

Luca Graverini,

A lepidus susurrus. Apuleius and the fascination of poetry

In: R.R. Nauta (ed.), *Desultoria scientia. Genre in Apuleius' Metamorphoses and related texts*, Leuven - Paris - Dudley (Ma), Peeters 2006, pp. 1-18.

DESULTORIA SCIENTIA
GENRE IN APULEIUS' *METAMORPHOSES*
AND RELATED TEXTS

Edited by

Ruurd R. NAUTA

PEETERS
LEUVEN – PARIS – DUDLEY, MA
2006

A CIP record for this book is available from the Library of Congress.

CONTENTS

Preface	vii–ix
<i>A lepidus susurrus</i> . Apuleius and the fascination of poetry..... <i>Luca Graverini</i>	1–18
Literary texture in the adultery-tales of Apuleius, <i>Metamorphoses</i> Book 9..... <i>Stephen Harrison</i>	19–31
Some cases of genre confusion in Apuleius..... <i>Vincent Hunink</i>	33–42
The wet rituals of the excluded mistress: Meroe and the mime..... <i>Wytse Keulen</i>	43–61
Camels, Celts and centaurs. Lucian’s aesthetic concept – the <i>charis</i> of the hybrid	63–86
<i>Peter von Möllendorff</i>	
Echoes of Roman satire in Apuleius’ <i>Metamorphoses</i>	87–104
<i>Maaike Zimmerman</i>	
<i>Bibliography</i>	105–113
<i>Index of passages discussed</i>	115–118
<i>General index</i>	119–121

Cover illustration: Figurine cut out of sheet bronze found during the 19th c. excavations at Borgo le Ferriere (Prov. di Latina)

© 2006, Peeters - Bondgenotenlaan 153 - 3000 Leuven, Belgium

D. 2006/0602/131
ISBN-10 90-429-1846-2
ISBN-13 9789042918467

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior permission of the publisher.

A *LEPIDUS SUSURRUS*.
APULEIUS AND THE FASCINATION OF POETRY*

Luca Graverini

Allusive, ambiguous, and even obscure passages are indeed easy to find in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*, but the prologue seems to be particularly written to stimulate, and possibly to deceive, the reader's interpretative capabilities. Even the very first words, *At ego tibi*, immediately raise a problem: why *at*? The particle implies some sort of transition or opposition, but its setting at the very beginning of our text is rather astonishing: the reader, of course, cannot know *from what* the transition or opposition is marked. John Morgan¹ argues that "the emphatic position of *at ego tibi* implies a previous storytelling *tu mihi*... we are plunged into the position of overhearing part of a larger narrative exchange already in progress"; this suggested contextualization would be perfectly consistent with the subsequent characterization of the novel as a *sermo Milesius* ('Milesian talk'), since from the pseudo-Lucianic *Erotes* "we learn that Aristides in the *Milesian Tales* also presented himself as a participant, listener as well as teller, in a cycle of stories". Alexander Scobie² argues that the parallelism with the introduction of *Cupid and Psyche* (4.27.8 *Sed ego te...*) could suggest that with *at* Apuleius "temporarily casts off the guise of Platonist and assumes that of a *fabulator*" and that "the opening sentence of the prologue was possibly a formula used by story-tellers". He also points out that an initial *at* is not uncommon in Latin poetry, beginning from Virgil's famous *At regina graui...* (*Aen.* 4.1).³ Wytse Keulen how-

* This essay is connected with a paper (Graverini 2005) I gave at the 2nd Rethymno International Conference on the Ancient Novel (Crete, May 2003). I could not avoid a few overlappings, but – at least in my intentions – the two studies are complementary to each other. I am grateful to Alessandro Barchiesi, Ellen Finkelpearl, Marco Fucecchi, and Antonio Stramaglia, who read previous versions of this paper and offered their very helpful advice; I also received extremely useful remarks and suggestions by Ruurd Nauta, the editor of this volume. The errors which remain fall of course to my own account.

1. Morgan 2001: 161.

2. Scobie 1975: 66.

3. Cf. Prop. 2.27.1 (*at uos*); Ov. *Ep.* 12.1 (*at tibi*); *Met.* 4.1; Luc. 9.1; Sil. 15.1; Stat. *Theb.* 3.1; V. Fl. 6.1. No occurrences at the beginning of a *first* book, though; the only two parallels for this placement, as Scobie notes, seem to be Xenophon's *Symposium*, ἄλλ' ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ... and *Respublica Lacedaemoniorum*, ἄλλ' ἐγὼ ἐννοήσας... Perhaps it should

ever suggests that “perhaps... *at* is merely a colloquial particle” and notes that “the combination *at ego* is characteristic of dialogue and occurs very frequently in comedy, sometimes to emphasise a promise or proposal”.⁴

This beginning, therefore, seems to put the reader *in medias res*, as though a dialogue, or simply a speech by the prologue speaker, has already begun in his absence; what has been told before *at ego*, unfortunately, is only a subject for hypotheses. As we have seen, *at* has been interpreted by others as pertaining to storytelling and/or dialogues; as a provocative and tentative introduction to this study, I am going to suggest a different and more literary contextualization.

The dialogue we are called to participate in, or the speech we are asked to listen to, has (at its beginning at least) a very definite and particular subject, judging by the part of it that we can read: the prologue speaker, whoever he is,⁵ is giving his audience some general information about the narration that is to follow. Confining ourselves to the first sentence, we are told that this narration will be a *sermo Milesius* (‘Milesian talk’), that it will consist of *uariæ fabulæ* (‘different sorts of tales’), and that it will be able to *permulcere aures* (‘soothe the ears’) of those who will listen to it. Each of these pieces of information would need some interpretation, but what concerns me now is that we are informed about genre (‘Milesian’),⁶ contents (different tales somehow connected to each other), and style (a ‘soothing’ narration) of the *Metamorphoses*.⁷ So, perhaps we could lay aside for a moment the position of *at ego* at the very beginning of our novel, and consider more attentively the fact that it is connected with a prologue, and most of all with a statement concerning literary genre and style. Perhaps we could also consider the possibil-

also be noted that several books of Homer (*Il.* 3 and 15; *Od.* 11, 12, 14, 19, and 20; cf. also *Il.* 9, 22, 23 and *Od.* 6) begin with *Αὐτάρ*.

4. Keulen 2003a: 60; cf. also Harrison 2003: 240–41.

5. This is the problem that more than any other seems to have attracted the curiosity of those scholars who have studied the prologue. See Kahane-Laird (eds.) 2001, and Graverini 2003 for some comments and a few bibliographical supplements.

6. While I am a supporter of Ken Dowden’s ‘prohibition 2’ (“No one shall seek to identify the speaker (singular) of Apuleius’ Prologue”: Dowden 2001: 129), I am not as much persuaded by his ‘prohibition 1’ (“No one shall refer to a genre of ‘Milesian Tales’”: 126). Keulen 2003a: 61–62 (on *Milesio*) offers enough evidence of the fact that the adjective *Milesius* seems to be connected to a fictional and novelistic literary genre. However, it is true that our knowledge of the Milesian ‘genre’ is scanty; and I am not sure that an ancient reader would label as ‘Milesian’ all the texts anthologised by Ferrari-Zanetto 1995.

7. Of course, there is no need to differentiate so sharply between the words adopted by the prologue speaker and the information that they convey. For example, it is possible that the mention of *sermo Milesius* has some relevance for the style too, if we connect Apuleius’ archaising style to Sisenna (cf. Callebaut 1968: 478; Dowden 2001: 127).

ity that *at ego tibi* implies not a preceding *tu mihi*, as Morgan says, but *alii tibi*: that is, it could stress the difference between the prologue speaker’s literary choices and other genres and/or styles that other speakers could offer the same audience.

At ego is, of course, a very common word sequence, and to set off in search of intertextual parallels could appear to be a desperate and, even worse, pointless effort. However, if we limit the research field to metaliterary statements, we can find some interesting, or at least interpretable, matches. *At ego* was not only a common colloquial combination, easily found in comedy and dialogical texts; it was also a well established tradition in ancient literature to begin a statement about one’s literary principles with something similar to ‘but I...’. The Roman historians, for example, in their prologues felt the need of confronting themselves with their predecessors, and of justifying their own choices. Sallust had to account for his decision to write history instead of devoting himself to his country: *Cat.* 3.2 *Ac mihi quidem, tametsi haudquaquam par gloria sequitur scriptorem et auctorem rerum, tamen in primis arduum uidetur res gestas scribere* ‘And for myself, although I am well aware that by no means equal repute attends the narrator and the doer of deeds, yet I regard the writing of history as one of the most difficult of tasks’.⁸ Livy had the less essential but still very important problem of justifying the choice of his subject matter, ancient and mythical instead of contemporary history: *pr.* 5 *ego contra hoc quoque laboris praemium petam* ‘I myself, on the contrary, shall seek in this an additional reward for my toil’.⁹ Proudly claiming his own impartiality and disinterest in writing history, Tacitus stresses in his prologues the opposition between himself (*Hist.* 1.1.3 and *Ann.* 1.1.3 *mihi*) and the other historians (*Hist.* 1.1.1 *multi auctores*; *Ann.* 1.1.1 *clari scriptores*).

Subject matter and literary genre were also a common and all-important issue for those Augustan poets who had a strong preference for a personal, lyric and/or elegiac Muse, while their patrons tried to promote a more politically committed poetry. In Propertius, for example, metapoetical statements often take the form of a *recusatio*, a refusal to engage in ‘civil’ or epic poetry. The ‘but I’ form explicitly shows up at 2.1.45 *enumerat miles uulnera, pastor oues; / nos contra angusto uersamus proelia lecto* ‘the soldier counts his wounds, the shepherd his sheep; I for my part wage wars within the narrow confines of a bed’, but it is clearly present also at 3.9.20–21 *naturae sequitur semina quisque*

8. Trans. Rolfe 1931.

9. Trans. Foster 1919.

suae. / *At tua, Maecenas, uitae praecepta recepi* ‘each man follows the elements of his own nature. But I have adopted your rule of life, Maece-nas’, and 4.1.61–62 *Ennius hirsuta cingat sua dicta corona: / mi folia ex hedera porrige, Bacche, tua* ‘let Ennius crown his verse with a ragged garland: Bacchus, give me leaves of your ivy’.¹⁰ If we consider similar adversative uses of first-person pronouns, the examples from Augustan poetry might easily multiply. See for example Ovid, *Fasti* 1.13 *Caesaris arma canant alii: nos Caesaris aras* ‘let others sing of Caesar’s wars; my theme be Caesar’s altars’;¹¹ and several passages in Horace, like *C.* 1.7.1–10 *Laudabunt alii claram Rhodon aut Mytilenen... me nec tam patiens Lacedaemon... percussit* ‘others will praise bright Rhodes or Mytilene... As for me, I am not so struck by much-enduring Lacedaemon...’.¹² An explicit *at*, like in Apuleius, recurs in the lengthy *recusatio* that opens the third book of Manilius’ *Astronomica*. After enumerating a series of topics he is not going to treat, the poet concludes: ‘it is a hackneyed task to write poems on attractive themes and compose an uncomplicated work. But I (*at mihi*) must wrestle with numerals and names of things unheard of’.¹³ Also later *recusationes* reiterate this pattern. For example, in Martial 8.3.17–19 the ninth Muse incites the poet with these words: ‘let the ultra-serious and the ultra-severe write such stuff, sad fellows looked upon by the midnight lamp. Bu do *you (at tu)* dip your witty little books in Roman salt... never mind if you seem to sing with a nar-

10. Trans. Goold 1990.

11. Trans. Frazer 1929.

12. Trans. West 1995. See also e.g. *C.* 1.6.1–9 *Scriberis Vario fortis... Nos, Agrippa, neque haec dicere... conamur*; 1.31.9–15 *Premant Calena falce quibus dedit / fortuna uitem... Me pascunt oliuae*; 4.2.25–32 *Multa Dircaeum leuat aura cycnum... ego apis Matinae / more modoque... carmina fingo*. Such antitheses based on first-person pronouns are usual in *recusationes* and metapoetical statements: cf. Nisbet-Hubbard 1970: 85 commenting on *C.* 1.6.5 *nos*.

13. Trans. Goold 1977. Manilius’ *recusatio* (on which see Liuzzi 1988: 85–88) is an extremely interesting comparison for Apuleius’ prologue, with which it shares some key points; there is probably no direct relationship between the two texts, but the correspondences suggest that both Manilius and Apuleius resort to stock themes in their prologues. After the *recusatio* proper with *at mihi*, the poet urges the reader to listen attentively; then he takes a stand in the diatribe between *utile* and *dulce* in poetry, declaring that he will not offer *dulcia carmina*, but useful teachings; and finally justifies himself for the presence, in his poem, of foreign terms (‘come hither, whoever is able to devote ear and eye to my emprise, and hearken to the truths I utter: apply your mind [*impendas animum*], and seek not poetry that beguiles [*nec dulcia carmina quaeras*]: my theme of itself precludes adornment, content but to be taught. And if any terms are spoken in a foreign tongue, blame this on subject, not on bard’). For the first point, cf. Apul. *Met.* 1.1.6 *Lector intende* (and, for the appeal to the reader’s ears and eyes, cf. 1.1.1 *aures* and *inspicere*); for the third, cf. 1.1.5 *En ecce praefamur ueniam, siquid exotici ac forensis sermonis rudis locutor offendero*; for the second, cf. 1.1.1 *lepido susurro permulceam*, and the interpretation of this expression that I am going to suggest in the following pages.

row pipe (*angusta auena*), so long as your pipe outmatches many people’s trumpets’.¹⁴

Of course, this is not the place for a thorough review of the theme of *recusatio* in Augustan poetry; but the picture would not be complete without a hint at Hellenistic Greek authors, who frequently adopted the same rhetoric gesture. Beginning with minor texts, my first example is an epigram attributed to Theocritus in the *Anthologia Graeca* (9.434.1–2): Ἄλλος ὁ Χίος, ἐγὼ δὲ Θεόκριτος δὲ τὰδ’ ἔγραψα / εἷς ἀπὸ τῶν πολλῶν εἰμὶ Συρακοσίων ‘The Chian is another, but I, Theocritus, the author of these works, am a Syracusan, one among many’.¹⁵ This is a problematic text. Its attribution to Theocritus appears to be autoschediastic; and also Wilamowitz’s identification of the ‘Chian’ with Homer, that would allow us to interpret the epigram as a contraposition between epic and bucolic poetry, is probably to be rejected: the anonymous epigrammatist rather aims at differentiating Theocritus of Syracuse, the bucolic poet, from another Theocritus, a sophist of Chios.¹⁶ But, even though only a difference between personal identities is at stake in the first two verses, a literary statement occurs in the fourth and last, where the epigrammatist points out the difference between the Muses that inspired the two authors bearing the same name: Μοῦσαν δ’ ὀθνεῖαν οὔ τιν’ ἐφελκυσάμαν ‘I have taken to myself no alien Muse’. Another relevant apocryphal text is the *Epitaphium Bionis* ascribed to Moschus. After enumerating a series of cities and places that lament Bion’s death much more than the loss of the famous poets to whom they gave birth (Ascra/Hesiod, Boeotia/Pindar, Lesbos/Alcaeus, Teos/Anacreon, Paros/Archilochus, Mytilene/Sappho, Syracuse/Theocritus), the poet says that he, on his behalf, sings as a bucolic poet the mourning of Ausonia for Bion: that is, he is differentiating himself from others as regards both birthplace and poetic genre, just like the author of the epigram quoted above does with Theocritus (vv. 93–94: αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ τοι / Αὐσονικᾶς ὀδύνας μέλω μέλος, οὐ ξένος ᾠδᾶς / βουκολικᾶς ‘but, on my behalf, I am singing the mourning of Ausonia, being no stranger to pastoral poetry’).

However, the most famous piece, and the most relevant for my purposes, is the prologue of Callimachus’ *Aitia*, a text that Margaret Hubbard defined as “possibly more significant for Latin poetry than any other

14. Trans. Shackleton Bailey 1993.

15. Trans. Gow 1952.

16. See Cameron 1995: 422–26; Rossi 2001: 344.

single page of Greek”¹⁷ and that has certainly had some influence on many of the above-quoted passages. The poet proclaims that he prefers the shrill cry (λιγὸς ἦχος) of the cicadas to the din (θόρυβος) of the ass. Both the chirp of the cicadas and the bray of the ass are clearly symbols of different kinds of poetry: let other poets bray like the long-eared beast, Callimachus prefers to be like the slight and winged cicada (vv. 31–32 Θῆρι μὲν οὐατόεντι πανείκελον ὀγκήσαιτο / ἄλλος, ἐγὼ δ’ εἶην οὐλαχύς, ὁ περόεις ‘Let others bray just like the long-eared brute, but let me be the dainty, the winged one’).¹⁸ At the end of the *Aitia* a similar pattern, αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ, announces a transition to a new work and a new genre, the *Iambi*: the poet says his farewell to Zeus and commends the royal house to his protection, while he, he says, is heading to the pasture where the Muses walk (fr. 112.8–9 Χαῖρε, Ζεῦ, μέγα καὶ σύ, σάω δ’ ὄλον οἶκον ἀνάκτων· / αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ Μουσέων πεζὸν ἔπειμι νομόν ‘Hail greatly thou too, Zeus, and save all the house of kings. But I will pass on to the prose pastures of the Muses’).¹⁹

In these texts, Callimachus employs ἐγὼ δὲ and αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ to set himself and his poems apart from other literary traditions; and, as we have seen, it is possible to find similar expressions in similar contexts also in later Hellenistic and Latin poets. Of course, it could be mere coincidence: ‘but I’ is a very natural and common way to begin a statement about one’s originality. Nevertheless, if we consider how often the name of Callimachus recurs in the critical literature about, for example, Propertius, and if we take into account that both expressions recur in similar contexts, we can at least wonder if Propertius’ *nos contra* – occurring just five lines after Callimachus himself has been mentioned as a model of the ‘slight’ poetry Propertius stands for – has something to do with Callimachus’ ἐγὼ δὲ. In other words, Propertius’ poem offers a sort of “collective security”²⁰ that allows us to imagine intertextual connections even in words or phrases that have no eye-catching peculiarity in them-

17. Hubbard 1974: 73; see also Thomas 1993: 199, who stresses that “Callimachus does in fact deserve, from a number of aspects, the prominent position accorded him by relatively recent criticism”.

18. Trans. Trypanis 1978.

19. Trans. Trypanis 1978. Pfeiffer 1949: 125 *ad loc.* points out that this is a variation on a standard closure of the Homeric Hymns: cf. e.g. *h.Cer.* 495; *h.Ap.* 546; *h.Merc.* 580; *h.Ven.* 293. Callimachus’ closure implies, I think, some sort of differentiation between the activities of the poet and those of Zeus and the kings (cf. Hes. *Th.* 94–96: ‘from the Muses are the singers... from Zeus the kings’); this could be an echo of the prologue, where he says that ‘it is Zeus’ job to thunder, not mine’ (v. 20 βροντῶν οὐκ ἐμὸν, ἀλλὰ Διός).

20. For the terminology see Hinds 1998: 28. I also refer to Hinds’ discussion of *me miserum* in Ovid and Propertius (pp. 29–34) as a theoretical background to the interpretability of such ‘loose’ intertexts.

selves. What I am suggesting is that ἐγὼ δὲ, *nos contra* and similar expressions could be regarded as stylised rhetorical gestures that recur with some frequency in metapoetical contexts, especially in the Hellenistic and Augustan authors, when a poet sets up his own style or literary genre against other ones; and, even though defining Propertius’ *nos contra* an allusion proper to Callimachus’ ἐγὼ δὲ would probably be too far-fetched, I think that an ancient reader could more or less easily identify this rhetorical gesture as typical of such metapoetical contexts, recalling Callimachus, Propertius and others.

Apuleius’ *at ego*, as we have seen, occurs precisely in a metaliterary context. However, I am sure that at this point no critic would be ready to admit that this *at ego* has something to do with ἐγὼ δὲ or *nos contra* (of course, assuming that at least somebody is now persuaded that ἐγὼ δὲ and *nos contra* have something in common): after all, Apuleius’ *Metamorphoses* is a prose narrative and its prologue, like the prologues of Sallust, Livy, and Tacitus, seems to have no connection with poetry, Callimachus and Callimacheanism.

It is exactly this last statement that I will try to confute in the following part of this paper.

Callimachus, in the prologue of his *Aitia*, used the braying of the ass and the songs of the cicadas as metaphors for bad and good poetry respectively. Now, exactly the same voices seem to reverberate in our prologue. The prologue speaker defines himself a *rudis locutor*, a ‘raw speaker’: almost all commentators, following John Winkler and Gian Franco Gianotti,²¹ connect the adjective *rudis* to the braying of the ass, *rudere* in Latin, so that *rudis locutor* also suggest a ‘braying speaker’, and somehow foreshadows Lucius’ metamorphosis into an ass. Wytse Keulen is rather sceptical about this point in his commentary,²² but this is one of the very few occasions in which I cannot agree with him. I would rather point out that the connection of *rudis locutor* with *rudere* is a pun that fits very well with his interpretation of the prologue in the light of ancient rhetoric since, as it seems, it was a common topos to compare an orator’s voice to the cry of an animal: the barking of the dog was, as it seems, the most common metaphor (cf. e.g. Cic. *Brut.* 58 *latrant enim iam quidam oratores, non loquuntur*),²³ but at least one orator was

21. Winkler 1985: 196; Gianotti 1986: 106.

22. Keulen 2003a: 81 *ad loc.*: “the idea seems ingenious but far-fetched”.

23. Cf. also Sallust, *fr.* 4.54 Maurenbrecher (Nonius 1.60 M. = 84 L.) *canina, ut ait Appius, facundia exercebatur*. On this passage see La Penna 1973; the metaphor is

unlucky enough to be described as a braying ass by Lucilius (*frg.* 261 M. *haec... rudet ex rostris*). As for the cicadas, we will see in a minute that they begin to enchant us with their chirp soon after *at ego tibi*. If this is true, it would be easy to interpret the prologue, at least partially and tentatively, as a reaction to Callimachus' poetic: a prologue speaker who tries to speak with a *lepidus susurrus* and ends up as a braying ass against a poet who refuses to speak like an ass²⁴ and identifies himself with a slight cicada – and, why not, *at ego* against ἐγὼ δέ. More appropriately, I think, we could say for the moment (I am going to show that there is more to be said about *lepidus susurrus*) that the prologue speaker takes over *both* the positions of Callimachus and of his opponents, showing a tendency to cross the boundaries of different genres and styles that is typical of Apuleius and the ancient novel: if so, the *Metamorphoses* are announced as a work that will participate in *both* the characteristics of a Callimachean composition (that is, high stylistic refinement) and of an anti-Callimachean poem (that is, a long narration with an epic flavour).²⁵

This is clearly an eccentric suggestion,²⁶ since it forces us to imagine Apuleius in dialogue with a Hellenistic poet like Callimachus, whose work has never been the first place critics have looked for intertextual connections with Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*. However, on the one hand

adopted also by Quint. *Inst.* 12.9.9 and Hieron. *Epist.* 119.1. Cf. Also Ov. *Ib.* 232 *latrat et in toto uerba canina foro* and several other passages quoted by La Penna 1973: 189 n. 2.

24. For a bad poet speaking like an ass see also Callimachus, *fr.* 192.11 Pf.; according to [Aristoteles], *Phgn.* 813A οἱ μέγα φωνοῦντες, 'loud-voiced speakers', are similar to asses.

25. Cf. Thomas 1993: 202–03 on the presence of Callimachean motifs and expressions in statements of anti-Callimachean poetics (Persius and others). On the *Metamorphoses* and epic poetry see e.g. Harrison 2000: 222–23, who states that "though... the *Metamorphoses* is full of literary allusions to many kinds of writing, it seems to be particularly concerned with highlighting its similarities with and differences from the epic in particular".

26. Of course, I take full responsibility for it; honours, if any, are to be shared with some predecessors, whose original and more sober suggestions I have expanded. The Callimachean prologue is connected to *rudis* by Winkler 1985: 196–97; James 2001: 259 and n. 8 points out the contrast between the *lepidus susurrus* and *rudis locutor*. I became aware of the "eye-catching use of *at* to announce the subject of this... work" reading Dowden 2001: 132, who (expanding on Harrison 1990b: 508) compares the prologue to the *Metamorphoses* with the verses that according to Servius originally opened Virgil's *Aeneid* (in particular the last one, *at nunc horrentia Martis / arma uirumque cano...*). Finkelpearl 1998 states that, in reading Apuleius, we should see "many allusions as, in part, literary criticism and replies to stylistic statements of earlier writers" (17); Callimachus and some metaliterary statements by the Augustan poets are exploited in her chapter on 'Hair, Elegy, and Style' (62–67).

it is well known that Apuleius had a wide and thorough Greek culture,²⁷ and this authorises us to make use of major Hellenistic authors to find an appropriate literary context to an Apuleian expression;²⁸ on the other, I will try to show that part of the Hellenistic texts concerned can actually be considered secondary references, only activated through the mediation of Latin authors.

But let us continue with the cicadas. The formulation I offered above of the relationship between the prologues of Apuleius and Callimachus implies some sort of connection between the prologue speaker's *lepidus susurrus* and the voice of the cicadas. My starting point in demonstrating this connection is a suggestion by Bruce Gibson,²⁹ who argues that Apuleius' *lepidus susurrus* is a hint at the first verse of Theocritus' *Idyll* 1, Ἄδύ τι τὸ ψιθύρισμα..., that describes the soft rustle of the wind through the branches of a pine. Indeed, the similarity is striking, and Gibson reinforces it with two further remarks: 1) the prologue also mentions the *calamus* with which the book has been written: *calamus*, here 'pen', can also mean 'reed pipe', and could somehow hint at the Pan-pipe whose sound is in Theocritus so similar to the ψιθύρισμα of the pine leaves (vv. 2–3 ἄδὸ δὲ καὶ τὴ / συρίσδεξ 'sweet is also your syrinx-playing');³⁰ 2) the prologue also lays great emphasis on Egypt, since it is explicitly told that the above-mentioned *calamus* comes from the Nile, and that the book is written on an Egyptian papyrus: a possible explanation for these Egypt-

27. The main bibliographical reference is, of course, Sandy 1997. Apuleius studied poetry at Athens (*Fl.* 20.4) and was on his way to Alexandria when he stopped in Oea to recover from the fatigue of the journey (*Apol.* 72), starting a chain of events that will lead to the trial in Sabratha (on Apuleius' biography see e.g. Harrison 2000: 1–10). He was proud to cultivate all literary genres, including of course all kinds of poetry, *tam graece quam latine* 'both in Greek and in Latin' (*Fl.* 9.14; 9.27–29); unfortunately his poetic production is almost completely lost for us, but his remaining verses show a "notevole influsso di modelli ellenistico-neoterici" (Mattiacci 1985: 249).

28. Gellius 9.9.3 is evidence that 2nd-century men of letters used to compare Virgil with Callimachus and Theocritus and others very closely: 'Virgil... showed skill and good judgment in omitting some things and rendering others, when he was dealing with passages of Homer or Hesiod or Apollonius or Parthenius or Callimachus or Theocritus' (trans. Rolfe 1927).

29. Gibson 2001: 71 ff.

30. Gibson's paper, in general, aims to demonstrate that the phrase *papyrus Aegyptiam argutia Nilotici calami inscriptam* does not refer only to the act of writing, but contains "possible auditory elements" too (68; on this, see also Finkelpearl 2003: 47–48). Of course my focus is different, and my brief quotations do not do justice to the sophistication of his arguments. Gibson also keenly notes (71, n. 12) that "beguiling whisperings are not always agreeable... quite apart from the possibly dangerous implications of *lepido susurro*... compare also the insidious qualities of *permulceo* at Quintilian, *Inst.* 2.12.6 *nihilque aliud quam quod uel prauis uoluptatibus aures adsistentium permulceat quaerunt*". His intuition is fully developed by Keulen 2003a: 8–19; see also Graverini 2005.

tian references is that “an Egyptian mode of composition could suggest Theocritus, a poet of Alexandria”. Unfortunately, Gibson leaves untold what this “Egyptian mode of composition” consists in, and to what extent an allusion to Theocritus in the prologue is significant to characterise the novel’s style, genre, or contents: should we think that the style of the whole novel is thereby characterised as Theocritean? Of course, this would really seem too far-fetched; ‘pastoral’ or ‘bucolic’ do not appear to be proper adjectives to define the *Metamorphoses* as a whole.

It is true, however, that we should not reject an interesting intertext only because we (still) do not know what we could make of it. I would also point out that Theocritus is not an unlikely source for an allusion in the *Metamorphoses*, and I will substantiate this statement with a new proposal. At *Met.* 8.1.3 one of Charite’s slaves reports the death of his masters to an audience consisting of grooms, shepherds, and cowherds (and of course the ass); this character has been frequently compared to a tragic messenger,³¹ and the comparison accounts very well for the pathetic tone of his speech. But the choice of words is not coherent with the tragic genre: the messenger’s opening, *equisones opilionesque, etiam busequae* ‘grooms and shepherds, and herdsmen too’, fully qualifies for an imitation of Theocritus, *Idyll* 1.80 ἦνθον τοὶ βοῦται, τοὶ ποιμένες ὀπλόλοι ἦνθον ‘the cowherds came, and shepherds and goatherds too’ while the Virgilian *Stant et oves circum... uenit et upilio, tardi uenerunt subulci* ‘the sheep stand around... and the shepherd came, and the slow swineherds too’ (*Ecl.* 10.16 and 19) seems to be less close to Apuleius’ text (the context is instead fully relevant in both Theocritus and Virgil: the shepherds and the others are called to participate in the mourning for the deaths, real or figurative, of Thyrsis and Gallus respectively). I suspect that this imitation is simply a display of Apuleius’ cultural showmanship, and that it would be pointless to go off in search for a further meaning in the implicit approach of the messenger to a bucolic poet, and of Charite to a bucolic character: she certainly dies for love, but her story is definitely too bloody for a pastoral song. What I am trying to demonstrate is only that Apuleius can imitate Theocritus, or at least that he can read Theocritus through Virgil, regardless of the literary context and also in contrast with a literary genre that is temporarily taken on. Nevertheless, a prologue is a very sensitive location for an allusion, and I still

31. Cf. López 1976: 338; and more recently Nicolini 2000: 255 *ad loc.*: “l’esordio e la struttura del discorso, con l’apostrofe a un gruppo di ascoltatori, l’uso della seconda persona plurale, l’immediata rivelazione della sciagura avvenuta, richiamano e forse addirittura parodiano uno schema comune dell’ ἄγγελος della tragedia”. On messengers in Euripides see the comprehensive study by de Jong 1991.

think that Gibson’s suggestion lacks some contextualization; this is at least a good reason for trying to develop his idea by following different paths.

The leaves of the Theocritean pine gently rustle in the wind; their sound is compared by Thyrsis to the sound of the *syrinx* of his unnamed fellow goatherd. Both the terminology and the idea are taken up by Virgil in his first *Eclogue*: Meliboeus, not without envy, tells Tityrus *hinc tibi, quae semper, uicino ab limite saepes / Hyblaeis apibus florem depasta salicti / saepe leui somnum suadebit inire susurro* ‘on this side, as of old, on your neighbour’s border, the hedge whose willow blossoms are sipped by Hybla’s bees shall often with his gentle hum soothe you to slumber’³² (*Ecl.* 1.53–55). The pastoral fascination (sleep) induced by the drone of the bees is connected with the preceding image, Tityrus enjoying the cooling shade near sacred springs (vv. 51–52). Michael Putnam has shown that this is “figurative for one aspect of the pastoral myth – the soul’s absorption by poetry and spiritual calm”;³³ the *leuis susurrus*, connected with the Theocritean description of a nature that sings together with the shepherds, conveys the same ideas.

In comparison with Theocritus’ ἄδύ ψιθύρισμα, Virgil’s *leuis susurrus* obviously lacks any connection with Egypt, is not strictly associated with the sound of a pipe,³⁴ and is not located in such a relevant position as the very first verse of an entire poetic collection. But, perhaps more importantly, it shares with Apuleius a fascinating effect, since it puts Tityrus to sleep: in the *Metamorphoses* the *leuis susurrus* has precisely the purpose of enchanting the listeners’ ears, *permulcere aures* (and the verb *mulceo* is frequently connected with sleep).³⁵ This is, I think, a good reason to treat the Theocritean intertext as a secondary one, and to put Virgil’s *Eclogue* 1 in the foreground. However, although this hierarchy might clarify the intertextual structure of the phrase, it is certainly not enough to solve our problem: why should Apuleius hint at a bucolic author, be it Theocritus or Virgil, at the very beginning of his prologue?

Let us focus for a moment on some significant innovations introduced by Virgil in the Theocritean description. Virgil’s *susurrus* comes, like

32. Trans. Fairclough 1935.

33. Putnam 1970: 47–48 (cf. Hor. *C.* 3.13.9–12 and 1.17.17–20).

34. But cf. v. 2 *auena*.

35. Cf. e.g. Verg. *Aen.* 7.754–55; Ov. *Ep.* 18.27; *Met.* 8.824, 11.625; Plin. *Nat.* 10.136; Sil. 7.293; Stat. *Theb.* 2.30–31; V.Fl. 1.299–300, 2.140. On the fascination implied by the expression *permulcere aures* see Graverini 2005.

Theocritus' ψιθύρισμα, from a plant (a willow hedge in Virgil,³⁶ a pine in Theocritus), but it is actually produced by the bees; it is not only sweet (ἄδύ in Theocritus, somehow echoed by *leuis* in Virgil, as well as by *suadebit*), but it also has a practical effect on those who listen to it, since as we have seen it induces sleep (*somnum suadebit*). Bees and sleep are two important details, that contribute to the metapoetical character of Meliboeus' speech. At the beginning of Callimachus' *Aitia* and of Ennius' *Annales* (and cf. also Prop. 3.3) sleep and dream are places of poetic initiation.³⁷ As for bees and honey, they were typically connected with poetry and with the Muses. For example, the bees are *Musarum uolucres* in Varro, *Res Rusticae* 3.16.7; and Plato, *Ion* 534a–b, exploiting the easy pun μέλη/μέλιτται, compares them to the poets: Λέγουσι... πρὸς ἡμᾶς οἱ ποιηταὶ ὅτι... ἀπὸ κρηνῶν μελιρρύτων... τὰ μέλη ἡμῖν φέρουσιν ὡς περ αἱ μέλιτται 'the poets tell us... that the songs they bring us are the sweets they cull from honey-dropping founts... like the bees'.³⁸

Virgil's bees have the distinctive feature of inducing sleep, and this seems to be an unparalleled detail for bees in ancient literature. Still, we can make a useful comparison with the cicadas of Plato, *Phaedrus* 258e ff. Like the bees, the cicadas are in Plato (and in Callimachus, as we have seen) closely connected with poetry and with the Muses.³⁹ Socrates tells Phaedrus that they were originally men who, enchanted by the songs of the Muses, forgot to eat and drink, and died of hunger and thirst. Later, from these men the cicadas were born and the Muses granted that they live without any food or drink, devoting all their time to songs and music. After their deaths, they report to the Muses in what way and how much living men honour each of them. But, Socrates says, they are also dangerous: in the noontide heat, with their mesmerising voice, they can avert the philosopher's mind from his philosophical thoughts, and put him to sleep like the slaves⁴⁰ who sit nodding under a shady tree or the

36. On the introduction of hedges and boundaries into the bucolic landscape see Putnam 1970: 46.

37. See Enn. *Ann.* 1.5; on Callimachus' dream cf. also e.g. *AP* 7.42; Prop. 2.34.32. Paus. 2.31.3 reports that 'Sleep is considered the god that is dearest to the Muses'. Useful references and further bibliography on the topos in Massimilla 1996: 233–37.

38. Trans. Lamb 1925. See Scarcia 1964: 19–24 and Waszink 1974 for further occurrences of the topos.

39. On the symbolic value of both bees and cicadas see the comprehensive treatment by Roscalla 1998: 60–75.

40. He probably means 'shepherds': cf. 230d.

sheep that rest near a cool spring at noon.⁴¹ The philosopher has to avoid them, just as Odysseus had to avoid the Sirens.⁴²

The possibility and the meaning of an allusion to Plato's cicadas in Virgil's first *Eclogue* deserves, I think, to be studied separately, and I will set it aside in this paper. What is interesting for me now is that Apuleius probably has Virgil as a model for an enchanting *susurrus*; and that, for the reasons that I am about to explain, it certainly was easy for Apuleius, or for a 2nd-century learned reader, to make a connection between Virgil's bees, the cicadas of Plato, and Callimachus.⁴³ As we have seen, bees and cicadas share the same symbolic value; they are also explicitly connected to each other by Virgil, *Ecl.* 5.77 'so long as the bees feed on thyme and the cicadas on dew – so long shall your honour, name, and glory abide'⁴⁴ (another passage that could easily be read as a metapoetical allusion); Aelianus, *NA* 5.13 is useful to demonstrate that such a connection could be a commonplace: 'what the divine Plato says of cicadas and their love of song and music one might equally say of the choir of

41. Plato, *Phdr.* 258e–259a: 'the cicadas seem to be looking down upon us as they sing and talk with each other in the heat. Now if they should see us not conversing at mid-day, but, like most people, dozing, lulled to sleep by their song because of our mental indolence, they would quite justly laugh at us, thinking that some slaves had come to their resort and were slumbering about the fountain at noon like sheep'. The translation is by Fowler 1914, but I have adopted 'cicadas' instead of his 'locusts' for τέττιγες.

42. Ferrari 1987: 27 comments that "Phaedrus... as cultural 'impresario',... has a tendency to promote clever talk for its own sake, indiscriminately. I propose that through the myth of the cicadas Plato takes his stand against this tendency in such a way as to admonish the readers that they too... must beware of careless discrimination among the breeds of intellectual discourse".

43. Trapp 2001: 41 already suggested, but very hesitantly, that Apuleius' prologue hints at Plato's description of the "bewitching buzz of the cicadas": "I would like to be able to see another echo of this scene [*sc. Phdr.* 258e–259d] in Apuleius' soothingly sibilant *aures... lepido susurro permulceam...*, but I am not sure that I can". Of course I support his hypothesis; and I also share his opinion that, in Apuleius' prologue "the Plato of the *Phaedrus* is... invoked not as an ally but as an adversary" (41): Apuleius here seems to adopt the poetics of the cicadas, rather than that of Socrates (but see below my conclusions). Plato is obviously an important model for Apuleius, who had a renown as *philosophus Platonicus*: see e.g. Harrison 2000: 252–59, who however warns that the primary function of Platonic allusion in the novel is "that of entertaining literary and cultural display" (255), and not of offering the reader a sketch of Platonic philosophy. The *Phaedrus* is obviously a model for the ending of the story of Socrates: see Harrison 2002: 255–56, and especially Keulen 2003a: 309–10 *ad* 1.18.8 *iuxta platanum istam residamus* (I would add that the *Phaedrus* is probably a relevant model also for the pastoral scene described by the *harundo uiridis* at 6.12.2–5, also containing a plane tree). Unfortunately, I have not been able to read O'Brien 2002 yet. In general, Trapp 1990: 141 states that "few works were more firmly entrenched in the 'cultural syllabus' of Hellenic *paideia* by the second century AD than Plato's *Phaedrus*".

44. Trans. Fairclough 1935.

bees'.⁴⁵ Finally, and most importantly, Plato's cicadas and Virgil's bees share the distinctive quality of inducing a peaceful (and poetical) sleep. As it seems, this is not a common feature for cicadas either: while their cry is often referred to as a *cantus* (cf. e.g. Apul. *Fl.* 13.1), there is also a tradition according to which it is irritating and *prevents* those who listen to it from sleeping (Phaedrus 3.16).⁴⁶

To sum up, in my opinion the prologue speaker's *lepidus susurrus*, that enchants his listener's ears, does not hint at a bucolic world, but more generally at the seducing power of literature, a metaphorical meaning that an ancient reader could easily attach to Virgil's bees and Plato's cicadas: the prologue speaker speaks with the voice of a bee or of a cicada, and his audience will be caught by his enchanting power.⁴⁷

This is a provocative assertion on Apuleius' behalf, and the *ego* speaking the prologue had a lot of opponents (*alii*, as I was suggesting at the beginning of this paper) who could attack such a programmatic statement. Any 2nd-century literate reader would be well aware of the never-ending debate, dating back to the times of Plato, between the supporters of a psychagogic approach to literature and rhetoric and those who preferred to stress the moral and pedagogical bases of the work of men of culture. In Plato's *Phaedrus* the cicadas and the sleep they induce are clearly an antagonistic power that the philosopher, whose main concern is truth and not enchantment, has to fight and overcome. On ψυχαγωγία in poetry see e.g. Horace, *Ars* 99–100 'Not enough is for poems to have beauty: they must have charm (*dulcia sunt*), and lead the hearer's soul where they will'.⁴⁸ Horace is well aware of the antithesis between education and entertainment, but is open to a compromise: 'poets aim either to benefit (*prodesse*), or to amuse (*delectare*), or to utter

45. Trans. Schofield 1958.

46. Plin. *Nat.* 11.266 defines the voice of the bees as a *murmur*, that of the cicadas as a *stridor*; however, cf. Verg. *Aen.* 7.65 where *stridor* is referred to the bees. In Callimachus' *Aitia* they sing with a λυγρὸς ἦχος (v. 29). Trypanis 1958 translates 'shrill voice', and D'Alessio 1996 'suono acuto', but λυγρὸς also conveys the idea of 'tuneful' and 'sweet': cf. e.g. Stephanus s. v. ("Stridulus, Argutus, s. Argutum stridens: interdum et Canorus, Iucundus... Suaviter loquens"), and esp. Hesychius' lemma λυγρόν· ἡδύ, γλυκό. Λυγρὸς is said of the Muses e.g. at Hom. *Od.* 24.62 and Plato, *Phdr.* 237a; cf. Verg. *G.* 2.475 (quoted also by Tac. *Dial.* 13.5) *dulces... Musae*.

47. The term *susurrus* is also connected with magical practices; see Keulen 2003a: 64 *ad loc.*, who points out that "the novel's pivotal theme of magic is introduced here on the level of the magic power of speech".

48. This and the other translations from Horace's *Ars* are by Fairclough 1929. See Brink 1971: 182 ff. for the distinction in literary criticism between *pulchrum* and *dulce*, καλὸν and ἡδύ.

words at once both pleasing and helpful to life' (vv. 333–34; cf. 343–44 'he has won every vote who has blended profit and pleasure, at once delighting and instructing the reader'). Bucolic poetry, however, clearly sided with *delectare* rather than with *prodesse*: Richard Hunter, commenting on Theocritus, *Idyll* 1.1 ἄδύ, states that "the pleasure (τὸ τερπνόν, *dulce, iucundum*) that poetry brings had been a battleground for Plato and Aristotle, and one branch of Hellenistic theory, particularly associated with Eratosthenes,⁴⁹ privileged poetry's emotional appeal, its ψυχαγωγία, over any moral or educational claims it might have. On this view, 'bucolic poetry' will have no effect in the world in which it is performed – goats go on being goats, and Daphnis' *pathos* will become... purely a subject for our aesthetic appreciation".⁵⁰ As regards rhetoric, of course the traditional Roman eloquence, trained to the gravity of the *Forum* and always solicitous about the moral qualities of the orator, did not normally like *susurrus*-like voices: see for example a Sallustian fragment preserved by Fronto, *multi murmurantium uoculis in loco eloquentiae oblectantur* 'they take delight by way of eloquence in the soft notes of mutterers'⁵¹ (*ad Anton. de eloqu.* 4.4, p. 148,9 Van den Hout²).⁵² The moral and stylistic principles of ancient rhetoric are extremely useful to interpret Apuleius' prologue: Wytse Keulen has well demonstrated that "the *ego* in the prologue avows exactly the kind of rhetoric against which the professors of rhetoric warned", and that *ares permulcere* was a common expression that suggested "a corrupt, hyperurbane style, including offensive mannerisms of the voice".⁵³ The most evident features of this corrupted kind of rhetoric were an excess in verbal delight and a singsong *pronuntiatio*, that according to Quintilian and Seneca were connected with moral depravation.⁵⁴

49. Hunter refers to Pfeiffer 1968: 166–67.

50. Hunter 1999: 70.

51. Trans. Haines 1929: 73.

52. Cf. also Fronto, *ad Anton. de eloqu.* 2.13, p. 141,14–5 Van den Hout²: *hoc indicat loqui te quam eloqui malle, murmurare et frigitire potius quam clangere*, 'this shows that you prefer mere speaking to real speaking, a whisper and a mumble to a trumpet note' (trans. Haines 1929: 67).

53. Keulen 2003a: 18. I have treated more briefly the same topic in Graverini 2005; *permulcere aures* has an equivalent in γαργαλιζειν τὰ ὦτα, an expression adopted by some Greek rhetors with the same meaning.

54. Quint. *Inst.* 11.3.60 'there are some people, too, who, as well as the other vices of their life, are slaves to the pleasure of listening to sounds that soothe their ears (*quod aures mulceat*) wherever they are' (trans. Russell 2001). Sen. *Ep.* 114.1 'You have been asking me why, during certain periods, a degenerate style of speech comes to the fore, and how it is that men's wits have gone downhill into certain vices – in such a way that exposition at one time has taken on a puffed-up strength, and at another has become mincing

Therefore, philosophers, poets, and rhetors, one way or another, negotiated their position in this debate. The ancient novel was an unstable, not well defined literary genre; although the works we label as ‘novels’ were written (mostly) in prose, as it seems they did not share the primarily moral and educational character of philosophy, history, and (part of) rhetoric, they were closer to poetry (at least, to some kinds of poetry) in their search for an entertaining and distracting narration.

Verbal and musical enchantment, though of course not alien to prose genres in ancient literature, contributes to this ‘poetic’ character of Apuleius’ novel, whose language has been well described by Wytse Keulen as a “Latin that breathes the spirit of Greek poetry rather than the *sermo forensis*”.⁵⁵ This sort of literary seduction is, as we have seen, a central issue in the prologue; and any reader provided with a superficial acquaintance with his style will agree, I think, that in the whole novel Apuleius is faithful to the promises of a narration in a musical and enchanting style.⁵⁶ However, even though the main concern of Apuleius’ prologue seems to be to reassure the reader that the *Metamorphoses* will be a delightful narration (cf. 1.1.6 *Lector, intende: laetaberis* ‘reader, pay attention: you will be delighted’), it could be a rash judgement to conclude that the whole novel is just like the chirp of a cicada, who in her passion for music totally forgets the necessities of life. The question of the moral, religious or philosophical meaning of the *Metamorphoses* is indeed a difficult one; especially after John Winkler’s thought-provoking book, it is probably impossible to obtain a general agreement on whether the novel is to be considered a work of pure entertainment, a moral and educational story about religious faith and philosophical truth, or both.⁵⁷ I doubt that this question can ever be answered to the satisfaction of all, or

and modulated like the music of a concert piece (*in morem cantici ducta*)... man’s speech is just like his life’ (trans. Gummere 1925).

55. Keulen 2003a: 18–19.

56. Even though not everybody appreciates his results: see e.g. the harsh judgement by Norden, who states that in Apuleius “alle die Mätzchen, die dem weichlichsten Wohlklang dienen, werden in der verschwenderischsten Weise angebracht” (Norden 1898: 601).

57. Winkler challenged the view, largely predominating at his time, that the *Metamorphoses* was a novel about religious/philosophical initiation. Cf. Winkler 1985: 124: “My ultimate assessment of the *Golden Ass* is that it is a philosophical comedy about religious knowledge. The effect of its hermeneutic playfulness, including the final book, is to raise the question whether there is a higher order that can integrate conflicting individual judgements. I further argue that the effect of the novel and the intent of Apuleius is to put that question but not to suggest an answer”. See also Harrison 2000: 248: “the text in the end, despite the carefully created elevated tone of a number of the religious passages, prompts the reader to treat Lucius’ account of the cults of Isis and Osiris in *Met.* 11 as an amusing satire on religious mania and youthful gullibility. This gives the novel as a whole a clear unity: the tone throughout remains fundamentally amusing and entertaining”.

even of the majority of the readers of Apuleius’ novel; but, most of all, I hope that the limited scope of a paper devoted to a part of the prologue excuses me from trying such an enterprise.

My own contribution to the debate has been a demonstration that the prologue speaker presents himself as a brilliant, sophisticated, and cicada-like entertainer, who invites his listeners to surrender to the pleasures of literature without caring too much about the moral and/or philosophical lessons that could stem from it. However, we should also ask ourselves whether this prologue speaker proves to be absolutely trustworthy. For example, as we have already seen, he also presents himself as a *rudis locutor*. If we understand this expression as referring to his poor linguistic and stylistic command of the Latin language, his statement is certainly false: he is only captivating our attention and benevolence by representing himself as a novice in the Latin language, and we cannot take his words seriously. So, are we really sure that we should take seriously his *lepidus susurrus* and his self-representation as an entertainer? Ancient literature teaches us that it is not impossible to conceal an educator under the appearance of an entertainer; and Apuleius himself declares at *Florida* 17.13 that *homini uox... maiorem habet utilitatem mentibus quam auribus delectationem* ‘the human voice is more useful to the mind than delightful to the ear’⁵⁸. If instead we refer the adjective *rudis* to the asinine voice Lucius will be forced to speak with, we have to remember that Lucius, with his retransformation in the last book, regains a human voice.⁵⁹ He is uncertain about what words he should say first, and his hesitation is expressed in terms that can easily suggest a *new prologue*, written (or, better, spoken) under the salvific influence of Isis:

At ego stupore nimio defixus tacitus haerebam, animo meo tam repentinum tamque magnum non capiente gaudium, quid potissimum praefarer primum, unde nouae uocis exordium caperem, quo sermone nunc renata lingua felicius auspicarer, quibus quantisque uerbis tantae deae gratias agerem (11.14.1).

58. In the preceding passage on the inferiority of the human voice compared with the sound of musical instruments (17.9), Apuleius adopts a terminology that reminds us of the prologue to the *Metamorphoses*: as a *rudor* (‘roar’, a rare term connected with the verb *rudere*; maybe an Apuleian coinage, according to Hunink 2001a: 176 *ad loc.*), the human voice is less fearful than the sound of a trumpet, while as a *susurrus* it is less pleasant than that of the flute (or bagpipe). The whole passage 17.9–13 seems to be written to deconstruct the programmatic statements of the prologue speaker – or vice versa, since we cannot be sure about the relative chronology of the two works: the speech anthologised in the *Florida* can be dated back to 164 AD (cf. Hunink 2001a: 172), but as is well known the dating of the *Metamorphoses* is controversial.

59. On Lucius gaining a voice through Isis’ intervention see Winkler 1985: 198–200; Finkelpearl 1998: 184–217; 2003, 37–51.

as for me, I was completely dumbfounded and stood speechless, rooted to the spot. My mind could not comprehend this great and sudden joy. I did not know what would be most appropriate to say first, where to find opening words for my new-found voice, what speech to use in making an auspicious inaugural of my tongue now born anew, or with what grand words to express my gratitude to so great a goddess.⁶⁰

Praefarer and *exordium* are the keywords suggesting that, even if we are by now in the middle of the last book, the passage presents itself as a new prologue. But it should be noted that the vocabulary of this passage consistently echoes the ‘real’ prologue of the novel: *at ego*, first of all; but also *gaudium* (cf. 1.1.6 *laetaberis*), *praefarer* (cf. 1.1.5 *praefamur*), *nouae uocis* (cf. 1.1.5 *rudis locutor*; 1.1.6 *uocis immutatio*), *exordium* (cf. 1.1.3 *exordior*), *quo sermone* (cf. 1.1.1 *sermone... Milesio*; 1.1.4 *indigenam sermonem*), *lingua* (cf. 1.1.4 *linguam Atthidem*), *felicius* (cf. 1.1.3 *glebae felices*).

Here we have silence instead of enchanting words, human instead of animal voice, a grateful devotee of Isis instead of a brilliant entertainer. We can think that this new *persona* completely obliterates the old Lucius and the old prologue speaker; but, after reading the prologue and as much as ten books of Lucius’ (the ‘old’ Lucius’) adventures, we can also have grown so accustomed to him as to be immune from believing in such a sudden and outright change. Unfortunately, the novel does not do very much to help us in this choice; all we can do is to decide whether we want to believe the first prologue speaker, the second – or both.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ackroyd, P., 1979, *Dressing Up. Transvestism and Drag: The History of an Obsession*, New York.
- Adamietz, J., 1986a, “Einleitung”, in: Adamietz (ed.), 1–6.
- , 1986b, “Juvenal”, in: Adamietz (ed.), 231–307.
- Adamietz, J. (ed.), 1986, *Die römische Satire*, Darmstadt.
- Adams, J. N., 1982, *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary*, London.
- Albrecht, M. von, 1986, “Horaz”, in: Adamietz (ed.), 123–78.
- Andersen, Ø., 1992, “Agamemnon’s singer (*Od.* 3.262–372)”, *Symbolae Osloenses* 57, 5–26.
- Anderson, G., 1976, *Studies in Lucian’s Comic Fiction*, Leiden.
- Anderson, W. S., 1982a, “Juvenal and Quintilian”, in: Anderson 1982c, 396–486 (repr. from *Yale Classical Studies* 17 (1961), 1–91).
- , 1982b, “Anger in Juvenal and Seneca”, in: Anderson 1982c, 293–361 (repr. from *California Publications in Classical Philology* 19 (1964), 127–96).
- , 1982c, *Essays on Roman Satire*, Princeton.
- Bachtin, M., 1971, *Probleme der Poetik Dostoevskijs* (tr. by A. Schramm of *Problemy poetiki Dostoevskogo*, Moscow 1963²), Munich.
- Bailey, D. R. Shackleton, 1993, *Martial: Epigrams*, vol. 2, Cambridge, Mass. and London (Loeb Classical Library).
- Bechtle, G., 1995, “The adultery tales in the ninth book of Apuleius’ *Metamorphoses*”, *Hermes* 123, 106–16.
- Beck, R., 1982, “The Satyricon: Satire, narrator, and antecedents”, *Museum Helveticum* 39, 206–14.
- Boyce, B., 1991, *The Language of the Freedmen in Petronius’ Cena Trimalchionis*, Leiden etc.
- Braund, S. M., 1992, *Roman Verse Satire*. Oxford.
- , 1996, *The Roman Satirists and Their Masks*, Oxford.
- Bretzigheimer, G., 1992, “Lukians Dialoge Εἰκόνας – Ὑπὲρ τῶν εἰκόνων. Ein Beitrag zur Literaturtheorie und Homerkritik”, *Rheinisches Museum* 135, 161–87.
- Brink, C. O., 1971, *Horace on Poetry. The ‘Ars Poetica’*, Cambridge.
- Broich, U., 1985, “Zur Einzeltextreferenz”, in: Broich and Pfister (eds.), 48–52.
- Broich, U., and M. Pfister (eds.), 1985, *Intertextualität. Formen, Funktionen, anglistische Fallstudien*, Tübingen.
- Brown, P. G. McC., 1995, “Aeschinus at the door: Terence, *Adelphoe* 632–43 and the traditions of Greco-Roman comedy”, in: *Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar* 8, 71–89.
- Brown, P. M., 1993, *Horace: Satires I*, Warminster.
- Cairns, F., 1972, *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry*, Edinburgh.
- Callebat, L., 1968, *Sermo cotidianus dans les Métamorphoses d’Apulée*, Caen.

60. Trans. Hanson 1989.

- Cameron, A., 1995, *Callimachus and His Critics*, Princeton.
- Ciaffi, V., 1960, *Petronio in Apuleio*, Torino.
- Classen, C. J., 1988, "Satire – The elusive genre", *Symbolae Osloenses* 63, 95–121.
- Coffey, M., 1976, *Roman Satire*, London and New York.
- Collignon, A., 1892, *Étude sur Pétrone. La critique littéraire, l'imitation et la parodie dans le Satiricon*, Paris.
- Costa, C. D. N., 1973, *Seneca: Medea. Edited with Introduction and Commentary*, Oxford.
- Currie, M. L., 1973, "Propertius IV. 8", *Latomus* 32, 616–22.
- D'Alessio, G. B., 1996, *Callimaco: Inni, epigrammi, frammenti*, Milan (2 vols.).
- Debrohun, J. B., 2003, *Roman Propertius and the Reinvention of Elegy*, Ann Arbor.
- Deichgräber, K., 1971, *Charis und Chariten, Grazie und Grazien*, Munich.
- Di Piro, A., 1995, "Le *Metamorfosi* di Apuleio nella tradizione indiretta. I. I testi", *Invigilata lucernis* 17, 55–76.
- Dowden, K., 2001, "Prologic, predecessors, and prohibitions", in: Kahane and Laird (eds.) 2001, 123–36.
- Effe, B., 1976, "Der mißglückte Selbstmord des Aristomenes (Apul. met. 1, 14–17). Zur Romanparodie im griechischen Eselsroman", *Hermes* 104, 362–75.
- Evans, S., 1971, "Odyssean echoes in Propertius IV. 8", *Greece & Rome* 18, 51–53.
- Fairbanks, A., 1931, *Philostratus the Elder: Imagines. Philostratus the Younger: Imagines. Callistratus: Descriptions*, Cambridge, Mass. and London (Loeb Classical Library).
- Fairclough, H. R. 1929, *Horace: Satires, Epistles and Ars Poetica*, Cambridge, Mass. and London (Loeb Classical Library; 2nd edition).
- , 1935, *Virgil: Eclogues, Georgics, Aeneid I–VI*, Cambridge, Mass. and London (Loeb Classical Library; 2nd edition).
- Fantham, R. E., 1988, "Mime: The missing link in Roman literary history", *Classical World* 82, 153–63.
- Ferrari, G. R. F., 1987, *Listening to the Cicadas. A Study of Plato's Phaedrus*, Cambridge.
- Ferrari, P., and G. Zanetto, 1995, *Le Storie di Mileto*, Milan.
- Fick, N., 1990, "Die Pantomime des Apuleius (Met. X. 30–34.3)", in: J. Blänsdorf, J. André, N. Fick (eds.), *Theater und Gesellschaft im Imperium Romanum*, Tübingen, 223–32.
- Finkelpearl, E. D., 1998, *Metamorphoses of Language in Apuleius. A Study of Allusion in the Novel*, Ann Arbor.
- , 2003, "Lucius and Aesop gain a voice: Apuleius met. 11.1–2 and *Vita Aesopi* 7", in: Panayotakis, Zimmerman and Keulen (eds.), 37–51.
- Finkelpearl, E., and C. C. Schlam, 2000, "A review of scholarship on Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* 1970–1998", *Lustrum* 42.
- Foster, B. O., 1919, *Livy*, vol. 1, Cambridge, Mass. and London (Loeb Classical Library).
- Fowler, H. N., 1914, *Plato: Euthyphro, Apology, Crito, Phaedo, Phaedrus*, Cambridge, Mass. and London (Loeb Classical Library).

- Frangoulidis, S. A., 2001, *Roles and Performances in Apuleius' Metamorphoses*, Stuttgart and Weimar.
- Frank, M., 1995, *Seneca's Phoenissae. Introduction and Commentary*, Leiden etc.
- Franzmann, J. W., 1981, *The Early Development of the Greek Concept of Charis*, Ann Arbor.
- Frassinetti, P., 1953, *Fabula Atellana: Saggio sul teatro popolare latino*, Pavia.
- Frazer, J. G., 1929, *Publius Ovidius Naso: Fastorum libri sex*, London.
- Freudenburg, K., 1993, *The Walking Muse. Horace on the Theory of Satire*, Princeton.
- , 2001, *Satires of Rome. Threatening Poses from Lucilius to Juvenal*, Cambridge.
- Frontisi-Ducroux, F., and F. Lissarrague, 1990, "From ambiguity to ambivalence: A Dionysiac excursion through the 'Anacreontic' vases", in: D. M. Halperin, J. J. Winkler, F. I. Zeitlin (eds.), *Before Sexuality. The Construction of Erotic Experience in the Ancient Greek World*, Princeton, 211–56.
- Fusillo, M., 2003, "From Petronius to *Petrolio*: *Satyricon* as a model-experimental novel", in: Panayotakis, Zimmerman and Keulen (eds.), 413–23.
- Gaisser, J. H., 1977, "Mythological exempla in Propertius 1, 2 and 1, 15", *American Journal of Philology* 98, 381–91.
- Gelzer, T., 1960, *Der epirrhematische Agon bei Aristophanes. Untersuchungen zur Struktur der attischen Alten Komödie*, Munich.
- Giancotti, F., 1967, *Mimo e gnome: Studio su Decimo Laberio e Publilio Siro*, Florence.
- Gianotti, G. F., 1986, *'Romanzo' e ideologia. Studi sulle Metamorfosi di Apuleio*, Naples.
- Gibson, B., 2001, "Argutia Nilotici calami: A Theocritean reed?", in: Kahane and Laird (eds.), 67–76.
- Gleason, M. W., 1995, *Making Men. Sophists and Self-Representation in Ancient Rome*, Princeton.
- Goold, G. P., 1977, *Manilius: Astronomica*, Cambridge, Mass. and London (Loeb Classical Library).
- , 1990, *Propertius: Elegies*, Cambridge, Mass. and London (Loeb Classical Library).
- Gow, A. S. F., 1952, *Theocritus*, vol. I: *Introduction, Text, and Translation*, Cambridge (2nd edition).
- Gowers, E., 2001, "Apuleius and Persius", in: Kahane and Laird (eds.), 77–87.
- Grassi, E., 1962, *Die Theorie des Schönen in der Antike*, Cologne.
- Graverini, L., 2003, review of Kahane and Laird (eds.) 2001, *Ancient Narrative* 2 (2002), 251–62.
- , 2005, "Sweet and dangerous? A literary metaphor (*auris permulcere*) in Apuleius' prologue", in: S. Harrison, M. Paschalis, S. Frangoulidis (eds.), *Metaphor and the Ancient Novel (Ancient Narrative, Supplementum 4)*, 177–96.
- Guardi, T., 1978, "I fullones e la commedia romana", *Pan* 6, 37–45.
- , 1985, *Titinio e Atta: Fabula Togata. I frammenti*. Milan.

- Gummere, R. M., 1925, *Seneca*, vol. 6, Cambridge, Mass. and London (Loeb Classical Library).
- Haines, C. R., 1929, *The Correspondence of Marcus Cornelius Fronto*, vol. 2, Cambridge, Mass. and London (Loeb Classical Library; 2nd edition).
- Hallett, J. P., 2003, "Resistant (and enabling) reading: Petronius' *Satyricon* and Latin love elegy", in: Panayotakis, Zimmerman and Keulen (eds.), 329–43.
- Hanson, J. A., 1989, *Apuleius: Metamorphoses*, Cambridge, Mass. and London (Loeb Classical Library; 2 vols.).
- Harrison, S. J., 1990a, "Some Odyssean scenes in Apuleius 'Metamorphoses'", *Materiali e discussioni* 25, 193–201.
- , 1990b, "The speaking book: the prologue to Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*", *Classical Quarterly* 40, 507–13.
- , 1997, "From epic to novel: Apuleius as reader of Vergil", *Materiali e discussioni* 39, 53–74.
- , 1998, "The Milesian Tales and the Roman novel", in: *Groningen Colloquia on the Novel* 9, 61–73.
- , 2000, *Apuleius. A Latin Sophist*, Oxford.
- , 2002, "Apuleius, Aelius Aristides and religious autobiography", *Ancient Narrative* 1 (2000–01), 245–59.
- , 2003, "Epic extremities: The openings and closures of books in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*", in: Panayotakis, Zimmerman and Keulen (eds.), 239–54.
- Harrison, S. J. (ed.), 1999, *Oxford Readings in the Roman Novel*, Oxford.
- Harrison, S. J., and M. Winterbottom, 2001, "The prologue to Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*. Text, translation, and textual commentary", in: Kahane and Laird (eds.), 9–15.
- Harrison, S. J. et al., 2001, *Apuleius, Rhetorical Works*, tr. by S. J. Harrison, J. L. Hilton and V. J. C. Hunink, Oxford.
- Heinrich, A., 1885, *Lukian und Horaz*, Progr. Graz.
- Heseltine, M., 1969, *Petronius*, Cambridge, Mass and London (Loeb Classical Library; rev. edition by E. H. Warmington).
- Hijmans, B. L., 1978, "Significant names and their function in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*", in: Hijmans and Van der Paardt (eds.), 107–22.
- Hijmans, B. L., and R. Th. van der Paardt (eds.), 1978, *Aspects of Apuleius' Golden Ass*, Groningen.
- Hijmans, B. L., et al., 1977, *Apuleius Madaurensis: Metamorphoses IV.1–27. Introduction, Text, Commentary. Groningen Commentaries on Apuleius*, Groningen (= *GCA* 1977).
- , 1995, *Apuleius Madaurensis: Metamorphoses IX. Introduction, Text, Commentary. Groningen Commentaries on Apuleius*, Groningen (= *GCA* 1995).
- Hinds, S., 1998, *Allusion and Intertext. Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry*, Cambridge.
- Homeyer, H., 1965, *Lukian: Wie man Geschichte schreiben soll*, Munich.
- Hordern, J. H., 2002, "Love magic and purification in Sophron, *PSI* 1214a, and Theocritus' *Pharmakeutria*", *Classical Quarterly* 52, 164–73.
- Householder, F. W., *Literary Quotation and Allusion in Lucian*, New York.
- Hubbard, M., 1974, *Propertius*, London.

- Hunink, V., 1998, 'Comedy in Apuleius' *Apology*', in: *Groningen Colloquia on the Novel* 9, 97–113.
- , 2001a, *Apuleius of Madauros: Florida. Edited with a Commentary*, Amsterdam.
- , 2001b, 'The fish catalogue in Ausonius' *Mosella*. Literary backgrounds of *Mos.* 75–149', in: A. P. Orbán, M. G. M. van der Poel (eds.), *Ad Litteras. Latin Studies in Honour of J. H. Brouwers*, Nijmegen 2001, 163–76.
- Hunter, R. L., 1996, *Theocritus and the Archaeology of Greek Poetry*, Cambridge.
- , 1999, *Theocritus. A Selection. Idylls 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 10, 11 and 13*, Cambridge.
- James, P., 1987, *Unity in Diversity: A Study of Apuleius' Metamorphoses with Particular Reference to the Narrator's Art of Transformation and the Metamorphosis Motif in the Tale of Cupid and Psyche*, Hildesheim.
- , 2001, "From prologue to story: Metaphor and narrative construction in the opening of the *Metamorphoses*", in: Kahane and Laird (eds.), 256–66.
- Jenkinson, J. R. 1980. *Persius: The Satires. Text with Translation and Notes*, Warminster.
- Jones, C. P., 1991, "Dinner theatre", in: W. J. Slater (ed.), *Dining in a Classical Context*, Ann Arbor, 185–98.
- Jong, I. J. F. de, 1991, *Narrative in Drama. The Art of the Euripidean Messenger-Speech*, Leiden etc.
- , 2001, *A Narratological Commentary on the Odyssey*, Cambridge.
- Kahane, A., and A. Laird (eds.), 2001, *A Companion to the Prologue of Apuleius' Metamorphoses*, Oxford.
- Kehoe, P. H., 1984, "The adultery mime reconsidered" in: D. F. Bright, E. S. Ramage (eds.), *Classical Texts and Their Traditions: Studies in Honour of C. R. Trahman*, Chico, Ca., 89–106.
- Kenney, E. J., 1990, *Apuleius: Cupid and Psyche*, Cambridge.
- Keulen, W. H., 2003a, *Apuleius Madaurensis: Metamorphoses Book I, 1–20. Introduction, Text, Commentary*, Diss. Groningen.
- , 2003b, "Comic invention and superstitious frenzy in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*: The figure of Socrates as an icon of satirical self-exposure", *American Journal of Philology* 124, 107–35.
- Kißel, W., 1990, *Aules Persius Flaccus: Satiren. Herausgegeben, übersetzt und kommentiert*, Heidelberg.
- Laird, A., 1993, "Fiction, bewitchment, and story worlds: The implication of claims to truth in Apuleius", in: C. Gill, T. P. Wiseman (eds.), *Lies and Fiction in the Ancient World*, Exeter, 147–74.
- Lamb, W. R. M., 1925, *Plato: Ion*, in: H. N. Fowler, W. R. M. Lamb, *Plato: The Statesman, Philebus, Ion*, Cambridge, Mass. and London (Loeb Classical Library).
- La Penna, A., 1973, "Una polemica di Sallustio contro l'oratoria contemporanea?", *Rivista di filologia e di istruzione classica* 101, 88–91 (= *Aspetti del pensiero storico latino*, Turin 1978, 187–91).
- Laplace, M. J. P., 1996, "L'ecphrasis de la parole d'apparat dans l'*Electrum* et le *De domo* de Lucien, et la représentation des deux styles d'une esthétique inspirée de Pindare et de Platon", *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 116, 158–65.
- Ledergerber, I., 1905, *Lukian und die altattische Komödie*, Einsiedeln.

- Leo, F., 1912, *Plautinische Forschungen zur Kritik und Geschichte der Komödie*, Berlin (2nd edition).
- Lins Brandão, J., 1995, "O Hipocentauro de Zêuxis. A poética da diferença em Luciano de Samósata", *Humanitas* 47, 409–24.
- Liuzzi, D., 1988, *Manilio: Astronomica. Libro III*, Lecce.
- López, V. C., 1976, "Tratamiento del mito en las *novelle* de las *Metamorfosis* de Apuleyo", *Cuadernos de filología clásica* 10, 309–73.
- MacDowell, D. M., 1971, *Aristophanes: Wasps. Edited with Introduction and Commentary*, Oxford.
- McKeown, J. C., 1979, "Augustan elegy and mime", *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 25, 71–84.
- MacLachlan, B., 1993, *The Age of Grace. Charis in Early Greek Poetry*, Princeton.
- Mal-Maeder, D. van, 1997, "Lector intende, laetaberis. The enigma of the last book of Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*", in: *Groningen Colloquia on the Novel* 8, 87–118.
- , 2001, *Apuleius Madaurensis: Metamorphoses Livre II. Texte, Introduction et Commentaire. Groningen Commentaries on Apuleius*, Groningen (= *GCA* 2001).
- Mason, H. J., 1999, "The *Metamorphoses* of Apuleius and its Greek sources", in: H. Hofmann (ed.), *Latin Fiction. The Latin Novel in Context*, London and New York, 103–12.
- Massimilla, G., 1996, *Callimaco: Aitia. Libri primo e secondo*, Pisa.
- Mattiacci, S., 1985, "Apuleio poeta novello", in: V. Tandoi (ed.), *Disiecti membra poetae*, Foggia, vol. 2, 235–77.
- , 1996, *Apuleio: Le novelle dell'adulterio (Metamorfosi IX)*, Florence.
- , 1998, "Neoteric and elegiac echoes in the tale of Cupid and Psyche by Apuleius" in: Zimmerman et al. (eds.), 127–51.
- May, R., 2002, *A Comic Novel: Roman and New Comedy in Apuleius' Metamorphoses*, D. Phil. thesis Oxford.
- Mazon, P., 1945, 'Sophocle devant les juges', *Revue des études anciennes* 47, 82–96.
- Möllendorff, P. von, 1995, *Grundlagen einer Ästhetik der Alten Komödie. Untersuchungen zu Aristophanes und Michail Bachtin*, Tübingen.
- , 2000, *Auf der Suche nach der verlogenen Wahrheit. Lukians Wahre Geschichten*, Tübingen.
- , 2004, "Puzzling beauty. Zur ästhetischen Konstruktion von *Paideia* in Lukians 'Bilder'-Dialogen", *Millennium* 1, 1–24.
- Morgan, J., 2001, "The prologues of the Greek novels and Apuleius", in: Kahane and Laird (eds.), 152–62.
- Müller, H., 2000, *Liebesbeziehungen in Ovids Metamorphosen und ihr Einfluß auf den Roman des Apuleius*, Göttingen.
- Musker, R. (transl.), 1972, *The Poems of Propertius*, London.
- Nauta, R. R., 2002, "'Lyrisch ik' en persona in de bestudering van de Romeinse poëzie", *Lampas* 35, 363–86.
- Nicolini, L., 2000, *Apuleio: La novella di Carite e Tlepolemo*, Naples.

- Nisbet, R. G. M., and M. Hubbard, 1970, *A Commentary on Horace: Odes. Book I*, Oxford.
- O'Brien, M. C., 2002, *Apuleius' Debt to Plato in the Metamorphoses*, Lewiston and Lampeter.
- Panayotakis, C., 1995, *Theatrum Arbitri: Theatrical Elements in the Satyrica of Petronius*, Leiden etc.
- Panayotakis, S., 1998, "On wine and nightmares: Apul. *Met.* 1.18", in: *Groningen Colloquia on the Novel* 9, 115–29.
- Panayotakis, S., M. Zimmerman and W. Keulen (eds.), 2003, *The Ancient Novel and Beyond*, Leiden and Boston.
- Pfeiffer, R., 1949, *Callimachus*, vol.1: *Fragmenta*, Oxford.
- , 1968, *History of Classical Scholarship from the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age*, Oxford.
- Pfister, M., 1985, "Zur Systemreferenz", in: Broich and Pfister (eds.), 52–58.
- Pinotti, P., 1993, *P. Ovidio Nasone. Remedia amoris*, Bologna (2nd edition).
- Pollitt, J. J., 1974, *The Ancient View of Greek Art. Criticism, History, and Terminology*, New Haven and London.
- Preston, K., 1915, "Some sources of comic effect in Petronius", *Classical Philology* 10, 260–69.
- Putnam, M. C. J., 1970, *Virgil's Pastoral Art. Studies in the Eclogues*, Princeton.
- Relihan, J. C., 1993, *Ancient Menippean Satire*, Baltimore and London.
- Riess, W., 2001, *Apuleius und die Räuber. Ein Beitrag zur historischen Kriminalitätsforschung*, Stuttgart.
- Riikonen, H. K., 1987, *Menippean Satire as a Literary Genre. With Special Reference to Seneca's Apocolocyntosis*, Helsinki.
- Rolfe, J. C., 1927, *The Attic Nights of Aulus Gellius*, vol. 2, Cambridge, Mass. and London (Loeb Classical Library).
- , 1931, *Sallust*, Cambridge, Mass. and London (Loeb Classical Library; 2nd edition).
- Roscalla, F., 1998, *Presenze simboliche dell'ape nella Grecia antica*, Florence.
- Rossi, L., 2001, *The Epigrams Ascribed to Theocritus: A Method of Approach*, Leuven etc.
- Roux, J., 1970–72, *Euripide: Les Bacchantes*, Paris (2 vols.).
- Rütten, U., 1997, *Phantasie und Lachkultur. Lukians "Wahre Geschichten"*, Tübingen.
- Russell, D. A., 2001, *Quintilian: The Orator's Education*, vol. 5, Cambridge, Mass. and London (Loeb Classical Library).
- Sallmann, K., 1995, 'Erzählendes in der Apologie des Apuleius, oder: Argumentation als Unterhaltung', in: *Groningen Colloquia on the Novel* 6, 137–58.
- Sandy, G. N., 1997, *The Greek World of Apuleius. Apuleius and the Second Sophistic*, Leiden etc.
- Scarcia, R., 1964, *Latina Siren. Note di critica semantica*, Rome.
- Schäfer, A., 1997, *Unterhaltung beim griechischen Symposion. Darbietungen, Spiele und Wettkämpfe von homerischer bis in spätklassische Zeit*, Mainz.
- Schmidt, P. L., 1979, "Invective – Gesellschaftskritik – Diatribe?", *Lampas* 12, 259–81.

- Schofield, A. F., 1958, *Aelian: On the Characteristics of Animals*, vol. 1, Cambridge, Mass. and London (Loeb Classical Library).
- Scobie, A., 1975, *Apuleius: Metamorphoses (Asinus Aureus) I. A Commentary*, Meisenheim am Glan.
- Selden, D. L., 1994, "Genre of Genre", in: J. Tatum (ed.), *The Search for the Ancient Novel*, Baltimore and London, 39–64.
- Shumate, N., 1996, *Crisis and Conversion in Apuleius' Metamorphoses*, Ann Arbor.
- Smith, W. S., 1980, "Husband vs. wife in Juvenal's sixth satire", *Classical World* 73, 323–32.
- , 1996, "The satiric voice in the Roman novelistic tradition", in: J. Knuf (ed.), *Unity and Diversity. Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference on Narrative*, Lexington, 309–17.
- Smith, W. S., and B. Woods, 2003, "Tale of Aristomenes: Declamation in a Platonic mode", *Ancient Narrative* 2 (2002), 172–93.
- Sommerstein, A., 1983, *Aristophanes: Wasps. Edited with Translation and Notes*, Warminster.
- Spettacoli* 1982: *Spettacoli conviviali dall'antichità classica alle corti italiane del '400*, Viterbo.
- Swain, S., 1992, "Novel and pantomime in Plutarch's 'Antony'", *Hermes* 120, 76–82.
- Tatum, J., 1969, "The tales in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*", *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 100, 487–527 (reprinted in Harrison (ed.), 1999, 157–94).
- , 1979, *Apuleius and The Golden Ass*, Ithaca and London.
- Thomas, R. F., 1993, "Callimachus back in Rome", in: M. A. Harder, R. F. Regtuit, G. C. Wakker (eds.), *Callimachus*, Groningen, 197–215.
- Trapp, M. B., 1990, "Plato's *Phaedrus* in second-century Greek literature", in: D. A. Russell (ed.), *Antonine Literature*, Oxford, 141–73.
- , 2001, "On tickling the ears: Apuleius' prologue and the anxieties of philosophers", in: Kahane and Laird (eds.), 39–46.
- Trypanis, C. A., 1958, *Callimachus: Aetia, Iambi, Lyric poems, Hecale, Minor epic and elegiac poems, Fragments of epigrams, Fragments of uncertain location*, Cambridge, Mass. and London (Loeb Classical Library).
- Walsh, P. G., 1970, *The Roman Novel*, Cambridge.
- , 1978, "Petronius and Apuleius", in: Hijmans and Van der Paardt (eds.), 17–24.
- (transl.), 1994, *Apuleius. The Golden Ass*, Oxford.
- (transl.), 1996, *Petronius. The Satyricon*, Oxford.
- Walter, J., 1893, *Die Geschichte der Ästhetik im Altertum*, Leipzig.
- Waszink, J. H., 1974, *Biene und Honig als Symbol des Dichters und der Dichtung in der griechisch-römischen Antike*, Opladen.
- West, D., 1995, *Horace: Odes I*, Oxford.
- Winkler, J. J., 1985, *Auctor & Actor. A Narratological Reading of Apuleius's Golden Ass*, Berkeley etc.
- Yardley, J. C., 1978, "The elegiac paraclausithyron", *Eranos* 76, 19–34.

- Zanetto, G., 2003, "Archaic iambos and Greek novel: A possible connection", in: Panayotakis, Zimmerman and Keulen (eds.), 317–28.
- Zanker, G., 1983, "The nature and origin of realism in Alexandrian poetry", *Antike und Abendland* 29, 125–45.
- Zanker, P., 1989, *Die trunkene Alte. Das Lachen der Verhöhnnten*, Frankfurt a.M.
- Zieliński, T., 1885, *Die Gliederung der altattischen Komödie*, Leipzig.
- , 1924, "Charis and Charites", *Classical Quarterly* 18, 158–63.
- Zimmerman, M., 1993, "Narrative judgement and reader response in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* 10,29–34: The pantomime of the judgement of Paris", in: *Groningen Colloquia on the Novel* 5, 143–61.
- , 2000, *Apuleius Madaurensis: Metamorphoses X. Introduction, Text, Commentary. Groningen Commentaries on Apuleius*, Groningen (= *GCA* 2000).
- , 2003, "Latinising the novel. Scholarship since Perry on Greek 'models' and Roman (re-)creations", *Ancient Narrative* 2 (2002), 123–42.
- Zimmerman, M., et al. (eds.), 1998, *Cupid and Psyche: Aspects of Apuleius' Golden Ass II*, Groningen.