

# No Success like Failure: The Task of the Translator in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*

RICHARD FLETCHER  
The Ohio State University

In a world of readers and writers, the translator is an unlikely hero. Fantastic tales of authorial adventures and readerly rites of passage, from Cervantes and Diderot to Blanchot and Auster, are bound to overshadow the drudgery of the 'dull translator'.<sup>1</sup> Our world of the ancient novel is no exception, as proved by the tales told by my fellow contributors in this volume. Yet, amid such talk of readers and writers, allow me to introduce the heroic translator-narrator of Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*.

Starting with the Prologue, Apuleius' narrator offers up a retrospective account of his previous life as a (Greek) human and ass in a newly adopted language (Latin).<sup>2</sup> Indeed, taking the Prologue at face value in this way makes it bear a resemblance to a 'translator's preface'.<sup>3</sup> Nevertheless, discussions of the narratological complexity of the *Metamorphoses* rarely consider the role of narrator as translator, especially beyond the limits of the Prologue.<sup>4</sup> Yet we encounter several appearances of the translator-narrator

---

<sup>1</sup> *Don Quixote*, *Jacques the Fatalist*, *Thomas the Obscure*, and *Leviathan* are exemplary of the range of ways in which readers and writers act as heroes. In recent years, we have found a few examples of the translator as hero, such as Aboulela 2006 and Hari 2008, as multiculturalism means that the tale of the translator is one worth hearing. The term 'dull translator' is borrowed from an anecdote retold by Alexander Pope about the bookseller Lintott, cited in Bannet 1993, 578.

<sup>2</sup> *Met.* 1,1 *forensis sermonis rudis locutor*. The edition of the *Met.* used is Helm 1968.

<sup>3</sup> On the face value of the Prologue see Henderson 2001. For the Prologue as 'translator's preface' see Morgan 2001.

<sup>4</sup> To use the narratological terminology adopted in the *GCA* series, such as *GCA* 1995, 7-14, the 'I'-narrator of the *Metamorphoses* tells his story in retrospect, he is also telling in Latin, thus enacting a translation from the Greek of the 'experiencing I'.

throughout the ensuing narrative.<sup>5</sup> For example, the oracle of Apollo at 4,32 is uttered in Latin ‘to show favour to the Milesian author’ (*propter Milesiae conditorem*), thus showing the old woman *narratrix* making a prospective glance to the translator’s finished text, or more ‘realistically’, it is the reformed narrator-translator imposing his role onto the Greek story world of the robber’s cave and, by extension, onto the language of the (Greek) god Apollo.<sup>6</sup> The later story of the Greek *hortulanus* at 9,39, who is *Latini sermonis ignarus*, shows a similar playful linguistic manipulation as the soldier’s Greek response is narrated in Latin. In both of these scenes we are treated to the narrator-translator’s retrospective reworking of a moment in which his recent acquisition of Latin – even as a self-acknowledged *rudis locutor* in that language – dictates the language choice of his testimony. However, compared to these successful acts of retrospective translation, we have some more complicated moments for the translator-narrator.

In a much debated series of passages (3,29; 7,3; 8,29), the ass Lucius tries but fails to speak.<sup>7</sup> In the first instance, the text leaves some ambiguity as to whether he would have cried out in Greek, Latin, or any other human language.<sup>8</sup> Interestingly, and with an informative comparison with the Greek *Onos*, on the second two occasions we can see that the reformed translator-narrator successfully translates the ass’ projected prayers into distinctly Roman phrases.<sup>9</sup> In these moments, the translator-narrator appears to hypercorrect his former asinine self, using these moments of his inhuman failure to speak to hammer home his new found bilingualism.<sup>10</sup> Given these consistent appearances of the translator-narrator throughout the *Metamorphoses*, it is

---

<sup>5</sup> Clarke 2001, 106 makes the connection between the treatment of the Latin language in the Prologue and the two scenes at *Met.* 4,32 and 9,39, and is followed by Hijmans 2006, 17 in his extended treatment of the former oracle scene. In general, the linguistic transformation of the narrator has been most successfully explored as a vital extension of his bodily transformation. See Too 2001 on how the rhetorical figure of *translatio* (metaphor) operates in the identity politics of the novel, specifically for the figure of Psyche. Readings of the *Metamorphoses* could definitely benefit from Slater 2005 in his approach to metaphor as translation in Heliodorus. A start in the right direction can be found in Moatti 2006.

<sup>6</sup> All translations of the *Met.* are from Hanson 1989, except where otherwise stated.

<sup>7</sup> The most recent and convincing treatment of these passages is Finkelpearl 2006.

<sup>8</sup> On this ambiguity see James 1987, 114 and Finkelpearl 2006, 213-220.

<sup>9</sup> 7,3 *non feci*; 8,29 *porro Quirites*. For the formula *non feci* as traditional in Roman law for a defendant who denies guilt, see *GCA* 1981, 98.

<sup>10</sup> On the relationship between translation and bilingualism (and multilingualism) see Kellman 2000, 33.

strange that when we reach the final book, we find two Greek terms left untranslated. Here is the whole passage at 11,17:

*at cum ad ipsum iam templum peruenimus, sacerdos maximus quiue diuinas effigies progerebant et qui uenerandis penetralibus pridem fuerant initiati, intra cubiculum deae recepti disponunt rite simulacra spirantia. tunc ex his unus, quem cuncti grammatea dicebant, pro foribus assistens coetu pastophorum — quod sacrosancti collegii nomen est — uelut in contionem uocato indidem de sublimi suggestu de libro de litteris fausta uota praefatus principi magno senatuique et equiti totoque Romano populo, nauticis nauibus quaeque sub imperio mundi nostratis reguntur, renuntiat sermone rituque Graeciensi τὰ πλοιαφέσια'.<sup>11</sup>*

When we arrived at the temple itself, the chief priest and those who carried the divine images and those who had already been initiated into the awesome inner sanctuary were admitted into the goddess's private chamber, where they arranged the lifelike effigies in their prescribed places. Then one of this group, whom everyone called the scribe, stationed himself before the door and summoned the company of the *pastophori* — the name of a consecrated college — as if calling them to an assembly. Then from a lofty platform he read aloud from a book verbatim, first pronouncing prayers for the prosperity of the great Emperor, the Senate, the knights, and the entire Roman people, for the sailors and ships, and of all that is under the rule of our world-wide empire.<sup>12</sup> Then he proclaimed, in the Greek language and with Greek ritual, the opening of the navigation season.

The name of the college of priests (*pastophori*) and the prayer for the launching of the ships (*ploiaphesia*) are Greek terms that, although glossed, are ultimately left untranslated in their original language.<sup>13</sup> What is the significance of these two Greek terms in this passage given the way in which the translator-narrator deals with Greek terms and phrases elsewhere? To answer this question I will firstly have to ask some more general questions about Apuleius' own role as translator, and specifically how he paints the

<sup>11</sup> Hanson 1989, 326 n. 1 comments on the garbled Greek in F and supplements τὰ.

<sup>12</sup> Translation adapted to follow Helm's adoption of F. Hanson 1989 translates *nauibusque, quae*.

<sup>13</sup> The former is glossed immediately following, while the latter is actually glossed earlier at 11,16 *vae litterae uotum instaurabant de noui commeatus prospera nauigatione*.

portrait of translator-narrator in more minor work in his extant corpus, the popular philosophical lecture *De deo Socratis*.

It is not surprising from what we know of Apuleius the writer that the translator appears as his hero in the *Metamorphoses*. From our knowledge of his extant translation of a passage of Menander's *Anechomenos*, two fragments of an otherwise lost translation of Plato's *Phaedo*, lost translations of technical works of arithmetic and music of Nichomachus of Gerasa, the free translation of *De Mundo*, and the Lucius of Patrae-*Onos-Metamorphoses* matrix, 'Apuleius the translator' is certainly a rich area of investigation.<sup>14</sup> For my purposes here, however, I am limited to exploring Apuleius' portrait of the translator-narrator in the *Metamorphoses*, rather than his translation practices throughout the corpus. That said, I find it instructive to balance this portrait with another less discussed translator-narrator that appears in *De deo Socratis*.

In *De deo Socratis*, the speaker presents himself as a translator (*interpres*) on three related levels. He not only explicitly presents himself as an *interpres* of the divine *sententia* of Plato (*Soc.* 16,155), but also a more general *interpres* of Greek philosophy into the Latin language and Roman culture. Furthermore, he puns on the fusion of his method and his subject matter by alluding to his role as philosophical, linguistic and cultural *interpres* as an earthly version of the daemonic role of *interpres* between the human and divine spheres.<sup>15</sup> This threefold role for the translator can be traced through the varieties of translation activity in the speech. Yet, as we shall see, the *interpres* of *De deo Socratis* has some affinities with the reformed *rudis locutor* of the novel. Both allude to their bilingual capabilities, both enact moments of successful translation performances and both express moments of failure in translation. As we shall see, the role of the translator in *De deo Socratis* helps us to appreciate how an apparent failure to translate can operate as a philosophical success. Yet, when a comparable failure occurs in the context of religious language and prayer in the above quoted section of the Isis-book of the *Metamorphoses*, the type of success is significantly different. In both tales of the translator, the success and failure of translation is related to an appreciation of the particular aims and egos of their respective translator-narrators. This appreciation of their particular aims and identities requires that rather than position the minor philosophical work somehow

---

<sup>14</sup> A study of Apuleius' translation practice as a whole is yet to be written. There are, however, some helpful comments in Hijmans 1987, Harrison 2000, 23 (on the *Phaedo*) and May 2006, 63-71 (on the *Anechomenos*).

<sup>15</sup> I owe this vital observation to Trzaskoma forthcoming.

*behind* the fictional masterpiece, I am committed here (as elsewhere) to giving voice to Apuleius' consistent concerns operating across his multifarious corpus.<sup>16</sup>

Yet before moving onto Apuleius' tale of two translators, I need to briefly expand upon what I mean by referring to a translator's failure and egotism via a particular scene of translation theory.<sup>17</sup>

### *The Translator is a Genius*

The classic discussion of the figure of the translator is Walter Benjamin's 'The Task of the Translator'. Benjamin famously opens his preface to his translation of Baudelaire's *Tableaux Parisiens* with some derogatory words about the reader's role in aesthetic appreciation:

In the appreciation of a work of art or an art form, consideration of the receiver never proves fruitful....No poem is intended for the reader, no picture for the beholder, no symphony for the audience...<sup>18</sup>

Given his negativity towards reception, Benjamin's exegetes have debated over why the translator should occupy such a prominent position in his essay. Paul de Man, in a lecture he delivered on Benjamin's essay, asks:

Why, in this text, to begin with, is the translator the exemplary figure? Why is the translator held up in relation to the very general questions about the nature of poetic language which the text asks?<sup>19</sup>

As an initial answer to Benjamin's choice of the translator de Man suggests that it may be because Benjamin is writing *as* a translator that he chooses the

---

<sup>16</sup> This is the focus of my forthcoming monograph on Apuleius, Fletcher forthcoming.

<sup>17</sup> This 'scene' of the work of Jakobson, Benjamin, de Man and Derrida is conveniently treated by Bannet 1993, as an 'afterword' to a primal scene between Alexander Pope and the bookseller Lintott. Note that the wilful anachronism of this genealogy is the very fault of translation. Hence Bannet's order of Jakobson 1963, Benjamin 1972, de Man 1986 and Derrida 1988. Does it matter that the 'original' order is Benjamin 1921, Jakobson 1959, Derrida 1982, de Man 1983? Scholarly reference tells its own tales of translation! Compare my own story of this scene in my bibliography.

<sup>18</sup> Benjamin 1921/1996, 253. For some intriguing additional comments on translation, see Benjamin 1916/1996 and Benjamin 1936/2002.

<sup>19</sup> de Man 1983/1985, 33.

translator above either writer or reader, for his theory of poetic language.<sup>20</sup> He then quickly discards the egotism of this argument, moving swiftly onto what he sees as the ultimate reason behind Benjamin's choice: that, unlike the writer or the reader, the translator ultimately *fails* in his task, in his debt to the 'original' poetic text. This idea of the inevitable failure of the translator is, as de Man points out with a helpful analogy with the Tour de France, itself a translation of the title of Benjamin's text.<sup>21</sup>

Yet, can we reconcile de Man's initial response to Benjamin's egotism as translator and this humbling idea of the translator's failure? One answer is that this failure is only in terms of the translator's debt to the 'original' and is thus only a failure on one level.<sup>22</sup> While Benjamin himself marks the failure of the translator as a failure to artistic, poetic creation, he also sees such a failure as one that enables a successful association with philosophy. Benjamin states that:

There is no muse of philosophy, nor is there one of translation. But despite the claims of sentimental artists, these two are not philistine. For there is a philosophical genius [*ein philosophisches Ingenium*] that is characterized by a yearning for that language which manifests itself in translations.<sup>23</sup>

In articulating the affinity between translation and philosophy *contra* poetic language, another Benjamin exegete, Jacques Derrida, hones in on this idea of 'philosophical genius', and specifically the failure to translate the Latin term *ingenium*. Derrida notes that following this passage a Mallarmé quotation is left untranslated in Benjamin's German (remaining in French in the translation he is reading), the same is not the case with the Latin term *in-*

---

<sup>20</sup> de Man 1983/1985, 33, 'it might just be out of megalomania that he selects the figure of the translator'.

<sup>21</sup> de Man 1983/1985, 33, 'If the text is called "Die Aufgabe des Übersetzers," we have to read this title more or less as a tautology: *Aufgabe*, task, can also mean the one who has to give up. If you enter the Tour de France and you give up, that is the *Aufgabe* – "er hat aufgegeben," he doesn't continue in the race anymore. It is in that sense also the defeat, the giving up, of the translator. The translator has to give up in relation to the task of re-finding what was there in the original.' de Man's focus on Benjamin's title may be a response to similar comments in Derrida 1980/2002, 112.

<sup>22</sup> To use Roman Jakobson's influential typology of translation, the failure of translation on an *interlinguistic* level (i.e. between two languages) can still enable a translation on an *intra-lingual* level (i.e. within one language). See Jakobson 1959/2001.

<sup>23</sup> Benjamin 1921/1996, 259, quoted in Derrida 1980/2002, 112-113.

*genium*.<sup>24</sup> In a later discussion, Derrida reminds his audience of his own ‘Plato’s Pharmacy’, a work at the crossroads of translation and philosophy, and proceeds to juxtapose the *pharmakon* with this untranslated (and untranslatable) *ingenium* in Benjamin’s essay.<sup>25</sup> Derrida reads both Greek and Latin terms as a challenge to the desired translatability of traditional philosophy.<sup>26</sup>

With this affinity between translation and philosophical *ingenium* in mind, I want to retrace our steps back to the path not taken by de Man – the egotistical argument that Benjamin chose the translator because he was writing as a translator. At first glance at his essay, this seems not to be the case since Benjamin consistently rates the translator in negative terms: referring to the ‘poor translator’, ‘adequate translator’, and the ‘basic error of the translator’. Yet, even if the egotistical reading of Benjamin’s translator is abandoned by de Man, such a reading is traceable *in* Benjamin if we remember the idea of the translator as a failed *subject*, as opposed to any failure of translation itself. Indeed, there is something of Benjamin’s trademark Messianic approach to history that finds a parallel in his discussion of how every original text will ultimately find its ‘best’ translator (look no further Baudelaire, Benjamin has arrived!).<sup>27</sup> Derrida puts it succinctly when he refers to the how Benjamin ‘does not say the task or the problem of translation. He

---

<sup>24</sup> Derrida 1980/2002, 112: ‘Benjamin has just quoted Mallarmé, he quotes him in French, after having left in his own sentence a Latin word, which Maurice de Gandillac has reproduced at the bottom of the page to indicate that by “genius” he was not translating from German but from Latin (*ingenium*).’

<sup>25</sup> Derrida 1982/1985, 120: ‘The origin of philosophy is translation or the thesis of translatability, so that wherever translation in this sense has failed, it is nothing less than philosophy that finds itself defeated. This is precisely what I tried to deal with in “Plato’s Pharmacy” by means of a certain number of words such as *pharmakon*, whose body is in itself a constant challenge to philosophy. Philosophical discourse cannot master a word meaning two things at the same time and which therefore cannot be translated without an essential loss. Whether one translates *pharmakon* as “poison” or “remedy”, whether one comes down on the side of sickness or health, life or death, the undecidability is going to be lost. So, *pharmakon* is one of the limits, one of the verbal forms – but one could cite many others and many other forms – marking the limit of philosophy as translation. I noticed that when Benjamin, in the first passage you read, speaks of philosophical genius, he makes use of a word that does not belong to his language: “*ingenium*”. In the French translation of Benjamin, Maurice de Gandillac notes at the bottom of the page: ““*ingenium*”, Latin word meaning. et cetera.” In other words, he was obliged to translate a word Benjamin left in Latin.’

<sup>26</sup> For a general discussion of the question of translation and philosophy see Benjamin 1989.

<sup>27</sup> For a discussion of the messianic hopes for translation see Robinson 1991, 88-92.

names the subject of translation, as an indebted subject...'.<sup>28</sup> With these conceptions of egotism, failure and indebtedness in mind, it is time to consider our two translators in Apuleius' *De deo Socratis* and the *Metamorphoses*.

### *The Tale of Two Translators*

In his *De deo Socratis*, Apuleius offers a spectrum of translation comparable to that displayed in the *Metamorphoses*. This particular area of comparison has been far from most readers' minds when approaching these two works. Most readers of both works search for comparable Platonic doctrinal cross-overs or signs of Apuleius' signature literary techniques.<sup>29</sup> Even when the speech is analysed from the perspective of its Latinising tendencies and its relation to contemporary Greek works on the same theme, the speaker's voice has not been identified as that of the translator.<sup>30</sup> One possible reason for this is the still debated issue of the relationship between the so-called 'False Preface' and the body of the speech.<sup>31</sup> In the 'False Preface' the speaker tells us he's switching from Greek to Latin, moving from Greece to Latium, in a spatial translation that parallels the linguistic transformation of the *Metamorphoses*' Prologue.<sup>32</sup> Given the problems of transmission, this introductory text should perhaps be read more as a transitional mid-point in the bilingual speech than as a 'translator's preface'. Nevertheless, it sets the scene for the various acts of translation to come, as well as the exegete's role as *interpres*.

In the speech, as in the *Metamorphoses*, we have moments of successful translation. The most direct instance is an off the cuff translation of Homer at 11,145:

*uersum Graecum, si paulisper opperiamini, Latine enuntiabo, atque adeo hic sit inpraesentiarum*

If you can wait a little, I can express the Greek verse in Latin – but here we are, right away.<sup>33</sup>

<sup>28</sup> Derrida 1980/2002, 114.

<sup>29</sup> For the former see Hijmans 1987; the latter, Harrison 2000, 136-173.

<sup>30</sup> For example, Harrison 2000, 137-140.

<sup>31</sup> For a convenient summary of this debate, see Harrison 2001, 177-180.

<sup>32</sup> As well as the end of one of Apuleius' Carthaginian Orations, *Florida* 18.

<sup>33</sup> The text used for *Soc.* is Moreschini 1991; the translation is Harrison 2001.

Both the 'False Preface' and this instant Homeric translation reflect the egotism of the text's translator as a bilingual speaker. In many ways this is a comparable success to the oracle and the *hortulanus* in the novel. Yet, as with the *Metamorphoses*, there are also some significant moments of less directly confident translation, such as the moments when Lucius the ass tries to speak. The most intriguing equivalent moment in *De deo Socratis* is concerning the central issue of translating the Platonic *daimon* into Latin. Midway though the lecture, Apuleius states at 15,150 that it is better for him to speak in Latin on the various types of *daimones*:

*id potius praestiterit Latine dissertare, uarias species daemonum philosophis perhiberi, quo liquidius et plenius de praesagio Socratis deque eius amico numine cognoscatis.*

It would be better to discourse in Latin of the various species of *daemones* spoken of by the philosophers, so that you may gain a clearer and fuller knowledge concerning the 'sign' of Socrates and the divine power which was his friend.

This claim for the preference of Latin is then followed with a more tentative approach of the translator than in the case of the Homeric translation, as he later in the same passage states:

*eum nostra lingua, ut ego interpretor, haud sciam an bono, certe quidem meo periculo poteris Genium uocare*

In our language, as I would translate it on my own account, if not perhaps accurately, you could call the *daemon* a 'Genius'.

This more tentative translation is then followed by successive attempts which expand on the wide range of roles *daimones* have if translated into an inherited Roman cultural vocabulary, from the *Lemur* of the 'ancient Latin language', to that most peaceable of the *Lemures*, the *Lar familiaris* and finally, the wandering *Larvae*, of which the *deus Manis* is a type. Significantly Apuleius' anxiety seems to be on account of his attempting to translate the Greek concept into an already established Latin terminology. Yet we have to ask, especially after stating that it would be better for him to speak in Latin on these various types of *daimones*, why Apuleius' role as translator is less confident than when he boasts of his translation of Homer? Why is there a difference? The answer can be found in the passage that immediately follows this tentative translation attempt of *daimon* for *Genius* (15,150-151):

*quod is deus, qui est animus sui cuique, quamquam sit immortalis, tamen quodam modo cum homine gignitur, ut eae preces, quibus Genium et genua precantur, coniunctionem nostram nexumque uideantur mihi obtestari, corpus atque animum duobus nominibus comprehendentes, quorum communio et copulatio sumus.*

Since that particular type of divinity, identical with the mind of each and every person, is (though itself immortal) nevertheless born in some sense together with a human being. Consequently, those well-known prayers in which men call upon their Genius and their knees seem to me to give evidence of this coalescence and connection of ours, embracing under these two names body and mind, the elements which make up our human conjunction and communication.

Here the *Genius* is called a *deus*, which is the same as the immortal soul (*animus*) when it is born with a human (*cum homine gignitur*). This procedure works through a progressive translation of the idea of *ingenium*.<sup>34</sup> The conflation of body and soul is perfectly presented by the punning phrase *Genium et genua*. So, when the speaker articulates the inadequacy of the translation of Greek *daimon* as Latin *Genius* he does so via a subtle discussion of the philosophical underpinnings of the Latin language. It is not sufficient for Apuleius to accept the Latin term *Genius* for *daimon*, he has to unpack and explain the philosophical concept and at the same time hold off the specific cultural implication of the Latin term. This process, unlike the translation of the Homeric line, develops from the failure to find a Latin translation for Greek *daimon* into a success of philosophical language. The *interpres* teaches his audience about Platonic demonology through the failure of *interlingual* translation. The glossing of the failed translation is where the philosopher achieves success.

Now let us finally return to the *Metamorphoses*. It is possible to compare how the *interpres* of the philosophical lecture enacts successful translation via an initial failure with the moments in which Lucius the ass fails to speak. In both cases, the narrator-translators successfully assert their particular aims. However, what about the Greek terms left untranslated in the Isis-book? Here we should not only make the same complaint that Derrida made of Benjamin's French translator, but also ask what has happened to our translator-narrator from elsewhere in the novel?

---

<sup>34</sup> On the etymology of *ingenium* from *in-gigno*, as well as the idea of a *Genius* inside, see Müller 2001, 321.

Let us consider the college of the *pastophori*. If we take the parodic view of Lucius' initiation, the main 'joke' has always been that Lucius celebrates being made into one of these priests when in fact they are pretty low-down in the cult's hierarchy, bordering on temple-servants. Griffiths notes in his commentary on the Isis book that:

Apuleius has already mentioned...ministrants who carried the sacred objects or images; but he has not used the term *pastophori* of these. Clearly he regards the *pastophori* as more important than the *sacrorum geruli*; perhaps he regards the latter as servants of the former.<sup>35</sup>

If we think that Lucius becomes one of the *sacrorum geruli*, how far has he really come from the *gerulus* figure of the ass? In many ways, the presence of the untranslated Greek name *pastophori* may seem to do the same work as the Latin phrase *sacrorum geruli*. However, for our initiate narrator, the carrier of sacred objects is a privilege vocation, with a title and a name. So, unlike the *interpres* of *De deo Socratis*, who relies upon the necessary translatability of philosophical language, the translator-narrator as initiate in the *Metamorphoses* resists the translatability of the name of his sacred office.<sup>36</sup> This gives the bilingual reader of the *Metamorphoses* an awkward sensation. As in many respects, the novel pins tales on us, as the *curiosus lector* in the text. While we can accept the reformed translator filling in the appropriate terms for the language of an ass, what does it mean if he resists doing so when speaking of his religious office? The same gesture is made for the Greek naming of the prayer for the sailing season. Both of these Greek terms enact the prestige of the narrator as initiate, a prestige that trumps the bilingual egotism of the translator. These tales of the successes and failures of the translator are sufficient warnings to us as exegetes not to too readily conflate narratorial and authorial voices, not only in the *Metamorphoses* but throughout Apuleius' multifarious corpus.<sup>37</sup>

---

<sup>35</sup> Griffiths 1975, 265.

<sup>36</sup> That is not to say that some forms of translation in the *De deo Socratis* mode do not occur in the *Metamorphoses*. Consider the several occasions the name Psyche is accompanied by either *animus* or *anima*. Indeed, this wordplay is the cornerstone of the Platonic readings of the novel. I explore how Apuleius utilizes the quotation of Plato in Greek for philosophical aims in my Fletcher 2009 forthcoming.

<sup>37</sup> I want to thank Michael Paschalis and Stavros Frangoulidis for inviting me to deliver the initial version of this paper at the *RICAN 4* conference, and all of the participants for a stimulating event.

### *Bibliography*

- Aboulela, L. 2006. *The Translator*, Grove Press.
- Bannet, E.T. 1993. 'The Scene of Translation: After Jakobson, Benjamin, de Man, and Derrida', *New Literary History* 24, 577-595.
- Benjamin, A. 1989. *Translation and the Nature of Philosophy*, London – New York: Routledge.
- Benjamin, W. 1916/1996. 'On Language as Such and on the Language of Man', in Bullock and Jennings (eds.), 62-74.
- 1921/1996. 'The Task of the Translator', in Bullock and Jennings (eds.), 253-263.
- 1936/2002. 'Translation – For and Against', in H. Eiland, H.W. Jennings (eds.), *Walter Benjamin: Selected Writings, vol. 3, 1935-1938*, Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press, 249-252.
- Bullock, M., Jennings M.W. (eds.) 1996. *Walter Benjamin: Selected Writings, vol. 1, 1913-1926*, Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press.
- Clarke, K. 2001. 'Prologue and Provenance: *Quis ille?* or *Unde ille?*', in Kahane and Laird (eds.), 101-110.
- de Man, P. 1983/1985. "'Conclusions": Walter Benjamin's "The Task of the Translator" Messenger Lecture, Cornell University, March 4, 1983', *Yale French Studies* 69, 25-46.
- Derrida, J. 1982/1985. 'Roundtable on Translation', in *The Ear of the Other: Otobiography, Transference, Translation*, Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 93-161.
- 1980/2002. 'Des Tours de Babel', in G. Anidjar (ed.), *Jacques Derrida: Acts of Religion*, London – New York: Routledge, 102-134.
- Finkelpearl, E. 2006. 'The Language of Animals and the Text of Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*', in Keulen, Nauta, Panayotakis (eds.), 203-221.
- Fletcher, R. 2009 forthcoming. 'Plato reread too late: Philosophical Citation and Affiliation in Apuleius' *Apologia*', *Ramus* 38.1.
- forthcoming. *Apuleius and the Impersonation of Philosophy*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Griffiths, J.G. 1975. *Apuleius of Madauros: The Isis-Book (Metamorphoses, Book XI)*, Leiden: Brill.
- Groningen Commentaries on Apuleius (GCA)* 1981 = Hijmans Jr., B.L., Van der Paardt, R.Th., Schmidt, V., Westendorp Boerma, R.E.H., Westerbrink, A.G., *Apuleius Madaurensis, Metamorphoses VI, 25-32 and VII: Text, Introduction and Commentary*, Groningen: Bouma's Boekhuis.
- Groningen Commentaries on Apuleius (GCA)* 1995 = Hijmans Jr., B.L., Van der Paardt, R.Th., Schmidt, V., Wesseling, B., Zimmerman, M., *Apuleius Madaurensis, Metamorphoses IX: Text, Introduction and Commentary*, Groningen: Egbert Forsten.
- Hanson, J.A. (ed., tr.) 1989. *Apuleius Metamorphoses* [Loeb Classical Library], Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hari, D. 2008. *The Translator: A Tribesman's Memoir of Darfur*, Random House.
- Harrison, S.J. 2000. *Apuleius: A Latin Sophist*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 2001. 'Apuleius, "False Preface"' and 'Apuleius, *On the God of Socrates*', in S.J. Harrison, J.L. Hilton, V.J.C. Hunink, *Apuleius Rhetorical Works*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 177-180; 184-216.
- Helm, R. (ed.) 1968. *Apuleius I: Metamorphoseon Libri XI*, Leipzig: Teubner.
- Henderson, J.G.W. 2001. 'In Yer (Pre)face', in Kahane and Laird (eds.), 188-197.
- Hijmans Jr., B.L. 1987. 'Apuleius Philosophus Platonicus', *ANRW* II 36.1, 395-475.

- 2006. ‘Apollo’s Sn(e)aky Tongue(s)’, in Keulen, Nauta, Panayotakis (eds.), 15-27.
- Jackobson, R. 1959/2001. ‘On Linguistic Aspects of Translation’, in R. Brower (ed.), *On Translation*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 232-239.
- James, P. 1987. *Unity in Diversity: A Study of Apuleius’ Metamorphoses*, Hildesheim: Olms-Weidmann.
- Kahane, A., Laird, A. (eds.) 2001. *A Companion to the Prologue of Apuleius’ Metamorphoses*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Keulen, W.H., Nauta, R.R., Panayotakis, S. (eds.) 2006. *Lectiones Scrupulosae: Essays on the Text and Interpretation of Apuleius’ Metamorphoses in Honour of Maaike Zimmerman* [Ancient Narrative Supplementum 6], Groningen: Barkhuis and Groningen University Library.
- Kellman, S.G. 2000. *The Translingual Imagination*, Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- May, R. 2006. *Apuleius and Drama: The Ass on Stage*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Moatti, C. 2006. ‘Translation, Migration, and Communication in the Roman Empire: Three Aspects of Movement in History’, *CLAnt* 25.1, 109-140.
- Moreschini, C. 1991. *Apulei opera philosophica*, Stuttgart: Teubner.
- Morgan, J. 2001. ‘The Prologues of the Greek Novels and Apuleius’, in Kahane and Laird (eds.), 152-162.
- Müller, C. 2001. ‘Rhétorique de l’*ingenium* et personnalité littéraire’, *Emerita* 69.2, 319-346.
- Robinson, D. 1991. *The Translator’s Turn*, Baltimore – London: Johns Hopkins.
- Slater, N.W. 2005. ‘And There’s Another Country: Translation as Metaphor in Heliodorus’, in S.J. Harrison, M. Paschalis, S. Frangoulidis (eds.), *Metaphor and the Ancient Novel* [Ancient Narrative Supplementum 4], Groningen: Barkhuis and Groningen University Library, 106-122.
- Too, Y.L. 2001. ‘Losing the Author’s Voice: Cultural and Personal Identities in the *Metamorphoses* Prologue’, in Kahane and Laird (eds.), 177-187.
- Trzaskoma, S.M. forthcoming. ‘Apuleian Mediocrity in the *De Deo Socratis*.’