

Offprint from the

Classical Review

NEW SERIES VOLUME XLVII NO 2 1997

G. MAGGIULI, M. F. B. GIOLITO: *L'altro Apuleio: problemi aperti per una nuova edizione dell' Herbarius*. (Studi Latini, 17.) Pp 205. Naples: Loffredo, 1996. Paper, L. 20,000. ISBN: 88-8096-464-X.

In late antiquity, Apuleius of Madauros had become so famous that many works were attributed to him, among which is a herbal known as the *Herbarius*. This is a relevant text for those interested in Roman medicine, botany, and magic, but unfortunately it is very hard to come by. Generally considered spurious, it is not included in editions of Apuleius. The latest publication of the *Herbarius* is by E. Howald and H. E. Sigerist, an unusual, large volume published in 1927 (Leipzig and Berlin). It is therefore most welcome that a new edition of the *Herbarius* is now announced by two Italian scholars. In this, their preparatory study, they deal with several problems concerning the text, and offer some insight into their working principles.

The title is somewhat misleading in its suggestion that we will be informed about 'the unknown side' of Apuleius. However, the authors do not defend his authorship. In their reconstruction, another 'Apuleius', living in the fourth century, is the author of the herbal in its first version. This was subsequently revised by yet another 'Apuleius' (called 'Apuleius Auctus' or, to make matters more confusing, 'Apuleius Platonius'), who lived in the early medieval period. This third Apuleius consciously introduced new elements into the text, and even tried to add to its Apuleian colour, e.g. by using typically Apuleian language in his short preface and by adding magicians' names in the lemmata.

In the first part of this study, M. discusses the relation between the two versions of the *Herbarius*, and the various forms of interpolations in the original text. M. shows that the structure of the lemmata in the *Herbarius* as found in the MSS simply follows the ancient conventions for herbals: after the name of the plant follow some synonyms and a picture, then come details on habitats, and finally its use is commented upon. This is a convincing correction to the approach of Howald and Sigerist, who had produced an entirely different order, on grounds which now seem hardly plausible. But on some points, M.'s approach becomes somewhat too strict and mechanical: anything diverging from the formulaic order and standard expressions is

immediately declared to be the result of interpolation. This leaves very little room for personal contributions by the author of the original version.

The second part, written by G., is devoted to a detailed study of one MS (*Laur. Pl. LXXXIII Cod. 4*), which illustrates the complex transmission of the *Herbarius*. Moreover, the analysis shows that this MS is of great importance for the establishment of the text, and that the *stemma codicum* of Howald and Sigerist has to be modified.

L'altro Apuleio is, obviously, not a study for a general readership, nor, I regret to add, will it surprise those interested in Apuleius of Madauros. On the most interesting issue for 'Apuleians', the attribution of the *Herbarius* to Apuleius, it contains hardly any new insights. But for scholars in general it opens up a pleasant prospect: they may look forward with confidence to the forthcoming Italian *Herbarius*. Particularly in its treatment of the text, the new edition will certainly be an improvement.

University of Leiden

VINCENT HUNINK