

Thus there are no grounds for accepting Mathisen's interesting thesis concerning the late date of Avitus' death; and as a result, much else of what he presents has no foundation. But the general problems presented by the chronicle of Hydatius and the *Chronica Gallica* are by no means confined to this particular episode or to these particular chronicles; and they show that one must understand as much as possible about an entire chronicle before judgment can be pronounced upon a part of it.

R. W. BURGESS
St. John's College,
Oxford

APOLLONIUS TYRIUS 46 AND THE EDITORS

The passage in question is the following (p. 101. 1-4 Riese² = p. 158. 3-5 Tsitsikli):¹

... dixit Athenagora "Cives Mytilenae civitatis, sciatis Tyrium Apollonium huc venisse, et ecce classes navium properant cum multis armatis eversuris istam provinciam. ..."

properant A: om. P *eversuris* Riese²: *eversurus* AP: *eversuras* Riese¹, probavit Ring

The same passage appears as follows in the most recent edition, by G. A. A. Kortekaas (p. 394. 3-6):²

... dixit Athenagora: "Cives Mutilene civitatis, sciatis Tyrium Apollonium huc venisse—et ecce, classes navium properant cum multis armatis—eversurus istam provinciam. ..."

"*eversurus* i.q. *eversurum* (nom. in apposit.)" Kortekaas

The thought is perfectly obvious: Apollonius has arrived with his fleet, and now he is pressing forward with his troops to destroy the province. The manuscripts are manifestly corrupt; no editor prints an acceptable text. The version printed by Ring, with Riese's *eversuras*, is unintelligible (*classes ... properant ... eversuras*).³ All editions, whatever their differences, by printing *et ecce classes navium* give undue prominence to the ships; the emphasis should surely be on Apollonius. The same objection applies to the conjectures *eversuras* and *eversuris*, which, by emphasizing ships and soldiers respectively, deny Apollonius his

1. The relevant editions of the *Historia Apollonii Regis Tyri* are those of A. Riese (Leipzig, 1871¹ and 1893²); M. Ring (Posen and Leipzig, 1888); D. Tsitsikli (Königstein, 1981).

2. *Historia Apollonii Regis Tyri* (Groningen, 1984).

3. Riese¹ printed: "sciatis Tyrium Apollonium regem magnum huc venisse, et tēxea classes navium properantes cum multis armatis eversuras istam provinciam" (wherein *exea* was his misreading of *ecce* and *properantes* his conjecture in place of *properantur*—for so he misread *properant* in A). In his apparatus Riese remarked "ex ea A, om. B; puto eius," whence it appears that he at least envisaged a text which would construe. How Ring, who restored A's *properant* while retaining the conjecture *eversuras*, explained the syntax to his own satisfaction could now be discovered only by a visit to a νεκομπαντεῖον.

due—which he has in the manuscripts (*eversurus*). Kortekaas appears to have felt this; but his explanation of the nominative case involves an extreme anacoluthon unlikely to convince many even in a text such as this.

Properant is also problematic; Thielmann conjectured *praeparat* and Weyman *properat* (which he took in a transitive sense, with Apollonius as subject and *classes* as object). Neither gives satisfactory sense. Why “make ready” or “speed on” ships that surely have already arrived with Apollonius (*huc venisse*)? Nevertheless, both scholars correctly perceived that the subject of the finite verb should be Apollonius, not the ships.⁴

The following sequence gives the sense and the appropriate emphases:

... dixit Athenagora “Cives Mytilenae civitatis, sciatis Tyrium Apollonium huc venisse et [ecce] classes navium. <et ecce> properat cum multis armatis eversurus istam provinciam. ...”

A scribe, by anticipation, wrote *et ecce* before *classes navium* rather than *et* alone. Either the following *et ecce* (after *classes navium*) was simultaneously omitted by accident, or the resultant *et ecce classes navium et ecce* induced someone to delete one of the two identical, and redundant, phrases. To a scribe faced with this situation it would hardly have occurred to expunge only the first *ecce* and not the *et* before it as well. Since this *et* was necessary as a connective, it had to stay, and *ecce* with it. Hence the removal of the second *et ecce* with the consequent juxtaposition of *classes navium* and *properat*. Change, conscious or otherwise, of *properat* to *properant* was then all but inevitable.

If confirmation of this sequence be required, the independent RB recension will provide it (p. 101. 2–4 Riese² [lower half of page] = p. 159. 4–6 Tsitsikli = p. 395. 4–7 Kortekaas):

... dixit <Athenagora> “Cives Mytilenae, sciatis Tyrium Apollonium regem magnum huc venisse et classes navium: exercitu proximante eversurus est civitatem. ...”

R. RENEHAN
University of California,
Santa Barbara

4. The omission of *properant* in P may be due to a copyist who saw the patent contradiction between *properant* and *eversurus* and simply omitted *properant* as a stopgap.