UC Davis
UC Davis Previously Published Works

## Title

Review of *Historia Apollonii regis Tyri: Prolegomena, Text Edition of the Two Principal Latin Recensions, Bibliography, Indices and Appendices* by G. A. A. Kortekaas

**Permalink**
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/161467ss

**Journal**
Speculum, 63(1)

**Author**
Hexter, Ralph Jay

**Publication Date**
1988

Peer reviewed

eScholarship.org Powered by the California Digital Library
University of California

Medieval Academy of America

Historia Apollonii regis Tyri: Prolegomena, Text Edition of the Two Principal Latin Recensions, Bibliography, Indices and Appendices by G. A. A. Kortekaas
Review by: Ralph Hexter
*Speculum*, Vol. 63, No. 1 (Jan., 1988), pp. 186-190
Published by: Medieval Academy of America
Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/2854364
Accessed: 13/11/2013 14:52

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

*Medieval Academy of America* is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Speculum.*

http://www.jstor.org

All use subject to JSTOR Terms and Conditions

of prints and also the historical and cultural context for the novice, and brings together all of the master's work with other close attributions so that readers may draw their own conclusions.

ROBERT G. CALKINS, Cornell University

G. A. A. KORTEKAAS, ed., *Historia Apollonii regis Tyri: Prolegomena, Text Edition of the Two Principal Latin Recensions, Bibliography, Indices and Appendices.* (Mediaevalia Groningana, 3.) Groningen: Bouma's Boekhuis, 1984. Pp. xxxi, 470. Hfl 120.

The *Historia Apollonii regis Tyri (HA)* has ever been an ugly duckling among ancient romances, itself a genre often disdained by classicists. Earlier generations of scholars interested only in origins and *Urtexte* made a priori assumptions about both. The hypothesis of a lost Greek original may ultimately go back to the expectation that all Latin literature is somehow derived from Greek, yet corroborating evidence was soon found. The *HA* appears in certain particulars — for example, the whirlwind of sea travel in the eastern Mediterranean, the emphasis on chastity — to resemble more closely the five complete Greek romances (of Xenophon of Ephesus, Achilles Tatius, Chariton, Heliodorus, Longus) than the sparse remnants of the apparently more idiosyncratic Latin novels (Petronius, of whose *Satyricon* we may have as little as one-twelfth, and Apuleius). Subsequently scholars found more compelling arguments in the names and values of coins and the appearance of (Greek) bride-price rather than (Latin) dowry. G. A. A. Kortekaas, too, on the basis of both *realia* and linguistic features, argues for a Greek phase in the prehistory of the *HA* in a sophisticated fashion (see below).

Late-nineteenth-century scholars approached the *HA* as if it were a deformed classical text. In some ways the challenge of sketching the manuscript relationships was well met. It was quickly recognized that the extant texts form two distinct recensions (RA, RB), and in his second edition Alexander Riese (1893) established the precedent of printing both texts. It also became clear that most of the other manuscripts fall into subrecensions in the orbits of but at varying removes from either RA or RB. More problematic, however, were assumptions about the language of the witnesses. While no one actually tried to rewrite the *HA* in Ciceronian Latin, the principle on which variants were chosen and emendations were made was that our texts represent a falling off from a more correct, late-classical original. (Obviously this principle also had profound ramifications for the construction of a stemma.)

Twentieth-century scholarship has developed new approaches to the problems posed by a popular text like the *HA,* for if anything defines the *HA,* it is a popularity witnessed by a rich medieval and Renaissance manuscript tradition (approaching that of the Alexander romances and the Troy story) and influence in the vernaculars, both strict retellings and other adaptations.[1] Drawing on the one hand on the concept of *texte vivante,* on the other on the increasing knowledge of and sophistication about the language of late-Latin texts, Kortekaas has produced a text of the *HA* on entirely new principles.

How revolutionary Kortekaas's advance is emerges from comparison with Dimitra Tsitsikli's edition (1981), the first since Riese to offer a text of the full Latin tradition and Kortekaas's only competition. Tsitsikli is totally dependent on Elimar Klebs's reconstruction of the manuscript and recensional relationships, which was indeed exhaustive and systematic when it appeared — in 1899! One might regard Tsitsikli's as the edition Klebs looked likely to make but never did. Tsitsikli cites 12 manuscripts, 7 for RA and RB themselves, 3 for RE, 1 for RT; of RC she cites 1 manuscript in one place; of Ra, Rb, RSt, RBern, and the bulk of RC, nothing, Except for proper names, orthography is adjusted to classical norms (Riese's practice). She uses italics in the text to alert readers to portions in one recension which differ significantly from the other (not unhelpful).

---

[1] For a recent survey of the tradition (to 1609), and suggestions about the *HA* as a Seleucid historical novel worth considering, see Elizabeth Frances Archibald, "*Apollonius of Tyre* in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance," Yale diss., 1984.

After twenty-five years of work, Kortekaas has produced a library, not a book. The "Prolegomena" (146 pages of text; its 784 notes fill an additional 124 blessedly double-spaced pages) includes a survey of 111 Latin manuscripts of the *HA* (25 discovered by Kortekaas); detailed descriptions (ranging from nine lines to five pages) of the 19 manuscripts used in the constitution of the texts of RA and RB; a convincing and readable explanation of "[t]he relationship of the recensions . . . and the interrelationships between certain manuscripts within each recension" (diagram, p. 134) — overturning Klebs; and two chapters on the linguistic features of first RA, then RB, in particular the degree to which each displays Late and/or Christian Latin usage and signs of epitomizing and "translation or adaption from . . . Greek" — chapters in the tradition of his avowed masters Einar Löfstedt and Christine Mohrmann.

The texts are on facing pages. Kortekaas employs italics and diacritics to signal any departure in his printed text from the reading of the single witness identified as the base manuscript for that portion of the text. Each recension is edited independently, and below the text is a three-tiered apparatus. Novel is the third, which Kortekaas employs when he feels readers may need orthographic, syntactic, or lexical help interpreting a radically unclassical form in the text. Scrupulously unnormalized and equipped with a full apparatus, Kortekaas's edition gives readers access to the authentic language of 19 manuscripts.

While Klebs has his eye on a hypothetical third-century original, Kortekaas is not interested in going further back than the fifth- or sixth-century archetypes of RA and RB to which the earliest extant manuscripts and sixth-century French testimonia point. RA and RB are both vulgar texts, if rarely so hair-raising as Fredegarius. Hence the most significant of Kortekaas's principles: "for the constitution of the text of both recensions . . . one should base oneself on the manuscripts with the most vulgar tone" (p. 60). While RB displays a tendency to correct vis-à-vis RA, Kortekaas regards this as only relative and does not set up RB as a pure tendency for correction: "b is indisputably a purer representative of RB" than other witnesses, which "bear more traces of editorial intervention" (p. 82; cp. pp. 88, 96). This principle informs his preference among variants and ultimately his decisions in matters of orthography and interpretation. Apropos of b Kortekaas writes, "we are . . . dealing with a case in which it is exceedingly difficult to distinguish between linguistic development and possible scribal errors: whenever parallel data justify it, I have opted for the former" (p. 39).

The principles of the edition are so clear, and by and large so consistently followed, that one has the impression that Kortekaas rarely interferes with his machine. This is false, for there is a world of difference between following principles blindly and following them intelligently. He rarely seems "original," but given his principles and the vast number of variants he himself has made available, he is more often called on to choose than to conjecture. The great majority of his choices are eminently sensible. I list those about which I have strong reservations. At 8, RB 36, *et si* (b) and *sed* (π) mean different things, but I find either perfectly comprehensible, while Kortekaas's *si* means nothing to me. At 16, RA 14, I lean towards *eam cepit* (F) in place of *accedens cepit* (P); though a footnote on page xix explains that his objections to Tsitsikli's edition are so profound they could not be addressed at so late a date in his book, he should adopt her reading *graui* for *sui* (18, RA 1) on the basis of *Aeneid* 4.1 cited there (also approved by J. M. Hunt's review article "On Editing *Apollonius of Tyre*," *Classical Philology* [1983], 333). Finally, (what I presume was) one extra stroke in P hardly seems enough reason to write *unianimes* for *unanimes* (39, RA 20).

Credit for the good correction *liuenti* (24, RA 30) should go to J. M. Hunt (*Classical Philology* 76 [1981], 343). To write "X sextertia *scripsi*" in the apparatus to 26, RA 13, is misleading, since Riese has "X sestertia," the same correction, only with his consistently normalized spelling. Indeed readers should note that Kortekaas's use of *scripsi* is often odd: it rarely indicates an original correction or conjecture. So at 28, RA 10, the apparatus has "mercaturus *dubitanter scripsi* : mercatus *P*," but it comes from RB, as a glance at the opposite page confirms. At 40, RA 29, we see "contra uoluntatem, *scripsi*," where the truth is better expressed "uolens *seclusi*." The edition is accurate. I came across only one printing mistake in the text of the *HA*: *qui* should be *quia* (22, RA 10). (Is there one "dit" too many in the *Textprobe* of Rα I[ϕ], p. 74, l. 26?)

The issues, large and small, raised in Kortekaas's learned prolegomena call for review. First, a minor point. "The poet Symphosius, whose riddles occur in chs. 42–43, is nowadays dated in the fourth or fifth century. . . ." Some of the arguments for regarding "Symphosius" himself as a ghost have been made by F. Murru ("Aenigmata Symphosii ou Aenigmata symposii?" *Eos* 68 [1980], 155–58) and should, I think, be given serious consideration.

Kortekaas's analysis of the language of the two recensions, based on unrivaled familiarity with the texts and late Latin, constitutes perhaps his greatest contribution, apart from the edition itself (an "Index verborum et locutionum," pp. 451–63, gives access to much of his learning). On the basis of linguistic comparisons Kortekaas finds that "the Christian elements form an integrated component of the linguistic usage of RA" (p. 101; for RB, cp. p. 118), and he adduces striking parallels with the language of fifth/sixth-century Italian (perhaps specifically Roman) hagiography. When he notes biblical "reminiscences" and "borrowings," from "the romantic *Book of Tobit*" (p. 105) in particular, his care to distinguish between Vetus and Vulgate texts is exemplary: that the borrowings come from the Vulgate supports arguments for a post-fourth-century date of the Latin *HA* (p. 237, n. 584). So close is his analysis that he uncovers as one feature of RB a marked preference for *cursus*.

The debate about the Christian nature of the *HA* has of course traditionally focused on larger issues. I feel even more strongly than Kortekaas that the *HA* is profoundly, albeit never explicitly, Christian. I remain unconvinced that elements such as Neptune's festival and even Diana compel us to posit an original pagan tale. I can well imagine a Christian writer setting the romance in a pagan world for appropriate generic color. (For a comparable maneuver compare the classical touches in the *Ephesiaca*, which make it a sort of historical novel.) Ultimately this devil-may-care usurpation of a pagan setting bespeaks much greater confidence in Christianity than the logically and doctrinally correct adaptation of the romance genre for (then necessary) propagandistic purposes by the author of the *Clementine Recognitions*.

In one area Kortekaas leaves me uncertain: the necessary existence of a Greek original text, or, in other words, the nature of the relationship between a Greek prehistory of the material and the Latin *HA*. Sometimes he is careful to talk about "a free adaptation" (p. 107). Yet much of the most compelling linguistic evidence he presents would seem to demand a direct translation. While puns which work in Greek and not in Latin may lend credence to a Greek stage, they can involve hearing as easily as reading (a pun between Greek ὀχεῖσϑαι [*vehi*] and ὀεύεσϑαι [*coitum facere*] may be as satisfactory an explanation as "misreading" [p. 110] for *scelere vehor* in Antiochus's riddle about his incestuous relationship with his daughter). Though Kortekaas caps his argument for a Greek *HA* with the Byzantine graffito from Pergamum which displays the Greek of "Quęro fratrem meum, meę matris uirum, uxoris meę filium" (4, RA 11), he ought to adduce the pun ᾿Απολλώνιος/ἀπόλλυμι here (p. 112), apropos of ᾿Α]πώλε‹σ›α, and not simply as an explanation of RB's peculiar *si necessitatis nomen queris, in mare perdidi* (15, 16–17; p. 119).[2]

However "Greek" the world of *HA* was, the HA presents it in thoroughly Latin guise. The pun on *queror*/*quaero* at 8, RB 6–7, is possible only in Latin. The citations of Latin poets have often been pointed to, much less frequently the form, *prosimetrum,* popular in both classical and late Latin but significantly less so in Greek. The subtlety and sophistication of Kortekaas's understanding of the degree to which late and Christian Latin is steeped in Greek inform his analysis, and he himself nearly formulates an alternate explanation for what appear as direct translations from a Greek text. Let me adduce as only one example *incidit in amorem* (1, RA 9). Kortekaas duly records the few examples of this usage in Latin authors of the first two centuries A.D., but points to its frequency in late Latin under the influence of Greek ἐμπίπτω. "[I]t is especially in literature translated from the Greek or based on it that one encounters this turn of phrase" (p. 109). Note 600 then offers the intriguing observation that the expression occurs "several times" in "Rufinus' translation/adaptation of the Pseudo-Clementine *Recognitiones*" in places where "the Greek of the version that has come down to us does not seem to offer any immediate cause for such usage." The example cited there of *incidit in amorem* as a translation not of ἐμπίπτω but of ἐρᾶσθαι (pp. 240 f.) is eloquent evidence that such Grecisms do not necessarily allow us to posit a Greek original; rather they bespeak the degree to which Greek, and the extensive literature of translation from Greek, had become part of the language. One might even go beyond consideration of how a body of translations effects linguistic change to the question of style: is there a tendency to employ Greek-Latin "translationese" in a given text or genre to heighten Hellenistic tone?

Not all the highways and byways of transmission are fully mapped. Kortekaas must remain vague (p. 132) about the stages through which the *HA* passed from what he argues was a late-fifth- or early-sixth-century Italian, perhaps specifically Roman (cp. p. 115) translation/adaptation and possible epitomization of a Greek second/third-century (p. 129) "original" to the post-eighth-century northern French texts of RA and RB we have or of which we have knowledge. An English phase is not impossible. Kortekaas explicitly eschews extensive codicological investigations (p. 23). The information he includes about manuscript context suggests that much might be inferred about the horizon(s) against which the *HA* was received at various times and in various locales. For example, two ninth-century manuscripts present Apollonius's story among accounts of the destruction of Troy; one of the two is the earliest of a number of manuscripts in which one finds *HA* cheek-by-jowl with works of geographical interest and wonders of the world, particularly the East. The *HA* appears alongside the matter of Alexander in two other manuscripts, one of them also with the story of Roland

---

[2] Kortekaas brushes aside the suggestion that the mysterious first line of this graffito (ΩΒΙΔ) could refer to Ovid ("seems very far-fetched") with a reference to Karl Krumbacher, *Geschichte der byzantinischen Literatur,* 2, 2nd ed. (Munich, 1897), p. 910. This makes me wonder about the relevance of much of the massive documentation in his notes, for while Krumbacher cites a Greek deformation of Ovid's name, there is no reference to this graffito whatsoever. The references to Ps. Ambrose, *De moribus Brachmanorum,* in notes 328–29 are questionable; one work with this title is found in PL 17:131–46.

and Charlemagne. Certain structural elements of the *HA* anticipate typical medieval narrative patterns — the repetition or near repetition of a series of events in two generations, for example. If one considers that the creators of medieval romances may have read the *HA* in manuscript collections like those described above, or heard the story told by a performer in whose repertory it alternated with tales of Alexander or Roland, we may have identified a mechanism by which the *HA* formed a productive link between late-antique and medieval literature.

RALPH HEXTER, Yale University

YVONNE LABANDE-MAILFERT, *Charles VIII: Le vouloir et la destinée.* Paris: Arthème Fayard, 1986. Paper. Pp. 512. F 120.

This book is another in Fayard's rapidly growing series of biographies of prominent figures in French history, intended for a general educated audience. The authors of books in this series have varied somewhat in their qualifications, but one could never question those of Yvonne Labande-Mailfert, who has spent a career studying Charles VIII of France and probably knows the documents of this king's reign better than any scholar working in this period.

In reviewing her major scholarly work on Charles VIII ten years ago (*Speculum* 52: 1013–15), I argued that she devoted too little space to the institutional and socio-political aspects of the king's reign and too much to the details of his Italian expedition. While the present volume does not exactly redress the balance, it is, I think, a more successful work in terms of the intended audience. We can grasp more clearly the broader issues of the reign, which no longer are submerged in a welter of detail, and one feels much closer to the king as a person.

One might ask how an author can produce two long books on a man who died before his twenty-eighth birthday without engaging in a great deal of repetition. The answer is that this is a very different book from its predecessor. It considers Charles VIII within the framework expressed by the subtitle. It is the story of a young man who was trained for kingship from his earliest childhood and who developed a sense of mission, of great plans for France and for Christendom, which he thought destiny had called on him to execute. Yet his true destiny was failure and frustration. He would die in his twenties without a son to succeed him and would be remembered mainly for launching the destructive Italian wars that ushered in the modern era of international conflict among the great powers.

Charles VIII was barely in his teens when his father, the able but peculiar and unpopular Louis XI, died in 1483. The early years of his reign were a time of considerable political turmoil, and Charles owed a good deal to the sister and brother-in-law who managed the government. Their role diminished steadily after they inherited the duchy of Bourbon in 1488, and the author shows that Charles was personally very much involved in the Breton war of that year. To solve the difficult Breton question, it was necessary for Charles to marry the heiress of that duchy, who was six years his junior. This in turn required delicate negotiations with the Habsburgs, whose previous settlement with France had been based on Charles's still unconsummated proxy marriage to the child Margaret of Austria, and with the pope, whose dispensation was essential to the project.

In the end Charles achieved his goals, and his eminently political marriage to Anne of Brittany seems to have blossomed into a union based on deep affection. First pregnant at the age of sixteen, the queen had several children and several miscarriages before being widowed at twenty-two, but none of the children lived past early child-