A PASSAGE OF APOLLONIUS

In *Arg.* i. 1332 ff. most manuscripts read

> Αἰσονίδη, μή μοί τι χολώσεαι, ἀφραδίῃσιν
> εἴ τί περ ἀασάμην, πέρι γάρ μ᾽ ἄχος ἧκεν ἐνισπεῖν
> μῦθον ὑπερφίαλόν τε καὶ ἄσχετον· ἀλλ᾽ ἀνέμοισιν
> δώομεν ἀμπλακίην, ὡς καὶ πάρος εὐμενέοντες.

In a previous paper (*CQ* n.s. xvii [1967], pp. 91 ff.) I have shown that this is the correct reading, and that the variant εἷλεν is a clumsy attempt made by a copyist (or ancient critic) who did not understand Apollonius. Since my elucidation of the matter has now been questioned by Campbell (*CQ* xix [1969], pp. 274 f.), I find it necessary to return to Apollonius' line in more detail, and I shall endeavour to demonstrate *geometrico more* that (*a*) my explanation of the poet's words is right because supported by the use of Homeric *Wortgut* made by Hellenistic poets; (*b*) Campbell's contention is wrong in that it starts from a false assumption and rests on basic methodological errors.

(i) First of all, we can dispose of εἷλεν: Campbell himself concedes that εἷλεν is a *Verschlimmbesserung*, and realizes that ἧκεν must be kept in the text (he would place ἧκεν between *cruces*, whereas I have argued that ἧκεν is sound).

(ii) Now to ἧκεν. Merkel saw that πέρι . . . ἧκεν makes, in itself, perfect sense: but he objected to the form ἧκεν and replaced it by ἵκεν. The reason why Merkel objected to the form ἧκεν was that, according to his dogmatic utterance, 'ἧκεν ab Apollonii et Homeri usu abhorret'. This statement has a distinctly Buttmannian flavour: Merkel lived at a time when one tended to assume that 'later epic poets did not intentionally extend the Homeric usage' (Goodwin, *Apollonius Rhodius*, Baltimore, 1891, p. 10 n. 1), but now we know that precisely the contrary is true, not only as far as *Wortbedeutung* is concerned, but also in the field of morphology. Hellenistic poets made it their business to add their own forms to Homeric defective paradigms (both verbal and nominal).[1] To say that my explanation of Apollonius' line under discussion is 'made highly unlikely by the fact that Homer uses ἥκω only in the forms ἥκω and ἥκειν', as Campbell writes, is therefore false, even if what Campbell calls a 'fact' were such and not an arbitrary statement, which it happens to be, as I shall demonstrate under (iii).

(iii) The falsity of Campbell's statement is demonstrated even more clearly by a more specific factor. We know that Hellenistic poets made it their business to reproduce debated variants that appeared in the Homeric text: the more obscure and debated the variant, the more elegant its reproduction was felt to be.[2] Now, the fact is that other forms of ἥκω apart from ἥκω and ἥκειν are

---

[1] Examples would be, of course, legion. For the Hellenistic tendency to enrich the epic vocabulary by analogy cf. Erbse, *Hermes*, 1953, p. 166, and my paper 'Der stilistische Gebrauch der Dorismen im Epos', in *Hermes*, 1970, pp. 257 ff. As far as the verbs are concerned, a glance at Veitch, *Greek* *Verbs*, will show how Hellenistic poets added their own forms to Homeric defective paradigms. The treatment of δίζημαι offered by Schneider, *Callimachea*, i, pp. 413 f. is instructive in this respect.

[2] On this cf. my paper 'Hellenistic Poetry and Homer', in *Antiq. Class.*, 1970, pp. 46 ff.

attested in Homer, as variants. For instance, Apollonius' ἄχος ἧκεν is closely paralleled by Homer's χόλος ἧκοι (variant in *Il.* 9. 525 and 17. 399; χόλος— a feeling—is neatly matched by Apollonius' ἄχος). Precisely the form ἧκεν occurs, as a variant, in *Il.* 1. 317 and 2. 153, and indeed—we shall, of course, not forget that Hellenistic poets, including Apollonius, often imitated the Homeric Hymns as well as the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*—in Hom. *Hymn. Ap.* 442 (and in Orph. *Hymn.* 38. 11) the only reading attested is ἧκεν. Whatever modern critics may think about the use of ἧκω and ἵκω in Homer (cf. La Roche, *Hom. Textkr. im Alterthum*, pp. 287 ff.),[1] the fact is that forms of ἧκω are abundantly present as variants in Homer;[2] it follows that Apollonius' ἧκεν, in the light of the Hellenistic epic technique whereby rare or disputed[3] Homeric (and Hesiodic) variants were sedulously reproduced, reveals itself to be a typical example of such technique.

(iv) Conclusion. The use of Homeric *Wortgut* made by Hellenistic poets (including, of course, Apollonius) confirms my explanation of Apollonius' ἧκεν. Campbell and Fränkel, who claim to have 'recognized ἧκεν for what it is' —i.e. a form of ἵημι—see themselves compelled, by their wrong assumption, to deface Apollonius' text, whereas I have shown that the poet's words make perfect sense[4] (as Merkel already saw, of course) and are exactly paralleled by Aratus, *Phaen.* 473.

(v) Appendix. Whether Apollonius' πέρι . . . ἧκεν is in tmesis (as I argued) or whether the περι is to be 'probably regarded as a preposition or adverb' in Apollonius and in the parallel passages Aratus 473, Q. Sm. ii. 615, as Campbell prefers, is irrelevant to the legitimacy or otherwise of ἧκεν in Apollonius. I think the hypothesis of a tmesis is supported by the fact that Aratus was particularly fond of tmesis (Maass, in his *Index Grammaticus*, counts no less than eleven cases of περί in tmesis, to which another four of περί in tmesis inversa are to be added; περικνέομαι is attested in schol. Ar. 862; περιήκω is attested in Herodotus, as I stressed in *CQ*, art. cit., p. 92 n. 2). Whether Apollonius' πέρι . . . ἧκεν is a pointed allusion to Aratus' περὶ . . . ἵκετο, or the two expressions are parallels which came into being independently of each other is also not relevant to the soundness or otherwise of the form ἧκεν in Apollonius. What is certain is that, since περικνέομαι (or ἰκνέομαι+the 'preposition or adverb' περι) could be used as Aratus and Quintus use them, Apollonius pointedly used ἧκεν instead of ἵκετο in order to show that he regarded this form of ἧκω as legitimate

[1] To say that 'Homer uses ἧκω only in the forms ἧκω and ἧκειν' and to add that any ancient 'reader of an epic poet', finding the form ἧκεν in an epic text, would not 'think of it as anything else' than a form of ἵημι, as Campbell writes (p. 275) is totally arbitrary: certain *modern* readers of epic poetry, in their ignorance of the ancient state of affairs, have chased certain forms of ἧκω from their Homeric text (Becker, Kühner, Jelf: cf. Veitch, *Greek Verbs* s.v. ἧκω), but these modern readers must not be confused with the *ancient* readers, least of all with the *erudite* ancient readers for whom Apollonius wrote.

[2] The variants ἧκοι and ἧξεις occur, as is well known, in Hes. *Theog.* 725 and *Op.* 477.

[3] The persecution of ἧκω in Homer is not new: both Choiroboskos and Eustathius chased it from the Homeric text.

[4] Cases in which modern critics have defaced the text of a Hellenistic or late epic poet because they did not understand the technicalities of his *Sprachgebrauch* are innumerable. Instructive methodological bibliography: for Musaeus and Colluthus, cf. *Journ. Hell. Stud.*, 1969, pp. 139–54; for Oppian, cf. 'On the Halieutica of Oppian', in *Eranos*, 1970, pp. 76 ff.; for Hellenistic poets, cf. 'Interpretationen Hellenistischer Dichter', in *Hermes*, 1969, pp. 440 ff., the already quoted paper 'Hellenistic Poetry and Homer', and 'L' humour des Alexandrins' ('Classical and Byzantine Monographs', ii, Amsterdam, Hakkert, in the press).

in Epic, whereas certain grammarians ostracized it[1] and regarded only ἵκω, ἱκνέομαι as permissible[2] in the genre.[3]

University of London, Birkbeck College   GIUSEPPE GIANGRANDE

[1] Whether ἧκεν is the original reading in *Arg.* ii. 239 and in i. 74 I shall not discuss here in detail. Considering that the copyists tended to chase forms of ἧκω out of epic texts in antiquity (the absurd variant ἦλθεν in Mosch. ii. 1 is a significant case), if we apply the criterion of *utrum in alterum*, it will appear that ἧκεν was what Apollonius wrote and what sedulous copyists (or critics) proceeded to expel from his text. In the case of i. 74, as Platt noted (*Journ. Philol.* 55, pp. 1 f.) 'throughout the catalogue of the Argonauts the verbs used are verbs of motion': ancient copyists, taught—like modern critics of the Merkel–La Roche school!—to remove forms of ἧκω from epic verse, promptly replaced his ἧκεν by the respectable form ἦεν, ἦεν (with or without iota subscriptum); Apollonius' σύν ... ἧκεν, it may be added, reappears in the late epic Manetho, iv. 393. At ii. 239 Brunck and Wellauer read Κλειοπάτρη ἕδνοισιν ἐμὸν δόμον ἧκεν ἄκοιτις because this is plainly the *lectio difficilior*. Κλειοπάτρην ... ἦγον ἄκοιτιν arose because (1) the subject of ἧκεν was assimilated to the subject of the verb ἄνασσον, which verb intervenes between κασιγνήτη and Κλειοπάτρη; (2) Phineus is boasting that he was a good catch and therefore says that Κλειοπάτρη could come into his house as a wife by means of ἕδνα, i.e. her dowry; the copyists assimilated Phineus' words to the

normal type ἕδνοισιν ἄγειν (*Arg.* 1. 977, Aesch. *Prom.* 559; *Od.* 16. 391 ἐέδνοισιν διζήμενος), but Phineus implies that it was he who was sought after by means of a dowry: he was ἐπίκλυτος ὄλβῳ, he was a ruler (ἄνασσον), and his πατήρ was the King Ἀγήνωρ; (3) the persecuted verb ἧκω was thus eliminated from the text.

[2] The author of the Orphic *Argonautica*, a faithful disciple of Apollonius, has ἧκε (from ἧκω) in line 1006, ἵξε in line 1012, ἧκε (from ἵημι) in line 1017, and the variants ἵκτο, ἧκε in line 1019; ἧκε (from ἵημι) occurs in lines 533, 589 (verse numbering according to Dottin's excellent edition, the Introduction to which should be compulsory reading for anyone dealing with epic literature).

[3] Typical example of Hellenistic 'arte allusiva' misunderstood by Campbell. Precisely because of the 'frequent occurrence of ἄχος ἱκάνει, ἄχος ἵξεται in Homer' (Campbell, art. cit., p. 275) Apollonius writes pointedly ἄχος ἧκεν in order to make his point clear (i.e. in order to imply that he believed in the legitimacy of ἧκεν alongside the forms of ἵκω, ἱκάνω in Epic). Merkel's ἵκεν, instead of being 'plainly superior' to what Apollonius and I are saying, would patently destroy Apollonius' point (and mine). *Poetae grammatici* like Apollonius made their grammatical points exactly in this designedly allusive way, as every specialist knows.