


A Companion to
Apollonius Rhodius

Edited by
Theodore D. Papanghelis
& Antonios Rengakos



BRILL

A COMPANION TO APOLLONIUS RHODIUS

MNEMOSYNE

BIBLIOTHECA CLASSICA BATAVA

COLLEGERUNT

H. PINKSTER · H. W. PLEKET

C. J. RUIJGH · D. M. SCHENKEVELD · P. H. SCHRIJVERS

BIBLIOTHECAE FASCICULOS EDENDOS CURAVIT

C. J. RUIJGH, KLASSIEK SEMINARIUM, OUDE TURFMARKT 129, AMSTERDAM

SUPPLEMENTUM DUCENTESIMUM DECIMUM SEPTIMUM

TH. D. PAPANGHELIS & A. RENGAKOS (EDS.)

A COMPANION TO APOLLONIUS RHODIUS



A COMPANION TO APOLLONIUS RHODIUS

EDITED BY

THEODORE D. PAPANGHELIS

AND

ANTONIOS RENGAKOS



BRILL
LEIDEN · BOSTON · KÖLN
2001

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

A companion to Apollonius Rhodius / edited by Theodore Papanghelis and Antonios Rengakos.

p. cm. — (Mnemosyne, bibliotheca classica Batava.

Supplementum, ISSN 0169-8958; 217)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 9004117520 (cloth : alk. paper)

1. Apollonius, Rhodius. *Argonautica*. 2. Greek poetry; Hellenistic—History and criticism. 3. Epic poetry; Greek—History and criticism.

4. Argonauts (Greek mythology) in literature. 5. Jason (Greek mythology) in literature. 6. Medea (Greek mythology) in literature.

PA3872.Z4 C66 2001

883.01—dc21

2001025887

CIP

Die Deutsche Bibliothek - CIP-Einheitsaufnahme

A companion to Apollonius Rhodius / ed. by Theodore Papanghelis and Antonios Rengakos. - Leiden ; Boston ; Köln : Brill, 2001

(Mnemosyne : Supplementum ; 217)

Erscheint unregelmäßig. - Früher Schriftenreihe. - Bibliographische

Deskription nach 208 (2000)

ISBN 90-04-11752-0

ISSN 0169-8958

ISBN 90 04 11752 0

© Copyright 2001 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Brill provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910 Danvers 01923, USA. Fees are subject to change.

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

CONTENTS

List of Contributors	vii
Editors' Introduction	
Theodore Papanghelis and Antonios Rengakos	xi
1. Outlines of Apollonian Scholarship 1955–1999	
Reinhold F. Glei	1
2. The Textual Tradition of the <i>Argonautica</i>	
Gerson Schade and Paolo Eleuteri	27
3. Myth and History in the Biography of Apollonius	
Mary R. Lefkowitz	51
4. Hellenistic Chronology: Theocritus, Callimachus, and Apollonius Rhodius	
Adolf Köhnken	73
5. The Poetics of Narrative in the <i>Argonautica</i>	
Richard Hunter	93
6. Apollonius Rhodius as “Inventor” of the Interior Monologue	
Massimo Fusillo	127
7. The Similes of Apollonius Rhodius. Intertextuality and Epic Innovation	
Bernd Effe	147
8. “Homeric” Formularity in the <i>Argonautica</i> of Apollonius of Rhodes	
Marco Fantuzzi	171
9. Apollonius Rhodius as a Homeric Scholar	
Antonios Rengakos	193
10. Apollonius as a Hellenistic Geographer	
Doris Meyer	217
11. Apollonius and Virgil	
Damien P. Nelis	237
12. “Est deus in nobis . . .”: Medea meets her Maker	
Edward J. Kenney	261
13. Echoes and Imitations of Apollonius Rhodius in Late Greek Epic	
Francis Vian	285

14. The Golden Fleece. Imperial Dream	
John K. Newman	309
Bibliography	341
Index	361

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

Bernd Effé is Professor of Greek Philology at the Ruhr-Universität Bochum, Germany. Main research interests: Greek Epic; Greek Drama; Didactic poetry; Hellenistic Poetry (esp. Theocritus and Bucolic poetry); Greek Novel; Ancient Myth; Ancient Philosophy (esp. Plato and Aristotle); Narratology; Historical Anthropology; Literary Theory.

Paolo Eleuteri is Professor of Codicology at the University of Venice. Main research interests: catalogues of manuscripts as well as text history and *Nachleben* of ancient literature in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance. His publications include: *Storia della tradizione manoscritta di Museo* (1981), *Scrittura greca nell'Umanesimo italiano* (1991, with P. Canart), *I manoscritti greci della Biblioteca Palatina di Parma* (1993), and *Repetitorium der griechischen Kopisten 800–1600*, vol. III (1997, with E. Gamillscheg and D. Harlfinger).

Marco Fantuzzi teaches Ancient Greek Literature at the University of Macerata. He has published widely in the field of Greek Literature, particularly Hellenistic poetry: his publications include a commentary on *Bion of Smyrna, Adonidis epitaphium* (1985), and *Ricerche su Apollonio Rodio: diacronie della dizione epica* (1988). He also co-edited with R. Pretagostini *Struttura e storia dell'esametro greco*, I–II (1995–6). A book on Hellenistic poetry, written jointly with R. Hunter, is forthcoming.

Massimo Fusillo is currently Associate Professor of Comparative Literature at the University of L'Aquila (Italy). His interests lie chiefly in ancient novel, narrative theory, contemporary reception of Greek tragedy and thematic criticism. His major works are: *Il tempo delle Argonautiche* (1985), *Il romanzo greco: Polifonia ed eros* (1989; under the title *Naissance du roman*, 1991); *La Grecia secondo Pasolini. Mito e cinema* (1996); *L'altro e lo stesso. Teoria e storia del doppio* (1998).

Reinhold F. Gleis is Professor of Classics at the Ruhr-Universität Bochum, Germany. He is the author of *Die Batrachomyomachie; synoptische Edition und Kommentar* (1984) and *Der Vater der Dinge. Interpretationen*

zur politischen, literarischen und kulturellen Dimension des Krieges bei Vergil (1991). He has published (with Stephanie Natzel-Glei) a German translation of the *Argonautica* of Apollonius (1996). He is also the editor (with M. Köhler) of the *Vellus Aureum*, a Neo-Latin poem written in 1431 by the Italian humanist Maffeo Vegio (1998). He is currently working on the reception of Apollonius from the Renaissance to the 20th century.

Richard Hunter is Regius Professor of Greek at the University of Cambridge and a Fellow of Pembroke College. His books include *The Argonautica of Apollonius: Literary Studies* (1993) and *Theocritus and the Archaeology of Greek Poetry* (1996), and he has written commentaries on *Argonautica* book 3 (1989) and a selection of Theocritus' poems (1999). He is the Editor of *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*.

Edward J. Kenney is Emeritus Kennedy Professor of Latin at the University of Cambridge. His publications include a critical edition of Ovid's amatory works (1961, 2nd corrected ed. 1995); editions with commentary of Lucretius' *De Rerum Natura* III (1971), Apuleius' *Cupid & Psyche* (1990), and Ovid's *Heroides* (XVI–XXI) (1996); a translation with introduction and notes of Apuleius' *Golden Ass* (1998), and a historical monograph, *The Classical Text* (1974; Italian translation by Aldo Lunelli 1995). He is at present working on a commentary on Ovid, *Metamorphoses* VII–IX.

Adolf Köhnken is Professor of Greek at the University of Münster. He is the author of *Apollonios Rhodios und Theokrit* (1965) and *Die Funktion des Mythos bei Pindar* (1971). He has also published on Homer, Pindar, Hellenistic poetry, narratology, historiography (Herodotus, Thucydides, Tacitus), drama (Euripides, Aristophanes), Aristotle's *Poetics* and the history of Classical Philology. He is co-editor of *Texte und Kommentare*, de Gruyter, Berlin.

Mary Rosenthal Lefkowitz is Andrew W. Mellon Professor in the Humanities at Wellesley College. She is the author of two books about fictional biography *The Lives of the Greek Poets* (1981) and *First-Person Fictions* (1991). Her recent *Not Out of Africa: How Afrocentrism Became an Excuse to Teach Myth as History* (1996) is about revisionist histories of the ancient world currently being written and taught in the United States. She is also co-editor (with Guy MacLean Rogers) of *Black Athena Revisited* (1996).

Doris Meyer is a classicist and “Wissenschaftliche Mitarbeiterin” in the research project “Mythische und historische Interpretation des Raumes in der geographischen Lehrdichtung der Antike im Zusammenhang mit dem Editionsprojekt FGrHist V (Geographen)” of the Department of Ancient History, University of Freiburg. Publications: *Inszeniertes Lesevergnügen. Die Rezeption des inschriftlichen Epigramms bei Kallimachos* (1995); various articles of hers on Hellenistic literature have been published in *Hellenistica Groningana* 1, 1993; *ScriptOralia* 61, 1995 and 95, 1998; *Antike Naturwissenschaft und ihre Rezeption* 8, 1998.

Damien P. Nelis has taught in the University of Fribourg (Switzerland) and in the University of Durham (UK). He is currently Professor of Latin in Trinity College Dublin. He is the author of a number of articles on Apollonius and on Virgil and his book *Virgil and Apollonius: the Aeneid and the Argonautica* will be published soon in the *ARCA* series directed by Professor Francis Cairns. He is currently working on a book provisionally entitled *Argonautica: Studies in Apollonius and his influence*.

John Kevin Newman is Professor of Classics at the University of Illinois, Urbana. His publications include: *Augustus and the New Poetry*, 1967; *The Concept of Vates in Augustan Poetry*, 1967; *Latin Compositions*, 1976; *The Classical Epic Tradition*, 1986; *Roman Catullus*, 1990; *Augustan Propertius*, 1997. He has also published *Pindar's Art: Its Tradition and Aims* with Dr. F. S. Newman (1984) and edited Latin Poems of Lelio Guidiccioni (1992). With Professor A. V. Carozzi he has edited an 18th-century Latin treatise on the origin of glaciers: *Horace-Benedict de Saussure: Forerunner in Glaciology*, 1995. He has published a number of original Latin poems.

Antonios Rengakos is Professor of Greek Literature at the Aristotelian University of Thessaloniki.

Gerson Schade has studied Classics and Comparative Linguistics at the Universities of Berlin, Cambridge, and Hamburg. He is a Humboldt scholar at the University of Venice. He has published *Lykophrons 'Odyssee': Alexandra 648–819* (1999).

Francis Vian, Professor Emeritus at the University of Paris X, is the editor (in *Collection des Universités de France*) of Quintus Smyrnaeus, *Posthomerica* (3 vols, 1963–1969), Apollonius of Rhodes, *Argonautica*

(with É. Delage, 3 vols, 1976–1981) and the *Orphic Argonautica* (1987). Since 1976 he has been working with others on the *Dionysiaca* of Nonnus of Panopolis (twelve out of the planned eighteen volumes have appeared so far). He is also the author of several works on Greek mythology, notably the *Guerre des Géants* (1952) and *Les Origines de Thèbes* (1963).

EDITORS' INTRODUCTION

The long process of re-assessment of Apollonius' *Argonautica* may have started when readers with a soft spot for romance like Sainte-Beuve saw fit to celebrate the Jason-Medea love affair to the exclusion of almost everything else; yet long after Sainte-Beuve enthused over book 3 and wished the poem had ended before the enamoured princess went on to acquire a criminal record, one could still with good reason complain that the sole Hellenistic epic to come down to us unscathed was receiving less critical attention than it deserved. A quick glance at the literature which has been encrusting the *Argonautica* over the last three decades or so will confirm that, whatever desiderata and gaps there may still be, any such complaint would be more or less churlish today. Whether as beneficiary of the changed ways in which post-classical literary products are now being studied or as a composition whose intrinsic value has at last dawned upon readers, the *Argonautica* now looks like one of those Hellenistic growth industries; and when Apollonius is deemed unconventional enough to be credited (or discredited, as the case may be) with "deconstructionist" instincts, one may suspect that rehabilitation of his epic has come with a vengeance.

Some preconceptions had to be overcome before Apollonius could come into his own; one was that he cherished Homeric aspirations and endeavoured to write an orthodox epic but then, having failed to keep up Homeric standards (especially in terms of unity), fell flat on his face. That Aristotelian unity or depiction of straightforward epic heroism may not have been the poet's overriding concern is the kind of "modernist" idea which few scholars would reject out of hand today. But this is not necessarily the result of the majority of Apollonius' students having jumped on the bandwagon of avant-garde hermeneutics. As in the case of other Hellenistic poets, informed re-evaluation of Apollonius' poetic aims owes a great deal to a realisation of which traditionally trained classical scholars should be capable par excellence, namely that, much like Callimachus and for much the same literary-historical, social and personal reasons, Apollonius operated as a scholar as well as a poet. And post-classical poets who are at the same time librarians or habitués of a great

library are nothing if not self-conscious—self-conscious about their place in the literary tradition, about the way they use poetic language and metre, about the norms and codes of their chosen genre, about the aesthetic and ideological implications of recounting what others, working under different circumstances and with different social and literary perspectives, had recounted before them.

All of these issues, and much else besides, have loomed large in recent and current research on Apollonius; and as a result, new critical perspectives on the *Argonautica* have been won, especially where sound scholarship and a wider theoretical awareness have combined to focus on the dynamics of the epic's new narrative modes, the manifold implications of its dense intertextuality with previous and contemporary literature and the crucial relation between its form and cultural background.

As it happens, Apollonius was the honorand of the fourth Groningen "Workshop on Hellenistic Poetry" held in 1998. The well-attended conference, whose papers are due to be published soon, confirmed that, along with Callimachus and Theocritus who were the subjects of the first two workshops in 1992 and 1994 respectively, Apollonius is increasingly popular with senior scholars and younger research students alike; that important aspects of his epic technique are currently being brought into sharper focus; and that, naturally, much remains to be done.

The principal aim of the present volume is to offer a survey of some of the major issues recently discussed and currently under examination among specialists on Apollonius. In such projects one quickly gives up the idea of exhaustiveness, both for intrinsic and practical reasons. We have, however, tried to be as comprehensive as possible in the sense that the papers collected here cover a wide range of research areas from the history of the *Argonautica* text, the poet's biography and trends in Apollonian bibliography, through individual aspects of poetic technique to questions of reception and *Nachleben*. Now that the book is finally completed, we are happily confirmed in our hope that readers of the volume will find both a fairly representative picture of the state of Apollonian scholarship and a stimulus to further exploration and elaboration.

In bringing this volume to publication we have incurred many debts. We wish to express our gratitude to Professors Hans-Christian Günther, Richard Hunter, E.J. Kenney, Mary Lefkowitz, George Parassoglou

and to Assistant Professors T. Kouremenos and P. Kyriakou for their valuable help and advice on linguistic and editorial matters. It goes without saying that any remaining defects, inaccuracies and obstinacies should be laid at the editors' door. Thanks are also due to the staff of Brill Academic Publishers for the care they have expended on the preparation of the book and for their polite and efficient cooperation, especially to Ms Marcella Mulder, Ms Loes Schouten and Mr Michiel Klein Swormink. Professor Annette Harder kindly allowed us to see the papers of the Groningen Workshop on Apollonius, still unpublished as these lines were being written. But the place of honour in our acknowledgements belongs to our Argonautic crew itself. It may not be presumptuous to say that their rallying had something to do with the fact that, after all these centuries, the summons issued once again from Argo's original home. Although the editors may be thus romantically deluding themselves, they are profoundly grateful for the alacrity of the response.

Theodore D. Papanghelis and
Antonios Rengakos

Thessaloniki, March 2001

This page intentionally left blank

OUTLINES OF APOLLONIAN SCHOLARSHIP 1955–1999

Reinhold F. Glei

Preliminary Remarks

In the last 10–15 years the stream of scholarly studies on Apollonius has swollen considerably: whereas in the period 1955–1965 the *Année Philologique* lists only a handful of entries per year, between 1985–1995 the number of studies exceeds a dozen per year and the rate is increasing. Scholars that row against this current feel as if they were sailing through the Clashing Rocks; they have barely struggled halfway through one wave and there rolls the next one tossing them backwards twice as far as they had progressed. One should then throw ballast overboard, muster courage and trust in divine assistance! Even if the attempt to pass through the clashing mountains of books succeeds, there is no hope of a pause and scholars find themselves in the grip of a debilitating ἀμηχανία. Enough of metaphors! For the above reasons a survey of recent scholarship is as much necessary as it is long overdue, and coinciding as it does with the end of the millennium it certainly offers an opportunity to take stock.

Starting from 1955, this survey continues the last *Forschungsbericht* of Apollonian studies since 1921 by Hans Herter (*Bursians Jahresbericht* Nr. 285 [1944–55]) without, however, being comparable with it in either methodology or scope: the nature of this “Companion” and, especially, the limitations of this author will only allow an “outline”, i.e. a preliminary overview of the trends that have informed Apollonian scholarship in the last 40–45 years. A focus on the areas that attract most attention is, therefore, necessary; less studied areas will be left out of consideration. Specialized studies on textual problems, the history of the text, metre and language, as well as studies on brief episodes or passages of the *Argonautica* and other works of Apollonius will not be discussed here. Not included either are studies on the influence of the *Argonautica*, especially the relation between Apollonius and Valerius Flaccus, for whereas scholarship on Valerius has in the meanwhile advanced considerably, the reception of Apollonius by other authors has not yet been adequately studied. Some studies on this topic are fortunately included in this volume.

The volume of secondary literature and the partly subjective choices of the author have determined the scope of the outline of the following areas. It should also be apologetically noted that the attempt to spice up here and there a dry survey of secondary literature may have occasionally led to pointed judgments and turns of phrase that not all readers will find to their taste. I ask for forbearance.

1. *Editions, Commentaries, Translations*

In the history of the scholarship on Apollonius and the reception of his epic book 3 of the *Argonautica* has constantly been the focus of attention; editions and commentaries are no exception. The most recent edition with commentary (Hunter [1989a]) as well as the first one in the period under survey are of book 3: Ardizzoni (1958) leads off the dance, launching with book 3 a planned edition of the entire *Argonautica* (with Italian translation and some linguistic notes). Vian (1961) follows soon thereafter, again with an edition of book 3 which later developed into a complete edition of the *Argonautica*. Fränkel's magisterial new Oxford edition (1961) came out in the same year. Being the starting point for rather than the end product of reflection on the text, it has influenced all subsequent work on the text of Apollonius. With a fine feeling for textual problems, Fränkel produced a "dynamic" edition which has lost nothing of its brilliance nearly 40 years after it appeared. As the OCT edition allowed only a short *Praefatio*, an *Einleitung zur kritischen Ausgabe* (Fränkel [1964]), justifying in detail the constitution of the text, was soon published separately. There follow the edition of book 1 by Ardizzoni (1967), whose planned edition of the entire epic remained unfinished, and Livrea's edition (1973) of the previously neglected book 4. Vian's is the second important edition of the *Argonautica* in the period under survey: books 1 and 2 came out first (Vian [1974]), books 3 and 4 were published later (Vian [1980, 1981]). A decisive advance over Fränkel's edition lies in the greater number of sources for the constitution of the text (especially the many papyri); at the same time, many of Fränkel's *lumina ingenii* were lost sight of through a very conservative approach to the text. This is not the place to decide upon the methodological dispute between the "Anglo-Saxon" and the "Continental" traditions; both approaches have their merits and as a consequence both editions are necessarily complementary. It is

perhaps preferable to retain both rather than unify them in a “super-edition” and thereby rob them of their distinct characters.

The commentators of Apollonius also owe a substantial debt to Fränkel and Vian. Fränkel’s *Noten* (1968) are a milestone—they are not a commentary in the usual sense of the term but an extremely rich collection of material concerning most of the issues raised by the interpretation of Apollonius, and they are still today an inexhaustible treasure-trove of incisive and stimulating, sometimes even strange, observations which can be profitably consulted with the help of a detailed index. The commentary in Vian’s edition (1974–81) is more traditional but unfortunately not very user-friendly, because of the usual division of a Budé edition into preliminary notes (“Notices”), footnotes and “Notes complémentaires”. Among the commentaries on individual books there stand out Livrea (1973) on book 4 with almost excessively rich material, Hunter (1989a) on book 3 with shorter, readable explanations that concentrate on the essentials, and finally Campbell (1994) on the first 471 lines of book 3 with sometimes unnecessarily exhaustive details. Other helpful tools are Campbell’s *Index Verborum* (1983b) and the Apollonius dictionary by Reich—Maehler (1991–97)—of which only the first three fascicles have appeared so far.

Available also are modern translations of the complete *Argonautica* in the major languages of classical scholarship: besides the quite free English translation by Rieu (1959) there are now two accurate modern English translations by Hunter (1993b) and Green (1997a) which will remain the standard English translations for a long time; the same holds for the French translation by Delage—Vian (1974–81). Pompella’s accurate Italian translation (1968, 1970) is based on the old Oxford edition by Seaton (1900) whereas the more recent Italian translation by Paduano (1986) is based on the Budé text. Finally, there is at last a translation in contemporary German prose by Gleis—Natzel-Gleis (1996)—before, one had to make do with the old-fashioned verse translation by von Scheffer (1940).

In general, the most important goals of scholarship in this area may be considered already achieved. For the reasons given above, a new critical edition combining the approaches of Fränkel and Vian would make little sense. Desirable as it is in itself, a commentary on the entire *Argonautica* would certainly grow into an immense work (projecting from Campbell [1994], one reaches the exorbitant estimate of 5.250 pages!) and at this juncture new translations in the

above languages seem superfluous. Therefore, all editors, commentators and translators should be advised to wait at least 50 years before any such undertaking is worthwhile again.

2. *Aesthetics: The Quarrel between Apollonius and Callimachus*

One of the major problems in Apollonian scholarship is the relationship between the *Argonautica* and Callimachean poetics: did Apollonius consciously distance himself from the poetic theory of Callimachus by composing an epic or does the particular character of the *Argonautica* suggest an attempt to apply Callimachean principles to the epic? If, further, the latter is the case, did Callimachus welcome Apollonius' attempt and savour its outcome or did he consider the *Argonautica* as an artistic failure, perhaps even flawed in principle?

Most scholars try to decide these issues from within the *Argonautica* and by detecting intertextual relations with relevant Callimachean passages (*Hymn to Apollo*, the *Aitia* prologue, *Ibis*). The issue has only grown hotter in view of the reports in ancient *Vitae* about a quarrel between Callimachus and his "student" Apollonius who, upset by a failed recital of the *Argonautica* in Alexandria, retreated to Rhodes. In the period under survey Eichgrün (1961) is the main advocate of the traditional approach which, in principle, takes the *Vitae* at face value and, relating the polemics in the Callimachean works to Apollonius, follows Callimachus in branding the *Argonautica* as a poetic failure (regularly faults are lack of unity, the episodic character of the epic and excessive learning). The rejection of this interpretation is one of the most important advances in the Apollonian scholarship of the last 40 years. Already Erbse (1955) expressed strong doubts as to whether it is the *Argonautica* that Callimachus attacks with the image of the muddy river in the *Hymn to Apollo*, but no one paid attention at the time (Huxley's mistaken thesis [1971] that the river alludes to Apollonius' description of Thermodon can be left aside here). The debate over the poetological position of the *Argonautica* started seriously again only 20 years later: in two short articles spun out of his unpublished 1974 dissertation Klein (1975, 1976) rejected vigorously—though by stating rather than arguing his thesis—any discrepancy between the poetics of the *Argonautica* and Callimachus.