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## Infelicium Avium: Reconsidering Passerat's Conjecture at Met. 3.17.4


#### Abstract

This article aims to corroborate Passerat's emendation infelicium [n]avium to Apul. Met. 3.17.4 by means of a twofold enquiry: firstly, attention will be paid to reconstructing the widespread implementation of birds in goetic practices; secondly, a palaeographical explanation of the corruption will be proposed by reviewing analogous dittographies of nasal consonants in contiguous words which occur in the Laurentianus Plut. 68.02 (F), the most authoritative MS. preserving the text of the Metamorphoses.
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## 1. Introduction and scholarship on the reading

At Met. 3.17.4-5 Photis describes to the protagonist of the tale Lucius the goetic paraphernalia (apparatus) of the eerie laboratory (feralis officina) of her mistress, the Thessalian maga Pamphile, ${ }^{1}$ which is set up with:
omne genus aromatis et ignobiliter lamminis litteratis et infelicium [n]avium durantibus damnis, defletorum, sepultorum etiam cadaverum expositis multis admodum membris every type of herb and metal tablets with undecipherable inscriptions, and the lasting remains of inauspicious birds, as well as several body parts taken from mourned and even buried corpses ${ }^{2}$

In this study I shall comment on infelicium navium ('of ill-fated shipwrecks') at Met.3.17.4, which is the reading handed down by the Laurentianus Plut. 68.02 (siglum: F) - the most

[^0]authoritative MS. containing the Apologia, the Metamorphoses and the Florida -3 and by the other MSS. alike, and I shall add content-based and palaeographical evidence to defend the emendation infelicium [ $n$ ]avium ('of inauspicious birds'), originally proposed by the French humanist Jean Passerat. ${ }^{4}$ This emendation has witnessed changing fortunes in modern critical editions of the Metamorphoses: although Helm accepts it in his first edition, ${ }^{5}$ he prints navium in the text of his second and third editions, ${ }^{6}$ as do Giarratano, ${ }^{7}$ Robertson, ${ }^{8}$ Giarratano and Frassinetti ${ }^{9}$ and recently Zimmerman. ${ }^{10} \mathrm{~A}$ strong case for conserving the lectio traditia was put forward by Adam Abt, ${ }^{11}$ who comments on the marine debris mentioned in Apol. 35.4 - which Apuleius paradoxically deems as tools for magical practices - and cautiously proposes a comparison between the resticulae ('pieces of strands') ${ }^{12}$ and PGM VII.594-595,13 a passage from a prescription for love-magic, where it is said moíךoov $\varepsilon$ हो $\lambda$ úरulov ónò $\pi \lambda$ oíou vevavaүๆкóтos ('make a wick of the hawser of a wrecked ship'). ${ }^{14}$ According to this argument, Abt ${ }^{15}$ explains that the emendation [n]avium in Helm's first edition would be unnecessary since navium would reflect this practice of implementing the remains of shipwrecks in magic. Van der Paardt ${ }^{16}$ aptly stresses a parallel with Apol. 58.2, a passage in which Apuleius reports that,

[^1]according to his prosecutors, the presence of smoke and birds' feathers would evidence that he had performed some impious nocturnal sacrifices (nocturna sacra) in the house of Iunius Crassus with his friend Quintianus. Nevertheless, Van der Paardt seems fundamentally to agree with Abt and the aforementioned editors since he prints the reading navium. ${ }^{17}$ Nicolini, ${ }^{18}$ however, again stresses the importance of the parallel with Apol. 58.2, and points out the infrequent use of parts of shipwrecks in goetic practices. I would add that the reference to birds instead of shipwrecks would be particularly apt in the following passage of the Metamorphoses, which concerns the hideous parts of corpses in Pamphile's laboratory. ${ }^{19}$ In addition to this internal argument, I shall now present substantial evidence to support of the validity of the emendation by examining the sources hinting at the implementation of birds and their remains in ancient magical rites.

## 2. The Employment of Birds in Greco-Roman Magic

Although it is true - as we have observed - that the PGM contains some allusions to the use of parts recovered from shipwrecks in magical practices, references to the usage of birds in such uncanny rituals is far more significant. The killing of birds for magical purposes was, in fact, a customary practice in the Greco-Roman world and Apuleius was fully aware of it: in Apol. 47.7 we find that the goetic ritual that he allegedly performed over the epileptic servant Thallus involved the killing of hens (gallinae) as sacrificial victims (hostiae lustrales). ${ }^{20}$ Furthermore, the implementation of birds in goetic practices is also attested by two prescriptions of the Greek

[^2]Magical Papyri: in the first, the complete burning of various birds serves to consecrate a ring; ${ }^{21}$ in the second, a bird's tongue is required to compel a woman to confess her lover's name. ${ }^{22}$

Not only the birds as wholes or their parts, but especially their feathers played an important function in ancient magical practices: it has already been remarked that, amongst the incriminations in the Apologia, Apuleius explains that birds' feathers - which he indicates as plumae ${ }^{23}$ and pinnae -24 had been used by his accusers as evidence of his goetic rites in Crassus' house. Their implementation is also prescribed in the Greek Magical Papyri for the achievement of various purposes: in PGM III.612-32, it is said that the practitioners can control their own shadow by putting the feather of a falcon behind their right ear ${ }^{25}$ and that of an ibis behind their left ear. ${ }^{26}$ In PGM IV.45-51, to complete a ritual of initiation, the practitioners need to rub their faces with the bile of an owl and an ibis feather, ${ }^{27}$ or with the yolk of an ibis' egg and the feather of a falcon. ${ }^{28}$ Additionally, at PGM VII.335-340, one must hold an ibis feather fourteen fingers long in order to obtain a direct vision.

The use of feathers in magical rites is also confirmed by literary evidence. Abt notes ${ }^{29}$ that amongst the eerie ingredients of Canidia's burnt offering ${ }^{30}$ are the feathers of a nocturna strix ('nocturnal screech owl'), ${ }^{31}$ a creature deeply associated with the idea of female magic in many literary sources, including Apuleius' Metamorphoses. ${ }^{32}$ We could add that in Propertius'

[^3]Elegies the feathers of an owl are mentioned again amongst the ingredients for a love-charm ${ }^{33}$ and that Medea, as portrayed by Seneca, ${ }^{34}$ uses the feathers of a Stymphalian bird in her dire ritual. Furthermore, in Lucian's Gallus, the Cock is nicknamed $\gamma$ ó $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ ('practitioner of evil magic') by the interlocutor Micyllus ${ }^{35}$ because of the preternatural powers of his tail's right plume:



To whoever I shall grant to pick up and hold my right feather, he will be able to unlock every door and to see everything while being unseen so long as I want it

## 3. Palaeographical Evidence: Dittographies of Nasal Consonants in $F$

So far we have cast light on the commonplace employment of birds in magical rituals according to literary and papyrological sources, strengthening the plausibility of the emendation. From a palaeographical viewpoint, we can consider infelicium [n]avium as a dittography induced by the presence of the previous nasal at the end of infelicium. Analogous types of corruption are well attested by F: Rudolf Helm ${ }^{36}$ mentions some noteworthy examples of dittographies of nasal consonants affecting either the end or the beginning of two consecutive words. I shall review his discussion and add further examples closely mirroring the corruption in Met. 3.17.4. Nasals are erroneously inserted at the end of the previous element of the couplet in the case of Apol. 39.3.11: purpura $[m]$ mu[r]riculi; ${ }^{37}$ Apol. 56.4: gratia [m] manum; Met. 1.13.7: qua[m] maxime Met. 3.4.4 publica[m] mihi; Met. 10.31.6: aspectu[m] minacibus; Fl. 9.35-36: vigor[em]

[^4]neminem; ${ }^{38}$ Fl. 22.3: poeta $[m]$ memorant. A nasal consonant is also often inserted at the beginning of the following term of the couplet as in: Apol. 95.2: sum [m]aeque; Met. 8.14.3: ablutum [m]unita; ${ }^{39}$ Fl. 9.17: eorum [m]emerat. Furthermore, closer scrutiny reveals that dittographies of nasal consonants in $F$ do not only affect the letter $m$ but also $n$, as in Met.1.22.3: inquam [ $n$ ]ominare; Met. 2.3.1: socia[m] nam; Met. 8.13.1: dolore[m] nescio. These last examples, particularly inquam [n]ominare at Met. 1.22.3, ${ }^{40}$ make it possible to confirm the hypothesis of a corruption since they display the same features of the corruption infelicium [n]avium at Met.

### 3.17.4.

## 4. Conclusion

This twofold survey has enabled us to ascertain the validity of Passerat's conjecture infelicium [n]avium at Met. 3.17.4: having discussed the evidence concerning the employment of birds in goetic practices, and reviewed the dittographies of nasal consonants affecting the most important manuscript testimony of the Metamorphoses, we can validate the cogency of an emendation which befits the horrifying tone evoked by Apuleius in Met. 3.17.4-5, and ultimately enables us to recover an addition trait of the macabre depiction of Pamphile's workshop. ${ }^{41}$

[^5]
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[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Pamphile's magical notoriety is already made clear at Met. 2.5.3-8.
    ${ }^{2}$ Translations, unless otherwise indicated, are mine.

[^1]:    ${ }^{3}$ See especially Robertson 1940, xxxviii-lv; Marshall 1983, 15-16 and recently Magnaldi, Giannotti 2004, 9-22; Carver 2007, 65-67; Zimmerman 2012, x-xxxix; lvii. For a different stemmatic explanation, see Pecere 1987, 99124 (reprint in Pecere, Stramaglia 2003, 37-60; 180-188 includes the bibliographical update by Luca Graverini). ${ }^{4}$ See Passerat 1608, 436 where, commenting on Prop. 3.6.29, he mentions this passage of Apuleius' Metamorphoses and writes: "lego avium; \& damna interpretor, demptas iis plumas" ('I read avium and I interpret damna as a reference to the feathers taken from the birds).
    ${ }^{5}$ Helm 1907, 65.
    ${ }^{6}$ See Helm 1913, 65 and 1955, 65, respectively.
    ${ }^{7}$ Giarratano 1929, 70.
    ${ }^{8}$ Robertson 1940, 74 who prints <repletam> after damnis, an integration proposed by Nolte 1864, 674.
    ${ }^{9}$ Giarratano, Frassinetti 1960, 75.
    ${ }^{10}$ Zimmerman 2012, 60.
    ${ }^{11}$ Abt 1908, 147-148.
    ${ }^{12}$ On the comic tone of this and the previous diminutives, see Hunink 1997, 112; May 2006 91; Pasetti 2007, 34. For a stylistic discussion of the whole passage, see Harrison 2000, 67.
    ${ }^{13}$ This is the only passage that Abt uses to support his argument but, from a more accurate analysis, we may add PGM V.64-65; 67-68 and VII.466, alluding to material - specifically water and a copper nail - taken from shipwrecked vessels. This evidence notwithstanding, the discussion of the employment of birds in magic below provides a stronger argument for accepting the emendation [n]avium.
    ${ }^{14}$ I follow the translation by Aune in Betz 1992, 135.
    ${ }^{15}$ Abt 1908, 222, n. 3.
    ${ }^{16}$ Van der Paardt 1971, 133.

[^2]:    ${ }^{17}$ Van der Paardt 1971, 17; 133.
    ${ }^{18}$ Nicolini 2005, 234, n. 16. In her discussion, however, she takes the house of Iunius Crassus, where Apuleius' friend Appius Quintianus lodged (Apol. 57.2), for Apuleius' own residence.
    ${ }^{19}$ See Apul. Met. 3.17.5.
    ${ }^{20}$ It is noteworthy that in Porphyry's account of Plotinus' life we find a ritual performed by an Egyptian priest
     10.15-28). Although Porphyry does not implement any goetic terms, Eitrem 1942, 62-67 and Dodds 1947, 60-61 compare this episode with PGM VII.505-527 and XIII.368-372. See also the recent discussion by Addey 2014, 16; 173-180.

[^3]:    ${ }^{21}$ PGM XII.213-215.
    ${ }^{22}$ PGM LXIII.7-12.
    ${ }^{23}$ Apul. Apol. 57.2; 58.9.
    24 Apul. Apol. 57.3; 58.2; 58.5; 58.10; 60.5. The sceptical approach by Abt 1908, 221 in interpreting pinna as 'feather' can easily be dispelled; see the occurrences in ThLL, vol.X.1, s.v. penna, 1085-1086, which includes the aforementioned passages of the Apologia.
    ${ }^{25}$ PGM III.619-620.
    ${ }^{26}$ PGM III. 620.
    ${ }^{27}$ PGM IV.45-47.
    ${ }^{28}$ PGM III.48-51.
    ${ }^{29}$ Abt 1908, 221.
    ${ }^{30}$ Hor. Ep. 5.17-24; such feathers have to be well burned on Colchian flames (5.24), a clear reference to uncanny powers of Medea (e.g. Ov. Met. 7.296; Sen. Med. 225).
    ${ }^{31}$ Hor. Ep. 5.20.
    ${ }^{32}$ See the bubones or nocturnae aves at Apul. Met. 3.23.3-4, and especially the fuscae aves in Met. 2.21.3. It is worth noting that the tale of Thelyphron in Met. 2.21-30 parallels that of the strigae at Petr. 63.2-10, as noted by Pecere 1975,128, n. 249 . The theme of the wicked women-owls is very popular in Latin literature: these strigae are

[^4]:    already known to Horace (Ep. 5.20), Propertius (3.6.29; 4.5.17), Ovid (Fast. 6.133-368) and even deserved attention of Pliny (Nat. 11.95.232).
    ${ }^{33}$ Prop. 3.6.29: et strigis inventae per busta iacentia plumae ('and the feathers of a screech owl found amongst forsaken graves'); this is the passage commented upon by Passerat 1608, 436.
    ${ }^{34}$ Sen. Med. 783.
    ${ }^{35}$ See Lucian Gal. 28.
    ${ }^{36}$ Helm 1910, xlvii.
    ${ }^{37}$ This example is unacknowledged by Helm.

[^5]:    ${ }^{38}$ This emendation is printed by Vallette 1924, 140 and followed by Hunink 2001, 35 and Todd Lee 2005, 44. Such mechanical mistake might have also been induced by the termination of neminem.
    ${ }^{39}$ Zimmerman 2012, 179 prints inunita.
    ${ }^{40}$ A further example can be added: in his first edition of the Metamorphoses, Helm 1907, 171 prints venerem [n]ullo at Met. 7.23.2, nullo being the reading in F, A (Ambrosianus N. 180 sup.), U (Illinoiensis Urbanensis 7, MCA.2) and the editio princeps (De Bussi 1469), whereas $\varphi$ (Laurentianus Plut. 29.02), E (Etonensis 147) and S (Audomarensis 653) offer the reading ullo. Because of the faded and partly erased text in $F$ fol. 158r, col. 1, 1.16, the reading seems to be venere followed by rasure, but by post-processing a high-resolution digitisation of the folio, I have verified the presence of the ' $m$-stroke' or ' 3 -shaped sign' (as it is called by Loew 1980, 171-173 and Newton 1999, 168 respectively). We find, thus, once more the same context of two contiguous nasals occurring in Met. 3.17.4. However, [ $n$ ]ullo is rejected in the second and third edition by Helm 1913=1955, 171 and by the other editors (see Giarratano 1929, 189; Robertson 1945, 25; Giarratano, Frassinetti 1960, 203; Zimmerman 2012, 163) on the grounds of Apuleius' intention to imitate colloquial language; for a discussion, see Hijmans et al. 1981, 232. In defence of the reading [ $n$ ]ullo, I would observe that the use of ullus after a negation is not infrequent in the speeches of Apuleius' characters (e.g. Met. 2.7.7; 2.13.2; 2.27.5).
    ${ }^{41}$ I hereby take the opportunity to thank the staff of the Biblioteca Laurenziana for having granted me a prompt access to a high-resolution digitisation of F , fol. 158r.

