

REVIEW

of Carlo Martino Lucarini, the member of the dissertation council for the dissertation of Svetlana Sergeevna Dubova on the topic “Aspects of archaism’ interpretation in Apuleius’ novel *The Metamorphoses*”, submitted for the degree of Candidate of philological sciences in a scientific speciality 5.9.7.

It was a pleasure to read Dobova’s dissertation about Apuleius’ archaism. To my knowledge, such a comprehensive overview of the subject had not yet been written before, and Dubova’s work contributes decisively to gain a correct understanding of Apuleius’ language.

The dissertation is divided into two main sections, the first one on the “Archaism in Latin literature”, the second one on the “Language of the *Metamorphoses*”.

The first chapter (“Archaism in the eyes of Apuleius’ predecessors and contemporaries”) of the first section deals with the history of the Roman literary archaism.

The second chapter (“Distinguishing between Archaism and Vulgarism”) of the first section deals with the famous problem of the distinction (which is often difficult) between archaic and vulgar words.

The first chapter (“Classification, research, objectives and statistical analysis of the vocabulary of the novel *The Metamorphosis*”) of the second section attempts at classifying the categories of archaisms and neologisms.

The two last chapters (“Words with archaic colouring” and “Neologisms”) offer a list of archaisms and neologisms, each one accompanied by a brief discussion.

It is important to stress that the dissertation focuses on the vocabulary, whereas syntax is left aside.

In the first part of her dissertation Dubova correctly rejects the once widespread view, according to which Apuleius was influenced by the language of Africa (*Africitas*): there is no reason to connect Apuleius’ archaistic language with his African origin. Another important point, where Dubova shows soundness of judgement, regards the relations between the archaism of Apuleius and Gellius, for which she rules out any reciprocal influence.

The dissertation offers a very valuable instrument to investigate archaic words in the *Metamorphosis*. Particularly the list of the archaisms (p. 73-164) will be of great utility to investigate this subject.

Two important points, where, in my view, Dubova’s work could be improved.

1) The archaic author, who provides more stuff to be compared with Apuleius, is Plautus. Dubova quotes the archaic playwright in almost every page of her dissertation, but she does not provide a general interpretation of Apuleius’ linguistic attitude toward Plautus. In a recent book (to which Dubova did not pay adequate attention) L. Pasetti (*Plauto in Apuleio*, Bologna 2007) argued that Apuleius, rather than to loan archaic words from Plautus, tried to create new words, that could sound Plautinian: My impression is that Pasetti is correct, but, however that may be, Dubova has to discuss Pasetti’s surmise.

2) The list of neologisms offered in the last chapter (p. 164-196) should be shortened. Some words are widespread throughout the whole Latin literature of the imperial period, and it is mere fortuitousness that they are first attested in Apuleius (f. i. “coetaneus”; “coapto”; “hortulanus”; “mediator”; “momentarius”; “oblatio” etc.); other words, although not so common as the previous,

belong to technical languages and there is no reason to suppose that they have been created by Apuleius or another writer of that period (f. i. “magnarius”).

Some minor points: at p. 24 Dubova refers to the question about the identity of the grammarian Sisenna and his possible identification with the historian of the same name. She is inclined to believe that the two writers should not be identified, and I agree with her, but, given the importance of Sisenna for the topic of the dissertation and in consideration of the fact that in the last decades many scholars (among them A. Aragosti and A. Perutelli, both editors of Sisenna) argued for the opposite view, the bibliography should be updated: the last systematic discussion in favour of the distinction between the two authors is: C. M. Lucarini, Per la storia del testo di Plauto nell’antichità e ancora sui due Sisenna, *Philologus*, 156 (2012) 260-291.

Dubova quotes Teuffel’s *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*, but she does not quote Schanz-Hosius’ more recent work on the same subject. Other bibliographical omissions are (at least): H. Kretschmann, *De latinitate L. Apulei Madaurensis*, Regimonti 1865; E. Paratore, La prosa di Apuleio, *Maia* 1 (1948) 33-47.

I hope that Dubova will continue her work taking into account my suggestions. My assessment on the submitted work is entirely positive: Dubova succeeded admirably to present a clever and sound examination of Apuleius’ archaic words.

Dissertation of Svetlana Sergeevna Dubova on the topic “Aspects of archaism’ interpretation in Apuleius’ novel *The Metamorphoses*” **meets** the basic requirements established by Order Nr. 11181/1 dd. 19.11.2021 “On the procedure for awarding academic degrees at St. Petersburg State University”. The appliant Svetlana Sergeevna Dubova **deserves** to be awarded the academic degree of **candidate** of philological sciences in a scientific speciality 5.9.7. No violations of paragraph 9 and 11 of the specified Order have been detected.

Prof. Carlo Martino Lucarini, Ph. D.
Dipartimento Culture e Società
Università di Palermo
Viale delle Scienze ed. 15
Italia-90128 Palermo



Date 17.01.2024