

MAAIKE ZIMMERMAN, ed., *Apulei Metamorphoseon Libri XI*  
Oxford Classical Texts  
2012 LIX + 289 pp. Oxford University Press, Oxford. \$ 75.-  
ISBN 9780199277025

Reviewed by Ellen Finkelpearl, Scripps College,  
[Efinkelp@ScrippsCollege.edu](mailto:Efinkelp@ScrippsCollege.edu)

Anyone reading *Ancient Narrative* has known for a long time that Maaïke Zimmerman, one of the core members of the Groningen Apuleius group, had been working on an Oxford Classical Text of Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*, and now it has arrived, it is certainly cause for celebration. Apart from all the careful work and years of deep thought that went into the edition, it is simply a pleasure to open a clean *Metamorphoses* that is not multi-volume like Robertson's Budé edition or a yellowing re-print with that type-face popular in the nineteenth century common in so many Classical texts (Helm's Teubner) but instead a bright new edition that will cause us all to see Apuleius afresh.<sup>1</sup> It is also cause for celebration and a testimony to a change in the place of Apuleius in the canon that Oxford finally saw fit to grant Apuleius (the *Met.* at least) his OCT.

Maaïke Zimmerman, if anyone needs to be reminded, is the sole author of the GCA commentary on Book 10 of the *Metamorphoses* (2000), the first author of the *Cupid and Psyche* GCA (2004), the first editor of *Aspects of Apuleius' Golden Ass II: Cupid and Psyche*, a joint author of the Book 9 GCA (1995) and the leader of the Groningen Apuleius group since 1992. She has also published numerous articles on Apuleius, and has thus, perhaps more than anyone, spent her life in the company of Apuleius and his *Metamorphoses*.

Zimmerman's fundamental approach to establishing the text is to follow the 11<sup>th</sup> century manuscript F that has generally been regarded as the source of all other extant manuscripts (see further below) and its immediate copy  $\phi$ , but to maintain "a healthy distrust" of the former. F has been damaged, corrected numerous times, and is sometimes illegible, but has nonetheless been

---

<sup>1</sup> The editions of Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* that will be cited frequently in this review are: R. Helm 1968. *Apuleius I: Metamorphoseon Libri XI*, third edition, Leipzig, Teubner; D. S. Robertson 1956. *Apuleé, Les Métamorphoses*, Paris Les Belles Lettres; C. Giarratano and P. Frassinetti 1960. *Apulei Metamorphoseon Libri XI, Torino, Paravia*; J. A. Hanson 1989. *Apuleius Metamorphoses*, Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press, Loeb Classical Library.

“fetishized” (Carver’s word) by many recent editors.<sup>2</sup> Citing work by van der Vliet, Robertson, Pecere and others, Zimmerman points to the importance of the “Class I” manuscripts which seem to be derived from a lost archetype “a”, which was probably a copy of F made before it had suffered corruption, and thus preserves some genuine readings not now in F. (In her article “Age and Merit”, pp. 154, 162-63, she also held out the tempting possibility that “a” could have been copied from the same archetype as F, rather than from F itself, and hence the Class I mss. have an independent ancestry.) Additionally, she argues that some of the early printed editions, by De Buxis (*editio princeps* Rome 1469), Philomathes (Florence 1522) and others, are likewise based on manuscripts that have preserved a genuine tradition and, where divergent from F, are not simply the conjectures of ingenious Renaissance humanists. All of these arguments are based on a meticulous review of collations of the manuscripts completed since the revised edition of Helm. She also reviews (both here and in two articles about the text) the fascinating history of the early transmission of the text of Apuleius, from its emendation by Sallustius at Rome in 396 through the monastic center of Montecassino and into the hands of the Humanists, profiting from recent work by Carver (*The Protean Ass*, Oxford 2008) and Gaisser (*The Fortunes of Apuleius and the Golden Ass*, Princeton 2008).<sup>3</sup> For the purposes of this edition, Zimmerman herself made new collations of the Class I manuscripts A and U, and of the *editio princeps*, consulted Beroaldus’ commentary (1500) and Philomathes’ edition, reviewed the images of F online, and F itself in some cases—and much else. Further, this edition has obviously profited from the detailed work of the Groningen group, which has now almost completed the set of commentaries on the entire *Metamorphoses*. As she notes in her Introduction, she does not always follow the readings established in the GCA volumes, but the textual debates in those volumes have always been important. This is certainly not a text made up of those established book by book in the GCA series.

The result of these collations and researches, then, is that Zimmerman puts greater faith in readings in Class I manuscripts,  $\phi$ , and also the *incunabula*, which she has convincingly demonstrated may preserve genuine readings. Where many earlier editors follow F, if its reading makes any sense at all, Zimmerman sometimes chooses a reading from what others might consider a

<sup>2</sup> The reference to Carver is taken from M. Zimmerman 2011, “Age and Merit: The importance of *recentiores* and *incunabula* for the text of Apuleius’ *Metamorphoses*,” *Segno e testo* 9, 131-63; the quotation is on p. 148.

<sup>3</sup> In addition to the article cited above, see M. Zimmerman 2012. “Text and Interpretation, Interpretation and Text,” in *Aspects of Apuleius’ Golden Ass III: The Isis Book, A collection of original papers*, edited by W. Keulen and U. Egelhaaf-Gaiser, Leiden, Brill, 1-27.

less faithful source, if it seems valid for a variety of reasons (see some examples below). Her apparatus reflects this different approach, listing more often than e.g. Helm, the readings of Renaissance humanists. She also frequently specifies in the apparatus what would in other editions be simply designated as “v” or ζ. So, for example, at 2.4.9, *qui deae vestigio discurrens in lenem vibratur undam*, Zimmerman’s apparatus reads (in part) “discurrentes v (*de Buxis*)” where Helm simply writes “discurrentes u.” It is Zimmerman’s belief that these manuscripts and early editions need more attention and that further research could lead to a better understanding of the relationships among these versions and F, and a revision of the stemma.

Overall, Zimmerman approaches each crux or disputed reading on its own merits, profiting from “the cross-fertilizing effect of textual criticism with the results of literary-historical research” (*Aspects* III, 3); examination of the manuscripts must go hand in hand with literary interpretation. Her increased trust in what others have considered less reliable sources leads to greater flexibility; F is no longer the default choice and the best reading must be ascertained by other means. This approach may be hard for some to accept, but after spending some time with her articles and text, I came away with a much better appreciation of the deficiencies of F.

The edition comes with an Introduction in English (not now anomalous among OCTs), including a brief outline of Apuleius’ life and works and a longer discussion of texts and transmission. A section on orthography explains her choices; for example, she uses “v” rather than consonantal “u” and she has regularized the spelling of Photis, despite the texts’ variations. Zimmerman has numbered her text with the standard page numbers but has also supplied the sentence numbers from Robertson on one side of the page, with line numbers on the other. This is a great relief and it is to be hoped that it will lead eventually to discarding the inconvenient system which has become standard in many of the Groningen commentaries and elsewhere, of referring to page and line numbers in Helm (e.g. 6.17.1 = 141,5). Even to someone steeped in Apuleius, “141,5” is fairly meaningless, while 6.17.1 is clearly recognizable as a passage near the end of “Cupid and Psyche.”

I confess that I did not read through the entire text and apparatus, but I browsed around, read the beginning of Book 1, most of Book 2, and several pages particularly in Books 5 and 11, as well as looking at some *cruces*. The examples below address such questions as how her readings compare with those of the earlier Groningen commentaries, and how her meticulous researches into the textual history has resulted in new readings (and the confirmation of old ones).

The first pages offered some surprises:

1.1.6: *Iam haec equidem ipsa vocis immutatio desultoriae scientiae stilo quem accersimus respondet.* (“For in fact this very change of language corresponds to the type of writing which we have sought out, which is like the skill of a rider jumping from one horse to another.”)

Here, F reads *accessimus*, which is accepted by Helm, Robertson, and Giarratano-Frassinetti, as well as Keulen in his GCA commentary and Harrison and Winterbottom in their essay in Kahane and Laird (15).<sup>4</sup> However, F’s reading has always been difficult since *accedo* in the sense of beginning a task usually is construed with *ad* (Keulen) and when used in a literary sense does not strictly have the meaning wanted here. *Accersimus* (“we have sought out”) is a reading drawn from de Buxis’ *editio princeps* of 1493 and is deemed “attractive” by both Keulen and Harrison and Winterbottom, the latter noting that its archaic flavor is fitting for Apuleius. This new reading, then, is a rather bold choice, but does make better sense of the passage.

It is also interesting to note that Zimmerman punctuates 1.1.2, with Keulen, as *...ut mireris, exordior. Quis ille?* following the punctuation of U (a Class I manuscript) and of earlier editors before Helm (who has *...ut mireris. exordior. quis ille?*).

1.2.3: *equi sudorem fronde curiose exfrico* (“I rub off the horse’s sweat with a bough”)

F reads *sudorem frontē* (i.e. *frontem*), which is accepted by Keulen as a double accusative construction. Others print *fronte* (Giarratano-Frassinetti), which is attested in the group designated as *v*, or add further phrases (Robertson). The reading adopted by Zimmerman comes from Becichemus, a sixteenth-century humanist mentioned in Hildebrand as having compared various manuscripts and proposed various emendations.<sup>5</sup> The choice is supported in the *apparatus* by a parallel to this practice in Dumas’ *Three Musketeers* (with reference to

<sup>4</sup> W. H. Keulen 2007. *Apuleius Metamorphoses Book I: Text, Introduction and Commentary (Groningen Commentaries on Apuleius)* Groningen. S. J. Harrison and M. Winterbottom 2001. “The Prologue to Apuleius’ *Metamorphoses*: Text, Translation and Textual Commentary,” in A. Kahane and A. Laird, *A Companion to the Prologue of Apuleius’ Metamorphoses*, Oxford, 9-15.

<sup>5</sup> G. F. Hildebrand 1842. *L. Apulei Opera Omnia*, 2 vols., Leipzig (repr. 1968 Hidesheim: Olms).

another critic). The reading *fronde* allows for a rubbing down of the horse's entire body and not simply his brow (*fronte*), but perhaps it is the very humanizing of the horse that the reference to its brow is meant to bring out. To me, *fronde* seems an unnecessary departure from the readings of most manuscripts when the principle objection to the transmitted text is the double accusative construction.<sup>6</sup>

Further examples:

2.2.3: *repente me nescius forum cuppedinis intuli*. ("suddenly without knowing it I stumbled upon the provision market.")

Most editors print *cupidinis* here, which is the reading of F. (Hanson alone prints *cuppedinis*.) The edition of de Buxis has *cupedinis*. The phrase also appears in Book 1 (1.24.3; 1.25.1), where F also has *cupidinis* (though  $\varphi$  has *cupedinis* in another hand at 1.24.3). The *forum cuppedinis* in Rome was a market devoted to delicacies, according to Paulus-Festus p. 48 and Varro *LL* 5.146, who explains the etymology. In his GCA commentary on Book 1, Keulen prints *cuppedinis*, and cites this instance as an example of "Romanization" of the Greek tale. He also cites as a parallel the word *cuppedinarius* in *Apology* 29.6. The corruption of the manuscript would clearly have resulted from the copyists' ignorance of the official name of the Roman market. Monks with their Christian minds on the evils of bodily desire, we could readily imagine, would have changed *cupedinis* to *cupidinis*, so *cupedinis* is clearly the *lectio difficilior*. With the adoption of *cuppedinis* we do not lose any of the thematically appropriate connections of Lucius with the pleasures of the body, since this *forum cuppedinis* was a place where the wealthy indulged their appetites for fish. Here again, the research done on the previously suspect readings of Renaissance humanists has led Zimmerman to what, for other reasons, seems a better choice.

2.7.6: *Felix et ter beatus cui permiseris illuc digitum intingere*. ("Happy and thrice blessed the man you would let dip his finger there.")

F reads *certius* and Helm prints <*certo*> *certius*. Here Zimmerman follows van Mal-Maeder and others in accepting the conjecture *ter*, which is exactly paralleled at 11.16.4 when the priest calls Lucius "*felix hercules et ter*

<sup>6</sup> For the most part in this review, I have refrained from any judgment, and this is the only reading in the edition with which I had any real disagreement.

*beatus*.”<sup>7</sup> Zimmerman notes in the apparatus “*sc. a librario scriptum: III beatus deinde tertius b. factum est, deinde certius b.*”, thus tracing the possible origin of the error. So here a very plausible conjecture, endorsed in van Mal-Maeder’s GCA is adopted where F’s reading is problematic but not impossible.

Noteworthy also is the reading *decitantes* at 2.4.2: . . . *palmaris deae facies, quae pinnis explicitis quasi in ingressu pilae volubilis instabile vestigium plantis roscidis decitantes*. . . In *decitantes* Zimmerman has adopted the reading of F, even though it is not attested elsewhere, following the example of the early edition of Oudendorp. In her GCA, van Mal-Maeder (96) argues that the fact that a word is a *hapax* is not an obstacle, since Apuleius invents numerous words. *Decitare* is evidently derived from *citare*, so the goddess’s feet seem to be hurrying the rolling of the ball.

10.15.2: *Nam neque asinum, qui solus interesset, talibus cibis adfici posse, et tamen cotidie partes electiles comparere nusquam...* (“The ass, they said, who was the only creature present, could not possibly be attracted by that sort of dish, and yet every day their choice bits were disappearing.”)

Here Zimmerman has departed from the text of her Book 10 GCA commentary, where she printed *pastus*. (Helm, Robertson and Giarratano-Frassinetti print *partis*, a reading suggested by Oudendorp, which is based on *v*, not otherwise specified.) F appears to have been erased and corrected several times, but seems to have the meaningless *pa~tes*. The reading in  $\phi$  is *pastis*. Zimmerman stresses in her GCA commentary that the *-st-* is strongly attested and the *r* is not. In the commentary, she defends the better-attested *pastus* on the basis of a parallel to a passage in Lucretius, in which *pastus* is used of human food (DRN 6.1127), and argues that Apuleius is here alluding to that passage. In the OCT, however, she has changed her mind and makes note in the apparatus of a series of convincing parallels in the immediate vicinity where the word *partes* is used to refer to portions of food. (One of these, if I am not mistaken, is actually the passage in question and should be omitted.) She also cites the reading *partes* in  $\delta$ , the Codex Dorvillianus of the late fifteenth century, which she had personally consulted. Ultimately, the reading (apart from orthography) remains identical to that in the other major editions, but is more secure

<sup>7</sup> D. van Mal-Maeder 2001. *Apuleius Madaurensis Metamorphoses Livre II, Texte, Introduction et Commentaire, Groningen Commentaries on Apuleius*, Groningen.

by virtue of consultation of other manuscripts and consideration of other issues (here repetition) to defend the reading.

In short, while the examples above show a number of examples where Zimmerman has adopted readings outside F, they also show that she has retained F when others have not, or endorsed conjectures when the text does not read well.

Some passages I was curious about, briefly:

Zimmerman does not attempt to re-write the impossible *ambacu pascuae iurulenta* at 2.7.2, but simply brackets it {}.

At 3.29.2 she writes, with F: *inter ipsas turbelas Graecorum genuino sermone nomen augustum Caesaris invocare temptavi*. (“Among the crowds of Greeks, I tried to call on the august name of Caesar in my own language” or “Among those crowds, I tried to call on the august name of Caesar in the native language of the Greeks.”) Here she resists the reading adopted by Robertson, *Graecorum* <*Romanorum*> that has had some support because Lucius is, in some sense, speaking Latin. Yet, within the fiction of the book, he speaks Greek—and the question has other complexities.

11.14.5: Here she rightly (in my view) writes *inhumano* (F) in reference to the priest’s otherworldly expression, rather than *perhumano* or *perhumanum* (Griffiths), which would be more immediately comprehensible, but unnecessary, given a parallel in the Cupid and Psyche tale at 5.8.1.<sup>8</sup>

She naturally retains *Madaurenses* at 11.27.9 in the face of some critics’ skepticism.

The *Spurcum Additamentum* receives discussion in the Introduction and is printed there in full, rather than being included in the apparatus as in Helm, Robertson and Giarratano-Frassinetti, where it is very difficult to read. Zimmerman reviews scholarship on the fragment and reiterates the view that it is not by Apuleius and probably of medieval origin, written in  $\phi$  in the margin, in the hand of Zanobi da Strada.

---

<sup>8</sup> J. G. Griffiths 1975. *Apuleius of Madauros: The Isis-Book (Metamorphoses Book 11)*, Leiden, Brill.

How different, ultimately, is Zimmerman's new OCT from the standard editions we have been using? Above, I have chosen examples that illustrate particular issues. But another way to assess this edition is to take a page at random and look at the differences in the text. This page may not be utterly representative, since my sense, reading most of Book 2 in sequence, was that every page bears some differences (but not overwhelming numbers) from earlier standard editions (which, of course, also differ among each other), but sometimes those differences are not of great moment—perhaps a change of prefix or a slight change in order. So, let us look at page 113 of her text (5.21.3-5.22.4). In the first line, we read *iam tamen facinori suas manus admovens*, where all other texts available to me omit *suas*. The GCA of *Cupid and Psyche* (2004) gives strong support to *suas* (a variant in  $\phi$  and suggested by F's *facinosu*) but does not adopt it.<sup>9</sup> At 5.21.5, Zimmerman prints *Nox aderat et maritus advenerat primusque Veneris proeliis velitatus...*, where some editions print *aderat* rather than *advenerat* and some have *prius* rather than *primus*. For *advenerat* she has adopted Pricaeus' reading, which is based on the Fuxensis manuscript, now lost, against the testimony of F and the choice of the GCA. In the next phrase, Zimmerman has added *in*, following Paratore: *altum <in> soporem descenderat* again departing from the GCA, but following grammatical sense, since *descendere* does not have the necessary meaning without *in*. At 5.22.2, she has retained the reading of F, *praenitebat*, in the phrase *acuminis sacrilegi novacula praenitebat*, where some editors have *paenitebat*, but views are divided. Most surprising on this page is her choice of *mutavit* in *sexum audacia mutavit* (5.22.1), where most (all?) standard editions have *mutatur*. Here *mutavit* is the reading of F, but apparently the correction of a later hand, and other manuscripts have *mutatū*. The passive or middle construction with *mutatur* is a bit awkward and *mutavit* gives Psyche more agency which seems appropriate here, yet has less manuscript support. In short, this page presents us with a number of disputed readings; in some cases, editors are divided and Zimmerman has opted for a reading endorsed by many. In one case, she has added a reasonable supplement suggested by another critic, and in two cases (*suas* and *mutavit*) she has made a significant change. In all cases, whether one agrees or not, it is clear that every decision is based on a careful consideration of the reliability of the manuscripts, a complete mastery of Latin grammar, a full review of the critical history of the passage, the stylistic tendencies of Apuleius and issues of literary interpretation.

---

<sup>9</sup> M. Zimmerman et al. 2004. *Apuleius Madaurensis Books IV 28-35, V and VI 1-24. Text, Introduction and Commentary*, Groningen.



There is no one in the world that I would trust more than Maaïke Zimmerman to establish the definitive edition of Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*, and what she has produced is both solid and exciting. Following through on recent re-assessments of the manuscript tradition and hence admitting a larger range of readings into consideration gives a greater flexibility in establishing the text, as does her incorporation of literary interpretation. Every decision she has made is fully informed, wise, and not at all rigid. Reading this new edition is a little like listening to a new recording of a favorite piece of music--say a Beethoven piano concerto. That old recording had gained a kind of validity simply because we had heard it a hundred times, not because its tempo and emphases were perfect. A new recording takes a little time to get used to, but I look forward with joy to getting used to this one.