

XI. Apolloniana Minora

DONALD NORMAN LEVIN

RICE UNIVERSITY

I. INTRODUCTION

Works of Apollonius Rhodius other than the *Argonautica* have shared neither that epic's renown nor its intact transmission. What survives from the shorter poems is a handful of references in grammatical, geographical, or mythological compendia with here and there a tantalizingly brief direct quotation subjoined. J. U. Powell, the latest editor to reassemble these remnants, prints some thirteen items.¹ The first three relate to a piece supposedly entitled *Canobus*,² the next nine to various κτίσεις, that is, poems celebrating the foundings of cities. Finally there is included an attack on Apollonius' colleague and contemporary, the poet-scholar Callimachus. This last item and the last of the group preceding have come down from antiquity with rather questionable credentials. It is my intention in this paper to reconsider the status of both.

II

Fragment 12 consists of twenty-one hexameters cited by Parthenius (*Erotica pathemata* 21.2) from a Λέσβου κτίσις. The story concerns a Methymnian maiden named Pisidice, who, smitten with love for Achilles, offers to open the gates of the city to his besieging army if the hero from Phthia will consent to marry her. The offer is accepted, and the promise is given. Yet once Achilles has become master of Methymna, he rewards his benefactress not with marriage but with death by stoning at the hands of his troops.

Granted that this is the sort of tale which would appeal to Alexandrian tastes and to those of Apollonius in particular

¹ *Collectanea Alexandrina* (Oxford 1925) 4-8. Prose fragments, excluded from Powell's book, are reprinted in J. Michaelis' *De Apollonii Rhodii fragmentis* (Diss., Halle, 1875) along with what is left of the shorter poems.

² See also below, note 26.

(consider anew the case of Medea, compelled by love to betray her family and country),³ granted too that it is incorporated into a *κτίσις*, a literary type which Apollonius seems to have favored, need we conclude that the author whose name Parthenius fails to furnish was none other than Apollonius Rhodius himself? C. Müller and P. Sakolowsky answer in the affirmative.⁴

What has led Powell to accept the conclusions of his predecessors is not so much the ancient acknowledgment that these hexameters formed part of a *κτίσις* as the close resemblance between the language and metre of the fragment and the language and metre of Apollonius. Powell calls attention to *φρένας ἐπτοίησεν*, a locution which occurs at the end of a verse both in the work under discussion (line 6) and in the *Argonautica* (1.1232). It should be noted, however, that as early as the *Odyssey* (22.298) there occurs a similar clausula: *φρένες ἐπτοίηθεν*.

So much for metrical correspondence. The author of the *Λέσβου κτίσις*, whoever he may have been, could have taken his erotic coloring as easily from Aeschylus, who in the *Prometheus Bound* (856 ff.) writes metaphorically of hawks chasing after doves *ἐπτοημένοι φρένας*. Or again he could have found a most apposite prototype in a lyric emanating from the very island which he chose to celebrate:

. . . τό μ' ἦ μὰν
καρδίαν ἐν στήθεσιν ἐπτόαισεν

So Sappho wrote (Frag. 31.5–6 Lobel-Page). One or more poets of a later period were influenced. Similarly one or more Roman poets were influenced by the Sapphic utterance immediately preceding (i.e. lines 2–5):

. . . ὅττις ἐνάντιός τοι
ἰσθάνει καὶ πλάσιον ἔδν φωνεί-
σας ὑπακούει
καὶ γελάσας ἰμέροεν . . .

Compare not only

qui sedens aduersus identidem te
spectat et audit
dulce ridentem . . .

³ See Books 3 and 4 of the *Argonautica*.

⁴ Respectively *FHG* 4.314 and *Mythographi Graeci* 2.1 (Leipzig 1896) xxv. 6 + T.P. 93

but also

dulce ridentem Lalagen amabo
dulce loquentem

The reference to the sweetly laughing maiden occurs in the identical words and in the identical position in the verse in both Latin imitations. We are fortunate in knowing that the one—actually more of a straight translation of Sappho's original—is the work of Catullus (51.3–5), that the other is the work of Horace (*Carm.* 1.22 ad fin.). Obviously the most recent of the three poets was in a position to build upon what the other two had contributed. I suspect that Horace's restoration of *dulce loquentem* = ἄδου φωνεῖ/σας serves not only as an allusion to the etymology of his beloved's name (Λαλαγή· ἀπὸ τοῦ λαλεῖν, as the grammarians would have explained prosaically), but also as a sort of pointed reminder that his more immediate predecessor was not as conscientious as he might have been in converting Sappho's Sapphics from Greek into Latin.

Could not something very similar have happened in the case of the *Argonautica* and the Λέσβου κτίσις? Consider first the fuller context in which Pisidice's erotically instigated agitation is depicted (lines 5–7):

. . . θαλερὴ δέ μιν ἄσσε Κύπρις.
ἡ γὰρ ἐπ' Αἰακίδῃ κούρης φρένας ἐποίησεν
Πεισιδίκης . . .

Now compare Apollonius' description (*Argonautica* 1.1232 f.) of the circumstances behind the sudden passion for young Hylas on the part of an hitherto aloof fountain nymph:

. . . τὴν δὲ φρένας ἐποίησεν⁵
Κύπρις, ἀμηχανίῃ δὲ μόλις συναγείρατο θυμόν.

⁵ Have certain editors—Mooney and Seaton among them—as well as an anonymous *fautor Apollonii*, who called into question my earlier hospitality to τῆς (the reading preserved in the better classes of MSS.), exercised good judgment in preferring the more felicitous duplicate accusative of the whole and the part, τὴν . . . φρένας, verifiable only in late codices, such as Parisinus Gr. 2727 and Escorialensis ΣIII 3? The use of the genitive is paralleled (as H. Fränkel is quick to note in the apparatus to his new edition of the *Argonautica* [Oxford 1961]) both in the Λέσβου κτίσις and in *Od.* 22.298. Comparable support, however, for τὴν would be forthcoming from the Sapphic passage cited on page 155 above, were it possible to establish beyond doubt that μ'ῆ is both an elision of the accusative (Page translates otherwise) and the correct reading (Diehl prints τό μοι μάν κτλ.).

It seems to me, at least, that the latter passage is the stronger, the more effective. Nevertheless relative merit—as those who assess the introduction of comparable motifs into the *Argonautica* and into the *Idylls* of Theocritus ought to have learned by now—is no sure guide to relative chronology.⁶

Let us turn away, however, from the realm of conscious imitation, conceding that Apollonius could even have imitated—and endeavored to improve upon—his own earlier performance, just as he is said to have subjected the *Argonautica* itself to revision during his stay at Rhodes.⁷ The practitioners of stylistic analysis claim that a writer betrays his identity quite often unawares through his choice of vocabulary and through iteration of certain words and combinations of words at the expense of others.⁸ Suggesting that the recurrence of “uocabula quae Apollonius usurpat” furnishes yet another proof of Apollonian authorship, Powell cites from Frag. 12 the following verbs, adjectives and nouns: ἀγάλλεσθαι (8), ἀλκίης (3), αὐτοκασίγνητος (4), δυσάμμιμος (20), ἐέλδεσθαι (9), ἐπαγαίεσθαι (18), θηεῖσθαι (8), οἶτος (18), ὑποσχέσθαι (14). Consultation of other authors will show, however, that only one of the words on Powell’s list, namely ἐπαγαίεσθαι (see *Argonautica* 3.470 and 1262), deserves to be

⁶ The story of Hylas, wherein the above quotation indicates a critical juncture, is duplicated (but with somewhat different emphasis) in Theocritus 13. Similarly both Theocritus 22 and the opening section of Bk. 2 of the *Argonautica* include a narrative of the boxing match between Polydeuces and the Bebrycian ruler, Amycus. Scholars dispute not only priority (hence who was trying to teach whom a lesson), but even quality. Not all are willing to concede Theocritus’ superiority to Apollonius—at least in the handling of the Hylas-myth. See, for example, M. Hadas, “Apollonius Called the Rhodian,” *CW* 26 (1932–1933) 41–46, 49–54. Contrast his observations with those of G. Knaack, (*Hermes* 18 (1883) 29–31; 23 (1888) 131–38 and 320; A. S. F. Gow (“The Thirteenth Idyll of Theocritus,” *CQ* 32 (1938) 10–17; see also the commentary to Gow’s text of Theocritus (2 ed., Cambridge 1952) 2.231–45), and others.

⁷ See the anonymous *Vitae* attached to the scholia on the poem. The scholiast cites also several passages (all from Bk. 1) as they had once appeared ἐν τῇ προεκδόσει. Concerning the relatively modern controversy over the number of editions through which the *Argonautica* passed in Apollonius’ lifetime (whether three or only two) and the significance of the alterations—which no doubt entailed more than the scholiast has indicated—see especially R. Linde, *De diuersis recensionibus Apollonii Rhodii Argonauticon* (Diss., Göttingen, 1885).

⁸ More dependable, I suspect, is the utilization of this technique to determine the relative dating of a number of works by the same author. For an author’s habits, likewise without his awareness, may undergo gradual modification. Scholars have seen no little significance for the order of composition of the Platonic corpus in such a seemingly trivial matter as predilection for τῶν ὄντων in some dialogues, an increasing tendency in others towards ὄντως.

called "peculiarly Apollonian." The rest appear one or more—even very many—times in earlier epic verse as well as in lyric and in tragedy.

Hence the catalogue of coincidences presented by Powell demonstrates not that the author of the *Λέσβου κτίσις* is identical with the author of the *Argonautica*, but that whoever wrote the former work availed himself of a vocabulary which had become, so to speak, the common coinage of poetry and particularly of poetry composed in hexameters. Would it not have been more scientific to check out each and every word of the fragment and its specific use therein against all known occurrences of each in extant poetic literature? Without attempting anything quite so ambitious I have at least ascertained that there is scarcely a word or expression in the entire twenty-one verses of Frag. 12 for which the *Iliad* or the *Odyssey* does not provide a duplicate. The verb *ὑποχλίζειν* employed at line 11 of the fragment to form the participial expression *κληῖδας ὑποχλίσσασα πυλάων* apparently occurs in no other work. The adjective *θαμνός*, on the other hand—note the combination *πανσυδῆρι θαμνησιν ἀράσσοντες λιθάδεσσιν* in the last of the hexameters quoted by Parthenius—enjoys an extensive post-Homeric vogue. The author of the *Hymn to Hermes* seems to have utilized it.⁹ Pindar introduces it into his *Epinicia* (*O*.1.53b) and *Paeans* (6.16), Aristophanes into his comedies (*Plutus* 292). Its use in Hellenistic times is attested not only for Apollonius (*Argonautica* 3.1266), but also for Callimachus both in the *Hymns* (6.64) and in Book 3 of the *Aetia* (Frag. 75.36 Pfeiffer²).¹⁰ Similarly *ἀλκήεις*, a post-Homeric word which was included in Powell's list (*θαμνός* was not), appears in the *Argonautica* (1.71), yet may be read at the same time in the *Hymn to Athena* (28.3) and in two *Epinicia* (*O*.9.77 and *P*.5.71) of Pindar.

What do I then conclude? I conclude that the state of our knowledge is insufficient to allow more than a dubious accreditation to a fragment whose several points of resemblance to what is undeniably Apollonian constitute at the same time several points of resemblance to what is Homeric or Sapphic or Pindaric

⁹ Actually *θαμνεῖναι*, cited by Choeroboscus, is more likely at line 44 of the *Hymn*, since the manuscript reading *θαμνεῖναι* will suit the metre only if the medial *ι* (short elsewhere) be taken as long. The same is true of the passage listed below from Callimachus' *Aetia*.

¹⁰ See also Nicander, *Theriaca* 239 and Frag. Alex. Lyr. Adesp. 7.14 Powell.

or—*mirabile dictu!*—even Callimachean. Consider, too, the fact that, whereas Parthenius quotes several hexameters from a *Καύνου κτίσις* and assigns them without hesitation to Ἀπολλώνιος ὁ Ῥόδιος (= Frag. 5 Powell), here he identifies the author only as an anonymous ὁ τὴν Λέσβου κτίσιν ποιήσας. If Apollonius composed both *κτίσεις*, how has it come about that Parthenius, living less than two centuries after his *floruit*, knows him to have composed only the one?

III

The other item in Powell's *Collectanea* (that is, No. 13) concerning whose Apollonian authorship I entertain doubts is not, to speak properly, a fragment at all. It is a two-line epigram transmitted among the *σκωπτικά* of the *Anthologia Palatina* (11.275):

Καλλίμαχος τὸ κάθαρμα, τὸ παίγνιον, ὁ ξυλινὸς νοῦς,
αἴτιος, ὁ γράφας "Αἴτια Καλλιμάχου."¹¹

Accepting the Croisets' proposals with regard to punctuation and interpretation,¹² H. J. Rose renders the distich into English as if it represented a pair of definitions in a dictionary:

Kallimachos: synonyms, *Rubbish, Fribble, Blockhead*. *Αἴτιος* [Rose notes parenthetically that the epigrammatist has attempted a pun on the meanings "originator" and "criminal"]: one who writes *Kallimachos' Aitia*.¹³

Many have taken this little piece to be part of the volley of insults and counter-insults committed to writing during the heat of the literary quarrel between Apollonius and Callimachus. This would be plausible if one could be certain that the occurrence of such a dispute was not a delusion of scholars fostered by a remark in Suidas' not always reliable *Lexicon* suggesting that Apollonius could be identified with Ibis, the butt of a vicious assault by Callimachus in a poem of the same name,¹⁴ as well as by

¹¹ Bentley prefers to read *Καλλίμαχος* in the pentameter as well as in the hexameter.

¹² A. and M. Croiset, *Histoire de la littérature grecque* 5 (Paris 1899) 211, note 5.

¹³ *A Handbook of Greek Literature*⁴ (London 1950) 325.

¹⁴ A similar reference (σκάπτω δ' ἐπαραῖς Ἴβιν Ἀπολλώνιον) is put into the mouth of Callimachus in an anonymous and late epigram in trimeters listing a number of works in the Callimachean canon. Whereas G. Perrotta, *SIFC* 4, n.s., (1925) 143, maintains that the author had obviously read the *Ibis*, since elsewhere in the epigram he shows himself to be well informed, E. Cahen, *Callimaque et son œuvre poétique* (Paris

misunderstanding both of external (mention, for example, in the *Vitae* of the failure of the initial reading of Apollonius' epic and of the poet's subsequent retirement to Rhodes) and of internal evidence (satirical thrusts and *obiter dicta* in extant verses of Callimachus and Theocritus—the latter apparently Callimachus' ally—parallelisms between certain Callimachean or Theocritean works and the *Argonautica*).¹⁵ Note that ancient biographers actually name Callimachus first as Apollonius' teacher, last (in *Vita B*, at any rate) as the individual with whom in death he shared a joint sepulchre. There is no explicit reference to bitterness between them, only a statement that, as a result of the unfavorable impression created by the first version of the *Argonautica*, Apollonius felt shame before his fellow citizens and suffered the jibes of fellow poets. Whether Callimachus was instrumental in bringing about this state of affairs simply cannot be determined. Nevertheless latter-day bibliography concerning the quarrel, real or imagined, between the hater of the μέγα βιβλίον (see Callimachus, Frag. 465 Pfeiffer² = 359 Schneider)¹⁶ and its arch-practitioner grows and will doubtless continue to grow.¹⁷

If not Apollonius, who then wrote the epigram attacking Callimachus? Has it come from the camp of Antiphanes, undisputed author of another anti-Callimachean σκωπτικόν (11.322 in the *Anthologia*)? What of Asclepiades and Posidippus?

1929) 69, sees no value independent of Suidas. A. Rostagni, meanwhile, though convinced that Callimachus polemicized against Apollonius in the *Hymns* and in the *Aetia* (see "Nuovo Callimaco," *RFIC* 6, n.s., (1928) 1–52 = *Scritti Minori* 2.1 (Turin 1956) 259–310; "I nuovi frammenti di commento agli «Aitia» e la polemica letteraria di Callimaco," *RFIC* 11, n.s., (1933) 189–210 = *SM* 2.1.311–31; "Postilla su poeti e Telchini," *RFIC* 12, n.s., (1934) 117–19 = *SM* 2.1.337–39; "Le nuove Διηγέσεις e l'ordinamento dei carmi di Callimaco," *ibid.* 289–312 = *SM* 2.1.340–62), insists no less firmly (*Ibis: storia di un poemetto greco* [Florence 1920]) not only that Apollonius was not the target of the Greek *Ibis*, but that that work (imitated by Ovid in an homonymous poem in elegiacs) was not even Callimachus' own, having been penned around the turn of the second century B.C. by someone strongly under his influence.

¹⁵ But see above, note 6, and below, note 25.

¹⁶ Cf. Epigr. 28.1 = *AP* 12.43.1 (ἐχθαίρω τὸ ποίημα τὸ κυκλικόν) as well as the closing lines (105–13) of *Hymn* 2 and the so-called "Prologue" to the *Aetia* (Frag. 1 Pfeiffer²), concerning which last see also below and note 18.

¹⁷ The more recent discussions are listed by H. Herter in the second of his "Berichte über die Literatur zur hellenistischen Dichtung seit dem Jahre 1921." See *JAW* 285 (1944–1955) 223 ff. Among those who would relegate a tiff between the two poets to the realm of legend are F. Spiro, "Ricerche alessandrine. II: Callimaco ed Apollonio," *RAL* 5, Ser. 2, (1893) 337–48, and G. Coppola, *Cirene e il nuovo Callimaco* (Bologna 1935) 125–30. See also F. Wehrli, "Apollonios von Rhodos und Kallimachos," *Hermes* 76 (1941) 14–21.

Both not only have written epigrams (*AP* 9.63 and 12.168 respectively) laudatory of Callimachus' least favorite poem, the *Lyde* of Antimachus—καὶ παχὺ γράμμα καὶ οὐ τορόν the Cyrenian derisively labels it (*Frag.* 398 Pfeiffer² = 74b Schneider)—but also are included apparently among the host of enemies collectively designated by Callimachus as the *Τελχῖνες*.¹⁸ Could one or the other have composed an attack on Callimachus as well as a defense of Antimachus? Or is the epigram in question simply a forgery foisted on Apollonius by persons not only aware of Callimachus' activities as a sometime literary polemicist, but also laboring under the illusion that Apollonius was the chief target and therefore the most likely to launch a brutal counter-assault?¹⁹

In any event there are some curious facts relating to the attribution—facts of which Powell has not even taken note. Attached not directly to this epigram, but suprascripted instead to the first of a pair of anonymous and—let it be added—complimentary ἐπιτύμβια for the deceased Callimachus (*AP* 7.41 and 42) are the following remarks: εἰς Καλλίμαχον τὸν ποιητὴν ὃν ἔσκαψεν²⁰ Ἀπολλώνιος ὁ Ῥόδιος ὁ γράψας τὰ Ἀργοναυτικά. εἶπε· Καλλίμαχος τὸ κάθαρμα κτλ. On the other hand, the suprscription to the σκωπτικόν itself identifies the author not as Ἀπολλώνιος ὁ Ῥόδιος, not even as Ἀπολλώνιος without surname—which might have amounted to much the same thing. Instead the distich is termed the work of Ἀπολλώνιος γραμματικός. Now it happens that the name Apollonius was particularly prevalent in the Greek-speaking world. It happens also that a number of these Apollonii were primarily grammarians. Apollonius Rhodius, however, though he seems to have served as director

¹⁸ See *POxy.* 2079, *Frag.* 1 (=Callimachus, *Frag.* 1.1 ff. Pfeiffer²) and accompanying Scholia Florentina (*PSI* 1219, *Frag.* 1.1 ff.). I find scant justification for Rostagni's claim (*opp. cit.*, above, note 14) that, since the *Τελχῖνες* of legend were associated with Rhodes, the real subject of Callimachus' verbal onslaught was Apollonius, recently exiled to that island. Even less credible is the assertion (*SM* 2.1.321 f.) that Asclepiades, Posidippus, *et al.* are listed by the scholiast only as authorities handling the same material as Callimachus, while the blame to which Callimachus replies comes from Apollonius (nowhere mentioned in the scholium—unless his name can be extracted from a lacuna bridged by the puzzling]*ωνλου*[in line 11).

¹⁹ See also below, note 24.

²⁰ The manuscript reading ἔσκαψεν (a frequent error, points out F. Jacobs in the commentary to his edition of the *Anthologia* [Leipzig 1813–17] 3.226 f.) may have resulted from confusion with an otherwise unattested compound of εἰς and κόπτειν.

of the libraries of Alexandria²¹ and though he is accredited with various philological writings,²² nevertheless gains his chief fame as a poet. One of his anonymous biographers (*B*) classifies him as *ὁ ποιητής*, Suidas, s.v., more specifically as *ἐπῶν ποιητής*, Strabo (14.2.3) and others more specifically still as *ὁ τοὺς Ἀργοναύτας ποιήσας*.²³

Hence, even without being a forgery, the verbal attack on Callimachus in *AP* 11.275 could be just what the attached suprascription says it is: the work of a certain grammarian. Whether or not this individual's name was really Apollonius need not concern us,²⁴ so long as we are not misled, like the suprascribers of the anonymous *ἐπιτύμβιον*, into believing that one who thought himself a wit for having clothed his vulgar puns in pseudo-lexicographic raiment could possibly be identified with the celebrated Alexandrian poet, every line of whose *Argonautica* manifests elegance and refinement. If our Apollonius, the emulator of Homer and the upholder of the epic tradition, wished to polemicize against Callimachus and the Callimacheans, he had far subtler weaponry at his command.²⁵

²¹ Despite the testimony of *Vita B*, of Suidas, s.v. *Ἀπολλώνιος*, and of the comparatively recently exhumed *POxy.* 1241 (published by B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt [London 1914]), scepticism concerning Apollonius' librarianship continues. See especially K. J. Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte*² 4.2 (Berlin and Leipzig 1927) 592–99, who “nur mit Ach und Krach” manages to squeeze Apollonius in for a few years (ca. 240–230 B.C.) between Callimachus (whose librarianship, please take note, is barely attested at all) and Eratosthenes. Cf. E. A. Parsons, *The Alexandrian Library* (London 1952) 116.

²² Fragments of or references to the *Περὶ Ἀρχιλόχου*, the *Περὶ Ἀντιμάχου*, and other lost treatises are collected by Michaelis (above, note 1). Whether or not Apollonius Rhodius is really to be identified with the author of the *Πρὸς Ζηνόδοτον* remains subject to debate, as does the suggestion in *Vita B* that he once taught rhetoric.

²³ Cf. *Vita A* (*ὁ τῶν Ἀργοναυτικῶν ποιητής*) and the already cited (above, page 161) suprascription to *AP* 7.41.

²⁴ I find attractive, however, Wilamowitz' theory (*Hellenistische Dichtung* [Berlin 1924] 2.97) that the epigram was composed in response to an assigned problem: *τί ἂν εἴποι Ἀπ. ἐκπίπτων ἐξ Ἀλεξανδρείας*;

²⁵ It has been suggested that the importation of a talking crow into Bk. 3 of the *Argonautica* was intended as an indirect thrust at Callimachus, in whose *Hecale* a similarly endowed bird, likewise a crow, plays an important rôle. See, for example, G. Knaack, *RE* 2 (1896) 128, s.v. “Apollonios” No. 71. Cf. Linde (above, note 7) 34–36, who contends, moreover that verses 927–48 of Bk. 3 did not form part of the first edition of the poem, but were introduced into the second as a rebuke to Callimachus, with whom the garrulous crow is equated, while laughing Mopsus here = Apollonius. Coppola (above, note 17) 68 and note 1—keep in mind his disbelief in a “polemica a due tra Callimaco ed Apollonio”—argues on the contrary that Apollonius imitated the *Hecale* by way of compliment. Without denying that the two poets

IV. CONCLUSION

Whereas the *Λέσβου κτίσις* (or, to be more exact, the extant fragment thereof) at least bears sufficient resemblance to authentic writings of Apollonius Rhodius to allow a surmise that the author of the *Argonautica* is possibly the author of this work as well, no such recommendation can be made for the epigram attacking Callimachus. I should prefer, then, to see Powell's assemblage of Apolloniana reclassified in accordance with the following tripartite scheme:

A. Genuine fragments of poems by Apollonius Rhodius

- 1-3 *Canobus*²⁶
- 4 Ἀλεξανδρείας κτίσις
- 5 Κάννου κτίσις
- 6 Κνίδου κτίσις
- 7-9 Ναυκράτews κτίσις
- 10-11 Ῥόδου κτίσις

B. Dubious

- 12 *Λέσβου κτίσις*

C. Spurious

- 13 *Anthologia Palatina* 11.275

quarreled Wilamowitz, *NGG* 1893, 743 f., suggests that both the *Hecale* and the *Argonautica* belong to the period before hostilities broke out between them.

²⁶ At a later date I shall take up the problem of whether the *Canobus* should be thought one of the *κτίσεις*. E. Maaß, *Aratea* (*Philologische Untersuchungen*, Heft 12 [Berlin 1892] 359-69, replies emphatically in the negative; yet his attempted reconstruction of the lost poem (368 f.) is denounced by Knaack (above, note 25) 132, as a bungle.