APULEIUS' *METAMORPHOSES* AND THE *SPURCUM ADDITAMENTUM* (10.21)

EPHRAIM LYTLE

THE DESIGNATION *spurcum additamentum* is the modern and unwarranted description of a much-abbreviated passage in the hand of Zanobi da Strada that appears in the margin of manuscript φ of Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* in the Laurentian library.[1] Apropos of the *additamentum,* Elmenhurst in his edition of 1620 expressed the opinion that decency and decorum should forbid that Apuleius' work be desecrated by its inclusion. His censoriousness was not, however, enough to prevent his discussing it at considerable length, prompting Oudendorp to ask, "If Elmenhurst was so pure, why didn't he rather enshroud the *additamentum* in silence" ("tam castus si fuit Emenhorstius, cur non potius silentio involvit hoc fragmentum")?[2] Since then the *additamentum* has held an almost irresistible attraction for scholars of Apuleius, but the majority agree with Hildebrand's deduction, in his *Opera omnia* of 1842, that it is not the work of Apuleius, "qui nefariam turpitudinem in his verborum involucris non tulit."[3] This view prevails today; the *additamentum* is commonly omitted or, at best, relegated to the *apparatus criticus.*[4]

Most of the arguments against Apuleian authorship, however, are less than compelling and in many of them one can see moral considerations given greater importance than whatever stylistic features are adduced in their

For numerous signficant suggestions and many corrections, I owe Larry Richardson a debt of gratitude. Likewise, I should thank *CP*'s anonymous reader for a number of helpful criticisms.

1. Manuscript φ = Laur. 29.2, a twelfth- or thirteenth-century Beneventan MS, and the oldest transcript of F = Laur. 68.2. For a discussion of these manuscripts see Lowe 1920 and Robertson 1924, with the additional comments of Dowden 1980. For the identification of the *additamentum* as in the hand of Zanobi da Strada, a hand found in the margins not only of φ, but of F and C as well, see Billanovich 1953, 31–33. The *additamentum* also appears in the margins of a later manuscript L1 (Laur. 54.32), where it is also much abbreviated, but with readings diverging slightly from those found in φ (see below, n. 18). Subsequently the *additamentum* was included in either the margin or the text itself of a number of MSS (Laur. 54.12, Laur. 54.24, and Urb. Vat. 199) derived from L1 or φ.

2. Oudendorp 1786, quoted in Hildebrand 1842, 930.

3. Hildebrand 1842, 931.

4. The *additamentum* can be found in the apparatus criticus of Helm's 1931 Teubner edition. It has disappeared entirely from the most recent Loeb edition, Hanson 1989, although in Gaselee's 1915 Loeb edition, the appendix includes an "Additional note to p. 508" where the *additamentum* is printed, with the comment, "In spite of [the lines'] extremely corrupt state, it is not impossible that they should be in part from the original text of Apuleius." This trend away from recognizing the possible authenticity of the *additamentum* is likewise evidenced by the *additamentum*'s omission from every translation except that of van den Broeck 1988.

Classical Philology 98 (2003): 349–65
 0009-837X/03/9804-0003$10.00

support.[5] As a result the *additamentum* has rarely been considered in light of the narrative structure of the story, despite, in the middle of the last century, an active debate in print regarding its history and authorship.[6] The majority of interested scholars have since agreed that the *additamentum* is neither Apuleian, nor, as held by Merkelbach and Mazzarino, a long-lost fragment of Sisenna, but the work of an anonymous scribe (dubbed "Spurcus" by Eduard Fraenkel), who was "quite content with seizing a purple patch to dazzle his contemporaries, whom he could confidently expect to be as ignorant of Greek as he was himself."[7] It is the work of a "pedant" who "pursued his queer sport."[8] One notable opponent of this now orthodox view is John Winkler, who writes:

> The sentence describing the ass's erection, omitted in F but recovered in the margin of φ, has not only been banished by most scholars as non-Apuleian for inadequate critical reasons, it has even been assigned the insulting name of *spurcum additamentum,* the "dirty addition."[9]

Many of the arguments against the ancient authorship of the *additamentum* are clever, some are nearly persuasive; but they are all misleading and based largely on stylistic or philological grounds, proceeding, as Winkler is well aware, from the assumption, a priori, that the *additamentum* is not by Apuleius, with the object of demonstrating it cannot be. As a result, the *additamentum* has been scrutinized separately and its vital position within the *matrona* scene has never been fully appreciated. In fact, divorcing the *additamentum* from the narrative structure of the *Metamorphoses* has resulted in the miscomprehension not only of the *additamentum,* but of the entire scene in which it is embedded. The object of this paper is to remedy this situation by demonstrating that the *additamentum* preserves a vital gap in a scene that parallels directly the difficult breeding of an ass with a mare.

Columella, in his *De re rustica,* tells us that every farm requires an ass, that they are *necessaria,* household fixtures ("quare omne rus tanquam maxime necessarium instrumentum desiderat asellum, qui, ut dixi, pleraque utensilia et vehere in urbem et reportare collo vel dorso commode potest," 7.1.3). It is my contention that Apuleius firmly roots his narrator in a wealth

5. Hildebrand's bias is apparent, as is that of Mariotti (1956, 229), who finds Hildebrand persuasive, "sull'uso non apuleiano dei grecismi e sull'esagerato compiacimento per l'oscenità." Fraenkel (1953, 153) calls it, among other things, an "unappetizing text."

6. One exception is Pennisi (1970), whose important and careful study does much to dismantle a number of arguments against Apuleian authorship. The most recent general discussion of the *additamentum* can be found as an appendix to Zimmerman 2000, 433–39, wherein Zimmerman presents a summary of competing claims. The bibliography is exhaustive although not arranged by subject as is the convenient recent bibliography of Finkelpearl and Schlam 2001, 223.

7. Fraenkel 1953, 153; likewise, Mariotti 1956. See also the views of Merkelbach (1952) and Mazzarino (1950). Pizzica (1981) concludes that it might not be medieval but can be no earlier than the fourth century C.E. Reasonable philological arguments for the possibility of Apuleian authorship can be found as early as Oudendorp 1786, and as recently as Herrmann 1951 and Pennisi 1970.

8. Fraenkel 1953, 154. Zimmerman (2000, 439), following Mariotti, concludes, somewhat inexplicably given the admitted ambiguities in the various arguments she presents, that "there is no doubt about the medieval origin of the *spurcum additamentum.*"

9. Winkler 1985, 193.

of carefully observed animal behavior that an ancient audience would be intimately familiar with and for which it could summon up immediate visual coefficients. Much of this behavioral detail is lost on modern audiences, which has led to misinterpretations that are compounded by Lucius' tendency to provide misleading or ironic narration. Stated simply, Lucius insists on anthropomorphizing his predicaments, rationalizing his own behavior as an ass in ways that do not quite coincide with the detail provided and what Apuleius' audience already knows about asses. Apuleius, on the other hand, wishes his audience to visualize a narrative reality that is radically different from Lucius' eccentric viewpoint.

Furthermore, this disjunction between narration and underlying narrative is progressive, reaching its climax in the tenth book, a book that is, as many scholars have noted, pivotal in numerous regards.[10] By briefly tracing the development of this narrative strategy, once we turn to Lucius' coupling with the *matrona* we will be able to distinguish clearly between Lucius' ironic narration and the underlying analogy from the breeding barn.

After Lucius' transformation, Apuleius immediately begins actively to call his narrator into question.[11] Shortly after his transformation, Lucius retires to the stable only to be kicked at by his own horse, an encounter he frames in ridiculously anthropomorphic terms. His horse, rather than "registering some recognition and compassion" and offering "hospitality and a fair lodging," instead "conspires" with Milo's ass as they "plot his destruction."[12] Apuleius' narrator couches the entire incident in terms of *hospitium et fides,* whereas the image of an alien ass being led into a stable, and the ensuing behavior of the other quadrupeds, would have been familiar and commonplace to nearly every ancient.

Apuleius confirms many of our suspicions about Lucius shortly hereafter as he is being led away by bandits. Planning to fake utter exhaustion, Lucius is horrified to discover that before he can act another ass collapses and is unable to rise. The robbers cut its hamstrings and fling off the corpse. Lucius interprets the scene, once again, in ridiculously anthropomorphic terms. According to Lucius-the-conspiracy-theorist, the other ass has guessed at his own intentions and then pre-empted them by attempting the scheme that

10. For a basic overview see the introduction to Zimmerman 2000 (18–25, "Themes in the *Metamorphoses* and Their Incorporation in Book 10").

11. Zimmerman (2000, 21) writes that, "From the metamorphosis (3,24) onward, the narrator repeatedly emphasizes that although Lucius has the body of an ass and is an ordinary ass in the eyes of other actors in the story, he nevertheless remains human inside." In fact, after his transformation, Lucius, as we shall see, *never* asserts his essential humanity in an unambiguous way. He only calls attention to his humanity in the context of questioning it. That Lucius' narration is not entirely reliable has been noted by numerous scholars but not in the context of relating his narration to the underlying behavioral description found in scenes such as that with the *matrona.*

12. This passage is worth quoting at length (3.26): "atque ego rebar, si quod inesset mutis animalibus tacitum ac naturale sacramentum, agnitione ac miseratione quadam inductum equum illum meum hospitium ac loca lautia mihi praebiturum. sed pro Iuppiter hospitalis et Fidei secreta numina! praeclarus ille vector meus cum asino capita conferunt in meamque perniciem" ("I assumed that if among the mute beasts some silent and natural accord existed, then certainly my own horse, recognizing and pitying me, would at least offer me hospitality and a fair lodging. But no, by God, by Juppiter Hospitalis and by all the hidden powers of loyalty, my own noble horse instead conspired with that ass to plot my destruction").

he himself devised.[13] We have, very early on, considerable doubts about the reliability of our narrator.

Apuleius, in case any of his readers is missing the point, himself articulates it as Lucius' unreliability increases, placing such phrases in his narrator's mouth as, "This familiarity became clear to me, even though I was an ass" ("quamvis asino sentire praestabant," 4.1), and shortly thereafter, "If indeed my *praecordia* was not altogether ass-like" ("iamque apud mea non usquequaque ferina praecordia," 4.2). At one point Lucius directly addresses the reader, "I ask that you measure very carefully whether I was an ass in intelligence and feeling as well as in body" ("faxo vos quoque, an mente etiam sensuque fuerim asinus, sedulo sentiatis," 4.6). At another point Lucius describes himself eating his fodder as if he were an ass ("in asini faciem," 3.29), the implication being that he really *is not* an ass, but shortly thereafter he describes himself feeling almost as if he were no longer an ass ("ut hercle ipse sentirem non asinum me," 4.2), the implication being that he really *is* an ass. Likewise, he describes himself as having a donkey's sense of decency ("verecundia asinalia," 4.23). He even questions openly his own logic, asserting, "This is certainly an idiotic deliberation, entirely assinine" ("haec quidem inepta et prorsus asinina cogitatio," 6.26). And finally, Lucius tells us outright, late in the narrative, that when he was disguised in an ass's skin he had been, in fact, less intelligent ("etsi minus prudentem, multiscium reddidit," 9.13).

Once we recognize that Lucius is very much an ordinary ass, the disjunction between narrative and narration is hard to miss, and whole scenes unfold before us, seen in an entirely new light. As an example, we can turn briefly to Lucius' treatment of his flight with Charite. Lucius tells us that Charite wrestled the reins free from the old lady and then "she mounted me, having called me back from flight with gentle whispers" ("extorto etenim loro manibus eius me placidis gannitibus ab impetu revocatum naviter inscendit," 6.27). The behavioral imagery is perfectly clear: Lucius the dumb, frightened ass with Charite calming him lest he bolt. Then they begin their escape, which Lucius describes as follows (6.28):

> ego simul voluntariae fugae voto et liberandae virginis studio, sed et plagarum suasu, quae me saepicule commonebant . . . virgini delicatas voculas adhinnare temptabam. sed et scabendi dorsi mei simulatione non numquam obliquata cervice pedes decoros puellae basiabam.
>
> The desire to escape and my eagerness to free the girl were reinforced by the blows she frequently gave me as an admonishment of our plight. . . . I tried to neigh soothing words to the girl, and, while pretending to scratch my back, I kept bending around and kissing her delicate feet.

13. Lucius' narration is comically absurd: "sed tam bellum consilium meum praevertit sors deterrima. namque ille alius asinus divinato et antecapto meo cogitatu statim se mentita lassitudine cum rebus totis offudit iacensque in modum mortui fustibus, non stimulis ac ne cauda et auribus cruribusque undique versum elevatis temptavit exsurgere" ("But evil fortune thwarted so fine a plan, since that other ass, somehow catching wind of my scheme and undertaking it himself, feigned exhaustion by collapsing to the ground as if he were dead. Nor, despite their beating and goading him, would he rise up again, even though they tugged at his tail and legs and ears").

Here we have nearly all the previously described elements of Lucius' narrative. The imagery is clear: Charite goading on an ass by slapping its flanks, with the ass occasionally twisting around its head, attempting to rub its bridle, perhaps brushing Charite's feet in the process.

Here Lucius' misguided narration is not only amusing, but it also works to sustain an awareness of his percolating sexuality, which constitutes a major element in the narrative strategy that achieves fruition in the scene with the *matrona.* Immediately after his transformation we are hardly surprised when Lucius describes his newly enlarged member as the only solace in an otherwise humiliating transformation, although he cannot, in his present form, embrace Fotis ("nec ullum miserae reformationis video solacium, nisi quod mihi iam nequeunti tenere Fotidem natura crescebat," 3.24). Likewise, by lamenting his inability to have sex with Fotis, Lucius is foreshadowing an eventual bestial union.

At the same time, Apuleius introduces the idea that humans might find Lucius as sexually desirable as he finds women. Shortly after being sold to the catamite, he is brought home and the very real possibility of bestiality arises, the possibility of a bestial orgy, no less. When a servant, whom the priests use as a sex slave, spies Lucius, he states, "At last you have come as a relief for my wretched labor . . . you shall be a boon to my masters, and to my spent loins as well" ("venisti tandem miserrimi laboris vicarius . . . dominis placeas et meis defectis iam lateribus," 8.26).

As if Apuleius' frequently reminding us of his narrator's endowment, and the bestial potential contained therein, were not enough, he is also careful to demonstrate that his narrator has every intention of using his newly acquired goods, although the objects of Lucius' desire, as he becomes less and less human, cease to be limited to his former species. Lucius is no sooner set loose in a field with other horses than he begins to "note which mares might make the best bed mates" ("equas opportunissimas iam mihi concubinas futuras deligebam," 7.16). He is frustrated in this pursuit, as one might expect in a narrative whose climax in the tenth book depends upon Lucius' long-delayed conquest.

It is only shortly after he is thwarted in the pastures that Lucius finds himself in the temporary custody of a sadistic youth. After a series of ambiguous mishaps, this youth returns home and maliciously concocts, or so Lucius claims, a graphic account in which Lucius, "far too much an ass" (*nimis asinum*), has been sexually assaulting various women and boys, "attempting illicit and unspeakable acts, aspiring to fulfill his bestial desires in an unholy union" ("illicitas atque incognitas temptat libidines, et ferinas voluptates aversa Venere invitat ad nuptias," 7.21). The scene, as soon as it is presented by the youth, exists for us as a set of images and, having learned to question Lucius, we are left wondering only how much of it might be true. The scene is a wonderful example of the way in which narrative devices rarely arise independently of one another, and here we witness the coexistence of a number of distinctly Apuleian narrative strategies: graphic detail, an unreliable narrator, and a pervasive sexual subtext. In the *Metamorphoses,* multiple suggestions and overtones often converge in a single

scene, even a single sentence, with a distinctly Apuleian harmony. Nowhere is this harmony more evident than in *Metamorphoses* 10.20–22 and the *additamentum*.

Metamorphoses 10.20–22 and the *additamentum* present an episode that has been generally misinterpreted, perhaps because much of the imagery requires a familiarity with donkeys that is beyond the reach of the average reader today. A coupling between Lucius and the *matrona* has been arranged well in advance. The donkey, we are told, has been fed wine, and he is then led into a carefully prepared chamber: *dii boni,* how royally things are prepared, with Tyrian dyed cushions and gold coverlets. The *matrona* then divests herself of her clothes, perfumes her nude body in his sight with *oleo balsamo,* and anoints Lucius's body likewise, giving particular attention to his nostrils. The Latin is emphatic:

> de stagno vasculo multo sese perungit oleo balsamo meque indidem largissime perfricat, *sed multo tanto impensius cura etiam nares perfundit meas.*
>
> She perfumed herself liberally with balsam oil from a tin jar and likewise generously rubbed me down with it, *although she concentrated chiefly on applying it copiously to my nostrils.*

This emphasis is by no means casual, as we soon discover, and the way in which editors have attempted to alter the text from the reading clearly attested in F is indicative of the degree to which the entire episode has been misunderstood.[14] Here, it is noted in the margin of our manuscript, should be inserted the *additamentum,* in which the woman cleans his groin and then manually stimulates him. If we omit this and stick to the accepted text, hereafter we read (10.21):

> tunc exosculata pressule, non qualia in lupanari solent basiola iactari vel meretricum poscinummia vel adventorum negantinummia, sed pura atque sincera instruit et blandissimos adfatus: "amo" et "cupio" et "te solum diligo" et "sine te iam vivere nequeo" et cetera, quis mulieres et alios inducunt et suas testantur adfectationes.
>
> She kissed me, not as they are accustomed to do in the bordellos and professional establishments, coaxing for money, but purely, sincerely, with these and like loving words, "You whom I love," "My sole desire," "I cannot live without you," and whatever other words women use to declare their passionate emotion.

Here again Apuleius inserts a marker, in case we are not yet clearly visualizing the narrative reality, by having his narrator remind us of the crucial importance of the wine and the ointment in what would otherwise be an impossible coupling (10.21):

> nam et vino pulcherrimo atque copioso memet madefeceram et unguento fraglantissimo prolubium libidinis sucitaram.

14. For example, Hanson, in his 1989 edition, by adopting Wiman's conjecture, does irreparable harm to the sense of the passage, making it to read: ". . . meque indidem largissime perfricat, sed multo tanta impensius; tura etiam nares perfundit meas." Likewise, numerous editors have proposed simply deleting *cura,* which strikes them as unnecessarily emphatic; see Zimmerman (2000, 275), who rightly defends the MS reading, concluding, however, that the emphasis is "a subtle hint that the smelly ass needs much more perfume than the lady."

> Indeed I had soaked myself with copious amounts of fine wine and stirred my appetite for sex with that most odoriferous ointment.

The *matrona,* having sufficiently aroused Lucius, whispers more blandishments, and proceeds to engage him in sex. Lucius then offers a careful, if ill-timed, explanation of his concern for the *matrona*'s safety (10.22):

> artissime namque complexa totum me prorsus, sed totum recepit. illa vero quotiens ei parcens nates recellebam, accedens totiens nisu rabido et spinam prehendens meam adplicitiore nexu inhaerebat, ut hercules etiam deesse mihi aliquid ad supplendam eius libidinem crederem nec Minotauri matrem frustra delectatam putarem adultero mugiente.
>
> Indeed, clasping me tightly she took in every inch of me. In fact, each time I tried to spare her and pull back my haunches she would push closer, gripping my spine and clinging in an even tighter embrace, until, by Hercules, I believed I would be insufficient to gratify her, and I understood how it was that the mother of the Minotaur found pleasure in her bovine lover.

We know to be wary of Lucius, but what is the reader meant to understand and visualize here?

The scene is based upon the breeding of quadrupeds, more particularly donkeys with mares, but with the obvious necessary substitutions made for a narrative in which Lucius' partner is, in fact, a woman who is taking both the role of the mare and the role of the "handler" or "steerer," in breeding barn parlance, as she leads Lucius, the donkey, into a union for which he is physiologically incapable of arousing himself. Overlaid on this reality we have a typically outrageous narration by Lucius, couched in the vocabulary of romantic love.[15]

Lucius has been led into a carefully prepared environment, not unlike a breeding stall. Varro, in his *De re rustica,* asserting that the mating of horses is similar to that of an ass and a mare (2.8.4), observes (2.7.8):

> si fastidium saliendi est, scillae medium conterunt cum aqua ad mellis crassitudinem; tum ea re naturam equae, cum menses ferunt, tangunt; contra ab locis equae nares equi tangunt.
>
> If the horse will not mount the mare, the core of the bulb of a squill is crushed in water until the solution has the consistency of honey. With this solution the genitalia of the mare is rubbed when she is in heat, and the nostrils of the horse are then anointed with the secretions from the genitalia of the mare.

The use of squill bulbs, from the plant *Scilla maritima* or *Urginea maritima,* as a stimulant and expectorant is attested throughout antiquity. The plant is found near the coast throughout the Mediterranean and its medicinal

15. Scholarly misinterpretations of this scene have often shown either a moral prudery foreign to Apuleius or else a failure to understand the distinction between Lucius' narration and what Apuleius wishes his audience to visualize. For instance, Finkelpearl (1998, 155), neglecting to comprehend the absurdity of Lucius' speech, describes this difficult breeding as "the most touching and tender scene between members of the opposite sex. . . . Our shock may be mediated, too, by the realization that Lucius is not actually a beast."

properties, which are still exploited today, were familiar to the earliest Greek medical writers.[16]

Columella adds that a sponge may be used to scent the nostrils of an ass with the genital secretions of a jenny to encourage the ass to mate with a mare (6.27.10). He also describes another method in which an ass is aroused by a donkey in heat, which is then switched for a mare once the ass is aroused (5.26.4). Obviously, the role of olfactory stimulation, by means of the genital secretions of a female of like species, in the breeding of quadrupeds would have been familiar to much, perhaps most, of Apuleius' audience. The degree to which ancient estate owners undertook seriously and scientifically such breeding can be seen not only in the many methods described by the agricultural writers, but also in a highly specialized breeding stall that Columella describes, a stall that he tells us *rustici* call a *machina,* which has a ramped floor designed to improve the angle of penetration for the donkey, thereby increasing the chances of insemination (6.37.10).

Vital to every successful breeding is the role of the handler, whom Varro tells us is needed to aid the donkey in mounting the mare ("itemque ut ineat equas per origas curamus," 2.8.4). But ancient agricultural writers felt no pressing need to describe with Apuleian detail how the handler performed his job. This is hardly surprising considering that the specialized knowledge of handlers, who may well have been slaves owned by the landowners for whom Columella and Varro wrote, lies outside the scope of such literature. That such a distinction existed between classes is clear from the abundant references in the agricultural writers to the particularized knowledge and vocabulary of the *rustici*. On the other hand, the modern breeding barn provides excellent parallels, wherein the handler is responsible for washing as well as both manually arousing and guiding the male in order, once again, to ensure a successful coupling. Likewise, we find the following in Varro (2.7.8):

> admittere oportet, cum tempus anni venerit, bis die, mane et vespere, per origam; sic appellatur quiqui admittit. eo, enim adiutante, equa alligata, celerius admittuntur, neque equi frustra cupiditate impulsi semen eiciunt.
>
> When the proper time arrives, the stallion should be admitted twice daily, in the morning and evening, by the handler, as the man who attends to the mating is called. Indeed, with this man's assistance, once the mare is restrained, they are bred more swiftly, and the males do not, in the heat of passion, eject their semen in vain.

Clearly the handler's role involves the physical manipulation of the male's member, and *celerius admittuntur* is simply a summary of the handler's role.

Keeping all of this in mind, it is hardly surprising, accustomed as we are to the unreliability of Apuleius' narrator, that we should discover beneath

16. References in ancient writers are abundant, e.g., in Latin, Pliny (*HN* 19.93, 20.97); Varro (*Rust.* 1.7.7); Vergil (*G.* 6.3.451). In Greek, references are found to σκιλλή throughout the Hippocratic corpus and in Aristotle (*Hist. an.* 556b4), Theophrastus (*Hist. pl.* 7.9.4 and *Char.* 16.14), and Dioscorides Medicus (7.171), to name but a few. Pliny tells us that Pythagoras, in addition to inventing the oxymel of squill, wrote an entire book on the subject of the squill and its medicinal properties.

Lucius' narration an ass in every way typical.[17] He is led into the *matrona*'s chamber, after, we are told, he has been fed with wine, although Lucius, true to his anthropomorphic habit, conflates the wine he has been given with the aphrodisiac effects of the ointment applied to his nostrils, whereas we learn from Pliny that it was commonly held in antiquity that the unruliness of a mule, and we can presume an ass as well, could be inhibited by frequent draughts of wine ("mulae calcitratus inhibetur vini crebriore potu," *HN* 8.69.173). The *matrona,* performing the functions of a handler, is careful to cover both herself and, most importantly, Lucius' nostrils, with the collected secretions of a jenny. She then speaks gently to him, as one might to soothe any quadruped, and for which we have already witnessed a parallel instance in the scene where he flees with Charite, an encounter which Lucius similarly misconstrues as romantic. The *matrona* then proceeds to steer him into an intercourse from which Lucius, as an ass, is predisposed to recoil. This is precisely what Lucius-the-ass attempts to do, trying to pull back his haunches, while Lucius-the-narrator overlays the entire scene with his own riotous alter-reality.

From what we know of the breeding barn, two important steps have been omitted from the commonly accepted text: first, the washing of the genitalia of male and female to encourage healthy insemination and, second, the active participation of the handler in arousing and guiding the male. But if we turn to the *additamentum* we discover precisely what is absent from the accepted text:

> et, Hercule, orchium pygam perteretem hyacinthi fragrantis et Chiae rosaceae lotionibus expurgavit [expiavit]. dein, digitis, hypate lichanos mese paramese et nete, hastam mihi inguinis nivei spurci(ti)ei pluscule excorians emundavit. et cum ad inguinis cephalum formosa mulier conatim veniebat ab orchibus, ganniens ego et dentes ad iovem elevans, priapo, frequenti frictura porrixabam, ipsoque pando et repando ventrem saepiuscule tractabam [tactabam]. ipsa quoque inspiciens quod genius inter anth. teneras excreverat, modicum morulae qua lustrum sterni mandaverat anni sibi revolutionem autumabat.
>
> And, by Hercules, she cleaned the hairless base of my balls with washes of fragrant hyacinth and Chiote roses. Then with her fingers—do re mi fa sol!—she cleaned for me

17. More specifically, he is a typical *breeding* ass. Perhaps our earliest reference in Greek to the particular husbandry of a breeding ass occurs in a fragment of Archilochus: ἡ δέ οἱ σάθη / ὥστ' ὄνου Πριηνέως / κήλωνος ἐπλήμυρεν ὀτρυγηφάγου ("His cock swelled like that of a grain-fed, Prienian breeding ass"). This fragment (West, 1989, 43) is quoted by Eustathius (1597.28) in his commentary on the *Odyssey,* where he tells us that early writers attest that κήλων is derived from asses kept specifically for breeding (οἵ φασιν ὡς κήλων μὲν πεποίηται ἀπὸ τῶν ὀχευτῶν ὄνων). This Archaic fragment captures the early history of a specialized husbandry that, having migrated across empires and languages, survives relatively unchanged in Apuleius, wherein we discover a striking echo. Shortly before being sold to Thiasus, a wealthy Corinthian, Lucius, whose imagined malnourishment has occupied a considerable portion of the narrative, suddenly finds himself owned by a cook and a baker, upon whose wares he fattens himself daily. He describes his subsequent transformation (10.15): "interea liberalibus cenis inescatus et humanis adfatim cibis saginatus, corpus obesa pinguitie compleveram, corium arvina succulenta molliveram, pilum liberali nitore nutriveram" ("Meanwhile, by feasting on abundant meals and stuffing myself with human food, I had managed to pad my frame with a thick layer of fat and soften my hide with a rich sheen, while nourishing my *pilum* with a generous splendor"). The pun on *pilum* is hard to ignore. Having been discovered gorging himself thus, Lucius is sold to Thiasus who, we are told, continues to provide a similarly rich diet, behavior that Lucius confuses with generosity, since it later becomes clear that Thiasus has every intention of turning Lucius into a breeding ass.

> the shaft of my snow-white groin, scouring away much filth. And when this lovely woman was coming up from my balls to the head of my cock in her efforts, whinnying and lifting my teeth heavenward, I swelled with a hard-on from the constant rubbing and, with it growing out, and out some more, I caressed my belly with it repeatedly. Seeing what a member had grown in the midst of such sweet flowers, the modicum of delay in which she had instructed that the breeding stall be made ready seemed to her to have lasted as long as a year.[18]

Lucius' washing is demanded not only by the parallel from the breeding barn, but also by the underlying framework of the narrative, where generous descriptions of Lucius' filth are a conspicuous element in the abundant detail Apuleius has already provided. At one point, Lucius relates (4.3):

> at illi canibus iam aegre cohibitis adreptum me loro quam valido ad ansulam quandam destinatum rursum caedendo confecissent profecto, nisi dolore plagarum alvus artata crudisque illis oleribus abundans et lubrico fluxu saucia fimo fistulatim excusso quosdam extremi liquoris aspergine, alios putore nidoris faetidi a meis iam quassis scapulis abegisset.
>
> And those men, having restrained with difficulty their dogs, tied me to a post with a thick rope and then flogged me nearly to death, and would have certainly done me in for good had not my belly, swollen with raw vegetables and abundant blows, been stricken with diarrhea that shot out in a jet, driving them from my abused haunches with the stench of the reeking gas, and with the spray of the disgusting fluid.

A similar and equally foul scene unfolds later (7.28), while passing references to Lucius' filth occur repeatedly throughout the story. The notion that Apuleius, having gone out of his way to stress the filth of his narrator-ass, would then couple the *matrona* with such a disgusting beast fails to recognize his concern with aesthetics.

That the vocabulary describing the lustration contained in the *additamentum* is ancient and reflects real usage in ancient breeding barns is immediately evident from the following passage in Columella, describing the steps that should be taken to ensure a hen's successful production of eggs (8.5.11):

> supponendi autem consuetudo tradita est ab iis, qui religiosius haec administrant, eiusmodi. primum quam secretissima cubilia legunt, ne incubantes matrices ab aliis avibus inquietentur: deinde antequam consternant ea, diligenter emundant, paleasque, quas substraturi sunt, sulfure et bitumine atque ardente teda perlustrant, et expiatas cubilibus iniciunt.
>
> The following is the customary method of preparation for those who are most zealous in the husbandry of such matters: first they choose nesting boxes that are tucked away, in order that the brooding hens are not disturbed by other birds; then, before they strew hay in them, they cleanse the boxes carefully, and, with bitumine and sulfur, they purify the hay that will be placed under the hens, and once the hay has been purged they strew it in the nesting boxes.

18. This translation is tentative and it should be noted that the *additamentum*, as it appears in the margins of the manuscripts, is abbreviated and possibly corrupt, although its rendering is not difficult and could possibly be improved if scholars were not so quick to assume the passage's spuriousness. The version of the text that I have produced relies on the transcription of Helm 1931, 252–53, as well as the editions of Hildenbrand 1842, 930 and Pennisi 1970, 131. Pennisi also includes a useful history of proposed emendations (132–33).

The parallels in language between this passage and the *additamentum* are remarkable. Even more remarkable is that these parallels exist despite the great differences in the process of purification used in the husbandry of species as diverse as chickens and donkeys. Given the careful attention to cleanliness observed here, it is inconceivable that the breeding of quadrupeds would not include cleansing. So it is hardly surprising that we discover a careful cleansing in the *additamentum*. Furthermore, the way in which the sensory details of that cleansing are described is distinctly Apuleian, *perteretem pygam* describing perfectly the smooth and hairless area around the genitalia of an ass, especially when coupled with its appropriate color image, *inguinis nivei*.

There follows, "dein digitis, hypate lichanos mese paramese et nete, hastam . . . emundavit" ("She purged the shaft with her fingers, hypate, lichanos, mese, paramese, et nete"). This sequence of the strings of a lyre has been much discussed and as much misunderstood. Fraenkel pounces on this detail in order to attribute the *additamentum* to an imagined medieval scribe whom he calls "Spurcus," who found these string names in Boethius' *De institutione musica,* an explanation that Mariotti and others have accepted. According to Fraenkel, Spurcus intended to perpetrate a hoax by pretending these string names were the names in Greek for the fingers, but gave himself away for, "Had he been possessed of even an elementary knowledge of Greek, he would have noticed that the fingers in Greek as well as in Latin are masculine."[19] Spurcus is a straw man, and this is precisely the kind of misrepresentation that has hindered a reasonable reevaluation of the *additamentum*.[20] First, the strings are not always presented in that order in Boethius' work. Nor do they occur anywhere as a simple list, but in a discussion spread across eight chapters (1.12–20). Second, there is no reason at all these names must come from Boethius. They are introduced in Vitruvius and explained as referring not only to the strings but to the corresponding notes of the scale (*De arch.* 5.3–9).

Furthermore, examined within the context of the narrative, it is clear that Apuleius is not naming the fingers at all but simply sounding the names of notes that correspond to each of the fingers as the *matrona* employs them around Lucius' member. The first, *hypate,* corresponds to the lowest pitch, *lichanos* to one slightly higher, and so on. Lucius is singing a rising scale, perhaps as familiar to every ancient as *do re mi* is to us, but it corresponds to the rising of his sexual pitch, exactly the kind of comical narration we have come to expect.[21] Finally, although the preponderance of Greek in the *additamentum* has been held up as a chief proof of its spuriousness, Vitruvius

19. Fraenkel 1953, 153.

20. For example, Zimmerman (2000, 438) asserts that Fraenkel "provided convincing proof that for the curious enumeration of the fingers in par. 2, which has nothing to do with the Greek names for fingers (except *licanos*), 'Spurcus' was inspired by a passage from Boethius' *De institutione musica*."

21. It is not surprising to discover that such a natural reading has presented itself independently to other acute readers. Pennisi (1970, 255) writes, "Un altro cardine dei 'negatori' erano i 'nomi della dita', *hypate, lichanos* etc., che sono in realtà nomi di corda della lira. Anche qui i termini, usati con senso in situazione erotico-sessuale hanno trovato la loro interpretazione con riferimento alla 'melodia' che la mano della donna suscita con l'atto della *frictura* sui sensi dell'asino-uomo."

tells us that the reason these terms are used by the Romans is because there are no Latin equivalents for certain theoretical musical terms ("quam si volumus explicare, necesse est etiam graecis verbis uti, quod nonnullae eorum latinas non habent appellationes," 5.1).[22] With regard to the Greek vocabulary, Lawrence Richardson writes:

> I find only the following: orchium, pygam, cephalum, orchibus, priapo, anth. Of these none except the last is at all difficult or uncommon, and the reading of the last is questionable. . . . There might be a medical coloring . . . but I really suspect that this was more like our use of French words.[23]

This interpretation is certainly correct, as one finds in Celsus an assertion that not only confirms Richardson's suspicion, but refutes any notion that the language in the *additamentum* is inappropriate or uncharacteristic of Apuleius (*Med.* 6.18.1):

> proxima sunt ea, quae ad partes obscenas pertinent, quarum apud Graecos vocabula et tolerabilius se habent et accepta iam usu sunt, cum in omni fere medicorum volumine atque sermone iactentur: apud nos foediora verba ne consuetudine quidem aliqua verecundius loquentium commendata sunt, ut difficilior haec explanatio sit simul et pudorem et artis praecepta servantibus.
>
> Next are those subjects related to the genitalia, for which the Greek terms are more tolerable and are generally used, while at the same time they are found in nearly every medical book and treatise. Nor are our crass words appropriate, even in common use, for any modest speaker, and thus it is far more difficult to relate these matters while observing both decency and the requirements of the art.

Despite Adams' assertion that in antiquity Greek sexual terms were not regularly imported into Latin, Celsus' meaning should be clear even to those of us not trained in hermeneutics.[24] It was clearly considered in poor taste, at least among educated speakers, to use vulgar Latin terms rather than the more polite Greek ones.[25] Celsus, however, is intent on avoiding these Greek terms because, like many Roman writers using source material originally written in Greek, he is using Latin programmatically. To write his medical treatise in Latin is half the point of writing it at all. Apuleius, on the other hand, and in marked contrast to the majority of Latin writers, is beholden to no such program. Lucius uses those terms that occur most naturally to an educated speaker like himself, and an educated speaker, as Celsus states outright, would prefer to use Greek.

22. Regarding the excessive use of Greek, see Hildebrand 1842, 930–35; Fraenkel 1953, p. 154, n. 1.

23. Richardson 2001.

24. Adams (1982, 228–30), with regards to the Greek sexual vocabulary, begs the question. Adams' assertion that Greek sexual terms, like those we find in the *additamentum,* are not commonly found in Latin authors, and that this proves the passage's spuriousness, ignores the likelihood that many Latin speakers were, like Apuleius, very familiar with Greek sexual terms, and their failure to employ them in formal writing speaks only to their adherence to, and Apuleius' radical departure from, Latin literary forms.

25. The general circulation of Greek sexual terms as reflected in the *additamentum* argues against the following theory found in Zimmerman 2000, 439: "The author of the *additamentum* shows a remarkable knowledge of anatomy and medical technical terms, as appears from several of Mariotti's notes. This may suggest that he was one of the *eruditi* who shared in the heyday of renewed medical studies." In fact, both Mariotti and Zimmerman rely in their translations of the *additamentum* on the overly technical application of terms intended to be idiomatically sexual rather than medical.

Furthermore, Apuleius' employment in the *additamentum* of borrowings from Greek is not radically different from his usage elsewhere in the *Metamorphoses*. Giuseppe Pennisi's important study not only collects a number of Apuleian coinages from Greek that are either elsewhere unattested or not earlier attested, but also demonstrates that there are a number of other passages in the *Metamorphoses* "in which the author has purposefully concentrated and clustered together a series of grecisms" ("in cui l'autore ha, per così dire, volutamente raggruppato e condensato tutta una serie di grecismi"), either in a single relatively short list (e.g., "oculis obunctis graphice prodeunt, mitellis et crocotis et carbasinis et bombycinis iniecti," 8.24, or "me phaleris aureis et fucatis ephippiis et purpureis tapetis et frenis argenteis et pictilibus balteis," 10.18) or spread throughout longer passages such as at 11.16 or 10.30–31.[26]

In fact, Apuleius' use of terms borrowed from Greek in the *additamentum,* rather than arguing against its authenticity, provides a possible explanation for its failure to be transmitted in F or its archetype.[27] That the *additamentum* otherwise reflects peculiarities of style and vocabulary that are distinctly Apuleian can hardly be denied. Indeed, the passage's authenticity has been questioned repeatedly despite bearing the immediately recognizable stamp of *genium Apuleianum*. But, as we have seen, these arguments are often based on generalizations that are easily dispelled by a careful evaluation of Apuleius' text. Likewise, the absence of the *additamentum* in Lucian's Greek version is still widely regarded as serious evidence against the passage's authenticity, an argument that is at least as old as Oudendorp, about whom Hildenbrand writes:

> Oud. ipsi, quamquam spurcissimum illud fragmentum genium Apuleianum satis spirare videatur, valde tamen suspectum est, potissimum quum in Luciano nullum eius extet vestigium.
>
> Although this most foul fragment seemed to him to breathe with the spirit of Apulieus, Oudendorp himself was nevertheless suspicious of its authenticity, chiefly because no trace of it remains in Lucian.[28]

Pennisi's careful comparison of the Greek and Latin versions does much, however, to undermine this argument against authenticity and provides numerous parallel examples that clearly contradict the still current claim that "in other respects the text of this episode in the *Onos* parallels Apuleius'

26. See Pennisi 1970, 209–13. Zimmerman (2000, 437), citing Pennisi's study, concedes that "the presence of many grecisms in this fragment is in itself not a decisive argument against its authenticity."

27. The manuscript readings in F are, judging by the number of proposed emendations, most unreliable precisely in those passages that employ abundant borrowings from Greek. In fact, F's reading for the Greek at 11.17 (variously emended, e.g., to πλοιαφέσια by Mommsen or ἀγία Ἐφεσία by Baehrens) is hopelessly corrupt, demonstrating the peculiar difficulties posed by Apuleius' texts, which reflect the essentially bilingual character of the Second Sophistic. One can imagine a context as early as the fourth century wherein the idiomatic employment of Greek found in the *additamentum* could have been lost on an editor, resulting in the subsequent omission of the passage. Pennisi (1970, 239–52) argues that F descends from a fourth-century *Sallustii recensio,* which, unlike the independently transmitted codex available to Zanobi da Strada, omitted the *additamentum*. On the question of Apuleius' transmission, particularly the important role of Montecassino, see Pecere 1987.

28. Hildebrand 1842, 931.

version completely."[29] And, while it has not been the object of this paper to carefully compare the very different narrative strategies of the two authors, I should point out that in each of the parallel scenes previously cited, Lucian's Greek version lacked each of the key elements present in Apuleius' account.[30]

In fact, the presence or absence of the passage in the Greek version is a red herring, and the only genuine consideration should be the content of the *additamentum* itself and its relationship to the rest of Apuleius' text. As we have seen, the lustration contained therein is practically demanded by the underlying narrative. What remains to consider is the role of the *matrona* as a handler actively arousing Lucius.

Mule breeding would have required not only the washing but also the manual stimulation of the male, precisely as we witness it here. The image of Lucius drawing up his belly and thrusting out with his phallus describes precisely the state of arousal sought by the handler. Varro relates an anecdote in which a handler forces a horse to mount the mare and the frenzied horse bites the handler (2.7.9). Columella similarly informs us that sometimes an ass, while mounting, will bite the back and neck of a mare ("cum admittitur, cervicibus dorsisque feminarum imprimit morsus," 5.37), and it is for precisely this reason that a leather shield was commonly draped across the withers of the mare, or over the head of the ass. The image, then, of Lucius-the-ass rolling back his lips and baring his teeth while drawing up his belly is plain, though he presents it in the extravagant terms we might expect from him: "ganniens ego et dentes ad iovem elevans" ("whinnying and lifting his teeth heavenward"). Likewise, Lucius' final observation, that the entire preparation of the chamber now seemed to the *matrona* to have constituted

29. Zimmerman 2000, 435.

30. These distinctions are present immediately after the transformation, where, in marked contrast to Apuleius' version, Lucian makes no mention of his narrator's now huge endowment, placing in Lucius' mouth only the observation (15), ἐγὼ δὲ τὰ μὲν ἄλλα ὄνος ἦμεν, τὰς δὲ φρένας καὶ τὸν νοῦν ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖνος ὁ Λούκιος, δίχα τῆς φωνῆς ("Although I was an ass in every other respect, in mind and intelligence I remained a human, and I was still the same Lucius, except for the ability to speak"). Lucian is careful to observe a distinction between mind and body, even taking pains to clarify, δίχα τῆς φωνῆς, since in the traditional Greek view the ability to speak is considered contingent less on human physiology than on intelligence, νοῦς. Likewise, those places in the Latin version where Lucius later questions the extent of his humanity are all absent from the Greek version. Subsequently, the disjunction between narration and narrative is not a part of Lucian's narrative strategy: in the barn Lucius states simply that the horses were defending their feed against the incursion of an unfamiliar quadruped; Lucian's narrator is not conspired against by his fellow pack animals; let loose in the field, Lucian's narrator nowhere indicates that he is planning, or even desiring, to mate with the mares. Likewise, it is simply inaccurate to claim, as does Zimmerman (2000, 435), that "in passages which give rise to obscene descriptions, the *Onos* tends to be more extensive and explicit than the *Met.;* if the *spurcum additamentum* were to be accepted as authentic, it would run counter to the pattern observable in such passages everywhere else." The scenes that I have previously cited all contradict this claim, as does the more extensive study, "I luoghi erotico-scollacciati delle *Metamorfosi* e il ΛΟΥΚΙΟΣ Η ΟΝΟΣ," found in Pennisi 1970, 55–123; see as well the arguments of Journoud 1965. That certain details vital to understanding the intended parallel with the breeding barn, such as the ointment being applied to the nostrils, are *accidentally* present in Lucian's Greek version has no bearing at all on the *additamentum,* unless one improperly treats Lucian's version as a "phenotext," which it clearly is not. Lucian, or a pseudo-Lucian, is imperfectly transmitting an earlier account, and based on his principles of exclusion, the absence of the material contained in the *additamentum* is precisely what we should expect. A careful interpretation of this scene leads to important conclusions about the origins of the various ass stories. For an introduction to this question, and good bibliographies, see Mason 1978 and 1993.

an intolerable delay, is characteristically ironic, more accurately reflecting as it does his own heightened state of arousal.

At the same time, we cannot exclude the possibility that the bestiality involved in this scene might itself have been a familiar spectacle.[31] The woman's specific actions in such a spectacle would be required, on account of the same physiological difficulties present in breeding asses with mares, to follow those of a handler. On the other hand, even if such spectacles were rare, the parallel from the breeding barn for each step of the interaction between Lucius and the *matrona* would have been immediately recognizable to many ancient landowners.

Finally, it has been proposed that the *additamentum* amounts to a kind of "adoration of the phallus" that is foreshadowed, perhaps even demanded, by the preceding narrative, beginning with Lucius' own observation immediately after his metamorphosis. In a narrative driven by Lucius' percolating sexual desire, the reader is constantly reminded that Lucius is now hugely endowed. Apuleius is careful to strengthen this awareness by occasionally forcing the reader to focus his or her attention on this anatomical fact. For example, when Lucius is placed on the auction block, and Lucius' physical condition is questioned by a skeptical buyer, the auctioneer tells Lucius' eventual buyer, "If you place your face between his thighs, you will quickly determine what enormous endurance he would show you" ("nam si faciem tuam mediis eius feminibus immiseris, facile periclitaberis, quam grandem tibi demonstret patientiam," 8.25).

Apuleius, as we have seen, is careful to postpone for his metamorphosed narrator not only a bestial consummation, but also sex between Lucius and his fellow quadrupeds. Likewise, Apuleius deliberately alludes to Lucius' huge endowment while purposefully withholding until the novel's climactic scene an expected graphic description of this. To assert that such an "adoration" is called for by the narrative, and even desired by the reader, is to recognize that it is largely irrelevant whether or not bestial spectacles actually took place on the ancient stage, and that it is more important to recognize that a pornographic, bestial spectacle is unfolding here in the tenth

31. See Salisbury 1994 for a discussion of bestiality from late antiquity through the Middle Ages. Salisbury reminds us, for example, of the strict penalties for bestiality that Christian legislators found it necessary to prescribe at the Council of Ancyra in 314 (88). Although it is impossible to know how common bestiality might have been in the arena, it is ironic that most scholars are willing to accept that the other spectacles presented on the Corinthian stage are representative of real events. Likewise, representations of bestial scenes similar to what we find in Apuleius are common in Greek and Roman art; see Johns 1982, 108–11. A sixth-century B.C.E. red-figure cup by Epiktetos in the National Museum in Naples (RP 27669) portrays a reclining, nude female offering herself to a donkey, while terracotta lamps depicting women engaged in intercourse with donkeys or horses were still being produced in the third century C.E. Such art, Johns (1982, 111) writes, "should possibly be considered in relation to stories such as the *Golden Ass*. . . . It is reasonable to suppose that such public exhibitions did take place." The Kinsey report provides ample evidence that bestiality, particularly between male humans and females of other species, will be present, and widespread, in most agricultural societies: in the 1940s perhaps as high as 50 percent of males living on farms in America had experienced some sexual interaction with animals (Kinsey 1948, 671). But, interestingly enough, Greek and Roman art rarely represents males engaged in bestiality: Johns (111) writes that "a number of representations of women with animals on lamps are matched by only one figure-type of a man copulating with an animal (a donkey)." One possible conclusion is that the images on Greek and Roman lamps reflect not the common varieties of bestiality pervasive in agricultural societies but rather the bestial spectacles occasionally witnessed in urban centers.

book of the *Metamorphoses,* and most readers, morally outraged or not, find it irresistible. Winkler writes,

> If a reader genuinely disapproves of vampire stories or pornography, why did he or she keep on reading? The only way to reach Book 11 is *via* the unambiguous, centrally important, and wholly endorsed depictions of witchcraft, sexual hedonism, and bestiality. . . . there are Catonian contexts in real life in which one might feel called on to disapprove Lucius's affair with Photis or the Corinthian lady's desire for the ass, but such a perspective does not enter the *Asinus Aureus.*

Winkler correctly infers both the importance of the *additamentum* to the scene as a whole, and the damage that omission of it would inflict on the text, and he is clearly right when he observes that those who would omit the *additamentum* "castrate the text at its most graphic moment."[32]

Duke University

32. Winkler 1985, 192–93.

LITERATURE CITED

Adams, J. N. 1982. *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary.* Baltimore.

Billanovich, G. 1953. *I primi umanisti e le tradizioni dei classici latini.* Fribourg.

Broeck, S. van den. 1988. *Apuleius* Metamorphosen. Antwerp-Baarn.

Dowden, K. 1980. Eleven notes on the text of Apuleius' *Metamorphoses. CQ* 74:218–26.

Finkelpearl, E. D. 1998. *Metamorphosis of Language in Apuleius: A Study of Allusion in the Novel.* Ann Arbor.

Finkelpearl, E. D., and Schlam, C. 2001. A Review of Scholarship on Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* 1970–1998. *Lustrum* 42:9–230.

Fraenkel, E. 1953. A Sham Sisenna. *Eranos* 51:151–54.

Gaselee, S., ed. 1915. *Apuleius:* The Golden Ass. Loeb Classical Library. London and New York. Revision of translation by W. Adlington (1566).

Hanson, J. A., ed. and trans. 1989. *Apuleius:* Metamorphoses. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass. and London.

Helm, R., ed. 1931. *Apulei opera quae supersunt I:* Met. *libri XI.* Leipzig.

Herrmann, L. 1951. Le Fragment obscène de l'*Âne d'or* (x, 21). *Latomus* 10:329–32.

Hildebrand, G. F., ed. 1842. *L. Apuleius: Opera omnia.* Reprint Hildesheim, 1968. Leipzig.

Johns, C. 1982. *Sex or Symbol: Erotic Images of Greece and Rome.* London.

Journoud, S. 1965. Apulée conteur: Quelques réflexions sur l'épisode de l'âne et la Corinthienne (*Métam.* X.19.3–22.5). *ACD* 1:33–37.

Kinsey, A. 1948. *Sexuality in the Human Male.* Philadelphia.

Lowe, E. A. 1920. The Unique Manuscript of Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* (Laurentian. 68.2) and Its Oldest Transcript (Laurentian. 29.2). *CQ* 14:150–55.

Mariotti, S. 1956. Lo *Spurcum Additamentum* Ad Apul. *Met.* 10, 21. *SIFC* 27–28:229–50.

Mason, H. J. 1978. *Fabula Graecanica:* Apuleius and His Greek Sources. In *Aspects of Apuleius'* Golden Ass, ed. B. L. Hijmans and R. T. van der Paardt, 1–15. Groningen.

_____. 1993. Greek and Latin Versions of the Ass-Story. *ANRW* 2.34.2:1665–1707.

Mazzarino, A. 1950. *La Milesia e Apuleio.* Turin.

Merkelbach, R. 1952. La nuova pagina di Sisenna ed Apuleio. *Maia* 5:234–41.

Oudendorp, F. 1786. *Apulei opera omnia.* Vol. 1, Metamorphoseon *libri XI.* Leiden.

Pecere, O. 1987. Qualche riflessione sulla tradizione di Apuleio a Montecassino. In *Le strade del testo,* ed. G. Cavallo, 97–124. Bari.

Pennisi, G. 1970. *Apuleio e l'*Additamentum *a* Metamorphoses *X, 21.* Messina.

Pizzica, M. 1981. Ancora sull'*additamentum* ad Apul. *Met.* X.21. In *Letterature comparate: Problemi e metodo. Studi in onore di E. Paratore II,* 763–72. Bologna.

Richardson, L., Jr. 2001. Letter to author.

Robertson, D. S. 1924. The manuscripts of the *Metamorphoses* of Apuleius. *CQ* 18:27–42, 85–99.

Salisbury, J. E. 1994. *The Beast Within: Animals in the Middle Ages.* New York.

West, M. L. 1989. *Iambi et elegi graeci ante Alexandrum cantati*^{2}. Vol. 1. Oxford.

Winkler, J. J. 1985. *Auctor and Actor: A Narratological Reading of Apuleius'* Golden Ass. Berkeley.

Zimmerman, M., ed. 2000. *Apuleius Madaurensis* Metamorphoses *Book X.* Text, Introduction and Commentary. Groningen.