

2. Plutarch in Gellius and Apuleius Katerina Oikonomopoulou

The Roman imperial authors Aulus Gellius and Apuleius of Madauros (both 2nd-c. AD) are our most important sources of knowledge on Plutarch's early reception in the Latin-speaking world of the high Roman Empire. Both authors spent a period of philosophical study at Athens, the place where in all likelihood they became acquainted with Plutarch's writings. Plutarch is an important philosophical authority for both men, but their respective level of engagement with his writings and thought differs, conditioned as it is by their professional and intellectual identities on the one hand (Gellius may have been a grammarian; Apuleius was an orator and Platonic philosopher), and the types of works that they produced on the other.

Aulus Gellius and the Attic Nights

Aulus Gellius was born between 125-128 AD, and lived during the reigns of the Roman emperors Hadrian, Antoninus Pius, and Marcus Aurelius. His life's work is a miscellanistic compilation entitled *Attic Nights*,¹ which comprises 20 books of various lengths. It was probably published around 178 AD,² and thus falls in the peak of the so-called Second Sophistic. Indeed, some of the prominent personages that Gellius depicts within his work, especially Favorinus and Herodes Atticus, are emblematic figureheads of this Greek cultural movement, their life and activity memorialised by Philostratus in his *Lives of the Sophists*. Even though Gellius' cultural and linguistic context is predominantly Latin, the Second Sophistic's preoccupations with the performance and display of knowledge, pure speech, antiquarianism, and cultural identity play out as major themes in his world as well.³

Plutarch is mentioned by name at several places across the *Attic Nights*' 20 books. Gellius is acquainted with a very limited range of his works, all of which are *Moralia*-writings. They include principally Plutarch's sympotic miscellany, the *Table Talk* (cited 4 times, at NA 3.5, 3.6, 4.11 and 17.11), the treatises *On controlling anger* (NA 1.26) and *On curiosity* (NA 11.16), and various works in the Plutarchan corpus that are either fragmentary or are considered spurious: from the former group Gellius cites from Plutarch's *Life of Heracles* (NA 1.1, fr. 7 Sandbach), the *Commentary on Hesiod* (NA 20.8, fr. 102 Sandbach), *On Homer* (NA 2.8-2.9, 4.11; the work is also known as *Homeric Studies*, see frs. 122-124 Sandbach), and *On the soul* (NA 1.3.31, 15.10, frs. 174-175 Sandbach); from the latter, Gellius' preface (NA pref. 6) mentions the *Stromateis*, a miscellanistic work attributed to Plutarch in antiquity.⁴

Gellius' uses of Plutarchan material are yoked to the principal aim of his work to stimulate the minds of his readers with the "desire for independent learning and ... the study of the liberal arts" (NA pref. 12).⁵ Learning useful facts is a key component

¹ On the *Attic Nights*' title, see Vardi (1993). On the *Attic Nights*' links with the imperial tradition of writing miscellanies, see Morgan (2004, 2007b and 2011); Oikonomopoulou (2017).

² Holford-Strevens (2003: 15-20).

³ See discussion in Stertz (1993); Moreschini (1994); Vessey (1994).

⁴ See fr. 179 Sandbach. See also the Italian translation of Plutarch's fragments by Volpe Cacciatore (2010).

⁵ In the remainder of this chapter, all translations from ancient texts are taken from the Loeb editions.

of this edificatory programme: Gellius explicitly declares his wish to save his readers from embarrassment at situations where one's erudition is often put to the challenge. (ibid., presumably having social situations such as symposia in mind.)⁶ To this end, he mines Plutarch's writings for interesting or curious facts about the natural world⁷ or for instructive information on the life of famous philosophers.⁸ Perhaps emblematically, Plutarch features in the *Attic Nights*' very first chapter (*NA* 1.1), which recounts an anecdote drawn from the *Life of Heracles*: according to the anecdote, the philosopher Pythagoras was able, through a complex process of reasoning and extrapolation, to calculate Heracles' height from the length of the stadium at Pisa. As trivial as its content may superficially look, the anecdote exalts curiosity of mind and love of knowledge, with the mention of Pythagoras' and Plutarch's names associating both attributes with philosophy. In this way, Gellius illustrates for his readers the valuable contribution enquiry can make to one's life, and urges them to adopt the mindset of the philosopher who seeks to gain useful knowledge from all facets of the world.⁹

Moral education is an indispensable part of Gellius' educational agenda,¹⁰ and in this regard Plutarch's extensive corpus of moral writings provides a rich source of admonition. In *Advice about keeping well*, Plutarch discourses against the perils of pleasure by quoting the Academic philosopher Arcesilaus: according to Plutarch, Arcesilaus stated that "it makes no difference whether a man practices licentiousness from the front or from the rear", addressing his saying specifically to adulterers and promiscuous people (126A). The saying re-surfaces in *Table Talk* 7.5 in the mouth of a character, Lamprias (Plutarch's brother), who quotes it in order to issue caution against degenerate music (705E). Gellius quotes the same saying in *Attic Nights* 3.5, acknowledging Plutarch as his source: he translates it in succinct Latin and also invests it with narrative context. In Gellius' version, Arcesilaus addressed his saying to a rich man who loved pleasure but had a reputation for incorruptibility and freedom from debauchery. Gellius adds sensational details (the rich man is described as possessing "affected speech, artfully arranged hair and eyes full of desire and alluring sensuality", *NA* 3.5.2) which serve to draw a vivid portrait of Arcesilaus' targets. This portrait is typical of the *kinaidos* in ancient Greek and Roman literature, but the emphasis on affected speech in particular would have additionally brought to mind a type of behaviour that was specifically associated with the imperial sophists' oratorical displays.¹¹ In this way, Gellius updates the saying for his imperial Roman readers, who carried as cultural background the traditional Roman aversion to

⁶ On the *NA*'s educational programme, see Anderson (1994); Henry (1994); Holford-Strevens (2003: 27-80); Vardi (2004); Morgan (2004); Beall (2004); Heusch (2011: 303-402); Oikonomopoulou (2017).

⁷ See esp. *NA* 3.6 (a curious fact about the palm tree, drawn from the *Quaest. conv.* See Holford-Strevens [2004: 249-281]); 15.10, citing Plutarch's *On the Soul* about a curious mental disease that befell the women of Miletus; 17.11 (offering a summary of *Quaest. conv.* 7.1, on the nature of the stomach and the windpipe); 20.8 (citing Plutarch's *Commentary on Hesiod* on the onion).

⁸ *NA* 4.11.11-13, citing Plutarch's *On Homer* about the Pythagorean way of life.

⁹ On the role of philosophy in the *NA*, see Moreschini (1994); Beall (2004).

¹⁰ See Morgan (2004).

¹¹ See Gleason (1995: 62-67, 82-158).

displays of opulence, luxury and effeminacy (all denounced on several occasions within the *Attic Nights*),¹² and were familiar with the the imperial sophists' (often) extravagant displays of eloquence.

It is not clear whether Gellius drew Arcesilaus' saying from *Advice on Keeping Well* or the *Table Talk*: the latter seems more likely, given that he uses the *Table Talk* elsewhere in his work (including in the immediately following chapter, 3.6) but shows no sign of familiarity with the former Plutarchan treatise. But what is clear is that, when necessary, he takes some liberties with his Plutarchan material and embellishes it so as to adapt it to the moral sensibilities of his Roman readers. By duly acknowledging Plutarch as his source, Gellius enhances the philosophical authority of Arcesilaus' saying and links the moral dimension of his own work to a long line of philosophers linked to the legacy of the Platonic Academy (Arcesilaus was an Academic Sceptic, and Plutarch a Middle Platonist).¹³

In *NA* 1.26, Gellius' Platonist teacher at Athens Calvenus Taurus (on whom see also Bonazzi in this volume)¹⁴ instructs his pupil Gellius on the topic of whether the wise man can get angry, by citing an anecdote about Plutarch. According to Taurus' story, Plutarch once ordered the flogging of one of his slaves as punishment for an offence; the slave violently protested against the punishment, by accusing his master of violating his own philosophical principles and allowing himself to succumb to anger, against what he advocated in treatises such as *On controlling anger*; to these accusations Plutarch responded by stressing that he felt and showed no anger on his face; the slave's punishment would therefore continue as planned. The anecdote is in all likelihood fictive, and seems to be inspired by Plutarch's own words in the treatise *On controlling anger* (459A-E). There, Plutarch discusses his relationship to his own slaves as a situation that regularly used to put his self-control to the test (459C ff.): slaves tend to behave like children and commit errors, and masters tend to feel angry at them and punish them harshly. Plutarch's solution was to limit the use of punishment against the slaves of his household, whenever they misbehaved; when punishment could not be avoided, he sought to inflict it at the right moment, in moderation and by allowing his slaves to defend themselves. In Gellius' anecdote, then, Plutarch appears to implement his own advice to the letter: he orders his slave to be punished, but allows him to defend himself; even when his slave's provocative and accusatory words test his self-restraint, he does not resort to harsher measures, but engages in dialogue with the slave as the punishment is inflicted. It is not clear whether this anecdote is based on Gellius's first-hand knowledge of the Plutarchan treatise *On controlling anger*. But it certainly serves to underscore Plutarch's authoritative status among later imperial Platonists like Taurus (who refers to him as *Plutarchus noster*, "our Plutarch": see Bonazzi in this volume for an interpretation of this phrase); and, in a manner that was suited to Gellius' practically-minded Roman

¹² On Gellius' Roman cultural programme, see Beall (2004); Keulen (2009: 17-94).

¹³ Cf. *NA* 1.3.31, citing a saying of Chilo (one of the seven wise men) about friendship and enmity, drawn from Plutarch's *On the soul*; 2.8-2.9, citing Plutarch's criticism of a syllogism of Epicurus, drawn from Plutarch's *On Homer*.

¹⁴ On Taurus' portrait in the *NA*, see discussion in Lakmann (1995); Roskam (2009).

readers, it offers a practical illustration of Plutarch's moral philosophy, presenting it in flesh and blood, as it were.

Plutarch's influence on Gellius was probably much more far-reaching: Plutarch's self-presentation as a philosopher and intellectual provided a model for Gellius' own autobiographical self-presentation. In *NA* 11.16, Gellius is preoccupied with what on the surface appears to be a linguistic matter, namely, how to render into Latin the Greek title of Plutarch's moral treatise *On curiosity* (*Peri Polupragmosunês*, also translated as *On being a busybody* in English), in order to describe its subject matter to a friend of his who knows no Greek. It quickly emerges that the Latin term for "busy" (*negotiosus*) does not satisfy as the basis for a Latin translation, as being actively involved in the duties of the household and state was a positive virtue in the Roman moral system.¹⁵ In fact, as Gellius explains to his friend, Plutarch's treatise advises against undertaking many duties in life. Gellius does not reflect on the deeper implications of this apparent clash between Plutarchan moral philosophy and the Roman value system; rather, the emphasis of his autobiographical anecdote falls on his own function as a cultural mediator who undertakes to communicate Plutarch's philosophical thought to his Roman audience. In this way he mirrors Plutarch himself, who sought to "translate" Roman culture and religion to his Greek readers through his works of parallelism (the *Parallel Lives*, but also works such as the *Roman and Greek Questions*).¹⁶

Plutarch's oeuvre offers a fascinating glimpse into the structure and activity of the intellectual circles that formed the social and intellectual background to his work and philosophy. Plutarch's friends and acquaintances appear as characters especially vividly in the *Table Talk*.¹⁷ In the various sympotic scenes that are contained within this work, Plutarch depicts himself as a symposiast at various phases of his life, surrounded by members of his close family, his teachers and friends.¹⁸ These depictions of intellectuals and their interactions are undoubtedly idealised: drawing on the rich tradition of the philosophical symposium, Plutarch constructs his sympotic scenes as a way of exalting and promoting philosophy (conceived as the practice of formulating and solving enquiries into the causes or origins of various phenomena) as a way of life.¹⁹ But in contrast to his philosophical predecessors, he leaves ample room for his own autobiographical self-presentation in his work: he not only appears as an active participant in it (sometimes in the role of sympotic host), he also functions as a key social and intellectual link between a truly diverse circle of men, which includes Greeks and Romans, philosophers and laypeople, young and old, specialists and dilettantes.²⁰ The men meet at various places in Greece and Rome²¹ and discourse as equals regardless of differences in status, authority or age. The

¹⁵ See discussion in Heusch (2011: 306-327).

¹⁶ See Keulen (2009: 193-235).

¹⁷ For a prosopography of Plutarch's friends, see Puech (1992).

¹⁸ See Klotz (2011); König (2011 and 2012: 60-89).

¹⁹ See Roskam (2010); Klotz and Oikonomopoulou (2011: 13-18); Klotz (2011); König (2011); Oikonomopoulou (2011).

²⁰ See Klotz (2011); König (2011 and 2012: 64-81); Hobden (2013: 228-234); Andurand (2015).

²¹ On the geographical locations that feature in the *Quaest. conv.* in connection to its panhellenism, see König (2007 and 2012: 64-89).

importance of equality is underscored especially in scenes where authority figures such as Plutarch's Platonist teacher Ammonius²² engage in dialogue with younger members of the group: the narrative makes a point of stressing that the young men who participate in the conversations are encouraged by the more experienced men to articulate philosophical arguments in support of or against those of their fellow-symposiasts.²³

We can surmise the presence of Plutarchan influence in Gellius' own presentation of his intellectual circles. The intellectual communities that feature within the *Attic Nights* are of two main types. In the first instance, they comprise a group of individuals who revolve around a prominent figurehead, usually a respected teacher or a prestigious intellectual. Such men are Sulpicius Apollinaris, a respected grammarian who was one of Gellius' teachers, Gellius' philosophical teacher at Athens Calvenus Taurus,²⁴ his legal teacher Titus Castricius, the jurist Marcus Cornelius Fronto and prominent sophists like Favorinus and Herodes Atticus.²⁵ The groups that are associated with these men vary in terms of their composition and internal dynamic: they may include groups of students in contexts of formal instruction, or social groups of (presumably) a more heterogeneous nature, whose members are linked to one other through their shared valorisation of true erudition. Symposia are key occasions that provide opportunities for such men to meet and share knowledge, and Gellius offers a good number of narrative scenes which purportedly took place at sympotic occasions. Some give centre stage to his teacher Calvenus Taurus: in one such scene (*NA* 19.6), Taurus reads from Aristotle's *Problems*, together with Gellius and other students of his; the reading offers opportunity for philosophical discussion, and appears to be integrated into Taurus' philosophical teaching.²⁶ Other sympotic scenes take place at luxury villas or the private homes of prominent men in Greece or Italy, and offer opportunities for intellectual discussion on various topics.²⁷ The atmosphere is not always harmonious: often in Gellius symposia and other social occasions provide opportunity for erudite men to expose the ignorance of pseudo-intellectuals, either pretentious philosophers or (most commonly) grammarians.²⁸ But overall, the diversity of intellectual interests pursued by Gellius' friends (including grammar, language, literature, science, philosophy and history) mirrors that of the *Table Talk* and casts Gellius and his friends in the mould of Plutarch.²⁹

The second type of intellectual community that Gellius describes consists of peers, who gather together on social occasions or in public contexts in order to

²² On Ammonius, see Jones (1967).

²³ See Roskam (2004); König (2012: 66-71); Oikonomopoulou (2011: 120-123).

²⁴ On Taurus and his philosophy, see Moreschini (1994); Lakmann (1995); Roskam (2009); Heusch (2011: 257-260).

²⁵ On these men, see Stertz (1994); Moreschini (1994); Beall (2001); Holford-Strevens (2003: 84-154); Keulen (2009: 155-189; 269-312); Heusch (2011: 251-301).

²⁶ See Roskam (2009); Oikonomopoulou (2013: 133-138); Meeusen (2018).

²⁷ Keulen (2009: 269-312) discusses such scenes in the villa of Herodes Atticus. See also Johnson (2009 and 2010: 98-136), on the activity of reading embedded in such scenes.

²⁸ See Keulen (2004). On grammarians in the *NA*, see Vardi (2001). On grammarians in the *Quaest. conv.*, see Horster (2008); Eshleman (2013).

²⁹ See Roskam (2009); Klotz and Oikonomopoulou (2011b).

practice their shared intellectual pursuits. As a rule, Gellius does not name these friends, but he sometimes describes them in terms of their professions, intellectual interests or literary output. All appear to be active members of Rome's intellectual scene, visiting libraries, producing written output like Gellius himself (he mentions a friend of his who also wrote a miscellany in *NA* 14.6), or engaging in lively debates on scholarly questions. A case in point is *Attic Nights* 18.2.1-5:

We used to spend the Saturnalia at Athens very merrily yet temperately, not "relaxing our minds", as the saying is – for, as Musonius asserts, to relax the mind is like losing it – but diverting our minds a little and relieving them by the delights of pleasant and improving conversation. Accordingly, a number of us Romans who had come to Greece, and who attended the same lectures and devoted ourselves to the same teachers, met at the same dinner-table. Then the one who was giving the entertainment in his turn, offered as a prize for solving a problem the work of some old Greek or Roman writer and a crown woven from laurel, and put to us as many questions as there were guests present.

In this passage, Gellius appears as a member of a group of Roman students at Athens who celebrate a Roman festival, the Saturnalia.³⁰ The members of the group appear to entertain themselves by posing and solving intellectual problems, an activity which, as we have already seen, elsewhere in the *Attic Nights*, takes place under the guidance of their philosophical teacher, Calvenus Taurus. The absence of a teacher in this scene, in conjunction with the fact that none of Gellius' friends is mentioned by name, serves to stress the element of equality in the Saturnalia celebration (Plutarch himself often includes unnamed friends as characters in the *Table Talk's* sympotic conversations). In addition, it puts into relief the role of philosophy as a practice that is valuable beyond the bounds of formal teaching, influencing all aspects of life.

Further parallels are worth noting: Gellius' Platonist teacher Calvenus Taurus is depicted within the *Attic Nights* in a manner that is reminiscent of Plutarch's teacher Ammonius in the *Table Talk*. Apart from the fact that both men are Platonists, they seem to follow a similar style of interaction with their students. Just as Ammonius appears within the *Table Talk* to encourage his philosophical pupils to articulate philosophical arguments,³¹ so Calvenus Taurus encourages his own philosophical pupils (Gellius among them) to solve intellectual problems and generously shares his philosophical knowledge with them in the context of symposia.³² Equally significantly, Plutarch and Gellius shared a close acquaintance with the philosopher and sophist Favorinus of Arelate, and both present Favorinus in a positive light, putting the stress on his philosophical identity (contrary to the

³⁰ On Gellius' studies at Athens, see Holford-Strevens (2003: 15-26); Howley (2014).

³¹ See esp. *Quaest. conv.* 3.1, 8.3.

³² See *NA* 1.26, 2.2, 7.10, 17.8, 19.6.

parodistic portraits of Favorinus as an extravagant and effeminate sophist that we find in Philostratus, Lucian and in physiognomical works).³³ Favorinus appears only once in the *Table Talk*, in the context of a symposium that took place at Thermopylae: Plutarch mentions a lecture that he gave (though he does not state its topic) and describes him as a man who “is an enthusiastic admirer of Aristotle on all counts, and considers the Peripatetics the most convincing of the schools” (8.10, 734D-E). We know that the two men were close friends: Plutarch dedicated to Favorinus his treatise *On the first cold*, as well as a (now lost) *Letter on friendship* (Lamprias catalogue 132); and Favorinus wrote a work entitled *Plutarch or On the Academic Disposition*. Favorinus’ role is much more prominent in the *Attic Nights*, as we have already seen: apart from presenting himself as a member of his intellectual circle, Gellius frequently quotes his opinions on philosophical or erudite matters in a manner that indicates respect for his authority³⁴ and recounts occasions where Favorinus’ philosophical learning and intellectual acumen become manifest.³⁵

Yet more significantly, the *Table Talk* (probably along with other miscellanistic works that Gellius cites, such as Pamphila’s *Historical Commentaries*³⁶) seems to have been a key literary model for the *Attic Nights*’ distinctive miscellanistic aesthetic. It is notable that the reader of the *Noctes Atticae* does not get a sense of an orderly, chronological progression in the representation of the various circles Gellius was a member of: the text is structured according to the technique of *variatio* (variety), and this means that its chapters offer a very fragmented picture of Gellius’ life, instead of arranging different episodes of his life chronologically.³⁷ This type of presentation is strongly reminiscent of the *Table Talk*, where, as Frieda Klotz has discussed, the different sympotic conversations are arranged non-chronologically and in a random order, blurring the impression of distinct chronological phases in Plutarch’s life.³⁸

It is quite striking that Gellius does not mention Plutarch’s *Parallel Lives* at any point within the *Attic Nights*. His work abounds with biographical anecdotes on all the major Greek and Roman generals and politicians that Plutarch wrote about (including Pericles, Themistocles, Alcibiades), yet it does not appear that the *Parallel Lives* was the direct source for any of them. Their sources are almost always Roman, and, when not, they are drawn from other miscellanistic collections or anthologies which are duly acknowledged (such as Pamphila, for example, who is explicitly acknowledged as the source of an anecdote on Alcibiades in *NA* 15.17). The most likely explanation for this is that Gellius’ acquaintance with Plutarch’s writings was

³³ See Gleason (1995: 3-20, 131-158).

³⁴ See *NA* 1.3.27, 1.15.17, 1.21.4-5, 2.1.3, 2.5, 2.12.5-6, 3.3.6, 3.16.17-19, 5.11.8-14, 9.8.3, 9.13.5, 10.12.9-10, 11.5.5, 19.3.

³⁵ *NA* 2.22, 2.26, 3.1, 3.19, 4.1, 8.2, 12.1, 13.25, 14.1-2, 16.3, 17.10, 17.12, 17.19, 18.1, 18.7, 20.1. See detailed discussion in Holford-Strevens (1997); Beall (2001); Holford-Strevens (2003: 98-130); Keulen (2009: 155-189). The fragments of Favorinus’ works (including miscellanistic writings) can be found in Barigazzi (1966) and Amato (2010).

³⁶ On Pamphila, see Oikonomopoulou (2017).

³⁷ On variety as a literary technique in miscellanies, see Morgan (2007: 257-273; 2007b); Fitzgerald (2016: 149-195); Oikonomopoulou (2017).

³⁸ Klotz (2011).

limited, and probably mediated through his philosophical training under his teacher Taurus at Athens. What Gellius does cite from Plutarch's oeuvre is probably the result of careful excerpting – the *commentarii* that, according to his preface, formed the groundwork for the *Attic Nights* as we have it, and which he began to compose already as a student at Athens.

Apuleius of Madauros

Apuleius was a contemporary of Gellius (he too was born around 125 AD). He was born in the north African town of Madauros and studied at Carthage and Athens. His period of study at Athens may have overlapped with Gellius' own, as some intriguing resemblances between their works that have been pointed out by Leofranc Holford-Strevens suggest.³⁹ We know little else about his life, except that he pursued a successful career as an orator and Platonic philosopher, giving lectures on various topics at different cities in the Mediterranean (his *Florida* is a collection of extracts from his lectures and speeches).⁴⁰ In 158 AD he was sued for magical practices by his wealthy wife's family, and wrote an *Apology* in defence of himself at the trial. Apuleius also wrote three treatises on Platonic philosophy (*On the god of Socrates*, *On Plato and his doctrine*, *On the universe*). But his most well known and celebrated work is the comic novel *The Golden Ass*, also known as the *Metamorphoses*. Apuleius' variegated output puts his many identities to the fore: there has been much discussion about whether he should be characterised as a sophist,⁴¹ and about his relationship to Middle Platonism. The Platonic subtext of the *Metamorphoses* has also been the subject of extensive investigation, particularly in light of the fact that the novel contains as an inset tale, the story of Cupid and Psyche, that is interpreted as a Platonic allegory.

The relationship of Apuleius to Plutarch has been much discussed by scholars, especially in light of the fact that both authors were Platonists. The only secure tie between them is found at the beginning of the *Metamorphoses*. There, the narrator Lucius presents himself as a Greek and a self-taught student of Latin. Lucius traces his lineage on his mother's side back to Plutarch (*Met.* 1.2):

I was travelling to Thessaly, where the ancestry of my mother's family brings us fame in the persons of the renowned Plutarch and later his nephew, the philosopher Sextus.

As Luc van der Stockt has suggested, Plutarch and Sextus' names probably serve to invite readers of the *Metamorphoses* to interpret the work as a "Plutarchan novel", and thus to relate it with Plutarch's thought and writings.⁴² Yet the fact that Plutarch's name is associated with Thessaly (traditionally, a land of magic), rather than his

³⁹ Holford-Strevens (2003: 22-26). See also Sandy (1997: 27-36); Harrison (2000: 1-14); Keulen (2004) and Howley (2014).

⁴⁰ See commentary by Hunink (2001) and Lee (2005). Also the new Loeb translation by Jones (2017).

⁴¹ See Sandy (1997) and Harrison (2000), who consider Apuleius a "Latin sophist".

⁴² Van der Stockt (2012: 170); see also his discussion of *Met.* 1.2 in (2012: 169-171). This is also the opinion of Walsh (1981: 22).

native Boeotia, may be seen “as a re-shaping and reformulating of various Plutarchan ideas and texts into a novelistic context.”⁴³ At any rate, beyond this reference no prominent allusions to Plutarch’s works can be found within the *Metamorphoses*. Several parallels that have been pointed out by scholars are intriguing, but unfortunately they do not prove a direct Plutarchan influence on Apuleius’ thought. I discuss the most important among them below:

1. The defining feature of Lucius is his curiosity (*curiositas*): although he himself rejects this characterisation, he nevertheless describes himself as someone who has “thirst for novelty” and as “the sort who wants to know everything, or at least most things” (*Met.* 1.2). Hearing stories is what Lucius appears to enjoy the most, and time and again the novel presents him as an avid listener of stories told by others.⁴⁴ In the course of the novel, Lucius’ curiosity (particularly for magical practices) is the reason for his loss of human form and many tribulations.⁴⁵ In the tale of Cupid and Psyche too (which functions as a *mise-en-abyme* within the *Metamorphoses*), Psyche is characterised as curious: her curiosity leads her to discover the secret identity of her husband Cupid and thus to lose him (*Met.* 5.23); later, in the course of the tribulations she has to undergo in order to be reunited with him, her curiosity gets the better of her once more, when, like Pandora, she opens the jar of divine beauty she has been entrusted with the explicit instruction not to open it (*Met.* 6.19-21).⁴⁶ This agrees with how Plutarch describes curiosity in the namesake treatise: “curiosity is really a passion for finding out whatever is hidden and concealed”, as he puts it (518C); busybodies, as he states, crave for novelty and are impatient at stale news, constantly seeking to hear new stories about others (518A). Plutarch recommends training and self-control as strategies for overcoming curiosity, citing as examples the lives of various philosophers such as Socrates. In this way, philosophy is promoted as a practice for curing character of this vice. In the fictional world of the *Metamorphoses*, on the other hand, the toils and tribulations of Lucius and Psyche serve as punishment for their curiosity, with redemption coming ultimately from the gods. Though a direct Plutarchan influence on Apuleius’ treatment of curiosity cannot be proved, it is certainly possible, given the existence of a Plutarchan treatise on the topic.⁴⁷ Still, the question is how seriously it should be taken: given, as we saw above, that Lucius presents himself as a descendant of Plutarch, the narrative leaves open the possibility that his vice is ultimately inherited from his prestigious philosophical relative.⁴⁸

2. The Platonic undertones of the tale of Cupid and Psyche can be put into sharper relief, if the tale is read in the light of Plutarch’s *Dialogue on Love*.⁴⁹ There,

⁴³ Finkelpearl (2012: 199). Hunink (2004: 259) notes that it is in fact Plutarch’s nephew Sextus and not Plutarch himself who is characterised as a philosopher here, and stresses (ibid.: 257-260) that the overall jocular context in which the association with Plutarch is offered in *Met.* 1.2.

⁴⁴ See esp. *Met.* 1.2-4, where Lucius encourages his fellow-travellers to share their stories with him.

⁴⁵ On the role of magic in the *Met.*, see study by Frangoulidis (2008).

⁴⁶ See Kenney (1990: 216-217); also Keulen (2007: ad loc.)

⁴⁷ See Walsh (1981: 24-26).

⁴⁸ So Hunink (2004: 259-260).

⁴⁹ This is argued by Walsh (1981: 29-30); cf. Hunink (2004: 253).

Plutarch's father discusses Eros' relationship to the soul (764B-765F). He rejects the poets' portraits of Eros as mockeries of his true powers (765D). Invoking Egyptian myth, he likens Eros to the sun and Aphrodite to the moon: just as the sun provides light, nourishment and growth to the body, so Eros warms the souls with his brilliant rays. In fact, Eros' light has an affect that is the opposite of the sun's: the sun's rays lead us to observe the world of the senses, making us believe it is the true one; Eros, by contrast, turns our attention to the intelligible world of Forms: "Divine and chaste Love teaches the soul the truth that leads her to the Plain of Truth, where Beauty, concentrated and pure and genuine, has her home" (765A). Love at first approaches humans through the beauty of the body, thus awakening our memory of pure Beauty. Soon the lover learns to look past the body's beauty, and seek in his lover's character and thoughts the image of ideal beauty (765C). After death, "The true lover, when he has reached the other world and has consorted with true beauty in the holy way, grows wings and joins in the continual celebration of his god's mysteries, ..." (766B).

Cupid's portrait in the *Metamorphoses* is clearly based on the poetic tradition, given that he is described as a winged creature of youthful appearance who carries a torch together with a bow and arrow.⁵⁰ But in Apuleius' novelistic universe, this portrait is not incompatible with a Platonist interpretation of the myth. One can detect a Platonic subtext, for example, in the scene where Psyche sees Eros for the first time: the body of sleeping Cupid is described in terms of its brilliance and resplendence, illuminated though it is by Psyche's faint candle light (*Met.* 5.22).⁵¹ The rest of the story can be read as a Platonic allegory: at first, Psyche is bewitched by Cupid's physical beauty, unable to perceive his divinity. Only after she undergoes various toils, which include a trip to Hades, is Psyche ready finally to re-join her husband in the divine realm, and recognise him for what he is. She is subsequently granted the gift of immortality and remains united with Cupid in a marriage that lasts forever, living among the other immortal deities.⁵² Unfortunately the parallels with Plutarch's *Dialogue on Love* do not necessarily imply direct Plutarchan influence on Apuleius, and can be more plausibly explained through the two authors' Platonism.

3. In the final book of the *Metamorphoses* (book 11), Lucius is redeemed by the Egyptian goddess Isis: he prays to her for his salvation and, after an epiphanic dream in which he has a vision of the goddess, he becomes her initiate. In the end, after undergoing ritual purification during her mysteries, he regains his human form. Scholars have drawn attention to the Plutarchan treatise *On Isis and Osiris* as a possible influence:⁵³ there, Plutarch recounts to his friend, the priestess Clea, the Egyptian myth of Isis and Osiris, preceded by a philosophical key to its interpretation. As Plutarch advises, the myth, as all Egyptian myths, should not be taken at face value, but interpreted allegorically, in a manner that is compatible with Platonic philosophy. However, the links between Apuleius and this treatise seem tenuous at

⁵⁰ See Kenney (1990: 169). Cf. the commentary by Zimmerman et al. (2004).

⁵¹ See Kenney (1990: 169-171).

⁵² See Edwards (1992). The arguments for reading the tale, as well as the novel as a whole, as a Platonic fiction are summarised by Tilg (2014: 58-83).

⁵³ Walsh (1981: 23-24).

best: apart from sharing Plutarch's interest in Egyptian mythology and religion, Apuleius describes the Isis cult and nowhere offers an interpretation of the Isis and Osiris myth.⁵⁴ Nevertheless, Isis' association with Venus and the Moon certainly invites philosophical reading (and may indirectly look back to the story of Cupid and Psyche).⁵⁵ Plutarch's *Dialogue on Love* can once more serve as a useful key to its philosophical interpretation, without necessarily constituting a direct influence.

Last but not least, the similarity of title and theme between Apuleius' treatise *On the god of Socrates* and Plutarch's dialogue *On the sign of Socrates* belies their philosophical differences. Scholarship has conclusively demonstrated that the two authors diverge in important aspects of their thought on the role of demons in the world. It may well be, as it has been argued, that Apuleius' treatise has much more in common with Maximus of Tyre's *Orations* 8 and 9 on the same topic, than with Plutarch's namesake work.⁵⁶

All in all, most of the parallels between Apuleius and Plutarch can be explained through their shared Platonic heritage. By citing Plutarch's name in the preface of the *Metamorphoses*, Apuleius acknowledges Plutarch as an important Platonic forebear, but the two authors appear to have followed independent paths as philosophers and intellectuals. A key sign of this divergence is that nowhere in his non-fictional works does Apuleius present himself as a reader of Plutarch's writings, as Gellius does. However, he may have shared Gellius' special interest in the *Table Talk*, given that Sidonius Apollinaris and Macrobius attribute to him a work entitled *Quaestiones Convivales* (*Symptotic Questions*);⁵⁷ the title appears to be a Latin parallel to the Greek title of Plutarch's *Table Talk* (also translated in English as: *Symptotic Problems* or *Symptotic Questions*). If so, then we could surmise that Apuleius, like his contemporary Gellius, relied on Plutarch for his own version of the philosophical symposium. Unfortunately no fragments of the work survive, rendering it impossible for us to ascertain whether Plutarch was its model.

Conclusions

Gellius' and Apuleius' testimony indicates that Plutarch's reputation and authority as (principally) a philosopher extended well beyond the Greek-speaking world of the Roman Empire. Plutarch's name carries different connotations for each author: for Gellius, it serves to affirm the status and usefulness of philosophical enquiry in life, as well as to provide practical ethical guidance for his Roman audience; for Apuleius, Plutarch provides a genealogical link with the tradition of Platonism, and offers a key to interpreting his own distinctive contribution to it as a novelist and philosopher. Most significantly, Plutarch's *Table Talk* appears to be the work that had special appeal for both authors. We can perhaps see why, given that it is dedicated to a

⁵⁴ See detailed discussion of the parallels by Van der Stockt (2012); Finkelppearl (2012). For the egyptological aspects of the Isis book, see the commentary of Gwyn Griffiths (1975); cf. the commentary by Keulen and Egelhahaf-Geiser (2014). See also Tilg (2014: 86-105).

⁵⁵ See Zimmerman (2012: 6-7); Drews (2012).

⁵⁶ See Hunink (2004: 253-256); Roskam (2010a); Fletcher (2014: 100-172); Benson (2016).

⁵⁷ Sidon. *Epist.* 9.13.3; Macr. *Sat.* 7.3.23-24. See Harrison (2000: 30-31); Zimmerman (2008: 152); König (2012: 27, 180). On Macrobius' reception of Plutarch, see Vamvouri Ruffy in this volume.

Author Manuscript, published in: S. Xenophontos, K. Oikonomopoulou (eds.) (2019), *Brill's Companion to the Reception of Plutarch*, Brill (Brill's Companions to Classical Reception 20), pp. 37-55. <https://brill.com/view/title/26685>

DOI: https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004409446_004

Roman (Plutarch's friend Sosius Senecio) and its sympotic dialogues feature several Roman characters (including Mestrius Florus, Plutarch's Roman patron) who practice philosophical enquiry on equal terms with Plutarch's Greek guests.

Bibliography

Primary sources

Amato, E. (ed. and transl.). 2010. *Favorinos d'Arles, Oeuvres III. Fragments*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Barigazzi, A. (ed.). 1966. *Favorino di Arelate, Opere. Introduzione, testo critico e commento*. Florence: Le Monnier.

Clement, P.A. and Hoffleit, H.B. (eds. and trans.). 1969. *Plutarch's Moralia: Vol. VIII*. Cambridge Mass and London: Loeb Classical Library.

Gwyn Griffiths, J. 1975. *Apuleius of Madauros: The Isis-Book (Metamorphoses, Book XI)*. Études Préliminaires aux Religions Orientales dans l'Empire Romain, 39. Leiden: Brill.

Hanson, J.A. (ed. and trans.). 1989. *Apuleius, Metamorphoses*, 2 vols. Cambridge Mass and London: Loeb Classical Library.

Helmbold, W.C. (ed. and trans.). 1962. *Plutarch's Moralia: Vol. VI*. Cambridge Mass and London: Loeb Classical Library.

Hunink, V. (ed. and comm.). 2001. *Apuleius of Madauros: Florida*. Amsterdam: J.C. Gieben.

Jones, C.P. (ed. and trans.). 2017. *Apuleius: Apologia; Florida; De deo Socratis*. Cambridge Mass. and London: Loeb Classical Library.

Kenney, E.J. (ed. and comm.). 1990. *Apuleius: Cupid and Psyche*, Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics (Imperial Library). Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

Keulen, W.H. 2007. *Apuleius Madaurensis Metamorphoses, Book I Text, Introduction and Commentary*. Leiden and Boston: Brill.

Keulen, W.H. and Egelhaaf-Geiser, U. 2014. *Apuleius Madaurensis Metamorphoses, Book XI, The Isis Book. Text, Introduction and Commentary*. Leiden and Boston: Brill.

Lee, B.T. 2005. *Apuleius' Florida: A Commentary*. Texte und Kommentare Bd. 25, Berlin and New York: De Gruyter.

Author Manuscript, published in: S. Xenophontos, K. Oikonomopoulou (eds.) (2019), *Brill's Companion to the Reception of Plutarch*, Brill (Brill's Companions to Classical Reception 20), pp. 37-55. <https://brill.com/view/title/26685>

DOI: https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004409446_004

Minar, E.L. Jr., Sandbach, F.H. and Helmbold, W.C. (eds. and transl.). 1961. *Plutarch's Moralia: Vol. IX*. Cambridge Mass. and London: Loeb Classical Library.

Moreschini, C. (ed.). 1991. *Apulei Madaurensis Opera vol. III (De philosophia libri)*. Stuttgart and Leipzig: Teubner.

Rolfe, J.C. (ed. and trans.). 1927. *The Attic Nights of Aulus Gellius*, 3 vols. Cambridge Mass. and London: Loeb Classical Library.

Sandbach, F.H. (ed.). 1969. *Plutarch: Moralia, vol. XV (Fragments)*. Cambridge Mass. and London: Loeb Classical Library.

Volpe Cacciatore, P. (ed.). 2010. *Plutarco: Frammenti*. Naples: D'Auria.

Zimmerman et al. 2004. *Apuleius Madaurensis Metamorphoses, Books IV 28-35, V and VI 1-24. 'The Tale of Cupid and Psyche'. Text, Introduction and Commentary*. Leiden and Boston: Brill.

Secondary sources

Anderson, G. 1994. 'Aulus Gellius: A Miscellanist and his World'. *ANRW* II 34.2. Berlin and New York: De Gruyter, 1834-1862.

Andurand, A. 2015. 'Le monde plutarquéen des banquets savants: essai d'approche spatiale'. *Histoire et informatique* 18-19, 64-71.

Beall, S. 2001. 'Homo fandi dulcissimus: The role of Favorinus in the *Attic Nights* of Aulus Gellius'. *AJPh* 122.1, 87-106.

Beall, S. 2004. 'Gellian humanism revisited', in L. Holford-Strevens and A. Vardi (eds), *The Worlds of Aulus Gellius*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 206-222.

Benson, G.C. 2016. 'Seeing demons: autopsy in Maximus of Tyre's *Oration 9* and its absence in Apuleius' *On the God of Socrates*'. *Ramus* 45.1, 102-131.

Drews, F. 2012. 'Asinus philosophans: Allegory's fate and Isis' Providence in the *Metamorphoses*', in W.H. Keulen and U. Egelhaaf-Geiser (eds), *Aspects of Apuleius' Golden Ass*. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 107-131.

Edwards, M.J. 1992. 'The Tale of Cupid and Psyche'. *ZPE* 94, 77-94.

Eshleman, K. 2013. 'Then our symposium becomes a grammar school': Grammarians in Plutarch's *Table Talk*'. *Syllecta Classica* 24, 145-171.

Author Manuscript, published in: S. Xenophontos, K. Oikonomopoulou (eds.) (2019), *Brill's Companion to the Reception of Plutarch*, Brill (Brill's Companions to Classical Reception 20), pp. 37-55. <https://brill.com/view/title/26685>

DOI: https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004409446_004

Finkelpearl, E. 2012. 'Egyptian Religion in *Met.* 11 and Plutarch's *DIO*: Culture, Philosophy and the Ineffable', in W.H. Keulen and U. Egelhaaf-Geiser (eds), *Aspects of Apuleius' Golden Ass*. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 183-201.

Fitzgerald, W. 2016. *Variety: The Life of a Roman Concept*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

Fletcher, R. 2014. *Apuleius' Platonism: The Impersonation of Philosophy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Frangoulidis, S. 2008. *Witches, Isis and Narrative. Approaches to Magic in Apuleius' Metamorphoses. Trends in Classics Supplementary Volume 2*, Berlin and New York: De Gruyter.

Gleason, M.W. 1995. *Making Men: Sophists and Self-Presentation in Ancient Rome*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Harrison, S.J. 2000. *Apuleius: A Latin Sophist*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Henry, M. 1994. 'On the aims and purposes of Aulus Gellius' *Noctes Atticae*'. *ANRW* II 34.2, Berlin and New York: De Gruyter, 1918-1942.

Heusch, C. 2011. *Die Macht der 'Memoria'. Die 'Noctes Atticae' des Aulus Gellius im Licht der Erinnerungskultur des 2. Jahrhunderts n. Chr.* Berlin: De Gruyter.

Hobden, F. 2013. *The Symposium in Ancient Greek Society and Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Holford-Strevens, L. 1997. 'Aulus Gellius: The non-visual portraitist', in M.J. Edwards and S. Swain (eds), *Portraits: Biographical Representation in the Greek and Latin Literature of the Roman Empire*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 93-112.

Holford-Strevens, L. 2003 (rev. edn.). *Aulus Gellius: An Antonine Scholar and his Achievement*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Horster, M. 2008. 'Some Notes on Grammarians in Plutarch', in A.G. Nikolaidis (ed.), *The Unity of Plutarch's Work: 'Moralia' Themes in the 'Lives', Features of the 'Lives' in the 'Moralia'*. Berlin and New York: De Gruyter (Millennium Studien 19), 611-624.

Howley, J. 2014. 'Heus tu rhetorisce: Gellius, Cicero, Plutarch and Roman study abroad', in J.M. Madsen and R. Rees (eds), *Roman Rule in Greek and Latin Writing. Double Vision*. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 163-192.

Hunink, V. 2004. 'Plutarch and Apuleius', in L. De Blois et al. (eds), *The Statesman in Plutarch's Works Vol. 1: Plutarch's Statesman and his Aftermath: Political, Philosophical, and Literary Aspects*. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 251-260.

Johnson, W. 2009. 'Constructing elite reading communities in the high empire', in W. Johnson and H. Parker (eds) *Ancient Literacies: The Culture of Reading in Greece and Rome*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 320- 330.

Johnson, W. 2010. *Readers and Reading Culture in the High Roman Empire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jones, C.P. 1967. 'The teacher of Plutarch'. *HSCP* 71, 205-213.

Keulen, W.H. 2004. 'Gellius, Apuleius, and Satire on the Intellectual', in L. Holford-Strevens and A. Vardi (eds), *The Worlds of Aulus Gellius*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 223-245.

Keulen, W.H. 2009. *Gellius the Satirist. Roman Cultural Authority in 'Attic Nights'*. Leiden and Boston: Brill.

Klotz, F. 2011. 'Imagining the past: Plutarch's play with time', in F. Klotz and K. Oikonomopoulou (eds), *The Philosopher's Banquet: Plutarch's Table Talk in the Intellectual Culture of the Roman Empire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 161-178.

Klotz, F. and Oikonomopoulou, K. 2011a. 'Introduction', in F. Klotz and K. Oikonomopoulou (eds), *The Philosopher's Banquet: Plutarch's Table Talk in the Intellectual Culture of the Roman Empire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1-31.

Klotz, F. and Oikonomopoulou, K. 2011b. 'Conclusion: Reading (from) the *Table Talk* in Aulus Gellius' *Attic Nights*', in F. Klotz and K. Oikonomopoulou (eds), *The Philosopher's Banquet: Plutarch's Table Talk in the Intellectual Culture of the Roman Empire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 233-7.

König J. 2007. 'Fragmentation and Coherence in Plutarch's *Symptotic Questions*', in J. König and T. Whitmarsh (eds), *Ordering Knowledge in the Roman Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 43-68.

König J. 2011. 'Self-Promotion and Self-Effacement in Plutarch's *Table Talk*', in F. Klotz and K. Oikonomopoulou (eds), *The Philosopher's Banquet: Plutarch's Table Talk in the Intellectual Culture of the Roman Empire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 179-203.

König J. 2012. *Saints and Symposiasts: The Literature of Food and the Symposium in Graeco-Roman and Early Christian Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Author Manuscript, published in: S. Xenophontos, K. Oikonomopoulou (eds.) (2019), *Brill's Companion to the Reception of Plutarch*, Brill (Brill's Companions to Classical Reception 20), pp. 37-55. <https://brill.com/view/title/26685>

DOI: https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004409446_004

Meeusen, M. 2018. 'Aristotelian natural problems and imperial culture: selective readings'. *ΣΧΟΛΗ (Scholē)* 12.1. *Ancient Philosophy and the Classical Tradition*, 28-47.

Moreschini, C. 1994. 'Aspette della cultura filosofica negli ambienti della seconda sofistica'. *ANRW* II 36.7, 5101-5133.

Morgan, T. 2004. 'Educational values', in L. Holford-Strevens and A. Vardi (eds), *The Worlds of Aulus Gellius*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 187-205.

Morgan, T. 2007a. *Popular Morality in the Early Roman Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Morgan, T. 2007b. 'Reading Moral Miscellanies'. *Scripta Classica Israelica* 26, 135-153.

Morgan, T. 2011. 'The Miscellany and Plutarch', in F. Klotz and K. Oikonomopoulou (eds), *The Philosopher's Banquet: Plutarch's Table Talk in the Intellectual Culture of the Roman Empire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 49-76.

Oikonomopoulou, K. 2011. 'Peripatetic Knowledge in Plutarch's Table Talk', in F. Klotz and K. Oikonomopoulou (eds), *The Philosopher's Banquet: Plutarch's Table Talk in the Intellectual Culture of the Roman Empire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 105-130.

Oikonomopoulou, K. 2013. 'Plutarch's Corpus of *Quaestiones* in the Tradition of Imperial Greek Encyclopaedism', in J. König and G. Woolf (eds), *Encyclopaedism from Antiquity to the Renaissance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 129-153.

Oikonomopoulou, K. 2017. 'Miscellanies', in W. Johnson and D. Richter (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of the Second Sophistic*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 447-462.

Puech, B. (1992), 'Prosopographie des amis de Plutarque'. *ANRW* II 33.6, 4831-4893.

Roskam, G. 2004. 'Plutarch on the communication between teacher and pupil'. *WS* 117: 93-114.

Roskam, G. 2009. 'Educating the young...over wine? Plutarch, Calvenus Taurus, and Favorinus as convivial teachers', in J. Ribeiro Ferreira, D. Leão, M. Tröster, and P. Barata Dias (eds), *Symposion and Philanthropia in Plutarch*. Coimbra-Classica Digitalia/CECH, 369-383.

Roskam, G. 2010a. 'Socrates' δαιμόνιον in Maximus of Tyre, Apuleius and Plutarch', in F. Frazier and D. Leão (eds), *Tyche et Pronoia: La marche du monde selon Plutarque*. Coimbra: University of Coimbra Press, 93-108.

Author Manuscript, published in: S. Xenophontos, K. Oikonomopoulou (eds.) (2019), *Brill's Companion to the Reception of Plutarch*, Brill (Brill's Companions to Classical Reception 20), pp. 37-55. <https://brill.com/view/title/26685>

DOI: https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004409446_004

Roskam, G. 2010b. 'Plutarch's 'Socratic symposia'. The *Symposia* of Plato and Xenophon as literary models in the *Quaestiones Convivales*'. *Athenaeum* 98, 45-70.

Sandy, G. 1997. *The Greek World of Apuleius: Apuleius and the Second Sophistic*. Leiden, Boston and Cologne: Brill.

Stertz, S.A. 1993. 'Semper in omnibus varius: The emperor Hadrian and intellectuals'. *ANRW* II 34.1, 612-628.

Tilg, S. 2014. *Apuleius' Metamorphoses: A Study in Roman Fiction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Van der Stockt, L. 2012. 'Plutarch and Apuleius. Laborious Routes to Isis', in W.H. Keulen and U. Egelhaaf-Geiser (eds), *Aspects of Apuleius' Golden Ass*. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 168-182.

Vardi, A. 2001. 'Gellius against the professors'. *ZPE* 137, 41-54.

Vardi, A. 2004. 'Genre, Conventions, and Cultural Programme in Gellius' *Noctes Atticae*', in L. Holford-Strevens and A. Vardi (eds), *The Worlds of Aulus Gellius*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 159-186.

Vessey, D.W.T. 1994. 'Aulus Gellius and the Cult of the Past'. *ANRW* II 34.2, 1863-1917.

Walsh, P.G. 1981. 'Apuleius and Plutarch', in H.J. Blumenthal, and R.A. Markus (eds), *Neoplatonism and Early Christian Thought*. London: Variorum, 20-32.

Zimmerman, M. 2008. 'Cenatus solis fabulis: a symposiastic reading of Apuleius' novel', in W. Riess (ed.), *Paideia at Play: Learning and Wit in Apuleius*. *AN Supplement* 11. Groningen: Barkhuis, 135-156.

Zimmerman, M. 2012. 'Text and interpretation, interpretation and text', in W.H. Keulen and U. Egelhaaf-Geiser (eds), *Aspects of Apuleius' Golden Ass*. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 1-27.