditae **F** def. Wiman et Fernhout : turbatis ... percitae Helm (percitae iam Lipsius) turbata ... perditae Bursian turbatis ... perdita Gruterus turbatis ... <peracta> perditae Grimal turbatis ... <perdita>, perditae Augello

Practically all editors have adopted one or another emendation. For instance: Robertson, Giarratano-Frassinetti, and Moreschini have followed Bursian, whereas Kenney has adopted Gruterus' emendation. Grimal has printed his own conjecture – something which he rarely does.

M. is not alone in retaining **F**'s reading; Hanson, too, has retained it. M.'s translation closely resembles Hanson's: 'Y así, tan enardecidas, después de saludar de mala gana a sus propios padres y de pasar la noche agitadas por el insomnio, aquellas malditas, al llegar la mañana, llegan volando hasta la peña ...'. Hanson: 'Enflamed as they were, they greeted their

<sup>8</sup> P. Frassinetti, review of: R.Th. van der Paardt. *L. Apuleius Madaurensis. The Metamorphoses. A Commentary on Book III*, Amsterdam 1971, in: *Athenaeum* 50 (1972), 447–449. G. Augello. *Studi Apuleiani. Problemi di testo e loci vexati delle Metamorfosi*, Palermo 1977.

parents haughtily and spent a disturbed and wakeful night. Early in the morning those damned women flew to the cliff ...’.

Both M. and Hanson, while retaining **F**, translate as if they are rendering the emendation by Bursian (*nocte turbata vigiliis*), an emendation which was probably meant to deal with the problem that in the two parallel ablative absolute constructions *parentibus ... appellatis* and *nocte turbatis uigiliis* as transmitted in **F**, the verbal element of the first (*appellatis*) refers to the parents as objects of the sisters’ action, while the verbal element of the second (*turbatis*) refers to the sisters themselves as the objects of the effect of *uigiliae*.

M. in his apparatus criticus suggests that retaining **F**’s reading is based on the defence by both Wiman and Fernhout, but those scholars in their defence of **F** suggested that *perditae* (meaning ‘exhausted, done for’) should be connected with *turbatis vigiliis* as a causal ablative (*turbatis* as an adjective: ‘restless, confused’). So, following Wiman and Fernhout in retaining **F** should result in a translation like: ‘having greeted their parents haughtily, they flew, exhausted by turbulent wakefulness during the night, early in the morning to the cliff ...’.

M. does not mention that Callebat in his revised edition of 1992 has also chosen to retain **F**’s reading, and adapted Vallette’s translation accordingly: ‘... puis, après les veilles agitées de leur nuit, dès le matin, ne se possédant plus, ...’.

V.18,2:

*At haec iam tua est existimatio ...*

app. cr. Martos:

at Beroaldus : ad **F** • est **F** def. Helm coll. Plaut. Cas. 292 Liu. 34.2.5 : esto Eysenhardt

In the first of the two textual problems, M. has in his text followed Beroaldus’ emendation, oddly, not only in view of his own principles, but also against most modern editors, who (rightly, in my opinion) retain **F**’s *ad* (only Helm adopted Beroaldus’ *at*). This becomes even more amazing when one reads M.’s translation which seems to be a translation of *Ad haec iam tua est existimatio*, not of *At haec ...*: ‘Ante esta situación, está ya en tus manos decidir si ...’. It was exactly by offering this interpretation of *Ad haec ...* that Hildebrand already defended **F**’s *ad*.

In the second of the text problems, M. rightly, with all editors, retains the indicative *est* of the mss.

V.19,4:

*Nunc si quam salutarem opem periclitanti sorori uestrae potestis adferre, iam nunc subsistite; ceterum incuria sequens prioris prouidentiae beneficia conrumpit.*

Unlike all editors, M. here retains the present *conrumpit* of **F**. All other editors follow Rohde, who proposed to print the future *conrumpet*, and to interpret *ceterum* as *ceteroquin* (‘or else, ...’). **F**’s present tense form, however, could be retained, provided one interprets *ceterum ... conrumpit* as a ‘gnomic’ utterance: ‘(Help me immediately, for) later negligence spoils earlier precautions’. This interpretation and the preservation of **F**’s present tense form are defended with Apuleian parallels of such gnomic phrases in *GCA* 2004, 251 ad loc. M.’s translation, however, seems to be based on reading a future tense (as Rohde proposed), and on interpreting *ceterum* as *ceteroquin*: ‘( ... ayudadme inmediatamente:) de otra manera, si nos descuidamos a partir de ahora, echaremos a perder la ventaja de habernos precavido antes.’

## VI.1.1:

*Interea Psyche uariis iactabatur discursibus dies noctesque mariti uestigationibus inquieta animo, tanto cupidior licet, si non uxoris blanditiis lenire, certe seruilibus precibus propitiare.*

app. cr. Martos:

animo **F** : animi *Robertson* • licet si **F** : licetsi *Weyman* licet [si] *Koziol* • uxoris **F** : uxoriis *Beroaldus*, *fort. recte*

With most editors, M. retains **F**'s *animo* and prints *dies noctesque mariti uestigationibus inquieta animo*. Robertson (followed by Kenney) had adopted *animi*, pointing to numerous instances in Apuleius of this genitive with adjectives indicating a mental state. M. could have made the case in favour of **F**'s *animo* stronger, in my opinion, by adopting Giarratano-Frassinetti's interpretation which connects *animo* with the comparative *cupidior*. This involves placing a comma after *inquieta*, connecting this closely with *mariti uestigationibus*; M.'s translation seems to suggest this: '... sin que su mente descansara un instante ni de día ni de noche de perseguir las huellas de su marido, ...'. See Augello's defence of Frassinetti's interpunction (Augello 1977, 136); for full discussion see *GCA* 2004, 364 ad loc. There, unfortunately, it is not mentioned that Callebat, in his revised edition of Robertson-Vallette's second Budé volume, has also adopted Frassinetti's interpunction, referring to Augello's defence.

As to the last item (*uxoris*): here, the apparatus criticus seems to me to be too fragmentary: M. stands almost alone in retaining the reading of **F** (Helm III also adopts it). But the reading *uxoris* has stronger ms. support than M.'s app. cr. suggests: it is found in  $\phi$  and  $\alpha$  as well. The reading *uxoriis* is not an emendation by Beroaldus (as Oudendorp wrongly reported, a mistake stubbornly repeated in the critical apparatus of subsequent editors), but it is suggested by the paraphrase in Pricaeus' note to this passage; it is proposed as an emendation by Meursius, and adopted by practically all editors, from Elmenhorst onward. These remarks would amount to the following notice in the app. cr. (following M.'s notation principles): uxoris **F** $\phi\alpha$ , *Helm* : uxoriis (*Pricaeo in paraphrasi viam monstrante*) *Meursius*, *fort. recte*.

## VI.1.3:

*uidet spicas frumentarias in aceruo et alias flexiles in corona et spicas hordei uidet.*

app. cr. Martos:

aceruo  $\phi$  : acerbo **F** • et spicas hordei uidet *def. Brakman coll. 9.15.2 et Armini coll. 1.23.1* et spicas hordei [uidet] *F. Norden* et spicas hordei uirides *Damsté* uidet spicas hordei *Giarratano coll. 5.1.2*

M. avoids printing diacritical signs in his text. Therefore, he indicates in his apparatus even the slightest spelling variants found in **F** and not adopted by him, as here: *aceruo* instead of **F**'s *acerbo*. Most editors omit mentioning obvious variants such as this. But M.'s aim is to give his readers as accurate a picture as possible of the situation in **F**. He could of course also have chosen to include some recurring spelling variants in **F**, not adopted in his text, in a chapter of his preface, so as not to overburden the apparatus. See, e.g., the remarks of Robertson on p. L of his Introduction to the Budé text (Robertson-Vallette 1940).

As to the second item in this part of the apparatus: all leading editions adopt **F**'s reading (M. has forgotten to place the siglum **F** after the first piece of Latin in his apparatus) which was decisively defended by Brakman and Armini. The repetition of the finite verb in chiasmic

position is shown to be one of the typical stylistic habits of Apuleius in the *Met.*; Augello (1977, 136 f.) adduces other parallels besides the ones given by Brakman and Armini. Only Giarratano 1929 conjectured and printed *uidet spicas hordei*, but in Frassinetti's revised edition of Giarratano, F's reading is retained. Whereas Helm II adopted F. Norden's proposal, Helm III retained F. No one has adopted Damsté's conjecture. M.'s apparatus is too cumbersome here. The following rendering would have saved a lot of space and ink:

et spicas hordei uidet **F edd.** *def.* Brakman coll. 9.15.2 et Armini coll. 1.23.1 [uidet] F. Norden uidet spicas hordei Giarratano coll. 5.1.2

VI. 1.5:

*Haec singula Psyche curiose diuidit et discretim remota rite componit, rata scilicet nullius dei fana <et> caerimonias neglegere se debere, ...*

app. cr. Martos:

remota **F** : semota Rohde coll. 6.10.3, fort. recte seiuncta Michaelis • fana **F** : fano Oudendorp • <et> caerimonias  $\zeta$  coll. Soc. 15 : caerimonias **F** caerimonias<ue> Robertson coll. 7.27.2, 9.10.2 <ac> caerimonias Hildebrand • neclegere se **F**<sup>2</sup> : neglegese **F** $\phi$

Like Helm and Paratore, M. retains F's *remota*, clearly the *lectio difficilior*, but not impossible. Most editors follow Rohde's proposal, *semota*, honoured by M. with '*fortasse recte*'. This slight emendation reads much better (cf. e.g. Hanson: '...and arranged them properly in distinct piles'). M.'s translation glosses over his choice of *remota*: the phrase *discretim remota rite componit* is rendered by: 'las dispone (translating *discretim remota ... componit*) con arreglo al ritual (= *rite*)'. When reading *remota* the phrase *et discretim remota rite componit* should yield something like: 'and having separated them out (*discretim remota*) she arranges them properly (*rite componit*)'.

The presentation of the next textual problem is confusing: the problem here is the asyndeton in F: *fana caerimonias*. Oudendorp solved this problem by conjecturing *fano*. The easiest solution was offered by Hildebrand: *fana <ac> caerimonias*: it is very likely that the scribe omitted *ac* by haplography of the final *a* of *fana* and the first *c* of *caerimonias*. Although Apuleius appears to have avoided *ac* before a word starting with *c* – and this was Novak's objection to Hildebrand's emendation – some examples show that he has not avoided this juxtaposition everywhere (see Paratore's extensive apparatus ad loc.). In my opinion, M.'s apparatus here would have been more clear and helpful if it was presented in this manner:

fana <et> caerimonias  $\zeta$ , Novák coll. Soc. 15 : fana caerimonias **F** fano caerimonias Oud. fana <ac> caerimonias Hildebrand fana caerimonias<ue> Robertson coll. 7.27.2, 9.10.2.

VIII.9.4:

*et ecce rursus improuide uoluptatis detestabilis petitor ... aderat.*

F has the clearly corrupt reading *imperor uide* ( $\phi$  has *impetor uide*). Most editors opt for either *improuidae* (found in  $\zeta$ ), or, like M., the adverb *improuide* ('imprudently' in his translation). In the apparatus *improuide* is presented as an emendation by Rossbach; however, *improuide* is also found in A, and thus has stronger ms. support than M.'s apparatus suggests.

## IX.1.2:

... *nec pauca rerum adparatus cibarii mensas etiam genialis impetu meo collido atque disturbo*

*geni<al>is* is Helm's emendation, adopted by M.; **F**ϕ have *geni*; (= *genus*), underlined by a second hand in **F**; in **F** there originally was room for more letters; ζ have *et id genus*. Most editors prefer Robertson's convincing emendation *et ignes*, which is based on the parallel narrative in the Greek *Onos*, where we have: ἀνατρέπω ... καὶ λυχνίαν καὶ τραπέζας (40,2). It is not clear to me why M. has not adopted *et ignes* here (he mentions it with 'fort. recte' in his apparatus). Probably, M., in his eagerness to retain as much of **F** as possible, found Helm's emendation more close to **F**'s *geni*; wrongly so, in my opinion, for *et ignes* may be considered even closer to what was in **F**'s source, and at the same time accounts for the extra space in **F**: an original abbreviation *ign* may well have been resolved incorrectly, resulting in the readings of **F**ϕ and ζ.

## IX.1.3:

... *paterfamilias ... me cuidam famulo curiose traditum <iubet> certo aliquo loco clausum cohiberi.*

M. here adopts *<iubet>*, found in the margin of ϕ; in the margin of **F** another hand has written *iussit*. Other editors prefer to read *tradit* instead of *traditum*. The latter solution seems to be a simpler intervention in the reading of **F** than the addition of either *iubet* or *iussit*, both late and marginal additions in ϕ and **F**, respectively. **F**'s *traditum* may have been the result of an abbreviation, of which there were several in this sentence with its many accusatives (thus *GCA* 1995, 37 ad loc.). An infinitive with *tradere* is possible (see *GCA* 1995 l.c.).

In IX.2.3 M. is the first editor who retains **F**'s *Hypatafium*, convincingly defended as a meaningful name by Panayotakis 1997 (mentioned by M. in his apparatus). Most editors here print a crux, or adopt one or another conjecture.

## IX.30.6:

*illis saepicule et interuocaliter clamantibus*

M. here wisely (with Helm III, Giarratano and Terzaghi) retains **F**'s *saepicule et interuocaliter*, translating: 'muchas veces y de vez en cuando a voces'. Brandt-Ehlers and Hanson accepted Robertson's bold intervention *<iterum et> saepicule [et inter]uocaliter* ('à deux reprises et davantage, ... de toute leur voix'; Hanson: 'several times at the top of their voice'). The problem with **F**'s reading is, that *interuocaliter* is an *hapax legomenon*, but, as Augello argued, it more likely is an Apuleian coinage rather than a corruption. Augello (1977, 202) points to a verb like *interclamare*, and explains *interuocaliter* with 'a voci alterne e repetute'. See also *GCA* 1995, 263 ad loc. for more Apuleian neologisms with *inter-*. Mattiacci 1996 likewise retains **F**'s text.

These critical remarks do not alter my opinion that M. with these two beautifully produced and carefully edited volumes has made an important contribution to Apuleian studies. His edition is based on thorough knowledge of Apuleius' language and style, and of Apuleian studies, and this knowledge is

consistently applied to a careful reconsideration of all textual problems. M.'s publication will, on the one hand, be rightly consulted with profit by Apuleian specialists who are interested in the interpretation of the novel's text, and on the other – thanks to the introduction, the rich bibliography, and the lucid translation – be *also* an excellent starting point for those who are newcomers to Apuleius' *Golden Ass*.