

# <Aristomenes sum>: Apuleius, *Asinus aureus* 1,5,3 and the Interpretative Implications of Naming Narrators

ANTON BITEL  
Oriol College, Oxford

Near the beginning of his adventures, Lucius – the principal *ego*-protagonist of Apuleius' *Golden Ass* – falls in with two other travellers on the road to Hypata in Thessaly. Encouraged by Lucius, one of the travellers agrees to resume a story that he had been telling to his companion before Lucius joined them. After halfheartedly thanking Lucius for offering him lunch at the next inn, and swearing to the story's truth (Apul. *Met.* 1,5,1–2), this as yet unnamed sub-narrator makes to introduce himself before launching into his tale:

*Sed ut prius noritis, cuiatis sim, qui sim: <Aristomenes sum> Aegiensis...*  
Apul. *Met.* 1,5,3

'But first, so that you know where I am from, who I am: <I am Aristomenes> an Aegian...'

No matter whether the ethnic marker *Aegiensis* refers to origins in Aegium or Aegae,<sup>1</sup> it clearly does not in itself constitute a complete answer to the very question(s) of identity that the sub-narrator has just posed. Castiglioni (1930, 99–100) found the omission of a name here so unsatisfactory that he inserted the supplement *Aristomenes sum* between *qui sim* and *Aegiensis*;

---

<sup>1</sup> For a full discussion of the implications of *Aegiensis*, see Keulen 2000; cf. Keulen 2003, 142 *ad loc.*

and in this he has been followed by all the standard editions of Apuleius.<sup>2</sup> It is certainly a neat solution to a difficult problem. After all, the name Aristomenes will shortly be used to refer both to the *ego*-protagonist of this sub-narrator's tale (*Met.* 1,6,4; 1,12,1; 1,12,7), and to the sub-narrator himself (*Met.* 1,20,1; 2,1,2) – so it seems reasonable to annex this name to an earlier, apparently lacunose section of the text where a name is most obviously required, and where, as Keulen (2003, 142) has suggested, the omission of the phrase can easily be explained by 'saut du même au même' (*sim – sum*). Yet in this paper, I shall try to demonstrate that Castiglioni's supplement is not only entirely unnecessary, but also reflective of an interpretative bias that risks making asses of us all.

From its very outset, Apuleius' text goes out of its way not to reveal, but to conceal and therefore problematise, the identity of its principal narrator. For after explicitly raising the question of who he is (*Met.* 1,1,3 *quis ille?*) in the prologue, that narrator promises to give an answer (*paucis accipe*), but then singularly fails to offer either his own name, his parents' name, or even an explicit statement of his place of birth – precisely the three pieces of information that are conventionally employed by strangers to identify themselves in the ancient world, and more particularly in ancient literature.<sup>3</sup> Instead, the *ego* in Apuleius' prologue employs elaborate circumlocutions to reveal not one, but three cities (*Met.* 1,1,3 *Hymettos Attica et Isthmos Ephyrea et Taenaros Spartiatica*), which he expressly designates as places where he has family going way back (*Met.* 1,1,3 *mea vetus prosapia*),<sup>4</sup> rather than as his *patria* (indeed, they cannot *all* be his *patria*).<sup>5</sup> In other words, the *ego*'s re-

<sup>2</sup> Castiglioni's supplement appears in Helm 1931, Robertson–Vallette 1940, Giarratano–Frassinetti 1960; more recently Keulen 2000, 311 has found the supplement 'attractive'; cf. Keulen 2003, 141–142 *ad loc.* Scobie 1975, 89 is more sceptical, as is Hanson 1989, vol. 1, 10, n.3.

<sup>3</sup> See, e.g., Hom. *Od.* 8,550 f. and 9,504 f.; Liv. 1,7,10 *nomen patremque ac patriam accepit*; Ov. *Met.* 3,581–582 *ede tuum nomen nomenque parentum / et patriam*; and, with particular pertinence, [Lucianus] *Asin.* 55. Apuleius' own awareness of the convention is made clear at Apul. *Met.* 7,5,6 (discussed below); cf. 10,18,1.

<sup>4</sup> For the meaning of the archaism *prosapia*, see van der Paardt 1971, 87; Scobie 1975, 73. It refers to pedigree or parentage rather than place of origin; at Pl. *Merc.* 634, Charinus poses *unde esset* and *qua prosapia* as separate questions; and Apuleius' other uses of the term *prosapia* suggest that he too consistently understands it to denote family background (*Met.* 3,11,1; 6,23,4; 8,2,5; 9,35,3; 10,18,1; *Apol.* 18,12; *Soc.* 23,174).

<sup>5</sup> Cicero's (unorthodox) suggestion that people can be thought to have two *patria*e, one the place of birth, the other the place where citizenship is held (Cic. *Leg.* 2,2,5), can hardly

sponse to the question *quis ille?* is both comic and mystifying in equal measure, offering both too much and too little detail. It transforms an apparently innocuous introductory question of identity into a programmatic textual enigma that has been challenging Apuleius' readers ever since; and while many readers have come up with answers of their own to the question, few would propose supplementing the prologue's actual text with one answer or another. The exception, one might say, proves the rule. In his English version of the *Golden Ass* (1950, Harmondsworth), Robert Graves translates *quis ille? paucis accipe* from the prologue as:

'Let me briefly introduce myself as Lucius Apuleius, a native of Madaura in North Africa...'

It goes without saying that this translation is entirely fanciful. Not only does it supplement an elaborate and controversial (albeit possible) answer to the question *quis ille?*, but it also completely effaces both the impact of the question and indeed the question itself. This is a case of highly subjective interpretation trying to pass itself off as textual criticism – in short, Graves' is a supplement too far.

The same principle ought to be applied to the sub-narrator's self-introduction. His question of identity (*cuiatis sim, qui sim*), though more elaborate than the principal narrator's (*quis ille?*), is a clear enough echo of it; and the sub-narrator's failure to supply a complete answer similarly echoes the principal narrator's reticence, and similarly signals to the reader that his identity is something of a puzzle. In both prologues the question of identity is topicalised as a *problem*. It is not so much that there is a lacuna in the text, as that the sub-narrator has withheld important information, thus stimulating the reader's curiosity and desire to read on in the hope of finding answers. For, of course, first-person narratives can in themselves form a part (however incomplete) of an answer to a question of identity. The classic illustration of this is Homer's Odysseus in the court of the Phaeacians, where he is a complete stranger. Arete asks him to give an account of himself with the same question that Apuleius' sub-narrator has asked:

---

be used to account for the multiplicity of (putative) provenances to be found in Apuleius' prologue.

‘Stranger, I shall first ask you this question myself: who are you among men, and where are you from? Hom. *Od.* 7,237–238

Odysseus neglects to answer Arete’s question directly (much as the sub-narrator fails to answer his own question), preferring to tell her a part of his story. This answer apparently leads Arete’s husband Alcinous to feel that he has enough of an idea what kind of man Odysseus is (*Od.* 7,312) to ask him to become his son-in-law. Later, however, Alcinous asks Odysseus to give a fuller account of who he is, insisting that he reveal his name, parentage and homeland, *as well as* more of his past adventures (*Od.* 8,547–586). Odysseus then obliges with a formal self-identification (*Od.* 9,19–20), before launching into a first-person narrative that spans four books of the *Odyssey*.

If the tales told by Odysseus amongst the Phaeacians demonstrate that questions of identity can (at least for a while) go unanswered, and that a tale itself can constitute at least a partial answer to a question of identity, they also show how names attached to the *ego*-protagonist *within* a narrative need not correspond to the name of the narrator. When the Cyclops Polyphemus, who also has no idea who Odysseus and his companions are (*Od.* 9,252), asks Odysseus to reveal his name (*Od.* 9,355–356), Odysseus answers cleverly with a false name, ‘No-one’ (*Od.* 9,366–367). Polyphemus believes this answer, which not only results in his losing his single eye, but also in his becoming a ridiculous fool (*Od.* 9,413–419); and anyone hearing or reading Homer’s epic who also concluded that the narrator of its ‘Phaeacian tales’ was similarly called ‘No-one’ would be as blind, credulous and lacking in urbanity as Polyphemus himself – if not more so.

This brings us back to the tale heard by Lucius along the road to Hypata (Apul. *Met.* 1,5,1–19,12), and the questions that it raises about the sub-narrator’s name and identity. The tale is preceded by a debate between Lucius and an unnamed third party about its truth value: the unnamed third party insists that the sub-narrative is an absurd lie (*Met.* 1,2,5; 1,3,1), whereas Lucius argues, contrariwise, that it is entirely credible (*Met.* 1,3,1–4,4). After the tale has been retold, both the unnamed third party and Lucius reassert their essentially incompatible positions (*Met.* 1,20,1–4), and Lucius parts company with the two travellers. Neither listener supports his position by reference to any of the tale’s specific content, so that the tale is left free floating, suspended between two irreconcilable, yet equally possible, readings. For, like the narrative equivalent of Schrödinger’s cat, the tale is in a

superposition of states, both true and untrue in the absence of further evidence to confirm its status unequivocally (evidence which, it need hardly be said, is never forthcoming within the text).

During this dispute, the sub-narrator himself remains something of a cipher. He makes no contribution to the debate himself,<sup>6</sup> and all that Lucius' and the unnamed third party's words reveal about the sub-narrator himself is his gender, and the fact that he has a tale to tell, a tale which the unnamed third party already does not believe, but which Lucius will believe (*Met.* 1,4,6 *credam*). Of course, the sub-narrator will have a lot to say for himself once he has been invited by Lucius to retread his tale (*Met.* 1,4,6 *fabulam remetire*) – but as the truth of his words has just been called into question by the unnamed third party, it remains a genuine possibility that some, or indeed all, of what he says is not to be believed. The dismissive disbelief of the unnamed third party may, or may not, be misplaced, but it casts, or at least ought to cast, a long shadow over the tale, as *one* explicitly available reading of it.

In the (pre-Castiglian) text, the name Aristomenes does not appear until the sub-narrative is well underway, when its *ego*-protagonist is addressed in the vocative by an old friend, Socrates (*Met.* 1,6,4 '*Aristomene*' *inquit*...). That Aristomenes is indeed the name of the sub-narrative's protagonist is confirmed within the tale at 1,12,1 (*de Aristomene testudo factus*) and again at 1,12,7 ('*At hic bonus*' *inquit* '*consiliator Aristomenes*...'). This, however, does not guarantee that it is likewise the name of the sub-narrator himself. For it remains possible that the sub-narrator, as someone whom the unnamed third party has declared to be peddling absurd fiction, might merely be inventing the persona of Aristomenes, and impersonating *his* voice as much as *he* impersonates the voice of Socrates (*Met.* 1,6,4; 1,7,1; 1,7,5–10; 1,8,2; 1,8,4; 1,8,6–10,6; 1,17,2; 1,17,6; 1,18,6–7), of Meroe (*Met.* 1,12,4–8), of Panthia (*Met.* 1,13,3; 1,13,7), and of the janitor (*Met.* 1,15,2; 1,15,4; 1,17,1). By using words that he ascribes to one Aristomenes, the sub-narrator need no more himself be called Aristomenes than Odysseus need actually be called 'No-one'.

It might be objected that the sub-narrator *is* expressly named Aristomenes after the sub-narrative has come to a close (*Met.* 1,20,1 *haec Aristomenes* [sc. *dixit*]), and again at the beginning of Book Two (*Met.* 2,1,2 *fabulam*...

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Winkler 1985, 34: 'This narrator is as uninvolved with his audience and their discussion of his tale as the physical book is in a reader's hands.'

*illam optimi comitis Aristomenis*); but at this point it becomes important to pay careful attention to who exactly is doing the naming. In the *Golden Ass*, Lucius is not only the protagonist of the principal narrative, but also its principal centre of orientation, focalising events as he experiences them from moment to moment, with only a very few discursive intrusions by the storyteller in the present time of narration.<sup>7</sup> Accordingly, *before* Lucius hears the sub-narrator's tale, he can only refer to the sub-narrator with an anonymous pronoun (*Met.* 1,5,1 *ille*); it is only *after* Lucius has heard the sub-narrator's tale that the sub-narrator can be referred to as Aristomenes, precisely because Lucius (the *ego*-protagonist/actorial focaliser) encounters this name for the first time *within* the tale. Just as within the tale Aristomenes infers that the strange woman standing before him is the witch Meroe who had featured in stories told earlier to him by Socrates (*Met.* 1,13,3 *Meroe – sic enim reapse nomen eius tunc fabulis Socratis convenire sentiebam...*), so too at the story's end Lucius has inferred the name of the otherwise unknown sub-narrator before him to be Aristomenes based on information that he has learnt from the sub-narrative itself. It is because Aristomenes *believes* Socrates' stories (as is shown by his reaction to them at *Met.* 1,11,1–3) that he is able to identify the person standing before him as a character from those stories. Similarly Lucius believes the sub-narrator's tale (*Met.* 1,20,3; 1,20,5), and so he identifies his story-telling companion with the person of the *ego*-protagonist Aristomenes, name and all; the unnamed third party, on the other hand, who expressly does not believe the sub-narrator's tale, also never refers to the sub-narrator by name. Both Lucius' readiness to name the sub-narrator as Aristomenes, and the third party's failure to do the same, might be regarded as symptomatic of their divergent attitudes (belief vs. disbelief) towards the sub-narrative.

Readers who refer to the sub-narrator by the name Aristomenes (and to the best of my knowledge, *all* scholarship on the tale of Aristomenes' adventures refers to the sub-narrator as Aristomenes) are in effect following Lucius in his interpretation of the tale as veridical, and disregarding (whether

---

<sup>7</sup> De Jong 2001, 208: 'the narrator... tells his story according to the (restricted) focalization of Lucius-actor'; cf. Winkler 1985, 140–153, esp. 141: 'Each event of the past is told for immediate effect, with virtually no intrusion of the present speaker judging, condemning, commenting on the action'; van Mal-Maeder 1995, 111–112: 'Dans les *Métamorphoses* en effet le monde romanesque est généralement décrit tel que le perçoit Lucius-acteur'; cf. *GCA* 1995, 12 n.18; *GCA* 2000, 30–31; *GCA* 2001, 8–9; van der Paardt 1978, 76–80; Dowden 1982, 429–432.

willfully or unconsciously) the alternative interpretation suggested by the unnamed third party's incredulity. It is of course the privilege of readers to interpret a text as they please; but in ignoring the possibility (and it is no more than a possibility, albeit one clearly signalled within the text itself in the discussions that frame the sub-narrative) that the sub-narrator's tale may be fiction, so that he need not share his protagonist's name or identity, readers find themselves in the uncomfortable position of siding with Lucius – credulous, asinine Lucius, who by his own admission has 'greater confidence' (or 'too much faith') in words (*Met.* 1,3,2 *ego in verba fidentior*), and who is so foolish as to pledge his belief in the sub-narrator's tale even *before* he has heard it (*Met.* 1,4,6 *haec pro isto credam*).<sup>8</sup> This will not of course be Lucius' last leap of faith, but rarely is faith so utterly blind.

Like Lucius, Apuleius' readers first learn the name Aristomenes from the body of the sub-narrative itself, when the *ego*-protagonist is addressed by his friend Socrates (*Met.* 1,6,4). Yet the unnamed third party's reading of this tale opens up the possibility that the same name need not be attached to the sub-narrator. The tale has allegorical significance for the principal narrative of the *Golden Ass*:<sup>9</sup> for shortly after he parts company with his two companions and arrives in Hypata, the principal *ego*-protagonist Lucius is himself named for the first time when, like Aristomenes, he runs into an old friend (with the suitably 'oracular' name Pythias) who addresses him in the vocative (*Met.* 1,24,6 *'Mi Luci' ait* [sc. Pythias]...; cf. 1,6,4 *'Aristomene' inquit*...). This close echo of the sub-narrative, coming so soon after it, suggests that perhaps one should similarly hesitate before attaching this *ego*-protagonist's name (Lucius) to the principal narrator of the *Golden Ass*. The sub-narrative equips the attentive reader to discern the equivocal relationship in the *Golden Ass* between narrators and their *ego*-protagonists, and primes her/him to suspend judgement on the question of whether the text's principal

---

<sup>8</sup> Winkler 1985, 27 (and n. 4) is quite right to characterise the attitude of the unnamed third party as 'cynical', involving as it does 'the uncompromising rejection of pretentious claims'; he is, however, surely mistaken to suppose that Lucius is a champion of (29) 'suspended judgement, an open mind, and an acknowledgement of the limitations of individual experience'. Lucius' slightly incoherent arguments (at *Met.* 1,3,2–4,5) for hearing the sub-narrative may seem to tend towards such a balanced position of scepticism, but his conclusion, an advance promise to believe an as yet unheard story already (*Met.* 1,4,6), seems little more than dogmatism at its most deranged.

<sup>9</sup> For other (thematic, rather than narratological) aspects of the sub-narrative that serve an allegorical function within Apuleius' text, see Tatum 1969, 493–499.

narrator must likewise be called Lucius and identified with the protagonist, or whether he might be someone with an altogether more mysterious identity (*qui sim/quis ille?*), no matter how many adventures he may unfold for the protagonist that he impersonates. To do otherwise is to risk restricting oneself to an (at most) one-eyed reading of the principal narrative akin to Lucius' reading of the sub-narrative – and Lucius is, to be sure, an ass.<sup>10</sup>

The starting point in this paper was Castiglioni's supplement of the phrase <*Aristomenes sum*> at *Met.* 1,5,3, which I have tried to refute by arguing that it is at best unnecessary and at worst a repetition of Lucius' own rather asinine assumptions about the identity of his fellow-traveller on the road to Hypata and the credibility of the story that he tells. I would therefore propose that any new edition of the *Golden Ass* should revert to the text of the principal manuscript F:

*Sed ut prius noritis, cuiatis sim, qui sim: Aegiensis...*

Apul. *Met.* 1,5,3

'But first, so that you know where I am from, who I am: Aegian...'

The possibility of course remains that *qui sim* is a (scribal) gloss on *cuiatis sim*;<sup>11</sup> but it seems more likely to be an (authorial) echo of the prologue's question *quis ille?*, coming as it does alongside several other echoes of the prologue in the sub-narrator's own self-introduction,<sup>12</sup> and so, on balance, *qui sim* should be retained. Furthermore, if *qui sim* is to remain as an echo of the prologue, then readers should not be too perturbed if it also remains

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Smith 1972, 521: 'If Lucius' judgment about people and events is suspect, it naturally follows that we cannot always believe his analyses of the *fabulae*...'

<sup>11</sup> See Keulen 2003, 141 *ad loc.*

<sup>12</sup> Besides the echo of *qui sim/quis ille?* (*Met.* 1,1,3/1,5,3), both the principal narrator's and the sub-narrator's respective prologues are introduced by the combination of (the same) adversative particle and pronoun (*Met.* 1,1,1 *at ego*...; 1,5,1 *at ille*...); both use the same verb to mark their formal status as a prologue (*Met.* 1,1,3 *exordior*; 1,5,1 *exordiar*); both contain requests to listen to some preliminary information (*Met.* 1,1,3 *paucis accipe*; 1,5,3 *sed ut prius noritis...audite*...); both refer to the narratives that they introduce as 'conversational' pieces (*Met.* 1,1,1 *sermone*; 1,5,2 *sermo*); both narrators link themselves to desultoriness, whether literal or metaphorical (*Met.* 1,1,6 *desultoriae scientiae stilo*; 1,5,3 *ultra citro discurrens*); and, of course, both the narrative and the sub-narrative begin with a protagonist travelling through Thessaly on business (*Met.* 1,2,1/1,5,3–4).



without an immediate, direct answer, since the same is true of the prologue's *quis ille?* Castiglioni's supplement needs to be recognised for what it is: one scholar's interpretation of the sub-narrator's identity, rather than what was actually written in the text. We do Apuleius a disservice by reducing the hermeneutic challenges of the *Golden Ass* to textual problems that can be averted, unravelled or massaged away with the mere stroke of a magic pen; if Castiglioni's *Aristomenes sum* has a proper place, it is in the imagination of the reader (as one of several possible solutions to the riddle of the sub-narrator's identity), rather than on the page. If the supplement is to appear at all in editions of the *Golden Ass*, it should in my view be relegated once and for all to the *apparatus criticus* as a footnote in the history of the text's reception.

Yet in a way, even if an ancient Apuleian papyrus were to emerge confirming Castiglioni's supplement, much of the argumentation presented here about the indeterminacy of the sub-narrator's identity would still remain unaffected. For once the unnamed third party has cast doubt on the truth of Aristomenes' words, such doubt can extend even to the content of the tale's prologue, including any assertions about the narrator's supposed name and identity. This is not merely some abstruse theoretical issue whispered amongst narratologists in their spare time, but a phenomenon that finds spectacularly concrete expression within the *Golden Ass* itself. For the only narrator in the entire text who introduces himself in full and formal terms, offering his name, parentage and place of birth, is the stranger who comes to the robbers' cave in Book Seven:

*Ego sum praedo famosus Haemus ille Thracius cuius totae provinciae  
nomen horrescunt, patre Therone aequae latrone incluto prognatus...*

Apul. *Met.* 7,5,6

'I am that famous brigand Haemus of Thrace, at whose name entire provinces tremble, and my father Theron is likewise a well-known robber...'

He then launches into a story, using the first person, of his (i.e. Haemus') recent escapades (*Met.* 7,6,2–8,3). This however is all a ruse, as Lucius later realises; for in fact the storytelling stranger is Tlepolemus, the fiancé of a girl whom the robbers have kidnapped (*Met.* 7,12,1). The (narrator) Tlepolemus

has invented the persona of Haemus for himself in order to steal his way into the bandits' confidence. The robbers have fallen for this trick, confusing the alter ego that Tlepolemus has assumed with Tlepolemus himself, and they eventually pay for their mistake with their lives. Lucius has also taken Tlepolemus' words at face value, leading him to all manner of foolish conclusions or as he puts it, the 'judgement of an ass' (*Met.* 7,10,4 *asini...iudicio*). And if we are honest with ourselves, Tlepolemus' deception also took most of us readers in too, at least on our first reading, confined as we are to Lucius' asinine focalisation. Like Odysseus in Polyphemus' cave, Tlepolemus claims to be someone other than he is, and his story reduces us all to Cyclopes, blind to the seductive spell of the fiction being perpetrated upon us.<sup>13</sup>

The lesson to be drawn here – one with broad implications for the interpretation of the *Golden Ass* as a whole – is that there are inherent dangers involved in assuming that narrators share, whether in full or even in part, the identities that they assume in their narratives or even in their prologues, including the names of their *ego*-protagonists. Tlepolemus' tale of Haemus equips the reader to realise that even if Lucius' storytelling companion on the road to Hypata had answered his own question of identity (*cuiatis sim, qui sim*) more fully, perhaps with something like Castiglioni's supplement, that answer need not have revealed anything (or at least anything straightforwardly true) about the person of the sub-narrator himself. As long as Lucius' own credulity is matched by the unnamed third party's incredulity, as long as the story is poised uncertainly between fact and fiction, the possibility remains that the *ego*-protagonist Aristomenes is an *auctor* only in the sense that he advised Socrates to escape (*Met.* 1,12,7 "*At hic bonus*" *inquit* [sc. Meroe] "*consiliator Aristomenes, qui fugae huius auctor fuit...*"), and not in the additional sense that he is the 'author' of the tale in which he so prominently features. For while the name Aristomenes does reflect an aspect, real or invented, of the sub-narrator, it should not necessarily be regarded as the *sum* of his person.<sup>14</sup>

<sup>13</sup> For other parallels between Tlepolemus' escape from the robbers' cave and Odysseus' escape from Polyphemus' cave, see Frangoulidis 1991, 1992a and 1992b.

<sup>14</sup> This paper freely reworks a few scattered ideas first presented in my doctoral thesis (Bitel 2000), for which it was my great privilege to have Maaïke as external examiner.

## Bibliography

- Bitel, A. 2000. *Quis ille? Alter egos in Apuleius'* Golden Ass, Diss. Oxford.
- Castiglioni, L. 1930. 'Apuleiana. I. Adnotationes ad Metamorphoseon Libros I–III', in: *Mélanges Paul Thomas*, Bruges: Imprimerie Sainte Catherine, 99–115.
- Dowden, K. 1982. 'Apuleius and the Art of Narration', *CQ* 32, 419–435.
- Frangoulidis, S. A. 1991. 'Charite dulcissima: A note on the nameless Charite at Apul. *Met.* 7.12', *Mnemosyne* 44, 387–394.
- Frangoulidis, S.A. 1992a. 'Epic inversion in Apuleius' tale of Tlepolemus/Haemus', *Mnemosyne* 45, 60–74.
- Frangoulidis, S.A. 1992b. 'Homeric allusions to the Cyclopeia in Apuleius' description of the robbers' cave', *Parola del passato* 47, 50–58.
- Giarratano, C.–Frassinetti, P. (edd.) 1960. *Apulei Metamorphoseon Libri XI*. Torino: In aedibus Io. Bapt. Paraviae.
- GCA 2001 = van Mal-Maeder, D. 2001. *Groningen Commentaries on Apuleius – Apuleius Madaurensis Metamorphoses – Livre II – Texte, Introduction et Commentaire*, Groningen: Egbert Forsten.
- GCA 1995 = Hijmans, B.L. – van der Paardt, R.Th. – Schmidt, V. – Wesseling, B. – Zimmerman, M. 1995. *Groningen Commentaries on Apuleius – Apuleius Madaurensis Metamorphoses – Book IX – Text, Introduction and Commentary*, Groningen: Egbert Forsten.
- GCA 2000 = Zimmerman, M. 2000. *Groningen Commentaries on Apuleius – Apuleius Madaurensis Metamorphoses – Book X – Text, Introduction and Commentary*, Groningen: Egbert Forsten.
- Hanson, J.A. (ed./transl.) 1989. *Apuleius, Metamorphoses*. (2 vols), Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press (The Loeb Classical Library).
- Harrison, S. J. (ed.) 1999. *Oxford Readings in the Roman Novel*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Helm, R. (ed.) 1931. *Apulei Platonici Madaurensis Metamorphoseon Libri XI*, Lipsiae: Teubner (reprinted with Addenda et Corrigenda 1955).
- Jong, I.J.F. de. 2001. 'The Prologue as a Pseudo-Dialogue and the Identity of its (Main) Speaker', in: Kahane, A. – Laird, A. (edd.) *A Companion to the Prologue of Apuleius' Metamorphoses*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 201–212.
- Keulen, W. H. 2000. 'Significant Names in Apuleius: a 'Good Contriver' and his rival in the cheese trade (*Met.* 1.5)', *Mnemosyne* 53, 310–321.
- Keulen, W.H. 2003. *Apuleius Madaurensis Metamorphoses Book I, 1–20: Introduction, Text, Commentary*, Diss. Groningen.
- Paardt, R.Th. van der. 1971. *Apuleius the Metamorphoses: A Commentary on Book III*, Amsterdam: A. M. Hakkert.
- 1978. 'Various Aspects of narrative technique in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*', in: Hijmans, B.L. – van der Paardt, R.Th. (edd.), *Aspects of Apuleius' Golden Ass*, Groningen: Bouma's Boekhuis, 75–94.
- Robertson, D.R. (ed.)–Vallette, P. (tr.) 1940–45. *Apulée: Les Métamorphoses*. (3 vols.), Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Scobie, A. 1975. *Apuleius Metamorphoses (Asinus Aureus) I – A Commentary*, Meisenheim (am Glan): Hain.

- Smith Jr., W.S. 1972. 'The narrative voice in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*', *TAPhA* 103, 513–34; reprinted in: Harrison (ed.) 1999, 195–216.
- Tatum, J. 1969. 'The tales in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*', *TAPhA* 100, 487–527; reprinted in: Harrison (ed.) 1999, 157–194.
- Van Mal-Maeder, D. 1995. 'L'Âne d'Or ou les Métamorphoses d'un récit: illustration de la subjectivité humaine', in: *Groningen Colloquia on the Novel* 6, 103–125.
- Winkler, J.J. 1985. *Auctor and actor: A Narratological Reading of Apuleius' Golden Ass*, Berkeley: University of California Press.