almost exclusively from the nineteenth century, and carries on dialogues with his predecessors throughout the volumes. His give and take with Leo (and to a lesser extent with the translations of Nisard), needless to say, takes priority of place, and readers, all of whom will have been raised on Leo, will not always agree with R.'s divergences—or his solutions. More than not, these involve rejecting conjectures by Leo (or by others whom Leo followed), but one example (not from the volume under review but exemplary of R.'s moves) with respect to 7.12.21 shows the reverse to be true. Here, Leo prints *Seu validi bufali ferit inter cornua campum*, following the manuscripts, but R. finds this line unintelligible (noting also that Nisard made sense of it by ignoring *campum*). This seeming incoherence leads R. to emend *validi bufali* to *validus bufalus*, on the grounds that the verse immediately subsequent, which lists three animals in the nominative case standing as subjects of *differt*, is as an example of parallel construction. But readers of Leo will no doubt object, since the line as it stands makes perfect sense ('whether he strikes the forehead of the strong ox between its horns') and is, in any case, a *lectio difficilior* when compared with R.'s emendation.

More defensible, if not entirely convincing, is R.'s decision regarding 11.5.4. Leo, correcting *nec spletam* (which most of the manuscripts report), prints *nec solitam* (reported incorrectly as *nec solidam* in R.'s critical apparatus). R. follows de Brower in emending to *nec inexpletam*, picking up on the imagery of nourishment and fasting that the poem trumpets throughout. This is not to say that *solitam* doesn't make good sense, only that R.'s move shows a care and deftness of interpretive touch that suffuses all of the volumes. That care is in best evidence in the concluding pages of each volume, where *notes complémentaires* are filled with multiple, though compressed, observations regarding all aspects of the poems. I found myself always wanting more from R. in these notes, which, in any case, form the bare bones of a much needed commentary on the poetry of Fortunatus.

There can be no doubting that this volume concludes an important and impressive accomplishment that makes even securer the base from which to study Fortunatus' words. Now is the time to gather the materials for a concordance and a commentary. Then students can more easily begin the slow process of studying for the first time in a serious way the poet's meanings. Given the quality of R.'s edition, and the impetus it will provide, I am optimistic that all of this work will proceed apace.

Brown University JOSEPH PUCCI
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni307

HISTORIA APOLLONII

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* Supplementum 253.) Pp. xxiv + 293, map, ills. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2004. Cased, €95, US$125. ISBN: 90-04-13923-0.

This is the second book (hereafter *editio minor*) by Kortekaas on the same two (there are eight) recensions of the *Historia Apollonii Regis Tyri* (hereafter *Historia*). The first book was published in 1984, and K. refers to it in his *editio minor* (p. 98) as the *editio maior*. K. had announced after the publication of his

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni308 Published online by Cambridge University Press

maior that he was working on, and would next publish, a commentary on the *Historia*, a *desideratum* of all who study the ancient novel. The appearance of the *minor* from K. is thus disappointing to novel scholars who had expected so much more. It seems, however, that the preparation of the awaited commentary has been entrusted to the very capable hands of Stelios Panayotakis, also of the University of Groningen.

How does the *editio minor* differ from the *maior*? The *minor* is much more focused on that which its title advertises, 'A Study of its Greek Origin'. Like the *maior*, however, the *minor* is really not an edition of the *Historia*: an edition would be an attempt to construct the most reliable text based on a study of all the best MSS, even though that text falls into the general category of *texte vivant*. As K. did in his *maior*, he prints the RA recension on the left-hand side of the opened book, and the RB recension on the right. Though the apparatus of the *minor* is much fuller and more receptive to a variety of conjectures, K.'s text of RA remains an apograph of A (Laurentianus plut. lxvi 40, s. ix, which is fragmentary), and his text of RB an apograph of b (Vossianus lat. F 113, s. ix, which is fragmentary). Improvements in the apparatus from *maior* to *minor* are considerable. K. is an excellent palaeographer, as pp. 151–274 of his *maior* illustrate. Printing that which his favorite MS reads, however, is not quite the same as producing an edition, but there are throughout the *minor* signs that K. wants to become an editor. Just one such sign: in RA 42–3 where the text contains ten riddles of Symphosius, for which K. had used the unfortunate text of Fr. Glorie (Turnholti, 1968) in his *maior*, in his *minor* he switches to the *AL* of D. Shackleton Bailey (Teubner, 1982), and the work of Glorie disappears even from K.'s bibliography.

But to move on to the purpose of K.'s *editio minor*: to show that the Latin text of the *Historia* descends from a Greek original. In S. Stephens, J. Winkler (edd.), *Ancient Greek Novels: the Fragments* (Princeton, 1995), pp. 391–99, there is a text and discussion of a Greek novel fragment called *Apollonios*, but K. (p. 4) is too honest a scholar to try to connect this fragment to the *Historia*. But while he can recognize distinctions among kinds of texts, K. still simplistically divides scholars of the ancient novel into just two camps: those like him who hold that the *Historia* had a Greek original vs. those (e.g. Konstan, Hunt, Schmeling) who believe that the extant Latin MSS of the *Historia* derive from earlier Latin MSS.

In defense of my position let me say first that, though the Latin of our extant *Historia* dates to the fifth or sixth century, we can in many places in the text push back the darkness even further and move the text much closer to its Latin origins in the early third century. Secondly, since writers of the third century in the Eastern Roman Empire are for the most part bilingual, it makes little difference to me in the end, whether the ideas and models behind the *Historia* are originally Greek or Latin.

K. argues that as a work of literature, the *Historia* is close to the tone, feeling, and structure of the five erotic Greek novels and far from the Latin *Satyrica* and *Golden Ass.* (As an aside I note that G. Jensson, *Ancient Fiction* 2 [2003], 86–122 sees the *Satyrica* as a palimpsest of a Greek novel.) This is to argue from a footing in quicksand, because the database, the five erotic Greek novels, is not homogeneous (cp. Longus and Heliodorus), and little like the *Satyrica* and *Golden Ass* is extant. Granted that the *Satyrica* is full of Greek characters, expressions, and words, it is nevertheless as Roman as the work of Horace; the *Golden Ass* seems to borrow a good bit from an anonymous *Ass*, but it is St Augustine who gives Apuleius' novel its Latin title. In his apparatus K. lists many structural parallels and motifs in common between the *Historia* and the Greek novel; in several publications I myself have done

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni308 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the same. My interest in citing those parallels was to try to group motifs and define some parameters of the ancient novel—regardless of the language. But the *Historia* in tone, feeling, and structure is quite different from the erotic Greek novels: it stands apart as a 'family novel'—not a novel about young lovers, but about fathers and daughters and raising families, as T. Szepessy (*AAntHung* 31 [1985–8], 357–670) illustrates so well (an article curiously omitted from K.'s extensive bibliography).

The extant Latin MSS of the *Historia* are their own best witness about their Latin origin. While K. (p. 4) admits that 'Unfortunately we know nothing on its origin or early history: there is not even the tiniest scrap of papyrus or parchment which could give us a clue on the question of a Greek or Latin origin', he proceeds in many pages (pp. 13–98) to try to prove that his view of the history of the text of the *Historia* can be re-constructed accurately: 1. pagan Greek original → 2. Greek epitome → 3. which becomes a Christian text → 4. Latin text arises from this Christian milieu. All of this from the same person who says that 'we know nothing on its origin'. From the evidence of the MSS the *Historia* seems to be a pagan text with later Christian accretions, which are probably attached to the text because the virgin females in the story so resemble virgin Christian martyrs. I have not been convinced that a Christian redactor/interpolator would allow the wife of the novel's hero to remain a priestess of Diana and at the very end of the story to allow hero and priestess to deposit a copy of their adventures in the temple of Artemis at Ephesus.

While it is not really important to me whether the *Historia* has a Greek or Latin origin, the Latin MSS of it which I used to prepare an edition for Teubner (1988) were all copied from Latin ancestors: all verbal allusions (as opposed to motifs like 'maintaining virginity in a whorehouse', which it shares with Greek novels) and quotations come from Latin authors, especially Virgil and Ovid. It is about what we would expect. If we go back through many re-copyings of the *Historia*, is it possible that the original text, which would bear few, if any, verbal resemblances to the extant Latin text, could conceivably have been written in Greek? My answer is 'yes'. But from the more than 100 MSS in front of me, and from the MSS from which these were copied, the *Historia* accuses itself of being a Latin text.

I would like to pick out for comment just two small items, among many with which I disagree with K. On p. 98 K. states: 'For any further investigations concerning the HA, however, the *editio maior* (1984) will be indispensable.' The interested reader should not heed K.'s advice, but should start with the *minor*, and only rarely turn to the *maior*; K.'s second effort is superior to his first. On p. 95 K. claims: 'Schmeling changes the *sigla* which ever since Klebs have been standard in the literature.' K. makes it sound as if I changed all or most of the *sigla*. In fact, I gave *sigla* to the MSS which I discovered, assigned *sigla* to MSS which had none or seemed to belong to none of the recognized recensions, and changed Gandensis 92 to Ge from K.'s L, and assigned L to K.'s (L).

Closer proof-reading would not have hurt this book. Right from the first pages we find problems: p. ix, l. 16, for 'based onand RB', read 'based on RA and RB'; p. xiii, l. 18, for 'Biliography', read 'Bibliography'; p. 4, l. 1, for 'We know nothing on its origin', read 'of its origin'; p. 4, l. 3, for 'clue on the question', read 'clue to'.

University of Florida GARETH SCHMELING
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni308

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni308 Published online by Cambridge University Press