# Introduction

## Apollonius and Herodotus

In fragment 43 of Pfeiffer's edition of the *Aetia* (fr. 50 M.), Callimachus has the Muse Clio rest her hand on the shoulder of her sister as she begins to speak for the second time,[1] in answer to one of his questions. The sister is unnamed, but it is tempting to think of this as Calliope,[2] who probably spoke second of the Muses in the *Aetia*,[3] and was often characterised as the 'senior Muse' in ancient texts.[4] This vignette hints at the close relationship between epic and historiography, the investigation of which is the subject of this book.[5] This closeness has, of course, long been recognised: Herodotus himself was characterised as Ὁμηρικώτατος ('most Homeric') by [Longinus] (*de subl.* 13.3), and modern scholarship has explored at length the Homeric affinities of Herodotean historiography[6] so that the roots of historiography in epic are as clear to us as they were for Archelaus of Priene in his Apotheosis of Homer, who depicts History among those sacrificing before the divine Homer, or for the makers of the 'Salmacis inscription'

---

[1] ὡς ἐφάμην· Κλειὼ δὲ τὸ [δ]εύτερον ἤρχ[ετο μ]ύθ[ου |χεῖρ' ἐπ' ἀδελφειῆς ὦμον ἐρεισαμένη·(vv. 56–7) ('So I spoke. And Clio for the second time began her account, supporting her hand on her sister's shoulder').

[2] Clio and Calliope are also the first and last named Muses in Hesiod's catalogue of Muses in the *Theogony* (77–9), both in line-initial position in vv. 77 and 79 respectively, and are the names traditionally attached to the first and last of the books of Herodotus.

[3] She speaks early in the poem at fr. 7.22ff. Pf./9.22ff. M.

[4] E.g. in Plato's *Phaedrus* (259d3) as well as Hesiod's *Theogony* (v. 79).

[5] Although we do not know exactly when the Muses received their precise, specialised domains such as the 'Muse of History', the process was clearly already underway in the Hellenistic period, and their domains are firmly established by the imperial period: see Murray 2002, 2004, 2005, Morrison 2011.

[6] Cf. e.g. Asheri et al. 2007: 49–50, Pelling 2006 and Griffiths 2006: 135 for various narrative, structural and thematic aspects of Herodotus' 'multi-threaded' text as deriving from the Homeric poems, Marincola 2007: 13–14 on Herodotus' persona as resembling the Homeric Odysseus. Rutherford 2012 compares the use of Homer by Herodotus and Thucydides.

1

which commemorated Herodotus as the 'Prose Homer of History'.[7] The great majority, however, of work on the relationship of historiography and epic has concerned how the former adapts the latter, especially (of course) Homer.[8] Less attention has been paid to investigating systematically the degree to which Greek epic after Homer responds to and makes use of the historiography which itself developed and modified various aspects of Homeric epic. There are, however, good reasons for thinking that historiography as a mode of discourse (its tropes, structures, means of characterising individuals, fields of interest), as well as the particular descriptions of places and peoples contained within particular texts, were exploited by Apollonius and other poets. Both epic and history are forms of long, complex narrative, often dealing with the same or similar locations, albeit from different perspectives and with different aims.[9] Moreover, the two genres as found in Greek literature were able also to show some important overlap in subject matter and content, since there existed from the Archaic period onwards several examples of epics with a distinct historical dimension, such as the *Corinthiaca* of Eumelus,[10] which connected historical peoples and places with mythic or historical forebears.[11]

With reference to the *Argonautica* in particular there have been important contributions outlining the use of individual episodes from historiography,[12] including Herodotus (where the major commentators are particularly rich in significant parallels),[13] as well as the investigation of

---

[7]  The inscription (*SGO* 01/12/02) was found on the harbour of modern Bodrum (Halicarnassus), dates from the second or early first century BC (see Isager 2004: 12–13) and celebrates the achievements of Halicarnassus; Herodotus is the first named author (col. 2, lines 43–4) in a list of the city's native poets and writers. On the inscription and the wider association in the Hellenistic period between Herodotus and Homer see Priestley 2014: 188–90.

[8]  The Apotheosis of Homer and Salmacis inscription are again instructive here.

[9]  For the use of prose texts of various kinds (including history, e.g. that of Xenomedes about his home island of Ceos) in Callimachus' *Aetia* see Hutchinson 2003: 58–9, Krevans 2004, Harder 2012: 51, 632–58. Here again the character and purpose of long elegiac poems, different from other kinds of discourse, is no barrier to their employment by an elegiac poet.

[10] On which see West 2002.

[11] A related phenomenon was the long genealogical or local elegiac poem in the Archaic period, such as Mimnermus' *Smyrneis* and Panyassis' *Ionica* (see further Bowie 1986, 2001, Dougherty 1994). Similar poems were popular in the Hellenistic period, e.g. the local epics of Rhianus, such as the *Messeniaca*, perhaps in part as a response to historiographical interest in local peoples and places. See pp. 37–41 on the differences between Hellenistic local epics and the *Argonautica*.

[12] For example, the use at A.R. 1.580–93 (the first part of the *Argo*'s voyage) of Hdt. 7.183–93 (the final stages of the journey of Xerxes' fleet towards Artemisium), noted by Delage 1930: 79, has been ably explored by Clauss 1993: 99–101 and Priestley 2014: 152–5 (see further pp. 174–7 below). Elsewhere, Apollonius makes important use of Xenophon's *Anabasis*, as examined by (e.g.) Beye 1982: 75–6, Fantuzzi & Hunter 2004: 129–32 and Clauss 2012 (see further n. 46 below).

[13] Esp. Fränkel 1968, Livrea 1973, Vian 1974, 1980, 1981, Hunter 1989, 2015. I have documented relevant instances in the footnotes.

some of the ways in which Apollonius adopts elements reminiscent of the genre of historiography more broadly.[14] Such work demonstrates both the *prima facie* likelihood of a significant connection between epic and historiography in the case of the *Argonautica*, and the importance of giving this topic a sustained and systematic treatment. I suggest that Apollonius exploits the differences which exist between the modes of epic and history as a key part of the construction of his own epic in order to subvert various aspects of its epic character, including the way the past can connect to the present and the means by which the epic narrative is authorised. My approach remains one to the *Argonautica* is as a poem and should not be mistaken for an analysis of the poem as if it were history, or a hybrid of history and epic,[15] though the relationship between epic and history is fundamental to the book. (It is, I argue, complex, much more so than a simple conception of them as different in function and purpose will allow).[16] Rather, I argue, the *Argonautica* uses various features of the discourse and narrative patterns of the genre of historiography, but remains an epic poem.

The focus of this book is principally the ways in which the *Argonautica* employs the characteristics and features of historiography as a mode of discourse: how the historian constructs his narrative, encompassing the structure of the narrative, the presentation of characters (including their motivation, psychology and ethnicity), the ways in which the historian's narrative is authorised and authenticated, the nature of the historian's explanations of events and their causes and origins. I examine Apollonius' use and adaptation of such features of historiographical discourse in order

---

[14] Particularly important forerunners in the study of the presence of elements of historiographical discourse in Apollonius include Fränkel 1968 and Dufner 1988. See further pp. 10–12 below.

[15] Hellenistic poets have often been characterised as approaching earlier literary types or genres through a 'crossing of genres' (*Kreuzung der Gattungen*, see Kroll 1924: 202–24). But this notion is insufficient to describe the complexity of the relationship of Hellenistic poetry to earlier literature, since it assumes 'pure' pre-Hellenistic genres which are then 'crossed' in the Hellenistic period to produce new 'hybrids' (the biological conception underlying this should be clear), which underplays the degree to which earlier examples of different genres were already using elements from different genres (Simonides' *Plataea* elegy is a good example). See further Fantuzzi 1993, Barchiesi 2001, Farrell 2003: 392–3, Morrison 2007: 18–20.

[16] Ian McEwan's 1997 novel *Enduring Love* makes extensive use of scientific texts, by imitating key aspects of scientific discourse (a main character appears to suffer from an erotomaniacal condition called de Clérambault's syndrome; the novel's narrator is a scientific journalist; appendix 1 is a case history apparently reprinted from the 'British Review of Psychiatry' and purporting to form the raw material from which the novel was shaped, but in fact written by McEwan himself). But the novel's generic identity remains clear, though it employs many of the tropes, subject matter and other markers of medico-scientific discourse. On the novel as representing the 'conflicts between scientific, literary, and religious worldviews' see Greenberg 2007.

to demonstrate how their employment affects readers of the epic in different ways, including controlling, manipulating and frustrating the readers' generic expectations of an epic and what it should properly contain, destabilising the authority of the epic narrator as a reliable means for accessing the mythological events depicted in the epic, and complicating the use of mythological characters from the Argonautic past as analogues or exemplars for contemporary Hellenistic rulers. One of the ways in which the last is achieved is through key intertexts with Herodotus, whose presentation of kings and tyrants is repeatedly engaged with in the *Argonautica* in such a way as to present kingship within the epic as complex and problematic.

Accordingly my approach can be characterised as both a reader-response and intertextual analysis and forms part, therefore, of the recent and ongoing investigation into the complex literary texture of Hellenistic poetry.[17] This book examines the relationship between one particular epic, the *Argonautica* of Apollonius Rhodius, and the discourse of historiography with a particular focus on the *Histories* of Herodotus. It is not, then, a treatment of the reception of Herodotus in the Hellenistic period (for which we now have Jessica Priestley's important monograph) nor a comprehensive account of Herodotus' place in the development of historiography (though I offer a sketch of Herodotus' legacy in this regard in the Herodotean Thought-World section, Chapter 1). But, one might object, why should *Herodotus* be the focus of such a discourse-based analysis, rather than historiography more generally, or a different historical text (Xenophon's *Anabasis*, for example)? Why Herodotus?

The reasons for selecting Herodotus as the main target of my investigation into Apollonius' use of historiography are many. Herodotus has a defining role in establishing as central some key features of historiographical discourse (most obviously a concern with sources, but also a strong interest in ethnographical descriptions of different peoples); these are such that Herodotus, I argue below,[18] is effectively for Apollonius the principal representative of the genre of historiography as well as the model for particular specific interactions. Herodotus is also central to the development of Hellenistic historiography. By the time Apollonius writes the *Argonautica* in the third century BC, historiography has become a well-established and flourishing genre within which Herodotus is a key

---

[17] Cf. e.g. Bing 1988, Haslam 1993, Hunter 1993, Knight 1995, Hunter 1996, Acosta-Hughes 2002, 2010, Fantuzzi & Hunter 2004, Morrison 2007. In general on the *Argonautica*'s intertexts see Zanker 1987: 195–209, 1998: 229–31, Clauss 1993: 5–10, Cuypers 2004, Köhnken 2010: 138. See further the section Intertexts and Readers below.

[18] See pp. 53–60.

figure, widely read, commented on and responded to in the Hellenistic period.[19] Oswyn Murray has demonstrated the great degree to which Hellenistic historians were working within patterns established by Herodotus:[20] in Murray's view, Herodotus is the fountainhead for 'the whole tradition of Hellenistic historical ethnography' and the lens through which Hellenistic historians view the world, even where they are attacking his views.[21] This picture has been largely confirmed by Jessica Priestley's recent monograph on the Hellenistic reception of Herodotus,[22] which demonstrates how various aspects of the *Histories* had profound and continuing importance for different kinds of Hellenistic literature (including, but not confined to, historiography), such as Herodotus' geographical knowledge and opinions, his interest in wonders and his portrayal of the Persian Wars.[23] Important too in the choice of Herodotus as the focus of my investigation into Apollonius' use of historiography is the clear presence in some key parts of the *Argonautica* (notably passages in crucial parts of the narrative of the epic) of particularly intense intertextual engagement with the *Histories*:[24] this engagement is widespread and extensive, further underlining the importance of Herodotus as a key reference-point for the *Argonautica*.

It should be emphasised that arguing that Herodotus is a key intertextual reference-point for Apollonius does not entail that I view Herodotus as the most important intertext of the *Argonautica*: that position is clearly occupied by the Homeric epics. The *Argonautica* is 'saturated'[25] with references to and developments of Homeric language,[26] episodes,

---

[19] Murray 1972: 202–4, Priestley 2014: *passim* and 223–9, and see pp. 29–34 below.

[20] Murray 1972.

[21] Murray 1972: 204, 205 and see pp. 30–2 below. The Alexander-historians form a particularly clear example of the importance of Herodotus for later historiography: see in general Pearson 1960 and Vasunia 2001: 258. See also Whitmarsh 2010: 400–2 for Herodotean characteristics such as 'digressiveness' and 'thrilling, episodic narrative' in later historians such as Ephorus, Theopompus and Ctesias.

[22] See Priestley 2014: 1–5 for a survey (building on Murray 1972) of Herodotus' importance for (e.g.) Nearchus, Hecataeus of Abdera, Manetho. The wider recognition in recent scholarship of taking Herodotus' reception in the Hellenistic period is shown by the place of Herodotus in Hornblower's recent commentary on Lycophron (Hornblower 2015). See also Engels 2008: 144–6 for Herodotus' importance for later historiography and in general on the reception of Herodotus Priestley & Zali (eds.) 2016.

[23] See Priestley 2014: 109–56 (geography), 51–108 (wonders), 157–86 (Persian Wars).

[24] See pp. 7–9 and 125–43 below. On the overall distribution of interaction with Herodotus in Apollonius see pp. 210–13 below.

[25] Hunter 2015: 17.

[26] E.g. on Apollonius' reminiscences (alongside careful variation) of Homeric formulaic diction through the creation of a 'para-formularity' see Fantuzzi 2001, Fantuzzi & Hunter 2004: 266–82.

characters and structures.[27] Nevertheless, Herodotus plays a key role
(I shall argue) in helping Apollonius to qualify the relationship of his epic
to the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*: it is, after all, no Homeric pastiche, but a modern,
slimmed-down four books (to stand against the forty-eight of Homer),
which begins by announcing it will relate 'the glorious deeds (κλέα) of men
of long ago' (A.R. 1.1) but carefully sidelines the description of heroic
battles which the echo of the Iliadic κλέα ἀνδρῶν (*Il.* 9.189) might have
led some readers to expect.[28] Accordingly, the presence of Herodotus in
the midst of the development of Homeric characters and scenes allows us
as critics to use Herodotus as a means of locating more precisely the
modification and qualification of Homer in the *Argonautica* and its effect
on its readers, while the adaptation of Homer allows us in turn to
triangulate the use of Herodotus by Apollonius and the difference it makes
to readers.[29] Nevertheless, it is important to make clear that the inter-
textual density[30] of the *Argonautica* is such that inevitably any study
concentrating on one or two intertextual relationships is bound to sideline
other important relationships of this nature.[31] I have little to say in this
book, for instance, about Apollonius' use of tragedy or archaic and early
Classical lyric, though both are of great importance at different points in
the epic. However, it is the *Argonautica*'s very complexity which means
that studies focusing on particular relationships can bring important
aspects of the epic to light, and make possible (in part, at least) a reassess-
ment of the poem's interaction with its other intertexts. In this book
I restrict myself in this regard largely to highlighting where Herodotus is
being used to articulate a difference from Homer;[32] this does not imply
that I do not think other intertextual relationships are important.

[27] The *Argonautica* is particularly closely related to the *Odyssey*: on the pervasive use of the *Odyssey* by
the *Argonautica* see especially Dufner 1988 (including a useful summary at 125–7); see also Knight
1995: 152–66, Hunter 2015: 14–21.

[28] See Fränkel 1968: 511–12 on the tendency to avoid expected battles in Apollonius. On the
beginning of the *Argonautica* see pp. 45–51 below.

[29] Cf. Dufner 1988: 80–3 on the modification enabled by features of other texts or genres of
Apollonius' reception of the *Odyssey*. Cf. also Fränkel 1968: 524, Beye 1982: 151–5.

[30] See further on this characteristic of Hellenistic poetry in general and the *Argonautica* in particular
pp. 17–22 below.

[31] A useful parallel is provided by the observations of Hexter 2006 on the privileging in reception
studies of work on the reception history of individual authors or texts (as opposed to more in-depth
accounts of particular moments of reception) and the consequences of such a focus, along with the
thoughtful response in Priestley 2014: 11–2.

[32] Given the pervasiveness of the *Argonautica*'s engagement with Homer, however, focusing on those
passages or elements in which historiography is a significant element in the transformation of earlier
epic will also inevitably leave out some aspects of the relationship between Homer and Apollonius

Herodotus, of course, himself develops (and modifies) the Homeric epics in his own work; such modification explains in part why he plays a crucial role in the modification of Homeric epic which we find in Apollonius. Herodotus' own self-definition in terms of *kleos* is important at the beginning of the *Argonautica*,[33] but the use in this way of Herodotus by Apollonius is widespread. Scenes which develop principally Homeric episodes or characters also often contain crucial interaction with Herodotus. A brief example will suffice here. Towards the end of book 4 of the *Argonautica*, when the Argonauts have passed through many dangers, they reach the island of Drepane, where the Phaeacians live. They welcome the Argonauts warmly (A.R. 4.994–1000), but soon a group of pursuing Colchians arrives determined to repatriate Medea. It is only King Alcinous who prevents violence on their part (A.R. 4.1008–10).[34] The wider Argonautic Phaeacian episode carefully develops and varies the Phaeacian books of the *Odyssey*.[35] Medea desperately pleas for help from Arete (in a scene which replays Odysseus' appeals to Arete's (future)[36] daughter, Nausicaa, in *Od.* 6 and to Arete herself in *Od.* 7), as well as from the Argonauts. The bedroom scene in which we hear Alcinous and Arete in conversation about Medea fills in the gap left at the very end of *Od.* 7 where we are told of Alcinous and Arete sharing their marital bed (*Od.* 7.346–7).[37] Their discussion, however, also importantly develops the bedroom scene of Darius and Atossa in book 3 of Herodotus.[38] The Homeric Alcinous also recalls a Herodotean Persian king.

Atossa has undertaken to return the favour which the Greek doctor Democedes, who is keen to return home, has done her by curing a worrying-sounding 'growth' (Hdt. 3.133) on her breast, and she addresses her husband on his behalf. The situations in the corresponding Herodotean and Apollonian scenes are similar, husband with wife 'in bed' (ἐν τῇ κοίτῃ, Hdt. 3.134.1; ἐνὶ λεχέεσσι, A.R. 4.1071), and the structure of both episodes is also closely similar, beginning with an appeal by the wife, followed by a response from the husband and then a response by the wife. In Herodotus this takes the form of a further speech by Atossa

---

where historiographical discourse does not play this role. But that wider relationship (though crucial) falls outside the scope of this book.

[33] See pp. 42–6 below.      [34] See also on this episode pp. 203–7 below.

[35] Dufner 1988: 109–27.

[36] That is, future from the perspective of the dramatic setting of the *Argonautica*, before the *Odyssey* (Fränkel 1968: 556, Vian 1981: 184, Dufner 1988: 109).

[37] So Hunter 1993: 71–2.

[38] See Hutchinson 1988: 133 n. 85, Hunter 1993: 71, Priestley 2014: 174–5.

(Hdt. 3.134.5); in Apollonius Arete rises from her bed to summon her herald to tell Jason to have sex with Medea, in order that she not be separated from her 'husband' (A.R. 4.1111ff.). Both scenes also end with immediate action: in Herodotus, Darius ταῦτα εἶπε καὶ ἅμα ἔπος τε καὶ ἔργον ἐποίεε ('so he spoke and at once he did word and deed', Hdt. 3.134.6), while Arete αὐτίκα δ' ὦρτο | ἐκ λεχέων ἀνὰ δῶμα· συνήιξαν δὲ γυναῖκες | ἀμφίπολοι, δέσποιναν ἑὴν μέτα ποιπνύουσαι ('at once arose from her bed and went through the house, and her serving-women hastened together, bustling after their mistress', A.R. 4.1111–13). Arete outdoes Darius here, however – his 'immediate' carrying out of his plan in fact waits until morning (ἐπείτε γὰρ τάχιστα ἡμέρη ἐπέλαμψε, 'So as soon as day had dawned', Hdt. 3.135.1), whereas Arete leaps into action straightaway.

More importantly, however, while Alcinous himself echoes the role Darius plays in the Herodotus scene, he describes Aietes in a manner which makes him sound very much like the Persian Great King:[39] οὐδὲ μὲν Αἰήτην ἀθεριζέμεν, ὡς ἀγορεύεις, | λώιον· οὐ γάρ τις βασιλεύτερος Αἰήταο, | καί κ' ἐθέλων, ἔκαθέν περ, ἐφ' Ἑλλάδι νεῖκος ἄγοιτο ('nor would it be better, as you suggest, to make light of Aietes. No one is more kingly than Aietes, and if he wanted, though he is far away, he could bring war against Greece', A.R. 4.1101–3). Aietes is not only someone not to be crossed; he is 'most kingly', strongly recalling the Achaemenid Persian kingly self-presentation as 'King of Kings' (e.g. on the Behistun inscription) as well as the common Greek description of the Persian king as ὁ μέγας βασιλεύς ('the Great King', cf. e.g. Isoc. 8.47, 9.64, Ar. *Ach.* 113). And Aietes is even more reminiscent of the kings of Persia: he is able to bring war to Greece itself from afar, in the manner of Darius or Xerxes (as Alexander of Macedon makes clear of the latter at Hdt. 8.140β.2). The engagement with Herodotus here takes place at a key stage of the narrative of the *Argonautica*:[40] Alcinous' decision ensures the marriage of Jason and Medea and their return to Greece (and hence the later events of their relationship as depicted, most famously, in Euripides' *Medea*), and the scene is appropriately heavy with foreshadowing of these later events, particularly through the mention of the potential offspring of Jason and

---

[39] As noted by Mori 2008a: 174; cf. Priestley 2014: 174–5.
[40] Cf. e.g. the echoes in the speech of Argos when the Argonauts are at a loss as to how to escape the pursuing Colchians (A.R. 4.259–93) of Croesus' fateful crossing of the Halys river (Hdt. 1.75) which marked the border between the Lydian and Persian empires (Hdt. 4.72.2) and of the map Aristagoras uses to try to convince the Spartans (unsuccessfully, Hdt. 5.49) and then the Athenians (successfully, Hdt. 5.97) to support the Ionian revolt. See further pp. 125–9 below.

Medea (οὐδέ γενέθλην, | εἴ τιν' ὑπὸ σπλάγχνοισι φέρει, δήιοισιν ὀπάσσω, 'nor will I, if she is carrying offspring in her womb, hand it over to enemies', A.R. 4.1108–9) and the separation of Medea from her husband (λέκτρον δὲ σὺν ἀνέρι πορσαίνουσαν, | οὔ μιν ἑοῦ πόσιος νοσφίσσομαι, 'if she shares her husband's bed I will not separate her from her spouse', A.R. 4.1107–8).[41] The scene in Herodotus is also a crucial moment in that narrative: the conversation of Darius and Atossa is what first brings Greece to Darius' attention, so that this is one 'beginning' of the conflict between Greeks and Persians. This notion of 'beginning' the conflict between Greeks and non-Greeks further connects the two scenes, because of course from the perspective of the sources cited in Herodotus' proem, we can see Alcinous' decision and Arete's subsequent action not only as the beginning of the *Medea* part of the Jason and Medea story, but also as itself the beginning of the kind of conflict which Alcinous anticipates Aietes might bring against the Greeks, because in the Herodotean proem the abduction (and non-return) of Medea features as a key link in the chain of events leading to the wars between the Greeks and the Persians (Hdt. 1.2.2–3).[42]

The Herodotean intertext modifies and complicates the use of Homeric characters in the Argonautic Phaeacian episode. Jason and Medea's visit to Alcinous and Arete is not simply a glimpse into the Odyssean backstory, nor an unproblematic portrayal of an idealised ruling couple.[43] Rather the just and engaging Alcinous is given Persian associations, which point to different explanations in Herodotus of the conflict between Greeks and non-Greeks, and remind readers of the role Alcinous himself implicitly plays in the Persian account at the beginning of Herodotus (and in generating the later tragic events of Euripides' *Medea*). This in turn destabilises his otherwise idealised portrait in the epic (with important consequences for the interpretation of the poem against its historical and political background). Examining the use of Herodotus here allows us to see more clearly the full import of the development of a Homeric episode and Homeric characters and its full effect on readers. It forms a further demonstration of the complexity of the literary texture of the *Argonautica* and the way in which historiographical intertexts need to be taken into account when examining the poem.

---

[41] See in general on the foreshadowing of the events of the *Medea* in the *Argonautica* Hunter 1989: 18–19, Clauss 1993: 9, Hunter 1993: 123–4.

[42] See further on this aspect Chapter 2, pp. 47–50 and Chapter 6, pp. 206–7. On the importance of the Persian account in the Herodotean proem for Apollonius, see Dufner 1988: 236–40.

[43] Cf. Hunter 1993: 161–2, Mori 2001, 2008a: 93.

A further key reason for choosing Herodotus, which itself may in part explain the importance of the intertextual relationship, is the striking similarity between the perspectives of the *Argonautica* and the *Histories*.[44] Both are Panhellenic in focus, rather than being confined to the mythology and history of a particular area (in the manner of a *ktisis*-poem or a local history, for example).[45] Both texts narrate enterprises conducted by Greeks from different parts of the Greek world coming into contact with various groups of non-Greeks and both texts range widely over the ancient world,[46] rather than being confined to one particular locale. Important too is the possibility Jessica Priestley raises, on the basis of the tradition preserved in the *Suda* associating Herodotus with the Macedonian court at Pella,[47] that the Ptolemies may have been particularly interested in possible links between Herodotus and a Macedonian royal family from which they could be portrayed as descending.[48] Priestley suggests the alleged patronage of Herodotus by the Macedonian court of the fifth century may have provided a model for Posidippus and the Ptolemies and may explain the prominence in Posidippus of stories from Herodotus.[49] If the Ptolemies were indeed interested in Herodotus in this manner then the use of Herodotus by Apollonius becomes particularly pointed, since I argue that Herodotus is employed to complicate the use of the mythological characters of the *Argonautica* as potential analogues or exemplars for Hellenistic rulers.[50]

It is worth making explicit this book's broad scholarly context: important work on the *Argonautica* has investigated how elements reminiscent of other genres or modes of discourse can play a crucial role in the poem,[51]

---

[44] On the Herodotean associations mobilised by Jason's presentation of the Argonautic expedition as a Panhellenic one at A.R. 4.190–205 see Dufner 1988: 234–40. See further pp. 49–50 below.

[45] See further on the Panhellenic dimensions of both Apollonius and Herodotus pp. 34–41 below.

[46] This aspect might also explain the important intertextual engagement with Xenophon's *Anabasis* which we can also discern in the *Argonautica*: see further n. 12 and pp. 188–9 below.

[47] *Suda* H 536 (s.v. Ἡρόδοτος), E 739 (s.v. Ἑλλάνικος) Adler. See Priestley 2014: 34–9. This tradition will have developed substantially after the death of Herodotus (Priestley 2014: 34).

[48] On the alleged relation of the Ptolemies to the royal house of Macedon, including Alexander the Great, see Tarn 1933: 57–61, Erskine 1995: 41.

[49] Cf. Posisipp. A–B 37 ~ Hdt. 1.24 (Arion), A–B 9 ~ Hdt. 3.39–43, 121 (Polycrates' ring, Anacreon). See also Chapter 3, pp. 104–5 below.

[50] See esp. Chapter 3, pp. 105–11, Chapter 6, pp. 198–208 below.

[51] Particularly important in this regard are the approaches of Beye 1982 and Dufner 1988 to 'alien' genres being employed in key parts of the epic. See Beye 1982: 153–5 on the presence of New Comedy in episodes such as the visits to Circe and the Phaeacians in A.R. 4. Dufner 1988: 232–44 argues for the importation of a broader range of genres, including Herodotean historiography, in these episodes, where she sees the use of Herodotus as part of the development of a rationalising perspective which is sharply juxtaposed in the *Argonautica* with other elements reminiscent of the fantastical and supernatural. Both Beye and Dufner are building on the insights of scholars such as