

APOLLONIUS RESARTUS: A STUDY IN CONJECTURAL CRITICISM

J. M. HUNT

FOR centuries readers of the influential *Historia Apollonii Regis Tyri* had been misconceiving its style and composition. The reason? In retrospect, simple: the tale had been edited under false premises. It had been edited as if the finished product might possess a single uniformity; as if, in effect, a motley pack of MSS whose line of division is recensional might somehow impart, through this choice here and that choice there, the tale's *Urform*. As for the aforementioned readers, *uel duo uel nemo*, I suspect, allowed his eye to stray into the large and amorphous notes then passing for an apparatus criticus. If he did he found profusion and confusion; he found a bewildering tangle of *lectiones*, *uariationes*, *intrusa*, *extrusa*, *interpolationes*—call them what you will. Such a tangle, on intuition perhaps, should not have been trimmed into a single recension; but trimmed it was and, in default of better material(s), trimmed it almost had to be. That is why even A. Riese's edition of 1871 was doomed to be, from its birth and conception, useless, or nearly so, and pernicious.

There followed, in 1888, an edition by M. Ring. Ring was no critic; and if his edition, *qua* edition, was of little moment, far otherwise was the MS (P) he brought to light. In the decade prior Riese had been working in comparative darkness. He had based his text on a MS (A) which, estimable though it was, contained scarcely a third of the tale. Its losses he was therefore obliged to repair from other MSS, promiscuously or even eclectically—yet in the end disastrously. Against this backdrop the new MS, once identified as A's younger brother, was a boon and a blessing. And no wonder: by containing the full tale, it repaired A's losses; by serving as a check, it served to settle (or unsettle) A's readings; and by being related to A, by that alone, it taught how unworthy MSS once assumed related were of that assumption. What more? It changed the basis of the text and, with it, its format: AP would now form one recension, other MSS another, and others still others.

In the wake of Ring's discovery Riese issued, in 1893, a second and vastly different edition. "Ex his duobus libris," claims he of AP, "iam nunc Apollonium genuinum edere mihi licet, quod olim fieri non poterat nisi in eis partibus, quae libro A extant" (*praef.*, p. iv). On the superiority of AP, "quos libros maxime omnium ad genuinam libelli formam accedere . . . apparet," see his *praefatio* for details. (The sanguine talk of *Apollonius genuinus*, of course, never mind; consider it the ghost of "attainable *Urform*" trying to repossess its erstwhile victim.) In this edition, beneath the text

of AP, stands that of several MSS belonging to a separate, the so-called B, recension.

Of the scores of MSS belonging to lesser recensions, appraised though these have been by E. Klebs in his long and laborious tome of 1899, I take no account. It is not from such MSS and the later versions of the tale which they purvey that an early version, like that of AP, most needs help: it is from AP. And my business here is with AP; I treat B sometimes as a foil to AP, sometimes for its own problems. What I offer then is essentially an *ars corrigendi*, a series of original conjectures not only made but—where further evidence may control the process of testing—tested. Nor do I overlook, in the example of the last editor, “the application of thought to textual criticism”: hence a certain fullness. My scheme is this. In section I, I consider in what spirit, for a *locus corruptus* in AP (or B), B (or AP) might be invoked. Here my emphasis is upon—since who does not sense the facile restoration of obviously lost similarities?—the allowance of differences. In section II, I show how, by this or that criterion, an already entrenched correction might still be refined. The corruption of the passage perhaps owing to perseveration, to errors of perseveration I turn next. I devote section III wholly to their kin, errors of anticipation. In section IV, I illustrate a source of error, dittography, whose ease and frequency my predecessors have conspicuously underrated. And finally, in section V, I subjoin conjectures on two other passages.

Of preface, already, enough and more. The text, cited by page and line, is Riese’s second edition, and must be, until such time as these offerings, others from the same hand, and others from yet other hands fly before the face of the next editor.¹

I

29. 7–13 Quem ut uidit rex flentem, respiciens filiam suam ait “nata dulcis, peccasti, quod dum teiust† nomen et casus adolescentis agnosceres, ueteres ei renouasti dolores. Ergo, dulcis et sapiens filia, ex quo agnouisti ueritatem, iustum est, ut ei liberalitatem tuam quasi regina ostendas.”

... “nata dulcis, peccasti. Dum uis nomen et casus adolescentis scire, ueteres ei renouasti dolores. Peto itaque, domina, ut quidquid uis iuueni dones.” B

Against *eius* Riese’s apparatus commends two conjectures, Ring’s *et* and his own *dum uis* . . . *agnoscere* [s]. The former we may instantly reject. Not only is it overemphatic, it varies without cause the formula fixed at 29. 2

1. The editions of the *Historia Apollonii Regis Tyri* are by A. Riese (Leipzig, 1871 and 1893) and M. Ring (Posen–Leipzig, 1888). Comparison of Riese’s first and second editions will provide a demonstration scarcely to be surpassed of the historical character of criticism. For *Überlieferungsgeschichte*, or the tale’s predisposition to recomposition, see E. Klebs, *Die Erzählung von Apollonius aus Tyrus* (Berlin, 1899).

References, unless otherwise labelled, are to the AP recension. To denominate the recension itself I have used AP, even where A’s testimony is unavailable. In places of doubt, therefore, the reader should consult Riese² to see whether, under the terms of that edition, P is *testis unicus*. Usually it is. For a handful of readings from FG, two MSS affiliated with AP, cf. Klebs, *Erzählung*, pp. 54–62.

"indica mihi *nomen et casus tuos*." The latter, though entailing further change, derives support from the B recension's *dum uis . . . scire*. Derives support: that is all. For differences between the AP and B recensions—be they differences of style (vocabulary and syntax) or content (inclusion or exclusion)—are many. Sometimes they are trivial or inconclusive, sometimes problematic. Where they are problematic they must be scrutinized and, if found "honest," imperatively allowed. A conjecture like Riese's then, if it ignores differences where differences exist, if it has recourse to B, and nothing more, will end criticism before criticism has properly begun. And worse, it will inspire confidence where all else counsels caution. Yet suppose it is right: how, ideally, can we tell? Ideally, it will be right not because it is found in B, but because it is better per se and nearer AP's style than its rivals; because it plausibly accounts for AP's reading; and because, in addition to this, it is found in B.²

In the context Archistrates has invited Apollonius, *naufragus* young and captivating, to a *cena*. The *rex* naturally has a *filia speciosa* who naturally meets the guest and whose love for the guest naturally, in the course of the *cena*, crystallizes. The *filia*, as the topos further dictates, is curious to a fault. When therefore she probes into the guest's past, she probes too deeply, causing him to weep and her father, contrary to his word (28. 11–13 "interroga illum; decet . . . te, filia sapientissima, omnia nosse"), to intervene. From the words of his intervention, which are the words of our passage, proceed next to the core of the problem: their style.

What, in the two recensions, are the differences in vocabulary and syntax, and what do those differences imply? Notice at once how the propriety of *agnoscere* to AP is underscored by the repetition, surely conscious, of *agnoui* in the following sentence: no accident that in B the repetition, no longer organic, no longer appears. Notice further, in point of meaning, that *agnosco* in AP can function alone as a finite verb and therefore, if the subjunctive is to be used, itself be the subjunctive: *scio*, on the other hand, cannot. Once let variation to *scio* occur, *scires*, in answer to *agnoscere*, becomes a flat impossibility. A prolative verb upon which the new verb may depend is thus the direst of necessities. But why *uis*? Or, rather, why the difference in mood? And should we, following Riese, disallow the difference? There happens to exist proof, proof positive, that we should allow it; that the moods as transmitted are exactly and demonstrably, not merely conceivably, right. That proof is this: *dum* with the subjunctive is a stylistic distinction of AP, but not of B. Consider 19. 12 *dum nauigare*t AP (*dum . . . nauigat* B), 23. 15–24. 1 *dum . . . cogitare*t (*dum cogitat*), 24. 8 *dum . . . uidere*t (*dum . . . intuetur*), 28. 1 *dum hortare*tur (*dum hortatur*), 28. 4 *dum osculare*tur (*dum . . . osculatur*), 43. 5 *dum . . . laudare*t (*dum . . . mirantur*), 46. 4–6 *dum . . . detinerentur* (*dum . . . detinetur*). What could be more compelling?³

2. Here I echo Housman's *aurea dicta*, *Manilius*, 5 vols. (Cambridge, 1937), 1:lx.

3. Never, incidentally, is the converse true, that AP has *dum* with the indicative where B has *dum* with the subjunctive—though on occasion, to be sure, both may have *dum* with the indicative.

The subjunctive established, *eius* remains. Look at it: what can it be but the vestige of a comparative adverb? For the precise adverb, of course, I cannot answer; it might have been *accuratius* or *certius* or *diligentius* or something else. My best surmise is that it was *(pl)ēius*. For the comparative of this adverb in this position in its clause, compare 23. 3 “ut *plenius* misericordiae suae satisfaceret” and 102. 8–9 “ut ergo *plenius* uestrae felicitati gratias referat.” And in context what could be apter than a comparative? The *filia* already knows Apollonius’ (mere) *nomen et casus*; for when she asked (29. 2), “indica mihi nomen et casus tuos,” he told her (29. 3–4), “si nomen quaeris, Apollonius sum uocatus; si de thesauro quaeris, in mari perdidit.” When next she asked (29. 4–5), “*apertius* indica mihi, ut intelligam,” he obliged her with a fuller account and, that completed, began to weep.

Transcriptional probability? This concern I put where it belongs, last, and I put it briefly.⁴ Riese subtracts one letter from one place, another from another, and inverts two more: I add two letters in one place. *Utrum quam alterum uiolentius?*

21. 3–4 Tunc quisque rapit tabulam, mortemque †minatur†. B

In his first edition Riese printed this sentence as a hexameter, the last of the preceding *descriptio tempestatis*. What tempted him is obvious—the coincidence that words entitled by ambivalence of position to be a hexameter, but for a hemiepes, *are* a hexameter. He therefore inserted *sibi* before *quisque*. Nothing could have been easier; and yet nothing could have been more misguided and nothing, surely, more detrimental to the subsequent amendment of *mortemque minatur*. That the words should not be in verse Riese might have determined, even then, on the observation that they refer to the effects of the storm on Apollonius and his men. The *descriptio*, by contrast, bears no such reference; it is sheer *exornatio*—a high-flown commentary on the narrative while never, quite, the narrative itself. And is this not, according to Menippean convention, precisely what one would expect? The expectation, had Riese but entertained it, was soon to be strengthened by the reading, in Ring’s MS, “Tunc unusquisque sibi rapuit tabulas, morsque nuntiatur.”

So much for editorial history. Whether Riese’s present text of *Tunc . . . tabulam* is altogether sound I do not presume to decide. Perhaps the cadence, if not fortuitous, represents a middle state which we have no choice but to suffer. Perhaps the words are corrupt and, if they could be recaptured, would be, if not exactly P’s, P’s in part and in part B’s own.⁵ Why speculate? From the beginning of the sentence then, where recensional differences cannot reliably be traced, come to its end, where they can.

Here the critic’s torment is *minatur*. And yet in Riese’s “*num miratur?*”

4. Here less briefly: from the MS reading, which is *e’ . . . agnosceres*, Riese subtracts the one letter of *eius* that is transmitted, inverts the untransmitted (but implied) *iu*, and then subtracts the *s* from *agnosceres*. That *eius* wears (as it wears elsewhere in P) the abbreviation *e’* suggests that it is, if anything, old and ingrained.

5. See Riese², *praef.*, p. x, n. 3; Klebs, *Erzählung*, p. 119.

most, rather than respect the particle, will probably acquiesce. Why? Principally no doubt because *miratur*, but for the prolongation of a stroke, will match *minatur*; and secondarily because it will turn nonsense into sense.⁶ Just reasons on the face of them, the correction stands condemned by yet another—its manifest resourcelessness. Resourceless I must call it when Riese fails to consider, for the light it might throw on B, P's *morsque nuntiatur*.⁷ Not that he does not consider it in its own recension: he does; he invests it in the apparatus with the interpretation "*nuntiatur sc. litteris nauigantium in mare demissis*" and in the index with a reference to "Xen. (*Ephesiaca*) II 11, 10 μόλις ἐν σαναίδι σωθέντες." On so foolish an interpretation evoking so foolish a spectacle I waste little print. To picture it is to refute it. And the violence that it does to *nuntiatur* it does also, necessarily, to *tabulas*. That these are the planks of a ship undergoing wreck seems confirmed, if confirmation be wanted, by 21. 9–10 "Apollonius uero *unius tabulae* beneficio in Pentapolitarum est litore pulsus." Let this be the accepted interpretation: what then will *mors . . . nuntiatur* mean? Presumably that death, or death's harbinger, presents itself to the sailors; that "death is foreseen by them."⁸ The phrase, though unusual, is surely sound. And equally surely it should not replace B's *mortem . . . minatur*, a replacement which *mortem* peremptorily forbids. The problem then will be to retain *mortem* and yet respect the sense, possibly even the traces, of *nuntiatur*. Solve it by adding one letter and reading *mortemque* <ο>*minatur*, "each one has a presentiment of death."⁹ The conjecture is Robert Renahan's. And in a larger sense what could be more scintillating? AP as the more literary recension will flaunt the *recherché* phrase, which B will once have varied, as elsewhere it varies, according to its lights.

A final point, for what it may be worth. In the variant reading *moratur* I seem to detect a paleographical argument that tells strongly in favor of

6. Or will it? The sense which Riese himself accords it seems neither suitable nor sufferable. To him his *miratur* should mean *intuetur*—a meaning further commended, he promises, by 2. 14 "*miratur scelesti patris impietatem*." This parallel is no parallel. Upon the impiety of one's father one may perhaps "look with wonder," but scarcely upon one's own death. If a defense for *miratur* is forthcoming, I suspect it ought rather to come from 64. 14–16. There it is said of Apollonius' *casus* that he "(in) naufragium incidit, *mortem uidit*, sua perdidit, exitium penuriae perpressus est."

7. An initial conjecture of my own, I admit, lay exposed to the same charge. I wanted to read *mortemque* <omnia> *minantur*. *Omnia* was to comprise the threatening forces of the tempest as catalogued in the poem. And I was prepared to cite Virg. *Aen.* 1. 91 "praesentemque uiris intentant omnia mortem" (the *intentant* of which, significantly, Servius Auctus explains *minantur*), Catull. 64. 187 "ostentant omnia letum," and Gell. 1. 2. 5 "periculis mortem minitantibus."

8. "By them": the ellipse postulated is those immediately involved, the sailors themselves. On Riese's interpretation one would be forced to postulate "others"—*alii*—and not a little obtrusively. For who the others were, or where, or in what spirit they might hear these tidings from the vasty deep, our *auctor* nowhere tells.

9. In origin, to be sure, both *nuntio* and *ominor* partake of prophecy—"Wort der . . . Augural-sprache," say Walde-Hofmann, *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*³, 3 vols. (Heidelberg, 1938–56), s.v. *nuntius*. The associations of the words, it might even be felt, are enhanced by the preceding "Triton terribili cornu cantabat in undis." Triton in the poem was announcing disaster with his *terribile cornu*—"prophetic powers" being, as West remarks on *Theog.* 233, "often attributed to marine deities." Did an early redactor, anterior to AP and B, intend the line of poetry to foreshadow this detail of the narrative? Whether he did or not, it does. So much for the words: for the thought, cf. Prop. 3. 11. 5 "uenturam melius praesagit nauita mortem." Corrupt or sound, as this stands it is a parallel.

ominatur. That reading, I would first concede, might have arisen by conjecture—the conjecture of a scribe resolved, as we have seen the scribes were, to have the words in verse. And a very pretty adonic *mortemque moratur* would make.¹⁰ Otherwise it arose by mistake—a mistake whereby, in an original *ominatur*, the *o* was lost (*minatur*), then added overhead

^o
(*minatur*), then inserted on the wrong side of *m* (*monatur*), with *moratur* as the inevitable sequel. This I could believe.¹¹ And my belief would seem

^u ⁱⁿ ^u ^o
bolstered by, from B, 9. 10 *afferre*, 20. 7 *flamma*, 31. 8 *canto*, 34. 8 *gaudia*,
^s
and 51. 1 *manu*.

58. 4–6 Ciues uero memores beneficiorum patris tui Apollonii liberabunt
te †neesse est†.

In AP Riese daggers the ^e*necess ē* of P, which B notably lacks. A conservative critic would but rivet the words, paratactically, to the end—“liberabunt te: necesse est”—and go his way. What has eluded notice, and yet appears crucial, is the likeness of this sentence to 17. 5–6 “*si necesse fuerit*, pro salute tua dimicabunt.” Greater likeness still has the context. The help which the Tharsians there pledge to Apollonius, “whenever the need arises,” is here pledged to his daughter—their namesake—Tharsia. With “ascende *in forum*, et inuenies *statuam* patris tui *Apollonii*” and “*ciues uero memores beneficiorum . . . Apollonii*” (58. 2–3 and 58. 4–5) compare, in the chapter succeeding the aforementioned sentence, 17. 11–12 “*huius beneficii memores*” and 18. 10–12 “*ciues uero* his tantis *beneficiis* cumulati . . . *statuam . . . collocauerunt in foro*.” In the troublesome *necesse est*, then, we are facing a reminiscence—but on whose part, scribe’s or *auctor*’s? If on the scribe’s: one might be emboldened, leaning the more heavily on B, to seclude. I would not. In B the words and the word order diverge as the sentence progresses; and, since by its end B’s *iniuriam tuam uindicabunt* would contrast with (were AP also to lack *necesse est*) *liberabunt te*, absolute responsion is obviously not to be pressed. If on the *auctor*’s: one might prefix *si* and perhaps then, if he were slavish, consider whether *ē*, instead of being *est*, might not be *fuerit*. Let it be *est*. And let the sentence exemplify a recurrent theme couched in similar—not the same—diction.

Si fell out as small words will. For the same fall-out, see 34. 12–35. 2

10. As pretty as *mortemque minatur* (Virg. *Aen.* 10. 900 *mortemque minaris*, 11. 348 *mortemque minetur*; Stat. *Theb.* 6. 458 *mortemque minantur*). Prettier only, in sheer abruptness, would be the sequence. In our sentence “each one seizes a plank and delays death,” and in the next “they all perished.”

11. The less credulous might prefer to appeal to a psychological lapse. *Quisque rapit tabulam* implying an attempt to avoid or delay death, what easier than for a scribe—his mind dominated by *MORTemque*—unwittingly to lapse into *MORaTur*? A parallel worth a hundred exists, in the same recession, at 62. 11–12 “*Villicus post moram exiit et uidens puellam raptam a morte, egit deo gratias*.” Here it is a fact that part of B, for *moram*, carries *mortem*. Was the motive *mortis* before, in lines 6–7 (“*et uidentes puellam sub iugo mortis stare*”), *morte* after, in line 12, or the idea of death pervading the previous context?

"*peto itaque et iuro tibi per regni mei uires ut, <si> desiderio natae meae parueris, quidquid tibi iratum abstulit mare, ego in terris restituam.*" (Thus read and punctuate; Riese reads and punctuates, "*peto itaque ut desiderio natae meae parueris, et iuro tibi per regni uires: quidquid tibi iratum abstulit mare, ego in terris restituam.*" Not only is his transposition of *ut . . . parueris* gratuitous; in view of the mood and tense of *parueris* it is perverse. Cf. 41. 10–12 "*iuraueras magistro meo Apollonio, ut si desiderio meis uel doctrinis paruisset, dares illi, quidquid iratum abstulit mare,*" and besides, for the placement of *si*, 62. 1–3 B "*peto, domine, ut, si iam nulla spes est uitae meae, deum mihi testari permittas.*")

II

57. 2–4 Quam pater tuus facto loculo cum ornamentis regalibus et XX sestertiis auri in mare demisit, ut ubi fuisset delata, ipsa testis *sui esset*.

In the text ought to stand not *sui esset*, the editorial sorting of P's *fuisse*, but *sibi esset*. *Sibi esset* would have been *siuisset*; and if an intermediary *siui* strikes anyone as offensive, let him ask himself why, in the same recension, *ualnea*, *pleueium*, *uica* (*biga*), *uase* (*base*), *guuernius*, *guūnum*, and *rediuiba* do not so strike him. What is clear is that, to whatever extent the conjectures resemble the ductus, the ductus should not have the last, or the only, word. Who knows? The corruption might have been due not merely, or even primarily, to resemblance; it might be due to the preceding "*ubi fuisset delata.*" If so, it was less a confusion on the spot, more a conditioned confusion, a *Perseverationsfehler*. Attend therefore to usage. Not only does the B recension answer our passage with "*ipsa sibi testis erit*": P itself obligingly reiterates the very incident with "in loculum deposui cum XX sestertiis auri, ut ubi inuenta fuisset, ipsa *sibi* testis esset" (108. 4–6).

On errors of perseveration P will prove its own best illustrator. To the foregoing passage, if such was its error, add 47. 9–11 "*placet tibi, ut eius corpus in pelagus mittam, †qui† me naufragum suscepit et egenum?*" No call here for the obelus. Read *quae*, the *qui* having sprung from 47. 1–3 "*quid respondebo pro te patri tuo . . . , qui me naufragum suscepit pauperem et egenum?*" The antecedent is *eius*—Apollonius' seemingly departed wife, who in this passage satisfies the clause's claim as properly as her father in that. At 69. 10 "*audi casus infelicitatis (infirmitatis P) meae,*" Riese was wise to adopt Velsler's *infelicitatis*—witness B's "*casus infelicissimae uirginis audi.*" Was not *infirmitatis* the product of some scribe's mind, still flitting through which was 56. 3–4 "*casus infirmitatis eius explorat?*" And what of 72. 4–5 "*aliorum coeperunt expectare exitum . . . illis expectantibus per occultum aspectum . . .*" and Riese's "*spectantibus puto?*" The safest answer no doubt is *non liquet*. But if Riese is right, and *expectantibus* is not late Latin for *spectantibus*,¹² the preceding *expectare* will have entrained the error in reading. At 77. 8–9 "[*sc. Apollonius ut audiuit*] *sic ait* 'Tharsia

12. E. Loefstedt, *Philologischer Kommentar zur "Peregrinatio Aetherae"* (Uppsala, 1911), p. 216.

filia mea . . . decessit,' " against A's *sic ait* P has—strangely—*scias*. Strangely only to the extent that the error is not *sciat*, and therefore visual; not at all strangely if the scribe was but recalling the look and thought, four lines above, of "*scilo (cito P) Tharsiam filiam tuam . . . fuisse defunctam.*" Compare 8. 6 *scias*, 17. 12 *scilote*, and 42. 5–6 *scilote filiam meam*, where *sciat* B. And why at 92. 8–9 does Riese disobey the injunction of his own apparatus ("*quaestionum ex B emendandum*") by obelizing the word in his text? Misgivings about the *ratio corruptelae*? For his text is "Item puella inflammata *prudencia* †*quaestionum*† ait ad eum," whereas B has *solutionum*. Adopt B's reading and ascribe the error in AP to the sentence, five lines above, "Tamen respondeo *quaestionibus* tuis: miror enim te in tam tenera aetate talem *prudenciam* habere." Particularly instructive, finally, as a footnote in the history of scholarship is 42. 1–2 "Postera uero die *uocantur* amici, *inuocantur* uicinarum urbium postestates." Here Riese, while printing P's *inuocantur*, had the candor to conjecture *inuulantur*. And yet Klebs, in the happy position of knowing that FG confirm the conjecture, preferred to conceal the coincidence.¹³ Black ingratitude? Appropriate comment in Housman, *Manilius*, 5:xxxiii–xxxiv.

I will mention one similar error from B not merely because it pleads for recognition but because, into the bargain, Riese has deserted a true reading for a false. At 36. 8–10 here is what he reads: "Sed ne uidear uos"—the three suitors—"saepius differre, scribite in codicellis nomina uestra et dotis quantitatem; *mittite* filiae meae, ut ipsa eligat, quem uoluerit." And yet in the apparatus against the *mitto* of b, one of B's MSS, he nerves himself to wonder whether "recte?" The wonder here is how he thought, on any grounds, he could read what factors internal and external flatly preclude. Did he think it a blunder as old as B itself? That would be to suppose that the blunder was committed, not by one of a hundred inattentive scribes, but by a redactor so ignorant of plot that he did not know, when he wrote *mittite* in this line, that in the very next he would write "Rex accepit codicellos et anulo suo signauit; et dat Apollonio"—who was not one of the three suitors—"dicens ei ' . . . hos codicellos perfer discipulae tuae ' " (36. 11–13) and, six lines after that, "codicellos, quos tibi *pater tuus misit*" (37. 5). That would be, besides, to fly full in the face of AP's " . . . scribite in codicellos nomina uestra et dotis quantitatem; et *dirigo* ipsos codicellos filiae meae. . . ." Nor (need I say?) is this the place for slogans. It would be as much an abuse to call *mittite* the *lectio difficilior* as to call *mitto* the *facilior*, and it would be an understatement to call the latter the *melior*. What is left but authority?¹⁴ And if Riese thought *mittite* had authority, then probably it was at the confusion of *-ite* and *-o* that he stuck, finding it unfathomable. The culprit is of course *scribITE*, the error again perseverative, a type involving the assimilation of a preceding termination. Did Riese fancy it never happens? It happens to the best: even R. G. Bury, usually vigilant in such matters, has on page 226 of volume 4 of his *Gibbon* "to conspire

13. *Erzählung*, pp. 61, 247, n. 3.

14. But even authority would be an abuse. "When reason has a word to utter," as Housman asserts (*Classical Papers* [Cambridge, 1972], p. 500), "authority must sit mum."

with their implacable enemies against a gracious and liberable benefactor." For this and other (often delightful) specimens, see J. Jackson, *Marginalia Scaenica* (Oxford, 1955), pp. 105–6.

69. 4–6 Sed Athenagora princeps affuit prior et uelato capite ingreditur
ad lupanar.

In the narrative already someone has accosted a king thrice, *ingressus* . . . *ad regem* (5. 12–6. 1, 7. 2, 11. 10–11), a husband once, *ingressa ad maritum suum* (63. 11). Conditioned by having edited, in those passages properly, *ingredi ad aliquem*, Riese seems to be acting on the reflex when he comes in this to edit *ingredi ad locum*. Apparently he has forgotten 23. 15 *ingreditur portam*, 24. 7 *ingreditur lauacrum*, 27. 1–2 *ingresso* . . . *triclinium*, 40. 8 *ingreditur domum regiam*, and 61. 8 *ingressa monumentum*; nor has he reason, having yet to edit, yet to know of 105. 8 *ingredere templum* and 114. 12 *ingressus est palatium*.¹⁵ Let us be honest: *ingredi ad locum* contains a contradiction. No marvel therefore that when the verb is so constructed elsewhere—in this recension or in Latin in general—it is constructed without *ad*. In this passage, moreover, the preceding sentence has "ducITUR ad LUPANAR." What scribe, while the ink of that sentence still was wet, would not be enticed to interpolate, between *ingredITUR* and *LUPANAR*, a similar *ad*? A classic case of interpolation through perseveration, and one of any number.¹⁶

The others the reader must ferret out for himself; his editor, by helping him only sporadically (and then imprecisely), helps him criminally little. I enlarge. I begin with 49. 4–6 "Et uidens subito ad caput eius pecuniam positam . . . [et] ait." Why no explanatory note when, saliently, *et ait* hovers three lines overhead? At 68. 12–69. 1 ". . . libram dabit; postea uero singulos aureos populo patebit. Fecit uillicus . . .," in stating "postea uero ante fecit falso iteratum P," Riese states a fact, an accurate fact, but again hides the cause. What seduced the scribe into writing a second *postea uero* was, when his eye met *paleBIT*, its utter likeness to the *daBIT* that had preceded the first. Or suppose at 77. 6–7, where P has "Apollonius ut audiuit tremebundus ut audiuit toto corpore . . .," P were our solitary witness: which would be the repetition? Again no help, no enlightening help, from Riese's "ut audiuit ante toto repetitum P." Nor is there need here of A, though here A exists, to tell us that the truth is "Apollonius ut audiuit tremebundus toto corpore. . . ." P itself tells us by 68. 2–3 "Puella uero ut haec audiuit toto corpore contremuit" and 76. 1–2 "Scelerata mulier hoc audito toto corpore contremuit."¹⁷ At 80. 8–9 "Cum igitur [omnes] nautae

15. Perhaps he remembers 27. 1 *ad cenam ingredi*, assuming it to be a parallel? A parallel, I say then, it is not and can never be, because *ad cenam* constitutes an idiom independent of the verb.

16. For another in another work, see my "Emendation in the *Epitoma Melensis*," *CP* 67 (1972): 288–89.

17. Was the repetition assisted by the similarity of the preceding *ApolloniUS* in these passages and the *tremebundUS* in ours? Cf. later, at 112. 2–3, "Mulier mala, ut uidit eam, . . . timo† (toto B) corpore contremuit." As for the obelus here, my head goes round: does Riese imagine that P's *imo* can be a corruption of anything but *toto*? Only let *TOTO* dwindle to *TO* and from *TO*, if misread *to*, nothing but *imo* could ensue.

Apollonii . . . conuiuuium melius ceteris nauibus *celebrarent*," where (and presumably because) deletion of *omnes* has status as the vulgate, the apparatus is stone silent. Was *omnes* generated spontaneously then? Why not indicate that it was in effect invited into this context from 79. 12–80. 1 "*ergo omnes diem festum celebrant praeter me*"? And lastly at 111. 12–14, where in the text Riese reads, on Bonnet's deletion, "*Ecce ostendam uobis; et hoc* (Riese: *ex hoc* P), *quod uisuri estis, . . . testimoniis uobis [ex hoc] ante probabo*," in the apparatus he does but note "*ex hoc ex u. 13 repetitum*." This is no mere repetition, but one prompted expressly by the context—to wit, by *uobis*.

III

58. 7–10 Cui Tharsia ait "cara nutrix, testor deum, quod si fortasse aliqui casus *mihi* euenissent, antequam haec mihi referres, penitus ego nescissem stirpem natiuitatis meae!"

"If anything had happened *to me* before you told me the true story, I would never have known my parentage." The problem here is *mihi*. The *si*-clause contains a custom-staled euphemism for death, but whose death? The speaker is Tharsia, the hearer the nurse. Therefore, if Tharsia had died before being told by the nurse, she, Tharsia, would never have known. Quite true, but absurdly and irrelevantly true. In the context it is the nurse, rather, who is about to die. Her dying words she has already uttered in the immediately preceding—and meticulously meditated—death speech (56. 4–58. 6). "*Audi, . . . mea Tharsia*," the speech proper begins, "*stemmata originis tuorum natalium, ut scias, quid post mortem meam facere debeas*" (56. 10–12). What then could be more inopportune or more unintended than the mention of death—hypothetical death—on Tharsia's part?

Restore *tibi*. *Mihi* sprouted from "*antequam haec mihi referres, penitus ego. . .*" Compare now B's "*si prius senectae tuae naturaliter accidisset quam haec mihi referres*."

56. 4–6 Nutrix uero . . . dixit ei "*audi et aniculae morientis uerba suprema, domina Tharsia; audi et pectori tuo manda*."

The *et* of the first "*audi et*" is naught. Delete it, as it asks audibly to be deleted, as an anticipation of "*audi et . . . manda*." Compare B's "*audi, domina, morientis ancillae tuae uerba suprema et pectori commenda*." Similar errors of anticipation recur at 38. 9–10 "*quod [tam] pudica uirgo tam impudenter scripserim*," where Riese deletes *tam*, and possibly 28. 6–8 "*quis est [nescio] hic iuuenis, qui contra te in honorato loco discumbit et nescio quid flebili uultu dolet?*" where I would delete *nescio*.¹⁸

18. "Quis est ille iuuenis, qui . . ." B, "*nescio quis hic puto*" Riese: which am I to believe? Nor would I discount the spell, five lines below, of "*Quis autem sit aut unde, nescio*."

IV

46. 4-7 Qui dum per aliquantos dies totidemque noctes Austri [uentorum] flatibus *diu* pelago detinerentur, nono mense cogente Lucina enixa est puella.

austri P, correxī *uentorum* glossema puto *diu* scripsi: *pie* P *puellam* adde

What possessed Riese to correct *pie* to *diu* in a sentence already containing “per aliquantos dies totidemque noctes” I cannot say: only that, if *diu* was needed, nothing was needed. Thus the simplest and most obvious correction has yet to be suggested: delete the word. Explain it as a ditto-graph begotten of *PELago* and refer, in the proper spirit, to B’s “Qui dum per aliquot dies uariis uentorum flatibus detinetur.” Dittography is a common freak in P, destined in the ensuing notes to grow commoner still: compare 21. 4 *instal stat*, 35. 11 *rex rex*, 53. 1 *puellam iam* (*iam* del. Riese), 82. 7 *nam non* (*nam* del. Riese), and 98. 2 *nam nam*.

But is not *pie*, I hear it asked, the remnant of an ornamental epithet for *pelago*? And indeed, since one MS, G, chances to have *impio*,¹⁹ why not *impio*? A reasonable query. For had that reading not the support of some MS it would soon have the support, *e coniectura*, of some critic. And yet, whoever would adopt it should be forewarned that in this work “sea” is customarily without epithet—unless, of course, the epithet is in point (and therefore not ornamental, as at 21. 8-9 B “intuens *mare tranquillum*, quod paulo ante turbidum senserat”) or part, as several times, of the petrified phrase *altum pelagus*. That, first, on general grounds: whether *impio* has intrinsic merit he will then be free to ponder, to which I freely leave him. Whether it has authority he will ascertain by posing the question, given *pie* and *impio*, “utrum in alterum?” The answer is evident. Equally applicable is the question’s corollary—to most heads horripilant—that *ceteris paribus* nonsense offers a firmer foundation than sense.

Riese’s treatment of *austri uentorum flatibus* I will seize this opportunity of flinging, itself, to the winds. Imagine: from *austri* he must wring a genitive before he can brand *uentorum* its gloss—a gloss which, though the noun it glosses is singular, is itself unluckily plural. So far so bad, and worse is to follow. For what he does he does in the teeth of B, when from B he should have inferred that *uentorum* is genuine and that *austri* harbors an epithet, nonornamental, for *flatibus*. Say the epithet was B’s *uariis*; the slip thence to P’s *austri* cannot have been hard. Maybe it was optical, though maybe, in part at least, it was psychological, provoked by the general “wind” context. Whatever the provocation it is in point of style that *uariis* will ultimately commend itself. This it does by contrasting with the “*certum iter*” of the preceding sentence. And indeed, since the preceding sentence in B lacking “*certum iter*” lacks the contrast, *uariis* creates

19. Klebs, *Erzählung*, p. 61.

sharper style where it lurks under disguise than where its identity is unmistakable. Ironical therefore, and irrational, not to print it for AP.

47. 11–15 Erant ex seruis eius fabri, quibus conuocatis secari et conpaginari tabulas, rimas et foramina picari praecepit, et facere (*fieri* B) loculum amplissimum et carta plumbea obturari iubet *eum* inter iuncturas tabularum.

A critic, when first he reads this sentence, will think *eum* an ineptitude in need of amendment. His eyes will descend to the apparatus, and he will scarcely believe them when he finds that *eum* is itself an amendment. P has *t*, its symbol for *et*. That another dittography has escaped detection he will speedily perceive and, acting on that perception, write *iubet [et]*.

The same symbol for *et* P has also at 52. 14, 53. 9, and 54. 12. From 53. 9 arises a problem such as any scholar might have solved *currente calamo*, though none has. Consider 53. 7–10 “Post paucos dies, ut cognouit eam regio genere esse ortam, adhibitis amicis in filiam suam sibi adoptauit. *Ut* rogauit cum lacrimis, ne ab aliquo contingeretur, exaudiuit eam. . . .” By the standard of the style of AP, *Ut rogauit* might seem an abrupt connection, perhaps to be alleviated by “adoptauit. *<Et> ut*.” Perhaps: the supplement would in any case be easy, the error due almost to haplography and the result countenanced by B’s “*Et* rogantem eam cum lacrimis. . . .”²⁰ But wait: P has not *ut*, which is editorial, but *t*. Thus the *Et* we might have added is there already, transmitted, and our supplement, now necessary, should rather be framed *Et <ut>*. For the error, compare 80. 9–10 “contigit *<ut>* Athenagora” and, in B, 45. 5–6 “*Et <ut>* libentius” and 97. 4 “dixit *<ut>* quid.”

84. 8–10 Athenagora . . . ascendit in nauem et . . . dixit “non potui persuadere domino uestro, ut *uel* ad lucem rediret.” B
 . . . “non potui domino uestro persuadere, ut ad lucem [ueniret] procederet.” AP

Here Riese prints, with remarkable unconcern, a *uel* that has no fit meaning. Consider first the context. Athenagoras, *princeps Mytilenae*, has visited Apollonius, whose fleet lies at anchor, only to find a dilemma. He finds Apollonius in the darkness of his ship’s hull, where he has been staying, *lugens coniugem et filiam*, in the most obstinate seclusion. Can the *princeps* persuade their master, wonder Apollonius’ men (who could not), to return to the light of day? Consider next the language which elsewhere expresses the dilemma: 82. 2–3 B “rogat te Athenagora . . . : procede de *tenebris* ad *lucem*” (AP “r. t. A. . . . ut procedas . . . de *tenebris* et ad *lucem* exas”), 84. 2 B “procede de *tenebris* ad *lucem*” (sic AP), 85. 7–9 B “nauis huius dominum sedentem in *tenebris* . . . exhorteris ad *lucem* exire” (AP “d. n. h. . . . s. in *tenebris* horteris consolationem recipere et . . . prouoces ad *lucem* exire”), 85. 10–11 B “suade ei exire ad *lucem*” (sic AP, omisso *ei*), 88. 7 B “et ac si me in *lucem* perduceres, laeta discede” (AP “. . . si in *lucem*

20. *Rogantem* for *ut rogauit*, as at 11. 1 and 62. 12 *uidens* B for *ut uidit* AP.

prodixeris me, gaude"), 89. 5-6 AP "prouoca eum ad *lumen* exire" (non habet B), and 97. 10 B "ad *lumen* conabatur adtrahere" (AP "ad *lucem* c. trahere").

What could be plainer? Apollonius has a choice, the choice involves extremes, and the extremes are reflected in the polarity of expression. He may either stay *in tenebris* (near death) or return *ad lucem* (to life): nothing more, nothing less. And so for Athenagoras to say that he could not persuade him "to return *even* to the light" conveys the unwanted implication that returning to the light is but a step in a progression. Rather, had his *suasoria* succeeded, he would quite literally have solved the dilemma. Since the solution of a dilemma by its very nature resists qualification, by "even" or any other word, remove the "even": delete *uel* (*ut*) as a dittograph of *ut*. Between the two, when *uel* is so abbreviated, a straining eye would have made no distinction.

V

65. 10-16 Dionysias uero induit se et filiam suam uestes lugubres, falsasque fundit lacrimas et ciues ad se †conuocans†, quibus ait "carissimi ciues, ideo uos clamauius, quia spem luminum et labores et exitus annorum nostrorum perdidimus: id est, Tharsia, quam bene nostis, nobis cruciatus et fletus reliquit amarissimos; quam digne sepelire fecimus."

non habet B lege *conuocauit*

So Riese. A methodical critic would seriously have questioned—in *examinatio*, where the question is in order—whether the MS reading might not be endured. Endured it might be if only, and only if, an anacoluthon be posited: a perfectly natural anacoluthon in which the main verb was to follow the direct speech and the *auctor*, because of the speech's length, lost sight of the construction. Did the defense ever occur to Riese? And if it did had he the wit, in the absence of other anacolutha, not to posit this?²¹ Suppose he had: whether a verdict so strong as the obelus was warranted I do not ask. That is a question more for taste than for reason, and one linked to the prevailing temper of criticism; and it is a question that will cease to be material if the obelus serves only, by standing where it stands, to mislocate the corruption. And here I fear it does just that. To demonstrate the point I shall fix the blame elsewhere and let the result speak for itself. Even should the demonstration miscarry, this note would not be in vain: even then one could wonder why Riese, when it was open to him to propose *conuocat*, proposed rather *conuocauit*.²²

21. The absence, that is, of other textually secure instances. Cf. 17. 2-3 "Stranguillio ut audiuit, prostrauit se pedibus Apollonii *dicens*," following which is direct speech of comparable length. Here, however, Riese prefers P's *dicens* to A's anacoluthic *et dicens*; B has *et ait*.

22. *Conuocat* like *induit* and *fundit*, and for the easier error of *conuocat* to *conuocās* (cf. 31. 7-8 *accommodat*, where -*dās* P, and 18. 11 B *stat* Riese, where *stans* B). True, the work does not want for "praesentia et perfecta promiscue posita" (Riese's index, s.v. *tempora uerborum*). But what of that, if the passages containing them are—and they are—more the exception than the rule?

A far better line of attack is to retain *conuocans* and expel *quibus*. The result, as the sentence goes, is at least as cogent as Riese's; and it becomes more cogent once the sentence is made to yield, by the merest reshaping, an extraordinary habit of style. With R. Renahan repunctuate: "lacrimas. *Et* ciues ad se *conuocans* [quibus] *ait*." See, on the very same page, lines 5–6 "*Et* in caelum *leuans* oculos *ait*" and 8 "*Et* *intuens* uxorem suam *ait*." And elsewhere: 13. 1–2 "*Et* *accedens* ad eum Hellenicus *ait*," 22. 5–6 "*Et* *proster-nens* se illius ad pedes effusis lacrimis *ait*," 26. 4 "*Et* *intuens* unum de famulis suis *ait*," 27. 15–16 "*Et* hilari uultu *respiciens* iuuenem *ait*," 32. 11–12 "*Et* *intuens* Apollonii famulos . . . *dixit*," 49. 4–6 "*Et* *uidens* subito ad caput eius pecuniam positam . . . *ait*," 80. 4 "*Et* *uocans* dispensatorem suum *ait*," 89. 7 "*Et* *descendens* Tharsia ad eum *ait*," 90. 10 "*Et* *agitans* caput Apollonius *ait*," 111. 14–112. 1 "*Et* *proferens* filiam Apollonius coram omnibus populis *ait*," and 115. 1 "*Et* *intuens* eum Apollonius *ait*." To these may be added 60. 7 "*Quem* ad se *conuocans* *ait*," where the relative (for *Et* *eum*) is a virtual connective.

72. 9–10

Sic ergo age cotidie, ut ampliores pecunias afferas. B

So Riese again. But is this correct? Its correctness seems called into question by AP's "Sic ergo age, ut cotidie mihi latiores pecunias adferas." And not only by that: on the adherence of *cotidie* rather to the notion of collecting money, witness, in the same context, 73. 9–10 AP "unde ergo *his duobus* (A: *omnibus* P) *diebus* tantam pecuniam obtulisti?" ("u. e. *his diebus* tantas pecunias abstulisti?" B), 74. 8 AP "et hac arte ampliabo pecunias *cotidie*" (*cotidie* om. B, perhaps through absorption into the following *Quod*), 74. 10–75. 1 AP "ut et uiri et feminae *cotidie* ei multa conferrent" ("ut . . . *cotidie* ei infinitam conferrent pecuniam" B), and 75. 6–7 B "Et cum *cotidie* uirgo misericordia populi tantas congerit pecunias in sinu lenonis."

Common to all these passages, because they involve the collection of money, is the *uerbum augendi* which, throughout Latin, *cotidie* commonly qualifies. But in ours there is another key—the comparative *ampliores*. Near or next to *ampliores*, which in strictness too it may qualify, is where *cotidie* belongs. Compare Cicero *Ad Atticum* 14. 11. 2 "quam uideo *cottidie* *faciliorem*," *Ad familiares* 6. 5. 1 "quae quidem *cottidie* *faciliores* mihi et *meliores* uidentur," *De domo sua* 113 "mihi summa et *cottidie* *maiora* prae-mia . . . fore," *Philippicae* 1. 5 "*cottidie* *magis* *magisque* *perditi* homines"; Seneca *Dialogi* 4. 9. 1 "*maior* *cottidie* peccandi cupiditas."

Three corrections suggest themselves: the realistic might transpose ("age, ut cotidie"), the timid repunctuate ("age, cotidie ut"), and the perverse, by not punctuating, leave interpretation to the reader ("age cotidie ut"). The second and the third, though superior to the edited text, will probably not survive acquaintance with the juxtaposition, in the parallels, of *cot(t)idie* and the comparative. Even if they did, little would be gained by having, against B's nature elsewhere, *ut* postponed *ad secundum*

locum.²³ Is not the problem then one of order? I would transpose; for other transpositions in B, or part of B, see 17. 10–18. 1 "Scitote *enim*, *me* . . . esse fugatum" (*me enim*), 18. 2–3 "centum milia *modiorum frumenti*" (*frumenti modiorum*), and 56. 3–4 "morientis *ancillae tuae uerba* suprema" (*uerba ancillae tuae*). On the cause, of course, no certainty. Perhaps it was by the purest accident that the words exchanged places, though I should not be surprised if *ut* was lost to *COTidie* and then, when replaced, misplaced.²⁴

Villanova University

23. *Ut* in a clause, I mean, which neither begins its sentence nor sets a syntactical trap. So please do not counter with passages like 32. 1–2 "Puella ut uidit iuuenem omnium artium studiorumque cumulatam, incidit in amorem," where *puella* is also the subject of the main verb, and 51. 8 "Quod ut uidit iuuenis, ait . . .," where the relative, serving as the connective, must precede.

24. I have been exceptionally fortunate in obtaining, *per litteras*, the assistance of Prof. R. Renahan. This last point and that about the comparative, for instance, I owe to him. I must thank him also for permission to publish his arresting conjecture at 21. 3–4 and his telling repunctuation of 65. 10–16.