Abstract

Before the publication of Professor Richard Hunter’s Cambridge Classics edition in August 2015, the last large-scale commentary on Apollonius Rhodius’ *Argonautica* Book 4 was that of Enrico Livrea in Italian in 1973, though mention should be made of the Budé volumes edited by Vian (1974–81). During this period the literary study of the poem has undergone a virtual revolution. The present thesis is an attempt to update and advance the work of the poem’s previous editors. It is intended as a prolegomenon to a commentary on the whole Book.

Apollonius’ epic is an outstanding example of Hellenistic poetic practice, embodying all of its allusive qualities. It draws on the entire tradition of previous Greek literature, while maintaining an innovative point-of-view. This commentary tries to elucidate Apollonius’ experiments with respect to all aspects of style and narration, viewing him both as an important literary critic, closely involved in maintaining the inheritance of Classical Greece, and as a creative artist intent on developing an individual voice.

The section chosen for commentary exhibits many aspects of Apollonius’ artistry: passages of atmospheric description, action sequences which speed the narrative, speeches, in some of which irony predominates while in others rhetoric prevails, similes which often contain fine images and a macabre climax of chilling power which achieves its effects through a number of striking and original details. There are, therefore, many reasons why the poem as a whole was enormously influential on Latin epic, especially on Virgil’s *Aeneid*, and why the story and Apollonius’ methods of retelling it enjoyed such an important reception in the European tradition.
PREFACE

Opusculum dilectissimae uxori Rosemarioe filioque Alexandro
dedicatum

This commentary’s first manifestation was a handwritten manuscript completed at University College London during the period 1972–4. It then tracked the path of the technological revolution from typewriter to first PC until the beginning of the 1980’s, when it was laid aside, almost completely, under the exigencies of career and family.

Apollonius Rhodius, however, has always been with me and so when I retired in 2009, he was first on the list of unfinished business. I was lucky to find at the University of Nottingham, two very patient and talented supervisors, Patrick Finglass and Helen Lovatt, who first gently made me aware of all the new developments in Classical research that I had missed in the interim and then did their best to disentangle my first convoluted attempts to update my original commentary. Helen helped me to understand something of the methodologies and critical language that Classical scholars now use when discussing ancient literature and in Patrick, I was fortunate to have as a guide and mentor someone quo non praestantior alter in the elucidation of and commentary on ancient Greek texts.

In some ways, technology has greatly aided the work of commentators. The parallels are easier to find (Thesaurus Linguae Graecae), much secondary literature can be checked online and classical researchers are blessed by the existence of a range of essential databases. However, the work of interpretation is still difficult and especially so in the case of a poet as quicksilver and enigmatic as Apollonius. His
poem which can be read primarily as a quest or adventure story – at least that is how it seemed to me, when I first found E. V. Rieu’s translation a very long time ago – raises a whole series of questions about its characters, its content and the style and nature of the Greek in which it is written. What, for instance, are we to make of Jason, the hero of the poem, who in terms of superficial appearance seems to be the equal of the Hellenistic princes who came after Alexander and yet is constantly afflicted by self-doubt? There is also the matter of a dominant female character such as Medea who, while often seeming at conflict with herself, might be based both on Euripides’ heroine and the powerful women that Apollonius would have encountered at the Ptolemaic court. Finally, how are we to understand and interpret the written language of a poet whose knowledge of his native literature would have been deep, critical and profound, while having at his command the resources of one the first great libraries?

The Argonautica raises many such issues and the commentary attempts to answer some of them, as this part of the poem is read as a continuous entity. The introduction which follows might have had many sections but it seemed better to try to explain the text as the reader progresses through it, fully in a tradition that Apollonius might have recognised.

If such an attempt is, in any way, successful, it owes a great debt to people already mentioned, but in a special way to Rosemary, docta utriusque linguae, who retyped the original UCL manuscript and then had the indescribable patience to wait outside various learned doors at Nottingham while matters were under discussion, to Alexander our son, doctus in an entirely different sphere, who at a vital moment wrote a computer program that changed Times New Roman into New Athena Unicode, and to our granddaughter (and her mother) who even at the age of fourteen months was able to lay a finger (mirabile dictu) on an overlooked typo!
Scriebam in urbe Escafeldensi et in insula Rhodia
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Introduction

1. The Ancient Transmission

The story of the Argonautica’s survival, appreciation and exegesis can be traced over more than two thousand years. Placing the dates of its author’s life and the publication of his poem at the start in this continuum is more difficult. There are four pieces of evidence: the list of the heads of the Alexandrian library in P.Oxy. 1241 (second century AD), the article about Apollonius in the Suda and two short biographies attached to the scholia (Vitae). P.Oxy. 1241 has long been considered an important source for the chronology of the heads of the library. However, a recent discussion has cast doubt on its contents and their validity. The papyrus says that Apollonius was διδάσκαλος τοῦ πρῶτου βασιλέως, ‘tutor of the first king’. This must be Ptolemy I Soter (304–283 BC). The Suda and the Vitae, on the other hand, associate him with the reign of Ptolemy III Euergetes (246–21 BC), based on which the editors emended the papyrus text to τρίτου βασιλέως. The belief that Apollonius held the posts of both tutor and librarian seems to be based on the lacunose opening of the papyrus that apparently mentions grammaticoi in connection with Ptolemy Philadelphus. The papyrus then says that Eratosthenes (276–195 BC) succeeded

---

1 Grenfell and Hunt (1914) 99–100.
2 Suda s.v. Απολλώνιος α 3419 (cf 307 6–10 Adler) μαθητής Καλλιμάχου, σύγχρονος Ερατοσθένους καὶ Εὐφορίωνος καὶ Τιμάρχου, ἐπὶ Πτολεμαίου τοῦ Εὐεργέτου ἐπικληθέντος, καὶ διάδοχος Ερατοσθένους γενόμενος ἐν τῇ προστασίᾳ τῆς ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ βιβλιοθήκης.
3 Wendel (1935) 1–2.
4 Murray (2012).
5 Grenfell and Hunt (1914) 100 say the list of grammarians ‘at last determines the order of the holders of the office under the earlier Ptolemies, and supplies fresh evidence for the much-discussed chronology of Apollonius Rhodius.’
6 ἀγαθὸς μαθητῇ ἱλικίας: Φιλαδέλφου (Col. 1). Forward slashes denote line end in the column.
Apollonius, without specifically mentioning the post of librarian. Even if the reference is only to the post of Royal Tutor and there is no evidence, apart from the assumptions based on P.Oxy. 1241, that the two posts were dependent on each other,\(^8\) it would place Apollonius’ activity earlier than that indicated by the information given in the *Suda* and *Vitae*, who see him as belonging to the generation after Callimachus.\(^9\) Finally, the nature of the papyrus as a whole tells against its worth as credible evidence for Apollonius’ dates, consisting as it does of lists of ancient figures supposedly famous in a particular sphere, the authenticity of which seem dubious\(^10\) and are perhaps meant to satirise contemporary second century scholarly catalogues or *compendia*. Therefore, it seems preferable to use the information provided by the *Suda*,\(^11\) supported by the *Vitae*, to postulate a poetic *floruit* stretching over the two reigns of Ptolemy Philadelphus and Ptolemy Euergetes, with the final publication of the poem occurring sometime during the reign of the latter. Eratosthenes and Apollonius seem to have been active in Alexandria at roughly the same time, Apollonius being spoken of as his contemporary (σύγχρονος Ἐρατοσθένους).\(^12\) Although Eratosthenes was specially summoned by Ptolemy Euergetes,\(^13\) we might

---

\(^7\) οὗτον δὲ δὲξέτο Ἐρατοσθένης (Col. II 14-15).

\(^8\) Murray (2012) 9 n. 12.

\(^9\) Callimachus perhaps began to write the *Aetia* in the 270s with a *terminus post quem* of 246/5 BC for the poems for Berenice; see Harder (2012) 121–4, Stephens (2015) 4–5.

\(^10\) For example, Col. VI: ἀλληγγας δὲ / πρῶτος φησὶν κατασκευά / οσσιθε Τυρρηνίος discusses the Tyrrhenian invention of the war trumpet.

\(^11\) ‘In the reign of Ptolemy known as the Benefactor and Eratosthenes’ successor in the Directorship of the Library in Alexandria’; see above n. 2.

\(^12\) See n. 2.

\(^13\) *Suda* s.v. Ἐρατοσθένης 2898 (II 403 6–18 Adler) μετεπέμφθη δὲ ἐς Ἀθήναν υπὸ τοῦ τρίτου Πτολεμαίου καὶ διέτριψε μέχρι τοῦ πέμπτου, Fraser (1972) II 330–32.
perhaps envisage Apollonius taking over the role of librarian, from the older man,\textsuperscript{14} when his poem was finally published. Indeed, the process of composition may have been a complex one involving interaction with Callimachus’ \textit{Aetia}. Annette Harder suggests that at some stage the four books of the \textit{Aetia} were arranged in response to the \textit{Argonautica}.\textsuperscript{15} It may, however, be possible to pinpoint a more particular final publication date.\textsuperscript{16} Using the systematic way in which Apollonius marks the passage of time throughout the \textit{Argonautica},\textsuperscript{17} together with the methods that modern astronomy now provides for the calculation of the position of the constellations in ancient times,\textsuperscript{18} Jackie Murray has made a plausible case for dating the poem to 238, a year in which Euergetes, as part of his birthday, instituted celebrations, including the introduction of a new calendar, which seemed to mark the beginning of a new era in his reign.

Almost as soon as the first copies of the poem were made, scholarly comment began: a friend of Apollonius, Chares,\textsuperscript{19} wrote about the sources of his poem and began a tradition of expounding the text which continued throughout antiquity. The names of commentators such as Theon of Alexandria (first century BC), Lucillus of Tarrha (mid-first century AD) and Sophocles (second century AD) are mentioned at

\textsuperscript{14} The \textit{Suda} entry about Eratosthenes’ life (see above) details a considerable amount of activity before he came to Alexandria. However see Pfeiffer (1968) 153–4, Geus (2002) 26-30, Matthaios (2011) 56 on some of the anomalies involved.
\textsuperscript{15} Harder (2012) i 4.
\textsuperscript{16} Murray (2014).
\textsuperscript{17} \textit{Ibid.} 260–7.
\textsuperscript{18} \textit{Ibid.} 263 n. 45.
\textsuperscript{19} See Fränkel (1964) 92 Χάρης αὐτοῦ τοῦ Ἀπολλωίου γνώριμος . . . περὶ ἱστοριῶν τοῦ Ἀπολλωίου (Σ 2.1052). None of the existing scholia contain any of Chares’ comments.
the end of Book 4 of the mediaeval scholia. There is evidence that ancient texts of the
Argonautica were annotated with variant readings, glosses and marginal notes.\textsuperscript{20}

Forty-nine Apollonian papyri survive.\textsuperscript{21} Most date from between the first and
the fourth centuries AD and come from Oxyrhynchus, although some take the
evidence for texts of Apollonius up to the end of the seventh or eighth century AD,\textsuperscript{22}
bridging the gap between antiquity and the early middle ages.\textsuperscript{23} Book 1 has the largest
number of fragments by a long way, twenty-four, Book 2 has nine, Book 3 ten and
Book 4 six. In antiquity, as now, readers who started long works did not always get to
the end,\textsuperscript{24} or possibly they skipped to, or had copied out, their favourite passages.
Among the texts from Book 1, seven are from the episode of the Lemnian Women
and five are concerned with some aspect of the Argonautes’ departure.\textsuperscript{25} The fragments
from Book 2 include one mention of the appearance of the ghost of Sthenelos, two
from the description of the battle between the Argonauts and the Bebryces, and one
from the meeting with the sons of Phrixos. The surprisingly small number from Book
3 cover Jason’s encounter with the bulls (3), scenes with Medea and Chalciope (2),

scholarship on the part of ancient readers, see Haslam (2004) 3 discussing, P.Oxy. 2694.

\textsuperscript{21} Figures taken from the Leuven database (LDAB); see also http://promethee.philo.ulg.ac.be/cedopal/ which lists all the items
mentioned below with bibliography and Schade and Eleuteri (2008) 29–50 which, as well as the papyrological evidence,
discusses the surviving Mediaeval manuscripts.

\textsuperscript{22} AD01: 4; AD01/2: 3; AD2: 11; AD2/3: 8; AD3: 10; AD3/4: 2; AD4: 1; AD4/5: 2; AD6: 1; AD6/7: 2; AD7/8: 1; cf. for the
same period Callimachus: 31 and Euripides: 76. For Euripides as one of the most popular authors represented in the papyri, see

\textsuperscript{23} A small piece of an uncial parchment codex at Strasbourg (of unknown provenance) has a reading at 3.158, not found in the
mediaeval manuscripts; see Haslam (1978) 68 n. 50, reading δικαίος μεγάλοιο θεοῦ with the codex. Wilson (1983) 251 comments
‘The discovery of a few more scraps of this kind would force us to revise drastically our reconstruction of the intellectual world
of the ninth century’, arguing that the number of literary texts in uncial lettering surviving into the ninth century, and continuing
to be read, was larger than is sometimes assumed.

\textsuperscript{24} Thus S. West (2011) 71, noting that there are more surviving papyri for Herodotus book 1 than for any other.

\textsuperscript{25} Other parts of the story covered are the Catalogue (4), general descriptions of sailing (3), and the episode of the Doliones (2).
the opening of the book on Mt. Olympus (2), but only one extract from the meeting between Jason and Medea. The sequence of episodes from Book 4 includes the murder of Apsyrtus (2), the visit to Phaeacia (1), and the speech of Argos (1). Although the numbers concerned are small, patterns are discernible. For example, perhaps the opening scenes of the poem with its emotional encounter between Jason and his mother, Alcimede, attracted an audience brought up on Euripidean tragedy.

The papyri chiefly discussed in this commentary are P.Oxy. 2694 (containing 2.917–53, 4.317–22, 4.416–61, 468–512) and P.Oxy. 2691 (containing 4.348–56, 1128–35). They offer at least one reading that is significantly different from what is found in the mediaeval tradition. There is also P.EES inv. 88/334 (Sackler Library, Oxford), an unpublished collection of fragments which seems to offer such strong support for a conjecture made at 4.464, that it perhaps should no longer be classed as such.

Apollonius soon found imitators as well as copyists. The Sicilian Greek Moschus wrote Europa sometime during the second century BC. He shows a ‘pervasive verbal debt to Homer and Apollonius (sometimes both together), covering both vocabulary and specific, contextualised echoes’. At Rome Lucius Accius (c.170–86 BC), in what remains of his play Medea sive Argonautae, seems to show direct knowledge of 4.303–81. The play probably opens with the arrival of the Argo
which terrifies a barbarian shepherd who has never seen a ship before, and then alludes to the plot between Jason and Medea to kill Apsyrtus.

After Accius, the poem continued to be much read and imitated among Latin poets. Only a few years after Catullus wrote poem 64, a Latin translation of the *Argonautica* was produced by Varro of Atax in Gallia Narbonensis, who seems to have made use of some form of the scholia to Apollonius. This is also true of Virgil whose overall debt to his Greek predecessor is considerable. Nelis (2010) emphasises the size of the ancient libraries that might have been available to him and the use that he would have made of ancient scholarship on both Homer and Apollonius.

Both Propertius and Ovid deal with different aspects of the Argonautic legend. The latter demonstrates a continuing fascination with the character of Medea,
constantly adapting and building on the portraits drawn by Euripides and
Apollonius.49 While carrying ‘out radical surgery on the plot as he found it’,40 he,
nonetheless, shows deep knowledge of the Argonautica as he produces his own
interpretation.41 Both Seneca and his nephew Lucan wrote tragedies entitled Medea,42
with the latter showing direct knowledge of Apollonius in his epic poem Bellum
Civile.43 While Apollonian influences have been perceived on Statius’ Thebaid (c. 92
AD)44 it is with Valerius Flaccus that we have further evidence of engagement with
Apollonius’ text and with scholarship connected with it.45

After Statius, the authors who show knowledge of Apollonius are again Greek:
Dionysius of Alexandria (c. 130 AD),46 the two Oppians (AD 177–80 / 212–17),47
Quintus Smyrnaeus (3rd century AD),48 Triphiodorus (end of 3rd century AD),49

49 In Heroides 6 (Hypsipyle) and 12 (Medea), Metamorphoses 7, the largely lost tragedy Medea, Amores 2.14.29–32, Ars
Amatoria 1.336, 2.103–4, 381–2, 3.33–4, Tristia 3.8.3, 3.9, Epistulae ex Ponto 3.9; see further Kenney (2008) 363–85, Boyle
41 Cf. Arg. 3.291–8 with Ov. Met. 7.79–81 utque solet ventis alimenta adsumere, quaeque / parva sub inducta latuit scintilla
favilla / crescere et in veteres agita resurgere vires and see further Kenney (2008) 371, 374–8 (on ‘Medea-as-scholiast’), 384
(comparing Ov. Met. 7.297 neve doli cessent with the part played by trickery and deceit in Arg. 3 and 4).
42 Boyle (2014) 66.
45 His Argonautica was probably composed 70–9 AD; see Stover (2012) 2. See Fränkel’s OCT app. crit. at 4.24 comparing Val.
Flacc. 8.17–19, also Fränkel (1964) 96–7.
46 He is often known as Periegetes. For his date see Lightfoot (2014) 4 n. 6 and for his indebtedness to A., Hunter (2003) and
(2004) and with particular reference to Book 4, Lightfoot (2014) 36, 36 n. 26, 37, 43, 43, 64, 82.
47 In the case of Oppian and pseudo-Oppian, A.’s influence is at the best only indirect but cf. [Opp.] Cyn. 1.494–501 with Arg.
148 for Hellenistic influences on [Oppian]. For the dates of the Haleutica and the Cynegetica, see Miguélez-Cavero (2013) 71.
48 For the date, see Maciver (2012) 3.
49 For the date, see Miguélez-Cavero (2013) 4–6.
Nonnus (5th century)\textsuperscript{50} and the author of the Orphic *Argonautica* (second half of the fifth century).\textsuperscript{51} About AD 140 Apollonius of Chalcedon, the Stoic philosopher was on his way to Rome to take up the post of tutor to the future emperor Marcus, accompanied by a large band of pupils. When Demonax, the Cynic, caught sight of him, he remarked: “Here comes Apollonius and his Argonauts,” Bearing in mind, the Stoic’s reputation for acquiring wealth, the joke seems to be comparing his trip to Rome, with Jason’s voyage to gain the Golden Fleece. Lucian’s story seems to suggest that the *Argonautica* was well-known in this period.\textsuperscript{52}

Some of these authors, mentioned above, imitated A. with direct reference to Book 4.\textsuperscript{53} Quintus Smyrnaeus alludes to Medea’s flight when describing Oinone’s secret departure during the night.\textsuperscript{54} Triphiodorus echoes A. in some thirty passages,\textsuperscript{55}

\textsuperscript{50} For a survey of possible dates, see Agosti (2012) 367: ‘a date around . . . 430–50 is nowadays favoured by scholars’.

\textsuperscript{51} Ibid. 368.

\textsuperscript{52} Lucian *Demon*. 31; the story is owed to Bowie (2000) who surveys the reception of the *Argonautica* in Imperial prose and poetry and concludes (p. 9) that A. was ‘recognised as an author of importance who attracted the attention of scholars and writers engaged with mythography or literature’ and this was emphasised by the fact that no Greek poet attempted another version of the *Argonautica* legend until the Orphic *Argonautica*.

\textsuperscript{53} Vian (2001) 285–308 covers the themes and motifs which Quintus Smyrnaeus, Triphiodorus and Nonnus take up from Apollonius.

\textsuperscript{54} For example, cf. 10.438–9 πυλεύσας ἁναρρήξασα μελάθρων / ἐκθορευ, ἢττ’ ἄλλα: φέρων δὲ μν ὅκη γυνα with 4. 40–1 δόμων ἐξέσατο κοῦρη. / τῇ δὲ καὶ αὐτόματοι θυρέων ὑποδίειαν ὀψῆς, 10.448–9 ἐλαρρότεροι ἐ’ ἐφέροντο / ἐσομενὶς πόθει αἰείν with 4.66 . . . πόθες φέρων ἐγκονεύσαν, 10.454–5 τὴν δὲ ποι ἐριπρώσα τὸθ’ ὤψῃ διὰ Σελήνη / μηγασμένη κατὰ θυμὸν ἁμόμουν Ἀνδομίλανος with 4.54–58 τὴν δὲ νέον Τιτηνίς ἀνερχόμενη περάτηθεν / φοιντλέγν ἐοδούσα διὰ ἐπερχόμην Μήν / ἀρπαλέως, και τοῦτα μετά φρειόν ἤξον ἔπεισα / . . . / οὐδ’ οὖς καλὰ περδάιμοι Ἀνδομίλιος: also Quint. Smyrn. 7.335–40 and 4.23–7.

\textsuperscript{55} So Vian (2001) 294–6 and see Miguélez-Caverio (2013) 61–2; cf. Triph. 373–5 ὡς ἦγεν περθέντος ἀναίξασα νύσσο / Ἐκατσάνθρθ, θέρησες ἐπικοϊνωνώς φῶσαν δὲ χαίτην / κοππαγόμενη καὶ στέρνον ἀνέπτας μανιν ἄλθην with 4.18–19 πυκνά δὲ κοινίζ / ἔλθεν πλούκαμος γοργή βροχήσασ’ ἀνίτη, 23 πτερότης δὲ οἱ ἐν φρειό θυμὸς, 28 ῥημασμένη πλούκαμον and Triph. 139 οἱ δ’ ἄλλοι πρωναία μεθέλετε πείαμα νηών with 4.208 απασάμανας πρωναία νεός ἀπ’ πείαμα ἐκοιμήν (for the use of πρωναία unique to Triph. and A.).
while Nonnus’ imitations are of a more varied and subtle nature.\textsuperscript{56} The author of the late Orphic \textit{Argonautica} is heavily indebted to his Alexandrian predecessor.\textsuperscript{57}

2. The Mediaeval Tradition

At some stage, the papyrus rolls of the \textit{Argonautica} were copied onto codices, written in uncial lettering.\textsuperscript{58} Nonnus might have read the \textit{Argonautica} from a codex,\textsuperscript{59} which possibly contained marginal annotations, the precursors of the mediaeval scholia.\textsuperscript{60} Excerpts were made by compilers of lexica from both the text and the ancient commentators.\textsuperscript{61} The \textit{Etymologicum Genuinum} quotes approximately 420 lines, together with commentary, and thus provides evidence for the indirect transmission of the \textit{Argonautica}. One of its descendants, the \textit{Etymologicum Magnum}, offers at least one textual alternative in the portion of the poem covered by this commentary that shows that the etymologica and lexica might have had access to better texts than the direct tradition.\textsuperscript{62}


\textsuperscript{59} There is evidence for the early use of codices, both papyrus and parchment, from Egypt (the end of the 1st century); see Turner (1977) 38, Jongkind (2007) 30 n. 2.

\textsuperscript{60} Vian (1974) XLII.

\textsuperscript{61} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{62} Ibid. XLII and Alpers (1991) 242, who says the author of the \textit{Etymologicum Genuinum} was not using excerpts but full texts of poets such as Apollonius; see 4.297a. where the \textit{Etymologicum Magnum} has ἄμφισμον for the μόρφιμον of the direct tradition.
Although in general the number of texts decreased during late antiquity, with interest in classical learning only reviving in the ninth century, papyri show that the *Argonautica* was read throughout this period. The survivors of this ‘bottle-neck’ would then have been copied into minuscule to form the beginning of the mediaeval tradition. *Pace* Fränkel and Vian, who both argue for the existence of an archetype, it is difficult to believe in the existence of only one such manuscript of Apollonius’ poem. The large number of textual variants adds support to the argument that there was more than one uncial text from which copies were made and collations carried out.

There is also the evidence from the survival of the scholia. The subscription at the end of Book 4 says παράκειται τά σχόλια ἐκ τῶν Λουκίλλου Ταρραίου καὶ Σοφοκλείου καὶ Ὀξωνος. The use of the word παράκειται shows that these comments were copied from the original hypomnemata of the three ancient commentators alongside the text. However there is a portion of the text for which scholia do not exist (1.321–400). If they were lost at some stage in the transmission, then the text was lost along with them. The text, however, is present and must have been restored from another manuscript without missing pages, possibly during the early middle ages. These manuscripts were probably uncial codices which survived

---

63 See above p. 4.
64 Haslam (1978) 68.
65 See Fränkel (1961) IX, Vian (1974) XLII–XLIII for their statements of this with respect to the *Argonautica*.
66 Thus Pasquali (1934) 16, 26, Barrett (1964) 53–62, Haslam (1978) 70, Mastronarde and Bremer (1982) 67, 76 discussing similar traditions to that of the *Argonautica*.
67 Dickey (2007) 164
68 Haslam (1978) 71.
the next precarious period of Byzantine history until the retaking of the city from the Latin Empire in 1261.\textsuperscript{69}

Fränkel uses the argument of a variant shared by all the mediaeval manuscripts to support the hypothesis of an archetype. At 2.1127 the transmitted text, ἦ ἀμετα
τείρομενοι ἀμεταχρέος ἐμεβεβαιῶτες, produces a verbless clause. This was healed by conjecture: πείρομεν οἵ δια κατά (Voss and Köchley),\textsuperscript{70} later confirmed by P.Berol. 13413 (1\textsuperscript{st} / 2\textsuperscript{nd} century AD). The scribal error (ΤΕΙΡΟΜΕΝΟΙΑΜ for ΠΕΙΡΟΜΕΝΟΙΔΜΑ) might have come about through transcription from uncial to minuscule script and the fact that it is, to some extent, construable might account for its preservation.\textsuperscript{71} While it is true to say that this error must go back to a common source, it could be one of a number of sources used to create the medieval tradition.\textsuperscript{72}

The stemmata printed by both Fränkel (OCT p. IX) and Vian ((1974) LXXXV) show a rich textual tradition in descent from the single archetype which they both postulate. Their most significant feature is the division between the two families known as m and w, Vian differing from Fränkel in the way in he traces the the interrelations of the two families and the progeny of the Protocretensis (k). The earliest member of m is Laurentianus gr. 32.9 (AD 960–80), the oldest and possibly

\textsuperscript{69}Two manuscripts . . . Laur. 32. 16 and Guelferbytanas Aug. 2996 . . . show many readings distinct from the rest of the tradition. Fränkel assumes that all surviving manuscripts are descended an archetype with variants. This may well be so . . . When one bears in mind that . . . Laur. 32. 16 was prepared for and annotated in 1281 by Maximus Planudes, such a proceeding seems quite possible. An equally likely explanation, however, is that Planudes or someone in his circle found an old manuscript, possibly in unicals, representing a different tradition and collated it with his own copy’ (Browning (1960) 17). In this article Browning stresses that late Byzantine scholars had opportunities to consult ancient manuscripts, including some written in unicals, that they availed themselves of these opportunities, and that they collated them with their own, modern copies of classical texts, but did not as a rule transcribe them in their entirety.

\textsuperscript{70}On the attribution of the conjecture see Fränkel (1964) 24 n. 2.

\textsuperscript{71}See Fränkel (1964) 23–4 for the full story of this textual problem.

\textsuperscript{72}Barrett (1964) 54.
the best source, equipped with glosses, variant readings and scholia, which contains, as well as the *Argonautica*, the seven tragedies, respectively, of Aeschylus and Sophocles. It shows signs of having been copied from an exemplar and then corrected from a second codex.\(^7\) The earliest representative of w is Laurentianus gr. 32.16 which originates from the circle of Maximus Planudes, dated 1280. Some of it may be in his hand.\(^7\) The two families are often at variance, and in many if not most cases the readings of both groups almost certainly go back to antiquity, with an admixture of Byzantine conjectures.\(^7\)

If one were to suggest an alternative stemmatic diagram for the *Argonautica* (see figure 3 above), it might bear a resemblance to that printed for Euripides’ *Hippolytus* by Barrett,\(^7\) showing different ‘minuscule archetypes, which acquired their readings, in whole or part, from different uncial ancestors’. During the periods

---

\(^7\) Vian (1974) XLI–XLVIII. See above p. 9 n. 59.

\(^7\) *Ibid*. XLIX.

\(^7\) Fränkel (1964) 70–1 and 464n.

\(^7\) Barrett (1964) 62.
when both the Laurentianus and the Soloranus were written, learned libraries were being transferred into the city. Maximus Planudes says that many books in the library of the Chora monastery were brought from elsewhere: πρὸς τὴν βασιλίδα πόλιν ὀθενδήποτε μετηνέχθησαν αἱ βιβλίοι (Epist. 67.69–70 = p. 83 Treu). There is also the story of the library of Nicephoros Moschopoulos, metropolitan of Crete and uncle of the scholar Manuel Moschopoulos whose private library was so large that it needed eleven mules to transport it. He is said to have possessed an Odyssey.77 It would not be surprising if he also owned an Argonautica.

So, although the suggestion of a more than one archetype may disturb the clarity of the story of the transmission of Apollonius’ poem, it is fully in accordance with the work’s passage from antiquity: one that was volatile and open to poetic and scholarly engagement at all stages.

3. Modern Survival

The Argonautica was printed for the first time in 1496 in Florence by Lorenzo de Alopa (Laurentius Francisci de Alopa). Janus Lascaris, the Greek refugee employed by Lorenzo de’ Medici as his librarian, edited the text and designed the font with which it was printed.78 The poem had become known again in the West when the humanist scholar Giovanni Aurispa arrived back in Venice from Constantinople in December 1423, bringing him with him 238 Greek codices, among which was the Codex Laurentianus 32.9. Paradoxically,79 the first editor did not use this but

77 See Browning (1960) 12–13 on the size of Moschopoulos’ library and the difficulties involved in transporting it.

78 He originally conceived the type as an upper case alphabet only, and added the lower case specifically for printing the scholia in this edition.

79 He later used L to publish the scholia that it contained to Sophocles, in Rome in 1518; see Finglass (2012) 16.
depended mainly on Laurentianus 32.16, with perhaps some reference to the Guelferbytus (14th century) and the Ambrosianus (beginning of the 14th century).\textsuperscript{80}

Other printed editions followed before the first edition with a commentary by Jeremias Hoelzlin in 1641,\textsuperscript{81} and that of John Shaw in 1778. Richard François Philippe Brunck, in his own edition, was hard on both of them. He speaks of ‘tenebrae Hoeltzlinianae’\textsuperscript{82} and agrees with another great textual critic of the Argonautica, David Ruhnken,\textsuperscript{83} in describing Hoelzlin as ‘tetricus et ineptus Apollonii commentator,’ while his opinion of Shaw, perhaps more justified, is that ‘in arte Graecos poetas edendi Shawium illum ne tironem quidem esse’, adding that ‘de ejus in Apollonium meritis quid censeam in notis abunde declaravi’.\textsuperscript{84} Hoelzlin has, however, achieved a measure of vindication, albeit late in the day: at 4.464 he suggests a conjecture that is now the earliest attested reading, thanks to an unpublished papyrus fragment.\textsuperscript{85} This conjecture was adopted by Brunck, without acknowledgment.\textsuperscript{86} Reading through Hoelzlin’s commentary and translation, one

\textsuperscript{80} This is not to decry the worth of Laur. 32.16, on which see p. 9 n. 57 (above), Fränkel (1964) 71, 111–12. For the Guelferbytus, see \textit{ibid.} 72–4 and for the Ambrosianus, \textit{ibid.} 59–67.

\textsuperscript{81} For a list of commentaries and editions of the Argonautica, see pp. 298–9.

\textsuperscript{82} Cf. his note on 4.1057: ‘Cimmeriis et plus quam Hoeltzlinianis tenebris mentem poetae involvit Magister Shawius, vertens: Nec defuturos se auxilio affirmabant, si causae iniquae obstarent’, adopting the reading ἀντιστάσαι, in which he is followed by Vian (1981) 184.

\textsuperscript{83} Ruhnken (1752) 69.

\textsuperscript{84} Brunck (1780) IV.

\textsuperscript{85} See p. 5 and this commentary \textit{ad loc.}

\textsuperscript{86} \textit{Ibid.} ‘sic legendum’ (p. 358). He seems to appropriate another of Hoelzlin’s corrections at 4.313 Νάρηκος for –ον δάρηκος (‘confirmatur nostra lectio’, (p. 351), though Vian credits this to Chrestien. However he approves of the alteration that Hoelzlin made at 4.1501: ‘sic optime distinxit et... sensum restituit’ (p. 399).
gains the impression of a polymath – he includes Greek, Latin and Hebrew parallels – who is able to discuss the text both philologically and as literature.\textsuperscript{87}

Brunck himself was the first critical editor of Apollonius in that, as stated on the title page of his edition,\textsuperscript{88} he collated manuscripts\textsuperscript{89} and, from that basis, emended the text when he considered it corrupt.\textsuperscript{90} However, he perhaps placed excessive trust in the manuscripts at his disposal, was too quick to emend his text\textsuperscript{91} and too prone to ‘odium philologicum’ and ‘the pillory and ducking stool as methods of persuasion’.\textsuperscript{92}

In spite of this Fränkel sums him up well when he says: ‘hercle Graece sciebat’.\textsuperscript{93} This is proved by notes that discuss manuscript readings, together with points of syntax and morphology, at the same time quoting apposite parallels.

Augustus Wellauer and Rudolf Merkel placed Apollonian studies on a more secure footing. Wellauer collated thirteen codices and provided an edition (1828) with notes, which took judicial note of the work of his predecessors.\textsuperscript{94} Merkel (1852 and

\textsuperscript{87} Cf. his note on 4.202 which begins: ‘Iason tansus imperator quantus orator postquam suorum armavit corpora, animum erigit duplici spei et metus fulcimento. Metus hic non fuga pericali’ (he quotes a parallel from Polybius) ‘sed est cautio vitae propriae custodia’; Fränkel (1962) 112 says of him that he is sometimes more correct than later interpreters.

\textsuperscript{88} ‘Apollonii Rhodii Argonautica e scriptis octo veteribus libris quorum plerique nondum collati fuerant nunc primum emenadate edidit.’

\textsuperscript{89} Brunck collated (or had collated for him) eight codices; see his praefatio p. V–VI, Fränkel (1961) XVII, (1964) 113.

\textsuperscript{90} He is mentioned in the following places in the app. crit. of Fränkel’s OCT of the portion of the text which this commentary covers: 85*, 172*, 202*, 233*, 269, 278, 345*, 408, 438*, 454*, 464*. An asterisk denotes that his reading is adopted in this commentary.

\textsuperscript{91} See, for example, Fränkel OCT app. crit. 4.1316, with Brunck’s note ad loc. discussing his suggestion οὐρα: ‘sic omnino legendum. Manifesta menda, codices et impressi libri’.

\textsuperscript{92} The latter phrase, used of Nicholaas Heinsius in a positive way, is owed to Tarrant (1999) 291. See Brunck’s own notes on 1.7, 612, 2.381, 1260.

\textsuperscript{93} Fränkel (1961) XVII.

\textsuperscript{94} See his praefatio (pp. V–VI) for a list of manuscripts used. He was a conservative editor: his comment on 1.1135 ‘contra librorum consensum nihil novare ausus sum’ contrasts with Fränkel’s (1961) XX ‘malai . . . periclitari quam declineare officium’, though see Griffin (1965) 166 for arguments against Fränkel’s predeliction for emendation. Even when Wellauer makes what
1854), on the other hand, relied specifically on two manuscripts.\(^9\) He realised the value of Codex Laurentianus 32.9 for the text of the *Argonautica*,\(^9\) maintaining that the text that he printed had to be based on the authority of good manuscripts and not reprinted from the work of previous editors. He was not, however, open to the idea that more recent manuscripts might sometimes provide good readings (‘recentiores non deteriores’).\(^9\) His edition has a modern appearance, methodically equipped with detailed reports of these manuscripts, followed by reports on the ancient testimonia and then conjectures made by him and previous scholars,\(^9\) without separate commentary. This pattern is repeated below the text on every page, noting each idiosyncrasy of his manuscripts, however many times they may be repeated.\(^9\) Fränkel finds him rather pedestrian and calls the prolegomena with which his ‘editio maior’ (1858) is equipped ‘praelonga’,\(^9\) perhaps an over-harsh judgment as they contain the first attempt at a full-scale treatment of important aspects of Apollonius’ poem and Hellenistic poetry in general.

---

\(^9\) Principally Laurentianus 32.9 and then Guelpherbytanus; see Fränkel (1961) XII.

\(^9\) See above p. 10.

\(^9\) The heading to chapter 4 of Pasquali (1934) 43–108; cf. also Timpanaro (2005) 47 discussing the concept of ‘recentiores non deteriores’, together with that of ‘eliminatio codicum descriptorum.’

\(^9\) Merkel was not good at emendation; see Fränkel (1964) 118 and cf. his attempt to emend συνθήσι at 4.437 into συννεφί (Merkel (1842) 618–19).

\(^9\) See Fränkel (1964) 116 n. 116. At 4.392, for example, he reports that the Guelferbytanus has the meaningless καταφλόξαι instead of καταφλέξαι.

\(^9\) See Fränkel (1961) XVIII, (1964) 118–19 for a description and evaluation of what they contain and also Wilamowitz (1921) 65, where it is perhaps unfairly commented that ‘umständliche Prolegomena nur eine Seite der Sprache behandeln’, ‘his elaborate Prolegomena deal with one aspect only of the poet’s language’. 
The heirs to Wellauer and Merkel are Fränkel (1961) and Vian (1974–81). Both have produced editions and commentaries. Vian’s text is by his own admission more conservative than that of his immediate predecessor. Both comment on the text much more fully than previous scholars. This attempt to interpret the poem using the resources of literary criticism, allied with the study of relevant aspects of ancient history, art and archaeology in addition to the more traditional philological approach, was taken forward by Enrico Livrea (1973) in the first full length commentary devoted to Book 4 of the Argonautica. While this remains the standard work of reference for that part of the poem, the time since then has seen numerous advances in the understanding of Apollonius’ work.

4. The present commentary

A poem that has survived the vicissitudes of more than two millennia still has secrets to divulge. These will emerge only through close investigation of the text, using all the tools at the commentator’s disposal, be they of whatever discipline. This commentary attempts to integrate discussion of text, language, style, and historical and artistic background as it progresses, and discusses topics of literary appreciation, such as characterisation, as they arise.

101 Wilamowitz at the end of his life said that Apollonius was ‘in den besten Händen’ (Solmsen (1979) 103), when referring to Fränkel.

102 See n. 69 and the account of older editions, commentaries and translations given by Mirmont (1892) I–XXXI (online at http://remacle.org/bloodwolf/poetes/apollonius/argointro.htm).

103 ‘Notre texte paraîtra conservateur à qui le comparerà à celui de H. Fränkel . . . nous ne croyons pas que le texte d’Apollonios soit une ruine’ (Vian (1974) LXX–LXXI).

In the matter of the choice of parallels, I have attempted not to fall into the trap of *parallelomania*\textsuperscript{105} and create a *Fundgrube*.\textsuperscript{106} Even when a number are quoted, I have tried to ensure that they are pertinent and advance the interpretation and understanding of the text. Although certain late authors frequently allude to Apollonius,\textsuperscript{107} these have not been included unless especially relevant.

In the belief that translation is part of the process of commentary and offers the possibility of encapsulating essential issues, all commented text has been translated.\textsuperscript{108} This translation is a personal effort that acknowledges a debt to all modern translators.

The main aim of this commentary is not to present a text through a series of extracted lemmata that are in danger of becoming fossilized, but as a continuous narrative equipped with tools for its explication and understanding.\textsuperscript{109} The *Argonautica* is a poem that deserves to be read rather than used as a work of reference.

---

\textsuperscript{105} See Gibson (2002) 347.

\textsuperscript{106} See Harder (2012) I 76.

\textsuperscript{107} See pp. 6–7.


\textsuperscript{109} On the choice of lemmata by commentators, see Kraus (2002) 10–16.
COMMENTARY

1–2 αὐτῇ νῦν κάματόν γε, θεά, καὶ δήνεα κούρης / Κολχίδος ἔννεπε, Μοῦσα, Διὸς τέκος: ‘You yourself, goddess, now tell of the suffering and plans of the Colchian girl, Muse, child of Zeus.’ The opening of Book 4 contains allusions that hint at how the poem might develop. A. may recall the invocations of both Iliad and Odyssey (Rossi (1968) 151–63) by combining θεά with Μοῦσα; cf. Il. 1.1 μὴν ἁεὶς θεά and Od. 1.1 ἀνδρα μοὶ ἐννεπε Μοῦσα. Although the narrative of Medea’s love for Jason continues, the tone in Book 4 is primarily heroic, not erotic (cf. Acosta-Hughes (2010) 43–4 and Albis (1996) 93–4 on the Homeric echoes contained in this opening). Also, Priestley (2014) 176 mentions the possibility of links between the alternatives presented here – shameful flight and passion – and Herodotus’ Phoenician version of why Io left Argos (Hdt. 1.5.1–2). For other possible Herodotean influences on A. see nn. 257–93, 272–4.

Κολχίδος ἔννεπε Μοῦσα could also be based on the opening words of the Odyssey, with θεά then used to describe the Muse as at Od. 1.10, and the substitution of Διὸς τέκος (cf. Il. 1.202, 2.157, Od. 4.762 = 6.324, Hom. Hym. 28.17, 31.1) for θύγατερ Διός of the same line. The allusion, however, may be more general. Μοῦσα often opens a poem; cf. Hom. Hym. 5.1–2, Hes. Op. 1–2. Callimachus probably began the fourth book of the Aetia Μοῦσαι μοι (Aet. fr. 86.1 Harder); see Finglass (2013) 4–5 on addresses to the Muse at the start of things. Yet the double allusion arma virumque cano (Virg. Aen. 1.1) argues that A.’s best interpreter (see Hunter (1993b) 170 n. 2, 170–89, Nelis (2001)) understood the allusion to be specifically Homeric. Other examples of split invocations are Theoc. 10.24–5 Μοῦσαι Πιερίδες . . . θεαί, Virg. Ecl. 10.70–2 divae . . . Pierides, Triph. 4 ἔννεπε, Καλλιόπεια, καὶ ἀρχαίην ἔριν
ἀνδρῶν; see Harden and Kelly (2014) 8 on the conventions of the proem in archaic epic which A. may be deconstructing here.

αὐτή νῦν stresses the link between the invocations of the Argonautica. At 1.1–2 ἄρχόμενος σέο, Φοῖβε, παλαιγενέων κλέα φωτῶν / μνήσομαι, the poet is the teller of the tale, at 3.1 παρά θ’ ἱστάσο, καί μοι ἐνιστε he asks Erato to stand by his side, and finally here he abdicates responsibility for the narration: the anonymous Muse of Book 4 is to tell the tale on her own. It has been argued (Hunter (1987) 134, (1989) 95) that the unidentified Muse here is also Erato; however, the heroic allusions in the opening lines signal a change of tone (448n.).


κάματος, frequently ‘physical toil’ or the resulting ‘weariness’ (2.673, 3.274, Od. 7.325), here describes human emotions, linking the opening of Book 4 with 3.288–9 καὶ οἱ ἄνυτο / στηθέων ἐκ πυκναί καμάτω φρένες, 3.961 Αἰσιονίδης, κάματον δὲ δυσίμερον ὀρσε φασάθεις; cf. Sappho fr. 43.5–7 Voigt ἀκαλὰ κλόνει / [ ]κάματος φρένα / [ ]ε κατισδάνε[ι where κάματος is linked in some way with the mind. Most importantly, κάματος denotes the suffering of disease (Hippocr. de Arte 3, Simon. fr. 8.9 IEG ὁδ’, ὑγίης ὅταν ἦ, φροντίδ’ ἐχει καμάτοι), a common way of viewing love (cf. Eur. Hipp. 476 with Barrett ad loc., Soph. Trach. 443, 491, 544 (Deianeira referring to Heracles’ passion for Iole as a disease), Theocr. 2.82–5 χέος
ίδον, ὡς ἐμάνην / . . . / καπηρὰ νόσος ἐξεσάλαξε; see Cyrino (1995) 2 and passim, Faraone (2009) 44. The word is suitable for female suffering in what is a vaguely sexual context.

gε emphasises κάματον as the alternative deemed to be more important (cf. K–G II 509 quoting Hdt. 1.11 ἦτοι κεῖνὸν γε, τὸν ταῦτα βουλεύσαντα, δὲ
ἀπόλλυσθαι, ἢ σε, τὸν ἐμὲ γυμνὴν θεσάμενου and other examples; also Od. 1.10 τῶν ἀμόθεν γε, θεά, θύγατερ Διός, εἴπε καὶ ἦμῖν). The combination of δήνεα (cf. Od. 10.289 ὅλοφώια δήνεα Κύρκης) with κάματον alludes to Medea’s two-sided character; see Hunter (1987) and Dyck (1989) on the inconsistency alleged by critics.

The Moon’s speech (57–65) develops this, ending with a parting shot echoing the first line: ‘although you are wise (καὶ πινυτῆ περ ἐσα), δήνεα κούρης), ‘you must suffer a sorrowful torment’ (πολύστον ἄλγος ἀείρειν ~ κάματον). For the lovesick maiden / witch character cf. Simaetha in Theocr. 2 and the woman in the Fragmentum Grenfellianum (text in Esposito (2005) 19–25). The two words also continue the ‘refracted’ (Acosta-Hughes (2010) 43) allusion to the beginning of the Odyssey. Both openings feature a single figure, enduring suffering and capable of ethically misguided judgments. A. makes this emergence from amatory to heroic mode more effective by self-quoting phrases used in an erotic context: κάματον δὲ δυσίμερον (3.961), in itself an implicit echo of Sappho (fr. 31 Voigt), is now used as part of a choice that is at once epic (4.1) and lyric (4.4).

Κολχίς is used of Medea elsewhere in A. only at 4.689, though cf. Eur. Med. 131–3 ἕκλυον δὲ βοάν / τὰς δυστάνου / Κολχίδος, Hom. Hym. 5.1–2 Μοῦσα μοι ἕννεπε ἑργα πολυχρύσου Ἀφροδίτης, / Κύπριδος (cf. Κολχίδος at 4.2).
For my mind within whirls in helplessness, as I debate.’ The poet now explains why he is appealing to the Muse to continue the story. Despite calling upon her after the style of both Homeric poems, he cannot choose between two possible motives for Medea’s leaving Colchis; his hesitation is cast in the form of a dubitatio (Quint. Inst. 9.12.9, [Cic.] Rhet. Her. 4.29.40; for examples cf. Hom. Hym. 3.19, Pind. P. 11.22–5, O. 2.2, Antagoras fr. 1 CA, Call. h. 1.5). In Book 3 she is, for the most part, infatuated with Jason, though there are moments when she feels doubt (e.g. 3.635–44). In 4.6–33, however, her love for Jason is overcome by her fear of her father because she has helped his enemy. Throughout these lines, Medea’s doubt mirrors that of the narrator.

ὥ γὰρ ἐμοιγε (Il. 21.439, Od. 15.152) marks the change to a personal tone, as A. voices his doubts about Medea’s emotional state. A. uses ἀμφαοὶ of Medea’s astonishment at her first sight of Jason (3.284) and of her hesitation before finally deciding to help him (3.811). Here, Medea’s internal psychological struggle is also echoed in the poet’s inability to speak. This form of the word is rare in Homer (Il. 17.695, Od. 4.704) but ἀφασία occurs in tragedy (Eur. Hel. 549, Her. 515, IA 837).

For νόος ἐνδον cf. Od. 24.474 εἰπέ μοι εἱρομένη, τί νύ τοι νόος ἐνδοθι κεύθει, 20.217–8 αὐτὰρ ἐμοὶ τόδε θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσι φίλοισι / πόλλ’ ἐπιδινεῖται. There is an elaborate development of the idea at [Aesch.] PV 881–2 κραδία δὲ φόβῳ φρένα λακτίζει. / τροχοδινεῖται δ’ ὀξυμαθ’ ἐλίγδην (~ ἑλίσσεται), on which see Sansone (1975) 69.

ἐλίσσω used of thought is not Homeric; but cf. Od. 20.23–4 τῷ δὲ μάλ’ ἐν πείσῃ κραδίῃ μένε τετλημῖα / νωλεμέως. αὐτὰρ αὐτὸς ἐλίσσετο ἐνθα καὶ ἐνθα and later 28 ὦς ἐφ’ ὡς ἐνθα καὶ ἐνθα ἐλίσσετο, μερμηρίζων. Pindar and Callimachus (cf. Vian (1981) 147) often create similar moments of excitement: Call Aet. fr. 43.85
4–5 ἡ μὲν ἀτης πῆμα δυσίμερου, ἢ τόγ’ ἐνίσπω / φύζαν ἀεικελίην, ἢ κάλλιτευ ἔθνεα Κόλχων. ‘whether I should call it the misery of an ill-starred infatuation or shameful panic, which was the reason for Medea’s leaving Colchis.’

With ὀρμαίνωτι / ἡ . . . ἡ . . . ἐνίσπω another nuance is added; cf. Finglass on Soph. Aj. 177–8 for examples and discussion of similar disjunctive interrogative or deliberative sentences. The indirect question construction, often introduced by ὀρμαίνω, is Homeric (cf. Il. 16.713–4, Od. 4.789–90, 15.300, 19.524–8), often of a warrior in a moment of doubt, not a poet worrying about his theme. Cf. particularly Il. 16.435–8 διχθὰ δὲ μοι κραδίη μέμονε φρεσὶν ὀρμαίνουτι, / ἡ μὲν . . . / . . . / ἡ, where Zeus is deciding Sarpedon’s fate: will he have an heroic death on the field of battle, or not? Hera provides the answer by insisting on Sarpedon’s death. At the opening of Book 4 the poet ponders which of two narratives he will follow – and again, Hera provides the answer, here by driving Medea to flight. A. portrays himself as being immersed in the psychological struggle that his character is undergoing and debates the decisions that he must make about his narrative in the manner of a warrior on the battlefield. Although the basic allusion is to a Homeric verbal pattern, the relationship implied between Muse and poet is different from that described explicitly at the beginning of the Catalogue of Ships (Il. 2.484–92).
μιμ . . . τόγ’ (mss.) is supported against Fränkel’s (OCT) suggestion τόγ . . . μιμ by Il. 16.435–6 (see above), Od. 15.304–6 πειρητίζων, / ἢ μιμ ἐτ’ ἐνδυκέως 
φιλέοι μεῖναι τε κελεύοι / αὐτοὺ ἐνίσταθμῷ κτλ. In A. μιμ can be followed by some form of ὄγε (or) or vice versa in a disjunctive; cf. 1.212–16 τήνυγε . . . μιμ, 620–3 μιμ . . . 

For ἄτης πῆμα δυσώμερον cf. Od. 3.152 Ζεὺς ἤρτε πῆμα κακοῖο, 14.338 δύσ ἐπί πῆμα γενοίμην, Soph. Aj. 363 πλέον τὸ πῆμα τῆς ἄτης τίθει, Phil. 765 τὸ 
pῆμα τούτο τῆς νόσου, Aesch. Ag. 850 πῆμ’ ἀποστρέψαι νόσου. Merkel’s ((1854) 
205) conjecture δυσώμερον (for transmitted δυσώμερον) emphasises Medea’s 
infatuation, a theme already mentioned (3.961) and one to which she will return 
(4.412–3, 1080, 1082). It achieves an elegant arrangement of adjective and noun 
which seems typically Hellenistic (cf. 4.201 δῆον θοῶν ἕχμα βολάων, possibly originating from phrases such as Theogn. 343 κακῶν ἄμπασμα μεριμνέων). For 
δυσώμερος (a coinage by A., here and 3.961) cf. δύσερως (Eur. Hipp. 193, Call. A.P. 
12.73.6 = 1062 HE, Theocr. 1.85, 6.7, Posidipp. Epigr. 19.8 A–B with Williams 

φύζα ἀεικελίη should be translated ‘shameful panic.’ The allusions to fear or 
general distress on Medea’s part in 11–29 provide the tacit answer to the question 
which A. asks in 2–5; cf. 4.360–2 ἐγὼ οὐ κατὰ κόσμον ἀναιδήτωρ ἰότητι / πάτρην 
tε κλέα τε μεγάρων αὐτοὺς τε τοκῆσα / νοσφισάμην. At Il. 9.2 it is Φύζα Φόβου 
kρυόεντος ἑταίρη and elsewhere φύζα ἀνάλκης (Il. 15.62) and φύζα κακή (Od. 
14.269 = 17.438), ‘rout’ or ‘the panic which follows the rout’. Aristarchus glossed the 
word as ἢ μετὰ δειλίας φυγή (p. 338 van Thiel). A. uses ἀεικελίος as a variation for
κάκος; cf. 1.304 μίμων δόμωι, μηδ᾽ ὅρυς ἀεικελίη πέλε νη, with II. 24.218–9 μηδὲ μοι αὐτή / ὅρυς ἐνὶ μεγάροισι κακὸς πέλευ.

For ἔθνεα Κόλχων cf. 2.1204–5 Κόλχων / ἔθνεα, 3.212 Κόλχων μυρίον ἔθνος, 4.646 ἔθνεα μυρία Κελτῶν, with II. 11.724 ἔθνεα πεζῶν and Herodotus’ frequent πολλὰ ἔθνεα (plus genitive) used to describe the nations encountered on his travels (e.g. 3.98), Emped. fr. 35.24 D–K ἔθνεα μυρία θυντῶν, Theocr. 17.77 ἔθνεα μυρία φωτῶν, Simylus, elegiacus aet. inc. ap. Plut. Rom. 17.5 ἔθνεα μυρία Κελτῶν (perhaps Hellenistic: see Horsfall (1981) 303).

6–9 ήτοι ο μὲν δῆμοιο μετ’ ἀνδράσιν, δόσοι ἄριστοι / παννύχιος δόλου αἰτόν ἐπὶ σφίασι μητιάσκεν / οἷσιν ἐνὶ μεγάροις, στυγερῷ ἐπὶ θυμὸν ἀέθλῳ / Αἰήτης ἄμοτοι κεχολωμένος. ‘Aites, together with the leading men of the people, spent all night devising sheer treachery against them in his palace, raging with anger in his heart at the outcome of the hated contest.’ The following narrative, picking up the end of Book 3 and also Aites’ first Colchian assembly (cf. 4.7 with 3.578 ἄτλήτους Μινύῃσι δόλους καὶ κήδεα τεύχων and 3.1406 πορφύρων ~ 4.7 μητιάσκεν, 3.1407 ἠμαρ ἐδυ ~ 4.7 παννύχιος; see Clare (2002) 217–9 on the significance of the two assemblies) reflects the pattern of Medea’s experience: her fear of being discovered, ‘her sense of isolation from other young girls, the option of suicide, and finally Hera’s deflection of that option’ (Acosta-Hughes (2010) 45) and so this connection between the two books reflects the consistency that can be traced in her characterisation (1–2 n.).

The threatening mood is increased by the delay of the name Αἰήτης (cf. 4.127–8, 4.912–14, 4.956–8, Theocr. 24.23–25, Hor. C. 3.7.5) and the use of oratio obliqua (cf. on A.’s use of indirect speech Hunter (1993b) 143–51 with Lightfoot
Aietes’ temper is emphasised from the first (2.1202) and its description can be of a violent nature (cf. 3.367–71, 3.396–400); cf. ὀλοόφρονος Αἰήταο (Od. 10.137).

A. may be caricaturing the bad–tempered tyrants of Greek tragedy such as Creon, Oedipus and particularly Thoas in Euripides’ Iphigeneia in Tauris, whose plot bears great similarities to the Argonautica (189–205n.). Hunter (1991) 81–99 = (2008) 95–114 emphasises the barbarian element in his character and Williams (1996) finds him to be a character adhering to old-fashioned Homeric values (231–5n.).

For μὲν following an invocation cf. II. 2.494, Od. 1.11, Arg. 3.6, Hes. Th. 115–6, 969, Denniston (1954) 389, 554.

For μητιάσασκεν / οἷον ἐνι μεγάροις cf. Od. 16.93–4 ἀτάσθαλα μηχανάσσθαι / ἐν μεγάροις, Arg. 3.213 ἐν μεγάροις ἀέκητι σέθειν κακά μηχανάσσθαι, and the similar 4.1070–1 κούρης πέρι μητιάσασκον / οἷον ἐνι λεχέσσαι. Aietes’ gathering of his best men recalls Agamemnon’s council of war in the Doloneia; cf. II. 10.197 αὐτοὶ γὰρ κάλεσαν συμμητιάσσθαι and also 208 ἄσσα τε μητιώσωσι μετὰ σφίσιν. A.’s use of μητιάσασκεν might reflect a Homeric v.l. in one of these passages.

For παννύχιος in the context of plotting cf. II. 7.478–9 παννύχιος δὲ σφιν κακὰ μῆδετο μητίετα Ζεὺς / ομερδαλέα κτυπέων (66–9n.). For deliberation at night
For δόλου αἰτίων cf. Hom. Hym. 4.66 ὀρμαίνων δόλου αἰτίων ἐνὶ φρεσίν, Od. 4.843 φόνον αἰτίων ἐνὶ φρεσίν ὀρμαίνοντες, Hes. Th. 589, Op. 83; also Od. 8.276 τεύξε δόλου κεχωλωμένος. The theme of δόλος is of prime importance in the story of Jason and Medea, particularly in their plot against Apsyrtus (cf. 4.421 μέγαν δόλου ἠρτύνοντο with nn. 70–4, 341–4, 404–5, 456–80).

Although ἀνήρ δήμου is often contrasted in Homer and elsewhere with βασιλεύς, ἔξοχος ἀνήρ, οἱ ἀριστοὶ (II. 2.188, 198, Hes. Op. 261, Hdt. 3.81, 5.66), cf. II. 6.314 ἔτευξε σὺν ἀνδράσιν οἳ τὸ τ΄ ἀριστὸν καὶ 11.328 ἀνέρε δήμου ἀριστῶ. Aietes’ initial plans against the Argonauts are similarly described; cf. 3.606–7 καὶ ρ’ ὁ μὲν ἄσχετα ἐργα πιφαύσκετο δημοτέροισιν / χωόμενος. 9–10 οὐδ’ ὡγε πάμπαν / θυγατέρων τάδε νόσφιν ἐὼν τελέεσθαι 

ἐώλπει. ‘Nor was he at all imagining that these things were being accomplished without his daughters.’ Aietes’ daughters are implicated in the treachery by the intricate syntax. The word that denotes their deeds (τάδε), menacing because of its indefinite nature, is embedded in the phrase (θυγατέρων . . . νόσφιν ἐὼν) that implicates them in Medea’s escape.

For τελέεσθαι ἑώλπει cf. τελέεσθαι οἵω (II. 1.204, Od. 1.201 etc.). A. has substituted a rare form for the ordinary οἵω. Fränkel’s proposed alteration to τετελέσθαι is unnecessary since A. has ὀἷσσάμενος τελέεσθαι at 2.1135. The present infinitive adds drama to the description (Vian ad loc.). Aietes suspects that a plot is going on around him. τετελέσθαι does not occur elsewhere in the Argonautica, Iliad or Odyssey; see Campbell (1976) 337 n. 18 against Fränkel.
The Alexandrians thought of ἐώλπει (II. 19.328, Od. 20.328, 21.96, 24.313) as an imperfect; cf. Theocr. 25.115 οὐ γάρ κεν ἐφασκέ τις οὐδὲ ἐώλπει. Here it balances μητιάσκεν; cf. 3.370 with Campbell ad loc., ‘he was convinced’. This interpretation is contradicted by LSJ⁹ s.v. ἐλπω II where it is explained as 3rd person singular pluperfect; see Marxer (1935) 8–36 on A.’s interpretations of Homeric verb forms.


ἐμβαλεν is frequently used of inserting a thought or emotion into the mind; cf. 1.803, 2.865–6, II. 17.118 θεσπέσιοιν γάρ σφιν φόβον ἐμβαλε Φοῖβος Απόλλων, Eur. Or. 1355 μὴ δεινόν Ἀργείουσιν ἐμβάλῃ φόβον. Hera works through silent action or suggestion elsewhere in the Argonautica at 3.250, 818, 1184–5, 1199–1200; see Campbell (1983) 50–6, Mori (2012) 12.

12–13 τρέσσεν δ’, ἡντε τις κούφη κεμάς, ἢν τε βαθείς / τάρφεσιν ἐν ξυλόχοιο κυνών ἐφόβησεν ὴμοκλή. ‘She fled like a gentle fawn which, in the thickets of a deep wood, the baying of dogs has startled.’ A.’s simile has multiple points of comparison, tying it closely to the action (nn. 35–9, 139–42). The simile is typical of the Homeric battlefield; cf. II. 11.546–51 τρέσσε δὲ παπτήνας ἰρ ὀμίλου θηρὶ ἐοικὼς / . . . / ως δ’ αἰθώνα λέοντα βοῶν ἀπὸ μεσσάλοιο / ἐσσεύαντο κύνες (4.13–κυνῶν . . . ὴμοκλή) τε καὶ ἀνέρες ἀγροϊῶται, / . . . / πάννυχιοι ἐγρήσοσουτες (4.7–πάννυχιοι δόλον αἰτῶν), where Ajax, put to flight by Zeus, is likened to a lion
driven from the fold by men and dogs. A. adapts this to fit Medea; so instead of the λεών, we have the κεμάς whose behaviour is more appropriate to the fearful heroine, though one who will later exhibit warrior characteristics (16–7n.) For the more timid animal cf. *II*. 10.360–1 (Diomedes and Odysseus in pursuit of Dolon) ώς δ’ ὀτὲ καρχαρόδοντε δύῳ κόνε εἰδότε θήρης / ἡ κεμάς ἠδὲ λαγωδὸν ἐπείγετον ἐμενὲς αἰεῖ. The timidity of deer is a frequent *topos* in Homer (*II*. 11.473–81, 22.189–93). For ἡμύτε τὶς κούφη κεμάς cf. τεθηπότες ἡμύτε νεβροί (*II*. 4.243, 21.29) or πεφυζότες ἡμύτε νεβροί (22.1).


κεμάς is Homeric *hapax* (cf. *II*. 10.361 quoted above). Callimachus explains his use of κέμας at *h*. 3.112 by the phrase (102) μάσσονες ἤ ταῦροι, ‘bigger than bulls’ (163 κεμάδας is similarly taken up by 167 ἐλάφοισι), perhaps emphasising that, since the word is used as a comparison for a full-grown man in the *Iliad*, it should not be used of a fawn or young deer. A. uses κεμάς three times and offers two interpretations. At 3.878–9 he copies Callimachus’ picture of Artemis’ chariot drawn by full-grown stags. However at 2.696 and here, κέμας means fawn; cf. *Σ* 2.696 (p. 181 Wendel) ἡλικία ἐλάφων, ‘the young (?) age of stags’, 4.12 (p. 262 Wendel) κέμας ἐστιν ὡ νέα ἐλάφος, Hesych. κ 2193 = 1459 Latte κεμάς· νεβρός, ἐλάφος· τινὲς

For κούφη cf. Anaetr. fr. 417.1–5 PMG πῶλε Ὁρηκίη . . . κούφα τε
σκιρτῶσα παιζεῖς, Aesch. Eum. 111–13 ὃ δὲ ἐξαλύξασθαι νεβροῦ δίκην / καὶ
tαῦτα κοῦφως ἐκ μέσων ἄρκυστάτων / ὁροῦσε (Clytemnestra describing Orestes’
escaping the ‘hounds of justice’, the Erinyes); also Eur. Alc. 584–6, El. 860–1 with
Hunter (1993b) 66 n. 80.

For ἥν τε βαθείης / τάρφεσιν ἐν ξυλόχοιο cf. Il. 5.554–5 (describing two
Greek heroes, Crethon and Orsilochus) λέοντες δύω ὀρέων κορυφῆσιν / ἔτραφέτην
ὑπὸ μητρὶ βαθείης τάρφεσιν ὕλης, 15.605–8 (of Hector being roused against the
Greek ships 607 τῶ δὲ οἱ ὄσσε ~16 ἐν δὲ οἱ ὄσσε, 608 λαμπέσθην ~ πλήτῳ πυρός),
16–17n.

κυνῶν ἐφόβησεν ὁ μοκλή alludes to a possible pursuit on Aietes’ part; cf.
Aesch. Cho. 1054 ἐγκοτοι κύνες, Eum. 246–7 κύων νεβρόν / πρὸς αἴμα καὶ
σταλαγμόν ἐκματεύομεν, with Finglass (2007) on Soph. El. 1388n. on the Erinyes
described as dogs. A.’s simile has multiple points of comparison, tying it closely to
the action (nn. 35–9, 139–42).

For ὁ μοκλή cf. Call. h. 4.158–9 ὑπ’ ὁμοκλῆς / πασσυδίῃ φοβέοντο, 231 αἴεν
ἐτοίμα θεῆς ὑποδέχθαι ὁμοκλήν (referring to a hunting hound). For ἐφόβησεν cf. Il.

14–15 αὐτίκα γὰρ νημερτές ὀίσσατο, μὴ μιν ἄρωγήν / ὁλθέμεν, ἀγα δὲ
πᾶσαν ἀναπλήσειν κακότητα. ‘For immediately she was quite sure that her
help would not escape his attention and that at any moment she would suffer a terrible
fate.’ Cf. Od. 19.390–1 αὐτίκα γὰρ κατὰ θυμόν ὀίσσατο, μὴ ἐ λαβοῦσα / οὐλὴν
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ἄμφράσσατο καὶ ἀμφαδὰ ἔργα γένοιτο (another important secret is being revealed: Odysseus is worried that Eurycleia will recognise him from his hunting wound). The use of indirect speech to describe Medea’s fears and the vagueness of the vocabulary (ἀρωγήν and κακότητα at opposite ends of the subordinate clause cover a range of threatening possibilities) maintain the tension. Direct speech is saved for Medea’s farewell (30–3).


For ἀναπλήσειν κακότητα cf. Il. 8.34 κακον ὁίτον ἀναπλήσαντες, 11.263, 15.132, Od. 5.207, 302, Hdt. 5.4 ἀναπλήσαι κακά, ἔχει πᾶσαν κακότητα, Hippon. fr. 115.7 IEG πόλλ’ ἀναπλήσει κακά, Theogn. 500–1 IEG ἀνδρὸς δ’ οἶνος ἔδειξε νόον / καὶ μάλα περ πινυτοῦ κακότητα δὲ πᾶσαν ἐλέγχει (~ 65 καὶ πινυτή περ ἐοῦσα, πολύστονον ἀλγος ἀείρειν). The use of the four syllable abstract noun (rather than κακά) emphasises Medea’s possible fate.

16–17 τάρβει δ’ ἀμφιπόλους ἐπιστόρας. ἐν δὲ οἱ δόσε / πλήτο πυρός, δεινόν δὲ περιβρομέεσκον ἄκουαί: ‘She feared what her servants knew: her eyes filled with fire and there was a terrible roaring in her ears.’ A. shortens his phrases, marking the frantic nature of Medea’s mood, pointed by the repetition of π. ἐπιστόρας is Homeric hapax (Od. 21.26 μεγάλων ἐπιστόρα ἔργων). A. offers two interpretations (2.872 ἐπιστόρα νηῶν, 4.1558 ἐπιστόρα πόντου, ‘skilled in’ or ‘having knowledge of’ and 4.89 ‘having knowledge of’ in the sense of ‘being witness to something’). Here, A. uses the word absolutely with no qualifying

ἐν δὲ οἱ ὀσσε... ἀκουαί mixes epic and lyric elements, referring both to Sappho fr. 31.11–2 Voigt (quoted below) and the Homeric battlefield. Rissman (1983) 72 discusses fr. 31 in terms of the application of ‘Homeric battle simile and terminology to lovers’; cf. Il. 15. 605–8 μαίνετο δ’ ὡς ὁτ’ Ἀρης ἐγχέσπαλος ἢ ὀλοὸν πῦρ... βαθές ἐν τάρφεσιν ὡς... τὸ δὲ οἱ ὀσσε / λαμπέσθην βλοσυρήσει τῷ ὀφρύσιν, 19.16–17, 365–7, Od. 5.151–2, 6.131–2, 10.247–8, 19.471–2, 20.348–9 where the reference to eyes is followed by a phrase saying that they were either full of fire or full of tears (e.g. Od. 4.704–5 δὴν δὲ μὴν ἁμφασίη ἐπέων λάβε τὸ δὲ οἱ ὀσσε / δακρυόφι πλῆσθεν). At the beginning of line 17, instead of the expected tear formula, we get the description usually used of warriors (cf. 1.1296–7 (Telamon), 4.1437 (Heracles), 4.1543–5 (δρακών)). On fire in the eyes of Homeric warriors, see Lovatt (2013) 311–24. Women on the point of suicide are often described as having blood-shot eyes; e.g. Virg. Aen. 4.642–3 effera Dido / sanguineam volvere aciem. In descriptions of the eyes, fire and blood imagery are often combined; cf. 2.210 (of the serpents) ardentisque oculos suffecti sanguine et igne. Medea’s fear is changing into a desperation close to anger; cf. her denunciation of Jason (30–3). A. is allusively portraying the volatility of Medea’s character; cf. 3.973–4 γνῶ δὲ μὴν Ἀἰσονίδης ἀτη ἐνιππεπτημίαν / θεμορίῃ with the desperate threats uttered at the end of the scene (especially 3.1111–7). For subtle
changes of emotion within a scene in Hellenistic poetry cf. Mosch. Eur. 145–6 (with Bühler’s note), and Theocr. 2 throughout.

The epic flavour of δεινὸν δέ (Il. 3.337, 11.42, Od. 16.401, 22.124) contrasts with περιβρομέεσκον ἀκουαί, imitating Sappho fr. 31.10–12 Voigt χρῶ πῦρ ὑπαδεδρόμηκεν, / ὀππάτεσοι δ’ οὐδ’ ἐν ὁρῆμι’, ἐπιρρόμ / βείσι δ’ ἀκουαί (cf. for other compounds of this verb 4.240 ἐπιβομεέειν πελάγεσιν, 4.908 ἐπιβομέωνται ἀκουαί, 1.879 περιβρομέεσκον μέλισσαί and Catull. 51.10–11 sonitu suopte / tintinant aures for a later imitation). A. is either varying Sappho or knew another reading (περιρρόμβεεισι / περιβρομεισι for ἐπιρρόμβεεισι; see Acosta-Hughes (2010) 45 n. 128, 238–40n.). For similar symptoms to those quoted by Sappho and A. cf. the Indian epic Bhagavad Gita (chapter 1.29–30 = Zaehner (1969) 117): ‘. . . My limbs give way (beneath me) / My mouth dries up, and trembling / Takes hold upon my frame: / My body’s hairs stand up (in dread). / (My bow) Gandiva, slips from my hand, / my very skin is all ablaze; / I cannot stand, my mind seems to wander (all distraught)’; see D’Angour (2013) 59–72.

18–19 πυκνὰ δὲ λαυκανίς ἐπεμάσσατο, πυκνὰ δὲ κουρίξ / ἐλκομένη πλοκάμους γοερῆ βρυχῆσατ’ ἀνίη. ‘Often she clutched her throat and often pulling her hair out by the roots she screamed in sorrowful pain.’ For the anaphora cf. 4.358–9n., 3.1071 (πῇ), 3.1088–9 (πρῶτος); cf. for the whole phrase Colluth. 340–1 γοεραί μὲν ἐπιμύουσιν ὀπώταπα / πυκνά δὲ μυρομένῃς θαλεραὶ μινύθουσι παρειαί; also 391 πυκνά δὲ τίλλε κόμην. Perhaps the repetition of πυκνά is meant to recall ‘something of the iterative nature of the pathos of Sappho fr. 31’ (Acosta-Hughes (2010) 45 n. 129; see Markovich (1972) 21 on the subjunctive ἰδω (line 7), ‘whenever

For the Homeric *dis legomenon* λαυκανίη (*Il.* 22.325, 24.642) the spelling λαυκ− is better attested, but, especially at 24.642, λευκ− is found; see West (2000) app. crit. At 2.192, mss., Σ (p. 141 Wendel) and testimonia unanimously read λευκ−, but at 4.18 λαυκ− is the more frequent reading. A. perhaps alludes to a Homeric *zetema* (Nagy (1996) 1) by using both forms (thus Rengakos (1993) 42, 135–6, (2002b) 148;). *Arg.* 2.192 would constitute A.’s allusion to *Il.* 24.642, both sharing the context of ‘feeding’, while *Il.* 22.325 and 4.18 refer to the neck *per se*; see Cuypers (1997) on 2.192.

κουρίξ is Homeric *hapax* (*Od.* 22.188); cf. [Call.] fr. *incerti auctoris* 772.1

Pfeiffer κουρίξ σινυμένους. A. adopts an interpretation later sanctioned by Aristarchus (*Σ*V = p. 384 Ernst) ὁ μὲν Ἀρίσταρχος τῆς κόμης ἐπιλαβόμενοι, ὁ δὲ Κράτης κουρίξ τὸ νεανικώς, Apoll. *Soph.* s.v. κουρίξ: σημαίνει δὲ τὸ τῆς κόρης λαβέσθαι. ἐνιὸν δὲ κουρικῶς, οἶον νεανικῶς). The use of κούρη (20) may be an indirect allusion to the interpretation κουρικῶς, οἶον νεανικῶς (Rengakos (1994) 177). The relationship between the two explanations is unclear. Did the Callimachean fragment continue κουρίξ / σινυμένους [πλοκάμους] or is something is seized ‘in the fashion of a young man’? Although Pfeiffer thinks that the authorship of this fragment is doubtful, it would suit Theseus in the *Hecale*, which describes the hero’s youthful exploits (cf. fr. 236 Pfeiffer = fr. 10 Hollis). On A.’s relationship to the scholarship of Aristarchus see Rengakos (1994) 106, (2001) 201–2.

ἐλκομένη πλοκάμους creates a chiasmus with the beginning of 21; cf. 28 and the *variatio* between 28 and 30, πλόκαμον ~ πλόκον (for which see below). Pulling out the hair is a demonstration of grief from Homer onwards (*Il.* 10.15, 22.77–8,

βρυχήσατ’ is properly used of a lion according to Hesych. β 1278 = i 352 Latte βρυχέται: μαίνεται βρυχήσεθαι ώς λέων. Cf. particularly Soph. Tr. 904 (of Deianeira) βρυχάτο μὲν βωμοῖσι προσπίπτουσ’. Sophocles’ audience must have been shocked to hear the word used of a woman; cf. 1070–2 οἰκτιρόν τέ με / πολλοίσιν οικτρόν, ὅστις ὠστε παρθένος / βέβρυχα κλαίων. It is used to liken Ajax to a bull at Soph. Aj. 322 (with Finglass ad loc.), and in the Iliad mostly of the death–cry of wounded men (cf. 13.392–3 κεῖτο τανυσθεὶς / βεβρυχώς).

20–1 καί νῦ κεν αὐτοῦ τήμος ύπερ μόρον ὄλετο κούρη / φάρμακα πασσαμένη. ‘There and then the young girl would have killed herself by taking poison.’ Cf. Od. 5.436–7 ἔνθα κε δὴ δύστηνος ύπερ μόρον ὄλετ’ Ὀδυσσεύς, / εἰ μὴ ἐπιφροσύνην δωκε γλαυκῆς Αθήνη. For καί νῦ κεν cf. Il. 5.311–2 καί νῦ κεν ἐνθ’ ἀπόλοιτο . . . Αἰνείας, / εἰ μὴ ἄρ’ ὄξυ νόησε . . . Αφροδίτη; similar are 5.388–9, 8.90–1.


For a heroine in Greek mythology contemplating or committing suicide, a rope or sword is a more common method; cf. 3.789–90 τεθναίην, ἢ λαμιόν ἀναρτήσασα μελάθρῳ / ἢ καὶ πασσαμένη ραιστήρια φάρμακα θυμοῦ with Eur. Tro. 1012–14 ποῦ δὴπ’ ἐλήφθης ἢ βρόχοις ἀρτωμένη / ἢ φάσγανον θήγουσ’, ἡ γενναία γυνὴ /
Hanging is an exclusively female means of death in tragedy (Loraux (1991) 8). However it is natural that Medea, as a woman skilled in drugs, contemplates poison as means of taking her life.

21–3 Ἡρης δ᾽ ἀλίωσε μενοινάς / εἰ μὴ μιν Φρίξου θεὰ σὺν παισὶ
φέβεσθαι / ὅρσεν ἀτυζομένην ‘and frustrated the desires of Hera, had not the goddess made her decide to flee in fear with the sons of Phrixos.’ The suspense of this part of the conditional is heightened by its rhetoric and word order (Φρίξου θεὰ σὺν παισί literally implicates the sons of Phrixos in the goddess’s machinations). The sentence structure previously used to describe the preservation of such heroes as Aeneas and Odysseus on the battlefield (see above) is now used of a panic-stricken girl; cf. φέβεσθαι (I.I. 6.41, 21.4 ἀτυζομενοι φοβέοντο) and ἀτυζομένην, used again of Medea at 4.39 in the ‘slave-girl’ simile.

23–4 πτερόεις δὲ οἱ ἐν φρεσὶ θυμὸς / ιάνθη. ‘Her fluttering heart within her chest was calmed.’ πτερόεις is applied to οἴστοι (I.I. 5.171), κεραυνός (Ar. Av. 576), ἐπεα (I.I. 1.201), ὑμον (Pind. I. 5.63), τροχῷ (Pind. P. 2.22), φυγάν (Eur. Ion 1238), but nowhere else to θυμός. Usually the adjective denotes something moving quickly in a definite direction, but here A. seems to be thinking of ἀναπτερόω which can mean metaphorically ‘excite’ or ‘make agitated’ (cf. Eur. Supp. 89 ὡς φόβος μ’ ἀναπτεροῖ, Or. 876). For similar verbs denoting mental agitation in an erotic context cf. Alcaeus fr. 283.3–5 Voigt κ’Ἀλένας ἐν στή[θε][σιν [ἐ]πτόω / θύμον Ἀργείας Τροίω δὲ ἐπ’ ἄν δ’ / ἐκμάνεισα, Sappho fr. 22.13–4 Voigt ἄ γαρ κατάγωγις αὐτα[ / ἐπτόωσι]’ ἰδοιςαν, 31.5–6 καὶ τὸ μ’ ἦ μὰν / καρδίαιν ἐν στήθεσιν ἐπτόσισεν, (for πτοέω see Rissman (1983) 110 n. 22, O’Higgins (1990) 158 =
Although φρεσὶ θυμὸς ιάνθη and its variations occur in Homer as clausulae (Il. 23.600, 24.321, Od. 15.165), the only place with matching metrical quantity and enjambment is Il. 23.597–8 τοῖο δὲ θυμὸς / ιάνθη (Od. 22.58–9 σὸν κῆρ / ιανθῇ, Il. 15.103); cf. 2.306, 3.1019, 4.1591–2, Theocr. 2.82, 27.70, Call. Aet. fr. 80.8 Harder, Mosch. Eur. 72, [Mosch.] Megara 1. The rhythm is striking: a molossus (−−−) followed by dactyls to denote the speed with which she transfers the drugs; see Mooney (1912) 412.

24–5 μετὰ δ’ ἕγε παλίσουτος ἀβρόα κόλπῳ / φάρμακα πάντ’ ἄμυδις κατεχεύατο φωριαμοῖο. ‘and then in a sudden rush she poured all the drugs back from the casket into the fold of her dress.’ Medea is a φάρμακας like Simaetha in Theocr. 2; cf. 161 τοῖα οἱ ἐν κίστᾳ κακὰ φάρμακα φαμὶ φυλάσσειν. There are parallels between this passage and 3.803–24, where her taking down this chest seems to presage an imminent death. As she replaces it, she resolves to live, a decision brought about by Hera. At 4.24–5, again under the influence of Hera (21), she takes the drugs from the chest, an action which symbolises her decision to live. The box is left behind, in the same way as the lock of hair. The separation of drugs from their coffer is a metaphor for the separation of magician from her native land.

It is at Hera’s suggestion that Medea is first consulted (3.27) because she is πολυφάρμακος. Hera, Medea and drugs remain a recurrent theme. πολυφάρμακος also connects Medea with Circe, her aunt (Od. 10.276): ‘Circe, enchantress of many
drugs is also the . . . most successful and most dangerous practitioner of erotic seduction. Her *thelxis* is simultaneously magical and erotic’ (Segal (1996) 62).

ἀθρόα . . . πάντ’ ἀμυδις combines two Homeric phrases: ἀθρόα πάντα (Il. 22.271, *Od.* 1.43, 2.356) and πάντ’ ἀμυδις (Il. 12.385, *Od.* 12.413); cf. 4.666 ἀθρόα φάρμακ’ ἔδαπτεν. The phrase emphasises that, as she prepares for flight, she is taking all her most precious possessions, packed into the capacious pocket of her chiton (cf. Gow on Theocr. 16.16, S. West on *Od.* 3.154 for κόλπος used of this pocket). Later in this description of her escape she does not appear to be carrying a chest (44–6).


The middle of καταχέω is not Homeric; apparently first at Hes. *Op.* 583, though cf. *Od.* 5.487 χύσιν δ’ ἐπεχεύσατο φύλλων, then Call. *h.* 6.5, fr. 69.11 Hollis and for the present phrase Euphorion fr. 15c.1 Lightfoot βλαψίφρονα φάρμακα χέειν.

26–7 κύσσε δ’ ἐὼν τε λέχος καὶ δικλίδας ἀμφοτέρωθεν / σταθμοὺς καὶ τοῖχον ἐπαφήσατο. ‘She kissed her bed and the double posts on both sides and touched the walls.’ This scene is foreshadowed at 3.635–64. The kiss (Hawley (2007) 12) is one of farewell to her family and the life, symbolised by the bedroom (and its
structural elements) that she has known as an unmarried girl; for kissing or handling the door-posts in farewell cf. Virg. *Aen.* 2.490 *amplexaeque tenent postes atque oscula figunt*, Val. *Flacc.* 2.168–9 *oscula iamque toris atque oscula postibus ipsis / ingeminant.*

Alcestis, in contrast to Medea, sees her bed as a symbol of her married life, as she prepares to die for her husband; cf. Eur. *Alc.* 175–7 *κἀπείτα θάλαμον ἐσπεσοῦσα καὶ λέχος / ἐνταῦθα δὴ ἐδάκρυσε καὶ λέγει τάδε· / ὡς λέκτρον ἐνθά παρθένει ἔλυσε· ἔγω, 183–4 κυνεῖ δὲ προσπίτνουσα, πάν δὲ δέμνιον / ὀφθαλμοτέγκτω δεύεται πλημμυρίδι. Medea herself will seek revenge for the sake of her bridal bed (Eur. *Med.* 999 *νυμφιδίων ἔνεκεν λεχέων, 1354 οὗ δ’ οὐκ ἐμελλές τὰμ’ ἀτιμάσας λέχη;* cf. Soph. *Trach.* 920–1 (Deianeira marking Heracles’ abandonment of her by a suicide carried out in a place that epitomises her married life) ὡς λέχη τε καὶ νυμφιτ’ ἐμά, / τὸ λοιπὸν ἢδη χαίρεθ’, (~ 4.32 χαίροις), ὡς ἐμ’ οὐποτε δέξεσθ’ ἐτ’ ἐν κοίταιοι ταῖς εὐνάτριαι, *OT* 1241–3 (Jocasta similarly carries out her suicide in her bedroom) παρηλθ’ ἐσω / θυρὼνσε, ἵτ’ εὐθὺς ἐς τὰ νυμφικά / λέχη, κόμην σπώσε’ ἀμφιδεξίοις ἀκμαῖς (~ 4.28 ῥξαμένη πλόκαμον), Virg. *Aen.* 4.650 (Dido sees her bed as epitomising the marriage that she thought she had) *incubuitque toro dixitque novissima verba.* The common context is the importance of the *thalamos* in a woman’s life; see Loraux (1987) 23-4, discussing the connection between marriage, death and the marriage chamber.

The bedroom and the bed continue to be an important motif in later erotic writing; cf. Prop. 2.15.1–2 *o tu / lectule deliciis facte beate meis, Plut. De Garrul.* 513F *οὔτω καὶ τοῖς ἑρωτικοῖς ἢ πλείστη διατριβή περὶ λόγους μνήμην τινὰ τῶν ἐρωμένων ἀναδιδόντας· οί γε καὶ μὴ πρὸς ἀνθρώπους, πρὸς ἄμυχα περὶ αὐτῶν διαλέγονται· ὥς φιλτάτη κλίνη and, in imitation of A., Nonn. *D.* 4.204–5 τυκτά
πολυγλυφέων ἠσπάσσατο κύκλα θυράων / ἄπνοα καὶ κλιντῆρα καὶ ἔρκεα παρθενεῶνος.

In the paradosis δικλίδας must agree with the σταθμοῦς. In this context, σταθμὸς apart from a reference in the Septuagint (LXX 4 Ki.12.9) always means ‘doorpost’. Homer always uses δικλίδες with words like θύραι (Od. 17.268, Arg. 1.786–7), πύλαι (Il. 12.455), σανίδες (Od. 2.345) to mean ‘double doors’. δικλίς, singular or plural, with or without a noun, is used of ‘a double or folding door’ (3.235–6 πολλαὶ / δικλίδες εὐπηγεῖς θάλαμοι τ´ ἔσαν ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα, Hesych. δ 1827 = 1458 Latte δικλίδες· θύραι, Asclep. A.P. 5.145.1 = 860 HE and see Gow on Theocr. 14.42). This makes ‘double door posts’ a difficult phrase; cf. 1.786–7 ἀνέσαν δὲ πύλας προφανέντι θεράττων / δικλίδας, εὐτύκτοιοι ἀρημεμένας σανιδεσσιν, with LSJ s.v. σάνις 1 and 6b. Although A. takes a delight in varying Homeric phraseology, it seems foreign to his practice to create a formula so different from the Homeric context; see Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 266–74 on the nature of A.’s adaption of Homeric style and language. Campbell (1971) 418 conjectured δικλίδος, offering two parallels, Aratus 193 and Theocritus 14.42, the latter a conversational passage, with a colloquial tone unlike A.’s more Homerically influenced diction.

27–9 χερσὶ τε μακρὸν / ῥηξαμένη πλόκαμον θαλάμῳ μυνημίᾳ μητρὶ / κάλλιπε παρθενῆς, ἄδινῇ δ’ ὀλοφύρωτο φωνῇ. ‘tearing away in her hands a long tress of hair, she left it in her bed chamber as a memorial of her maidenhood for her mother and lamented with a grieving voice.’ Although the background to this scene is traditional, that of a young girl leaving the family home and making a ritual dedication (cf. [Archil.] A.P. 6.133.1–2 = 536–7 FGE Ἀλκιβίη πλοκάμων ἱερὴν ἀνέθηκε καλύπτρην / Ἡρη, κουριδίων εὔτ’ ἐκύρησε γάμων, Call. h. 4.296–8, Eur.
IT 820), Medea’s gesture is more violent because she is a bride embarking on a formal ceremony against her will, as the words of her farewell show. Her dedication of the lock to her mother, rather than to a deity, provides a dramatic subject for her first reported words. For the wider tradition of sacrificing hair to procure a good outcome, see Harder (2012) 803, quoting in particular Il. 23.140–1 (where Achilles sacrifices a lock of hair to Patroclus), Vian (1981) 148.

The dedication of a lock also recalls Callimachus’ *Coma Berenices* (fr. Aet. 110–110f Harder; see Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 85–8, 87 n. 179, Acosta-Hughes (2007), (2010) 48). Both poets use the image of ‘involuntary separation’ (30–2n. λιποῦσα). Callimachus is attempting a clever literary conceit – the lock leaves its owner behind and speaks about its action, while A. uses the idea to raise the emotional level of Medea’s speech. The contrast is the same as that between Catull. 66.39 *invita, o regina, tuo de vertice cessi* and Virg. Aen. 6.460 *invitus, regina, tuo de litore cessi*, ‘*a locus classicus* of literary allusion’ (Wills (1998) 278; see Harder (2012) 811 and Pellicia (2010–11)).

Although the Callimachean original is fragmentary (fr. Aet. 110 39–40) plausible reconstructions have been made, e.g. ἄκων ὦ βασίλεια, σέθεν κεφαλήφων ἀπῆλθον, fitting well with the following line, which is largely preserved, viz. ἄκων, [σὴν τε κάρην ὡμοσα σὸν τε βίον (Barber (1936) 351). If Medea’s speech is influenced by Callimachus, it is tempting to see 4.30 as another allusion to the missing line. The situation is reversed, with Medea’s abandoning the lock, this being emphasised by ἀντ’ ἔμεθεν, and εἶμι λιποῦσα, the equivalent of its later imitators’ cessi. For more possible allusions to *Coma Berenices* see 57–65n. A. uses the motif of unwilling departure more explicitely at 4.1021–2 μὴ μὲν ἔγὼν θέλουσα σὺν ἀνδράσιν ἄλλοδαποῖσιν / κεῖθεν ἀφωρμήθην; see 30–2π. οἱ λιποῦσα.
For ῥηξαµένη πλόκαµον cf. ἐλκοµένη πλοκάµους and Soph. OT 1243 κόµην σπῶσ’ ἀµφιδεξίος ἀκµαῖς but the word seems excessively violent for the removal of some hair (cf. more usually φάλαγγα (Il. 6.6), τεῖχος (Il. 12.198), πύλας (Il. 13.124), πρότονους (Od. 12.409)). It has been emended (τιµηξαµένη – Maas OCT, Vian (1981) ad loc.) but the text is a sound, if daring, experiment in language, conveying emotion by suggesting an act of violence and continuing the use of heroic language for Medea’s situation (16–17n.); see Livrea (1983) 421 in support of ῥηξαµένη and cf. Aesch. Pers. 199 ξέρξης, πέπλους ῥήγνυσιν ἀµφὶ σώµατι, 468. If ῥήγνυσθαι can describe the ‘rending of clothes’ as a sign of grief, ‘rending of hair’ seems possible here. The influence of δαιξ̄ω may also be felt; cf. 18.27 φιλησὶ δὲ χερσὶ κόµην ἶσχυνε δαιξ̄ων, and Nonn. D. 5.375 καὶ πλοκάµους ἐδαιξ̄εν, ὅλον δ’ ἔρρηξε χιτῶνα; also Virg. Aen. 12.870 infelix crinis scindit Iuturna solutos, Ov. Met. 11.683, Her. 3.79, Tibull. 1.10.55.

μυηµήηα µητρὶ is an Ionicism; cf. Hdt. 2.135 ἐπεθύµησε γὰρ Ῥοδώπις μυηµήηον ἐσωτής ἐν τῇ Ἑλλάδι καταλιπέσθαι (2.126), Eur. Ba. 6 µητρὸς µυῆµα, Or. 798 µητέρος µυῆµα, Boesch (1908) 23, 43–7. While µυηµήηον often refers to a permanent memorial left by, or in honour of people after their deaths, its use here underlines the extreme nature of the action that Medea is taking in cutting herself off from her family.

For a farewell to παρθενίη cf. Sappho fr. 114.1 Voigt παρθενία, παρθενία, ποῖ µε λίποισα (~ 30 λιποῦσα) τοῖχη, Eur. Ale. 176–7 ἐνταῦθα δὴ ἰδάκρυσε καὶ λέγει τάδε: / ὃ λέκτρον ἐνθὰ παρθενεῖ εἶλος’ ἐγὼ, and Medea’s concern with her παρθενίη at 3.640; see Calame (1999) 126 on παρθενία and νύµφη as two formal stages of marriage. Medea’s words are an ironic twist on such statements as her relationship with Jason only achieves a degree of formality at 4.95–100 when he
makes an offer of marriage, the motives for which are a mixture of sympathy and self-interest. There may be a reference to Call. Aet. fr. 110.7 Harder ἦς ἀπό, παρ[θ]ενή μὲν ὅτ’ ἦν ἔτι with Harder ad loc., quoting Hes. Op. 518–20.

For ἄδινή δ’ ὀλοφύρατο φωνῆ cf. 3.635 ἄδινὴν δ’ ἄνευκατο φωνήν, Il. 19.314 ἄδινῶς ἄνευκατο φωνησέν τε. The word ἄδινὸς describes lamentation and grief; cf. Silk (1983) 323–4 on the concept of the ‘iconym’, ‘a word which has become obsolete’ and in which it is ‘barely possible to separate the question of meaning from the effect’ and Tsagalis (2004) 55 comparing Il. 24.747 τῆσιν δ’ αὖθ’ Ἐκάβη ἄδινοù ἐξῆραξ γόοιο with 761 τῆσιν δ’ ἐπειθ’ Ἐλένη τριτάτη ἐξῆραξ γόοιο to show how easily ἄδινὸς may be replaced by a more significant word in a formulaic phrase. The definitions of ἄδινὸς given by LSJ9 (close, thick, crowded, thronging, vehement, loud) show the impossibility of classifying such a word.

30–2 τόνδε τοι ἀντ’ ἐμέθεν ταναὸν πλόκον εἰμι λιποῦσα / μὴτερ ἐμή.
χαίροις δὲ καὶ ἀνδιχα πολλὸν ιούσῃ, / χαίροις Χαλκιόπη, καὶ πᾶς
dόμος. ‘I go leaving this flowing lock for you instead of me, my mother. Farewell as I depart on a long journey. Farewell, Chalkiope and all my home!’ In 6–29 A. has adopted a voice similar to that of a messenger in tragedy, describing the last moments of a main character. Medea now speaks directly, increasing the drama of the moment. Eur. Alc. 175–7 (quoted 26–7n.) displays the same technique.

with the exoticism of Dionysos, even though as a woman, it would be natural for her to have long hair. Schaaf (2014) 223–47 argues that A. invokes the imagery of Maenadism to convey Medea’s troubled state of mind. For possible allusions to Callimachus’ *Coma Berenices* see 27–9n., and for the variation πλόκαμον ~ πλόκον cf. Damagetus *A.P.* 6.277.2, 4 = 1376, 1378 *HE.*

λείπω and its cognates are a recurrent feature of the theme of unwilling departure. The archetypal passages are Sappho fr. 94.5 Voigt Ψάφφ’, ἦ μὰν σ’ ἀέκοιο’ ἀπυλιμπάνω, the ironic Archil. fr. 5.2 *IEG* κάλλιτον οὐκ ἐθέλων (of his shield left on the battlefield), and Eur. *Alc.* 386 (Ἀδ.) ἀπωλόμην ἀρ’, εἰ μὲ δὴ λείψεις, γύναι, 390 (Ἀλ.) οὐ δὴθ’ ἐκούσα γ’· ἄλλα χαίρετ’, ὡ τέκνα.; see Pelliccia (2010–11) 156–62 and add Eur. *Phoen.* 1738 λιποῦσ’ ἀποπρὸ γαίας, which Tsagalis (2008) 269 compares to the language of a fourth century Attic epitaph. It retains something of that nature here. The verb represents one of the expected elements of the scene, which Medea’s exceptional gestures (28 ῥηξαμένη πλόκαμον) and language (32–3) distort and fracture.

The statement χαίροις also characterises the departure as in Sappho fr. 94.6–8 Voigt τὰν δ’ ἥγω τάδ’ ἀμειβόμαι / χαίροισ’ ἐρχεο κάμεθεν (~ ἀντ’ ἐμέθεν) / μέμναισι’, οἴσθα γὰρ ὡς σε πεθήπομεν and also Eur. *Alc.* 177–8 ὡ λέκτρον . . . / χαῖρ’, *Tro.* 458 χαῖρέ μοι, μήτερ, δακρύσης μηδέν’ ὡ φίλη πατρίς (Cassandra saying ‘farewell’ to her mother as she is taken from her native land). Pelliccia (2010–11) 160 discusses the wider tradition in which the word is often closely associated with μιμήσικω. For the two words combined cf. *Od.* 8.461–2 χαῖρε, ξείν’, ἵνα καὶ ποτ’ ἐῶν ἐν πατρίδι γαίη / μνήσῃ ἐμεῖ’ where the tone of Nausicaa’s speech is poignant and nostalgic compared with Medea’s bitterness here.
For πᾶς δόμος, marking Medea’s intention to split from her entire family cf. Eur. Med. 113–4 παῖδες ὀλοισθε στυγερᾶς ματρός / σών πατρί, καὶ πᾶς δόμος ἔρροι. Chalciope is mentioned particularly because of the complex interplay between the two sisters in Book 3 (3.674–740; see De Forest (1994) 114–17 on the way they attempt to manipulate one another, while masking this with Homeric allusions; cf. 3.732–3 ὦς δὲ καὶ αὐτῇ / φημὶ κασιγνήτη τε σέθεν κούρῃ τε πέλεσθαι with 4.368–9n.).

32–4 αἴθε σε πόντος, / ξεῖνε, διέρραισεν, πρὶν Κολχίδα γαῖαν ἱκέσθαι. / ὦς ἄρ’ ἐφη, βλεφάρων δὲ κατ’ ἄθροά δάκρυα χεῦεν. ‘Would that the sea had destroyed you, stranger, before you arrived in Colchis. So she spoke, and abundant tears poured down from her eyes.’ This is an echo of the ‘might-have-been’ thought from the opening of the Medea (Eur. Med. 1–15) which has its origin in Od. 18.401–2 (the suitors discussing Odysseus in disguise as a beggar) αἴθ’ ὄφελλ’ ὁ ξεῖνος ἀλώµενος ἀλλοθ’ ὀλέσθαι / πρὶν ἐλθεῖν. It was later much imitated; Enn. Medea Exul fr. 208–9 Jocelyn, Catull. 64.171–2, Virg. Aen. 4.657, Ov. Her. 12.9–10.

Medea’s words are an expression of the common ancient wish to trace the origin of troubles back to an archē kakōn (e.g. the Judgment of Paris); see Finglass on Soph. Aj. 282 and Mastronarde (2010) 123–4, 134, 140.

Medea mentions Jason for the first time in Book 4, addresses him as ξεῖνε (88–90n.) and curses him. Her first appeal for help is to the sons of Phrixos (4.71–2) to whom she is related. The arrival of a ‘stranger’ in Colchis perhaps reflects the contacts that had taken place in the eastern Mediterranean over a period of three hundred years in which encounters between native women and Greek men must have
been frequent; see Stephens (2003) 191–2 discussing the theme of an adventuring male arriving in a foreign land and encountering a foreign woman, often high born.

ῥαίω rather than διαρραίω is more usually used of a shipwreck (Od. 8.569, 13.151, 23.235) but cf. Od. 12.290 (Eurylochus giving a forceful answer to Odysseus) ἀνέμοιο θύελλα, ἤ Νότου ἤ Ζεφύροιο, οἳ τε μάλιστα νῆα διαρραίασι. The use of the compound verb increases the violence of Medea’s curse. The combination δάκρυα χέεν is not Homeric but cf. Il. 16.3 δάκρυα θερμα χέων, Od. 23.33 λέοντες δ άπο δάκρυον ἤκεν, Eur. Her. 489 ἀθρόον . . . δάκρυ (similar are Il. 7.426 δάκρυα θερμα χέοντες, 17.437–8 δάκρυα δέ σφι / θερμα κατά βλεφάρων, Od. 4.114, 8.522, 14.129, 17.490, 23.33, 24.46, [Mosch.] Megara 57–9 δάκρυα / . . . κόλπον ἐς ιμερόεντα κατά βλεφάρων ἐχέοντο / μυησαμένη τέκνων τε καὶ ὦν μετέπειτα τοκήων). Instead of repeating Homeric phraseology, A. gives his description particular point by combining it with the unique Euripidean usage: to say that Medea’s tears are abundant stresses the emotion of the moment.

35–9 οἵη δ᾽ ἄφνειοῖο διειρυσθεῖσα δόμοιο / ληιάς, ἦν τε νέον πάτρης ἀπενόσφισεν ἀτίσα / οὐδέ νῦ πω μογεροῖο πεπείρηται καμάτοιο, / ἀλλ᾽ ἔτ᾽ ἄνθεσσουσα δύνης καὶ δουλία ἐργα / εἰσιν ἀτυζομενή χαλεπᾶς υπὸ χεῖρας ἀνάσσης. ‘Just like a prisoner-of-war dragged through a rich house, whom fate has just separated from her homeland – nor has she yet experienced wearying labour, but, unused to wretchedness and fearing the work of slaves, she goes under the harsh control of a mistress.’ The slave-girl unwillingly goes to face an immediate harsh fate, as Medea unwillingly (cf. 32–3) goes to find Jason and throw in her lot with him. The atmosphere is that of Euripides’ war plays. In the prologue of Andromache the eponymous character talks of her slavery, using phrases reminiscent
of A.’s comparison; cf. 12–15 αὖθι δὲ δούλη τῶν ἐλευθερωτάτων / οἰκῶν νομισθείσα, Ἑλλάδ’ εἰσαφικόμην / ... / δοθείσα λείας Τρωίκῆς ἐξαίρετον. The whole play has features which recall the Argonautica; e.g. the alleged use of φάρμακα by Andromache, ‘the foreign, barbarian woman’ to make her rival, Hermione, barren (Andr. 33).

διειρυσθείσα (my emendation for mss. διειλυσθείσα) makes clearer the point of the simile that both girls go unwillingly to their respective fates; cf. 1.687 γειοτόμον νεοῖο διειρύσσουσιν ἄροτρον (~ — εισιτο διειρῦ —), the point of similarity being the use of physical force. The slave-girl is dragged through the house to meet her mistress, after separation from her homeland. The idea that she is escaping (see Σ ad loc. below) from the house does not fit well with line 39. Medea leaves the house to find Jason. Medea hurries (ἐξέσσυτο), but this is of necessity. She goes to find Jason much against her will (cf. 20–33) and is similarly separated from her homeland. Since the presiding deities of both Books 3 and 4 are Erato and Eros (cf. the invocations 3.1, 4.1 and 4.445–9), the χαλεπ ἄνασσα of line 39 could also be Aphrodite and one implicit meaning of the simile as a whole that love has the power to ruin an innocent girl’s life and condemn her to an uncertain future. νέον, νύ πω and ἔτ᾽ ἀηθέσσουσα are all markers of the immediacy of the description. The picture is one of the slave-girl’s mental anguish at her immediate prospects after her arrival at her place of captivity. The unexpected comparison is not about speed of movement but about the state of mind that the two girls share.

διειλύομαι occurs elsewhere only at Nonn. D. 4.363–4 ψαφαρῆ δὲ κατ’ αὐχένος ἔρρεε χαίτη / αὐτομάτης πλαδαροῖο διειλυσθείσα καρῆνου, ‘a rough mane slipping out of the dank head ran down disorderly over his neck.’ Nonnus who is fond of imitating A. (p. 7 n. 44) must have taken it from an already corrupted text
of the *Argonautica* and like Σ (p. 263 Wendel) on A. guessed that it meant λάθρα
dieξέλθουσα τοῦ δόμου, ἀποδράσα, φύγουσα, based on 40 δόμων ἐξέσσυτο
κούρη. Erbse (1963) 23 explained διειλυσθείσα by reference to 3.1313 διὰ φλογὸς
εἰθαρ ἐλυσθεὶς but here and elsewhere (1.254) ἐλυσθεὶς means ‘enveloped, wrapped
in’ (διὰ φλογὸς is practically equivalent to ἐν--; for this use of διὰ cf. 4.199, 4.874, *Il.*
9.468 = 23.33 διὰ φλογὸς Ἡφαίστοιο, Theocr. 25.219). ἐλυσθεὶς may also mean
does εἰλύω (which in A. and late epic generally can equal ἐλύω; see Mooney on
3.1291 and LSJ⁹ s.v. εἰλύω and ἐλύω) bear any meaning denoting motion. Fränkel
ὀλλυμένους ἐλκηθείσας τε θύγατρας, where there is a v.l. ἐλκυθείσας. However
dιέλκω is not the right word for prisoners-of-war being forcibly dragged. It means
‘tear apart’ or ‘drag across (LSJ⁹ s.v.).

For ληίας cf. *Il.* 20.193–4 ληίάδας δὲ γυναίκας ἐλεύθερον ἰμαρ ἀπούρας /
dούλιών μ’ ἐσάγαν αἰσαν. A. is using a typical motif (woman as slave-captive) in an
erotic context; cf. 4.400 οἴα τε ληίοθείσαν, *Eur. Med.* ἐκ γῆς βαρβάρου λελημένη
with Asclep. *A.P.* 12.50.2 = 881 *HE* οὔ σὲ μόνον χαλεπὴ Κύπρις ἐληίσατο (*Sens*
(2011) *ad loc.*). For the idea of marriage as forced exile cf. Soph. *fr.* 583.8 *TrGF* in
which a woman compares the pleasant life a woman leads in her father’s house to her
life afterwards, when she is traded in marriage; see Hunter (1987) 137 = (2008) 54–5.

αἰσα and μοῖρα are equivalent in A. and other authors; cf. 3.3–4 οὔ γὰρ καὶ
Κύπριδος αἰσαν / ἔμμορες, 3.208 and Soph. *Aj.* 516 μητέρ’ ἅλλη μοῖρα τῶν
φύσαντά τε / καθείλεν Ἀιδοῦ θανασίμους οἰκήτορας; *Eidinow* (2011) 83–6 on
possible nuances in the use of the two words.

ἀηθέσσουσα δύης καὶ δουλία ἐργα / εἶσιν ἀτυζομενη closely parallels Medea’s fate. As a princess, she had a band of ἀμφίπολοι to do her bidding (3.838). Livrea printed Lloyd–Jones’s suggestion (OCT app. crit.) δύην, comparing Semon. fr. 7.58 IEG ὡς δούλι᾽ ἐργα καὶ δύην περιτρέπει. However, ἀηθέσσουσα is hapax in Homer (II. 10.493) and takes the genitive. It is doubtful whether A. would have changed the case. The enjambment of the established text, taking δουλία ἐργα with ἀτυζομενη, (cf. 4.512 ἀτυζόμενοι χόλον ἁγριον Αἰήταο, Eur. Andr. 130–2 τί σοι / καιρὸς ἀτυζομένα δέμας αἰκέλιου καταλείβειν / δεσποτῶν ἀνάγκαις) is more in A.’s style.

For δούλια ἐργα cf. Eur. Andr. 109–10 αὕτα δ᾽ ἐκ θαλάμων ἀγόμαν ἐπὶ θίνα θαλάσσας / δουλοσύναν στυγερὰν ἀμφιβαλοῦσα κάρα and also Deianeira at Soph. Trach. 302 αἰ πρὶν μὲν ἦσαν ἔς ἐλευθέρων ἱσως / ἀνδρῶν, τανὺν δὲ δούλον ἱσχοουσιν βίον on the captives made by her husband Heracles.

χαλεπάς ὑπὸ χεῖρας ἀνάσσει also has significance for Medea’s plight. The ἀνάσσει is possibly Hera (cf. 4.21) or more probably Aphrodite (see p. 47), forcing her into the arms of Jason, although she does not want to go. She is often spoken of as a cruel goddess (Anacr. fr. 346 5-6 PMG δεσμ[ῶν] / χαλεπῶν δι᾽ Ἀφροδίτη, Asclep. A.P. 5.189.3–4 = 1007–8 GP, Archil. fr. 193.1-2 West δύστηνος ἐγκείμαι πόθῳ, ἀψυχος, χαλεπῆι θεῶν ὁδύνησιν ἐκητι;) cf. for the whole phrase Eur. Andr. 29–31 ἐπεὶ δὲ τὴν Λάκαιαν Ἐρμιώνῃ γαμεὶ / τούμον παρώσας δεσπότης δούλον λέχος, / κακοῖς πρὸς αὐτῆς σχετλίοις ἐλαύνομαι, Soph. El. 1092 τῶν ἐχθρῶν . . . ύπόχειρ ναιεις (Musgrave: ύπο χείρα codd.), Call. h. 1.74 ὅν ύπο χείρα, h. 62 δεσποτικὰν ύπο χείρα.
40 τοιά ἄρ’ ἰμερόεσσα δόμων ἐξέσσυτο κοῦρη. ‘In such a state of mind the lovely maiden rushed from her home.’ A. is reminding us that in spite of her distress, Medea retains her beauty and that at 92 Jason has a tangible reason for rejoicing. The description of the simile concentrates on her inner state of mind; the main text on her outward appearance. Homer only uses ἐξέσσυτο once of anyone making a speedy exit; cf. Il. 7.1 πυλέων ἐξέσσυτο φαΐδιμος Ἐκτῶρ. There is a similar ‘turn of speed’ on the part of a female character described at Theocr. 14.35–6 ἀνειρύσσασα δὲ ἀπέσερθε τάσαν, 14.41–2 ἐδραμε τήνα / ἵθυ δ’ ἀμφιθύρω καὶ δικλίδος, ἃ πόδες ἁγον.


For θυρέων cf. Od. 21.47–50 ἐν δὲ κληίδ’ ἥκε, θυρέων δ’ ἀνέκοπτεν όχια / . . . / ἐβραχε καλὰ θύρετρα / πληγέντα κληίδι, πετάοσθεν δὲ οἱ ὅκα. Penelope opens the door through effort: Medea through magic.

Fränkel (1961) obelises ὥκείαις and suggests ἐρκείων. Campbell (1969) 282 defends the paradosis, as does Livrea, who tries to show that ὅκυς in certain senses is equivalent to ὐξὺς when referring to sound. Campbell (quoting Od. 21.50) and Vian ((1981) 148 citing the v.l. suggested by Aristarchus at Il. 14.418 together with 23.880) must be right when arguing that ὥκείαις is equivalent to an adverb. For the adjective
as adverb cf. *Od.* 8.38 θοήν ἀλεγύνετε δαῖτα, Aesch. *Ag.* 476–7 πόλιν διήκει θοᾶ / βάξις, Soph. *Aj.* 998 ὅξείδα γάρ οὐ βάξις with Finglass *ad loc.* ‘ὀξύς means both swift . . . and bitter’), *Arg.* 4.907 κραιπνόν ἑυτροχάλοιο μέλος κανάχησεν ἄοιδῆς. A.’s example is more involved because the transferred epithet-adverb is not attached to the subject or object of the phrase but to an instrumental dative.

A. is fond of structuring the line with adjective and noun at opposite ends (cf. 3.1285, 3.1325, 4.97, 4.452, 4.623); see Wifstrand (1933) 134–5 for comparison with other epic poets.

43 γυμνοίσιν δὲ πόδεσσιν ἀνὰ στεινὰς θέεν οἴμους, ‘On bare feet she ran through the narrow streets.’ One way to describe haste is to say that the individual concerned did not have time to put on their shoes. Cf. Alcman fr. 1.15 *PMGF* ἀπέδιλος ἀλκά (‘unsandalled might’ of the horses of the Sun), [Aesch.] *P.V.* 135 οἴθιν δ’ ἀπέδιλος, Theocr. 24.36 μὴ δὲ πόδεσσιν ἐοῖς ὑπὸ σάνδαλα θείης, *Arg.* 3.646 νῆλιπος, οἰέανος, one of the many links between these two scenes.

44–6 λαἰῇ μὲν χερὶ πέπλον ἐπ’ ὀφρύσιν ἀμφὶ μέτωπα / στειλαμένη καὶ καλὰ παρήσια, δεξιτερῇ δὲ / ἀκρῆν ψώθι πέξαν ἀερτάζουσα χιτῶνος, ‘with her left hand wrapping her robe at eye-level around her forehead, covering her lovely cheeks and with her right lifting the hem of her tunic high off the ground.’ Medea is in disguise and, therefore hides beneath her draped cloak. She raises the hem of her garment so she may flee all the faster. There are perhaps some similarities with this small bronze statue (250-150 BC, height 20.5cm., from Alexandria, current location: Metropolitan
Museum of Art, serial no. 1972.118.95). While this figure is usually believed to be that of a dancer (Naerebout (2001), Martins (1985) 48–49), the pose that she adopts fits A.'s description of Medea. Movement and concealment are combined with a hint of seduction, although the statue uses the 'wrong' hand to hide her face (222–4n.). For similar examples from the art of the seventh century and later cf. CVA Louvre III I d, plate 51, nos. 4, 6, Webster (1964) plate X; XIXB, Havelock (1971) plates 118, 119, plate 130 and Llewellyn-Jones (2003) on veiled women in antiquity: the dancer appears to be wearing a face veil and was perhaps an image with which A. was familiar.

The Homeric formula is σκαιῇ, δεξιτερῇ δ᾽ (Il. 1.501, 21.490); cf. ll. 16.734 σκαιῇ . . . ετέρηφι, 222–4n. A. does not place λαιῇ . . . δεξιτερῇ δὲ together but at opposite ends of consecutive lines, creating an chiastic arrangement. Medea is 'wrapped' in her cloak both physically and verbally. He uses the non-Homeric λαιῇ for σκαιῇ, (cf. 1.1237–8 λαιὸν μὲν . . . / . . . δεξιτερῇ δὲ, 2.599 where he follows the Homeric model: σκαιῇ, δεξιτερῇ, 4. 222–3 σκαιῇ μὲν . . . / τῇ δ’ ἐτέρη).

The image of girls raising their dress to run is not found in Homer or Hesiod. Nausicaa's maids are described as running along side her at Od. 6.84, but cf. Hom. Hym. 2.176 ὡς σα ἐπισχόμεναι ἐανῶν πτύχας ἱμεροέντων which A. imitates at 3.874–5 ἃν δὲ χιτῶνας / λεπταλέους λευκῆς ἔπιγουν ἄχρις ἄειρον, adding some sensual detail as he does at 4.940 when describing the Nereids; also Call. h. 3.11–12 ἐς γόνυ μέχρι χιτῶνα / ξώνυσθαι λεγνωτόν, Theocr. 14.35–6 (quoted above), 26.16–7, Mosch. Eur. 126–7, Catull. 64.128–9. There is probably no erotic connotation here or link with Artemis or Diana.
47–9 καρπαλίμως δ’ ἀϊδήλος ἀνὰ στίβον ἐκτοθι πύργων / ἀστεὸς εὐρυχόροιο φόβῳ κλῖν, οὐδὲ τις ἔγνω / τήνυγε φυλακτήρων, λάθε δὲ σφεας ὀρμηθέσα. ‘She quickly went in fear, unseen along a path outside the walls of the city with its broad ways; none of the guards recognised her and she escaped their notice as she went on her way.’ We should read ἀ iideloς rather than transmitted ἀ iidelon. The adjective is only found in Homer meaning ‘unseen’ as a v.l. in the secondary tradition (= Et. Mag. 41.44 Gaisford) at Il. 2.318 τὸν μὲν ἀρίζηλον θήκεν θεός ὡς περ ἐφήνε and at Hes. Op. 756; but see Finglass on Soph. Aj. 606–7/8, ‘ἀϊδήλος . . .’ in Homer and Hesiod always signifies ‘making invisible’, and hence ‘consuming, destructive, abominable’. He translates 608 ἀ iidηλον Ἀιδαν, ‘unseen Hades’. In A. it means ‘unseen’ three times, here and at 1.102, 4.865. In the present case what is ‘unseen’ is not the path but Medea (48 οὐδὲ τις ἔγνω reinforces the fact that no one sees her). She is wrapped up in her cloak. A. nowhere else combines στίβος with an adjective (cf. 1.781, 1253, 3.534, 3.927, 3.1218). Perhaps the line was in Virgil’s mind when he wrote Aen. 6.268 ibant obscuri sola sub nocte, where obscuri is Virgil’s equivalent of ἀ iidηλος, with the transferred sense of sola sub nocte stressing that the walkers are alone.

For ἀ στεὸς εὐρυχόροιο cf. Od. 24.468 ἀθρόοι ἱγερέθοντο πρὸ ἀ στεὸς εὐρυχόροιο, Sappho fr. 44.12 Voigt (news of the wedding of Hector and Andromache) φάμα δ’ ἠλθὲ κατὰ πτόλιν εὐρύχορον φίλοις, Stes. fr. 100.15 F εὐρυχόροιο. The use of the epithet with ἀστεὸς stresses the richness of the life that Medea is leaving behind her for the sake of the Greek foreigner.

For the dative φόβῳ cf. Aesch. Th. 240–1 ταρβοσύνῳ φόβῳ τάνδ’ ἐς ἀκρόπτολιν / τίμιον ἔδος ἰκόμαν, Arg. 2.552. Fränkel (OCT app. crit.) objects to the mss. ἤκετ’, suggesting that a verb denoting flight is required such as διέτ’. His
objection is a valid one and cannot be answered, as Livrea tries to do, by quoting II. 19.115 καρπαλίμως δ’ ἵκετ’ Ἀργος Ἀχαικών. What is required is a verb not of arrival, but of progression as at 4.1182–3 ἕρως δὲ γυναικεῖς ἀολλέες ἐκτοθι πύργον / βαῖνον ἐποψόμεναι. A more plausible suggestion than Fränkel’s is κίεν. There has already been a reference to the speed of Medea’s progress (ἐξέσσυτο κούρη) and she has not yet arrived at her destination. The corruption is easily explained. ΦΟΒΩΙΚΙΕΝ was wrongly divided as ΦΟΒω / ΙΚΙΕΝ which led to ΦΟΒῳ ΙΚΕ. For κίεν with ἀνά cf. 1.310 τοῖος ἀνὰ πληθὺν δήμου κίεν.

οὐδὲ τις ἔγνω recalls II. 24.690–1 Ἐρμείας ζεῦς ἦτο ύμιόνους τε, / βίμφα δ’ ἄρ’ αὐτὸς ἔλαυε κατα στρατόν, οὐδὲ τις ἔγνω where the context is similar: Priam and his herald escape the Greek camp by night after their visit to Achilles; cf. Phoenix’s escape from his father’s palace, II. 9.475–7 καὶ τότ’ ἐγὼ θαλάμιοι . . . / . . . ἔξηλθον . . . / ρεῖα, λαθὼν φύλακάς τ’ ἄνδρας δημορᾶς τε γυναικας. Darkness and secrecy pervade the opening of Book 4; this atmosphere is only dispelled when Jason and Medea gain the Fleece with its illuminating radiance at 4.167–86. For similar contrasts between light and dark cf. Eur. Ba. 608–11 ὤ φάος μέγιστον (the light of deliverance – Dionysus released from a gloomy prison) and see Rood (2014) 72 n. 16 discussing Arg. 4.296–7 (a literal instance) and Eur. IT 746.

50–1 ἐνθεν ἵμεν νειόνδε μάλ’ ἐφράσατ’ οὐ γὰρ ἀδιδρισ / ἦν ὅδῶν. ‘From there she intended to make straight for the plain: for she was not ignorant of the way.’ Most mss. (LASG) want to send her to the temple of Hecate (νηόνδε) but νειόνδε (PE) is to be preferred. The plain of Ares, where the contest has been held, was on the south bank of the river opposite the city (2.1266–9). The Argonauts have moored beside it (3.1270–7). The conjecture νηόνδε (Maas OCT app. crit.) is unnecessary and
supposes an unusual diaeresis (cf. 1.1358). Vian (1981) 149 argues for the retention of νηόνδε. In terms of the plot, there is little point in her going to the temple of Hecate. She wants to cross the river and reach the Argonauts (68), who then come to meet her in the Argo (77–80).

οὐ γὰρ ἀδιδρίς signals a change of tone in the narrative. The escape-by-night of a scared young girl becomes an allusive disquisition on the skills and habits of Thessalian witches, concluding with the ironic intervention of the goddess of the Moon.

51–3 θαμὰ καὶ πρὶν ἀλωμένη ἀμφὶ τε νεκροὺς, / ἀμφὶ τε δυσπαλέας ρίζας χθονός, οἶα γυναῖκες / φαρμακίδες. ‘as often in past days she had roamed in search of corpses and roots that were difficult to dig up as women who work with drugs do.’ At 3.531–3 Argos talks of Medea’s extraordinary skills as a witch. This is one of the first things that we hear of her in the poem (see Fantuzzi (2007) 77–95, (2008) 302–3, 4.51–3n.). Medea is at once witch and love-sick maiden; cf. Simaetha in Theoc. 2 and the woman in the Fragmentum Grenfellianum (Esposito (2005) 19–25). Part of the rites of ancient witches involve corpses; cf. Hor. Sat. 1.8.21–2, Ov. Her. 6.89–90, Lucan. 6.511–2. For θαμὰ see 58–61n., where it also marks recurrent actions and feelings.

A’s use of δυσπαλέας (LSJ9 s.v. 2 δυσπαλής ‘dangerous’ should be deleted; cf. Et. Mag. 292.32–4 Gaisford δυσπαλέας ρίζας Ἀπολλώνιος τὰς κακῶς ἀναδιδοένας) recalls Od. 10.310 μῶλυ δὲ μιν καλέουσι θεοί, χαλεπὸν δὲ τ᾽ ὀρύσσειν. For ρίζας χθονός cf. Sophocles’ Root-cutters in which Medea is described cropping evil plants while turning away, so that the power of their noxious smell will not kill her (F534.1–6 TrGF).
For the activities of γυναῖκες φαρμακίδες described elsewhere cf. Ar. Nub.


53 τρομερῷ δ’ ὑπὸ δείματι πάλλετο πθυμός. ‘But her heart trembled with quivering fear.’ δέ marks a strong contrast: Medea is used to wandering around in this area, searching for raw materials; but fear now makes her heart beat. For δείματι πάλλετο πθυμός cf. ll. 22.451–2 ἐν δ’ ἔμοι αὐτῇ / στήθει σελήνη ἄνα στόμα ll. 22.461 παλλομένη κραδίην, Hom. Hym. 2.293 δείματι παλλόμεναι, Aesch. Suppl. 566–7 χλωρῳ δείματι θυμόν / πάλλοντ’ ὤψιν ἀθήνη, Aesch. Cho. 524, Soph. OT 153, Arg. 4.752. Hdt. 7.140.3 (from an oracle) δείματι παλλόμενοι, Mosch. 2.16–17). For φρένα as the object in a related expression cf. [Aesch.] PV 881 κραδία δὲ φόβῳ φρένα λακτίζει (2–3n.).

54–6 τὴν δὲ νέον Τιτηνὶς ἀνέρχομένη περάτηθεν / φοιταλέην ἐσιδοῦσα θεά ἐπεχήρατο Μήνη / ἀρπαλέως καὶ τοῖα μετὰ φρεσίν ἥσιν ἔειπεν.
‘The daughter of Titan, the Moon goddess, was just rising from the horizon and seeing her mad haste rejoiced heartily and such were her unspoken thoughts.’ The introduction of the goddess of the Moon alters the mood entirely. The past misfortunes of the goddess and her present unexalted emotion adds a delightful twist to the narrative whose chief note has previously been pathos, fear and excitement; see further Hutchinson (1990) 123. The intricacy of the word order of 54–5 heightens the bizarreness and the surprise: Medea is ‘trapped’ (φοιταλέην) between the two references to the Moon (Τιτηνὶς . . . Μήνη).
Lovers address the Moon, stars and night as a way of relieving their feelings; cf. Pind. fr. 104 S–M where Σ says τῶν ἑραστῶν οἱ μὲν ἄνδρες εὐχονται <παρ> εἶναι Ἡλιοῦ, αἱ γυναικὲς Σελήνην, Σ Theocr. 2.10 with Fantuzzi (2008) 303, PGM 4.2785 ‘Come to me, O beloved mistress, three-faced Selene; kindly hear my sacred chants; Night’s ornament, young, bringing light to mortals’, Theocr. 2.165–8, Marc. Argent. A.P. 5.16, Philod. A.P. 5.123 = 3212–17 GP with a mention of Endymion in the last line, Meleager A.P. 5.191 = 4378–85 HE. On this critical occasion the Moon addresses the lover. We can only guess at the actual extent of Α’ s originality. He may have had a precedent in New Comedy. The prologue in Plautus’ Rudens, spoken by the star Arcturus, goes back to Diphilos; see Marx (1928) 52, Hunter (2008) 177.

ἀνερχομένη περάτηθεν may be astrological terminology; cf. Arat. 821 ἀμφότερον δύνοντι καὶ έκ περάτης ἀνιόντι and [Manetho] Apotelesmatica 6.558–60 with similar phraseology and also 68 ἀντιπέρην, 71 περαιόθεν, 78 περαιής adding realistic descriptive detail to the scene; see Rengakos (1994) 127 for πέρατη, περάτηθεν and έκ περάτων, with discussion of Od. 23.243–4 as a Homeric source for the Hellenistic use of these words and also Redondo (2000) 144 for A.’ s non-epic use of ἀντιπεράτηθεν, ἀντιπέρην and similar as prepositions.

For φοιταλέην cf. Eur. Or. 326–7 λαθέσθαι λύσσας / μανιάδος φοιταλέου, Mosch. Eur. 46 φοιταλή δέ πόδεσσιν ἐφ’ ἄλμυρὰ βαῖνε κέλευθα. The word is used of characters pushed to the edge of reason; cf. Hesych. φ 719 (p. 172 H/C) φοιταλέος· παράκοπος, μανιώδης. For ἐσιδοῦσα... ἐπεχήρατο cf. Il. 11.73 Ἔρις δ’ ἅρ’ ἐχαιρε πολύστονος εἰσορόωσα.

ἀρπαλέως usually used of a ‘strong appetite’ (cf. 2.306, Od. 6.249–50 πῖνε καὶ ἠσθε πολύτλας δίος Οδυσσεύς / ἀρπαλέως) emphasises the relish with which the Moon speaks.
For καὶ τοῖα . . ἔειπεν cf. Arg. 3.18 τοῖα μετὰ φρεσίν ὁρμαίνουσαν,

Theocr. 25.76 χαίρων ἐν φρεσίν ἦσιν, Od. 11.428 τοιαῦτα μετὰ φρεσίν ἔργα βάληται. This half line marks the beginning of an interior monologue on the part of the Moon. Cf. in Homer the frequent opening ὀχθήσας δ᾽ ἄρα εἶπε πρὸς ὃν μεγαλήτορα θημόν (e.g. Il. 11.403), after which the sentiments expressed by the character in question are usually highly emotional as they debate a critical course of action. It is part of the surprise that the reported thoughts of the Moon are of a different nature; the interior monologue in A. is discussed in Fusillo (2001) 127–46.

57–65 According to Σ (p. 264 Wendel) on A. Sappho (fr. 199 PLF, omitted by Voigt) was the first to write about Endymion and Selene. The legend can be traced in literature from then down to Nonnus; cf. (in addition to the list in Σ) Theocr. 3.49, 20.37, Meleager A.P. 5.165 = 4254–59 HE, Isidorus A.P. 6.58. Herodas 8.10 (with Headlam’s note), Catull. 66.5–6, Propert. 3.15, Ov. Her. 18.63, Ars 3.83, Trist. 2.299, Lucan 79.19; see Fowler, EGM II § 133–4, 54–6n.

Catull. 66.5–6 with its reference to the story of Selene and Endymion, opens the possibility that it may have featured in his model, Callimachus’s Coma Berenices, although there is no mention of it in fr. 110 Harder. Sistakou (2002) 163 argues for its inclusion. If it were present at the end of the Aetia, an image of divine love for a mortal would balance a similar allusion at the beginning of the poem (Eos and Tithonus; cf. fr. 1.30 with Harder on the influence of Sappho fr. 58.9–10 on this poem). The tone of the Moon’s speech in A. is arch and ironic, much in the manner of Callimachus (cf. Harder (2012) II 239–40, 446). If he only alluded to the legend in passing, as Catull. 66. 5–6 seems to suggest, perhaps Selene’s direct speech is A.’s variation on the theme.
The Moon’s intervention is a statement of unrequited love similar, in essence, to Sappho fr. 26 Voigt πῶς κε δῆ τις σοῦ θαμέως ἁσαιτο, / Κύπρι δέσποιν’, ‘How can one help being regularly heartsick, my Lady’; see West (2014) 9–12. Selene’s opening remarks mention a similar ‘recurrent mental malaise’ (West ibid. 10 n. 19) and are linked verbally to the Sappho fragment by the use of θαμέως ~ θαμά (59).

The difference between the two is that roles have been reversed and it is the deity who comments on human suffering. Bearing in mind the number of reminiscences of Sappho at the beginning of this book (cf. particularly 17 but see also nn. 27–9, 58–61), perhaps we may discern, behind the Moon’s speech, a Sapphic original, similar to fr. 26, on the theme of Endymion and Selene, that A. is recalling and viewing through a Callimachean lens. Comparison of the love of Jason and Medea with the love of Endymion and the Moon is appropriate in that the sleep of Endymion is balanced by the indifference with which Jason later treats Medea in Book 4. A. makes the Moon say that she is not the only one to be driven to madness over an indifferent lover; Medea is now involved in a similar situation. The Moon’s sentiments are clarified by the section of the speech, beginning νῦν δὲ καὶ αὐτὴ δῆθεν ὀμοίης ἐμοριὲς ἀτης ‘and you yourself, so it seems, have shared a similar madness’. Even for the Moon, the story of her frustrated love for Endymion seems to function as a literary motif.

The close links between the two stories can be illustrated from art of the late Classical period: an Apulian Red Figure
crater, Dallas Museum of Art (1998.74), attributed to the Underworld Painter, 4th century BC depicts the shepherd Endymion luring the moon-goddess Selene from the sky with a shining Fleece. The goddess rides in a four-horse chariot, and is crowned with a crescent moon and aureole. To her left stand Aphrodite and Peitho. To the right of Endymion is Athena and a serpent-entwined tree which covers both the upper and lower panels. The Endymion, Athena and serpent-tree are probably simultaneously designed to represent the story of Jason and the Golden Fleece.

57 οὐκ ἄρ’ ἐγὼ μούνη μετὰ Λάτμιον ἀντρον ἀλύσσω ‘So I am not the only one to be restless for the Latmian cave.’ For this type of consolation cf. Theogn. 696 IEG τέτλαθι (~ 4.64) τῶν δὲ καλῶν οὐ τὶ σὺ μοῦνος ἐρᾶις, who also states it in another form at 1345–6 παιδοφιλεῖν δὲ τὶ περπνόν, ἐπεὶ ποτε καὶ Γανυμήδους / ἦρατο καὶ Κρονιδῆς. It can be traced throughout tragedy and Hellenistic poetry; cf. Eur. Hipp. Kalypt. fr. (34) F431 TrGF, Soph. fr. 684 TrGF, Theocr. 8.60, 13.1, Asclep. A.P. 12.50.2 = 881 HE οὐ σὲ μόνον χαλεπὴ Κύπρις ἐληίσατο (~36 ληίας), Asclep. A.P. 5.64.5, 5.167.6 = 858, 875 HE, Antip. Thess. A.P. 5.109 = 362 GP, Meleager A.P. 12.65 = 4530 HE, 12.101 = 4540 HE, 12.117 = 4092 HE, with Finglass on Soph. El. 153 and Fantuzzi (2008) 304 on Theocritus’ innovative use of the topos at 13.1 where he views it as being used as both a consolation and a warning. The same might be said of the present passage; cf. in particular the concluding lines of the Moon’s speech.

ἀλύσσω is my emendation: the paradosis ἀλύσκω always means ‘flee from, shun, avoid’, frequently in the last place in the line; cf. Od. 4.416 σύθι δ’ ἔχειν μεμιαῶτα καὶ ἐσούμενον περ ἀλύξαι, 4.1505–6 κεῖτο δ’ ἐπὶ ψαμάθοισι μεσημβρινὸν ἡμαρ ἀλύσκων / δεινὸς ὕφις). Such a sense is wrong in this context.
This use of the verb has previously been explained as equivalent to ἀλύω or ἀλύσσω. This occurs nowhere else. A more plausible solution is to emend ἀλύσκω into ἀλύσσω. The mss. confusion of κ and σ / ς is easy (329–30n.). Such a corruption would be helped by the common occurrence of forms of ἀλύσκω at the end of the line and the rarity of ἀλύσσω, once in Homer at Il. 22.70 and then only in [Hipp.] Mul. 1.2 (ἀλύξει τε καὶ ρίψει ἑαυτήν, ‘will be restless and throw herself’). Hippocrates’ use of the word favours the emendation; cf. Erbse (1953) 189–90 on A.’s allusions to medical or scientific contexts. A medical word to describe Selene’s love fever is not surprising especially as the Greeks often described love explicitly as a disease or fever (e.g. Eur. Hipp. 767, Theocr. 2.85, 30.2 with Gow ad loc.).

58–61 οὐδ’ οἶν καλῷ περιδαίομαι Ἐνδυμίωνι, / ἢ θαμὰ δή καὶ σεῖο, κύον, δολίσαιν ἀοιδαῖς / μησομένη φιλότητος, ἵνα σκοτίῃ ἐνι νυκτὶ / φαρμάσης εὐκηλος, ἃ τοι φίλα ἔργα τέτυκται. ‘Nor am I the only one to burn with love for Endymion, often indeed mindful of love because of your crafty spells, you bitch, so that in the gloom of night you could happily work your sorcery, tasks dear to your heart.’ Implicit in what the Moon says is that Medea, following the practice of Thessalian witchcraft, had drawn down the moon to the cave of Endymion (51–3n. and Hill (1973) for this skill). The lines contain echoes of Sappho and Theocritus 2 (Acosta-Hughes (2010) 21–9, 59; cf. this passage with Sappho fr. 1 5–7 (addressed to Aphrodite) Voigt ἀλλά τυίδ’ ἐλθ’, αἰποτα κατέρωτα / τασ ἐμας αὐδας αἴοσα πῆλοι / ἐκλυες (’but come hither, if ever before you heard my voice from afar and listened’). Just as Medea is associated with δολίσαιν ἀοιδαῖς, Aphrodite is called δολόπλοκος (fr. 1.2). Sappho’s incantation to Aphrodite is neatly paralleled, with its typical Hellenistic reversal, by Selene’s address to Medea.
Theocritus’ Simaetha, also skilled in drugs, calls on Selene and compares herself to Medea (2.14), her dilemma with Delphis paralleling that of Medea with Jason.

The ‘fires’ or ‘warmth’ of love is found at Soph. fr. 474.81–83 TrGF τοίαν Πέλοψ ἦγγα θηρατηρίαν / ἐρωτός, ἀοστραπήν τιν’ ὀμμάτων, ἔχει / ἦ ταλπεται μὲν αὐτός, ἔξοπτά δ’ ἐμέ; also [Aesch.] P.V. 90, 650, Pind. P. 4.219. The metaphor becomes common in the Hellenistic poets: Hermesianax fr. 3.37 Lightfoot, Theocr. 2.40, 2.82, 2.133, 7.55, 7.102, 11.51, 14.26, Call. A.P. 12.139 = 1081–6 HE, Fragmentum Grenfellianum 15 Esposito, Meleager A.P.12.80.2 = 4083 HE.

For θαμά describing symptoms of emotional distress cf. Alcaeus fr. 358.5 Voigt τὸν ὥν θάμα θύμον αἰτιάμενον, Anacreon PMG 395.7–8 διὰ ταύτ’ ἀνασταλύζω θάμα Τάρταρον δεδοικώς; see West (2014) 10 n. 19, Arg. 4.57–65n.

There is no need to alter transmitted κύον to κύθον, ‘I was hidden’ (Fränkel OCT app. crit. and (1968) 460) or κίον (Anon. ap. Ruhnken (1782) 310 with Vian’s app. crit.) or κλυον (Fantuzzi (2007) 91–3). The vocative is similar to other colloquial exclamations found at Call. Aet. fr. 75.4–5 Harder Ἡρην γάρ κοτέ φασί – κύον, κύον, ἵσχεο, λαϊδρέ / θυμέ and Call. 6.63–4 ναί ναί, τεύχεο δῶμα, κύον κύον, ὃ ἐν δαίτας / ποιησεῖς. As a word of reproach, it is used in Homer to denote shamefulness or audacity on the part of a woman; cf. Il. 6.344, 356 (of Helen by herself) with Graziosi and Haubold (2010) 175, and for links between Medea and Helen, 367–8n.

μιμήσκω, which is in keeping with a passage that may contain allusions to Callimachus’s 
Coma Berenices (57–65n.).

62 νῦν δὲ καὶ αὐτῇ δῆθεν ὁμοίης ἔμορφος ἄτης ‘And now you yourself have a part, it would seem, in a similar passion.’ The sentiment recalls the appeal to Erato at the beginning of Book 3 (3–4) σὺ γὰρ καὶ Κύπριδος αἶσαν ἔμορφος. This speech could be seen as marking the end of the erotic narrative that begins at 3.1 and occupies the middle part of the Argonautica, the race by night through the streets and the description of her nocturnal practices being balanced by the characterisation of her magical powers at 3.528–33. The πολύστονον ἵον from Eros’s bow (3.279) has become the πολύστονον ἄλγος of 4.56.

There is a similar ironic use of καὶ αὐτός at Asclepiades A. P. 5.167.5–6 ἀχρι τίνος, Ζεῦ; / Ζεῦ φίλε, σίγησον, καῦτος ἔραν ἔμιαθες.

The model for ὁμοίης ἔμορφος ἄτης must be Il. 1.278 ὥποθ’ ὁμοίης ἔμορφος τιμῆς (similar clausulae at Il. 15.189, Od. 5.335, Hom. Hym. 5.37, Hes. Th. 414). The change τιμῆς – ἄτης ‘honour’ to ‘ruin’ is typically Hellenistic. The exact meaning of ὁμοίης has been disputed. Erbse (1953) 170 argues for the interpretation given by Σ on Il. 4.315 (i 504.31 Erbse) ὅτι οἱ γλωσσογράφοι ὁμοίων τὸ κακόν as against Apoll. Soph. 120.29 (p. 120 Bekker) Ὅμηρος γὰρ πᾶσι τὸ ὁμοίως συμβαίνον ὁμοίων λέγει (‘common to all, impartial’). Rengakos (1994) 177 believes that there is a reference to both interpretations. However, Medea’s love for Jason is to meet the same reception as Selene’s for Endymion. A.’s imitation of Il. 1.278 (above) where ὁμοίης means ‘not equal, not similar’ and therefore ‘out of the ordinary’ seems to point to this being the primary meaning here.
63–6 δῶκε δ᾽ ἀνιηρὸν τοι ἡσυχα πῆμα γενέσθαι / δαίμων ἄλγινόεις. ‘And a cruel god has given you Jason to be a grievous pain.’ From a similar amatory context cf. Asclep. A.P. 5.189.3–4 = 1008–9 HE οὐ γὰρ ἔρωτα / Κύπρις, ἀνιηρὸν δ᾽ ἐκ πυρὸς ἣκε βέλος. For πῆμα γενέσθαι cf. ll. 22.421, Od. 17.597 and Arg. 4.4. δαίμων ἄλγινόεις may allude to the οὐγάρεις of 4.445–9; cf. particularly ἐκ σέθεν . . . ἄλγεα . . . τετρήχασιν (446–7) with 35–9n. (pp. 47, 49).

64–5 ἀλλ᾽ ἔρχεο, τέτλαθι δ᾽ ἐμμης, / καὶ πινυτη περ ἑοῦσα, πολύστονον ἄλγος ἀείρειν. ‘Well, go, and steel your heart, wise though you are, to take up your burden of pain, fraught with many sighs.’ This final admonition perhaps echoes the end of Sappho fr. 1.25–8 Voigt ἐλθε μοι καὶ νῦν, χαλεπάν δὲ λύσου / ἐκ μερίμναν ὠςα δὲ μοι τέλεσαι / θύμος ἰμμέρρει τέλεουν, σὺ δ᾽ αὐτα / σύμμαχος ἔσσο; in the one the protagonist begs for release from a burden and in the other a burden is imposed.

ἔρχεο is a common exhortation in Homer but cf. particularly Sappho fr. 94.6–8 Voigt τὰν δ᾽ ἔγω τάδ᾽ ἀμειβόμαι / φιλοιχοι᾽ ἔρχεο κάμεθεν / μέμναιος᾽ (30–2n.). For the end of the Moon’s speech cf. 1.299–300 (Jason to Alcimede) ἀνιάζουσα περ ἐμμῆς / τληθὶ φέρειν, ll. 1.586 τέτλαθι μῆτερ ἐμῆ, καὶ ἀνάσχεο κηδομένη περ, 5.382, Od. 20.18, Theogn. 396 IEG τέτλαθι τῶν δὲ καλών ὡς τι σὺ μοῦνος ἐρᾶς (62n.), and also Sappho fr. 31 Voigt ἀλλὰ πὰν τόλματον (from a poem to which A. has already alluded: 16–7n.). For καὶ πινυτη περ ἑοῦσα cf. Od. 20.131 τοιαύτῃ γὰρ ἐμῆ μῆτηρ, πινυτη περ ἑοῦσα (Od. 21.103, ll. 7.289).

ἄλγος ἀείρειν (cf. 1.297 ἐπ᾽ ἄλγεσιν ἄλγος ἄροιο) reverses the Homeric κῦδος ἄροιο (ll. 4.95, 9.303), with an additional allusion to ἄχθος ἀείραν (Od. 3.312; similar phrases at ll. 20.247, Hes. Op. 692. Simaetha expresses a similar
sentiment, this time from the side of the lover as she dismisses the Moon at the end of her spell-making session: ἐγὼ δ᾽ οἰσῶ τον ἐμὸν πόθον οὕσπερ ὑπέσταν (Theocr. 2.164).

66–81 After the Moon’s sarcastic intervention, the description of Medea’s night escape continues at a faster pace (66 ἐγκονέουσαν). The light of the heroes’ fire seen through the darkness, together with Medea’s voice cutting through the gloom, are dramatic touches.

There may be reminiscences of night scenes in Homer such as Priam’s visit to Achilles, the Doloneia (Il. 10) and Il. 18.203–30 during which Achilles’ flaming helmet and shout terrify the Trojans (70–4n.). The motif of fire seen through the darkness occurs at Il. 10.11–12 (66–9n.). In the Doloneia much is made of going to spy on the Trojans by night (Il. 10.82–3 ἀνὰ στρατῶν ἔρχεσαι οἶος / νύκτα δι’ ὀρφανίην ~ 4,70 διὰ κνέφας), just as Medea is seeking out the Argonauts. There is also a loud scream as Athena sends her heron as a good omen to Odysseus: Il. 10.276 νύκτα δι’ ὀρφανίην. For night as a background to planning and action, see nn. 6–9, 47–9.

Medea approaches Phrontis first not Jason or Argos because her feelings towards Jason are ambivalent (30–33) and Argos is a close associate of Jason (3.318, 440), even though a relationship exists between him and Medea (i.e. Aunt; 32–4n.). The indirectness of Medea’s approach makes a sharp contrast with Jason’s instant magnanimity in 92–98 (92–3n.).

Why does A. stress that Phrontis is the youngest of Phrixos’ children (71–2 ὁπλότατον Φρίξοιο . . . παίδων, / Φρόντι), placing the name in an emphatic position? There appear to have been different rankings given to the sons of Phrixos: Σ
Ἀκουσίλαος δὲ καὶ Ἑσίοδος ἐν ταῖς Μεγάλαις Ἡοίαις (fr. 255 M–W) φασὶν ἐξ Ἰοφώσσης (see Fowler, *EGM* II § 6.1.1) τῆς Αἰήτου. καὶ οὗτος μὲν φησιν αὐτοὺς δ᾽ Ἀργον, Φρόντιν, Μέλανα, Κυτίσωρον; though it is uncertain whether οὗτος refers to A. or to Hesiod (see M–W app. crit.). Hyg. *fab.* 14.21, has Argos, Melas, Phrontides, Cylindrus whereas [Apollod.] *Bibl.* 1.9.1 gives the order as Argos, Melas, Phrontis, Kytissoros. A. explicitly says that Phrontis is the youngest here and at 2.1155 has the order Kytissoros, Phrontis, Melas, Argos, though this is for rhetorical effect: Argos begins with Kytissoros so that he can end his speech with his own name. Σ (p. 160 Wendel) 2. 388–391a has the sequence Argos, Melas, Kytissoros, Phrontis. In 71 as well as making a point in the characterisation of Jason and Medea, A. may be stating an opinion concerning mythological detail.

Jason is shown in heroic mode in 79–81. In his eagerness to play the rescuer, he does not wait for the ship to beach before jumping ashore; cf. Protesilaus, who was the first to leap ashore at Troy (Lucian 77.27–8, 530–1, Ov. *Her.* 13.93–4, Hyg. *Fab.* 103) and also the François Vase (Black Figure Krater, Kleitias, *ABV*, 76,1) which shows the ship coming to pick up Theseus with the young Athenians he rescued from the Minotaur, or just arriving in Crete. A youth labelled Phaidimos jumps overboard and another swims to the shore. For A.’s attention to descriptive detail cf. the scene when Thetis and the Nereids help the Argonauts to negotiate the Planktai where again A. could be describing a work of art (4. 939–60 with Vian (1981) 181).

66–9 ὡς ἀρ’ ἔφη. τὴν δ’ αἶψα πόδες φέρον ἐγκονέουσαν. ἅσπασίως δ’ ὰχθησιν ἐπιπέρθη ποταμοῖο, ἁ ἀντιπέρην λεύσσουσα πυρὸς σέλας, ὅ ῥά τ’ ἀέθλου / παμνύχιοι ἢρωες ἐυφροσύνησιν ἔδαιον. ‘So she spoke. But Medea’s feet carried her quickly forward as she hastened. And on the banks of the
river she was happily excited, seeing the gleam of fire on the opposite side which all night long the heroes were kindling in joy at the contest.’ For ὀξθῆσιν . . . ποταμῶι cf. Od. 6.97 παρ’ ὀξθῆσιν ποταμῶι, II. 4.487, 11.499, Theocr. 7.75.

ἐπηέρθην (aorist passive form of Homeric ἐπαείρω) gives a strange sense, if literally translated: ‘was raised up on the banks of the river’; cf. II. 7.426 ‘lifted up and set him upon wagons’. Hunter seems to understand it in this way, ‘with relief she climbed the rising banks of the river’, Rieu and Livrea offer similar translations. A clearer picture emerges if we translate metaphorically, taking ἐπαείρω to mean ‘raised up’ in the sense ‘raised spirits, excitement, elation’; cf. LSJ9 II, Eur. IA 124–5 καὶ πῶς Ἀχιλεὺς . . . / οὐ . . . θυμὸν ἐπαρεῖ; Soph. OT 1328 τίς σ’ ἐπῆρε δαιμόνων; for the form of the verb cf. fr. anon. ap. Plut. Moralia 1101F.3 (= fr. 386 Schneider (II p. 787) ὡς ὁ ποιητὴς εἴρηκε καὶ τε γέρων καὶ γρῆς, ἐπὴν χρυσῆς Ἀφροδίτης / μνήσωμαι, καὶ τοῖσι ἐπηέρθη φίλον ἢτορ. The end of the second line varies the Homeric κατεκλάσθη φίλον ἢτορ (Od. 4.538, 9.256). A.’s absolute use of ἐπηέρθη, could be seen as a development of this. Up to this point, Medea’s flight has been a fearful one, but the sight of the Argonauts’ fire changes her mood. Both ἀσπασίως and λεύσσουσα fit more naturally into the sense of the sentence if ἐπηέρθην is interpreted in this way.

the Trojan and Greek camps respectively, where it is usual for such fires to be extinguished when evening turns into night so that the army can sleep (Finglass on Soph. Aj. 285–7).

70–4 ὀξείῃ δὴπειτα διὰ κνέφας δρθία φωνῇ / ὀπλότατον Φρίξοι
περαιόθευν ἦπνε παίδων, / Φρόντιν. ὥ δὲ ξὺν ἐοῖσι κασιγνήτοις ὑπα
κούρης / αὐτῷ τ' Αἰσονίδῃ τεκμήρατο· σίγα δ' ἐταϊροι / θάμβευν,
εὖτ' ἐνόησαν ὁ δὲ καὶ ἔπτημυμον ἦεν. ‘Then through the gloom, in a piercing voice from across the river, she called on Phrontis, the youngest of Phrixos' sons, and he with his brothers and Aeson's son recognised the maiden's voice; and in silence the comrades were amazed when they realised that it was so in truth.’ With Medea’s dramatic shout across the river, A. adds to the effectiveness of this scene in a way that Σ Il. 10.3–4 (III 2.34–6 Erbse) ἐπ’ ἄλλο εἴδος τρέπεται ὁ ποιητής, διὰ δόλου καὶ νυκτὸς ἀναπληρῶν τὴν μεθ’ ἡμέραν ἀτυχίαν τῶν Ἑλλήνων) might have approved. After Homer’s use of a range of story elements, he mentions his turning to another form to introduce narrative variety. For night as a backdrop to decisive action cf. nn. 6–9, 47–9, 66–81, Ajax’s cattle raids by night (Soph. Aj. 42, 285–6 κεῖνος γὰρ ἄκρας νυκτός, ἡνίχ᾽ ἑσπερό / λαμπτήρες οὐκέτ’ ἤθολ), the climax to the story of Nisus and Euryalus (Virg. Aen. 9.176–449 with many allusions to the importance of the cover of darkness; e.g. 9.355 . . . nam lux inimica propinquat) and the emphasis that Xenophon puts on the night after the murder of the generals in which he, himself, comes to the fore (An. 3.1–2).

For ὀρθία φωνῇ and Medea’s shout cf. Il. 18.203–30 (Achilles’ shout from the trench) (214–15) ὡς ἀτ’ Ἀχιλλῆος κεφαλῆς σέλας αἰθέρ’ ἵκανε / στῇ δ’ ἔπι τάφρον . . . (217) ἐνθὰ στὰς ἥσσος . . . (221–3) ὡς τότ’ ἀριξήλη φωνῇ γένετ'
Αἰακίδαιοι / οἱ δ’ ώς οὖν άιον ὡτα (~ 4.72 ὡτα κούρης) χάλκεον Αἰακίδαιοι, / πᾶσιν ὀρίνθη θυμός with nn. 66–81, 75–6, Hom. Hym. 2.20 ἱάχησε δ’ ἄρ’ ὀρθία φωνῇ, Il. 11.10–1 ἐνθα στάσῃ ἦπες (~ 4.71 ἦπνε) τεα μέγα τε δείνον τε ὀρθί’, Hom. Hym. 2.432, Sappho fr. 203.32 Voigt πάντες δ’ ἄνδρες ἔπηραν Ἰαχήσε δ’ ἄρ’ ὀρθία φωνῇ, Il. 11.10–1 ἔνθα στᾶσῃ ἠὕησε (~ 4.71 ἠὕε) θεά μεγά τε δείνον τε ὀρθί’, Hom. Hym. 2.432, Sappho fr. 203.32 Voigt πάντες δ’ ἄνδρες ἐπήραν Ἰαχήσε δ’ ἄρ’ ὀρθία φωνῇ, Il. 11.10–1 ἔνθα στᾶσῃ ἠὕησε (~ 4.71 ἠὕε) θεά μεγά τε δείνον τε ὀρθί’, Hom. Hym. 2.432, Sappho fr. 203.32 Voigt πάντες δ’ ἄνδρες ἐπήραν Ἰαχήσε δ’ ἄρ’ ὀρθία φωνῇ, Il. 11.10–1 ἔνθα στᾶσῃ ἠὕησε (~ 4.71 ἠὕε) θεά μεγά τε δείνον τε ὀρθί’, Hom. Hym. 2.432, Sappho fr. 203.32 Voigt πάντες δ’ ἄνδρες ἐπήραν Ἰαχήσε δ’ ἄρ’ ὀρθία φωνῇ, Il. 11.10–1 ἔνθα στᾶσῃ ἠὕησε (~ 4.71 ἠὕε) θεά μεγά τε δείνον τε ὀρθί’, Hom. Hym. 2.432, Sappho fr. 203.32 Voigt πάντες δ’ ἄνδρες ἐπήραν Ἰαχήσε δ’ ἄρ’ ὀρθία φωνῇ, Il. 11.10–1 ἔνθα στᾶσῃ ἠὕησε (~ 4.71 ἠὕε) θεά μεγά τε δείνον τε ὀρθί’, Hom. Hym. 2.432, Sappho fr. 203.32 Voigt πάντες δ’ ἄνδρες ἐπήραν Ἰαχήσε δ’ ἄρ’ ὀρθία φωνῇ, Il. 11.10–1 ἔνθα στᾶσῃ ἠὕησε (~ 4.71 ἠὕε) θεά μεγά τε δείνον τε ὀρθί’, Hom. Hym. 2.432, Sappho fr. 203.32 Voigt πάντες δ’ ἄνδρες ἐπήραν Ἰαχήσε δ’ ἄρ’ ὀρθία φωνῇ, Il. 11.10–1 ἔνθα στᾶσῃ ἠὕησε (~ 4.71 ἠὕε) θεά μεγά τε δείνον τε ὀρθί’, Hom. Hym. 2.432, Sappho fr. 203.32 Voigt πάντες δ’ ἄνδρες ἐπήραν Ἰαχήσε δ’ ἄρ’ ὀρθία φωνῇ, Il. 11.10–1 ἔνθα στᾶσῃ ἠὕησε (~ 4.71 ἠὕε) θεά μεγά τε δείνον τε ὀρθί’, Hom. Hym. 2.432, Sappho fr. 203.32 Voigt πάντες δ’ ἄνδρες ἐπήραν Ἰαχήσε δ’ ἄρ’ ὀρθία φωνῇ, Il. 11.10–1 ἔνθα στᾶσῃ ἠὕησε (~ 4.71 ἠὕε) θεά μεγά τε δείνον τε ὀρθί’, Hom. Hym. 2.432, Sappho fr. 203.32 Voigt πάντες δ’ ἄνδρες ἐπήραν Ἰαχήσε δ’ ἄρ’ ὀρθία φωνῇ, Il. 11.10–1 ἔνθα στᾶσῃ ἠὕησε (~ 4.71 ἠὕε) θεά μεγά τε δείνον τε ὀρθί’, Hom. Hym. 2.432, Sappho fr. 203.32 Voigt πάντες δ’ ἄνδρες ἐπήραν Ἰαχήσε δ’ ἄρ’ ὀρθία φωνῇ, Il. 11.10–1 ἔνθα στᾶσῃ ἠὕησε (~ 4.71 ἠὕε) θεά μεγά τε δεί

For the silent astonishment of the Argonauts at Medea’s sudden appearance cf. Il. 9.29–30 οἱ δ’ ἀρα πάντες ἀκὴν ἐγένοντο σιωπῆ. / δὴν δ’ ἄνεῳ ἦσαν τετιηότες υἷες Ἀχαιῶν, Od. 7.142–5 where Odysseus adopts the role of supplicant to Arete as does Medea towards Jason (81–101n.) and Il. 18.228–9 (see below). On the crasis δήπειτα see West (1966) 100. δία κνέφας is A.’s variation on Homeric διὰ νύκτα μέλαιναν (Il. 10.394, 24.366); see 436–8n.

75–6 τρὶς μὲν ἄνηυσεν, τρὶς δ’ ὀτρύνοντος ὁμίλου / Φρόντις ἀμοιβήδην ἀντίαχεν. ‘Three times she called, and three times at the bidding of the company Phrontis called out in reply.’ τρὶς . . . τρὶς is a frequent structuring phrase in Homer; cf. Il. 5.436–7, 8.169–70, 16.702–3, Il. 11.461–3 σὺς δ’ ἐταῖροις / τρὶς μὲν ἐπειτ’ ἦπεν ὄσον κεφαλῆ χάδε φωτός, / τρὶς δ’ ἄιεν ἰάχοντος (Odysseus shouts for help on the battlefield); see Usener (1903) on the importance of ‘3’ in Greek antiquity. Medea’s shout seems to be verging on a war cry; cf. Achilles at Il. 18.228–9 τρὶς μὲν ὑπὲρ τάφρου μεγάλ’ ἱαχε δίος Ἀχιλλεύς, / τρὶς δὲ κυκήθησαν Τρῶες (70–4n.). The verb is a strong one (ἀναύω is elsewhere only at Theocr. 4.37) and marks her approach to the Argonauts as strong and confident, revealing the heroic side of her character, likening her to Achilles (4.16–7n.), despite the fact she is about
to play the role of the suppliant.

ἀμοιβήδην is rare, occurring only here and at 2.1171 καὶ τοι μὲν ἀμοιβήδην ἐλάασκον but ἀμοιβηδίς occurs at II. 18.506, Od. 18.310, Hom. Hym. 2.326–7 ἀμοιβηδίς δὲ κιόντες / κύκλησκον. Aristarchus read ἀμοιβήδων at Σντ II. 18.506 (in 539.86–90 Erbse). ἀμοιβηδίς is, perhaps, A.’s contribution to a discussion about the correct form of the adverb; see Rau (2006) 214. For ἀντιάχω, only here and at [Orph.] Arg. 828, cf. II. 11.463 above. A. may be subconsciously echoing ἄϊεν ιάχοντος, when forming this rare verb; cf. A.’s formation of ἀνιάχω (2.270, 3.253) probably based on the ἀνίαχοι at II. 13.41 (Janko ad loc. and 152–3n.).

76–81 οἱ δ´ ἄρα τείως / ἡρωες μετὰ τὴνυεθοοὶς ἐλάασκον ἐρετομίτς. / οὐπω πείσματα νηός ἐπὶ ἡπείροιο περαίγα / βάλλον, ὦ δὲ κραῖπνοὺς κρέσῳ πόδας ἤκεν ἴησον / ὕποι ἀπ´ ἱκριοφίν· μετὰ δὲ Φρόντις τε καὶ Ἀργος, / τὰ δὲ θόρον οὖς Φρίλου, χαμάδις θόρον. ‘And meantime the heroes were rowing with swift oars in search of her. Not yet were they casting the ship’s ropes upon the opposite bank, when Jason with light feet leapt to land from the deck above, and after him Phrontis and Argos, sons of Phrixos, leapt to the ground.’ ἐλάασκον occurs in similar scenes at 1.1156 οἱ δὲ γαληναίῃ πίσυμοι ἐλάασκον ἐπιπρό νηβ βίη and 2.1171. The iterative tense reinforces the fast-moving action, as does the asyndeton of οὐπω, for which cf. 4.261 and Aratus 108. Πείσματα νηός does not occur in Homer but cf. Od. 10.127 πείσματ’ ἐκώσα νεός, Arg. 4.208 πρυμναίται νεώς ἀπὸ πείσματ’ ἐκώσεν, Call. 47.9–10 Hollis ἐλύσαν πείσματα νηός, Call. Aet. fr. 18.10 Harder. A. has many variations on the solitary phrase in the Odyssey (e.g. 1.652, 1013, 2.496).
For περαίης cf. 54–6n. περάτηθεν. With κραιπνοὺς . . . πόδας cf. 2.428

For the hyperbaton ὁ . . . Ἰήσων cf. 4.6–9 ὁ µὲν . . . Αἰήτης, 4.912–4
Τελέοντος ἐὺς πάις . . . Βοῦτης, 956–8 αὐτός ἀναξ . . . Ἡφαιστός. Up to line 79, Phrontis has been the chief negotiator on the Argonauts’ side. Before the reader reaches the end of the line, ὁ δὲ could well refer to him. The unexpectedness of Ἰήσων making his rescue leap is emphasised by the position of his name in the line (6–9n.).

One does not ‘throw’ (βάλλον) cables in Homer. Od. 9.136–7 ἐν δὲ λιµὴν ἐὔφορµος, ἵν’ οὐ χρεώ πείσµατός ἔστιν, / οὖτ’ εὐνάς βαλέειν οὔτε προµηνήσθαν άνάψει gives the usual order of operations (cf. Od. 15.498 ἐκ δ’ εὐνάς ἐβαλον, κατὰ δὲ προµηνήσθαι ἐδησαν with Arg. 4.661–2 ἐκ δ’ ἀρα νηὸς / πείσµατ’ ἐπ’ ἰόνων σχεδόθεν βάλον). A. is quickening the pace of his description, by shortening the Homeric formulae that he is adapting; see Fränkel (1968) 636–7 on related aspects of A.’s style.

ὑψοῦ ἀπ’ ικριόφιν refers to the half deck at the stern of a ship. Telemachus is described similarly at Od. 15.551–2 εἶλετο δ’ ἀλκιµόν ἐχχος, ἀκαχµένον οξεὶ χαλκῷ, / νηὸς ἀπ’ ικριόφιν τοι δὲ προµηνήσθαι ἐλυσαν, though here he is embarking.

The dual ὀτι δῦω occurs three times in the Argonautica, always at the beginning of the verse: 1.163, here and 4.1465. In the first (and only there), ὀτι δῦω Ἀλεου· τρίτατος γε µὲν ἐσπετ’ ιοῦσιν / Ἀγκαῖος, the phrase is inserted in a structure which may recall a Homeric model: II. 12.95 ὀτι δῦω Πριάµοιο· τρίτος δ’ ἢν Ἀσιός ἥρως, with ὀτι δῦω at the beginning of the line, the name of the father up to the caesura in the third foot, and then the addition of the name of a ‘third’ son. The first
time A. uses a phrase from archaic epic he frequently alludes to its original context, but then, in successive re-uses, it seems to become an organic element of his diction, no longer directly referring to Homer but rather resuming a previous passage in his poem; see Fantuzzi (2001) 186–91).

With χαμάδις θόρον cf. *Iliad* 8.320 (Hector leaping from his chariot) αὐτός δ’ ἐκ δίφροιο χαμαι θόρεν and ἄλτο χάμοζε (*Iliad* 3.29, 5.494). A. varies on χέρσῳ which he used in line 79.

81–101 Medea’s speech is a supplication. In Book 3 Medea was supplicated by Chalkiope and Jason to obtain her help; now, severing all links with her parents and fatherland, she is a fugitive suppliant. Her plea echoes that of Phineus in 2.218 (see below). Her approach to Jason and the other leaders of the Argonauts shows one of the paradoxes of the suppliant state. On the one hand she is weak and defenceless (4.92 ἀκηχενή) and yet still constitutes a threatening force. This has already been implied throughout the opening part of her escape, when she has been described by similes and language more usually attached to heroic conflict. At the beginning of her speech Medea calls Jason and the other Argonauts φίλοι (82). The situation is further complicated by the presence of Phrontis and Argos, the sons of Phrixos. Medea is to be imagined going from one to the other, ending at Jason’s knees (81–2n.). There are natural reasons why she approaches her own relatives first (66–81n.). The bond between them is stronger than that of mere ξεῖνοι; (cf. 4.89 ξεῖνε; and also *Odyssey* 8.546 ἀντι κασιτητος ξείνος θ’ ἱκέτης τε τέτυκται). Even at this stage, it is the promise of even more help which decides in her favour: she offers to bewitch the dragon and enable the Argonauts finally to obtain the Golden Fleece. Her supplication is successful: she is immediately raised up from her position at Jason’s knees (cf. *Odyssey* 8.546 ἀντι κασιτητος ξείνος θ’ ἱκέτης τε τέτυκται).
10.264 ἀμφοτέρησι . . . γούνων), a comforting speech is made and an oath sworn to Zeus and Hera, the goddess of marriage, an important role in Book 4. Odysseus is similarly raised by Alkinoos at Od.7.167–9 and like Thetis at Il. 1.514–6 Medea requires an oath from Jason to allay her fears and secure her future.

The supplication here of Jason by Medea in front of his comrades matches the promises made by him in Book 3, when they met alone near Hekate’s temple. The right hand offered to seal the promise answers the right hand given by Medea when she decides to help Jason (3.1067–8) and yield to passion. Textbook ritual behaviour is, however, in sharp contrast with the perjury committed by Jason soon afterwards; on supplication in this scene and in general see Plantinga (2000) 105–28, Gould (1973) 74–103 = (2001) 22–77, and Naiden (2006) 111, 304 for discussion of this scene and a reference list of supplications in A.

81–2 ἡ δ’ ἄρα τούσγε / γούνων ἀμφοτέρησι περισχομένη προσέειπεν.

‘With both arms she clasped their knees and said to them.’ τούσγε refers to Argos and Phrontis and at τύνη . . . ξεῖνε (88–9) we must imagine some movement on the part of Medea as she turns to address Jason. Visualisation on the part of the reader of features of a scene roughly sketched or hinted at by the author is a frequent feature of Hellenistic poetry (cf. the opening of Arg. 4, where there is no detailed scene-setting).

Friends, save me in my misfortune and yourselves too from Aietes.

Medea’s first plea contained between the hyperbaton of preposition (ἐκ) and noun (Aἰήταο) is an abrupt and dramatic opening. The enclitic’s (με) position is in accordance with Wackernagel’s law but although there are other examples in A. of words placed between ἐκ and its noun (1.207, 1109, 2.184, 202, 2.586–7) the separation is never as drastic as here (with the exception of 2.586–7); cf. Theocr. 25.195 ἀμφὶ δὲ σοι τὰ ἐκαστὰ λέγοιμι κε τοὺδε πελώρου (see Gow ad loc.), Call. fr. 51.1–2 Hollis (with note ad loc.) ἐκ με Κολωνάων τις ὡμεστον ἤγαγε δήμου / τῶν ἐτέρων (cf. Pfeiffer on fr. 1.22 for other examples in Call.). This stylistic feature must have arisen as a reaction against Homeric word order which, compared with that of Hellenistic poetry, is much closer to prose (simpex ordo); it exhibits a desire to introduce a more sophisticated placing of words (cf. A.’s fondness of the type of line framed by adjective and noun in agreement; 41–2n.). The influence of Pindar and lyric poetry on the Alexandrians (see Newman (1985) 69–189, Fuhrer (1988) 53–68) may have resulted in an attempt to introduce the more involved word order of lyric poetry into hexameter verse; cf. Pind. I. 8.26–8 Ζεὺς ὡτ’ ἀμφὶ Θέτιος / ἀγλαὸς τ’ ἐρίσαν Ποσειδᾶν γάμω, / ἀλοχον εὐειδέα βέλων ἐκάτερος where ἀμφὶ governs γάμω and for widely separated noun and adjective cf. the opening phrase of Pind. O. 6.1–2 Χρυσέας ὑποστάσαντες εὐτείχει προθύρῳ βαλάμου / κίονας.

84–5 ἃναφανδά τέτυκται / πάντα μάλ’, οὔδέ τι μῆχος ἱκάνεται. ‘Everything that was done is known and there is no way out.’ Cf. 3.615 ἀρίδηλα καὶ ἄμφαδα ἔργα πέλοιτο which imitates Od. 19.391 ἄμφαδα ἔργα γένοιτο; see Kidd (1997) on Aratus 64 ἄμφαδόν. Mooney (1912) points out that ἃναφανδά is here used as an adjective and that in Homer it is an adverb. The form ἃναφανδά is used three times in Homer (Od. 3.221, 3.222, 11.455). At 11.455 κρύβην µὴ ἃναφανδά it is an adverb but at 3.221–2 there is room for differing interpretations: οὐ γάρ πω ἵδον ὄδε θεοὺς ἃναφανδά φιλεύτας, / ὡς κεῖνῳ ἃναφανδά παρίστατο Παλλάς Ἀθήνη. The first ἃναφανδά, used in a construction, easy to parallel, (Arg. 2.893 ἐτῶσια γηράσκοντας, 4.303 ἐτῶσια μαστεύσωτες, Theocr. 1.38, 7.48, Il. 2.222 ἰξέα κεκλήγων, 303–4n.) was interpreted by A. as a neuter plural adjective and this adjectival interpretation is reproduced here.

οὔδὲ τι μῆχος always occurs at the end of the line in Homer (Il. 2.342, 9.249, Od. 12.392, 14.238). This moving of a phrase from its usual Homeric sedes often happens thanks to A.’s variatio (23–4n.). He uses it again at 2.444 where it retains its Homeric position; cf. Eur. Andr. 535–6 οἷοι οἱ, τί δ’ ἐγὼ κακών / μὴχος ἐξανύσωμαι in another context of supplication.

85–6 ἀλλ’ ἐνὶ νηὶ / φεύγωμεν, πρὶν τόνδε θοῶν ἐπιβήμεναι ἵππων. ‘But let us flee on the ship before he mounts his swift horses.’ ἐνὶ is Brunck’s correction of transmitted ἐπὶ; cf. 2.397–8 ἐνὶ νηὶ / πείρεθ, 2.960–1 ἀλλ’ ἐνὶ νηὶ / . . . ἐβησαν 3.525 ἐρητύοισθ᾽ ἐνὶ νηὶ. By comparison, Fränkel’s (OCT) ἐπὶ νηὸς is unlikely. Of the two parallels he quotes, only 2.1184 occurs in the same metrical position.
Confusion between ὅδε and ὅγε is common. Here τόνγε is the reading of P.Oxy. 4.692, the mediaeval tradition. having τόνδε. Campbell (1971) 417 expresses doubts about τόνγε, arguing that Medea is imagining that Aietes will be upon her at any moment and therefore τόνδε pointing out something close at hand might be in order. Perhaps τόνγε was wrongly introduced into 86 from 77.


87–8 δῶσω δὲ χρύσειον ἐγὼ δέρος, εὐνήσασα / φρουρόν ὄφιν. ‘I shall give you the Golden Fleece, by putting to sleep the serpent that guards it.’ With expressions that have formulaic possibilities such as ‘Golden Fleece’ A. succeeds in being as unrepetitive as possible by alternating between κῶς (8 times) and δέρος (7), χρύσειον (11) and χρύσεον (4), hyperbaton (Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 267) often separating the two combinations.

The hyperbaton here with the personal pronoun placed between the two components of the formula emphasises Medea’s role in the Argonauts’ ultimate success and the price that she can exact. The echo of Aietes’ statement at 3.404 δῶσω τοι χρύσειον ἄγειν δέρος (similar phraseology at 2.290) is deliberate: Aietes is not going to give the Argonauts the Fleece without a fight. Medea gives it to them in exchange for saving her from Aietes. The phrase is an adaptation of the Homeric formula for gift-giving; cf. Od. 4.589–91 δῶσῳ δὲ τοι ἄγλα αἱ δῶρα, / τρεῖς ἐπίπους και δίψρον ἐὔςουν αὐτάρ ἐπεῖτα / δῶσῳ καλὸν ἀλείσον Od. 8.403, 16.80,
21.340, II. 9.128, 10.305. Callimachus uses the same formula at h. 5.127–8 and reverses it at h. 3.6–18 (δός μοι repeated five times in Artemis’ mock supplication of her father Zeus).

For εὐνήσασα / φρουρόν ὄφιν cf. 4.1433–4 ἀπούρας / φρουρόν ὄφιν ζωῆς, part of the description of Heracles stealing the golden apples of the Hesperides, a deed carried out in brutal fashion, in marked contrast with Jason’s dependence on Medea to take the Golden Fleece away from its guardian snake (127–9n.). The climax in 156–61 where Medea puts the dragon to sleep by means of a drug deviates from the usual legend (156–8n.).

ἀκήρατα φάρακα at line 157 and εὐνήσασα may contain a reference to contemporary medicine, i.e. to anaesthetics. Such references are not unknown in A. (57n.). εὐνήσασα can mean ‘stupefy with narcotics’ (Arctaeus Medicus CA 2.5).

88–90 τύνη δὲ θεοὺς ἐνὶ σοῖσιν ἑταίροις, / ξεῖνε, τεῶν μύθων ἐπιίστορας, οὐς μοι ὑπέστης, / ποίησαι. ‘but do you, stranger, among your comrades make the gods witness of the vows you have taken on yourself for my sake.’ For this strong assertion beginning with τύνη cf. 414n. It contrasts with her supposed suppliant status and perhaps shows A. modifying some of the traditional elements of a supplication to demonstrate the force of Medea’s character; see Plantinga (2007) 544–5 on similar modifications during the Circe episode in Book 4. Medea is also attempting to put her relationship with Jason on to a legal footing. Vian (1981) 150 points out that after her flight, she no longer has a legal guardian (χήτει κηδεμόνων) and to avoid becoming an object of scorn and disgrace, she tries to persuade Jason to accept a form of marriage by mutual consent, which would place her under the
protection of her husband. There is some evidence of a move towards this type of relationship in the Hellenistic period; see Gagarin and Cohen (2005) 352–3. Up to this point, Medea refers to Jason as ξείνε (4.89, 3.619, 630, 638, 905). After they make the marriage contract, she calls Jason by his name (4.355 Αἰσονίδη). This subtle point of characterisation might represent something of the breakdown of the barriers against mixed marriages that took place in Egypt in the third century; see Gagarin and Cohen (2005) 350. For ἐπίστορας cf. 16–17n.

90–1 μῆδ’ ἐνθέν ἐκαστέρω ὀρμηθείσαιν / χήτει κηδεμόνων ὀνοτήν καὶ ἀεικέα θείης. ‘And once I have travelled far from my home here, do not turn me into an object of scorn and disgrace because I have no one to protect me.’ For χήτει κηδεμόνων cf. Soph. Phil. 195 καί νῦν ἀ πονεῖ δίχα κηδεμόνων. The shame incurred by Medea’s desertion of her family is a constant theme in the opening of Book 4 (nn. 4–5, 360–2).

χήτει with the genitive occurs three times in Homer, always at the beginning of the line, as here; cf. II. 6.463 χήτει τοιοῦθ’ ἄνδρός, II. 19.324 χήτει τοιοῦθ’ ύιος, Od. 16.35 χήτει ἐνευναίων (similar are Hesiod Th. 605, fr. 409 M–W). There are different scansion of the word: ~ with correction (Od. 16.35) and ~ (II. 6.463 etc), though in the latter the dactyl is not guaranteed and ~ is possible. The dactyl is certain at Hom. Hym. 3.78 χήτει λαῶν but Arat. 1152 χήτει χαροποῖο σελήνης (—~ ~ ~~) perhaps points to some ancient disagreement about the correct scansion of II. 6.463, Aratus putting forward the interpretation which he accepted in his own poem. A., however, makes no clear decision. At 4.91 he reproduces the ambiguous scansion of II. 6.463 and at Arg. 1.887 ἰδε δάκρυα χήτει ἱόντος the correction of Od. 16.35.
ὀνοτός is found only here and at Pind. I. 4.54, Call. h. 4.20. The Homeric form is ὄνοστός (only at II. 9.164). Pindar’s influence on Callimachus is well-known, (cf. Acosta-Hughes and Stephens (2012), Smiley (1914) 46–72 and 83–4n.). Both Pindar and Callimachus seem to be using the word with reference to size. A., however, glosses ὀνοτήν with ἀεικέα. Σ (p. 267 Wendel) ad loc. explains the word by μεμπτῆν and this is similar to Hesych. ῥ 919 = II 765 Latte ὄνοστὰ· ἐκφαυλισμοῦ ἀξία· μεμπτά· εὐτελῆ· φαύλα. A. clearly thought that this meaning was more appropriate in an epic context.

Platt (1914) 38–9 thought that θείης should be subjunctive (θείησ) rather than optative, as being the more natural mood after an imperative. There is the same type of confusion at 4.1015, 1087 and Theocritus 24.36 ἀνοστα, μηδὲ πόδεσι τεοῖς ὑπὸ σάνδαλα θείης, but Gow notes Homeric parallels for this type of sequence; cf. II. 3.406–7 ἦσο παρ’ αὐτὸν ἱοῦσα . . . / μηδ’ ἕτι σοῖ σι πόδεσιν ὑποστρέψειας "Ολυμπον.”

92–3 Ἰσκεν ἀκηχεμένη· μέγα δὲ φρένες Αἰσονίδαο / γῆθεον. ‘She spoke in anguish; but greatly did the heart of Aeson’s son rejoice.’ For ἀκηχεμένη cf. II. 1.103 ἄχρύμενος· μένεος δὲ μέγα φρένες ἀμφιμέλαιναι = Od. 4.661 and for γῆθεον cf. II. 7.214 τὸν δὲ καὶ Ἀργεῖοι μὲν ἐγήθεον εἰσορόωντες, and similar phrases at 7.127, 8.559. Jason’s joy seems to result from Medea’s presence, not just that he is about to obtain the Fleece. This is demonstrated by his jumping ashore to greet her and showing her physical signs of affection (see below). As Book 4 develops, this magnanimity will be seen to short-lived.
93–4 αἶψα δὲ μιν περὶ γούνασι πεπτημιᾶν / ἦκ᾽ ἀναιρόμενος
προσπτύζατο, θάρσουνέν τε. ‘And at once, as she fell at his knees, he raised her
gently and embraced her, and spoke words of comfort.’ A. is describing the classic
mode of supplication; cf. II. 1.500–1 (Thetis) καὶ ρα πάροιθ’ αὐτοῖο καθέζετο, καὶ
λάβε γούνων / σκαίη, δεξιτερῇ δ’ ἄρ’ ὑπ’ ἀνθερεώνος ἐλούσα and also Nausicaa’s
advice to Odysseus in a similar context, Od. 6.310–1 μητρός περὶ γούνασι χεῖρας /
βάλλειν ἡμετέρης. A. describes the suppliant’s posture more emotively, using a more
dramatic word πεπτημιᾶν ‘crouched at his knee’; cf. Arat. 353–4 τὴν δὲ καὶ οὐκ
όλιγον περ ἀπόπροθι πεπτημιὰν / Ἀνδρομέδην. The polysyllabic nature of these
lines (πεπτημιᾶν . . . ἀναιρόμενος προσπτύζατο, θάρσουνέν) reinforces the
solemnity of the oath that Jason is about to swear.

The participle πεπτημιᾶν is derived from πτήσσω, (cf. Od. 14.354 κείμην
πεπτημός, 14.474 ὑπὸ τεύχει πεπτηώτες, 22.362 πεπτημός γὰρ ἔκειτο ὑπὸ
θρόνον), but sometimes seems connected with πίπτω (Arg. 1.1056, 3.321, 4.1263,
1268).

For προσπτύζατο, θάρσουνεν τε cf. II. 24.193 φώνησεν τε, Od. 4.647
προσπτύζατο μύθῳ, 1.1330–1 χεῖρα δὲ χειρὶ / ἀκρὴν ἀμφιβαλῶν προσπτύζατο
φώνησεν τε. Fränkel (1968) 462 found the occurrence of θάρσουνεν here and in 108
difficult. He thought that θάρσουνεν was not an appropriate introduction to the oath
that Jason makes in lines 95–8 and that Jason’s words are ‘degraded’ (‘entwürdigt’) by it. Therefore, without printing it, he showed approval of the reading of D:
φώνησεν. On the quality of the variants offered by D see Fränkel (1961) XIV and Vian (1981) LIV–LV. φώνησεν must be a case of invasion from Homer (446n.) and,
pace Fränkel, θάρσουνεν an implicit comment on the true nature of Jason’s oath. His
sincerity only runs surface deep.
Δαιμονίη, Ζεὺς αὐτὸς Ὀλύμπιος ὀρκίος ἐστώ, / Ἡρη τε Ζυγίη, Διὸς εὐνέτις. 'Lady, may Olympian Zeus himself, and Hera goddess of marriage, who shares Zeus’ bed, witness my oath.' For the importance of the oath as a theme see 358–9n. and 388–9n. Δαιμονίη is a frequent opening to Homeric speech; cf. Il. 24.193–4 Ἐκάβην ἑκάλεσσατο φῶνησέν τε / δαιμονίη Διόθεν μοι Ὀλύμπιος ἁγγελός ἤλθε and the word which Jason again uses to propitiate Medea at 4.395n.; see Brunius-Nilsson (1955) 73.

For ὀρκίος ἐστώ cf. Il. 7.411 ὀρκία δὲ Ζεὺς ἰστὼ ἐρίγδουτος πόσις Ἡρης, 19.258 ἰστὼ νῦν Ζεὺς πρῶτα θεών ὑπατος καὶ ἀριστος, Hom. Ημ. 2.259 ἰστὼ γὰρ θεών ὀρκός ἀμείλικτον Στυγὸς ὑδρ (see Richardson ad loc. on ὀρκίος), Soph. Phil. 1325 Ζῆνα δ’ ὀρκίον καλώ, Eur. Med. 208–9 παθοῦσα / τὰν Ζηνὸς ὀρκίαν Θέμιν. Vian (1981) 150 found the conjecture ἵστω (Chrestien; see Vian (1974) LXXIX) ‘séduisante’ but rejected it on a number of grounds: ἵστω, for example, usually comes earlier in such phrases. He might have added that ἵστω is supported by clausulae such as Il. 7.76 Ζεὺς δ’ ἄμμ’ ἑπιμάρτυρος ἐστώ; Hes. Op. 370 ἀρκίος ἐστώ, and particularly Pind. P. 4.166–8 καρτέρος / ὀρκός ἄμμιν μάρτυς ἐστώ / Ζεὺς ὁ γενέθλιος ἀμφοτέροις.

Zugia and Zugios are surnames of Hera and Zeus, describing them as presiding over marriage. As goddess of marriage, she is consistently called Teleia (Aesch. Eum. 214, fr. 383 TrGF, Ar. Thesm. 973–6); more rarely Zygia (Nonn. D. 4.322 ζυγίη φύγεν Ἡρη / συζυγίην, 31.186 ζυγίην θαλαμητόλον Ἡρην, Thallus A.P. 7.188.4 = 3423 GP οὐδ’ Ἡρης ζυγίης, Musaeus 275, Hesych. ζ’ 189–90 = 1 263 Latte Ζυγία· Ἡρη / Ζύγιος· Ζεὺς and Virg. Aen. 4.59 Iunoni ante omnis, cui vincla iugalia curae).
For the form εὐνέτις cf. Arg. 1. 1126 ἐνναέτις, 2.353 καταιβάτις, 509 ἀγρότις, 3.292 χερνήτις, 666 ἐπέτις. This noun formation appears first in drama (Aeschylus: βοάτις, βουλευτίς, νησιώτις) and then later cf. Nonn. D. 4.47 καὶ οὐ Δίος εὐνέτις Ἑρή; see Redondo (2000) 140 n. 55 and Buck and Petersen (1948) 607–8.

96–8 ἥ μὲν ἐμοίσιν / κούριδην σε δόμοισιν ἐνιστήσεσθαι ἄκοιτιν, / εὖτ’ ἄν ἐς Ἑλλάδα γαῖαν ἵκωμεθα νοστήσαντες. ‘that I shall make you my lawful wedded wife in my home, when we return to the land of Hellas.’ The consequences of this oath will be felt through the poem. The installation of the bride in the conjugal home is part of the essential elements of the ancient Greek marriage ceremony.

For adjective and noun at opposite ends of the line cf. 41–2n. and 4.1085 κούριδην θήσεσθαι ἐνὶ μεγάροισιν ἄκοιτιν where it seems that Arete has had a verbal report from Medea of what Jason said here; also II. 19.298 κούριδην ἀλοχον θήσειν, Od. 21.316 οἶκαδὲ μ’ ἄξεσθαι καὶ ἐὴν θήσεσθαι ἄκοιτιν, Hes. Th. 998–9 ὠκείης ἐπὶ νηὸς ἄγων ἐλικώπιδα κούρην / Αἰσονίδης, καὶ μιν θαλερὴν ποιήσατ’ ἄκοιτιν. A. makes Jason speak in a formal way that, bearing in mind the parallel from the Theogony, may be a traditional part of the retelling of the story.

For Ἑλλάδα γαῖαν cf. Od. 1.290 = 2.221 νοστήσας δὴ ἔπειτα φίλην ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν. Ἑλλάδα γαῖαν is not Homeric. A., as with ‘Golden Fleece’ (87–8n.), builds up his own system of formulas; cf. Arg. 1.336, 904, 2.891, 3.339, 993. The use of the phrase also stresses the Barbarian v. Greek contrast, a major theme of the poem; see 204–5n., and Hunter (2008) 97, 108, 114 on the force and use of the term ‘Hellene’, contrasted with other nationalities.
99–100 ὡς ποῦδα, καὶ χεῖρα παρασχεδὸν ἔρασε χειρὶ / δεξιτερῆν. ‘With these words he straightaway took her right hand in his.’ Cf. Parmenides fr. 1.45–6 D–K χεῖρα δὲ χειρὶ / δεξιτερῆν ἔλευ, II. 21.286 χειρὶ δὲ χεῖρα λαβόντες ἐπιστώσαντ’ ἐπέεσσι, II. 24.671–2 ἐπὶ καρπῷ χεῖρα γέρου ἄροντος / ἐλλαβε δεξιτερῆν. The gesture adds to the solemnity of the oath and implies acceptance of the supplication. It echoes a similar gesture made by Medea at 3.1067–8, when she first decides to help Jason. One might expect a moment in which Medea shows gratitude in some way. As it is, Jason's right hand is left hanging in the enjambed position and her immediate dominance is shown by the way in which she commands them to go to the sacred grove. Cf. also Virg. Aen. 1.408 dextrae iungere dextram, 8.164 and the ritual of supplication in Euripides (Eur. IA 909, Her. 1207, Supp. 277) with Naiden 110, 111 n. 39.

100–2 ἡ δὲ σφιν ἐς ἱερὸν ἄλσος ἀνώγει / νὴαθηήν ἐλάιαν αὐτοσχεδόν, δορ’ ἐτὶ νῦκτωρ / κῶας ἐλόντες ἁγοιντο παρὲκ νόον Αἰήταο. ‘and she ordered them to row the swift ship to the sacred grove near at hand, in order that, while it was still night, they might seize and carry off the Fleece against the will of Aeetes.’ Medea gives the orders, although she has just been playing the role of the humble suppliant. In a similar way, during their encounter with the guardian serpent, Medea takes care of the frightened Jason just as the mothers take care of frightened newborn children (4.136–8).

For κῶας ἐλόντες cf. Mimnermus fr. 11.1–2 IEG κῶας ἀνήγαγεν αὐτὸς Ἱήσων / έξ Αἴης τελέσας ἀλγινόεσσαν ὁδόν and for παρὲκ νόον Αἰήταο Il. 10.391 παρὲκ νόον ἠγαγεν "Εκτωρ, Call. fr. 8 Hollis παρὲκ νόον εἰλήλουθας, Arg. 1.130
παρὲκ νόον Εὐρυσθῆος.

103 ένθ’ ἐργον ἤδε καὶ ἐργον ὁμοῦ πέλεν ἐσσυμένοισιν. ‘Word and deed were one to them in their eagerness.’ Cf. Il. 19.242 αὐτίκ’ ἐπειθ’ ἀμα μῷθος ἦν, τετέλεστο δὲ ἐργον, Hom. Hym. 4.46 ὡς ἀμ’ ἐργος τε καὶ ἐργον ἐμήδετο, Mosch. Eur. 162 καὶ τετέλεστο τὰ περ φάτο with Bühler ad loc.

104–6 εἰς γάρ μιν βήσαντες, ἀπὸ χθονὸς αὐτίκ’ ἔωσαν / νῆα, πολύς δ’ ὀρυμαγάδδος ἐπειγομένων ἐλάτησιν / ἤν ἀριστήων. ‘For they took her on board, and straightaway thrust the ship from shore; and loud was the din as the heroes strained at their oars.’ The action now speeds up, aided by A.’s brief allusions to more expansive Homeric passages and also prose usage; cf. Od. 9.103–4 οἱ δ’ αἶψ’ εἰσβαινον καὶ ἐπὶ κληίσι καθίζον, / εξῆς δ’ ἐξόμενοι πολιήν ἀλα τύπτον ἔρετμοῖς, Antiphon De caede Herodis 29.3 πρῶτον μὲν εἰσβάντες εἰς τὸ πλοῖον, Xen. Hell. 1.6.21.3 εἰσβάντες δὲ ἐδίωκον τὴν εἰς τὸ πέλαγος.


106–8 ἡ δ’ ἐμπαλιν ἄσσουσα / γαῖη χείρας ἐτεινεν ἀμήχανος. αὐτὰρ ἔσσων / θάρσυνέν τ’ ἐπέεσι, καὶ Ἰσχανεν ἀσχαλόσωσαν. ‘She, starting back, held out her hands in helpless despair towards the shore. But Jason spoke cheering words and restrained her grief.’ For this instinctive, but almost formal gesture in such situations cf. Il. 4. 523 ἀμφο χείρε φίλοις ἐτάροιοι πετάσσας, Ap. Rhod. fr. 12.9 CA χείρας ἐτεινεν, Arg. 4.1048–9, Mosch. Eur. 111–2 ἦ δὲ
metastrefbeísa phílaς kaléseken etáiraς / cheíras orégynuménη, Virg. Aen. 6.314
		
tendebant... manus ripae ulterioris amore.

For thárounén τ᾽ épéesoí cf. 93–4n., II. 4.233 τοὺς μάλα tharouνeke
paristaménov épéesoí. Similar are Arg. 4.323, II. 10.190 thárōnve te mütho, 23.682
tharouνwov épéesoí and for ἵσχανεν ἀσχαλόωσαν cf. Arg. 3.710, 4.138 (same sedes).

109–14 The approaching dawn brings decisive action (cf. Soph. El. 17–19 with
Finglass ad loc.) and such a moment can be marked by an elaborate description of the
passing of time and a comparison with activities taking place in a different scene.
Callimachus (fr. 74.25–6 Hollis, quoted below) has a similar passage linked to this by
the use of the rare ἄγχαυρος. A. also strikingly describes the moment when night
gives way to dawn at 2.669–71, using another choice word ἀμφιλύκη (671) to enrich
the verse. This echoes and refines Homer’s practice, whose similes have been found
to contain less formulaic phrasing and many hapax legomena and late linguistic

This allusion to the time of day is an extension of Homeric examples such as
II. 7.433 ἦμος δ᾽ οὐτ᾽ ἀρ πε ηῶς, ἐτι δ᾽ ἀμφιλύκη νύξ, II. 11.86–90, 23.226–8, Od.
βουσιν εἰρήναν παρέχοισα πατρώαις, τὸν δὲ σύγκοιτον γλυκὺν / παῦρον ἐπὶ
γλεφάροις / ὑπόνον ἀναλίσκοισα ἐπὶ γλεφάροις πρὸς ἀῶ; see Fränkel (1921) 36,

For other elaborate time indications based on the onset of night or day cf.
13.25, 24.11, Call. Aet. fr. 178.1 Harder, fr. 18 Hollis, Mosch. Eur. 2 and Bühler (pp.
210–11).
109–13 ἰμος δ’ ἀνέρες ὑπνον ἀπ’ ὀφθαλμῶν ἐβάλοντο / ἀγρόται, οἳ τε κύνεσσι πεποιθότες οὔποτε νύκτα / ἀγχαυρον κνώσσουσιν, ἀλευάνσιν φάος ἰόης, / μή πρὶν ἀμαλδύνη θηρῶν στίβου ἴδε καὶ ὀδυήν / θηρείην λευκῇσιν ἐνισκήσασα βολῆσιν. ‘At the time when huntsmen shake the sleep from their eyes, who trust in their hounds and never sleep all through the night into the morning, but avoid the light of dawn in case, striking with its white beams, it spoils the track and scent of the quarry.’ Jason and Medea become the hunters, with the Fleece as quarry, after Medea has been the hunted one at 4.10–13. Sleep is the hunter’s enemy; cf. Clytemnestra’s words to the chorus at Aesch. Eum. 94–139, particularly 131–2 ὄναρ διώκεις θῆρας, κλαγγαίνει δ’ ἄπερ / κύων μέριμναν οὔποτ’ ἐκλείποντας, where there was disagreement about its meaning. It sometimes means ‘country man’ (Eur. Or. 1270 ἀγρότας ἀνήρ), sometimes ‘huntsman’ (Alcm. fr. 1.8 PMGF though this is uncertain, Simias fr. 20.1 CA, Leonidas A.P. 6.13 = 2250 HE, Hesych. α 831 π. 32 Latte ἀγρόται θηρεύοντες). For κύνεσσι πεποιθότες cf. Eur. Hel. 154 κυσίν πεποιθῶς ἐν φοναίς θηροκτόνοις. There is no Homeric parallel but cf. Iliad 11.549 ἐσσεύαστο κύνες τε καὶ ὕπνον... ἐβάλοντο is not Homeric; cf. Eur. Ba. 692 αἱ δ᾽ ἀποβαλοῦσαι θαλερὸν ὄμισσιν ὑπνον, Soph. Trach. 989–91 σκεδάσασι / τῷ ἀπὸ κρατός / βλεφάρων θ’ ὑπνον, Alcm. 3 fr. 1.3i.7 PMGF ὑπνον ἀ]πὸ γλεφάρων σκεδ[α]σι γλυκῶν, Pind. P. 9.23–5 (Cyrene as a young huntress) τὸν δὲ οὐγκοιτον γλυκῶν / παύρου ἐπὶ γλεφάρος / ὑπνον ἀναλίσκοσα ῥέοντα πρὸς ἀδ. ἀγρότης occurs in Homer only at Od. 16.217–18 τέκνα / ἀγρόται ἐξείλοντο πάρος πετενά γενέσθα, where there was disagreement about its meaning. It sometimes means ‘country man’ (Eur. Or. 1270 ἀγρότας ἀνήρ), sometimes ‘huntsman’ (Alcm. fr. 1.8 PMGF though this is uncertain, Simias fr. 20.1 CA, Leonidas A.P. 6.13 = 2250 HE, Hesych. α 831 π. 32 Latte ἀγρόται θηρευταῖ).
ἀνέρες ἀγροιῶται; for ancient hunting with dogs see Barringer (2001) who particularly refers to Xenophon (see below p. 88), Lilja (1976) 101 n. 35 discussing this passage and quoting Od. 19.428–30 for hunting in the early morning.

For κνώσσουσιν cf. Od. 4.809 ἤδυ μάλα κνώσσουσ’ ἐν οὐειρείησι πῦλησιν, Theocr. 21.65 εἰ δ’ ὑπαρ σὺ κνώσσων τὰ πελώρια ταῦτα ματεύσεις, Herod. Mim. 8.10 δει[λή] Μεγαλλί, κα[ί] σὺ Λάτμιον κνώσσεις (57n.), Mosch. Eur. 6 τήμος ὑπωροφίοισιν ἐνι κνώσσουσα δόμοις, 23 ἤδυ μάλα κνώσσουσαν ἀνεπτοίησαν δνειροὶ with Bühler ad loc. The word seems to be of a homely and almost onomatopoeic nature, so well suited to the description of countrymen.

ἄγχαυρος occurs elsewhere only at Call. fr. 74.25–6 Hollis στιβήεις ἄγχαυρος, ὅτε οὐκετί χεῖρες ἑπαγροί / φιλητέων ἤδη γὰρ ἐωθινὰ λύχνα φαείει. Both passages are examples of the elaborated Hellenistic time note (109–14n.). An examination of the variatio used by the poets supports Callimachus’ priority. His phrase στιβήεις ἄγχαυρος (‘frosty dawn’) may be a neat variation on the Homeric στίβη ὑπηοίη (‘early morning frost’) (Od. 17.25). στίβη only occurs at Od. 5.467, Od. 17.25, Call. A.P. 12.102 = 1037 HE στίβη καὶ νιφέτῳ κεχρηκένος, and στιβήεις is a coinage by Callimachus. The neat reversal (στίβη [noun]–στιβήεις [adjective]; ὑπηοίη [adjective]–ἄγχαυρος [noun]) and the substitution of a more recherché word as part of the variation is typical of Hellenistic poetry.

A.’s phrase can be seen as the third stage in the pattern of variation. As Callimachus reversed the Homeric phrase (noun changed into adjective), so A. reverses Callimachus, and uses ἄγχαυρος not as a noun but as an adjective with νύκτα.

Pace Erbse (1953) 185 n. 2 who does not believe that νὺξ ἄγχαυρος can bear the meaning ‘through the night and during the morning’, the combination is striking
and unexpected: a word usually understood to mean ‘dawn’ is used as an adjective to
describe ‘night’. The combination is emphasised by enjambment. Erbse thinks that
νόκτα is a gloss that has displaced some rarer word. For recherché words used as part
of such elaborate descriptions cf. 3.277 (μύωπα), 4.175 (ἀχαινένυ), 4.1695
(κατουλάδα), 109–14n. It seems unlikely that A. would have used two such words so
closely together. In the transmitted phrase νόξ offers exegesis of ἄγχαυρος.

The combination of ἀλευάµενοι with φάος ἕος is not Homeric (338–40n.).
This passage as a whole (109–85) can be read almost as a ‘sunrise’, from the twilight
at the beginning to the radiance of the Fleece at the end. A.’s interest in the description
of reflected light has been much commented on; see nn. 123–6, 167–70, 184–5,

ἀµαλδύνω occurs only in the formula τείχος ἀµαλδύναι (Il. 7.463, 12.18,
12.32) meaning ‘destroy’. After Homer the sense is gradually modified; cf. Hom.
Hym. 2.94 εἶδος ἀµαλδύνουσα, ‘conceal’, [Hipp.] Mul. 2.201 ὡµισα ἀµαλδύνηται, ‘weaken’, Arat. 863–5 ἐξαπίνης ἀκτίνες ἀπ’ οὐρανόθεν τανύωνται,
/ ὡσπότον ἀµαλδύονται, ὅτε σκίάσαι . . . / . . . σελήνῃ ‘fade’. A.’s use here and at 1.834
(ἀµαλδύνουσα φόνου τέλος) is a natural development; cf. Xen. Cyn. 5.5 ἡ γῆ
ἀφανίζει τὸ θερμὸν ἐξουσίαν ἐστὶ γὰρ λεπτὸν καὶ αἱ κύνες ἦττον ὀσφραίνονται,
Arist. De sensu et sensibilibus 443b.15 ἡ ὀσμή. καὶ διὰ τούτο τὸ ψυχρὸν καὶ ἡ
πῆξις καὶ τοὺς χυμοὺς ἀμβλύνει καὶ τὰς ὀσμὰς ἀφανίζει.

Frinkel (OCT) conjectured θερμόν for θηρῶν, because of the repetition
θηρῶν ~ θηρείν, wrongly comparing θερμοῖς ἰχνει α at Anon. A.P. 9.371.2 which
means ‘hot-foot’ and not ‘warm tracks’; see Gow on Theocr. 17.121. A. uses
polyptoton freely; cf. 1.726–7 (ἐρευθος ~ ἐρευθήεσσα), 1.1128–9 (Ἰδαίης ~ Ἰδαῖοι),
2.130 (μελισσάων ~ μελισσοκόμοι), 3.949–50 (μελπομένης ~ μολτήν), 4.1638–46
(χάλκειος ~ χαλκείης ~ χαλκείοις ~ χάλκεος), and as a possible model, Hom. Hym. 4.353 ἀφραστὸς γένετ’ ὡκα βοῶν στίβος ἥδε καί αὐτοῦ.

λευκός is elsewhere used to describe light at Od. 6.45 λευκὴ δ’ ἐπιδέδρομεν αἰγλῆ, Il. 14.185, Eur. El. 102–3, Ba. 457, Soph. Aj. 708; cf. also Arg. 1.672, 2.368, 4.1735 (all phrases with λευκῇσιν in the same sedes). λευκός applied to a new enterprise denotes an auspicious beginning and possibly a good outcome; cf. Eur. El. 102 νῦν οὖν – ἕως γὰρ λευκὸν ὀµµ’ ἀναίρεται, and λευκόπωλος at Aesch. Pers. 386, Soph. Aj. 673 meaning 'lucky'.

A. uses ἐνισκήπτω twice elsewhere (3.153, 3.765), with the meaning 'pierce' or 'plunge'; cf. Il. 16.612 = 17.528 οὔδεὶ ἐνισκίμφη. At Il. 17.437 the horses of Achilles are described as they weep for Patroclus: οὔδεὶ ἐνισκίμψαντε καρῆσατα, 'pressing on' or 'inclining towards' (cf. Σ ad loc. = iv 398.70–1 Erbse προσερείσαντες καὶ πελάσαντες) and this is A.'s model when he uses the word to describe the sun 'pressing down' on the animal trail and piercing the early morning mist.

The concept of a beam of light as a missile occurs in Homer (Od. 5.479, 19.441). Thereafter βάλλω and βολαί are often used of the sun; cf. Soph. Aj. 877 ἀφ’ ἥλιου βολῶν (with Finglass ad loc.), Eur. Ion 1134 (coni.) ἥλιου βολάς, Or. 1258–9; and elsewhere in A. at 1.607, 2.943, 3.1389, 4.679, Barrett on Eur. Hipp. 530–4.

114–7 τῆμος ἀρ’ Αἰσονίδης κούρη τ’ ἀπὸ νηὸς ἔβησαν / ποιήνστ’ ἀνὰ χώρον, ἵνα κριοῦ καλέονται / εὐναί, δ’ι πρῶτον κεκμῆτα γούνατ’ ἐκαψεν, / νότοισιν φορέων Μινυήιον υἱ’ Ἀθάμαντος. 'Then did Aeson's son and the maiden disembark from the ship onto a grassy spot, the “Ram's couch” as they call it, where it first bent its wearied knees, bearing on its back the
Minyan son of Athamas.' This is where the Ram came almost to the end of its journey, a place associated with weakness and tiredness. Yet it is also the point from which Jason and Medea begin theirs. The monster is lurking in a pastoral setting. For the idea of the *locus amoenus* cf. Rosenmeyer (1973) 188–9, disrupted in this case by the serpent in the garden (Ogden (2013) particularly 347–83). ποιήνετ’ ἀνὰ χώρον varies the beginning of *Od.* 14.2 χώρον ἀν’ ὑλήνετα = *Il.* 10.362. χώρον is often followed by ὅθι, (*Il.* 23.138), ἐνθά (*Od.* 9.182).


Μινυήιον occurs elsewhere at *Arg.* 1.763, *Il.* 11.722 Μινυήιος (proper name), [Hes.] fr. 257.4 Μ– withStyles Ὁρχοµενὸν Μινυήιον, Euphorion fr. 90.14 Lightfoot Μινυήιον Ὄλµωυ,. Μινύειος occurs at *Il.* 2.511, *Od.* 11.284, Theoc. 16.104–5. On the obscure ‘Minyan’, derived from the mythical ‘Minyas’ see Simon (1992) 581–2, Fowler, *EGM* ii § 5.5. Minyas is only known through his adjective, used of the Argonauts as well as Orchomenos. The epithet is older than the Trojan Wars (Kirk (1985) 198) and is used by both Homer and A. to add legendary status, as does the
patronymical phrase υἷ' Ἀθάμαντος (Arg. 2.653, though not at the end of the line (76–81n.), modelled on II. 13.185 υἷ' Ἀκτορίωνος and II. 13.792 υἷ' Ἰπποτίωνος; also Theocr. 22.139 ἀδελφεώ υἷ' Ἀφαρῆος).

118–21 ἐγγύθι δ' αἰθαλόεντα πέλεν βωμοίοι θέμεθλα, / ὅν ρά ποτ' Ἀιολίδης Διὶ Φυξίῳ εἴσατο Φρίξος, / ῥέξων κεῖνο τέρας παγχρύσεον, ὡς οἴ έειπέν / Ἑρμείας πρόφρων ξυμβλήμενος. ‘And close by was the smoke-blackened base of the altar, which the Aeolid Phrixos once set up to Zeus, god of fugitives, sacrificing that golden wonder at the bidding of Hermes who graciously met him on the way.’ αἰθαλόεντα used in Homer of 

μεγάροιο μέλαθρον (II. 2.414–5, Od. 22.239) and κόνις (II. 18.23, Od. 24.316) stresses that the altar is in regular use. Smoke played an important part in ancient sacrifice; see Naiden (2013) VII and passim. Although the ancients would have been used to soot on altars, a sacrificial altar hidden deep in a sacred grove is an exotic descriptive detail (163–6n. and the more macabre description at Eur. IT 65–71).

For the slight hypallage cf. 1.1218–9 πρόφασιν πολέμου . . . λευγαλέην 2.378 Ζηνὸς Ἐυξείνοιο Γενηταίην ὑπὲρ ἀκρήν, 2.475 ἀλλ' ὣγε πατρὸς ἑοῖο κακὴν τίνεσκεν ἰμπῆν with Vian (1973) 93, Giangrande (1977) 514 n. 40. A more usual Homeric phrase is βωμός θυήεις (II. 8.48, Od. 8.363).

Here, θέμεθλα means the foundations of a building or temple; cf. Pind. P. 4.16 Διὸς ἐν Ἀμμωνος θεμέθλοις, Call. h. 2.15 έστηξειν δὲ τὸ τεῖχος ἐπ̣' ἀρχαίοις θεμέθλοις. In Homer it is used twice and means ‘the roots of the eye’ (II. 14.493) and ‘the base of the throat’ (II. 17.47); see Finglass on Stes. fr. 135.3.

Φυξίος occurs as a title of Zeus in Thessaly (cf. Σ (p. 207 Wendel) 2.1147 Φύξιος Ζεὺς παρὰ Θεσσαλοῖς, 4.699). He also had a cult at Argos (Paus. 2.21.3,
3.17.8), in Athens (Photius ε 604 Ελευθερίου καὶ Φυξίου βωμοὶ Αθήνησιν ἐν ἀγορᾷ) and also at Sparta (Wide 14). It occurs elsewhere in poetry only at Lycophron Alex. 288 but cf. SEG 7.894, 35.1570 = I. Gerasa 5 (Arabia), first century AD; see Hornblower (2014) 94 n. 12, Bremmer (2008) 103, 113–4, 304 for other references to Zeus Φυξίος. Zeus, the god of fugitives, is closely associated with another of his roles as the god of suppliants; cf. 2.1131–2 ἀλλ’ ἰκέτας Ζείνους Διὸς εἶνεκεν αἰδέσσασθε / Ζείνιου Ἰκεσίου τε, 1146–7 τὸν μὲν ἐπείτ’ ἔρρεξεν ἐῖς ὑποθηµοσύνην / Φυξίῳ έκ πάντων Κρονίδῃ Διί, Aesch. Suppl. 347, 350, 359–60. For A.’s epithets, see Feeney (1991) 61–3. There is assonance and wordplay here (cf. Φυξίῳ ~ Φρίξος; also 125 νεφέλῃ, Nephele being the mother of Phrixos and Helle).


For ῥέζων cf. Call. h. 3.199–200 ἀνεστήσαντο δὲ βωμοὺς / ιερά τε ῥέζουσι, based on Hom. Hym. 5.100–1 περιφαινομένῳ ἔνι χώρῳ, / βωμὸν ποιήσω, ῥέξω δέ τοι ιερὰ καλά.

The Fleece is generally described as golden ([Hes.] fr. 68 M–W, Pherecyd. EGM II § 6.1.1). Simonides (fr. 242a Poltera) and others (Acus. EGM II § 6.1.1) said it was purple or even white (Σ Αργ. 4.176–7 = p. 271 Wendel ὁ δὲ Σιμωνίδης ποτὲ μὲν λευκόν, ποτὲ δὲ πορφυροῦν). For παγχρύσεων cf. Pind. P. 4.68 τὸ πάγχρυσον νάκος κριοῦ, Pind. P. 4.231, Eur. Hyps. fr. 752.22–4 TrGF ἢ τὸ χρυσεδώμαλλον / ιερὸν δέρος ὁ περὶ δρύω / ὀξοὶς ὤμως δράκοντος (cf. 4.162), Med. 480–1 δράκοντά θ’, ὃς πάγχρυσον ἀμπέχων δέρος / σπείραις ἔσωζε πολυπλόκοις ἄυπνος ἑων. Elsewhere A. uses the simple χρύσεων of the Fleece: e.g. 3.13, 4.176, 1142, 1319; See 87–8n.
Noegel (2004) 125 compares the image of Amun-Re, often shown as a ram, overlaid in gold and protected by a magic serpent on his brow. The strange glow that the Fleece gives off as Jason carries it back to the ship (4.185) could be compared to the golden hue possessed by the Egyptian gods (cf. Noegel (2004) 125 n. 14 who makes a strong case for Egyptian influence, although gold and the gods is an established feature of Greek culture; see Finglass on Stes. fr. 8.1–2).

τέρας, although here used of the ram, often describes a monster such as the one that Medea and Jason are soon to encounter; cf. Eur. *IT* 1245–7 ὃθι ποικιλόνωτος οἴνωπός δράκων, / σκιερᾷ κατάχαλκος εὐφύλλῳ δάφνᾳ, / γᾶς πελώριον τέρας.

This version of the story, that the ram is sacrificed on the instructions of Hermes, does not seem to agree with 2.1143–7, where the chief cause of confusion is 1146 τὸν (i.e. κριόν) μὲν ἔπειτ’ ἔρρεξεν ἐξ ὑποθημοσύνης with its vague use of ἐός; for the free use of reflexive pronouns see Mooney on 1.1113, 202–4n., and Rengakos (2002a). It is best to understand ἐξ ὑποθημοσύνης as referring to Hermes (Livrea (1968) 18), not Zeus (Fränkel (1968) 294) nor the ram (the most generally accepted view (Vian (1973) 101)); cf. *Il.* 15.412 = *Od.* 16.233 ὑποθημοσύνης Ἀθήνης, Xen. *Mem.* 1.3.7 Ἐρμοῦ τε ὑποθημοσύνη (the god / goddess is the advisor. Hermes is mentioned in 2.1145).

If, with Vian, one takes ἐξ as referring to the immediately preceding τὸν (i.e. to the ram; so Σ (p. 207 Wendel)), then one must still explain the contradiction between the two versions. Campbell (1971) 416 explained it as a deliberate piece of characterisation. Argos, a naive and credulous individual, chooses the more sensational version to impress his listeners, a case of disputed ‘double motivation’, the same event having a divine and a human cause. This seems over elaborate.

121–2 ἐνθ’ ἀρα τούσγε Ἅργου φραδμοσύνησιν ἀριστῆς μεθέηκαν.


Abstract nouns in –σύνη are uncommon in Homeric poetry and their use somewhat restricted to direct speech. Krarup (1949) 1–17 notes 521 examples in direct speech and 90 examples in narrative (356–8 n.); see 356–8n.

123–86 This description of Jason and Medea’s confrontation with the guardian snake and the rescue of the Fleece, opens and closes with non-Homeric similes concerned with different aspects of its radiance. Initially, it is compared to the light of the rising sun (125–6), then of the moon (169–70) and finally the lightning of Zeus (185). Between these two comparisons are two other similes, both inspired by Homer. The snake’s spiraling body and the raising smoke rings to which it is compared (4.139–44) bring to mind two Iliadic passages (18.207–14, 21.522–5) used of the fear provoked
by Achilles among the Trojans. In the second half of the passage, as the snake relaxes under Medea’s ministrations, it is compared to soundless waves (4.152–3), an imitation of II. 14.16–22, where Nestor hesitates over a decision, and also an inversion of similes where the sea roars (II. 2.209–10, 394–97, 14. 394–5, 17. 263–6). The passage as a whole exhibits a loose ‘ring-composition’ (Kouremenos (1996) 238). Its action mirrors that of the Argonautica as a whole, in that, just as Medea, at first a suppliant, leads the way in recovering the Fleece, the role that she plays in the poem becomes increasingly prominent, culminating in the destruction of Talos (4.1638–88). Such ‘mirroring’ episodes have been described by the phrase ‘mise-en-abyme’ and have been discussed by Fowler (2000) 89–113.

123–6 τῶ δὲ δι’ ἀτραπιτοῖο μεθ’ ἵερὸν ἄλσος ἱκοντο, / φηγὸν ἀπειρεσίην διζημένω, ἡ ἐπὶ κώας / βέβλητο, νεφέλη ἐναλίγκιον, ἡ τ’ ἀνιόντος / ἡλίου φλογερῆσιν ἐρεύθεται ἀκτίνεσσιν. ‘And the two of them by the pathway came to the sacred grove, seeking the huge oak tree on which was hung the Fleece, looking like a cloud that blushes red with the fiery beams of the rising sun.’ ἀτραπιτός (cf. Rhianos fr. 72.1 CA δι’ ἀτραπιτοῖο κιόντι) occurs once in Homer (Od. 13.195) and Callimachus (h. 4.74 ἀτραπιτοὺς ἐπάτησεν). More common forms are ἀταρπιτός (II. 18.565, Od. 17.234, Hom. Hym 3.227) and ἀταρπός (II. 17.743, Od. 14.1, 1.1281); see S–D 1342 on the development from ρα to αρ.

For μεθ’ ἵερὸν ἄλσος ἱκοντο cf. 4.100 ἕς ἵερὸν ἄλσος, Od. 6.321–2 κλυτόν ἄλσος ἱκοντο / ἰρὸν Ἀθηναῖς, 6.291 ἀγλαον ἄλσος Ἀθηνῆς, [Hes.] Scut. 99, Sappho fr. 2.2–3 Voigt ἄγνον ὀππ[α]ι χάριει μὲν ἄλσος / μαλί[αν], βῶμοι ἑξεμπλημάμε and the picture of the καλὸν ἄλσος at Call. h. 6.25–30, the beauty of
which is also to be disrupted (163–6n.).

For κῶας / βέβλητο cf. Od. 19.58 ἐπὶ μέγα βάλλετο κῶας, 19.101 ἐπ’ αὐτῷ κῶας ἔβαλλεν. The Fleece hangs on a tree (cf. 2.404–7, 1268–70, 4.162). The description at Pind. P. 4.244 is more general: κεῖτο γὰρ λόχῳ, δράκοντος δ’ εἰχετο λαβροτατάν γενύων (see Braswell ad loc.). On a cup by Douris (Rome, Vatican Museums, ARV 437.116), Jason is being disgorged by the serpent, with the Fleece hanging on a tree nearby.

A. has a number of descriptions which are concerned with the effect of light (1.450–3, 519–21, 1280–3, 2.164–5, 3.755–9, 1223–4, 4.109–11, 167–70). See 172–3n., with Phinney (1967) 147–8 arguing that A. saw and described like a painter. The image of the cloud flecked with red may originate from passages such as Arat. 867 φαίνωνται νεφέλαι ύπερευθέες ἄλλοθεν ἄλλαι and also 880–2 (see below on ἔρευθεται). For ἀνιόντος / ἥλιου cf. Il. 22.134–5 ἐλάμπετο εἰκελός αὐγῆ / ἕ πυρὸς αἰθομένου ἢ ἥλιοι ἀνιόντος. In Homer νεφέλαι can sometimes be perceived as brightly-coloured cloaks (Il. 5.186 νεφέλη εἰλυμένος ὀμοῦς, 14.350, 15.308, 17.551, 20.150), leading A. to describe the Fleece similarly here and later (4.169) as an ἑανός (Kouremenos (1996) 329).

ἔρευθος and its cognates are thematic in the Argonautica. The word combines craft, magic and eroticism (Hughes Fowler (1989) 17) as part of the chiaroscuro that permeates this passage. The middle of ἔρευθειν occurs first at Sappho fr. 105a.1 Voigt οἶον τὸ γλυκύμαλον ἔρευθεται ἄκρῳ ἐπ’ ὀφθαλμῷ, an image which A. may be recalling here and which Catullus later used (65.24 with Acosta Hughes (2010) 77); cf. 1.778, 1.1230, Theoc. 7.117, 17.127, and for the phrase Arg. 3.163 ἥλιος πρώτησιν ἔρευθεται ἀκτίνεσιν). For A.’s adaptation of epic language by using middle and passive voices for Homer’s actives see Boesch (1908) 17–21, Redondo

127–9 αὐτὰρ ὁ ἀντικρὺ περιμήκεα τείνετο δειρήν / ὄξυς ἀύπνοισιν προϊδὼν ὅφις ὀφθαλμοῖσιν / νισσομένους, ῥοῖζει δὲ πελώριον. ‘But right in front the serpent with his keen, sleepless eyes saw them coming, and stretched out his long neck and hissed mightily.’ The long neck of the serpent calls to mind Scylla at Od. 12.90 ἐξ δὲ τὲ οἱ δειραι περιμήκεες. The eyes of a snake are always open and are protected by immobile transparent scales. A. stresses this with ὄξυς ἀύπνοισιν προϊδὼν and then the word-play based on ὅφις and ὀφθαλμοῖσιν; For the etymology of ὅφις and δράκων (δέρκαι µαι) see Küster (1913) 57, Braswell (1988) 335, Noegel (2004) 129 n. 38 and for the connection made by the Greeks between ὄνοµα and φύσις see Finglass on Soph. Aj. 430–1.

For ἀύπνοισιν and προϊδὼν cf. Eur. Med. 481 σπείραις ἔσωξε πολυπλόκοις ἀυπνοὶς ὅν, Od. 5.393 ὄξυ μάλα προϊδὼν. The Hesiodic passage describing the birth of Typhoeus (Hes. Th. 835 ῥοῖζεσχ’, ὑπὸ δ’ ἱχεεν οὐρεα λακρά) may be one of A.’s models here, playing a part in his desire to recreate the world before Homer. For the influence of the Theogony narrative on the Argonautica, see Martin (2012) 31–4. For other guardian snakes cf. 149–51n., Soph. Phil. 1328 σηκὸν φυλάσσει κρύφιος οἰκουρῶν ὅφις, Eur. Phoen. 657–6 and the snake in the Erechtheion, which was identified with Erichthonios or Erechtheus and called οἰκουρὸς ὅφις (Ar. Lys. 759). Serpents are traditional mythological guardians of treasure but most, like the Colchian one, prove ineffective in the end (Braswell (1988) 333, Ogden (2013) 58–63).

129–30 ἀμφὶ δὲ µακρὰì / ἡῖόνες ποταµοῖο καὶ ἄσπετον ἴαχεν ἀλσος.
‘and all round the long banks of the river echoed and the boundless grove.’ Cf. Il.


In the Homeric passage the meaning of ἀκραὶ ἡὦνες is not clear. It has been translated ‘the shores echo to their farthest points’ (Leaf). ἡὦνος is a Byzantine correction which is not satisfactory (see West (2001) 241, (2000) app. crit.). The scene described is an estuary bordered by sands on which the waters churn noisily. If there are any ‘headlands’ they would mark the limits of the ἡὦνες as in Il. 14.35–6 καὶ πλῆσαν ἄκραι ὑῇ ṽος στόμα μακρόν, ὃσον ὑνεφεργαθὼν ἀκραὶ a description which makes a clear distinction between ἡὦνες and ἀκραὶ. Nonnus seemingly adopted the original Homeric text. Quintus (1.322) takes pains to explain what he thinks is being described in the Homeric passage and is probably copying A’s version when he also writes at 3.668 περιστενάχοντο δὲ μακραὶ / ἡὦνες πόντοιο. It is possible to see here A. in his role as Homeric critic, reading ἡὦνες at Il. 17.264–5 and making the simple emendation μακραὶ for τ᾽ ἀκραὶ (malim: West app. crit.). The Homeric simile was famous in antiquity for its sound effects and drew the attention of Solon, Plato. Σ Il. 17.264 = IV 380–1 Erbse says that they both burnt their poetry in despair) and Aristotle (Poet. 1458b31); see Edwards (1991) 88–9.

For ἀσπετοῦ ἢachsen ἄλσος cf. Hom. Hym. 27.7 ἢachsen δ᾽ ἐπὶ δάσκιος ὑλῆ, Hes. Th. 694 λάκε δ᾽ ἀμφὶ πυρὶ μεγάλ᾽ ἀσπετοῦ ὑλῆ, [Orphic] Arg. 997 ἢachment δὲ σύσκιον ἄλσος. For the assonance cf. 2.1095 ἀσπετοῦ ὀλβοῦ ἄρωνται. For the pathetic fallacy cf. 3.1218 πίσεα δ᾽ ἐτρεμε πάντα κατὰ στίβον, 4.1171–2 αἰ δ᾽
Expressions such as these, which endow Nature with human emotions, are found in Homer and become a topos in hexameter poetry; cf. Il. 13.18, 19.362, Hom. Hym. 2.38, Theocr. 7.74 (see Gow ad loc.). On A.'s use of the pathetic fallacy see Jenkyns (1998) 45–9.

131–2 ἐκλυον οἳ καὶ πολλὸν ἐκάς Τιτηνίδος Αἴης / Κολχίδα γῆν
ἐνέμουτο. ‘Those heard the noise, who, even very far from Titan Aia, inhabited the Colchian land.’ Cf. Virg. Aen. 7.515–18 contremuit nemus et siluae insonuere profundae. / audiit et Triuiae longe lacus, audiit amnis / . . . / et trepidae matres pressere ad pectora natos adapts this passage. For Τιτηνίδος Αἴης cf. 3.313 ἀπόπροθι Κολχίδος αἴης, 4.337 Νέστιδος αἴης, 4.568 Φλιουντίδος αἴης, 4.1779 Κεκροπίην γαῖαν, Call. h. 4.287 οὔρεα Μηλίδος αἴης. A. is describing a place whose name is Αἴα (i.e. the city, though sometimes the two seem to be interchangeable; see Fränkel’s OCT index s.v. Αἴα, 277–8n., and West (2007) 196–8 for the derivation of Αἴα). He chooses Τιτηνίς as an alternative to Κόλχις, a common adjectival formation in geographical descriptions (4.330, 511, 535, 583, 919). Σ (p. 268 Wendel) offers this explanation: τοῦ Τιτῆνος ποταμοῦ, ἀφ’ οὗ καὶ ἡ χώρα Τιτηνίς κέκληται, μνημονεύει Ἐρατοσθένης ἐν Γεωγραφικοῖς. However, the river Titan is not mentioned elsewhere and the adjective is usually used to mean ‘Titan’, with particular reference to Prometheus; cf. 2.1247–9 where the Argonauts hear his agonised cry, as they draw near to Colchis, 3.865 ῥίζης τεμνομένης Τιτηνίδος; but also 4.54 Τιτηνίς Μήνη, Call. h. 4.17 Τιτηνίδα Τηθύν, [Aesch.] PV 874 Τιτανίς Θέμις, Aesch. Eum. 6–7 Τιτανίς ἄλλη παῖς Χθονὸς καθέζετο / Φοίβη, Eur. Hel. 382 Τιτανίδα κούραν. Possibly Τιτηνίδος also refers to Aietes’ ancestry, the son of
Helios (2.1204) and so grandson of the Titan Hyperion (cf. Mooney on 4.54, Delage (1930) 182). Roman poets regularly use *Titan* as a synonym for *Sol* (e.g. Virg. *Aen.* 4.119).

Κολχίδα γῆν makes an immediate contrast with Τιτηνίδος Αἴης. For ἐνέμοντο cf. the formulae of the Homeric Catalogue of Ships; e.g. *Il.* 2.499 οἱ τ᾽ ἄμφ᾽ Ἀρμ᾽ ἐνέμοντο, emphasising the size of Aietes’ empire and forces.

132–4 παρὰ προχοῇσι Λύκοιο, / ὅσ τ᾽ ἀποκιδνάµενος ποταµοῦ

In this geographical excursus, A. names actual places and rivers. This device of particularity, intended to add colour and life to the image, is a technique which the Hellenistic poets developed and the Augustan Latin poets later adopted; cf. *Od.* 19.205 ὡς δὲ χιών κατατήκετ’ ἐν ἀκροπόλοισιν ὀρέσσιν with Cal. *h.* 6.91 ὡς δὲ Μίµαστι χιών where Callimachus names the mountain on which the snow is melting, *Hom. Hym.* 2.38–9 with Cal. *h.* 4.137–40, *Il.* 5.560 with Catull. 64.105, (where Catullus adds colour and life to his image by telling us that the falling tree is on the summit of Taurus).
Where is the River Lycus? Strabo (12.3.15) describes a River Lycus which joins the Iris and not the Phasis. Delage (1930) 182–3 points out that this particular River Lycus is so far away from the Phasis that it is difficult to credit A. with such an error as he is generally geographically accurate. He refers to another passage of Strabo (11.14.7) ποταμοὶ δὲ πλείους μὲν εἰσὶν ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ, γνωριμώτατοι δὲ Φᾶσις μὲν καὶ Λύκος εἰς τὴν Ποντικὴν ἐκπίπτοντες θάλατταν (Ἐρατοσθένης δ’ ἀντὶ τοῦ Λύκου τίθησι Θερμώδουτα οὐκ εὔ), εἰς δὲ τὴν Κασπίαν Κῦρος καὶ Ἀράξης and thinks that this is the River Lycus here described, that it is a different
one, nearer the Phasis, and that A. was wrong about it joining the Phasis. The sources are confused. Strabo disagrees with Eratosthenes on the identity of one river so it is difficult to come to a conclusion (cf. Pliny *N.H.* 6.10, Xen. *Anab.* 6.2.1–2, 2.367, 963, 724). However one possibility is that there is only one River Lycus – the above passages strengthen this suspicion – and that the present passage has been corrupted by someone who did not understand the geography; cf. the ancient and modern maps of the area above and below. Kura is the Ancient Kyrus / Cyrus and Aras is the Araxes.

The sense seems to call for a river, a long way from Colchis (πολλὸν ἑκάς) and closely associated with the Araxes. I therefore tentatively suggest the emendation Κύροιο (i.e. the river Kyrus) or Κόροιο. The quantity (Κῦρος (Strabo *loc. cit.*) is, perhaps, a problem, though Strabo 11.3.2 ἐν μέσῳ δ᾽ ἐστὶ πεδίον ποταμοῖς διάφρυτον, μεγίστῳ δὲ τῷ Κύρῳ, ὃς τὴν ἀρχὴν ἔχων ἀπὸ τῆς Άρμενίας, εἰς τὴν Κασπίαν ἐμβάλλει θάλατταν. ἐκαλεῖτο δὲ πρότερον Κόρος suggests that it could
be considered as short. The error, which A. or his geographical sources made, is in thinking that the Kyrus joined the Phasis somewhere in the Caucasus Mountains; for uncertainty as to where the Phasis went cf. Σ (p. 273 Wendel) on 4.257. His mistake would be similar to the one that he made later in the poem, when he takes the Argonauts along the Ister (Danube) from the Black Sea to the Adriatic, again showing uncertainty regarding the confluence of rivers in a hinterland.

κίδναμαι and its compounds are usually used of the spreading of light (cf. Il. 7.451, 7.458, Arg. 4.183, Arat. 735) or sound (2.1079). One might plausibly expect a word meaning ‘split off’ (cf. 4.291); cf. Arist. Meteoor. 350a.24 τούτου δ’ ο Τάναίς ἀποσχίζεται μέρος ὡν εἰς τὴν Μαιώτιν λίμνην, Polyb. 16.17.6 ὁ δ’ ποταμός οὐ πολὺν τόπον ἀποσχῶν τῆς πηγῆς. We might possibly read ἀποσχισάμενος, comparing Hdt. 4.56 ποταμός ἀπέσχισται μὲν ἀπὸ τοῦ Βορυσθένεος and explain the error on both phonetic and visual grounds. If the transmitted reading is retained, it might be supported by Il. 2.850 Ἀξιοῦ οὗ κάλλιστον ὕδωρ ἐπικίδναται αἴαν (cf. 2.978), where a compound of κίδναμαι is used of the motion of a river. ἀποκιδναμαί of one river branching out from another might be seen as a natural development.

For ποταμοῦ κελάδοντος cf. Il. 18.576 πάρ ποταμὸν κελάδοντα, Ar. Nub. 283 ποταμῶν ζαθέων κελαδήματα, Arg. 1.501, Theocr. 17.92; also Call. h. 3.107 where Κελάδοντος is the name of the river described. A. varies the phrase at 3.532 καὶ ποταμοῦς ἱστησιν ἄφαρ κελάδεινα ρέουντας. For ποταμοὶ κελαδοῦντες as a standard phrase in the magical papyri cf. PGM III 556, IV 2540.

For ἱερὸν ρόον cf. II. 11.726 ἱερὸν ρόον Ἀλφειοῖο, Hes. Op. 566 ἱερὸν ρόον Ὀκέανοῖο, Eur. Med. 410, Arg. 2.515. For the significance and meaning of the word ἱερὸς see Clarke (1995) 296–317. He links it with the Vedic root denoting ‘swift movement’ and, commenting particularly on Od. 10.351 ἐκ θ’ ἱερῶν ποταμῶν, οἱ τ’
εἰς ἅλαδε προχέουσι, says (311) that ‘the fact that the rushing water flows with ἱερὸς ρόος is the root of the belief that the river contains godhead.’

134–5 οἱ δὲ συνάμφω / Καυκασίην ἅλαδ’ εἰς ἑλαυνόμενοι προχέουσιν. ‘And both of them flow into the Caucasian sea, united into one.’

Καυκασίην ἅλαδ’ could refer to both the Black Sea and the Caspian. A. thinks of the Caucasus Mountains as being one of the landmarks near Colchis (cf. 2.1247, 1267, 3.852, 3.1224) and so it is a natural extension to talk of the ‘Caucasian Sea’. It is appropriate, if the emendation Kύροιo (132–4n.) is accepted.

For εἰς ἑλαυνόμενοι cf. Arat. 364–5 Κητείης δ’ ὀπιθέν λοφίς ἐπιμίξ φορέονται / εἰς ἑλαυνόμενοι, which is either A.’s direct model, or both poets had a common didactic source. προχέουσιν ~ προχοῇσι (132) is an intentional repetition on the lines of ροίζει (129), ροίζῳ (138); cf. ll. 21.219 οὐδὲ τι πη δύναμαι προχέειν ρόον εἰς ἅλα δίαν.

136–8 δεῖματι δ’ ἐξέγροντο λεχώίδες, ἀμφὶ δὲ παιδίν / νηπιάχοισ, οἳ τέ σφιν ὑπ’ ἀγκαλίδεσαι ἵαυνο, / ροίζῳ παλλομένοις χεῖρας βάλον ἀσχαλόωσαι. ‘Women who had just given birth woke in terror and, at a loss threw their arms around the infant children sleeping in their arms and shook at the hissing.’

The picture of the children being frightened by the monster adds a homely element to the description, although the model is Eur. Tro. 557–9 βρέφη δὲ φίλια / περὶ πέπλους ἐβάλε / ματρὶ χεῖρας ἐπτοήθηκας. It becomes a topos in later poets; cf. Call. h. 3.70–1 αὐτίκα τὴν κούρην μορμύρωσε, ἢ δὲ τεκνοῦσης / δύνει ἔσω κόλπους θεμένη ἐπὶ φάεσι χεῖρας, Theocr. 2. 108–9, Euphorion fr. 71.15 Lightfoot, Virg. Aen. 7.518, Juv. Sat. 3.175–6. For bibliography on the development of the
portrayal of childhood in Greek literature and art, see Ambühl (2007) 373 n. 3. For a mother terrified at the fate of her child cf. Alcmena at Pind. N. 1.50–2 and at the beginning of Theocritus’ Herakliskos (e.g. 24.60–1), shown in the fresco from the House of the Vetii at Pompeii; see Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 210, Zanker (1981) 297–311 on the Hellenistic technique of enargeia. The gesture described, grasping something in extreme danger, is natural, and the whimpering of the children in their sleep is a vivid detail.

For ἐξέγροντο cf. Theocr. 24.21 καὶ τότ’ ἂρ’ ἐξέγροντο (of the baby Iphicles and Heracles suddenly waking up by the serpents sent by Hera). λεχωίδες is a Hellenistic formation (Call. h. 3.127, 4.56, 4.124); for the more usual λεχώ cf. Eur. El. 652.

For ὑπ᾽ ἀγκαλίδεσσιν cf. Il. 18.555 ἐν ἄγκαλίδεσσι φέροντες, 22.503, Call. h. 3.73 μετ᾽ ἄγκαλίδεσσι φέρουσα, Eur. Held. 41–3 τὸ θήλυ παιδὸς . . . γένος / . . . υπηγκαλίσει / ἱαύει . . . and for ἱαύον the Homeric ἀγκοίνῃσιν ἱαύειν (Il. 14.213, Od. 11.261, Hom. Hym. 2.264).

139–42 ὡς δ’ ὅτε τυφομένης ὦλης ὑπερ αἰθαλόεσσαι / καπνοῖ τροφάλιγγες ἀπείριτοι εἰλίσσονται, / ἅλλη δ’ αἰγ’ ἐτέρη ἐπι τέλλεται αἰὲν ἐπιπρό / νείδθεν εἰλιγγοισιν ἐπήρος ἔξανιούσα· ‘As when countless fiery spirals of smoke are whirled above a burning forest, one upon another constantly rising from below in circling motion.’ Similes based on forest fires or smoke rising from a fire are found in Homer; cf. for the forest fire Il. 11.155–7, 20.490–3, and for rising smoke Il. 18.207–13, 21.522–4. At Il. 2.455–7 the glare from a forest fire can be seen from afar, just as the glare of the Achaean’s armour can be seen as they advance. At Il. 11.155–7 fire ‘falls upon a wood and the thickets perish in
the onrush of the flames’ just as the Trojans perish under the attack of Agamemnon. A. is unexpectedly linking the fear experienced in battle with the horror caused by the monstrous snake.

The language of the Homeric similes is generally simpler than those of A.; cf. the opening of *Il.* 18.207–13 ὡς δ’ ὁτε καπνὸς ιὼν ἐξ ἀστεος αἰθέρ’ ἱκηται with the intricate wording of αἰθαλόεσσαι / καπνοῖο στροφάλιγγες. There are also differences in connection between simile and subject. At *Il.* 18.207–13 the rising smoke is only the primary reference point from which the simile extends to describe the action of the siege. A., however, establishes a more direct equation, choosing words appropriate to rising smoke, which also suit the movements of the serpent (see below). This is unlike Homer’s practice where we find a much looser connection; cf. *Il.* 20.490–3 ὡς δ’ ἀναμαμάει βαθ’ ἄγκεαι θεσπιδαὲς πῦρ / . . . / (493) ὡς ὡς πάντῃ θᾷνε σὺν ἀρχει δαιμονί ιός, which compares Achilles’ path through battle to a fire racing through some meadows. On the tendency of A. to relate a simile closely to the matter described, see Effé (2001) 148–50, Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 103, nn. 12–3, 35–9, and for the interest that Virgil showed in this passage cf. *Aen.* 5.84–5 lubricus ab imis / septem ingens gyros, septena volumina traxit.

The movement defined by στροφάλιγγες is appropriate both to the movements of the serpent and to the rising smoke. The Homeric phrase ἐν στροφάλιγγι κονίς (*Il.* 16.775, 21.503, *Od.* 24.39) refers to the swirl and billow of rising dust. A. has associated this movement with the gyrations of a snake; cf. 3.758–9 (of light rising), Arat. 43 (of an orbit). For εἰλίσσονται cf. *Il.* 1.317 κνίσῃ δ’ οὐρανὸν ἰκέν ἐλισσομένη περὶ καπνῶ, 22.95 (δράκων) σμερδαλέου δὲ δέδορκεν ἐλισσόμενος περὶ χείᾳ.

Most editors read ἀλλη δ’ αἰς’ ἐτέρη ἐπιτέλλεται. Mooney notes that ἐπιτέλλομαι meaning ‘rise after’ is an innovation of A. It (and τέλλομαι) are usually
used of the rising of the stars or the sun; for ἐπιτέλλομαι cf. Hes. Op. 383, 567, Hom. Hym. 4.371 and for τέλλομαι cf. Arat. 285, 320, 382. However, 'rise after' seems awkward, especially as in similar phrases with ἀλλη κ.τ.λ. ἐπὶ is usually part of the ἄλλος phrase; cf. 2.81 ἐπὶ ἄλλῳ δ’ ἄλλος, 2.1042 ἄλλος ἐπὶ προτέρῳ, Call. h. 2.101 ἄλλου ἐπὶ ἄλλῳ. The construction ἐπὶ plus dative regularly means 'one after another' (Od. 7.120, Aesch. Cho. 406). In view of this we should read ἀλλη δ’ αἶψ’ ἐτέρη ἐπὶ τέλλεται, for which cf. Mosch. Eur. 80–2 οὐχ οἷς σταθμοῖς ἐνι φέρβεται / . . . / οὐδ’ οἷς ποίμνης ἐπὶ βόσκεται; with Bühler pp. 221–8, Arg. 1.250 and Gow on Theocr. 7.36. In a similar phrase at Arg. 3.123–4 ἄλλου ἐτ’ αὐτῶς / ἄλλῳ ἐπιπροείς the correct reading may well be ἄλλω ἐπὶ προείς (cf. ΣἈΒΤ II. 4.94 = 1 462.43–4) Erbse τλαίης κεν Μενελάῳ ἐπιπροέμεν ταχύν ἰδν Ἀρισταρχος ἀναστρέφει).

Wellauer’s alteration of mss. εἰλίγγοιςιν to ἠλίγγοιςιν (printed by Fränkel) is unnecessary. εἰλίσσονται ~ εἰλίγγοιςιν ~ ἠλέλιζε ~ ἠλισσομένοιο forms part of the deliberate repetition (127–9n.) ἠλιγγος usually describes ‘agitation’ or ‘spinning round’, especially ‘swimming in the head’, ([Hipp.] Aph. 3.17, Pl. Rep. 407c, Leg. 892e). Although A. often uses medical terminology (Erbse (1953) 186) ‘swimming in the head’ is different from ‘swirling smoke.’ One might expect ἠλίξ; cf. Arg. 1.437–8 λίγνον / πορφυρέαις ἐλίκεσιν ἐναίσσουσιν, Eur. Her. 397–9 δράκοντα πυρσόνωτον, / ὃς ἀπλοτόν ἁμελεκτός / ἐλικ’ ἐφρούρει, κτανών. One possible emendation might be εἰλίγκεσι, from εἰλιγξ, which according to LSJ s.v. is a possible formation.

For ἔξανιοῦσα Fränkel printed ἀίσσουσα, which L has as a v.l. Other mss. have ἔξανιοῦσα, which Vian (1981) retained. In support of this choice of variant cf. 1.438 (quoted above), 2.134 κατνὸ τυφόμεναι πέτρης ἐκῆς ἀίσσουσιν and II. 10.99
καπνὸν δ’ οἶν οὔρῳ, ἀπὸ χθονὸς ἀῖσσουτα. However the mss. evidence and the parallels between this and the doublet passage 3.756–9 (3.757 εξανιοῦσα, 759 στροφάλιγγι, 760 ἐλελίζετο) argue for retaining εξανιοῦσα. 3.759 ἀῖσσουσα may be the cause of the v.l. rather than the correct reading.

143–4 δ’ τότε κεῖνο πέλωρον ἀπειρεσίας ἐλελίζειν / ῥυμβόνας ἀζαλέῃσιν ἐπηρεφέας φολίδεσσιν. ‘so then that vast monster was curling his countless coils, overhung with dry scales.’ Mooney and Fränkel print δ’; Vian and Livrea correctly δ’; cf. Il. 1.512 Θέτις δ’ ὡς ἦψατο γούνων, / δ’ ἔχετ’ ἐμπεφυυῖα, LSJ⁹ s.v. ὡς Αα3.

πέλωρον is used of a δράκων at Il. 12.202 = 12.220; of the Gorgon at Il. 5.741, Od. 11.634 and of the offspring of the earth at Hes. Th. 295, 845, 856.

For ἀπειρεσίας cf. ἄπειριτοι (140). The word fits with A.’s description of the dragon’s size as being of almost cosmic scale. The exaggeration contrasts with line 149 and the simple way in which Medea conquers it (156–9).

ἐλελίζειν is similarly used at Il. 2.316 (of a δράκων) τὴν δ’ ἐλελιξάμενος πτέρυγος λάβεν ἄμφιαχυῖαν, 11.39 κυάνεος ἐλελικτὸ δράκων and Ar. fr. 515 PCG χθονία θ’ Ἑκάτη / σπέιρας δέρων ἐλελιξομένη. Imperfect (Castiglioni OCT app. crit.) rather than the transmitted aorist must the reading more in keeping with the sense of the passage: the monster is constantly writhing around. On ἐλελίζω and its close semantic links with ἐλίσσω see Skoda (1984) 223–32.

ῥυμβόνας, not found elsewhere, must be connected with ῥόμβος (see LSJ⁹ s.v.); cf. Claudius Aelianus Soph. fr. 149b Domingo-Forasté ἀπὸ τοῦτο δὲ καὶ τὰς κινήσεις ὀ ἀπολλάκτων ῥυμβόνας καλεῖ. Snakes at rest curl up into neat piles of coils, the position of the serpent when Medea and Jason approach. Then it uncoils for
action and in the process its body goes round and round in circles. This is the motion of the ῥόμβος or ‘bull-roarer’ (see Gow on Theocr. 2.30); cf. Pind. O. 13.94 where he talks of javelins being made to whirl as they fly and Σ (p. 269 Wendel) on A., who explains ῥυμβόνας as τὰς εἰλήσεις τῆς σπείρας, τὰς περιδινήσεις ‘the whirling round of the coil’. As the smoke rises from the fire so more and more serpent emerges from the pile of coils.

For ἀζαλέος cf. Nic. Ther. 157 φράζεο δ’ αὐαλέῃσιν ἐπιφρικτήν φολίδεσσιν, 221 ἀξαλέαις φρίσσουσαν ἐπηετανὸν φολίδεσσι. It elsewhere describes ρινοῦς (Arg. 2.59) and βῶν (Il. 7.238–9), and is therefore appropriate of a serpent’s tough scaly back.

In Homer ἐπηρεφής is always active and means ‘overhanging’ and not ‘overhung’; cf. Il. 12.54, Od. 10.131, 12.59. The passive may first occur at Hes. Th. 598 μένοντες ἐπηρεφέας κατὰ σύμβλους, though this is unclear. ἐπηρεφής plus dative is an extension of a use of κατηρεφής found at Od. 9.183 (σπέος) ύψηλόν, δάφνησι κατηρεφές (cf. Hes. Th. 778, Theocr. 7.9), Simias fr. 1.8 CA νήσους ύψικόισιν ἐπηρεφέας δονάκεσσιν, 1.1121 ἱδρυσαν, φηγοῖσιν ἐπηρεφές ἀκροτάτησιν. For A.’s habit of changing the voice of adjectives from their usual Homeric usage cf. 156–8n. ἀκήρατα, Mooney on 1.694 ἐπήβολός and Erbse (1953) 193.

For similarly interwoven four-word lines used by Hellenistic and later poets cf. 1.1121, 2.372, 3.928, Theocr. 7.9, Nic. Ther. 221, Mosch. Eur. 57, Nonn. D. 35.55; see Hoffer (2007) 299–30, who notes the infrequency of interlacing word order in Greek poetry (300 n. 1) compared with Latin, Wilkinson (1963) 214–5, Conrad (1990), and Vivante (1996) 120.
For φολίδεσσιν cf. Nic. Ther. 157, 221 (both quoted on ἀζαλέῃσιν above),
Pausanias 9.21.1 (the eels in Lake Tanais) τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν αὖμα φολίδι λεπτῇ
πέφρικέ σφισι, Posid. fr. 57.2–4 Α–Β σπείραν ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς εξεκύλιε[ν ὑφις,] /
[k]υάνεον φολίδωμα· πυρὸς δὲ αἴθω[ν σέλας ὅσσοις,] / [αὐ]χενίους ἢδη τείνετ’ ἐπὶ
πλ[οκάμους···]. Nicander and others thought that a snake should ‘bristle with’ rather
than be ‘overhung with’ scales.

145 τοῖο δ’ ἐλισσομένοιο κατ’ ὁμματ’ ἐείσατο κοῦρη. ‘The girl went into
the snake’s line of vision.’ It only becomes clear at the end of the line that it is the girl
not the hero who is to take on the serpent. Read κατ᾽ ὁμματ’ ἐείσατο for κατ’
τόμματος ἐείσατο+ as printed by Fröinkel (OCT) and as a resolution of the
ὁμματ’ ἐείσατο which he postulated as the archetype. The scribe’s superscript ὁμ
might have been an attempt to correct a form that he did not recognise or that had
already been corrupted by the omission of an epsilon. A. has ἐείσατο elsewhere at
2.582, 3.399, 502, 4.1478, 1589, 1733, always in the sense of ‘to appear’ or ‘to seem’,
except perhaps at 4.1589–90 ἐείσατο λίμην / εἰσβαίνειν which seems to reflect an
Homerica ambiguity at Od. 8.283 ἐείσατ’ ἦμεν ἐς Λήμνον. On 4.1589 Mooney says that
ἐείσατο means ‘was seen’ but Σ (p. 323 Wendel) on A. explains it by ὦρμησεν (as
here at 145), and the Homerica model can be interpreted as ὦρμησεν i.e. ‘he went to
go’ (cf. the common phrase βῆ δ’ ἦμεν (Od. 1.441 and often)). A. may have
understood ἐείσατ’ at Od. 8.283 as a variation on 277 βῆ ἐ’ ἦμεν and 287 βῆ δ’ ἦναι.
Similarly ἐείσατο or ἐείσατο seem to denote movement at II. 4.138 διαπρὸ δὲ ἐείσατο
καὶ τῆς, 5.538 ἐείσατο, 12.118 ἐείσατο, 15.415 ἐείσατο, Od. 22.89 ἐείσατο. For
another substitution of a recherché for a more ordinary form cf. 4.522 ὅτε δὴ σφιν
ἐείσατο νόστος ἀπῆμων with Od. 4.519 ὃτε δὴ καὶ κεῖθεν ἐφαίνετο νόστος ἀπῆμων. For the elision in the fourth dactyl see 4.620 (OCT app. crit.).

Any attempt to explain the κατόμματον of LASG as an adverb on the lines of ἐναντιον (Marxer (1935) 48–9) is not convincing since no adjective κατόμματος or even κατόμματιος is recorded. For κατ’ ὄμματα cf. Hom. Hym. 2.194, 5.156 (also Soph. Ant. 760), Eur. Hyps. fr. 752f. 22–4 TrGF ἱερὸν δέρος ὁ περὶ δρυὸς / ὅξις ὄμμα δράκοντος / φρουρεῖ, Eur. Andr. 1064 κρυπτὸς καταστάς ἢ κατ’ ὄμμι’ ἐλθὼν μάχη, 1117 κατ’ ὄμμα στάς, Eur. El. 910 θρυλοῦσ’ ἢ γ’ εἴπειν ἤθελον κατ’ ὄμμα σὸν.

146–8 Υπνον ἀοσσητήρα, θεῶν ὑπατον, καλέουσα / ἡδείη ἐνοπῇ, θέλει τέρας· αὖ δ’ ἄνασσαν / νυκτιπόλον, χθονίην, εὐαντέα δοῦναι ἐφορμήν. ‘in a sweet voice calling on Sleep the helper, the highest of the gods, to charm the beast; she invoked the queen, the night wanderer, the infernal to give success to the mission.’ Medea calls on the supernatural from below and above the earth. Cf. Hera’s appeal to Υπνος at ll. 14.233 Υπνε ἀναξ πάντων τε θεῶν πάντων τ’ ἀνθρώπων (also the chorus at Soph. Phil. 827–838). The passage from the Iliad verges on the light-hearted (the grandiloquent address is sly flattery on Hera’s part), while A.’s adaptation prefaces an appeal to Hecate, expressed through indirect speech, assimilating the narrator’s language with that of Medea; see Albis (1996) 34. The language used displays a feature typical of prayer, successive epithets applied to the power or deity to whom the prayer is addressed (cf. 1.1125–31, 3.861–2).

For θεῶν ὑπατον (elsewhere only used of Zeus) cf. ll. 19.258, 23.43, Od. 19.303 with Headlam (1922) on Herodas 3.45. For the appeal to Hecate cf. 3.861–2

Εἰνοδία θύγατερ Δάματρος, ἃ τῶν / νυκτιπόλου ἐφόδων ἀνάσσεις. In A.
νυκτιπόλος is always used of Hecate (3.862, 4.829, 4.1020). The word is not
Homerian (Eur. Ion 718, fr. 472.11 TrGF μύστης γενάμην καὶ νυκτιπόλου Ζαγρέως
βούτης and PGM 2.vii.692, Nonn. D. 44.195 (of Hecate) ἔρχεο, νυκτιπόλος,
sκυλακοτρόφος).

χθονίην often used to describe Hecate; cf. Ar. fr. 515.1–2 PCG χθονία θ’
Ἐκάτη / σπείρας ὄφεων ἐλελιζομένη, Orphic H. 1.2, Theocr. 2.12 (with Gow),
Aesch. Ag. 89; see Johnston (1999), particularly, Part III, 'Divinities and the Dead'.

After this dread invocation, Medea puts the beast out of action merely by dosing it
with some harmless drugs. There is a degree of ironic humour in the whole passage.

149 εἵπετο δ’ Αἰσονίδης περφοβημένος. ‘But the son of Aeson followed her,
terrified.’ The real ‘hero’ of the scene leads the way. In the same way, Aeneas carries
out the instructions of the Sybil in Aeneid 6 (Aen. 6.236) and Dante follows in the
footsteps of Virgil in the Inferno (‘dietro a le poste de le care piante’ Inferno v. 148).
Aeneas himself calls on the powers of the Underworld (Virg. Aen. 6.247) and then
continues more confidently than Jason (6.263 İLLE DUCEM HAUD TIMIDIS VADENTEM
passibus aequat).

One of the major contrasts in the present episode is between 4.109–61 where
Medea is the leading figure and takes on the guardian dragon, and 4.161–83 during
which Jason takes complete charge of the Fleece once all the dangers have been
overcome. This forms part of A’s picture of a fearful anti-hero. A., Theocritus and
Callimachus wished to show the hero in different and more realistic situations (cf.
Heracles in Theocritus’ Heracliskos, Theseus in Callimachus’ Hecale) displaying
emotions pitched on a more human, ordinary level (e.g. Jason’s frequent confession of ἀμηχανία). This section of the poem may be A.’s attempt at a similar epyllion. The theme of a hero tackling a monster is common to all three.

This reconsideration of the role of the hero may not be a completely Hellenistic innovation; cf. Dover’s ((1971) LXX–LXXI) assertion that ‘Hellenistic poetry began not with the great Alexandrians but with the deaths of Euripides and Sophokles’. A.’s presentation of a fearful Jason could be described in the terms that Sophocles used when he said that, while he represented human beings as better than they are, Euripides represented them as they are (Arist. Poet. 1460b33–4 = TrGF IV testimonia 53a p. 54). Jason often seems to behave in the same way that Euripides’ heroes do, showing anxiety and doubt at times of crisis (cf. Demophon in the Heraclidae and his words at a moment of crisis (472–3) βουλὴν ἐτοίμασεν, ὡς ἐγὼ γὰρ ἀμήχανος / χρησὶν ἀκούσας εἰμὶ καὶ φόβον πλέωσ. For Jason’s character see Hunter (1993b) 8–15, 25, Mori (2005) 210 nn. 1, 2.

149–51 αὐτὸς δὲ γὰρ ἡδὴ / οὐμὴ θελγόμενος δολιχὴν ἀνελύετ’ ἀκανθαν / γηγενέος σπείρας, μὴκυνε δὲ μυρία κύκλα. ‘But already, charmed by the spell of the song, the serpent was relaxing the spine of his earthborn coil and stretched out its innumerable spirals.’ Cf. Robert Southey, the eighteen-century poet laureate, Madoc in Aztlan Book 6 (the closing lines) ‘The serpent knew the call, and, rolling on, wave upon wave, his rising length, advanced his open jaws.’ Southey knew the Argonautica and owned two copies of it; cf. two notes from the auction catalogue of Southey’s books: item 60 Apollonius Rhodius, the Argonautic Expedition, by Greene, 2 vols., with severe observations in a note, in the autograph of the Poet Laureat 1780
The power of θέλξις is a feature of Medea’s character as witch (nn. 24–5, 442–4) and οἶμη, meaning ‘voyage, journey’ or ‘way of song’, is almost a metaphor for the whole poem (cf. Od. 8.481 οἶμας Μοῦσ’ ἐδιδαξε with 4.296 στέλλεσθαι τῇν όιμον; see Albis (1996) particularly chapter 4 entitled ἡ δολιχὴ οἶμη, where the theme of the ‘journey’ is traced through Book 4). Attention has also been drawn to other possible literary metaphors in this passage (Kouremenos (1996) 241): λεπταλέος (4.169) is an adjective that Callimachus used to describe his Muse at Aet. fr. 1.24 Harder while ἀστόν (4.176), describing the fine wool of the Fleece, is one of Callimachus’ words for the fineness of his poetry (h. 2.112), as it is for Pindar (P. 10.53). In the same way, μυρία κύκλα could be taken to denote the cyclic poetry that Callimachus disparaged (fr. 1.4, A.P. 12.102 = 1035–40 HE). The guardian snake roars and makes a loud noise that renders it comparable to Achilles, the greatest epic hero, in the same way that the Telchines (Aet. fr. 1.1) make unpleasant noises (ἐπιτρύζουσιν) when criticising Callimachus’s poetry. ἐλισσειν (Call. Aet. fr. 1.5 ἐπος δ’ ἐπὶ τυτθὸν ἐλ[ισσο] with Harder ad loc., used of the delicate nature of Callimachean verse), is applied by A. to the spirals of the snake’s body (4.145, 140). A literary interpretation of οἶμη would be in keeping with the above, as would a view of the whole passage that saw it as a partial response to Callimachus’ Hecale (174–7n.).

For ἄκανθα used of the backbone of a snake (Latin: spina) cf. Hdt. 2.75.4, Theocr. 24.32 (the snakes sent to kill the baby Heracles) ἄψ δὲ πάλιν διέλυον, ἐπεὶ μογέοιεν, ἄκανθας. A.’s ἀνελύω occurs in Homer (of the undoing of Penelope’s web: Od. 2.105, 2.109) but, more importantly, it is used as a medical term (57n.)
meaning ‘relax’, (Arist. *Gen. Anim.* 728a15, Diosc. *Medic.* 5.3). διαλύω is not Homoeric but is a medical term; cf. [Hipp.] *Aph.* 3.17, where it is used of ‘relaxing’ or ‘weakening’ the body. A. seems to be echoing the Theocritean phrase and improving its epic pedigree, by alluding to Penelope’s ‘relaxation’ of her web.

For γηγενέος cf. Eur. *Phoen.* 931–2 οὐ δράκων ὁ γηγενής / ἐγένετο Δίρκης ναμάτων ἐπίσκοπος, 658, 935, 127–9n. Sacred snakes were associated either with what emerges from the earth, such as trees or springs, or what is placed inside it, such as foundations of houses and altars, or graves; see Küster (1913) 85–100, Ogden (2013) 347–82.


152–3 οἷον ὅτε βληχροῖσι κυλινδόμενον πελάγεισιν / κύμα μέλαν κωφὸν τε καὶ ἄβρομον. ‘As when a black wave rolls dumb and noiseless on a sluggish sea.’ The ‘cyclic’ coils of the serpent’s body are likened to the futile slapping of the waves of the sea. This comparison might be interpreted in literary terms (149–51n.); cf. ‘the Assyrian river’ at Call. *h.* 2.106–12.

While A. uses both, Homer does not use βληχρός, only ἄβληχρός (of Aphrodite's hand, *Il.* 5.337, τείχεα 8.178, *Arg.* 2.205 with Cuypers (1997) *ad loc*.). There is no difference in meaning between the two words. However, there was ancient disagreement about whether the ἀ was intensive (copulative) or privative; cf. Pind. fr. 130 S–M βληχροῖ δυνατὸς νυκτὸς ποταμοί, Alcaeus fr. 319.1 Voigt
βλήχρων ἀνέων ἄχειμαντοι πυόαι, with Σ (p. 142 Wendel) on Arg. 2.205 ἀσθενοποιῶ ἢ ἀσθενεῖ, κατὰ στέρησιν τοῦ βληχροῦ, ‘making weak or weak, according to the negation of βληχρός’. An attempt to differentiate is apparent in Eustathius on II. 8.178 (II 554.26 Van der Valk) ἐν δὲ τοῖς Ἡροδώρου καὶ Ἀπίωνος φέρεται ὅτι Ἡρακλείδης μὲν ὁ Μιλήσιος βαρύνει τὴν λέξιν, λέγων ὡς βληχρὸν ἐστὶ τὸ ἰσχυρὸν καὶ ἐν συνθέσει, ἀβληχρὸν ὡς ἄκακον, Suda α58 (I 8.58 Adler) ἀβληχρὴν· ἀσθενῆ. βληχρὸν γὰρ τὸ ἰσχυρὸν καὶ ἐν συνθέσει, ἀβληχρὸν ὡς ἄκακον, in interpreting the words correctly. By using βληχρός and ἀβληχρός in contexts where they can only mean ‘sluggish, helpless’, A. makes clear his own position in this discussion (Rengakos (1994) 29 n. 29, Reece (2009) 122–3).

For κῦμα . . . κυλινδόμευον cf. Od. 1.162, 9.147, 14.315 etc., Arg. 2.732 κῦμα κυλινδόμευον, Alcaeus fr. 208a Voigt τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἐνθὲν κῦμα κυλινδέται, Eur. fr. 822 TrGF κῦματι δ’ ὡς ἐπὶ κῦμα κυλ[ίν]δεται. The Homeric phrase is elegantly repositioned in a line that contains a number of Homeric ‘zetemata’ (18–9n.).


For κωφὸν cf. II. 14.16–18 ὡς δ’ ὀτε πορφύρῃ πέλαγος μέγα κῦματι κωφῷ / . . . / αύτῶς, οὐδ’ ἄρα τε προκυλινδεται (~ 152 κυλινδόμευον) οὐδετέρωσε, Lycophron Alex. 1452, Aratus 922–3. It describes a calm sea with a flat and level surface rather than one disturbed by rolling waves. A. has transferred this picture to his description of the serpent.
A. uses another disputed word, ἄβρομος, an Homeric ἄπαξ; cf. II. 13.40–1 Ἐκτορ Πριαμίδη ἄμοτον μεμαώτες ἔπουτο / ἄβρομοι αὐθαχοί; see Janko ad loc. As with βληχρός / ἀβληχρός there was a discussion in antiquity as to whether the α was a privative or intensive; cf. Hesych. α 200 = I 10 Latte s.v. ἄβρομοι· χωρὶς βρόμου ἢ ἀνευ θορύβου, Σ^A II. 13.41 (III 406.18–21 Erbse) ἀντὶ τοῦ ἄγαν βρομοῦντες καὶ ἄγαν ιαχοῦντες, Apion 3.8 ἄφωνοι καὶ ἰσουχοί, Rengakos (1994) 29 mentioning Tsopanakis (1990) 113–18, who understands ἄβρομος in Homer, as derived from an original ἀνάβρομος with Aeolic apocope of the preposition.

153–5 ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐμπης / ύψοι σμερδαλέην κεφαλὴν μενέαινεν ἀείρας / ἀμφοτέρους ὁλοῇσι περιπτύζαι γενύσσιν. ‘But nonetheless, having lifted on high its terrible head, it was eager to engulf both of them in its deadly jaws.’ A. uses ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐμπης and enjambment to surprise the reader: ‘a black wave dumb and noiseless’ and a non-committal line ending is followed by the serpent’s sudden attack.

A. is adapting the Homeric ύψος’ ἀείρας (II. 10.465, 10.505, 20.325, Od. 9.240), splitting the phrase as the first and last words in the line and placing their object between them. In 154–5, the serpent’s sudden burst of activity is marked by a long stretch of dactyls, emphasising his speed of movement after his initial sluggishness.

περιπτύζαι is more usual of the human embrace; cf. Eur. Alc. 350 ὁ προσπεσούμαι καὶ περιπτύσσων χέρας, Med. 1206 ὃμωξε δ’ εὐθὺς καὶ περιπτύζας χέρας, Andr. 417 δάκρυα τε λείβων καὶ περιπτύσσων χέρας. A.’s extension of the word to cover the grip of the serpent’s jaws has a ghastly appropriateness.
156–8 ἡ δὲ μιν ἀρκεύθοιο νέου τετμητότι θαλλᾷ / βάπτουσ’ ἐκ
κυκέωνος ἀκήρατα φάρμακ’ ἀσιδαῖς / ράινε κατ’ ὀφθαλμών. ‘But she,
with a freshly cut sprig of juniper that she had dipped in a potion sprinkled gentle
drugs over its eyes, with her spells.’ On juniper in poetry see Lightfoot (1999) 439.
Sprinkling magic potion on the eyes is an idea that is developed in Latin poetry; cf.
Eur. IT 1337–8 Iphigeneia’s actions are similar to Medea’s treatment of the guardian
dragon: ἀνωλόλυξε καὶ κατῇδε βάρβαρα / μέλη μαγεύουσ’. This version of the
story in which Medea drugs the dragon emerges first in A., though Σ (p. 270 Wendel)
4.156 says that he is following Antimachus (συμφώνως Ἀντιμάχῳ), who retold the
Argonautica legend in his elegiac poem Lyde (see Matthews (1996) 26). Σ at 4.87 (p.
267 Wendel) and 4.156 (p. 270 Wendel) reports the versions of Herodorus (EGM II §
6.5) and Pherecydes (EGM II § 6.5) in both of which the dragon is killed by Jason.
This is what happens in Pindar (P. 4.249): (Jason) κτεῖνε μὲν γλαυκῶπα τέχναις
ποικιλώσεως ὀφιν. At Eur. Med. 481 Medea claims to have killed the dragon
herself, a vivid touch probably originating from Euripides himself, designed to make
Medea still more terrifying. Afterwards it occurs at Ov. Met. 7.149–58, Val. Flacc.
8.69–121, [Apollod.] Bibl. 1.9.23, Hyg. Fab. 22, [Orph.] Arg. 887–933. There is
artistic evidence for Medea’s use of drugs from a Lucanian hydria (c. 380–60 B.C.) on
which Medea sits next to the snake and its tree holding a cup from which the dragon
seems to have drunk (Neils (1990) 633 § 40, Ogden (2013) 61). For the tradition of
sprinkling a drug over its eyes cf. Neils (1990) 633 §§ 38, 39, 41. The theme of
inducing sleep occurs elsewhere in the Colchian mythology. In the Naupactica (fr. 6
GEF) Aphrodite inspires Aietes with desire for his wife. He then falls asleep,
allowing the Argonauts to escape with Medea and the Fleece. The use of spells and drugs enhances the exotic side of the story and subverts the role of the hero.

For τετιηότι θυμῷ cf. τετιημένος ήτορ (Il. 11.556, Od. 4.804), the equivalent of τετιηότι θυμῷ (Il. 11.555, 17.664) and also τετλήοτι θυμῷ (Od. 4.447). It has been argued (Boesch (1908) 14–6, Marxer (1935) 17) that with certain verbs e.g. κεχαρηώς, βεβαρηώς, κεκώς, τετιήος, Α. would not have differentiated between forms in –ιήως and –ιήμενος; e.g. 1.1256 βεβαρημένος ἀσθματι θυμόν, 4.1526 κλίνας δαπέδῳ βεβαρηότα γυία, Od. 3.139 οἴνῳ βεβαρηότες, Od. 19.122, 4.1569 with S–D ι 768ε.

Pace Mooney, Theocr. 5.127 ἀνθ’ ὅδατος τὰ κάλπιδι κηρία βάψαι is not a parallel for βάπτουσ’, ἐκ κυκεῶνος (LSJ s.v. βάπτω). It means ‘to draw forth honeycomb in a pitcher instead of water.’ Much better is Antiphanes Aleiptria fr. 26 PCG ἀρύταιναν (cup / bucket) ὑμῶν ἐκ μέσου βάψασα τοῦ λέβητος and possibly Eur. Hec. 610 βάψασ’ ἑνεγκε δεῦρο ποντίας ἁλός. On κυκεῶν, the magic potion that Circe uses at Od. 10.234, see Richardson (1974) 344.

ἀκήρατα φάρμακα is an oxymoron based on the common Homeric formula ἡπια φάρμακα πάσο--; cf. Il. 11.515, 11.830, Arg. 3.738 θελκτήρια φάρμακα ταύρων, Arg. 4.442, 666, 1080–1, and Il. 15.394 φάρμακ’ ἀκέσματ’ ἐπασσε μέλαινας ὀδυνάων with v.l. ἀκήρατα. Perhaps A. also knew of a v.l. ἀκήρατα.

As often A., with ἀκήρατος, reflects all the nuances of a difficult Homeric word (Il. 24.303 ‘undefiled’, Il. 15.498, Od. 17.532 ‘unharmed’). At 1.851–2 ὅρρα κεν αὕτης / ναίηται μετόπισθεν ἀκήρατος ἀνδράσι Λήμνος must mean ‘so that Lemnos may be inhabited in the future, without danger for men’, and this is the meaning at 4.157 (pace LSJ s.v.):’drugs which were unharmed’ which fits well into the immediate context – after the application, the dragon goes to sleep. For other
examples of this switch between active and passive cf. 143–4n., ἐπηρέφης 1.1121, 2.736, ἐπήβολος, active at Od. 2. 319, 2.1280, 4.1380 but passive at 1.694, 3.1272, and πολύστονος, active at Il. 1.445, 11.73, 15.451, Arg. 3.279, 4.65 but passive at Od. 19.118 and 2.1256.

158–61 περὶ τ’ ἀμφὶ τε νήριτος ὀδημὴ / φαρμάκου ὑπνον ἐβαλλε· γένυν δ’ αὐτῇ ἐνὶ χώρῃ / θηκεν ἐρεισάμενος· τὰ δ’ ἀπείρονα πολλὸν ὀπίσσω / κύκλα πολυπρέμνων διεξ ὑλῆς τετάνυστο. ‘All around the immense smell of the drug spread sleep. In that very place, it lowered its jaw to the ground and far into the distance its innumerable spirals were stretched through the wood with its many trees.’ For περὶ τ’ ἀμφὶ τε cf. 3.636, Il. 2.305 ἡμεῖς δ’ ἀμφὶ περὶ, Hom. Hym. 2.276, Hes. Th. 848, [Hes.] fr. M–W 150.28, Call. fr. 69 Hollis, Call. h. 4.300, Theocr. 7. 142. The pleonasm stresses the transformation that takes place as the drug gradually overpowers the serpent; cf. the different change at Hom. Hym. 2.276 where Demeter’s beauty spreads over her after she has been disguised as an old woman.

For νήριτος ὀδημή cf. Od. 5.59–60 τηλόσε δ’ ὀδημὴ / κέδρου τ’ εὐκεάτοι θύου τ’ ἀνὰ νῆσον ὀδώδει, Hom. Hym. 2.277–8 ὀδημὴ δ’ ἰμερόεσσα . . . / σκίδνατο. However νήριτος (of ὕλη at Hes. Op. 511; cf. Νήριτον εἰνοσίφυλλον at Il. 2.632, Od. 9.22) seems out of place applied to ὀδημή. Much more in keeping would be νήδυμος ὀδημή, bearing in mind that juniper is sweet smelling. The change would introduce a typical and pointed Hellenistic variation on a Homeric phrase; cf. Il. 2.2 νήδυμος ὑπνος (same sedes as νήριτος ὀδημή at Il. 2.2, 10.91, 14.242), 16.454 νήδυμον ὑπνον, Od. 5.492 ὑπνον ἐπ’ ὀμμασὶ χεῦ’; also Od. 12.338, 20.54. The corruption would stem from a recollection of the Homeric and Hesiodic passages.
(above) and the prevalence of the notion of size in the passage (πελώριον ~ ἄσπετον ~ ἱαχεν ~ ἀπείριτοι ~ ἀπειρεσίας).

For γένυν cf. Eur. Her. 235 λάβρον δράκοντος ἐξερηµώσας γένυν, Ion. 1427 δράκοντε µαρµαίροντε πάγχρυσον γένυν. For διέξ ὑλης cf. Hym. Hom. 3.360–1 ἡ δὲ καθ’ ὑλην / πυκνα µάλ’ ἐνθα καὶ ἐνθα ἐλίσσετο (the Pytho at Delphi being slain by Apollo). τετάνυστο is used of a large form stretched out, prone at II. 7.271 ὑπτιος ἐξετανύσθη (Hector). The dragon has been laid low on the ‘battlefield’ of the grove of Ares.

πολυπρέµιος, only here and at Colluthus 358, is a variation on the Homeric πολυδένδρεος (Od. 4.737, 23.139, 359, Hom. Hym. 3.475, Theocr. 17.9). The abundance of trees is stressed because of their importance in the beliefs attached to sacred groves (163–6n.).

162–3 ἐνθα δ’ ὁ µὲν χρύσειον ἀπὸ δρυὸς αἰνυτο κῶας, / κούρης κεκλοµένης. ‘Then Jason removed the Golden Fleece from the oak at the girl's command.’ The gesture is a heroic one; cf. Od. 21.53 ἐνθεν ὑπεξαµένη ἀπὸ πασσάλου αἰνυτο τόξον but A. undercuts it by stressing that it is carried out at Medea's command. For formulae describing the Golden Fleece see 87–8n.

163–6 ἡ δ’ ἐµπεδον ἐστηµία / φαρµάκῳ ἐψηχεν θηρὸς κάρη, εἰσόκε δὴ µιν / αὐτὸς ἐν ἐπὶ νήα παλιντροπάσσαθαι ἱησων / ἱνωγεν. λείπον δὲ πολύσκιον ἀλσος Ἀρηος. ‘She stood her ground and stroked the head of the beast with the drug, until Jason ordered her to return to his ship and they left the deep-shaded grove of Ares.’ A shady grove is a very holy place (Dowden (2000) 111). The most famous Greek example is Dodona and in the Roman world that of Nemi. There
are few references to sacred groves for Ares (cf. Arg. 2.404 ἄλσος...σκιέων Ἄρης with *Batrach.* 130 παγχάλκεον ἔργον Ἄρης) One is Geronthrai in Messenia (Paus. 3.22.6–7); see Bonnechere (2007) 17–19.


παλιντροπάσσαθι is not ‘esclusivamente apolloniano’ (Livrea *ad loc.*); cf. *Il.* 16.95 ἀλλὰ πάλιν τρωπάσσαι which could have been read as παλιντρωπάσσαι (see West (2000) *app. crit.* for some evidence that it was), Arg. 4.643 ἄνω δὲ παλιντροπώντο (παλιντροπίους 3.1157, παλιντροπές Nic. *Th.* 402) and παλιντροπος (Aesch. *Ag.* 777, Soph. *Phil.* 1222, Eur. *Hr.* 1069.)

167–70 ὡς δὲ σεληναίην διχομήνιδα παρθένος αἰγλήν / υψόθεν εἰσανέχουσαν ὑπωρόφιου θιλάμωιο / λεπταλέῳ ἀνψόχεται: ἐν δὲ οἱ ἦτορ / χαίρει δερκομένης καλὸν σέλας. 'As a young girl catches on her fine dress the light of the full moon coming from on high into her bedroom under the roof and her heart is delighted by the fine radiance.' Jason is unexpectedly compared to a young girl, for which there are Homeric precedents; cf. *Od.* 8.523–30 (Odysseus’ grief is compared to that of a woman over her dead husband), *Il.* 16.7–11 (Patroclus’ tears are compared to the tears of a young girl); also Arg. 1.269–74 where Jason’s mother, Alcimede, is compared to a young girl.

The light of the simile (σεληναίην διχομήνιδα...αἰγλῆν) is juxtaposed with πολύσκιον ἄλσος Ἄρης. At the beginning of the episode (109–11), it is still night.
and Jason and Medea make their way to the dragon’s tree in darkness. A. begins to illuminate the scene in 167–9. He has already used images which suggest different kinds of light (118, 125–6, 139–40) but as the two return to the ship, the light grows and the glow of the Fleece suffuses the returning hero.

On his way to Hypsipyle Jason was compared to the Evening Star (1.774–81) that girls on the point of marriage watch from upper chambers while their future bridegrooms are away at war. Here it is Jason who fulfils the maiden’s role. As ὡς τότ’ ἥσσων (4.170) shows he is the point of comparison for this simile. Bremer (1987) 423–26 stresses the associations with marriage and for the moment Jason is a prospective joyous bridegroom. However, once again, A. must be glancing forward to the tragic consequences of the story.

The reversal of the gender roles heightens the eroticism of the moment, as does the choice of words such as διχομήνιδα (for forms in διχο– see Redondo (2000) 141) with its allusion to passages such as Pind. Ο. 3.19–20 διχόμηνις ὀλον χρυσάρματος / ἐσπέρας ὀφθαλμόν ἀντέφλεξε Μήνα. The comparison of a person to some aspect of the moon’s light does not occur before Sappho, although at Hom. Hym. 5.88–90 the effect of a necklace on Aphrodite’s breasts is compared with the moon. Sappho realised the possibility of ‘connecting women with the mysterious rhythms of the moon as separate from the sharp, bright male world of sun and stars’ (Stehle (1996) 148). The lyric nature of the language used in the simile (172–3n.), combined with the fact that Sappho wrote poetry about Selene and Endymion (57–65n.), raises the possibility that A. may be alluding to a piece of her poetry both here and at 4.125–6. Lyric imagery would, then, enclose the Iliadic similes describing the guardian serpent. The idea of being able to catch the light of the moon in one’s robe is
appropriate to the image. Perhaps it refers to rich cloth’s being oiled to give it extra sheen (465–7n.).

Read εἰσανέχουσαν (conjectured by me in 1974 and independently suggested by Campbell (1976) 38) for the unmetrical †ανέχουσαν† of the mss. Cf. Arg. 1.1360–2 oi δὲ χθονὸς εἰσανέχουσαν / ἀκτῆν ἐκ κόλπου μάλ’ εὑρεῖαν ἐοιδέσθαι / φρασάμενοι, where Mooney correctly translates χθονὸς εἰσανέχουσαν as ‘running into the land’ i.e. from the point of view of the sailors, 4.290–1 πόντου Τρινακρίου εἰσανέχοντα, ‘flowing into the Trinacrian Sea’. ‘εἰσανέχουσαν was misunderstood by someone who did not see precisely what the moonlight was doing. The image of the moon’s light ‘coming into’ the girl’s room is an apt one, pace Vian (1981) 153. The alteration is supported by Σ’s gloss (p. 270 Wendel) εἰσβάλλουσαν, in the sense of ‘enter, make an inroad into’.

The conjecture ἐξ–, reported as such in PE by both Vian and Fränkel, is an attempt to heal the metre, based on the common Homeric line opening ὑψόθεν ἐκ (Od. 17.210, 20.104, 22.298), and a misunderstanding of what is happening.

Transmitted υπωρόφιον is printed by Fränkel, with the comment (OCT app. crit.) ‘structura verborum obscura’. It must describe αἵγλην and the image that it creates is a strange one of the maiden trying to catch the light as it hovers under the roof of her bedroom. Merkel’s υπωρόφιον ((1854) CLXII, 213) is to be preferred. A. uses it twice, here and at 3.293 ὡς κεν υπωρόφιον νῦκτωρ σέλας ἐντύναιτο,with the meaning ‘in a house’ (cf. II. 9.640). However υπωρόφιος can be used more particularly; cf. Mosch. Eur. 6 τήμος υπωροφίοιοιν ἐνὶ κνώσσουσα δόμοισι, alluding to the Homeric υπερῷον, the upper part of the house where the women lived (II. 2.514 παρθένος αἰδοίῃ υπερῷοιν εἰσαναβάσα). For a further justification for υπωρόφιον cf. II. 9.582 ύψηρεφέος θαλάμοιο.
Just as the girl catches (ὑποίσχεται) the light on her dress, so Apsyrtus later catches the blood from his wound to stain Medea's veil and dress (4.473). The form occurs only in A.; cf. 3.119–20 ὑπὸ μαζῶ / . . . ὑποίσχανε χειρὸς ἀγοστόν and LSJ s.v. a. ὑπέχω.

170–1 ὧς τὸτ’ ἦσσων / γηθόσυνος μέγα κώας ἐαῖς ἀναέιρατο χερσίν.

‘Just so did Jason rejoice as he lifted up the great Fleece in his hands.’ The Fleece is in Jason’s hands but not thanks to his own efforts. Only now do we learn that Jason is the object of the simile which is not self-contained and breaks off in the middle of the line. A. would be aware of contemporary criticisms of the Homeric simile. Zenodotus, for example, athetised Il. 11.548–87 presumably because it occurred elsewhere. This suggests disapproval of a simile so self-contained that it could be assigned appropriately and without change to more than one place in the narrative, (139–42n., Carspecken (1952) 66, 74, Hunter (1993b) 129, Knight (1995) 19).

Fränkel rightly adopted ἐαῖς ἀναέιρατο χερσίν (SG) against ἐναέιρατο (LAPE). Jason is lifting something up (ἀνά–); cf. 4.94, Il. 23.614, 778, 882.

ἐναέιρομαι, attested nowhere else, is due to a mistake on the part of a scribe who thought that the datives needed a preposition, i.e. ‘he lifted up the Fleece in his hands’ (cf. the similar error at 4.1771: mss. ἐνθέμενοι; Brunck rightly ἐνθέμενοι.)

172–3 καὶ οἱ ἐπὶ ξανθῆσι παρηίσιν ἥδὲ μετώπῳ / μαρμαρυγῇ ληνέων φλογὶ εἶκελον ἵζεν ἔρευθος. ‘and on his fair cheeks and forehead sat a blush like fire from the sparkle of the wool.’ The language is erotic and lyrical in tone; cf. 167–70n. and the description of Hylas at 1.1230 κάλλεῖ καὶ γλυκερῇσιν ἐρευθόμενον χαρίτεσσιν. Jason’s personal beauty is framed in terms of a number of consistent
features, one in particular being the colour red; cf. 1.725–8 of Jason walking in his variegated cloak. The juxtaposition of ἔρευθος and a simile based on moon-imagery calls to mind Sappho fr. 96.8 Voigt βροδοδάκτυλος θμήνα, ‘rosy-fingered moon’; cf. 123–6n. and Virgil’s use of rubor at Aen. 12.65–6 cui plurimus ignem / subiecit rubor, describing the blush on Lavinia’s face.

ξανθός with παρηΐς is unusual. In Homer it is the word for ‘fair, golden hair’ (II. 1.197, 23.141). A. uses ξανθός of hair at 1.1084, 3.829, 3.1017, 4.1303 and παρηΐδες are either λευκαί or evidence of a fair complexion (Eur. Med. 1148, IA 681 ὡ στέρνα καὶ παρηΐδες, ὡ ξανθαὶ κόμαι). A. must mean that Jason is tanned; cf. Plut. Alex. 4 (talking about a famous painting of Alexander the Great by Apelles) Ἀπελλῆς δὲ . . . οὐκ ἐμιμήσατο τὴν χρόαν, ἀλλὰ φαιότερον καὶ πεπινωμένον ἐποίησεν. ἦν δὲ λευκός, ὡς φασίν· ἤ δὲ λευκότης ἐπεφοίνισσεν αὐτοῦ περὶ τὸ στῆθος μάλιστα καὶ τὸ πρόσωπον. To picture Jason as superficially resembling Alexander would be appropriate in A.’s portrayal of a somewhat vainglorious hero; cf. the swaggering Alexandrians at Theocr. 2.78–9 τοῖς δ’ ἦν ξανθότερα μὲν ἑλιχρύσοιο γενειάς, / στήθεα δὲ στίλβοντα πολὺ πλέον ἢ τῷ Σελάνα, where the reference to the Moon seems to link the two passages.

For μαρμαρυγῇ ληνέων cf. Strabo 11.2.19 ‘it is said that in their country gold is carried down by the mountain torrents, and that the barbarians obtain it by means of perforated troughs and fleecy skins, and that this is the origin of the myth of the Golden Fleece’; see Ryder (1991). On μαρμαρυγῇ as Odyssean hapax see Rengakos (1994) 111, who mentions the two traditional interpretations, ‘gleaming’ or ‘quick movements’. The meaning here must be ‘gleaming’ or ‘sparkling’. Rengakos believes that it is going too far to see a double allusion on the basis of 4.178 αἰὲν ὑποπρὸ ποδῶν ἀμαρύσσετο νισσομένοιο. The two meanings may be linked semantically;

The Fleece is also likened to fire at 4.1143–8; see 123–6n. for the Hellenistic painter Antiphilus, whose ‘Boy Blowing on a Fire’ was admired for the way in which the artist made the house and boy’s face reflect the glow. Pliny mentions a picture of the painter Philiscus showing a painter’s workshop where a boy is blowing on a fire (Pliny N.H. 35.11.40); cf. Posidippus fr. 7 A–B which describes a precious stone which lights up (?) a woman’s pendant ‘so that on her bosom a honey-coloured light shines together with her white skin’ and Zanker (2004) 62.

For ἵζεν used metaphorically cf. Il. 10.26, Pind. N. 8.2 ἀ τε παρθενήιος παιδῶν τ’ ἐφίζοισα γλεφάροις, speaking of the ‘prime of life’ (Ὥρα πότνια), Mosch. Eur. 3 (with Buhler ad loc.).

174–7 δόση δὲ ρινὸς βοὸς ἦνιος ἢ ἐλάφοιο / γίγνεται, ἢν τ’ ἀγρῶσται ἀχαιῖνεα καλέουσιν, / τόσσον ἐπη σῶν πάντη· χρύσεον δ’ ἐφύπεθεν ἀωτὸν / βεβρίθει λήνεσσιν ἐπηρεφές: ‘As great as the skin of a yearling heifer or the stag which huntsmen call ‘achaiinea’, so great in every way was the Fleece, golden above and heavy with its thick covering of wool.’ Comparisons in which difficult words are glossed or explained are a feature of Hellenistic poetry; cf. 3.277, 4.111, 4.1695, Call. fr. 117 Hollis, h. 1.14, h. 2.69, Pfeiffer (1968) 139. For ἀχαιῖνεα cf. Phalaecus A.P. 6.165 = 47 FGE with Page ad loc., and [Opp.] Cyn. 2.426. Eustathius (Il. 711.38 = π 574.26 Van der Valk) talks about the difficulties this word caused to interpreters, apparently referring to this passage.

ρινὸς βοὸς (only occurs at Il. 20.276) is an unexpected point of comparison when describing the Fleece and perhaps hiding an allusion to Callimachus’ Hecale
and the Bull of Marathon. Although the hide is said to be of a young heifer, the stress is put on its size. ἀγρῶσται usually means 'countrymen' but cf. Σ (p. 270 Wendel) οἱ κυνηγοὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀγρώσσῳ ῥήματος πέπτωκεν, and ἀγρόται (109–13n.). The word occurs in Call. fr. 69.13 Hollis, meaning 'countrymen', in the passage which describes Theseus bringing the live Bull back from Marathon. Theseus brings back a beast, described as μέγαν καὶ πελώριον (fr. 69.3 Hollis); Jason has faced an adversary described as πέλωρος (4.143 and elsewhere) and has brought back the Fleece, described in terms that emphasise its size. Theseus directly addresses the countrymen in a confident manner; Jason says nothing and seems anxious (4.180); cf. A.’s use of indirect speech, when reporting Aietes’ speech with the speech that Callimachus gives him in Aet. fr. 7 Harder. The image of the falling leaves, used by A. of the number of Aietes’ troops, occurs again as part of the description of the greeting given to Theseus by the country people (fr. 69.11–13 Hollis). The whole section concerned with the final capture of the Fleece (Arg. 4.109–82) opens with an indirect allusion to the Hecale; it would be typical of the allusive Hellenistic style, if it closed with others.

Platt’s (1914) 41–2 treatment of line 176 (τόσσον ἔην πάντη χρύσεον δ’ ἐφύπερθεν ἄωτον; see OCT app. crit.) is correct; cf. his justification: ‘The κῶσς is the whole skin . . . the ἄωτον is the woolly Fleece upon the skin, as it is in Homer. The ἄωτον does not grow all over the κῶσς, hence the distinction between πάντη and ἐφύπερθε’. For the original Homeric meaning of ἄωτον, ‘woolly Fleece’, differentiated from the metaphorical, Pindaric (Pind. O. 3.4) ‘bloom, flower’, see Rengakos (1994) 64.
177–8 ἤλιθα δὲ χθῶν / αἰὲν ὑποπρὸ ποδῶν ἀμαρύσσετο νισσομένοιο.‘As he went on his way, the ground in front of his feet sparkled brilliantly.’ A. takes his lead from Pindar’s κῶς αἰγλᾶεν χρυσέῳ θυσάνῳ (Pind. Π. 231), ‘the Fleece gleaming with its golden fringe’, and spreads the light of the Fleece through his narrative. Jason is suffused with a golden glow (118–21n.) as he goes back to the ship, its extent emphasised by ἤλιθα (ἀθρόως according to Σ (p. 230 Wendel)), ὑποπρὸ ποδῶν and the fire-imagery of ἀμαρύσσω (cf. Hes. Θ. 826–7 ἐν δὲ οἳ ὁπο / . . . πῦρ ἀμάρυσσεν, Hom. Ηym. 4.415).

179–81 ἢιε δ’ ἂλλοτε μὲν λαῖφ ἐπειμένος ὤμῳ / αὐχένος ἐς ύπάτοιο ποδηνεκές, ἂλλοτε δ’ αὔτε / εἰλει ἀφασσόμενος: ‘Sometimes he went along with it draped over his left shoulder, from the top of his neck down to his feet, other times he rolled it up and stroked it.’ Jason carries the Fleece, sometimes with a great deal of show, sometimes fearfully hiding it; cf. I.1. 10.23–4 = 10.177–8 ἀμφὶ δ’ ἐπεῖτα δαφοινὸν ἐέσσατο δέρμα λέοντος / αἰθῶνος μεγάλοιο ποδηνεκές, εἰλετο δ’ ἔγχος, Arg. 1.324 δέρμα δ’ ὁ μὲν ταύροιο ποδηνεκές ἀμφέχετ’ ὦμους where ποδηνεκές, in particular, denotes the flamboyant display of a warrior. Jason cannot entirely match this swagger.

Ἀλλοτε μὲν / δὲ is in a chiastic arrangement. In Homer ᾧλοτε occurs at opposite ends of the same line (I.24.10, 530, Od. 4.102, 11.303, 16.209) or at the beginning of consecutive lines (I.23.368–9, Od. 5.331–2, 23.94–5, Hom. Ηym. 3.141–2). A.’s arrangement is typical of the consciously elaborate word order of Alexandrian poetry (44–6n.).

For εἰλεω, ‘roll up’ cf. LSJ9 s.v. CII. The narrator doubts Jason's heroic pose. At the beginning, the exultant Jason passes the Fleece from hand to hand, and
examines it from every angle. Then the non-committal ἀλλοτε δὲ αὐτε introduces the unexpected εἶλει ἀφασομένος, making it seem that Jason’s courage has suddenly failed him and that he fears that a chance encounter will rob him of the Fleece.

However, εἶλει does summon up a strange picture. The small alteration to εἶλετ’ (cf. II. 10.23–4 = 10.177–8 quoted above) would still give the sense of Jason anxiously checking the Fleece – he takes it from his shoulder and checks it – without making him a somewhat ridiculous figure.

181–2 περὶ γὰρ δίεν, ὥφρα ἐ μὴ τίς / ἀνδρῶν ἢ ἦθεων νοσφίσσεται ἀντιβολήσας. ‘For he was very afraid that any man or god might encounter him and take it away.’ For ὥφρα ἐ μὴ τίς cf. Od. 20.20–1 ὥφρα σε μὴτίς / ἔξαγαγ’ ἐξ ἀντροιο διόμενον θανέσσαι where Odysseus thinks back to the μὴτίς pun which saved him in the cave of the Cyclops. A. Is alluding to this while satirising Jason’s unheroic behaviour; cf. Antim. fr. 3.3 Matthews ὡς ρά ἐ μὴ τίς / μηδὲ θεῶν ἄλλος γε παρέξ φράσσατό κεν αὐτοῦ and II. 17.666 ἦπε πόλλ’ ἀέκων· περὶ γὰρ δίε μὴ μν Ἀχαιοί, Od. 22.96.

For ἀνδρῶν ἢ ἦθεων (D), printed by Frankel against ἠδέ (cett.) cf. II. 13.632, 19.96 where there is mss. confusion between ἦ and ἠδέ.

For ἀντιβολήσας cf. Priam’s words when he is met by Hermes in a way similar to that fearfully anticipated by Jason (II. 24.374–5) ἄλλ’ ἐτὶ τίς καὶ ἐμεῖο θεῶν υπερέσχεθε χείρα, / ὡς μοι τοιόνδ’ ἦκεν ὀδοιπόρον ἀντιβολῆσαι; also Odysseus’ meeting with Hermes on his way to Circe’s house (Od. 10.277 ἐνθα μοι Ἠρμείας χρυσόρραπις ἀντεβόλησεν).
183 Ἡώς μὲν ῥ’ ἐπὶ γαῖαν ἐκίδνατο. ‘Dawn was spreading over the earth.’ Cf. 
*Iliad* 8.1, 24.695. The episode of winning the Fleece is over and is marked, as it was at 
the beginning, by a time-indication (109–13n.)

184–5 τοι δ’ ἐς ὁμιλοῦν / Ἱξον. θάμβησαν δὲ νέοι μέγα κόρας ἴδοντες / 
λαμπόμενον στεροπῇ ἱκέλον Διός. ‘They returned to the group. The young 
men were astonished seeing the great Fleece shining like the lightning of Zeus.’ The 
Argonauts react like Odysseus’ men when he returns from his hunting expedition at 
*Odyssey* 10.181 ἐπεὶ τάρπησαν ὁρῶν θυμημοί; cf. *Iliad* 8.76–7 οὐ δὲ ἴδοντες 
θάμβησαν, only here in Homer. θάμβος often describes astonishment at a new event 
43b.2 Harder, Theocr. 25.233, Pind. *O. 3.32*).

στεροπῇ ἱκέλον Διός continues the fire-imagery of line 173 φλογὶ ἐκέλον. 
In Homer it describes the glittering bronze of spears; *Iliad* 10.153–4 τῇ δὲ χαλκῷ / 
λάμφ᾽ ὡς τε στεροπῇ πατρὸς Διός.

185–6 ὄρτο δ’ ἐκαστος / ψαυσαι ἐελδόμενος δέχθαι τ’ ἐνι χερσίν 
ἐήςιν. ‘Everyone rose up, eager to touch it and receive it in his hands.’ ὄρτο δ’ 
ἐκαστος is only here. For the assonance of ἐνι χερσίν ἐηςιν cf. 194, 196, 197, 199, 
204, 211, 213; also *Odyssey* 8.181, 8.148, 12.444, *Iliad* 22.426, 24.165 (nn. 118–21, 214–5)

187–9 Αἰσονίδης δ’ ἄλλους μὲν ἐρήτυε, τῷ δ’ ἐπὶ φάρος / κάββαλε 
νηγάτευν· πρύμνη δ’ ἐνι εἴσατο κούρην / ἐνθέμενος καὶ τοῖον ἔποιο 
μετὰ πᾶσιν ἔειπεν. ‘But the son of Aison restrained the others and threw a newly-
made robe over the Fleece. He sat the girl in the stern, having put her on board and
addressed them all as follows: For ἐρήτυε cf. *Od.* 9. 493 = *Od.* 10.442 ἐρήτυον ἄλλοθεν ἄλλος.

For φάρος / κάββαλε νηγάτεου cf. *Il.* 2.42–3 ἔδυνε χιτῶνα / καλὸν νηγάτεου, peri δὲ μέγα βάλλετο φάρος. A. conflates the two Homeric lines in this allusion.

The compound aorist middle ἐνεείσατο in transmitted πρύμην δ᾽ ἐνεείσατο κούρην is found nowhere else (see LSJ⁹ s.v. ἐνιζω). Necessitating only a slight change, πρύμην δ᾽ ἕνι εἰσάτο κούρην invites the reader to contrast the form with the end of line 145, or even 119 in the sense that Jason is ‘establishing’ or ‘setting up’ (LSJ⁹ s.v. 2. ιζω) Medea as part of a triumphal monument by sitting her on the Fleece. For this form and the structure of the resulting phrase cf. *Od.* 14.295 ἐς Λιβύην μ᾽ ἐπὶ νῆσος ἔσσατο ποντοπόροι; also *Il.* 1.310 ἀνὰ δὲ Χρυσίδα καλλιπάρην / εἰσεν ἄγων, 15.285–6 ἐν πρύμην δ᾽ ἄρ᾽ ἐπείτα καθέζετο, πάρ δὲ οἴ αὐτῷ / εἴσε Θεοκλύμενου, *Eur.* *IT* 1382–3 λαβὼν / ἐκηκ’ ἀδελφῆν <τ᾽> ἐντὸς εὐσέλιου νεώς, *Nonn.* *D.* 4.233–4 ἐπὶ πρύμην δὲ καὶ αὐτὴν / Ἄρμονήν ἄψαυστον ὀμόπλοου ἵδρυε κούρην. A. often uses the middle voice of verbs which Homer only has in the active, (e.g. εἴσε at *Od.* 15.286, ἀναείρω 4.171 with nn. 123–6, 430). For a similar wrong word-division cf. 4.546 αὐτῇ ἐνὶ ἐλδετο νῆσῳ (Facius for the ἐνεέλδ– of the mss.) Anastrophe of ἐνι in this metrical position can be paralleled; cf. 3.278, 977, 4.434, 546, 1500, Mooney (1912) 50 n.11, and Bühler (1960) 221–28 for the frequency of anastrophe in post-Homeric epic. Rengakos (1993) 66, on *Od.* 14.295 where Zenodotus read ἐφείσατο and Rhianos ἐφέσσατο, follows Rzach (1878) 552 in surmising that A. took Zenodotus’ reading as an unaugmented form and so formed ἐείσατο.
For the transmitted ἀνθέµενος cf. Xen. *Anab.* 2.2.4 ἀναθέσθαι τὰ σκέυη ἐπὶ τὰ ὑποζύγια, (LSJ s.v. B1). It is only once used of putting something on board ship (*IG v/1 1421*). Read ἐνθέµενος instead and cf. *Od.* 5.166 (where Calypso is talking about the provisions that she is going to put on board Odysseus’s raft), Antiphon 5.39 ἐνθεῖς τινα εἰς τὸ πλοῖον; and particularly *Arg.* 1.357–8 ὀπλα δὲ πάντα / ἐνθέµενοι πεπάλασθε. For mss. confusion of ἐν / ἄν cf. OCT app. crit. at 1.1237, 4.171, 1365, 1771.

189–205 Both leaders exhort their troops before operations commence, although the two sides do not engage (202–4n.). Jason's words are directly reported; Aietes' in indirect speech. Cf. with Jason’s speech *Eur.* *IT* 1385–91 ναὸς <Δ'> ἐκ μέσης ἐφθέγξατο / ἔρθεν γὰς Ἑλλάδος ναύτης λεώς, / λάβεσθε κόπης ῥόθια τ’ ἐκλευκαίνετε· / ἔξομεν γὰρ ὄντερ οὐνεκ’ ἀξένοι πόρον / Συμπληγάδων ἔσωθεν εἰσεπλεύσαμεν. / οἱ δὲ στεναγὸν ἠδὺν ἐκβρυχώθησαν / ἐπαισαν ἀλμην, the major common factor being the appeal to the crew in the name of all Greece.

There are striking similarities between the plot structure of the *Argonautica* and that of the *IT*; see Sansone (2000) 155–70, Hall (2012) 69–92. The action is situated in roughly the same geographical region. Orestes and Pylades have been sent, like Jason, to take back home an object of miraculous origin (cf. *IT* 85–91). To achieve this they are forced to enlist the assistance of a priestess. They are opposed in their mission by a hostile, barbarian King; cf. especially Thoas’ speech *IT* 1422–34 ~ Aietes’ speech at 4.228–36. When tragedies began to be reperformed in the early part of the fourth century (386), Euripides’ plays were popular: one of his *Iphigenia* plays (341) – possibly *Iphigenia among the Taurians* rather than *Iphigenia at Aulis* (thus Taplin (2007) 149) – , his *Orestes* (340), and another play by him (339) were
performed at the Dionysia (IG ii² 2320); see Millis and Olson (2012) 65, Ceccarelli (2010) 113 n. 43, Finglass (2016). Fourth-century audiences seem to have been interested in exciting stories, scenic effects, good speeches for the actors and what today we call ‘theatre’. For the popularity of Euripides compared with that of Aeschylus and Sophocles cf. Scodel (2007) 130–33, Nervegna (2007) 17–18.

It is tempting to imagine A. being familiar with the IT, praised as it was already by Aristotle (Poet. 1454a4–7, 1455a16–20, 1455b3–15). He might not only have read it but also seen it produced. The early Ptolemies encouraged the presentation of dramatic performances and both at Ptolemais and at Alexandria there were bands of Dionysiac artists who under Royal patronage gave performances of tragedies and comedies (Fraser (1972) 618–19, Faulkner (2002) 346–8, Lightfoot (2002) 209–24), the larger part of the repertoire consisting of revivals. For statistics concerning papyri fragments of Euripides, surviving from the Ptolemaic period see Carrara (2009), Finglass (2016), p. 3 n. 15.

190 μηκέτι νῦν χάζεσθε, φίλοι, πάτρηνδε νέεσθαι. ‘No longer hold back, my friends, from returning to your homeland.’ μηκέτι νῦν (nine times) with the imperative is a frequent opening of Homeric speeches of exhortation; cf. Il. 15.426 μὴ δὴ πῶ χάζεσθε μάχης ἐν στείνεϊ τῷδε. Jason is again portrayed as indulging in mock heroics. The beginning of his speech is something of an oxymoron: ‘Do not give ground . . . to get away!’ His later advice is the same as Amphidamas’ at 2.1060–3 when the Argonauts are attacking the birds of Ares. Odysseus also addresses his crew as φίλοι; cf. Od. 12.208 etc.
191–3 ἢδη γὰρ χρειώ, τῆς εἴνεκα τὴν ἀλεγεινήν / ναυτιλίην ἔτλησιν οἰζύι μοχθίζοντες, / εὐπαλέως κούρης ὑπὸ δήνεσι πολλά, κακὰ πολλὰ, ἡς εἵνεκα πολλοὶ Ἀχαιῶν / ἐν Τροίῃ ἀπόλοντο.

Rengakos (1994) 49 believes that the expression ἀλεγεινὴν ναυτιλίην is not based on the Homeric ἀλεγεινά...κύματα (II. 24.8 etc) but on εἰρεσίης...ἀλεγεινῆς (cf. Od. 10.78). Kekrāantai (cf. Od. 12.37 ταῦτα μὲν οὕτω πάντα πεπείρανται) is a rare verb, singular here but unclear at Od. 4.132, 616, 15.116 (Veitch (1848) 153, S–D II 771ε), marking the climax of the complex sentence.

194–5 τὴν μὲν ἐγὼ ἐθέλουσαν ἀνάξομαι οἴκαδ’ ἀκοὶτιν / κουριδίην.

‘With her consent, I will take her home as my lawful wife.’ This line carries with it dubious connotations; cf. Od. 3.272 (Aegisthus and Clytemnestra) τὴν δ’ ἐθέλοιν ἐθέλουσαν ἀνήγαγεν, ὑνῖ δομονδε, 21.316 (Penelope talking to Antinoos about the disguised Odysseus) οἴκαδὲ μ’ ἄξεσθαι καὶ ἐὰν θήσεσθαι ἀκοὶτιν. The link with Aegisthus and the deceptions of the end of the Odyssey is a hint at the way in which Jason’s proposal will develop. Jason has made a solemn promise (96–8n.) and undertaking which Medea will have to frighten him into keeping and which he will
then break, when offered a better opportunity in Corinth. He is explicit here in describing the union as a marriage, a dubious statement seeing that Medea has been taken from her father, not given by him; cf. Il. 19.298 κουριδίην ἄλοχον βήσειν in which Briseis reports Patroclus (not Achilles) as assuring her that back home in Phthia she would be recognised as Achilles’ wedded wife. For οἴκαδ’ ἄκοιτιν cf. 185–6n., Od. 13.42 οἴκοι ἄκοιτιν. The usual Homeric combination is κουριδίην ἄλοχον (Il. 1.114, 7.392, 13.626, 19.298); κουριδίην ἄκοιτιν is only in A.

195–7 ἀτὰρ ύμες Ἀχαιίδος οία τε πάσης / αὐτῶν θ’ ύμειών ἔσθλην ἐπαρωγόν ἐουσαν / σωτετε. ‘But do you save her, as the salvation of the whole of Greece and you yourselves.’ These are stirring pre-battle sentiments, until one remembers that he is simply escaping with the booty (cf. Hippocrates at Thuc. 4.95.2 ἐν γὰρ τῇ τούτων ὑπὲρ τῆς ἥμετέρας ὁ ἁγών ἔσται and Nikias at Thuc. 7.61.1 ἀνδρες στρατιώται Ἀθηναίων τε καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ξυμμάχων, ὁ μὲν ἁγών ὁ μέλλων όμοίως κοινὸς ἀπασίν ἔσται περὶ τε σωτηρίας καὶ πατρίδος, 7.69.2 (discussing one of Nikias’ final speeches to the Athenians). . . καὶ ὑπὲρ ἀπάντων παραπλήσια ἐξ τε γυναίκας καὶ παιδας καὶ θεοὺς πατρώιων προφερόμενα, ἀλλ’ ἐπὶ τῇ παρούσῃ ἐκπλήξει ὠφέλιμα νομίζοντες ἐπιβοῶνται, ‘instead they bring forward the kinds of appeals that can generally be used on all occasions: wives, children, gods of the native land’ (231–5n.), Aesch. Pers. 402–4 ὡ παιδες Ἑλλήνων ἰτε, / ἐλευθεροῦτε πατρίδ’, ἐλευθεροῦτε δὲ / παιδας γυναίκας θεῶν τε πατρώων ἐδη (202–4n.). Although Jason’s speech is meant to be understood ironically, A. wrote at a time when the concept of ‘Hellene’ as a replacement for citizen identity was beginning to gain ground and perhaps the use of Ἀχαιίδος . . . πάσης here and Ἑλλάς at 204–5n. reflects this; see Stephens (2003) 183.
σώετε is forcefully placed, emphasizing the contrast between 190–4 ‘our
αἰθλὸν has been achieved by Medea’ and the rest of the speech in which the
Argonauts are exhorted to fight Ἀχαιδὸς οἷά τε πάσης.

197–8 δὴ γάρ που, μάλ’ οίομαι, εἰσιν ἐρύξων / Αἰήτης ὀμάδῳ
πόντονδ’ ἵμεν ἐκ ποταμοῖο. ‘For I think there’s no doubt that Aietes will come
with a great force to prevent us reaching the sea from the river.’ The run of short
particles (δὴ γάρ που, μάλ) conveys nervous apprehension at the prospect of
encountering Aietes. δὴ γάρ gives strong emphasis (Denniston 243 citing II. 11.314–
5 δὴ γὰρ ἐλεγχος / ἔσσεται, 21.583 ἡ δὴ που μάλ’ ἔολπας ἐνι φρεοὶ) with που
adding a note of diffidence (Denniston 491) quickly masked by the assertive μάλ’
The prospect of being caught by him is the threat and as such his name occupies the
first position in the line.

199–200 ἀλλ’ οἱ μὲν διὰ νηός, ἀμοιβαδίς ἀνέρος ἀνήρ / ἔξομενος,
πηδοίσιν ἐρέσσετε ‘Therefore every other man through the length of the ship
should stay on his bench and ply the oars.’ For the absolute construction of ἔξομενος,
see K–G II 288 and other examples at 1.396, II. 3.211, 10.224. Rengakos (1993) 68–9
compares II. 3.211 ἄμφω δ’ ἐξομένω γεραρώτερος ἦν Ὁδυσσεύς which Zenodotus
did not accept, reading ἐξομένων; cf. Arg. 1.911–2 λάζοντο δὲ χερσὶν ἐρετιὰ /
ἐνσχερῷ ἐξομένων and Od. 4.579–80 οἱ δ’ αἰψ’ εἰσβαινον καὶ ἔπι κληίοι καθίζουν, /
ἐξῆς δ’ ἐξομένοι πολιήν ἀλα τύπτον ἐρετμοῖς (also Od. 9.104, 9.180, 9.472 etc.)
For πηδοίσιν ἐρέσσετε cf. 189–205n., Od. 7.328 εὖθ’ οἱ ἀνακλινθέντες ἀνερρίπτουν
ἀλα πηδώ, 13.78, II. 1.435 εἰς ὀρμον προέρεσαν ἐρετμοῖς = Od. 15.497.
And the other half protect our return by holding out their oxhide shields as a swift-moving protection against enemy missiles."

Cf. Od. 3.157–9 ἡµίσεις δ᾽ ἀναβάντες ἐλαύνοµεν αἰ δὲ µάλ’ ὦκα / ἐπλέον, Arg. 2.1061–2 ηµίσεις µὲν ἐρέσσετ’ ἀµοιβαδίς, ηµίσεις δὲ / δούρασί τε ξυστοίοι καὶ άσπίσιν ἄροστε νήσα. Compared with Odysseus’ narrative, Jason’s instructions are more elaborate as befits an exhortation to his men. The combination βοείας / ἁσπίδας is in enjambment at Il. 5.452–3, 12.425–6.

δήων θοὸν ἐχµα βολάων suits a speech in which Jason adopts the role of valiant but verbose leader after the dangerous work has been done by Medea; cf. the simpler phrase at 1.743 θοὸν σάκος. For ἐχµα meaning ‘bulwark, defence against’ with the genitive cf. Hom. Hym. 4.37 ἐπηλυσίης πολυπήµονος ἔσσεαι ἐχµα, Il. 5.316 ἔρκος ἐµεν βελέων. For a similar structure, forming a single idea, ‘protection which consists of a tower’ and hence ‘tower of defence’ cf. Soph. Aj. 159 πῦργου ρώµα with Finglass ad loc. and Call. fr. 677 Pfeiffer βελέων ἐρµια; see Erbse (1953) 194, comparing Il. 7.238–9 οἶδ’ ἐπὶ δεξιά, οἶδ’ ἐπ’ ἀριστερὰ νωµήσαι βῶν / ἄζαλένν, τὸ µοι ἐστὶ ταλαύρινον πολεµίζειν and for θοὸς West on Hes. Th. 481 and Buttmann (1861) 365–70 who argues that the adjective, besides meaning ‘swift,’ also carries the association of terror and danger, though the idea of the swift movement of the shields is prominent here.

For προσχόµενοι, meaning ‘holding a shield or a weapon before one’ cf. Ar. Nub. 989 τὴν ἁσπίδα τῆς κωλῆς προέχων, Il. 13.157 = 803 πρόσθεν δ’ ἐχεν ἁσπίδα.
With ἐπαύνετε, A. ironically recalls Hector’s words at Il. 12.243 εἰς οἰωνός ἀριστὸς ἄμυνεσθαι περὶ πάτρης and military exhortations such as Thuc. 3.14 ἐπαύνατε Μυτιληναῖοι ξύμμαχοι γενόμενοι, 4.92 πάτριόν τε ὑμῖν στρατὸν ἀλλόφυλον ἐπελθόντα καὶ ἐν τῇ οἰκείᾳ καὶ ἐν τῇ τῶν πέλας ὁμοίως ἄμυνεσθαι, Isoc. Panegyr. 4.184.9, Plut. 9.5.8.

202–4 νῦν ἐνὶ χερσὶν / παῖδας ἐοὺς πάτρην τε φίλην γεραροὺς τε τοκῆας / ἱσχομεν. ‘Now we have in our hands, our children, our dear country, and honoured parents.’ Jason continues the emotive rhetoric (195–7n.); cf. Il. 15.497–8 (Hector, exhorting the Trojans, links defending πάτρη, ἀλοχός, παῖδες, οἶκος and κλῆρος), Il. 15.662–3 (Nestor) ἐπὶ δὲ μνήσασθε ἐκαστὸς / παῖδων ἤδε ἀλόχον καὶ κτήσιος ἡδὲ τοκῆων, 15.496–7 οὐ οἱ άεικὲς άμυνομένῳ περὶ πάτρης / τεθνάμεν· ἀλλ᾽ αλοχός τε σόῃ καὶ παῖδες, 22.338. The ascending tricolon with ‘love of country’ embedded between ‘love for children and parents’ adds to the emotion of the appeal. However, as elsewhere in the poem, the theme of a warrior arming or preparations for combat never leads to an actual confrontation; see Vian (1981) 154, Fränkel (1968) 468–72.

Transmitted δ᾽ was rightly deleted by Brunck. Platt (1914) 42 compares Il. 15.718–9 αὐτοὶ ἀολλέες ὄρνυτ’ ἀυτὴν’ / νῦν ἡμῖν πάντων Ζεὺς ἄξιον ήμαρ ἐδώκε. The addition is due to the influence of clausulae such as 4.1155 οἱ δ᾽ ἐν χεροῖν and the fact that scribes abhor an asyndeton. For the expression cf. Hdt. 1.35 ἔχοντος δὲ οἱ ἐν χεροῖ τοῦ παιδὸς τὸν γάμον ἀπικνέεται ἐς τὰς Σάρδις. For νῦν replaced by νῦν δ᾽ see Headlam (1910) 436 on Aesch. Ag. 1475, Finglass (2011) 319 on Soph. Aj. 612–17.
For ἕός used for the first person plural see Rengakos (1993) 117–8, Harder (2012) 297–8 who refers to Marxer (1935) 62 and for lines shaped like 203 (cf. 4.361,1036) see Bühler (1960) 218–21, who traces its origin to Il. 6.181 πρόσθε λέων, ὅπιθεν δὲ δράκων, μέσση δὲ χίμαιρα.

204–5 ήμετέρη δ’ ἐπερείδεται Ἑλλᾶς ἐφορμῆ, / ἢ κατηφεῖν, ἢ καὶ μέγα κύδος ἀρέσθαι. ‘Hellas depends upon our enterprise, as to whether it will achieve despair or great glory.’ Jason’s emotive appeal (189–205n.) to Hellas may also contain a contemporary historical reference. The decree proposed by Chremonides during the Chremonidean War (268–61 BC) reminded the Greeks that together ‘they had fought many glorious battles against those who wished to enslave the cities’ and urged them to ally themselves with Ptolemy, the defender of the ‘common freedom of the Greeks’; see Chaniotis (2005) 230.

For Jason’s final flourish cf. Sarpedon’s similar philosophy at Il. 12.328 ἵσομεν ἢ τῷ εὔχος ὑπέξωμεν ἢ τις ἡμῖν as he exhorts Glaucus to attack the Trojan wall.

Gylippus and the Spartan generals end their final speech with a similar aphorism at Thuc. 7.68 καὶ κινδύνων οὕτωι σπανιώτατοι οἳ ἄν ἐλάχιστα ἐκ τοῦ σφαλῆν βλάπτοντες πλεῖστα διὰ τὸ ἐυτυχῆσαι ὑφελώσιν, ‘of the dangers these are the rarest when failure brings no great loss and success confers no little gain’, Catull. 64.102 aut mortem appeteret Theseus aut praemia laudis.

Fränkel suggested ἐπ’ ἐρείδεται for transmitted ἐπερείδεται. There is no need to change the text; cf. Aesop. Fab. 27 ὡς ἔλπιδι θησαυροῦ ἐπερειδόμενος, Ar. Eccl. 276–7 κατὰ ταῖς βακτηρίαις ἐπερειδόμεναι, for which in turn cf. Il. 14.38 ἐγχεῖ ἐρειδόμενοι (also Il. 19.49, Od. 10.170). The metaphorical use of the verb enhances Jason’s appeal, together with the use of ἐφορμῆ. While the verb (ἐφορμάω) is
common in Homer, the noun occurs only at *Od.* 22.130 μία δ᾽ οἶη γίνετ’ ἕφορμή. The Spartan king Archidamus expresses a similar martial sentiment before an invasion of Attica at Thuc. 2.11.2 ἡ γὰρ Ἑλλὰς πᾶσα τῇ δὲ τῇ ὀρμῇ ἐπηρταί.

For κατηφείην cf. *II.* 3.51 δυσμενέσιν μὲν χάρμα, κατηφείην δὲ σοι αὐτῷ, 16.498 = 17.556 κατηφείη καὶ ὀνειδὸς, Thuc. 7.75.5 κατηφεία τέ τις ἀμα καὶ κατάμεμψις ὁφῶν αὐτῶν πολλῆς ἦν. For κῦς ἁρέσθαι cf. *II.* 9.303 μέγα κῦς ἁροιο but κῦς ἁρέσθαι occurs without μέγα at *II.* 12.407, 17.419, 20.502 etc. At the end of such a speech the expected sentiment is ‘Let us do our best and either win glory or die in the attempt.’ κατηφείη, ‘dejection’ is more in keeping with Jason’s character as a sometime sufferer of ἀμηχανία.

206–8 ὡς φάτο, δῦνε δὲ τεῦχε’ ἀρηία· τοὶ δ’ ἱάχησαι / θεσπέσιον μεμαώτες. ὁ δὲ ξίφος ἐκ κολεοῖο / σπασσάμενος πρυμναία νεῶς ἀπὸ πείσματ’ ἐκοψεν. ‘With these words, he put on his warlike armour. The Argonauts gave a great shout of eagerness and Jason, having drawn his sword from its sheath, cut the ropes at the ship’s stern.’ As often, a loud roar greets the encouragement to battle. The response to Hector’s words at *II.* 12. 230–50 is 12.251–2 τοὶ δ’ ἀμ’ ἕποντο / ἡχῇ θεσπεσίῃ. At *II.* 13.833–4 τοὶ δ’ ἀμ’ ἕποντο / ἡχῇ θεσπεσίῃ, ἐπὶ δ’ ἱαχὲ λάὸς ὀπίσθεν follows the threat that Hector utters against Ajax.

For ξίφος ἐκ κολεοῖο cf. *Od.* 10.126–7 (Odysseus’s flight from the Laestrygonians) τόφρα δ’ ἐγὼ ξίφος ὃς ἐρυσσάμενος παρὰ μηροῦ / τῷ ἀπὸ πείσματ’ ἐκοψα νεῶς κυανόπρῳροιο. A. omits the formulaic adjectives (όξυ, κυανόπρῳροιο), shortens the formula by leaving out παρὰ μηροῦ and instead of ἐρυσσάμενος (also at *II.* 12.190) he uses σπασσάμενος (cf. *II.* 16.473 = *Od.* 10.439 = 11.231 σπασσάμενος ταυτήκες ἀν παξέος παρὰ μηροῦ). He adopts a more
complicated word order (nn. 83–4, 143–4): enjambment of ξίφος . . σπασσάµενος, separation of πρυµναία and πείσµατ'; tmesis of ἀποκόπτω. On Attic νεώς, see below.

Just like the Colchians, the Laestrygonians have been holding an ἀγορή (Od. 10.114) and their numbers are large (10.120 μυρίοι). Bearing in mind, how expensive ship’s rope would have been in the ancient world (Casson (1971) 231), Jason’s action in drawing the sword and cutting the ropes could be seen as empty heroic gesture, emphasising his attempt to reassert himself after the secondary role he has played in the encounter with the serpent. In the case of Odysseus and the Laestrygonians, the gesture is motivated. They are intent on pursuit (118–19) and armed (121–2). The action in A. moves at a slower pace and gives time for the elaborate simile about the vast number of Colchians (214–17) and the description of Aietes. Aeneas does the same at Virg. Aen. 4.579–80 dixit vaginaque eripit ensem / fulmineum strictoque ferit retinacula ferro. This gesture has great power as Aeneas uses the sword that Dido gave him as a gift and he is in a hurry to leave Carthage; see Basto (1984) 333–4.

πρυµναία is a coinage by A. It occurs elsewhere at Triphiod. 139, Opp. H. 1.191. The usual phrases are Od. 12.148 αὐτούς τ’ ἀµβαίνειν ἀνὰ τε πρυµνήσια λῦσαι. / οἴ δ’ αἴψ’ εἰσβαίνουν καὶ ἐπὶ κλῆσι καθίζουν, Od. 2.418 τοὶ δὲ πρυµνήσι’ ἐλυσαν.

For νεώς cf. νεός κυανοπρῶροι (ll. 15.693, Od. 9.482, 539, 10.127). The Attic genitive νεώς is found elsewhere in epic: Od. 10.172 (v.l.), [Orph.] Arg. 1203–1 καὶ τότ’ ἄρ’ οὐκ ἀπιθήσε νεώς κυανοπρῶροι / ἰθύντωρ Ἀγκαῖος, and Nonn. D. 4.231. For occasional Attic forms elsewhere in A. cf. 1.811 κόραι, 3.1036 ἔργα µελισσῶν, with Antim. fr. 57.3 IEG ὀπλά τε πάντα νεώς. A. was an admirer of Antimachus and if he found this genitive in his poetry, it is plausible that he might
introduce it into his own. The mss. tradition favours νεώς (LASPE, G. has ναός). Elsewhere A. has νηός and once νεός (1.1201). In view of the presence of many Atticisms in our text of Homer (West (2001) 31–2), it is likely that A. would reflect this and it is therefore wrong to eliminate them with Rzach (1878).

209–10 ἀγχὶ δὲ παρθενικῆς κεκορυθμένος ἱθυντηρὶ / Ἀγκαίῳ
παρέβασκεν. ‘Armed, he took his place, near to the maiden, next to the steersman Ancaeus.’ The imagery is both that of charioteer and steersman, even though Jason and Medea are in the prow of the ship, but cf. Catull. 64.9 ipsa levi fecit volitantem flame currum, (where ipsa refers to Athena and currum to the Argo; cf. ὀξὶς and ὄχημα in tragedy, e.g. Aesch. Supp. 33 ὀξὶς ταχυρὴι, Soph. Tr. 656 πολύκωπτον ὄχημα ναός. These lines are neatly balanced by 224–7. Framed between is the simile of the leaves and the elaborate description of Aietes in full armour. The focus of the narrative switches between Colchians and Argonauts in almost cinematic fashion (225–7n.).

For κεκορυθμένος cf. κεκορυθμένος αἵθωπι χαλκῷ (II. 4.495, 5.681, 17.3 etc), another example ‘shortening’ of an Homeric phrase (206–8n.). ἱθυντηρὶ is a rare word; cf. Soph. fr. 314.79 TrGF θεὸς Τύχη καὶ δαῖμον ἱθυντηρὶ, Theocr. Syrinx 2. More usual is κυβερνῆτης; cf. II. 19.43, 23.316, Od. 3.279 but ἱθυνω is used of guiding a chariot (Il. 11.528 κεῖσ’ ἵππους τε καὶ ἅρμ’ ἱθύνοιν) and of steering a ship (Od. 5.270 αὐτὰρ ὁ πηδαλίῳ ἱθύνετο τεχνήντως, Od. 9.78 τὰς δ’ ἄνειμός τε κυβερνήται τ’ ἱθύνοιν).

παρέβασκεν occurs only at Il. 11.104 ὃ μὲν . . . ἤνιόχευεν, Ἀντίφαξ αὐτοῦ παρέβασκε περικλυτός. The παραβάτης is used of the warrior who stands beside
the charioteer; cf. Il. 23.132 ἂν δ’ ἐβαν ἐν διφροσὶ παραβάται ἰνίοχοι τε. For A.’s use of imperfects with –σκ– see Redondo (2000) 137.

210–11 ἐπείγετο δ’ εἰρεσίη νῆσος / σπερχομένων ἁμοτον ποταμοῦ ἀφαρ ἐκτὸς ἐλάσσαι. ‘The ship sped forward by the rowing of the men very eager to drive the ship outside the river without delay.’ A. alludes to longer Homeric formulae such as Od. 4.579–80 ἂν δὲ καὶ αὐτοὶ βάντες ἐπὶ κληίσι καθίζουν, / ἐξῆς δ’ ἐξόμενοι πολιήν ἁλα τύπτον ἐρετμοῖς, 12.205 ἐρετμὰ προήκεα χεροῖν ἐπειγον, 13.115 τοὐν γὰρ ἐπείγετο χέρα’ ἐρετάων, later imitated at Virg. Aen. 3.207 nautae / adnixi torquent spumas, Catull. 64.13.

212–13 ἡδὴ δ’ Αἰήτῃ ύπερήνωρι πᾶσι τε Κόλχοις / Μηδείης περὶπυστος ἐρως καὶ ἐργ’ ἐτέτυκτο. ‘Already Medea’s love and deeds were fully known to proud Aietes and all the Colchians.’ The sudden transition between Argonauts and Colchians is marked by ἡδη, which often denotes a change of scene, like iamque; cf. 3.1137, 4.226. The adjectives περὶπυστος and ύπερήνωρ emphasise the split between father and daughter, the former marking Medea’s now notorious reputation, (Parth. Narrat. amat. 25.3.3 Lightfoot ἦ γυνὴ μάλα περὶπυστος οὖσα with Lightfoot ad loc., but ἀπυστος (Od. 1.242, 4.675, 5.127) and ἐκπυστος (Plut. Caes. 64.2.3)), and the latter alluding to Aietes’ character and used of Pelias, also an overbearing tyrant, at Hes. Th. 995.

Homer does not have ἐργ’ ἐτέτυκτο, only Il. 17.279 = Od. 11.550 = 11.610 = Hom. Hym. 4.12 ἐργα τέτυκτο. With respect to the elision at the quasi-caesura of the fifth foot and whether ἐργ’ ἐτέτυκτο or ἐργα τέτυκτο be written, the contrast between 4.61 ἐργα τέτυκται and the mss. consensus for ἐργ’ ἐτέτυκτο here seems to
show that A. felt that the augmented form was required, and would have agreed with Aristophanes in reading ὑπέστρεφον τί ἀναφανδὰ τέτυκται, see Mooney 415, West (1998) xxvi–vii, Taida (2007) 3–12.

For the sentiment ‘all is discovered’ cf. 4.84 πρὸ γάρ τ’ ἀναφανδὰ τέτυκται, Eur IA 1140 ἀπωλόμεσθα: προδέδοται τὰ κρυπτά μου, and Men. Sam. 316 εἰδότα γ’ ἀκριβῶς πάντα καὶ πεπυσμένον.

214 ἐς δ’ ἀγορὴν ἀγέροντ’ ἐνὶ τεύχεσιν. ‘They gathered for their meeting, armed.’ Cf. II. 2.92–3 ἐστιχόωντο / ἱλαδὸν εἰς ἀγορὴν, 18.245 ἐς δ’ ἀγορὴν ἀγέροντο. For the figura etymologica see Louden (1995) 28–9 and Clary (2007) 113–36 for discussion of word-play in Homer. For further examples in A. cf. 1.403–4 ἐπάκτιον Ἀπόλλωνος, Ἀκτίου Ἐμβασιόι τ’ ἐπώνυμον calls attention to Apollo’s titles, 2.295–7 (ὑπέστρεφον ~ Στροφάδας), 2.188–9 (Ἀρπνιαι ~ ἠρπαζον; 223 ~ ἀφαρπάζουσιν), 4.518–21 (Κεραύνια κικλήσκονται ~ κεραυνοί).

ἐνὶ τεύχεσιν only occurs here. It was unusual to attend an agora under arms; cf. II. 2.808 αἴψα δ’ ἠλυσ’ ἀγορὴν· ἐπὶ τεύχεα δ’ ἐσσεύοντο and for laws against carrying arms in the agora, see Sealey (1994) 27. Used here, the phrase suggests that the time for discussion or persuasion is over: only fighting can sort things out now.

214–15 ὅσσα δὲ πόντου / κύματα χειμερίοιο κορύσσεται ἐξ ἀνέμοιο. ‘As many as the waves of the sea raised into a crest by a stormy wind.’ The emphasis on the great size of the Colchian horde reminds the reader of the historical parallel of Xerxes and the Persians versus small bands of Greeks; cf. Thuc. 4.126.3 (from a speech of the Spartan commander Brasidas, about to be attacked by a large force of
Illyrians) οὗτοι δὲ τὴν μέλλησιν μὲν ἔχουσι τοῖς ἀπείροις φοβεράν καὶ γὰρ πλήθει ὅμεσος δεινοὶ καὶ βοής µεγέθει ἀφόρητοι, 4.127.1 οἱ δὲ βάρβαροι ἰδόντες πολλῇ βοή καὶ θορύβῳ προσέκειντο. The model for the first part of Α.’s simile is II. 4.422–4 ὡς δ᾽ ἐν αἰγιαλῷ πολυηχεῖ κύμα θαλάσσης / ὀρνυτ᾽ ἐπασσύτερον Ζεφύρου ὑπὸ κινήσαντος / πόντῳ μὲν τε πρώτα κορύσσεται; cf. Catull. 64.269–75, Virg. G. 2.105, Gow on Theocr. 16.60. The rowing Argonauts might be compared to the Greeks at Salamis, showing agility and fast movement against overwhelming numbers. The waves of the sea represent the Colchians or Persians, a powerful force, ultimately frustrated in its aims. For similes comparing large armies to waves in Greek and Western Asiatic literature see West (1997) 245.

The switch to a simile is sudden and unexpected. The language is elaborately structured, with alliteration and assonance (κύματα χειμερίου κορύσσεται ἐξ ἀνέμου (κ+χ+ε), 216 περικλαδέος πέσεν, 216–7 φύλλα, φυλλοχόω ἐνὶ μηνί, 217 ὡς οἱ ἀπειρέσιοι ποταμοῦ παρεµέτρεον ὄχθας). For similar effects in a description of natural phenomena cf. Pind. Π. 1.20–2 νιφόεσ’ Αἴτνα, πάνετες χίονος οξείας τιθήνα / τᾶς ἑρεύγοντας µὲν ἀπλάτου πυρὸς ἄγνόταται / ἐκ µυχῶν παγαί. An especially neat effect is the unexpected parenthetical question, also with forceful alliteration (216–17n.).

216–7 ὡς φύλλα χαμάζει περικλαδέος πέσεν ὒλης / φυλλοχόω ἐνὶ µηνὶ (τίς ἄν τάδε τεκµήριατο;) ‘Or as many as the leaves that fall to the ground in a dense wood in the leaf-shedding month – who could count them?’ The accumulated similes enable A. to explore the scene described from every angle. The Colchians are like the waves, but are also compared to falling leaves, numberless but signalling death and futility. Milton does the same when he explores all possible

περικλαδέος is a coinage by A. (περίπυστος: 212–13n.). A. is especially fond of alliteration in π (1.157, 1.169, 1.634, 1.671 and especially 2.937 πρητάτου ποταμοῦ, παρεμέτρεου). For φυλλοχόω ἐνι μηνι cf. [Hes.] fr. 333 M–W φυλλοχόος μὴν, Call. fr. 69.12 Hollis ὁτ’ ἐπλετο φυλλοχόος μείς.

For τίς ἄν τάδε τεκμήριατο cf. Dante Inferno xxviii.1–3 ‘Chi poria mai pur con parole sciolte / dicer del sangue e de le piaghe a pieno / ch’i’ ora vidi, per narrar piu volte?,’ Ecclesiasticus / Sirach 1.2–3 ‘The sands of the sea, the drops of rain, the days of eternity – who can count them?’; the rhetorical questions draws the reader into the passage. Possibly the phrase comes from philosophical debate; cf. Iamb. De vita Pythag. ἀλλὰ μὴν τεκμήριατο ἄν τις καὶ περὶ τοῦ μὴ παρέργωσ αὐτούς τὰς ἀλλοτρίας ἐκκλίνειν φιλίας; with Il. 9.77 τίς ἄν τάδε γηθήσει; and especially Pind. Ο. 2.98–100 ἐπεὶ ψάμιοι ἁριβόμοι περιπέφευγεν; / καὶ κεῖνος ὁσα χάριματ’ ἀλλοις ἐθηκεν / τίς ἄν φράσαι δύνατο;

218–19 ὡς οἱ ἀπειρέσιοι ποταμοῦ παρεμέτρεου δόξας, / κλαγγῇ μαιμώοντες· ‘Like this, the hordes were passing by the banks of the river, screaming in their eagerness.’ The explanation of παρεμέτρεου in Σ (p. 271 Wendel)
παρέπλεον must be wrong. The Colchians are going to an assembly and have not yet set sail (214). In A. παραμετρέω always means ‘pass by’ (cf. 1.595, 1.1166, 2.937). This seems strange until one remembers that δχθαί is the ‘built-up’ bank of a river; cf. Il. 21.171–2.

219–21 ὁ δ᾽ ἐν θυκτῷ ἐνι δίφρῳ / Αἰήτης ἵπποις μετέπρεπεν, οὗς οἱ δισασσεν / Ἡέλιος πνοίησιν ἐειδομένους ἀνέμιο. ‘In his finely-wrought chariot Aietes was resplendent with the horses that the Sun had given as swift as the wind.’ As the early dawn (110–11) fades and the sun raises, so does Aietes, the son of Helios. His son, Apsyrtus, is sometimes known as Phaethon (3.245,1235, 4.598). The present description of Aietes – spear in one hand, torch in the other, a companion in the chariot,– refers to his ancestry; cf. Letta (1988) 606. He is conspicuous (μετέπρεπεν) and so his name comes early in the sentence, while ἐειδομένους, used of his horses, suggests physical similarity with gusts of wind. While the image is not new (Il. 10.437 θείειν δ᾽ ἀνέμοιοι ὁμοῖοι, Il. 16.148–9, 19.415, 20.227, 20.229; see Nagy (1979) particularly chapter 20), the use of ἐειδομένους (Pind. N. 10.15) varies a familiar theme. For the winds as a metaphor for swiftness cf. Finglass (forthcoming) on Soph. OT 467–8.

ἐνι δίφρῳ varies Homeric expressions such as εὔξεστῳ ἐνὶ δίφρῳ (Il. 16.402) ἐνυπλέκτῳ ἐνὶ δίφρῳ (23.335). For the present passage cf. Il. 8.434 = 13.25–6 γέντο δ᾽ ἰμάσθην / χρυσείην ἐειδοκτου, ἐεῦ δ᾽ ἐπεβήσετο διφρου which describes the travels of Zeus and Poseidon respectively. These Homeric allusions connect particularly with the parallel scene at 3.1225–45. During this passage Aietes is explicitly compared to Poseidon (3.1240–45) who is the patron god of Pelias, Jason’s enemy (cf. 1.13) and just as he pursues Odysseus relentlessly, so Aietes will
track Jason and Medea, (231–5n.). The connexion between Poseidon and horses is well known (cf. Stes. frr. 18.4–5, 272 with Davies and Finglass, ad loc., Braswell on Pind. P. 4.45(b)).

For gifts from the gods, especially gifts of horses, see Davies and Finglass on Stes. fr. 2, Heath (1992) 387–400 and Harrison (1991) 252–54, who emphasises the possible destructive nature of these gifts. In Aietes’ case, although he has received the gift of swift horses, they will not help him to catch the fleeing Argo.

222–4 σκαίη μὲν ρ’ ἐνὶ χειρὶ σάκος δινωτὸν ἀείρων, / τῇ δ’ ἐτέρῃ πεύκην περιμήκεα· πάρ δὲ οἱ ἔγχος / ἀντικρὺ τετάνυστο πελώριον.

‘in his left hand, raising his circular shield and in the other a huge torch, and beside him lay his mighty spear, close at hand.’ The Homeric warrior brandishes his spear but uses his shield for protection; cf. Il. 8.424 ἀντα πελώριον ἔγχος ἀείραι, 20.373 ἔγχε ἀείραν. At the moment Aietes is more concerned to light the morning gloom with his torch and burn the Argo than fling his spear after a fleeing Jason. The massive spear reminds us of his prowess as a fighter (cf. the more elaborate description at 3.1225–45), but the torch conveys the imminent threat and its blaze suits the son of the Sun. Latinus, another descendant of the Sun, is similarly described (Virg. Aen. 12.161–4). In such descriptions the contents of the left hand are usually given first; cf. Il. 16.734, Call. Aet. fr. 114.5–6 Harder (of Delian Apollo), where see Harder ad loc., Bühler (1960) 167–8, West on Hes. Th. 179, 44–6n.

In Homer, δινωτός, ‘round’ of a shield only occurs at Il. 13.405–7 (ΣD = van Thiel p. 433 εὖ περιδεδινημένην καὶ κυκλοτερῆ). Similarly he has Il. 7.222 σάκος αἰόλον, 10.149 ποικίλον ἀμφ’ ὀμοιός σάκος, 13.552 σάκος εὐρύ παναίολον; see
Van Wees (1994) 132–3 on Homeric armour and Rengakos (1994) 70 on διυωτός meaning 'round' and 'artfully made'.

Alliteration of π (216–17n.) reinforces the threat that Aietes’ torch presents for the retreating Argo, with a reference to Hector’s attempt to burn the Greek ships in Iliad 15, or to the device on Capaneus’ shield at Aesch. Sept. 432–4 ἔχει δὲ σήμα γυμνὸν ἀνδρα πυρφόρον, / φλέγει δὲ λαμπάς διὰ χερών ὑπλισμένη, / χρυσός δὲ φωνεῖ γράμμασιν “πρήσω πόλιν”.

For the relationship between 3.582 αὐτανδρον φλέξειν δόρυ νῆιον, Call. Aet. fr. 7.32–3 Harder σοῦ[σθε νῆιο]ψ ὡ σφε φέρει / αὐταν[δρον] Ἄλιος ἔστω and the present passage, see Harder (2012) Π 155-6, 159, who argues that it is difficult to decide on priority when comparing similar passages in the Aetia and Argonautica. The motif of Aietes’ wanting to burn the Argo had occurred already in the Naupactica (EGF 7a). Callimachus alludes to the story in passing in a different context (fr. 7.19–21: The return of the Argonauts and the rite at Anaphe). A. fully develops the story at a later date, in response to Callimachus’ more episodic approach.

Hector appears twice with a spear ‘eleven cubits’ long (Il. 6.319, 8.494); see Van Wees (1994) 133. Achilles’ enormous spear is described at Il. 16.141 = 19.388; see De Jong on Il. 22.133–4). Aietes has temporarily put his spear to one side. For τανύω with ἐγχος cf. Od. 15.282–3 ἐδέξατο χάλκεον ἐγχος / καὶ τό ὅ’ ἐπ’ ἱκριόψιν τάνυσεν νεός ἀμφιελίσης. That the spear is to hand, ready for action, is stressed by ἀντικρύ and πελώριον fits with the picture of an Aietes of superhuman stature. It is used of Ἀἰδῆς and Ἄρης at Il. 5.395 and 7.208 and, significantly, of the ἐγχος of Ἄρης at Il. 5.594. At Eur. IT 1325–6 Thoas says οὐ γὰρ ἄγχιπλουν πόρον / φεύγουσιν, ὡστε διαφυγεῖν τούμμον δόρυ.
224–5 ἡνία δ’ ἵππων / γέντο χεροῖν Ἀψυρτος. ‘And Apsyrtus seized in his hands the reins of the steeds.’ For ἡνία δ’ ἵππων cf. Il. 5.851 ἡνία δ’ ἵππων, 8.129 ἡνία χεροῖν, 17.482 ἡνία λάζετο χεροῖν). A adds a lexical rarity (γέντο) and writes χεροῖν (dual; not Homeric) for χερσίν; see Redondo (2000) 134.

For γέντο = εἴλε / εἴλετο cf. Il. 7.264 εἴλετο χειρί, Od. 16.154 εἴλετο χερσίν. Homer has γέντο δὲ χειρί (Il. 18.476), γέντο δ’ ἰμάσθλην (Il. 8.43), Call. h. 6.43 γέντο δὲ χειρὶ; no other part of this verb occurs in extant literature. The section ends, perhaps with sinister significance, by naming Apsyrtus and then switching in the middle of the line to the escaping Argo.

225–7 ὑπεκπρὸ δὲ πόντου ἐταμνεν / νυσὶς ἡδη κρατεροίσιν ἐπειγομένη ἔρετησιν, / καὶ μεγάλου ποταμοῖο καταβλώσκοντι ἱεθρῷ. ‘But already the ship was beginning to cut through the sea, urged on by its strong oarsmen, and the stream of the mighty river rushing down.’ The scene reverts back to the Argo (210–11n.). This disruption of linear narrative is a feature of the literature of the third century. ‘the Aristotelian rules snap like straws . . . Action begins and ends in mid-air’; see Lowe (2000) 98, 129–57 on the changes that the Hellenistic poets introduced and how these had been foreshadowed by the author of the Odyssey.

The unusual ὑπεκπροτάμνω (only in A., though cf. Od. 3.174–5 πέλαγος . . . / τέμνειν, 13.88 θαλάσσης κύματ’ ἐταμνεν with Il. 9.506 ὑπεκπροθέει, 20.147 ὑπεκπροφυγών, Od. 6.87 ὑπεκπρόρεεν) marks the switch to the Argo and stresses that the Argonauts were making the quickest possible getaway. The ship leaps forward as it gathers speed. A. often uses double prepositions (1.30, 983 ἐπιπρό, 1.39 ἀπόπροθεν 2.867 περιπρό, mostly with πρό as the second element; see Redondo (2000) 138, K–G 1.529. This is also underlined by ἡδη marking a change of scene or
stressing the immediate moment: cf. 212–13n., and 

iamque at Virg. Aen. 2.209 fit sonitus spumante salo, iamque arva tenebant

The prominent position of νηῦς makes the Argo into a character in its own right.

The rare καταβλώσκω (only elsewhere at Od. 16.466, 1068) is used instead of κατέρχοµαι (Il. 11.492, Hdt. 2.19, Pl. Cr. 118d, Call. h. 4. 207–8.)

228–30 αὐτὰρ ἀναξ ἄτη πολυπήµονι χεῖρας ἄείρας / Ἡέλιον καὶ Ζῆνα κακῶν ἐπιμάρτυρας ἔργων / κέκλητο, δεινὰ δὲ παντὶ παρασχεδόν ἡπυε λαῷ.

‘But the king in grievous anguish lifted his hands, calling on Helios and Zeus to bear witness to their evil deeds; and, from close at hand, uttered terrible threats against all his people.’ Like Amycus at 2.10 (παρασχεδόν ἐκφατο µῦθον), Aietes utters his threats at short range. The shouts of Polyphemus are similarly described at Od. 9.399 αὐτὰρ ὁ Κύκλωπας μεγάλ᾽ ἡπυεν. Significantly placing his name first (see below on appeals to Zeus and Helios), Aietes is appealing to Helios his father in the same way that Polyphemus, another superhuman figure, appeals to Poseidon (219–21n.); cf. Od. 9.527 εὔχετο, χεῖρ᾽ ὀρέγων εἰς οὐρανάνων. For the resemblances between Polyphemus and Aietes (pride in their ancestry, personal arrogance, and inhospitality that can be dangerous for the recipients) see Regan (2009) 109. The threatening nature of Aietes’ words is emphasised by the frequency of π (ἡπυε with παρασχεδόν, together with the tricolon πάντα ~ πάντα ~ πάσαν; cf. 4.1661–2, Fraenkel on Aesch. Ag. 268, nn. 214–15, 389–90, ). For ἄτη πολυπήµοιν cf. 4.1044 λωβή πολυπήµοιν, Il. 2.111= 9.18 Ζεὺς µε µέγα Κρονίδης ἄτη ἑνέδησε βαρείᾳ and for ἄτη meaning ‘anguish or ‘misfortune’ cf. 233–5n., Hes. Op. 230–1 οὐδὲ ποτ’ ἱθυδίκησι μετ᾽ ἀνδράσι λιµός ὀπηθεὶ / οὐδ᾽ ἄτη and Hdt. 1.44
(of Croesus after the accidental killing of his son) περιηµεκτέων δὲ τῇ συµφορῇ δεινῶς ἐκάλεε μὲν Δία καθάρσιον. There is irony involved in the phrase κακῶν . . . ἔργων, as there are still more evil deeds to come – the death of Apsyrtus.

Similarities have also been noted between Aietes and Antigonos I Monopthalmos, one of the Diadochi renown for his savagery, arrogance and the trust that he placed in his son Demetrius Poliorcetes. Their relationship appears to bear close resemblance to that between Aietes and Apsyrtus; see Regan (2009) 110–19. For a description of Antigonos’ behaviour and characteristics, see Plut. Dem. 2.2, 3.2, 19.3, 27.4. Just as Aietes threatens to burn the Argonauts, along with the Argo, as soon as he meets them (3.582), Antigonos dropped his captured enemy Antigenes into a pit and burned him alive (Diod. 19.44.1–3).

How should ἐπιμάρτυς / ἐπιμάρτυρος be divided here and at II. 7.76 Ζεὺς δ’ ἄμμ’ ἐπιμάρτυρος ἔστω, *Od.* 1.273 θεοὶ δ’ ἐπιμάρτυροι ἔστων and [Hes.] *Scut.* 20? The mss. evidence is divided (Harder (2012) II 629–30). In A. G k m have ἐπιμάρτυρος but SD ἐπὶ μάρτυρας, paraphrased by Σ (p. 272 Wendel) μάρτυρας . . . ἐπεκαλεῖτο (see Livrea and Rengakos (1994) 87). Harder (630) examining the relevant parallels, discerns a difference in emphasis between ‘being present as a witness and something or somebody being a witness’. The latter seems to be true of the present instance, and so ἐπιμάρτυρας is preferable. The structure (ἐπιμάρτυρας between κακῶν … ἔργων) makes it clear that he is focusing attention on the word as a single unit; cf. Hes. *Th.* 595 κακῶν ξυνήονας ἔργων ‘conspirators in evil works’ (also 601–2 ξυνήονας ἔργων ἄργαλέων).

Zenodotus apparently preferred the form μάρτυς (Σ A II. 2.302a = 1 250.19–22 Erbse), while Aristarchus favoured μάρτυρος. As μάρτυς is so common (e.g. *Hom. Hym.* 4.372. and Call. *A.P.* 6.311.2 = 1172 HE μάρτυρα), Campbell (1971) 410 argues that this passage cannot be used as support for Zenodotus’s readings. However, it would be typical of A. to present both sides of a question of Homeric criticism (356–8n.). See also nn. 16–7, 88–90, Rengakos (1993) 86 n. 2) and on the invocations of witnesses in oaths, Hirzel (1902) 23, Sommerstein (2007) 74, 338–40n.

231–5 Aietes’ threats to his people, reported in indirect speech, contrast with Jason’s pre-battle rhetoric (6–9n.). There is a direct connection with his address to the Colchian assembly at 3.579–608, (particularly 3.606 καὶ ἡ ὁ μὲν ἄσχετα ἔργα πιφαύσκετο δημοτέροις). The speech’s violence is intensified by the jerky syntax and word order, the forced antithesis between ‘land and sea’ at 231, the awkward
word order at 232 and the violent change of subject from ἄξουσιν to ἐνιπλῆσει; see Hunter (1993b) 147–8.

The speech characterises a barbarian tyrant uttering imprecations against a band of Greeks; see Williams (1996) 463–4, Mori (2008) 163. Another possible model (228–30n.) may be Thoas at Eur. IT 1422–30 (cf. 1428–9 ὡς ἐκ θαλάσσης ἐκ τε γῆς ἰππεύμασι / λαβόντες with Arg. 4.231–2 and the continuation of Thoas’ speech 1431–3 ύμᾶς δὲ τὰς τῶν δ’ ἱστορας βουλευμάτων, / γυναῖκες, αὐθις . . . / ποινασόμεσθα with 4.9–10. There is a tradition of battlefield rhetoric being reported in indirect speech; cf. Thuc. 4.11.4, 4.96.1, 5.69, 7.5.3–4, 7.69.2 and see Zoido (2007) 141–58 (particularly 143).

231–3 εἰ μὴ οἱ κούρην αὐτάγρετον, ἢ ἀνὰ γαῖαν, / ἢ πλωτῆς εὑρόντες ἐτ’ εἰν ἀλὸς οἴδματι νῆα, / ἄξουσιν ‘that unless they immediately captured his daughter, through their own efforts and brought her to him, whether they found her on land or found the ship, on the swell of the navigable sea.’ Here αὐτάγρετος means ‘immediate capture by one’s own hands or efforts.’; cf. Apoll. Soph. (p. 47 Bekker) s.v. αὐτάγρετα· αὐτόληπτα and ΣβH on Od. 16.148 (II 626.10–12 Dindorf) παραυτά· ἀγρευόμενα. At 2.326, it means ‘own choice’ (Od. 16.148 εὶ γάρ πως εἰη αὐτάγρετα πάντα βροτοῖς; also at Hom. Hym. 4.474 = 489 σοὶ δ’ αὐτάγρετὸν ἐστι δαήμεναι ὀττί μενοινᾶς); see Rengakos (1994) 61–2, 153, 171, 176.

The syntax of ἢ πλωτῆς εὑρόντες is disjointed, conveying Aietes’ anger. For πλωτῆς ‘navigable’ cf. Soph. OC 663 μακρὸν τὸ δεῦρο πέλαγος οὐδὲ πλώσιμον, Hdt. 2.102.8 ἀπικέσθαι ἐς τάλασσαν οὐκέτι πλωτὴν ὑπὸ βραχέων, and the oath
reported at Vettius Valens Astrol. 4.11.48 ἐπιορκοῦσι δὲ τὰ ἑναντία, μήτε γῆ βατὴ μήτε θάλασσα πλωτὴ.


233–5 καὶ θυμὸν ἐνιπλήσει μενεαίνων / τίσασθαι τάδε πάντα,
δαήσονται κεφαλῆσιν / πάντα χόλον καὶ πᾶσαν ἐγὼ ὑποδέγμενοι ἀτὶν. ‘and he will fulfil his angry rage, eager to avenge everything that had happened, they will learn with their heads all his anger and experience the fullest of his misfortune.’ Aietes rages like Achilles seeking revenge at Il. 22.312–3 μένος δ’ ἐμπλήσατο θυμὸν / ἀγρίου. For τίσασθαι τάδε πάντα cf. Hdt. 3.127.2 ἐπεθύμεε τὸν Οροῖτην τείσασθαι πάντων, 4.1.4 τῶν ἀδικημάτων εἴνεκεν, ἐπεθύμησε ὁ Δαρεῖος τείσασθαι Σκύθας; it is the kind of language associated with tyrants such as Dareios, Aietes and Antigonos (228–30n.). For the violent expression, δαήσονται κεφαλῆς cf. Il. 4.161–2 ἀπέτισαν / σὺν σφῆσιν κεφαλῆς, Od. 22.217–8 οἶα μενοινᾶς / ἔρδειν ἐν μεγάροις: σῶ δ’ αὐτοῦ κράαστι τείσεις.

For ἐγὼ ὑποδέγμενοι ἀτὴν cf. Od. 13.310 = 16.189 βίας ὑποδέγμενος ἀνδρῶν. There is no need to alter ἀτὴν to ἀρῆν after the suggestion of West (1963) 12. ἀτὴ means ‘misfortune’ (nn. 228–30, 411–3). By their suffering the Colchians will learn what the king is suffering in losing his daughter and the Fleece. For ἐός used for the third person plural see Rengakos (1993) 116, 279–81n.
Aietes spoke in this way. On that same day the Colchians drew down their ships, and placed their equipment on board, and on that same day put to sea. ὥς ἔφα τ᾽Ἀἰήτης αὐτῷ δ᾽ ἐνὶ ἀτι Κόλχοι / νηάς τ᾽ εἰρύσαντο, καὶ ἄρμενα νησὶ βάλοντο, / αὐτῷ δ᾽ ἡματι πόντον ἁπάσας. 'You would not have said that such a great number made up a naval expedition but a great family of birds screaming over the seas.' These lines seem to be a shorthand version of a traditional epic simile. ‘You would say’ this, if you were an epic poet; cf. II. 4.429–30 οὐδὲ κε φαίης / τόσον νηίτην στόλον ἐμεναι, ἀλλ᾽ οἰωνῶν / ἰλαδὸν ἀσπετον ἐθνος ἐπιθρομέειν πελάγεσιν. ‘You would not have said that such a great number made up a naval expedition but a great family of birds screaming over the seas.’ These lines seem to be a shorthand version of a traditional epic simile. ‘You would say’ this, if you were an epic poet; cf. II. 4.429–30 οὐδὲ κε φαίης / τόσον λαὸν ἐπεσθαί ἔχοντ᾽ ἐν στήθεσι σῷδην, / σιγῇ δειδίότες σηµάντορας; see Hunter (1993b) 132, with bibliography on Homer’s use of κε φαίης.
In Homer the Greeks are silent, while the Trojans are noisy and likened to bleating sheep (II. 4.433–6). A. is imitating this contrast but uses an object of comparison from another simile: II. 3.2–3 Τρώες μὲν κλαγγῇ τ’ ἐνοπῇ τ’ ἱσαν ὅρνιθες ὡς / ἠὔτε περ κλαγγῇ γεράνων πέλει ὑπαρανόθι πρό. Greek order and discipline – the Argonauts go on board in orderly fashion at 4.199–201 – develops into a *topos*, especially with the Persian War when the noisy East encounters the self-controlled West (Aesch. *Pers.* 399–407, Hdt. 7.211, Thuc. 4.126.5 for the Illyrians, 1.49.3, 2.89.9 for discipline in general contrasted with clamour, Pind. *N.* 3.60, Eur. *Phoen.* 1302–3; see Heath (2005) 68).

ἐπιβρομέειν is apparently first in A.; cf. 3.1371 ὀξείῃσιν ἐπιβρομέων σπιλάδεσσιν, 4.908 ἐπιβρομέωνταί ἄκουαί, 4.17 περιβρομέεσκον ἄκουαί, 1.879 περιβρομέεσκον μέλισσαι, 4.787 ἔνθα πάρος δειναὶ βρομέουσι θύελλαι, II. 16.641–2 ὡς ὑπὲρ / σταθμῷ ἐνι βρομέως (v.l. ἐπί). There are similarities with βρέειν and its compounds; cf. II. 17.739 τὸ δ’ ἐπιβρέμει ἵνα ἄνεμοιο, Soph. *Ant.* 591 στόνῳ βρέμουσι δ’ ἀντιπλήγες ἄκται, Ar. *Ran.* 679–81 χείλεσιν ἄμφιλάλοις δεινὸν ἐπιβρέμεται / Θρηκία χελίδων, Arg. 2.323 περὶ στυφελῇ βρέμει ἀκτῇ; see LSJ s.v. βρέμω. It seems possible to distinguish between the two roots (–βρο/–βρεμ), the former usually denoting some kind of buzzing sound, the latter loud noises associated with the sea. A. seems to blur this distinction here and at 3.1371, 4.787. It is difficult to decide whether one should emend or accept that ‘buzzing in the ears’ is a similar sound to that made by sea birds flying over the sea. It is tempting to read ἐπιβρεμέειν; see 16–17n.

241–3 οἱ δ’ ἄνεμον λαϊσηρὰ θεᾶς βουλῆσιν ἄντος / Ὅρης, ὀφρ’ ὀκιστὰ κακὸν Πελίαο δόμοισιν / Ἀιαίη Μήδεια Πελασγίδα
γαίαν ἴκηται ‘Swiftly the wind blew, as the goddess Hera planned, so that most quickly Aeaean Medea might reach the Pelasgian land, an evil to the house of Pelias.’ Hera is the directing deity of the Argonautica and so her name is placed in emphatic first position with immediately following pause. In raising a wind, she is carrying out a duty usually fulfilled by her husband; cf. Od. 9.67 νησί δ’ ἐπώρσ’ ἄνεμον βορέην νεφεληγερέτα Ζεύς, 12.313 ὄρσεν ἐπὶ ζαὴν ἄνεμον νεφεληγερέτα Ζεύς. The elaborate word order of 241 (cf. Il. 14.17 λιγέων ἄνεμων λαιψηρά, – adjective not adverb –, κέλευθα, Hom. Hym. 5.3 ὃθι μιν Ζεφύρου μένος ὕγρον ἀέντος) emphasises that the wind rises because the goddess wishes it (Il. 13.524 Διὸς βουλήσει, Hom. Hym. 4.413, 2.9.)

ὄφρ’ ὀκιστα, a variation on the more common ὀφρα τάχιστα, stresses the speed with which Hera’s plan will be accomplished. It is foreshadowed at 3.1134–6 ως γὰρ τὸδε μῆδετο Ἡρη, / ὀφρα κακὸν Πελίῃ ἱερὴν ἐς ἱερόν ἱκοῖτο / Αἰαίη Μήδεια. The juxtaposition of adjectives, Αἰαίη ~ Πελασγίδα, underlines the theme of barbarian and Greek; cf. Eur. Med. 255–8 483–4, 3.1105–17, 4.360–1, Hunter (1991) 81–99. For κακὸν Πελίαο cf. Pher. fr. 105 EGM ως ἐλθοὶ ἤ Μήδεια τῷ Πελιᾷ κακόν, Pind. P. 4.250 κλέψετε ἡ Μήδειαν οὖν αὐτά, τὰν Πελίαο φονόν. For Πελασγίδα γαῖαν ἴκηται cf. 4.98 Ἑλλάδα γαῖαν ἱκώμεθα (96–8n.). Πελασγίς occurs first at Hdt. 7.42 (Πελασγίη equals Ἑλλάς at Hdt. 2.56). At 4.265 (265–6n.) it is an allusion to the prehistory of Greece and reminds us that the Argonauts’ story takes place before the Trojan War; see Stephens (2003) 190, 270.

244–5 ὥσι ἐνὶ τριτάτῃ πρυμνησίᾳ νηὸς ἔδησαν / Παφλαγόνων ἀκτῆσι, πάροιθ’ Ἀλυος ποταμοῖο. ‘On the third morning, they tied their stern cables to the Paphlagonian shore at the mouth of the river Halys.’ A. shortens the
formulae that Homer uses to describe landings; cf. *Il.* 1.436–7 = *Od.* 15.498–9 ἐκ δ’ εὐνᾶς ἔβαλον, κατὰ δὲ πρυμνήσι’ ἐδησαν’ / ἐκ δὲ καὶ αὐτοὶ βαίνον ἐπὶ ρηγμένι θαλάσσης; also *Il.* 13.794 ἤοι τῇ προτέρῃ, *Od.* 5.390 = 9.76 = 10.144 ἀλλ’ ὅτε δὴ τρίτον ἦμαρ ἐὔπλοδοκομος τέλεο’ Ἡώς. The chief emphasis of the passage is to be the mysteries of Hecate and the poet’s silence about them.

246–50 ἡ γάρ σφ’ ἐξαποβάντας ἀρέσσασθαι θυέεσσιν / ἡνώγει Ἐκάτην. καὶ δὴ τὰ μέν, ὤσσα θυηλὴν / κούρη πορσανέουσα τιτύσκετο, (μὴ τὴς ἱστωρ / εἶη, μὴτʼ ἐμὲ θυμός ἐποτρύνειεν ἁείδειεν) ἄξομαι αὐθήσαι· ‘For Medea had ordered them to disembark and to propiate Hecate with sacrifices. I am in awe to speak of all that the maiden did in preparing these sacrifices (no one must know nor must I let myself be tempted to sing of it).’

One might have expected them to pray to Apollo the god of disembarkation (cf. 1.966 Ἐκβασίῳ βωμὸν θέσαν Ἀπόλλωνι, Malkin (2011) 103, and, for Apollo as a presiding deity of the *Argonautica*, Albis (1996) 46). However, assistance from Hecate has ensured the success of the mission (4.147–8). This makes her the subject of the first aetiological stop of the Argonauts’ return and, with typical Hellenistic irony, the subject of the aition will remain undescribed because the poet rather than the Muses is taking responsibility for the content of his poem. Just as he hesitates at 4.982–92 to narrate an inappropriate myth about Ouranos, here he steps back from full disclosure by reversing an echo of Alcinoos’ description of Demodocus (*Od.* 8.44–5 τῷ γάρ ἡθὸς πέρι δῶκεν ἁοιδήν / τέρπειν, ὡσθ’ ἐποτρύνῃσιν ἁείδειειν).

Mystery rites, such as those of Eleusis and Hecate, were kept secret; cf. Hdt. 2.171, *Hom. Hym.* 2.478–9, Cuypers (2004) 49 and Fantuzzi (2008) 296–7 who
highlights the use of ἂζομαι as signalling a pious act of religious silence (εὐφημία).

There are links between the two cults; see Wasson (2008) 112. Schaaf (2014) 260–7 comparing the mysteries at Samothrace and Callichorus.

A.’s interjection (μήτε . . . ἀείδειν) shows him adopting the role of priest or seer as does Callimachus at the beginning of the Hymn to Apollo; cf. h. 1.5 ἐν δοιῇ μάλα θυμός. For the appeal to θυμός at a lyric moment cf. Aesch. Ag. 992, with Call. Aet. fr. 75.5 Harder, Pind. N. 3.26, O. 2.89, Archil. fr. 128.1 IEG, Cercidas fr. 7.10 CA, Theogn. 877, 1070 IEG, Ibycus fr. 317.5 PMG, Meleager A.P. 12.117.3 = 4094 HE, A.P. 12.141.2 = 4511 HE and Sullivan (1999) 121–47 for θυμός in classical Greek poetry.

250–3 τὸ γε μὴν ἔδος ἐξέτι κείνου, / ὅ ρα θεᾶ ἢρως ἐπὶ ῥηγίσιν ἐδείμαν, / ἀνδράσιν ὀψιγόνοισι μένει καὶ τῆμοι ἰδέσθαι. ‘From that time, however, the shrine which the heroes raised on the beach to the goddess remains till now, a sight for men of a later day.’ Although ἐξέτι κείνου is a Callimachean phrase (h. 2.47, h. 4.275), there is a difference in perspective between the two poets: Callimachus looks back to mythical past, while the Argonauts initiate rituals and cults and leave traces for future generations (ἀνδράσιν ὀψιγόνοις). For other aitia concerning the marks which heroes have left on the physical world cf. 2.717 (temple to Homonoia), 1.1060–1 (tomb of Cyzicus), 2.841 (tomb of Idmon); see Valverde Sánchez (1989) 309–11, Harder (2012) i 24–6, Thalmann (2011) 39–41, Arg. 4.430n.

γε μὴν is adversative (not Homeric but cf. Aesch. Ag. 1378, Soph. OC 587, Dennistont 348) and stresses that although nothing can be said about the ritual in honour of Hecate, the Argonauts physically mark the site with some kind of shrine not an altar (pace Livrea: ‘all’ altare che gli eroi eressero’); for Hecate on the Black Sea,
see Manoledakis (2012) 300 who specifically mentions this passage in connection with a gem (2nd century AD), possibly showing her with Apollo and Artemis, from the southern Black Sea region.

καὶ τῆμος must mean ‘even now’ or ‘even today’ and this usage is difficult to explain. τῆμος usually means ‘then, thereupon’ (LSJ s.v. τῆμος). IG IX/2 517.44 (Larissa, 3rd century BC) τὰ ψαφίσματα τὸ τε ύππρό τὰς γενόμενον καὶ τὸ τάμον has been compared, ‘... the former decree and the present one’. A more plausible explanation may be based on a question of Homeric interpretation; cf. Od. 7.317–20 πομπῆν δ᾽ ἐς τὸδ᾽ ἐγὼ τεκμαίρομαι, ὅφη εὖ εἰδῆς / αὐριον ἐς τῆμος δὲ σὺ μὲν δεδημένον ὑππω / λέξει, οἱ δ᾽ ἐλόωσι γαλήνην, ὅφη ἄν ἰκηι / πατρίδα σήν.

There was discussion about this passage in antiquity; cf. Σ (I 352.6–10 Dindorf) ἐς τῆμος δὲ βέλτιον τοῦτο. Π. ἐν ἐστι τὸ τημόσδε. τὸ δὲ ἐς τὸδὲ καὶ ἐς τημόσδε ταυτὸν δηλοῦσιν, ἀντὶ τοῦ κατ᾽ αὐτὴν τὴν ὥραν, ὡς ἐἰ τις λέγοι, ἄνω ἀνάβηθι ἐπὶ τὴν κλίην. βέλτιον δὲ τοῖς ἄνω συνάπτειν. τὸ τῆμος δὲ οίον εἰς τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον. Ρ.Τ.

Σ not only punctuated the text differently from modern editors (αὐριον ἐς τημόσδε) but also understood the contrast to be ‘tomorrow I shall arrange an escort for you, until this time you will sleep.’ Perhaps he saw τῆμοσδὲ ... λέξει as a parenthesis or he put a full stop after λέξει. Arg. 4.1396–1400 also seems to show that the Odyssey Scholia’s interpretation of τῆμος was known to Homeric Alexandrian critics: ὦ ἐνι Λάδων / εἰσέτι που χθιζὼν παγχρύσεα ρύτεο μήλα / ... τῆμος δ᾽ ἣδη κεῖνος ύφ’ Ἡρακλῆι δαίχθείς, ‘Ladon yesterday was still guarding the golden apples ... now the snake, destroyed by Heracles.’
τοιούτων θεός.

His references to Egypt seem influenced by Herodotus (cf. 2.3.1 καὶ δή καὶ ἐς Ὀῆβας τε καὶ ἐς Ἡλίου πόλιν αὐτῶν τούτων εἰνεκα ἐτραπόμην, ἐθέλων εἰδεναι εἰ συμβήσονται τοῖσι λόγοισι τοῖσι ἐν Μέμφι) and by Plato (cf. 4.279 οἳ δή τοι γραπτὸς πατέρων ἑθέλλοις εἰρύονται with the words of the priest at Tim. 23a εἰ πού τι καλὸν ἢ μέγα γέγονεν ἢ καὶ τινα διαφορὰν ἄλλην ἔχον, πάντα γεγραμένα ἐκ παλαιοῦ τῇ δὲ ἐστὶν ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς καὶ σεσωσμένα).
At 4.272–5 Argos alludes to the story of a mysterious, all-conquering Egyptian king. In the priest’s narrative something similar is described at Pl. Tim. 24ε λέγει γὰρ τὰ γεγραμμένα δόσην ἢ πολίς ύμων ἐπαυσέν ποτε δύναμιν ὑβρεῖ πορευομένην ἅμα ἐπὶ πάσαν Εὐρώπην καὶ Ἀσίαν. The anonymous conqueror mentioned by Argos is usually taken to be the mythical pharaoh Sesostiris. However, in a Ptolemaic context these lines would doubtless be read as a reference to the Ptolemies themselves. Virgil is perhaps doing the same thing at Aen. 6.789 when he makes his own seer Anchises speak of Augustus Caesar, yet to be born. The Latin poet is working in a similar way to A. by creating an imaginary ‘prehistoric’ past (1.1 παλαιγενέων κλέα φωτῶν) to praise and magnify the present régime.

Overall, Argos’ speech is rhetorical and grandiloquent. After Jason, Medea and Phineus he has the most lines of direct speech (J. = 382; M. = 263; Ph. = 172; Arg. = 162). Noteworthy features are the evocation of prehistory 261 οὔπω τείρεα . . . and 282 ἐστι δὲ τις ποταμὸς, the epanalepsis 263–4 Ἀρκάδες . . . / Ἀρκάδες, the high-flown language of 276 πουλὺς γὰρ ἄδην ἐπενήνοθεν αἰῶν, the balancing of Αἶα . . . Αἶαν in 277–8 and the archaic ring of 279 οἱ δὴ τοι γραπτὸς πατέρων ἐθεν εἰρύονται.

257–8 νισσόμεθ’ Ὀρχομενόν τῇν ἔχραεν ὑμιὶ περήσαι / νημερτὴς δὲ μάντις, ὅτῳ ξύμβλησθε πάροιθεν. ‘We were going to Orchomenos, by the route which the truthful prophet whom you recently encountered told you to use.’ νισσόμεθα is imperfect (pace Mooney and Livrea: ‘present for future’) and a variation on 2.1153 νεύμεθ’ ἐς Ὀρχομενόν, describing the destination of Argos and the sons of Phrixos, when Jason and his men first encountered them, travelling there to reclaim their grandfather Athamas’ possessions. Fränkel is right to print νισσόμεθ’, correcting
νεισόμεθ’ (LA; SG ν(ε)σόμεθ’) rather than νεύμεθ’ (Vian; PE). To repeat the opening of 2.1153 would not be in A.’s style. The corruption began when one of the sigmas was omitted.

The Argonauts are not going to Orchomenos in Boeotia, as the last line of the poem shows. The opening to the speech is abrupt. Hence the scholiast’s expansion (ὀντως δὴ τῇ ἐξωτάτῃ ὁδῷ κεχρημένοι, ἦ καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς Ὀρχομενόν ἐπορευόμεθα, πορεύεσθε), which Frankel used to postulate a lacuna unnecessarily. Before Argos begins to speak, Jason and the Argonauts have been discussing an alternative route (254 πλόον ἄλλον) and this phrase is picked up by Argos in the next line. He is about to describe the alternative return route that is hinted at in 2.421 ἐπεὶ δαίμων ἑτερον πλόον ἡγεμονέσθη.

For τὴν ἔχραεν ὑμιμι περῆσαι cf. ll. 6.291–2 ἡγαγε Σιδονίηθεν ἐπιπλῶς εὐρέα πόντου / τὴν ὄδον ἢν Ἑλένην περ ἀνήγαγεν, Pl. Lys. 203α ἐπορεύθησαν τὴν ἐξω τείχους (i.e. ὄδον). For νημερτής ὁδὲ ἑπτις cf. the phrase used of Proteus in the Odyssey, γέρων ἅλιος νημερτής (Od. 4.349, 384, 401) and the similar line at 3.932 ἀκλειῆς ὁδὲ ἑπτις ὁς οὐδ’ ὁσα παῖδες ἱσασιν.

Ξύμβλησθε should be read for the transmitted ξυνέβητε, as συμβαίνω only rarely means ‘meet’; cf. LSJ 9 s.v. 13. The usual Homeric words are ξύμβλημενος (Od. 24.260), ξύμβληται (Od. 7.204), ξύμβλητο (Od. 10.105); cf. LSJ 9 συμβάλλω s.v. 11 3. For the form in A. cf. 1.311 ξύμβλητο, 1253, 4.121 ξύμβλημενος. The corruption resulted from a copyist who did not recognise the verb formed by analogy from Homer.

259–60 ἔστιν γὰρ πλόος ἄλλος, ὃν ἀθανάτων ιερῆς / πέφραδον, οἵ Θῆβης Τριτωνίδος ἐκγεγάσαιν. ‘For there is another route, which the priests
of the immortals who spring from Tritonian Thebes, told of. ‘ἔστιν γὰρ πλόος ἄλλος (cf. Hes. Op. 678 ἄλλος . . . πέλεται πλόος) is a variation for the formula ἔστι δὲ τίς (282–3n.), marking a change in A.’s approach to the geography of the voyage. Phineus had described the tribes and peoples that the Argonauts would encounter; Argos gives directions based on his knowledge of an ancient map. Ethnography has given place to cartography; see further Meyer (2001) 233 n. 83.

Θήβης Τριτωνίδος ἐκγεγάασιν is to be understood as a reference to the city (pace Platt (1918) 139 ‘Thebe, daughter of Triton’); cf. II. 9.381–2 οὔδ’ ὤσα Θηβας / Αἰγυπτιας, and for the singular II. 4.406 Θήβης ἐπταπύλοιο. The general background to the passage is a section of Herodotus where he is consulting priests, designated as coming from a particular city (257–93n.). Stephens (2003) 190, 207 shows that A. uses ‘geographical doublets’ (in this case Boeotian and Egyptian Thebes) not as a recherché literary display but as a way of joining Greek and Egyptian worlds. Vian (1981) 157 n. 260 points out that ἐκγέγαα indicates parentage not origin; Stephens (above) notes, however, that the sense must be priests from the city, not priests who trace their descent from the nymph. Unlike Greeks, in Egypt only the king could have divine ancestors.

261 οὔπω τείρεα πάντα τά τ’ οὐρανῷ ἐλίσσονται. ‘Not yet did all the constellations whirl around the heavens.’ This and the following lines are an attempt to link the prehistory of Greece with that of ancient Egypt, which begins in 2 67.

For the whole line cf. II. 18.485 ἐν δὲ τὰ τείρεα πάντα, τά τ’ οὐρανός ἐστεφάνωται, Hes. Th. 382 ἀστρα τε λαμπετῶντα, τά τ’ οὐρανός ἐστεφάνωται. In the Homeric line, Zenodotus (Σ^IV^ = IV 531.31–2 Erbse) read τά τ’ οὐρανὸν ἐστήρικται ‘the constellations that are fixed in the heaven,’ Perhaps either
he or A. conjectured, or had, in their Homeric texts a further variant οὐρανῷ (see West (2000) app. crit.); cf. II. 4.443 οὐρανῷ ἑστήριξεν, Hom. Hym. 4.11 τῇ δ᾽ ἤδη δέκατος μεῖς οὐρανῷ ἑστήρικτο. Aristarchus, on the other hand, read τὰ τ᾽ οὐρανὸν ἑστεφάνωκε ‘the constellations that garland the heavens’.

A.’s line should be read as a contribution to this debate. εἰλίσσω is a technical term for the movement of the planets; cf. Arat. 265 (of the Pleiades), Arist. Metaph. 998a. As often, he seems to be responding to one of Zenodotus’ more radical critical decisions (nn. 253–6, 356–8), while Aristarchus adopts a more conservative approach.

262–3 οὐδὲ τί πω Δαναῶν ἱερὸν γένος ἤνεν ἀκούσαι / πευθομένοις ‘nor was it possible for enquirers to learn of the sacred race of the Danaans.’ Does πευθομένοις refer to the priests of Thebes, travelling historians such as Herodotus, or Alexandrian geographers such as Timagetus (285–7n.) and Timosthenes (an admiral of Ptolemy Philadelphus III based on Rhodes)? The vagueness adds to the mystery.

For πυνθάνομαι cf. Hdt. 2.2.7 ὡς οὐκ ἐδύνατο πυνθανόμενος πόρον οὐδένα τούτου ἀνευρεῖν, οἳ γενοίτο πρῶτοι ἀνθρώπων. The enjambment gives it added stress; cf. 263, 264, 270, 271, 4.52n. Janko (1982) 30–33 has comparative data for enjambment in Homer, Apollonius and Virgil and shows that its use is notably greater in the two literary poets. For enjambment in Hellenistic poetry and Callimachus, see Harder (2012) 145–7.

263–5 οἱ οὗ δ᾽ ἔσαν Ἀρκάδες Ἀπιδανῆες, / Ἀρκάδες, οἳ καὶ πρόσθε σεληναῖης ύδεουται / ζωείν, φηγὸν ἐδοτες ἐν οὐρεσιν. ‘Only the Apidanean Arcadians existed, Arcadians, who are said to have lived before the moon, eating acorns in the mountains.’ Aristotle said that Arcadia, before the Greeks, had a
population of Pelasgians who ruled the land before the moon was in the sky and that for this reason they were known as Προυσέληνοι (Arist. fr. 591 Rose); cf. Thuc. 1.2 (Arcadians), 1.3 (Deucalion and the Pelasgians), Xen. *Hell.* 8.1.23, 482 τῶν πρόσθε μήνης, Call. fr. 191.56 Pfeiffer εὑρεν ὁ Προυσέληνος.


Callimachus uses Ἀπιδανῆες in a similar way, discussing early Greek mythology at *h.* 1.14 ὡγύγιον καλέουσι λεχώιον Ἀπιδανῆες; similarly Rhianos fr. 13.2–3 *CA* τοῦ δὲ ἐκγένετ’ Ἀπις / ὃς ᾧ Ὄπιν ἐφάτιξε καὶ ἀνέρας Ἀπιδανήας.

There is no certain example of the verb ὑδέω before Callimachus; cf. ὑδείομεν in the sense of ὑμνέομεν at *h.* 1.76, the *Suda* (v 41 = iv. 634.15 Adler) ὑδέουσιν ἠδουσι, λέγουσι which Pfeiffer attributes to the *Hecale* (fr. 372 Pfeiffer = fr. 152 Hollis (see *ad loc.*). In fr. 371 it again has the sense of ὑμνῶ; see Harder (2012) II 437. For the form ὑδέονται cf. 2.528, Arat. 257, Nic. *Al.* 47, 525. After the Alexandrian period there are no more examples. Commenting on fr. 372, Pfeiffer thought that it might be taken from tragedy and noted that Wilamowitz conjectured it in a fragment of Euripides (Hyps. F752g.15). The verb may be based on the Homeric scholarship of the poets concerned; cf. 4.1748 where A.’s use of πεμπάξων to mean ‘thinking, pondering’ may have been based on *Il.* 16.50 οὐτε θεσπροτίης ἐμπάξωμαι where a variant reading, πεμπάξομαι, might have existed. Possibly, ὑδέω is based on a mistaken interpretation of forms from αὐδάω; cf. Maiistas *Aretologia*, 2–3 *CA* ἔργα τὰ μὲν θείας ἀνὰ τύρσιας Αἰγύπτιοι / ἡδηται, ‘your deeds have been
proclaimed throughout the towers of divine Egypt’, while LSJ s.v. ὕδης notes that ὕδεω, ὕδης, ὕδη maybe cognate with αὐδή. It is not surprising that such an interpretation might be forgotten and, ultimately find a home in the Suda gloss which, according to Pfeiffer (see above) ‘does not seem to exist anywhere else’.

For acorns as a food source before the invention of agriculture cf. Pausanias 8.1.6. (describing Arcadia) ‘it was Pelasgos who . . . discovered that the fruit of oak trees was a food’, Lykophrhon Alex. 480–3, Hdt. 1.66, Virg. Aen. 8.318 (a description of the early history of Latium) Evander telling Aeneas that sed rami atque asper victu venatus alebat, Campbell (2002) 16.


265–8 οὐδὲ Πελασγίς / χθὼν τότε κυδαλίμοισιν ἀνάσσετο
Δευκαλίδησιν, / ἡμὸς ὧτ’ Ἡερίη πολυλήιος ἐκλήιστο / μήτηρ
Αἰγυπτῶς προτερηγενέων αἰζηῶν ‘nor at that time was the Pelasgian land ruled by the glorious sons of Deucalion, in the days when Egypt, mother of men of an older time, was called fertile Eerie.’ A. uses a number of geographical markers belonging both to Greece and Egypt. A name and defining characteristic of Egypt here, Ἡερίη is given a Greek context at 1.580-1 Ἡερίη πολυλήιος αἶα Πελασγῶν / δύετο, ‘soon the rich grainlands of the Pelasgians disappeared in the mist.’ ‘Such doublets are a feature of aetiological writing, the Greek marking of a foreign place with familiar Greek names’ (Stephens (2003) 190). Crete, another place, associated with ‘origins’ (Hunter (2008) 110 comparing Virg. Aen. 3.102–117 with this passage) is also called Ἀερία or Ἡερία.
A.’s use of ‘Pelasgian’ is sometimes particular, as at 1.580, and sometimes a general term for the ancient time before the Hellenes, as here (see OCT index s.v. Πελασγίς / Πελασγοί) and this reflects the literary tradition as a whole; cf. Rhianos fr. 13.2–3 CA (263-5n. Απιδανήμες), and A.’s fragmentary κύσις of Rhodes, fr. 10 CA ὡσσα τε γαίης / ἔργα τε Δωτιάδος πρότεροι κάμον Αιμονιής, Dotion being a city in Thessaly – very much Pelasgian country – and the combination πρότεροι Αιμονιής adding the historical colour, as do Απιδανήμες and προτερηγενέων (268).

A.’s different uses of ἡέριος reflect Alexandrian Homeric scholarship; see Rengakos (1994) 93–4, 167, 171–2, 177. In Homer it means either ‘at early dawn’ or ‘misty’ and the former meaning is found at 3.417 when Aietes talks of yoking his bulls ‘early in the morning’. Mooney comments that the ‘hazy ἀήρ’ of Egypt is being contrasted with the αἰθήρ λαμπρότατος of Attica, and indeed at Aesch. Supp. 75 Egypt is called ‘Ἀερίας . . . γᾶς. There is no authority for the word used as a proper name, apart from Et. Mag. (421.11 Gaisford) Ἡερίη· ἡ Ἀἰγύπτος τὸ πρὶν ἐκαλεῖτο. However cf. Call. h. 1.18–19 ἕτι δ’ ἄβροχος ἤνεν ἄπασα / Ἀρκαδίη where Λησηνίς (ά–Ζήν ‘without Zeus’) has been proposed (McLennan (1977) ad loc., arguing that Ἀρκαδίη is an intruded gloss). A’s idea may be similar. He takes a rare Homeric adjective and turns it into a proper name, supposedly, used in antiquity.

For the structure of κυδαλίμοιοιν ἀνάσαστο Δευκαλίδησιν cf. Il. 6.184 Σολύμοιοι μαχήσατο κυδαλίμοιοι and 21.188 πολλοῖσιν ἀνάσασων Μυριμδόνεσσι. The four syllable word at the end of the line echoes the portentousness of the speaker’s statement (cf. 260, 261, 263, 264); cf. Arg. 1.34.

With ἡμοὶς ὅτ’, the second part of the prehistory begins and primeval Greece is linked with ancient Egypt; cf. Theocr. 17.77–80 (with Hunter ad loc.) μιρίαί ἀπειροί τε καὶ ἑθενα μυρία φωτῶν / λήιον ἀλθησκούσιν ὀφελλόμεναι Διός ὁμβρῳ (~
4.270–1) / ἀλλ᾽ οὕτις τόσα φύει, ὡσα χθαμαλὰ Αἴγυπτος, / Νεῖλος ἀναβλύζων διερὰν ὄτε βύσλακα θρύπτει (~ 4.271). The wealth and fertility of Egypt is mentioned in Greek literature, since Achilles’ declaration that he would not yield to Agamemnon, even if he offered him all the riches that ‘pour into Orchomenos, or Thebes in Egypt’ (Il. 9.379–85); see also Aesch. Suppl. 1024–5 μηδ’ ἔτι Νεῖλου / προχοὰς σέβωμεν ὕμνοις.

Callimachus writes in the same way of the birth of Zeus at the beginning of h. 1. He uses the impersonal φασι (4.272 of the story of Sesostris and Call. h. 1.6 of different locations for the birth place of Zeus), mentions the Apidanians and Arcadia, describes a world still in a primitive state (4.261 οὔπω τείρεα παντα and Call. h. 1.18 Λάδων ἀλλ᾽ οὔπω), and uses words like νιώνι (4.277 and Call. h. 1.41) and προτερηγενέες (4.268 and Call. h. 1.57). A. reverses Callimachus’ μέλλειν . . . καλέσθαι (h. 1.19) in his attempt to build a pre-Homeric background for his poem. He uses κλήζομαι rather than καλέω and, by analogy, forms from it a pluperfect ἐκλήσθαι (4.267, 1202). The archaic form and the spondaic ending increase the assonance and sonority of the line.

μήτηρ Αἴγυπτος προτερηγενέων αἰζηῶν, composed of only four words and heavy with long vowels also emphasises the weightiness of Argos’ pronouncements; cf. Soph. Phil. 326 χῇ Σκῦρος ἀνδρῶν ἀλκίμων μήτηρ ἔφυ and Pind. O. 8.1 Μάτερ ὡ χρυσοστεφάνων ἄθθλων Οὐλυμπία.

προτερηγενέων occurs elsewhere only at Antim. fr. 41a Matthews προτερηγενέας Τιτῆνας, Call. h. 1.58. For the possible origin of the word cf. Il. 23.790 οὕτος δὲ προτέρης γενεῆς προτέρων τ᾽ ἀνθρώπων.

A. writes αἰζηῶν, rather than ἀνθρώπων, for its sound and for its elevated tone; αἰζηῶν are διοστεφέες (Il. 2.660, 4.280)
καὶ ποταμὸς Τρίτων εὐρύρροος, ὥτι ἐπὶ πᾶσα / ἀρδεῖται Ἑρίη, Διόθεν δὲ μιν οὐποτε δεῦει / δῆμβρος· ἄλις προχοήσιν ἀνασταχύουσιν ἄρουραι. ‘and the river wide-flowing Triton, by which all Eerie is watered, and never does the rain from Zeus moisten the earth; but from the flooding of the river abundant crops spring up.’ ‘This was what the Nile was called in former times’ comments Σ (p. 277 Wendel). There is no other authority for ‘Triton’ as a name for the river except Lycophron Alex. 576 Αἰγυπτιον Τρίτωνος ἐλκοντῃ ποτόν (also 119). However this is not a matter of literary precedent but an example of metonymy. Callimachus uses ‘Nereus’, through metonymy, to mean the ‘sea’ at h. 1.40. ‘Tethys’, meaning ‘sea’ is a possible reading at Call. Aet. fr. 110.70 Harder, and seems to be how Catullus understood it (66.70) lux autem canae Tethyi restituit; cf. Call. h. 3.44, 231, 1069; see Matthews (2008) 199, Navarro Antolín (1996) 518, Hunter (2006) 67. As well as using ‘Triton’ to mean the Nile, Lycophron has ‘Tethys’ meaning the sea at Alex. 1069. In a passage where A. has used ἡέριος to create an imaginary name for ancient Egypt such a metonymic use of ‘Triton’ would not be out of place; see Priestley (2014) 126–7.

εὐρύρροος is a conjecture of Meineke (1843) 47 for transmitted ‘ἐύρροος’. Although the word does not exist elsewhere (only εὐρυρέων Il. 2.849, 5.545, 2.1261); cf. [Aesch.] PV 852–3 (the further wanderings of Io) ὅσην πλατύρρους Νεῖλος / ἀρδέυει χθόνα. This speech of Prometheus opens with words ‘There is a city Canobus’; Κάνωβος is the title of one of A.’s lost poems. Cf. also Aesch. fr. 300 1–6 TrGF ἐνθὰ Νεῖλος ἐπτάρους / γάνος κυλίνδων ῥευµατων ἐποµβρίαις / ἐν ἂν πυρωπὸν γλῆνος ἐκλάψαν φλόγα / Ἀἴγυπτος ἁγνοῦ νάµατος πληροµυένη / τίκει πετραίαν χίονα· πᾶσα δ’ἐὐθαλής / φερέσβιον Δήµιµτρος ἀγγέλλει
στάχυν. This fragment with its parallels to the present lines (ὅµβρος ~ ἐποµβρίαις; ἀνασταχύσασιν ~ στάχυν and also the general sense of the whole passage) is evidence for A’s knowledge of Aeschylus.

The proverbial fertility of Egypt (cf. Bacchyl. fr. 20B. 14–16 S–M, Ar. fr. 581.15 PCG) is caused by the annual flood (cf. Call. fr. 384.27 Pfeiffer, Strabo 15.1.22–3). The Ptolemies emphasised the richness of the land and used it as an ideological weapon; see Hunter on Theoc. 17.77–85, 95–7.

For ἄρδεται Ἡερίη cf. Σ (p. 276 Wendel), quoting Eur. Hel. 1–3 Νείλου μὲν αἰδε καλλιπάρθενι φοαί / ὡς ἀντὶ δίας ψακάδος Αἰγύπτου πέδου / λευκῆς τακείσης χίονος ύγραίνει γύην, also [Aesch.] PV 852–3, Aesch. fr. 300 TrGF (both quoted above) together with Hdt. 2.13.3, 22.3, Tibull. 1.7.23 Nile pater . . . te propter nulos tellus tua postulat imbres, / arida nec pluvio supplicat herba Iovi.

There is the possibility that A. is playing with possible meanings of δεύω, more usually ‘wet’ or ‘drench’ but also ‘miss, want’ (= δέω, LSJ s.v. δεύω (B)). The latter meaning is more usual as a deponent form but cf. Alcaeus P.Oxy. 1788.15 ii δεύοντος. The Tibullus passage (see above) lends support to this interpretation, as does Eur. Hel. 1–3. Both passages help to resolve Σ’s doubts about the syntax (p. 277 Wendel) ἀµφιβολία περὶ τὴν σύνταξιν). Take ἅλις with the rest of the line, not ὁµβρος, omitting δέ, which was added to avoid the asyndeton, (except in PE). The floods provide sufficient irrigation. See 272–4n. τινὰ φασί for the further significance of Tibullus’ poem.

ἀνασταχύω occurs first in A. but cf. Arat. 1050 συνασταχύσαιν ἅρουραι, II. 23.598–9 ὡς εἴ τε περὶ σταχύσασιν ἔρη / λῃσον ἀλβήσκοντος, ὁτε φρίσσουσιν ἅρουραι.
ἐνθεν δὴ τινὰ φασὶ πέρις διὰ πᾶσαν ὀδεύσαι / Εὐρώπην Ἀσίην τε βίη καὶ κάρτεϊ λαῶν / σφωιτέρων θάρσει τε πεποιθότα· 'From this land, it is said, a king made his way all round through the whole of Europe and Asia, trusting in the might and strength and courage of his people.' It has been generally assumed that Argos means Sesostris, a semi-mythical king of Egypt whose conquests are described in Hdt. 2.102–11. The use of indefinite τινὰ conveys a sense of the distant past, as well as the conjectural vagueness of the style of the earliest geographers; Pearson (1938) 455–6 and Murray (1970) 162 n. 1 for variants of the name of the Pharaoh and Priestley (2014) 144–57 on the links between A. and Herodotus.

There also seems to be an allusion to a contemporary account of Sesostris (Sesoösis) in Hecataeus of Abdera (Diod. Sic. 1.54.1 (= FGrH 264 F 25.54.1) with Murray (1970) 168 n. 9) who explains that Sesoösis before beginning his campaign of world conquest ‘courted the goodwill of all of the Egyptians by generosity and by these means acquired soldiers who were prepared to die for their leaders’; see Stephens (2003) 177. It is certainly how the reference is understood by Σ (p. 277 Wendel) who, calling him Sesonchosis, cites a range of authorities. However, ‘campaigning through Europe and Asia’ and ‘founding many cities’ might also allude to the conquests of Alexander.

In a Ptolemaic context, one also thinks of Dionysus, linked with whom would be Osiris (Fraser (1972) 206). A familiar story connected with both gods is a triumphal trip throughout the known civilised world and the language in which this is described in a passage from Diodorus Siculus (1.27.5), ‘I am Osiris the King, who campaigned to every country, as far the unhabited regions of the Indians and those who lie in the far north, as far as the sources of the River Ister and back to the other areas as far as Ocean’ is similar to the present passage. For this language of the

For Ἑὐρώπην Ἀσίην τε cf. Bühler on Mosch. *Eur.* 9 Ἀσίδα τ’ ἀντιπέρην, adding Catull. 68.89 *Asiae Europaeque.* The landmass, according to ancient geographers was divided into three continents, Europe, Asia and Africa. Both Herodotus and Eratosthenes seemed to deny the usefulness and validity of these divisions (Hdt. 4.45.6, Strabo 1.4.7, Fraser (1972) 530) in a world where geographical knowledge, due to the impetus provided by Alexander’s conquests was constantly increasing; cf. the Egyptian priest at Pl. *Tim.* 24α πορευομένην ἄμα ἐπὶ πᾶσαν Ἑὐρώπην καὶ Ἀσίαν; and Herodotus describing Sesostris’ triumphal tour at 2.103.

According to Herodotus (2.103), Sesostris is supposed to have marked his conquests with statues of himself inscribed with the words ἐγὼ τὴνδε τὴν χώρην ὀμοίοι τοῖς ἐμοῖσι ἐκτησάμην. A.’s words are a reversal of this phrase. The mysterious leader is collegiate just like Jason at 3.173–4 ξυνὴ γὰρ χρειώ, ξυνοὶ δὲ τε μὴθοι ἔσαιν.

For the combination βίη and κάρτος cf. *Od.* 13.143, 18.139 βίη καὶ κάρτεϊ ἔικων, *Il.* 8.226, 17.329. For this type of variation depending on sound and association cf. Merkel (1854) **XXXVIII–XLIV**, (on the same thing in Callimachus), De Jan (1893) 23, and Edwards (1971) 74 for the origins of this technique later developed by the Hellenistic poets. For A.’s freedom in the use of σφωίτερος see Rengakos (1993) 118–19 and (2002), noting that it may be related to Antimachus fr. 8 Matthews. Antimachus seems to have been the first to use this possessive as a third person, although he preserved its dual nature. A. is more indiscriminate in its use: second person singular (= σός) at 3.395, third singular (= ὅς) at 1.643, 2.465, 544, 763, 3.335, 600, 625, 1227, third person plural (= σφός, σφέτερος) at 1.1286, 4.454.
274–6 μυρία δ’ ἄστη / νάσσατ’ ἐποιχόμενος, τὰ μὲν ἦ ποθι
ναιετάουσιν, / ἥ ἰ ὁῦ· ‘and countless cities did he found wherever he came, of which some are still inhabited and some not.’ Cf. Sesostris’ travels and conquests described at Hdt. 2.106 combined with the description of the foundation of Colchis at 2.103 (272–4n.).

While, on the one hand, A. specifically places Sesostris’ city founding in a primeval time, before the constellations, before the moon, μυρία δ’ ἄστη could be a reference to the 33,333 cities of Ptolemaic Egypt (Theocr. 17.82–4), which according to Hunter ad loc. is a number that derives from Hecataeus of Abdera (cf. Diod. Sic. 1.31.7–8) and evokes the Egyptian and Ptolemaic passion for counting and census making. It might also contain a reference to Herodotus’ opening (Hdt. 1.5.3–4) in which he says that he will describe how some cities have become great and others small: ὁμοίως σμικρά καὶ μεγάλα ἄστεα ἀνθρώπων ἐπεξιώνυ. τὰ γὰρ τὸ πάλαι μεγάλα ἦν, τὰ πολλὰ σμικρά αὐτῶν γέγονε· τὰ δὲ ἐπ’ ἐμεῦ ἦν μεγάλα, πρότερον ἦν σμικρά.

276 ποιλύς γὰρ ἀδὴν παρενήνοθεν αἰών. ‘A great age has passed by since then.’ The Ionicism ποιλύς is appropriate in a passage with an Herodotean background. Read παρενήνοθεν for transmitted ἐπενήνοθε. At Il. 2.219 ψεδωὴ δ’ ἐπενήνοθε λάχνη (similar is Il. 10.134) and Od. 8.364–5 the word means ‘to be upon the surface of’ (cf. Apollon. Soph. s.v. (p. 71 Bekker) ἐπενήνοθε ἐπτήν· ἐπέκειτο). There is no connection between this and A.’s desired meaning ‘for a long age has passed’. A. is using the compound of the rare ἐνήνοθε to emphasise the elevated nature of Argos’ discourse (see Richardson on Hom. Hym. 2.279). For less elevated
expressions concerning ‘the passage of time’ cf. Hdt. 2.86 ἐπεὰν δὲ παρέλθωσι αἱ ἕβδομηκοντα (sic. ἢμεραί), Eur. fr. 1028.2 TrGF τὸν τε παρελθόντ’ . . . χρόνον; also Soph. Tr. 69, Pl. Prt. 310a, Xen. Cyr. 8.8.20. παρενήνοθεν occurs elsewhere in A. as a coinage at 1.664 (Hypsipyle) παρενήνοθε μῆτις (cf. Σ (p. 58 Wendel) ἀντὶ τοῦ παρελήλυθε). There is a similar mss. confusion at Eur. Ba. 16 ἐπελθὼν ~ παρελθὼν where Dionysus is describing a similar triumphal progress to that of Sesostris, (see 272–4n.).

277–8 Αἶα γε μὴν ἐτὶ νῦν μένει ἐμπεδον, ύωνοι τε / τῶν ἀνδρῶν
οὐς ὡς γε καθίσατο ναιέμεν Αἴαν. ‘On the other hand, Aia remains unshaken even now and the sons of those men whom that king thus settled to dwell in Aia.’ For adversative γε μὴν see 250–3n. and cf. Hdt. 1.1.1 καὶ οἰκησαντες τοῦτον τὸν χώρον καὶ νῦν οἰκέουσι ‘having settled in the land where they continue even now to inhabit’ (the Phoenicians’ first colonisations). For more Herodotean references to Aia cf. 1.2.2, 7.193.2 ἐπὶ τὸ κόσας ἐπλεον ἐς Αἴαν τὴν Κολχίδα, 7.197.3 ἐξ Αἴης τῆς Κολχίδος.

Aia was originally a mythical land in the far east; see Vian (1987) 250, West (2005) 62. It was the golden home of the rising sun; cf. Mimn. fr. 11a 1–3 IEG

Αἰήταο πόλιν, τόθι τ’ ὦκεός Ἡλίοιο / ἀκτίνες χρυσέω χείστα ἐν ϑαλάμῳ / Ὀκεανοῦ παρὰ χεῖλος, ἵν’ ῥἀχετο θεῖος Ἱησοῦ. The earliest evidence of its identification with Colchis is Eumelus Corinthica fr. F26–8 EGF; cf. Soph. fr. 915 TrGF εἰς Αἴαν πλέων on which Σ says (Steph. Byz. 37.1) Αἴα, πόλις Κόλχων . . . ἔστι δὲ καὶ Θετταλίας ἄλλη, ης μέμνηται Σοφοκλῆς τῆς μὲν προτέρας λέγων “εἰς Αἴαν πλέων” τῆς δὲ δευτέρας οὕτως “ἔστιν τις Αἰα Θεσσαλὼν παγκληρία”.

‘Aia, a city of the Colchians . . . there is another ‘Aia’ in Thessaly. Sophocles
mentions the first one saying ‘sailing to Aia’ and the second one in this way ‘There is a place called Aia, a settlement of the Thessalians’. This is a unique reference to a Thessalian ‘Aia’ and one in which A. might have been interested as establishing a Greek hinterland for his Ptolemaic patrons, even though in these lines he is implying that Sesostris, an Egyptian ruler, founded Colchis. See 257–93n. and Stephens (2003) 189–90.

ἔτι νῦν μὲνεὶ ἐμπεδοῦ is part of an implicit comparison with Egypt. The stability of its institutions and its use of writing (279 γραπτοῦς / γραπτὺς) were defining characteristics of Egypt; cf. Pl. Phdr. 274c5–75b1, Tim. 21e24, Leg. 700a–701b.

Read οὗς ὡς for the MS. ἄγε; cf. Hdt. 2.154 Ψαμμήτιχος μὲν νυν οὐτῶ ἔσχε Αἴγυπτον ‘Thus then Psammetichos obtained Egypt’, Arg. 2.528 καὶ τὰ μὲν ὡς υδέωνται; ‘and these things are told in this way’. ὡς in this line is the concluding ὡς and refers back to the policy of conquest and colonisation described in 275. For γε used to modify a subordinate clause cf. Soph. OT 715 καὶ τὸν μὲν, ὡσπερ γ’ ἢ φάτις, ξένοι ποτὲ / λησταὶ φονεύουσ’ ἐν τριπλαῖς ἄμαξιτοῖς. The mss. reading is unmetrical and not comparable with 4.282 ἔστι δὲ τις ποταμὸς where the last syllable μός has been lengthened by ictus and position (Mooney p. 424). Fränkel (OCT) pointed out that usually printed ὅσγε does not exist as a demonstrative pronoun in either A. or Homer. Erbse (1963) 27 ‘since ὡς is possible in Epic poetry, then so is ὅσγε’ is not convincing.

For ναίεμεν Αἶαν cf. Il. 15.190 πολιήν ἀλα ναίεμεν αἱεὶ with Eur. Med. 2 and 277–8n., 272–4n. κάρτει λαῶν. There is a similar anagrammatic and assonantal pattern at Philitas fr.12.3 Lightfoot ἀμφὶ δὲ τοι νέαι αἰεὶ ἀνύαι τετρῆχασιν.
For the epanalepsis (here with polyptoton) see 263–4n. and cf. Call. h. 5.40–1

Κρεῖον δὲ ής ὄρος ὡκίσατο / Κρεῖον ὄρος. A.'s use of repetition here may be Herodotean imitation; see Baragwanath and De Bakker (2012) 134–5.

279–81 οἳ δὴ τοι γραπτοὺς πατέρων ἔθεν εἰρύονται / κύρβιας, οἷς ἐνι πᾶσαι ὁδοὶ καὶ πείρατ' ἔσιν / ὕγρης τε τραφερῆς τε πέριες ἐπινισσομένοισιν. 'They who preserve the writings of their fathers, engraved on pillars, upon which are marked all the ways and the limits of sea and land for those who journey on all sides round.' Cf. Herodotus describing Aristagoras of Miletos, asking Cleomenes of Sparta for military assistance: ἔχων χάλκεον πίνακα ἐν τῷ γῆς ἀπάσης περιόδος ἐνετέτμητο καὶ βάλασσά τε πᾶσα καὶ ποταμοὶ πάντες (Hdt. 5.49); also Pl. Tim. 23a quoted on 257–93n., Diog. Laert. 5.51.10 ἀναθεῖναι δὲ καὶ τοὺς πίνακας ἐν όισι σι τῆς γῆς περιόδοι εἰσιν. The added significance of these pillars lies in the fact they preserve knowledge that comes from Egypt through the Colchians, who, according to Herodotus, (Hdt. 2.104) were descended from the Egyptian conquerors under Sesostris; see Thalmann (2011) 43. The description is part of the cartographical theme, which runs throughout the Argonautica, particularly the latter half; on maps and narrative, see Purves (2010) 119.

Read γραπτοὺς . . . κύρβιας with Wellauer (see his note ad loc.). It creates an enjambment of the type frequent in Argos' speech. γραπτός, printed by Fränkel, is a Homeric hapax (cf. Od. 24.229 where Laertes is described in his garden: κνηδίδας ῥαπτάς δέδεω, γραπτός ἀλεείνω ' . . . to save him from the scratches'). It also occurs in a papyrus fragment of Eratosthenes' Hermes γραπτὸς ἀνθρώπω [ (fr. 397 col. ii 1 SH with note ad loc.), which seems to have some connection with writing. For κύρβιας cf. Σ on Ar. Nub. 448 ὡς Ἑρατοσθένης φησίν, ἀξεύων Ἀθήνησιν οὔτω
καλούμενος, ἐν ὧν οἱ νόμοι περιέχονται ‘as Eratosthenes says (referring to κύρβεις in the text of Aristophanes) this was what the revolving block was called at Athens on which the laws were preserved’. Davis (2011) 17, discussing the evidence about κύρβεις, concludes that they were widely employed throughout the Greek-speaking world in the sixth century BC to early fifth century to carry any authoritative text. A.’s use of the word here enhances the antiquity of his description.

There are also traces of a scholarly discussion of γραπτὺς at Apollon. Soph. Lex. Homer. s.v. (p. 55 Bekker) γραπτὺς· τὰς ἀμύξιν καὶ καταξύσεις· κυμηίδας γραπτὰς (v.l. in the Odyssey passage quoted above for ῥαπτὰς) δέδετο, γραπτὺς ἀλεεῖνων. τοιοῦτο καὶ τὸ “ἐπέγραψε χρόα φωτός” καὶ “νῦν δὲ μ’ ἐπιγράψας ταρσῷ” καὶ “γράψας ἐν πίνακι πυκτῷ θυμοφόρα πολλά,” οίνον ἐγχαράξας σημεῖα πολλά, which after glossing γραπτὺς with an explanation, (‘tearing and scrapping’) tries to make a link between the Homeric use of ἐπιγράψω ‘graze’ and γράφω ‘write’ such as the line “he grazed the skin of a man (Il. 4.179)” and “now you have grazed me on the foot” and having written on a folded tablet many soul-destroying things (Il. 6.169)” that is to say you have engraved many signs’.

The ancient critics, perhaps beginning with A. himself, were puzzled by the strange Homericism ‘γραπτὺς’ and tried to explain it by linking it with a more explicable root (γραφαί / γραπταί). This possibility is reinforced by Athen. 10.451d (II 481.17–19 Kaibel) ‘And Achaeus the Eretrian . . . sometimes makes his language obscure, and says many things in an enigmatic way; for instance, in his ‘Iris’ (1.20 F 19 TrGF), a satyr play, he says: “ a flask made of litharge full of ointment was suspended from a Spartan tablet, written upon and twisted on a double stick”, meaning to say a white strap, from which a silver flask was suspended; and he has spoken of a Spartan written tablet (γραπτὸν . . . κύρβιν) when he merely meant the
Spartan 'scytale' (a Spartan method of sending dispatches). And that the Lacedaemonians put a white strip of leather, on which they wrote whatever they wished, around the "scytale" we are told plainly enough by Apollonius Rhodius in his treatise on Archilochus. In view of the evidence that A. wrote about a related textual point (Archil. fr. 185 IEG ἀχνυμένη σκύταλη), we should see A.'s γραπτούς . . . κύρβιας as his interpretation of a difficult word, which has been mistakenly corrected by a particularly learned scribe who remembered the Homeric parallel. On Achaeus the Eretrian and the Spartan Scytale see S. West (1988) 42–8.

There are five forms of the gen. of the 3rd pers singular pronoun in A. ἔθεν, εἶο, ἐου, ἔοιο, and οῦ (in the combination οῦ ἔθεν). ἔθεν is used not only for the 3rd person singular reflexive (e.g. 2.973), but also here for the 3rd person plural. It adds an appropriate archaic tone to Argos’ description of ancient times; see Rengakos (1993) 112, (2002).

The same is true of the rare use of ἐιρύομαι to mean ‘guard, protect, preserve’, based on II. 1.238–9 δικασπόλοι, οἵ τε θέμιστας / πρὸς Διὸς εἰρύαται where εἰρύαται is explained as an Ionicism for εἴρυνται, a perfect form with present sense, ‘have guarded and still guard’.

For πείρατ' ἔσαι cf. Hes. Th. 738 ἔξείης πάντων πηγαί καὶ πείρατ' ἔσαι. The more usual phrase is πείρατα γαῖς, often associated closely with Oceanus; cf. II. 14.200, Od. 4.563, 11.13, Hes. Th. 518, Op. 168–71, Hom. Hym. 5.227. As part of the variation A. has added another epic phrase ἐπὶ τραφερῆν τε καὶ υγρῆν changed from its more usual accusative form (II. 14.308, Od. 20.98, Hom. Hym. 2.430); see Thalmann (2011) 43 n. 58 on ‘wet and dry’ as a polar expression in Homer, where it often describes the area over which the gods travel.
For πέριξ cf. Hdt. 4.36 γελῶ δὲ ὤρεος γῆς περιόδους γράφαντας πολλοὺς ἡδη καὶ οὐδένα νόον ἐχόντως ἐξηγησάμενον· οἱ Ψικεανόν τε ἰέντα γράφουσι πέριξ τὴν γῆν ἐούσαν κυκλοτερέα ὡς ἀπὸ τόρνου, καὶ τὴν Ἀσίην τῇ Εὐρώπῃ ποιεύσαντων ἵσην. Argos, in describing his own ancient engraved map, stresses that he, like Herodotus, holds the key to accurate information.

282–3 ἦστι δὲ τὶς ποταμὸς, ὑπατόν κέρας Ψικεανότητα / εὐρύς τε προβαθῆς τε καὶ ὀλκάδι νηὶ περῆσαι· ‘There is a river, the uppermost horn of Ocean, broad and exceeding deep, crossable in a merchant ship.’ This type of scene-setting goes back to Homer (cf. Il. 11.721 ἦστι δὲ τὶς ποταμὸς Μινυήτος εἶς ἀλα βάλλων, 6.152 ἦστι πόλις Ἑφύρη μωιξῆ Ἀργεος) and then occurs in tragedy where the style is close to epic (e.g. Aesch. Pers. 447 νῆσος τὶς ἦστι, Eur. Hipp. 1199 ἀκτή τὶς ἦστι τούπεκείνα τῇδε γῆς, Eur. El. 1258 ἦστιν δ᾽ Ἀρεώς τὶς ὁχῆς). The device was taken over by the Hellenistic and Latin poets; cf. 1.1117, 2.360, 927, 3.1085, Antim. fr. 2 Matthews ἦστι τὶς ἡμειόδεις ὀλιγος λόφος, Aratus 233, 311, Virg. Aen. 1.159, 7.563, 4.481–2 (with a variation by Call. on the traditional word order: h. 4.191 ἦστι διειδομένη τὶς ἐν ὕδατι νῆσος ἀραιῆ).

For ὑπατον κέρας cf. Σ (p. 210 Wendel) 2.1211 who mentions Herodorus (c. 400 BC) from Heraclea on the Pontic coast: περὶ δὲ τοῦ τὸν Τυφῶνα ἐν αὐτῇ κεῖσθαι καὶ Ἡρόδωρος ἱστορεῖ ἐν ὧ καὶ τὴν Νύσαν ἱστορεῖ· ἦστι δὲ τὶς Νύση ὑπατον κέρας ἀνθέου χελη / τηλοῦ Φοινίκης ἑχεὶν Αἰγύπτοι ῥοῇ. ‘Herodorus tells the story of Typhon lying in it (Lake Serbonis) in the work in which he also tells the story of Nysa: there is a certain Nysa, mountain high, with forests thick, in far off Phoenicia, close to Aegyptus’ streams.’ The sense has been considered incomplete; see Allen (1904) 4 who mentions that a reference to Homer
may have dropped out. Herodorus, however, wrote in prose and the line is correctly identified as a variant of Hom. Hym. 1.8–9 ὑπατὸν ὄρος at Diod. Sic. 1.15.4, Fowler, EGM II § 1.6.2. Although the Alexandrian critics did not use evidence in their textual work from the hymns, not considering them to be Homeric (Richardson (2010) 32), they imitated them in their poetry; cf. Hom. Hym. 4.228 ὄρος καταείμενον ὕλη with Call. h. 1.11 ἔσκεν ὄρος θάμνῳς περισκεπές.

κέρας Ὠκεανοῖο is a reversal of the beginning of Hes. Th. 789. See West (1966) who states that the metaphor is probably connected with the representation of rivers as bulls (cf. Eur. Or. 1378, Jones (2005) 11, 43 n. 1).

For νῆι περῆσαι cf. Hdt. 4.47–8 ποταμοὶ τε δι’ αὐτῆς ρέουσι . . . ὤσοι δὲ ὀνομαστοί τε εἰδί αὐτῶν καὶ προσπλωτοί ἀπὸ θαλάσσης . . . Ἰστρός μὲν, ἔως μέγιστος . . . ρέει καὶ θέρεος καὶ χειμώνος, πρῶτος δὲ τὸ ἀπ’ ἐσπέρης τῶν ἐν τῇ Σκυθικῇ ρέων, 5.52 ἐστὶ ποταμὸς υμισιπέρητος.

284 Ἰστρον μιν καλέοντες ἑκὰς διετεκμέραντο. ‘they call it Ister and have marked it far off.’ The Greeks had known about the lower reaches of the Ister for a long time. Hdt. (4.48) describes the Ister as the most important of the rivers known to him and located its sources in the land of the Celts: (quoted above). On the popularity in general of Herodotus in the Hellenistic Era, see Murray (1972) 213 who notes that Herodotus heavily influenced Hecataeus of Abdera, who glorified ‘the land of Egypt’, presenting it ‘as the source of all civilisation and the ideal philosophical state’. The suggested structure of Hecataeus’ work—‘Firstly, the archaeologia, prehistory . . . the mythical period . . . then perhaps a geographical section’ finds a number of echoes in Argos’ speech.

ἐκάς διετεκµήραντο refers to the primitive maps denoted by γραπτύς (γραπτούς) / κυρβιας in 279–80. ἐκάς (and ὑπατω in 282) must refer to the river as the ὑπατων κέρας Ὀκεανοῖο, marked at the outer limits of the map, Ocean being the great river encompassing the earth and the source of all other rivers (West on Th. 789).

285–7 ὅς δὴ τοι τείως μὲν ἀπείρονα τέµνει ἀρουραν / εἰς ὦιος, πηγαὶ γὰρ ὑπὲρ πνοιῆς βορέαο / Ῥιπαῖοις ὑπὲρ ὁρέσσιν αἰπόπροβι μορμύρουσιν. ‘which for a while cuts through the boundless pasture alone in one stream; for beyond the blasts of the north wind, far off in the Rhipaean mountains, its springs bubble forth.’ ἀπείρονα . . . ἀρουραν is a combination of ἀπείρονα γαιαν (final sedes at Il. 7.446 and often) and ζείδωρον ἀρουραν (final sedes at Od. 5.463 and often).

Read τέµνει (with Fränkel ad loc.) rather than transmitted τέµνετ’, which as a present middle form with elision is difficult to parallel; cf. Od. 3.175 δεῖξε, καὶ ἡνώγει πέλαγος μέσον εἰς Εὐβοιαν / τέµνειν, Pi. P. 3.68 ἐν ναυσὶν μόλου ἱονίων τάμυνων θάλασσαν, Hdt. 2.33 ὁ Νεῖλος καὶ μέσην τάμυνων Λιβύην, Eur. El. 410–1 ἀμφὶ ποταμὸν Τάναν Αργείας ὄρους / τέµνουτα γαίας Σπαρτιάτιδὸς τε γῆς.

More Herodotean reminiscences complete these lines. For εἷς οἶος cf. 2.17 ῥέει εἷς ἐὼν ὁ Νεῖλος and for πηγαὶ 1.189 Γύνδη ποταμῶν, τοῦ αἱ μὲν πηγαὶ ἐν Ματηνοῖσι ὄρεσι, ῥέει δὲ διὰ Δαρδανέων, ἐκδιδοῖ δὲ ἐς ἔτερον ποταμὸν Τίγρην.

For ὑπὲρ πνοιῆς βορέαο cf. Il. 5.697 περὶ δὲ πνοή Βορέαο, 15.171 ὑπὸ ριπῆσ
αἰθρηγενέος Βορέα, Bacchyl. 5.46 ρίπα τ' γὰρ ἵσος Βορέα. There is word play between πνοιῆς Βορέα and Ριπαίοις ἐν ὀρέσσιν. The blasts (ρίπα) of Boreas were supposed to come from these mythical mountains; cf. Soph. OC 1248, Virg. G. 1.240

**Scythiam Riphaesque arduus arces.**


ἐκ τῶν Ῥιπαίων ὀρῶν, ἀ ἐστι τῆς Κελτικῆς, εἶτα ἐκδίδοναι είς Κελτῶν λίμνην, μετὰ δὲ ταύτα εἰς δύο σχίζεσθαι τὸ ὕδωρ, καί τὸ μὲν εἰς τὸν Εὔξεινον πόντον εἰσβάλλειν, τὸ δὲ εἰς τῆν Κελτικὴν τάλασσαν. ἰδιὰ δὲ τοῦτο τοῦ στόματος πλεύσαι τοὺς Ἀργοναύτας· καὶ ἐλθεῖν εἰς Τυρρηνίαν. κατακολουθεῖ δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ Ἀπολλώνιος, Call. Aet. fr. 186.8–9 Harder ὑἷες Ὑπερβορέων Ῥιπαίου πέπουσιν ἀπ' οὖρεος.

288–90 ἀλλ' ὀπόταν Θρηκῶν Σκυθέων τ' ἐπιβήσεται οὖρων, / ἐνθα διαὶ τὸ μὲν αὕθι μετ' ἡοίην ἄλα βάλλει / τῇδ' ὕδωρ. 'But when it enters the boundaries of the Thracians and Scythians, here, dividing its stream into two, it sends its waters partly into the eastern sea.' Cf. in general Herodotus' description of the course of the Ister (284n.).

In view of Hdt. 4.125 μὴ ἐπιβῆσειν τῶν οὔρων, Pl. Leg. 778ε ως δῇ τῶν ἱδρῶν τῆς χώρας οὐκ ἐάσοντας ἐπιβῆσειν, read οὖρων for the mss. οὖρους. The genitive was probably altered by a scribe who wished to avoid three consecutive genitives, but cf. 2.125 λάθρῃ ἐυρρίνων τε κυνῶν αὐτῶν τε νομῆων. The accusative is found with ἐπιβῆσειν in the sense of 'go to a place' (LSJ III). The
parallels are not as close (Hdt.7.50, Soph. Aj.144). For ἐπιβαίνειν with the genitive in A. (not the accusative) cf. 2.875, 3.869, 1152, 4.458.

For διχῇ with σχίζω cf. Pl. Tim. 21e ἐπεί γὰρ κυριαὶ σχίζεται τὸ τοῦ Νεῖλου ρέμα, Hdt. 1.75 ἐσχίσθη ὁ ποταμός, 2.17 (285–7n.).

The second mss. ἐνθα seems awkward. Read αὖθι and cf. 1.303 ἀλλὰ σὺ μὲν νῦν αὖθι μετ’ ἀμφιπόλοισιν ἐκηλοσ, 1.315 ἀλλ’ ἡ μὲν λίπτετ’ αὖθι παρακλιδόν. The passage is to be construed ἐνθα διχῇ . . . σχίζομενος, τὸ μὲν αὖθι . . . τὸ δ’ ὀπισθε. Perhaps the scribe had the common Homeric tag ἐνθα καὶ ἐνθα in mind. The conjecture is also supported by Σ on 282–91b (p. 281 Wendel) σχίζεται εἰς δύο καὶ τὸ μὲν αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν Ἑὔξεινον πόντον βάλλει, τὸ δὲ ἐτερον εἰς τὴν Τρινακρίαν θάλασσαν. The scholiast’s τὸ μὲν αὐτοῦ strongly suggests that he had αὖθι in his text. For similar corruptions cf. Eur. Tro. 1098–1100 and also [Hes.] fr. 276 M–W.

Read ἡοίην for transmitted ἱονίην. An allusion to the Pontos is required. Wilamowizt’s μεθ’ ἡμετέρην ((1924) 187) is possible because of the contrast created with 292–3 γαίῃ ὡς ὑμετέρη. However the paraphrase in Σ (p. 280 Wendel) on which it is based εἰς τὴν καθ’ ἡμᾶς θάλασσαν seems to refer to the Mediterranean. ἡοίην (Gerhard) 1816 80–82 or ἡοίην (Platt (1914) 42) is preferable; see Delage (1930) 201 and cf. 2.745 εἰς ἀλα βάλλων / ἡοίην.

290–3 τὸ δ’ ὀπισθε βαθὺν διὰ κόλπον ἱπσιν / σχιζόμενος πόντου Τρινακρίου εἰσανέχοντα, / γαίῃ ὡς ὑμετέρῃ παρακέκλιται, εἰ ἔτεον δὴ / ὑμετέρης γαίῆς ἁχελώιος ἔξανίησιν. ‘and behind it the other branch flows through a deep gulf that connects with the Trinacrian sea, that sea which lies along your land, if indeed Achelous flows forth from your land.’ One ancient name of Sicily, referring to its triangular shape, was Trinakria (Thuc. 6.2.2), and A.’s ‘deep
gulf’ is the Adriatic (Σ 289–9 1d = p. 281 Wendel). Perhaps A. had in mind the myth of Arethusa the nymph who changed into a Syracusan spring to escape the hunter Alpheios, who pursued her from Western Greece to Sicily in the form of a submarine river (Σ Pind. Nem. 1.3, Paus. 5.7.2). A. seems to think that the western branch of the Ister similarly flowed under the Adriatic, either to join up with the Acheloos or else, like the Alpheios, to Sicily; cf. Strabo 6.2.4 who discusses the topic of submerged rivers; see further Green (1997) 305–6.

Instead of διὰ Fränkel suggested either μετά, πρὸς or ποτί, troubled by A’s ideas about how rivers meet the sea. However, the Ister joins the Πόντος Τρινακρίος by way of a deep gulf or bay (κόλπος). For εἰσανέχοντα cf. 167–70n. with Hdt. 7.198 (also 4.99) πρώτη μὲν νῦν πόλις ἑστὶ ἐν τῷ κολπῷ ἱόντι ἀπὸ Ἀχαιῆς Ἀντικύρη, παρ’ ἵν Σπερχείος ποταμὸς ρέων ἕξ’ Ἐνίηνων ἔς θάλασσαν ἐκδίδοι.

For παρακέκλιται used as a geographical term cf. Hecat. 1 F 286 FGriH = Steph. Byz. s.v. Μηδία (μ 172 = III 312 Billerbeck = p. 449 Meineke) χώρα ταῖς Κασπίαις παρακεκλιμένη πύλαις, Call. h. 4.72 φεῦγε δ’ ὀλη Πελοπηνίς ὅσῃ παρακέκλιται ᾽Ιοθμη, 4.1239.

For υμετέρης γαίης cf. Od. 7.269 γαίης υμετέρης, reversed to create a chiasmus with 292 (cf. Od. 7.276–7 ὄφρα με γαίη / υμετέρη ἐπέλασε κέφεων ἄνεμος).

The Homeric hapax ἐξανίησιν (Il. 18. 471) echoes 290 ἵησιν and 291 εἰσανέχοντα; cf. Call. h. 4.206–7 ῥόον ὄντε βάθιστον / γαία τότ’ ἐξανίησιν, only here and in Callimachus of rivers.

294–6 ὡς ἄρ’ ἔφη. τοῖς δὲ θεά τέρας ἐγγυάλιζεν / αίσιον ὧ καὶ πάντες ἐπευφήμησαν ἰδόντες / στέλλεσθαι τὴνδ’ οἷον. ‘So he spoke,
and the goddess granted them a favourable omen; as they saw it they all shouted in approval that they should take this path.’ The mention of a portent may continue the Herodotean theme that runs through Argos’ speech (cf. the τέρας, which appeared to Hippocrates at Hdt. 1.59.8 θεησάμενος τὸ τέρας and 6.98.5 τέρας ἀνθρώπων τῶν μελλόντων ἑσεθαι κακῶν ἐφημε ὁ θεός). In both Herodotus and A. oracles and portents are one of the permitted exceptions to the distanced position of the gods in the narrative as compared with Homer. However, Hollman (2011) 51–75 argues that, while Herodotus is acutely concerned with the many ‘signs’ that he narrates in his inquiry, the origins of such an interest can be traced back to the archaic period (cf. Pelling (2006) 75–104 and Stesichorus fr. 170.1 Finglass). The idea of a guiding portent is based on scenes such as Il. 4.75–7 (Athena compared with one of Zeus’ shooting stars) οἶον δ’ ἀστέρα ἤκε Κρόνου πάις ἀγκυλομήτεω / ἢ ναύτησι τέρας ἢ στρατῷ εὑρέτα λαῶν / λαμπρόν τού δέ τε πολλοὶ ἀπὸ σπινθῆρες ἔσεσθαι, 19.375–6 (Achilles’ shield compared to the light of a beacon) ὡς δ’ ὀτ’ ἀν ἐκ πόντοιο σέλας ναύτησι φανή / καιομένοι πυρός (~ 4.301 οὐρανίου πυρὸς αἰγλῆ), Il. 12.252–6 (Zeus sends a whirlwind to lead the way for the Trojans against the Greek ships).

τέρας ἐγγυάλιξεν is not Homeric. τέρας is more usually found with φαίνω (e.g. Il. 2.324 τὸς ἐφης τέρας μέγα μητίετα Ζεὺς, Od. 12.394, 15.168 etc) or a verb implying physical force (e.g. ἤκε Il. 4.76, Od. 21.415, προίαλλε Il. 11.3). ἐγγυάλιζω is always used of ‘making a gift’ and almost invariably implies hand-to-hand exchange (e.g. Od. 8.318–9 ἔδενα, / ὡσσα οἱ ἐγγυάλιζα, Il. 9.98, Arg. 1.770 ποτὲ οἱ ξεινήιον ἐγγυάλιζεν). Exceptions are κράτος (Il. 11.752, 11.207, 17.613) and A.’s ὀλεθρον, / οἴον Ἀλωιάδῃσι πατήρ τεὸς ἐγγυάλιζεν (1.488–9), where however the connotation of gift-giving is still evident.
A.'s τέρας ἐγγυάλιξεν is an appropriate invention in connection with the Argonauts’ presiding deity. The guiding star is Hera’s gift to the Argonauts. She cuts short Argos’ geographical speculations and points them towards the correct route; the Colchians are, after all, close behind them.


296–7 ἐπιπρὸ γὰρ ὀλκὸς ἐτύχθη / οὐρανίης ἀκτῖνος, ὀπη καὶ ἀμεύσιμον ἥεν. ‘For a furrow of heavenly ray appeared right in front, marking the route they had to travel.’ Virgil elaborated the idea of the shooting star making a mark in the sky, when describing the star which shows Aeneas and his family that they must leave Troy (Aen. 2.692–7; cf. Lucan 5.561–3, 10.502, Dante Paradiso 15.13–8). A. uses ὀλκὸς similarly at 3.1377–8 πυρόεις ἀναπάλλεται ἀστήρ / ὀλκὸν ὑπαυγάζων, τέρας ἀνδράσι; cf. 3.141. Before A. the word is not so used, but cf. σμίλης ὀλκούς, ‘the traces of a chisel in wood’ (Ar. Th. 779) and ὀλκὸς τοῦ ξύλου, ‘the furrow made by the wood’ (Xen. Cyn. 9.18), where there is some connotation of dragging and the marks left by it; to talk of a star making an ὀλκὸς in the heavens is not difficult and implies the mirroring of celestial and terrestrial phenomena inherent in the idea of omens.

ἀμεύσιμον against transmitted μόρσιμον is the correct reading of the Etymologicum Magnum (82.15 Gaisford; see Fränkel OCT pp. xvi, xxii), which was
probably altered by a scribe remembering *Il.* 5.674 υἱὸς μόρσιμον ἦν, ‘it was destined’
(for this type of error see Fränkel viii). For the rarer ἀμεύσιμον cf. Euphorion fr. 156
Lightfoot οὐδάτα δινήςτος ἀμευσάμενος Αθύρασο, *Pind.* 1.45 μακρὰ δὲ ρίψας ἀμεύσασθ᾽ ἀντίους,
*Pind.* fr. 23 S–M and ἀμευσίπορος at *Pind.* 11.38.

298–300 γηθόσυνοι δὲ, Λύκοιο κατ᾽ αυτόθι παῖδα λιπόντες, / λαίφεσι πεπταμένοισιν ὑπεῖρ ἀλα ναυτίλλοντο / οὔρεα Παφλαγόνων θηεύμενοι. ‘Leaving Lykos’ son there, joyfully they sailed over the sea with the sails spread, gazing with wonder on the mountains of the Paphlagonians.’ The Argonauts’ joy results from the omen that Hera has sent them; for joy at a cosmic event cf. *Il.* 8. 555 πάντα δὲ εἴδεται ἀστρα, γέγηθε δὲ τε φρένα ποιήσε, *Od.* 5.269
= 10.506 γηθόσυνος δ’ οὐρῷ πέτασ’ ἰστία δίος Ὀδυσσεύς. The dactyls of 298 perhaps signify the frantic activity of departure. Things slow down as the sails are spread, the Argo glides over the waves and the sailors gaze at the passing landmarks.


The son of King Lykos of the Mariandynoi was last heard of at 2.814, and if A. did not mention him in this way, no reader would give him a second thought. Such tidying-up of loose ends is unhomeric. There are numerous examples, in both Homeric poems, of inconsistencies of plot and character; cf. the case of Pylaemenes, slain in *Il.* 5.576, but mourning the death of his son at *Il.* 13.653, an incongruity which Zenodotus avoided by emendation. The Alexandrian critics, notably Zoilus of Amphipolis, known as Homerosmastix, criticised him for this, and A. by being so careful of loose ends may be trying to avoid similar criticism of his own poetry. See Nunlist (2009) 240–2.
For the division of ΚΑΤΑΥΤΟΘΙ, as A. would have written, cf. Od. 21.90 κατ᾽ αὐτόθι τόξα λιπόντε. Modern editors have to decide between καταυτόθι and κατ᾽ αὐτόθι, i.e. they must decide whether the preposition belongs to to the adverb or stands in tmesis with the verb. At Il. 10.273, 21.201, Od. 21.90 καταυτόθι with λείπειν is usually written separatim in accordance with Herodian’s view of the first passage (Lentz II/2.71.3). In A. Vian and Fränel both print καταυτόθι everywhere except 3.889 (see Vian (1980) 138). Mss. do not show any clear policy. For an attempt to differentiate between A.’s frequent uses of the word cf. Cuypers (1970) 313: tmesis impossible at 2.776, 4.537, 1409, tmesis possible at 1.517, 1356, 2.16, 892, 3.648, and tmesis most satisfactory at 3.889. See Rengakos (1993) 155–6, Gow on Theocr. 25.153, Cuypers on Arg. 2.16.

The Homeric phrase is ἱστία λευκὰ πέτασσαν (Il. 1.480, Od. 5.269 = 10.506). For variation A. substitutes λαίφεα (first in Hom. Hym. 3.406, but cf. Od. 20.206 where it means rags).

Phineus mentions the Paphlagonian mountains as one of the sights on the Argonauts’ outward route at 2.357–8. θεάομαι is used of ‘gazing in wonder’; cf. Od. 9.218 ἐλθόντες δ᾽ εἰς ἄντρον ἐθηεύµεσθα ἡκαστα and those who gaze on mighty works; cf. Il. 7.444 θηεῦντο μέγα ἐργοῦ. The present passage is an example of the narrative style, which A. uses to describe the Argonauts’ voyages; cf. 2.940–5, Od. 3.170–3, Hom. Hym. 3.409–30. Proper names in such passages lend verisimilitude and, in the case of 2.941–2, euphony; cf. Virg. Aen. 3.124–7. There is a contrast with the lack of detail when the Argonauts’ journey across Europe is described (4.316–337); Vian (1987b) 254 notes its brevity and lack of chronological detail and believes that A. did not have the information to hand and refused in a semi-scientific way to
describe anything for which he did not have evidence (cf. Call. fr. 612 Pfeiffer ἀμάρτυρον οὐδὲν ἀείδω).

300–2 οὐδὲ Κάραμβιν / γνάμψαν ἐπεὶ πνοιαὶ τε καὶ οὐρανίου πυρὸς αἴγλη / μίμεν τε ἢστροιο μέγαν ρόθον εἰσαφίκοντο. ‘Nor did they round Karambis since both the breezes and the gleam of heavenly fire stayed with them until they arrived at the great stream of the river Ister.’ The Argonauts do not hug the coast after the fashion of a periplous (Thalmann (2011) 11–13), which was the way they approached Colchis; cf. 2.943 ἐνθὲ δ’ αὐτὲ Κάραμβιν . . .

γνάμψαντες. Instead of rounding the point, they set course across the Black Sea, carried along by the winds and guided by Hera’s portent. γνάμπτω is first in A. meaning ‘rounding a headland’, but γνάμπτω is the poetic equivalent of κάμπτω and is frequently so used, especially in Herodotus, (e.g. 4.42 κάμψαντες Ἡρακλέας στήλας ἀπίκοντο ἐς Ἀἴγυπτον).


Cf. the similar scene at Theocr. 13.50–2 ὡς ὁ τε πυρός ἀπ’ οὐρανοῦ ἠριπεῖν ἀστήρ / ἀθρόος ἐν πόντῳ, ναῦτας δὲ τις εἶπεν ἐταῖροις / “κουφότερ’, ὦ παῖδες, ποιεῖσθ’ ὀπλα· πλευστικὸς οὐρὸς”. Shooting stars were a portent of good weather; cf. Σατυρ. Il. 4.75–9 (1459.38–48 Erbse), [Thphr.] fr. 6.1.13 Wimmer, Arat. 926–9. Theocritus’ colloquialism is in contrast with A.’s emphasis on the ‘fiery radiance’ that leads the Argonauts across the Pontos. For πυρὸς αἴγλη cf. πυρὸς αὐγή (Il. 9.206,

303–4 Κόλχοι δ’ αὖτ’ ἄλλοι μὲν ἔτώσια μαστέυοντες / Κυανέας Πόντοιο διὲκ πέτρας ἐπέρησαν.

‘Some of the Colchians travelled through the Dark Rocks at the mouth of the Pontos, searching in vain.’ This first group are not seen again until the Argonauts reach Phaeacia (4.1001–3).
μαστεύω is not in Homer (cf. Hes. fr. 209.4 M–W), who only has ματεύω. For ἐτώσια μαστεύοντες cf. 2.893 ἐτώσια γηράσκοντας; Theoc. 1.38 = 7.48 ἐτώσια μοχθίζοντι, [Opp.] Cyn. 2.247 ἐτώσια δημιώντα. Although there is no Homeric parallel for the phrase, the type (neuter plural adjective as adverb plus participle) is common; cf. Od. 3.321 ἀναφανδά ψιλεύντας, Il. 2.222, 8.334, 21.417, Eur. Phoen. 1666 μάταια μοχθεῖς.

The rocks are elsewhere called κύανεα at 1.3, 2.318, 770, and 4.1003; cf. Eur. Andr. 862–4 κυανόπτερος ὄρνις ἐθ’ εἴην, / πευκάεν σκάφος ἀ διά κυανέας / ἐπέρασεν ἀκτάς, Hdt. 4.85, Soph. Ant. 966, Eur. Med. 1–2, Strabo 3.2.12. The Cyanean Rocks in question are identified with the Blue Rocks near the Thracian Bosporus; see Oliver (1957) 254–5. One of the terms of the so-called Peace of Callias (449–8 B.C.), as it was transmitted in antiquity (Dillon and Garland (2000) 263–5), forbade the Persians to sail within the Chelidonian Islands, or Phaselis, and the Cyanean Rocks (Callisthenes 124 F 16, Crateros 342 F 13 FGrHist ἔνδον δὲ Κυάνεων καὶ Χελιδονίων μακρὰ νηὶ καὶ χαλκεμβόλῳ μὴ πλέειν); see Hornblower (2011) 34. Using these landmarks as a boundary within such a treaty indicates that the Cyanean Rocks and the neighbouring Chelidonian Islands were well-known and closely associated by at least the 4th century. Theocritus was perhaps playing on this association when he wrote at 13.41 κυάνεον τὲ χελιδόνιον.

Homer never uses κυανέος of the sea; but cf. Arg. 4.842–3 ἐμπεσε δίναις / κυανέου πόντοι, Eur. IT 7 κυανέαν ἀλα, 392, Xenarchus fr. 1.7 PCG πόντου κυανέας δίναις, Stewart (2006) on the interpretation of Greek colour terms. She argues (327) that from Homer down to the second century kyan—words contain two ingredients: ‘a dark, darkly-shining blue, and a poetic ‘affect’ of threat.’
Apsyrtus made for the river, which he entered through the Lovely Mouth, leaving the Argonauts behind. Apsyrtos’ party follow a route based on the erroneous idea that the Danube, having its source in the Rhipaean mountains, divides at a central point, the Kauliakos spur, (nn. 4.285–7, 323–6, Delage (1930) 209) with one arm emptying eastward into the Black Sea, and the other westward into the Adriatic (see map above).

A. mentions only two mouths in the Ister delta, though different estimates exist, (Herodotus (4.47) and Ephorus (FGrHist 70 F 157) say five but Timagetus (FHG iv 519 = Σ 4.306) says three, and reverses their position; see Casella (2010) 473 n. 18. The ‘Fair Mouth’, Καλὸν στόμα, was north of the mouth called Narex: Vian (1981) 160. The triangular island Peuke is described as being formed by these two mouths, which unite above its apex. Apsyrtos and the Colchians take the southern route, and get ahead of the Argonauts, who enter by the northern one; for the route, see Casella (2010) 472–4, Kos (2006) 15.

For Καλὸν στόμα, a well-omened place that will lead to a far from well-omened result, cf. Καλὸς Λιμήν (1.954). However, someone reading this line for the first time in scriptio continua would probably take the words not as a proper name but as καλὸν δὲ διὰ στόμα, ‘through a fair mouth’, and be reminded of lines such as Il. 16.405 γναθιμὸν δεξιτερόν, διὰ δ’ αὐτοῦ πεῖρεν ὁδόντων, 16.346 τὸ δ’ ἀντικρὺ δόρυ χάλκεον ἔξεπέρησε (~ διὲκ πέτρας ἐπέρησαν). This use of fighting language and imagery, which continues in the next lines, enlivens the narrative and is appropriate because Apsyrtus is attacking the Argonauts, albeit from a distance; cf. with λιασθεῖς, Od. 5.462 ποταμόο λιασθεῖς and, in the context of hand-to-hand

307–8 τῷ καὶ ὑπέφθη τούσγε βαλὼν ὑπερ αὖχένα γαίης / κόλπον ἐσω πόντοιο πανέσχατον ἱονίοιο. ‘In this way, crossing the neck of land, he reached the furthest gulf of the Ionian Sea before them.’ ὑπέφθη is also a ‘fighting’ word, generally used to mean ‘getting in first with one’s blow’; cf. *Il.* 7.144–5 ὑποφθάς / δουρὶ µέσον ὑπέρ αὖχένα γαίης κόλπον, *Od.* 4.547. The same is true of τούσγε βαλὼν; cf. *Il.* 5.657 ὃ µὲν βάλεν αὖχένα (~ αὖχενα γαίης) µέσον, 14.412 στῆθος βεβλήκει ὑπὲρ ἀντυγος ἀγχόθι δειρῆς.

αὖχένα γαίης designates the stretch of land between the Pontus and the Adriatic; cf. Hdt. 1.72.1 ἔστι δὲ αὖχην οὔτος τῆς χώρης ταύτης ἀπάσης, *Xen.* Anab. 6.4.3., but also δειρᾶς at Eur. *IT* 1089–90 παρὰ πετρίνας / πόντου δειράδας, 1240. There was a mistaken belief that the division between the Adriatic and the Aegean was narrow enough for both seas to be visible from the summit of Mt. Haimos in the Balkan range of Thrace (Strabo 7.5.1).

For the non-epic use of βάλλω of a ship entering another sea cf. 1.928, 4.596, 639, 1579 with Dem. 35.13 ἔαν δὲ µὴ εἰσβάλωσι (sc. εἰς Πόντου). However the use is an easy extension of passages such as *Il.* 11.722 ἔστι δὲ τὶς ποταμὸς Μινυήιος εἰς ἁλα βάλλων.

κόλπον, together with αὖχένα and καλὸν στόμα, continues the use of words also associated with the body. It forms part of a chiasmus (κόλπον ~ πανέσχατον / ἐσω πόντοιο ~ ήονίοιο), which ends the paragraph and divides the ring structure into which this passage is set (305–8 ~ 313–14). For further examples of word-patterning
such as 308 cf. 1.917, 2.434, 3.1215, 4.144, 604, Call. h. 4.14, 6.9, and see Reed (1995) 94–5 on similar word arrangements.

309–11 ἵστρῳ γάρ τις νῆσος ἐέργεται οὖνομα Πεύκη, / τριγλώχιν, εὔρος μὲν ἐς αἰγιαλοὺς ἀνέχουσα, / στεινὸν δ’ αὐτ’ ἀγκῶνα ποτὶ ρόουν. ‘For a certain island is enclosed by Ister, by name Peuke, three-cornered, its base stretching along the coast, and with a sharp elbow towards the river.’ Casella (2010) 474 describes possible connections between these lines and the work of Timagetus. Callimachus in the Aetia, while also dividing the pursuing Colchians into two groups, said that the Argonauts returned by the same route which they came; see Harder (2012) II 162–3. Perhaps A. is commenting on the Aetia, based on his own geographical research; cf. 4.303 μαστύος with Call. Aet. fr. 10 Harder μαστύος ἀλλ’ ὅτ’ ἐκαμον ἀλητύι, 4. 310 τριγλώχιν with Call. Aet. fr. 1.36 Harder τριγλω[χι]ν ὄλ[ῳ]υ νῆσος ἐπ’ Ἑγκελάδῳ. On the route described by Timagetus see 285–7n.

A. writes in the style of a versifying geographer; cf. Od. 295–6 ἐνθα νότος μέγα κύμα ποτὶ σκάιον ρίου ὀθεὶ, / ἐς Φαιστόν, μικρὸς δὲ λίθος μέγα κύμ’ ἀποέργη. 7.244 Ὡγυγίη τις νῆσος ἀπόπροθεν εἰν ἄλι κεῖται, 9.25, 10.195, 3, Hdt. 1.180 τὸ γὰρ μέσου αὐτῆς (Babylon) ποταμὸς διέργει, τῷ οὖνομά ἐστι Εὐφρήτης, 4.178, Thuc. 4.53. For the close links between poetry and geography see Lightfoot (2014) 8–11.

For τριγλώχιν cf. II. 5.393 δεξιτερόν κατὰ μαζόν ὀιστῶ τριγλώχιν, 8.297 and 11.507, referring to the arrowhead, apparently meaning ‘three-barbed’. Later the word was used to describe the three headlands of Sicily (ἡ Τρινακρία); cf. Call. Aet. fr. 1.35–6 with Harder ad loc., h. 4.31. A. is describing a similarly shaped piece of
land. The εὖρος or wide, lower edge of the arrowhead-like island faces the sea and the surrounding αἰγιαλοί (310), while the point of the arrow (στεινὸν . . . ἀγκώνα) is turned towards the mouth of the river Ister (ποτὶ ῥόου). For the use of comparisons to shapes, geometrical and otherwise see Lightfoot (2014) 25 n. 100.

ἀγκώνα continues the theme of using terms for parts of the body but with a geographical reference; cf. Il. 5.582 χερμαδίῳ ἀγκώνα τυχὼν μέσον, Hdt. 2.99 ἦτι δὲ καὶ νῦν ὑπὸ Περσέων ὁ ἀγκών σωτός τοῦ Νείλου ὡς ἀπεργμένος ρέῃ ἐν φυλακῆσι μεγάλῃσι. A. rejects πρὸν or πρηών, much commoner in Homer and elsewhere, meaning ‘foreland’ or ‘headland’.

311–13 ἀμφὶ δὲ δοιαὶ / σχίζονται προχοαι. τὴν μὲν καλέουσι

Nάρηκος, / τὴν δ’ ὑπὸ τῇ νεάτῃ, Καλὸν στόμα. ‘and round it the waters are split in two. One mouth they call the mouth of Narex, and the other, at the lower end, the Fair mouth.’ For the geography see 305–6n. A. may have confused the position of the mouths.

For structure of the lines cf. Il. 22.147–9 κρουνώ δ’ ἰκανὸν καλλιρρόω· ἐνθα δὲ πηγαὶ / δοιαὶ ἀναίσσουσι Σκανδρίδου δινηέντος. / ἢ μὲν γάρ θ’ ύδατι λιαρῷ ρέει where the poet talks of πηγαὶ / δοιαὶ and then takes them one by one (ἡ μὲν).

The estuary splits into two around the pointed end of the island. δοιαὶ / σχίζονται is the equivalent of διχῇ σχίζεσθαι (288–90n.) προχοαι can mean ‘the mouth, the estuary’ of a river, or its waters (132–4n.).

τὴν μὲν καλέουσι (Hom. Hym. 1.21, 18.487, Hdt. 1.105.17, 1.110.7, Call. h. 1.45, 3.199) adds verisimilitude to the narrative. With τὴν δ’ ὑπὸ τῇ νεάτῃ, understand ἴνα ὸκ ὀν the lower side of the island’, as opposed to 315 νῆσοι κατ’ ἀκροτάτησι.
313–6 τῆσδὲ διαπρό / Ἀψυρτὸς Κόλχοι τε θεώτερον ὑμηθησαν / οἱ δ᾽ ύψοι νήσοι κατ᾽ ἀκροτάτης ἐνέοντο / τηλόθεν. ‘And through this Apsyrtus and his Colchians rushed with all speed; but the heroes went upwards towards the highest part of the island, far away.’ These lines complete the ring composition that opened with 303 (see 307–8n.).

Read τῆσδὲ, my emendation, made independently (1972) of Livrea (‘in notis’; see Vian (1981) app. crit., Luiselli (2003) 155 n. 36) for transmitted τῇ δὲ. The natural thing is to say that one of the parties went through one of the two openings, and not that they went through τῇ δὲ, ‘there’ (Platt (1919) 82). II. 5.281 τῇς δὲ διαπρό supports the alteration. Similar phrases (II. 5.66, 7.260, 14.494, 20.276) always refer to spears piercing shields; cf. in particular II. 4.138 ἦ οἱ πλεῖστον ἔρυτο· διαπρὸ δὲ εἴσατο καὶ τῇς. For explanatory asyndeton in brisk narratives of this kind cf. Hes. Th. 769–71 (with West). τῇ δὲ in the majority of mss. arose from a desire to avoid the asyndeton.

Luiselli (2003) 153 reports the reading ἐπιπρὸ in 313 from a papyrus in the Bodleian Library (MS. Gr. class. c. 237 (P) fr. A), dating from the sixth or seventh century. He supports this by suggesting that we read οἱ δ᾽ ἄρ᾽ ἐπιπρό, to avoid the hiatus and compares 3.1338 οἱ δ᾽ ἄρ᾽ ἐπιπρό and 2.750–1 τῇ ρ᾽ οἰγ᾽ αὐτίκα νηὶ . . . ἐκέλασαν. Adoption of this reading would remove one of the images connected with fighting and parts of the body (305–6n.) that run through this passage. Pace Luiselli, it is to be seen as lectio facilitor. ἐπιπρό occurs eleven times in A., against once for διαπρό, and would be an easy change to make for a scribe who did not fully understand A.’s use of διαπρό.
For ὡρμήθησαν in the context of hand-to-hand combat cf. II. 10.359

φευγένειαν τοι δ᾽ αἰώνα διώκειν ὡρμήθησαν. For ὑψὸς νῆσοι κατ᾽ ἀκροτάτης cf. 
Il. 13.12 ὑψὸς ἐπ᾽ ἀκροτάτης κορυφῆς Σάμου ύλησσης.

316–8 εἰςμενήςι δ᾽ ἐν ἀσπετα πώεα λεῖπον / ποιμένες ἄγραυλοι νηῶν 
φόβῳ, οἷα τε θῆρας / ὀσσόμενοι πόντου μεγακήτεος ἐξανιόντας.

‘And in the meadows the country shepherds left their countless flocks through fear of 
the ships, thinking that they were beasts coming out of the monster-teeming sea.’ The 
fear that the Argo inspires in these early pastoral nomads must be linked to the 
tradition (rejected by A.; see Jackson (1997) 251 n. 4)) that Argo was the first ship 
(see Σ Eur. Med. 1.1, Catull. 64.11, Jackson (1997) 233–50, Dräger (1999) 419–22, 
Fabre-Serris (2008) 172). A. uses the shepherds’ fear to stress that the Argonauts (and 
Colchians) are going into unknown territory. Transhumance still exists as a way of 
life in Romania. For its existence in antiquity cf. Soph. OT 1132–5 with Thoneman 
(2011) 198.

εἰςμενήςι is singular in Homer (Il. 4.483 = 15.631 εἰςμενή ἔλεος). The word 
was discussed in antiquity; cf. Hesych. ε 17 = Π 23 Latte τόπος ὅπου πόσα φύεται 
ποταμοῦ ἀποβάντος ἢ ἔλος παραποτάμιον κάθυδρον ἢ ἀναβολῇ ποταμοῦ 
φυτὰ ἔχουσα (cf. Σ (p. 283 Wendel) and ΣAT II. 4.483 = t 530.37–8 Erbse) There also 
seems to have been a problem as to its number; cf. Euphorion fr. 135 Lightfoot οἷόν 
θ᾽ εἰςμενής ὑποκυδέος, Call. h. 3.193 ἄλλοτε δ᾽ εἰςμενήςιν and in A. sing. at 2.818, 
3.1220 and plural at 2.795, 3.1202. Perhaps A. knew mss. of Homer in which 
εἰςμενής ἔλεος was written to avoid the hiatus.

A. delays the subject of λεῖπον by the enjambment of ποιμένες ἄγραυλοι, 
and οἷα τε θῆρας placed at the end of the line suggests that he is leading into a land-
animal development of the description. The meaning only becomes clear with πόντου μεγακήτεος ἐξανιόντας. The clausula, οἵα τε θήρας, is doubly misleading in that θήρ is frequently specifically opposed to ἱχθύς etc.; cf. Od. 24.291–2 ἢ ποῦ ἐν πόντῳ φάγον ἱχθύες, ἢ ἐπὶ χέρσου / θηροί καὶ οἰωνοῖσιν ἔλωρ γένετ’ (and see LSJ s.v. θήρ).

For ποιμένες ἄγραυλοι cf. Il. 18.162, Hes. Th. 26 (both same ), Hom. Hym. 4.286 πολλοὺς δ’ ἄγραύλους . . . μηλοβοτήρας, [Hes.] Scut. 39 ποιμένας ἄγραιώτας = [Hes.] fr. 195.39 M–W. For shepherds fearful at the sight of the Argo or in general cf. 4.319n., the fragment of Accius’s Medea preserved by Cicero (N. D. 2.89 = fr. 1 Ribbeck), Catull. 64.15 aequoreae monstrum Nereides admirantes (monstrum = the Argo), Virg. Aen. 8.107–10 (of Aeneas’ arrival in Rome), 2.307–8 (a shepherd frightened by an impending flood), Ov. Ars 2.77–8 and Met. 8.217–20 where amazement at the flying Icarus is described. It is not difficult to imagine a relief or group sculpture (like the Laocoon or the dying Gauls) with such fearful emotions vividly depicted on the faces of the subjects, after the fashion of the Pergamene school; see Green (1990) 336–61. The passage contrasts the rusticity of these shepherds (cf. Hes. Th. 26 ποιμένες ἄγραυλοι, κάκ’ ἐλέγχεα, γαστέρες οἶον), who mistake ships for sea monsters, with the background of Greek thought about ships and seafaring as exemplified in the Homeric epics; see Thalmann (2011) 158–61. The allusion marks how A.’s Argonauts’ are on the edge of the Ptolemaic sphere of influence and, in a literary sense, have gone much further than any of their predecessors; see 309–11 n. on Callimachus’ version of the Argonauts’ return.

For ὀσσομαι meaning ‘imagine, see with the mind’s eye’ cf. Il. 18.224, Od. 1.115 etc, but for ‘predict evil to others’, Il. 14.17, 24.172. This is later modified to ‘see’ or ‘look’; cf. Call. fr. 374 Pfeiffer ὀμμασι λοξόν ὑποδράξ ὀσσομένη where
Pfeiffer’s parallels show that ὀσσόμενος = βλέπω / ὀράω (cf. Aesch. Sept. 498 
φῶς ἃν βλέπων and [Hes.] Scut. 426 δεινόν ὀρῶν ὀσσοίσι). As often in the case of a 
word whose meaning is disputed, A. reflects all the possibilities. At 2.28 ἐπὶ δ’
ὀσσεται οἰόθεν οἶον / ἄνδρα τὸν means ‘he looks only at the man’ and here A. uses ὀσσόμενοι, with the earlier Homeric connotation.

The meaning of μεγακήτεος in Homer was disputed; cf. Il. 8.222, 11.5, 
11.600 μεγακήτης υἷς, ‘a ship of very great size’, 21.22 δελφίνος μεγακήτεος, ‘a 
dolphin with great jaws’, Od. 3.158 μεγακήτεα πόντον, ‘a sea yawning with mighty 
hollows’. A. adopts the latter meaning here; cf. Et. Mag. 574.41–2 Gaisford
μεγακήτεα πόντον τὸν μεγάλα κήτη ἐχοντα ἢ ἄπλως μέγαν παρὰ τὸ κήτος,
perhaps based on Od. 5.421–2 ἢ τί μοι καὶ κήτος ἐπισεύη μέγα δαίμων / ἢ ἀλὸς 
(cf. 12.96–7). A. emphasises this interpretation by emphatic οἷα τε θῆρας at 4.317. A 
more explicit interpretation of Od. 3.158 is Theocr. 17.98 πολυκήτεα Νείλιον 
(crocodiles; see Hunter ad loc.) and Theogn. 175 βαθυκήτεα πόντον (West perhaps 
wrongly prints the variant μεγακήτεα). Cf. in general Hdt. 6.44 θηριωδεστάτης 

319 οὐ γάρ πω ἄλλας γε πάρος ποθὶ νῆας ἱδοντο. ‘For never yet before 
had they seen seafaring ships.’ The motif of amazement at a possible new find or 
invention, or, here, sighting at sea has a long history; cf. Aesch. Diktyulkī fr. 46a 
TrGF {B.} δερκοῦ ὑν ἐσ κευ[θώνα] / {A.} καὶ δὴ δέδορκα τρώδε.[ / έας / τὶ φῶ 
tόδ’ εἶναι; πότερα .[ / φάλαιναν ἢ ζύγαιναν ἢ κ. / ἢ ζύγαινα]
‘Look into the depths of the sea. I’m looking. What are we to call this? A whale or a 
shark, or . . . ’ In another Aeschylus fragment (25e TrGF), a shepherd describes his 
impression of Glaucus emerging from the sea in language that is similar to the present
passage. After A. cf. Arrian’s description of Alexander’s fleet getting underway on the River Hydaspes (Anab. Alex. 6.1–6), ‘One may imagine the noise of this great fleet getting away under oars all together: it was like nothing ever heard before . . . The natives . . . had never before seen horses on shipboard’.

The structure is based on Il. 1.262–3 οὐ γάρ πω τοίοις ἔδω τάξιαν οὐδὲ ἔδωμαι / οἴν Περίθοου . . . (followed by two lines of proper names as in A.’s version); similar are Od. 6.160–1 οὐ γάρ πω τοιούτων ἔδω βροτόν ὀφθαλμοῖσιν / οὔτ’ ἄνδρ’ οὔτε γυναικα (for the combination of οὐ . . . οὔτε . . . οὔτε 320–2n. οὔτ’ αὖ), 18.36 οὐ μέν πώ τι πάρος τοιούτων ἐτύχθη.

ἀλίας . . . νῆας is not Homeric (cf. Pind. O. 9.72–3 ἀλίασιν / πρύμναις Τήλεφος, Lucill. A.P. 11.390.5 νῆεσιν ἀλιπλανέεσσι) but ποντοπόροισι νέεσσι and the like is frequent (Il. 3.240 etc). A. reverses the common epic πάρος γε, with γε emphasising that the shepherds had not seen sea-going ships before. Fränkel (1968) 476) notes that the peoples of this region lack sea-going ships and that the point emphasised by γε is that they might have small boats that enable them to travel short distances along the river, but they cannot undertake the long-distance voyages to distant places that are one of the distinguishing features of Greek civilisation (Thalmann (2011) 158 n. 28).

320–2 οὔτ’ οὖν Θρήσεις μιγάδες Σκύθαι, οὐδὲ Σίγυννοι, / οὔτε Τραυκένιοι, οὖθ’ οἱ περὶ Λαύριον ήδη / Σίνδοι ἐρηματαῖον πεδίον μέγα ναιτάουσι. ‘neither the Scythians mixed with the Thracians, nor the Sigynni, nor yet the Traukenii, nor the Sindi that now inhabit the vast desert plain of Laurium.’

Catalogues and lists play a part in epic poetry. A catalogue is first and foremost a way of giving information and in this passage A. has something in common with periplous
and periods poetry, popular in the Hellenistic period, such as the works attributed to Pseudo-Scymnus of Chios, Apollodorus of Athens, Pseudo-Scylax, and Simmias. On Hellenistic love of geographical catalogues, see Krevans (1983) 208, Romm (1992) 30–1 and Lightfoot (2014) 9–10. There are earlier examples, such as the Catalogue of Ships at II. 2.494–974, which may originate in a description of a voyage along the coast of Greece because the order of place names corresponds to a logical circuit of much of the known Greek world; see Beye (2006) 97. At Hom. Hym. 3.30–45 the poet stresses the great distance that Leto had to travel before she could give birth to her son. At Aesch. Pers. 485–95 the geographical details add realism to the wretched retreat of the Persians; cf. Eur. Ba. 13–18, [Aesch.] PV 709–35, Call. h. 4.70–6, 4.562–6.

Scythia was traditionally seen as being one of the ends of the earth; cf. [Aesch.] PV 1–2, Hdt. 4.99. Herodotus knows of (at least) four different versions of the Scythians’ origins, which he reports, consecutively, at the beginning of Book 4. Perhaps A.’s phrase Ὄρηξιν μιγάδες Σκύθαι reflects his knowledge of Herodotus. His Argonauts are explorers extending the limits of the known Greek world. On the popularity of Herodotus in Alexandria, see Murray (1972), West (2011) 70 and on Herodotus and the Scythians Hartog (1988) 3–19, and on Herodotus and the sources of the Danube and his possible influence on A., Pearson (1934), Casella (2010) 476–7.

By using the phrase οὔτ᾽ οὖν Ὄρηξιν μιγάδες Σκύθαι, A. is perhaps influenced by the language of early geographers; cf. [Scylax] 3.2. ἀπὸ δὲ ἱβήρων ἔχουται Λίγυες καὶ ἱβήρες μιγάδες μέχρι ποταμοῦ Ῥοδανοῦ. Παράπλους Λιγύων ἀπὸ Εμπορίου μέχρι Ῥοδανοῦ, 323–6n. but there is also Eur. Ba. 16–18 Μηδῶν ἐπελθὼν Ἀραβίαν τ᾽ εὐδαίμονα / Άσιαν τε πᾶσαν ἢ παρ᾽ ἀλμυράν ἄλα /

For the Σιγύννοι cf. Hdt. 5.9 τὸ δὲ πρὸς βορέω τῆς χώρης ἐτι ταύτης οὐδεὶς ἔχει φράσα τὸ ἀτρεκὲς οἵτινες αὐτήν, ἀλλὰ τὰ πέρην ἤδη τοῦ Ἰστρου ἑρμίος χώρη φαίνεται ἐούσα καὶ ἀπειρός μοῦνος δὲ δύναμαι πυθέσθαι οἰκέουτας πέρην τοῦ Ἰστρου ἀνθρώπους τοῖσι οὐνομα εἶναι Σιγύννας. At 2.99, A. talks of the Bebryces wielding ‘hard clubs and hunting spears,’ κορύνας ἁζηχέας ἤδὲ σιγύννους and Σ (p. 283 Wendel) says that the name of the weapon derives from the name of the tribe. The names of exotic tribes and the mention of the deserted plains of central Europe strengthens A’s picture of the Argonauts as explorers of the unknown.

We should read with Wellauer οὔτε Τραυκένιοι. P.Oxy. 2694 has οὔτ’ οὖν Τραυκένιοι. The transmitted text is οὔτ’ αὖ (PE) and οὔτ’ οὖν (LASG). A consideration of the structure οὐ . . . οὔτε . . . οὔτε helps us decide between them. At II. 17.19–21, we have the sequence οὐ . . . / οὔτ’ οὖν . . . οὔτε . . . / οὔτε and at Od. 2.199–201 οὐ . . . / οὔτ’ οὖν . . . / οὔτε. The particle οὖν lends weight to a member of the sequence thought to require emphasis (such as ‘the Scythians mixed with the Thracians’), and it is not usually in combination with αὖ which seems to be used slightly differently; e.g. Soph. El. 911, OT 1373 οὐκ . . . οὐδ’ αὖ and introducing a forceful conclusion at Dem. 27.49 οὔτε . . . ἀπέφηνεν οὐδὲ παρέσχεται μάρτυρας, οὖτ’ αὖ τὸν ἀριθμὸν . . . ἐπανέφερεν, Pl. Resp. 426b οὔτε φάρμακα οὔτε καύσεις οὔτε τοιμαί οὐδ’ αὖ ἐπωδαί. There seems to be no reason why Τραυκένιοι should merit such treatment here. οὔτ’ οὖν is defended by Vian on the grounds that A. allows such repetitions, though the two that he quotes 2.142–3 and 4.1228–9 are not of the same type as the one under discussion. οὖν was added from 320 metri gratia and
changed into αὖ (οὔτ’ αὖ Τραυκένιοι) later, by someone who did not like the repetition. For the scansion of οὔτε cf. 3.848, 4.619, II. 18.404, Od. 5.32, 7.247, and Hellenistic poets’ often liking to scan two repeated words differently (e.g. Arg. 2.707 ἔτι . . . ἐτι, 4.281 τε . . . τε, Aratus 56 δυο = ~ / δυο = ~ and the differing quantities at Hes. Op. 182 οὐδὲ . . . οὐδὲ τι παίδες, / οὐδὲ with Hopkinson (1982) 162–77).

Τραυκένιοι is a correction formally proposed by Kassel (1969) 98 based on an entry in Steph. Byz. 631 s.v. Τραυχένιοι (p. 631 Meineke): ἔθνος περὶ τὸν πόντον Εὐξείνων ὄμορον Σίνδοις, though first mentioned, as Kassel points out, by Housman (1916) 136 n. 1 = (1972) 924, ‘I only mention them in order to bring together a pair of ἀπαξ εἰρημένα which ought to merge in one.’

For οἱ περὶ Λαύριον, together with part of ναίω cf. II. 2.757–8 οἱ περὶ Πηνειὸν . . . / ναίεσκον, 2.749–50, [Hes.] fr. 7.3. M–W οἱ περὶ Πιερίν καὶ Ὀλυμποῦ δώματ’ ἐναίον and Od. 8.551 ἄλλοι θ’ οἱ κατὰ ἄστυ καὶ οἱ περιναετάουσιν, Arg. 4.792 αἱ τ’ εἶν ἀλὶ ναετάουσιν, Hdt. 2.104 Σύριοι δὲ οἱ περὶ Θερμώδοντα ποταμῶν καὶ Παρθένιον καὶ Μάκρωνες οἱ τούτοις ἀστυγείτονες which support the conjecture ναετάουσι for mss. ναετάοντες, originally made by Svensson (1937) 32. Confusion between participle and present indicative is common in such clauses; cf. Hes. Th. 592, 877 with West ad loc.

Σίνδοι are mentioned by Herodotus at 4.28 during his description of Scythia, as living near the Cimmerian Bosphorus. For ἐρημαίον πεδίον μέγα cf. [Aesch.] PV 1–2 Χθονὸς μὲν ἐς τηλουρὸν ἦκομεν πέδου, / Σκύθην ἐς οίμοι, ἀβατον εἰς ἐρημῖαν, [Hippocr.] De Aër. 18.4 ἢ δὲ Σκυθέων ἐρημίς καλεμένη πεδίας ἐστι. The form ἐρημαῖος occurs first in Emped. fr. 49.3 D–K νυκτός ἐρημαῖς and [Simon.] A.P. 6.217 = 919 FGE ἐρημαίην ἠλυθ’ ὑπὸ στιλᾶδα, and then in A. and Call. fr. 253.5 Pfeiffer = 40.5 Hollis χρῆς ἔ[η]μαίῃ ἐνι ναεῖς).
But when they had passed near the mount Angouron, and the cliff of Kauliakos, far from the mount Angouron, round which the Ister divides and pours its stream in abundance this way and that, and the Laurion plain.' An ὄρος is often a natural landmark in such descriptions; cf. Il. 2.603 οἱ δ᾽ ἔχον Ἀρκαδίην ὑπὸ Κυλλήνης ὄρος αἰπύ, Aesch. Pers. 493 and for the repetition which seems to be a feature of this geographical style cf. Hdt. 2.158 ὄρος, ἐν τῷ αἱ λιβοτομίας ἐνεισι τοῦ ὤν δὴ ὄρους τοῦτο, 3.97 μέχρι Καυκάσιος ὄρεος (ἐς τοῦτο γὰρ τὸ ὄρος ὑπὸ Πέρσῃσι ἀρχεται), The repetitions in this passage may also be another attempt (see 320–2n. οἱ περὶ Λαύριον ἡδη) at imitating the 'Catalogue' style; cf. Il. 2.730 Ὕψιλην ~ Ὕψιλης, 741–2 Πειριβόοιο ~ 840 Πειριβόω, 654–5 Ρόδου ~ Ρόδιων ~ Ρόδου, 840 Πελασγῶν ~ Πελασγοῦ and for another repetitious geographical passage, see 4.1759–61.

ἀπωθεῖν ἐόντα is 'suspectus' according to Fränkel but cf. 4.443 and Xen. Cyn. 5.8.2 κατακλίνονται δ᾽ εἰς ἃ ἡ γῆ φύει . . . ἐν αὐτοῖς, παρ᾽ αὐτά, ἀπωθεῖν πολύ, μικρόν, μεταξὺ τούτων. For σκόπελον πάρα Καυλιακοῖο cf. in a similar context 2.650 = 2.789 σκόπελον τε Κολιώνης. Casella (2010) 477 identifies Kauliakos as the spur of Kalemegdan at the confluence of the Sava and the Danube near Belgrade. For ὁ πέρι δὴ σχίζων cf. Pl. Tim. 21e (288–90n.), Hdt. 2.33, 4.49.

ῥόον ἐνθα καὶ ἐνθα is taken from Od. 5.327 τὴν δ᾽ ἐφόρει μέγα κύμα κατά ρόον ἐνθα καὶ ἐνθα. Transmitted ρόον ἀλός is difficult since ἀλός cannot sensibly be connected with anything else and A. is describing the course of a river not the sea. Therefore read with Hoelzlin ((1641) 296), Merkel ((1852) 136) and Platt ((1914) 42)
There are many parallels in A. for ἅλις in this position; cf. 2.87, 3.272, 3.972 etc. and for ἅλις used in similar contexts cf. 3.67 ἐξοτ' ἐπὶ προχοῆσιν ἅλις πλήθους Ἀναύρου, II. 17.54 ὦθ' ἅλις ἀναβέβροχεν ὕδωρ, 21.352 περὶ καλὰ ἰδεύθρα ἅλις ποταμοῦ περφύκει. The corruption possibly stemmed from passages such as Arg. 2.400–1 τηλόθεν ἐξ ὀρέων πεδίοιό τε Κιρκαίοιο/Φᾶσις δινήεις εὐρύν ῥόου εἰς ἀλα βάλλει, II. 11.495 εἰς ἀλα βάλλει.

ἡμείψωντο thus used is not Homeric. It first appears in tragedy (Aesch. Pers. 69). παραμείβεσθαι is more usual; cf. Hom. Hym. 3.409, Hdt. 1.72, 6.41 and occurs often in the writers of periploi; cf. Periplus Hannonis 2.1 ὡς δ' ἀναχθέντες τὰς Στήλας παρημείψαμεν καὶ ἐξώ πλοῦν δυοῖν ἦμερῶν ἐπλεύσαμεν, Αἰτ. Periplus ponti Euxini 10.1 ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ Φάσιδος Χαρίεντα ποταμὸν παρημείψαμεν ναυσίπορον.

327–8 δὴ ρα τότε Κρονίην Κόλχοι ἅλαδ' ἐκπρομολόντες / πάντη, μὴ σφε λάθοιεν, ὑπετμήξαντο κελεύθους. ‘then the Colchians emerged into the sea of Cronos and cut off every path by which the Argonauts could escape.’ This whole passage has reminded some critics of scenes from Xenophon’s Anabasis; see Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 129–31. In both works, Greeks achieve a dangerous return journey by a circuitous route, pursued by a barbarian multitude. The language also has a military flavour. The Sea of Cronos is the northern Adriatic (see also 4.509, 548 βῆ δ' ἅλαδε Κρονίην). Σ (p. 284 Wendel) says τὸν Ἀδρίαν φησὶ ἐνταῦθα γὰρ τὸν Κρόνον κατῳκῆκεν φασίν. Wilamowitz (1924) 191 rightly connects Σ’s explanation with [Aesch.] PV 836–8 ἐντεῦθεν οἰστρῆσασα τὴν παρακτίαν/κελευθον ἤξας πρὸς μέγαν κόλπου Ῥέας, / ἀφ' οὗ παλιμπλάγκτοις χειμάξη δρόμοις, as the only literary parallel; see Vian (1981) 24 n. 3. The allusion to Cronos
plays a part in A.’s attempt to recreate a pre-Homeric world (Radke (2007) 197–8 and passim).

ἐκπρομολεῖν is only in A. and at Orph. Lith. 706. However, the phrase may be based on clausulae such as Hom. Hym. 3.23 = 145 ποταμοί θ’ ἀλαδε προρέοντες; similar are 4.523, II. 5.598, Od. 10.351.

For μὴ οφε λάθοιν cf. Od. 4.527 μὴ ἔλαθοι, 12.220 μὴ σε λάθησιν. Parallels for such military manoeuvres include Thuc. 8.80.3 αἱ μὲν τῶν Πελοποννησίων αὐταί νῆες ἀπάρασαι ἐς τὸ πέλαγος, ὡσεις λάθοιν ἐν τῷ πλῷ τούς Ἀθηναίους, 8.99.1, 8.100.2.

For ὑπετμήξαντο κελεύθους cf. Hdt. 5.86.4 λαθεῖν τε ἐς Ἑπιδαύρου διαβάντας ἐς τὴν νῆσον καὶ οὐ προακηκοόσι τοῖσι Ἀθηναίοισι ἐπιπεσεῖ τὸν ἐπὶ τῶν νεῶν, Xen. Hell. 1.6.15 ἐδίωκεν ὑποτεμίνομενος τὸν εἰς Σάμον πλοῦν, ὡσεις μὴ ἔκεισε φύγοι, Dion. Hal. Antiq. Rom. 5.44.3 and Homeric clausulae such as Od. 7.272 κατέδησε κέλευθον, 4.380 = 469 πεδάᾳ καὶ ἔδησε κελέυθον, 5.383.

329–30 οἱ δ’ ὀπίθεν ποταμοῖο κατήλυθον, εἰς δ’ ἐπέρησαν / δοιάς Ἀρτέμιδος Βρυγηίδας ἀγχόθι νῆσους. ‘And they (the Argonauts) came out of the river behind and reached the two Brygean islands of Artemis near at hand.’ The map shows the general area of engagement (336–7n.) and the supposed
end of the Argonauts’ journey across Europe. The Colchians have taken up a defensive position to prevent the Argonauts’ retreat. Even for Greeks of A.’s day this area was a kind of Finisterre, where the country of the beyond began; see Cabanes (2008) 158–9 on the Brygean islands.

4.1684 ὑλοτόµοι δρυµοῖο κατῆλυθον shows that ποταµόοι κατῆλυθον means ‘they came out from the river’, and not, as Mooney suggests, ‘they came down the river’. Livrea translates ‘dietro, gli eroi scendevano lungo il fiume’ and Hunter ‘the heroes travelled down the river behind them and came out.’

Read εἰς δ’ ἐπέρησαν for transmitted ἐκ δ’ ἐπέρησαν; cf. 4.654–5 Στοιχάδες αὐτὲ λιπόντες ἐς Αἰθαλίην ἐπέρησαν / νῆσον and 4.627 ἐκ δὲ τόθεν Ροδανοῖο βαθὺν εἰσεπέρησαν. Eubulus fr. 10.5 Hunter Ἀθήνας ἐκπερᾶν, quoted by Mooney and Livrea, ‘to go forth to’ or ‘proseguire per,’ is from a different context and an unconvincing parallel. The required meaning here must be ‘cross to’. Therefore the Homeric parallels quoted by Livrea where ἐκπεράαν means ‘cross’ are not sufficient (II. 13.652, 16.346, Od. 7.35 etc.).

For Βρυγηίδας ἀγχόθι νῆσους cf. 4.1712 ἅπτορίδος ἀγχόθι νῆσου. Geographical adjectives in –ις are frequent in Hellenistic poetry; cf. in A. Δολοπηΐς (1.68), Φιλυρηΐς (2.1231), Πιμπληΐς (1.25), Ανθεοµείσις (2.724) and Bühler (1960) 94 n. 9, K–B II 282.

331–3 τῶν ἢτοι ἐτέρη μὲν ἐν ἱερόν ἐσκευ ἔδεθλον· / ἐν δ’ ἐτέρη, πληθὺν πεφυλαγμένοι Λυψύρτωι, / βαϊνον. ‘On one of these islands was a sacred shrine and on the other, the Argonauts disembarked, avoiding Apsyrtus’s great force.’ The exactness of the detail reinforces A.’s adopted persona as military historian. For πληθὺν πεφυλαγμένοι cf. II. 11.405 πληθὺν ταρβῆςάς, Thuc. 2.89.1
ὁρῶν ύμᾶς, ὦ ἄνδρες στρατιώται, πεφοβημένους τὸ πλῆθος τῶν ἐναντίων ξυνεκάλεσα, 3.78.1. The sentence structure ἐτέρη μὲν ἐν . . . ἐν δ’ ἐτέρῃ is a Hellenistic inversion of the more usual τῇ μὲν ἐτέρῃ . . . τῇ δ’ ἐτέρῃ (II. 14.272, 21.71, 22.183). The τῶν ἦτοι of PE seems to be preferable to τῶν δ’ ἦτοι (LASG), where δὲ was probably added by a scribe to avoid asyndeton. For τῶν ἦτοι cf. 3.59, 239, II. 5.724, Od. 12.85–6 ἐνθα δ’ ἐνὶ Σκύλλη ναιεὶ δεινὸν λελακυῖα / τῆς ἦτοι φωνὴ μὲν, Nic. Th. 770–1. In addition, the problem of whether to read δὴ τοι or δ’ ἦτοι is difficult (see Bühler (1960) 131, Denniston 533). ἦτοι is sufficiently emphatic here without the introduction of δή.

ἔδεθλον is a recherché word, not in archaic epic; cf. Antim. fr. 33 Matthews, Call. h. 2.72, fr. 162.1 Harder, 880, 987 and by emendation at Aesch. Ag. 776. For its counterpart, θέμεθλα, see 118–21n.

333–5 ἔπει κείνας πολέων λίπον ἐνδοθι νῆσων / αὐτώς, ἄζομενοι κούρην Διός, αἱ δὲ δὴ ἄλλαι / στεινόμεναι Κόλχοις πόρους εἰρυντο θαλάσσης. ‘Since they (the Colchians) left these among many islands, showing reverence to the daughter of Zeus: but the others, packed full of Colchians, protected the ways of the sea.’ Read νῆσων instead of transmitted νῆσους. Α. is likely to have repeated νῆσος from 330 ἄγχοθι νῆσους but in a different case or form; cf. 4.1712 νῆσος ἱδεῖν, ὀλίγης Ἰππουρίδος ἄγχοθι νῆσου. The large number of islands needs to be stressed. The two islands of Artemis have been adequately introduced already. For a similar verbal structure and use of ἐνδοθι cf. 4.1637 Κρήτην ἢτ’ ἄλλων ύπερέπλετο εἰν ἀλι νῆσων, Call. h. 4.42 Σαρωνικοῦ ἐνδοθι κόλπου, 222 ἐνδοθι νῆσου.

There is a neat contrast between ἄζομενοι κούρην Διός and II. 1.21 ἄζομενοι
Διός υἱόν, an indirect reference to another situation in which the possession of a woman was the point at issue. Instead of a river packed with corpses (Il. 21.220 στεινόμενος νεκύεσσι) we have the Adriatic islands full of Colchians (στεινόμεναι Κόλχοις), tracking the possible route of the Argonauts.

From ΣΑ Il. 21.220 (v 174.13–4 Erbse) τοῦ στενοχωρούμενος ύπο τοῦ πλήθους τῶν νεκρῶν, οὓς στενάζων, it appears that some critics there took στείνοιαι as the equivalent of στένω, a meaning allowed by Livrea in the other place where the word occurs in A. (2.128). Although there is no pointer to this meaning in that place (see Cuypers (1970) 156–7), it would be typical of A. to utilise all possible alternatives. It is not the meaning here, as is evident from the self-glossing of 4.332, 336 πληθύν. See Rengakos (1994) 141–2, particularly 650n., where the ancient exegesis of στείνοιαι is discussed with reference to Soph. fr. 1096 TrGF and Theocr. 25.97.

πόρους...θαλάσσης denotes the seaways around the Adriatic islands (see maps pp. 209, 213 and cf. 4.524–5). The latter passage well describes the coastal waters between Rijeka and Zadar, where, as Pliny noted (N.H. 3.151–2), there are over a thousand islands and a network of estuaries and narrow shallow channels.

For πόρους εἴρυντο θαλάσσης cf. Od. 12.259 πόρους ἀλὸς and the verbal reminiscence Il. 14.75 εἱρύσταται ἄγχιθα θαλάσσης, ‘the ships which were drawn up near the sea.’ The form εἴρυντο occurs in Homer at Il. 12.454, with the meaning ‘protected’, but cf. Il. 18.68–9 ἀκτὴν εἰσανέβαινον (~~ eἰς ἀκτὰς πληθὺν ἄγεν) ἐπισχερώ, ἐνθαθαμειά / Μυρμιδόνων εἴρυντο νέες ταχύν ἀμφι Ἀχιλῆα. A., as often, is expressing an opinion concerning the meaning of a rare Homeric form; see 370–2n., Rengakos (2001) 197–203. The same type of tactic is described at Aesch. Pers. 368 ἐκπλοὺς φυλάσσειν καὶ πόρους ἀλιρρόθους.
Also, in the same way, Apsyrtus led his host on to the coasts, near the islands, as far as the river Salangon and the Nestian land. Transmitted ἄκτας πληθὺν λίπεν ἄγχοθι νήσους may be corrupt. The scribe’s eye has gone back to 330 ἄγχοθι νήσους and 333 λίπον ἐνδοθὶ νήσους. However, the sense is clear: Apsyrtus, after having filled the islands with soldiers, does the same for the coasts near the islands. See the modern maps (above and below) for a possible site for these manoeuvres. If this interpretation is correct, the variant νήσων (W<sup>mg</sup> V<sup>241</sup>; see Vian (1974) LXXXVI–II) for νήσους is a necessity. Read ἐγγύθι for ἄγχοθι (cf. 1.633 ἐγγύθι νήσου, 4.1074–5 ἐγγύθι Άργος / ἡμετέρης νήσοιο 3.927 ἐγγύθι νησοῦ and II. 9.76 = 10.561 ἐγγύθι νηών) and ἀγεν for λίπεν (cf. 4.761 ἐλθέμεν εἰς ἄκτας); see Vian (1981) 161. For ἄκτας in similarly phrased passages cf. Aesch. Ag. 696 κέλσαν τὰς Σιμόεντος ἄκτας, Eum. 10 κέλσας
ἐπ’ ἀκτὰς ναυπόρους τὰς Παλλάδος.

According to [Scylax] = Shipley (2011) 23-4, an Illyrian tribe Nesti lived by the side of the river Nestos. This has been identified with the modern Cetina; see Wilkes (1969) 5. The geography of the area lends reality to the story that A. is trying to recreate. As a many-sided narrator, he is playing the role of both historian and geographer.

338–40 ἔνθα κε λευγαλέῃ Μινύαι τότε δηιτήτι / παυρότεροι πλεόνεσσιν ὑπείκαθον, ἀλλὰ πάροιθεν / συνθεσίην, μέγα νεῖκος ἀλευάμενοι, ἔτάμοντο. ‘Then the Minyans would have yielded in grievous combat, few against many, but they avoided this great strife by first reaching an agreement.’ At Il. 13.738–9 μάχονται / παυρότεροι πλεόνεσσι, Polydamas advises Hector that to fight when outnumbered is bad strategy. A. models this scene on a moment in Homer in which a warrior unusually advises caution rather than the pursuit of κλέος, even though Hector rejects the seer’s advice. There is a similar discussion of whether a smaller number can be made to fight against a larger at Hdt. 7.103 καὶ ἓοιεν ἀναγκαζόμενοι μάστιγι ἐς πλεύνας ἐλάσσονες ἐόντες. It is a theme that runs through Greek history; cf. Thermopylae (Hdt. 7.228.1) and Salamis (Hdt. 8.60.1 νησί ὀλίγησι πρὸς πολλάς). The Homeric μάχονται contrasts with A.’s
The Argonauts are portrayed as negotiators rather than fighters. A. ironically introduces the possibility of deadly combat, only for it to be avoided by treaty.


syntheisa are a recurring theme in this section and in the relationship of Jason and Medea as a whole; cf. 4.378 and 390, which form part of Medea’s accusations against Jason for the breaking of the promises made in 4.95–8, and 4.1042–44 δείσατε συνθείας τε καὶ ὀρκία, δείσατ’ Ἐρινύν / Ἰκεσίντι, νέμεσιν τε θεῶν, ἐς χείρας ίούσαν / Αἰήτεω λώβῃ πολυπήμονι δημαθήσαι, where Medea’s warning concerning treaties and oaths has a double meaning: agreements are to be feared not only because Nemesis and the Furies will punish those who violate them, but also because they may be made secretly to the disadvantage of others and lead easily to deception (Mori (2008) 160). Even in Book 3, when Medea is supposedly besotted by the exotic foreigner, she realises that she is entering into a bargain; cf. 3.1105 Ἐλλάδι που τάδε καλά, συνημοσύνας ἀλεγύνειν, ‘In Hellas, no doubt, honouring agreements is a fine thing’, where συνημοσύνη suggests a covenant or agreement sanctioned by the gods or kinship (see Mori (2008) 161 n. 39).

Nestor uses συνθεία in a similar recriminatory manner at Il. 2.339–41 πη δή συνθείας τε καὶ ὀρκία βήσεται ἡμῖν; / ἐν τῷ πυρὶ δῆ βουλαί τε γενοίατο μή δεά τ’ ἀνδρῶν / σπονδαί τ’ ἀκρητοί καὶ δεξιά, ἦς ἐπέπιθιμον. Pindar’s Pelias (P. 4.166–8 καρτερός / ὀρκος ἀμιν μάρτυς έστω Zeús ὁ γενέθλιος ἀμφοτέροις. / σύνθειαν


ταύταν ἐπαινήσαντες οἱ μὲν κρίθεν) uses σύνθεσις in a way which finds echoes here and at Arg. 4.95–8.

In its prose form, ξυνθήκη, the noun is part of the language of diplomacy; cf. Thuc. 1.78 σπονδάς μή λύειν μηδὲ παραβαίνειν τοὺς ὅρκους, τὰ δὲ διάφορα δίκη λύεσθαι κατὰ τὴν ξυνθήκην. εἰ δὲ μή, θεοὺς τοὺς ὅρκιος μάρτυρας ποιούμενοι πειρασόμεθα ἀμύνεσθαι πολέμου ἁρχοντας, which contains a number of key words featuring in the present negotiations with Aietes; cf. 1.145.1, Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 10.59.2. The making and affirming of treaties played a particular part in Ptolemaic diplomacy; see Marquaille (2008) 51, Adams (2008) 92. Perhaps the Argonauts’ solution represents something of contemporary diplomatic practice.

μέγα νεῖκος is a common epic combination (Il. 13.121, 15.400 with Finglass on Stes. fr. 97.187). A.’s phrase elegantly combines Hes. Th. 87 αἰψά τι καὶ μέγα νεῖκος ἐπισταμένως κατέπαυσε and Il. 15.223 ἀλευάμενος χόλον αἰπύν.

Homer has only aorist ἀλευάμενος, although ἀλευόμενος occurs as a variant reading at Il. 4.444, 15.223. A. conforms to this practice, except for the present at 4.474, on the formation of which see Marxer (1935) 14. There the present marks the drama of that particular moment; here the aorist participle functions as a complement to the action of the main verb. See Bühler (1960) 122 and Vian (1959) 161, where examples of present and aorist participles are distinguished and discussed. Later poets favour the present; cf. Quint. Smyrn. 3.361, 4.348, Opp. Hal. 1.529 with Campbell (1981) 27, who adds post-Hellenistic references.

parallels lend strong support for Schneider’s συνθεσίν (in Merkel (1854) 223) against transmitted –σίῃ (LASG) or –σίας (PE). The use of ἐτάµοντο implies that the treaty has been sanctioned by sacrifice, the most significant ritual action of an oath; see Fletcher (2012) 9, Sommerstein and Bayliss (2012) 302–3.

341–4 κῶς μὲν χρύσειον, ἐπεὶ σφισιν αὐτὸς ὑπέστη / Αἰήτης, εἰ κείνῳ ἀναπλησείαν ἀέθλους, / ἐμπεδον εὐδικὴ σφέας ἐξέμεν, εἶτε δόλοισιν, / εἶτε καὶ ἀμφαδίνην αὐτῶς ἀέκοντος ἀπηύρων. ‘As to the Golden Fleece, since Aietes himself had promised them if they should fulfil the contests, they should keep it as justly won, whether they carried it off by craft or quite openly despite the King’s unwillingness.’ The treaty between Colchians and Argonauts seems a reasonable proposal and contrasts with the emotional nature of Medea’s reaction. For the asyndeton cf. Aietes’ remarks starkly reported at 4.231–5, and K–G II 866, which says that asyndeton frequently occurs when a new clause is introduced by μὲν; cf. Od. 12.341 with Denniston 111. The language is suitably legalistic (e.g. εἴτε . . . εἴτε, emphasizing the conditions attached to the agreement, and εὐδικὴ σφέας ἐξέμεν; cf. Thuc. 5.47 for the language and formulae used in treaties and IG II² 3752, 2193.1 for εὐδικὴ in legal contexts; also Xen. Anab. 5.4.15 ἔφασαν τούτους οὐ δικαίως ἔχειν τοῦτο, ἀλλὰ κοινὸν ὁν καταλαβόντας.

Read κείνῳ (Castiglioni; see Vian (1981) LXXIX)) for transmitted κεῖνοι. In spite of 4.1388 τίς κ’ ἐνέποι τὴν κεῖνοι ἀνέπλησαν μογέοντες, the use of the demonstrative pronoun κεῖνοι is awkward, especially after σφίσιν in the previous line. The close parallel, Pind. P. 4.230–1, shows that we require a reference to Aietes and not to the Argonauts, (Aietes speaking) τοῦτ’ ἔργον . . . ἐμοὶ τελέσαις ἀφβιτον στρωμνὰν ἁγέσθω / κῶας αἰγλᾶεν χρυσέω ψυσάνω; cf. Pind. P. 4.243 ἡλπετο δ’
οὐκέτι οἱ κεῖνόν γε πράξεοθαι πόνον καὶ Homeric usage in passages like *Il.* 9.299
ταῦτα κέ τοι τελέσει, 10.303 τίς κεν μοι τόδε ἔργον ὑποσχόμενος τελέσει;

Fränkel's *ei κέν oï* is wrong because *ei...ἀέθλους* represents the protasis of a
gvage future conditional in *oratio obliqua*, `Since Aietes promised that they would
have the Fleece, if they were to fulfil the tasks for him`. Such protases do not
generally take take ἀν or κε, (Goodwin §74.1). Two possible parallels, *Il.* 11.791–2 =
15.403–4 τίς δ' οἴδ' *ei κέν oï σύν δαίμων θυμών ὀρίναις / παρειπών, express
potentiality, not as here a condition. The parallel, 1.490–1 φράζεο δ' ὀππος χείρας
ἐμάς σόδος ἕξαλεοίο, / χρείω ϑεσπίζου μεταμώνιον ἕν κεν ἀλώης, given by Fränkel
(1968) 478 is not close. *Pace* Vian (1981) 161 KEINOI for KEINΩI is as likely a
corruption as KENOI for KEINOI.

For ἀναπλήσειαν ἀέθλους cf. *Od.* 8.22 ἐκτελέσειν ἀέθλους and similar
phrases at 21.135 = 21.180 = 21.268 ἐκτελέσωμεν ἀέθλουν, 3.262 τελέοντες ἀέθλους,
together with the frequent Homeric πότιον / οἵτων ἀναπλήση– (*Il.* 4.170, 8.34, 354,
465, 11.263); cf. *Arg.* 4.365 ἀναπλήσειας ἀεθλουσ. The force of ἀνα– is that the
ἀέθλουi are no light task and to be accomplished to their fullest extent; cf. *Il.* 4.170 αἱ
κε θάνης καὶ μοῖραν ἀναπλήσης βιότοιο and especially the curse expressed by
Hipponax at fr. 115.7 *IEG* πόλλας ἀναπλήσαι κακά.

For ἐμπέδου...οφέας ἔξεμεν cf. *Il.* 16.107 ἐμπέδον αίεν ἔχων, 16.520 σχεὶν
ἐμπέδον, *Eur.* *IT* 758 τὸν ὄρκον εἶναι τόνδε μηκέτ' ἐμπέδον. The infinitive ἔξεμεν
occurs at *Il.* 5.473, 11.141; *Callimachus* has ἔξεμεναι (fr. 75.27 Harder). The
archaising form in –ἐμεν stresses the formality of the agreement (14–15 n. ληθέμεν).

For ἐίτε...ἐίτε cf. Hdt. 3.65.6 ἐίτε δόλω ἔχουσι αὕτην κτησάμενοι, δόλω
ἀπαιρεθναι ὑπὸ ύμέων, ἀλλ' ἐίτε καὶ σθενεί τεω κατεργασάμενοι, 4.9 ἐίτε αὐτοῦ
κατοικίζω (χώρης γὰρ τῷ ἔχω τῷ κράτος αὕτη) ἐίτε... with its similar
explanatory clause introduced by γάρ, and for εἴτε δόλοις cf. Od. 1.296 = 11.120 ἢ δόλῳ ἢ ἀμφαδόν and for εἴτε καὶ ἀμφαδίνιν, II. 7.196 ἢ καὶ ἀμφαδίνιν.

αὐτῶς ἀκόντος ἀπηύρων recalls II. 1.430 = 4.646 τὴν ῥα βίη ἀκόντος ἀπηύρων, ‘the woman that they took from him by force, in spite of his (Achilles’) disagreement’, with its reference to the abduction of Briseis and the dispute over Chryseis at the beginning of the Iliad. For similarities between the position of Medea, as a woman fleeing her country and that of Helen in the Iliad, see Knight (1995) 255. See LSJ s.v. ἀπούρας for the defective (only ἀπηύρων, ας, α, ἀπηύρων) aorist indicative ἀπηύρων and LSJ s.v. 2 for αὐτῶς used in a contemptuous sense. It adds a note of legal nicety to the indictment: ‘they took the Fleece quite openly.’

345–6 αὐτὰρ Μήδειαν (τὸ <δε> γὰρ πέλεν ἀμφηριστον) / παρθέσθαι κούρη Λητωίδι νόσφιν ὅμίλου. ‘but Medea (for this was the point at issue) should be entrusted to the daughter of Leto, away from everybody else.’ As in 341, the item in dispute is put at the start of the sentence. For the end of the phrase in parenthesis cf. 3.627, Arat. 712 ἀμφηριστα πέλοιτο, Call. h. 1.5, II. 23.382 = 527 ἀμφηριστα ἠθηκεν. Such explanatory clauses with γάρ are common enough in Homer and later (II. 4.49, 323, Hes. Op. 759, Arg. 2.913, 2.1043, 3.500, 4.794, Call. Aet. fr. 43.70–1 Harder, fr. 200a.1 Pfeiffer, h. 3.244–5, 4.49). The parenthesis heightens the tension, coming immediately after Μήδειαν – what is to become of her? The middle of the line has lost a single syllable, LAGPE having only τὸ. The lack of a syllable is corrected only in S; see Fränkel (1961) XII, and Vian (1974) XLIX, LX who comments on the propensity of this scribe to make corrections. However, τόδε (Brunck) is to be preferred to τόγε (3.200, 382, 481, 1134) and other conjectural supplements (γε, τό Wellauer, Merkel, τόδε δή and τόγε δή Fränkel
(1968) 478–9) because demonstrative ὁδε is frequent in such statements by A. (Vian (1973) 88); cf. 2.713, 4.794, 3.1134 ὃς γὰρ τόδε (with LAPE against τόγε of SG) μήδετο Ἡρη and 3.104 νῦν δ’ ἐπεὶ ὑμιν φίλον τόδε δὴ πέλει ἀμφοτέρησιν. The ΔΕ of ΤΟΔΕ might have been omitted by a scribe, unfamiliar with parenthetical statements of this kind, and untroubled by the resulting faulty scansion. Wellauer’s γε, τὸ γὰρ can be ruled out because the emphasis is required in the parenthesis ‘for this was the point at issue’ and not with Medea.

For syncopated παρθέσθαι cf. παρθέμενοι at Od. 2.237, 3.74, 9.255; παρθέσαν at 4.66 and πάρθετο at Call. h. 2.76, 2.249. Its meaning here seems to be unhomeric, e.g. παρθέμενο at Od. 2.237 means ‘stake or hazard’. Here the sense is ‘entrust or commit to the charge of another person.’ See LSJ s.v. 2α παρατίθημι for later parallels from the Gospels; cf. also Arrian Epict. 2.8.22 εἰ δέ σοι ὀρφανὸν τινα ὁ θεὸς παρέθετο.

The combination κούρη Λητωΐδι is a variation on the Homeric κούρη Δίος (333–5n.) and appears elsewhere in A. at 2.938, 3.878; cf. Alex. Aetol. fr. 4.7 Magnelli θεῆς . . . Λητωΐδος (cf. Magnelli ad loc. with Fernández-Galiano ν1 571 s.v. Ῥαμνουσίς), Bühler on Mosch. Eur. 44, Call. h. 3.45, Phil. Thessal. A.P. 9.22.1 = 2873 GP for the predilection of Hellenistic poets for patronymic or ethnic adjectives in –ις.

347–9 εἰσόκε τις δικάσησι θεμιστούχων βασιλῆω, / εἴτε μιν εἰς πατρὸς χρειῶ δόμον αὐτὸς ἱκάνειν, / εἴτε μετ’ ἀφνείην θείου πόλιν Ὀρχομενοῖο / εἴτε μεθ’ Ἑλλάδα γαϊαν ἀριστήεσσιν ἐπεσθαι. ‘Until one of the kings who issue judgements should decide whether she had to return to the house of her father or to the rich city of Orchomenos or follow the heroes to Greece.’
Line 347 consisting of four polysyllabic words gives a sonorous feel to the forthcoming judgement of the kings, eventually pronounced by Alcinoos in Phaeacia (4.1098–1120). These alternatives form a large part of Medea’s speech to Jason; cf. 4.369 μεθ’ Ἑλλάδα γαϊάν ἐπεσθαί, 371 ἐποιχόμενος βασιλῆας, 376 εἰ κέν με κασιγνήτοιο δικάσση, 377–8 τῶ ὑπίσχετε τάσδ’ ἀλεγεινάς / ἀμφω συνθεσίας. πώς ἔξομαι ὀμιστα πατρός:.

The concepts of Dike and Themis, together with συνθεσίαι and ὀρκία, are significant themes in the relationship between Jason and Medea (338–40n.). Both involve the notion of right, Themis having to do with what is right for all and Dike signifying what is right for each within the larger context of social life; see Carstens (1985) 11–12, Sullivan (1995) 174.

The mention of θεμιστούχοι βασιλῆες summons up a picture of traditional justice; cf. Hes. Th. 84–7 οἱ δὲ νῦ ἁλαι / πάντες ἐς αὐτὸν ὅρωι διακρίνουτα θέμιστας / ἱθείσοι δικήσιν ὁ δ’ ἀσφαλέως ἀγορεύων / αἰψά τι καὶ μέγα νείκος (~340) ἐπισταμένως κατέπαυσε. The disputing parties come before the βασιλεύς, who settles the case (cf. Hes. Op. 35 ἀλλ’ αὖθι διακρινώμεθα νείκος ἱθείσο δίκης) by pronouncing a legally binding judgment (θέμις). It contrasts with the conflict and the fierce reaction described in 350–91. The calm of epic legal procedure is disrupted not by the heroic temper of an Achilles, as at the beginning of Iliad 1, but by A.’s equally tempestuous replacement for him, Medea. For the phrase, which must also be related to the Homeric σκηπτούχος βασιλεύς, a sceptred king (Il. 2.86, Od. 2.231 Mondi (1980) 203–16), and Finglass on Soph. El. 420–1) cf. [Hes.] fr. 10.1 M–W θεμιστοπόλοι βασιλῆες, Hom. Hym. 2.103 = 215 θεμιστοπόλων βασιλῆων; also δικασπόλοι at Il. 1.238. θεμιστούχοι occurs only in A. It emphasises the right of such kings to judge.
For the εἴτε . . . εἴτε . . . εἴτε structure cf. 341–4n. The disputed line 348a (thus Fränkel and Vian) should be in the text and called 349, as it was before Ruhnken’s

*Epistola Critica II* (1752) 67–8: for him the line was a secure part of the mss. tradition and indeed, although P.Oxy. 2691 (= 4.348–56) offers no clear evidence, ἥτις being the original reading, Haslam (1978) 66 n. 46 notes that the letter could easily be ε. All medieval mss. contain the line and this observation raises the possibility that so did those of antiquity.

Unfortunately Ruhnken later changed his mind ((1782) 310) and has been followed by subsequent editors (Brunck, Wellauer, Fränkel and Vian). The line, however, forms part of an ascending tricolon (cf. Ruhnken’s Latin paraphrase *ad loc.*) and makes good sense in that the case of Medea’s legal guardianship involves three parties; Aietes, Jason, as her betrothed, and her nephew Argos or one of his brothers; cf. the way in which she appeals to the sons of Phrixos at the beginning of Book 4 (4.71). The agreement mentions three possibilities: Medea can go back to the house of her father, or can be put under the protection of her relatives in Orchomenos, or can be taken back to Greece by Jason. In 4.195 he speaks of the Argonauts’ mission on behalf of ‘all Achaea’. The line is repeated from 2.1186 where the family relationships of the main characters are discovered and discussed. Such repetition has parallels in *A.;* cf. 3.410 = 496. The line gains significance here by echoing the moment, when important family links are discovered for the first time.

For πατρὸς δόµων cf. Sappho fr. 1.7 Voigt πατρὸς δὲ δόµων λίποισα. For χρειῶ . . . ἱκάνειν cf. *Il.* 10.118 χρειῶ γὰρ ἱκάνεται, *Od.* 6.136 χρειῶ γὰρ ἱκάνε etc. For μεθ’ Ἑλλάδα γαῖαν cf. the frequent formula in the *Odyssey* πάτριδα γαῖαν ἱκέσθαι (4.558 etc). Ἑλλάδα γαῖαν ἱκέσθαι is an Apollonian formula (1.904, 2.891,
1122, 4.98), varied here with ἂριστήεσσιν ἔπεσθαι; cf. the echo in Medea’s speech 
369 μεθ’ Ἑλλάδα γαίαν ἔπεσθαι.

350–2 ἐνθά δ’ ἐπεὶ τὰ ἐκαστὰ νῦν πεμπάσσατο κούρη, / δὴ ῥά μιν ὀξεῖαι κραδίην ἔλελιξαν ἀνίαι / νωλεμέσ. ‘When the young girl had thought 
this over in her mind, bitter pains shook her heart unceasingly.’ After the terse 
previous section, the language becomes more complex and elaborate. πεμπάζομαι 
means ‘count up mentally, think over, ponder upon’ (cf. Od. 21.222 τῶ δ’ ἐπεῖ 
eἰσιδέτην ἐν τ’ ἔφρασσαντο ἐκαστὰ, Virg. Aen. 8.20–1 animum . . . / in partisque 
rapit varias perque omnia versat). It is equivalent to ἄναπεμπάζομαι, the usual word 
for mental calculation; cf. Pl. Ly. 222 εἶδομαι . . . τὰ εἰρημένα ἄπαντα (~ τὰ 
ἐκαστὰ) ἀναπεμπάσσονται. The qualification of πεμπάσσατο by νῦν (4.350) and 
θυμῷ (4.1748) makes this clear; cf. Hesych. Π 1377 (p. 68 Hansen) πεμπαζόμενοι: 
ἔπιστρεφόμενοι· ἐκπληττόμενοι· μεριμνῶντες.

For ὀξεῖαι . . . ἀνίαι cf. Od. 19.517 ὀξεῖαι μελεδῶνες ὀδυρομένην ἐρέθουσιν, 
from a speech in which Penelope describes her fate to the still unknown Odysseus; 
also Il. 11.268 ὀξεῖαι δ’ ὄδυναι δύνου μένος Ἀτρείδαο. Penelope is wistfully 
melancholic; Medea is on the attack to prevent herself from becoming abandoned. 
Although the two lines only have one word in common, the sense is similar and taken 
with other variations, particularly Arg. 3.1103 τῆς δ’ ἀλεγεινόταται κραδίην 
ἐρέθεσκον ἀνίαι, show that A. and his reader might recall the earlier passage; cf. 
Sappho fr. 1.3–4 Voigt μὴ μ ᾧσαι μηδ’ ὀνίαισι δάμνα, / πότνια, θῦμον, Pind. N. 
1.53 ὀξεῖαις ἀνίαισι τυπεῖς, Philitas fr. 12.3 Lightfoot ἄμφι δὲ τοι νέαι σιέν ἀνίαι 
tετρήχαισιν, Theocr. 21.5, Call. h. 5.83, fr. 714.1 Pfeiffer, Catull. 64.99. νωλεμέσ
emphasises the continuity of the pain. The ἀνίαι that shake her are not those of love but of anger.

In Homer ἐλελίζω is used of physical, often violent, movement; cf. II. 8.199 ἐλελίζε δὲ μακρὸν Ἐλυμπο, 6.106 οἱ δ’ ἐλελίχθησαν καὶ ἐναντίοι ἦσαν Αχαιῶν, of a routed army being ‘turned round’, 22.448 τῆς δ’ ἐλελίχθη γυῖα of Andromache’s fainting when she hears that Hector may be dead. It is appropriate here because Medea is not in love; she is angry because an agreement has been broken and she has realised that Jason is capable of betraying her. A.’s use of the word to describe pain afflicting the heart is an innovation in epic language. As often in describing Medea’s emotions he is influenced by Sappho; cf. fr. 47.1–2 Voigt Ἐρος δ’ ἐτίναξε μοι / φρένας. The use of τινάσσω in hexameter poetry is similar to that of ἐλελίζω; cf. II. 20.57–8 Ποσειδαών ἐτίναξε / γαῖαν, 12.298, Hes. Th. 680. For more imitations of Sappho by A. cf. Acosta-Hughes (2010) 12–62.

352–4 αἶψα δὲ νόσφιν Ἰήσονα μοῦνον ἐταίρων / ἑκπροκαλεσσαμένη ἄγεν ἀλλυδίς, ὁφρ ἠλισθεν / πολλὸν ἕκας, στονόεντα δ’ ἐνωπαδίς ἐκφατο μῦθον. ‘Straightaway she called Jason aside, alone, away from his friends, and when they were far from the others, face-to-face, she made this sorrowful speech.’

While A. has stressed the collective responsibilities of the Argonauts for the negotiations with the Colchians (380–40), Medea personalises her criticism by specifically accusing Jason. With a degree of paranoia, roused by the conspiracies of the male, she calls him away (νόσφιν) from his followers, a fact emphasised by the length of the word (ἑκπροκαλεσσαμένη) employed. It is the preliminary to a highly emotional and threatening speech; see Sistakou (2012) 96. For νόσφιν cf. 3.913
αὐτίκα δ’ Αἰσονίδην ἑτάρων ἀπο μούνον ἐρύσας. The leader is more human and more vulnerable separated from the group and easier to talk to alone.

For ἐκπροκαλεσσαμένη cf. Od. 2.400 ἐκπροκαλεσσαμένη μεγάρων ἐν ναιταύντων (cf. Hom. Hym. 3.111), 15.529 τὸν δὲ Θεοκλύμενος ἑτάρων ἀπονόσφι καλέσσας. This must be a fighting image. She is ‘calling him out’ for a fight or confrontation. For ἄγεν in a similarly structured line cf. Od. 17.10 ἄγ’ ἐς πόλιν, ὅρπ’ ἄν ἐκεῖθι and for ἄφαρ ἐλίασθεν, II. 1.349 ἑτάρων ἀφαρ ἐξετο νόσφι λιασθείς.

A. has built up the introductory line to Medea’s speech from the frequent Homeric clausula φάτο μῦθον (Od. 2.384, 8.10, 21.67 etc.) which rarely has an adjective with μῦθον (but cf. Od. 6.148, II. 21.393) and never a descriptive adverb. στονόεντα is frequent in A. and Homer, but never of μῦθος; cf. Medea’s reply to Jason, 4.410 σύλον ἐκφατο μῦθον. Medea’s speech is ‘sorrowful’, both in the sense of the anguish that she feels and in the threats that she has prepared for others.

ἐνωπαδίς is only in A. Homer has ἐνωπαδίως (Od. 23.94); cf. in particular Arg. 4.720 καὶ δ’ αὐτή πέλας ξεν ἐνωπαδίς, where one of the points of the scene is the eye contact that Circe makes with Medea, through which she recognises her relative’s guilt.

355–90 The chief antecedent of this rhetorical tour de force is Medea’s speech at Eur. Med. 446–520 which also focuses on the invalidity of Jason’s oaths and the desolation of Medea, summarising the core arguments of Euripides’ play. Catullus was influenced by both speeches when writing Ariadne’s soliloquy at 64.132–201. It stands at the beginning of a long tradition of abandoned heroines; see Lipking (1988) 2. Medea, however, unlike Catullus’ Ariadne and others, is not yet abandoned. She is
fighting to hold Jason to his bargain. Her words are blunt and natural, alternating between questions, pleas and curses.

Nonetheless, the whole piece is full of art and literary allusion. 4.355–69 is an opening address to Jason, full of attack and carried forward through the use of enjambment. Words in the emphatic position summarise many of the important themes of Medea’s predicament (άμφ’ ἔμοι ~ ἀγλαίαι ~ χρειοὶ ἐνισχόμενος ~ ὀρκία πάτρην ~ νοσφισάμην). The speech is full of bitter echoes of what has gone before (nn. 372–3, 388–9.)

In 4.370–6 Medea demands that Jason keep his promises or kill her immediately. How can she return to her father’s house? She is still the suppliant (nn. 81–101, 358–9). In the closing part of the speech (4.376–90), she is seized by anger of heroic proportions. If he breaks his oaths, she will call down the avenging Erinyes. By finishing on the keyword συνθεσιάων (338–40n., 390), she reinforces the main theme and echoes the first line of her opening statement (συναρτύνασθε ~ συνθεσιάων); see Toohey (1995) 153–75.

355–6 Αἰσονίδη, τίνα τήνδε συναρτύνασθε μενοινήν / ἄμφ ἔμοι; ‘Son of Aison, what is this plot that you have devised together about me?’ Medea begins in a formal manner, not using the words of a lover; cf. Hom. Hym. 4.261 Λητοΐδη, τίνα τούτον ἀπηνέα μύθον ἔειπας (also the opening line). Homeric speeches often begin with a question; cf. Il. 1.552 αἰνότατε Κρονίδη, ποίον τὸν μύθον ἔειπες; and also the database associated with Beck (2012),
http://www.laits.utexas.edu/DeborahBeck/home, where an enquiry about speeches opening with questions in the Iliad yields a total of forty-seven. The use of the plural verb emphasises that she is one woman against a group of men. Her opening
complaint is that this group are conspiring to overturn an agreement previously made between her and Jason (4.95–100).

For the structure cf. Meleager A.P. 4.1.1= 3926 HE (τίνι τάνδε), LSJ s.v. ὅδε 1.4. Medea’s approach to Jason resembles the way in which Iliadic warriors address one another at moments of crisis; cf. Il. 8.229 (Agamemnon encouraging his men) πῇ ἔβαν εὔχωλαι ‘where are your boastings gone?’, parallel to Medea’s questions about oaths and promises, 2.344–5 Ἀτρείδη, σῦ δ’ ἔθ’, ὡς πρὶν ἔχων ἀστεμφέα βουλήν / ἄρχευ’, 17.469–70 Αὐτόμεδον, τίς τοι νυ θεών νηκερδέα βουλήν / ἐν στήθεσιν ἔθηκε; The opening question sets a tone of remonstrance, the level of which varies with the particular situation. In Medea’s case the use of συναρτύνομαι in the plural form, rather than the simple verb, emphasizes that she feels that the Argonauts are plotting against her. The substitution of μενοινή for βουλή (‘desire’ instead of ‘plan’) heightens the emotional level.

συναρτύνασθε μενοινήν varies πυκινήν ἠρτύνετο βουλήν (Il. 2.55, Od. 10.302). συναρτύνω is a coinage by A. and μενοινή appears first in Hellenistic poetry (also at Call. h. 1.90). Marxer (1935) 38 compares the formation of μενοινή from μενοινάω with A.’s formation of ἀνωγή from ἀνώγα (or ἀνώγω), similarly always at the end of the line (1.1134, 2.449, 566).

For ἀμφ᾽ ἐμοί after βουλή cf. Od. 14.337–8 τοῖς δὲ κακῆς φρεσίν ἦδανε βουλή / ἀμφ᾽ ἐμοί (Odysseus trying to deceive Eumaeus by telling him that he is a Cretan merchant). The situation is similar. The Thesprotians intend to sell Odysseus into slavery; Jason may be intending to hand Medea over to the Colchians. Similar vocabulary in the next line (n.) suggests that there may be a specific allusion to that passage. Odysseus’s general situation is analogous to that of Medea, in that they are both attempting to take control of their fate, but perhaps Medea’s allusion to an
Odyssean lie is meant to underline the atmosphere of deception now created between her and Jason.

356–8 ἦ σε πάγχυ λαθιφροσύναις ἐνέηκαν / ἀγλαίαι, τῶν δ᾽ οὐτὶ μετατρέπη, ὅσσ᾽ ἄγόρευες / χρείοι ἐνισχόμενος; ‘or has your glorious success cast you completely into forgetfulness and do you care nothing for all that you said, when hard pressed by necessity?’ Ariadne rails against Theseus’ forgetfulness in the same way; cf. Catull. 64.135 immemor a! devota domum periuia portas?; see also Eur. Med. 465–519, Virg. Aen. 4.305–30 and 383–4n. For introductory ἦ, introducing an additional provoking alternative, cf. 3.11–12 σὺτη νῦν προτέρη, θύγατερ Διός, ἄρχεο βουλῆς. / τί χρέος; ἦ δόλων τινὰ μήσεαι, 3.129–30.

The rhetorical juxtaposition of two abstract nouns is striking. ἀγλαίαι is almost personified. Just like one of Pindar’s triumphing athletes, Jason has been taken over by thoughts of glory; cf. O. 9.98–9 σύνδικος δ᾽ αὐτῷ Ἰολάου τύμβος ἐνναλία τ᾽ Ἐλευσὶς ἀγλαίαισιν. For the plural cf. Od. 17.244 τῷ κέ τοι ἀγλαίας γε διασκεδάσειν ἀπάσας, [Hes.] Scut. 284–5 πόλυν θαλίσαι τε χοροὶ τε / ἀγλαίαι τ᾽ έἴχον and also 4.1040–1 αὐτάρ ἐμοί ἀπό δὴ βαρὺς έιλετο δαίμων / ἀγλαίας (a linguistically similar speech by Medea). The use of abstract nouns in Homer is largely restricted to direct speech; see Cauer (1921–3) 438–9, Krarup (1949) 1–17, Griffin (1986) 37, Hunter (1993b) 109–11. A. does not discriminate in this way, probably due to the influence of prose (Denniston (1952) 38, quoting Isocrates using examples such as αἰσχύναι, ἀλήθειαι).

แหละ σε πάγχυ continues the allusion to Od. 14.338 ἀμφ᾽ ἐμοί, ὁφρ᾽ ἔτι πάγχυ (355–6n. ἀμφ᾽ ἐμοί).
For λαθιφροσύναις ἐνέηκαν cf. Od. 15.198 ὀμοφροσύνησιν ἐνήσει, II. 9.700 ἄγηνορίησιν ἐνήκας. Glory is an opposite of forgetfulness and Jason is not forgetting at all as Medea’s next remark shows. λαθιφροσύνη is only in A. (though cf. λαθιφθόγγοι [Hes.] Scut. 131.) For another heroic character reproached with forgetfulness cf. II. 9.259 (Phoenix to Achilles) ὡς ἐπέτελλ᾽ ὡ γέρων, σὺ δὲ λήθεαι (= 11.790). Achilles’ and Patroclus’ forgetfulness is different from the cynical abandonment that Jason has been plotting. The majority of nouns ending in –φροσύνη derive from words in –ων; e.g. σωφροσύνη from σώφρων (Buck and Petersen (1944) 289, 296). Hesychius has λαθίφρων· ἀφρών· ἐπιλήσων (λ 102 = II 564 Latte) and λαθασονίη· λήθη· λησφοσύνη (λ 94 = II 564 Latte); cf. Hes. Th. 55.) λαθιφροσύνη would not have been a difficult formation; see Redondo (2000) 141.

With τῶν δ᾽ οὕτι μετατρέπη cf. II. 1.160 πρὸς Τρώων· οὐ τι μετατρέπη (similar lines are II. 9.630, 12.238, 20.190), a line athenised by Zenodotus. A. wrote a monograph Πρὸς Ζηνόδοτον (Pfeiffer (1968) 147). By using the phrase A. is perhaps implicitly rejecting Zenodotus’ critical decision; see Rengakos (1993) 49–86, nn. 253–6, 259–60.

ὡς ἀγορ– is frequent in Homer (II. 8.523, 9.41, 17.180, 24.373 etc) but ὡς ἀγόρευ— does not occur. Similarity in pronunciation makes it an easy variation (cf. 2.23 ὡς ἀγορεύεις, 3.711 οἳ ἀγορεύεις, 3.458 οὓς ἀγόρευσεν).

For χρειοὶ ἐνισχόµενος cf. 3.987–8 ἱκέτης ξεῖνός τε τοι ἐνθάδ’ ἱκάνω / χρειοὶ ἀναγκαίη γουνούµενος and II. 8.57 (referring to the dire need of the Trojans) χρειοὶ ἀναγκαίη. The latter is unique in Homer; the former comes from Jason’s first approach to Medea. She is directly echoing his words and reversing the situation. Jason was a suppliant; now Medea takes up that role, both here and at 4.83–91.
Where are your oaths by Zeus protector of suppliants? Where, then, have all your sweet promises gone? Although she is blaming her lover, Medea speaks heroically; cf. Nestor at Il. 2.339 πὴ δὴ συνθεσίαι (~ 390 συνθεσιάων) τε καὶ ὀρκία βήσεται ἡμῖν;, Agamemnon at Il. 8.229 (355–6n.). She is at the same time suppliant, a jilted young girl about to be abandoned by a sophisticated foreigner, and a character of heroic stature. This tension within the text increases its dramatic power. Other close parallels are Il. 13.219–20 ποὺ τοι ἀπειλαὶ / οἰχοῦνται, Bacchyl. 3.37–9 ύπέρβιε δαἶμον, / ποὺ θεῶν ἐστὶν χάρις; / ποὺ δὲ Λατοίδας ἀνάξ; Ov. Fast. 3.485 (spoken by Ariadne deserted by Theseus and Bacchus) heu, ubi pacta fides? ubi, quae iurare solebas? The anaphora strengthens the force of her accusations, as does the added τοι, an arresting particle, which buttonholes the addressee; see Finglass on Soph. Aj. 221–23, Denniston 547, Cooper (1998) 321–6 and for the anaphora, Il. 13.770 (Hector criticising Paris, as Medea questions Jason here), Call. h. 3.113–6, Rufin. A.P. 5.15.1–4, 5.27.1–3.

Διὸς Ἱκεσίοι ὀρκία refers to earlier meetings; cf. 3.986 καὶ Διὸς, ὃς ξείνοις ικέτησι τε χεῖρ ὑπερίσχει, 4.95 (Jason) Δαιμονίῃ Ζεὺς αὐτὸς Ὀλύμπιος ὀρκίος ἔστω. Medea picks up Jason’s own words to give point to her remarks.

The metaphorical sense of μελιμηρός does not occur before the Hellenistic poets (cf. Call. A.P. 9.507.2 = 1298 HE). A.’s use of μελίχιος ~ μελίφρων is similar cf. 3.458 μύθοι τε μελίφρονες οίς ἀγόρευσεν. In critical situations, μελίχιη is part of the diplomatic approach which Jason uses e.g. 4.394 μελίχιοις ἐπέσσιν ὑποδείεσσας προσέειτεν; cf. Catull. 64.139 at non haec quondam blanda promissa dedisti / voce.

For the idea of sweetness in speech cf. Il. 1.248–9 (Nestor) ἡδυπης ἀνόρουσε λιγὺς Πυλίων ἄγορητης, / τού καὶ ἀπὸ γλώσσης μέλιτος γλυκίων βένε αὐδή with Eustathius’ interpretation of this passage (1.151.15) ‘[the honey] from the Muses’ beehive’, Finglass on Stes. fr. 3, Pind. N. 3. 76–8 ἐγώ τόδε τοι / πέμπω μελιγμένον μέλι λευκῷ / σὴν γάλακτι and Theocr. 20. 26–7 ἐκ στομάτων δὲ / ἔρρεε μοι φωνὰ γλυκερωτέρα ἢ μέλι κηρῷ, Cic. Orat. 32 sermo . . . melle dulcior. For Nestor’s ‘honey-sweetness’ as exemplifying the middle style of oratory cf. Quint. Inst. 12.10.64, Cic. Brut. 40, Sen. 31, Tac. Dial. 16.5, with Hunter (2012) 162. Tissol (1997) 21 on the figure of syllepsis (the comparison ‘sweeter than’ applied to unexpected objects). A.’s portrayal of Jason as ‘honey-tongued’ has a long tradition. The idea can be found in other cultures; cf. Song of Solomon 11 ‘Thy lips, 0 my spouse, drop as the honeycomb: honey and milk are under thy tongue’, with West (1997) 229–30, (2007) 90, Xenophon was called the Attic bee (Suda s.v. Ξενοφῶν = IV 494.47 Adler), a swarm of bees was said to have settled on Plato’s lips when he was a child (Cic. De div. 1.36.78), and Milton’s description of Belial (P. L. 2.112–4 ‘His tongue / Dropped manna, and could make the worse appear / The better reason’). Calypso and the Sirens also have honey-sweet voices (μελίγημας: Od. 12.187); see Graverini (2005) 186–7.
ὑποσχεσίη occurs only once in Homer (Il. 13.369); elsewhere ὑπόσχεσις. It is used several times by A. and Callimachus: 2.948, 3.510, 625, 4.456, Call. Aet. fr. 59.19 Harder, A. P. 6.150.2 = 1136 HE. A. is fond of nouns ending in the Ionic –ιη; e.g. ἀµηχανίη (1.638), ἕνεοστασίη (3.76) ἕννεοστίη (1.7); Redondo (2000) 141.

The form βεβάασιν occurs once in the Iliad (Il. 2.134) and not in the Odyssey. Hesych. β 495 = Ι 319 Latte has βεβάαςι· βεβήκαςι. It is part of A.’s more elaborate version of Il. 2.339 (338–40n.): parallel clauses with anaphora; ὤρκια expanded with Διὸς ἱκεσίοιο; use of the unHomeric ὑποσχεσίη; introduction of the metaphorical use of μελιχρός.

360–2 ἣς ἑγὼ οὐ κατὰ κόσμον ἀναιδήτῳ ἵστητι / πάτρην τε κλέα τε μεγάρων αὐτούς τε τοκῆας / νοσφισάμην, τά μοι ἤν ὑπέρτατα. ‘For which, abandoning all restraint, with shameless determination, I have left my country, the glories of my home and even my parents, things that were dearest to me.’ Introductory ἣς is bitterly ironic: she has left everything for sweet promises. The dactyls and repeated τ sounds of 360–1 emphasise the importance of the things she has lost and contrast with the softer, more melancholy sounds of 363.

δόμους ἐμοὺς, Arg. 4.203, 1036. In none of these passages does the plaintiff mention κλέα (see below). Medea’s mention of this heroic ideal is another pointed contrast with Jason’s ‘sweet promises’.

For οὐ κατὰ κόσμον cf. Iliad 2.44, 5.759, 8.12, 17.205, Odyssey 3.138 etc., but ἀναίδητος occurs only in A. and therefore the more familiar epic phrase οὐ κατὰ κόσμον must be intended as an explanatory gloss. A., in writing this line, possibly remembered the sound of Iliad 5.593 Κυδοῖν ἀναιδέα δηίοτῆτος. In this connection cf. Σ on Iliad 11.4 (III 124.61–5 Erbse) οί δὲ ἀστραπὴν φασὶ τὴν ἔριδα φέρειν, ὡς καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης . . . Ἀπολλώνιος δὲ τὸν κυδοῖν ἀναιδέα δηίοτήτα· οί δὲ τὸ ἔφως . . . ; A. had a scholarly opinion about the passage that he imitates here.

In Homer κλέα only occurs in the phrase κλέα ἀνδρῶν (Od. 8.73, Iliad 9.189, 524); and for the idea of a μέγαρον having κλέος cf. Pindar P. 4.280 καὶ τὸ κλεευνότατον μέγαρον Βάττου. Since the α is shortened in κλέα ἀνδρῶν, A. treats the α as short generally; cf. 1.1 κλέα φωτῶν; see West on Hesiod. Th. 100 κλεία προτέρων ἀνθρώπων.

For αὐτοὺς τε τοκῆας cf. Iliad 17.28 κεδνοὺς τε τοκῆας, [Hesiod] Scut. 90, Arg. 4.203 γεραροὺς τε τοκῆας and for the different quantity of τε in the same line cf. Iliad 1.177, 2.58, Callimachus h. 1.2 with Denniston (1954) 500; 320–2n.

τά μοι ἦν ὑπέρτατα is not in Homer but cf. Iliad 1.381 ἐπεὶ μάλα οἱ φίλοι ἦν, 6.91 καὶ οἱ πολὺ фιλτατος αὐτῇ, together with Pindar P. 3.88–9 λέγονται μᾶν βροτῶν / ἐλβόν ὑπέρτατον οἱ σχεῖν. For the construction cf. Odyssey 23.355 κτήματα μέν, τά μοι ἔστη. Perhaps ὑπέρτατος subtly introduces the lyricism of 363.

362–4 τηλόθι δ᾿ οἶη / λυγρὴσιν κατὰ πόντον ἀμ’ ἀλκυόνεσσι

φορεῦμαι / σῶν ἐνεκεν καμάτων ‘and far away, all alone I am borne over the
sea with the plaintive kingfishers because of your toils. These lines add a note of pathos, intensified by the long vowels, to the theme of separation in 360–2.

For τηλόθι δ᾽ οἴη cf. Mosch. Eur. 148 πλάζομαι οἴη, Arg. 4.1041 στυγερῇ ὑπὸ οἴη and for λυγρῆσιν cf. Hesych. λ 1347 = II 610 Latte λυγρόν ἐπίπτονον· κακόν· χαλεπών· ἵσχυρόν· πενθικόν· and Arg. 4.1561–3. The sadness of the Halcyons becomes a literary topos; see below on ἀλκυόνεσσι.


364–5 ὅτι οὐς ἄμφι τε βουσὶν / ἄμφι τε γηγενέσσιν ἀναπλήσθεις ἀέθλους. ‘so that through me you might safely accomplish the contests of the bulls and the earthborn men.’ For the enclitic μοι cf. Od. 15.42 οὐνεκά οἱ σῶς ἐσσι καὶ ἐκ Πύλου εἰλήλουθας, 16.131. While in the Odyssey passages it means ‘safe for her’, here the required meaning must be ‘safe through me’; cf. with Vian (1981), 3.786 ἐμῆ ἱότητι σαωθεῖς. The prominent position of σῶς stresses that it is thanks to Medea that Jason is alive at all. Similarly, the parallelism of ἄμφι . . . ἄμφι emphasises the extent of Medea’s help against the worst that animals and men
had to offer. Medea reminds Jason of the gratitude that he owes her, by alluding to her previous services; cf. Eur. Med. 476–82, Ariadne at Catull. 64.149 certe ego te in medio versantem turbine leti eripui, Dido at Virg. Aen. 4.317 si bene quid de te merui. While Medea’s sibilants do not hiss as violently as they do in Euripides’ play (Med. 476), the same threatening tone does seem present. Cf. Eur. IT 765 τὸ σῶμα σώσας τοὺς λόγους σώσεις ἐμοί, Plato fr. 29 PCG εὗ γέ σοι γένοιθ’, ἤμας ὡτι / έσωσας έκ τῶν σίγμα τῶν Εὐριπίδου with Pirrotta ad loc.; see Wilkinson (1963) 54, and Clayman (1987) 69–84.

For ἀμφὶ τε βουσὶ cf. 3.624 άιτε δ’ ἀμφὶ βόεσιν / αὐτή ἀεθλεύουσα μάλ’ εὐμαρέως πονέοσαι (Medea dreaming that she easily carries out the contest of the bulls herself), II. 15.587 where Zenodotus read οί αὑτώρ instead of βόεσιν, Od. 17.471–2, [Hes.] Scut. 12, Hom. Hym. 4.390 εὗ καὶ ἐπισταμένως ἄρνεύμενον ἀμφι βόεσιν, Stes. fr. 15.27 with Finglass ad loc. on cattle-rustling. The words are an important leitmotif in the relationship between the two, establishing a verbal link between significant moments in Books 3 and 4.

ἀναπλήσειας ἀέθλους picks up 4.342 ἀναπλήσειας ἀέθλους; Medea echoes the terms of the agreement made about her. The phrase is somewhat ironical at the end of this sentence: he can accomplish these labours only because of Medea’s help, so the second person is not as celebratory of Jason’s achievements as he would like.

366–7 οὐστατον αὖ καὶ κώς, ἐφ’ άρ πλόος οὕμιν ἐτύχθη, / εἴλες ἐμῆ ματίη. ‘And finally, even the Fleece which was the reason for your expedition, you took through my folly.’ The climax of Medea’s argument (‘you survived the contests because of me and needed me to take even the Fleece’, referring to her assistance in conquering the serpent) reads more naturally and coherently if ἐφ’ άρ πλόος οὕμιν
ἐτύχθη (PE) is adopted rather than ἐπεὶ τ’ ἐπαίστον ἐτύχθη (LASG), ‘when the matter became known’ or ‘when my part in the matter became known’ (ἐπαίστοσ and ἐτύχθην SG); cf. Hdt. 8.128 ἐπαίστος δὲ ἐγένετο ὁ Τιμόξεινος προδιδοὺς τὴν Ποτίδαιαν and see LSJ s.v. ἐπαίστοσ. Support for the reading of PE is offered by Eur. IT 1040 ἐν δόμοιο βρέτας ἐφ’ οὐ πεπλεύκαμεν, Pind. P. 4.68–9 καὶ τὸ πάγχρυσον νάκος κριοῦ· μετὰ γάρ / κεῖνο πλευσάντων Μινυὰν, Soph. El. 541 ὃς ὁ πλούς ὃς ἦν χάριν and line endings such as II. 2.155 ἐνθά κεν Ἀργείοισιν ὑπέρμορα νόστος ἐτύχθη, Arg. 1.492 νεῖκος ἐτύχθη, 4.296 ὀλκός ἐτύχθη. There is also a similar statement of the expedition’s purpose at 4.191–2 ἦδη γάρ χρείω, τῆς εἶνεκα τήν ἀλεγεινήν / ναυτιλίην ἐτήμεν. See Fränkel’s praefatio XIII on the preservation by PE (familia k) of good readings, different from those of LASG. Fränkel’s explanation of the corruption (confusion between ΕΠΙΩΠΛΟΟΣΥΜΜΙΝ and ΛΟΟΝΑΙΣΧ in 367, later corrected to fit the sense and the metre) seems convincing. The phrase coming after κῶας emphasises how important the Fleece was – the very goal of their expedition – and the value of Medea’s contribution.

εἷλες ἐµῇ ματίῃ recalls phrases such as Od. 10.79 ἠμετέρη ματίῃ, ἐπεὶ οὐκέτι φαίνετο πομπῆ. It is an indication of Medea’s emotional state that she ends on such a word not e.g. μῆτις. She bitterly regrets her assistance even as she recounts it.

Rengakos (1993) 157 points out, with particular reference to the Homeric hapax ματίῃ, that Od. 10.79 is missing from a Ptolemaic Homeric papyrus (P.Oxy. 778) from about the same time as A. The word’s occurrence elsewhere only in A. (also 1. 805) is another indication of A.’s involvement in contemporary Homeric scholarship.

367–8 κατὰ δ’ οὐλοῦν αἴσχος ἔχειν / θηλυτέραις. ‘I poured deadly shame over women.’ Agamemnon, when questioned by Odysseus in the underworld, says of
Clytemnestra (Od. 11.433–5) ἡ δ᾽ ἐξοχα λυγρὰ ἱδυῖα / οἷ ἔχευ καὶ ἔσομένησιν ὀπίσσω / θηλυτέραι γυναιξί. He describes her as δολόμενη (11.422) and his description of his own death: αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ ποτὶ γαῖῃ χεῖρας ἀείρων / βάλλον ἀποθνήσκων περὶ φασγάνῳ (11.423–4) resembles that of Apsyrtus (cf. 4.471–4), similarly contrived by δόλος.

Medea’s character has evolved from the Nausicaa figure of Book 3. She has already (360–2n.) used words similar to those of Helen to describe her predicament and while these lines allude to Clytemnestra, the next strand of her argument recalls Andromache (368–9n.).

In general, her situation is similar to that of Helen, a woman who has eloped with a foreigner from her native land, for whose recovery a military expedition has been sent (Knight (1995) 255). These subtle allusions to the words of heroines are part of the prequel technique, common in Roman and Hellenistic poetry. Another example is Theocritus’ Polyphemus who hopes that a future visitor (Odysseus) will teach him to swim (11.61). They form part of the process whereby the knowing reader is drawn more closely into an ironic narrative. A. is saying that in Medea he has discovered the original of all the great Homeric women and that her words are not an echo of theirs, but their source.

Medea’s thought that one bad or shameless woman makes all women bad finds another echo at Od. 24.198–202 where Agamemnon predicts that Penelope’s faithfulness will be immortalised in song but Clytemnestra’s murder of her husband will bring evil repute on all womankind, even the virtuous. Other examples are Eur. Ion 398–400 where Creusa says that the reputations of evil women get mixed up with good, Eur. fr. 494–6 TrGF αἱ γὰρ αφαλέσαι ταῖσιν ὤκ ἐσφαλμέναις / αἴσχος γυναιξί καὶ κεκοίνωνται ψόγον / ταῖσ ὤκ κακαῖσιν αἱ κακαί, Eur. fr. 494.24–6
Soph. fr. 679 TrGF where a character in his Phaedra asks that a chorus be sympathetic and silent, for ‘a woman should cover up what brings shame on women’, and Eur. Med. 410–30 where a hope is expressed for new songs that can generalise men’s unfaithfulness in the same way that men have generalised women’s. Medea is to be seen as the archetype of these tragic women; see Chong-Gossard (2008) 18–19.

TrGF οἳ τ’ ἄγαν ἠγούμενοι / ψέγειν γυναῖκας, εἰ μὲν εὑρέθη κακή, / πάσας ὀμοίως,

368–9 τῶ φημί τεῇ κούρῃ τε δάμαρ τε / αὐτοκασιγνήτη τε μεθ

Ἑλλάδα γαῖαν ἐπεσθαί. ‘Therefore I tell you that I follow you to the land of Hellas, as your daughter, wife and very sister.’ Medea echoes Andromache when she encounters Hector on the Scaean gate: Il. 6. 429–30 Ἕκτορ ἀτὰρ σὺ μοι ἐσσὶ πατὴρ καὶ πότνια μήτηρ / ἣδὲ κασίγνητος, σὺ δὲ μοὶ θαλερὸς παρακοίτης. Andromache stresses her total dependence on her man; Achilles killed her father, destroyed her city, slaughtered her brother and made a slave of her mother. Medea puts herself in the position of a suppliant but states her case more strongly. A. evokes the Hector and Andromache passage only to emphasise the differences. Medea herself has broken these familial relationships. τῶ φημί is a strong assertion and ironically stresses that Medea’s shaming all women is the reason for her becoming Jason’s bride. It is usually the virtue of a woman that is the explanation for this. She alludes to Andromache’s words but asserts her right to demand Jason’s protection. Andromache uses language that attributes qualities to Hector; Medea’s assertions are made about herself. On Hector and Andromache, see Graziosi and Haubold (2010) 44–7.

The rhetorical idea of one individual constituting an entire relationship is old. In near Eastern texts, rulers or gods are often said to be ‘like father and mother’ to their people (Graziosi and Haubold (2010) 201). Clearchus, one of the leaders of the
Ten Thousand, after a period of hesitation, reminiscent of Jason (Anab. 1.3.2), says later in his speech (1.3.6) νομίζω γὰρ ύμᾶς ἐμοὶ εἶναι καὶ πατρίδα καὶ φίλους καὶ συμμάχους.

Other heroines have spoken in the same way: Soph. Aj. 514–17 (Tecmessa to Ajax) ἐμοὶ γὰρ οὐκέτ’ ἐστιν εἰς ὅ τι βλέπω / πλὴν σοῦ. σὺ γὰρ μοι πατρίδ’ ήστωσας δορί, / καὶ μητέρ’ ἀλλή μοῖρα τὸν φύσαντά τε / καθεῖλεν Ἀιδοῦ θανασίμους οἰκήτορας. The relationship between Ajax and Tecmessa is different from that of Andromache with Hector. Achilles’ actions have made Andromache totally dependent on him, while Tecmessa says that Ajax, while he sacked her city, is not to blame for the deaths of her parents. For other variations on the theme cf. Soph. El. 1145–8, Eur. Hel. 278, Ov. Her. 3.51, all of which emphasise the dependency of the speaker on her protector. Medea reverses the topos to underline the sacrifice that she has made for Jason and their mutual dependency.

αὐτοκασιγνήτη, used of Medea’s aunt, Circe, at Od. 10.137 αὐτοκασιγνήτη ὀλοόφρονος Αἰήταο, is a powerful climax to the ascending tricolon that describes the links that Medea believes have been made between them. μὲθ’ Ἑλλάδα γαῖαν ἔπεσθαι is a significant (and unique) variation on the more familiar πατρίδα γαῖαν ἱκέσθαι (Od. 4.558, 823, 5.15, 207): Medea is deserting her native land and following Jason, as a dependent suppliant, to his.

370–2 πάντη νυν πρόφρων ὑπερίστασο, μηδὲ με μούνην / σεῖο λίπης ἀπάνευθεν, ἐποιχόμενος βασιλῆας, ἀλλ’ αὐτῶς εἰρυσο ‘Now, in every way, protect me graciously and do not leave me, faraway from you, alone, as you pay court to kings, but defend me come what may.’ Medea changes the tone of her appeal and turns from forceful argument to supplication. πρόφρων indicates a conciliatory
tone, almost prayer-like in nature; cf. Aesch. *Suppl.* 216 (to Apollo) συγγνοῖτο δῆτα καὶ παρασταίῇ πρόφρων, Soph. *El.* 1380 (to Apollo) αἰτώ, προπίτω, λίσσομαι, γενοῦ πρόφρων, Pind. *P.* 5.11, *Od.* 5.143. Medea is trying to capture Jason’s goodwill as though he were a god, and indeed one of the psychological points of supplication is that the act shows that the suppliant is no threat. In Medea’s speech, however, the power inherent in the act is made more explicit. Together with the act of supplication comes the threat of retaliation by greater powers on behalf of the suppliant; cf. *Od.* 13.213–14, 14.283–4 where the protector is Zeus and 4.381, 386 where she calls on Hera and the Erinyes, respectively.


μηδὲ με μούνην represents the ultimate plea of one about to be abandoned. Her condition verges on that of bereavement. Admetus is described as left alone by Alcestis in exactly such language (Eur. *Alc.* 296 κούκ ἄνω μονωθεῖς σῆς δάμαρτος ἔστενε, 380 τί δράσω δῆτα σοῦ μονούμενος; The Danaids ask their father, Danaus, not to leave them because a ‘deserted woman is nothing’ (Aesch. *Suppl.* 749 γυνὴ μονωθεῖσ’ οὐδέν). Tecmessa (Soph. *Aj.* 496–503) emphasises the consequences of Ajax’s death, his abandonment of her, more than the actual fact itself.

ἐποιχόμενος gives the picture of Jason lobbying the Kings to obtain the desired decision in the dispute and being most assiduous in doing so; cf. 4.274–5 (wide-ranging conquests of the early Egyptian king Seostris) μυρία δ’ ἀστη /
νάσσα τ᾽ ἐποιχόμενος, *Il.* 10.171 (to go on a round of inspections) and LSJ⁹ s.v. II 2. ἐποίχομαι.

ἐἱρυσσο is an imperative formed from ἐρύω, meaning here ‘to save, protect’.

For the other semantic areas covered by this verb (draw, protect, drag) see LSJ⁹ s.v. ἐρύω and cf. *Il.* 15.290 ἐρύσατο καὶ ἐσάωσεν, Soph. *OC* 285 ῥύου μὲ κάκφυλασσε. A. reflects all aspects of what must have been a disputed derivation among Alexandrian critics (e.g. protect, save at 1.401, 1.1083, 2.1269, 3.713, 3.1305, 4.279 etc; drag, check at 1.357, 1.760, 1.1204, 3.913, 4.237 etc). The archaic flavour acts as a suitable introduction to the formal appeal to δίκη and θέμις which follows.

372–3 δίκη δέ τοι ἐμπεδος ἐστω / καὶ θέμις, ἢν ἀμφω συναρέσσαμεν.

‘let justice and right, to which we have both agreed, stand firm.’ θέμις and δίκη refer back to Jason’s oath at 4.95–8 and to his speech at the temple of Hecate where, as a suppliant, he used these ideas to persuade her (3.981 χώρῳ ἐν ἥγαθεω, ἵνα τ’ οὗ θέμις ἐστι’ ἀλιτέσθαι, 990–1 soi δ’ ἀν ἐγώ τίσαμι χάριν μετόπισθεν ἄρωγης, / ἦ θέμις, *Od.* 9.215 οὕτε δίκας ἐν εἰδότα οὕτε θέμιστας with Hunter on 3.990–2 and Vian on 4.373). Medea’s words allude to Eur. *Med.* 160–3 ὥ μεγάλα Θέμι καὶ πότνι’ Ἀρτεμι, / λεύσσεθ’ ἀ πάσαχο, μεγάλοις ὀρκοῖς / ἐνδησαμένα τὸν κατάρατον / πόσιν. Her appeal (347–9n. for the significance of δίκη and θέμις) also recalls the world of Hesiod’s θεμιστούχοι βασιλῆς (cf. Hes. *Op.* 9–10 δίκη δ’ ἰθυνε θέμιστας with West). The solemnity of the phrasing is subverted by the sordid nature of the dispute.

The use of συναρέσσαι emphasises the bargain that she believes she has made with Jason, in the same way that 4.355 τίνα τήνδε συναρτύνασθε μενοινήν stresses the agreement about to be made between him and the Colchians about her fate.

373–4 ἡ σύγ’ ἐπείτα / φασγάνῳ αὐτίκα τόνδε μέσον διὰ λαιμὸν ἀμήσαι ‘If not, then straight away with your sword slash the middle of this my throat.’ Medea presents the irresolute Jason with a stark alternative to keeping his word, which implies more resolution than he has previously shown. She prefers a hero’s death to abandonment. Her fate is not to be that of a tragic heroine contemplating suicide (Eur. Her. 319 ἰδού, πάρεστιν ἢδε φασγάνῳ δέρη, Eur. Tro. 1012–4; see Loraux (1987)) but of a warrior perishing in battle from an adversary’s blow (II. 20.481 πρόσθ’ ὀρόων θάνατον· δὲ φασγάνῳ αὐχένα θείας, 18.34 δείδε γὰρ μὴ λαιμὸν ἀπαμήσειε). Again, the tempo of the speech has changed, together with the tone: from the elevated appeal to the abstract concepts of Dike and Themis to physical brutality. On the different readings at II. 18.34 (Zenodotus ἀπότιμησειε; Aristarchus ἀπαμήσειε) see Rengakos (1993) 99.

375–6 δῶρ’ ἐπίηρα φέρωμαι ἐοικότα μαργοσύνησιν, / σχέτλιε. ‘so that I may pay a fitting price for my wantonness, cruel man!’ The words are full of irony and self-recrimination, after the style of Helen in the Iliad. ἐοικότα splits the line into two, balancing a question of Homeric interpretation and a noun with lyrical and elegiac associations.

A. has both ἐπίηρα φέρωμαι,’win’ or ‘carry off’, and ἦρα φέροντες (405–7n.), ‘gratify’, representing two possibilities in a philological argument. ἐπίηρα
φέρωμαι refers to the question of whether ἐπίηρα φέρειν (Il. 1.572 ἐπίηρα φέρων, 1.578 ἐπίηρα φέρειν) or ἐπὶ ήρα φέρειν should be written in Homer. At Od. 3.164 ἐπ’ Ἀτρείδῃ Αγαμέμνονι ήρα φέροντες, Aristarchus, according to Herodian (see Lehrs (1882) 111), supposed a tmesis and read ἐπίηρα. Buttmann (1861) 338–44 showed that this was mistaken, but other poets anticipated this interpretation (Soph. OT 1093 ὡς ἐπίηρα φέροντα, Rhianos fr. 1.21 CA Ζηνὶ . . . Δίκῃ τ’ ἐπίηρα φέρουσα, Phaedimus A.P. 13.22.10 = 2920 HE ἐπίηρα δέχθαι.)

μαργουσῆ (μάργος Arg. 3.120, Alcm. fr. 58.1.1 PMGF; μαργοσύνη Anacr. fr. 5.2. IEG, and, for the dative plural, Theogn. 1271) is the lack of σωφροσύνη in sexual matters, induced by μάργος Ἐρως. It could be a recollection of μαχλοσύνη (in Homer only at Il. 24.30 τὴν δ’ ήνη’ ὣν οἱ πόρε μαχλοσύνην ἄλεγειν, referring to the judgment of Paris where it was rejected by Aristarchus and Aristophanes (ΣΑ ν 523.58–61 Erbse παρ’ Ἀριστοφάνει καὶ τισι τῶν πολιτικῶν ὣν οἱ κεχαρισμένα δῶρ’ ὄνομην, καὶ τάχα μάλλον οὕτως ἄν ἔχοι ἀθετεῖ γὰρ Ἀρίσταρχος διὰ τὴν μαχλοσύνην τὸν στίχον), perhaps through prudishness: see Richardson ad loc.), but cf. Hes. Op. 586 μαχλόταται δὲ γυναῖκες (see Petropoulos (1994) 85), [Hes.] fr. 132.1 M–W εἶνεκα μαχλοσύνης στυγερῆς, Eur. El. 1027 νῦν δ’ οὕνεχ’ Ἑλένη μάργος ἣν. For the use of the abstract noun, see 356–8n.

Transmitted σχέτλιε should be retained. Hermann (1805) 735 thought the sense demanded σχετλίη but throughout the speech Medea constantly attacks Jason; cf. 389, 1047, Virg. Aen. 4.310–11 ire per altum / crudelis. For this reason, Wilamowitz (1924) 201 n. 2 σχέτλιοι also seems wrong. ‘In Homer and Herodotus it denotes cruelty or, occasionally, inhuman courage . . . the adjective suggests the question “How could you bring yourself to do this?”’ (Finglass on Soph. Aj. 887/8–890). The pause permits the hiatus; cf. Reeve (1971) 516.
376–8 εἴ <γάρ> κεν ἐκασιγνήτοιο δικάσῃ / ἐμμεναι οὕτος ἄνας,
tὸ ὑπίσχετε τάδ᾽ ἀλεγεινᾶς / ἀμφω συνθεσίας 'If the king, to whom you both entrust these cruel agreements, decides that I am the property of my brother.'

These lines have the formal sound of the law courts about them (347–9n.); for the same legalistic tone cf. Thuc. 5.31.4 οἱ δὲ Λακεδαιμόνιοι οὐδὲν ἤσσον ἐδίκασαν αὐτονόμους εἶναι Λεπρεάτας καὶ ἀδικεῖν Ἤλείους and for εἶναι plus genitive, expressing possession by another, LSJ 9 s.v. C II δ ἐιμί (cf. Soph. Ant. 737 πόλις γὰρ οὐκ ἔσθ᾽ ἡτίς ἀνδρός ἔσθ᾽ ἐνός), K–G. II 591. The notion of ownership implied by this genitive is an anathema to the heroic temper of Medea.

ἀμφω stresses the adversarial nature of Medea’s speech. She is defending herself against both Jason and Apsyrtus. There is no good parallel for transmitted ἐπίσχετε meaning to submit the case to an impartial arbiter. Read ὑπίσχετε with Platt (1918) 140–1. Livrea (ad loc.) finds unconvincing support for ἔπέχω at LSJ 9 s.v. II 1, where it means ‘to offer food and drink’. ὑπέχω would continue the legal colouring of the passage; cf. LSJ 9 II 3 a, Hdt. 2.118 αὐτοὶ δίκας ὑπέχειν τῶν Πρωτεὺς ὁ Αἰγύπτιος βασιλεὺς ἔχει, Eur. Or. 1649 δίκην ὑπόσχες αἱματος . . . Εὐμενίσι, Pl. Leg. 872c ὑπεῖχε φόνου δίκας.

There is a syllable missing at the beginning of 376. Vian supplies γάρ, following a suggestion of Wilamowitz (375–6n.) See Vian’s and Fränkel’s app. crit. for other possibilities. Its abbreviation might easily have been confused with another particle or even omitted; cf. Od. 15.545 Τηλέμαχῳ, εἰ γάρ κεν σὺ πολὺν χρόνων ἐνθάδε μίμοις, Hes. Op. 361 εἰ γάρ κεν.
πῶς ἱξομαὶ διμματα πατρὸς; / ἦ μάλ' ἐυκλεἴης ‘How shall I come into my father’s sight? Doubtless, with a very glorious reputation.’ ἦ μάλ’ (coniecit anon. apud Wellauer) introduces ‘sarcastic anticipation of a warm welcome from an injured party’ (Finglass on Soph. Aj. 1006–8). Medea is discussing alternatives to death. At Eur. Med. 502–5 she asks herself a similar question: νῦν ποι̣ τράπωμαι; πότερα πρὸς πατρὸς δόμους, / οὕς σοι προδούσα καὶ πάτραν ἀφικόμην; / ἦ πρὸς ταλαίνας Πελιάδας; καλῶς γ᾿ ἂν οὖν / δἐξαιντό μ᾿ οἴκοις ὑπν πατέρα κατέκτανοι; cf. 4.361–2. The answer that she gives herself (καλῶς — ἐυκλεἴης) is similar to that of the Apollonian Medea. Sophocles’ Ajax, when pondering the alternatives that he faces in his own situation, questions himself in the same way (460–3) πότερα πρὸς οἴκους . . . / . . . περῶ; / καὶ ποῖον δόμμα πατρὶ δηλώσω φανεῖς / Τελάμων; His answer includes the same word that A’s Medea uses (465 speaking of his father) ὥν αὐτὸς ἔσχε στέφανον εὐκλείας μέγαν; cf. Soph. Aj. 1006–8, Od. 14.402 (Eumaeus’ offer to Odysseus’ bet on his own return) οὕτω γάρ κέν μοι ἐυκλείη τ’ ἀρετή τε εἰη ἐπ’ ἄνθρωπους, Eur. Hel. 270 πρῶτον μὲν οὐκ οὖσ’ ἀδικος, εἰμὶ δυσκλείης. On rhetorical questions in tragedy, see Mastronarde (1979) 7–8.

For the ‘effrontery involved in looking in the eye those whom one has betrayed’ (Cairns (2005) 146 n. 23) cf. Soph. Aj. 460–3 (with Finglass), 1290, Eur. Med. 467–2, IA 454–5. Medea’s reference to looking her father in the eye, if she is forced to go back to Colchis, is particularly pertinent, bearing in mind the piercing eyesight of the Colchian Royal Family (4.727–9).

The passage and sentiments are echoed at Ennius Med. 217–18 Jocelyn quo nunc me vortam? (cf. C. Gracchus, quoted at Cic. de orat. 3.214 = fr. 61 Malcovati quo me miser conferam), Catull. 64.177–80 nam quo me referam? . . . and form the
basis of the questions which Dido poses herself at Virg. Aen. 4.323–30 cui me moribundam deseris?

379–81 tīna δ᾽ οὐ τίσιν, ἥε βαρεῖαν / ἀτην οὐ σμυγερῶς δεινῶν ὑπερ, οἶα ἔργα, / ὀτλήσω; οὐ δὲ κεν θυμηδέα νόστον ἔλοιο; ‘What revenge, what grim and horrible fate will I not suffer for the terrible things I have done? While you would achieve a pleasant return home?’ After the long question expressing her likely grim fate, Medea’s words οὐ . . . νόστον ἔλοιο condense sentiments such as those of the Cyclops’ prophecy at Od. 9.532–4 ἀλλ’ εἰ οἱ μοῖρ’ ἐστὶ φίλους τ’ ἰδέειν καὶ ἱκέσθαι / . . . εἶν ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν, / ὑψε κακῶς ἐλθοὶ and phrases such as Il. 16.82 φίλον δ’ ἀπὸ νόστον ἔλωνται, Od. 11.100 νόστον διζημα μελιδέα, Pind. N. 24 σὺν εὐκλέει νόστῳ (~ ἦ μάλ’ ἐυκλειής) into a brief and contemptuous remark.

For the repetition of the negative, giving the maximum emphasis to the case that she is making, cf. Soph. Ant. 4–6 οὐδέν γὰρ οὗτ’ ἀλγεινὸν οὗτ’ ἀτης ἀτερ (text insecure) / οὗτ’ αἰσχρόν οὗτ’ ἀτιμὸν ἐσθ’, ὑποῖον οὗ / τῶν σῶν τε κάμῶν οὐκ ὀπωτ’ ἐγὼ κακῶν; also Phil. 416, Tr. 1014, Aesch. Ag. 1634. ὀτλήσω is a choice word (ὁτλος Aesch. Sept. 18, Σ at Soph. Tr. 7–8, ὀτλέω Call. fr. 310 Pfeiffer, 819, Arat. 428, 3.769, 4.1227, ὀτλεύω 2.1008), an Alexandrian formation, perhaps meant to stand for ἀποτίνω or the like.

Wellauer’s emendation οὖ δὲ κεν (in the same at Od. 4.547) for transmitted οὐδέ κε (LA), οὐ κε (SPE), or οὐ δή κε (G) should be adopted. A. is also echoing Il. 3.414–17 μὴ μ’ ἔρεθε σχετλή . . . οὐ δὲ κεν κακὸν οἴτου ὄληαι. It emphasises the alternatives offered by Medea’s rhetorical question.
382–3 μὴ τόγε παμβασίλεια Διὸς τελέσειεν ἁκοιτὶς, / ἦ ἐπι κυδιάεις·

‘Never may Zeus’ bride, the queen of all, in whom you glory, bring that to pass.’ It is ironic that Medea is made to call on the very deity who is manipulating her fortunes (4.21–3). For Διὸς ἁκοιτὶς cf. Soph. Tr. 1048 ἁκοιτὶς ἦ Διὸς, II. 8.384 = 14.193 Ἡρη πρέσβια θεά, 18.184 = Hes. Th. 328 Διὸς κυδρῆ παράκοιτις. The use of παμβασίλεια (Ar. Nub. 357, 1150, of Persephone IG XII/5. 310.15; cf. Stes. fr. 18.2 Finglass παμβαςιλη, of Zeus, Alcaeus fr. 308.3–4 Voigt Κρονίδαι . . . παμβαςιλη), a rare word, strengthens the appeal.

τελέσειεν evokes Hera Teleia, goddess of marriage; cf. Ar. Thesm. 973–4

’Ἡραν δὲ τὴν τελείαν / μέλψωμεν, 95–6n. Readers can only think of how bitterly the marriage between Jason and Medea will end. In Aeschylus’ Eumenides, Hera Teleia and Zeus Teleios are called on as guardians of marriage when Apollo accuses the Erinyes of disregarding marriage (Aesch. Eum. 213–5, Clark (1998) 16).

Write ἦ ἐπι κυδιάεις rather than ἦ ἐπικυδιάεις; cf. 1.286–7 σεῖο πόθῳ μινύθουσα δυσάμορος, ὡ ἐπι πολλῆν / ἀγλαίην καὶ κῦδος ἔχουν πάρος. Homer has only the participle (II. 2.579, 6.509, 21.519). κυδιάω is an Alexandrian present formed by analogy perhaps prompted by forms such as Hom. Hym. 2.170 κυδιάουσαι. The supposed compound ἐπικυδιάω is attested nowhere else. Medea is mocking Jason because she believes that he has achieved κῦδος, the point of a hero’s existence, only through her aid (364–5n.).

383–4 μνήσαιο δὲ καὶ ποτ’ ἐμεῖο, / στρευγόμενος καμάτοισι· ‘May you some time remember me, when you are overcome with continual suffering.’ This is the cry of the one about to be deserted or abandoned; cf. in an heroic context, II.

1.173–4 (Agamemnon about to be deserted by Achilles) φεῦγε μᾶλ’ εἰ τοι θυμὸς
ἐπέσσυται, οὐδὲ σ’ ἔγωγε / λίσσομαι εἶνεκ’ ἐμεῖο μένειν, Virg. Aen. 4.381 i, sequere Italiam ventis, pete regna per undas / . . . / supplica hausurum scopulis et nomine Dido / saepe vocaturum. Both Dido and Medea are forced to cut their ties with a social group, the family, to attach themselves to their lovers; see Monti (1981) 50–1.

Medea’s ‘remember me’ comes with a threat, unlike the wistful tone of Nestor to Achilles at Il. 23.648 ὡς μεν ἀδι μέμνησαι ἐνηέος, Nausicaa’s simple farewell to Odysseus at Od. 8.462. μνήσῃ ἐμεῖ’, and the appeal of Odysseus’ comrades at Od. 10.472 μμνήσκεσ μπατρίδος αῆης. Both Hypsipyle and Medea’s previous use of the appeal at 1.896, 3.1069, 3.1110 are also emotionally charged but in a less menacing way.

στρεύγεσθαι is dis legomenon in Homer; cf. Il. 15.512 and Od. 12.351 where it is used to describe persons who prefer to die at once rather than be gradually worn down (στρεύγεσθαι) (see Dyck (187) 156, Rengakos (1994) 144). Rengakos (2001) connects this explanation to glossographic exegesis (199) and applies it to the three occurrences of the word in A. (here, 4.621, 1058). There is, however, evidence that the word was a matter of debate for Hellenistic poets (cf. Timoth. fr. 792.81 Hordern φάτ’ ἀοθματι στρευγόμενος, Nic. Alex. 291 τῷ καὶ στρευγομένῳ περ ἀνήλυθεν ἐκ καμάτοιο, 313, Call. h. 6.67 μεγάλα δ’ ἐστρεύγετο νοῦσῳ, and also the coinage στρευγεδόνι at Nic. Alex. 313). For a different explanation of the word see 4.1058 with Et. Mag. 729.52 Gaisford στρευγομένη στρεφομένη and Bulloch (1977) 106). Here, A. may be echoing and varying Callimachus’ phrase (above). For κόματος as a disease see LSJ⁹ s.v., 1–2n. Medea is condemning Jason to a long period of suffering without immediate respite.
384–5 δέρος δὲ τοι ίσον ὀνείρῳ / οἶχοιτ’ εἰς ἔρεβος μεταμώνιον ‘may the Fleece like a dream vanish into the nether darkness on the wind!’ First, the Fleece’s radiance was overwhelming (4.171–7) and now its light is to vanish. δέρος . . . ὀνείρῳ stresses the futility of Jason’s efforts without Medea’s assistance (cf. Od. 11.207–8 τρίς δὲ μοι ἐκ χειρῶν σκιῇ εἰκελον ἥ καὶ ὀνείρῳ / ἔππατ’, 11.222, 19.581 and also Patroclus’ soul disappearing like smoke: Il. 23.100–1 ψυχῇ δὲ κατὰ χθονὸς ἡὕτε καπνὸς / ὀχετο τετριγυῖα, with its Latin imitations: Lucr. 3.455, Virg. G. 4.499, Aen. 5.740, 6.794–5). For μεταμώνιον cf. Stes. fr. 42.2 ] . . . αἰμόγυιον with Finglass ad loc. who mentions the possible supplement there of πεδαμώνιον, ‘vain, fruitless’.

The light of the Fleece will be totally extinguished in the darkness of Erebo.

West (1997) 159 says that Erebo is a region of darkness as opposed to the realm of light; cf. his note on Th. 123, to which Finglass on Soph. Aj. 394a–5 adds Alcaeus A.P. 7.429.10 = 105 HE, together with Marinatos (2010), who defines Erebo (p. 198) as ‘the complete absence of sunlight to be distinguished from night which bears within herself the potential of day.’ Medea threatens Jason with the total loss of his prize.

385–7 ἐκ δὲ σε πάτρης / αὐτίκ’ ἐμαί σ’ ἐλάσειαν Ἐρινύες, οἶα καὶ αὐτή / σῇ πάθον ἀτροπίη. ‘May my Furies drive you from your homeland immediately because of what I have suffered through your heartlessness.’ Medea’s curse comes true. After Jason delivered the Fleece to Pelias, he called upon Medea to take vengeance on him. Medea duped his daughters into boiling the dissected parts of his body in a cauldron. Pelias remained dead, and his son Acastus expelled Jason and Medea from Iolcus. The story of Medea’s attempted rejuvenation is found first at Eur.
Ironically, Medea uses words and sentiments similar to those of Jason when he curses her at the end of Euripides’ play (Med. 1389–90 ἀλλά σ᾽ Ἐρινύς ὀλέσει τέκνων / φονία τε Δίκη, 1405 ὡς ἀπελαυνώμεθ᾽). The repetition of σὺ (linked with σῇ) should be retained for the increased emphasis. Fränkel (OCT) wanted to write ἐμαί ἑλάσειαν but cf. similar repetitions at Il. 8.102–3, 24.772–3.

Medea speaks forcefully of ‘my Erinyes’. It makes the vendetta with which she threatens Jason more personal and intense; ‘even beggars may have Erinyes’ (Lloyd-Jones (1983) 76, alluding to Od. 17.475). It is the task of the Erinyes to pursue (Aesch. Eum. 421 βροτοκτονοῦντας ἐκ δόμων ἐλαύνομεν). Δίκη and θέµις (4.373–4) are associated with Ἐρινύες, since the latter especially punish sins against kinsfolk or relatives; cf. Aesch. Ag. 1432–3, Soph. Tr. 808–10. On occasions, the Erinyes are seen as the champions of justice and the natural order (Heracl. D–K 22 B 94 = 172.9) Δίκης ἐπίκουροι rather than of the rights of relatives. See Lloyd-Jones (1990) 204 = (2005) 91–2, Finglass on Soph. El. 792.

ἀτροπία ‘inflexibility, hardheartedness’ is a rare word and only occurs at Theogn. 218 before A. (4.1006, 1047). It is picked up by νηλεές in 388–9n. Σ (p. 285 Wendel) ad loc. explains it as τῇ σῇ κακροπίᾳ καὶ ἀβουλίᾳ, ‘malice and thoughtlessness.’ Perhaps, A. also means the reader to remember the πολυτροπία of Odysseus, when compared with the ἀμηχανία of Jason.

388–9 τὰ μὲν οὐ θέµις ἀκράαντα / ἐν γαίῃ πεσέειν, μάλα γὰρ μέγαν ἥλιτες ὀρκον, / νηλεές ‘It is not right that these curses fall unaccomplished to the ground. You have broken a very great oath, pitiless one.’ Cf. the words used at their first meeting at 3.891 ὡ φιλαί, ἦ μέγα δή τι παρήλιτον, οὐδ’ ἐνόησα and later
ἀλιτέσθαι (3.981); see Hunter (1993b) 63–4.


An oath is regarded as the greatest, i.e. the most binding and sacred of pledges (for μέγας with ὁρκος: Aesch. Ag. 1290, Il. 9.132, 15.37–8). Broken oaths play an important part in the complaints of Euripides’ Medea; cf. 20–2 Μήδεια δ’ ἡ δύστηνος ἠτιμασμένη / βοᾷ μὲν ὁρκος, ἀνακαλεῖ δὲ δεξιᾶς / πίστιν μεγίστην, 160–2, 168–70, 439–40, 492, 495–6 ἐπεὶ σύνοισθα γ’ εἰς ἐμ’ οὐκ ἐυορκος ὤν / φεῦ δεξιὰ χείρ (~4.99–100), ἦς σύ πόλλα ἔλαμβάνου; see Torrance (2014) 133. This emphasis on oaths is important on two levels: first, oaths did not normally play a part in the normal wedding ceremony. Any contract would be between the bridegroom and the legal guardian of the bride. Medea, both here and in Euripides’ play, speaks of Jason’s oaths and pledges as having been given to her. In contracting a marriage in this way, she takes on the role of a male citizen. Euripides’ (and Apollonius’) divergence from custom makes the intended betrayal more personal: when he abandons Medea, Jason breaks vows that he made to Medea herself. See 88–90n., Williamson (1990) 18, Ewans (2007) 56.

νηλεές, addressed directly to Jason, occupies a strong position in the line and links closely with σχέτλιε (376) and ἀτροπίῃ (387). It alludes to Il. 16.33–5 νηλεές, οὐκ ἀρα σοι γε πατήρ ἢν ἵπποτα Πηλεύς, / οὐδὲ Θέτις μήτηρ· γλαυκὴ δὲ σε τίκτε θάλασσα / πέτρα τ’ ἡλίβατοι, ὅτι τοι νόος ἐστίν ἀπηνής with A.'s ἀτροπίῃ
summarising Homer’s more elaborate description; cf. 4.1047 σχέτλιοι ἀτροπίης καὶ ἄνηλέες.

389–90 ἀλλ’ οὐ θήν μοι ἐπιλλίζοντες ὀπίσσω / δὴν ἔσσεσθ’ εὐκηλοὶ ἐκητὶ γε συνθεσιάων. ‘but, surely, not long, will you and your comrades be at ease leering at me, for all your agreements.’ Medea’s speech finishes strongly, with two lines full of assonance and alliteration; on such effects see Silk (1974) 173–92.

A.’s imitators are Catull. 64.200–1 and Virg. Aen. 4.628–9.

οὐ θήν is heavily ironic (cf. Il. 2.276, Od. 5.211) and ἐπιλλίζοντες (Arg. 1.486, 3.791, Od. 18.11) sums up how she feels about the Argonauts at this moment: she is surrounded by ungrateful and insensitive men. It implies the same kind of mockery which Electra cannot bear at Soph. El. 1153–4 γελῶσι δ’ ἐχθροί· μαίνεται δ’ ύφ’ ἡδονῆς / μήτηρ ἀμήτωρ; see Knox (1964) 30 ‘Sophocles’ heroes cannot bear mockery’, and ‘even if the hero does not experience this face to face he imagines it in his moments of brooding despair’. Medea seems to be imagining a similar situation.

Wifstrand (1928) 120 read ἔσσεσθ’, ‘you will not long sit’, comparing 1.1290, Il. 75–6, Od. 13.423–4 and basing the form of the verb on Il. 9.455 μὴ ποτε γοῦνασιν οἴσιν ἐφέσσεσθαι φίλον υἱόν, where ἐφέσσεσθαι is the reading of Aristarchus against ἐφέζεσθαι. However, in the parallels quoted to support ἔσσεσθ’, those addressed are actually sitting. It seems inappropriate here.

συνθεσιά (nn. 338–40, 355–90), echoing the first line of the speech, are a theme of the discussions and the marriage between Jason and Medea. Here they will achieve the murder of Apsyrtus: later they will be tragically broken in Corinth. The full significance of this final word can only be appreciated by the reader. It is
emphasised by A.’s for combining a dactylic fifth foot with the sixth in a single word, e.g. 1.380 ἀμφοτέρωθεν (Mooney (1912) 413).

391–3 ἄρ διήγεται ἀναζεύον τῷ ὀλυμπῷ ἤγε / νήα καταφλέξαι, διά τ’ ἐντεα πάντα κεάσσαι, / ἐν δὲ πεσεῖν αὐτή μαλερῷ πυρί. ‘So she spoke, seething with grim anger. She longed to set fire to the ship, burn all the equipment and then throw herself into the consuming flames.’

Transmitted ἐμπεδὰ πάντα cannot bear any sense which would connect it with the ship’s fixtures: therefore, read ἐντεα; cf. Hom. Hym. 3.488–9 νῆα δ’ ἐπείτα δοὴν ἀν’ ἐπ’ ἡπείρου ἐρύσασθε, / ἐκ δὲ κτήμαθ’ ἐλεοθε καὶ ἐντεα νηὸς ἠσθίσαις and for ἐντεα πάντα, Quint. Smyn. 14.444–5 ἔγωγ’ ἀνθίσταμαι εἶνεκ’ Ἀχαιῶν, / ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐντεα πάντα. Medea wants to start a fire on board the Argo, make sure that it spreads to the rigging (cf. Od. 15.322 πῦρ τ’ εὐ νηός διά τε ξύλα δανά κεάσσαι where διακεάζω was interpreted as either ‘burn’ or ‘split’, Σ (II 615.10 Dindorf) and Hesych. s.v. κέασαι (κ 1954 = II 451 Latte) καῦσαι ή σχίσαι) and throw herself into the blaze. The corruption might have been caused by a scribe’s recollection of lines such as Il. 12.12 τόφρα δὲ καὶ μέγα τεῖχος Ἀχαιῶν ἐμπεδοῦ ἦν, where the context is that of Hector’s attempt to burn the Greek ships.

Rengakos (1994) 102 thinks that κεάζειν = σχίζειν is not possible here. He believes that ‘burn the Argo’, ‘smash everything’, and ‘throw oneself on the fire’ does not give the required progression in terms of Medea’s threats and interprets κεάζειν as equivalent to καῦσαι. This interpretation is reinforced by a use of καταφλέξαι which may also result from contemporary Homeric criticism. At Il. 9.653 κτείνοντ’ Ἀργεῖος, κατά τε συμβέλει µυρί νήας, there is a v.l. κατά τε φλέξαι (quoted at Pl. Hp. Min. 371c) which Rengakos (1993) 133 n. 1 believes that A. knew. Medea’s
words are totally concentrated on burning the Argo.

Other proposed emendations have been ἄρμενα Livrea (1973) 127, ἐμπολα Fränkel (1968) 483–4, ἐνδοθι Fränkel (1961), ἀμφαδά Campbell (1971) 420, Vian (1981), and τε ξύλα Krevelen (1971) 242, based on Quint. Smyrn. 12.567–8 ἃ γάρ οἱ μενέεινε διὰ ξύλα πάντα κεδάσσαι / ἥ καταπρῆσαι μαλερῷ πυρί, not as parallel as it seems, because Quintus’ heroine, Cassandra, is armed with an axe.

393–4 τοῖα δ᾽ ἱῆσων / μειλιχίοις ἐπέεσαν ύποδείσας προσέειπεν.
‘Jason took fright and spoke to her with soothing words.’ Jason is more afraid of Medea than of the Colchian army. His answer echoes the way in which he responded to the suspicions of Aietes (3.385–6 αὐτὸς ἀμείψατο μειλιχίοσιν / Αἰήτη, σχέο μοι). The two speeches are also connected by the description of Jason’s general demeanour (3.396, 4.410 ύποσσαίων). Medea has lost any illusions she might have had about Jason’s heroism and Jason sees that Medea resembles her father. On Jason the conciliator see Mori (2005) 210-11, on the rhetorical nature of his speeches, Volonaki (2013) 51–70 and on his soothing words 358–9n., Mori (2007) 465–6.

395 ἰσχεο, δαιμονίη, τὰ μὲν ἀνδάνει οὐδ’ ἐμοι αὐτῷ. ‘Calm down, poor lady. I too take no pleasure in this.’ In Homer δαιμονίη expresses astonishment or criticism (95–6n.); cf. ΙΙ. 6.326–9 (Hector to Paris) δαιμόνι’ οὐ μὲν καλὰ χόλον τόνδ’ ἐνθεο θυμῷ, / λαοὶ μὲν φθινύθουσι . . . / μαρνάμενοι σέο δ’ εἶνεκ’ (~ 4.398 εἴνεκα σεῦ) ἀυτὴ τε πτόλεμός τε / ἀστυ τόδ’ ἀμφιδέδη πεν (~ 4.397 ἀμφιδέθην). Jason’s solution is a reversal of Hector’s call to action.

Even at ΙΙ. 6.407 (Andromache to Hector) δαιμόνιε φθίσει σε τὸ σὸν μένος, although the speech is a tender one, the initial tone is critical. Andromache has
previously (389) been described as μανωμένη ἐκκύσα. The literal meaning of δαίμονι is ‘possessed by a δάιμον.’ Jason often uses the word when he is trying to placate Medea, using methods that verge on lying (3.1120, 4.95). Both ἵσχεο (cf. Il. 213–4 where Athena recommends restraint to Achilles) and τὰ . . . αὔτῳ (Il. 7.407, Od. 2.114) are further attempts to mollify.

396–7 ἀλλὰ τιν ἀμβολίην διξήμεθα δηιστήτος / ὅσον δυσμενέων ἀνδρῶν νέφος ἀμφιδέθην / εἶνεκα σεῦ. ‘but we are looking for some way to postpone a battle, for such a cloud of hostile men, like a fire, surrounds us, on your account.’ Surrounded as he is by hordes of Colchians, Jason’s advice to delay matters and relay on δόλος and συνθεσίη rather than combat contrasts with the way in which a Homeric warrior behaves at a time of crisis. For example, Ajax exhorts the Greeks to immediate conflict rather than to suffer Hector and the Trojans’ constant threats to burn the Greek ships at Il. 15. 511–2.

The Homeric phrases that Jason alludes to (cf. Il. 7.290 νῦν μὲν παυσώμεσθα μάχης καὶ δηιστήτος, 24.288 δυσμενέων ἀνδρῶν, 16.66 κυάνεον Τρώων νέφος ἀμφιδέθηκε, 6. 328–9 σέο δ’ εἶνεκ’ αὐτή τε πτόλεμος τε / ἁστυ τόδ’ ἀμφιδέθη) are subverted by his ulterior motives.

398–400 πάντες γάρ, ὅσοι χθόνα τήνδε νέμονται, / Ἀχιλλός ἰμακάσιν ἀμυνέμεν, ὕφρα σε πατρί, / οἶα τε ληισθεῖσαν, ὑπότροπον οἶκαδ’ ἄγοιντο. ‘All who inhabit this land are keen to help Apsyrtus, so that the Colchians can take you back to your father, as if you had been plundered in war.’ Jason continues to justify his course of action using Homeric phrases that attempt to mask
the reality of the situation. Medea’s possible fate is softened by the potentiality of οἷά τε and the use of a passive participle.


401–3 αὐτοὶ δὲ στυγερφι κεν ὀλοίμεθα πάντες ὀλέθρω, / μίξαντες δα’ χεῖρας· ὃ τοι καὶ ρίγιον ἄλγος / ἔσσεται, εἰ σε θανόντες ἔλωρ κείνοισι λίποιμεν. ‘If we were to join battle, we would all perish in hateful death and it would be even worse for you, if dying we were to leave you as easy prey for them.’ The matter is not be decided by combat (cf. Il. 2.385 στυγερφο κρινώμεθ’ Ἀρηκ, 18.209, 13.286, 14.386–7). The echo of Hector’s words to Andromache at 6.462–3 σοὶ δ’ αὖ νέον ἔσσεται ἄλγος / χήτεϊ τοιοῦ δ’ ἀνδρὸς ἀμύνειν δούλιον ἢμαρ and the reference to a frequent fate on the field of Troy (cf. 1.4 αὐτούς δὲ ἐλώρια τεῦχε κύνεσσοι, 5.488 = 17.151, 17.667) emphasise that Jason is avoiding combat. His argument is rhetorically empty in that Medea’s situation will not alter much whatever happens. Unlike Andromache, she still has a family to whom she can be returned. Jason’s thoughts are centred on self-preservation.

404–5 ἡδὲ δὲ συνθεσίη κρανείει δόλον φι μιν ἐς ἄτην / βήσομεν. ‘But this agreement will accomplish a trick by which we will lead Apsyrtus to destruction.’ Jason proposes an alternative to combat and the phrase that he uses is unexpected. Treaties are usually made to ensure peace not treachery and κραίνω is a word
appropriate to solemn undertakings; cf. Il. 1.41, 504 τόδε μοι κρήηνον ἐέλδωρ but also Od. 8.276 τεῦξε δόλον, 11.439 δόλον ἡρτυε, Hes. Op. 83 δόλον αἵτιν ώτα αἷμα ἱερήν εὔδεσθεν, Aesch. Suppl. 1470–1 ἂτης δ᾽ ἂβυσσων πέλαγος οὐ μάλ’ εὔπορον / τόδ᾽ ἐσβέβηκα, κούδαμοι λιμήν κακῶν, Soph. OC 997. Critics have debated whether he has planned to use δόλος all along or whether it is an inspiration of the moment; see Hunter (1993b) 15 discussing the unstable nature of the perspective that A. adopts with regard to Jason’s characterisation. This uncertainty is typical of Jason and the euphemisms that fill the end of this speech contrast sharply with Medea’s reply.

His suggestion of δόλος recalls Aesch. Cho. 555–7 (Orestes to the Chorus)

αἰνῶ δ᾽ ἐκρύπτειν τάς δε συνθήκας ἐμάς, / ὡς ἄν δόλῳ κτείναντες ἄνδρα τίμιον / δόλοισι where Orestes and Electra believe that they are planning a justified revenge. In contrast, Jason and Medea offer no moral justification for their stratagem.

405–7 οὐδ᾽ ἂν ὄμως περιναιέται ἀντίδωσι / Κόλχοις ἥρα φέροιεν ύπέρ σέο νόσφιν ἄνακτος, / ὃς τοι ἁσσητήρ τε κασίγνητός

τετένυκται. ‘Nor, equally, would the local people agree with the requests of the Colchians, without their leader who is your guardian and brother.’ Jason explains the practicalities of his agreement. One of the reasons for the confusion of the transmitted tradition (ἀντιώσι and φέροντες SG, ἀντιώσι and φέροιεν PE, ἀντιώσι and φέροντες LA, εἰσάγοντες and φέροντες D) is the vagueness of Jason’s concluding remarks. For ἀντίαω as an equivalent of ἀντίάζω, see LSJ⁹ s.v. ἀντίαω and ἀντιάζω. Here, it is a dative plural participle, emphasising the dependency of the Colchians on the local population (366–7n.).
ἦρα φέροιεν is a reference to whether ἐπίηρα φέρειν or ἐπὶ ἦρα φέρειν should be written in Homer (375–6n.). In another example (II. 14.132 θυμῷ ἦρα φέροντες) there is no ἐπί at all, simply a dative with φέροντες (cf. Choerilus fr. 17a.3 PEG). If φέρειν required neither a compound form nor the preposition ἐπί, then ἐπίηρα could be seen as a compound noun, the prefix bearing the meaning of over or beyond the normal; cf. the difference between Hesychius’ definitions, η 1954 = II 291 Latte ἦρα· ἤ χάριν, βοηθεῖαν, ἑπικουρίαν and ε 4780 = II 156 Latte ἐπίηρα· τὴν μετ’ ἑπικουρίας χάριν μέγαλην ἢ ἐκ τῆς περιουσίας; see Rengakos (1994) 86, 156, 169, 176.

ἀοσσητήρ is usually explained as ‘helper’ (Hesych. α 5691 = II 95 Latte) ἀοσσητήρ· βοηθός), which, although appropriate at 4.146 ὡςον ἀοσσητήρα, θέων ὑπατον, seems strange here. Some meaning, such as ‘guardian, saviour’ (possibly derived from σωτήρ) would make better sense; cf. Eur. IT 923 κάμος γε σωτήρ, οὐχι συγγενής μόνον, II. 15.254–5 τοίν τοι ἀοσσητήρα Κρονίων / ἐξ ἑδῆς προέηκε παρεστάμεναι καὶ ἄμυνειν (where Apollo is sent by Zeus to help or save Hector in a moment of despair), Od. 4.165 ζῷ ἁλλοι ἀοσσητήρες ἐωσιν (of the lack of support for Telemachus in Odysseus’ absence). ἀοσσητήρ is well attested in Homer and later epic poetry; see Harder (2012) II 189. The whole line, with its awkward formality, adds to the impression of prevarication that Jason gives here; see Vian (1981) 164 who takes it to refer to Medea’s legal position, depending on the judgment of the kings (376).

408–9 οὐδ’ ἄν ἔγω Κόλχοισιν ύπείξω μὴ πτολεμίζειν / ἀντιβίην, ὅτε μὴ με διέξ εἶσθι νέεσθαι. ‘I too shall not shrink from facing the Colchians in battle, if they do not allow me to pass through.’ Jason continues to discuss possibilities rather than make decisions. The awkwardness of the syntax reflects his
hesitation. \( \text{ὑπείξω} \) μὴ πολεμίζειν is Gerhard’s emendation ((1816) 45–7) for transmitted \( \text{ὑπείξομαι} \); for the infinitive with \( \text{ὑπείκω} \) cf. 4.1676, Od. 5. 332, Soph. OC 1184. Read διέξε εἰῶσι (Gerhard (1816) 46, for mss. διεξίωσι, comparing Il. 20.139 οὐκ εἰῶσι μάχεσθαι.

410 ἵσκεν ὑποσσαίνων· ἢ δ’ οὐλοὸν ἐκφατο μοῦθον· ‘he spoke to her in a fawning way, trying to soothe her but her reply was deadly.’ This line is crucial to our understanding of the relationship between the two characters. σαίνω means ‘wag the tail’ and is used literally of dogs in the Odyssey (10.217, 16.6 and of Argos 17.302). Later it is used metaphorically meaning ‘fawn upon’ (Pind. P. 2.28, 1.52, Aesch. Ag. 798), or ‘cringe before’ (Aesch. Sept. 383, 704); see Barrett on Eur. Hipp. 862–3. The compound ὑποσσαίνω is used of dogs (Ael. NA 17.7), of lions (9.1) and, metaphorically, by Plutarch (Adulator 65c.7) of men. At 3.396 it describes Jason’s speech to Aietes promising him help if he will treat the Argonauts as suppliants and give them the Fleece. At 3.974 Jason, when he sees that Medea is in love with him, speaks to her similarly asking for help in the contest; cf. the opening of her previous statement, (352–4n.), together with Il. 21.393 (Ares’ forthright words to Athena) καὶ όνείδειον φάτο μοῦθον; see Hughes Fowler (1989) 137–9, DeForest (1994) 129.

The Alexandrian use of ἵσκεν as an equivalent of ἐλεγε is based on an ancient critical discussion of Od. 22.31 ἵσκεν ἐκαστος ἀνήρ (Rengakos (2001) 198).

411–13 φράζεο νῦν· χρεὶῶ γὰρ ἀεικελίοισιν ἐπ’ ἔργοις / καὶ τόδε μητίσασθαι, ἐπεὶ τὸ πρῶτον ἀάσθην / ἀμπλακῆ, θεόθεν δὲ κακὰς ἡνυσσα μενοινᾶς. ‘Listen carefully now, for it is necessary to plan also this, after my shameful acts, since I first sinned through my folly, and accomplished evil desires
through the will of a god.' Medea begins with a bitter echo of their first meeting (3. 1026 φράξεο νῦν, ὡς κέν τοι ἐγὼ μητίσουν ἀρωγήν) and with words suitable for a Homeric speech of deliberation and planning. φράξεο νῦν occurs at Il. 17.144, 22.358 but cf. 22.174 ἀλλὰ ἂγετε φράξεσθε . . . καὶ μητιάσασθε. For ἄεικελιοισιν ἐπ᾽ ἔργοισ cf. Eur. Hipp. 721–2 αἰσχροῖς ἐπ᾽ ἔργοισ . . . μέλλεις δὲ δὴ τί δρᾶν ἀνήκεστον κακὸν; After the violence of Medea’s initial outburst against Jason, there is a degree of litotes in the way in which she approaches the murder of her brother, which makes it all the more chilling.

For ἐπεὶ . . . ἀάσθην cf. Il. 19.136–7 (Agamemnon speaking of his treatment of Achilles) ᾧ ἡ πρώτων ἀάσθην / ἀλλ᾽ ἐπεὶ ἀασάμην καὶ μεν φρένας ἐξέλετο Ζεύς. Interpreting this second line, A. uses the unepic ἀμπλακία and is less specific with regard to which god controlled Medea’s actions. This makes her self-reproach more personal. In spite of the reference to a god (θεόθεν – presumably Hera; 11n.), her actions (ἤνυσσα) appear to be more self-determined. For more links between Medea and Agamemnon see Knight (1995) 255.

For other passages where ἂτη and ἀμπλακία (or ἀμαρτία; see Dawe (1967) 102) are linked cf. Archil. fr. 127 IEG, Pind. P. 2. 28–30, Soph. Ant. 1259–60. The meaning of ἂτη, and the way in which poets use it to describe and explain human actions, has been much discussed; cf. Dodds (1951) 5 ’ate is a state of mind – a temporary clouding or bewildering of the normal consciousness. It is . . . a partial and temporary insanity; and like all insanity, it is ascribed, not to physiological or psychological causes, but to an external “daemonic agency”.' However, he also states (p. 3), while commenting on Il. 19. 136–7, that this does not absolve an individual from responsibility for their actions; cf. Dawe’s classification of possible meanings (1967) 99, Doyle (1984), Neuburg (1993) 503–4, Sommerstein (2013) 1–15.
414 τύνη μὲν κατὰ μῶλον ἀλέξεο δούρατα Κόλχων 'Your job is to ward off the spears of the Colchians in the tumult of battle.’ Medea’s brutal sentiments are the opposite of those of Andromache to Hector. Jason’s job is to fight. Andromache (II. 6.431–2) wishes Hector to avoid combat. τύνη is brusque and almost contemptuous. See Prince (2002) 22 who refers to West’s note on Hes. Th. 36 believing that there is a contrast here between θεόθεν and the instructions that she is issuing to Jason. κατὰ μῶλον recalls μῶλος Ἀρηος (II. 2.401 etc) and has an archaic ring with possible linguistic connections between it and Hittite mallai harrai, ‘grinds and pounds’ (Puhvel (1991) 141, Barnes (2008) 1–19). For ἀλέξεο cf. Archil. fr. 128.2–3 IEG τάναδευ δυσμενῶντι δ’ ἀλέξεο προσβαλῶν ἐναντίον / στέρνον τένδοκουσιν ἐχθρῶν πλησίον κατασταθεὶς which seems to be from a similar context. There is no need to alter it to ἀλεύεο with Fränkel (1968) 487; cf. 4.551 ἀλεξόμενον περὶ βουσίν, 1488 ἀλεξόμενος κατέπεφνεν and LSJ9 s.v. ἀλέξω. Jason is to take care of the fighting, if necessary (414 ~ 420), while Medea plays the major role in the plot against Apsyrtus.

415–18 αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ κεῖνον γε τεάς ἐς χεῖρας ἰκέσθαι / [417] εἰ κέν πως κήρυκας ἀπερχομένους πεπίθοιμι / μειλίξω. σὺ δὲ μιν φαίδροις ἀγαπάξεο δώροις / οἱ θεόν οἴον ἐμοίσι συναρθήσατε ἐπέεσσι. ‘But I, if I can persuade the heralds as they leave, will bewitch that man so that quite alone he agrees with my words.’ The transposition of one line gives tighter sense to the proposed plot and greater consistency with the reported version at 4.435–8. For the parenthetical conditional cf. 3.479–80 τὴν εἰ κέν πεπίθοιμεν, οἴσαι, οὐκέτι τάρβος /
ἔσσε τ᾽. Magic is how Medea gets her way, whether it be with the Moon (4.59), the guardian serpent (4.158) or her own brother. The heralds are said to be departing because they have just concluded a treaty (4.340) and are going back to give Apsyrtus, whose fleet is at a different location (4.453) instructions and gifts which are φαιδρά because one in particular is a considerable work of art. οἰόθεν οἶον is echoed in 4.459 when Apsyrtus comes face to face with his sister.

419–20 ἐνθ᾽ εἴ τοι τόδε ἔργον ἐφανδάνει, οὔτι μεγαίρω, / κτεῖνε τε, καὶ Κόλχοισιν ἀείρεο δηιοτήτα. ‘If this plan pleases you, I have no objections, kill him and raise war with the Colchians.’ Although Medea at first seems to be employing a polite circumlocution, perhaps with a hint of sarcasm (cf. 3.485 ὦ πέπον, εἴ νῦ τοι αὐτῷ ἐφανδάνει, οὔτι μεγαίρω – spoken by Jason), her concluding statement is abrupt in the extreme. After an effort to distance herself from the act of murder now contemplated, she has made up her mind that the act must be done. The fatal verb κτεῖνε, in an abrupt but objectless imperative, is a pointed contrast with Jason’s previous wordiness. The omission of an object suggests an unwillingness, possibly based on magical belief, even to name the prospective victim. For ἀείρεο δηιοτήτα, not a Homeric expression, cf. Hdt. 7.132.5 οἱ Ἑλλήνες ἔταµον ὀρκίον οί τῶ βαρβάρω πόλειµον ἀειρόµενοι.

421–34 Cloaks and outward display play an important part in this passage. The purple cloak described in this passage is an erotically-charged garment, called ‘holy’ (423) but used with an unholy end in view. Hypsipyle was the granddaughter of Ariadne and Dionysus, and Ariadne’s story is the example that Jason uses to strengthen his case when trying to persuade Medea to help him at 3.997–1004: he tells Medea how
Ariadne helped Theseus escape from similar difficulties to his own but omits to mention that he later abandons her.

This part of the story is indirectly played out for us now through the *ekphrasis* of the cloak. Theseus’ desertion of Ariadne is never spoken of between Jason and Medea but is depicted so vividly that any spectator would gaze on the sight insatiably (429). There is a chance that Medea will be castaway on an island and left by a Greek whom she has helped (434) but the garment that foreshadows the possibility will prove the agent that helps her avoid this but also lead to ultimate separation and tragedy. Medea, herself, has previously said, 3.1107–8 οὐδ’ Ἀριάδνῃ Ἰσοῦ µαι, ‘I am not like Ariadne’ and indeed she will prove herself to be much more than a plaything of a drunken god (432–3). We know as informed readers that robes and, of course, the Golden Fleece, will play a significant part in her future life. The Fleece will provide Jason and Medea’s marriage bed in the sacred cave on Phaeacia (4.1145–7) but in Corinth, it will be another robe that Medea uses to poison her rival, Creusa. The description of the cloak itself draws on many sources. There is the shield of Achilles (*Il.* 18.478–608) and the Hesiodic shield, together with the veil and headband, the work of Athena and Hephaistos, worn by Pandora (*Hes. Th.* 573–84). Also in *Odyssey* 19.225–35 the disguised Odysseus tells Penelope about a meeting with her husband when the latter came to Crete on his way to Troy: ‘King Odysseus wore a thick double mantle (χλαῖναν πορφυρέην); it was crimson, and had a clasp of gold with two sheaths.’ Jason is a hero who relies on the magic of sexual attraction, using the outward trappings of personal appearance to bolster his deficiencies. Achilles relies on his armour, Odysseus on his eloquence but Jason uses a cloak whose style might have been inherited from Demetrios Poliorketes: ‘One of his chlamydes had taken months to weave on the looms, a superb piece of work in which the Kosmos
with the heavenly bodies were represented’ (Plut. Demetr. 41.4–5; cf. Ath. 535f–536a.). Alexander himself is spoken of as wearing ‘a cloak more elaborate than the rest of his armour; it was a work of Helikon, the ancient, and presented to him as a mark of honour by the city of Rhodes’ (Plut. Alex. 32.5–6). Before these two, Alkibiades was admired when he appeared in the theatre wearing his purple robe (Athen. 535c). Perhaps we are to understand Jason as being dressed as a Hellenistic king; cf. the fresco from Boscoreale, from Room H of the Villa of P. Fannius Synistor at Boscoreale, ca. 40–30 BC, which has been identified as Achilles, mourning for Patroclus, with his mother Thetis but also as an Hellenistic dynast and his wife. He has a himation of the period draped across his knees; see Muller (1994), Torelli (2003), Strootman (2007), and http://www.metmuseum.org/toah/works-of-art/03.14.6 (URL checked 07/04/2015).

For further references to garments similar to Jason’s cloak cf. the descriptions of contemporary Alexandrian artistic life attributed to Kallixeinos of Rhodes, (Athen. 197A–202B: describing a festival pavilion build for the Grand Procession of Ptolemy Philadelphus) ‘And in the spaces between the posts there were pictures hung by the Sicyonian painters . . . garments embroidered with gold, and most exquisite cloaks, some of them having portraits of the kings of Egypt embroidered on them; and some, stories taken from the mythology.’

421–2 ὥς τώγε ξυμβάντε μέγαν δόλον ἤρτυνοντο / Ἀψύρτῳ, καὶ πολλὰ πόρον ξεινήϊα δῶρα. ‘So the two of them agreed on a terrible deceit against Apsyrtus and gave many gifts of friendship.’ δόλον contrasts harshly with ξεινήϊα δῶρα. Jason is abusing one of the fundamental laws of Greek society; cf. Od. 24.313–4 θυμὸς δ’ ἐτι νῶιν ἔωλπει / μίξεσθαι ξενίῃ ἣδ’ ἀγλαὰ δῶρα διδώσειν with
Medea’s deadly gifts in Euripides’ play. Gifts (ξεινήϊα, ξεινήϊα δῶρα, δωτίνη) are offered by a host to a guest as a material symbol of friendship. In return, the host expects the guest to remember him (μεμνημένος Il. 4.592, 8.431, μιμνήσκεται 15.54, μνήμα 15.126), and to reciprocate with an equally valuable gift sometime in the future (άμοιβής 1.318, άμειψάμενος 24.285). It is the custom (θέμις 9.267–68, 24.285–6) that guest-gifts be exchanged back and forth, and gifts that fail to elicit counter gifts are said to be given in vain (ἐτώσια 24.283). The plot that Jason and Medea are hatching subverts this framework, for which there are Homeric antecedents: Polyphemus’ cynical guest-gift (ξεινήϊον 9.370) to Odysseus is the privilege of being eaten last of the men and the suitor Ctesippus offers as an equally cynical guest–gift (20.296) a pelting with an ox-hoof from the meat basket; see Reece (1993) 36.

423–4 οἷς μέτα καὶ πέπλον δόσαν ιερὸν Ὑψιπυλείης / πορφύρεον.

‘among which they gave the holy purple robe of Hypsipyle.’ There are numerous references in the Iliad to garments of purple worn by kings and generals. Odysseus is given a purple cloak by Penelope (Od. 19.225). Helen weaves a purple cloth with images of the Trojan War (Il. 3.126) and likewise Andromache is weaving a purple tapestry when she receives news of Hector’s death (Il. 22.441). Herodotus describes Croesus offering purple robes to Apollo at Delphi (Hdt. 1.50). The use of purple was endorsed when Alexander the Great, after his defeat of Darius, exchanged his white Macedonian robes for purple. The royal tomb at Vergina, supposed final resting place of Philip the second of Macedon, contained a fragment of purple cloth embroidered with gold; see Elliott (2008) 179, Reinhold (1970) 11, Navarro Antolin (1996) 225 and, on Jason’s cloaks in particular, Lawall (1966) 154–8, Shapiro (1980) 263–86, Hunter (1993b) 52–9, Fusillo (1985) 300–7, Lovatt (2013) 183.
424–8 τὸν μὲν ῥα Διωνύσῳ κάμον αὐταί / Δίῃ ἐν ἄμφιάλῳ Χάριτες
θεαί, αὐτὰρ ὦ παιδὶ / δῶκε Θόαντι μεταύτις, ὥ δ’ αὖ λίπεν
‘Ὑψιπυλείη, / ἢ δ’ ἔπορ’ Αἰσονίδῃ πολέσιν μετὰ καὶ τὸ φέρεσθαι /
γλήνειν εὐεργές ξεινήιον. ‘which the divine Graces themselves had woven for
Dionysos on sea-girt Dia, but he gave it to his son Thoas afterwards who left it for
Hypsipyle, who gave it to the son of Aeson to take away as a finely wrought guest
gift, together with many other wonderful things.’ Cf. II. 2.100–7 (the history of
Agamemnon’s sceptre), 10.261–71 (the boar tusk helmet worn by Odysseus in the
Doloneia, originally stolen by his grandfather, Autolycus). In Homer the genealogy of
an antique object often implies a comment on the present situation: the solemn
tradition embodied by the staff throws into relief the deception of Agamemnon and
his failure to live up to the standards of his ancestors and the helmet’s biography
provides a model for Odysseus’ trickster-like character in the Doloneia. Similarly,
Jason’s cloak is associated with a story in which deception plays a major part (nn.
421–34, 421–2, 423–4).

Διωνύσῳ and Δίῃ ἐν ἄμφιάλῳ refer to the story of Ariadne, Theseus and
Dionysus. Od. 11.321–5 places the death of Ariadne on an island called Dia.
Callimachos (fr. 601 Pfeiffer), Diodoros (4.61, 5.51) and others tell us that Dia was an
alternative or former name for Naxos. It has been suggested that Naxos was not the
original setting of the story. One hypothesis is that the story was originally associated
with a small island close to Crete named Dia (cf. Strabo 10.5.1, Pliny N.H. 4.61,
Steph. Byz. s.v. Δία (δ 68 = 1138 Billerbeck–Zubler = p. 229 Meineke), Fowler, EGM
π § 16.3.1).
428–9 οὐ μὴν ἀφάσσων, / οὔτε κεν εἰσορόων γλυκύν ἕμερον

ἐμπλήσειας. ‘You could never satisfy your sweet desire either by touching or gazing upon it.’ This comment emphasises the superficially attractive and sensuous nature of the cloak. Appealing to three of the senses, it emphasises the eroticism, charged with mutual mistrust and treachery that exists between Jason and Medea.

This heightening of the narrative is typical of Hellenistic poetry; cf. Aelius Theon’s definition of ekphrasis, which requires descriptive speech to bring the subject vividly before the eyes: ἐκφρασίς ἐστὶ λόγος περιηγηματικὸς ἐναργῶς ὑπ’ ὁμίν ἁγῶν τὸ δηλοῦμενον (Progymn. 118.6) and see Zanker (1981) 297–311, Fowler (1991) 25–35 = 2000 (64–85), Webb (1999) 7–8, Lovatt (2013) 162–205. The introduction, as well as the ekphrasis itself, is full of erotic connotations. For ἀφάσσων cf. 4.181 (Jason caressing the Golden Fleece) εἶλει ἀφασσόμενος, Archil. fr. 196a.34 IEG ἄπαν τῇ σῶμα καλὸν ἀμφαφώμενος, Mosch. Eur. 95 (Europa caressing Zeus as the bull) ἡ δὲ μὴ ἀμφαφάσασκε καὶ ἱρέμα χείρεσιν ἄφρον. For sight associated with desire or general amazement cf. Hom. Hym. 5. 72–3 ἡ δ᾽ ὀρόωσα μετὰ φρεσὶ τέρπετο θυμὸν / καὶ τοῖς ἐν στήθεσι βάλ᾽ ἕμερον, Soph. Colchides fr. 338 1–2 TrGFκαν ἐθαύμασας / τηλέσκοπον πέμφιγα χρυσέαν ἰδῶν, Theocr. 15.80–6.

430–1 τοῦ δὲ καὶ ἀμβροσίη ὀδὴν ἄεν ἐξέτι κείνου / ἐς οὖ ἀναξ ἀυτὸς

Νυσῆιος ἐγκατελεκτό. ‘And from it a divine fragrance breathed from the time when the Nysian lord himself lay down upon it.’ Ambrosial fragrance is integral to a divine scene such as this; cf. Hom. Hym. 7.36–7 ὄρνυτο δ᾽ ὀδὴ / ἀμβροσίη, Theogn. 8–9 Δῆλος ἀπειρεσίη / ὀδης ἀμβροσίης, Lucian De Syr. Dea 30.9 ἄποξει δὲ αὐτοῦ ὀδὴ ἀμβροσίη, and Virg. G. 4.415 et liquidum ambrosiae diffudit, Milton P.L. 10.850–1 ‘A bough of fairest fruit, that downy smil’d / new gathered, and
ambrosial smell diffus’d.’

P. Oxy. 2694 according to its first editor (Kingston 1968: 55) has μ[ε]ν[ν, instead of transmitted πέλεν. Re-examination of the papyrus seems to show that this is doubtful:

A[ ]N is more likely. Fränkel (1964) 14–15, (1968) 490 n. 2 suggested πνέεν. Haslam (2013) 116 reads α[ε]ν, comparing 1.605 and 2.1228 and citing the ἄη / ἄει variation at Od. 12.325 and 14.458. He sees it as a possible correction of the well-attested ἄει, presupposing ἄω alongside ἄημι. He also mentions that Hesychius (α 1365 = i 49 Latte) has ἄεν ἔπνει which would mitigate the objection that ἄημι is generally used of a wind blowing a ship along; cf. Hom. Hym. 2.276–7 περὶ τ’ ἀμφί τε κάλλος ἄητο / ὑμημή δ’ ἰμερόεσσα θυηέντων ἀπὸ πέπλων / σκιδνάτο, Hes. Th. 583 χάρις δ’ ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ἄητο, θαυμάσια, ‘was wafted’ with West’s note. To use ἄε instead of ἄητο would be a typical Hellenistic trick, active for middle tense (cf. Bulloch (1985) 173 on Call. h. 5.65, Boesch (1908) 16).

ἕξετι κείνου usually signals an aetiological explanation, here given a special twist; cf. Call. h. 4.47, 275 τῶ καὶ νησάων ἀγιωτάτη ἐξέτι κείνου / κλῆξιν, 4.250; see Thalmann (2011) 105, 115 on the use of this and similar phrases.

For the folk etymology that links Dionysus, Zeus, and Nysa, see Stephens (2003) 83–4, who notes that Stephen of Byzantium lists ten Nysas, several of which were in the Near East or North Africa (282–3n.) and that the identification of Nysan Dionysus with Osiris was common in the Hellenistic period and part of the Alexandrian poetic strategy of relocating mythological locations and events from
Mainland Greece to the Southern Mediterranean and the north-eastern coast of Africa.

Acosta-Hughes (2010) 175 connects ἐγκαταλέγειν with Thucydides' description of the funerary stelae that the Athenians insert into their hastily-constructed walls following the Persian Wars (1.93.2) and also with Call. Aet. fr. 64.7. Harder πῦργῳ δ᾽ ἐκατέλεξεν ἐµὴν λίθον, 'he built my tombstone into a tower.'

However, A. is alluding rather to Od. 19.49–50 γλυκὺς ὑπνὸς ἱκάνοι / ἐνθ᾽ ἄρα καὶ τότ᾽ ἐλεκτὸ καὶ Ἡῶ δίαν ἐµιµνεν, [Hes.] Scut. 46 παννύχιος δ᾽ ἄρ’ ἐλεκτὸ σὺν αἰδοῖη παρακοίτη, where the form is derived from λέχοµαι.

432–3 ἀκροχάλιξ οἴνῳ καὶ νέκταρι, καλὰ µεµαρπῶς / στὴθεα


The phrase ἀκροχάλιξ οἴνῳ only occurs here and at Dion. Perieg. 948 and is usually compared to ἀκροθώραξ which LSJ9 s.v. interprets as ‘slightly drunk’ but cf. ἀκροπότης, ‘a hard drinker’ (Nonn. D. 14.108). This interpretation of ἀκροχάλιξ must be wrong. ἀκρο– signifies ‘the edge of, the height of’ and χάλις is unmixed wine. If the god has drunk this and nectar, he is a little more than slightly drunk; cf. Hippon. fr. 67.1 IEG ὀλίγα φρονέουσιν οί χάλιν πεπωκότες.

The figure of a drunken Dionysus is a frequent one (cf. Xen. Sym. 9.2 Διόνυσος ὑποπεπωκότος) and in company with Ariadne seems to have spread widely through the Hellenistic world. Here, the story of their marriage produces a charged erotic atmosphere as a prelude to the murder of Apsyrtus; cf. the effect produced by the steamy re-enactment described by Xenophon at Sym. 9.3–5, which brings the party to an abrupt end, with the married men rushing home to their wives and the
single men wishing they were married; see Wohl (2004) 354–5. However, the links between the present description and the murder that follows are of a darker nature.

While the personal beauty of Jason resembles that of Dionysus, in the next scene he is to play the role of sacrificial butcher (468 βουτύπος). Death and the erotic can be close; cf. Bataille (1962) 71–81 on the links between sexuality and murder and Csapo and Miller (2007) 176–9, 192 n. 93) for discussion of further examples of Dionysus and Ariadne from vase painting and the theatre.

433–34 ἵν ποτε θησεύς / Κνωσσόθεν ἐσπομένην Δή εἰν κάλλιτε νήσῳ. ‘whom Theseus once abandoned on the island of Dia after she had followed him from Knossos.’ A. adapts Od. 11.321–5 Ἀριάδνην, / κούρην Μίνωος ὀλοόφρονος, ἵν ποτε Θησεύς / ἐκ Κρήτης ἡς γουνὸν Αθηνάων ἱεράων / ἣγε μέν, οὔδ᾽ ἀπόνητο πάρος δὲ μιν Ἀρτεμίς ἐκτα / Δή ἐν ἀμφιρύτη Διονύσου μαρτυρῖσαι. To make possible this reference to Theseus as a model for Jason, and Ariadne as a model for Medea, A. alters the usual chronology (as exemplified by the Hecale) in which the voyage of the Argo, which brought Medea to Greece, logically takes place before Medea’s attempt to poison Theseus and before his adventure on Crete and liaison with Ariadne. That the comparison is a false one must be an implicit comment on the relationship between Jason and Medea and the work of art through which we are led to view it. It shows a complex use of exemplarity on A.’s part.

The tension between the Argonautica and the Hecale is likely to be deliberate (cf. Call. fr. 2.1–2 Hollis τίον δὲ ε ἐ πάντες ὃδειται / ἡρα φίλοξενίης with Medea’s rejection of Jason’s exemplum at 3.1108 οὔδ᾽ Ἀριάδνη / ἱσούμαι τῶ μή τι φίλοξενίην ἀγόρευε; see Murray (2004) 231, Bulloch (2006)). On Ariadne abandoned by Theseus, see Knox (1995) 234, where he notes that ‘the desertion of
Ariadne by Theseus was one of the most celebrated episodes of seduction and betrayal in ancient poetry. As the unknown author of the Aetna remarked, *quis non periuare doluit mendacia, / desertam vacuo Minoida litore questus?* (21–2). The story is one of the links between Medea and Simaetha who says (Theocr. 2.45–6) τόσοον ἐχοι λάθας, ὁσόν ποκα Θησέα φαντ/ ἐν Δία λασθῆμεν ὑπλοκάμω 'Αριάδνας. For further links between the two characters, see 4.58–61n. and Duncan (2001) 43–56. The Ariadne myth has been variously treated by Homer (*Od.* 11.321–5), Plutarch (*Thes.* 20), Ovid (*Met.* 8.151–82, *Her.* 10, *Ars.* 1.527–64, *Fast.* 3.459–516), [Apollod.] (*Bibl.* 3.1), Hyginus (*Fab.* 14, 43, 270) and Catullus (64). However the desertion story is not mentioned in any extant pre-Apollonian literary source.

436–8 ἡ δ᾽ ὅτε κηρύκεσιν ἐπεξυνώσατο μύθους / θέλγε μιν, εὖτ᾽ ἄν πρῶτα θεᾶς μετὰ νηὸν ἱκται / συνθεσίη, νυκτός τε μέλαν κνέφας ἀμφιβάλησιν, / ἐλθέμεν, δφρα δόλον συμφράσσεται Ἐνθέν, when she first arrived at the temple of the goddess according to the agreement and the black darkness of night covered everything, so that he could help her contrive a trick.

επεξυνώσατο, only here and at 3.1162 оἶον ἔξι κακὸν ἔργον ἐπιευνώσατο βουλή, intimates that the heralds are Medea’s co-conspirators. θέλγε μιν, mentioned by Merkel (1854) 227 but rejected by him, is better than the transmitted infinitive θελγέμεν. It removes the problem of the anacoluthon and clarifies that it is Medea who charms, not the heralds (cf. 4.416 μειλήξω).

P. Oxy. 2694 (430n.) has μετά. Read this rather than transmitted περί which does not make sense; cf. 2.1169 = 3.915 μετὰ νηόν.

κνέφας. Night is a time when plotting or clandestine deeds take place (66–81n.). See Vian (1981) 20–3 on the Aeschylean language that A. used to describe Apsyrtus’ murder.

For δφρα δόλον συμφράσσεται cf. Hes. Th. 471 μὴ τιν συμφράσσοσθαι. P. Oxy. 34.2694 has traces of a different text. Haslam (2004) 18 comments on the displacements and misalignments that the papyrus has suffered, so the space taken up by the ‘Μ’ of συμφράσσεται is reconcilable with the transmitted text.

However, ‘Ρ’ is discernible before συμφράσσεται which suggested to Kingston (1968) 56 μήχαρ, a metrical impossibility. Although δόλος is an important theme in this section of the poem (cf. 4.421), it is difficult to match with the traces.

438–41 ὦ κευ ἐλοῦσα / χρύσειον μέγα κῶς ύπότροπος αὐτὶς όπίσσω / βαί ἐς Αἰήταο δόμους. πέρι γάρ μιν ἀνάγκη / υἱῆς Φρίξοιο
dόσαν εἰνοισιν ἁγεσθαι. ‘by which she might take the great Golden Fleece and return home again to Aietes’ house, for the sons of Phrixos had given her by force to the strangers to be carried off.’

P.Oxy. 2694 has ϕ (previously conjectured by Brunck (1810) 357 and Koechly (1853) 14) instead of the ϕ as of the paradosis. An ancient reading is not automatically rendered true by having previously been proposed by a modern scholar; see Haslam (1978) 48, quoting Paul Maas on ‘deceptive confirmation’, Barrett (2007)
191 n. 211–‘a papyrus never “sichert” anything’. However cf. 3.12–13 ὃ κεν ἐλόντες ἔμθ᾽ Ἐλλάδα κῶς ἀγοιντο, 4.404 δόλον, ὃ μιν ἐς ἄτην / βήσομεν.

πέρι γάρ μιν has been seen as problematic (Fränkel παρά OCT) but cf. Od. 3.95 πέρι γάρ μιν ὀἰζυρὸν τέκε μήτηρ and LSJ for its use as an adverb meaning ‘exceedingly’.

Although P.Oxy. 2694 has αὖθις, retain the epic form αὖτις, cf. Il. 6.367 ὑπότροπος ἵξοις αὖτις, Od. 21.211 αὖτις ὑπότροπον οἴκαδ᾽ ἱκέθαι, Arg. 1.838 εἰμὶ δ’ ὑπότροπος αὔτις and see Pfeiffer on Call. fr. 197.49.

With πέρι . . . ἀγοέθαι, Medea is referring to 4.80–1 and alters the truth, to entice Apsyrtus to the proposed meeting. She was not forced to join the Argonauts, although the imagery and language through the scene between Jason and Medea suggests forced separation as an underlying alternative.

442–4 τοῖα παραφαμένη θελκτήρια φάρμακ’ ἐπασσεν / αἵθερι καὶ πνοήσαι, τά κεν καὶ ἀπωθεν ἐόντα / ἀγριον θελβάτοιο κατ᾽ οὐρεος ἔγαγε θῆρα. ’After this persuasive message, she sprinkled enticing drugs on the air and breezes that would have attracted a wild animal down from a high mountain, even far away.’ The implication is that Apsyrtus is the beast to be summoned by Medea’s spells to his doom, without the guile (he is likened to a ἀταλὸς παῖς ‘young child’ at 460) to escape slaughter as a sacrificial animal (468 ὡστε μέγαν κερεάλκέα ταύρου); cf. Clytemnestra’s description of how she has trapped Agamemnon (Aesch. Ag. 1380–1), σφτω δ’ ἐπραξα, καὶ τάδ’ οὐκ ἀρνήσομαι, / ὡς μήτε φεύγειν μήτ’ ἀμύνεσθαι μόρον. As Book 4 progresses, Medea increasingly dominates and manipulates the male characters of the poem. A number of important leitmotifs
connected with her characterisation occur in this passage and the description of the murder that follows. ‘The end result of Medea’s μῆτις, indicated by the collocation of words such as θέλγω, δόλος and φάρμακα, is murder by treachery, the remarkable hapax δολοκτασία (479), applied to the slaying of a blood relation’ (Holmberg (1998) 154).

θέλξις is a characteristic closely associated with Medea. Her drugs are θελκτήρια (3.738, 766, 820, 4.1080) but, in this scene, so are her words; cf. 4.416 μειλίξω, 4.442 παραιφαμένη; on θέλξις, see Pratt (1993) 80–1, who discusses it as a major feature of the characterisation of Odysseus.

The detail of being able to draw the beasts down from the mountains reminds us of Orpheus who can move the implacable gods of the underworld, and can bring life to oaks and rocks, the most unresponsive elements of nature. Clare (2002) 232, 245 has suggested that Orpheus represents order and Medea chaos through her chthonic associations and that A. attempts a deliberate contrast between the two; cf. 4.444 with Orpheus’ benign use of θέλξις at 1.31.

A. does not agree with the distinction made by Aristarchus between ἀήρ, αἰθήρ, οὐρανός and Ὄλυμπος (Rengakos (2008) 251 n. 33, (1994) 37–9) and uses αἰθήρ with the common post-Homeric meaning.

445–51 The narrator chides Eros as the first cause of the terrible deed that Jason and Medea are planning, and as no longer the playful child who appeared at the beginning of Book 3. The tone is dramatic and rhetorical (μέγα . . . μέγα, the repetition of τ, the spondaic τετρήχασιν and the vivid image of 447).

In the Argonautica, problematic events are often framed by references to other agents. A. is more inclined than Homer to intervene in the events of his own poem (cf.
where the narrator invokes Zeus to witness his bewilderment over the
method which Medea uses to kill Talos; also 1.919–21, 4.984–6 with Homer’s appeal
to Patroclus at II. 16.692–3); see Cuypers (2004) 48. The effect is of heightened
emotion but ‘this is countered by the editorial glossing and self-conscious reference to
the sequence of his own epic; and given the overt criticism of Medea’s killing, the
appeal to Eros to strike down the poet’s own enemies is morally disorienting’
(Rutherford (2005) 31–3).

This passionate outburst has many possible sources; cf. in particular Theogn.
1231–4 σχέτλι’ Ἕρως, μανίαι σε τιθημήσαντο λαϐούσαι / ἐκ σέθεν, Soph. Ant.
781–801 Ἕρως ἀνίκατε μάχαυ (cf. 794 τοδε νείκος ἄνδρων ἕναμιον ἔχεις
tαράζας with 4.447 ἄλγεα . . . ἀπείρονα τετρήχασιν), Eur. Hipp. 538–43 Ἕρωτα
dὲ, τὸν τύραννον ἄνδρων / . . . / . . . / πέρθοντα καὶ διὰ πάσας / ιέντα συμφορᾶς /
θυσίας ὄταν ἔλθη, and for love causing chaos and destruction, II. 14.294 ὥς δ’
ἰδεν, ὡς μιν Ἕρως πυκνᾶς φρένας ἀμφεκάλυψεν. It is imitated by Virgil (Aen.
4.412) and Catullus (64.94–8).

445 σχέτλι’ Ἕρως, μέγα πῆμα, μέγα στύγος ἄνθρωποισιν ‘Ruthless
Love, great bane, great curse to mankind.’ For the general sentiment cf. Pl. Sym. 188a
7 ὅταν δὲ ὁ μετὰ τῆς ὑβρεως Ἕρως ἐγκρατέστερος περὶ τὰς τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ ὥρας
γένηται, διεφθείρεν τε πολλὰ καὶ ἠδίκησεν and see Albis (1996) 79 for possible
Platonic influences in A.’s references to Eros.

For σχέτλι’ Ἕρως cf. Meleager A.P. 5.57.2 = 4075 HE φεύξετ’ Ἕρως καὐτή,
σχέτλι’, ἕχει πτέρυγας, A.P. 5.176.1 = 4022 HE δεινός Ἕρως, δεινός, 3.120
μάργος Ἕρως, 445–51n. Also Acosta-Hughes (2010) 203–4, as part of a wider
argument for A.’s debt to lyric poetry, notes the Simonides fragment preserved by Σ
(p. 216 Wendel) at Arg. 3.26 (= fr. 263 Poltera) σχέτλιε παὶ δολομήδεος
Ἀφροδίτας, / τὸν Ἀρηὶ δολομηχάνωι τέκεν, 'cruel child of wile-weaving
Aphrodite, whom she bore to [guile-contriving] Ares’.

Although μέγα πῆμα is a frequent Homeric combination (Il. 3.50, 9.229, 17.99), μέγα στύγος occurs only at Aesch. Sept. 445 ([Aesch.] PV 1004 μέγα στυγούμενον) and cf. Eur. fr. 400.2 TrGF Kannicht ὅσον νόσημα τὴν Κύπριν κεκτήμεθα. For the anaphora μέγα . . . μέγα cf. Arat. 15 μέγα θαῦμα, μέγ’ ἀνθρώποισιν ὅνειρα, Mosch. Eur. 38 μέγα θαῦμα, μέγαν πόνον Ἡφαίστοιο.

446 ἐκ σέθεν οὐλόμεναι τ’ ἐρίδες στοναχαὶ τε πόνοι τε 'from you come both deadly strifes, grieving and troubles.' Il. 1.177 αἰεὶ γάρ τοι ἔρις τε φίλη πόλεμοι τε μάχαι τε, [Hes.] Scut. 148–9 δεινὴ Ἐρίς πεπότητο κορύσσουσα κλόνον ἀνδρῶν, / σχετλίη, ἤ ρα νόσου τε καὶ ἐκ φρένας εἵλετο φωτῶν are similar. However P.Oxy. 2694 omits τ’. Haslam (1978) 54 believes that it was added to avoid the hiatus. However, the omission of τ’ seems likelier than the addition (Fränkel (1964) 15). A.’s imitation of Il. 1.177 is neater with it than without. For the triple τε cf. 4.361, 468.

The mediaeval tradition is γόοι τε. Π (P.Oxy. 2694) clearly has πόνοι. The utrum in alterum principle favours the latter: invasion from Homer is a well-known phenomenon in the Argonautica; cf. Od. 16.144 στοναχῆ τε γόω τε and Hes. Th. 226–8 αὐτὰρ Ἐρίς στυγερῆ τέκε μὲν Πόνον ἄλγινόεντα / Λήθην τε Λιμόν τε καὶ Ἀλγεὰ δακρυόεντα / Ὑσίμιας τε Μάχας τε Φόνους τ’ Ἀνδροκτασίας τε, where Ἐρίς and Πόνος occur together and the following lines are linked by τε. See Hunter
who points out that πόνοι looks forward to 4.586.

447 ἄλγεα τ' ἄλλ' ἐπὶ τοῖσιν ἀπείρονα τετρήχασιν ‘And countless other pains on top of these are stirred up.’ Cf. Philitas fr. 12.2-3 Lightfoot (350–2n.) with Spanoudakis (2002) 121–2 who compares Euphorion fr. 26.20 Lightfoot τάδ' ἀμφὶ σ[η]τετρήχοιεσ, Rengakos (1994) 146 n. 674, Arat. 276 τὰ δὲ οἱ ἐπὶ τετρήχυνται. For τετρήχασι, epic perfect with passive sense, ‘have been stirred up’, see LSJ\(^9\) s.v. τάρασσω III, with Od. 5.291 ἐτάραξε δὲ πόντον and Archil. fr. 54 IEG κύμασιν ταράσσεται πόντος but also cf. 1.613 τρῆχον ἔρον, ‘savage passion’, 3. 275–6 τόφρα δ' Ἐρως . . . ἢξεν ἠφαντος, / τετρήχως, ‘confused’ or ‘causing confusion’, where A. is playing on a possible connection between τρῆχος and τάρασσω (Livrea (1973) 144, Berkowitz (2004) 136 n. 113).


448 δυσμενέων ἐπὶ παῖσὶ κορύσσεο, δαίμον, ἀερθεῖς ‘Rear up and arm yourself, divine spirit, against the children of my enemies.’ δυσμενέων ἐπὶ παῖσι introduces an apopemptic curse, the wish that evil should be diverted onto one’s enemies; cf. Finglass on Soph. El. 647. This exhortation sounds like a battle cry on the part of the poet: the ‘Muse of Love’, Erato, was previously invoked (3.1) and, though unnamed, called upon to take over the narration of Book 4 (4.1–2). Here,
κορύσσεο is a call to arm for battle (Ov. Am. 1.9 militat omnis amans) as well as continuing the metaphor begun with τετρήχασιν; cf. Il. 4.422 κύμα πόντωρ μὲν τὲ πρῶτα κορύσσεται. It also provides another link with ἔριδες; cf. Il. 4.440–2 Δεῖμός τ’ ἡδὲ Φόβος καὶ Ἑρις ἁμοτον μεμαυα ἢ τ’ ὀλίγῃ μὲν πρῶτα κορύσσεται, also in a similar context, Ibycus fr. S227 8–10 PMGF κορύσσεται δὲ[ / κορθ]ὔται με[τ]εω[ρίζεται / ]ος ὁ πόθος, martial vocabulary used in an erotic context. Virgil unexpectedly appeals to Erato in a similar context (Aen. 7.37 nunc age, qui reges, Erato) as the Iliadic section of the Aeneid begins (see Toll (1989) 107–118, M. Sullivan (2012), Acosta-Hughes (2010) 41 n. 112).

449 οἷος Μηδείῃ στυγερῆν φρεσὶν ἐμβαλες ἀτην. ‘As you were when you threw hateful folly into Medea’s heart.’ The section ends significantly with ἀτην; cf. Il. 19.87–8 ἀλλὰ Ζεὺς καὶ Μοῖρα καὶ ἤμεροφοῖτις Ἑρινύς, / οἳ τέ μοι εἰν ἄγορῃ φρεσὶν ἐμβαλον ἅγριον ἀτην and, for the mention of an unnamed divine agent, Od. 19.10 τὸδε μεῖζον ἐνὶ φρεσὶν ἐβαλε δαίμων. For the question of Medea’s moral responsibility, see 411–13n. on ἀτη.

450–1 πῶς γὰρ δὴ μετιόντα κακῷ ἐδάμασσας ὀλέθρῳ / Ἀψυρτον; τὸ γὰρ ἥμιν ἑπισχερῶ ἤν ἀοιδῆς. ‘How then did you crush Apsyrtus in bitter death, when he met her? For this is the next stage in our song.’ A. emphasises that he is proceeding to the next stage of his narrative and seems to stress its linear nature. There was an ancient interest in questions of chronology and temporal sequence and A.’s use of ἑπισχερῶ may signal his awareness of this debate; see Grethlein (2009) 69–70 on scholiastic comments about this and Danek (2009) 275–91 on the narrative structure of the Argonautica compared with that of Homer.
P. Oxy. 2694’s ἐδάμασσας is to be preferred to transmitted ἐδάμασσε. A. is addressing Eros as his Muse, his mode of address much altered from 3.1 and 4.1–2; cf. Theocr. 22.115 πῶς γὰρ δὴ ἐπε, θέα, σὺ γὰρ οἴοθα· ἐγὼ δ’ ἐτέρων ύποφήτης. Used of victory in battle, δαμάζω is a strong word, (cf. II. 10.210 ἐπεὶ δαμάσαντό γ’ Ἀχαιός but also the metaphorical use II. 14.316 ἔρος . . . θυμὸν ἐν ἑτέρων . . . ἐδάμασσεν.

The damaged letter in Π before ὀλέθρῳ seems to be a lunate sigma, which makes Eros the agent of destruction, acting through Medea, who leaves the physical action to Jason in the ensuing scene.

452–4 ἡμος ὅτ’ Ἀρτέμιδος νῆῳ ἐν τῇ νυγ’ ἑλίποντο / συνθεσίῃ, τοι μὲν ἡ διάνδιχα νησίν ἔκελσαν / σφωιτέραις κρινθέντες. ‘When they had left her in the temple of Artemis, according to the agreement, the two sides parted and beached their ships apart.’ Read νήῳ (Fränkel OCT) for the mss. νῆσῳ which could have come into the text from 434 and from a memory of passages describing ‘castaways’ such as II. 2.721–2 ὃ μὲν ἐν νῆσῳ κεῖτο . . . / . . . ὃθι μὲν λίπον ὕεις Ἀχαιῶν, Hdt. 4.153.2.

The συνθεσίη is that Medea should be left in the care of Artemis (346, 436) and the ambush is later described as taking place near the temple of the goddess (469–70, together with 330–1). Later 483–4 assumes that the Argo and the Colchian ships are in different places.

454–5 ὃ δ’ ἐς λόχον ἤνεν ήσων / δέγμενος Ἀψyrτόν τε καὶ οὗς ἐξαύτις ἑταίρους. ‘But Jason went to set an ambush, lying in wait for Apsyrtus and then for his comrades.’ There is a contrast between Jason and the other Argonauts
and Colchians (453 τοι μὲν ρα); cf. 76 οἱ δ᾽ ἀρα τείως referring to the Argonauts and 79 ὁ δὲ . . . ἰήσων. Jason takes the lead in a piece of treachery, involving λόχος and δόλος, whereas when it comes to hand-to-hand fighting he arrives late (489 ὁψὲ δ᾽ ἰήσων).

456–8 αὐτὰρ ὅγ᾽ αἰνοτάτησιν ὑποσχεσίησι δολωθεῖς / καρπαλίμως ἡ νηί διεξ ἀλὸς οἴδμα περήσας, / νῦχθ᾽ ὑπὸ λυγαίνῃ ἱερῆς ἐπεβήσετο νῆσου. ‘But he, deceived by the terrible promises, quickly crossed the swell of the sea in his ship and disembarked onto the holy island under the darkness of night.’ For ὑποσχεσίησι δολωθεῖς cf. 2.948, II. 13.369 ὑποσχεσίησι πιθήσας, Hes. Th. 494


For νῦχθ᾽ ὑπὸ λυγαίνῃ (also at 2.1120) cf. II. 22.102 νῦχθ’ ὑπὸ τήνδ’ ὀλοήν, Eur. IT 110 νυκτὸς οἴμα λυγαίας. The island is holy because it is sacred to Artemis, although a horrific mock sacrifice is to take place there.

ἐβήσετο, ἐδύσετο, so-called ‘mixed-aorists’, are found in several places in some Homeric mss., and were preferred by Aristarchus to the lectiones facilibores
ἐβήσατο, ἐδύσατο, although he did not introduce them into the text (Σ II. 2.35a I.184 = I 184 Erbse). They were regarded as imperfects by ancient grammarians (ΣΑ II.
1.496 = I 137.26–30 Erbse) and it seems best to interpret them as past tenses of the
desideratives βήσομαι and δύσομαι which served as futures; see Chantraine I 416–7 §
A.’s use of ἐπεβήσετο could be prompted by Call. h. 5.65 ἑώ ἐπεβάσατο δίφρω and
a difference of opinion between the two poets about Homeric verb forms; see Bulloch
(1985) on Call. h. 5.65, Rengakos (1993) 103 who mentions the possibility of
Homerisation.

459–62 οἴθι δ’ ἀντικρύ μετιῶν πειρήσατο μύθοις / εἶο κασιγνήτης
ἀταλὸς πάις οία χαράδρης / χειμερίης, Ἡν οὐδὲ δι’ αἰζηοὶ περόσαιν
/ εἰ κε δόλου ξείνοισιν ἐπ’ ἀνδράσι τεχνήσαιτο. ‘All alone he went
straight away to his sister to test her with words, as a tender child tries a wintry torrent
which not even strong men can pass through, to see if she would devise some guile
against the strangers.’ For the guile (πειρήσατο) on the part of Apsyrtus cf. Od. 3.23
οὐδὲ τί πω μύθοισε πεπείρημαι πυκινοῖσιν, immediately presented in a different
light by the simile ἀταλὸς πάις. He is a child compared to his sister and her lover,
even though he is a leader of ships and men; cf. II. 21.282–3 (Achilles about to perish
in the Scamander) ἐρχθέν τ’ ἐν μεγάλῳ ποταμῷ ὡς παιδὰ συφορβόν, / ὃν ᾿ ῥά τ’
ἐναυλὸς ἀποέρσῃ χειμώνι περῶντα. Apsyrtus in the present passage is ἥρως (471)
only in name. Perhaps, as part of the uncertain moral background against which A.
paints this scene, we are to see him as a ‘man-child poised precariously between
tender youth and mature adulthood’ (Byre (1996) 12).
Cf. Hector speaking to Ajax at II. 7.235–6 μή τί μεν ἡπτε παιδὸς ἀφαυροῦ πειρήτιζε / ἦ γυναικὸς (παιδὸς ἀφαυροῦ ~ ἀταλὸς πάις; πειρήτιζε ~ πειρήσατο μύθοις); see 468–9n. ὀπιπεύσας. The sacrifice of children is a theme that runs through this episode; one thinks of Medea’s children later in Corinth. There is perhaps an echo of the language of this simile at Flacc. A.P. 7.542.1–2 = 3813–4 GP Ἕβρου χειμεριοις ἀταλὸς κρυμοῖς δεθέντος / κούρος ὀλισθηροῖς ποσσίν ἔθραυσε πάγον.

The image is one of pathos, recalling also Jason himself who, crossing the winter stream of the Anauros, lost his sandal (Arg. 1.9). ‘Whereas Jason is spectacularly successful in his crossings, Apsyrtus will meet with dismal failure in his’ (Byre 1996) 13.

For χαράδρης χειμερίης cf. Anacr. fr. 413.2 PMG χειμερίη δ’ ἐλουσεν ἐν χαράδρῃ. The theme of δόλος returns at the end of 462; cf. Od. 11.613 μηδ’ ἄλλο τι τεχνήσατο (only here in Homer). For A.’s use of possessive pronouns (εἷο), in line with Homeric usage or otherwise, see 272–4n., Rengakos (1993) 112, (2002).

463 καὶ τῶ μὲν τὰ ἐκαστα συνῆνεον ἀλλήλοισιν. ‘And so they two agreed together on everything.’ The speed of agreement underlines Apsyrtus’ gullibility. συναινέω is well-attested in tragedy but not in Homer; cf. Aesch. Ag. 484, Soph. El. 402 with Redondo (2000) 133 n. 16.

464–81 Apsyrtus’ murder is staged as in a tragedy. The details of the murder, the mutilation of the body, the image of the blood welling from the wound, the sideways glance of the Erinyes, the rite of licking and spitting the blood and the burying of the corpse, all visualize the horror stemming from Medea’s Eros: ‘the killing itself . . . is horrible but the horror is almost impersonal . . . No speech, or thoughts or feelings are
reported: the characters are shown acting only, in a sort of surrealistic dumb show’ (Byre (1996) 13); see further Sistakou (2012) 97.

464 αὐτίκα δ’ Αἴσονίδης πυκινοῦ ἐξάλτο λόχοιο. ‘and straightway Aeson’s son leapt forth from the cunning ambush.’ Adopt the reading of Π²: πυκινοῦ ἐξάλτο [ο and cf. 2.268 (the Harpies) νεφέων ἐξάλμεναι, Il. 5.142 (a lion) βαθέης ἐξάλλεται αὐλῆς. Π² comes from P.EES inv. 88/334 (Sackler Library, Oxford): over forty small fragments from Arg. 3–4, first half of second century AD, unpublished, information about which was kindly communicated to me by Amin Benaissa of Lady Margaret Hall, Oxford. The following note is based on the emails that we exchanged.

The text of the mediaeval manuscripts, whether ἐπαλτο (<&lt;ἐπ–ἀλλομι) or ἐπαλτο (&lt;πάλλομι) shows no appreciable difference in meaning; see Leumann (1950) 61–4, Bühler (1960) 149–51 and Livrea ad loc. Both are inappropriate with the genitive of separation λόχοιο and do not scan with the variant πυκινοῦ. Nor is πυκινοῖο ἐπαλτο defensible, whether one reads ἐπ–άλτο ο or ἐ–παλτο: the prefix ἐπ– in ἐπ–άλτο is inappropriate with the genitive of separation λόχοιο and ἐ–παλτο, without a prepositional prefix governing λόχοιο, is difficult and undesirable. Even more worrying is the hiatus and the breach of Hermann’s Bridge. πυκινοῖο of SE looks like a Byzantine emendation intended to make the line scan with the corrupt reading ἐπαλτο, S going back to the circle of the Byzantine scholar Maximus Planudes and containing several such emendations.

ἐξάλτο was first conjectured by Hoelzlin, but printed by Brunck in his edition; see introduction p. 13. It was incorporated by all editors of the Argonautica after Brunck and was defended by Erbse in his review of Fränkel’s edition, though he was subsequently accused of being ‘obstinate’ by Livrea ad loc. That obstinacy, it
turns out, was well placed.

465 γυμνὸν ἀνασχόμενος παλάμη ἕιφος. ‘lifting his bare sword in his hand.’

For γυμνὸν . . . ἕιφος cf. Hdt. 3.64.10 γυμνωθὲν δ’ ὁ τὸ ἕιφος, Arg. 3.1381 γυμνὸν δ’ ἐκ κολεοῖο φέρεν ἕιφος. The combination is not Homeric, but cf. Od. 11.607 γυμνὸν τὸξον ἔχων, 21.416–17 εἶλετο δ’ ὦκὺν ὀιστόν, ὁ οἱ παρέκειτο τραπέζῃ γυμνὸς, Theocr. 22.146. γυμναὶ δ’ ἐν χερσὶ μάχαιραι, Arg. 1.1254. Much in this scene echoes the killing of Agamemnon by Aegisthus and Clytemnestra; on the question of whether a sword or an axe was used see 468–9n.

465–7 αἶψα δὲ κούρη / ἐμπαλιν ὄμματ’ ἐνεικε, καλυψαμένη ὀθόνησιν, / μὴ φόνον ἀθρήσει κασιγνήτοιο τυπέντος. ‘and quickly the maiden turned her eyes aside and covered them with her veil that she might not see the blood of her brother when he was struck down.’ Medea’s act of veiling stems from her shame at her participation in the murder of her brother; on the significance of Medea’s veil see Pavlou (2009).

Clytemnestra turns her eyes away as Orestes kills Aegisthus (Attic red figure pelike vase, 510–500 BC, Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna Inv. No. IV 3725).

For καλυψαμένη ὀθόνησιν cf. Il. 3.141 ἀργεννήσι καλυψαμένη ὀθόνησιν (of Helen to whom Medea is often likened). As often A. shortens the unique Homeric phrase. She covers her eyes with ‘fine linen’, which often had a covering of olive oil to make it shine (Od. 7.107 καιρουσσέων δ’ ὀθονέων ἀπολείβεται ύγρὸν ἐλαιον).

For μῆ... τυπέντος cf. Il. 8.330 κασιγνήτω τοιο πεσόντος and also 12.391 βλήμενον ἀθρήσει in a similar context.

468–9 τὸν δ’ ὄγε, βουτύπος ὡστε μέγαν κερελκέα ταῦρον, / πλῆξεν ὀπιπεύσας υποῦ σχεῦν. ‘As the slaughterer at a sacrifice kills a great, horned bull, so did Jason strike down his prey, having kept watch for him near the temple.’

Cf. Eur. El. 839–43 τοῦ δὲ νεύοντος κάτω / ὀνυχας ἐπ’ ἀκρος στὰς κασιγνητος σέθεν / ἐς σφονδύλους ἐπὶς ζυγοῦσα σέθεν / κάτω / ἠπαίρειν ἠπάταξι δυσθνῄσκων φύνῳ. As Porter (1990) 257 notes, the description is particularly unsavoury in its explicitness: ‘as (Aegisthus) was leaning down, your brother raised on the tips of his toes and smote at his spine, smashing the vertebrae; his body was convulsed, heaving, writhing in hard and bloody death.’ A. largely rejects the explicit physical nastiness of the Euripidean description in order to concentrate on Medea’s reactions, but still aims to elicit an emotional response through brutality and melodrama. Each poet uses sacrificial imagery to achieve a macabre atmosphere. Euripides portrays Orestes’ killing of Aegisthus as a perverse sacrifice: his hero strikes his victim in the back with a sacrificial cleaver while the latter is bending over the entrails of an earlier, more conventional victim. A., on the other hand, not only locates the murder in a precinct of Artemis, (for the inviolate
nature of which see 4.329–5), but expressly compares Jason to a sacrificial priest in a
simile that recalls a number of passages including Il. 17.520–2 ὡς δ᾽ ὤτ᾽ ἀν ὃξ᾽
ἐξὼν πέλεκυν αἰζήιος ἀνήρ / κόψας ἐξ ὑποθεν κεραύνος ἄγγαρυλοιο (‒ μέγαν
κερεαλκέα ταύρων 468), / ἵνα τάμη διὰ πᾶσαν, δὲ πρόθορων ἐρίησοι (‒ γνυξ
ἐρίης 471), Od. 4.534–5 τὸν (sc. Agamemnon) δ᾽ οὐκ εἰδότ᾽ ὀξηθοῦν ἀνήγαγε καὶ
κατέπεφνε (sc. Aegisthos) / δειπνίσσασας, ὡς τίς τε κατέκτανε βοῦν ἐπὶ φάτνη.
Earlier in this latter passage (529), it is said of Aegisthuses that δολίην ἐφράσσατο
tέχνην (‒ αἰνοτάτῃσιν ὑποσχεσίῃσι δολωθεὶς 456, ὃφρα δόλον συμφράσεται
438) and also εἷσε λόχον (531 ~ 454 ὃ δ᾽ ἐς λόχον ἰεν ἰῆσων). Other connected
passages are Od. 11.409–11 where Agamemnon describes his own death in language
similar to Od. 4.534–5, Aesch. Ag. 1125–9 (quoted below), and Eur. El. 1142–4
(Electra describing the fate about to befall Clytemnestra) κανοῦν δ᾽ ἔνηρκται καὶ
tεθηγμένη σφαγίς, / ἥπερ καθεῖλε ταύρον, οὐ πέλας πεσῇ / πληγεῖσα.

Unlike these parallels, A. specifically identifies the sacrificial priest to whom
Jason is compared. He is a βουτύπος, the individual at the Athenian festival of
Bouphonia who slew an ox in the precinct of Zeus Polieus and then fled. The origins
of this festival are obscure (Porter (1990) 266 31n., Finglass (2006) 191 n. 20). The
rite of Bouphonia was thought to be based on the first blood sacrifice, when a farmer
cought one of his herd feeding on a vegetable offering at an altar. The βουτύπος
would re-enact this event by coming up behind his victim stealthily and killing it as
Orestes kills Aegisthus and Jason, Apsyrtus. This veiled allusion to ritual bloodshed
depdens the force of A.’s description, linked as it is with Apsyrtus’ being likened to a
μέγαν κερεαλκέα ταύρον, and the deed taking place, just as a ritual sacrifice would
have done, outside the temple of Artemis. Although Jason is spoken of as γυμνὸν
ἀνασχόμενος παλάμη ξίφος, ‘raising a naked sword blade in his hand (464), the
simile of the βουτύπος also brings to mind Clytemnestra’s slaying of Agamemnon and suggests that the weapon used was an axe; for the question of whether she used an axe or a sword, see Davies (1987), Sommerstein (1989) with Aesch. Ag. 1125–8 (Cassandra is speaking) ἀπεχε τής βοὸς / τὸν ταῦρον· ἐν πέπλοισι / μελαγκέρῳ λαβούσα μιχανήματι τύπτει, πίτνει <ἐν> ἐνύδρῳ τεῦχει. / δολοφόνου λέβητος τύχαν σοι λέγω, (μελαγκέρῳ ~ 468 μέγαν κεραικέα).

In the midst of the slaughter, there is a philological point. A. writes ‘a bull weighty in the horns’ but Callimachus (h. 3.179) describes βόες who are εἰναετιζόμεναι ‘nine years of age’ as κεραικέες, drawing by the horns’. A. did not believe that oxen were attached to the plough by their horns, disagreeing with the scholiastic tradition; cf. Σ h. 3.179 κεραικέες· διὰ τὸ τοῖς κέρασιν ἐλκειν τὸ ἄροτρον.

πλῆξεν introduces heroic language used in an altered and sordid context; cf. Il. 3.361–2 Ατρεΐδης δὲ ἔρυσσάμενος ξίφος ἀργυρόηλον / πλῆξεν, 5.146–7. The use of ὀπιπεύσας is similar; cf. Il. 7.242–3 ἀλλ’ οὐ γάρ σ’ ἐθέλω βαλέιν τοιοῦτον ἐόντα / λάθρῃ ὀπιπεύσας. See also γνὺξ ἦριπε, θυµὸν ἀποπνείων and the use of ἥρως (below).

469–70 δὲν ποτ’ ἔδειμαν Αρτέμιδι Βρυγοὶ περιναιέται ἀντιπέρηθεν.

‘which the Brygi on the mainland opposite had once built for Artemis.’ Medea has previously been likened to or associated with Artemis (cf. particularly 3.876–86.) Artemis is associated with Hecate (cf. Davies and Finglass on Stes. fr. 178, Aesch. Suppl. 676) from whom Medea’s magical powers derive and who is also closely connected with the transitions that mark the stages of a woman’s life. Medea’s ride from the city is part of this transition, as is her role in the murder of her brother close
to the precincts of her patron goddess’ temple. Artemis’ temple also plays a significant role in Euripides’ *Iphigenia in Tauris* (cf. 78–103 with 189–205n., Hall (2013) 27–31).

The detailed location intensifies the reality of the moment. It is not the first time that Jason and Medea have had dealings in a temple; cf. 3.981 χώρῳ ἐν ἡγαθέῳ, ἵνα τ’ οὐ θέμισ ἔστ’ ἀλιτεσθαί, and Σ (inaccurately) Eur. *Med.* 1334 (= II 211.11 Schwartz) ἀνειλε τὸν Ἀμφρωτον ἐπὶ τῷ βωμῷ τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος ώς Ἀπολλώνιος φησιν.

471 τοῦ δὲ ἐν προδόμῳ γνυξ ἡριπε. ‘In its vestibule he fell on his knees.’ ἐν προδόμῳ is a Homeric formula (*Il*. 9.473, 24.673, *Od*. 4.302) generally referring to any sort of vestibule. Here it seems to be equivalent to the pronaos, the front of the temple, significantly close to the altar (Aesch. *Suppl.* 494–5 βωμοὺς προνάους καὶ τπολιοσούχων ἔδρας / εὐρωμεν), where an animal sacrifice would take place.


471–3 λοίσθια δ’ ἱρως / θυμόν ἀποπνείων χερσίν μέλαν ἀμφοτέρησιν / αἴμα κατ’ ὀτειλῆν ύποίσχετο. ‘and at last the hero breathing out his life caught up in both hands the dark blood as it welled from the wound.’ A’s use of the word ἱρως (here and at 477 ἱρως δ’ Αἰσονίδης) must be ironic. P.Oxy. 2694, quite plainly has ἀποπτ[...], (not ἀνα–) and this should be adopted. For ἀποπνείων cf. *Il*. 4.524 = 13.654 θυμόν ἀποπνείων (only here in Homer). Fränkel (1964) 15–6 cites *Arg*. 2.737, 3.231, 1292 as parallels for ἀναπνείων used in the sense of ‘aushauchen’, ‘breathe out’, ‘exhale’, but these passages differ from the
present one: breathing out cold air or fire is not the same as breathing out one’s soul.

A. is echoing a rare Homeric usage, in a context of heroic language being used to describe a very unheroic death (see γνὐξ ἦριπε above). Antim. fr. 53 Matthews θυμὸν ἀναπείων is not sufficient reason to reject the reading of Π; see Vian (1981) 166.

μέλαν αἷμα is a frequent combination (cf. II. 4.149 = 5.870, 17.86 αἷμα κατ’ οὔταμένην ὄτειλήν, Theogn. 349, Aesch. Ag. 1389–90 κάκφυσιῶιν ὀξεῖαν αἷματος σφαγήν / βάλλει μ’ ἐρεμῇ ψακάδι φοινίας δρόσου, Soph. Phil. 824–5, Eur. El. 318–19, Theocr. 2.13, Padel (1992) 68 n. 66, Finglass on Soph. Aj. 374–6n.), which maintains its force through the contrast with καλύπτρην ἀργυφέην.

ὑποίσχετο gains a certain ghastly effectiveness by comparison with 4.169 λεπταλέῳ ἑανῷ ὑποίσχεται, where the young maiden catches not blood but the reflection of the moonlight on a similar fine garment.

473–4 τῆς δὲ καλύπτρην / ἀργυφέην καὶ πέπλον ἀλευομένης ἐρύθηνεν. ‘and stained red Medea’s silver veil and robe, though she tried to avoid it.’ ἐρύθηνεν is the last use in the poem of ἔρευθος and its cognates. Previously it has described the beauty of young men, of maidenly modesty and of raising stars and the sun (1.726, 778, 791, 3.122, 298, 681, 963, 4.126, 173); now it marks blood-guilt contracted in the name of love (nn. 123–6, 172–3 and Rose (1985) 38–9). The gesture itself is a melodramatic one, consistent with the fact that Hellenistic tragedy had moved towards the presentation of violent acts on stage. Hall (2005) 5–6 has mentioned that Hellenistic versions of the murder of Agamemnon may have been shown on stage. Horace discusses such portrayals at Ars Poetica 153–294, arguing that violent acts such as Medea’s killing her children should not be seen by the audience; see Fantuzzi and Hunter (2004) 435. The influence of late Euripidean
tragedy on the *Argonautica* has already been noticed (nn.195–7, 189–205). Might A. have been used to a more spectacular stage practice than that of fifth century Athens when he went to the theatre, and brought something of it into his description of the death of Apsyrtus?

For the contrast between red and white cf. *Il.* 4.140–1 αὐτίκα δ᾽ ἔρρεεν αἷμα κελαινεφές ἐξ ὦτειλῆς / ὡς δ᾽ ὀτε τίς τ᾽ ἐλέφαντα γυνὴ φοίνικα μιῆη, Aesch. *Ag.* 1389–90, Soph. *Ant.* 1238–9, [Eur.] *Rhes.* 790–1, Virg. *Aen.* 12.36 (the Tiber warm with blood and the plains white with bones), 12.67–9 (Lavinia’s blush). The smearing of blood from the wound marks the metaphorical and physical transference of the guilt associated with the murder. The power of this symbolism is intensified by the word order of 472–4: χερσὶν μέλαν ἀμφοτέρησιν αἷμα is closely linked through the chiasmus and the separated participial phrase τῆς . . . ἀλευομένης highlights the target (καλύπτρην / ἀργυφέην καὶ πέπλον) of Apsyrtus’s blood-stained hand. On red and white symbolism, see Thomas (1979) 310–16, Lovatt (2013) 274.

475–6 ὀξὺ δὲ πανδαμάτωρ λοξῷ ἑδὲν οἶον ἔρεξαν / δηματι νηλείῆς ὀλοφώιοιν ἔργον Ἐρινὺς. ‘With disapproving eye the pitiless Fury, subduer of all, saw clearly the deadly deed that they had done.’ Medea herself is referred to as Ἐρινὺς at Eur. *Med.* 1260 φονίαν . . . Ἐρινὺν ὑπαλαστόρων.

Ἐρινύς encloses the whole sentence. νηλειής (not Fränkel’s νηλειεῖς) ... Ερινύς embraces the ‘deadly deed’, as does λοξῶ... ὁματί.

The Erinyes are said to see the crimes which they punish: Soph. *Aj.* 836 ἀεί... ὁρώσας πάντα τὰν βροτοῖς πάθη, *OC* 42, *El.* 139, [Orph.] *Hym.* 69.4–5.

For λοξῶ... ὁματί cf. Pind. *O.* 2.41 ἰδοῖσα δ’ ὀξέι’ Ἐρινύς. Lefkowitz (1985) 280 notes that admirers of Pindar in the Hellenistic age and after appear to cite phrases because of the reputation of this poet for obscurity and allegorical meaning fostered by the exegetical scholia, adding that later imitations of Pindaric phrases have a concreteness lacking in the original. This would be an appropriate description of A.’s expansion of the terse Pindaric original here. A., using the explanation given by Σ, ὀξέως βλέπουσα, clarifies Pindar’s more enigmatic ἰδοῖσα δ’ ὀξέι’. The disapproving, sideways glance λοξῶ... ὁματί first appears at Sol. fr. 34.5 *IEG*, Anacr. fr. 417.1 *PMG* then in *Arg.* 2.664–5, Call. *Aet.* frr. 1.38–9 Harder, 374 Pfeiffer, Theocr. 20.13, Ov. *Met.* 2.752. ‘The piercing, side-long glance of the Erinys may indeed recall tragedy’s preoccupation with both the necessity and the surprising twists of punishment for wrong-doing’ (Goldhill (1991) 332, who notes the significance of ἔρεξαν, often used to mean ‘to complete a sacrifice’, (LSJ9 s.v. ῥέζω II)).

477–9 ἕρως δ’ Ἀισονίδης ἔξαργματα τάμνε χανόντος / τρίς δ’ ἀπέλειξε φόνου, τρίς δ’ ἔξ αγος ἐπτυσ’ ὀδόντων, / ἠ θέμις αὐθέντησι δολοκτασίας ἱλάεσθαι. ‘The hero, the son of Aeson, cut off the dead man’s extremities, three times he licked the blood and three times he spat the pollution out from his teeth, as is the proper way for slayers to expiate treacherous murders.’ Line 477 describes the ritual of *maschalismos* in which the dead man’s extremities (ἔξαργματα) are cut off and tied under his neck and armpits. The use of this ritual as
a concluding motif adds another Aeschylean echo to the episode of Apsyrtus’ murder (cf. Aesch. Cho. 439). Another example is found in Sophocles’ play about Achilles’ murder of the Trojan prince Troilus (fr. 623 TrGF) in the sanctuary of Apollo Thymbraios before the walls of Troy. In the same place a different type of maschalismos took place: snakes tore to pieces Laokoon and his sons, as a late fifth century South Italian krater illustrates (cf. Simon (1992) 196–201, with Kossatz-Deissmann (1981) 72–85 Achilles and Troilus). The action is plainly one to be carried out in a sanctuary after an abnormal sacrifice and it is after A.’s manner to give exact details of the ritual. The traditional story is that Medea killed her brother and cut him into pieces, throwing them into the river to delay her father’s pursuit (Fowler, EGM §6.6, Cic. Leg. Man. 22, Apollod. 1.9.24. The formality of the detail (for spitting out the blood cf. Aesch. fr. 186a TrGF) emphasises the cold-blooded nature of Jason’s actions. See Finglass (2007) on Soph. El. 445 and Bremmer (1997) 87–8. Ceulemans (2007) argues that Jason uses the ritual of maschalismos not to atone for the murder but to avoid the victim’s revenge and that the use of the word ἐξάργυματα (hapax in A.) continues the sacrificial context, which pervades the whole scene.

Spitting (often three times) is an old piece of folklore (cf. Gow on Theocr. 6.39) and is still a way of warding off evil in Greece today. On the one hand Jason, by licking the blood and spitting it out, is attempting to rid himself of the pollution connected with the murder, but on the other, apparently in accordance with tradition and custom (ἵ θέμις), he tries to propitiate (ἵλαεσθαί) the dead Apsyrtus.

480–1 ὑγρὸν δ’ ἐν γαίῃ κρύψεν νέκυν, ἐνθ’ ἔτι νῦν περ / κεῖται ὀστέα κεῖνα μετ’ ἀνδράσιν Ἀψυρτεύσιν. ‘He buried the corpse in the ground while it was still fresh, where to this day those bones lie among the Apsyrtes.’ Apsyrtus’
name was frequently linked with the Apsyrtides islands, which were near the Illyrian coast. In early imperial times the grave of Apsyrtus was shown to passing tourists (Arr. Peripl. 6.3) and Procopius (Goth. 2.11.14) claims that in his time the inhabitants of Apsaros, once called Apsyrtus, said that the murder had taken place on the islands.

The word order in these concluding lines is mannered and chilling. ‘Apsyrtus was warm flesh’, says our narrator, ‘but now in our day his bones still remain’. ὑγρόν opens the couplet in an emphatic position balanced by ὀστέα κεῖνα at the end of the phrase, with the spondaic Ἀψυρτεῦσιν solemnly ending the episode.
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