

they are elaborated throughout the rest of the play' (p. 52). But the evidence is quite inadequate to support such a reconstruction. Apart from responsibility for the war, we know nothing at all of what Kratinos said about Perikles in that play.

My conclusion is that, regrettably, I have learned nothing about Old Comedy from this book.

University of Glasgow

DOUGLAS M. MacDOWELL

APOLLONIAN ANGER

P. DRÄGER: *Die Argonautika des Apollonios Rhodios. Das zweite Zorn-Epos der griechischen Literatur*. Pp. viii + 174. Munich and Leipzig: K. G. Saur, 2001. Cased, €80. ISBN: 3-598-77707-8.

Many of the Apollonian studies of the last two decades have presented us with the certainty that the Argonautic protagonists were quite different 'heroes' from those of Homer, and that an important manifestation of this difference was the rejection of 'Achillean' anger as a behavioural pattern by most of the Argonautic characters (see lastly R. Hunter, 'Le 'Argonautiche' di Apollonio Rodio e la tradizione epica', in R. Hunter and M. Fantuzzi, *Muse e modelli, la poesia ellenistica da Alessandro Magno ad Augusto* [Rome and Bari, 2002], 137–52). We have therefore to welcome Dräger's provocative effort to show that the whole *Argonautica* is structured (i) around the anger of Zeus as prime mover of the Argonautic enterprise, an anger primarily caused by the attempted sacrifice of Phrixus at Zeus' altar, which had to be expiated with the return of the golden fleece to Greece, as is first stated at ll. 2.1194–5 and 3.336–9; later aroused again by the sacrilegious *maschalismos* of Apsyrtos, which had to be expiated with the purification by Kirke and the Lybian wanderings, cf. 4.557–61; and (ii) around the cooperative actions of Apollo, who utters the oracle to Pelias, which is quoted at the beginning of the poem as the cause of the expedition. This 'double perspective' is, according to D., a unitarian design underlying the *Argonautica*, though as a *poeta doctus* Apollonius would keep the motive of Zeus' anger hidden to the readers till the middle of the poem (after all, the anger of Poseidon, the most crucial mover of Odysseus's wanderings, had also been revealed in the *Odyssey* just before the middle of the poem, at 11.102–3 and 121–31: cf. pp. 126–34). Indeed, this double perspective is hardly attested in the other versions of the Argonautic myth (pp. 7–58), and hence would be a conscious imitation/emulation by Apollonius of the same double perspective operating in the *Iliad* (pp. 59–61): it accounts for a number of events of the enterprise which are generated by somebody's anger or indignation for transgressions of laws or customs (pp. 62–79); it also explains (on pp. 85–119) the prominence in the poem of descendants from Zeus (Pelus, Telamon, Polydeukes and Kastor, Herakles), or of characters connected with Apollo (Orpheus, Idmon, Mopsus, Phineus), no less than the consequent overshadowing of some heroes who are not connected with Zeus (Meleager, Theseus, Idas).

No previous essay has pursued the unity of the narrative design of the *Argonautica* with a subtlety and a logical coherence comparable to D.'s, and as an answer to the task of finding a 'Leitidee' (p. 5), this book is a success, though not all the modern scholars involved in the 'Rehabilitierung der hellenistischen Dichtung' will (still) believe that to spot the 'unity' of the *Argonautica* is a vital aim of this task. It is also a successful continuation of the interest about the rôle of divine agency inside the *Argonautica* and

in the adaptation/innovation of the versions of the myth by Apollonius, which already featured in D.'s previous book, *Argo pasimelousa* (1993). More broadly this book turns out to be a useful exploration of the intertextual connections between Apollonius and Homer. Though the methodological references which D. quotes on the issue are hardly satisfactory (Reiff's dissertation of 1959, and an entry in *Der Neue Pauly*: pp. 2–3; no mention of the extensive recent works on allusion in ancient poetry, e.g. by G. B. Conte), a sound empiricism allows D. to offer, *inter alia*, an innovative analysis of Kirke's episode in the *Odyssey* and its embedded *nekyia* as the intertext of the Argonauts' visit to the Kirkaion at 3.200–9, with its hanging Colchian 'cemetery' (pp. 80–4).

At least some readers will be led to doubt D.'s optimism about the 'unitarian' design he has highlighted—even the readers who do not overrate the difference between the ancient and the modern idea of poetic 'unity'. The traditional (pre-Apollonian) motif of Hera's anger against Pelias, for instance, does not fit D.'s double perspective of Zeus and Apollo, though it is the first divine anger prospected by the author (1.13–14), stands out as the crucial agent of the love of Medeia for Jason in the most emphatic Olympic scene at the beginning of the third book, and is recollected at 3.1134–6 and 4.241–3. Can we agree with D., who implies that Hera's anger may be somehow 'reduced' to Zeus' anger since she is quite often called 'Zeus' wife'? (p. 119; D. failed to acknowledge the underlying fact that this designation is an innovative reversal of the Homeric formula for Zeus, *posis Heres*.) Would it not be easier to believe that inside the *Argonautica* a polyphony of human and divine motivations operated that cannot (or does not want to) be reduced to unity? As for Apollo, D. quite often calls him 'mouthpiece of Zeus', and considers his rôle almost only in the light of the double perspective described above; but the reader will hardly forget that Apollo may also have a different, autonomous and most important rôle inside the *Argonautica*, as a 'mirror' of the author, since to this idea, which also surfaces at least once in D.'s work (p. 141: 'Dieser Apollon[ios] hat alles bis ins kleinste vorausbedacht'), a whole brilliant book has been devoted (R. V. Albis, *Poet and Audience in the Argonautica of Apollonius* [Lanham, 1996]), which I would have liked to have seen considered by D. And when D. suggests that Apollonius keeps Zeus' rôle secret because of a literary device, since he wishes to inform the reader of his double perspective only late, like modern authors of detective stories do (p. 128), would it not alternatively be possible to share Feeney's idea that this prolonged silence rather (or, at least, also) reflects the traditional belief in the uncertainty of any knowledge of Zeus' mind? (The absence of D. C. Feeney's *The Gods in Epic* [Oxford, 1991] is another regrettable gap in D.'s bibliography). After all—a point that had also escaped Feeney's attention—Apollonius himself imposes this insight at 4.561, when he omnisciently comments on Zeus' decision about the necessary purification of the Argonauts with the phrase 'no one of the heroes understood this (plan)'. Last but not least, once we have accepted D.'s idea that human and divine anger has a more important narrative rôle than usually assumed in the *Argonautica*, and that the Homeric precedent was a powerful intertext for it, this anger appears mainly to consist in positively promoting or facilitating the action of the Argonauts: it guarantees the fulfilment of their enterprise, and therefore it works quite differently from the dangerous obstacles, concrete damages, and retardations of the fulfilment of the narrative action, which human and divine anger cause in the Homeric poems. This difference still needs to be highlighted.

Firenze/Macerata

MARCO FANTUZZI