sympathetic magic, using arguments of possibility and probability to make up for the absence of any evidence.

Finally two papers on intertextuality in Petronius end up being in different sections of the book. P. Monella’s ‘Non humana viscera sed centies sestertium comesse’ (Petr. Sat. 141,7) Philomela and the Cannibal heredipetae in the Crotonian Section of Petronius’ Satyricon explores intertextual patterns in the last sections of the extant text and discovers a direct relationship to the narrative of Procne and Philomela in the sixth book of Ovid’s Metamorphoses. M. Lippman’s ‘False Fortuna: Religious Imagery and the Painting-gallery Episode in the Satyricon’ interprets Eumolpus as an ironic priest-substitute in a familiar story pattern exploited by Petronius to kid his reader into expecting a revelation and closure.

As I write this review, preparations are in hand for ICAN V in Houston in 2015. In the capable hands of E. Cueva, it promises to be on a scale to rival the Lisbon novel-fest. However, I end like the old curmudgeon that I am, on a negative note. Good twenty-minute conference papers do not automatically mutate into good publications, and the ruthless drive towards bibliometrically quantifiable outputs has led to too much work with a short scholarly shelf-life being prematurely committed to a permanent form. How many of the papers in the volume under review will be read with profit in ten years’ time? Despite the rigorous criteria of acceptance applied in ICAN IV, and despite the lure of the witty misquotation of Apuleius in the book’s title (perhaps designed to destabilise the novelist’s claim lector, intende: laetaberis), my guess would be one or two.
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There are four chapters in this book with a concluding fifth on the Metamorphoses. Inspired by Winkler’s book about Apuleius’ novel and by Mason’s about how ‘Philosophy’ appeals to her audience to engage, F. sets out a ‘narratology for philosophy’ (J.J. Winkler, Auctor and Actor: a Narratological Reading of Apuleius’s Golden Ass [1985]; J. Mason, Philosophical Rhetoric [1989]). There has been an irresistible pull towards anointing the Metamorphoses as the all in all, the whole of Apuleius’ corpus. A book about Apuleius the philosopher, among many about the novelist Apuleius, redresses the imbalance.

The term ‘impersonation’ in the title, one presumes, refers to the way philosophical knowledge continually reproduces and develops, rather than deceives. F.’s case, deftly made in the first third of the book, is that images of the philosopher’s body actually make the superstructure, the ratio, of the entire Apuleian corpus. Traditional divisions between ‘philosophical works’, ‘novel’ and ‘rhetorical works’ are erased because the narrator of each unifies them all by wearing different ‘impersonations of philosophy’ for each. The Apuleian corpus as a whole must be seen as the elegant dress of speech, oratio, clothing the philosopher’s body. F.’s key metaphor, used everywhere in his book, for this synergy between reason and speech is found in ‘A life of Plato’, the outset to On Plato and
his Doctrine. From an extended account of his early education and the death of Socrates to his interaction with the philosophy of Pythagoras, Plato’s biography culminates in his ability to produce his own unified body of philosophical knowledge out of various philosophies. His ability to file down or polish up these philosophies with reason (ratio), and equally his genius in dressing his hard won philosophical knowledge in speech (oratio) are admirable, because Plato can then instruct others (DP 188). The ‘personae’ of ‘human-kind’, the ‘beholder of virtue’, ‘schoolmistress reason’ and the Sage, conceptual impersonations in Apuleius’ expansion of this biography of Plato, urge the would-be philosopher to greater knowledge. Apuleius voices out in his writing an impersonation of the very best and virtuous human being, the philosopher, whose best dressed soul makes him agreeable to himself and to others by his actions and in his speech (verbis) (DP 227). It is undeniable that a close reading of the text does reveal a persuasive Apuleian ‘voice’, and so it is no surprise that the audience for this voice is vital. There is no philosophical knowledge unless you can communicate it. This comprises Plato’s impersonation of philosophy and his method sets the course for Apuleius and others to follow.

In his development of this approach F. isolates different methodologies especially biographical exegesis, conceptual personification and authorial protreptic. These methodologies, donned by the speaker, or by the narrator, in each text, help the reader to hear, to visualise, to enjoy and eventually to understand the different impersonations of philosophy. ‘Who is speaking’ is obviously an important question in this enterprise. Close readings of selected passages for example, of Plato’s ‘Life’, of the Universal Ruler, or of daemonology, with F.’s interpretations and translations into English, are one of the best features of the book.

Other figures, besides Plato, assume equal importance in this process of communication by means of biographical exegesis, and in the second third of F.’s book the pivotal figures are Socrates and Aristotle. Socrates’ life (written by Plato) is an example to the philosopher to study philosophy and ethics. Aristotle (and Theophrastus) who followed Plato as their example inspire study of the physical world, are an inspiration to philosophise. Guided by Philosophy, humans can reach supreme knowledge and live an adventurous life of the mind (De mun. 287). There is a good reading of the supreme ruler of the world in De mundo and the journey of Philosophy towards him. Socrates and his philosophical soul are the perfect objects of praise, commemorated by Plato’s portrait, and urge the aspiring philosopher towards emulating his example. This Platonic philosophical sententia about Socrates is one which Apuleius can, and does, interpret for his audience in ‘the most astonishing moment of Platonic impersonation in the entire Apuleian corpus’. Apuleius, to demonstrate the vast gap between gods and men is bridged by daemons, specifically by the soul-daemon of the philosopher, appropriates Plato’s voice (DDS 132–3 ‘Plato might respond in defence of his opinion via my voice’, pro sententia sua mea voce).

The final third of the book isolates the ways, if any, the philosopher can engage his audience’s interest in philosophy, through authorial protreptic. Apuleius’ defence of himself against a charge of being a magician, in effect of being a caricature of a Platonic philosopher, is countered with a ‘Platonised Life of Apuleius’ in the Apology. Apuleius is the one who is the translator of Plato’s Greek, who is the interpreter of the nature of magic (an alternative, immature branch of wisdom, he cites Alcibiades and Charmides), and who is the doctor knowing how epilepsy attacks the highest part of the soul (based on the Timaeus). The image of the body of philosophy in the Apology is both the defence of Philosophy and the more active specific defence of the Platonic philosopher at the same time. Who would not turn to such rewarding study? The person who understands Plato, who tracks down citations in the Platonic corpus, is a person who plays a game in his life that cannot be regretted and who is, one presumes, on the winning side (Apol. 41.7). The speeches of the Florida portray the philosopher amid other competing forms
of intellectual endeavour especially the role of contemporary sophist. The biography of Plato is not replayed here directly, but mediated through a series of narratives about sages (Thales, Pythagoras), sophists (Hippias, Protagoras) and a Cynic (Crates) in order to show the audience what a real, that is, Platonic, philosopher looks like. A close reading of one of the longer speeches, *Florida* 18, examines how Apuleius delivers the reward of true learning to his home city of Carthage, in imitation of Thales’ ‘beautiful reward’ (*pulchra merces*) of philosophical knowledge. As the place where Apuleius took his first steps in philosophy, Carthage is the audience for this particular ‘impersonation of philosophy’, a philosophical lesson in how to achieve the beauty (to kalon) of true knowledge. *Florida* 16 is an account of a similar ‘exchange of gifts’ between the Carthaginians and their famous philosopher son. The senate of Carthage votes to set up a statue in Apuleius’ honour but not the money to pay for it. Just as Thales had not stipulated his ‘reward’ but received it, Apuleius gets the reward of a statue without asking for it. But both Thales and Apuleius lose money. The citizens of Carthage have not neglected a sense of humour in their pursuit of supreme knowledge.

The final tenth of the book, the ‘Conclusion (Metamorphoses)’, explores the ways the novel can be read to show how ‘not only how Platonism works in the text, but also how it is developed by the work’. The identity of the voice of the narrator of the novel and the difference between the first ten books and the eleventh, a major concern, offer the reader two different models of the philosopher-figure. The philosophising ass and the eloquent initiate exemplify stages in the life of the aspiring philosopher. They mirror the account of Plato’s early education and, after the death of Socrates, his interaction with the philosophy of Pythagoras. The whole novel is a parable of the education of the philosopher, but leaves the question of whether this educative process is a success or not, of whether Apuleius’ ratio is properly dressed. F.’s book is a welcome and erudite addition to Apuleian studies.
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C. notes that this book is the fruit of revisions to a doctoral thesis completed at Padua in 2010 (p. vii). Comparison of the two texts shows that those revisions were full and thoughtful, but the book still reads like a thesis. Most significantly conclusions are scarce. A 54-page bibliography is followed by an 86-page introduction, then a translation and text, 110 pages of commentary, and a 5-page index *nominum et rerum*.

The introduction includes sections on the title of the *Ludus septem sapientum*, the dedication to Pacatus (in a short footnote at the end of the section, C. rejects outright the important study of Pacatus’ life and career offered by Turcan-Verkerk, whose name is misspelt), school poetry, the seven sages in the theatre, ‘Aspects of the work attributable to the iconographic tradition’, the iambic senarii of the *Ludus*, and sections on the seven sages in antiquity (up to the eighth century) and in the Renaissance.

C. says that Ausonius’ dedication of the work to Pacatus is full of clichés (p. lxxiii), which is true if she means that Ausonius praises the dedicatee and downplays the quality