reference to Augustus.[22] His work deals with what experience can teach us, and he himself praises the value of experience from lines 427–9. I argue that in an age of political transition Grattius prefers to praise the eternal virtues of hunting where his own experience lay. One of the best ways for a poet to demonstrate mastery, knowledge and experience is to cite authority, and so Pindar's *Olympian* 1 is repurposed to heighten the reader's appreciation of dogs as well as Grattius.

St. Olaf College LISA WHITLATCH
whitla1@stolaf.edu
doi:10.1017/S0009838816000719

APULEIUS, *METAMORPHOSES* 11.23.5

quaeras forsitan satis anxie, studiose lector, quid deinde dictum, quid factum. dicerem, si dicere liceret; cognosceres, si liceret audire. sed parem noxam contraherent et aures et lingua[e] < … > illae temerariae curiositatis.[1]

In spite of the reader's curiosity, the narrator will not break the secrecy of Isis' mysteries. Precisely an act of *curiositas* had brought about Lucius' transformation into an ass; at the end of the novel he demonstrates that he has learnt his lesson.[2]

That something has dropped out, most probably between *lingua* and *illae*, is clear.[3] It has frequently been assumed that *illae temerariae curiositatis*, referring to *aures*, needs a corresponding expression of similar length and structure (deictic in nom. + adjective and noun in gen.), referring to *lingua*. This hypothesis is in line with Apuleius' predilection for parallelism and stylistic richness. Van der Vliet, followed by Robertson, proposed incorporating *ista impiae loquacitatis* after *lingua*;[4] Nicolini, followed by Zimmerman and the recent Groningen commentary, suggested *illicitae intemperantiae ista* in the same position.[5] Corrections like these are elegant and perfectly plausible, but highly invasive.

I wonder whether the solution might not be much simpler. The risk is that, in a contrasting pair (*dicerem* ~ *cognosceres*), the narrator's tongue and the reader's ears may

[22] Examples of Grattius' self-praise include his description of the poem as a great work that could help even mythological people (Grat. 61–8), the trustworthiness of his work (Grat. 300), and a reference to himself as experienced (Grat. 350).

[1] This is the text of *Met*. 11.23.5 as in M. Zimmerman, *Apulei Metamorphoseon Libri XI* (Oxford, 2012), but without the supplement <*illicitae intemperantiae ista*> (on which see below).

[2] As is well known, *curiositas* is one of the most prominent themes in Apuleius' novel. See e.g. the recent Groningen commentary: W.H. Keulen *et al.*, *Apuleius Madaurensis Metamorphoses Book XI* (Leiden and Boston, 2015), 383–5 with further bibliography.

[3] Some editors print the text of F unchanged (see now the list in Keulen [n. 2], ad loc.). They defend *illae* as either a nominative plural or an irregular form of genitive singular. But see the objections rightly raised by L. Nicolini, 'Due proposte al testo delle Metamorfosi di Apuleio', *Philologus* 154 (2010), 149–54, at 153, and Keulen (n. 2), ad loc.

[4] J. Van der Vliet, *Lucii Apulei Metamorphoseon libri XI* (Leipzig, 1897); D.S. Robertson, *Apulée. Les Metamorphoses*, vol. 3 (Paris, 1956[2]).

[5] Nicolini (n. 3), 154; Zimmerman (n. 1); Keulen (n. 2).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838816000495 Published online by Cambridge University Press

commit an 'analogous crime' (*par noxa*). The crucial point, therefore, does not seem to be so much the distinction between the two behaviours (emphasized by the supplements mentioned above) as their close collaboration, which results in the perpetration of the intellectual sin of *curiositas* by the reader. Along this line is S. Harrison's recent emendation *sed parem noxam contraherent et aures et lingua, <ex> illa*[*e*] *temeraria*[*e*] *curiositate*.[6] To my eyes, this is an excellent 'diagnostic' conjecture. It does not postulate a huge lacuna, thereby opening the way to supplements less speculative than the ones put forward so far. However, there is no need to suspect that so many terms were involved in the corruption.

I would suggest: *sed parem noxam contraherent et aures et lingua, <anc>illae temerariae curiositatis*.

The metaphorical use of *ancilla* and synonyms in reference to passions, urges or vices is well attested in Latin authors.[7] In Apuleius, cf. *Met*. 5.23.5 *lucerna ... amoris uile* ***ministerium***; 4.22.7 (of Lucius as an ass) *uentri tam profundo* ***seruiens***; 7.27.3 *uoracitati suae* ***deseruit***; *Apol*. 12.2 *animalium* ***serua*** *corpora* (i.e. won over to lust); *Met*. 9.14.5 *matutino mero et continuo stupro corpus* ***manciparat***. Psyche is often referred to as *ancilla Veneris*, which allegorically signifies the subjugation to love of the human soul (*Met*. 6.8.2, 6.8.6, 6.9.5, 6.10.2).

The image of the body or specific parts thereof as 'attendants' of the intellectual part is common all through the history of ancient culture.[8] One text in particular is worth singling out here, since it was famous and demonstrably known to Apuleius. When describing the function and reciprocal relations of the parts of the body in the *Timaeus*, Plato repeatedly has recourse to terms designating command and obedience: for instance, the head is the lord of the rest of the body that has been assigned to it as a servant (44d δεσποτοῦν … ὑπηρεσίαν); the chest, as seat of the courage, is meant to obey reason (70a τοῦ λόγου κατήκοον); through the blood the commands of the mind are conveyed to the limbs (70b παρακελεύσεων … ἐπήκοον … ἔποιτο … ἡγεμονεῖν); the genitals of males are disobedient and rule by themselves (91b ἀπειθές τε καὶ αὐτοκρατές). Most importantly for this paper, according to Plato the human tongue was expressly devised by the intermediary divinities so that the flow of speech might 'serve' the intelligence (75e γλώττῃ … ὑπηρετοῦν φρονήσει). Apuleius explicitly tells us that he knew and appreciated this section of the *Timaeus* (*Apol*. 49.1–2).

In the section of his *De dogmate Platonis*[9] devoted to the human body (1.13–18) Apuleius himself repeatedly employs master/servant terminology: the soul is the master

[6] Keulen (n. 2), 396.

[7] Numerous instances, in a variety of nuances of meaning, can be found in *TLL* 2.28.10–17 (*ancilla*), 2.29.9–11 (*ancillula*), 6.269.1–12 (*famula*), 8.256.53–81 (*mancipium*), 8.1003.37–58 (*minister*), 8.1005.9–22 (*ministra*): cf. e.g. Sen. *Dial*. 7.13.5 *uirtutem ... uoluptati tradere ancillam*; Sall. *Cat*. 1.1 *pecora ... uentri oboedientia*; Liv. 24.25.9 *irarum indulgentes ministri*; Val. Max. 9.4.ext.1 *pecuniae miserabile mancipium*.

[8] In Latin authors, cf. e.g. Sall. *Cat*. 1.2 *animi imperio, corporis seruitio*; Ov. *Her*. 18.24 *dextra ... sensus apta ministra mei*, 21.114 *lumina propositi facta ministra tui*; Sen. *Ep*. 114.23 *rex noster est animus; hoc incolumi cetera manent in officio, parent, obtemperant*; Sen. *Clem.* 1.3.5 *totum corpus animo deseruit ... manus, pedes, oculi negotium illi gerunt*; Tert. *Resurr*. 7 *caro ... ministra et famula animae*. The examples may be multiplied.

[9] The great majority of scholars regard the Apuleian authorship of *De Platone* and *De mundo* as either certain or very likely: e.g. C. Moreschini, *Apuleio e il Platonismo* (Firenze, 1978), 51–132, A. Marchetta, *L'autenticità apuleiana del De Mundo* (L'Aquila and Rome, 1991), S.J. Harrison, *Apuleius. A Latin Sophist* (Oxford, 2000), 174–209. A forthcoming *CQ* article by Justin Stover

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838816000495 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of the body (*esse animam corporis* ***dominam***, 13); the less noble parts of the body are 'ruled' by the better ones and merely provide a nutritional 'service' (*inferiora* ***reguntur*** *optimatium praestantia et ipsa* ***ministerium*** *suggerunt uictuale*, 15); everything below the neck 'serves' the head (*cetera enim membra* ***ancillari*** *et* ***subseruire*** *capiti*, 13; *pedes ceteraque umerorum tenus capiti* ***oboediunt***, 15); the various organs of the head (no doubt including ears and tongue) are 'instruments', the function of which is to 'assist' the mind (***machinamenta*** *... in conspectu rationis, ut intellegendi ac persentiscendi ueritas* ***adiuuetur***, 13); one page later, as in our passage, ears and tongue are mentioned in sequence with special emphasis put on the service they provide to the intellect (*auditu ... per quem prudentiam sapientiamque condisceret ... lingua ... promptuarium potius rectae rationis*, 14). For the notion of parts of the body as 'servants' in Apuleius, cf. also *De mundo* 27 *manus ad*[10] ***ministerium*** *praesto erunt*.

Two parallels for my proposal come from the *Apologia*. At 3.7 Apuleius says that certain ranting speakers are used to hiring out (the service of) their venomous tongue to the acrimony of their clients (*solent linguae suae uirus alieno dolori* ***locare***). The concept is similar to that presupposed by our passage: in both cases the tongue is depicted as being wilfully subordinated (*ancilla* ~ *locare*) by its owner (Lucius ~ speakers) to a negative urge (*curiositas* ~ *dolor*) of someone else (reader ~ clients).

Even more compelling is a later passage in which the tongue is ironically presented as an 'attendant' serving up lies and bitterness: *Apol*. 8.3 *lingua, mendaciorum et amaritudinum* ***praeministra***. This passage is particularly significant owing to its structural correspondence to ours, with the synonyms *ancilla* ~ *praeministra* both being nouns in apposition immediately following the nominative *lingua* and both governing genitives that specify the type of vice ~ unpleasant things.

Also interesting for their structure are *De dog. Plat.* 9 *detur enim uenia nouitati uerborum,* ***rerum obscuritatibus seruienti*** #[11] and *De mundo* 36 *omnium animalium agrestium et cicurum, pinnatarum et pedestrium et aquatilium natura gignitur, nutritur, absumitur,* ***parens caelestibus institutis*** #: as in the *Met*. passage, a larger sentence is closed by a clearly marked-off three-word explanatory addition (here a participle, in the *Met*. a substantive in apposition) designating 'service' or 'obedience'.

For appositions consisting of a noun governing a genitive at the very end of a sentence (the apposition being attached to the subject) in Apuleius, cf. *Met*. 2.15.6 *mensula ... et calices ... et lagoena ...,* ***prorsus gladiatoriae Veneris antecenia*** #; 5.22.7 *iacebat arcus et pharetra et sagittae,* ***magni dei propitia tela*** #; 7.10.1 *sic ille latronum fisci aduocatus nostram causam pertulerat,* ***uirginis et asini sospitator egregius*** #; *Apol*. 77.6 *matri suae, praeter ingenium placidissimum immobili, iram quoque sua expostulatione accessisse,* ***non mediocre pertinaciae alumentum*** #; *Flor*. 22.2 *quin eo tempestiue Crates interueniret,* ***litium omnium et iurgiorum inter propinquos disceptator atque arbiter*** #. A further element of resemblance between these cases and ours is that the nouns in apposition refer to analogously 'ancillary' functions (prelude, instrumentality, support, assistance). At *Met*. 6.9.2 *ubi sunt, inquit, Sollicitudo atque Tristities,* ***ancillae meae****?* #, we find the same sequence as in our passage: two feminine nominatives connected through 'and' (cf. *aures et lingua*) > appositive *ancillae* > genitive ~ possessive. Cf. also (in a different case) the final apposition of *minister* at *Met*. 6.31.4 … *de isto*

and Mike Kestemont, 'Reassessing the Apuleian corpus: a computational approach to authenticity', also endorses the authenticity of these two works.

[10] *ad* is the standard emendation for the transmitted *atque*.

[11] Here and in the following examples # means [period].

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838816000495 Published online by Cambridge University Press

asino semper pigro quidem, sed manducone summo, ***nunc etiam mendaci fictae debilitatis et uirginalis fugae sequestro ministroque*** #.

The loss of *anc-* can be explained in at least two different, yet not necessarily incompatible, ways: owing to the semantic autonomy of the segment *-illae*[12] and owing to haplography with respect to the preceding syllable. In the latter case, whether the corruption of *lingua* into *linguae* took place before or after *anc-* was lost would be immaterial, since an haplographic dropping of *anc-* might be facilitated both by the contiguity in *scriptio continua* of the same letter (*linguaãcillae*) and by the paleographic similarity, in many minuscules, of *ae* and *ac* (*linguaeãcillae*).

Columbia University, New York ELIA R. RUDONI
er2598@columbia.edu
doi:10.1017/S0009838816000495

BENFORD'S LAW AND NUMERICAL STYLIZATION OF MONETARY VALUATIONS IN CLASSICAL LITERATURE

In an article published in this journal in 1996, I surveyed number stylization in monetary amounts recorded in Roman-era literature up to the Severan period.[1] I argued that certain leading digits such as 1, 3 and 4 were heavily over-represented in the evidence.[2] For the limited samples I used at the time these findings are not in need of revision. However, as I show here, a more inclusive approach to the material produces a substantially different picture. The most significant shortcoming of my study was my failure to take account of the probable distribution of leading digits in a random sample, which may serve as a benchmark for assessing the nature and extent of number preference. While I noted that lower leading digits were inherently more likely to occur than higher ones, I schematically related observed frequencies to an even distribution of leading digits (in which each of them is expected to make up one-ninth of the total). This benchmarking strategy is invalidated by a widely observed phenomenon known as Benford's Law, according to which leading digits frequently conform to a predictable pattern that greatly favours lower over higher numbers.[3] This is true in particular if observations are spread across several orders of magnitude. Ancient monetary valuations satisfy this condition since

[12] Cf. e.g. 1.5.1 <*omni*>*uidentem*, 2.2.8 <*amus*>*sim*, Petron. 34.3 <*supel*>*lecticarius*.

[1] W. Scheidel, 'Finances, figures and fiction', *CQ* 46 (1996), 222–38.

[2] See Scheidel (n. 1), 225-9 for the popularity of these digits, and also 235 fig. 3 for the preponderance of 1, 4, 10, 30, 60, 100, 200, 300 and 400 million in thematically specific samples.

[3] Introduced by F. Benford, 'The law of anomalous numbers', *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 78 (1938), 551–72. The Wikipedia site https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Benford's_law (accessed 29 July 2015) provides a convenient introduction. See now also A. Berger and T.P. Hill, *An Introduction to Benford's Law* (Princeton, 2015) for a comprehensive survey. A. Berger, T.P. Hill and E. Rogers curate the 'Benford Online Bibliography' that refers to hundreds of relevant studies (http://www.benfordonline.net, 2009, accessed 29 July 2015).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838816000495 Published online by Cambridge University Press