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Apollonius Rhodius’ description of the boxing-match between Amycus and Polydeuces in Argonautica 2.67-97 consists of three “rounds”, all largely narrated through similes (67-78, 79-87, and 88-97). In the first round, Polydeuces leaves the initiative to Amycus and evades his opponent’s blows until he has found out his weaknesses and strengths:

70 Ἐνάντια δὲ Βεβήρυκου μὲν ἄνας, ἀ τε κύμα θαλάσσας τριχὰ ποταμίον ἐπὶ νησί κυρίεσται, ἡ δ’ ὕπ’ ὑπό τυφθὸν ἱδρείη πυκνοίνοι κυβερνητήρος ἀλάσκει τειχῶν πορέσεσθαι ἐσω τοίχου κλύδωνος ὡς ὅ γε Τυνδαρίδης φοβέον ἐπετ’ οὐδὲ μιν εἶα
75 δηθύνειν, ἢ δ’ ἀρ’ σιέν ἀνοιντὸς ἦν διὰ μήτιν ἀίσαντι ἀλέξενεν. Ἀφηγέα δ’ αἴτη μνήμας πυγμαζήν, ἡ κάρτος ἀάτατος ἢ τε χερείων, στῇ ἢ ἀμοτον καὶ χερόν ἐναντία χειράς ἐμιξεν.

76 ἀίσαντι Pierson: ἀίσανον Ω Σ1 77 κάρτος Ω Σ2αλκα.: θάρσος αρ. Σ1β λατ. tere susp. Vian ἀάτατος Λ: ἀάτατον wE: ἀάτατον L2D Σ3λακ.: ἀάτατον A Σ1θ
ἡ [ἡ] LI τε χερείων Ω Θ ς3λακ. Σ1λακ.: ἡ καὶ ἀρείων L2 (et καὶ ἀρ Σ2αλκ.), cf. EG1, s.v. ἀρείων 78 στῇ n Σ1θυ

Then the king of the Bebrycians, just as a rough wave at sea rears its crest to attack a fast ship, but the ship, by the skill of its clever pilot, evades (but only just) the surge that strives to break over its boards—just so did Amycus follow behind the son of Tyndareos, harrying him, and left him no respite; but he, by his skill, kept escaping from Amycus’ attacks unhurt. And having quickly sized up Amykos’ ruthless way of boxing, its strengths and its weaknesses, he stood his ground and mixed his hands with those of the king.

The textual problems in lines 76-78 have been satisfactorily solved, I believe, by Vian, from whose edition (1974) I have reproduced the text and apparatus. In this paper I will investigate the precise meaning of ἀκάτος and στήρι ὁ ᾠμοτος in 77-78, the connotations which these words carry, and how these connotations color our reading of Apollonius’ text. I will also argue that the confusion in the mss. at line 77 may be partly caused by confusion over the interpretation of ἀκάτος.

Besides in the Argonautica,1 the adjective ἀκάτος only occurs in three passages in Homer: at ll. 14.271, Hypnos asks Hera to swear by the ἀκατον Στυγνὸς ὄδωρ; at Od. 21.91, Antinous calls Penelope’s test of the bow an ἄθλον ἀκάτον; and Odysseus repeats this expression when he has passed the test and is about to kill the suitors at Od. 22.5, ἄθλος ἀκάτος ἐκτελέσται. Ancient critics largely agree that ἀκάτος is cognate with ἁφα, and since ἁφα is usually glossed with βλάπτω (used of "Ἀτη c.e.g. in Il. 9.507), the standard rendering of ἀκάτος is understandably an adjective in -βλαβής: either ἁβλαβής (interpreting the initial ἁ as privative) or ἐπι-βλαβής (interpreting the initial ἁ as intensive).2

Most modern critics base their interpretation on these glosses, and argue that ἀκάτος should mean either «harmful» or «harmless». But although

1 See also 1.803 prooemiosis, discussed at the end of this paper.

2 Full evidence: (1) privative ἁ: ἁβλαβής (passim), ἁνευ βλαβής (schol. V Od. 21.91), δίχα βλαβής (Eust. ad Od. 22.5), ἐνχερής (Ap. Soph. and Hesych., s.v.), ἁνευ ἄρης (ibid.), ἀπαναφοράς (schol. T ll. 14.271), ἀπερατος (ibid.), ἀναμεμέρης, ἄγος, ἀπολαθής, ἀπαθής (all Lex. Seg.); (2) intensive ἁ: ἐπιβλαβής (passim), λίαν βλαπτικός (schol. b ll. 14.271), βλαστικός (schol. T ibid.), πολυβλαβής (Eust., ibid., etc.), πάνω βλαφερός (Eust. ad Od. 21.91), ἅτηρος (Eust. ad Il. 14.271, etc.), ἄνωχερής (Ap. Soph., s.v.); (3) confused with ἁτος: ἁπλίαρτον (Hesych., s.v.). See also H. Seiler, ἁτος, in Lggr E I, cc. 2-3; Rengakos 1994, p. 28. No ancient critic seems to have considered the possibility that the variation in quantity between ll. and Od. (ἄκατος vs. ἀκάτος) involves a variation in meaning (compare the variable prosody of aor. ἁσσω).
the first interpretation would work for our passage in the *Argonautica*, a keen Homeric critic as Apollonius can hardly have failed to notice that neither ἐπιβλαβής nor ἄβλαβής is very satisfactory for *Od.* 21.91 and 22.5. It seems likely that the ancient critics were here hampered by the limitations of their own language, which forced them to gloss ἀόως with an adjective in -βλαβής that does not have quite the same force as the non-existent verbal adjective ἄβλαπτός. Since ἀόω is consistently used in early Greek epic in the sense «to deceive», «mislead», its verbal adjective in -τος with privative α should mean «not subject to deceit». This interpretation indeed fits the Apollonian passage and all Homeric contexts. Oaths sworn by the water of Styx (*H.* 14.271) are the most binding imaginable because Styx (unlike Zeus, *H.* 19.90-136) is not susceptible to ἀτη, i.e. she cannot be deceived, is infallible. The test of the bow (*Od.* 21.91, 22.5) is of such a nature that it allows no foul play and is infallible in the sense that it cannot be passed by anyone but the desired candidate.

Apollonius’ Polydeuces, finally, needs to find out, in order to decide on his tactics, to what extent Amycus is «inulnerable to being deceived» by μῆτις (75) because of his strength (κάρτος), which surpasses his own, and to what extent he is inferior to him (χερετων, compare Ap. Rh. 3.465, *H.* 1.114, *Od.* 5.211, etc.) because of his lack of μῆτις and τέχνη. As said, «harmful» also fits the Apollonian context, but it is weaker since it robs us of a reference to Polydeuces’ μῆτις and its opposition to Amycus’ κάρτος. The opposition of μῆτις / τέχνη, represented by Polydeuces, and βῆ / κάρτος, represented by Amycus, is an important motif in *Arg.* 2.67-97, and it is particularly emphasized in the simile immediately preceding our passage, where Amycus is likened to a wave (the raw force of nature) which rises against a ship, threatening to wash over its boards, and Polydeuces is the ship’s pilot who time and again manages to evade the towering waves through his skill (72 ἰδρείη, πυκνοῦο, 75 ἤν διὰ μῆτιν). There-

3 Compare the use of ἄβλαβής in treaties (LSJ, s.v., II 3), expressions such as *H.* Cer. 259 ἀμείλικτον Στυγος ὄδωρ (after 258 ἀσθής), and perhaps Hes., *Th.* 389, 397 Στυγος ἀφθίτος, 805 Στυγος ἀφθίτον ὄδωρ (differently Theocrit. 24.98 ἄβλαβες ὄδωρ, alluding to Styx).

4 Closest to the interpretation advocated here are Janko on *H.* 14.271-274 («invincible») and Chantaine, *DELG*, s.v. («invincible»). For discussion see further Rengakos 1994, p. 28; Seiler, ἀόως, cit.; Vian 1974, p. 267; Wilstrand 1929, p. 76; Fernández-Galiano, Stanford on *Od.* 21.21; Ameis and Hentze, *Anhang* on *H.* 14.271; Moorhouse 1961 (who unconvincingly argues a connection with ἄοω, «to satiate»).

5 The idea is also conveyed by allusions to Tgn. 673-676 (which adds to the Homeric models for the simile the crucial element of the skillful pilot), and to *H.* 7.197f. (Ajax: οὐ γὰρ τίς με βη γε ἐκὼν ἀκόνιτα δημιαν, / οὐδέ τι ἰδρείη, from one of the general models for the boxing-match, the duel of Hector and Ajax), and by the intra-
fore it seems likely that we are here dealing with a case where Apollonius allows his readers to choose between (1) an interpretation which gives acceptable sense and can be reached by anyone familiar with the schoolmaster’s exegesis of Homer, and (2) a superior interpretation which makes an expression more meaningful in a specific context and/or unites all it’s actual uses, but which requires a more profound insight in Homeric usage and in the semantics of the Greek language.

A clear indication that Apollonius indeed wants to call our attention to the interpretation of ἀκόρητος and invite us to regard it as a philological problem is presented by ὀμόος in the next line. As we shall see, this adverb evokes similar semantic problems, including a dispute over the force of the initial α (privative or intensive?). Moreover, there can be little doubt that Apollonius also wants us to remember the problematic initial α, etymology, and meaning, as well as the connotations, of the similar adjective ἀστός, which I think did not by mere coincidence intrude into part of the Apollonian mss. at 2.77. In early epic this adjective occurs in the collocations [name+] ἀστός πολέμου (6x), μάχης ἀστον (1x), and δόλων ἄστε (2x).\(^6\) Ancient critics offer the following explanations:

1. ἀκόρεστος, ἀπλήρωτος «insatiable», i.e. derivation from ἀω «to satiate» with privative α, clearly right;\(^7\)
2. ἐπιβλαβής, βλαβερός, πολυβλαβής «harmful», i.e. derivation from ἄω, directly or via contracted ἄτι with intensive α;
3. [Etymologicum Magnum: ἄνευ ἄτης; ὁ ἐστιν] ἄβλαβής, ἄνευ βλαβής, i.e. derivation from ἄω / ἄτι with privative α (or just confusion with ἀστός), which requires an unidiomatic interpretation of ἄβλαβής as «unharmful» if the explanation is to make any sense (compare the gloss ἄβλαβης in Ap. Soph., s.v.).\(^8\)

Apollonius uses ἀστός in his description of the Argonauts’ after-dinner party at 1.457-459

Μετέπειτα δ' ἀμοιβαίδες ἀλλήλοις
μιθεῦνθ' οία τε πολλ̣ά νέοι παρά διατί καὶ οἴνω
τερπν̣ός ἔψωντα, ὅτ' ἀστός ὑβρὶς ἄπει̣.

textual connections between 70-76 and the Argonauts’ passage, guided by their skillful pilot Tiphys, through the Bosporus entrance (2.169-177) and the Symplegades (2.549-610), which is reinforced by dovetailed allusions to the sequential similes at II. 12.41-47, 15.381-384, and 623-628.

\(^6\) See (1) II. 5.388, 863, 6.203, 13.746, Ἑς., ἠβ. 7.14, [Ḥes.], Sc. 59, cf. ib. 101 (in various cases); (2) II. 22.218; and (3) II. 11.430, Ὀδ. 13.293. Most of our mss. of Homer and Hesiod read ἄτος; I print the uncontracted spelling adopted by Apollonius.

\(^7\) Compare II. 7.117 μόθου... ἀκόρητος, 12.335 πολέμου ἀκορήτω, 13.621 ἀκόρητοι ὑπης, 13.639 μάχης ἀκόρητοι.

\(^8\) For evidence and discussion see Seiler, ἀστός, cit. and Rengakos 1994, pp. 28f.
and once more in Phineus’ description of his plight at 2.232 ff.:

_olla me ikri deita kai aastos ischey anagkhe_
_minei kai mineonta kakei en yosteri thesai._

An interpretation ἐπιβλαβῆς works for ἄστος both contexts, as it would for ἄστος at 2.77. This interpretation would imply that Apollonius saw ἄστος as ἄστος plus intensive α, and that he regarded the words as virtually synonymous. But although the scholia and Quintus of Smyrna fell for this interpretation, it is just as colorless for 1.459 and 2.232 as it is for 2.77. A sense ἀκόρεστος would clearly add more zest to 2.232, where the ἀνάγκη of which Phineus speaks is insatiable hunger. However, this meaning does not fit 1.459, even though the dining context clearly alludes to it. Moreover, this interpretation implies that we cut the strings between ἄστος and 2.77 ἄστος. Yet Apollonius signals that he does not want us to do this by using ἂμοτον in 2.77. Not coincidentally, Homeric ἂμοτον is often glossed with ἀκόρεστον, as we shall see, and although Apollonius definitely does not use it in this sense in 2.77, the combination ἄστος + ἂμοτον cannot but refer us to ἄστος, which like ἂμοτον is often glossed with ἀκόρεστος.

As regards Apollonius’ use of ἄστος, it seems that, as in the case of ἄστος, he primarily advocates a direct re-etymologization from ἄσω and ἄτη (ἄτη), namely «connected with ἄτη»: ὑβρίς is «caused by ἄτη» (1.459), and Phineus too chooses to present his ἀνάγκη as «caused by ἄτη» (2.232), as is made clear by, for example, 2.313 ἀσάμην. This gives us a plausible hypothesis to knit the passages together: Apollonius treats ἄστος as the verbal adjective from ἄσω (1.459, 2.232), ἄστος as its negated form with privative α (2.77), while at the same time evoking and, partly, allowing alternative interpretations.

It remains for us to analyze the contribution to the semiotic web made by the various Homeric and Apollonian contexts to which 2.77 ἄστος points us. The boxing match between Amycus and Polydeuces that is here about to begin for real is a contest (Od. 21.91 ἀεθλον ἄστον and 22.5 ἀεθλος ἄστος, marking the start and conclusion of the contest of the bow) which is in appearance sportive but in reality martial and deadly (Il. 5.388 et al. [Ἀρης] ἄστος πολέμωτο, Il. 14.271 Στυγγος ώδωρ), and which will be decided by μῆτις (Il. 11.430 et al. δόλον ἀατε). The Apollonian passages containing ἄστος additionally suggest that Amycus is a ὑβριστης (1.459), and more specifically associate his ὑβρις with that of Idas (for which see also the appendix, below).

* Schol. 1.459 ἢ ἄμον βλαττητη τὸ γάρ ἢ τὸ πρῶτον ἐπίτασις ἔστιν; schol. 2.232 ἢ πολυβλαβῆς Q. S. 1.217 θάρσος ἂμον (for which see also the appendix, below).
ted by Phineus. These connections are re-inforced elsewhere in the episo-
date and further on in *Argonautica* 2.10

With στὶ ρ’ ἄμο tons in 78, Apollonius is doubtless alluding to *Il*. 22.35f.,
ό δὲ προπάροιθε πυλών / ἐστι κεῖ ἄμο tons μεμαδων Ἀχιλλῆι μῆχεσθαι, at
the beginning of the duel of Achilles and Hector, a Homeric episode
which functions as a general model for *Argonautica* 2.1-97. No ancient cri-
tic ever seems to have considered the possibility that ἄμο tons should be
taken with ἐστί κεῖ in *Il*. 22.36, and therefore it is almost an insult to as-
sume, as some modern scholars do,11 that this is how Apollonius inter-
preted his model, in spite of many examples to show him that ἄμο tons is to be
taken with the following μεμαδων.12 Surely he intended to transform his
model by using ἄμο tons in a novel way. The question is: in which way? We
may arrive at an answer by combining the explanations of ἄμο tons offered by
ancient exegetes with the context of *Il*. 22.36.

Ancient critics generally gloss ἄμο tons with ἀπλήρωτον, ἀκόρεστον, i.e. «insatiably», sometimes followed by πολύ, σφοδρόν
(less specific) or ἀκατάλαμπτον (more specific).13 As we have seen, Apol-
lonius points his readers to this explanation through 77 ἀώτος, which
evokes ἄώτος (notably in *Il*. 22.218, see below), which is also commonly
(and correctly) glossed with ἀπλήρωτος, ἀκόρεστος, but used by Apol-
lonius in a different sense. Because clearly for ἄμο tons in 78 «insatiable» is
no viable interpretation, it is likely that just like in the case of ἀώτος and
ἀώτος, Apollonius is re-etymologizing the adverb's meaning. The fullest
evidence on ancient attempts to etymologize ἄμο tons is provided by the
*Etymologicum Genuinum* (s.v.):

παρά τὸ μένῳ γίνεται μοτός καὶ ἄμος καὶ ἄμος, οἷον: «ἄμοτον μεμαδω
μάχεσθαι» [II. 15.79], ἄναμονιόν, ἵνα ἃ ἐστι τὸ ἐπίταττον. Ἡ μότα
λέγονται τὰ ράκη τὰ πληρωτικά τῶν πληγῶν, καὶ ἄμοτον κατὰ ἀπόφασιν τὸ
μὴ πεπληρωμένον, ἀπὸ μεταφοράς τῶν μὴ πεπληρωμένων τραυμάτων, τούτο-
ἔστιν τῶν μότων.

The last half of this comment (which the *Genuinum* attributes to Orion) is
also found in various forms in other sources, of which schol. B on *Od.*
6.83 deserves to be mentioned for its explicit reference to the reasoning
implied:

10 See Cuypers, forthc., Introduction; Cuypers 1997, pp. 4-7 and 194, 211; Murray,
forthc.
11 See for example Fränkel 1968, p. 159 n. 15; Rengakos 1994, p. 48.
BEP *Od*. 6.83, schol. ΩΙ *Ap. Rh.* 4.923, and *EG*, Hesych., s.v. For the full evidence
For the first half compare also Zonaras (s.t.):

παρά το μένῳ γίνεται μοτός καὶ ἄμοτος, οἷον: «ἄμοτον μεμιαίται μάχεσθαι»
[iI. 13.79], ἐπιθάσει τοῦ ἀν’.

From these testimonies it appears that just as in the case of ἄμοτος we are dealing with rivalling etymologies which differ in their treatment of the initial α; they may be summarized as: (1) privative α + μότος; and (2) intensive α + μένω. The second etymology appears to form the basis of Apollonius’ use in 2.78, which from the Genuininum’s curious ἄνυσμομόνητον (where ἄν- makes little sense) and the paraphrase ὑποστάσεις in schol. Ω on 2.78 may be glossed with ὑπομόνητος. The phrase as a whole then comes to mean ἔστη καὶ ἔμυμεν: Polydeuces «stood his ground».

To arrive at this interpretation, Apollonius does not expect us to work from Homeric scholarship alone. An important key is provided by the direct and wider context of the Homeric model, ii. 22.36. In the prelude to the duel between Hector and Achilles, a lot of emphasis is laid on Hector’s decision to stay (μένειν / μιμείν) outside the gates of Troy, the crucial decision which leads to his duel with Achilles. Compare ii. 22.35-40

35 ὁ δὲ προπάροιθε πυλῶν
ἐστήκει, ἄμοτον μεμαίως ‘Αχιλλῆ μάχεσθαι
τὸν δ’ ὁ γέρον ἔλεειν προσημόθα χεῖρας ὁρεγνύς
’Εκτορ, μή μοι μίμε, φιλον τέκος, ἀνέρα τούτον
οίος ἄνευθ’ ἄλλων, ἕνα μή τάχα πότιον ἐπίσπης
40 Ἡπλείων δομεῖς, ἐπεὶ ἦ πολὺ φέρτερός ἐστι,

and

90 Ὡς τὰ γε κλαίοντε προσαυδήτην φίλον φίλων,
pολλὰ λισσόμενον σοῦ ἔκτορι θυμόν ἐπειθον,
ἀλλ’ ὁ γε μίμε Ἀχιλῆ χεῖρά λαμβάνον ὑδατα.
ὡς δέ δράκον ἐπεὶ χεῖρ ἀρέστερος ἀνδρα μένησι κτλ.
131 Ἡμεῖς ὁρμαίνειν μένον, ὁ δὲ οἱ σχεδὼν ἦθεν Ἀχιλλεύς
136 ’Εκτορά δ’, ὡς ἐννόησεν, ἔλε τρόμος’ σοῦ ἄρ’ ἐτ ἐτήλ
σὺθ’ μένειν,

and last but not least 231 (Deiphobus / Athena to Hector):

ἀλλ’ ὁ γε δὴ στέοιεμεν καὶ αλεξόμεεθα μένοντες
(with 237 ἄλλοι δ’ ἐντοσθε μένουσι, 241 αὕτη μένειν).14

14 For ἵστασαι + ptc. μένουν compare furthermore ii. 4.333f. οἱ δὲ μένοντες / ἐστασαν, 21.552 ἐστη, πολλα δε οἱ κραδή πορφυρε μένοντι, Od. 22.181 ἐσταν... μένοντε. For ἄμοτον compare in Homer also ii. 19.300 ἀ. κλαίω, 23.567 ἀ. κέχουμενος, and Od. 6.83 (ἡμίνοι) ἀ. ταύνυντο, readable as «I keep crying», «still angry», and «they kept running». Such paraphrases also work well for the remaining Apollonian
Besides evoking the prelude to the duel of Achilles and Hector, ἀμοῦτον in 2.78, just as ἀάτος in 77, carries more relevant associations. In a general way, by evoking the common Homeric collocation of ἀμοῦτον and μενεότιον (above, n. 12), it suggest that Polydeuces, who has so far dodged the fight, is now very eager to fight Amycus, just as Amycus' eagerness to fight Polydeuces was connote in ἀάτος, which evoked the formula ἀάτος πολέμου (above, n. 6). In fact, Apollonius' readers will have made this connection almost automatically, because before arriving at the correct interpretation of ἀμοῦτον in this context (or not, as the case may be), they must have gone through the schoolbook interpretations and considered the options ἀπλῆρωτον / -όως, ἀπλῆστον, ἀκόρεστον. And they will also have considered the derivation from privative α + μότος, which conjures the suggestion that Polydeuces now finally unleashes his power.

Finally we are also pointed – by the collocation of ἀμοῦτον and ἀάτος as such and by the specific allusion to I. 22.36 ἐστήκει, ἀμοῦτον μεμιᾶσθαι Ἀχιλλῆι μάχεσθαι – to Heracles’ speech to Cycnus just before their duel in the Hesiodic Shield, where the same collocation of words as in I. 22.36 occurs in a different construction, in which ἀμοῦτον seems to be used just as ἀάτος in I. 22.218 μάχης ἄατον. Compare [Hes.], Sc. 357-361:

οῖ πέπον, οὐ μὲν γὰρ τοῦ Ἀρης θανάτου τελευτήν ἀρκέσει, εἰ δὴ νοὶ συνοισομεθα πτολεμιζείν. ἢ δὲ μὲν τε ἐφιμι καὶ ἄλλοτε πειρηθῆναι ἐγχεος ἡμετέρου, ὅθε' ὑπὲρ Πύλου ἡμαθηντος ἀντίος ἐστι ἐμείλο, μάχης ἀμοῦτον μενεαίνον.

Not coincidentally, this passage from the Shield directly depends on what is also Apollonius’ primary intertext for 2.77-78, the duel of Achilles and Hector. Compare Athena’s encouraging words to Achilles at I. 22.216-218, νοὶ ἑολπά… / οἰσεσθαι μέγα κύδος… / Ἑκτορά δηώσαντε μάχης instances: 1.513 (Orpheus stopped singing) τοῖ δ’ ἀμοῦτον λήξαντος ἐπὶ προύχοντο κάρνα (the Argonauts «continued to look at him», alluding to Od. 17.520), 2.666 ἅβρεμει («keeps roaring»), 4.923 α’, βοάσκεν («kept shouting»), 3,1252 and 4.9 άκοντων / κεχολομένους (as II. 23.567; cf. also II. 16.61 ἀσπερχές κεχολόσθαι, Od. 1.681. ἀσκελες σίεν / … κεχόλωσαν), 4.211 σφερχομένων ἅ. («as they kept trying», cf. Od. 6.83), 4.1417f. ῥοον, ὃ ἀπὸ δῆμαν / οἰδομενὴν ἅ. λαφθήσειν («our ever-burning thirst»). Yet often we are clearly invited also to read ἀκόρεστος, as in 2.77 (cf. e.g. schol. on 1.513 ἀπλῆρωτοι [τὴς φώρης] ὄντες). For discussion see Fränkel 1968, p. 159 n. 15; Rengakos 1994, p. 48 (both «stood still»), Livrea on 4.923 («insatiably» but in 2.77 «violently»), which he claims, with Lfg+iE, is the Homeric sense), Mooney on 1.513 («boundless», i.e. privative α + μότος); also Lfg+iE and Chantraine, DELG, s.v. (both sympathetic towards an etymology ἄμυτο- from μεν), and Janko on I. 13.39f. (ἀμοῦτον μεμαότες = «striving for things hard to strive for» after Forssmann 1986: unlikely).
Apollonians anonymous (Argonautica 2.77-78) 231

ἀστὸν περ ἔόντα (with a variant of the formula ἄστος πολέμιον which is not found elsewhere: see above n. 12). Both intertexts forebode ill for Apollonius’ Amycus (who is indeed killed by Polydeuces in 88-97). There are more signals that ask us to regard Heracles’ duel against Cycnus and Ares in the Shield as a general model for Polydeuces’ duel against Amycus. For example, it can hardly be coincidental that the war against the Pylians in which Heracles here claims to have faced Ares before, turns up more often in the intertexts of Argonautica 2.1-177. And more generally, Apollonius keeps reminding us throughout the episode that Polydeuces acts as a stand-in for the hero of the Shield, Heracles, who is the divine patron of boxers and had acted as the Argonauts’ champion until his accidental abandonment in Mysia immediately before this episode. A pointer to the Shield is furthermore that in that poem both Ares and Heracles are called «insatiable in war» at crucial points in the action. Thus it appears that Apollonius uses ἄστος and ὀμός to play off in the background not only the duel of Achilles and Hector, but also that of Heracles and Ares. What is clear in any case, is that the reader who is to grasp the full potential of Apollonius’ words in Argonautica 2.77-78 must be a true philological addict.

Appendix: the text of 2.77 (and 1.803)

For 2.77 κάρτος there once seems to have existed a variant θάρσος. This is strongly suggested by the unmotivated comment in schol. ΩJ, θάρσος δὲ θράσους διαφέρει. θάρσος γὰρ τὸ εὐλογον, θράσος δὲ τὸ μετά ιταμότητος, οὕτω καὶ Ἀριστιππὸς ὁ φιλόσοφος, which has a follow-up in the schol. on 118 Λυκοδρόμου θράσους υἱός, which comments τὸ δὲ θρασὺς ἐπὶ ἀγαθὸν νῦν, οὕτω ἐπὶ ιταμότητος. It is possible that there was here originally some reference to the Homeric expression θάρσος ἅπτων ἔχουσα at Il. 21.395 (compare also Q. S. 1.217 θάρσος ἁπατον), where ἅπτος is sometimes glossed in similar terms as αὐτος (e.g. μεγαλοβλαβεῖς, Αρ. Soph. 12.5; but μέγιστον schol. D). Yet in the context of 2.77, unlike in Homer, θάρσος can hardly have been a positive quality: it should have

5 See Guypers, forthc., e.g. on 56, 105; the motif conspires with others to suggest that the Argonauts’ confrontation with Amycus is from one point of view (which is not the narrator’s) an ordinary cattle-raid.

8 Beside 361 cf. 346 Κύκνος ὁ ἰπαθόσλοος (the epithet of Polydeuce’s brother) καὶ Ἄρης ἄκροπτος ἄντης (Cycnus and Ares advancing to attack), 433f. τοῖς ἄρ Ἀμφιτριονιάδης, ἄκροπτος ἄντης, / ἀντίσιος ἔστη Ἄρης, ἤνι ὑπεοὶ θάρσος ὡξεῦν (— Αρ. Rh. 2.44f.; Heracles, having brought down cycnus, stands to face Ares), 457ff. (after Athena has frustrated what was to be Ares’ decisive attack; cf. her role in ll. 22) ὁδριάμενος ὁ Ἐρίχος ἐλενεμένος ὁ ἄρ ὀξὺ / ἔοτεν ἐφ Ἡρακλέα κρατερόφρονα, τόν δ’ ἐπίοντα / Ἀμφιτριονιάδης, δεινῆς ἄκροπτος ἄντης, / μηρόν… / οὐτοσ).
been a weak point. It is therefore incompatible with an interpretation of the line in which ἀάσατος refers to Amycus’ strengths. We may therefore consider the possibility that θάρσος was originally part of an attempt (of whatever status) to bring the text in line with an interpretation of ἀάσατος as «harmless» (ἀβλαβῆς), also preserved in L²⁴ η καὶ ἄρειων.¹⁷ This amounts to a reconstructed reading ἐθάρσος ἀάσατος η (so also L') καὶ ἄρειων that presupposes the interpretation of θάρσος («over-confidence») which is rejected by the scholiast (who may have been defending the transmitted text). Since Merkel, scholars have proposed to trace this discussion back to Lucillus of Tarraha, arguing from Etymologicum Genuinum, s.v.: ἄρειων: ὁ βελτίων: [...] οὕτως Ταρραίως ἐν τοῖς Ἀργοναυτικοῖς. Yet this lemma may just as well refer to 4.1336, where the text is also uncertain (ἄρειων m, ἄριστη m) or to any of the eight other lines where ἄρειων occurs in a case other than nom. sg. m. (1.665, 676, 901, 2.801, 3.136, 399, 438, 546). Finally, it is also conceivable that we are dealing with an author’s variant, as in 1.803, where the differences between procodis and transmitted text may reflect a change of mind about the meaning of ἀάσατος. The procodis text which the scholia cite for 1.803 is καὶ τὸτε ἔπειτα ἀνὰ δῆμον (of the Lemnians) ἀάσατος ἐμπέσει λύσαρ; the mss. have Κύπριδος, ἦ τε σφίν θυμιοθόρον ἐμβάλειν ἄτιν. If we assume that the procodis line is indeed by Apollonius (which need not be true), it seems unavoidable to conclude that Apollonius at one point opted for ἀάσατος = ἐπιμεληθῆς. If so, 2.77 testifies to a later rejection of this interpretation that may have caused him to remove ἀάσατος from 1.803 in revising his poem.

Martijn P. Cuypers


¹⁸ See Merkel 1853, p. LXI; also Wendel 1932, p. 82; Haslam 1978, p. 67; Fränkel 1961 and Vian 1974 ad loc.