

## SOME OBSERVATIONS ON THE TEXT OF HYGINUS' CATALOGUE OF ARGONAUTS (*FAB.* 14)\*

### I. *FABULAE* 14.4, CAENEUS

At *Fabulae* 14.4.20–8 we come in the catalogue of the Argonauts to the entry for Coronus son of Caeneus,<sup>1</sup> the bulk of which consists of the story of Caenis/Caeneus' miraculous sex change, well-known invulnerability to weapons, and ultimate death at the hands of the Centaurs. This last event is described as follows (22–3): *ostendit nullo modo Centauros ferro se posse uulnerare, sed truncis arborum in cuneum adactis* ('He demonstrated that the Centaurs could in no way wound him with iron, but [they did harm him] with tree-trunks shaped into wedges'). Several issues in the second clause have much vexed scholars. Above all, the account does not accord with any other version known from Greek or Latin authors. Briefly, there are two traditions referring to the burial of the still-living but invulnerable Caeneus. In the most common, Caeneus is beaten with fir trees into the ground. In the other, that of Ovid, the Centaurs pile the fir trees and earth on top of the hero, creating a tumulus over him.<sup>2</sup> For Rose alone the transmitted text of Hyginus offers a genuine variant, representing a Graeco-Roman parallel to the Norse myth of Balder's vulnerability only to a weapon fashioned from mistletoe.<sup>3</sup> Additionally, a finite verb is lacking and the phrase *in cuneum adactis* is odd, though there is a potential (but poetic) parallel in Propertius' *in faciem prorae pinus adacta* (3.22.14).<sup>4</sup>

Editors have attempted several solutions, none satisfactory.<sup>5</sup> Scheffer proposed *in cumulum adiectis* to bring the passage into alignment with the wording of the Ovidian account (*cumulo*, *Met.* 12.514). Muncker compared the phrasing of the Ovidian prose *Narrationes* on Caeneus (*congestis in eum arborum truncis spiritum reddere coactus est*, *Narr.* 12.4) and suggested *in eum coniectis* or *congestis*. Van Staveren and Bunte see no reason to alter *adactis*, for it can be used in senses close enough to the alternatives to

\* The observations that follow arose while I read the drafts of a new translation of Hyginus' *Fabulae* by my colleague and collaborator R. Scott Smith. A final version of this has now appeared in R.S. Smith and S.M. Trzaskoma (edd), *Apollodorus' Library and Hyginus' Fabulae: Two Handbooks of Greek Mythology* (Indianapolis and Cambridge, MA, 2007). I am most grateful to Smith for his perceptive comments. In one or two cases he prefers another solution to one I present here – ample assurance, I hope, that any errors here belong entirely to me. Thanks are due also to CQ's anonymous referee, whose comments sharpened the argument in several places.

<sup>1</sup> At least, according to T. Muncker's supplement, which is printed by Marshall in his edition, for Coronus' name has dropped out of the text, amidst several other severe corruptions in the surrounding context. All references to the text are to Marshall's second edition, including line numbers: P.K. Marshall (ed.), *Hyginus. Fabulae* (Munich and Leipzig, 2002).

<sup>2</sup> Ov. *Met.* 12.459–535 (particularly 507–26).

<sup>3</sup> H.J. Rose (ed.), *Hygini Fabulae* (Leiden, 1963), 15: *qua cum fabula conferri posse dixi Balderi historiam et alias bene multas*.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Muncker's opinion: *horride dicitur adigere in cuneum*.

<sup>5</sup> Marshall adopts none of the proposed solutions and prints the text as transmitted, though he documents the conjectures of Scheffer, Muncker and Robert in his usually selective apparatus. Van Staveren proposed no solution of his own: *Ego vero nihil frustra tento*.

make them unnecessary. Bunte thus took up Muncker's *in eum* but left *adactis*, thinking that perhaps *cuneum* was the remnant of a gloss (*Caeneum*) to *eum*. In C. Robert's lengthy article on the catalogue,<sup>6</sup> he proposed two additions: first, *necatus est* to provide an explicit finite verb for the clause; second, he thought we ought to read *truncis* <ut> *in cuneum adactis*.<sup>7</sup>

Thus we have one problem of content, namely the details of Caeneus' demise, and three textual issues: (1) *in cuneum*, (2) *adactis*, and (3) the lack of a finite verb. These can all be dealt with by making two easy changes. Almost all of our sources describe Caeneus' being *driven into the ground*. It is perfectly plausible, then, that Hyginus said something similar to all of the non-Ovidian Latin sources: *in terra* (Servius *ad Aen.* 6.448, taken up by the First Vatican Mythographer 151) or *in terram* (Second Vatican Mythographer 130). Here, our author could not resist one clever development, a purely Latin etymological wordplay on the hero's name, for *cuneum* must be a corruption of *caenum*. Curiously, although several earlier scholars were willing to change *adactis*, none seems to have considered simply altering its form. *Adigo*, after all, is an eminently suitable verb for our context: cf. OLD s.v. *adigo* 5, 'To force or drive (a pile, wedge, etc.) into or through (the ground, wood, etc.)'. The difficulty here is, of course, that it is Caeneus who is being driven into the mud, not the trees (cf. *fixus* (*est*) in Servius and the first two Vatican Mythographers). It should be clear, then, that *adactis* was originally *adactus* (and probably *adactus est*). No doubt *caenum* was corrupted early to *cuneum* because of its proximity to *adactus*,<sup>8</sup> and this led to the further corruption. The clause can be set right: *sed truncis arborum in caenum adactus est*. 'He demonstrated that the Centaurs could in no way wound him with iron, but he was driven into the mud with the trunks of trees.'

This brings Hyginus into line with the common tradition, which is also the one in Apollonius Rhodius 1.57–64, the ultimate source behind this portion of Hyginus. The scholiast to that passage quotes as Apollonius' source a vivid fragment of Pindar (fr.167 Maehler): ὁ δὲ χλωραῖς ἐλάτῃσι τυπεῖς ὤχετο Καίνεός, σχίσας ὀρθῶ ποδὶ γᾶν<sup>9</sup> and then goes on to summarise the Centaurs' action as κατὰ γῆν αὐτὸν ὠθοῦσιν. The scholion to *Iliad* 1.264 presents a similar image: ἤρεισαν εἰς γῆν. The point here is that Caeneus' death (caused by Zeus) resembles his sin: he fixed his spear into the ground and gave orders that it be worshipped, an event the Homeric scholiast carefully and causally links to his demise: πῆξας ἀκόντιον ἐν τῷ μεσαιάτῳ τῆς ἀγορᾶς, θεὸν τοῦτο προσέταξεν ἀριθμεῖν. δι' ἣν αἰτίαν ἀγανακτήσας ὁ Ζεὺς, τιμωρίαν τῆς ἀσεβείας παρ' αὐτοῦ εἰσεπράξατο. Just as he drove his spear into the ground, the Centaurs drive him ramrod stiff into the ground by beating on him with trees.

<sup>6</sup> C. Robert, 'Der Argonautenkatalog in Hygins Fabelbuch', *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philologisch-Historische Klasse* (1919), 469–500.

<sup>7</sup> That Caeneus was driven into the ground 'like a wedge' seems possible to me, but Robert's conjecture implies that something like *adigere truncos in cuneum* is possible. One would, however, expect rather *adigere truncis cuneum*.

<sup>8</sup> The two words are often found together, as one might expect from their meanings. Cf. Columella, *Arb.* 26.4 *cuneo adacto* (also at *Rust.* 5.11) and *Rust.* 5.10 *cuneu*<*m*>...*adigito*, Plin. *HN* 10.40 *cuneumve adactum*, and 17.110 and 17.253 *cuneo adacto*, 25.14 *cuneus*...*adactus*, Sen. *De Ira* 1.6.1 *adactis cuneis*, Valerius Flaccus *Argonautica* 3.164 *cuneisque*...*adactis*, Val. Max. 9.12 *cuneis adactis*.

<sup>9</sup> Regarding ὀρθῶ ποδί note that Servius qualifies *fixus*...*est* with *paulatim* and so keeps clear the image as we are meant to conceive of it. Because he goes into the ground only a little at a time, Caeneus is driven in vertically and straight, like a nail.

II. *FABULAE* 14.12–13, LYNCEUS

*Fabulae* 14.12.66–13.73 consists of the entry for Lynceus and Idas, most of which is about the proverbially sharp sight of the former, including the following (67–70): *ex his Lynceus sub terra quaeque latentia uidisse dicitur, neque ulla caligine inhibebatur. alii aiunt Lynceum noctu nullum uidisse* ('Of these Lynceus is said to have been able to see everything hidden underground, and he was not hindered [sc. from seeing] by any darkness. Others say that at night Lynceus saw no one'). Marshall's apparatus is silent, presumably on the basis of Giangrande's defence of the transmitted text.<sup>10</sup> Otherwise, although the passage has been widely suspected of corruption, only Barthius has attempted corrections, proposing reading either *nocte illuni* (or *novilunio*) or, alternatively, replacing *nullum* with *multum* on the basis of 14.32.153–5 *Lynceus...qui multum videbat* (where it is equally colourless). Both Scheffer and Muncker were willing to adopt this last solution.

Although Lynceus' superpower is essentially conceived of as twofold, the ability to see sharply at great distances and to see through things, there is, however, one passage from ancient literature that is relevant in this regard, but which does not seem to have been cited in this connection, namely Cicero *Fam.* 9.2.2: *quis est tam Lynceus qui in tantis tenebris nihil offendat, nusquam incurrat?* Cicero's use of Lynceus is figurative, but the implication is nevertheless that someone with Lynceus' sight can see in darkness. This practically destroys Giangrande's firm ('Doch ist der Text ganz gesund') but somewhat laborious defence of the transmitted text. His argument is: (1) *neque ulla caligine inhibebatur* refers to Lynceus' being able to see Heracles through the mist in the account of Apollonius Rhodius (*Argon.* 4.1480 ἐπαχλύουσιν); (2) *Caligo* and ἀχλύς both refer to the darkness of night as well as mist; (3) commentators on whom Hyginus was relying (*alii*) did not want any ambiguity, which might leave someone with the impression that Lynceus could see in the dark, so they specified that at night (*noctu*) he could see no one. No trace of this distinction survives in the Greek or Latin scholia or anywhere else, and, as we have seen, Cicero provides an instance of just the opposite.<sup>11</sup> Giangrande also places too great a weight on Apollonius' ἐπαχλύουσιν, for the word does not refer directly to the circumstances in which Lynceus spies Heracles; rather, it modifies μῆνην in the following simile of a man trying to make out the new moon, and he has fundamentally misunderstood that simile. Pace Giangrande, it is distance rather than mist that hinders Lynceus (*Argon.* 4.1478 ἀπειρεσίης τηλοῦ χθονός).

All of this suggests that Barthius' *multum* ought at the very least to have found a place in Marshall's apparatus. But it is not, I believe, the solution. For that we must turn to the rest of the account in Hyginus: *alii aiunt Lynceum noctu nullum uidisse. idem sub terra solitus cernere dictus est ideo quod aurifodinas norat; is cum descendebat et aurum subito ostendebat, ita rumor sublatus eum sub terra solitum uidere.* Muncker was the first to suggest that this rationalising account derives from that in Palaephatus 9, which is a possibility (though not a necessity – no doubt there were other roughly

<sup>10</sup> G. Giangrande, 'Zum Argonautenkatalog des Hyginus', *Wiener Studien* N.F. 8 (1974), 77–9, which I will discuss below. Rose (n. 3), 17 clearly feels the passage is corrupt, but goes on to suggest (*si haec sana sunt*) the possibility of taking *nullum* as subject accusative ('Others say that no one could see Lynceus at night.'), which is unlikely in the extreme.

<sup>11</sup> Though D.R. Shackleton Bailey's remark on this passage in his Loeb edition (*Cicero, Letters to Friends*, [Cambridge, MA, 2001], where 9.2.2 = 177.2 in his numbering scheme), namely, 'The Argonaut Lynceus could see in the dark', is oversimplified when viewed against the complex tradition.

equivalent rationalised versions of the Lynceus myth in antiquity). That account can be summarised briefly: Lynceus was the first to discover metals; he carried lamps (λύχνους) into his mine and brought the metals back up; people, therefore, said that he could see beneath the earth. If one allows for the possibility that the rationalising in Hyginus begins not at *idem* but at *alii aiunt*, a solution presents itself. Behind *Lynceum* lies *lychno eum*. Palaephatus does not say that Lynceus invented lamps, only that he carried them in his mine, but the present state of that text does not allow us to assume that that detail was not originally present. It would certainly make sense, for if we are to imagine lamps being widely available, Lynceus' innovation is limited simply to the idea of taking one underground, which is hardly an impressive feat. It may then be that originally our text was a typical example of the mythographer's *protos heurètes* motif and we ought to read *alii aiunt lychno eum noctu primum uidisse* ('Others say that he was the first to see at night by using a lamp'). The loss of *lychno* would have made *primum* not only unnecessary but absolutely absurd, for it cannot be imagined that Lynceus could somehow have been the first to see at night. This presumably led to the strange corruption of *primum*.<sup>12</sup>

### III. *FABULAE* 14.17, IPHICLUS

Hyginus often preserves alternatives of genealogy and geography, but in 14.17.89, there seems no reason to me not to restore *Calydonius* for the transmitted *Lacedaemonius*.<sup>13</sup> After all, Iphiclus was Calydonian, and a quick glance at *Calydonius*, with the sequence *c-l-d* would very easily have prompted a copyist to produce *Lacedaemonius*, with its *l-c-d*. Two other Calydonians precede Iphiclus: his nephew Meleager, and another of Meleager's uncles, Laocoon; both have their *Calydonius* intact.

Whether we read *Calydonius* or *Lacedaemonius*, the following *hic fuit Arcas cursor iaculator* in the *editio princeps* cannot stand, for *Arcas* is otiose in the first case and contradictory in the second. Giangrande wished to delete the offending word as an explanatory gloss originating in a now lost commentary to Apollonius that identified *λυκάβας* in 1.198 as an Arcadian word.<sup>14</sup> If the word is intrusive, I think it more likely that it arose from a correction of *Lacedaemonius* than in the complicated manner Giangrande supposes; but we ought not assume too quickly that it has intruded into the text. Marshall prints Robert's *acer*. Two similar conjectures are recorded in Marshall's apparatus, Micyllus' *artificiosus* and Muncker's *acris*. All of these simply provide an intelligible text but give us little reason to suppose that they are correct. The passage is difficult because it represents corruption overlying a misunderstanding of Apollonius Rhodius' Greek on the part of Hyginus (whatever we might mean by that name), a later redactor, or a source for one of them. The underlying passage is *Argonautica* 199–201:

καὶ μὴν οἱ μήτρῳσ αὐτὴν ὁδόν, εὖ μὲν ἄκοντι  
εὖ δὲ καὶ ἐν σταδίῃ δεδαημένος ἀντιφέρεσθαι,  
Θεστιάδης Ἰφικλος ἐφωμάτησε κίοντι.

<sup>12</sup> It is tempting, as the anonymous referee points out, to delete *nullum* and be done with it, but without the *protos heurètes* motif that occurs with a correction to *primum*, the story seems feeble.

<sup>13</sup> Already marked as 'verdächtig' by Robert (n. 6), 476.

<sup>14</sup> G. Giangrande, 'Three textual problems in Hyginus', *Museum Philologum Londiniense*, 1 (1975), 121–5.

The emphasis here, signalled by  $\epsilon\upsilon \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$  and  $\epsilon\upsilon \delta\grave{\epsilon} \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ , is on Iphiclus' unusual ability to excel equally well in two very different kinds of combat. The misunderstanding in the text of Hyginus, it has long been recognised, arose with the phrase  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu \sigma\tau\alpha\delta\acute{\iota}\eta$ , which someone somewhere along the line thought had to do with the noun  $\sigma\tau\alpha\delta\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu$ , 'race', rather than its correct derivation from the adjective  $\sigma\tau\alpha\delta\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$ . Apollonius, therefore, praises the hero's simultaneous mastery as a thrower of the javelin and as a hand-to-hand fighter, while our Latin mythographer has simply replaced the latter with the idea that he was a runner. A silly error to be sure, but the attempted faithfulness to the underlying original text means that a solution for *Arcas* can perhaps be found there as well. The striking feature of the Apollonius passage and its real point is the balanced phrasing. I believe Hyginus too must originally have stressed this equality of Iphiclus' excellence at two pursuits. To restore this balance, read: *aeque cursor <ac> iaculator* ('Just as much a runner as a javelin-thrower'). Scheffer earlier proposed that *ac* had fallen out, suggesting we read *arte cursor <ac> iaculator*.

#### IV. *FABULAE* 14.18, THE HARPIES

Much of the entry for Zetes and Calais (14.18.91–104) is devoted to describing the Harpies (99–101): *hae dicuntur fuisse capitibus gallinaceis, pinnatae, alasque et brachia humana, unguibus magnis, pedibusque gallinaceis, pectus aluom feminaque humana*. The syntax here shows some disruption. Van Staveren proposed an ellipsis of *habuisse* to govern the accusatives, but did not believe it, calling the ellipsis *dura*. Scheffer had earlier rewritten it whole (*hae fuisse dicuntur pennatae, alisque et unguibus magnis, pedibusque gallinaceis. brachia humana, pectus album, feminaque humana habuisse*). The latter solution has the virtue of removing one bizarre element in this description: Harpies are nowhere portrayed in ancient art with the heads of birds. However, the surgery seems too radical to me, and it leaves intact another error, for in the sort of Harpy described here, they should not have human legs or thighs (*femina humana*).<sup>15</sup> I do not propose here a complete solution to the corruptions, but I do think we can get closer to the correct text.

To remove the monstrosity of the bird-headed Harpies we have no need to delete *capitibus gallinaceis*, simply read *capitibus capillatis*. The adjective would easily have been corrupted because of the *gallinaceis* below, and in the meagre extant remains of the manuscript on which the *editio princeps* was based one can see a similar error of *ga-* for *ca-* at pr.41 (*gallirhoe* for *Callirhoe*). *Capillatus*<sup>16</sup> is apropos of the Harpies. The *locus classicus* is Hesiod, *Theog.* 267  $\eta\upsilon\kappa\acute{o}\mu\omicron\nu\varsigma \theta' \mathcal{A}\rho\pi\upsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$ . Artistic representations likewise always show long hair.

In the same vein, the Harpies of the hybrid form are never portrayed in art with human legs, and Lycophon even coined the adjective  $\mathcal{A}\rho\pi\upsilon\iota\omicron\gamma\omicron\nu\nu\omicron\varsigma$  (*Alex.* 653) to describe the Sirens. A scholion on the passage explains:  $\acute{\alpha}\rho\pi\upsilon\iota\omicron\gamma\omicron\nu\nu\omicron\varsigma \delta\grave{\epsilon} \lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\iota \tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \sigma\epsilon\iota\rho\eta\nu\alpha\varsigma \omicron\iota\omicron\nu \omicron\rho\nu\iota\theta\omicron\gamma\omicron\nu\nu\omicron\varsigma \cdot \pi\tau\epsilon\rho\omega\tau\alpha\acute{\iota} \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho \eta\acute{\iota}\sigma\alpha\nu \tau\acute{\alpha} \kappa\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega \mu\acute{\epsilon}\rho\eta \omicron\rho\nu\acute{\iota}\theta\omega\nu \acute{\epsilon}\chi\omicron\upsilon\sigma\alpha\iota$

<sup>15</sup> To be more precise, the Harpies are portrayed in two ways. In the first, they are fully human except for the addition of wings. Obviously, in this form they have human legs, but the other avian features mentioned here are irrelevant. In the second, in which we see a half-human/half-avian monster, the heads are always human and the legs entirely avian. This latter, hybrid form is what Hyginus seems to be describing.

<sup>16</sup> *Capillaceus* would be a closer palaeographical fit, but this is exceedingly rare and it is difficult to know whether it could carry the sense needed here.

τὰ δὲ ἄνω ἀνθρώπων. Read, therefore: *pectus aluomque feminae [humana]* ('the chest and abdomen of a woman.'). *Feminae* would easily have been misread in a list of body parts as *femina*, the accusative plural of *femur*. The conjunction would have been moved accordingly, and *humana* would then have been repeated from above for clarity since a specific point of contrast would seem to be missing. Compare Hyginus' descriptions of similarly mixed monsters: Scylla in pr.39.81–2, *Scylla quae superiorem partem feminae, inferiorem canis habuit*, which is particularly close (cf. also 125.14.2–3 and 151.1.5–6), and the Sirens in 125.13.58–9, *quae partem superiorem muliebrem habebant, inferiorem autem gallinaceam*.

The whole passage then reads: *hae dicuntur fuisse capitibus capillatis, pinnatae, alasque et brachia humana, unguibus magnis, pedibusque gallinaceis, pectus aluomque feminae [humana]*. This is not entirely free of corruption, with the accusatives still unexplained, but the basic sense of the description is now clear: 'These are said to have had heads with long hair, feathers, both wings and human arms, great talons, feet like fowls, and the breast and belly of a woman.'

#### V. *FABULAE* 14.21, GRANDSON OF THESTIUS

*Asclepius Apollinis et Coronidis filius, a Tricca <...> Thestii filia, Argiuis*. A lacuna was first posited by Scheffer after *filius*. Muncker corrected *Atriacha* of the *editio princeps* to a *Tricca* (cf. *Fab.* 97.6) and indicated the lacuna in this position. The last two editors, Marshall and Boriaud, print the lacuna without comment or reconstruction, but the solution has long been known. Perizonius (cited by Muncker) proposed that our missing Argonaut was Amphiarus son of Oecles. Muncker summarised the issue: *cum igitur* (sc. *Amphiarus*) *Argiuis fuerit, matrem habuerit Thestii filiam, & ab aliis inter Argonautas numeretur, adeoque omnes huius descriptionis reliquiae in eum conueniant, ne dubitemus eum hoc loco ab Hygino memoratum esse*. In fact Amphiarus by virtue of his marriage to Eriphyle daughter of the Argive Talaus, is the only Argive grandson of Thestius. There is no way, in other words, that anyone's name but Amphiarus' could fit into the lacuna if we presume the words immediately following it are sound. The silent scepticism of the latest editors is unwarranted and they ought to have printed, as Rose does, something like, *<Amphiarus Oeclei<sup>17</sup> filius, matre Hypermestra> Thestii filia, Argiuis*.<sup>18</sup>

#### VI. *FABULAE* 14.26, IDMON

The death of Idmon at the court of King Lycus from a wound inflicted by a boar is mentioned in similar terms in three *Fabulae*. These are worth comparing:

14.26.128–30: *Idmon autem Apollinis filius ibi apud Lycum cum stramentatum exisset, ab apro percussus decidit*.

18.1.4–6: *Argonautae dum apud Lycum morantur et stramentatum* (Muncker, *extra uenatum* F) *exissent, Idmon Apollinis filius ab apro percussus interiit*.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. *Fab.* 70.1, 73.1 and 250.2.

<sup>18</sup> This varies slightly from Rose, who restores *<filius>* after *filia*. The phrasing of the supplement I give here, however, is typical for *Fab.* 14. Cf. 14.1.5 *Asterion Pyremi filius, matre Antigona Pheretis filia, ex urbe Pellene*, as well as 14.2.10 (Polyphemus), 14.2.11 (Iphiclus), 14.2.13 (Admetus), 14.16.81 (Ancaeus), and 14.17.87 (Iphiclus alter).

248.1.2–3: *Idmon Apollinis filius, qui stramentatum* (Muncker, *extra metam* F) *exierat cum Argonautis apud Lycum regem*.

We ought to be suspicious of *stramentor*. It is attested in Latin only in 14.26.129, and this does not justify Muncker's (and subsequent editors') sanguine adoption of it in the parallel passages. Although the ultimate source of the incident, Apollonius Rhodius 2.815–34, emphasises reeds in the setting of the attack (818 *δονακώδεος ἐν ποταμοῖο*, 825 *ἐκ δονάκων*), *stramen* does not refer to reeds, and it would be odd to gather *stramen* from a wet location anyway. More importantly, there is no hint in Apollonius that Idmon or any of the other Argonauts are interested in gathering anything – it would be very strange hospitality for Lycus to display to have his heroic guests go gather straw for their own bedding. But Lycus is, in fact, an excellent host, and Apollonius just above in 811–14 describes him giving the Argonauts numerous gifts and sending them on their way. Actually, he does not just send them, but he sends his son *out of his palace* (814 *δόμων ἔκπεμπε*) as a new member of the crew. It is as Idmon and the Argonauts make their way from the palace to the river, where the *Argo* is moored, that the boar unexpectedly savages him. I think it quite likely, therefore, that Hyginus said something rather similar. Read in all three passages: *extra munimentum* (or *munimenta*; Livy uses the phrase four times in the plural and Quintus Curtius Rufus twice). The Argonauts have left the fortified city of the king and are heading to their ship when he is struck down. How the corruption occurred in three different places and with three such different results, I cannot say, though the dropping of *muni-* before the second *m* of the word seems a likely start to the trouble and *uenatum* in 18.1 can be explained away as a reasonably intelligent attempt to correct for the resulting nonsense. After all, heroes are usually wounded by boars while hunting, even if Idmon is not. For parallels to the phrase *extra* + noun *exire* in Hyginus cf. 26.3.12 (*si qua autem extra tumultum exit...*) and 120.4.21–2 (*...ne quis eorum extra urbem exiret*.)

## VII. *FABULAE* 14.30, THOSE WHO JOIN THE ARGONAUTS

After giving an account of those original Argonauts who did not complete the journey, Hyginus tells of the sons of Phrixus (Argus, Melas, Phrontides and Cylindrus) who joined the expedition. In 14.30.144–8 we veer into somewhat strange territory and are given a supposed alternative version of this story. In this second account, the sons' names are Phronius, Demoleon, Autolycus and Phlogius, and they were abandoned by Hercules during his mission to get the belt of the Amazons. The last three are, of course, none other than the three sons of Deimachus (Demoleon = Apollonius' Deileon), who form, in fact, a separate group of siblings that also joins the Argonauts. I suspect that they have improperly become alternatives because of a lacuna. Originally, three further alternative names would have stood after Phronius and then there would have been a full transition to the story of Deimachus' sons. In our current text, these two tales have been collapsed. Still, the story is vaguely recognisable until the final words: (sc. *Hercules eos*) *reliquit terrore percultos a Dascylo Lyci regis Mariandyni filio*. Dascylus has nothing to do with the sons of Deimachus (or the sons of Phrixus). I would, therefore, suggest that originally there was yet another lacuna, this one after *percultos*, and that Dascylus was yet another entirely separate entry in a list of the three additions to the crew of the *Argo* in Apollonius' second book: (1) the sons of Phrixus (2.1093ff.), (2) the sons of Deimachus (2.946–65), and (3) Dascylus, who is sent with the Argonauts by his

father (2.802–14). In transmission, all three were clumsily and oddly collapsed into a single tale.

Perhaps a minor sign of this reworking can still be seen in the transition *ut alii aiunt*. Elsewhere, it is the practice in our text of Hyginus that the phrase *alii aiunt* and its equivalents (with *dicunt* or *putant* or *tradunt* or *dixerunt*) are introduced with *siue ut* (cf. 186.1, 198.1, and 200.1) or *uel ut* (cf. 14.5, 70.1, and 111.1) or inserted asyndetically (thirteen times in *Fab.* 14 alone and often elsewhere).<sup>19</sup>

*University of New Hampshire*

STEPHEN M. TRZASKOMA  
s.trzaskoma@unh.edu

<sup>19</sup> As *CQ*'s referee notes, *uocitatos* is also corrupt, or at least appears in its current context to be.