



Costantini, L. (2022). Review of G. Magnaldi, *Apulei opera philosophica* (Oxford 2020). *Prometheus: rivista di studi classici*, 48, 292-294.
<https://oaj.fupress.net/index.php/prometheus/article/view/13243>

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

License (if available):
CC BY

[Link to publication record on the Bristol Research Portal](#)
PDF-document

This is the final published version of the article (version of record). It first appeared online via Firenze University Press at <https://oaj.fupress.net/index.php/prometheus/article/view/13243>. Please refer to any applicable terms of use of the publisher

University of Bristol – Bristol Research Portal

General rights

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the reference above. Full terms of use are available:
<http://www.bristol.ac.uk/red/research-policy/pure/user-guides/brp-terms/>

Anno XLVIII – 2022

nuova serie XI

Prometheus

Rivista di studi classici

Fondata da Adelmo Barigazzi



ISSN 0391-2698 (print)

ISSN 2281-1044 (online)

PROMETHEUS

Rivista di studi classici

Direttore Angelo Casanova

Segretari di Redazione

Paolo Carrara

Enrico Magnelli

Redazione

Francesco Becchi, Paolo Carrara, Emiliano Gelli, Daria Gigli Piccardi, Augusto Guida, Walter Lapini, Enrico Magnelli, Eleonora Melandri, Francesco Michelazzo.

Comitato Scientifico

Guido Avezzù (Verona),

Alain Billault (Paris IV Sorbonne),

Alberto Cavarzere (Verona),

José Antonio Fernández Delgado (Salamanca),

Thomas Gärtner (Köln),

Paolo Mastandrea (Venezia),

Giuseppe Mastromarco (Bari),

Silvia Mattiacci (Siena),

Aurelio Pérez Jiménez (Málaga),

Rita Degl'Innocenti Pierini (Firenze),

Aldo Setaioli (Perugia),

Alan H. Sommerstein (Nottingham),

Pietro Totaro (Bari)

Mauro Tulli (Pisa),

Luc van der Stockt (Leuven),

Bernhard Zimmermann (Freiburg i.B.)

Redazione Scientifica

Cattedra di Letteratura Greca, Dipartimento di Lettere e Filosofia,

Università degli Studi di Firenze, via della Pergola 60, 50121 Firenze

Editore

Firenze University Press

Università degli Studi di Firenze

Via Cittadella, 7

50144 Firenze - Italia

Versione online: <http://www.fupress.net/index.php/prometheus/>

PROMETHEUS

XLVIII 2022

SOMMARIO

L. Ferreri:	Per l'interpretazione di Theogn. 341-350	p. 3
T. Salvatori:	L'elegia delle due barbe (Theogn. 1330)	" 29
A. Tibiletti:	On the alleged <i>dativus ethicus</i> in Pindar	" 35
B. Brogi:	La metrica di Eveno di Paro	" 46
L. Floridi:	'Platone' e l'anima <i>δύσερος</i> . Una nota ad <i>AP</i> 5.78	" 54
A. Di Flumeri:	Per una semantica delle pietre: Posidippo e i trattati litologici tardoantichi	" 68
G. Cattaneo:	Un <i>excerptum</i> inedito della <i>Biblioteca</i> pseudo- apollodorea (2.26-29)	" 79
A. Gullo:	A note on an epigram of Meleager (<i>AP</i> 7.79.5-6)	" 86
A. Allen:	Catullus 1.9-10	" 96
G. Zago:	Orazio, <i>Carm.</i> 1.10.13-16	" 99
P. Gagliardi:	Properzio, Ovidio e le <i>Laudes Galli</i>	" 104
R. Degl'Innocenti Pierini:	Caligola, Augusto e il gioco dei dadi. Per il testo e l'interpretazione di Sen. <i>Cons. ad Pol.</i> 17.4 (e di Svet. <i>Aug.</i> 71.3)	" 129
A. Gavrielatos:	Satirical designators for Romans. The Roman past and Roman names in Persius' <i>Satire</i> 1	" 145
L. Bocciolini:	Le 'pretese' di un maestro (nota a Petronio, <i>Sat.</i> 46.5)	" 164
M. Carmignani:	Petronio, ¿un sutil <i>Homeromastix</i> ? Nota al topos <i>ergo me non ruina terra potuit haurire?</i> (<i>Sat.</i> 81.3)	" 179
F. Cannizzaro:	Archi e imprese notturne: una nota esegetica (e testuale) a Valerio Flacco 3.133-137	" 187
S. Audano:	Nota testuale a <i>De rebus bellicis</i> 2.6	" 196
A. Casanova:	Timossena, la moglie di Plutarco	" 206
A. I. Jiménez San Cristóbal:	Celebrando a Dioniso en la polis: las Dieciséis mujeres de Elis	" 217
K. Panegyres:	Theognis and Cassius Dio	" 234

C. Savino:	La principessa, il sacerdote e il medico. Note sulla rappresentazione del mal d'amore nelle <i>Etiopiche</i> di Elio- doro (3.7-11, 4.6-7)	p. 236
E. N. Merisio:	L'epitafio di Zosimos: tra versi omerici e "scritture ispirate"	" 253
A. Rossi:	Un falso problema di testo in Gregorio Nazianzeno (nota critica a <i>carm.</i> 2.1.12, v. 426)	" 267
F. Becchi:	A new source for the <i>Commentaria</i> of John Philoponus on Aristotle's <i>De anima</i> : Marc. Gr. 266 (M)	" 277
A. Guida:	Un lettore bizantino di Caritone	" 281

NOTIZIE BIBLIOGRAFICHE

P. J. Finglass, <i>Sophocles. Oedipus the King</i> , ed. with introd., translation and commentary	(E. Magnelli)	p. 287
J. Kwapisz, <i>The Paradigm of Simias. Essays on Poetic Eccentricity</i>	(E. Magnelli)	" 290
G. Magnaldi, <i>Apulei opera philosophica</i>	(L. Costantini)	" 292
S. Renker, <i>A Commentary on Quintus of Smyrna, Posthomerica 13</i>	(J. Tasselli)	" 295
A. Guida, <i>Teodoro di Mopsuestia. Replica a Giuliano imperatore</i> , seconda edizione riveduta e ampliata	(R. Franchi)	" 298
A. Conte, <i>Gregorio Nazianzeno. Tra autobiografia e teologia</i> [<i>carm.</i> II,1,68. II,1,30]	(C. Paravano)	" 303
S. Micciché, <i>Giovanni Aurispa, umanista siciliano</i> Nuove ricerche bibliografiche con antologia di testi critici	(L. Ferreri)	" 306
M. von Albrecht, <i>Sermones. Satiren zur Gegenwart</i> , Lateinisch und Deutsch	(A. Setaioli)	" 309
Segnaliamo Inoltre...	(Redaz.)	" 314
Indice per Autore		" 317

κίδης di Stratone comico (p. 80) citerei R. Kassel, "ZPE" 14, 1974, 121-127 = *Kleine Schriften* 310-316, E. Livrea, "ZPE" 40, 1980, 27-31 = *Studia Hellenistica*, Firenze 1991, I 239-242, e più di recente M. Di Marco, "ZPE" 174, 2010, 37-43. Sulla datazione del cosiddetto "nuovo Pallada" (p. 110 n. 69) vd. soprattutto L. Floridi, "ZPE" 197, 2016, 51-69. L'anonimo epigramma, forse tzetiziano, contro Licofrone (p. 130) è riedito e commentato da A. Rhoby, *Ausgewählte byzantinische Epigramme in illuminierten Handschriften*, Wien 2018, 115-118 (DE10, con riproduzione alla tav. XIX della spassosa miniatura nel cod. Heidelb. Pal. gr. 18, f. 96v), che però K., con ogni probabilità, non avrà fatto in tempo a vedere. L'articolo di Maas 1913 (p. 174) è ristampato nelle sue *Kleine Schriften*, 135-138. Un utile *addendum* alla bibliografia può essere S. Beta, *Il labirinto della parola. Enigmi, oracoli e sogni nella cultura antica*, Torino 2016.

La lettura del volume è resa ancor più gradevole dall'uso di un inglese davvero eccellente, nonché dall'arguzia, mai invadente o affettata, che caratterizza lo stile di K. (per un esempio fra i tanti, p. 10: "The notion of laws of history may go too heavy on mysticism, and at any rate these are for predicting the future, whereas my concern is with untangling the patterns of the past"; cfr. anche p. 40 n. 91 e il tragicomico aneddoto riportato a p. 89, nonché l'autoironia di p. 93 n. 13). Scarsissimi gli errori di stampa: a p. 10 r. 18 si legga "Simias, Laevius", alla r. 24 "Frankenstein", a p. 54 n. 6 "that Melissus", a p. 58 r. 24 "for Laevius", a p. 71 r. 26 "which may have belonged", a p. 77 n. 115 "Bastianini", a p. 109 r. 6 "δῶρα γενεθλίδι", a p. 124 r. 26 "his own oration", a p. 131 r. 17 "approached" e r. 20 "*technopaegnia*", a p. 151 n. 37 "rediscovery", a p. 168 r. 27 "di Rodi", a p. 188 col. ii r. 11 "*Eclogues*".

A p. 1, K. scrive che "there were good reasons not to write this book, and there are good reasons not to read it". Ecco, questo è l'unico punto su cui dissento totalmente da lui.

ENRICO MAGNELLI

G. Magnaldi, *Apulei opera philosophica*, OUP, Oxford 2020, pp. XXXVIII-140

Scholars interested in Apuleius' *philosophica* – namely, *De Deo Socratis*, *De Platone*, and *De Mundo* – have been waiting with much anticipation for M.'s new edition of these works for the "Oxford Classical Texts". Not unlike Holford-Strevens' 2019 edition of Gellius for the same series, M.'s edition of the *philosophica* is a significant contribution to Apuleian scholarship, Imperial Platonism and, in my view, textual criticism. Her work is the culmination of decades of research into the manuscript transmission of Apuleius' *philosophica*, which circulated in Northern Europe alongside the *Asclepius* and *Peri Hermeneias*, both generally considered spurious (see e.g. C. Moreschini, *Apuleius and the Metamorphoses of Platonism*, Turnhout 2015, 41; 204-218). It is regrettable that the advances brought by M.'s edition seem to have hitherto been missed or misunderstood. In reviewing this edition, I shall attempt to explain why it should be held in high regard and I shall summarise M.'s methodological advances – the so-called "parola-segnale" in particular – which may otherwise be inaccessible to non-Italian readers. It is hoped that explaining these points will make it possible to rectify some of the criticism M.'s work has received in the review by B. Bakhouché ("BMCREv" 2021.03.04), which is unjust in my view.

M.'s volume opens with a summarising preface, written in elegant Latin, which follows the traditional format of the OCT series. Although there has been an increasing preference for vernacular since the publication of Lloyd-Jones and Wilson's edition of Sophocles in 1990, this has not deterred some OCT editors from continuing to adopt Latin in their prefaces (see, for instance, Holford-Strevens' aforementioned edition of Gellius; R. Rodgers' edition of

Columella, published in 2010; and J. Powell's edition of Cicero's *De Re Publica*, *De Legibus*, *De Senectute*, and *De Amicitia*, which came out in 2006). As M. explains (pp. vii-xii), her systematic collation enables her to divide the manuscripts into three classes, thus rejecting the bipartite stemma proposed in Goldbacher's edition (1876) and subsequently accepted by the Teubner editors, Thomas (1908) and Moreschini (1991), and the Budé editor, Beaujeu (1973). Class α is the most authoritative one; Class δ is highly contaminated and interpolated but necessary to supplement the errors and lacunae in α ; Class ϕ , mainly represented by R (Vaticanus Reg. lat. 1572), is the product of the activity of a learned scribe, who understood many of the readings in the common ancestor of $\alpha\delta\phi$, but altered other readings and introduced errors of his own (on this third class, see also R. Klibansky - F. Regen, *Die Handschriften der philosophischen Werke des Apuleius*, Göttingen 1993, 158-168; J. A. Stover, *A New Work by Apuleius*, Oxford 2016, 46-59). One of M.'s merits is to have demonstrated the importance of Class α 's B (Bruxelles, Bibliothèque Royale 10054-10056): as L. D. Reynolds, *Texts and Transmission*, Oxford 1983, 17, and B. Bischoff, *Katalog der festländischen Handschriften des neunten Jahrhunderts*, I, Wiesbaden 1998, 160, no. 740 rightly pointed out, this codex does not belong to the eleventh century but to the ninth, and M. argues that it descends from a late-antique exemplar in uncial script and in *scriptio continua*. This witness was richly annotated by Nicolaus Cusanus, who acquired it in the first half of the fifteenth century, but it was not until E. Rohde, "RhM" 37, 1882, 146-151 rediscovered it that editors started to take it into account. M. argues that B alone is unaffected by contamination and emphasises the importance of the readings and corruptions it preserves, which closely resemble its model.

M. has devoted considerable efforts over the years to the genesis of manuscript corruptions, and this led her to recognise an ancient correction technique, used in the exemplars of the Greek and Latin codices she inspected, which she calls "parola-segnale". As M. explains in various studies (e.g. *La forza dei segni*, Amsterdam 2000, and in E. Bona - C. Lévy - Ead. (edd.), *Vestigia notitiae*, Alessandria 2012, 351-352), this intuition was sparked by discussions on transposition she had with Michelangelo Giusta: M. noticed that several corruptions involving misplaced repetitions could be explained if one imagines that an ancient scribe corrected a misspelt or omitted term in the exemplar by writing it marginally and repeating the previous and/or following terms in order to link the correction to the corrupted passage as clearly as possible. This correction technique must have been widely adopted until Late Antiquity, but later scribes misunderstood it, incorporating such marginalia into the texts they were transcribing. This caused the simultaneous presence in a text of wrong readings and their corrections, thus M. also calls them "*lectiones falsae* and *emendatae*", or "*duplices lectiones*". A similar technique is that of the so-called "lettere-segnale", which consisted in indicating marginally or interlinearly not the entire word, but only the corrected letters that needed replacing, accompanied by the previous term. By understanding how these corrections underlie a good number of corruptions, M. proposes convincing restorations of passages that earlier scholars attempted to emend (listed in M.'s preface at pp. xix-xxi). For example, previous editors of the *philosophica* adopt the vulgate *tunc progressus, tunc vero regressus* (*Socr.* 2, p. 120 = 2.3 ed. M.); M., however, focuses on the passage transmitted by B, which she restores as follows: *tunc <vero> progressus [tunc vero] [amens], tum autem regressus*. The corruption would derive from the original omission of *vero*, which was reported marginally with the preceding *tunc*. A later scribe, unfamiliar with the "parola-segnale" technique, added the annotation to the text alongside another gloss, *amens*, with which a prejudiced reader presumably criticised the divine status Apuleius ascribes to the moon, the sun, and the stars (M. discusses this at greater length in "RFIC" 139, 2011, 407-410, and in P. Galand - E. Malaspina (edd.), *Vérité et apparence*, Turnhout 2016, 523-524). At least another example may be offered. *Plat.*

2.26, p. 260 (= 2.26.6 ed. M.): *instituendos vero eos esse, utcumque parentes nec ita sexus esse*, is a heavily corrupted passage in which Apuleius summarises the views on the education of children found in Plato's *Laws*, Book VII. The transmitted phrase becomes easily intelligible if one emends it as follows: *instituendos vero eos <sexus> esse, <nec ita> utcumque parentes* [*nec ita sexus esse*]. Again, a later copyist seems to have misunderstood and transposed a marginal correction that must have looked like *sexus esse nec ita* (i.e. add *sexus* before *esse*, then add *nec ita* afterwards), as M. discusses more fully in *Vestigia notitiae*, 363. It is regrettable that the preface's brevity does not allow M. to introduce readers to this correction technique. Perhaps a study addressed to a broader audience in English, detailing these discoveries and summarising her editorial choices, would have made these points more easily accessible.

As in earlier editions of the *philosophica*, M.'s critical text arranges Apuleius' writings in the order they are found in the manuscripts, starting from the so-called "false preface" of the *De Deo Socratis* – an order that probably goes back to an ancient collection of Apuleius' works (pp. xvii-xviii). An innovation that M. introduces is the helpful paragraph division, following what Jones did in his Loeb (2017) for the *De Deo Socratis*. This replaces the conventional but rather impractical referencing to the pages of Oudendorp's edition (1823).

The apparatus is admittedly rich for the usual practice of the OCT series, but it finally provides a comprehensive overview of the manuscript variants, which M. has rigorously and integrally collated. Further readings have been supplied in the Appendix Critica (pp. 131-135). Conjectures have, for their part, been included more selectively. While general readers may find this apparatus burdensome, it is, indeed, a treasure trove for those who are interested in the transmission of Apuleius' *philosophica*, and it will serve as a point of reference for future studies. In this respect, J. Ulrich, "CR" n.s. 71, 2020, 118-119 is perhaps too critical when he argues that M.'s apparatus "forces the reader-*qua*-archaeologist to sift through" the reading it offers. Nor does it seem fair to imply that M. would have benefitted from the annotated translation of *De Platone* by R. C. Fowler, *Imperial Plato*, Las Vegas-Zurich-Athens 2016, when she could access the richer commentary by Beaujeu and the updated commentary by E. Dal Chiele, *Apuleio. De Platone et eius dogmate*, Bologna 2016. More unfair and – to some degree – even uninformed seems the criticism that M. received from B. Bakhouché. Had Bakhouché read M.'s contributions, listed in the bibliography and referred to throughout the pages of her edition, she would probably have been able to appreciate M.'s editorial work as well as her understanding of Apuleius' broader philosophical context. One can disagree with M.'s textual choices, but Bakhouché's taking issues with M.'s attention to the manuscripts is surprising, especially in the light of the restorations M. proposes. Likewise, claiming that an editorial work should only be justified by the discovery of new witnesses and should not lead to a text "sensiblement identique" – here Bakhouché is citing F. Le Blay's review of S. Amigues, *Théophraste. Les signes du temps. Les vents*, Paris 2019, "BMCR" 2020.12.32, in which Le Blay approves of Amigues' relying on previous editions – seems surprisingly anti-philological from a scholar who has herself authored a critical edition (cf. *Calceidius. Commentaire au Timée de Platon*, éd. crit. et trad., I-II, Paris 2011).

Serious and reliable editions, such as that produced by M., are the cornerstones of classical scholarship. By reassessing the manuscript tradition of Apuleius' *philosophica*, M. has provided the current and the next generations of scholars with a firmer basis for appreciating and appraising these works, and deserves only the warmest thanks.

University of Bristol

LEONARDO COSTANTINI