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Abstract

In response to recent scholarship on the function of the prologue to Apuleius’ *Metamorphoses* and the *exordium* of the *Apologia*, this thesis employs the intersection of these approaches in analysis of Apuleius’ *Florida*, a collection of rhetorical fragments. Although most of the fragments are incomplete, some can be identified as *exordia* which still retain some or all of their contextualizing *narrationes*; these fragments can be analyzed similarly to the *exordium* of the *Apologia* in that the themes introduced in the *exordium* can be traced intratextually throughout the course of the speech. *Florida* 1, although its *narratio* has not survived and thus cannot be analyzed as an introductory *exordium*, does occupy the position of the *praefatio* to the collection as it has survived in textual form. *Florida* 1 therefore occupies the same role for the collection as a whole as the prologue does for the *Metamorphoses*, preparing the reader for the literary text to follow. An analysis of the introductory passages to Apuleius’ *Florida* must take into account the text’s unusual plurality of introductions both in number and form, necessitating an approach that incorporates both the rhetorical and the literary.

Analysis of these passages principally demonstrates Apuleius’ didacticism and dialogism, the foundations of which are the relationship which he cultivates with his audience, his own text, and other texts. Apuleius characterizes his relationship with his audience most prominently by means of *captationes benevolentiae*, statements generally
dismissed by scholars as the means by which an orator ingratiates himself to his audience. Apuleius’ addresses to his audience, however, demonstrate the cultural and intellectual exchange which is the foundation of their relationship. He often presents his speech as a means of intellectual repayment to the city of Carthage, creating an intimate link between his audience, his speech, and education. In this manner, Apuleius invites his audience to participate in intellectual and philosophical discourse.

Apuleius’ many introductions also display a high degree of intratextuality and intertextuality. These rhetorical devices are also often dismissed as sophistic displays, but the way in which Apuleius’ speeches and texts reference themselves allow Apuleius to cue his auditor or reader into the main themes which are explored throughout any given text. This self-referencing allows the ancient auditor or modern reader to more closely follow Apuleius’ arguments and to create connections between different sections of texts which on the surface may deal with different concepts. Such intratextuality therefore serves as a didactic tool, allowing Apuleius to lead his audience to greater understanding. Similarly, Apuleius’ intertextuality prompts the cognizant auditor to juxtapose new texts and new themes, prompting an intellectual and intertextual dialogue between Apuleius, auditor, and texts.

An analysis of Apuleius’ introductory passages allows us to witness the manner in which his sophistic rhetoric allows him to lay the groundwork for philosophical discourse.
Dedication

quibus tandem uerbis pro hoc tuo erga me animo gratias habitu... nondum hercle repperio.

--Apuleius, Florida 16.32
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Chapter One: Introduction

Introductions and First Appearances

“Fust appearances are ced to be everything. I don’t put all my faith into this sayin. I think oysters and klams, for instance, will bear looking into.”

--Henry Wheeler Shaw

First appearances are—by nature—impossible to avoid, yet we often find that our reading of a certain person, situation, or text changes with a little looking into. It is, perhaps, our own fascination with the inevitability of first impressions that has led to the proliferation of works addressing ‘programmatic’ and introductory passages in Greco-Roman literature.¹ This flurry of scholarly work on introductory passages has consequently influenced contemporary Apuleian scholarship and interpretative approaches to the Apuleian corpus. Two major works have arisen in the past decade: Kahane and Laird’s *A Companion to the Prologue of Apuleius’ Metamorphoses* (published 2001, but resulting from their 1996 colloquium on the prologue to Apuleius’ *Metamorphoses*), and Asztalos’ “Apuleius’ *Apologia* in a Nutshell: The *Exordium*” (2005). Kahane and Laird’s collection arose from the premise that “[v]iewed on its own, the Prologue raises many linguistic, historical, and literary questions. But the fact that it is also a programmatic declaration multiplies these problems, and projects them into a much wider sphere.”² A number of readings of the prologue emerge, from those relying on cultural or philosophical contexts to those which explore

---

¹ For the rise of scholarship on programmatic passages, see Batstone (2007); for scholarship on introductory passages, see the collection of essays in Dunn (1992).
² Kahane and Laird (2001), 1.
Apuleius’ use of intertextuality to those probing dialogism, narrative, and the authorial voice. While each scholar is examining the prologue, in truth these articles (necessarily?) move beyond the prologue—the question which permeates the various approaches is how this puzzling prologue can allow us to better understand the *Metamorphoses* as a whole. This work in turn prompted Asztalos to devote a paper to the *exordium* of Apuleius’ *Apologia*. In addition to serving as a response to the attention lavished upon the prologue to the *Metamorphoses*, she also works under the premise “that the *exordium* presents a compact and condensed version of the speech as a whole.” She carefully demonstrates how Apuleius discredits his various prosecutors in these introductory lines. As did the various scholars dwelling upon the prologue to Apuleius’ *Metamorphoses*, Asztalos begins with the beginning but traces the ramifications throughout the following speech: the beginning leads her to the end and a better understanding of the whole.

This thesis will examine the extent to which these principles and methodologies are applicable to one of Apuleius’ works which has not as yet been thoroughly analyzed with a view towards introductions: the *Florida*. The *Florida* is a collection of selections from Apuleius’ epideictic speeches delivered in Carthage in the 160s CE. Although the origin and method of selection of the collection is unknown, Lee notes that most of the fragments are in some way concerned with Carthage, and that “[i]n this regard the *Florida* could be

---


4 Laird (2001) observes that “the Prologue can be integrated with the rest of the text—as fabula or narrative—if we acknowledge a form of narratival ring composition which links it to the end of the work. This is ‘ring composition’ in a fuller sense than is generally understood. However, we have to enter the ring at a certain point. The Prologue allows us to do so, by simultaneously operating as sermo” (279).

5 Asztalos (2005), 268.

6 Harrison (2000) hypothesizes that the *Florida* as it survives today is a further excerption from an originally Apuleian selection (92).
correctly termed Carthaginian orations.”\(^7\) As a collection of rhetorical fragments, the *Florida* arguably has no single beginning, unlike the *Metamorphoses* or the *Apologia*, but is rather a collection of beginnings, as noted by Harrison: “[m]any of the *Florida* are clearly opening passages.”\(^8\) The first fragment of the work as it has survived, however, does appear to provide an appropriate introduction to the collection as a whole; Lee notes that there are “thematic connections” and that *Florida* 1 also provides a suitable introduction to the language in the *Florida* as a whole.\(^9\) Thus, while the *Florida* appears to be a collection of epideictic *exordia*, *Florida* 1 also provides the textual incarnation of these introductory rhetorical fragments with a suitably introductory *praefatio*. Such a complexity of introductions nested within introductions may explain why the *Florida* has hitherto escaped analysis in the manner of Kahane and Laird’s treatment of the prologue to the *Metamorphoses* or Asztalos’ of the *Apologia*.

Harrison further notes that many of the *Florida’s* fragments “share elements of content with extant προλαλία,” although he concludes with the caveat that “though most of the *Florida* would in some sense conform to this type, it is difficult to fit all its elements into this category.”\(^10\) Perhaps appropriately for such a problematic collection of texts, *prolalia* itself is a somewhat ambiguous term. Nesselrath, in his work on the introductions of Apuleius’ contemporary Lucian, explains that *prolalia* was not an ancient term, but rather was first seen as a subtitle to certain of Lucian’s works in tenth-century manuscripts.\(^11\) The term *lalia* is attested to in the rhetor Menander, when he outlines how to construct an effective

---

\(^7\) Lee (2005), 14.  
\(^8\) Harrison (2000), 133.  
\(^9\) Lee (2005), 62-3.  
\(^10\) Harrison (2000), 133.  
\(^11\) Nesselrath (1990), 111.
introduction. Although Nesselrath, Harrison, and Hilton all designate the *Florida as prolalia* (or fragments of *prolalia*) and Lee notes that some of Apuleius’ *Florida* seem to parallel Menander’s definitions of *laéia* (especially *propeµµηκΗ λαήia*), such an identification does not provide much context for what is happening in Apuleius’ *Florida*. Before it is possible to discuss the manner in which the introductions to Apuleius’ *Florida* function, it is necessary to take a step back and briefly review their rhetorical context.

**Introduction to the Rhetorical Framework**

Aristotle, in his *On Rhetoric* (1358b), identifies three main types of rhetoric: *συµβουλευτικόν* (in which the audience is judging things done in the past), *δικανικόν* (in which the audience is judging things to be done in the future), *ἐπιδεικτικόν* (in which the audience is composed of spectators). In addition to the three types of speeches which can be made, there were five main components of rhetoric, the three main points being: invention (Gk. *heuresis*, Lat. *inventio*), in which the orator determined his subject matter; arrangement (Gk. *taxis*, Lat. *dispositio*), which concerned the organization of his speech; and style (Grk. *lexis*, Lat. *elocutio*), which was concerned with his choice of diction and composition. The additional two factors (memory and delivery) became commonplace by the 1st cent. BCE. While each type of speech is subject to its own *inventio*, the recognized divisions of *δικανικόν* or judicial oratory are best attested in rhetorical handbooks as containing: “(1) introduction, or prooemium, (Gk. *prooimion*, Lat. *exordium*); (2) narration (Gk. *diēgēsis*, Lat. *narratio*), the exposition of the background and factual details; (3) proof (Gk.

---

12 Nesselrath (1990), 112-3.
14 Lee (2005), 21.
15 Kennedy (1994), 4-5.
pistis, Lat. probatio); and (4) conclusion, or epilogue, (Gk. epilogo, Lat. peroratio).” On the other hand, Kennedy notes that “[e]pideictic speeches have a structure of their own; for example a speech in praise of someone may take up the ‘topics’ of his or her country, ancestry, education, character, and conduct.” Thus, the formula for epideictic orations (like the fragments found in the Florida) is not as consistent; Apuleius’ speeches, however, appear to share certain traits with the more established forms of judicial oratory, in that several of the fragments of the Florida clearly preserve his exordia and narrationes.

With regard to epideictic oratory, Kennedy comments that “[i]f the audience is not being asked to take a specific action, Aristotle calls the speech ‘epideictic’ (i.e., ‘demonstrative’). What he has in mind are speeches on ceremonial occasions, such as public festivals or funerals, which speeches he characterizes as aimed at praise of blame.” Many of Apuleius’ Florida can be pinpointed as speeches delivered on ceremonial occasions (e.g., fragment 9 in honor of the proconsul Severianus and his son, Honorinus; or fragment 16, in which Apuleius thanks the consul Aemilianus Strabo and the Carthaginian senate for the honor of a statue), and thus Apuleius’ Florida are generally regarded as a collection of epideictic fragments. Aristotle claims that for epideictic speeches, “the listener is merely a θεωρός (a spectator) and entertainment is the primary function of the oration. The oration is a display (ἐπίδειξις).” While Apuleius’ speeches clearly had an element of rhetorical display and sophistry to them, this paper contends that there exist deeper, philosophical subtexts (intratexts and intertexts) to these fragments, which are evident from the very

17 Kennedy (1994), 5.
20 Lee (2005), 23.
exordia of Apuleius’ speeches. Although prooemia/exordia are generally said to serve the simple purpose of aiming “at securing the interest and good will of the audience,”21 Apuleius’ exordia do much more in serving as his introduction and invitation to didactic and dialogic discourse.

In order to discuss Apuleius’ exordia, it is first necessary to briefly examine the historical function of these introductions. Aristotle says of epideictic προοίμια in particular that (Rhetoric 1415a.5-8): τὰ μὲν οὖν τῶν ἐπιδεικτικῶν λόγων προοίμια ἐκ τούτων, ἐξ ἑπαινοῦ, ἐκ ψόγου, ἐκ προτροπῆς, ἐξ ἀποτροπῆς, ἐκ τῶν πρὸς τὸν ἄκροατήν· δεῖ δὲ ἣ ἔξω ἡ οἰκεία εἶναι τὰ ἐνδόσιμα τῶν λόγω (“[t]hese then are the sources of epideictic exordia—praise, blame, exhortation, dissuasion, appeals to the hearer. And these exordia may be either foreign or intimately connected with the speech”). While many of Apuleius’ exordia may initially seem ἔξω to the themes which follow in his narrationes, the intratextual ties which Apuleius carefully forges ultimately prove his introductions to be thematically οἰκεία to the rest of their respective orations. Most of Apuleius’ exordia fit neatly under Aristotle’s listed usages, as the majority of his speeches are made in honor of Carthage or some consular or proconsular figure; however, some of his speeches do make use of blame.22 The most important element in Apuleius’ exordia for my readings of his Florida concern his appeals to the reader: πρὸς τὸν ἄκροατήν. Apuleius’ exordia are where he not only prepares his auditors for what is to follow, but also builds a relationship with them.

22 For speeches in honor of Carthage, see Florida 16 in which Apuleius thanks the people of Carthage for a statue or Florida 18 in which Apuleius thanks the people of Carthage with a hymn to Aesculapius for his early education among them; for speeches in honor of a consular or proconsular figure, see Florida 9 in honor of Severianus and his son or Florida 17 in honor of Scipio Orfitus; for speeches that make use of blame, see the exordia of Florida 9 and 16, in which Apuleius makes reference to his rivals.
which can open the door to potentially philosophic discourse. Aristotle informs us that
(Rhetoric 1415a.22-5): τὸ μὲν ὁδὴν ἀναγκαϊότατον ἔργον τοῦ προοιμίου καὶ ἰδίου τούτος,
δηλώσαι τί ἐστιν τὸ τέλος οὗ ἕνεκα ὁ λόγος (διότι έν δήλον ἦ καὶ μικρὸν τὸ πράγμα, οὗ
χρηστέον προοιμίῳ)· τά δὲ ἄλλα εἴδη οἷς χρώνται, ἱατρεύματα καὶ κοινά (“the most
essential and special function of the exordium is to make clear what is the end or purpose of
the speech; wherefore it should not be employed, if the subject is quite clear or unimportant.
All the other forms of exordia in use are only remedies”). Although Apuleius’ speeches
appear simple enough on the surface (e.g., gratiarum actiones or encomia), he often addresses
much larger issues (e.g., virtue, education, the nature of artistry). Thus, his exordia provide
Apuleius the opportunity to introduce himself and these complex philosophical ideas to his
audience. Aristotle provides one last comment on the nature of prooemia (Rhetoric 1415b.4-9):
δεὶ δὲ μὴ λανθάνειν ὅτι πάντα ἔξω τοῦ λόγου τὰ τοιοῦτα· πρὸς σαῦλον γὰρ ἀκροατήν καὶ
τά ἔξω τοῦ πράγματος ἄκουόντα· ἐπεὶ ἄν μὴ τοιοῦτος ἦ, οὐθὲν δὲὶ προοιμίου, ἄλλ' ἦ
ὅσον τὸ πράγμα εἰπεῖν κεφαλαιοδός, ἴνα ἔχῃ δίσπερ σῶμα κεφαλήν (“[b]ut we must not
lose sight of the fact that all such things are outside the question, for they are only addressed
to a hearer whose judgment is poor and who is ready to listen to what is beside the case; for
if he is not a man of this kind, there is no need of an exordium, except just to make a
summary statement of the subject, so that, like a body, it may have a head.”). Thus, for
Aristotle, although the prooemium serves certain introductory functions, it is not strictly
necessary except as a polite gesture of introducing the subject to the (morally scrupulous)
auditor. Apuleius’ exordia seem bloated in contrast, although I believe that they form a
necessary link between the philosopher and the φάντος ἄκροατής, allowing Apuleius to invite all members of his audience into philosophical discourse.

Closer to Apuleius’ own time, Quintilian notes that (Institutio oratoria 4.1.5):

causa principii nulla alia est quam ut auditorem quod sit nobis in ceteris partibus accommodator praeparatus, id fieri tribus maxime rebus inter auctores plurimos constat, si benivolentiam attentum docilem fecerimus, non quia ista non per toto actionem sint custodienda, sed quia inititis praeecessit necessaria, per quae in animum indicis ut procedere ultra possimus admitterimur.23

The sole purpose of the exordium is to prepare our audience in such a way that they will be disposed to lend a ready ear to the rest of our speech. The majority of authors agree that this is best effected in three ways, by making the audience well-disposed, attentive and ready to receive instruction. I need hardly say that these aims have to be kept in view throughout the whole speech, but they are especially necessary at the commencement, when we gain admission to the mind of the judge in order to penetrate still further.

While Apuleius’ exordia certainly aim to render his audience benivolus and attentus, for Apuleius the most important goal is to make his audience docilis. Although docilis can be taken as ‘docile,’ it also has the connotation of being easily instructed, and Apuleius’ speeches aim at instruction in addition to entertainment. This can be seen often from the very captationes benevolentiae which Apuleius employs. Although the term captatio benevolentiae is not itself a classical term, the concept does seem well attested in Aristotle’s and Quintilian’s respective discussions of prooemia and exordia above. The term was closely associated with the formalities of letter writing (ars dictaminis), and first use of the term does not appear until the publication of Alberic of Monte Cassino’s Dictaminum radii in 1087. 24 The term was not unique to the ars dictaminis, however, and was also used in treatises on prayer and

23 All non-Apuleian Greek and Latin texts and translations from Loeb editions provided under References, unless otherwise noted. Latin texts for the Florida are taken from the text and commentary of Lee (2005), and all English translations for the Florida are taken from Hilton’s contribution to Apuleius: Rhetorical Works (2001).

24 Murphy (1981), 203-6; of the first attestation of the word-set in Alberic of Monte Cassino: Colores autem eius dieo quibus captur benevolentia docilitas, attentio.
Modern takes on the *captatio benevolentiae* vary from the assumption that it is mere flattery to equation with the *exordium* as a whole. The latter sense is well-attributed in medieval definitions of rhetoric:

> Cicero’s argument that the purpose of the *exordium* is to capture the good will of the audience becomes one of the standard medieval definitions of the purpose of a work’s beginning, particularly in dictaminal treatises. By the twelfth century, indeed, most dictaminal treatises referred to the *exordium* simply as the *captatio benevolentiae*.

The *captatio benevolentiae*, then, is a label which is rarely provided a concrete definition outside of epistolary handbooks; it is a term often thrown about dismissively in modern rhetorical scholarship to denote mere flattery of the audience. I believe that Apuleius’ *captationes benevolentiae*, like the *exordia* in which they are found, are not merely empty formulae, but rather serve to further define his relationship with his audience by involving them in an intratextual dialogue within his own speech and also in intertextual dialogues with other pertinent works. The many links which Apuleius forges within these *exordia*—with the *narratio* which follows, with his audience, with outside texts—are therefore the foundation upon which our understanding of Apuleius’ text is built.

Similar principles are at work within literary *praefationes*. While Asztalos based her work as a corollary to Kahane and Laird’s exploration of the prologue to the *Metamorphoses*, her work necessarily differs given the generic differences (rhetoric versus prose fiction/novel) and the intended audience (auditors and judge in a courtroom versus readers).

---


26 For the *captatio benevolentiae* as a means of flattery, see Tate (2008), who notes that “In *captatio benevolentiae*, the author offers flattery by assuming that the reader will be familiar with a particular corpus of knowledge” (169); for the *captatio benevolentiae* as synonymous with the *exordium*, see Svendson (1978), who notes that “Apuleius’ novel opens with a *captatio benevolentiae*, an amusing introduction which anticipates both thematic and stylistic approaches” (101).

27 D. Smith (2001), 76.
Thus, while Asztalos, like Kahane and Laird, addresses the introduction of a work, she deals with the *exordium* of the *Apologia*, while the latter deal with a written prologue or *praefatio* to the *Metamorphoses*. Having provided a thorough explication of rhetorical *prooemia* and *exordia* above, it now becomes necessary to briefly differentiate the literary *praefatio* and what the ramifications of this distinction are for *Florida* 1, which serves as the *praefatio* for the textual collection of the *Florida*. The word *praefatio* itself only occurs in 33 contextual instances in Classical Latin, and not before 70 BCE. It also appears in numerous manuscripts to denote a preface, but whether this is an original title or the addition of later manuscriptists cannot be determined. Although Quintilian does use the term *praefatio* five times in his *Institutio oratoria*, it is evident that it functions quite differently from the *exordium*. For instance, a *praefatio* can alert the audience that the orator is about to speak extemporaneously

(Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria* 2.21.20): *nam cum aliquid de quo dicamus accipimus, positam nobis esse materiam frequenter etiam praefatio testamur* (“for when we have been given a subject on which to speak, we often preface our remarks by calling attention to the fact that the matter has been laid before us”) or serve to introduce new parts of a long and complex argument

(4.1.74): *utique si multiplex causa est, sua quibusque partibus danda praefatio est, ut ‘audite nunc reliqua’ et ‘transeo nunc illuc’* (“further if the case involves a number of different matters, each section must be prefaced with a short introduction, such as ‘Listen now to what follows,’ or ‘I now pass to my next point’”). In this later instance, the *praefatio* would assist in tying the oration back to the *exordium* proper. In either case, however, the *praefatio* clearly serves in an introductory capacity quite different from that of the *exordium*.
Notable examples of Latin *praefationes* include those to Pliny’s *Naturalis historia* and Livy’s *Ab urbe condita*. It is important to first notice that Pliny’s and Livy’s works are textual—the *praefationes* serve to introduce their multi-volume works. Pliny’s *praefatio* utilizes the word *praefatio* twice, but in two very different contexts. The first usage occurs in the opening line of the *praefatio*, and it is employed to denote Titus’ title (*Naturalis Historia* 1.pr):

> libros *Naturalis Historiae*, novicium *Camenis Quiritium tuorum opus*, natos apud me proxima fetura

licentiore epistula narrare constituì tibi, iucundissime Imperator; sit enim haec tu praefatio, verissima (“this treatise on Natural History, a novel work in Roman literature, which I have just completed, I have taken the liberty to dedicate to you, most gracious Emperor, an appellation peculiarly suitable to you”). Here there is a complex intersection of a *praefatio* which is detailing Pliny’s work and methodology as well as detailing his relationship to Titus and his text’s relationship to Titus. Pliny’s use of *praefatio* defines this relationship in the same way in which he is placing a label upon his work. The second appearance of this term in Pliny comes in a passage in which Pliny implies that a *praefatio* can act as an excuse for the manner in which some of his topics must be discussed, almost like Quintilian’s use of a *praefatio* as an apology for delivering a speech *ex tempore* (Pliny, *Naturalis Historia* pr.3):

> rerum natura, hoc est vita, narratur, et haec sordidissima sui parte ac plurimarum rerum aut rusticis vocabulis aut externis, immo barbaris etiam, cum honoris praefatione ponendis (“[t]he nature of things, and life as it actually exists, are described in them; and often the lowest department of it; so that, in very many cases, I am obliged to use rude and foreign, or even barbarous terms, and these often require to be introduced by a kind of preface”). In this instance, too, *praefationes* act to set up and prepare the reader for what is to follow. Livy’s *praefatio* never uses the word *praefatio*, but we

---

28 For further analysis of these *praefationes*, see Howe (1985) and Moles (1993), respectively.
can see the way in which the præfatio is functioning in allowing Livy to guide his readers’ reading of the books to follow (Ab urbe condita pr.9):

\[
\text{ad illa mihi pro se quisque acriber intendant animum, quae vita, qui mores fuerint, per quos urbs quibusque artibus domi militiaeque et partum et auctum imperium sit; labente deinde paulatim disciplina velut desidentes primo mores sequatur animo, deinde ut magis magisque lapsi sint, tum ire coeperint praecipites, donec ad haec tempora quibus nec utia nostra nec remedia pati possimus perventum est.}
\]

Here are the questions to which I would have every reader give his close attention—what life and morals were like; through what men and by what policies, in peace and in war, empire was established and enlarged; then let him note how, with the gradual relaxation of discipline, morals first gave way, as it were, then sank lower and lower, and finally began the downward plunge which has brought us to the present time, when we can endure neither our vices nor their cure.

Livy very clearly addresses the reader, informing him to intendat animum and provides a list of indirect questions on which his reading should focus. The præfatio to Livy’s work thus enables him to establish his relationship to his readers and also to establish his readers’ relationship to the text. Florida 1 functions in a similar introductory fashion, but both as an exordium to the speech it once prefaced and as the præfatio for the collected Florida. Similarly to an exordium, this præfatio will allow Apuleius to introduce both himself and his text to the audience (here, a reader) and initiate a dialogue with the reader through intratextual ties to the rest of the Florida and also intertextual ties to other pertinent texts.

**Introduction to the Theoretical Framework**

I contend that intratextuality and intertextuality are vital to any productive reading of Apuleius’ exordia and rhetorical fragments, and that such interrelationships between

---

29 “It is the hypothesis of intratextuality that a text’s meaning grows not only out the readings of its parts and its whole, but also out of readings of the relationships between the parts, and the reading of those parts as parts, and parts as relationship (interactive or rebarbative): all this both formally (e.g. episodes, digression, frame, narrative line, etc.) and substantively (e.g. in voice, theme, allusion, topos, etc.)—and teleologically” (Sharrock (2000), 6-7). Apuleius’ exordia and captiones benevolentiae, then, also react with the fragments as a whole—their narrationes and other elements—to create a richer understanding of the text.
Apuleius, his text(s), and his audience can be seen from the very *exordia* of his work, including the *captatio benevolentiae* which most modern scholars so flippantly dismiss. The way in which Apuleius constructs his texts to talk to his own text (intratextuality) and with other texts (intertextuality)—and the way in which he carefully constructs a relationship with his audience in the *exordia* and *captationes benevolentiae*—are all elements of a Bakhtinian dialogism\(^\text{31}\) which is central to Apuleius’ didactic program. The very mention of dialogism calls to mind Apuleius’ Platonic roots and Plato’s well-known philosophical dialogues.

Cossutta explains that in philosophical discourse “[d]ialogue is the polyphonic testing-ground for the diversity of discourse whose *telos* is Truth.”\(^\text{32}\) Just as Plato experiments with polyphonic discourse between Socrates and any given interlocutor, Apuleius’s own diversity of discourse—dialoguing with various intertexts, the audience, and even his own narrative voice and corpus—allows him to guide his audience towards a greater intellectual Truth.

Moors notes that in Plato’s philosophical dialogues:

---

\(^{30}\) Garner (1990) notes in the introduction to his book on Homer and Greek tragedy that “poetic allusions—this is part of their power both to charm and to frustrate—cannot be proved or disproved,” (1). I thus employ the term “intertextuality” with all the caution which it merits, and here note that I take much the same approach as Finkelpearl (1998): “I myself find it difficult to discuss allusion wholly in terms of the relationship between texts, though I do see such discussion as my ultimate goal. In many cases, if one is to offer any analysis at all, the alluding text must be seen as the conscious creation of an author attempting to evoke a particular effect through the juxtaposition of texts. By the word *author*, however, I mean not the real-life Apuleius, of whom we (perhaps) see glimpses in the *Apology*, but rather the characteristics of the text, the literary personality of the author. Sometimes, it seems to me, the rhetoric of the debate between intertextualists and those who believe in authorial intent obscures the fundamental agreement between the two camps when it comes to practical analysis” Finkelpearl (1998), 6.

\(^{31}\) See Mikhail Bakhtin, “Chapter Five: Discourse in Dostoevsky” in *Problems of Dostoevsky’s Poetics*, 181-204. Apuleius’ intertextuality results in a “double-voiced discourse,” in which there is a deliberate reference to someone else’s discourse. This double-voiced discourse is often of the “active type,” in which “another’s discourse in this case is not reproduced with a new intention, but it acts upon, influences, and in one way or another determines the author’s discourse, while itself remaining outside it” (195). Like Dostoevsky’s novel, *Florida* are “constructed not as the whole of a single consciousness, absorbing other consciousnesses as objects into itself, but as a whole formed by the interaction of several consciousnesses, none of which entirely becomes an object for the other,” (18).

\(^{32}\) Cossutta (2003), 72.
Through irony, Socrates addresses different things to different people. It shields the truth, or more precisely, the way to the truth, from those who cannot understand. Yet the door remains ajar for those few who are capable. Socrates averts the danger of disseminating material to those who cannot correctly handle it.\textsuperscript{33}

Apuleius’ intertextuality acts in much the same way, analogous to one of Eco’s forms of intertextual irony called double coding, in which the text “speaks on two levels at once.”\textsuperscript{34} In this case, the reader can miss the second of these two readings (the significance of one of Apuleius’ intertexts) but still enjoy the speech as a whole. Thus, Apuleius provides basic knowledge for all, but a deeper knowledge growing out of the intertexts for those who are equipped and/or willing to seek it.

The fact that Apuleius’ \textit{Florida} are written and delivered in Latin is also a significant factor in his relationship to his audience.\textsuperscript{35} Opeku notes that:

\begin{quote}
The teaching method which Apuleius applied to the popular audience in the theater was basically in the form of the oration of the practitioners of the Second Sophistic, but it was modified by the normal purpose of delighting the audience and an overriding desire to be understood. . . . This same [didactic] purpose is shown in the fact that these discourses were presented in both Latin and Greek . . . If we remember that the normal practice of the Second Sophistic was to give their lecture exclusively in Greek even where the audience was Latin-speaking, then this extra effort of Apuleius becomes significant and indicative of his pedagogical purposes.\textsuperscript{36}
\end{quote}

Apuleius thus takes great care to reach his audience and ensure their understanding (at least on a basic level) of his orations. By cultivating a pedagogic relationship with his audience, he ensures that there is constant cultural exchange driving his orations which mirrors the exchange between educator and student. Although Apuleius possesses the narrative force

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{footnotelist}
\item \textsuperscript{33} Moors (1978), 83-4.
\item \textsuperscript{34} See Eco (2002), 214-9 for further discussion.
\item \textsuperscript{35} It must be noted, however, that Apuleius also employed Greek on occasion (e.g., in quotation in the \textit{Apologia}, in the lost dialogue and hymn to Aesculapius which \textit{Florida} 18 introduces, etc.). Although Apuleius often mentions his fluency in Greek as well as in Latin (\textit{Florida} 9.27-9), what is preserved of his Carthaginian orations in the form of the \textit{Florida} seem to indicate that he chose to address his audience primarily in Latin rather than Greek.
\item \textsuperscript{36} Opeku (1993), 35-6.
\end{footnotelist}
\end{footnotesize}
which allows the dialogue to exist, the audience proves to be an essential element in any rhetorical endeavor, but particularly to Apuleius’ didactic program.

**Breakdown of Chapters**

The following chapters will be devoted to unearthing how Apuleius develops his didactic and dialogic rapport with his audience, specifically within his *exordia* and within the *captationes benevolentiae* in particular. I have chosen to focus this project on *exordia*, believing that Apuleius’ *exordia* are carefully constructed in such a way as to intratextually prepare his audience for the *narrationes* to follow and to intertextually prepare his audience for didactic dialogism. By delving into the persona which Apuleius offers to his audiences’ first impressions, I aim to better understand Apuleius as an orator and philosopher. I proceed with caution as I embark upon what Batstone terms the “veritable industry in ‘programmatic poetry”’ in a recent article on Catullus in which he traces the propagation in recent decades of ‘programmatic’ scholarship.37 Although fully cognizant of the limitations and traps inherent in any given methodology, I embrace Batstone’s challenge to “[r]ead a different poem as programmatic; explore a strange figure of speech or an odd metaphor! Ask it to help you imagine relationship within the corpus that will help you understand the corpus or even yourself more convincingly.”38 And thus I have chosen different fragments from the collection of the *Florida* as a whole which have preserved both the *exordium* and some or all of the following *narrationes* and plan to read them programmatically to examine the way in which Apuleius forges a pedagogical relationship with his audience.

---

37 *L’Année philologique* records 4 instances of ‘programmatic’ in our sense for the decade of the 1970s (none for the 1960s), a total that jumps to 14 in the 1980s and 22 in the 1990s; *Classical Philology* shows a similar pattern with 7 for the 1960s, 12 for the 1970s, 17 for the 1980s, and 41 for the 1990s; likewise, *Classical Review* shows 2 for the 1960s, 21 for the 1970s, 27 for the 1980s, and 55 for the 1990s,” Batstone (2007), 239.

38 Batstone (2007), 251.
Chapter Two will focus on how these introductory passages function within Apuleius’ *Florida*. While the nature of the excerpts and collection is murky, a great number of the fragments can be identified as possible or probable introductions. After a cursory explication of the various theories behind the origins of the *Florida* as it survives today (and the difficulties arising from this lack of context), I intend to focus on select fragments from the *Florida* which seem especially important as introductory passages, including *Florida* 9 (on the philosopher Hippias and the African proconsul Severianus), *Florida* 16 (on Apuleius’ statue and the comedian Philemon), *Florida* 17 (on the proconsul Scipio Orfitus), and *Florida* 18 (on the Carthaginian audience, Protagoras and Thales, and the hymn to Aesculapius). Although I believe that Apuleius’ didactic and dialogic program with the audience plays a role in each and every one of the *Florida*, this project is necessarily limited in scope and there is simply neither the time nor space to fully examine all of the *Florida*. For this reason, I have chosen to focus in the second chapter on those *Florida* which are most likely to have served as true introductions and which allow for an examination of how these themes play out in the succeeding *narrationes*. When analyzing each of these fragments, I shall begin with a full explication of what Apuleius is accomplishing through the *exordium* before moving into how the themes set out for the audience in the beginning can be traced intratextually through the *narratio* which follows. Intertexts will be analyzed as they become relevant, with

---

39 While some of the other fragments (e.g., *Florida* 6 on the gymnosophists or *Florida* 15 on Samos and Pythagoras) are doubtless programmatic and played out certain themes in the *exordia* which preceded them, they are quite unlikely to have served as true introductions to a speech and it would be impossible to treat them as fully and in a similar manner to *Florida* 9, 16, 17, and 18. Yet even fragments such as *Florida* 2, which “begins with an implied reference to something which has gone before (*at non itidem*), indicating that it is not the opening of a speech” (Harrison (2000), 96) show evidence from the very beginning of Apuleius’ Platonism (*meus maior Socrates, Flor. 2.1*) and the inclusive use of the first person plural (*possimus ... caecutimus ... nobis ... nos, Flor. 2.6-7*) which begins Apuleius’ dialogue with his audience. Although these fragments have not “made the cut,” it is not because they do not contribute to a deeper understanding of Apuleius as a philosopher and orator.
particular attention paid to the manner in which they relate to the intratextual themes in Apuleius’ speech and also push the auditor beyond the confines of the topics at hand.

Chapter Three will address the shift that occurs between the *exordium* as a rhetorical performance and the *exordium* become text, as seen specifically in *Florida 1*. While “there is every indication that this passage constitutes the beginning of a speech,” it is now an *exordium* devoid of its *narratio*—it has become an *exordium* without context. While we may infer the ways in which it was programmatic for its original speech, this seems a fruitless task without the body of the text to support such a reading. *Florida 1* serves another important programmatic function, however, within the text of the *Florida* as it survives today: there is no formal *praefatio* to the work, and thus *Florida 1* takes the role by default in being the first fragment in the textualized collection. This puts *Florida 1*—as text versus oration—in a comparable position to the prologue of the *Metamorphoses*, whether the original collection was assembled by Apuleius himself, some later compiler, or even pared down by some subsequent manuscript copier, *Florida 1* was seen fit to introduce the text and invites us to reread and return to it in light of what follows. Consequently, the entirety of *Florida 2* through 23 can almost be read as the accidental *narratio* to this textual incarnation of *Florida 1*. Just as the *exordia* in Chapter Two allowed Apuleius to define his relationship as an orator to the audience, we shall see that *Florida 1* similarly defines Apuleius’ relationship as an author to his readers throughout the text as a whole.

Chapter Four will bring these inquiries to a close, and further meditate upon how the understanding of Apuleius’ scholarly and philosophical, intratextual and intertextual dialogism as outlined in previous chapters provides a cue to both the ancient auditor and the

---

40 Harrison (2000), 95.
modern reader as to how to approach his comprehensive corpus. It is my hope that these readings will allow the modern reader to dialogue with Apuleius in the same manner in which he originally approached his audience.
Chapter Two

The Exordia of the Florida

Sit igitur orator vir talis qualis vere sapiens appellari possit, nec moribus modo perfectus (nam id mea quidem opinione, quamquam sunt qui dissentiant, satis non est), sed etiam scientia et omni facultate dicendi; qualis fortasse nemo adhuc fuerit.

Let our ideal orator then be such as to have a genuine title to the name of philosopher: it is not sufficient that he should be blameless in point of character (for I cannot agree with those who hold this opinion): he must also be a thorough master of the science and the art of speaking, to an extent that perhaps no orator has yet attained.

--Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria* 1.pr.18

Aside from our knowledge that the *Florida* is a collection of epideictic excerpts from Apuleius’ rhetorical works, very little can be said with certainty about the collection as a whole. There is no indication of who compiled the fragments, when this was done, or what the criteria for selection were. Due to ambiguities in the manuscripts, even “the exact number of passages in the collection is a matter of controversy.”

Based on the odd separation of the 23 fragments into four short (and sometimes unnaturally divided) books, Harrison concludes that “[o]ur *Florida* is thus a collection of excerpts itself excerpted from a choice collection,” suggesting that the current book divisions are preserved from the original, fuller collection of excerpts. He also believes that the *Florida*, in its current form, “is

---

1 Hilton (2001), 123.
2 Harrison (2000, 94.)
not itself an Apuleian selection,” although that it was likely excerpted from an originally Apuleian selection.³

Hilton demonstrates the way in which the form of the Florida has ramifications for its literary interpretation: “[t]he argument that the Florida as a whole has a ‘literary unity’ and that the individual passages have ‘thematic links and relations’ has not found general acceptance and appears to be impossible to demonstrate.”⁴ While I do not propose that there is one over-arching interpretation under which all of the Florida can conveniently fit, I do believe that the relationship which Apuleius cultivates with his audience can be seen in most (if not all) of the fragments, and that this dialogism is an important part of Apuleius’ characterization of himself as both an orator and philosopher. While this chapter largely focuses on those few fragments that can be identified as contextualized exordia (Florida 9, 16, 17, and 18), it is important to remember that not every fragment must fit under the label of a προλαλία or exordium in order to be read as introductory or programmatic.

*Florida* 2, for example, “begins with an implied reference to something which has gone before (at non itidem), indicating that it is not the opening of a speech and suggesting that the collection is not composed simply of rhetorical openings.”⁵ But this also signifies that the preserved passage is both a continuation of and break from the previous material. Here Apuleius is ostensibly providing a contrast (“but this is *not* the case with . . .”), and thus this fragment can be said to introduce a new thought, even if it is *not* the introduction to the speech as a whole. Of particular significance is the fact that Apuleius overtly gestures

---

³ Harrison (2000), 132 and 92, respectively.
⁴ Hilton (2001), 128. On the opposing side of this argument, cf. Hunink (2004), who traces certain recurring characteristics of the *persona* developed by the first-person narrator in the *Florida*, such as his piety, literariness, African roots, and cultural prestige.
⁵ Harrison (2000), 96.
towards his philosophical roots; with the phrase *maior mens Socrates* (*Flor.* 2.1), he asserts his claim to philosophy and demonstrates a personal stake in the philosophic question that follows. In short, each fragment is—in its own way—introductory.

As noted, this present study is more interested in the ways in which such introductions engage the auditor and allow the themes with which Apuleius begins a given speech to continue in the body of the speech (intratextuality) and even spiral out into new avenues of thought through inviting contrast with other texts (intertextuality). In my analysis of the fragments which follow, therefore, we shall first thoroughly scrutinize the *exordia* and how Apuleius draws his audience into a dialogue and then we shall explore the manner in which these themes resurface in the *narrationes* and how Apuleius’ intertextuality in turn influences the *exordia* and facilitates philosophical discourse both within and externally to Apuleius’ oratory.

*Florida 9*

In *Florida 9*, Apuleius narrates the exemplum of the sophist Hippias, who displayed great talent and versatility in the material arts, as a foil to discuss his own literary versatility. He then moves into a panegyric for proconsul Severianus (and his son, Honorinus), bridging the two sections with a wish that he could materially present his literary versatility to the proconsul. Harrison notes that it “seems very likely that this piece is the first complete speech to appear in the collection,”6 fragment 16 being the other. Whether fragment 9 is complete or not, we do seem to have a complete *exordium* and some or all of the following speech. The *exordium* to *Florida 9* opens with a reference to any of Apuleius’ critics or rivals who might be in the audience (9.1-5), from which he moves to the pressure he feels due to

---

6 Harrison (2000), 106.
his respect for the audience and their respect for him (9.6-14). It is at this time he moves into the narratio of Hippias, and the exordium likely transitions into the speech proper. The MSS seem to support such a division, as the division between the first and second books occurs between 9.14 and 9.15. While Harrison attributes this somewhat puzzling division in the middle of a continuous piece to “some form of error in the transmission,” it does seem to be the most logical division if a break did have to occur in fragment 9, since 9.15 heralds the end of the exordium and begins the narratio of Hippias. Thus, I shall take 9.1-14 as the exordium as it survives of the speech, which is followed by a narratio concerning Hippias’ workmanship and also a panegyric of the proconsul Severianus and his son. Although the narratio concerning Hippias’ crafts and the panegyric of Severianus may appear to have little in common, Apuleius weaves these various elements together through the themes of imitation and virtue, specifically the representational power of rhetoric. Despite the moral flavor of these themes and the majority of the speech, Apuleius’ use of rhetorical intertexts ([Cicero] and Quintilian) support the rhetorical angle which he, as an orator, both embodies and espouses.

Throughout this fragment, Apuleius equates his oratorical craft with physical craft, and he plays on the antithesis of the two by also opening the exordium to the speech with the theme of imitation and of rivals (Florida 9.1-6):

\textit{Si quis forte in hoc pulcherrimo coetu ex illis invisoribus meis malignus sedet, quoniam, ut in magna civitate, hoc quoque genus inventur, qui meliores obtrectare malint quam imitari et, quorum similitudinem despervit, eorumdem adjecent simulatam, scilicet uti, qui suo nomine obscuri sunt, meo invocant, si quis itur ex illis lividis splendidissimo huic auditorio velut quaedam macula se immiscuit, velim paulisper suos}

---

7 Harrison (2000), 90.
8 Hilton (2001), e.g., hypothesizes that the manuscriptist may have been working with shorter-than-average scrolls which necessitated the split of fragment 9 for the purpose of distributing the text evenly over four scrolls (136).
oculus per hunc incredibilem consessum circumferat contemplatusque frequentiam tantam, quanta ante me in auditorio philosophi numquam visitata est, reputet cum animo suo, quantum periculum conservandae existimationis hic adeat qui contemni non consuevit, cum sit arduum et oppido difficile vel medicae paucorum exspectationi satisfacere, praeertim mibi, cui et ante parta existimatio et vestra de me benigna praesumptio nihil non quicquam sinit neglegenter ac de summo pectore hincere.

If, by any chance, one of those jealous rivals of mine is sitting malevolently in this most splendid assembly—since, as one would expect in a great city, you will come across the type of person who prefers to detract from their betters rather than to follow their example (people who dissemble hatred for those they cannot hope to resemble, men whose own names are not known, but who clearly hope to make their mark through mine)—if, then, any of those spiteful individuals has oozed himself into this auditorium like a sort of stain, I would like him to run his eyes briefly over this amazing audience and, when he has reflected on the size of the crowd, such as has never been seen in the auditorium of a philosopher before me, let him consider how much of a risk a man takes, who is not used to being held in contempt, if he wants to preserve his reputation, since it is hard work and extremely difficult to satisfy even the moderate expectations of a few people. This is especially true for me, since the reputation that I have already won and your kind confidence in me do not allow me to mouth anything I like off the top of my head.

This opening sentence of the speech constitutes nearly half of the *exordium*, and so naturally raises a fair number of points. Firstly, there is the contrast that Apuleius draws between his audience (*pulcherrimo coetu*) and the possible *malignus* spectator from among his *invisores*. While the use of *pulcherrimus* to describe Apuleius’ audience is doubtless a form of flattery directed towards both his audience and himself (“the quality and quantity of the audience reflects, of course, the status of the speaker”), there is also an implicit moral contrast. The term *malignus* “expresses a judgment of character, forming a sharp contrast with the virtue of the ‘illustrious’ audience.” Apuleius will go on to make further moral contrasts within the speech (most noticeably between Hippias and himself), and so the introduction of this theme within the *exordium* is significant. Also significant, as always, is Apuleius’ use of the

---

10 Lee (2005), 102.
term philosophus (9.4) in reference to himself. This, too, will set up a later contrast between himself and Hippias (sophista, 9.15) later in the speech.

Apuleius also defines his relationship to his audience in this opening sentence in demonstrating the mutuality of their existimatio. He demonstrates that he is in possession of existimatio from his audience when mentioning ante parta existimatio et vestra de me benigna praesumptio ("the reputation that I have already won and your kind confidence in me," Florida 9.6), while at the same time implying that he has existimatio for the audience (which, in turn, stems at least in part from the fact that his existimatio is dependent upon them) (Florida 9.5):

quantum periculum conservandae existimationis hic adeat qui contemni non consuet, cum sit arduum et oppido difficile vel modicae paucorum exspectioni satisfacere ("how much of a risk a man takes, who is not used to being held in contempt, if he wants to preserve his reputation, since it is hard work and extremely difficult to satisfy even the moderate expectations of a few people").

Apuleius’ relationship with his audience, then, is one of mutual existimatio: he receives existimatio from his audience, but in order to maintain it, he must necessarily have enough for them to do his job well.

While the use of existimatio and exspectatio in this passage is certainly clever for its word play, it becomes even cleverer as an introduction securing the goodwill of his audience when these verbal echoes are recognized from a passage in the Rhetorica ad Herennium on how an orator is to secure the good will of his audience in his introduction11 (1.8-9):

ab nostra persona benivolentiam contrabemus, si nostrum officium sine adrogantia laudabimus . . . ab adversario persona benivolentia captabitur, si eos in odium, in invidiam, in contentionem adducamus . . . ab auditorum persona benivolentia colligatur, si res eorum fortiter, sapienter, mansuete, magnifice indicatas proferemus; et

11 Cicero, Rhetorica ad Herennium 1.8: benivolos auditores facere quattuor modis possimus: ab nostra, ab adversario nostro, ab auditorum persona, et ab rebus ipsis ("[w]e can by four methods make our hearers well-disposed: by discussing our own person, the person of our adversaries, that of our hearers, and the facts themselves").
From the discussion of our own person we shall secure goodwill by praising our services without arrogance . . . From the discussion of the person of our adversaries we shall secure goodwill by bringing them into hatred, unpopularity, or contempt . . . From the discussion of the person of our hearers goodwill is secured if we set forth the courage, wisdom, humanity, and nobility of past judgements they have rendered, and if we reveal what esteem they enjoy and with what interest their decision is awaited. From the discussion of the facts themselves we shall render the hearer well-disposed by extolling our own cause with praise and by contemptuously disparaging that of our adversaries.

Thus, Apuleius’ captatio benevolentiae utilizes the same vocabulary (existimatio, expectatio) which [Cicero] employs to discuss how ab auditorum persona benivolentia colligitur. Moreover, in this first sentence Apuleius makes use of all four ways recommended in the intertext to secure the good will of his audience: discussing his own reputation as an orator, putting down his adversaries, praising the assembly, and introduction of the topics to come—such as artistry and imitation, which once again returns to the contemptible adversaries and commendable audience. Such allusion to this passage on rhetoric calls attention to Apuleius’ rhetorical craftsmanship, which sets up the later contrast with the Hippias as a craftsman.

These themes of imitation and craft (both rhetorical and material) become explicit in 9.8, when Apuleius describes the way in which his audience judges his performance in language expected of material craft (Florida 9.8): meum vero unumquodque dictum acriter examinatis, sedulo pensiculatis, ad limam et lineam certam redigitis, cum torno et coturno vero comparatis: tantum habet vilitas excusationis, dignitas difficulthis (“[b]ut you examine every word of mine keenly, weigh it carefully, subject it to the file and rule, and compare it with the products of the lathe or productions on the stage. Such is your lenity towards poor ability, such your severity towards true merit’’). The application of this vocabulary to Apuleius’ rhetoric furthers the
analogy to Hippias later in the speech, while simultaneously demonstrating the versatility of rhetorical craft (and the virtuosity of Apuleius’ rhetoric in particular) in appropriating the vocabulary of the material arts.

Apuleius continues to unravel the themes of imitation (both true and false) as he continues in the *exordium*, themes which were first introduced through the rivals seen in the very first sentence of the speech (*Florida* 9.9): *adgnosco igitur difficultatem meam, nec deprecor quin sic existimetis. nec tamen vos parva quaedam et prava similitudo falsos animi habeat, quoniam quaedam, ut saepe dixi, palliata mendicabula obambulant* (‘I therefore acknowledge my difficulty and do not ask you not to think in this way. However, a paltry and faulty likeness should not deceive you, since, as I have often said, certain beggars are prowling about wearing philosophers’ cloaks’). This passage both returns to Apuleius’ opening sentence regarding oratorical rivals and elucidates their inferiority in imitation. This in turn raises questions about the type of oratory in which Apuleius and his rivals engage, and the concatenation of *similitudo* and *falsus* makes this explicit, especially in light of Quintilian’s distinctions between *bonae et malae* (*Inst.* 8.5.19) classes of *sententiarum genera* (8.5.21): *est etiam generis eisdem, nescio an uitiosissimum, quotiens uerborum ambiguitas cum rerum falsa quadam similitudine iungitur* (“ut perhaps the most execrable of all is when ambiguity in the words is joined with something that conveys a false notion as to the matter”). According to Quintilian, false representation of a given matter is one of the worst things that can be accomplished through shoddy oratorical practice, which is often the result of *uerborum ambiguitas*. *Ambiguitas* in turn seems to play upon the ideas of sophistry and the belief that sophistic rhetoric is capable of making the weaker argument the stronger—a parallel which is invited by Apuleius in his introduction of the *palliata*
Thus, Apuleius sets up a contrast between false/imitative philosophers and true philosophers, a distinction which hinges on rhetoric. The use of rhetorical intertexts is particularly appropriate given that the speech addresses (and even advocates) rhetorical art throughout.

The next section of the *exordium* examines the difference in the manner of speaking of the proconsul and his herald, and the permanence of the proconsul’s words in tablets upon leaving his mouth (9.10-12). Apuleius then relates these circumstances to his own rhetoric (*Florida* 9.13): *patior et ipse in meis studiis aliquam pro meo captu similitudinem; nam quodcumque ad vos protuli, exceptum ilico et lectum est, nec revocare illud nec autem mutare nec emendare mibi inde quicquam licet* (“[t]o the extent to which I have any ability, I too suffer some hostility in my work, for whatever piece I have exhibited before you is immediately taken down and read and I may not then recall it nor change it nor correct it at all”). The reiteration of *similitudo* here bears scrutiny, given Apuleius’ concern with true versus false reproduction as seen above; the phrase *patior…aliquam…similitudinem* is a “most unusual phrase that seems to mean ‘I undergo a certain form of copying;’ Apuleius claims his own work is vulnerable to reproduction as text.” That Apuleius can be copied is significant for the theme of imitation and rivalry; that his rhetoric can be rendered as text has important implications for the contrast drawn throughout between material and rhetorical artistry—Apuleius’ art has the potential to become just as physical as the arts of Hippias to be seen below.

In the *exordium* to *Florida* 9, Apuleius thus endeavors to set up a number of contrasts: himself versus rivals, philosophy versus sophistry, and rhetorical versus material artistry. In
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12 Lee (2005) notes that “Apuleius returns to the theme of the *pallium* several times in the *Florida* . . . in all these passages the *pallium* serves as a sign for the philosopher” (80).
13 Lee (2005), 105.
addition to flattering his audience as a *pulcherrimus* crowd, he acknowledges the reciprocity (and even co-dependency) of the orator-auditor relationship and utilizes every means outlined in [Cicero]’s rhetorical handbook to secure their goodwill. The possible intertexts in the *exordium* both tellingly come from rhetorical handbooks, a fact which nicely complements the conceit of rhetorical craft which Apuleius constructs throughout: allusion to and mastery of these rhetorical principles demonstrate his own rhetorical artistry. Moreover, Apuleius also competes with the material arts through subsuming its very vocabulary.

The speech proper which follows this *exordium* continues to develop these themes of sophistry versus philosophy, material versus rhetorical art, and imitation, most explicitly through the clear contrast between Apuleius and Hippias which is established from Apuleius’ first words concerning Hippias (*Florida* 9.15): *et Hippias e numero sophistarum est* (“Hippias was one of the Sophists”). *Sophista* is a word which Apuleius never uses to describe himself, preferring instead the label of *philosophus* (9.4). This sets the stage for further contrasts between the two characters which are to follow. Apuleius sets the scene for the *narratio* by noting that (*Florida* 9.16): *venit Hippias iste quondam certamine Olympio Pisam, non minus cultu visendus quam elaboratu mirandus* (“[t]his Hippias once came to Pisa at the time of the Olympic games, equally worth seeing for his dress and admiring for its elaboration”). This is the point at which Apuleius first intimates that Hippias’ exertions may be slightly misplaced, as he appears to put as much effort into his physical presentation (*cultu*) as he does into his intellectual presentation (*elaboratu*). Although *cultus* can be meant “not only as
‘grooming’ but also as ‘education’ or ‘refinement’ of rhetorical style,” Apuleius certainly seems to emphasize the more physical definition as he continues to discuss Hippias’ dress in greater detail (Florida 9.18-23):

For clothing he wore an inner tunic of very fine texture, triple thread, and double-dyed purple (he had woven it for himself alone at home). For fastening he wore a belt decorated with wonderful colours like a Babylonian painting (and nobody helped him in this either). For covering he wore a white cloak, which he wore thrown over the rest (I understand that the cloak too was his own handiwork). Furthermore he had stitched together his own sandals to protect his feet, and he also sported a gold ring with a clever design on his left hand (he himself had circled the roundel of the ring and had beveled the bezel and chiseled the jewel). I have not told you everything yet. For I will not be ashamed to mention what he was not shy of showing off: he stated in a large gathering that he had also made himself an oil flask which he carried about him, in the shape of a lentil, with a smooth cover, compact and round, and next to it a fine, miniature body-scraper, with a straight tapering tip, and with a flexible hollowing of the tongue, so that it lay comfortably in the hand at the handle and so that the sweat would run from it in a stream.

Lee and Marangoni both note that this description is a close reworking of the depiction of Hippias in Plato’s Hippias Minor (368a-369a), but that the order of the crafts has been changed and that Apuleius has elaborated upon their descriptions to some extent. Naturally, it is significant whenever a self-proclaimed philosophus Platonicus utilizes a character or exemplum previously found in Plato. Apuleius starts with Hippias’ tunic, which is strikingly luxurious, especially when compared to the usual pallium of the philosopher.

14 Lee (2005), 106.
15 Lee (2005), 97; Marangoni (2000), 22-3; Lee (2005), 97.
Included in the list of extravagant attire is indeed the usual *pallium candidum*, but the least number of words are expended on the description of this article and it seems lost in the middle of the narration of Hippias’ other, more splendid adornments. The mention of the *pallium* being *superne* also suggests that while this outer covering gives Hippias the look of a philosopher, the similarity is a mere illusion which is easily dispelled with the removal of the cloak and revelation of the splendor underneath.

As Apuleius continues to list the more opulent items of Hippias’ wardrobe, he curiously adds that *non pigebit me commemorare quod illum non puditum est ostentare, qui magno in coetu praedicavit fabricatum semet sibi* (*Florida*, 9.22). Apuleius’ assertion that he will not be ashamed to recall the way in which Hippias was not embarrassed to show off in front of a crowd implies that Hippias ought to have actually been embarrassed. The use of *coetu* mirrors Apuleius’ reference to his own audience (*coetu*) in 9.1, making more explicit both the similarity in their performance and the divergence in what precisely each offers his audience.

The fact that “the description of Hippias’ artifacts uses a series of adjectives that are also stylistic and technical terms from rhetoric: *rutunditas, clausula* (a reading from the ‘vulgate’), *sudor, daedalum, suppellectilis,*” also heightens the sense of contrast: although Hippias’ artifacts can be described using the vocabulary of a rhetor, his artifacts themselves—while impressive—do not afford him the rhetorical skill which would be expected of him as a sophist. We saw in the *exordium*, however, that Apuleius’ rhetorical utilization of technical vocabulary enables him to compete with Hippias’ craftsmanship, and his *ekphrasis* of Hippias’ crafts allows him to excel in both arts whereas Hippias fails as a rhetorician.

Apuleius makes this contrast explicit when he adds that (*Florida* 9.24-6):

---

16 Lee (2005), 99.
Who will not praise a man skilled in so many arts, distinguished by such extensive knowledge, and like a Daedalus in his skill with so many tools? Yes, I too laud Hippias, but I would prefer to rival the fecundity of his genius in matters of learning than his store of various household utensils. I confess, indeed, that I am not particularly skilled in the manufacturing arts; that I buy my clothes at a clothes shop and order these slippers from a shoe shop; that I wear no ring and do not value gems and gold more than lead and pebbles; that I procure my strigil, flask, and other bath utensils at the market.

Apuleius’ use of the verb *aemulari* when describing his relationship to Hippias is significant in that it calls upon the themes of imitation and depiction which were introduced earlier, especially with reference to Apuleius’ own rivals. Within this passage, Apuleius also develops the contrast between Apuleius’ and Hippias’ respective creative geniuses. I have already mentioned that Apuleius’ “craft” through this speech is an elaborate *ekphrasis* of both Hippias and the many fine material arts which Hippias himself has created. In this way, Apuleius as the rhetor trumps Hippias as the more physical artist, and Apuleius demonstrates his own, more literary versatility after his thorough exposition of Hippias’ material artistry (*Florida* 9.27-9):

I confess that I prefer to refresh with my one reed poetry of all kinds suitable for epic, lyric, comedy or tragedy, also satires and riddles, similarly diverse accounts of things and also orations praised by eloquent men and dialogues celebrated by philosophers. And just as I produce these and others of that kind in Greek, so I produce them in Latin, with like love, equal enthusiasm, and similar style.
This versatility recalls Apuleius’ mention of Hippias’ *studia varia* in 9.15, but Apuleius has built a case for the superiority of his own literary versatility over the more material artistry of Hippias, and the very nature of the speech itself stands testament to this. The *narratio* of Hippias thus serves as confirmation of Apuleius’ description of himself as a *philosophus* in the *exordium* through contrast with the sophist figure, while also allowing Apuleius to continue to develop the themes of literary craft which were introduced in the *exordium* through various rhetorical intertexts.

From the comparison of Hippias’ and his own artistic talent and versatility, Apuleius moves into the panegyric of Severianus. He cleverly bridges the Hippias and Severianus sections of the speech through a wish that he could present Severianus with a material manifestation of his works, reminding us of Hippias’ material arts (*Florida* 9.30): *quate utinam possem equidem non singillatim ac discretim, sed cunctim et coacervatim tibi, proconsul [ut] optime, offerre ac praedicabili testimonio tuo ad omnem nostram Camenam frui!* (“I wish I could present to you all my literary efforts, excellent proconsul, not individually and separately, but all together in one heap, and to enjoy the glory of your approval of them!”). The use of *Camena* here is reminiscent of the Camenae Apuleius had referenced previously when introducing the comparison between Hippias and himself (9.14). Thus the imagined materiality of his own corpus again plays with the contrast between the arts of Hippias and the speech which Apuleius now presents to the proconsul.

After again asserting his philosophical roots at 9.33 (*sed philosophia me docuit . . .*), Apuleius again returns to the theme of imitation, but this time with a more philosophical angle. Apuleius’ encomium of the proconsul plays with the philosophical side of imitation, in that Severianus is laudable for the virtues which he himself is able to teach by example
(Florida 9.35): quis enim a te non amet discere quanam moderatione obtineri queat tua ista gravitas
incunda, mitis austeritas, placida constantia blandusque vigor? (“[f]or who is not delighted to learn
from you the self-control by which your cheerful earnestness, mild austerity, quiet firmness,
and friendly energy may be won?”). The moderatio which Severianus is able to teach (discere)
sets up a parallel with Apuleius’ own characterization of himself in the exordium, as he
previously informed the audience that his reputation did not allow him neglegenter ac de summo
pectore bocrine (Florida 9.6). The audiences’ expectations of Apuleius, then, have also led him to
learn quanam moderation obtineri, and this moderation he in turn models for his audience.
Apuleius is allowed to instruct his audience in the moderation which they themselves have
taught him, and thus both Apuleius and Severianus are presented as public exemplars and
instructors of virtue.

In addition to his praise of Severianus, Apuleius also praises his son, Honorinus, for
his emulation of his father’s virtues (Florida 9.36 and 38):

nemo similiorem virtute filium adduxit . . .
paterna in filio aequitas, senilis in iuvene [auctoritas] prudentia, consularis in legato auctoritas, prorsus
omnis virtutes tuas ita effingit ac repraesentat, ut medius fidius admirabilior esset in iuvene quam in te parta
laus, nisi eam tu talem dedisses (“[n]o one has brought with him a son more like himself in
virtue. . . . There was in the son the fairness of the father, in the youth the prudence of the
old man, in the legate the authority of the consul. Yes, so well does he represent and reflect
all your good qualities, that truly the praise won by your son would be more admirable than
your own, if it were not that you had given it to him”). The phrase virtutes tuas effingit ac
repraesentat “depicts the practice of virtue as a process of representation and reproduction.”17

This ties Honorinus’ emulation of his father back to the themes of emulation and

17 Lee (2005), 112.
representation which Apuleius introduced earlier in the speech when he mentioned his rivals and all of the creations of Hippias. Through this contrast, Apuleius seems to imply that there are virtuous and less virtuous classes of imitation and that Honorinus, in emulating his father’s virtues, engages in those more virtuous acts of emulation.

The phrasing in Apuleius’ commendation of Honorinus’ emulation also introduces another rhetorical intertext, ironically from Quintilian’s writings regarding emulation (Inst. 10.2.15): *nec uero saltem iis quibus ad euitanda uitia iudicii satis fuit sufficiat imaginem virtu et salam, ut ita dixerim, cutem* (“and even those who have sufficient critical acumen to avoid the faults of their models will not find it sufficient to produce a copy of their merits, amounting to no more than a superficial resemblance”). This passage comes in the midst of Quintilian’s discussion of how rhetors ought to relate to the works of their predecessors. While imitation of the admirable is admirable, it is not enough; Quintilian feels that unreflective emulation falls flat, and thus cautions that *ergo primum est ut quod imitaturus est quisque intellegat, et quare bonum sit sciat* (“consequently it is of the first importance that every student should realise what it is that he is to imitate, and should know why it is good,” Inst. 10.2.18). In praising Honorinus’ successful imitation of his father’s virtues, then, Apuleius appears to be not only commending him for the act of imitation but also for the thoughtful process that successful imitation requires. While Hippias’ representations were physical and manual, Honorinus’ physical representation of his father’s virtues requires philosophical reflection. Additionally, the use of another rhetorical intertext allows Apuleius to tie virtuous emulation back to the principles of rhetoric introduced earlier. Apuleius’ own rhetorical representations of Hippias, Severianus, and Honorinus are all carefully crafted to complement philosophical themes about the very nature of craft itself.
Apuleius thus weaves throughout both *exordium* and *narratio* themes regarding imitation and representation. The layers of representation appear to amplify throughout, as Apuleius first represents his rivals, who represent him in attacking his speech, which is apparently even a step below imitation (*qui meliores obtrectare malint quam imitari*, “who prefers to detract from their betters rather than to follow their example,” *Florida* 9.2); Hippias, who is representing through his physical crafts; and Honorinus, who is representing his father through replicating his lived virtues. Thus, Apuleius represents for his audience through his speech representations which are not to be emulated (the poor imitations of rivals), representations which are admirable and deserving of praise but do not measure up to those which require philosophical reflection (the material crafts of Hippias), and truly virtuous representations (those of Severianus, Honorinus, and Apuleius) through literature and words or even life itself—especially its virtues. Even Apuleius’ use of intertextuality embodies the spirit of representation which Apuleius espouses through demonstrating mastery of rhetoric and the ability to recycle rhetorical principles in an innovative and crafty metarhetorical manner. The fact that all of the intertexts in this fragment are from rhetorical works is particularly significant given the emphasis throughout the speech on rhetorical craft, especially as read against the figure of Hippias. In this fragment—both thematically and rhetorically—Apuleius creates for his audience an illustration of the very themes he illustrates throughout regarding the philosophy and virtues of representation.
In Florida 16, Apuleius delivers a speech of thanks to the people of Carthage and Aemilianus Strabo for an honorary statue. The speech also serves as an apology for Apuleius’ delay in speaking, since—similarly to the Greek comedian Philemon’s missed performance due to his untimely death—he has been out of commission due to an injury. The speech is undoubtedly introductory in nature, as it opens with prinsquam ... occipiam, indicating that in all likelihood nothing preceded the opening lines of this fragment as they currently survive. Furthermore, Hilton and Harrison agree that this fragment “has every appearance of being a complete composition.” The exordium to this speech is quite short (16.1-5), especially given that this is the longest fragment in the Florida. The exordium offers the people of Carthage both Apuleius’ thanks and also his apologies before transitioning into the narratio of Philemon, whose story is told in such a way as to closely parallel that of Apuleius. Through this comparison, Apuleius ensures that the themes of thanksgiving and the close relationship between literature (or philosophy) and life which are introduced in the exordium will prove significant throughout the speech. The use of philosophical intertexts (Plato and Seneca) throughout the narratio develops this link through infusing Apuleius’ own literary endeavors with philosophic sentiment.

Apuleius begins the speech with a direct address to an audience he identifies as the Carthaginian elite (principes Africæ viri), thanking them for decreeing a statue in his honor and indicating that he would like to provide his excuse for not speaking to them sooner (Florida 16).

---

18 Lee (2005) mentions with respect to Apuleius’ claim in 16.46 that he had received statues in other cities that “IL_A 2115, an inscription honoring a Platonic philosopher found on a statue base at Madauros, may substantiate Apuleius’ claim: [Ph]ilosopho [Pl]atonico [Ma]daurense[s] cius / ornamenti[s] suo d(ecreto) d(ecurionum) p(ecunia) ([p]ublica)” (145).
16.1): priusquam vobis occipiam, principes Africae viri, gratias agere ob statuam, quam nibi prae senti
boneste postulastis et absenti benigne decrevisti, prius volo causam vobis allegare, cur aliquam multos dies a
conspectu auditorii aferim (“before I begin, chief citizens of Africa, to thank you for the
statue, which you honourably proposed for me in my presence, and which you kindly
decided on in my absence, I wish first to explain the reason why I have not appeared in this
hall for quite a few days . . .”). Lee seems sure that such an address indicates that the speech
must have been delivered in the Carthaginian senate, arguing that otherwise it would have
been addressed to the citizens in general.²⁰ If it is true that this speech is being delivered for
the Carthaginian senators, this would indicate a very different audience than the crowd
largely composed of the “relatively uneducated if not illiterate laity of Carthage”²¹ whom he
was accustomed to address. Consequently, we might expect to see even more of the
intertexts and allusions (specifically of a philosophical nature) than Apuleius is accustomed
to employ in other of the Florida; our expectations are in fact not disappointed with allusions
to the philosophical writings of Plato and Seneca later in the exordium and in the narratio.

After his appeal to the Carthaginian elite, the exordium continues with Apuleius
providing the rationale behind the urgency he feels to excuse his recent absence (Florida
16.3): quippe ita institui omne vitae meae tempus vobis probare, quibus me in perpetuum firmiter dedicavi:
nibil tantum, nihil tantulum faciam, quin eius vos et gnaros et indices habeam (“for as a matter of
principle I wish you, to whom I have firmly committed myself for all time, to approve of the
whole course of my life. I will never do anything, anything at all, without your knowledge
and approval”). In offering his life for the approval of the people of Carthage (vobis probare),

²⁰ Lee (2005), 149.
²¹ Bradley (2005), 19.
Apuleius attempts to demonstrate the reciprocity of his relationship with the present audience: in return for the dedication of a statue (and implicit approval), he dedicates himself to their continued approval. Although such sentiments doubtless serve as a *captatio benevolentiae*, there is also a deeper philosophical dimension to this statement:

His excuse of absence is given to justify himself in the eyes of his audience, whom he presents as continual witnesses of his civic dedication (16.3). This notion has evident affinities with the Socratic idea of the philosopher’s life as wholly open to scrutiny, both by himself and by his city, but also shows Apuleius largely based at Carthage rather than pursuing the semi-permanent travels typical of some contemporary Greek sophists.²²

Thus, there are two significant points to Apuleius’ statement. Firstly, his relative fixedness in Carthage—especially when compared to his more itinerant sophistic contemporaries—could serve as an argument in favor of a more ‘philosophical’ lifestyle in the manner of Plato, who himself was likely to have travelled (as Apuleius did to Athens and Rome) before settling in Athens. Secondly, there is the matter of the openness of the philosopher’s life, for which Harrison refers the reader to Plato’s *Apology* (32a-b):²³

> ἀλλ’ ἔγω διὰ παντὸς τοῦ βίου δημοσία τε εἰ πού τι ἔπραξα τουσίτος 
> φανούμαι, καὶ ἵδια ὁ αὐτὸς ὁδός, οὐδὲν πώποτε συγχωρήσας οὐδὲν 
> παρά τὸ δίκαιον οὔτε ἄλλῳ οὔτε τούτων οὐδενὶ οὔς δὴ διαβάλλειτε 
> ἐμεφῳ ἐμοίς μαθητας εἴναι. ἐγὼ δὲ διδάσκαλος μὲν οὐδενὸς πώποτ' 
> ἐγγούμην· εἰ δὲ τίς μου λέγοντος καὶ τὰ ἐμαυτὸν πράττοντος ἐπιθυμοὶ 
> ἄκουεν, εἰτε νεώτερος εἰτε πρεσβύτερος, οὐδὲν πώποτε ἐφόνησα, 
> οὐδὲ χρήματα μὲν λαμβάνων διαλέγομαι μὴ λαμβάνων δὲ οὐ, ἀλλ’ 
> ὁμοίως καὶ πλουσίως καὶ πένητα παρέχο ἐμαυτὸν ἐφοταν, καὶ ταὶς 
> βουλήται ἀποκρίνουμενος ἄκουεν ὅπως ἐν λέγω, καὶ τούτων ἐγὼ είτε τίς 
> χρηστὸς γίνεται εἰτε μή, οὐκ ἐν δικαιῶς τὴν αἰτίαν ὑπέχωμι, ὅπως 
> ὑπερήφανον μηδέν μηδὲν πώποτε μάθημι μήτε ἐδίδαξα· εἰ δὲ τίς φησὶ 
> παρ’ ἐμοὶ πώποτε τί μαθεῖν ἢ ἄκουεις ἱδία ὅτι μή καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι πάντες, 
> εἰ ἴστε ὅτι οὐκ ἀληθὴ λέγει.

But you will find that through all my life, both in public, if I engaged in any public activity, and in private, I have always been the same as now, and have never yielded to any one wrongly, whether it were any other person or any of those who are said by my traducers to be my pupils. But

²³ Harrison (2000), 120 n. 104.
I was never any one’s teacher. If any one, whether young or old, wishes to hear me speaking and pursuing my mission, I have never objected, nor do I converse only when I am paid and not otherwise, but I offer myself alike to rich and poor; I ask questions, and whoever wishes may answer and hear what I say. And whether any of them turns out well or ill, I should not justly be held responsible, since I never promised or gave any instruction to any of them; but if any man says that he ever learned or heard anything privately from me, which all the others did not, be assured that he is lying.

In the public performances he stages in Carthage, Apuleius presents himself to the people of Carthage as one who, like Socrates, is able to be seen by whoever (young or old) wishes to hear him speak while he is going about his business (τὰ ἐμαυτὸν πράττοντος). Like Socrates (and later Plato, with his Academy), Apuleius is also more philosophical and less sophistic in the manner in which he freely offers his instruction to all who wish to hear him speak. Thus, within this short *exordium* Apuleius accomplishes a careful characterization of himself as a philosopher to the people of Carthage (which in turn serves to invite his audience to see themselves as his pupils) as well as prepares the crowd for the upcoming *narratio* by introducing the trope of the affiliation between life and performance.

Apuleius next transitions to the *narratio* of how Philemon’s death led him to miss a recitation, which parallels his own recent injury and absence from the stage (*Florida* 16.5):

exemplum eius rei paulo secus simillimum memorabo, quam improvisa pericula hominibus subito oboriantur, de Philemone comico (“I will relate a virtually identical example of how unexpected dangers suddenly confront people— that of the comic writer, Philemon”). Harrison takes issue with some of the particulars of Apuleius’ rendition of the events which follow, specifically Apuleius’ identification of Philemon as a poet of Middle Comedy[^24] and the fact that

[^24]: Harrison (2000) states that “Apuleius’ own knowledge of Philemon seems to be tralatician and garbled: he identifies him as a poet of the Middle Comedy rather than the New (16.6 *mediae comicæ scriptor*), while his literary comments on the writer (16.7-8) are conventional commonplaces very likely borrowed from another source” (117). Lee (2005) offers a persuasive alternative interpretation to Apuleius’ statement: “*medius* here...
“Apuleius has not chosen the usual version of Philemon’s end, found for example in Lucian (Macr. 25), in which Philemon dies of excessive laughter, as befits a comic poet.” He further adds that Apuleius’ narrative is similar to “that of Aelian in his lost Πεπὶ Προφοιας, in which Philemon died in his sleep after finishing a play and seeing a vision of the Muses (not the book in Philemon’s hand in Apuleius’ version—16.15).”

It is significant to note, however, that Aelian was not born until nearly the time of Apuleius’ death; therefore, Apuleius’ retelling appears to be entirely his own invention, and perhaps is not merely the result of what Harrison labels a “garbled” understanding of Philemon’s biography. Instead, I believe that Apuleius has carefully narrated the story of Philemon to suit the program of demonstrating the textual nature of life as introduced previously in the exordium.

Apuleius’ narration of Philemon takes on two parts—a discussion de ingenio and de interitu of Philemon—following the audience’s purported response to Apuleius’ question (Florida 16.5): de ingenio eius qui satis nostis, de interitu paucis cognoscite. an etiam de ingenio paucis vultis? (“[y]ou are familiar with his genius, but now hear a few words about his death. Or do you want me to say a few words about his genius also?”). Any involvement of the audience—even if feigned for rhetorical purposes—is an acknowledgment of the relationship between audience and rhetor, which happens to be the precise relationship Apuleius is commemorating in this speech in which he is thanking his audience for their support in the form of a commemorative statue. Apuleius’ success as a rhetor is dependent perhaps ‘mediocre’ (in comparison to Menander), surely chosen for its sonority with comoediae” (149). Even if Apuleius did misreport the period in which Philemon wrote, Apuleius has been known to misquote (or misrepresent quotes—cf. especially his mistaken context for his allusion to Vergil and his misrepresentation of Plautus’ quotation in DDS 11). Such lapses of memory are wholly understandable and ought not to detract from the importance of what Apuleius is actually trying to convey.

26 Harrison (2000), 117.
upon his audience, and such an appeal to the audience gestures towards this understanding, even if it strikes us as a mere formality.

The story of Philemon—especially as Apuleius tells it—takes on a very literary focus, to the extent that it seems as though “it is the narrative itself that Apuleius offers in return for the statue (or, an inducement to the second).”\(^{27}\) Thus, speech becomes a service offered in exchange for Apuleius’ own commemoration by his audience. There are a number of parallels which arise between the speech-giving Philemon and the speech-giving Apuleius, but Apuleius’ manipulation of the figure of Philemon suggests that he has something more up his sleeve than merely trying to flatter himself through comparison with a celebrity. This seems especially true in light of the fact that “[t]here is no evidence that the plays of New Comedy were ever recited solo by the poet in an auditorium; Philemon’s declamatory performance is likely to be invented in order to aid the analogy between Philemon and Apuleius as great performers of literary quality.”\(^{28}\) Thus, it would appear that Apuleius is less concerned with the comparison for the sake of celebrity, and more interested in how he can draw out the parallels between his and Philemon’s respective performances, both literary and lived.

This performative aspect is emphasized through the amount of detail which Apuleius devotes to describing the audience’s anticipation of the second half of Philemon’s reading, particularly given the parallel in the attention Apuleius pays in building his own relationship with the audience in the *exordium* of this fragment (*Florida* 16.11-13):

\[
\text{postridie igitur maximo studio ingens hominum frequentia convenere; seque quisque ex adversum quam proxime collocat; serus adveniens amicis adnuit, locum sesui importiant; extimus quisque ex cuneati queruntur; farto toto theatro, ingens stipatio,}
\]

\(^{27}\) Lee (2005), 147.
\(^{28}\) Harrison (2000), 118.
Apuleius appears to be providing his audience with a model of what precisely it means to be a good audience. Although Apuleius takes great care to describe the size of the audience, what is even more notable about this particular audience is the level of interest and investment had for the performance: life is happening in the audience (people are complaining to each other and beckoning to friends), they are dialoguing and asking each other what has happened (pecontari), and in the end everyone is excited about the coming performance (sequentia exspectare). In already complementing his own crowd for being such a good audience (hoc splendidissimo conspectu uestro, 16.4), Apuleius seems to be indicating to his audience the level to which he holds them—which is both a compliment and a challenge—as well as instructing them in the best method by which to gain something from his performance. In performing what it is that the audience should be doing (essentially living the performance), Apuleius continues to blur the distinction between life and literature seen throughout this speech.

This conceit is continued when Philemon’s most eager audience members (ex promptioribus, 16.14) attempt to track Philemon down and end up finding another performance of sorts (Florida 16.15): commodum ille anima edita obrigerat, iacebatque incumbens.
toro, similis cogitanti: adhuc manus volumini implexa, adhuc os recto libro impressus, sed enim iam animae vacuus, libri oblitus et auditorii secures (“[h]e had just gone rigid after breathing his last and lay resting on his elbow on the bed as if thinking. His hand still held his place in the scroll, his face still pressed against the outspread text, but he was already lifeless, unaware of the book, and unconcerned about his audience”). Apuleius stresses the literary nature of Philemon’s death by describing his body “intertwined with the book, and has become a part of it.”

Just as Apuleius mentioned in the exordium that his life as a rhetor is open to his audience and he conflates the literary and the physical in trading literary depictions for sculpted ones, so does the story of Philemon identify the physical and the literary in this interlacing of the poet’s bodily corpus with his literary corpus. The spectacle is given a greater performative flair through the reaction of Philemon’s literary audience as the audience of his death (Florida 16.16): *stetere paulisper qui introierant, perculsi tam inopinatae rei, tam formosae mortis miraculo* (“[t]hose who had entered stood still awhile, struck with wonder at so unexpected an event, so beautiful a death”).

The concept of a ‘beautiful death’ introduces another possible philosophical intertext in the form of Seneca’s *Naturales Quaestiones*, in which Seneca reflects on the fascination with which people watch the changing colors of a dying mullet (3.18.4): *nihil est moriente formosius* (“there is nothing more beautiful than a dying [mullet]”). The thought that dying is fair calls to mind certain of Socrates’ sentiments in the works of both Plato and Xenophon that philosophy is preparation for death. While the spectators in both Apuleius and Seneca witness a *formosa mors*, Seneca condemns the spectators of the dying mullet as *gulosi* (*non sunt*...
ad popinam dentibus et ventre et ore contenti; oculis quoque gulosi sunt, “[t]hese drivellers are not satisfied to bring teeth, and palate, and stomach to the revel; they make their very eyes partners in their gluttony,” 3.18.7), while Philemon’s spectators do not seem gulosi. Seneca’s spectators are feasting their eyes in addition to their stomachs; while Philemon’s death may be theatrical, his is also an embodiment of the literary and thus a much more worthy object of intellectually gulosi spectators. The philosophical nature itself of the intertexts within this speech stands testament to the nexus existing between literature and philosophy, and thus the conflation between life and literature which Apuleius builds becomes also a statement about the relationship of life to philosophy.

The parallel between life and literature is strengthened through Apuleius’ explanation of how Philemon’s body and his body of work are both treated similarly upon his death (Florida 16.18): 

proin, quoniam poeta optimus personam vitae deposuerit, recta de auditorio eins exequeus eundum, legenda eins esse nunc ossa, mox carmina (“And that since this excellent poet had laid aside his role in life, everyone should go to his funeral straight from the auditorium; and that his bones should now be collected, and then his poems”). While Philemon’s own physical remains are collected/read first, his physical works are collected/read very soon afterward. This conflation of remains being either collected or read (legenda) merely furthers Apuleius’ analogy between literature and life through the equation of the physical with the literary corpus.

After having made explicit through the narrative of Philemon the relationship existing between literature and life which was introduced in the exordium, Apuleius returns to the parallels between Philemon’s and his own situations (Florida 16.19): 

haec ego ita facta, ut commemoravi, olim didiceram, sed bodie sum e meo periculo recordatus (“I learnt long ago that these
events happened as I have said; but today I have been reminded of them by my own hazard”). The equation of Apuleius with Philemon and of the physical with the literary becomes very clear when Apuleius describes his own twisted ankle and the physical/literary results (Florida 16.22): *inde acerbus dolor intestinorum coortus modico ante sedatus est, quam me denique violentus exanimaret et Philemonis ritu compelleret ante letum abire quam lectum, potius implere fata quam fanda, consummare potius animam quam historiam* (“next an acute pain of the intestines began, which eased off just before it finished me off with its virulence, and forced me, like Philemon, to be dead before I had read, to meet my death rather than my deadline, to come to my end rather than the end of my story”). The word play in this passage serves “to conceptually intertwine life and literature,” which is very similar to the treatment of Philemon’s corpse and his book earlier in the narratio.

Following Apuleius’ story about the death of Philemon and his exploration of the narrative’s many parallels to his own situation is what Harrison characterizes as “a somewhat ‘philosophical’ passage on the ethics of asking for, receiving, and giving thanks for gifts (16.25-8). The flavour here is very much that of Roman theoretical debates on benefits and gratitude.” Apuleius claims that, as difficult a task as it is, he will endeavor to thank the people of Carthage *dum memor ipse mei, dum spiritus hos regit artus* (“While I am conscious, while I breathe and control my body,” Flor. 16.33). Hilton and Lee both note that this is a direct quotation of Vergil *Aeneid* 4.336. While it doubtless serves as a learned quotation and a hyperbolic declaration of his gratitude, Apuleius’ use of intertexts is rarely so simple. This

---

31 The analogy seems particularly apt when it is considered that “in the second century A.D. Athens awarded Philemon a statue, whose base is preserved in *LA* 4266” (Lee, 147).
32 Lee (2005), 153.
33 Harrison (2000), 119. Harrison refers the reader to such passages as Cicero *Off.* 2.52-71 and Seneca *De Ben.* 2.18-25 for similar passages (119, n. 100).
34 Hilton (2001), 162 n. 91; Lee (2005), 154-5.
quotation comes from the passage in which Aeneas explains his destiny and departure to Dido (Vergil, *Aeneid* 4.335-7): nec me meminisse pigebit Elissae dum memor ipse mei, dum spiritus hos regit artus. pro re pauca loquar (“[n]or shall my memory of Elissa be bitter, while I have memory of myself, and while breath governs these limbs. For my conduct few words will I say . . .”).

Aeneas claims that he will always have pleasant memories of the Carthaginian queen, and wishes to explain his departure (much as Apuleius wishes to explain his recent absence to the people of Carthage). This quotation and its suitably parallel context may well have been recognizable to Apuleius’ audience, especially since “[t]his book of the *Aeneid* was particularly popular with Carthaginian readers.”

Such a quotation serves a purpose similar to that of a *captatio benevolentiae* in serving to delight his audience, but like Apuleius’ *narratio* of Philemon above, this too is a literary gesture as repayment for the statue which Carthage has granted him.

Declarations of thanks to Carthage are followed by thanks to Aemilianus Strabo for his personal support in securing the statue (16.34-5), his personal friendship (16.36-7), and for his promise to erect a statue in Apuleius’ honor at his own private expense (16.39). Apuleius’ response demonstrates how flattered he is by Aemilianus Strabo’s generosity (*Florida* 16.39): quid igitur superest ad honoris mei tribunal et columen, ad laudis meae cumulum? immo enimvero, quid superest? (“[w]hat greater elevation and height does my rank need, or what is missing from the crown of my glory?”). Through this flattery of Strabo, Apuleius also manages to use his words and literary prowess to flatter himself. Firstly, the phrase *ad honoris mei tribunal et columen* is “visually suggesting an equivalence between the dais of a magistrate

---

Lee (2005), 154.
and Apuleius’ own honor.” The visual equivalence which Apuleius describes suggests an equality between the two men, as does Apuleius’ personal friendship with Strabo and their shared background as fellow students (Flor. 16.36-7). Although they are of very different political rank, their equality in education (demonstrated in such phrases as a commilitio studiorum eisdem magistris, 16.36; condiscipulum, 16.37; and ex pari, 16.37) seems to imply (at least to the literary-minded Apuleius) near equality in other respects. In this respect, too, Apuleius blurs the line between literature and life.

Apuleius closes this fragment (and possible the entire speech) with a final appeal to the Carthaginian senators and the implied exchange of a liber conscriptus for the dedicatio statuae meae (Florida 16.47-8):

sed de hoc tum ego perfectius, cum vos effectus. quin etiam tibi, nobilitas senatorum, claritudo civium, dignitas amicorum, mox ad dedicationem statuae meae libro etiam conscripto, plenius gratias canam eique libro mandabo, uti per omnis provincias est totoque abhinc orbe totoque abhinc tempore laudes benefacti tui ubique gentium, semper annorum repraesentet.

But on this issue I will be more proficient when you are more efficient. Furthermore for you, noble senators, famous citizens, worthy friends, I will also soon intone my thanks more fully in a piece written for the dedication of my statue; and I will instruct that book to go through all the province, and to advertise my praises of your benefaction in every other place throughout the whole world and to continue to do so for all time to come.

---

36 Lee (2005), 156.
37 The phrase ad cumulum laudis suggests another possible intertext with Valerius Maximus’ Facta et Dicta Memorabilia (8.7.pr): Quid cessit uire industrias commemorare, cuius alae spiritu militiae stipendia roborantur, foris gloria ascendit, fido sinu cuncta studia recepta nutruntur, quidquid animo, quidquid manu, quidquid lingua admirabile est, ad cumulum laudis perducitur? quae cum sit perfectissima nitus, duramento sui confirmatur (“But why do I delay to record the power of Diligence? By her active spirit military service is fortified, civilian glory fired, all studies are received in her faithful bosom and nourished, whatever is admirable in mind, hand, or tongue is brought to the acme of excellence. By diligence virtue even at its most perfect is confirmed through a hardening of itself”). What follows in this section of Valerius Maximus (De Studio et Industria) is the exemplum of Cato the Elder, who Graecis litteris erudiri concepisti, quam sero (8.7.1) and eloquentia magnum gloriæ partam habet (8.7.1). Apuleius’ use of this intertext could also be seen to suggest that academic pursuit is as valid a means to influence as politics, again bringing Apuleius to near equal rank with the likes of Strabo and Cato the Elder. This argument, too, fits into Apuleius’ message throughout this speech about the fine line between literature and life, and would also serve to infuse Apuleius didactic speeches with a new power and urgency.
As with the narratio above, Apuleius here offers yet another literary incarnation of thanks to the people of Carthage in exchange for the statue they have erected in his honor. Harrison rightly notes the familiar trope of the wandering book, but also the subtle variation employed by Apuleius in which his book wanders about praising the addressee instead of the author. Apuleius’ departure from the norm of whom the book praises is significant, and definitely underscores the relationship Apuleius has built with his audience and with the city of Carthage throughout the speech. Through this request, Apuleius does still gain the praise that Horace and Ovid seek, but (as Apuleius depicts it) his will come from the statue erected in exchange for the book rather than through the book itself (which is instead intended to result in the praise of the people of Carthage).

This exchange embodies Apuleius’ relationship of intellectual dialogism with his audience in allowing both parties to commemorate through a physical act the cultural reciprocity of their relationship. Carthage’s erection of a statue in Apuleius’ honor would depict him as an intellectual leader in the community, while Apuleius’ liber would in turn depict Carthage as the cultural center which made the entire exchange possible. The nature of the exchange is further stressed by the fact that:

Apuleius’ promise of a book in exchange for a publicly funded second statue (16.47-8 nec ad dedicationem statuae meae libro etiam conscript plenius gratias canam aique libro mandabo uti…laudes benefacti tui…reprezentet) extends an equivalence between literary and figurative representation, by suggesting that one can be traded for the other in a mutually beneficial transaction.

---

38 See, e.g., Horace, Epistles 1.20.22-3: quantum generi demas, virtutibus addas; / me primis urbis belli placuisse domique, “as much as you take away from my family, you may add to my merit: that I was in favor with the first men in the state, both in war and peace”; Ovid, Tristia 3.1.57-8: quandocumque, precor, nostro placere parenti /isdem et sub dominis aspiciare domus, “I pray, that, some day, your house makes peace with him / who authored me, and, under the same masters, greets him!”; Ovid, Tristia 1.1; and Martial, Epigrams 1.70
40 Lee (2005), 148.
Just as Apuleius provides a speech about Philemon in return for the first statue, he again is able to offer the city of Carthage the literary and intellectual in return for the hypothetical second statue. There is a nice parallelism between Apuleius’ claim in the *exordium* that he has dedicated his life to Carthage in 16.3 and to his promise in 16.47-8 that he will dedicate a book to them in exchange for the dedication of a statue.

Although on the surface Apuleius’ *Florida* 16 appears to be a speech about speech-making and sophistic honors, Apuleius weaves throughout a series of literary undertones through which he characterizes as the underpinnings of his very relationship to his audience and the city of Carthage. In stressing the literary dimension of their connection and in presenting himself as an “open book” dependent upon Carthage’s culture, Apuleius constructs a deeper philosophical subtext to his sophistic rhetoric, and the philosophical subtexts are manifested as real philosophical intertexts in the form of Plato and Seneca. The *narratio* of Philemon also emphasizes the literary and performative aspects of his life, which is paralleled in Apuleius’ own life as a performer in Carthage who has opened his life (Platonically speaking) to the community. As Harrison notes, Apuleius “clearly regards himself as an instructor of his local community.” Through his literary approach to his audience, Apuleius succeeds in providing the people of Carthage with the opportunity to engage with him dialogically on a textual level and open their lives intertextually to philosophy as he has.

---

*Florida* 17

41 Harrison (2000), 120.
Florida 17 is largely a panegyric addressed to the proconsul Scipio Orfitus (163/4 CE) into which Apuleius weaves some meditations on rhetoric which hinge upon the comparison between the human voice and the various calls of animals. Although fragments 16 and 18 can be identified with greater certainty as the introductions to speeches, fragment 17 does provide context for the speech through its direct address to Scipio Orfitus and in the fashion in which it clearly defines Apuleius' rhetoric and relationship to Scipio Orfitus. Harrison also notes that “[t]he extract may be an opening, beginning from a reference to rival speakers (quibus mos est . . .) as from detractors in Flor. 9.”42 This parallelism between Florida 17 and Florida 9's use of relative clauses (specifically to comment on rhetorical rivals) would seem to indicate that Apuleius found his rivals to be a useful foil against which to define his own rhetorical principles.

Any reading of this fragment must necessarily be complicated by the apparent lacuna between sections 5 and 6.43 Nevertheless, 17.1-23 would seem to provide a fitting introduction to the panegyric of Scipio Orfitus which is set up to follow 17.22-3 (sed nequeo quin ex plurimis, quae in te meritissimo admiramur, ex his plurima quin uel paucissima attingam. nos ea mecum, cines ob eo servati, recognoscite, “[b]ut I must touch on at least a few of the many virtues which we quite rightly admire in you. You citizens who have been saved by him, review these with me”). Thus, while 17.1-5 is all that remains unbroken of the exordium, all that survives of the fragment appears to functions as the exordium as a whole (17.1-23). Although the speech proper does not begin until the panegyric following the break in the text, an

42 Harrison (2000), 121.
43 Lee (2005) explains that the primary manuscript (F) would appear to show a Beneventan full stop at the end of 17.5, which “may indicate either that the scribe himself recognized a gap in the text, or that the exemplar of F itself showed a division between excerpts at this point . . . In either case, the full stop is a significant aspect of the text.” Thus, “Many editors have had some trouble finding the logical connection between sections 5 and 6” (159-60).
argument can also be made that Apuleius has embarked upon a *narratio* of sorts by the time the speech picks up again at 17.6, at which point he has moved into discussion of the human voice. Due to the lacuna which occurs between 17.5 and 17.6, I believe that it would be most helpful to view 17.1-17.5 as the *exordium* as it survives of this speech and what follows as the *narratio*. Although it is difficult to note how the *exordium* may prove programmatic for the panegyric which has not survived, Apuleius carefully constructs a program regarding the rational and philosophical nature of rhetoric throughout all that survives of fragment 17. Thus, despite the fact that the speech is on the surface a panegyric, Apuleius’ underlying discussion of the nature of rhetoric is well-suited to the philosophical intertexts to Cicero and Seneca found within.

Apuleius opens his speech with a comparison between himself and those who are presumably rhetorical rivals of his, similarly as in *Florida* 9 (*Florida* 17.1): *viderint, quibus mos est oggerere se et otiosis praesidibus, ut *impatientia linguae* commendationem ingenii quae*\textit{r}ant et *adfectata amicitiae vestrae specie* glorientur. *utrumque eius a me, Scipio Orfite, longe abest* (“[t]hose who are in the habit of imposing themselves even on governors who are on holiday should consider the way in which they are seeking recognition of their talent by their lack of verbal restraint and how they are boasting of a show of pretended friendship with you. I dissociate myself from both of these practices, Scipio Orfitus”). Within this contrast, Apuleius defines both the sort of rhetoric which he will be utilizing (not that characterized by *impatientia linguae*) and also the closeness of his own relationship with Scripio Orfitus (as the rivals are merely *amicitiae vestrae specie*, which would intimate that Apuleius has more than the mere *species* of friendship in comparison). With respect to the former point of Apuleius’ rhetoric, the phrase *impatientia linguae* suggests that “[s]peech is a type of action that has moral significance
and must consequently be dictated by rationality. Anything less represents a loss of control to the desires and a moral failure.”

With respect to the latter point concerning Apuleius’ friendship with Orfitus, although Apuleius has not yet positioned himself for a dialogue with the entire audience, the directness of this address to Scipio allows for the beginnings of a sort of dialogue with the addressee of the panegyric. Thus, from the very opening of this exordium, Apuleius has already laid the groundwork for a personal communication with his purported friend, Scipio Orfitus, and has characterized himself as a rational and moral man through the comparative patientia of his own lingua.

There are clearly sophistic elements to Apuleius’ rhetoric, as seen in his shameless self-promotion (following what is perhaps shameless promotion over his rivals) (Florida 17.2-3):

\[
\text{nam et quantulumcumque ingenium meum iam pridem pro captu suo hominibus notius est, quam ut indiget novae commendationis, et gravior tuam tuorumque similitudine malo quam iacto, magisque sum tantae amicitiae capitor quam glorior, quoniam capere nemo nisi vere [putem] potest, potest autem quavis falsa gloriar.}
\]

For even my small talent has too long been too well known to people, to its own extent, to need new commendation and I value rather than boast of your good will and that of men like you. I am more enthusiastic than bombastic about such an important friendship, since no one can desire a thing unless he is sincere about it, but anyone can boast falsely.

Although such flattery of Scipio Orfitus is clearly a captatio benevolentiae, Apuleius’ assertion that he is not seeking nova commendatio characterizes him as someone who is genuinely desirous of Orfitus’ friendship (capitor amicitiae) rather than someone who merely wants to be able to brag about it (glorior). Talk of amicitia, especially by one who proclaims himself a

---

44 Lee (2005), 160.
45 Harrison (2000) justifies his labeling of Apuleius as a sophist based upon “his status as a star performer in Carthage, his obvious self-promotion and cult of his own personality, and his prodigiously displayed literary and scientific polymathy” (38).
philosophus, cannot escape the matrix of memory most heavily influenced by Cicero’s famous De amicitia, in which he clearly equates amicitia with virtus (82-4):

 cum homines benevolentia coniuncti primum cupiditatibus iiis quibus ceteri serviant imperabunt, deinde aequitate instituente gaudebunt, omniaque alter pro altero suscipiet, neque quaecumque umquam nisi bonum et rectum alter ab altero postulabit, neque salum velint inter se ac diligent sed etiam verbunten. . . . virtutis opera danda est, sine qua nec amicitiam neque ullam rem expetandum consequi possumus.

When, that is to say, men who are united by affection learn, first of all, to rule those passions which enslave others, and in the next place to take delight in fair and equitable conduct, to bear each other's burdens, never to ask each other for anything inconsistent with virtue and rectitude, and not only to serve and love but also to respect each other. . . . we must devote ourselves to virtue; for without virtue we can obtain neither friendship nor anything else desirable.

Because Apuleius is able to claim amicitia with Orfitus (or at the very least that he is a genuine cupitor of his amicitia), he is able to claim a sort of kindred moral high-ground through their mutual understanding of a philosophical intertext which the gloriatores and false-friends do not possess. This strengthens the connection between Orfitus and Apuleius introduced previously while also highlighting the moral and philosophical undertones to the speech.

Apuleius strengthens his claim to Orfitus’ friendship and also his own philosophical persona as he continues the captatio benevolentiae (Florida 17.4):

 ad hoc ita semper ab incepto aero bonas artes sedulo colui, quamque exsitionem morum ac studiorum cum in provincia nostra tum etiam Romae penes amicos tuos quaesisses me tute ipsae locupletissimes testis es, ut non minus vobis amicitia mea capessenda sit quam mihi vestra concupiscenda.

In addition, I have always diligently cultivated respectable accomplishments from the beginning of my life, and you yourself are a most authoritative witness that I have sought such an assessment of my character and endeavors both in our province and in Rome among your friends, so that my friendship is no less acceptable to you than yours is desirable to me.
The phrase *bonae artes* carries some interesting connotations, being used frequently both by Ovid and Seneca the Younger.\(^{46}\) The phrase has a definite philosophical connotation, as can be seen in Seneca’s *Epistula Moralis* 73, which examines the relationship between those devoted to philosophy (*philosophiae fideliter deditos*) and their *magistratus* (73.4): *quamadmodum praeceptores suos veneratur ac suspicit quorum beneficio illis invisi exit, sic et hos sub quorum tutela positus exercet artes bonas* (‘Just as a man honours and reveres his teachers, by whose aid he has found release from his early wanderings, so the sage honours these men, also, under whose guardianship he can put his good theories into practice’). Within the context of a speech addressed by a man *philosophiae fideliter deditus* to his proconsular *magistratus*, Apuleius’ claim that he has always sought to cultivate the *bonae artes* (and that Orfitus is himself a *testis* of this) serves to further the effect of the *captatio benevolentiae* by humbling himself to Orfitus, who has pursued (*capessenda*) their *amicitia* but is also the more authoritative character. Although a highly sophistic manipulation of language, the philosophical intertext casts the exchange in a philosophical light and also cements the characterization of the two interlocutors. Thus we see how Apuleius infuses his rhetoric with philosophical intertexts in the *exordium*, all the while characterizing himself as a philosopher and Scipio as a kindred spirit and powerful friend.

The next section of the speech, in which Apuleius advocates the use of the voice, follows the lacuna in the text and appears to fill the role of the *narratio* within this speech. Despite the textual break, 17.6 and following does seem to follow thematically in suggesting that Apuleius is thus justified in utilizing rhetoric (specifically given the present

\(^{46}\) Ovid: *Ars Amatoria* 1.459 and *Tristia* 3.7.32; Seneca: *Dialogi* 12.17.3 and *Epistulae Morales ad Lucilium* 73.4 and 80.2.
circumstances: a panegyric for Orfitus). This argument for the use of language is based upon likening the uselessness of the unused voice to disease of other parts of the body (Florida 17.6-7): *ceterum vox cobilita silentio perpeti non magis usui erit quam nares gravedine appletae, aures spurcitie obseratae, oculi albugine obsucti. quid si manus manicis restringantur, quid si pedes pedicis coartentur, iam rector nostri animus aut somno soluatur aut uino mergatur aut morbo sepeliatur?* ("[y]et a voice confined in perpetual silence will be no more useful than nostrils filled with mucus, ears blocked by discharge, eyes white with cataract. What if the hands are pinioned by handcuffs? What if the feet are shackled with fetters? Or if our governor, the mind, is relaxed in sleep, submerged in wine, or laid low by disease?"). Here, too, rhetoric or the *vox* is given another parallel to philosophy: through the phrase *rector nostri animus*, "[w]e are reminded of the charioteer allegory of the soul at Phaedrus 247c-248b."47 Because Apuleius lays claim to being a *philosophus Platonicus*, any potential reworking of Plato’s metaphors or themes takes on even greater significance. Moreover, in this argument for the use of the voice, Apuleius again links the moral and philosophical with the rhetorical, in claiming that *desueto omnibus pigritiam, pigritia veterum parit* ("[i]nactivity engenders indolence in everyone, and indolence produces a decline," Florida 17.8). Thus, Apuleius’ argument for the training of the human voice also serves as an argument for maintaining virtue, as rhetoric and philosophy are demonstrated to go hand-in-hand.

And yet, Apuleius must recognize an inherent futility to training the human voice (*ceterum ipsius vocis hominis exercendi cassus labor supervacaneo studio plurifariam superatur, "[h]owever, training the human voice is a waste of effort; hard work on it would be superfluous, as it is surpassed in many ways," Florida 17.9) when it is compared to the *distinctae proprietates* of the

47 Lee (2005), 163.
calls of animals. Both Harrison and Lee note that Cicero and Quintilian make use of comparison between the human and animal voices in discussion of oratory, a trope which Apuleius also utilizes in other of his own Florida. As in Florida 12 and 13, Apuleius utilizes this juxtaposition of human and animal speech to emphasize the philosophical and rational aspects of human discourse. Apuleius concedes that in matters of volume, pitch, and similar qualities that the voices of animals are often superior, and that pro quibus homini vox divinitus data angustior quidem, sed maiorem habet utilitatem mentibus quam auribus delectationem. quo magis celebrari debet frequentius usurpata, et quidem non nisi in auditorio, tanto viro praesidente, in hac excellenti celebritate multorum eruditorum, multorum benignorum (“[i]n comparison with these, the voice granted to man by heaven is certainly thinner, but it is more serviceable to the mind than agreeable to the ear. And so we should make use of it and exercise it frequently, and where if not in an auditorium, presided over by such an important man, in this excellent crowd of many scholarly and may kindly men?,” Florida 17.13-14). In favoring content (utilitas mentibus) over the purely sonic effects of language (auribus delectatio), Apuleius again connects language—specifically human rhetoric—to the philosophical, as he did in the exordium through his philosophical intertexts.

The next section of this fragment is a further defense of rhetoric (and Apuleius’ current panegyric) in the form of a discussion of audience as couched in a consideration of

---

48 Cf. Apuleius, Florida 17.11: Mitto dicere multorum animalium immediatatos sonores distinctis proprietatibus admirandos, ut est tauro rum gravis mutitus, lupo rum acutus ululatus, elphantorum tristis barritus, equorum hilaris hinnitus . . . (“I omit to mention the untrained calls of many animals, which are admired for their own special properties, such as the deep bellowing of bulls, the high-pitched howling of wolves, the melancholy trumpeting of elephants, and the cheerful neighing of horses . . .”).

the auletes. Orpheus and Arion. Harrison notes that “Menander Rhetor encourages speakers in the more informal and prefatory λαλία to mention famous auletes as analogies for the speaker himself (II.392.18ff).” Both Harrison and Lee note that Orpheus and Arion were popular figures in the Second Sophistic. As with the comparison between animal and human speech above, Apuleius again employs a familiar trope but provides it with a philosophical spin. In addition to merely being a popular sophistic topos, there exists a distinct philosophical dimension to this musical metaphor through parallels to Plato (who believed that music was a necessary component of education in the ideal state) and Aristotle (who thought that rhythm and melody correlated to moral qualities which had the capability of influencing the soul). Furthermore, “harmony provided an irresistible metaphor for the correct interrelationship of the different parts of the soul—and for the correct mode of life, which is governed by rational thought.” In employing the figures of Orpheus and Arion, then, Apuleius is not merely engaging in popular sophistry but very likely drawing upon Platonist and Aristotelian philosophy.

The use of the verb cantilare to describe Orpheus and Arion’s music is also not without significance, as this verb is not utilized by any other author in classical Latin, and

---

50 The use of the figure of an aulete is familiar from Florida 4, in which Apuleius utilizes the complaint of the aulete Antigenidas.
51 Harrison (2000), 98.
52 Cf. Harrison (2000), 122 n. 114, who refers the reader to “Orpheus and Arion: Dio Or. 19.2, 32.61. Orpheus alone: Aristides Or. 22.1, Fronto Ad M. Caes. 2.3.3 (a Greek letter). Arion alone: Fronto Arion, a brief retelling of the Herodotean story (1.23-4) which is very like the anecdotes of the Florida.”
53 Cf. Plato, Republic 398e-399d.
54 Cf. Aristotle, Politics 8 1339a-1342b.
55 Lee (2005), 78.
56 Lee (2005), 78.
there are only five instances in which the noun *cantilena* appears before Apuleius.\(^{57}\) Because of its rarity, the word calls to mind a parallel, in which the noun in question is used of a philosopher within a philosophical text (Seneca, *Epistulae Morales* 24.18-20):

\[
\text{non sum tam ineptus ut Epicuream cantilenum hoc loco persequer et dicam vanos esse inferorum metus; nec Ixionem rote volvi nec saxum umeris Sisyphi trudi in adversum nec allius viscera et renasci posse cotidie et carpi... mors nos aut consumit aut escuit; emissis meliora restant onere detracto, consumptis nihil restat, bona pariter malaque summota sunt... non repente nos in mortem incidere sed minutatim procedere. cotidie morimur.}
\]

I am not so foolish as to go through at this juncture the arguments which Epicurus harps upon, and say that the terrors of the world below are idle, - that Ixion does not whirl round on his wheel, that Sisyphus does not shoulder his stone uphill, that a man's entrails cannot be restored and devoured every day. . . . Death either annihilates us or strips us bare. If we are then released, there remains the better part, after the burden has been withdrawn; if we are annihilated, nothing remains; good and bad are alike removed . . . we do not suddenly fall on death, but advance towards it by slight degrees; we die every day.

The larger context of Seneca’s work attempts to reassure a friend regarding the nature of death (and consequently life). Thus, we can see the philosophical theme which might here become pertinent in a passage about Orpheus, who was famous for his *katabasis*, which has itself taken on philosophical connotations due to the historically close association between philosophy and music. Although this particular *cantilena* of Epicurus is not portrayed positively by Seneca, it certainly invites philosophical thought and thus draws those willing auditors in Apuleius’ audience into philosophical discourse concerning the nature of life and death both with Apuleius and Seneca.

Both Harrison and Lee note that the allusion to Orpheus and Arion is introduced by an unmarked quotation (8.56) from Vergil’s *Eclogae*.\(^{58}\) While the line which Apuleius utilizes

\(^{57}\) Cf. Terence, *Phormio* 495; Cicero, *De oratore* 1.105, *Epistulae ad familiares* 11.20.2, *Epistulae ad Atticum* 1.19.8; and Seneca Iunior, *Epistulae Morales* 24.18. The noun appears to pick up in popularity, found 29 times in authors and works subsequent to Apuleius.

\(^{58}\) Harrison (2000), 122; Lee (2005), 158.
(Orpheus in siluis, inter delphinas Arion) seems rather unremarkable and appears to provide simply a setting of sorts for each of the aulete’s performances, it would be a mistake to dismiss the allusion as a mere learned nod to Vergil. While such allusions doubtless serve in part as an element of the sophistic display of his own learnedness, this quotation seems oddly suited to the context. *Eclogue* 8 itself opens with a competition (*quos . . . certantis*) between the two main speakers of the poem, Damon and Alphesiboeus. This opening seems to parallel the opening of *Florida* 17 itself, with the implied *certamen* between Apuleius and those who *impatientia linguae commendationem ingenii quaerant et affectata amicitiae vestrae specie gloriantur* (“seek recognition of their talent by their lack of verbal restraint and boast of a show of pretended friendship with you,” *Florida* 17.1). The very act of these learned and philosophically laden allusions through the figures of Orpheus and Arion (through Plato and Aristotle, through Seneca, and finally through Vergil) is itself a facet of this implied competition with rivals and itself demonstrates the superiority—both in craft and

---

59 That Vergil is the one ‘literary’ intertext in a veritable sea of philosophical intertexts within this fragment is certainly somewhat striking and deserves consideration. Elsewhere in his corpus, we see instances of Apuleius ‘philosophizing’ Virgil, and so the distinction between ‘philosophical’ and ‘literary’ intertexts need not be black-and-white. This is especially evident within the *De deo Socratis*, itself a philosophical work addressing the daimonion of Socrates, in which a number of citations from Vergil appear. See, e.g., DDS 131, in which a quotation from Vergil (*Aeneid* 10.773) about Mezentius serves as a negative example regarding the swearing of oaths (*dextra nibi deus et telum, quod missile libro*); and DDS 150, in which a quotation from Vergil’s Nisus and Euryalus episode (*Aeneid* 9.184-5) is used to demonstrates that even the human mind can function as a daemon in a sense (*dine hunc arborum mentibus addunt, Euryale, et sua cuique deus fit dira cupido? / Igitur et bona cupidis animi bonus deus est*). Fletcher (2009) discusses with respect to Apuleius’ *Apologia* the manner in which Apuleius ‘Platonizes’ Latin poetry: “The interweaving of poetic quotation and Platonic philosophy cannot be undone, but must be taken together. However, this does not mean that Apuleius is merely privileging the philosophical over the poetic, Plato over Catullus and Afranius—he is directly ‘Platonising’ them” (55). It should also be noted that this is the last of the intertexts in *Florida* 17, the previous intertexts of which have all been philosophical in nature. In the succeeding fragment, *Florida* 18, we see a strange reversal in which a predominantly philosophical speech is laden with literary intertexts. Thus, this intertext seems to pave the way within the collected *Florida* for the transition from the philosophical intertexts of the more literary fragments to the more poetic intertexts of the philosophically-minded fragment to follow, making this intertext into something of a turning point.
philosophically—of Apuleius’ rhetoric, just as the voice of man is superior to those of animals.

Apuleius further links the figures of Orpheus and Arion to himself—and music to rhetoric—in his claim that (Florida 17.16): *eos ego impensius admirarer, si hominibus potius quam bestiis placissent. avibus haec secretaria utiquam magis congruerint, merulis et lusciniis et oloribus* (“I would admire them more unreservedly if they had won over men rather than wild animals.

In any case, such secluded places were more appropriate for birds, such as blackbirds, nightingales, and swans”). Here again we see Apuleius imply that men (*hominis*), whom he has above praised for their rationality, are the more admirable targets for performance than beasts (*bestiae*). The use of the verb *admiror* is also significant, as it appears three times within the context of the speech. Previously, Apuleius used it to refer to the calls of beasts, stating that *multorum animalium immediatos sonores distinctis proprietatibus admirandos* (“the untrained calls of many animals are admired for their own special properties,” *Florida* 17.11). Despite the admiration that must be given to the voices of beasts, however, human voices are more serviceable to the mind (*maiorem habet utilitatem mentibus, Flor.* 17.13) and thus all the more deserve to be celebrated (*quo magis celebrari debet, Flor.* 17.14). In 17.16, Apuleius again implies that performances which appeal to rational men are superior to those appealing to irrational beasts. The verb *admiror* makes one final appearance in the speech at the close of this *exordium*, in which Apuleius notes the admiration which Orfitus possesses (*Florida* 17.22): *sed nequeo quin ex plurimis, quae in te meritissimo admiramur, ex his plurimis quin vel paucissima attingam* (“[b]ut I must touch on at least a few of the many virtues which we quite rightly admire in you”). This progression in the usage of *admiror* from beast to rational man to the recipient of
the panegyric—especially as it relates to language—again asserts the superiority of Apuleius’ speech, especially within the present context of Orfitus’ panegyric.

In a roundabout way, Apuleius thus sets Orfitus up as a man of the greatest rationality, who deserves the praise of another rational man (*enimvero qui pueris et adulescentibus et senibus utile carmen prompturus est, in mediis milibus boninum canat, ita ut boc meum de virtutibus Orfiti carmen est,* “but he who is going to produce a song that will benefit young men, adults, and the elderly should sing before thousands. Such is this song of mine concerning the virtues of Orfitus,” *Florida* 17.18). In thus characterizing his *Orfiti carmen,* “Apuleius asserts the public and civic function of his rhetoric.”60 He further asserts that his praise of Orfitus is *serium, nec minus gratum quam utile Carthaginiensium pueris et invenibus et senibus* (“sincere and no less pleasing than profitable to the young men, adults, and elders of Carthage,” *Florida* 17.19). Thus, in addition to being more worthy of praise for being one of those whom *boninibus potius quam bestiiis placuissent,* Apuleius also provides his audience with something *utile* through his rhetorical performances. Apuleius thus builds a speech in which rationality, rhetoric, and admiration are intertwined, and which justifies both his speech and his praise of Orfitus, which presumably follows (*Florida* 17.23): *vos ea mecum, cives ab eo servati, recognoscite* (“[y]ou citizens who have been saved by him, review these [virtues of Orfitus] with me”).

Although Apuleius utilizes a variety of sophistic rhetorical features in his speech—from the *captatio benevolentiae* directed towards Scipio Orfitus to the comparison between the voices of animals and humans to the common sophistic trope of Orpheus and Arion—he manages to imbue them with a deeper philosophical implication, often by employing potentially philosophically significant intertexts with such authors as Cicero and Seneca.

60 Lee (2005), 158.
Apuleius succeeds in pulling Orfitus (whom he directly addresses at the beginning and end of the *exordium*), his audience (whom he directly addresses in the very last line), Seneca, Cicero, Vergil, and himself into a dialogue concerning the rational and philosophical merits of language. Thus, Apuleius manages to justify his praise of Orfitus and his own rhetoric through demonstrating the rationality of both himself and the object of his present panegyric, picking up on the themes of his relationship with Orfitus and his own superiority over his rivals which were introduced in the *exordium*.

*Florida 18*

*Florida* 18 is the last of the larger fragments found within the *Florida*, and also the last which seems to come from the introduction of a speech. Harrison notes that “[l]ike Flor. 17, this piece is clearly an introduction to another performance of a different kind, and looks to be complete as an introduction.”61 Within this fragment, Apuleius praises the people of Carthage for coming to hear him speak and for the intellectual support with which they have provided him since his youth. Apuleius then relates the two stories of Protagoras and Thales regarding the act of repayment and introduces a bilingual (Greek and Latin) dialogue and hymn to be performed in honor of the god Aesculapius. The text breaks off at the end of Apuleius’ introduction to this work. The *exordium* of this speech appears to encompass the whole of Apuleius’ thanksgiving to the assembled citizens of Carthage (18.1-18). As seen in other fragments analyzed above, the *exordium* transitions to a *narratio* (here, the *narrationes* of Protagoras and Thales) which elaborate upon the themes introduced in the *exordium*. This fragment is particularly interesting given the nesting of introductions within introductions, as the fragment breaks off at the conclusion of a second introduction to the lost hymn.

---

61 Harrison (2000), 123.
speech is primarily a gesture of thanks to the people of Carthage for the education with which they have provided Apuleius; therefore, the literary intertexts complement the content and agenda in allowing Apuleius to offer literature to those who originally provided him access to it.

Lee notes that this speech is not addressed to a proconsul, but rather to the city of Carthage itself, a fact which can be seen from Apuleius’ direct address to his audience in the second person (Florida 18.1): *tanta multitudo ad audiendum convenistis, ut potius gratulari Carthagini debeat, quod tam multis eruditionis amicos habet, quam excusare, quod philosophus non reconsaverim dissertare* (“such a crowd of you have come to hear me that I ought rather to congratulate Carthage for having so many friends of learning than to apologize for not having refused to speak although I am a philosopher”). From this very first sentence, Apuleius characterizes his relationship with the people of Carthage as an intellectual one. He refers to them as *eruditionis amici*, which is a phrase unique to Apuleius in surviving Latin literature. He also refers to himself as a *philosophus*, making clear the nature of the speech which is to follow. Apuleius effectively characterizes what is to come as a philosophical discourse for a crowd he holds responsible for being intellectually-minded—an assembled group who are friends of learning, and by association, friends of Apuleius. Of Apuleius’ seemingly odd need to apologize for the fact that *philosophus non reconsaverim dissertare*, “Apuleius suggests that he was reluctant to speak in a theater since it is usually the location of spectacles and entertainment.” Apuleius has effectively dispelled the need to apologize

---

62 Lee (2005), 167.
63 Lee (2005), 169.
(potius gratulari Carthagini debeam . . . quam excusare) because he has carefully defined the intellectual nature of this spectacle.

Apuleius moves from commending his audience to commenting on their current venue (the Carthaginian theater), describing in detail what his audience should not be focusing on (the interior of the theater) and what they should be concentrating on instead (Florida 18.3-5):

> praeterea in auditorio hoc genus spectari debet non pavimenti marmoratio nec proscaenii contabulatio nec scaenae columnatio, sed nec culminum eminentia nec lacunarium refulgentia nec sedilium circumferentia, nec quod hic alias minus hallucinatur, comodius sermocinatur, tragoeidus societatur, funerarius periclitatur, praestigiator furatur, histrio gesticulatur ceterique omnes ludiones ostentant populo quod cuiusque artis est, sed istis omnibus supersessis nihil amplius spectari debet quam convenientium ratio et dicentis oratio.

Moreover, in an auditorium of this kind, what ought to be looked at is not the marbling of the paving, nor the flooring of the proscenium, nor the pillaring of the stage, nor the eminence of the roof, nor the brilliance of the paneled ceiling, nor the expanse of the seating, nor the fact that here at times the mime hallucinates, the comedian prates, the tragedian debates, the ropewalker moves into jeopardy, the juggler engages in thievery, the pantomime deals in dactylogy, and all the other players show their tricks to the people. But these things aside, nothing else ought to be looked at more closely than the enthusiasm of the audience and the vocalism of the speaker.

The use of *praeterea* allows Apuleius to transition from one potential distraction (the large size of the audience) to “the distraction of the beauty of the civic edifice.” Apuleius thus makes an attempt to differentiate the material (here the setting) from the intellectual, a division he explored in some depth in *Florida* 9 when illustrating the difference between Hippias’ material arts and his own art of oratory. Here he asks his audience to disregard their physical surroundings, since the theater is more conducive to less intellectual forms of entertainment. He plays upon this differentiation of the physical and the intellectual even

---

64 Lee (2005), 170.
65 Such dismissal of the physical settings of the theater parallels *Florida* 5.
further as he asks the audience to imagine settings suitable to his performance (Florida 18.6-9):

quinquopter, ut poetae solent hic ibidem varias civitates substituere, ut ille tragicus, qui
in theatro dicit factum: Liber, qui augustus haec loca Cithaeronis colis, item ille comicus:
perparvam partim postulat Plautus loci de vostris magnis et amoenis moenibus,
Athenas quo sine architectis conferat, non secus et mihi licet nullam longinquam
et transmarinam civitatem hic, sed enim ipsius Carthaginis vel curiam vel libriothecam
 substituere. igitur proinde habebote, si curia digna protulero, ut si in ipsa curia me
audiatis, si erudita fuerint, ut si in libriotheca legantur.

And so, just as poets fabricate various cities on stages like this, such as the
tragedian who makes an actor say in the theatre, ‘Liber, you who live on
these famous slopes of Cithaeron,’ or similarly the comedian: ‘Plautus asks
for just a tiny space / From your extensive and lovely city walls / To
which, without builders, he may bring you Athens.’ In the same way
allow me to put before you no remote city overseas, but the senate house
or the library of Carthage itself. Thus, if I express thoughts worthy of the
senate, imagine that you are listening to me in the senate house itself, and
if I say anything that is erudite, imagine that you are reading it in the
library.

In asking his audience to think up a suitable setting within each of their own minds, he is on
some level moving the intellectual performance into their very heads, where intellectual
discourse is best suited. This sentiment is picked up in Apuleius’ advice that what spectari
debet is convenientium ratio et dicentis oratio. Apuleius shifts the focus onto the nonmaterial ratio
and oratio, and this again characterizes his relationship to his audience since the “ratio belongs
to the audience, and so underscores the didactic function of Apuleius’ oration.”

In asking the audience which he has characterized as intellectual from his opening sentence to focus
upon the nonmaterial ratio and oratio, Apuleius is able to establish the proper setting for a
philosophical exchange.

Additionally, Apuleius’ entreaty to his audience regarding their invited intellectual
change of venue is introduced by a passage notable for its high degree of intertextuality.

Harrison, Hilton, and Lee all note the presence of a quotation from Plautus (Florida 18.7):

66 Lee (2005), 171.
perparvam partim postulat Plautus loci de vostris magnis atque amoenis moenibus, Athenas quo sine architectis conerat ("Plautus asks for just a tiny space / From your extensive and lovely city walls / To which, without builders, he may bring you Athens"). There is also a quotation from an unidentified Roman tragedy (Florida 18.6): Liber, qui angusta haec loca Cithaeronis colis ("Liber, you who live on these famous slopes of Cithaeron"). Significantly, these passages “are both from prologues, stressing the introductory nature of the extract.” There is a certain cleverness to the fact that Apuleius utilizes well-known introductions which set the scene for their audiences when introducing and setting the scene for his own audience. But although there is a certain sophistic flair to such literary virtuosity and cleverness, Apuleius’ use of quotation and intertextuality serves a more significant purpose, as seen previously. The reference to architecti in the Plautus passage “recalls the architectural features that Apuleius enumerated in the fragment’s opening.” Of course, Apuleius is similarly sine architectis, but both performers face a problem of scenery which is appropriate to their audience. Apuleius is in a hall which is suitable for the comœdis sermocinatur, however, and so seeks an escape from the dramatic which Plautus invites his audience to create.

Additionally, Apuleius’ use of quotation from Truculentus would have invited those in his audience who recognized the source of the quotation to remember the plot of Plautus’ comedy, the main character of which is the meretrix Phronesium. Her rapaciousness is seen throughout the play in her exchanges with her three lovers, especially in the scene in which she requests a munusculum (425) from Diniarchus. Similarly, the concept of exchange and

---

69 Harrison (2000), 123.
70 Lee (2005), 171.
payment will later become an important theme in this speech, especially once Apuleius comes to the narratio of Protagoras and Thales. Apuleius’ allusion to Plautus’ narrative, then, foreshadows some of the themes which will be introduced in his own performance’s narratio. The use of intertexts from dramatic performances here also contrasts with the decisively undramatic performance for which Apuleius is attempting to set the stage (literally and figuratively) for his audience.

After his appeal to his audience regarding their venue and his appeal to remember where their focus should be (their own ratio and Apuleius’ oratio), Apuleius’ exordium moves into a section which details his professed nervousness before the present crowd. This nervousness is primarily fueled by Apuleius’ mutual respect from and for the audience, which is a feature of his relationship to the crowd seen in other of the fragments (Florida 18.12): nam quan(to videor plura apud vos habere ad commendationem suffragia, tanto sum ad dicendum nimia reverentia vestri cunctatio[ri] (“[f]or the more expressions of commendation I have from you, the more hesitant I am to speak because of the great respect I feel towards you”). The reverentia which Apuleius feels towards Carthage is an important theme which Apuleius will return to throughout the speech (as he does throughout his corpus), as it is, in part, the motivation behind the entire speech. In this way Apuleius again characterizes a sort of give-and-take with his audience in which their respect for him is matched by his respect for them. Apuleius demonstrates that this is a much more intimate relationship than would usually be expected between performer and audience, however, when he reminds them of just how longstanding their relationship is (Florida 18.14): an non multa mihi apud vos adhortamina suppetunt, quod sum vobis nec lare alienus nec pueritia invisitatus nec magistris peregrinus nec secta incognitus nec voce inauditus nec libris infectus improbatisve? (“[d]o you not provide me with plenty
of encouragements, such as that I am familiar with your household gods, that we shared our childhood together, that we had the same teachers, and follow the same principles? Surely you have listened to me speak and have read and approved of my books?”). While the normal performer-audience relationship is limited to the duration of the performance, Apuleius insists that Carthage has shared in his entire intellectual journey to this point—they share the same *lar*, *pueritia*, *magistri*, and *secta*. Calling upon this shared cultural and intellectual heritage allows Apuleius to emphasize his personal relationship to the members of the audience and assume that they have some share in his success.

But this shared cultural heritage goes both ways, and thus also means that Apuleius owes a certain debt to his audience, as *ita mibi et patria in concilio Africae, id est nostro, et pueritia apud nos et magistri nos et secta, licet Athenis Atticis confirmata, tamen hic inchoata est* (“[m]y home region belongs to the council of Africa (that is, to your council), I was a boy among you, you were my masters, and my philosophical views, though strengthened in Attic Athens, took shape here,” *Florida* 18.15). All of the elements related in the previous section as part of Apuleius’ shared heritage (*pueritia, magistri, secta*) are again mentioned here as things which Apuleius has gained from the Carthaginians. The term *secta* is particularly interesting, as it “gives evidence for Middle Platonic activity in Carthage.”71 Thus, Apuleius even owes his philosophical roots to Carthage, which explains his eagerness to contribute to the city as a *philosophus Platonicus*.

In addition to expressing his thanks to the people of Carthage, Apuleius adds that he

*semper adeo et ubique vos quippe ut parentis ac primos magistros meos celebro mercedemque vobis rependo, non illam, quam Protagora sophista pepigit nec acceptit, sed quam Thales sapiens nec pepigit et acceptit*

71 Lee (2005), 173.
(“[m]oreover I praise you always and everywhere as my parents and first masters and I pay you your fee: not the one that Protagoras, the sophist, agreed on but did not receive, but that which the wise Thales did not agree on, but did receive,” Florida 18.18). Apuleius thus repays his philosophical and intellectual debt to Carthage not only through offering them philosophical and intellectual speeches and declarations of his thanks, but also by praising them semper adeo et ubique. The choice of vocabulary here (mercedemque uobis rependo) is significant in allowing Apuleius to create a parallel between his situation and those of Protagoras (sophistic payment) and Thales (philosophical payment) which will follow, as Apuleius himself presents the speech as a gift. Apuleius thus manifests his thanks for the Carthaginians by putting into practice the very things (oratory and philosophy) with which they themselves have equipped him. The introductory literary intertexts within this introduction demonstrate the importance of literature to Apuleius’ didactic past and present with Carthage. With his mutually didactic relationship to the Carthaginians fully defined and the thematic parallels to the narrationes of the fees of Protagoras and Thales set, Apuleius brings the exordium to a close and begins his narration with an acquiescence (whether genuine or merely symbolic) to the audiences’ will (Florida 18.18): video quid postuletis: utramque narrabo (“I see what you want; I will tell you the story of both”).

The first narratio is a cautionary one told of the arrangement between Protagoras and his pupil, Euathlus. Apuleius describes Protagoras as a man qui sophista fuit longe multisius et cum primis rhetoricae repertoribus perfacundus (“Protagoras was a sophist, a polymath, and an extremely eloquent man, one of the first inventors of rhetoric,” Florida 18.19). While

72 Lee (2005), 174.
Apuleius rightly praises Protagoras for being *multiscius* and *perfacundus*, Lee rightly notes the importance of Apuleius’ label of *sophista*, remarking that:

> Apuleius never uses this word of himself. In fragment 9, the term is used of Hippias, who also serves as a straw-man. We should notice that this figure is greedy and soon to be outsmarted, in line with Plato’s depiction of sophists. This is the bad rhetoric, that simultaneously creates a place for Apuleius’ good rhetoric.

That Apuleius has used the term *sophista* of Protagoras twice so far—once for each mention of his name—demonstrates that this is an important aspect of Apuleius’ characterization of the figure of Protagoras. Apuleius makes his negative characterization of Protagoras even more explicit when he mentions the arrangement that Protagoras makes with Euathlus regarding his fee (*Florida* 18.20): *Protagoran auit cum suo sibi discipulo Euathlo mervedem nimis uberem condicione temeraria pepigisse* (“[t]hey say that this Protagoras made an agreement with his disciple, Euathlus, for an excessively fat fee on a rash condition”). Firstly, the *merces* *nimis uber*, reminding us of Apuleius’ warning in the *exordium* that good fortune and bad go hand-in-hand (*ubi uber, ibi tuber*, 18.11). Protagoras is further characterized by his rashness (*temeraria*). Thus, we are presented with a man who is learned but who is not contemplative and does not take the time to think things through.

Euathlus is characterized similarly (*cuncta illa exorabula indicantium et decipula adversantium et artificio dicentium versutus alioqui et ingenious ad astutiium facile perdidicit, contentus seire quod concupierat*, “Euathlus, who was quite clever and who had an in-born disposition to craftiness, easily mastered all the ways of persuading judges, the techniques for tricking one’s adversaries, and the artifices of speaking,” *Florida* 18.21), and as Protagoras’ *perfectissimus discipulus* (18.26) we are invited to assume that he has learned these habits from his *magister*.

In describing Euathlus’ knowledge as *decipula adversantium* and the *artifícia dicentium*, Apuleius calls into question the extent to which Euathlus (and his teacher Protagoras) can be called an orator—they know the tricks of those who speak, but these are the mere semblances of rhetoric and they are not actually speakers themselves. Not surprisingly, the student turns these tricks upon the master: Protagoras’ receipt of payment is dependent upon Euathlus winning his first appearance in court, and after a long period has elapsed in which Euathlus has avoided the courts, Protagoras finally summons Euathlus before the judges himself.

Apuleius provides further insight to Protagoras’ character in his description of how both Protagoras and Euathlus present their cases. He tells the audience that Protagoras delivered an *argumentum ambifariam* (“double-edged dilemma,” *Florida* 18.23), and mentions of Euathlus that *Euathlus, utpote tanti veteratoris perfectissimus discipulus, biceps illud argumentum retorsit* (“Euathlus, as you would expect from the model student of such a sly old fox, turned that double-headed argument around,” 18.26). Again, neither of these statements paints Protagoras in a positive light. Although *ambifariam* appears to be unique to Apuleius and *biceps* is most often used anatomically or geographically, both descriptors in this context recall the familiar notions of the trickery inherent in sophistic speech of making the weaker argument the stronger. Additionally, the use of *veterator* here has a distinctly pejorative feel.

Although the judges are very impressed upon hearing Protagoras’ argument, Protagoras’ *perfectissimus discipulus* presents his argument in such a way that *ita me omni modo liberat* (“[s]o every way you look at it I get off,” *Florida* 18.27). Since Protagoras is a master of

---


*75 Generally of Parnassus (cf., e.g., Persius, *Saturae* pr.2; Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 2.221; or Seneca Iunior, *Oedipus* 281).*
double-edged arguments, it is no surprise that his best pupil is able to play the game as well, ultimately costing him his rashly bargained fee. Apuleius concludes the narratio of Protagoras and Thales with a rhetorical question to the audience (Florida 18.28-9):

> nonne vobis videntur haec sophistarum argumenta obversa invicem vice spinarum, quas ventus convolverit, inter se cohaerere, paribus utrimque aculeis, similì penetratione, mutuo vulneri? atque ideo merces Protagorae tam aspera, tam sentiosa versuti et avari relinquenda est: cui sì licet multo tanta praestat illa altera merces, quam Thalen memorant suasisse.

Do you not think these sophistries, turned against each other, are like thorns swept together by the wind, which stick to each other by their prickles, each stabbing the other to the same depth? And so we must leave the difficult and thorny question of the fee of Protagoras to those who are clever and greedy. The other fee, which Thales is said to have solicited is far superior to it.

Again, Apuleius draws attention to the characterization of Protagoras (and thus his disciple, Euathlus) as sophistic in describing the arguments presented as haec sophistarum argumenta. Of the metaphor which Apuleius utilizes likening their arguments to spinae, “Vallette (164n1) notes this is an allusion to the simile in Odyssey 5.328ff, of the winds that come from the storm that wrecks Odysseus’ ship.”76 While the futility of sophistic arguments is clear from the metaphor without recognition of the possible Homeric allusion, the Homeric reference makes clear the destructive potential of these arguments (which Protagoras himself has just experienced in watching his own argument sink like Odysseus’ raft). Apuleius thus turns from this sort of merces both literally and figuratively by leaving it to those who possess Protagorean cleverness and greed (versuti et avari) and moving on to the story of Thales, whose merces is clearly stated to be the better of the two (praestare).

---

76 Lee (2005), 175; cf. Homer, Odyssey 5.328-30: ὡς δ’ ἐτ’ ὀπωρινὸς βορέῳς φορέσην ἀκάνθας / ὕμ πεδίον, πυκναι δὲ πρὸς ἀλλήλησιν ἔχοντα, ὧς τὶν ὕμ πέλαγος ἄνεμοι φέρον ἐνθα καὶ ἐνθα ("As when in autumn the North Wind bears the thistle-tufts over the plain, and close they cling to one another, 5.330so did the winds bear the raft this way and that over the sea").
Although Apuleius never uses the term *philosophus* of Thales, he nevertheless characterizes him as the more philosophical antithesis to Protagoras. Apuleius introduces Thales with the statement that *Thales Milesius ex septem illis sapientiae memoratis viris facile praecipuus* (“Thales of Miletus was easily the most important of those famous seven wise men,” Florida 18.30). While Apuleius essentially describes Thales as *sapientissimus*—the wisest of the Wise—*sapientia* was not one of the qualities associated with the rash and greedy *sophista* Protagoras above. Instead, Protagoras and Euathlus are characterized as *multiscii* (Flor. 18.19), *veteratores* (18.26), and their speaking is replete with *decipula* (18.21), *artificia* (18.21), and the *sophistarum argumenta* (18.28). Thus, Apuleius immediately draws a sharp contrast between the types of rhetoric and types of learning which these two figures embody, setting trickery and appearances against wisdom and truth. The rest of the story is concerned with the consequences of the *divina ratio* (18.32) which Thales thought up in his old age and the *merces* (18.33) he chooses in return for teaching (*edocuisse*, 18.33) his discovery to Mandraytus of Priene. The description of Thales’ discovery as a *divina ratio* serves to further the contrast between him and Protagoras but also to invite comparison of Thales with Apuleius himself, who will later be offering his own divinely inspired work (a hymn to the god Aesculapius) to the Carthaginian people, whom Apuleius characterizes in his *exordium* as also possessing *ratio*.

Mandraytus tells Thales to *optare…quantam vellet mercedem sibi*, and the use of *quantam* seems to indicate that Mandraytus had a monetary reward in mind. Thales, however, requests something quite different and much less tangible (Florida 18.34): *‘satis inquit, ‘nihi fuerit meredes,’ Thales sapiens, “si id quod a me didicisti, cum proferre ad quospiam coeperis, tibi non adsciveris, sed eius inventi me potius quam alium repertorem praedicaris’* (“I shall be sufficiently paid,”
said Thales the Wise, ‘if you do not claim as your own what you have learnt from me, when you have begun to hand it on to others, but state clearly that it was I, and no one else, who discovered this law’”). This difference between the material and nonmaterial picks up the distinction Apuleius makes in the *exordium* when challenging his audience to focus their attentions on their own *ratio* and his *oratio* instead of the luxuries of the stage. Thus, Apuleius has prepared his audience for the contrast in these *narrationes* presented between Protagoras, who most desires monetary compensation in exchange for his words, and Thales, who instead values being remembered as an inventor and a man of learning, as Apuleius remembers Carthage. It comes as no surprise, then, that Apuleius commends his similar choice (*Florida* 18.35): *pulchra merces prorsum ac tali viro digna et perpetua; nam et in hodiernum ac deinde semper Thali ea merces persolvetur ab omnibus nobis, qui eius caelestia studia vere cognovimus* (“[a] fine reward indeed, worthy of such a man, and everlasting! For to this day and forever after, that reward will be paid to Thales by all of us who truly understand his researches into the heavens”). Part of what makes this *merces* in exchange for education so *digna* is the fact that it lives on through the very act of education (*studia*)—it is a testament to education itself as well as to Thales’ discovery and wisdom in choosing his *merces*. This, too, mirrors Apuleius’ implication in the *exordium* that the Carthaginian education for which he is so thankful lives on through his own didactic speeches which they themselves taught him to deliver. Thus, Apuleius’ payment is to that: *semper adeo et ubique vos quippe ut parentis ac primos magistros meos celebro mercedemque vobis repondo* (“[m]oreover I praise you always and everywhere as my parents and first masters and I pay you your fee,” *Florida* 18.18).
Apuleius again reiterates this point as he concludes the *narrationes* of Protagoras and Thales and prepares to transition into the introduction to the hymn of Aesculapius (*Florida* 18.36):

```
bane ego vobis, mercedem, Carthaginienses, ubique gentium dependo pro disciplinis,
quas in puertula sum apud vos adoptus. ubique enim me vestrae civitatis alumnus fero,
ubique vos omnimodi laudibus celebro, vestras disciplinas studiosius percolo, vestras
opes gloriiosius praedico, vestros etiam deos religiosius veneror.
```

This is the kind of payment I make to you, Carthaginians, all over the world, for the education I received among you in my boyhood. Everywhere I go I present myself as an alumnus of your city; everywhere I go I celebrate your praises of every kind. I enthusiastically admire the education you offer, I boastfully parade your wealth, and I religiously venerate your gods.

Here Apuleius drives home the moral of the *narratio* and makes explicit his correlation to Thales. The word *alumnus* recalls Apuleius’ philosophical roots in Carthage as it is used “also of philosophical disciples at Cic. *Fin.* 4.72; Vell. 2.36.2.”77 This ties back to Apuleius’ mention of the philosophical *secta* (18.14) which he learned in Carthage from his boyhood. Additionally, the vocabulary in this passage (e.g., *celebro, percolo, praedico, veneror*) “bind celebratory rhetoric into a praxis of religion and study . . . *veneror* begins a formal transition to the next part of the speech, the hymn to Aesculapius.”78 This intersection of religious and rhetorical can also be seen throughout the passage, since Apuleius reminds his audience of the fact that they honor the same *lar* (18.14) in the *exordium* and then describes Thales’ discovery as a *divina ratio* (18.32) in the *narratio*. This divine quality of speech which is so closely tied to Apuleius’ debt and payment to Carthage serves as a suiting transition to the hymn to Aesculapius (*Florida* 18.37-8): *nunc quoque igitur principium mihi apud vestras auris auspicitissimum ab Aesculapio deo capiam, qui arcem nostrae Carthaginis indubitabili numine propitius*

77 Lee (2005), 177.
78 Lee (2005), 177.
now too I will take as my starting-point a subject that is most auspicious to your ears—the
god Aesculapius, who benevolently looks after the citadel of our city Carthage with his
undoubted divine power. I will sing you a hymn to the god, in Greek and Latin verse, that I
have dedicated to him”). The hymn⁷⁹ is thus a suitable merces to Carthage in addition to the
praise he offers in his travels, because it reflects all that he has learned from Carthage,
including worship of Aesculapius, who was “the patron deity of Carthage’s citadel.”⁸⁰ This is
therefore a hymn which is particularly suited for his audience and also as a component to
Apuleius’ thanksgiving.

Apuleius goes on to describe in greater detail the nature of the hymn and the
dialogue which will precede it (Florida 18.38-41):

For I am not unknown as his devotee, nor a recent worshipper, nor an
unfavoured minister; and I have already paid him reverence in prose and
verse, just as right now I shall sing a hymn to him in both Languages,
which I have prefaced with a dialogue also in Greek and Latin. In it
Safidius Severus and Julius Persius will hold a conversation—men who
are very close mutual friends, as well as being deservedly friends to
yourselves and the public good. They are peers in learning, eloquence,
and kindness—it is not clear whether they are more restrained in modesty,
more inclined to hard work or more acclaimed for their distinctions.
Although they are in close accord with one another, they are nevertheless
rivals and in competition on this one point, which of them loves Carthage

⁷⁹ Lee (2005) notes the rarity of hymnus [Gk. ὑμνος], which is only found “in a fragment of Seneca’s lost De
Matrimonio = fr. 88 Haase, and De Mundo 29 (#355), 35 (#368); Hunink (2001), 192.” Thus, “Apuleius’ use of
the Greek term for a Carmen is appropriate, inasmuch as the hymn to Aesculapius will be in both Latin and
Greek” (177).

⁸⁰ Lee (2005), 167.
more—and in this matter they both strive with every fibre of their being, but neither is defeated.

Firstly, we note that Apuleius expounds upon his religious pedigree with such words as *sacricola, cultor,* and *antistes,* which are further linked to the themes of education seen previously through their juxtaposition with words such as *ignatus.* Secondly, Apuleius introduces the *dialogus* which itself will introduce the hymn to Aesculapius. Apuleius’ reference to a *dialogus,* especially as a *philosophus Platonicus,* naturally suggests the possibility that he is here paying homage to Plato as well. Along these lines, Harrison states that:

> Plato’s *Symposium, Parmenides,* and *Protagoras* all open by presenting a meeting at which an earlier conversation is reported. This kind of framework plainly presents Apuleius as analogous to major philosophical figures such as Socrates, Parmenides, and Pythagoras whose discourses are worth preserving.81

Thus, Apuleius’ payment to Carthage is not only the praise he gives them wherever he goes, but also proving that what he has taught in Carthage is deserving of some permanence. Carthage provided Apuleius with his philosophical foundations; in creating his own philosophical dialogues, Apuleius hopes to achieve the sort of permanence which would not only bring honor to him, but also to Carthage. And so, while in Carthage, Apuleius does what he can by offering a speech which he states (*Florida* 18.42): *eorum ego sermonem ratus et robis auditu gratissimum et mihi compositu congruentem et deo dedicatu religiosum* (“I thought that their conversation would be very pleasing for you to hear, very agreeable for me to compose, and suitably religious to dedicate to the god”). Apuleius’ use of *gratissimus* not only emphasizes the fact that he is trying to please his audience, but is also on some level a pun which again draws upon the expressions of gratitude introduced in the *exordium.*

81 Harrison (2000), 125 n. 119.
In *Florida* 18, Apuleius weaves together the various elements—exordium, narrationes, introduction to a dialogue and hymn—with themes expressing his thanksgiving to the people of Carthage for providing him with the educational and philosophical underpinnings through which he is able to express his thanks. The *exordium* introduces these major themes through the request that his audience picture a suitable venue for the speech (which characterizes his discourse as nondramatic—in part through contrast with the literary intertexts to Plautus and an unidentified tragedy which he employs) and also through his emphasis on the cultural and educational relationship which he shares with his Carthaginian audience (the literary aspect of which is also characterized through the literary intertexts mentioned above). His choices in constructing this speech of thanks, then, are especially emblematic of the education and culture he owes to Carthage: the composition and delivery of a bilingual hymn to Aesculapius to the city of Carthage emphasizes Apuleius’ educational debt, but also his attempts to use what he has learned for Carthage’s benefit. Even Apuleius’ intertexts in this speech—Plautus and Homer—are symbolic of his intellectual debt: Apuleius learned literature and Latin and Greek from the people of Carthage, and his use of Homer here serves to distance himself from mere sophistic display in being used to denounce the ‘sophistries’ of Protagoras. Through demonstrating the value of philosophy and of the intellectual *merces* through the story of Thales, Apuleius shows his audience that he repays their service to him in full and in kind in offering them literary recompense in the form of *narrationes*, bilingual dialogues and hymns, and literary allusions.
Conclusion

Within those fragments of Apuleius’ *Florida* which have a clearly preserved *exordium* and *narratio*, it is evident that Apuleius carefully endeavors to first characterize his relationship with his audience as a didactic relationship. He does this most often through emphasizing either the reciprocity (or even indebtedness) of the orator-audience relationship (as in *Florida* 9, 16, and 17) or asserting a shared cultural heritage (as in *Florida* 18). In this way, Apuleius often highlights his personal relationship with his Carthaginian audience and also the intellectual debt which he owes to them. Thus, his speeches often become a type of recompense, either for some sort of physical honor (e.g., a statue) or merely in return for the very education which he receives in Carthage. In return for the education which he has received in Carthage, Apuleius’ orations often take on a didactic nature in turn, and this didactic function of his rhetoric leads to certain organizational features throughout the speech to maximize the effectiveness of Apuleius’ impact on his audience.

Apuleius’ didactic program leads him to carefully craft his speeches to ensure the maximum comprehension. We have seen above how the *exordia* in particular prepare his reader for the *narrationes* which follow: the *exordium* of *Florida* 9 begins with Apuleius’ rivals and also likens his audiences’ judgment of his speech in material terms, paving the way for the *narratio* of the sophist Hippias’ material representations which, while commendable, do not measure up to Apuleius’ representations through rhetoric or Honorinus’ representation of his father’s virtues; *Florida* 16 opens with Apuleius’ thanks to the Carthaginian senate for the statue which they have decreed in his honor and also his apologies for the delay in delivering this speech, which are paralleled in the *narratio* of Philemon not only given the similarity in Apuleius’ and Philemon’s missed performances but more importantly through
the link between literature and living, not only excusing Apuleius’ absence but also allowing him to thank the people of Carthage through his life and literature; *Florida 17* seeks from the beginning to carefully define Apuleius’ relationship with Scipio Orfitus as that of a philosopher with a learned and powerful friend (a relationship which Apuleius’ rivals do not possess), which justifies Apuleius’ later panegyric in honor of Orfitus because of the superiority—rhetorical and philosophic—of his own rhetoric; finally, *Florida 18* opens with Apuleius’ thanks to the people of Carthage for coming to hear a philosopher speak and also for the education with which they provided him, paving the way for the *narrationes* of the lesser monetary *merces* of the sophist Protagoras and the intellectual and abiding *merces* of the *sapiens* Thales, which is superior and mirrors Apuleius’ own thanks to the people of Carthage in the form of oratory and a hymn to Aesculapius. These intratextual connections within the speech are aimed to facilitate and develop his audience’s understanding, and thus are integral to the didactic relationship he so carefully cultivates with the people of Carthage.

Equally important to Apuleius’ relationship with his audience are the various intertexts which he employs, both in his *exordia* and in his *narrationes*, which allow those auditors who are up for the challenge to follow Apuleius’ arguments beyond the margins of his current speech. Apuleius’ intertextuality, therefore, plays an important role in his dialogic relationship with his audience and extends beyond mere sophistic display in supporting and broadening the themes related through his intratexts. *Florida 9*, which deals largely with rhetorical representation and types of imitation, suitingly echoes Quintilian and [Cicero] (*Rhetorica ad Herennium*), especially those passages in which these rhetorical handbooks discuss the nature of imitation; *Florida 16* is primarily concerned with the intersection of life and literature, and thus Apuleius’ utilization of the philosophical intertexts of Plato’s *Apology*. 
and Seneca’s *Naturales Quaestiones* is appropriate in infusing his own literary endeavors with a philosophical bent suitable to his subject matter; *Florida* 17 is concerned with Apuleius’ panegyric to Scipio, which he demonstrates as superior to those of his rivals through the bonds of friendship and philosophy which he shares with Orfitus, which are supported largely through the philosophical intertexts of Cicero’s *De amicitia* and Seneca’s *Epistulae morales*; lastly, *Florida* 18 addresses Apuleius’ thanks to the people of Carthage for the education with which they have provided him, and his repayment with this very education in the form of an oration and hymn is enhanced through literary references to Plautus and Homer which advance his argument in favor of a literary *merces* through literature itself.

While we might not expect intertexts to [Cicero] and Quintilian to be particularly important in a speech which addresses Hippias or Plato and Seneca to be important to a *narratio* about a comedic playwright, these intertexts do ultimately relate to the themes under consideration in any of the fragments above, both within their given context and for the larger themes of the speech as a whole as introduced from the *exordia*.

While there may not exist one overarching interpretation which encompasses all of the various fragments of the *Florida*, it is possible to trace within each of these larger fragments Apuleius’ careful cultivation of his relationship with his audience and the theme(s) which run throughout the surviving sections of his speeches. In addition to the highly intratextual nature of these fragments, there exists an intertextual aspect which is equally important for both his epideictic and didactic aims in underscoring Apuleius’ own themes as introduced in his *exordia* and inviting his audience to ruminate on the various connections within and between these various literary interlocutors. By presenting his audience with texts which are highly dialogic on account of their intratextual and intertextual relationships,
Apuleius as speaker draws his audience into dialogue with himself and also the various texts which he draws into play. While Apuleius endeavors to make these various interconnections as clear as possible in his dialogue with the audience to ensure the maximum effectiveness of his didactic program, a large component of the instructive nature of these fragments is to be found in the dialogue which must be taken up independently by the audience with the various intra- and intertexts.
Chapter Three

From Exordium to Praefatio: Reading Florida 1

Τὸ μὲν οὖν προοίμιον ἐστὶν ἀρχὴ λόγου, ὅπερ ἐν ποιήζει πρόλογος καὶ ἐν αὐλήζει προαύλιον· πάνηα γὰρ ἀρχαὶ ταῦτα εἰσὶ, καὶ οἷον ὁδοποίησις τῷ ἔπιοντι.

The preface is the beginning of a work; for example the prologue in poetic composition, the prelude in musical composition, these are all beginnings, a type of route for someone embarking on a journey.

--Aristotle, Rhetoric 1414b

Both exordia and praefationes serve a similar function in preparing the intended audience for what is to come next; they differ in that the exordium disposes the auditor for what is to follow in the rest of the oration, while the praefatio prepares the reader for all that comes next in the written text. This distinction becomes particularly important in the instance of Apuleius’ Florida 1, which shows “every indication that this passage constitutes the beginning of a speech,”¹ but which also serves as the first fragment in a collection which lacks any formal praefatio. Because the narratio which would originally have followed Florida 1 in its original performative context has not been preserved, it is not possible to analyze as I did in Chapter Two the way in which this fragment functions as an exordium and allows Apuleius to introduce the themes which he intratextually (and intertextually) weaves throughout the oration. However, as the default praefatio for the collected fragments of the Florida, similar techniques may be employed to analyze the function of Florida 1 as an introduction to the themes which surface throughout the text of the Florida as a whole, much in the manner that

¹ Harrison (2000), 95.
the various contributors to Kahane and Laird’s collection attempted to analyze the prologue of the *Metamorphoses*. Lee has noted that there are “thematic connections” between *Florida* 1 and some of the other fragments and that *Florida* 1 also provides a suitable introduction to the language in the *Florida* as a whole. The rest of this chapter will examine the way in which *Florida* 1 as a praefatio didactically provides cues to the reader as to how to read the subsequent textual fragments, both through intratextual links to the text which comprises the *Florida* collection and through intertextual links to outside works which influence the reader’s literary dialogue with *Florida* 1, the *Florida* as a whole, and Apuleius himself.

**Apuleius’ False Prefaces**

Before delving into the analysis of *Florida* 1, it is now appropriate to briefly examine some of the questions regarding the collection’s origins and the manuscripts which have not yet been addressed within this thesis. For Harrison, the lack of preface (and conclusion) strongly suggests that the work is a further excerption of an original, four-book collection of Apuleian excerptions, commenting that “a self-respecting sophistic writer seems to me unlikely to have composed an anthology from his own works in the form we have.” Working from the assumption that the collection is a selection of extracts, Harrison hypothesizes some of the possible intentions behind the selection process: an interest in Carthage, an interest in philosophy, an interest in technical models for rhetorical instruction, or merely a chronological survey. The absence of any true preface (Apuleian or otherwise) does contribute to a frustrating lack of context with respect to the original excerptor’s

---

2 Lee (2005), 62-3.
3 Harrison (2000), 92.
4 Harrison (2000), 132-5. With respect to the theory that the *Florida* may have been excerpted with a view towards rhetorical construction, Harrison (2000) notes that of the fourteen types of προγνώσματα (basic exercises and techniques of rhetorical composition) which are listed by Kennedy (1994), 202-8, at least seven appear in Apuleius’ *Florida* (134).
method of selection; however, whatever the method of selection, we have been provided
with a hint in the form of the default introduction: our very first fragment, *Florida* 1. Kahane
and Laird in their treatment of the prologue to Apuleius’ *Metamorphoses* explain why it is that
the prologues to classical works take on such great importance for their readers:

> Nowadays we can judge books by their covers. In antiquity, when a
> ‘book’ was a papyrus roll, its first few words made up the jacket blurb, and
> advertised the nature of the text to follow. This is why the beginnings of
> ancient works are thought of as programmatic, and have always received
> particular attention.5

Thus, while the process of selection for the *Florida* is unknown and while many of the
individual fragments are themselves programmatic, we as readers still seek to understand the
collection at least in part through *Florida* 1, which is placed in a programmatic position.

Such confusion regarding praefationes seems common in Apuleius’ corpus given the
questions surrounding interpretations of his prologue to the *Metamorphoses* and his other
famously contested praefatio: the ‘false preface’ to the *De deo Socratis*. Because of its
historically close association with the *Florida*, the latter must now be addressed in greater
detail. Like *Florida* 1, which is not a true praefatio to the *Florida*, most scholars still believe
that the false preface to the *De deo Socratis* is also not a true praefatio (or exordium) to the work
which follows it in the manuscripts.6 The *De deo Socratis* is largely devoted to discussion of
the daimonion of Socrates, while the five fragments of the preface address extempore speech,
Aristippus’ estimation of philosophy, the similarities between building an extempore speech
and a stone wall, the fable of the fox and the crow, and an address to the audience in which

---

5 Kahane and Laird (2001), 282.
6 Hunink (2000) aptly summarizes the prevailing attitude, that “In length, style and content, the prologue
seemed more like a section from Apuleius’ *Florida*,” (293). For examples of scholarship, cf. Harrison (2000),
130-2; Flamand (1989), 298-317. For examples of how modern editors have chosen to deal with the fragments,
cf. Beaujeu (1973), who includes the false preface under miscellaneous fragments with the heading <Florida>;
Moreschini, who, like Thomas, adds the title <Ex Apulei Floridis>; and Barra and Pannuti, who “suppose that
it replaces a now lost genuine introduction to *Sæ*” (Hunink (1995), 295).
Apuleius notes that he is shifting from speaking in Greek to speaking in Latin as his audience has requested. Although the idea that the fifth fragment of the preface is genuine has gained popularity in recent scholarship, the majority of scholars and editors have decided that the false preface has more in common with the Florida (and may actually constitute five displaced fragments of the Florida) than with the De deo Socratis. Scholarship arguing for the authenticity of all five fragments is rarer still.

But with respect to the MSS, Hunink raises three important points: 1) the De deo Socratis has been transmitted with Apuleius’ philosophical works while the Florida was separately grouped with the Metamorphoses and Pro se de magia, and “both groups remained completely separate until the 14th century”; 2) headings in the various manuscripts clearly articulate that the prologue belongs to the De deo Socratis; and 3) the headings in the various manuscripts would seem to indicate that, if the preface is split, that there are two sections consisting of what most scholars now label fragments 1-4 and fragment 5. With respect to content, Hunink observes both that “the prologue seems to be slightly different in tone from the Florida” and also follows Helm and Mantero in examining three ways in which the false preface fits thematically with the De deo Socratis: 1) both the preface and the main text make mention of and/or are improvisational, 2) both texts seem to refer to topics or themes which have presumably been dealt with, and 3) the De deo Socratis is fundamentally ‘Roman’ in nature, which particularly suits the fifth fragment of the preface.

---

8 See, e.g., Hunink (1995), who agrees largely with Helm (1900) and Mantero (1973).
9 Hunink (1995), 297; for additional information regarding the manuscript tradition of the De deo Socratis, see Reynolds (1983), 15-19.
Hunink follows Helm’s reconstruction in dividing the false preface into a *praefatio* (fragments 1-4) and a *praelocutio* (fragment 5). Helm argues for strong thematic links between the prologue and the *De deo Socratis* and hypothesizes that the entire speech had originally been a bilingual extemporization, of which only the second (Latin) half remains. In his proposed restoration, the first four fragments of the preface which deal most heavily with improvisation (Hunink’s *praefatio*) would have preceded the Greek portion of the speech, while the fifth (Hunink’s *praelocutio*) likely would have functioned as a bridge between the Greek and Latin halves of the speech. Of course, no Greek half remains, and the theory is “unfortunately without a shred of evidence to support it.” Thus, while the MSS would seem to support the authenticity of the false preface for the *De deo Socratis*, the possible gaps in the text and the uncertainties regarding the proposed reconstruction of the speech make it difficult to analyze the *praefatio* as a fitting introduction to the *De deo Socratis*. This is especially the case if there is indeed a lost Greek half of the text which would follow Hunink’s proposed *praefatio* (fragments 1-4). Thus, while it is not possible to determine indubitably whether the false preface of the *De deo Socratis* is the true *exordium* of the speech as it was originally delivered, the fact that it forms the *praefatio* of the text as it survives today nicely parallels the situation of *Florida* 1.

---

11 For additional information, cf. Helm (1900).
13 The preservation of only the Latin sections of the oration by the manuscriptist would not be particularly surprising, given that some of the *Florida* appear to cut off right before we would expect to Apuleius move to Greek; see, e.g., *Florida* 18 (which ends abruptly before the bilingual dialogue and hymn to Aesculapius which Apuleius has just introduced).
Florida 1: Exordium and Praefatio

Ut ferme religiosis viantium moris est, cum aliqui lucus aut aliqui locus sanctus in via oblatus est, votum postulare, ponum adponere, paulisper adicere: ita mihi ingresso sanctissimam istam civitatem, quamquam oppido festinem, praefanda venia et habenda oratio et inhibenda properatio est. neque enim iustius religiosam moram viatori obiecerit aut ara floribus redimita aut spelunca frondibus inumbrita aut quercus cornibus onerata aut fagus pelibus coronata, vel enim colluisus saepiimine consecratus vel truncus dolamine effigiatus vel caspes libamine umigatus vel lapis unguine delibutus. parva haec quippe et quamquam paucis perontantibus adorata, tamen ignorantibus transcursa.

As is generally the custom with religious wayfarers, when some grove or sacred alcove presents itself to them on their way, to make a suit to the gods, to set down fruit, and to sit down for a while, just so, now that I have entered this most holy city, although I am in an uncivil rush, I must beg your pardon, hold an oration, and hold back my precipitation. For an altar wreathed with flowers, a cave shaded with boughs, an oak loaded with horns, a beech crowned with hides, even a knoll consecrated by fencing, a trunk shaped by hewing, turf drenched with pouring, or a stone stained with smearing, cannot more justly delay the wayfarer on religious grounds. These are small things indeed and, though adored by the few who are diligent, bypassed by the ignorant.

At 92 words, Florida 1 is considerably shorter than the other fragments analyzed in the previous chapter.14 The fragment opens with a metaphor likening the speaker’s obligation—even if he is in a rush—to honor the city at which he has arrived with an oration to that of a religious wayfarer who has encountered a sacred shrine (1.1-4). The fragment closes with the observation that the sights which are sacred to the religious wayfarer can be honored by the few who recognize them or neglected by the ignorant (1.5).

Florida 1 fills the role two introductions in one: as an exordium within its original performative context it would have allowed Apuleius to construct a first impression with his audience, and it functions similarly for the modern reader as the praefatio of the collected Florida. Although the origin of the collection and manner of excerption is unknown, Florida 1 seems a suitable introduction to the Florida as a whole, introducing many of the linguistic

---

14 The shortest fragment analyzed in Chapter Two was Florida 17, at 548 words. The other fragments—Florida 9 (1051 words), Florida 16 (1383 words), and Florida 18 (1128 words)—were considerably longer. While not the smallest fragment in the collection, Florida 1 is certainly one of the shorter pieces in the collection.
and thematic currents which flow throughout and between the *Florida*. *Florida* 1 is notable even among the rest of the *Florida* for all of its wordplay. Lee notes that in this respect in particular, *Florida* 1 is a suitable introduction to a collection of epideictic fragments given that

the chief characteristic of epideictic is its use of language, particularly of amplification (μακρολογία). Such language is defined by the six Gorgianic figures: 1) antithesis, 2) paronomasia, 3) parechysis (alliteration or repetition of sound), 4) anadiplosis (repetition of words), 5) homoioteleuton (likeness of sound in final syllables of successive words or clauses), 6) pariosis or isocola (arrangement of words into nearly equal periods). All these are outstanding traits of the *Florida*’s language: and in fact all except one appear in the very first fragment.15

The language of the *Florida* has even been suggested as a method of excerption, explained by the title of the collection.16 Those who hold that Apuleius’ style may have prompted the excerption and titling of the work often point to Quintilian’s discussion of the intermediate *or floridum genus* (medium ex duobus, alii floridum (namque id ἀνθηπόν appellant), Inst. 12.10.58) (12.10.60): medius hic modus et tralationibus crebrior et figuris erit iucundior, egressionibus a moenus, compositione aptus, sententiis dulcis, lenior tamquam amnis et lucidus quidem sed uirentibus utrimque ripis inumbratus (“[t]he intermediate style will have more frequent recourse to metaphor and will make a more attractive use of figures, while it will introduce alluring digressions, will be neat in rhythm and pleasing in its reflexions: its flow, however, will be gentle, like that of a river whose waters are clear, but overshadowed by the green banks on either side”). While this style does seem well-suited to the *Florida* as a whole, Lee does note that “not all the passages in the *Florida* are flowery.”17 Additionally, the substantive *floridum* to describe a piece of writing in a flowery style is unattested.18 It is for this reason that Lee and Harrison both argue instead that the title of *Florida* refers to the actual act of selection, citing a similar usage

15 Lee (2005), 22.
16 Hijmans (1994), 1722 and ThLL s.v. floridus (926.5).
17 Lee (2005), 1.
18 Lee (2005), 1.
in Claudianus Mamertus’ *Epistolae (e summis auctoribus . . . doctiora quaeque velut thyme fraglantia et fecundiora veluti quaedam florida praecerpens).* While the question of the significance of the collection’s title may never be satisfactorily resolved, the choice of title does certainly invite the reader to associate Apuleius’ work with the *genus floridum,* and the language of *Florida* 1 does not disappoint the readers’ expectations.

*Florida* 1 is equally suited as an introduction to the themes which Apuleius treats throughout the *Florida* as it is as an introduction to the collection’s florid style. Considering just how short *Florida* 1 is, it is surprising how many of the words which Apuleius introduces therein recur in the succeeding fragments of the *Florida,* e.g., *via* (path),

*religious* (pious/reverent),

*sanctissimus* (most venerable),

*postulo* (to ask),

*festino* (to hurry),

*venia* (indulgence),

*effigies* (image),

*percontor* (to inquire), and

*oratio* (speech/discourse). Such repetition doubtless serves a programmatic purpose, as it is central to certain themes and tropes which surface throughout the *Florida* such as piety, travel and itinerancy, representation and imitation, and seeking and questioning. For example, *oratio* is certainly a theme traced throughout the *Florida,* given Apuleius’ rhetorical mastery and clever allusions to rhetorical handbooks and his correlation of oratory with life and philosophy in the fragments analyzed in Chapter Two. *Oratio* also becomes an important theme in *Florida* 13, in which the term appears twice, which compares the *oratio* of a philosopher with the songs

---

20 *Florida* 15.4, 21.1, and 21.5.
21 *Florida* 4.1, 15.19, 18.36, and 18.42.
22 *Florida* 7.7 and 16.41.
23 *Florida* 9.32, 16.1, 16.11, 16.36, 18.7 (in a quotation from Plautus), and 18.18.
25 *Florida* 17.5.
26 *Florida* 7.6 and 16.6.
of various birds. This, too, recalls the comparison in *Florida* 17, in that the calls of animals were found superior in some respects but lacking in *ratio*; thus, in *Florida* 13, Apuleius asserts the superiority of philosophical discourse in comparison with birdsong.29 Once a particular theme is picked up, the interconnections within the various fragments of the *Florida* are positively labyrinthine. Thus, although all of these stylistic similarities and lexical parallels which exist between *Florida* 1 and the rest of the collection are certainly striking and important, I believe that the more valuable approach is to proceed with a thorough thematic analysis of *Florida* 1 with particular emphasis on how the piece provides a suiting introduction to both Apuleius and his collected *Florida*.

To return to the epigraph of this chapter (Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 1414b): Τὸ μὲν οὖν προοίμιον ἐστὶν ἀρχὴ λόγου, ὅπερ ἐν ποιήσει πρόλογος καὶ ἐν αὐλήσει προαύλιον· πάντα γὰρ ἀρχαὶ ταῦτ' εἰσί, καὶ οἶον ὁδοποίησις τὸ ἐπίοντι (“[t]he preface is the beginning of a work; for example the prologue in poetic composition, the prelude in musical composition, these are all beginnings, a type of route for someone embarking on a journey”). In this passage, Aristotle likens a *prooemium* to the beginning of a path for one about to embark upon the journey of the speech; in a similar fashion, Apuleius’ *Florida* 1 is the starting point for the reader’s journey through the collected *Florida*. Appropriately enough, the first fragment of the *Florida* also opens with a conceit of travel (*iuantes*, 1.1; *nia*, 1.1; and *viator*, 1.3), which is a suitable introduction to the reader to both the author (as an itinerant philosopher-figure) and to the text itself, which analogously becomes its own pilgrimage of sorts. The first-person narration (cf. *festinem*, etc., as seen throughout the *Florida*) allows the

29 *Florida* 13.3: *Sed enim philosophi ratio et oratio tempore ingis est et auditu venerabilis et intellectu utilis et modo omnicana* (“But the discussion and discourse of the philosopher is unbroken in time, listened to with respect, useful to understand, and polyphonic in mode”).
reader to make a number of identifications: it can of course be read as the narrative voice of Apuleius (as, naturally, is literally the case given his role as orator and author), but in the process of reading the first-person speaker can simultaneously be understood as the reader’s own voice (as experienced through his or her own inherently first-person world view), and also as the textual voice, analogous to the prologue of Apuleius’ *Metamorphoses*. In the latter two instances, the reader is drawn into the role of religious wayfarer him- or herself, and this conceit of travel is important not only as a literary metaphor but also for some of its philosophical resonances.

In presenting himself as an itinerant orator, “Apuleius is here taking part in a tradition of idle Platonic allegory, which describes life as a religious journey.” While Apuleius’ use of intertexts almost always seems chosen to offer his audience and readers some deeper understanding of the matter at hand, a self-proclaimed *philosophus Platonicus*’ use of Plato necessarily always requires our attention. Lee notes that this allegory pervades Greek literature, from Hesiod’s *Works and Days* to Apuleius’ near contemporary, Maximus of Tyre. Maximus’ oration can be traced to similar Platonic passages, such as *Gorgias* 497c, *Symposium* 210a, and *Phaedrus* 249c. Thus, Apuleius is tapping into a familiar philosophical conceit in presenting himself as a religious wayfarer (one of the *religiosus viantium*). Moreover, since both the reader and text are allowed to identify with the first-person narrative voice, the reader and text themselves are among the *religiosi viantium*.

---

30 For further information on the way in which readers identify with characters/authors/texts, see Oatley (1995), 63-72.
31 See Harrison (2000), 228. The “travelling book” was a trope found in other poetic works (cf. Martial, 1.70; Horace, *Epistulae* 1.20; and—most pertinent to the present discussion, given its first-person narrative—Ovid, *Tristia* 3.1.
32 Lee (2005), 61.
34 Lee (2005), 62.
In her analysis of the prologue to Apuleius’ *Metamorphoses*, de Jong notes that “[t]he majority of Plato’s dialogues open with a conversation. Most of the time we enter the conversation at its beginning, a speaker meeting another person and asking him where he is going or where he is coming from, for example, *Phaedrus*: {ΣΩ.} Ὄφιλε Φαίδρε, ποῖ δὴ καὶ πόθεν.” The first-person narrator’s act of narrating his travels likewise serves to draw the audience into a sort of dialogue. Although we do not know where our narrator is going, we do know that he is in a bit of a hurry to get there (quamquam oppido festinem, 1.2) but is still willing to put things on hold (inhibenda properatio est, 1.2) to address sanctissima ista civitas. While this gesture seems to be a favor (venia) to the addressed civitas, it is the narrator himself who begs pardon (praefanda venia). Some sort of reciprocity is thus established in this literary relationship, much as seen in Apuleius’ carefully cultivated relationship with his auditors in the oratorical fragments analyzed above. The metaphor of the religious wayfarer offers this former speech/now prologue (and by association, the work that follows) as Apuleius’ votum.

The first lines of the praefatio thus emphasize the importance of travel and delay, which both frame the work as philosophical discourse through use of the Platonic conceit of life as a religious journey while also defining the author’s/text’s relationship to the reader in presenting the text as a (religious) gift or votum which merits disruption of hurried travels. This concatenation of themes recalls two Ovidian passages, a very suitable source for this praefatio given Ovid’s obsession with the power of art—especially literary. While the Platonic intertexts are naturally important coming from a *philosophus Platonicus*, the Ovidian references form a surprisingly suiting allusion to introduce the beginning of a literary

---

35 de Jong, 202.
36 See E. J. Kenney’s “The *Metamorphoses*: A Poet’s Poem” in the Blackwell *Companion to Ovid.*
collection given Ovid’s status as one of the consummate literary authors. Within the context of *Florida* 1 as a literary *praefatio*, these Ovidian intertexts really ground Apuleius’ rhetorical *Florida* in the literary realm. The first of these allusions is to Ovid’s *Tristia* (3.3.71-80):

> quoque legat versus oculo properante viator,  
> grandibus in tumuli marmore caede notis:  
> Hic ego qui laco tenerorum lasor amorum  
> ingenio perii Nasso poeta meo  
> at tibi qui tansies ne sit grave quisquis amasti  
> dure Nasonis molliter ossa cubent,  
> hoc satis in titulo est: etenim maiora libelli  
> et diuturna magis sunt monumenta mihi,  
> quos ego confido, quamvis nocuere, daturos  
> nomen et auctori tempora longa suo.  

and carve these lines in fine letters on the marble for the hurried eyes of passers-by to read:

I live here, who toyed with tender love,  
Ovid the poet betrayed by my genius:  
be not severe, lover, as you pass by,  
say ‘Easy may the bones of Ovid lie’  
That suffices for an epitaph. In fact my books are a greater and a lasting monument,  
those, I know, though they’ve injured him will give their author fame and enduring life.

The fact that this passage comes from one of Ovid’s collections of exile poetry raises some interesting parallels from the start, as Ovid himself is a forced *viator* of sorts and utilizes the text to address his close friends and family and also his other works.³⁷ *Florida* 1 is similarly an address from a traveler to an audience with whom Apuleius seeks to cultivate some sort of intimacy and which references other works in his corpus (especially other works within the *Florida*).

---
³⁷ For further analysis of how Ovid’s exile poetry relates to Apuleius’ *Metamorphoses*, cf. Graverini (2004-2005). With respect to the *Metamorphoses*, Graverini notes that “Ovid is an exile in Tomis, and the remoteness from Rome affects his linguistic skill. Change of language and of cultural context are also important themes in Apuleius” (228). I would like to add that these are also important themes throughout the *Florida*, as we have already seen the manner in which Apuleius plays with ideas concerning rhetoric (and its embodiment) as well as the importance of Carthage for him as a cultural context to his works.
There are a few important implications to this passage and the parallels it invites. Firstly, there is the traveler (viator), who is imagined to be in a hurry since he scans the monument quickly (legat . . . oculo properante), which mirrors the imagined setting of the current praefatio. Because the first person narrative also allows the reader to occupy the role of the hurrying religious wayfarer, Ovid’s hope that the viator will quickly read his own epitaph mirrors Apuleius’ hopes that his reader can also be bothered to slow down and read the text. There is also a juxtaposition of text with author and text with life: maiora libelli / et diurna magis sunt monimenta mihi and nomen et auctori tempora longa suo. This is a theme familiar from Florida 16 in which we saw Apuleius juxtapose literature with life through the figure of Philemon, but here it serves the additional role of inviting the reader to conflate life and literature and to take the conceit of life as a religious journey from the text and apply it to real life. This introduces the didactic call to action which becomes particularly important with the choice Apuleius offers later in the implied contrast between those pauci percontantes and ignorantes (Flor. 1.5).

The very idea of an introduction recalling an epitaph is unusual, as it seems to be a far more common trope for the end of a collection or for a sphragis poem. Concluding with an epitaph perhaps seems more natural, given that epitaphs themselves mark a conclusion of sorts; therefore they are a suiting means of inviting the passerby (or reader) to remember upon the conclusion of the author’s work. The fact that Apuleius’ introduction alludes to Ovid’s epitaph seems an oddly suitable inversion, however, in that it complements the circularity inherent in the way his exordia always refer the auditor to the end. Beginning

---

38 Sphragis poems which evoke epitaphs include Propertius, Elegies 1.21, which is compared to an epitaph by Stahl (1985), Traill (1994), Davis (1971), Heiden (1995), etc.; and Horace, Ode 3.30: “ecogi monumentum aere perennius . . .”
with an allusion to Ovid’s epitaph reminds the reader of the obvious—there is an end—but also provides a clue as to how Apuleius’ corpus works with its various levels of self-referentiality. Therefore, we see the end in the introduction as we often do in others of Apuleius’ 

exordia, and beginning with the end invites the reader to revisit the 

praefatio upon the conclusion of the text. Additionally, the use of poetic epitaph generally allows the author to present his work as a lasting testament and a symbol of his poetic immorality; but the nature of Apuleius’ Florida (a collection of speeches assembled after the fact) by nature pays homage to his literary immortality. Thus, the fact that Apuleius’ work opens with an allusion to such literary immortality is perhaps unconventional, but oddly appropriate for such a collection. Additionally, there is a certain symmetry in the parallelism between the Florida collection as a whole opening with an allusion to Ovid’s epitaph and closing with further thoughts on mortality and disease. Thus, the allusion to Ovid’s epitaph through the figure of a hurrying traveler is an unorthodox but suitable introduction to Apuleius’ work in playing upon the parallels between beginnings and endings seen throughout his 

praefatio, exordia, and collected Florida.

The second possible Ovidian intertext comes from the Heroides (7.74): 

grande morae pretium tuta futura via est (“your safe voyage will be great reward for your waiting”). This particular line comes from Dido’s letter to Aeneas, which is also significant given that a number of the orations in the Florida address Carthage. Additionally, Lee hypothesizes that Florida 1 as a speech was likewise addressed to Carthage (perhaps even as Apuleius’ debut

---

39 See Florida 23, on the parallels between the vulnerability of a rich man to disease and a fine ship to shipwreck.
40 For the “North African cultural pride in relation to Dido,” see Finkelpearl (1998), 143. Chapter 6 (“Charite, Dido, and the Widow of Ephseus) demonstrates the way in which Apuleius possibly rewrites and reclaims the character of Dido within his own Metamorphoses.
oration), although Harrison feels that they city in question cannot be Carthage but is instead a city en route to somewhere else. Dido requests Aeneas to wait a little while for the sea to calm (Heroides 7.73: da breve saevitiae spatium pelagique tuaeque, “[g]rant a short space for the cruelty of the sea, and for your own, to subside”) before he may safely continue on his journey. Similarly, the narrator grants the audience a short delay in his travels before it is assumed that he will resume them, while at the same time requesting that his busy readers grant a little of their time for a journey into the text before continuing on their own ways.

In this way, Florida 1 constructs an appeal to the reader—an appeal to stop and read and to take in the words of a fellow religiosus viantium. Lee notes that the conceit of the religious path introduced from the opening lines “is a metaphor for the manner in which we conduct our lives . . . the religious path provides an analogy for the conduct of one’s self.”

Thus while Apuleius’ fragment ends with a list of sights which are capable of being seen by all travelers, he implies different levels of perception (Florida 1.5): parua haec quippe et quamquam paucis percontantibus adorata, tamen ignorantibus transcursa (“indeed these things are small and, although honored by those few inquisitive souls, nevertheless they are bypassed by the ignorant”). In this manner, Apuleius is offering his audience a choice, in that the reader “may be like the many who rush past and miss everything (ignorantibus transcursa); or like the few that seek out small things but at the same time are then able to appreciate them, even revere them (paucis percontantibus adorata).” In the close associations that the praefatio has built between narrator, text, reader, and living, this choice encompasses both literary and

---

41 Lee (2005), 61.
42 Harrison (2000), 94.
43 Lee (2005), 62.
44 Lee (2005), 63.
philosophical ramifications. Lee notes of the verb *percontor* that its etymology (*contare* fr. Gk. *kontos* a ‘pole,’) signifies “‘to probe’ by asking questions,” which in Apuleius is usually “used of spoken exchanges.” Thus, the reader is invited to take part in the literary discourse, which stands in stark contrast to the *ignorantes* for whom the *parva are transcursa*. Lee’s notes on the word *transcursa* also invite literary metaphor in characterizing things which are “hurriedly passed over” (i.e. without being noticed), frequently of things treated superficially in discourse: “Cf. the noun *transcursus*, -us a ‘superficial’ piece of rhetoric of writing.”

Thus, the reader is presented with a choice of being one of the few who actually stop and read and question/engage with the text (*paucis percontantibus adorata*) or of merely scanning it or of even throwing it aside as something superficial (*ignorantibus transcursa*). As the praefatio prepares the reader for his or her journey into the text (both by preparing him or her for the themes which recur in other of Apuleius’ *Florida* but also by instructing the reader as to *how* to read the text), so does it prepare the reader for the choices involved in literature, which is here and elsewhere in the *Florida* closely connected with life. Thus, Apuleius invites the reader to stop and attend to the *votum* which the life of virtue demands (*postulare*). Taking the time to read the text itself become a path to virtue, and *Florida* 1 invites and instructs the reader to take that journey.

**Conclusion**

Although *Florida* 1 was likely an *exordium* in its own right in its original performative context, the loss of its *narratio* renders fruitless any analysis of its rhetorical function as employed in Chapter Two. As the first fragment to the *Florida* as they survive today,
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45 Lee (2005), 65.
46 Lee (2005), 66.
however, *Florida* 1 does serve as the *praefatio* to the text as a whole, and as we were able to see earlier the way in which *exordia* prepare the auditor for the speech to follow, so does *Florida* 1 intratextually prepare the reader for the subsequent fragments, both linguistically and thematically. In the same way which Apuleius carefully constructs a relationship with the audience in his *exordia* above, so does the *Florida* 1 as *praefatio* carefully build relationships between text, narrator, author, and reader. The narrator and text, as a religious wayfarer, draw upon the Platonic allegory of life as a religious journey. Thus, the text is intertextually characterized as a philosophic discourse, and the reader is presented with the ultimate choice of engaging with the text/philosophy or of disregarding it.

In addition to providing a suitable linguistic introduction to the *Florida*, then, *Florida* 1 intratextually prepares the reader for the dialogic and philosophic discourse in which s/he is invited to participate in fragments 2-23, in part through the intertextual journey through texts which characterizes Apuleius’ literary relationship to his audience. Although the Platonic intertext which equates the act of journey with the virtuous life is certainly an important theme for the reader embarking on a journey through a *philosophus Platonicius*’ literary text, the less expected Ovidian intertexts are no less important in defining Apuleius’ text and his readers’ relationship to it. The allusion to Ovid’s epitaph in the *Tristia* plays upon the way in which Apuleius’ introductions always look towards (and instruct the audience in preparation for) the end. It also models for the reader the very process of reading, in embodying the circularity of the process: the end invites the reader to return to and reread the beginning, in which new appreciation for the ending can be found. Likewise, the allusion to Ovid’s *Heroides* which links delay with safe travels and rewards draws upon the *festinans viator* with which Apuleius opens *Florida* 1 while preparing the reader for the
choice which closes the fragment: to be one of those who slows his or her pace and consequently reaps the rewards of the dialogic (percontor) literary journey or to rush by and remain in ignorance (ignorans).

The prevalence of Ovid in the praefatio to the Florida serves to further link it to the prologue of the Metamorphoses, in which Ovid also plays an important intertextual role. Ovid can be seen at work in the prologue of the Metamorphoses from the analogy of titles to the metaphor of ‘weaving’ (conserant) which links the narrator to Ovid’s Arachne to the possibility that both Apuleius’ prologue and Ovid’s Tristia begin with a speaking book.47 Just as “speaking books appear to be an important topos in Ovid’s poetry,”48 Apuleius’ various praefationes endeavour to initiate the dialogue with his readers through his own speaking books. Analogy with Ovid calls attention to the literary nature of these texts and the way in which texts themselves can speak with each other; in allowing his own praefationes to speak to the reader (in part through these intertextual links to Ovid), Apuleius invites his readers to dialogue with his speaking books and commence a true literary journey.

Chapter Four: Conclusion

The End of the Program and Last(ing) Impressions

What’s past is prologue.
--William Shakespeare

If what is past is prologue, it is equally true for Apuleius’ prologues that they enable his ancient auditors (and modern readers) to see the ends in the beginnings. This study was inspired by recent scholarship addressing the introductions to two of Apuleius’ most famous works: Kahane and Laird’s volume on the prologue of the *Metamorphoses* and Asztalos’ article on the *exordium* of the *Apologia*. Although both works address Apuleian introductions, Kahane and Laird naturally approach the prologue of the *Metamorphoses* as the introduction to the literary work it is, while Asztalos analyzes the *exordium* as a suitable introduction to the speech which follows and the way which the *exordium* is a model of the entire speech in a ‘nutshell.’ The *Florida*’s complex textual status as a collection of fragments of unknown derivation leaves it in a unique position between the prologue of the *Metamorphoses* and the *exordium* of the *Apologia*, necessitating a new approach to the old problem of programmatic analysis.

We have therefore seen the manner in which some of the fragments in Apuleius’ *Florida* (specifically those which appear in all likelihood to have complete *exordia* and some or even all of the following *narrationes*) can be analyzed as rhetorical fragments in the manner of Asztalos, by seeing the manner in which the themes which Apuleius introduces in his *exordia*
resurface intratextually throughout the speech and find further elaboration in the narrationes through means of intertextually significant digressions. Florida 1, on the other hand, while originally an exordium, cannot be analyzed in the same fashion due to the loss of its succeeding narratio. Nevertheless, we can see the parallels which exist between the role which Florida 1 fulfills for the collected Florida and that of the prologue to the Metamorphoses—both effectively set the scene for the written texts which are to follow through preparing the reader for the themes and language of the works as a whole.

Intratextuality and intertextuality are equally important for fully understanding the way in which Florida 1 complements the collected Florida as for understanding the manner in which Apuleius’ exordia prepare the auditor for his narrationes. In both instances, the introductions show particular care in Apuleius’ cultivation of his relationship with his audience, especially by means of his captationes benevolentiae. The manner in which he prepares his audience for the subject manner to follow is indicative of his didactic program, and the manner in which he emphasizes his cultural, intellectual, and personal relationship with Carthage allows Apuleius to offer his orations in recompense to the intellectual debt he owes. Thus, Apuleius invites his audience to participate as students in the speech and to make themselves amenable to the intellectually and philosophically disposed discourse which occurs between the dialogues of intratexts and intertexts, orator and auditor.

A similar approach utilizing Apuleius’ didactic and dialogic introductions could also be employed to enrich our understanding of some of Apuleius’ less-studied philosophical treatises, which have hitherto received little scholarly attention.¹ My aim in this study,
however, was to demonstrate the complexity of the *Florida*, and how it is that we can and do read the collection as a whole and the way in which Apuleius’ carefully crafted introductions assist in our comprehension of the speeches individually and as a collection. As seen in Apuleius’ major “literary” works (the *Metamorphoses*, *Apologia*, and *Florida*), Apuleius’ rhetorical mastery necessarily invites the auditor or reader to go back and reflect on the beginnings—reconsideration of what has come before leads to the realization that the conclusion has perhaps been staring us in the face all along. Just as we cannot help but to read the *Metamorphoses* again in a different light after Lucius’ unexpected conversion to the cult of Isis, so does reflection upon what has preceded in any of Apuleius’ given rhetorical fragments prompts us to probe the connections within and without of the text. Apuleius therefore invites us to push beyond the margins of his works and into our own intellectual and philosophical explorations.

Plato). Although there are scholars who feel that the style and prose rhythm of these works are too divergent from Apuleius’ other works to belong to his corpus (see Beaujeu, *Apulée: Opuscules philosophiques* (Paris, 1973), ix-xxix for a summary of these arguments), Harrison (2000), 179 and Lee (2005), 9-10 support Apuleian authorship of these treatises. The presence of a very discrete prologue to the *De Mundo* “which may be taken as programmatic in terms of the work’s literary tradition as well as in terms of its thematic content” (Harrison (2000), 184) and the various allusions and intertexts to Cicero and Lucretius found therein (Harrison (2000), 184-7) and the introductory biography of Plato which opens the *De Platone* and which “contains more typical elements of Apuleius style than any other passage in *De Platone* of comparable length” (Harrison (2000), 200) invite further analysis than these *praefationes* have previously received. Harrison (2000) asserts that the true beginning to the *De Platone* may have been lost (200); this makes the identification of the biography as the *praefatio* for the work more problematic, but also renders a fuller analysis of the programmatic fit of the *praefatio* as it survives today for the following text all the more necessary and potentially fruitful. For additional information on the textual and literary attributes of each of these treatises, see Harrison (2000), 174-95, and 174-80 and 195-209, respectively.
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