

the violence in the city which shows the consequence (in every sense) of his speech. The central section of this chapter – and one of the finest in this very fine book – discusses the burning and restoration of the Capitol. S. situates the destruction in the context of the various Republican restorations of this building, presenting a highly compelling picture of this site of Republican memory (p. 213) finally here ‘restored’ by Tacitus’ text. Even more original is the analysis of the restoration scene, which he views from the future, from Domitian’s later gaudy reconstruction, from which his name was probably ultimately erased. S. also speculates provocatively on the possible association of the temple’s restoration with Helvidius Priscus’ offence to Vespasian; thus the happy scene of restoration in *Histories* 4.53, which many of us read as clausal, may well have been the beginning of this significant martyrdom. The final section of this chapter examines the other destroyed temple, in Jerusalem, and argues for the Jewish excursus as a ‘narrative of sacrifice’ (p. 237) to ensure the salvation of Rome.

The final chapter focusses on the most discussed portion of *Annals*, the fourth book, with its ‘second preface’, the trial of the historian Cremutius Cordus and Tiberius’ speech about imperial memory. S. makes some highly original and persuasive contributions here. First, he argues that the second preface is designed to convince readers of the regime’s hostility to Tacitus’ work in the face of his ongoing survival and probable literary success. Secondly, the tradition about Cremutius as it emerges in Seneca and Quintilian is thoroughly reviewed and linked to declamatory traditions about Cicero as another exemplar of literary *libertas*. This enables S. to make important observations about Cremutius in Tacitus: that his offence is linked exclusively to his history and not to any other actions, thus making possible a tighter association with Tacitus; and that his speech of defence displays little of the *libertas* one would expect from the tradition, since this would work against that association. The book concludes with a brief *jeu d’esprit* on the end of *Annals* as we have it, and a salutary comment on how we modern readers identify with Tacitus in so far as he is anti-Principate, but feel uncomfortable with his imperialism.

S. achieves absolute lucidity without sacrificing the complexity and subtlety of the vision he conveys. This is a highly original and important book, and it will resonate in Tacitean and Roman Imperial studies for years to come.

University of Bristol

ELLEN O’GORMAN
e.c.ogorman@bristol.ac.uk

APULEIUS

FRANGOULIDIS (S.) *Witches, Isis and Narrative. Approaches to Magic in Apuleius’ Metamorphoses*. (Trends in Classics Supplementary Volumes 2.) Pp. xiv + 255, ill. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2008. Cased, €78, US\$98. ISBN: 978-3-11-020594-7.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X09990746

This book is introduced as ‘the first to be devoted to a comparative study of the various approaches Lucius and secondary characters adopt towards magic in Apuleius’ (p. xi). However, given that F. focusses not only on characters but also on motifs, themes and narrative structures, the subtitle provides a simpler and more appropriate description. If this does not sound so innovative and coherent it only reflects an actual lack of these qualities. Throughout the book F. recycles much of the

The Classical Review vol. 60 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2010; all rights reserved

extensive work he has done on the *Metamorphoses* ever since his doctoral thesis of 1990. Four out of nine chapters are revised versions of conference papers published previously. Neither these nor the other five chapters seem parts of a planned whole. Rather than a monograph, we here have a collection of individual small studies loosely revolving around a basic idea. It is a pity that this idea is never put forward in the way of a leading hypothesis. Still, from F.'s frequent recurrence to his underlying assumptions it becomes clear enough that essentially he regards the *Metamorphoses* as a narrative about black magic, associated with witches and 'witch-like' figures, versus white magic (equalling religion), associated with Isis – hence the title. Thus F. finds his own phrasing of the age-old moralistic reading of the apparent rift in the *Metamorphoses* between the picaresque Books 1–10 on the one hand and its religious ending in Book 11. Ticking off other readings in lists of previous scholarship rather than engaging with them, F. takes for granted that Apuleius stages a spiritual trajectory from damnation to salvation and that a web of structural oppositions between bad magic and good religion is a major means to express this. Much could be objected to these premises, but they are defensible as one way of coming to terms with the text. After all, there is a great deal of magic in the *Metamorphoses* and some structure of salvation, of whatever significance, is undeniable in its plot. It may be appreciated that F. adds a further nuance to the moralistic reading of the *Metamorphoses* by pointing us to a deep structure of magic versus religion. If he had managed to do this in a convincing way, his less than economical presentation (a considerable part of the book is taken up by plot summaries, unnecessarily full quotations and unmotivated footnotes) could be considered a minor flaw and various stretches of the concept of magic (as in the proliferation of 'witch-like' figures) might be excused as the kind of overstatement that every specialised reading entails. But it all turns sour, at least to this reviewer, over two shortcomings in F.'s approach.

First, there is his decision to read Apuleius' novel almost exclusively from within (the only substantial exception being the last chapter on Apuleius' adaptation of the ideal novel – an interesting piece in its own right), as if it had little or nothing to do with literary history or the literary rationale of an author. F. does not make any effort to set the *Metamorphoses* in the intellectual context of Apuleius' *œuvre* and his time, and while he of course knows that the author in large part followed the model of the Greek *Metamorphōseis* – usually thought to be epitomised in the *Onos* – he turns a blind eye to this fact in his 'intratextual' hunt for narrative patterns, correspondences and analogies. An extreme consequence of this self-chosen limitation is Chapter 7, in which F. ponders narrative advantages gained by Apuleius from having his hero transformed into precisely an ass rather than any other animal. Such an investigation would be called for if Apuleius really *had* replaced the ass of his Greek model text with another animal. Going the other way round and making his adherence to the model a wide-ranging narrative decision seems odd. In the few cases, however, in which F. does take a look beyond Apuleius' text and considers relations with a larger tradition of ancient fiction his ideas are too often vague. On p. 204, for instance, he speaks of the ideal novel as 'standard romance', whatever this may be; and the Milesian Tales, which F. introduces mistakenly as *fabula Milesiaca* instead of *Milesia* (p. 13; cf. further references on pp. 45, 87, 106), still lack any definition at the end.

Secondly, there is F.'s excessive use of intratextual comparisons as a methodological tool. Pages not filled by plot summaries and quotations are mostly used for the exhaustive and exhausting establishment of 'pattern[s] of similarities and differences' (e.g. p. 114; cf. similar phrases on pp. 87, 119, 128–9, 135, 208) in episodes, characters, motifs, etc. The more significant part of the parallels and contrasts

brought to light by F. in this way have, at least in a basic form, long been recognised. The remaining part is either marred by a zero sum game resulting from the long list of 'differences' stereotypically attached to that of 'similarities'; or it is too impressionistic to follow. Some problematic examples may speak for themselves. Lucius' transformation into an ass is compared with Thelyphron's facial mutilation, with the main difference being that Thelyphron loses his ears and nose while Lucius' corresponding body parts grow (p. 104); Apollo's oracle at the beginning of the story of Cupid and Psyche should be a 'distant parallel of the recommendation letter Lucius bears from Demeas of Corinth' and the 'wind that transports Psyche to the magic valley has the same function as the aged tavern keeper who gives information to Lucius about Milo' (p. 111); Lucius' alleged poverty in magical Hypata is said to contrast with his affluence in religious Rome (p. 200), but here F. adds an evident mistake (it is not Lucius who suffers from poverty 'as Meroe's victim', but the secondary character, Socrates) to a number of quite subjective associations of Hypata (*quae ciuitas cunctae Thessaliae antepollet*, 1.5) with poverty.

F.'s volume reminds readers of the significance of magic and religion in the *Metamorphoses* and expands somewhat on what we know about narrative strategies in this context. To be of larger benefit it should have been more carefully thought through as a whole and should have used a broader interpretative horizon.

University of Zurich

STEFAN TILG
stefan.tilg@klphs.uzh.ch

GELLIUS

GUNDERSON (E.) *Nox Philologiae. Aulus Gellius and the Fantasy of the Roman Library*. Pp. x + 313. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2009. Cased, US\$55. ISBN: 978-0-299-22970-2.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X09990758

Reviewing 'G.'s book' seems to undermine the views on authors and books suggested by this Protean work, which imitates many aspects of Gellius' *Noctes*, interweaves its own *capita rerum* with those of Gellius, includes itself in the bibliography, at times posing as a modern edition of a classical text, at others as a re-issue of an anonymous book whose 'reproduced' title page sets Hegel as a *terminus post quem*. Yet since it is G.'s book that I have been asked to review, it is apparently both possible and pragmatically necessary to distinguish between this figure of a true author and his disguises as an editor, another Gellius or a Macrobius.

G.'s *Nox*, then, is a study of Gellius, of writing about Gellius, of what it terms 'antiquarianism', indeed of the practices of all text-oriented research, and of the 'logic of textuality itself' (p. 284). Its constant play with prefaces and indexes, tables of contents and *capita rerum*, lists of *fragmenta adespota* and *spuria*, makes it also a book about the apparatus of ancient and modern scholarly publication.

The highly self-reflexive approach of the author is made prominent right from the start, where a study of Gellius' *praefatio* is followed by one of the author's own, emphasising shared aims and anxieties and a common stand against the world of scholarship. The next three chapters, on *auctoritas*, *ratio* and *usus*, contain a number of close readings of Gellian chapters that are often intriguing and will, I believe, be found the most interesting and fruitful for 'traditional' Gellianists. The three key