AN EMENDATION TO APULEIUS, *APOLOGIA* 47.1*

The most authoritative testimony for the text of Apuleius' defence-speech known as *Apologia* or *Pro Se De Magia*[1] is a Cassinese MS indicated with the *siglum* F (Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Plut. 68.2),[2] written under the abbotship of Desiderius (1058–1087) in a mature Beneventan script, which also preserves the text of the *Metamorphoses* and the *Florida*.[3] The text that F preserves is unsurprisingly not flawless, and in this note I argue for the presence of a corruption affecting *aut* in *Apol*. 47.1. For the sake of clarity, I provide the passage from *Apol*. 46.6 to 47.2 below:

quod si forte patronus tuus uerbo prolapsus est et nullos pueros habes quos producas, saltem XIIII seruis quos exhibui ad aliquid utere. a[u]t cur sisti postulabas tantam familiam? magiae accusans de XV seruis denuntiasti: quid si de ui accusares, quot tandem seruos postulares? sciunt ergo aliquid XV serui et occultum est. an occultum non est et magicum est?

At *Apol*. 47.1 I propose emending the transmitted *aut* to *at cur sisti postulabas tantam familiam?*[4] This sentence comes from a section of the *Apologia* (42–7) where Apuleius counters the allegation of having enchanted a slave-boy by the name of Thallus with magical incantations during an occult ceremony (42.3). More specifically, this clause marks the passage to another part of this section of the speech in which Apuleius attempts to twist his accusers' argument against them in order to emphasize its self-contradictory nature: as discussed below, he maintains that, since magic is notoriously occult and secretive, and since the attackers demanded the presence in court of several eyewitnesses to the allegedly magical ritual, it follows that this ritual could not have anything to do with magic, given the number of witnesses (47.1–6).

* Thanks to Regine May for her helpful comments on an early draft of this article, and to Bruce Gibson and the anonymous reviewer for their valuable suggestions. Special thanks to Dániel Kiss for his unreserved support and encouragement.

[1] On the title of this work, cf. U. Schindel, 'Der Titel von Apuleius' Verteidigungsrede', *StudMed* 39 (1998), 865–88.

[2] Editors of the *Apologia* acknowledge the stemmatic importance of F: cf. R. Helm, *Apulei Platonici Madaurensis Florida* (Leipzig, 1910, 1959[2]), xxxiv–xli; H.E. Butler and A.S. Owen, *Apulei Apologia siue Pro se de magia liber* (Oxford, 1914), xxix–xxxiii; P. Vallette, *Apulée. Apologie, Florides* (Paris, 1924), xxxi–xxxvii; P.K. Marshall, 'Apuleius. *Apologia*, *Metamorphoses*, *Florida*', in L.D. Reynolds (ed.), *Texts and Transmission*: *A Survey of the Latin Classics* (Oxford, 1983), 15–16; V. Hunink, *Apuleius of Madauros Pro Se De Magia* (*Apologia*), 2 vols. (Amsterdam, 1997), 1.28; J. Martos, *Apuleyo de Madauros. Apología o discurso sobre la magia en defensa propia*. *Floridas*. [*Prólogo de El dios de Sócrates*] (Madrid, 2015), li.

[3] F. Piccioni, 'Il *De magia* di Apuleio. Un testimone trascurato: il codice assisiate 706', in *Linguaggi del potere, poteri del linguaggio* (Alessandria, 2010), 365–75 suggests that the Assisi fragments of the *Apologia* (Assisi, Fondo Biblioteca Comunale no. 706, *siglum* C) are an apograph of F; cf. also F. Piccioni, 'Sul *De magia* di Apuleio. Alcune proposte di *constitutio textus*', in *Vestigia notitiai*. *Scritti in memoria di Michelangelo Giusta* (Alessandria, 2012), 445–54, where the validity of some readings is discussed in view of a forthcoming edition of the *Apologia* by Piccioni. However, L. Pepe, 'Un nuovo codice di Apuleio del sec. XI', *GIF* 4 (1951), 214–25 and O. Pecere, 'Qualche riflessione sulla tradizione di Apuleio a Montecassino', in G. Cavallo, *Le strade del testo* (Bari, 1987), 102—reprinted in O. Pecere, A. Stramaglia, *Studi apuleiani* (Cassino, 2003), 42–3—argue that C is independent from F, since the former is thought to be earlier on the grounds of palaeographical evidence, about which cf. Lowe's assessment in D.S. Robertson, 'The Assisi fragments of the *Apologia* of Apuleius', *CQ* 6 (1956), 68–80, at 69.

[4] In case the hypothesis of Pepe (n. 3) and Pecere (n. 3) were correct, the corruption *aut* might have originated in a common ancestor of F and C, given that the latter also reads *aut cur* in fol.7^{v}, line 4.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838818000241 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Translations of the reading *aut* such as those by Butler,[5] Hunink,[6] Hammerstaedt and Martos[7] prevent us from fully understanding the cogency of Apuleius' counter-argument, characterized by a recurring feature of Apuleius' rhetorical style which consists in introducing a lambasting with the disjunctive *at*. I would, therefore, propose to read this and translate the question at 47.1 as follows: 'But why on earth did you require the presence of so many servants?'. To conserve the preserved reading *aut*, translating it with 'or', would imply that at 47.1 Apuleius is merely taking up an exhortation addressed to his enemies at 46.6, so that they may put to some use the fourteen witnesses that he produced in court (*saltem XIIII seruis quos exibui ad aliquid utere*); or why else demand so many witnesses?

Yet, this interpretation prevents us from comprehending not only the real meaning of the whole passage at *Apol*. 47.1–6 but also the structure of the previous section of the speech, which goes from 45.1 to 46.6. There Apuleius provokes his opponents with 'repeated staccato rhetorical questions', as Harrison puts it.[8] First, Apuleius employs these rhetorical questions to attack his arch-enemy Sicinius Aemilianus, provocatively exhorting him to question the witnesses in the courtroom of Sabratha instead of demanding the presence of Thallus (45.1), and claiming that the collapse of the slave boy cannot be ascribed to his supposed incantations (45.2–3).[9] Second, he again uses fast-paced rhetorical questions to batter the advocate Tannonius Pudens, who accused Apuleius of having also enchanted other *pueri* in Oea without substantiating this allegation with any evidence or depositions (46.1–4); finally, Apuleius attacks Aemilianus with another barrage of provocative questions (46.5–6).

Therefore, *Apol*. 46.6 (*saltem XIIII seruis quos exibui ad aliquid utere*) brings to its conclusion this invective against Aemilianus and Tannonius, a micro-section that runs from 45.1 to 46.6, by slightly varying the opening lines of this section at *Apol*. 45.1 (*XIIII seruos quos postulasti exhibeo*. *cur illis ad quaestionem nihil uteris?*), with a clear ring-composition. This enables Apuleius to move to a different point, and in this context the strong adversative *at* would fittingly mark the beginning of a passage where Apuleius reproaches his attackers' arguments by demonstrating how they are contradictory, while the preserved reading *aut* trivializes both this and the previous

[5] H.E. Butler, *The Apologia and the Florida of Apuleius of Madaura* (Oxford, 1909), 84 is quite free and avoids translating *aut*: 'If you refuse, why did you demand the appearance of such a houseful'.

[6] V. Hunink in S.J. Harrison (ed.), *Apuleius. Rhetorical Works* (Oxford, 2001), 71 translates: 'Or why else did you summon so large a staff.' This mirrors the French translation by P. Vallette (n. 2), 57 and the Italian translation by C. Marchesi, *Apuleio*. *Della magia* (Milan, 1955, repr. 2011), 65, which underplays the meaning of the whole passage for the reasons discussed above.

[7] The German translation by J. Hammerstaedt in *Apuleius*: *De Magia*. *Eingeleitet*, *übersetzt und mit interpretierenden Essays versehen von Jürgen Hammerstaedt, Peter Habermehl*, *Francesca Lamberti*, *Adolf M. Ritter und Peter Schenk* (Darmstadt, 2002), 138, and the Spanish translation by Martos (n. 2), 83 render the preserved reading *aut* with 'or' (i.e. 'oder' and 'o' respectively). Because of this interpretation, Martos (n. 2), 83 rearranges the canonical subdivision into paragraphs and puts *aut cur sisti postulabas tantam familiam?* at the end of *Apol*. 46.6, instead of leaving it at the beginning of *Apol*. 47.1.

[8] S.J. Harrison, *Apuleius. A Latin Sophist* (Oxford, 2000), 70; Harrison focusses on the Ciceronian style of *Apol*. 46.3–6 and does not emphasize the fact that Apuleius employs a similar strategy at *Apol*. 45.1–3.

[9] In the following part of *Apol*. 45 Apuleius inserts a digression on the idea that epileptics could have a fit by smelling burning jet, or by seeing the wheel of a potter while spinning (45.4–5). Then he underscores Aemilianus' *mala fides*, since the only deposition corroborating the accusers' argument is that given by Sicinius Pudens, on whose behalf Apuleius was tried (45.6–8).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838818000241 Published online by Cambridge University Press

passage.[10] In *Apol*. 47.1–6, in fact, Apuleius formulates an argument to disprove the accusation of having practised an eerie magical ritual (*sacrum magicum*)[11] in which he allegedly enchanted the slave-boy Thallus. The strategy of Apuleius' defence from this charge (42–7) is based on underscoring the implausibility of his enemies' argument: Thallus, whose epilepsy is known to everyone (43.7–44), could never have been used in magical divination, as the prerequisite for such rituals was the purity of the youth (43.3–6). Since the prosecution employed the depositions of Sicinius Pudens (45.7) and of some of Thallus' *conserui* (44.4) to corroborate the accusation, Apuleius needs to counter their validity, and he does so in 47.1–6: here he argues that the commonplace rule of magic is secrecy (47.3) and explains that only a very few free men are allowed access to such rites (47.4). Therefore, the presence of the fourteen servants,[12] whom the prosecutors called to testify as witnesses to the alleged rite (44.2–45.3), implies that no occult magical action could really have taken place.[13]

Furthermore, in 47.1 the opening of the sentence with the adversative conjunction *at*[14]—as often happens in Apuleius' prose—displays his contempt for the feebleness of the indictment, similarly to *Apol*. 40.5 ('*at enim*,' *inquit*, '*piscem cui rei nisi malae proscidisti* [...] *?*') and to 25.2 (*at non contraria accusastis?*).[15] In the first passage, Apuleius reproduces his opponents' suspicious reaction to his allegedly magical dissection of fish.[16] The sentence is inserted by Apuleius to highlight that the prosecutors' suspicions are misplaced: he has, in fact, already explained that his interest in sea creatures is merely scientific (36–9), and in the passage which follows '*at enim*,' *inquit*, '*piscem cui rei nisi malae proscidisti* […] *?*' Apuleius underlines once again the scientific character of his fish enquiry (40.5). This enables him to underscore his self-presentation as a knowledgeable philosopher, whose interests have nothing to do with magic, before giving more details about the dissection of an unspecified mollusc, which his enemies identified as the poisonous sea-hare (40.6–10). The second passage (25.2) introduces a strong counter-attack against Apuleius' attackers: his claim is that they brought forward a frivolous body of charges, and by means of a fast-paced summary he refutes these charges as being self-contradictory.[17] It is possible to observe,

[10] It could be observed that the syntagm *aut cur* recurs in *Apol*. 54.7, but in that passage *aut* is used to introduce a series of disjunctive sequences, differing from 47.1 where the connotation of the sentence is contrastive.

[11] Cf. 45.6; 45.8; 47.5 for the ceremony described as *sacrum*.

[12] In 47.1–6 Apuleius speaks of fifteen slaves, including Thallus, in order to make their number appear even bigger. For other references to these fourteen witnesses, cf. *Apol*. 44.6; 44.7; 45.1; 46.6.

[13] Cf. 47.2; 47.5–6.

[14] Cf. *Apol*. 78.4; *Met*. 1.24.9; 2.24.5; 6.15.3; *Mun*. 17. For Apuleius' predilection for using *at* at the beginning of a sentence in general, cf. W.H. Keulen, *Apuleius Madaurensis Metamorphoses Book I* (Groningen, 2007), 63 on the opening of *Met*. 1.1.1, and L. Graverini, *Le Metamorfosi di Apuleio: letteratura e identità* (Pisa, 2007), 2–11.

[15] I translate these passages as follows: *Apol*. 40.5: 'but why on earth, if not for an evil reason, did you tear apart the fish?'; 25.2: 'but did you not bring self-contradicting arguments against me?'.

[16] The whole charge concerns the magical seduction of Pudentilla by means of sea creatures resembling human genitals; this indictment is rebutted at 29–41.

[17] Cf. 25.2: *peram et baculum ob auctoritatem*, *carmina et speculum ob hilaritatem*, *unum seruum ut deparci*, *tris libertos ut profusi*, *praeterea eloquentiam Graecam*, *patriam barbaram?* ('the bag and the staff to accuse me of austerity; some poems and a mirror as evidence of my frivolity; the possession of one slave to claim that I am miserly; the manumission of three slaves as evidence of my squandering; and even my Greek eloquence and my foreign origins?'). For further remarks on Apuleius' manipulations in this passage, cf. Hunink (n. 2), 2.85–6; and especially Harrison (n. 8), 62.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838818000241 Published online by Cambridge University Press

therefore, that Apuleius' implementation of *at* in both of these questions introduces a strong point against his accusers, whose arguments and suspiciousness are presented as inconsistent. I argue that the same forensic strategy is adopted at 47.1, in which the interrogative sentence (*a*[*u*]*t cur sisti postulabas tantam familiam?*) serves to introduce Apuleius' point that the presence of so many witnesses to the alleged magical ritual implies that no real magic could have actually taken place.

In addition to stylistic and content-based explanations, the hypothesis of a textual corruption is not implausible from a palaeographical viewpoint, given that the copyist of F often produces various kinds of interpolations under the influence of contiguous words[18] and, amongst these, some concern the letter *u*—at times in association with other letters—such as in *Met.* 1.13.1: *succ***us**[*sus*]**su**; *Met*. 8.7.7: *m***u***nia*, *pr***o**[*ru*]*rs***us**; *Met*. 10.29.1: *mihimet*[*u*] ***u**olens*; *Flor.* 9.30: *procons***ul** [*ut*][19] *optime*. Interestingly enough, in two passages of the *Metamorphoses* the erroneous insertion *a*[*u*]*t* under the influence of adjacent words occurs twice: *Met.* 3.22.6–23.1: *q***u***ando? a*[*u*]*t mihi*[20] *scel***us** *ist***ud**; *Met*. 5.30.3–4: *saepi***us***? a*[*u*]*t r***u***sticae*. Analogously to these cases, the reading *aut* in *Apol.* 47.1 may have originated because of the proximity to the previous ***ut**ere* (46.6) and following *c***ur**. The phrase's wider context—as written in F, fol. 114^{v}, col. 1, line 3—with its repetition of the letter *u*, may have induced the scribe to erroneously write *a*[*u*]*t*: *aliq***u***id* ***ut**ere*. *aut c***ur** *sisti postulabas tanta*^{3}.[21] Moreover, the similarity of the letters *a* and *c* in Beneventan script would have also facilitated this kind of dittography.[22]

In conclusion, for content-based, stylistic and palaeographical reasons, the emendation *at* in place of the transmitted *aut* enables us to recover the pregnant meaning of Apuleius' rebuttal in *Apol.* 47.1–6 with only very slight alteration of the text as transmitted in F.

University of Leeds LEONARDO COSTANTINI
L.Costantini@leeds.ac.uk
doi:10.1017/S0009838818000241

[18] E.g. *Apol*. 3.3: *qua***ant**o *obsole*[*n*]*tior*; 26.6: *omn***ia** *quae uelit incredibili*[*a*]; 35.3: *per plur***im**[*is*]*o***s** *pi***s***cator***is** *quaesi***s***se*; 38.2: *sub***ent**[*ant*], *mares suri***ant**; 55.10: *p*[*l*]*u***bl***ice*; 63.2: *e*[*n*]*uide***ns**; 68.4: *filio*[*s*] ***s**uo*[*s*] ***S**icinio*; 75.4: *uxore***m** ***n**o*[*n*]*ta*[*m*] *co***n***lusio*; 84.6: *nulla*[*m*] *i***m***pertita*; 102.9: ***form**[*orm*]*atum*. Cf. the discussion in Helm (n. 2), xlviii–il, li–lii. For general remarks on the influence of contiguous letters, cf. L. Havet, *Manuel de critique verbale appliquée aux textes latins* (Paris, 1911), 135–6.

[19] V. Hunink, *Apuleius of Madauros. Florida* (Amsterdam, 2001), 34 and 118 defends the reading *uir* in place of F's *ut* which is found in later MSS and early editions.

[20] *mihi* is abbreviated m^{i} in F fol. 137^{v}, col. 1, line 16, thus making the influence of the contiguous *scelus istud* on *aut* even stronger.

[21] The characteristic abbreviation for *m* in Beneventan script was the so-called 'm-stroke' or '3-shaped sign', as it has been defined by E.A. Lowe, *The Beneventan Script. A History of the South Italian Minuscule*, 2 vols. (Rome, 1980^{2}), 171–3 and F. Newton, *The Scriptorium and Library at Monte Cassino, 1058–1105* (Cambridge, 1999), 168 respectively.

[22] Cf. Lowe (n. 21), 133–4 and Newton (n. 21), 144, 146.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838818000241 Published online by Cambridge University Press