CRITICAL NOTES ON
APOLLONIUS RHODIUS[1]

1. 110   μετὰ δ' ἤλυθεν ἐλδομένοισιν.

                          μέγα Platt.

Ardizzoni retains μετὰ, but gives no reasons for doing so. Platt's correction is technically easy, but the difficulty is, I feel, imaginary. I take μετέρχομαι as absolute, = 'joined the expedition': so μετακιάθω at 1. 90, 139—not, as LSJ give, 'come next'—and μετέρχομαι' μέτειμι often. ἐλδομένοισιν is dative of interest or advantage, as, for example, Od. 24. 400 νόστησας ἐελδομένοισιν, 21. 209, 12.438, A.R. 2. 1092, Q.S. 6. 119, 10. 24. μετέρχομαι here does not 'govern' a dative any more than does, for example, νόστησας at Od. 24. 400. And μέγα seems to me to be rather oddly placed.

1. 342   μιῇ δέ τε πάντες αὐτῇ
          σημαίνειν ἐπέτελλον.

                          -δέ ἑ codd.: correxi.

Platt remarked on 1. 691 'It is really astonishing how long the most glaring bad grammar will escape one's notice.' ἐπιτέλλω takes the dative, and there is no parallel for a construction 'enjoin that one should . . .' with accus. and inf.

At 343 note the *variatio* of *Il.* 21. 445 ὁ δὲ σημαίνων ἐπέτελλεν at verse-end (Merkel, *Praefatio*, p. xxxviii). More attention should be paid, I think, to this less obvious type of adaptation. A good example is 3. 712 Ἀράς τε στυγερὰς καὶ Ἐρινύας (στυγερὴ . . . . Ἐρινύς / 704): cf. *Od.* 2. 135 στυγερὰς ἀρήσετ' ἐρινῦς (again at verse-end).

(I now find at Coluth. 259 μιν ἐφεδρήσσειν . . . ἐπέτελλε, but this oddity is hardly decisive.)

1. 369–70   ἵν' εὖ ἀραροίατο γόμφοις
          δούρατα καὶ ῥοθίοιο βίην ἔχοι ἀντιόωσαν.

Mooney translates 'might have strength to resist the surge', and quotes *Il.* 7. 231 for ἀντιάω c. gen. But 'possess strength which opposes the surge' is surely dubious Greek. Apollonius is thinking of *Il.* 16. 213 βίας ἀνέμων ἀλεείνων and βίην singular is the expected *variatio*.[2]

What Apollonius must mean here is 'withstand the opposing force of the surge'. So Seaton, Ardizzoni, de Mirmont ('soutenir la violence ennemie des eaux'). This is of course an acceptable meaning of ἔχω, but as the text stands (a) ἔχω in this sense is rarely found in the present tenses;[3] (b) more importantly, ἔχοι does involve an ambiguity[4]—the meaning is not immediately obvious where one would expect it to be.

---

[2] This Homeric passage, ὡς δ' ὅτε τοῖχον ἀνὴρ ἀράρῃ πυκινοῖσι λιθοῖσι / δώματος ὑψη-λοῖο, βίας ἀνέμων ἀλεείνων (note the ἀράρῃ concept here in Apollonius), forms the basis of the simile at 2. 1073 ff., as Mooney remarks. But Apollonius also there draws upon

the variation of this simile at *Il.* 23. 712 ff. Cf. also Q.S. 11. 361 ff.

[3] For instances see Ebeling, *Lex. Homer.* s.v. ἔχω, p. 517 (a), 21 ff., LSJ A II 9.

[4] Whereas at, for example, *Od.* 5. 451 ἔσχε δὲ κῦμα (praeced. παῦσεν ἑὸν ῥόον), the meaning is quite clear.

Apollonius may have written σχέθοι. ἀραροίατο is aorist optative and there seems to be no compelling need for a switch to the present. ἔχοι would be the normalized form substituted by the scribe.

1. 600   πνοιῇ ἀνέμοιο θέοντες

It is not at all safe to reject πνοιῇ here for πνοιῆς, as Ardizzoni[1] does, comparing *infra* 1013 and numerous cases of πνοιῆς ἀνέμοιο in Homer, to which may be added Q.S. 9. 503. For ἐννύχιοι πνοιῇ ἀνέμοιο θέοντες here cf. 4. 1223–4 ἀνέμοιο / πνοιῇ ἐπειγόμενοι προτέρω θέον, 2. 168 πνοιῇ . . . ἰθύνοντο. See also 2. 725. An Apollonian *variatio* on a constant Homeric use is expected. For the hiatus see Rzach, 'Der Hiatus bei A.R.', *Wiener Studien* iii (1881), 48.

1. 798 ff.   εὖτε Θόας ἀστοῖσι πατὴρ ἐμὸς ἐμβασίλευε,
                τηνίκα † Θρηικίην†, οἵ τ' ἀντία ναιετάουσι,
                †δήμου† ἀπορνύμενοι λαοὶ πέρθεσκον ἐπαύλους   800
                ἐκ νηῶν, αὐτῇσι δ' ἀπείρονα ληΐδα κούραις
                δεῦρ' ἄγον. οὐλομένη δὲ θεᾶς πορσύνετο μῆνις
                Κύπριδος.

799 Θρηικίην codd. omnes, nisi -ίης Vind. Vrat.; Θρηικίων Hoelzlin, Θρηικίους Fränkel. 800 δήμου vix sanum: Λήμνου Pierson.   πέρθεσκεν L[1].   ἐπαύλους Pierson: ἐναύλους LAPE: ἐπαύλεις S. schol. 799/800 τὰς οἰκίας τῶν Θρᾳκῶν ἐπόρθουν οἱ Λήμνιοι (sed δηλονότι οἱ Λήμνιοι schol. L[g]).   802 οὐλομένη Fränkel: οὐλομένης codd.   μῆνις Fränkel: μῆτις codd., sed μῆτίς L[1].

I do not believe that these lines have been satisfactorily emended. I offer my own solution only tentatively. A number of difficulties, it seems to me, have been entirely glossed over by the editors. Corruption may be more extensive than has been hitherto imagined. I shall first (a) examine the case for the manuscript reading Θρηικίην, and for the conjectures Θρηικίων and Θρηικίους, none of which seems to me to be tenable, and put forward a suggestion which, I believe, makes sense of the passage for the first time. I shall then (b) examine δήμου, which I think corrupt, and finally (c) put forward a case for Pierson's ἐπαύλους.

(a) Θρηικίην is basically the manuscripts' reading: -ίης is probably derived from 795 Θρηικίης. Θρηικίην must be corrupt, since it leaves οἵ τ' ἀντία ναιετάουσι hopelessly hanging in the air. To explain it as Mooney does, 'Thrace, the tribes who dwell opposite', is a desperate resort. One has only to examine Lehr's translation, 'Thraciam, qui . . .', to see this. Merkel attempts to solve the difficulty by a reference to 2. 520–1 λαὸν ἀγείρας / Παρράσιον τοί-περ . . . εἶσι. There Fränkel's Παρρασίων is probably right. (He refers to 4. 549–50 λαὸν ἀγείρας / Φαίηκων). -ίων is not an emendation but merely a reinterpretation of -ΟΝ. But even if Fränkel is not right, the difference between λαόν οἵ, 'a people who', where λαόν and οἵ are indisputably and under all circumstances the same, and Θρηικίην οἵ, where the 'land of Thrace' and the 'people' in it are not *exact* equivalents, is immense. I note also 3. 1186–7, λαὸν . . . ὅσοι, although there ὅσοι makes the expression a very easy one.

Θρηικίην is thus very difficult. But it involves another problem. On what does it depend? Merkel regards it as an accusative of motion, but the example

which he quotes and the half-dozen which Mooney adds to these[1] do not contain the idea of hostility which Mooney attaches to the phrase. Such a notion of course is not strictly necessary, but there is the added difficulty that phrases involving 'ἀπόρνυμαι from X' seem invariably to be composite and not to be involved with a further idea of motion to, whether this be expressed with a preposition or without one. For examples see Ardizzoni's note on this passage and add Pind. *Pyth.* 1. 66, Call. *Dian.* 98, Coluth. 6. Hence I regard the accusative use here as dubious, and in view of the added difficulty of Θρηικίην this solution seems most unlikely.

Fränkel writes Θρηικίους. But Θρηικίους ἐπαύλους οἵ—so he must take this; τ' cannot of course mean 'and', nor can λαοί οἵ be taken together, as M. L. West (*C.R.* n.s. xiii [1963], 12) seems to believe—is hardly as defensible as λαὸν Παρράσιον οἵ. It is a mistake to suppose that any adjective expressing 'Thracian' can take such a relative clause. It would surely have to depend on what substantive is employed with that adjective. For the expression he compares A. *Pers.* 870 Θρηικίων ἐπαύλων, which proves only that the expression is found in Greek (if the text is right there), not that it is correct here.

Hoelzlin conjectured Θρηικίων. This is better, since it provides an antecedent for οἵ. It cannot, however, be correct. Apollonius uses the adjective Θρηίκιος on eleven occasions, and never does it mean 'Thracians', = Θρήικες or Θρῆκες. Moreover, there is no example of such a use recorded in Pape's *Eigennamen*, and I know of none.

I conclude therefore that the text is unsound, and that the methods of Hoelzlin and Fränkel are wrong. Θρηικι—seems genuine enough. It is difficult to imagine any reason for its wholesale intrusion here, and we do require at this point some reference to 'Thracians'.[2] What makes Θρηικι- necessary in my eyes is the expression Θρηικίην δηοῦντες, *supra* 614. I shall discuss this important passage below.

Θρηικι- then needs something on which to depend. I should suggest λαῶν for λαοί at 800, and read Θρηικίων with Hoelzlin. If λαοί arose from assimilation to ἀπορνύμενοι, which seems likely enough, then a corruption to -ίην in Θρηικίων would naturally follow, especially since Apollonius had written Θρηικίης at 795. Θρηικίων . . . λαῶν οἵ at once gives οἵ an antecedent, and the use of λαός is Apollonian. Homer would not have said Θρηίκιοι λαοί (cf. LSJ s.v. λαός *ad fin.*), but Apollonius has λαὸν Παρράσιον 2. 520–1 (s.v.l.), λαοὶ . . . Δολίονες 1. 1058. But is such a corruption likely? Two points, I think, are in its favour:

1. L¹ reads πέρθεσκεν at 800. This could of course be explained as a mere dittography coming from the following ἐναύλους. But L¹ also reads μῆτις at 802. From this Fränkel conjectures μῆνις, certainly rightly,[3] but the ν is written over the ς of μῆτις and not over the τ. This indicates to me that L¹ originally had ἄγεν too—I wonder if it in fact does—and ἀπορνύμενος, viz. the scribe was originally at a loss for a subject to the τηνίκα clause and wrote πέρθεσκεν . . . ἄγεν . . . πορσύνετο μῆτιν, understanding Θόας from the preceding clause. If λαῶν were the original he might have found difficulty in extracting ἀστοί

[1] Mooney's list is inaccurate: 1. 645 text doubtful; 1. 987 doubtful again, see Fränkel; 2. 906 doubtful, though admittedly it makes very little difference here; 3. 42 better with μυχόν in 'partial' apposition; 4. 257 τήν = τὴν ὁδὸν ἥν as Mooney himself says.

[2] So in the imitation of Quintus (9. 343)

πέρθοντές ποτε γαῖαν ἀρηιφίλων Θρηίκων.

[3] There seems to be no 'scheme' at work here. μῆνις echoes χόλος of 614, which I discuss below. οὐλομένη . . . μῆνις can be paralleled from *Il.* 1. 1–2. For χόλος and μῆνις as equivalents in Apollonius see D. A. van Krevelen, *Mnemosyne* s. iv, vi (1953), 53–4.

from the εὖτε clause. Further, schol.ᴸᵍ say on 800 δηλονότι οἱ Λήμνιοι. This may explain an original anacoluthon, where ἀστοί had to be taken from the εὖτε clause to provide a subject for πέρθεσκον and ἄγον.

2. The reading Θρηικίων . . . λαῶν expresses exactly what the schol. say, τὰς ἐπαύλεις τῶν Θρᾳκῶν, and the paraphrase may be an old one. It might be objected that the word order would be extremely contorted, but it is often so in Apollonius, as, e.g., *supra* 624-6. The same applies to whatever reading is adopted here.

(*b*) 800 δήμου codd. This cannot be right. The explanation generally given by those who keep it is this: ' "Our people, making forays from their land": δῆμος in its Homeric sense of "land" (which is property of a community)' Mooney. And so, e.g., Ardizzoni, 'regione'. The difficulty about this is that in Homer the word *is* generally thought of in regard to the community, e.g. who rules it, a 'kingdom', 'holding' (e.g. *Il.* 2. 547); the land expressed (e.g. *Od.* 1. 103); often πίονα, i.e. with regard to its inhabitants; most commonly some one person is thought of in reference to the δῆμος (e.g. *Il.* 5. 78), or the people of the community are thought of in reference to the δῆμος as a whole (e.g. *Od.* 3. 214). This latter passage is cited by Mooney; there the λαοί are the same as the δῆμος.

As a mere equivalent of γαίης, which δήμου would have to be here, the word seems linguistically repulsive. Moreover, if, as seems likely, a genitival form of some kind underlies Θρηικι-, δήμου would cause a hopeless ambiguity. So Merkel, who, with reference to Θρηικίων -ίης remarks, 'ambiguam efficiunt locutionem'.

For δήμου Pierson proposed Λήμνου. The corruption would be a likely one in itself, *ΛΗΜΝΟΥ—ΔΗΜΟΥ*,[1] but there seems little point in Hypsipyle's naming *Lemnos* specifically at this juncture. At the same time we do require some word to express the point of departure (as in *Il.* 5. 105, etc.).

Since I read λαῶν in 800 I explain δήμου as a gloss arising from λαῶν, or at least as an intrusion from a paraphrase in the schol. Exactly this has happened at 2. 274, where ὀπίσω has intruded from ἔτρεχον ὀπίσω of the schol.[2] If this assumption is correct, one might write, e.g., ἔνθεν here. The phrase is a common one: Hes. *Theog.* 9, *h. Ap.* 29, A.R. 4. 631, Call. *Dian.* 98. For ἔνθεν = 'from the place where I (the speaker) now am' cf. 3. 1094, 4. 90.

For my reading here, Θρηικίων οἵ τ' ἀντία ναιετάουσι . . . λαῶν πέρθεσκον

---

[1] Fränkel apparently thinks δήμου a gloss on Λήμνου. He refers to 621 *supra*, of Thoas, κατὰ δῆμον ἄνασσε. The schol. on Pind. *Olymp.* 4. 31 (*b*) give Λῆμνον. But this is hardly comparable: (*a*) it is a reverse corruption; (*b*) a scholiast in talking of 'Thoas king of Lemnos' might be expected to write Λῆμνον there. At 608 *supra* Σιντηίδα Λῆμνον ἵκοντο Fränkel supposes a similar confusion to that at 621. He reads νῆσον for Λῆμνον, basing this on the note of the schol. ἐπιθετικῶς Σιντηὶς ἡ Λῆμνος. This *may* be right, but the schol. could mean 'Lemnos is called S. in terms of an epithet'—they are given to such remarks. Ardizzoni surprisingly says (in app. ad loc.) 'sed cf. 4. 1759', where there is no schol. complication.

[2] ἐπ' ἴσῳ (vel ἴσης) Fränkel. There is perhaps no need in view of this obvious intrusion to stick so closely to the 'ductus litterarum'. The phrase ἐπ' ἴσῳ seems unparalleled, and it would not, I think, give the meaning which Fränkel wants, 'pari velocitate'. It would rather mean 'pariter', 'abreast', referring to the Boreads, which does not seem entirely suitable. The schol. have παραπλησίως, 'almost equal with them', and one might guess at, e.g., σχεδόθεν: cf. 273 κατόπισθε, 274 (e.g. σχεδόθεν) with the sequel τυτθόν . . . μετόπισθεν 280, μάλα σχεδόν 282. For the expression cf. *Il.* 23. 763 Ὀδυσεὺς θέεν ἐγγύθεν, αὐτὰρ ὄπισθεν / ἴχνια τύπτε πόδεσσι κτλ.

ἐπαύλους one may compare 1. 613–14 ἀγίνεον ἀντιπέρηθεν (cf. also δεῦρ' ἄγον here) Θρηικίην δηοῦντες. This would correspond with my reading, and such correspondence could be significant, because 1. 611 ff. is a superb *variatio*[1] of the story given here.

$$\begin{cases}611/12 \\ 804/5\end{cases}$$ δὴ γὰρ ἀπηνήναντο γυναῖκας . . . ἐχθήραντες.
δὴ γὰρ κουριδίας μὲν ἀπέστυγον . . . ἀπεσσεύοντο.

$$\begin{cases}612/13 \\ 806\end{cases}$$ ἔχον δ' ἐπὶ ληιάδεσσι / τρηχὺν ἔρον.
ληιάδεσσι . . . παρίαυον.

$$\begin{cases}614/5 \\ 802/3\end{cases}$$ χόλος αἰνὸς ὄπαζε / Κύπριδος.
οὐλομένη . . . μῆνις / Κύπριδος [Fränkel].[2]

(c) 800 ἐπαύλους Pierson.

In Homer we find once ἐπαύλους, 'folds', *Od.* 23. 358.[3] There a very small number of manuscripts give ἐν-, see Allen's *app. crit.* The schol. on the present passage give as their first explanation τὰς ἐπαύλεις, τὰς μάνδρας. With this may be compared Eustathius 1950, on the *Odyssey* passage, σταθμούς, αὐλάς, ἐπαύλεις, and Hesychius s.v., μάνδρας. Now since this meaning is found also in Sophocles (*OT* 1138), and since the derived sense of ἔπαυλοι in the sense of 'homes', σταθμά, is a possible one here (an alternative in the schol.), and is again found in Sophocles (*OC* 669, where see Jebb), and in Aeschylus (*Pers.* 870), it is clearly preferable to read ἐπαύλους with Pierson here. ἐπαύλεις, a prose word, seems to have been introduced into the text of S from the gloss of the schol., probably because the writer of S failed to understand ἐναύλους.

At any rate ἐναύλους, adopted by Fränkel, cannot be right here. The word seems always to retain the basic sense of 'hollow', αὐλός, in something.[4] In Homer it means the 'bed' of a stream (cf. the extended use in Nonnus, *D.* 2. 652 νησαίους δὲ τένοντας ἀποτμηγέντας ἐναύλων), and then the stream running in that bed. (Cf. Q.S. 2. 472, schol.[b] on *Il.* 21. 283 χειμάρρους διὰ στενοῦ τόπου . . . ποιούμενος τὴν ῥύσιν, Ebeling, *Lex. Homeric.* s.v. I.)

LSJ give a further sense of 'haunts', especially of divinities, but this translation of ἔναυλοι is highly misleading, as an examination of the nature of these 'haunts' shows. The sense of αὐλός is just as prominent as that of αὐλή. At Hes. *Theog.* 129 they are on mountains, probably caves in which the nymphs resided (cf. Q.S. 14. 83, A.R. 1. 1226 cited below); Eur. *Bacch.* 122 ἔναυλοι of the Curetes = ἄντροις ibid. 123. The ἔναυλοι mentioned in *h.Ven.* 74, 124 are probably caves on an ὄρος (which is termed σκιερόν), or coverts, as at Eur. *Hel.* 1107 Scaliger, Nonn. *D.* 3. 16. Oppian thrice (*H.* 1. 305, 3. 5, 5. 21) uses the word of fishes, etc., which live in the κοίλη ἅλς. This is frequent in this sense in Nonnus (*D.* 1. 269, 6. 325, 10. 153, 20. 384, 23. 270, 43. 81). At Eur.

[1] For a discussion of *variatio* in general in Apollonius see Fränkel, *T.A.P.A.* lxxxiii (1952), 144 n. 2.

[2] Fränkel's ἔκ τε for ἐκ δέ at 804 is not accepted by the latest editor Ardizzoni, but it must be right. The clauses κουριδίας . . . ἀπέστυγον and ἐκ . . . γυναῖκας are not opposed. The αὐτάρ clause takes up the μέν, and the sentence corresponds to 611 ff., δὴ γὰρ κουριδίας μὲν ═══ . . . ἔχον δ' ἐπὶ ληιάδεσσι.

[3] We may now add χαρίεντας ἐπαύ[λους

from P.Oxy. 2494 B (b) = [Hes.] *fr.* 66. 1 M.–W. The sense of 'stalls' is clearly suggested by the context there. The supplement ἐπαύ[λους is recommended, as Lobel remarks, by Hes. *Theog.* 129 χαρίεντας ἐναύλους (on this see below). But χαρίεντας is an odd epithet of ἐπαύλους, if the accusative case is correct, unless they are so because they belong to Hermes.

[4] I have amplified the lists given in Stephanus–Dindorf and LSJ, but I am not sure that I have found every case of this word.

HF 371, where shepherds' chalets seem to be referred to, the word may mean grottoes used as shelter (as, apparently, at [Opp.] *C.* 1. 142), or simply 'torrents' in the Homeric sense. Thus there seems to be no authority for taking the word as a mere equivalent of 'steadings', and the sense 'homes' also offered by the schol. here would be impossible.

Finally Apollonius' own use of the word would seem to be fixed by 1. 1226, where the schol. gloss σπήλαια.

1. 1176   κακὰ πολλὰ ἑῇ ἠρήσατο γαστρί.

κατὰ Ardizzoni (iam Wellauer, typographico ut vid. errore).

This seems at first sight tempting, but it is wrong. Ardizzoni's arguments for κατά are as follows: (*a*) elsewhere in Apollonius ἀράομαι means 'pray' (159, 886 *supra*); (*b*) schol.ᴾ has κατηρήσατο; (*c*) he compares *Il.* 9. 454 πολλὰ κατηρᾶτο.

(*a*) No weight can be attached to this. At 1. 886 ἀράομαι = 'pray' absolutely, the normal Homeric use; at 1. 159 it means 'pray for' something, which is not Homeric. There seems to be no reason for denying to Apollonius a third, Tragic, use. He has many others. Three occurrences, in fact, barely constitute a basis for an 'usus scribendi'.

(*b*) What the schol. present is in fact this: προσεῖπεν L, κατηρήσατο ἢ προσεῖπεν P. A gloss κατηρήσατο on ἀρήσατο, 'curse', is to be expected. And προσεῖπεν, 'pronounced', again indicates a simple ἠρήσατο.

(*c*) *Il.* 9. 454 proves nothing. And there κατηρᾶτο is absolute. For the use with the dative we have to look elsewhere, *Od.* 19. 330 τῷ δὲ καταρῶνται . . . ἄλγε' ὀπίσσω.

The correct explanation of the line is, I believe, this. Homer often refers to the belly in uncomplimentary terms. See especially *Od.* 17. 473–4 γαστέρος εἵνεκα λυγρῆς, / οὐλομένης, ἣ πολλὰ κάκ' ἀνθρώποισι δίδωσιν, ibid. 286–7 (cited by Mooney) γαστέρα . . . /οὐλομένην, ἣ πολλὰ κάκ' ἀνθρώποισι δίδωσιν. Cf. also *Od.* 15. 344–5 ἕνεκ' οὐλομένης γαστρὸς κακὰ κήδε' ἔχουσιν / ἀνέρες. This is a typically Alexandrine sophistication. The roles are reversed: the ἀροτρεύς here is heaping κακὰ πολλά on the γαστήρ which *causes* κακὰ πολλά in Homer.

For the γαστήρ as a bringer of ill cf. also *Od.* 18. 53–4, 7. 216, A.R. 2. 233 (s.v.l.).

1. 1252   ἠέ μιν ἄνδρες
                        μοῦνον ἰόντ' ἐλόχησαν.

ἐόντ' codd.: correxi.

Cf. *Od.* 4. 670 ὄφρα μιν αὐτὸν ἰόντα λοχήσομαι, ibid. 14. 181.

1. 1333–4   †πέρι† γάρ μ' ἄχος †ἧκεν† ἐνισπεῖν
                        μῦθον ὑπερφίαλόν τε καὶ ἄσχετον.

1333 πέρι vel περὶ codd.   ἧκεν LSGPE: εἷλεν A, v.l. L.

HKEN seems clearly to be the reading from which any discussion of this passage must start. πέρι . . . εἷλεν will make some sense: 'anguish has smitten me in great measure', with πέρι as, e.g., 2. 20; or even περὶ . . . εἷλεν, see, e.g., *h.Ap.* 461 πέρι φρένας ἵμερος αἱρεῖ. This usage is modelled upon the Homeric one of περιέρχομαι, as at *Od.* 9. 362, cf. LSJ s.v. 12. But εἷλεν is ill attested, and looks like an attempt to make sense out of nonsense. If ἧκεν is corrupt, as I

think it probably is, what should be entered in the text is not †εἶλεν†, as Fränkel, but †ἧκεν†. Mooney's πέρι . . . εἷλκεν strains the meaning of ἕλκειν and, since it is based on the reading εἷλεν, is unlikely to be right.

Giangrande (C.Q. N.S. xvii [1967], 91 ff.) believes that ἧκεν here is from ἥκω, and takes the use to be an 'Ionic' coinage. This is, I think, made highly unlikely by the fact that Homer uses ἥκω only in the forms ἥκω and ἥκειν, while Apollonius himself does not employ the word at all.[1] Moreover, ἧκε(ν) occurs several times in Homer and several times in Apollonius, and invariably this comes from ἵημι and not from ἥκω. Nor would the reader of an Epic poet think of it as anything else. Hence I must regard this 'Ionic' coinage as a mere ghost.

According to Giangrande Apollonius is here imitating Aratus (Phaen. 473), περὶ φρένας ἵκετο θαῦμα, where περικνέομαι, he claims, is in tmesis. I doubt, however, if a Greek of Apollonius' time would notice this as particularly 'Aratean'. Aratus' phrase is simply an extension of such expressions as are found in h.Ap. 461 mentioned earlier (based, that is, on Homer's περιέρχομαι). In fact the περι was probably regarded as a preposition or adverb rather than a preverb. For this see also, e.g., Q.S. 2. 615 περὶ φρένας ἄλγος ἵκηται.

If Apollonius here did mean to express the sense that Giangrande desiderates, Merkel's conjecture is plainly superior. The latter noted the frequent occurrence of ἄχος ἱκάνει, ἄχος ἵξεται in Homer, and Apollonius himself has at 3. 1401 the variatio ἄλγος ἱκάνει. Hence Merkel wrote περὶ . . . ἵκεν, from which ἧκεν would easily arise by iotacism. None the less, Apollonius does not elsewhere employ this form (from ἵκω he has ἷξεν and ἷξον), and the expression does seem to me to be forced and unnatural, although admittedly ἐνισπεῖν as consecutive infinitive is quite comprehensible, as Giangrande remarks.

Better sense is given by Fränkel's ἐπὶ . . . ἧκεν, which recognizes ἧκεν for what it is, and gives an Homeric use (Il. 18. 108, al.).[2] But if the π in περι is genuine—it may have arisen from εἴ τι περ—I suggest as an alternative παρὰ . . . ἧγεν. παρά and περί are frequently confused, e.g. 2. 1188 πάρα PE, πέρι LASG, and for ἧγεν . . . ἧκεν cf. 2. 239. The sense yielded seems the most suitable one here: 'led me astray, so that . . .'. Apollonius imitates the Tragic use of ἄγω c. inf. (cf. LSJ s.v. II. 1) at 2. 817, al., and there seems no reason to disbelieve that he would not extend the use of παράγω similarly with the use of a consecutive infinitive, employing an obviously choicer mode of expression by means of tmesis. The tmesis would resemble such cases as Od. 14. 488-9 παρά μ' ἤπαφε δαίμων / οἰοχίτων' ἴμεναι.[3]

2. 65.   (62) τοῦ δ' ἀντίος ἦλυθε Κάστωρ / ἠδὲ . . . Ταλαός.
            (65) τοῦ δ' αὖτε Ἀρητός καὶ Ὀρνυτος.

65 τῷ codd.: correxi.

This surely carries variatio too far. In 65 we must supply ἀντίοι ἤλυθον, not

---

[1] At 2. 239 Brunck and Wellauer are certainly mistaken in reading Κλειοπάτρη ἔδνοισιν ἐμὸν δόμον ἧκεν ἄκοιτις: SG's reading Κλειοπάτρην . . . ἧγον ἄκοιτιν is supported by 3. 38 (cited by Fränkel), but still more by 1. 977 (Κλείτην) θεσπεσίοις ἔδνοισιν ἀνήγαγεν ἀντιπέρηθεν. (Cf. also Il. 22. 472, 16. 90, Od. 6. 159, A. Pr. 559, A.R. 4. 194.)

[2] Platt had already hinted at this by a

reference to Od. 14. 464, but he kept πέρι.

[3] LSJ s.v. παραπαφίσκω group along with Il. 14. 360, where π. takes the infinitive (παρήπαφεν εὐνηθῆναι), A.R. 2. 952, where in παρήπαφεν εὐνηθῆναι / ἱέμενον (note the line break) the infinitive goes with ἱέμενον— a subtle variatio. For the infinitival use they might have quoted, e.g., Q.S. 1. 645.

ἀμφέδεον from 64, as the parallelism of expression (with *variatio* in ἠδὲ 62—
τε καὶ 65) makes clear. In 65 it is better to read τοῦ. τῷ would be an easy
corruption since the scribe, in thinking of ἀντίοι ἤλυθον, would automatically
normalize into the dative ('less freq. in Homer with dat., but mostly so after
Homer' LSJ s.v. Ἰ 1. a *ad fin.*).

2. 107–8   τοῦ δ' ἆσσον ἰόντος
          δεξιτερῇ σκαιῆς ὑπὲρ ὀφρύος ἤλασε χειρί.
          107 'exspect. τὸν et ἰόντα' Fränkel.

It is not particularly helpful to refer to 106 *supra*, as Fränkel does, since the
fact that Apollonius says τὸν . . . ὑπὸ στέρνοιο πλῆξε there does not make it
necessary to assume that he will not employ a *variatio* here. Indeed Apollonius'
style leads one to expect this kind of trick. As a genitive absolute when τὸν and
ἰόντα would be readily at hand the expression is a strained one (though not
without parallel). The papyrus reading has fortunately prevented Fränkel
from placing an accusative in the text.

There is no need to take τοῦ . . . ἰόντος as a genitive absolute at all. At 111
infra we read οὖτα . . . κατὰ λαπάρην Ταλαοῖο,[1] where 'dealt a wound in the
flank of T.' = 'dealt T. a wound in . . .'. This expression is an imitation of the
Homeric οὔτησε κατ' ἀσπίδα (*Il.* 11. 434, *al.*), and with the genitive added, e.g.
Il. 3. 347 βάλεν Ἀτρεΐδαο κατ' ἀσπίδα, *Il.* 5. 305 βάλεν Αἰνείαο κατ' ἰσχίον.

So here 'dealt a blow over the brow of' = 'dealt one a blow over the brow'.
The genitive is extended by a participle, but this is surely defensible as a
variatio on Homer; and such a *variatio* is all the more expected here because
Apollonius has said already (102–3 *supra*) ἀνέρα Κάστωρ | ἤλασ' . . . κεφαλῆς
ὕπερ. The word order is involved, as it often is in Apollonius, but observe what
he has done here with the order in general to secure a juxtaposition of adjec-
tives of kindred relationship:

δεξιτερῇ | σκαιῆς ὑπὲρ ὀφρύος | ἤλασε χειρί.

In view of the Homeric prototype I should not regard the possible objection
that a Greek would *naturally* take τοῦ δ' ἆσσον ἰόντος as a genitive absolute as
a serious one. One may note further that Homer does not employ this con-
struction with οὐτάω/οὐτάζω, nor with ἐλαύνω.

At 2. 73 another unusual genitive occurs. Fränkel there remarks 'fort.
ἱέμενον et κλύδωνα'. Earlier[2] he has put the case more strongly: 'A genitive
absolute is intolerable when a direct object is required; five genitive forms
in two lines are ridiculous . . .'.

There is nothing 'ridiculous' about five genitives if they are fulfilling a
proper function. The genitives *are* different both in form (-οιο twice; -ος twice;
-ου) and in function.

First, the construction of 70–1. Three are possible: (*a*) ὑπὸ in tmesis with
ἀλύσκει (so schol.[P]); (*b*) ὑπὸ as preposition, 'from under': cf., e.g., 1. 10; (*c*)
ὑπὸ τυτθόν together, comparing ἐπὶ τυτθόν,[3] with ἀλύσκω c. gen. as in Tragedy.

---

[1] This is a good example of conscious *varia-
tio*. In Apollonius' line there is a shift from
Homer's constant οὖτα κατὰ λαπάρην at the
beginning of the verse (*Il.* 6. 64, 14. 447, 517).

[2] *T.A.P.A.* lxxxiii (1952), 148 n. 15.

[3] Ardizzoni (on 1. 1359) wrongly changes
ἐπὶ τυτθόν (to ἔτι) at 1. 1359 and 4. 1529. Cf.
Pfeiffer on Call. *fr.* 1. 5, though his inter-
pretation of the Callimachean passage seems
questionable.

Of these (*a*) is plainly superior. (*b*) causes a violent hyperbaton, and (*c*) produces a phrase ὑπὸ τυτθόν which is not attested elsewhere and seems unlikely in itself. Since therefore ὑπαλύσκω does not seem to be found with the genitive, we are faced with a genitive absolute. (ὑπαλύσκω is used absolutely at *Scutum* 304.) And as such I believe it to be defensible and indeed necessary.

κλύδων and κῦμα are not exact equivalents: κλύδων once in Homer, *Od.* 12. 420–1, ἀπὸ τοίχους / λῦσε κλύδων τρόπιος (viz. the surge jumping up) τὴν δὲ ψιλὴν φέρε κῦμα. Here the κλύδων and the κῦμα are plainly contrasted. Compare Hesychius' definition of the former as κυμάτων σφοδρότης. Here the run of the lines would suggest to me: 'the wave rises against the ship—the ship just escapes from under (the wave), while (all this time) the surge keeps rushing on . . .'. The genitives are odd, but Apollonius, in thinking of the *Odyssey* passage, wants to keep the κῦμα and the κλύδων distinct.[1]

2. 144   καί δή τις ἔπος μετὰ τοῖον ἔειπεν.
                 τοῖσιν codd.: correxi.

For the confusion see 4. 738, ἔπος δ᾽ ἐπὶ τοῖον ἔειπεν: τοῖον SG, τοῖσιν LAPE (impossible in the context). My objections to τοῖσιν here are (*a*) τις[2] in such expressions is equivalent to πᾶς τις and τοῖσιν is not particularly appropriate with this;[3] (*b*) a dative is found in such expressions (but not with τις) at, e.g., 2. 773, 3. 522, 4. 189, but τοῖον is the norm in this type of speech opening. Add to the three quoted 2. 1276 τοῖον μετὰ μῦθον ἔειπεν, 3. 544 τοῖον ἔπος ἀγόρευσεν, 1. 277 τοῖον ἔπος φάτο, 1. 699 = 3. 1078 τοῖον ἔπος ηὔδα, 2. 10= 2. 684 =3. 24 τοῖον ἔκφατο μῦθον, 3. 259 = 974 τοῖον φάτο μῦθον, 3. 726 τοῖον δ᾽ ἐπὶ μῦθον ἔειπεν, with its *variatio* 4. 1098 ἔπος δ᾽ ἐπὶ τοῖον ἔειπεν. For its use in later Epic see Q.S. 1. 211, 3. 559, *passim*, Coluth. 138, Nonn. *D.* 1. 92, 20. 136, 44. 133; for the combination τις . . . τοῖον Q.S. 4. 19, 10. 470, 13. 14.

2. 224   ἔκποθεν ἀφράστοιο καταΐσσουσαι †ὀλέθρου†

The examples cited by Mooney in support of Koechly's ὄλεθροι (3. 777, 1135, 4. 63, 242) are not really comparable, and the bare use of the word 'destroyers' does not strike one as Apollonian or as Epic. Perhaps Hemsterhuis's ὄλεθρον, which he translated 'ex improviso undecunque perniciem inferentes', has been unjustly ignored, since Apollonius notoriously makes normally intransitive verbs transitive (G. Boesch, *De A.R. Locutione*, pp. 8 ff.), and there is some case for preserving the manuscript reading ἐπαΐσσων at 1. 1254 (see Ardizzoni), although Ruhnken's ἐπισσείων seems to me to be certain. One might suggest alternatively, supposing -αΐσσουσαι to have come from 187 *supra*, καταιγίζουσαι ὄλεθρον. For the metaphor cf. *infra* 267 ff.

2. 867   περιπρὸ γὰρ εὖ ἐκέκαστο
                 ἰθύνειν.

This is Fränkel's note: 'fort. περ. δὲ νηῦν ἐκέκ. Cf. *Od.* 3. 282 sq. [ἐκαίνυτο . . . /

---

[1] In this simile Apollonius puts to a new use *Il.* 15. 381 ff., ὥς τε μέγα κῦμα θαλάσσης εὐρυπόροιο / νηὸς ὑπὲρ τοίχων καταβήσεται, where the comparison is with the Trojans' climbing of the wall.

[2] The expression here recalls the well-known formulaic line ὧδε δέ τις εἴπεσκεν

ἰδὼν ἐς πλησίον ἄλλον (cf. Leaf on *Il.* 2. 271).

[3] Mr. Griffin calls to my attention Theoc. 13. 51, where, however, as he himself says, the text is doubtful. And that passage seems a good deal easier than the present one with its bare τις . . . τοῖσιν.

νῆα κυβερνῆσαι], *Arg. Orph.* 730 νῆα κατιθύνων, scil. Ancaeus recens electus (728 κεκάσθαι).'

This suggestion[1] is based on a faulty method. Critics are fortunate in possessing a number of external aids for the poem (for it is clear that here Fränkel is laying particular stress on the parallel *Orph. Arg.* passage), but such external aids must be used with discretion. Here Fränkel is prepared to ignore altogether Apollonius' own 'usus scribendi'. ἰθύνειν is absolute, 'be, act as a pilot': cf. 897 *infra*, ἰθύνειν λελιημένοι, where it is quite unnecessary to extract νῆα from νῆα θοὴν ἄξειν 895 (itself a *variatio* of *Il.* 23. 317 νῆα θοὴν ἰθύνει). Further, Apollonius twice employs ἰθυντήρ without qualification in the sense of 'pilot' (4. 209, 1260, schol. L^gP ad loc. κυβερνήτης). And the imitator in *Orph. Arg.* 730, if he chose to use κατιθύνω, would hardly omit νῆα. Cf. also *Od.* 5. 255, varied by Apollonius at 1. 562.

2. 889   τῶ καὶ ὁμοῦ φθιμένοισι κακὴν προτιόσσομαι ἄτην.

'textus susp.' Fränkel.

This comment, I suspect, is a legacy of the mishandling of the passage by the commentators and translators. Fränkel gives no suggestion in his note, and it would in fact be hard to pin down a corruption here. Seaton translates 'Wherefore I forebode an evil doom for us even as for the dead', i.e. 'as dire as that of the dead' Mooney, and so Lehrs, Coleridge, etc.

What Apollonius means is: 'I foresee a κακὴ ἄτη (for us), along with those who have perished',[2] i.e. along with Idmon and Tiphys who have recently died. Jason is alluding to the death of his comrades: καταυτόθι δ' ἄμμε καλύψει 892 echoes 856 *supra*, αὖθι μινυνθαδίη πάτρης ἑκὰς κτλ. The schol. seem to take it thus: διὸ καὶ σὺν τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις καὶ αὐτὸς προορῶμαι τὴν ἀπώλειαν.[3]

2. 1251/2   τὸν μὲν †ἐπ' ἀκροτάτης† ἴδον ἕσπερον ὀξέι ῥοίζῳ
                νηὸς ὑπερπτάμενον νεφέων σχεδόν.

1251: ἀπ' Naber   ἑσπέρου Madvig et Platt.

I do not believe that on present evidence this line can be emended with certainty, but I should like to point out some difficulties in the current treatment and to suggest some other possibilities which have been ignored.

Platt's objections to 1251 are sound. He points out that ἐπ' ἀκροτάτης cannot mean 'over the ship', and that ἕσπερον in the sense of 'at evening', defended by Mooney with a reference to κνέφας at 2. 407, is impossible. See *JP* xxxiii (1914), 23 ff.

Platt conjectured (as had Madvig before him) ἑσπέρου, and this is received into the text by Fränkel. But this creates a problem no less serious. There seems to be no parallel at all for such a use of ἐπί with the genitive (cf. LSJ s.v. A II 1. a). If Platt is on the right lines it would be better to read ὑπ' ἀκροτάτην

---

[1] As for the contents of the emendation proposed, it is certainly not entirely safe to introduce into Apollonius' text another example of the curious form νηῦν found at 1. 1358 (νέα La Roche).

[2] This may pick up the previous speech (881 ff.): '*They* have encountered death—but there are pilots left among us.' Jason: 'These pilots seem more dejected than I am, hence we will meet with as great an ἄτη

as did the dead heroes.' Not a very cogent link, but this set of speeches is very odd in any case.

[3] Admittedly this is obscure too, but what does seem to emerge is that the schol. take φθιμένοισι as a reference to Idmon and Tiphys. It looks as if what the schol. are saying here is that just as those two foresaw ἄτη, so too did Jason, whereas in fact it was only Idmon who was said to do this (1. 140).

... ἕσπερον, cf. LSJ s.v. ὑπό C III 2, and ὑφ' ἕσπερα = ποτὶ ἕσπερα at *A.P.* 5. 304.[1] The sense given, 'just before evening', is perhaps satisfactory, since night proper does not seem to be reached until ἐννύχιοι at 1260. Apollonius has said between the two δηρὸν δ' οὐ μετέπειτα 1256, and at 1259, when the bird returns, the heroes εἰσενόησαν ('felt the presence of it'?), rather than saw distinctly.

Even this could be wide of the mark, since, firstly, ἄκρος in the superlative seems never to be used with reference to time[2] (neither Passow nor LSJ s.v. ἄκρος provides any examples), and secondly, it ignores another possibility which seems to have been overlooked by the commentators. ἕσπερον could be adjectival. It is so at *h.Hom.* 19. 14, and it is exactly this rare type of usage which Apollonius loves to imitate. For the expression τὸν . . . ἴδον ἕσπερον cf., e.g., Call. *fr.* 75. 12 Pf. δειελινὴν τὴν δ' εἷλε κακὸς χλόος, and Gow's note on Theoc. 13. 33. If ἕσπερον is adjectival then one might expect something like ὑπὲρ πάσης, 'over the whole length of' (cf. 2. 583). But I believe that it is safer at the moment to obelize.

3. 652   ἐκ δὲ πάλιν κίεν ἔνδοθεν, ἄψ τ' ἀλέεινεν   650
               εἴσω, τηΰσιοι δὲ πόδες φέρον ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα.
               ἤτοι ὅτ' ἰθύσειεν, ἔρυκέ μιν ἔνδοθεν αἰδώς.

There is a good deal of repetition in this highly graphic passage, but the occurrence of ἔνδοθεν here after ἔνδοθεν 650 seems suspect. Vian is the only editor to make a note on the word. He says it means (*a*) 'in her apartment'; = ἔνδοθι, or rather (*b*) 'within (her heart)', comparing ἔντοσθεν 724. For (*a*) one might compare the slightly different use at 250 *supra*, μιν ἔρυκε δόμῳ. But (*b*) is altogether more likely, cf. 1. 274 δέδεται κέαρ ἔνδοθεν ἄτῃ, LSJ s.v. II 2, who oddly omit *Od.* 4. 293, 467. Add also Q.S. 3. 504, 5. 171, 7. 537, 12. 534.

Yet however we take ἔνδοθεν here, it seems ugly after its literal use 'from indoors' at 650. If it has been interpolated here, perhaps ἐν φρεσίν, sim.,[3] was the original. At any rate we must keep ἔνδοθεν at 650, since there there is a plain contrast with εἴσω.

3. 706–8   νειόθι δ' ἀμφοτέρῃσι περίσχετο γούνατα χερσίν,
               σὺν δὲ κάρη κόλποις περικάββαλεν. ἔνθ' ἐλεεινόν
               ἄμφω ἐπ' ἀλλήλῃσι θέσαν γόον.

    707 περικάββαλεν SGPE: -ον LA (ex ἐλεεινόν vel γόον 708).

Fränkel and Vian read -ον with slighter manuscript authority, but (*a*) it seems clear that σὺν (= simul) expresses the act of the person who περίσχετο. It is not until the next clause, ἔνθ' ἐλεεινόν κτλ., that both (ἄμφω) are represented as acting simultaneously; (*b*) if A kneels to B, how can both A and B place head upon bosom? This point is surely obvious: Wellauer simply wrote 'Singular(is), quem sensus postulat'.

Fränkel terms the compound a 'vox obscurior'. Here it would have to mean 'threw down her head upon', 'dans (sur)' Vian. This is very odd. At 3. 156 the compound περικάτθετο[4] is unusual, but in this περι- means

---

[1] The schol. say παρὰ τὴν ἑσπέραν. This use of παρά would express ὑπό here.

[2] It is conjectured by Fränkel at 1. 516 (προέκδοσις). Of course this objection is hardly a disastrous one.

[3] ἔρυκε γὰρ ἄσπετος αἰδώς Quintus (9. 144), who often imitates Apollonius closely. But ἄσπετος αἰδώς does not strike one as Apollonian.

[4] 'κατατίθεμαι est improprie: il signifie

'around' and is clear enough. At 3. 543 περικάππεσεν, περι- means 'impaled on', a common use from Homer down. So also at 2. 831 περικάππεσε = 'fall to the ground impaled upon'. (It is hard to see why Fränkel prints the compound *divisim* here and not at 3. 543.) In view of the proximity of περίσχετο here, I think it highly likely that what Apollonius wrote was ἐνικάββαλεν. For the compound cf. 1. 1239. To the objection that Apollonius uses περικατα-compounds frequently I should reply with ἐνικαταθνῄσκω 2. 834, ἐνικατατίθεμαι 3. 282, ἐνικαταπίπτω 3. 655. And ἐνι- surely gives the sense required.

For the preposition ἐνί cf., e.g., 3. 1308 ἐν χθονὶ κάββαλεν; for the confusion see also 3. 973 ἐνιπεπτηυῖαν LAPE, περι- SG.

3. 1032–4
  1032 βόθρον ὀρύξασθαι περιηγέα, τῷ δ' ἐπὶ θῆλυν
  1033 ἀρνειὸν σφάζειν καὶ ἀδαίετον ὠμοθετῆσαι,
  1034 αὐτῷ πυρκαϊὴν εὖ νηήσας ἐπὶ βόθρῳ.

    1032 ἐπὶ scripsi: ἐνὶ codd. (ex 1031, 1207?).

The description given in this passage is resumed at 1207–9:

  1207 πήχυιον δ' ἄρ' ἔπειτα πέδῳ ἔνι βόθρον ὀρύξας,
  1208 νήησεν σχίζας, ἐπὶ δ' ἀρνειοῦ τάμε λαιμόν,
  1209 αὐτόν τ' εὖ καθύπερθε τανύσσατο.

I leave aside for the moment discussion of a similar process in Homer.

Apollonius' description is obscure, but what is happening, I think, is this: Jason must dig a pit (1032): *over* the pit he must cut a ewe's throat and let the blood flow in (1032/3), and also sacrifice the entire ewe (1033) after (νηήσας, aorist) building a pyre on the actual edge of the pit (1034, = ἀμφ' αὐτῷ Homer, v. infra). Then he does dig the pit (1207), heap up billets (1208), cut the ewe's throat *over* (the pit), 1208, and lay the actual body of the ewe (αὐτόν[1]) 'above' (on the pyre: ἐπὶ τὸ πῦρ schol.). At 1209–10 he kindles a fire under the pyre, and at 1210 he pours libations over the pyre.

It seems unlikely from the description given that the pyre is *in* the pit. Since the ewe goes on the pyre (1209), and the pyre is on the edge of the pit (1034), then ἐνί at 1032 is wrong. As the description at 1032 of the cutting of the throat is echoed by 1208 ἐπὶ δ' ἀρνειοῦ κτλ., ἐπί must be read at 1032. To take ἐνί of motion, '(blood) goes into the pit' (cf. Homer *infra*) is impossible in view of ἀδαίετον ὠμοθετῆσαι. This seems right as opposed to Fränkel's suggestion ἔνι at 1034. One must be right, since the αὐτῷ . . . ἐπὶ βόθρῳ looks clearly resumptive.

The Homeric original is to be found at *Od.* 11. 24–50. Editors generally quote *Od.* 10. 517–30, which is made up almost entirely of the passage in 11. But in the latter a number of details are added which are relevant to Apollonius here.

Od. 11. 35–6: τὰ δὲ μῆλα λαβὼν ἀπεδειροτόμησα / ἐς βόθρον,[2] ῥέε δ' αἷμα

normalement "déposer": cf. *Od.* 21. 264' Vian; 'exspect. περὶ οἷ θέτο' Fränkel. 'Impropre' it may be, but it is right: Q.S. 6. 196 μεγάλοις περικάτθετο γυίοις / τεύχεα: id. 12. 303 ὤμοισι κατ' ἄμβροτα θήκατο τεύχη.

 [1] αὐτήν Fränkel: but if Apollonius here

calls the ewe ἀρνειός *simply* and not θῆλυς ἀρνειός, can he really be expected to write anything but αὐτόν?

 [2] For this expression cf. *Il.* 23. 148, Ov. *Met.* 7. 245, Paus. 9. 39.

κελαινεφές. The sprinkling of blood brings up the ψυχαὶ νεκύων. The blood in Apollonius must have the same function. The pyre strictly has nothing to do with it. It is added by Apollonius from the Homer passage, where (a) Odysseus promises on his return home to heap up a pyre with ἐσθλά; (b) after the rising of the dead, Odysseus' comrades slay the sheep, and are told κατακῆαι them (while calling upon Hades and Persephone, ἐπαινῇ Περσεφονείῃ, perhaps glossed by Apollonius with δεινὴ θεός at 1213).

The libations in Homer are poured ἀμφ' αὐτῷ (scil. βόθρῳ), along the edge of the pit; in Apollonius the libations are poured over the actual pyre standing on the edge of the pit.

Apollonius' technique of *variatio* from his model is interesting in other respects. He scatters the details given in the single Homeric passage over a wider stretch of the poem. The libation list in Homer (27 ff.), μελίκρητον then wine then water,[1] is given as μελίκρητον alone in Apollonius. At 1199 Argos is said to bring milk; at 1036 honey is mentioned. These form the μιγάδας λοιβάς of 1210, and perhaps Apollonius is pointing out that he took μελίκρητον[2] to be a mixture of honey and milk (cf. Vian on 1036). Apollonius postpones till the later passage the reference to the size of the pit, 1207 πήχυιον, Homer ὅσσον τε πυγούσιον. And, as Vian notes, he seems to interpret Homer's ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα as περιηγέα there.[3] In Homer Odysseus says ἐμὲ δὲ χλωρὸν δέος ᾕρει; so later in Apollonius, 1221, Αἰσονίδην δ' ἤτοι μὲν ἕλεν δέος. At the end of *Od*. 11 the hero admits to making haste back to his comrades: αὐτίκ' ἔπειτ' ἐπὶ νῆα κιών κτλ. So in Apollonius, 1222–3, but already alluded to as early as 1041.

Other details are illuminating. Anything black or dark, as is well known, is naturally associated with the dead. At *Od*. 11. 32–3 an ὄιν . . . παμμέλαν' is mentioned. Apollonius chooses to focus attention on the clothing of the hero: 1031 ἐνὶ φάρεσι κυανέοισιν, 1204–5 φᾶρος . . . κυάνεον. In Homer Odysseus wears only χλαῖνάν τε χιτῶνά τε (10. 542). So Medea invokes Hecate σὺν ὀρφναίοις φαρέεσσιν 862. Apollonius' treatment of darkness in this scene is particularly impressive. At the end of the Hecate episode the light of day returns, with the elaborate lines 1223–4 ἤδη δὲ φόως νιφόεντος ὕπερθεν / Καυκάσου ἠριγενὴς ἠὼς βάλεν ἀντέλλουσα. This breaks in at mid-line, and is strikingly contrasted with the normal 'formulaic' use at the beginning of a passage.

These passages afford an instructive comparison in that they show Apollonius' readiness to adapt an Homeric situation of similar nature, the summoning of the ψυχαί there, the rousing of Hecate here. His technique of *variatio*,

[1] The libation-list in *Od*. 11. 27 ff. At A.R. 3. 222 ff. editors point out for κρῆναι πίσυρες *Od*. 5. 70. From this passage Apollonius borrows other details (*Od*. 69—Ap. 221, *Od*. 73—Ap. 222). For the fountains running with milk-wine-oil-water they instance *Il*. 22. 147 ff., the cold Scamander. But Apollonius is also drawing on the χοή passage of *Od*. 11. 27 ff. and putting it to a new use.

[2] Eustathius (1688. 22) says that the ancients took μελίκρητον in Homer as 'milk and honey', but that later it was understood as 'honey and water'.

At 2. 1272 there appears to be a libation of honey and wine: οἴνου ἀκρασίοιο μελισταγέας χέε λοιβάς. The schol. there give for

μελ. γλυκείας, ἡδείας, and most translators follow them (LSJ 'sweet as dropped honey'). Linguistically this seems unlikely. Because wine is ἀκηράσιος does not mean that it cannot be accompanied by honey. The phrase probably means λοιβὰς οἴνου καὶ μέλιτος σταζόντος. Cf. αἱματοσταγής, αἱμοσταγής, νεκταροσταγής, etc. Perhaps the schol. are here influenced by Homer's οἶνος μελιηδής, μελίφρων, or even by a reminiscence of *Od*. 9. 205 (οἶνον) ἡδὺν ἀκηράσιον.

For varieties of offerings see Platnauer on Eur. *IT* 162, Broadhead on A. *Pers*. 607–10, and *Od*. 11. 27 ff. mentioned above.

[3] Schol. BQV on *Od*. loc. cit. gloss ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα with εἰς πλάτος καὶ εἰς μῆκος.

especially in spreading out details so as to make the borrowings less obtrusive, is marked.

3. 1368   τόν ῥ’ ἀνὰ †χεῖρα† λαβών, μάλα τηλόθεν ἔμβαλε μέσσοις.

Fränkel is certainly right in sensing corruption here.

Gillies says that ἀνά means 'up on to', and compares Homer's ἀνὰ στόμα ἔχειν. This is obviously, as is ἀνὰ θυμὸν ἔχειν, quite different. He would have done better to quote such Homeric uses as these (LSJ give no indication of such a sense): *Il.* 10. 466 θῆκεν ἀνὰ μυρίκην, 'up on to', 18. 278 στησόμεθ’ ἄμ πύργους.

Vian explains similarly: ' "dans la main", avec idée de mouvement vers le haut'. For this he compares Eur. *Ion* 1455, but there the text is dubious, cf. Owen ad loc., Lloyd-Jones, *C.R.* n.s. xiii (1963), 157.

But, even granted that ἀνά could bear this sense, there remains this very serious difficulty: one would expect ἀνὰ . . . λαβών, which certainly looks like a case of tmesis, to mean 'take up, lift up', as, e.g., τόξα, ὅπλα, sim. (cf. LSJ s.v. ἀναλαμβάνω). One would further expect that what is being 'lifted up' is not Jason's hand but the stone (cf. Homer below).

The detail of *ease* in lifting heavy objects is found twice in Homer, *Il.* 5. 304, 12. 448, and Fränkel would read ῥεῖα. Since the manuscripts offer *XEIPA* it is plainly better to read χειρί, as he proposes in the *apparatus*. Cf. *Il.* 5. 302 λάβε χειρί = *Il.* 20. 285, Virg. *Aen.* 12.899 'manu correptum torquebat in hostem'.

4. 41–2   θυρέων ὑπόειξαν ὀχῆες
             ὠκείαις ἄψορροι ἀναθρῴσκοντες ἀοιδαῖς.

'The bolts of the doors gave way, springing back swiftly before her incantations.'

LSJ's interpretation is grotesque: s.v. ὠκύς I 2, 'of sound, *shrill*, ἀοιδαί, of the creaking of door-hinges'. Apart from the translation of ὠκείαις as ὀξείαις (which Spitzner in fact conjectured here), where are the 'door-hinges'? Their interpretation of ἀοιδή, on the other hand (cf. s.v. ᾠδή), is correct: '*spell, incantation*, A.R. 4. 42, 59'. Cf. the schol. here, ταῖς διὰ φαρμάκων ἐπῳδαῖς, and at 59, ἐπῳδαῖς. Apollonius seems to have been the first to use the simple ἀοιδή for ἐπαοιδή (Homer, etc.), but Sophocles had used ἀοιδός = ἐπῳδός, *Trach.* 1000, where see Jebb.

Fränkel obelizes ὠκείαις, but this must be wrong, as the Homeric passage which Apollonius is following shows:

Od. 21. 47   ἐν δὲ κληῗδ’ ἧκε, θυρέων δ’ ἀνέκοπτεν ὀχῆας
ibid. 50   πετάσθησαν δέ οἱ ὦκα.

Apollonius here is thinking of the effortless ease with which Penelope opened the doors in Homer, and he applies the situation to the spontaneous opening of doors before the power of a sorceress. The language is similar in both passages: ἀναθρῴσκω here corresponds to ἀνακόπτω in Homer, 'push back'.[1] To express the notion of speed (ὦκα) in *Od.* 21. 50 Apollonius chooses to attach an epithet to ἀοιδαῖς, where ὠκείαις governs not ἀοιδαῖς exclusively—the notion of fast or hurried incantations is not a particularly happy one[2]—but the sentence in general. ὠκείαις in essence is equivalent to an adverb.

---

[1] See Gow on Theoc. 24. 49. He does not, however, mention ἀναθρῴσκω here.
[2] Cf. Erbse, *Gnomon* xxxv (1963), 23.

This interpretation is confirmed by another passage in Apollonius, 3. 1318 θοῇ συνάρασσε κορώνῃ, which is modelled again on *Od.* 21. 46. There θοῇ is undoubtedly, as Vian notes, equivalent to an adverb θοῶς. See his note and the v.l. at *Od.* 24. 46 which he mentions.

4. 151–3   μήκυνε δὲ μυρία κύκλα,
                    οἷον ὅτε βληχροῖσι κυλινδόμενον πελάγεσσιν
                    κῦμα μέλαν κωφόν τε καὶ ἄβρομον.

152 κυλινδόμενον SGPE: -νος LA; οἷόν τε et -νος coniecit Fränkel.   153 μέλαν omisit
PE (? propter haplog. κυMAMEλαν); πέλει vel πέλεν Damsté.

κυλινδόμενον ... μέλαν is essentially the reading handed down: -ος LA would easily arise from a continuation of sense, viz. ὅγ' from 149. Damsté[1] felt the want of a main verb and proposed either πέλει or πέλεν. But the ellipse of a main verb in simile introductions is widespread, e.g. with ὅτε, see LSJ s.v. II. 1 (ὡς δ' ὅτε), Goodwin *MT* 485, Pind. *Olymp.* 6. 2, where Gildersleeve remarks: 'the ellipsis was hardly felt'. So here the general notion of the 'unfolding' wave can easily be gathered from 150–1. And perhaps, as Mr. Griffin remarks, he was thinking here in particular of *Il.* 2. 394 ὡς ὅτε κῦμα κτλ. Wilamowitz[2] at any rate found nothing wrong with this ellipse.

οἷον ὅτε introducing a simile is not Homeric: only twice in Apollonius, here and 1062–5 *infra*, where there is a main verb. But Apollonius uses ὥστε three times in similes, and on each occasion there is a different construction—indicative, subjunctive, ellipse.[3] The rarity of the form tells very much against Fränkel's alteration here. It is also difficult to imagine precisely what meaning he attaches to his suggestion.

Perhaps Damsté felt that μέλαν is awkwardly placed. But, in spite of the translators, κωφόν and ἄβρομον are quite clearly adverbs, and μέλαν cannot be dismissed on this count. In reality μέλαν is an integral part of the simile, and again Apollonius' Homeric learning is at play. It appears to have eluded the editors. Apollonius' model for this simile is *Il.* 14. 16 ff.

                    ὡς δ' ὅτε πορφύρῃ πέλαγος μέγα κύματι κωφῷ,
                    ὀσσόμενον λιγέων ἀνέμων λαιψηρὰ κέλευθα
                    αὔτως, οὐδ' ἄρα τε προκυλίνδεται οὐδετέρωσε,
                    πρίν τινα κεκριμένον καταβήμεναι ἐκ Διὸς οὖρον,
                    ὡς ὁ γέρων ὥρμαινε.

Some details are changed, but Apollonius is here comparing the unfolding of the serpent's coils to a κῦμα κωφόν. The process is elucidated by schol. BL ad Hom. loc. cit. They mention μελαίνεσθαι of water not yet ὕπαφρον: 'the Attics call this κολόκυμα, the Aeolians σκώληξ.' It seems clear that Apollonius knew of this. What I take to be happening is this. The song of Medea causes the serpent to act as it does at 149 ff. The storm which causes the groundswell here (cf. Leaf on *Il.* 14. 16) is still at a distance, and in a sense the song here is a mere preliminary. What will have devastating effects on the serpent is the second process, the application of the narcotic. So here the serpent's unfolding is a mere ripple: ἀλλὰ καὶ ἔμπης / ὑψοῦ ... κεφαλὴν ... ἀείρας κτλ. (153–4). The final sweep has yet to be made.

[1] *Adversaria ad A.R. Argonautica*, p. 52.   [2] *Hell. Dicht.* ii, p. 251.
[3] For variation in general in simile-introductions see Carpecken, *T.Cl.S.* xii (1952), 63 ff.

For Apollonius' idea of the κολόκυμα here compare the Suda's gloss κολόκυμα· κωφὸν κῦμα, and for the process see Bekk. *Anecd.* 62 (cited by Neil on Ar. *Eq.* 692) σκώληξ· ἡ κωφὴ τῶν κυμάτων ἐπανάστασις. The schol. on Homer knew that μελαίνεσθαι was associated with this. It is clear that Apollonius knew it too.

4. 1038   ὔμμε δὲ καὶ πάτρην καὶ δώματα ναιέμεν αὖτις
               ἤνυσα.
               ὔμμι codd.: correxi.

ὔμμι: 'for you I have brought it about that you should live again in . . .'. This is not very elegant, and there seems to be no precise parallel for the construction. For ὔμμε see Soph. *OT* 720; for the corruption 1. 660.

4. 1462   ἔκριθεν ἄλλυδις ἄλλος ἀναΐξας ἐρεείνειν.
               ἀναΐξας scripsi: ἐπαΐξας codd.

But 'rushed at' what? ἐπαΐξας cannot mean 'sped away' Mooney, 'started up' Coleridge, 'profectus' Lehrs. Nor is there any parallel for a meaning 'rushing to the search'. ἐπ- came from ἐπηλίνδητ' in the next line; and ἐπαΐξας is f.l. for ἀναΐξας at *Il.* 24. 440.

I append some briefer notes:

1. 280. The compound, as Giangrande remarks in *C.R.* n.s. xiii (1963), 154, *may* be right. It cannot however be defended by explaining it as = ἀφέμεν καὶ μεθέμεν (Ardizzoni). This misses the point of Fränkel's objection altogether. Another possibility (αὐτίχ' ἅπαξ or αὐτίκα πως Fränkel, αὐτίκ' ἄρα Giangrande) is αὐτίκ' ἄφαρ: cf. *Il.* 23. 593. Something strong seems required (αὐτίκα νῦν *Od.* 18. 203 *in re simili*).

1. 638. In spite of 3. 811, Call. *Lav. Pall.* 84 (cf. also *h.Dem.* 282), an imperfect, as Erbse says in *Gnomon* xxxv (1963), 27, does seem preferable: cf. A.R. 4. 959–60. If the rhythm is defensible, an improvement on ἔσχοντο (Meineke–Fränkel) would be εἴχοντο, which gives a Homeric usage: cf. *Od.* 9. 295, *Il.* 22. 409.

1. 1091. παρασχεδόν is universally taken as temporal by the editors and translators, but the Homeric passage which Apollonius is imitating shows clearly that it is not: *Il.* 10. 157 ff. τὸν παραστὰς ἀνέγειρε . . . λὰξ ποδὶ κινήσας. Cf. also *Od.* 10. 172 ff.

2. 955. The string of genitives seems ugly: ἀγανοί?

2. 1189. In spite of such uses as 2. 749, Q.S. 14. 504, κακόν here is intolerably weak. Perhaps κακήν, which would give a contrast with Jason's preceding words, a contrast which is found at 2. 1126 ff., 3. 340 ff. For κείνην (contemptuous) see 3. 320.

3. 1400. Vian actually places Morel's κατημύουσι χαμᾶζε in the text, but Hes. *fr.* 96. 86 Rz. is hardly decisive in the matter. A good argument for not accepting it is this: Homer prefers χαμᾶζε to ἔραζε, but in Apollonius the reverse is the case. χαμᾶζε occurs once, 4. 216 φύλλα χ. . . . . πέσεν (from *Il.* 6. 147, probably also a *variatio* of Hes. *Op.* 421), but ἔραζε six times, always at verse-end.

4. 1311. ἐν? Cf. Call. *Jov.* 16, Hom. *Od.* 7. 296, A.R. 3. 876 (ἐν Fränkel, whom Vian rightly follows, for ἐφ' codd.). ἐφ' ὕδασιν (ναίειν, sim.), is common, e.g. 1. 36, Τρίτωνος ἐφ' ὕδασιν Call. *fr.* 37. 1 Pf., where, however, the ἐφ' is properly used.

University of St. Andrews   M. CAMPBELL