The Multipartite Muse: Sectioned Composition in Hellenistic Long Poems

Phillip Bone

Exeter College

Thesis submitted for the degree of DPhil in Classical Languages and Literature

Word Count: 79, 816

2021

Contents

Preface 3

General Introduction 4

Part 1: Poems in Sections

Context and Introductory Remarks 8

1.1 Aratus and Nicander: Openings

1.1.1 Aratus and Nicander: introductory remarks 22
1.1.2 Frontloading 23
1.1.3 Opening constructions 30

1.2 Aratus and Nicander: Endings

1.2.1 Aratus' section endings 39
1.2.2 Nicander's section endings 41
1.2.3 Aratus and Nicander: general remarks and conclusion 45

1.3 Lycophron: Openings

1.3.1 Lycophron: introductory remarks 49
1.3.2 Archaising section openers: articles, ἄλλος and numbers 50
1.3.3 Other section openers: Cassandra's voice, short bursts and later sub-sections 57

1.4 Lycophron: Endings

1.4.1 Ending sections with αὐδηθήσεται etc. 59
1.4.2 Repeated themes 61
1.4.3 Three-word trimeters 63
1.4.4 Lycophron: conclusion 66

1.5 Pseudo-Scymnus

1.5.1 Pseudo-Scymnus: introductory remarks 68
1.5.2 Ideas of beginning and ending 72
1.5.3 Functional and 'prosaic' section openers 73
1.5.4 Names and naming 76
1.5.5 Foundations 77
1.5.6 Pseudo-Scymnus: conclusion 78

1.6 Apollonius

1.6.1 Apollonius: introductory remarks 80
1.6.2 Opening adverbs and collocations 81
1.6.3 Night and day 90
1.6.4 Narratorial intrusions 98
1.6.5 Aetiology and religion 99
1.6.6 Self-contained runs of sections: the 'Catalogue of Heroes' and Phineus 102
1.6.7 Apollonius: conclusion 108

Part 1: Conclusion 109

Part 2: Connecting, Arranging, 'Collecting' Sections
Introductory Remarks 113

Part 2a: Organising Sectioned Poems
Context and Introductory Remarks 116

2.1 Large-Scale Arrangement
2.1.1. Overall design 121
2.1.2 Accumulation 131
2.1.3 Large-scale arrangement: conclusion 135

2.2 Connections and Arrangements on a Smaller Scale
2.2.1. Time and space; connection and expression 139
2.2.2 Pointed disconnectedness; creative connections 152
2.2.3 Connections and arrangements on a smaller scale: conclusion 158

Part 2a: Conclusion 159

Part 2b: Sectioned Poems as 'Collections'
Context and Introductory Remarks 160

2.3 Sections and Sources: Pseudo-Scymnus and Apollonius
2.3.1 Sections and sources: context and introductory remarks 171
2.3.2 Pseudo-Scymnus 175
2.3.3 Apollonius 180

2.4 Sections and Sources: Nicander
2.4.1 Mapping sources to sections? 186
2.4.2 Sources as disruptors of sectioning? 187
2.4.3 Sections and sources: Conclusion 202

2.5 General Literary Collections
2.5.1 General literary collections: introductory Remarks 204
2.5.2 Lycophron 205
2.5.3 Apollonius 212

Part 2b: Conclusion 216

General Conclusion 218

Bibliography 221

Preface

The field of Hellenistic poetry has seen many interesting developments in recent years, but a very basic feature shared by the long poems of the period has yet to be given the attention it deserves. This feature is the division of the texts into large numbers of clearly marked sections. An examination of the processes of 'sectioning' demonstrates how significant a role this aspect of composition plays in shaping our experience of the poems. Engaging with sections allows for a fuller appreciation of the poets' achievements, and helps us to understand the potential appeal of those poets less well received (or less well noticed) by modern scholarship. The study of this feature takes us to questions of great literary importance in the Hellenistic world, and places this varied group of poems firmly at the centre of Hellenistic literary culture.

The writing of a doctoral thesis cannot help but involve the accruing of a number of debts. First and foremost, thanks must go to my supervisor, Gregory Hutchinson, whose kindness and learning seem to know no bounds. During the final stages of the project, I have learnt that the same is true of his patience! This thesis could not have come into being in anything like its present form without his guidance. The thesis also owes its existence to the AHRC, without whose generous funding I would not have been able to undertake the project. I would also like to thank those who looked at early extracts for Transfer and Confirmation of Status: Tim Rood, Luke Pitcher and especially Steve Heyworth, my MSt supervisor, who provided much helpful feedback on both pieces. The final few months of the project have involved considerable disruption to normal academic life, and I am grateful to Barney Taylor for his scanning of otherwise inaccessible literature. I am grateful, too, to my examiners, Jane Lightfoot and Evina Sistakou, who gave extremely useful comments which have enhanced my thinking on the topic, both in its minutiae and in its overall conception. It remains for me to thank my wife Sophie for her unfailing support and cheerful endurance of the several years in which I have avoided 'the real world'.

General Introduction

Scholarship on Hellenistic poetry has expanded in various directions over the last few decades. Recent work has explored the relation of this poetry to older literature, the visual arts, politics and Egyptian culture, looked at texts from new angles, and broadened the Hellenistic canon.[1] My thesis interacts with some of these developments, but is concerned primarily with examining the basic building blocks of the surviving long poems of the third and second centuries BC.

The texts which survive complete, or for several hundreds of continuous lines, are the *Phaenomena* of Aratus, the *Argonautica* of Apollonius, the *Alexandra* of Lycophron, the *Theriaca* and *Alexipharmaca* of Nicander, and the *Periodos* of Pseudo-Scymnus. These poems share a basic feature of their composition, namely a division into clearly marked sections: it is remarkable that so fundamental a structural feature is shared by such a diverse group of texts. This 'sectioning' has rarely been the focus of scholarly attention for its own sake, but an important exception is Hutchinson 2008, especially in the chapters 'Hellenistic Epic and Homeric Form'

[1]The following is only a very small sample: Fantuzzi and Hunter 2004 and Acosta-Hughes 2010 deal with Hellenistic poetry's relation to older literature. Prioux 2008 brings together art and epigram (as do several chapters in Gutzwiller 2005). Discussions of the relation of politics to specific poems can be found in Mori 2008 (the *Argonautica*), Fantuzzi 2005 and Thompson 2005 (both on the epigrams of Posidippus). Stephens 2003 treats the poems of Callimachus, Theocritus and Apollonius through a political lens and examines their relation to Egyptian culture. A completely different way of thinking about Hellenistic poetics comes in Sistakou 2012. The papers gathered into Harder, Regtuit and Wakker 2006 focus on works 'beyond the canon', and there are lengthy conference proceedings on the previously unpopular authors Lycophron (Cusset and Prioux 2009) and Euphorion (Cusset, Prioux and Richer 2013). A number of new commentaries have also appeared since the turn of the millennium, on texts ranging from the well-known to the obscure: the *Aetia* (Harder 2012a and b), *Argonautica* 4 (Hunter 2015), the *Alexandra* (Hurst and Kolde 2008, Hornblower 2015), the *Theriaca* (Jacques 2002, Overduin 2014), the *Alexipharmaca* (Jacques 2007) and the *Periodos to Nicomedes* (Marcotte 2002, Korenjak 2003). Sider 2017 brings together a large number of texts for comment, introducing some extremely obscure names to a wider audience.

(pp. 66-89), 'The Metamorphosis of Metamorphosis: P. Oxy. 4711 and Ovid' (pp. 201-27) and 'Books and Scales' (pp. 251-66).[2]

As we shall see from prose works, papyrus anthologies and so on (see pp. 116-20, 160 n. 237), these sectioned texts demonstrate concerns which can be shown to be important in the broader literary culture of the period. Sectioning, I argue, will have been a subject of interest, and not merely a feature too trivial for attention. If we pay close attention to the sectioned nature of the poems, as the poets clearly encourage us to do, we are led to important artistic questions and different ways of appreciating these works, some of which have been poorly regarded or little treated by recent scholarship.[3]

Part 1 examines the various methods used by the poets to mark their sections. Here we shall see the attention they give to this aspect of their composition, and the extent to which section marking shapes our experience of the poems. We shall begin to see the importance of sectioning, as patterns on a range of scales are built up and occasionally subverted for effect, generic affinities are indicated and so on.

Part 2 moves beyond section marking *per se* to continue the argument that engaging with sectioning helps us to appreciate these poems and their potential

---

[2] Asquith's 2005 thesis examines Hellenistic *Kollektivgedichte*, but she is keen to separate her 'listed narratives' from works such as the *Argonautica* in which different sections are more closely linked to each other (2005b: 2).

[3] Pseudo-Scymnus in particular is not often studied, with the important exceptions of two commentaries in the early 2000s (see above, n. 1). Nicander is more often discussed, but even today one gets the impression that Gow's 1950 denouncement reflects the view of rather too many: "Some day, it may be, a better Greek scholar and more skilful emendator than I will summon to his aid from among scientists familiar with the Levant a botanist, a herbalist, a herpetologist, and an entomologist, empanel for consultations a small body of medical men who have practised in the Near East, and produce an annotated text and translation of Nicander; and when this has been done it will be possible to read him, *not indeed with pleasure*, but with a good deal less labour and vexation than attend the process at present. Meanwhile, those whose duty obliges them to struggle through the *Theriaca* and *Alexipharmaca* with the aids now available stand in no need of the injunction not to forget him which the author has appended to those two poems" (95; my italics).

popularity with Hellenistic readers. 2a demonstrates the poets' concern with the connection and organisation of their sections, and the relevance of this concern to contemporary theoretical debate. This discussion is relatively brief, since it touches on familiar themes of scholarship, although the material presented in Part 1 allows for some new perspectives on these issues. 2b takes as its starting point the basic similarity of sectioned poems and various types of Hellenistic literary collection, and suggests on the basis of evidence from the poems themselves and elsewhere that the authors and/ or their early readers will have recognised this similarity.

As observed above, this is a very diverse group of texts, which spans a number of genres, subjects and metres. It will not be the case that every poet approaches sectioning in exactly the same way. Even between the two poems of Nicander there are significant differences (and what survives of his other poems suggests that these were different again: see below e.g., pp. 41-2.). This should not be taken to mean that the basic structural similarity between the texts is insignificant. Sectioning has generic resonances with both archaic verse and Hellenistic technical prose, which can explain some of the differences, but some of the poets, Aratus and Nicander in particular, are engaging quite visibly with both types of text. It will become clear over the course of the thesis that we are seeing a coherent, if varied, phenomenon.

It should be noted that Hellenistic readers are likely to have approached the poems with a keen eye on sections and how they are treated. Not only is clear sectioning a common feature of Hellenistic prose (see the introduction to Part 1, pp. 11-15), prose authors who are more keen to give us explicit commentary on their

approach to composition show similar concerns to those which we can see in our texts (see the introduction to Part 2a, 116-18). Indeed, Pseudo-Scymnus, who is admittedly our most prose-like author, gives us an explicit invitation to think of his poem as 'sectioned' (see below, p. 68.). As we shall see throughout the thesis, when we engage actively with sections we are rewarded by poets who have evidently given much thought to their deployment.

Part One: Poems in Sections

Context and Introductory Remarks

In this first group of chapters we shall examine each poem in turn to see how the beginnings and endings of sections are marked (the *Phaenomena*, *Theriaca* and *Alexipharmaca* are grouped for reasons explained in the introduction to the material concerning Aratus and Nicander). The building up of patterns of section markers draws attention to these divisions in the texts, and it is certainly not the case that repeated beginnings and endings become a tired feature of the poems barely to be noticed by readers. Patterns are varied and subject to meaningful deviations, and often sectioning interacts enjoyably with content (see below, pp. 18-20, for Callimachean examples).

The methods of section marking range considerably, from the use of repeated words, phrases or themes to ostentatious metrical virtuosity. The importance of the sections as structural units is underlined by the fact that certain section markers could easily have been used for whole poems, as in the case of 'natural' beginnings and endings such as dawn and night or self-conscious announcements of 'beginning' or 'ending'.[4]

What survives of other long poems of the period suggests that the sectioned composition of our extant texts places them within a broader trend. We can see evidence of repeated section openers in Phanocles' *Erotes* and in Hermesianax's

---

[4] For 'natural' endings, see Fowler 2000: 259-63. Famous endings with night come in *Eclogues* 1 and 10. Examples of self-conscious endings can be found in Leonidas Tarentinus' epigrams on crafts: παυσάμενος, παυόμενος and παυσάμεναι καμάτων are the last words of 7, 8 and 42 G-P respectively.

Leontion, as well as in the probably shorter 'Tattoo Elegy', while the titles and ancient descriptions of a number of Hellenistic poems allow for the possibility of sectioning as an important feature.[5] Most famously, Callimachus' *Aitia* presents a series of aetiological episodes in individual sections, bound together by the frame of the poet's conversation with the Muses in Books 1 and 2, and, it seems, less closely connected thereafter (see Part 2, p. 127, for this change in approach in the

[5] Phanocles, Hermesianax and the 'Tattoo Elegy' all seem to date from the beginning of the Hellenistic period (the style of the 'Tattoo Elegy' has been compared to that of both poets: see the overview and bibliography of Rawles 2006: 489 with nn.). ἢ ὡς opens sections at Phanocles frr. 1.1 and 3.1, and οἵη(ν) μέν at Hermesianax fr. 7.1 and 7.85 Powell. στίξω is the first word of sections in the 'Tattoo Elegy' (P. Brux. Inv. E. 8934 + P. Sorb. Inv. 2254) at col. ii. 4 and col. iii. 18, and appears in the first line of a section at col. ii. 14, with a paragraphus before each new section (it is unclear whether col. i. 5 begins a section: perhaps the preceding lines, which contain μνήσονται ἀοιδαί ('songs will make mention') and ὥς τε πυρὶ φλέγομαι ('how I burn with fire'), will have served as an introduction). The method of composition of the pre-Hellenistic *Lyde* of Antimachus is decribed at Ps.-Plut. *Cons. ad Ap.* 106c as ἐξαριθμησάμενος τὰς ἡρωικὰς συμφοράς ('enumerating the disasters of heroes'), which seems to suggest a poem comprising discrete sections concerning the misfortunes of different figures (note the diversity of subject matter demonstrated by the fragments: Matthews 1996: 207-64). The title of another work of Antimachus, the *Deltoi* ('Writing-Tablets') is suggestive, but next to nothing is known about the poem (see Matthews 1996: 45-6). Alexander Aetolus, apparently a contemporary of Aratus (cf. e.g. *Vita Arati* 1. 8. 12-17 Martin), is said to have written the suggestively-titled *Muses* (Macrobius *Sat*. 5. 22. 4), and it has been thought that his *Apollo* takes the form of a catalogue of prophecies (an important forerunner of Lycophron if so): see Magnelli 1999: 16-23. Certainly the opening couplet of the section which survives in Parthenius 14 reads like a heading: παῖς Ἱπποκλῆος Φοβίος Νειληϊάδαο/ ἔσται ἰθαιγενέων γνήσιος ἐκ πατέρων ('Phobius, the child of Hippocles, descendant of Neleus, will be the legitimate progeny of true-born fathers'; note the striking four-word hexameter which begins the section). The major third-century poet Euphorion seems to have written a number of works for which sectioned composition seems likely, such as the Ἄτακτα, so called, according to the *Suda*, because ἔχει […] συμμιγεῖς ἱστορίας ('it contains a mix of narratives'), and the *Chiliades*, in which the *Suda* tells us that the poet συνάγει διὰ χιλίων ἐτῶν χρησμοὺς ἀποτελεσθέντας ('collects prophecies fulfilled after a thousand years'; another important comparandum for Lycophron). Athenaeus 13. 590b tells us of a pair of poets, Sosicrates and Nicaenetus (the former undateable, the latter apparently at least no later than the third-century historian Phylarchus: cf. Ath. 15. 673f), to whom he attributes an Ἠοῖοι and a *Catalogue of Women* respectively. It is hard to imagine that the former did not have sections beginning ἠ' οἷος in the style of the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* (on which see below, p. 10). Among the poets under consideration in this thesis, Nicander at least seems to have written other sectioned poems: evidence for a variety of mythological stories grouped into his *Heteroioumena* is provided by the *Metamorphoses* of Antoninus Liberalis (see pp. 131 n. 215, 151 n. 230), and a suggestive run of marked endings to sub-sections can be found in fr. 74, from the *Georgica* (see pp. 41-2). It is worth observing the number of elegiac works mentioned in this note: one might almost get the impression that elegy was the preferred vehicle for poetry in sections, and in particular for verse in the spirit of archaic catalogues. As it happens, none of our texts use this metre (although the *Aetia* does, of course). Doubtless our understanding of the place of these poems within their contemporary literary landscape would be greatly enchanced by the survival of at least one or two full elegiac poems in sections.

second half of the poem and its relation to some of our poems).[6] In the first two books sections seem to have started quite regularly with direct questions from the poet: see κῶς at frr. 3. 1 and 7c. 1 Harder, and Harder's note on the former (2012b: 122). Even in Books 3 and 4 we have hints at a similar sort of pattern, for example in frr. 76b (εἴπ' ἄγε μοι), 79 (τεῦ δὲ χάριν) and 86 (Μοῦ]σαί μοι). Again, key names often seem to have been placed in the first couplets of sections, for example in frr. 7c (Lindos and Anaphe in the first couplet, Heracles in the third line), 67 (Eros, Acontius and Cydippe all in the first couplet) and 101 (where the first words are Ἥρῃ τῇ Σαμίῃ). We shall see a similar tendency to start sections with key words in several of our poems.

In a number of the titles and fragments of poems named so far it is possible to discern the influence of archaic catalogue poetry: certainly at least Phanocles, Hermesianax, Sosicrates and Nicaenetus look to have taken as their model Hesiod's *Catalogue of Women* and its use of ἠ' οἵη to open sections.[7] We shall see throughout

[6] The recording of the first lines of individual sections in surviving *diegeseis* suggests that ancient readers understood these sections to some extent as discrete entities. See e.g. P. Mil. Vogl. 1, 18 for *diegeseis* of sections of Books 3 and 4, and P. Oxy. 20, 2263 for *diegeseis* of sections of Book 1. Discussion of Callimachean *diegeseis* and texts of relevant papyri are found in van Rossum-Steenbeek, 1998: 74-81, 83-4, 259-78. See also Hutchinson 2003: 48 on the appearance of *coronides* and *paragraphi* between sections on papyri of the poem itself. If, as seems likely, the prologue's ἓν ἄεισμα διηνεκές ('a single continuous poem'; fr. 1.3) is supposed to represent a sort of poetry of which the *Aetia* is pointedly *not* an example, Callimachus himself will be drawing attention to the sectioned nature of his work at its very beginning (on the interpretation of the phrase see e.g. Heath 1989: 56-7).

[7] See Asquith 2005a: 272-6 and Hunter 2005b: 263-4, where slightly less caution is shown, and even the 'Tattoo Elegy''s στίξω is felt hold a Hesiodic resonance. Already Trüb 1952: 69-82 follows up his survey of archaic catalogue poetry with a discussion of 'Alexandrian' examples: his two primary case studies are Antimachus and Hermesianax, but he also mentions, among others, the *Aetia*, the *Argonautica* and the *Phaenomena*.

this first group of chapters that sectioned verse of the archaic period often lies behind the section markers of our poems.[8]

Contemporary and archaic poems, however, are not the only important comparanda for our sectioned texts. Surviving prose of the Hellenistic period often contains clear and regular divisions, and technical treatises in particular have a tendency to show this structure. This context is especially important, since three of our authors, Aratus, Nicander and Pseudo-Scymnus, engage extensively with prose texts (see below, e.g. pp. 30-1, 46-8, 69-70.), and in Part 2 we shall see that Apollonius also interacts with contemporary prose genres (pp. 180-5). The same is probably true of Lycophron, although the evidence is less clear (see below, p. 205 n. 301). In the cases of Aratus and Nicander at least, the sectioned structure of their poems evokes both archaic verse and recent prose, and their self-positioning is complicated by the fact that while archaic equivalents of these didactic poems would have been written in hexameters, the subsequent advent of technical prose meant that authors in the Hellenistic period had a real choice.

Among the remains of technical prose, mathematical texts are particularly well attested, and have been shown to demonstrate an aesthetic kinship with 'Alexandrian' poetry.[9] The *Elements* of Euclid and the *Conics* of Apollonius of Perga both build up patterns of section openers.[10] In Book 1 of the *Elements* all forty-eight propositions have a first sentence whose main verb is a third-person imperative: in

---

[8] Note the surprise of Hornblower 2015: 11 n. 26 that Asquith's 2005a chapter makes no mention of Lycophron, whom we shall see to engage with a variety of archaic poems.
[9] See Netz's 2009 monograph.
[10] Apollonius seems either to have been born or to have come to prominence under the reign of Ptolemy III Euergetes (Eutocius *in Con.* 168. 57 Heiberg), and it can be inferred from the suggestion that he spent time among the pupils of Euclid at Alexandria (Pappus *Syn*. 7. 678. 8-12) that the latter was active early in the third century.

thirty-seven cases these verbs are placed as the first word in their sections after the heading: 1-6, 8-12, 16-20, 22-26, 30-40, 42-47. It is worth noting that all of these sections use ἔστω/ ἔστωσαν, while all the sections which delay the imperative (with the exception of 48) use either compounds of εἶναι or different verbs altogether: this seems to suggest an element of deliberate design on Euclid's part. A similar pattern is found in the *Conics*: in Book 2 ἔστω/ ἔστωσαν begin all of the fifty-three propositions except for 2 (εἰ γὰρ δυνατόν, συμπιπτέτω), 9 (τεμνέσθω, delayed), 26 (εἰ γὰρ δυνατόν and then, after a delay, τεμνέτωσαν), 28 (τετμήσθωσαν, delayed), 44 (γεγονέτω, καὶ ἔστω), 45 (τοῦτο δὲ φανερόν) and 48 (εἰ γὰρ δυνατόν, ἔστω). In his headings, too, Apollonius builds patterns: thirty-eight of the fifty-three begin with ἐάν, including a run from 22-43 (and not at all thereafter until 52), while sections 44-7 all begin with τῆς δοθείσης (albeit with different nouns). Euclid's headings lack such a long-running pattern as Apollonius' ἐάν, but note e.g. sections 16-20, which all begin with παντὸς τριγώνου (to a certain extent determined by the subject matter, of course).

A later (probably second century BC) technical treatise in sections is Biton of Pergamon's Κατασκευαί, which presents six siege engines, each in its own passage with a strongly marked beginning.[11] The opening of the work indicates a didactic function, and bears some similarites to the openings of the *Theriaca* and the *Periodos*:

---

[11] The work was traditionally, but problematically, dated to the second half of the third century BC (see e.g. Marsden, 1971: 5-6, 78), presumably because of a reticence to accept that a work describing the construction of non-torsion catapults could have been written any later. Lewis' 1999 suggestion that a mid-second-century crisis requiring non-torsion engines to be built in the absence of a large enough quantity of sinew at the Attalid court addresses a range of difficulties with this dating. Despite the stress on the practical use of the treatise in the prologue (e.g. πέπεισμαι ὅτι ταῦτα τὰ κατὰ τὰς προσβολὰς τῶν πολεμίων ὄργανα ῥᾳδίως ἀναστρέψεις, ἀντιστρατευόμενος ταῖς ὑπογεγραμμέναις μεθόδοις. πειρῶ δὲ ταῖς ἐπιστήμαις χρῆσθαι (1. 3-5); 'I am persuaded that you will

λιθοβόλου ὀργάνου κατασκευὴν ἐπιβέβλημαι γράψαι, ὦ Ἄτταλε βασιλεῦ· καὶ μὴ σκώψῃς, εἴ τινα ἑτέραν αὐτοῦ εἰς ὑπόθεσιν πίπτοντα τυγχάνει ὄργανα, [...]. δι' ὧν πέπεισμαι, ὅτι ταῦτα τὰ κατὰ τὰς προσβολὰς τῶν πολεμίων ὄργανα ῥᾳδίως ἀναστρέψεις,[12] ἀντιστρατευόμενος ταῖς ὑπογεγραμμέναις μεθόδοις. πειρῶ δὲ ταῖς ἐπιστήμαις χρῆσθαι· χρὴ γὰρ χρῆσθαι καὶ τοῖς μέτροις καὶ ἔτι τοῖς ῥυθμοῖς τῶν προβεβλημένων. πειρῶ δέ, ὅσα μὲν ἂν ᾖ ξύλινα, κατασκευάζειν εἰς τὴν χρείαν διά τε τῶν μελεΐνων ξύλων [....] ταῦτα γὰρ ἁρμόσειεν <ἂν> μάλιστα.
(1)

I have thrown myself into writing about the preparation of the stone-throwing engine, Attalos, my king. And do not scoff if the machines happen to belong to a different class from this […]. I am persuaded by this that you will easily turn back these engines designed for enemy attacks by fighting against them in accordance with the methods described below. Try to use the knowledge. For it is necessary to use both the measurements and, further, the arrangements of what is set before you. And try, with whatever is wooden, to set up for your need things made of ash-wood and […], for these will be the best adapted for the purpose.

An address of an Anatolian king and a promise of usefulness are also found in the prologue of Pseudo-Scymnus, while the idea that, once instructed, the addressee will suceed in his endeavours also comes at *Theriaca* 4-8.[13] We need not push these similarities too far, but these three texts, possibly all written in the second century BC and all with a link to Anatolia, seem at least to be engaging in the same basic

easily turn back these engines designed for enemy attacks by fighting against them in accordance with the methods described below: try to use the knowledge') it does not seem entirely impossible that it was actually an antiquarian academic exercise with an ironic prologue.

[12] Willamowitz's ὅτι καὶ τὰς προσβολὰς τῶν πολεμίων ῥᾳδίως ἀναστρέψεις (1930: 256) produces less awkward Greek and is worth consideration, but the text as it stands is not quite so "schlechthin sinnlos" as he suggests.

[13] σὲ δ' ἂν πολύεργος ἀροτρεύς
βουκαῖός τ' ἀλέγοι καὶ ὀροιτύπος, εὖτε καθ' ὕλην
ἢ καὶ ἀροτρεύοντι βάλῃ ἔπι λοιγὸν ὀδόντα,
τοῖα περιφρασθέντος ἀλεξητήρια νούσων.
And the hard-working ploughman and the herdsman and the woodcutter, whenever while he is in the woods or ploughing a creature strikes him with its baneful fang, will esteem you owing to your having learnt such ways of warding off illnesses.

Cf. *Al.* 4-5 (ῥεῖά κέ τοι ποσίεσσιν ἀλέξια φαρμακοέσσαις/ αὐδήσαιμ' ἅ τε φῶτας ἐνιχριμφθέντα δαμάζει; 'Indeed, I can easily tell you about remedies for the poisonous draughts which attack people and overcome them') and *Phaen.* 1153-4, the closing lines (τῶν ἄμυδις πάντων ἐσκεμμένος εἰς ἐνιαυτὸν/οὐδέποτε σχεδίως κεν ἐπ' αἰθέρι τεκμήραιο; 'with an eye on all of these signs together throughout the year, you would never be making an unconsidered inference about the weather').

discourse.[14] This should encourage us to allow that such obscure technical prose could be an important comparandum for our poems, and, indeed, Biton's approach to section marking will find several echoes throughout Part 1.

The regularity of the section openings has been emphasised by Roby 2016: 217, but it is worth reproducing the first few sentences of each section here to demonstrate the development and variation of patterns:

1. ἀρξόμεθα οὖν καταβαλέσθαι τοῦ ὑπογεγραμμένου πρῶτον λιθοβόλου τὴν κατασκευήν· ἀναθεωρεῖν δέ σε παρακαλῶ τῇ λογοθεσίᾳ. ἔστι δὲ τοῦτο <τὸ> πετροβόλον ἐν Ῥόδῳ ἠρχιτεκτονευμένον ὑπὸ Χάρωνος τοῦ Μαγνησίου. (2. 1-4)	'I shall begin, then, to set down the preparation of the stone-thrower described first below, and I urge you to pay close attention to the description. This is the stone-thrower designed on Rhodes by Charon the Magnesian.'
2. ὑπογράψομεν δέ σοι καὶ ἑτέρῳ τρόπῳ λιθοβόλου κατασκευήν. πολλάκις γὰρ αἱ τῶν τόπων θέσεις οὐκ ἐπιδέχονται τὰ αὐτὰ τῶν ὀργάνων. ἔστι δὲ τοῦτο κατεσκευασμένον ἐν Θεσσαλονίκῃ ὑπὸ Ἰσιδώρου τοῦ Ἀβυδηνοῦ. (3. 1-4)	'And I shall write below for you also of the preparation of another type of stone-thrower. For often the topography of different places will not admit the same siege-engines. This is the one constructed at Thessalonica by Isidorus the Abydene.'
3. ἐχομένως δὲ τούτων ἑλεπόλεώς σοι κατασκευὴν ὑποτάσσομεν ἣν ἠρχιτεκτόνευσε Ποσειδώνιος ὁ Μακεδὼν Ἀλεξάνδρῳ τῷ Φιλίππου. (4. 1-3)	'And, following these, I set out below for you the construction of the Helepolis which Posidonius the Macedonian designed for Alexander, son of Philip.'

[14] See Hutchinson 2009 for a discussion of the relation of didactic verse and didactic prose in the Hellenistic and Roman periods. He demonstrates that these two broad categories can interact closely, and that borrowings and similarities can be seen in both directions. See also Pajón Leyra 2014: 87-8, for the relation of the list of 'greatest islands' in the *Laterculi Alexandrini* to didactic verse (cf. below, p. 119 n. 197; we should bear in mind here Pseudo-Scymnus' discussion of the easy memorability of iambic trimeters, translated in full at p. 145 n. 226.) Apollodorus' *Chronica*, another text on the boundary between verse and prose, also seems to have begun with an address to an Anatolian king, accompanied by a claim of easy memorability (p. 145 n. 226) Note too that Lycophron's *Alexandra*, also potentially written in the second century BC (see Hornblower 2015: 36-9), is another text which begins with an address to an (albeit mythological) Anatolian king, and displays a number of interesting affinities with the *Periodos* (see below, p. 71 n. 122)

4. ἐχομένως δὲ τῶν προγεγραμμένων ὑπογράψομέν <σοι> σαμβύκης κατασκευήν. φέρει γὰρ καὶ τοῦτο τὸ ὄργανον ἐν τοῖς πολεμικοῖς ἀγῶσι μεγάλων πραγμάτων κινήσεις. ὑπογράψω δέ σοι, ὃ ἠρχιτεκτόνευσε Δᾶμις ὁ Κολοφώνιος. (5. 1-4)	'And, following what is written above, I shall write below for you of the preparation of the Sambyke. For this siege-engine too allows for the achievement of great deeds in contests with an enemy. I shall write below for you of this, which Damis the Colophonian designed.'
5. ἐχομένως δὲ τῶν καταπαλτικῶν γαστραφέτου σοι ἀρχιτεκτόνευμα προκεχείρισμαι ἀναγράψαι. ἔχει δὲ τόνδε τὸν τρόπον. ἔστω γὰρ ὁ ὑποκείμενος γαστραφέτης ὃν ἠρχιτεκτόνευσε Ζώπυρος ὁ Ταραντῖνος ἐν Μιλήτῳ. (6. 1-4)	'And following the catapult-related information, I have turned my hand to writing up information for you pertaining to the construction of the Gastraphetes. It has the following arrangement. Let the Gastraphetes set before us be the one which Zopyrus the Tarentine designed at Miletus.'
6. τούτου δ' ἐχόμενόν σοι τὸν ὀρεινοβάτην γαστραφέτην ὑπογράψομεν. ἔχει γὰρ τόνδε τὸν τρόπον. ἐκθήσω δέ σοι, οἷον ἠρχιτεκτόνευσε Ζώπυρος ὁ Ταραντῖνος ἐν Κύμῃ τῇ κατ' Ἰταλίαν. (7. 1-3)	'And following this I shall write below for you of the Gastraphetes for mountainous terrain. It has the following arrangement. I shall set out for you the sort which Zopyrus the Tarentine designed at Cumae in Italy.

If the engine in question has a specific name, it is always given in the first sentence. The designer is always named with an accompanying designation of his homeland in adjectival form, and usually with the distinctive verb ἀρχιτεκτονεύω. There are also smaller patterns: in sections '1' and '2' the sentence which introduces the name of the designer starts with ἔστι δὲ τοῦτο, and sections '5' and '6' both use the filler sentence ἔχει δὲ τόνδε τὸν τρόπον before naming the designer. There is a strong internal connection of content in the two pairs '1'-'2' (both catapults) and '5'-'6' (both Gastraphetai), and these connections are underlined by the close similarity of the section openings. All four of these sections also add a place of first use to the name of the designer: in both pairs this serves a useful function in distinguishing

the two machines, particularly in '5'-'6', since the two Gastraphetai share a designer. Starting at '3' a pattern emerges of ἐχομένως δέ as the first words of each section, with a slight variation in '6'. Similar buildings-up and variations of large- and small-scale patterns of section markers, and interactions between section marking and content, will be the central focus of this first group of chapters: it is important to bear in mind that our authors share an artistic impulse with a broad range and register of texts, even prose of an obscure, technical variety.[15]

So far as we can tell, clear sectioning will often have been deployed also in more 'literary' Hellenistic prose. Certainly this is the case in the fourth-century *Characters* of Theophrastus, although this is perhaps not too far removed in its nature from technical treatises.[16] Each section deals with a different character-type, and after the spurious headings we tend to find the opening formula ὁ δὲ **'x'** τοιοῦτός τις οἷος ('the x is the sort of man who…').[17] It is unclear whether all of the sections were written or published together by Theophrastus himself (see Diggle 2004: 27-37, with further bibliography), but P. Hamb. 143 shows that at least some of the *Characters* appeared together by the First Century BC at the latest.[18] More

---

[15] It should be pointed out that even Biton is not without artistic pretensions. He opens with a pun, after all: λιθοβόλου ὀργάνου κατασκευὴν ἐπιβέβλημαι γράψαι (1. 1 'I have thrown myself into writing of the preparation of the stone-throwing engine'; and, a few sentences later (1. 6-7), χρὴ γὰρ χρῆσθαι καὶ τοῖς μέτροις καὶ ἔτι τοῖς ῥυθμοῖς τῶν <u>προβεβλημένων</u>, where the pun is harder to render in English). Cf. Asper 2017: 35-6 on the adoption of a markedly 'mathematical' approach in the introduction to '5', seemingly aimed at raising the status of the mechanical subject matter (p.44).

[16] See Ranocchia 2011 for a survey of scholarship on the nature of the *Characters*: at p. 87 he lists the four main positions held by scholars: "1) i *Caratteri* sono un complemento a un trattato di filosofia morale; 2) costituiscono un'opera letteraria scritta in una prosa artistica con un intento umoristico; 3) rappresentano un esercizio di tipo retorico; 4) sono l'appendice di un trattato di teoria poetica ad uso dei poeti comici". His own view is that only the third and fourth options are serious possibilities.

[17] There are a number of textual difficulties: see Giangrande 2003: 94 n. 4 for variations in the construction used in the opening formula. Diggle's 2004 edition tends to standardisation in this respect. It should be noted that the apparently non-Theophrastean headings were added at least by the time of Philodemus: Diggle 2004: 17.

[18] Cf. Diggle 2004: 37-8. For the papyrus and its date see Gronewald's 1979 edition, with image 2a.

purely 'literary' is the work of the first-century Parthenius, in whose *Erotica Pathemata* self-contained stories take up individual sections. It is possible that a large number of small-scale, self-contained prose narratives also appeared earlier in the *Milesiaca* of Aristides (second century BC?).[19] This has been inferred from the opening of Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* and a passage of Pseudo-Lucian's *Amores*.[20]

It is clear that our poets were writing against a rich background of sectioned literature, both contemporary and archaic.[21] More specific comparisons with individual works and genres are made throughout the following chapters. The approach of these chapters is to present each of the various methods of marking sections in the poem concerned, showing how often and where in the texts these marked beginnings and endings appear, and to provide analysis of their use, including suggestions of other texts or genres likely to be called to the minds of Hellenistic readers and discussion of the aesthetic effects achieved by the creation

---

[19] At any rate earlier than Sisenna, praetor in 78 BC, who translated his work.

[20] Apuleius begins his work *at ego tibi sermone isto Milesio varias fabulas conseram* ('come, I shall join together various stories in that Milesian style'). Harrison 1998: 68-70 and Bitel 2001: 141-2 provide useful discussions of inferences that can be drawn from these words and of the possible structural and content-based similarities with Aristides' work (see too the further bibliography provided by each, as well as Scobie 1975: 66-8 and Keulen 2007: 8-11). Harrison most explicitly connects *conseram* with the structure of the *Milesiaka* (pp. 68-9). Note, however, that Keulen (p. 65) views the stitching together of stories and the reference to the *Milesiaka* as separate, arguing that *Milesius* could simply connote fiction (although he does admit that this 'stitching together' was probably a characteristic of Aristides' text). Pseudo-Lucian *Amores* 1. 8-12, suggests a possible structure for the *Milesiaca*: πάνυ δή με ὑπὸ τὸν ὄρθρον ἡ τῶν ἀκολάστων σου διηγημάτων αἱμύλη καὶ γλυκεῖα πειθὼ κατεύφραγκεν, ὥστ᾽ ὀλίγου δεῖν Ἀριστείδης ἐνόμιζον εἶναι τοῖς Μιλησιακοῖς λόγοις ὑπερκηλούμενος (During the course of the morning, indeed, the wily and sweet persuasion of your unbridled tales cheered me up, so that I thought that I was only a little way short of being Aristides, completely bewitched by the Milesian tales'). "This implies", says Bitel (p. 142), "that Aristides' collection of Milesian tales featured a principal first person narrator [… who] presented himself as a rapt audience to the licentious stories of his interlocutors and that these other stories make up much (perhaps most) of his narrative" (cf. Harrison p. 71).

[21] Further types of sectioned prose are discussed in the introduction to Part 2a (pp. 116-19). In the introduction to Part 2b (pp. 160-70) we shall see that individual works of Hellenistic sectioned literature can be placed within a broader contemporary trend for bringing together large numbers of literary items, together with epigram collections, anthologies on papyrus and so on.

of, and occasional deviation from, patterns of section markers. There are a number of overlaps between chapters, and these will be pointed out where they occur. The very large amount of material to be discussed here underlines the importance of sectioning in the composition of the poems, and we shall often see that our appreciation of the poets' work can be enhanced by reading them through, rather than in spite of, their sections.

Before we turn to the first chapter, it is worth demonstrating that engaging with section markers can enhance our appreciation of sectioned verse. As we have seen above (p. 10), enough survives of the *Aitia* to give an idea of Callimachus' methods of section marking. In two passages we can see pointed deviation from the usual patterns. The tendency to place key names at the beginnings of sections seems to be avoided pointedly in the section concerning the Lock of Berenice, where the names of Conon and Berenice, and a mention of the lock itself, are delayed until the fourth couplet.[22] With an eye on the deviation from the pattern, we might ask how the self-important lock (note e.g. Βερ]ενίκειος καλὸς ἐγὼ πλόκαμος (fr. 110. 62 Harder; 'I, the beautiful lock of Berenice') has refrained from announcing its identity for so long. Perhaps the bombast involved in the circuitous description of Conon (presumably preserved with reasonable accuracy by Catullus) is especially pronounced if we are expecting a name to appear more or less at the very beginning of the section:

omnia qui magni dispexit lumina mundi,[23]

[22] Lines 2-6 of the original are lost, but the phrasing of 7-8, as well as comparison with Catullus 66, leaves us in little doubt that the important figures are named first here.

[23] In Callimachus' original: πάντα τὸν ἐν γραμμαῖσιν ἰδὼν ὅρον ᾗ τε φέρονται ('seeing every boundary in the star-charts where [the stars?] move […]').

qui stellarum ortus comperit atque obitus,
flammeus ut rapidi solis nitor obscuretur,
ut cedant certis sidera temporibus,
ut Triviam furtim sub Latmia saxa relegans
dulcis amor gyro devocet aerio
idem me ille Conon caelesti in lumine vidit
e Bereniceo vertice caesariem[24] […]
(Catullus 66.1-8)

He who discerned all the lights of the great heavens, who learned of the rising and setting of the stars, how the flaming gleam of the swift Sun is dimmed, how the heavenly bodies retreat at fixed times, how sweet love, consigning Trivia secretly to the area beneath the Latmian rocks, calls her away from her aetherial circle, this very same man, Conon, saw me in the heavenly light, a lock from the head of Berenice […]

Another common section opener, especially in Books 1-2, is a question from the poet to one of the Muses. A pointed deviation comes in fr. 178 (the Ician guest), where the questioning is delayed considerably, until the twenty-third surviving line (note κῶς in 24), and is aimed at the Ician Theogenes rather than a Muse. On the assumption that the fragment is not missing more than a couplet or two before the first surviving lines (ἠὼς οὐδὲ πιθοιγὶς ἐλάνθανεν οὐδ' ὅτε δούλοις/ ἦμαρ Ὀρέστειοι λευκὸν ἄγουσι χόες; 'And the dawn of the Pithoigia did not pass him by, nor when Orestes' pitchers bring a bright day for slaves') there will have been an accumulation of Attic festival terminology at the beginning of the section, leading the reader to expect that, in accordance with the usual pattern, these names will give an indication of the material to be presented thereafter.[25] This feeling will have

[24] In Callimachus: †η† με Κόνων ἔβλεψεν ἐν ἠέρι τὸν Βερενίκης/ βόστρυχον ('Conon saw me in the air, the Lock of Berenice').
[25] Cf. Cameron 1995: 134, who points out that the first οὐδέ of line 1 suggests the naming of at least one further piece of festival terminology. Note too the appearance of dawn (a 'natural' beginning) early in the section.

been even more pronounced if this is the first *aition* in Book 2 (see e.g. Harder 2012b: 956-7). As the section progresses it becomes clear that we are not reading an *aition* for the Anthesteria or any other Attic festival. Instead, Callimachus enters into a conversation with an Ician with whom he shares opinions about drinking before turning suddenly to a completely different, and thoroughly aetiological, topic:

> ἦ μάλ' ἔπος τόδ' ἀληθές, ὅ τ' οὐ μόνον ὕδατος αἶσαν,
>   ἀλλ' ἔτι καὶ λέσχης οἶνος ἔχειν ἐθέλει.
> τὴν ἡμεῖς— οὐκ ἐν γ[ὰ]ρ ἀρυστήρεσσι φορεῖται
>   οὐδέ μιν εἰς ἀτ[ενεῖ]ς ὀφρύας οἰνοχόων
> αἰτήσεις ὁρόω[ν] ὅτ' ἐλεύθερος ἀτμένα σαίνει—
>   βάλλωμεν χαλεπῷ φάρμακον ἐν πόματι,
> Θεύγενες· ὅσσ[α] δ' ἐμεῖο σ[έ]θεν πάρα θυμὸς ἀκοῦσαι
>   ἰχαίνει, τάδε μοι λ[έ]ξον [ἀνειρομέν]ῳ·
> Μυρμιδόνων ἑσσῆνα τ[ί πάτριον ὔ]μμι σέβεσθαι
>   Πηλέα, κῶς Ἴκῳ ξυν[ὰ τὰ Θεσσαλι]κά,
> τεῦ δ' ἕνεκεν γήτειον ιδ[. .]υτ[. . . .]ρτον ἔχουσα
> (fr. 178.15-25 Harder)
>
> Indeed, that saying is very true, that wine wishes to have its due share not only of water but also of conversation. Since this is not borne about in ladles, and you are not to ask for it by looking into the strained brows of the wine pourers when the free man fawns upon the slave, let us cast this into the irksome drink as a drug, Theogenes. And at my questioning tell me everything which my heart yearns to hear from you: why is it that your fatherland honours Peleus, king of the Myrmidons? How are Thessalian matters common to Icus? And for what reason, holding an onion […]

The effect of the "comic anti-climax" (Hutchinson 1988: 27-8) is enhanced by the unusual delay of the questioning and the misdirection of the opening, which increases the surprise caused by the sudden relevation of the true subject of the section.

Deviations from patterns can be especially striking, but it is also important to note that the building up of a pattern itself can achieve aesthetic effects. The repeated opening of sections in the *Aitia* with questions, for example, helps to

develop the impression of the work as a 'poem of knowledge' (cf. Hutchinson 2003: 48). Throughout these first few chapters we shall see both general impressions created by the repeated use of certain section markers and specific effects engineered by individual deviations.

1.1 Aratus and Nicander: Openings

1.1.1 Aratus and Nicander: introductory remarks

The *Phaenomena*, the *Theriaca* and the *Alexipharmaca* are grouped together into chapters 1.1 and 1.2 for two reasons. First, uniquely among our poems, the *Theriaca* has received reasonably thorough work on a number of its section markers, in Overduin's 2014 commentary. In places where he has already covered sufficient ground, it will make for more instructive reading to put his findings into the context of comparable material in the *Phaenomena* and the *Alexipharmaca* rather than simply to cite his commentary and say little or no more (this material comes predominantly in section 1.1.3, 'Opening constructions'). More significantly, these three poems invite closer comparison than does any other grouping of our texts: they have in common both their metre and their didactic mode, and, what is more, both Aratus and Nicander take pains to place themselves within a didactic tradition.[26] Naturally the poems share some approaches to section marking, and these are juxtaposed for ease, but the differences between these three poems in particular are just as interesting: the grouping together of the texts allows these divergences to receive their due attention.

---

[26] See below, 121 n. 199), for opening 'nods' to Hesiod in the *Phaenomena* and the *Theriaca*. Nicander also seems to associate himself with Aratean didactic early in the *Theriaca* by his inclusion of the story of Orion (13-20); cf. Overduin 2014b: 47, 190-2. The shared early use of ῥεῖά κέ τοι at *Theriaca* 1 and *Alexipharmaca* 4 suggests an intention on the part of the poet to align his two poems to some extent.

1.1.2 Frontloading

As we saw in the introduction (p. 10), it is likely, based on the evidence available, that the early placement of key names within sections will have been common in the *Aitia*. Nicander in particular also favours this method of opening sections, which from now on I shall call 'frontloading'. In the *Alexipharmaca*, the poison or other threat with which a section is concerned is named in the first line of its section at 115 (the blister beetle), 157 (coriander), 186 (hemlock), 279 (chamaeleon-thistle; ἰξιόεν is the first word of its section.), 312 (bull's blood), 335 (buprestis), 364 (curdled milk), 376 (thornapple), 415 (henbane), 433 (opium), 465 (sea hare), 567 ('summer' toad, coupled with the naming of the 'dumb' λαχειδής toad in the next line) and 594 (lead oxide). On another five occasions (excluding the second named toad at 568) we find the item named in the second line of its section: 13 (aconite), 74 (white lead), 208 ('arrow-poison'), 397 (pharicum) and 537 (salamander). In one further case Nicander gives the poisonous substance in question, named in the second line, an alternative appellation in the first:

> ἢν δὲ τὸ Μηδείης Κολχηίδος ἐχθόμενον πῦρ,
> κεῖνό τις ἐνδέξηται ἐφήμερον [...]
> (249-50)
>
> And if one receives the hateful fire of Colchian Medea, the famous meadow-saffron [...]

This pattern of early naming is only broken twice, and in quick succession: the section starting at 495 seems to contain an affliction without a stated cause, as desperate thirst is described in the opening lines, before this thirst leads to the real danger in 500, leeches:

ἢν δέ τις ἀζαλέῃ πεπιεσμένος αὐχένα δίψῃ
ἐκ ποταμοῦ ταυρηδὸν ἐπιπροπεσὼν ποτὸν ἴσχῃ
λεπτὰ διαστείλας παλάμῃ μνιώδεα θρῖα,
τῷ μέν τε ῥοιζηδὰ φιλαίματος ἐμπελάουσα
ῥύμῃ ἅλις προὔτυψε ποτοῦ μέτα χήτεϊ[27] βρώμης
βδέλλα πάλαι λαπαρή τε καὶ ἱμείρουσα φόνοιο. (495-500)

And if someone, pressed in his throat by parching thirst, falling forward like a bull, takes a drink from the river, separating the mossy leaves with the palm of his hand, a blood-lover, approaching him rushingly, strikes him with force along with the drink in its want for food, a leech, long since limp and desirous of gore.

The build-up to the naming is protracted by the detail of 497 (which could drop out of the text with no loss of strictly 'required' information), before φιλαίματος introduces the main subject in vague but ominous terms.[28] When the animal is finally named, it is in striking language; ἱμείρουσα φόνοιο, reminiscent of Homer's λιλαιόμενα χροὸς ἆσαι ('eager to be sated with flesh', of spears: *Il.* 11.574, 15.317) forms a weird coupling with λαπάρη, and even the word βδέλλα, at the start of the line, has a strange ring to it.[29] Here, then, Nicander can be seen to play on the delay in naming the dangerous animal, allowing these lines to build to a climax (albeit an unusual one).

The next section also fails to give us an early name, and the juxtaposition of the only two main sections not to engage in frontloading seems likely to be a pointed gesture from a poet who takes such care in the structuring of his work.[30] In this next case Nicander even seems to address an expected interest in names on the

---

[27] See White 1987: 106-8 for a defence of the MS reading *χείλεσι*. The text as printed here (and in most editions) allows for a build-up of similar words and phrases (φιλαίματος, χήτεϊ βρώμης and ἱμείρουσα φόνοιο), a reasonably common phenomenon in Nicander. Here, the near-tautology helps to draw out the revelation of the name.
[28] It is used of Phobos at Aesch. *Septem* 45 and of Ares at *A.P.* 7. 226. 3 (Anacreon).
[29] βδ- is one of Shipp's "unusual sound combinations" (1967: 6-7). For ἱμείρουσα φόνοιο cf. Overduin 2014a: 637-9 on Homeric military language used in descriptions of animal behaviour in the *Theriaca*.
[30] See Effe 1974: 62-5 for a detailed examination of section size, proportion and arrangement.

part of the reader (cf. below, pp. 51-2, 59-60, 76-7, on Lycophron and Pseudo-Scymnus; audiences of the period were evidently rather interested in names and naming). After a vague opening mention of a ζύμωμα κακὸν χθονός ('evil fermented mixture of the earth') at 521, we are denied further specification until 525-6:

> κεῖνο κακὸν ζύμωμα τὸ δή ῥ' ὑδέουσι μύκητας
> παμπήδην, ἄλλῳ γὰρ ἐπ' οὔνομα κέκριται ἄλλο.
>
> That evil fermented mixture is the one which people call fungi generally, for there are different names allotted to different ones.

The periphrasis which started the section will, the poet seems to remember, not be enough for his audience. It is an especially playful touch that he teases us with a mention of the names for individual fungi at this point, but moves abruptly in 527 to measures for combatting fungi (at an unusually great length relative to the description of the poison: Effe 1974: 65) rather than to any examples of these names.[31] Already, then, we can see that section marking can work together with content to produce enjoyable effects and can interact with important contemporary poetic concerns.[32]

---

[31] A similar play with naming may come at *Phaenomena* 367-85, where the names of the stars in question are delayed until the third line, which begins, emphatically, with νώνυμοι ('nameless'). The section also ends on the theme of anonymity (οὐκ ὀνομαστὰ φέρονται; 'they are borne along without names'); cf. Kidd 1967 for the suggestion of a very detailed 'Chinese-box' structure for this section as a whole.

[32] Frontloading and an interest in names are combined in earlier didactic, too. In Archestratus, for example, there seems to be frontloading at frr. 14. 1 (καὶ σκάρον ἐν παράλῳ Καλχηδόνι τὸν μέγαν ὄπτα; 'And the parrot-wrasse, the big one from coastal Calchedon: roast it'), 15. 1 (τὸν δ' ὄνον Ἀνθηδών, τὸν καλλαρίην καλέουσιν,/ ἐκτρέφει εὐμεγέθη; 'And the hake, which they call the Callaria: Anthedon nourishes ones of a great size'), 18. 1 (αὐτὰρ <τὸν> σινόδοντα μόνον ζήτει παχὺν εἶναι; 'And the sea-bream: just see to it that it is a big one') etc., as well as a play with expectations concerning names in fr. 40 (at 40. 3 he says of the name of a fish that ἐν μέτρῳ οὐ θέμις εἰπεῖν, 'it is not allowed to be spoken in verse'). Frontloading also seems to have been finding its way into technical prose on topics similar to Nicander's. Theophrastus' *Historia Plantarum*, generally without a uniform structure, contains a few passages marked by frontloaded sections: of special interest in our consideration of Nicander is the list of plants with medicinal uses at 9. 9-20 (with some reasonably lengthy deviations towards the end), where the names of the plants are frequently the first word in their sections apart from articles and particles.

The *Theriaca* is less insistent in its frontloading, but does contain some marked sequences. Especially prominent is the run of spider names as the first words of their sections at 725, 729 and 734, with another two examples named later in the first lines of their sections at 738 and 747 (see Overduin, 2014b: 452):[33]

> Ἀστέριον δέ φιν ἄλλο πιφαύσκεο […]
> (725)
>
> And learn of one different from these, the 'star' spider […]
>
> Κυάνεον δέ τοι ἄλλο πεδήορον ἀμφὶς ἀίσσει
> λαχνῆεν·
> (729-30)
>
> And, indeed, another, the hairy 'blueish' spider, darts about off the ground.
>
> Ἀγρώστης γε μὲν ἄλλος, ὃ δὴ λύκου εἴσατο μορφῇ
> μυιάων ὀλετῆρος·
> (734-5)
>
> Another, I tell you, is the 'hunter' spider, which in form, indeed, resembles the 'wolf' spider, the destroyer of flies.[34]
>
> ἄλλο γε μὴν δύσδηρι, τὸ δὴ σφήκειον ἔπουσι […]
> (738)
>
> Another, I tell you, is hard to fight off, the one, indeed, which people call the 'wasp' spider […]
>
> εἰ δ' ἄγε, μυρμήκειον, ὃ δὴ μύρμηξιν ἔικται,
> δειρῇ μὲν πυρόεν, ἄζῃ γε μὲν εἴσατο μορφήν […]
> (747-8)
>
> Come now, the 'ant' spider, which, indeed, resembles ants, is fiery-coloured on its neck, but resembles dry soil in its body […]

Note too that the general term φάλαγξ, used for φαλάγγιον ('spider') appears in the first line of this run of sections (715).[35] Scorpions as a general category are named

---

[33] See below, p. 38 n. 50, for the repetition of ἄλλο in this sequence.
[34] Cf. below, pp. 28-30, on reference constellations and reference snakes?
[35] This introduction takes up one and a half lines: the first individual spider, the ῥώξ, is named in the second half of 716.

in the second line of their run of sections (770), although individual members of this grouping are identified by appearance rather than by name.[36]

In the group of sections concerning individual snakes (145-482) we find a run of successive first lines containing the name of the snake to be discussed in that section: 209 (vipers), 258 (cerastes), 282 (haemorrhois), 320 (sepedon), 334 (dipsas), 359 (chersydrus), 372 (amphisbaena) and 384 (scytale). In the next section the 'King of Snakes' appears in the second line (397), before two successive first-line namings at 411 (dryinas, also given the alternative name chelydrus in the same line) and 438 ('dragon'). The pattern is broken by the final proper snake (see below, p. 126-7, for Nicander's tendency to end his groupings in the *Theriaca* with a turn towards miscellaneity). The cenchrines is only introduced after several lines of geographical material:

> εἴ γε μὲν Ἡφαίστοιο χαλαίποδος ἐν πτυχὶ νήσου
> βήσεαι ἠὲ Σάμον δυσχείμερον, αἵ τ᾽ ἐνὶ κόλπῳ
> Θρηικίῳ βέβληνται, ἑκάς[37] Ῥησκυνθίδος Ἥρης
> Ἕβρος ἵνα Ζωναῖά τ᾽ ὄρη χιόνεσσι φάληρα
> καὶ δρύες Οἰαγρίδαο, τόθι Ζηρύνθιον ἄντρον,
> δήεις κεγχρίνεω δολιχὸν τέρας [...]

---

[36] And it does not seem likely that all or even most of these (usually quite rare) colour terms, such as ζοφόεις (775) and ἐμπέλιος (782) will have been used themselves as names: comparison with scorpions whose appearance is described in a different way suggests that naming is not really a feature of Nicander's scorpion grouping:

> τὸν δ᾽ ἕτερον δήεις ἐναλίγκιον αἰγιαλῆι
> καρκίνῳ ὃς μνία λεπτὰ ῥόθον τ᾽ ἐπιβόσκεται ἅλμης.
> ἄλλοι δὲ ῥοικοῖσιν ἰσήρεες ἄντα παγούροις
> γυῖα βαρύνονται·
> (786-9)
>
> And you will find another to be like the coastal crab which grazes on the delicate seaweed and the crashing of the brine. And others are weighed down in their limbs in a manner which is visually similar to bow-legged crabs.

Gow and Scholfield 1953: 21-2 suggest that the iologist Apollodorus and other authorities on dangerous creatures "would seem to have been weak on scorpions", and that this 'weakness' has carried over into Nicander's presentation of this material: perhaps specific names were not known to him.

[37] Cf. White 1987: 27-9.

(458-63)

> If you are going to walk in a valley of the island of limping Hephaestus or to ill-weathered Samos, which lie in the Thracian Gulf, far from Rhescynthian Hera, where are found the Hebrus and the Zonaean mountains, white with snow, and the oaks of the son of Oeagrus (there too is the Zerynthian cave), you will find the long monster that is the Cenchrines.

This deviation from the pattern of frontloading at the very last opportunity is noteworthy, but more specifically the use of χαλαίπους in the first line of this section seems especially teasing: though used as an epithet of Hephaistos, it almost sounds as though it could be the name of one of these creatures.

Aratus sometimes employs frontloading in sections concerning specific constellations: the Crown (71), the Charioteer (156), the Horse (205), Aries (225), the Tortoise (268), the Bird (275) and the Arrow (311) are named in the first lines of their sections. The same is true of Pisces, one of three main subjects in its section, at 282 (note the close proximity to the frontloaded Tortoise and Bird). Also noteworthy is Κηφῆος μογερὸν γένος Ἰασίδαο (179; 'the wretched family of Cepheus, descendant of Iasus') at the head of a run of related sections. At other points the poet employs a related technique in his first lines, that of naming a constellation or constellations by reference to which we are to find the main constellation of the section. A run of section openings containing the name of a reference constellation but not that of a main constellation comes at 74 (the Crown and the back of Engonasin as guides to Ophiuchus), 88 (the Crown and the jaw of the Snake as guides to Libra), 91 (Helice as a guide to Boötes) and 96 (Boötes as a guide to Virgo).[38] Later examples come at

[38] In 74 and 88 the Crown is the only constellation named (Engonasin and the Snake are not named directly, but parts of them are described after their appearance at the end of the preceding sections).

322 (Taurus as a guide to Orion), 386 (Capricorn as a guide to the Southern Fish) and 389 (Aquarius as a guide to a group of nameless stars; their namelessness makes the use of a reference constellation essential). Some first lines contain both a reference constellation and the main subject: 167 (the Charioteer as a guide to Taurus), 316 (Capricorn as a guide to the Dolphin), 337 (Orion as a guide to the Hare) and 342 (Sirius as a guide to the Argo). This use of reference constellations might be thought to reflect a natural approach to the night sky (see Part 2a, pp. 139-40, for the spatial arrangement of section groupings), and we could think of this method of transition between sections as evocative of the apparent associative composition of archaic didactic, especially when the reference constellation is the main subject of the previous section.[39] Boötes is the primary subject of the section starting at 91, for example, and then the next section begins ἀμφοτέροισι δὲ ποσσὶν ὕπο σκέπτοιο Βοώτεω/ Παρθένον […] (96-7; 'And observe beneath the two feet of Boötes the Maiden […]'). We need not take this to mean, however, that Aratus is barely marking out his sections at all.[40] The clusterings of individual variations of the frontloading formula, such as at 268-82 (straight frontloading) and 74-96 (reference constellations), point to the poet's design.

Nicander, too, uses reference items: throughout the sequence of markedly frontloaded snake sections in the *Theriaca* we find early references to other snakes from the catalogue: these come in the first two lines of sections beginning at 258

---

[39] See chapter II.3 'Das assoziative Kompositionsprinzip' in Fakas 2001: 72-6. These reference constellations are not mentioned there; his main interest lies in transitions between digressions and other material

[40] Hunter 2008a: 156 "it has long been observed that the gliding transitions between subjects within the *Phainomena*, which avoid a systematic sectioning such as is familiar from Latin didactic, must be an attempt to reproduce the archaic manner" (similar is Fakas 2001: 72-3). We shall see that far more rigid sectioning appears at points (which can still evoke archaic catalogues).

(main subject: cerastes; reference snake: viper), 320 (main subject: sepedon; reference snake: haemorrhois), 334 (main subject: dipsas; reference snake: viper), 359 (main subject: chersydrus; reference snake: asp) and 384 (main subject: scytale; reference snake: amphisbaena).[41]

1.1.3 Opening constructions

It is in this category of section markers that Overduin's 2014 commentary is most interested. In the section of his introduction entitled 'Lexical Structural Markers' (pp. 61-3), he has already discussed the role of εἰ δέ and εἴ γε as section markers in the *Theriaca* (with a list in his n. 252); further discussion of the former comes in the body of his commentary (p. 209).[42] We should note the variation of this opening: Nicander uses εἰ both interjectionally and conditionally, thus keeping up the pattern, but in a non-uniform way. In the *Alexipharmaca*, sections begin with ἢν δέ or ἤν γε at 157, 249, 312, 364, 495, 537 and 567. Here the pattern is much more consistent: these sections always begin with a condition along the lines of 'if someone ingests such-and-such a poison'. These section openers in the *Alexipharmaca* are reminiscent of medical prose: a third of the sections of the Hippocratic *De Morbis* 2, for example, begin with 'if'.[43] In both authors the protasis introduces the attack on the victim's health, with advice to follow later in the section:

ἤν γε μὲν οὐλόμενόν γε ποτὸν κορίοιο δυσαλθές

[41] See Part 2a, p. 148, for the role of reference snakes in arrangement.
[42] Cf. e.g. Lycophron's use of ἄλλος and numbers in section openings (pp. 53-4).
[43] 4-5, 8, 15, 17-20, 22-3, 25, 29-33, 40, 42, 50, 53, 55, 58-59, 61-62.

ἀφραδέως δεπάεσσιν ἀπεχθομένοισι πάσηται […]
(*Alexipharmaca* 157-8)

If a man ingests thoughtlessly from hateful goblets the destructive and difficultly-healed draught of coriander […]

ἢν περὶ τὸν ἐγκέφαλον φλέβια ὑπεραιμήσῃ […]
(Hippocrates, *Morb.* 2.4)

If around the brain the vessels are over-filled with blood […]

This parallel allows a reasonably confident suggestion that Nicander's approach to section marking would have evoked the structure of prose treatises on poisons (whether or not those of Apollodorus in particular; see below, pp. 186-7), hardly a distant field from medicine: perhaps the poet is gesturing towards the authority of technical prose.[44]

Aratus uses 'if' far more often in the 'Weather-Signs' than earlier in the *Phaenomena*. Here, we find much smaller units grouped into larger 'super-sections' (the first grouping (778-818), for example, brings together signs related to the Moon). Sub-sections start with 'if' at 788, 792, 794, 811, 825, 838, 840, 854, 858, 903, 905, 988 and 1082.[45] Note the extremely close proximity of 'if's at 788-94, 838-40 and 903-5. In the first passage in particular one gets the impression of one snippet after another (I mark out the sub-sections in the text and translation):

εἰ δέ κ' ἀπ' ἀμφοτέρων κεράων τρίτον ἦμαρ ἄγουσα
μήτ' ἐπινευστάζῃ μήθ' ὑπτιόωσα φαείνῃ,
ἀλλ' ὀρθαὶ ἑκάτερθε περιγνάμπτωσι κεραῖαι,
ἑσπέριοί κ' ἄνεμοι κείνην μετὰ νύκτα φέροιντο.
| εἰ δ' αὕτως ὀρθὴ καὶ τέτρατον ἦμαρ ἀγινοῖ,
ἦ τ' ἂν χειμῶνος συναγειρομένοιο διδάσκοι.
| εἰ δέ κέ οἱ κεράων τὸ μετήορον εὖ ἐπινεύῃ,
δειδέχθαι βορέω, ὅτε δ' ὑπτιάῃσι, νότοιο.

[44] We will recall too the use of 'if' as a section marker by Apollonius of Perga (see above, p. 12).
[45] I have omitted a few cases at line- and sentence-beginning where the thought of what might be considered a sub-section is too closely related to that of the previous lines to warrant this status.

(788-95)

> <u>And if</u>, when bringing the third day of the month, [the Moon] does not bend forwards or shine leaning backwards in either of her horns, but instead, the upright horns bend round from either side, westerly winds may come after that night. **|** <u>And if</u>, similarly upright, she also brings the fourth day of the month, then, verily, she may tell of a gathering storm. **|** <u>And if</u> the upper of the two horns bends forwards to a great extent, expect the north wind, and when it leans backwards, expect the south wind.

Earlier we find sections beginning with 'if' at 156 and 469: this second instance marks a significant shift in the text, as we move to the first of the circles of heaven, the Milky Way**.** It is noteworthy that the only other section to begin with 'if' before the 'Weather-Signs' seems to be giving us a preview of the sort of material we can expect to read there, with a discussion of winds:

> εἰ δέ κεν ἑσπερίης μὲν ἁλὸς κενταυρου ἀπείη
> ὦμος ὅσον προτέρης, ὀλίγη δέ μιν εἰλύοι ἀχλὺς
> αὐτόν, ἀτὰρ μετόπισθεν ἐοικότα σήματα τεύχοι
> νὺξ ἐπὶ παμφανόωντι Θυτηρίῳ, οὔ σε μάλα χρὴ
> ἐς νότον ἀλλ᾽ εὔροιο περισκοπέειν ἀνέμοιο.
> (431-5)

> And if the Centaur's shoulder should be as far from the Western Sea as from the other, and should a light mist enwrap him, while, behind him, night fashions recognisable marks on an entirely visible Altar, there is certainly no need of your looking out for the South Wind, but rather for the East.

The fact that the major shift of subject matter in the poem is accompanied by the vastly increased prominence of a method of section opening serves as an indication of the thought which Aratus gives to section marking and its importance as a compositional tool.

Overduin's 'Lexical Structural Markers' section also discusses ἀλλ᾽ ἤτοι and νῦν δ᾽ ἄγε (τοι), and in an earlier section of his introduction he deals with the important section opening ναὶ μὴν (καί) (pp. 56-7, with a list of instances in both the

Theriaca and the *Alexipharmaca* in his n. 234, and further discussion at pp. 205-6). A similar case is presented by ἀλλά in the *Alexipharmaca*: in every use of the word at line- and sentence-start it begins either a section (12, 376) or a sub-section (260, 402, 527, 573). These last four examples of ἀλλά all come at the start of the second halves of larger units, as the description of the dangerous item and its symtpoms gives way to suggested cures. Nicander's marking of these second halves is very clear:[46] τῷ stands at the beginning of most of the rest of these units (always representing the victim of poisoning): 43 (τῷ καί που τιτάνοιο χερὸς βάρος ἔσσεται ἄρκος/ πιμπλαμένης; 'And perhaps for this man the weight of a handful of gypsum will be a cure'), 87, 128, 162, 298, 319, 347 and 366. It is not otherwise used very frequently at the beginning of a line. In 167 and 244, it begins digressions. In 291 and 378, it may well be used for playful misdirection, leading us to expect that we are about to move on to cures, when in fact we are still to hear more about symptoms. This is especially effective in 378, since the previous section (364-75, on curdled milk) has spent only two lines introducing the subject before moving with τῷ δ' ἤτοι to methods of combatting it. Thus, in when we find the same words at the start of 378, after two lines introducing the next dangerous item, thornapple, we could expect a continuation of this structure, but have our expectations subverted (note too that Nicander even compares thornapple to milk, perhaps entrenching the feigned parallelism):

> ἢν δ' ἐπιτυρωθῇ νεαρὸν γάλα τεύχεϊ γαστρός,
> δὴ τοτὲ τόνδε πνιχμὸς ἀθροιζομένοιο δαμάζει.
> τῷ δ' ἤτοι τρισσὰς πόσιας πόρε [...] (364-6)

[46] We shall see below (p. 58) that Lycophron too favours particular constructions for sub-sections which fall later within their larger units.

> And if fresh milk curdles in the vessel of the stomach, then, indeed, when it collects, suffocation overcomes a man. Provide him, I tell you, with a threefold draught […]
>
> ἀλλ᾽ ἄγε δὴ φράζοιο δορύκνιον, οὗ τε γάλακτι
> ὠπή τε βρῶσίς τε παρὰ στομάτεσσιν ἔικται·
> τῷ δ᾽ ἤτοι λυγμοὶ μὲν ἀηθέσσοντες ὁμαρτῇ
> αὐχέν᾽ ἀνακρούουσιν […] (376-9)
>
> Come now, consider the thornapple, whose look and taste upon the mouth resemble milk. And, I tell you, retchings to which he is unaccustomed strike up at a man's neck all at once.

291, as we shall see in Part 2 (pp. 190-1), comes in a section characterised by extending description beyond its expected length, and the information introduced by τῷ continues the theme of digestive wind beyond what had seemed like its (absurd) climax in a comparison to Olympic thunder and to the roaring of the sea (289-90).

Overduin 2014b: 62-3 also points out the use in the *Theriaca* of what he calls "didactic verbs" in section openings: these are often verbs of learning or similar, or alternatively may relate to specific instructions regarding the creation of cures and so on. Not every example is an imperative, prohibition or optative (either imperatival or potential with the sense 'you would do well to…'), but a list of occurrences of any of these constructions in the first lines of sections will make the point sufficiently: *Theriaca* 157 (φράζεο), 209 (εὖ δ᾽ ἂν […] ἴδοις), 258 (εὖ δ᾽ ἂν […] μάθοις), 320 (εὖ δ᾽ ἂν […] γνοίης), 359 (νῦν δ᾽ ἄγε […] εἴρεο), 396 (τεκμαίρευ), 411 (πιφαύσκεο), 438 (φράζεο), 509 (ἐνδατέοιτο), 541 (περιφράζεο), 574 (μηδὲ σύ γ᾽ […] ἐπιλήθεο), 583 (μηδὲ σέ γε […] λάθοι), 594 (ἄγρει), 625 (μὴ σύ γ᾽ […] λιπεῖν), 630 (although νῦν δ᾽ ἄγε τοι strengthens the first peron indicative ἐρέω), 656 (φράζεο), 666 (ἄγρεο), 700 (πεύθεο), 715 (περιφράζοιο), 725 (πιφαύσκεο), 759 (φράζεο),

Alexipharmaca 12-13 (ἰδὲ […] πνυθείης), 74 (ἐπιφράζευ), 186 (τεκμαίρεο), 279-80 (σε μή […] λήσειεν), 335-6 (μή […] λήσειεν), 376 (ἀλλ' ἄγε δὴ φράζοιο), 397 (μηδέ σέ γ' […] λήθῃ), 415 (μηδέ […] κορέσκοι), 465 (εἰδείης), 521 (μή […] κήδοι), with several more examples in the first lines of 'second halves' (e.g. 195: τὸν μέν τ' ἢ λίπεος κορέοις ἢ ἀμισγέος οἴνης; 'You should fill up the victim with either oil or unmixed wine').[47] The juxtaposition of two sections beginning with μηδέ at both *Ther*. 574 and 583 and *Alexiph*. 397 and 415 produces an especially strong effect. In Aratus's 'Weather-signs' the imperative σκέπτεο is especially favoured: it is the first word of its section or sub-section at 778, 799, 832, 880, 892 and 994.

A playful engagement with the 'didactic verb' opening comes at *Ther*. 805ff.. Here, the opening οἶδά γε μήν begins two successive sections (at 805 and 811). After the similar-sounding σῆπά γε μήν in 817 and a slight variation on the original pattern at 822 (ναὶ μὴν οἶδ'), finally in 829 the verb is delayed to the second line of its section and appears without a strengthening particle. Overduin 2014b: 491 has noted the pattern and pointed to the importance of the didactic speaker's knowledge, but it might be added that between the third and fourth occurences of the verb there is an acknowledgement of at least the possibility of ignorance:

ναὶ μὴν οἶδ' ὅσα πόντος ἁλὸς ῥόχθοισιν ἑλίσσει,

---

[47]The use of instructions of this sort as section openings for didactic poetry may seem an obvious choice, but it is not an inevitable one: Aratus does not use many imperatival constructions in the part of the *Phaenomena* concerning constellations. Similarly, Oppian's *Halieutica* avoids the use of instruction in structuring: φράζεο δ' ἀφραδίῃ προφερέστατον ἡμεροκοίτην/ ἰχθύν (2. 199; 'Learn of the 'day-sleeping' fish, foremost in thoughtlessness') is a rare example. Interestingly, one of his preferred section markers (a form of ἄλλος and δέ: 1. 102, 128, 131, 145, 305, 747, 2. 422) is a favourite of Lycophron's: see below, pp. 52-3. It also appears in short bursts in the *Theriaca*: see below, p. 38 n. 50. Note too his repeated use of ἔστι δέ τις (1. 555, 388, 2 .141, 4. 468, 647), which appears as a section opener in Apollonius and Homer (see pp. 84, 86). Even within the range of explicit instruction, Nicander's preferences (ususally imperatives or optatives) are reasonably narrow: see Gibson, 1998: 80-1 for the wide range of types of 'imperatival' in Latin didactic verse (a number of which would also be possible in Greek).

> σμυραίνης δ' ἔκπαγλον· ἐπεὶ μογεροὺς ἁλιῆας
> πολλάκις ἐμπρήσασα κατεπρήνιξεν ἐπάκτρου
> εἰς ἅλα φυζηθέντας ἐχετλίου ἐξαναδῦσα,[48]
> εἰ ἔτυμον κείνην γε σὺν οὐλοβόροις ἐχίεσσι
> θόρνυσθαι προλιποῦσαν ἁλὸς νομὸν ἠπείροισι.
> τρυγόνα μὴν ὀλοεργὸν ἁλιρραίστην τε δράκοντα
> οἶδ' ἀπαλέξασθαι·
> (822-9)
>
> Yes, indeed, I know all of the things which the sea whirls about in its crashing of brine, and the wonder of the moray eel. For often, leaping from the hold and startling the wretched fishermen, it has thrown them from their boat to flee into the sea, if it is true that this is the creature which mates with deadly-biting vipers on the mainland, abandoning the pasture of the brine. Truly, when it comes to the evil-doing sting-ray and the ravening marine snake, I know how to ward them off.

It is interesting that as the pattern is weakened (soon to be broken completely as the abortive list of sea-creatures fails to capture ὅσα πόντος ἁλὸς ῥόχθοισιν ἑλίσσει) the knowledge which it emphasises is also called into question by the moment of apparent doubt pertaining to paradoxical information (cf. n. 48, on ἐξαναδῦσα). We might also consider a Callimachean connection here. The οἶδα-pattern may recall the repeated use of the verb at *Aitia* fr. 43. 46-55 Harder, on the cities of Sicily (cf. Harder 2012b: 321, Massimilla 1996: 332), but in 822 (οἶδ' ὅσα πόντος) Nicander can also be seen to distance himself from Callimachus by an ironic echo of Phthonus' words at *Hymn* 2. 106 (οὐκ ἄγαμαι τὸν ἀοιδὸν ὃς οὐδ' ὅσα πόντος ἀείδει; 'I do not love the singer who does not sing as much as the sea'). This is an excellent example of meaningful interaction between section marking and content: Nicander, it seems,

---

[48] Cf. White, 1987: 57-60 and Overduin 2014b: 489-90 for a discussion of the lack of need for a lacuna (and previous attempts to solve the problem). 826-7, I think, explains the preceding material (with ἐξαναδῦσα as the very last word) insofar as it provides another example of the eel's departure from water unharmed, and so a pause as weak as a comma seems acceptable here (following the text of Schneider, as discussed by Gow and Scholfield 1953: 187). Of course, the explanation is even stranger than the preceding claim, but this is hardly unexpected in Nicander!

is taking Callimachean knowledge to dangerously uncallimachean levels (everything that the sea has to offer): is it any wonder that he cannot keep the pattern up?[49]

Related to these didactic verbs are other features which highlight the speaker's authority, such as the particle τοι (cf. above on ἀλλ᾽ ἤτοι etc.), which appears in the opening few words of sections or sub-sections beginning at *Phaenomena* 156, 233, 303, 311, 431, 469, 819, 909, 954 and 973. Overduin 2014b: 291 notes the specific borrowing of σῆμα δέ τοι in *Theriaca* 282 from *Phaenomena* 303 and 909. See also *Ther*. 1, 411, 528, 636, 715 and 729. As we shall see in subsequent chapters, the voice of the narrator (or embedded speaker in the case of the *Alexandra*) is often prominent at transitions between sections in our other poems (pp. 57, 98-9).

---

[49] Note that a possible model for Callimachus' list of Sicilian cities also claims the ability to list a number of items within a specific category of knowledge before an abrupt end to the catalogue. In fr. 59 O.-S., the Sicilian Archestratus (fourth century BC) builds up a list of wines: τόν τ᾽ ἀπὸ Φοινίκης ἱερῆς τὸν Βίβλινον αἰνῶ (5; 'And I praise Bibline wine from sacred Phoenicia'), ἔστι δὲ καὶ Θάσιος πίνειν γενναῖος (15; 'And Thasian wine is also good to drink'). At 17-20 he suggests that he could provide many more examples, but has chosen not to:

> οἶδα δὲ κἀξ ἄλλων πόλεων βοτρυοσταγῆ ἔρνη
> εἰπεῖν αἰνῆσαί τε καὶ οὔ με λέληθ᾽ ὀνομῆναι.
> ἀλλ᾽ οὐθὲν τἄλλ᾽ ἐστὶν ἁπλῶς πρὸς Λέσβιον οἶνον.
> ἀλλά τινες χαίρουσιν ἐπαινοῦντες τὰ παρ᾽ αὑτοῖς.
>
> And I know how to speak of grape-dripping shoots from other cities too, and it has not slipped my mind how to praise them and name them. But the others are simply nothing compared to Lesbian wine. But certain people rejoice in praising things from their own areas.

The relationship between the three texts may be stronger than the context-shorn fragment of Archestratus allows us to see (for a possible relationship between Archestratus and Nicander see below, p. 130 n. 214). Incidentally, Nicander may have built up similar patterns of short sections focused on his knowledge in other poems. Fr. 32, perhaps from the *Ophiaca*, begins ἔκλυον ὡς Λιβύης Ψύλλων γένος οὔτε τι θηρῶν/ αὐτοὶ κάμνουσιν μυδαλέῃσι τυπαῖς/ οὓς Σύρτις βόσκει θηροτρόφος ('I have heard how Libya's race of the Psylli do not themselves suffer at all from the dripping wounds of the beasts which beast-rearing Syrtis nourishes'). Morel 1928: 356 suggests that Plin. *NH* 8. 229 (snakes in Syria not harming Syrians) may be indebted to Nicander, in which case fr. 32 might have formed part of a sequence of instances of locals avoiding harm from local snakes ('I have heard […] 'I have heard […]').

A final point worth noting before we turn to section endings is that it is not only through repetition that section markers can be conspicuous. While Aratus builds up fewer large patterns of similar section-opening constructions than does Nicander, he does occasionally provide lengthy phrases which let us know very clearly that we are starting a new unit: two of the best examples are at 233 (ἔστι δέ τοι καὶ ἔτ᾽ ἄλλο) and 443 (ἀλλ᾽ ἔτι γάρ τε καὶ ἄλλο).[50] A similar effect comes from the combination of several marked features into a single opening, for example at *Phaenomena* 832 (σκέπτεο, εἰ and τοι) and *Theriaca* 509 (ἤτοι, frontloading and hortation; it is also a four-word line).

[50] Nonetheless, there are still a reasonable number of local patterns to be found in Aratus: even two small sub-sections in a row starting with πολλάκι (938, 942) can gesture towards the effect of sectioning. A slightly larger-scale sequence of sorts comes at 179ff.: οὐδ᾽ ἄρα (179, τοῦ δ᾽ ἄρα (188), αὐτοῦ γὰρ (197), ἀλλ᾽ ἄρα (205), αὐτοῦ καὶ (225). This relatively well-marked system of transition coincides to an extent with an especially closely related group of constellations, those depicting some of the family of Cepheus (and others nearby). Comparable sequences come at *Theriaca* 777ff., as different scorpions are introduced with forms of ἄλλος or ἕτερος (ἄλλος δέ (777), ἄλλος δ᾽ (782), τὸν δ᾽ ἕτερον (786); cf. below, pp. 52-3. on Lycophron), and 725ff., where the frontloading of spider names (see p. 26) is combined with ἄλλο (725), ἄλλο (729), ἄλλος (734) and ἄλλο (738).

1.2 Aratus and Nicander: Endings

1.2.1 Aratus' section endings

The poets share far less common ground in their section endings than in their section openings. The endings of Aratus' sections are frequently marked formally, whereas Nicander's most conspicuous patterns are based in content. Of the 165 σπονδειάζοντες in the *Phaenomena*, 38 occur in the final line of a section, sub-section or digression (or in a "cluster" culminating in the final line):[51] 10, 12, 14, 32, 33, 35, 44, 62, 73, 224, 229, 230, 232, 274, 318, 325, 347, 387, 388, 401, 442, 479, 500, 510, 524, 754, 755, 757, 777, 798, 904, 932, 953, 998, 1103, 1121, 1123 and 1154 (the final line of the poem).[52] At about a quarter of the total number of occurrences, this phenomenon seems reasonably secure in general terms, but it is most visible and effective in a short burst concerning the 'circles' of heaven (462-544), where sections concerning the Milky Way (469-79), the Tropic of Cancer (480-500), the Tropic of Capricorn (501-10) and the Equator (511-24) all end in σπονδειάζοντες: οἱ δύο, τοὶ δέ σφεων μέγα μείονες εἱλίσσονται (479), ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν ἐν βορέω περὶ Καρκίνον ἐστήρικται (500), τῶν ὀκτώ, τὰ δὲ πέντε κατώρυχα δινεύονται (510), Ἱππείη κεφαλὴ καὶ

[51] On these clusters, see Kidd 1997: 168. His relevant cases are 10, 12, 14, 32, 33, 35, 229, 230, 232, 754, 755 and 757.

[52] My figure for the total number of σπονδειάζοντες in the poem is six more than the figure given by Kidd 1997: 35. After several recounts I cannot account for so striking a difference. I therefore list here every case I have counted, and encourage the reader with an interest in metre to find six cases where I am mistaken: 5, 10, 12, 14, 32, 33, 35, 44, 62, 73, 97, 108, 111, 118, 124, 128, 135, 142, 158, 159, 186, 194, 217, 221, 224, 229, 230, 232, 234, 248, 258, 262, 265, 270, 274, 276, 296, 297, 309, 318, 325, 331, 347, 351, 353, 365, 368, 370, 379, 383, 387, 388, 394, 401, 403, 405, 408, 412, 419, 420, 421, 425, 428, 442, 447, 455, 456, 462, 467, 479, 487, 497, 500, 506, 510, 518, 524, 526, 555, 564, 565, 569, 597, 609, 615, 616, 636, 653, 656, 658, 661, 673, 677, 689, 700, 720, 731, 744, 745, 754, 755, 757, 774, 777, 798, 802, 811, 841, 845, 848, 854, 866, 870, 873, 874, 881, 887, 892, 893, 896, 901, 904, 911, 926, 927, 929, 932, 933, 939, 942, 944, 949, 953, 954, 955, 958, 975, 980, 986, 998, 1000, 1001, 1004, 1006, 1013, 1021, 1030, 1034, 1038, 1048, 1061, 1066, 1103, 1110, 1115, 1121, 1123, 1124, 1129, 1133, 1134, 1137, 1140, 1144, 1154.

ὑπαύχενον εἱλίσσονται (524). Note too that the first line of this run of sections, 462, is a σπονδειάζων: ἤτοι μὲν τάγε κεῖται ἀλίγκια δινωτοῖσιν.

Other 'impressive' features which end sections are alliteration (examples, with varying degrees of certainty, come at 95, 146, 166, 318, 589, 595, 633), rhyme (see especially 264-7, […] ὀνομασταὶ/ […] εἱλίσσονται/ […] ἀρχομένοιο/ […] ἀρότοιο) and couplets consisting of similar line endings (e.g. 237-8, […] εὐάστερός ἐστιν/ […] ἀστέρες εἰσίν).[53] Sometimes form and content combine in these impressive endings: 315 has *figura etymologica*, while 401 is a striking four-word σπονδειάζων (see Kidd 1997: 35 on the combination of these two metrical phenomena as a closing device) where all of the words have some notion of circling involved in their meaning (401; δινωτοὶ κύκλῳ περιηγέες εἱλίσσονται). Even without formal virtuosity, ending lines such as 253 can live long in the memory (ἴχνια μηκύνει κεκονιμένος ἐν Διὶ πατρί ('[Perseus] lengthens his stride, bedusted, in his father Zeus'). Pendergraft 1996 has demonstrated Aratus' interest in the sound (pp. 49-53, 59-64) and meaning (pp. 54-9) of words, and if we allow such aspects of his poetry to be meaningful, it is certainly interesting that so many of these different effects are utilised at the ends of sections.[54] The build-up to the close of the section concerning the Bears demonstrates how effective Aratus' section endings can be:

> καὶ τὴν μὲν Κυνόσουραν ἐπίκλησιν καλέουσιν,
> τὴν δ' ἑτέρην Ἑλίκην. Ἑλίκῃ γε μὲν ἄνδρες Ἀχαιοὶ
> εἰν ἁλὶ τεκμαίρονται ἵνα χρὴ νῆας ἀγινεῖν·
> τῇ δ' ἄρα Φοίνικες πίσυνοι περόωσι θάλασσαν.
> ἀλλ' ἡ μὲν καθαρὴ καὶ ἐπιφράσσασθαι ἑτοίμη
> πολλὴ φαινομένη Ἑλίκη πρώτης ἀπὸ νυκτός·
> ἡ δ' ἑτέρη ὀλίγη μέν, ἀτὰρ ναύτῃσιν ἀρείων·

---

[53] Kidd 1997: 281 links rhyming couplets to Hesiod and "popular jingles associated with weather".
[54] She discusses line 315 on p. 55 and alliteration generally on p. 60. Cf. Maltby 2005 for etymologising placed near the beginnings and ends of important sections in Lucretius' arguments.

μειοτέρῃ γὰρ πᾶσα περιστρέφεται στροφάλιγγι·
τῇ καὶ Σιδόνιοι ἰθύντατα ναυτίλλονται.
(36-44)

And men give one [of the Bears] the name Cynosura and the other Helice. It is by Helice that Achaean men on the brine infer whither there is a need to lead their ships, but it is relying on the other that the Phoenicians cross the sea. Helice is clear and easy to recognise, appearing fully from the start of the night. The other, however, is small, albeit better for sailors, for it is turned entirely in a lesser rotation. By this one, indeed, Sidonians sail most directly.

After a reversal of expectations, in which Helice seems to be presented as the more useful constellation before Cynosura's victory is asserted, the poet plays with size in a fashion similar to that of Callimachus, *Ep.* 8 Pf.[55] The smaller turning circle of the Phoenicians' favoured Bear is expressed in especially large words: both 43 and 44, the latter a σπονδειάζων, contain only two words after a third-foot caesura (and the only other line of which this is true, 36, also concerns Cynosura).[56]

1.2.2 Nicander's section endings

Nicander does dabble in formal markers of section endings. He thrice ends successive sections or sub-sections of the *Theriaca* with impressive four-word hexameters: the lines in question are 7 and 20, 144 and 156, and 319 and 333.[57] It is

[55] There, the final word of a poem extolling the virtues of brevity is βραχυσυλλαβίη.

[56] See Kidd (1997: 189) for other facets of the "elaborate artistry" of 36-44 (and individual notes on 43 and 44 (pp. 191-2)).

[57] This last line (λεῦκαί τ' ἀργινόεσσαν ἐπισσεύουσιν ἔφηλιν) contains an elided τε in addition to the four words, still a 'versus tetracolos' if we are counting 'metrical words' (on the definition of appositives set out by Magnelli 2002: 58) rather than grammatical words. The decision of whether to include such lines in lists of versus tetracoli is a difficult one. On the one hand, "the inclusion of metrical words has the result of inflating numbers […] and raises the problem of how many metrical words to allow in a single line" (Lightfoot 2020: 254; cf. Lightfoot 2014: 72 n. 90), but on the other, as Lightfoot 2020: 254 observes of Pseudo-Manetho "many occur in the same contexts and have just the same functions as the pure grammatical examples". The appearance of one of these lines in a set of pointed pairings in the *Theriaca*, and of two such lines in the metrically virtuosic fr. 74 (as we are about to see) underlines this last point.

noteworthy that in fr. 74, from the *Georgica*, Nicander uses four-word hexameters far more extensively at section ends: these occur (with an extra elided preposition in one case and an extra elided enclitic particle in another) at ll. 8, 16, 23-4, 30 and 63-5.[58] The difference in approach between his poems may suggest a keenness to experiment with different types of section marking.

More prominent than metrical flourishes at the endings of sections in the *Theriaca* and *Alexipharmaca* are repeated ideas and motifs. In the *Alexipharmaca*, we very often find words or phrases relating to safety or combatting illness: this is true in 73, 114, 156, 278, 334,[59] 464, 536 and 566. Often, these have quite a general flavour, such as in 565-6 (at the end of the section concerning the salamander):

> […] οἷσι κορέσκων
> ἀνέρα καὶ θανάτοιο πέλας βεβαῶτα σαώσεις.
>
> Filling him up with these things [the cures suggested earlier in the section], you will save a man even when he has come close to death.

Sectioning and content work together here: in a poem concerned with warding off harm, it makes sense that the end of many sections should allude to victory over the dangerous items discussed.[60] Similarly, it seems fitting that we find so marked

---

[58] This last cluster of three such lines in a row is especially impressive:
> φάσγανα παρθενικαῖς νεοδουπέσιν ἀμφιχέονται,
> αὐτάς τ' ἠιθέας ἀνεμωνίδες ἀστράπτουσαι
> τηλόθεν ὀξυτέρῃσιν ἐφελκόμεναι χροιῇσι.

Cf. below, p. 80 n. 135., on four-word hexameters in Apollonius, and pp. 63-6, 71 n. 121 on three-word trimeters in Lycophron and Pseudo-Scymnus. See also Harder 2012b: 656 for four-word lines in Callimachus.

[59] διαθρύψειας, 'break up'; used of blood-clots, but perhaps less conspicuous than the other examples given.

[60] But note the significant deviation from this pattern in the section concerning arrow-poison (ending at 248): this section is already aberrant in its addition of a digression concerning the use of the poison by barbarians after the description of cures, and it finishes on a dark note: τὰ δὲ πολλὸν ἀναλθέα τραύματα τεύχει/ σάρκα μελαινομένην, πικρὸς δ' ὑποβόσκεται Ὕδρης/ ἰός, σηπόμενον δὲ μύδῳ ἐκρήγνυται ἕρφος (246-8; 'and the greatly incurable wounds make the flesh black, and the bitter posion of the Hydra grazes down into it, and the skin breaks up, rotten in decay').

a run of sections ending in death in the passage of the *Theriaca* concerning spiders and extending into the moth section:

ἰσχία δ᾽ αὔτως/ μάλκη ἐνισκήπτουσα κατήριπεν ἔχματα[61] γούνων. (723-4)

And just so a numbness falling upon his hips casts down the supports of his knees.

ἐν δὲ κάρος κεφαλῇ, γούνων δ᾽ ὑποέκλασε δεσμά. (728)

And a weight is upon his head and breaks the bonds of his knees.

[…] νέμει δέ οἱ ἐγγὺς ὄλεθρον. (733)

And he considers ruin to be near him.

μινύθοντα δὲ τόνδε δαμάζει
ἐσχάτιον κακοεργὸς ἄγων παυστήριον ὕπνος. (745-6)

And an ill-working sleep bringing the final alleviation overcomes this man as he wastes away.

κραδίη δὲ παραπλάζουσα μέμηνε,
γλῶσσα δ᾽ ἄτακτα λέληκε, παρέστραπται δὲ καὶ ὄσσε. (757-8)

And his heart, going astray, raves, and his tongue shrieks disorderly things, and his eyes are turned to the side.

ῥεῖα δέ κεν θανάτοιο καὶ αὐτίκα μοῖραν ἐφείη. (768)

And easily, there and then, it may send upon him the doom of death.[62]

Here we might even be reminded of Homeric battle episodes, where small textual units end with the deaths of men. Overduin 2014b: 452 rightly points out the many Homeric resonances in his commentary on this run of sections and even says that "Nic.'s description of the struggle between poisonous creatures and men […] calls

[61] I follow Jacques (2002: 56) in favouring the reading of the MSS, with which there seems to me no great problem.
[62] 736 describes a painless bite, and 751 refers back to the effects of other spiders.

Iliadic battle-scenes to mind".[63] It should be emphasised that this evocation extends to section ending. At *Il.* 5. 38-83, for example, units end as follows:

> δούπησεν δὲ πεσών, ἀράβησε δὲ τεύχε᾽ ἐπ᾽ αὐτῷ. (42)
> And he thudded as he fell, and his armour rang out upon him.
> ἤριπε δ᾽ ἐξ ὀχέων, στυγερὸς δ᾽ ἄρα μιν σκότος εἷλε. (47)
> And he fell from his chariot, and hateful darkness took him.
> ἤριπε δὲ πρηνής, ἀράβησε δὲ τεύχε᾽ ἐπ᾽ αὐτῷ. (58)
> And he fell head-first, and his armour rang out upon him.
> γνὺξ δ᾽ ἔριπ᾽ οἰμώξας, θάνατος δέ μιν ἀμφεκάλυψε. (68)
> And he fell to his knees, groaning, and death covered him over.
> ἤριπε δ᾽ ἐν κονίῃ, ψυχρὸν δ᾽ ἕλε χαλκὸν ὀδοῦσιν. (75)
> And he fell in the dust, and took the cold bronze in his teeth.
> τὸν δὲ κατ᾽ ὄσσε/ ἔλλαβε πορφύρεος θάνατος καὶ μοῖρα κραταιή. (83)
> And down over his eyes purple death and mighty fate took him.

In both cases a mixture of summary-clauses and specific descriptions of wounding end sections, and Nicander may even provide a 'modern' take on Homeric formularity in the similar endings to 724 and 728 (see Overduin 2014b: 454 for the impression that the latter is a word-for-word rephrasing of the former).

While it is clear that sections ending with death or salvation underline the themes of the *Theriaca* and the *Alexipharmaca*, it is less obvious why we should be faced with a pattern of wine appearing at or near the end of sections in the second half of the *Theriaca* (in the final lines of sections or sub-sections unless otherwise stated): 507 (penultimate line), 519, 540, 563 (twice), 603, 622 (antepenultimate line) and 624, 655, 698 (penultimate line), 713 (penultimate line), 913 (penultimate line)

[63] See generally Overduin 2014b: 125-7 for Iliadic vocabulary.

and 956 (the last line before the poem’s concluding couplet). Perhaps we are to understand it to be an especially useful tool in man’s fight against the dangerous world?

1.2.3 Aratus and Nicander: general remarks and conclusion

We have seen some specific evocations of prose and archaic verse in the section marking of Nicander, but it is also worth emphasising that the *Phaenomena* often recalls archaic catalogue poetry. The treatment of this aspect of the poem by Fakas 2001: 77-84 is extremely useful: see especially pp. 82-3 on some of the section markers in the ‘Weather-Signs’, such as μηδέ at 973-87 and *WD* 715-18, 724-59 (cf. already Hutchinson 1988: 232). Another interesting observation is that of p. 78 on the affinities between the zodiac-catalogue (544-50) and Pleiades-catalogue (262-3) and the *Theogony*. He concludes that Aratus updates Hesiod’s catalogue-style in part by a greater variety of section markers (84).[64]

We have also seen that the poets can achieve interesting effects by beginning or ending sections in unexpected ways, and it should be added that the absence of whole sections or parts of them when they are expected can also be a striking tool. A good example comes in the run of sections concerning the the constellations

[64] It should be added that the filling of lines with names at 455-50 also recalls the Catalogue of Ships, where the only words (other than particles or conjunctions) in many lines are the names of people or places and the epithets describing them (*Il.* 2. 495 even lacks epithets: Ἀρκεσίλαός τε Προθοήνωρ τε Κλονίος τε). An interesting extension of this technique might be seen in Aratus’ tendency to fill up lines in descriptions of constellations with words referring to body-parts: 633 ([…] ἀτὰρ Κηφεὺς κεφαλῇ καὶ χειρὶ καὶ ὤμοις), 671-2 (γυῖά τε καὶ ζώνη καὶ στήθεα πάντα καὶ ὦμος/ δεξιτερῇ σὺν χειρί· κάρη δ’ ἑτέρης μετὰ χειρός), 683 ([…] κεφαλήν τε καὶ ἄλλην χεῖρα καὶ ἰξύν), 704 ([…] μογεραὶ χεῖρες καὶ γοῦνα καὶ ὦμοι).

which rise and set along with each sign of the zodiac at *Phaenomena* 559-732.[65] Aries, it turns out, is denied a proper section of its own, and only a few words on this constellation appear sandwiched between much fuller sections concerning Pisces and Taurus:

> [...] τά γε μὲν κατὰ δεξιὰ χειρὸς
> αὐτοὶ ἐφέλκονται, τὰ δ᾽ ἀριστερὰ νειόθεν ἕλκει
> Κριὸς ἀνερχόμενος. τοῦ καὶ περιτελλομένοιο
> ἑσπερόθεν κεν ἴδοιο Θυτήριον, αὐτὰρ ἐν ἄλλῃ
> Περσέος ἀντέλλοντος ὅσον κεφαλήν τε καὶ ὤμους·
> αὐτὴ δὲ ζώνη καί κ᾽ ἀμφήριστα πέλοιτο
> ἢ Κριῷ λήγοντι φαείνεται ἢ ἐπὶ Ταύρῳ
> σὺν τῷ πανσυδίῃ ἀνελίσσεται. οὐδ᾽ ὅγε Ταύρου
> λείπεται ἀντέλλοντος, ἐπεὶ μάλα οἱ συναρηρὼς
> Ἡνίοχος φέρεται·
> (707-17)
>
> [Pisces] drag up the parts of [Andromeda] along her right side, and those along the left Aries drags from below the horizon as it comes up. And when it rises you may see the altar from the West, and as much as the head and shoulders of Perseus rising from the other side. And it may be contested whether his belt is visible with the completion of Aries' rising[66] or with Taurus, with which he travels up in his entirety. And when Taurus rises the Charioteer is not left behind, for it is borne along very closely attached to it.

The coincidence of this lack of a proper section and the narrator's uncertainty in these lines is noteworthy. Hipparchus talks of a discrepancy between Eudoxus' *Phaenomena* and *Enoptron* on the subject of the extent to which Perseus rises at the same time as Pisces (2. 3. 12, 29). Kidd 1997: 418-19 (on *Phaen*. 712) tells us that Aratus is unsure whether to follow the *Phaenomena* or the *Enoptron*, but since Aries comes after Pisces, and since the poet says that only the head and shoulders of Perseus rise with Aries, it is not possible for him to be agreeing with the *Enoptron*,

---

[65] For another example, see Part 2b (pp. 191-3) on the possible absence of symptoms in the section of the *Alexipharmaca* concerning henbane.
[66] Cf. Kidd 1997: 419-20.

which says that almost all of Perseus rises with Pisces. Attalus, quoted by Hipparchus at 2. 3. 22-3, thinks that Aratus' uncertainty in 711-13 stems from the fact that the belt comes up between the beginning of Aries and the beginning of Taurus. At 2. 3. 24 Hipparchus rejects this view: πρῶτον μὲν οὖν ἐν τούτοις ὁ Ἄτταλος ἀγνοεῖ, νομίζων ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον τὴν ἀκρίβειαν ἐν τοῖς Φαινομένοις ὑπὸ Ἀράτου διειλῆφθαι ('first of all, Attalus is wrong in thinking that accuracy is taken to such a level by Aratus in the *Phaenomena*'). Kidd 1997: 418-19 suggests that "in this highly technical section Aratus is obliged to follow his model more closely than he did in his earlier description of the constellations, the details of which he could check for himself from diagrams or from the night sky itself. He does not elsewhere question his source material in this section, and indeed his primary purpose is to illustrate the helpfulness of Zeus rather than to compose an astronomical textbook". But Aratus has implicitly attempted an answer in 710-11, and at the very least he has told us that *Enoptron* is wrong. There may even be a degree of playfulness in the way in which the poet pushes the point of uncertainty into the next constellation. In denying a proper section to Aries, he allows the whole attention of this short passage to fall on the problem of Perseus' rising. Here then, the subversion of expectation in the very absence of a section where we feel there should be one allows the poet to shape our experience of the material: bound up with our surprise about the lack of a section concerning Aries is a pressing interest in the minutiae of *paranatellonta*.[67] A similar discussion of this passage (even with

[67] We shall see in Part 2b (pp. 187-98) that Nicander often deviates from his usual methods of presenting sections when he hints at multiple sources lying behind his work. In these places he also gives the impression of strong interest in the topics at hand.

an eye on sectioning) can be found at Fakas 2001: 81: "nicht ohne Humor hält sich der Dichter hier bei einer Kleinigkeit auf, um auf seine neuartige, die Grenzen zwischen einzelnen Kataloggliedern verwischende Aufzählenstechnik aufmerksam zu machen".[68]

In these first chapters we have seen that while some patterns are built up over the course of nearly a whole poem, conspicuous and effective runs of section markers can be created on a smaller scale. We have also seen the potential afforded by section marking for individual aesthetic effects (and in a less fashionable author like Nicander just as much as in Callimachus). In the case of the didactic poets the strong authorial presence blurs the lines between pure form and pure content in passages such as *Theriaca* 805-29 and *Phaenomena* 707-17, or at least allows for a dramatisation of the process of writing in sections, but enjoyable effects can also be created in the absence of such concerns (for example at *Alexipharmaca* 495-500). As we turn to the remainder of our poets, we shall see different methods and focuses, but also areas of overlap (for instance an interest in naming reflected in section marking): naturally we might expect Nicander to share more in some respects with poets closer to him in date than Aratus, even if we have seen that they seem to share a 'didactic pool' of opening constructions.

---

[68] See also Fakas 2001: 80 (with further bibliography in n. 64), for a 'blurring' of the various risings and settings over the edges of different zodiacal constellations throughout this run of sections.

1.3 Lycophron: Openings

1.3.1 Lycophron: introductory remarks

Cassandra's prophecy is broken up into a very large number of sections, several of which are grouped into runs, often in a reasonably intricate manner.[69] The grouping concerning Helen's five husbands (144-79), for example, contains smaller units devoted to subsets of this group (147-8, 149-67, 168-71, 171-9), and this is itself part of a larger entity concerning Paris and Helen (90-182). There is not always agreement among scholars about the exact beginning and ending points of sections, but there is reason to believe that a degree of complexity in sectioning is a deliberate ploy on Lycophron's part: sometimes, for example, we can see two different methods of sectioning cutting across each other.[70] We shall see below that a sequence of sub-sections (229, 232, 243 and 249) all begin with καὶ δή, but one could also quite reasonably understand a section (concerning Achilles at Troy) to be marked out by bookending at 243-80:

> καὶ δὴ στένει Μύρινα καὶ παράκτιοι
> ἵππων φριμαγμὸν ἠόνες δεδεγμέναι,
> ὅταν Πελασγὸν ἅλμα λαιψηροῦ ποδὸς
> εἰς θῖν' ἐρείσας λοισθίαν αἴθων λύκος
> κρηναῖον ἐξ ἄμμοιο ῥοιβδήσῃ γάνος,
> πηγὰς ἀνοίξας τὰς πάλαι κεκρυμμένας.
> […]

[69] These sections within runs tend to be larger than those we saw in the 'Weather-Signs' (see pp. 31-2).

[70] Large-scale outlines of structure are attempted by Hurst and Kolde (2008: xxvii) and Durbec (2008a: 430-2). Again, the analysis by McNelis and Sens 2016: 67-100 of Cassandra's speech presents fairly large sub-sections of two major sections (the Trojan War: 31–1282; "the broader context of the long conflict between East and West: 1283-1450"). Most useful for our purposes is the synopsis given by Hornblower (2015: 115-118), which marks out smaller units, but is not always to be followed. Both Hornblower and McNelis and Sens consider the 'Paris and Helen' unit, for example, to end at 179. My preference for an end to the section at 182 rests on the fact that Paris is still the subject of these lines, before a subsequent move to Iphigeneia's sacrifice at 183. One of Durbec's 'five acts' ends at 182.

> καὶ <u>λοῖσθος</u> εἰς γῆν δυσμενῶν ῥῖψαι <u>πόδα</u>,
> τὸ σόν, ξύναιμε, κἀν ὕπνῳ πτήσσων δόρυ. (243-8, 279-80)
>
> And, indeed, Myrina and the seaside beaches groan, receiving the snorting of horses, when the fiery wolf, leaning the Pelasgian leap of his nimble foot onto the edge of the shore, will cause a spring's sparkle to gush from the sand, opening up streams long hidden.
> […]
> And he will be the last to cast his foot upon his enemies' land, agitated by your spear, brother, even in his sleep.

The bookending created by repeated subject matter is underlined by the verbal echoes of ποδὸς [...] πόδα and λοισθίαν [...] λοῖσθος.[71] The content of the opening and closing lines is also consistent with what we might expect of the beginning and ending of an individual section in the poem.[72] In addition to competing structures of this kind, there are also several false endings to sections throughout the poem (as we shall see below), and so we can already discern a touch of playfulness in the poet's approach to section marking; certainly we shall see sustained and active engagement with the possibilities of sectioning.

1.3.2 Archaising section openers: articles, ἄλλος and numbers

A frequent section opener in the *Alexandra* is the definite article (often used as a pronoun) followed by δέ.[73] Of the thirty examples which begin both a line and a sentence, twenty can be thought fairly confidently to start a section or sub-section.

---

[71] Even if the meaning of λοισθίαν is presumably something like 'the edge [of the shore]'; cf. Hornblower 2015: 176-7.
[72] Given the prominence of created springs at apparently important moments in Hellenistic poetry, πηγὰς ἀνοίξας τὰς πάλαι κεκρυμμένας sounds very much like an introduction to a literary item. The concluding focus on cowardice is an example of a repeated ending motif. Hutchinson 1988: 263 compares the lines directly preceding 279-80 (concerning Achilleus' female outfit in Skyros) to those which close the section concerning Odysseus (815-19; his pretended madness): in both cases, he points out, we have a climactic turn to a "demeaning" tale about the subject. 280, of course, continues the theme of Achilles' cowardice to the very end of his section.
[73] Actually, in every case to be listed, the particle is elided.

The table below indicates these sections or sub-sections, and also shows in which of these examples αὖ follows δ’, providing a more marked opening formula.[74]

<table>
<tr><td>ὁ δ’</td><td>335: Priam’s death</td><td>592: Diomedes</td><td>820: Menelaos</td><td>930: Epeios</td><td>1047: Podaleiros’ death and oneiromantic shrine</td></tr>
<tr><td>ἡ δ’</td><td>28: Kassandra opens her mouth to speak[75]</td><td colspan="2">1346: Herakles’ sack of Troy</td><td colspan="2">1366: Europe’s revenge for Paris’ actions</td></tr>
<tr><td>τὸν δ’</td><td>168 (αὖ): Helen’s fourth husband</td><td>387: Lesser Ajax’s death</td><td>431 (αὖ): Idomenus’ sub-section of the larger ‘Deaths at Kolophon’ unit</td><td>911: Philoktetes</td><td>1011 (αὖ): Nireus and Thoas</td></tr>
<tr><td>οἱ δ’</td><td>183 (αὖ): Iphigeneia’s sacrifice</td><td>202: Greek oaths</td><td>633: Boiotians</td><td>1008 (αὖ): Sub-section of larger ‘Settlers of Bruttium’ unit concerning settlers of Tereina.</td><td>1083 (αὖ): Settlers of Lucania</td><td>1388 (αὖ): Descendants of Dymas</td></tr>
<tr><td>τοὺς δ’</td><td colspan="6">648: Lycophron’s ‘Odyssey’.</td></tr>
</table>

Especially in light of the importance of frontloading as a technique of section marking in other poets (see above, pp. 23-8), Lycophron’s frequent provision of what looks like a definite article (even if it often turns out to be a pronoun in

[74] Less certainly section openers, but worth mentioning are 20 (οἱ δ’), where the account of Paris’ voyage begins in earnest after an introductory description of the dawn, and 948 (τὰ δ’), if Epeios’ dedication of his tools can be thought to form a sub-unit of his larger section.

[75] The only definite example from outside her speech itself, and perhaps less crucial to the sectioning effect. It has been pointed out, however, that the ‘prologue’ shares aspects of Cassandra’s language (see e.g. Hornblower 2015: 120; he cites Wilamowitz), and opening constructions are no less a part of her language than obscure vocabulary.

function) and consistent refusal to provide a key name to accompany it looks to be quite a pointed gesture. Naming and not naming are important to the poet, of course, and it is noteworthy that one of the very few sections to open with a frontloaded name has naming as a central issue (Σήταια τλῆμον, σοὶ δὲ πρὸς πέτραις μόρος/μίμνει δυσαίων (1075-6; 'And, wretched Setaia, an ill-lifed fate awaits you on the rocks'): see below, p. 60). An interesting use of the article + δέ opening comes in 1008, where οἱ δ' αὖ may have a misdirecting force, encouraging us (now that we have grown accustomed to the general pattern) to think that we are moving to a new section concerning an entirely unrelated group of people before we find ourselves to be reading one last sub-section of the 'settlers of Bruttium' unit.

A similar opening is a form of ἄλλος followed by δέ. In all but one case this formula certainly begins a section (including two 'transitional' sections):[76] 569 (the daughters of Anios), 666 ('transition'), 877 (shipwrecks near Libya), 909 ('transition'), 951 (city-foundations on Sicily), 993 (settlers of Bruttium), 1027 (settlers of Malta).[77] The use of this marker in 951, 993 and 1027 is especially effective: here, three sections in close proximity concerning city-foundation begin with ἄλλοι δέ /δ', and the section concerning city-foundation at Tarentum at 978 begins with the similar πολλοὶ δέ. There is a degree of variation in the deployment of this opening: in both of the 'transition' sections the word does not mark out another member of a list, but looks ahead within its line: ἄλλος δ' ἐπ' ἄλλῳ μόχθος ἄθλιος μενεῖ (666; 'one wretched hardship after another awaits'); ἄλλην δ' ἐπ' ἄλλῃ

---

[76] For transitions see Hornblower 2015: 280, 343, 452.

[77] The final example (1160) seems to separate out different generations of 'Locrian Maidens' (see Hornblower 2015: 417 on the meaning of ταῖς θανουμέναις ἴσαι), but it does not certainly divide the larger unit into sub-sections.

κῆρα κινήσει θεός (909; 'one doom after another shall a god set in motion'). Beginning several sections with ἄλλος has a sort of cumulative effect, as prophecies concerning a variety of different groups are piled up. Here, the impression of accumulation is instead stressed within the 'transition' sections themselves.

Numbers, too, are found quite frequently at the beginnings of sections. In the run of sections concerning Greeks who will travel to Cyprus (446-591), for example, the five main subjects are introduced with ὁ μέν (450), ὁ δεύτερος δέ (479), τρίτος δέ (494) and, in the third line of their section, πέμπτοι τέταρτοι (588). This final entry in the series constitutes a deviation in several respects: after an extremely long and digressive third section, the numbers are brought together, delayed, and given in reverse order, while the men in question are actually named in their first line.[78] An additional playful touch comes in the fact that Cepheus and Praxandrus are apparently named precisely because they are not named in Homer's Catalogue of Ships,[79] a fact to which 587's "paradox" ἀνώνυμοι σποραί seems to refer (Hornblower, 2015: 253).[80] The combination of various methods of undermining the pattern draws attention to Lycophron's deviation from it and gives a real sense that the poet enjoys the possibilities for play which section markers provide. More numbers are found among the openings deployed in the group of sections devoted to the 'Asia against Europe' theme (1283-1450): ὄλοιντο ναῦται πρῶτα (1291), καὶ δευτέρους (1309), πάλιν δ' (1322), αὖθις δὲ (1351), λοίσθος δ' (1361), ἡ δ' αὖθις (1366),

[78] Cf. Sens, 2010: 301-2 on "'Herodotean' digressiveness" in the poem: the section concerning those who will travel to Cyprus is his example. See more generally on Herodotean elements of the *Alexandra* West 2009.

[79] Sens 2009: 27 and Sistakou 2009a: 248-9 both make this point, citing the scholion on 586. See **below** on the similarity of Lycophron's opening markers to those used in the Catalogue of Ships.

[80] Sens 2009: 27 suggests that this adds to the "humorous irony".

πρῶτος μέν (1369), ὁ δεύτερος δέ (1374), τρίτος δ' (1378), οἱ δ' αὖ τέταρτοι (1388).[81] Lycophron achieves variety by his use of cardinal as well as ordinal numbers: sections begin with cardinals at 147, 365, 424 (with its own run of ordinals) and 439. These last examples come in the sections preceding the run concerning the five Greeks who will travel to Cyprus, which itself begins with οἱ πέντε (447): section marking in this area of the text is dominated by numbers.

The Lycophronic section markers discussed so far have quite a strong archaising force, which has often been detected in the poem. Most striking, perhaps, is the similarity to the Homeric Catalogue of Ships, as discussed by Sens 2009: 25-6:[82]

"A word referring to a Greek or group of Greeks (frequently an article used as a pronoun, but sometimes a number or a form of ἄλλος) is followed by a catalogue (often quite extended) of toponyms. […] This structure closely resembles, at least in form if not in syntax, the most common method of transition in the Homeric Catalogue of Ships, namely that a relative pronoun referring to a group of Greeks is followed by a series, sometimes extended, of local toponyms […]. Lycophron's account of the *nostoi* of the Greeks may be viewed as a clever and typically Hellenistic reversal of the Homeric Catalogue: Lycophron evokes (and slightly varies) the structure and language of the transitions between geographical areas in the Catalogue, but instead of focusing on the origin of the individuals involved, his anti-Greek Cassandra describes where they meet their fate."

Appreciation of Lycophron's debt to archaic catalogue poetry is found even in Eustathius, whose commentaries on two other Homeric catalogues (Zeus' lovers at *Il*. 14.313-28, and the dead women of *Od*. 11.225-330) note their influence on his style.[83] The *Alexandra* has also been compared to the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*:

[81] See Part 2b, pp. 205-7, for the evocation here of the opening of Herodotus' *Histories*.
[82] I have anglicised the spelling of 'catalogue' throughout.
[83] The passages of Eustathius are helpfully quoted and briefly discussed by Berra 2009: 274-6, who is right to point out Lycophron's "inversion" of normal archaic catalogue practice in his general omission of names (276).

Hornblower 2015: 10-11 briefly mentions the influence of the archaic poem with a mention of section markers as a shared feature (famously, the *Catalogue* makes frequent use of ἠ' οἵη).[84]

Runs of sections with numbers used as opening markers are also evocative of archaic catalogues. Each of the 'Ages of Man' (*WD* 106-201), for example, contain an ordinal number no later than in their second line, and only the fourth Age (which is in another sense an outlier)[85] has its number later than the first line.[86] The use of the article followed by δέ may also point us to other texts beyond the Catalogue of Ships (where the predominant marker is the relative οἵ).[87] An extended use of this section marker comes in Semonides 7, where, from the seventh line onwards, all of the types of women are introduced by τὴν δέ (7, 12, 21, 27, 43, 50, 57, 71, 83; note too τὰ δ' at the start of 94).[88] Among the many archaic poems with which the *Alexandra*

[84] It might be added that the feeling of continuation created by the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* (on which see Osborne 2005: 12-13, assessing the effect of similar descriptions of mothers and daughters: "in the structure of the poem, today's daughters are tomorrow's wives") is recalled slightly in the effect of the 'transition' sections discussed above. See Part 2b, pp. 205-6, for a discussion of the catalogue of Helen's husbands in light of the catalogue of her suitors in Hesiod.
[85] Uniquely, it is a "juster and better" race than that which precedes it (158).
[86] The 'Days', albeit for obvious reasons, are also heavily reliant on numbers in sectioning (e.g. 770, πρῶτον ἕνη τετράς τε καὶ ἑβδόμη ἱερὸν ἦμαρ; 'first of all, the first, fourth and seventh days are holy'), and the same can be said of Solon 27 (on the stages in a man's life), where all of the periods from the third onward are identified by an ordinal number, usually following the article, at the start of their couplet, with the exception of the seventh and eighth, which share a couplet, and which use cardinal numbers (both of which come at the start of a line, even though ὀκτώ τ' (14) ends a clause). Another relevant passage is *Theogony* 886-907 (one of several in the poem where numbers play a part in sectioning), where the start of the list of Zeus' wives is marked with πρώτην, and the list's second item begins with δεύτερον (901). Additionally, the first section contains its own subsidiary πρώτην at the start of a line and clause to mark out Athena as Metis' first child. Interestingly, the third item in the list of Zeus' wives begins with the cardinal number τρεῖς (907). In addition to these examples, see Cingano 2005: 122 n. 20 on πρῶτον etc. in mini-catalogues in archaic hexameters.
[87] A small-scale pattern of this kind appears in the *Theogony*, where two consecutive items in the list of monsters' births begin thus (or three, if 304-5 are genuine; see West 1966: 250): 295 (ἣ δ') and 306 (τῇ δὲ) are the more secure cases.
[88] 32 might be thought a false beginning; cf. *Alexandra* 1008, discussed above, p. 52.

has affinities, Semonides 7 is especially interesting.[89] In addition to the shared approach to section marking, Lycophron's general tendency not to name his subjects and often to replace names with animals might be compared to Semonides' practice of attributing a (normally) animal origin to his types of women:[90] we are presented with women from a pig (2), a fox (7), a dog (12), a donkey (43), a weasel (50), a horse (57), a monkey (71) and a bee (83).[91]

The range of archaic verse evoked by the section marking of the *Alexandra* is impressive, and helps to shape our experience of a poem with a central paradox: Lycophron is writing after his forebears in the form of a prophecy apparently made before them, and in a style which he seems to have extrapolated from the earliest poetry he has available to him.[92]

---

[89] In addition to those discussed here, other potentially relevant archaic influences for Lycophron are the Epic Cycle and the *Melampodia* (discussed by Hornblower 2015: 8-10, 212).
[90] Schade 1999: 26 (with n. 93) very briefly (and in general terms) raises the comparandum of Iambus and Comedy for Lycophron's use of animals standing in for people. For a list of pertinent animal metaphors see Sistakou 2009a: 242, and see Ciani 1973: 134-6 (with n. 12) for the chosen animals as traditional or suggested by situations and morals.
[91] Note Wilamowitz's 1907: 136 remark that "die *Alexandra* ist keine tragödie, sondern ein iambos" (lack of capitalisation his). His main point concerns metre and ionicisms; cf. his n. 24, where he argues against emending away *Alexandra* 1056 and 1250 on the basis of mute and liquid making position even in cases involving a word break (very common in archaic iambus: Sem. 7. 21, 61, 64 etc.). The general preference for such features in Hellenistic Tragedy prevents our placing too much weight on them as 'archaising'.
[92] According to the *Suda* entry on Semonides, some held him to have been the first writer of iambics.

1.3.3 Other section openers: Cassandra's voice, short bursts and later sub-sections

It is quite common to find the embedded speaker's voice felt prominently at the start of sections. Often this comes in the form of apostrophe: a conspicuous example of two successive sections starting in this way comes at 1174 (ὦ μῆτερ, ὦ δύσμητερ; 'O mother, o poor mother') and 1189 (σὺ δ', ὦ ξύναιμε; 'And you, brother'), where Hecabe and Hector are the subjects.[93] Interjections are especially noticeable: αἰαῖ, for example, serves this function at 31 (the opening of the whole speech)[94] and 307, with οἴμοι very soon after this second example, at 314. We also find questions starting at the section openings in 1283 and 1451,[95] and the first person verb στένω begins what might be considered successive sub-sections at 69 (twice) and 72:[96] note too λεύσσω at 52 and 86, with a later occurrence at 216.

Some of these openings are examples of a broader tendency of the poet to use similar markers at the beginnings of a few successive or nearby sections so as to gesture towards a greater uniformity than actually exists within the poem. An especially noteworthy case is καὶ δή at the start of sections at 229, 232, 243, 249, with one earlier occurrence at 90. Holzinger 1895: 207 suggests that this repetitive section marker is an expressive tool, mirroring the continual Greek advance, and we might compare the extremely frequent ἐντεῦθεν ἐξελαύνει σταθμούς (with the additions of

[93] See also τάλαινα (31, 258, 315), τλήμων/ τλῆμον (52, 348, 968, 1075, 1451) and compounds starting with δυσ- (314, 1174).
[94] See Hornblower 2015: 127 for the idea that this hints at Cassandra's future attacker, the lesser Ajax.
[95] And note ταλαίνη in 1283.
[96] Perhaps 69-71 is an introductory sub-section; 72 certainly signals a move from general to specific. See also στενάζω (307). καὶ δή στένει (243) may remind us of the uses in 69 and 72.

the appropriate number on each occasion) in Xenophon's *Anabasis*, which has been read as expressive of Cyrus' "regular progress".[97]

Lycophron also pays a fair amount of attention to marking out sub-units within larger structures, and this can also be seen in the juxtaposed groups of sections concerning Odysseus (648-819) and Menelaos (820-76), where the use of openings such as ἥξει δ'(/δὲ) (681, 852, 856, 866) and ὄψεται (including compounds: 659, 662, 673, 825, 828,[98] 834 and 847) within both larger units gestures towards a far more uniform structure.[99] It is worth noting, too, that some openings, such as χὠ, seem to be reserved for opening later sub-sections (cf. Nicander's τῷ, pp. 33-4): this particular example comes at 180 (the final sub-section of the 'Paris and Helen' unit), 200 (the start of a recapitulation before a new section)[100] and 812 (the sub-section of Odysseus' broader unit concerning his 'second journey' to Hades).[101]

---

[97] Rood 2010: 55-6; his paper more broadly demonstrates the effects achieved by Xenophon's variation of his descriptions of various phases of the march, and this prose forebear must therefore be taken into account in our consideration of the poets' play with section markers and its effect.
[98] Here the sub-section starts at the caesura rather than at the beginning of the line, reasonably uncommon in Lycophron.
[99] See Hornblower, 2015: 273, 284 on these and other similarities between the two sections.
[100] See p. 63 n. 108 on l. 199. See also below, pp. 141-2, on the expressive effect of these sequences.
[101] Note too that αὐτανεψίας in the previous line seems to form a marked ending to a sub-section by echoing 798, where another sub-section can be considered to end: see p. 64 n. 109 on that line. Incidentally, 811 is only made up to four words by an elided τε (cf. above, p. 41 n. 57).

1.4 Lycophron: Endings

1.4.1 Ending sections with αὐδηθήσεται etc.

Where finite future passive verbs with meanings similar to αὐδηθήσομαι appear, they are almost always contained within the final sense unit of their section or sub-section. αὐδηθήσεται/ αὐδηθήσομαι itself is used thus in 306 (final line), 630 (antepenultimate line) and 1140 (final line); it appears only once elsewhere in the poem. κληθήσεται occupies the penultimate lines of sections in 797and 1124;[102] it, too, appears only once elsewhere. φημισθήσεται comes in the final line of a section in 1082, while ὑμνηθήσεται comes in the penultimate line of Kassandra's prophecy proper in 1449; neither of these words appear elsewhere in the poem. Metrical constraints make the final position in the line the most suitable for all of these words except κληθήσεται (which occupies the final position of both of its lines anyway), and their use in the final lines of sections or subsections (306, 1082 and 1140) is thus especially marked. It is tempting to connect the use of these verbs at the end of sections with the strong Hellenistic interest in aetiology, and 630, 1082, 1124 and 1140 certainly demonstrate this interest.[103] We have seen that Nicander in particular makes great use of names in sectioning (pp. 23-8), and here, by deploying verbs with meanings related to naming and so on, as in his use of the article in section

[102]797 may be considered the ending of a sub-section of the more general 'Odysseus' section. This sub-section ends with his death, while the next, from 799-811, concerns his role as a posthumous prophet at Trampya. 812 then starts a sub-section concerning his second descent to Hades.

[103] See also 1212-13, 1350, 1458-60 for similar ideas of divine honours or celebration. On Lycophron's enjoyment of names generally, see Hornblower, 2015: 158 (several of these lines are discussed). Also relevant here is the suggestion of Sens 2009: 20 that "Lycophron's *Alexandra* may be read as an extended *aetion* for the presence of Greeks and their culture outside the limits of the Hellenic world as it was imagined to exist at the time of the Trojan War […]".

openings, Lycophron can be seen to be playing on the importance of naming in Hellenistic literature (we shall see below, pp. 76-7, that Pseudo-Scymnus, too, uses naming as a tool for section marking): note especially 1081-2, where φημισθήσεται comes in close proximity to φερώνυμος ('name-bearing'), in a section whose first word is that rarest of things in Lycophron: a name (see above, pp. 51-2). Especially similar to each other are 630, of Diomedes (θεὸς δὲ πολλοῖς αἰπὺς αὐδηθήσεται, 'And he shall be called a high god by many'), and 1139-1140, of Cassandra herself (κείναις ἐγὼ δηναιὸν ἄφθιτος θεὰ/ῥαβδηφόροις γυναιξὶν αὐδηθήσομαι, 'And among those rod-bearing women I shall be called an undying god for many ages'). Also comparable to each other are 1124-5, of Agamemnon (Ζεὺς Σπαρτιάταις αἱμύλοις κληθήσεται/ τιμὰς μεγίστας Οἰβάλου τέκνοις λαχών, 'he shall be called Zeus by the wily Spartans, receiving the greatest honours from the children of Oibalos'), and 1449-50, of Cassandra's future kinsman (πρέσβιστος ἐν φίλοισιν ὑμνηθήσεται/ σκύλων ἀπαρχὰς τὰς δορικτήτους λαβών, 'he shall be celebrated as the most august amongst his friends, taking the first spear-won offerings from the spoils'). The proximity of 1124 and 1140 marks out very clearly these successive sections concerning cults for Agamemnon and Cassandra.

1.4.2 Repeated themes

The previous category of section endings also falls into a broader grouping of repeated themes at the close of sections. We have already seen the tendency to end on a "demeaning" note in sections concerning the Greeks (p. 50 n. 72), and another conspicuous section ending is death and related topics, such as graves (this is a 'natural' ending: see introduction, p. 8 n. 4): 51 (τὸν Ἅιδην δεξιούμενον πάλαι; 'the one who had greeted Hades in the past'), 68 (ψυχὴν περισπαίροντι φυσήσει νεκρῷ; 'she will breathe out her life on his still-palpitating body'), 416 (δεξιώσονται τάφους; 'they will greet their tombs'), 446 (φόνῳ λουσθέντας ἀλλήλων τάφους; 'each other's tombs washed with gore'), 992 (κελαινῷ βωμὸν αἱμάξῃ βρότῳ; 'he will stain the altar with his dark blood'), 1097-8 (ὃν νεοσκαφὲς/ κρύψει ποτ᾽ ἐν κλήροισι Μηθύμνης στέγος; 'whom a freshly-dug grave will hide one day in the land of Methymna') and so on. Occasionally we can see this section ending treated playfully: in 313 Troilus is said to be fated to 'bloody' the τύμβον of his father, which seems on the face of it to keep up the pattern, but the word actually seems to be used to mean 'altar' (Hornblower 2015: 188). By placing this strange usage in a position where we may expect to be reading about tombs, Lycophron adds to our challenge in understanding the text. Another ending focused on death demonstrates a different sort of play: 1188, where Hecabe is told, of Odysseus' commencement of her stoning, Ἅιδῃ κελαινῶν θυμάτων ἀπάρξεται ('he will begin the black sacrifices to Hades'), the pattern is kept up, but at the same time we have a section ending with a 'beginning', a game which we shall also see Pseudo-Scymnus to be playing (see pp. 72-3).

Another persistent ending-theme is marriage, and related topics such as sex and beds: 84-5 (αἵ τ᾽ ἐπ᾽ ἀρσένων/ φέρβοντο φῶκαι λέκτρα θουρῶσαι βροτῶν; 'and seals, which leap into the beds of men'), 114 (κεναῖς ἀφάσσων ὠλέναισι δέμνια, preceding a digression concerning Proteus; 'reaching out to your bed with empty arms'), 142-3 (εἴδωλον ἠγκαλισμένος/ τῆς πενταλέκτρου θυιάδος Πλευρωνίας; 'embracing the image of the five-husbanded Pleuronian maenad'), 146 (νυμφεῖα πεντάγαμβρα δαίσασθαι γάμων, ending the introduction to Helen's 'five husbands'; '[that they will] be given a five-husbanded wedding feast at their marriage'), 201 (ἱμείρων λέχους; 'yearning for his marital bed'), 372 (θρήνοισι τοῖς ὁμευνίδων; 'with the lamentations of their wives'), 423 (ὅτ᾽ εἰς νόθον τρήρωνος ηὐνάσθη λέχος; 'when he spent the night in dove's bastard bed'), 1089 (ἐμῶν ἕκατι δυσγάμων ῥυσταγμάτων; 'in return for my ill-married maltreatment') and so on.[104] Death and marriage are both key themes in a poem dedicated to negative prophecies and largely spoken by a woman who has suffered what she characterises as a perverted sort of marriage in the form of her rape by the lesser Ajax (see 360 and 1089) and who has rejected the romantic advances of Apollo with such terrible consequences.[105] As in the *Alexipharmaca*, where we saw the usefulness of the poet's advice reinforced by the frequent placement of references to curing or otherwise overcoming ill health at the end of sections (see p. 42), the use of these themes at the end of a large number of sections in the *Alexandra* helps to shape our view of the

---

[104] Perhaps 412 (ἐστεναγμένος γάμος) is a playful false ending before the transitional section actually ends at 416, with tombs. On false endings generally (Lycophron may offer us another below) see Fowler 2000: 259-63.

[105] Admittedly, endings such as 84-5 cannot easily be linked with Cassandra's own experience. There seems to be a strain of of unpleasant or tabboo subject matter in the poem: 84-5 is a good example.

tone and focus of the poem: we can see, then, that sectioning provides the possibility for repeated moments of emphasis (in openings and endings), which, when devoted to similar topics on multiple occasions, allow the poets to direct our responses to their work.

1.4.3 Three-word trimeters

Three-word lines are by no means confined to section ends, but just over a quarter either end sections (or sub-sections), or closely precede a section ending marked with another three-word line.[106] The lines in question (quoted with a little preceding context), and their sections, are as follows:

89	[…] ἣν τόργος ὑγρόφοιτος ἐκλοχεύεται, κελυφάνου στρόβιλον ὠστρακωμένην. '[…] to which the moisture-traversing vulture gave birth, encased circularly by a shell'. End of the introductory sub-section of the larger 'Helen and Paris' unit (86-182).
199	[…] ὃν μέλαινα ποιφύξει φθιτῶν σάρκας λεβητίζουσα δαιταλουργίᾳ.[107] '[…] on which the black woman will blow, cauldroning the flesh of dead men by means of her skill in cookery'. Precedes a recapitulation which ends the 'Iphigeneia and Achilles' section.[108]
614	τύμβος δ' αὐτὸν ἐκσώσει μόρου Ὁπλοσμίας, σφαγαῖσιν ηὐτρεπισμένον.

[106] See Hornblower 2015: 137 for a brief discussion and a list of all of the poem's three-word lines. 1082, which is omitted from this list (even though the note on the line refers us back to the list), takes the total up to 55. See Marcovich 1984: 173-4 for three-word trimeters as rhetorical closing devices in tragedy.

[107] There seems to me no need to emend δαιταλουργίᾳ, the reading of the MSS (and printed by Holzinger 1895: 198), to δαιταλουργία, as Wilamowitz 1883: 256 and Hornblower 2015: 199 have done (the latter based on the apparent 'bareness' of μέλαινα).

[108] At least, on the reading of Holzinger, who says that πατήσει 'points to' the Racecourse of Achilles (1895: 198). Alternatively, on the view of Mari 2009: 435, 199 can be thought to end the "*excursus sul destino di Ifigenia*".

	‘And the altar of Hoplosmia will save him from his fate when he has been readied for slaughter’. 615 begins another sub-unit of the Diomedes section, with the story of the Trojan-Wall ballast as its starting-point. This sub-unit starts at 610, and concerns the cause of his post-war troubles.
798	κέλωρ δὲ πατρὸς ἄρταμος κληθήσεται, Ἀχιλλέως δάμαρτος αὐτανέψιος. ‘And the son will be called his father’s butcher, the cousin of Achilles’ wife’. End of the sub-section of the larger ‘Odysseus’ unit concerning his death. 799 moves on to his posthumous prophetic shrine and the death of Herakles.[109] Cf. above, pp. 59-60, for κληθήσεται.
845, 846	[…] ὃς ζῳοπλαστῶν ἄνδρας ἐξ ἄκρου ποδός ἀγαλματώσας ἀμφελυτρώσει πέτρῳ, λαμπτηροκλέπτης τριπλανοῦς ποδηγίας. […] ‘the one who, moulding men from the ends of the feet up and bestatuing them, wrapped them in stone, the lamp-stealer of the triply-wandering foot-guide’. End of the digression concerning Perseus within the larger Menelaus section.
908	[…] ἀκτέριστον ἐν πέτραις αἰῶνα κωκύσουσιν ἠλοκισμένοι. ‘[…] having furrows cut into them on the rocks, they will bewail their unburied eternity’. End of the section concerning shipwrecks near Libya.
950	τὰ δ’ ἐργαλεῖα, τοῖσι τετρήνας βρέτας τεύξει ποτ’ ἐγχώροισι μερμέραν βλάβην, καθιερώσει Μυνδίας ἀνακτόροις. ‘And he will dedicate the tools with which, boring holes, he will one day build the image which will be a baneful source of harm to my countrymen in the temple of the Myndian’. End of the ‘Epeios’ section.
1082	σπιλὰς δ’ ἐκείνη σῆς φερώνυμος τύχης πόντον προσαυγάζουσα φημισθήσεται. ‘And that name-bearing crag, gazing at the sea, will be described by your fate’. End of the ‘Setaia’ section. Cf. above, pp. 59-60, for φημισθήσεται.
1138, 1140	[…] Ἐρινύων ἐσθῆτα καὶ ῥέθους βαφὰς πεπαμέναι θρόνοισι φαρμακτηρίοις. κείναις ἐγὼ δηναιὸν ἄφθιτος θεὰ ῥαβδηφόροις γυναιξὶν αὐδηθήσομαι.

[109] That is, the son of Alexander (Hornblower 2015: 314). This sub-section end is perhaps controversial: Gigante Lanzara 1997: 53 is not interested in structure *per se* in his article on Lycophron’s ‘Odyssey’, but it is interesting that he considers the sub-section which he entitles “*Verso Itaca: la morte di Odisseo*” to end at 796. Schade 1999: 192-9, on the other hand, includes 797-8 in the sub-section called “*Odysseus’ Tod*”.

	'[…] taking on the clothing of the Erinyes and faces died with medicinal herbs. I shall be called an undying goddess forever by the rod-bearing women'. Antepenultimate and final lines of the 'Cassandra's cult' section. Cf. above, pp. 59-60, for αὐδηθήσομαι.
1311	καὶ δευτέρους ἔπεμψαν Ἄτρακας λύκους ταγῷ μονοκρήπιδι κλέψοντας νάκην δρακοντοφρούροις ἐσκεπασμένην σκοπαῖς. 'And they sent the second wolves, Atracians, with a singly-sandalled chief, to steel the fleece watched over by the dragon-guarded lookout point'. End of the introductory sub-section of the larger 'Jason and the Argonauts' unit.
1350	τὸν ἡ παλίμφρων Γοργὰς ἐν κλήροις θεῶν καθιερώσει, πημάτων ἀρχηγέτις. 'Changing her mind, Gorgas, the first cause of his calamities, consecrated him into the lot of the gods'. End of the section concerning Herakles' sack of Troy.
1434	[…] ὡς λυκοψίαν κόρη κνεφαίαν, ἄγχι παμφαλώμενος, χαλκηλάτῳ κνώδοντι δειματουμένη. '[…] gazing from nearby at the oak-built palisade like a girl afraid of a bronze-forged sword edge in the dusky twilight'. End of the 'Xerxes' section.

To these might be added 858, which precedes a digression concerning a festival of Achilles. If Lycophron has expected his readers to notice this pattern, then 1117 may form a sort of false ending before two further lines relating to Kassandra's death.[110] 950 and 1350 both begin with the verb καθιερόω (albeit with different meanings). These and the end of Cassandra's cult section end emphatically with a combination of three-word lines and religious activity, which might be related to the use of αὐδηθήσεται and similar verbs as section enders (797 and 1082 also combine a three-word line and an interest in naming). Three-word trimeters are impressive features, of course, and we might think back to Aratus' tendency to end his sections with σπονδειάζοντες, alliteration, rhyme and so on (pp. 39-41). These endings are even more striking when combined with impressive vocabulary (even relative to Lycophron's usual lexicon). Such a case comes at 846

[110] Alternatively, her death may be being separated from her journey to the afterlife in the same way as Odysseus' (although in Odysseus' case there is, of course, a description of his prophetic shrine and later events in its vicinity separating death and the afterlife further).

(λαμπτηροκλέπτης τριπλανοῦς ποδηγίας, 'the lamp-stealer of the triply-wandering foot-guide') a "miracle of condensation, [...] consisting of three neologistic words" (Hornblower 2015: 326), and the effect is increased by the eye-catching verb ἀγαλματόω ('bestatue'),[111] used in the active voice, in the previous line. This ending thus stands out even in a section which is "infiorata di neologismi" (Gigante Lanzara, 2009: 113).[112]

1.4.4 Lycophron: conclusion

Lycophron's sectioning has a significant impact on our experience of the poem, especially in the creation an 'archaic' feeling (this demonstrates that building up patterns as well as deviating from them can achieve important aesthetic effects). The fact that the *Alexandra* was compared to archaic catalogue poetry even in antiquity despite the metrical differences (see above, p. 54) should encourage us to think that section markers (which are crucial to Lycophron's archaising effect) were important to ancient readers.

Naturally, there are differences from the section markers employed by the didactic poets, but the overlaps are instructive, especially between Lycophron and Nicander, who may both have lived in the second century.[113] Most strikingly, they both seem to expect an interest in names on the part of their readers, and exploit this interest through their section marking (even if in different ways). We shall see in the next chapter that this is also true of the second-century poet Pseudo-Scymnus, in whose work there are a number of other connections to Lycophron. If we can

[111] See Guilleux 2009: 226.
[112] Note also 199, which, as Hurst and Kolde 2008: 130 point out, contains two *hapax legomena*.
[113] Neither dating is certain: see Overduin 2014b: 10-11 and Hornblower 2015: 36-9, 114 for recent discussions with further bibliography.

infer that naming really was an important literary concern for the contemporaries of these poets, its prominence (or conspicuous absence) at the beginnings and endings of sections indicates that the sections themselves are to be viewed as important structural units.

1.5 Pseudo-Scymnus[114]

1.5.1 Pseudo-Scymnus: introductory remarks

The *Periodos* of Pseudo-Scymnus is a geographical and historical poem in comic trimeters probably written in the third or fourth quarter of the 2nd Century BC.[115] In the prologue, as he describes the nature of his work and encourages individuals at least to find the section which concerns their native land, the poet gives us an indication that his sections are important entities in their own right:

> ἁπλῶς θ' ἁπάντων χωρίων διέξοδον
> καὶ τὴν ὅλην περίοδον ἐν ὀλίγοις στίχοις,
> ἧς ὁ κατακούσας οὐ μόνον τερφθήσεται,
> ἅμα δ' ὠφελίαν ἀποίσετ' εὔχρηστον μαθών,
> εἰ μηθὲν ἕτερον, φασί, ποῦ ποτ' ἔστι γῆς,
> κἀν τίσι τόποις τὴν πατρίδα κειμένην ἔχει,
> τίνων τε πρότερον γενομένην οἰκητόρων
> πόλεσί τε ποίαις συγγένειαν ἀναφέρει·
> (90-7)
>
> Put simply, a description of all lands and an entire circumference of the world in a few verses, from which the listener will not only derive enjoyment but at the same time take away a useful benefit, learning, if nothing else, as they say, where in the world he is and in what location his fatherland lies, to which inhabitants it belonged in former times, and to what sorts of city it traces its ethnic links.

The implication seems to be that any given section concerning a specific polis or area could be read in isolation. At any rate, Pseudo-Scymnus gives the impression that he will be giving us a poem with easily discernible sections; this promise is certainly fulfilled.

---

[114] Seven hundred and forty seven lines of the poem survive more or less intact, taking the *periodos* from the Straits of Gibraltar to the south west of the Black Sea. A number of fragments survive from the rest of the poem, but my account focuses on 1-747, where sectioning is easiest to observe.
[115] For a detailed discussion of the date of the poem see Marcotte 2002: 7-16.

The subject matter of the poem may strike us as especially suited to prose, and the Pseudo-Scymnus encourages us to think in these terms in his prologue with a list of sources on which he will rely in the composition of the work:

> ἤδη δ᾽ ἐπ᾽ ἀρχὴν εἶμι τῆς συντάξεως
> τοὺς συγγραφεῖς ἐκθέμενος, οἷς δὴ χρώμενος
> τὸν ἱστορικὸν εἰς πίστιν ἀναπέμπω λόγον·
> τῷ τὴν γεωγραφίαν γὰρ ἐπιμελέστατα
> γεγραφότι, τοῖς τε κλίμασι καὶ τοῖς σχήμασιν,
> Ἐρατοσθένει μάλιστα συμπεπεισμένος,
> Ἐφόρῳ τε καὶ τῷ τὰς κτίσεις εἰρηκότι
> ἐν πέντε βίβλοις Χαλκιδεῖ Διονυσίῳ,
> Δημητρίῳ τε Καλλατιανῷ συγγραφεῖ
> καὶ τῷ Σικελῷ Κλέωνι καὶ Τιμοσθένει,
> τὴν τῆς [ ]θέσιν.
> καὶ τὸν πολίτην[
> [2vv. des.]
>]τόπους[
>]ἀκολουθῶν δὲ καὶ Καλλισθένη
>]δὲ καί
> Τίμαιον, ἄνδρα Σικελὸν ἐκ Ταυρομενίου,
> ἐκ τῶν ὑφ᾽ Ἡροδότου τε συντεταγμένων·
> (109-27)
>
> And now I shall come to the beginning of my collection, setting out the prose authors[116] by use of whom I bring my historical account into a state of trustworthiness, relying greatly on Eratosthenes, who wrote his geography most carefully, for latitudes and diagrams, and on Ephorus and on Dionysius of Chalcis, who told of cities in five books, and on Demetrius, the writer from Callatis, and on Sicilian Cleon and on Timosthenes […] the position of […] places […] and following Callisthenes […] and Timaeus, a Sicilian from Tauromenium, and from what is collected by Herodotus.

It has been observed by Effe 1977: 186 and Hunter 2008b: 513-14 that listing sources in this way at all (over and above the fact that all of the names belong to prose authors) may align the poem more closely with prose treatises than with didactic verse. The best examples of lists of previous authors on the relevant subject come

[116] For this specific meaning of συγγραφεύς see Marcotte 2002: 155. LSJ give Plato *Phaedrus* 235c and 278e and Isocrates, *Antidosis* 35 as examples of this usage.

later,[117] but the lack of earlier examples is probably down to the relative paucity of prose texts surviving from the third and second centuries BC.[118] The use of comic trimeters also encourages us to keep prose in mind: Aristotle's suggestion that μάλιστα λεκτικὸν τῶν μέτρων τὸ ἰαμβεῖόν ἐστιν (*Poetics* 1449a 25, 'the iambic is the most speech-like of metres'; cf. perhaps Ps.-Sc. 34, τῆς σαφηνίας χάριν) is especially true of the relaxed trimeters of Pseudo-Scymnus.[119]

We shall see that the evocation of prose is extended to a number of the section markers deployed in the poem, and the poet's tendency to break up his material into a large number of sections might also be thought to point to the structure of prose geographies.[120] Nonetheless, Pseudo-Scymnus should not be viewed as

---

[117] Varro *De Re Rustica* 1. 1. 8-10 (1st C. BC) lists fifty-one authors, all Greek except for Mago, and Columella *De Re Rustica* 1. 1. 7-14 (1st C. AD) lists fifty-four authors, Greek, Roman and Mago. Strabo *Geography* 1. 1 also discusses authors to have tackled similar subject matter in the past, although the majority of this discussion is concerned with Homer and only a few others are named.

[118] Note that already Apollonius of Perga (third/second centuries BC) discusses the work of Euclid in the preface to his *Conica*, and that of two predecessors, Conon and Nicoteles, at the start of the fourth book, even if his concern is to show his own superiority rather than his reliance on pre-existing texts.

[119] An example of a markedly comic feature of his verse is the second-foot anapaest, which appears in nineteen of the first two hundred lines, only thrice in combination with a name (21, 55, 57, 65, 86, 100, 107, 118 (name), 120 (a fragmentary line), 136 (name), 154, 156, 157, 162, 173, 176, 177, 180 (name), 200); I have not included line 3 (τὸ καὶ βραχέως…), where we are presumably to understand synizesis.

[120] The lists of occurences of each section marker below will often contain entires separated by only a line or two. In passages such as 703-17 the effect is especially strong (I mark out the divisions in the text and translation, and underline marked openings which are discussed over the course of this chapter):

προσεχὴς δὲ Λυσιμάχεια· ταύτην δ᾿ ἔκτισεν
ἐπώνυμον Λυσίμαχος ἀφ᾿ ἑαυτοῦ πόλιν.
| Λίμναι δ᾿ ἐφεξῆς εἰσὶν αἱ Μιλησίων·
| εἶτ᾿ Αἰολέων Ἀλωπεκόννησος πόλις·
| ἑξῆς Ἐλαιοῦς, Ἀττικὴν ἀποικίαν
ἔχουσα, Φόρβας ἣν συνοικίσαι δοκεῖ.
| ἔπειτα Σηστὸς καὶ Μάδυτος, αἱ κείμεναι
ἐπὶ τοῦ στενωποῦ Λεσβίων δ᾿ οὖσαι κτίσεις.
| εἶτ᾿ ἔστι Κριθώτη πόλις τε Πακτύη·
λέγουσι καὶ ταύτας δὲ Μιλτιάδην κτίσαι.
| μετὰ τὴν δὲ Χερρόνησον ἐν Προποντίδι
Θρᾴκη παρήκει, καὶ Σαμίων ἀποικία
Πέρινθός ἐστιν· | ἐχομένως Σηλυμβρία,
ἣν οἱ Μεγαρεῖς κτίζουσι πρὶν Βυζαντίου·
| ἑξῆς Μεγαρέων εὐτυχῶν Βυζάντιον.

simply versifying an imagined prose treatise: his section marking also displays shared interests with our other poets (above and beyond the interest in prose sectioning evident in Nicander).[121] We shall see a number of overlaps in particular with Lycophron, a poet with whom Pseudo-Scymnus otherwise shares several interesting connections, and who perhaps wrote earlier in the same century (see Hornblower 2015: 36-9).[122]

> <u>And next</u> is Lysimacheia: Lysimachus founded this city named after him. **|** <u>And next</u> is Milesian Limnai. **|** <u>Then</u> is Alopeconnesus, the city of the Aeolians. **|** <u>Then</u> is Elaeus, which has an Attic colony which Phorbas is thought to have peopled. **|**<u>Then</u> there are Sestus and Madytus, which lie on the strait and are foundations of the Lesbians. **|** <u>Then</u> there are the cities of Crithote and Pactye: they say that Miltiades founded these. **|** <u>And after</u> the Chersonese Thrace is next, on the Propontis, and there is Perinthus a colony of the Samians. **|** <u>Next</u> is is Selymbria, which the Megarians founded before Byzantium. **|**<u>Then</u> is prosperous Byzantium of the Megarians.

Another good example comes at 196-203 (quoted below, p. 143), where the impression of 'bittiness' is enhanced by the frequent non-coincidence of line and section beginning. Cf. e.g. Ps.-Scylax 73-80 for a run of sections which are extremely brief and to the point, and note that Apollonius employs a similar strategy in 'voyagaing mini-sections' (see below, e.g. p. 96).

[121] Note that even in the 'prosaic' source list we find a play with the distinctions between verse and prose, with two of the poem's only fourteen three-word lines, a markedly 'poetic' feature, appearing here (and another very soon afterwards, at 129, where Pseudo-Scymnus has moved on to emphasising the importance of autopsy for his project). I have followed Marcovich 1984 in including lines with monosyllabic enclitics as a fourth word (cf. above, p. 41 n. 57). It should be borne in mind later as we move on to the consideration of section markers, and especially of Pseudo-Scymnus' relationship to Lycophron that two more of the three-word lines end sections (cf. pp. 63-6.). In both cases the division thus marked is a significant one: 368 precedes the group of sections concerning the Adriatic (and 369 begins this grouping by the use of two different stock openings: see below, pp. 73, 76), while 510 precedes the Peloponnese (which also begins with multiple stock openings: see below, pp. 73, 75).

[122] Even taking into account the lopsided survival of Pseudo-Scymnus' iambics, both poets seem especially interested in the West (for the *Alexandra*'s "preoccupation with the western Mediterranean" generally see Hornblower 2018: 49-50): note for example the shared use of names which allude to the underworld for landmarks in the vicinity of Lake Aornos (Pseudo-Scymnus calls a nearby oracle Κερβέριον (239), while Lycophron calls local mountains πολυδέγμων (700) and Ληθαιῶν (703)); more significantly, perhaps, Lycophron and Pseudo-Scymnus provide the two earliest, or two of the three earliest examples of the Greek pun on the name of Rome (the former with ἔξοχον ῥώμῃ γένος (1233; 'a race outstanding in strength') and the latter with ἔχουσ' ἐφάμιλλον τῇ δυνάμει καὶ τοὔνομα (232; 'possessing a name which rivals its power')); Erskine 1995: 368 thinks that the other potentially early attestation of the pun, *Supp. Hell.* 541 ('Melinno'), might most reasonably be dated to the time of the Roman Republic. Another area of interest may be the two prologues, both addressed to kings of areas in North-West Anatolia (cf. the address of Pergamene royalty in Apollodorus' *Chronica*, presumably not too far removed in time from the *Alexandra*, and on which Pseudo-Scymnus seems to be modelling his prologue). Note the first words πάντων and πάντα. Furthermore, one might contrast the plea for forbearance from Priam in listening to a long speech (*Alex.* 2-3) with the request for understanding from Nicomedes in listening to a short prologue (*Per.* 13-14). Again, mention of Lycophron's obscure tragic trimeters in contrast with

1.5.2 Ideas of beginning and ending

As the prologue finally comes to an end, the body of the poem begins, quite naturally, with references to 'beginning':[123]

> τὰ δὲ πολλὰ συνελὼν ἄρξομαι τῶν πραγμάτων,
> πρῶτον δὲ τάξω τοὺς κατ' Εὐρώπην τόπους.
> (136-7)
> Having gathered together many things, I shall begin the affair: first I shall set out the locations of Europe.

We may detect a hint of playfulness in this declaration of a beginning so many lines into the poem, especially in light of the apparently self-assured promise of a brief prologue at 13-15:

> αἰτῶ δοθῆναι τῇ προεκθέσει λόγον
> μὴ πολύν· ἐμοὶ γὰρ κρίνεται λακωνικῶς
> περὶ μεγάλων ἐλάχιστα πραγμάτων λέγειν.
>
> I require that no great length of speech be given to my prologue, for it is preferable in my opinion to speak laconically of great things in the shortest way possible.

What is more, we have already come across a declaration of a beginning at 109 (ἤδη δ' ἐπ' ἀρχὴν εἶμι τῆς συντάξεως, 'and now I shall come to the beginning of my collection'). The poet's play with the proper place for beginnings seems to be continued by his placement of another ἀρχή in the final line of a section:

> λέγουσι δ' αὐτόθεν
> τὸν Ἴστρον ἀρχὴν λαμβάνειν τοῦ ῥεύματος.
> (194-5)
>
> And they say that it is from there [the Celtic boundary stone] that the Ister has the start of its flow.

Pseudo-Scymnus' claims of great clarity for his comic trimeters (1-3) has already been made by Hunter 2008b: 514 n. 31. Pseudo-Scymnus seems to have known the *Alexandra* (see Marcotte 2002: 118 n. 48 on *Per.* 337 and *Alex.* 1195), and thus there may be some significance in these connections and contrasts.

[123] Cf. Ps.-Scylax 1: ἄρξομαι [...].

We do, however, find an ending in its proper place in 216, where the final word of the section concerning the edges of the Sardinian Sea is ἐσχάτη.

1.5.3 Functional and 'prosaic' section openers

Several of the more commonly used section openers in the poem either have direct counterparts in prose texts or are otherwise suited to the geographical content. Most familiar from geographical prose is μετά, which opens sections at 162 (where the beginning of the section does not coincide with the start of the line), 218, 236, 283, 326, 361, 447, 453, 473, 696 and 713.[124] We might compare the prose *Periplus* of Pseudo-Scylax (seemingly written in the Fourth Century BC[125]) where μετὰ δέ begins sections at 14-22, 28, 30-45, 49-52, 54-5, 57, 59-62, 64, 68, 72-3, [74], 75-6, [77], 78-83, 85-94, 99, 101-2 and 111-12.[126] Similar is ὑπὲρ δὲ τούτους at *Periodos* 401,[127] 434 (and note the close proximity of ὑπὲρ δὲ Βρύγους at the start of the next section, 437) and 607 (again, note the close proximity of ὑπὲρ τὰ Τέμπη at the start of the next section, 618). Another common section opener is ἔπειτα/εἶτα/εἶτεν: 167, 215, 309, 330, 369, 444, 502, 511, 597, 640, 643, 676, 709, 711, 724 and 728 (cf. e.g. ἐντεῦθεν at the start of successive sections in Pseudo-Scylax 95-6). Forms of κεῖμαι also appear frequently in the first and second lines of sections: 143, 196, 222, 254, 357, 392 (after an introductory line), 402, 426, 464, 478, 488, 511, 536 (second line), 550, 567 (second

---

[124] Note also 415, where the preposition appears later in the line: ἡ δ' Ἰλλυρὶς μετὰ ταῦτα παρατείνουσα γῆ […] ('And the Ilyrian land, stretched out after this […]').
[125] See Shipley 2011: 6-8 for a brief overview of scholarship on the question of the work's date.
[126] Note also ἀπὸ δέ at 3, 5, 7, 23-4, 56, 66, 100 and 108-9 (and ἀπό alone at 4), and κατὰ δέ at 6, 13, 29, 53 and 103 (and κατὰ alone at 47).
[127] See Marcotte 2002: 120 for the line-numbering. The topic changes in this line from the Istrian Thracians to the Ismenoi and Mentores.

line), 579, 602, 619 (second line), 672, 699 (second line) and 709.[128] Again, this sort of opening would clearly have been at home in sections of a contemporary prose text on the same subject: cf. the openings of Pseudo-Scylax 6 and 47 (κατὰ δὲ Τυρρηνίαν κεῖται νῆσος Κύρνος, 'and after Etruria lies the island of Corsica'; κατὰ Λακεδαίμονα νῆσος κεῖται Κρήτη, 'After Sparta lies the island of Crete'). Noteworthy among these examples in Pseudo-Scymnus are 222 and 254, in reasonably close proximity, where the same form of the verb (κεῖνται) is preceded by ἐν τῷ πόρῳ:

> ἐν τῷ πόρῳ κεῖνται δὲ νῆσοι πελάγιαι,
> Κύρνος τε καὶ Σαρδὼ [...]
> (222-3)
>
> And in the strait lie the sea-islands of Corsica and Sardinia [...]
>
> ἐν τῷ πόρῳ κεῖνται δὲ τῷ Τυρρηνικῷ
> νησῖδες ἑπτὰ τῆς Σικελίας οὐ πρόσω [...]
> (254-5)
>
> And in the Tyrrhenian Strait lie seven islands not far from Sicily [...]

The same collocation appears with a different form of the verb later in the poem (note the echo of 222 in νῆσος πελαγία):

> ἐν τῷ πόρῳ δὲ κειμένη τῷ Κρητικῷ
> ἄποικός ἐστιν Ἀστυπάλαια Μεγαρέων,
> νῆσος πελαγία·
> (550-3)
>
> And lying in the Cretan Strait is the sea-island of Astypalaia, a colony of the Megarians.

Another repeated opening collocation is εἰσὶ δ᾽ ἐπάνω, at 226 and 458.

A number of these section markers emphasise the sequential nature of the composition and its subject matter. This function is also performed by participles of

[128] A number of these examples consist of the 'εἰμί + κείμενος' construction, the prominence of which in the poem has been emphasised by Bravo 2009: 97.

ἔχω in the middle voice, which appear in the first lines of sections at 152, 244, 244, 483, 508 and 698.[129] We also find and ἑξῆς (264, 323, 470, 485, 511, 559, 592, 600, 659 and 707),[130] ἐφεξῆς (705) and προσεχής (300, 401 and 703). The cluster at 703, 705 and 707 is especially marked. Noteworthy among these cases are 559 (ἑξῆς Ἀθῆναι·) and 703 (προσεχής δὲ Λυσιμάχεια·), where the first clause of the section consists only of the section marker and the name of the city with which the section is concerned. Similar is εἶτ' Ἀμφίπολις at 650[131] and εἶτεν Μαρώνει' at 677, although here the sentence continues with a relative clause. We may be reminded here of the 'tags' which stand at the head of sections in some prose texts.[132]

---

[129] Cf. ἐχομένως/ ἐχόμενον in Biton (discussed in the introduction, p. 16) where the sequentiality denoted by the adverb and partciciple lies in the presentation of material rather than anything inherent in the subject matter itself; that is, there is no obvious reason for the presentation of any given siege engine in any given order, beyond the two gastraphetai, which naturally belong together.

[130] All at the start of the line except in 511 and 600.

[131] The high stop which modern editors have employed at the end of the preceding line might reasonably be changed to a full stop: 646-9 concern Mount Athos, and we have moved up the coast to Amphipolis at 650-5 (note that the section beginning at 655 starts μετ' Ἀμφίπολιν).

[132] Such 'tags' appear at the start of sections ("Ἴβηρες (2), Λίγυες καὶ Ἴβηρες (3) etc.) in Parisinus Suppl. gr. 443 (Pseudo-Scylax), with a space before the words and the first letters in a different colour, although it is obviously unclear at what point these words entered the text. Compare the text of Hippocrates, for example: many MSS have these 'tags', but they are frequently absent from one of the oldest, Vindobonensis Medicus Graecus 4. It is interesting to note that the spurious introductory 'tags' in Theophrastus' *Characters* were added by the time of Philodemus (Diggle 2004: 17). Cf. perhaps *Ther*. 797: τὸν δὲ μελίχλωρον. The accusative suggests that we are to assume something like φράζεο, as in the translation of Gow and Scholfield 1953: 81 ('learn too of the honey-coloured scorpion"), but there is no such verb in the vicinity, and, indeed, only one other scorpion is introduced as the object of a verb (786: τὸν δ' ἕτερον δήεις […]; quoted in full above, p. 27 n. 36), a full eleven lines earlier. Accordingly, the resemblance of 797 to a prose tag may have been felt quite strongly by early readers.

1.5.4 Names and naming

Words related to naming constitute a rich source of section markers. Forms of λέγω used in this sense (very often in the participle) appear as the last words of sections at 225, 282, 430, 658, elsewhere in the final lines at 469, 613 and 639, and in penultimate lines at 413 and 427. The same verb is used in the first line of sections at 369, 391, 447, 631, 640 and 724. Similarly, καλέω is used in the first line of sections in 167 and 627, and in the second line of a section at 567. It is the last word of its section in 723. Moreover, οὔνομα and its cognates appear in the final line of sections at 235 (last word), 263, 322, 477, 591, 630 (last word), 642 (last word) and 704, and in the penultimate line of a section at 577. Pseudo-Scymnus' clear interest in naming and his use of it in section marking might usefully be compared to the practice of our two (probably or possibly) second-century poets. We will recall that Nicander's deviations from his pattern of naming his main subject seem to anticipate an interest in names on the part of his readers (see above, pp. 24-5), and in this context it may be worth pointing out that sections begin with a place name (with or without an article) at 300, 415, 535 and 646; the 'prose tags' discussed above are relevant here too. The interest in names in general also points us towards Lycophron and Nicander, and in particular we might compare the examples above of sections whose final word concerns naming with Lycophron's use of αὐδηθήσεται and so on to end sections (see above, pp. 59-60): certainly Pseudo-Scymnus' ὠνομασμένη (630) has a similar effect by virtue of its combination of length and final position. This shared use of naming in section marking by three texts which may have been

written not too distantly in time from each other may tell us something about the tastes of their contemporary audiences and the appeal of this sort of verse.

1.5.5 Foundations

As promised in his prologue, Pseudo-Scymnus shows a great interest in city-foundations,[133] and this is reflected in his section ends. κτίσις and its cognates appear in the final lines of sections at 214 (last word), 243, 443, 463 (last word), 479, 578 (last word), 678 (last word), 710 (last word) and 712 (last word; note the proximity to the previous section end). ἀποικία and its cognates appear in the final line of sections at 158 (last word), 210 (last word), 286 (last word), 325, 414 (last word), 436, 596 and 645 (last word).[134] Again, we find συνῴκισαν in the final line of sections at 586 and 671. This is another interest paralleled in Lycophron: for foundation-myths in the *Alexandra* see Hornblower 2015: 53-62, 2018: 170-8. We might also compare the *Argonautica*, where we shall see that the Argonauts' foundational activity ends sections fairly frequently in Book 4 in particular (see below, pp. 99-102).

It may be noted that the use of city-foundation in structuring the poem underlines Pseudo-Scymnus' conception of geography as a subject with temporal

---

[133] His description of the work's contents begins with this promise, in fact: ἐκ τῶν σποράδην γὰρ ἱστορουμένων τισίν/ ἐν ἐπιτομῇ σοι γέγραφα τὰς ἀποικίας/ κτίσεις τε πόλεων […] ('On the basis of certain scattered historians I have written for you in summary of colonies and the foundations of cities […]").

[134] Note the similarity of 325 (Μύσκελος Ἀχαιὸς ἣν ἀποικίσαι δοκεῖ, 'which the Achaean Myscelus is thought to have founded') and 436 (ἣν Κόρκυρ' ἀποικίσαι δοκεῖ, 'which Corcyra is thought to have founded').

as well as spatial concerns: his interest in time is made explicit in passages such as 211-14, on Marseille:

> ἐν τῇ Λιγυστικῇ δὲ ταύτην ἔκτισαν
> πρὸ τῆς μάχης τῆς ἐν Σαλαμῖνι γενομένης
> ἔτεσιν πρότερον, ὥς φασιν, ἑκατὸν εἴκοσι.
> Τίμαιος οὕτως ἱστορεῖ δὲ τὴν κτίσιν.
>
> And they founded it in Liguria one hundred and twenty years, it is said, before the occurrence of the battle of Salamis. Timaeus reports its foundation thus.

We shall see in Part 2a (pp. 142-6) that sections are connected by temporal as well as by spatial sequences, and accordingly that the structure of the poem and its runs of sections do not simply follow the subject matter without much thought.

1.5.5 Pseudo Scymnus: conclusion

The *Periodos* provides a good example of the potential for achieving aesthetic effects by the building up of patterns of section markers rather than by inidivual pointed deviations: just as Lycophron creates the impression of an 'archaic' text, here Pseudo-Scymnus uses functional markers to evoke the structure of prose treatises at a large scale. The repeated clustering of individual section markers suggests that the poet's approach is a calculated one, and that he has not simply lifted his style from a prose geography without much thought.

Despite the relative lack of scholarly attention given to Pseudo-Scymnus, his approach to section marking places him firmly among our other poets, with whom he demonstrably shares interests. The prominence which he gives to naming and to city foundations in particular points to a poet in tune with contemporary literary concerns, and this is borne out by Polybius' claim at 9. 2. 1-2 that literature of his

day was saturated with τά τε περὶ τὰς γενεαλογίας καὶ μύθους καὶ περὶ τὰς ἀποικίας, ἔτι δὲ συγγενείας [cf. Ps.-Sc. 97] καὶ κτίσεις ('matters concerning genealogies and myths, and concerning colonisations, and also ethnic blood-relations and city-foundations'): this could almost be a description of the contents of the *Periodos* (cf. the long description of contents at 65-97, quoted below in translation, p. 164 n. 246).

1.6 Apollonius[135]

1.6.1 Apollonius: introductory remarks

The *Argonautica* is different in two important respects from the poems examined so far. The linear narrative contained within the poem complicates its status as a 'sectioned' work, and a narrative hexameter poem on a heroic topic will naturally lead to a closer association in the minds of readers with the tradition of Homer than is the case with our other authors and any single forerunner. Nevertheless, we can get a lot out of reading Apollonius' work through the same lens as we have employed in our examination of the other poets: the *Argonautica* is episodic, and often in Books 1, 2 and 4 the episodes feel separate enough from each other to be comparable to the sections of our other poems.[136] This sectioning shapes our experience of the poem: as Hutchinson 2008: 81 puts it, "the strong divisions between books, episodes, scenes not only disrupt and express, but also […] articulate a design". We shall see, too, that while in some methods of section marking Apollonius unmistakably evokes Homer (although even here he can add

[135] Note that in this chapter metrical methods of section marking are not brought together into a single discussion. Four-word lines and σπονδειάζοντες (and four-word σπονδειάζοντες) are common enough in Apollonius to make the raw statistics of their use as section ends somewhat underwhelming. Nevertheless it seems reasonably clear that Apollonius appreciates the feeling of finality able to be bestowed by these phenomena (the last line of the whole poem contains four words), and so I make a note of them when lines are discussed for other reasons.

[136] Beye 1982: 100-5 talks of the second book as a sort of "catalogue" of information comprising episode after episode without much apparent 'plot' tying them together, at least on the face of it. Again, Hunter 2015: 3-4 discusses the deliberate "randomness" of the fourth book and the "major joins" signalling the "composite nature" of the Argonauts' journey home. He makes similar points elsewhere about specific sections, as we shall see. Hutchinson 1988: 95 points to the "deliberately [highlighted…] disjointedness" of Books 1, 2 and 4, and the role of *aetia* in this effect (on which see below). See too Sistakou's 2009b discussion of "fragmentation" as a narrative strategy in the *Argonautica* and the *Aetia*. The expansion of a single episode to almost the length of Book 3 temporarily disrupts this effect, but variation in section size is not unparalleled: we might compare Lycophron's 'Odyssey' (648-819), even if the number of small sub-sections contained within it makes it an imperfect parallel.

a twist), in others the closest parallels are to be found elsewhere in Hellenistic poetry.

An indication of Apollonius' view of the structural importance of his sections lies in his use of shared techniques to mark book division and section division (see especially 'Night and Day', below).[137] We shall also see that he recognises and enjoys the aesthetic opportunities presented by section marking perhaps more than any other of our authors. Certainly, at least, the relatively great length of the *Argonautica* allows its poet to develop and experiment with his handling of his section markers to a greater extent.

1.6.2 Opening adverbs and collocations

The temporal and spatial adverbs κεῖθεν, ἔνθεν and ἔνθα frequently appear at the start of sections. In any given case, such openings are less striking on the face of it than, say, extended descriptions of times of the day, but even these seemingly quite insignificant words, when built up into patterns, go quite some way to shaping our experience of the poem. The following table presents the clearest cases and the sections which they begin:

---

[137] It is worth observing too that Apollonius marks his interest in beginnings and endings clearly. In choosing ἀρχόμενος to be the first word of the poem, he begins with beginning, as it were (cf. pp. 72-3). Again, several sections end with 'ending' or 'leaving': see e.g. ληξάντων ἀνέμων νῆσον λίπον εἰρεσίῃσιν (1. 1152; 'with the winds ceasing they left the island by rowing') ἀνέμοιο νέον λήγοντος ἔκελσαν (2. 751; 'they put in to port with the wind just ceasing'), ῥίμφα δὲ νῆσον ἀποπροέλειπον Ἄρηος (2. 1230; 'and quickly they left the island of Ares') and λεῖπον δ᾽ ἀπὸ δώματα Κίρκης (4. 752; 'and they left the house of Circe'). 'Ending with ending' is familiar in contemporary verse from some of Leonidas Tarentinus' epigrams on crafts: παυσάμενος, παυόμενος and παυσάμεναι καμάτων are the last words of 7, 8 and 42 G-P respectively. Cf. also παύσασαι βροτολοιγὸν Ἄρη᾽ ἀνδροκτασιάων (Il. 5. 909; 'having made mortal-slaying Ares cease from his slaughter of men') and παῦσαν ἄρ᾽ ὀρχηθμοῖο πόδας, παῦσαν δὲ γυναῖκας (*Od*. 23. 298 in close proximity to the 'end' of the *Odyssey* at 23. 296; 'they made their feet stop dancing, and they stopped the women').

κεῖθεν	1. 922 (the journey between the Isle of Electra and the Mount of Bears): κεῖθεν δ' εἰρεσίῃ Μέλανος διὰ βένθεα Πόντου/ ἱέμενοι [...] And pressing on from there across the depths of the Black Sea by rowing [...]
	2. 351, 369: see below, p. 105-6, on the speech of Phineus.
	2. 1242 (the journey between the Isle of Philyra and the mouth of the Phasis): κεῖθεν δ' αὖ Μάκρωνας ἀπειρεσίην τε Βεχείρων/ γαῖαν ὑπερφιάλους τε παρεξενέοντο Σάπειρας [...] And then they sailed from there past the Macrones and the boundless land of the Becheirans and the overbearing Sapeires [...]
	4. 1765 (the water contest on Aegina; 1764 is a σπονδειάζων): κεῖθεν δ' ἀπτερέως διὰ μυρίον οἶδμα ταμόντες/Αἰγίνης ἀκτῇσιν ἐπέσχεθον. And cutting swiftly from there through the measureless sea-swell they reached the headland of Aegina.
ἔνθεν	1. 402 (religious activity devoted to Apollo 'Of the Shore'): ἔνθεν δ' αὖ λάιγγας ἁλὸς σχεδὸν ὀχλίζοντες [...] And next, then, heaping up pebbles near the sea [...]
	1. 592 (the journey from the Ἀφέται Ἀργοῦς to Lemnos; 591 is a σπονδειάζων): ἔνθεν δὲ προτέρωσε παρεξέθεον Μελίβοιαν [...][138] And thence they went forth past Meliboia [...]
	2. 911 (the tomb of Sthenelus): ἔνθεν δὲ Σθενέλου τάφον ἔδρακον Ἀκτορίδαο [...] And next they saw the tomb of Sthenelus, son of Actor [...]
ἔνθα	1. 609 (Lemnos): ἔνθ' ἄμυδις πᾶς δῆμος ὑπερβασίῃσι γυναικῶν/νηλειῶς δέδμητο παροιχομένῳ λυκάβαντι. There in the past year all the citizen body had been overcome pitilessly by the transgressions of the women.
	1. 1153 (rowing competition resulting in Heracles' broken oar): ἔνθ' ἔρις ἄνδρα ἕκαστον ἀριστήων ὀρόθυνεν [...] Then competitiveness stirred each of the noble men [...]
	2. 1 (Amycus and the boxing match): ἔνθα δ' ἔσαν σταθμοί τε βοῶν αὖλίς τ' Ἀμύκοιο [...] And there were the cattle-stalls and the farmstead of Amycus [...]
	2. 178 (Phineus): ἔνθα δ' ἐπάκτιον οἶκον Ἀγηνορίδης ἔχε Φινεύς [...]

[138] Vian deletes 592-3 (1974: 77). This would give a section opening of dawn (see below, 'Night and day').

	And there Phineus son of Agenor had his seaside home.
	2. 353 (probably after a after a four-word σπονδειάζων, but the end of 352 is not certain), 373 (after a four-word σπονδειάζων), 399: see below, p. 106, on the speech of Phineus.
	2. 815 (the death of Idmon): ἔνθα δ᾽ Ἀβαντιάδην πεπρωμένη ἤλασε μοῖρα/ Ἴδμονα […] And there destined fate struck Idmon son of Abas […]
	2. 835 (the burial of Idmon): ἔνθα δὲ ναυτιλίης μὲν ἐρητύοντο μέλεσθαι […] And then they were held back from giving thought to voyaging […]
	4. 338 (the Argonauts' plan to escape the Colchians): ἔνθα κε λευγαλέῃ Μινύαι τότε δηιοτῆτι/ παυρότεροι πλεόνεσσιν ὑπείκαθον […] There the Minyans would then have given out in baneful battle, fewer men against many […]
	4. 350 (Medea's plan to escape the Colchians): ἔνθα δ᾽ ἐπεὶ τὰ ἕκαστα νόῳ πεμπάσσατο κούρη […] And then, when the girl had mulled each of these things over in her mind […][139]
	4. 492 (the Argonauts' decision about their next course of action): ἔνθα δὲ ναυτιλίης πυκινὴν πέρι μητιάασκον/ ἑζόμενοι βουλήν […] And then they sat and thought up a shrewd plan for their voyage […]
	4. 1364 (the appearance of a τέρας): ἔνθα τὸ μήκιστον τεράων Μινύῃσιν ἐτύχθη. Then the greatest of marvels was wrought for the Minyans.
	4. 1502 (the death of Mopsus): ἔνθα καὶ Ἀμπυκίδην αὐτῷ ἐνὶ ἤματι Μόψον/ νηλειὴς ἕλε πότμος […] Then ruthless fate took hold of Mopsus son of Ampycus on the very same day […]
	4. 1620 (the 'Harbour of the Argo'; see below, 'aetiology and religion', on the playfulness of this section opening): ἔνθα μὲν Ἀργῷός τε λιμὴν καὶ σήματα νηός/ ἠδὲ Ποσειδάωνος ἰδὲ Τρίτωνος ἔασιν/ βωμοί […] There are the harbour of the Argo and the signs of the ship and the altars of Poseidon and of Triton […]

[139] Note the close proximity and similar subject matter of 4. 338ff. and 4. 350ff. The next entry in the table is also of interest here.

Common too is αὐτίκα, at 1. 580 (the Ἀφέται Ἀργοῦς), 1. 1273 (the quarrel of the Argonauts and epiphany of Glaucus), 2. 930 (the journey from Sthenelus' tomb to Sinope), 2. 946 (Sinope; note the proximity to the previous use), 2. 1262 (entering the mouth of the Phasis, after an introductory description of the time of day; see below, 'Night and Day', pp, 90-7), 3. 576 (the assembly of Aietes), 3. 913 (Jason's journey to meet Medea), 4. 253 (the start of the return journey), 4. 1128 (the wedding of Jason and Medea) and 4. 1694 (Anaphe). We also find marked opening collocations: ἔστι δέ τις appears at the start of sections at 1. 936 (the Mount of Bears; 1. 935 is a σπονδειάζων), 2. 360 (see below, p. 106, on the speech on Phineus) and 4. 982 (Drepane), and ἀλλ' ὅτε δή at 4. 1537 (Triton, Euphemus and the clod) and 4. 1731 (the dream of Euphemus; 1730 is a four-word σπονδειάζων);[140] the connection between these two episodes late in Book 4 is underlined by the repeated opening collocation.

Apollonius gestures towards a greater segmentation of his work by the use of these section markers at points other than the very start of sections. Often this occurs at the start of the key action of the episode: at 1. 1164 (during the rowing contest starting at 1153; see table above) ἀλλ' ὅτε δή introduces the actual breaking of Heracles' oar; at 2. 169 (during the journey from the Bebrycians to Phineus, starting with a time-description at 2. 164; see below, p. 91) ἔνθα introduces the mini-episode concerning the huge wave; at 3. 1201 (the section concerning Jason's preparations for his great labour, starting at 1191 with a time-description; see

[140] In 4. 1731, the opening collocation is actually even longer: ἀλλ' ὅτε δή καὶ κεῖθεν. Cf. 2. 1009 (Tibarenia; τοὺς δὲ μετ' αὐτίκ' ἔπειτα; 1008 is a σπονδειάζων). We might recall here that Aratus is fond of employing very lengthy opening collocations (see above, p. 38).

below) ἀλλ᾽ ὅτε δή marks the actual start of Jason's ritual; at 4. 162 (during the section concerning the retrieval of the Golden Fleece, starting with a time-description at 109; see below, p. 91) ἔνθα marks Jason's actual acquisition of the Fleece following Medea's dealing with the dragon;[141] at 4. 464 (during the section devoted to Apsyrtus' death, starting with the narratorial intrusion at 445-51; see below) αὐτίκα marks the moment at which Jason leaps from his hiding-place and kills Medea's brother; at 4. 930 (during the episode concerning the Wandering Rocks, starting at 922), ἔνθα marks the beginning of the action after some introductory scene-setting.[142] A number of the lines preceding these 'openings' display marked metrical features, enhancing the impression of segmentation: 1. 1163 and 4. 463 are σπονδειάζοντες, and 2. 168 and 4. 161 are almost four-word lines (both are made up to five words by prepositions; cf. above, p.). An extension of this technique seems to come in 2. 593-5, where, after a σπονδειάζων,[143] we come to a turning point in the action, as the impasse between rowers and sea is finally broken: ἔνθεν δ᾽ αὐτίκ᾽ ἔπειτα κατηρεφὲς ἔσσυτο κῦμα/ ἡ δ᾽ ἄφαρ ὥστε κυλίνδρῳ ἐπέτρεχε κύματι λάβρῳ/ προπροκαταΐγδην κοίλης ἁλός ('And next, then, straight away a downwardly sloping wave rushed at them and the ship ran atop the

[141] Apparently enough of an episode in its own right to form the subject of "several vase-paintings" (Hunter 2015: 104), and, of course, the goal of the voyage, but there may be some irony in the gesture towards the simple taking of the fleece as worthy of its own section, especially since we have just read εἵπετο δ᾽ Αἰσονίδης, πεφοβημένος (149; 'Aeson's son followed in fear') while Medea has removed the monstrous guardian of the prize.

[142] See also 1. 853, where ἔνθα marks Jason's acceding to Hypsipyle's request and second entrance into her city. Perhaps there is some playfulness on Apollonius' part here: Jason, under Aphrodite's influence (850-2), may well think at this point that the duration of his stay on Lemnos will be significant, or, on a metapoetic level, that it will be worthy of a full section of its own. But as it is, in only a few lines time Heracles will prevent a long stay on the island. Segmentation of a different sort of section occurs at 3. 235, during the description of Aietes' palace: the description of the exterior, culminating in a four-word line in 234, gives way here with ἔνθα to an account of the interior.

[143] βιαζομένων ἡρώων at the end of 592 is expressive of the rowers' effort, of course (cf. Hutchinson 1988: 131).

boistrous wave of the hollow sea like a cylinder, storming down and on'; note use of two common section openers in 593, with the addition of ἔπειτα).[144] These cases do not quite constitute the extensive division into subsections found in Pseudo-Scymnus (see p. 170 n. 120; this sort of hyper-segmentation is found in short bursts in Apollonius, as we shall see below, pp. 96-7), but they do seem to demonstrate the poet's active engagement with the idea of sectioning, and his awareness of the significance which can be bestowed on passages by the use of section markers.

A number of these section markers are found also in Homer,[145] and especially relevant is their use in the 'voyaging books' of the *Odyssey*: note for example the repeated line ἔνθεν δὲ προτέρω πλέομεν ἀκαχήμενοι ἦτορ ('And from there we sailed on, grieved at heart'; 9. 62, 105, 565, 10. 77, 133),[146] and the use of ἀλλ᾽ ὅτε δή in 10. 469. ἔστι δέ τις also appears five times in Homer. *Arg.* 1. 936 (ἔστι δέ τις αἰπεῖα Προποντίδος ἔνδοθι νῆσος; 'And there is a steep island within the Propontis') is especially evocative of Homeric precedent: *Il.* 2. 811 and 11. 711, and *Od.* 3. 293, all contain αἰπεῖα in addition to the collocation, and *Od.* 4. 844 contains νῆσος).

Neither Homer nor Apollonius uses these openings solely to express progress on a voyage, however, and it may also be instructive to consider, for

---

144 Similar, perhaps, is 4. 1665, during the Talos episode, where, after a nearly four-word line (made up to five with a preposition), Medea's actions begin in earnest. Later in the episode, at 1673 (after a four-word line), a narratorial intrusion invoking Zeus (see below on such intrusions as section markers) introduces a description of the effects of Medea's magic on her bronze opponent. We almost, then, have a tripartite section, with sub-sections devoted to preparation, action and effect.

145 When considering spatial and temporal section markers which express the progress of the voyage we should not forget the 'functional' section markers of Pseudo-Scymnus (see above, pp. 73-6); cf. also below, pp. 105-8, on the speech of Phineus, and under 'Night and Day', on segmentation.

146 Three of the five cases (9. 62, 565, 10. 133) continue into the line ἄσμενοι ἐκ θανάτοιο, φίλους ὀλέσαντες ἑταίρους ('glad to be safe from death, but having lost dear companions').

example, the fifth book of the *Iliad*, where Diomedes' *aristeia* and the associated fighting is peppered with what we might think of as sections beginning with ἔνθα: 5. 1, 144, 159, 541, 578, 608, 677, 703. The majority of these 'sections' begin 'and then he killed x', as, for example, in 144: ἔνθ' ἕλεν Ἀστύνοον καὶ Ὑπείρονα ποιμένα λαῶν ('And then he slew Astynous and Hypeiron, shepherd of the people'), and the accumulation of similar lines builds the overwhelming impression of death after death (cf. Hutchinson 2008: 73). A slightly less 'heroic' accumulation comes in *Arg.* 4, where at 338, 350 and 492 we find a succession of plans introduced by ἔνθα (see table above): the juxtaposition of the first two episodes in particular gives the impression that the journey is floundering somewhat, and requires plan after plan to get it back on track (and it is here that Hunter 2015: 3-4 senses "randomness" most acutely; see above, 81 n. 136). Apollonius also dabbles in repeated deaths, and we might compare the deaths of Idmon and Tiphys in Book 2 to some of those in *Iliad* 5. At *Il.* 5. 552, a new section begins, but ἔνθα is delayed:

> βῆ δὲ μετὰ Ξάνθόν τε Θόωνά τε Φαίνοπος υἷε
> ἄμφω τηλυγέτω· ὃ δὲ τείρετο γήραϊ λυγρῷ,
> υἱὸν δ' οὐ τέκετ' ἄλλον ἐπὶ κτεάτεσσι λιπέσθαι.
> ἔνθ' ὅ γε τοὺς ἐνάριζε [...]
> (152-5)
>
> And then he went after Xanthos and Thoon, the twin sons of Phainops, both darlings of their father; and he was worn by baneful old age, and had not begot any other son to be left to his possessions. Then Diomedes killed them [...]

The belated intrusion of the 'opening' after a few lines which encourage our sympathy for the victims and their father has the effect of stressing the sudden cruelty of their death. At *Arg.* 2. 812, with dawn (see below, 'Night and Day', pp. 90-7), we may think that we are starting a new section as the Argonauts set off from

Mariandynia in the company of Lycus' son. But this course of action is cut off almost immediately with the sudden death of Idmon:

> ἦρί γε μὴν ἐπὶ νῆα κατήισαν ἐγκονέοντες·
> καὶ δ' αὐτὸς σὺν τοῖσι Λύκος κίε, μυρί' ὀπάσσας
> δῶρα φέρειν· ἅμα δ' υἷα δόμων ἔκπεμπε νέεσθαι.
> ἔνθα δ' Ἀβαντιάδην πεπρωμένη ἤλασε μοῖρα
> Ἴδμονα, μαντοσύνῃσι κεκασμένον […]
> (2. 812-16)
>
> At dawn they went down quickly to the ship, and Lykos himself hied with them, giving them numberless gifts to bear. And he sent his son to go with them from home. And then his destined fate struck Idmon, son of Abas, excellent in prophecy […]

By dividing the material concerning Idmon's death and burial into two sections (the second also beginning with ἔνθα, at 2. 835), Apollonius appears to be marking out the burial as an almost uniquely significant event (see above on the segmentation of sections). But the next section, starting at 851, immediately undermines this expectation: τίς γὰρ δὴ θάνεν ἄλλος; ('Who else died, then?'), which incidentally recalls questions like ἔνθα τίνα πρῶτον τίνα δ' ὕστατον ἐξενάριξαν/ Ἕκτωρ τε Πριάμοιο πάϊς καὶ χάλκεος Ἄρης; (*Il.* 5. 703-4; 'Who then was the first, and who then the last that Hector, son of Priam, and bronze Ares killed?'), suddenly raises the expectation of more death. In Homer, of course, there was never any doubt before 5. 703 that more characters are soon to die, but in the *Argonautica*, the similar question has a different effect: both presage more death, but Apollonius' question may catch us off guard. Even the juxtaposition of two deaths can gesture towards the sort of accumulation found in Homer, and Apollonius seems eager for us to appreciate the point (cf. Van der Schuur's 2014: 102 suggestion that ἄλλος and καὶ ἔτ' αὖτις in 2. 851 "stress the idea of duplication"). It is certainly no coincidence that

this pair of deaths is matched in Book 4 by those of Canthus and Mopsus (4. 1485, 1502; note the similarity of 2. 815, ἔνθα δ᾽ Ἀβαντιάδην […], to 4. 1502, ἔνθα καὶ Ἀμπυκίδην […]). But our poet also stresses his difference from Homer: as Hutchinson 1988: 94 notes, the Homeric feel of the question in 2. 851 gives way very quickly to aetiological details, which allow us retrospectively to understand the apparently Homeric section opener as introducing something like a Callimachean *aition*.

We shall see more evidence of Apollonius' engagement with Homeric 'section marking' under the next sub-heading, but so far it is clear that while at least some of his section markers evoke Homeric precedent, he can turn them to more recognisably Hellenistic ends. The material presented so far also demonstrates that the poet can put his section markers to a variety of aesthetic uses. Like Homer, or, for that matter, like Pseudo-Scymnus, he can use them over a long period as a tool to express the progress of a voyage (or, on a slightly smaller scale in Book 4, to express precisely the lack of progress of the voyage). Again, section marking can create or contribute to specific effects in individual places in the text (and here we may turn back to similar instances in our other poets): the false-beginning of 2. 812, for example, undercut by the true and unhappy beginning at 815, or the potentially ironic gesture towards a whole section dedicated to the simple acquisition of the Fleece by Jason at 4. 162 after he has sheepishly watched Medea complete the real challenge involved in securing it.

1.6.3 Night and day

A very conspicuous sectioning technique in the *Argonautica* is the use of times of the day.[147] In itself, this could be thought an obvious choice: dawn is a natural beginning and nightfall (or darkness, or sleep) a natural ending, and obviously there is Homeric precedent here: we might think, for example of Ἠὼς μὲν κροκόπεπλος ἀπ᾽ Ὠκεανοῖο ῥοάων/ ὄρνυθ᾽, ἵν᾽ ἀθανάτοισι φόως φέροι ἠδὲ βροτοῖσιν (Il. 19. 1-2; 'Saffron-clothed Dawn set off from the streams of the Ocean to bring light to immortals and to mortals'), κοιμήσαντ᾽ ἄρ᾽ ἔπειτα καὶ ὕπνου δῶρον ἕλοντο (7. 482; 'Then they lay down and took the gift of sleep') and Ἠῶ μίμνον (8.565; 'they waited for dawn').[148] But a survey of the times of the day used (some of which are extended to a great number of lines)[149] shows that Apollonius gives the 'obvious' pattern a twist:

---

[147] Specific times (i.e. dawn, night etc., rather than time itself) in Apollonius have been discussed several times before, notably by Fantuzzi 1988: 121-54 and Williams 1991: 25-51. A grand framing of the majority of the action of the poem by times of the day is spotted by Hutchinson 1988: 129, who notes that the Argo shouts encouragingly on the first dawn of the voyage (1. 524-7) and passes on Zeus' unhappiness about Apsyrtus' killing at night (4. 592).

[148] See Williams 1991: 34 n. 24 for a full list of Homeric book-ends at night and book-beginnings at dawn (it is likely according to Schironi 2010: 35-6 that in Ptolemaic copies of Homer there will not normally have been an end title after the final line of a book, and so in the case of book-endings at least we can be fairly confident that Apollonius' contemporaries will have been used to looking for finality within the text itself, even if they will often have been guided by a paragraphus or coronis). For discussions of Apollonius' engagement with Homeric temporal phrases in addition to those by Fantuzzi and Williams, see James 1978, and Christol 2003 (in this case specifically on κνέφας). It will be worth remembering when considering some of Apollonius' more extended descriptions of time that only two of James' examples from Homer match the length of these Apollonian passages, and that only one of these, *Il*. 11. 84-90, can really be thought to start a passage. *Od*. 23. 241-6 comes in the middle of the true reunion of Odysseus and Penelope. For 'natural' beginnings and endings see above, p. 8 n. 4.

[149] Fantuzzi 1988: 134-5 sees elaborated time descriptions as marking especially important episodes, an opinion echoed by Williams despite her strange claim that "Apollonius never dwells upon darkness or sunrise", at most giving us "slight" elaboration (1991: 31-2). For another elongated time-description in Hellenistic narrative hexameters, see *Hecale* fr. 74. 22ff., and Hollis 2009: 253-6 for notes. Hollis himself points out the similarity to several passages in Apollonius (the shared ἄγχαυρος (4. 111), of course, is particularly noteworthy). It is a shame that the fragment breaks off

Section Openings	1. 450-2 (the Argonauts' dinner on the beach and Orpheus' song): heading towards evening	1. 519-21 (the start of the voyage; 518 is a σπονδειάζων): dawn[150]
	1. 985 (the ascent of Dindymum; 984 is a σπονδειάζων): dawn	1. 1172-6 (Hylas): evening
	1. 1273-4 (the quarrel of the Argonauts and epiphany of Glaucus; note the added use of αὐτίκα): dawn	2. 164-5 (the journey from Bebrycia to Phineus): dawn
	2. 669-71 (the epiphany of Apollo): morning twilight	2. 720 (the Acherusian headland; 719 is a σπονδειάζων): morning
	2. 899-900 (the river Callichorus; 899 is a four-word line): dawn	2. 1228/1231 (the Isle of Philyra): dawn/nightfall; see below on fragmented sections
	2. 1260 (entering the mouth of the Phasis): night	3. 1191-3 (the ritual preceding the great ἄεθλος): sunset
	4. 109-13 (the dragon and the Golden Fleece): before dawn	4. 183 (departure from Colchis; 182 is almost a four-word line, only made up to five by ἠέ): dawn
	4. 482 (slaughter of the Colchians; 481 is a σπονδειάζων): night, implied by the σέλας	4. 885 (the Sirens): dawn
	4. 1170-1 (Alcinous' judgement): dawn	4. 1223-4 (Syrtis): dawn
	4. 1629-35 (Talos): night, day, and night again	4. 1689-90 (shrine-building on Crete; 1689 is a σπονδειάζων): night
Section Endings[151]	1. 518 (the Argonauts' dinner on the beach and Orpheus' song; a σπονδειάζων): night	1. 607-8 (the journey from the Ἀφέται Ἀργοῦς to Lemnos): evening
	1. 934-5 (the journey between the Isle of Electra and the Mount of Bears; 935 is a four-word σπονδειάζων): night	1. 1151-2 (sacrifices to Rhea): dawn
	1. 1362 (the quarrel of the Argonauts and epiphany of Glaucus; a nearly four-word	2. 497 (Phineus; a σπονδειάζων): sleep

before we can see how decided a change of direction the narrative takes after this lengthy description of time.

150 Note that in the προέκδοσις (whatever exactly we understand by the word) the start of the voyage received a more extended description of dawn (see Fantuzzi 1988: 121-4 for a discussion of the differences between the two versions).

151 Perhaps to be added to these examples is 2. 1241 (the Isle of Philyra), which ends with εὐνῇ (see Part 2b, p. 183).

	σπονδειάζων, and the end of the first book): dawn	
	2. 1285 (entering the mouth of the Phasis; the end of the second book): dawn	3. 1223-4 (the ritual in preparation for the great ἄεθλος; 1124 is a σπονδειάζων): dawn
	3. 1407 (the great ἄεθλος; the end of the third book): nightfall[152]	4. 884 (Thetis and Peleus): night
	4. 980-1 (the Wandering Rocks): dawn	

Often we find times of day other than those we might expect at the beginnings and ends of sections: night frequently begins sections and dawn frequently closes them (and we have a few instances of very specific times such as at 2. 669-71 and 4. 109-13, which allow for quite elongated descriptions). Especially noteworthy are the endings of the first two books with dawn, and in the second case, this ending is even more than usually pointed, because the book could easily have ended in the previous line (a σπονδειάζων) with night: ἔνθ᾽ οἵγε διὰ κνέφας ηὐλίζοντο·/ ἠῶς δ᾽ οὐ μετὰ δηρὸν ἐελδομένοισι φαάνθη (2. 1284-5; 'There they passed the night in the darkness. And not long later dawn appeared to them in their eagerness'). Ending books with dawn (which naturally promises more action; note ἐελδομένοισι in 1285), produces a playful tension between the structural units and the flow of the narrative.[153] As Williams 1991: 26 points out in a brief discussion of Homer's use of dawn and sunset as "transitions between episodes", he tends to have his action take place in the day, with night marking an end, or a time for a different sort of action

[152] Significantly, this line also contains the phrase τετελεσμένος ἦεν ἄεθλος ('the task was completed'); see below, p. 162, for the *Argonautica* as a sort of 'collection' of ἄεθλοι.

[153] Williams 1991: 34 n. 23 presents a survey of interpretations of ending books with dawn (her own interpretation has to do with "[suggesting] positive outcomes in the books which are to follow"). Campbell 1983 points out the similarities between the end of *Arg.* 1 and of *Od.* 2, of *Arg.* 2 and that of *Il.* 8, and of *Arg.* 3 and *Il.* 7. 465 (almost the end of the book).

("feasting, song and storytelling"). She presents *Od.* 2. 388ff. as an exception, with a voyage beginning at night (n. 8), and *Il.* 10 as a large episode occurring entirely at night (n. 9). It should be noted that even in *Il.* 10 Homer does not go so far as to end the book with dawn, which comes at the start of Book 11. The idea of a prolonged episode set at night in the *Iliad* obviously discomfited ancient critics (hence the T scholion on 10. 1 claiming the Book 10 was originally a separate composition and was added to the *Iliad* in the time of Pisistratus), and so Apollonius' use of a nominally Homeric method of section marking will presumably have struck his contemporaries as a twist on 'proper' narrative hexameter practice.[154] It may be putting it a little too strongly to suggest that "dawn is consistently positive, while night is a time for misfortune and anxiety" (Williams 1991: 27), but the weaker claim that the *Argonautica* is in general a poem in which stealth, mistakes, magic, love and so on are prevalent, and that this is reflected in Apollonius' use of times of the day in section marking, is certainly attractive. Several sections require their nocturnal setting for their full effect or for coherence: the accidental killing of Cyzicus (1. 1012-77), Jason's magical preparation (3. 1191-1224), the confrontation with the dragon and removal of the fleece (4. 109-82) and the wedding (4. 1128-69) all fall into this category.[155]

As well as this large-scale play with Homeric precedent and shaping of the tone of the poem, we also find individual instances of these section markers used

---

[154] The remark that ἐπ' ἄλλο εἶδος τρέπεται ὁ ποιητής, διὰ δόλου καὶ νυκτὸς ἀναπληρῶν τὴν μεθ' ἡμέραν ἀτυχίαν τῶν Ἑλλήνων (ΣbT 10. 3-4; 'the poet turns to a different mode, topping up the misfortune of the Hellenes by day with trickery and night') suggests that ancient readers will have considered such distinctions significant.

[155] On the tendency for action in Book 4 in particular to happen at night see Williams 1991: 44-9.

to create specific effects. Apollonius' specificity in marking out the time of ἀμφιλύκη as the setting of Apollo's epiphany (2. 669ff.), for example, has been claimed by Hunter to involve a pun: he argues that ἀμφιλύκη "has a particular appropriateness as a time for seeing Apollo, and […] Apollonius has helped us to see this by making the god travel Λυκίηθεν" (2008c: 34).[156] Another passage in which section marking related to times of the day is bound up pointedly with content comes in Book 4, in the section concerning Anaphe. A very brief section concerning shrine-foundation on Crete has preceded (4. 1689-93), and moved us in the space of a few lines from night to dawn. Suddenly, and unexpectedly, darkness falls:

> αὐτίκα δὲ Κρηταῖον ὑπὲρ μέγα λαῖτμα θέοντας
> νὺξ ἐφόβει τήνπερ τε κατουλάδα κικλήσκουσιν
> νύκτ' ὀλοήν· οὐκ ἄστρα διίσχανεν, οὐκ ἀμαρυγαί
> μήνης, οὐρανόθεν δὲ μέλαν χάος, ἠδέ τις ἄλλη
> ὠρώρει σκοτίη μυχάτων ἀνιοῦσα βερέθρων·
> αὐτοὶ δ' εἴτ' Ἀΐδῃ εἴθ' ὕδασιν ἐμφορέοντο
> ἠείδειν οὐδ' ὅσσον […]
> (4. 1694-1700)

> And straight away as they rushed over the great Cretan Sea night put fear into them, that night which men call the baneful shroud. Stars did not split it, nor the rays of the moon, but a black chaos came from heaven, or some other darkness rising from the lowermost depths. And they did not know even to any extent at all whether they were borne along in Hades or upon the waters.

Apollo will appear and return light to the Argonauts (1706-10), and this episode becomes a sort of dramatisation of the movements from night to dawn found often in sections throughout the poem (even if neither the 'night' nor the 'dawn' here are

[156] On a similar note, Hopkinson 1988: 195, discussing the move to αὔλιος (4.1630 (Talos); only elsewhere found at Call. fr. 177. 5 (cf. Fantuzzi 1988: 153)) from οὔλιος at *Il.* 11.62, points out that "Apollonius […] adds an explanatory 'gloss': the star is αὔλιος because it 'brings relief to wretched ploughmen', i.e. signals their return home. Nor is this mere pedantry: the 'gloss' is particularly apt, since 'ploughing the sea' is a common metaphor for rowing. The ploughmen can rest; but the heroes' work is only just begun".

normal). Note the insistence on νύξ, which appears at the start of 1695 and 1696. This episode was also dealt with in the *Aitia*,[157] and it has been pointed out by Albis 1995: 106, for example, that Apollonius and Callimachus both choose darkness over the storm favoured in other accounts of the event. Apollonius actually seems to go even further than Callimachus, by not hinting at all at natural marine events (whereas in the *Aitia* we have at least clouds and mist (Vian 1981: 207)). Thus the emphasis on 'night' itself in Apollonius seems to have been stronger than strictly required by his material, and we can see that times of the day are not a tired technique of starting episodes which are plugged in without much consideration and easily ignored. Apollonius gives the impression of enjoying this aspect of his work, both on a large scale, with his frequent inversion of the expected times used at the beginning and end of episodes, and in individual cases, where night and day not only mark the action but constitute the action.

We have seen a few examples already of false beginnings and endings in the *Argonautica* and our other authors, and Apollonius also creates these by undermining the expectations aroused by times of the day as a result of their extensive use in section marking. At 1. 1053, for example, the line-opening ἠῶθεν ('at dawn'), might under normal circumstances lead us to expect that the Argonauts move on into new action. As it is, Cyzicus' death in the previous lines (as yet unknown to the characters) prevents the continuation of the voyage. This deviation from the usual pattern underlines and enhances the emotional effect of the action.

---

[157] See Hutchinson 1988: 87. The ending of this section (a four-word σπονδειάζων, and a focus on aetiology; see below) is marked very clearly, and its place in the *Aetia* gives it a sort of 'legitimacy' as a unit in its own right.

Again, at 2. 498 ἦρι ('in the morning', after a σπονδειάζων) seems to suggest that the Argonauts' departure from Phineus is imminent. It surprises us, then, when a digression concerning Cyrene intrudes two lines later, without any sort of connecting particle, and delays the continuation of the voyage until 536 (mirroring a delay in fictional time (528-30); see below, pp. 156-7 on this section).

Sometimes, in the voyaging passages of the poem, Apollonius can give us several of these markers in quick succession, creating a number of very short sub-sections. A good example of this sort of composition comes in the journey from the Ἀφέται Ἀργοῦς to Lemnos, where a combination of time-based section markers and the adverbs examined above are used (I mark out the sub-sections in the text and translation):[158]

> ἔνθεν δὲ προτέρωσε παρεξέθεον Μελίβοιαν,
> ἀκτήν τ' αἰγιαλόν τε δυσήνεμον †εἰσορόωντες·[159]
> | ἠῶθεν δ' Ὁμόλην αὐτοσχεδὸν εἰσορόωντες
> πόντῳ κεκλιμένην παρεμέτρεον· οὐδ' ἔτι δηρὸν
> μέλλον ὑπὲκ ποταμοῖο βαλεῖν Ἀμύροιο ῥέεθρα.
> | κεῖθεν δ' Εὐρυμενάς τε πολυκλύστους τε φάραγγας
> Ὄσσης Οὐλύμποιό τ' ἐσέδρακον· | αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα
> κλίτεα Παλλήναια, Καναστραίην ὑπὲρ ἄκρην,
> ἤνυσαν ἐννύχιοι πνοιῇ ἀνέμοιο θέοντες.
> | ἦρι δὲ νισσομένοισιν Ἄθω ἀνέτελλε κολώνη
> Θρηικίη, ἣ τόσσον ἀπόπροθι Λῆμνον ἐοῦσαν,
> ὅσσον ἐς ἔνδιόν κεν ἐύστολος ὁλκὰς ἀνύσσαι,
> ἀκροτάτῃ κορυφῇ σκιάει, καὶ ἐσάχρι Μυρίνης.
> | τοῖσιν δ' αὐτῆμαρ μὲν ἄεν καὶ ἐπι κνέφας οὖρος
> πάγχυ μάλ' ἀκραής, τετάνυστο δὲ λαίφεα νηός.
> αὐτὰρ ἅμ' ἠελίοιο βολαῖς ἀνέμοιο λιπόντος
> εἰρεσίῃ κραναὴν Σιντηίδα Λῆμνον ἵκοντο.
> (1. 592-608)

[158] A similar passage is quoted in Part 2, p. 140-1
[159] See above, n. 138.

> And then they travelled further, past Meliboea, looking upon the headland and the ill-winded beach. **|** And at dawn they measured out the distance past Homole, sloping down hard by the sea, looking upon it as they went; not long hence they were to come beneath the flow of the river Amyrus. **|** And after that they beheld Eurymenae and the oft-washed chasms of Ossa and Olympus. **|** And then, afterwards, they got past the Pallenean slopes, beyond the Canastraean heights, running nocturnally on the blast of the wind. **|** And at dawn the Thracian Mount Athos rose up before them as they travelled, that which with its highest peak beshadows Lemnos, even as far as Myrine, though one be so far off from the other as the distance which a well-equipped trade-ship can complete up to midday. **|** And for the whole day until dark there was always wind for them, a very strongly-blowing one indeed, and the ship's sails were stretched out. With the wind's departure at the same time as that of the Sun's rays, they arrived at rocky Sintian Lemnos by rowing.

Here we may be reminded of the very short sections of Pseudo-Scymnus: certainly there is a similarity to the style of a prose *periplus*, a genre with which the Argonautica is often connected.[160]

In addition to evoking geographical prose (see further pp. 105-7 on the speech of Phineus), this breaking-up of voyaging into a number of sub-sections, with even uneventful aspects of the voyage treated as though they were episodes in their own right, gives us a real sense of the length of the expedition as a whole.[161]

---

[160] See e.g. Meyer 2008

[161] See Vian's tables of days in the voyage (1974: 18, 118; 1981: 12-13) for an impression of the vast scale of the fictional time of the work. Williams 1991:32-3 suggests that this sort of passage: "lends some energy and movement to what otherwise would be a list of place names or a series of episodes"; of course, an examination of Apollonius' section marking encourages us to view the poem precisely as a series of episodes!

1.6.4 Narratorial intrusions

Like Lycophron's Cassandra, the voice of the *Argonautica*'s narrator can be especially prominent at the divisions between sections; we will also recall the individual 'dramatisations' of the didactic poets' approaches to sectioning (see pp. 45-8); note too that of the didactic poets Nicander in particular makes his authorial persona felt pervasively through imperatives, hortations and so on at the beginning of sections; see pp. 34-5). Narratorial asides are relatively infrequent in the first two books, but the section concerning the Isle of Electra is closed by a refusal to discuss the Samothracian mysteries:

> τῶν μὲν ἔτ᾽ οὐ προτέρω μυθήσομαι˙ ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὴ
> νῆσος ὁμῶς κεχάροιτο καὶ οἳ λάχον ὄργια κεῖνα
> δαίμονες ἐνναέται, τὰ μὲν οὐ θέμις ἄμμιν ἀείδειν.
> (1. 919-21)
>
> I shall discuss these things no further. But all the same I bid the island itself farewell, along with the divine inhabitants to whose lot has fallen those rites of which it is not lawful for me to sing.[162]

It is in the third and (primarily) the fourth books that Apollonius begins to exploit his speaker's input to its full structural potential.[163] The invocation of Erato (3. 1-5) marks the beginning of the most important ἄεθλος of the poem, in which, of course, love will play a crucial role. At 4. 445-51, the narrator addresses Eros at the point at which the ἄεθλος is completed and the start of an escape has been made; now a

---

[162] Reticence to discuss sensitive religious matters is common in Hellenistic poetry, of course: cf. Call. *Aet.* fr. 75. 4-7., *Phaenomena* 637. Later in the *Argonautica* a similar ploy is used in combination with another common ending, at 4. 247-52, where the narrator's unwillingness to discuss Medea's ritual in detail leads him to change tack rather abruptly to safer altar-building material (see below, 'Aetiology and Religion', pp. 99-102).
[163] See Hunter 2008d: 116-27 for a discussion of some of these interjections and other sorts of functions they perform.

darker trial awaits, the murder of Apsyrtus. 4. 552-6 marks the end of that episode and the start of the rest of the journey, as the narrator asks the Muses about the next episode (the visit to Circe in Italy),[164] even as far as τίνες σφέας ἤγαγον αὖραι; (556; 'What breezes carried them?'). Hunter 2008c: 139 remarks that "the appeal to the Muses […] marks the suddenness, almost randomness of the change".[165] We also find an apostrophe of Canthus at the start of the section in which he is to die (4. 1485), reminiscent of Homeric practice of course, but also a reasonably frequent section opener for Lycophron (albeit not with characters actually named).[166]

We shall see in Part 2b (pp. 180-5) that Apollonius' sectioning goes hand in hand with a desire to emphasise the work he has put into gathering his source material. Readers of a metapoetic bent are thus likely to be primed for the role of the poet-narrator at section division.

1.6.5 Aetiology and religion

A number of sections close with an emphasis on religious activity, foundations and so on. Whereas some of the section marking in the *Argonautica* is pointedly in dialogue in Homer, here we are on firmly Hellenistic ground: see the discussions of foundations in Pseudo-Scymnus (pp. 77-8) and naming in Lycophron (pp. 51-2 59-

[164] This is reminiscent of the questioning which opens sections of the *Aetia*.
[165] He also suggests that the talk of fate at 4. 122-6 "[advertises] the 'composite' nature of the narrative, to allow the seams in the 'stitched song' to show" (2008: 139-40).
[166] Another genre in which the narrator's persona is especially visible at the boundaries between different parts of texts is historiography: cf. e.g. Herodotus' use of χαιρέτω to close digressions at 2. 117 (the authorship of the *Cypria*) and 4. 96 (Salmoxis). Note too that Polybius' musings on the proper order of his material and his apologies for digressions (for which see the introduction to Part 2, pp. 116-18 tend to come at the beginning or end of what we might call 'sections' (or at least relatively self-contained passages).

60). In his 2013 chapter, Asper demonstrates that aetiology was felt by ancient authors and readers as a topic which naturally "gestures towards closure" but also one which could be subject to playful deviation. We shall see this borne out in Apollonius' treatment of this sort of material.[167]

1. 591	τὴν δ᾽ ἀκτὴν Ἀφέτας Ἀργοῦς ἔτι κικλήσκουσιν. (σπονδειάζων) 'and people still call that headland the 'Setting-Off Point of the Argo'.
2. 717-19[168]	[...] καί τ᾽ εἰσέτι νῦν γε τέτυκται κεῖσ᾽ Ὁμονοίης ἱρὸν ἐύφρονος, ὅ ῥ᾽ ἐκάμοντο αὐτοὶ κυδίστην τότε δαίμονα πορσαίνοντες. (σπονδειάζων) 'and even now a temple of well-minded Harmony stands there, at which they themselves toiled then, tending the honoured goddess'.
2. 849-50	[...] οἱ δ᾽ ἀντὶ θεουδέος Αἰολίδαο Ἴδμονος εἰσέτι νῦν Ἀγαμήστορα κυδαίνουσιν.[169] (σπονδειάζων) 'but instead of god-fearing Idmon the Aeolid, to this day they honour Agamestor'.
2. 909-10	ἐξ οὗ Καλλίχορον ποταμὸν περιναιετάοντες ἠδὲ καὶ Αὐλίον ἄντρον ἐπωνυμίην καλέουσιν. 'from that time those who live nearby have given the river the name Callichorus and the cave Aulion'.
2. 929	ἐκ τοῦ δὲ Λύρη πέλει οὔνομα χώρῳ. 'and after this the name Lyra belongs to the place'. Cf. *Phaen*. 268-71 (albeit not a section end).
4. 250-2	[...] τό γε μὴν ἕδος ἐξέτι κείνου, ὅ ῥα θεᾷ ἥρωες ἐπὶ ῥηγμῖσιν ἔδειμαν, ἀνδράσιν ὀψιγόνοισι μένει καὶ τῆμος ἰδέσθαι. 'still now the shrine there which the heroes built on the shore for the goddess remains to this day to be seen by men of later times'.
4. 658	ἔνθα λιμὴν Ἀργῷος ἐπωνυμίην πεφάτισται. 'there is the harbour said to be named after the Argo'.
4. 917-19	ἀλλά μιν οἰκτείρασα θεὰ Ἔρυκος μεδέουσα Κύπρις ἔτ᾽ ἐν δίναις ἀνερέψατο, καί ῥ᾽ ἐσάωσεν πρόφρων ἀντομένη Λιλυβηίδα ναιέμεν ἄκρην. 'but Cypris, the goddess who rules Eryx, pitying him [Butes], removed him from the whirlpools and, greeting him favourably, saved him to inhabit the Lilybaean height'.

[167] He discusses Apollonius briefly on pp. 73-4 and Callimachus in more detail on pp. 71-3, 75-6 and 78-81.
[168] On *aetia* in Book 2 generally, see Paskiewicz 1988.
[169] See Hitch 2012 on the importance of hero-cult in the poem generally (especially relevant to our concern with the poem as a collection of ἄεθλοι is her connection of the quests with their "process of [heroisation]" (150).

	Cf. the colonisation so frequent in Pseudo-Scymnus (pp. 77-8)
4. 1727-30	[…] ἐκ δέ νυ κείνης μολπῆς ἡρώων νήσῳ ἔνι τοῖα γυναῖκες ἀνδράσι δηριόωνται, ὅτ᾽ Ἀπόλλωνα θυηλαῖς Αἰγλήτην Ἀνάφης τιμήορον ἱλάσκωνται. (Four-word σπονδειάζων) 'and, indeed, as a result of that banter of the heroes, women on that island wrangle in such a way with the men when they propitiate Apollo Aigletes, protector of Anaphe, with sacrifices'. See above on the link to the *Aitia*.
4. 1761-4	[…] ἐκ δὲ λιπόντας Σπάρτην Αὐτεσίωνος ἐὺς πάις ἤγαγε Θήρας καλλίστην ἐπὶ νῆσον, ἀμείψατο δ᾽ οὔνομα Θήρης ἐξ ἕθεν. ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν μετόπιν γένετ᾽ Εὐφήμοιο. (σπονδειάζων) 'Theras, the noble child of Autesion, brought them [the descendants of Euphemus] to the beautiful island when they had left Sparta, and its name changed to Thera because of this. But these things happened after Euphemus'. Cf. the colonisation so frequent in Pseudo-Scymnus (pp. 77-8)
4. 1770-2	ἔνθ᾽ ἔτι νῦν πλήθοντας ἐπωμαδὸν ἀμφιφορῆας ἀνθέμενοι κούφοισιν ἄφαρ κατ᾽ ἀγῶνα πόδεσσιν κοῦροι Μυρμιδόνων νίκης πέρι δηριόωνται. 'There, still now, the youths of the Myrmidons, placing full jars on their shoulders, immediately compete with each other on their swift feet for victory in the contest'.

Note especially the similarity of 1. 591, 2. 910, 2. 929 and 4. 658 to the ending of sections in Lycophron with αὐδηθήσεται and similar. Also important to note is the occasional clustering of such sections, which builds the impression at points of the poem as one *aition* after another: Hutchinson 1988: 93 notes the "flurry of aitia" near the end of the poem, and we might also look at 2. 910 and 929, which occupy successive section ends, and both refer to naming.

The pattern built up by these section ends, and deviations therefrom, is also a source of aesthetic possibility, as has been observed before: Hunter 2015: 297, for example, notes of the section beginning at 4. 1620 that "although 1617-18 seemed to

suggest that the Argonauts headed off immediately, we now learn that in fact they paused to commemorate the divine help they received". Thus, the *aition* surprises us with its place at the start of the section after that to which it really belongs (disguised initially by the standard opening ἔνθα). Again, Durbec 2008b: 64 points out that Idmon's death is undermined by the "mistaken identity" involved in the *aition* which closes the section. *Aitia* provide such fitting section ends because of their lasting reach from mytho-historical time into the world of the reader, and there is thus something particularly unsettling about this close.[170]

1.6.6 Self-contained runs of sections: the 'Catalogue of Heroes' and Phineus

Two passages in the poem are worthy of examination in isolation as super-sections made up of a large number of sub-sections. The first, which appears almost at the very start of the poem, is the Catalogue of Heroes (1. 23-233), which has been read as a promise of the sort of poetry to come: "The question of narrative order is clearly an issue of concern to the poet, as is evidenced by his decision to begin his narrative proper with the most ordered narrative form of all. At the same time that it introduces the action, the catalogue by virtue of its very position is a powerful statement of how exactly this narrative is to be told" (Clare 2002: 264-5).

---

[170] Another section end which has been read as failing (deliberately) to provide closure is the generalising statement near the end of the wedding scene (4. 1165-7; in theory it might provide a strong gnomic flourish), which, Byre 1997: 70-1 suggests, makes us all too aware of the lack of finality: Alcinous has still to announce his decision and, more broadly, they are not yet home.

The relationship between the Catalogue of Heroes and the Homeric Catalogue of Ships has been explored many times,[171] but little attention, relatively speaking, has been given to section markers. Händel 1954: 16 the only treatment which I have found with any real focus on this topic.[172] He is right to point out a general move away from the section markers used by Homer (and by Hesiod in the catalogue of Helen's suitors),[173] although it should be pointed out that Apollonius nods to his forebear in this respect (note οἵ τ' in 151),[174] but one of our poet's section markers in his catalogue might be thought to play more specifically with Homeric precedent. At 86, 90, 95 and 133 sections begin with a dative masculine article followed by δέ, a form reminiscent of the beginnings of the clauses which often end items in the Catalogue of Ships, providing the number of ships accompanying each captain or set of captains (e.g. τοῖς δὲ τριήκοντα γλαφυραὶ νέες ἐστιχόωντο (*Il.* 2.

[171] Generally useful (although not without the odd strange moment) is Carspecken 1952: 38-58. Particularly interesting are his suggestions (e.g. at 52 n. 45) of "conscious criticism of Homeric technique"; cf. Hunter 1993: 126-127 on the self-consciousness of the catalogue more generally. Carspecken shows that Apollonius has followed Homer in giving a geographical flow to his catalogue, engaging with and departing from his predecessor at various points (1952: 45; similarly Vian 1974: 4-6). Examples of a more modern approach to the relationship include Clauss's suggestion (1993: 30-1, building on earlier work), that the two 'halves' of the catalogue (headed by Orpheus and Heracles), contain different types of hero, cleverly reworking Homer's two catalogues (of Greeks and Trojans). See also Vian 1974: 7 for the suggestion that Apollonius' genealogical interest in his catalogue draws on the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*. Another type of archaic text of which the catalogue has reminded modern scholars is the episodic narrative on a single hero: Sistakou 2009b: 391 suggests that "in selecting a sole adventure for each hero (Heracles and Theseus) and turning it into a fragment, he alludes to the episodic structuring of [Heracleids and Theseids]".
[172] There is a hint in Hunter 1993: 126 n.98.
[173] See too Blumberg 1931: 10 who points to the more varied use of verbs in the first clauses of entries in Apollonius' catalogue than in Homer's.
[174] See above on Lycophron's engagement with the Catalogue of Ships for the usual form of Homer's section markers. Another area in which Apollonius nods to Homer (or archaic catalogues more generally) is his inclusion of some items with a sense of non-fulfilment. The absence of Theseus (101-4), attacked by Beye as "forced and inappropriate, and perhaps, therefore, self-conscious" (1969: 39) actually parallels a number of absentees in the Homeric catalogue, most famously Achilles (*Il.* 2.686-94), while the assertion that Meleager would have been second only to Heracles among the Argonauts if he had been a year older (195-8) recalls the ending of the list of Helen's suitors in the Hesiodic *Catalogue*.

516); 'and with them sailed thirty hollow ships'). What marked the final 'sub-section' of entries in Homer has become a main introduction in Apollonius. A look at the repeated section markers of the Catalogue of Heroes will also reveal the same sort of small-scale build-up of patterns as we have seen frequently in all of our poems (all but the third item in the table begin at least one set of consecutive sections):

ἤλυθε	35, 57, 65
οὐδέ	45, 49, 122, 224
καὶ μήν	69, 161
τῷ/ τοῖς/ τοῖσι δ'	86, 90, 95, 133

This passage begins to look like one of our poems in miniature,[175] which is not to say, of course, that it is felt as unintegrated into the rest of the poem.[176]

We have seen throughout the material examined so far that runs of sections, and the markers used to start or finish them, can perform expressive functions and the same can be said here, as the introduction of the heroes in successive sections imitates their gathering at Iolcus.[177] Clare's disagreement with this sort of

---

[175] The interest which Apollonius seems to take in building his catalogue complements nicely the importance he gives to it by its earlier position in the *Argonautica* than that of its Homeric equivalent. Cf. Clauss 1993: 26 on the popularity of catalogues in the Hellenistic world (a popularity which is also clear from the engagement which we have observed earlier in this chapter), making it an "auspicious starting point", rather than simply ticking a Homeric box.

[176] See e.g. Carspecken 1952: 48-9 on Orpheus as a link to the preceding Muses and Acastus and Argus (who finish the catalogue) as links to the expedition's origin (Acastus is Pelias' son) and its fulfilment (Argus built the Argo), with p. 52 on other details. Another form of integration with the rest of the *Argonautica* could be the continuation of catalogue-features beyond the catalogue itself. One might have expected the rejection of Atalanta (1. 769-73), for example, to form part of the catalogue proper (see above, n. 174, on non-fulfilment as a typical feature of catalogues), and its placement several hundred lines later calls our minds back to the Catalogue of Heroes.

[177] A point made by Carspecken 1952: 57. He argues that the early placement of the catalogue, which itself gives an impression of its being the necessary precursor to the voyage, and the "gradual

interpretation of the catalogue is unnecessarily pedantic (and in one point incorrect): "the Catalogue of Heroes is not introduced or even intended as a description of a physical act of congregation in the same way as the Homeric catalogues […]. It is not until the verse by means of which Apollonius rounds off the digression [… 1.228, ἠγερέθοντο] that a verb of congregation is used (but without the crew being described as coming together in any particular place), and it is not until after the catalogue is complete that we are given our first view of the Argonauts as a group entity, making their way from Iolcus to Pagasae" (2002: 176). ἠγερέθοντο appears at 86, and in this context the section opener ἤλυθε seems to describe the Argonauts' arrival, while the dative articles discussed above seem to mean 'after him/them', giving the impression that the men are coming in in dribs and drabs. Apollonius does not need to tell us explicitly where they accumulate because every reader will realise that it is in Iolcus (perhaps after a sort of promotional tour by Jason (cf. 1. 770 with Vian 1974: 4 n. 5)). We only see them as a group entity after the catalogue because they are only the recognisable group 'the Argonauts' once all (or the majority) are gathered.[178]

The other large and self-contained run of sections comes within the speech of Phineus in which he describes the future itinerary of the Argonauts (2. 311-407). Apollonius is famously indebted to geographical prose throughout the poem,[179] but

---

convergence of the heroes, singly and in small groups, upon the palace of Pelias", makes it "part of the action rather than a digression from it".

[178] Clare is right, however, to disagree with the labelling of Argus' and Acastus' later journey to Pagasae as "repetition, unnecessary and undesirable" (2002: 179, quoting Carspecken 1952: 57). μέλλον (227) is crucial in this point, even if the full story, i.e. that they set off later, is only revealed later. They obviously provide an exception to the gathering at Iolcus (one at least is already there).

[179] See e.g. Delage 1930, Meyer 2008; and above, pp. 84-6, on breaking up sections.

it is in this passage from the second book that this debt is demonstrated most clearly.[180] As Pearson 1938: 447 puts it "[the speech's] peculiarity is that it contains many sentences which might have come straight out of a periegesis". At pp. 447-59 he demonstrates this point by the comparison of several passages with relevant parts of geographical texts. The section markers used by the seer are of special interest for our purposes:[181]

317: πάμπρωτον

345: ἣν δὲ[182] [...] αὐτίκα

351: κεῖθεν

360: ἔστι δέ τις

369: κεῖθεν δὲ προτέρωσε

373: ἔνθα δέ

379: τοῖς δ' ἐπὶ [...] ἑξείης

382: τοὺς παραμειβόμενοι

392: προτέρωσε

395: ἑξείης δέ

399: ἔνθα δ'

Several of these section openers will remind us of Pseudo-Scymnus' 'functional' section marking, and of Pseudo-Scylax (discussed in the previous chapter).[183] Just

---

[180] See Scherer 2006: 135-222 for an extended discussion of the speech.

[181] Scherer's lists of connectives (2006: 174-5), whose contents are not limited to those used to begin sections or mini-sections, includes most of those which I provide.

[182] Cf. Nicander and Hippocrates, discussed above, pp. 30-1.

[183] It is not only prose that is evoked, of course. In addition to Nestor's speech, discussed in the next note, claims have been made for *Od.* 9, 11.92-137, 10. 488-540 and 12.37-141 (see Scherer 2006: 139; on p. 138 he calls Phineus' speech a 'borderline' catalogue). Especially well discussed is the connection to *Prometheus Bound* 700-876: see Scherer 2006: 140-1, with references to fuller treatments

like the catalogue, Phineus' speech has the feel of a sort of Hellenistic 'sectioned poem' in miniature. In addition to using subject matter which could easily form the basis for a whole poem, Apollonius also encourages us to view this passage as equivalent in some senses to his poetic creation by packing the speech full of familiar sectioning methods, at 2. 351, 353, 360, 369, 373 and 399. It is fitting that in this 'mini-Argonautica' we have much shorter sections than are usually found in the main run of the text, although this may also have something to do with the geographical subject matter: it is in voyaging passages, after all, that Apollonius tends to break up his sections into smaller units, and compare the sections of Pseudo-Scymnus and Pseudo-Scylax (on which see above, pp. 70-1 n. 120). Note, of course, that Homer provides a precedent for sharing compositional techniques between the narrator and the characters: even leaving aside the potentially special case of Odysseus' longest narrative speech, we might look at his (still reasonably long) speech to Eumaeus describing a feigned backstory: 'sections' begin with ἔνθα at 14. 240, 259, 271, 285, 292, 316, 321, 336, 345 and 353. The same adverb begins sections of Nestor's long speech in *Iliad* 11 (at 753 and 759, not really at 771; see also ἀλλ' ὅτε δή at 737).[184] Another speech in the *Argonautica* which uses sectioning

---

of the topic in his nn. 488-9. The *PV* parallel is especially compelling in light of Prometheus' repeated statements to the effect that he will tell Io everything which she wishes to know (e.g. at 786-7). We should compare Phineus' opening words (2. 311-16) in which he promises to tell everything which is allowed to be told, but regrets having revealed too much information in the past (see Scherer 2006: 152). Interestingly, an earlier version of this promise (609-10) is clearly in the background of the first lines of another prophetic text of our period, the *Alexandra* (cf. Hornblower 2015: 120). Notwithstanding the echo of the *PV*, perhaps the opening of Phineus' speech involves a playful reversal of the claims to completeness often made at the start of prose treatises

[184] Nestor's speech has been considered a model for Phineus': see Scherer 2006: 169 for a table of verbal overlaps between Phineus' and Nestor's speeches (including the aftermath of Nestor's speech).

techniques familiar from the rest of the poem (albeit to a much smaller extent) is that of Lycus (2. 774-810), which ends (at 806-10) with a focus on religious activity.[185]

1.6.7 Apollonius: conclusion

While we have certainly had to take account of Homer in this chapter more than we did any single 'model' author in the previous chapters, it is clear that Apollonius' sectioning is more than a rehashing or even simple updating of Homeric practice. The sorts of aesthetic use to which Apollonius puts his section markers, and some of the section markers in and of themselves (aetiological endings in particular) place him firmly amongst his contemporaries. Again, for a poem with such a strictly linear narrative, the *Argonautica i*s remarkably episodic, to the extent that a number of the sections (even setting aside the overtly self-contained runs discussed above) could almost be poetic entities in their own right (literally, in some cases, since around the time of the composition of the poem Theocritus was writing individual works on the Hylas and Amycus episodes). Apollonius gives the impression of building a collection of Argonautic ἄεθλοι, all of which are significant individually, but which naturally gain different kinds of significance when grouped together.

[185] And note that Lycus begins his narration of a past achievement of Heracles with ἔνθα δ' (2. 780; the previous lines have set up the context, but the actual achievement, a boxing victory against Titias preceding military success against the Mysians, starts here).

Part 1: Conclusion

Viewed as a group, our poems form a remarkably attractive advertisement for the benefits of enaging with sectioning. Significant overarching effects (such as the evocation of archaic verse in the *Alexandra* or that of prose in the *Periodos*) are achieved by the creation of patterns of section markers, while individual deviations from these patterns can lead to some striking effects; indeed, *Theriaca* 822-9 and *Alexipharmaca* 495-500 (see pp. 35-7, 23-4) are two of the most enjoyable passages of Nicander.

We are clearly not dealing with a one-size-fits-all aspect of composition: division into clearly marked sections is too fundamental a feature of such a wide variety of poems to have been implemented uniformly. Nonetheless, we have seen that overlaps between the poems are numerous, and where this seems to reflect a shared use of section marking to emphasise important literary concerns of the Hellenistic period (names and naming, for example), it can at least show us that sectioning is a compositional feature of similar *importance* to our array of authors.

There have been hints throughout these chapters that ancient readers will have considered sectioning and section marking well worth their attention, and another indication that this will have been the case comes in the continuation of the practice by later authors. Before we move on to Part 2, and the arrangement of sections, it will be worth looking at one example of a similar approach to section marking in a later poem.

One of the most easily-recognisable aspects of the structure of *De Rerum Natura* 1 is the repetitive marking of sub-sections within Lucretius' large-scale

arguments. The sub-sections of the first four of these arguments are marked as follows:[186]

1. 'Nothing comes into being out of nothing' (149-214): *nam* (159), *praeterea* (174), *porro* (184), *huc accredit uti* (192), *denique* (199), *postremo* (208).

2. 'Nothing is destroyed into nothing' (215-64): *nam* (217), *praeterea* (225), *denique* (238), *postremo* (250).

3. 'The existence of the invisible' (265-328): *principio* (271), *tum porro* (298), *denique* (305), *quin etiam* (311), *postremo* (322).

4. 'The existence of void' (329-417): n.a. (335), *praeterea* (346), *denique* (358), n.a (370), *postremo* (384).

Naturally the order of the openings is varied to an extent, and some markers are more common than others, but the point to emphasise is that *postremo* begins all four final sections. The other common markers appear frequently throughout the rest of the book, but we are made to wait for another final sub-section beginning with *postremo* until 998:[187]

> postremo ante oculos res rem finire videtur;
> aer dissaepit collis atque aera montes,
> terra mare et contra mare terras terminat omnis;
> omne quidem vero nihil est quod finiat extra.
> (998-1001)

[186] The structural breakdown and the summaries of the arguments are those of Sedley 1997; his table comes at pp. 38-40. The same table, with slightly more detail, is printed again at Sedley 1998: 188-9. There are sometimes a few preliminary or summary lines either side of the groups of sub-sections.
[187] The word appears only once elsewhere in the book, at 890, but does not even begin a sentence there.

> Finally, before our eyes one thing is seen to bound another. Air separates hills and mountains separate air. The land provides an end-point for the sea, and the sea provides an end-point for all land. But assuredly there is nothing beyond to provide an end to the universe.

If we allow that the use of *postremo* to begin final sub-sections in the first four large-scale arguments arouses in readers the expectation that this pattern may continue,[188] it is noteworthy that our long wait for finality ends with a passage which precisely denies spatial finality to the universe. Lucretius shows himself to be mindful of this irony by the inclusion of an abundance of words related to 'ending' in lines 998-1001.[189] Here then, we can see a successor to the Hellenistic interaction of section marking and content in the Golden Age of Latin literature.

---

[188] A natural expectation in light of the meaning of *postremo*. It should be noted that Gutiérrez Galindo's 1989 attempt to cast *postremo* as 'less final' than *demum* rests solely on *DRN* 5. 1056, where one *postremo* precedes another at 1078 (p. 265). But 1056's *postremo* does begin a final section, which happens itself to incorporate a list whose final grouping (birds) is also introduced by the word.

[189] It is worth noting that the position of 998-1001 has been suspected. See Bailey 1947: 771: the lines have been placed after 983 and after 1007. Bailey himself prefers their current position on account of its preservation of the pattern in which *postremo* is used to end sequences of argument; he is also of the opinion that the lines work logically as a conclusion to their argument (Deufert also keeps the lines here, but makes no mention of them in his 2018 critical commentary). More recently, a placement after 967 has been suggested by Morenval 2015: 227-8. If the placement of the lines after 983 were accepted (as e.g. by Munro 1928: 108) we would have a run of sub-sections beginning *praeterea* (968), *postremo* (998), *praeterea* (984), and clearly this would work well with the content: just as any expected end to the universe will turn out not to exist, so too does this apparent end of the argument subvert our expectations. Even if we were to keep the lines in the position in which they were transmitted, a lack of finality might still be discerned as a result of the subsequent move into the closely-related argument concerning the infinity of matter. After all, this second argument begins with a point directly tied to the infinity of the universe, that void and matter are by nature bounded by each other *ut sic alternis infinita omnia reddat*; 1011 (I take 1002-7 as a recapitulation of the preceding group of sub-sections (Sedley's omission of these lines from his table suggests that his view is the same, and *igitur* seems to point in this direction), albeit one which introduces a new (and striking) image of lightning journeying endlessly through space. Its appearance after 998-1001 need not indicate any lack of finality in those lines (cf. e.g. 1. 398-417, 5. 1087-90)). In either case, Lucretius' game would seem to have caught somebody out. In one scenario, an early editor (so Munro 1928: 108), and subsequently Bailey, will have misunderstood that the pattern of beginning final sub-sections with *postremo* has been playfully subverted to emphasise the idea of a lack of finality expressed in the text. In the other, Munro, who is uncomfortable with the sequence of argument, will have misunderstood that Lucretius is deliberately placing at the end of this argument a sub-section which is bound to raise questions about the idea of finality: is it so very surprising that these questions might include what constitutes a logically appropriate end to an argument?

Examples of later successors to Hellenistic sectioning, from the Imperial period, come in the form of Oppian, whose *Halieutica* shares section markes with some of our poems (and, interestingly, is closer to Lycophron and Apollonius than to the otherwise more similar Nicander; see above, p. 35 n. 47), and Dionysius Periegetes, whom Lightfoot 2008 has shown to imitate Hellenistic approaches to catalogue writing (see especially pp. 20-1, where she compares the technique of Dionysius to that of Aratus and Hermesianax). It is encouraging to see that later ancient readers seem to have considered sectioning an important aspect of Hellenistic poetry and sought to emulate it.

Part 2: Connecting, Arranging, 'Collecting' Sections

Introductory Remarks

The central argument of this thesis is that 'sectioning' is a fundamental basic feature of the poems, and that recognising it as such enables us better to appreciate their potential appeal to contemporary readers. In Part 1, we have examined the mechanics of marking sections, and the sheer amount of material for discussion helps to demonstrate the first half of the argument. We have begun, too, to see why contemporary readers might have enjoyed prominent section marking, which enables the poets to connect themselves to and engage with other authors and genres, and provides possibilities for expressive patterns of composition and specific moments of aesthetic interest. Part 2 moves beyond section marking *per se* to continue and expand both halves of the argument. Through clear and repeated section marking, the poets seem to be encouraging us to view sections as important entities in their own right. As we have seen, this is explicitly the case in the *Periodos*, where Pseudo-Scymnus tells us that a valid way of engaging with his text is simply to find and learn from one particular section (see above, p. 68). The extent to which sections feel like separable entities varies between and within poems: at one extreme is the *Alexipharmaca*, where one might get the impression that any section could have appeared in more or less any order (although Effe 1974: 62-5 demonstrates that some patterns can be found), but even in the *Argonautica*, which

is strictly speaking a linear narrative, and which presents 'formally continuous' sections, we find a number episodes which elsewhere constitute full poems (such as 'Hylas' and Theoc. 13: see below, p. 213).[190]

Once we view the sections of the poems as significant structural units, a number of questions present themselves: how do the poets conceive of these units? How do they connect and arrange them? Is there a tension between the oneness of the poems and the multiplicity of the basic atoms which make them up? As I suggest some possible answers to these questions over the course of the next few chapters, we shall continue to see the importance of sectioning as a compositional feature of the poems. Moreover, it will become clear that by writing sectioned works the poets are placing themselves firmly in the mainstream of Hellenistic literary culture: this can help to explain the potential contemporary appeal of a group of poems whose modern reputation could hardly be described as uniformly positive.

Recognising the importance of sectioning allows us to think of our poems in two ways:

1.) Formally single entities, articulated into sub-units.
2.) Numerous smaller items brought together into a grouping, or 'collection', and thereby granted new significance.

Nor, I would suggest, is this double aspect a modern overthinking: there is good reason to believe that contemporary readers, and even the poets themselves, may

---

[190] See Hutchinson 2008: 208-10 on the distinction between "formally continuous" and "formally discontinuous" works. His discussion is especially important for our purposes, since it emphasises the relation of poems which are made up of "a set of parallel entities" to other forms of literary 'collecting', namely poetry books and anthologies. See below on the 'double aspect' of our poems.

have been disposed to look at the texts through both lenses.[191] On the one hand, much thought was evidently given to the organisation of multiplicities of material within single works, and on the other, the Hellenistic Period was one in which the gathering and organisation of multiple items into various sorts of 'collection' was a popular strand of literary activity (and itself a part of a broader trend, taking in the visual arts and more). We shall see in Part 2b that the poets themselves (and other Hellenistic authors) encourage us to connect their activity with that of other literary 'collectors', and that reading the poems as 'collections' of 'textual items' (i.e. their sections) yields attractive results.

The chapters of Part 2a will look at the poems through the first suggested lens, that is as 'formally single entities, articulated into sub-units'. Here, the texts will be brought together into a single discussion, which will be relatively brief: questions of internal structure and the tension between unity and variety in Hellenistic poetry have already received a reasonable amount of scholarly attention. Nevertheless, our examination of sectioning thus far will enable some different perspectives on the topic. Then, in Part 2b, we shall consider the poems as 'collections', looking at the ways in which the poets relate their gathering of source material to their sectioned composition and give the impression of collecting 'literary items', as if into an anthology, or even a library.

---

[191] And cf. n. 190, for another modern observation of the similarity of sectioned poems and other literary collections. See also below, 163 n. 242, for a suggestion even of the 'formally continuous' *Argonautica* as interacting with another form of literary collection, and for a similar suggestion concerning Nicander.

Part 2a: Organising Sectioned Poems

Context and Introductory Remarks

While we shall see that it is attractive to think of our poems as collections of multiple items, and even that the poets may be encouraging us to do so, they are, strictly speaking, single entities, albeit divided clearly into multiple sections, as we have seen in Part 1. As such, they will inevitably have aroused interest in contemporary readers. After all, the organisation of multiple parts within single works was evidently much discussed in the Hellenistic Period.

Most strikingly, Polybius often muses on the proper order and treatment of the numerous parts of his text in relation to the whole. He makes an explicit statement of the importance of arrangement at 5. 31. 6-7:[192]

> ἐπεὶ γὰρ οὐ τινά, τὰ δὲ παρὰ πᾶσι γεγονότα γράφειν προῃρήμεθα, καὶ σχεδὸν ὡς εἰπεῖν μεγίστῃ τῶν προγεγονότων ἐπιβολῇ κεχρήμεθα τῆς ἱστορίας, καθάπερ καὶ πρότερόν που δεδηλώκαμεν, δέον ἂν εἴη μεγίστην ἡμᾶς ποιεῖσθαι πρόνοιαν καὶ τοῦ χειρισμοῦ καὶ τῆς οἰκονομίας, ἵνα καὶ κατὰ μέρος καὶ καθόλου σαφὲς τὸ σύνταγμα γίνηται τῆς πραγματείας.
>
> For since I have chosen to write not of some things but of what happened among everyone, and have made more or less the greatest approach to history, so to speak, compared with my predecessors, as I have already shown, I think, it will be necessary for me to give the greatest forethought to both treatment and arrangement,[193] so that the constitution of my work is clear both in its parts and as a whole.

Again and again throughout the *Histories* Polybius explains and defends his decisions to digress and deviate from his initial plan. At 1. 12. 5-9 he offers a catch-

[192] At 5. 31. 2-5 he has defended his shift of focus from Europe to Asia with reference to his overall plan, and said that he thinks it important not yet to 'weave together' (συμπλέκειν) the histories of different parts of the world. In 5. 32 he will go on to discuss the importance of beginnings.

[193] For οἰκονομία as 'arrangement' here and in Diod. Sic. 5. 1 (quoted immediately below), see LSJ I 3.

all apology for future sketches of previous history (in contravention of his planned arrangement), but apparently he is concerned that this will not satisfy readers who are invested in his usual arrangement of material, and gives us many further apologies on a similar theme as the work goes on (of which the following are only a sample):[194]

> ὑπὲρ ὧν δοκεῖ μοι χρήσιμον εἶναι κεφαλαιώδη μὲν ποιήσασθαι τὴν ἐξήγησιν, ἵνα τὸ τῆς προκατασκευῆς οἰκεῖον συσσώσωμεν κατὰ τὴν ἐξ ἀρχῆς πρόθεσιν, ἀναδραμεῖν δὲ τοῖς χρόνοις ἐπὶ τὴν ἀρχήν, ἐξ ὅτου κατέσχον οἱ προειρημένοι τὴν χώραν· ἡγοῦμαι γὰρ τὴν περὶ αὐτῶν ἱστορίαν οὐ μόνον ἀξίαν εἶναι γνώσεως καὶ μνήμης, ἀλλὰ καὶ τελέως ἀναγκαίαν χάριν τοῦ μαθεῖν τίσι μετὰ ταῦτα πιστεύσας ἀνδράσι καὶ τόποις Ἀννίβας ἐπεβάλετο καταλύειν τὴν Ῥωμαίων δυναστείαν.
> 2. 14. 1-2
>
> About which [the war between the Carthaginians and the Italian Celts] it seems to me useful to make a summary account, so that I may keep properly to what fits my original plan as laid out in the preface from the beginning, but to go back in time to the starting point from which the aforementioned people held the land. For I think that a history of these people is not only worthy of knowledge and remembrance, but also completely necessary for the sake of learning of the men and places on which Hannibal relied as he devoted himself to overthrowing Roman power.
>
> ἴσως δέ τινες ἐπαπορήσουσι πῶς ἡμεῖς τὰς ἄλλας πράξεις ἁπάσας κατ᾽ ἐνιαυτὸν γράφοντες τὰς καταλλήλους περὶ μόνων τῶν κατ᾽ Αἴγυπτον ἐν καιρῷ τῷ νῦν ἐκ πλείονος χρόνου πεποιήμεθα τὴν ἐξήγησιν. ἡμεῖς δὲ τοῦτο πεποιήκαμεν διά τινας τοιαύτας αἰτίας […]
> 14. 12. 1-2
>
> And perhaps people will wonder why, having written of all the other events in any given year state by state, in the case of events in Egypt alone I have

[194] Other relevant passages in Polybius: 1. 13 .6-9 (defending the decision to attach two introductory books of summary: τοῖς τε φιλομαθοῦσιν ἐκ τῆς τοιαύτης οἰκονομίας εὐμαθῆ καὶ ῥᾳδίαν ἐπὶ τὰ μέλλοντα ῥηθήσεσθαι παρασκευάσομεν τὴν ἔφοδον (‘from such an arrangement I shall make the approach to what is to be said later intelligible and easy for those who love learning’)), 3. 1-5 (an extended recapitulation of his original plan), Book 6 preface (a discussion of the right place in the work for describing the Roman constitution), and several defences for deviations from the proper order of the work, e.g. at 1 .12. 5-9 (apology for future digressions in the work), 2. 7. 12, 2. 71. 1-2, 3. 118. 10-12 (in the last two cases accompanied by references back to the original plan for the work).

> now at the present moment made an account going back a huge amount of time. I have done so for the following reasons […]

These passages can tell us two things. First, however strong a sense of arrangement is promised or expected in a work, authors will be able to make specific alterations for effect. In the first passage, Polybius uses two defences: that, in actual fact, he is helping us to understand his primary (and more properly arranged) material about the Second Punic War by deviating slightly from his planned arrangement, but also that his digression is interesting in and of itself. Secondly, Polybius expects criticism for his failure to keep rigidly to his plan (note the phrasing of the second passage: ἴσως δέ τινες ἐπαπορήσουσι). Certainly in the prologue of the *Aitia* (length, subject matter) and in *Iambus* 13 (*polyeideia*) Callimachus gives the impression of the Hellenistic period as one in which at least some readers held rather strong opinions about works of literature, and Polybius' insistent focus on the issue of arrangement in his work, which far surpasses anything similar in the older extant historians, suggests that he thought it an important concern of his contemporaries. Indeed, this importance may be reflected in the continued prominence of self-consciousness about arrangement in historiography: in the next century Diodorus Siculus strikes a similar tone, this time in the context of historiography in general rather than with reference to his particular plan: πάντων μὲν τῶν ἐν ταῖς ἀναγραφαῖς χρησίμων προνοητέον τοὺς ἱστορίαν συνταττομένους, μάλιστα δὲ τῆς κατὰ μέρος οἰκονομίας (5. 1. 1; 'those who compose a history are to give forethought to all things useful for their work, and particularly to the arrangement of its individual parts').[195]

[195] Note too the frequent justification for cutting short discussions of material with the participial phrase στοχαζόμενοι [/-οις] τῆς συμμετρίας ('striving for due proportion'), at 1 .8. 10, 1. 9. 4, 1. 29. 6, 4. 5. 4, 4. 68. 6, 6. 1. 3 and, most interestingly for our purposes, at 1. 41. 10, where it appears as a

If we move beyond historiography, we can infer from developments in the systematisation of material in other genres that the explicit discussions in Polybius and Diodorus reflect a broader literary concern. The development of organisational methods in lexicography, for example, is particularly visible to us: see Hatzimichali 2013: 75-8 on the move from from Philitas' *Ataktoi Glossai* to Zenodotus' alphabetical *Glossai* to the more sophisticated arrangement of Callimachus' *Ethnikai Onomasiai*, and beyond into the work of Aristophanes of Byzantium.[196] Again, in the field of paradoxography, Antigonus of Carystus seems to have replaced Callimachus' geographical arrangement of marvels (called Θαυμάτων τῶν εἰς ἅπασαν τὴν γῆν κατὰ τόπους ὄντων συναγωγή, 'Collection of wonders in the whole world, organised by place' by the Suda) with a thematic one (see Schepens and Delcroix 1996: 394-9). What we have of other genres suggests a similar direction of travel.[197]

---

defence for splitting Book 1 into two parts: ἐπεὶ δὲ τὴν βίβλον ταύτην διὰ τὸ μέγεθος εἰς δύο μέρη διῃρήκαμεν, στοχαζόμενοι τῆς συμμετρίας [...] ('and since we have separated this book into two parts on account of its size, striving for due proportion [...]').

[196] See further Lightfoot 2017: 126-7: "from [Aristophanes'] περὶ τῶν ὑποπτευομένων μὴ εἰρῆσθαι τοῖς παλαιοῖς ("words supposed not to have been in use among the ancients"), ὀνόματα ἡλικιῶν ("words denoting times of life") and περὶ συγγενικῶν ὀνομάτων ("on terms for relationships"), we gain a sense how related terms are grouped together, systematised and differentiated, with a number of literary and dialectal forms cited in the course of the discussion". On the meaning of Philitas' title, and whether the author himself gave it to his work, see Dettori 2000: 21-2 n. 54 (a survey of suggestions put forward by others), 27 (Dettori's own view).

[197] See Hatzmichali 2013: 73-5 on the epitome of Aristotle's *Historia Animalium* by Aristophanes of Byzantium, where information which was originally systematised by *differentiae* is rearranged into sections concerning individual animals. Again, by the time of Pliny the Elder's *NH* 37, Theophrastus' organisation by differences in the qualities of stones in his *De Lapidibus* has become more friendly to the layman with arrangements first by colour and then alphabetically. See also Rawson 1978 for a discussion of the vastly increased systematisation of Roman prose from the second century to the first BC, which she casts as evidence of Greek influence on Roman thought. Arrangements of varying degrees of sophistication can be found in the so-called *Laterculi Alexandrini* (P.Berol. 13044r, second/first century BC: a number of catalogues): the lists of mountains and rivers, for example, are arranged geographically, in different directions, while the fountains are arranged alphabetically, and the 'greatest islands' by no discernible principle, at first glance at least (Legras 1994: 167-9). Pajón Leyra 2014 has ingeniously shown that the order of this group allows for the creation of a run of iambic trimeters.

Bound up with the connection and arrangement of multiple entities within a formally single whole is the notion of unity, or at least coherence. Aristotle's *Poetics* and the prologue of the *Aitia* are frequently discussed in relation to unity and Hellenistic poetry, but other hints suggest that these formed part of a far wider discourse.[198]

[198] Unity, or at least internal coherence, in works of literature seems to have been discussed at least since Plato, as we may infer from *Phaedr.* 268d, where Phaedrus says that the art of tragedy lies in τὴν τούτων σύστασιν πρέπουσαν ἀλλήλοις τε καὶ τῷ ὅλῳ συνισταμένην ('the fitting combination of these things [various kinds of speeches] so that they cohere with each other and with the whole'). On unity in Hellenistic epic see Heath 1989: 56-60 and 65-7 (the second passage concerning the *Argonautica* specifically). Hunter 1993: 190-5 brings together the *Poetics*, the *Aetia*-prologue and the *Argonautica*. Moving beyond these texts, see Walbank 1972: 67 on unity as an important component of literary works after Aristotle as reflected in historiography. Note also the claim of *Rh. Al.* 1436a 29 (Fourth Century BC) that χρὴ τάττειν τοὺς λόγους σωματοειδῶς ('one should arrange speeches with internal coherence'), and cf. Walbank 1975: 197-9 on the terms συμπλοκή ('a weaving together') and σωματοειδής ('unified', 'coherent') in Polybius. It has even been thought that the *Poetics* was not well read in the Hellenistic period (see Lucas 1968: xxii-xxiii), but see Kyriakou 1995: 142 n. 46, with bibliography, on the likelihood that the *Poetics* was held in the Alexandrian library. It is possible that Pseudo-Scymnus demonstrates knowledge of the work when he tells us that Marseille was founded one hundred and twenty years before the (completely unrelated) battle of Salamis (ἐν τῇ Λιγυστικῇ δὲ ταύτην ἔκτισαν/ πρὸ τῆς μάχης τῆς ἐν Σαλαμῖνι γενομένης/ἔτεσιν πρότερον, ὥς φασιν, ἑκατὸν εἴκοσι; 211-13 (the passage is quoted in its fuller context below, p. 143)). We may be reminded here of Aristotle's distinction between epic and history (*Poetics* 1459a 19-29). Epicists, he tells us, should avoid imitating historians, who focus not on a single action but a single time period and connect events by time despite a lack of causality: ὥσπερ γὰρ κατὰ τοὺς αὐτοὺς χρόνους ἥ τ' ἐν Σαλαμῖνι ἐγένετο ναυμαχία καὶ ἡ ἐν Σικελίᾳ Καρχηδονίων μάχη οὐδὲν πρὸς τὸ αὐτὸ συντείνουσαι τέλος, οὕτω καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἐφεξῆς χρόνοις ἐνίοτε γίνεται θάτερον μετὰ θάτερον, ἐξ ὧν ἓν οὐδὲν γίνεται τέλος ('For just as there was a sea-battle at Salamis at the same time as the battle of the Carthaginians in Sicily [Himera], not at all tending to the same end, so too sometimes in continuous time-periods one thing happens after another, of which there is no one end'). Although Pseudo-Scymnus is not writing epic, we may feel that he is being deliberately provocative. The date of the foundation of Marseille was evidently disputed (see Marcotte 2002: 169), and it is possible, or even probable, that the relative dating of this event and the battle of Salamis is taken directly from Timaeus, whom Pseudo-Scymnus credits as the source of his 'Marseille section' (214). Nonetheless, given the poet's clear interest in connecting sections and sub-sections temporally even where his material does not necessarily require it (on which see below, 142-146), and in light of the poem's place as a very prosaic sort of verse (note that Aristotle would not consider the *Periodos* to be poetry at all, given his position on the work of Empedocles at 1447b 18-19), might it be tempting to think that Pseudo-Scymnus, self-avowedly following the temporally-organised historical poem of Apollodorus (see below, p. 145 nn. 226-7), is aware of recent debate about poetry and the non-causal connection of information?

2.1 Large-Scale Arrangement

2.1.1 Overall design

We have seen in previous chapters that most of our poets look to archaic verse as models in their composition of sectioned poems, and a useful starting point in thinking about the large-scale arrangement of material might be to compare the overall designs of the *Phaenomena* and *Theriaca* to that of Hesiod's *Works* and *Days* (comparisons which will have been natural to contemporary readers).[199] On the face of it, both poems follow a nominally bipartite *WD*.[200] Aratus broadly categorises his material into two super-sections, the first concerning astronomy and the second concerning meteorology, while Nicander presents us with information pertaining to snakes in the first 'half' of the *Theriaca* and pertaining to other dangerous creatures in the second.[201]

In both the *WD* and its didactic successors, of course, the real picture is more complicated.[202] Both the astronomical material and the weather signs in the

---

[199] Comparisons of Aratus to Hesiod were made as early as Callimachus, whose claim that the ἄεισμα and the τρόπος are Hesiod's (*Ep*. 27 Pf.) is thought to refer at least in part to the *WD* (see Van Noorden 2015: 172-3, with n. 31.). Nicander invites his readers to compare him to Hesiod by mentioning his didactic forerunner at the beginning of the *Theriaca* (Ἀσκραῖος […] Ἡσίοδος; 11-12), even if the specific reference is not to the *WD*. In fact, according to the scholiast, the claim that various creatures have their origins in the blood of the Titans can be found nowhere in Hesiod: ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι ψεύδεται ὁ Νίκανδρος ἐνταῦθα· οὐδαμοῦ γὰρ τοῦτο εἶπεν ἐν τοῖς πραττομένοις (Σ *Ther*. 12a; 'it is to be observed that Nicander is lying here, for he [Hesiod] says this nowhere in his works').

[200] Fakas, whose 2001 monograph is the most comprehensive treatment of the relationship between the *Phaenomena* and Hesiod, works on the assumption of a bipartite *WD* (67). We shall see below that the structure of the poem is a little more complicated in truth, but the important point here is that it will have been thought of to some extent as a bipartite work, as suggested by the title (on which see West 1978: 136; as he puts it, "it is hard to imagine that it was called anything but Ἔργα καὶ Ἡμέραι in Callimachus' *Pinakes*").

[201] See Overduin 2014b: 49-52 for a more extended discussion of the *Theriaca*'s "bipartition".

[202] A useful table showing various scholars' attempts at dividing the *WD* into constituent parts (of which, for example, all of the 'Ages of Man' or all of the 'Days' would count as one) can be found at Nicolai 1964: 202. The smallest number is Waltz's seven, while Nicolai himself provides the highest

Phaenomena are grouped into a few different runs of sections: Kidd 1997: 5-7, for example, presents three main groupings (the constellations (19-461), the passage of time observable from the heavens (462-757) and the 'Weather Signs' (758-1141)), subdividing each into several smaller units. In addition to breaking up the 'Weather Signs' into the sections concerning the Sun, the Moon and so on, a stronger division might be made in Kidd's second super-section, between the 'Circles of Heaven' (462-558) and the 'Zodiac' (559-732), with 733-57 forming an important link between the astronomical material and the 'Weather Signs' (there are, for example, references forward to the Sun and Moon (e.g. 753, 733), and back to the zodiac (740)).[203] Again, the *Theriaca*'s two 'halves' are themselves divided into sections concerning dangerous creatures and sections concerning cures, which come grouped together at the end of each 'half' (493-714, 837-958). Furthermore, the creatures in the second 'half' are broken down into a number of groupings, namely spiders (715-68), scorpions (769-804) and others (805-36).[204] Certainly we should not see the structures of the *Phaenomena* and the *Theriaca* as unoriginal recreations of that of the *WD* –both poems show a more marked internal coherence than Hesiod's, for example–[205] but an engagement with archaic sectioned verse is clear.[206] A final

---

total with seventeen, not including the 'Days', which he regards as spurious (p. 143). More recently Thalmann 1984: 57-8, for example, has argued for a more limited tripartite structure of exhortation (1-326), advice (327-764) and the Days (726-828). Clauss 2006: 162 even attempts to produce a truly bipartite structure with the following division: "a protreptic to Perses and unjust Kings (11-380) followed by a loosely connected series of practical suggestions (381-828)".

[203] See Kidd 1997: 425 on what he considers the oft-committed "error" of starting the weather signs at 733.

[204] See Effe 1974: 54-62 for a detailed discussion of the poem's structure.

[205] The *Theriaca*'s variety comes in the limited form of different groupings of animals. The apparently greater diversity of the two main groupings of sections in the *Phaenomena* is softened somewhat by the linking passage at 733-57 (and cf. Kidd 1997: 8: "the structure of the poem is more clearly organised [than that of the *WD*]").

[206] As we saw in Part 1, pp. 43-4, 45, the influence of other sectioned verse of the archaic period is discernible in both poets.

similarity worth mentioning is the tendency for the shortening of groupings and the sections within them as the works progress. The 'Days' (765-828) form a relatively short grouping in the context of the *WD*, and the many 'bitty' sections are far shorter than the sections of the 'Ages of Man' or the 'Farmer's Year': no section in the 'Days' is as long as ten lines, and most are only three or four, whereas the 'Ages of Man' fills almost one hundred lines (109-201) with only five sections, and in the 'Farmer's Year' (383-617) the section concerning the month Lenaion (504-64) is almost as long as all the 'Days' put together. Similarly, the astronomical 'half' of the *Phaenomena* takes up a great deal more space than the 'Weather Signs', and this second 'half' is comprised of a large number of smaller sections than those which appear earlier in the poem. After astronomical groupings such as the 'Circles of Heaven' (462-8, 469-79, 480-500, 501-10, 511-24, 525-44) and the 'Zodiac' (545-68, 569-89, 590-5, 596-606, 607-33, 634-64, 665-82, 683-92, 693-711,[207] 712-23, 724-32), we find passages such as the following (I mark out the sections in the text and translation):[208]

> σκέπτεο δ', εἴ κέ τοι αὐγαὶ ὑπείκωσ' ἠελίοιο,
> αὐτὸν ἐς ἠέλιον, τοῦ γὰρ σκοπαί εἰσιν ἄρισται,
> εἴ τί που ἤ οἱ ἔρευθος ἐπιτρέχει, οἷά τε πολλὰ
> ἑλκομένων νεφέων ἐρυθαίνεται ἄλλοθεν ἄλλα,
> ἢ εἴ που μελανεῖ· καί τοι τὰ μὲν ὕδατος ἔστω
> σήματα μέλλοντος, τὰ δ' ἐρεύθεα πάντ' ἀνέμοιο.
> | εἴ γε μὲν ἀμφοτέροις ἄμυδις κεχρωσμένος εἴη,
> καί κεν ὕδωρ φορέοι καὶ ὑπηνέμιος τανύοιτο.
> | εἰ δέ οἱ ἢ ἀνιόντος ἢ αὐτίκα δυομένοιο
> ἀκτῖνες συνίωσι καὶ ἀμφ' ἑνὶ πεπλήθωσιν,
> ἤ ποτε καὶ νεφέων πεπιεσμένος ἢ ὅ γ' ἐς ἠῶ
> ἔρχηται παρὰ νυκτὸς ἢ ἐξ ἠοῦς ἐπὶ νύκτα,
> ὕδατί κεν κατιόντι παρατρέχοι ἤματα κεῖνα.

---

[207] See above, pp. 45-8.
[208] Cf. 788-95, quoted above, pp. 31-2.

> ❙ μηδ’ ὅτε οἱ ὀλίγη νεφέλη πάρος ἀντέλλησιν,
> τὴν δὲ μέτ’ ἀκτίνων κεχρημένος αὐτὸς ἀερθῇ,
> ἀμνηστεῖν ὑετοῖο. ❙ πολὺς δ’ ὅτε οἱ πέρι κύκλος
> οἷον τηκομένῳ ἐναλίγκιος εὐρύνηται
> πρῶτον ἀνερχομένοιο καὶ ἂψ ἐπὶ μεῖον ἴῃσιν,
> εὔδιός κε φέροιτο, καὶ εἴ ποτε χείματος ὥρῃ
> ὠχρήσῃ κατιών.
> (832-51)

> And look, if the Sun’s rays yield to you, at the Sun itself, for looking at *this* is best, to see if either, perhaps, a redness runs across it, as at many other times it is reddened here and there as clouds are dragged across it, or if, perhaps, it is black. Let the latter be a sign of coming rain, and all rednesses a sign of wind. ❙ If it is coloured with both together it will both bring rain and be stretched out full of wind. ❙ And if at its rising or subsequent setting its rays travel together and fill up the area around one place, or if it is ever squeezed by clouds when it comes to dawn from night or from dawn to night, those days will run by with down-pouring rain. ❙ When a small cloud comes up before it, and it itself rises wanting in rays, be not heedless of rain. ❙ And when a great circle around it broadens as if melting when it is first rising, and then goes back to a smaller size, the Sun should travel along in fair weather; this is the same if ever in the season of winter it becomes pale on its downward path.

Again, the breaking up of the shorter second ‘half’ of the *Theriaca* into shorter runs of sections coincides with a shortening of the sections themselves. In the third grouping of the second ‘half’ (805-36; other animals) we find sections concerning bees (805-10), insects (811-16, including the shrew), lizards (817-21), the moray eel (822-7) and the sting-ray (828-36, with a mention of the sea-snake). Compare the sections dealing with snakes in the first ‘half’ of the poem: 145-56 (seps), 157-208 (asp), 209-57 (viper), 258-81 (cerastes), 282-319 (haemorrhois), 320-33 (sepedon), 334-58 (dipsas), 359-71 (chersydrus), 372-83 (amphisbaena), 384-95 (scytale), 396-410 (‘King of Snakes’), 411-37 (dryinas), 438-57 (‘Dragon’), 458-82 (cenchrines).

A related tendency, and one which the *Phaenomena* and *Theriaca* share with other Hellenistic literature, is a movement from clearer groupings to greater

miscellaneity as the works go on.[209] The logical, spatial arrangement of Aratus' astronomical material (on which see further below, pp. 139-40) gives way to a hotchpotch of weather signs, which themselves move from groupings based on the celestial body from which signs can be inferred (the Sun (778-818), the Moon (819-91) and the Manger (892-908)) to a more random-feeling collection of, it seems, any signs of particular weather types (mostly storms) which struck the mind of the author. At the end of the 'Weather Signs' we find the following passage, which demonstrates the extent to which an impression of miscellaneity has developed:

> ἀλλὰ γὰρ οὐδὲ μύες, τετριγότες εἴ ποτε μᾶλλον
> εὔδιοι ἐσκίρτησαν ἐοικότες ὀρχηθμοῖσιν,
> ἄσκεπτοι ἐγένοντο παλαιοτέροις ἀνθρώποις,
> οὐδὲ κύνες· καὶ γάρ τε κύων ὠρύξατο ποσσὶν
> ἀμφοτέροις χειμῶνος ἐπερχομένοιο δοκεύων,
> κἀκεῖνοι χειμῶνα μύες τότε μαντεύονται.
> καὶ μὴν ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ καρκίνος ᾤχετο χέρσον
> χειμῶνος μέλλοντος, ἐπαΐσσεσθαι ὁδοῖο.
> καὶ μύες ἡμέριοι ποσσὶ στιβάδα στρωφῶντες

[209] Outside of poetry, we might think for example of the *Epistle to the Hebrews* (apparently well-regarded as a literary document: see Origen ap. Eus. *Hist. eccl.* 6. 25. 11-12), in which the first twelve chapters develop the theme of Jesus' central importance before the thirteenth turns to miscellaneous instructions: ἡ φιλαδελφία μενέτω. τῆς φιλοξενίας μὴ ἐπιλανθάνεσθε, διὰ ταύτης γὰρ ἔλαθόν τινες ξενίσαντες ἀγγέλους. μιμνῄσκεσθε τῶν δεσμίων ὡς συνδεδεμένοι, τῶν κακουχουμένων ὡς καὶ αὐτοὶ ὄντες ἐν σώματι. τίμιος ὁ γάμος ἐν πᾶσιν καὶ ἡ κοίτη ἀμίαντος, πόρνους γὰρ καὶ μοιχοὺς κρινεῖ ὁ θεός […] (13. 1-4; 'Let brotherly love remain. Do not neglect the giving of hospitality to strangers, for through this some have unknowingly given hospitality to angels. Remember the bound as though bound with them, and the wronged as though you yourselves were in their body. Marriage is to be honoured among all men, and the marital bed is to be undefiled, for God will judge fornicators and adulterers'). A similar move in a pre-Hellenistic text can be found in the Hippocratic *Diseases of Women* 1, where there are five broad groupings of sections related to female ailments (with only a very few outliers), before a final grouping (74-109) of treatments for assorted conditions, some of which are not even specific to women (e.g. 102: eye medicine). See Potter 2018: 3-6 for a useful table of all the sections in the work within their groupings. We might also compare the compiling of editions of pre-Hellenistic poets in the Alexandrian library: Pindar's encomia are arranged into books based on the contest at which the event took place (see introduction to Part 2b, pp. 160-1 n. 237), but both the *Isthmians* and the *Nemeans* end with a few odes celebrating victories at different contests (*Nemean* 8 even celebrates a successful election to the position of πρύτανις at Tenedos). Admittedly, however, Prodi 2017: 555 is right to point out that at least in the *Nemeans* (the last few *Isthmians* are fragmentary) the standard ordering based on event hierarchy (as laid out by Irigoin 1952: 43-4) is adhered to within this small grouping. He is also right to argue (2017: 554-5 n. 22) against Irigoin 1952: 41-2 that the significance of these odes' coming at the end of the epinicans as a whole is dampened by their appearance also in the *Isthmians*.

κοίτης ἱμείρονται, ὅτ' ὄμβρου σήματα φαίνῃ.
(1132-41)

Mice, indeed, if ever they were squeaking more than usual in calm weather and springing about as if in a dance , were not overlooked by more ancient men; nor were dogs. For a dog digs with its two feet when expecting a coming storm, and those mice also prophesy a storm then. Even the crab travels from water to land when a storm is about to dart on its path. And mice turning straw with their feet in the day desire bed when there are signs of rain.[210]

Again, the second 'half' of the *Theriaca* contains three general groupings to the first's one, and of these the third (other animals: a variety of insects, lizards and fish) is itself more miscellaneous than the first (spiders) and second (scorpions). In fact, there is a tendency to move from greater coherence to greater miscellaneity throughout the poem. Both 'halves' move from sections which describe dangerous animals to those describing an array of cures, apparently not specialised to individual threats. Even within some of the broad groupings there are gestures in late sections to a wealth of material which might have had fuller discussion. Before the remedies for snake-inflicted ills there is a short section concerning the Gecko and finally a survey of a variety of other reptiles:

ἄλλα γε μὴν ἄβλαπτα κινώπετα βόσκεται ὕλην,
δρυμοὺς καὶ λασιῶνας ἀμορβαίους τε χαράδρας,
οὓς ἔλοπας λίβυάς τε πολυστεφέας τε μυάγρους
φράζονται, σὺν δ' ὅσσοι ἀκοντίαι ἠδὲ μόλουροι
ἠδ' ἔτι που τυφλῶπες ἀπήμαντοι φορέονται.
(488-92)

Indeed, other, harmless reptiles feed in the forest, in copses and thickets and rustic ravines, which men call Elopes and Libyes and twisted Mousers, and

[210] For a different perspective on Aratus' shift from astronomy to meteorology, and especially to passages such as this, see Hutchinson's 1988: 216 suggestion that a "broad movement from grand matter to lowly" is shared by the *Phaenomena* and the *WD*.

> with these all the Darters and Molouroi and also, I think, the blind snakes are held not to do harm.

Later in the poem, the groupings devoted to spiders and to other animals both end with the playful impression that they could have extended into a vast number of loosely connected sections. Before moving from spiders to scorpions, Nicander instructs us to φράζεο δ' Αἰγύπτοιο τά τε τρέφει οὐλοὸς αἶα/ κνώδαλα (759-60; 'Consider the creatures which the deadly land of Egypt bears'), and towards the end of the third grouping in the second 'half' of the poem he claims ναὶ μὴν οἶδ' ὅσα πόντος ἁλὸς ῥόχθοισιν ἑλίσσει (822; 'Moreover, indeed, I know of everything the sea whirls about in its crashing of brine').[211] In both cases the idea seems to be that the poet is about to make a section out of every example he can name within extremely broad categories (dangerous Egyptian and marine animals), and in the second case in particular readers with access to more of Nicander's œuvre could have taken his threat seriously: after all, his *Oetaica* seems to have named a large number of fish (frr. 16, 18, quoted below, pp. 194-5). In the end, what we actually find in both cases is much more modest (the moth in the first case, and the moray eel, the sting-ray and the sea-snake in the second).

A move from tighter coherence to greater miscellaneity seems to have been a feature of the *Aitia*, in which the framework of a discussion between Callimachus and the Muses in Books 1-2 gives way to the apparently 'self-standing' sections of Books 3-4. The same general impulse can be detected in the *Argonautica*, where it is in Book 4, after the strongly unified third book, that Hunter 2015: 3-4 detects pointed "randomness". See Part 1, p. 87, for the apparent aimlessness of the action in Book

[211] See above, pp. 35-7.

4, and note the observation of Hutchinson 1988: 93 that the poem ends with a "flurry of *aitia*". Certainly in light of the subsequent claim that there are simply no ἄεθλοι left, and the implication that the poet would have included more sections in the work if there were any more episodes to be found (4. 1776; see below, p. 185), the short, almost rushed, final episode of the poem (the water-race on Aegina) can be read as an attempt to squeeze in one last *aition*:

> κεῖθεν δ᾽ ἀπτερέως διὰ μυρίον οἶδμα λιπόντες
> Αἰγίνης ἀκτῇσιν ἐπέσχεθον˙ αἶψα δὲ τοίγε
> ὑδρείης πέρι δῆριν ἀμεμφέα δηρίσαντο,
> ὅς κεν ἀφυσσάμενος φθαίη μετὰ νῆάδ᾽ ἱκέσθαι.
> ἄμφω γὰρ χρειώ τε καὶ ἄσπετος οὖρος ἔπειγεν.
> ἔνθ᾽ ἔτι νῦν πλήθοντας ἐπωμαδὸν ἀμφιφορῆας
> ἀνθέμενοι κούφοισιν ἄφαρ κατ᾽ ἀγῶνα πόδεσσιν
> κοῦροι Μυρμιδόνων νίκης πέρι δηριόωνται.
> (4. 1765-72)
>
> And from there, quickly leaving behind a vast amount of the sea, they stopped at the headland of Aegina. And straight away they competed with each other in a blameless contest of fetching water, to see who could beat the others in drawing it and getting back to the ship. For both need and an unceasing wind urged them on. There, still now, the youths of the Myrmidons, placing full jars on their shoulders, immediately compete with each other on their swift feet for victory in the contest.

We almost get the impression of the poet fitting in any Argonautic odds and ends which spring to mind as his work comes to a close.[212]

Conversely, the *Alexandra* finds a sense of increasing coherence and drive in its turn to the theme of Europe and Asia in conflict at 1283 (continuing to 1450, almost at the very end of Cassandra's speech), although it is important to note that there are significant groupings of sections throughout the work ('Helen's Five Husbands' (144-79), the 'Odyssey' (648-819) and so on). The web of negative

---

[212] See Hutchinson 2008: 44-5 for a discussion of the *Aetia* and the *Argonautica* turning from greater coherence to greater miscellaneity.

prophecies finally comes together into a positive, with the two continents reconciled, apparently by Roman conquest of Greece under Flamininus (so Hornblower 2015: 496):

> ᾧ δὴ μεθ' ἕκτην γένναν αὐθαίμων ἐμὸς
> εἷς τις παλαιστής, συμβαλὼν ἀλκὴν δορὸς
> πόντου τε καὶ γῆς κεὶς διαλλαγὰς μολών,
> πρέσβιστος ἐν φίλοισιν ὑμνηθήσεται,
> σκύλων ἀπαρχὰς τὰς δορικτήτους λαβών.
> (1446-50)
>
> Truly, after six generations, a singular wrestler, my kinsman, coming together with him [seemingly Philip V of Macedon: see Hornblower 2015: 495-7] in a battle of spears and coming to agreements regarding sea and land, will be sung of as most revered among his friends, taking the spear-won first-offerings of the spoils.[213]

A move towards greater coherence throughout a work may call to mind Polybian συμπλοκή (see above, 120 n. 198).

The *Periodos* as we have it contains two major groupings, concerning Greece and the Black Sea Coast (and the similarity of the openings to these super-sections suggests that Pseudo-Scymnus is encouraging us to view them as significant entities; see Part 2b, p. 178), but it is hard to see how the remainder of the work could have become decidedly more or less coherent or miscellaneous.

On the face of it, the *Alexipharmaca* lacks development of this sort, although Effe 1974: 62-5 demonstrates that the deployment of sections is not completely random. Whereas the *Phaenomena* and *Theriaca* show themselves to engage with archaic didactic in their overall schemes, a better comparandum for the

---

[213] Note that the grouping has set itself up for some sort of resolution by starting with the question τί γὰρ ταλαίνῃ μητρὶ τῇ Προμηθέως/ ξυνὸν πέφυκε καὶ τροφῷ Σαρπηδόνος […]; (1283-4; 'What is there in common between the wretched mother of Prometheus [Asia] and the nurse of Sarpedon [Europe]?'). Cf. *Aetia* fr. 178. 24 Harder: κῶς Ἴκῳ ξυν[ὰ τὰ Θεσσαλι]κά […]; ('How are Thessalian matters common to Icus?').

Alexipharmaca might be medical prose, although even here it is common for sections to be grouped, as for example, in the Hippocratic *Internal Affections*, where in 1-34 there are groupings by organ and 35-54 by types of disease. We might also think of a more recent didactic poem than the work of Hesiod, the *Hedypatheia* (or *Gastronomia*) of Archestratus (fourth century BC). There is reason to suppose that Nicander knew this work, and while poison might be thought a slightly less 'low' topic than food (although Overduin 2014b: 17 n. 79, at least, is cautious about labelling the *Hedypatheia* "proper parody") we might consider Archestratus as a forerunner of Nicander in the presentation in hexameters of topics which might be considered inappropriate for didactic poetry.[214] The structure of the *Hedypatheia*, according to Olson and Sens 2000: xxv, "seems to have consisted of an extended catalogue of foods, and examination of the fragments as a group shows that most are constructed out of a limited number of basic common elements which often appear in the same general order" (further discussion at xxv-xxvii). If one were to replace "foods" with "poisons", this description might quite neatly fit the *Alexipharmaca*, where the standard arrangement of material within sections consists of an introduction to the substance or animal in question followed by a description of victims' symptoms and finally suggested cures (deviations from this sequence

---

[214] Olson and Sens note the parallel use of φίλος with the name of the addressee in the proem of the *Theriaca* and in Archestratus fr. 5. 2 (2000: 25, later Overduin 2014b: 173; on p. 23 Olson and Sens suggest that fr. 5 begins "the catalogue of foods that occupied the bulk of the poem"). Another possible point of contact between Nicander and Archestratus comes in their presentation of goslings: Nicander's βοσκαδίης χηνὸς νέον ὀρταλιχῆα (*Alexipharmaca* 228; 'the new young of a fattened goose') might be read as a rephrasing of Archestratos' σιτευτὸν καὶ χηνὸς […] νεοττόν (fr. 58. 1; 'and the grain-fed offspring of a goose'). It should be noted that σιτευτοῦ has been suggested for Archestratus (see the discussion in Olson and Sens 2000: 213), which would make Nicander's periphrasis a closer rephrasing of Archestratus'. Archestratus seems to display features which are prominent in our sectioned poems (including those of Nicander): note the suggestive πρῶτα of fr. 5. 1, and apparent frontloading of the names of subjects (frr. 14. 1, 15. 1, 18. 1, etc.), quoted above, p. 25 n. 32.

are very infrequent). Note, however, that Olson and Sens 2000: xxv also suggest an expressive organisation of sections across the whole of the work, with material arranged so as to match the order of service at a banquet (and note too that on a smaller scale there seems to have been at least some geographical arrangement: see below, p. 151). The extreme lack of overall movement of this sort in the *Alexipharmaca* becomes more interesting when placed beside the structural engagement with Hesiod displayed in the *Theriaca*. Nicander emerges as a poet keen to experiment (cf. Part 1, pp. 41-2), and able to create strikingly different poems from reasonably similar subject matter.[215]

2.1.2 Accumulation

In addition to allowing for large-scale arrangements, composition in sections naturally brings with it a feeling of multiplicity, and in several of our poems accumulation appears as one of the overarching aesthetic impulses.[216] The

---

[215] He seems to have taken different approaches again elsewhere in his œuvre. Through references in the *Metamorphoses* of Antoninus Liberalis we can see that in the *Heteroioumena* Nicander grouped types of metamorphosis together: metamorphoses into stones appeared in Book 1, for example (in Antoninus: Cragaleus (4), Battus (23) the wolf attacking Peleus' flock (38)).

[216] An impulse apparently shared, for example, by Antimachus (whose approach in the *Lyde* is described by Ps.-Plut. *Cons. ad Ap.* 106c as ἐξαριθμησάμενος τὰς ἡρωικὰς συμφοράς 'enumerating the disasters of heroes'), Euphorion (the Suda remarks that his *Chiliades* συνάγει διὰ χιλίων ἐτῶν χρησμοὺς ἀποτελεσθέντας; 'collects prophecies fulfilled after a thousand years') and Apollodorus, whose composition of the *Chronica* is described by Pseudo-Scymnus as follows (cf. Pseudo-Scymnus' own list of contents, below, p. 145 n. 246):

> ἔτη δὲ τετταράκοντα πρὸς τοῖς χιλίοις
> ὡρισμένως ἐξέθετο, καταριθμούμενος
> πόλεων ἁλώσεις, ἐκτοπισμοὺς στρατοπέδων,
> μεταναστάσεις ἐθνῶν, στρατείας βαρβάρων,
> ἐφόδους περαιώσεις τε ναυτικῶν στόλων,
> θέσεις ἀγώνων, συμμαχίας, σπονδὰς, μάχας,
> πράξεις βασιλέων, ἐπιφανῶν ἀνδρῶν βίους,
> φυγὰς, στρατείας, καταλύσεις τυραννίδων·
> πάντων ἐπιτομὴν τῶν χύδην εἰρημένων·
> (24-32)
>
> He set out, in clearly delimited fashion, one thousand and forty years, enumerating the captures of cities, the migrations of camps, the uprootings of peoples, the campaigns of

Alexandra, for example, opens boldly with the promise λέξω τὰ πάντα ('I shall tell you everything'), as if we are reading the first words of the earnest author of a prose treatise.[217] We have seen in Part 1 (pp. 52-3) that accumulation is stressed throughout the poem, for example by the use of numbers in section marking, and by the inclusion of miniature 'summary' sections introduced by ἄλλος. Pseudo-Scymnus' prologue makes a similar claim, albeit less succinctly, with an extremely long list of his work's contents, culminating, at 90-1, with ἁπλῶς θ' ἁπάντων χωρίων διέξοδον/ καὶ τὴν ὅλην περίοδον ἐν ὀλίγοις στίχοις ('put simply, a description of all lands and an entire circumference of the world in a few verses').[218] He picks up the claim of totality again at 101-2: οὐχὶ μόνον ἑτερόφυλον ἀνθρώπων βίον/ ἐθνῶν ὅλων δὲ γνώσετ' ἄστη καὶ νόμους ('[the reader/listener] will know not only of the life of men of other races but of the cities and customs of all peoples').

> barabarians, the attacks and crossings of naval fleets, the settlements of disputes, alliances, treaties, battles, the affairs of kings, the lives of eminent men, exiles, campaigns and the downfalls of tyrants, in an epitome of everything which [elsewhere] has been described profusely.

See also Hutchinson 2008: 251-66 on accumulation in Hellenistic and Latin poetry.

[217] Such promises become common in later prose: see e.g. Vitruvius pr. 3: *his voluminibus aperui omnes disciplinae rationes* ('in these volumes I have opened up all the precepts of the discipline'); Dionysius of Halicarnassus *AR* 1. 8. 2, culminating in συλλήβδην ὅλον ἀποδείκνυμι τὸν ἀρχαῖον βίον τῆς πόλεως (in short, I show the whole archaic life of the city [of Rome]'); Josephus *JA* 1. 5: μέλλει γὰρ περιέξειν ἅπασαν τὴν παρ' ἡμῖν ἀρχαιολογίαν καὶ διάταξιν τοῦ πολιτεύματος ἐκ τῶν Ἑβραϊκῶν μεθηρμηνευμένην γραμμάτων ('for it [the work] is going to encompass our entire antiquity and organisation of government translated from the Hebrew writings'. Due to the scanty nature of the remains of technical prose from our period, it is hard to be sure that such openings were popular in prose of Lycophron's day, but we do find something akin to the promise for totality in Philo Mechanicus (third century BC): in the introduction to the '*Belopoeica*' chapter of his work on mechanics (Thevenot page 49.6-18) he says that he intends τὰς τῶν ὕστερον παραδεδομένας μεθόδους περὶ τῆς καθόλου τέχνης [...] ἐμφανίζειν ('to make clear the methods handed down by later authors about the whole art [of catapult construction]') albeit with the justification that older accounts disagree on such basic points as the size of the hole for the sinew and the implication that so full an account might not be necessary otherwise.

[218] I translate this long list below, 164 n. 246. For 90-1 cf. his claim that Apollodorus' *Chronica* dealt with ἃ καὶ διὰ πάσης γέγονε τῆς οἰκουμένης ('what had happened throughout the whole inhabited world').

Apollonius' accumulation of Argonautic material is not announced explicitly at the start of the poem, but the claim at the end of the final episode that there are no more ἄεθλοι left, as we have seen (p. 128), might be interpreted as a suggestion that the composition of the poem has involved the accumulation of all available Argonautic episodes into one collection: the implication seems to be that if the Argonauts had had any more adventures on their way home, Apollonius would have written about them.[219]

In the *Alexipharmaca* we are not promised totality, but the impression of accumulation is built by the many sections which end with the promise of safety (see Part 1, p. 42). As we progress through the poem the heaping up of poisons is matched by the growing feeling that the poet's knowledge can keep us safe from harm (an idea expressed explicitly at *Theriaca* 4-7). In the *Theriaca* we find promises of totality in the first lines of both super-sections concerning cures (τῶν μὲν ἐγὼ θρόνα <u>πάντα</u> καὶ ἀλθεστήρια νούσων/ φύλλα τε ῥιζοτόμον τε διείσομαι ἀνδράσιν ὥρην (493-4; 'I shall go through for men <u>all</u> the medicinal plants and cures for these ailments, as well as the herbs and the right time for the cutting of roots'); οἷσιν ἐγὼ τὰ <u>ἕκαστα</u> διείσομαι ἄρκια νούσων (837; 'Against these I shall go through <u>all</u> of the remedies for ailments)), and the bringing together of large numbers of items into these broad groupings again builds an impression of the extensive expertise of the poet. He plays further with this idea in the creation of his οἶδα-pattern, for example, where his bulk of potential accumulated knowledge does not in the end appear (see above, pp. 35-7), and we shall see in Part 2b (pp. 187-98) that in the *Alexipharmaca*

[219] This is pointedly ironic, of course: much will happen to Jason and Medea, at least, when they return to Greece, as all of Apollonius' readers are aware.

too he builds an impression of swathes of knowledge which could have been incorporated into his poem, but which are only ever hinted at.

Aratus does not directly claim to provide knowledge of everything at the start of his poem, and even shies away from discussing the planets at 460 (οὐδ᾽ ἔτι θαρσαλέος κείνων ἐγώ; 'on the subject of them I am no longer confident'), and yet we do get a sense of totality in the poem, namely the totality of Zeus' provision for man. Note the repetition of μεστός and πᾶς/ πάντη in the proem:

> μεσταὶ δὲ Διὸς πᾶσαι μὲν ἀγυιαί,
> πᾶσαι δ᾽ ἀνθρώπων ἀγοραί, μεστὴ δὲ θάλασσα
> καὶ λιμένες· πάντη δὲ Διὸς κεχρήμεθα πάντες.
> (2-4)
>
> All the streets are full of Zeus, and all the marketplaces of men, and full too are the sea and the harbours. We all need Zeus in every way.

See also 768-72, especially πάντη δ᾽ ὅ γε σήματα φαίνων (the full passage is quoted below, p. 137.). Other hints at totality come in the acrostic of 803-6 and in the final couplet of the poem (1153-4):

> πάντη γὰρ καθαρῇ κε μάλ᾽ εὔδια τεκμήραιο
> πάντα δ᾽ ἐρευθομένῃ δοκέειν ἀνέμοιο κελεύθους·
> ἄλλοθι δ᾽ ἄλλο μελαινομένῃ δοκέειν ὑετοῖο.
> σήματα δ᾽ οὐτᾶρ πᾶσιν ἐπ᾽ ἤμασι πάντα τέτυκται·
> ἀλλ᾽ ὅσα μὲν τριτάτῃ τε τεταρταίῃ τε πέλονται
> μέσφα διχαιομένης, διχάδος γε μὲν ἄχρις ἐπ᾽ αὐτὴν
> σημαίνει διχόμηνον, ἀτὰρ πάλιν ἐκ διχομήνου
> ἐς διχάδα φθιμένην·
>
> For you may infer very fine weather from a Moon which is unblemished everywhere. And expect the coming of wind from a Moon which is red all over, and expect rain from a Moon which is blackened differently in different spots. But the signs are not all wrought for all of the days. All those, rather, which occur on the third and fourth day go as far as the half Moon, and those at the time of the half Moon give signs as far as the full Moon itself, and again from the full Moon to the waning half Moon.

> τῶν ἄμυδις πάντων ἐσκεμμένος εἰς ἐνιαυτὸν

> οὐδέποτε σχεδίως κεν ἐπ' αἰθέρι τεκμήραιο.
>
> With an eye on all of these signs together throughout the year, you would never be making an unconsidered inference about the weather.

In the first passage there seems to be a playful tension between the striking acrostic and the lack of a complete one-day-to-one-day system for telling the weather from the Moon, while in the second we get the idea of a complete set of knowledge required within this field.

Naturally the sense of accumulation grows over the course of each poem, but it is worth noting that individual heapings up can be emphasised to achieve specific effects, such as in Nicander's run of sections concerning spiders at *Theriaca* 715-68 and in Apollonius' question τίς γὰρ δὴ θάνεν ἄλλος; ('Who else died, then?') at *Argonautica* 2. 851, both of which gesture towards the tendency of deaths to mount up in the *Iliad* (see pp. 43-4, 87-9). In the case of Apollonius, it is remarkable that this effect is achieved despite the listing of only two deaths.

2.1.3 Large-scale arrangement: conclusion

Given the diversity of genre and subject matter in our poems, it is not especially surprising that their overarching arrangement of sections differs. Certainly the influence of other genres and other texts plays a role here. Of the three didactic texts, for example, the *Alexipharmaca* draws least attention to Hesiodic precedent: it lacks an obvious early 'nod' to the archaic poet to match the *Phaenomena*'s reworking of the praise of Zeus at *WD* 1-10 (*Phaen*. 1-16) and the direct naming in the *Theriaca* of Ἀσκραῖος [...] Ἡσίοδος (11-12), and arguably presents the least Hesiodic subject matter (the *Theriaca*, at least, indulges in fabulous digressions, such

as the story of the Dipsas and the Ass (343-58), apparently a passage sufficiently central to Nicander's conception of the poem as to merit housing his name in acrostic form).[220] The impression that in its arrangement of sections it is also the most distant from Hesiod should encourage us to think of sections and their treatment as highly significant in the overall conception of our poems.

Factors other than the traditions of specific genres and the influence of specific texts are also at play. The tendency to move from more rigid or logical coherence to a greater degree of miscellaneity or lack of connection seems to have cut across generic boundaries: in the context of a literary culture apparently keen on dispute (see above, p. 118), and given the importance of the opposite move to the overall conception of the work of the rather outspoken Polybius (see p. 120 n. 198), we may suspect that contemporary readers will have paid close attention to this sort of feature of the poems.

What connects the overall conception of all of our poems is a feeling of accumulation, even if it is more explicitly expressed in some texts than in others. Given the apparent interest in 'oneness' in Hellenistic literary theory (see above, p 120 n. 198), it is noteworthy that our poems share a basic structural approach (composition in sections) which suggests multiplicity. It seems likely that at least some of our poets are playing on the tension between one and many. Lycophron connects his heap of prophecies by the frame of a single utterance of Cassandra, reported in a single, albeit vastly extended, messenger-speech (cf. *Aetia* Books 1-2, in which the various stories are bound by the framework of Callimachus'

---

[220] The acrostic comes in lines 345-53. A very full discussion of the fable and the acrostic (with further bibliography) comes in Overduin 2014b: 309-23.

conversation with the Muses). Aratus encourages us to think of the two 'halves' of the *Phaenomena* as connected by Zeus' providence, with both the stars and the weather signs provided by the god (and see above, p. 122, on 733-57 as a bridge between the astronomical and meteorological material):

> πάντα γὰρ οὔπω
> ἐκ Διὸς ἄνθρωποι γινώσκομεν, ἀλλ' ἔτι πολλὰ
> κέκρυπται, τῶν αἴ κε θέλῃ καὶ ἐσαυτίκα δώσει
> Ζεύς· ὁ γὰρ οὖν γενεὴν ἀνδρῶν ἀναφανδὸν ὀφέλλει
> πάντοθεν εἰδόμενος, πάντῃ δ' ὅ γε σήματα φαίνων.
> (768-72)
>
> For not yet do we men understand everything from Zeus: many things, indeed, are still hidden, and Zeus will presently reveal examples of these that he wishes. For he helps the race of men by appearing openly and from every side, and by showing signs everywhere.

In the *Alexipharmaca*, accumulation is stressed by repeated claims that the knowledge of the poet will save the reader and his acquaintances from death, but/and it is precisely the figure of the knowledgeable poet that connects the various pieces of information which are thrown at us it the course of the poem. Most ambitiously, perhaps, Apollonius presents an accumulation of (almost separable) Argonautic episodes within a strictly linear hexameter narrative.[221]

We shall see in Part 2b that some of the poets emphasise the gathering of large amounts of material as an important aspect of their work, and that in so doing they align themselves clearly with an important strand of contemporary literary activity. Multiplicity and/or accumulation are vital to this impression, and this may help us to understand the Hellenistic penchant for sectioned composition. First,

---

[221] See e.g. Heath 1989: 65-6 for the idea that "Apollonius has sought to emphasize the continuity by frequent cross-reference", and Hutchinson 2008: 78-81 on the tension and/or interaction between the multiplicity of the ἄεθλοι and their cohesion.

though, it remains for us to get an impression of how the poets deal with connection and arrangement from section to section: we shall see evidence of careful (and ostentatiously careful) thought given to the grouping of sections, and also that the boundaries between sections, just like the section markers themselves, are areas full of aesthetic possibility.

2.2 Connections and Arrangements on a Smaller Scale

2.2.1 Time and space; connection and expression

Often in the poems there is a logic to groupings of sections on a less grand scale than discussed in the previous chapter, and two of the commonest organising principles are time and space. These sequences of related sections serve to emphasise the coherence of the material, but can also achieve specific expressive effects. In the *Phaenomena*, for example, the spatial arrangement of a number of early sections is emphasised by Aratus' use of 'reference constellations' as section markers (see Part 1, pp. 28-9).[222] When we read patterns such as the following, it is easy to imagine that we are moving our eyes through the sky under the instruction of the poet-teacher:

λοξὸς μὲν Ταύροιο τομῇ ὑποκέκλιται αὐτὸς
Ὠρίων.
(322-3)

At a slant from the section of Taurus reclines Orion himself.

τοῖός οἱ καὶ φρουρὸς ἀειρομένῳ ὑπὸ νώτῳ
φαίνεται ἀμφοτέροισι Κύων ὑπὸ ποσσὶ βεβηκώς [...]
(326-7)

---

[222] We might think this an obvious choice for the poet, but other kinds of spatial sequence were available to authors on astronomical topics: Manilius will go on to create a different sort of spatial arrangement for his material by mapping celestial onto geographical space: *nunc age diversis dominantia sidera terris/ percipe. sed summa est rerum referenda figura* (4. 585-6; "come now, learn the constellations which govern various parts of the earth. But a picture of places comprising the key points is to be given"). At 587-695 he provides us with a sort of miniature '*periplus*', and at 744-805 he describes which areas of the earth are covered by which zodiacal constellations. Sections tend to begin with both the constellation and the relevant places named early on, e.g. *Taurus habet Scythiae montes Asiamque potentem/ et mollis Arabas* (753-4; 'Taurus holds the Scythian mountainsand powerful Asia and the soft Arabs'), *Phrygia, Nemeaee, potiris* (759; 'You have power over Phrygia, Nemean Lion'), *Virgine sub casta felix terraque marique/est Rhodos* (763-4; 'Rhodes is prosperous on land and on sea beneath chaste Virgo') etc.

And similarly appears his [Orion's] guard Dog, standing on two feet beneath his raised back.

ποσσὶν δ᾽ Ὠρίωνος ὑπ᾽ ἀμφοτέροισι λαγῳός
ἐμμενές ἤματα πάντα διώκεται.
(338-9)

And beneath the two feet of Orion the Hare is continuously pursued for all time.

ἡ δὲ Κυνὸς μεγάλοιο κατ᾽ οὐρὴν ἕλκεται ἀργῷ
πρυμνόθεν˙
(342-3)

And alongside the great Dog's tail the Argo is dragged by its stern.

Spatial and temporal sequences are especially effective expressive tools when used in voyaging contexts. We saw in Part 1 that both Apollonius and Pseudo-Scymnus make frequent use of section markers which draw attention to the progress of the journeys described in their poems (κεῖθεν/ἔνθεν/ἔνθα in Apollonius: pp. 81-9 μετά/ὑπέρ etc. in Pseudo-Scymnus: pp. 73-5) The effect is felt especially strongly in Apollonius' runs of miniature sections between larger episodes, for example in the journey from the Isle of Electra to the Mount of Bears:[223]

κεῖθεν δ᾽ εἰρεσίῃ Μέλανος διὰ βένθεα Πόντου
ἱέμενοι, τῇ μὲν Θρῃκῶν χθόνα τῇ δὲ περαίην
Ἴμβρον ἔχον καθύπερθε· νέον γε μὲν ἠελίοιο
δυομένου Χέρνησον ἐπὶ προύχουσαν ἵκοντο.
ἔνθα σφιν λαιψηρὸς ἄη νότος, ἱστία δ᾽ οὔρῳ
στησάμενοι κούρης Ἀθαμαντίδος αἰπὰ ῥέεθρα
εἰσέβαλον. πέλαγος δὲ τὸ μὲν καθύπερθε λέλειπτο
ἦρι, τὸ δ᾽ ἐννύχιοι Ῥοιτειάδος ἔνδοθεν ἄκρης
μέτρεον, Ἰδαίην ἐπὶ δεξιὰ γαῖαν ἔχοντες.
Δαρδανίην δὲ λιπόντες ἐπιπροσέβαλλον Ἀβύδῳ,
Περκώτην δ᾽ ἐπὶ τῇ καὶ Ἀβαρνίδος ἠμαθόεσσαν
ἠιόνα ζαθέην τε παρήμειβον Πιτύειαν.
καὶ δὴ τοίγ᾽ ἐπὶ νυκτὶ διάνδιχα νηὸς ἰούσης
δίνῃ πορφύροντα διήνυσαν Ἑλλήσποντον·
(1.922-35)

[223] Cf. *Arg*. 1.594-608 (quoted above, pp. 96-7).

> Setting out from there by rowing through the depths of the black sea, they had the land of the Thracians on one side and Imbros on the other, below them. With the Sun just sinking, they arrived at the promontory of Chersonesus. There, a swift southerly breeze was theirs, and putting up the sails against the wind, they came to the steeply-falling streams of Athamas' daughter. And at dawn the sea on their upper side was left behind, and at night they were measuring out the inner side of the Rhoeteian heights, keeping the Idaean land to their right. And, leaving Dardania behind, they came towards Abydos, and after this they passed Percote and the sandy beach of Abarnis and sacred Pityeia. And, indeed, at night they completed their journey through the Hellespont, which surged in its whirling as the ship travelled by its two different methods of propulsion.

The combination of section markers which pinpoint times of the day (see Part 1, pp. 90-7) with those indicating sequentiality (as well as Δαρδανίην δὲ λιπόντες) allows every step of the journey to be followed closely by the reader through time and space. It is because of Apollonius' attention to detail in this regard that Vian was able to create such detailed itineraries for various parts of the expedition (1974: 18, 118 (the journey to Colchis in Books 1-2); 1981: 12-13 (the return journey in Book 4)).

A similar effect can be achieved even without the use of explicitly temporal or spatial section markers. Lycophron presents Menelaus' journey home from Troy through the hero's eyes by his repeated use of (ἐπ)όψεται at the start of sections in this grouping:

> ἐπόψεται μὲν πρῶτα Τυφῶνος σκοπὰς
> (825)
>
> First he will see the lookouts of Typhon [the location is not entirely clear: see Hornblower 2015: 319-20].
>
> ὄψεται δὲ τλήμονος
> Μύρρας ἐρυμνὸν ἄστυ
> (828-9)
>
> And he will see the fortified city of wretched Myrrha [Byblos].
>
> ἐπόψεται δὲ τύρσιας Κηφηίδας

(834)

And he will see the towers of Cepheus [in Ethiopia].

ἐπόψεται δὲ τοὺς θερειπότους γύας
(847)

And he will see the fields which drink in summer [i.e. the Nile floodplain].

The effect is continued by the use of ἥξει at the start of three successive sections as Menelaus' journey takes him to various locations in Magna Graecia:

ἥξει δ' ἀλήτης εἰς Ἰαπύγων στρατόν
(852)

And he will come as a wanderer to the people of the Iapyges.

ἥξει δὲ Σῖριν καὶ Λακινίου μυχούς
(856)

And he will come to Siris and the nooks of Lakinion.

ἥξει δὲ ταύρου γυμνάδας κακοξένους/ πάλης κονίστρας
(866-7)

And he will come to the bull's inhospitable training arenas for wrestling.

The low level of variation over a reasonably large number of sections can be thought to emphasise the very great length of the hero's multipartite voyage, and the use of (ἐπ)όψεται in particular gives the reader an impression of the experience of the journey.[224]

There is good reason to think that the poets are actively interested in their methods of grouping and arranging sections at a local level. Pseudo-Scymnus, for example, cultivates ambiguity in his method of arrangement. One might expect a *Periodos* to have a primarily geographical focus, but passages such as that concerning the area around northern Iberia and Liguria (where, as is common in

---

[224] Note that ἐφοράω is often used of seeing unpleasant things: LSJ 2.

the poem, a larger section is broken up into miniature units: see Part 1, p. 70 n. 120) demonstrate the poet's strong interest also in time:

> τῶν πρὸς τὸ Σαρδῷον δὲ πέλαγος κειμένων
> οἰκοῦσι Λιβυφοίνικες, ἐκ Καρχηδόνος
> ἀποικίαν λαβόντες· ἑξῆς δ', ὡς λόγος,
> Ταρτήσσιοι κατέχουσιν· εἶτ' Ἴβηρες οἱ
> προσεχεῖς. ἐπάνω τούτων δὲ κεῖνται τῶν τόπων
> Βέβρυκες. ἔπειτα παραθαλάττιοι κάτω
> Λίγυες ἔχονται καὶ πόλεις Ἑλληνίδες,
> ἃς Μασσαλιῶται Φωκαεῖς ἀπῴκισαν·
> πρώτη μὲν Ἐμπόριον, Ῥόδη δὲ δευτέρα·
> ταύτην δὲ πρὶν ναῶν κρατοῦντες ἔκτισαν
> Ῥόδιοι. μεθ' οὓς ἐλθόντες εἰς Ἰβηρίαν
> οἱ Μασσαλίαν κτίσαντες ἔσχον Φωκαεῖς
> Ἀγάθην Ῥοδανουσίαν τε, Ῥοδανὸς ἣν μέγας
> ποταμὸς παραρρεῖ, Μασσαλία δ' ἐστ' ἐχομένη,
> πόλις μεγίστη, Φωκαέων ἀποικία.
> ἐν τῇ Λιγυστικῇ δὲ ταύτην ἔκτισαν
> πρὸ τῆς μάχης τῆς ἐν Σαλαμῖνι γενομένης
> ἔτεσιν πρότερον, ὥς φασιν, ἑκατὸν εἴκοσι.
> Τίμαιος οὕτως ἱστορεῖ δὲ τὴν κτίσιν.
> εἶτεν μετὰ ταύτην Ταυρόεις καὶ πλησίον
> πόλις Ὀλβία κἀντίπολις αὐτῶν ἐσχάτη.
> (196-216)
>
> Libyphoenices inhabit part of the area next to the Sardinian Sea, receiving a colony from Carthage. And next in order, it is said, the Tartessians have land. Then, next to them, are the Iberians. Above these places lie the Bebrycians. Then, below, are the seaside Ligurians and the Hellenic cities which the Massalian Phocaeans colonised, first Emporion, Rhode second. The Rhodians, who were in former times masters of ships, founded it. Coming after whom into Iberia, those Phocaeans who founded Massalia held Agathe and Rhodanusia, by which the great river Rhone flows, and Massalia is next, a very great city, a colony of the Phocaeans. They founded it in Liguria one hundred and twenty years, people say, before the occurrence of the Battle of Salamis. Timaeus reports its foundation thus. Then, after this, is Tauroeis and, nearby, the city of Olbia and Antipolis, the last of them.

In the midst of the geographical sequence the poet slips into a temporal one at 206 where we learn something of the order of the arrivals of peoples into Iberia. This creates ambiguity in the surrounding area, for instance in πρώτη μὲν Ἐμπόριον,

Ῥόδη δὲ δευτέρα, which could either describe the order in which the cities lie on the imagined route or the order in which they were founded. Perhaps a similar ambiguity exists in ἐσχάτη.[225] There are several such slips into temporal sequences throughout the poem, for example in three successive sections (concerning Aegina, Athens and Euboea) which describe changes in names and/or inhabitants over time:

> πρότερον μὲν Οἰνώνη προσηγορεύετο,
> ὕστερον ἀπ' Αἰγίνης δὲ τῆς Ἀσωπίδος
> Αἴγιναν ἐκάλεσεν κατασχὼν Αἰακός·
> (554-6)
>
> Formerly it was called Oenone, but later its ruler Aeacus called it Aegina, after Asopid Aegina.
>
> φασὶ δ' οἰκητὰς λαχεῖν
> ταύτας Πελασγοὺς πρῶτον, οὓς δὴ καὶ λόγος
> Κραναοὺς καλεῖσθαι, μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα Κεκροπίδας,
> Κέκροπος δυναστεύσαντος, ὑστέροισι δέ
> χρόνοις, Ἐρεχθέως τῆς πόλεως ἡγουμένου,
> ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς τὴν προσηγορίαν λαχεῖν.
> (559-64)
>
> They say that the first inhabitants to gain possession of it were Pelasgians, who, indeed, were called Cranai according to the tradition, and after this the Cecropidae, when Cecrops was king, and in later times, when Erectheus ruled the city, it took its name from Athena.
>
> Εὔβοια κεῖται νῆσος, ἡ καλουμένη
> διὰ τὴν φύσιν τὸ πρότερον, ὥς φασιν, Μάκρις,
> ἔπειτεν ἀπὸ τῆς λεγομένης Ἀσωπίδος
> χρόνῳ λαβοῦσα τοὔνομ' Εὐβοίας πάλιν.
> (567-70)

[225] We may also observe a more subtle sort of temporal sequencing: this first mention of Iberians comes after an earlier designation of the Spanish coast as Celtic (167). Marcotte 2002: 167 draws the inference that the poet considered the Iberians to have arrived later into the peninsula than the Celts (see also Korenjak 2003: 75 on this designation as surprising for readers). Thus the mention of Iberians now almost creates a historical sequence, or at least embraces the course of time (cf. Hutchinson 2008: 59-60 on the course of time presented as a proper 'object of knowledge' in the *Aetia*).

> There lies the island of Euboea, which, they say, was formerly called Macris, in accordance with its nature, and then, in time, taking the name Euboea in turn from the daughter of Asopus so named.

We are positively encouraged to think seriously about Pseudo-Scymnus' connection of his material. After all, he is explicitly emulating Apollodorus' *Chronica* (16-54):[226] his collection of sequential spaces is self-avowedly similar to a collection of sequential moments in time.[227] We might even suspect (as suggested above, p. 120 n. 198) that in including the date of the Battle of Salamis at 211-13 in an otherwise unrelated context (whether or not copied over from Timaeus) he is

[226] I present a full translation of these lines here because they raise some interesting points (lines 24-32 are quoted in Greek above, p. 131 n. 215): "For the kings in Pergamon, whose reputation among us all, even though they are dead, remains alive after all this time, one of the true Attic philologists, who was a disciple of Diogenes the Stoic and studied for a long time with Aristarchus, composed a 'Chronographia' drawn up from the capture of Troy to the present day. He set out, in clearly delimited fashion, one thousand and forty years, enumerating the captures of cities, the migrations of camps, the uprootings of peoples, the campaigns of barabarians, the attacks and crossings of naval fleets, the settlements of disputes, alliances, treaties, battles, the affairs of kings, the lives of eminent men, exiles, campaigns and the downfalls of tyrants, in an epitome of everything which [elsewhere] has been described profusely. And he chose to put this in verse, and in comic verse, specifically, for the sake of clarity, seeing that it would be easy to remember. And he took the following comparison from life in his creation of a simile: just as someone who wished to take up and carry a large amount of loose timber would not easily be in control of it, whereas if it were bound up it would be easy, even so it is no quick thing to pick up loose speech, but it is a quick thing to retain unerringly and faithfully what is enrounded by metre. For an utterance has a grace running over it whenever historical enquiry and poetic language weave together into it. This man, then, gathering the chief points of time, exposed to the grace of king Philadelphus even what had happened throughout the whole inhabited world, allotting an undying reputation to Attalus, who received the dedication of the work. And I, because I have heard that you alone among today's kings possess kingly worth, desired to take upon myself a test of this, and to come to you and to see what a king is, so that I myself might have it in me in turn to report it to others". The long list of subject matter anticipates the similarly exhaustive list of contents in Pseudo-Scymnus' own work at 65-91 (see below, p. 164 n. 246, for these lines in full). The long explanation of the use of comic trimeters (in which Pseudo-Scymnus follows Apollodorus), including a simile apparently lifted in its entirety from Apollodorus himself, suggests that our poet is encouraging a particularly close comparison between himself and his forbear in the composition of 'prosaic poetry'.

[227] Pseudo-Scymnus' interest in the past has been explored by Bravo 2009: 30-111: see e.g. p. 91 on the frequency of πρότερον in the text. Bravo's general impression of the poem is that it blurs the lines between past and present, taking his information predominantly from books of the past while pretending to present the world as it is at the time of writing (p. 31). The closing focus on dedicating these poems to Anatolian kings (cf. above, n. 226) makes the similarity explicit. See Hunter 2008b for discussions of various parts of this passage.

making a statement about the sort of literature we are reading vis-à-vis its connection of material.[228]

A different approach to highlighting the problem of connecting material can be seen early in the *Theriaca* (115-47), where we find what could be considered a presentation of the various potential methods of organising the snake-related sections and a dramatisation of Nicander's decision-making process. I have split up the passage into what I interpret as the different abortive principles of arrangement:

> **(1.)** εἰ δέ που ἐν δακέεσσιν ἀφαρμάκτῳ χροῒ κύρσῃς
> ἄκμηνος σίτων, ὅτε δὴ κακὸν ἄνδρας ἰάπτει,
> αἶψά κεν ἡμετέρῃσιν ἐρωήσειας ἐφετμαῖς.
> τῶν ἤτοι θήλεια παλίγκοτος ἀντομένοισι
> δάχματι, πλειοτέρη δὲ καὶ ὁλκαίην ἐπὶ σειρήν·
> τοὔνεκα καὶ θανάτοιο θοώτερος ἵξεται αἶσα.
> (115-20)
>
> **(1.)** But if, perhaps, with untreated skin and when fasting from food you happen upon biting creatures (when, indeed, evil harms men), straight away you may escape harm by means of our instructions. Verily, the female of them is hostile to those who come across it with its bite, and it is thicker up to its dragging tail; for this reason, indeed, the doom of death will arrive more quickly.
>
> **(2.)** ἀλλ᾽ ἤτοι θέρεος βλαβερὸν δάκος ἐξαλέασθαι
> Πληιάδων φάσιας δεδοκημένος, αἵ θ᾽ ὑπὸ Ταύρου
> ἀλκαίην ψαίρουσαι ὀλίζωνες φορέονται·
> ἢ ὅτε σὺν τέκνοισι θερειομένοισιν ἀβοσκής
> φωλειοῦ λοχάδην ὑπὸ γωλεὰ διψὰς ἰαύῃ,
> ἢ ὅτε λίπτῃσιν μεθ᾽ ἑὸν νομόν, ἢ ἐπὶ κοῖτον
> ἐκ νομοῦ ὑπνώουσα κίῃ κεκορημένη ὕλης.
> (121-7)
>
> **(2.)** But, verily, beware during the summer of the harmful creature, having watched the appearance of the Pleiades, the smaller ones which are borne along grazing the tail of Taurus, when the Dipsas sleeps unfed with its warmed offspring in the holes of its lair or longs for its pasture or, satisfied by the forest, hies dozily from its pasture to its bed.

[228] Cf. 731-3 on the relative dating of the foundation of Apollonia Pontica and the reign of Cyrus the Great (see Marcotte 2002: 80-3). The dating of the foundation of Mesembria relative to Darius' campaign against the Scythians seems more causally motivated (cf. Marcotte 2002: 237-8).

(3.) μὴ σύ γ᾽ ἐνὶ τριόδοισι τύχοις ὅτε δάχμα πεφυζώς
περκνὸς ἔχις θυίῃσι τυπῇ ψολόεντος ἐχίδνης,
ἡνίκα θορνυμένου ἔχιος θολερῷ κυνόδοντι
θουρὰς ἀμὺξ ἐμφῦσα κάρην ἀπέκοψεν ὁμεύνου·
οἱ δὲ πατρὸς λώβην μετεκίαθον αὐτίκα τυτθοί
γεινόμενοι ἐχιῆες, ἐπεὶ διὰ μητρὸς ἀραιήν
γαστέρ᾽ ἀναβρώσαντες ἀμήτορες ἐξεγένοντο·
οἴη γὰρ βαρύθει ὑπὸ κύματος, οἱ δὲ καθ᾽ ὕλην
ᾠοτόκοι ὄφιες λεπυρὴν θάλπουσι γενέθλην.
(128-36)

(3.) May you not happen upon the dusky male viper at a crossroads when, having escaped the bite of the sooty female viper, it is maddened by its blow, at the time when, as the male mounts it, the violent female, attaching itself to its mate in a scratching manner with its foul fang, decapitates it. But immediately when being born the little vipers avenge the harm done to their father, since, eating through their mother's thin stomach, they are born motherless. For only this type of snake is weighed down by childbirth, but the egg-laying snakes from the forest warm shelled offspring.

(4.) μηδ᾽ ὅτε ῥικνῆεν φολίδων περὶ γῆρας ἀμέρσας
ἂψ ἀναφοιτήσῃ νεαρῇ κεχαρημένος ἥβῃ,
ἢ ὁπότε σκαρθμοὺς ἐλάφων ὀχεῇσιν ἀλύξας
ἀνδράσ᾽ ἐνισκίμψῃ χολόων γυιοφθόρον ἰόν·
ἔξοχα γὰρ δολιχοῖσι κινωπησταῖς κοτέουσι
νεβροτόκοι καὶ ζόρκες· ἀνιχνεύουσι δὲ πάντη
τρόχμαλά θ᾽ αἱμασιάς τε καὶ ἰλυοὺς ἐρέθοντες,
σμερδαλέῃ μυκτῆρος ἐπισπέρχοντες ἀυτμῇ.
(137-44)

(4.) Neither should you happen upon it when, having lost the wrinkled age of its scales, it wanders back, rejoicing in its new youth, or when, having avoided the leaping of deer in its lairs, raging, it casts limb-ravaging poison at men. For red deer and roe deer bear a special grudge against long serpents, and they track them down everywhere, searching stone-heaps, walls and their lairs, following close on their trail with the terrible breath of their nostrils

(5.) ναὶ μὴν καὶ νιφόεσσα φέρει δυσπαίπαλος Ὄθρυς
φοινὰ δάκη, κοίλη τε φάραγξ καὶ τρηχέες ἀγμοί
καὶ λέπας ὑλῆεν, τόθι δίψιος ἐμβατέει σήψ […]
(145-7)

> **(5.)** Furthermore, indeed, steep and snowy Othrys bears deadly beasts, as does the hollow ravine and rough crags and wooded rock, where the thirst-inducing Seps wanders […]

It is remarkable that a passage which jumps around so much has been described (accurately) in such bald terms as "weibliche Schlangen seien gefährlicher als männliche, und in bestimmten Situationen müsse man besonders vorsichtig sein" (Effe 1974: 56). We move through different sorts of time and space as if Nicander is trying them out as as potential organising principles: any time in which we are unprepared **(1.)** is followed by a more fixed time in the form of a season **(2.)**, with didactic pedigree in its description (note the Hesiodic/Aratean four-word line), before we turn to a general type of place (a crossroads; **(3.)**) and then a time in the life of a snake **(4.)** followed by a specific place (Othrys; **(5.)**), which is itself accompanied by further general types of place (ravines and so on). Despite settling largely for an arrangement of his snakes based on physical similarities (see Part 1, pp. 29-30, for 'reference snakes'), Nicander does return to place as an ordering tool towards the end of his catalogue of snakes: 411-19 (oaks and valleys), 438-40 (an oak on Mount Pelion), 458-64 (Lemnos and Samothrace; see above, pp. 27-8), 488-9 (forests, thickets and ravines; see above, pp. 126-7), and perhaps 483 (if ἔνθα refers to the Thracian islands mentioned in the previous line; Overduin 2014b: 361 is doubtful).[229] An abortive categorisation by differences between European and Asian types appears in the viper-section (note especially the accumulation of place-names, underlined):

> τοιάδ’ ἀέξει
> Εὐρώπη τ’ Ἀσίη τε· τὰ δ’ οὐκ ἐπιείκελα δήεις.
> ἤτοι ἀν’ Εὐρώπην μὲν ὀλίζονα, καί θ’ ὑπὲρ ἄκρους

[229] See also an introductory use of a general type of place (rocky hills and hedges) at 282-5.

> ῥώθωνας κεραοί τε καὶ ἀργίλιπες τελέθουσιν,
> αἱ μὲν ὑπὸ Σκείρωνος ὄρη Παμβώνιά τ᾽ αἴπη,
> Ῥυπαῖον, Κόρακός τε πάγον, πολιόν τ᾽ Ἀσέληνον·
> Ἀσὶς δ᾽ ὀργυιόεντα καὶ ἐς πλέον ἑρπετὰ βόσκει,
> οἷα περὶ τρηχὺν Βουκάρτερον, ἢ καὶ ἐρυμνός
> Αἰσαγέης πρηὼν καὶ Κέρκαφος ἐντὸς ἐέργει.
> (210-18).
>
> Europe and Asia grow them thus. And you will not come across vipers that are alike there. Verily, they are smaller in Europe, and above their nostril-tips they are horned and white, those from beneath the peaks of Skeiron and the Pambonian heights, Rypaion and the cliff of Korax and grey Aselenos. But Asia nourishes serpents which are a fathom long, and even more, the sort which are around rough Boukarteros, or which the strong headlands of Aisagea and Kerkaphos fence within themselves.

Later, too, place is a strong presence at the end of parts of the second 'half' of the poem. We have seen in Part 1 (pp. 35-7) that 822 focuses our attention on the sea as we near the end of the run of sections concerning assorted creatures (805-36). Again, the final section of the spider grouping (715-68), which concerns the moth, begins with a mention of Egypt (note the appearance of the name of the land early in the first line of the section):

> φράζεο δ᾽ Αἰγύπτοιο τά τε τρέφει οὐλοὸς αἶα
> κνώδαλα, φαλλαίνῃ ἐναλίγκια τὴν περὶ λύχνους
> ἀκρόνυχος δειπνητὸς ἐπήλασε παιφάσσουσαν·
> (759-61)
>
> And learn of the creatures which the deadly land of Egypt nourishes, such as the moth which the meal-time at nightfall brings rushing about the lamps.

In both cases Nicander plays with the feeling that we might be about to read a full spatially-linked sequence but denies it to us: we have seen that a reference to Callimachus enables him to hint at a sea-sequence before abandoning the idea with only three creatures named, and at 760 the plural κνώδαλα might lead us to expect an Egyptian catalogue rather than the single animal which precedes the scorpions (cf. above, p. 149).

These passages provide hints at what could have been, but with the exception of the final miscellaneous group of insects, sea-creatures and so on, each major grouping of animals in the *Theriaca* gives a fairly strong impression of coherence (at least until Nicander's favoured final gestures to miscellaneity; see above, pp. 126-7). Conversely, Aratus commits fully to mixing his methods of arrangement in the 'Weather Signs', initially grouping material by the heavenly object in which we are to observe the signs, and subsequently collecting signs pertaining to particular weather types (see above, p. 125). It should also be noted that his astronomical material is not presented uniformly: the description of the constellations emphasises its spatial arrangement (see pp. 139-40), while the run of sections concerning the Zodiac (559-732) is arranged temporally (strictly speaking we should call this grouping 'Zodiacal *Paranatellonta*'): note especially ὅτ' ἀντέλλῃσιν ἑκάστη (560; 'when each rises'), ὅτε Καρκίνος ἀντέλλῃσιν (569; 'when Cancer rises') and καμπαὶ δ' ἂν Ποταμοῖο καὶ αὐτίκ' ἐπερχομένοιο/ Σκορπίου ἐμπίπτοιεν ἐϋρρόου ὠκεανοῖο (634-5; 'And immediately the twists of the River will fall into the beautifully-flowing Ocean with the rise of Scorpio'), from the introduction and two section openings.

Time and space are useful examples of organising principles employed in our poems, not least because they lend themselves to expressing the sectioned nature of ancient voyaging, which happens to find a prominent place in three of the texts. It must be emphasised, however, that these are only examples, and a number of other principles of arrangement and connection can be observed. We might think of the bringing together of constellations making up the family group of Cepheus

at *Phaenomena* 179-253 (although spatial references are still used here), or the grouping of prophecies related to Cassandra's family at *Alexandra* 1174-1280.[230] Even in the linear narrative of the *Argonautica* we can observe runs of sections grouped by different principles: "in Book 1, things tend to go sadly wrong. […] Book 2 is generally marked, until the blow of Tiphys' death, by heroic achievement" (Hutchinson 2008: 81). What survives of other contemporary and recent poems suggests that the creation of small-scale groupings and sequences will have been typical: see Harder 2012b: 719-20 on a grouping of scapegoat rituals in the fourth book of the *Aitia* (frr. 90-3), and 544 on the possibility of a "cluster of love-related aitia [as] a deliberate part of the design of *Aetia* 3-4". Athenaeus provides evidence of geographical arrangement of a sort in Archestratus:

> Ἀρχέστρατος μὲν γὰρ ἐν τῇ Γαστρονομίᾳ καὶ ὁπόθεν ἕκαστον μέρος αὐτοῦ δεῖ συνωνεῖσθαι διηγεῖται οὕτως·
>
> > γόγγρου μὲν γὰρ ἔχεις κεφαλήν, φίλος, ἐν Σικυῶνι
> > πίονος ἰσχυροῦ μεγάλου καὶ πάντα τὰ κοῖλα.
> > εἶτα χρόνον πολὺν ἕψε χλόῃ περίπαστον ἐν ἅλμῃ. (fr. 19 O.-S.)
>
> ἑξῆς τε περὶ τῶν κατ᾽ Ἰταλίαν τόπων διεξιὼν πάλιν ὁ καλὸς οὗτος περιηγητής φησιν·
>
> > καὶ γόγγρος σπουδαῖος ἁλίσκεται, ὅς τε τοσοῦτον
> > τῶν ἄλλων πάντων ὄψων κρατεῖ αὐτός, ὅσον περ
> > θύννος ὁ πιότατος τῶν φαυλοτάτων κορακίνων. (fr. 20 O.-S.)
>
> (7. 293f-294a)
>
> For Archestratus in his *Gastronomia* sets out whence each part of it [the conger-eel] is to be bought as follows:
>
> > For, my friend, you get the head of a fat, strong, large conger-eel in Sicyon, as well as its cavities. Then boil it for a long time in brine after it has been sprinkled with herbs.
>
> And next, in turn, this fine guide, going through locations throughout Italy, says:
>
> > And a proper conger-eel is caught [there?], which itself surpasses all other dishes by as much as the fattest tuna surpasses the completely valueless 'korakinoi'.

---

[230] It may be worth noting here that according to Antoninus Liberalis the two children of Dryops both appeared in Book 1 of Nicander's *Heteroioumena* (Cragaleus 4, Dryope 32 in Antoninus).

Again, we can see a sort of spatial arrangement in the remains of the 'Tattoo Elegy', with a move from the victim's back (col. i. 5) upwards onto the top of his head (col. ii. 4) and then continuing round onto his forehead (col ii. 14)

2.2.2 Pointed disconnectedness; creative connections

Inherent in the writing of formally unifed poems split up into a large number of sections is a tension between oneness and multiplicity, connectedness and disconnectedness. In addition to attempting to bridge this gap by the arrangement of sections on a large scale and in localised groupings, the poets can sometimes do exactly the opposite, and emphasise discontinuity.

One method of achieving this is through digressions. It may well not be a coincidence that among our poems the *Alexipharmaca*, which we have seen to lack the overarching patterns of connection visible in the other texts (see pp. 129-31), contains the largest number of digressive passages (often only a few lines long). Interestingly, Heath 1989: 154 has suggested that this sort of diversity can be a "constituent of coherence": "A digression must be smoothly articulated with the surrounding text, so as to seem a natural elaboration of the text rather than an arbitrary excrescence, emerging from and returning us to the hypothesis by some intelligible train of thought".[231] When we look closely at Nicander's digressive

[231] Note too that for Aristotle digressions are an acceptable part of a unified whole. At *Poetics* 1459a 29-36, in a discussion of the merits of Homer as opposed to other epicicsts, he tells us that the poet of the *Iliad* understood that he could not treat the whole Trojan War in its entirety, since this would be too unmanageable: νῦν δ᾽ ἓν μέρος ἀπολαβὼν ἐπεισοδίοις κέχρηται αὐτῶν πολλοῖς, οἷον νεῶν καταλόγῳ καὶ ἄλλοις ἐπεισοδίοις οἷς διαλαμβάνει τὴν ποίησιν ('As it was, picking out one part, he used snippets of many others, as in the case of the Catalogue of Ships and the other snippets by which he diversifies the poem'). On this passage see Heath 1989: 49-51.

material we can see this sort of approach in action, and we might infer that he relishes the tension between coherence and disconnectedness. A good example comes at 165-85, where we are faced with three digressive passages in quick succession:

> πολλάκι δ' ὀρταλίχων ἁπαλὴν ὠδῖνα κενώσας
> ἀφρὸν ἐπεγκεράσαιο, θοοῦ δορπήια κέπφου·
> **(1.)** τῷ γὰρ δὴ ζωήν τε σαοῖ, καὶ πότμον ἐπισπεῖ
> εὖτε δόλοις νήχοντα κακοφθόρα τέκν' ἁλιήων
> οἰωνὸν χραίνωσιν, ὁ δ' ἐς χέρας ἔμπεσε παίδων
> θηρεύων ἀφροῖο νέην κλύδα λευκαίνουσαν.
> καί τε σύ γ' ἀγλεύκην βάψαις ἰόεντα θάλασσαν,
> ἥν τε καὶ ἀτμεύειν ἀνέμοις πόρεν Ἐννοσίγαιος
> σὺν πυρί· **(2.)** καὶ γὰρ δὴ τὸ πνοαῖς συνδάμναται ἐχθραῖς.
> πῦρ μὲν ἀείζωον καὶ ἀχύνετον ἔτρεσεν ὕδωρ
> ἀργέστας· καί ῥ' ἡ μὲν ἀκοσμήεσσα φιλοργής
> δεσπόζει νηῶν τε καὶ ἐμφθορέων αἰζηῶν,
> ὕλη δ' ἐχθομένοιο πυρὸς κατὰ θεσμὸν ἀκούει.
> ναὶ μὴν ἀτμένιόν τε κεραιόμενον λίπος οἴνῃ
> ἢ χιόνι γλυκέος μίγδην πόσις ἄλγος ἐρύξει,
> **(3.)** ἦμος ὑπὸ ζάγκλῃσι περιβρίθουσαν ὀπώρην
> ῥυσαλέην ἐδανοῖο καὶ ἐκ ψιθίης ἐλίνοιο
> κείροντες θλίβωσιν, ὅτε ῥοιζηδὰ μέλισσαι,
> πεμφρηδών, σφῆκές τε καὶ ἐκ βέμβικες ὄρειαι
> γλεῦκος ἅλις δαίνυνται ἐπὶ ῥαγέεσσι πεσοῦσαι,
> πιοτέρην ὅτε βότρυν ἐσίνατο κηκὰς ἀλώπηξ.

> And, often, emptying out the delicate egg of a chicken, you should mix with it foam, the foodstuff of the swift petrel. **(1.)** For with this it conserves its life and also brings on its doom, when the deadly children of fishermen smear the swimming bird with their trickery, and it falls into the boys' hands as it hunts the freshly whitening wave of foam. And you should also draw water from the unsweet purple sea, which the Earth-Shaker has made a slave to the winds, along with fire. **(2.)** For, indeed, that too is overcome by hostile blasts. Ever-living fire and far-spreading water tremble at the North-Westerly winds. And, verily, the disorderly anger-lover [the sea] is lord over ships and the hearty men who die in it, while the forest obeys the command of hated fire. Yes, indeed, much-toiled-over oil[232] mixed with wine, or a drink of grape-syrup mixed with snow, will ward off pain, **(3.)** at the time when,

[232] For two different interpretations of ἀτμένιος, see Gow, 1951: 99 and White, 1987: 84-6. The translation here follows White's interpretation, which better fits other ancient descriptions of oil-production (and agrees with the scholiast).

> cutting the heavy, wrinkled fruit from the sweet, and specifically Psithian vine[233] with their reaping-hooks, men tread it down while bees with their buzzing sounds, tree-wasps and hornets and mountain-buzzers, falling upon the grapes, feast on the sweetness in large quantities and a mischievous fox harms one of the richer clusters.

First we have the sea as useful to men (1.), then the sea and fire as a danger to men (2.), and then a *locus amoneus*, which culminates with a negative note (3.). The subjects of the first and second parts of this progression are linked in content, but varied in tone and value, with nature's aid for and oppostion to man's activity respectively emphasised. The third part of the progression varies the content quite dramatically, with a scene which could almost come from Theocritus, but the final detail of the fox eating grapes, with a telling use of the verb σίνομαι, links us to the previous part through the focus on nature's potential harm to mankind and its activity. Such creative connections between apparently disparate material are common in the *Alexipharmaca*.[234]

A tension between connectedness and disconnectedness can also be seen at points in our other poems. On a large scale, we might think of Aratus bringing together astronomy and meteorology into one poem. The difference in subject matter is underlined by a different approach to sectioning in the two 'halves' (see above, pp. 31-2), but the poet goes to some lengths to connect the material: this seems to be the purpose of 733-57 (see p. 122), and references to Zeus in both 'halves' (e.g. 265, 964) provide a sort of overarching outlook. In individual passages of the *Alexandra* we can see simultaneous coherence and near-randomness. We saw above

[233] Cf. White, 1987: 82-4.
[234] See Bone: forthcoming for another example: at 472-5 Nicander moves from a digression concerning cuttlefish ink to the symptoms of sea hare poisoning by means of a learned joke.

(pp. 141-2) that the sections making up Menelaus' voyage are marked with a consistent pattern of openings and effectively express the progress and experience of his journey. At the same time, Lycophron uses the multitude of destinations as a starting point for forays into various corners of Greek mythology. The flow of the prophecy is broken again and again by references to events which are in the past from Cassandra's perspective: 826 (a lithified old woman; see Hornblower 2015: 319-20), 829-33 (Myrrha), 836-46 (Perseus), 866-7 (Eryx), 869 (the castration of Kronos) and 872-6 (Argonautic activity in the western Mediterranean). Then, as we move on to a new grouping of sections on the ostensibly distant topic of shipwrecks off Libya, the almost immediate appearance of further Argonautic material (starting with Mopsus in 881) produces a strong, if oblique, connection (see McNelis and Sens 2016: 87 on the Argonautic material as a "bridge", and see Part 2b, p. 202 n. 298, for the 'collection of Argonautic material' in the *Alexandra*).

The *Argonautica* contains the most obviously connected material at first glance (since the whole poem concerns the Argonauts). Nonetheless, Apollonius gestures towards a feeling of separation, for example by the inclusion of a number of 'bitty', self-contained sections such as the Isle of Electra (1. 910-21) and the tomb of Sthenelus (2. 911-29), which receive little or no mention once the Argonauts have moved on.[235] On the other hand, both episodes allow for a foray into a general

[235] See Sistakou 2009b: 386-94 for the idea of a fragmentation of narrative in Apollonius (also useful are her words on the *Aetia* in this vein; 394-401). The specifics of her argument are bound up with notions of romanticism and the past, but in general terms this 'fragmentation' is very interesting for our purposes. See too her suggestion of Jason's cloak as a sort of collection of fragments in miniature (388-9; as she points out, διακριδόν (1. 729) "stresses the discontinuity between the various scenes"): she argues that each scene gives a "snapshot" from another epic poem, and it will be worth remembering this in Part 2b as we consider the idea of the Argonautica as a 'collection' of multiple texts.

theme which with Apollonius is much concerned (religion and aetiology respectively). At other points we are actively encouraged to see connections between ostensibly quite distant material: see e.g. Heath 1989: 65-6 and Hutchinson 2008: 79-81. A good example of a section which is simultaneously integrated into and strikingly separate from what surrounds it is the digression concerning Cyrene (2. 498-530). Asquith 2005b: 2, explaining her reasoning for the absence of the *Argonautica* from her discussion of *Kollektivgedichte*, cites this passage as an example of Apollonius' integration of different material into his coherent overriding narrative: "the Aristaeus narrative is an aetiological digression on the Etesian winds; it explains the delay in the Argonauts' journey, and provides a pause in the poem's action that mirrors this delay". This is certainly true, but Apollonius goes to some lengths to make this digression stand out. After two lines in which the Etesian winds are introduced, we suddenly (and rather bafflingly at first) find Κυρήνη as the first word of 500, without even a connecting particle. It is not until 524-5 that the link is made explicit, even if the connection with the Etesian winds is likely to have dawned on contemporary readers some time between the start of the digression and this point (Aristaeus was a relatively well-discussed figure in the fourth and third centuries: see the parallels for Call. *Aet*. fr. 75. 33-7 assembled by Harder 2012b: 615-18). It does seem, however, that the opening is especially ambiguous (is the place or the person meant?). In fact, the story of Cyrene is barely required in an explanation of the origin of the Etesians: Apollonius could really have begun his story at 516, with a line or two added in place of 518's τόνγ' to give Aristaeus' name and parentage. This elaboration beyond what is strictly necessary to explain the

Etesian winds might suggest that Apollonius is rather enjoying his brief time spent away from Argonautic material. Jackson's 2003 article on the Etesian Winds provides two further interesting pieces of information for our purposes. They were (and are) felt very strongly in Alexandria, and they were associated with the sons of Boreas. The first point, coupled with the Ptolemaic connections of Cyrene, allows the digression to move away from the distant world of myth towards that of the reader (Apollonius' aetiological episodes often make this move).[236] The second demonstrates a connection with the Phineus episode more broadly (since it is the sons of Boreas who chase off the harpies).

Another factor at play in the Cyrene digression is the link to *Pythian* 9. In Part 2b we shall see that Apollonius makes a show of incorporating a variety of different 'texts' into his Argonautic 'collection' (pp. 212-15). Any given example of such a section will naturally give the impression of being self-standing, but when grouped together they gain a sort of coherence.

As we come to the end of this part of the thesis, it is worth reproducing an observation from Hunter 1993: 194 which neatly demonstrates Apollonius' ability to create coherence and its opposite simultaneously. In a discussion of Idmon and

[236] We can find a comparandum at *Ther*. 564-71, where Overduin 2014b: 391, 393 has suggested that the digression concerning the hippopotamus, with its rare discussion of a purely Egyptian topic, is aimed at an Alexandrian audience. This is another good example of a passage which is in some respects quite distant from its surroundings but manages to be connected in interesting ways: In addition to Overduin's 2014b: 392 suggestion that Nicander "proceeds […] through association" to the hippopotamus from the previously mentioned beaver, considering the former a larger version of the latter, it might be pointed out that the requirement for the animal's testicle can be connected with its metaphorical 'sickle' in the digression (*Ther*. 567) by the story of Cronus' castration of Uranus: Overduin 2014b: 393 even suggests that Hes. *Th*. 179, where ἅρπην appears in the same *sedes*, may be recalled here (although he does not seem to connect this with the testicle, explicitly at any rate).

Tiphys, he points out that it is precisely by grouping these deaths together that Apollonius can "flaunt their randomness, their lack of causal nexus".

2.2.3 Connections and arrangements on a smaller scale: conclusion

A full discussion of every small-scale connection and separation of material in our poems would take up a whole thesis by itself. What we have been able to see in this brief survey is that the poets are certainly aware that in writing 'sectioned verse' at all they are raising questions for readers brought up on a literary culture with strong theoretical underpinnings. One might almost get the impression at points that some of our authors will have taken pride in placing seemingly unrelated material in close proximity and challenging themselves to find a way to connect it.

While we should not underplay this strain of ostentatious virtuosity, it is also important to remember that the arrangement of material is not only a vehicle for showboating or reacting to theoretical debate. Expressive sequences, for example those concerned with voyaging, give more evidence (in addition to what we have seen in Part 1) for the benefit of reading these poems through their sections rather than in spite of them.

Part 2a: Conclusion

Questions of arrangement, structure, unity and so on have been thought crucial to the understanding of works of Hellenistic literature from the period itself to modern scholarship (see 2a introduction, pp. 116-20). Even in the brief account given in these chapters it has become clear that thinking of our poems as sectioned works allows us to approach these questions from new angles. We saw in Part 1 that the poets are aware of and exploit the aesthetic opportunities afforded by section marking, and in Part 2a we have seen that they relish the opportunities and questions raised by the multiplicity which their sectioning creates. They are necessarily brought into contact with other types of literature and with literary theory, and also given the chance to create interesting and enjoyable effects (and sometimes, it seems, simply to show off).

Even when viewed strictly as single entities, our sectioned poems all exude feelings of multiplicity and accumulation, and we shall see in Part 2b that the latter in particular connects them to other strands of Hellenistic literary culture and may go some way to explaining the appeal of this kind of poetry to contemporary readers.

Part 2b: Sectioned Poems as 'Collections'

Context and Introductory Remarks

In our examination of the poems as 'formally single entities, articulated into sub-units', we have seen a concern with the treatment, arrangement and the very multiplicity of these smaller units (i.e. the sections). As we turn to considering them as 'numerous smaller items brought together into a grouping, or 'collection', and thereby granted new significance', it should be noted that Hellenistic literary collections in the strict sense show similar concerns. We might think, for example, of the development of epigram books or of anthologies on papyrus, or even of collected works of individual authors.[237] Hellenistic literary culture seems to have

[237] For principles of arrangement and selectivity in epigram collections (primarily the Milan Posidippus) see Krevans 2005 and 2007. Much has also been written on specific sections of Posidippus' book: see e.g. Prioux 2008: 167-72 on some ordering principles of the 'Lithika'. There is a remarkable range of grouping-methods in papyrus anthologies: by author (e.g. P. Köln Inv. 21351 + 21376, third century BC; cf. Hutchinson 2008: 8-10, with further bibliography in his n. 9: the order of this Sapphic collection differs from that of later papyri, which has interesting implications for the activity of the 'collector'), by metre or genre (P. Petrie 1 III 1, third century BC; an iambic or dramatic collection, containing excerpts of Epicharmus and Euripides), by subject matter (the papyrus published by Barns 1950, second or first century BC; a gnomic anthology which contains prose by e.g. Demosthenes as well as iambs) and by no discernible method (P. Hamb. 121, second century BC; apparent bucolic and dramatic fragments, and Aratus 480ff.). See Hutchinson 2008: 5-15 for a fuller list. Editions of older poets also show a similar interest: the arrangement principles within the books of the Alexandrian edition of Pindar produced by the sometime head librarian Aristophanes of Byzantium (third-second century BC) are discussed by Irigoin 1952: 43-4: type of event and status of encomiand seem to have been the most important factors, chronology and geography not at all. The picture is different at a larger scale, of course, since the arrangement into books based on the different sets of games is to some extent geographical; Irigoin also suggests (43) that the books are ordered according to the relative antiquity of the founding of each of the sets of games. Negri's 2004 monograph, however, suggests that here too 'hierarchy' of a non-chronological sort was employed (at 44-118 she suggests that the relative chronology of the festivals was far from universally agreed upon). Regardless of the actual criteria used, debates of the sort reflected by Negri's evidence, including Callimachus' apparent treatise Περὶ ἀγώνων (fr. 403 Pf.; here we are told that he claims antiquity for the Aktian Games), are potentially illuminating: the possibility that Aristophanes' arrangement of Pindar's Epinicians engaged with this sort of work, whether with an eye on antiquity or another form of hierarchy, allows us to posit 'ordering' as a serious business, and one in which

been dominated by the accumulation of large numbers of items into single collections, ranging from personal groupings of short poems or extracts onto single rolls of papyrus to professional anthologies associated with named authors to groupings of physical items in libraries (whether small personal collections or large royal institutions).[238] Indeed, this literary impulse seems to reflect a broader trend in different arts.[239] Note too that the various strands of Hellenistic collecting have

---

no small amount of judgement seems to have been involved. Smaller-scale manipulations of the general criteria of arrangement can also be observed: Irigoin (44) explains the placement of *Pythian* 2 with the claim that "Aristophane de Byzance a certainement voulu grouper trois odes écrites en l'honneur de Hiéron". See also above, p. 125 n. 209, for a turn towards miscellaneity towards the end of some books in the edition of Pindar. Different sorts of arrangement might have been found, as possibly in the Alexandrian edition of Anacreon: note Bernsdorff's 2020: 728-9 suggestion that the poet's ageing may have been reflected in the order of a Hellenistic collection of his poems. Cicero has a notion of a grouping of his speeches forming a 'whole': at *ad Att*. 2. 1. 3 in response to a request for two speeches, he says that he will send them along with several more so that Atticus will have *hoc totum* σῶμα. Note that Galen will go on to write a treatise *On the Order of his Own Books*. Generally on arrangement and selection, important factors in the creation of collections, see Fantuzzi and Hunter 2004: 50, who mark out the "[exercising] of judgement", as a hallmark of the "Alexandrian version" of the "great systematisation of knowledge which so characterises the Hellenistic and Roman periods" (2004: 50).

[238] For anthologies on papyrus, perhaps personal, see previous note. A professional anthology associated with a named author of the second or first century BC may be attested for Gorgus of Colophon, known only from an inscribed epigram in Notion (first edited by Schuchhardt 1886: 426-7). The first two lines of the text, which seem to suggest such a work, are much disputed in their significance (see P. Ceccarelli, *BNJ* 17 for detailed discussion of the date and these lines, with further bibliography): τὸν πάσης πο‹λ›ύβυβλον ἀφ' ἱστορίης μελεδωνὸν/ πρέσβυν ἀοιδοπόλων δρεψάμενον σελίδα (perhaps 'The old guardian who plucked out his work of many books from all the narratives of the poets'). In addition to the (potentially) authorially designed Milan papyrus, there is probable evidence for personal epigram collections: this may be suggested by the poor quality of P. Oxy. 662 (first century AD; for a brief discussion see Argentieri 2007: 150): "the copyist, who wrote in an irregular uncial hand, was a careless and unintelligent person" (!) (Grenfell and Hunt 1904: 64). The popularity of professional epigram collection can be seen in the shape of Meleager's *Garland*. We have seen examples of sectioned prose texts which 'collect' items in the introductions to Part 1, and Part 2a (pp. 13-16, 119). For libraries, public and private: Fraser 1972: 320-35 discusses the Alexandrian library (a brief but useful account of its role and influence is given by Thalmann 2011: 210-11); see Platthy 1968: 160-5 and 170-1 for testimonia for the library at Pergamon and Seleucid libraries at Antioch. Casson's 2001 chapter 'The Growth of Libraries' (48-60) discusses libraries beyond the large royal institutions (and some of his evidence probably points to individuals' collections); Johnstone 2014 also includes material on private collections.

[239] As demonstrated, for example, by collections of physical objects with aesthetic value, such as gemstones: see Kuttner 2005: 141 n. 1 for bibliography; her chapter generally attempts to connect Posidippus' literary collection constituted by the 'Lithika' with physical collections of gemstones, and is thus of interest for us in our examination of the connection between different types of literary collection. See also Prioux 2008: 159-252 on both the 'Lithika' and the 'Andriantopoiika', and Krevans (below, n. 242).

been connected to each other: it is certainly attractive to think of collection as a unifying impulse of Hellenistic literary culture.[240]

Against this background, we might ask whether the poets and/or their early readers will have recognised similarities between their poems, which might be thought of as multiple 'textual items' grouped together, and other forms of literary collection common at the time. The didactic poems of Aratus and Nicander might be thought of as collections of signs, dangerous creatures and posions, the *Alexandra* as a collection of (mostly negative) prophecies, the *Periodos* as a collection of places around the Mediterranean and Black Seas, and the *Argonautica* as a collection of Argonautic ἄεθλοι. Indeed, some Hellenistic poems which are no longer extant certainly seem to have been thought of in similar terms by ancient readers: the Suda tells us that Euphorion's *Chiliades* <u>συνάγει</u> διὰ χιλίων ἐτῶν χρησμοὺς ἀποτελεσθέντας ('<u>collects</u> prophecies fulfilled after a thousand years'), while Pseudo-Scymnus describes Apllodorus' composition of the *Chronica* as κεφάλαια <u>συναθροίσας</u> χρόνων (45; '<u>gathering together</u> the chief points in time').[241] Furthermore, there have been recent attempts to connect some of the poems to

[240] Kerkhecker 1999: 288 connects the writing of authorially-designed poetry books with the scholarly activity of arranging editions of older poets. Prodi 2017: 547-9 suggests that we view epigram collections and anthologies on papyrus as part of the same general trend as the arrangement of older poets into books, with the important caveat that "the intriguing common-ground of Hellenistic collection-making should not obscure the variety of the phenomenon"; cf. Gutzwiller 2005: 289 on the unsurprising variety of arrangement-methods in Hellenistic poetry books. The literary-focused usage of Aristotle's *Historia Animalium* (more quoted in the Homeric scholia than works specifically concerning Homer: Hatzimichali 2013: 73-5) demonstrates the possibility for overlap between technical prose and literary scholarship.

[241] Pseudo-Scymnus' characterisation of Apollodorus' work in these terms is especially important for our purposes, since the *Periodos*, which presents itself as a continuation of the tradition started by the *Chronica* (see above, p. 145 n. 226) is one of the most explicitly 'collection-like' of our texts. Note too that the Suda credits Nicander with a work described as Ἰάσεων συναγωγή ('Collection of Cures'): an original title?

various types of Hellenistic literary collecting, and the influence of the library on the work of Hellenistic poetry in particular is a popular topic of scholarship.[242] Significantly, Callimachus' *Pinakes* demonstrate engagement with the physical library in textual form, and so it seems that this line of enquiry has the potential to be a fruitful one.[243]

Before turning to our poems, it is worth bringing into consideration two texts which engage explicitly with the idea of the library through their titles, the historical and mythological 'libraries' of Diodorus Siculus and Pseudo-Apollodorus respectively.[244] Evidence for what a reader (even if one potentially quite considerably later than our poets) might have thought a 'textual library' should be is provided by an epigraph which Photius (*Bib*. 186. 142b) claims to have read in a copy of Pseudo-Apollodorus' βιβλιοθήκη:[245]

---

[242] Harder 2013, for example, approaches the topic of the influence of the library of Alexandria on the work of Callimachus and Apollonius. Interesting for our purposes is her assertion that "Apollonius seems to make the library, where the reader may go and find the information the poet is holding back, into a kind of living presence in his work" (p. 105). See also the introductory remarks of Krevans 2007: 131-2 on anthologies, under which she groups "encyclopaedic compilations" in prose, epigram collections, actual anthologies on papyrus of passages from (e.g.) drama and, most interestingly for our purposes, poems like those of Nicander. She suggests that these sorts of literary activity constitute a "textual analogy to the ultimate Hellenistic collection – the great library at Alexandria". Her n. 1 also provides useful bibliography for collections of books, art and animals. Lightfoot 2017: 131-2 (whose whole chapter connects *onomastica* to Hellenistic poetry) discusses Nicander's interest in names in the context of *onomastica*, especially interesting for our purposes given the poet's extensive use of names in section marking.

[243] For the *Pinakes* see Blum 1977: 224-44. Another 'textualising' of a library comes in the form of the 'library catalogue' from Tauromenium (probably early second century BC), on which see Battistoni 2006. Note e.g. the summary of contents in the entry for Fabius Pictor, which will be worth remembering as we examine sections of our poems which claim to give us content from the work of a named author.

[244] Diodorus himself seems to have given his work its title (see Pliny *NH* pr. 25), whereas the name βιβλιοθήκη is not certainly given to the work of Ps.-Apollodorus until Photius (Ninth Century). Nevertheless, its relevance for us lies in a response to the text recorded by Photius, and we can reasonably assume the idea of the library to be relevant here. Too 2010: 116-69 discusses both of these works *qua* textual versions of a library. At pp. 123-4 she claims a textual library of this sort to be an anti-Callimachean venture (despite the fact that the *Aetia* collects a large number of stories, just like Pseudo-Apollodorus' work).

[245] This epigraph is discussed by Too at pp. 117-23.

αἰῶνος σπείρημα ἀφυσσάμενος ἀπ' ἐμεῖο
παιδείης, μύθους γνῶθι παλαιγενέας,
μηδ' ἐς ' Ομηρείην σελίδ' ἔμβλεπε, μηδ' ἐλεγείην,
μὴ τραγικὴν Μοῦσαν, μηδὲ μελογραφίην,
μὴ κυκλίων ζήτει πολύθρουν στίχον. εἰς ἐμὲ δ' ἀθρῶν
εὑρήσεις ἐν ἐμοὶ πάνθ' ὅσα κόσμος ἔχει.

Drawing the coils of time from my culture, learn of ancient myths, and do not look in a Homeric column, nor an elegy, nor at the tragic Muse, nor at lyric song, and do not search the clamorous verse of cyclic epic. But looking into me you will find in me everything which the universe holds.

We might compare the claim that the reader need look no further than this one place for such a wide array of knowledge with the boasts of Pseudo-Scymnus' prologue, where an extremely long list of the work's contents (65-91)[246] is followed by these lines:

συνελόντι δ' εἰπεῖν, οὐχὶ τὴν Ὀδυσσέως
ἀναδεξάμενος, ὥς φασιν οἱ μῦθοι, πλάνην,
ἐπὶ τῆς ἰδίας δὲ καταμένων εὐδαιμόνως,
οὐχὶ μόνον ἑτερόφυλον ἀνθρώπων βίον,
ἐθνῶν ὅλων δὲ γνώσετ' ἄστη καὶ νόμους.
(98-102)

To sum up, not taking upon oneself the wandering of Odysseus, as the stories tell it, but remaining happily in one's place of origin, one will know

[246] A translation of these lines demonstrates their feeling of exhaustiveness: "On the basis of certain scattered historians I have written for you in summary the colonies and foundations of cities of almost all the world, as much as is navigable and able to be travelled among its locations. And as much of this as is evident and clear I shall set out summarily, cutting it down, but as much of it as is not known clearly, this my account will make precise in due proportion, so that, king, you receive a whole demarcation of the boundaries of the inhabited world in abridged form, the peculiarities and flowings of great rivers, the position of the two continents in turn, which cities of Hellenes are located in each , who built them, at what time they founded them, those who share their ethnic make-up with others and those who are indigenous to their areas, which tribes of barbarians are neighbouring, which are said to belong to the 'mixed' races, which sorts are nomadic, which are gentle, which are most inhospitable in their customs and most barbaric in their ways and their deeds, which peoples are the greatest and well-numbered, which laws and livelihoods each employ, all the most prosperous of their markets, the position of all the islands next to Europe, and, in turn, of those which lie near Asia, the foundations of cities which are reported to be situated on them, put simply, a description of all lands and an entire circumference of the world in a few verses". Note that this final claim of totality (90-1; ἁπλῶς θ' ἁπάντων χωρίων διέξοδον/ καὶ τὴν ὅλην περίοδον ἐν ὀλίγοις στίχοις) is picked up again, with a change in focus, at 102 (ἐθνῶν ὅλων δὲ γνώσετ' ἄστη καὶ νόμους; 'one will know of the cities and customes of all peoples'); given Ps.-Scymnus' subject matter, we are not too far here from πάνθ' ὅσα κόσμος ἔχει.

> not only of the life of men of other races but of the cities and customs of all peoples.[247]

In Diodorus, too, we find interesting overlaps with Pseudo-Scymnus' prologue. In defence of his decision to write a 'universal' history, the historian makes the following claims:[248]

> ἐκρίναμεν ὑπόθεσιν ἱστορικὴν πραγματεύσασθαι τὴν πλεῖστα μὲν ὠφελῆσαι δυναμένην, ἐλάχιστα δὲ τοὺς ἀναγινώσκοντας ἐνοχλήσουσαν. […] ἐξέσται γὰρ ἐκ ταύτης ἕκαστον πρὸς τὴν ἰδίαν ὑπόστασιν ἑτοίμως λαμβάνειν τὸ χρήσιμον, ὥσπερ ἐκ μεγάλης ἀρυόμενον πηγῆς. τοῖς μὲν γὰρ ἐπιβαλλομένοις διεξιέναι τὰς τῶν τοσούτων συγγραφέων ἱστορίας πρῶτον μὲν οὐ ῥᾴδιον εὐπορῆσαι τῶν εἰς τὴν χρείαν πιπτουσῶν βίβλων […]
> (1. 3. 5-8)
>
> I decided upon following a historical template which is able to be benefit its readers as much as possible, and which burdens them as little as possible. […] For it is possible for each man easily to take from this what is useful for his own ends, as if drawing from a great fountain. For, first, it is not easy for those who give themselves to going through the histories of so many authors to procure the books which turn out to be required […]

---

[247] Cf. perhaps Call. *Aet*. fr. 178. 32-3, where the Ician responds to Callimachus' requests for obscure knowledge with τ̣ιρισ̣μάκαρ, ἦ παύρων ὄ̣λβιός ἐσσι μέτα,/ ναυτι̣λίης εἰ νῆιν ἔ̣χεις βίον ('Thrice-blessed man, truly you are blessed in a way that few are, if you have a life which has been ignorant of seafaring'). The *Aetia* is well worth comparing here more generally: the narrator tends to have knowledge brought to him, and, like Pseudo-Scymnus, Callimachus can match up the material of individual sections to specific authors (see fr. 75. 54, quoted below, pp. 199-200., even if Xenomedes is much more obscure than Ps.-Scymnus' sources), emphasising the 'bookishness' of his collection. Leandrius of Miletus seems to have been mentioned as a source at fr. 92. 2-3, but there is little surviving material to allow a view of how Callimachus uses this author (and εἰ in 92. 2 adds a further level of uncertainty as to what exactly the poet is doing here; cf. Greene 2017: 29-30): Λε]α̣νδρίδες εἴ τι παλαιαί/ φθ̣[έγγ]ο̣νται̣[ ]υ̣φαν ἱστορίαι ('If the ancient Leandrian histories say […]'). See Greene 2011: 82-5 for a discussion of a few possibilities. It is at least clear that these lines finished their *aetion* (Melicertes and a ritual of Tenedos), and we shall see a similar approach to source-naming in Pseudo-Scymnus (see below, 175-9).

[248] We can reasonably assume the title βιβλιοθήκη to be bound up with Diodorus' conception of 'universal' history; his authorship of this work seems intended to remedy the situation that "dates and events are scattered in a great number of treatises and in a variety of prose authors" (διερριμμένων τῶν τε χρόνων καὶ τῶν πράξεων ἐν πλείοσι πραγματείαις καὶ διαφόροις συγγραφεῦσι; cf. Ps.-Scymnus 65-6: ἐκ τῶν σποράδην γὰρ ἱστορουμένων τισίν/ ἐν ἐπιτομῇ σοι γέγραφα […]; 'On the basis of certain scattered historians I have written for you in summary of […]'). It is also worth noting that Pliny *NH* pr. 24-5 seems to be praising Diodorus for giving his work a title which accurately reflects its nature when he says *apud Graecos desiit nugari Diodorus et* βιβλιοθήκης *historiam suam inscripsit* ('among the Greeks Diodorus put an end to trifling at gave his history the name βιβλιοθήκη') after a list of such names as ἴα ['Violets'], Μοῦσαι ['Muses'], πανδέκται ['All-receivers'], ἐγχειρίδια ['Handbooks'] and λειμών ['Meadow']). Note that at least some of these other names indicate a penchant for anthology-like composition.

Unburdensome benefit and the freedom to pick and choose which parts of the text to give one's attention are also connected by Pseudo-Scymnus to his work. Directly before his promise that his audience need not leave their homelands, he tells us the following:

> ἧς ὁ κατακούσας οὐ μόνον τερφθήσεται,
> ἅμα δ᾽ ὠφελίαν ἀποίσετ᾽ εὔχρηστον μαθών,
> εἰ μηθὲν ἕτερον, φασί, ποῦ ποτ᾽ ἔστι γῆς,
> κἀν τίσι τόποις τὴν πατρίδα κειμένην ἔχει,
> τίνων τε πρότερον γενομένην οἰκητόρων
> πόλεσί τε ποίαις συγγένειαν ἀναφέρει·
> (92-7)
>
> From [this poem] the listener will not only derive enjoyment but at the same time take away a useful benefit, learning, if nothing else, as they say, where in the world he is and in what location his fatherland lies, to which inhabitants it belonged in former times, and to what sorts of city it traces its ethnic links.

Diodorus' work, not too far distant in time from that of Pseudo-Scymnus, has been considered to be engaging actively with the idea of the library: Sacks 1990: 77, who adduces 3. 38. 1 and 17. 52. 6 as evidence of Diodorus' probable use of the Alexandrian library, suggests that "Diodorus intended that his work recall that great collection [the library of Alexandria], whose books were listed and described by *pinakes*. In naming historians and the periods their works covered, Diodorus is cataloguing and memorialising the process of history writing".[249]

---

[249] 3. 38. 1: τὰ μὲν ἐκ τῶν ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ βασιλικῶν ὑπομνημάτων ἐξειληφότες 'taking these things [information about the Arabian Gulf] from the royal records in Alexandria'. At 17. 52. 6 Diodorus mentions his having had a discussion with οἱ τὰς ἀναγραφὰς ἔχοντες ('those who keep the public records') in Egypt. His use of library materials elsewhere is hinted at in his introduction to the work: the project has been possible τῇ ἐν Ῥώμῃ χορηγίᾳ τῶν πρὸς τὴν ὑποκειμένην ὑπόθεσιν ἀνηκόντων (1. 4. 2, 'through the supply in Rome of things relevant to the undertaking which lay before me'); Rome has provided him with ἑτοιμοτάτας καὶ πλείστας ἡμῖν ἀφορμὰς (1. 4. 3, 'easily accessible and abundant resources'); διὰ τὴν ἐπιμιξίαν τοῖς ἐν τῇ νήσῳ πολλὴν ἐμπειρίαν τῆς Ῥωμαίων διαλέκτου περιπεποιημένοι, πάσας τὰς τῆς ἡγεμονίας ταύτης πράξεις ἀκριβῶς ἀνελάβομεν ἐκ τῶν παρ᾽ ἐκείνοις ὑπομνημάτων ἐκ πολλῶν χρόνων τετηρημένων (1. 4. 4, 'Having procured a great deal of familiarity with the language of the Romans through our mixing with them on the island, we have received

This discourse of unburdonsome benefit from a work bringing together large amounts of disparate material will have been familiar to early readers of Pseudo-Scymnus. We find something similar in Polybius (and, in fact, Diodorus' sentiments may owe something to those of his predecessor; see below, p. 172, for more similarities):

> ᾗι καὶ τοὺς ὑπολαμβάνοντας δύσκτητον εἶναι καὶ δυσανάγνωστον τὴν ἡμετέραν πραγματείαν διὰ τὸ πλῆθος καὶ τὸ μέγεθος τῶν βύβλων ἀγνοεῖν νομιστέον. πόσῳ γὰρ ῥᾷόν ἐστι καὶ κτήσασθαι καὶ διαναγνῶναι βύβλους τετταράκοντα καθαπερανεὶ κατὰ μίτον ἐξυφασμένας καὶ παρακολουθῆσαι σαφῶς ταῖς μὲν κατὰ τὴν Ἰταλίαν καὶ Σικελίαν καὶ Λιβύην πράξεσιν ἀπὸ τῶν κατὰ Πύρρον εἰς τὴν Καρχηδόνος ἅλωσιν, ταῖς δὲ κατὰ τὴν ἄλλην οἰκουμένην ἀπὸ τῆς Κλεομένους τοῦ Σπαρτιάτου φυγῆς κατὰ τὸ συνεχὲς μέχρι τῆς Ἀχαιῶν καὶ Ῥωμαίων περὶ τὸν Ἰσθμὸν παρατάξεως, ἢ τὰς τῶν κατὰ μέρος γραφόντων συντάξεις ἀναγινώσκειν ἢ κτᾶσθαι;
> (3. 32. 1-3)
>
> On this basis, indeed, it should be considered that those who regard my work as difficult to obtain and read on account of its number of books and its size are ignorant. For how much easier is it both to obtain and to read forty books stitched together with thread, as it were, and to follow clearly events in Italy and Sicily and Libya from the time of Pyrrhus to the capture of Carthage, as well as events in the remainder of the inhabited world from the exile of Cleomenes the Spartan all the way as far as the battle of the Greeks and Romans at the Isthmus, than to read or obtain the compositions of those who write about specific parts?

The desire to defend 'universal history' accounts for the argument of this passage, but Polybius and Pseudo-Scymnus, potentially contemporaries, apparently share an expectation that their audiences want an easy life: it should be for authors, not audiences, to do the hard work of gathering disparate material into one place (and

---

accurate information about all the events of their empire from the records which have been guarded among them for a long time'). It should be borne in mind as we turn to the matching of individual sections and runs of sections to individual authors or types of work in Pseudo-Scymnus and Apollonius that Diodorus has been thought to make predominant use of individual authors for several sections at a time (even if the picture is really a little more complicated: see the extended discussion of Diodorus' use of sources in Book 1 by Burton 1972: 1-34).

cf. Diod. Sic. 1. 2: the historian's work ἀπείρατον κακῶν ἔχει τήν διδασκαλίαν; 'provides [to its readers] an education which requires no experience of dangers').

In the first two chapters of Part 2b, we shall examine the interaction of sectioning with the display of gathering source material in Pseudo-Scymnus and Apollonius, as well as the slightly different approach of Nicander. Here we shall see that the poets encourage us to see their works as 'literary collections', similar to or engaging with the material gathered into physical libraries or the 'textual items' excerpted from large numbers of scrolls. In the second part we shall look at gestures towards less focused literary collections, which resemble personal book collections or anthologies on papyrus rather than definitive groupings of material on any given subject: the two best cases for study in this respect are Lycophron and Apollonius.

This leaves only Aratus without any dedicated discussion in Part 2b (although the evidence which is available to us suggests a degree of similarity to Nicander: see below, p. 197). There are a few things which can be said here about the *Phaenomena* before we turn to the fuller discussions of the poems for which the evidence allows firmer conclusions. First, at a very basic level, the poem seems to bring together two prose texts into one place, Eudoxus' *Phaenomena* and a text concerning weather signs on which the surviving Pseudo-Theophrastan *de Signis* is based.[250] Secondly, if we think of Aratus' poem as 'Hesiodic', as we are clearly

---

[250] Sider and Brünschon 2007: 14-15, following Böhme 1884: 82, think it likely that something like the extant *De Signis* appeared in Eudoxus, on the basis that ancient authorities only mention Eudoxus as a source for Aratus. They quote several sources in support of the notion that Eudoxus dealt with such subject matter, but the first of these only really attests Eudoxan authorship of parapegmatic material (which is known for certain anyway). Joh. Diacon. Gal.'s allegorical commentary on the *Theogony* claims that, Eudoxus, along with Aratus and Aristotle *Meteor*. 2 tells us that κατὰ διαφόρους ἐπιτολὰς καὶ δύσεις ἄλλων καὶ ἄλλων ἄστρων, καὶ ἐκ διαφόρων μερῶν τοῦ παντὸς οἱ ἄνεμοι πνέουσιν ('at the same time as different risings and settings of such-and-such constellations, so too do winds blow from different parts of the world'; Flach pages 324-5). If we examine the relevant passage of

encouraged to do, and as Hellenistic and modern readers have done (see above, p. 121 nn. 199, 200), we may see another bringing together of two texts: the two 'halves' of the poem might be thought each to represent a different work of Hesiod, the *Astronomia* in the case of the first 'half', and perhaps the *Ornithomanteia* in the case of the second.[251] In either case, a 'collection' would be rather a grandiose term for two texts brought together, and it is less easy to connect his grouping of 'texts' with

---

Aristotle (361b 30ff.), he seems to be telling us that the risings and settings of certain constellations just happen to coincide with strong winds on account of their occurrence at the changes of seasons (he has just explained that extreme heat and coldness stop winds from blowing, thereby making the changes of the seasons ideal times for this sort of weather):

> ἄκριτος δὲ καὶ χαλεπὸς ὁ Ὠρίων εἶναι δοκεῖ, καὶ δύνων καὶ ἐπιτέλλων, διὰ τὸ ἐν μεταβολῇ ὥρας συμβαίνειν τὴν δύσιν καὶ τὴν ἀνατολήν, θέρους ἢ χειμῶνος, καὶ διὰ τὸ μέγεθος τοῦ ἄστρου ἡμερῶν γίγνεται πλῆθος· αἱ δὲ μεταβολαὶ πάντων ταραχώδεις διὰ τὴν ἀοριστίαν εἰσίν.
>
> And Orion is thought to be confused and troublesome, both at its setting and at its rising, on account of its setting and rising coinciding with a change of season, summer or winter, and because of the size of the constellation these [setting and rising] happen over a great number of days. And the changes of all things are disturbing on account of their indefiniteness.

Aratus too associates constellations with winds, as at 150-5, 157-9, 300-4, 326-35 and 314-15, which elicit explanations like the following in the scholia: ἡ γὰρ ἑῴα δύσις τῶν Ἐρίφων χειμῶνα φέρει ἡλίου Τοξότην διανύοντος, ἡ δὲ Αἲξ τὴν ἑῴαν ποιεῖται δύσιν ἡλίου ὄντος ἐν Αἰγοκέρωτι περὶ τὰς χειμερινὰς τροπάς (*Σ Phaen*. 158; "for the setting of the kids at dawn brings the stormy season when the Sun is at the end of Sagittarius, and the goat makes its dawn setting when the Sun is in Capricorn around the winter solstice"). This is hardly the same as what we find in the Weather Signs, and we know that passages similar in gist to those in Aratus appeared in Eudoxus' parapegmatic writing (e.g. Scorpio rising at dawn on the 21st day of Sagittarius as a sign of winter). Their second piece of evidence comes in the form of Sextus Empiricus' attack on predictive astronomy 'as practiced by Hipparchus and Eudoxus' (*Adv. Math*. 5. 1-2). Earthquakes, one of the items on the list of predicted events, are thought by Sider and Brünschon more likely to have been predicted from animal signs than from stars. But they admit that no animal signs appear in the earthquake predictions of Paus. 7. 24. 7-11. Conversely, the appearance of stars is a method of earthquake prediction listed by Pausanias (7. 24. 7). The securest testimonium for purely 'Weather-Sign' material is Geminus *Eisag*. 17. 49, where a brief attack on the use of animals as well as celestial bodies in predicting the weather is tacked on to the end of a denouncement of parapegmata (the gist of the chapter is 'the stars do not determine the weather, but merely coincide with it at certain times'). At any rate, even if Eudoxus wrote a separate 'Weather Signs', Aratus would still be bringing two Eudoxan texts into one. Only if Eudoxus' *Phaenomena* contained weather signs would this aspect of Aratus' poem be absent.

[251] Among the topics of the surviving fragments of the *Astronomia* (288-93 M.-W.) are the Hyades and Pleiades (cf. *Phaen*. 172-4, 254-67), although it should be borne in mind that astronomy is, of course, not entirely absent from the *WD*: see Kidd 1997: 9-10 for some relevant passages. The *Ornithomanteia* was considered by some to be part of the *WD*, but Apollonius athetised it (Σ *Op*. 828). The line which West 1978: 365 reconstructs for it (ταύτην γάρ σφισι μοῖραν ἐδάσσατο μητίετα Ζεύς; 'for this is the portion that Zeus the Counsellor allotted to them') would not be out of place in Aratus, but very little is known about the poem, and so any proposed similarity to parts of the 'Weather Signs' must be very tentative indeed.

his sectioned composition (which evokes the overall structure of both prose treatises and Hesiodic verse), but at least we might say that Aratus, at the very beginning of our period, is making some sort of movement in the direction pursued more vigorously by our later poets.

2.3 Sections and Sources: Pseudo-Scymnus and Apollonius

2.3.1 Sections and sources: context and introductory remarks

Starting with Herodotus, whose *Histories* begin Ἡροδότου Ἁλικαρνησσέος ἱστορίης ἀπόδεξις ἥδε ('this is the result of the enquiry of Herodotous of Halicarnassus'), emphasis on the effort of the author in gathering material for his work is a commonplace in Greek literature. Note especially the apparent opening of Archestratus' *Hedypatheia*: ἱστορίης ἐπίδειγμα ποιούμενος Ἑλλάδι πάσῃ (fr. 1 O.-S.; 'making a display of my enquiry to the whole of Greece'). Often focus is placed on physical travel, as in Hdt. 2. 3 (travels and enquiry in Egypt), and, if Athenaeus' description of Archestratus' material concerning conger-eels is accurate (see above, p. 151), the poet's journeying may also have been foregrounded in the main body of the poem. An extensive later example comes in the preface to Artemidorus' *Oneirocritica* (second century AD):[252]

---

[252] Another example of a text which foregrounds the author's travel is Appian's *Preface*, which emphasises his journeying ὥσπερ ἀλώμενον ('as though a wanderer') to collect disparate information into one place (45-7). Early in *On the Decline of Oracles*, Plutarch decribes the journeying of a certain Clemobrotus of Sparta for the purpose of composing a treatise:

> […] Κλεόμβροτος δ' ὁ Λακεδαιμόνιος, πολλὰ μὲν ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ περὶ τὴν Τρωγλοδυτικὴν γῆν πεπλανημένος, πόρρω δὲ τῆς Ἐρυθρᾶς θαλάσσης ἀναπεπλευκὼς οὐ κατ' ἐμπορίαν, ἀλλ' ἀνὴρ φιλοθεάμων καὶ φιλομαθὴς οὐσίαν δ' ἔχων ἱκανὴν καὶ τὸ πλείονα τῶν ἱκανῶν ἔχειν οὐκ ἄξιον πολλοῦ ποιούμενος ἐχρῆτο τῇ σχολῇ πρὸς τὰ τοιαῦτα καὶ συνῆγεν ἱστορίαν οἷον ὕλην φιλοσοφίας θεολογίαν ὥσπερ αὐτὸς ἐκάλει τέλος ἐχούσης.
> (410a-b)
> […] and Cleombrotus the Spartan, who had wandered much in Egypt and around the land of the Troglodytes, and had sailed beyond the Red Sea, not on a business trip, but as a man keen on seeing the sights and on learning, and having sufficient property as not to think there much worth in having more than enough, he spent his leisure time in such pursuits, and was collecting historical material to be the basis for a philosophy which had as its end theology, as he put it.

Later in Plutarch's treatise we hear of sights and reports from Cleombrotus' journey: e.g. the lamp at the Ammonium consuming less and less oil each year (410b, 411b), and a mysterious and learned Greek who consorts with other humans only once a year near the Red Sea and whom Cleombrotus found only πλάναις πολλαῖς καὶ μήνυτρα τελέσας μεγάλα ('after much wandering and spending large amounts of money on rewards for information'; 421a-e).

καὶ ἐν Ἑλλάδι κατὰ πόλεις καὶ πανηγύρεις, καὶ ἐν Ἀσίᾳ καὶ ἐν Ἰταλίᾳ καὶ τῶν νήσων ἐν ταῖς μεγίσταις καὶ πολυανθρωποτάταις ὑπομένων ἀκούειν παλαιοὺς ὀνείρους καὶ τούτων τὰς ἀποβάσεις· οὐ γὰρ ἦν ἄλλως χρήσασθαι τῇ κατὰ ταῦτα γυμνασίᾳ. ὅθεν μοι περιγέγονεν ἐκ περιουσίας ἔχειν περὶ ἑκάστου λέγειν […]

Undertaking in the cities and festivals in Greece and in Asia and in Italy and on the largest and most populous of the islands to hear about old dreams and what arose from them. For it was not possible by any other means to be furnished with training in these matters. As a result of this it has come about that I am able from such a glut of material to talk about each individual matter […].[253]

This emphasis on travel is funnelled through the figure of Odysseus in Pseudo-Scymnus, Polybius and Diodorus Siculus. We saw above (pp. 164-5) that Pseudo-Scymnus promises his audience the knowledge of the whole world without the need for an Odyssean journey, and the implication seems to be that the poet himself has done the work so that we do not have to. Diodorus 1. 2 also promises that the consumer of history will gain an education without the need for undergoing Odysseus' misfortunes, while Polybius 12. 27-8, who explicitly demands more from historians, requires that they embody the traits of the hero (cf. Appian's self-presentation in his *Preface*, n. 252). Regardless of the exact use of Odysseus, the three authors do seem to be engaging in a shared discourse, and it is quite possible that the Odyssean author travelling to collect source material was a Hellenistic commonplace.

Enquiry can also take the form of the consultation of many sources. According to Artemidorus' preface, ἐγὼ δὲ τοῦτο μὲν οὐκ ἔστιν ὅ τι βιβλίον οὐκ

---

[253] On the self-presentation of the author in the preface see Harris-McCoy 2011.

ἐκτησάμην ὀνειροκριτικὸν πολλὴν εἰς τοῦτο φιλοτιμίαν ἔχων ('there is no book of dream interpretation which I have not obtained, being in possession of a great deal of ambition in this regard'): note the emphasis on the author's achievement through the dramatic fronting of ἐγὼ δέ. The activity of the author-collector in the library also appears in a text probably much closer to our poets in time: the author of P. Köln 126 (Apollodorus, *On the Gods*?) gives an insight into the process of gathering source material: περιεπέσομεν δὲ ποιήμασιν, ἐφ' ὧν ἦν ἐπιγραφὴ Μεροπίς οὐ δηλ̣ο̣ῦσα τὸν ποήσα̣[ντα], ἣ πρ̣ὸ̣ς̣ τοῖς ἄλλοις Μέροψι̣ [τ]ο̣ῖ̣ς̣ ἐν τῆι Κώιαι καταριθμουμένοις καὶ Ἄστερον ὑπάρχειν διεσάφει· (col. ii. 9-15; "I happened upon a poem on which was written the title *Meropis*, giving no indication of who had composed it, which clarified that in addition to the other Meropes reckoned to be on Kos, there was also Asteros"). Interestingly for our purposes, Obbink 2005: 110-11 connects the activity of this author to that an epigram collector.[254] Given that Apollodorus then proceeds to summarise and quote from this *Meropis*, his approach to composition will certainly find echoes in this chapter, especially in the work of Pseudo-Scymnus.[255]

In Pseudo-Scymnus in particular, the two methods of collecting material, travel and perusing sources, are brought together (and, indeed, he is generally keen

[254] "He takes the time and trouble, in the course of an expansive study of the etymological significances of divine epithets, to give an epitomized version of the poem in miniature, recording it (as he says) 'because of the peculiarity of its narrative'. Apollodorus in the twenty-two books of his Περὶ θεῶν selected, copied out, grouped, and arranged literally thousands of such excerpts from many works of literature obscure and famous, canonical and subliterary alike into his collection as materials for his study and theme and no doubt because many of these texts were inaccessible to his readers. Might not the compiler of the Milan roll have worked in a similar way and, in part, out of similar motives?"

[255] The author of another Hellenistic prose text, and one whom we met earlier in fact, has also been seen to be acting as a compiler: "instead of presenting himself as a technological innovator, Biton casts himself in the role of technologically savvy anthologist, collecting and reshaping technologies devised by others and presenting them in a text that increases their accessibility and utility for his own audience" (Roby 2016: 221).

to play on our journey through the text as a representation of a journey through space: one might think of the double meaning of διέξειμι in the passages quoted on pp. 177-8).[256] Whereas in Polybius there is a hierarchy of knowledge (12. 27-8), for Pseudo-Scymnus autopsy (128-36) is a complement to the consultation of books: books bestow πίστις on the poem (111), and at any rate σποράδην (65) may suggest that the poet wants us to think that he does not live within easy reach of a sufficiently well-stocked library.[257]

We shall see that Pseudo-Scymnus' effort in gathering source material is represented within the text itself, with sections or runs of sections given over to specific authors, as if these sections are the very texts gathered and perused on the shelf. Apollonius, too, despite the generic gulf between the two authors, can be seen to take a similar approach. In both cases it is attractive to think of the poems as large numbers of 'textual items' collected into meaningful groups, but an examination of Nicander will show that the idea of collection can also interact with sectioned poems viewed first and foremost as single entities articulated into multiple sub-units.

---

[256] Cf. Athenaeus' description of the conger-eel material in Archestratus, quoted above at p. 151).

[257] Polybius' view, paraphrased to save a very lengthy quotation: we have two senses which enable us to acquire the sort of information which might appear in a history, namely 'sight' and 'hearing'. The sort of knowledge acquired by 'hearing' is itself divided into two subcategories, namely reading books and questioning eyewitnesses. Libraries involve no danger, so long as there is a well-stocked one nearby, while questioning witnesses involves expensive and potentially dangerous travel, but produces better history. Ideally historians will be men of action who have participated in events (or at least have experience of the *type* of events they describe). Polybius does use a large number of sources, named and unnamed, of course: see e.g. L. Pitcher, *BNJ* 83 'Biographical Essay' (second paragraph).

2.3.2 *Pseudo-Scymnus*

Of all our authors, Pseudo-Scymnus is the one who most explicitly positions his text as a collection of source material, and this impression is developed throughout the poem. After a list of authors in the prologue whom he will use to give his work credibility (109-27), the poet names sources fairly frequently in the *periodos* proper.[258] This practice will owe something to the poet's imitation of technical prose style, of course (see Part 1, pp. 69-70), but this need not prevent the impression that the matching up of individual sections to specific authors underlines the similarity of these textual items to their counterparts in the physical βιβλιοθήκη (i.e. books, with named authors).

It is worth noting that even where we seem to have individual pieces of information rather than whole sections explicitly attributed to specific authors, we should consider the possibility that readers would have recognised the surrounding material as 'belonging' to the author in question. At 370-8, for example, Theopompus is credited with several lines' worth of information concerning the Adriatic and the islands which lie within it, before ἱστοροῦσι (375) might lead us to

[258] Timaeus of Tauromenium is credited with information concerning the foundation of Massalia (214), Theopompus with material concerning the Adriatic (370), Timaeus and Eratosthenes with a discussion of the relative Greekness or barbarism of the Hylloi (412), Ephorus of Cyme with material concerning Crete (546), and Herodotus with information concerning the history of Athens (565). Two further mentions suggest references to whole works, or large parts of works, rather than corroboration of specific points of detail: the character of Ephorus' description of Greece is held up as a model for the subsequent passage of Pseudo-Scymnus (470-2), and Demetrius of Callatis is praised for the quality of his description of the areas surrounding the Black Sea, just as Pseudo-Scymnus begins his own description of these same areas (718-20). The reconstructed fragments of the rest of the poem also contain the names of prose historians: Demetrius (F 7b, F 16 Marcotte), Ephorus (F 15a, F 15b, F 16) Herodotus (F 25 Marcotte, albeit contradicting him) and Hecataeus of Teos (F 15b). Boshnakov 2004: 221 has a useful table showing the distribution of lines (including those after the end of the transmitted text) in which prose authors are named (he misses Eratosthenes in 412). As he points out (p. 79) the Pontus-section (which largely falls outside of the surviving text) has a higher concentration than earlier.

think that we are no longer reading material derived from the historian. And yet the information following this apparently new start, concerning the number of people inhabiting Adriatic coastal areas, has been considered to be "héritée vraisemblement de Theopompe" (Marcotte 2002: 119 n. 57).[259] The loss of the majority of Pseudo-Scymnus' source material is an obstacle to our ascertaining how close a section credited to an author might actually be to that author's work, but the limited evidence is encouraging. The contents of the section concerning Athens are attributed to Herodotus, and are close enough to the historian's discussion of the same topic as to make it likely that readers will have recognised the similarity:[260]

> ἑξῆς Ἀθῆναι· φασὶ δ' οἰκητὰς λαχεῖν
> ταύτας Πελασγοὺς πρῶτον, οὓς δὴ καὶ λόγος
> Κραναοὺς καλεῖσθαι, μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα Κεκροπίδας,
> Κέκροπος δυναστεύσαντος, ὑστέροισι δέ
> χρόνοις, Ἐρεχθέως τῆς πόλεως ἡγουμένου,
> ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς τὴν προσηγορίαν λαχεῖν.
> Ἡρόδοτος ἱστορεῖ δὲ ταῦτα συγγράφων.
> (Pseudo-Scymnus 559-65)

> Next is Athens. They say that the first inhabitants to gain possession of it were Pelasgians, who, indeed, were called Kranaoi according to the tradition, and after this Kekropidai, when Kekrops was in power, and in later times, when Erechtheus ruled the city, it took its name from Athena. And Herodotus records this in his writings.

> Ἀθηναῖοι δὲ ἐπὶ μὲν Πελασγῶν ἐχόντων τὴν νῦν Ἑλλάδα καλεομένην ἦσαν Πελασγοί, ὀνομαζόμενοι Κραναοί, ἐπὶ δὲ Κέκροπος βασιλέος ἐκλήθησαν Κεκροπίδαι, ἐκδεξαμένου δὲ Ἐρεχθέος τὴν ἀρχὴν Ἀθηναῖοι μετωνομάσθησαν […]
> (Herodotus 8. 44. 2)

[259] See also e.g. Korenjak 2003: 92 on Ephorus in the section concerning Crete (535-49).
[260] Hunter is confident that "the closeness of P. to his source is instructive for his practice more generally" (2017: 537).

> While the Pelasgians held what is now called Hellas, the Athenians were Pelasgians, named Kranaoi, and when Kekrops was king they were called Kekropidai, and when Erechtheus received the kingship they were renamed Athenians.

Even where we lack exact passages for comparison, changes in the focus or style of the text may give us clues about the extent to which contemporaries of Pseudo-Scymnus would have felt sections to 'belong' to the named authors. The addition of the story of Phaethon (387-97) to the previous rationalising (and thus recognisably Theopompan) account of the Adriatic, for example, has been considered by Bianchetti 1990: 107 to be a transition to recognisably Eratosthenic material a few lines before the author is credited with further information (at 412).[261]

Especially interesting for our purposes is the mention of Ephorus at 470-2, where what follows is promised to 'belong' to the historian in approach rather than in specific points of detail:

> ἑξῆς διέξιμεν δὲ πάλι τὴν Ἑλλάδα,
> ἐπὶ κεφαλαίου τούς τε περὶ αὐτὴν τόπους
> ἐθνικῶς ἅπαντας κατ' Ἔφορον δηλώσομεν.

> And next we shall go in turn through Greece and reveal summarily all of the places around it, people by people, in the manner of Ephorus.

Here a large run of sections form a collective unit, giving us a 'version' of Ephorus' description of Greece.[262] The association with Ephorus in style rather than purely in

---

[261] The picture may be complicated a little by the material concerning the fertile animals and the weather of the Adriatic (375-87) between what is certainly Theopompan and what seems to be Eratosthenic. It is well-known that these lines demonstrate close similarities to Aristotelian texts (Ps.-Aristot. *Mir*. 128, cf. Marcotte 2002: 198, Korenjak 2003: 84; Aristot. *Meteor*. III 370b 17-371a 19, cf. Marcotte 2002: 198-9 and Korenjak 2003: 84). Is this an 'Aristotle' subsection between those 'belonging' to Theopompus and Eratosthenes, or is scientific material concerning weather a continuation of the rationalism thought to be typical of Theopompus?

[262] The specification that this 'super-section' is Ephorean *in style* presumably explains how it can contain smaller units such as that attributed *in content* to Herodotus.

content should encourage us to think that Pseudo-Scymnus is not unthinkingly reproducing the tendency of prose treatises to credit pieces of information to named sources.

Despite the lack of an explicit statement to this effect, we are probably to understand that something similar is happening with the mention of Demetrius of Callatis at 718-21, which precedes what has been considered to some extent a "selbständige Texteinheit" (Boshnakov 2004: 79):[263]

> μετὰ ταῦτα δ' ἔσθ' ὁ Πόντος, οὗ δὴ τὴν θέσιν
> ὁ Καλλατιανὸς συγγράφων Δημήτριος
> ἔοικεν ἐπιμελεστάτως πεπυσμένος.
> κατὰ μέρος αὐτοῦ τοὺς τόπους διέξιμεν.
>
> And after this is Pontus, the topography of which Demetrius, the writer of Callatis, seems to have ascertained very carefully. We shall go through its areas individually.

Worthy of note is the shared use of διέξιμεν in 721 and 470, which may indicate that Pseudo-Scymnus views as parallel to each other these two introductory passages to runs of sections concerning large areas (the Black-Sea coast, in the second case). Certainly Demetrius seems to have been a constant presence behind the following material (see Bianchetti 2014: 765-6 and the commentary on the historical sources for Ps.-Scymnus' Black Sea material, including beyond the end of the extant poem, in Boshnakov 2004: 139-210). We might also notice a change of focus in the immediate aftermath of the naming of Demetrius, as the emphasis on founders, previous inhabitants and myths which dominates the move upwards through Thrace is replaced for a few lines by geography of a more strictly topographical

[263] Perhaps the impressive three-word trimeter of 720 might be thought to mark a significant break and the beginning of a new part of the text (see above, p. 71 n. 121, on three-word trimeters as section markers).

kind.[264] This is a matter of gesture rather than exhaustive strategy: the poet will return to a mixture of interests in the remainder of the extant poem and beyond. Nonetheless, we have seen above that a change of style or focus is a possible tool in Pseudo-Scymnus' armoury, and when we add the similarity to 470-2, it seems an attractive idea that what follows 718-21 is an equivalent for Demetrius of the run of sections 'à la Ephorus'.

As we read the poem and keep finding these sections and runs of sections which are equated to or represent the works of other authors, or extracts of these works, we learn that not only need we not undertake the *periplus* ourselves, we are also relieved of the task of gathering the books about the various areas of the world. Pseudo-Scymnus blurs the lines between physical travel to gather material, the physical gathering of books within the library and the gathering of his sections into his own textual 'collection', which itself becomes a sort of analogue of the library (to borrow the phrasing of Krevans 2007: see p. 163 n. 242). All that we need is housed in this one super-text, comprising a collection of useful individual 'textual items'.

---

[264] E.g. 681-92, a myth of Samothrace; 703-4, Lysimachus as founder of Lysimacheia; 715-17 foundations of the Megarians. Then, for a few lines after the mention of Demetrius, a number of words indicating the nature of the land and sea, and a specification of coast length.

2.3.3 *Apollonius*

Pseudo-Scymnus is the most prose-like of all our authors, as we saw in Part 1 (see pp. 69-70), and so it may not come as a surprise that he emphasises his gathering of prose source material and also conceives of his collecting in a way which shows affinities to prose texts (even if, as we have seen, his creation of a 'collection' does not read like an unthinking reproduction of the activity of a prose author on a similar topic). Nevertheless, we can see something of a similar approach in the *Argonautica*.

Apollonius, as a poet of narrative hexameters in a reasonably Homeric vein, will obviously not be as free as a poet of comic trimeters to give explicit names to authors from whom he has taken information, but on several occasions he too seems to point to sources. At 4. 985, for example, οὐκ ἐθέλων ἐνέπω προτέρων ἔπος ('it is not willingly that I tell the story of the men of old') refers to the less tasteful explanation for the name Drepane. Comparison with similar phrasing at Pindar *N.* 3. 53 (λεγόμενον δὲ τοῦτο προτέρων ἔπος ἔχω; 'this story I have is one told by the men of old'), which is held by some to denote a paraphrase of the Hesiodic *Precepts of Chiron*,[265] suggests a reference to specific earlier source material, and, indeed, the scholia point to Timaeus as the source for this story, and seem to point to Aristotle as the source for the alternative aetiology, involving Demeter's teaching of

[265] See Stamatopoulou 2017: 114-16 for a discussion of this passage and a similar 'paraphrase' demarcated by φαντί ('they say') at *P.* 6. 21: p. 116 is especially interesting for our purposes, since there the author discusses the possibility of Pindar's taking on a formal aspect of the *Precepts of Chiron* in *Pyth*ian 6; as we shall see below, taking on the style as well as the content of the authors in question is an approach adopted at several points by our poets. Stamatopoulou's n. 40 provides bibliography in support of and against the certainty of *N.* 3's actually referring to a specific text. Aratus *Ph.* 637 (προτέρων λόγος) also seems to lurk behind *Arg.* 4. 985.

agriculture to the Titans (Σ *Arg*. 4. 982-92g).[266] The reference in Σ *Arg*. 2. 1052-7 to Χάρης αὐτοῦ τοῦ Ἀπολλωνίου γνώριμος ἐν τῷ Περὶ ἱστοριῶν τοῦ Ἀπολλωνίου ('Chares, an acquaintance of Apollonius himself, in his *On the Stories [/Sources?] of Apollonius*') suggests that reading the *Argonautica* as a collection of sources was considered a valid approach to the text from its very earliest existence.[267] The abundance of material concerning Apollonius' sources in the scholia demonstrates that this way of reading the poem remained popular: it is likely that Apollonius' position as librarian at Alexandria will have encouraged readers to connect his gathering of sources in the poem to his activity there.

Relevant for our purposes are whole sections which seem to be able to be 'attributed', as it were, to a specific source. A good example is material in *Argonautica* 2 relating to Heraclea Pontica: the scholion on 2. 729-35a tells us that Nymphis wrote of the Acherousian headland in his *On Heraclea*, παρ' οὗ Ἀπολλώνιος ἔοικε ταῦτα μεταφέρειν ('from which Apollonius seems to have taken these things'); the section concerning Idmon's death may have been taken from Promathidas or Nymphis (the former also wrote an *On Heraclea*, and both authors

---

[266] As Fränkel 1968: 550 n. 203 points out, the story credited to Timaeus also appears at Call. fr. 43. 68-71 (although Callimachus' reference to the story seems bare enough to indicate a likely shared use of Timaeus rather than an implication that the Cyrenaean was one of Apollonius' πρότεροι).

[267] Cf. Cameron 2004: 63; Chares is mentioned in the context of names given to the Stymphalian birds. It is, presumably, unlikely that a work dealing with such details would have neglected to name sources. On sources in the poem more generally see Cuypers 2004: 50, who remarks that "references to [them] abound in the *Argonautica*", and that within the text these are usually either anonymous or 'locals' (one of her examples is the name of the springs in which Hylas is drowned at 1. 1221-2). In the second case in particular one can see how Local Histories could lie behind such passages. Cf. Harder 2013: 103 and, less cautiously, Greene 2017: 25 with n. 52 (he is apparently certain that the anonymous 'it is said' [*vel sim.*] statements "act as smokescreens for the scholarly poet's textual sources"). Both Harder and Greene compare Apollonius' practice in this regard with that of Callimachus in the *Aetia*. See further Hinds 1998: 1-5 on the 'Alexandrian footnote' in Roman poetry, and West 2011 on Pindar (see also above, n. 265), who appears as a sort of proto-Hellenistic poet in this regard (note that West is keen to emphasise his use of physical texts).

seem to have told this story; Σ *Arg*. 2. 815); it is claimed by Σ *Arg*. 2. 911-14, 928-9 that Apollonius took the story of Sthenelos' deeds and death from Promathidas, and that Orpheus' placement of his lyre at the tomb also appeared in Promathidas (albeit that Apollonius made up the story of his ghost). Since we have seen that Apollonius values individual sections as entities in their own right, the parallel with the prose compiler or even the book collector becomes more striking when these 'entities' can be thought of as 'belonging' in some way to an author, or at least to a specific genre (i.e. many of Apollonius' readers may have detected the presence of local histories behind individual sections, even if they could not pinpoint Promathidas, say, as the individual author used here).[268] A large amount of the source material incorporated into the *Argonautica* will not have been matched up neatly to an individual section, of course, but the point is that Apollonius gives the *impression* of the effort which has gone into his 'collection of texts'. The poet's approach is one of gesture rather than exhaustiveness, but close groupings of sections such as those which seem to 'belong' to Pontic local historians in Book 2 help to build the impression of a collection of this sort of material, just as Pseudo-Scymnus' matching of sections to authors creates a historical and geographical collection.

[268] The grouping of *aetia* at points in the poem (notably towards the end of Book 4) is likely in and of itself to imply the presence of local histories behind the individual episodes: see e.g. Thomas 2019: 282-3 for local histories focusing on this sort of material. On the apparently externally focused style of local histories, with rich details of places which would have been well-known to local readers, for example, see Tober 2017. This will have meant that local histories could in theory be 'incorporated' without too much alteration of general style into a work whose narrator is detached from any one locality. The distinction between local and general history seems at any rate not to have been too hard and fast: note Burstein's 1976: 2-3 description of the local history of Nymphis as "in effect, a general history of Anatolia and the Pontus, as viewed from the perspective of Heraclea".

Another cluster of passages which 'belong' to a specific genre comes at the end of Book 2, where we find a sort of 'titanic mythography' grouping. At 2. 1207-15 Argos tells of Typhaon's imprisonment beneath the Serbonian Lake, apparently in agreement with the account of Herodorus (Σ *Arg*. 2. 1209-15b).[269] Then, at 1231-41, the section ostensibly covering the Argonauts' journey from the island of Ares to the island of Philyra is given over almost in its entirety to the story of Cronus and the Oceanid. Note the use of ἔνθα at 1232 (cf. Part One, pp. 82-3), which almost marks out the digression as a complete section in and of itself (cf. also p. 91 n. 151 for εὐνῇ as a play on the common 'natural ending'):

> νυκτὶ δ' ἐπιπλομένῃ Φιλυρηίδα νῆσον ἄμειβον·
> ἔνθα μὲν Οὐρανίδης Φιλύρῃ Κρόνος, εὖτ' ἐν Ὀλύμπῳ
> Τιτήνων ἤνασσεν, ὁ δὲ Κρηταῖον ὑπ' ἄντρον
> Ζεὺς ἔτι Κουρήτεσσι μετετρέφετ' Ἰδαίοισιν,
> Ῥείην ἐξαπαφὼν παρελέξατο· τοὺς δ' ἐνὶ λέκτροις
> τέτμε θεὰ μεσσηγύς, ὁ δ' ἐξ εὐνῆς ἀνορούσας
> ἔσσυτο χαιτήεντι φυὴν ἐναλίγκιος ἵππῳ·
> ἡ δ' αἰδοῖ χῶρόν τε καὶ ἤθεα κεῖνα λιποῦσα
> Ὠκεανὶς Φιλύρη εἰς οὔρεα μακρὰ Πελασγῶν
> ἦλθ', ἵνα δὴ Χείρωνα πελώριον ἄλλα μὲν ἵππῳ
> ἄλλα θεῷ ἀτάλαντον ἀμοιβαίῃ τέκεν εὐνῇ.
>
> And with the coming of night they passed the island of Philyra, where Cronus, son of Uranus, when he was lord of the Titans on Olympus, and Zeus was still being brought up by the Idaean Curetes in the Cretan cave, lay with Philyra, having deceived Rhea. And the goddess came upon them in the middle of the act in bed, and he, rising up from the bedding, rushed off in a form like that of a flowing-maned horse. But Philyra, daughter of Oceanus, leaving the land and those accustomed places in shame, came to the long mountain ridges of the Pelasgians, where, as a result of her change in bedding, she bore monstrous Chiron, part, indeed, like a horse, and part like a god.

[269] Perhaps a mistake for Herodotus (cf. *Histories* 3.5): Lachenaud 2010: 332 n. 315 and Fowler 2013: 28.

Here the scholiast points to Pherecydes for Cronus' equine form as the explanation for Chiron's double nature (Σ *Arg*. 2. 1231-41a). The 'titanic mythography' grouping comes to an end with the episode in which the Argonauts pass Prometheus and his eagle (1246-59), where there is clear evocation of Hesiod (for e.g. 1249, with ἀλυκτοπέδῃσι in a four-word hexameter, cf. *Theogony* 521), whom the scholiast mentions at Σ *Arg*. 2. 1248-50b. Again, with the exception of Prometheus and Hesiod, we do not have to assume that contemporary readers will have pinpointed specific authors behind each of these sections, or even that Apollonius himself necessarily used the authors mentioned in the scholia: note, for example, that at Σ *Arg*. 1. 554 the explanation for Chiron's form is credited to ὁ τὴν Γιγαντομαχίαν ποιήσας ('the author of the *Gigantomachy*') and not to Pherecydes. The important point is that we notice these groupings of sections which give the impression of excerpting similar source material (notwithstanding the possible verse-prose divide in this case).[270] These groupings by genre or subject matter may even have reminded contemporary readers of sections of the library.[271]

---

[270] The 'titanic mythography' grouping is especially appropriate at the end of Book 2, of course, as the Argonauts approach the realm of the descendants of the Sun. As they come closer to their destination, the titans begin to appear in character speech and narratorial digression, before finally entering the action of the poem (Vian 1974: 173 calls the Prometheus episode "un lever de rideau" as the action shifts to Colchis).

[271] Tzetzes' report that Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ Αἰτωλὸς καὶ Λυκόφρων ὁ Χαλκιδεὺς μεγαλοδωρίαις βασιλικαῖς προτραπέντες Πτολεμαίῳ τῷ Φιλαδέλφῳ τὰς σκηνικὰς διωρθώσαντο βίβλους, τὰς τῆς κωμῳδίας καὶ τραγῳδίας (*Prol.* 1; 'Alexander Aetolus and Lycophron of Chalcis, having their heads turned by great royal gifts from Ptolemy Philadelphus, sorted out the dramatic books, respectively the tragic and the comic') seems to indicate organised subdivision of material within the Alexandrian library, even if διωρθώσαντο probably refers to editing of texts rather than organising collections of them. Callimachus' *Pinakes* seem to have subcategorised quite extensively: there was apparently a subcategory of the miscellaneous section entitled δεῖπνα ὅσοι ἔγραψαν (Ath. 5. 244a; 'All those who wrote on banqueting'), and an even more specific subsection seems to be suggested by Ath. 14. 643e: οἶδα δὲ καὶ Καλλίμαχον ἐν τῷ τῶν παντοδαπῶν συγγραμμάτων Πίνακι ἀναγράψαντα πλακουντοποιικὰ συγγράμματα Αἰγιμίου καὶ Ἡγησίππου καὶ Μητροβίου, ἔτι δὲ Φαίστου ('And I know that Callimachus in his 'Pinax' of miscellaneous works put writing on cake making by Aegimius and Hegesippus and Metrobius, and also by Phaestus'). We might wonder to what extent these groupings reflected the real arrangement of the Alexandrian library.

Apollonius may not give us a list of sources, but he does seem to encourage us to think of him as a collector of source material by his clustering of sections matched up to specific genres. In addition to vague allusions to 'former song' we even have the explicit mention of former ἀοιδοί at 1. 18: at this early stage we are invited to see him as a poet-narrator fully aware of the existence of other Argonautic literature. By the end of the poem, the impression of the poet gathering any Argonautic material possible is felt quite strongly in the quick succession of *aitia* which come in the later stages of Book 4, culminating in the final self-contained episode at 1765-72 (see above, p. 128, and below, p. 213). We may then wonder if ἤδη γὰρ ἐπὶ κλυτὰ πείραθ᾽ ἱκάνω/ ὑμετέρων καμάτων˙ ἐπεὶ οὔ νύ τις ὔμμιν ἄεθλος/ αὖτις ἀπ᾽ Αἰγίνηθεν ἀνερχομένοισιν ἐτύχθη (4.1775-7; 'for now I have arrived at the glorious end of your toils, since no quests befell you thenceforth as you returned from Aegina') might be paraphrased metapoetically as 'the poem can now end, since there are no more Argonautic episodes for me to extract from the shelves of the library and turn into sections of the work'.

2.4 Sections and Sources: Nicander

2.4.1 Mapping sections to sources?

In the case of Nicander, it is difficult to pinpoint specific source material: potential candidates have not survived, and Nicander's decision to write in hexameters (and more or less in Homeric diction; cf. Overduin 2014b: 64-5) makes explicit naming of sources less suitable for the *Theriaca* and *Alexipharmaca* than it is for the *Periodos*.[272] Furthermore, the scholia, which display a strong interest in the sources for the *Argonautica* in particular, are much less helpful where the *Theriaca* and *Alexipharmaca* are concerned.

Very occasionally we hear of a certain Apollodorus, author of a περὶ θηρίων (Σ *Ther*. 715a, 858-9, and 781b without the title of the work). Judging by Σ *Al*. 570g and 594a, where an Apollodorus is presented as a pharmacological authority, we can probably assume that the same author wrote a treatise or treatises covering material broadly similar to that of the *Alexipharmaca* as well as one which shares the interests of the *Theriaca*. Although Schneider 1856: 189-201 was able to demonstrate more overlaps of subject matter by identifying a number of references to Apollodorus in later authors, primarily in Pliny the Elder, it is clear that Nicander is not simply versifying Apollodoran material: more recent discussions of the relationship between the two authors (invariably centred on the *Theriaca*) have

---

[272] There is a sort of source-naming at *Ther*. 541-49 and 666-75, where the discovery of the medicinal uses of two plants is credited to a certain Alcibius (whose name appears as the second word in both sections), but he seems to be mythological: Overduin 2014b: 111-12 paints these sections as examples of the didactic "*protos heuretes*-motif", but we might wonder whether Nicander is also imitating the source naming which we might expect to find in a prose work on the same subject as that of the *Theriaca*.

moved away from Schneider's view of 'Nicander Metaphrastes'.[273] It is worth noting that of the seven points of contact between the *Alexipharmaca* and Apollodorus as presented by Schneider, all but one very minor agreement come in the 500s: if this is not a coincidence, might the run of sections concerning fungi (521-536), salamanders (537-66), toads (567-93) and litharge (594-610) have been felt by Nicander's contemporaries to 'belong' strongly to Apollodorus?[274]

2.4.2 Sources as disruptors of sectioning?

Despite the difficulty in identifying sources matched up to specific sections, Nicander can be seen to highlight his gathering of material in another way. His subject matter in the *Theriaca* and the *Alexipharmaca* gives him licence to stray into a number of fields at the egdes of his ostensible areas of interest: when he does so, he often dwells on them for longer than we might expect or otherwise gives them special emphasis. Sometimes this is achieved by elaborate tautology or near-

[273] Jacques's 2002: xlix-lii treatment of the subject, for example, concludes that in the *Theriaca* "Nicandre ne prend chez Apollodore que ce qui lui convient".

[274] The relevant passages are Σ *Al.* 570, 594, Plin. NH 20. 86, 22. 19, 21. 116. The other case is a minor agreement with Apollodorus about the use of nettle seed against henbane at *Al.* 427, which rests on the assertion of Pliny *NH* 22. 31 that *Apollodorus [urticae semen] et salamandris cum iure coctae testudinis, item adversari hyoscyamo [adfirmat]* ('Apollodorus encourages nettle-seed against salamander, with an instruction for cooked tortoise, and, again, to counter henbane'; this also points to an agreement between Apollodorus and *Al.* 550). Pliny discusses almost all of the remaining poisons presented in the A*lexipharmaca* (aconite e.g. at 27. 4-10, white lead e.g. at 22. 112, blister beetles e.g. at 23. 87, coriander e.g. at 23. 43, hemlock e.g. at 25. 151-4, arrow-poison e.g. at 28. 161, chamaeleon thistle e.g. at 22. 45-7, bull's blood e.g. at 20. 25, buprestis e.g. at 22. 78, curdled milk e.g. at 22. 105, thornapple e.g. at 23. 30, pharicum at 28. 158, opium e.g. at 23. 30, sea hare e.g. at 24. 19, leeches e.g. at 23. 55), although Apollodorus' absence from these passages is, of course, not conclusive. Nevertheless, it is probable that Nicander made use of sources other than Apollodorus (see Jacques 2007: xix-xxi for other prose texts covering similar ground to that of the *Alexipharmaca*, and Jacques 2002: lii-liv on potential relationships with iologists other than Apollodorus in the *Theriaca*), and it is interesting to note that the two major overlaps with Numenius highlighted by the scholia to the *Theriaca* (237, 256) come in the same section (519 and 637 demonstrate agreement only on very minor matters).

tautology, as in *Al.* 49-54 and 268-71, where Nicander's metallurgical and botanical interests are highlighted:

> [...] ἐν βάμματι σίμβλων
> σβεννὺς αἰθαλόεντα μύδρον γενύεσσι πυράγρης,
> ἠὲ σιδηρήεσσαν ἄπο τρύγα τήν τε καμίνων
> ἔντοσθεν χοάνοιο διχῇ πυρὸς ἤλασε λιγνύς·
> ἄλλοτε δὲ χρυσοῖο νέον βάρος ἐν πυρὶ θάλψας
> ἠὲ καὶ ἀργυρόεν θολερῷ ἐνὶ πώματι βάπτοις.
> (49-54)
>
> [...] quenching in 'the vinegar of the beehives'[275] a fiery red-hot mass of iron held in the jaws of a pair of fire-tongs, or iron dross which the smoke of the fire has driven apart within the melting-pot of the furnace. And at other times you should dip into the foul beverage a weight of gold or a silvery one which you have just warmed on the fire.
>
> καί τε σὺ γυμνώσειας ἐυτρεφέος νέα τέρφη
> καστηνοῦ, καρύοιο λαχυφλοίοιο κάλυμμα,
> νείαιραν τόθι σάρκα περὶ σκύλος αὖον ὀπάζει
> δυσλεπέος καρύοιο τὸ Καστανὶς ἔτρεφεν αἶα.
> (268-71)
>
> And you should strip the young shells from the fruit of a well-grown chestnut-tree, the coverings of the lightly-husked nuts, where the dry skin surrounds the inner flesh of the difficultly-peeled nut which the Castanian land nourished.

In the first passage the underlined words provide a (strictly unneccessary) definition of the preceding term σιδηρήεσσα τρύξ ('iron dross'): we get the impression that the poet is rather enjoying showing off his extra-pharmacological knowledge.[276] In the second, the instruction to remove the shells of chestnuts seems to give Nicander an occasion to focus heavily on this aspect of nut anatomy: the

[275] "The mixture of honey and vinegar called elsewhere ὀξυμελίκρητον and ὀξύμελι" (Gow and Scholfield, 1953: 191).
[276] Cf. Sistakou's 2012: 230 suggestion that we are here "invited to enter a dark [alchemist's] laboratory".

underlininings demonstrate the extent to which this passage is dominated by references to the shell and husk of the chestnut.[277]

In the first passage Nicander's metallurgical interest is also demonstrated by his presentation of a number of similar alternatives within the same field. Sometimes in such passages these lists of alternatives can give the impression of being elaborated unnecessarily. An extreme example comes at 516-20, where the poet might simply have written something like 'give salt to the victim of a leech attack':[278]

> ἢ αὐτὴν ἅλα βάπτε, τότ' ἠελίοισι δαμάζων
> εἶθαρ ὀπωρινοῖσι, τότ' ἠνεκὲς ἐν φλογὶ θάλψας.
> πολλάκι δ' ἢ ἅλα πηκτὸν ὁμιλαδόν, ἢ ἁλὸς ἄχνην
> ἐμπίσαις τήν τ' αἰὲν ἀνὴρ ἁλοπηγὸς ἀγείρει
> νειόθ' ὑφισταμένην ὁπόθ' ὕδασιν ὕδατα μίξῃ.

> Or draw salt-water itself, sometimes overcoming it at once with the harvest Sun, at other times warming it gently on a flame. And often you should give him to consume either a large amount of rock salt or the little bits of salt which the salt-worker is always gathering as they form a sediment at the bottom when he mixes water with water.

---

[277] Might the length of time spent on the outer layers of chestnuts perform an expressive function, in light of the difficulty of peeling them? A similar passage is found at *Al.* 489-92, where attention is focused on pomegranates and their anatomy. Note the impressive four-word line which rounds off the instruction:

> βρύκοι δ' ἄλλοτε καρπὸν ἅλις φοινώδεα σίδης
> Κρησίδος, οἰνωπῆς τε καὶ ἣν Προμένειον ἔπουσι,
> σὺν δὲ καὶ Αἰγινῆτιν, ὅσαι τ' ἐσκληκότα κάρφη
> φοίνι' ἀραχνήεντι διαφράσσουσι καλύπτρῃ·
>
> And sometimes he should eat ample quantities of the blood-red fruit of the Cretan pomegranate, and the wine-coloured one, and the one which they call Promenean, and along with these also the Aeginetan, and all those which divide off hard red seeds with a covering resembling a spider's web.

This passage is another example of a list containing a number of similar alternatives (see next paragraph). The last example may even be a general description of any pomegranate, and if so this will be another redundant list, as in 516-20 (discussed in the next paragraph).

[278] Cf. Paul. Aeg. 5. 37: ἃς ἐκβάλλει ἅλμη καταρροφουμένη ('Swallowed salt-water will cast [the leeches] out'). Even an author who gives alternative types of salt, Aelius Promotus (who may well even be following Nicander: see the parallels given in Jacques 2007: *passim*), is less insistent in his verbal repetition: ἢ ἅλμην, ἢ θαλάσσιον ὕδωρ θερμάνας ἐν ἡλίῳ δίδου πιεῖν, παραμίξας καὶ ἁλὸς ἄνθους (περὶ τῶν ἰοβόλων θηρίων καὶ δηλητηρίων φαρμάκων 76; 'or give him saltwater, or sea water which you have warmed in the sun to drink, mixing in also salt-precipitate').

Nicander demonstrates an awareness of the redundancy of these lines by a lack of variation: even in the absence of an alternative word for 'salt', one might have expected him to refer periphrastically to at least one of the alternatives, and he further adds ἁλοπηγός to increase the monotony, forcing our focus to remain on salt for several lines.[279]

Elaboration beyond what is strictly necessary from a pharmacological point of view is also achieved by digressive detail, as for example in 292-7, where the effects of medicine on the victim of chamaeleon-thistle poisoning are compared to the egg laying of an unhealthy chicken:

> πόσιες δὲ παραυτίκα λύματ' ἔχευαν
> φαρμακόεις ᾠοῖσιν ἀλίγκια τοῖά τε βοσκάς
> ὀρταλὶς αἰχμητῇσιν ὑπευνασθεῖσα νεοσσοῖς
> ἄλλοτε μὲν πληγῇσι νέον θρομβήια γαστρός
> ἔκβαλεν ἐν μήνιγξιν ἀνόστρακα, πολλάκι νούσῳ
> δαμναμένη δύσποτμον ὑπὲκ γόνον ἔκχεε γαίῃ.
>
> But pharmaceutical drinks immediately pour out of him faeces like eggs, similar to the unshelled little lumps which the self-feeding fowl, lying upon her warrior-chicks, sometimes casts out in their membranes from her belly as a result of blows which she has suffered recently, and often, overcome by disease, she pours out her ill-fated offspring onto the earth.

Again, the poet gives the impression of a great interest in a non-pharmacological topic, in this case zoology: not only is the description strikingly detailed (and even bordering on exuberant in 294, with its four words and Aratean-style epithet),[280] πολλάκι […] (296-7) reads like an unnecessary addition which Nicander cannot prevent himself from including. This point is demonstrated nicely by the discomfort of Gow and Scholfield 1953: 195: "if 296f. mean merely that they break the eggs they

---

[279] He even adds further repetition with ὕδασιν ὕδατα.

[280] Cf. e.g. δείλαιαι γενεαί, ὕδροισιν ὄνειαρ,/ […] πατέρες […] γυρίνων (*Phaen*. 946-7; 'the wretched race, a boon to water-snakes, […] the fathers of tadpoles').

are brooding or drop their eggs away from the nest, N. has lost sight of his human patient, but we do not see what else the lines should mean".[281]

By the inclusion of a number of passages such as these Nicander gestures towards a broad range of knowledge around his primary subject matter. We might imagine him consulting his collection of treatises to glean interesting titbits. Although it is rarely the case that sections or subsections are devoted in their entirety to this sort of material, it is often the case that they can give the impression of being 'taken over'. In the last two passages quoted, the subsections end with digressive material (the life of the ἀνὴρ ἁλοπηγὸς and the fate of the unfortunate chicks) without a return to the central subject matter of the section. In 520 in particular it is a surprise that there is no equivalent of the 'doing this you will ward off danger' line which often ends sections (see Part 1, p. 42). Another striking case of a subsection which seems to have been 'taken over' by non-primary material is 415-22, where henbane is introduced, but the expected symptomology is replaced (at first glance, at least) by a digression about toddlers:

> μηδὲ συοσκυάμῳ τις ἀιδρήεντα κορέσκοι
> νηδύν, οἷά τε πολλὰ παρασφαλέες τεύχονται,
> ἠὲ νέον σπείρημα καὶ ἀμφίκρηνα κομάων
> κοῦροι ἀπειπάμενοι ὀλοήν θ' ἑρπηδόνα γυίων,
> ὀρθόποδες βαίνοντες ἄνις σμυγεροῖο τιθήνης
> ἠλοσύνῃ βρύκουσι κακανθήεντας ὀράμνους,
> οἷα νέον βρωτῆρας ὑπὸ γναθμοῖσιν ὀδόντας
> φαίνοντες τότε κνηθμὸς ἐνοιδέα δάμναται οὖλα.
> (415-22)

[281] Cf. Overduin's 2014b: 54-7 account of "Pseudo-associative composition" in the *Theriaca*. What Gow and Scholfield seem to interpret as an actual loss of focus from the poet can be seen be readers better disposed to Nicander as effective characterisation of his persona in the poems. As Overduin points out in his discussion, Nicander's approach is a learned Hellenistic updating or imitation of Hesiodic practice: readers are hardly likely to believe that the poet is adding related subject matter which has just sprung to mind. Instead, we might think of him consulting a zoological treatise or similar.

> And let no man satisfy his unknowing belly with henbane, as those who err do often, or as young boys, fresh from renouncing their swaddling and head-bands, as well as the ruinous crawling of the limbs, walking upright on their feet without their wretched nurse, bite its evilly-flowering stems in their folly, since they are just showing their eating-teeth in their jaws, at the time when itching overcomes their swollen gums.

It is probable that Nicander considers the swelling and itching of the gums to be a symptom of henbane poisoning, and so the final line can be seen to work on two levels (perhaps it would be attractive to place a high stop at the end of 421 and to allow τότε its normal meaning): 1.) 'Avoid ingesting henbane. Toddlers tend to ingest it when their teeth are just coming through. Incidentally, the emergence of teeth makes the gums swell and itch [the same sort of continuation of a digression as we have seen in 296-7]'; 2.) 'Avoid ingesting henbane. Toddlers tend to ingest it when their teeth are just coming through. Ingesting henbane causes an itching and swelling of the gums'.[282] On this reading, we may be tricked, to start with at least, into thinking that Nicander has been derailed from his central subject matter by his desire to continue the vignette about the plight of the toddler. The scene is undeniably a domestic one, and holds our attention through its portrayal of the

---

[282] Σ *Al.* 422 and Eutecnius' paraphrase (15) both interpret the swelling and itching of the gums as symptoms of henbane poisoning, and while Gow 1951: 116 suggests that both are simply "struggling with the existing text", it should be noted that later medical literature corroborates their interpretation: τοῖς λαβοῦσι τὴν ὑοσκύαμον παρακολουθεῖ κνησμὸς οὔλων (Aelius Promotus περὶ τῶν ἰοβόλων θηρίων καὶ δηλητηρίων φαρμάκων 66; "on those who take henbane there follows an itching of the gums"); καὶ δῆξις οὔλων καὶ κνησμὸς (Aëtius Amidenus 13. 69; "and a biting and itching of the gums"). Whereas in other cases these two authors may even be using Nicander (cf. above, p. 189 n. 278), on the subject of henbane their accounts differ enough from his that borrowing from the *Alexipharmaca* seems less likely. See Jacques 2007: 183 for the symptomology of Aelius and Aëtius as the fullest of any surviving authors on the subject. My suggested interpretation of this passage would have to be forsaken if Gow 1951: 116 is right to posit a lacuna after 422 in which there will have been a description of symptoms. Jacques 2007: 39-40 (with 183) suggests lacunae either side of τότε […] οὖλα, which in his view is solely aimed at describing symptoms of henbane poisoning. My suggestion of 422's double significance requires Nicander to be demanding a lot of his readers, but this is hardly unexpected (see e.g. Bone: forthcoming, for another example of this sort of demand). It is worth noting that Oikonomakos 2002: 39 makes no suggestion of a problem with 422.

young child, but teething will still have been seen as a legitimate subject for technical knowledge: the Hippocratic *De Dentitione* devotes many of its observations to the subject, and at *Aph.* 3. 25 itching gums are given as a side effect of dentition.

The impression of Nicander's gathering of material from his many areas of knowledge is especially strong when he employs subject matter similar to that found elsewhere in his body of work. A good example comes at 385-96, the part of the 'thornapple' section devoted to cures. This subsection is dominated by culinary suggestions, and as in several of the passages examined so far, the poet gives the impression of getting carried away a little:

> τῷ δὲ σὺ πολλάκι μὲν γλάγεος πόσιν, ἄλλοτε μίγδην
> ῥεῖα γλυκὺ νείμειας ἀλυκρότερον δεπάεσσι·
> καί τε καὶ ὄρνιθος φιαρῆς πυρὶ τηκομένη σάρξ
> θωρήκων ἤμυνεν ἐυτρεφέων βρωθεῖσα·
> ἤμυνεν καὶ χυλὸς ἅλις κύμβῃσι ῥοφηθείς,
> ὅσσα τε πετρήεντος ὑπὸ ῥόχθοισι θαλάσσης
> κνώδαλα φυκιόεντας ἀεὶ περιβόσκεται ἀγμούς·
> ὧν τὰ μὲν ὠμὰ πάσαιτο, τὰ δ' ἑφθέα, πολλὰ δὲ θάλψας
> ἐν φλογιῇ. στρόμβων δὲ πολὺ πλέον, ἠ̃ ἔτι κάλχης,
> κηραφίδος, πίνης τε καὶ αἰθήεντος ἐχίνου
> δαῖτες ἐπαλθήσουσιν ἰδὲ κτένες· οὐδέ τι κῆρυξ
> δὴν ἔσεται τήθη τε γεραιρόμενα μνίοισι.

> And often you should give the victim a drink of milk, at other times with grape syrup mixed with it in the cup, lightly warmed. And the flesh from the well-nourished breast of a sleek fowl also acts as protection when softened up over a fire and eaten. Large amounts of gruel in bowls also act as protection when swallowed, as too do all the creatures which always graze about the seaweedy crags beneath the roaring of the rocky sea. He should eat some of these raw, some boiled, and many that he has warmed on the fire. And much more curative will be meals of sea-snails, or, again, of a limpet, of a crayfish and of a pinna[283] and of a fiery-coloured sea-urchin, as

[283] A type of mollusc.

> well as scallops. Nor are the trumpet-shell or sea-squirts, rejoicing in seaweed, to be at all long for this world.[284]

As in 520, the common 'doing this you will ward off danger' ending is absent, as an extra-pharmacological interest seems to take over the section. Cookery (by Nicander's day a relatively well-represented topic in didactic poetry, tackled for example by Archestratus and Numenius, and apparently the subject of several subcategories in Callimachus' *Pinakes*: cf. above, p. 184 n. 271) seems to have been a favourite subject of the poet. At any rate, it features prominently in surviving fragments of the *Georgica*, such as frr. 68 and 70, where we find instructions for preparing meat broths and various recipes for turnips respectively. Especially noteworthy is fr. 83, which contains a list of shellfish similar to that prescribed against thornapple in the *Alexipharmaca*: the *Georgica*'s list also features στρόμβοι and the πίνη. Despite the claim of Gow and Scholfield 1953: 213 that "it is difficult to guess why there should be [a list of shellfish] in the *Georgica*", it seems highly likely that the context is culinary, given that the fragment is quoted by Athenaeus as part of a discussion of whether to eat shellfish raw or cooked (cf. *Al*. 392-3), and that the next quotation comes from Archestratus (Ath. 3. 92d). Sea creatures *per se* also appear as a favourite topic of Nicander across his œuvre: his *Oetaica* seems to have focused a fair amount of its attention on fish (fr. 16: πομπίλος ὃς ναύτῃσιν ἀδημονέουσι κελεύθους/ μηνύσαι φιλέρωσι καὶ ἄφθογγός περ ἀμύνων; 'the pilot fish, which would show the way to sailors in love and in anguish, giving aid even in

[284] The translation of οὐδέ τι κῆρυξ/ […] is based on the interpretation of δὴν ἔσεται provided by White 1987: 92-3: "the words […] refer to the fact that [the κῆρυξ and τήθη] will no longer […] be long-lived now that Nicander has recommended them to be eaten as remedies for thorn-apple-poisoning". The parallel with *Il*. 6. 139-40 (Diomedes speaking about Lycurgus, οὐδ᾽ ἄρ᾽ ἔτι δὴν/ ἦν ('and he did not live for long after that')) allows for a sort of absurd climax. Cf. Overduin 2014a: 637-9 on Homeric military language used of animals in the *Theriaca*.

spite of being voiceless'; fr. 18: ὡς δ' ὁπότ' ἀμφ' ἀγέλῃσι νεηγενέεσσιν ἰώπων/ ἠὲ φάγροι ἢ σκῶπες ἀρείονες ἠὲ καὶ ὀρφός [...]; 'and as whenever around the new-born shoals of sprats the sea-bream or larger *skopes*[285] or even the sea-perch [...]'), and he also seems to have indulged this interest in the *Heteroioumena* (fr. 59: ἢ σκάρον ἢ κίχλην πολυώνυμον; 'either parrot-wrasse or the many-named wrasse').[286] As we have seen at several points above, he even hints at the possibility of a run of sections concerning ὅσα πόντος ἁλὸς ῥόχθοισιν ἑλίσσει ('all of the things which the sea whirls about in its crashing of brine') at *Ther*. 822. In fact, he seems to be rather fond of suggesting that, if he so wished, he could give us exhaustive lists of sea-creatures: ὅσσα τε πετρήεντος ὑπὸ ῥόχθοισι θαλάσσης/ κνώδαλα φυκιόεντας ἀεὶ περιβόσκεται ἀγμούς (*Al*. 390; 'all the creatures which always graze about the seaweedy crags beneath the roaring of the rocky sea'), ἠὲ καὶ ὄστρεα τόσσα βυθοὺς ἅ τε βόσκεται ἅλμης (fr. 83. 1; 'or even all the shellfish which graze in the depths of the sea').

A number of the passages quoted above concern subject matter to which Nicander returns frequently throughout his œuvre: cures which read like food-preparation appear at *Ther*. 689-98 (a whole section, albeit a strange one, in which a γαλέη is treated like a normal culinary ingredient) and *Al*. 59-63, for example, while an interest in zoology beyond the strict requirements of the material is also demonstrated by passages such as *Ther*. 566-71 (a vignette of a hippopotamus).[287]

---

[285] Possibly cod, according to Gow and Scholfield 1953: 139, 203.

[286] It is possible that fish form the subject of a single lengthy diversion from the main topic of the *Oetaica*: both frr. 16 and 18 are said to come from Book 2, and fr. 18 looks like it forms the start of a simile. The other two pieces of evidence for the *Oetaica* (Σ *Arg*. 1. 1304, *Ath*. 9. 411a) show that it elsewhere concerns Heracles, and Schneider 1856: 31 suggests that fr. 112 (concerning Eurybatus) also belongs to the poem.

[287] Overduin 2014b: 391, 393 makes the attractive suggestion that this passage is a piece of Egyptian knowledge aimed at an Alexandrian audience (cf. above, p. 157 n. 236).

Mineralogy, too is a recurring topic in the *Alexipharmaca* and the *Theriaca* (see Mottana 2006), and possibly formed the subject of a distinct poem.[288] Most striking are Nicander's evident interests in *paradoxa* and in metamorphoses, the latter of which he treated for their own sake in his *Heteroioumena*.[289] We have only just scratched the surface of Nicander's reuse of material across different texts: doubtless if more survived of his other poems the number of overlaps would increase.[290]

In incorporating so much material from the edges of his 'proper' subject matter (but from within the legitimate scope of technical prose or didactic poetry), Nicander is gesturing towards a broad range of knowledge which he can bring to bear as required. This impression is strengthened by his inclusion of subject matter

---

[288] Schneider 1856: 127-9 suggests a '*Lithica*' to house three pieces of stone-related information credited to Nicander (Plin. *NH* 36. 127: *magnes* named after its discoverer; ibid. 37. 102: *sandaserion* as an alternative name for *sandareson*; Serv. ad *Aen*. 4. 261: yellow jasper). Even if there were no work of Nicander dedicated entirely to stones, it is at least clear that his interest in mineralogy was played out over a wider range of his work than simply in the two extant poems.

[289] On metamorphoses see Sistakou 2012: 205-7: her discussion takes in passages in the *Theriaca* and *Alexipharmaca* concerning Marsyas, Hyacinthus and the Gecko) I share the caution of Hutchinson 2006: 71 n. 1 about Nic fr. 62 as a passage of the *Heteroioumena*. If, instead, it were "a short mythological excursus of a kind common in Nicander", we could see a wider spread of Nicander's interest in metamorphoses throughout his body of work. On *paradoxa* and paradoxography see Sistakou 2012: 216, 218-19 and Overduin 2014b: 117-20. Both focus on the paradoxical tone of the *Theriaca*'s snake sections, and also point to *Ther*. 741 (the origin of bees and wasps) and 791-6 (the origin of a type of scorpion). Antigonus of Carystus *Rerum Mirabilium Collectio* 19. 4 gives evidence for an epigrammatist, Archelaus the Egyptian, writing on paradoxical themes similar to those of Nicander in the time of an unspecified Ptolemy (Philadelphus or Euergetes?), and Varro *de re Rustica* 3. 16. 4 credits this Archelaus with a line very much like *Ther*. 741: ἵππων μὲν σφῆκες γενεά, μόσχων δὲ μέλισσαι ('Wasps are the offspring of horses, and bees of calves'); cf. Nic.'s ἵπποι γὰρ σφηκῶν γένεσις ταῦροι δὲ μελισσῶν ('Horses are the origin of wasps, and bulls of bees'). Gow and Scholfield 1953: 185 remark that the line "must be imitated by or from N.". Against this background we might think of *Ther*. 805-36, with a quick succession of *paradoxa* (the provision for the bee of both life and death by it sting (810), the ability of the centipede to cause death from both ends of its body (813), the salamander's resistance to flame (819-21), the mating of the moray eel on land with vipers (826-7), the effect of a sting-ray's sting on trees (831-4)), a potential evocation of a run of epigrams on paradoxical themes. Certainly the brevity of the sections speaks in favour of such a reading, as does the 'epigrammatic' pithiness of lines like κέντρον δὲ ζωήν τε φέρει θάνατόν τε μελίσσαις (810; 'and the sting brings both life and death to bees').

[290] Another significant piece of shared material concerns an appendage of the lily at *Al*. 405-9 and fr. 74. 25-30 (both in the vicinity of the iris and both ending in a four-word line).

belonging to his other works, and readers with access to his whole corpus will have appreciated the range of his apparent expertise. It seems that Nicander was not the first to present himself in this way, and he may well have modelled himself on a figure like Numenius, who wrote a work on food (Ath. 1. 5a), one with subject matter similar to that of the *Theriaca* (see above, p. 187 n. 274), and a *Halieuticon* (*SH* 568-588). In some cases these snippets of knowledge take up whole sections or subsections, and here we might think of these sections as items gathered by Nicander into his 'collection', but often they disrupt the normal pattern.[291] Sections are commandeered by material from other realms of knowledge. We will recall that disruption of the proper operation of sectioning is also a marker of the use of multiple sources in Aratus, who denies Aries its expected section in the grouping concerning the Zodiac to draw attention to a disagreement between the *Phaenomena* and *Enoptron* of Eudoxus (see Part 1, p. 187 n. 274). Since both poets are interacting with the idea of the prose treatise (cf. Part 1, pp. 12-14), even if they are clearly not simply turning individual treatises into an exact verse equivalent, it may be attractive to suggest that they see logical (or at least consistent) sectioning as a feature appropriate to this type of text (and examples from Part One bear this out: see pp. 11-12, 14-16, 30 etc.). By associating deviations from this practice with the wealth of source material available to them, they remind us of the tension between the two ways of looking at their poems: are they single entities, neatly divided into consistent parts, or are they an array of items on more or less closely related

---

[291] Further examples: ethnography appended to the 'cures' part of the 'arrow-poison' section (*Al.* 244-8), geography breaking the pattern of frontloading in the final snake section (*Ther.* 458-63; see above, pp. 27-8).

subjects, whose very multiplicity and diversity present difficulties in the creation of consistent collections?

In the case of Nicander, at least, there seems to be an element of showing off precisely how multiple and diverse his 'collections' are. Indeed, there is reason to believe that this is how his contemporaries may have viewed his texts. In the preface of his fourth book, Athenaeus Mechanicus (first century BC) says the following:

> οἱ δὲ γράφοντές τι ἢ παραγγέλλοντες ἡμῖν καὶ τῆς ὠφελείας εἵνεκα δοκοῦντες αὐτὸ πράττειν οὐκ ἀπεικότως, πολυγραφοῦντες εἰς οὐκ ἀναγκαίους λόγους καταναλίσκουσι τὸν χρόνον, ὅπως ἐμφήνωσι τὴν ἑαυτῶν πολυμάθειαν· παρεκβάσεων γὰρ πληρώσαντες ἀπολείπουσι τὰ βιβλία· καὶ ταῦτα τῶν ἀρχαίων φιλοσόφων καλῶς εἰρηκότων τὰ τοῦ καιροῦ μέτρα δεῖν εἰδέναι ὡς ὑπάρχοντος ὅρου τῆς σοφίας.[292]
> (Wescher page 4)
>
> And those who write something or give us advice and think that they are doing so with a view to benefit, not unreasonably, waste time writing at length in unnecessary passages[293] so as to show off their breadth of learning. For they leave their books full of digressions. And they do this despite the ancient philosophers having said well that one should know the measure of appropriate time, this being the definition of wisdom.[294]

Nicander presents his works as collections of knowledge, and we might compare Hutchinson's 2003 treatment of the *Aitia*, which brings out the importance of sectioning and the relationship with prose. Certainly we get the impression in *Aitia* fr. 75 that the indication of Xenomedes as a source intrudes on the neat conclusion of the section concerning Acontius and Cydippe with a gesture towards all the many stories from this history which might have found a fuller account in the poem.

---

[292] Cf. Diodorus' στοχαζόμενοι τῆς συμμετρίας, 'striving for due proportion' (see above, pp. 118-19 n. 195).
[293] 'Treatises' according to Whitehead and Blyth 2004: 45.
[294] We will recall that, according to Heath, diversity can be a "constituent of coherence" (see above, p. 152). It certainly should not be claimed that Nicander's poems are disunified or incoherent: they read as collections of knowledge around central subject areas.

This passage is well discussed, but is worth quoting in full, since it contains much of interest for our purposes:[295]

> ἐκ δὲ γάμου κείνοιο μέγ᾽ οὔνομα μέλλε νέεσθαι·
> δὴ γὰρ ἔθ᾽ ὑμέτερον φῦλον Ἀκοντιάδαι
> πουλύ τι καὶ περίτιμον Ἰουλίδι ναιετάουσιν,
> Κεῖε, τεὸν δ᾽ ἡμεῖς ἵμερον ἐκλύομεν
> τόνδε παρ᾽ ἀρχαίου Ξενομήδεος, ὅς ποτε πᾶσαν
> νῆσον ἐνὶ μνήμῃ κάτθετο μυθολόγῳ,
> ἄρχμενος ὡς νύμφῃσι[ν ἐ]ναίετο Κωρυκίῃσιν,
> τὰς ἀπὸ Παρνησσοῦ λῖς ἐδίωξε μέγας,
> Ὑδροῦσσαν τῷ καί μιν ἐφήμισαν, ὥ̣ς̣ τ̣ε Κιρῴ[δης
> .]ο̣.. θ̣υσ̣[.]τ̣ο̣.. ᾤκεεν ἐν Καρύαις·
> ὥ]ς τέ μιν ἐννάσσαντο τέων Ἀλαλάξιος αἰεί
> Ζεὺς ἐπὶ σαλπίγγων ἱρὰ βοῇ δέχεται
> Κᾶρες ὁμοῦ Λελέγεσσι, μ̣ε̣τ̣᾽ οὔνομα δ᾽ ἄλλο βαλ̣έσ̣θ̣[αι
> Φοίβου καὶ Μελίης ἶνις ἔθηκε Κέως·
> ἐν δ᾽ ὕβριν θάνατόν τε κεραύνιον, ἐν δὲ γόητας
> Τελχῖνας μακάρων τ᾽ οὐκ ἀλέγοντα θεῶν
> ἠλεὰ Δημώνακτα γέρων ἐνεθήκατο δέλτ[οις
> καὶ γρηῢν Μακελώ, μητέρα Δεξιθέης,
> ἃς μούνας, ὅτε νῆσον ἀνέτρεπον εἵνεκ᾽ ἀλ̣[ι]τ̣[ρῆς
> ὕβριος, ἀσκηθεῖς ἔλλιπον ἀθάνατοι·
> τέσσαρας ὥς τε πόληας ὁ μὲν τείχισσε Μ̣ε̣γ̣α̣κ̣[λ]ῆ̣ς̣
> Κάρθαιαν, Χρυσοῦς δ᾽ Εὔπ[υ]λος ἡμιθέης
> εὔκρηνον πτολίεθρον Ἰουλίδος, αὐτὰρ Ἀ̣κ̣α̣ῖ̣[ος
> Ποιῆσσαν Χαρίτων ἵ̣δ̣ρ̣υμ᾽ ἐυπλοκάμων,
> ἄστυρον Ἄφραστος δὲ Κορή[σ]ιον, εἶπε δ̣ὲ̣, Κ̣ε̣ῖ̣ε̣,
> ξυγκραθέντ᾽ αὐταῖς ὀξὺν ἔρωτα σέθεν
> πρέσβυς ἐτητυμίῃ μεμελημένος, ἔ̣ν̣θεν̣ ὁ π̣α̣[ι]δ̣ός
> μῦθος ἐς ἡμετέρην ἔδραμε Καλλιόπην.
> (fr. 75. 50-77)

And a great name was to come from that marriage. For still your race, the Acontiadae, inhabit Ioulis in large numbers and with a great deal of honour, Cean, and we heard of that desire of yours from ancient Xenomedes, who once set down the whole island into mythological memory, beginning from when it was inhabited by Corycian nymphs whom a great lion had chased from Parnassus, for which reason they also called it Hydroussa, and how Cirodes […] lived in Caryae, and how Carians and Leleges, whose sacred bulls Zeus of the War Cry receives to the sound of trumpets, lived there at the same time, and Ceos, son of Phoebus and Melia, made it change to

[295] Useful recent discussions can be found in Krevans 2004: 179-81 Greene 2011: 76-82, Harder 2012b: 631-58 and Greene 2017: 32-5. References to these treatments are frequent in the discussion below.

> another name. And in the midst of these things, the old man put in his writing-tablets arrogance and deadly thunder and the wizards, the Telchines and Demonax, who, in a crazed state, did not heed the blessed gods, and the old woman Macelo, the mother of Dexithea, the two of whom alone the immortals left unscathed when they overturned the island on account of sinful arrogance. And he told of how, on the subject of its four cities, Megacles founded Carthaea, Eupylus, son of the semi-divine Chryso, founded well-fountained Ioulis, and Acaeus founded Poeessa, the seat of the beautifully-tressed Graces, and Aphrastus founded the town of Coresus, and Cean, mixed in with these, the old man told of your eager love, having care, as he did, for truth, whence ran the story of the child to my Calliope.

We seem to be coming to a fitting conclusion with the "promise [of] a genealogy-aetion" at 50-2 (Krevans 2004: 180-1) before the incorporation of a summary of Xenomedes' work extends the section quite considerably while denying any real focus on the descendants of Acontius. The impression of the poet desperately fitting in as much knowledge as he can is enhanced by the relatively high amount of summarised content compared to the number of finite verbs describing the activity of the prose author: in the just over twenty-three lines from part way through 54, there are only three (κάτθετο (55), ἐνεθήκατο (66) and ξυγκραθέντ' (75)), of which two are accompanied by participles. We have seen above (p. 127) that Nicander's indications of subject matter which might have found a place in his work gain a sort of playful plausibility by their overlaps with material which does actually occur elsewhere in the same poem or throughout his œuvre, and here Callimachus' approach is comparable: an exhaustive list of sections elsewhere in the *Aitia* of a similar sort to those sketched out in the summary of Xenomedes' work is provided by Greene 2017: 34.[296]

---

[296] And these seem to have been the sorts of story that Hellenistic readers will have enjoyed and expected: see e.g. Harder 2012b: 644 on the popularity of changes to the names of islands as a topic of poetry.

Conversely, comparisons can be made here with the approaches of Pseudo-Scymnus and Apollonius. The whole section, after all, is matched up to Callimachus' named source. It is possible that a similar attribution occurs at least once elsewhere in the poem (see above, p. 165 n. 247), and even without the inclusion of the Xenomedes-summary, readers of a complete *Aitia* may well have thought of the poet's role in terms of bringing together disparate source material. Certainly the summary of Xenomedes' work underlines the effort of the poet in gathering his *aitia*: "the reader both becomes aware of the amount of scholarly research that lies behind this relatively brief poetic passage and can also appreciate the poet's discernment in selecting a single episode to treat from such a comprehensive work" (Greene 2011: 78).[297] The poet's decision to include a summary of Xenomedes' work instead of a simple attribution is of great interest in the context of our examination of Hellenistic long poems as textual equivalents of other forms of literary collecting: Callimachus has, in a sense, included a 'whole work' within his 'collection'.

2.4.3 Sections and sources: conclusion

Pseudo-Scymnus and Apollonius often encourage us to match up whole sections to specific authors or types of text. When reading their poems, then, we can get the

[297] Cf. Krevans 2004: 181: "I would argue that if "Acontius and Cydippe" has an aetion, it is the origin of the story; i.e. how Callimachus obtained his material".

impression at points of sections as 'textual items' brought together into literary collections, rather like anthologies, or even physical collections of books. Nicander, on the evidence available to us, is less keen on this sort of 'section = textual item' equation. Instead, his gathering of source material intrudes on his otherwise highly consistent sectioning, especially in the *Alexipharmaca*. We should not overstate the distinction (not least because we have seen that Callimachus' use of Xenomedes straddles the two approaches): Nicander, we have seen, can build runs of sections evocative of specific genres, such as paradoxography at *Ther*. 805-36 (see above, p. 196 n. 289), and he may well attribute groupings of sections in his poems to specific prose sources (see pp. 186-7). Again, we might think that Apollonius gives the impression of his poem being 'taken over' by his mythographic knowledge towards the end of Book 2, as increasing amounts of sections are given over to titanic material: first, the story of Typhon and the Serbonian Lake takes up about half of a character's speech, and then all but the first line of the section concerning the journey from the island of Ares to the island of Philyra is filled by a digression (which produces an unusual version of a common section end), before the final piece of titanic material becomes an episode in the action of the poem. Furthermore, some topics at the edge of Apollonius' central subject are scattered around the *Argonautica*. We might think of material concerning Heracles, for example: Feeney 1986: 49-66 gives a useful account of the great variety of the hero's appearances in the poem, which are somewhat out of kilter with the otherwise linear progression of the narrative.[298]

---

[298] Apollonius may be gesturing towards the sort of all-encompassing work on Heracles exemplified by the poems of Pisander and Panyassis: the former apparently narrated χώσους ἐξεπόνασεν […]

We are faced, then, with these two different ways of gesturing towards the collection of source material in our poems. Sometimes sections are themselves the constituents of the 'collections', representations of textual items in an anthology or on the shelf. At other times, the information gathered into the works threatens to derail the coherent and consistent articulation of the poem *qua* single entity. We might say that this apparently incompatible duality is a metatextual aspect of the central tension first laid out in the introduction to Part 2 (see p. 114) between the poems as formally single entities articulated into a number of sub-units and as multiple entities gathered into meaningful groupings.

ἀέθλους (Theoc. *Ep*. 22. 5; 'all the labours at which he toiled'). Cf. Sistakou 2009b: 392 on the inclusion of Heracleid-style myths. She suggests in her n. 31 that Theseus is given similar treatment in his appearcances at 3. 996-1004, 1096-1101, 4. 433-4. Note that another 'collection' of sorts comes in the *Alexandra*, where over the course of the poem we are drip-fed with Argonautic material in an order pointedly different from Apollonius': the first two mentions of the expedition (872-6, 881-90) contain information related late in Book 4, on the Argonauts' return journey, before 1309-21 provides details about the main quest (Book 3 and the start of Book 4), even referring to Jason's single sandal (1310), alluding to a story told the first few lines of the first book of Apollonius. See Hurst and Kolde 2008: 295 for a useful breakdown of all of the action condensed into 1313-21 and the relevant passages of Apollonius and others. Schmakeit-Bean 2006: 284 even goes so far as to identify a backwardly temporal pattern including 171-9, 874-94 and 1309-21 (see also West 2008 for a detailed look at Argonautic material in the poem in general). Callimachus or Apollonius or both may be playing a similar game in their placement of material found in the *Argonautica* and *Aetia* respectively (see below, pp. 212-15.).

2.5 General Literary Collections

2.5.1 Introductory remarks

In addition to thematically focused collections, gathering all possible information on a subject (and a little more, in the case of Nicander), we can also see overlaid on two of our texts in particular representations of more general literary collections. These might be thought of as analogous to broad ranging anthologies on papyrus like P. Hamb. 121 (see above, p. 160 n. 237), compilations of epigrams on a range of themes as in the Milan Posidippus,[299] or even collections of books. I do not want to insist upon too sharp a distinction between the 'collection' building discussed in this part and that discussed in the last. It is certainly not a case of 'collecting' prose items on the one hand and poetic items on the other: we saw that Hesiod featured in Apollonius' 'mythography' grouping, and we shall see below that Lycophron's overlaid 'collection' includes Herodotus.[300] Nonetheless, reading a text as a

---

[299] I am making no claims about authorial design or otherwise.

[300] And we might consider the possibility that Pseudo-Scymnus' Sicilian material (264-99), which is packed with city names, presents a 'version' of Callimachus' treatment of the cities of Sicily (*Aetia* fr. 43). Certainly, even in the context of a poem which displays a great interest in the foundation of cities, the focus on this aspect of historical geography reaches a noticeable extreme at this point in the *Periodos*. I have underlined all the Sicilian city names and adjectives derived from them in the passages below:

> μετὰ ταῦτα δ' ἀπὸ Νάξου Λεοντῖνοι πόλις,
> ἡ τὴν θέσιν τ' ἔχουσα Ῥηγίου πέραν,
> ἐπὶ τοῦ δὲ πορθμοῦ κειμένη τῆς Σικελίας,
> Ζάγκλη, Κατάνη, Καλλίπολις ἔσχ' ἀποικίαν.
> Πάλιν δ' ἀπὸ τούτων δύο πόλεις, Εὔβοια καί
> Μύλαι κατῳκίσθησαν ἐπικαλούμεναι,
> εἶθ' Ἱμέρα καὶ Ταυρομένιον ἐχομένη·
> (283-89)
>
> And after this, founded from Naxos, is the city of Leontini, which has its position opposite Rhegium, and, lying on the Strait of Sicily, Zancle, Catania and Callipolis have their colonies. And, again, from these, the two cities called Euboea and Mylae were founded, and then Himera and Tauromenium, bordering them.
>
> Μεγαρεῖς Σελινοῦνθ', οἱ Γελῷοι δ' ἔκτισαν
> Ἀκράγαντα, Μεσσήνην δ' Ἴωνες ἐκ Σάμου,
> Συρακόσιοι δὲ τὴν Καμάριναν λεγομένην ·

collection of Hesiod, Herodotus, an epigram compilation and so on is somewhat different from reading it as a collection of geographical and historical source material. We shall see, however, that these ways of looking at sectioned texts need not be mutually exclusive: the *Argonautica* invites being read in both ways.

2.5.2 Lycophron

The scholia on Lycophron do not offer us so much ground for identifying the gathering of sources in the *Alexandra* as do the scholia on Apollonius in the case of the *Argonautica*. Nor does the text itself make the task easy, although there are some promising hints.[301] It is much easier, however, to see an overlaid 'literary collection' in the poem: the list of Helen's husbands at 144-79 is commonly recognised as a reworking of the list of her suitors in Hesiod's *Catalogue of Women* (frr. 196-204 M.-W.),[302] and it is often pointed out that the list of past and future conflicts (from Cassandra's perspective) between Europe and Asia at 1283-1373 is a 'version' of the opening of Herodotus' *Histories*.[303] To be added to these passages is the abundance of epigrammatic material at 365-446, which, I shall argue, can be read as a sort of

---

(292-4)

Megarians founded Selinous, and the Gelans founded Acragas, and Ionians from Samos founded Messina, and Syracusans founded the city called Camarina.

cf. Call. fr. 43. 29 (Κατάνην) 36 (Νάξ[ον) 42 (φήσω καὶ Καμάριναν; 'I can speak of Camarina') 46 (οἶδα Γέλα ποταμοῦ κεφαλῇ ἔπι κείμενον ἄστυ; 'I know the city which lies at the head of the river Gela') 50 (οἶδα Λεοντίνους; 'I know Leontini'), and 52 (ἔχω δ' Εὔβοιαν ἐνισπε[ῖν; 'I can speak of Euboea'); 59-72 relates the story of Zancle, and there is a clear focus on the colonisers throughout the fragment).

[301] See e.g. Hornblower 2015: 217-19 on Cyprus (447-591) and Eratosthenes/Philostephanus. Interestingly, one author is named in the text, in a manner of speaking. At 422, Lycophron uses ὅμηρος to describe Phoenix's blindness as a punishment by his father for sleeping with his concubine. Is there some playfulness in Lycophron's 'naming' of Homer precisely when introducing a detail not found in Homer?

[302] See e.g. Hornblower 2015: 11.

[303] See e.g. West 2009: 81, Hornblower 2015: 452.

epigram collection (or section thereof). Before we turn to these lines, it is worth pointing out that in the other two passages Lycophron goes a little further than simply reminding us of the texts in question by means of shared or similar general content; instead, there are hints at the style of the quoted text, specific verbal reminiscences or other more significant overlaps. The 'catalogue of husbands' gestures towards the Hesiodic (or perhaps general archaic) tendency to introduce suitors in twos with the opening of its first item (δοίω, 147),[304] and, more significantly, it follows its Hesiodic forebear in ending with Achilles and a sense of non-fulfilment. The final item of Hesiod's catalogue states that Achilles cannot take his place among the wooing heroes on account of his youth (fr. 204. 87-93), while in the *Alexandra* the final 'husband', Achilles, does not really marry Helen at all, but only dreams of the event:

> ἐν δὲ δεμνίοις
> τὸν ἐξ ὀνείρων πέμπτον ἐστροβημένον
> εἰδωλοπλάστῳ προσκαταξανεῖ ῥέθει […]
> (171-3)
>
> And she will scratch the fifth down to nothing on his bed with her image-formed face as he is spun about by dreams.

In the 'Herodotus super-section', Lycophron's evocation of the historian is made especially clear by the use of καὶ δευτέρους to start the section concerning the Argonautic expedition (1309) despite the insertion of extra material concerning the activity of the Cretans after the Io-Europa pairing (1291-1301): strict numerical accuracy is sacrificed in order to follow Herodotus' δευτέρῃ δὲ λέγουσι γενεῇ at the start of his own Argonautic passage (1. 3).[305] The Herodotean feeling is increased by

[304] Cf. frr. 197. 6, 199. 4 M.-W., and also e.g. the Homeric Catalogue of Ships.
[305] Might we think of Lycophron's additions as 'notes' on his Herodotus?

specific verbal reminiscences,[306] as well as by the continuation of the discussion of the conflict of the continents into a treatment of Xerxes' invasion of Greece (1412-34). The introduction to this run of sections also contains a cluster of what might be thought Herodotean geographical material.[307]

The grouping of 'epigrammatic' material at 365-446, where we read of Greeks dying at sea and shortly after arriving home or in new lands, has received less attention. Durbec 2009: 128-30 briefly notes the appearance of the themes of funerary epigrams at 365-416,[308] but the relevant passages, which extend beyond 416 as we shall see, deserve comparison with Hellenistic epigrams (this has been done in some individual cases, as pointed out in the table below):

ἑνὸς δὲ λώβης ἀντί, μυρίων τέκνων Ἑλλὰς στενάξει πᾶσα τοὺς κενοὺς τάφους, οὐκ ὀστοθήκαις χοιράδων ἐφημένους,[309] οὐδ' ὑστάτην κεύθοντας ἐκ πυρὸς τέφρην κρωσσοῖσι ταρχυθεῖσαν, ἣ θέμις φθιτῶν, ἀλλ' οὔνομ' οἰκτρὸν καὶ κενηρίων γραφὰς θερμοῖς τεκόντων δακρύοις λελουμένας παίδων τε καὶ θρήνοισι τοῖς ὁμευνίδων (365-72) 'But in return for the sin of one man, all of Greece will groan over the empty tombs of tens of thousands of children, not placed over their sarcophagi of rocks, nor guarding	The 'empty-tomb for the man lost at sea' motif; e.g νῦν δ' ὃ μὲν εἰν ἁλί που φέρεται νέκυς, ἀντὶ δ' ἐκείνου οὔνομα καὶ κενεὸν σῆμα παρερχόμεθα. (Call. *Ep*. 17. 3-4 Pf.; Hornblower 2015: 200) 'But as it is his corpse, perhaps, is borne on the brine, and instead of him, we pass by a name and an empty tomb'. Τιμάρης δὲ κενὸν τέκνου κεκλαυμένον ἀθρῶν

[306] See e.g. Hornblower 2015: 459 on ἀντ' ἴσων ἴσα (1302).

[307] […] ἃς πόντος Ἕλλης καὶ πέτραι Συμπληγάδες/ καὶ Σαλμυδησὸς καὶ κακόξεινος κλύδων,/ Σκύθαισι γείτων, καρτεροῖς εἴργει πάγοις/ λίμνην τε τέμνων Τάναϊς ἀκραιφνὴς μέσην/ῥείθροις ὁρίζει, προσφιλεστάτην βροτοῖς/ χίμετλα Μαιώταισι θρηνοῦσιν ποδῶν (1285-90; 'those places which the Hellespont and the rocks called the Symplegades and Salmydessos and the unwelcoming wave, neighbour of the Scythians, fence off with mighty crags, and which the pure Tanais divides with its streams, cutting through the middle of the lake which is beloved of Maiotian mortals, those who lament the chilblains on their feet'). Cf. Herodotus 4. 28, on the cold in Scythia, 4. 45, on the boundaries of continents, and 4. 47-57 on Scythian rivers; the Tanais is the last in his list (it should be noted, however, that chilblains are quite at home in iambography; cf. Hipponax 34 W (choliambs), where the speaker complains of this affliction).

[308] And see Sistakou 2009a: 246-7 for the importance of tombs in the poem more generally.

[309] On the problems of this line, see Liberman 2009. I am not sure the Greek as it stands is absolutely indefensible.

the very last ashes from their pyres, buried in urns, as is proper for the dead, but as lamentable names and writing on cenotaphs, washed by the hot tears of parents and children and by the dirges of their bedfellows'.	τύμβον, δακρύει παῖδα Τελευταγόρην. (Leonidas 15. 7-8 G.-P.) 'And Timares, gazing at the much lamented empty tomb of his child, weeps for his son Teleutagoras'.
ὅσων στεναγμῶν ἐκβεβρασμένων νεκρῶν σὺν ἡμιθραύστοις[310] ἰκρίοις ἀκούσετε, ὅσων δὲ φλοίσβων ῥαχίας ἀνεκβάτου δίναις παλιρροίοισιν ἕλκοντος σάλου […] (377-80) 'How many groans will you hear when the corpses are cast out onto the shore along with half-broken sterns, and how many roars of the unavoidable tide, when the sea's tossing drags them with backwardly-flowing whirlpools […]'	The 'corpses cast upon the shore' motif ; e.g. ἄπνους εὐρεῖ ἐπ᾽ αἰγιαλῷ (Leonidas 15. 6) 'Breathless on the wide shore'. ἐπεὶ τρηχεῖα θάλασσα νεκρὸν πεπταμένους θῆκεν ἐπ᾽ αἰγιαλούς. (Leonidas 14. 7-8) 'Since the rough sea set me upon the spreading shore'.
ψυχρὸν δ᾽ ἐπ᾽ ἀκταῖς ἐκβεβρασμένον νέκυν δελφῖνος ἀκτὶς Σειρία καθαυανεῖ. τάριχον ἐν μνίοις δὲ καὶ βρύοις σαπρὸν κρύψει κατοικτίσασα Νησαίας κάσις, Δίσκου μεγίστου τάρροθος Κυναιθέως. τύμβος δὲ γείτων ὄρτυγος πετρουμένης τρέμων φυλάξει ῥόχθον Αἰγαίας ἁλός. (396-402) '**1.** And the Sirian ray will dry the dolphin's cold corpse [Ajax the Lesser], cast out onto the headland. **2.** And Nesaia's pitying sister [Thetis], the helper of the great Kynaithan disk [Zeus], will hide the putrid pickled fish in seaweed and sea-lettuce. **3.** And his tomb, the neighbour of the lithified quail [Delos], will watch the roaring of the Aigaian brine, trembling.'	**1.** A narrating dolphin describes its beaching: ἀλλά με πορφυρέα πόντου νοτὶς ὧσ᾽ ἐπὶ χέρσον, κεῖμαι δὲ ῥαδινὰν τάνδε παρ᾽ ἠιόνα. (Anyte 12. 5-6; Hornblower 2015: 204) 'But the heaving moisture of the sea pushed me onto dry land, and I lie along this narrow beach'. **2.** The 'strangers burying a shipwreck-victim' motif; e.g. τίς, ξένος ὦ ναυηγέ· Λεόντιχος ἐνθάδε νεκρόν εὗρέ σ᾽ ἐπ᾽ αἰγιαλοῦ χῶσέ τε τῶιδε τάφωι (Call. *Ep*. 58. 1-2 Pf.; McNelis and Sens 2016: 82 compare 398-400 with this motif, but provide no examples from epigram) 'Who are you, shipwrecked stranger? Leontichos found your corpse here on the shore and buried you in this tomb.' **3.** A tomb tells the sea to stay away:[311]

[310] ἡμίθραυστος is used of damage caused by water at Dioscorides 34. 5 G-P.

[311] The trembling tomb of 401-2 might also be thought to provide an example of a tomb's taking on the character of the deceased (examples from epigram are given in the final row of the table): it is fitting in the world of epigrammatic wit that the tomb of a man who had died at sea would itself

	ὀκτὼ μευ πήχεις ἄπεχε, τρηχεῖα θάλασσα (Asclepiades 30. 1; McNelis-Sens 2016: 82) 'Keep eight cubits away from me, rough sea.'
πολλῶν γὰρ ἐν σπλάγχνοισι τυμβευθήσεται βρωθεὶς πολυστοίχοισι καμπέων γνάθοις νήριθμος ἑσμός· οἱ δ' ἐπὶ ξένης ξένοι παῶν ἔρημοι δεξιώσονται τάφους. (413-16) '**1.** For a numberless swarm of them will be entombed in the innards of many sea-monsters, eaten by their many-rowed jaws. **2.** And some, isolated from their kin, will greet their tombs as strangers in a strange land.'	**1.** A dead man describes half of his body being eaten by a sea monster: ἐβρώθην· τοῖόν μοι ἐπ' ἄγριον εὖ μέγα κῆτος ἦλθεν, ἀπέβροξεν δ' ἄχρις ἐπ' ὀμφαλίου (Leonidas 65. 7-8) 'I was eaten; such an absolutely huge wild sea-monster came at me and ate me up as far as my navel.' **2.** The 'strangers buried in a strange land' motif; e.g. εὖ μιν ἔθαψαν ἑταῖροι ἐπὶ ξείνης ξένον ὄντα (Theocritus 10. 3) 'His companions buried him well, a stranger in a strange land.'
δοιοὶ δὲ ῥείθρων Πυράμου πρὸς ἐκβολαῖς αὐτοκτόνοις σφαγαῖσι Δηραίνου κύνες δμηθέντες αἰχμάσουσι λοισθίαν βοὴν πύργων ὑπὸ πτέρνῃσι Παμφύλου κόρης. αἰπὺς δ' ἁλιβρὼς ὄχμος ἐν μεταιχμίῳ Μάγαρσος ἁγνῶν ἠρίων σταθήσεται, ὡς μὴ βλέπωσι, μηδὲ νερτέρων ἕδρας δύντες, φόνῳ λουσθέντας ἀλλήλων τάφους. (439-46) 'And the two hounds of Derainos, overcome by mutually-slaying blows by the offshoots of the Pyramos' flow, will clash spears with their last battle-cry beneath the heel of the towers of Pamphylos' daughter. And salt-eaten Magarsos, the lofty fortress, will be stood midway between their holy barrows so that, even when they have sunk	The graves of Mopsos and Amphilochos, the rival seers, are separated from each other by the city of Magarsos so that they will not have to see each other after their deaths. The reflection of the men's hatred in life in the placement of their tombs in death makes this an example of the 'tombstone taking on the character of the deceased' motif; e.g. A.P. 9. 67: the tombstone takes on the vindictive character of the step-mother beneath. Theodoridas 16: the grave-marker of Heraclitus.[312]

fear the sea. There is no transfer of character in Ascl. 30, but Sens 2011: 201 provides a number of comparanda for that poem, of which a few make explicit the link between death at sea and the tomb's dislike for the sea.

[312] See Bruss 2005: 72-3 for a discussion of aspects of the stone which allow it to be identified as recognisably belonging to the philosopher.

to the seats of those below, they may not see each other's tomb, washed with gore.'	

The length of this passage (eighty-two lines) makes it similar to that of a section in an epigram book (cf. e.g. Posidippus' 'Oionoskopika'; eighty lines), and the same can be said for its general topic (the Milan Papyrus contains 'Nauagika' and 'Epitymbia' sections). The first passage might even be thought to encourage the reading of the following lines as a sort of epigrammatic collection through its mention of κενηρίων γραφὰς (370). It should also be noted that Lycophron does more than simply share epigrammatic content: at points he treats this content in a recognisably epigrammatic, witty way. At 415-16 (penultimate row, no. 2), for example, the 'strangers buried in a strange land' motif, which is remarkably close to Theocritus *Ep*. 10 in delivery (note the juxtaposition of the two cases of the same word in both texts), is enriched by the addition of δεξιώσονται τάφους: it is entirely fitting that strangers will have to greet such gravestones as if with a handshake.

Epigram collection itself is an activity which is a sort of parallel to that of our poets: in both cases small textual units are grouped together into larger runs which are combined to make a sort of single super-entity. We have seen that the Milan Posidippus shows an interest in the arrangement of its constituent parts (see above, p. 160 n. 237). Lycophron chooses several types of sectioned literature to incorporate into his collection: catalogue poetry, an epigram compilation and a famous example of prose divided into a sequence of units. We might say that the poet of the *Alexandra* is demonstrating awareness of the sort of work he is writing, and to which types of literature it has similarities. At the very least, we can see that his decision

to represent types of literature which are themselves divided into smaller sections interacts with his clear enjoyment of presenting a number of multipartite units in his work: we saw in Part 1 (p. 58) that the *Alexandra* gives more attention than most of the poems to the demarcation of sub-units within sections. His interaction with the idea of a collection works on a range of scales. At 365-446 he is taking on the role of the compiler of the Milan papyrus (whether Posidippus or another) or P. Berol. 9812 (epigrams on artworks; early Ptolemaic according to Gronewald 1973), gathering individual textual items into a significant grouping. Over the course of the poem as a whole he is taking on the role of a collector of books or excerpts from them.

Absent from the discussion so far has been Lycophron's '*Odyssey*' (648-819): the attention afforded by the great length of this run of sections may have encouraged Lycophron's contemporaries to think of it as another text in the 'collection' even in spite of some pointed deviations from Homer.[313] Other texts, too, may be represented, perhaps including the *Aitia* prologue (115-123, 'Proteus') and Simias' *Pelekus* (930-50, 'Epeius').[314] Whether we are confident about all of these

---

[313] Most striking is 771-3, on the apparent infidelity of Penelope: ἡ δὲ βασσάρα/ σεμνῶς κασωρεύουσα κοιλανεῖ δόμους,/ θοίναισιν ὄλβον ἐκχέασα τλήμονος ('And the vixen, fornicating haughtily, will hollow out the house, pouring out the wretched man's wealth in banqueting').

[314] For 930-50 and Simias, see Hornblower 2015: 355-6 and Kwapisz 2013. Might the ring-composition of this section (see Part 1, pp. 49-50) imitate the curious arrangement of Simias' lines? The relation of 115-23 to Callimachus'prologue seems not to have been discussed before:

> ὁ γάρ σε συλλέκτροιο Φλεγραίας πόσις
> στυγνὸς Τορώνης, ᾧ γέλως ἀπέχθεται
> καὶ δάκρυ, νῆις δ' ἐστὶ καὶ τητώμενος
> ἀμφοῖν, ὁ Θρῄκης ἔκ ποτ' εἰς ἐπακτίαν
> Τρίτωνος ἐκβολαῖσιν ἠλοκισμένην
> χέρσον περάσας, οὐχὶ ναυβάτῃ στόλῳ,
> ἀλλ' ἀστίβητον οἶμον, οἷά τις σιφνεύς,
> κευθμῶνος ἐν σήραγγι τετρήνας μυχούς,
> νέρθεν θαλάσσης ἀτραποὺς διήνυσε [...]
> (115-23)

cases or not, it is certainly attractive to think of Lycophron gesturing towards a general literary collection in the composition of the *Alexandra* by associating sections or (more often) runs of sections with specific poems or types of text. His role as a 'collector' is underlined by his positioning of material. The 'Catalogue of Suitors', from the final book of the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*, is placed early in the poem, and the 'Opening of Herodotus' is placed late: this emphasises Lycophron's control over these textual items, which he can excerpt and place wherever he sees fit. Depending on the relative dating of poets, we may see something similar in Apollonius.

2.5.3 Apollonius

Much that has to be said about Apollonius gesturing towards a general literary collection depends on the relative chronology of the three most famous Hellenistic poets. The most important overlaps are these:

- The dedication of the anchor-stone (*Arg*. 1. 953-60, *Aet*. Book 4, frr. 108-109a Harder).

> For the sullen husband of the Phlegraian wife Torone, he to whom both laughter and tears are hateful and who is ignorant and wanting in both, he who once came all the way from Thrace to the headland plain furrowed by Triton's offshoots, not in a sea-travelling fleet, but along an untrodden path, like a mole, boring through corners in the hollows of caves to complete his short-cut beneath the sea […]

νῆις (117) corresponds to Callimachus' νήιδε� ις (fr. 1. 2 Harder), and 'laughter and tears' might be thought the realm of the Muses, of whom Callimachus claims the Telchines to be ignorant. 18-20 may remind us of Callimachus' ἐπὶ Θρήϊκας ἀπ' Αἰγύπτοιο [πέτοιτο (1. 13; 'let [the crane fly] to Thrace from Egypt); the direction of travel, of course, is reversed (reversal seems to be pointed in this passage: ""The order of narration is inverted: Proteus' return to Egypt from Thrace (118ff.) is narrated before the explicit statement that he left his native Egypt for Thrace originally [(126-7)]" (Hornblower 2015: 150)). ἀστίβητον οἶμον seems to pick up στείβε˩ιν and οἶμον (1. 25, 27), while ἀτραπούς may echo ἀτρίπτο]ṳς (1. 28). Given the metapoetic significance of the sea in the *Hymn to Delos*, for example, 'boring a path beneath the waves' sounds a very loaded phrase.

- Anaphe and Apollo Aigletes (*Arg*. 4. 1701-30, *Aet*. Book 1, frr. 7c-21d Harder).

- The *Hydrophoria* (*Arg*. 4. 1765-72, *Iamb*. 8)

- Hylas' abduction (*Arg*. 1. 1207-72, Theoc. 13).

- The boxing-match of Amykos and Polydeukes (*Arg*. 2. 1-97, Theoc. 22. 27-134).

The relative dating of the *Argonautica* and these other poems has been the subject of much discussion, and it is not my intention to make any new arguments in favour of any of the positions taken on the subject. Instead, after a summary of recent views, I shall discuss the ramifications for our view of the *Argonautica* if Apollonius was writing with knowledge of the relevant works of Callimachus and Theocritus (writing, that is, either after the publication of their poems in the form in which they have come down to us or in an atmosphere of mutual influence during roughly contemporaneous composition). As far as the relationship between Apollonius and Callimachus is concerned, modern treatments of the subject overwhelmingly favour either the anteriority of Callimachus or a mutual influence between two poets with access to each other's work before publication in the form known to us.[315] The relationship between Apollonius and Theocritus has found less consensus.[316] Köhnken's 2008 chapter, which argues for Apollonius as later than both

[315] Harder 1993: 103-10 gives a balanced discussion of the question of the relative dating of the two, coming to the conclusion that Apollonius was the more likely to have been imitating. But e.g. at 2012a: 33 she considers the possibility of a two-way interaction. Cameron's discussion of the relative chronology of *Iamb* 8 and *Arg*. 4 (1995: 251-3, with bibliography) argues for Callimachus as earlier. Hutchinson 1988: 85-9 favours the anteriority of Callimachus in several specific cases, but also raises the possibility of contemporaries with access to each other's work in progress (at least before finalisation into what we have now) during the composition of their own.

[316] For Apollonius as earlier see Hutchinson 1988: 193, with note 81, Effe 1992 (his focus is on the Hylas-connection), Hunter 1996: 59-63 (tentatively) and Cuypers 1997: 13-25 (approaching the question primarily from the angle of the boxing-match). For Theocritus as earlier see Vian 1976: 39-49 and Cameron 1995: 426-31. Cozzoli 2015 argues for a mutual relationship.

Callimachus and Theocritus, includes a broader range of bibliography than the sample of recent contributions which I have mentioned in my footnotes.

Taking the more secure case of Callimachus first, we can see an approach to placement similar to that of Lycophron, with material from the first book of the *Aitia* appearing in the fourth book of the *Argonautica* and material from the fourth book of the *Aitia* appearing in the first book of the *Argonautica*.[317] There is also an accumulation of Callimachean material towards the end of the poem. Building on Harder's 1993 chapter, Köhnken places great weight on the fact that the last three *aitia* in the poem are all found also in Callimachus ("Apollonius evidently shows his debt to his teacher"; 78-9): he links 1750-64 ('Kalliste/Thera') to Call. fr. 716 Pf., which may be part of the 'Anaphe' *aition* (so, tentatively, Pfeiffer 1949: 460).

If Theocritus wrote before Apollonius, or if there were a mutual influence, the latter's placement of his 'Theocritean' sections looks pointed: they are positioned next to each other, perhaps to highlight their shared 'authorship' (and Köhnken suggests that the anonymous comment of *Arg*. 2. 145-53 is Apollonius' way of pointing to this connection), but separated by book division. Alternatively, if Apollonius were earlier, Theocritus' excerpting these two episodes from the *Argonautica* would show an interest in the separability of Apollonius' sections in the very early reception of the poem.

Assuming that the work one or both of Callimachus and Theocritus was available to Apollonius and his early readers, it is likely that these readers will have

[317] It is worth adding that Jason's prayer in Call. fr. 18 Harder seems to be alluded to at 1. 411-19 as well as in the shared Anaphe-context in Book 4. See Albis 1995 for a discussion of these prayers; especially interesting is 107-9, where he claims that ἐπαίτιος alludes to the title of Callimachus' poem.

appreciated this 'collecting' of modern poetry, and they certainly will not have missed a section representing an older text at 2. 498-530, where the digression concerning Cyrene recalls Pindar's ninth *Pythian* (and Apollonius ensures that the section stands out and holds our attention: see above, pp. 156-7). See also above, p. 202 n. 298, for the idea of a '*Heracleia*' represented throughout the poem.

Apollonius is unique among our poets in providing enough evidence for us to see different kinds of 'collection building' clearly. He can give the impression of putting together Argonautic source material from various genres in the creation of his text, while also overlaying a collection of the sort of works most contemporary book collections might have been expected to contain. As stressed above, this distinction should not be insisted upon too firmly. Only *Pythian* 9 of the poems discussed in this chapter cannot really be called 'Argonautic source material', and the Callimachean grouping towards the end of Book 4 seems to work in a similar way to the 'Pontic local history' and 'titanic mythography' groupings in Book 2. If we look at all the material together, Book 2 in particular represents a richly varied collection, which contemporaries may have been inclined to attribute to Apollonius' access to the Alexandrian library: even just in this one book we find a 'Theoc. 22', a '*Pythian* 9' some 'Pontic local history' and some 'titanic mythography'.

Part 2b: Conclusion

There is certainly good reason to think that the poets are aware of their place within a broader literary culture, and that they encourage us to associate their sectioned composition with other contemporary gatherings of textual items. Pseudo-Scymnus gives the clearest indication of his creation of a collection by excerpting material from a range of prose sources, and Apollonius invites reading in a similar way, even if his broadly Homeric hexameter mode of presenting his material does not allow for so explicit an announcement of his approach. Matching up sections and runs of sections to specific texts or types of text encourages readers who are familiar with the idea of textual collections to think of these sections as the building blocks of the poems. Apollonius and Lycophron also gesture towards more general collections in their poems: in Lycophron in particular the general character of these relevant sections gives them the impression of being overlaid rather than constituting fundamental atoms of the poem, but his 'epigram book' in particular demonstrates an awareness of the similarity of his approach to composition and that of other contemporary collections. Nicander's approach, so far as it is visible to us, is different again: his multiplicity of source material routinely disrupts and complicates the coherent articulation of his text. Sections are important here too, but primarily in their evocation of a focused prose text. At the edges of Nicander's focused topics is a huge range of material, and its incorporation seems almost too much for a neatly articulated text to bear.

What remains of the *Aitia* suggests that Callimachus will also have exploited the similarity between his sectioned work and other contemporary collections.

Local Histories seem to have provided the 'building blocks' (see Hutchinson 2008: 210; the naming of Xenomedes at fr. 75. 54 is especially significant; see above, pp. 198-201), while a number of sections have been shown to be matched up to specific genres: fr. 64, the 'tomb of Simonides', for example, has been thought to evoke epitaphic epigram (see Harder 2012b: 514), and the 'Victoria Berenices', claimed to have started Book 3, represents epinician poetry (see Parsons 1977, Harder 2012b: 388-9).

Long poems of the Golden Age of Latin literature will continue to present 'collections' of material. At a basic level, the *Aeneid* brings together an '*Odyssey*' (Books 1-6) and an '*Iliad*' (Books 7-12). We have also seen an incorporation of a sort of miniature '*periplus*' into the astronomical text of Manilius (4. 587-695; see above, p. 139 n. 222).[318] A more complicated relationship between sources and sections might be observed in Lucretius, who seems to be working from Epicurean source material (Sedley 1998: 135-44) but who sometimes gives us sections representing the work of other specific authors: we might think of 1. 635-920, where there are three sections associated with named philosophers whose arguments are refuted (638, Heraclitus, 716, Empedocles, 830, Anaxagoras). It is remarkable that these prose authors are named explicitly in a hexameter poem, even one of a philosophical character. As in the conclusion to Part 1, we might think that the practice of Hellenistic poets is being emulated in later literature.

[318] It has been suggested that in Book 4 Manilius is visibly making use of Egyptian source material (Goold 1977: lxxxiv, referring to Bouché-Leclercq 1899: 235 with n. 2 and Bartalucci 1961).

General Conclusion

Over the course of the thesis it has become clear that engaging with the idea of sectioning deepens our understanding of how the poems work. In Part 1 we saw that the marking of sections is an aspect of composition to which the poets devote a great deal of attention, and which allows them to position their texts generically. We also saw that they enjoy exploiting the possibilities of pattern building, which allows for expressive sequences and specific moments of interest where there is pointed deviation. In Part 2, we saw that sectioning places these poems firmly at the centre of Hellenistic literary culture. The poets are aware of the questions and resonances that sectioning will have raised in the minds of their readers, and show themselves to be keen to address these issues.

An important benefit of engaging actively with sectioning is that it can help us to understand why the poems which have been the subject of hostile, or relatively little, scholarship might have been popular with Hellenistic audiences. Once we pay attention to section markers for their own sake, Nicander emerges as an especially enjoyable deviator from patterns, as demonstrated memorably at *Ther*. 811-29, for example. Again, once we think of sectioning as part of the same literary trend which encompassed anthologies, poetry books and even libraries, Pseudo-Scymnus can be seen to be a self-aware poet with a significant similarity to Apollonius.[319]

[319] As far as I can see, only Meyer 1998 has brought these two poets together at any length.

Thinking about sectioning also affords us a useful angle from which to approach the relation of Hellenistic verse to Hellenistic Prose.[320] Some of our texts interact quite extensively with the structures of technical prose of the period, but we have also seen that the way in which the authors of more literary prose (Polybius and Diodorus Siculus) conceptualise their work bears quite close relation to what we can infer from (or are told by) our poets. I have done little more here than draw attention to similarities: a thorough comparison of sectioning in the poems and in various types of Hellenistic prose might well produce some interesting results.

Were the *Aitia* more fully extant, our view of the possibilities and resonances of sectioning would no doubt be extended greatly: the surviving fragments are certainly promising. We have also seen that what survives of other long poems of the period points to a rich assortment of Hellenistic (and fourth-century) sectioned verse. The variety of approaches demonstrated by our poems urges caution against assuming a rather homogeneous picture of long Hellenistic poems, but it does seem to have been the case that the basic feature of sectioning was dominant. What we have seen of Hellenistic theoretical discourse suggests that sectioning allowed for effective explorations of a number of literary ideas of the time, while the picture of sectioned verse in first century BC and Imperial poetry presented in the conclusions to Parts 1 and 2 suggest that later ancient readers saw sectioning as an important aspect of these Hellenistic poems, and one to be imitated.

Part 2b, which considered the poems as 'collections' and compared them to other strands of Hellenistic literary 'collectionism', showed that the poets

---

[320] Hardly an overstudied topic, although Hutchinson 2009 and 2014 has made important recent contributions.

themselves thought of their works as participating in a broader cultural trend. We certainly get the impression of a period in which there was an intense interest in the relation of large literary entities to the smaller units which make them up.

Sectioning was evidently central to the authors' and their readers' conceptions of what these poems are doing and where they fit into their wider cultural context. If we are properly to appreciate the aims and achievements of these works, it is imperative that we too pay sections the attention they deserve.

Bibliography

Acosta-Hughes, B., 2010 *Arion's Lyre: Archaic Lyric into Hellenistic Poetry* (Princeton)

Albis, R. V., 1995 'Jason's Prayers to Apollo in *Aetia* 1 and the *Argonautica*' *Phoenix* 49: 104-9

Argentieri, L. 2007 'Meleager and Philip as Epigram Collectors' in Bing and Bruss (edd.), 147-64

Asper, M., 2013 'Minding the Gap: Aetiology and (False) Closure' in Grewing, Acosta-Hughes and Kirichenko (edd.), 63-82

- 2017 'Machines on Paper: From Words to Acts in Ancient Mechanics' in Formisano and van der Eijk (edd.), 27-52

Asquith, H., A., 2005a 'From Genealogy to Catalogue: The Hellenistic Adaptation of the Hesiodic Catalogue Form' in Hunter (ed.), 266-86

- 2005 *Listed Narratives in Greek Poetry from Hesiod to Callimachus: The Development of a Genre* (Thesis: University of Cambridge)

Atherton, C. (ed.), 1997 *Form and Content in Didactic Poetry* (Bari; *NCLS* 5)

Augustakis, A. (ed.) 2014 *Flavian Poetry and its Greek Past* (Leiden: *Mnemosyne* supplement 366)

Bailey, C., 1947 *Titi Lucreti Cari* De Rerum Natura *Libri Sex* vol. 2 (Oxford)

Baines, J., van der Blom, H., Chen, Y. S. and Rood, T. (edd.), 2019 *Historical Consciousness and the Use of the Past in the Ancient World* (Sheffield)

Barns, J., 1950 'A New Gnomologium: With some Remarks on Gnomic Anthologies (I)' *CQ* 44 (126-37)

Bartalucci, A., 1961 'Una fonte egizia di età tolemaica nella geografia zodiacale di Manilio' *SIFC* 33: 91–100

Battistoni, F., 2006 'The Ancient Pinakes from Tauromenion: Some New Readings' *ZPE* 157, 169-80

Bernsdorff, H, forthcoming *Anacreon of Teos* (Oxford)

Berra, A., 2009 '*Obsuritas Lycophronea* : les témoignages anciens sur Lycophron' in Cusset and Prioux (edd.), 259-318

Beye, C. R., 1982 *Epic and Romance in the* Argonautica *of Apollonius* (Carbondale, IL)

Bianchetti, S., 1990 '*πλωτὰ καὶ πορευτά*': *sulle trace di una periegesi anonima* (Florence)

- 2014 'Aspetti di geografia eforea nei Giambi a Nicomede' *PP* 69, 751-80

Bing, P. and Bruss, J. S. (edd.), 2007 *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram* (Leiden)

Bitel, A., 2001 'Fiction and History in Apuleius' Milesian Prologue' in Kahane and Laird (edd.), 137-51

Blum, R., 1977 *Kallimachos und die Literaturverzeichnung bei den Griechen: Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Biobibliographie* (Frankfurt am Main)

Blumberg, K. W., 1931 *Untersuchungen zur epischen Technik des Apollonios von Rhodes* (Leipzig)

Böhme, J., 1884 *de Theophrasteis quae feruntur* Peri Semeion *excerptis* (Hamburg)

Bone, P., 2020 'Nicander's Jaundice' *CQ* 70.2: 898-901

Boshnakov, K., 2004 *Pseudo-Skymnos (Semos von Delos?)* (Stuttgart: *Palingenesia* 82)

Bouché-Leclercq, A., 1899 *L'Astrologie grecque* (Paris)

Bravo, B., 2009 *La* Chronique *d'Apollodore et le Pseudo-Skymnos : érudition antiquaire et littérature géographique dans la seconde moitié du II*[e] *Siècle Av. J.-C.* (Leuven: *Studia Hellenistica* 46)

Bruss, J. S., 2005 *Hidden Presences: Monuments,* Gravesites, and *Corpses in Greek Funerary Epigram* (Leuven: *Hellenistic Groningana* 10)

Bülow-Jacobsen, A. (ed.), 1994 *Proceedings of the 20th International Congress of Papyrologists : Copenhagen, 23-29 August, 1992* (Copenhagen)

Burstein, S. M., 1976 *Outpost of Hellenism: The Emergence of Heraclea on the Black Sea* (Berkeley; *Classical Studies* 14)

Burton, A., 1972 *Diodorus Siculus Book 1: A Commentary* (Leiden)

Byre, C. S., 1997 'Suspense in the Phaeacian Episode of Apollonius' *Argonautica*' *ICS* 22: 65-73

Cairns, F. (ed.) 2005 *Papers of the Langford Latin Seminar* vol. 12 (Cambridge)

Cameron, A., 1995 *Callimachus and his Critics* (Princeton)

- 2004 *Greek Mythography in the Roman World* (Oxford)

Campbell, M., 1983 'Apollonian and Homeric Book Division' *Mnemosyne* 36: 154-5

Carspecken, J. F., 1952 'Apollonius and Homer' *YClS* 13 (33-143)

Casson, L., 2001 *Libraries in the Ancient World* (New Haven)

Christol, A., 2003 'Καὶ ἐπὶ κνέφας ἦλθε : comment lire Homère ?' *GAIA* 7: 89-104

Ciani, M. G., 1973 '"Scritto con mistero": osservazioni sull'oscurità di Licofrone' *GIF* 4: 132-48

Cingano, E., 2005 'The Catalogue of Helen's Suitors' in Hunter (ed.), 118-52

Clare, R. J., 2002 *The Path of the Argo* (Cambridge)

Clauss, J. J., 1993 *The Best of the Argonauts* (Berkeley)

- 2006 '*Theriaca*: Nicander's Poem of the Earth' *SIFC* 4 (160-82)

Cozzoli, A. T., 2015 'Un dialogo tra poeti: Apollonio Rodio e Teocrito' *Lexis* 33 (218-40)

Cusset, C. and Prioux, E. (edd.), 2009 *Lycophron : éclats d'obscurité* (Saint-Étienne)

Cusset, C., Prioux, E. and Richer, H. (edd.) 2013 *Euphorion et les mythes : images et fragments* (Naples)

Cuypers, M. P., 1997 *Apollonius Rhodius* Argonautica *2.1-310: A Commentary* (Leiden diss.)

- 2004 'Apollonius of Rhodes' in De Jong, Nünlist and Bowie (edd.), 43-62

De Jong, I. J. F., Nünlist, R. and Bowie, A. (edd.) 2004 *Narrators, Narratees and Narratives in Ancient Greek Literature* (Leiden)

Delage, E., 1930 *La Géographie dans les* Argonautiques *d'Apollonios de Rhodes* (Bordeaux)

Dettori, E., 2000 *Filita grammatico: testimonianze e frammenti grammaticali* (Rome: *Quaderni dei Seminari Romani di Cultura Greca* 2)

Diggle, J., 2004 *Theophrastus:* Characters (Cambridge)

Durbec, Y., 2008a 'L' *Alexandra* de Lycophron, un drame en cinq actes : questions de structure' *PP* 63: 429-36

- 2008b 'Several Deaths in Apollonius Rhodius' *Argonautica*' *Myrtia* 23: 53-73
- 2009 'Ajax et le naufrage de la flotte Grecque: L'Alexandra de Lycophron, v. 365-416' *PP* 64, 128-36

Effe, B., 1974 'Der Aufbau von Nikanders *Theriaka* und *Alexipharmaka*' *RhM* 117: 53-66

- 1977 *Dichtung und Lehre: Untersuchungen zur Typologie des Antiken Lehrgedichts* (Munich: *Zetemata* 69)
- 1992 'Die Hylas-Geschichte bei Theokrit und Apollonios Rhodios. Bemerkungen zur Prioritätsfrage' *Hermes* 120: 299-309

Erskine, A., 1995 'Rome in the Greek World: The Significance of a Name' in Powell (ed.), 368-83

Fakas, C. 2001 *Der hellenistische Hesiod: Arats* Phainomena *und die Tradition der antiken Lehrepik* (Wiesbaden: *Serta Graeca* 11)

Fantuzzi, M., 1988 *Ricerche su Apollonio Rodio* (Rome)

- 'Posidippus at Court: The Contribution of the hippika of P. Mil. Vogl. VIII 309 to the Ideology of Ptolemaic Kingship' in Gutzwiller (ed.) 2005, 249-68

Fantuzzi, M. and Hunter, R. L., 2004 *Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry* (Cambridge)

Feeney, D. 1986 'Following after Hercules, in Virgil and Apollonius' *PVS* 18 (47-85)

Formisano, M. and van der Eijk, P. (edd.) *Knowledge, Text and Practice in Ancient Technical Writing* (Cambridge)

Fowler, D., 2000 *Roman Constructions: Readings in Postmodern Latin* (Oxford)

Fowler, R. L., 2013 *Early Greek Mythography* vol. 2 (Oxford)

Fränkel, H., 1968 *Noten zu den* Argonautika *des Apollonios* (Munich)

Fraser, P. M., 1972 *Ptolemaic Alexandria* vol. 1 (Oxford)

Giangrande, G., 2003 'Observations on Theophrastus' *Characters*' *Orpheus* 24: 93-113

Gibson, R. K., 1997 'Didcatic Poetry as 'Popular' Form: A Study of Imperatival Expressions in Latin Didactic Verse and Prose' in Atherton (ed.), 67-98

Gigante Lanzara, V., 1997 'Il νόστος di Odisseo e la prospezione della memoria: Lycophr. *Alex*. 648-819' *Maia* 49: 43-68

- 2009 'ἔστι μοι … μυρία παντᾷ κέλευθος' in Cusset and Prioux (edd.), 95-115

Goold, G. P., 1977 *Manilius:* Astronomica (Cambridge, MA: *LCL* 469)

Gow, A. S. F., 1951 'Nicandrea, with Reference to Liddell and Scott, ed. 9' *CQ* 1 (95-118)

Gow, A. S. F. and Scholfield, A. F., 1953 *Nicander: The Poems and Poetical Fragments* (Cambridge)

Greene, R. J., 2011 *Muse Without Measure: Callimachus and the Greek Prose Traditions* (Thesis: University of Washington)

- 2017 'Callimachus and New Ancient Histories' *Aitia* 7.1

Grenfell, B. P. and Hunt, A. S., 1904 *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*: part IV (London)

Grewing, F. F., Acosta-Hughes, B., Kirichenko, A. (edd.), 2013 *The Door Ajar: False Closure in Greek and Roman Literature and Art* (Heidelberg)

Gronewald, M., 1979 'P. Hamb. 143 = Theophrast, *Charaktere* 7 und 8' *ZPE* 35: 21-2

- 1973 'Ein Epigramm-Papyrus' *ZPE* 12, 92-8

Guilleux, N., 2009 'La Fabrique des *Hapax* et des *Proton Legomena* dans l'*Alexandra*, entre connivence et cryptage' in Cusset, Prioux (edd.), 221-36

Gutiérrez Galindo, M. A., 1989 '*Denique*, *demum*, *tandem* y *postremo*: estudio funcioestructural (con especial referencia a la obra lucreciana)' *Emerita* 57.2: 263-75

Gutzwiller, K. (ed.), 2005 *The New Posidippus: A Hellenistic Poetry Book* (Oxford)

Händel, P., 1954 *Beobachtungen zur epischen Technik des Apollonios Rhodios* (Munich: *Zetema* 7)

Harder, M. A., 1993 'Aspects of the Structure of Callimachus' *Aetia*' in Harder, Regtuit, Wakker (edd.) 1993 (99-110)

- 2012a *Callimachus:* Aetia vol. 1 (Oxford)
- 2012b *Callimachus:* Aetia vol. 2 (Oxford)
- 2013 'From Text to Text: The Impact of the Alexandrian Library on the Work of Hellenistic Poets' in König, Oikonomopoulou and Woolf (edd.), 96-108

Harder, M. A., Reguit, R. F. and Wakker, G. C. (edd.), 1993 *Callimachus* (Groningen)

- 2004 *Callimachus* II (Leuven)
- 2006 *Beyond the Canon* (Leuven)
- 2012 *Gods and Religion in Hellenistic Poetry* (Leuven)

Harris-McCoy, D., 2011 'Artemidorus' Self-Presentation in the Preface to the *Oneirocritica*' *CJ* 106.4: 423-44

Harrison, S. J., 1998 'The Milesian Tales and the Roman Novel' *Groningen Colloquia on the Novel* 9: 61-73

Hatzimichali, M., 2013 'Encyclopaedism in the Alexandrian Library' in König and Woolf (edd.), 64-83

Heath, M., 1989 *Unity in Greek Poetics* (Oxford)

Hinds, S., 1998 *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry* (Cambridge)

Hitch, S., 2012 'Hero Cult in Apollonius Rhodius' in Harder, Regtuit and Wakker (edd.), 131-62

Hollis, A., 2009 *Callimachus:* Hecale 2nd ed. (Oxford)

von Holzinger, C., 1895 *Lykophron:* Alexandra (Leipzig)

Hopkinson, N., 1988 *A Hellenistic Anthology* (Cambridge)

Hornblower, S., 2015 *Lykophron:* Alexandra (Oxford)

- 2018 *Lykophron's* Alexandra*, Rome and the Hellenistic World* (Oxford)

Hunter, R. L. (ed.) 1993 *The* Argonautica *of Apollonius: Literary Studies* (Cambridge)

- 1996 *Theocritus and the Archaeology of Greek Poetry* (Cambridge)
- 2005a *The Hesiodic* Catalogue of Women: *Constructions and Reconstructions* (Cambridge)
- 2005b 'The Hesiodic *Catalogue* and Hellenistic Poetry' in id. 2005a, 239-65
- 2008a 'Written in the Stars: Poetry and Philosophy in the *Phainomena* of Aratus' in (id.) *On Coming After* (Berlin: *Trends in Classics* 3.1), 153-88 (reprinted from *Arachnion* 2.1, 1995)
- 2008b 'The Prologue of the *Periodos to Nicomedes* ('Pseudo-Scymnus')' in (id.) *On Coming After* vol. 1 (Berlin: *Trends in Classics* vol. 3.1), 503-22 (reprinted from Harder, M. A., Regtuit, R. F., and Wakker, G. C. (edd.) 2006 *Beyond the Canon* (Groningen): 123-40)
- 2008c 'Apollo and the Argonauts: Two Notes on Ap. Rhod. 2.669-719' in (id.). 2008 *On Coming After* vol. 1 (Berlin: *Trends in Classics* Suppl. 3.1) reprinted from *MH* 43 (1986), 50-60
- 2008d 'The Poetics of Narrative in the *Argonautica*' in Papanghelis and Rengakos (edd.), 115-46
- 2015 *Apollonius of Rhodes:* Argonautica *Book IV* (Cambridge)
- 2017 'Pseudo-Scymnus' in Sider (ed.), 524-37

Hurst, A. and Kolde, A., 2008 *Lycophron:* Alexandra (Paris)

Hutchinson, G. O., 1988 *Hellenistic Poetry* (Oxford)

- 2003 'The *Aetia*: Callimachus' Poem of Knowledge' *ZPE* 145: 47-59
- 2008 *Talking Books* (Oxford)
- 2009 'Read the Instructions: Didactic Poetry and Didactic Prose' *CQ* 59: 196-211

Irigoin, J., 1952 *Histoire du texte de Pindare* (Paris)

Jackson, S., 2003 'Apollonius of Rhodes: The Etesian Winds' *WS* 116 (2003)

Jacques, J.-M., 2002 *Nicandre: Œuvres II* (Paris)

- 2007 *Nicandre: Œuvres III* (Paris)

James, A. W., 1978 'Night and Day in Epic Narrative from Homer to Quintus of Smyrna' *MPhL* 3: 153-83

Johnstone, S., 2014 'A New History of Libraries and Books in the Hellenistic Period' CA 33.2, 347-393

Kagan, D. (ed.), 1975 *Studies in the Greek Historians* (Cambridge: *YCS* 24)

Kahane, A. and Laird, L. (edd.), 2001 *A Companion to the Prologue of Apuleius' Metamorphoses* (Oxford)

Kidd, D. A., 1967 'The Pattern of *Phaenomena* 367-385' *Antichthon* 1: 11-15

- 1997 *Aratus:* Phaenomena (Cambridge)

Kerkhecker, A., 1999 *Callimachus' Book of* Iambi (Oxford)

Keulen, W. H., 2007 *Apuleius Madaurensis* Metamorphoses *Book 1: Text, Introduction and Commentary* (Groningen)

Köhnken, A., 2008 'Hellenistic Chronology: Theocritus, Callimachus and Apollonius Rhodius" in Papanghelis and Rengakos (edd.) 2008, 73-92

König, J., Oikonomopoulou, K. and Woolf, G. (edd.), 2013 *Ancient Libraries* (Cambridge)

König, J. and Woolf, G. (edd.), 2013 *Encyclopaedism from Antiquity to the Renaissance* (Cambridge)

Korenjak, M., 2003 *Die Welt-Rundreise eines anonymen griechischen Autors ("Pseudo-Skymnos")* (Hildesheim)

Krevans, N., 2004 'Callimachus and the Pedestrian Muse' in Harder, Regtuit and Wakker (edd.), 173-83

- 2005 'The Editor's Toolbox: Strategies for Selection and Presentation in the Milan Epigram Papyrus' in Gutzwiller (ed.), 81-96
- 2007 'The Arrangement of Epigrams in Collections' in Bing and Bruss (edd.) 131-46

Kuttner, A. 2005 'Cabinet Fit for a Queen: The Λιθικά as Posidippus' Gem Museum' in Gutzwiller (ed.), 141-63

Kwapisz, J., 2013 *The Greek Figure Poems* (Leuven: *Hellenistica Groningana* 19)

Kyriakou, P., 1995 *Aristotle's* Poetics*: Its Theoretical Foundations and its Reception in Hellenistic Literary Theory* (Thesis: Ohio State University)

Lachenaud, G., 2010 *Scholies à Apollonios de Rhodes* (Paris)

Legras, B., 1994, 'L'horizon géographique de la jeunesse grecque d'Égypte (IIIème siècle av. n. è.–VIème siècle de n. è.)' in Bülow-Jacobsen (ed.) 165-76

Lewis, M. J. T., 1999 'When was Biton?' *Mnemosyne* 52: 159-68

Liberman, G., 2009 Review of Hurst and Kolde 2008 (*BMCR* 2009.03.38)

Lightfoot, J. L., 2008 'Catalogue Technique in Dionysius Periegetes' *Ramus* 37: 11-31

- 2014 *Dionysius Periegetes:* Description of the Known World (Oxford)
- 2017 'Words, words, words: Onomastica and Onomastic Technique in Alexandrian Poetry' in Rico and Dan (edd.), 125–38
- 2020 *Pseudo-Manetho:* Apotelesmatica *Books Two, Three and Six* (Oxford)

Lucas, D. W., 1968 *Aristotle:* Poetics (Oxford)

Magnelli, E., 1999 *Alexandri Aetoli testimonia et fragmenta* (Florence)

- 2002 *Studi su Euforione* (Rome)

Maltby, R., 2005 'Etymologising and the Structure of Argument in Lucretius Book 1' in Cairns (ed.), 95-111

Marcotte, D., 2002 *Les Géographes grecs : introduction générale; Pseudo-Scymnos* (Paris)

Marcovich, M. 1984 *Three-Word Trimeter in Greek Tragedy* (Königstein im Taunus)

Mari, M., 2009 'Cassandra e le altre: riti di donne nell' *Alessandra* di Licofrone' in Cusset and Prioux (edd.), 405-40

Marsden, E. W., 1971 *Greek and Roman Artillery: Technical Treatises* (Oxford)

Martini, E., 1927 'Ovid und seine Bedeutung für die römische Poesie' in *ΕΠΙΤΥΜΒΙΟΝ: Heinrich Swoboda dargebracht* (Reichenburg), 165-94

Massimilla, G., 1996 *Callimaco:* Aitia *Libri Primo e Secondo* (Pisa)
Matthews, V. J., 1996 *Antimachus of Colophon: Text and Commentary* (Leiden: *Mnemosyne* supplement 155)

McNelis, C. and Sens, A., 2016 *The* Alexandra *of Lycophron: A Literary Study* (Oxford)

Meyer, D., 2008 'Apollonius as a Hellenistic Geographer' in Papanghelis and Rengakos (edd.) 267-85

Morel, W., 1928 'Iologica' *Philologus* 83: 345-89

Morenval, A. 2015 *Le Tout et l'infini dans le* De rerum natura *de Lucrèce* (Thesis: Université Grenoble-Alpes)

Mori, A., 2008 *The Politics of Apollonius Rhodius'* Argonautica (Cambridge)

Mottana, A., 2006 'Nicander on Stones and Inorganic Materials' *Rend. Fis. Acc. Lincei*. 17: 333-53

Munro, H. A. J., 1928 *T. Lucreti Cari* De Rerum Natura *Libri Sex* vol. 2 (London)

Negri, M., 2004 *Pindaro ad Alessandria* (Brescia)

Netz, R., 2009 *Ludic Proof: Greek Mathematics and the Alexandrian Aesthetic* (Cambridge)

Nicolai, W., 1964 *Hesiods* Erga*: Beobachtungen zum Aufbau* (Heidelberg)

Obbink, D., 2005 'New Old Posidippus and Old New Posidippus: From Occasion to Edition in the Epigrams' in Gutzwiller (ed.), 97-115

Obbink, D. and Rutherford, R. (edd.), 2011 *Culture in Pieces: Essays on Ancient Texts in Honour of Peter Parsons* (Oxford)

Oikonomakos, K., 2002 Νικάνδρου Ἀλεξιφάρμακα (Athens)

Olson, S. D. and Sens, A., 2000 *Archestratos of Gela: Greek Culture and Cuisine in the Fourth Century BCE* (Oxford)

Osborne, R., 2005 'Ordering Women in Hesiod's *Catalogue*' in Hunter (ed.), 5-24

Overduin, F., 2014a 'The Anti-Bucolic World of Nicander's *Theriaca*' *CQ* 64: 623-41

- 2014b *Nicander of Colophon's* Theriaca*: A Literary Commentary* (Leiden: *Mnemosyne* supplement 374)

Pajón Leyra, I., 2014 'The Order of the Seven Greatest Islands in the *Laterculi Alexandrini* (P.Berol. 13044r)' *ZPE* 192: 85-8

Papanghelis, T. D. and Rengakos, A. (edd.) 2008 *Brill's Companion to Apollonius Rhodius* 2nd ed. (Leiden)

Parsons, P. J., 1977 'Callimachus: Victoria Berenices' *ZPE* 25: 1-50

Paskiewicz, T. M., 1988 'Aitia in the Second Book of Apollonius' *Argonautica*' *ICS* 13 (57-61)

Pearson, L., 1938 'Apollonius of Rhodes and the Old Geographers' *AJPh* 59: 443-59

Pecere, O. and Stramaglia, A. (edd.) 1996 *La letturatura di consumo nel mondo greco-latino* (Cassino)

Pendergraft, M. L. B., 1996 'Euphony and Etymology: Aratus' *Phaenomena*' *SyllClass.* 6: 43-67

Pfeiffer, R. 1949 *Callimachus* vol. 1 (Oxford)

Platthy, J., 1968 *Sources on the Earliest Greek Libraries* (Amsterdam)

Potter, P., 2018 *Hippocrates* vol. ix (Cambridge, MA: *LCL* 538)

Prioux, É., 2008 *Petits musées en vers : épigramme et discours sur les collections antiques* (Paris)

Prodi, E., 2017 'Text as Paratext: Pindar, Sappho and Alexandrian Editions' *GRBS* 57: 547-82

Ranocchia, G., 2011 'Natura e fine dei *Caratteri* di Teofrasto' *Philologus* 155.1: 69-91

Rawles, R., 2006 'Homeric Beginnings in the Tattoo Elegy' *CQ* n.s. 56: 486-95

Rawson, E., 1978 'The Introduction of Logical Organisation in Roman Prose Literature' *PBSR* 46: 12-34

Rico, C., and Dan., A., (edd.) 2017 *The Library of Alexandria: A Cultural Crossroads of the Ancient World* (Jerusalem)

Roby, C., 2016 *Technical Ekphrasis in Greek and Roman Science and Literature* (Cambridge)

Rood, T., 2010 'Xenophon's Parasangs' *JHS* 130: 51-66

Sacks, K., 1990 *Diodorus Siculus and the First Century* (Princeton)

Schade, G., 1999 *Lykophrons 'Odyssee':* Alexandra *648-819* (Berlin)

Schepens, G. and Delcroix, K. 1996. "Ancient Paradoxography: Origin, Evolution, Production, and Reception" in Pecere and Stramaglia (edd.), 375-460

Scherer, B., 2006 *Mythos, Katalog und Prophezeiung: Studien zu den* Argonautika *des Apollonios Rhodios (*Stuttgart: *Palingenesia* 87)

Schironi, F., 2010 Τὸ μέγα βιβλίον: Book-ends, End-titles, and Coronides in Papyri with Hexametric Poetry (Durham, NC: *American Studies in Papyrology* 48)

Schmakeit-Bean, I. A., 2006 'Ein Beitrag zur Entschlüsselung eines Rätsels: Die Argonauten in Lykophrons *Alexandra*' in Harder, Regtuit and Wakker (edd.), 271-86

Schneider, O. 1856 *Nicandrea:* Theriaca *et* Alexipharmaca (Leipzig)

Schuchhardt, C., 1886'Kolophon, Notion und Klaros', *AM* 11: 398-434

Scobie, A., 1975 *Apuleius* Metamorphoses *(*Asinus Aureus*) I: a Commentary* (Meisenheim am Glan)

Sedley, D., 1997 'The Sequence of Argument in Lucretius 1' in Atherton (ed.), 37-55

- 1998 *Lucretius and the Transformation of Greek Wisdom* (Cambrige)

Sens, A., 2009 ‘Lycophron’s *Alexandra*, the Catalog of Ships and Homeric Geography’ in Cusset and Prioux (edd.), 19-37

- 2011 *Asclepiades of Samos: Epigrams and Fragments* (Oxford)

Shipley, G., 2011 *Pseudo-Skylax's* Periplous (Bristol)

Shipp, G. P., 1967 ‘Unusual Sound Combinations in the Greek Vocabulary’ *Antichthon* 1: 1-11

Sider, D. (ed.), 2017 *Hellenistic Poetry: A Selection* (Ann Arbor)

Sider, D. and Brunschön, C. W., 2007 *Theophrastus of Eresus:* On Weather Signs (Leiden: *Philosophia Anitqua* 104)

Sistakou, E., 2009a ‘Breaking the Name Codes in Lycophron’s Alexandra’ in Cusset and Prioux (edd.), 236-57

- 2009b ‘Fragments of an Imaginary Past: Strategies of Mythical Narration in Apollonius’ *Argonautica* and Callimachus’ *Aitia*’ *RIFC* 137: 380-401
- 2012 *The Aesthetics of Darkness: A Study of Hellenistic Romanticism in Apollonius, Lycophron and Nicander* (Leuven)

Stamatopoulou, Z., 2017 *Hesiod and Classical Greek Poetry: Reception and Transformation in the Fifth Century B.C.E* (Cambridge)

Stephens, S., 2003 *Seeing Double: Intercultural Poetics in Ptolemaic Alexandria* (Berkeley)

Thalmann, W. G., 1984 *Conventions of Form and Thought in Early Greek Epic Poetry* (Baltimore)

- 2011 *Apollonius of Rhodes and the Spaces of Hellenism* (Oxford)

Thomas, R., 2019 ‘Historical Consciousness and the ‘Aetiology’ in Greece’ in Baines et al. (edd.), 279-292

Thompson, D. (2005), ‘Posidippus, Poet of the Ptolemies’, in Gutzwiller (ed.), 269-83

Tober, D., 2017 ‘Greek Local Historiography and its Audiences’ *CQ* 67, 460-84

Too, Y. L., 2010 *The Idea of the Library in the Ancient World* (Oxford)

Trüb, H., 1952 *Kataloge in der griechischen Dichtung* (Thesis: Universität Zürich)

van der Schuur, M., 2014 ‘Conflating Funerals: The Deaths of Idmon and Tiphys in Valerius’ *Argonautica*’ in Augoustakis (ed.), 95-112

Van Noorden, H., 2015 *Playing Hesiod: The 'Myth of the Races' in Classical Antiquity* (Cambridge)

van Rossum-Steenbeek, M., 1998 *Greek Readers' Digests? Studies on a Selection of Subliterary Papyri* (Leiden: *Mnemosyne* supplement 175)

Vian, F., 1974 *Apollonios de Rhodes :* Argonautiques, *Chants I-II* (Paris)

- 1981 *Apollonios de Rhodes :* Argonautiques, *Chant IV* (Paris)

Walbank, F. W., 1972 *Polybius* (Berkeley)

- 1975 '*Symploke*: its role in Polybius' Histories' in Kagan (ed.) 197-212

West, M. L., 1966 *Hesiod:* Theogony (Oxford)

- 1978 *Hesiod:* Works and Days (Oxford)
- 2011 'Pindar as a Man of Letters' in Obbink and Rutherford (edd.), 50-68

West, S., 2009 'Herodotus in Lycophron' in Cusset and Prioux (edd.), 81-93

White, H., 1987 *Studies in the Poetry of Nicander* (Amsterdam)

Whitehead, D. and Blyth, P. H., 2004 *Athenaeus Mechanicus*: On Machines (Stuttgart)

von Wilamowitz- Möllendorf, U., 1883 'Die beiden Elektren' *Hermes* 18 (214-63)

- 1907 *Einleitung in die griechische Tragödie* (Berlin)
- 1930 'Lesefrüchte' *Hermes* 65: 241-51

Williams, M. F., 1991 *Landscape in the* Argonautica *of Apollonius Rhodius* (Frankfurt am Main)