

G. A. A. KORTEKAAS, *The Story of Apollonius, King of Tyre. A Study of its Greek Origin and an Edition of the Two Oldest Latin Recensions* (Mnemosyne Supplement 253), Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2004, xxiv + 296 pp., ISBN 90-04-13923-0.

The appearance of a new edition of the *Historia Apollonia Regis Tyri* (hereafter *HA*) by a scholar who has devoted a whole career to this text (a dozen publications going back to 1977) should constitute a major event in Apollonian studies; and indeed, in some ways it is. But this is an unusual edition, in that it has an agenda, as the title shows: K. aims in the *prolegomena* (a third of the volume) to establish the existence of a Greek original of *HA*, including its date and a more specific location in Asia Minor, possibly Tarsus. This, and the fact that the text itself is an *editio minor* of K.'s earlier edition¹, means that the introductory material is the real centre-piece of this volume, and it is therefore to the *prolegomena* that I shall direct most of the comments in this review.

K.'s aims, stated in a Foreword, are “to make a new edition... with limited attention to the manuscripts, their vicissitudes and orthography, but with great emphasis upon the readability of the story, and most importantly, its Greek origin.” (p. vii). K. regrets that a projected commentary with line-by-line comparison of the two recensions, *RA* and *RB*, together with fuller comparisons with other Greek and Latin texts, could not appear simultaneously with this volume. This regret is bound to be shared by the reader, since the projected commentary is often referred to when something needs to be argued more fully there. The result is that some conclusions here are provisional, however plausible, and one is forced to take

¹ G.A.A. Kortekaas, *Historia Apollonii Regis Tyri*. Prolegomena, text edition of the two principal Latin recensions, bibliography, indices and appendices, Groningen 1984, referred to by K. in the present edition as *editio maior*.

K.'s word that the promised evidence will justify his current statements when it is published. That said, his most important hypotheses are argued fully enough here to justify the revised principles on which his edition rests. These are, in sum: (1) that the original of *HA* was a pagan Greek text (referred to as *HA[Gr]*), bearing the marks of an interest in astrological writings; it was probably written in the third century AD in Asia Minor (perhaps in Tarsus). (2) *HA(Gr)* was epitomised in Greek (*R[Gr]*), with radical Christianising alterations; probably in the fifth century in Asia Minor. (3) *RA* is a translation of *R(Gr)*, produced in a Christian environment, possibly in Rome in the late fifth / early sixth century. (4) *RB* is an adaptation of *RA*, also produced in a Christian milieu; but by an adaptor who also had available in some form a text of *R(Gr)*, and who was eager to show off a greater knowledge of classical literature, both Latin and Greek, by inserting quotations, adaptations, and allusions to such literature. This position is outlined and compared with the current prevailing view in a pair of opposing stemmata (p. 14). Aside from the aforementioned origin in Greek, not Latin, the most important difference which affects the methodology for editing *HA* (in any recension) is with point (4): other editions have been based on the assumption that *RA* and *RB* are independent redactions of a Latin epitome (*R*), so that they can be used as independent witnesses for *R*. I shall now outline and assess the argumentation of the *prolegomena* which aims to substantiate K.'s position.

Chapter 2 (pp. 17-24) surveys Late Latin and Christian elements in *RA* and *RB*; the cumulative evidence (late or Christian vocabulary/expressions, usages, constructions etc., as well as allusions to the Vulgate), though listed rather than discussed in detail, tends to support the claim that these are integral to the text in both recensions and not later interpolations into a more classical Latin original. Such elements are therefore embellishments by the redactors of *RA* and *RB*, and do not support a Latin over a Greek original. If accepted (and the weight of evidence seems to favour this course), the implications of this for an edition are clear, and significant: as K. notes, the "theory of interpolation has led to considerable excesses [in editorial deletion]" (p. 22).

Chapter 3 (pp. 25-30) compares *RA* and *RB*, attempting to show that the latter was working with the former and correcting

or modifying it according to certain principles: classicising instead of late forms; the more or less consistent removal or toning down of ‘indelicate’ or vulgar terms, and of references to *fatum*, *fortuna* and astrology; the use of stress-based rhythm, sometimes achieved simply by changing the word order of *RA*. *RB* also generally tends to abbreviate *RA*; and where, by contrast, it expands upon *RA*, it is usually to provide some motivation for a character’s action that seems to be lacking in *RA*. Finally, “In a few places *RB* blunders and thereby reveals his secondary position vis-à-vis *RA*,” (e.g. *HA* 27: “*RA* 6 (*sanguis*) a *perfrictione* (*coagulatus*) ~ *RB* 5 *ad perfectionem* (!)”, p. 29). (Those places where *RB* is certainly independent of *RA* are examined in later chapters.) Of course these arguments can only support K.’s thesis in conjunction with those of chapter 2; alone, they might still point to two independent redactors of an identical earlier Latin text—one less concerned to state motivations found in the original, the other keen to make certain changes to the original which the other kept. The few ‘blunders’ in *RB* might likewise show carelessness in adapting an original which *RA* copies accurately at those points. However, in light of the evidence presented in chapter 2, and later arguments, the evidence accumulated here is very convincing.

Chapter 4 (pp. 31-42) establishes a very clear case for *RA* and *RB* as translations from Greek, in the first instance by compiling a list of what appear to be translation errors. Some of these have been pointed out by other scholars (e.g. *stans* (*HA* 1, *RA* 16, not in *RB*) for $\sigma\tilde{\alpha}\sigma\alpha$) but K. adds several other, less obvious examples, which are nonetheless very plausible; for instance *innocens* (*HA* 6, *RA* 10 / 10, *RB* 7) for $\acute{\alpha}\beta\lambda\alpha\beta\eta\varsigma$ when the passive sense of the Greek word (‘unharméd’) rather than the active (‘not harming, innocent’) is required. To this list are added further classes of evidence: words and phrases which are used in a way suggestive of the usage of their Greek equivalents; Greek-like constructions; and phrases with close parallels in the Greek novels. As K. readily admits, it is only the translation errors which stand alone as proofs (the others could be a result of an author’s lateness, Greek background and imperfect knowledge of Latin, and imitation of the novels); but those proofs are substantial, and once accepted, the other classes of evidence add weight to them. In concluding this chapter, K. notes that *RB* generally follows *RA* in his choice

of words, “but often eliminates Greek constructions and turns of phrase when he recognises or suspects errors.” (p. 41) Although this tendency needs further illustration, this is presumably saved for the commentary: “we must restrict ourselves to a few important remarks...” (p. 42). However, this conclusion, while provisional, seems fairly secure from the evidence presented here and with the promise of further arguments.

Chapter 5 (pp. 43-51) examines the Greek epitome, *R(Gr)*. Since no one doubts that we are dealing with some kind of epitome, due to the many difficulties in the texts that we have, I shall pass over K.’s summary of the evidence for this. As for the epitome being Greek, and there not being an intermediate Latin stage, K. argues (p. 43) “It is extremely unlikely that the great quantity of Greek material in words and phrases as demonstrated in the preceding chapter should have been preserved notwithstanding the filter of a Latin epitomisation.” Added to this are his arguments for a late, Christian Greek milieu for the epitome, which eliminates pagan (e.g. astrological) motivations for the action. Such evidence comes from further examples of underlying Greek words, but this time, of later terminology specific to nunneries, found only in Asia Minor (pp. 47-8): namely, *maior* (*HA* 48, *RA* 15-6) ~ μειζότερος/-ρα in the sense of ‘superior of a monastery’; and *secunda* (*HA* 49, *RA* 11-2) ~ δευτεραρία as the feminine counterpart of δευτεραριος, ‘prior’. Similarly, K. argues (pp. 49-51) that Apollonius’ royal status (kings being very rare in most contexts in Latin, and similarly in the Greek novel genre to which the original *HA* must belong) is due to a Christian epitomator imitating the Old Testament, where the phrase ‘King of Tyre’ occurs several times. What is more, it most often refers to Hiram/Εὔρωμος in his contact with Solomon; and Josephus (*Antiq. Iud.* 8.148f.) tells of a riddle contest between these two kings rather similar to that in *HA* 41-2. Therefore K. concludes that the author of *R(Gr)* is probably imitating Josephus (imperfectly adapted to the context), and adds the title of King to the Tyrian Apollonius in an attempt to connect his insertion to the original more closely. In combination, these arguments, which I have merely summarised here, are very successful in attesting a late Greek, probably Asia Minor, location for *R(Gr)*.

Chapter 6 (pp. 53-72) is concerned with the original Greek text, *HA(Gr)*. K. acknowledges that here the argument of the *prolegomena* is at its most complex and hypothetical (p. 53); and naturally, much of it rests on what has come before. As such, it is impossible to do it justice here, but I shall summarise what K. sets out to establish, following his section numbers. (1) Contents: the epitomator has especially removed references to Apollonius' original status and family relations; to pagan religion, astrology and *fatum*; and to relations between 'high' and 'low' in which help is requested or received by the former to the latter class, and to the keeping of promises. (2) Localisation in Asia Minor: a list of expressions (referring to titles, institutions, practices, etc.) which find particular parallels in epigraphic and other evidence from Asia Minor is presented. This evidence appears to justify K.'s certainty concerning this region as the origins of *HA*, though he again projects further discussion in a commentary. (3) Language and style: some phrases which might preserve a linguistic register similar to the Greek novel genre, and the possibility of finding allusions to the extant novels, are briefly raised; this section is among those most in need of filling out with details. (4) Date: K. notes that the internal evidence is scanty and does not produce very precise results; there are, however, two important pieces of external evidence. The first is the inscription from Pergamum containing two Greek riddles (cf. *MDAI(I)* 35, 1910, 488-9), one of which is very close to that in *HA* 4, *RA* 7-10. K. counters sceptics over the value of this inscription as evidence for *HA(Gr)*; but on its own this inscription, which is far later than *RA* and *RB*, tells us nothing about the *date* of the Greek original, so that this section is curiously placed within the chapter. Finally, a coin of Caracalla (Tarsus, AD 215), in its imagery and inscriptions, is compared to the description of the statue of Apollonius erected by the citizens of Tarsus (*HA* 10, *RA* 15-6) and to other elements in the story, leading K. to hypothesise quite ingeniously (p. 71) that "the original author of *HA(Gr)* has... taken this coin as his starting point." Needless to say, this can only ever be speculative, and it needs to be discussed at greater length; but it is worthy of such a development. The date of *HA(Gr)* would most likely be soon after this issue (early third century), if K. is correct. Note that this date does not depend precisely on the author taking

the coin “as his starting point,” as opposed to merely alluding to it; but K.’s thought is presumably that it must be an integral part of the original conception of the novel rather than a later embellishment (cf. the classicising embellishments to the epitome, mostly referring to his presumed location in Rome, which he attributes to *RB*, p. 23). I would tend to agree, but there must be a possible case for a clever interpolater building on coincidences between an existing story and the new coin in order to slot these allusions to it into the text, adding extra local significance to a story of Asia Minor origin for readers in Tarsus just as *RB* was later to do in Rome. However, this complicates the picture in that it involves postulating a version of the text before AD 215 as well as one shortly after it, whereas K.’s interpretation is plausible enough and does not add to the already numerous phases in the history of *HA*.

Chapter 7 (pp. 73-82) surveys the presumed translating techniques and abilities of *RA* and *RB*, comparing them to the translators of the *Vitae Patrum* and to each other. K. here expands on earlier arguments concerning *RB*’s principles for altering *RA*, and demonstrates his greater command of the classical languages and literature than *RA*. The evidence for *RB* additionally using a text of *R(Gr)* in some form (other than that used by *RA*) is set out: the excursus at *HA* 8, *RB* 2-20 (no equivalent in *RA*) contains many difficult expressions, which can be explained by underlying Greek; and *RB* adds many proper names not found in *RA*, all of which can be derived from Greek. The divergent endings of *RA* and *RB* might also be explained thus.

Chapter 8 (pp. 83-91) is a sustained argument for the *HA* being written in Tarsus. The evidence put forward for this proposition is rather circumstantial, beginning with the fact that Apollonius arrives in Tarsus by fate as opposed to there being a particular narrative dependent motivation; but the epitomised text that we have is lacking in motivating explanations for many of the events it narrates, and besides, a narrative has to be set *somewhere*—the choice of one place over another as setting for part of the story shows nothing about the place it was written. K. continues by comparing details of geography and institutions in the narrative of *RA* with what we know of Tarsus, in order to show that the author was familiar with Tarsus. If these arguments are accepted,

that is precisely what is shown: familiarity, not provenance. This knowledge of Tarsus K. corroborates mostly with reference to Strabo and to Dio Chrysostom's Tarsian orations; these or other contemporary texts could have been the source of the author's supposed familiarity with Tarsus; it is not at all unlikely that a writer in the Greek novelistic genre would be well read and employ such sources, as well as possible first-hand experience of some places, in order to provide accurate descriptions of a variety of locations in the Greek speaking world. Furthermore, some of the evidence K. adduces is not particularly unique to Tarsus, for instance the existence of an akropolis (p. 86); or the elders (οἱ γέροντες) as a political group (p. 87). Indeed in the latter case he cites C.B. Welles² stating that 'the Elders formed a distinct political organization both in Tarsus *and in many other cities* in that time,' (my emphasis); and whereas Dio Chys. *Or.* 34.16 refers to three bodies at Tarsus (δῆμος, βουλή and γέροντες), *HA* 10, *RA* 3 only refers to two: *cunctis civibus et maioribus eiusdem civitatis*. Altogether the arguments of this chapter do no more than make a Tarsian origin seem a possibility, and K. overstates his case in concluding that '*HA* very probably originated in Tarsus' (p. 88). As for the arguments from possible Graecisms in *RB* concerning going ashore for supplies, far from 'unmistakably point[ing] to Tarsus' (p. 90), these are even more general, applicable as they are to all seafaring and ports.

Chapters 9 and 10 (pp. 93-8) summarise the development of *HA* as K. sees it, and the implications of this for the edition. K.'s main aim is to provide a clear, readable text, "unhampered by countless, in themselves worthwhile, details" (p. 97; in this he is responding to criticism of his *editio maior*), and in this he is very successful. The text of the two recensions is presented on facing pages for ease of comparison, usually a chapter per page. There is an *apparatus fontium* which includes not only citations of Latin authors (including the Vulgate and other Christian texts) but also "the most striking parallels" (p. 97) with the Greek novels. Thus in the text itself as well as in the *prolegomena* K.'s

² "Hellenistic Tarsus", *Mélanges de l'Université Saint Joseph* 38, 1962, 41-75: 73 n. 3.

case for an original *HA* in the pagan Greek novel tradition is put forward. Of the *apparatus criticus*, K. states that it “has been kept down to a minimum” (p. 98), with readings of one, inferior MS recorded only selectively, and “on account of the totally different point of view, modern emendations and conjectures have been recorded only sporadically, in the text as well as the app. crit.” The resulting text is what might be called in normal circumstances a very conservative one, paring away as it does many alternative readings and proposed emendations of modern editors, to be left with something much closer to the MSS. But in this case there are good reasons, if K.’s highly plausible and well-argued case is accepted, for removing editorial changes based upon very different assumptions about the relation of *RA* and *RB* to each other and to preceding phases in the history of the *HA*. However, for all these reasons (as K. acknowledges, p. 98) his *editio maior* remains indispensable. We might add that for many purposes a more conventional edition (such as Schmeling’s Teubner³) will also retain its utility even with the acceptance of K.’s proposals, since it provides one text and not two, which surely provides a clearer presentation of the story, K.’s stated aim. That said, if the reader is convinced of K.’s hypotheses then the current edition will form the basis for any text of (either of) the two recensions.

There are several very useful indices: separate *indices locorum* for the Vulgate, other Latin, and Greek authors; an index of personal and geographical names; one of words and phrases from the text; one of grammatical and stylistic terms; and finally an index of passages discussed in the *prolegomena*. The book contains several errors, but all minor and none likely to cause the reader any difficulty.

In summary, then, this volume in all its components represents a significant contribution to studies on the text, history and interpretation of the *HA*. Most importantly, K.’s *prolegomena* bring new arguments (with varying degrees of convincingness and thoroughness) which combine to make a good case for a

³ G. Schmeling, *Historia Apollonii Regis Tyri*, Bibliotheca Teubneriana, Leipzig 1988.

revised history of the origins, translation and adaptation of the *HA*. Some of these arguments apparently stand to benefit greatly from a projected commentary by the same author, and there is no doubt that the simultaneous appearance of the two volumes would have been preferable, leaving the reader able to come to a less provisional judgement of K.'s individual points and the impressive overall picture he wants to build from them. The text does not aim to supercede K.'s own previous edition, and is too different in both its aims and its underlying assumptions to be usefully compared to other editions, but the principles upon which the edition is founded make it a text which should be consulted by any scholar concerned with the history of the *HA*, especially in its Greek and earliest Latin incarnations.

OWEN HODKINSON

The Queen's College, Oxford

owen.hodkinson@classics.ox.ac.uk