Notes on Apuleius' "Apology"
Author(s): Vincent Hunink
Source: *Mnemosyne*, Apr., 1996, Fourth Series, Vol. 49, Fasc. 2 (Apr., 1996), pp. 159-167
Published by: Brill
Stable URL: https://www.jstor.org/stable/4432587

NOTES ON APULEIUS' *APOLOGY**)

BY

VINCENT HUNINK

For the transmission of Apuleius' *Apology*, *Florida* and *Metamorphoses*, our main witness is a Florentine MS (F = Laur. 68,2), on which all other MSS depend[1]). Closely related to F is Φ (= Laur. 29,2), which often presents the correct reading when F is illegible. Some more recent MSS appear useful in other cases where FΦ agree in obviously wrong readings. On the whole, the authority of FΦ has been widely accepted in modern Apuleian scholarship. In individual places, their readings are increasingly defended[2]). As far as the *Apology* is concerned, the same tendency can be observed, but many editors and other scholars still allow much room for emendations[3]).

*) This article is a preliminary study for a new edition with commentary of Apuleius' *Pro se de magia* (*Apologia*), Amsterdam 1997. Research was supported by the Foundation for Literary Studies, Musicology and Drama Research, which is subsidized by the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO). I wish to express my thanks to the Biblioteca Medicea-Laurenziana at Firenze (Italy) for granting me permission to consult F (Laur.68,2). I also thank Prof. J.H. Brouwers (Catholic University Nijmegen), Dr. R. van der Paardt (State University Leiden and member of the Apuleius Research Group at the State University Groningen), Prof. E.J. Kenney (Cambridge University) and the anonymous reader of *Mnemosyne*. The critical comments of these scholars have been of great use to me, even in the numerous places where I have not followed their advice. Of course, they are in no way responsible for any of my statements or proposals.

1) Recently, this position has been challenged by O. Pecere, *Qualche riflessioni sulla tradizione di Apuleio a Montecassino*, in: G. Cavallo (ed.), *Le strade del testo* (Roma 1987), 97-124. Pecere argues for a tradition independent from F, of which the so called Assisi fragments (C) would be an example. However, his examples are hardly of any consequence for our constitution of the text. For this, not even Pecere denies the central importance of F.

2) For the *Metamorphoses*, cf. especially the *Groningen Commentaries on Apuleius (GCA)*, where readings of FΦ are consistently defended wherever possible.

3) The practice of making new emendations still continues even for the *Apology*. Recently, a number of them have been brought forward by W.S. Watt, *Ten notes on Apuleius, Apologia*, Mnemosyne 47 (1994), 517-20. Most of Watt's proposals to change the text are superfluous, since they concern passages where F's reading

© E. J. Brill, Leiden, 1996

In this article, I will examine some passages in the *Apology*. In most of them, emendation can be discarded in favour of readings found in the MSS[4]). For each passage, the text as printed in the edition of Butler and Owen[5]) is given, followed by variant readings and a brief discussion.

15,33 (...) an, ut alii philosophi disputant, radii nostri seu mediis oculis proliquati et lumini extrario mixti atque ita uniti, ut Plato arbitratur, seu tantum oculis profecti sine ullo foris amminiculo, ut Archytas putat, seu intentu aëris *coacti*, ut Stoici rentur, cum alicui corpori inciderunt spisso et splendido et leui, paribus angulis quibus inciderant resultent ad faciem suam reduces atque ita, quod extra tangant ac uisant, id intra speculum imaginentur.

facti F; *acti* Helm; *coacti* Purser and most editors

This is part of a complex text dealing with various explanations of visual perception. In the clause on the Stoic view, F reads *facti*, which seemed problematical to most editors. The preceding word is given by F as *ueris*, where the emendation to *aeris* seems beyond reasonable doubt. However, none of the solutions proposed for *facti* seems satisfactory on a philosophical level. In a study on the Stoic theory of vision, Ingenkamp[6]) discusses the present passage, but is unable to decide whether or not Apuleius has correctly understood the Stoic theory. If he has, all conjectures are to be rejected, Ingenkamp argues, since they mistakenly assume an emission of pre-existing rays from the eyes; if he has not, all attempts at conjecture seem rather pointless. His conclusion is that we should probably come to terms with *facti*.

makes good sense and is undisputed. In one or two other cases, where F is probably corrupt (e.g. 16,1), I cannot agree with Watt's suggestions either.

4) Here I follow the general principles set out by B.L. Hijmans jr, *Apuleius orator: 'Pro se de Magia' and 'Florida'*, in: ANRW II 34,2, (1994), 1708-84, esp. 1770-80. Among earlier scholars defending F in difficult places, I mention Harry Armini, *Studia Apuleiana*, Eranos 26 (1928), 273-339, esp. 327-30.

5) H.E. Butler, A.S. Owen, *Apulei apologia sive Pro se de magia liber* with introduction and commentary (Oxford 1914). Reference is made to paragraphs and lines in this edition also. The most important other editions are: P. Vallette, *Apulée, Apologie, Florides* (Paris 1924) (Budé series) and R. Helm, *Apulei Platonici Madaurensis Pro se De Magia liber (Apologia)* (Leipzig 1972) (Teubner; 5th impr.).

6) Cf. H.G. Ingenkamp, *Zur stoischen Lehre vom Sehen*, RhM 114 (1971), 240-6, esp. 245-6, n.8.

I agree with this: in the absence of strong arguments against a reading in F, it is best to retain it. A crux is not absolutely necessary; the sense of the Latin words might be that the *radii* are formed in some way by the tension of the air. Apuleius may even have used the rather general *facti* on purpose, in order to avoid a technical point too difficult for his public, and perhaps even for himself. It should not be forgotten that Apuleius' aim is rhetorical rather than academic. He wants to impress his audience, not to annoy it with matters too abstruse[7]).

27,30 Hiscine argumentis magian probatis, casu *pueruli* et matrimonio mulieris et obsonio piscium?

puerili FΦ; *pueruli* Salmasius

This seems a relatively simple case, where emendation can be dispensed with. Apuleius often uses an adjective instead of a noun in the gen. pl. For *puerilis*, cf. *Met.* 3,20 *puerile ... corollarium*; *Apol.* 43 *animus ... puerilis*. Hijmans (1994), 1775, n. 218 compares *Met.* 6,31 *uirginalis fugae* with GCA a.l.

40,21 (...) more hoc et instituto magistrorum meorum, qui aiunt hominem liberum et magnificum debere, *si quo eat*, in primori fronte animum gestare.

si queat FΦ; *si quo eat* Helm; *si qua eat* Van der Vliet

Helm's emendation is commonly accepted, but in fact quite unnecessary. Similarly, we can avoid that proposed by Van der Vliet, for which Augello wrongly claims credit. The argument that such emendations give a stronger sense is not a sufficient reason to change the MSS' text. In addition, it may be argued that the statement becomes more universal with the traditional reading: one's face should reflect one's mind *if possible*, that is: not merely in public or at a certain place or time.

46,01 Hic satius ueteratorie Tannonius Pudens (...) ait pueros alios producturum, qui sint aeque a me incantati. (...) Cedo pueros istos, quibus confiditis: produc, nomina qui sint. (...) Dic, inquam, Tannoni. Quid taces, quid cunctaris, quid respectas? Quod si hic nescit quid *didicerit* aut nomina oblitus est, at tu, Aemiliane, cede

7) If we compare similar 'technical' passages, e.g. that in c.49-50 on epilepsy, we find Apuleius taking great care to make his exposition lucid and easy to follow for his non-specialist audience.

huc, dic quid aduocato tuo mandaueris, exhibe pueros.

didicerit Van der Vliet; *dicerit* F; *dixerit* Φ

Van der Vliet's conjecture is now generally accepted. It makes the point that the advocate Tannonius 'has forgotten the evidence with which he was primed by the accusers', as Butler and Owen paraphrase. This point will be made explicitly a few lines later, in *dic quid aduocato tuo mandaueris*. Admittedly, the passage is not without repetitions, and it is possible that this strong point is made twice on purpose. On the other hand, Φ's reading *dixerit*, which remains closest to F's obviously incorrect reading, makes excellent sense: Tannonius has announced that he would bring some witnesses, but when requested to present them, it seems that he 'does not know what he has said himself, or has forgotten their names'. With this reading of Φ, the sarcasm of the passage is even sharper.

63,27 Hunc *[sc. a small statue of Mercury]* qui sceletum audet dicere, profecto ille simulacra deorum nulla uidet aut omnia neglegit. Hunc denique qui laruam putat, ipse est *laruatus*.

laruatus V1 V3 V5; *laruans* FΦ; *larua* M1.

Unlike most other editors, Butler and Owen choose *laruatus*, a form attested in Apuleius' *Met.*[8]). However, *laruans* may be retained. Its defenders seem to interpret it as participle of a deponent *laruari* or an intransitive verb *laruare* 'to be fearful, haunted by ghosts' or 'to be one of the ghosts'. But it seems better to take it as a participle of an active verb 'to haunt with ghosts', 'to evoke ghosts'; cf. TLL VII,978,65-67 *laruis terreo*; OLD s.v.; and Marchesi's translation 'le fa lui le larve'[9]). This projects the charge on the accuser himself, who is now pictured as an 'actively bad man' rather than a 'passive victim'. For a similar Apuleian pun, cf. a few lines before: *Em uobis quem scelestus ille sceletum nominabat.*

72,1 Cum in hoc statu res esset *inter procationem* matris et metum fili, fortene an fato ego aduenio pergens Alexandriam.

interpretationem F; *inter procationem* Casaubonus; *inter precationem* M1

8) Cf. also Thomas D. McCreight, *Rhetorical strategies and word choice in Apuleius' Apology* (Diss. Duke University 1991), 453-6, with lexicographical discussion on *laruatus*. Recently, P. Frassinetti (*Note testuali ad Apuleio (Apol. Flor.)*, in: *Studi di filologia classica in honore di Giusto Monaco*, III (Palermo 1991), 1205-8) proposed *larualis*.

9) For periphrastic expressions of a participle with *est*, cf. Louis Callebat, *Sermo cotidianus dans les Métamorphoses d'Apulée* (Caen 1968), 320-1.

All editors accept Casaubon's emendation[10]), but it involves serious difficulties. Firstly, it is a hapax legomenon. Apuleius' works show many of these, but it seems dangerous if scholars create them. Secondly, its sense seems not quite clear. Translations remain rather vague: 'les projets matrimoniaux de la mère' (Vallette); 'il desiderio di maritarsi' (Mosca), 'matrimonial intentions' (Butler). But since it is to be derived from *procare* 'demand', its sense is 'the act of wooing, suit' (OLD s.v.), which requires a male subject[11]), and makes *matris* an objective genitive. But this would produce an awkward lack of balance with *fili*, a subjective genitive. More importantly, in this passage Pudentilla is not suitored at all, but is rather actively looking for a husband.

If we look for an alternative, the reading of F seems impossible to defend. McCreight (1991), 284 briefly discusses *electionem*, but admits that it is difficult to explain paleographically. Here we may follow M1 (though it is not a reliable independant witness) and read *inter precationem*. The word *precatio* is regular, though in the Apuleian corpus it occurs only in *Ascl.* 41[12]); Apuleius, however, is fond of nouns on *-io*. Furthermore, it involves only a very small difference from F, and it would retain the balance with *metum fili*.

The word does not refer to marriage plans in general, but to Pudentilla's ardent wish to marry. After a number of years, she had expressed the wish to remarry and had sent a letter to her son Pudens in Rome (70,15 ff), exposing her intentions and demanding his sympathy for her case (cf. 70,22 ff *tandem aliquando se quoque paterentur solitudini suae et aegritudini subuenire*). Therefore, the strong noun *precatio* might refer to her praying his help and consent; in that case, the religious connotation of the noun would be weak, as is often the case with related words such as *precor*.

10) Earlier, I have also followed it in my Dutch translation of the *Apology*. Cf. Apuleius, *Toverkunsten*, vertaald (...) door Vincent Hunink, met een inleiding van Rudi van der Paardt (Amsterdam 1992), 75.

11) The noun *procus* 'suitor' is actually used in the context of Pudentilla's marriage in 68,14 *ceteros procos absterrebat* (sc. Pudentilla) and 92,35 *ob haec et alia uiduae dote aucta procos sollicitant* (it also occurs in 76,4). These passages from the *Apology* clearly show that Roman women can deter or attract suitors, but not 'suitor' them.

12) On the question of the authenticity of the *Asclepius*, see: Vincent Hunink, *Apuleius and the 'Asclepius'*, in: *Vig.Chr.* 1996 (forthc.).

If, on the other hand, *precatio* retains its usual religious echoes, Pudentilla is praying the gods for a suitable husband. She has merely expressed the wish to marry, without having a specific candidate in mind. It is only in c.72 that we hear how Apuleius was to cross her path[13]). Whether Pudentilla was deeply religious or not, we do not know. But in her letter to Pudens (70), she had at least used the phrase *deum uoluntate.*

79,3 An sola Phaedra falsum epistolium de amore commenta est *ac* non omnibus mulieribus haec ars usitata est, ut, cum aliquid eius modi uelle coeperunt, malint coactae uideri?

ac Novák; *at* FΦ; *an* V5.

The emendation *ac* connects two thoughts in one sentence. This is not necessary. If we follow F's reading and print a question mark after *commenta est*, the two sentences make excellent sense, and the rhetorical force becomes even stronger. The adversative *at* introduces a protesting contrast to an implied affirmative answer to the first question: 'Or is Phaedra the only woman who forged a love letter? *But* is it not the case that all women ...?'. It may be added that short, pressing questions are much to Apuleius' taste (some examples can be found in the same chapter). For *at non* as introduction for such a question, cf. 25,3 *At non contraria accusastis?*

Alternatively, a case could be made for *an.* We would then have two parallel questions: *an ...? an ...?*, as in 15,7-8 *an ...? an non ...?*; 59,2 ff. But in view of the stronger authority of F, *at* seems preferable here.

91,22 'modicam dotem neque eam datam sed tantum modo <*commodatam*>'

commodatam addit Purser; *creditam* addit Helm; alii alia; *promissam* addunt L3 V1 V5 et m.saec.XVI in Φ

A word seems required for something less than 'given'. Many solutions have been brought forward. Butler and Owen print Purser's *commodatam.* Mainly on the basis of the legal aspects, F. Norden defended *sed* <*dictam*> *tantum*[14]), as in c.102 *uti dotem mihi ... diceret.*

13) Apuleius' remarks in c.71 are a personal comment, and are not part of his narration of past events.

14) Fritz Norden, *Apulejus von Madaura und das römische Privatrecht* (Leipzig 1912), 97; on *dotem dicere*, see 96-8. For the present passage, Norden explains the omission

It may be added that inserting *dictam* produces an Apuleian sound effect with *datam*.

It has been pointed out that there was a minor, formal distinction between *dotem dicere* and *dotem promittere*: the first did not include a formal question, but only a one-sided statement. Both are legal methods of contracting to give a dowry, not just plain, common terms[15]). Furthermore, Augello says that in the course of time *dictio* of the *dos* was replaced by *promissio*. Given these facts, the old conjecture *promissam* may be supported as well[16]).

96,19 Litteras tamen, quas ad me Carthagine uel iam adueniens ex itinere praemisit, quas adhuc ualidus, quas iam aeger, plenas honoris, plenas amoris, quaeso, Maxime, paulisper recitari sinas, ut sciat frater eius, accusator meus, quam in omnibus <*minor*> *Mineruae* curriculum cum fratre optumae memoriae uiro currat.

in omnibus Mineruae FΦ; *in omnibus* <*minor*> *Mineruae* Butler; *in omnibus minor u*<*it*>*ae* Van Lennep; alii alia

We can retain the text of F, with Hildebrand, Marchesi, Mosca and TLL IV,1511,28 ff ("modo sanus sit locus"). *Mineruae curriculum* is an accusative with *currat*, in a rare figura etymologica (TLL gives as parallel only Stat.Theb. 3,116 *certamen*). But one problem of interpretation remains: where is the 'negative' element in the comparison between both brothers if we do not add *minor*? The translations of Marchesi and Mosca here seem to suggest that we should take *quam* as rather ironically: 'let him see how (i.e. how little)[17]) he competes... with his brother', but such use of *quam* seems without parallel. Alternatively, the element of comparison might be implicit in *currat* or in *optumae memoriae uiro*. However, nothing of this would adequately explain the expressions used in the middle of the sentence. Actually, *quam in omnibus*, and especially the striking phrase *Mineruae curriculum* carry more weight than the rest.

as paleographically easy between *seD TANtummodo*. Cf. also A.J. Kronenberg, *Ad Apuleium*, Mnemosyne 56 (1928), 29-54, esp. 46. Without reference to Norden, Kronenberg proposes *sed tantummodo* <*dictam*>.

15) Cf. Jane F. Gardner, *Women in Roman law & society* (London 1990), 99-100.

16) Admittedly, by itself the value of these late MSS is limited; cf. Butler and Owen (1914), xxxvi-xxxix. Augello a.l. defends *promissam* too, but his objection to *dictam* is rather apodictic ("la dotis dictio è in decadenza fin dall' epoca classica") and comes without any proof.

17) Marchesi actually renders 'quanto poco egli sia compagno al fratello...'; Mosca prints 'quanto (...) resti indietro rispetto a suo fratello'.

Pontianus is closely associated with Minerva (cf. TLL's paraphrase: "nunquam Pontianum quicquam inuita Minerua scripsisse"). Possibly, it is in this bond that we have the negative implication for Pudens. In all things, he runs not a simple course against his brother, but a 'Minerva's course', which is impossible for him to win, since he lacks the erudition and culture of his brother. Pudens, who does not know Latin and speaks mostly Punic (c.98), simply does not stand a chance in a *Minerva's course.* Recitation of Pontianus' flattering and polite letter will show that Pudens runs such a course *in omnibus*, that is: in the field of letter writing too. Shortly before, Apuleius had referred to a letter by Pudens: *quam nimis contumeliose et turpiter de matre tua scriptam* (c.86), the very opposite of Pontianus' letter here.

101,4 Ipse iam, *ut <qui> sui potens ac uir* acerbissimas litteras matri dictet, iram eius deleniat: qui potuit perorare, poterit exorare.

ut sui potens ac uir FΦ; *<qui>* add. Helm

The text is perfectly sound and no emendation is required. Still, Helm's addition has crept into all modern editions, surprisingly also that of Butler and Owen, although they explicitly reject Helm's suggestion in their commentary.

103,5 Ceterum ad haec, quae obiecistis, numera an binis uerbis respondeam. 'Dentes splendidas': ignosce munditiis. 'Specula inspicis': debet philosophus. 'Vorsus facis': licet fieri. 'Pisces exploras': Aristoteles docet. 'Lignum consecras': Plato suadet. 'Vxorem ducis': leges iubent. '*Prior natu'st': solet fieri. 'Lucrum sectatus es'*: dotalis accipe, donationem recordare, testamentum lege.

prior natu is est FΦ.

Butler and Owen very rightly point out that we need two words (*binis uerbis*) for each element. It may be added that this is apparent until the very end of the section quoted here. Accordingly, they print *natu'st*, which is accepted by many other editors[18]). However, Butler and Owen shrink back before *sectatu's* (already proposed by Purser), although they give this form in the commentary, arguing that Apuleius is likely to have at least pronounced it in this way. Here, we must surely print it as well, if the effect is not to be spoiled. Admittedly, aphaeresis of *es* is less common than of *est*, but

18) Slightly less irregular are: 50,1 *praecipuast* and 50,24 *sanctissimast.*

examples can be found in comedy, e.g. Plaut. *Pers.*146 *facturu's*; 237 *odiosu's*; *Curc.*407 *quoiati's*; *Epid.*630 *remoratu's*[19]). A parallel within the *Apology* might be 46,10 *pollicitu's*, for F's *pollicitus*, to which most editors add <*es*>.

6522 GB NIJMEGEN, Erasmusplein 1, KUN Vakgroep GLTC

19) Cf. W.M. Lindsay, *The Latin language (...)* (Oxford 1894), 121; further Lindsay on Plautus' *Captivi*, p.24-5. The phenomenon (also called 'procope' or 'prodelision') seems to be somewhat neglected in the standard grammars; for instance, Leumann, 123-4 only gives some examples in passing.