specifically Pindaric topos, viz. the idea that man should confine his ambitions to objects within his reach: cf. O. 1, 114 μηχετί πάπταινε πόρσιον (similarly O. 3, 44, P. 3, 21-2), P. 3, 62 τάν δ’ ἄμπραχτον ἀντλει μαχανάν, P. 10, 62 τυχών κεν ἀρπαλέαν σχέθοι φροντίδα τάν πάρ ποδός (where the potential optative is equivalent to an adhortative subjunctive: cf. Kühner-Gerth I, 233-4, Bruhn, Soph. Anhang, § 113), N. 3, 75 φρονεῖν δ’ ἐνέπει τὸ παρκεῖμενον (similarly I. 8, 12). See also my note on N. 11, 31 οἰκείων.
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APOLLONIAN AND HOMERIC BOOK DIVISION

I

Apollonius will have divided his Argonautica into books¹). The poem is neatly packaged. There is parallelism in the cut-off points of I/II (dawn) and in the proems of III/IV. The close of I coincides with the disappearance of the dominant figure of Heracles²), II with arrival at Colchis. In III the focal point is the city of Aea. There is nothing mysterious³) about the division of III/IV. It is true that IV 212 marks the start of the return journey proper. But, the telling climax apart (it is akin to that of Virg. A. 6/7:1 f. resumption of narrative, 37 f. invocation with announcement of new theme⁴)), once Jason’s ordeal is over there is movement away from the city: first Medea (5 κάλλιπεν ἔθνα Κόλχων), then Medea and the Argonauts. The poem is headed with ἀρχόμενος and closes with a formal sphragis (πεῖραθ’ IV 1775⁵)).

II

All this seems at first sight to be far removed from Homer, and Ap. had at his disposal a wealth of epic material that is lost to us. Even so, correspondences with the standard Homeric book divisions⁶) are sharp enough to merit attention⁷).

(i) The proems of III/IV are ornamental: take them away, and you lose nothing in coherence: (a) III 6 ὥς οἱ μὲν ... μὴ μὴν ἄριστης λελογημένοι· αἱ δὲ ἐνόησαν ... An Olympian scene follows (for its position cf. below, and Il. 4, Od. 5 init.). The unit ὥς οἱ μὲν occurs in the recapitulatory summaries heading various books of Il.⁸); a δὲ/αὐτάρ clause carries the narrative in a different direction: Il. 9 (8

MISCELLANEA

fin. ήω; cf. Ap. II 1285), 16, 18, 20 + Olympian scene, 22, 23; cf. ὁ μὲν ... in II. 12 (2—ἡμένον· οἱ δ' ἐμάχοντο ...); Od. 6 (2 αὐτάρ Ἀθήνη/ ...), 7. Noteworthy perhaps: Od. 4 fin. μένον λοχώντες, 5 init. ἡως + Olympian scene, but Ap. II fin. ἡως, III 7 μίμον ... λέλοχημένοι. (b) IV 6 f. ἦτοι ὁ μὲν ... δόλον ... μητιάσασκεν/ οἷς ἐνι μεγάρος .../ Ἀθήνης ... (III fin. nightfall): cf. Od. 18, 428 bedtime, 19, 1 f. /αὐτάρ ὁ ἐν μεγάρῳ ... Ὀδυσσεύς/ ... φόνον (v.l. δόλον Αρ.?) ... μεριμνήζων/ ...

(ii) (a) I/II fin. dawn. For the latter see above. The former seems based partly on Od. 2 fin. (note ἄνεμος, παννυχιή, ἡως), partly on id. 12, 5 ἔκλεισαμεν, 7 Ἦω (indeed one would have expected a new book to commence at verse 8 with its formal time-reference). (b) III fin. ἠμαρ ἔδω καὶ τῷ τετελεσμένῳ ἤν ἄνθλος ~ II. 7, 465 δύσετο δ’ ἡλίου τετέλεστο δὲ ἔργον Ἀχιλλῶν (followed by a short narrative extending to the end of the book, as II. 1, 605 +, Od. 1, 423-4 +) and Od. 3 fin. ἦν δ’ (III 1405 ἦν δ’ ...) ... δύσετο τ’ ἡλίου σκιόδων τε πᾶσαι ἄγωναι.

IV fin. ἀστασίως ἀκτὰς Παγασηδας εἰσαπέβητε has often been thought to reflect the notorious 'πέρας/ τέλος' of Od. 23, 296 ἀσπασίως λεκτροῦ παλαιοῦ θεμῶν ἱκοντο. L. E. Rossi argues the case at length, thus: (i) (a) The similarities go beyond ἀσπασίως-ιοι: ἱκοντο ~ εἰσαπέβητε, θεμῶν ~ ἀκτὰς, λεκτροῦ παλαιοῦ ~ Παγασηδας. (b) "Ἀπολλonio ha sentito in un certo modo il talamo di Ulisse come l’ ‘ultimo porto’ del suo νόστος’. These points Rossi owes to S. Mariotti. (a) is tendentious, (b) does not bear thinking about. (ii) II 728 ἀσπασίως ἄρχης Ἀχερουσίδος ὁρμον ἱκοντο looks much more like Od. 23, 296. In Rossi’s view this strengthens rather than invalidates the case for imitation in IV. A remarkable claim. (iii) IV 1 θεὰ = II. 1, 1, IV 2 ἐννεπτε Μοῦσα = Od. 1, 1, IV 2 || ἦ γὰρ ἐξείρχεται corresponds to Od. 1, 1 || ὁς μᾶλα πολλά. So (p. 161), Ap. pays his debt to Homer, which he has failed to do before (I 1 f.). If IV init. is from Od. 1 init., then IV fin. is from Od. 23, 296. IV 1 f. is in reality a concentration of tags: αὐτὴ νῦν (cf. αὐταί in anon. hex. POxy. 2816, ed. Luppe, Philologus 120, 1976, 194.7; αὐτὴ οὖν in the paraphrase of II. 1, 1 edited by Parsons in ZPE 6, 1970,135; and perhaps Sapph. PLF 124), θεὰ (passim10), ἐννεπτε Μοῦσα (cf. II. 2, 761, H. Aphr. 1, H. Hom. 19, 111), Διὸς τέχος (cf. H. Hom. 31, 1 etc.), γάρ clause12).

The case for, then, is not merely fragile but baseless13).
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