

ARCTOS

ACTA PHILOLOGICA FENNICA  
SUPPLEMENTUM II

STUDIA  
IN HONOREM  
IIRO KAJANTO

HELSINKI 1985 HELSINGFORS

## INDEX

Géza Alföldy	Ein neues Zeugnis für "suprafamiliare organisationen" im antiken Hispanien . . . . .	9
E. Badian	Apollonius at Tarsus . . . . .	15
Patrick Bruun	Gloria Romanorum . . . . .	23
Pierre Grimal	Le Dialogue des Orateurs — témoin de son temps . . . . .	33
Anne Helttula	<i>Post depositum militiae munus</i> . Official Phraseology in Ammianus Marcellinus . . . . .	41
G. L. Huxley	Kastor on the Foundation of Eleusis . . . . .	57
Iosephus IJsewijn	De <i>huius nympha loci</i> (CIL VI/5, 3+e) eiusque fortuna poetica syntagmation . . . . .	61
Siegfried Jäkel	Τί τὸ σοφόν; Einige Überlegungen zu Euripides, Bakchen 877, 897 . . . . .	69
Maarit Kaimio	The Theme of Victory in Aeschylus' Oresteia and Ag. 314—316 . . . . .	79
Bengt Löfstedt	Lexikalisches zur Vulgata . . . . .	99
Olivier Masson	Sur le nom de Bilistiché, favorite de Ptolémée II . . . . .	109
Dag Norberg	Original ou fautes de copie? . . . . .	113
Ulla Nyberg	Zu den inschriftlichen Kontraktionen von <i>dominus</i> in der sakralen und in der profanen Bedeutung . . . . .	125
Martti Nyman	The Meaning of <i>micarius</i> . . . . .	143
Teivas Oksala	Carmen Vergili? abiturii (Catal. 5) . . . . .	147
Silvio Panciera	Qualche nuova iscrizione urbana d'interesse onomastico . . . . .	153
François Paschoud	Le début de l'ouvrage historique d'Olympiodore . . . . .	185
Tuomo Pekkanen	Notes on Tac. Germ. 46,3 . . . . .	197

Reijo Pitkäranta	Zur wissenschaftlichen Terminologie einer mathematischen Dissertation in Turku 1645 .....	215
Heikki Solin	Namenpaare .....	229
Giancarlo Susini	Una memoria fotografica della tradizione bolognese di C. Mario .....	261
Ronald Syme	Praesens the Friend of Hadrian .....	273
Holger Thesleff	Notes on the Name of Homer and the Homeric Question ..	293
P. G. Walsh	Catullus 17 and the Priapean .....	315
Rolf Westman	Neues Licht auf New Fragment 8 des Diogenes von Oino- anda .....	323
Ladislav Vidman	Frauen der Senatoren in der Nomenklatur ihrer Sklaven und Freigelassenen .....	329
Toivo Viljamaa	The Accusativus cum Infinitivo and <i>quod-</i> , <i>quia-</i> , <i>quoniam-</i> Clauses in Latin .....	337
Henrik Zilliacus	Ein verlorener Papyrusbrief aus der Berliner Sammlung ..	351
Jaakko Aronen	Iiro Kajanto: Bibliography of Published Works .....	355

## APOLLONIUS AT TARSUS

E. Badian

There has recently been a spurt of interest in the text of the History of Apollonius King of Tyre. A competent and useful edition by Dimitra Tsitsikli, under the guidance of Reinhold Merkelbach, has made it much easier to see what the principal codices actually offer, for each of the two main versions (RA and RB) of the text that has come down to us.<sup>1</sup>

Better still, the new edition was carefully (indeed, perhaps in places pedantically) discussed by a leading expert on the text, J. M. Hunt, in a long review article in *Classical Philology*.<sup>2</sup> The article starts with a survey of earlier editions, up to what had before Tsitsikli's been the standard and authoritative one of A. Riese (his second edition of 1893), the continuing importance of which was amply illustrated by the fact that it was reprinted by Teubner in 1973. Hunt is scathing on Riese, both as regards technical aspects and above all as regards critical acumen: "The opportunities for textual improvement that Riese has missed ... can be counted by the score." Although this is perhaps a little hard on a scholar who did a great deal to make sense of a complex tradition of a rarely edited work (after all, the pages of our journals demonstrate that there is room for improvement even in the text of Catullus or Cicero), the objective fact that there is much room for improvement in the History is true enough; indeed, Hunt proceeded, by way of example, to suggest several improvements in his discussion of the new edition, and he will no doubt give us many more. It is the purpose of this little note to look

---

<sup>1</sup> *Historia Apollonii Regis Tyri*, ed. Dimitra Tsitsikli, *Beiträge zur Klassischen Philologie* 134, Königstein 1981.

<sup>2</sup> J. M. Hunt, *On editing Apollonius*, *CPh* 78 (1983) 331—343.

at a passage where the text has not been questioned and to suggest a small improvement, incidentally looking at some of the rather complex factors that may go into a corruption. I hope this conjecture will at least amuse our honorand, in view of his interest both in texts and in later Latinity.

In chapter 51, near the end of the novel, when all has been working out for the best and the final loose ends are being tied up — the family has been reunited and the villains who tried to murder the hero's daughter have just been duly punished, with exemplary forgiveness for their reluctant and now penitent instrument — Apollonius bestows lavish gifts on the city of Tarsus, where this act of justice has been performed, before leaving for Pentapolis and the next act. Our text of RA<sup>3</sup> is given as follows by Tsitsikli:

*itaque Apollonius pro hac re <ad> laetitiam populo addens munera {restituens} restaurat universa. thermas publicas, moenia, murorum turres restituens moratur ibi cum suis omnibus diebus XV.*

This text is taken straight from Riese, without change or discussion, and it is in fact largely Riese's creation. If we look at the apparatus, we see that P (the only codex we here have for RA) appears to read as follows:<sup>4</sup>

*itaque Apollonius pro hac re laetitiam populo addens munera resti-  
{restituens} restaurat universa. thermas publicas, moenia, murorum  
restituens morantur ibi (etc.).*

The only correction that is certain and obvious is that to the singular of one main verb (*moratur*): indeed, what the manuscript is reported as offering here is *morātur* — a trivial corruption and probably a very recent one, perhaps even due to the scribe of P himself. The rest, though clearly not correct as transmitted, does need discussion. The only obvious and certain error apart from the verb is the repetition of *restituens*, which is not only clumsier than even the standards of our simple tale will allow, but cannot make sense in view of *restaurat*. (The meaning of the two verbs, in later Latin, is the same.) It is not at once obvious in which place it ought to be deleted. Also, as Riese saw, *moenia publica* is suspect,

---

<sup>3</sup> On RB see further below: it is better treated separately. I omit Tsitsikli's rather odd use of italics in her text, in any case irrelevant here.

since *moenia* cannot be *priuata*, at least as regards a city.<sup>5</sup> On the other hand, there is nothing obviously wrong with *universas termas* or with *laetitiam populo addens*: Riese's changes in those phrases were consequential, and while this is fully legitimate, we must watch carefully that the general gain obtained is not outweighed by particular loss in clarity and sense in phrases needlessly altered.

That this has happened in at least one of these instances can hardly be questioned. Riese's dissociation of *thermas* from its adjective, with punctuation between them, is the weakest point of his creation. For what can *restaurat universa* mean? Not the whole of the city, surely (and even that ought to be *universam urbem*). At most, *universa* <*opera publica*>. But if so, why is that not stated (for we can hardly claim its omission as a corruption)? Moreover, the list of buildings is in fact rather limited; there is no reference to administrative buildings or to temples: only baths and the city walls (with their appurtenances) are listed. However naive our author, he should not be saddled with this. On the other hand, it is perhaps unlikely (whether or not he knew Tarsus) that he thought of a major Greek city as containing only a single bath complex. Cities, and their wealthy citizens, vied with each other in providing such amenities. Thus *universas thermas* seems positively required for the best sense. In fact, *thermae publicae*, though it is found, is by no means a common phrase, for *thermae* are normally public: there is no need to state the obvious.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> As I have not seen a copy and editors do not report all spelling variations, I cannot vouch for accuracy.

<sup>5</sup> The phrase, though rare, can occur: e.g., four times in the index to ILS, three of them concerning one person. As we shall see (next note with text), Riese's transposition offers no improvement in this respect. This may be the place to mention that Ring (1887), also noting the similarity of *munera* and *moenia* (on which see below), read (I correct a misprint)

*moenia restituens restaurat universas thermas publicas*

and thus deleted *moenia* (before *publica*, which he had to emend) as "intrusive", while not objecting to the repetition of *restituens*. It will appear that, if my argument is followed, *munera* should not be ejected from the text.

<sup>6</sup> Not in the index to CIL VI; three times in that to ILS (cf. on *moenia*, last note). Also twice in HA, once (Tac. 10,4) in rhetorical contrast with *priuatus*. As we see, both these combinations are possible; they are simply not good

Riese's major change thus reveals obvious weaknesses, to be accepted (I repeat) only if there is no better alternative for attaining sense. His addition of *ad* is based on a rather insecure emendation in RB, which, even if correct, may not be relevant here.<sup>7</sup> In itself, and divorced from Riese's rewriting of the text as a whole, it produces no improvement on the *traditio*. It makes as good sense for Apollonius to add pleasure for the people as to add gifts to the people for (their) pleasure, in order to celebrate the occasion (*pro hac re*). It is merely Riese's deletion of the first *restituens* that converts *munera* into a required object for *addens*.

The basic question, therefore, is: can we deal with *moenia publica* and the duplication of *restituens* in a way that leads to less unsatisfactory consequences? Let us experiment with a rather bolder suggestion than Riese's.

Let us assume that *publica* may have slipped from following *munera* to following *m(o)enia* owing to the similarity of the two words in successive lines. This may have been noticed by a reader who put a marginal note in, to indicate the error he had spotted. As often happens, such a note produced confusion rather than correction, and the wrong word was inserted in the gap — moreover, without being deleted in the place where it stood. In other words, I suggest that we should consider an original text that may have read

*itaque Apollonius pro hac re laetitiam populo addens munera publica restaurat. universas thermas moenia murorum turres restituens moratur ibi (etc.).*

The actual changes are on the whole no greater than Riese's, and we have at least tried to set up a model to account for the corruption, which

---

and neither is preferable to the other. There is no TLL entry for *thermae* yet; see OLD s.v.: "usu. a public establishment..." It should be asked whether Riese, who does not discuss his changes, meant *universa* to go (emphatically and rhetorically) with *munera*, thus probably taking *munera* in the sense I suggest below. But his insertion of *ad* before *laetitiam* seems to exclude this. Depriving that noun of its function as an object to *addens* (which needs one), it leaves nothing but *munera* to serve instead. It must therefore be regarded as intended to be divorced (as it also *prima facie* is by word order) from *universa*.

<sup>7</sup> On this see my discussion below. The emendation is possible, but inadvisable.

is no longer a series of haphazard errors, one of them (the repetition of a word in a different place) difficult to explain. It must be admitted that not all textual corruptions can be rationally explained and that this should not be a condition of acceptance. But where an explanation *can* be offered, it is surely preferable to follow it.

At least the text thus restored offers no difficulties such as *mar* Riese's. The use of *munera* for buildings endowed by a citizen's (or a ruler's) generosity is common enough, and baths and city defences are among the common objects of such generosity.<sup>8</sup> And Tarsus now has, as it ought to, more than one public bathing establishment: as I pointed out, the text should never have been doubted on this. I still have some difficulty in believing that our author thought all these extensive works could be accomplished in fifteen days. But if Riese wondered about this, he gave no sign of doing so. That someone else either wondered, or indeed never saw this figure, is certain: RB here has *sex mensibus*, which seems a more reasonable estimate, and also better fitted to underline the lavish generosity of Apollonius' gift. But I do not see what we can do about it, as far as the actual text is concerned. There is nothing technically suspect about the text we have, and mere tinkering (e.g., increasing the number of days by adding numerals) would be plain fiction.

Now that we have happened upon RB, let us conclude with a suggestion about its text and add a speculation — rather fanciful, admittedly, but perhaps suitably so *pro hac re* — independent of the argument concerning RA.

RB does not help with our basic problems in RA, for it includes neither *universas* nor *publica* in any form. But it seems certain that one branch, at least, of its (much more complex) tradition reported the work of restoration in the passive, with inescapable consequences for the meaning. Unfortunately Tsitsikli's editorial principles<sup>9</sup> make it impossible to gather

---

<sup>8</sup> For *munera*, see TLL s.v. II 4 b. The index to ILS readily furnishes examples of the endowment of public buildings.

<sup>9</sup> As announced on p. V: she claims to have seen all these codices of the "Erfurt recension" and to have completely collated them, but she will cite them only "wo sie für die Herstellung des Textes förderlich sind". It might have been better to leave the decision on this to those using her text. It will be seen that, in the instance here discussed, they are left simply helpless.



what some of the codices she cites actually read. But one of the main codices (the only one cited by Riese),  $\beta$ , certainly has this version. It is reported as reading

*restaurantur termenia*

(i.e. *ter*<*me*> *menia*, with a trivial error); and the other,  $\pi$ , going along with it, confirms, offering

*restaurantur turme menia*,

where the first syllable has been coloured by what immediately precedes. Whether the texts of the "Erfurt recension", cited for *therme menia*, also offer *restaurantur* (as one might expect) the apparatus does not permit us to see (cf. above): it will have to be checked by those with access to the evidence. But for the main tradition it seems assured that an editor ought here to print

*restaurantur thermae, moenia, (?et) murorum turres.*

Tsitsikli does not make clear why she follows Riese's *restaurants* without comment.

The tradition of at least one branch of RB thus had a strong break before the works of restoration. What came before? The two principal codices ( $\beta$  and  $\pi$ ) are essentially agreed:

*Apollonius vero dat (dans  $\pi$ ) licentiam populo dedit munera.*

They are joined in this by two of the Erfurt codices: only  $\mu$  has *leticiam*. Riese printed †*ad licentiam*. Tsitsikli without hesitation prints *ad laetitiam*, adding "cf. RA" — where *ad*, of course, was added by Riese on the basis of this very emendation he made in RB! Since *dat* once appears as *dans*, the emendation *ad* is implausible, though obviously not impossible.

We are led to the conclusion that RB here simply had a different version from RA (it would be presumptuous to decide which was the original version<sup>10</sup>), whether it really had the clumsy *dat licentiam populo*

<sup>10</sup> In view of the well-known "triangular" relationship of RA and RB to the presumed original (see Tsitsikli p. I), which may in fact be much more complicated than the "triangular" hypothesis suggests. None of the versions in various vulgar tongues (I have consulted versions in Anglo-Saxon, Danish, English, French, German, Italian (Tusco-Venetian), Mediaeval Greek, Spanish

or whether the emendation *ad* is correct. I.e., either (as our manuscripts have it)

*dat licentiam populo: dedit munera, restaurantur thermae* (etc.).

Or (if we feel we must emend)

*ad licentiam populo dedit munera; restaurantur thermae* (etc.).

We cannot avoid the conclusion that the redactor of this version thought (whether rightly or wrongly) that Apollonius' *munera* were public games: it is surely only in such a context that *licentia* makes sense. In this version, the *munera* are, as we have seen, syntactically separated from the works of restoration, whereas in RA they are (as I have suggested) the objects of restoration or (if Riese be followed) the acts of restoration. So far the argument seems certain. But let me now fulfil my promise of a touch of fancy.

Could we have, somewhere in the distant past of RB, the phrase *munera publica*, which I have tried to recover for RA — and which would indeed quite naturally be understood (or misunderstood — whichever it is) as referring to public games? The usual simplification and shortening in RB has deprived us of the answer, and indeed of understanding what, long before these versions diverged, Apollonius was said to have done.<sup>11</sup>

---

and Swedish and feel fairly confident that more exhaustive search would not make any difference) throw any light on the point here discussed, as they lack the details of our two Latin versions. We cannot tell how the translations are related to the actual Latin versions we have.

<sup>11</sup> The passage here discussed was first drawn to my attention by Professor G. Schmeling, who will probably be very surprised at what I have made of it. As usual, I am glad to thank my colleague, Professor Shackleton Bailey, for kindly looking over what I have written, naturally without assuming any responsibility for it.