FURTHER NOTES ON APOLLONIUS
RHODIUS[1]

1. 5–8   τοίην γὰρ Πελίης φάτιν ἔκλυεν . . .
          δηρὸν δ' οὐ μετέπειτα τεὴν κατὰ βάξιν Ἰήσων . . .

THE difficulty of τεὴν at 8 is notorious, and it has never been answered. The word refers back to Apollo, who has been invoked in the first line, but 'it is not in accord with epic convention that, after the invocation, reference should be made to it' (Seaton, *CR* xxviii [1914], 17). I suggest that we simply should not expect Apollonius to conform to the conventions of older epic: he does not do so in a number of other important respects. One is reminded here of the nervous restlessness of Callimachean poetry, particularly *Cer.* 25. There the goddess is addressed out of the blue with τὶν δ' αὐτᾷ, and emendation is unconvincing. Perhaps τεὴν in Apollonius is even more abrupt than the example in Callimachus. Yet Apollonius seems on many occasions to carry further the devices of his master. The astonishing parenthesis at 1. 623 f. is a good example (for Callimachus see Lapp, *De Call. Cyr. Tropis et Figuris* (1965), 52 f., F. Bornmann, *Call. Hymnus in Dianam*, l–li).

Attempts to eradicate the 'contravention' have been signally unsuccessful. For τοίην at 5 Fränkel conjectures Πτοίην, but τοίην has a formal parallel at 1. 1095 and is untouchable. A glance at Mooney's app. crit. will show that τεὴν at 8 simply will not yield to emendation. It was argued by Pfeiffer, and it is often repeated, that τεὴν is protected by Call. *Aetia*, fr. 18. 9 σήν, Φοῖβε, κατ' αἰσιμίην. The answering passage in Apollonius is 1. 411 f., but there σὴν διὰ μῆτιν occurs at 422, and in the same line μοίρῃ (cf. *Et. G.* s.v. αἰσιμία· . . . παρὰ τὴν αἶσαν, τὴν μοῖραν). Whatever the relation between these two episodes may be, it is surely wrong to claim that 'apparet Apollonium mirum illud τεὴν κατὰ βάξιν . . . finxisse ad exemplum loci Call. σήν, Φοῖβε κ.τ.λ.' (Pfeiffer, *Callimachus* ii, p. xlii).

1. 28 f.   φηγοὶ δ' ἀγριάδες κείνης ἔτι σήματα μολπῆς
            ἀκτῆς Θρηικίης Ζώνης ἔπι τηλεθόωσαι . . .

There are too many genitives in 28 and 29, as Fränkel sees. In 29 he writes ἀκτῇ Θρηικίῃ Ζώνης. But we require only ἀκτῇ Θρηικίης Ζώνης. It is closer to the manuscripts, Σ Nic. *Ther.* 460 (Θρηικίη Ζώνη) supports Θρηικίης, and, above all, G has the clearly transitional reading ἀκτῆς (Θρηικίας).

1. 41 f.   (Πολύφημος) ὃς πρὶν μὲν ἐρισθενέων Λαπιθάων,
            ὁππότε Κενταύροις Λαπίθαι ἐπὶ θωρήσσοντο,
            ὁπλότερος πολέμιζε· τότ' αὖ βαρύθεσκέ οἱ ἤδη
            γυῖα, μένεν δ' ἔτι θυμὸς ἀρήιος ὡς τὸ πάρος περ.

The genitive at 41 is awkward. Meineke's προμάχιζε for πολέμιζε at 43 is attractive, but there is an easier remedy. Apollonius distinguishes two periods

---

in Polyphemus' career. Before (πρὶν μὲν 41) he fought, but now (τότ' αὖ 43) he was old. ὁπλότερος, 'in his younger days', is by no means essential to this contrast. Apollonius may have written ὁπλότατος. Confusion of comparative and superlative is common; for Apollonius cf. M. L. West's certain πικρότερον for πικρότατον at 2. 222[1] (*CR* N.s. xiii [1963], 10).

Apollonius has ὁπλότατον at 4. 71, πανοπλοτάτην at 3. 244. ὁπλότερος with him either has a comparative sense (4. 1751, and 4. 971 [the younger of two]), or is more or less the equivalent of κουρότερος (1. 992, cf. 1. 693, and perhaps 1. 316).

1. 59 f.   Καινέα γὰρ ζωόν περ ἔτι κλείουσιν ἀοιδοί
             Κενταύροισιν ὀλέσθαι, ὅτε σφεας οἶος ἀπ' ἄλλων
             ἤλασ' ἀριστήων . . .

Giangrande, like others before him, pours scorn on ζωόν περ ἔτι: 'obviously they could only slay him when he was still alive . . . , and not when he was already dead. Such a text . . . (is) also untrue, because Caineus, who was ἄτρωτος, was *not* slain by the Centaurs' (*CR* N.s. xiii [1963], 154 n. 3). But Caineus *was*, technically speaking, 'dead': ἐδύσετο νειόθι γαίης (63). ζωόν περ ἔτι means 'Caineus, though he is[2] still alive, was actually killed', and this is a wry piece of irony, which one might expect in the approach to such a θαῦμα as this (cf. 154, *al.*). Apollonius' language is very like that of Pindar's ζώει μὲν . . . ἀποθανοῖσα βρόμῳ . . . Σεμέλα (*Ol.* 2. 25 f.), where ζώει is similarly placed in an emphatic position.

ἔτι κλείουσιν ἀοιδοί occurs shortly before this passage at 18. κλείουσιν ἀοιδοί must be regarded as suspicious, but ἔτι is certainly sound.

At 61 ἀριστήων is read by LASG and supported by Σ^AD *Il.* 1. 264. PE have ἀριστεύων, which Fränkel prefers: 'Lesen wir -ήων, so war Kaineus "allein" und nicht begleitet von "anderen grossen (Lapithen-) Helden" als er (leichtsinnigerweise) eine Horde von Kentauren überfiel' (*Einleitung zur kritischen Ausgabe der Arg.*, 83). This last word is an inaccurate translation, and 'leichtsinnigerweise' is wholly unjustified. The πρόμαχος Caineus (ἀριστεύς = πρόμαχος) *attacked* the Centaurs along with the other πρόμαχοι (the Lapithae), but left these behind by driving deep into the ranks and *putting* the enemy *to flight* (ἤλασ' 61).

ἀριστήων not only makes sense, but is actually desirable. οἶος ἀπ' ἄλλων occurs as a composite phrase at *h. Ven.* 79 οἶος ἀπ' ἄλλων /, id. 76, *Od.* 9. 192 οἶον ἀπ' ἄλλων. Apollonius abandons this fixity by extending the expression into the following line. This is common practice in him: consider 1. 880 f. and 4. 1301 f. against *Od.* 6. 292, or 1. 88 f. against *Od.* 11. 324, 16. 120, 17. 293. Similar is 3. 25 f. :

                 ἐπιπλόμεναι δέ μιν ἄμφω
        παιδὶ ἑῷ εἰπεῖν ὀτρύνομεν, αἴ κε πίθηται
        κούρην Αἰήτεω πολυφάρμακον οἶσι βέλεσσι
        θέλξαι ὀιστεύσας ἐπ' Ἰήσονι.

This text is now confirmed by *P. Oxy.* 2699; at 28 Brunck conjectured ὀιστεύσαντ', and Fränkel obelizes. But Apollonius is here abandoning the rigidity of

---

[1] This is regarded by Giangrande (*CQ* N.s. xvii [1967], 86 n. 1) as a case of superlative for comparative, but the alleged examples in Apollonius are doubtful: ὕστατον 4. 510 (ὕστερον West, p. 12) need only mean 'in the end'; μήκιστον at 1. 87 can be otherwise explained.

[2] 'is', not 'was'—the hackneyed ἔτι of the aition, and immediately intelligible as such.

the Homeric formula αἴ κε πίθηαι (πίθηται) /, which is extended to govern an infinitive as it does at *Od.* 22. 316 (in this case Apollonius was perhaps encouraged by *Il.* 21. 293 f. and 23. 82 f.).

In short, we had better not import into the text of 1. 61 the obvious thought that Caineus was performing an *aristeia*. ἀριστεύων is either a banal substitution, or a corruption originating from ἀριστήων ∼ ἀριστείων, a process of error now demonstrated by *P. Oxy.* 2699 at 3. 21. For the hyperbaton of ἀριστήων, if it can be called that, cf. 4. 105 f.

1. 177   Πελλήνης ἀφίκανον Ἀχαιΐδος.

There is an obvious similarity to Call. *Hec.* fr. 260. 27 Pf., Πελλήνην ἐφίκανεν Ἀχαιΐδα; but Apollonius' line presents a difficulty. As Fränkel has seen, ἀφικάνω nowhere else takes a genitive of separation, and Ardizzoni's long note does not encourage the belief that Apollonius could have used the verb thus. Fränkel's own solution is ἀφ' ἵκανον, which is unconvincing on general grounds and destroys the close correspondence with the Callimachean line.

It seems to me obvious that Apollonius wrote ἐφίκανον. For ἐφικάνω in the sense of 'come to the expedition' cf. ἐπελθέμεν at 1. 197; for the corruption see 1. 680, where the true reading[1] ἐφικάνει (for ἀφικάνει) has only just survived. Both poets use ἐφικάνω in a novel way: in Callimachus we expect 'come upon, overtake'; in Apollonius 'hit'.

1. 213 f.   Oreithyia bore the Boreads

     ἐσχατιῇ Θρῄκης δυσχειμέρου· †ἔνθ' ἄρα† τήνγε
     Θρηΐκιος Βορέης ἀνερέψατο Κεκροπίηθεν,
     Εἰλισσοῦ προπάροιθε χορῷ ἔνι δινεύουσαν,   215
     καί μιν ἄγων. ἔκαθεν, Σαρπηδονίην ὅθι πέτρην
     κλείουσιν ποταμοῖο παρὰ ῥόον Ἐργίνοιο,
     λυγαίοις ἐδάμασσε περὶ νεφέεσσι καλύψας.

Vestigia h.vv. habet *P. Oxy.* 2700.   213 ἔνθ' ἄρα Π quoque.   214 ἀνερέψατο Π, S (G) -ερείψατο LAPE.   215 Εἰλισσοῦ restitui ex Π (Εἴλεισοῦ): 'Ιλισσοῦ codd.   218 λυγαίοις: λυγκαιος Π, unde Λύγκαιος nom. propr. Kingston.

It is difficult to make anything of ἔνθ' ἄρα at 213. As Fränkel points out, neither ἔνθα nor ἄρα is suitable. One would expect γάρ, which will not fit. It is possible that Apollonius wrote αὐτὰρ ὁ τήνγε (cf. the 'doublet' passage of 2. 502 f.), with αὐτάρ in the reasonably common sense of 'now'.

At 215 Π offers Εἴλεισοῦ. I have always in reading this line automatically translated χορῷ ἔνι δινεύουσαν into εἰλισσομένην, and it seems possible that Apollonius wrote Εἰλισσοῦ for the sake of a pun. This spelling is attested for Apollonius here in some Parisian manuscripts (cf. Wellauer), in Pausanias and Lucian (cf. Pape–Benseler s.v.), and perhaps more significantly as a variant in the imitation of Apollonius at Orph. *A.* 221.[2] Nonnus puns on the name of the river with ἐλελίζω (*D.* 47. 13); for εἰλίσσομαι of an actual river in Alexandrine poetry cf. Call. *Del.* 105, A.R. 2. 368, 981, 3. 1220,[3] with the clever hint at

---

[1] So Fränkel: Ardizzoni returns to ἀφικάνει, which he would not have done if he had set 1. 680 beside 4. 1157. Cf. also Fränkel's note on 4. 513.

[2] Prof. Vian reminds me of the warrior Εἴλισσος in Q.S. 1. 228.

[3] The subject is νύμφαι ποταμηΐδες; here εἰλίσσονται (or - οντο) means not 'hanter' (Vian) but 'dance', the normal occupation of nymphs (cf. 1. 1135, 4. 1198). The ambiguity of εἰλίσσομαι recalls the spirit of Callimachus' fourth hymn.

that usage by Apollonius at 3. 1277 (where the text has been wrongly questioned).

Kingston argues for the proper name Λύγκαιος at 218. This causes a geographical difficulty, as H. Lloyd-Jones has pointed out,[1] but an even more decisive factor against it is that '*Thracian* Boreas carried her off, *and* the *Lyncaean one* raped her' is a type of writing which is foreign to Apollonius—he may be learned, but not in this way. Besides, λυγαίοις, one would have thought, is an essential part of the picture; it is attested with νέφος (cf. LSJ s.v.), and is a favourite word of Apollonius. And Apollonius nowhere else has *productio* at the beginning of the second foot when the complex $\stackrel{\scriptscriptstyle 1}{-}\,\smile\smile\,\stackrel{\scriptscriptstyle 2}{-}$ forms a single word. Perhaps κλείουσιν at the beginning of the preceding line caused a muddle.

1. 276 f.   ἑὸν παῖδ' ἀγκὰς ἔχουσα
          Ἀλκιμέδη.

Fränkel prints Rzach's πάιν, which the latter justified by applying strict metrical rules (*Sitz. Wien.*, 1878, 504 f.). One wonders whether such a procedure is ever advisable in this poet. Apollonius' model here tells against the proposal: *h. Cer.* 141 παῖδα . . . ἐν ἀγκοίνῃσιν ἔχουσα. Similarly at 1. 811 Rzach (pp. 454 f.) read κοῦραι for τε κόραι because the form κόρη is isolated in Apollonius; Fränkel follows suit. But κόρην occurs in the same Homeric hymn (439), and Callimachus admitted κόρη in an epic hymn (*Del.* 67).

1. 295 f. Alcimede is in despair at her son's departure, and Jason tries to console her with some homely moralizing:

          μή μοι λευγαλέας ἐνιβάλλεο μῆτερ ἀνίας
          ὧδε λίην, ἐπεὶ οὐ μὲν ἐρητύσεις κακότητος
          δάκρυσιν, ἀλλ' ἔτι κεν καὶ ἐπ' ἄλγεσιν ἄλγος ἄροιο.

Line 296 is senseless as it stands, but Fränkel's ἐρωήσεις is not a particularly rare word and ἐρητύσεις could hardly be called a simplification. We require 'you will not ward off disaster[2] (from me) by weeping'. I suggest ἐρητύσεις κακότητα (the genitive could easily have crept in from ἄλγος immediately below). ἐρητύω would be used for the more usual ἐρύκω (cf. *Il.* 15. 450), just as κατερητύω at 1. 494 is the equivalent of the (Homeric) κατερύκω, and as at 1. 171 ἐρητύω takes the infinitive on the analogy of the (post-Homeric) ἐρύκω.

1. 462. Jason in a fit of depression skulked off to a corner to brood over his destiny:

          τὸν δ' ἄρ' ὑποφρασθεὶς μεγάλῃ ὀπὶ νείκεσεν Ἴδας.

P. Oxy. 2695 has ἐπιφρασθείς, which Kingston (ad loc.) accepts. But as a learned equivalent of ὑπονοήσας ὑποφρασθείς is quite intelligible and as such must be regarded as *lectio difficilior*. Vian, *REG* lxxxii (1969), 231 remarks: 'ἐπιφρασθείς est confirmé par la glose de L θεωρήσας.' But this need only imply that the scribe who wrote θεωρήσας had no more idea than has LSJ of what ὑπο- would have to mean.

1. 513 f.   τοὶ δ' ἄμοτον λήξαντος ἔτι προύχοντο κάρηνα,
          πάντες ὁμῶς ὀρθοῖσιν ἐπ' οὔασιν ἠρεμέοντες
          κηληθμῷ· τοῖον σφιν ἐνέλλιπε θέλκτρον ἀοιδῆς.

[1] *REG* lxxxii (1969), 232.
[2] Not 'misery, distress': cf. κακόν 291, and, more remotely, κακόν 251.

The text of 515 is that given by Fränkel. LAG have τοῖόν, but SPE τοίην (with ἀοιδήν S); θέλκτρον is Meineke's conjecture for θέλκτην LAG, -νν PE.[1] This is suspiciously tidy, since the feminine τοίην is conveniently forgotten. τοῖον is common in an adverbial sense, and might therefore be liable to be substituted by a Homerizing scribe. On balance, τοίην seems the more likely reading. The only acceptable feminine form for the substantive is θέλξιν (some inferior manuscripts have θέλκτιν, see Wellauer—a compromise between an original -ιν termination and the -λκτ- of the bulk of the MSS.?).

The quarrelsome Argonauts were soothed by Orpheus' lyre. He had just treated them to a not very exciting cosmogony which looks (and is meant to look) uncomfortable in an epic setting. In the present lines Apollonius uses an Odyssean motif to make the contrast with Homer all the more striking. When Odysseus has ended his own vast epic, the audience react thus (*Od.* 11. 333 f., and again 13. 1 f.):

> ὣς ἔφαθ', οἱ δ' ἄρα πάντες ἀκὴν ἐγένοντο σιωπῇ,
> κηληθμῷ δ' ἔσχοντο κατὰ μέγαρα σκιόεντα.

This passage helps with the problem of 515. The audience sat ὀρθοῖσιν ἐπ' οὔασιν ἠρεμέοντες (Σ ἀνατετακότες τὰ ὦτα καὶ ἠρεμοῦντες ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ). Et. M. (510. 31) explains the word κηληθμός as follows: ἡ μεθ' ἡδόνης ἡσυχία (!)· κυρίως ἡ διὰ τῆς ἀκοῆς (!) ἡδόνη καὶ τέρψις καὶ θέλξις, where θέλξις means 'rapture'. Clearly one aspect of this gloss is covered by Apollonius at 514; if θέλξιν is right, then he will be covering another. θέλξις occurs as an explanation of κηληθμός also in Σ[V] ad Od. 13. 2.

At the close of 515 Vrat. has ἀοιδῇ, perhaps rightly; or ἀοιδή?

1. 516 f.
> οὐδ' ἐπὶ δὴν μετέπειτα κερασσάμενοι Διὶ λοιβάς,
> ᾗ θέμις, ἑστηῶτες ἐπὶ γλώσσῃσι χέοντο
> αἰθομέναις, ὕπνου δὲ διὰ κνέφας ἐμνώοντο.

οὐδ' ἐπὶ δὴν, obelized by Fränkel, is defended in different ways by Ardizzoni, and by Erbse, *Gnomon*, xxxv (1963), 27. But it is incredibly awkward and crabbed, and the chaotic note of Σ seems to conceal a vestige of the reading δηρὸν δ' οὐ μετέπειτα (cf. also Σ 1. 516, and 1. 8, 2. 1256, 3. 1330). The doublet passage (4. 1128) has αὐτίκα δὲ, 'presently'.

1. 520 f.
> ἐκ δ' ἀνέμοιο
> εὔδιοι ἐκλύζοντο τινασσομένης ἁλὸς ἄκραι.

Damsté (*Adversaria ad Ap. Rhod. Arg.*, 29 f.) conjectured ἀκταί, and this is accepted by Fränkel and Ardizzoni. His main complaint was that ἄκραι should not follow so soon after ἄκριας at 520. But Apollonius has the jingle ἀκροτάτας . . . ἄκριας at 1. 1273,[2] and although ἀκτή is commoner in such contexts as the present one (e.g. 2. 554, Q.S. 3. 511, 601), ἄκρη is found too (Q.S. 1. 322, cf. *Il.* 17. 264?), and has rarity on its side.

1. 571 f.
> Ἄρτεμιν, ἣ κείνας σκοπιὰς ἁλὸς ἀμφιέπεσκεν
> ῥυομένη καὶ γαῖαν Ἰωλκίδα.

---

[1] Prof. Vian kindly informs me that S has θέλκτον before, and θέλκτιν after, correction (see below).

[2] This plainly recalls the jingle of *Od.* 12.

11 ἀκροτάτη πρόεχ' ἀκτή (where there was a variant ἀκρότατος, which Apollonius could not have recognized). Ardizzoni's note here is unfortunate.

Rhythm and sense would be improved, I think, by κείνης (-ας by assimilation);
cf. 1. 986 πόρους κείνης ἁλός.

1. 572 f.   τοὶ δὲ βαθείης
              ἰχθύες ἀίσσοντες ὕπερθ᾽ ἁλός.

On μέθυ λεῖβον ὕπερθ᾽ ἁλός at 534 Fränkel comments: 'ὕπερθ᾽ ἁλός susp.
(aliter 573, 622)'. But ὕπερθ᾽ ἁλός is protected by Q.S. 14. 378 f. I differ on the
question of ὕπερθε. At 534 and 622 (μιν ὕπερθ᾽ ἁλὸς ἧκε φέρεσθαι), ὕπερθε means
'out over, from a point strictly above, or vertical with' the sea. ὕπερθε at 573
does not fall into this category, and the fact that Apollonian MSS. are commonly
subject to contamination by reminiscence leads me to suspect that at 573 the
original was ὑπὲξ ἁλός. This gains strong support from a parallel situation at
4. 933 f., ὡς δ᾽ ὁπόταν δελφῖνες ὑπὲξ ἁλὸς εὐδιόωντες / σπερχομένην ἀγεληδὸν
ἐλίσσωνται περὶ νῆα.[1]

The Quintus passage mentioned above is noteworthy from another point of
view. At 14. 379 f. Quintus writes: πολλὰ θεοῖσιν / εὐχόμενοι μακάρεσσιν
ἀκηδέα νόστον ὀπάσσαι. This plainly owes something to A.R. 1. 885 (cf. also 1.
249), but Quintus, who in this episode uses A.R. 1. 525–85 a good deal,[2] must
have been influenced also by 1. 556 νόστον ἐπευφήμησεν ἀκηδέα νισσομένοισιν.
There is a complication: in this line Epim. Homer. (Cramer, Anecd. Oxon. 1.
84. 7) s.v. ἀπηρής has the reading ἀπηρέα for ἀκηδέα, and this is taken into
Apollonius' text by modern editors. Yet 'Quintus must have read ἀκηδέα in his
text.[3] It may be that ἀπηρέα really belongs to the προέκδοσις, and was eradi-
cated by Apollonius on the principle that an unusual word is better used only
once (cf. 1. 888).

1. 593 f.   . . . ἀκτήν τ᾽ αἰγιαλόν τε δυσήνεμον εἰσορόωντες·
                ἠῶθεν δ᾽ Ὁμόλην αὐτοσχεδὸν εἰσορόωντες
                πόντῳ κεκλιμένην παρεμέτρεον.

εἰσορόωντες at 594 must be right (cf. 1. 1166 παρέμετρεον εἰσορόωντες, and
Giangrande CR n.s. xiii [1963], 155). It does not seem to have been noticed
that εἰσορόωντες at 593, which is often conjectured away (see Fränkel), is put
beyond all doubt by 4. 660 ἀκτὰς Τυρσηνίδας εἰσορόωντες. Fränkel's tentative
transposition of 593 after 596 does not do very much to alleviate the repetition.
593 therefore must be excised, but the rare δυσήνεμον shows that it must be
from Apollonius' pen: προέκδοσις?

1. 616. The poet reflects upon the character of the Lemnian women:

              ὦ μέλεαι ζήλοιό τ᾽ ἐπισμυγερῶς ἀκόρητοι.

But ὦ does not make sense: read ὤ.

1. 790 f.   ἡ δ᾽ ἐγκλιδὸν ὄσσε βαλοῦσα
              παρθενικὰς ἐρύθηνε παρηίδας.

_____

[1] An echo in Mosch. Eur. 118 Νηρεῖδες
ἀνέδυσαν ὑπὲξ ἁλός (δελφίς 117).

[2] Cf. F. Vian, Recherches sur les Posthomerica
de Quintus de Smyrne, 81 f.

[3] ἀκηδέα . . . νόστον at A.R. 4. 822 seems
to be too far away to have influenced either
Quintus, or, as Fränkel appears to believe,

the scribes of Apollonius at 1. 556. Here we
might have expected as a simplification not
ἀκηδέα but, as at 1. 888, ἀπήμονα, which is
a favourite word of Apollonius' and which
bears some visual resemblance to the rarer
word.

Hypsipyle is confronted by Jason, and she blushes. Fränkel writes παρθενικὴ, 'potius quam -ίας; non enim in Apollonii more foret "virginales genas".' A further reason he gives is that adjectival παρθενικός is found nowhere else in Apollonius (at 4. 909 παρθενίην is clearly right). The change is unnecessary. First, Fränkel's 'non in Ap. more' is no more convincing than his similar claim about 4. 1406 f., well defended by Erbse, *Gnomon*, xxxv (1963), 27. Secondly, there are clear imitations in Nonnus, *D.* 1. 83 f. αἰδομένη (cf. αἰδομένη Ap. 1. 792) δέ / παρθενίην πόρφυρε παρηῗδα Παλλάς, Q.S. 14. 41 καλὰς ἀμφερύθηνε παρηῗδας,[1] and Orph. *A.* 230 ἀργεννὰς ἐρύθηνε παρηῗδας (cj. Stephanus). The Nonnus passage might be thought to support παρθενίας (so Ardizzoni, already rejected by Fränkel himself), but the isolated adjectival παρθενικὰς would be matched by an isolated variant at *Od.* 11. 245 λῦσε δὲ παρθενίην (-κὴν) ζώνην and is clearly preferable. παρθενικός, which occurs in later poetry (see Bühler on Mosch. *Eur.* 72-3, p. 117), may well have occurred in Hellenistic works now lost.

A. Hurst, *Apollonius de Rhodes: Manière et Cohérence*, 61 n. 4 remarks: '. . . pour l'épithète [παρθενικάς], elle peut convenir aux joues, mais non à la reine qui n'est plus vierge (1. 807)'. This will hardly do.

1. 934 f.
    καὶ δὴ τοίγ' ἐπὶ νυκτὶ διάνδιχα νηὸς ἰούσης
    δίνῃ πορφύροντα διήνυσαν Ἑλλήσποντον.

τοίγ' at 934 looks innocuous enough, but four of the Parisini have τῆγε (which Hoelzlin conjectured), and D, whose testimony must command respect, τῆσγε (i.e. the iota subscript changed into a sigma, as Brunck says). The Argonauts, we are told in the preceding lines, made good progress. They passed the Rhoetaean headland, Dardania, Abydos, Percote, Abarnis, Pityeia,[2] all of them ἐννύχιοι (929). One would expect 934 to say not 'and indeed they in the night', but rather 'yes, and in *this* night too they passed right through the Hellespont', that is, τῆδ' ἐπὶ νυκτὶ. This expression occurs in line 516 of the προέκδοσις.

1. 1006 f.
    ὡς οἱ ἐνὶ ξυνοχῇ λιμένος πολιοῖο τέταντο
    ἐξείης, ἄλλοι μὲν ἐς ἁλμυρὸν ἀθρόοι ὕδωρ
    δύπτοντες κεφαλὰς καὶ στήθεα, γυῖα δ' ὕπερθεν
    χέρσῳ τεινάμενοι.

The Earthborn have been cut down by the Argonauts. In these lines they are compared to timbers which woodmen lay out in rows on the sea-shore. The precise point of this grotesquerie is hard to see;[3] it may be that Apollonius considered the climax of 1011 amusing:

    ἄμφω ἄμ' οἰωνοῖσι καὶ ἰχθύσι κύρμα γένεσθαι,

[1] Q.S. 14. 39 f. draws heavily on Apollonius. One imitation in particular is significant. At 46 Quintus says of Helen /ἕσπετο νισσομένοιο κατ' ἴχνιον ἀνδρὸς ἑοῖο. This is relevant to A.R. 1. 575 f. ἀγραύλοιο κατ' ἴχνια σημαντῆρος / μυρία μῆλ' ἐφέπονται, where editors read PE's μετ' (κατ' LAS: deest G), the expected but by no means invariable preposition. It seems to me unlikely that they are right.

[2] At 932 Περκώτην δ' ἐπὶ τῆ κ.τ.λ., P. Oxy. 2698 offers τ'. Kingston (ad loc.) claims that there is nothing to choose between the two; but δ' is supported by such passages as 2. 649-52, 4. 572 f.

[3] Cf. H. Fränkel, *Noten zu den Arg. des Ap.*, 127.

for the line has a lofty epic ring, and Homer had never succeeded in giving the tag κύρμα γένεσθαι such wide application!

At any rate, the description quoted above contains a joke which no one seems to have detected. The Giants are lying outstretched in the sea and on the shore. The description is next reversed (1009 f.):

<p style="text-align:center">τοὶ δ' ἔμπαλιν, αἰγιαλοῖο
κράατα μὲν ψαμάθοισι, πόδας δ' εἰς βένθος ἔρειδον.</p>

The tops of the bodies lie in the sea, the lower parts on the shore, or conversely, the upper parts are sprawled on the shore, the lower in the deep sea. But γυῖα δ' ὕπερθεν at 1008 immediately suggests the *upper* limbs; ὕπερθεν at line-end in this sense is common in Homer (*Il.* 5. 122, *al.*). The γυῖα are of course the lower ones, as the following lines make clear. ὕπερθεν, 'up on the shore', is not really clarified until we reach εἰς βένθος at 1010. If Apollonius had wanted to be quite unambiguous he could have replaced the dispensable ὕπερθεν with ἔνερθεν, = πόδας 1010 (cf. *Il.* 13. 75 ἔνερθε πόδες καὶ χεῖρες ὕπερθε). Apollonius hints at what we are to make of ὕπερθεν as early as 945, where the creature's six arms are described:

<p style="text-align:center">αἱ μὲν ἀπὸ στιβαρῶν ὤμων δύο, ταὶ δ' ὑπένερθεν
τέσσαρες αἰνοτάτῃσιν ἐπὶ πλευρῆς ἀραρυῖαι.</p>

I. 1051 f.
<p style="text-align:center">αἶψα δ' αὐτῆς
πλῆτο πόλις στονόεντος ὑποτροπίῃ πολέμοιο.</p>

Σ explain ὑποτροπίῃ at 1052 as φυγῇ, and the commentators follow suit. But the flight of the Doliones has already been described in some detail at 1039 f. Their champions were killed in hand-to-hand combat, the rest gave way and ran for their lives, everyone burst into the gates in a confused mass, and soon the city was filled with the cry of battle.

ὑποτροπίη is a new formation for ὑποτροπή, like ἀποτροπίη ∼ ἀποτροπή at 4. 1504 or ἀμβολίη ∼ ἀναβολή at 1. 861, *al.* ὑποτροπή can mean either 'repulse' or 'recurrence' (LSJ s.v.). It is the latter sense that is meant here: 'with the return of doleful war'. When the Doliones spotted the Argonauts returning, they failed to recognize them,

<p style="text-align:center">ἀλλά που ἀνδρῶν
Μακριέων εἴσαντο Πελασγικὸν ἄρεα κέλσαι·
τῷ καὶ τεύχεα δύντες ἐπὶ σφίσι χεῖρας ἄειραν (1023 f.).</p>

Σ on 1024a, in a very well-informed note, remark that this people had invaded before: οἵτινες ἀεὶ πολεμοῦσι τοῖς Κυζικηνοῖς; Valerius Flaccus knew this too: cf. his allusive 'soliti rediere Pelasgi' at 3. 45. Now war had come again, bringing sorrow to the inhabitants of Cyzicus.

I. 1213
<p style="text-align:center">δίου Θειοδάμαντος.</p>

Apollonius does not devote much space to the story of Theiodamas, and at 1220 he openly admits to being allusive. Heracles wanted a pretext for making war on the unjust Dryopians. He met Theiodamas, who was ploughing a field, demanded an ox from him, and killed him when he refused. The obvious difficulty is that Theiodamas ploughs fields yet is still important enough to occasion a war. He is, however, no ordinary man of the field, and the clue lies

in the epithet δίου.[1] Theiodamas is on a par socially with Eumaeus in the *Odyssey*. Eumaeus is called δῖος several times (*Od.* 16. 56 etc.), and δῖος is the equivalent of ἀγαθός, meaning something like 'trusty' (cf. Gow on Theocr. 12. 12). Theiodamas was a ploughman, and was δῖος; his death involved his country in war. The missing link must be that Theiodamas was the beloved and faithful servant of the king (Laogoras according to Apollod. 2. 155). The king was incensed by the treatment Theiodamas received, and declared war on the aggressor.

The 'beloved servant' need not be inconsistent with the 'ploughman'. Theiodamas might be imagined as having a field of his own, just as Eumaeus owned a slave. Naturally he would depend on his own field (and ox) for his food.

1. 1226 f. αἱ μέν, ὅσαι σκοπιὰς ὀρέων λάχον ἢ καὶ ἐναύλους,
αἳ δὲ καὶ ὑλήωροι, ἀπόπροθεν ἐστιχόωντο.

1227 αἱ δὲ καὶ *Et. G.* s.v. ὑλή (αἱ ego): αἵ γε μὲν codd. (αἶδε S, μὴν A).

αἵ γε μὲν is shown to be wrong by A. Köhnken, *Apollonios Rhodios und Theokrit* (*Zetemata*, Heft xii [1965]), 56 n. 3. He adopts *Et. G.*'s αἱ δὲ καὶ, but this is better reinterpreted, as S's αἶδε indicates, as αἱ δὲ καὶ, producing αἱ μὲν ὅσαι λάχον, αἱ δὲ καὶ (ἔσαν); cf. 4. 1151. The process of corruption is straightforward: αἱ δὲ καὶ ∼ αἱ δὲ μὲν (ex 1226) ∼ αἵ γε μὲν.

1. 1248 f. ἀμφὶ δὲ χῶρον
φοίτα κεκληγώς, μελέη δέ οἱ ἔπλετ' ἀϋτή.

This describes the desperate search of Polyphemus for Hylas. At the end of 1249 ἔπλετ' ἀϋτή is the reading of *Et. G.M.* s.v. μέλεον; ἔπλετο φωνή codd. Ardizzoni defends the latter by reference to *Il.* 14. 400 ἔπλετο φωνή, and draws attention to the reading of Aristarchus ἵκετ' ἀϋτή for ἵκετο φωνή at *Il.* 11. 466. Fränkel believes that it is impossible to decide, but the balance of probability is firmly on the side of ἔπλετ' ἀϋτή: (*a*) Q.S. 3. 417 has ἔπλετ' ἀϋτή /; (*b*) Theocritus (Hylas, 11. 59) writes ἀραιὰ δ' ἵκετο φωνά / ἐξ ὕδατος;[2] *variatio* in Apollonius might be expected (Köhnken, op. cit., 69 n. 1); (*c*) ἀϋτῇ occurs a little later at 1272. In the descriptions of Polyphemus and Heracles at 1240–72 many repetitive elements occur (e.g. 1248 ∼ 1272, 1249 ∼ 1269), and this fact supports ἀϋτή at 1249; (*d*) Apollonius is fond of the word ἀϋτή, always at line-end (12 instances apart from 1. 1249), whereas φωνή occurs only thrice (3. 635, 4. 29, 70), where all three resemble one another but not the use postulated here; (*e*) ἔπλετο φωνή is Homeric, and Homericisms are liable to be foisted into the text of this epic, particularly at the close of the line.

1. 1305 f. Heracles killed the Boreads on Tenos,

καὶ ἀμήσατο γαῖαν
ἀμφ' αὐτοῖς στήλας τε δύω καθύπερθεν ἔτευξεν,
ὧν ἑτέρη, θάμβος περιώσιον ἀνδράσι λεύσσειν,
κίνυται ἠχήεντος ὑπὸ πνοιῇ Βορέαο.

---

[1] Giangrande (*CQ* n.s. xvii [1967], 90 n. 3) sees the true meaning of δῖος (he refers to Theocr. 25. 51), but he does not carry his suggestion through.

[2] μελέη in Apollonius means not 'miserable' or 'vain' but 'feeble'; cf. Theocritus'

ἀραιά (= ἀσθενής, Gow ad loc.), Vian on A.R. 3. 487, and 1. 1247, where the wild animal to whom Polyphemus is compared exhausts itself with roaring (βρέμει ἄσπετον, ὄφρα κάμῃσιν).

No one has accepted Apollonius' invitation to guess *whose* pillar this was. It must have been that of Zetes, whose name was popularly interpreted as ζαήτης (Σ Pind. *P.* 4. 324; Calais is ὁ καλῶς ἄων). When the brothers return from their pursuit of the Harpies at 2. 426 f., it is Zetes who gets the limelight, not least because he can be described as ἔτ' ἄσπετον ἐκ καμάτοιο / ἆσθμ' ἀναφυσιόων (430 f.).

1. 1321 f.   Πολύφημον ἐπὶ προχοῇσι Κίοιο
πέπρωται Μυσοῖσι περικλεὲς ἄστυ καμόντα
μοῖραν ἀναπλήσειν Χαλύβων ἐν †ἀπείρονι† γαίῃ.

Apollonius of all people would not claim that the land of the Chalybes was 'limitless'. Rühnken conjectured ἀτειρέϊ (cl. 2. 375), but it has never won a place in the text. I suggest as an alternative ἀπηνέϊ. Dionysius the Periegete, who copied Apollonius' description of the Chalybes at 2. 374 f., writes

τοῖς δ' ἐπὶ καὶ Χάλυβες στυφελὴν καὶ ἀπηνέα γαῖαν
ναίουσιν (768 f.).

ἀπηνής in this sense is assigned solely to late prose authors by LSJ. But such an extension of usage is readily assignable to an Alexandrine poet. *Et. M.* s.v. explain the word as σκληρός or στυφελός, and Apollonius calls the land of the Chalybes στυφελήν at 2. 1005. If απηνει became απεινει by a phonetic error, ἀπείρονι would be the natural result, especially as ἐπ' ἀπείρονα γαῖαν is a common line-ending in Homer (cf. Ardizzoni's note).

1. 1326 f.   ἦ, καὶ κῦμ' ἀλίαστον ἐφέσσατο νειόθι δύψας·
ἀμφὶ δέ οἱ δίνῃσι κυκώμενον ἄφρεεν ὕδωρ
πορφύρεον, κοίλην δὲ διὲξ ἁλὸς ἔκλυσε νῆα.

Fränkel's δ' ἀίξ for διὲξ at 1328 requires little discussion. ἀίξ, as one might expect (4. 820; cf. κατάιξ, καταιγίς, sim.), refers to wind, not to sea, nor is there any exaggeration at 1328, as the description of the turmoil at 1327 shows; for κλύζειν of propulsion by impact cf. Hoelzlin's note and 1. 257, where ἐπικλύσαι clearly means 'swamp and carry out of sight'.

When Glaucus had delivered his prophecy to the astounded Argonauts, he dived into the sea. The ship is described at 1328 as κοίλην. This may have some point (the ship was buoyant?) but it does not have very much. The emphasis is clearly on the enormous rift which Glaucus made in the sea. This suggests κοίλης; the jump has caused a hollow in the sea, around which the swirling water foamed. Similarly at 2. 594 f. the Argo ὥστε κυλίνδρος ἐπέτρεχε κύματι λάβρῳ / προπροκαταίγδην κοίλης ἁλός. κοίλην would be an easy assimilation to νῆα, especially with the Homeric tag κοῖλαι νῆες (which Apollonius avoids) to help it along.

1. 1348 f.   ἐπηπείλησε δὲ [sc. Ἡρακλέης] γαῖαν
†Μυσίδ'† ἀναστήσειν αὐτοσχεδόν, ὁππότε μή οἱ
ἢ ζωοῦ εὕροιεν Ὕλα μόρον ἠὲ θανόντος.

Variants at 1349: μυσίδ' LASG: μυσίδα PE. ἀναστήσειν LASPE: ἀναστήσειν G. Textus receptus: Μυσίδ' ἀναστήσειν. ἀναστήσειν is the majority reading, and G's ἀναστήσειν looks like a conjecture; the latter is certainly *lectio facilior*, for the syncopated form (cf. 4. 1325) is what one would expect to be the genuine one, not the other way round. PE have Μυσίδα without elision, and this

indicates a gloss, of which PE are notoriously full. Surely γαῖαν / Μυσῶν ἀνστήσειν; cf. 1. 1298 Μυσῶν ἐπὶ γαῖαν, the language here as a whole (γαῖαν Μυσῶν, ὁππότε μὴ ⟨Μυσοὶ⟩ εὕροιεν), and Σ at 1. 1349, which shows in reverse how such a gloss might have crept in.

1. 1360 f.   οἱ δὲ χθονὸς εἰσανέχουσαν
          ἀκτὴν ἐκ κόλποιο μάλ᾽ †εὐρεῖαν† ἐσιδέσθαι
          φρασσάμενοι . . .

No one, I imagine, will accept εὐρεῖαν; SPE's εὐρεῖάν γ᾽ provides the obvious metrical stop-gap. Read εὐρείην: cf. v.l. Od. 5. 163, 251 εὐρείην, A.R. 2. 375 τρηχείην (τρηχεῖαν S: τρηχεινὴν Hermann, τρηχαλέην Koechly), Orph. A. 181 τρηχείην (τρηχαλέην vel τρηχεινὴν Hermann, Orphica, p. xii), βαθείην Q.S. 6. 645 (P, Vian: βαθὺν H).

Fränkel's suggestion that the original sense was 'valde idoneam (ad appellendum et aquationem) se conspexisse rati' is impossible. φράζεσθαι c. infin. is not Apollonian, and ἐσιδέσθαι occurs epexegetically at 3. 958. Cf. also A. Wifstrand, *Von Kallimachos zu Nonnos*, 107.

2. 23. Polydeuces' reply to the swaggering Amycus:

          θεσμοῖς γὰρ ὑπείξομεν ὡς ἀγορεύεις.

Köhnken, op. cit., 97 n. 1 accepts Arnaldus's οἷς for ὡς, but ὡς is right. Once in Homer (Od. 13. 147) ὡς ἀγορεύεις, exactly as here, means 'do as you tell (me to do)' (with the variant ὡς σὺ κελεύεις!). The paraphrase of Σ at 23 resembles their explanation of οἷς ἀγόρευεν / θεσμοῖσιν at 2. 149, but this need only mean that they have been influenced by that passage here.

2. 27 f. Amycus was infuriated by the straight talking of Polydeuces. His reaction is illustrated by a simile (25 f.). He is like a lion who has been wounded by a hunter:

          ὁ δ᾽ ἰλλόμενός περ ὁμίλῳ
τῶν μὲν ἔτ᾽ οὐκ ἀλέγει, ἐπὶ δ᾽ ὄσσεται οἰόθεν οἶος
ἄνδρα τόν, ὅς μιν ἔτυψε παροίτατος οὐδ᾽ ἐδάμασσεν.

At 28 Struve and Madvig conjectured οἶον. It has had little success, but it is inescapable. Amycus is obsessed with the killing of the πρόμος Polydeuces, just as the lion fixes his gaze *solely* on the man who has struck a blow. The solitude both of Amycus and of the lion is irrelevant: the μέν/δέ clause of 28 is concerned wholly with the lion's behaviour towards the man who has wounded him as opposed to the general throng.

The note of Σ has aided the survival of οἶος in Apollonius' text: μόνος οὖν ὑπάρχων μόνον ἐκεῖνον προσβλέπει τὸν τρώσαντα, 'the lion, being all alone, gazes at that man alone'. Σ is interpreting the Homeric οἰόθεν οἶος (Il. 7. 39, 226) as μόνος μόνον, but it cannot mean that here. The expression elsewhere in Apollonius means 'absolutely alone'.[1] In addition, the action of the two parties involved is not, as in the Homeric examples, a *reciprocal* one (cf. M. Leumann, *Homerische*

---

[1] 4. 418 οἰόθεν οἶον, 1198 οἰόθεν οἶαι, and οἰόθεν alone 1. 270. At 3. 1169 f. ὁ δ᾽ οἰόθεν οἶος ἑταίρων / Ἴδας ἧστ᾽ ἀπάνευθε δακὼν χόλον, the construction has not been properly explained. οἰόθεν οἶος means 'quite

alone', but οἶος also governs the genitive ἑταίρων, as οἶος in, e.g., Il. 11. 74 and A.R. 2. 15, correctly explained by Mooney ad loc.; ἀπάνευθε is adverbial. For οἶος ἑταίρων see 1. 1240, 4. 912.

Wörter, 258f.) ; that is, Apollonius would have to mean 'the lion looks at the hunter alone (who alone looks at him)', which is absurd. A scribe has remembered his Homer here : in Homer οἰόθεν οἶος does not occur in the oblique cases.

2. 102 f.   πρῶτός γε μὲν ἀνέρα Κάστωρ
                        ἤλασ' ἐπεσσύμενον κεφαλῆς ὕπερ.

When Polydeuces has killed Amycus, the Bebrycians attack. Castor is the first to claim a victim. There follows a list of other single combats, and in this the victims are named. Accordingly, since one might expect a proper name in 102 also, the text has either been emended (e.g. Μεγάνορα Brunck) or regarded as lacunose (Fränkel), the latter against the evidence of *P. Oxy.* 1179. I suspect that Apollonius has here pulled a fast one on his readers. The battle scene echoes *Il.* 5. 37 f., which is heralded by ἕλε δ' ἄνδρα ἕκαστος / ἡγεμόνων. What better way to recall the passage than to make ἀνέρα a *proper* name? There is a similar list at 1. 1040 f., where the Argonauts kill the champions of the Doliones. Of two of these, Telecles and Megabrontes, Σ remark πέπλακε τὰ ὀνόματα ταῦτα Ἀπολλώνιος, οὐκ ἀπὸ ἱστορίας ἔλαβεν. οὕτω Ταρραῖος. The list as a whole in fact savours of invention, and among the Doliones is one Βασιλεύς (1043), which seems only slightly less odd than an Ἀνήρ among the Bebrycians.

At 65 Aretus and Ornytus bound gauntlets on Amycus. Of these Apollonius says οὐδέ τι ᾔδειν / νήπιοι ὕστατα κεῖνα κακῇ δήσαντες ἐπ' αἴσῃ (65–6). Fränkel insists that since we hear of the death of Aretus (114 f.), we expect a mention of Ornytus too. This is true, but we have no right to demand it; perhaps Apollonius got more interested in Oreites (or Oreides), Ἀμύκοιο βίην ὑπέροπλος ὀπάων (110).

2. 549 f.   οἱ δ' ὅτε δὴ σκολιοῖο πόρου στεινωπὸν ἵκοντο
                τρηχείης σπιλάδεσσιν ἐεργμένον ἀμφοτέρωθεν,
                δινήεις δ' ὑπένερθεν ἀνακλύζεσκεν ἰοῦσαν
                νῆα ῥοός, πολλὸν δὲ φόβῳ προτέρωσε νέοντο.

Fränkel deletes the δ' of 551. But Apollonius admits a sequence of δέs at moments of high excitement,[1] notably at 2. 556–73 and 1. 1235–9, where at 1236 αὐτίκα δ' ἦγε replaces the expected αὐτίκ' ἄρ' ἦγε (1. 655 f., 2. 1080 f.). Similar is 4. 23–9; accordingly at 27 I conjecture δὲ for τε.

φόβῳ in the next line has gone out of favour (see Fränkel's app. crit.). The reason advanced is that φόβῳ spoils the climax of 575 and 577. This is very shortsighted. Here the Argonauts approach the Symplegades, and naturally they are 'afraid'. Later the suspense heightens: then they tremble visibly (τρόμος 575), and are gripped by αἰνότατον (!) δέος (577).

The Argonauts proceed further still: ἐν δ' ἄρα μέσσαις / Πληγάσι δινήεις εἶχεν ῥόος (595 f.). Here Fränkel conjectures εἷλεν, claiming that an aorist is required, and comparing Σ's κατέσχεν. But an aorist would ruin the sequence of imperfects from 594 on; the aorists only begin when Athene intervenes at 598 f. How reliable are Σ? They confuse tenses in their paraphrase of 590 f. (ἀπόρουσεν ∼ ὑπέστρεφε), and κατέσχεν is suspicious here since it appears as an explanation of the awkward ἀντέσπασε just below at 598.

---

[1] Prof. Vian believes that the ὅτε δὴ of 549 is picked up by δὴ τότ' ἔπειθ' at 555; to my ear Apollonius rather loses sight of the ὅτε δὴ, and the sequence of δέs mentioned above seems dominant (at 1. 318 f. ἐπεί ῥα . . ., λίπ' . . ., ἀκτὴν δ' ἵκανεν, SG's ἀκτήνδ' is probably, but not certainly, correct).

2. 611 f. Tiphys addresses the Argonauts after their passage through the Symplegades:

> ἔλπομαι αὐτῇ νηὶ †τόγ'† ἔμπεδον ἐξαλέασθαι
> ἡμέας.

Fränkel rightly obelizes the meaningless τόγ'. Since there seems to be nothing that will fit,[1] τόγ' is very probably a line-filler, and this invites the inference that ἔμπεδον is an intrusive gloss or has come from 644 below. The most likely word is διαμπερὲς (cf. 2. 319).

2. 794 f.   ὄφρ' ἐβάλοντο
> οὖρα βαθυρρείοντος ὑφ' εἰαμεναῖς Ὑπίοιο.

ἐφ' Schneider, Fränkel. But ὑφ' means 'on the banks of', as at h. Hom. Ap. 18 ὑπ' Ἰνωποῖο ῥεέθροις; see Allen–Sykes–Halliday ad loc., and note especially the variant ὑφ' (for ἐφ') Ὑρμίνη at Il. 2. 616 (cf. Ap. ὑφ' ... Ὑ.?).

Some passages in Apollonius involving prepositions can conveniently be grouped together here:

(1)   2. 1229 ὑπαὶ ῥιπῆς ἀνέμοιο. At 3. 970, where the same expression occurs, ὑπὸ is the majority reading; only ED have ὑπαί. One must reckon with the possibility that ὑπαί at 2. 1229 is a metrical 'correction' of a common type (as παραί for παρά often, in Apollonius e.g. 1. 217).

(2)   3. 44 ἧστο δόμῳ δινωτὸν ἀνὰ θρόνον ἄντα θυράων. One cannot be seated 'up on to a chair'. δινωτῷ ἐνὶ θρόνῳ Fränkel; perhaps better δινωτῷ ἀνὰ θρόνῳ, more pompous-sounding than ἐνὶ, and exactly suited to the tone of the passage. For ἀνά c. dat. cf. 2. 699 (3. 166 is very doubtful).

(3)   3. 1396 (the earthborn emerging from the earth) πολλοὶ δ', οὐτάμενοι πρὶν ὑπὸ χθονὸς ἴχνος ἀεῖραι, / ὅσσον ἄνω προύτυψαν[2] ἐς ἠέρα ... ὑπέρ Fränkel, but ὑπό means 'from under', an occasional use in early poetry (cf. especially Hes. Theog. 669, Il. 21. 56). The alternative, Struve's ἀπό, is wrong because it would imply that the feet were already on the ground, and that they were raised from the surface of it (cf. LSJ s.v. χθών, and Od. 8. 375, al.).

(4)   4. 436 εὖτ' ἂν πρῶτα θεᾶς περὶ νηὸν ἴκηται (sc. Ἄψυρτος). P. Oxy. 2694 reads μετὰ νηὸν, which has won general acceptance. Yet Apsyrtus was killed νηοῦ σχεδόν (469): it is better to allow an unusual (but hardly incredible) use of περί than to sacrifice precision. μετὰ νηόν is a tag in Apollonius and is an expected simplification.

(5)   4. 1505 f. κεῖτο δ' ἐπὶ ψαμάθοισι, μεσημβρινὸν ἦμαρ ἀλύσκων, / δεινὸς ὄφις. ἐπί, not surprisingly, has caused considerable trouble. The snake lies on the sand—avoiding the heat of noontide; so ἐνὶ Wifstrand. In fact the behaviour of a Homeric snake is to blame,[3] Il. 22. 93–5:

---

[1] τότ' is perhaps possible: 'It is my considered opinion that we escaped then with Argo's help; the goddess Athene is responsible for that. But (617) do not be anxious, for your future ordeals (μετόπισθεν) are catered for as well.'

[2] Fränkel's προύκυψαν (accepted by Vian) is strongly supported by Nonn. D. 4. 431,

433, but surely προύτυψαν is the choicer word. At 1. 953 the Argo προύτυψεν, 'shot forward'; here ἄνω ἐς ἠέρα makes the direction explicit.

[3] A Hesiodic snake too (but merely a dangerous one): Hes. fr. 204. 135 f. M.–W., for which see W. Morel, Hermes, lxi (1926), 233.

ὡς δὲ δράκων ἐπὶ χειῇ ὀρέστερος ἄνδρα μένῃσι . . .
σμερδαλέον δὲ δέδορκεν ἑλισσόμενος περὶ χειῇ.

It is a good guess that these lines made the same impression on Apollonius as
they did on Paley: '. . . to the [want of observation] (a rare fault in our author)
we must attribute the statement that a snake waits to attack a man near its
hole, instead of entering it . . .'

2. 932 f.   ἡ δ' (sc. Ἀργώ) ἐς πέλαγος πεφόρητο
ἐντενές, ἠύτε τίς τε δι' ἠέρος ὑψόθι κίρκος
ταρσὸν ἐφεὶς πνοιῇ φέρεται ταχύς, οὐδὲ τινάσσει
ῥιπήν, εὐκήλοισιν ἐνευδιόων πτερύγεσσιν.

ῥιπήν at 935, suspected by Fränkel, is now supported by *P. Oxy.* 2694.
General arguments for its retention are advanced by Drogemüller, *Gymnasium*,
lxxi (1965), 471; but it is possible to be more precise. No one would have
complained had Apollonius written οὐδὲ τινάσσει . . . ῥιπὴν πτερύγων, but this
last element is omitted simply because the word is required to complete the
picture at the end of 935. The use of τινάσσει is evidently meant to surprise: we
might expect wind (ῥιπή) to shake or ruffle (τινάσσειν) the plumage of the
bird.[1] The language is choicer than Aeschylus' ῥιπαῖς πτερύγων (*P.V.* 126) or
Nonnus' ἐρεσσομένων πτερύγων ἀνεμώδεϊ ῥιπῇ (*D.* 13. 8, of Iris).

2. 1042 f. One of the birds of Ares' island swoops down upon the Argonauts:

ἀλλά μιν ἥρως
Εὐρυτίδης Κλυτίος—πρὸ γὰρ ἀγκύλα τείνατο τόξα
{ ἧκε δ' ἐπ' οἰωνὸν ταχινὸν βέλος—αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα }
πλῆξεν, δινηθεὶς δὲ θοῆς πέσεν ἀγχόθι νηός.

1044 δ' LAG: ἧκεν SPE; ἧκέ τ' Fränkel.

The lines as they stand lack coherence. Attempts to solve the difficulty fall
into four classes: (*a*) An alteration in 1042 (ἀλλὰ μὲν Brunck; not Greek), or in
1043 (πρόπαρ Schneider; unconvincing). (*b*) Rewriting of αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα at 1044
(the favourite). Morel (*RhMus* N.s. cv [1962], 190) quotes the epigram of
Pollianus in *A.P.* 11. 130 τοὺς κυκλίους τούτους, τοὺς "αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα" λέγοντας /
μισῶ, λωποδύτας ἀλλοτρίων ἐπέων. The hackneyed αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα has, he believes,
ousted a quite different original (in his view αὐχένα μέσσον; others in Fränkel,
and add Matthiae's gentle but insipid αὐτίκ' ἔπειτα). But is this really likely?
There is no evidence that αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα exerted such influence elsewhere, and it
seems incredible that it should have been introduced here, and survived in all
manuscripts, when all would have run well without it. (*c*) A lacuna after 1044
(Bergk). But what more is there to be said? (*d*) Deletion of 1044 (Herwerden,
Mnem. N.s. xi [1883], 113, and Maas *apud* Fränkel). This is more plausible:
1044 could be a patchwork of 1036 and 1038 supra, and cf. such lines as *Il.* 1.
382 ἧκε δ' ἐπ' Ἀργείοισι κακὸν βέλος. But the presence of ταχινὸν causes a
difficulty. This is a good Hellenistic word (Callimachus, Theocritus, Aratus),
and seems unlikely for an interpolator (the obvious one is Homer's ὠκύ).

---

[1] For examples of this verb applied to
wind see Giangrande, *CQ* N.s. xvii (1967),
91. His own solution is ingenious: he insists
that ῥιπήν must mean 'wind', and takes
ἐνευδιόων transitively with ῥιπήν; with οὐδὲ
τινάσσει he understands ταρσόν from the
beginning of 934. But this produces an
intolerably jerky rhythm.

I suspect that once again (cf. above on 1. 572 f. and on 1. 593 f.) the προέκ-δοσις may be responsible. The lines run well enough without 1044, and a scribe with the προέκδοσις before him might easily have let a line slip in under the influence of 1036 and 1038 above. Corroboration might perhaps be found in the variants at the beginning of the line. SPE omit the connective particle— not a remarkable divergence in itself, but given the difficulty of 1044 as a whole an original draft may have read something like τόξα τανύσσας (cf. 3. 278) / ἧκεν . . .

2. 1146. Argos tells the Argonauts how Phrixus sacrificed the ram:

$$\text{τὸν μὲν ἔπειτ' ἔρρεξεν ἑῆς ὑποθημοσύνῃσιν.}$$

It is well known that this account does not square with 4. 120 f., where we are told that Hermes confronted Phrixus and commanded him to sacrifice his benefactor. There is a comparable (and serious)[1] inconsistency in the story of Argo's passage through the Symplegades. At 2. 602 f. it is Athene who rescues the crew; at 4. 786 f. it is Hera. The answer is simple and obvious, and no violence is required: in both cases the alternative account appears *in a speech*, and there is no real inconsistency in that it is not Apollonius, but the speaker, who must be credited with the view expressed. At 2. 1146 the account of the ram's self-immolation is a piece of sensationalism perfectly suited to the credulous and naïve Argos; at 4. 786 f. Hera's claim to a prize part in the saga suits her treacherous character (Apollonius smiles at Aphrodite δολοπλόκος in 3. 152 f.: in fact it is Hera who deserves that epithet). Thetis, to whom the words are addressed, could not know the truth, and Hera takes advantage of the situation. Similar is 1. 9 f. as against the fairy tale of 3. 66 f.

2. 1249 f.   Προμηθεύς
          αἰετὸν ἥπατι φέρβε παλιμπετὲς ἀίσσοντα.

Shortly afterwards, at 1258, the eagle departed: αὖτις ἀπ' οὔρεος ἀίσσοντα. ἀίσσοντα at 1250 has been suspected (ἀλδήσκοντι ex. gr. Fränkel), but perhaps (cf. on 2. 932 f. above) this is another surprise. There are two well-known features in the story of Prometheus. His liver kept growing; and the bird of prey kept coming back for more. We certainly expect the former: 'Prometheus kept feeding the eagle with his liver, as *back* it . . .', but in fact we get the latter. There were two derivations offered in ancient times for the adverbial παλιμπετές: from πίπτω, or from πέτομαι. Apollonius adopts the latter (and rarer) meaning at 3. 285 (cf. Vian's note), and that is what, unexpectedly, it is derived from here.

2. 1265 f.   εἰσέλασαν ποταμοῖο μέγαν ῥόον, αὐτὰρ ὁ πάντῃ
                    καχλάζων ὑπόεικεν.

Fränkel adopts Platt's ὅγ' ἄντην: 'Who would ever say that the water of a river gave way to a boat *everywhere*?' (*JPh* xxxiii [1914], 25). But πάντῃ belongs with καχλάζων: as the Argo forged through the μέγας ῥόος, the water plashed all round the sides as it began to give way (ὑπόεικε). Nor does ἄντην ὑπόεικε (if that is what Platt means) sound like a Greek locution.

3. 363. Argos proudly points out some of the Argonauts to Aeetes. The third in

---

[1] Of course these examples stand apart from (e.g.) the treatment of Circe's habitat (cf. Vian, *Chant III*, 18 n. 6).

his list he introduces with the words Τελαμὼν δ' ὅγε. First was Jason (τόνδε μέν 356), second Augeias (τόνδε δ' ἄρ' 362), and the third must have been referred to as Τελαμὼν δ' ὅδε. Cf. 2. 1155 f. τῷδε . . . τῷδε . . . τῷ, where τῷ = τῷδε, not τῷγε.

Confusion between ὅδε and ὅγε is of course common. At 2. 175 it is hard to see how editors can tolerate οἵδε, when οἵγε (cf. 2. 1076, al.) is plainly required. But decision is sometimes difficult. At 2. 151 τόνγε is generally printed (LA, and now P. Oxy. 2697: τόνδε SGPE, test.), and similarly at 4. 86 τόνγε P. Oxy. 692, for τόνδε. Yet these two cases have a common factor: at 2. 151 the speaker yearns nostalgically for an absent friend, and at 4. 86 the speaker is imagining that the person in question will be upon her any moment. I would not print τόνγε in either of these places with any firm conviction that it is right.

3. 426   ὀψὲ δ' ἀμειβόμενος προσελέξατο κερδαλέοισι.

Jason has been thoroughly cowed in Aeetes' presence. He was speechless and in despair (422), and again at 432 he was ἀμηχανίη βεβολημένος. In the present line Jason replies to Aeetes' imposition of the ordeal with a resigned acceptance; he must do what he was told, for Necessity and Pelias' ὕβρις had brought this upon him (427 f.). Accordingly, it comes as something of a surprise that Jason's words are termed κερδαλέοισι. The speech is not 'crafty', not is it 'wise', and it is pointless forcing the word to mean 'tactful' (Gillies). Seven lines below (433) there occurs ΣΜΕΡΔΑΛΕΟΙΣ, and its similarity to κερδαλέοισι cannot be a coincidence. 426 has clearly been contaminated by this and has subsequently been given metrical respectability. The word suitable to Jason's plight is μειλιχίοισι ('submissive', as often).

3. 541 f.   πελειάς
       ὑψόθεν Αἰσονίδεω πεφοβημένη ἔμπεσε κόλπῳ,
       κίρκος δ' ἀφλάστῳ περικάππεσεν.

I mentioned περικάππεσεν at 543 briefly in CQ N.s. xix (1969), 280, but could not there divine Fränkel's real objection to it (Noten, 359), that it would be 'grotesque' for the bird to be 'impaled on' the ἄφλαστον. This remark is, to say the least, surprising. The portent passage is a joke (cf. 539 with 540), designed to raise a belly-laugh from the audience, and is only surpassed by the similar passage at 3. 927 f. The 'grotesque' fate of the aggressor is an integral part of the light-hearted atmosphere—the gravity of the hawk's death is exaggerated merely to throw the lighter aspects into sharper relief. The halcyon at 1. 1089 simply perches on the ἄφλαστον, but the halcyon was a friendly bird with friendly advice to give. This 'doublet' passage provides a clue to a further humorous detail at 542. The dove lands unceremoniously in Jason's lap. This is meant as a παρὰ προσδοκίαν for the audience, acquainted as it was with early epic usage. The end of Apollonius' line recalls the Homeric clausula ἔμπεσε πόντῳ (Od. 4. 508, 5. 50, 318), and the alert listener will pick this up (cf. on ὕπερθεν at 1006 f. above). Note that ὑψόθεν Αἰσονίδεω reads at first sight as 'above Jason's head', just as the halcyon at 1. 1084 f. flew ὑπὲρ ξανθοῖο καρήατος Αἰσονίδαο.[1]

[1] It is curious that readers of Apollonius seem not to have realized the full extent of Callimachean mischief in this poet, and to have actively and consistently rejected it. When Apollonius makes the Cyclopes sit at their laborious work (1. 730), the text is emended. But Callimachus in his third hymn, upon which Apollonius drew a good deal, stresses their standing posture (49 f., cf. 59). What is the point of denying a

3. 1237 f.   ἐκ δὲ πόληος
ἤλασεν εὐρεῖαν κατ' ἀμαξιτόν, ὥς κεν ἀέθλῳ
παρσταίη, σὺν δέ σφιν ἀπείριτος ἔσσυτο λαός.

Phaethon was waiting for Aeetes with his chariot. Aeetes mounted (1236) and drove off. The present lines appear to say: 'he (Aeetes) drove . . . in order to be present at . . . and with *them* . . .' Hence ἤλασαν Fränkel (in text) and παρσταῖεν (in app. crit.). But σφιν is singular—against Apollonius' *usus scribendi*, but we have no right to expect uniformity in a playful poet.

4. 26 f.   κύσσε δ' ἑόν τε λέχος καὶ δικλίδας ἀμφοτέρωθεν
σταθμούς.

In the face of the Homeric use of δικλίδες with θύραι (cf. A.R. 1. 786 f.), πύλαι, σανίδες, it is not very easy to take δικλίδας σταθμούς here as 'door-posts of the folding-doors'. σταθμοί could mean 'doors', although that meaning is attested, according to LSJ s.v. II, only in the *Septuagint*; or ἀμφοτέρωθεν could mean 'on both sides', viz. 'on the posts' (cf. Virg. *Aen*. 2. 490, with Servius' note). But both are unlikely. There is no good reason for supposing that σταθμούς has anything but its normal sense; hence read δικλῖδος. For the singular (Alexandrine) see Theocr. 14. 42, and δ. θύρη Arat. *Phaen*. 193.

4. 59 f.   ἦ θαμὰ δὴ καὶ σεῖο κύον δολίῃσιν ἀοιδαῖς
μνησαμένη φιλότητος, ἵνα σκοτίῃ ἐνὶ νυκτί
φαρμάσσῃς εὔκηλος, ἅ τοι φίλα ἔργα τέτυκται.

The goddess Mene is drawn down from the sky by Medea's spells, and in these lines she complains about it. Ruhnken's κίον for κύον at 59 has been accepted by many, but, as Fränkel observes, Mene 'came down', not simply 'came'. His own solution is κύθον, but it must be owned that κύον, 'you bitch' (so par. Σ^P), is very much in place here. I think it highly probable that a line describing Mene's descent from heaven has dropped out after 59.

4. 228–35.   αὐτὰρ ἄναξ ἄτῃ πολυπήμονι, χεῖρας ἀείρας,
'Ήέλιον καὶ Ζῆνα κακῶν ἐπιμάρτυρας ἔργων
κέκλετο, δεινὰ δὲ παντὶ παρασχεδὸν ἤπυε λαῷ·
εἰ μή οἱ κούρην αὐτάγρετον, ἢ ἀνὰ γαῖαν
ἢ πλωτῆς εὑρόντες ἔτ' εἰν ἁλὸς οἴδματι νῆα,
ἄξουσιν, καὶ θυμὸν ἐνιπλήσει μενεαίνων
τείσασθαι τάδε πάντα, δαήσονται κεφαλῆσιν
πάντα χόλον καὶ πᾶσαν ἑὴν ὑποδέγμενοι ἄτην.

229 ἐπιμάρτυρας:
This word was written *divisim* by some in *Od*. 1. 273 θεοὶ δ' ἐπιμάρτυροι ἔστων, and in *Il*. 7. 76 Ζεὺς δ' ἄμμ' ἐπιμάρτυρος ἔστω, cf. Ebeling s.v. μάρτυρος; the same doubt arises in *Scutum* 20. In that case, ἐπί would be adverbial. Erbse, *Hermes*, lxxxi (1953), 164 n. 4, proposes ἐπὶ μάρτυρας here in Apollonius. This might be regarded as a sophisticated variation of the passages quoted above,

connection between the two passages (K. J. McKay, 'Erysichthon', *Mnem*. Suppl. vii [1962], 139 n. 4) when *oppositio* is cultivated so much, regardless of poetic propriety? In this line Fränkel's ἠμμένοι for ἤμενοι is a special Pindaric usage which does not look at home in Apollonius' context.

since ἐπί would most naturally be taken in tmesis with κέκλετο (so, apparently, Σ already). But the compound is I believe preferable. In his discussion of the form μάρτυρες Erbse rightly rejects Merkel's view that μάρτυρες here instead of the Homeric μάρτυροι is based on Zenodotus' reading of μάρτυρες for μάρτυροι at *Il.* 2. 302, *al.* Apollonius is not dependent on Zenodotus because the form μάρτυρες had become well established since Homer, particularly in tragedy. But if we are going to dissociate the form μάρτυρες from scholarly treatment of the Homeric text, then we should do the same for ἐπιμάρτυρες, which had occurred at least once before the Alexandrine era (Ar. *Lys.* 1287). The same goes for Call. fr. 75. 48 ψήφου δ' ἂν ἐμῆς ἐπιμάρτυρες εἶεν.

231–5:

Fränkel believes that the text of this passage is suspect at many points. In my view there is very little wrong with it. It bears a general resemblance to the stilted, almost staccato, oratio obliqua of 3. 576 f., only here Aeetes is more furious still, and his language is correspondingly more jerky.[1] The antithesis between 'land' and 'sea' at 231 f. is forced; the word-order at 232 grotesque (perhaps aggravated by a desire for the triple epsilon alliteration); after the long disjunctive colon of 231–2 ἄξουσιν falls heavily on the ear; with ἐνιπλήσει the subject changes violently; even the separation of τείσασθαι from μενεαίνων in the previous line seems abrupt; the triple πᾶς in 234–5 is indelicate but has an explosive effect;[2] ὑποδέγμενοι at 235 is in a very odd position (on this see below). Similarly in Aeetes' outburst of 3. 375–6 LASG present a disjointed sentence which may well be correct.

232 πλωτῆς:

This word should mean 'navigable', but, in spite of the above remarks, it is hard to see why the sea should be called that here. πλωτήν, contemptuous for πλώουσαν, would give much better sense: 'bring back my daughter to me', Aeetes threatens: 'I don't care whether you find the Argo beached or still floating about on the swell of the sea!' For πλωτός used in this way cf. LSJ s.v. I; πλωτήν has, as often, been attracted to the case of the nearest noun, ἁλός. With ἀνὰ γαῖαν understand νῆα εὑρόντες from 232, not, as the translators, κούρην εὑρόντες.

235 ἄτην:

M. L. West (*CR* n.s. xiii [1963], 12) proposes ἀρήν: 'Aeetes can threaten to visit the Colchians with his wrath, but not with his ἄτη, since ἄτη can bear no sense which would be appropriate to such a threat.' χόλον and ἄτην, it is true, do not make very happy mates, but the insertion of ἑήν and ὑποδέγμενοι makes all the difference[3]—δαήσονται κεφαλῆσιν is now lost sight of, and the words mean 'you will bear the full brunt of my ἄτη (because you in your turn will have it inflicted on you)'. For ὑποδέγμενοι cf. *Od.* 13. 310, 16. 189 βίας ὑπο-δέγμενος ἀνδρῶν.

---

[1] Cf. Hermann on Orph. *A.* 852: 'Abruptam orationem, qualis est merito minarum regiarum . . .'.

[2] Cf. παντὶ παρασχεδόν at 230, and Fraenkel on A. *Ag.* 268. Note the elaborate

κακῶν ἐπιμάρτυρας ἔργων κέκλετο at 229 f.

[3] Brunck placed commas after τείσασθαι and κεφαλῆσιν, which is clearly not acceptable (for τάδε πάντα cf. τάδε at 4. 10).

4. 236 f.   αὐτῷ δ' ἐνὶ ἤματι Κόλχοι
νῆάς τ' εἰρύσσαντο καὶ ἄρμενα νηυσὶ βάλοντο,
αὐτῷ δ' ἤματι πόντον ἀνήιον.

Fränkel obelizes καὶ ἄρμενα νηυσὶ, with the note 'exspect. ἐνί τ' ἄρμενα τῇσι βάλοντο, cl. 1. 392 f.' (add, e.g., 1. 357, from Od. 2. 389, and Hes. Op. 631 f.). But (a) the dative with a verb of motion is Homeric: Il. 7. 187 (κλῆρον) κυνέῃ βάλε, Od. 10. 333 κολεῷ μὲν ἄορ θέο, Chantraine, G.H. ii, § 109, K.G. i, § 426 (b); (b) Quintus in imitating Apollonius went so far as to use βάλλομαι without the dative in the sense of 'throw on board' (6. 98 f., 14. 354).

Fränkel clearly feels uneasy about νῆας ... νηυσί. But cf. Homer's common νῆα μὲν οὖν πάμπρωτον (imitated at 1. 367 f., the launching of Argo) ἁλὸς βένθοσδε ἔρυσσαν, / ἐν δ' ἱστόν τε τίθεντο καὶ ἱστία νηὶ μελαίνῃ (Od. 4. 780 f., al.; cf. also id. 4. 577 f.). A similar case of such repetition occurs at 1. 747: (on δίπλαξ of Jason) ἐν δὲ βοῶν ἔσκεν λάσιος νομός, ἀμφὶ δὲ βουσίν . . . , where Fränkel reads τῇσιν. Again this spoils a lively touch: when we look at a picture we naturally say 'there is X, and next to X is Y . . .'

4. 391 f.   ἵετο δ' ἥγε
νῆα καταφλέξαι διά τ' †ἔμπεδα† πάντα κεάσσαι,
ἐν δὲ πεσεῖν αὐτὴ μαλερῷ πυρί.

Medea is incensed by Jason's shabby conduct, and is seized with a desire to burn Argo and its contents and hurl herself into the conflagration. ἔμπεδα at 392 is clearly corrupt. Fränkel (Noten, 483) remarks that the 'everything' that Medea longs to break to pieces is 'everything belonging to the Argonauts, especially the fleece, 384 f.'. Underlying ἔμπεδα, Fränkel feels, is 'a rare word meaning "cargo"'. His own tentative solution is ἔμπολα, which seems little better than his former ἔνδοθι (app. crit.). In fact it is highly unlikely that any substantive will fit; it seems more reasonable to suppose that πάντα is the only object required, and that ἔμπεδα in reality conceals an adverb.

ἀμφαδὰ would meet all requirements. The corruption would be an easy one (ἀμφαδὰ ∼ ἀμπαδὰ ∼ ἔμπεδα), and the word gains powerful support from 3. 95 (Aphrodite of Eros) καὶ δή οἱ μενέηνα (!) . . . / . . . δυσηχέας ἆξαι (!) ὀιστούς / ἀμφαδίην ('before his very eyes').

I have assumed in the above that διακεάσσαι means 'break in pieces'. Most scholars prefer 'burn', as some ancient critics understood κεάζειν in Homer. But (a) cf. 4. 1267 καί κεν ἐπισμυγερῶς διὰ δὴ πάλαι ἤδε κεάσθη / νηῦς ἱερή, and (b) the clue in the imitation passage, Il. 9. 241–2 (ἀπὸ - κόψειν!). The answer of course is that Apollonius is pointing to the fact that he is aware of this interpretation of κεάζειν by using it in the context of fire.

Note: The verb κεάζειν is discussed by R. Browning, 'Quintus Smyrnaeus 12. 567', in CR n.s. xvii (1967), 254 f. It is difficult to agree with much of what he says, but I single out one point in particular for comment. At A.R. 2. 1125 f. πόντῳ γὰρ τρηχεῖαι ἐπιβρίσασαι ἄελλαι / . . . διὰ δούρατα πάντ' ἐκέδασσαν, Browning suggests ἐκέασσαν. The relevance of this passage to Browning's wider argument, and the reason for the change, escape me. A 'translation' of A.R. 2. 1125 f.: 3. 320 f. (νῆα) ἄφαρ διέχευαν ἄελλει / ζαχρηεῖς; a 'repetition' of 2. 1125 f.: 2. 1189 (νῆα) διὰ κῦμ' ἐκέδασσεν.

4. 1131.   ἄντρῳ ἐν ἠγαθέῳ.

P. Oxy. 2691 offers ἄντρῳ ἐνὶ ζαθέῳ. The variant is a vexing one, but I believe
a firm decision is possible. ζάθεος is frequently associated with the caves of
divine beings, e.g. E. *Bacch.* 121 f. ζάθεοι . . . ἔναυλοι, Corinna, *PMG* 654 (i) 13
ζαθίο[ι] . . . ἄντροι (of Zeus; surely right, in spite of accent of *Π*, contra Page,
Corinna, p. 18), Moero 1. 3 = Powell, *Coll. Alex.*, p. 21 (of Zeus). Endymion in
Q.S. 10. 127, quoted by Vian, *REG* lxxxii (1969), 232, is not very different
from these. The cave in Apollonius is the old dwelling of Macris, but she does
not nurture Dionysus *in* the cave. This she does elsewhere (1134 f.), and this
act of nurture must have led to the substitution of ζαθέῳ for ἠγαθέῳ at 1131.
In addition, the MSS. text is supported by 3. 981 χώρῳ ἐν ἠγαθέῳ (at verse-
beginning, as here). Cf. also *Il.* 6. 133 ἠγάθεον Νυσήιον with Apollonius'
ἠγαθέῳ (1131), and Διὸς Νυσήιον υἷα later at 1134.

4. 1300 f.   ἢ ὅτε καλὰ νάοντος ἐπ' ὀφρύσι Πακτωλοῖο
                    κύκνοι κινήσωσιν ἑὸν μέλος, ἀμφὶ δὲ λειμών
                    ἑρσήεις βρέμεται ποταμοῖό τε καλὰ ῥέεθρα . . .

At 1300–2 Fränkel quotes with approval the opinion of R. Burn that 'καλὰ
νάοντος et καλὰ ῥέεθρα de eodem fluvio susp.'. My subjective impression is that
it is perverse to fault the studied beauty of these lines—a miniature Ring-
composition encases in an exquisite way the picture of the swans singing by a
river, and of the river echoing with the notes of the swans' song. In any case,
there are parallels in older poetry for the repetition (cf. above on 4. 236 f.):
Hom. h. Ap. 240 f. Κηφισὸν δ' ἄρ' ἔπειτα κιχήσαο καλλιρέεθρον, / ὅς τε Λιλαίηθεν
προχέει καλλίροον ὕδωρ, Hes. *Op.* 737 f. αἰενάων ποταμῶν καλλίροον ὕδωρ / ποσσὶ
περᾶν, πρίν γ' εὔξῃ ἰδὼν ἐς καλὰ ῥέεθρα. Apollonius makes his repetition as
elaborate as these by giving different syntactical functions to the double καλά,
the first being adverbial, the second adjectival.[1] In fact, corruption is unlikely
on general grounds. καλὰ νάοντος as a polished equivalent of καλὰ ῥέοντος (e.g.
h. Hom. εἰς ξένους 5) is unparalleled, and νάω is itself a rare verb (cf. Ardizzoni
on 1. 1146 and on 3. 223). ποταμοῖό τε καλὰ ῥέεθρα / in turn is a *variatio* in
Apollonius' manner of *Il.* 21. 238, al., καλὰ ῥέεθρα /, and *Il.* 14. 245 ποταμοῖο
ῥέεθρα / (varied again at A.R. 1. 27 ποταμῶν τε ῥέεθρα /).

The real difficulty lies in the expression κινήσωσιν[2] ἑὸν μέλος. Fränkel
suspects this, and three emendations will be found in his critical note. In
Noten ad loc. Fränkel insists that -ι νέον must be read for -ιν ἑὸν, but the swan's
death song is only implicit in the passage. It is not the finality of the song that
is stressed, but the lamentation: so the fledglings at 1299, and the hand-
maidens in the apodosis of the simile at 1304, who ἐλεεινὸν ἰήλεμον ὠδύροντο
(cf. also 1297). ἑὸν μέλος is 'their own (particular kind of) song', that is a γόος
or θρῆνος.

Fränkel also maintains that κινήσωσιν μέλος is meaningless. Erbse nodded

---

[1] This accounts for the surprising repe-
tition of ἄσπετον at 1. 1181 and 1183. The
first is neuter adjective, the second (in spite
of 1. 453–4) not a feminine adjective with
φυλλάδα, but an adverb with ἀμήσαντες, as
the rhythm in fact suggests.

[2] So SG; LAPE have κινήσουσιν. The
latter is *lectio facilior* (assimilation to κλάζουσι

1299?), since mood and tense variation of
this type (though less involved than here) is
found now and again in Homeric epic (see
Chantraine, *G.H.* ii, § 253). In writing
κινήσωσιν here Apollonius would have been
influenced, perhaps unconsciously, by the
fact that κινεῖν in the aorist subjunctive is
very common in Homer.

badly when he quoted in support E. *Suppl.* 172 (*Gnomon*, xxxv [1963], 24); yet
this passage, γεραιὰ κινοῦσαι μέλη, is not as irrelevant as it looks at first sight.
κινεῖν μέλος in Apollonius is strange, but it is clearly meant as a variation on
Homer's οὐδέ τι κινῆσαι μελέων ἦν (*Od.* 8. 298, cf. *Hom. h. Ven.* 234). 'Limb'
is replaced by 'song'. Further, there is a bridge between these two elements.
Nonnus talks of the ὡρίων and compares it to a swan; but unlike the swan this
bird does not sing ὑμνοτόκων πτερύγων ἀνεμώδεα ῥοῖζον ἰάλλων (*D.* 26. 204). It
was a widespread belief that the swan produced its song by the *movement* of
its wings:[1] that is what Apollonius alludes to in κινεῖν μέλος.

4. 1338 f.   λέων ὣς ὅς ῥά τ' ἀν' ὕλην
        σύννομον ἦν μεθέπων ὠρύεται· αἱ δὲ βαρείῃ
        φθογγῇ ὕπο βρομέουσιν ἀν' οὔρεα τηλόθι βῆσσαι,
        δείματι δ' ἄγραυλοί τε βόες μέγα πεφρίκασιν
        βουπελάται τε βοῶν.

The above is the text as printed by Fränkel. βαρείῃ at 1339 is a suggestion of
Brunck's, which he himself rejected; the MSS. have βαρεία (VASG) or
βαρεῖαι (L in ras., PE). At 1340 the MSS. have ὑποτρομέουσιν; Fränkel,
following the lead of Castiglioni's ἐπιβρομέουσιν, conjectures ὕπο βρομέουσιν,
comparing 4. 1302, Q.S. 4. 240 f., 7. 257 f. — τρομέουσιν, he believes, is due to
δείματι κ.τ.λ. in 1341.

It is at least equally arguable that the entire picture from 1339 on is con-
cerned with the feeling of terror which the lion's roar inspired in nature, in
animals, and in man. The text of Fränkel gives a conventional picture, but it
may be worth considering whether this is what we really want. Homer talks
of nature trembling beneath the feet of a god (*Il.* 13. 18 f.):

        τρέμε δ' οὔρεα μακρὰ καὶ ὕλη
    ποσσὶν ὑπ' ἀθανάτοισι Ποσειδάωνος ἄνακτος.

Callimachus gives this trembling of nature a new application in his *Hymn to
Delos* 137 f. There Ares banged on his shield,

                            ἔτρεμε δ' ''Οσσης
        οὔρεα καὶ πεδίον Κραννώνιον αἵ τε δυσαεῖς
        ἐσχατιαὶ Πίνδοιο, φόβῳ δ' ὠρχήσατο πᾶσα
        Θεσσαλίη.

ὑποτρομέουσιν in Apollonius is a detail well worth keeping, and besides, it
recalls the picture of Artemis at 3. 883 f.:

                            ἀμφὶ δὲ θῆρες
    κνυζηθμῷ σαίνουσιν ὑποτρομέοντες ἰοῦσαν . . .

ὑποτρομέω is used absolutely at *Il.* 22. 241, and here βαρείῃ φθογγῇ ὑπο-
τρομέουσιν might mean 'shudder deep within at (by reason of) the roar'; the
obvious alternative is ὕπο τρομέουσιν, but the compound seems the choicer
reading.

4. 1436 f.   ἤλυθε γὰρ χθιζός τις ἀνὴρ ὀλοώτατος ὕβριν
        καὶ δέμας, ὄσσε δέ οἱ βλοσυρῷ ὑπέλαμπε μετώπῳ . . .

---

[1] Cf. Allen–Sykes–Halliday on *h. Hom.* 21. 1.

Heracles is described by the Hesperides as 'a man most destructive in wanton violence and body'. This is supposed to mean 'most fell in wanton violence, most grim in form' (Seaton). One might at a pinch explain δέμας as 'bodily strength', but it would be far better to read μένος; the two words are confused in our manuscripts at 3. 847. The slip would have been greatly assisted by the long description of Heracles' physical attributes which follows immediately on these lines.

4. 1714 f.   τοὶ δ᾽ ἀγλαὸν Ἀπόλλωνι
    ἄλσει ἐνὶ σκιερῷ τέμενος †σκιόεντα† τε βωμόν
    ποίεον.

The culprit must be σκιόεντα, for the beginning of 1715 combines the two Homeric passages where σκιερός occurs: *Il.* 11. 480 / ἐν νέμεϊ σκιερῷ (γλαφυρῷ Zenodotus), and *Od.* 20. 278 ἄλσος ὕπο σκιερὸν ἑκατηβόλου Ἀπόλλωνος. It seems likely enough that the termination -όεντα is sound, and obviously only a limited number of words will fit at all.

The context provides a strong clue. The Argonauts have landed on the tiny island of Anaphe. As often, they are faced with the awkward situation of sacrificing to a god, and to do so they must improvise an altar. On two occasions they make an altar of pebbles, 1. 1123 (cf. Wendel on Σ ad loc.), and 2. 694 f. (cf. Mooney's note); there is another such altar at 2. 1170 f. (ἐσχαρὴ στιάων).[1] Accordingly we expect in this passage an epithet which is connected in some way with the material from which the altar is made. At 2. 694 f. the pebbles are collected from the beach. I suggest therefore μνιόεντά τε βωμόν. The altar is 'seaweedy' because it is covered with seaweed from the pebbles of the shore. For the expression cf. Opp. *H.* 2. 167 μνιαροῖσιν ἐπὶ πλαταμῶσι; for the word itself (Apollonius only) 4. 1237. Such an allusive way of referring to an altar of this kind would be very much in Apollonius' manner.

University of St. Andrews   M. CAMPBELL

[1] στιόεντα would be ideal here, but it would not conform to Apollonius' strict rules of synizesis.