

THE OLD ENGLISH *APOLLONIUS OF TYRE* IS  
COMPLETE AS IT STANDS<sup>1</sup>

Eichi Kobayashi

I

The story of *Apollonius of Tyre*<sup>2</sup> with its long history is one of the most widely read tales of medieval or even modern Europe. The ultimate provenance, which has been much disputed, is still unknown. However, it seems to have been a Greek Apollonius romance, now lost, in the third century A.D. The earliest surviving version of the story is the Latin prose romance *Historia Apollonii Regis Tyri*<sup>3</sup> which appears to have been an original translation from the Greek romance. It seems to have been composed in the fifth century. From the earliest references to the story it now seems that the Latin version must have been known in western Europe as early as the end of the fifth or the beginning of the sixth century.<sup>4</sup>

An examination of the Latin Apollonius shows evidence that the work is full of Greek elements. The numerous allusions to pagan gods, Neptune, Apollo, Diana; the descriptions of pagan festivities and rites of burial; the localization of the story in Antioch, Tyre, Tharsus, Cyrene, Ephesus, Mitylene; and the social and political life described in the story; unquestionably point to pagan antiquity for the origin of the story.<sup>5</sup>

It is worth noting that there are more than one hundred extant manuscripts of the Latin *Historia*, which are distributed throughout Europe: England, Vienna, Munich, Paris, Rome, Berne, Leipzig, Goettingen, Basel and many other places.<sup>6</sup>

In the process of being translated from Greek into Latin, Christianized Latin elements had been added to the story,<sup>7</sup> which might have been one of the causes of its immense popularity for more than a thousand years. Throughout western Europe which had been completely Christianized by the end of the twelfth century, the god in the phrase "favente deo" ("gefultumigendum Gode" in Old English), for instance, must have been quite naturally taken as the Christian God.

The story coupled with Christianized Latin elements thus readily found its way into European vernacular languages. The vernacular versions of the story appear in such countries as Germany, Denmark, Sweden, Holland, Italy, Spain, France, Hungary, Russia, and, of course, England. With the exception of the English version which will be later discussed in detail, the earliest are the twelfth-century German versions and the rest of them range from the fourteenth to the nineteenth century. It is a matter of interest that all the vernacular versions made from the fourteenth century onward are translations, with varying degrees of modification, from the *Gesta Romanorum*,<sup>8</sup> the extremely popular fourteenth-century collection of tales. They are not from the *Historia*, which is older by far than the *Gesta*.<sup>9</sup>

I now turn to the English version of the story, which had taken its course in English literature chronologically as follows:

1. The Old English romance, in the middle of the 11th century.
2. An early English metrical translation.
3. Gower's *Confessio Amantis*, c. 1483.
4. *Kynge Apollyn of Thyre*, a prose romance, translated by Robert Copland from the French. Published by Wynkyn de Worde, 1510.
5. Twine's *Patterne of Paineiful Adventures*, 1576.
6. Shakespeare's *Pericles*, 1609.
7. Geo. Wilkins' *Pericles Prince of Tyre*, a novel, 1608.
8. Lillo's *Marina*.<sup>10</sup>

As the above list shows, the history of the Apollonius story began at an

exceptionally early date in England. Indeed, it is *the* earliest known version of the story in a European vernacular language.

With respect to the place which the Old English *Apollonius of Tyre* occupies at the present time in the history of English literature, C.L. Wrenn, who seems not too enthusiastic about the romance, has to say as follows:

*Apollonius of Tyre* in Old English may possess some claim to be called the first English novel, although one can trace no direct influence from it on the Middle English users of the same material. . . . He [the maker of the Old English version of the story] has maintained a vivid if not at all subtle presentation of his human characters, with a tone of courtesy and sympathy with romantic love which cannot be paralleled till the days of the Middle English romances. . . . The tone of *Apollonius* may remind us at times of the high romance of *The Faerie Queene* in its treatment of terrifying adventures and of faithful love.<sup>11</sup>

Stanley B. Greenfield and Daniel G. Calder, who are more positive in their appreciation of the work say as follows:

Of the works showing Eastern influence, by far the most attractive is the Old English version of the Greek-Latin romance *Apollonius of Tyre*. . . . the Old English version . . . translates the Latin characters with sensitivity and understanding and the human relationships with a humor unique in Old English prose literature. . . . The smooth Old English prose, so suitable for narrative and so different from anything by Alfred, Aelfric, or Wulfstan, is a glimpse of narrative style that might have been developed if English had not been replaced by French after the Norman Conquest.<sup>12</sup>

It may be true, as Wrenn says, that the later authors of the same material have had no direct influence from the Old English *Apollonius*. But it is in order to explain some of the later works dealing with the story, following Smyth's list quoted above.

A fragment of a certain early English metrical translation of some two hundred and fifty lines, the language of which seems to antedate that of Gower, is printed by Smyth.<sup>13</sup> There is no way of knowing its immediate source. The concluding lines state that the poem "... was translaytyd/ Almost at Engelondes ende," by one who "was vicary, y understonde,/ At Wymborne mynstre in that stede." The "Wymborne mynstre" is in Dorsetshire.<sup>14</sup>

As it is well known, Gower produced a long and rather monotonous version of the story in his *Confessio Amantis*.<sup>15</sup> He tells us the source of his tale in his opening lines:

Of a Cronique in daies gon,  
The which is cleped Pantheon,  
In loves cause I rede thus,  
Hou that the grete Antiochus, (11. 271-4)

Thus his story was evidently based on Godfrey of Viterbo's *Pantheon*, but Macaulay mentions a number of points in which the story of the *Pantheon* is different from Gower and from the Latin *Historia*. Therefore, Gower must have drawn on some other earlier Latin version.<sup>16</sup> It was Gower's version, presumably, which made Chaucer write his much debated and often quoted lines:

How that the cursed Kyng Antiochus  
Birafte his doghter of hir maydenhede,  
That is so horrible a tale for to rede,  
Whan he hir threw upon the pavement.

(Introduction to *The Man of Law's Tale*, 11. 82-5)

The rest of the history of the Apollonius story in English literature will be left unexplained, since it does not have direct relevance to the present paper. I will now turn to the main part of my discussion on the Old English *Apollonius of Tyre*.

## II

The Old English version of *Apollonius of Tyre* does not pretend to be original but clearly states that it is a translation. When the translator comes to the end of his story he does not forget to add a few lines of epilogue in a manner reminiscent of Alfred and Aelfric:

Her endað ge wea ge wela Apollonius þæs tiriscan, ræde se þe wille.

And gif hi hwa ræde, ic bidde þæt he þas awændednesse ne tæle, ac þæt he hele swa hwæt swa þar on sy to tale. (Goolden, p. 42)

(Here ends both the misery and happiness of Apollonius the Tyrenian, let him read it who wishes to. And if anyone read it, I pray that he will not blame this translation, but that he will conceal whatever may be blameworthy in it.)

Thus the Old English version is unmistakably a translation. However, as it was stated earlier, there are numerous Latin manuscripts of the story which show considerable textual differences. This makes it difficult or nearly impossible to determine which particular Latin version formed the basis of the Old English translation.

Consequently, the studies on the story hitherto produced are concerned primarily with the similarities and differences between the Latin versions and the Old English version.<sup>17</sup> The most recent work on the subject is Goolden's edition of *Apollonius*, in which he has reconstructed a Latin text, based upon a large sample of Latin manuscripts, designed to go with the Old English version as closely as possible.

As a result of those and other comparative textual studies, it is now made clear and generally agreed that the translator of the Old English version was not attempting a complete translation of his source. He evidently followed the usual method of Old English translators of Latin texts, which Alfred made famous in the *Preface* to his translation of Gregory's *Pastoral Care*, in that the translation was done "hwilum word be worde, hwilum

andgit of andgite (sometimes word for word, sometimes sense from sense)" — a method King Alfred had learned from his Archbishop Plegmund and his other priests. The primary purpose of the Old English translator was no doubt, then, to grasp the essence of the Latin structures and to transmit the spirit of his source text into intelligible late Old English.

It has been pointed out that the Old English version has some "mis-translations" and "confusions" due probably to some passages which were simply not understood or due to some other reasons, to which I will refer again later in this paper. On the whole, however, the translation is quite accurate for both sense and feeling. It has in fact more warmth, vigor and vividness than the Latin version.<sup>18</sup>

Even today it is hard to define the meaning of "translation." There are many questions which still remain to be resolved when we ponder the meaning of "translation." However, with respect to the Old English version of the story, the problems involved in its translation have been discussed in terms of "omission," "addition," "paraphrasing," "adaptation," "mis-translation," and "confusion," compared with its supposedly corresponding Latin version.

The so-called "mistranslations" appear to be of little consequence in medieval literature as a whole, and in this sort of romance, which is primarily for entertainment, in particular. In fact, would it be possible for us to draw a clear-cut line between a medieval "translation" and a medieval "adaptation"?

As quoted earlier, the whole of this romance is the misery and happiness of Apollonius the Tyrenian. And the Old English version is said to have preserved almost exactly half of the original story. The size of the missing intervening narrative can only be guessed at and restored from the various Latin texts which contain a more complete version of the story. The first fragment of the Old English version ends with:

Nu for ðam þe he gehyrsum wæs þinre hæse and minum willan, ic

for æfter him. . . . (Goolden, p. 34)

(Now, because he was obedient to your command and my wish, I

[Arcestrate] went after him [Apollonius] . . . .)

As this point it breaks off until just before the end of the story, where the tale is resumed. However, this first fragment seems to constitute a charming love story complete in itself with enough of the misery and happiness of Apollonius.

In the second fragment Apollonius goes to the temple of Diana at Ephesus, as he is instructed by an angel in a dream, with his daughter, Thasia, and his son-in-law, Athenagorus, and recognizes his wife, Arcestrate, who had been serving the temple as a priestess. The rest of the story consisting, in a form of summary, of Apollonius' due vengeance upon his foes and generous reward to his friends, comes to an end with a happy ending. In a sense, therefore, it would be possible to say that this second and final fragment is rather remotely related functionally to the first fragment, but it serves to restore the missing sections except the brothel sequences, as mentioned above, and to "complete" the story. Those two distinct fragments constitute part of the unique extant manuscript, Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, MS. 201, to which I will return again later in the present paper.

This sense of incompleteness of the Old English *Apollonius* may have been largely responsible for the fact that it has attracted hitherto inadequate attention of literary historians and students of Old English literature. Furthermore, in the midst of didactic and homiletic literature, the Apollonius story, which is mostly for mere entertainment, might have attracted a special interest of the age. At the same time it might well have been one of those translations which, in the eyes of Aelfric, the homilist, are erroneous English books admired by the ignorant.<sup>19</sup>

R.M. Wilson, who is considered an expert on the subject of "Lost Literature," points out that the library of the Benedictine abbey at Burton-on-Trent has an extant catalogue drawn up in about 1175 which contains,

among other titles of works in English, *Apollonium, anglice*, but none of these manuscripts seems to have survived.<sup>20</sup> However, there is no way of telling whether the English *Apollonius* listed in this catalogue is the same manuscript as the one we have now in terms of quality and quantity. Wilson, however, says in his later work that the *Apollonium, anglice* is perhaps the manuscript of the Old English *Apollonius of Tyre* which we have now.<sup>21</sup>

Would it really be adequate to conclude that the missing parts in the Old English version, which had once been in existence, have been lost and to dismiss the whole issue? Is it not a fact that we often talk about "interpolations" or "digressions" when we discuss medieval literature? When we discuss the *Canterbury Tales* of Chaucer, for instance, we generally agree that of Chaucer's hundred and sixteen projected tales, he had written only twenty-three, and some of these were unfinished and the pilgrims were only just approaching Canterbury, their destination. Would there be not any probability that Chaucer had completed all his projected tales but many of the tales have been "lost" and what we have now is only fragments?

The portions which have been "lost" in the Old English *Apollonius* can be restored from the various Latin texts.<sup>22</sup> In terms of themes, they are roughly as follows:

1. Arcestrate, Apollonius' wife, gives birth at sea to a daughter and seemingly dies. She is put in a chest with gold and a letter. And the chest is cast overboard. But she is washed up at Ephesus and is revived. She serves the temple of Diana as a priestess.
2. Apollonius comes to Tharsus, entrusts his daughter, Thasia, to the care of foster parents and goes away to Egypt, where he stays for fourteen years.
3. The jealous foster mother orders her steward to kill Thasia, who is allowed to pray before being killed and in the interval is taken away by pirates and carried off to Mitylene.



4. At Mitylene the pirates sell Thasia to a brothel. But she manages to preserve her virginity and is protected by Athenagorus.
5. Apollonius returns, hears about his daughter's supposed death, and comes to Mitylene by boat. He stays on board grieving over his daughter. Thasia, his own daughter, is sent to console him with her songs and riddles, but he repulses her.
6. Thasia tells her life story to Apollonius and they recognize each other.

Of those six, 1, 2, and 3 are sufficiently reproduced in the form of recollections made by Apollonius, Arcestrate, and Thasia, in front of the temple of Diana at Ephesus in our second fragment. What has really been "lost" in the Old English version is themes 4, 5, and 6 which, roughly speaking, make up the brothel sequences.

### III

In this paper I would like to conjecture that the portions between the first and the second fragments in the Old English version of *Apollonius of Tyre* have not been lost at all but have been deliberately suppressed either by the Old English translator who translated it for the first time or by a scribe in the process of his copying it into the Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, MS. 201. This conjecture will be focused upon the following three points:

1. The Old English translator was a highly moral Christian monk or cleric<sup>23</sup> who had been heavily influenced by St. Paul's conception<sup>24</sup> of celibacy as the holy or preferred state of living.

When Apollonius takes the letters of the three suitors to Arcestrate, the princess, who was in her bedroom, he is apparently quite embarrassed at the discovery that a girl so young should react the way she did and said

“Lareow, hwi gæst þu ana?” (Teacher, why have you come alone?), to which Apollonius says:

“Hlæfdige, næs git yfel wif, nim ðas gewrita ðe þin fæder þe sænde and ræd.” (Goolden, p. 30)

This passage which has been unintelligible or at least puzzling to many students of the story reads in the Latin text:

“Domina, nondum mulier mala, sume *hos* codicellos quos tibi pater tuus misit et lege.” (Goolden, p. 31)

This “næs git yfel wif” has invited various comments and interpretations. A.J. Wyatt omits the *næs*-phrase in his text, indicating a break, but gives no explanation.<sup>25</sup> S. Moore and T.A. Knott omit the phrase, indicating a break, and say “the words that follow *hlæfdige* in the MS. (*næs git yfel wif*) are unintelligible.”<sup>26</sup> Goolden following Zupitza (*Anglia*, i (1876), 466-7) explains *næs* as derived from *ne* and *ealles*, not *ne* and *wæs*, and paraphrases “mistress, not yet a bad woman,” that is, still innocent. But he goes on to say that the remark seems pointless and out of context.<sup>27</sup> Michael Swanton renders this passage as “you are not yet a woman of ill repute!”<sup>28</sup>

O.F. Emerson proposes the following interpretation of this passage. He first compares the *næs*-phrase with its corresponding Latin *nondum mulier mala* and suggests that the *næs git yfel wif* be taken as parenthetical words of the narrator of the story, rather than of Apollonius himself. He reminds us of the fact that the classical story had often been modified by a Christian monk or cleric. The Christian monk, who had translated or copied the story, influenced by his clerical conception of celibacy, contrasted *mulier* in its sense of “married woman” with *domina*, which in this particular case he knows belongs to our unmarried princess, Arcestrate. To *mulier* “married woman” he hastened and added his rather strong disapproval of the married state of living in *mala*. The Old English translator made the expression more clearly parenthetical by putting in *næs*, which is nothing but “she was not.” With this Emerson says that we do not have to

take Zupitza's interpretation of *næs* as *ne ealles* but "all that is necessary to clear the passage is to indicate the separation of the speech from the parenthetical words, partly by dashes as Cook does, but more fully by adding quotation marks after *Hlæfdige* and before *nim*."<sup>29</sup>

In connection with Emerson's interpretation of this particular passage, what I would like to emphasize is that he reminds us that the maker, be he a translator or a scribe, of the Old English version must have been a Christian monk or cleric.<sup>30</sup>

With respect to this Christian influence it is not by chance that the story has here and there didactic and aphoristic passages, which must have been quite congenial to the Christian translator of the Old English version. A few examples of this didacticism will suffice, although almost all dialogue passages show the tendency.

(a) When Apollonius fails to respond to his inferior, Hellanicus, he is promptly and soundly rebuked by the latter for his unbecoming discourtesy:

Wes gesund, Apolloni, and ne forseoh þu cyrliscne man þe bið mid wurðfullum þeawum gefrætwod. (Goolden, p. 12)

(Hail Apollonius, and do not scorn a humble man who is graced with honorable manners.)

(b) A little later the same Hellanicus, scorning Apollonius' generous suggestion that he reports Apollonius' death and gets the reward from King Antioch, has to say:

... mid godum mannum nis naðer no gold ne seolfor wið godes mannes freondscipe wiðmeten. (Goolden, p. 12)

(... among good men neither gold nor silver is compared with the friendship of a good man.)

(c) Another good illustration is this; when the old fisherman, who had rescued, clothed, and fed Apollonius, says to Apollonius "I charge you, if through the aid of God you recover your former dignity, that you do not forget my poor garment," Apollonius says in reply to the fisherman:

Gif ic þe ne geþence þonne me bet bið, ic wisce þæt ic eft forliden-  
 nesse gefare and þinne gelican eft ne gemete. (Goolden, p. 18)

(If I do not remember you when things go better for me, I hope that  
 I may again suffer shipwreck, and not find someone like you again.)

There is no doubt that the passages illustrated above and other similar passages were in perfect harmony with the predilection of our Christian translator and his Christian audience.

2. The second point that I would like to make is that our Christian translator had rather freely modified and suppressed parts of the story which might have been felt to be unpleasant to him and his readers.

As pointed out by Goepf, comparison with the related Latin texts shows that the Old English translator followed his original very faithfully and on the whole reproduced it quite accurately, but there are two important departures.<sup>31</sup>

The first departure is that of the incest episode which appears at the beginning of the story. This part in the Old English version seems to have suffered some suppression, especially in the provocative description of King Antiochus' daughter. The Old English version has the following:

he hæfde ane swiðe wlitige dohter ungelifedlicre fægernesse.

(Goolden, p. 1)

(he [Antioch] had a very lovely daughter of unbelievable beauty.)

But in one group of Latin texts, which Goolden designates as Ri, there is a comment, in place of the repetitious phrase "of unbelievable beauty," which goes as follows:

in qua hihil rerum natura exerraverat nisi quod mortalem statuerat.

(nature had made only one mistake in shaping her and that was to have made her mortal.<sup>32</sup>)

Furthermore, according to the version in the *Gesta Romanorum*, the beauty of the girl is delineated more fully:

... the exquisite loveliness of her face, the delicacy of her form,  
 ...<sup>33</sup>

In the Old English version her beauty was such that her own father

... on ðare mánfullan scilde abisgode and þa ongeanwinnendan  
 fæmnan mid micelre strengþe earfoðlice ofercom, ... (Goolden, p. 1)  
 (... engaged in that wicked sin, and with difficulty overcame the  
 struggling woman by great strength, ...)

In this connection our attention might be drawn to the first part of the Sigemund episode in *Beowulf*<sup>34</sup> (874a-84a). It alludes to the well-known tale of revenge which corresponds to parts of the Old Norse *Vǫlsunga saga* (c. 1200). Since the Danish *scop*, *cyninges þegn* (867b) uses this particular episode in order to praise Beowulf and his deeds of strength and hardship, the true relation between Sigemund and Fitela, who are *ēam* and *nefa* in the Old English poem, may have been unimportant to the scop and the author of the poem. But considering the fact that the word *nefa* had sometimes been a euphemism for a bastard son since the early days of the Church, we can probably infer that the *Beowulf* poet, who was actually well acquainted with the true relation between the two men, stated their relation as *ēam* and *nefa* in the usual sense of the term. Or it may be quite possible to say that he, out of his sense of propriety, had omitted deliberately this brother-and-sister incest motif. I am, therefore, inclined to agree with Klaeber when he says:

... it [the fact that Fitela is referred to as Sigemund's *nefa* only] may be attributed to the Christian author's desire to suppress the morally revolting motive.<sup>35</sup>

Thus we can say that even in the eighth-century England, which had already become Christianized to a great extent, repugnant stories or parts of them seem to have been suppressed or omitted entirely. And the Old English Apollonius story was made in the eleventh-century England.

When Thasia is sent to see if she can console Apollonius who was too

grieved over the supposed loss of his daughter to leave the cabin of his ship, she finally falls on his neck and embraces him, but he repulses her and kicks her. This entire brothel episode has been suppressed by our Old English translator, because here Apollonius is about to commit incest, though unwittingly, which we can readily surmise, with his own daughter. The incest between King Antioch and his daughter being part of the story organically, it cannot be avoided all together. And the Old English translator manages to minimize it.

At this point it is of great interest and worth noting that even in Apollonius' narration of his life story, in the second fragment, before the temple of Diana, he simply says of King Antioch:

Ac he silfa wæs mid þam fulestan horwe þar to geþeod and me þa sirwde to ofsleanne. (Goolden, p. 36)

(But he himself was united with her in the foulest filth, and then plotted to kill me.)

But he says no more about this offensive subject-matter. Furthermore, Apollonius in his recollection makes no reference whatsoever to the brothel scenes in which his own daughter, Thasia, had been involved.

The second important departure is concerned with the Old English translator's omission of the whole passage in which King Arcestrates' daughter becomes lovesick for Apollonius, and the king summons doctors to diagnose her sickness:

Interposito pauci temporis spacio, cum non posset puella ulla ratione amoris sui vulnus tolerare, simulata infirmitate coepit iacere. Rex ut audivit filliam suam subitanam valitudinem incurrisse, sollicitus adhibuit medicos, at illi temptant venas, tangunt singula membra corporis, nullas causas aegritudinis inveniunt. (Goolden, p. 31)

(After a short space of time, as the girl could not endure the wound of her love by any means, she began to feign sickness. When the king heard that his daughter had suddenly fallen to sickness, he was ex-

tremely worried and summoned the doctors, and they examined her veins, touched every part of her body, but they found no cause of sickness.)

It is rather difficult to believe that the Old English translator was content to leave this whole passage untranslated, unless he had some reasons for it. Was it merely due to an oversight rather than a deliberate omission?

According to Goepf,<sup>36</sup> there is one circumstance which suggests that the passage in question may have been deliberately omitted because it was thought to be somewhat unpleasant to the Old English translator. In the scene immediately following the omitted passage, King Arcestrates says to the three suitors for his daughter's hand:

Nabbe ge ná godne timan aredodne. Min dohtor is nu swiáe bisy ymbe hyre leornunga, . . . (Goolden, p. 30)

(You have not hit upon a good time. My daughter is now extremely busy with her studies, . . . )

Though this scene between the king and the three suitors is regarded as a comedy scene — the very first comedy scene in the English language,<sup>37</sup> how should we interpret the king's rather absurd excuse, which is quite different from the Latin version? In the Latin text the king gives a different excuse, which is

. . . Filia enim mea . . . pro amore studiorum inbecillis iacet. . . .

(Goolden, p. 31)

( . . . Because my daughter is sick from love of study. . . . )

Here, it is not easy to determine whether or not the king believes *amore studiorum* to be the real cause of her sickness. Probably he does, for the doctors have been unable to diagnose her case. In any case, the point is that the Old English version, as it stands, is consistent with itself. I think it is possible that the Old English translator did not want the princess to become "sick," nor did he want her to be "examined or touched by the doctors." After all, that Arcestrate had been examined by the doctors and

revived in Mitylene had not been reproduced in the second fragment, either. Therefore, there is a possibility that the missing part of the Old English version was deliberately expurgated and the king's ensuing speech was altered accordingly, to suit the taste of the Old English translator and his society.

These observations will help to support my conjecture that the Old English translator had quietly expurgated the brothel sequences in their entirety which correspond roughly to the fourth, fifth, and sixth themes of the story mentioned above and suppressed the incest and its related themes, which might have been too unpleasant for exact translation or copying, as the case may be.

3. The third and final point I would like to make is concerned with the mid-eleventh century manuscript itself, Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, MS. 201, in which the Old English *Apollonius* has been uniquely preserved. This manuscript is made up of two separate parts which were put together in the sixteenth century. The Apollonius story, which is located in the first part of the manuscript, follows a large quantity of Wulfstan's homilies and laws. To be more specific, the story beginning on page 131 and ending on page 145 "is written in the same clear, round hand as the earlier material of the manuscript." It is noteworthy that from page 8 to page 145 there is no change of a scribal handwriting. The story thus covers some fifteen pages of the manuscript; the first fragment of some twelve pages are followed immediately by the second and final fragment of less than three pages.<sup>38</sup>

The fact that the manuscript has no indication of a break in the story and that the whole story is written in the same hand may help us to conjecture that there is no "lost quire of parchment."<sup>39</sup>



## IV

My conclusion is that the Old English *Apollonius of Tyre* is complete as it stands. In the version nothing has been lost but large numbers of passages both unpleasant and repetitious have been deliberately either suppressed completely or altered freely by the Old English translator or scribe, who must have been a highly sensitive Christian monk or cleric, in such a way that the story could find its way to a Christianized society of the late Old English period and find its place in the flood of homiletic literary works of Aelfric and Wulfstan.

Finally, the Old English translator may be praying that the reader of his translation will not actually "conceal" but "deal leniently with" his deliberate "mistranslations" and "expurgations" by saying

And gif hi hwa ræde, ic bidde þæt he þas awændednesse ne tæle, ac  
þæt he hele swa hwæt swa þar on sy to tale. (Goolden, p. 42)

(And if anyone read it, I pray that he will not blame this translation,  
but that he will conceal whatever may be blameworthy in it.)

## NOTES:

1. This is a revised and enlarged version of my paper "On the 'Lost' Portions in the Old English *Apollonius of Tyre*." In *Explorations in Linguistics: Papers in Honor of Kazuko Inoue*, eds. George Bedell, Eichi Kobayashi, and Masatake Muraki. Tokyo, 1979, pp. 244-50.
2. Peter Goolden, ed., *The Old English Apollonius of Tyre*, Oxford, 1958.  
E. Kobayashi, ed., "The Old English *Apollonius of Tyre*," *Annual Reports* (Division of Languages, ICU) III (1978), pp. 33-84.  
Josef Raith, ed., *Die alt- und mittelenglischen Apollonius-Bruchstücke, mit dem Text der 'Historia Apollonii' nach der englischen Handschriftengruppe*, Munich, 1956.
3. A. Riese, ed., *Historia Apollonii Regis Tyri*, revised edition, Leipzig, 1893.
4. Goolden, pp. x-xii; L.A. Hibbard (Mrs. Loomis), *Medieval Romance in England*, new edition with supplementary bibliographical index (1926-1959), New York, 1960, pp. 164-173.
5. Goolden, p. ix.
6. A.H. Smyth, *Shakespeare's Pericles and Apollonius of Tyre*, Philadelphia, 1898, p. 17.
7. Goolden, p. x.
8. H. Oesterley, ed., *Gesta Romanorum*, Berlin, 1872, Chapter 153. This is a selection of 181 stories made and published at Cologne, which Oesterley calls the *Vulgärtext* or Vulgate.  
Charles Swan, *Gesta Romanorum*, translated from the Oesterley's Vulgate in 1824. Revised and corrected by Wynnard Hooper in 1876. Dover edition, New York, 1959. Tale 153, pp. 259-299.  
Sidney J.H. Herrtage, ed., *The Early English Versions of the Gesta Romanorum*, Oxford, 1879, reprinted 1898, 1932, 1962. The story of Apollonius of Tyre, Pericles, Prince of Tyre, is not found in the English MSS. p. 529.  
The *Gesta Romanorum* Text, Smyth, pp. 93-112.
9. Smyth, pp. 25-47.

10. Smyth, p. 48.
11. C.L. Wrenn, *A Study of Old English Literature*, London, 1967, pp. 255-6.
12. Stanley B. Greenfield and Daniel G. Calder, *A New Critical History of Old English Literature*, New York, 1986, pp. 96-7.
13. Smyth, pp. 49-55.
14. Smyth, p. 55.
15. G.C. Macaulay, ed., *Confessio Amantis*, Oxford, 1901, reprinted 1957, Liber Octavus, 11. 271-2008.
16. Macaulay, pp. 536-7.
17. F.H. Chase, "The Absolute Participle in the Old English *Apollonius*," *MLN*, vii (1893), 486-9.  
O.F. Emerson, "The Old English *Apollonius of Tyre*," *MLN*, xxxviii (1923), 269-72.  
E. Helming, "The Absolute Participle in the *Apollonius of Tyre*," *MLN*, xlv (1930), 175-8.  
J. Zupitza, "Verbesserungen und Erklärungen," *Anglia*, i (1878), 463-7.
18. Philip H. Goepf, 2nd., "The Narrative Material of *Apollonius of Tyre*," *Journal of English Literary History*, v (1938), p. 172.  
Greenfield and Calder, p. 97.
19. Benjamin Thorpe, ed., *The Homilies of the Anglo-Saxon Church*, London, 1844-46, reprinted 1971, p. 2. Here Aelfric says "... forþan þe ic geseah and gehyrde mycel gedwyld on manegum Engliscum bocum, þe ungelærede menn þurh heora bilewitnysse to micclum wisdomtealdon; ..." (... because I have seen and heard of much error in many English books, which unlearned people, through their simplicity, esteemed as great wisdom; ...)
20. R.M. Wilson, *The Lost Literature of Medieval England*, New York, 1952, pp. 81-2.
21. ———, *Early Middle English Literature*, 3rd ed. London, 1968, p. 21.
22. Goepf, pp. 151-3.
23. O.F. Emerson, p. 271.
24. cf. *1 Corinthians*, Chapter 7.

25. Alfred J. Wyatt, *An Anglo-Saxon Reader*, Cambridge, 1919, p. 36.
26. S. Moore and T.A. Knott, *The Elements of Old English*, 10th ed., Ann Arbor, 1955, p. 96.
27. Goolden, p. 57.
28. Michael Swanton, tr. and ed., *Anglo-Saxon Prose*, London, 1975, p. 168.
29. Emerson, pp. 269-272.
30. Of course it must be kept in mind, too, that the maker of the Latin version had already been under the influence of Christianity.
31. Goepp, p. 171.  
Morton Donner, "Prudery in OE Fiction," *Comitatus* 3 (1972), pp. 93-5.
32. Goolden, p. xix.
33. Swan, p. 259. This particular portion is not found in the Latin text of the *Gesta Romanorum*, which is printed in an Appendix to Smyth's book cited earlier. p. 93.
34. Fr. Klaeber, ed., *Beowulf and The Fight at Finnsburg*, 3rd ed., Boston, 1950.
35. Klaeber, p. 159.
36. Goepp, p. 171.
37. Goolden, p. xxvii.
38. Goolden, pp. xxxii-iii.
39. Wrenn, p. 255.

Greenfield and Calder say "—the central part seems unfortunately missing—" p. 96.

As the following reproduction of the MS in question shows, it might be argued that because there is no indication of a break in the story and the first fragment extends to the very end of the last line of the page (see A below) and the second fragment begins at the very first line of the following page (B), there is a possibility that the intervening portions might have been "lost," as it seems to have universally been agreed upon.

B

Ða fæst hinc geð se ðan calðen. q. f. þ. u. r. r.  
 mid hif. adame. 7 mid hif. dale. 7 mid  
 þe hie f. ge. hif. de. hro. hif. lge. mid. e. ut. li.  
 7 mid. þu. þ. þ. an. ge. þ. e. m. de. 7 hif. h. e. a. þ. e. r

ne mid. þ. o. p. r. b. r. e. p. r. o. e. a. d. p. e.  
 de. þ. a. z. e. p. p. o. r. e. a. p. o. l. l. o. m. o.  
 n. i. þ. i. l. l. a. n. o. n. l. a. p. r. f. þ. i. þ. u. p. o. l. o. r. s. e.  
 f. a. h. i. a. e. t. b. r. a. d. A. u. p. o. r. d. a. n.  
 7 m. i. n. u. þ. i. l. l. a. n. a. e. p. o. r. a. f. e. h. i.

A