

Apollonius *Argonautica*: notes on 4.391-451

391 ἀναζείουσα βαρὺν χόλον: “cf. Aesch. *PV* 370 ἐξαναζέσει χόλον; Euripides had bequeathed to the tradition a very close link between Medea and χόλος, cf. *Medea* 590.” (Hunter 2015)

392-3: nb destructive Medea at 4.392-3 (where wants to set fire and throw self into flames): cf. Euripides where Medea ponders setting fire to Jason's chamber and gifts burning up Glaucus/Creon. Here similarly deceitful words and gifts. Effect?

392 “Her desire to burn the Argo (4.392) in fact echoes an intention of Aietes himself (3.582, cf. 4.223); in her anger she is her father's daughter,⁶⁶ and Jason must resort to the same tactics with her as he used to calm Aietes” (Hunter 1993: 61)

392 loeb reads ἔμπεδα; Race notes ἔμπεδα Ω: ἀμφοδὰ Campbell. Hulse 2015 reads διὰ τ' ἔντεα πάντα κεάσσαι (translating “She longed to set fire to the ship, burn all the equipment”) and comments: “Transmitted ἔμπεδα πάντα cannot bear any sense which would connect it with the ship's fixtures: therefore, read ἔντεα... ἔντεα πάντα. Medea wants to start a fire on board the Argo, make sure that it spreads to the rigging ... and throw herself into the blaze” (Hulse 2015 who discusses textual solutions)

392 διὰ τ' ἔμπεδα πάντα κεάσσαι ‘shatter everything [. . .] in pieces’. At *Od.* 15.322, πῦρ τ' εὖ νηῆσαι διὰ τε ξύλα δανὰ κεάσσαι, grammarians differed as to whether the second verb meant ‘burn’ or ‘split’, LfgrE s.v. κεάζειν. At 1267, ‘burn’ is impossible and Ap. uses the simple verb in the sense of ‘cut’ at 2.104, 3.378; ‘burn’ is here not impossible, but ‘break to pieces’ seems much more likely (pace Rengakos 1994: 102); see Campbell 1971: 420, citing *Il.* 9.241–2 (about Hector) στεῦται γὰρ νηῶν ἀποκόψειν ἄκρα κόρυμβα | αὐτάς τ' ἐμπρήσειν μαλεροῦ πυρός. ἔμπεδα πάντα is impossible, and the error may have arisen from the fact that ἔμπεδα πάντα is Homeric in this sedes, but with quite inappropriate sense (cf. *Od.* 2.227, 11.178, 19.525). Campbell proposed ἀμφοδὰ πάντα, ‘everything before their faces’, cf. 3.95–6, *Od.* 19.391.” (Hunter 2015)

393ff: Jason goes on to speak. How much do we think he is backtracking to soothe her? See e.g. Beye 1996: 10. Volonaki, E. 2013 “The art of persuasion in Jason's speeches: Apollonius of Rhodes, *Argonautica*” (in: Kathryn Tempest and Christos Kremmydas (edd.). *Continuity and Change. Oratory in the Hellenistic Period*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013, 51–70) discusses Jason's speech of 4.395–409: “A different kind of argument is used in Jason's last speech to Medea (4.395–409). Medea is furious and angry at the prospect of being left behind by the Argonauts, as part of an agreement they have made with the Colchians to escape safely from their ambush: she wishes to set fire to their ship and destroy everything. Jason, in fear, tries to calm her anger, addressing her with ‘honey-sweet words’ (394: μελιχίοις ἐπέεσσιν). Jason's arguments are logically sequenced, as he tries to convince Medea that this plan is their best chance of avoiding battle and part of a ploy to trap and kill her brother, Aspyrtos. Jason's words stress the contrast between the personal worries of an individual and the anxieties on behalf of the group of comrades, and, as such a leader, Jason resembles Agamemnon (*Il.* 10.1 ff.) or Odysseus”

393-4 τοῖα δ' ἴήσων / μελιχίοις ἐπέεσσιν ὑποδδείσας 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 μελιχίοισιν / Αἰήτη, σχέο μοι). The two speeches are also connected by the description of Jason's general demeanour (3.396, 4.410 ὑποσσαιῶν). 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.” (Hulse 2015)

395–409: “Jason responds that the pact with Apsyrtos is merely a ruse to gain time and a trick to lead him to destruction. We have no more idea than does Medea whether to understand that he is merely improvising his way out of a difficult situation (Hunter 1993: 15), but we do read his speech against his Euripidean model’s plea for flexibility at *Medea* 446–64 and the hypocrisy of that speech. (Hunter 2015)

395 ἴσχεο: “cf. σχέο μοι at 3.386, one of a number of echoes of how Jason tried win Aietes around.” (Hunter 2015)

395 ἴσχεο, δαιμονίη, τὰ μὲν ἀνδάνει οὐδ’ ἐμοὶ αὐτῷ: “‘Calm down, poor lady. I too take no pleasure in this.’... The literal meaning of δαιμονίη is ‘possessed by a δαίμων.’ Jason often uses the word when he is trying to placate Medea, using methods that verge on lying (3.1120, 4.95). Both ἴσχεο ... and τὰ αὐτῷ are further attempts to mollify” (Hulse 2015, who cfs Hector to Paris at Il. 6.326–9 (here reversal of that call to action)

395 δαιμονίη: “cf. 95, 3.1120, where again the use of this address suggests that Medea is over-reacting.” (Hunter 2015)

396–7 ἀλλά τιν ἀμβολίην διζήμεθα δηιοτήτος / ὅσσον δυσμενέων ἀνδρῶν νέφος ἀμφιδέδην / εἵνεκα 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... The Homeric phrases that Jason alludes to (cf. Il. 7.290 νῦν μὲν παυσώμεσθα μάχης καὶ δηιοτήτος, 24.288 δυσμενέων ἀνδρῶν, 16.66 κυάνεον Τρώων νέφος ἀμφιβέβηκε, 6. 328–9 σέο δ’ εἵνεκ’ αὐτὴ τε πτόλεμός τε / ἄστρῳ τόδ’ ἀμφιδέδην) are subverted by his ulterior motives.” (Hulse 2015)

396–8: “Cf. Il. 6.326–9 (Hector to Paris) δαιμόνι’, οὐ μὲν καλὰ χόλον τόνδ’ ἔνθεο θυμῷ . . . σέο δ’ εἵνεκ’ αὐτὴ τε πτόλεμός τε | ἄστρῳ τόδ’ ἀμφιδέδην. Hector is trying to stir Paris to fight and to keep fire from his city (cf. 6.331), whereas Jason seeks a respite from war, such as Paris is enjoying, as well as avoiding the burning of his ship. Aristarchus (and perhaps other scholars before him) wondered to what χόλον in line 326 referred (see Graziosi-Haubold ad loc.), and it is possible that Ap. does not just rewrite this exchange, with a complete reversal of the Homeric situation (Jason, after all, is more naturally a ‘Paris’), but also uses the Homeric motif of χόλος more appropriately than it was believed that Homer himself had done.” (Hunter 2015)

397 ἀμφιδέδην: “‘blazes around’, an intransitive perfect of ἀμφιδαίω; Ap. follows Homer in using it metaphorically of war, cf. previous n., Il. 12.35.” (Hunter 2015)

398–9: “Neither we nor Medea have any way of knowing how much Jason knows about local attitudes to the dispute (Fränkel 1968: 485). μεμάασιν is, however, a strong word and Jason, at least, paints the situation in the blackest possible terms.” (Hunter 2015)

398–400 πάντες γάρ, ὅσοι χθόνα τήνδε νέμονται, / Ἀψύρτῳ μεμάασιν ἀμυνέμεν, ὄφρα σε πατρί, / οἷά τε ληισθεῖσαν, ὑπότροπον οἴκαδ’ 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.” (Hulse 2015)

400 οἷά τε ληισθεῖσαν: “‘in as much as you are a captive’, i.e. in the belief that more true than they might realize, 35–40n. Jason seems to allow Medea to understand that the Colchians have falsely misrepresented the situation to the locals, a misrepresentation which would of course strengthen their case for her return. Green 1997: 310 takes the phrase to refer rather to what will happen to Medea when returned to the Colchians, but that would be much weaker rhetoric.” (Hunter 2015)

400 ἄγοιντο: Hunter 2015 reads singular ἄγοιτο instead of better attested plural.

401–3 αὐτοὶ δὲ στυγερά κεν ὀλοίμεθα πάντες ὀλέθρῳ, / μίξαντες δαὶ χεῖρας· ὃ τοι καὶ ῥίγιον ἄλγος / ἔσσεται, εἴ 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 to be decided by combat ... The echo of Hector’s words to Andromache at 6.462–3 σοὶ δ’ αὖ νέον ἔσσεται ἄλγος / χήτεϊ τοιοῦδ’ ἀνδρὸς ἀμύνειν δούλιον ἦμαρ and the reference to a frequent fate on the field of Troy (cf. 1.4 αὐτοὺς δὲ ἐλώρια τεῦχε κύνεσσιν, 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.” (Hulse 2015)

402–3 ὃ τοι καὶ ῥίγιον ἄλγος| ἔσσεται: “‘something which will be, believe me, an even worse grief . . . ’. Jason here strikes a heroic attitude, continued in 403, by saying that the knowledge that the Argonauts were leaving Medea to her fate would make their deaths even more painful and disgraceful; the closest Homeric parallel is probably Hector’s anxiety for Andromache at *Il.* 6.454–65. τοι is thus best taken as the particle ‘I assure you’. More usually, Jason is understood to be saying that, if the Argonauts are killed, things will be even worse for Medea, with τοι as ‘for you’, cf. 407, *Il.* 1.563 (Zeus speaking harshly to Hera) τὸ δέ τοι καὶ ῥίγιον ἔσται; this has obvious rhetorical point, but places a great deal of weight upon the simple τοι. With the interpretation adopted here, Ap. pointedly varies the meaning of τοι in the Homeric model.” (Hunter 2015)

404 συνθεσίη: where else does Jason make agreements?

404 κρανέει: future of κραίνω.

404 μιν: = Apsyrtus. How has been Apsyrtus portrayed (Beye 1996 notes shadowy figure but AR seems to give positive picture)? Who is responsible for Apsyrtus’ fate in AR, what different traditions might he have followed, and how do the choices made by AR affect our views of the protagonists involved? (note the snake is only drugged! Jason has previously killed Cyzicus, by mistake) “That Medea is not completely responsible for the murder becomes clearer from the way in which Apollonius presents Apsyrtus’ murder and the stance that he adopts towards the crime of fratricide. First of all, in contrast to previous versions (in which Apsyrtus is just a child, and Medea’s brother from the same mother), the Apollonian Apsyrtus is an adult and Medea’s half-brother. Moreover, Medea does not actively participate in the murder, as is the case in the versions advanced by Pherecydes, Euripides, Sophocles, and Callim. (fr.8 Pf). In the *Argonautica* it is Jason who has the ‘leading role’ in the heinous crime of murder. Sophocles in his *Colchians* (see Sad 223–30d, Wendel 272) presents Medea killing the baby Apsyrtus at her house near the hearth before fleeing with Jason, while Pherecydes (see Sad 223–30d, Wendel 272), recounts that she and Jason took Apsyrtus away from home, murdered him, and threw his dismembered limbs in the river in an effort to delay Aeetes’ pursuit. In the Euripidean tragedy, although Medea does not specify the nature of her crime, she admits that she has killed her brother (Eur. *Med.* 166–7).” Pavlou (2009). On the fate of Apsyrtus, see C. S. Byre, ‘The Killing of Apsyrtus in Apollonius Rhodius’ *Argonautica*’, *Phoenix* 50 (1996).

405–6 βήσομεν: “‘we will cause him to enter’, LSJ s.v. βαίνω b.” (Hunter 2015)

405 οὐδ’ ἂν ὁμῶς . . . ὑπὲρ σέο: “‘And those who dwell around will not oppose us in the same way in rendering service to the Colchians on account of you . . . ’. ἀντιώωσι is best understood, despite ἂν, as the principal verb, and the meaning will be either ‘oppose [us] equally’ or perhaps ‘aid [the Colchians] equally’; for the latter cf. 849. The present tense with ἂν is, however, hard to parallel and Diels’ ἀντιώωντο still deserves consideration, cf. 1.470 καὶ εἰ θεὸς ἀντιώωτο (a pointed variation of Od. 12.88). Alternatively, ἀντιώωσι may be understood as the dative plural of the participle in agreement with Κόλχοις, to be taken with

φέροιεν in 406, i.e. ‘... would not equally render service to the Colchians when they ask for assistance’, cf. 703, 3.35n., LSJ s.v. ἀντιάω v. ἦρα φέροντες; cf. 375n. (Hunter 2015) 404–5 ἦδε δὲ συνθεσὶ κρανεῖ δόλον ᾧ 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.. 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 τὰς δε συνθήκας ἐμάς, / ὥς ἂν 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.” (Hulse 2015)

405–7 οὐδ’ ἂν ὁμῶς περιναιέται ἀντιώσι / Κόλχοις ἦρα φέροιεν ὑπὲρ σέο νόσφιν ἄνακτος, / ὅς τοι ἄοσσητήρ τε κασίγνητός τετέυκται. ‘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, ἀντιῶντες and φέροιεν PE, ἀντιῶντες and φέροντες LA, εἰσαῖοντες and φέροντες D) is the vagueness of Jason’s concluding remarks. For ἀντιάω as an equivalent of ἀντιάζω, see LSJ9 s.v. ἀντιάω and ἀντιάζω. Here, it is a dative plural participle, emphasising the dependency of the Colchians on the local population (366–7n.)” (Hulse 2015)

407 ἄοσσητήρ: “‘helper’, cf. 146, 785; from the point of view of the Colchians Apsyrtos has come to try to ‘help’ Medea, who – so they believe (400n.) – is a captive of the Greeks. There is no need (with Vian, cf. Pietsch 1999: 155) to invent a new sense ‘legal protector’, i.e. κύριος, for the term here.” (Hunter 2015). Beye (1996: 8-9) notes importance of idea of woman under power and protection of father or guardian until she passes into that of husband: Apsyrtus in position of *loco parentis*.

408 loeb οὐδ’ ἂν ἐγὼ Κόλχοισιν ὑπεῖξω μὴ πτολεμίζειν (so too Hulse 2015): Hunter reads ἔϋπεῖξομαι πτολεμίζειν and comments: “the required sense is probably ‘I would not refuse to fight the Colchians . . .’, rather than ‘I would not be defeated in battle by the Colchians . . .’ (for which cf. 339). Gerhard’s ὑπεῖξω μὴ is the favoured solution, but we should be cautious about introducing by emendation a breach of ‘Naeke’s Law’ (i.e. word-division after a fourth-foot spondee, as, e.g., 971); *Arg.* breaches this rule roughly every 87 verses. Moreover, the expression, lit. ‘I would not yield not to fight . . .’, is at least awkward; Brunck’s ὑπεῖξαιμι, ‘I would not withdraw from fighting . . .’ is perhaps better, but a convincing solution has yet to be found. Platt’s πτολεμίζων cannot be adopted in ignorance of the preceding text.” (Hunter 2015); Hulse 2015 remarks “Jason continues to discuss possibilities rather than make decisions. The awkwardness of the syntax reflects his hesitation.”

410 ἴσκεν ὑποσσαίνων: “‘he spoke trying to soothe her’, cf. 92, 3.396 (with Hunter and Campbell ad loc.). The participle is used of an earlier speech of Jason to Medea at 3.974.” (Hunter 2015)

410 οὐλοὺν . . . μῦθον: “the speech will help bring about Apsyrtos’ ‘destruction’, but the poet also passes judgement on the ‘deadly’ quality of what the young girl says.” (Hunter 2015)

410 ἴσκεν ὑποσσαίνων· ἡ δ’ οὐλοὺν ἔκφατο μῦθον: “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’ ..., or ‘cringe before’ ... 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 ὀνειδέειον φάτο μῦθον; see Hughes Fowler (1989) 137–9, DeForest (1994) 129. The Alexandrian use of ἴσκειν as an equivalent of ἔλεγε is based on an ancient critical discussion of *Od.* 22.31 ἴσκειν ἕκαστος ἀνὴρ (Rengakos (2001) 198).” (Hulse 2015)

411 φράζεο νῦν: “‘Pay attention now!’ The use at 3.1026, in a similar context, is somewhat different.” (Hunter 2015)

411 ἀεικελίουσιν ἐπ’ ἔργοις: “ἐπί is probably ‘on top of, in addition to’ (447, 1.297, LSJ s.v. b 1e), but there is also a causal nuance ‘in view of’ (LSJ s.v. iii). (Hunter 2015)

412 τόδε: “i.e. the plan she is about to propose.” (Hunter 2015)

411–13 φράζεο νῦν· χρειῶ γὰρ ἀεικελίουσιν ἐπ’ ἔργοις / καὶ τόδε μητίσασθαι, ἐπεὶ τὸ πρῶτον ἀάσθην / ἀμπλακίῃ, θεόθεν δὲ κακὰς ἦνυσσα μενοινάς. “‘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 φράζεο νῦν, ὥς κέν τοι ἐγὼ μητίσομ’ ἀρωγήν) and with words suitable for a Homeric speech of deliberation and planning.... 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) Ἄτης ἣ πρῶτον ἀάσθην / ἀλλ’ ἐπεὶ ἀασάμην καὶ μεν φρένας ἐξέλετο Ζεὺς. 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 (ἦνυσσα) appear to be more self-determined. For more links between Medea and Agamemnon see Knight (1995) 255.” (Hulse 2015)

413 θεόθεν: “Medea now shifts responsibility, but she speaks more truly than she knows, given Hera’s role in Books 3 and 4.” (Hunter 2015)

414 “An apparently awkward verse, given that the fighting should follow the killing of Apsyrtos (cf. 420), but Medea picks up the bravado of Jason’s final words of 408–9 and holds him to them.” (Hunter 2015)

414 ἀλέξεο: “keep off, defend yourself against”. (Hunter 2015)

414 τὴν 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 (*Il.* 6.431–2) wishes Hector to avoid combat. τὴν 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..” (Hulse 2015)

415–16 αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ κεῖνόν γε τεὰς ἐς χεῖρας ἰκέσθαι / μελίζω· σὺ δέ μιν παιδοῖς ἀγαπάξεο δώροισι; I/you and Medea and Jason’s different roles.

416 μελίζω: “‘I will induce’, with a suggestion of ‘beguile, trick’; in the event, Medea’s θέλξις (436, 442) involves the use of potions to lure Apsyrtos to her (442–4).” (Hunter 2015)

417–19 εἴ κέν πως κήρυκας ἀπερχομένους πεπίθοιμι / οἶόν θεν οἷον ἐμοῖσι συναρθῆσαι ἐπέεσσιν. / ἔνθ’ εἴ τοι τόδε ἔργον ἐφανδάνει, οὐ τι μεγαίρω; Race, Loeb tr. “in hopes that I may persuade the heralds going to him to make him come all alone to listen to my words.” Hulse 2015 transposes a line and comments: “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.”

417 “Ap. shows a very experimental technique in the handling of messengers and messenger-speeches (cf. 435–6, Hunter 1993: 144–5), but it is hard to believe that ‘in the hope that I can persuade departing heralds falls in with . . . ’ can stand for ‘in the hope that I can persuade him, through the departing heralds, to fall in with . . . ’; the scholiastic paraphrase, εἴ πως . . . πείσαιμι τὸν Ἀψυρτον μόνον πρὸς μόνην ἥκειν, φιλίαν πρὸς αὐτὸν συνθεμένη, increases doubt. The compression is barely tolerable, even leaving aside the questions of the identity of the heralds (Colchian?) and the absence of any detail. It is possible that a whole verse (or verses) has fallen out after ἀπερχομένους and/or we need some word for ‘despatching, sending’.” (Hunter 2015)

418: “Moreover, the deception and killing of Apsyrtus is a sinister and perverted reprise of the meeting of Jason and Medea at the temple of Hecate; it is thus a particular instance of how the meaning of much of Book 4 is created out of a ‘rewriting’ of earlier events. Apsyrtus is told to come alone (4.418, cf. 3.908) to a temple to secure the Fleece and eventually to return home with Medea” (Hunter 1993: 61–2)

418 συναρθῆσαι: “at *Il.* 7.302 Hector suggests to Ajax that they exchange ‘glorious gifts’, as a mark that, though they fought, they parted ἐν φιλότῃ . . . ἀρθμήσαντε; Ap. echoes that passage at 1.1344 and perhaps here also. Doubt about the text of 417 makes the exact nuance uncertain: perhaps ‘fall in with, unite himself to my words’, but ‘make an agreement < . . . > through my words’ cannot be ruled out.” (Hunter 2015)

419 οὐ τι μεγαίρω: “‘I do not begrudge it’, i.e. ‘that is fine by me’, cf. 3.485.” (Hunter 2015)

419–20 ἐνθ’ εἴ τοι τόδε ἔργον ἐφανδάνει, οὔτι μεγαίρω, / κτεῖνέ τε, καὶ Κόλχοισιν ἀείρεο δημοτῆτα.: “‘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 ὃ πέπον, εἴ νύ 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.” (Hulse 2015)

420 κτεῖνε: “the absence of an expressed object, ‘Apsyrtos’ or ‘my brother’, speaks volumes. ἀείρεο δημοτῆτα ‘begin your strife with . . . ’, LSJ s.v. ἀείρω iv 4.” (Hunter 2015)

421–521: “The death of Apsyrtos. Apsyrtos is lured to his grisly death by deceitful words, by splendid gifts and by Medea’s magical powers. In earlier versions, Medea’s very young brother was killed and dismembered either in the royal palace itself or during the Argonauts’ flight from the city, cf. 460–1n., Pherecydes, FGrHist 3 F32, Soph. fr. 343R, Call. fr. 8, but it is unclear whether Ap.’s version is his own innovation. The aura of tragedy is, however, palpable in this episode; see nn. on 468, 472, 475–6, 477. Important too was probably the death of the Trojan prince Troilos, who was ambushed by Achilles at a shrine of Apollo outside the walls of Troy; the story, which is well attested in art, occurred in the Cypria (West 2013: 121–2, 242–3) and seems to have been dramatized by Sophocles. Such Cyclic material, with its elements of ‘unheroic’ strangeness (cf. 477), sits well with the obvious evocation of the death of Agamemnon, told above all in the Nostoi and then in Aeschylus; here and elsewhere, Ap. uses the Cycle as one of the ways in which he establishes his poetic voice against that of Homer; see 693–4n., Hunter 2008b: 143–6, Fantuzzi– Hunter 2004: 95–7, Introduction, pp. 19–21. It is, moreover, a reasonable modern speculation that Achilles fell in love with Troilos’ sister, Polyxena, during this same episode, and this would then create a brother–sister lover triangle analogous to, though differently configured from, Apsyrtos–Medea–Jason. On Troilos as a model for Apsyrtos see esp. Mori 2008: 201–9, and for this

episode see also Sansone 2000: 166–8, Porter 1990, Griffiths 1990, Byre 1996a, Nishimura-Jensen 1996: 168–89, Bremmer 1997, Stephens 2003: 226–9.” (Hunter 2015)

421 ξυμβάντε: “coming to an agreement” (Hunter 2015).

δόλον ἡρτύναντο: “in Homer this phrase occurs only of Clytemnestra’s plot against Agamemnon (*Od.* 11.439), which is to be a principal paradigm for the killing of Apsyrtos. 423–34 As in Books 1 and 3, a marvellous cloak is fraught with symbolic significance, cf. 3.1203–6n., Rose 1985; cloaks are in Arg. very ‘significant objects’ (Griffin 1980: ch. 1 on Homer), and the use of a peplos in this context recalls such fatal gifts as that of Deianeira to Heracles in Sophocles’ *Trachiniae* and, in particular, the device by which Medea kills the young princess in Euripides’ tragedy. Formally, the ‘digression’ to describe the history of the cloak imitates such passages as *Il.* 2.101–8 (Agamemnon’s sceptre), but the history also completes some of the story of Theseus and Ariadne which Jason had dangled before Medea (and us) in Book 3, anticipates (again) what awaits Medea in Greece, and lengthens the shadow which the Lemnian episode of Book 1 casts over the whole epic (see further 3.997–1004n.). Hypsipyle’s gift of a cloak to the departing Jason (for the motif cf. 2.30–2) found its Homeric model in the εἵματα θυώδεα in which Calypso clothed the departing Odysseus; Plutarch, *Mor.* 831d describes those clothes as ‘fragrant of her divine skin, gifts and memorials of her love’ (cf. 430–4).” (Hunter 2015)

425 Δίη ἐν ἀμφιάλῳ: “cf. *Od.* 11.325 Δίη ἐν ἀμφιρύτῃ Διονύσου μαρτυρίῃσι, in the story of Ariadne (seen by Odysseus in the Underworld), cf. 433–4n. Dia was believed to be an old name for Naxos, cf. Call. fr. 601; Diod. Sic. 5.51 records Strongule, Dia and Naxos as successive names for the island, and places the story of Theseus and Ariadne in the time of the last name. At 5.52 Diodorus explains the importance of Naxos for Dionysus: he was raised there by local nymphs, and yet another name for the island, which grows splendid wine (cf. 432), is Dionysias.” (Hunter 2015)

Χάριτες: “Callimachus made the Graces children of Dionysus and a Naxian nymph called Coronis, the same name which Diodorus had given to one of the Naxian nymphs said to have raised the god (Schol. Flor. 30–2, p. 13 Pfeiffer, cf. Harder 2012: 2.138). (Hunter 2015)

427–8 ‘and she gave this too to the son of Aison, for him to carry away, a splendid hospitality-gift together with many other fine objects’.” (Hunter 2015)

γλήνεσι: a Homeric hapax: “at *Il.* 24.192 Priam chooses gifts (including fabrics, 229–31) for Achilles from among the γλήνεα πολλά of his storerooms; a standard gloss for the Homeric term is ποικίλματα (e.g. Hesychius γ 631 and the scholia here). The preciousness of Hypsipyle’s gifts is marked by the rarity of the word used to denote them. (Hunter 2015)

428–9 ἀφάσσω: cf. 184–6n. γλυκὺν ἥμερον ἐμπλήσειας: the audience is to feel the same quasi-erotic longing as Apsyrtos and as is inscribed in the cloak’s history; the audience can no more resist the gift than Apsyrtos can; see 444n., Byre 1991: 224–5. In Book 1, such addresses to the audience frame the description of Jason’s marvellous cloak (1.725–6, 765–7)” (Hunter 2015).

430 ἀμβροσίη ὀδμή: ὀδμή | ἀμβροσίη: “arises from the wine with which Dionysus fills the pirate-ship in *HH Dion.* 36–7. Cf. also Moschus, *Europa* 90–2 (indebted to this passage). ἄεν was supplemented by Haslam 2013, and is probably to be accepted (Fränkel had conjectured πνέεν), despite the resultant double hiatus; previously the papyrus was thought to read μ[έ]νε[v]. Elsewhere Ap. uses ἄεν (an alternative imperfect of ἄημι/ἄω) only of winds, but cf. *HH Dem.* 276–8 (Demeter’s epiphany) περὶ τ’ ἀμφὶ τε κάλλος ἤτο | ὀδμή δ’ ἡμερόεσσα θυγόντων ἀπὸ πέπλων | σκίδνατο, with Richardson 1974: 253.” (Hunter 2015)

431 Νυσήϊος: “Nysa was very early associated with Dionysus, but there was no agreement as to where this place was, cf. 1134, *Il.* 6.132, *HH Dion.* (1) 8–9, Dodds on Eur. *Ba.* 556–9; Hesychius ν 742 notes that it is ‘a mountain, not in any one place’ and enumerates 15 Nysas in various locations.” (Hunter 2015)

432 ἀκροχάλιξ: “‘tipsy, pleasantly drunk’, from a believed association with χάλις ‘unmixed wine’; the word is otherwise found only in an imitation of this passage at Dion. Perieg. 948, but ἀκροθώραξ means much the same (Kassel–Austin on Diphilus fr. 45.2). Gods drink nectar rather than wine (*Il.* 1.598 etc.), but – as the inventor of wine – Dionysus naturally drinks both.” (Hunter 2015)

Μεμαρπώς: “‘grasping, holding tight’, cf. *Il.* 14.346 (another divine union) ἀγκὰς ἔμαρπτε Κρόνου πάις ἦν παράκοιτιν. 433–4 A variation on *Od.* 11.321–5, Ἀριάδην, | κούρην Μίνωος ὀλοόφρονος, ἦν ποτε Θησεὺς | ἐκ Κρήτης ἐς γουνὸν Ἀθηνάων ἱεράων | ἦγε μὲν, οὐδ’ ἀπόνητο· πάρος δέ μιν Ἄρτεμις ἔκτα | Δίῃ ἐν ἀμφιρύτῃ Διονύσου μαρτυρήϊσι. In Homer there is no suggestion that Theseus deliberately abandoned Ariadne (see 3.997–1004n.).” (Hunter 2015)

παρθενικῆς Μινωίδος: “the phrase occurs already at 3.998, and cf. Call. fr. 110.59 νόμφης Μινωίδος. 435–41 As elsewhere, Ap. experiments creatively with the sending of 3.998, and cf. Call. fr. 110.59 νόμφης Μινωίδος.” (Hunter 2015)

435–41: “As elsewhere, Ap. experiments creatively with the sending of messages; here a mixture of direct and indirect speech, an almost anacoluthic parenthesis and the extraordinary postponement of a main verb until 442 create a palpable air of secrecy and deceit (Hunter 1993: 144–5).” (Hunter 2015)

435–8 κηρύκεσσιν ἐπεξυνώσατο μύθους | θελγέμεν . . . ἐλθέμεν: “is best understood as ‘she exchanged words with [i.e. ordered] the heralds to charm [with her gifts] to come’, or perhaps ‘ . . . words for charming to come . . . ’; θέλγειν, rather than, say, πείθειν is used because all Medea’s words, as well as her gifts, carry magical force. The construction seems awkward (Fränkel proposed θέλγουσ’ and Merkel θέλγε μιν), but should perhaps be accepted in view of related syntactical experiments elsewhere.” (Hunter 2015)

437 ἀμφιβάλησιν: “must here be ‘envelop’, although the meaning is as hard to parallel as an intransitive ‘fell about’ would be; ἀμφιβέβηκη would be expected, but the corruption would be very hard to explain.” (Hunter 2015)

438–9: “3.12–13 (Hera to Athena) are verbally very close to these verses.” (Hunter 2015)
δόλον: “it is very unclear whether Π1 did in fact have an alternative reading; see Kingston 1968: 56.” (Hunter 2015)

440–1: “are a kind of explanatory parenthesis in direct speech: ‘For, said>, the sons of Phrixos . . . ’.” (Hunter 2015)

Πέρη: “‘very much, exceedingly’, i.e. ‘with irresistible compulsion’, LSJ s.v. περί e ii. Fränkel 1964:15 suggested παρὰ . . . δόσαν ‘handed over’.” (Hunter 2015)

δόσαν ξείνοισιν ἄγεσθαι: “there is perhaps a resonance of ‘gave in marriage to strangers’. 442 παραιφαμένη need not imply deceit (cf. 2.287, 3.14–15n.), but here that implication is clear. θελκτήρια φάρμακ’ continues the erotic atmosphere (428–9, 444n.) of Medea’s ‘attraction’ of Apsyrtos, cf. the Nurse’s φίλτρα . . . θελκτήρια | ἔρωτος at Eur. *Hipp.* 509–10.” (Hunter 2015)

444: “Medea’s powerful magic may remind us of Simaitha’s attempts to win back (and/or destroy) Delphis in Theocritus 2 (note φάρμακα 2.15, πάσσειν 2.18–21, Ἔρωσ ἀνιαρέ 2.55, ἔλκε in the repeated refrain etc.). Both scenes evoke so-called ἀγωγή spells (cf. ἤγαγε) used to attract a desired lover to one and to separate him or her from any possible rivals (see esp. Faraone 1999); in such spells the boundary between the wish to induce desire (cf. γλυκὺν ἵμερον in 429) and the wish to destroy or inflict pain was a very fluid one, and Medea’s use of erotic magic to lure Apsyrtos to his death is a new twist on that phenomenon. There is thus a very close link (normally overlooked) between these verses and the apostrophe to Eros which immediately follows.” (Hunter 2015)

445–9: “are an invocation by the narrator to Eros in a form related to that of the ἀποπομπή or prayer to a god to leave one alone and exercise destructive powers on others, cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 1571–3 (with Fraenkel’s note), Cat. 63.91–3, Fraenkel 1957: 410–11, Hunter 1993: 116–18;

the chorus at Eur. *Hipp.* 525–9 express a very similar sentiment, and a comparison of these verses to the stasimon of a tragedy has often been made. This passage was to have a rich *Nachleben*, cf., e.g., Cat. 64.94–8, Virg. *Aen.* 4.412. The invocation forms the transition from the plotting of Jason and Medea to the actual killing, and this ‘proemial’ function increases the probability that Ap. was drawing specifically on *Theognis* 1231–4, verses placed (at some time) at the head of ‘Book 2’ of the elegiac collection: *σχέτλι’ Ἔρωος, Μανίαι σ’ ἐτιθνήσαντο λαβοῦσαι· | ἐκ σέθεν ὤλετο μὲν Ἴλιου ἀκρόπολις, | ὤλετο δ’ Αἰγείδης Θησεὺς μέγας, ὤλετο δ’ Αἴας | ἐσθλὸς Ὀϊλιάδης σῆσιν ἀτασθαλίαις.*” (Hunter 2015)

445–9, “which pick up the language of the proem of the book (cf. 1–5n., 62–3n.), have been at the centre of a debate about the extent to which *erôs* is still an important narrative driver in Book 4 (sometimes expressed as ‘Does Medea still love Jason?’), cf., e.g., Fränkel 1968: 494–6, Fusillo 1985: 393n. 37, but whether we look to the longer causal chain, emanating from the god’s intervention at the start of Book 3, or to the immediate context, erotic desire can hardly be written out of both the present and future stories of Jason and Medea; this is the god who ‘derails the minds of just [p144] men to make them unjust and bring them to ruin’ (Soph. *Ant.* 791–2). See further 446n.” (Hunter 2015)

445: “Aratus, *Phain.* 15, *χαῖρε, πάτερ, μέγα θαῦμα, μέγ’ ἀνθρώποισιν ὄνειαρ*, has a very similar shape and expresses an almost exactly opposite emotion – grateful admiration rather than fear and loathing. As *Phain.* 15 serves to introduce a first-person statement by the poet (cf. 450–1) and comes from the proem, the probability that Ap. here echoes that verse must be considered strong.” (Hunter 2015)

πῆμα “picks up the themes of the proem (cf. 4).” (Hunter 2015)

446 “In one of his laments for the ‘fallen’ human condition, Empedocles exclaimed (fr. 124 D–K) *ὦ πόποι, ὦ δειλὸν θνητῶν γένος, ὦ δυσάνολβον, | τοίων ἔκ τ’ ἐρίδων ἔκ τε στοναχῶν ἐγένεσθε*. It was Strife (*νεῖκος*) which caused the unhappy human condition, but Ap. transfers this to *ἔρωος*, the equivalent of Empedocles’ *φιλία* or *φιλότης*, the alternative to Strife (Kyriakou 1994: 315). The murder of Apsyrtos and its aftermath is thus placed under the sign of Empedocles, for whom *φόνος* was the ‘archetypal sin’ (Osborne 1987: 48); cf. further 676–81, 678–80nn.” (Hunter 2015)

ἐρίδες: “cf. 448n. Haslam 1978: 54 argues that the reading of the papyrus is correct, with *τ’* of the MSS being a scribal addition to avoid hiatus.” (Hunter 2015)

πόννοι: “both ‘(physical) sufferings, toils’ and ‘emotional griefs’, cf. 1 *κάματος*, 4 *πῆμα* *δυσίμερον*, *Theognis* 1323–4 *Κυπρογένη, παῦσόν με πόνων, σκέδασον δὲ μερίμνας | θυμοβόρους*, Ar. *Eccl.* 975 *διά τοι σὲ πόνους ἔχω*, Hunter 1993: 117n.70. The word leads into the storm imagery which follows; the ‘sea of love’ is a rich vein of ancient images (see, e.g., Nisbet and Hubbard on Hor. *C.* 1.5.16), particularly appropriate in an Argonautic context, and Aphrodite has by birth and cult a close association with the sea. *γόοι* of the MSS is also perfectly possible, and might be thought to pick up the first line of Empedocles fr. 124 (above), but adds little after *στοναχαί*, cf. *Od.* 16. 144 *στοναχῇ τε γόωι τε*, from which the MSS reading may have arisen.” (Hunter 2015)

447 *τετρήχασι*: “‘swirl up’, an intransitive perfect of *ταράσσω* (or *θράσσω*), cf. 3.276, Philetas fr. 7.3 Powell (another passage of nautical imagery) *ἀνῖαι τετρήχασιν*, Campbell 1994: 244–5. The image here is of ‘waves’ of grief, cf. 1.1167 *τετρηχότος οἴδατος*, Leon. Tar. AP 7.283.1 (= HE 2351) *τετρηχυῖα θάλασσα*, and following note.” (Hunter 2015)

448 “‘Against my enemies’ children, divine spirit, rise to a high peak . . .’; destructive love more often affects the young, hence ‘children’, but the suffering of one’s children is also more painful than one’s own. The image is of a monstrous wave, cf. 215, 2.70–1 *κῦμα θαλάσσης | τρηχὺ θοῇ ἐπὶ νηὶ κορύσσεται*, *Il.* 21.306–7 *κόρυσσε δὲ κῦμα ῥόοιο | ὑψόσ’ ἀειρόμενος*; the image was understood in antiquity as a wave rising to a peak like a helmet (*κόρυς*). Others take *κορύσσειο* here simply as ‘arm yourself’ (cf. *δυσμενέων*), but although

there is certainly a resonance of war and death here, this does not do justice to the repeated imagery of the passage. Ap. has in mind the allegory of Eris at *Il.* 4.442–5, ἥ τ' ὀλίγη μὲν πρῶτα κορύσσεται . . . νεῖκος ὁμοῖον ἔμβαλε . . . ὀφέλλουσα στόνον ἀνδρῶν; there too the image is drawn from a wave (see Kirk on line 442). The familiar play on ἔρις ~ ἔρως is signalled by ἔριδες in 446. δαῖμον may refer simply to Eros' divine power to inflict both good and evil, but Ap.'s readers may also think of the Platonic explanation of Eros as a δαίμων, mediating between men and gods (*Symp.* 202d-3a)." (Hunter 2015)

449 στρυγερὴν . . . ἄτην: "again picks up the themes of the proem, cf. 4–5n.; at 1.802–3 Aphrodite is said to have cast θυμοφθόρον . . . ἄτην upon the Lemnian men. Ap. here combines the Iliadic Eris (448n.) with 'Agamemnon's apology' for his disastrous behaviour at *Il.* 19.87–8, [Zeus and Moira and Erinys] εἰν ἀγορῇ φρεσὶν ἔμβalon ἄγριον ἄτην." (Hunter 2015)

450–1 "The narrator's intrusion continues (which has led to the mistake in the papyrus in 450), but rather than the emotional and personal involvement of 445–9, we now have the poet marking the stages of his song, in a manner which places distance between himself and his material, cf. 552–6, 2.851, 1090, Theocr. 22.115 πῶς γὰρ δὴ Διὸς υἱὸς κτλ.; although such questions can be understood to be addressed to the Muse (as explicitly in Theocr. 22), the absence of any explicit reference and the 'footnote' of 451 enhance the contrast with the invocation which has immediately preceded. Morrison 2007: 302–3 understands the question to be addressed to Eros (with ἡμῖν as 'the poet and Eros'), but this seems very unlikely, and ignores the progressive force of γὰρ δὴ, which marks a new stage in the narrative, cf. 2.852, 1090, Denniston 244." (Hunter 2015)

ἐδάμασσαν: "the subject is Medea, brought forward from 449." (Hunter 2015)

τὸ . . . ἐπισχερὸν . . . ἀοιδῆς: "'the next part of my song', here conceived as a linear progression like a journey (Albis 1996: 50–1); we might think of this 'next part' as 'the Apsyrτος': it is framed by Ἄψυρτον (451) ~ Ἀψυρτεῦσιν (481), as the 'Hylas' is similarly framed (1.1207 ~ 1.1354), and cf. 661–2n. ἐπισχερὸν is more usually an adverb." (Hunter 2015)