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The least studied of the works of Apuleius is beyond doubt the Florida, a collection of twenty-three fragments of his epideictic orations. This thesis examines the conformity of the work to the rhetorical theory of the second century.

The first chapter is a brief examination of the origins and nature of the Second Sophistic, the Greek literary renaissance of Apuleius' time. It concludes that the Second Sophistic was as much a social as a literary phenomenon, and that the chief figures of the movement, the sophists, were more notable for the social importance they suddenly gained than for any literary originality they had.

The second chapter is a survey of what is known of the life of Apuleius. Its conformity to the usual pattern of the sophist's career is demonstrated through the parallel treatment given in the chapter to the lives of two other rhetoricians of North Africa, Fronto and Augustine.

The third chapter is an explanation of the nature of epideictic oratory. The relevant passages from
Aristotle's *Rhetoric* are quoted and some indication is given of what is known of epideictic oratory before Aristotle. The growth in the importance of the genre between his time and the Second Sophistic is documented by a partial listing of the types of epideictic speech recognized in the two epideictic handbooks of the early third-century rhetorician Menander of Laodicea.

The second part of the thesis opens with a brief discussion of the manuscripts of the *Florida* and then moves to an examination of the individual fragments with the aid of the *Institutio Oratoria* of Quintilian and the two treatises of Menander already mentioned. It is discovered that the fragments of the *Florida* can be integrated into the systems of Menander and Quintilian with little difficulty. The longer fragments can often be classed according to the types defined by Menander; thus, in *Florida i* we have an instance of the *epibatērios logos*, in xviii and xx fragments of encomiums of a city (Carthage), and in ix part of a propemptic oration. In the longer fragments we can also see the rhetorical techniques employed by Apuleius, most of which are defined in Quintilian. Favourite among them are augmentation and the extensive use of the *exemplum*. Most of the shorter fragments consist of
isolated exempla, many of them being anecdotes of the philosophers. All of the fragments are examined for content and for rhetorical devices employed.

A brief conclusion suggests that, in view of Apuleius' Greek training and what the Florida reveals to us of his activities, he should be considered a true representative of the Greek Second Sophistic.
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THE PLAN AND OBJECT OF THIS WORK

Apuleius, the African writer of the second century, is remembered today chiefly for his prose romance, the *Metamorphoses*, which has had an important influence on the development of the modern novel. In antiquity he was most famous as a philosopher. This essay is an examination of a third aspect of his activities, his career as a sophist or professional rhetorician.

The first chapter is a short description of the second-century literary renaissance to which Apuleius belonged, the movement known to us as the Second Sophistic. The second chapter is a summary of what we know of the lives of Apuleius and two of his fellow-sophists, the emphasis being placed on those elements common to the biographies of all. The third chapter, which concludes the first part of the essay, is an account of that branch of ancient rhetoric known as épideictic ("display") oratory, the genre to which the *Florida* of Apuleius belongs.

1For Apuleius' view of himself as primarily a philosopher see chapter XII below; for a similar later judgment cf. Augustine *City of God* iv.2, viii.14-22, ix passim.
The second part of the essay looks at each of the twenty-two fragments of Apuleius' speeches that make up the Florida and assesses their conformity to the rhetorical theory of Apuleius' time as described by Apuleius' contemporary Menander in his two treatises On Epideictic Oratory and the first-century teacher of rhetoric Quintilian in his Education of the Orator. There is a brief conclusion.

I wish this work to be accessible to the general reader, and have therefore provided translations for all quotations from works not in English. With the same object, I have inserted footnotes only where absolutely essential. The use I have made of modern works of scholarship is indicated in the annotations to the bibliography.

For references to the works of Apuleius I have used the text and numbering of the Budé edition, now made complete by the publication in 1973 of Jean Beaujeu's edition of the Opuscules philosophiques et fragments.
PART ONE

THE SECOND SOPHISTIC
In the first and second centuries after Christ a renaissance occurred in ancient literature, a renaissance known as the Second Sophistic, the name given to it by its historian Philostratus. Philostratus lived around the end of the second century, and was therefore nearly contemporary with the movement he described. This is the account he gives of its origin in his Lives of the Sophists:

1According to the Souda (no. 422 Adler) he survived to the reign of Philip the Arab (244-49). For a full treatment of Philostratus and his work see the first chapter, "The Biographer of the Sophists," of Bowersock's Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire (pages 1-29).
Now ancient sophistic, even when it propounded philosophical themes, used to discuss them diffusely and at length; for it discoursed on courage, it discoursed on justice, on the heroes and gods, and how the universe has been fashioned into its present shape. But the sophistic that followed it, which we must not call "new," for it is old, but rather "second," sketched the types of the poor man and the rich, of princes and tyrants, and handled arguments that are concerned with definite and special themes for which history shows the way.

Gorgias of Leontini founded the older type in Thessaly, and Aeschines, son of Atrometetus, founded the second, after he had been exiled from political life at Athens and had taken up his abode in Caria and Rhodes; and the followers of Aeschines handled their themes according to the rules of art, while the followers of Gorgias handled theirs as they pleased.

481 (trans. W.C. Wright)

In claiming Aeschines as the founder of the Second Sophistic Philostratus is probably searching for a pedigree for the movement rather than giving us reliable information on its early history, for he covers the four
centuries following Aeschines in one sentence and goes immediately to an account of Nicetes, a rhetor of the age of Nero:

'Ὑπερβάντες ο’ Ἀριστοφάνην τὸν Κήλικα καὶ Ἑνόφρονα τὸν Σικελιάτον καὶ Πείθαγόραν τὸν ἕκ.

Κυρίμναν, οἱ μέτε γυναῖκι ἠκουεύ σαν, μᾶθε ἐρμηνεύσας ὑπ' ἑυσεβεία, ἀλλ' ἄπνοι γεννών

σοφιστών ἐσποουδάσθησαν τοῖς ἔφ' ἐμιτοίν Ἐλληνοι, ὅταν τοῦ τρόπου τοῖς σῖτον ἀποροῦσιν ὁ ὀρέσσει, ἐπὶ

Νικήταν ἰπτοιαν τὸν Σμυρνίαν. οὗτος γὰρ ὁ Νικάτω

παιδαχῦν τῶν ἐπιστημῶν ἐστενὸν ἀπειθημένων ἐδωκεν μέτοι παρόδος πολλῷ λυμπρατέος ὡν κυτος ἔτη Ἐμύρη ἐδέψω, συνεῖς τὸν πόλιν ταῖς

ἐπὶ τῶν Ἠρεμον πύλαις καὶ διὰ μέγεθος ἀντεξέρας

λόγως ἐργα. ὁ δὲ ἀκοῦσαν τοῖς μὲν δικανικοῖς

ἀμείβων ἔδωκεν τῇ δικανίᾳ, τοῖς δὲ σοφιστικοῖς

τῇ σοφιστικῇ περιδεξίῳς τε καὶ ἔρεα θυμιλλῆν ἔσ.

ἔμων ἐφιστήθη, τοῦ μὲν γὰρ δικανικῶν σοφιστικών

περιβολῆς ἐκατάμενον, τοῦ δὲ σοφιστικῶν κέντρῳ

δικανικῶς ἐπέρεσσαν. ὃς δὲ ἰδεῖ τῶν λόγων τοῦ

μὲν ἀρχῶν καὶ πολιτικῶν ἀποκέφαλεν, ὡπόθ' ἔκτως

dη πλευραμαθής, ταῖς ἐν τῶν ἰδιών τε καὶ

παρέδοσες ἐκδίδωσιν, ὡσπερ ὁμοιότοι θύρας αὐτὸς τὸ μὲν, καὶ τοὺς ἐσόμοις τοῦ γέλοιτος.'
We will pass over Ariobarzanes of Cilicia, Xenophron of Sicily, and Peithagoras of Cyrene, who showed no skill either in invention or in the expression of their ideas, though in the scarcity of first-rate sophists they were sought after by the Greeks of their day, as men seek after pulse when they are short of corn; and we will proceed to Nicetes of Smyrna. For this Nicetes found the science of oratory reduced to great straits, and he bestowed on it approaches far more splendid even than those which he himself built for Smyrna, when he connected the city with the gate that looks to Ephesus, and by this great structure raised his deeds to the same high level as his words. He was a man who, when he dealt with legal matters, seemed to be a better lawyer than anything else, and again when he dealt with sophistic themes he seemed to do better as a sophist, because of the peculiar skill and the keen spirit of competition with which he adapted himself to both styles. For he adorned the legal style with sophistic amplification, while he reinforced the sophistic style with the sting of legal argument. His type of eloquence forsook the antique political convention and is almost bacchic and like a dithyramb, and he produces phrases that are peculiar and surprise by their daring, like "the thyrsi of Dionysus drip with honey," and "swarms of milk."

510-11 (trans. W.C. Wright)

There follow accounts of some forty sophists of the second century.

What were the characteristics of this movement? For two reasons this is a question difficult for us to answer. The first is that the works of most of the sophists mentioned by Philostratus have completely disappeared; only the works of Aelius Aristides and Dio Chrysostom survive in large number. The second is
that in many ways the Second Sophistic was not a new departure in literature, but simply a fresh synthesis of elements already existing.

Philostratus distinguishes the two sophistics chiefly on the basis of subject; the First Sophistic dealt mainly with philosophical themes, while the Second Sophistic used fictional and historical topoi. But there is ample evidence for the existence and use of these topoi in the ages of Seneca the Elder and Cicero, and earlier still. It therefore seems that it was not subject matter that differentiated the Second Sophistic from the earlier rhetorical tradition.

André Boulanger has given a very satisfactory explanation of the nature of the Second Sophistic:

Nous avons vu en effet qu'il est aisé, si mal informés que nous soyons, de remonter dans le passé plus loin que ne le fait la Vie des sophistes et d'apercevoir avant Nicétès une lignée ininterrompue de rhéteurs dont l'art ne différait guère du sien et qui, comme lui, plaidaient, déclamaient en public sur des thèmes d'école, prononçaient des discours de cérémonie.

Cependant, et cela non plus ne paraît pas contestable, si Nicétès n'est pas l'homme providentiel, le créateur qu'imaginait Philostrate, une transformation importante s'accomplit à son époque dans la sophistique. Les sophistes du temps de Nerva et surtout ceux des générations suivantes se distinguent de leurs prédécesseurs par une différence essentielle: ceux-ci sont surtout des maîtres de rhétorique qui ne sortent de l'école que dans les grandes occasions; ceux-là sont des personnages officiels qui ont leur rôle marqué dans la vie publique et représentent à eux seuls presque toute la
We have seen that it is easy, ill-informed as we are, to go further into the past than do the *Lives of the Sophists*, and to perceive before Nicetes an uninterrupted series of rhetors whose technique barely differed from his and who, like him, spoke in court, declaimed in public on school themes, and gave orations on formal occasions.

If, as must be admitted, Nicetes is not the man sent by Providence or the creative force that Philostratus imagined, an important transformation nonetheless did occur in the sophistic of his period. The sophists of the time of Nerva and especially those of the following generations are distinguished from their predecessors by one essential difference: the latter are teachers of rhetoric who never leave the schoolroom except on important occasions; the former are official figures who have an important role in public life, and who represent the whole world of letters. But it is not the sophists who have changed, but rather the conditions of their existence and their public. The exaggerated importance now given a literary genre which for long had been nothing more than a preparation for everyday speaking can only be explained by exceptionally favourable circumstances and an indulgent public.

André Boulanger,
*Aelius Aristide* p. 70

This change Boulanger imputes to the peaceful conditions of the second century and the encouragement given the arts under the Good Emperors.
In the absence of further evidence Boulanger's theory deserves acceptance; the fifty years since the publication of his work have seen no demonstration of literary originality in the Second Sophistic, but much fresh evidence for the commanding social position granted the leading figures of the movement\textsuperscript{3}.

We shall now pass on to a close examination of the career of Apuleius as a professional sophist.

\textsuperscript{2}G.W. Bowersock's recent (1969) \textit{Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire}, cited above, deserves special mention.
II
THE LIFE OF APULEIUS

This chapter is an examination of what is known to us of the lives of Apuleius, his contemporary Fronto, and the church father Augustine. All three were born in North Africa; all three were teachers of rhetoric; and a fair amount is known of the life of each of them. I hope by this method to give a clear demonstration of Apuleius' conformity to the standard sophistic pattern of his time.

I. Birth and Family

Apuleius was born around 123 A.D.\(^1\) in the North African city of Madauros,\(^2\) which is situated about

\(^1\)Aemilianus Strabo, a fellow-student of Apuleius (Florida xvi.36), became consul suffectus in 156. The minimum age for the consulate was thirty-three years; we therefore arrive at 123 as the probable year of his birth, and at the same time fix the approximate date of birth of Apuleius.

\(^2\)Augustine, City of God viii.14 "Apuleius...Platonicus Madaurensis" - "Apuleius...the Platonic [philosopher] of Madauros"; Apuleius, Metamorphoses xi.27.9 "Nam sibi visus est quie te proxima, dum magno deo coronas exaptat...[lacuna]...et de eius ore, quo singulorum fata dictat, audisse mitti sibi Madaurensem" - "For on the previous night there had appeared to him, while he was preparing crowns for the great god...and from his lips, which pronounce the fate of every man, he had heard that a man from Madauros was being sent to him."
two hundred and fifty kilometres southwest of Carthage. About his family little is known, and that little is disputed. His father was evidently well off; Apuleius tells us that he became duumvir of his city 3.

The *Metamorphoses* gives what may be authentic information on the life of Apuleius, but there are difficulties in using the work as a source for his biography. The main narrative of the *Metamorphoses* is taken from an earlier Greek work of which an epitome, the *Onos* (*Ass*) survives in the manuscripts of Lucian 4.

The eleventh book, dealing with the rescue of the main character Lucius by the goddess Isis, appears to be in some degree an account of events in Apuleius' own life; this is indicated by the existence of a quite different end to the narrative in the *Onos* and by the fact that at *Metamorphoses* xi. 27. 9 (quoted in the second footnote of the present chapter) Lucius is called "the man from Madauros" and hence identified with Apuleius.

There stands as well in the Latin work a preface,

3 *Apology* xxiv. 9 "in qua colonia patrem habui loco principis duumviralem cunctis honoribus perfunctum" - "In this colony I had a father who held the high rank of duumvir, having held all the other elected positions."

apparently by Apuleius, in which he apologizes for his Latin style; he is, he says, of Greek origin, and in any case is telling a Greek tale. He then begins the narrative portion of the work with this sentence:

Thessaliam - nam et illic originis maternae nostrae fundamenta a Plutarcho illo incolito ac mox Sexto philosopho nepote eius prodita gloriam nobis faciunt - eam Thessaliam ex negotio petebam.

I was on my way to Thessaly - for it is from there that my mother's family, distinguished by its descent from the famous Plutarch and his nephew Sextus, traces its origins - I was on my way, as I said, to Thessaly for business reasons.

1.2.1

The problems raised by this beginning are great, but not insuperable. Sextus is known to have had considerable contact with the western part of the empire, having been a tutor of Marcus Aurelius; literary eminence in this period was often inherited; there is evidence that Greek was the everyday language in Apuleius' circles; it is far from impossible that he was of Greek origin. But in the absence of further

5Cf. Marcus Aurelius, Meditations i.9; Philostratus, Lives of the Sophists 557; Dio Cassius lxxi.1.2.

6Cf. the examples cited by Bowersock, Greek Sophists pp. 24-25.

7The letter of his wife Pudentilla that Apulèius quotes from at Apology lxxxii.2 is in Greek.
evidence a certain conclusion is unattainable.

Fronto was born around 110 in the city of Cirta, situated about one hundred and twenty-five kilometres northwest of Madauros. Little is known of his family beyond his father's name, Titus. 

Augustine was born in the year 354 in the town of Thagaste, situated some twenty kilometres from Madauros. Nothing is known of his family beyond his parents, who were of moderate means.

II. Education

Presumably Apuleius' earliest schooling was at Madauros, but he went to Carthage when still quite young to continue his education, as he states in his address to the Carthaginians in the Florida:

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 inlectus improbatusve? Ita mihi et patria in concilio Africae, id est vestro, et pueritia apud vos et magistri vos et secta, licet Athenis Atticis confirmata, tamen hic inchoata est.

8 Cf. C.I.L. viii.5350, where Fronto is called "f. T.," i.e. "son of Titus."

9 Augustine, Confessions ii.3 "patris, municipis Thagastensis admodum tenuis" - "of my father, a citizen of Thagaste of little wealth." Yet one cannot help suspecting that Augustine means his father was poor for a member of the upper class. For an examination of the usual social and economic background of the sophist see Bowersock, Greek Sophists pp. 21-24.
Hanc ego vobis mercedem, Carthaginienses, ubique gentium dependo pro disciplinis, quas in pueritia sum apud vos adeptus. Ubique enim me vestrae civitatis alumnunm fero, ubique vos omnimodis laudibus celebro, vestras disciplinas studiosius percolo, vestras opes gloriosius praedico, vestros etiam deos religiosius veneror.

There is much that should give me courage in your presence. I have made my home in your city which I knew well as a boy, and where my student days were spent. You know my philosophic views, my voice is no stranger to you, you have read my books and approved of them. My birthplace is represented in the council of Africa, that is, in your own assembly; my boyhood was spent with you, you were my teachers, it was here that my philosophy found its first inspiration, though 'twas Attic Athens brought it to maturity.

Such is the recompense I pay you, citizens of Carthage, through all the world, in return for the instruction that Carthage gave me as a boy. Everywhere I boast myself your city's nursling, everywhere and in every way I sing your praises, do zealous honour to your learning, give glory to you wealth and reverent worship to your gods.


After studying at Carthage, he went on to Athens:

Ego et alias creterras Athenis bibi: poeticae commentam, geometriae limpidam, musicae dulcem, dialecticae austerulam, iam vero universae philosophiae inexplebilem scilicet <et> nectaream.

I, however, have drunk yet other cups at Athens - the imaginative draught of poetry, the clear draught of geometry, the sweet draught of music, the austerer draught of dialectic, and the nectar of all philosophy, whereof no man may ever drink enough.

Florida xx.4 (trans. H.E. Butler)
The emphasis Apuleius here places on his philosophical training is significant; we know that he considered himself primarily a Platonic philosopher, and in fact possess two of his philosophical works.\[^{10}\]

There is some evidence that Fronto studied for a time in Alexandria; the date of his arrival in Rome is unknown.\[^{11}\]

Augustine's earliest training was in his native town of Thagaste, but when he was fifteen years of age he went to study in Madauros, the birthplace of Apuleius. His education was cut short after a year there, however, and he was forced by his parents' financial situation to return to Thagaste. After a

\[^{10}\]On the God of Socrates and On the Doctrine of Plato. His philosophy, and more particularly his demonology, will be treated in chapter X. For a consideration of the chief figures of the Middle Platonism of Apuleius' time see pp. 64-83 of The Cambridge History of Later Greek and Early Medieval Philosophy.

\[^{11}\]Fronto, Letters p. 169 Naber: "Alexandriam ad familares meos scripsi ut Athenas festinarent, ibique me oppirerentur" - "I wrote to my friends at Athens to hurry to Athens and wait for me there," and p. 170 Naber "Supplivavi iam tibi per biennium pro Appiano amico meo, cum quo mihi et vetus consuetudo et studiorum usus prope cotidianus intercedit" - "For two years now I have been your suppliant for my friend Appian, with whom I have had a long friendship and almost daily practice of studies." The historian Appian passed his youth and early manhood in Alexandria.

\[^{12}\]It must have been when he was still quite young, however; by 136 he was the leading advocate at Rome, according to Dio Cassius (lxix.18).
year spent there he went to Carthage to continue his studies, and it was in that city that he completed his education.

III. The Professional Sophist

On a journey to Alexandria in the mid-150's Apuleius fell sick at Oea (Tripoli) and was forced to stay there to convalesce. Here he saw much of an old friend from Athens, Sicinius Pontianus. Pontianus' mother was recently widowed and, wishing to get her out of the way of undesirable suitors, Pontianus proposed to Apuleius that he consider marrying her. Apuleius, although hesitant at first, found himself more and more attracted to the idea and, around the year 155, married Aemilia Pudentilla. This resulted in a lawsuit on the part of a frustrated suitor who charged Apuleius with having used magic to entrap Pudentilla into marriage. Apuleius' speech of defence, the Apology, is still extant, and in it there are

Augustine, Confessions ii.3.

The trial was held at Sabrata (some eighty kilometres west of Oea) before the proconsul of the province, Claudius Maximus. Lollianus Avitus had been Maximus' predecessor in office (Apology xciv.5). As Lollianus Avitus was consul in 144, and the normal interval between consulate and proconsulate was ten to thirteen years, we find 156 to be a likely year for his term of office and 157 for that of Claudius Maximus. The events at Oea can therefore be dated to the mid-150's.
some brief mentions of Apuleius' career up to his arrival in Oea. In it we learn of Apuleius' being asked to address the citizens of Oea after recovering from his illness:

Interibi revalesco; dissero aliquid postulantibus amicis publice; omnes qui aderant ingenti celebritate basilicam, qui locus auditorii erat, complentes inter alia pleraque congruentissima voce "insigniter" adclamant petentes ut remanerem, fierem civis Oeensium.

In the meantime I had recovered and gave a public oration at the request of some friends. The basilica, which was the place of the oratorical display, was filled with a huge crowd of spectators, who cried "marvellous!" with one voice, and asked me to remain and become a citizen of Oea.

lxxiii.2

We can conclude from this episode that Apuleius already had a considerable reputation as a sophist before his coming to Oea.

After a time in Oea he apparently moved to Carthage; it is here that most of the speeches represented in the Florida were probably delivered. Of the rest of his life we know little beyond his becoming chief priest of the province of Africa. The date of his death

\[15\text{Cf. Florida ix.40, xvi.25, and xviii.1. No speech in the Florida can be demonstrated not to have been delivered at Carthage.}\]

\[16\text{Cf. Florida xvi.38 and Augustine, Epistles cxxxviii.19.}\]
is unknown.

Fronto early acquired a considerable reputation as an orator; by 136, we are told, he was the most famous advocate at Rome\(^\text{17}\). He was much in demand as a teacher\(^\text{18}\); his most famous students were the future emperors Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus\(^\text{19}\). A considerable portion of his later correspondence with them survives. His educational activities did not prevent him from pursuing an active political career; he served as suffect consul in 143. The year of his death is uncertain, but is later than 176\(^\text{20}\).

Augustine began his career as teacher at Thagaste; one year later, following the death of a close friend, he returned to Carthage (376)\(^\text{21}\). In 383 he left Carthage for Rome\(^\text{22}\), and in the following year was appointed

\(^{17}\)Cf. Dio Cassius lxix.18.


\(^{19}\)Marcus Aurelius mentions him at Meditations i.11.

\(^{20}\)Cf. Letters p. 155 Naber: "Non malim mihi nummum Antonini aut Commodi aut Pii?" - "Shall I not prefer a coin of Antoninus, Commodus, or Pius?" Commodus would not have his portrait on coins before he received imperium at the end of 176. For a discussion of the problem see Appendix III, "The Date of Fronto's Death," of Bowersock's Greek Sophists, pp. 124-26.

\(^{21}\)Confessions iv.7.  \(^{22}\)Confessions v.8.
Professor of Rhetoric at Milan\textsuperscript{23}. It was in this city that he was finally converted and baptized; at this point his interest for our purpose ends. His baptism was in early 387\textsuperscript{24}; the following year he went to Rome for a few months, then to Carthage and Thagaste. In 391 he was passing through Hippo Regius (a seaport some two hundred and fifty kilometres west of Carthage), when to his consternation he was seized by the local congregation, ordained priest by the bishop, Valerius, and named successor to the see. Those of cynical temperament may ponder the similarities between Augustine the Christian bishop and Apuleius the pagan high priest. Augustine remained in Hippo until his death in 430.

IV. Conclusion

The career of the ancient sophist was as narrowly regulated as is today the career of the university academic. Apuleius' life is a good illustration of this pattern; raised in a family of the upper class, he was sent to Carthage, the metropolis of North Africa, for a thorough training in rhetoric. This completed, he went to Athens for further study, especially in the Platonism of his time. He then began his career as sophist and, before many years had passed, gained a

\textsuperscript{23}Confessions v.13. \textsuperscript{24}Confessions ix.6.
considerable reputation. He returned to Carthage and spent the major part of his career there. The conformity of the lives of Fronto and Augustine to this pattern indicates an identical cultural milieu.
III

EPIDEICTIC ORATORY

The earliest extant Greek treatise on oratory, the Rhetoric of Aristotle, divides rhetoric into three classes:

"Εστιν δὲ τῆς βουλικής εἶδη τὴν τοῦ ὁρισμοῦ.
τουσώτων γὰρ καὶ οἱ ἀκροαται τῶν λόγων ὑπὲρχουσιν ὅντες. σύγκειται μὲν γὰρ ἐκ τριῶν ὁ λόγος, ἐκ τῶν λέγοντος καὶ περὶ όι λέγει καὶ πρὸς ὄν, καὶ τὸ τέλος πρὸς τοῦτον ἐστιν, λέγω δὲ τὸν ἀκροατήν. ἀνάγκη δὲ τὸν ἀκροατήν ἢ θεωρὸν εἰς ἡ κρίτην, κριτὴν δὲ ἢ τῶν γεγενημένων ἢ τῶν μελλόντων. ἐστιν δὲ τῶν μελλόντων κρίνων ὁ ἐκκλήσιοις, ὁ δὲ περὶ τῶν γεγενημένων οἰκίας ὁ δικαστής, ὁ δὲ περὶ τῶν δικαίων οἱ θεωρῶν, ὅτι τὰ τῶν συμφωνεῖ, εἰς ἀνάγκης ἢ εἰς τρία γένη τῶν λόγων τῶν δικαίων, συμφωνετικών, δικαίων, ἐπιδεικτικών.

τέλος δὲ ἐκείστοις τούτων ἐπέρον ἐστι, καὶ
πρὸς ὅσοι τρία, τῶν μὲν συμφωνεύοντι τὸ συμφέρον καὶ βλαφέρον, ὁ μὲν γὰρ προτέρων ὡς βέλτιον συμφωνεύει, ὁ δὲ ἀποτρέπου τὸς ἴχθυος ἀποτρέπει, τὰ δ' ἐλλά τὸ πρὸς τούτο συμπαραλλάγατε,
The kinds of Rhetoric are three in number, corresponding to the three kinds of hearers. For every speech is composed of three parts: the speaker, the subject of which he treats, and the person to whom it is addressed, I mean the hearer, to whom the end or object of the speech refers. Now the hearer must necessarily be either a mere spectator or a judge, and a judge either of things past or of things to come. For instance, a member of the general assembly is a judge of things to come; the dicast, of things past; the mere spectator, of the ability of the speaker. Therefore there are necessarily three kinds of rhetorical speeches, deliberative, forensic, and epideictic.

Each of the three kinds has a different special end, and as there are three kinds of rhetoric, so there are three special ends. The end of the deliberative speaker is the expedient or harmful; for he who exhorts recommends a course of action as better, and he who dissuades advises against it as worse; all other considerations, such as justice and injustice, honour and disgrace, are included as accessory in reference to this. The end of the forensic speaker is the just or the unjust; in this case also all other considerations are included as accessory. The end of those who praise or blame is the honourable and disgraceful; and they also refer all other considerations to these.

1358 a-b
(trans. J.H. Freese)
This is virtually all that Aristotle has to say about epideictic oratory. His definition of the genre became standard; we find it reproduced by Menander at the beginning of his first treatise On Epideictic Speeches five centuries later.

In the period before Aristotle we find three chief varieties of speeches which, being neither political nor judicial, fall into the class of epideictic oratory. The most important of these is the epitaphios, the funeral oration, of which the most famous instances are that of Pericles reported by Thucydides, and that given by Socrates in the Menexenus of Plato.

The second type is the panegyric, or festival oration. Gorgias, Lysias, and Hippias are known to have delivered panegyrics at the Olympic games.

The third type is the encomium, or laudation, of which the most famous instances are the two encomia of Helen (both extant) of Gorgias and Isocrates. Notable also is the praise of Love by Pausanias in Plato's Symposium.

But the emphasis was clearly on the practical application of rhetorical technique; thus the large
majority of the speeches of Demosthenes, Lysias, and Isocrates were written for the courtroom and the public assembly. The epideictic speech played only a minor role.

Under the Second Sophistic we find this situation reversed. This was the period of ancient literature when rhetoric enjoyed its highest prestige and popularity, and this very circumstance favoured the development of the epideictic speech. For while the political and forensic branches of oratory have the advantage over epideictic that their subject is more likely to be of intrinsic interest and will occupy the attention of the listener to a greater extent, epideictic oratory, not being restrained by any necessity to prove a case or persuade the adoption of a political policy, gives a greater freedom to the demonstration of technique. It is therefore to be expected that in an age when rhetorical technique was valued most highly, and its practical applications of least importance, epideictic oratory should achieve its greatest prominence. And we find in fact that the most eminent figures of the Second Sophistic were famed not for their political speeches (they had no effective power), nor for their legal pleadings, but for their display orations.

This shift in emphasis is reflected in the rhetorical
handbooks; Aristotle has little more to say on epideictic oratory than what I have quoted above, while in the second century A.D. we find the extraordinarily detailed treatises of Menander entirely devoted to the epideictic genre. To give an idea of the development of the epideictic speech in the five intervening centuries I shall list some of the types of epideictic speech treated by Menander:

(1) The praise of a country.
(2) The praise of a harbour.
(3) The praise of an acropolis.
(4) The praise of a city from its ancient inhabitants.
(5) The praise of city from the arts practised in it.
(6) The speech on one's arrival in a town to the people of the town or to its ruler.
(7) The speech to one departing from a city.
(8) The speech of farewell of the speaker on leaving a city.
(9) The epitaphalamium, or marriage hymn.
(10) The speech on a person's birthday.
(11) The address of welcome to a ruler.
(12) The speech of invitation to a special event or ceremony addressed to a ruler.
(13) The funeral oration.
(14) The monody, or plaint. It may be occasioned by the death of a relative or friend, a natural disaster, or any type of unfortunate occurrence.
It will be clear what variety the epideictic genre had by the time of the Second Sophistic.

With this chapter ends the first part of the thesis. An attempt has been made to orient the reader to the Second Sophistic, to the type of career led by its chief figures, and finally to its most typical genre, the epideictic speech.

In the second part I shall examine the *Florida* of Apuleius as an example of epideictic literature, using the rhetorical treatises of Menander and Quintilian to illustrate its conformity to the literary norms of its day.
PART TWO

RHETORICAL ELEMENTS AND TECHNIQUES
IN THE FLORIDA OF APULEIUS
IV

THE SURVIVAL OF THE FLORIDA

We owe the survival of the Florida to one manuscript alone\(^1\). This manuscript, Laurentianus 68.2, henceforth referred to as F, is our source as well for the Apology and Metamorphoses of Apuleius\(^2\). Written at the Benedictine monastery of Monte Cassino in the eleventh century, it is preserved today in the Laurentian Library at Florence. There exists a number of other manuscripts of these three works, but without exception they are derived from F.

For the Metamorphoses this is demonstrated by the fact that damage caused by a tear in F at viii.7-9 is reflected in the lacunae or obvious conjectures found in the other manuscripts at this point.

For the Apology this is demonstrated by the textual confusion at lvi.8. Here F presents the reading 'inducat animum.' In the space between the two words the letter u shows through from the other side of the sheet from the word facundia (lv.11). For this passage the other manuscripts are divided between the readings 'indicatu

\(^1\)The information in this chapter is largely taken from the introductions of Helm and Vallette to their editions of the Florida.

\(^2\)F is also our source for the second fragment of the Annals of Tacitus and what survives of his Histories.
animum' and 'inducat in animum,' the second reading being an obvious emendation of the first. F is consequently the parent of the other manuscripts.

For the Florida there is no guarantee of the primacy of F like that provided for the other works by F's shabby condition. Nonetheless, the Florida is believed to have descended to us through F, and this for two reasons.

The first reason is that there is virtually no variation in the text presented by the manuscripts, even when that text is in manifest error\(^3\). All the manuscripts are therefore derived directly, or, if indirectly, at no great remove, from a single exemplar.

The second reason is that the majority of the manuscripts that contain the Florida contain the Metamorphoses and the Apology as well. As it is clear that all the manuscripts of the two last-named works are derived from F, it is simplest to assume that the same is true of the Florida.

The Florida as we have it does not form a complete work, but rather a collection of some twenty-three fragments of a lost original. Fortunately there is some evidence for the length of this original preserved in F.

\(^3\)Cf. i.2 festine MSS, festinem Oudendorp; iv.1 asii MSS, Iastium Glareanus.
The fragments there given are divided into four books. Now the ancient book does not correspond to the chapters or books into which a modern work is divided. The modern division is a convenience which serves to provide a break at appropriate points in a work, and can be dispensed with at will. The parchment codex, of which the modern book is a descendant, did not come into general use for literary texts until the fourth century; up to that time the physical format of a literary work was the papyrus roll, and the ancient author while writing divided his work into books, each of which would fit onto one roll. The length of the ancient book can be determined roughly by a look at any sizable work of antiquity; keeping to Apuleius, we find that the Metamorphoses is divided into eleven books, each of which covers on average some twenty-six pages in the Teubner edition and consists therefore of perhaps 5200 words. The Apology is in two books; the first covers seventy-four pages in the Teubner edition (14,500 words), the second forty pages (8,000 words). Turning to the Florida, we find that it covers forty-two Teubner pages, and contains approximately 8400 words. We can reasonably guess that the work lying behind the Florida was perhaps three times as long as the fragments we now possess.

---

4 The divisions are at ix.14, xv.27, and xvii.22.
When was the original work abridged and by whom? No certain answer can be given to this question. The fragments range in length from the thirty-nine words of v to the fifteen hundred words of xvi, and their subjects are so varied that the criteria used in making the selection cannot be determined.

The **Florida**, then, has come to us in a state of severe mutilation, but sufficient is preserved for us to form a fair conception of the nature of the original work. It is clear that this original was a collection of some of the epideictic speeches of Apuleius. The following chapters will examine what these fragments reveal of the rhetorical techniques employed by Apuleius.
A NOTE ON QUINTILIAN AND MENANDER

In the following chapters the *Florida* will not be examined in isolation, but reference will continually be made to the works of two ancient writers on rhetoric, Quintilian and Menander.

Born in Spain around 30-35 A.D., Quintilian early came to Rome for his education. He made a brilliant career there as advocate and teacher and was distinguished by being given a state pension and named tutor to the great-nephews and heirs of Domitian. His major surviving work, the *Institutio Oratoria* (Education of an Orator), written around the year 90, is a lengthy treatise which deals with the training of an orator from cradle to manhood. The first two books of the work are indeed chiefly concerned with the early training of a boy, but the ten books which follow are concerned less with education than with the whole rhetorical art, its nature and use, the organization of the oration, questions of style, figures of thought and speech, in short all aspects of rhetoric. Quintilian assumes little knowledge on the part of his reader, and takes care to explain even the most basic terms and concepts of rhetorical theory; in consequence,
it is for the modern reader by far the most accessible of the ancient rhetorical handbooks.

There survive to us two treatises On Epideictic Speeches ascribed by their manuscripts to Menander of Laodicea. Little is known of this rhetorician apart from his having lived during the third century and having written commentaries on the rhetorical treatises of Hermogenes and Minucian. Unlike Quintilian's treatise, Menander's works assume a considerable acquaintance with rhetorical technique on the part of the reader; their outstanding merit for our purposes, however, is that they address themselves particularly to the nature and problems of the epideictic genre.

These two authors, each of whom substantially remedies the deficiencies of the other, will serve as guides in our examination of the Florida.
VI

EPIBATERIOS LOGOS - FLORIDA I & XXI

The epibatērios logos was the speech delivered on another's or one's own arrival in a city. I quote from Menander:

ΠΕΡΙ ἘΠΙΒΑΘΡΙΟΥ

Ἐπιβαθριον ὁ βουλόμενος λέγειν δῆλος ἐστι
βουλόμενος προσφωνήσαι ἢ τὴν ἐκμοδο
πατρίδα ἢς ἀποδέχεσθαι, ἢ πόλιν ἔτεραν,
εἰς ᾗν ἀνάρτις ἔχων, ἢ καὶ ἐρχομένα ἐπιστέντα
τῇ πόλει. οὐκοῦν ἐν τούτοις ἄμεθα τὸ
προσέμεν ἐκ περιχερεῖσ εὖδος.

THE SPEECH UPON AN ARRIVAL

Obviously one desiring to give a speech upon an arrival wishes either to address his native city after returning from a journey, or another city, to which he has just come, or the governor who rules a city. Consequently, in all these cases one must take one's exordium from the joy one feels.

p. 377 line 31 -
p. 378 line 4 Spengel

In Florida i we clearly have the opening of one of these speeches. It can easily be summarized: "When one is travelling and happens upon a roadside shrine, one stops for a time and makes an offering; similarly, even
though I am in some hurry, I cannot simply pass through this city, but must give an oration."

Quintilian recognizes **comparison** as a useful method of strengthening an assertion:

Proximas exemplo vires habet similitudo, praecipue illa quae ducitur citra ullam translationum mixturae ex rebus paene paribus: "ut qui accipere in campo consuerunt iis candidatis quorum nummos suppressos esse putant inimicissimi solent esse: sic eius modi iudices infesto tum reo venerant." Nam parabole, quam Cicero conlationem vocat, longius res quae comparantur repetere solet. Nec hominum modo inter se opera similia spectantur...sed et a mutis atque etiam inanimis interim [lacuna] huius modi ducitur.

**Simile** has a force not unlike that of **example**, more especially when drawn from things nearly equal without an admixture of metaphor, as in the following case: "Just as those who have been accustomed to receive bribes in the Campus Martius are specially hostile to those whom they suspect of having withheld the money, so in the present case the judges came into court with a strong prejudice against the accused." For **parabole**, which Cicero translates by "comparison," is often apt to compare things whose resemblance is far less obvious. Nor does it merely compare the actions of men...on the contrary, similces of this kind are sometimes drawn from dumb animals and inanimate objects.

v.11.22-24
(trans. H.E.Butler)

**Florida** xxi consists of a comparison similar to that in the first fragment: "Even when one is forced to hurry, certain delays can be justified. Thus a traveller, even when travelling quickly, on meeting a man of importance
is not reluctant to stop and accompany him, accepting the delay gladly enough." The context of the comparison does not survive.
I begin with quotations from Menander and Quintilian:

ΠΩΣ ΥΡΗ ΠΟΛΕΙΣ ΕΠΑΙΝΕΙΝ

Οἱ τοῖνυν πέρι τῶν πόλεων ἔπαινοι μικτοὶ εἰσίν ἀπὸ κεφαλαίων τῶν περὶ χώρας εἰρημένων καὶ τῶν περὶ ἀνθρώπων. Ἐκ μὲν γὰρ τῶν περὶ χώρας τῶν θεσίων λύπτεων, ἐκ δὲ τῶν περὶ ἀνθρώπων τὸ γένος, τῆς πράξεως, ἐπιτυμεῖσθαι. Ἀπὸ γὰρ τῶν τῶν πόλεως ἑγκυμοσύνης.

HOW ONE SHOULD PRAISE CITIES

The eulogies of cities are combined from those topics concerned with the surrounding country and those concerned with men. From the topics concerned with the surrounding country one should take the description of a city’s location, and from those concerned with men the ancestry of a city, its deeds, and its pursuits. On the basis of these things we praise cities.

Laudantur autem urbes similiter atque homines. Nam pro parente est conditor, et multum auctoritatis adfert vetustas, ut iis qui terra dicuntur orti, et virtutes ac vitia circa res gestas eadem quae in singulis: illa propria quae ex loci positione ac munitione sunt. Cives illis ut hominibus liberis sunt decori.
Cities are praised after the same fashion as men. The founder takes the place of the parent, and antiquity carries great authority, as for instance in the case of those whose inhabitants are said to be sprung from the soil. The virtues and vices revealed by their deeds are the same as in private individuals. The advantages arising from site or fortifications are however peculiar to cities. Their citizens enhance their fame just as children bring honour to their parents.

iii.7.26  
(trans. H.E. Butler)

There are in the Florida two fragments of this type of oration, xviii and xx.

Apuleius begins xviii with flattery of his audience:

Tanta multitudo ad audiendum convenistis, ut potius gratulari Carthagini debeam, quod tam multos eruditionis amicos habet, quam excusare, quod philosophus non recusaverim dissertare.

You have come in such large numbers to hear me that I feel I ought rather to congratulate Carthage for possessing so many friends of learning among her citizens than demand pardon for myself, the professed philosopher who ventures to speak in public.

xviii.1  
(trans. H.E. Butler)

In doing so he conforms to a recommendation of Quintilian's:

Ipsorum etiam permiscenda laus semper (nam id benivolos facit), quotiens autem fieri poterit, cum materiae utilitate iungenda.
It will be wise too for him [sc. the orator] to insert some words of praise for his audience, since this will secure their good will, and wherever it is possible this should be done in such a manner as to advance his case.

iii.7.24

In praising his audience as being "friends of learning" Apuleius at once gains their favour and prepares them for the philosophical exempla\(^1\) that are to follow.

He then states that his oratory should attract more attention than its setting, the theatre. There follows a description of the physical attractions of the theatre and the variety of the performances that take place there. Quintilian recognizes the praise of a building as a branch of epideictic oratory:

\[
\text{Est laus et operum, in quibus honor utilitas pulchritudo auctor spectari solet: honor ut in templis, utilitas ut in muris, pulchritudo vel auctor utrubique.}
\]

Praise too may be awarded to public works, in connexion with which their magnificence, utility, beauty, and the architect or artist must be given due consideration. Temples for instance will be praised for their magnificence, walls for their utility, and both for their beauty or the skill of the architect.

iii.7.27
(trans. H.E. Butler)

\(^1\)The exemplum is defined and discussed later in the present chapter.
Quintilian gives a lengthy discussion of methods of emphasizing the importance of a person or thing (amplification); in the course of this discussion he names and defines the technique employed by Apuleius at xviii.3-5:

Quattuor tamen maxime generibus video constare amplificationem, incremento comparatione ratiocinatione congerie.

Incrementum est potentissimum cum magna videntur etiam quae inferiora sunt. Id aut uno gradu fit aut pluribus, et pervenit non modo ad summum sed interim quodam modo supra summum. Omnibus his sufficit unum Ciceronis exemplum: 'facinus est vincire civem Romanum, scelus verberare, prope parricidium necare; quid dicam in crucem tollere?' Nam et si tantum verberatus esset uno gradu increverat, ponendo etiam id esse facinus quod erat inferius, et si tantum occisus esset per plures gradus ascenderat; cum vero dixerit 'prope parricidium necare', supra quod nihil est, adiecit 'quid dicam in crucem tollere?' Ita cum id quod maximum est occupasset necesse erat in eo quod ultra est verba deficere.

I consider, however, the there are four principal methods of amplification: augmentation, comparison, reasoning and accumulation.

Of these, augmentation is the most impressive when it lends grandeur even to comparative insignificance. This may be effected either by one step or by several, and may be carried not merely to the highest degree, but sometimes even beyond it. A single example from Cicero will suffice to illustrate all these points. "It is a sin to bind a Roman citizen, a crime to scourge him, little short of the most unnatural murder to put him to death; what then shall I call his crucifixion?" If he had merely been scourged, we should have had but one
step, indicated by the description even of the lesser offence as a sin, while if he had merely been killed, we should have had several more steps; but after saying that it was "little short of the most unnatural murder to put him to death," and mentioning the worst of crimes, he adds, "What then shall I call his crucifixion?" Consequently, since he had already exhausted his vocabulary of crime, words must necessarily fail him to describe something still worse.

viii.4.3-5
(trans. H.E. Butler)

Florida presents close similarities to the opening of xviii. Apuleius begins the fragment by praising the people for having come to the theatre; the theatre, he says, does not take away from his speech, but the performance and not the setting is what is important. This augmentation complete, he gives a list of theatre performers similar to that at xviii.4, a list terminating with himself, the philosopher. Here the fragment ends.

We return to xviii. Having described the activities of the theatre, Apuleius asks his audience to consider anything he says that is worthy of the senate-house or the library to have been spoken at those places; this request he justifies by reference to the dramatic poets, quoting an unknown tragic author who names Cithaeron as the place of action, and the first three lines of Plautus' Truculentus, in which the playwright
asks the audience to consider Athens to be the scene of the play.

The quotation of poetry was considered an integral part of the epideictic speech:

\[
\text{ἔξειν δὲ δὲὶ σὲ μνήμην καὶ χρηματικῶν όμηρου, Ἡσίδου, ρώμην λυρικῶν.} \text{ὁτοῖ} \text{τε} \text{γάρ} \text{καθ' εὐθοὺς} \text{κἀ} \text{πολλοῖς} \text{μὲν} \text{ἐν} \text{ἐνεκώμισιν,}
\text{πολλοῖς} \text{δὲ} \text{ἔλεγκτων} \text{sic, παρ' ὦν} \text{δυνฯ} \text{λαβεῖν παρὰ σαίγαλα.}
\]

You should make mention also of the famous poets, Homer, Hesiod, and the lyric poets. For they are in themselves worthy of mention, and they both praised and criticized many people. From them you will be able to take many exempla.

Menander p. 393
lines 5-9 Spengel

Adhibebitur extrinsecus in causam et auctoritas. Haec seuti Graecos, a quibus krisēs dicuntur, iudicia aut iudicationes vocant, <non> de quibus ex causa dicta sententia est (nam ea quidem in exemplorum locum cedunt), sed si quid ita visum gentibus, populis, sapientibus viris, claris civibus, inlustribus poetis referri potest.

Nam sententiis quidem poetarum non orationes modo sunt referae, sed libri etiam philosophorum, qui quamquam inferiora omnia praecipitae suis ac litteris credunt, repetere tamen auctoritatem a plurimis versibus non fastidierunt.

Authority also may be drawn from external sources to support a case. Those who follow the Greeks, who call such arguments krisēs, style them judgments.
or adjudications, thereby referring not to matters on which judicial sentence has been pronounced (for such decisions form examples or precedents), but to whatever may be regarded as expressing the opinion of nations, peoples, philosophers, distinguished citizens, or illustrious poets.

As for reflexions drawn from the poets, not only speeches, but even the works of poets, are full of them; for although the philosophers think everything inferior to their own precepts and writings, they have not thought it beneath their dignity to quote numbers of lines from the poets to lend authority to their statements.

v.11.36, 39

Apuleius then intimates that all is not entirely well, quoting three proverbs to the effect that with everything sweet some bitterness is mixed in. The use of the proverb as an authority is recommended by Quintilian:

Ne haec quidem vulgo dicta et recepta persuasione populari sine usu fuerint. Testimonia sunt enim quodam modo, vel potentiora etiam quod non causis accommodata sunt, sed liberis odio et gratia mentibus ideo tantum dicta factaque quia aut honestissima aut verissima videbantur.

2The first two quotations, "nothing good is received from heaven without some accompanying difficulty" and "where there is honey there is gall," are commonplaces in ancient literature from Plato on; cf. A. Otto, Die Sprichwörter und Sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer (Leipzig: 1890; repr. Hildesheim: 1965), pp. 217-18.

The third proverb, "ubi uber ibi tuber" translates as "where there is a breast there is a swelling." Context demands a meaning similar to that of the two preceding proverbs, yet it is difficult to see how it can be so interpreted. Otto (Sprichwörter p. 352) and Vallette in his note on the passage do not really face the problem.
Nay, even common sayings and popular beliefs may be found to be useful. For they form a sort of testimony, which is rendered all the more impressive by the fact that it was not given to suit special cases, but was the utterance or action of minds swayed neither by prejudice or influence, simply because it seemed the most honourable or honest thing to say or do.

v.11.37
(trans. H.E. Butler)

The problem, it turns out, is that Apuleius' respect for the Carthaginians makes him embarrassed to speak. This pretended embarrassment was standard rhetorical practice:

In primis igitur omnis sui vitiosa iactatio est, eloquentiae tamen in oratore praecipue, adfertque audientibus non fas-tidium modo sed plerumque etiam odium. Habet enim mens nostra natura sublime quid-dam et erectum et inpatiens superioris: ideoque abiectos aut summittentes se libenter adlevamus, quia hoc facere tamquam maiores videmur, et quotiens discessit aemulatio, succedit humanitas. At qui se supra modum extollit, premere ac despicere creditur nec tam se maiorem quam minores ceteros facere.

Faciunt favorem et illa paene communia, non tamen omittenda vel ideo ne occupentur: optare, abominari, rogare, sollicitum agere.

In the first place, then, all kinds of boasting are a mistake, above all, it is an error for an orator to praise his own eloquence, and, further, not merely wearies, but in the majority of cases disgusts the audience. For there is ever in the mind of man a certain element of lofty and unbending pride that will not brook superiority: and for this reason we take delight in raising the humble and submissive to their feet, since such an
act gives us a consciousness of our superiority, and as soon as all sense of rivalry disappears, its place is taken by a feeling of humanity. But the man who exalts himself beyond reason is looked upon as depreciating and showing a contempt for others and as making them seem small rather than himself seem great.

But there are certain tricks for acquiring good-will, which though almost universal, are by no means to be neglected, if only to prevent their being first employed against ourselves. I refer to rhetorical expressions of wishing, detestation, entreaty, or anxiety.

Apuleius emphasizes the incongruity of the situation by mentioning his many ties with Carthage, particularly his early education there, an education completed at Athens:

χρίς δέ καί μνημονεύειν αὐτῶν Ἀθηνῶν, ἐς ὁπν εὐπάροδος, καί ἱεροφανῶν καί θαυμάτων καί Παναθηναίων, καί λόγων ἀρώμαν καί μουσικῶν, καί παιδευτῶν καί νεολαίας ἔρει ἀρ ταῦτα πολλὰν γλυκύτητα.

One should mention Athens also, whence came the entrance of the chorus, and mention the hierophants, the torchbearers, the Panathenaic festival, the contests of words and music, the teachers, and the festive bands of youths; for that brings much pleasure to the listener.
Apuleius then says that he celebrates the Carthaginians everywhere as his "parents and first teachers." This also can be connected with a passage of Menander:

καὶ ὅτι ἐπιλήσθην κύτων οὐδὲν οὐδέποτε, καὶ ὅτι διαδώσεις λόγον ἐπιταχυῶθ' ἐκμαζών κύτων τὰ ἐξερέτα.

And [say] that you will never forget them, and that you will spread their fame everywhere, wondering at the excellences of their city.

Apuleius then introduces two philosophical exempla. Before proceeding further we shall briefly examine the nature of this component of ancient rhetorical technique.

**Excursus: The Nature of the Exemplum**

Menander assumes an acquaintance with exempla (para-deigmata) on the part of his reader, so Quintilian will be our chief source.

Quintilian treats the standard oration as consisting of five parts. The first is the exordium, an introduction serving to conciliate judge and audience. The second is the narration, an account of the facts of the case. The third is the division, which states which particular points will be demonstrated to be true. It is followed by this proof. The speech ends with the peroration.
It is the proof which here concerns us. Quintilian divides proofs into two varieties, artificial and inartificial:

Ac prima quidem illa partitio ab Aristotele tradita consensum fere omnium meruit, alias esse probationes quas extra dicendi rationem acciperet orator, alias quas ex causa traheret ipse et quodam modo gigneret; idecoque illas atechnous, id est inartificiales, <has entechnous, id est artificiales; vocaverunt. Ex illo priore genere sunt praediudicia, rumores, tormenta, tabulae, ius iurandum, testes, in quibus pars maxima contentionum forensium constitit.

To begin with it may be noted that the division laid down by Aristotle [Rhetoric 1355 b] has met with almost universal approval. It is to the effect that there are some proofs adopted by the orator which lie outside the art of speaking, and others which he himself deduces or, if I may use the term, begets out of his case. The former therefore have been styled atechnoi or inartificial proofs, the latter entechnoi or artificial. To the first class belong decisions of previous courts, rumours, evidence extracted by torture, documents, oaths, and witnesses, for it is with these that the majority of forensic arguments are concerned.

v.1.1-2
(trans. H.E. Butler)

Artificial proofs, according to Quintilian, are those which are not direct evidence for the truth or falsehood of an assertion, but are brought to bear on it by the orator.

Indications are equivalent to circumstantial evidence. Quintilian, thinking primarily in terms of judicial oratory, gives as concrete examples a shriek,
a blood-stained garment, and a livid spot. If an indication is so strong that it alone decides a question, it is an inartificial proof. If, however, it is not immediately decisive, it is artificial and must be completed by an argument. The argument for the blood-stained garment mentioned above would be something like this: "Blood was found on the garment. Someone therefore suffered a wound. Murder was attempted."

For a definition of the exemplum we shall return to Quintilian's words:

Tertium genus, ex iis quae extrinsecus adducuntur in causam, Graeci vocant para-deigma, quo nomine et generaliter usi sunt in omni similium adpositione et specialiter in iis quae rerum gestarum auctoritate nituntur.

Omnia igitur ex hoc genere sumpta necessitate est aut similia esse aut dissimilia aut contraria. Similitudo adsumitur interim et ad orationis ornatum; sed illacum res exiget, nunc ea quae ad probationem pertinent exequar. Potentissimum autem est inter ea quae sunt huius generis quod proprie vocamus exemplum, id est rei gestae aut ut gestae utilis ad persuadendum id quod intenderis commemoratio. Intuendum igitur est totum simile sit an ex parte, ut aut omnia ex eo sumamus aut quae utilia erunt. Simile est: 'iure occisus est Saturninus sicut Gracchi'. Dissimile: 'Brutus occidit liberos proditionem molientis, Manlius virtutem filii morte multavit'. Contrarium: 'Marcellus ornamenta Syracusanis hostibus restituit, Verres eadem sociis abstulit'. Et probandorum et culpandorum ex his confirmatio eodem gradus habet.

3v.9.1.
The third kind of proof, which is drawn into the service of the case from without, is styled a paradeigma by the Greeks, who apply the term to all comparisons of like with like, but more particularly to historical parallels.

[In section 2 Quintilian states that he will translate paradeigma by the Latin word exemplum, "example."

All arguments of this kind, therefore, must be from things like or unlike or contrary. Similes are, it is true, sometimes employed for the embellishment of the speech as well, but I will deal with them in their proper place; at present I am concerned with the use of similitude in proof. The most important of proofs of this class is that which is most properly styled example, that is to say the adducing of some past action real or assumed which may serve to persuade the audience of the point which we are trying to make. We must therefore consider whether the parallel is complete or only partial, that we may know whether to use it in its entirety or merely to select those portions which are serviceable. We argue from the like when we say, "Saturninus was justly killed, as were the Gracchi"; from the unlike when we say, "Brutus killed his sons for plotting against the state, while Manlius condemned his son to death for his valour"; from the contrary when we say, "Marcellus restored the works of art which had been taken from the Syracusans who were our enemies, while Verres took the same works of art from our allies." The same divisions apply also to such forms of proof in panegyric or denunciation [that is, epideictic oratory; cf. Aristotle, Rhetoric 1358 b, quoted above on page 22].

v.11.1, 5-7
(trans. H.E. Butler)

In his final book, a description of the ideal orator, Quintilian gives this advice:

In primis vero abundare debet orator exemplorum copia cum veterum tum etiam novorum,
adeo ut non ea modo quae conscripta sunt historiis aut sermonibus velut per manus tradita quaeque cotidie aguntur debeat nosse, verum ne ea quidem quae sunt a clarioribus poetis ficta neglegere. Nam illa quidem priora aut testimoniorum aut etiam iudicatorum optinent locum, sed haec quoque aut vetustatis fide tuta sunt aut ab hominibus magnis praeceptorum loco ficta creduntur. Sciat ergo quam plurima.

Above all, our orator should be equipped with a rich store of examples both old and new: and he ought not merely to know those which are recorded in history or transmitted by oral tradition or occur from day to day, but should not neglect even those fictitious examples invented by the great poets. For while the former have the authority of evidence or even of legal decisions, the latter also either have the warrant of antiquity or are regarded as having been invented by great men to serve as lessons to the world. He should therefore be acquainted with as many examples as possible.

Menander gives this advice for adorning a speech:

Kalwμίας de τον λόγον καὶ εἰκός καὶ ἱστοριαὶ καὶ παραβολαίς καὶ τὰ ἐλλεῖπτικαί καὶ ἱστοριαὶ καὶ ἐκφράσεις πολύν ἐν τῷ ἐπικίνδυνῳ τῆς πόλεως.

You will beautify your speech with similes, stories, illustrative anecdotes, other pleasant things, and lengthy descriptions when praising the city.

p. 433 lines 13-15
Spengel
These "similes, stories, and illustrative anecdotes" are nothing other than exempla. Menander is following Quintilian in recommending their use in the epideictic speech.

We shall now return to our consideration of Florida xviii. At xviii.18 Apuleius says that he praises the Carthaginians everywhere, and supports the statement with two exempla. The first, that of how Euathlus tricked Protagoras out of his payment, is a demonstration of what Apuleius does not do, and is therefore an instance of what Quintilian calls the exemplum dissimile or dissimilitude (v.11.7). The second, that of the payment given Thales by Mandraytus, is an exemplum simile, a similitude (v.11.6).

Apuleius states that he praises the Carthaginians wherever he goes, and in the same way he worships their gods. He then introduces the hymn he has composed in honour of Aesculapius, written in Latin and Greek, which

4 The anecdote is found also in Diogenes Laertius, Lives of the Philosophers ix.56 and Aulus Gellius, Attic Nights v.10.3. The question of its historicity is complicated by the fact that Protagoras did apparently remit the fees of unsatisfied students (Plato, Protagoras 328 b).

5 Thales is credited by Diogenes Laertius also with having discovered the ratio between the size of the sun and the size of its orbit (i.54), but Apuleius is our sole authority for Mandraytus' having been a follower of Thales.
is to be performed by two of his friends, Sabidius Severus and Julius Persius. Here the fragment ends.

Fragment xx also appears to be from a speech in praise of Carthage. It begins with the maxim of "a wise man" to the effect that the first cup of wine is for thirst, the second for merriness, the third for pleasure, but the fourth for madness. To these cupfuls of wine he opposes those of the Muses, which can never be drunk to excess. The image is extended by the equation of these different cups to the various stages of Apuleius' education, ending with his philosophical studies at Athens.

He next names six literary genres and their chief practitioners, stating that he practises all of these genres, thereby implying his superiority to the writers just named and completing the augmentation.

He then deprecates his own talents with the statement that in everything it is the intention and not the action that should be considered, and finishes by flattering both himself and his audience by asking what greater honour there could be than to have the opportunity to praise Carthage.

6: The maxim is found also in Diogenes Laertius (Lives of the Philosophers i.103), who attributes it to Anacharsis, a philhellene Scythian prince of the sixth century B.C.
I begin with a quotation from Menander:

\[ \text{PERI PROSOPOPHATIKOU} \]
\[ 'O \text{ prosopohatikos logos estin euφηmos eis} \]
\[ karktias legekemos opoion, t\'i d' \text{erwmos} \]
\[ eukukmion, oμw\'i t\'elion. ou yap ekei p\'i\'a \]
\[ ta to\'e eukukmion, all\' eκ\'i\'eis \text{prosopohatikos} \]
\[ yinei, ou\'n e\'i k\'i\'wn t\'i\'n \text{prosopohane}\\]
\[ w' \text{protev\'eis o logos t\'i\'n a\'i\'w\'eis leuβh\'eis} \]

ON THE ADDRESS OF WELCOME

The address of welcome is one of greeting pronounced by someone to governors, and constitutes in fact an encomium, though not entirely so; for it does not have all the elements of the encomium, but is most precisely an address of welcome when it glorifies the governor on the basis of his deeds.\(^1\)

\(^1\text{Menander's meaning is probably that the address of welcome is not entirely an encomium in that it leaves out such considerations as the governor's country and ancestors, and concentrates instead on his actions in the province. That archon should be translated "governor" is indicated by Menander's recommendation a few lines beyond the passage cited above that one "say that the kings are to be wondered at in many things, but most especially in their choice of governors (archonton)" (page 415 lines 14-15 Spengel).}\)
We shall first examine *Florida* xvii, an extract from a speech addressed to the proconsul Scipio Orfitus. In the first part Apuleius excuses himself if he has seemed to pay insufficient attention to the proconsul. Others may follow after the governor and parade themselves as his intimate acquaintances; this course Apuleius will not follow. His talent already has a reputation, and does not need any further recommendation; as regards the favour of the governor, he cares for it more than he makes evident, and desires that glorious friendship rather than boasts of it. In any case, it is not just Apuleius who has reason to desire the proconsul's friendship, but also the proconsul who has reason to desire that of Apuleius, for they have many mutual friends.

Apuleius then proceeds to an extended comparison. His voice, long unheard, is like various other portions of the body when they are made useless, or the whole body when it is asleep, drunk, or deep in sickness. The unused voice is like the unused sword; both deteriorate when not used. A demonstration of this is the fact that the voices of tragic actors are kept in form only by frequent use.

He then moves to a lengthy amplification. The human voice does not have the charming tone of various musical

---

2Proconsul of Africa in 163/64.
instruments, nor yet does it have the wide range of sounds found among the animals; the human voice does not appeal to the ear, rather it is of use to the mind. He quotes as exempla the stories of Arion and Orpheus; he would admire them more if they had performed before men, and not while alone. Various species of birds sing songs appropriate to the various times of life, and they do this in the wild; but when one's song is useful to people of all ages, it should be performed not when one is alone but when thousands of people are present. Apuleius is following this precept in singing the merits of Scipio Orfitus.

He then announces his intention to proceed to the eulogy of the proconsul, but says he is afraid of being stopped by his own or the proconsul's modesty. We have examined this technique of feigned embarrassment in the preceding chapter\(^3\). Apuleius then asks the audience to pay special attention to him while he lists the virtues of the proconsul. It is at this point that the fragment breaks off.

In *Florida* viii we have a short fragment of another oration addressed to a magistrate. It begins with a brief comparison and augmentation: the position of the magistrate is an honourable one, but he owes more to his own qualities

\(^3\) pp. 45-46.
than he does to his position. Apuleius then further magnifies the excellence of the proconsul; there are, he says, few men who are senators, few senators who are of noble family, few of noble family who are ex-consuls, few ex-consuls who are good men, and few good men who are learned. Apuleius is here making use of the rhetorical device known as **climax** ("staircase"), of which I quote Quintilian's description:

Gradatio, quae dicitur ***climax***, apertiorem habet artem et magis adfectatam, ideoque esse rario debet. Est autem ipsa quoque adiectionis: repetit enim quae dicta sunt, et priusquam ad alius descendat in prioribus resistit. Cuius exemplum ex Graeco notissimo transferatur: 'non enim dixi quidem <haec>, sed non <scripsi, nec scripsi quidem, sed non> obii legationem, <nec obii quidem legationem,> sed non persuasi Thebanis.' Sunt tamen tradita et Latina: 'Africano virtutem industria, virtus gloriām, gloria aemulos comparavit.'

**Gradation**, which the Greeks call **climax**, necessitates a more obvious and less natural application of art and should therefore be more sparingly employed. Moreover, it involves **addition**, since it repeats what has already been said and, before passing to a new point, dwells on those which precede. I will translate a very famous instance from the Greek. "I did not say this, without making a formal proposal to that effect, I did not make that proposal without undertaking the embassy, nor undertake the embassy without persuading the Thebans." There are, however, examples of the same thing in Latin authors. "It was the energy of Africanus that gave him his peculiar excellence, his excellence that gave him glory, his glory that gave him rivals."

ix.3.54-56
(trans. H. E. Butler)
Apuleius then returns to his earlier augmentation, saying even the outward insignia of the magistracy are a rare distinction. At this point the fragment ends.

We come to fragment xvi last, which differs from those already treated in that it is not simply a laudation of the consular Aemilianus Strabo, but a giving of thanks to him and the Carthaginian senate for the statue of Apuleius they had decreed be erected.

Apuleius begins by saying that before expressing his gratitude he wishes to explain his recent absence. He has been away at the Persian Waters for a cure; the events leading up to it are similar, he says, to those surrounding the death of the comic poet Philemon. Thus the exemplum is introduced, and we learn of Philemon's recitation of a play being interrupted by a storm, his failure to appear the next day to finish the recitation, and his being found dead at home, the play of his life over.

Suffect consul in 156.

There are numerous accounts of the death of the Attic comic poet Philemon (c. 364-265 B.C.). The version given by Apuleius is not found elsewhere. According to Aelian (quoted by the Souda), Philemon had a dream that the Muses had abandoned his house in order not to be defiled by the sight of a corpse. He thereupon completed the comedy he was working on and died. According to Plutarch (Moralia 785 B) he died while at the theatre. According to Lucian (Macrobii 25) and Valerius Maximus (ix.12.6) he died of laughter at a joke he made on seeing an ass eating figs. But Diogenes Laertius (Lives of the Philosophers vii.185) tells the same story of the Stoic philosopher Chrysippus (c. 260-207 B.C.), furnishing the joke as well. Chrysippus suggested the ass be given some wine as well.
An oration of Apuleius was similarly interrupted by rain and postponed; in the interval he twisted his ankle and was forced to leave the city for treatment. Once cured, however, he immediately hurried back to the city. He had good reason to do this; the unsolicited gift is best, and that is what he has received. There are recognized forms for expressing one's gratitude for such honours, and he will follow them in writing a book in honour of Aemilius Strabo, the most illustrious of those who are best, the best of those who are illustrious, and the most learned of either class. Apuleius is abashed at the great honour accorded him.

There follows an augmentation: to be known to Aemilianus Strabo is already a great honour, but the consular has gone so far as to praise him in a public speech. The contents of this speech are summarized in a lengthy climax, which ends with the proposal made by the consular: that a statue be erected in honour of Apuleius.

Apuleius then moves to a short augmentation. The senate showed itself in complete agreement with the consular, and will probably itself vote to erect a second statue; but even to be named in the senate is an honour.

The speech ends with a comparison. Less important cities have voted statues to Apuleius, and have erected
them without delay; a city of Carthage's importance should do no less. The book he will write for the dedication of the statue will immortalize their generous action.
I quote Menander's definition of the *logos pro-
pemptikos*, the speech on someone's departure:

ΠΕΡΙ ΠΡΟΠΕΜΠΤΙΤΙΚΗΣ

'Η προπεμπτιτικὴ λαλία λόγος ἐστὶ μετ'
εὐφημίας τινὸς προπεμπτικῶν τῶν ἀπαύγοντας.
χαίρε, δὲ αἰρότατι, καὶ διηγημάτων ἀριστῶν
χάρισι.

ON THE PROPEMPTIC ORATION

The propemptic oration is a speech with
some auspicious saying, sending off one
who is departing. It is best with sensuous
use of language and the grace imparted by
extended description of things of the past.

p. 395 lines 1-4
Spengel

This type of speech, as Menander recognizes, can
in fact often be classed as a kind of encomium:

γένοιτο δ' ἄν καὶ ἄλλος τρόπος πλείους
διατριβὴν ἔχων περί τῇ ἐγκώμιῃ μῆλλον, σκεδῶν
dὲ εἰπεῖν μικρῶν σύμπτωσιν, διὰν ἔθελην προ.
ἵστασθαι τῷ μὲν δοκεῖν προπεμπτιτικῶν λόγον,
There can be another type having much to do rather with the encomium or being almost entirely concerned with it, when it appears to be a propemptic speech but is in fact an encomium. This happens when we send off a governor who is either ending governorship or going from one town to another.

Apuleius begins fragment ix with an invitation to any of his detractors who happen to be in the audience to look at the crowd there assembled and to consider the excellence of the speaker who must undergo its scrutiny. This type of self-praise formed part of the sophist's stock-in-trade:

"Τὴν οὖν Ἀθηναίαν ἔχω, ὡσπερ ἂν εἰ μελλομεν προτέμπτικ᾽ ἄρχοντα ἢ τῆς ἄρχων πτεταμένον ἢ ἀφ ἑτέρας εἰς ἑτέραν πόλιν μέλλοντα λατέανην."

"There can be another type having much to do rather with the encomium or being almost entirely concerned with it, when it appears to be a propemptic speech but is in fact an encomium. This happens when we send off a governor who is either ending governorship or going from one town to another.

Apuleius begins fragment ix with an invitation to any of his detractors who happen to be in the audience to look at the crowd there assembled and to consider the excellence of the speaker who must undergo its scrutiny. This type of self-praise formed part of the sophist's stock-in-trade:

"Ὅπερ οὖν γὰρ ἃτομ τὸν Πολέμων, ὡς πόλεσι μὲν ἀπὸ τοῦ προῦχοντος, δυναστεῖ δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ μὴ ὄφειμένου, θεοῖς δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱεροῦ διάλειψαί εἰς Ἀθηναίοις μὲν γὰρ ἐπιδείκνυμεν αὐτο- σχέδιοι λόγοις, ὡς καὶ πρῶτον Ἀθήνης ἱπτερα, ὥστε εἰς ἐγκώμιαν κατέστησαν ἔμυτον τοῦ ἀντίος, τοσοῦτον ὄντων, ὅτι ὡσπερ Ἀθηναίοιν ἐν εἰποι, οὔτ' ὥσπερ ἔστι ἐμυπο δέοις ἐμαρμαρριζομεν, καίτοι καὶ τῆς τοιοῦτος ἱδέας ὑπελούσος τοὺς σοφιστὰς ἐν τοῖς ἐπιδείξεσιν."
For in truth Polemo was so arrogant that he conversed with cities as his inferiors, Emperors as not his superiors, and the gods as his equals. For instance, when he gave a display to the Athenians of extempore speeches on first coming to Athens, he did not condescend to utter an encomium on the city, though there were so many things that one might say in honour of the Athenians; nor did he make a long oration about his own renown, although this style of speech is likely to win favour for sophists in their public declamations.

Philostratus
Lives of the Sophists
535 (trans. W.C. Wright)

Apuleius asks his audience not to be deceived by the appearance of his adversaries, and compares the situation to a trial, where the public crier appears to be the most important person, but is in fact subordinate to the proconsul. Just as the proconsul's words are irrevocable, so Apuleius' words cannot be recalled once spoken. Therefore Apuleius must be careful in what he says, and this not in just one genre; for his literary works are more varied than the craftsman's works of Hippias. There follows the exemplum of Hippias' coming to the Olympic games wearing shoes, clothes, and ring, and carrying oil-flask and scraper, all of them made by himself.

The exemplum is based on a passage of the *Hippias Minor* of Plato (368 a-d). Plato begins his description by saying that Hippias once came to the Olympic games with nothing on him he had not himself made. Apuleius follows Plato by mentioning Hippias' coming to the Olympic games; the second phrase he expands and makes into an antithesis; Hippias, he says, had bought none of the things which he was wearing, but had made them all with his own hands,

> et indumenta, quibus indutus,
> et calciamenta, quibus erat inductus,
> et gestamina, quibus erat conspicatus.

the clothes, in which he was clad,
the shoes, with which he was shod,
the ornaments, by which he was made conspicuous.

ix.17

Plato and Apuleius then proceed to catalogue the things that Hippias was wearing; their lists correspond closely\(^2\), but differ in their ordering of the individual items; Plato begins with the ring, strigil, oil flask, and shoes, and then mentions the clothing proper, the cloak, tunic, and belt. Apuleius more or less reverses this order; he begins with the clothing, possibly because it offered him an opportunity for a

\(^2\)Apuleius does not mention the second ring (seal) listed by Plato.
second triplet of parallel sentences:

Habebat indutui ad corpus tunicam
interulum tenuissimo textu,
triplici licio, purpura duplici:
ipse eam sibi soli texuerat.
Habebat cinctui balteum,
quod genus pictura Babylonica
miris coloribus variegatum:
nec in hac eum opera quisquam adiuverat.
Habebat amictui pallium candidum,
quod superne circumiecerat:
id quoque pallium comperior
ipsius laborem fuisse.

Next to his skin he wore as covering a tunic
of triple weave and the finest
texture, double-dyed with purple.
He had woven it by himself and
for himself at his house.
He had for girdle a belt,
embroidered in Babylonian fashion
with many wonderful colours.
In this work too no one had assisted him.
He had for outer garment a white cloak
cast about his shoulder.
I am informed that this cloak
too was his work.

ix.20

Apuleius ends the description by naming the four
other items mentioned by Plato. He then moves to an
augmentation: Hippias is indeed worthy of praise, yet
Apuleius does not envy him his skill in handicrafts,
for he is as versatile himself in the sphere of literature.
In order to produce this augmentation Apuleius is obliged
to suppress the final section of Plato's description
of Hippias; there the great variety of Hippias' literary
works is praised.
The augmentation complete, Apuleius begins the encomium of the proconsul. He wishes to offer all of his works to the proconsul and gain his approbation. He has not yet received any personal favours from him, but the excellence of his administration of the province has been sufficient to win Apuleius' approval. He has conferred favours on many; to all he has given an example of rectitude. His administration of justice has been remarkable.

Menander recommends a similar type of flattery:

\[\text{Tou\ en\ de\ te\ dikaiosyna\ pali\ orheis\ tou\} \]
\[\text{pros\ tou\ uphikous\ phian\ thwptin,\ t\ ou\ meron\} \]
\[\text{to\ trope\ ou,\ t\ ou\ dhmumtik\ ou\ pros\ tou\ prositn\ tas,}\]
\[\text{t\ ou\ kathar\ en\ tais\ dikai\ kai\ diphodakton,}\]
\[\text{t\ ou\ m\ pros\ xiron,\ m\ pros\ apikhts\ krinein\ tais\ dikai,\ t\ ou\ m\ pros\ tigim\ tous\ euiperous\ twi\ adunatw.}\]

In discussing his justness you will mention once again his kindliness to his subjects, the mildness of his manner, his willingness to meet with those who come to him, his honesty in trying cases, his refusal of all bribes, his judging of cases without favour to his friends or hostility to his enemies, and his not favouring the rich over the less powerful.

p. 416 lines 5-10
Spengel

The proconsul was rarely absent from Carthage; when he was, his son Honorinus remained in the city, and so they felt the proconsul's absence less. Why, Apuleius asks, is it necessary that governors be changed with such frequency? That this question was a commonplace is indicated by a passage in Menander:

Ψηφίσματα χρέωμεν πρὸς βασιλέας ἐπιμελοῦντες θυμῶμενες ἀλίτους τῶν χρόνων εἰς ἀρχὴν πλείους.

Let us vote on motions and send them to the kings [sic] praising and marveling and asking for the governor's term to be extended.

p. 417 lines 28-29
Spengel

The fragment ends with Apuleius' wish that the son Honorinus might follow his father and in his turn come to the province as proconsul.
The fragments of the *Florida* that can be assigned to specific types of epideictic oratory have now been discussed; the following chapters will deal with the various exempla, anecdotes, and excurses which remain.

In *Florida* iii we are given the story of the defeat of Marsyas by Apollo in a musical contest. There are references to the story throughout ancient literature; of interest to the student of the Second Sophistic are the mentions of it by Philostratus the Younger (*Images* ii) and Lucian (*Dialogues of the Gods* xvi.2). Menander recommends that music be prominently mentioned in the epideictic oration:

Χρὴ δὲ σε καὶ κήθουσῶν ὄνοματα διαφόρων
εἴδεναι, Ὀρφέως, Ἀρίωνος, Ἀμφίωνος καὶ τῶν περὶ
ἀληθεύων εὐδοκίμων... πλείστων γὰρ ἴδον τῶν ταύτων
παρέχει τῷ εἰδεὶ τῆς λαλίας.

You should know the names of the famous players of the cithara, of Orpheus, Arion, Amphion, and those famous for playing the
flute...this gives the speech a very pleasant appearance.

Fragment x is concerned with astrology and demonology. It begins with two hexameter lines describing the sun; there follows (in prose) a list of the moon and the five planets then known and the properties attributed to each. But there are, Apuleius says, other intermediate divine powers who cannot be seen but whose effects can be felt. One of them is Amor, Love, who formed the mountains and the plain, put meadows and streams everywhere, gave wings to birds, coils to reptiles, the power of running to beasts, and of walking to man. Here the fragment breaks off.

The whole of Florida x bears a close resemblance to the opening of Apuleius' treatise On the God of Socrates. Apuleius begins this work by dividing the universe into three sections. The highest of them is occupied by those gods visible to us as heavenly bodies, the sun, moon, planets, and other stars. There is also a second class of gods whose existence we know of, but whom we

\[\text{Apuleius begins his discussion of the gods by quoting two hexameter lines describing the stars. It is a tempting conjecture that the two lines describing the sun which begin Florida } x \text{ are from the same source.}\]
cannot ourselves observe. Apuleius gives the traditional pantheon of twelve as an example of this second class of gods.

In the lowest section of the universe Apuleius places the terrestrial creatures, of which man is the greatest, although even his existence is not very happy.

The third section, the air which lies between men and the gods, is populated by spirits, daemones. The gods take no direct interest in human affairs; it is the daemons who have men as their concern. Not only are they physically situated between gods and men, but they also have some of the characteristics of both. They are immortal, like the gods; like men, they have emotions, and can feel anger or pity.

Apuleius then proceeds to a classification of the daemons. The first sort is the genius, the guiding spirit of each man, who watches and cares for him from birth. The second is the human soul which has finished its time on earth and left the body it had been associated with. There is a third type of daemon, smaller in number but of greater importance than the two classes mentioned, which has never been connected with a physical body. Of this class are the daemons Amor (Love) and Somnus (Sleep); the first has the power of keeping one awake, the second of causing one to sleep. Here Apuleius' demonology ends.
and he proceeds to that consideration of Socrates’ daemon promised by the title of his treatise.

It will be clear enough from my summary that Florida and the first part of On the God of Socrates are both expositions of the same system. The immediate sources of the two passages is unknown; the demonology expounded in them goes back at least to the early Academy. The crucial Platonic passage is in the Symposium, where Socrates reports a conversation he had once had with Diotima, a priestess at Mantinea:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Tí ò̂n àn, ἕφιν, εἶν ὅ Ἐρως; Θνατός; } \\
\text{Ἄκιστα γε, } \\
\text{Ἀλλὰ τί μήν; } \\
\text{Ὅτερ τὰ πρῶτα, ἕφι, μετὰ τὸν Θνατόν } \\
\text{καὶ Ἀθανάτον. } \\
\text{Tí ò̂n, ὡ Διοτίμα; } \\
\text{Ἀξίμαν μέγας, ὡ Σώκρατες καὶ γὰρ } \\
\text{πᾶν τὸ δαιμόνιον μετὰ εὖ ἐστὶ Θεοῦ τε } \\
\text{καὶ Θνατόν. } \\
\text{Tína, ὡν δ’ ἐγὼ, δύναμιν ἔχον; } \\
\text{Ἐρμηνεύον καὶ διαποθέκειον θεοῖς τὸ } \\
\text{πάρ’ ἀθρώπων καὶ ἄνθρωποι τὰ πάρ’ Θεῶν, } \\
\text{τῶν γὰρ τὰς διήθεις καὶ θυσίας, τῶν δὲ } \\
\text{τὰς ἐπίταξεις τε καὶ ἐμοίβατι τῶν θυσιῶν, }
\end{align*}
\]
'What then is Love?' I asked; 'Is he mortal?' 'No.' 'What then?' 'As in the former instance, he is neither mortal nor immortal, but in a mean between the two.' 'What is he, Diotima?' 'He is a great spirit (daimon), and like all spirits he is intermediate between the divine and the mortal.' 'And what?' I said, 'is his power?' 'He interprets,' she replied, 'between gods and men, conveying and taking across to the gods the prayers and sacrifices of men, and to men the commands and replies of the gods; he is the mediator who spans the chasm which divides them, and therefore in him all is bound together, and through him the arts of the prophet and priest, their sacrifices and mysteries and charms, and all prophecy and incantation, find their way. For God mingles not with man; but through Love all the intercourse and converse of god with man, whether awake or asleep, is carried on. The wisdom which understands this is spiritual; all other wisdom, such as that of arts and handicrafts, is mean
and vulgar. Now these spirits or intermediate powers are many and diverse, and one of them is Love.'

202 d - 203 a
(trans. Jowett)

Here Plato gives us a system that corresponds closely to that of Apuleius, but with one major omission: Plato does not name any special part of the universe as the habitation of the daemons. For this element of Apuleius' demonology we must turn elsewhere.

There is in the Platonic corpus a dialogue called the Epinomis, which forms a kind of pendant to the Laws. Its authorship is a matter of dispute; if not by Plato, it was certainly written by a member of his school not long after his death. Here we find a full expression of the physical system given by Apuleius:

\[ \text{Θεοὺς δὲ δὲ τοὺς ὑπατούς, μεγίστους καὶ τιμωτέρους καὶ δεύτερον ὑπάρχως πάντα, τοὺς πρώτους τῶν τῶν ζωτῶν φύσιν λεγέτεν καὶ ὅσα μετὰ τούτων} \]

\(^2\)It was known to Aristophanes of Byzantium (c. 260-184 B.C.), who included it in his classification of Plato's works. For a full discussion of the question of authorship see Leonardo Tarán, Academica: Plato, Philip of Opus, and the Pseudo-Platonic Epinomis ("Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society," vol. 107; Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1975), pp. 3-47.
But as our visible gods, greatest and most honourable and having keenest vision every way, we must count first the order of the stars and all else that we perceive existing with them; and after these, and next below these, the divine spirits [daemons], and air-borne race...the heaven being filled full of live creatures, they interpret all men and all things both to one another and to the most exalted gods, because the middle creatures move both to earth and to the whole of heaven with a lightly rushing motion.

984 d - 985 b
(trans. W.R.M. Lamb)

Xenocrates, a disciple of Plato and eventual successor to him (after Speusippus) as head of the Academy, is known to have constructed a similar system:

Ξενοκράτης Ἀγαθένορος Καλυμβύντος...προσγραμμένε...Θεοῖ δ' εἶναι καὶ τῶν οὐρανῶν καὶ τῶν ἄστερων παρώδεις Ὀλυμπίους θεοὺς, καὶ ἑτέρους ὑποσελήνους δαίμονας ἄριστους.

Xenocrates of Chalcedon, son of Agathenor, says that the heaven is a god, the fiery stars
the Olympian gods, and that there are other daemons beneath the orbit of the moon who are invisible.

Fragment 15 Heinze

It is clear that in Florida x and the first part of On the God of Socrates Apuleius was not presenting a system of his own, but expounding a by then long-established doctrine of the Platonic school.

Florida ii begins in the middle of a discussion of which is the more valuable sense, sight or hearing. Apuleius quotes authorities for the two sides of the question. Socrates, he says, on seeing a handsome youth, expressed a wish to hear him, so that he might truly see him; a character in Plautus¹ says, "The testimony of one sight is worth more than ten hearings." But, Apuleius continues, if greater weight be given sight than hearing, the eagle must be considered the wisest of living creatures. He then gives a lengthy encomium of the eagle. There is a similar comparison in the Ninth Discourse of Dio Chrysostom². Here Dio tells of a conversation the Cynic philosopher Diogenes had with an athlete who had just won a race: "Well," said Diogenes, "if the swiftest thing is the best, it is much better, perhaps, to be a lark than to be a man." The question of the superiority of man over beast was in any case a common-

¹Truculentus 489. The line in fact means, "One's own observation of a thing is worth ten reports from others."

²ix.19. Dio was a sophist and popular philosopher of the first century. Cf. Philostratus, Lives of the Sophists 48
place of ancient literature\textsuperscript{3}.

The praise of a bird or land animal was recognized by Menander as a type of epideictic speech:

\begin{quote}
oi \ de \ peri \ th\omega\nu \ [\theta\nu\tau\omega\nu] \ o\i \ me\nu \ peri: \\
\log\i\kappa\nu, \ \alpha\nu\varphi\omega\nu, \ o\i \ de \ peri \ \alpha\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\nu\nu \ \gamma\iota\nu\omicron\nu\tau\tau\iota:
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\'e\pi\alpha\nu o\i, ... peri \ \tau\eta \ \kappa\rho\omicron\omicron\alpha, \\
oi \ de \ peri \ \epsilon\nu\upsilon\rho\omicron\alpha \ \epsilon\pi\iota\nu o\i \ \gamma\iota\nu\omicron\nu\tau\tau\iota, \ kai \ \tau\o\i \ me\nu \ peri:
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\tau\o\i\nu \ \epsilon\nu\upsilon\rho\omicron\alpha \ \pi\alpha\i\nu \ \zeta\omicron\omicron\nu\omicron\theta\epsilon\mu\epsilon\beta\iota, \ \tau\o\i\nu \ \delta'\alpha\i, \ \tau\o\i\nu \ \epsilon\gamma\gamma\epsilon\iota\omicron\nu, \ \mu\epsilon\omicron\sigma \ \delta\i\omicron\tau\omicron\omicron, \ \omicron \ \pi\tau\iota\nu o\i \ \pi\tau\iota\nu o.
\end{quote}

There are encomiums of living things, some of the creature with power of speech, man, and some of those creatures that are dumb... of encomiums of creatures that are dumb, some are of the creatures of the dry land, others of sea animals. We shall delay our discussion of sea animals; of those of the dry land there is a twofold division, those that are winged, and those that move on foot.

p. 332 lines 11-17
Spengel

The most famous encomium of this type is probably Lucian's \textit{The Fly}.

Another encomium of a bird is found in \textit{Florida} xii; here gives a long description of the parrot based on

that of Pliny the Elder (*Natural History* x.58-59).

Pliny and Apuleius both begin by stating that the parrot is a bird from India; Pliny adds that in that country it is known as the *siptacen*. They then move to describe the physical appearance of the bird:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{viridem toto corpore, torque tantum miniato in cervice distinctam.}
\end{align*}
\]

Its whole body is green, only varied by a red circlet at the neck.

*Natural History* x.58

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{instar illi minimo minus quam columbarum,} \\
\text{sed color <non> columbarum;} \\
\text{non enim lacteus ille vel lividus} \\
\text{vel utrumque, subluteus aut sparsus est,} \\
\text{sed color psittaco viridis} \\
\text{et intimis plumulis} \\
\text{et extimis palmulis,} \\
\text{ nisi quod sola cervice distinguitur.}
\end{align*}
\]

*Enimvero cervicula eius circulo man eo* \\
*velut aurea torqui* \\
*parsi fulgoris circumactu* \\
*cingitur et coronatur.*

It is slightly smaller than a dove, but does not have the colour of the dove. For it is not white, or dark blue, or both; neither is it yellow or mottled, but the parrot is green at the roots of its feathers and at the tips of its wings except for the markings on the neck. For its neck is circled and crowned with a crimson ban like a collar of gold it shines throughout its length.

*Florida* xii.1-2
Pliny then briefly mentions the parrot's ability to mimic people. This Apuleius omits. They then describe the hardness of the bird's head and beak. The parrot uses its beak to lessen the shock of landing; as for its head, its hardness is such that the bird must be disciplined with an iron rod while being trained; otherwise it will not feel the blow. This rod, Apuleius says, is for the parrot equivalent to the master's cane.

Pliny concludes his remarks by saying that all birds that imitate human speech have broad tongues. Apuleius incorporates this information into his advice on the selection and training of the parrot. It must be less than two years of age, and have five toes on each foot. Its diet should have consisted of acorns. The parrot imitates the human voice more pleasantly than does the raven. If you teach the bird words of abuse, it will repeat them incessantly, thinking them a song; to escape the insults you will be obliged either to cut the bird's tongue out or let it go free. Here the fragment ends.

*Florida* xiii consists of a brief augmentation. Philosophy, Apuleius says, did not give him the type of eloquence which is observed in birds, which is only heard briefly and at certain times. He then gives a lengthy description of the songs of various birds, ending
with the statement that the wise speech of the philosopher is of all tones and useful at all times. The sentiment is repeated at xvii.16-18, where Apuleius states that various birds sing songs appropriate to the various times of life, and they do this in the wild, but when one's song is useful to people of all ages, it should be performed not when one is alone but when many people are present.

In the First Discourse of Dio Chrysostom there is a similar discussion of the relative values of the flautist and the philosopher. Music, Dio says, cannot repair defect of character; the words of a philosopher are considerably more useful.

\[4i.8-10.\]
We have Philostratus' testimony for the close connection between philosophy and rhetoric in the Second Sophistic:

τοὺς φιλοσοφοῦντας ἐν δόξῃ τοῦ
σοφιστεῖου καὶ τοὺς οὕτω κυρίως
προσθέντας σοφιστὰς ἐσ ὅσβιλία
ἀνέγραψα σοι.

Σοφιστὰς δὲ οἱ παλαιοὶ ἐπωνύμαθοι
οὐ μόνον τῶν ῥητόρων τοὺς ὑπερφιλοσόφους τε
καὶ λαμπρῶς, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν φιλοσοφῶν τοὺς
ἐνεν εὐρίαι ἐρμηνεύοντας, ὑπὲρ ὃν ἀνέγκα
προτέρων λέγειν, ἐπειδὴ οὐκ ἄντες σοφισταί,
δοκοῦντες δὲ Παράλυον ἐσ τῶν ἐπωνυμίαν
ταύτην.

I have written for you in two Books an account of certain men who, though they pursued philosophy, ranked as sophists, and also of the sophists properly so called.

\[^{1}\text{Gordian, consul and future emperor (d. 238).}\]
The men of former days applied the name "sophist," not only to orators whose surpassing eloquence won them a brilliant reputation, but also to philosophers who expounded their theories with ease and fluency. Of these latter, then, I must speak first, because, although they were not actually sophists, they seemed to be so, and hence came to be so called.

Apuleius must be classed among these philosopher-sophists. Throughout his works he refers to himself as a philosopher; at only one point does he call himself an orator. In a passage of the Florida he makes it clear which of his abilities he most values:

Ego et alias creterras Athenis bibi: poeticae commentam, geometriae limpidam, musicae dulcem, dialecticae austerulam, iam vero universae philosophiae inexplebilem scilicet <et> nectaralem.

I, however, have drunk yet other cups at Athens - the imaginative draught of poetry, the clear draught of geometry, the sweet draught of music, the austerer draught of dialectic, and the nectar of all philosophy, whereof no man may ever drink enough.

xx.4 (trans. H.E. Butler)

---

1Cf. Apology iv.1, ix.4, xiii.5, xvii.11, xviii.1; On the God of Socrates v.
There survive two of his philosophical works, On the God of Socrates and On the Doctrine of Plato. The large number of philosophical exempla in the Florida reflects the fundamental orientation of Apuleius' activities.

We begin with Florida vi. It starts with a list of the wonders of India, its ivory, pepper, cinnamon, foundries, gold and silver mines, the skin colour of its inhabitants, its river, the Ganges, and its elephants. Apuleius completes his augmentation by saying that above all these things he admires the gymnosophists. He does not admire

The attribution to Apuleius of the Latin translation of the pseudo-Aristotelian treatise On the World (De Mundo) is disputed. For a full discussion of the question see pp. ix-xxix of Beaujeu's edition.

The gymnosophists are historical. Known as the digambaras, "those who are clothed in the quarters of the sky," they are one of the two chief sects of Jainism, a modified Hinduism developed in the sixth century B.C. and still existing today. Cf. Hermann Jacobi, "Digambaras" and "Jainism," Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, ed. James Hastings, IV (1912), 704 and VII (1915), 465-74. They became known to the Mediterranean world through the conquests of Alexander; the account of them in Strabo's Geography (xv.1.60 ff.) is largely drawn from the memoirs of his companions. The gymnosophists were subsequently incorporated into the Alexander Romance. Cf. Plutarch, Life of Alexander 64 and Leben und Taten Alexanders von Makedonien: Der Griechische Alexanderroman nach der Handschrift L, ed. H. von Thiel ("Texte zur Forschung," Band 13; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1974), pp. 128-33 (3.4-6) and the appendix of the same volume, "Alexanders Gespräch mit den Gymnosophisten," pp. 242-47. Apuleius' anecdote of the disciples being sent away without dinner preserves something of the truth; fasting is highly regarded in the sect, and deliberate self-starvation not unknown.
their agricultural expertise, but rather their single-minded search for knowledge. They hate laziness. Before meals are served, their students are asked what good deeds they have done that day. Those who have none to recount are sent away without dinner.

There are two fragments of the *Florida* having to do with the Cynic philosopher Crates. In xiv we learn how, after listening to Diogenes, he gave away all his wealth and gave himself over to philosophical poverty. Once established in this new mode of life, he inspired such passion that a girl of good family made advances to him. Crates removed his cloak and invited the girl to inspect him. The girl was still willing, so Crates led her off to a stoa for the consummation of the marriage, which would have taken place in public had his disciple Zeno not spread an old cloak in front of them.

In xxii we have the opening of a similar account of Crates. He was, we are informed, honoured at each household in Athens as though he were a domestic god.

---

4His dates are c. 365-285 B.C. His wife Hipparchia was herself a noted philosopher; an account of her life is given by Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of the Philosophers* vi.96-101. The anecdote given by Apuleius is also told of Crates' teacher Diogenes (Diogenes Laertius vi.69; Augustine, *City of God* xiv.20).
and, much as Hercules had rid the earth of evil monsters, so Crates rid the human soul of evil feelings. Before becoming his true self Crates was a notable citizen of Thebes, the city of Hercules. But when he understood that riches were of no aid for living virtuously...

Here the fragment breaks off before the tale of his renunciation of riches can be told.

Fragment xv begins with a description of the isle of Samos. The island is, according to Apuleius, rather infertile; a reason for this unflattering description being allowed in the speech is suggested by a passage of Menander:

εἰ δὲ εὐφόρος τε καὶ δύσφόρος, δὴ
φιλοσοφεῖν τε καὶ ψυχεῖν διδάσκονσι.

If [the country] is unfruitful and infertile, say that it teaches one philosophy and endurance.

p. 346 lines 7-8
Spengel

Apuleius moves on to a description of the port of Samos and its temple of Juno with its rich treasury. Among the treasures is a statue of Bathyllus dedicated by the tyrant Polycrates, wrongly believed by some to be a statue of Pythagoras. The statue is described at length; we are then given a brief account of the life
of Pythagoras, of how he fled the island and went to study in Egypt, Babylonia, and India, where he studied with the Brahmans and more especially with the gymnosophists. The Babylonians furnished him with information on astrology; the Brahmans gave him the basis of his philosophy, the spiritual exercises, the division of the parts of the soul; the stages of life, and the torments and rewards reserved for those who have died.

Pherecydes, the first writer in prose, was another of his teachers, and when he had died (eaten by worms) it was Pythagoras who piously buried him. He is also said to have studied with Anaximander, Epimenides of Crete, and Laodamas.

Once he had received this formidable education, Pythagoras taught the rule of silence above all things. The period of silence he imposed on his followers was

5The mystery surrounding the life and doctrines of Pythagoras is complete. The story of his studies in Egypt and Mesopotamia is also found in Iamblichus, Life of Pythagoras iv, but cf. Gisela Kirk and J. E. Raven, The Presocratic Philosophers (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1957), p. 224, "He [Pythagoras] is said by different late writers to have visited, and to have learnt from, peoples as various as the Chaldaeans, the Indian Brahmans, the Jews, and even the Druids and the Celts; but all the such traditions tell us is that certain similarities were later detected between the teaching of Pythagoras and the beliefs held in countries other than Greece." Evidence for his studies with any of the men named by Apuleius is similarly unreliable.
adjusted according to need. The value of his philosophy is indicated by the fact that Plato was greatly influenced by him. Apuleius is himself a disciple of Pythagoras; his opportune silences have been much appreciated by the predecessors of the magistrate he is addressing.

The final fragment of the Florida to be discussed in this chapter, xix, recalls some of the episodes of the Metamorphoses. It is an anecdote of Asclepiades, a physician at Rome in the early part of the first century B.C. Coming back from his country home, Asclepiades happened to see a funeral in progress. The body was already prepared for burial, but Asclepiades noticed some signs of life in the man, took him back to his house, and there revived him.

---

6 Cf. the beginning of xvii, where Apuleius excuses himself for having been previously silent and having praised the proconsul Scipio Orfitus insufficiently.

7 I include xix in my treatment of the philosophical exempla because there is evidence that during the Second Sophistic medicine was often regarded as being a part of philosophy. Cf. chapter 5 of Bowersock's Greek Sophists, "The Prestige of Galen" (pp. 59-75), and G. P. Reardon, Courants littéraires grecs des II et III siècles après J.-C. ("Annales littéraires de l'université de Nantes," Fascicule 3; Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1971), pp. 46-63.

8 The incident is apparently historical and is recounted by Pliny the Elder (Natural History vii.24) and Celsus (On Medicine ii.6.15).
The fraudulent philosopher, a commonplace of ancient literature\(^1\), is the subject of Florida vii. The fragment begins with a eulogy of Alexander who, says Apuleius, was the noblest of kings and richly deserved the title "the Great." Here Apuleius is using a technique recognized by Quintilian:

\[\text{Ponunt in persona et nomen: quod quidem accidere ei necesse est, sed in argumentum raro cadit, nisi cum...ex causa datum est, ut Sapiens, Magnus, Pius.}\]

Names also are treated as accidents of persons; this is perfectly true, but names are rarely food for argument, unless indeed they have been given for some special reasons, such as the titles of Wise, Great, or Pious.

\[\text{v.10.30} \quad \text{(trans. H.E. Butler)}\]

Alexander founded the greatest empire the world

\(^1\)It was especially frequent in the Second Sophistic; Boulanger (Aelius Aristide pp. 261-65) gives an impressive list of those known to have attacked disreputable philosophers, among them Dio Chrysostom, Aristides, and Herodes Atticus. Domitian's expulsions of the philosophers from Italy in 89 and 95 perhaps indicate the strength of popular feeling against them.
had ever seen; his virtue was the equal of his good fortune; he has no rival, no one could hope for his virtue, no one could wish for his fortune. To this we can compare a passage of Quintilian:

\begin{quote}
Sciamus gratiora esse audientibus quae solus quis aut primus aut certe cum paucis fecisse dicitur, si quid praeterea supra spem aut expectationem.
\end{quote}

We must bear in mind the fact that what most pleases an audience is the celebration of deeds which our hero was the first or only man or at any rate one of the very few to perform; and to these we must add any other achievements which surpassed hope or expectation.

\begin{quote}
iii.7.16
(trans. H.E. Butler)
\end{quote}

Alexander did many notable things, but the greatest of his deeds was his edict that only Polycletus\textsuperscript{2} might sculpture, Apelles paint, or Pyrgoteles engrave his portrait. It is not possible to determine Apuleius' source with certainty; the story is mentioned quite often in ancient literature, most notably by Horace, Pliny the Elder, and Plutarch\textsuperscript{3}. Plutarch was of the three the writer closest to Apuleius in time; if it was his version

\textsuperscript{2}Polycletus lived a century before Alexander; the other sources for this anecdote give the name of the famous fourth-century sculptor Lysippus.

\textsuperscript{3}Epistles ii.1.237-41; Natural History vii.125; Life of Alexander 4.
that Apuleius drew on, we find Apuleius conforming to another of Menander's recommendations:

Χροσίμωται δὲ πρὸς λαλίν καὶ οἱ Πλούταρχεῖοι θεοὶ, ὡσπερ εἰς ἀλλὰν πολλὰν καὶ ποντοδατίν παιδευσίν καὶ ἐξ πληρείς εἰσὶν ἱστορίων καὶ ἀποθεμάτων καὶ παροιμίων καὶ ἡρείων. Τὰῦτα ἔρχονται καταμεμφύμως τὰς λαλίας χροσίμου.

The Lives of Plutarch are most useful for speeches, as tending to a large and varied culture, full of histories and apopthegms and proverbs and moral tags. All this is useful to mix into one's orations.

Alexander issued his decree in order that a correct likeness be handed down to posterity, and he succeeded in his object. A similar edict should be in force for philosophers, as they produce images of Philosophy.

This type of argument is recognized by Quintilian:

Est argumentorum locus ex similibus: 'si continentia virtus, utique et abstinentia': 'si fidem debet tutor, et procurator'. Hoc est ex eo genere quod epagôgèn Graeci vocant, Cicero inductionem.

Arguments are also drawn from similarities: "If self-control is a virtue, abstinence is also a virtue." To this class belongs the type of argument called epagôgê by the Greeks, induction by Cicero.
There remain three fragments of the Florida which, having proved resistant to classification, have not been examined in any of the preceding chapters.

We shall first look at fragment iv, which deals with the fact that the same name is often applied to things vastly different. Antigenidas, Apuleius tells us, was a player of the flute; he complained, when at the height of his fame, that funeral musicians shared with him the title of their profession. He would be less annoyed if he looked at the mimes, where the actors wear the same purple cloth as those presiding at their performance, or if he looked at the public games. The toga is worn at marriages and at funerals; the bodies of the dead are covered with the pallium of the philosopher.

Fragment ii evidently forms part of a comparison. He (unknown) suffers the same problem as those who cultivate an infertile field; they are unable to grow

---

1 A famous musician of the fourth century B.C. Cf. Theophrastus, Enquiry into Plants iv.11.3; Plutarch, On Music xxi, Aulus Gellius, xv.17.
anything, and are forced to raid the fields of their neighbours. The case is the same with someone who has no virtue of his own; he must go to others.

The comparison of mind with garden is a rhetorical commonplace:

\[ Ut, \text{si animum dicas excolendum, similitudine utaris terrae, quae neglecta sentes ac dumos, culta fructus creat. } \]

\[ \text{Illa vulgaria videri possunt et utilia tantum ad conciliandum fidel: 'ut terram cultu, sic animum disciplinis meliorem uberioremque fieri.' } \]

For instance, if you wish to argue that the mind requires cultivation, you would use a comparison drawn from the soil, which if neglected produces thorns and thickets, but if cultivated will bear fruit.

The following type [of simile] may be regarded as commonplace and useful only as helping to create an impression of sincerity: "As the soil is improved and rendered more fertile by culture, so is the mind by education."

Quintilian v.11.24; viii.3.75 (trans. H.E. Butler)

We come finally to fragment xxiii, another comparison. "No matter how beautifully a ship is outfitted, if it has no steersman, or if a tempest comes up, it will easily be wrecked. Doctors, when they come to visit a sick man, pay no attention to the beauty of his house, but only to his own condition; he may have to fast while the slaves feast." The simile of
the ship is a commonplace of ancient literature, and is mentioned once by Menander (page 379 lines 28-29 Spengel); I have been unable to find any precise parallel to the second part of the passage.

We have now completed the detailed examination of the *Florida*. A brief conclusion follows.
CONCLUSION

The second century after Christ was the age of the Greek literary movement known as the Second Sophistic. This movement was characterized by the complete dominance of rhetorical technique; its typical figure was the professional orator or sophist, its typical genre the epideictic oration.

In the Florida of Apuleius we have a collection of fragments of just such orations. The longer fragments reveal themselves as belonging to such epideictic subgenres as the encomium of the city and the propemptic oration, the shorter as being the exempla and other ornaments that Menander and Quintilian recommend for use in the epideictic speech. In their content also we find the preoccupation with the Greek past that is characteristic of the Second Sophistic.

Apuleius was possibly of Greek family; in any case, Greek was certainly for him a language of everyday use. At Athens he received a thorough education in the literary and philosophical culture of his time. Of his works, the Metamorphoses is a reworking of
a Greek original, and *On the God of Socrates* and *On the Doctrine of Plato* are expositions of the Greek Middle Platonism of his day.

But it is the epideictic oratory preserved in the *Florida* which shows this African philosopher-sophist to be as fully a part of the Greek literary movement of his time as any of the sophists in the pages of Philostratus.
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