

MANUEL SANZ MORALES, *Chariton of Aphrodisias' Callirhoe: a critical edition*, Antike Texte 2, Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter, 2020, xxx+185 pp., €32,00, ISBN 978-3-8253-6615-5.

The stock of the ancient Greek novel has never been higher. The last two years alone have witnessed a glut of exegetical and textual-critical aids for those interested in this dazzling genre (if such it can be designated): editions and commentaries of Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe* and Achilles Tatius' *Leucippe and Clitophon* (Books 1-2) by, respectively, Ewen Bowie (2019) and Tim Whitmarsh (2020) in the Cambridge 'Green and Yellow' series, and of Antonius Diogenes' *The Wonders Beyond Thule* by Helena Schmedt for De Gruyter (2020). To this we can now add the volume under review, a critical edition of Chariton of Aphrodisias' *Chaereas and Callirhoe* by Manuel Sanz Morales (hereinafter S.M.).<sup>1</sup> It is destined to serve as the textual acolyte of the recently published commentary on the first four books of Chariton's novel, which S.M. has co-authored with Michael Baumbach (*Chariton von Aphrodisias, Kallirhoe: Kommentar zu den Büchern 1-4*, Heidelberg 2021).

Published in Winter Verlag's 'Antike Texte' series, S.M.'s *Callirhoe* is marketed as offering a reliable critical edition of the ancient text to students, scholars, and teachers. It does so with success, and at a very reasonable price. Its contents (on which I shall elaborate below) are as follows: a Preface (in English), which contains detailed discussion on witnesses to the text and its transmission, as well as some brief words on Chariton's linguistic aspects (characterised as a 'Hellenistic literary koiné', p. xvii; more promised in S.M. and Baumbach's commentary) and orthography (pp. v-xviii), a comprehensive bibliography on textual-critical matters relating to Chariton (pp. xix-xxvi), abbreviations and sigla (pp. xxvii-xxx); the text itself, including, at the foot of the page, a thorough but not overbearing *apparatus criticus* ('a more comprehensive critical apparatus than that of the editions of Chariton after Blake', p. xvi) and a slender *apparatus fontium* (pp. 1-166); an *apparatus criticus 'additicius'*, essentially a supplementary apparatus 'reflecting all the other corrections to the text, with the exception of those that are clearly erroneous' (pp. 167-79; quotation at p. xvi); and *index nominum*, which helpfully distinguishes between instances in the printed text and those in

<sup>1</sup> *Chaereas and Callirhoe* is the title awarded to the novel by F, the most significant – but not unproblematic – witness to the text of Chariton, although Sanz Morales, following the second-century and thus oldest extant witness, *P.Michael*. 1, as well as Chariton's sphragis at the very end of the novel, quite reasonably jettisons Chaereas and opts for *Callirhoe*.

the apparatuses (pp. 180–5). There is no *index verborum*. The combination of the conventional *app. crit.* and the supplementary *app. crit. 'additicius'* forms part of an effort to distil and bring under one roof the fruits of all the textual-critical labour brought to bear on Chariton's text, and is certainly one of the unique selling points of this edition (S.M. is explicit on such selling points at p. xvi). It would be fantastic if, in the future, this could be offered digitally such that it can be updated in line with developments in scholarship on Chariton's text.

The Preface does an excellent job of succinctly establishing the history of the text and how it came to be constituted. It is highly readable, and therefore makes for a reassuring entry-point for those who might characterise themselves as uninitiated in textual-critical matters. We learn that D'Orville's *editio princeps* only saw the light of day in 1750 and that it was based on an apograph of a thirteenth-century (or, less likely, fourteenth-century) Florentine codex (F: Florentinus Laurentianus Conventi Soppressi 627) produced in the 1720s (other apographs are listed on pp. viii–ix). At 140 folios, F contains the bulk of Chariton's novel (it is the 'sole witness for approximately 95% of the work'), as well as being the '*codex unicus* for the whole of Xenophon of Ephesus and for Longus 1.12.4–1.17.4' (p. v); this is significant for the question as to whether the novels constitute a coherent 'genre'. Subsequent editors of the text – Beck (1783), Hirschig (1856), Hercher (1859) – never consulted F but relied on D'Orville, and even the results of Cobet's collation of the manuscript in 1842 were beset by complications, including an incident involving a chemical reagent that rendered some of it illegible. The editions of Blake (1938), Molinié (1979), and Reardon (2004) were, however, based on collation of F – whilst S.M. has also consulted the codex, he quite reasonably offers an apologia for not himself having undertaken a collation of it, on the basis that 'the work of all these scholars made it unnecessary to collate F anew for the present edition' (p. viii).

The Preface also makes it clear that F is not the only game in town. The existence of four second- and third-century papyri (*P. Michael.* 1; *P. Fay.* 1; *P. Oxy.* 1019, 2948) suggests that during this period 'Chariton's novel enjoyed considerable popularity' (p. x). To F we can also add the *codex Thebanus deperditus*: a seventh-/eighth-century manuscript of Egyptian provenance (perhaps originally belonging to a library of a monastery in Upper Egypt, p. xi), it was transcribed by Wilcken and used for his 1901 edition, but met its fiery and watery end when the boat on which it was being transported from the archaeological expedition at Egyptian Thebes went up in flames while anchored at Hamburg, the codex hence earning the cognomen '*deperditus*' – Chariton clearly jinxed his own textual transmission when he torched Chaereas' ship off Miletus (3.7.3). S.M. does a fine job of summing up the similarities and differences between the witnesses, as well as their various virtues and faults: in general, F is closer to the papyri than is the *codex*

*Thebanus*; F and the papyri offer something approximating an original version; the papyri themselves are superior to F, and, according to S.M., ‘the discrepancies in the papyri cannot simply be explained as mechanical copying errors’ (p. xiii); the *codex Thebanus* represents a version of the text containing ‘interpolation of expressions or phrases ... [designed] to make the text more attractive for a readership which enjoyed the exotic or sentimental’ (p. xiv). Reiterating a conclusion elaborated at greater length elsewhere, S.M. very interestingly determines also that ‘the papyri present a rough copy, made with no desire to be absolutely exact; a dictated copy...’ (p. xiv). Indeed, it is one of the strengths of this edition that so much previous scholarship on these matters, much of it by S.M. himself, has been condensed into easily digestible nuggets of information whose details the reader can follow up using the fulsome footnotes and bibliography.

As far as the text goes, it is against Reardon’s Teubner edition (2004) that S.M.’s will no doubt be judged – favourably in my view, as has already been the case in reviews so far published (W.M. Owens, *BMCR* 2021, <https://bmc.brynmawr.edu/2021/2021.01.12/>; J.R. Morgan, *CR* 71.1, 2020, 74–6). Reardon’s edition is undoubtedly authoritative. It represents a marked improvement on Molinié’s Budé (1979) (see Reardon’s own critical review of this edition: *REG* 95, 1982, 157–73) and, as befits a Teubner, offers more by way of manifest textual-critical infrastructure than does Goold’s highly readable Loeb edition (1995). Whilst Reardon was responsible for a game-changing edition of Chariton, it cannot be said that S.M. merely rides in his wake. More frequently than not he favours the reading of F where Reardon prefers to emend, and he is also less indulgent of the *codex Thebanus* than Reardon. In these respects he is a little more conservative. He does, however, (following most editors) prefer the papyri’s spelling of Καλλιρόη to F’s Καλλιρρόη (although the latter does make an appearance at e.g. 1.3.4, 1.4.9). S.M. is also keen to incorporate his own (often previously published) conjectures. For example, at 1.7.1, where F characterises the pirate Theron as sailing the seas ἐξ ἀδικίας (‘as a criminal’), S.M. conjectures ἐκ Λυκίας (‘from Lycia’, the operational base of Theron’s pirate crew); this is supported by 1.13.9, where Theron talks of an onward journey to Lycia, and is cross-referenced in the *app. crit.* as such. This is another selling point of S.M.’s apparatus, that it frequently incorporates cross-references (via the ‘cf.’ manoeuvre) to *loci* in Chariton’s text as well as in the other novelists that corroborate or otherwise bear on the editorial choice.

S.M. includes an *apparatus fontium* that is more heavy duty than that of Reardon. It contains three types of information: (i) citations / quotations (frequently of Homer or Xenophon’s *Cyropedia*); (ii) allusions to a range of Greek authors working in different genres (and notably, at 3.5.4, even to Latin poetry, in this instance Verg. *Aen.* 4.323, though there is surely more going on in the novel than this single instance: see D.A. Jolowicz, *Latin Poetry in*

*the Ancient Greek Novels*, Oxford 2021); (iii) other relevant information that connects with previous literature (e.g., at 1.1.3, the fact that Ariston is a Thucydidean name, or, at 2.2.1, that Plangon is a New Comic name). The *apparatus fontium* also stands out for the fact that it offers accompanying contextualising information (in Latin), thus lending a hand to the reader who wants to press the reference into the service of interpretation. It also very usefully includes cross-references to other relevant passages in Chariton's text. It is worth noting here that, as befits an *apparatus* 'of sources', all the references look backwards in time rather than forwards, which begs the question of the author's date (this currently irresolvable issue is very briefly addressed at p. x, insofar as it is given a *terminus ante quem* on the basis of the dating of the papyri). It is thus telling that, for example, at 7.5.10, while Xenophon and Demades are offered as possible sources of an allusion, the imperial author Plutarch is relegated to a 'cf.' category. I imagine that many of the matters discussed in this paragraph will be elaborated on in S.M. and Baumbach's commentary, at least those concerning the first four books of the novel.

In sum, students and scholars of Chariton are on very safe ground with S.M.'s new edition. Although it by no means replaces Reardon's Teubner, it offers something a little different in terms of text and apparatuses. Its accessible English-language Preface will welcome the neophyte, whilst the *apparatus criticus* 'addictius' will offer potentially fresh (or indeed long-forgotten) pastures for seasoned Chariton scholars.

DANIEL JOLOWICZ  
King's College London  
daniel.jolowicz@kcl.ac.uk