ANTIKE TEXTE

MANUEL SANZ MORALES (Ed.)

2

Chariton of Aphrodisias' *Callirhoe*

A Critical Edition

Universitätsverlag
WINTER
Heidelberg

ANTIKE TEXTE
Band 2

Die Reihe *Antike Texte* bringt griechische und lateinische Originalschriften in einer verläßlichen Textgestalt und erschließt diese über einen Kommentar und Erläuterungen. Ziel ist es, die Studierenden ebenso wie die Lehrenden wieder an die Originalschriften und die Originalsprache heranzuführen, und zugleich eine verläßliche, editorisch aufbereitete Textfassung für das Studium und die Lehre antiker Werke zu liefern.

Chariton of Aphrodisias' *Callirhoe*

A Critical Edition

Edited by
MANUEL SANZ MORALES

Universitätsverlag
WINTER
Heidelberg

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek
Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation
in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie;
detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet
über *http://dnb.d-nb.de* abrufbar.

UMSCHLAGBILD

Odysseus mit Polyphem, archaisches Vasenbild
(Archäologisches Museum Argos). Photo: Zde, 25. Juni 2000,
Nutzung und Bildbearbeitung gemäß Creative-Commons-Lizenz
CC BY-SA 4.0,
https://commons.wikimedia.org/w/index.php?curid=55120585

ISBN 978-3-8253-6615-5

Dieses Werk einschließlich aller seiner Teile ist urheberrechtlich geschützt.
Jede Verwertung außerhalb der engen Grenzen des Urheberrechtsgesetzes
ist ohne Zustimmung des Verlages unzulässig und strafbar. Das gilt ins-
besondere für Vervielfältigungen, Übersetzungen, Mikroverfilmungen
und die Einspeicherung und Verarbeitung in elektronischen Systemen.

© 2020 Universitätsverlag Winter GmbH Heidelberg
Imprimé en Allemagne · Printed in Germany
Typesetting and layout: Juan Manuel Macías |
https://maciaschain.gitlab.io/lunotipia
Druck: Memminger MedienCentrum, 87700 Memmingen

Gedruckt auf umweltfreundlichem, chlorfrei gebleichtem
und alterungsbeständigem Papier.

Den Verlag erreichen Sie im Internet unter:
www.winter-verlag.de

PREFACE*

Of the five ancient Greek novels that have come down to us in their complete form, that of Chariton was the last to be introduced to modern readers. It was not until 1750 that the *editio princeps* was published, by the Dutch scholar Jacob Philipp D'Orville (1696–1751) in Amsterdam. In it the Greek text was accompanied by an extensive commentary in Latin by D'Orville himself, along with a Latin translation by the eminent German Hellenist Johann Jakob Reiske (1716–1774).

D'Orville's edition was based on the text of the only manuscript containing the whole novel, Florentinus Laurentianus Conventi Soppressi 627 (F in the editions except for that of Molinié, who denotes it as L). With its 140 folios, this extremely important codex has handed down to us a considerable part of the corpus of the ancient Greek novel since it not only preserves the complete text of *Callirhoe* in ff. 48r–70r and constitutes the sole witness for approximately 95% of the work,[1] but is also the *codex unicus* for the whole of Xenophon of Ephesus and for Longus 1.12.4–1.17.4.[2] The provenance of the manuscript is unknown, with Melitene in Cappadocia, the area of Nicea, and even Constantinople itself having been put forward as the possible place of origin.[3] Nor is its dating certain. Editors seem to be in agreement

---

* English translation by Catriona F. Zoltowska. The material presented in this preface will also be dealt with in the section Textüberlieferung und Editionen of the introduction to the commentary I have written along with M. Baumbach (cf. Baumbach and Sanz Morales, forthcoming). Some repetition will be inevitable.

[1] The novel has traditionally been known under the title of *Chaereas and Callirhoe*, as in F, following the lines of the other known Greek novels, but at the end of book II P. Michael. 1 (published in 1952 and which I will mention later) has Χαρίτωνος Ἀφροδισιέως τῶν περὶ Καλλιρόην διηγημάτων λόγος β'. This colophon, together with Chariton's statement closing the novel, τοσάδε περὶ Καλλιρόης συνέγραψα, would seem to confirm that it was known by the name of its female protagonist, for which reason the title *Callirhoe* has attained predominance among specialists in recent times.

[2] On F, cf. Bianchi (2001), with copious information and bibliography. For a description of the complete codex, cf. Rostagno (1893: 172–176).

[3] Bianchi (2001:165–168). This author is in favour of the last-mentioned

in attributing it to the final decades of the 13th century, but the possibility of its being later cannot be ruled out completely: there have been proposals to date it to the 14th c., and even well into it. The only certain information is provided by the writings of Byzantine authors of the seventh decade of the 13th c. which form part of the codex. It would therefore seem prudent to recommend a *terminus post quem* of around 1270 or a few years earlier. There is no agreement on a more precise chronology.[4]

But D'Orville never saw the Florentian codex,[5] as his edition was based on the apograph copied by Antonio Cocchi between November 1727 and April 1728.[6] Cocchi intended to edit the novel but, eventually unable to carry out his plan, decided instead to sell the copied exemplar to the Dutch scholar. D'Orville's *editio princeps* therefore compounded the corruptions in the codex itself with the copying errors of Cocchi. Although the editor corrected them in part and a good number were also made good by Reiske in the textual notes D'Orville allowed him to incorporate into his own edition, the fact is that the text of Chariton left the printer's in a significantly corrupted state.

The editions that followed over the next two centuries did not solve the basic problem, since none of the editors were able or willing to examine the Florentian codex. Neither Christian Daniel Beck, for his reedition (1783) of D'Orville's text, to which he added textual

---

location, previously proposed by Vieillefond in his edition of Longus (Paris 1987, XXXVIII, n. 1; XL).

[4] The proposals include the year 1280 as *terminus ante quem* (Wilson), the end of the 13th c. or beginning of the 14th (Vitelli-Paoli), the beginning of the 14th (Treu), or even the third quarter of that century (Harlfinger). For all of this cf. Bianchi (2001: 162–163, esp. n. 8), who states no preference but says that the codex does not necessarily date from the 13th c. It is worth mentioning that some editors of the novel date it to the 13th c. with no explanation offered (Molinié, Goold); Blake prudently states "s. xiii vel xiv"; Reardon is more precise, dating it "ca. 1270–1280" (cf. his ed., p. VI, n. 5).

[5] For the gestation of D'Orville's edition and the vicissitudes of the 19th c. editions, consult the prefaces by Blake (1938) and Reardon (2004) to their own editions and in particular the account in Reardon (2001).

[6] Cocchi (1695–1758) was a physician but also devoted himself to philology. As the author of the *editio princeps* of Xenophon of Ephesus (London 1726) he was very familiar with the codex.

notes by himself and others, nor Wilhelm Adrian Hirschig for his *editio Didotiana* (1856), nor Rudolf Hercher for his Teubner edition (1859) visited Florence, so that they were unable to restore the correct readings transmitted by the medieval codex and distorted by the 18th c. apograph.

In 1842 the great Dutch scholar Carel Gabriel Cobet (1813–1889) collated the manuscript with the help of D'Orville's edition, but the progress his collation might have represented did not materialize. Cobet sent his collation to his friend Hirschig, who was preparing his own edition, but Hirschig mixed the corrections Cobet had made on the basis of his collation with his own conjectures for corrupt passages of the codex. The result was an extremely confusing text which fails to distinguish between readings supported by the manuscript tradition and readings *ope ingenii*.[7]

A specific problem affecting the beginning of the novel must be mentioned in relation to Cobet's work. The first page of F (f. 48r, from the beginning to 1.1.11) was damaged and difficult to read, which led Cobet while working on his collation to request permission from the library to apply a chemical reagent to it. He was thus able to read most of the first folio before it became completely illegible as a result of the use of this reagent. As a result, for the beginning of the novel we are still dependent today on Cobet's apograph, which the Biblioteca Nazionale Laurenziana preserves alongside the codex.[8]

The ostracism to which the Florentian codex was subjected came to an end in 1938, when Warren E. Blake published his critical Oxford edition after reading the manuscript, now no longer the only known witness for the novel. For the first time scholars had access to a reliable text, based on Blake's collation of F. Subsequently both Molinié (1979) and Reardon (2004) carried out their own *collatio* of the manuscript and helped to clear up a number of dubious readings. Other

[7] Cf. Blake (1931: 69–71) and Reardon (2001: 66–67). As a result the only useful part of Hirschig's edition is his own contributions to the text.

[8] Cobet's copy takes up the front and part of the back of a folio kept in an envelope stuck to the back cover of the codex. Folio 48r was digitized by Guida, but unfortunately it was not possible to make any progress with respect to Cobet's reading (Guida 2008: 177; the work includes two plates showing f. 48r before and after being treated).

scholars have also studied the Florentian codex,[9] making valuable critical contributions and improving our knowledge of it. In my view, the work of all these scholars made it unnecessary to collate F anew for the present edition. I did, however, judge it essential to consult the codex personally, which enabled me to confirm some doubtful readings and solve certain problems for which the photograph I had been working with was not sufficiently reliable.[10]

There are three apographs of F, one of them already mentioned.[11] They are witnesses of no value for the *constitutio textus* but their authors do provide some interesting conjectures.[12]

---

[9] Worthy of particular mention are Augusto Guida and Nunzio Bianchi.

[10] I carried out the consultation at the beginning of June 2018, during the final phase of my edition. As for the photograph, it is the same as the one previously requested and used for his own edition by Reardon, who kindly set me on the track of the negative. I wish to record my thanks to him for this, as well as to the Institut für Papyrologie of the University of Heidelberg for the digitized copy it supplied.

[11] Worthy of at least a note are two witnesses to Chariton's text which have not been preserved. The first is a copy of F made by Henri Estienne along with a transcription of Xenophon of Ephesus during one of his stays in Florence between 1547 and 1555, most likely with the intention of editing both novels (cf. Guida 1999: 278). Of greater interest is the "phantom" codex of Chariton which was supposedly to be found in the Biblioteca Vaticana in the mid–18th c. (on this, cf. Guida 2010). The main clue lies in a letter from Angelo Maria Bandini, director of the Bibl. Laurenziana and cataloguer of its Greek codices, to Tommaso Perelli (1704–1783), mathematician and professor of astronomy at the Studio Pisano, who in 1747 had conceived the project of editing and translating Chariton, a plan he abandoned after the publication of D'Orville's edition. In this letter, dated 24 April 1751, Bandini states that a collation has been made of the *editio princeps* against the ms. in question and sent to Holland. The recipient was D'Orville, but he died on 13 September that year, and there all trace of the collation is lost. Guida's research into the ms. and the collation has yielded no fruit. It should be pointed out that in D'Orville's collected letters, now in the Bodleian Library at Oxford, there is no mention of these witnesses.

[12] Furthermore, the Österreischische Nationalbibliothek of Vienna keeps a manuscript copy (Codex Vindobonensis Palatinus, Suppl. gr. 129) of the *editio princeps* by D'Orville, from the beginning of the novel to 2.10.1. This copy was made by Nicolas Joseph Jacquin in 1750 and does not include marginalia (cf. Roncali 2002: 103–140, with a facsimile of the entire copy).

In chronological order, the first is the ms. Marcianus cl. VIII 16 (1194), an apograph of F copied by Anton Maria Salvini (1653–1729) sometime before 9 November 1711.[13] Salvini, a teacher of Greek, transcribed the Florentian codex with a view to publishing an edition which never saw the light of day. We have a copy of the Chariton part of this apograph in Riccardianus 2482, with marginal notes by the renowned Tuscan scholar Giovanni Lami (1697–1770), a disciple of Salvini, up to the beginning of book II. Lami also had plans to publish the novel, along with Latin and Italian translations.[14] Finally there is the ms. Bodleianus D'Orville 319, the apograph by Antonio Cocchi referred to above as the basis for the *editio princeps*. All of which reveals significant scholarly undertakings surrounding the Florentian manuscript in the first half of the 18th century.[15] This activity is not wholly successful, since it gives rise to a number of frustrated attempts to produce an edition, but it does show the interest aroused at the time by the only known witness of Chariton.

The Laurentian codex contains the whole of Chariton's novel but, in addition, fragments of the text have come down to us thanks to three papyri of very similar dating. P. Fayûm 1,[16] probably written around the year 200, conserves part of book IV. The second papyrus, which can also be dated to between the second and third centuries and contains a part of book II, consists of two fragments published over half a century apart: P. Oxyrhynchus 1019[17] and P. Oxyrhynchus

[13] Guida (1999: 281–283 and n. 16).

[14] An indispensable study for this apograph is Guida (2005: esp. 137), who rediscovered it in the modern period. Ricc. 2482 contains a greater number of marginal annotations; however, these are not Lami's, but are copied from the notes made by Salvini in Marc. cl. VIII 16 (1194), the antigraph of Ricc. 2482 (Guida 2005: 139).

[15] Another example of this activity is the incomplete Latin translation (up to 5.2.7) contained in a codex preserved in Arezzo (Biblioteca Città di Arezzo, Fondo speciale "Biblioteca della Fraternità dei Laici", cod. 487) and published by Roncali (2002: 5–102), which Guida (2005: 139–140) has identified as the autograph manuscript of the above-mentioned Tommaso Perelli (see n. 11), who had also hoped to embark on the project of editing and translating the novel.

[16] Ed. Grenfell and Hunt (1900: 74–82).

[17] Ed. Hunt (1910: 143–146).

2948.[18] P. Michaelidae 1[19] contains the end of book II. This papyrus is the one that preserves the least text, but it is probably also the oldest witness of Chariton known to us. Its editor, Crawford, assigned it to the second century, Turner chose to date it to the second half of the same, and Edgar Lobel, under Turner's influence, suggested "later second century".[20]

Although not the only evidence, the papyri provide the most certain information for the dating of our author, as they place the *terminus ante quem* of the novel approximately in the second half of the second century, and undoubtedly near the year 200 (possibly slightly earlier). Three papyri is a not insignificant number of witnesses, especially in comparison with the other four complete novels we have,[21] and the fact that all three can be dated to a fairly narrow time frame, between the second half of the second century and the beginning of the third, reveals that in this period Chariton's novel enjoyed considerable popularity.

But *Callirhoe* continued to be read in the 7th (or perhaps 8th) century, as is shown by the fifth and final witness to the work. This is the copy made by Ulrich Wilcken of the *scriptura inferior* contained in four folios (at two columns per page) of a palimpsest acquired near the Egyptian Thebes and accordingly known as the *codex Thebanus*. These pages were destroyed in a fire which broke out on the boat which carried the German archaeological expedition back home, after it had anchored at the port of Hamburg. The text is therefore known to us only through the edition published by Wilcken in 1901 from his own

[18] Ed. Weinstein (1972: 12–14).

[19] Ed. Crawford (1955: 1–4).

[20] Turner expressed his opinion in a letter sent to Petri (cf. R. Petri, *Ueber den Roman des Chariton*, Meisenheim am Glan 1963, 47 and 51). As regards P. Fayûm 1 and P. Oxy. 1019 (P. Oxy. 2948 was as yet unknown), Turner coincides with the editors, although for P. Oxy. 1019 he is inclined to opt for a slightly earlier date than 200. For the text of the papyri, see the general studies of Zimmermann (1928b; only Π[1] and the first part of Π[2]) and Lucke (1985); for more specific problems, cf. Roncali (1999) and Sanz Morales (2002b and 2006c).

[21] Only for Achilles Tatius do we have a greater number of papyri; we have none for Xenophon of Ephesus, Longus or Heliodorus (for the last-mentioned we have only a tiny parchment fragment).

copy.[22] Before the unfortunate accident Wilcken had copied part of the passage preserved (8.5.9–8.7.3), although his copy unavoidably presented lacunae, since he was unable to read all of the text on the flesh side; the hair side was illegible owing to the conditions in which the papyrologist had to work.

The place of origin of the codex is unknown, but it might have belonged to the library of a monastery in Upper Egypt, since this was the source of the Coptic material offered to Wilcken. As regards the dating, Wilcken assigned it to the 7th century based on a comparison with other manuscripts, adding that the 8th century could not be ruled out completely.[23] This means that six or seven centuries after Chariton had written his novel, it was still in circulation and being read in the Greek cultural sphere. The nature of the text that was read is another matter, but we shall deal with this point later.[24]

As for the sigla used in this edition, while the majority of editors have used the sigla Theb., I have opted to denote it as W (from Wilckenus), as does Molinié, since the text we know is that of the exemplar copied by Wilcken (his edition, to be precise), which obviously may contain errors with respect to its antigraph, the *codex Thebanus deperditus*.

In this preface special mention should be made of the striking textual discrepancies between the witnesses, in particular between W and F, which have prompted several attempts to find an explanation.

Wilcken was the first to consider the problem, concluding that the *Thebanus* and F contained two completely independent versions, and that both were reworkings of Chariton's original text.[25] He also considered the two to be abbreviated versions of this original text, as in his opinion there were no cases in which the long version was

[22] Wilcken (1901: 232–238, text; 238–252, commentary).

[23] Wilcken (1901: 229). He states that his initial impression was that the hand could be dated to between the 6th and 7th centuries. This might explain why some editions and studies date the codex to this period.

[24] Indispensable on the text of the *codex Thebanus* as a whole, apart from Wilcken (1901), is the study by Zimmermann (1923); other works on more specific aspects or problems are Sanz Morales (2006a: 135–138), Conca (2010) and Martelli (2018).

[25] Wilcken (1901: 251–252).

inferior to the short one. He believed that F had been shortened much more than the Theban codex.

It is quite likely that Wilcken would have altered his conclusions had he been able to study the papyri, the text of which coincides substantially with that of F. In fact, after the discovery of P. Fayûm 1 and P. Oxy. 1019, Zimmermann established that the divergences between F and the two papyri were very slight in comparison with the differences between F and the *Thebanus*.[26] It was therefore possible now to consider the possibility that F and the papyri offered the original version (or at least one closer to the original than the version presented by W). As regards W, Zimmermann considered it to be an inferior witness to F, although it might be superior in some specific passages.[27]

As far as the basic considerations are concerned I agree with Zimmermann and think that the divergences in W might have arisen from a manipulation of the original text, especially through the presence of interpolations supposedly designed to make the text of the novel more attractive.[28] Passages such as the interpolation καὶ εὐνούχους καὶ παλλακίδας at 8.6.12 or the dialogue in 8.5.15 indicate, in my view, that the text of W has been manipulated, perhaps with the aim of making it more attractive to a certain type of reader, one who might take pleasure in the touches of oriental colouring which spoke of eunuchs or concubines, or who would appreciate over–sentimental passages like the moving conversation between Dionysius and his son, without stopping to consider the contradictions they might present in the internal logic of the narration. This does not mean that W does not contain a series of readings superior to those of F, but from the analysis carried out it can be deduced that the inferior readings of

[26] Zimmermann (1923). In fact, Zimmermann was able to assess the papyri with just as much precision as we can today, as there was only one of the three currently existing papyri that he had not seen, P. Michael. 1, by far the least valuable of the three because of its meagre amount of text. Nor had he seen the second part of the Oxyrhynchus papyrus (P. Oxy. 2948), though he was able to evaluate the text on the basis of the first.

[27] Zimmermann (1923: 380–381).

[28] Sanz Morales (2006a).

F can be explained as textual corruptions resulting from the normal vicissitudes of transmission.[29]

As for the papyri, those who have studied the text contained in them have considered it to be superior in general to that of F,[30] an opinion that has also been tacitly accepted by recent editors to judge by the text published in the editions themselves. But the matter does not stop here. Comparing the complete text of the papyri with that of F, I have reached the conclusion that the discrepancies in the papyri cannot simply be explained as mechanical copying errors.[31] Discrepancies, to mention the most striking, such as 4.2.4 γλυκύ F : δριμύ Π¹, 4.2.6 τῷ δεσπότῃ F : Μιθριδάτῃ Π¹, 4.2.9 αἵματος F : τ̣ολμ[ήματος] Π¹, 4.2.11 ἔχειν ἐκείνῃ γυναῖκα F : τῶν γυναικῶν Π¹, in the case of P. Fay. 1; or such as 2.3.6 ἀνεβόησεν ἵλεως εἶης F : εἵλεως ἔφη Π², 2.3.10 τὸ γεγονὸς F : om. Π², 2.3.10 om. F : ὁ Π², 2.3.10 om. F : αὐτομάτως Π², 2.3.10 om. F : αὐτῇ Π² (these various omissions in the same paragraph affect words that are superfluous), 2.4.10 ἐθεασάμην ...

[29] Two recent works examine aspects of the text of the *codex Thebanus*. Martelli (2018) offers a typological classification of the textual discrepancies between W and F; her assessment (Martelli 2018: 204) does not differ substantially from those of Zimmermann (1923) or Sanz Morales (2006a). For his part, Conca (2010) has studied the two passages (8.5.13–14 and 8.5.15) which in his opinion present the greatest variation between W and F, concluding that in these cases a reevaluation of the text of W is necessary (*contra* Baumbach and Sanz Morales, forthcoming, esp. *ad* 8.5.9–8.6.1 and 8.6.8–8.7.3). However, editors from Blake onwards coincide in attributing greater value to the text of F, as can be deduced in particular from the fact that in the passages with different wording they tend to follow the medieval codex. There are also editors who state this more or less explicitly: Blake, p. XI; Goold, p. 19 ("the vagaries of the Theban palimpsest"); Borgogno, p. 370, n. 389; Reardon, p. XII ("Thebanus porro tam frequenter variationes et errores praebet").

[30] Lucke (1985), Sanz Morales (2002b, 2009a); Roncali (1999) accords greater value to F (as against P. Fay. 1) in two specific passages, 4.2.4 and 4.2.9 (*contra* Baumbach and Sanz Morales, forthcoming, *ad loc.*). It should be pointed out that there is no absolute certainty that the three papyri offer the same version, since they are witnesses to different passages of the novel. Be that as it may, and with all due caution in the light of their brevity, especially in the case of P. Michael. 1, the papyri would appear to present a text that is very close to F.

[31] Sanz Morales (2009a).

ἔδοξε F (41 litt.) : ἐθεασάμην (lac. 14–17 litt. Π²) ἔδοξεν, i.e. ca. 24–27 litt. om. Π², seem to be signs that the papyri present a text that is not identical with that of F, although the difference is limited to small divergences of the verbal type. We would thus be dealing with the same text and not a text that has clearly been modified by means of the inclusion of phrases, or even of a short dialogue, as is the case in W. It is difficult to determine the exact reason for such discrepancies; as a possible explanation I have suggested[32] that the papyri present a rough copy, made with no desire to be absolutely exact; a dictated copy, with the omission of some words and a slightly different form of certain expressions could likewise be the reason, one not incompatible with the previously mentioned motive. The papyri and F would accordingly contain the same text, but with a few minor differences not attributable to normal copying errors.

In short, with regard to the text of Chariton that has come down to us it is possible to draw three conclusions:

1. In the transmission of Chariton's text two different versions can be detected. One of them, as witnessed by W, is a version that circulated in Egypt around the 7th (or perhaps 8th) century and which originated in the manipulation of a previous text (which would be the one that has reached us through F and the papyri, with the qualifications noted below), especially by means of the interpolation of expressions or phrases. The aim of this manipulation would have been to make the text more attractive for a readership which enjoyed the exotic or sentimental.
2. The text transmitted by F and the papyri is essentially the same (but see the following conclusion). This coincidence, together with the fact that this version is superior to that of W, permits us to assume that we have Chariton's original text before us, or at least a text that was already in circulation between the second and third centuries and was still preserved at the end of the 13th century.
3. The papyri contain a text that is less corrupt than that of F, but they also present certain readings which reflect some kind of

[32] Sanz Morales (2009a: 224–225).

copy made without aiming at literality, which makes it advisable in these cases to adopt the text of the medieval codex.

The following editions of Chariton have appeared to date: J.P. D'Orville (Amsterdam 1750 ; with commentary by the editor together with *animadversiones* and Latin translation by J.J. Reiske; 2nd ed. by C.A. Beck, Leipzig 1783) ; G.A. Hirschig (Paris 1856); R. Hercher (Leipzig 1859); W.E. Blake (Oxford 1938); G. Molinié (Paris 1979; 2nd ed. revised by A. Billault, 1989); G.P. Goold (Cambridge Mass. 1995); B.P. Reardon (Munich 2004); A. Borgogno (Turin 2005); C. Meckelnborg and K.H. Schäfer (Darmstadt 2006).[33]

Four of these editions warrant a few comments as they have marked important stages in the history of Chariton's text.[34] Apart from being the *editio princeps*, D'Orville's includes valuable textual annotations: those of the editor himself and, in particular, those of Reiske.[35] It was the only edition for more than a century. The second is that of Hercher, whose profound mastery of Greek enabled him to publish a text which improved its predecessor in quality even though he had no direct knowledge of the indispensable text of the medieval manuscript. Hercher's was the reference edition for almost 80 years, until the appearance of Blake's edition in 1938: as has been stated above, the first whose author consulted the Florentian codex personally and there-

[33] The complete references can be found in the section Editiones, p. xxix.

[34] Hirschig's edition adds scarcely anything of interest to that of D'Orville, and in addition it compounds the confusion surrounding the text offered by the witnesses, as has been stated above. Molinié's edition falls short for a number of reasons (cf. in particular the critical evaluation of Reardon 1982; also Hägg 1981). Goold has a very selective critical apparatus, as is usually the case with Loeb editions. Borgogno and Meckelnborg-Schäfer lack an apparatus and include a list of divergent readings with respect to the edition by Blake. There are also two translations that include a Greek text, but without a critical apparatus or a list of textual discrepancies with regard to a previous edition. Roncali (1996) reproduces the text of Molinié and Billault and includes observations on textual criticism in her notes. Rojas Álvarez (2014) does not mention which text she is using.

[35] For his second edition of 1783, Beck included in footnotes his own textual proposals along with those previously published by Pierson and Abresch, but without modifying the text of the first edition.

fore the only truly reliable edition up to then. It was also the first to incorporate three previously unknown witnesses: the El Fayûm papyrus, the first part of the Oxyrhynchus papyrus and the *codex Thebanus*. After 66 years during which Blake's text was the one used by virtually everyone, 2004 saw the publication of the Teubner edition by Reardon, a rigorous work incorporating the fresh contributions of other scholars in addition to the two most recently discovered witnesses (P. Oxy. 2948 and P. Michael. 1), and which has become the reference edition in recent years.

It is not easy to add significantly to the achievements of so many expert editors, but we can update our knowledge of the text with the contributions of the critics over the last 18 years.[36] This is what any edition should do, but in mine I have attempted to contribute something more in three aspects of particular interest. First of all, a more comprehensive critical apparatus than that of the editions of Chariton after Blake, since the conjectures of scholars worthy of at least appearing in the apparatus but which have hitherto been excluded from it ran the risk of falling unjustly into oblivion. In addition to this, a complementary apparatus is provided at the end of the edition, and before the Index Nominum, reflecting all the other corrections to the text, with the exception of those which are clearly erroneous as they are the result of a confusion of some kind.[37] Together with the apparatus criticus, this complementary apparatus may help to trace the history of the efforts made by scholars to correct Chariton's text over the years. Thirdly, I have included an *apparatus fontium* which in many cases contextualizes the relevant *locus*, in order to offer readers something more than a mere reference out of context, which in many cases may mean nothing to them.[38]

As regards the language used by our author, I limit myself here to

[36] The most recent publication Reardon was able to use for his edition is Dawe (2001).

[37] This has happened in particular with corrections to what were supposedly readings of F, which were later shown to be wrong after the ms. had been read correctly by Blake or subsequent editors.

[38] For example, when at 3.5.6 the mother of Chaereas embraces her son's knees and rips open her dress, exposing her breast to him, in an attempt to stop him from setting off on his dangerous voyage in search of Callirhoe, Chariton places on her lips the words spoken by Hecuba to Hector at *Il.* 22.82 ff. The

referring the reader to studies published in recent years which, even if not exhaustive, have improved our knowledge of this aspect.[39] A fairly full *conspectus* of the main aspects of the author's language will be available in the introduction to our commentary which is currently at press (Baumbach and Sanz Morales, forthcoming).[40] In any case, it is not too hazardous to claim (as supported by the studies in general) that Chariton's language can be characterized as being part of the Hellenistic literary koiné, which uses koiné as a basis, with the addition of forms taken from the classical prose writers. A language, however, that cannot yet be termed Atticizing and which some have called *classicizing* prose.[41]

As for the orthography, I have generally followed the criteria adopted by the editors since Blake, which are the same or very similar and basically consist in respecting the spellings of the ms., given that it is very difficult to determine precisely what the author's orthography might have been. In some cases the discrepancy between witnesses (which is also proof of the non-existence of spelling norms) makes it necessary to decide on the orthography of one of them: this is the case, for instance, with the Καλλιρόη transmitted by $\Pi^1\Pi^2$W (perhaps also by Π^3) and preferable to the Καλλιρρόη of F. The punctuation signs in the text likewise generally follow the later editions (basically the punctuation used by Blake), except where the sense calls for a different solution from that normally adopted.

The internal division of Chariton's work is the traditional one: into

intention to identify Chaereas here with the Trojan hero seems plain and the note in the apparatus is designed to make it patently clear.

[39] To be specific: for the phonology, cf. Sanz Morales (2014a); morphology, Sanz Morales (2015); syntax, in particular Papanikolaou (1973); lexis, Ruiz Montero (1991) and Hernández Lara (1994); and in general, see also Zanetto (1990). Extremely useful is the lexicon of the Greek novelists by Conca, Beta, De Carli and Zanetto (1983–1997).

[40] As far as the study by Heibges (1911) on Chariton's clausulae is concerned, I agree with Reardon, who in his edition (2004, p. XIV and n. 35, cf Editiones, p. xxix) points out that his arguments are ill-founded and the book of little use.

[41] The concept appears in Lasserre (1979) and has been accepted and used by later authors.

8 books in accordance with F, each book being divided into chapters following D'Orville, and each chapter into paragraphs following Hercher.

The present edition represents the work of many years. In the course of the project I have benefited from research stays in the departments or seminars of Classical Philology at the universities of Heidelberg, Zürich, Bochum, Bologna and the Complutense (Madrid), as well as at the Deutsches Archäologisches Institut in Rome.[42] I would like to record my gratitude to these institutions and in particular to their library staff, as well as to the many colleagues working in them who have offered me their assistance at specific moments.

Other colleagues who have read parts of this edition and contributed with suggestions or corrections I wish to name personally, apologizing in advance for any I might unwittingly have overlooked: Giovanna Alvoni, José Miguel Baños, Esteban Calderón, Enzo Degani†, Augusto Guida, Gabriel Laguna, Míriam Librán, Luis M. Macía, José B. Torres Guerra.

Of great value to me was the correspondence from 2004 on that enabled me to exchange information and opinions on the text of Chariton with Bryan Peter Reardon, whose death in 2009 left studies on the ancient novel irreparably orphaned. Needless to say, in our trading of philological armour I played Diomedes to his Glaucus.

With Manuel Baumbach I have spent so much time studying this novel, with Chariton present for endless hours in our conversations, that to express my thanks to him would be insufficiently generous: I prefer to say that this edition is in part his.

Cáceres, August 2019

[42] In addition to the facilities provided by these institutions, I wish to acknowledge the financial support received through research projects HUM2005-03090/FILO (Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia de España and European FEDER funds) and FFI2014-55244-P (Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad de España). The translation of this preface has been funded by the regional government of Extremadura (Junta de Extremadura, GR18144) and FEDER, through the research group HUM-015.

Studies about Charito's text and language

Abresch, F.L. (1753), *Dilucidationes Thucydideae*, Trajecti ad Rhenum.
Albini, U. (1962), "Noterelle esegetiche", *PP* 17, 381–384.
Angelo, M.L. (1975), "Ad Charit. VIII,5,5", *SicGymn* 28 , 551–556.
Anon. Leid. (s.a.) = Anonymus Leidensis, *Collectanea Critica ad Scriptores Eroticos Graecos*, ms. chartaceus, B.P.L. 743, Lugduni-Batavorum s. XVIII, ff. 145–163.
Arnott, W.G. (1966), "Notes on Greek texts", *SO* 41, 79–80.
Baumbach, M. and M. Sanz Morales (forthcoming), *Chariton von Aphrodisias: Kallirhoe. Kommentar zu den Bücher I–IV*, Heidelberg.
Beck, C.A. (1783), *Charitonis Aphrodisiensis... Libri Octo*, Lipsiae. D'Orville's edition with notes by Beck and other scholars.
Bernard, J.S. (1750), *Bibliothèque raisonée des ouvrages des savans de l'Europe* 45, 331–349.
Beta, S., E. De Carli and G. Zanetto, cf. Conca, F., E. De Carli and G. Zanetto (1989–2004).
Bianchi, N. (2001), "Il codice Laur. Conv. Soppr. 627 (F): problemi e ipotesi di localizzazione", *AFLB* 44, 161–181.
— (2004), (a cura di). *Caritone e Senofonte Efesio. Inediti di Giovanni Lami*, Bari.
Blake, W.E. (1931), "The Overtrustful Editors of Chariton", *TAPA* 62, 68–77.
— (1933), "Some Conjectures for the Text of Chariton", *CPh* 28, 307–310.
— (1936), "Modal Usages in Chariton", *AJPh* 57, 10–23.
Borgogno, A. (2003a), "Note al testo di Caritone d'Afrodisia", *Eikasmós* 14, 129–132.
— (2003b), "Restauri testuali a tre romanzi greci", *Orpheus* 24, 7–13.
— (2004a), "Indice critico per gli *Erotici graeci* (su Caritone, Senofonte Efesio e Longo Sofista)", *GIF* 56, 23–41.
— (2004b), "Per il testo di Caritone d'Afrodisia", *Prometheus* 30, 246–252.
— (2005), "Note critiche al testo di Caritone e Senofonte romanzieri", *Sileno* 31, 239–252.
Brioso Sánchez, M. (1991), "Sobre Caritón 7.6.2 y 6.7 y sus lagunas", *Habis* 22, 263–272.
Browne, G.M. (1981), "Ad Charitonem 1.3.7", *AJPh* 102, 321.
— (1985), "Chariton and Coptic", *ICS* 10, 135–137.
Calderini, A. (1913), *Le avventure di Chaerea e Calliroe*, Torino.

Castiglioni, L. (1906), "Osservazioni critiche a Longo Sofista, Senofonte Efesio e Caritone", *RFIC* 34, 293–320.
— (1929), Review of Zimmermann 1923, *Gnomon* 5, 127–129.
Cobet, C.G. (1842), Marginalia exemplari editionis D'Orville, Lugduni-Batavorum, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit, B.P.L. 759 E 71.
— (1843), *Collatio manuscripta codicis Florentini Conventi Soppressi 627*, Lugduni-Batavorum, ms. chartaceus, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit, B.P.L. 1299 I k.
— (1847), *Oratio de Arte Interpretandi Grammatices et Critices Fundamentis Innixa Primario Philologi Officio*, Lugduni-Batavorum, 74–75, 128.
— (1858a), "Charitonis Loci Aliquot Emendati", *Mnemosyne* 7, 123–124.
— (1858b), *Novae lectiones quibus continentur observationes criticae in scriptores Graecos*, Lugduni-Batavorum, 372–373, 491, 559–560, 786 (repr. Hildesheim, Zürich and New York 2005).
— (1859), "Annotationes Criticae ad Charitonem", *Mnemosyne* 8, 229–303.
— (1873), *Variae lectiones quibus continentur observationes criticae in scriptores Graecos. Editio secunda auctior*, Lugduni-Batavorum, 167, 169–172 (repr. Hildesheim, Zürich and New York 2003).
Cocchi, A. Marginalia in his copy of F, 1727–1728 (cf. Sigla, Apogr.), Oxonii, Bibliotheca Bodleiana, ms. D'Orville 319 Auct. X.2.1.16 (17197).
Conca, F. (2010), "Il Codex Thebanus e i papiri: suggestioni sul testo di Caritone", in: G. Bastianini and A. Casanova (edd.), *I papiri del romanzo antico. Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studi. Firenze 11–12 giugno 2009*, Firenze, 139–152.
Conca, F., E. De Carli and G. Zanetto (I–II), and S. Beta, E. De Carli and G. Zanetto (III–IV) (1989–2004), *Lessico dei Romanzieri Greci*, I–IV, Hildesheim, Zürich and New York (vol. I = Milano 1983).
Cramer, J.A. (1839–1841), *Anecdota Graeca e Codd. Manuscriptis Bibliothecae Regiae Parisiensis*, Oxonii, III, 451.
Crawford, D.S. (1955), *Papyri Michaelidae*, Aberdeen, 1–4.
Crönert, W. (1901), "Litterarische Texte mit Ausschluß der christlichen (Fortsetzung)", *APF* 1, 502–539 (528–529).
Dawe, R.D. (2001), "Some erotic suggestions. Notes on Achilles Tatius, Eustathius Macrembolites, Xenophon of Ephesus and Charito", *Philologus* 145, 291–311 (306–311).
Esposito Vulgo Gigante, G. (2002), "Un *hapax* omerico nel romanzo di Caritone", *SIFC* 20, 182–185.
Fuhr, K. (1911), Review of A.S. Hunt, *BPhW* 31, 889–895 (894).

Gärtner, T. (2009), "Vier Konjekturen zu griechischen Romanen", *ExClass* 13, 119–122.
Gasda, A. (1860), *Quaestiones Charitoneae*, Diss. Bratislaviae.
Gerschmann, K.–H. (1974), *Chariton-Interpretationen*, Diss. Münster.
Grenfell, B.P. and A.S. Hunt. (1900), "P. Fay. 1", in: B.P.G., A.S.H. and D.G. Hogarth, *Fayûm Towns and their Papyri*, London, 74–82.
Groeneboom, P. (1918), "Varia III", *Mnemosyne* n.s. 46, 165–171 (171).
Guida, A. (1978), "Note al testo di Caritone e di Senofonte Efesio", *RhM* 121, 195–196.
— (1999), "Un apografo sconosciuto di Caritone, un'ambigua nota del Pasquali e una fallita impresa editoriale del '700", in: V. Fera and A. Guida (edd.), *Vetustatis indagator. Scritti oferti a Filippo di Benedetto*, Messina and Firenze, 277–308.
— (2005), "Precisazioni su alcuni testimoni della fortuna di Caritone", *Prometheus* 31, 137–140.
— (2008), "Prove di restauro virtuale sul codice Laur. Conv. Soppr. 627", in: S. Lucà (ed.), *Libri palinsesti greci: conservazione, restauro digitale, studio*, Roma, 171–177.
— (2010), "Caritone in Vaticana", in: G. Bastianini and A. Casanova (edd.), *I papiri del romanzo antico. Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studi. Firenze 11–12 giugno 2009*, Firenze, 153–163.
Hägg, T. (1981), Review ed. Molinié 1979, *Gnomon* 53, 698–700.
Haupt, M. (1871), "Coniectanea", *Hermes* 5, 321–322.
Headlam, W. (1895), "Various Conjectures III", *Journal of Philology* 23, 260–323 (266).
— (1910), "Emendations and Explanations", *Journal of Philology* 31, 1–13 (13).
Heibges, S. (1911), *De Clausulis Charitoneis*, Diss. Monasterii et Halis Saxonum.
Hercher, R. (1854), "Zu Eudoxia, Apollonius, S. Empiricus, Chariton", *Philologus* 9, 592.
— (1858), "Zur Litteratur der griechischen Erotiker", *Fleckeisen's Jbb. für class. Philologie* 77, 153ss.
— (1859), "Zu Chariton", *Philologus* 14, 549.
— (1867), "Zu Aeneas Tacticus und Chariton", *Hermes* 2, 72–75.
Hernández Lara, C. (1990), "Rhetorical aspects of Chariton of Aphrodisias", *GIF* 42, 267–274.
— (1994), *Estudios sobre el aticismo de Caritón de Afrodisias*, Amsterdam.
Hertlein, F.K. (1875), "Zur griechischen Prosaikern", *Hermes* 9, 363.