

A.R. 1.609-1077: An Intertextual and Interpretative Commentary.

A thesis submitted to the University of Manchester for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
in the Faculty of Humanities

2015

Timothy Kenny

School of Arts, Languages and Cultures

Contents

Introduction	8
1. Preliminary Remarks	8
2. Readers and Readings of the <i>Argonautica</i> Proem (A.R. 1.1-22)	14
<i>Stating the Obvious</i>	14
<i>Beginning and Beginnings</i>	15
<i>Where, how, and when to begin</i>	21
<i>Beginning Again</i>	26
3. Methodology.	30
3.1 <i>The Role of the Reader</i>	30
3.2 <i>Narratology</i>	31
3.3 <i>Intertextuality</i>	38
4. Speech Modes.	43
5. Managing Expectations.	55
 2. Lemnos (A.R. 1.609-921).	 59
L1. 'Previously on Lemnos' (609-632).	68
L2. 'Lemnian action' (633-639).	89
L3. 'Musing with Mnemosyne' (640-652).	94
L4. 'The Lemnian Assembly' (653-708).	101
i. <i>Hypsipyle's Proposal</i> (653-666)	103
ii. <i>Polyxo Counters</i> (667-696)	105
iii. <i>Hypsipyle's Decision</i> (697-708)	107
L5. 'Iphinoe's Message' (709-720).	110
L6. 'Jason's Journey' (721-792).	113
i. <i>Jason's Cloak</i> (721-767)	117
ii. <i>Jason's Spear</i> (768-773)	126
iii. <i>Jason's Star</i> (774-792)	127
L7. 'Hypsipyle, Story-teller' (793-841).	130
i. <i>A Royal Revision</i> (793-833)	132
ii. <i>A Hero's Compromise</i> (834-841)	139
L8. 'That's Entertainment' (842-860).	141
L9. 'Hercules Furens' (861-874).	147
L10. 'The Argonauts depart' (875-909).	151
i. <i>Women in Distress</i> (875-887)	151

ii. <i>Hypsipyle's Goodbye</i> (888-898)	152
iii. <i>Jason's Reply</i> (899-909)	154
L11. 'Beginning Again' (910-21).	155
Cyzicus (A.R. 1.922-1077).	157
C1. 'To the Propontis' (922-35).	162
C2. 'Setting the Scene' (936-52).	164
i. <i>Location</i>	165
ii. <i>Inhabitants</i>	166
C3. 'Anchoring Time' (953-60).	169
C4. 'Reading Signs' (961-84).	172
C5. 'The Earthborn' (985-1011).	185
C6. 'Battle with the Doliones' (1012-52).	191
i. <i>Return to Cyzicus</i>	191
ii. <i>A Little Iliad</i>	194
iii. <i>The Dolionian Roll-Call</i>	197
C7. 'Cyzicus and Cleite' (1053-77).	200
i. <i>A King Dies</i>	201
ii. <i>A Queen Dies</i>	204
iii. <i>A People Grieve</i>	209
Bibliography	211

Word Count: 78117

Abstract

A syntagmatic analysis of the Argonauts' encounters with the Lemnian women and the Doliones in Apollonius of Rhodius' *Argonautica* Book 1. Combining intertextuality with cognitive narratology, I approach the text from the perspective of the reader. Beginning with a study of the poem's programmatic proem before moving to a study of the Argonauts' first encounters on their outward journey, I map the reader's experience on their own voyage through a difficult and elliptical narrative. To tackle the demands of a densely allusive text and the manipulations of a subjective narrator, I employ a plurality of readers: the general reader is accompanied on this exploration by two fictional readers. Charting the varying interpretations of the attentive reader and the experienced reader (Homeric auditor and Homeric scholar respectively) enables me to combine investigation of text and intertexts as moderated by the narrator with analysis of the ways they modify the expectations of the reader as they progress in a linear fashion from episode to episode. By consideration of where interpretations overlap and where they differ according to what the reader brings to the text and of how the narrative conditions its readers on the journey, I demonstrate the value of the reader-orientated approach to tackling the complexities of the narrative and the demands it places on all its readers.

Declaration

No portion of the work referred to in the thesis has been submitted in support of an application for another degree or qualification of this or any other university or other institute of learning.

Copyright Statement

- i. The author of this thesis (including any appendices and/or schedules to this thesis) owns certain copyright or related rights in it (the “Copyright”) and s/he has given The University of Manchester certain rights to use such Copyright, including for administrative purposes.
- ii. Copies of this thesis, either in full or in extracts and whether in hard or electronic copy, may be made only in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (as amended) and regulations issued under it or, where appropriate, in accordance with licensing agreements which the University has from time to time. This page must form part of any such copies made.
- iii. The ownership of certain Copyright, patents, designs, trademarks and other intellectual property (the “Intellectual Property”) and any reproductions of copyright works in the thesis, for example graphs and tables (“Reproductions”), which may be described in this thesis, may not be owned by the author and may be owned by third parties. Such Intellectual Property and Reproductions cannot and must not be made available for use without the prior written permission of the owner(s) of the relevant Intellectual Property and/or Reproductions.
- iv. Further information on the conditions under which disclosure, publication and commercialisation of this thesis, the Copyright and any Intellectual Property and/or Reproductions described in it may take place is available in the University IP Policy (see <http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/DocuInfo.aspx?DocID=487>), in any relevant Thesis restriction declarations deposited in the University Library, The University Library’s regulations (see <http://www.manchester.ac.uk/library/aboutus/regulations>) and in The University’s policy on Presentation of Theses.

Acknowledgements

My text is an analysis of Apollonius' text. My text maps the negotiations of his text with the texts of his predecessors. Narrators and their narratees have been demarcated and hypothetical readers constructed; the thesis rarely engages with authorship. And yet, the written words on the page are the work of their author; words informed and inspired not only by the texts of other authors but also (shifting from the general to the specific and from the abstract to the actual) by the criticism and counsel of supervisors and colleagues. And whilst I claim sole responsibility for my finished text, its realisation was only possible with the support and encouragement of family, friends and loved ones.

I could never have set off in pursuit of the Argo without a vehicle of my own and for this I would like to thank the Arts and Humanities Research Council for the generous funding of the entirety of my PhD and, *a mālo ad ouum*, to my supervisor Andrew Morrison and MPhil examiner Emma Griffiths for supporting that initial funding application. My MPhil project, exploring *inter alia* the sustained intertextual engagement of Catullus 64 with the *Argonautica*, motivated the selection of the text analysed in this PhD thesis but was in itself stimulated by my own reading experiences as a KCL undergraduate. All who taught me then have both my affection and gratitude, but in regard to this particular project I would like to thank especially Carlotta Dionisotti who introduced me to the *Argonautica* (and for whom I wrote my first 'close-reading' of a passage from the poem) and Michael Silk to whom I owe my own considerable Homeric debt.

For their help and assistance on this thesis, great or small, I thank all the staff and my colleagues in the Department of Classics and Ancient History at the University of Manchester. In particular, I would like to thank Alison Sharrock and Roy Gibson who agreed to co-supervise me for a second research project and provided numerous suggestions and criticisms. I should like to thank Alison especially for pointing out the comedy where my own readings were (and are) dominated by echoes of war, and to apologise for not doing much more with them (yet). I would like to thank also my examiners, Ruth Morello and Nick Lowe, for a vigorous and invigorating critique of my work. Their suggestions, particularly in relation to my methodology, have already set me on paths of further exploration.

However, amidst these various and sincere expressions of gratitude, the greatest is reserved for my supervisor Andrew Morrison who has now steered and encouraged me at every step to the completion of two postgraduate theses. I owe to him my introduction to Narratology which turned wanting to do ‘something intertextual’ with Catullus 64 into a productive analysis of the relations between narrators and implied author in the consideration of those intertexts, and which during the process of this second project has developed into a more Sternbergian approach to exploring the dynamics of the reading process. His input in both helping me refine my approach (in having the acuity at an early stage to see what it was that interested me) and in offering advice and fruitful discussion of individual passages has been constant and invaluable. Moreover, there were times (though he might not fully endorse the comparison) when like a daughter of Libya appearing to one seeing only sand stretching to the horizon, he guided me out from my personal Syrtis.

My final thanks are to those whose presence is not visible in the final production but without whom that production would not have been possible, those who keep us happy and anchored. So thank you to my parents, my seven siblings, my ten nephews and nieces and to all my friends for caring, for supporting, for being there. And within the final category of this catalogue, my especial thanks to Sarah whose love and encouragement helped push me over the line.

Introduction

1. Preliminary Remarks

‘Desirable as it is in itself, a commentary on the entire *Argonautica* would certainly grow into an immense work... Therefore, all editors, commentators and translators should be advised to wait at least 50 years before any such undertaking is worthwhile again.’¹

I begin firstly by apologising for making my own contribution some thirty-four years ahead of schedule and secondly by offering an explanation for my exuberance. This commentary is (necessarily) selective, not comprehensive, and interpretative in focus rather than directed at the minutiae of traditional philological commentaries. As Glei writes, ‘commentators owe a substantial debt to Fränkel and Vian’ and that is a debt I happily acknowledge.² Vian’s 1974 Budé text is the text upon which my analysis is based. I have relied not only on those commentaries referred to by Glei but also those of Mooney and Ardizzoni in creating my own.³ Mine is a supplement, not a substitute.

Discussing her selective ‘narratological’ commentary on the *Odyssey*, de Jong notes the advantages and disadvantages of her own interpretative approach. Against the wider compass of the philological commentary, she observes that a commentary interested in the text as a whole can have as much to say about areas of the text which present no difficulty of comprehension. Most importantly to support and clarify my own goal in this commentary, she counters the alternative of a paradigmatic analysis (discussions of themes, characterization, scenes and so on by chapter division) as opposed to a lemmatic commentary with the pertinent observation, ‘It is their specific context, i.e., the syntagmatic relation with what precedes and follows, which gives recurrent elements their individual flavour and effect.’⁴

This is where my contribution is situated – an interpretative analysis of the text as it is read and from the perspective of the reader(s). de Jong’s ‘narratological’ commentary on the *Odyssey* is thus the Code-Model for my own and her work on

¹ Glei 2001: 3–4.

² Glei 2001: 3.

³ Ardizzoni 1967, Mooney 1912.

⁴ de Jong 2002: 63.

narratology in the Classics fundamental to my approach which highlights the role of the narrator who guides the reader's journey through the narrative. I supplement her own work in this regard with the important contributions of Richardson on the Homeric narrator and Morrison on Archaic and Hellenistic narrators. Where I differ importantly from de Jong is the wider remit I allow myself: my commentary is reader-orientated and intertextual, rather than exclusively narratological. For the intertextual methodology, I rely on the approach of Conte (as importantly expanded and explained by Hinds).⁵ For the intertexts themselves, in which my particular interest is the narrative's engagement with Homer, Knight's work on responses to Homer in Apollonius is invaluable.⁶ Again, where I differ from Knight is that rather than approach the *Argonautica* with models already extracted and search the text to observe their dispersal, my linear analysis is focused on when they appear and how they are developed in the reading process.

Of course, any and all discussion of particular passages and their intertexts draws upon the vast Apollonian scholarship that Gleason observes in his survey and the many paradigmatic analyses since 2001. My own citations underline my debt to Hunter, Hutchinson, Goldhill, Clare, Clauss *et alii* for their literary insights and whilst my own focus is fundamentally on literature,⁷ on the *Argonautica*'s negotiations with Homer, I have drawn upon the work of Mori and Stephens in particular when considering the historical and socio-cultural ramifications of the text.⁸

In terms of my overall approach, my own closest parallels are the works of Byre on Apollonius and Morrison's monograph, *Homeric Misdirection*.⁹ Byre takes a similarly Sternbergian approach to my own to the narrative (syntagmatic and reader-orientated), but does not focus on intertexts to the same degree.¹⁰ My approach is profoundly intertextual, in which it also differs from Morrison who in his analysis of Homer has only *material* (myth) to set his texts against whereas in Homer I have solid parallel texts.

For some of the interpretations proposed and developed throughout the commentary, I have created two first-time Hellenistic readers of this poem, Alexandros

⁵ Conte 1986, Hinds 1998. See further pp. 9-12 below.

⁶ Knight 1995. Homer is the *Argonautica*'s epic 'Code Model' in Conte's terminology.

⁷ Hunter 1993, Hutchinson 1988, Goldhill 1991, Clare 2002, Clauss 1993.

⁸ Mori 2008, Stephens 2003.

⁹ Byre 2002, J. V. Morrison 1992.

¹⁰ Sternberg 1978.

and Callimachos (abbreviated A. and C.) as a supplement to my general reader. They have been designed with the intention of distinguishing between some interpretative options based on the knowledge a reader brings to the text. The simplest expression of their roles is that Callimachos is the experienced intertextual reader (the Hellenistic scholar) and Alexandros is the attentive intratextual reader (an enthusiast whose reading is dominated by the text of the *Argonautica*).¹¹ Their Hellenistic designation is intended to provide a *terminus ad quem* for the limits of their experience as readers (a third reader Vergilius is beyond the scope of the current commentary).¹²

This basic distinction now needs refining. Alexandros, my attentive Alexandrian reader, does not come to the text an epic virgin. He is familiar with Homeric epic as a 'Code-Model.' Callimachos is familiar with Homeric epic as Code-Model and as an 'Example-Model.' Here, I am shaping these two readers based on the approach to genre and intertextuality of Gian Biagio Conte (and its amplification and explication by Stephen Hinds). Code-Model and Example-Model, the terms employed in my commentary, are Hinds' translations of Conte's *modello codice* and *modello esemplare*.

On the relationship between Homeric epic and Vergil, Conte writes, 'Homer is often, indeed nearly always, Virgil's "exemplary model" ... but he is also constantly the "code-model." That is, he is present as the model divided into a series of individual sedimented units, but he is also representative of the epic institution that guarantees the ideological and literary functions of poetry itself - functions that Virgil uses for their exemplary value and restores by direct, unmediated contact.'¹³ Alexandros is aware of

¹¹ Sharrock (2000: 6): 'It is the hypothesis of intratextuality that a text's meaning grows not only out of the readings of its parts and its whole, but also out of readings of the relationships between the parts, and the reading of those parts as parts, and parts as relationship (interactive or reverberative): all this both formally (e.g. episodes, digression, frame, narrative, line, etc.) and substantively (e.g. in voice, theme, allusion, topos, etc.) - and teleologically.'

¹² There are occasions where interpretations are suggested that depend upon my own supplementing of fragmentary *material* with later sources, e.g. versions of myths recorded in substance only in first century AD authors like Apollodorus or occasional reference to Statius' *Thebaid* to make my own readers aware of Hypsipyle's life after Lemnos. In doing so, I am following existing scholarly assumptions on the availability of these myths and their variants but endeavour to maintain the distinction between extant texts and speculative *material* (See Introduction 5. Managing Expectations). On *material*, see de Jong 2014: 169 on Cohn's 'testimonial stratum' in historiographical narrative (Cohn 1990). In my analysis, the mythological variants noted by the scholia serve as potential sources at the referential level, in so far as they are useful in highlighting not only divergences but the manner of the Apollonian narrator – the gaps and the alternations between the volunteering and suppression of information that condition the reading experience.

¹³ Conte 1986: 31. I have opted to use Hinds' suggested 'Example-model' rather than 'Exemplary-model.' See Hinds 1998: 42 n.148 "Example-model", though less elegant, is closer to the required sense, viz

the ‘epic institution.’ He is familiar with the Homeric epics as the main generic reference-point of the *Argonautica*, which provide the model for its language, contents, characters and structures. Thus the grammar and stylistic features listed in Hunter’s statement ‘[Apollonius’] language is based on that of Homer; this is true of morphology, vocabulary, dialect, syntax and prosody’ are ones recognised by my Alexandros.¹⁴

Callimachos shares this familiarity and when I draw upon Homeric parallels in relation to A., it should be understood that A. = A. + C. What C. sees, and what A. does not, are specific details. For example, those correspondences of lexis that are a critical commonplace used either to suggest an intertext or confirm it (one might term these ‘trigger words’).¹⁵ C. recognises the use of a Homeric *hapax legomenon*, the positioning of a word or phrase in the same *sedes* as a verse in Homer, and so on. C. reads his *Iliad* and *Odyssey* alongside his *Argonautica*.¹⁶

When reading the ecphrasis on Jason’s Cloak (see pp. 114-126), A. recognises the Shield of Achilles as the Code-Model and can bring to his reading the Iliadic context of Hephaestus equipping Achilles for his return to battle. He sees in Jason’s dressing for his encounter with Hypsipyle the elements of a Homeric arming-scene. He knows it as a type-scene from its frequent occurrences in the *Iliad*, just as he knows that Jason being likened to a star on his subsequent approach to the city is the narrator’s employment of an epic simile. What he does not know and what C. brings to his reading to supplement these observations are additional ecphrastic models (e.g. Helen’s weaving in *Iliad* 3 which has a lexical correspondence at v.126 (δίπλακα πορφυρέην ~ δίπλακα πορφυρέην, A.R.1.722)), the specific arming-scene of Agamemnon in *Iliad* 11 or the particular star simile that is applied to Achilles, *Il.* 22.25-32. When specific intertexts are introduced by C., it is to the exclusion of A.

It does not necessarily follow that as a reader C. > A. (though given the densely intertextual nature of the commentary, he is more loquacious). He is not simply a foil for C.¹⁷ For example, correspondences of lexis which confirm an intertext for C. can

model *qua n* particular *exempla* imitated.’

¹⁴ Hunter 1989: 38.

¹⁵ For a discussion of parallels and ‘parallelomania’ (*mea culpa*) see Gibson 2002: 331–57. Cf. e.g.

¹⁶ So when Clauss (1993: 10) writes ‘[Apollonius’] allusive technique presupposes an audience that possesses, and actively engages in their reading of the poem, a comprehensive knowledge of past and contemporary literature in order to see the important suggestions between the lines’, my Callimachos is designed to fulfil this role in the intertextual interpretations.

¹⁷ A. is just as intelligent but reading (and writing) is for C. a vocation, for A. leisure.

result not only in establishing a relationship but in the intertext subsequently dominating an interpretation. It is perfectly possible for C. to immerse himself in those images of Achilles and Agamemnon and, should he do so, his expectations of the ensuing meeting between Jason and the Lemnian queen become overly fraught with (misdirected) anticipations of a violent clash of arms. For A. the echoes of that conflict sound in a more subdued manner, and his reading, being more reliant on the *Argonautica*'s text, favours a perfectly amicable meeting – his expectations are guided by explicit mention in the text of how both parties were inclined towards a hospitable outcome.¹⁸

There is some overlap: a grey area where it is my discretion which intertexts I consider sufficiently widely known for A. to incorporate in his readings (and my own readers might disagree). E.g. I allow to A. the echo in Aphrodite's rage (in Hypsipyle's first speech to Jason) of the *Iliad*'s first two verses (μῆνιν ἄειδε θεὰ Πηληϊάδεω Ἀχιλῆος | οὐλομένην ~ Οὐλομένης δὲ θεᾶς πορσύνετο μῆνις | Κύπριδος, A.R. 1.802-3) which I believe sufficiently memorable so as not to raise eyebrows. Of course what the readers then do with the recognition can differ. Essentially, A. sees more of the forest whereas C. more of the trees (and in identifying trees replanted from different forests C. is prone to following the paths of previous rambles).

I should stress A. and C. are hypothetical constructs, not reconstructed Hellenistic readers.¹⁹ They are interpretative tools, a way to engage with possible readings, heuristic devices to distinguish between the intratextual interpretations and between the levels of the intertextual ones (and how they are then prioritised in the reading process). Every reader brings something to a text, at the very least an understanding of the language in which the text is written.

Regarding the mythological content, Alexandros has yet to experience this *Argonautica*, but he does not approach it having never heard of Jason, of Medea, of the quest for the Golden Fleece. He knows basic elements of the myth and its pre-Argonautic history (e.g. that the fleece is the fleece of the ram sent by Zeus to rescue Helle and Phrixos from their stepmother, Ino). This issue of 'the myth before Apollonius' is problematic. For Alexandros to be of sufficient use to justify the conceit, I have equipped him throughout with an awareness of the outlines of myth (the

¹⁸ See 697-701n., 717-20n.

¹⁹ For the latter, see Rossum-Steenbeek 1998.

material) in so far as they are constant in antiquity (see Hunter 1989: 12). Thus when Berkowitz (2004:24) talks of a supplementation requiring only a 'rudimentary knowledge of the legend' or Byre (2002:2) of the narrator suppressing information 'on the grounds of what is already well-known to his audience,' I presume for Alexandros this level of knowledge.²⁰ What he does not have are specific intertexts to hand. Only the experienced reader C. can consult if he wishes such texts as Pindar's *Pythian* 4.

What neither A. or C. know is how *this* particular narration will unfold but they come, as does every reader, with (a horizon of) expectations that this text will confront, conform with or modify as it progresses.²¹

My approach is reader orientated: text - reader and in between these two, the story as presented by the *Argonautica*'s subjective, intrusive and inconstant narrator. Approaching from the perspective of the reader and charting the voyage of the readers through the narrative is a means to exploring the interpretative possibilities of a demanding text: a text that is unstable and open. Intertexts prompt comparisons and highlight differences in a manner which subjects interpretations and the expectations built upon them to persistent reappraisal. As Hunter (1993:5) says, 'Inconsistency and unevenness reign in all aspects of the *Argonautica* - narrative style, tonal level, characterisation, *Realien*, literary texture, and so forth.' The one consistency is its inconsistency.

²⁰ Berkowitz 2004: 24, Byre 2002: 2.

²¹ The horizon of expectations is the term of Hans Jauss which he defines as 'the objectifiable system of expectations that arise for each work in the historical moment of its appearance, from a pre-understanding of the genre, from the form and themes of already familiar works, and from the opposition between poetic and practical language (Jauss 1982: 22).'

2. Readers and Readings of the *Argonautica* Proem (A.R. 1.1-22)

I begin by turning first to a reading of the poem's proem. Beginnings are programmatic for readings and a reading of this beginning will illustrate the nature of the problems faced by the reader from the outset. It is the proem which sets up the manner of the subsequent narrative, the proem where the reader must get to grips with what is expected of them as readers and which begins the conditioning of the reader for the narrative ahead. A further important reason for examining in this introduction the opening sections of the epic as a whole is the fact that this material will have already been read by readers of the episodes on which this commentary concentrates (viz. those on Lemnos and at Cyzicus). This opening material, then, conditions the expectations of the readers of those later episodes, both in terms of its content and in terms of various features of the narrator's storytelling manner which the reader first encounters here.

Stating the Obvious

Ἀρχόμενος σέο, Φοῖβε, παλαιγενέων κλέα φωτῶν
μνήσομαι, οἳ Πόντοιο κατὰ στόμα καὶ διὰ πέτρας
Κυανέας βασιλῆος ἐφημοσύνη Πελῖαο
χρύσειον μετὰ κῶας εὐζυγον ἤλασαν Ἀργῶ.
A.R. 1.1-4

Within the opening four lines of the poem, any reader familiar with epic generic traits (A.) will observe several aspects that conform to those generic norms. In its dactylic hexameters and its use of Homeric vocabulary (and dialect, etc.), Homer is clearly established from the outset as the poem's Code-Model.

Furthermore, it begins with an address to a deity, here Apollo, just as in the first verse of both Homeric proems the poet calls upon the Muse to tell him the story. The Argonautic narrator makes a statement of intent (to recall the glorious deeds of people from long ago) and proceeds to summarise the content (vv.2-4), the journey of the Argo, picking out as a detail the passing through the Clashing Rocks. Likewise, the Homeric proems summarise (some of) the content of those epics. The poet of the *Iliad* calls upon the Muse to sing of the anger of Achilles and to take as a starting point his quarrel

between Achilles and Agamemnon (*Il.* 1.6-7). The Odyssean narrator asks the Muse to tell him of the man of many turns, picking up the story after the sacking of Troy and offering as a detail the eating of the cattle of the sun by Odysseus' crew (*Od.* 1.7ff.). The Iliadic narrator identifies his protagonist Achilles from the outset, but the suspension of the naming of Jason in the Argonautic proem (v.8) is not an unHomeric practice. In fact, it comes sooner than the identification of Odysseus as the man of many turns of the first line of the *Odyssey* (*Od.* 1.21).²²

None of the three proems set out to summarise the entire story or indeed their respective climactic episodes. No mention of Achilles' duel with Hector or of Odysseus' battle with the suitors is made. That the acquiring of the golden fleece does not turn out to be the climactic episode of *this* telling of the tale is not therefore, at least in this sense, unHomeric. In picking out a few details and sketching the general subject matter as the quest for the golden fleece, the proem conforms with this generic norm of Homeric epic - offering some of the story but not the whole story.

Upon reading this outline, the reader ought reasonably to expect the narrative to involve the capture of the fleece but not when that event might occur in this narrative or how detailed its treatment. Coming to the text familiar with the characters and their mythological exploits, the reader might furthermore anticipate their success but that success still remains open until the text confirms it for the reader.²³

Beginning and Beginnings

μῆνιν ἄειδε θεὰ Πηληϊάδεω Ἀχιλῆος | οὐλομένην²⁴
Il. 1.1-2

ἄνδρα μοι ἔννεπε, μοῦσα, πολύτροπον, ὅς...
Od. 1.1

²² Clare 2002: 12.

²³ The prophecy of Idmon (A.R. 1.440ff.) is an early move towards confirmation and closure but when faced with a text that is unstable and whose narrator's reliability can be questioned, the issue of success or failure remains theoretically open, or better, can be re-opened, as the narrative develops and the reader's relationship with the narrator evolves/deteriorates.

²⁴ On the echo of Achilles in the rage ascribed to Aphrodite by Hypsipyle, see 798-803n.

The first word of the *Argonautica*, the beginning, is the participle ‘beginning’: ‘indubitably a powerful exercise in self-reflexivity; the beginning of this particular narrative straightaway draws attention to itself both *in* the act of beginning, and *as* an act of beginning.’²⁵

Ἀρχόμενος then is a prompt to the reader to reflect upon the point at which a story should begin and calls to mind other beginnings, where and how other narratives start. ‘Rage, sing, goddess/Of the man, tell me Muse/Beginning with you, Phoebus’; similarity and difference.

First lines matter. The *Iliad* begins in rage, the theme then its expansion. The *Odyssey* begins with the man, then his history. The *Argonautica* begins with an act of beginning. It is an address to a deity and thus a ‘Muse-like’ invocation but also a narrator’s decision, a point of embarkation. From the outset then, the reader encounters the familiar and its modification and the possibilities accumulate.²⁶

i. *Beginning as Performance*

In his first comment on the poem, Mooney writes ‘ἄρχομαι was the *vox propria* for the opening invocation of a hymn.’²⁷ The use of hymnal phraseology is unmistakeable, the parallels copious.²⁸ One C. will find remarkably close is *h.Hom.* XXXII.18-19, σέο δ’ ἀρχόμενος κλέα φωτῶν | ῥήσομαι ἡμιθέων ‘Beginning with you [Selene], I will sing the glorious deeds of demigods.’ Clauss has a *caveat* on the dating of this parallel, noting ‘it could well date to the Hellenistic era.’ However, whilst the dating and

²⁵ Clare 2002: 21. Cf. Albis 1996: 17–42, Beye 1982: 1–38, DeForest 1994: 4–11, Fusillo 1985: 360–85, Goldhill 1991: 284–333, Hunter 1993: 101.

²⁶ Cf. Hunter 1993: 120 n.78. ‘That ἀρχόμενος is doing more than one job is recognised already in Σ 1.1-4; it marks both the hymnal form and Apollo’s role in the story, while “focus[ing] attention on the act of narration” (Goldhill 1991: 287).’

²⁷ Mooney 1912: 67. The instances he cites, however, are Arat. *Phaen* 1 and *Il.* 9.97.

²⁸ See Berkowitz 2004: 59 who additionally cites *ibid.* n.26: *h.Hom.* XXXI.18-9, XXV.1, IX.8-9, II.1-11, IX.1-4, XIII.1-2, XVI.1-4, XXII.1-3, XXVI.1-5, XXVIII.1-6, also Hes. *Th.* 1-4, *Thgn.* 1-4. See also A. D. Morrison 2007: 116.

question of which text is imitating which cannot be answered with certainty, Clauss does point out that what this parallel (and the many others) illustrates is that the narrator ‘will not be restricted in the exposition of his epic theme by considerations of genre’.²⁹

What effect does the use of hymnic language have upon a receptive reader with regard to the current issue of beginnings? Apollo, god of music and song, is an acceptable substitute for an epic Muse but accepting the Example-Models³⁰ creates an additional performative context: the hymns were a prelude to an epic recital.

The formula has incorporated the prelude to performance within the poem, within the very first line of the epic itself. This in itself evokes a performative context as it reminds the alert reader that his role was once that of a listener (a common feature of Hellenistic poetry, e.g. the mimetic Hymns of Callimachus).³¹ It creates the illusion of performance whilst simultaneously acknowledging that Hellenistic epic is an entirely different construction, considered and intertextual - a beginning that recalls the beginning not only of other narratives but of their performances, of before the beginnings of those performances. The narrative begins with the first line, it has to begin there, it begins somewhere and begins by suggesting to the reader that there are other somewheres, in this narrative, in other narratives, in the act of telling of narratives.³²

ii. *Beginning in character*

It should also be noted that the narrators of the hymns are first person narrators and active like the Argonautic narrator and unlike the Homeric narrator, who despite the imperatives, is passive in role and in the oblique case – he is a *recipient* of the Muse’s knowledge. However, there are other narrator models to be considered and it is important to observe that from the beginning this narrator has a fondness for masks because intertextually the lines also ‘look to Homer’s description of Demodocus at

²⁹ Clauss 1993: 16, citing *ibid.* n.9, Klein 1974, Goldhill 1991: 286–300.

³⁰ Here I include A. on the reading on the basis of the ubiquity of ἄρχομαι and the language of beginnings in invocations to the gods.

³¹ On which see A. D. Morrison 2007: 109–15.

³² The performative atmosphere suggested by the hymnic intertexts thus incorporates the context of epic performance within the text itself.

work.³³

ὥς φάθ', ὁ δ' ὀρμηθεὶς θεοῦ ἤρχετο, φαῖνε δ' αἰοιδήν,
ἔνθεν ἔλῶν ὥς οἱ μὲν εὐσσέλμων ἐπὶ νηῶν
βάντες ἀπέπλειον...
Od. 8.499-501

Demodocus *begins* to sing his third and final *song*, the song of the wooden horse (Odysseus' own request!), and selects a point (ἔνθεν) to begin. We will turn to Demodocus and his song in more detail shortly and the parallels observed by Hunter. Most important for now is to note the Argonautic narrator's readiness to associate with a different type of narrator, that is character-narrators: these narrators are not omniscient, are open to suspicion of bias and employ evaluative language in a manner the Homeric primary narrators do not.

This muddling of narrator models and their methods will be key to the multiple interpretations posited during the narrations of events on Lemnos and Cyzicus as told by a narrator who is indebted to Odysseus as narrator and his narration of his own wanderings in the *Odyssey* for the structuring of the Argonauts' voyage and encounters.³⁴ A further point of contact which should be made in regard to 'beginning' is that the final song of Demodocus is both the last embedded narrative to take place before Odysseus *begins* his own *Odyssey* and in its content relates events immediately antecedent to the *Odyssey*'s fabula (*Od.* 9.39 - Odysseus chooses as his starting point Ἰλίοθεν the same point from where the Homeric narrator began his summary ἐπεὶ Τροίης ἱερὸν πτολίεθρον ἔπερσεν *Od.* 1.2).

In addition to the Phaeacian bard, there is another less likely singer whose words

³³ Hunter 1993: 121. On the reliability of the Argonautic narrator see e.g. Berkowitz (2004: 1): 'These difficulties in interpretation apparently arise because the poem's narrative voices – those of the narrator and various characters – continually fail to provide the reader with an adequate amount of information. These voices often reveal perspectives that are rather limited, and the reader must continually take into consideration that the narrator's words can be biased by a point of view that is particular and non-authoritative.'

³⁴ See the Homeric Models sections that *begin* my commentaries the Lemnian and Cyzicus episodes. On the blending of voice-models, see e.g. Berkowitz 2004: 1 'These difficulties in interpretation apparently arise because the poem's narrative voices – those of the narrator and various characters – continually fail to provide the reader with an adequate amount of information. These voices often reveal perspectives that are rather limited, and the reader must continually take into consideration that the narrator's words can be biased by a point of view that is particular and non-authoritative.'

are echoed in the phrase παλαιγενέων κλέα φωτῶν. When the embassy arrived at the tent of Achilles in *Iliad* 9, they found the absent hero, lyre in hand, entertaining Patroclus with song, ᾗειδε δ' ἄρα κλέα ἀνδρῶν (*Il.* 9.189). This is an echo often noted and the altered diction (the transformation of ἀνδρῶν into the potentially more inclusive φωτῶν) used to argue the shifted stance of a Hellenistic heroism with its emphasis on the collective rather than the individual and so forth.³⁵ Leaving aside the well-worn debate on the nature of Argonautic heroism, the particular image conjured is of another character performer and of another epic recital. Demodocus sang of Troy - at Troy Achilles sings of other heroes. The images of both characters as performers, whether privileged or submerged, are present when the Argonautic narrator makes his own beginning of song.

Whom did Achilles sing of in his tent at Troy? *Iliad* 9 features the stories of Meleager as told by Phoenix in an analogy of Achilles' current situation. Phoenix is a man of the previous generation and the subject of his narration, Meleager, is an Argonaut (one albeit reduced in this telling to a place in the Argonautic catalogue, A.R. 1.190-201).³⁶ Did Achilles (who the reader encounters as a baby as the Argo sets sail, A.R. 1.558) sing of the Argonauts? If the reader finds this plausible, then the Argonautic narrator in alerting the reader to the Iliadic passage and to a pointed revision of a word which seeds a programmatic shift from the model as regards the type of heroism the reader will encounter in this narrative, has, at the same time, inserted his own narrative as an intertext for the song of Achilles. When I re-read the κλέα ἀνδρῶν of *Iliad* 9, I think of Argonauts.

iii. *Beginning with Medea*

Before proceeding further into the proem, I would like to draw attention to an absent figure, Medea, and quote from my Preliminary Remarks regarding the *material* available to the attentive reader, 'Alexandros has yet to experience this *Argonautica*, but

³⁵ See e.g. Carspecken 1952, Lawall 1966.

³⁶ Phoenix is another character-narrator model. The introductory formula employed to set the scene for the Argonaut's arrival at Cyzicus (see 936-41n.) is used twice by Nestor as a story-teller in *Iliad* 11.

he does not approach it having never heard of Jason, of Medea, of the quest for the Golden Fleece.’

One tends not think of one without the other, most often it is the couple, ‘Jason and Medea.’ As already stated, the proem is only an outline and there is no Hector, no Patroclus in the Iliadic proem. Clare in his study of the Argonautic proem writes: ‘As with the Homeric poems, crucial aspects of the plot are passed over in silence (principally the importance of Medea’s role).’³⁷ However, Callimachos should see her lurking.³⁸

Εἴθ’ ὥφελ’ Ἀργοῦς μὴ διαπτᾶσθαι σκάφος
Κόλχων ἐς αἶαν κυανέας Συμπληγάδας,
E. Med. 1-2

Mooney (in his commentary) quotes these lines to explain (via another commentary) the meaning of κυανέας ‘where Verrall explains the epithet as “blue (misty, distant).”’³⁹

It is not, however, the explanation of the vocabulary that is of interest here, but that it warrants explanation. The philologist searches for an appropriate translation and that search takes him to a specific text. C. should recognise the epithet prominently placed (planted) at the beginning of the third line of the *Argonautica* and be reminded of the nurse’s opening wish in the *Medea*. Again I indulge A. in that any reader familiar with the tragedy might recall the content of those opening lines, and the image of the Argo passing through the Clashing Rocks which is here evoked again.⁴⁰

I suggest that the presence of Medea is herself already being suggested to the reader, carried in the echo of another text that the reader brings to this text. Hunter (1993:124 n.91) is convinced of her presence, adding πάγχρυσον δέρος (E. Med. 5), ‘Obviously, two poets writing about the Argonauts will use similar vocabulary, but in view of the tragedy’s importance for the epic as a whole, deliberate reminiscence is here

³⁷ Clare 2002: 31. Cf. Beye 1982: 19.

³⁸ And it could be argued anyone acquainted with the *Medea*. First lines of any text or performance (in particular those with a notable hysteron-proteron) often endure in the memory.

³⁹ Mooney 1912: 68.

⁴⁰ In his analysis of the opening of Catullus 64 and its Argonautic allusions, Clare (1997: 62) notes ‘one essential ingredient of such a context is missing, namely mention of the *Argo*’s passage through the Clashing Rocks, a *prerequisite* [my italics] in the narration even of a summary *Argonautica*’, citing *ibid.* Od. 12.59-72, Pi. P. 4.208-9, E. Med. 2, Theoc. 13.22 and 22.27 and, of course, Apollonius.

certain.’ Lexical correspondences confirm for C. what A. only suspects.

Where, how, and when to begin

Τοῖν γὰρ Πελῆϊς φάτιν ἔκλυεν, ὥς μιν ὀπίσσω 5
μοῖρα μένει στυγερή, τοῦδ’ ἀνέρος, ὃν τιν’ ἴδοιτο
δημόθεν οἰοπέδιλον, ὑπ’ ἐννεσίησι δαμῆναι.
Δηρὸν δ’ οὐ μετέπειτα τῆν κατὰ βᾶξιν Ἰήσων,
χειμερίοιο ῥέεθρα κιῶν διὰ ποσσὶν Ἀναύρου,
ἄλλο μὲν ἐξεσάωσεν ὑπ’ ἰλῦος, ἄλλο δ’ ἔνερθεν 10
κάλλιπεν αὖθι πέδιλον ἐνισχόμενον προχοῇσιν.
A.R. 1.5-11

‘Such was the oracle Pelias heard.’ With verse five, Apollo’s role is modified. His oracle and Pelias’ attempt to avert it initiates the story. The inclusion of backstory at this stage of the narrative is not itself unHomeric. The Iliadic narrator follows mention of the quarrel with an enquiry to the Muse as to which god caused the two to fight (*Il.* 1.9). Immediately answering his own question, he proceeds with the story of the dishonouring of Apollo’s priest Chryses and the subsequent plague in the camp caused by Apollo. However, there the god becomes active, a physical presence in the narrative, firing his arrows into the Greek camp (*Il.* 1.44-49).

The nature of the pre-narrative has changed. This Argonautic Apollo is at a distance, the words of an oracle reported indirectly. The reader is not privy to the words of the oracle. What the reader receives is a character’s interpretation of them since the account that follows, vv.5-7, is focalised through Pelias.⁴¹

The king, we are told, fears he will perish at some unknown future point through the designs of the one-sandalled man, ὑπ’ ἐννεσίησι τοῦδ’ ἀνέρος. What is the reader bringing to the text? Who kills Pelias? By whose design? A reader familiar with other versions of the later story, in which it is not Jason but Medea who is responsible for the

⁴¹ See 969-71n. on the problematic presentation of the oracle given to Cyzicus – another indirect report which prompts the intratextual reader to refer back to the difficulties of interpretation considered here and which might lead him to the forming of unwelcome comparisons (see 980-4n.).

king's demise, might well be given pause here. Medea, I have already proposed, has been at least hinted at, and might well already be lurking in the reader's mind.⁴² Will this then be a different telling of the tale? Until the text informs otherwise, such a possibility remains open. Has Pelias misinterpreted the oracle? The reader cannot know because there is no disclosure, only a brief character interpretation. Already there are gaps and the information that is being disclosed is being filtered (See 5. Managing Expectations.). The text invites questions, questions that knowledge of other texts multiply rather than eliminate.⁴³

In his study of Homeric Misdirection, Morrison calls attention to a debate in the scholia concerning *moira* in the *Iliad*'s proem. 'On the third line of the *Iliad*, "[the wrath of Achilles] sent many heroes to Hades," a commentator remarks... "[The poet] now appears to say that they perished not because of fate (Moirai), but rather due to the wrath of Achilles"... In response another commentator on *Iliad* 1.3 cites Hector's remark to Andromache: "I think that no man has escaped his fate [Moirai] (*Il.* 6.488)". This line is introduced to emphasise the controlling power of destiny and to argue against the interpretation that mortals have any control over events. Presumably this is an Alexandrian controversy (a *problema*).⁴⁴

The mention of *moira* called my own attention to this discussion and to the Alexandrian debate over interpretations of Homer which calls upon in this instance an intratextual parallel. I raise it because of my preceding observation on the questions raised by the manner of the Argonautic narrative. The scholarly narrator in presenting a story filled with gaps and ambiguities is not solving *problemata* but creating them.⁴⁵

With verse 8, the narrator turns again to address Apollo directly *τεῖν κατὰ βῶξιν* ('in accordance with your oracle'). Where is Apollo to be situated? The external addressee of the opening line invoked using a hymnic formula becomes in v.5 additionally a character within the narrative, or rather at this stage, the pre-narrative. The subsequent backstory offers the reader insight into Pelias' motivation for commanding the voyage

⁴² Casting back to *παλαιγενέων κλέα φωτῶν*, is the adjustment made in reference to Medea and gender? Hera's instrument of vengeance for Pelias' unexplained slight is a woman.

⁴³ See e.g. Hunter 1993: 7 'The *Argonautica* is a poem which invites "readings" rather than "a reading."

⁴⁴ J. V. Morrison 1992: 32.

⁴⁵ On Alexandrian *problemata*, see e.g. Slater 1982.

(v. 3) and as Clare notes, ‘The reader now realises that to begin from Apollo in terms of poetic inspiration is also to begin from Apollo in terms of plot.’⁴⁶ However, only three verses after the narrator has incorporated Apollo within the text as instigator of the plot, there is a return to a direct address regarding that reported oracle. The god’s role and positioning shifts from invocation through inclusion and into apostrophe in eight lines of verse.

Apollo’s role in the evolving Argonautic proem is thus multi-faceted. He is both external and internal, Muse-substitute, hymnic addressee, instigator of the expedition due to an interpreted oracle referred to by the narrator in the poem’s prehistory who goes on to feature in the narrative proper - from the outset then, the reader’s ‘problem’ is evident. Familiarities encourage the reader’s recognition and that recognition draws attention to the modifications of the familiar. The text places demands on the reader to evaluate and to question, and then to revise those evaluations as the text itself undergoes revision.

ἵκετο δ’ ἐς Πελίην αὐτοσχεδὸν ἀντιβολήσων
 εἰλαπίνης, ἣν πατρὶ Ποσειδάωνι καὶ ἄλλοις
 ῥέζεε θεοῖς, Ἥρης δὲ Πελασγίδος οὐκ ἀλέγιζεν.
 αἶψα δὲ τόνγ’ ἐσιδὼν ἐφράσσατο, καὶ οἱ ἄεθλον 15
 ἔντυε ναυτιλίας πολυκηδέος, ὄφρ’ ἐνὶ πόντῳ
 ἦε καὶ ἄλλοδαποῖσι μετ’ ἀνδράσι νόστον ὀλέσσει.
 A.R. 1.12-17

The summary of Pelias’ encounter with Jason is concise and the reader already being conditioned by the nature of the text is prompted to further speculations by what is related and what is not. For example, Pelias’ interpretation of the oracle has been given as his motivation for instigating the expedition (and the narrative). What was his motivation for ignoring Pelasgian Hera? No explanation is given. This is the same character, Pelias. A motivation has been offered for one action but regarding the motivation for the action that precedes it (in the fabula) the narrator is silent. There are gaps in the text that are left for the reader to fill. The narrator’s treatment of characters, even of the same character, is uneven - a mediated disclosure of one motivation, and

⁴⁶ Clare 2002: 25.

nothing at all for another.

What knowledge of the myth pertaining to Hera's relationship with Jason is the reader bringing to the text? At vv.8ff. in the narrator's address to Apollo, we read that Jason lost his sandal crossing the river Anaurus but not what he was doing at the time or who else was there: Hera. A reader familiar with the myth knows that, in other versions at least, it was when carrying a disguised Hera across the river that he lost the sandal. That reader (A. + C.), by her very omission, is made to think of her. It is then not long before she does appear in the text, and not in relationship to Jason, but instead to Pelias. He would perish through the designs of the man with one sandal. Why did Jason only have one sandal? Hera. Who wants Pelias dead? Hera.

The possibility remains, whilst gaps exist, that this telling could be different. In fact, there is a resolution, though the reader will have to wait until Book 3 to hear in Hera's direct speech to Aphrodite her version of Jason and the Anaurus and how Pelias will suffer an evil doom (her κακὸν οἶτον, A.R. 3.64, a recasting of the μοῖρα στυγερή Pelias hoped to avert) for depriving her of honours (A.R. 3.56-76). This account is later followed by an emphatic narrator comment during Jason's encounter at the temple with Medea ὥς γὰρ τόδε μήδετο Ἥρη, | ὄφρα κακὸν Πελὶη ἱερὴν ἐς Ἰωλκὸν ἵκοιτο | Αἰοίη Μήδεια, (3.1134-6). Hera will destroy Pelias through her agent Medea.

Leaving aside this confirmation/revision which is a considerable time later in the narrative, the hints are already there for a reader who knows the myth that Pelias' interpretation is flawed. His attempt to dispose of the man by whose designs he believes he will perish only set in motion the means of his destruction - Medea's return to Greece. On Lemnos, the issue of divine retribution will be encountered again when the reader is faced with competing narratives and gaps in the narrative that make it ambiguous as to who offended Aphrodite (See 614-5n.) and an episode whose favourable outcome for the Lemnian women complicates the reader's relationship with the primary narrator (See L7 below). On Cyzicus, another oracle is reported and cannot be averted. The difficulties of interpreting, the dangers of misinterpreting, the potentials created by both narrative gaps and mediated accounts that the reader later encounters are already present in the proem, already conditioning the reader for the narrative voyage ahead.

Clare's study of the proem is focused primarily on its relationship with the Odyssean proem, a familiarity with which further nuances Pelias' actions in the

language the narrator uses to describe them. For Pelias the quest is not the fleece. For Pelias, the aim of the expedition is Jason's death by destroying his homecoming. His curiously phrased strategy then is to fabricate a mission from which his perceived nemesis will not return. Clare (whose observations are shared by C.) notes three separate Odyssean intertexts here.⁴⁷ Firstly the destruction of Jason on sea or amongst foreign men (A.R. 1.16-17) and the setting of land and sea established in the Odyssean proem (e.g. *Od.* 1.12). Secondly Pelias envisages the mission as οἱ ἄεθλον | ἔντυε ναυτιλίας πολυκηδέος (A.R. 1.15-16), and Odysseus describes his own prospective homecoming to the Phaeacians as νόστον ἐμὸν πολυκηδέ' (*Od.* 9.37). Thirdly in conversation with Penelope, Odysseus refers to their many trials πολέων κεκορήμεθ' ἄέθλων, and his difficult homecoming ἐμὸν πολυκηδέα νόστον (*Od.* 23.350-1). 'Apollonius' Homeric allusions are clearly intended to communicate the impression to the learned reader [C.!] that Pelias is concocting some kind of odyssey for Jason, an impression bolstered by the king's sacrifice to Poseidon.'⁴⁸ On this reading then, the god opposed to Odysseus' homecoming is juxtaposed with (replaced by) the goddess overseeing Jason's own return. All of which leads Clare to conclude that 'the great irony in all of this is that the one journey precedent which Pelias would not wish to Jason's circumstances is a precedent according to which the hero *does* return.'⁴⁹

I would add to Clare's ironic reading the warning in this intertextual reading when poetic memory conflicts with expression. The choice of vocabulary used to describe Pelias' intentions undermines those same intentions. An echo of Medea in the first four verses can be interpreted as foreshadowing her involvement and echoes of Odysseus' *nostos* in these verses can be interpreted as foreshadowing for the experienced reader Jason's own successful *nostos*.

Pelias misinterprets an oracle and his own limitations as a reader are underlined by these intertexts deployed by the primary narrator (which the more experienced reader here observes). Still, such pitfalls also await the *Argonautica*'s readers. Intertexts can run contrary to expectations. When the Argonauts disembark on Cyzicus, Odyssean intertexts picked up by the alert reader similarly mislead as to what type of encounter

⁴⁷ Clare 2002: 25–7.

⁴⁸ Clare 2002: 26.

⁴⁹ Clare 2002: 26.

awaits. The Argonauts do not there suffer a Laestrygonian-type ambush, but C. especially is ambushed into expecting one (See 953-7n.). Echoes are not necessarily corroborative and positive. Pelias' interpretation was flawed. Was the wording of the oracle ambiguous, open to misinterpretation? Whilst the experienced reader, in agreement with Clare's insights, might well enjoy the irony of the intertexts at work, Pelias' own misreading of an oracle serves as a warning to the reader - an *exemplum* of how texts can be misread or differently interpreted.

Beginning Again

Νῆα μὲν οὖν οἱ πρόσθεν ἔτι κλείουσιν ᾠδοὶ
Ἄργον Ἀθηναίης καμέειν ὑποθημοσύνησιν.
Νῦν δ' ἂν ἐγὼ γενεήν τε καὶ οὔνομα μυθησαίμην
ἡρώων, δολιχῆς τε πόρους ἄλός, ὅσσα τ' ἔρεξαν
πλαζόμενοι· Μοῦσαι δ' ὑποφήτορες εἶεν ᾠοδῆς.
A.R. 1.18-22

With verse seventeen, the prehistory concludes and the reader encounters a switch of subject, a second beginning and a *praeteritio*. 'The ship, former bards still celebrate in song...' Again a performative context for the poem is created, one of competing bards and a theme already famous in song. The narrator does not name names but he announces the existence of these bards, and claims the story of the Argo's building is widely known.

The former (πρόσθεν) is juxtaposed with the now (ἔτι). The past runs into the present. The word-order underscores the continuity of time and the song. The poetry of the past is still known. From Argonautic prehistory, the temporal setting shifts to the narrator's present whilst an acknowledgement of other narrators takes the reader out of the story to consider other versions of the same story, of how they begin, of where a story should begin.

As Hunter notes, νῆα is prominently placed, first word of the verse, a new

subject, ‘as though a quotation of the opening word of some epic on the subject.’⁵⁰ The proems of both the *Iliad* τίς τ’ ἄρ σφωε θεῶν ἔριδι ξυνέηκε μάχεσθαι (*Il.* 1.8) and the *Odyssey* τῶν ἀμόθεν γε, θεά, θύγατερ Διός, εἰπὲ καὶ ἡμῖν (*Od.* 1.10, narrator again recipient) have a second start, a second appeal to the Muse. The Odyssean narrator follows up the appeal with a clear temporal marker that the story proper is to begin τῶν ἀμόθεν γε, θεά, θύγατερ Διός, εἰπὲ καὶ ἡμῖν. | ἔνθ’ ἄλλοι μὲν πάντες. (*Od.* 1.10-1).

At A.R. 1.20, the Argonautic narrator provides his own response νῦν δ’ ἄν ἐγὼ ... μυθησαίμην. His presence is obtrusive and emphatic. It is a temporal marker and signifies a shift in narrative direction but it is not a marker of a time within the story (of which event in the fabula to take as a starting point). It is in the time of the narrator. He captures himself in the act of composition and picking that moment to begin. The question and appeal which signal a shift in the direction of the Homeric narratives have become a meditation upon the nature of story-telling. There are other singers of the Argonauts’ song. The narrator has sources. His telling will be different. He is selective and active in making these decisions of what to include, what to omit, where to start.

Here, Hunter (and likewise C.) finds several parallels with the Demodocus of *Odyssey* 8, asked by Odysseus to sing of the horse built with Athena’s help.⁵¹ The objects of the narrations are both wooden marvels, both vehicles for carrying men, both built by mortals with the aid of Athena. Crucial here is the fact that Demodocus does not sing of the construction but chooses another point to begin.

ὥς φάθ’, ὁ δ’ ὀρμηθεὶς θεοῦ ἤρχετο, φαῖνε δ’ αἰοιδήν,
ἔνθεν ἐλὼν ὥς οἱ μὲν εὐσσέλμων ἐπὶ νηῶν
 βάντες ἀπέπλειον, πῦρ ἐν κλισίῃσι βαλόντες,
Od. 8.499-1

Recognising the intertext further involves the experienced reader in this reflection on beginnings. As Clare notes, ‘The Homeric allusion subtly raises the question of whether

⁵⁰ Hunter 1993: 122. See *ibid.* n.85 ‘It is tempting to think of the poem “The building of the Argo and Jason’s voyage to Colchis” ascribed to Epimenides.’

⁵¹ Hunter 1993: 121–2.

a comparably suitable beginning may be found for Apollonius' poem, on the general principle that certain stories have built into them appropriate points of commencement.⁵² Hunter's suggestions of alternate possibilities such as Pelias' usurpation, his dishonouring Hera, Jason's upbringing, the story of the Fleece are an illustration of the text at work. The text makes the reader think. The story as it is presented is inviting reflection on beginnings and engaging the reader in exploring potentials.⁵³

This narrative then will be not start with the building of the Argo but with (the narrator's choice) a catalogue of heroes. What then will be the role of the Muse? The last verse with another reference to song provides the contentious answer, ὑποφῆτορες.⁵⁴ Are the Muses to be inspirers or interpreters? The Muses can, of course, have more than one role. The Muses here mark the boundary between the proem and the epic proper, as in a performative context they marked the boundary between the preceding hymn and the epic recital itself.

ὑποφῆτορες can be interpreted as inspirers in the sense of turning source-material into poetry or as a collaborative arrangement with the Muses in a somewhat subordinate role recording the material. Still, the narrator's confident stance does not suggest that what he requires from them is the material itself. If we read ὑποφῆτορες as 'interpreters', then for whom are they interpreting?

Their role has changed somehow, certainly marginalised in comparison with the Muses of Homeric epic just as the narrator is much more obtrusive and, for now, authoritative. To read is to interpret. Casting back to Pelias and the possibility of himself as *exemplum* of a bad reader, it is tempting to see here in the proem's second beginning reflecting on beginnings, a new role being offered to the Muses in the telling of stories, that of themselves as readers. A Muse with her unfailing memory, with access to all possible intertexts and material, with divine insight, represents the ultimate

⁵² Clare 2002: 22.

⁵³ Hunter 1993: 123. On δολιχῆς, Clare (2002: 29) observes that 'in the Homeric poems this is an epithet traditionally applied to lengthy journeys, especially in a problematic sense' and considers it an admission that the journey will be difficult. Again I think the reader sharing the narrative voyage should take note, the journey through the text will be likewise difficult.

⁵⁴ For a summary of the inspirer/interpreter debate, see A. D. Morrison 2007: 288–93.

Callimachos. Do not read like Pelias, but read (and interpret) like the Muses is a daunting formulation (and in the narrative Idmon's *exemplum* cautions against such hubris, 1.481-4). Still we can, at least, by being attentive avoid the former, and bring what experience we can to a fallible mortal imitation of the latter.⁵⁵

⁵⁵ By my own admission, the readings of the commentary are those of a reader striving to follow Calliope to the neglect of her eight sisters.

3. Methodology.

3.1 *The Role of the Reader*

As evident then from my discussion of the proem, my approach to the text is from the perspective of the reader. At its most basic, the formula remains throughout: Reader - Narrators - Text.

The starting point for my interpretations is the text as experienced by the first-time readers (as mediated by the text's narrators) established in the preceding section. To reiterate, the Hellenistic readers (deployed at times to demonstrate how expectations can be led down different paths) are entirely artificial. They are heuristic devices designed to open negotiations with the text.

Commenting upon a *historical* audience of Homer, Morrison writes, 'For an ancient, aural audience, we still assume a familiarity with the epic tradition, although the knowledge of actual auditors will vary from a superficial acquaintance to a developed expertise.'⁵⁶ Leaving aside the assumption for now (See 5. Managing Expectations.), the concession is pertinent. There are, of course, between the hypothesised attentive reader (A.) and the attentive and experienced reader (C.) an entire spectrum of possible readers, implied or historical. However, for reasons of both clarity and brevity, a scholastic schism will be maintained in the commentary. A., familiar with the Code-Model and with the broad strokes of myth, is the intratextual reader whose experience is led to a greater degree by the development of the *Argonautica*'s text. C. is likewise an intratextual reader, but operating towards the other end of the reading spectrum his experience is modified by recognition of more Example-Models, leading to interpretations that can overlap with A.'s and bolster them or diverge by degrees, according to how those intertexts, once acknowledged, are then privileged in the *Argonautica*'s reading. To refer back to an earlier term taken from Reader-response theory, the Horizon of Expectations of A. and C. are those of the Homeric auditor and scholar respectively. They approach the text with certain expectations based on their readings of Homer.

I do not employ any reader-response theory, the 'aesthetics of reception' as

⁵⁶ J. V. Morrison 1992: 105–6.

developed by the Constance school to make aesthetic judgements or argue the text's place in literary history, but only some of the observations made possible by the approach, the effects of approaching the text with preconceived assumptions acquired through the reading of other texts and an awareness of the mythological subject-matter of the epic which this text will modify. Moreover, Iser's *Leerstellen*, the 'empty places', gaps in the narrative which the reader is required to supply and *Appellstruktur*, the openness of the text, the indeterminacies that engage the reader in the search for solutions, are concepts spectacularly appropriate for applying to the *Argonautica*'s text.

As my own readers will see, in practice, following the reader through the text and charting the experience is largely following the approach of Sternberg (1978) and his dynamics of the reading process which Byre (2002) has already applied to the *Argonautica*, albeit without the Homeric readers I deploy and without due consideration of the dense intertextual nature of the narrative.

3.2 Narratology

These gaps and indeterminacies that the reader is forced to engage with from the outset are bound within the presentation of the story. The *Argonautica*'s primary narrator is the conduit between reader and text. My analysis of the poem employs certain narratological distinctions to demarcate his character and to explore possible interpretations based upon his method of narration.

As stated in 1. Preliminary Remarks, my treatment of the text is not purely narratological but one which nevertheless utilises some basic narratological distinctions in analysing the process of reading the text as mediated by its narrators. My narratological methodology is indebted to de Jong's narratological analysis of the Homeric epics and I adopt some of the terminology she employs. de Jong (1987), following Bal (1985), observes the three narratological layers of text (first layer), story (second layer) and fabula (third layer).

In my analysis, the text remains the text. For the purposes of this commentary, it is the Greek text in Vian's 1974 edition, *Apollonios de Rhodes: Argonautiques* (Tome 1). It is the printed words on the page. The creation of a text (which is outside the remit of this interpretative commentary) does itself involve interpretation and selectivity by its editor. Instances in which variants with other textual editions give rise to alternative

interpretations (or complicate my readings) will be discussed in the commentary itself. However, such textual variants do not challenge the broad theoretical distinctions being set out here.

Story and fabula are both abstractions derived from the physical text that is the author's creation. The text is the result of a narration. The object of the narration is the story. The narrator tells this story based upon his focalisation of the fabula which is a 'logically and chronologically related series of events ... the result of all kinds of activities by characters in a fictional world.'⁵⁷

The fabula of this *Argonautica* is the voyage to Colchis in quest of the fleece and the voyage home again. It is an abstract reconstruction of events in their chronological order. In this case, the linear reordering of fictional events is a simple one because the story of this *Argonautica*, that is how the narrator tells the focalised fabula, is likewise linear. The presentation of the story does not skip back and forth in time (as e.g. the *Odyssey* in which we only read of Odysseus' adventures after he left Troy in his own narration in Books 9-12) but follows in general a linear chronological path (barring brief passages of backstory, e.g. the oracles in the proem, discussed above). It begins with the heroes assembling and ends when they reach Pagasae.

The *story* (as de Jong defines the term) can be seen as proceeding along with the voyage it focalises. Focalisation is not only seeing but ordering and interpreting the fabula from a particular viewpoint. In concrete terms there is only the text but the reader's engagement with the text, and subsequent immersion in the fictional world, is dependent upon an acceptance of the fabula, that the events occurred, that the characters interacted and that the version presented to us is what the narrator has interpreted and transmitted to the reader via the act of narration. The *story* then is the product of those interpretations and choices made.

Not all narratological theories or studies employ the same terminology. Chatman's terminology is of 'Story' and 'Discourse' in which the 'story' is de Jong's (Bal's) fabula, the *what*, and the 'discourse' is de Jong's (Bal's) story, the *how*.⁵⁸ Fabula and *sujet* are the terms used by Sternberg, 'the fabula involves what happens in the work as (re)arranged in the "objective" order of occurrence, while the sujet involves what

⁵⁷ de Jong 1987: 31.

⁵⁸ Chatman 1978.

happens in the order, angle, and patterns of presentation actually encountered by the reader.’⁵⁹

In 1. Preliminary Remarks, I allowed my hypothetical reader A. a familiarity with the broad strokes of myth (*material*). Posed by *my* narratologist as A. prepares to begin his reading of the *Argonautica*, ‘Do you know the *story* of Jason and the Argonauts?’ would be a trick question. He knows a fabula, the myth of the Argonauts, as reconstructed from whoever narrated to him their story about the myth. The experienced reader C. who has a solid intertext in Pindar, *Pythian* 4 can claim to know a fabula reconstructed from the Pindaric treatment of the myth. And if C. is basing his expectations on the Pindaric story, he will be surprised on reading this story to find the Argonauts arriving first at Lemnos when in the reconstructed fabula he has brought with him from Pindar, the episode occurs on the *nostos*.⁶⁰

Returning to the narrator himself, de Jong’s narratological analysis of the *Iliad* demonstrated the subjective elements of that poem’s narration and argued convincingly against Homeric objectivity whether defined as the narrator’s absence from the text or as providing a neutral presentation, concluding that the manner of presentation was in fact *multiple*.⁶¹ With regard to the Argonautic narrator, finding him is not a problem. As my analysis of the poem demonstrated, this narrator is present from the outset. It is not a matter of locating instances of objective versus subjective, or of invisible versus intrusive but a matter of negotiating with the degrees of his subjectivity and intrusion.

The focus of this commentary differs. It does not aim to provide strict narratological classifications of the features of the narrative or to break down the presentation of the story into narratological structures. However, de Jong’s methodology provides two major benefits. Firstly, the narrative features she uses to identify the Homeric narrator’s presence can be employed to investigate how the Argonautic

⁵⁹ Sternberg 1978: 8–9, developing the terminology of the Russian Formalists, such as Viktor Shklovsky.

⁶⁰ Myths are fluid. Other stories can follow a different fabula. Characters can act differently, have greater roles or drop out altogether (e.g. the absence of Atalanta in this *Argonautica* (see L6ii). Cf. e.g. West (1989: 132) on the *telos* of the *Odyssey* (and *Iliad*): ‘A poet who took his theme from the Matter of Troy did not have to fasten off the loose ends of his narrative in the way that we expect of a modern popular novelist, since his principal characters enjoyed an existence far beyond his own treatment; that the *Iliad* does not extend to include the death of Achilles and the fall of Troy is not (at any rate nowadays) felt to be a defect. I can see no reason why the *Odyssey* should not originally have ended with Odysseus’ household asleep at the end of their eventful day.’

⁶¹ de Jong 1987. For a discussion of scholarship on presentation, *ibid.*: 14–28.

narrator's discourse directs (or misdirects) the reader's experience. Secondly it provides itself a Code-Model for epic narration, for me a convenient referential model to illustrate divergence of practice, or more often, to highlight the augmentation of those instances of narrator involvement.

The *Argonautica*'s narrative presents the reader no difficulty in reconstructing the chronological sequence of events but that is only one aspect of the relationship between the fabula and the story. What elements of the myth does the narrator choose to report? Within any given episode which of those events are treated in detail and which in summary? Are the words of characters reported or given in direct speech? What is the reader not being told explicitly? What is the reader being forced to infer?

My own alert reader will have observed that I have so far blurred a fundamental narratological distinction. The addressee of the *Argonautica*'s external primary narrator-focaliser (NF₁) is the primary external narratee-focalisee (NeFe₁). In reading the text, the reader (historical or imagined) takes on the role of the NeFe₁. In the interests of avoiding some torturous syntax when discussing multiple intertexts that impact differently upon different readers (who are acting as primary external narratee-focalisees), I use simply 'reader' and ask that their intermediary role as external narratee-focalisees be understood as already applied and incorporated.

Now, a narration of an episode in which all events were given equal weight would likely be uniformly bland. Nevertheless, the emphases and ellipses of the Argonautic narrative, the different treatments given succeeding episodes, persistently pose the reader difficult questions. It is not so much why this way and not another, but in keeping with the focus of this reader-oriented approach, what is the effect upon the reader? How does the reader arrive in Lemnos? What does the reader having left Lemnos expect upon arrival in Cyzicus? How are those expectations met or confounded? How much is the reader left to supply? How hard does the reader have to work at the fiction?

Summaries, ellipses and emphases are all aspects of 'rhythm', the handling of 'time' in the narrative and show the presence of the primary focaliser: 'an agent who orders and interprets the events of the fabula.'⁶² Individual instances will be examined within the commentary and with regard to the *Argonautica*'s narrator they are not

⁶² de Jong 1987: 42.

necessary to demonstrate what is an obtrusive and persistent presence. The reader of the *Argonautica* has a visible guide, evident from the first line of the narrative, who does not jump ship after the proem.

The primary narrator (and focaliser) of the *Argonautica* is external.⁶³ He plays no role in the story. His position is posterior, a position evident from the poem's first line and declaration to recall the deeds of people born long ago (παλαιγενέων κλέα φωτῶν, A.R. 1.1). Whilst there are no biographical details, some inferences can be made from the text. Thus Morrison (2007) notes his comments on the Mossynoeci (2.1021-5) indicate the narrator is a male Greek and his knowledge of the colonisation of Thera (4.1764) places him long after the Argonauts.⁶⁴ However, as Morrison points out, the broader aspects of his persona, 'his presentation as a scholar and someone who prepared to react morally and emotionally to his narrative' are more important. Reference to sources (e.g. the former bards discussed in the preceding section), scepticism, speculation and the inclusion of contentious passages of Homer ('exegesis') all contribute to creating a scholarly persona. The use of evaluative language and the many instances of narratorial intrusion in which the narrator makes gnomic statements or announces, for example, why certain events cannot be related on grounds of impropriety combine to flesh out the subjective and moralist aspects of the narrator's own character. And we have seen in the proem evidence of a narrator highlighting his own role in the selection of material, of a narrator drawing attention to the activity of creating and controlling the story.

Finding evidence in the simple narrator-text to give substance to his narrative persona is unproblematic, but the reader's engagement with that persona is not.⁶⁵ A commentary on episodes in Book 1 does not involve exploration of the developing narratorial crisis that occurs on the return voyage from Colchis but the presence of a confident and forthright scholar directing the narrative provides its own interpretative difficulties. What, for example, is the reader to make of the inclusion of two different accounts of the Lemnian backstory? One account is given by the primary narrator to the

⁶³ I use external and internal rather than heterodiegetic and homodiegetic (Genette 1980, on whose terminology see the helpful summary in Schmitz 2008: 55–60), and following de Jong (2004: xv) 'when I use the word "narrator", I mean the "primary narrator-focalizer."'

⁶⁴ A. D. Morrison 2007: 272–3.

⁶⁵ Simple narrator-text is the text presented by the primary narrator to the primary narratee.

external narratee before the Argonauts land and then a variant version is given later by the Lemnian queen Hypsipyle to Jason, internal secondary narrator to external secondary narratee (See L7i below)?

The Lemnian episode involves several instances of character-text in its use of direct speeches, whereas the subsequent episode on Cyzicus contains none (See 4. Speech Modes.). There are always gaps for the reader of fiction to fill and a uniformity of treatment ought not to be expected. On the other hand, the narrative conditions the reader as they read. Expectations are created and a relationship is established with a prominent narrator. When these expectations are subverted, revised, reaffirmed etc. by a text which places great demands upon that reader and multiple interpretations are possible, these narratological distinctions can aid in the exploration of these possibilities, or at the least help to elucidate the processes involved.

To take an example from the proem, τοῖν γὰρ Πελῆϊς φάτιν ἔκλυεν, ὥς μιν ὀπίσσω | μοῖρα μένει στυγερή, 1.5-6. Who perceives fate as hateful? Is this simple narrator-text, the result of the narrator's focalisation and his evaluation on the fate that awaited Pelias? Is it a transmission of the words of the oracle? Is it the perception of Pelias upon hearing the oracle? This last option is an instance of what de Jong calls explicit embedded focalisation in complex-narrator text (following a verb of perception).⁶⁶ Put more simply, the character is doing the evaluating and the narrator is reporting the character's evaluation.

To support the reading/classification of an instance of embedded focalisation, one could use intratextual examples (as with the Alexandrian scholars and their *problemata*!) and point to Polyxo's use of the same adjective in character-text to describe old-age κουρότεροι δ' ἄγονοι στυγερὸν ποτὶ γῆρας ἵκησθε (1.684) or point to the narrator choosing to leave the same noun unqualified in his account of Cyzicus' death, ὁ δ' ἐνὶ ψαμάθοισιν ἔλυσθεις | μοῖραν ἀνέπλησεν (1.1034-5, see 1034-9n.).

The reader's Argonautic experience will not be unduly ruffled by an initial

⁶⁶ de Jong 1987: 101–14.

speculation as to whether fate was hated by the narrator or by Pelias (or by both).⁶⁷ Nevertheless, what this one early example does demonstrate is how a narratological approach can both raise the reader's awareness of possibilities and assist in the layering and exploring of multiple available readings.

Based upon the usage of *στυγερός* in the text up to 1.1035, the attentive reader (A.) can make an evaluation supported by the intratextual evidence of Book 1 to bolster the conclusion that at 1.6, the focalisation was that of Pelias.⁶⁸ Now, the experienced reader (C.) could draw upon the narratological Code-Model (the Homeric narrator) and search for Example-Models of the word's Homeric usage for additional support in his own evaluation.

Of the seventeen instances in the *Iliad*, it is found in simple narrator-text four times in *androktasiai* - three times of darkness (*Il.* 5.47, 13.672, 16.607) and once of sickness (13.670). Otherwise there is only one other occurrence in a simile as a qualification on 'battle' (18.209). It is found in complex narrator-text in the embedded focalisations of Agamemnon (on war, 4.240) and Hera (on Zeus, 14.158).

The remaining nine occurrences occur in speeches (character-text) qualifying/evaluating a greater variety of nouns: battle (2.385), Helen (3.404), war (6.330, 19.230), Hades (8.638), the Erinyes (9.454), old age (19.336) mourning (22.483), the need for food (23.48) and doom (23.79).⁶⁹

The Argonautic narrator is not bound to the practice of the Homeric narrator. Indeed, one of the ways we can explore his greater immersion in the narrative is to track the higher usage of emotional and evaluative language in narrator-text which in the Homeric texts is confined predominantly to character-text.

Now, this brief scan of the uses of *στυγερός* uncovers some potentially

⁶⁷ On the ambiguity of embedded focalisation, explicit and implicit, I side with de Jong in her choice (2014: 52): 'it could be argued that embedded focalisation should be restricted to those cases where the focalisation of a character is without question... This would considerably reduce the amount of embedded focalisation in a narrative text... It seems therefore more enriching to operate the other way round and assume that the presence of a verb of seeing and so on *always* indicates that an embedding focalisation takes place, keeping open the possibility of ambiguity or intrusion.'

⁶⁸ Other than the instances cited, *στυγερός* occurs at 1.443 in character-text. Idmon prophesies his own death as *στυγερῇ ὑπὸ δαίμονος αἴσῃ*.

⁶⁹ de Jong (2001: 145) has the figures for combined *Iliad* and *Odyssey* usage: 'twenty-four times in speech, four times in embedded focalisation... six times in simple narrator text, of which twice in a simile' and is clear that in the incidence she discusses (*Od.* 5.394-9), 'the narrator increases the pathos by using character-language.'

enlightening parallels. Polyxo qualifies old age (A.R. 1.684) with the same adjective used by Achilles when speaking of his father. The Iliadic passage in which the narrator twice uses *στυγερός* of disease and death (*Il.* 13.670, 72) in narrating the two possible fates of Euchenor, whose father was a prophet and who chose to embark for Troy to die there rather than of sickness at home, might remind the experienced reader of Idmon's prophecy on his fate and of the narrator's earlier comment in the Catalogue (A.R. 1.140-1) that he came in this knowledge 'lest the people begrudge him glory.' Finally, and closest to the qualification focalised by Pelias (and Idmon), the ghost of Patroclus speaks of the hateful doom (*κῆρ στυγερή*, *Il.* 23.78-9) that awaited him since birth and prophesies to Achilles his own fate to die at Troy (*καὶ δὲ σοὶ αὐτῷ μοῖρα, θεοῖς ἐπιείκελ' Ἀχιλλεῦ, | τείχει ὑπὸ Τρώων εὐηφενέων ἀπολέσθαι*, *Il.* 23.80-1).

This contemplation of *στυγερός* has already shifted from identification of a narratorial evaluation in the presentation of the *Argonautic* story through consideration of the Code-Model into the context of specific intertextual Example-Models. The three branches of my methodology - The Role of the Reader, Narratology and Intertextuality - blend to create various interpretative possibilities and are not readily separable. Sometimes one informs the other and a rigid methodological hierarchy, beyond maintaining the reader-orientated outlook, is impractical. A recognition of an intertext can alter the reader's experience of the narrative and their view of the narrator. The narrator's positioning of an intertext, if recognised, can affect the reading of the subsequent story. In the commentary proper, rather than always seek to maintain a 1-2-3 approach, I have opted to tackle that which I consider most significant first and then consider its possible effects, thus in practice often 3-1-2 or 2-1-3, etc.

It remains then, to clarify my methodology regarding the use of intertexts, what I incorporate in my readings and what I allow my hypothetical readers to include and discount in considering alternative Argonautic experiences.

3.3 Intertextuality

The language of the *Argonautica* is constructed out of the language of Homeric epic. Instances of convergence, of possible parallels to be spotted by the Homeric scholar are therefore copious. Additionally, both Homeric scholar and Homeric auditor can compare

the *Argonautica* against the Homeric Code-Model. Intertextuality, in my approach, encompasses not only the locating and interpreting of precise lexicographical correspondences, of ‘modelling *by particular source-passages*’⁷⁰ but much broader instances of similarity and difference in the treatment of e.g. *topoi*, type-scene, simile, speech. All, that is, that is demonstrably ‘epic’. For my analysis, the Code-Model incorporates the narratological approach outlined in 3.2. Thus my intertextual analysis encompasses the presentation of the story of the *Argonautica* read against the presentation of Homeric epic stories.

These two definitions, Example-Model and Code-Model, are in my application combined. For example, the instance of *androktasia* at A.R. 1.1025-1052 contains both similarity and difference with the Homeric *androktasiai* as a model of that type of scene, whilst within it are suggested parallels with specific Homeric *androktasiai* (See C6).

As stated already in 1. Preliminary Remarks, my approach to intertextuality in the *Argonautica* is based upon the methodology and arguments of Conte (1986) and Hinds (1998). A work of Alexandrian scholarship with an obvious epic model is by its nature replete with ‘allusion’, ‘reference’, ‘parallel’ and ‘accidental confluence.’

‘Reference’ is the term favoured by Richard Thomas in preference to ‘allusion’ to define more precisely the contract between author and reader whereby a reader is expected to spot the reference and to refer to its source.⁷¹ Hinds questions this tidy dynamic, and the openness of ‘reference’ set against the covertness of allusion as one which ‘gives to complex Alexandrianizing allusion, and to the detective work of a modern philologist like Thomas himself, its real fascination.’⁷²

How does a detective-reader confirm an allusion? One ‘unequivocal marker’ of allusive control is the diction; there are ‘abstruse lexicographical allusions to Homer in the poetry of Alexandria which offer the ultimate assurance to the critic in their isolability and one-to-one specificity.’⁷³ We can imagine our reader C. putting down his *Argonautica*, drawing the relevant scroll of the *Iliad* from the basket, circling the corresponding word, line or passage and smiling contentedly. However, the

⁷⁰ Hinds 1998: 41. His italics are his translation there of Conte’s ‘modello-esemplare.’

⁷¹ Thomas 1986 (building upon the foundations of Thomas 1982).

⁷² Hinds 1998: 23.

⁷³ Hinds 1998: 25–6.

identification of allusion, whilst indicative of the inclusive nature of the relationship whereby the reader is invited to recognise the signs placed by the narrator, if left there, does little beyond that. To borrow again from Hinds, regarding the use of ‘cf.’ to excuse my own failings to incorporate the entirety of potential intertexts in the commentary: ‘The critic, like the poet, can bring only finite resources to the infinity of discourse.’ Mooney’s commentary brims with notes on the adaptation of Homeric diction and syntax but for my purposes, unless an interpretative point can be made by this reader, such citations are (largely) excluded.

Interpretative points can seem minor, e.g. recognising an allusion to a controversial passage of Homer.⁷⁴ Such a Homeric ‘exegesis’ might have little bearing on the reader’s interpretation of the story, but, if observed, it does reinforce the scholarly aspect of the narrator’s persona which could then influence a reader in various ways. For example, if encountered when reading a passage which contained variants with some other account the reader had prior knowledge of, a reminder that this narrator ‘had done his homework’ could lean the reader towards accepting this new or consolidated version. On the other hand (or simultaneously), this nod towards scholarly debate could take the reader away from events of the story-world, towards thinking again about how narratives are constructed.

Returning to ‘the infinity of discourse’, my analysis of the proem in the second section of the Introduction explored the effect on the reader’s experience of reading into the text recognised intertexts not only of Homer but of Euripides’ *Medea*, the *Homeric Hymns* and Pindar’s *Pythian* 4. In Conteian terms, Homer was both Code-Model (the representative of epic poetry) and Example-Model for the various points of contacts and departure with the proems of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. Lexicographical allusions to phrasing found in *Homeric Hymns* contributed Example-Models of performance, performative context and prompted further consideration of how to begin a narrative. A tragic undercurrent and foreshadowing of *Medea* was read into a recognition of the *Medea*’s own beginning. Furthermore, an allusion in the opening line of the *Argonautica* to the beginning of *Medea*’s speech in *Pythian* 4 augmented her

⁷⁴ See A. D. Morrison 2007: 279–80 and *ibid.* 280: ‘such allusions to debates about the text of Homer flag the narrator (and author) as engaged on a fundamentally literate project, whatever the fiction of oral communication which the epic maintains at the surface.’

background presence, offered narrator-models (Pindar and Medea), additional consideration on beginnings and a variant account against which the Argonautic proem can be read.⁷⁵

Now, if we were to discard on the basis of what is absolutely unequivocal, we would lose the various Medeas, some of the Homer (Achilles and Demodocus) and read the proem purely against the Homeric proems and the *Homeric Hymns*. This would be an extreme response but one I use to excuse my willingness to engage with what some might consider (mere) confluence.⁷⁶

To approach the text, and its intertexts, from the point of reception, is not to wish the author away, to deny that there was an Apollonius who wrote this poem and wrote into it his personal engagement with the poetry of its past. It is done to broaden the field of interpretative possibilities (and to shift the emphasis from authorial intention to reader involvement). Some of the intertexts suggested in this commentary could be dismissed as failing philological criteria but that does not deny their existence or their ability once observed to affect the reading.

Echoes build upon echoes and, as we have seen already in the proem, the process of reading the *Argonautica* is also one of revising and rereading. When expectations are modified, the reader looks back and reappraises. The poem begins with a subject in a language of performance. It begins with a beginning and a confident 'I'. This prompts comparison and reflection. The reader thinks of other beginnings and of other performances. The poet as a rhapsode becomes Demodocus in Phaeacia and Achilles in his tent, Medea's nurse on the stage and Pindar singing lyric. An intertext does not stop at correspondence but opens up the range of correspondence. Intertexts have contexts. If C. and/or A. recognise an intertext then that brings to their reading of the *Argonautica* not only the memory of that text but the circumstances of reading that text and its context.

In addition to this rippling effect, there is the effect of gradual accretion to observe. Instances of language that might seem at first no more than a nod to the Code-Model develop as the verses progress from 'ambience' to something more pointed, not according to philological criteria regarding a precise passage but to an intertextual

⁷⁵ A. D. Morrison 2007: 284 n.47.

⁷⁶ For a discussion of philological fundamentalism and the *unknowability* of the poet's intention, see Hinds 1998: 144.

accumulation that requires the reader to join all the dots.

In summary, mine is a reception-based approach to intertextuality which embraces confluence within the reader-experience. In practice, given my preoccupation with the Homeric models and having situated my hypothetical accomplices in third century BC Alexandria, the actual range of intertexts is far from the infinity of discourse but the approach is sufficiently flexible to add new material to the discussion of those already observed and to add others for consideration.

4. Speech Modes.

When characters engage in direct speech, we read via the narrator's quotation the perspectives, thoughts, and interpretations of those characters on events in the fabula in which they operate. Characters in Homeric epic (the Code-Model) engage in dialogue with one another or express their thoughts and feelings in monologue to their hearts.

From the Code-Model (available to both the attentive reader (A.) and the experienced reader (C.)), some basic features can be observed. This character-text employs emotional and evaluative language as characters have an interest in the events of the fabula. The content of their speech when it is a dialogue can be seen to be tailored according to their addressee, based upon the narrative situation which frames the speech and what has been offered in that narrative by way of the motivation for speaking.

de Jong (1987) analysed nine examples from the *Iliad* of different characters employing different vocabulary and altering content according to either who their addressees are or how the internal character-narrator perceived an event. For example, four different characters (Zeus, Teucer, Ajax and Hector) comment on the breaking of Teucer's bow using vocabulary according to their interpretation of the event.⁷⁷ Poseidon's exhortatory speech to the Achaeans at *Iliad* 13.95-124 blames Agamemnon for the current misfortune, whereas his exhortation to Agamemnon (*Il.* 14.139-46) blames Achilles.

As de Jong further notes on that last example, in both instances Poseidon is in disguise and 'we can only guess at [his] personal opinion concerning the conflict between Agamemnon and Achilles.'⁷⁸ He tells them what they want to hear and we can only guess his own opinion because Poseidon does not state in either the incident or elsewhere, nor does the *Iliad*'s narrator provide the information for the reader. This brings up two further basic observations. As readers of the text, we have access to all the speeches of the narrative. We overhear everything. Secondly, what we hear can be further affected by the narrator because character-text is embedded within narrator-text. The narrator provides the frame of the speech and can include information on how to read the speech-content. Or, as in the example with Poseidon, he can opt to omit

⁷⁷ de Jong 1987: 157.

⁷⁸ de Jong 1987: 155.

information which could confirm or dismiss a reader's speculation.

Hunter provides some basic figures on quantity, 'Whereas some 45% of the *Iliad*, 67% of the *Odyssey* and 47% of the *Aeneid* are in the direct speech of characters - the high *Odyssey* figures being largely due to Odysseus' narrative of his adventures in Books 9-12 - only 29% of the *Argonautica* falls into this category.'⁷⁹ Without expecting the reader to count lines, and on the understanding that rough percentages tell us little about the type or content of speeches in the *Argonautica*, we can proceed on the understanding that there is a markedly higher percentage of narrator-text than character-text in comparison with both Homeric epic (and Vergil).⁸⁰

Now Hunter notes this practice to be un-Aristotelian and that though the transition from oral to written epic plays a part, it 'must also be viewed in the context of the insistent authorial voice.'⁸¹ Characters in the *Argonautica* are not being given as much opportunity to speak for themselves. Their words are being reported with greater frequency than in the Code-Model.

What then are the possible knock-on effects of this practice for the *Argonautica*'s readers? This remove creates a distance from events of the fabula. The reader becomes more reliant on the narrator's reports. Without verbatim quotation, the reader must sift a greater amount of related (focalised) summaries. Summaries are also elliptical. They will not contain the fullness of expression provided by a quoted speech. If they contain evaluations, are they those of the characters being recorded or of the narrator's own focalisation?

Laird, analysing two newspaper articles to exemplify the uses of direct and indirect speech in competing accounts has noted how 'the use of direct discourse... give us the sense of having direct access, a window' with the effect being we judge the speech as we judge the character, whereas indirect discourse 'gives room to manoeuvre to the person reporting the words of others' including judgement, bias and cues to

⁷⁹ Hunter 1993: 138. Similar figures are recorded in Rutherford 1992: 58 'discounting the special case of the narrative portions of books 9-12... 6,835 lines of direct speech [out of 12,103 in the *Odyssey*] ... The corresponding figures for the *Iliad* are 7,018 out of 15,690.' See *ibid.*: 58-72 on the types and functions of speech in the *Odyssey*.

⁸⁰ The absence of repeated speech in the *Argonautica*, both messenger-speeches (with one important exception, Iphinoe's speech. See 712-16n.) and formulaic repetitions, would account for some of the disparity.

⁸¹ Hunter 1993: 41.

interpretation.⁸²

The diminished volume of direct speech makes those speeches which the reader does hear all the more vital to accessing the perceptions of the characters. Who does the narrator allow to speak? For how long? At what point in the narrative? Placement in the narrative's structure, choice of character, type of speech, its secondary audience, purpose of speech and its framing all contribute to the reader's experience of what is clearly a crucial component of epic narration.

The reader's experience is a linear one and this is a syntagmatic analysis intended to show how that experience builds and how the narrative conditions the reader's expectations as they read (though the rhythm of the commentary with retardations and accelerations is not to the same tempo as the eye travelling across the printed page).⁸³

So, what I propose to do here is to consider what speech patterns exist in the preceding narrative that the Lemnian and Cyzicus episodes follow on from and develop. And in doing so, I hope to prepare my reader for what awaits them on Lemnos and beyond.

Within the proem, there was no direct speech though attention was drawn to both the words of the oracle and Pelias' command to Jason. Both the prophecy and the command were reported by the narrator, both in an elliptical manner, and both problematic. The reader can only guess at the wording of the oracle and has only Pelias' interpretation of it as motivation for the subsequent command to Jason. What did he tell Jason? What does Jason know of Pelias' true intentions? Information can be imported from elsewhere (C. might use Pindar's *Pythian* 4) but based on the proem alone, the reader cannot make any sure deductions as yet (and there is no guarantee for C. that the Apollonian and Pindaric Argonautic treatments will align!). From the beginning then, the reader is already building upon inferences.

Laird makes further distinctions in categorising speech modes, supplementing the standard *oratio obliqua* in which 'we are given the explicit impression that the

⁸² Laird 1999: xii–xv. See *ibid.*: xv 'The relationship between a text and reader offers some important insights, if it is considered in conjunction between speakers and addressees, as they are presented in the texts we read. Conceiving of texts as utterances affirms the ideological dimension of intertextuality.'

⁸³ On narrative *time*, see de Jong 2014: 92–101 with further bibliography.

words of the original speaker(s) have been modified by the speaker or narrator presenting them⁸⁴ with free indirect speech which has no introductory verb.⁸⁵ An example from the *Argonautica* of the latter is the presentation of Medea's thoughts after first seeing Jason, αὐτός θ' οἶος ἔην, οἷοισί τε φάρεσιν ἔστο, | οἷά τ' ἔειφ', ὥς θ' ἔζετ' ἐπὶ θρόνου, ὥς τε θύραζε | ἦεν (A.R. 3.454-6).

The recognition of direct speech is itself unproblematic but the manner of its employment is more nuanced. Another of Laird's speech analyses should be brought into consideration. This is the 'the angled narration of dialogue,' a disparity of treatment of dialogue which is classified thus: 'the words of one speaker are spotlighted by being given in direct discourse; whilst the words of his interlocutor are presented by the narrator in indirect discourse. The words of the speaker who is quoted in direct discourse tend to have the most impact in these situations.'⁸⁶ On Lemnos, the reader finds that it is the women do most of the talking and that most of what the men have to say is reported. This 'angled' narration has to affect the reader who hears far more from the female inhabitants of the island than the male Argonauts who arrive there in the first episode of the voyage.

To *oratio recta* (DD) and *obliqua* (ID), Laird adds a third category of Records of Speech Acts (RSA) which are either 'terse' or 'informative.'⁸⁷ His examples of terse include 'They agreed', 'He told them about the war' and 'Irim de caelo misit Saturnia Juno [Verg. *Aen.* 9.2].'⁸⁸ 'Expansive' RSA is more informative but only ever summarises. The two examples from the proem would both fall in Laird's last category, instances of expansive RSA. Following the proem comes the Catalogue of Heroes and the first direct speech of the poem is thus suspended until its conclusion.

With regard to the Argonautic narrative, I would add a further category of Inferred Speech Acts in which some form of dialogue has to have occurred but the reader was not told about it. For example, in Hypsipyle's second speech to Jason she begins with wishing the gods' blessing on him and refers to the golden fleece and to the king [Pelias] (A.R. 1.888-90). There is no mention of him telling her about the quest in

⁸⁴ Laird 1999: 88, 94-7.

⁸⁵ Laird 1999: 96-7.

⁸⁶ Laird 1999: 101.

⁸⁷ Laird 1999: 89.

⁸⁸ Laird 1999: 99-101.

the preceding narrative beyond his one brief direct speech to her when they met and a reference to his λυγροὶ ἄεθλοι (841). As it is too much to infer that Hypsipyle herself inferred from that phrase ‘Pelias and the quest for the golden fleece’ then it has to be inferred by the reader that the two of them have been having pillow-talk in the meantime away from eager eyes and ears. A truly ‘full narration’ is an absurd concept but for the readers of the *Argonautica*, there is a feeling that sometimes things are going on behind closed doors and we are not invited. So then, we should probably grasp onto and squeeze meaning from whatever speech comes our way.

When it does first appear in Book One, it comes in a burst - four speeches in sixty-five lines (1.240-305). The Catalogue serves as a transition from narrative past and exposition to its present.⁸⁹ The list concludes and the crowd reacts to the sight of the heroes thus assembled and now heading to the ship. The focus of the crowd’s speech is the voyage (242-6). The women within that crowd then speak (251-259). The focus of their speech is Jason’s mother, Alcimede, whom they address as if present though it turns out later on that she is in the house.⁹⁰ The narrator responds to their speech by shifting the narrative to the household of their addressee and sets the scene with servants, grieving mother, bed-ridden father and consoling son. Only Alcimede is named, and likened to an abused step-child in her misery. Following her lament for her own misfortunes (278-291) comes the son’s consolation (295-305).

In the elements of shared content, we (and A. + C. as these are elements of the Code-Model) can observe features present in de Jong’s analysis of Iliadic speeches referring to the same event from different perspectives. All four speakers – 1. The crowd, 2. the women in crowd, 3. Alcimede and 4. Jason express thoughts on the voyage.

1. The crowd, amazed at the gathering, wonder why Pelias has commanded it. They express both their confidence in the heroes’ ability but also some apprehension for the heroes’ safe return. 2. The women make the first reference to the myth of Helle,

⁸⁹ On the ‘fictive present’ see Sternberg 1978: 19–23. He establishes it in relation to the ‘scenic time-norm’ that every narrative possesses (itself measured by quantifying representational to represented time). At the risk of overly simplifying, every story has its rhythm. Find the beginning of the rhythm, the first full scenic treatment and you find the fictive present, the first occasion to be ‘discriminated.’

⁹⁰ There is no indication in the text that Alcimede is not present as their addressee until the scene shifts inside the house which mention of Aeson in his bed confirms (264). Similarly, when Hercules castigates the crew for dallying in Lemnos, it is entirely unclear whether Jason is present or not (see 872-4n.).

Phrixos and the ram in the poem in an unfulfilled wish that children and beast had all perished together at the Hellespont so that Alcimede's current misfortune, the impending loss of her son, had never come about. 3. Alcimede wishes she had died before the command had come that would see her lose her only son and expresses disbelief that Phrixos' escape has caused her this pain. 4. Jason consoles her with mention of Athena's assistance, Apollo's favourable oracles and the might of the heroes. The speech-cluster thus concludes with Jason bidding Alcimede remain in the house whilst he goes to take his place with the assembly of heroes following which the speech sequence began.

Additionally, we can observe in the framing by the narrator directions as to the manner of their narration. Thus ἄλλη δ' εἰς ἑτέρην ὀλοφύρετο δακρυχέουσα (250) directs the reader to interpret what follows as spoken in lament. Similarly, Alcimede's speech both begins and concludes with markers of her mournful state of mind. Jason's speech of consolation begins μελιχίοις ἐπέεσσι ('with gentle words', 294). The speeches contain evaluative language. The women proclaim that κακός has come to Alcimede (251), the trials are likewise κακός (255) and they describe the ram as κακὸν τέρας (258). For Alcimede, κακός is her assessment of Pelias' command.

Then there are differences and elaborations to be observed. The first direct speech of the epic is the response of an anonymous crowd to a spectacle. Anonymous utterances (the sort of thing someone would say) are not at all unHomeric, but as the first speech of the epic? In the crowd's speech, there is speculation on Pelias' motivation and speculation on the accomplishment of a future narrative event - Αὐτῆμάρ κε δόμους ὀλοῶ πυρὶ δηώσειαν | Αἰήτεω, ὅτε μή σφιν ἐκὼν δέρος ἐγγυαλίξῃ, (244-5). The speech is a general reaction, concluding ὥς φάσαν ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα κατὰ πτόλιν, (247). 'So they spoke here and there throughout the city.' This is the type of thing that everyone was saying.

The second speech, that of the women in the crowd, although more particular in its focus on Alcimede's personal suffering due to the expedition, is also generalising, ἄλλη δ' εἰς ἑτέρην (250). They are speaking to one another, not to Alcimede, despite her being the addressee of the speech's opening line, Δειλὴ Ἀλκιμέδη, καὶ σοὶ κακὸν ὀφέ περ ἔμπης | ἦλυθεν (251). We read their common concern for Alcimede (whom we might have in mind at this point as she was named in the Catalogue's postscript

v.233 as Jason's mother) and then the scene shifts to focus on her directly.

The narrator does not announce a switch of location. There is no 'but in the house of X...' and the reader is left to do a modicum of figuring out from the presence in the scene of lamentation and consolation of the bed-ridden father (263-4) that we have moved inside (finally confirmed v.306 when Jason leaves home - if there remains some possibility of Aeson's bed being outdoors for the farewell). In itself this is not a huge obstacle to interpretation but it is a reminder that the narrative is elliptical and requires attention.

Following a simile which compares Alcimede's emotional state to that of an abused step-daughter comes her speech to Jason. It is a lament which picks up elements of the two generalising speeches that the reader has now heard. Alcimede wishes she had been dead and buried by her son the day Pelias had given his evil command. Her beginning recalls the anonymous crowd's opening Ζεῦ ἄνα, τίς Πελῖαο νόος; (242) and her closing reference to never having thought Phrixos' escape would cause her sorrow (290-1) picks up the unfulfilled wish in the women's lament that Phrixos and the ram had drowned along with Helle (256-9).

There is a curious linking to be observed throughout the sequence. It is not a straightforward 'X said, then Y replied, to which Z responded' but instead conveyed in a blurring of narrative levels. We read the Catalogue. The heroes are assembled. The crowd responds. There is optimism in their belief that such a gathering could destroy Aetes' palace. Yet that is followed with a difficult to interpret 'difficult,' Ἄλλ' οὐ φυκτὰ κέλευθα, πόνος δ' ἄπρηκτος ἰοῦσιν ('but the voyage cannot be avoided and the task is unmanageable/impossible,' 246). As though picking up on the negativity in the final phrase, the women's concern is for the parents of Jason, developing their/our thoughts from the mention of Alcimede in the narrator-text which concluded the Catalogue.

Theirs is the first reference in the poem to the myth of Phrixos, Helle and the ram coming about in a wish that it had all ended in the Hellespont. Alcimede, unaware of what is being said about her, also finds in Phrixos common cause for present woe. For the reader, there is little exposition. We are not told where Helle drowned (it will be tersely and allusively referenced vv.927-8, see 922-35n.), how she was related to Phrixos, where they were going or why or how the speaking ram was involved. No mention has been made of the golden fleece of the proem (1.4) until the negative

comment of the women describing it as a monster.

If we did know the myth from elsewhere, if we had some details of how they fled their wicked stepmother, then we might read a further echo of Helle in the simile describing Alcimede that keeps the myth flowing from speech to speech whilst binding Alcimede's lot with that of her doomed relation Helle. Such a suggestion, however, depends upon knowledge of some other telling of the myth. In these initial speeches, the characters, like the narrator, are giving little away beyond passing references.

In his discussion of narrative exposition in the *Odyssey*, Sternberg observes how the Ithacan situation is unfolded for the reader by a disguised Athena's questioning of Telemachus (*Od.* 1.213f.).⁹¹ So what does the reader gain by way of exposition from these initial speeches in the *Argonautica*? The first line of the first speech is a question, but this question has no addressee and goes unanswered. The anonymous crowd do not know the intention of Pelias. The reader does, having been privileged with that information in the proem: it is to destroy Jason's *nostos* (*A.R.* 1.17). In this instance, the reader has access to information the characters do not. The crowd remains ignorant. On the other hand, in the references of the women and Alcimede to Phrixos and Helle, the characters have information the reader does not, that the narrator has not shared, that we have to bring from elsewhere. Yes, the reader has access to the narrative and all the character-text it contains but when characters are not sharing as much as they could, it is not a straightforward matter to situate ourselves besides the narrator. In consoling his mother, Jason urges her to take courage from Athena's assistance and from the oracles, ἐπεὶ μάλα δεξιὰ Φοῖβος | ἔχρη (1.301-2). If Phoebus has proclaimed very favourable prophecies, the reader has had no access to their content.

As an experiment, if we were to engage in some editing and excise vv. 240-306 and follow the image of the heroes gleaming like stars (1.240) directly with Jason likened to Apollo as he went through the crowd (1.307f.), what has been lost to the reader-experience by the redaction of the intervening speech cluster (aside from it establishing a pattern for the manner of narration)? Sternberg defines suspense as the lack of information about the narrative future and curiosity as the lack of information

⁹¹ Sternberg (1978: 60): 'The information given in his answer is of course indispensable to the reader, not to the omniscient goddess.'

about the narrative past.⁹² I believe that both these reader-responses are in play here. We have characters reacting to a present event with concern for how it will unfold and their apprehensions and uncertainty trigger our own speculation. What do we know thus far? What other information can we access? Questioning what will happen creates suspense. And the characters' elliptical references to events in their past stimulates our curiosity. In some instances, we know more and in others less. The manner of the narration encourages us to read on and to look for answers to our and the characters' speculations.

If the reader knows something of the myth, of another version of the story, how does that knowledge interact with the Argonautic narrative? Byre coins the term the 'poetics of uncertainty' to define Apollonius' 'exploitation of his reader's knowledge ... and his adoption of the stance of a suppressive, sometimes less than omniscient, and sometimes uncertain narrator' who provides insufficient or conflicting information to unsettle the reader.⁹³ Using Steinberg's terminology, he considers the narrator 'deliberately suppressive' rather than 'omnicommunicative,' a narrator who withholds information the reader needs to reconstruct the fabula from the story and to predict how it will unfold (the 'dynamics of the reading process'). Byre, however, sees this as a developing position on the part of the narrator which is not present in the pre-launch narration in which the exposition whilst elliptical in parts is sufficient.⁹⁴

My position, evident from my analysis of the poem, is that these tensions are set in motion from the beginning, that the reader is supplied with enough material to conjecture but not to confirm and that what additional material the reader brings, particularly intertextual (which Byre suppresses throughout his analysis) only adds to the reader's speculations. For example, the lament of the women contains the unfulfilled wish for Phrixos' death. In the first line of the poem, there was the suggestion of another unfulfilled wish, that of the tragic Medea's nurse's wish that the Argo had never sailed

⁹² Sternberg (1978: 65): 'Both suspense and curiosity are emotions or states of mind characterised by expectant restlessness and tentative hypotheses that derive from a lack of information... Suspense thus essentially relates to the dynamics of ongoing action; curiosity [because conflicts have been resolved], to the dynamics of temporal deformation.'

⁹³ Byre 2002: 11.

⁹⁴ Byre (2002: 8): 'The entire preliminary part of the poem, up to and including the departure from Pagasae, leads us to expect that in this world the Argonauts, favoured with the lively and personal interest of the gods, will attain success...' A strong suspicion or anticipation of success does not erase concerns. The reader of the *Odyssey*'s proem might well expect Odysseus to achieve his *nostos* and still in the process of reading experience suspense, uncertainties and even fear for the protagonist as the narrative progresses. Byre's reader of the 'preliminary part' is even more optimistic than the Iolcian witnesses discussed above.

through the Symplegades to Colchis. An unfulfilled wish from a woman in a Corinthian future that the Argo had never arrived is countered here by a wish from Thessalian women in our narrative present referring to a narrative past in a wish that the ship had never had a reason to sail.

Still, to reiterate the information which the reader has been explicitly supplied with regarding the background to the mission: this is the quest for a golden fleece (1-4), the fleece is in Colchis, a land ruled by Aeetes (the primary narrator comments on Augeas' eagerness to go there in the Catalogue, 174-5), it is the fleece of the ram which headed there with Phrixos and Helle (256-7), Phrixos was escaping something (290-1). Everything else the reader must supply from elsewhere or construct their own hypothesis and wait for the narrative to confirm or deny it.

C., a reader of Pindar's *Pythian* 4, knows of Pelias' claim to have been visited in a dream by the ghost of Phrixos wanting his spirit put to rest. He has the option to read into Alcimede's closing statement her awareness of this but it will not be confirmed for him (or revealed to A.) in the Argonautic narrative until Jason's speech to the sons of Phrixos at 2.1179-95.

What else then can be gleaned from the speeches? The narrator gives us our first insight into Jason's *oikos* here and the situation he is leaving behind, a grieving mother and a sick father, and he gives us our first opportunity to assess his character. Our first impression of Jason might be that he is confident and reassuring (though that impression is to be undermined as soon as he has finished speaking a second time, to the Argonauts, v.340f.). The reader susceptible to intertexts, however, might still have the *Medea* in mind and the prematurely grieving *oikos* here could well remind of a future grieving one in Corinth.

I conclude this section with a little detective work undertaken by C. to demonstrate the utilisation of different types of intertextual correspondences to build a case. Within the simile at vv.269-77 Alcimede is likened to a maltreated step-child πολέεσσιν ὀνειδέσιν ἐστυφέλιξε, 273. Mooney (an experienced reader) comments that ἐστυφέλιξε is the same verb used in Andromache's speech speculating on the fate awaiting Astyanax (ἐστυφέλιξε, *Il.* 22.496).⁹⁵ In isolation, that one correspondence of

⁹⁵ Mooney 1912 ad loc.

lexis is not doing enough to justify an intertext but if we cast the net further and consider structural speech models and their context, we can find it some support.

In *Iliad* 22, there is a sequence of three speeches by three characters (Priam, Hecabe and Andromache) referring to the same event: the death of Hector (*Il.* 22.416f.). The sequence also employs a similar shift in scene from public to private. 1. In place of a crowd speaking, Priam speaks to the crowd, calling each by name ὀνομάζων ἄνδρα ἕκαστον (*Il.* 22.415). He speaks of his desire to supplicate Achilles and of his own old age. 2. Following him, Hecabe leads the women in lament (rather than as in the Argonautic sequence the lamenting women addressing the absent mother). 3. Then the Homeric narrator tells us that the wife knew nothing yet because she was in the home (*Il.* 22.440). The scene shifts to within the home and Andromache's reaction to the noise. She does finish her speech outside but it begins within with a call to her handmaids.

These two scenes both contain multiple speeches by different characters referring to the same event (and in one case to a dead hero, in the other to the potential for dead heroes). Both scenes involve laments, both involve switches of location from public to private. ἐστυφέλιξε is no longer so lonely. Approached the other way round by observing first the structural similarities of the speech-models, the lexical correspondence concealed in the Argonautic simile would be a confirmation for C. of an Iliadic speech-cluster parallel.⁹⁶

Then again, the experienced reader could privilege a more optimistic intertext in the speech of Jason that follows. Jason's confident words and his concluding pronouncement for Alcimedea to stay home and not to be an ill-omen whilst he and the men proceed to the launch calls to mind Telemachus' words to Penelope to go to her room and attend her weaving, μῦθος δ' ἄνδρεσσι μελήσει | πᾶσι, μάλιστα δ' ἐμοί· τοῦ γὰρ κράτος ἔστ' ἐνὶ οἴκῳ (*Od.* 1.356-9). Here another young man made newly bold (by the direct speech and intervention of a disguised Athena rather than the Jason's focalized interpretation of Apollo's oracle) and preparing himself to set out on a journey of his own rebukes his mother for not wanting the bard Phemius to sing the *nostoi* of the

⁹⁶ Then C. has to decide what to make of the following tragic echoes (E. *Hipp.* 159 & S. *El.* 285) noted by Vian (1974: 63) and Mooney (1912: 87) in vv.274-5.

Achaean.⁹⁷

Finally taking both possible intertexts together and matching up the structures of speech and speakers along with the characters, we can set the mournful Alcimedea/Andromache (and Iolcian women) against the confident Jason/Telemachus (and Iolcian men) in the gendered division the reader will encounter on Lemnos. Perhaps C. should not read lamentations of Hector's death too much into the Iolcian females' sad goodbyes. Jason and Idmon both prophesy success and there are no gods against this undertaking. At the point of departure, the intratextual evidence is (largely) optimistic. Intertexts can work for and against expectations and as the voyage progresses, the readers must constantly decide which ones they can trust.

⁹⁷ On Telemachus' authority, see e.g. Laird 1999: 1–2. There is also a touch of Achilles about Jason's statement to his mother that gods mete out unforeseen woes to mortals (1.298–9), that reminds this reader of Achilles' account to Priam regarding the jars of Zeus (*Il.* 24.525f.).

5. Managing Expectations.

In his monograph *Homeric Misdirection*, Morrison defines it thus: ‘When the poet structures the narrative in such a way as to upset or disappoint the audience’s expectations in some way, I call this *misdirection*.’⁹⁸ This misdirection, the generation of false expectations, is based on either prolepses in the text or on the reader’s familiarity with the tradition. The former category is capable of influencing any reader of a text but with regards to the latter and to the readers of the *Argonautica*, the relationship is more complex.

‘A poet singing a traditional song can mislead a knowledgeable audience by exploiting the audience’s assumption that it is in a privileged position of superior knowledge. False predictions and untraditional episodes - alternating with accurate predictions and familiar scenes - force the audience to negotiate between everything it knows (based on knowledge of the tradition and expectations generated early in the epic) and an uncertainty as to how and whether the story will indeed turn out as expected.’⁹⁹

For misdirection to have an effect it must be recognised. This recognition is based on two not necessarily inclusive elements, a knowledge of a tradition and expectations generated by the text. Alexandros, an attentive reader of the text, has expectations. His reading is conditioned by the text of the *Argonautica* and he arrives at Lemnos, the first of the episodes analysed in this commentary, with those expectations that his reading of the text to that point has generated. Additionally, we assigned to Alexandros a familiarity with the *material*, which in this case is the myth of Jason and the Argonauts in its broad strokes – the voyage to Colchis, the acquisition of the fleece with the aid of Medea and the successful return to Greece.¹⁰⁰ What is problematic for Alexandros (and for Morrison’s reader of Homer) is defining the limits of knowledge, and of what constitutes the ‘tradition.’ What are these readers reading their predictions against? The Lemnian episode can be considered an element of the Argonautic tradition. A.’s expectations are not thwarted when in the course of the narrative the Argonauts stop

⁹⁸ J. V. Morrison 1992: 3–4.

⁹⁹ J. V. Morrison 1992: 6.

¹⁰⁰ The referential level. See de Jong (2014: 39): ‘earlier versions of myths are the material or intertexts from which later authors draw.’

there. Callimachos, however, might be surprised when the stop turns out to be the *first* of the *outbound* voyage. After all, in Pindar's version in *Pythian* 4 the Lemnian episode takes place on the return journey.

Our second reader has not only the expectations of Alexandros (expectations generated by this text and an awareness of tradition) but additionally, expectations generated by the texts' intertexts, by the text's own engagement with Homer, Pindar and so forth. A familiarity with these texts, reading the *Argonautica* against them, creates an additional set of expectations (depending on how they are privileged in the reading), expectations which can be raised and tracked with greater precision than those dealing with 'tradition.'

C.'s erudition brings additional problems and therefore a need for a more nuanced approach than that which Morrison employs for his Homeric reader (and that we might apply to (some of) Alexandros' readings). For example, Morrison discusses the narrator's options regarding predictions: (1) to introduce a prediction or not, (2) to make it persuasive or not, (3) to make it true (foreshadowing) or false (misdirection).¹⁰¹

We have seen already from an analysis of the proem that readings and therefore expectations can be intertextually generated. When discussing readings based not solely upon the text but upon the suggestions of other texts behind the text, interpretations which are available to the experienced reader and which the *Argonautica*'s narrator neither explicitly confirms or denies, how can we term them true or false? Any such reading remains available due to the narrator's strategy of withholding in the first instance information (which generates speculation) and in the second some confirmation regarding actorial motivation or some narratorial pronouncement on events to affirm or deny the reading. Thus rather than true/false, expectations are better, in regard to the *Argonautica*, termed 'open' or 'closed.'

οὐδ' ὅ γε δηιοτῆτος ὑπὲρ μόρον αὖτις ἔμελλεν	1030
οἴκαδε νυμφιδίους θαλάμους καὶ λέκτρον ἰκέσθαι·	
ἀλλὰ μιν Αἰσονίδης τετραμμένον ἰθὺς ἑοῖο	
πλῆξεν ἐπαΐξας στήθος μέσον, ἀμφὶ δὲ δουρὶ	
ὀστέον ἑρραίοσθη· ὁ δ' ἐνὶ ψαμάθοισιν ἔλυσθεις	
μοῖραν ἀνέπλησεν. Τὴν γὰρ θέμις οὐ ποτ' ἀλύξαι	1035

¹⁰¹ J. V. Morrison 1992: 14.

θνητοῖσιν· πάντῃ δὲ περὶ μέγα πέπταται ἔρκος·
 ὥς τὸν οἰόμενόν που ἀδευκέος ἔκτοθεν ἄτης
 εἶναι ἀριστῶν αὐτῇ ὑπὸ νυκτὶ πέδησε
 μαρνάμενον κείνοισι.
 A.R. 1.1030-8

The narrator's comment on the impending death of Cyzicus hardly involves suspense or constitutes much of a prediction, coming as it does immediately prior to Jason killing him. However, prior to the narratorial intrusion, it has been strongly foreshadowed for an experienced reader alert to a Homeric intertext. The narrator's description of Cyzicus at A.R. 1.972-9 cannot fail but call to mind *Iliad* 11 for Callimachos. There, in a passage beginning with an appeal to the Muses (Ἔσπετε νῦν μοι Μοῦσαι, *Il.* 11.218), we are told the story of the Thracian youth Iphidamas, son of Antenor, prior to his death at the hands of Agamemnon. He went to Troy with twelve ships, γήμας δ' ἐκ θαλάμοιο (11.227). We are given the additional detail that this newly-wed left his ships at Percote (home of Cyzicus' father-in-law) before he fights Agamemnon and dies.

ὥς ὁ μὲν αὖθι πεσὼν κοιμήσατο χάλκεον ὕπνον
 οἰκτρὸς ἀπὸ μνηστῆς ἀλόχου, ἀστοῖσιν ἀρήγων,
 κουριδίης, ἥς οὔ τι χάριν ἶδε, πολλὰ δ' ἔδωκε·

Now, there is nothing in the text to prevent Alexandros from being pessimistic about the fate of Cyzicus. A description of his status as new groom is not superfluous information, not simple colouring and any attentive reader might spot a set-up. However, for Callimachos, Iphidamas offers a clear intertext to read the passage as a prediction, a reading which is closed when the narrator comments upon and describes the death of Cyzicus. And there is additional supporting evidence in the prophecy of Merops.

This is, however, an over-simplification. For the experienced reader, Odyssean intertexts observable from the start of the Cyzicus episode (to Laestrygonians, Cyclopes and Suitors) create expectations of conflict, suspend them during the friendly encounter with the Doliones, seemingly resolve them in the clash with the Earthborn, only to re-open them in the second violent encounter with the Doliones. Expectations are being opened, closed, re-opened as the narrative develops and those expectations are created by the narrator's withholding of (or partial distribution of) information in a manner

which demands the reader to engage with the text, to explore their own hypotheses. Furthermore, suspense as to whether or not (and if so when) Cyzicus will die is not a resolution for the reader. 'Will he or won't he?' is a question which propels the reader on with a narrative but the question we are left with in the aftermath, the more troubling question, is 'why?'

2. Lemnos (A.R. 1.609-921).

The Homeric Models

In her analysis of the fragmentation of Homeric models throughout the *Argonautica*, Knight observes lexical correspondences between Odysseus' preparations to leave Ogygia and the Argonauts' departure from Pagasae and further notes the 'structural significance' of allusion to Odysseus' first voyage in the *Odyssey* with the Argo's initial launch.¹⁰²

Her final comment echoes an earlier observation on Odysseus' wanderings being 'recalled at some point by similarities of situation and/or verbal parallels, or even directly.'¹⁰³ Fuller explication of the close lexical correspondences that are observable to the experienced reader (C.) are considered within the relevant sections of the commentary, but firstly, I wish to explore further the matter of 'structural significance' or what I term 'narrative shape.'

i. *Lemnos and Phaeacia*

In a reader-reconstructed fabula of his adventures, Phaeacia is for Odysseus the last leg on his return from Troy to Ithaca, whereas Lemnos, in the more straightforward linear chronology of the *Argonautica*, is the first inhabited island visited on the Argonauts' outward journey. However, in the narrative, in the presentation of the story, both are the first interactions of the poems' protagonists with foreign peoples that are presented to the reader.

In the *Argonautica*, the voyage to Lemnos is described in summary (580-608) before a backstory provided by the narrator gives the reader information on Lemnian events taking place the previous year (an external narratorial analepsis, 609-632). The narrative then reverts to its present but remains focused upon the island's inhabitants, the Lemnian women, as they head for an initial encounter with the Argonauts (633-652).

¹⁰² Knight 1995: 222, citing A.R. 1.561-2 with *Od.* 5.237, 255, 270 and A.R. 1.548-9 with *Od.* 5.283-4.

¹⁰³ Knight 1995: 32.

Following this encounter, summarily reported, the women meet in assembly in the episode's first detailed narrative, observed from a scenic standpoint with the reader having privileged access as the women engage in direct speech to discuss their dilemma.¹⁰⁴ The meeting of Jason and the Lemnian queen Hypsipyle is thereby suspended until 774ff. with their dialogue occurring 793-841 (her speech 793-833, his reply 836-41).

For the reader of the *Odyssey*, the protagonist's first encounter *following a voyage* is with Nausicaa in *Od.* 6 after Odysseus has washed up on the shores of Scheria at the end of *Od.* 5. In *Od.* 6, the focus moves away from the protagonist, opening instead with Athena on her way to the city of the Phaeacians. At *Od.* 6.4-12, the narrator provides a summary of Phaeacian history, a compressed colonial narrative on the island's inhabitants in an external narratorial analepsis.¹⁰⁵

Following that, the reader is introduced to the princess Nausicaa (6.15f.). The narrator's focus remains with the princess (6.15-112), encompassing Athena's speech in her dream, conversation with father and journey to shore. Her arrival there returns the reader to the protagonist when he is woken by her and her attendants. The subsequent conversation is initiated by Odysseus in direct speech (6.149f.).

So, if we break down the above in terms of narrative shape, the following sequence of correspondences can be observed: (1) First Arrivals, (2) Analepses which result in a switch of focus, (3) a return to the main character with exposition provided for the reader as to the motivation of the inhabitants, and (4) dialogues between male arrival (hero) and female inhabitant (helper). Within the structure there are modifications. For example, on Lemnos the women's motivation is supplied within the backstory (and modified/made explicit in the assembly, see L4 below) whereas on Phaeacia Nausicaa's motivation is supplied via Athena's speech to the dreaming princess. On Lemnos, the meeting is delayed; a brief initial entente brokered by Aethalides segues to the Lemnian

¹⁰⁴ On spatial standpoints, see de Jong 2014: 60–5. With the scenic standpoint, the narrator (and by invitation the readers of the text) takes up a position on site, in this instance at the Lemnian assembly.

¹⁰⁵ The Lemnian episode has its own colonial narrative. The descendants of the Argonauts and the Lemnian women will be the future colonists of Thera (See 623-6n.). Whilst there is little expansion regarding the relocation of the Phaeacians due to their formerly aggressive neighbours, the Cyclopes, and the Theran narrative covertly begun on Lemnos is only revealed at the epic's end (A.R. 4.1756ff., Euphemos throws the divine clod into the sea that creates Thera), it remains an additional point of contact between episode and model.

Assembly and the subsequent ecphrasis of Jason's cloak causes additional suspense. On Lemnos, Jason comes to the girl. On Phaeacia, the girl comes to Odysseus.

The narrator gives the reader enough to suggest the model, to encourage anticipations and note divergences. For example, Odysseus in need speaks first, seeking aid from the girl. In Myrine, Hypsipyle speaks first. The Argonauts are not shipwrecked, they might require provisions but the real need belongs to the women and Hypsipyle speaks first to win over the man (793f.).

Connected with observations of similarities of shape are the correspondences of character, in particular between the Phaeacian princess and the Lemnian queen. Both women are royal maidens seeking/requiring a husband, though differently motivated in that aim.¹⁰⁶ Nausicaa can take a local man, which is an option no longer available to Hypsipyle. Nausicaa's thoughts were turned explicitly towards thoughts of marriage by Athena (*Od.* 6.33-5). Hypsipyle's thoughts are turned to the necessity of repopulating Lemnos by the cold realities of Polyxo's speech in the assembly scene (694-6).¹⁰⁷ Nausicaa masks her intention from her father (who nevertheless divines the erotic motivation) when requesting a wagon to go washing by the shore. Hypsipyle keeps her secret when spinning her alternate version of recent Lemnian history to Jason. The mapping of the exchange is not precise and roles can switch. Jason is persuaded just as Nausicaa is persuaded. On gender-reversed Lemnos, Hypsipyle can play Odysseus.

The Phaeacian princess is not, to be sure, her only character model. In the danger that the Lemnian women present to the undertaking, exemplified in the episode by the interactions of Jason and Hypsipyle, both readers (A. and C.) are reminded of two additional Odyssean females – the nymph Calypso and the witch Circe.¹⁰⁸ Yet, before

¹⁰⁶ For the learned reader C., there are lexical markers. E.g. the formulaic *Ναυσικάα, θυγάτηρ μεγάλιτορος Ἀλκινόοιο* (*Od.* 6.17) finds an echo in the juxtaposition of daughter and father marking Hypsipyle's first mention at A.R. 1.620-1, *Οἷη δ' ἐκ πασέων γεραροῦ περιφείσατο πατρός | Ὑψιπύλεια Θόαντος*. Daughters and kingly fathers share close proximity.

¹⁰⁷ That marriage persists in Nausicaa's mind is evident from her comments to her handmaidens post Athena's make-over of Odysseus (*Od.* 6.242-5) and her remarks to the hero regarding hearsay (*Od.* 6.276-88). In contrast, with nothing in the intervening narrative beyond a positive response from the group to Polyxo's proposal, Hypsipyle's offer of her father's position (827-9) might well startle Jason and the reader (on the topic of marriage providing motivation, both actorial and narratorial, for the sequence of events in Phaeacia, see de Jong 2001, cf. de Jong 2002: 52-3).

¹⁰⁸ Preceding her account to Jason, the experienced reader (C.) alert to lexical correspondences should note, for example, an echo in her 'charming words' (*μύθοισι αἰμυλίοισι*, 792) of Calypso's beguiling manner, and the phrase employed at *Od.* 1.56 in Athena's first direct speech (*μύθοισι αἰμυλίοισι* ~

commenting on well-established Circean links, it should be pointed out that the model for both shape and characters proposed here is the stage for another story-teller.

It is the palace of Alcinous that provides both setting and audience for Odysseus' own narration of his wanderings. Mori notes the Lemnian inversions of the character-narrator's perspective: a Phaeacian audience hear Odysseus' narration of his adventures from his point of view and he is sparing in set-up, resulting in the audience (and readers) experiencing 'fresh suspense as safe harbours breed unexpected horrors.'¹⁰⁹ On Lemnos, in contrast, the external narrator prepares the setting for an exclusively external audience and when the narrative returns to the fictive present, the action is focalised from the perspective of the women: '[He] rescripts the Odyssean formula (in which unsuspecting, civilised Greeks are ambushed by lawless barbarians) and recasts the Argonauts as invaders.'¹¹⁰

The inverted perspective, aligning the reader with the women as the episode gets underway, is a pertinent observation (though as noted already, I believe the narrative shape here modelled on *Od.* 6).¹¹¹ Exposition, however, does create suspense. The additional information encourages the reader to speculate. We have been introduced to the inhabitants, given background knowledge and led to anticipate a conflict – a conflict which then does not take place. It is a suspense built on direction (or misdirection as it turns out) rather than being lulled into complacency and shocked.¹¹²

αἰμυλίοισι λόγοισιν) – a complaint to Zeus concerning Calypso's detention of Odysseus on Ogygia (see 790-92n.). Lemnos offers the same threat.

¹⁰⁹ Mori 2008: 103, citing as examples *Od.* 9.105-51 (Cyclopes), 10.80-94 (Laestrygonians). The latter episode is of particular intertextual relevance to the Cycizus narrative and will be fully explored as a model in its own right.

¹¹⁰ Mori 2008: 103. On the fictive present, see n.89.

¹¹¹ Indeed Mori (2008: 104) makes another intertextual link with Phaeacia, likening the assembly scene to the Phaeacians' reception of Odysseus and drawing a parallel between the elders Echineus (*Od.* 7.155-66) and Polyxo (A.R. 668-96).

¹¹² I am not, in any case, convinced of the shock value of Odysseus' narration. The Cyclopes are described from the outset as ὑπερφιάλων ἄθεμίστων, *Od.* 9.106. The reader knows the Cyclops Polyphemus has been blinded by Odysseus and that this is the reason for Poseidon's enmity and Odysseus' continual wandering (*Od.* 1.68f.). As already noted, the Phaeacian analepsis (*Od.* 6.4f.) related the relocation from Hyperia to Scheria, motivated by the hostility of their former neighbours the Cyclopes. Both the primary and secondary narratees would be shocked (in fact, misdirected by expectations generated) if hostilities did not ensue.

ii. *Circe*

Again, Knight notes the similarities of ‘basic plot structure.’ Both islands are inhabited by women, a woman sleeps with the leader, and one of crew leads the call to depart.¹¹³ There are important differences too: Circe has magic and is the island’s sole inhabitant (transformed creatures excepting) and the Lemnian threat is dissipated quickly, at least in this account.¹¹⁴

In terms of narrative shape, the Circe model is (for me) most evident in the departure scene in which Heracles can be seen adopting the role of Eurylochus.¹¹⁵ However, these two characters have very different agendas. Heracles’ complaint is motivated by the quest and the pursuit of *kleos*, not solely with the *nostos* as is the case with Odysseus’ men.

Prior to this, the presence of Circe (and Calypso) begin to make their presence felt as character models for Hypsipyle when Jason approaches Myrine, his journey to the palace following in the intertextual footsteps left by Odysseus making his way to Circe’s hut. So Clauss likens the reaction of the Lemnian women to Jason to the fawning animals outside the hut and observes a first ‘verbal clue’ in the way Iphinoe invites Jason to sit (vv.786-90) and Circe’s greeting of Odysseus (*Od.* 10.312-5).¹¹⁶

Parallels persist in the women’s invitations to both hero and crew and in the dangers these women thus present to the voyages (See 790-92n.).

A distinction which should be observed between the two Homeric models is that the second is taken from Odysseus’ own narration and that distinction brings with it a reminder of another likeness. Odysseus is an internal secondary narrator though still intrusive in his narration. He uses evaluative language. The external primary Argonautic narrator is likewise subjective and intrusive and at this stage of the voyage is likewise a confident narrator. Odysseus passes judgements. The Argonautic narrator condemns the actions of the Lemnian women. There are, of course, limits to the comparison. For

¹¹³ Knight 1995: 162.

¹¹⁴ Knight 1995: 163 n. 4 notes the contrast with lost tragedies in which violence did occur. See Σ ad loc. On ‘frustrated warfare,’ Knight 1995: 115–7.

¹¹⁵ Knight 1995: 167. Some of the echoes noted by Knight that occur, at least prior to Jason’s approach to Lemnos, are less convincing.

¹¹⁶ Clauss 1993: 130–1.

example, the Argonautic narrator is omnispatial, capable of bird's eye views or teleporting to Olympus to describe the divine (though no Olympian scene occurs until Book 3 after he has called upon Erato for assistance). And the Argonautic narrator's persona is fixed temporally far in the future and removed from the fabula, the mythical events out of which his story is constructed. Still, similarities of subjectivity are worth reiterating (and it might also be added that just as Odysseus' narration covers four books of the Odyssey, our poem likewise is four books).

Eros on Lemnos

οὐ γάρ πώ ποτέ μ' ὦδε θεᾶς ἔρος οὐδὲ γυναικὸς
θυμὸν ἐνὶ στήθεσσι περιπροχυθεὶς ἐδάμασσε,
Il. 14.315-6

ἀλλ' ὑπέρτολμον ἀν-
δρὸς φρόνημα τίς λέγοι
καὶ γυναικῶν φρεσὶν τλαμόνων καὶ
παντόλμους ἔρωτας
ἄταισι συννόμους βροτῶν;
ξυζύγους δ' ὁμαυλίας
θηλυκρατῆς ἀπέρω-
τος ἔρως παρανικᾷ
κνωδάλων τε καὶ βροτῶν.
A. Ch. 594-601

The Odyssean character-models, Nausicaa, Circe and Calypso have been frequently and rightly used in analyses of Medea's intertextual Homeric debt. However, Hypsipyle employs them first and in doing so becomes an intratextual model for Medea.

Vian (1974: 24) writes, 'Si l'escala Lemnienne se présente comme *un simple intermède* [my italics] dans la narration, le poète a néanmoins réussi à lui donner une justification psychologique et esthétique. L'idylle passagère de Jason préfigure sa rencontre avec Médée. C'est Aphrodite qui mène le jeu dans les deux cas.' Vian is right to see the foreshadowing but unduly disparaging in describing the episode as a digression. Aphrodite, Eros and Jason combine to win Medea, the girl key to the quest and Hera's vengeance. It is on Lemnos that Jason realises his erotic appeal and is realised as a lover. It is key to developing the reader's awareness of this vital aspect of

his character and this shapes the reader's expectations for the Colchian episode. What is strongly foreshadowed here is confirmed by Phineus in Book 2 and the invocation of Erato in Book 3 is entirely appropriate.

The interactions between Jason and Medea in Colchis are read against the interactions between Jason and Hypsipyle on Lemnos. In Colchis, Eros is made manifest. There, the god himself enters the narrative and petitioned by his mother (herself petitioned by Hera) targets one particular woman. On Lemnos, the entire population has suffered from his influence. We encounter the women in his aftermath and in their subsequent narrative the all-conquering power of sexual desire (that subdued even Zeus, *Il.* 14.316 cited above) is persistent and pervasive.

Eros enters the Lemnian story early on, in the analepsis on recent history, as the sexual drive that afflicted the men with thoughts only for Thracian girls that brought about their own destruction. Eros is qualified by τρηχύς. He is something harsh, savage, prickly.¹¹⁷ It is the quality of desire evident in Colchis when the god himself takes aim at Medea (τετρηχώς, 3.276). As Hunter notes there, τετρηχώς is from the verb τράσσω but is also used by Apollonius in ways which suggest a link with τρηχύς.¹¹⁸ In Colchis before the volatile Eros shoots, the simile of a heifer stung by a gadfly conveys the tormenting effect that desire will have on Medea (3.277f.): 'Apollonius gives concrete form to the metaphorical frenzy of love found in earlier literature.'¹¹⁹ This love-madness occurs in the similar simile when Heracles raging at the loss of Hylas is compared to a bull stung by the same fly (1.1265f.).¹²⁰ Erotic desire is something that pierces and torments.

Within the confines of this commentary, I often treat the Lemnos and Cyzicus episodes as a doublet, and with regard to the erotic content, the relatively happy ending of the former, at which point the women though upset at the men's departure are successful in their primary objective and thus all's well that ends well (though see 849-52n.) can be contrasted with the tragic love of Cyzicus and Cleite, a doomed young

¹¹⁷ It is the adjective used by the Euripidean Jason of Medea's anger, τραχεῖαν ὀργήν (*E. Med.* 447).

¹¹⁸ Hunter 1989: 128.

¹¹⁹ Hunter 1989: 128.

¹²⁰ Cf. the wandering Io tormented by a gadfly, e.g. χρίει τις αὖ με τὰν τάλαιναν οἴστρος, *A. Pr.* 567, *ibid.* 877f. On the importance of Io in the cycle of migration, see 627-9n.). Outside of the god himself, the noun appears only once more in the narrative when report of Medea's love reaches Aeetes (4.213).

groom and his bride. However, at least in regard to the love theme, the episodes can be extended into a triptych with the Mysian episode and Hylas as a love-object whose abduction by the nymph causes a Heracles fiercely resistant to the erotic atmosphere on Lemnos to abandon the quest and *kleos* to search for his young charge.

After foregrounding the erotic content and before proceeding to the analysis of the text, I include here for my reader some brief comments on the obscene. On Jason's approach to Myrine, Thalmann (2011: 74) writes, 'When Jason enters the gates (πύλαι) of the city (1.782) and then the doors (θύραι) of Hypsipyle's house are thrown open to him (1.786-7), there is an *obvious suggestion* [my italics] of sexual penetration.'¹²¹ To which we might add the observation that he is also entering whilst holding his spear.

In the *Maculate Muse*, Henderson notes the popularity of doors and gates as metaphors for female genitalia. In Aristophanes' *Lysistrata*, the innuendo occurs in the context of denying men access e.g. ἐς τὴν θύραν κρηδὸν ἐμπέσοιμεν (Ar. *Lys* 309), ἀνοῖξαι τὰς πύλας | ταύτας (*Lys* 250) and ὑπὸ τῶν γυναικῶν ἀποκέκλημαι ταῖς πύλαις (*Lys* 423).¹²² There are many more such metaphors for those interested in digging. Lawall has likened Myrine to a brothel: 'The scene teems with sexual imagery, involving such symbols as plowing, sowing of seed, sleek cattle, and double gates. Even the name of the queen is symbolic: Hypsipyle, "High Gates."'¹²³ The Lemnian women, the narrator claims, prefer to plough themselves. Polyxo wonders who will do the ploughing when they grow old. Hypsipyle tells Jason how the women found the courage to receive the men no longer between the towers and points out the fertility of Lemnos' fields. She concludes her speech with a reminder to come inside the city. And following the explicit (though certainly not obscene) references to their sexual congress (See L8 below), the distraction to the voyage leaves Heracles frothing about all the ploughing of rich fields.

Henderson does include cautions to his impressive and exhaustive catalogue with regard to sexual metaphor in more elevated genres. For an agricultural society

¹²¹ I italicise, as whilst it's a possible reading, it is hardly the most obvious or the first thing that springs to mind (depending on the mind in question).

¹²² Henderson 1991: 137.

¹²³ Lawall 1966: 150.

‘comparison of the processes of fertility in the land with human sexuality is inevitable... the line that separates metaphorical obscenity in this class of comparisons from the many noble and exalted metaphors found in serious poetry is very often delicate and sometimes merely a matter of context.’¹²⁴

Still one’s mind need not be firmly in the gutter to read in Hypsipyle’s blush in Jason’s presence that she finds him physically attractive (and is thinking about sex).¹²⁵ And given the prominence of Aphrodite in the episode and the challenges she presents to interpretation,¹²⁶ one more sexual euphemism from Henderson’s collection appeals – such euphemistic usages are found ‘in paratragic passages or passages parodying the language and tone of other serious genres.’¹²⁷ Amongst those listed is the complaint of Cinesias, (Myrrhine’s [Myrine’s?] sexually frustrated husband in the *Lysistrata*) τὰ δὲ τῆς Ἀφροδίτης ἰέρ’ ἀνοργίαστά σοι | χρόνον τοσοῦτόν ἐστιν, *Lys* 898f.). Aphrodite’s rites being neglected by Lemnians ἐπὶ δηρὸν made her angry (see 614-5n.).

I do not suggest my readers approach Lemnos looking to dig dirt, but, if one is inclined to look for it, it can be found. Perhaps Phinney Jr. summarises this aspect best: evident sexual undertones but a decorous presentation.

¹²⁴ Henderson 1991: 46.

¹²⁵ See Henderson 1991: 4f. on shame words. His examples relevant here as Lemnian intertexts are the Odyssean Nausicaa and the Cyrene of Pi. *P.* 9.

¹²⁶ Phinney Jr. 1967: 331.

¹²⁷ Henderson 1991: 154.

L1. ‘Previously on Lemnos’ (609-632).

With the Argonauts’ arrival at Lemnos (Λῆμνον ἵκοντο, 608), the narrator switches focus, giving the reader background material of events that have occurred on Lemnos in the preceding year. Action in the narrative present is frozen. The pluperfect verb and accompanying time-phrase (δέδμητο παροιχομένῳ λυκάβαντι, 610) signal the narrative’s departure into the (recent) past.

A reconstructed fabula runs as follows: The Lemnian men preferred Thracian women captured in raids to their own wives. The Lemnian women then killed their husbands, the captured women and the entire male population. Hypsipyle was the exception and saved Thoas, her father. Subsequently the women adopted the now vacated male military and agricultural roles in their society. This is the sequence of events in summary; male action, female reaction, and the ensuing status quo on Lemnos at the time of the Argonauts’ arrival.

However, this backstory (an external analepsis) is focalised and narrated by the overt external primary narrator, and in addition contains within it the embedded focalisation of the women. It follows a linear sequence but its presentation, the story as we read it, is emotionally charged and contains both gaps and ambiguities of expression that complicate the interpretation of recent Lemnian history. The reader is being privileged with a knowledge that the arriving male characters do not (yet) possess but processing that information has its own challenges. When we read it, our interpretation will inform the reading of subsequent events in the narrative present. For the reader, and based upon the reader’s preferred reading, it will create anticipations of events yet to unfold.

Furthermore, possession of this information forces the reader to reconcile disparities (a dilemma not shared by the characters) when Jason is later offered an alternate version of events in Hypsipyle’s direct speech (See L7i below). How we interpret her exposition is dependent upon and complicated by (and might cause revision of) our interpretation of the information initially offered here. Moreover, it is not simply a case of juxtaposing the two versions in a paradigmatic analysis and neglecting the intervening narrative. The narrator’s account of the slaughter itself concludes v.619 and Hypsipyle’s speech begins v.793. In between, the reader witnesses

Hypsipyle in action, conducting the assembly and performing as a responsible and egalitarian leader open to suggestions (See 702-8n.). The narrator points out the deceitful nature of her speech before she addresses Jason, but in the preceding verse she is also a blushing maiden (see 790-92n.), and having observed the Lemnian dilemma expounded at length and having heard in the assembly what informs the women's agenda (fear of extinction), we see her also as a queen motivated by her people's needs (needs prioritised over her own initial suggestion motivated by fear of a bad reputation).

The Material

There is both selectivity and ambiguity evident in the narrator account when considered against potential source-material in the form of alternate versions of the myth of the Lemnian women. Σ ad 1.609-19a claims that the women neglected to honour Aphrodite and thus angered her. However, our narrator does not state unequivocally who failed to worship the goddess (See 614-5n.).

There is no mention in the text of the foul odour noted in Σ ad 1.609-19e with which Aphrodite afflicted the women (the Lemnian men sought sexual congress elsewhere because their own women had begun to reek). And not all the sources cited in the scholia agree on the agent of that affliction. Myrsilus in his *Lesbiaka* attributes the source of the foul smell to Medea and is contrasted with other recorders (τῶν δὲ ἄλλων ἱστορούντων, Σ ad 1.609-19e) who do attribute it to Aphrodite.¹²⁸

For Medea to have cursed the women, the episode would have to have occurred on the *return* from Colchis, as is the case in the Pindaric version (Pi. *P.* 4.252ff.).¹²⁹ Pindar, a poet who knew only too well the fluidity of myth,¹³⁰ first relates the colonisation of Thera by Euphemus' Lemnian descendants in the mouth of Medea prophesying whilst standing on Thera itself (*P.* 4.13-56), then, answering his own question as to the cause of the voyage (*P.* 4.70), he returns in his own Argonautic narrative to recount the sojourn on Lemnos (Λαμνιάν τ' ἔθνει γυναικῶν

¹²⁸ Berkowitz (2004: 45 n. 5) identifies this Myrsilus as Myrsilus of Methymna 'a predecessor of Antigonos of Carystus, who flourished at around 240 BC and is known to have cited Myrsilus on three occasions (*FGrHist* 477 F 2, 5, 6).'

¹²⁹ See Braswell 1988.

¹³⁰ See e.g. υἱὲ Ταντάλου, σὲ δ', ἀντία προτέρων, φθέγξομαι, Pi. *O.* 1.36.

ἀνδροφόνων, *P.* 4.252). Medea is present on Pindaric Lemnos but there is no smell.

Green (2008: 213–4) offers various speculations as to when or how the smell might have or must have dissipated (for the Argonauts are not repelled). They are speculations based on variants on what is nowhere explicit in the text and can only be tenuously inferred. Again, this is the elliptical nature of the text and its selective presentation working against the expectations of an experienced reader who has consulted sources and is compelled to find an answer – an answer in this instance to a question nowhere raised in the narrative but one prompted by a perceived absence. Let us say that A. is unaware of the curse. His expectations are unaffected because he has none regarding any stench. C. is expecting something and finds only a gap. This is not misdirection but C. (like Green) has to navigate between the presentation of this story and the consideration of the telling of stories because his knowledge of variants heightens his awareness of the narrator’s selectivity (See *Where, how, and when to begin*).

Moreover, if the Lemnian women were afflicted with some pungent curse and by Aphrodite, not all the scholia’s sources agree on who dishonoured the goddess. For example, the mythographer Asclepiades of Tragilus (fourth century BC) attaches blame and punishment to the men. Vian (1974: 27) pursues this and suggests Aeschylus wrote a *Lemnian Men* not a *Lemnian Women*.¹³¹ Now, if as readers we are conditioned to expect the comforting regularity of cause and effect and to anticipate in the story-world a pattern whereby crimes and transgressions are punished, then the Lemnian episode as we read it here presents problems (for A. and C.). However, before moving on to consider the manner of this particular presentation, it should be noted that the slaughter of the Lemnian men itself had considerable notoriety. The chorus of another play by Aeschylus illustrates the position of privilege which this crime held.

κακῶν δὲ πρεσβεύεται τὸ Λήμνιον
λόγῳ· γοᾷται δὲ δὴ πάθος κατὰ-
πτυστον· ἤκασεν δέ τις
τὸ δεινὸν αὖ Λημνίοισι πῆμασιν.
θεοστυγίῳ δ’ ἄχει

¹³¹ See Vian 1974: 27 n.2 and (on dramatic treatments of the *Lemnian Women* prior to Apollonius) 19-28 *passim*.

βροτῶν ἀτιμωθὲν οἴχεται γένος.
A. Ch. 631-6

A proverbial expression (available to A. and C.) voiced by the captive women of the *Choephoroi*, for which Vian enlists support from Herodotus: νενόμισται ἀνὰ τὴν Ἑλλάδα τὰσχέτλια ἔργα πάντα Λήμνια καλέεσθαι (Hdt. 6.138.4. On history repeating itself, see 849-52n.).¹³²

It is against this backdrop of conflicting causes and general abhorrence that the Apollonian narrator sets his own account. He proves to be reticent in making his own position emphatic and employs evaluative language which reveals sympathy alongside revulsion at the crime.

Ἐνθ' ἄμυδις πᾶς δῆμος ὑπερβασίῃσι γυναικῶν
νηλειῶς δέδμητο παροιχομένῳ λυκάβαντι. 610
Δὴ γὰρ κουριδίας μὲν ἀπηνήναντο γυναῖκας
ἄνδρες ἐχθήραντες· ἔχον δ' ἐπὶ ληιάδεσσι
τρηχὺν ἔρον, ὅς αὐτοὶ ἀγίνεον ἀντιπέρηθεν
Θρηκίην δηιοῦντες, ἐπεὶ χόλος αἰνὸς ὄπαζε
Κύπριδος, οὐνεκά μιν γεράων ἐπὶ δηρὸν ἄτισσαν. 615
A.R. 1.609-15

609-10: The narrator's first reference to the actions of the women is to label it ὑπερβασία, a trespass/transgression. On its usage in Homer, de Jong notes that with the exception of *Od.* 13.193 (Athena disguises Odysseus to prevent him being recognised until the suitors had paid for all their crimes πρὶν πᾶσαν μνηστῆρας ὑπερβασίην ἀποτίσαι), it is confined to speech only and that particular instance could be seen as Athena's embedded focalisation.¹³³ The Apollonian narrator is employing Homeric character-language. The context of its parallel semantic usage at *Il.* 3.107 when Menelaus urges the men not to violate oaths sworn by Zeus (ὑπερβασίῃ Διὸς ὅρκια δηλήσεται) calls to mind the theme of piety raised earlier in the Argonautic narrative in Idmon's *exemplum* of Otus and Ephialtes, who were slain by Apollo for daring to

¹³² See Vian 1974: 20.

¹³³ de Jong 2001: 323. Cf. Griffin 1986: 40.

assault Olympus (481-4, See 760-1n.). In the *Odyssey* it is used only of the suitors and the disloyal Melanthius, and always in the context of exacting payment for their transgressions. The Lemnian women kill the entire male population out of such a fear, v.619.

The adverb νηλειῶς adds to the emotional colouring. de Jong (2001: 225) notes that the adjective νηλής when used of persons is again Homeric character-language. It was Patroclus' rebuke to Achilles, νηλεές, οὐκ ἄρα σοί γε πατήρ ἦν ἱππότης Πηλεΐς (*Il.* 16.33). The three instances that occur in the *Wanderings* are all in the same phrase, in the same metrical position at line end and share the same subject, νηλεῖ θυμῷ - the pitiless heart of the Cyclops (*Od.* 9.272, 287, 368). This is not to attempt to suggest the experienced reader (C.) might be drawn to make a parallel between the monster and the women, but there are some relations.¹³⁴ The episode with the Cyclops is the first extended narration within Odysseus' first person account of his travels (*Od.* 9.105-566), following summary treatments of the Cicones (*Od.* 9.39-61) and Lotus Eaters (*Od.* 9.82-104). Moreover, the subjective elements evident already in the Lemnian backstory share common ground with the subjective style employed by Odysseus.¹³⁵ The emotional involvement is further underlined by δέδημητο. The evaluative adverb νηλειῶς qualifies a nuanced verb.

δαμάζω 'laying low, overcoming' is used of subjecting another to one's will. δέδημητο occurs in Nestor's narration of Aegisthus' subjugation of Mycenae (*Od.* 3.305). In the context of battle, it can be construed as 'kill,' e.g. of Hector χερσὶν Ἀχιλλῆος δάμασε γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη (*Il.* 22.446), but in relation to women it is also used of taking/taming a woman as wife, so e.g. Thetis speaking on her subjection to Peleus, ἐκ μὲν μ' ἀλλάων ἀλῖάων ἀνδρὶ δάμασσεν (*Il.* 18.432). The Lemnian women have transgressed (which should exact a payment) in piteously killing their men, but already there is a suggestion of more, that in that subjection these women have become themselves 'tamers' - an initial hint of the more explicit instances of Lemnian gender-reversal to come (See 627-9n.).

¹³⁴ Though on comparisons between the Cyclops and the Suitors/Odysseus himself, see Brelinski 2015.

¹³⁵ See de Jong 2001: 223f.

611-14: Following the summary condemnation of the opening two verses comes the explanatory Δὴ γὰρ – and what follows provides a motivation for the transgression; the rejection of the women by their husbands/victims in favour of captured concubines. From subject and active as transgressors and tamers, a shift further back in time returns the women to the status of discarded object, ἀπηνήναντο γυναῖκας. A clear opposition is laid out in the actions of the men - on the one hand μὲν ἀπηνήναντο γυναῖκας, on the other ἔχον δ' ἐπὶ ληιάδεσσι | τρηχὺν ἔρον. A spurning of wives set against a desire for captive women.

The metrical positioning of wives and husbands is emphatic. The women as object occupy the end of verse 611 and in enjambment opening verse 612 comes the subject ἄνδρες ἐχθήραντες, the husbands who hate them. And these are not simply their women but immediately following the explanatory particle v.611 comes the qualification κουρίδιος. The adjective κουρίδιος ‘lawful, wedded’ first occurs here in the poem (and recurs in Hypsipyle’s adaptation of this account, v.804). Otherwise, it has eight occurrences from Book 3 onwards, five times with ἄκοιτις and once with παράκοιτις (Medea’s dream, 3.624). It legitimises the women, which is not to say it sanctions their action, but the description of them as lawfully-wedded wives set against spear-won girls (See v.806), shares if not shifts blame. Hypsipyle will go on to make her own contrast (adopting a mother’s perspective) between legitimate and illegitimate children, vv.809-10.

The depiction of men rejecting their lawful wives with lethal consequences provides an ominous parallel for Jason who will speak of Medea as his lawful wife (4.194-5) but post-Argonautic narrative he will abandon her in Corinth. Whilst the term κουρίδιος does not occur within the vocabulary of Euripides’ *Medea*, the bare outline of rejection and retaliation apparent here should still serve to foreshadow for an attentive reader (A.) the tragic denouement, whilst for the experienced reader there is one pertinent lexical correspondence in the choice of participle ἐχθήραντες. The pragmatic Jason of the *Medea* explains that it was not out of hatred for her bed that he re-married but to ensure he could provide for his family: οὐχ, ἦ σὺ κνίζη, σὸν μὲν ἐχθαίρων λέχος | καινῆς δὲ νύμφης ἰμέρω πεπληγμένος, E. *Med.* 555-6. This in a speech in which he assigns to Cypris his success in Colchis (527-8), declares women

think they have everything if all's well in bed (569-70) and concludes with a wish that children be conceived without women, χούτως ἄν οὐκ ἦν οὐδὲν ἀνθρώποις κακόν (575). Jason in Corinth might have left his wife's bed, but not he claims due to being smitten by desire (unlike the Lemnian men who are entirely in the grip of Eros).

On ἀπηνήναντο, Mooney notes that the verb is 'used especially of refusing the intercourse of love,' citing *Od.* 10.297 where Hermes advises Odysseus not to refuse Circe's bed.¹³⁶ Here, the Lemnian women are being refused sex because the Lemnian men are getting it elsewhere, holding on to a savage love. The vocabulary is evocative, ἔρος qualified by the adjective τρηχύς (See 'Eros on Lemnos' above).¹³⁷ Eros' effect here, as it first enters the narrative for the first time, is to consume the Lemnian men with thoughts only for their concubines.

The relative clause vv.613-4 takes the reader a step back again, explaining where these women came from, taken in a raid on nearby Thrace. The added detail might draw the reader's attention to consideration of a fourth interested party who goes unmentioned. The Lemnian men have Lemnian women and Thracian women. What about the Thracian men? Focused on his account of the slaughter, the narrator neglects to mention them but when the narrative returns to its present, the possibility of retaliation is revealed to be a genuine concern for the Lemnian women (See 630-2n.). Beyond the immediate episode, the kidnapping of foreign women can be seen as foreshadowing a 'kidnapping' of Medea. The very situation, a cycle of raid and counter-raid, of the kidnapping of women, whilst it does not materialise in this episode (the women expecting Thracians get Argonauts instead), recalls Herodotus' account of the causes of war between Greeks and other peoples, in which Medea features, being taken from Aia in retaliation for the Phoenician abduction of Io (Hdt.1.2.2f.).¹³⁸

614-5: The narrator shifts from object of desire to the divine source driving the emotion

¹³⁶ Mooney 1912 ad loc. The bed of Hypsipyle, who presents a similar threat to the continuance of Jason's journey and whose palace he enters in a scene which echoes the Odyssean model (See 785-90n.), Jason, like his role-model, does not refuse. Cf. Knight 1995: 165.

¹³⁷ It is the adjective used by the Euripidean Jason of Medea's anger, τραχεῖαν ὀργήν (*E. Med.* 447).

¹³⁸ On the implicit linking of Greek and Egyptian cultures in the Herodotean proem, see Stephens (2003: 174-5): 'Io, as a Greek, became the ancestor of Egypt and Libya, while the Phoenician Europa became the eponymous mother of western Europe.' On the Herodotean proem in general, see Dewald 2012: 61-7, Bakker 2002, Wecowski 2004.

and a problematic cause. They were attended by the dread rage of Aphrodite. Wives scorned, husbands lusting for concubines, erotically-motivated violence – the narrative is firmly within her realm. According to Achilles, Fate and the troublesome rage of Hera overcame Heracles (ἀλλά ἐ μοῖρα δάμασσε καὶ ἀργαλέος χόλος Ἥρης, *Il.*

18.119).¹³⁹ And according to Nestor, Agamemnon tried but failed to placate Athena's terrible rage (ὥς τὸν Ἀθηναίης δεινὸν χόλον ἐξακέσαιτο, *Od.* 3.145).¹⁴⁰ Unlike μῆνις, χόλος is not exclusive to divinities and Achilles, nor exclusive to character-text, though weighted towards it as Griffin notes '[it] shows a clear preference for speech (47-13).'¹⁴¹ It occurs qualified by αἰνός in a simile, Hector's rage likened to a snake's (χόλος αἰνός, *Il.* 22.94), but a much closer correspondence, not only of lexis but of situation is found in a speech in a hymn.

In the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, Hermes reports to Hades the decision of Zeus to recall Persephone due to the famine caused by Demeter. Against the gods she holds a terrible rage (χόλου καὶ μήνιος αἰνῆς, *h.Cer* 350), she devises a terrible deed (μέγα μῆδεταί ἔργον, 351) and she does not mingle with the gods for she holds a terrible rage (ἦ δ' αἰνὸν ἔχει χόλον, 354). It is an emotionally-coloured and qualified phrase found in connection with wronged female divinities which here identifies the violent source which initiates violent action. Consequence and cause are being unravelled back in stages – men killed because the women were spurned, women spurned because the men lusted after Thracian women, Thracian women desired because Aphrodite was angry, Aphrodite angry because... οὐνεκά μιν γεράων ἐπὶ δηρὸν ἄτισσαν. The explanation provides the what someone did but not the who or why.

The subject of the verb can be either the men or the women (or both). Context suggests the men who were the previous subject, but a switch of subject to the wives who were the object of rejection is not an impossible construction. The explanation could look forward for its subject to the women who are addressed in the following

¹³⁹ Again the verb δαμάζω occurs in the context of female rage (Hera) with a male cause (the infidelity of her husband Zeus) and a male victim (the illegitimate son Heracles) who is *overcome*.

¹⁴⁰ In contrast to Agamemnon's failed appeasements to Athena, Aphrodite appears to take the initiative herself in helping the women (vv.8501-1) with sacrifices in her honour coming only after the fact in the summary treatment of the city celebrations (vv.857-60).

¹⁴¹ Griffin 1986: 43 on its occurrences in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*.

verse. It is not a gap, but it is not enough. Aphrodite is angry due to being deprived of her honours (γέρας being the part of a sacrifice given to the god), nor is the slight unique but ongoing, ἐπὶ δὴρὸν.¹⁴² And yet, in tracing back the sequence, the reader concerned with apportioning blame and wanting to know who so incited the goddess that the end result was the slaughter of the male population, finds no explicit subject for the verb. Information key to interpretation is being suppressed.

At a loss, the experienced reader can scour the *material*, though as noted above the possible sources are both fragmentary and inconsistent in apportioning blame. Mori, for example, drawing upon the first century AD mythographer Apollodorus as evidence, writes ‘The narrator explains that because the Lemnian women failed to honour Aphrodite...’¹⁴³ That explanation is not offered in the text. Similarly, Green (2008: 214) dismisses Asclepiades and the ‘indiscriminate feminist zeal’ of scholarship favouring male culpability: ‘Why are men sacrificing to Aphrodite in the first place? And why should Aphrodite in effect then punish the women for the men’s dereliction of duty?’ Why should the men all be killed for the women’s dereliction? Do men not honour Aphrodite as one of the Twelve?¹⁴⁴ Nothing in the text refers to a festival of Aphrodite exclusively attended by women. When the women eventually ‘entertain’ the Argonauts, the city unites in song and sacrifice to the gods, but Hephaestus and Aphrodite especially.

Ambiguities spark the debate, ambiguities caused by the (wilful) neglect of a single pronoun. And yet this is the nature of the narrative, one which has conditioned the reading experience of the attentive reader. Alexandros can look back to the poem’s beginnings; a feast for all the gods, Hera ignored, no explanation given.¹⁴⁵ As was evident in my analysis of the proem, the attentive reader of the *Argonautica* is forced to engage, is here pulled down towards revelation of the source only to find expectation thwarted and the matter, for the time being, left open. The ambiguity impacts on the

¹⁴² On γέρας as the choice cut offered at a *trapezoma*, see Vergados 2013: 341–2 (on the infant Hermes’ ‘sacrifice’ to the twelve Olympian gods). Cf. Clay 1989: 119–22. On the occurrence of ὄπαζε *h.Herm* 120, Vergados (2013) ad loc notes the verb ‘normally accompanied by κύδος or ὄλβος, i.e. precisely those things Hermes is after.’ Common in Homer at verse-end, e.g. κύδος ὀπάζει, *Il.* 8.141, at v.614 perhaps due to a perceived lack of κύδος, χόλος αἰνὸς attends in its place.

¹⁴³ Mori 2008: 103, citing *ibid.*: 102 n.59 Apollod. *Bibl.* 1.9.17.

¹⁴⁴ On the composition of the Twelve, see e.g. Long 1987.

¹⁴⁵ See *Where, how, and when to begin*. For an extant explanation of Pelias’ neglect, Hunter (1989: 12–13) casts forward again to Apollod. *Bibl.* 1.9.

reader's evaluation of the women, but, to persist with the Hera parallel, what the actions of Aphrodite do here, regardless of the cause of the slight, is provide Hera with a precedent when in Book 3 she visits the goddess of love for help with Medea.

Raising various questions as to the lack of logical coherence in the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, Parker (1991: 11) asks 'can such an "attentive reader" abandon so readily the natural impulse to try and make sense of the narrative that is recounted to him? Are unmotivated actions tolerable?' and answers by proposing that answers can be found in consequences rather than 'causes', the result rather than its motivation. To make a narratological distinction, what both Parker's observations and the Aphrodite-Hera comparison concern is the relationship between actorial motivation and narratorial motivation. The latter is 'the "why" of the story in terms of the aims and intentions of the narrator.'¹⁴⁶ The divine wrath of Aphrodite both recalls the situation in the proem and foreshadows Hera's conspicuous involvement in Book 3. In this instance, actorial motivation is working in tandem with narratorial as Hunter notes: 'It is significant that Aphrodite had punished the Lemnians for a similar slight to her (1.614-15), as this reinforces the justice of Hera's claim.'¹⁴⁷

ᾠ μέλεια ζήλοιο τ' ἐπισμυγερῶς ἀκόρητοι,
οὐκ οἶον σὺν τῇσιν ἐοὺς ἔρραισαν ἀκοίτας
ἀμφ' εὐνῇ, πᾶν δ' ἄρσεν ὁμοῦ γένος, ὥς κεν ὀπίσσω
μή τινα λευγαλέοιο φόνου τίσειαν ἀμοιβήν.
A.R. 1.616-19

616: The exclamatory apostrophe creates a connection as the narrator reaches inside the narrative to its characters.¹⁴⁸ The device is in itself subjective. This crossing of the boundary is a display of narratorial sympathy.¹⁴⁹ Whose side is the narrator on? Is he inconsistent in condemning the crime but pitying the women? In what sense can the women be considered 'miserable, of jealousy sadly insatiable'? It can be read as

¹⁴⁶ de Jong 2001: xvi.

¹⁴⁷ Hunter 1989: 104. Cf. M. Campbell 1983: 14 'Hera needs to place a real burden on Cypris' shoulders: this is the kind of bad behaviour that she herself will understand.'

¹⁴⁸ On apostrophe, see Richardson 1990: 171-4, A. D. Morrison 2007: 91-2, Block 1982, Block 1986.

¹⁴⁹ This reader is reminded of Vergil's exclamatory intrusion into the narrative of Silenus' song to comment on Pasiphae's lust for the bull, 'a uirgo infelix, quae te dementia cepit!' (*Ecl.* 6.47).

sympathy for past actions, for the victims of an all-consuming emotional state that compelled them to the slaughter. Or the exclamation could be considered proleptic, an anticipation of punishment for the slaughter, be that either a divine retribution for kin-slaying or the threat posed by raiders now that their own manpower has been obliterated.¹⁵⁰ The full extent of the Lemnian women's plight (threat of extinction and/or subjugation) will be elucidated for them and the reader by Polyxo in the assembly scene (677f.). The narrator's exclamation shows sympathy but is so tersely formulated that its motivation remains unclear and its interpretation might have further complications.

Morrison observes a neglected model for the narrative device in the emotional exclamations of Bacchylides, but in relation to this particular instance finds that emotion potentially subverted. Not only is the emotional tone surpassed in Hypsipyle's later account (thus causing the reader to reconsider just how involved the narrator might be at this point after all) but additionally the content returns us to the same speech from the *Medea* mentioned above and Jason's comments (*E. Med.* 569-73) on Medea's sexual jealousy: 'The narrator's description of the situation of the Lemnian women recalls Jason's own (future) view of Medea's behaviour. This further marks the narrator of the *Argonautica* out as a male, and as a male commenting on the behaviour of women.'¹⁵¹ Is it sympathy then or exasperation?

617-19: The elaboration on the extent of the killing continues to be subjectively narrated. The men are not simply killed but shattered. ῥαίω 'break' or 'shatter' creates a vivid image of their destruction and the verb is commonly used of shipwrecks, e.g. *Od.* 8.569 (Nausithous' prophecy that Poseidon would destroy the Phaeacian ships). With this usage it occurs A.R. 2.1112, the shattering of the ship carrying the sons of Phrixos. Thus George considers the verb a reminder: 'The treatment the women rendered their pirate-husbands is described in a term reminding one of the ungentle nature of the men's own occupation. Once again attention is divided, this time between the

¹⁵⁰ On proleptic narratorial statements, see e.g. de Jong (2014: 58): 'It is one of the perennial themes of narrative to contrast the more restricted focalization of the characters entangled in the action with the superior understanding of the primary narrator-focalizer recounting it.'

¹⁵¹ A. D. Morrison 2007: 286. See *ibid.* 284-6, esp. the possible pun in v.616 (ἀκόρητοι ~ ἀ-κόρη 'un-womanly' as suggested in Hunter 1993: 112 n. 49).

odiousness of the women's crime and that of the men's pursuits which led to the crime.'¹⁵²

On this reading, the narration of the action contains implicit commentary on the action that prompted it. And within the imagery is a threat. Their sea-faring husbands were first tamed, then wrecked, and another ship is about to moor at Lemnos. In Hypsipyle are echoes of both Circe and Calypso, those enchanting detainers of Odysseus. Is the Argo in danger of being wrecked? Is the *Argonautica*? The erotic metaphor/threat continues in the location of the wreckage, ἄμφ’ ἐὺνῃ. The phrase has been translated both causally, e.g. ‘for making love’ (Race), ‘on account of their marriage beds’ (Seaton) and localising ‘in their beds’ (Ardizzoni, Vian).¹⁵³ The construction is problematic, but a double-meaning (killed for their love-making and whilst in the act and/or location) is not impossible to construe. What is missing is any details as to how such the act was orchestrated. The entire male population and all the slave-girls are summarily and efficiently killed in a bed and two verses.

Οἷη δ' ἐκ πασέων γεραροῦ περιφείσατο πατρός	620
Ὑψιπύλεια Θόαντος ὃ δὴ κατὰ δῆμον ἄνασσε·	
λάρνακι δ' ἐν κοίλῃ μιν ὕπερθ' ἄλως ἦκε φέρεσθαι,	
αἶ κε φύγῃ. Καὶ τὸν μὲν ἐς Οἰνοίην ἐρύσαντο	
πρόσθεν, ἀτὰρ Σίκινόν γε μεθύστερον αὐδηθεῖσαν	
νῆσον, ἐπακτήρες, Σικίνου ἄπο, τὸν ῥα Θόαντι	625
Νηιάς Οἰνοίῃ Νύμφη τέκεν εὐνηθεῖσα.	
A.R. 1.620-26	

620-1: In the strict female versus male dichotomy that the Apollonian narrator maps out in this backstory, Hypsipyle bridges the divide. The Odyssean Nausicaa was depicted as exceptional amongst her handmaidens in her beauty, but amongst the Lemnian women Hypsipyle is exceptional in action: ‘She alone out of all saved her aged father.’¹⁵⁴ The

¹⁵² George 1972: 53.

¹⁵³ Race 2008, Seaton 1967, Ardizzoni 1967, Vian 1974.

¹⁵⁴ *Od.* 6.102-9 (Artemis), 149-68 (Odysseus' speech). Nausicaa's beauty is well-established. Despite the erotic charge on Lemnos, the attractiveness of its women goes unmentioned in the narrative (unless we read this as reticence to relate their stink!). What appeal we ascribe to Hypsipyle is by convention and the reflection of her models – we imagine her as beautiful because Nausicaa, Calypso and Circe are beautiful, because epic heroines are beautiful. The one beauty who is singled out on Lemnos is Jason.

subject is suspended then introduced in enjambment and, for a brief moment, the reader is invited to reflect on her uniqueness before the narrator names daughter and father together - Hypsipyle and Thoas.¹⁵⁵

Then there is an expansion on Thoas' position, 'he who lorded over the people.' It is a position she usurped. Father and daughter are linked several times in the episode: Hypsipyle, daughter of Thoas wears his armour (637-8); she sits in the assembly on her father's seat (667); Iphinoe tells the Argonauts that Hypsipyle, daughter of Thoas sent her (712-3). The reader is constantly reminded of the man she saved and replaced. It is only after her own speech to Jason that the father disappears from the text. His later removal from her proximity perhaps indicating some form of 'closure' for the Lemnian women, a crime undiscovered and a crisis averted. In the beginning of the episode, she is very much her father's daughter.

The narrator does not here explicitly state that she now rules the island but invites the reader to make the connection, just as the Argonauts do following Iphinoe's announcement (See 717-20n.). Do the other women know how exceptional she is? The inference would be no, or else her being part of the community would be problematic. Again there is a gap.

623: After describing how she sent her father to sea in a casket, the narrator volunteers her motivation, αἶ κε φύγη 'in the hope that he might escape.'¹⁵⁶ However, her chosen method of salvation is hopeful at best and can be seen as having quite the opposite intention, e.g. Clauss (1993: 113): 'Fathers traditionally exposed children on the sea, especially unmarried daughters, discovered to be pregnant. The motive was to escape the pollution of parricide while at the same time to do away with their children.' Such a reading recalls the myth of Danae and the infant Perseus cast adrift by her father Acrisius, λάρνακι | ἐν δαιδαλέῳ.¹⁵⁷

¹⁵⁵ The father does occur by name in the *Iliad*, and in connection to Lemnos: ἔξ' Ἀθόω δ' ἐπὶ πόντον ἐβήσετο κυμαίνοντα, | Λῆμνον δ' εἰσαφίκανε πόλιν θείοιο Θόαντος, *Il.* 14.229-30 & στήσαν δ' ἐν λιμένεσσι, Θόαντι δὲ δῶρον ἔδωκαν, *Il.* 23.745.

¹⁵⁶ See Vian 1974: 21 for a reconstruction of the fragments of Euripides' *Hypsipyle*. Set twenty years after the visit of the Argonauts, Thoas makes a return to Lemnos. As a result of this revelation, the women exile Hypsipyle. It is in Nemea where the exiled queen relates an account of the murder of the Lemnian men. See Bond 1969, Stat. *Theb* 5.200-39 and L4i.

¹⁵⁷ Simonides 543.1-2 *PMG*, on which see e.g. Page 1951, D. A. Campbell 1982: 389-92, Hutchinson

For the suspicious reader, it is a plausible reading and noting its inversion here (the daughter disposes of the father in a way which avoids guilt) adds to the instances of Lemnian gender-reversals: the daughter takes her father's throne; the daughter acts as the father; the father acts as the daughter/infant.

The reader has a choice; accept a superficial reading and the role of Hypsipyle as saviour or privilege the mythological material and take a more subversive view of the daughter's actions. Doubt as to who dishonoured Aphrodite is due to a reticent narrator, doubt as to how to read Hypsipyle is due to the curious nature of the rescue and awareness of similarities to a tradition with a contrary motivation. The methods are different but the result the same in that the reader cannot make judgements with certainty. This exposition generates expectations of how the narrative present will proceed once women and Argonauts converge but those expectations are multiple, conflicting and punctuated by question marks.

623-6: From contrasting Hypsipyle's action with that of the women as a whole, the narrator digresses into a Thoan narrative, expanding upon the fate of the one Lemnian male (Καὶ τὸν μὲν, 623) to set up a second contrast with developments on Lemnos post-slaughter (Τῆσι δὲ, 627). Sicinus is not his destination in all accounts, and in some he does not escape the slaughter, but in this narrative the old king is not only rescued but goes on to have descendants. The narrator offers the episode's first *aition* to confirm his version: the island gained its name from the son Oenoe bore to Thoas.¹⁵⁸

The word-order at vv.623-5 is, as Mooney comments, 'very involved.'¹⁵⁹ 'And they dragged him to Oenoe, as it was called then, though later it was called Sicinus, the island, fishermen did.' The narrator's interest in the names of the island and how they came by them takes precedence over the anonymous rescuers. *Aitia* are frequently

2001: 306–20. For a similar mythological narrative, see D.S. 5.62: Rhoeo, impregnated by Apollo, is cast adrift by an irate father Staphylus in a λάρναξ but washes ashore at Delos and gives birth to a baby boy. It is also, however, the lexical choice of intentional salvation, the arks of Deucalion and Noah, on which see Feldman 1998: 28.

¹⁵⁸ Killed by Lemnian women (Apollod. *Bibl.* 3.6.4., hypothesis ad Pi. *Nem.* p.424 Boeckh), Sikinus the destination in Xenagoras (*FGrHist* 240 F 31), alternately the land of the Taurians (Val. Fl. 2.242-310, Hyg. *F.* 120) or Chios (Stat. *Theb.* 5.284-91). These sources, the majority much later, are noted in Clauss 1993: 112.

¹⁵⁹ Mooney 1912 ad loc.

employed throughout the poem to note remnants and reminders of the Argonauts' journey, but here within the backstory, a Lemnian aition, more precisely a male Lemnian aition.¹⁶⁰ In effect, Oenoe is colonised, made male, becomes Sicinus.¹⁶¹ The colonisation is achieved through the son, and in this apparent digression as the narrator indulges his scholarly interest, the reader is being nudged towards the consideration of descendants.

It is nowhere explicit in the backstory and left for Polyxo to spell out in assembly (683f.) and confirm for the reader what is being suggested here. In the short term, Thoas' activities post-slaughter are being set against those of the women, but there is a long term juxtaposition being put in play here - a parallel between descendants and colonies. For Thoas the results are almost immediate. For the Lemnian women and reader the parallel achievement is much longer in the making. The penultimate action of the Argonauts in the poem is Euphemus throwing the clod of earth given him in Libya by Triton into the sea and raising the island Calliste (4.1756f.). This island, the narrator there informs us, was in later times colonised by Euphemus' Lemnian descendants: Καλλίστην ἐπὶ νῆσον, ἀμείψατο δ' οὔνομα Θήρης | ἔξ ἔθεν. ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν μετόπιν γένητ' Εὐφρήμοιο, '[Theras led them] to the island Calliste, and changed the name to Thera after himself. But these things happened after Euphemus' (4.1763-4).¹⁶² The latter renaming mirrors the former. The colonisation of Sicinus is narrated within an analepsis (a prolepsis within an analepsis) introducing the Lemnian women, and three books later in a prolepsis casting far beyond the fabula but before narrator-time we read the results of the union of these women and our heroes.

The Lemnian women and the Argonauts together are the ancestors of a people who will go on from Thera to Libya and found Cyrene.¹⁶³ Stephens (2003: 180) notes the divergences of the Apollonian version from that of Pindar in *Pythian* 4: 'What is

¹⁶⁰ On *aitia* in the *Argonautica*, see Fusillo 1985: 116–42, Goldhill 1991: 321–33, A. D. Morrison 2007: 273–4.

¹⁶¹ For Pavlock (1990: 46) 'a reinforcement of male supremacy.' On travel *aitia* in the *Argonautica*, see Harder 1994.

¹⁶² See the similar conclusion to the colonisation narrative in Hdt. 4.148.4 τῇ δὲ νήσῳ ἐπὶ τοῦ οἰκιστέω Θήρα ἢ ἔπωνυμίη ἐγένετο. Cf. Pi. *P.* 4.1–63, Call. *H.* 2.71–9.

¹⁶³ See Vian 1974: 23. See Mori 2008: 40 'from an aetiological perspective, the ultimate consequences of the stay on Lemnos outweigh even the recovery of the Golden Fleece... Jason's quest is merely the heroic frame for what really matters: the establishment of a Greek community in northern Africa.' On the Ptolemaic ramifications, see e.g. Stephens 2003.

accidental in Pindar [Medea prophesies that the clod washes ashore at Thera] becomes a deliberate action to accomplish divine will [at Jason's instruction, Euphemus throws the clod into the sea and *creates* Thera].¹⁶⁴ Out of Africa an island is born to be colonised by Euphemus' descendants who will return from there to Africa. This cyclic (and divinely motivated) colonial narrative is nowhere made explicit in the Lemnian episode, despite the fundamental role the women have as ancestors of future Therans, and whose own agenda (once the alternative is made plain by Polyxo) is driven by a need to procreate that ensures there will be descendants to carry out future colonisations. Yet, rather than overtly mention or even foreshadow the parallel to Thoas and Sicinus, the narrator immediately turns instead to an account of how the women were managing just fine without men.

Τῇσι δὲ βουκόλιαί τε βοῶν χάλκειά τε δύνειν
 τεύχεα πυροφόρους τε διατμήξασθαι ἀρούρας
 ῥήτερον πάσῃσιν Ἀθηναίης πέλεν ἔργων
 οἷς αἰεὶ τὸ πάροιθεν ὁμίλεον. Ἀλλὰ γὰρ ἔμπης 630
 ἦ θαμὰ δὴ πάπταινον ἐπὶ πλατὺν ὄμμασι πόντον
 δείματι λευγάλεω, ὅποτε Θρήικες ἴασι.
 A.R. 1.627-32

627-9: Not only have the women taken on the roles of the men they have killed but, the narrator tells us, they prefer them to their former tasks. These women are no longer wives and weavers but farmers and soldiers. The image of them donning bronze armour (χάλκειά τε δύνειν | τεύχεα) adds an Iliadic colouring - the phrase τεύχεα ποικίλα χαλκῷ ('the bronze of his crafted armour') occurring e.g. *Il.* 12.396 (Sarpedon kills Alkmaon), 13.181 (Teukros kills Imbrios), 14.420 (Hector struck by Aias' boulder). The precise Homeric formula is avoided but in the arming and the bronze, these women are presented in the posture of Iliadic warriors. The initial cluster of images is defiantly masculine, of the women rolling up their sleeves to herd, fight, plough but it is in the comparison and the accompanying comment on rejected activities that the real seeds of

¹⁶⁴ Stephens notes the lack of any reference to the Battiades or Cyrene (fundamental in the context of the Pindaric ode to Arcesilas IV of Cyrene), suggesting (2003: 180) Apollonius has made Euphemus and his descendants 'mythological analogues for Greeks in general who were destined to colonise Libya'. Cf. on the Pindaric version *ibid.* 179: 'the usual structural hierarchies are fully operative: male over female, Greek over barbarian, and culture over nature.'

the Lemnian episode are being planted.

Ἀθηναίης πέλεν ἔργων refers to weaving (Σ ad 1.629 explains as ‘working the loom and other women’s tasks’) and the allusive manner of the reference requires the reader to pause and grasp the meaning. However, once that basic groundwork is done, the process of making connections is activated in the attentive reader – comparing and contrasting the women with the divinity, with her dual roles as warrior goddess and instructor of domestic duties. Putting together Athena, women, weavers and warriors triggers a whole series of associations: character-models, colonial/erotic narratives, metaphor and theme.

In what follows, the numerical demarcations are not indicative of a required reading order, and each of my readers is free to rank as they see fit but all the echoes listed (woman’s Hesiodic prototype, Homeric heroines, Herodotean Amazons and a Pindaric huntress) are, I believe, being put into play and persist to a greater or lesser degree throughout the developing Lemnian narrative.

1. To prefer male occupations to weaving is to reject Athena in her role as the instructor of women. The *locus classicus* for this is Hesiod’s *Works and Days* and the narrative of Pandora’s creation. At Zeus’ command, Athena taught Pandora weaving (αὐτὰρ Ἀθήνην | ἔργα διδασκῆσαι, πολυδαίδαλον ἱστὸν ὑφαίνειν, Hes. WD 63-4). The intertextual link to woman’s Hesiodic nature is confirmed by the presence within the Lemnian episode of the four gods commissioned by Zeus to create Pandora.

Hephaestus her craftsman appears by name in the summary of the felicitous coming together of women and heroes (v.851) though already by that point he has an intertextual presence generated by the ecphrastic description of Jason’s cloak (See L6 below). And, casting back just prior to the Lemnian backstory (vv.601f.), Clauss proposes an appealing intertext (and associated gender-reversal) in the god’s recollection of his Lemnian crash-landing (*Il.* 1.592-94): ‘both Hephaestus and the Argonauts spend an entire day travelling to Lemnos and arrive at sunset; both travel to Lemnos from a mountain (Athos and Olympus); and both are cared for by the Sintian people.’¹⁶⁵

¹⁶⁵ Clauss 1993: 103. See *ibid.*: 102-4. Female Lemnians replace male Sintian nurses. Argonautic

His wife Aphrodite is, of course, the divinity driving the narrative. Woman's ability to instil painful yearning and limb-gnawing cares (Aphrodite's gifts to Pandora, Hes. WD 65) already evident in the prickly lust that afflicted the Lemnian men for Thracian women (τρηχὺν ἔρον, 613) and later manifested in the sweet desire that ensures prolonged love-making of Lemnian women with the Argonauts (γλυκὺν ἵμερον, 850). Hermes is referenced in connection with his son, the diplomatic Aethalides (vv. 642-3). Hypsipyle's artful and persuasive speech to Jason which succeeds in its objectives (the Argonauts enter Myrine and remain ignorant of the 'Lemnian Deed') owes more than a verbal echo to the qualities Hermes placed in Pandora's heart: ψεύδεά θ' αἰμυλίους τε λόγους καὶ ἐπὶ κλοπὴν ἦθος, Hes. WD 78. The women might have ostensibly rejected weaving a web of cloth but not a web of words.

In the Hesiodic narrative, Athena is also responsible for dressing Pandora, and not in bronze armour (ζῶσε δὲ καὶ κόσμησε θεὰ γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη, Hes. WD 72). It is in the context of weaving and clothing that she next appears in an analepsis on the cloak she made for Jason with which he dresses himself in a reworking of several Homeric arming scenes (See L6 below). This is another obvious gender-reversal in that Jason uses for *cosmetic* effect an object whose manufacturing now (allegedly) disinterests the women. Given the effect the cloak has on the women (vv. 783-4), some suspicion must fall in hindsight on the validity of the narrator's claim.

2. Athena also stands at the head of the list of epic weavers. In the *Odyssey*, she appears again as instructor - of Penelope (*Od.* 2.116-7), of Phaeacian women (7.110-11), of the daughters of Pandareus (20.72). Amongst mortal weavers in Homer, Andromache and Penelope stand as paradigms of the dutiful wife; the former weaving when news came of Hector's death (*Il.* 22.440-6), the latter weaving a shroud for Laertes to thwart the suitors' advances (*Od.* 2.85-142). The Lemnians have discarded weaving along with

intervention ensures the restoration of the male line via the further intervention of this god's wife, Aphrodite (See 849-52n.). He is, however, wrong to downplay the relevance of the mention of Sintians *Od.* 8.294 as well as *Il.* 1.594. The latter text is more apposite to their parallel arrivals but the wider *Odyssey* 8 intertext, the song of Ares and Aphrodite in its entirety, teased in the early Sintian connection (οἶχεται ἐς Λῆμνον μετὰ Σίντιας ἀγριοφώνους ~ Σιντηίδα Λῆμνον ἴκοντο) becomes much the more dominant intertext, evident in the ecphrasis and in suggesting plausible actorial motivation for Aphrodite's restoration of Lemnos (See L8).

their men.

However, Antinous' account in the Ithacan assembly contains not only comment on Penelope's exceptional skill at the loom (*Od.* 2.116-32) but how she used it to trick and manipulate; ἐξ οὗ ἀτέμβει θυμὸν ἐνὶ στήθεσσι νῆαρχα (2.90), ἡ δὲ δόλον τόνδ' ἄλλον ἐνὶ φρεσὶ μερμήριξε (2.93), ὥς τριέτες μὲν ἔληθε δόλῳ καὶ ἔπειθεν Ἀχαιοὺς (2.106).

This emphasis on cunning should remind C. of a further Homeric weaver whose self-characterisation as a manipulative bitch ('δᾶερ ἐμεῖο κυνὸς κακομηχάνου ὀκρυοέσεως, *Il.* 3.344) evokes the κύνεόν τε νόον Hermes placed in Pandora (*Hes.* WD 67). Helen is an adulteress and a problematic abductee, but she is still a weaver and one whose handiwork in *Iliad* 3 provides a model for Jason's cloak (See L6 below). The Helen of the *Odyssey* also offers an example of how to spin a tale and remodel one's public image, casting herself (whilst sat with distaff and wool!)¹⁶⁶ as helper in her narration of Odysseus in Troy (*Od.* 4.239-64) and blaming Aphrodite for her adultery.¹⁶⁷

Coming full-circle, there is no-one better at spinning tales than the Odyssean Athena, evident in her own disguises and 'lying tales,' in her claim to Odysseus ἐγὼ δ' ἐν πᾶσι θεοῖσι | μήτι τε κλέομαι καὶ κέρδεσιν (*Od.* 13.298-9) and in her offer of collaboration with him to *weave* a plan to ensure the suitors' demise, ἵνα τοι σὺν μῆτιν ὑφίηνω, *Od.* 13.303. Love and manipulation will be key to winning over Medea and ensuring success in Colchis. Yet it is on Lemnos that the language of δόλος and μῆτις arises and that the efficacy of fabrication is first demonstrated (see L4 below).¹⁶⁸

3. The act of rejection itself, however, and preference for arms invokes another group of women. Herodotus' Amazons are explicit in their disinterest of domesticity, ἔργα δὲ

¹⁶⁶ Cf. Arete spinning by the hearth in Nausicaa's proleptic description, *Od.* 6.305-7.

¹⁶⁷ On Helen's story and her Aphrodite-sent ἄτη, see de Jong 2001: 102 'the argument is often used as "extenuating circumstances" in apologies or excuses.' Telemachus buys into it, telling Penelope how he'd met Helen, ἥς εἵνεκα πολλὰ | Ἀργεῖοι Τρῳέες τε θεῶν ἰότητι μόγησαν, *Od.* 17.118-9. Likewise, Jason will accept Hypsipyle's account, an account in which she relates the ἄτη cast into the men by Aphrodite (v.803, see L7 below). On Helen's self-presentation versus criticism in her absence, see de Jong 2001: 97. Cf. Olson (1989: 388): 'None of this is really inconsistent with the picture of Helen presented in *Il.* 3.121-242, 383-447 esp. 164f; 173-5; 426-36.' On ἄτη, see e.g. Wyatt Jr. 1982.

¹⁶⁸ Hutchinson 1988: 117-20.

γυναικῆια οὐκ ἐμάθομεν, Hdt. 4.114.3). In the story he recounts (Σαυροματέων δὲ πὲρ ὧδε λέγεται, 4.110ff.), the Amazons are initially in conflict with Scythian men whose name for them is glossed as ἀνδροκτόνοι.¹⁶⁹ One group of martial man-killers recalls the other.

After a protracted stand-off, the Scythians upon inspecting the bodies on the battlefield discover that their adversaries are women, want to have their children and after negotiations, both sides opt for making love over war. The narrative concludes with Scythians and Amazons emigrating together and becoming one people. This is another foundation story, another colonial narrative. And yet, their female descendants never forget their roots - riding, fighting and dressing like men. An Amazon girl is forbidden from marriage until she has killed a man in battle (οὐ γαμῆται παρθένος οὐδεμία πρὶν ἂν τῶν πολεμίων ἄνδρα ἀποκτείνῃ· αἱ δὲ τινὲς αὐτέω καὶ τελευτῶσι γηραιαὶ πρὶν γήμασθαι, οὐδυνάμεναι τὸν νόμον ἐκπλήσσαι, Hdt. 4.117).

There are clear correspondences and inversions if the reader accepts the invitation to view the Lemnian women as nascent Amazons: Scythia the setting is geographically adjacent to Thrace; a race of armed women are about to come into contact with a band of men; on Lemnos it will be the women motivated by need for children; the description of Polyxo and her attendant spinsters in the assembly scene (vv.668-72) recalls the final clause of the Herodotean account and the future of girls who fail as Amazons. The Lemnian women are being set up as Amazons but also set up to fail *en masse*.¹⁷⁰

4. Recognition of my fourth intertext is, as in the case of the Amazons, dependent upon the warrior-woman analogy and an awareness of the covert colonial narrative already

¹⁶⁹ Τὰς δὲ Ἀμαζόνας καλέουσι Σκύθαι Οἰόρπατα, δύναται δὲ τὸ οὔνομα τοῦτο κατὰ Ἑλλάδα γλῶσσαν ἀνδροκτόνοι· οἱὲν γὰρ καλέουσι ἄνδρα, τὸ δὲ πατὰ κτείνειν, Hdt. 4.110.1.

¹⁷⁰ As the Argo proceeds East, there is an expectation that the crew will encounter the genuine Amazons that the present Lemnian facsimile teases. This is a misdirection. Amazons do enter the narrative in Phineus' speech outlining the geography of the Black Sea (2.373-4) and the temple they built on the island of Ares (2.385-7), which will be visited by the Argonauts (2.1169f.). Elsewhere, the reader encounters them in narratorial asides on the divergent adventures of Heracles once he has left the ship (2.911-4, 964-9). The best tease of all is the narrator's explanation that but for a contrary wind, they would have actually fought the Themiscyean Amazons (2.985-1001).

set in motion. In *Pythian* 9, composed for Telesicrates of Cyrene, Pindar narrates the ‘humorous and mildly erotic’ myth of Apollo’s love for the Thessalian huntress Cyrene.¹⁷¹ The object of the god’s amour is a maiden with no interest in weaving (ἀ μὲν οὔθ’ ἰστῶν παλιμβάμους ἐφίλησεν ὁδούς, *P.* 9.18) but in spears, swords and hunting wild beasts (βουσὶν εἰρήναν παρέχοισα πατρώαις, *P.* 9.23). Her keeping safe the herds is echoed in the description of the Lemnian women as βουκόλιαί τε βοῶν, v.627. Apollo takes the huntress to Libya, has a son Aristaeus by her and establishes her in her city, Cyrene.

The Cyrene myth is followed by a shorter mythological narrative in which is related the race at Argos for the forty-eight unwed daughters of Danaus (*P.* 9.112-6). The Danaids were an intertextual presence from the moment Lemnian women slaughtered their own husbands, and Danae, grand-daughter of Danaus, evoked in Hypsipyle’s setting her father adrift.

The family of Danaus is a crucial link between Greece and Egypt. Stephens summaries the migration patterns thus: ‘the Greek Io wanders to Egypt where she becomes the ancestor of Libya, Danaus, Aegyptus and Phoenix. In a later generation, Danaus, with his daughters, returns to Argos. To this a third migration could sometimes be attached: Danaus’s great grand-daughter was Danae, who, like her ancestor Io, attracted Zeus’s attention and, impregnated by a shower of gold, bore Perseus, who eventually returned to Egypt and Ethiopia.’¹⁷²

And so another foundation myth is potentially echoed then but it is an alternate foundation in which no clods of earth are involved and no link is made to the Euphemid/Battiad line.¹⁷³

630-2: Griffin’s notes on these final verses of the analepsis well observe their subjectivity: ‘ἔμπης, the emphatic word of contradiction, and the emotional ἦ introducing a narrated fact; even the word “often” (θαμά comes in Homer eight times in speech, once in narrative: πολλάκι 15 times in speech, twice in narrative): all these

¹⁷¹ Verity and Instone 2007: 165.

¹⁷² Stephens 2003: 25.

¹⁷³ See A. D. Morrison 2012: 120–1.

tiny points help Apollonius' description to be subjectively coloured, un-Homeric, on the way to the manner of Virgil.¹⁷⁴

In his exposition the primary narrator has shown himself to be both omnitemporal and omnispatial. The narrative shape has models in the Homeric primary narrator's Phaeacian story. The texture, however, highly subjective throughout, has much in common with character-text. Events of the fabula are being focalised by a narrator with a personality, a voice with an emotional interest giving the reader a filtered and selective presentation of action.¹⁷⁵

He tells us that their eyes are constantly gazing out to sea 'in miserable fear.' Is this his focalisation showing sympathy for a group of women (despite his evaluation of the slaughter) with their current predicament? Or is it the focalisation of the women as they scan the sea for Thracians, a focalisation he persists with post-analepsis? The verb παπταίνω indicates that this is their focalised emotional state, and Mooney (1912: 109) notes the indicative ἴασι expresses certainty. It is not a question of *if* but *when* the attack will come. Yet the qualification also repeats that occurring earlier in the account of the killing, the penalty they feared to pay for the miserable slaughter (λευγαλέοιο φόνου τίσειαν ἀμοιβήν, 619). Deed and emotional reaction to the aftermath have a shared evaluation (λευγαλέοιο ~ λευγαλέω) that could affirm a Thracian attack as an appropriate retribution.

The Lemnian women are not genuine Amazons since theirs was an erotically motivated man-killing. They are passive, they watch and wait. There is no suggestion of them carrying out raids themselves. Contrary to the narrator's assertion that they are comfortable in their new roles, the eradication of the menfolk has left them vulnerable to a Thracian counter-raid, and they're afraid.

L2. 'Lemnian action' (633-639).

The narrative shifts from exposition to the narrative present when the reported habitual

¹⁷⁴ Griffin 1986: 48.

¹⁷⁵ For example, there are no gory details of the murder or mention of the logistics necessary to such an undertaking. The male population existed and then it did not.

Τῷ καὶ ὅτ' ἐγγύθι νήσου ἐρεσσομένην ἴδον Ἀργῶ,
αὐτίκα πασσυδίῃ πυλέων ἔκτοσθε Μυρίνης
δήϊα τεύχεα δῦσαι ἐς αἰγιαλὸν προχέοντο,
Θυάσιν ὠμοβόροις ἵκελαι· φὰν γάρ που ἰκάνειν
Θρήικας. Ἡ δ' ἅμα τῇσι Θεοαντιάς Ὑσιπύλεια
δύν' ἐνὶ τεύχεσι πατρός. Ἀμμηχανίῃ δ' ἔσχοντο
ἄφθογγοι, τοῖόν σφιν ἐπὶ δέος ἠωρεῖτο.
A.R. 1.633-39

¹⁷⁶ A connection can still be made between the actions of Lemnian/Thracian men and those of the Argonauts in Colchis (taking the fleece and Medea). Cf. Hdt. 1.2.2-3, on which Fantuzzi and Hunter 2005: 102 n.56 ‘There may here [A.R.1.457-9] also be a glance towards a “rationalising” version in which the Argonauts are merchants who carry off a local girl.’

90

don't grab whatever is available and rush to ward off a perceived Thracian raid but don their bronze armour (δήϊα τεύχεα δῦσαι) and advance (ἐς αἰγιαλὸν προχέοντο, 635).

For a semantic arming parallel cf. e.g. ἀλλ' ἄγε νῦν ἐπίμεινον, Ἀρήϊα τεύχεα δύνω, (*Il.* 6.340, Paris to Hector). The *Iliad* provides A. with the Code-Model for preparations for and approach to martial confrontation. For C. there is a pertinent lexical correspondence, ἐς αἰγιαλὸν προχέοντο ~ ἐς πεδῖον προχέοντο (*Il.* 2.465). The first coming together (in the *Iliad*) between Greeks and Trojans by the river Scamander is echoed as these women head off to war at the seaside.¹⁷⁸

The grand (or bathetic) impression is, however, immediately muddled by the comparison 'like Thyiades who eat raw meat' (636). Likening them to frenzied worshippers of Dionysus does not speak well of their state of mind or bode well for the prospect of a diplomatic resolution. The presentation of the Lemnians as a chaotic swarm has similarities with the similes which frame that Iliadic intertext, both to the cranes that fly here and there (*Il.* 2.462) and to the flies that buzz around the farmer's milk-pails (*Il.* 2.469-71) but for a specific Example-Model, Mooney cites *Il.* 22.460: Andromache rushes from her hall μαινάδι ἴση.¹⁷⁹

Her Bacchic-like frenzy, however, is there induced by fear for Hector, a fear quickly confirmed when from the tower she sees his body dragged around the wall. In contrast, the Lemnian women fear for their own lives and they are both spectators and participants. Their slaughter of the men and assumption of their roles was a rejection of the 'Andromache' role, the good wife who was *weaving* when she heard the cries (*Il.* 22.440-1). And yet, like Andromache's, theirs is a female response.¹⁸⁰ They act like men but react like Maenads.

ὠμοβόρος 'eating raw flesh' adds a barbaric touch just as erotically motivated murder suggests irrationality. Is their 'civilisation' only skin-deep? Are they savages?¹⁸¹ The narrator's assertion that they were comfortable in their new roles is being

¹⁷⁸ This reader is reminded of Laurence Sterne's claim, quoted in Sternberg 1978: 18–19 'the happiness of the Cervantic humour arises from this very thing – of describing silly and trifling Events, with the Circumstantial Pomp of great Ones.'

¹⁷⁹ Mooney 1912 ad loc. For correspondences between the women's reactions to the Argonauts' arrival and departure, see L10i.).

¹⁸⁰ Cf. Demeter's reaction to seeing Persephone again, ἥν τε μαινὰς ὄρος κατά δάσκιον ὕλη, *h.Cer* 386.

¹⁸¹ Returning again to the monster, cf. ὠμοβρῶς τ' ὀρειβάτης | Κύκλωψ, 'the flesh-eating, mountain-ranging Cyclops' (*E. Tr.* 436-7).

unravelling. Are they deluded? At the first sign of trouble, their male mirage is dissolving.

636-7: φὰν γάρ που, ‘for they thought, *no doubt*.’ The move from fear of Thracians to sighting of ship was seamless (632-33) and only the inattentive reader (a third hypothetical reader who, no doubt, exists but shall remain anonymous and largely unemployed) could fail to spot the connection; the explicit embedded focalisation following φὰν provides the women’s interpretation - the ship is the Thracian threat they had anticipated. However, that motivation is qualified by a narratorial inference, που.

Similarly, in the parallel situation on Cyzicus (vv.1023-4) the Doliones *do* attack the Argonauts because they do not recognise them: ἀλλά που ἀνδρῶν | Μακρίεων εἴσαντο Πελασγικὸν Ἄρεα κέλσαι ‘but *I suppose* thought a Pelasgian war party of Macrian men had landed.’ On Cyzicus the encounter takes place in the night and the lack of light is explicitly introduced as cause of the mistaken identification (ὑπὸ νυκτὶ, see 1021-5n.). The timing here is not made explicit but it was evening when we left the ship (v.605-7).¹⁸²

On the narrator’s scholarly deduction here (a part of the scholarly persona he projects), Morrison observes, ‘The implication is that the narrator has sources for the Thracian threat, the Lemnian women’s rushing out to meet the Argonauts etc., but does not have an *explicit* account of the motivation behind their armed greeting.’¹⁸³

We do not have access to these sources implied by the text and are reminded that we stand at a further remove, that our own deductions and inferences as readers are of a text whose narrative purports to have been constructed from the narratives of other texts that have already been appraised. Moreover, such intrusions foreground the narrator’s role, his use of sources and remind the reader that whilst the narrator is omnitemporal and omnispatial, he is not omniscient: ‘[The narrator] does not have universal access to the events of the story (in the narratological sense) or to the workings of the minds of his characters, because Apollonius depicts him as constructing his narrative from previous versions and information about the past.’¹⁸⁴

¹⁸² See Vian 1974: 18 n.2. See v.651 (the Argonauts stay overnight due to the fading light).

¹⁸³ A. D. Morrison 2007: 276. On the Apollonian narrator’s use of που, see *ibid.*: 275-9.

¹⁸⁴ A. D. Morrison 2007: 278 (narratological terminology following Chatman 1978, story=fabula).

637-8: The only mortal characters identified mentioned in the episode thus far are juxtaposed, ‘and she along with them, the daughter of Thoas, Hypsipyle, put on the armour of her father.’ She is both with the women (‘Ἡ δ’ ἄμα τῇσι, 637) and not, defined by a patronymic and in relation to armour inherited from a father. The backstory singled her out from the collective (Οἷη δ’ ἐκ πασέων 620, see 620-1n.). Again she is being distinguished from the group.

C., with *Iliad* 2 still in mind, can draw comparison with the model. Following the massing together of the collective, the Homeric narrator narrows the focus to Agamemnon (*Il.* 2.477-83).¹⁸⁵ There is, moreover, one notable passage of the *Iliad* concerning armour passed down from father to son: the armour which was divinely gifted to Peleus was passed on by him to Achilles (*Il.* 17.195-7). However, acknowledging that specific intertext, or any inference of inheritance only reminds the reader of the problematic interpretation of Hypsipyle’s relationship with her father. If the rescue is interpreted as attempted patricide, then the juxtaposition and repeated linking of daughter to father reinforces an image of Hypsipyle as usurper.

Risking a speculation overly concerned with logical coherence, does the armour fit? Whose armour are the rest of the women wearing? To make an inference from Hypsipyle’s appropriation of Thoas’, then presumably their husbands’ equipment, and what awaits the Argonauts on the shore is a motley group wearing ill-fitting (and intertextually mismatching) hand-me-downs.

On the comic treatments of the Lemnian episode, see Vian 1974: 23, who notes the existence of *Lemnian Women* by Aristophanes, Nicochares, Antiphanes *et alii*.¹⁸⁶ The situation, sex-deprived women dressed as men, does lend itself to comedic treatment. The various innuendoes have already been put before my reader in ‘Eros on Lemnos.’ Vian finds humour not only in this shore scene but in the depiction of a hunch-backed Polyxo (L4ii), the love-making city (L8), the women buzzing like bees (L10i), Heracles’ rage (L9) etc.¹⁸⁷ Though, lest we get carried away, Phinney Jr.

¹⁸⁵ See esp. *Il.* 2.482-3: τοῖον ἄρ’ Ἀτρεΐδην θῆκε Ζεὺς ἥματι κείνῳ | ἐκπρεπέ’ ἐν πολλοῖσι.

¹⁸⁶ See *ibid.* n.1.

¹⁸⁷ See Vian 1974: 28.

commenting on Stoessl's (1941: 40) perfectly plausible suggestion of the intrusion of the *Ecclesiazusae* as an intertext here ('In der ganzen Behandlung der Lemnierinnengeschichte liegt viel vom Witz der aristophanischen Ekklesiazusen') declares, 'Aristophanes' comedy is much franker than that of Apollonius.'¹⁸⁸ Quite so, but for the reader inclined to levity, it is there to be read.

638-9: The noun ἀμυχανία first occurs here but the adjective ἀμήχανος was used of Jason when considering the enormity of the tasks ahead (v.460). Then Idas had rebuked him for being a coward but Idas was not privy to his thoughts. On that incident, Hunter (1993: 19) comments, 'Appearances give no access to any simple, unmediated "truth": you cannot tell with any certainty what someone is thinking or what their mood is from their facial expression.'

The Lemnian women offer an externally fearsome (or comical depending on the reader/viewer) spectacle but inwardly are despairing and afraid. Here the reader is again privileged with insight into their emotional state but how will the Argonauts interpret these silent armed figures? Again the added information also reminds that interpretations will differ depending upon the knowledge available and its presentation. These women are hard to read.

L3. 'Musing with Mnemosyne' (640-652).

A reader privileging the military aspect, a likeness to Amazons and/or the women's unstable frame of mind is drawn into the expectation of physical confrontation between men and man-killers. C.'s expectations are further (mis)guided by competing Iliadic and Aristophanic allusions. In favouring the former intertexts from what is structurally the first battle of the *Iliad*, he too would be drawn into anticipating violence in the Argonauts' first encounter with foreigners. The *material* is scarce and fragmentary but in other accounts, there was a fight on the shore (See Σ ad loc).¹⁸⁹

¹⁸⁸ Phinney Jr. 1967: 330 n.13 citing Stoessl, F. (1941) *Apollonios Rhodios: Interpretationen zur Erzählungskunst und Quellenverwertung*. Bern.

¹⁸⁹ Though an intertext unavailable to our reader C., the later account of this episode in the *Thebaid* contains extravagant epic violence.

For such a reader, what follows is anticlimactic. Aethalides intervenes and the threat of conflict is postponed if not yet resolved. This is the first instance of what becomes an identifiable pattern – expectations of violence are generated either explicitly in the text or can be inferred from intertexts and are then suspended or thwarted entirely.¹⁹⁰ On Cyzicus, the reader is on alert, at ease, caught by surprise, at ease, caught by surprise again (See 953-7n.). Similarly, in the Colchian narrative of Book 3, the threat of a fight breaking out during the audience with Aeetes does not transpire (in contrast with, e.g. Pi. *P.* 4, 212-13 where there is fighting in Colchis).

Fighting against women is, in any case, problematic for valour. Unless that is they are actual Amazons rather than an analogue, in which event at least one of the crew would be less reluctant to join battle: Heracles' capture and ransom of the Amazon Melanippe is narrated in an aside, 2.966-9.¹⁹¹

Τείως δ' αὖτ' ἐκ νηὸς ἀριστῆες προέηκαν	640
Αἰθαλίδην κήρυκα θοόν, τῷ πέρ τε μέλεισθαι	
ἀγγελίας καὶ σκῆπτρον ἐπέτρεπον Ἑρμείας	
σφωιτέροιο τοκῆος, ὅς οἱ μνηστὶν πόρε πάντων	
ἄφθιτον. Οὐδ' ἔτι νῦν περ ἀποικομένου Ἀχέροντος	
δίνας ἀπροφάτους ψυχὴν ἐπιδέδρομε λήθη·	645
ἀλλ' ἢ γ' ἔμπεδον αἰὲν ἀμειβομένη μεμόρηται,	
ἄλλοθ' ὑποχθονίοις ἐναρίθμιος, ἄλλοτ' ἐς αὐγὰς	
ἡελίου ζωοῖσι μετ' ἀνδράσιν. Ἀλλὰ τί μύθους	
Αἰθαλίδεω χρεῖώ με διηνεκέως ἀγορεύειν;	
Ὅς ῥα τόθ' Ὑψιπύλῃν μελίσσατο δέχθαι ἰόντας	650
ἥματος ἀνομένοιο διὰ κνέφας. οὐδὲ μὲν ἡοῖ	
πείσματα νηὸς ἔλυσαν ἐπὶ πνοιῇ βορέας.	
A.R. 1.640-52	

640-6: The battle-narrative is retarded when, whilst the women are assembling in silence, the Argonauts send their herald. Τείως 'meanwhile' introduces a simultaneous action, on which Klooster (2007: 69) in his analysis of narrative time in the poem observes: 'occasionally the narrative divides up into two simultaneous storylines, when individual members (e.g. Heracles and Hylas, 1.1198-1272) wander off or the Argonauts

¹⁹⁰ On 'frustrated warfare', see Knight 1995: 114–21, Fränkel 1968: 469–72.

¹⁹¹ Is his staying by the ship and annoyance over the derailment of the quest and pursuit of *kleos* motivated by frustration at an erotic resolution?

meet important antagonists (e.g. the Lemnian women, 1.609-910).’ This feature is much more prominent in Book 3 in the structural arrangement of the back and forth scenes between the Argonauts and Medea but here is an early example of the feature, the narrative flicking from one group’s actions to the other’s.

What causes the retardation until v.650 is another narratorial digression. Aethalides is named in the Catalogue, the son of Hermes by Eupolemeia (1.53-5). He appears by name only once more in the poem when he is sent along with Telamon to collect the serpent’s teeth from Aeetes (3.1175). Here, the naming expands via the additional information that he has been entrusted with the sceptre of Hermes into the revelation of the special power that his divine father granted him, ὅς οἱ μνήστιν πόρε πάντων | ἄφθιτον (643-4).

Several of the Argonauts have divine ancestry and powers that make them more than human and a son of Hermes presents a suitable candidate for the position of herald. However, this is the first mention of his supernatural ability, his ‘imperishable memory of all things.’ The special abilities of other heroes were related within the Catalogue: Orpheus who charmed rocks and rivers (1.26-7), Lynceus and his telescopic vision (153-5), Euphemus who could run on water (182-4), the flying sons of Boreas (219-223). Of these only Orpheus has provided any demonstration thus far. Assuming the narrator did not forget, then several intertexts taken in combination suggest the mention of memory here has added bite.

What other individuals possess an unfailing memory? The Muses, the daughters of Mnemosyne, for whose aid the Homeric narrator memorably appealed prior to the Catalogue of Heroes in *Iliad* 2: ‘You are gods, and attend all things and know all things, but we hear only the report and have no knowledge’ (*Il.* 2.485-6) which is followed by the ‘many mouths’ motif (*Il.* 2.488-92). As discussed in the Introduction (*Beginning Again*), our narrator has a more complicated relationship with the Muses (inspirers and/or interpreters) with the first person intrusion νῦν δ’ ἄν ἐγὼ ... μυθησαίμην (v.20) indicative of both his narrative control and his use of source-material out of which (and against which) to construct his own story.

In both its narrative shape and placement, *Iliad* 2 offers a recognisable model for our reader A., whilst for C. there are lexical correspondences which here work to confirm the connection with a narrative already in mind from the Lemnian armed response (See 633-6n. & 637-8n.). Aethalides has been entrusted a sceptre (σκῆπτρον

ἐπέτρεπον, 642) and has an imperishable memory. At *Iliad* 2.25, Dream tells Agamemnon that sleep should not last so long for one to whom the army is entrusted, ὅτι λαοὶ τ' ἐπιτετράφονται καὶ τόσσα μέμηλε. Upon waking, Agamemnon prepared to call an assembly and took up his sceptre, εἴλετο δὲ σκῆπτρον πατρώϊον ὄφθιτον αἰεὶ, *Il.* 2.46). Following the assembly comes the Catalogue introduced by that invocation of the Muses. And finally, following the Catalogue comes the advance of the opposing armies that begins *Iliad* 3.

Why connect Aethalides with the Muses? Noting the intertexts reinforces the link between scenes of preparations for battle. This reading underscores the (misdirected) expectation of conflict with which this section began. Still, the preceding echoes were, I think, already loud enough not to require simply more intertextual corroboration. However, if we consider the wider context of the Iliadic model, options present themselves.

A close alignment of the present narrative to that of the model suggests the possibility of a Catalogue preceding the first conflict of the Argonauts with foreigners. This is a possibility which does not materialise because the Argonautic Catalogue has already taken place in its 'proper' position, at the beginning. Regarding that Catalogue, Hunter (2001: 114) notes that 'there is in the *Argonautica* nothing corresponding to the scenes of *Iliad* 2-4 which seem to belong "really" to the earlier part of the war - and the early placing of the Apollonian catalogue might be taken as a "corrective" of the Homeric positioning.' However, an expectation is being manufactured in the intertextual context encouraged by the shared power of Aethalides and the Muses. It does not happen. No names are listed in what follows. It is another intertextually-generated expectation which is never realised.

Two additional observations can be drawn from this; on the one hand it can be taken as reminder of and commentary upon the correct sequencing of events (Catalogues belong at beginnings), and on the other (reflecting on our misdirected anticipation of conflict), that battle and with it the acquisition of *kleos* will not be of prime concern, at least not on Lemnos.

Pressing this last observation, μνήστis occurs on three other occasions in the poem: 3.290 (Medea struck by Eros, unable to remember anything but Jason), 4.724 (Circe remembers her bad dream) and 4.1746 (Euphemus remembers his prophetic

dream for the creation of Thera).¹⁹² Its enjambed and emphatic qualification here ἄφθιτος is in Homer used almost always of things with two exceptions; Zeus (father of the Muses) is described as ἄφθιτα μήδεα εἰδώς (*Il.* 24.88) and when Achilles famously speaks of his fate should he stay at Troy, ὥλετο μὲν μοι νόστος, ἀτὰρ κλέος ἄφθιτον ἔσται (*Il.* 9.413). For the Iliadic warrior, martial κλέος and its celebration in song is the means to achieve lasting fame but when the participants of this conflict opt to make love rather than war, their own lasting fame is assured genealogically through their descendants. Heracles (for whose speech Achilles provides one Homeric model) demonstrates only an understanding of the former when he berates the men for dallying in Lemnos, Οὐ μὰν εὐκλειεῖς γε σὺν ὀθνεῖησι γυναιξὶν | ἐσσομέθ' ὥδ' ἐπὶ δηρὸν ἐελμένοι (869-70).

Throughout the voyage, the Argonauts leave traces in descendants, markers and customs whereas the only traces left of events recounted in the *Iliad* are the *Iliad* itself. Reading thematically, these suggested intertexts prompt the reader to evaluate alternative routes to *kleos*, and an alternative ethos presented in the narrative. The temporal marker ἔτι νῦν περ (644) shows the narrator's keen interest in continuation, in constantly bridging the now and the then. It also has another function: it introduces a digression (one which triggered my own musings on memory). The subsequent external prolepsis telling the reader what became of Aethalides suspends the narrative relating the result of his meeting until, that is, the narrator suddenly stops himself.

648-9: 'But what need for me to speak on and on the stories of Aethalides?'¹⁹³ This is an emphatic first-person singular intrusion. The narrator breaks off his contemplations on Aethalides (and interrupts those he prompted in the reader) and corrects the course of the narrative. There are other stories he could tell (the question again reminds the reader that this narrator has sources), but now is not the time - he is in control of the narrative

¹⁹² Although it might require the reader to possess a μνήστιν ἄφθιτον themselves, the last instance links the scene creating Thera with the arrival of the herald whose diplomacy ensured the Therans' ancestors would not get off to a rocky start.

¹⁹³ In introducing a son of Hermes he has also seeded an Odyssean intertext. The son of Hermes here in the role of go-between and interceding on behalf of the crew acts in the role his father who visited Circe prior to Odysseus' meeting with her and directly aided the hero to ensure that encounter was ultimately amicable.

and it is *his* narrative.

In a break-off at the end of the Lemnian episode, the narrator strikes a moralistic pose - he excuses himself for not speaking about the secret rites the Argonauts learn on Samothrace (1.915-21, the next island visited following their sojourn in Lemnos) because θέμις ‘what is right’ forbids him, τὰ μὲν οὐ θέμις ἄμιν αἰεῖν (1.921, where the choice of verb reinforces the ambience of performance). Here the impression is one of artistic consideration. It is the narrator’s conscious decision to get back to the story. The reader is being reminded of the poem as composition, of the selectivity and arrangement of material into presentation, and in being reminded is taken out of its story to reflect on it as a work (whilst simultaneously the vocal interruption within the narrative suggests a work still in progress, the conceit of an *ex tempore* composition!).

Similarly, the narrator breaks off a digression on Heracles and the Dryopeans to return to the narrative of Hylas’ abduction, ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν τηλοῦ κεν ἀποπλάγξειεν ἄοιδῆς (1.1220), on which Morrison comments, ‘This stress on the ἄοιδή (‘song’) and its proper arrangement keeps the focus firmly on the narrator.’¹⁹⁴ This particular break-off on Aethalides, Morrison finds ‘reminiscent of that of Hes. *Th.* 35.’¹⁹⁵ There Hesiod breaks off from relating how the Muses taught him on Helicon to begin his *Theogony* proper, ἀλλὰ τίη μοι ταῦτα περὶ δρῶν ἢ περὶ πέτρην;

We come round again. The first person singular signals the narrator’s independence from the Muses whilst a model for the technique recalls their instruction of (and authorisation of) Hesiod. Moreover, as A. should spot, this is the first first-person singular intrusion since 1.20, ‘Now I wish to relate the lineage and names...’ which returns the reader again to *Iliad* 2, to Catalogues and to the Homeric narrator’s reliance on the memory of Muses.

And, teasing another connection between the description of Aethalides and the

¹⁹⁴ A. D. Morrison 2007: 295. Cf. (on its many incidences in Pindar) *ibid.*: 69 ‘Those which portray the narrator as having gone off course make the most explicit reference to the song as an ongoing composition...’ Cf. Carey (also on Pindar) 1995: 100 ‘The ode progresses as though the poet were composing orally and did not have the opportunity to alter or expunge, merely to redirect.’ And *ibid.* 101 ‘The dramatic quality of such passages also enlivens the performance as experience by turning the audience into onlookers witnessing a developing and tense situation.’ The instance at vv.648-9 is in manner much like Pindar’s break-off to correct his course at *N.* 3.26-7, θυμέ, τίνα πρὸς ἄλλοδαπὸν | ἄκραν ἐμὸν πλόον παραμείβεται;

¹⁹⁵ A. D. Morrison 2007: 294 n.91.

Hesiodic epiphany on Helicon, as a symbol of his new calling the Muses give Hesiod a staff: *καί μοι σκῆπτρον ἔδον δάφνης ἐριθηλέος ὄζον | δρέψασαι, θηητόν· ἐνέπνευσαν δέ μοι αὐδὴν | θέσπιν*, Hes. *Th.* 30-2.¹⁹⁶ Poets have staffs just as kings like Agamemnon have staffs (and staffs authorise Homeric speakers, see e.g. *Il.* 1.234-9, 10.321-28) just as heralds like Aethalides have staffs.¹⁹⁷ Hesiod is not so subordinate to the Muses as Homer (as the Hesiodic break-off indicates),¹⁹⁸ but nevertheless presents himself as recipient of their gifts whose validity is confirmed by their parentage (*τὰς ἐν Πιερίῃ Κρονίδῃ τέκε πατρὶ μιγεῖσθαι | Μνημοσύνη*, Hes. *Th.* 53-4) and he is in markedly more communication than the Apollonian narrator thus far. Intertextual and intratextual evidence combine to mark out an autonomous assured narrator.

650-1: Finally, the narrator's report of Aethalides' embassy relates that he was successful in persuading Hypsipyle to let them stay moored that night at Lemnos (deflating the expectations of any reader keen for action). What is here indicative of the future presentation of the developing story on Lemnos is that it is a report, it is indirect discourse. The first character-speech in the episode comes in the assembly scene in the exchange between Hypsipyle and Polyxo and is followed by Hypsipyle's instructions to Iphinoe.

There is a marked disparity of access to the two camps. The reader spends far more time in the episode with the Lemnian women and is privy to their speech whilst having only summary reports from the Argonaut camp until Heracles' outburst. There is no direct speech from any Argonaut until Jason gives response to Hypsipyle, and that in six lines (836-41) compared to her speech giving her version of recent events and offering him rule of Lemnos itself (793-833).¹⁹⁹ The reader has no access to whatever words Aethalides used to persuade the Lemnian women of their friendly intentions. He goes with a sceptre that distinguishes him as a speaker but we don't get to hear him speak!

This added remove of reader from characters becomes especially problematic in

¹⁹⁶ On the inspirational breath and Medea as Muse-figure in *Pi. P.* 4, see A. D. Morrison 2007: 308–9.

¹⁹⁷ On Hesiod's credentials, see Griffith 1983: 50 and the short biblio. *ibid.* n.54. Pushing the parallel, Muses favour kings as well as poets (Hes. *Th.* 80-97).

¹⁹⁸ On Hesiod's greater narratorial control, see A. D. Morrison 2007: 74–6, Stoddard 2004: 60–97.

¹⁹⁹ See 'the angled narration of dialogue' in Introduction 4. Speech Modes.

the following episode on Cyzicus in which there is no direct speech at all and certain interpretations of character motivation must be built solely upon the (at times) oblique reports of a subjective narrator combined with (and complicated by) intertextual inferences.

Here the reader might infer that ἰόντας (650) could have been from Aethalides' original speech describing the men as 'travellers,' and supplement with a further inference when overhearing Hypsipyle's instructions to Iphinoe to summon the man ὅς τις στόλου ἡγεμονεύει (704) that Aethalides had also told her that they were on an expedition (and perhaps puzzle over what seems her ignorance of (or disinterest in) the leader's identity). The reader's dilemma is that faced by the Homeric narrator and the reason he made his appeal to the Muses. We are mortal and hear only reports.

L4. 'The Lemnian Assembly' (653-708).

After the reader's focus has been shifted briefly to view this simultaneous action of Aethalides and after being informed that the Argonauts were prevented from sailing away the next morning by an adverse wind, the reader is returned again to the women to follow the progression of *their* story.²⁰⁰ The men's continued presence instigates the women's assembly and provides the reader, here a witness at the debate, with the episode's first direct speeches.

Hypsipyle's proposal to supply the men and send them on their way is motivated by a fear of a report of the man-killing spreading abroad, of their story getting out (or a fear of what version of the story gets out. See 660-3n.). It is a short-term plan aimed at removing an immediate threat but as Polyxo explains to the assembly (and to the eavesdropping reader), sending these men away without taking advantage will only ensure the ongoing story of the Lemnian women is one of continual decline to a needlessly premature end. What Polyxo suggests and what is agreed upon so enthusiastically is a new beginning. The covert Thera narrative effectively starts here, initiated by how the women choose to react to the Argonauts' presence. And the reader

²⁰⁰ See Vian 1974: 257 ad 652.

is being given unmediated access to its beginning.

There are different ways to tell a story (See Introduction 2. *Beginning and Beginnings*). The option was there, for example, after the break-off (vv.648-9) to return with Aethalides to the ship, wake with the crew the next morning, hear their discussion, find out if they had any plans to approach the Lemnians again or simply wait for the wind to change. Instead, we stay with the women. Briefly for the reader, there is the feeling that the Argonautic narrative has been submerged within a Lemnian Woman narrative.²⁰¹ It is a narrative driven by the women (as Aphrodite has driven them) and one in which Hypsipyle herself, repeatedly named, steps up to become a protagonist whilst the men play the foreigners - ξείνοισιν (676), ξείνοισι (696) and ξεῖνε (793, where Jason plays the handsome stranger. See L7 below). This feeling persists until the intervention of Heracles (who wants his old narrative back. See L9 below).

For A., there are structural similarities with the Argonauts' earlier debate over leadership (1.327-362) during which Jason [Hypsipyle] has the men sit in assembly (328) then opens the debate and asks for opinions (332-40). Heracles [Polyxo] rises and speaks (341-347). The men [Lemnian women] approve his [her] speech (348). Jason [Hypsipyle] speaks again and announces the plan of action (351-62). Both debates scenes are ostensibly democratic (though Polyxo opts for logic and rhetoric rather than Heracles' threat of brute force). In terms of narrative shape and the intertextual models, I refer back to my opening remarks in this chapter on *Lemnos and Phaeacia* and the continued focus in *Odyssey* 6 on Nausicaa until she and Odysseus meet. An additional parallel can be observed with the Ogygian narrative in *Odyssey* 5 in which the reader is privy to the conversation between Hermes and Calypso that establishes what is to be done with the hero before we finally get to meet him (*Od.* 5.87-147).²⁰²

²⁰¹ There are few dialogues in the poem exclusive to non-Argonauts; the three Olympian goddesses 3.6-166, Medea & Chalciope 3.674-739, Alcinous & Arete 4.1068-1109. See Vian 1974: 24-5 on the notion of the Lemnian episode suggesting a tragedy in six parts (the notion that scenes in this Lemnian episode owe much to earlier tragic treatments e.g. this assembly scene and the dialogues between Jason and Hypsipyle are entirely plausible but his breakdown of *this* narrative with its lopsided distribution of dialogue, disparities of narrative emphases and its detailed engagement with its Homeric models is, to me, unconvincing).

²⁰² This intertext also provides an example of misdirection. The reader's expectation of meeting the protagonist at last are thwarted by the narrator's comment that he isn't there! See *Od.* 5.81-3: οὐδ' ἄρ' Ὀδυσσῆα μεγάλῃτορα ἔνδον ἔτετμεν, 81.

i. *Hypsipyle's Proposal* (653-666)

Λημνιάδες δὲ γυναῖκες ἀνὰ πτόλιν ἴζον ἰοῦσαι
 εἰς ἀγορήν· αὐτὴ γὰρ ἐπέφραδεν Ὑψιπύλεια.
 Καί ῥ' ὅτε δὴ μάλα πᾶσαι ὁμιλαδὸν ἠγερέθοντο, 655
 αὐτίκ' ἄρ' ἢ γ' ἐνὶ τῇσιν ἐποτρύνουσ' ἀγόρευεν·
 “ὦ φίλοι, εἰ δ' ἄγε δὴ μενοεικέα δῶρα πόρωμεν
 ἀνδράσιν, οἷά τ' ἔοικεν ἄγειν ἐπὶ νηὸς ἔχοντας,
 ἦια καὶ μέθυ λαρόν, ἵν' ἔμπεδον ἔκτοθι πύργων 660
 μίμνοιεν, μηδ' ἄμμε κατὰ χρεῖῳ μεθέποντες
 ἀτρεκέως γνῶωσι, κακὴ δ' ἐπὶ πολλὸν ἴκηται
 βᾶξις, ἐπεὶ μέγα ἔργον ἐρέξαμεν· οὐδέ τι πάμπαν
 θυμηδὲς καὶ τοῖσι τό γ' ἔσσεται, εἴ κε δαεῖεν.
 Ἥμετέρη μὲν νῦν τοίη παρενήνοθε μῆτις·
 ὑμέων δ' εἴ τις ἄρειον ἔπος μητίσεται ἄλλη, 665
 εγρέσθω· τοῦ γάρ τε καὶ εἵνεκα δεῦρο κάλεσσα.”
 A.R. 1.653-66

660-3: After the women come as one to the *agora* at her bidding, Hypsipyle makes plain the reason for her solution. It is lest the men come to know them accurately (ἀτρεκέως γνῶωσι, 661). ‘Accurate knowledge’ strikes a key note in how the episode unfolds. Ultimately the men sail away never knowing the women ‘accurately,’ due to the strategy of dissimulation that emerges from the assembly scene and that Hypsipyle puts to use in weaving her version of events to Jason (See L7i below).²⁰³

Hypsipyle’s own concern is for their reputation. She does not openly admit what they did was evil but that is how it will be read. The evaluation κακὴ (661) precedes the subject, which is suspended in enjambment: βᾶξις (662).²⁰⁴ Nor is the narrator’s φόνος (619, 834) a word in Hypsipyle’s vocabulary. For her, the Lemnian women’s deed was a μέγα ἔργον, 662. There is a psychological realism in her choice of lexis, a refusal to reflect on the mass killing. Hector wanted future generations to learn of his own great

²⁰³ Discussing *Od.* 7.241-2 and *Aen.* 1.753-5, Hunter (2001: 108 n.52) notes ‘The parallel passage at *Od.* 8.572 [ἀλλ’ ἄγε μοι τόδε εἰπὲ καὶ ἀτρεκέως κατάλεξον] shows how readily διηνεκέως and ἀτρεκέως, “accurately, truly” overlap.’ Whereas the Argonauts’ ignorance here ensures the episode’s amicable conclusion, on their return to Cyzicus a lack of clear perception leads there to violence (See 1021-5n.).

²⁰⁴ On what Jason’s reputation will be should he stay in Lemnos, see L9 below.

deeds, to be remembered, ἀλλὰ μέγα ῥέξας τι καὶ ἔσσομένοισι πυθέσθαι (*Il.* 22.305). Hypsipyle wants the reverse.

Great deeds, however, are not necessarily good. For C. (and for my own attentive reader, see 614-5n.) there is a parallel in Hermes' report of Demeter's famine, μέγα μήδεται ἔργον (*h. Cer.* 351). A reluctance to speak openly of kin-slaying might also call to mind the usage of the phrase in Pindar's refusal to speak of Peleus and Telamon's murder of their half-brother Phocus, αἰδέομαι μέγα εἰπεῖν ἐν δίκῃ τε μὴ κεκινδυνευμένον (*Pi. N.* 5.14).²⁰⁵

How then are these evaluated and nuanced phrases to be interpreted by the reader. This is Hypsipyle's direct speech and thus her focalisation of events. However, is κακὴ as applied to reputation an admission on her part that the action was itself wrong or is it rather her assessment of how the men will perceive it (οὐδέ τι πάμπαν | θυμηδὲς καὶ τοῖσι τό γ' ἔσσεται) and consequently report it? In the present of the narrative, her assessment of the Argonauts' reaction is hypothetical but the reader has already been privy to one report from the primary narrator in addition to what reports are being brought to the reading from other sources. Her speech in an assembly scene in which the women offer their side of the story (and in which the reader starts to know them as the Argonauts do not) is already challenging the reader to reflect on what he already knows and on how and by whom that knowledge was presented. When in the course of her speech to Jason she revises the deed as one of women rising up against oppression, the gauntlet is thrown down 'truly' (See 820-6n.).

664-6: For C. lexical and structural correspondences when Hypsipyle opens up the debate to the people point to *Iliad* 14 as an Example-Model and the similar gesture made by Agamemnon when looking for a *metis* following their defeat by Hector, νῦν δ' εἴη ὃς τῆσδέ γ' ἀμείνονα μῆτιν ἐνίσποι, *Il.* 14.107-8. There Diomedes [Polyxo]

²⁰⁵ Other instances of great/terrible deeds include e.g. δὸς δὲ πάλιν ἐπὶ νῆας εὐκλείας ἀφικέσθαι | ῥέξαντας μέγα ἔργον, ὃ κε Τρώεσσι μελήσῃ (*Il.* 10. 281-2 Odysseus invokes Athena's assistance in the slaughter of Thracians), οἳ μέγα ἔργον ἔρεξαν ἀτασθαλίῃσι κακῇσι (*Od.* 24.458 Halitherses rebukes the Ithacans for bringing the slaughter upon themselves), ἡ μέγα ἔργον ἔρεξεν ἀιδρεΐῃσι νόοιο | γημαμένη ᾧ νῦν (*Od.* 11.271-2 Epicaste is married to her son Oedipus).

excuses his youth and low birth and suggests immediate attack even though they are wounded.²⁰⁶ Hypsipyle has a plan but opens the floor for someone to plot a better proposal, ἔπος μητίσεται (665). What she is asking for can also be read as a request to devise a story, which is what she herself will go on to do. Now, as the reader watches and listens to the women, the vocabulary of δόλος and μῆτις (See[ded] 627-9n.) infiltrates the narrative. Polyxo will come up with the better plan (ἄρειον ἔπος) and Hypsipyle will spin a better story to make it work and secure their future (and in so doing secure the future of the Thera narrative).

ii. *Polyxo Counters* (667-696)

Carpe uiros! Polyxo's alternative (grasping what providence has sent their way) secures the women's survival, although it has attendant risks. Inviting the men to extend their stay, or even become permanent residents can only increase the likelihood of their great deed being uncovered. And yet the old nurse's counter-proposal meets with unanimous approval and cheers of delight. For these sex-starved Lemnians, rewards far outweigh any risks.²⁰⁷

ὦς ἄρ' ἔφη, καὶ θῶκον ἐφίζανε πατρὸς ἐοῖο
 λάινον. Αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα φίλη τροφὸς ὦρτο Πολυξώ,
 γήραϊ δὴ ρικνοῖσιν ἐπισκάζουσα πόδεσσιν,
 βάκτρῳ ἐρειδομένη, πέρι δὲ μενέαιν' ἀγορεῦσαι· 670
 τῇ καὶ παρθενικαὶ πίσυρες σχεδὸν ἐδριόωντο
 ἀδμήτες, λευκῇσιν ἐπιχνοάουσαι ἐθείραις.
 Στῇ δ' ἄρ' ἐνὶ μέσση ἀγορῇ, ἀνὰ δ' ἔσχεθε δειρήν
 ἦκα μόλις κυφοῖο μεταφρένου, ὧδέ τ' ἔειπεν·
 A.R. 1.667-74.

²⁰⁶ Clauss (1993: 117) in citing the parallel notes the contrast of gender and age in Diomedes and Polyxo as a further gender reversal. I would add that Diomedes' speech, although there with no sexual subtext, does include mention of the wheat-bearing fields of Argos (ἄρουραι | πυροφόροι, *Il.* 14.122-3). Cf. Σ ad 665.

²⁰⁷ On the cheering, see Phinney Jr. 1967: 330–1 who notes the sexual undertones in the women's responses throughout the episode. He is right to describe the clamour of v.697 as 'ambiguous' as it is a doubly motivated response. To the Lemnian women the Argonauts represent both salvation and sex (and salvation via sex).

667-8: In the reference to the stone seats of the *agora*, Hypsipyle is linked again to Thoas - as she put on his armour, now she sits on his throne (See 637-8n.).

668-74: Only two details are given in setting the scene between the speeches, Thoas' seat and the four white-haired maidens who sit beside Polyxo. The seat has obvious relevance though interpreting the precise dynamic between father and daughter (successor/saviour or usurper/attempted murder) is problematic for the reader. What relevance we assign to the four maidens is dependent upon what we see in the first instance.

“Δῶρα μὲν, ὥς αὐτῇ περ ἐφανδάνει Ὑψιπυλείη, 675
πέμπωμεν ξείνοισιν, ἐπεὶ καὶ ἄρειον ὀπάσσαι.
ὔμμι γε μὴν τίς μῆτις ἐπαυρέσθαι βιότοιο,
αἴ κεν ἐπιβρίσῃ Θρήϊξ στρατὸς ἢ τις ἄλλος
δυσμενέων, ἃ τε πολλὰ μετ’ ἀνθρώποισι πέλονται,
ὥς καὶ νῦν ὃδ’ ὄμιλος ἀνωίστως ἐφικάνει; 680
Εἰ δὲ τὸ μὲν μακάρων τις ἀποτρέποι, ἄλλα δ’ ὀπίσσω
μυρία δημοτῆτος ὑπέρτερα πῆματα μίμνει.
Εὗτ’ ἂν δὴ γεραραὶ μὲν ἀποφθινύθουσι γυναῖκες,
κουρότεραι δ’ ἄγονοι στυγερὸν ποτὶ γῆρας ἴκησθε,
πῶς τῆμος βώσεσθε, δυσάμμοροι; ἦ βαθείαις 685
αὐτόματοι βόες ὕμμιν ἐνιζευχθέντες ἀρούραις
γειοτόμον νειοῖο διειρύσσουσιν ἄροτρον,
καὶ πρόκα τελλομένου ἔτεος στάχυν ἀμήσονται;
A.R. 1.675-88.

675-80: Polyxo agrees with the proposal to send gifts but not with the purpose of keeping the men away. What Polyxo wants to know is the plan (τίς μῆτις, 677) for the future. Her self-presentation is as the voice of age and experience, evident in her generalising statement that raiders are a commonplace. Even if *these* men are not hostile, the Thracians will still come or another band, ἃ τε πολλὰ μετ’ ἀνθρώποισι πέλονται (679). Unless, that is, they can appropriate the Argonauts as a defence.

681-8: Following the voicing of her concerns over the lack of children, or possibility thereof, Polyxo's questioning whether bulls will plough the fields themselves has a clear sexual subtext. Ploughing as a metaphor for sex along with the fertility of fields/women

recurs throughout the episode (See ‘Eros on Lemnos’ above).²⁰⁸ It is very evident what these women want and that these men are a gift not to be turned away.

Ἥ μὲν ἐγών, εἰ καὶ με τὰ νῦν ἔτι πεφρίκασι
Κῆρες, ἐπερχόμενόν που οἶομαι εἰς ἔτος ἤδη 690
γαῖαν ἐφέσσεσθαι, κτερέων ἀπὸ μοῖραν ἐλοῦσα
αὐτὼς ἢ θέμις ἐστί, πάρος κακότητι πελάσσαι.
Ὅπλοτέρησι δὲ πάγχυ τάδε φράζεσθαι ἄνωγα·
νῦν γὰρ δὴ παρὰ ποσσὶν ἐπήβολός ἐστ’ ἀλεωρή,
εἴ κεν ἐπιτρέψητε δόμους καὶ λήϊδα πᾶσαν 695
ὑμετέρην ξεινοῖσι καὶ ἀγλαὸν ἄστνυ μέλεσθαι.”
A.R. 1.689-96.

689-96: Polyxo adds a touch of theatre in her self-presentation – a comical image of the Keres shuddering (πεφρίκασι) at her decrepitude.²⁰⁹

iii. *Hypsipyle’s Decision (697-708)*

ὣς ἔφατ’· ἐν δ’ ἀγορῇ πλήτο θρόου· εὔαδε γάρ σφι
μῦθος. Ἀτὰρ μετὰ τήν γε παρασχεδὸν αὖτις ἀνῶρτο
Ὑψιπύλη, καὶ τοῖον ὑποβλήδην ἔπος ἠΐδα·
“Εἰ μὲν δὴ πάσῃσιν ἐφاندάνει ἥδε μενοιδή, 700
ἤδη κεν μετὰ νῆα καὶ ἄγγελον ὀτρύναιμι.”
Ἥ ῥα, καὶ Ἰφινόην προσεφώνεεν ἄσσον ἐοῦσαν·
“Ὅρσο μοι, Ἰφινόη, τοῦδ’ ἀνέρος ἀντιόωσα
ἡμέτερόν δε μολεῖν ὅς τις στόλου ἡγεμονεύει,
ὄφρα τί οἱ δῆμοιο ἔπος θυμηδὲς ἐνίσπω· 705
καὶ δ’ αὐτοὺς γαίης τε καὶ ἄστεος, αἶ κ’ ἐθέλωσι,
κέκλεο θαρσαλέως ἐπιβαινέμεν εὐμενέοντας.”
Ἥ, καὶ ἔλυσ’ ἀγορήν· μετὰ δ’ εἰς ἐὼν ὦρτο νέεσθαι.
A.R. 1.697-708

697-701: There is an emphasis on concord. Polyxo’s speech, the narrator informs us,

²⁰⁸ Cf. Pi. P. 4.254-6, καὶ ἐν ἀλλοδαπαῖς | σπέρμ’ ἀρούραις τουτάκις ὑμετέρας ἀκτίνος ὄλβου
δέξατο μοιριδίον | ἄμαρ ἢ νύκτες. For C., this intertext gives further confirmation to the covert
colonial narrative and the seeding of Euphemus’ descendants that is explicit in the Pindaric version.

²⁰⁹ So too Vian 1974: 82 n.4.

delights the women (εὐάδε γάρ σφι | μῦθος, 697-8) and Hypsipyle corroborates this (πάσῃσιν ἐφανεύει ἥδε μενοινή, 700).

‘So she spoke, and a clamour arose in the *agora*’ (697-8). There was a similar response from the Achaeans in the suggested Iliadic structural speech model following Diomedes’ call to arms, ὥς ἔφαθ’, οἳ δ’ ἄρα τοῦ μάλα μὲν κλύον ἡδὲ πίθοντο (*Il.* 14.133). In the Iliadic parallel, the men make no reply but simply act upon Diomedes’ suggestion.²¹⁰ The overwhelmingly favourable response to Polyxo’s suggestion essentially to surrender everything to the men (695-6) casts considerable doubt on the narrator’s account of how readily they had adapted to the vacated male roles in their society (627-9).

The μῦθος proposed by Polyxo (698) in response to Hypsipyle’s request for μῆτις (664) activates the μενοινή (700) of the Lemnian women. For desire to be realised, ‘proposal and plan’ must be re-interpreted as ‘story and craft’ (See 664-6n.). The dawn that delayed the Argonautic narrative (v.651) will now be the dawn of a new Lemnian story. When μενοινή next occurs, it is in Hypsipyle’s farewell to Jason (v. 894), her desire for his ‘Lemnian’ *nostos*.

ἦδη κεν μετὰ νῆα καὶ ἄγγελον ὀτρύναιμι (701). Hypsipyle’s vocabulary conveys the general urgency of the women when she proposes to speed a messenger and right now. The plan has been voiced and approved, their desire is out in the open, and the pace quickens. Iphinoe keeps the speed up by addressing the men at once (ῥῶκα δέ, 710) and telling them to come right away (αὐτίκα νῦν, 716). Her speed proves infectious when the Argonauts are in turn pleased by the request (εὐάδε γάρ σφι | μῦθος, 697-8 ~ πάντεσσι δ’ ἐναΐσιμος ἦνδανε μῦθος, 717) and respond by dispatching Jason quickly (ῥῶκα, 719).

²¹⁰ Cf. e.g. ὥς Τρώων ἀλαλητὸς ἀνὰ στρατὸν εὐρὺν ὀρώρει: | οὐ γὰρ πάντων ἦεν ὁμὸς θρόος οὐδ’ ἴα γῆρυς, *Il.* 4.436-7. The massed ranks of the Trojans and their allies is described as a cacophony. Although ἀλαλητός most obviously corresponds to the clamour in the market-place, given the echoes of the conflict of Achaeans and Trojans in the massing of the Lemnian women on the shore, the experienced reader might be again reminded that beneath the surface of a positively expressed enthusiasm something more wild and desperate might be bubbling (See 633-6n).

702-8: Hypsipyle asks for the man ὅστις στόλου ἡγεμονεύει, 704. One inference would be that Aethalides did not have time or inclination to pass on much detail to the women. Another would be that Hypsipyle was not paying attention (or unlike Aethalides she possesses a perishable memory of all things). Another would be that contrary to the narrator's (suspect) report that the women had adapted readily to male roles they have no understanding of their husbands' former occupation as sailors/pirates. Jason was last mentioned by name when crying as the Argonauts sailed away from Greece (1.534) and is not mentioned by name again until v.854, his return visit to the palace of Hypsipyle (who is herself frequently named). Hypsipyle cannot define him and her inability to do so prompts the reader to speculate and the speculations that result are multiple because we had no access to her dialogue with Aethalides. In itself this speculation might appear quite incidental and one that has no bearing on how the narrative develops but it is one more to add to the accumulation of speculations that are arising because of a deliberately suppressive narrator. I draw attention to it because it is an essential component of how this text conditions its readers to pay attention, to think and to engage with it.

Iphinoe is told to convey not Hypsipyle's command but the decision of the people, δήμοιο ἔπος (705). Despite occupying her father's seat, Hypsipyle presents herself as an egalitarian leader. Associations of her with a ruler are left to the narrator's description of Thoas (κατὰ δῆμον ἄνασσε, 621), the detail that it was *her* Aethalides persuaded (650) and the reported speculation of the Argonauts ('Υψιπύλῃν δ' εἶσαντο... ἄνασσέμεν, 718-9).²¹¹

Alternatively, the reader might reasonably wonder whether Hypsipyle fully endorses the plan at this stage. It's the people's decision not hers. Whilst she will proceed with it, her own proposal was to get rid of the men. She has already been distinguished twice from the collective by the narrator (See 620-1n. & 637-8n.). The man she spared (or tried to kill) was her father, not an unfaithful husband. Hypsipyle is

²¹¹ Mori (2008: 183) assesses Hypsipyle's style of governance here 'as a ruler capable of balancing prudent self-interest with piety and civility' who accepts 'the assembly's decision to invite the Argonauts into the capital.' Cf. *ibid.* 104 n. 64 citing K. Cuik's resume on Rostropowicz 1983: 17-18 (presenting the view that the Lemnian women project the ideal assembly and exemplify a utopian democracy).

portrayed as a daughter, not a wife. Her first speech conceives the Argonauts as a threat to the reputation of the women, not as their potential sexual partners. The description of her blush in Jason's presence (παρθενικὰς ἐρύθηνε παρηίδας, 791) is that of a virgin queen feeling a first flush of desire. There are echoes of an Odyssean temptress in her dissembling speech but in her emotional state the echoes are of a Nausicaa ascended to the throne in dubious circumstances (See 790-2n.).²¹²

L5. 'Iphinoe's Message' (709-720).

ᾠς δὲ καὶ Ἰφινόη Μινύας ἵκεθ'. Οἱ δ' ἐρέεινον χρεῖος ὅ τι φρονέουσα μετήλυθεν· ᾠκα δὲ τοὺς γε πασσυδίη μύθοισι προσέννεπεν ἐξερέοντας·	710
"Κούρη τοί μ' ἐφέηκε Θοαντιάς ἐνθάδ' ἰοῦσαν Ὑψιπύλῃ καλέειν νηὸς πρόμον ὅστις ὄρωρεν, ὄφρα τί οἱ δῆμοιο ἔπος θυμηδὲς ἐνίσπη· καὶ δ' αὐτοὺς γαίης τε καὶ ἄστεος, αἴ κ' ἐθέλητε, κέκλεται αὐτίκα νῦν ἐπιβαινέμεν εὐμενέοντας."	715
ᾠς ἄρ' ἔφη, πάντεσσι δ' ἐναίσιμος ἦνδανε μῦθος· Ὑψιπύλῃν δ' εἶσαντο καταφθιμένοιο Θόαντος τηλυγέτην γεγαυῖαν ἀνασσέμεν. ᾠκα δὲ τὸν γε πέμπον ἴμεν, καὶ δ' αὐτοὶ ἐπεντύνοντο νέεσθαι.	720

A.R. 1.709-720

709-11: ᾠκα δὲ τοὺς γε (710) is picked up by ᾠκα δὲ τὸν γε (719). The parallel phrases in parallel positions underscore the sense of a chain reaction. Iphinoe motivates the Argonauts to move and they then motivate Jason.

712-6: Iphinoe's speech plays with the messenger type-scene (available to A. + C.). Verbs are changed from first and third person and she paraphrases part of the instruction. Ὑψιπύλῃ, καλέειν νηὸς πρόμον, ὅστις ὄρωρεν (713) echoes but does not repeat τοῦδ' ἀνέρος ἀντιόωσα | ἡμέτερόν δε μολεῖν ὅς τις στόλου ἡγεμονεύει

²¹² See Vian 1974: 28 on Hypsipyle and Jason as a couple – the players (who play it straight) set against the comic backdrop of cavorting women and Argonauts.

(703-4). Her request is not for the leader of the expedition but whoever the man is who commands the ship. Hypsipyle is named at the beginning of the verse and juxtaposed with the anonymous commander at verse-end. Her naming clarifies the opening word of the preceding verse - she is Κούρη Ὑψιπύλη. Again, she is not a wife but a girl and a daughter. This can be read as Iphinoe's identification on behalf of the men – 'the daughter of Thoas' indicative of who is now in charge on Lemnos. Polyxo's contrast between age and youth could have affected Iphinoe's evaluation, but here (significantly focalised by another woman) the reader finds Hypsipyle again referred to as girl not as woman. It reiterates her different (and problematic) position on Lemnos (and foreshadows her appeal to Jason).

αὐτίκα νῦν (716) is not only an emendation of Hypsipyle's θαρσαλέως (707) but suggests that the general sense of urgency of the women has affected Iphinoe (cf. ὦκα δὲ, 710. See 697-701n.). Her interest is not so much in putting the men at ease as getting them to act quickly. The women are impatient.

717-20: Just as the μῦθος of Polyxo pleased (εὔαδε 697) the Lemnian women, the same proposal as reported by Iphinoe has a similar effect on the men, it is favourable to all - πάντεσσι δ' ἐναίσιμος ἦνδανε μῦθος (717).²¹³ Although that 'all' the reader later discovers does not include Heracles. Potential conflict has given way to the *prospect* of mutual satisfaction.

The narrator offers a supposition εἴσαντο (718) for the Argonauts' acceptance of the current political climate on Lemnos. Their conclusion is that Hypsipyle rules because she is the only child of the former king. On what evidence are they basing this? Have they heard of Thoas? He was mentioned briefly in the *Iliad* (*Il.* 14.230, see 620-1n.). Perhaps godlike Thoas was famous in the previous generation. Do the Argonauts know that there are no men on the island? They should suspect based on the composition of the greeting party but it is not until Hypsipyle tells Jason not to linger outside the gates because there are no men (793-4) that we find explicit confirmation.

²¹³ Cf. e.g. ὥς φάτο, τοῖσι δὲ πᾶσιν ἐαδὸτα μῦθον ἔειπε, *Od.* 18.422 (Amphinomus suggests a libation and the suitors retire leaving the beggar Odysseus to Telemachus' care). The formula is echoed in both 697 and 717.

The absence of details concerning Aethalides' embassy (the male messenger counterpart to Iphinoe) makes the reader search for evidence to support this supposition. Aethalides persuaded Hypsipyle (650-1) and Iphinoe has now come at the behest of Thoas' daughter (712). From these two references we have to infer ourselves in order to construct a sense of what the Argonauts now know and on what they are basing their supposition. The parallelism in the structure of message and response underlines where they are taking their cues from and developing them. 718-19 invert the order of 712-13, proceeding from Hypsipyle (Ὑψιπύλῃν ~ Ὑψιπύλῃ, same metrical position) to death of father (καταφθιμένοιο Θόαντος) to only daughter (τηλυγέτην γεγαυῖαν ~ Κούρη, both at beginning of line). τηλύγετος 'darling child' is here equivalent to μονογενής 'only child', (so Σ ad 1.718-9).²¹⁴ Then Ἀνασσεμέν occupies the same *sedes* as Θοαντιάς - in the report of their supposition, her role stands in place of the daughter's father.

Of course, it's only partially correct: Hypsipyle is in charge but Thoas is not dead, he's the only Lemnian man still living. Again the reader is confronted with issues of interpretation and misinterpretation when inferences are made from fragmentary evidence.

'Him' is quickly sent on his way ὧκα δὲ τόνγε | πέμπτον ἴμεν, (719-20). Heracles will ape the narrator's manner when addressing the men, τὸν δ' ἐνὶ λέκτροις | Ὑψιπύλῃς εἶ᾽ αὖτε πανήμερον (872-3, see 872-4n.). 'Him' is sent to her in narrator-text and 'him' is told to stay with her in character-text.²¹⁵ What did the Argonauts say to Iphinoe, or to Jason? The proposal pleased them. They sent him. I refer back to the Introduction and to the discussion of Laird's categories of speech modes). Both of these are examples of Laird's 'terse' RSA (See above p.46). Moreover, their deployment here is indicative of the overall narrative treatment of speech in this episode: this is angled narration of dialogue. We did not hear Aethalides' message but we heard Iphinoe's. We heard all that the women proposed in the assembly but nothing from the men. When Jason and

²¹⁴ Cf. λιποῦσα παῖδά τε τηλυγέτην, of Hermione, the *only* daughter of Helen, *Il.* 3.175.

²¹⁵ Cf. Hypsipyle tells him to go back to the ship and report, Ἄλλ' ἄγε νῦν ἐπὶ νῆα κίων ἐτάροισιν ἐνίσπες | μύθους ἡμετέρους. Jason spends a good deal of this episode shuttling back and forth between city and ship.

Hypsipyle speak, he will finally get the opportunity to make himself heard, but he does so in six lines (836-41) compared to forty-one lines from her (793-833). Our Lemnian experience as readers right up until Heracles gets upset and effectively brings the episode to a conclusion is dominated by the views and voices of the women. The manner of the treatment contributes to the feeling that this is *their* story.

L6. ‘Jason’s Journey’ (721-792).

In the text, sixty-six lines come between the acceptance of the proposal and Iphinoe leading Jason to the palace; that is roughly twenty percent of the narrative between arrival at and departure from Lemnos. In terms of the advancing the plot, this section of the narrative moves Jason from the Argo to Myrine, from scene to scene. As de Jong notes in her observations on narrative *rhythm*, ‘narratives typically modulate between *scenes*, in which events are told in great detail (often including the words spoken by a character) ... and *summaries*, where events are dealt with quickly and in broad strokes.’²¹⁶

Now, there was an urgency in Iphinoe’s message (αὐτίκα νῦν, 716) to which the Argonauts responded in kind (ὤκα, 719) and Jason is not sluggish. His preparations involve only two actions, he puts on his cloak (αὐτὰρ ὅγ’ ἀμφ’ ὤμοισι θεᾶς Τριτωνίδος ἔργον, | δίπλακα πορφυρέην περονήσατο, 721-2) and picks up his spear (Δεξιτερῇ δ’ ἔλεν ἔγχος ἐκηβόλον, 769). Then he sets off in epic style (Βῆ δ’ ἵμεναι προτὶ ἄστυ, 774). Both preparations and journey pass without incident or dialogue but the detail, what causes the retardation of the narrative here, comes in the form of description.

The preparation is dominated by the ecphrasis on the images woven into the cloak whilst the spear comes with a short but not insignificant history. The narrative of the journey itself is lengthened by simile, one not concerned with movement but appearance, the hero’s likeness to a star and the effect that has on the observing women.

²¹⁶ de Jong 2014: 92–3. In the former case, story time roughly equates to fabula time. In the latter, story time is less than fabula time.

Following the positive response to the message, the reader's expectation is that Jason will meet Hypsipyle, but that meeting is being postponed whilst we are asked to look at Jason, at his cloak, to imagine him and, when the narrative does move forward and he enters Myrine, to look at the women looking at him and to see him from their perspective.

Readers are not all obliged to interpret and react in the same manner and recognition of familiar components in the narrator's descriptions modulates our responses but, fundamentally, this retardation of the narrative is achieved through the narrator's focus on appearance and perception, and the reader's reflection upon those perceptions. Specifically, that focus is Jason. In the Colchian narrative of Book 3, at the court of Aeetes, Jason makes a remarkable impression on the love-struck Medea who cannot stop thinking about him, about what he wore or how he moved (3.453-6). He has had one movement scene earlier in the narrative with attendant simile. In his departure from home to the shore, he was likened to Apollo leaving his sacred sites, and the crowd cheered their hero on (1.306-311). This is different. This is his first encounter with a foreign people, this is the reader's first experience of him on the voyage and the impressions we form now create expectations of how he will perform in the future.

Jason's 'Arming' Scene (721-773)

As previously noted, there are only two actions that occur in the arming scene, story-time is in stasis as the narrator conveys additional information to the reader, and for our readers A. + C. the intertextual connections formed have an unsettling effect on both interpretation of the scene being described and expectations regarding the imminent meeting of Jason and Hypsipyle.²¹⁷

Regarding the actions, the presentation of the hero dressing and equipping recalls a Homeric arming scene. So e.g. Vian (1974: 83 n.2): 'Apollonios se souvient de la scène "typique" de l'armement du guerrier.' Jason's activities trigger the association of any Homeric warrior readying himself for battle. Beyond generic reminiscences of

²¹⁷ So Fusillo (1985: 219): 'Troviamo poi una sezione che non riguarda l'azione dei personaggi, ma solo il rapporto narratore - lettore, con sospensione del tempo del racconto.'

the type-scene, there are correspondences both lexical and structural to specific arming scenes.

In the opening scene of *Iliad* 11, Agamemnon prepares for battle. His corselet is a guest-gift (τόν ποτέ οἱ Κινύρης δῶκε ξεινήϊον εἶναι, *Il.* 11.20), reference is made to the circumstances of reception (*Il.* 11.21-3) and a brief description is given (*Il.* 11.24-8). After he slings his sword about his shoulders (ἀμφὶ δ' ἄρ' ὤμοισιν βάλετο ξίφος, *Il.* 11.29), he takes up his shield, the description of which includes a short ecphrasis, the depiction of the Gorgon flanked by Fear and Terror (*Il.* 11.36-7). His last action is to take up his two spears (εἴλετο δ' ἄλκιμα δοῦρε δύω, *Il.* 11. 43-44).²¹⁸

Jason puts on his cloak as Agamemnon does his sword (Αὐτὰρ ὅ γ' ἀμφ' ὤμοισι, θεῶς Ἰτωνίδος ἔργον, | δίπλακα πορφυρέην περονήσατο, 721-2) and mirrors the final action in taking up his spear, to which is attached the guest-gift analepsis (Δεξιτερῇ δ' ἔλεν ἔγχος ἐκηβόλον, ὃ ρ' Ἀταλάντῃ | Μαινάλῳ ἔν ποτέ οἱ ξεινήϊον ἐγγυάλιξε, 769-70). Agamemnon's is a prominently placed arming scene comprising thirty-two lines preceding extensive *androktasiai* (*Il.* 11.91-180, 218-283). The adaptation of structure, use of ecphrasis and analepsis (and for C. a lexical correspondence, ἀμφὶ δ' ἄρ' ὤμοισιν ~ ὅ γ' ἀμφ' ὤμοισι) are sufficient echoes to invite some comparison to a rampaging Agamemnon but making that comparison highlights the very different nature of Jason's undertaking.

Agamemnon's arming scene contains more paraphernalia (greaves, corselet, sword, shield, helmet) and more balanced descriptions thereof. Jason's scene is significantly weighted in favour of the cloak and the ecphrasis thereon.

This skewed narrative emphasis (forty-eight lines on the cloak against five on the spear) foregrounds the first object, the lengthy description of which is owing to the ecphrasis which in turn demands to be read against its main model the Shield of Achilles.²¹⁹ In *Iliad* 18, the setting is Olympus. The reader observes the exchange between Thetis and Hephaestus, her request for armour (οἷά τις αὖτε | ἀνθρώπων πολέων θαυμάσσεται, ὅς κεν ἴδῃται, *Il.* 18.466-7) and witnesses the shield's creation (478-608). It is not until the following book that the armour is delivered and the

²¹⁸ See Vian 1974: 83 n.2 & 86 n.2.

²¹⁹ On narrative emphases, see A. D. Morrison 2007: 7-9.

reactions of the Achaeans and Achilles to its appearance are narrated (*Il.* 19.14-19). There is a structural similarity. Following the ecphrasis on the shield, the armour, as with Jason's spear, is allotted a summary treatment comprising only four lines (*Il.* 18.610-3). In effect, two models, wearing and making, merge in Jason's preparations but the single most striking adaptation of these martial models is the switch of material, from forged metals to woven fabric.

Lawall (1966: 158) commented upon the transition succinctly, 'The cloak clothes a civilised man on what promises to be a peaceful mission to a city and a palace, while the shield decks out a warrior on the field of battle.'²²⁰ 'Promise' is an interesting choice of verb. In reading beyond the arming scene into the journey and star simile (774-81), the shadow of Achilles lengthens. Priam watched him rushing over the plain in his divine armour, shining like a star (*Il.* 22.25-32). In observing this accumulation of martial intertexts, Clauss finds the scene being set 'in such a way that the reader envisages a climactic military clash between opposing warriors... The vivid contrast between the reader's expectations and the actual event is significant.'²²¹ The meeting *will* be amicable and Clauss notes the importance of Jason's attractiveness, as established in the Lemnian episode, to the expedition's ultimate success. However, the effect of the intertextual pull here requires further consideration.

Had, for example, Jason set out alone to the city following Aethalides' negotiations (v.652), then recognition of these Iliadic intertexts could conceivably increase the reader's uncertainty regarding the situation and prompt expectations towards a violent denouement (dependent on the view held of the women at that point). Yet subsequently, the reader witnessed the women in assembly, was privy to their debate in direct speech and to the narrator's report that the decision to entertain the Argonauts as guests met with unanimous approval (εὐάδε γάρ σφι | μῦθος, 697-8). Likewise, when Iphinoe repeated the proposal in direct speech to the men, the narrator stated their own positive response (πάντεσσι δ' ἐναίσιμος ἦνδανε μῦθος, 717). Iphinoe is herself an assuring constant here not leaving the reader's sight; in attendance at the assembly, responsible for relaying the message, Jason's guide to Myrine.

²²⁰ Cf. Goldhill 1991: 303 'the choice of a cloak – an ornament and something to sleep on – makes a significant contrast with the shields of Homer and Hesiod, a contrast which has important implications for the sort of figure Jason is and the sort of narrative we are engaged in.'

²²¹ Clauss 1993: 122.

Against the prevailing mood of optimism and narrative continuity it is difficult to privilege the aforementioned intertexts to the extent that they misdirect the reader into anticipating violence at the palace. On the other hand, it is too simplistic to read them antithetically. Jason remains a hero, and a warrior, but he does things his own way. Nevertheless, the associations are unsettling. During this retardation of the narrative viewing the hero and his apparel, the reader's experience of other texts suggests divergent paths. In his analysis of Homeric misdirection, Morrison explores how it plays against tradition and encourages speculation on outcomes and the loss of confidence: 'the narrator puts the audience into a situation experienced by mortal characters: this situation is characterised by doubt, delay, frustration, and false expectation.'²²² The misdirection here is a tension between text and intertext not tradition, but the observations are relevant. The reader might wonder how an Achilles would have fared on Lemnos, or perhaps how the situation would have played out had the Argonauts sent Heracles instead of Jason. More importantly, C. in particular might read on with some sense of unease, the narrator's assurances disquieted here by the murmurings of violence.

i. *Jason's Cloak (721-767)*

Αὐτὰρ ὃ γ' ἀμφ' ὤμοισι, θεῆς Ἰτωνίδος ἔργον,
 δίπλακα πορφυρέην περονήσατο, τήν οἱ ὄπασσε
 Παλλάς, ὅτε πρῶτον δρυόχους ἐπεβάλλετο νηός
 Ἀργοῦς καὶ κανόνεσσι δάε ζυγὰ μετρήσασθαι.
 Τῆς μὲν ῥηίτερόν κεν ἐς ἥλιον ἀνιόντα
 ὅσσε βάλοις ἢ κεῖνο μεταβλέψειας ἔρευθος·
 δὴ γάρ τοι μέσση μὲν ἐρευθήεσσα τέτυκτο,
 ἄκρα δὲ πορφυρέη πάντῃ πέλεν. Ἐν δ' ἄρ' ἐκάστῳ
 τέρματι δαίδαλα πολλὰ διακριδὼν εὖ ἐπέπαστο.
 A.R. 1.721-29

721-2: Contained within the action are two key phrases focusing attention first on authorship and then on the nature of the object itself. In referring to Athena as the

²²² J. V. Morrison 1992: 22.

Itonian goddess, the narrator recalls the reader to the Argo's launch at Pagasae when Pelion's nymphs looked down and marvelled at the Argo, ἔργον Ἀθηναίης Ἰτωνίδος (A.R. 1.551).²²³ Now the reader is being invited to marvel in turn at another of her works. The cloak is the product of her skill in weaving (See 627-29n.). Just as Jason's preparations are beginning, Lemnian gender reversal is foregrounded. The women put on armour for battle (v.635), now the hero dresses to impress. Acknowledging the model ecphrases draws further attention to the reversal – the god and forger Hephaestus has been replaced by the goddess and weaver Athena. Her authorship is made more emphatic by the reiteration of her name v.768 which closes the ecphrasis and puts her seal upon it.²²⁴

Shields are not the only epic model for ecphrases and for the experienced reader C. the cloak and its colour has a sound Iliadic precedent. In *Iliad* 3, Iris goes to Helen to inform her of the impending duel between Paris and Menelaus and finds her working on a purple cloak, δίπλακκα πορφυρέην (*Il.* 3.126). It is the same phrase and found in the same line position as in our v.722. She is embroidering her cloak with scenes of the Trojan War (*Il.* 3.126-8), the conflict endured for her sake (ἐθεν εἵνεκ', *Il.* 3.128). No exposition of those woven scenes occurred, only the mention of her theme. Nor does the reader encounter scenes from a single narrative here but, in contrast, a collage of mythical episodes. Still the allusions to a narrative of war, one instigated by passion, put in the reader's mind conflict brought about by love and the context of *Iliad* 3 also suggests another model for Jason in Paris. His abduction of Helen is neatly summarised

²²³ On the proximity of Iton to Pagasae, see Σ ad 1.551, Mooney 1912 ad loc. We should also note that Ἰτωνίδος is the reading in Vian's MS E and in a scholium to MS L, whereas other MSS have Τριτωνί-, but Itonian is preferable here (surely *lectio difficilior*). Likewise, there is a similar discrepancy in the MSS at 1.551 (there Itonian is in a copyist's correction in one MS (L), a variant in the schol. and in the testimonia (such as the *Etymologicum Magnum*), showing it was an early reading.

²²⁴ On the ring composition, see Clauss 1993: 120. In contrast, George (1972: 49 & *ibid.* n.2) notes 'a subtle de-emphasis of the manufacture of the art-work by the deity in the story.' His comments on the increased importance of viewing and the poet's role are correct, I think, but I would question whether Athena's presence is diminished. A decreased emphasis on manufacture can be attributed to the interlacing of the arming and making models. The Argonautic reader is viewing a finished product on its intended wearer rather than witnessing its creation at the forge (hence a lack of active making verbs). Within the ecphrasis (which is shorter than these models) there is variation in the transitions between scenes and Athena's presence at both beginning and end (enclosing and sealing the whole) is sufficient emphasis on her authorship, I believe, without imitating the repeated references to Hephaestus found on the Hesiodic Shield.

in Hector's rebuke (*Il.* 3.47-9) – gathering comrades, mixing with foreigners, bringing back a woman from a faraway land – has obvious parallels with the quest and Medea.²²⁵ And within the same passage Paris' good looks are noted (*Il.* 3.39, 44-5, 54) though Jason ought not to be regarded as γυναιμανής (as it turns out, it is the Lemnian women who are mad for him).

723-4: After mention of the gift, the narrative slips back into the moment of giving. The two-line analepsis on the cloak's reception reminds of Athena's past and continued support of the enterprise and takes the reader momentarily back to the building of the Argo – an event in the fabula which the narrator in a marked display of control earlier declared was a song he chose not to sing (See Introduction 2. *Beginning Again*). On the rhetoric of *praeteritio*, a commentary on narration, Goldhill (1991: 290) writes, 'it marks the (wilful) entrance of the narrator into the narrative.' Here, a casting back to the Argo's construction invites recollection of that early emphatic intrusion as the narrator is on the point of making his presence felt again.

725-6: A direct address to the reader that does not occur in the Homeric or Hesiodic models. The address is paired by a second address following the final scene of the ecphrasis (765-7). Thus, within the frame of authorship lies a second frame opened by a *caveat* on viewing so dazzling an object and closed by one on the frustration of hoping to hear words spoken by an image. George (1972: 49) astutely observes the dual function of the cloak for the narrative: 'the poet means the cloak to be a highly personal communication between himself and the reader, as well as a powerful object of admiration for the Lemnian women.'

And yet this communication will not be easy. There are images on the cloak but the nature of the cloak itself is working against the viewing: it's so dazzling it's hard to look at. Goldhill, focusing on this difficulty to interpretation considers how the ecphrasis 'may be paradigmatic for the narrative of the *Argonautica*' and 'how Apollonius as he offers the allusive structures of allegory, prefigurement, a modelling of the narrative, interlaces his offer with the imagery of illusion, of misreading.'²²⁶

²²⁵ The character motivation behind Jason's refusal to take Atalanta on the voyage is, the narrator tells us, because he feared the strife love causes. See 771-3n.

²²⁶ Goldhill 1991: 311.

The colour at the cloak's centre is ἔρευθος, the red of blushes, of passion, of desire. ἔρευθος is the colour which will beguile the Lemnian women (see 774-81n.). Our protection against the cloak, against being absorbed in its redness, is the narrator. Ecphrasis is a mediated description of an object which the reader is invited to visualise, a visualisation which is reconstructed from the narrator's focalised narration. The narrator is presenting the cloak as a challenge to accurate perception, as an object whose appearance has the potential to overwhelm the viewer whilst simultaneously by nature of the address reminding the reader of his own controlling/guiding presence.

Ἐν μὲν ἔσαν Κύκλωπες ἐπ' ἀφθίτῳ ἡμένοι ἔργῳ, 730
 Ζηνὶ κεραυνὸν ἄνακτι πονεύμενοι· ὅς τόνον ἤδη
 παμφαίνων ἐτέτυκτο, μῆς δ' ἔτι δεύετο μοῦνον
 ἀκτῖνος· τὴν οἷ γε σιδηρεῖης ἐλάασκον
 σφύρησιν, μαλεροῖο πυρὸς ζείουσιν αὐτμήν.
 Ἐν δ' ἔσαν Ἀντιόπης Ἀσωπίδος υἱέε δοιῶ, 735
 Ἀμφίων καὶ Ζῆθος, Ἀπύργωτος δ' ἔτι Θήβη
 κείτο πέλας, τῆς οἷ γε νέον βάλλοντο δομαίους
 ἰέμενοι· Ζῆθος μὲν ἐπωμαδὸν ἥρταζεν
 οὔρεος ἡλιβάτοιο κάρη, μογέοντι ἐοικώς·
 Ἀμφίων δ' ἐπὶ οἷ χρυσέῃ φόρμιγγι λιγαίνων 740
 ἦιε, δις τόσση δὲ μετ' ἵχνια νίσετο πέτρῃ.
 A.R. 1.730-41

735-41: The scene depicts the foundation of a city. The builders are named and their lineage is accounted for - Amphion and Zethus, twin sons of Antiope the daughter of Asopus. Lemnos has no sons and Hypsipyle, daughter of Thoas, cannot hope to emulate Antiope. However, the scene does have points of contact, prompts to remind the reader of what was observed at the Lemnian Assembly and to Polyxo's confronting the possibility of Lemnian extinction (See L4ii above).

The foundation parallel (Thebes) does not map precisely to the future foundation of Thera. Thera will be populated by Euphemus' descendants, not those of Hypsipyle and Jason for whose imminent meeting the narrative is building the reader's anticipation. Nevertheless, the invitation is there, in light of the current situation on Lemnos, for the reader to be thinking in terms of ancestry, foundation and colonisation when met by this foundation scene on the cloak.

The scene concludes with a comparison of the different approaches to labour of

the two sons, one which might be reduced to strength vs. skill, and seen as a triumph for the latter in that the magic of Amphion moving a boulder twice the size as that his brother carries makes him a more effective builder. Again, this can be seen by the attentive reader as not only having thematic significance to the larger narrative but to the particular episode. Hypsipyle (unlike her Homeric counterparts or Medea) is no magician, but the strategy of the women (to be carried out by their queen) has more in common with skill (and doubts have already been cast on the possibility of strength winning the day by their depiction by the narrator helpless on the shore, vv.638-9, and the absence of any such strategy put forward in assembly). To win over the men, to achieve both short and long-term aims, the method is deception and manipulation.

Hypsipyle's plan on which Lemnian survival in the present depends (and which the future foundation of Thera requires) is that of an Amphion rather than a Zethus – the charm and enchantment of words.

Ἐξείης δ' ἥσκητο βαθυπλόκαμος Κυθήρεια
 Ἄρεος ὀχμάζουσα θοὸν σάκος· ἐκ δέ οἱ ὦμον
 πῆχυν ἔπι σκαιὸν ξυνοχὴ κεχάλαστο χιτῶνος
 νέρθε παρὲκ μαζοῖο· τὸ δ' ἀντίον ἀτρεκὲς αὐτῶς
 χαλκείῃ δείκηνον ἐν ἀσπίδι φαίνεται' ἰδέσθαι.
 A.R. 1.742-46

745

742-6: These alternatives (strength and skill) persist in Aphrodite's scene in which comparison and contrast between arms and amour is brought into bolder relief. The voyeuristic depiction of Aphrodite has her admiring her beauty in the shield of Ares. Again that can be reduced (so e.g. Lawall) to a contest of love and war and triumph of the former – an opposition that suggests the women will (like Aphrodite) overcome the Argonauts.

Alternatively, the reader might be forgiven for having misgivings. The Lemnian women have so far, in the narrator's account, been shown to have an uneasy and ambiguous relationship with the goddess of love, having overcome (610) their husbands as a result of her influence. Whilst a plan is in place and one agreeable to both sides (the women's response 697-8 answered at 717), the unpredictability and previous involvement of Aphrodite in Lemnian affairs can still at this juncture cause a reader some unease.

Aphrodite in a state of partial dress combined with her possession of the war god's shield are images that point A. to the song of Demodocus on their adulterous union and the trap set by Hephaestus. There is no mention of the cuckolded husband here and it is a noteworthy omission – he is absent from the bedroom just as he can be seen absent from his forge by the experienced reader, for as Clauss has observed, there is a potential learned allusion to Hephaestus finishing tripods (*Il.* 18) in the Cyclopes depicted just finishing their work on the thunderbolts. And, outside of description, there is his absence from authorship itself. He is the creator of the model, the Shield of Achilles (and the pseudo-Hesiodic shield). The transformation of object and material, cloak and cloth, has seen his authorship supplanted by Athena's.

A shift in the function of the object, a dressing for a diplomatic mission rather than battle, is a plausible explanation but there remains a remarkable succession of omissions/substitutions – authorship/forge/lover – Athena/Cyclopes/Ares – all concerning a god with whom Lemnos is closely aligned (Σιντηίδα Λήμνον, 608). The employment of ecphrasis invites comparison with the model, it puts the shield and its creator in the reader's mind, but the only shield here is that which his wife gazes upon, not to admire its designs but her own reflection.

Additionally, the attentive reader (A.) might wonder if the cloak will be entirely successful in impressing the women who we have already been told have rejected Athena's works and dress for war (see 627-9n.) though their subsequent reaction (see L4ii above) might undermine confidence in the narrator's assertion. These are misgivings not dependent upon a reader alert to abstruse intertexts but upon an interpretation of events narrated thus far. Overtly the signs do portend favourably but the narrator, whilst not undermining the reader's confidence at that outcome can tease some unease and create tension.

The prompt towards the story of Aphrodite and Ares has further implications that can modify the reader's relationship with the current narrative and its narrator. As noted in the Introduction (2. *Beginning and Beginnings*), the Argonautic narrator has from the proem referenced character-narrators as potential models including the Phaeacian bard. Character-narrators are not omniscient and their narrative is not impartial. The reader faced with the static image of the goddess in ecphrasis is reminded of its narration, of hearing the song before and in a performative context. Again this does not in itself make

the reader question the ongoing Lemnian narration but it adds nuance. The reader who sees the cloak and hears the song witnesses the transformation of narrative to description, is put in mind of alternative narrators and ways of story-telling, of sources, performances and their audiences.

Additionally, in the mythological chronology, what the image is reminding the reader of is a song yet to be sung. Knight (1995: 195–6) discusses two instances concerning Circe in *Argonautica* 4 which put before the reader the same conflict of literary and mythological time. The first is the qualification of her harbour as ‘famous.’ It is ‘κλυτός [A.R. 4.661] because it has already been celebrated in poetry by Homer; the adjective refers to the reader’s situation, not to that of characters in the poem.’ The second instance is the adverb attached to Circe’s usage of drugs. The witch (we are told) has used them to enchant men ‘before’ (πάρως, 4.667). ‘Before’ is not a hint towards victims of her sorcery prior to the Argonautic fabula but to the reader’s experience of an extant text (as external primary narratees of the story related by Odysseus to the Phaeacians in *Odyssey* 11).

Ecphrasis creates a pause in the action with characters fixed in position whilst the reader is invited to stop and look, and in looking at (visualising) Aphrodite’s reflection is invited to reflect himself on the story as a story, on how is it being presented and on how has it been presented before. How does the reader’s situation differ as primary external narratees compared to the situation of the Lemnian women who are secondary narratees not visualising the cloak through the primary narrator’s lens but themselves viewing? What do they see? What do we imagine we see?

For example, if following Lawall we pursue a didactic reading, for whom does the cloak serve as instruction? For Jason, the lesson is to recognise the efficacy of strategy over strength, for which he and the reader might receive hindsight confirmation with Phineus’ pronouncement to be mindful of Cypris, source of their future success (A.R. 2.423-5).²²⁷ The reading into the cloak of such instruction, however, might be problematised by what the reader knows of its author. The goddess Athena is the weaver *par excellence* and amongst the gods the most exceptional in cunning (See 627-9n.) but she is a stranger to Love (she will admit in direct speech in this narrative her own

²²⁷ See Hunter 1993: 122.

ignorance of love's power to Hera, A.R. 3.32-3). What do the Lemnian women who have killed their own men and taken up their arms see in Aphrodite's image? Do they notice it at all? Is their focus on the details or rather on the dazzling surface when they view Jason in Myrine (καί σφισι κυανέοιο δι' ἥερος ὄμματα θέλγει | καλὸν ἐρευνθόμενος, vv.777-8)?

What in the image marks the shield as the shield of Ares? It is his shield because the narrator tells us so but is that information conveyed somehow in the image's detail or is it additional information supplied by the narrator that in turn suggests a possible mythological scenario?

Where do we situate ourselves as observers? How do we reconstruct the image from the details of the description? 'The joining of her dress had slipped from the shoulder onto her left arm, under her breast, and even so her precise likeness was plain to see in the bronze shield opposite her.' Do we situate ourselves face-to-face, looking at Aphrodite shield in hand and infer the image she sees? Is her back to the viewer and over her shoulder we gaze at her reflection, at her body partially exposed? It is voyeuristic but we are invited to be voyeurs by the presentation of the image, to think about angles and points of view and to reconstruct. In a similar manner, the closing image of Phrixos and the ram encourages the reader to eavesdrop, to imagine and (re)create a dialogue.

We are presented with one image but there are multiple viewpoints available to our reconstruction. Our interpretation is dependent upon available knowledge from more than one source and how we weight this source-material when making that interpretation. It is only for Aphrodite that the image is clear, ἀτρεκές (745).

Hypsipyle's fear was that the men come to know them exactly (ἀτρεκέως, 661. See 793-7n.). Do the women see themselves clearly? Will the Argonauts come to see them clearly?

Ecphrasis suspends action. From the moment the reader is invited to look at the cloak (725) until Jason takes up his spear (769), nothing can happen. Our attention is turned to the object. Our momentum paused is as we observe and try to assimilate new material and how it might affect the narrative. Aphrodite reflecting on her reflection thus mirrors the reader's own reflecting triggered by the image presented.

Ἐν δὲ βοῶν ἔσκεν λάσιος νομός· ἀμφὶ δὲ βουσί
 Τηλεβόαι μάρναντο καὶ υἱέες Ἥλεκτρύωνος,
 οἱ μὲν ἀμυνόμενοι, ἀτὰρ οἳ γ' ἐθέλοντες ἀμέρσαι,
 ληισταὶ Τάφιοι· τῶν δ' αἷματι δεύετο λειμῶν 750
 ἐρσήεις, πολέες δ' ὀλίγους βιόωντο νομῆας.
 Ἐν δὲ δύω δίφροι πεπονήατο δηριόωντε.
 Καὶ τὸν μὲν προπάραιθε Πέλοψ ἵθυνε τινάσσων
 ἡνία, σὺν δέ οἱ ἔσκε παραιβάτις Ἴπποδάμεια.
 Τοῦ δὲ μεταδρομάδην ἐπὶ Μυρτίλος ἤλασεν ἵππους· 755
 σὺν τῷ δ' Οἰνόμαος, προτενὲς δόρυ χειρὶ μεμαρπώς,
 ἄξονος ἐν πλήμνῃσι παρακλιδὸν ἀγνυμένοιο
 πῖπτεν, ἐπεσσύμενος Πελοπῆια νῶτα δαΐξαι.
 Ἐν καὶ Ἀπόλλων Φοῖβος οἰστεύων ἐτέτυκτο,
 βούπαις, οὗ πω πολλός, ἐὼν ἐρύοντα καλύπτρης 760
 μητέρα θαρσαλέως Τιτυὸν μέγαν, ὃν ῥ' ἔτεκέν γε
 δῖ' Ἑλάρη, θρέψεν δὲ καὶ ἄψ' ἐλοχεύσατο Γαῖα.
 A.R. 1.747-762

747-51: The battle over cattle most closely corresponds to one on the model, the Shield of Achilles, in which the herdsmen of a besieged city are ambushed and killed (*Il.* 18.524-9). Here, as shepherds are beset by pirates, a pastoral scene is shattered by violence, resulting in the vivid image of the meadow drenched in blood. Again, however, the figures are given an *identity*. The narrator prompts the reader to a *story* rather than offering a generic scene: ἀμφὶ δὲ βουσὶν | Τηλεβόαι μάρναντο καὶ υἱέες Ἥλεκτρύωνος (747-8).

For the reader conditioned to look for correspondences, the activity offers parallels within the episode. In the backstory, the narrator recounted the practice of the Lemnian men to raid Thrace. The comparison is not exact. The reader is not being invited to imagine the Thracians as the sons of Electryon or substitute cattle for women. However, it does prompt to the circumstances which gave rise to the current situation. When backstory became narrative, the fear of the Lemnian women sighting the *Argo* was that the Thracians were coming which suggests a correspondence, as focalised by the women, between the Teleboae and their initial assumption regarding the Argonauts. Again, the question of perspective is raised but what the Lemnian women feared was Thracian reciprocation (see 636-7n.). Raid and counter-raid, the capture of women – the scene prompts reflection on causes and can be read as looking again to Herodotus' opening account of the Persian view of the origins of conflict between Greeks and

752-58: The scene depicting Pelops and Hippodameia pursued by Oenomaus (again characters in a pre-existing story) clearly foreshadows Jason, Medea and Aeetes. In our narrative, however, it will be the deception of the maiden that achieves success. The scene is one in which cunning is shown to triumph but Jason's role does not neatly equate to that of Pelops who sabotaged the chariot.

Ἐν καὶ Φρίξος ἦν Μινυΐης, ὥς ἑτέον περ
 εἰσαΐων κριοῦ, ὃ δ' ἄρ' ἔξενέποντι ἑοικώς.
 Κείνους κ' εἰσορόων ἀκέοις ψεύδοιό τε θυμόν,
 ἔλπόμενος πυκινὴν τιν' ἀπὸ σφείων ἔσακοῦσαι
 βᾶξιν, ὅτεν καὶ δηρὸν ἐπ' ἐλπίδι θηήσαιο.
 A.R. 1.763-767

ii. *Jason's Spear* (768-773)

126

Τοῖ' ἄρα δῶρα θεᾶς Ἰτωνίδος ἦεν Ἀθήνης.
 Δεξιτερῇ δ' ἔλεν ἔγχος ἐκηβόλον, ὃ ρ' Ἀταλάντη
 Μαινάλῳ ἔν ποτέ οἱ ξεινήιον ἐγγυάλιξε,
 770
 πρόφρων ἀντομένη· πέρι γὰρ μενέαινεν ἔπεσθαι
 τὴν ὁδόν. Ἀλλὰ γὰρ αὐτὸς ἐκὼν ἀπερήτυε κούρην,
 δεῖσεν δ' ἀργαλέας ἔριδας φιλότητος ἔκητι.
 A.R. 1.768-773

768-771: Unlike the ecphrasis which was a static description of scenes on the cloak, the description of the spear is dynamic. The focus is not on its appearance but on the history of its reception and includes an actorial motivation - when it was given to him, where, by whom and why. The actorial motivation behind the spear-giving transitions to the actorial motivation of why Atalanta is not aboard.²²⁸ Furthermore, the spear is a guest-gift. Within the analepsis is contained a reference to that key feature of Homeric epic – *xenia*. Argonauts and Lemnians have yet to observe due guest-host relations, but they will in a way which unlike here combines both *xenia* and *philotēs* (See L8 below).

771-3: The actorial motivation, in an aside, foreshadows the dangers presented by another woman who does come on the voyage out of necessity. Jason will leave Hypsipyle behind as he left Atalanta behind, but he will not leave Medea behind. The strife seeded here will be made explicit in the narrator's apostrophe to Eros in Book 4 and his bemoaning the source of οὐλόμενάι τ' ἔριδες (4.446, see 804-9n.).

The irony in the motivation and imminent scenario is noted by Fränkel (1968 ad 769-73): Jason fearful of one woman amongst many men is about to enter a city as one man amongst many women!

iii. *Jason's Star* (774-792)

Βῆ δ' ἵμεναι προτὶ ἄστν, φαεινῷ ἀστέρι ἴσος,
 775
 ὃν ῥά τε νηγατέησιν ἐεργόμεναι καλύβησι
 νύμφαι θηήσαντο δόμων ὕπερ ἀντέλλοντα,
 καὶ σφισι κυανέοιο δι' ἡέρος ὄμματα θέλγει
 καλὸν ἐρευθόμενος, γάννυται δέ τε ἡιθέοιο

²²⁸ Ἀταλάντη Σχοινέως is amongst the list of named Argonauts in Apollod. 1.9.16.

παρθένος ἰμείρουσα μετ' ἄλλοδαποῖσιν ἔόντος
 ἀνδράσιν, ᾧ καὶ μιν μνηστὴν κομέουσι τοκῆες· 780
 τῷ ἵκελος προπόλοιο κατὰ στίβον ἦεν ἥρως.
 A.R. 1.774-781

774-81: When Jason starts to move, the focalisation returns to the women and to how he is perceived. The reader gazes on him through their eyes and evaluates what they see – a beautiful object. He is like a star that beguiles the eyes ὄμματα θέλγει, (777). The red star (καλὸν ἐρευθόμενος, 778) seen by young maidens is like the red cloak of the hero that the narrator warned would dazzle us. The sight of the red-cloaked Jason will provoke a similar reddening in Hypsipyle when she blushes at the sight of him, παρθενικὰς ἐρύθηνε παρηίδας v.791. The fleece itself (foreshadowed on the cloak) will be likened to a cloud glowing red (4.126) and will cause Jason to blush when he seizes it, rejoicing as a girl seeing her dress in the moonlight (4.169-73). The moon that reddened Hylas' body confounded the nymph who fell in love with him (1.1230). ἐρευθῶ and ἔρευθος occur time and again in such contexts: the atmosphere as Jason enters Myrine is charged with the erotic. On θέλγειν, the power to bewitch, charm or enchant with sight or words, Goldhill writes '[it] is used in a variety of contexts but in particular to describe verbal and sexual seduction.'²²⁹

There is a transition in the simile from the general to the particular, from the brides (776) to a maiden who rejoices (779). If we map brides to Lemnian women and the maiden to Hypsipyle, then we have the same transition from the crowd to the queen as Jason makes his way to the palace. The simile mirrors (and foreshadows) the focusing in on reactions, and the focus for us is not on the object itself but on its effect – we watch them watching and they are charmed - by the star that charms, by Jason. To the Lemnian women, he is not an armoured Achilles or an Agamemnon, glorious and terrible. Nor is he wearing his cloak and with spear in hand an Alexander. To the Lemnian women, Jason is a man, and he's sexy.

Καί ῥ' ὅτε δὴ πυλέων τε καὶ ἄστεος ἐντὸς ἔβησαν,
 δημότεροι μὲν ὀπίσθεν ἐπεκλονέοντο γυναῖκες

²²⁹ Goldhill 1991: 60. Cf. Hunter 1989: 97 'very common of the power of *eros*.'

γηθόσυναι ξείνῳ· ὁ δ' ἐπὶ χθονὸς ὄμματ' ἐρείσας
 νίσετ' ἀπηλεγέως, ὅφρ' ἀγλαὰ δώμαθ' ἵκανε 785
 Ὑψιπύλης. Ἄνεσαν δὲ θύρας προφανέντι θεράπναι
 δικλίδας, εὐτύκτοισιν ἀρηρεμένας σανίδεσσιν·
 ἔνθα μιν Ἴφινόη κλισμῷ ἐνὶ παμφανόωντι
 ἐσσυμένως καλῆς διὰ παστάδος εἶσεν ἄγουσα
 ἀντία δεσποίνης. Ἡ δ' ἐγκλιδὸν ὅσσε βαλοῦσα 790
 παρθενικὰς ἐρύθηνε παρηίδας· ἔμπα δὲ τὸν γε
 αἰδομένη μύθοισι προσέννεπεν αἰμυλίοισι·
 A.R. 1.782-792

782-85: He is still the stranger as the women flock around him (γυναῖκες | γηθόσυναι ξείνῳ), but importantly, a handsome one.

785-90: The scene of the servants opening the doors and Iphinoe escorting him to a seat echoes for C. Odysseus' entrance to Circe's cottage (*Od.* 10-312-5). C. might still be speculating danger. He knows of fighting at the shore in variants of the myth. Perhaps this narrator has craftily suspended that expectation and shifted it to Myrine (see 953-7n.). Now his *Achilles* could be heading straight into *Circe*'s trap! A. is approaching with less trepidation. He saw the shield become a cloak, Jason is looking good and A. knows what these women want.

790-92: Hypsipyle's reaction to Jason's physical appearance (790) foreshadows Medea's own (ἡ δ' ἐγκλιδὸν ὅσσε βαλοῦσα ~ ἡ δ' ἐγκλιδὸν ὅσσε βαλοῦσα, 3.1008). The exact phrasing and *sedes* in both cases. Both maidens have the same response and look down lest their looks give away the feeling the sight of him has aroused. The blush that is the physical symptom of the feeling (791) will likewise flush hot on Medea's cheeks, when she sees him approach (παρθενικὰς ἐρύθηνε παρηίδας ~ θερμὸν δὲ παρηίδας εἶλεν ἔρευθος, 3.963). When we observe that Colchian tryst and observe Medea's reactions, our expectations are guided by what we see here on Lemnos, the effect Jason has on women. To see him is to love him. Though whereas he approached here like Hesperus, the maiden's delight, there he will approach like Sirius (a darker and closer match for Achilles) ὅς δὴ τοι καλὸς μὲν ἀρίζηλός τ' ἐσιδέσθαι,

In spite of this flustering, she collects herself and speaks μύθοισι αἰμυλίοισιν (792). The narrator is guiding the interpretation of the forthcoming speech. It is intended to win him to her cause.²³¹ It is the same manner with which Athena claimed the nymph Calypso constantly *beguiled* Odysseus, αἰμυλίοισι λόγοισιν | θέλγει (*Od.* 1.56-7). For C., there are mixed signals in the build-up to Hypsipyle's speech. To add to the echoes of Circe on the approach, C. now finds an echo of Calypso – the intertexts lurking behind the queen are to the two women who delayed Odysseus' *nostos*. Who is going to beguile who? Will Jason be charmer or charmed? He comes with spear in hand but also comes eyes cast to the floor like a maiden whereas Hypsipyle blushes like one but speaks (for C.) in the manner of an Odyssean temptress.

Or does she speak like a goddess of love, or like Jason himself? In Book 3, Aphrodite addresses her unexpected visitors, Hera and Athena, προσέννεπεν αἰμυλίοισιν (A.R. 3.51). In Colchis, Medea will be won by a combination of Jason's beauty and beguiling words, θυμὸς ὁμῶς μορφῇ τε καὶ αἰμυλίοισι λόγοισιν (3.1141).²³² When A. overhears that conversation of the goddesses on Olympus (their coming together as a trio a dress rehearsal for Paris' Judgement), he might well remember first and foremost the Lemnian queen. For A. the successful strategy of Hypsipyle foreshadows a likewise successful outcome in Colchis via the same method.

L7. 'Hypsipyle, Story-teller' (793-841).

Now Jason gets to hear in the queen's own words what has happened on Lemnos. Now the reader gets to hear a character-version of the same events the narrator provided in exposition before any Argonaut set foot on the island. Two external analepses – for the reader a repeating actorial analepsis that demands to be read against the narrator's. Her

²³⁰ See Hunter 1993: 48–9.

²³¹ On the narrator providing prompts to guide the reading, see e.g. Beye (1993: 169): 'The poet of the *Odyssey*, when he describes someone as beginning to speak, very often comments upon the wisdom or the awareness or the deceitfulness or the cynicism of the speaker.'

²³² See further Mori 2008: 122.

embedded narrative is explanatory, persuasive and thematic (most pertinently to ways of presenting the story).

For Jason, its text-internal audience, the speech has an argument function. It is intended to explain the current odd situation (why are there only female inhabitants), to provide assurances and to persuade him to enter the city. It has a basic rhetorical speech pattern: the opening ‘why do you stay outside the city...’ (793) is answered at the end of her argument by ‘[therefore] do not stay outside the city’ (833). For the text-external readers (primary narratees), it has a key function. We are obliged to compare with the primary narrator’s account and engage with the resultant problems that our comparison brings.

The tailoring of a story is an activity familiar to the Homeric auditor. The mythological paradigm employed by Phoenix to persuade Achilles back into the fight is an obvious Iliadic example in which elements of the story which especially apply to Achilles’ own situation are given prominence in the embedded narrative of Meleager and his (invented?) wife Cleopatra (Patroclus?).²³³

Throughout the *Odyssey*, the paradigm of the House of Atreus is referenced by Zeus, Athena, Nestor and Agamemnon, each foregrounding those elements most pertinent to their purpose, persuading the listener. To these, we can add that poem’s ‘Lying Tales’ for examples of how to blend fact and fiction, to adapt the tale with its audience in mind.

The narrative of Prometheus and Zeus in Hesiod’s *Theogony* has curious contradictions of its own whereby Zeus states emphatically that he cannot be tricked then chooses wrongly anyway! The *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* begins with the narrative of Persephone’s abduction by Hades. When reunited with her mother, she tells her an account of her abduction in which some details are expanded and precedes it with the story of the pomegranate in which some details subtly diverge from the narrator’s version.

The deployment of tailoring and competing presentations is not novel but what is striking here is the extent of the adaptation, the emotional charge that Hypsipyle invests in her treatment and the result – Jason is persuaded. The Lemnian women achieve at least some of their goals: impregnation (and thus survival) and keeping their

²³³ On mythological *paradeigma* in the *Iliad*, see e.g. Willcock 1964.

secret for now (the Argonauts sail away none the wiser). In this telling of the story, the narrator's version only remains relevant to the reader. The characters abide by her version and their acceptance of her version secures the Thera narrative.

i. *A Royal Revision (793-833)*

"Ξεῖνε, τίη μῖμνοντες ἐπὶ χρόνον ἔκτοθι πύργων
 ἦσθ' αὐτως, ἐπεὶ οὐ μὲν ὑπ' ἀνδράσι ναίεται ἄστυ,
 ἀλλὰ Θρηκίης ἐπινάστιοι ἠπείροιο 795
 πυροφόρους ἀρώσι γύας; Κακότητα δὲ πᾶσαν
 ἐξερῶ νημερτές, ἵν' εὖ γνοίητε καὶ αὐτοί.
 εὔτε Θόας ἀστοῖσι πατὴρ ἐμὸς ἐμβασίλευε,
 τηνίκα Θρηκίην οἷ τ' ἀντία ναιετάουσι
 δήμου ἀπορνύμενοι λαοὶ πέρθεσκον ἐναύλους 800
 ἐκ νηῶν, αὐτῇσι δ' ἀπείρονα ληίδα κούραις
 δεῦρ' ἄγον. Οὐλομένης δὲ θεᾶς πορσύνετο μῆνις
 Κύπριδος, ἣ τέ σφιν θυμοφθόρον ἔμβαλεν ἄτην·
 A.R. 1.793-803

793-7: Her speech begins with a deft touch. 'Ξεῖνε' she says, that greeting so commonly applied to the much-travelled Odysseus. 'Ξεῖνε' was Nausicaa's opening address (*Od.* 6.187).

Hypsipyle does not ask for a name but instead she asks why he and the men remain outside. She turns her earlier suggestion to the women (ἵν' ἐμπεδον ἔκτοθι πύργων | μίμνοινεν, 659-60) into a question to the man.²³⁴ Already she is adapting. With ἐπεὶ (794) she launches into an explanation – that there are no men in the city is an assurance that her addressee has nothing to fear. The following οὐ μὲν introduces her explanation why – an account of where the men are now to contrast with the sorry situation of the Lemnian women (Κακότητα δὲ πᾶσαν | ἐξερῶ, 796-7). Her presentation of the latter is strong and her evaluation is clear: it is a κακότης. However, in light of what he has already read, A. might find the contrast a sick joke.

George (1972: 58) classes what she says vv.794-7 an 'outright lie' but is it?

²³⁴ George 1972: 58.

DeForest considers Θρηκίης ἄροσιν χιονώδεα (826) a ‘chilling metaphor’:

‘According to the dominant imagery of this episode, women’s bodies merged with the earth, and ploughing symbolises sexual intercourse. The “snowy ploughland of Thrace,” then alludes both to the murdered Thracian concubines and to the dead men who once “ploughed” them.’²³⁵ However, the suggestion is already there in vv. 795-6. The narrator’s version, against which the reader must set this account, informed us that the men and their concubines were killed ἄμφ’ εὐνῇ (see 617-16n.). My inference then would be that wherever the bodies now are that they lie mingled in death as they were at the time of the murder. Somewhere the Lemnian men are still posed ploughing their Thracian women. πυροφόρους ἄρώσι γύας (796) is her focalisation of what the men saw in their concubines, why they preferred them. The Lemnian men found the Thracian women more attractive and thus emigrated to Thrace, Θρηκίης ἐπινάστιοι ἡπείροιο (795). For this ‘emigration’ (abandonment of their wives) they were killed and, I believe, lie with them still. Thus when Hypsipyle claims to speak the truth, and ἐξερέω νημερτές (797) is in sound Homeric fashion,²³⁶ she is not lying in any straightforward way. She is telling *a* truth, as she sees it.²³⁷

Her character audience can only grasp the obvious meaning but the reader has additional material to consult and as a result (at least in this instance) can observe her manipulation of language (and truth). The *truth* that she offers, contrary to the purpose she states (ἵν’ εὖ γνοίητε καὶ αὐτοί, 797), ensures that these men will come to know these women sexually but not truly.²³⁸

798-803: Hypsipyle offers her version of the habitual state of affairs on Lemnos under Thoas’ rule. It was a time when Lemnian raids on Thrace were the norm. The mention of her father serves as a reminder to her audience of her present authority, of who rules now and of how she came to power. However, when Hypsipyle moves towards the moment everything changed, it comes with an unusual revelation by a mortal and an

²³⁵ DeForest 1994: 92. I am less convinced, however, with her assessment of Hypsipyle viewing the murder with ‘amused detachment.’

²³⁶ Cf. e.g. *Od.* 4.314 – Menelaus asks Telemachus to speak truthfully.

²³⁷ The difference between her focalisation and that of the narrator’s was evident in her opening speech to the women, see 660-3n.

²³⁸ It is a disparity of meaning which reminds this reader of the Catullan speaker’s reproach to Lesbia (*Cat.* 72): Dicebas quondam solum te nosse Catullum (1) – Nunc te cognoui (5).

unmistakable intertext for all readers.

μῆνιν... Ἀχιλλῆος | οὐλομένην (*Il.* 1.1-2) ... Διὸς δ' ἐτελείετο βουλή (*Il.* 1.5).

On the point of offering her own extended account of life in last year's Lemnos, the allusion signals Hypsipyle's embarkation on an epic narration of her own. τίς τ' ὄρσφωε θεῶν (*Il.* 1.8) asked the Homeric narrator, before announcing Λητοῦς καὶ Διὸς υἱός (*Il.* 1.9), Apollo. Hypsipyle knows the source of the Lemnian misfortune. Or infers it based on the nature of what occurred: Οὐλομένης δὲ θεᾶς πορσύνετο μῆνις | Κύπριδος (802-3). The woes of the women, she knows, are the product of destructive Aphrodite's rage.²³⁹

When it comes to explaining how the women managed to keep their men away, Hypsipyle reverts to the Homeric character default τις θεός (820) but here she names. μῆνις is the reading adopted by Vian,²⁴⁰ but the alternative reading μῆτις²⁴¹ is still close enough I believe to support the intertext. Against its additional inclusion of the vocabulary of δόλος (and μῆτις evident) is traded the closer correspondence of lexis and Hypsipyle's revision (and improvement) of the narrator's χόλος αἰνός (614).

The βουλή Διός is not for men to know. The Homeric narrator does not elucidate. Hypsipyle as narrator claims to know the will of Aphrodite.²⁴² In Book 2, the reader encounters another character who knew and revealed the will of Zeus and was punished for it. Phineus prophesied in order and to the end (ἐξεῖης τε καὶ ἐς τέλος, 2.314). He advises they look to Aphrodite's wily assistance (δολόεσσαν ἄρωγῆν, 2.423) for the glorious accomplishment of their tasks (κλυτὰ πείρατα... ἀέθλων, 2.424) and when we come to the poem's close, we find that he has accurately predicted the narrative's end, ἤδη γὰρ ἐπὶ κλυτὰ πείραθ' ἰκάνω | ὑμετέρων καμάτων (4.1775-6).

For the quest to succeed, for its *telos* to be achieved, a specific goddess is

²³⁹ See Introduction 2. *Beginning and Beginnings* for a discussion of the Argonautic and Homeric proems. Hypsipyle is not only adapting the narrator's content but assuming the performative role.

²⁴⁰ On the basis of a variant in *P.Oxy.* 2698 and in his MS L, and also the reading of MS C.

²⁴¹ See Vian's *app. crit.* ad loc.: μῆτις was the reading of the archetype.

²⁴² There could be a nod to the *Cypria* here which made plain the will of Zeus as a cull on humanity to stop over-population - a banal over-explanation 'dissolving the *Iliad*'s imposing opaqueness to an all too perspicuous "rationality"' (Griffin 1977: 48).

required and a specific type of help is required. δόλος and μῆτις, the qualities of Aphrodite, of Medea, of Odysseus, are qualities which first become evident in the narrative here on Lemnos and they achieve results. ‘This is my plan,’ said H. in assembly (μῆτις, 1.664) before asking who could devise a better one (ἄρειον ἔπος μητίσεται ἄλλη, 665) and when Polyxo did, Hypsipyle fabricates her way to its success (see 664-6n. & 697-701n.). μῆτις works.

On θυμοφθόρον ἄτην (803), George (1972: 59) comments on Fränkel’s note (1968: 108) on the alternatives, ‘there is an accurate interpretation (‘mind-perverting infatuation’) and an inaccurate one (‘life-destroying misfortune’). But it seems consonant with the overall action to suppose that Hypsipyle intends Jason to take the first of these meanings, while knowing (along with the reader) that the second is just as true.’ In the present of the action described ‘life-destroying’ is proleptic. The action did cost them their lives, as Hypsipyle can confirm. The infatuation was not in and of itself fatal, but the consequences were. Her phrase has one meaning for her character audience and an additional one for the reader - μῆτις in action.²⁴³

δὴ γὰρ κουριδίας μὲν ἀπέστυγον ἔκ τε μελάθρων ἢ ματῇ εἷξαντες ἀπεσσεύοντο γυναῖκας,	805
αὐτὰρ ληιάδεσσι δορικτήταις παρίαυον, σχέτλιοι. Ἡ μὲν δηρὸν ἐτέλαμεν, εἴ κέ ποτ’ αὖτις ὄψε μεταστρέψωσι νόον· τὸ δὲ διπλόον αἰεὶ πῆμα κακὸν προύβαινε. Ἀτιμάζοντο δὲ τέκνα γνήσι’ ἐνὶ μεγάροις, σκοτὶν δ’ ἀνέτελλε γενέθλη·	810
αὐτῶς δ’ ἀδμήτες κοῦραι, χῆραί τ’ ἐπὶ τῇσι μητέρες, ἅμ’ πτολίεθρον ἀτημελέες ἀλάληντο· Οὐδὲ πατὴρ ὀλίγον περ ἔῃς ἀλέγιζε θυγατρός, εἰ καὶ ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖσι δαΐζομένην ὀρόωτο μητρυῖς ὑπὸ χερσὶν ἀτασθάλου· οὐδ’ ἀπὸ μητρός	815
λώβην ὥς τὸ πάροιθεν ἀεικέα παῖδες ἄμυνον, οὐδὲ κασιγνήτοισι κασιγνήτη μέλε θυμῷ·	

²⁴³ One interpretation does not exclude the other. In this instance, the additional knowledge with which the reader has been privileged complicates the reading but we are not obliged to make a stand beside the primary narrator. The phrase has more than one meaning for us. ‘Mind-perverting infatuation’ is Hypsipyle’s focalisation and can be read as her perception and not an outright lie. The meaning which we then foreground in the reading (if we choose to do so) is dependent upon where our sympathies lie and on how those sympathies have been modified in the process of reading the entirety of the text in sequence from the opening analepsis to this speech and coming to know these women better (than the Argonauts) in the process.

Ἄλλ' οἶαι κοῦραι ληϊτίδες ἔν τε δόμοισιν
 ἔν τε χοροῖς ἀγορῇ τε καὶ εἰλαπίνῃσι μέλοντο,
 εἰσόκε τις θεὸς ἄμμιν ὑπέρβιον ἔμβαλε θάρσος, 820
 ἃς ἀναερχομένους Θρηκῶν ἀπο μηκέτι πύργοις
 δέχθαι, ἴν' ἢ φρονέοιεν ἅπερ θέμις, ἢ ἐπὶ ἄλλῃ
 αὐταῖς ληϊάδεσσιν ἀφορμηθέντες ἵκοιντο.
 Οἱ δ' ἄρα θεσσάμενοι παίδων γένος ὅσσον ἔλειπτο
 ἄρσεν ἀνὰ πτολίεθρον, ἔβαν πάλιν ἔνθ' ἔτι νῦν περ 825
 Θρηκίης ἄροσιν χιονώδεα ναιετάουσιν.
 A.R. 1.804-826

804-9: δὴ γάρ - Hypsipyle begins her explanation in the same manner as the narrator (δὴ γάρ, 609) but revises certain elements of his selective account. She repeats his κουριδίας γυναῖκας (609) adding the evaluation ματὴ εἴξαντες. In place of the harsh lust that they had for their captured women (611) she supplies the verb παρίανον (806), repeating the narrator's ληϊάδεσσι (612) but qualifying with δορικτήταις.

For C., her amendments point to a specific intertext. παριαύω occurs only here in the *Argonautica* and only once in Homer at *Il.* 9.326-7, τῇ παριαύων | τερπέσθω (Achilles' reply to Odysseus).²⁴⁴ δορίκτητος occurs only here in the text, though in the same intertext C. is already consulting, he finds ὥς καὶ ἐγὼ τὴν | ἐκ θυμοῦ φίλεον δουρικτητὴν περ ἐοῦσαν *Il.* 9.342-3. These are the words of Achilles to Odysseus on loving Briseis though he won her by his spear and the only occurrence in Homer as well! Applied to the Lemnian context, the allusion suggests the trouble brought by women, by a Briseis or a Helen (or a Medea).²⁴⁵ To echoes of the βουλή Διός, C. can add echoes of the causes of the Trojan War and of the *Iliad* itself. She is outdoing the primary narrator in elevating her narrative.

σχέτλιοι (807)! Hypsipyle evaluates the characters in her narrative to Jason for whom 'foolish men' has a different resonance than it does to her and for the reader. The narrator will reimplement it in his apostrophe to Eros: σχέτλι ' Ἔρως, μέγα πῆμα, μέγα στύγος ἀνθρώποισιν, | ἐκ σέθεν οὐλόμενά τ' ἔριδες στοναχαί τε γόοι τε

²⁴⁴ It does occur in tmesis e.g. *Il.* 9.470, *Od.* 14.21.

²⁴⁵ See Barbanti 2007 on the spear-won land at the core of Ptolemaic ideology. Cf. Mori 2008: 110–11.

(4.445-6, see 771-3n.). It is Hypsipyle who casts erotic desire (Aphrodite) as destructive and what happened to the women as a πῆμα κακόν (809). In 627-9n., I suggested the Hesiodic Pandora as a plausible intertext in operation throughout the Lemnian episode. Hesiod's descriptions of Pandora include the phrases μέγα πῆμα (WD 56) and πῆμ' ἀνδράσιν (WD 82). Hypsipyle reverses the Hesiodic (standard) polemic and uses it here *against* men.

809-19: Hypsipyle's account of the troubles in Lemnos. The details are the *true* part of her narrative and the motivation/justification for the subsequent actions of the women (murder, or in her version resistance). There is considerable expansion on the narrator's account as she covers all the bases. Legitimate children are dishonoured and bastards produced (809-10, future generation are in danger!). Both maidens and mothers are made vagrant (811-2, young and old affected alike). Fathers neglect daughters, sons neglect mothers and brothers neglect sisters (813-7, all family connections broken down). Slave-girls usurp the women's place in homes, markets, dances and feasts (818-19, the Thracian women are the new Lemnian women).

ἀδμῆτες κοῦραι, χῆραί τ' ἐπὶ τῇσι | μητέρες (810-11). Her vocabulary recalls Polyxo's advice in the assembly and the untamed women besides her (παρθενικὰ ἀδμῆτες 668-74n.) Hypsipyle is thinking about marriage, about being 'tamed'. 'Widowed', however, beyond the pathos of the imagery (at least for Jason the text-internal audience) might be also read as a gloss. Yes, the Lemnian women are widows now, but they have widowed themselves!

820-6: Hypsipyle creates an image of women rising up to defeat the odds. With the aid of some god (divine backing justifies/vindicates their actions) they find the courage to resist - τις θεὸς ἄμμιν ὑπέρβιον ἔμβαλε θάρσος (820). The narrator did not mention any god supporting a slaughter and the only god in play here is Aphrodite, who is responsible for motivating them but not in the way Hypsipyle is suggesting. The great deed that the women feared the Argonauts would discover has now been rewritten as an

inspired revolt against oppression, the emancipation of the Lemnian women.²⁴⁶

Returning to her own preliminary remarks, Hypsipyle repeats for Jason that there is nothing to fear for there are no men to cause them trouble. She has given a full account of the background to the current situation on Lemnos and the Argonauts should have every confidence when entering Myrine. For the reader, it returns us to the inference made earlier (793-7n.) that the men and their concubines are still together somewhere, dead.

ἔτι νῦν περ, she says. ‘Even now...’ (825). She adopts the narrator’s favoured temporal marker and applies it to her story. ‘They’re still with the Thracian women to this day,’ she tells Jason. That has a darker meaning for the reader. When the narrator employs it, the temporal gap to be bridged is centuries and from narrator-time to story-time, but Hypsipyle is using it to refer to an incident in the previous year and its ramifications for her present. Her story is an *aition* of a city without men.

τῷ ὑμεῖς στρωφᾶσθ’ ἐπιδήμιοι· εἰ δέ κεν αὖθι
ναιετάειν ἐθέλοις καί τοι ἄδοι, ἧ τ’ ἂν ἔπειτα
πατρὸς ἐμῆο Θόαντος ἔχοις γέρας· οὐδέ σ’ οἴω
γαῖαν ὀνόσσεσθαι, περὶ γὰρ βαθυλήιος ἄλλων 830
νήσων Αἰγαίῃ ὅσαι εἰν ἄλιν ναιετάουσιν.
ἀλλ’ ἄγε νῦν ἐπὶ νῆα κιῶν ἐτάροισιν ἐνίσπες
μύθους ἡμετέρους, μηδ’ ἔκτοθι μίμνε πόληος.”
A.R. 1.827-33

827-33: For C. an echo of Nausicaa’s wish to her handmaidens that a man like Odysseus would be her husband, αἱ γὰρ ἐμοὶ τοιόσδε πόσις κεκλημένος εἴη | ἐνθάδε ναιετάων, καὶ οἱ ἄδοι αὐτόθι μίμναι (Od. 6.244-5). The narrator made references to two temptresses in Calypso and Circe. Hypsipyle responds by putting herself forward as a Nausicaa.

βαθυλήιος (830) ‘with deep grain’ is a euphemism for the fertility of Lemnian women as she moves from explanation to the advantages of good land free for the ploughing.

²⁴⁶ If we accept the various innuendoes for men being invited into gates, we can read this shut-out of the Lemnian men μηκέτι πύργοις | δέχθαι (821-2) as a reversal of the men’s rejection of the women. After they’d been with their Thracian women, the Lemnian women didn’t want them back!

ii. *A Hero's Compromise* (834-841)

834-5: By way of riposte, the narrator's use of φόνος picks up on his own account of Lemnian prehistory - the entire male population was erased to prevent retribution for a λευγαλέος φόνος (619). The speech was introduced as being spoken with words intended to flatter/deceive (μύθοισι προσέννεπεν αἰμυλίοισιν, 792) and is closed with a reminder of what the narrator states as actually having happened. Her extended narration is thus framed and coloured by references to its (and her) manipulative intent. She is described as glossing over the murder (ἀμαλδύνουσα, 834).

Of course, the Lemnian women's extreme response to avoid some future retribution has left them facing one anyway. The eradication of the men will inevitably lead to their own extinction. The present gambit is an attempt to rectify this, and will be accomplished through manipulation. Hypsipyle's speech will work. Charm will work.

The narrator's comments are thus not entirely negative. Her speech is an illustration of how an end can be achieved through persuasion. The manner of success for the Lemnian women offers a model (is programmatic) for success for the Argonauts in Colchis.

ἀμαλδύνουσα φόνου τέλος is to be explained as 'glossing the coming to pass of the slaughter.' In the *Iliad* ἀμαλδύνω is only ever 'destroy.' Of its three occurrences, two are in the same passage and offer another intertext for C. here. At *Il.* 12.18 and 32, ἀμαλδύναι and ἀμαλδύνας are employed in the account of the destruction of the Achaean wall by Poseidon and Apollo which ensures there is no *sēma* visible for future generations! This is one of only two external prolepses in the Iliadic narrator-text. As discussed by de Jong (1987:88), two interpretations are prevalent: 1. It accounts for the absence of any *sēma* and 2. There was another tradition which the destruction reflects and replaces. De Jong adds a third intratextual one: in the way that analepses on an object's history underline its significance so can a prolepsis on an object's future (or lack thereof) – it is important to *Iliad* 12 and the narrative of its *teichomachia*.

We can apply the same model to the consequences of Hypsipyle's speech: 1. No *sēma* of the murder remains; 2. the narrator's account has been replaced; 3. the killing

and its erasure from memory is fundamental to the Lemnian narrative. Hypsipyle's speech has effaced/destroyed the murder. In the new narrative of Lemnos according to her, it no longer exists. And in doing so she has changed the *telos*. Lemnos will be repopulated. A Theran narrative has begun.

'Heart-cheering' θυμηδέος (836) is throughout the episode a popular evaluation. At 662f., the Lemnian women's 'great deed' would not be heart-cheering (663) to the men should they hear it, Hypsipyle tells the women. At 705, Iphinoe is instructed to tell the men a heart-cheering proposal (ἔπος θυμῆδες), which she does (ἔπος θυμῆδες, 714).²⁴⁷ Hypsipyle knew what to tell the men, and Jason's use of the same word indicates she was correct in her assessment and in her execution. Jason's response is one of wholehearted acceptance of assistance – 'we'll take the offer of help and I'll be back (for you?).' At Pagasae, the Iolcian women prayed at the onset of the voyage for a 'heart-cheering end' (νόστοιο τέλος θυμῆδες, 249). If A. makes the connections, there is a suggestion in the Lemnian goodbyes that the Argonauts now have another location for their *nostos* (see 879-82n.). The *telos* for the Lemnian episode (descendants and colonisation) is indeed heart-cheering.

Hypsipyle's speech was a heavily edited version of the narrator's containing omission, revision and embellishment but her version is now for one set of narratees the accepted version. Hers is the version which Jason is prepared to repeat without any criticism, omission or embellishment but 'in due order' κατὰ κόσμον (839). He is true to his word when announcing her story from beginning to end, διηνεκέως (847). His announcing his intentions to repeat the story, ἐξείπω κατὰ κόσμον, also recalls her announcement preceding her account to expound the truth of all the wicked events, ἐξερῶ νημερτές (796-7). A. can make an inference on the intratextual echo that Jason has accepted without further consideration that what he was told was the truth. A. might come to consider this a character-trait when Jason is reported as speaking in the exact same manner when narrating his own *Argonautica*-in-progress to Lycus (2.762-773).

His preoccupation with the quest (ἀλλά με λυγροὶ ἐπισπέρχουσιν ἄεθλοι,

²⁴⁷ Following Vian. θυμῆδες 'pleasing to the heart' is the reading of Ω⁷ for 705 and E for 714.

841) in his limited response as he declines her overly generous offer recalls the earlier image of him at the outset of the voyage weighed down by concerns, pondering each thing like a man in despair (460-1). The emphasis he again places on reporting of everything might characterise him as a meticulous planner but the grievous trials that oppress him are forgotten in Hypsipyle's bed and the intervention of Heracles is required to get the expedition back on track and away from Lemnos.

In the speech he professes his own limitations. He does not boast, 'I've undertaken a glorious quest' but complains, 'I'm burdened and there's no way out.' He portrays himself as a victim of circumstance: 'I am not unwilling, but grievous trials press *me*.' He appears active in expression of intentions (ἔγω γε μὲν οὐκ ἀθερίζων, 840), but passive in his ability to act upon them. Of course this can and has been read as evidence of his tactful diplomacy which he will also have to employ in Colchis.

His reply is terse. There is no expansion here on the nature of these trials. Despite the characterisation of himself as a man who pays attention to the details, he offers none to here to Hypsipyle. He does not need to do so. She has offered him everything already. There is here a marked disparity between words and actions. Hypsipyle's proposal offers Jason and the reader an alternative *Argonautica*. The quest would end on Lemnos. Jason is quick to dismiss this but in the lingering that follows there is no indication how long they tarried before it was left to Heracles to return the narrative to its original trajectory and the pursuit of glory promised by the narrator in the poem's opening line.²⁴⁸

L8. 'That's Entertainment' (842-860).

842-8: Any martial remnants in the episode dissolve when the hand that took the spear (Δεξιτερῇ δ' ἔλεν ἔγχος, 769) takes the hand of the queen (842). When this scene is replayed in Colchis, in a reversal of roles Medea casts aside her shame and takes *his* hand, εἶλέ τε χειρὸς | δεξιτερῆς. (3.1067-8). The manner of his departure (843) echoes

²⁴⁸ See J. V. Morrison 1992: 130 n.8 on Homeric decision making as a choice of two alternatives with the character invariably taking the second option - what Jason proposes is a compromise.

his starry approach βῆ δ' ἵμεναι (774) and just as the women swarmed around him as he entered the gates (782) so the action is repeated as he passes out of them. The mood of the women (844) will be the mood of Jason as he departs from his meeting with Medea, καὶ νῆα κεχαρμένος ὥρτο νέεσθαι (3.1148). Their joyful expectation for men now will be mirrored in Colchis in his excited anticipation of the fleece.²⁴⁹

The arrangement of the text (845-8) inverts the linear progression of events. Jason's speech precedes the arrival of the women but the verse in prioritising the subsequent activity of the women lends the impression of the women themselves pressing behind him down to the shore in their eagerness for the men.

Hypsipyle told Jason to repeat her words ἐνίσπες μύθους | ἡμετέρους (832-3) and he dutifully does (847). However, does the reader understand μῦθος as her words or her story? Both, I believe. The narrator preceded her speech with reference to her beguiling words, μύθοισι... αἰμυλίοισιν (792). There was also the μῦθος of Polyxo which pleased the Lemnian women (698). Iphinoe's message was treated as an auspicious proposal, ἐναίσιμος ἦνδανε μῦθος (717). Over and again we meet the power of words to please, persuade, charm and all in relation to if not entire fabrications, then at least edited versions.

DeForest draws attention to the previous occurrence of διηνεκέως when the narrator broke off his Aethalides' digression (648-9) Ἀλλὰ τί μύθους | Αἰθαλίδεω χρεῖώ με διηνεκέως ἀγορεύειν ~ μῦθον ὅτ' ἤδη πάντα διηνεκέως ἀγόρευσεν (847). Her suggestion is that in the previous instance there was implied self-criticism on the narrator's part for narrating in a 'continuous' Homeric (and anti-Callimachean) manner, a criticism which the present usage attaches to Jason for an implied verbatim (and uncritical) repetition of everything Hypsipyle said to him. From this, in a manner which demonstrates how intratexts work on the attentive reader, she suggests that the 'stories' of Aethalides are plural for a reason, that Αἰθαλίδεω could be a subjective

²⁴⁹ The women are happy because Hypsipyle's speech was a success and as a result the women will get what they want. Jason is happy on leaving Medea because he too was a successful speaker and will get what he wants. Manipulation works and the reader's expectation for Jason's success is bolstered by the echo of the earlier success of the strategy as employed here on Lemnos. The reader learns from Hypsipyle.

genitive and that the son of Hermes with access to Hades and an infallible memory is, as a result, a plausible muse-source for the narrator account! It is not his digression about Aethalides that causes the narrator to chastise himself but for repeating verbatim the stories of (acquired from) Aethalides. Thus ‘the narrator, who blindly accepts Aethalides’ version of events, is no less culpable than Jason who blindly accepts Hypsipyle’s.’²⁵⁰ Considering my own digression on Aethalides and Muses, this is a rather attractive hindsight confirmation. Yet, there remains another source for the narrator, Hypsipyle herself.

Our narrator is situated temporally centuries later with access to a wide variety of source-material and if we allow the reconstruction of Euripides’ *Hypsipyle* which draws on the later account in Statius’ *Thebaid*, then the alternative presents a narrator having fun with his character. The narrator’s version is a redacted version of the version Hypsipyle told in direct speech in another text, and a telling that in the mythological chronology is posterior to the telling she offers Jason in the *Argonautica*. This Hypsipyle is then revising a version that a later version of herself will tell (or has told in an earlier text).

For the purposes of our narrative the version she relates here is the active version but the κακὴ βᾶξις (see 660-3n.) will get out. The ‘Lemnian Deed’ will achieve notoriety and quite possibly, because of her.

849-52: The women are active. Iphinoe led Jason to his audience and now *en masse* the women lead the men to the homes ξεινοῦσθαι ‘to host them’ (849). The verb picks up on the gifts they brought to the shore (ξεινίῃα, 846) but the real gifts are themselves. The hospitality these women are providing is sex and in what follows a quasi-marriage atmosphere permeates Myrine.

‘The women led them effortlessly for, you see...’ The goddess returns in the narrator’s explanation, Κύπρις γὰρ ἐπὶ γλυκὺν ἔμερον ὥρσεν (850). Harsh Eros and the wrath of destructive Aphrodite destroyed the Lemnian men. The goddess now shows her other side and arouses sweet desire. For C., the phrase recalls its refrain-like usage in Aphrodite’s own hymn (*h. Ven.* 2. 42, 53, 143). Its synonym πόθος²⁵¹ will later occur

²⁵⁰ DeForest 1994: 90. See *ibid.*: 86-92.

²⁵¹ See Braswell 1988: 268 on Pi. *P* 4.184.

qualified by γλυκὺς when the Argonauts gaze at the fleece that serves as the marriage-bed of Jason and Medea: δαῖε δ' ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς γλυκερὸν πόθον (4.1147). Amidst this Lemnian ecstasy, there is one slightly puzzling matter. In whom does Aphrodite arouse desire? In the men, in the women, in both? Aphrodite is at work again, and again the narrator suppresses any specification.

Both parties were receptive and on this occasion the reader might not be unduly troubled. What does require more active engagement is the actorial motivation that follows, Ἥφαιστοιο χάριν πολυμήτιος (851). We know Aphrodite is responsible for the current plight of the Lemnian women, whether or not we apportion blame to the men or women (or both) for slighting her. Why does she want to make Hephaestus happy? The gesture could be symbolic of the accord that should exist between husband and wife and which has been shattered on Lemnos. Or it could be an act of recompense. The reader last saw her embroidered on Jason's cloak admiring her reflection in the shield of her lover. Is Aphrodite feeling guilty for her infidelity? Has the adultery been discovered?²⁵²

The epithet common to Odysseus²⁵³ is used once of Hephaestus in the *Iliad* (πολυμήτιος Ἥφαιστοιο, 21.355) though the context there is his burning of the Scamander. Where we do find references to Hephaestus' skill/cunning is *Od.* 8.266-370, Demodocus' tale of how Hephaestus caught Aphrodite and Ares in bed together. Now, A. + C. have already been put in mind of this mythological episode by the scene on the cloak (see 742-6n.), and C. can revisit that intertext for confirmation. Lemnos is sacred to Hephaestus; it was where he fell when hurled by Zeus (*Il.* 1.594, discussed 627-9n.)²⁵⁴ and in the tale sung by Demodocus the island is mentioned three times - 1. Having set his trap, he pretends to visit Lemnos, his favourite place in all the world: εἶσατ' ἴμεν ἐς Λῆμνον, εὐκτίμενον πτολίεθρον, | ἥ οἱ γαῖάων πολὺ φιλτάτη ἐστὶν ἀπασέων (*Od.* 8.283-4) 2. Ares arrives to tell Aphrodite that now is as good a time as

²⁵² Valerius Flaccus clearly read the Song of Demodocus as suggested by the ecphrasis into his version of Lemnos. There an Aphrodite, furious at being caught in the act, punishes the Lemnians to spite him (Val. Fl. 2.101f.).

²⁵³ E.g. *Od.* 1. 83 - Athena beseeches Zeus for his *nostos*.

²⁵⁴ So Mooney 1912: 122. It is worth noting, I think, that the fall was a result of a previous attempt to intercede and protect his mother, Hera (Hephaestus relates the tale himself), which is another example of a dutiful son - in marked contrast to the Lemnian sons who (at least in Hypsipyle's account) we do not find acting in the manner of their patron deity.

any with Hephaestus away in Lemnos (294). 3. We are told that the Sun spied them together and stopped Hephaestus on his journey to Lemnos (301). The island becomes itself part of the ruse, a part of the narrative of infidelity. In the *Iliad*, Lemnos is a place of bargains, seductions and cunning. It was in Lemnos that Sleep and Hera met to contrive the deception of Zeus (*Il.* 14.229ff.).

The epithet πολυμήτιος is redundant in its Iliadic usage, adding nothing to the context, and likewise in our text in that he for all his resourcefulness, this god is helpless to aid the Lemnians, but if we are already thinking of Hephaestus' relationship with the island in epic narrative, it prompts the reader towards that time when he did demonstrate craft and cunning. The net which traps the lovers is the work of ingenious Hephaestus (πολύφρονος Ἡφαίστοιο, *Od.* 8.296, 327).

The reader cannot know the will of Aphrodite but intertextual and intratextual evidence suggests that her motivation is an attempt to reconcile marital difficulties of her own. By her intervention, the fate which Polyxo feared for the women of countless woes to come (681-2) has been averted (and averted despite the Argonauts not staying).

This is the first intervention of a god (reading Cypris as an actual divinity interceding, not as an abstraction for the erotic atmosphere on Lemnos) in the narrative but it does not aid in the accomplishment of the quest for the fleece but rather the *telos* of Thera. The timing and placement of her intervention in the narrative sequence *as we read* suggests to the reader that it is also a response to and approval of the preceding narration of Hypsipyle.

For A. the narrator's statement that Lemnos will be populated by men in an untroubled hereafter (ὄφρα κεν αὖτις | ναίηται μετόπισθεν ἀκήρατος ἀνδράσι Λῆμνος, 851-2) projects a bright future into his Lemnian reading, which has been guided by heart-cheering words and joyful throngs and in which martial echoes were there but downplayed. But C., being conditioned as a wary reader drawn into intertextual games, remembers a Herodotean intertext that destabilises his reading of any 'happily ever after.' In *Hdt* 6.138.1-4 we find the account of a later slaughter on Lemnos, when in a distorted mirror version of the Argonautic account, Athenian boys and their mothers are killed by Pelasgian men. As Morrison observes, 'Lemnos, the Herodotean intertext reminds us, has harm to come to it yet, indeed events which replay (and invert) the actions of the Lemnian women condemned by the Apollonian

narrator.²⁵⁵

C. then has to decide if the ‘untroubled hereafter’ is a narratorial statement (erroneous/false) or it is the narrated hope of Aphrodite (who would then be a fallible divinity).²⁵⁶ A scene that A. is rightly enjoying has C. nervous for the future.

853-6: For the first time in the episode, Jason is named, Αἰσονίδης (854). The patronymic is appropriate in the context of the re-population of Lemnos and the descendants who will trace an ancestry back to these Argonauts. It also serves to contrast him for the readers with the other hero named here and who wants no part of this narrative, Heracles (855). The one goes to the city, the other stays at the ship. Lasting fame for Heracles is the *kleos* a successful conclusion to the mission will bring, not being remembered via offspring (see 865-71n.).

857-60: The plight of the Lemnian women is resolved. In her speech, Hypsipyle gave an account of civic life perverted, of their men consorting with their concubines at dances and feasts, vv.818-9. Now the Lemnian women are seen here performing in their proper role. The transition is abrupt, αὐτίκα (857). No sooner have the men gone wandering to town than the celebrations are underway. The women along with their ‘husbands’ are depicted as giving sacrifice, giving to Aphrodite the honours she had previously been deprived of and which instigated the slaughter on Lemnos. In this scene, the Lemnian pre-history offered by the narrator has now been erased by Hypsipyle’s manipulation of truth and by the intervention of Aphrodite. The mock-Amazons the narrator depicted are entertaining their men. Fields will be ploughed.

859: Two gods are appropriately singled out for honours, Hephaestus and Cypris. The mood is joyous and the playfulness seems to have affected the narrator as he interchanges references to Hera’s glory (and the pursuit of *kleos*) and her glorious son (patron of the Lemnian sons-to-be) - Ἡρακλῆος ~ Ἡρης υἱά κλυτὸν ~ Ἡρακλῆς (855, 859, 864).

²⁵⁵ A.D. Morrison *Clio and Calliope*.

²⁵⁶ Or a changeable divinity. Her vacillations are already evident from this narrative without the need to bring in additional support.

L9. ‘Hercules Furens’ (861-874).

Heracles is the only other Argonaut besides Jason with direct speech in the Lemnian episode. His speech upbraiding the crew corrects the course of the expedition and saves the voyage. Previously he spoke curtly to renounce leadership and nominate Jason, vv. 345-7. Heracles’ speech here is effective again. The men obey and there is no debate. Heracles does not look to others to support his arguments. In contrast with Hypsipyle in the Lemnian assembly looking for alternatives, Heracles states his mind and expects others to follow. He did not simply suggest Jason as leader but declared him so and threatened any who disagreed, ἄλλον ἀναστήσεσθαι ἐρύξω (346).

861-4: Ἀμβολίη δ’ εἰς ἡμᾶρ ἀεὶ ἐξ ἡματος ἦεν | ναυτιλίας, (861). Caught up in the festival atmosphere of the city, not even the narrator is keeping an eye on the time. For the reader, there is no way of knowing how long the Argonauts stayed or how long they would have stayed, but for Heracles. The only measurement of duration here is ‘How long does/did it take for Heracles to get angry?’ The narrator qualifies his speech as ἐνιπτάζων (864) which A. will recall was last used v. 492 by the narrator following *after* Idas’ rebuke to Idmon. Heracles is about to speak aggressively.

865-71: His opening word δαιμόνιοι (865) then follows the narrator’s cue, ‘Fools!’ δαιμόνιος was used by Idmon in opening his address to Idas v. 476. No quarrel breaks out here due to the Argonauts simply doing as Heracles bids, yet for A. it is an intratextual echo of a quarrel that did. For C., it brings back into play the Circe model. When Odysseus was caught up in the entertainment provided by his hostess, his comrades had to remind him of home: δαιμόνι’, ἥδη νῦν μιμνήσκειο πατρίδος αἴης, *Od.* 10. 472.

What follows (ἐμφύλιον αἶμ’) is a curious opening gambit from a kinslaying hero. ἐμφύλιος only recurs at 4.725 of Medea’s native tongue. The context there is the audience with Circe and her desire to know what brought them (somehow she knows of Apsyrtus’ murder and the part played in it by his sister - a kinslaying there preventing the *nostos* as expiation is required). Heracles has a complicated and convoluted mythic

chronology, difficult for either A. or C. to reorder.²⁵⁷ Hunter (1993: 34) commenting on Heracles as kinslayer does find some intratextual support: ‘He himself killed his own children, and we can hardly doubt the existence of a version in which the Labours, and hence a long absence from his homeland, were a direct result of this murder; at any event we are later told of a trip by Heracles to Corfu to purify himself (4.539-41).’ Now νιψόμενος παίδων ὀλοὸν φόνον ‘washing off the destructive slaughter of the children’ (4.541) does sound very much like a kinslaying and very much like the miserable murder (λευγαλέοιο φόνου 619) of the narrator’s Lemnian account though A. will have to read a lot further before confirmation allows him to appreciate the irony.²⁵⁸

But the irony goes on when with ὀνοσσάμενοι πολίτιδας (867) he unwittingly touches on the slaughter of the Lemnian men whose rejection of the women led to their demise, according to Hypsipyle at any rate: δὴ γὰρ κουριδίας μὲν ἀπέστυγον | ... γυναῖκας (804-5). What Heracles is saying is ‘Let’s not sleep with Lemnian women’ but what it suggests to the attentive reader is also ‘Let’s not act like Lemnian men.’

Mooney turns to an Iliadic parallel (*Il.* 9.580) to explain the sense of ταμέσθαι as ‘to divide/mark off,’ (the Aetolians offering to cut off a piece of land to appease the hero Meleager in Phoenix’s story).²⁵⁹ Polleichtner, on the other hand, finds the expression ‘quite rude,’ more so than the previous references to ploughing (627-30, 685-688) and ‘aimed specifically at Jason and Hypsipyle.’²⁶⁰ What should be clear to the reader is that Heracles has no interest in ‘heterosexual diversions.’²⁶¹ His interest lies in the pursuit of *kleos*: Οὐ μὰν εὐκλειεῖς γε σὺν ὀθνεῖησι γυναῖξιν | ἐσσόμεθ’ ὧδ’ ἐπὶ δηρὸν ἐέλμενοι (869-70).

He is both right and wrong. They will not become famous in legend by breaking

²⁵⁷ According to Hyginus 1.32, he killed Megara and his sons in madness leading to him serving Omphale, whereas e.g. Diodorus Siculus 4.11.1f. has him killing his children prior to service to Eurystheus, though the labours are not an expiation for the murders. In the Euripidean version, the madness is inflicted following his completion of his final labour, the capture of Cerberus. See Galinsky 1972.

²⁵⁸ For biblio. on Heracles’ kinslaying, Bond E. *HF*, xxviii-xxx.

²⁵⁹ Mooney 1912 ad loc.

²⁶⁰ Polleichtner 2005: 132.

²⁶¹ Hopkinson 1988: 185.

off from the story of the fleece, but they will achieve fame in a foundation story, in the colonisation of Thera by their descendants. Heracles, on behalf of the Argonauts, enforces a return to the former but his, it turns out, is a third story separate to either narrative. He broke off from his labours to join the expedition, appearing in this narrative fresh from capturing the Erymanthian boar (vv.122-31),²⁶² and after Hylas' abduction, he will return to them (1220ff.). Glaucus makes it clear to the Argonauts that Heracles has no further part to play, and that any attempt to retrieve him from his search would be contrary to Zeus' will: 'Τίπτε παρὲκ μεγάλιο Διὸς μενεαίνετε βουλήν (1315).

A. will note a further intratextual echo with Polyxo's speech, first to the ploughing and then to the notion of bulls yoking themselves (αὐτόματοι βόες, 686) to do the ploughing, when Heracles fancifully suggests the fleece will magic its way to them κῶας | αὐτόματον 870-1). Thinking of automata, A. might then recall Hephaestus (now thanks to his wife, a part of the Lemnian episode) in the *Iliad* was the maker of such marvels.

872-4: When Heracles narrows his focus on what he perceives the reason for the delay, the reader has a problem to solve. τὸν δ' ἐνὶ λέκτροις | Ὑψιπύλης εἶατε πανήμερον he points accusingly (872-3). Or does he just refer? Is Jason here listening or is he in Hypsipyle's bed? The reader is forced to check an elliptical text. The narrator informed us that Heracles gathered his companions away from the women (ἀολλίσσας ἐτάρους ἀπάνευθε γυναικῶν, 863).

Clauss (1993: 138) believes Jason is present: 'Heracles prods the group, including Jason, to leave Lemnos by reminding them of their goal, the acquisition of the golden fleece.' Clauss also notes the echo of Thersites in Heracles' rebuke, οἴκαδέ περ σὺν νηυσὶ νεώμεθα, τόνδε δ' ἐῷμεν | αὐτοῦ ἐνὶ Τροίῃ γέρα πεσσέμεν (*Il.* 2.237-8) and points out how such an echo upsets the portrayal of a heroic Heracles here. I think C. could draw two further points from this intertext to support the 'Jason is here' view. Thersites' speech concludes ὧς φάτο νεικείων Ἀγαμέμνονα ποιμένα λαῶν (*Il.* 2.243). Agamemnon was there and the manner of the speech is described with the same

²⁶² According to Apollod. 2.5, his fourth labour. Cf. Diodorus Siculus 4.11-26.

verb which the narrator uses of Heracles (875), *νεικέω*. This might lend weight to the notion Jason himself was present and if we read the model further, makes his meek acquiescence all the more notable (or reinforce our perception of him as a man who needs time to ponder in silence). Odysseus rose immediately to respond to Thersites' insults and then gave him a savage beating for the amusement of the men (*Il.* 2.265ff.). C.' second observation is structural. Thersites gives his rebuke to the men *en masse* before directing his insults at Agamemnon. His derogatory phrase *Ἀχαιῖδες οὐκέτ' Ἀχαιοί* (*Il.* 2.235) whilst not echoed here in the lexis certainly has resonance with these cowed Argonauts.²⁶³

On the other hand, for A. without additional intertexts to lead him towards Thersites for support, there is a greater reliance on the text and on the details Heracles gives. 'Let that man...'? There is a marked contrast between the 'we' of the crew and 'that man.' Is he actually one of the comrades gathered (*ἐτάρους*, 863), a part of the upbraided crew (*ὄμιλον*, 875)? Why is Heracles singling him out and singling him out with reference to Hypsipyle's bed? Is it because that is where he still is? He did not attend the group meeting and that is why Heracles is singling him out for his absence. Contrary to the models that C. brings to the reading (Thersites and Eurylochus),²⁶⁴ Heracles is not telling Jason to his face. There is also an echo of the quarrel between Achilles and Agamemnon in *Iliad* 1, but if Jason is not here then Heracles is arguing with himself.

In closing, Heracles makes a good point and, in keeping with the rest of his speech, without intending it. For the secondary internal audience the content has a clear message but for the external audience ironic or inaccurate subtexts. *μεγάλη τέ ἐ βᾶξις ἵκηται* (874). Jason will not gain a great reputation via his children by Hypsipyle but he will go on to become famous, or infamous in his myth following his return to Greece.

²⁶³ Odysseus dominated the talk even when absent in *Od.* 1-4 whereas Jason is not being mentioned by the narrator even when present (assuming he is present).

²⁶⁴ Both models involve characters concerned with *nostoi*. Heracles' principal concern is with the outbound voyage, what they have to do before they can go home.

L10. ‘The Argonauts depart’ (875-909).

i. *Women in Distress* (875-887)

No more delays. The narrative picks up pace again on Heracles’ insistence. The urgency of the women drove the speed of the episode and now following the lull that ensued, it is a man that provides the impetus away from the island and its women ἄλλ’ αὐτῶς ἀγορήθεν ἐπαρτίζοντο νέεσθαι | σπερχόμενοι, 877. The Argonauts’ response is immediate. None question Heracles. All are ready to leave at once. The narrative makes no mention of Jason, of any reaction on his part to either speech or report of it (depending upon where he is) and when next we find him he is saying his goodbyes to Hypsipyle (886f.). The narration is highly compressed as within one verse the women are aware and there at the shore, buzzing round the men like bees about lilies.

879-82: The most obvious point of comparison is the manner of the movement, the swarming around that also recalls the way the women thronged about Jason on his solitary approach and departure from the city, but the joyous anticipation there is not paralleled here. Happiness exists in the bucolic imagery of the simile, in a dewy rejoicing meadow, whereas the predominant emotion of the women is grief. Clauss (141) cites references for ancient agricultural theory that bees collect their young from flowers (Aristotle, *HA* 2.51, *GA* 3.10. Vergil *G.* 4.200-202) and thus the simile hints that Lemnian women are pregnant: they have acquired children from the men (and hence their sadness ought not be too great). The depiction of the women flitting about from man to man like bees plucking sweet fruit offers one last gender-reversal for the reader before leaving Lemnos.

They pour forth to say goodbye in a manner (προχέοντο, 883) that for A. echoes their reaction to the men’s arrival ἐς αἰγιαλὸν προχέοντο (635). Now however the anxiety is motivated by their passion. They are ἐνδυκές, derived from Homeric adverb ἐνδυκέως ‘attentively, with relish.’ Their former silent apprehension of the dangers the men might bring (ἄφθογγοι 639) has become the vocalised lamenting (κινυρόμεναι, 884) on the sudden and unwanted departure. And their last gesture, a

recorded speech act, contains another puzzle - ἀπήμονα νόστον ὀπάσσαι (885). To where are the women wishing the Argonauts a safe return? To Greece or to Lemnos? There are echoes of the Argonauts' initial departure, of the Iolcian women lamenting and wishing for a heart-cheering return (249-50). Have the Lemnian women become assimilated themselves then after being tamed, are they acting 'Greek'? The alternative, and what Heracles voiced as a concern, is that Lemnos is being set up as a new home. The *nostos* of the poem does return to the Lemnian episode/foundation narrative. These women want them to come back to Lemnos. C., reading Pi. P 4 into this might now anticipate a second trip to Lemnos in this narrative and be disappointed when they return via a different route.²⁶⁵

Now it is Hypsipyle who takes the initiative and grasps Jason's hand (χεῖρας ἐλοῦσα 866, see 842-8n.) and elements of the speech which follows foreshadow those in Medea's speech after she makes the same gesture (εἶλέ τε χεῖρὸς | δεξιτερῆς 3.1067-8). 'Remember me', says Hypsipyle, after taking his hand (μνῶεο ... | Ὑψιπύλης 896-7), 'Remember me' says Medea (μνῶεο δ' ... | οὔνομα Μηδείης 3.1069-70). On both occasions, request and name are initial words on the line and form a clear parallel. Both asking to be remembered just as their model Nausicaa asked to be remembered by Odysseus (*Od.* 8.461-2).

ii. *Hypsipyle's Goodbye* (888-898)

889-92: Here is the first indication that Jason told Hypsipyle anything of the undertaking when she references the golden fleece, χρύσειον δέρος (889, already at the forefront of the reader's mind following Heracles' flight of fancy with automata). When did they have this conversation about Pelias and the quest? This is inferred speech. A dialogue has to have occurred but it was not reported to the reader, who is left to assume it took place during the indefinite time period the Argonauts spend being entertained.

²⁶⁵ See Vian 1974: 22 on a very problematic reconstruction of the fragments of Euripides' *Hypsipyle* which suggest Jason took his two sons by Hypsipyle (Euneos and Thoas) on to Colchis (meaning staying at Lemnos until after the birth)! Or that he collected them on the way back (presumably with an unimpressed Medea alongside).

The quest has been backgrounded on Lemnos as the women's story took precedence – a scene on ecphrasis (763-5) and Jason's allusion to trials (841). Contrary to being the burden he presented those trials as to her (ἀλλά με λυγροὶ ἐπισπέρχουσιν ἄεθλοι, 841), Hypsipyle's rhetoric hints that the quest is more appealing to him than she is, ὥς ἐθέλεις καὶ τοι φίλον (890).

Again she demonstrates her capacity for emotional manipulation and reiterates her offer of the kingdom of her father, σκῆπτρά πατρὸς (891), with an open-ended invitation, should he desire δὴ ποτε νοστήσας ἐθέλῃς ἄπορρον ἰκέσθαι (892). 'What do you desire Jason, me or the fleece?' The choice she implies is one that will trouble Medea's dreams in Colchis (ὄφρα δέ μιν σφέτερον δόμον εἰσαγάγοιτο | κουριδίην παράκοιτιν, 3.622-3).

A reference to his *nostos* invites the reader to consider what they know of Jason post-*Argonautica*, to think of him in Corinth. To the Jason of the *Medea*, a return to Lemnos might be a tempting proposition. 'Remember me,' she says (μνῶεο, 896), as Nausicaa did, as Medea will.²⁶⁶ Though there is an obvious contrast with Medea. The Colchian princess has betrayed her father and is on the run. Hypsipyle has not betrayed hers (possibly, see 623n.). Their departure scene is heavy with talk of return as she imagines him already there and thinks of him coming back to her, νόστιμος (896). Her speech has already referred to his return home, νοστήσας (892), and this following the women's prayers for ἀπήμονα νόστον in the narrative (885).

She ends her artful farewell (if not for the kingdom, if not for me, then for our children) with a birth. A key note for an episode concerned with population and foundation - ἦν ἄρα δὴ με θεοὶ δώωσι τεκέσθαι (898). Hypsipyle's final words are 'I'm pregnant.'

Her request for instruction invites us to consider the *telos* of the Lemnian narrative. The Lemnian women's plan will succeed whilst the men will continue on the narrative of the fleece. Jason and Hypsipyle are the key figures in the success of the Lemnian venture but their union is itself incidental, their son Euneos only a footnote in

²⁶⁶ Hunter 1993: 51, "Blushes, the shyness of eyes, the appeal to Jason's grievous challenges, the touching of hands, the deceptive use of gifts and the regret of the one left behind are all common to both scenes."

the future of Lemnos (see 915-21n.). However, any mention of children in proximity to Jason inevitably (for A. and C.) triggers memories of the *Medea*.

When the reader comes to her in Book 3, he brings Hypsipyle with him – not only the erotic, the blushing maiden, and the power of Jason to instil desire but also reflection on a road not taken. Our experience of the first woman informs the second, and the reader who looks beyond the narrative might judge that he did not choose wisely.

iii. *Jason's Reply* (899-909)

899-909: Jason's self-presentation shows a marked lack of ambition in this hero ἐπεὶ πατρίην μοι ἄλις Πελῖας ἔκητι | ναιετάειν (902-3). Unlike the Pindaric Jason seeking his rightful rule, he tells the queen that he desires only to live back home if Pelias should allow it. There is no notion of usurping him and no expression of loftier goals. Kingship is not for him says the man who came to her with cloak and spear.

In contrast to Heracles (869), Jason offers no talk of glory μοῦνόν με θεοὶ λύσειαν ἀέθλων (903). The quest is presented to her as it was the first time, a trial imposed on him (ἄεθλοι, 841). And one he portrays himself as dependent on a god to be released from. This burdened figure recalls his disposition upon the departure from Iolcus, tearful and unable to look upon the shore as they set sail, vv.534-5.

Following burdened Jason, we find dutiful Jason, the son concerned for his parents, πατρί τ' ἐμῷ καὶ μητρὶ δύης ἄκος (907). His request to Hypsipyle for any male son to be sent home should he fail to return to Greece himself (and how would she know?) runs counter to the needs of the Lemnian women who need the male children to repopulate Lemnos, but he does present himself as a sympathetic family-orientated figure. He appeals to Hypsipyle's understanding of family values, and after all she has explained to him at length the breaking down of them on Lemnos and should understand (the reader might see the irony depending on the view held of the queen). Jason's motivations for the quest are to save his family, not to win glory or claim a throne.

His closing comments avoid all commitment to any Lemnian return, only the unjust king ἄνδιχα τοῖο ἄνακτος (908). The instigator of the expedition is recalled as Jason

qualifies her first point and reminds the reader that it's time to be underway again.

L11. 'Beginning Again' (910-21).

910-14: There are no reactions. Jason is first to leave. The crew follow suit and the episode is over. The attentive reader will recall that Jason was similarly quick to act in getting the expedition underway once the leadership issue settled: Ἥ ῥα καὶ εἰς ἔργον πρῶτος τράπεθ' (363). The echo reinforces the sense that the quest is once more underway and a sense of the men's former order is restored when the heroes follow Jason's lead and then sit in their appropriate positions, ἐνσχερῶ ἐζόμενοι (912). ἐνσχερῶ 'in a row' is a *hapax*, a unique usage which should still call to mind the more usual ἐπισχερῶ that was the manner in which they sat in assembly (330) and the manner in which they took their seats on the benches to row out of Pagasae (528).

Then there is the return of named Argonauts to the narrative. First, the builder Argus is named as he looses the cable and gets the ship underway (912) and once sailing has resumed, Orpheus reappears in the story, instructing on the next port of call (915).

915-21: Mooney (1912 ad 126) notes that Samothrace was home to the mystic rites of the Cabiri, who had power over vineyards.²⁶⁷ It was sweet wine that Hypsipyle suggested the women offer to keep the Argonauts away. Wine links back to Lemnos and for C. via the *Iliad* to the relationship between Jason and Hypsipyle: νῆες δ' ἐκ Λήμνοιο παρέσταν οἶνον ἄγουσαι | πολλάί, τὰς προέηκεν Ἰησονίδης Εὐνήος, | τόν ῥ' ἔτεχ' Ὑψιπύλη ὑπ' Ἰήσони ποιμένι λαῶν (*Il.* 7. 467-9). Euneos, Jason's son by the Lemnian queen, is a supplier of wine to the Achaeans.²⁶⁸ The reader's recognition of the intertext answers any speculation prompted by the contents of their final dialogue: they would have a son (or two according to what the reader brings from myth and later texts). This intertextual foreshadowing (if the reader is able to follow the link

²⁶⁷ Mooney 1912 ad 916: 'The *Cabiri* was the name of a play by Aeschylus 'probably a satyric drama following the trilogy containing the *Argo* and the *Hypsipyle*.'

²⁶⁸ He recurs in two narratorial analepses *Il.* 21.41 (ransoming Priam's son Lykaon from Achilles) and 23.747 (Odysseus' prize in the foot-race is Thoas' mixing-bowl gifted by Euneos to Patroclus).

and find the reference) footnotes the relationship of the principal Lemnian players.

The narrator makes his presence felt with a pious first-person intrusion, refusing to speak further on the nature of the mysteries: οὐ προτέρω μυθήσομαι (919). Such undue exposition would, he claims, transgress *themis* to sing (τὰ μὲν οὐ θέμις ἄμμιν ἀείδειν, 921). His statement combines pious posturing (and assumption of Homeric character language in making the evaluation), erudition (in his knowledge of secret rites), first person involvement (μυθήσομαι) and narrative control (οὐ προτέρω) as the voyage moves on. The verb recalls for A. the emphatic and authoritative presence who announced as his starting point the Catalogue of Heroes (see Introduction 2. *Beginning and Beginnings*). He has never been away, evident in the evaluations and intrusions of the Lemnian episode, but he is closing it and moving on with a strong statement both of control and of commentary on his narratorial manner.

He is back to tell (sing) the story, but only so much of the story. An explicit narratorial comment that is an effective end to the Lemnian episode and an appropriate footnote to the manner of its narrative treatment before he ends with ‘a measured farewell to Samothrace and its gods’ κεχάροιτο καὶ οἱ λάχον ὄργια κείνα | δαίμονες ἐνναέται, (920-1).²⁶⁹

²⁶⁹ Morrison 2007: 294. See *ibid.* n.95 on the echo of hymnic closure in κεχάροιτο and the transitional nature of the phrase: ‘The farewell also marks the passage as strongly transitional, marking the move from Lemnos to Cyzicus.’

The Homeric Models

As with my analysis of the Lemnian episode, I begin by foregrounding two Homeric models for the narrative shape of the Cyzican narrative. Again, structural similarities invite the reader to make the connections which in the process of reading, direct and misdirect expectations.

i. *Aeolus*

Odyssey 10 opens with Odysseus' character-narration of his encounter with Aeolus. He and his men are received hospitably and assistance given for their safe and speedy return to Ithaca (*Od.* 10.1-30). However, when within sight of home, his comrades open the bag of winds (10.47-55) and their ships are blown back to Aeolus' island where a second and unfriendly encounter takes place.²⁷⁰ No further offer of aid is extended and they are dismissed with some hostility (10.72-5). Their next encounter, on the seventh day of sailing, is with the Laestrygonians.

Likewise, the Argonauts are greeted hospitably, sail away, are blown back and on their return met with hostility. Odysseus' return to Aeolus was a direct result, he tells us, of folly, αὐτῶν γὰρ ἀπώλομεθ' ἀφραδίῃσιν (10.27, his crew speculating the bag contained riches open the bag of winds). The Argonauts' return to Cyzicus in the night is due we are told simply to contrary winds (A.R. 1.1016-7).

ii. *The Laestrygonians*

Also in *Odyssey* 10 is Odysseus's narration of the encounter with the Laestrygonians. On the approach, Odysseus gives an expansive description of the harbour which has a narrow entrance and is protected either side by sheer cliffs (*Od.* 10.87-93). All the ships moor there save his own which he moors just outside. He then scales an outlook point to survey the surroundings (10.96-7) and sends three of his men into the city (10.100-2).

²⁷⁰ Obviously an important difference here is that at this stage the Argonauts' voyage is outbound and not a *nostos*.

At the spring of Artacie, they encounter the daughter of the Laestrygonian Antiphates who takes them to her father's house (10.104-11). The Laestrygonians themselves are akin to giants (10.120), violent and cannibalistic. All the ships moored in harbour are pelted with boulders and crushed, their crew speared for food. In the meantime, Odysseus and his own crew make their escape.

iii. *Aeolus and The Laestrygonians*

The general parallels between inhabitants are clear. In place of Aeolus and his family, in the Argonautic episode we find Cyzicus and the Doliones. The first encounter is friendly and the Doliones give what aid they can. The second encounter, following a similarly inadvertent return to the island, results in battle much as Odysseus receives an inhospitable albeit not violent response in his second encounter with Aeolus.

In place of the Laestrygonians, it is the Earthborn who attack the ship moored in safe harbour. The Earthborn, like the Laestrygonians are physically imposing (ἀπὸ στιβαρῶν ὤμων δύο, A.R. 1.945), and aggressive (ὕβρισταί τε καὶ ἄγριοι, 942 and ἔκπαγλοί, 950). Notably, however, the Argonauts negotiate their encounter with savages unscathed, whereas the Laestrygonians accounted for the loss of eleven of Odysseus' twelve ships and their crews.²⁷¹

However, and importantly, the two successive Odyssean models are merged. The Doliones and the Earthborn are separated not by seven days' sailing but by a narrow isthmus and within this close geographical proximity, their narratives are intertwined (Earthborn - Doliones - Earthborn – Doliones). Recognising the models, and reading them into the narrative, can thus confound the reader's expectations. What promises to become a violent encounter with 'Laestrygonians' turns out to be a pleasant encounter with 'Aeolus' only for the 'Laestrygonians' to show up and after a fight and quick getaway becomes a return visit to 'Aeolus.'

The merger is more involved than this cut-and-paste suggests. As noted above, the narrator offered no driving force behind the return to Cyzicus beyond bad weather. We can take the narrator's statement as it is, and conclude the consequent deaths of

²⁷¹ The Laestrygonian encounter reduces Odysseus to one ship and makes the *Odyssey* an even better parallel for the *Argonautica*.

Cyzicus and Cleite terribly unfortunate. However, when we come to consider the events immediately preceding their hasty departure, there is at least the possibility that the return is not simply due to bad luck but, though never made explicit, because a transgression has been committed in their slaughter of the Earthborn, and this transgression requires expiation before the voyage can proceed. The models are spliced together, and stitched together.

Cyzicus and Lemnos

In addition to the Homeric intertextual models, for the reader linearly following the voyage there is now an intratextual one: Lemnos. A second landfall and a second encounter following a summary description of the intervening sailing invites the reader to make comparisons as the Cyzican episode unfolds.²⁷²

The threat of martial conflict or at any rate, the tension that was initially intimated on Lemnos is on Cyzicus replaced by open exchange and offer of assistance. Yet this apparent frankness has an opposite outcome to the manipulations of the Lemnian women when the Argonauts find themselves unwittingly engaged here in two battles, the only such conflicts in Book One, with both the Doliones and first their neighbours, the Earthborn. On Cyzicus, there are two of everything, as Vian (1974: 29) notes: ‘deux débarquement compartant chacun deux étapes (v.953-60, 986-7; 1018-20, 1109-1111), deux batailles (v.989-1011, 1026-52), deux tempêtes (v.1016-1018, 1078-80), deux ascensions au Dindymon (v.985-6, 988, 998-99; 1110-52).’²⁷³

Most surprisingly, what we do not get here is any direct speech. This is a marked contrast with the previous episode in which the reader had access to the Lemnian Assembly, to Jason’s audience with Hypsipyle, to Heracles upbraiding the group and to Jason and Hypsipyle’s farewells: all in character speech.

To return to narrative shape, this is suggestive of the structure found in Odysseus’ wanderings (all of which is character text and thus a secondary narrator’s account containing the embedded dialogue of tertiary narrators). Odysseus’ narration of

²⁷² See Clare 2002:187-9.

²⁷³ To which we can add two pairs of models – Aeolus/Laestrygonians and Cyclops/Phaeacians. The poem has a fondness for doubling up. Amongst the Argo’s crew are two prophets, two suitable helmsmen, a couple of pairs of brothers. In the course of the narrative, Jason will take on two lovers.

his wanderings juxtaposes short accounts with longer episodes which do involve direct speech.²⁷⁴ Thus *Od.* 9.43f. his reported speech on Cicones (another violent interaction with foreigners) and *Od.* 9.82f. his reported speech on Lotus-Eaters (a different ‘Lemnian’ threat to the *nostos* following a ‘Dolionian’ Cicones one) are two short narrations followed by an extended narration on his encounter with the Cyclops which contains plentiful direct speech *Od.* 9.105-566. Similarly structured is *Odyssey* 10: *Od.* 10.1-27 the first visit to Aeolus (reported speech only, short speech concludes return trip 28-76), 76-132 the Laestrygonian episode (reported speech only), then again extended narration and direct speech in Circe episode, 133-574.

However, there is more at work here than creating a narrative texture that resembles that of the Wanderings. On Cyzicus, the reader is being excluded.²⁷⁵ The privileges granted on Lemnos are suddenly denied. On Lemnos, the narrator both left gaps and made ambiguous statements that forced the reader to infer and build interpretations on those inferences. Character-speech in some instances (e.g. Polyxo’s) confirmed inferences, in others (Hypsipyle’s rewriting Lemnian history) challenged the reader with assessing what was true or what mattered as truth (see 793-7n.). When the narrator’s manner on Cyzicus continues to be both gap-riddled and oblique, the reader’s difficulties arise not from having to reconcile different evidence presented in the story but how to construct sense when given too little.²⁷⁶

To summarise, what the reader has to negotiate on Cyzicus is passage through an episode reported entirely by the external primary narrator which invites comparison and contrast with the previous episode and which in its own interwoven internal doubling of Dolonian and Earthborn narratives, asks to be read against their Homeric models (and the additional intertexts which lie in wait like Suitors for Telemachus).

²⁷⁴ On the structure of the *Apologoi*, see Most 1989: 22-4, de Jong 2001: 221-7.

²⁷⁵ See Hunter 1993 :138-51. See Introduction 4. Speech Modes.

²⁷⁶ On the lack of motivation provided by the narrator for several Argonautic characters (notably Jason), see in general Beye 1982: 15-16, 19-20, 23-4, Fantuzzi-Hunter 2004: 113-15.

The Material

Sources from Scholia and Fragments

Deiochus (Σ ad 1.961-63, 966, 974-76a, 987a, 989-91, 1037-38b, 1061, 1063. *FGrH* 471 F 7-8), an obscure 5th century BC author of a local history of Cyzicus. In his account, the Argonauts fight neither against Doliones nor Earthborn but the Pelasgi who have previously been driven from Thessaly and are hostile to Thessalian Argonauts. They attack at night and also attempt a blockade of the harbour (as do the Earthborn).

Ephorus (Σ ad 1.1037-38b [= *FGrH* 70 F 61] and Conon (*FGrH* 26 F 1) identify the Doliones with the Pelasgians.

According to Herodorus (Σ ad 1.936-49o), Heracles battled the Earthborn in this area. However, Heracles was not one of his Argonauts (Σ ad 1.1289-91a, *FGrH* 31 F 7, 41). Clauss suggests Apollonius ‘grafted this story onto his Cyzicene narrative’ following Knorr’s argument that it is adapted from Herodorus’ *Heracleia*.²⁷⁷

Neanthes (Σ ad 1.1063, 1065-6), a local chronicler and source of the inauguration of the cult of the Idaean mother (see Hdt. 4.76, which relates the story of Anacharsis, a Scythian traveller who observes the rites at Cyzicus, performs them himself upon his safe return home and in consequence is killed by a Scythian observer).

Pindar (Σ ad 1.1085-87b) provides a source for the halcyon that announces an end of the bad weather detaining them at Cyzicus. In Pindar’s Paean (fr. 62 Snell), the bird is sent by Hera.

²⁷⁷ Clauss 1993: 150, citing Knorr, *De Apoll. Rh. Arg. fontibus* (Diss. Leipzig, 1902) 28ff.

C1. ‘To the Propontis’ (922-35).

Κεῖθεν δ’ εἰρεσίη Μέλανος διὰ βένθεα Πόντου
ἰέμενοι, τῇ μὲν Θρηκῶν χθόνα, τῇ δὲ περαίην
Ἵμβρον ἔχον καθύπερθε. Νέον γε μὲν ἡέλιοιο
δυομένου Χερώνησον ἐπὶ προύχουσιν ἴκοντο. 925
Ἐνθα σφιν λαιψηρὸς ἄη Νότος, ἰστία δ’ οὔρῳ
στησάμενοι κούρης Ἀθαμαντίδος αἰπὰ ρέεθρα
εἰσέβαλον. Πέλαγος δὲ τὸ μὲν καθύπερθε λέλειπτο
ἦρι, τὸ δ’ ἐννύχιοι Ροιτειάδος ἔνδοθεν ἀκτῆς
μέτρεον, Ἰδαίην ἐπὶ δεξιὰ γαῖαν ἔχοντες. 930
Δαρδανίην δὲ λιπόντες ἐπιπροοσέβαλλον Ἀβύδῳ,
Περκώτην δ’ ἐπὶ τῇ καὶ Ἀβαρνίδος ἡμαθόεσσιν
ἡίονα ζαθέην τε παρήμειβον Πιτύειαν.
Καὶ δὴ τοί γ’ ἐπὶ νυκτὶ διάνδιχα νηὸς ἰούσης
δίνῃ πορφύροντα διήνυσαν Ἑλλήσποντον. 935
A.R. 1.922-35

922-35: The transitional passage through the Hellespont is rapid.²⁷⁸ The locations passed along the route from Lemnos to Cyzicus are marked off in sequence with almost no expansion or ornament. Pityeia is given the epithet ‘holy’ and the Hellespont referred to by a genealogical allusion to Helle’s father. The brevity of description and clustering of names adds to the sense of momentum achieved first by their strenuous rowing and then bolstered by a felicitous wind. The pace of the narrative has picked up as the reader is sped to the next episode.

Despite the increased speed, there is again, following the vague time-keeping of the Lemnian episode, a renewed attention to detailed accounting. They reach the headland of Chersonesus at sunset (Νέον γε μὲν ἡέλιοιο | δυομένου, 924-5), by early morning (ἦρι, 929) they have navigated the Gulf of Saros and into (ἐννύχιοι, 929) and on through the following night (ἐπὶ νυκτὶ, 934) they traverse the Hellespont. The narrator, building upon the authoritative break-off (see 915-21n.), gives the impression of being firmly in control. As well as increasing the tempo, the names that roll by also serve to remind that this narrator has source-material. He is referencing and in command

²⁷⁸ Thalmann (2011: 75 n.68) considers the Hellespont and Propontis operate here as transitional spaces between the ‘Greek’ and the ‘Other.’

of his referencing. There is nothing superfluous here, nothing that does not concern the expedition (and no expansion on that which does, e.g. Helle). It reinforces his scholarly persona as he is about to create another episode from various mythological strands and state his opinions on some contentious issues (at least for the scholiasts noted above).²⁷⁹

Still if we can fight against the propulsion, there is an Iliadic intertext here which brings with it a few observations and one that could prove key for C., though it might only register in hindsight. Several of these cities and regions are mentioned in close proximity in the Catalogue of Trojan heroes at *Iliad* 2.819ff. (Dardanians 2.819; Ida 2.821, 824; Pityeia 2.829; Percote 2.831, 835; Abydos 2.836; Thracians 2.844; Hellespont 2.845 and the Pelasgi whom the narrator will mention v.1024 at *Il.* 2.840). All these peoples and cities follow immediately on from Hector and the Trojans themselves at the head of the list, *Il.* 2.816-9. A further point of contact comes at the head of the list, Μέλανος διὰ βένθεα Πόντου (922) identified as the Gulf of Saros (so e.g. Mooney 1912 ad loc, Race 2008: 77 n.93). Σ ad 1.922 notes *Il.* 24.79, ἔνθορε μείλανι πόντῳ. Those black waters into which Iris sprang to give Zeus' message to Thetis are in the same area, μεσσηγὺς δὲ Σάμου τε καὶ Ἰμβρου παιπαλοέσσης (*Il.* 24.78). Epithet has become appellation but these are Homeric waters (on the understanding that Samos=Samothrace).²⁸⁰

These lands then which the Argonauts rush by are the lands of future and principal Trojan allies. The Argo is passing through potentially hostile territory. The next generation of Greek heroes will fight the men of these regions. The haste of narration might be intertextually motivated then, as the rapid passage of the Argo avoids contact here with dangerous inhabitants of 'future' epic. Or, less timidly, passing beyond the Hellespont might then be read as passing out of the sphere of the *Iliad*. Entering the Propontis and continuing beyond brings new encounters. Thus, the verses acknowledge the relevance of these locations to epic whilst the absence of expansion might be seen to indicate that those are associations for another time. We might here recall the image as the Argo set sail of Chiron's wife holding the infant Achilles on the shore (A.R. 1.557-

²⁷⁹ On the scholarly persona, see Morrison 2007: 273-80. See Introduction 2. *Beginning and Beginnings*.

²⁸⁰ On this identification in the *Iliad*, see Macleod 1982: 97.

8) and the programmatic point it made: the *Argonautica* is its own Hellenistic epic.²⁸¹

One activity which clearly distinguishes these Argonautic heroes from their Homeric counterparts is raiding. The Argonauts are on a quest as Levin has noted: ‘All three epics [*Argonautica*, *Odyssey*, *Aeneid*] concern the adventures of persons who, being absent from home, must hope for favourable and generous reception wherever they go.’²⁸² One could take issue with the inclusion of the *Odyssey* considering that the first episode narrated by Odysseus has him sacking Ismarus (*Od.* 9.39-61). The Argonauts do not come to Cyzicus as an Iliadic war-party but after the Doliones mistakenly suspect them of being invaders, act out a role they did not want and kill their hosts anyway.

A last point here on what A. might find remarkable given the nature of the expedition is the absence of any comment concerning the Hellespont itself. The reference to Athamas’ daughter invites readers to think of Helle, sister of Phrixos, and of how she fell from the ram there and gave her name to the strait. Yet, that allusion aside, the narrator offers us nothing. The location elicits no more reaction from the crew than any other they have just sped past. The only prior mention of Helle and the Hellespont occurred 1.256; the women of Iolcus lament the expedition and wish Phrixos and the ram had perished along with Helle - an analepsis on the origin of the expedition.

C2. ‘Setting the Scene’ (936-52).

There is a change of pace following the breakneck dash through the Hellespont. The narrative is suddenly becalmed as the narrator describes the island’s location, layout and inhabitants. Geographical details (vv. 936-41) cede to anthropological and the reader is offered a first taste of the fantastical with the introduction of the Earth-born, the six-armed savages that (potentially) lie in wait for the Argonauts (vv.942-6).²⁸³ The section concludes with the introduction of the Doliones and their king Cyzicus, and the narrator provides a genealogical explanation of their entente with the Earthborn: the Doliones

²⁸¹ So e.g. Hopkinson 1988: 185.

²⁸² Levin 1971: 91-2.

²⁸³ See Sistakou 2012: 65-66.

have a divine ancestor, Poseidon.

Mention of this god so prominently opposed to Odysseus' homecoming should alert the reader that the Argo is steering from Iliadic into Odyssean waters and encourage further connections. Aeolus and the Laestrygonians provide the models for narrative shape but regarding geographical proximity another Homeric parallel suggests itself. Poseidon is ancestor to the Phaeacians (*Od.* 7.56ff.) and father of the Cyclops, Polyphemus (*Od.* 9.519). *Odyssey* 6 opened with Athena's visit to the Phaeacians and that analepsis, οἱ πρὶν μὲν ποτ' ἔναιον ἐν εὐρυχόρῳ Ὑπερείῃ, | ἄγχοῦ Κυκλώπων ἀνδρῶν ὑπερηνορέοντων (*Od.* 6.4-5).

Parallels can be made between Doliones and Phaeacians, between Earthborn and Cyclopes. Phaeacians and Cyclopes once lived in proximity but whereas the Cyclopes' plundering tendencies (*Od.* 6.6) caused Phaeacian relocation, here there is an uncomfortable co-existence maintained by Poseidon (cf. Lemnians and Thracians).

i. *Location*

Ἔστι δέ τις αἰπεῖα Προποντίδος ἔνδοθι νῆσος,
τυτθὸν ἀπὸ Φρυγίης πολυληίου ἡπείροιο
εἰς ἄλα κεκλιμένη ὅσον τ' ἐπιμύρεται ἰσθμὸς,
χέρσῳ ἐπιπρηγῆς καταειμένη· ἐν δέ οἱ ἄκται
ἀμφίδυμοι· κεῖται δ' ὑπὲρ ὕδατος Αἰσῆποιο·
Ἄρκτων μιν καλέουσιν Ὀρος περιναιετάοντες.
A.R. 1.936-41

940

936-41: With the introductory formula Ἔστι δέ τις αἰπεῖα... νῆσος (936) the pace slackens. The narrator zooms in on the second port of call. 'There is a steep island...'. Clauss (1993:156) notes the allusion to *Od.* 4.844-47, an island also having two shores where the suitors plan to wait in ambush for Telemachus. This offers an ominous parallel for C. of what might await the Argonauts (See 989-91n.).

Other Homeric instances show the formula to be a common way to begin a description when telling a tale. Other instances are *Il.* 2.811 ('There is in front of the city, a steep mound...'), 11.711 ('Now there is a city, Thryoessa...' Nestor's tale), 722 ('Now there is a river, Minyeius...' Nestor again), 13.32 ('There is a wide cave... halfway between Tenedos and rocky Imbros'), *Od.* 3.293 ('There is a smooth cliff, steep

towards the sea...').²⁸⁴ The formula is employed by the Argonautic narrator on four more occasions to set the scene, 2.360 (Phineus giving directions), 3.927, 4.282, 982 (all narrator).²⁸⁵

The establishment of location ends on a puzzling note, Ἄρκτων μιν καλέουσιν Ὅρος περὶ ναιετάοντες (941). Whose present is this in? Do the neighbours of the narrative or of the narrator's time call the island 'Bear Mountain'? There is a lack of any concrete indication either way which in itself fits into a wider pattern, the obscuring of the poem's temporal levels.²⁸⁶

ii. *Inhabitants*

Καὶ τὸ μὲν ὕβρισταί τε καὶ ἄγριοι ἐνναίεσκον
 Γηγενέες, μέγα θαῦμα περικτιόνεσσιν ἰδέσθαι·
 ἔξ γὰρ ἐκάστω χεῖρες ὑπέρβιοι ἠερέθονται,
 αἱ μὲν ἀπὸ στιβαρῶν ὤμων δύο, ταὶ δ' ὑπένερθεν 945
 τέσσαρες αἰνοτάτησιν ἐπὶ πλευρῇς ἀραρυῖαι.
 Ἴσθμὸν δ' αὖ πεδῖον τε Δολίονες ἀμφενέμοντο
 ἄνδρες· ἐν δ' ἥρως Αἰνῆιος υἱὸς ἄνασσε
 Κύζικος ὃν κούρη δίου τέκεν Εὐσώροιο
 Αἰνῆτη. Τοὺς δ' οὐ τι, καὶ ἔκπαγλοί περ ἑόντες, 950
 Γηγενέες σίνοντο, Ποσειδάωνος ἀρωγῇ·
 τοῦ γὰρ ἔσαν τὰ πρῶτα Δολίονες ἐκγεγαῶτες.
 A.R. 1.942-52

942-6: The narrator humorously begins his description of the inhabitants with a stock Odyssean phrase.²⁸⁷ Upon waking in Phaeacia, Odysseus speculates as to what kind of men inhabit the land, ἢ ῥ' οἱ γ' ὕβρισταί τε καὶ ἄγριοι οὐδὲ δίκαιοι, | ἦε φιλόξεينوι

²⁸⁴ Cf. e.g. ἔστι διειδομένη τις ἐν ὕδατι νήσος ἀραιή, (Call. *Del.* 191). To reinforce the catalogue link in C1 for C., the use of the formula at *Il.* 2.811, Ἔστι δέ τις προπάρσιθε πόλιος αἰπεῖα κολώνη, precedes the Trojan catalogue and concerns a mound known by two names. Men call it Batieia but the immortals call it the grave-mound of Myrine, σῆμα πολυσκάρθμοιο Μυρίνης (*Il.* 2.814). By the close of this episode, Cyzicus too will have a *sēma*.

²⁸⁵ Cf. Ardissoni ad loc: 'si tratta peraltro di una formula omerica introduttiva di descrizioni geografiche o topografiche.'

²⁸⁶ E.g. the Mossynoeci, a historical people in a mythological past. Time periods = 1. Time pre-*Argo* construction, 2. the 'story' time, 3. post *Argonautica*/pre-narrator time, and 4. narrator time.

²⁸⁷ Cf. e.g. Sistakou 2012: 66 n.50.

καί σφιν νόος ἐστὶ θεουδής; (*Od.* 6.120-1). It is a question he repeats in his own story of the Cyclops (9.175-6).²⁸⁸ de Jong notes that it marks Odysseus as a much-travelled man (*Od.* 1-3) and is formulated as two alternatives followed by a decision to find out for himself.²⁸⁹ Here transferred to indirect discourse, the narrator gives a statement not a question, Καὶ τὸ μὲν ὑβρισταί τε καὶ ἄγριοι ἐνναίεσκον. The discovering has been done for us. ‘Watch out for Monsters!’ reads the sign. Then five lines later there is another sign ‘Civilised Men live here!’ It turns out that on Cyzicus both options are represented. But first the narrator details the creatures, a great wonder to behold.

In Homer, the phrase μέγα θαῦμα mainly occurs in character-text; in the *Iliad* in the repeated line, ὦ πόποι ἦ μέγα θαῦμα τόδ’ ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ὀρῶμαι (*Il.* 13.99, 15.286, 20.344, 21.54) and once in the *Odyssey* in the slight variant, ὦ πάτερ, ἦ μέγα θαῦμα τόδ’ ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ὀρῶμαι (*Od.* 19.36). Whilst on the look-out for monsters, another being considered a wonder by Odysseus was Polyphemus himself (*Od.* 9.190).

The wings of the Boreads were earlier described by our narrator in similar terms, μέγα θάμβος ἰδέσθαι (*A.R.* 1.220), but if C. burrows further into the parallels there might be more at work here than wonderment, a sense that the marvellous can also be accompanied by reverence. In his own Homeric hymn, Apollo transformed into a dolphin is a μέγα θαῦμα that the sailors dare not approach (*h.Ap.* 415). The monstrous Typhon of *Pythian* 1 spurting fire from Aetna is a wonder to see and a wonder to hear about, θαυμάσιον προσιδέσθαι, θαῦμα δὲ καὶ παρεόντων ἀκοῦσαι (*Pi. P.* 26). These six-armed creatures in the *Argonautica* are certainly monsters and for the language used to describe them, the narrator turns to Hesiod and the description of the Hundred-Handers (*Hes. Th.* 150-3, 671-3).²⁹⁰ But they are also born of Earth,²⁹¹ and if we allow this reading of the Earthborn being something wondrous and of divine origin, then their culling at the hands of the Argonauts offers one explanation (in hindsight) for why the Argonauts are required to propitiate Rhea on their inadvertent return to the island (1.1092ff.) as well as suggesting that their return was not down just to bad luck

²⁸⁸ So too on his return to Ithaca, *Od.* 13.200.

²⁸⁹ de Jong 2001: 157.

²⁹⁰ Similarly, when battle is later joined, the echoes in the supposition of Hera’s involvement are Hesiodic (See 996-7n.).

²⁹¹ Though monsters do tend to be born from the Earth, e.g. Typhon who attacks the gods. The monster for whose wounding Odysseus needs to propitiate Poseidon is his son.

with the weather (See 1015-8n.).

The narrator offers no reason for the propitiation which must take place for the voyage to continue but there are Odyssean precedents for divine affliction following transgressions. The killing of the cattle of Helios in *Odyssey* 12 brings about the destruction of the last remaining ship. Poseidon answers the prayer of the mutilated Polyphemus that Odysseus' return be troubled and cost him his comrades (*Od.* 9. 530-5).

947-50: After turning to the regular human inhabitants in a verse on the general population, the focus narrows onto Cyzicus, emphasising his status. He is ἥρως (948) and rules the Doliones. There is a similarity here with the manner in which the principal Lemnian, Hypsipyle, was singled out from the rest of the women in the narrator's analepsis as the Argo neared Lemnos. First she was introduced as exceptional, then named in enjambment vv.620-1 (then additional information relayed in the expanded description of her father Thoas, ὃ δὲ κατὰ δῆμον ἄνασσε, 621). Cyzicus is introduced to the readers as 'the hero, the son of Aeneus, ruled | Cyzicus'.

Furthermore, the description of Cyzicus' parentage has the same sheen of Homeric grandeur used to describe Sicinus, progeny of Thoas and the nymph Oenoe (625-6). The phrase κούρη τέκεν has already been employed twice in the Catalogue of Heroes for the offspring of mortal women and gods, v.55 (Aethalides) and v.136 (Nauplius). It occurs once more in Jason's account of Ariadne's lineage: ἦν ῥά τε Πασιφάη κούρη τέκεν Ἡελίοιο (3.999). The narrator is introducing Cyzicus as a man of sound stock.

951-2: The narrator now provides an explanation of how it is these Doliones can survive as neighbours of the violent Earthborn.²⁹² Poseidon keeps the peace. Both groups, however, will suffer violence themselves at the hands of the arriving Greeks. In contrast to the Argonauts' productive intrusion on Lemnos which ensured the survival of the Lemnians (and future population of Thera), here the intrusion is markedly destructive to both Doliones and Earthborn.

²⁹² In the *Iliad*, ἔκπαγλος used of Laomedon (21.452) and Achilles (21.589).

C3. 'Anchoring Time' (953-60).

Unlike on Lemnos where our focus remained with the Lemnian women following the analepsis (See L2 above), here we revert to the Argonauts' perspective as they anchor.

Ἐνθ' Ἀργῷ προύτυψεν ἐπείγομένη ἀνέμοισι
Θρηκίοις· Καλὸς δὲ Λιμὴν ὑπέδεκτο θεούσαν.
Κεῖσε καὶ εὐναίης ὀλίγον λίθον ἐκλύσαντες
Τίφυος ἐννεσίησιν ὑπὸ κρήνῃ ἐλίποντο,
κρήνῃ ὑπ' Ἀρτακίῃ· ἕτερον δ' ἔλον, ὅς τις ἀρήρει,
βριθύν· ἀτὰρ κεῖνόν γε θεοπροπίαις Ἑκάτοιο
Νηλεΐδαι μετόπισθεν Ἰάονες ἰδρύσαντο
ἱερόν, ἣ θέμις ἦεν, Ἰησονίης ἐν Ἀθήνῃς.
A.R. 1.953-60

953-7: We now know that the Earthborn are violent and that only Poseidon's protection keeps the Doliones safe. The Argonauts are about to anchor without any such divine shield. First came the description of the Earthborn, second the description of the Doliones. Following the pattern, the reader can expect the Argonauts to be now introduced in the same order. Two lexical allusions taken together lead C. in particular to expectation of an immediate clash with the Earthborn. The first clue is the harbour. Καλὸς δὲ Λιμήν (954) ~ ἐς λιμένα κλυτόν (*Od.* 10.87) which appears when Odysseus narrates his own arrival to the land of the Laestrygonians, on the seventh day after leaving Aeolus for a second time. But, there is also an exact match earlier in the *Odyssey*, when Nausicaa gives her stranger the layout of Scheria, καλὸς δὲ λιμήν (*Od.* 6.263). So C. should probably favour the latter and a friendly encounter. Then the second allusion rings warning bells again - the Argonauts land and switch anchors, placing the old and lighter stone κρήνη ὑπ' Ἀρτακίῃ (957). The spring's name is the name of the spring in the country of Laestrygonians, *Od.* 10.108!

Who should C. expect? The daughter of Alcinous or the daughter of Antiphates?²⁹³ An expectation of the latter is suspended as the narrator jumps forward in

²⁹³ Cf. Clauss 1993: 160 for the parallels between daughter-guides and the two different receptions here.

time to provide an *aition* and when he returns to the story-time, the expectation dissipates as he narrates instead the Doliones coming to meet them in friendship. The signs were there to be read but set in the wrong place. The Argonauts will fight the Earthborn, but not yet.

The pattern turns out to be chiasitic: Earthborn (942-6) + Doliones (947-52) [Intermission in which the crew disembarks and switches anchors] – Doliones (961-84) – Earthborn (985-1011). The former pairing are the introductions of inhabitants to the reader, the latter reversed pairing those inhabitants encountering the Argonauts.²⁹⁴

958-60: Having mapped out the terrain and its inhabitants, an island untouched by Argonauts, the narrator now begins the process of colonising it. The placing of the old anchor by the spring triggers a temporal jump to a time post-*Argonautica* but pre-narrator in referencing a future colonisation of the island by the Νηλεΐδαι Ἰάονες. The reader is dislocated, taken away from any expectations of conflict by a scholarly narrator consulting sources and relating the future story of stone's relocation. The stone itself is a *sēma*, a visible marker of the Argonauts' passing. It is the first of a succession of markers – a temple (960), a path (988), a rock (1019). And then, following their return visit, there are further markers; a burial-mound (1061-2), a fountain (1068-9), two rituals (1075-7, 1138-9) and a spring (1148-9). A stopping-off to change anchor and get directions leaves Cyzicus littered with traces of their passing. 'The Argonauts were here' is written all over the island.²⁹⁵

The first *sēma* is moved inside a second *sēma*, the temple of Athena 'Helper of Jason' by these Ionian settlers, ἦ θέμις ἦεν (960). Again there is blurring of temporal levels, the Argonauts leaving the stone and the Ionian settlers moving it.

This first occurrence of *themis* in the episode is the narrator's comment on the actions of later settlers, doing what was 'right.' Its first occurrence in the *Iliad* is in the speech of Agamemnon to the commanders concerning making trial of the men 'as is customary' (*Il.* 2.73), after which 9.33 (Diomedes to Ag.), 9.134 (Agamemnon speaks of

²⁹⁴ For a more impressive (super)structure see the elaborate ring composition spanning verses 910-1152 proposed by Clauss 1993: 152-3.

²⁹⁵ Stephens 2011: 97, 'Place was not simply where individuals lived. It serves as a mnemonic for cultural identity - rivers, mountains, gods, heroes, shrines, rituals, stories, even objects like rock formations link the present inhabitants of a place to their collective past.'

not having slept with Briseis as is customary), 9.276 (repeated to Achilles by Odysseus, and again 19.177), 11.779 (Nestor speaks of Achilles' hospitality), 23.44 (Achilles will not wash away the blood until Patroclus is buried), 23.581 (Antilochus told to take an oath), 24.652 (Achilles speaks of the habit of the Achaean commanders). All these instances are character-text. And outside of speech it only occurs twice, first in a comment on the sword wielded by Poseidon, τῷ δ' οὐ θέμις ἐστὶ μιγῆναι | ἐν δαΐ λευγαλέῃ, ἀλλὰ δέος ἰσχάνει ἄνδρας (14.386-7), and subsequently in a comment on Apollo knocking the helmet from Patroclus before his death, πάρος γε μὲν οὐ θέμις ᾗεν (16.796). On both occasions a divinity is involved.

The narrator then is again taking the character-language of the Homeric hero, and here extracting it as a model of proper usage to be then applied by himself to the actions of historical Ionian settlers. This is an example of what Morrison has termed 'ethnographic *themis*': 'In Homer it was the characters who employed terms such as *themis* in order to articulate their ethics to one another (and by extension, to the audience), but in Apollonius such terms are employed by the primary narrator adopting an external point of view as to what is correct in heroic society.'²⁹⁶

I included the two examples from Homeric narrator-text as there is something which C. if alert can infer as motivating the placing and moving of the stone (albeit in a very oblique fashion). The Argonauts put the old stone by the fountain at the suggestion of Tiphys, the helmsman last mentioned when the Argo set sail (561). Τίφυος ἐννεσίησιν (956) is a curious phrase to associate with him. ἐννεσίησι(ν) has occurred once previously, of Pelias' command in the proem (7). Elsewhere it is used of divine command/counsel, so e.g. in Homer (*Il.* 5.894, Hera), in Hesiod (*Th.* 494, Gaia) and in Callimachus (*Call. Dian.* 108, Hera). Apollonius has a fondness for the phrase which later recurs 2.1110, 2.1166 (unspecified immortals), 3.29 (Medea), 3.478 (Hecate), 3.818 (Hera), 4.646 (Hera), 4.1445 (Heracles).

Now similar diction has been previously used of giving instructions, e.g. ὑποθημοσύνησιν 1.112 (Athena's on building the Argo) and 1.367 (Argus on how to rope a ship's boards to withstand the waves). Alone ἐννεσίησιν might not carry especial significance but does, I think, stand out for C. as a lexical choice not commonly used of

²⁹⁶ A.D. Morrison *Clio and Calliope*. See Richardson 1990: 141, Griffin 1986: 38.

mortals. In the Catalogue of Heroes, Tiphys leaves home to join the crew because, the narrator tells us, Athena sent him (109-10). A connection between him and the goddess thus already exists in the narrative. To where is the anchor stone relocated, as was right? The temple of Athena. At whose suggestion did the Argonauts leave it by the spring? Tiphys' or Athena's (via Tiphys)?

If that seems too mysterious to untangle even for the workings of gods then there is the intratextual alternative that A. might readily jump to, even if not yet knowing exactly why. As noted, the only previous usage was regarding Pelias. Combine that with the Far-Shooter's oracle (958), and we are back to the proem and Pelias' attempt to avert a prophecy which has brought us on the voyage and will ultimately bring about Pelias' destruction (See 980-4n.).

C4. 'Reading Signs' (961-84).

Τοὺς δ' ἄμυδις φιλότῃτι Δολίονες ἡδὲ καὶ αὐτὸς
Κύζικος ἀντήσαντες, ὅτε στόλον ἡδὲ γενέθλην
ἔκλυον οἳ τινες εἶεν, ἐυξείνως ἀρέσαντο·
καὶ σφεας εἰρεσίῃ πέπιθον προτέρωσε κιόντας
ἄστεος ἐν λιμένι πρυμνήσια νηὸς ἀνάψαι. 965
A.R. 1.961-5

961-3: As on Lemnos, so on Cyzicus. Potential conflict is averted (postponed) when Argonauts do not encounter the Earthborn in a Laestrygonian-style conflict as the reader misdirected by the Laestrygonian (and/or Cyclopean) intertexts expected. Instead they are met in friendship by the Doliones whose genial disposition contrasts with the apprehension of the Lemnian women. But then the Doliones have nothing to fear and nothing to hide. Except that, and this is something anyone familiar with a hospitality type-scene will see (A. as well as C.), they are doing something wrong.²⁹⁷ ὅτε στόλον ἡδὲ γενέθλην | ἔκλυον οἳ τινες εἶεν, ἐυξείνως ἀρέσαντο – asking questions about identity and then being friendly? That's just not Homer! Levin raises the Homeric

²⁹⁷ On hospitality type-scenes in epic (and type-scenes in general), see Edwards 1975. Cf. e.g. Reece 1993.

objection here to the Doliones' behaviour: 'Homer's hosts prefer to feed the stranger-guest before asking who he is, whence he has come, and what business has brought him hither.'²⁹⁸ de Jong has analysed the common elements of the type-scene (a welcome, invitation, seating, meal, after-meal talk) which is itself a component of a 'visit' type-scene: "'visit" scenes are to [the *Odyssey*] what the "battle" scenes are to the *Iliad*.'²⁹⁹ 'Improper' 'visit' scenes do occur in the *Odyssey*, e.g. Circe drugs her guests (*Od.* 10.314-7) and the Cyclops eats his (*Od.* 9.273f.), but it is recognising the model that allows the reader to note the subversions.

Circe is able to manipulate her guests because they expect *xenia* and the reader, having already witnessed examples of the standard type-scene, sees the common elements (the welcome, the invitation to sit) and then notices the divergence (drugging the wine). The Cyclops claims to not care less about what is expected of him and eats his 'guests.' The Argonautic hospitality scenes might not all follow Homeric practice but they do depend on an awareness of the standard from which to note the differences (as with any intertext).³⁰⁰

Why do the Doliones need to know who these strangers are before extending hospitality according to *xenia*?³⁰¹ There is no immediate explanation for the inversion but what might make the reader (but not the Argonauts) more circumspect about these friendly Doliones is that we arrive at Cyzicus straight from Lemnos. There we had access (and the Argonauts did not) to the narrator's backstory (L1) and the Lemnian Assembly (L4). We acquired some information about the women that for the crew never came to light. At Cyzicus, we do not go 'backstage' as it were but that does not mean there is nothing there to be seen. Removing those two key sections of the Lemnian episode would have made for a very different reader experience. At Cyzicus our reader experience (in so far as understanding the motivation of the island's inhabitants) moves closer that of the Argonauts' on Lemnos.

²⁹⁸ Levin 1971: 92.

²⁹⁹ de Jong 2001: 17, see *ibid.*: 21-3.

³⁰⁰ Clauss (1993: 160 n.28) points out Vian's objections to Levin in light of how such scenes play out in the *Argonautica*. The rewrites are, I think, always demanding to be read against the model. Cf. the audience with Aeetes 3.299f. The king is livid that he has fed his guests first before questioning them and now cannot kill them. He's angry with himself for dutifully observing Homeric practice!

³⁰¹ For the answer, see below 969-71n.

964-5: The Doliones persuade (πέπειθον) the Argonauts to move the ship from its initial anchorage into the city harbour. On the surface this is a friendly suggestion. In the Laestrygonian model, however, the harbour is the ambush site. It is only the fact that Odysseus stayed back and moored his own ship outside of it (as do the Argonauts initially here) that saved him from the Laestrygonians.

Now, as I wish to propose different interpretations regarding actorial motivation in how this episode develops, one being that the Doliones a) engineer an encounter between Argonauts and Earthborn or b) are not forthcoming about their monstrous neighbours' existence in the hope that the Argonauts are destroyed, a scholarly disagreement must be acknowledged.

There is some debate concerning the number of harbours the island possesses and/or how many of them the Argonauts utilise in the course of their stay. Thalmann favours three harbours and considers vv.986-87 'an untenable awkwardness in the narrative' (the Argonauts would be sailing into the city harbour after having already built an altar there vv.966-7), and one that cannot be explained away as a parenthesis.³⁰² Thus the Heaped-Up Harbour they anchor in and where the Earthborn attack must be a third harbour. I agree with the illogicality of the temporal sequence that Thalmann *et alii* find problematic but this three-harbour solution proposed is bizarre in itself as a narrative sequence.

According to this solution, the Argonauts having disembarked at Fair Harbour (this is inferred from the changing of the stones and leaving the old one by the spring) are met by the Doliones, who persuade them to anchor in the city harbour. Immediately the Argonauts do as suggested and row to there (with the Doliones ambling alongside?). They disembark a second time. The exposition of my previous two sentences has to be inferred from the single word Ἐνθ' (966). There (Ἐνθ'!) they build an altar and make sacrifices. After a conversation in which they realise the Doliones can tell them nothing of use, they board the ship and set off again to another harbour (for some reason passed over that we are left to infer – not *per se* out of keeping with the narratorial manner)

³⁰² Thalmann 2011: 96 with citations *ibid.* n.56. For Mooney, Vian, Race there are only two harbours in play in the narrative. See the discussion in Ardizonni 1967 ad 966 & 986-7. Clauss summarises the narrative sequence in which the Argonauts move from harbour to harbour to harbour without raising any objection (1993: 160-1) whereas it strikes me that they should not have changed to a heavier anchor if they were going to be lugging it around so much.

where they are ambushed by the Earthborn. It is an unnecessary and unmotivated amount of embarking and disembarking.

I would suggest that there are only two harbours and that the Argonauts do not teleport to the city harbour following the suggestion of the Doliones, and instead that 'Evθ' (966) refers not to the city harbour but the Fair Harbour where they have already disembarked and encountered the Doliones. It is *there* that they build the altar by the shore (there is no verb of motion pushing 'there' into 'thither'), sacrifice and converse with Cyzicus and it is the following morning (985) that they act on the Doliones' advice and row into the city harbour (which is itself Heaped-Up Harbour).³⁰³ This would be a sensible narrative sequence that finds support in the Homeric model – the Argonauts take up the position of Odysseus' ship (*Od.* 10.95-6) but the next day row into the enclosed position that the rest of Odysseus' fleet took up (*Od.* 10.91-94). The Doliones, in effect, persuade them to move closer to the model. This would be my solution and the one that keeps my options a) and b) in play.

Readers adamant that the Argonauts made three separate moorings can disregard the following speculation of foul play (and subsequent interpretations based upon it).

Now when the Earthborn reappear and make their assault, the first thing they do is seek to seal in the Argo (989). All the preceding conversations between Doliones and Argonauts are related indirectly and the Earthborn have dropped out of the narrative. As the episode advances, the lack of any direct access becomes increasingly problematic. The reader already knows the Earthborn are out there but do the Argonauts have any idea prior to the assault? Do the Doliones mention them at all? If they do, the narrator does not relay that on to the reader. The Doliones are described as φιλότιτι (961), ἐυξείνως (963) and later ἐυξείνοισι Δολίοισιν (1018) although that last citation is just prior to battling the Argonauts. Maybe, perhaps, possibly it could be inferred that these people are *too* welcoming.

The Argonauts, of course, have less reason for suspicions. They had a very different Lemnian experience to the reader. The questioning in advance might be off-

³⁰³ Ardizzoni (1967: 228) suggests 'in senso temporale,' 'there' means 'then' which also works for my reading.

putting but the welcome *appears* friendly enough.³⁰⁴

Ἔνθ' οἳ γ' Ἐκβασίῳ βωμὸν θέσαν Ἀπόλλωνι
εἰσάμενοι παρὰ θῖνα θυηπολῆς τ' ἐμελοντο.
Δῶκεν δ' αὐτὸς ἄναξ λαρὸν μέθυ δευομένοισι
μῆλ' ἄ θ' ὁμοῦ· δὴ γάρ οἱ ἔην φάτις, εὖτ' ἂν ἴκωνται
ἄνδρῶν ἡρώων θεῖος στόλος, αὐτίκα τόν γε
μείλιχον ἀντιάαν μηδὲ πτολέμοιο μέλεσθαι.
A.R. 1.966-71

970

966-8: After explaining their presence there, the Argonauts carry on with marking the moment. Just as at v.402f. they built an altar to Apollo Actius and Embasius before setting out, now they build an altar to Apollo Ecbasius. If passage beyond the Hellespont is viewed as a transition, a move into new and unknown territory (hence the need to get information or survey the terrain for themselves at this juncture. See 985-88n.), then the altar to Apollo here marks the beginning of a second stage of the voyage as the narrative pushes on beyond any recognisably Greek territories.

For Thalmann, who has brought spatial theory to bear on the Argonautic narrative, putting down markers is symbolic of their conquest of space, a making the Other into the Greek. Regarding this altar, he discusses the importance of stories of friendly encounters to a colonial narrative and considers the altar a marker that ‘commemorates contact between the Greek newcomers and the local people.’³⁰⁵ In recalling the altar at Pagasae, it can be read as establishing a link back to mainland Greece.

His approach is refreshing and this function is sound but whether future viewers of the altar will be reminded of two people meeting in friendship is debatable. Stories change. In the immediately preceding narrative, it is the narrator who focalises the Dolionian greeting and it is his evaluation ‘friendly’ (961) that is presented in the story. This then is the evaluation encoded into the altar at the time of construction – a *sēma* of

³⁰⁴ The pro-Doliones reader can look for support to the way in which the Argonauts greet the Mysians in the following episode φιλότῃ κίοντας (1179) and are, as a result, welcomed ἐυξείνως (1179) and supplied ἥϊά τε σφι | μῆλ' ἄ τε δευομένοισι μέθυ τ' ἄσπετον ἐγγυάλιξαν (1180-1). The pro-two harbour party should note Ἔνθα in first position on the following verse (1082). The Argonauts stay where they are and make sacrifice again to Apollo Ecbasius (1186-7).

³⁰⁵ Thalmann 2011: 95.

a friendly encounter between Greeks and foreigners. It provides an actorial motivation for the altar's construction. It is built to commemorate that amicable event, to relate a moment of contact and friendship.

However, if in the process of reading the episode, that narratorial evaluation (encoded into the *sēma*) is called into question, the message on the altar is destabilised and subject to revision. If I, as a reader, become suspicious of the Doliones and whilst reading begin to suspect some insincerity (or irony) in the narratorial qualification of v.961, then the story of the *sēma* is no longer 'friendly' in any straightforward way. Or if, on reaching the end of the episode, I interpret the deaths of Cyzicus and Cleite as entirely accidental and avoidable then the positivity the altar's construction was intended to represent to future observers, to be triggered by me as viewer/reader, is nuanced by my reflections on what unfolded that I evaluated as a senseless tragedy. The *sēma* is encoded at a specific point in the narrative but the message is not stable. It is modified by interpretation and subsequent revision of interpretations (See C7i below). The only moment it can ever be *read* as 'friendly' and nothing more is if I reach the end of verse 967 and close the book.

As for the sacrifice itself, Mori has documented an impressive 'thirty sacrifices, libations, and offerings' in the poem, and eight more possibles.³⁰⁶ This sacrifice would be the fifth performed by the Argonauts in the narrative thus far; the first being the one to Apollo mentioned above, the second to Zeus (vv.516-7), the third to Dolops (vv.587-8), and the fourth the joint sacrifice with the Lemnian women to all the gods (See L8 above). There will be another fourteen before the Argonauts reach Colchis as 'the narrator marks the Argo's progress with a fairly inclusive record of sacrifices at landings and embarkations, funerals, purifications, celebrations of thanksgiving, as well as simple meals.'³⁰⁷ For the attentive reader A., repetition becomes pattern and there is comfort in routines. For a moment there is a lull in the narrative - the crew engage in sacrifice and the reader who had feared an Earthborn attack is made a more relaxed observer (at least a reader not put on alert by my seeding of suspicion).

³⁰⁶ Mori 2008: 156, neatly tabulated *ibid.*: 157-60.

³⁰⁷ Mori 2008: 161.

968-9: Cyzicus appears before the Argonauts in the manner he was introduced to the reader, as a king. αὐτὸς ἄναξ reiterates the initial exposition ἥρως Αἰνίδιος υἱὸς ἄνασσε | Κύζικος (948-9). For Mori, his provisioning of the Argonauts with wine and sheep for sacrifice marks Cyzicus as a good ruler, and she draws a contrast with Phineus: ‘the sudden death of the young ruler who dies prematurely out of ignorance is opposed to the protracted age of a far-seeing king who long outlives his reign.’³⁰⁸

It does seem a benevolent gesture, but again for A. there is a recent (and troublesome) intratextual echo. The sweet wine Cyzicus gives to his guests recalls Hypsipyle’s suggestion in the Lemnian assembly to give the Argonauts provisions and sweet wine to keep them out of the city, λαρὸν μέθυ (968) ~ ἦια καὶ μέθυ λαρόν (659). She was explicit in voicing her own motivation, μηδ’ ἄμμε κατὰ χρεῖῳ μεθέποντες | ἀτρεκέως γνῶωσι (660-1). Maybe the Doliones and their *wanax* do have something to hide.

969-71: Here comes the character motivation. Cyzicus acts in obedience to an oracle. From friendly greeting to questioning to accommodating to explanation – the critical information has been saved for last. What was the oracle that Cyzicus heard? There is no source given and no direct quotation, only an indirect report. Was it simply as reported, ‘Be friendly to heroes and do not fight them’? This is sound advice but it is not especially oracular. Is there a missing ‘or else’ to be inferred? ‘Fight with heroes and you will die.’ Was the oracle ‘You will meet your death at the hands of an expedition of heroes’? If this is closer to the original expression, then the indirect report is in fact a combination of actorial motivation and a strategy for avoiding Fate. On this reading, Cyzicus opts to be friendly not because that is his natural disposition but because he is motivated by self-preservation. What were the circumstances in which Cyzicus received this oracle? Did he seek an oracle out asking if he would have a long life? From whom did he receive it? These questions are all prompted by an incomplete and reported motivation.

Following Cyzicus’ death at Jason’s hands, the narrator’s comment on the young king fulfilling his destiny (μοῖραν ἀνέπλησεν, v.1035), which leads into more general

³⁰⁸ Mori 2008: 180.

observations on man's inability to escape Fate, might bolster an interpretation whereby Cyzicus made some attempt to manipulate destiny and escape his allotted time.

Ἄρμοϊ που κἀκείνῳ ἐπισταχέεσκον ἴουλοι·
οὐδέ νύ πω παίδεσσιν ἀγαλλόμενος μεμόρητο,
ἀλλ' ἔτι οἱ κατὰ δώματ' ἀκήρατος ἦεν ἄκοιτις
ὠδίνων, Μέροπος Περκωσίου ἐκγεγαυῖα 975
Κλείτη εὐπλόκαμος. Τὴν μὲν νέον ἐξέτι πατρὸς
θεσπεσίοις ἔδνοισιν ἀνήγαγεν ἀντιπέρηθεν·
ἀλλὰ καὶ ὥς, θάλαμόν τε λιπὼν καὶ δέμνια νύμφης,
τοῖς μέτα δαῖτ' ἀλέγυνε, βάλεν δ' ἀπὸ δείματα θυμοῦ.
A.R. 1.972-9

972-9: Coming after the revelation of the oracle, this is a wonderfully rich and exemplary passage, both full of suggestion and devoid of any explicit confirmations. The reader is painted a picture. Cyzicus is, like Jason, a young man and his beard just sprouting. Unlike Jason, he has a wife but no children yet. They have just been wed. He paid her father Merops a wondrous bride-price and rightly so. She is beautiful (Κλείτη εὐπλόκαμος, 976).³⁰⁹ Following on the heels of an oracle about not fighting heroes, an image is conjured of a handsome young couple just starting their lives together that concludes with the new husband leaving the honeymoon suite to meet the newcomers βάλεν δ' ἀπὸ δείματα θυμοῦ.³¹⁰ This might not end well.

For C., recognition of certain Iliadic intertexts mark Cyzicus for death. In *Iliad* 11, in a passage beginning with an appeal to the Muses (Ἔσπετε νῦν μοι Μοῦσαι, *Il.* 11.218), we are told the story of the Thracian youth Iphidamas, son of Antenor. He went to Troy with twelve ships, γήμας δ' ἐκ θαλάμοιο (11.227).³¹¹ The story is related just before he fights Agamemnon and dies.

ὥς ὃ μὲν αὖθι πεσὼν κοιμήσατο χάλκεον ὕπνον

³⁰⁹ Εὐπλόκαμος is common in Homer, cf. e.g. *Il.* 11.624 (Hecamede), 18.48 (the Nereid Amatheia), *Od.* 5.58 (Calypso), and frequent without discrimination (mainly to deities, so Levin 1971: 94 n.5) e.g. Circe, Athena, Artemis etc.

³¹⁰ For a semantic parallel cf. e.g. Laomedon's challenge to Odysseus σκέδασον δ' ἀπὸ κήδεα θυμοῦ (*Od.* 8.148).

³¹¹ These twelve ships Iphidamas moored (or will moor) at Percote (home of Cyzicus' father-in-law).

οἰκτρὸς ἀπὸ μνηστῆς ἀλόχου, ἀστοῖσιν ἀρήγων,
 κουριδίης, ἧς οὐ τι χάριν ἶδε, πολλὰ δ' ἔδωκε·
Il. 11.241-3

There can be no mistaking the similarities of circumstances. The following verses proceed to list the particulars of the bride-price (cattle, goats, sheep) which our narrator here summarises as θεσπέσιος ‘divinely sweet’ (977). The verses are also remarkable for the evaluative comment on Iphidamas as οἰκτρὸς ‘pitiable,’ which is found only here in Homer though later recurrent in Tragedy. Cyzicus is not going to fight the Argonauts, he is going to have a meal with them yet he goes shadowed by this other young groom going to die.³¹²

Or grooms: to Iphidamas, we can add Protesilaus, ‘the most famous example of this mythological topos.’³¹³ Knight acknowledges the Iphidamas model as the fullest treatment but fills out the briefer Iliadic treatment of Protesilaus (*Il.* 2.700-1)³¹⁴ with details from tradition, ‘he had only one day of married life before going to Troy.’³¹⁵ With the inclusion of Protesilaus, I would suggest that the model of the new groom who dies in battle would also be recognised by A. who knows a topos and is thus likewise encouraged with the sense of foreboding that fills C. busily cross-referencing details in the Iphidamas passage.³¹⁶

What C. will not find mentioned there is the added detail here, ἀκήρατος ἦεν ἄκοιτις | ὠδίνων (974-5). Here we find the explicit mention that the new wife had not yet had children. Following an episode in which an island of women has been impregnated and the Lemnian future secured, comes a parallel with the young bride yet to go into labour (or indeed conceive); a parallel which becomes a contrast when both bride and groom die and any future is extinguished.³¹⁷

These doomed Homeric grooms share similar backgrounds but no attendant

³¹² There are additional points of contact. The sons of Merops are killed by Diomedes in the same passage of fighting (*Il.* 11.328f.). Cyzicus is the grandson of Eusorus, another Thracian (Σ ad 936-49r).

³¹³ Knight 1995: 87 citing *ibid.* n.16 Griffin 1980: 131-4.

³¹⁴ He was the first of the Greeks to die at Troy and his death is related in a narratorial analepsis.

³¹⁵ Knight 1995: 87 citing Euripides’ *Protesilaus* (Σ ad Aristidem 671f.).

³¹⁶ Given the difficulties of assessing Cyzicus’ intentions regarding the arrivals, it is perhaps apposite that the reader can call upon both a Greek and a Trojan model for the groom and his bride.

³¹⁷ For another Lemnian echo here, ἀντιπέρηθεν (976). Cyzicus gets his bride from the land opposite and so did the Lemnian men their Thracian concubines ἀντιπέρηθεν | Θρηκίην (613-4). Cyzicus paid a handsome price for his bride whereas the Lemnian men stole their concubines.

prophecies. For C., however, an attempt to circumvent Fate could now call to mind another recently married man: the account of the demise of Croesus' son Atys in Herodotus, a young man whose death by an iron weapon Croesus foresaw in a dream (Hdt. 1.34.2). Despite attempts to remove all threat, he reluctantly allowed his son (νεόγαμός τε γὰρ ἐστί, 1.36.3) to join a boar-hunt during which he was killed by friendly fire, an erroneous spear-throw from the Phrygian Adrastus, a guest in his house (οἰκίοισι ὑποδεξάμενος τὸν ξεῖνον φονέα τοῦ παιδὸς ἐλάνθανε βόσκων, 1.44.2). Observing guest-host relations is no guarantee of survival.

δείματα puzzled Levin who observes the lack of explicit reference and the need to *infer* that it relates to the oracle.³¹⁸ He strains to reconcile a conflict between two oracles, one to be friendly to strangers and another to not fear them, the latter motivated by warlike neighbours (the Pelasgians/Macrians) who occur nowhere in the text until the Doliones' mistaken supposition when the Argonauts return (see Levin 1971: 93-5). I mention this as an example of the doubts, inferences, and compromises which any reader is forced to tackle when the narrative is deliberately suppressive.

My reading is that vv.976-9 are an analepsis (and that there are only two harbours and one meeting). Cyzicus and the Doliones meet the Argonauts and ask who they are. Only then do they invite them to a meal. The king is generous because of the oracle. Description of the king transitions to description of his queen who is not present. This is now exposition that has slipped back temporally to their wedding then to him leaving the bridal chamber apprehensively (because of the oracle and because he hasn't met the Argonauts yet) then back to the narrative present on the shore with the Argonauts ready for the after-meal talk element of the 'visit' type-scene.

975-6: Going back to the last question posed 969-71n., from whom did Cyzicus receive the oracle? Cyzicus' new father-in-law is Merops of Percote. For C., this will cause both a smile of recognition and a rueful shake of the head. In the same passage of fighting in which Iphidamas dies, the sons of Merops are killed by Diomedes.

ἔνθ' ἐλέτην δίφρὸν τε καὶ ἀνέρε δήμου ἀρίστῳ
 υἷε δ'ὡς Μέροπος Περκωσίου, ὃς περὶ πάντων

³¹⁸ Levin 1971: 95-6.

ἦδεε μαντοσύνας, οὐδὲ οὐς παῖδας ἔασκε
 στείχειν ἐς πόλεμον φθισήνορα· τὼ δέ οἱ οὔ τι
 πειθέσθην· κῆρες γὰρ ἄγον μέλανος θανάτοιο.
Il. 11.328-32

330

Merops was a prophet and foresaw their deaths at Troy. They would not listen to him and went to war. At v.975 of our text, there is the explicit mention of Merops. In the intertext, Merops and his two dead sons are located eighty-five verses after Iphidamas dies. Μέροπος Περκωσίου is in the same *sedes* in both text and intertext.³¹⁹ C. now has a very plausible source for Cyzicus' oracle and might infer that the prophecy similarly foretold his death (albeit making Merops' prophetic utterances gloomily one-note in the process). Merops' sons did not listen to his prophecies and die at Troy (or will die there in the chronology of the story-time). Cyzicus either did as was bid but still got it wrong or attempted to thwart destiny but he does not escape it. That accounts for C.'s smile but why the subsequent shake of the head?

It is not the first time these two sons have been mentioned in the *Iliad*. They appeared by name in the Catalogue, Adrastus and Amphius amongst the leaders of the Trojan allies (*Il.* 2.830). *Il.* 11.329-4 is a verbatim repetition of *Il.* 2.831-4. Within a transitional passage which recalled a Trojan catalogue (See C1 above), one crucial echo has been omitted which when it now occurs both confirms the earlier Catalogue intertext and explains the prophet's absence until now.³²⁰

Ἀλλήλους δ' ἐρέεινον ἀμοιβαδῖς· ἦτοι ὁ μὲν σφεων
 πεύθετο ναυτιλῆς ἄνυσιν Πελῖάο τ' ἐφετμάς·
 οἱ δὲ περικτιόνων πόλιας καὶ κόλπον ἅπαντα
 εὐρέιης πεύθοντο Προποντίδος· οὐ μὲν ἐπιπρὸ
 ἡεῖδει καταλέξαι ἐλδομένοισι δαῖναι.
A.R. 1.980-4

980

³¹⁹ See Σ ad 1.977, Vian 1974: 96 n.3, Mooney ad loc, Ardizzoni ad loc (who noted the *sedes*). Clauss (1993: 155) speculates that Apollonius might have got the idea of a prophecy from *Il.* 2.830-34 but not that Merops himself presents an obvious source in the narrative.

³²⁰ The suspension of the mention of Merops might be read as a comment on the correct placement of a passage. This interpretation can be corroborated by viewing the narrator's arrangement of the locations. He has collected and corrected the geography of the region. The Argonauts are passing through an updated and revised Homeric Catalogue (e.g. the inclusion of Abarnis, found in Hecataeus (*FrGH* 1 F220) but not in Homer). See Clauss 1993: 154. In an episode in which the fondness for doubling has already been noted, we now have an Iliadic Adrastus to join the Herodotean Adrastus in the context of oracular allusions.

980-4: The first Homeric model (discussed above) for narrative shape is recalled when Argonauts and Cyzicus question one another in turn. As related by Odysseus, Aeolus asked for all the details of Troy and his *nostos* to that point and Odysseus told him all before requesting help for his onward journey (*Od.* 10.14-18). de Jong (2001: 251) notes the summarising treatment and how the ‘brevity is due to the fact that this scene forms an anticipatory doublet of the much more dramatic second visit (59-76).’ Observing that narrative shape, the return to Cyzicus and second encounter with the young king will be especially dramatic. Unlike Aeolus, whose refusing Odysseus nothing ‘characterises him as a perfect host’, the mortal Cyzicus offers limited assistance.³²¹

In contrast to an Aeolus or to the *Odyssey*’s Circe or Tiresias (the latter’s Argonautic substitute Phineus awaits the reader in Book 2), Cyzicus lacks the knowledge to help, prompting the Argonauts to investigate the landscape for themselves. Cyzicus cannot see further than his own surrounds. We might draw a parallel here with his similar ignorance of his future and make further general comment on the wider theme of ignorance (and the limits of knowledge) of both characters and readers.

What did Jason tell Hypsipyle on Lemnos? In his short reply to her expansive and personal account of the Lemnian plight, he told her he was under a trial (See L7ii above). At their departure scene, she makes reference to the fleece and hopes for his success in returning it to the king (See L10ii above). The reader is thus left to infer that this information was related to her by Jason in the vague time period between the Argonauts accepting Lemnian hospitality and Heracles deciding it was time to move on. From the reported exchange vv.980-4, we might infer that Jason told Cyzicus much the same thing, ‘We’ve been sent by Pelias to fetch the fleece from Colchis.’ When the Argonauts come to meet Lycus, king of Mariandynians in Book 2, the narrator relates that Jason gives the same information to him (2.762ff.) along with an account of their voyage to that point, including all that they did around Cyzicus. Jason is not reticent to share any and all information with the characters he encounters. The problem for the reader is that it is not being shared with us, or rather, the narrator offers us no more than

³²¹ de Jong 2001: 251.

brief reported summary despite our own eagerness to learn.

It is Cyzicus' reported lack of knowledge that leads to the ascent of Dindymum to scout the terrain ahead. It sets in motion the subsequent narrative; conflict with the Earthborn, hasty departure, subsequent return at night and Cyzicus' own death due to the ignorance of both parties as to the identity of their opponents.³²²

But before rushing him to his death, talk of oracles, of ignorance and of Pelias cannot help but remind the attentive reader (A.) of what instigated the voyage – Pelias' attempt to thwart his own fate (See Introduction 2. *Where, how, and when to begin*). The Argonauts ascend Dindymum to assess the route ahead because Cyzicus we are told does not know. Is that lack of knowledge the narrator's comment or what Cyzicus actually said? The very first direct speech of the poem is anonymous, an expression of the thoughts of the crowd and the very first line is a question: Ζεῦ ἄνα, τίς Πελίοιο νόος, v.242. What is the intention of Pelias? Jason does not know that the motivation he offers Cyzicus now for the quest is not the motivation of Pelias in ordering it. As discussed in the Introduction, it is Pelias' intention to avoid a prophecy and destroy Jason's *nostos*. What is the intention of Cyzicus?

At this point, for C. there are several active intertexts to help fill the gaps and compensate for the narrator's reticence: 1. Expectations of Laestrygonian/Cyclopean violence (currently suspended/misdirected), 2. Iliadic echoes of young grooms about to die, and 3. A source for the oracle in Merops. To these we can add the Pelias Prophecy intratext. Alexandros whose reading is more reliant on the text itself has not noticed Merops but for him Pelias should loom large, given his explicit mention here (981) and his recollection of the proem. Of the intertexts 1 and 2 are both active in his broader recognition of models without being drawn into the correspondences of lexis which highlight them in C.'s reading.

I suggest that three readings are currently on the table: 1. The Doliones are genuinely friendly and the ensuing battles are both accidental, 2. The Doliones withheld mention of the Earthborn (sharing the primary narrator's reticence to divulge too much), and 3. The Doliones persuaded the Argonauts to row into Heaped-Up Harbour in the

³²² Readers tracking another monstrous intertext can draw a contrast between the need for knowledge that pushes the Argonauts into conflict with the Earthborn and Odysseus and his crew falling foul of the Cyclops because of the hero's curiosity (*Od.* 9.228-30).

hope that the Earthborn fell upon them and in doing so ended any threat to their king Cyzicus. Until the narrative explicitly rules any of these interpretations out, all remain open when the Argonauts begin their ascent of Dindymum.

C5. ‘The Earthborn’ (985-1011).

Ἵοϊ δ' εἰσανέβαν μέγα Δίνδυμον, ὄφρα καὶ αὐτοὶ	985
θηήσαιντο πόρους κείνης ἀλός· ἐν δ' ἄρα τοί γε	
νῆα Χυτῷ λιμένι προτέρου ἐξήλασαν ὄρμον.	
Ἦδε δ' Ἰησονίη πέφαται Ὀδός, ἣν περ ἔβησαν.	
Γηγενέες δ' ἐτέρωθεν ἀπ' οὐρεος αἶξαντες	
φράξαν ἀπειρεσίησι Χυτοῦ στόμα νειόθι πέτρης,	990
πόντιον, οἷά τε θῆρα λοχώμενοι ἔνδον ἔοντα.	
A.R. 1.985-91	

985-88: The action begins at dawn, the next phase of the narrative introduced by the temporal marker Ἵοϊ. On Cyzicus there is no direct speech, no access to the thoughts of characters, confusion as to motivation, speculation as to source material but the time-keeping throughout is careful and meticulous.

The Argonauts split into two groups, some make the ascent, some move the ship into Heaped-Up Harbour. The intertextual possibilities accumulate. Those making the ascent do so ‘to explore the paths of the sea.’ The phrase recalls again the wandering Odysseus narrating his journeys (*Od.* 12.259). Whilst his fleet anchored in the Laestrygonian harbour, Odysseus went alone to survey the country (*Od.* 10.97f.). Odysseus left no trace on the landscape but for the Argonauts, the journey up the mountain results in another marking of their presence on the island - the path they took became named after Jason. This marker announced before the battle with the Earthborn will be mirrored by another geographic marker in the Sacred Rock before they battle the Doliones (See 1019-20n.).

989-91: The Earthborn make their belated appearance, taking Argonauts and the reader of the models by surprise. They should have been lurking not far from Artacie’s spring when the reader told to watch out for violent savages was ready for them (See 953-7n.).

Instead, model was woven inside model and reader ambushed by their relocation. Heaped-Up Harbour now gets its name as the Earthborn set about blockading the vulnerable ship with rocks, and within the short simile, λοχώμενοι brings another echo. At the ominous close of *Odyssey* 4, the suitors lay in wait plotting ambush for Telemachus, λοχώωντες (*Od.* 4.847).

Ἄλλὰ γὰρ αὖθι λείπειτο σὺν ἀνδράσιν ὀπλοτέροισιν
 Ἡρακλῆς, ὃς δὴ σφι παλίντονον αἶψα τανύσσας
 τόξον, ἐπασσύτερους πέλασε χθονί. Τοὶ δὲ καὶ αὐτοὶ
 πέτρας ἀμφιρῶγας ἀερτάζοντες ἔβαλλον· 995
 δὴ γὰρ που κἀκεῖνα θεὰ τρέφεν αἰνὰ πέλωρα
 Ἥρη, Ζηνὸς ἄκοιτις, ἀέθλιον Ἡρακλῆι.
 Σὺν δὲ καὶ ὦλλοι δῆθεν, ὑπότροποι ἀντιόωντες
 πρὶν περ ἀνελθέμεναι σκοπιήν, ἥπτοντο φόνοιο
 Γηγενέων ἥρωες ἀρήιοι, ἡμὲν οἴστοις 1000
 ἡδὲ καὶ ἐγχείρησι δεδεγμένοι, εἰσόκε πάντας
 ἀντιβίην ἀσπερχὲς ὀρινομένους ἐδάϊξαν.
 A.R. 1.992-1002

992-5: Heracles appears in this episode (albeit with his naming here in enjambment) subject to the same verb as in the Lemnian episode, Ἡρακλῆος ἀνευθεν· ὁ γὰρ παρὰ νηὶ λείπειτο | αὐτὸς ἐκὼν παῦροί τε διακρινθέντες ἐταῖροι (855-6). In place of ‘chosen comrades’ here ‘the younger men’ accompany him. A second landfall, a second encounter with the inhabitants, and again the expedition’s ‘star name’ is left behind with the ship. Heracles stands out from his companions since they are all ὀπλοτέροι. When it came to choosing a leader, the young men (νέοι, 341) had looked to him. Heracles is a man apart. No motivation is offered as to why he is once more with the ship but just as was Odysseus’ decision to moor his own ship outside the Laestrygonian harbour, Heracles’ positioning proves fortuitous. The crew’s best warrior is on hand for the poem’s very first battle.

993-4: There is no match for Heracles in the Odyssean source-material, yet the heroic paraphernalia and the manner of his retaliation are still described in Homeric terms culled from elsewhere. So e.g. for a semantic parallel there is Teucer’s bow, παλίντονα

τόξα τιταίνων (*Il.* 8.266).³²³ And Teucer again provides the model for an intertextual archer when following the short catalogue of his victims comes the summary πάντας ἐπασσυτέρους πέλασε χθονὶ (*Il.* 8.277) ~ τόξον, ἐπασσυτέρους πέλασε χθονί, v.994.

Heracles, however, is engaged in an activity that the Iliadic hero never is, monster-slaying. Still, the depiction of him here bending back his bow does recall the phantom of him that Odysseus encountered in the Underworld: ὁ δ' ἑρεμνῇ νυκτὶ εἰκώς, | γυμνὸν τόξον ἔχων καὶ ἐπὶ νευρῆφιν οἰστόν, | δεινὸν παπταίνων, αἰεὶ βαλέοντι εἰκώς (*Od.* 11. 606-8). αἶψα (993) is a nice touch - Heracles is not a man of meditation.

In marked contrast the actions of the Earthborn (995) involve the non-Homeric ἀερτάζω and the *hapax* ἀμφιρρώξ for 'jagged.' Heracles' actions can be adapted from the conventional heroic depictions but for uncommon creatures, the narrator provides uncommon vocabulary.

996-7: Once Heracles has set about peppering the hapless Earthborn with arrows, the narrator intrudes with a speculation of his own regarding the ambush (δὴ γάρ που): it was likely a test for Heracles designed by Hera. The phrase αἰνὰ πέλωρα occurs in same *sedes* at *Od.* 10.219 of the lions and wolves bewitched by Circe, in the episode following the Laestrygonian encounter.³²⁴

Yet the echoes that follow the supposition for the *nurturing* of monsters to oppose Heracles are Hesiodic: ἦν θρέψε θεὰ λευκώλενος Ἥρη | ἄπλητον κοτεύουσα βίη Ἡρακλειῆη (*Hes. Th.* 314-5 'the Hydra'), τὸν ῥ' Ἥρη θρέψασα Διὸς κυδρὴ παράκοιτις (*Hes. Th.* 328 'the Nemean Lion'). Naming of the goddess is enjambed and the following epithet echoes the Hesiodic appellation of *Th.* 328 (Ἥρη Διὸς παράκοιτις ~ Ἥρη, Ζηνὸς ἄκοιτις). The motivation is left until last, suspended until

³²³ Cf. παλίντονος commonly used of bows (*Il.* 15.443, 10.459, *Od.* 21.11), also *Hdt.* 7.69 describing the bows used by the Arabians. For τανύω, 'stringing' a bow cf. most famously, Odysseus, ῥηϊδίως δ' ἐτάνυσσε βιόν (*Od.* 24.177).

³²⁴ So too *Cypr.* 32 'the Gorgons'. And as the instruments of Hera, of the snakes sent to kill the infant Heracles, (*Theoc.* 24.13, modelled on *Pi. N.* 1. The lexical choice for wild creature there being κνώδαλον, 51).

line end. It is succinct and finds a parallel in Callimachus, Ἡρῆς ἐννεσίῃσιν, ἀέθλιον Ἡρακλῆϊ (Call. *Dian.* 108 ‘the Cerynean deer’). In both verses, mother and husband’s illegitimate son could not be further apart! In the Hymn, one of the five deer that Artemis hunts escapes her ‘by the designs of Hera, as a labour to Heracles’.

According to the later mythographer Apollodorus (Apollod. *Bibliotheca* 2.5.3), this was Heracles’ third labour. Echoes of Hesiod contain references to the first (Nemean lion) and second (Lernean Hydra). When we first encounter Heracles in the poem, we are told that he hears of the expedition whilst on his return from capturing the Erymanthian boar (A.R. 1.122f.), his fourth labour (according at least to Apollod. *Bibliotheca* 2.5.4).³²⁵ The narrator’s supposition then, has in effect brought the reader up-to-date on Heracles’ current status. In manner it gives the impression of the scholarly narrator who knows his Heracles and Hera mythology and has sources for them other than the Muse. Perhaps he is speculating, given the flexibility of myth for the inclusion of another labour in the slaying of these Earthborn.

However, given Hera’s role in the current quest, the suggestion she is testing a key member of the crew is problematic for some readers. Vian is not happy with the conjecture: ‘n’est pas à sa place dans le récit d’une expédition qu’Héra ne cesse de favoriser.’ Should the reader infer from this supposition that had it not been for Heracles, the Earthborn would not have attacked? The doubling of events and complications that arise within this episode are a result of the physical juxtaposition in the same geographical area of men and monsters and the entwining of one narrative within the other. If the narrator is suggesting that the Argonauts would be better off without him, his cast of characters certainly disagree (see 1.1284f.).

998-1002: The rest of the heroes pull back from their ascent to join the battle. The sudden attack of the Earthborn prevents the Argonauts for achieving their survey. The phrase ἀνελθέμεναι σκοπιήν further reinforces for C. the Laestrygonian connection as it echoes Odysseus’ climb to do his own survey of their land once ships were moored,

³²⁵ On the other hand, the mythographer Hyginus considers the boar the third labour and the deer the fourth: *Aprum Erymanthium occidit. Cervum ferocem in Arcadia cum cornibus aureis vivum in conspectu Eurysthei regis adduxit* (Hyg. *F.* 30.4-5). Despite the neatness of echoes and canonical chronology of labours here, it is not preserved. At A.R. 2.1052f., the Arcadian Argonaut Amphidamas suggests they adopt Heracles’ strategy in dealing with the Stymphalian birds in Arcadia (fifth canonical labour) to deal with the birds on the island of Ares.

σκοπιὴν ἐς παιπαλόεσσιν ἀνελθῶν (*Od.* 10.97).

ἥρωες ἀρήιοι (1000) is a curiosity occurring only here in the poem. It occurs once in Homer in the singular describing that luckless Thessalian Protesilaus, first to land at Troy, ἥρως Πρωτεσίλαος ἀρήϊος (*Il.* 2.708). Perhaps there is a suggestion in the echo that the Argonauts are too keen for the slaughter.³²⁶ Unlike Protesilaus though, and unlike his Argonautic model, Cyzicus, the Argonauts have little to fear here.

Following Heracles' example, the heroes approach battle with these monsters in a like Iliadic fashion, resisting the Earthborn assault with arrows and spears. So e.g. δεδέξομαι ὅξεϊ δουρί (*Il.* 5.238, Pandarus), δεδεγμένος ἔγχει (*Il.* 15.745, Ajax) and τόξοισι δεδεγμένος, (*Il.* 8.296, Teucer). As a first battle for the poem, the conflict itself is decidedly flat. There is no expansion or detail. The Earthborn, however fiercely roused, are poor opposition and simply cut down.

Ὦς δ' ὅτε δούρατα μακρὰ νέον πελέκεσσι τυπέντα
ύλοτόμοι στοιχηδὸν ἐπὶ ῥηγμῖνι βάλῳσιν,
ὄφρα νοτισθέντα κρατεροὺς ἀνεχοῖατο γόμφους· 1005
ὥς οἱ ἐνὶ ξυνοχῇ λιμένος πολιοῖο τέταντο
ἐξείης, ἄλλοι μὲν ἐς ἄλμυρὸν ἀθρόοι ὕδωρ
δύπτοντες κεφαλὰς καὶ στήθεα, γυῖα δ' ὑπερθεν
χέρσῳ τεινάμενοι· τοῖ δ' ἔμπαλιν, αἰγιαλοῖο
κράατα μὲν ψαμάθοισι, πόδας δ' εἰς βένθος ἔρειδον, 1010
ἄμφω ἅμ' οἰωνοῖσι καὶ ἰχθύσι κύρμα γενέσθαι.
A.R. 1.1003-1011

1003-11: The epic battle attracts an epic simile. The relationship between tenor and vehicle is not one of action, not the manner in which these monsters are cut down (as Talos' demise is described at 4.1682f.)³²⁷ but with aftermath, with stillness. Their lifeless bodies are laid out like wood to be treated.

Epic phrases combine with technical elements to create a novel whole. There is a temptation in δούρατα μακρά (1003) which echoes *Od.* 5.162 (Calypso tells Odysseus to make his raft) to tease out a metapoetic wink. The narrator is constructing a simile

³²⁶ At A.R. 1.349, Jason was incongruously 'warlike' when accepting command of the expedition. Is *this* the battle he's been waiting for?

³²⁷ Cf. e.g. Αἰγισθος ὅπως δρῶν ύλοτόμοι | σχίζουσι κάρα φονίῳ πελέκει (*S. El.* 98-99, Electra describing Agamemnon's murder).

out of the Homeric vocabulary used to describe the components of the raft. Two verses later, the narrator displays a technical touch (1005). Moistened wood was considered by Theophrastus better for shipbuilding due to the need for bending, ναυπηγικῇ δὲ διὰ τὴν κάμψιν ἐνικμοτέρῳ ἀναγκαῖον (Thphr. *CP*. 5.7.4).

A point of contact between the dead and the simile is in the arrangement but whereas the timbers so laid out are material for construction, the only purpose the bodies of the Earthborn now serve is for consumption. The Earthborn becoming food for fish (ἄμφω ἅμ' οἰωνοῖσι καὶ ἰχθύσι κύρμα γενέσθαι, 1001) inverts the Laestrygonian model in which the cannibalistic giants spear Odysseus' men *like* fish to take home for their meal (*Od.* 10.124). The Homeric vehicle has become the Argonautic tenor.

There is the obvious allusion to the *Iliad*'s proem and the fate of the fallen at Troy, αὐτοὺς δὲ ἐλώρια τεῦχε κύνεσσιν | οἰωνοῖσί τε πᾶσι (*Il.* 1.4-5), though employing κύρμα rather than the proem's ἐλώρια (they are sometimes found together, e.g. ἔλωρ καὶ κύρμα, *Il.* 5.488).³²⁸ However, the fate referred to in the *Iliad*'s proem never occurs in the poem itself. Perhaps the pre-Iliadic world of *Argonautica* populated by the fantastical and the chthonic is a cruder and more violent world. The Argonauts have done what Achilles only threatened: θρόσκων τις κατὰ κῦμα μέλαιναν φρήχ' ὑπαῖξει | ἰχθύς, ὅς κε φάγησι Λυκάονος ἀργέτα δημόν (*Il.* 21.126-7).³²⁹

There is one prominent simile in the *Odyssey* with dead men compared to fish netted and dying: the Suitors (*Od.* 22.384-9. See 1056n.).

³²⁸ The substitution of fish for dogs, appropriate in the setting, has made their fate possibly more ignoble (if monsters are to be treated as men). Regarding Palamedes fishing in the *Cypria* (*fr.* 21), Griffin (1977: 46) writes: 'Fishing is itself unheroic in Homer, and it was often pointed out in antiquity that his heroes exist exclusively on roast beef, evidently because it was the heroic dish *par excellence*, while fish are eaten by Odysseus' men only when in desperate straits (ἔτειρε δὲ γαστέρα λιμός). Nor can a great hero in Homer meet so inglorious a death as drowning, which both Achilles in the *Iliad*, 21.281, and Odysseus in the *Odyssey*, 5.312, call λευγαλέος θάνατος and contrast bitterly with a proper heroic death in action.'

³²⁹ Cf. ἰχθύσι μὲν καὶ θηροὶ καὶ οἰωνοὶς πετεηνοῖς λίσθμεν ἀλλήλους, ἐπεὶ οὐ δίκη ἐστὶ μετ' αὐτοῖς (Hes. *WD* 277-8) & καὶ τὴν μὲν φώκησι καὶ ἰχθύσι κύρμα γενέσθαι (*Od.* 15.480. Eumaeus recounts the fate of the Sidonian woman).

C6. 'Battle with the Doliones' (1012-52).

i. *Return to Cyzicus*

Ἦρωες δ', ὅτε δὴ σφιν ἀταρβῆς ἔπλετ' ἄεθλος,
δὴ τότε πείσματα νηὸς ἐπὶ πνοιῆς ἀνέμοιο
λυσάμενοι προτέρωσε διἔξ ἄλως οἶδμα νέοντο.
Ἦ δ' ἔθεεν λαίφεσσι πανήμερος· οὐ μὲν ἰούσης 1015
νυκτὸς ἔτι ῥιπὴ μένεν ἔμπεδον, ἀλλὰ θύελλαι
ἀντίαι ἀρπάγδην ὀπίσω φέρον, ὅφρ' ἐπέλασσαν
αὖτις εὐξείνοισι Δολίοσιν. Ἐκ δ' ἄρ' ἔβησαν
αὐτονυχί· Ἰερὴ δὲ φατίζεται ἥδ' ἔτι Πέτρῃ
ἧ πέρι πείσματα νηὸς ἐπεσσύμενοι ἐβάλλοντο. 1020
Οὐδέ τις αὐτὴν νῆσον ἐπιφραδέως ἐνόησεν
ἔμμεναι· οὐδ' ὑπὸ νυκτὶ Δολίονες ἄψ ἀνιόντας
ἥρωας νημερτὲς ἐπήισαν· ἀλλὰ που ἀνδρῶν
Μακρίεων εἴσαντο Πελασγικὸν Ἄρεα κέλσαι·
τῷ καὶ τεύχεα δύντες ἐπὶ σφίσι χεῖρας ἄειραν. 1025
A.R.1.1012-25

1012-14: No reaction is provided for this monster-slaying. Instead the exceptional is followed by the familiar, with the Argonauts going back to sea. ἐπὶ πνοιῆς ἀνέμοιο (1013) is a recurring phrase in their navigation (cf. 1.600, approaching Lemnos & 4.1224-5, leaving Drepane). Though the narrator states there was nothing more to fear, the actions of the Argonauts (what he narrates as opposed to comments upon) suggest the contrary. There is no second attempt at the lookout point but instead they immediately set sail. They are proceeding with the voyage without making any survey of what lies ahead and having gained no information from Cyzicus. The 'imperfection' puzzled Vian (1974: 34): 'alors qu'ils n'ont pu monter au Dindymon pour reconnaître leur route.' Why are they so keen to leave? Is there still a threat? Have they done something wrong? Again no explicit actorial motivation is offered. The narratorial motivation is clear – they need to leave in order to come back again.

1015-8: ἀλλὰ θύελλαι | ἀντίαι ἀρπάγδην ὀπίσω φέρον ~ τοὺς δ' αἶψ' ἀρπάξασα φέρεν πόντονδε θύελλα, (*Od.* 10.48) The winds that blow the Argonauts back to Cyzicus carry in them the winds that blew Odysseus back to island of Aeolus. The

Earthborn (and the Laestrygonian model) have been dispensed with, but in an episode shaped on a model within the model there is no escaping a return to Cyzicus and the Doliones. In the intertext the return was due to the crew opening the bag of winds, the result of their avarice and folly. And when Odysseus revisited Aeolus seeking additional assistance, he was rebuffed and a different and damning explanation of his return proffered by his former host: ἔρρε, ἐπεὶ ἄρα θεοῖσιν ἀπεχθόμενος τόδ' ἰκάνεις (*Od.* 10.75). Aeolus refused to help them, οὐ γάρ μοι θέμις ἐστὶ κομιζέμεν (*Od.* 10.73).

There is no explicit suggestion of any divine agency in our text. Are narrative gaps and echoes encouraging the reader to make the same inference here as Aeolus did? Were the contrary winds part of fate's forecast for Cyzicus? Or just bad luck? Whilst we are speculating on this, the Argonauts are returning at night to a people making inferences of their own. The qualification attached to the Doliones is pointed, ἐυξείνοισι Δολίοσιν (1018). They will not be friendly this time.

A reference to their friendly nature, especially here when they will not be friendly is a reference to (and reversal of) the characterisation of another Odyssean people who have been waiting to be properly introduced into the discussion (See 953-7n.). The Phaeacians are a people proverbially hostile and aloof, e.g. Nausicaa's statement to Odysseus, οὐδέ τις ἄμμι βροτῶν ἐπιμίσγεται ἄλλος (*Od.* 6.205).³³⁰ As it turned out, they were very welcoming to Odysseus. Prophecies occur in the narratives of both people. The ship of the Phaeacians was turned to stone for taking Odysseus home, an act Alcinous said fulfilled a prophecy (*Od.* 13.172f.) They did the right thing but that is not necessarily rewarded in epic. The Phaeacians become isolated as a result of their positive intervention. The Doliones, in their lack of awareness of lands beyond their immediate surroundings (See 980-4n.), appear similarly cut off. Whether they too did the right thing or not, they are not going to be rewarded either.

1019-20: Once again, the narrator has his eye on the clock. The Argonauts return 'that very night.' Αὐτονυχί as C. will spot occurs only once in Homer. Hector boasts that they shall make the Achaeans embark on their ships that very night, αὐτονυχὶ νηῶν ἐπιβησέμεν ὠκείων, *Il.* 8.197. Here, the Argonauts do the opposite and disembark.

³³⁰ Cf. Athena to Odysseus, *Od.* 7.32-3. See Rose 1969.

And in doing so, create another *sēma*. Just as their initial arrival prompted the narrator's account of the anchor-stone in the temple of Jasonian Athena (See 958-60n.), the unforeseen return leads to a second mooring and a second *sēma*. The mooring point exists and is still called the Sacred Rock.

1021-5: These five verses seal Cyzicus's fate and it is due to problems of perception.

Without certain knowledge, inferences are made and when those inferences are incorrect, godlike expeditions of heroes kill you. Οὐδέ τις αὐτὴν νῆσον ἐπιφραδέως ἐνόησεν - not one of the Argonauts correctly/shrewdly understood where they were.³³¹

Focalisation switches immediately to the Doliones squinting for truth (νημερτές) in the night, ὑπὸ νυκτί. Obscured by darkness/provoked by panic, a mistaken attack leads to mistaken bloodshed. Obscured by darkness, the Argonauts lacked information and made a mistake. The reader should see a parallel for the difficulties (and dangers) in assessing the episode with confidence when motivations remain obscured.

With ἀλλά που (1023), the narrator offers another supposition as to who the Doliones believed they were fighting and does so using character-speech. So in Homer all but once (*Od.* 4.639), e.g. *Il.* 5.193 (Pandarus), 13.225 (Idomeneus), 15.43 (Hera disingenuously), *Od.* 2.164 (Halitherses), 4.639 (the Suitors supposed Telemachus still in Ithaca), 8.293 (Ares to Aphrodite).³³²

The first half of verse 1025 is a close verbal echo of the situation the Argonauts faced upon arrival at Lemnos (635). The second half (underlined) displays the divergence. τῷ καὶ τεύχεα δύντες ἐπὶ σφίσι χεῖρας ἄειραν ~ δῆϊα τεύχεα δῦσαι ἐς αἰγιαλὸν προχέοντο (635). The Dolionian arming mirrors the Lemnian arming, which was followed vv.636-7 by a similar supposition to that which precedes the Dolionian preparations, φὰν γάρ που ἰκάνειν | Θρήικας.

³³¹ ἐπιφραδέως 'correctly.' The adverb has only one previous occurrence, *Parm. fr.* 1.39 and later not before Sextus Empiricus (*S.E. M.* 7.111.22). Apollonius, however, is fond of it, and it recurs 1.1336, 2.1134 (both Jason), 3.83 (Hera). These incidences are all in context of choosing words carefully in reply.

³³² Elsewhere the phrase occurs in tragedy (Euripides, Sophocles), comedy (Aristophanes, Menander) and prose (Plato, Demosthenes).

Difficulties of perception cloud both scenarios. The Lemnian women were armed for battle but terrified at the prospect (638-9). Aethalides' diplomacy averted any immediate prospect of battle which subsequently never materialised. On Cyzicus, in the dark, the clueless Lemnian women's rush to the shore (Ἀμηχανίη δ' ἔσχοντο, 638) has become in the second half of v.1025 a decisive clash of arms.³³³ The Doliones prove as unhesitant about joining battle as they were about giving aid. The result for them will be catastrophic, as Goldhill (1991: 317) summarises succinctly: 'a battle with those linked by *xeinosune*, a battle that destroys a king and queen, poised on the threshold of maturity, and that thus wipes out their dynasty, their *oikos*, to the grief of all concerned.'

Unlike their positive effect on Lemnos (that they were manipulated into making), the introduction of the Argonauts onto Cyzicus proves to be something of an ecological disaster for the indigenous populations. The Earthborn corpses are still fresh on the shore from the morning's killing as the Argonauts set about another retaliatory slaughter.

ii. *A Little Iliad*

Σὺν δ' ἔλασαν μελίας τε καὶ ἀσπίδας ἀλλήλοισιν,
 ὀξεῖη ἵκελοι ριπῇ πυρός, ἥ τ' ἐνὶ θάμνοισι
 αὐαλέοισι, πεσοῦσα κορύσσεται. Ἐν δὲ κυδοιμὸς
 δεινός τε ζαμενής τε Δολιονίῳ πέσε δῆμῳ·
 οὐδ' ὅ γε δηιοτῆτος ὑπὲρ μόρον αὐτὶς ἔμελλεν 1030
 οἴκαδε νυμφιδίους θαλάμους καὶ λέκτρον ἰκέσθαι·
 ἀλλὰ μιν Αἰσονίδης τετραμμένον ἰθὺς ἐοῖο
 πλῆξεν ἐπαΐξας στήθος μέσον, ἀμφὶ δὲ δουρὶ
 ὅστέον ἐρραίοσθη· ὁ δ' ἐνὶ ψαμάθοισιν ἔλυσθεῖς 1035
 μοῖραν ἀνέπλησεν. Τὴν γὰρ θέμις οὐ ποτ' ἀλύξαι
 θνητοῖσιν· πάντῃ δὲ περὶ μέγα πέπταται ἔρκος·
 ὥς τὸν οἰόμενόν που ἀδευκέος ἔκτοθεν ἄτης
 εἶναι ἀριστήων αὐτῇ ὑπὸ νυκτὶ πέδησε
 μαρνάμενον κείνοισι.
 A.R. 1.1026-39

1026-9: As with Lemnos, so on Cyzicus – the prospect of battle is inevitably layered

³³³ Though this decisiveness will result in something ἀμήχανος itself v.1053.

with Iliadic references. On Lemnos the hints never manifested in the narrative as actual conflict. On Cyzicus, after over nine hundred verses without a fight, two come along at once. This is a strictly human affair and the echoes of war multiply. The coming together (1026) recalls the clash of Achaeans and Trojans following the breaking of the truce and the *Iliad*'s first *androktasia* (*Il.* 4.446ff.). The simile (1027-8) is a variation of ὥς δ' ὅτε πῦρ... , *Il.* 11.155f. (Agamemnon). Ἐν δὲ κυδοιμός (1028) ~ ἐν δὲ κυδοιμόν, (*Il.* 11.52, 538, 'evil din of war'). This phrase also occurs in the description of the ambush on the Shield of Achilles, *Il.* 18.535, on which the image of the Teleboae battling the sons of Electryon on Jason's cloak was modelled (see 747-51n.).

1030-1: The Iliadic stage now set, the narrator zooms in on the individuals, first and inevitably to the one man who does not know that this is the confrontation he has been trying to avoid. As with Iphidamas (*Il.* 11.241f.), reference is made to his newly-wed status at the moment of his death, though here it occurs just prior to the blow. But just like the young Thracian in Agamemnon's *androktasia*, Cyzicus is here the first to die. He cannot transcend Fate. ὑπὲρ μόρον (1030) later occurs A.R. 4.20, when Hera intervenes lest Medea die before her Fate. It appears an exact point one can neither fall short of or exceed. This was his moment to die. And at the hands of heroes.

There will be no *nostos* for Cyzicus to his bride and bed.³³⁴ No, he will not return home again but had it not been dark he could probably still have seen it. Iphidamas left his new bride and went to fight at Troy. Now 'Troy' has come to Cyzicus. For C., there is a danger here of being overwhelmed by the intertextual noise of the battle scenes and Homeric figures. Cyzicus can bear the weight of an Iphidamas who is no more than an incidental character, a moving vignette in the battle scenes of Troy. But when we read the intertexts being suggested after his death when the narrator and Argonauts attempt to rectify a mistake by elevating the status of the fallen, Cyzicus struggles to bear the burden of Hector's armour (see C7i below).

1032-4: This is the first mention by name of Jason in action in the episode, albeit by his patronymic. It is a belated entrance by our hero as he records his first kill of the

³³⁴ Cf. as a semantic parallel e.g. εὖ δ' οἴκαδ' ἰκέσθαι, *Il.* 1.19.

narrative: his host. So Cyzicus dies in battle but not in a Homeric duel. He dies caught on the turn in general melee, struck by a spear to the chest. So did Aeneas spear Aphareus in the throat as he turned (*Il.* 13.541-2) in a particularly frenetic passage of Iliadic combat (13.496f.) that whilst much fuller than what occurs here also lacked exposition on the backgrounds of the dead.

1034-9: He rolled in the sand and fulfilled his destiny.³³⁵ Τὴν γὰρ θέμις οὐ ποτ' ἄλύξαι | θνητοῖσιν. The narrator again steps in to make a judgement. The narratorial pronouncement here calls to mind (or recalls, see 614-5n.) the words of Achilles to his mother Thetis at *Iliad* 18.115-19 on the inevitability of his own death.

κῆρα δ' ἐγὼ τότε δέξομαι ὅππότε κεν δὴ
 Ζεὺς ἐθέλῃ τελέσαι ἡδ' ἀθάνατοι θεοὶ ἄλλοι.
 οὐδὲ γὰρ οὐδὲ βίῃ Ἡρακλῆος φύγε κῆρα,
 ὅς περ φίλτατος ἔσκε Διὶ Κρονίωνι ἄνακτι·
 ἀλλὰ ἐ μοῖρα δάμασσε καὶ ἀργαλέος χόλος Ἥρης.

‘and I shall take my own death at whatever time Zeus and the other immortal gods wish to bring it to me. Even the mighty Heracles could not escape death, and he was the dearest of men to lord Zeus, son of Kronos: but fate conquered him, and the cruel enmity of Hera.’ (trans. Hammond)

Yet the word the Apollonian narrator uses is that Homeric speech-word *themis*. It is not *themis* for a man to escape death. Can we infer from this that Cyzicus had done something contrary to what was right? Viewing Cyzicus in the most negative light, this was a fitting end then for a mini-Pelias who sought to ensure his own safety by luring the heroes into the vicinity of his aggressive neighbours.³³⁶ It is a dark reading made possible by the text, by the gaps in the text, by what is not said or partially said. The plan does not work. The heroes return and he dies regardless. The heroes return due to the adverse winds.

Now Clauss reads the propitiation of Rhea on Dindymum, which follows this

³³⁵ Cf. αἵ κε θάνῃς καὶ πότμον ἀναπλήσῃς βιότοιο, *Il.* 4.170 (Agamemnon to Menelaus) where πότμον is the reading of Aristarchus and μοῖραν the reading of MSS.

³³⁶ See the discussion of τοῖν γὰρ Πελῆϊς φάτιν ἔκλυεν, ὥς μιν ὀπίσσω | μοῖρα μένει στυγερή (1.5-6). in Introduction 3.2 *Narratology*.

episode as motivated by a need to atone for the slaying of the Earthborn.³³⁷ Accepting that reading in tandem and inferring a divine source behind the winds, then the Pelian Cyzicus has set in motion his own demise by ensuring the Argonauts come back again, just as Pelias instigates the fulfilment of his fate by instigating a voyage which will bring back Medea as Hera's instrument of vengeance. Is the Cyzicus episode functioning as a *mise-en-abyme* for a narrative that extends beyond the bounds of this story? It is all rather too neat but a reading that remains open until evidence in the narrative can close it.

A final point here on the prophecy itself. Oracles are usually ambiguous or partial (more so when reported indirectly!). Phineus is punished for revealing too much (A.R. 2.311-16). What is missing from the reported oracle to go to meet the expedition straightaway in amicable manner and have no design on battle is the timing - should that godlike expedition arrive a second time, arrive again, arrive at any time. Cyzicus thought he was safe but he did not take the time into account (unlike the narrator who has been diligently ticking off the days).

iii. *The Dolionian Roll-Call*

Πολεῖς δ' ἐπαρηγόνες ἄλλοι	
ἔκταθεν· Ἡρακλῆς μὲν ἐνήρατο Τηλεκλῆα	1040
ἡδὲ Μεγαβρόντην· Σφόδριν δ' ἐνάριξεν Ἀκαστος·	
Πηλεὺς δὲ Ζέλυν εἶλεν ἀρηίθοόν τε Γέφυρον·	
αὐτὰρ ἐυμελὴς Τελαμῶν Βασιλῆα κατέκτα·	
Ἴδας δ' αὖ Προμέα, Κλυτίος δ' Ὑάκινθον ἔπεφνε,	
Τυνδαρίδαι δ' ἄμφω Μεγαλοσσάκεα Φλογίον τε·	1045
Οἰνεΐδης δ' ἐπὶ τοῖσιν ἔλε θρασὺν Ἴτυμονῆα	
ἡδὲ καὶ Ἀρτακέα, πρόμον ἀνδρῶν· οὓς ἔτι πάντας	
ἐνναέται τιμαῖς ἡρώσι κυδαίνουσιν.	
A.R. 1.1039-48	

1039-47: In the *Iliad*, a warrior's death is frequently the opportunity for supplying background. X killed Y who was the son of/whose father was/who lived/who was considered and so on. There is none of that in this abbreviated list of slayers and slain.

³³⁷ Clauss 1993: 166-7.

Intertexts might lend a heroic gloss to the overall combat but the Dolionian dead remain names on a list.

Happening in the night, there is no occasion for the standard protocol of Iliadic heroes meeting in single combat - exchange of names and lineage - things fundamental to the winning of *kleos*. The great warrior gains *kleos* by killing his opponents, stripping their arms as trophies, the visible signs of his accomplishments. The dead man's reputation will also endure, absorbed into the story of his conqueror. This is why Heracles demanded they leave Lemnos (L9). This is what Hector once said when challenging the Achaeans to send a champion to face him.³³⁸

καί ποτέ τις εἴπησι καὶ ὀπιγόνων ἀνθρώπων
νηὶ πολυκλήϊδι πλέων ἐπὶ οἴνοπα πόντον·
ἀνδρὸς μὲν τόδε σῆμα πάλαι κατατεθνηῶτος,
ὃν ποτ' ἀριστεύοντα κατέκτανε φαίδιμος Ἴκτωρ. 90
ὥς ποτέ τις ἐρέει· τὸ δ' ἐμὸν κλέος οὔ ποτ' ὀλεῖται.
Il. 7.87-91

This cannot happen here.³³⁹ In the night there are no names and no faces. This lack of perception does prompt questions. How do the individual heroes know which Doliones they killed? How does the narrator? The obvious source for such information for the latter is the one he persists on doing without: A Muse.

Accepting the argument that this conflict between heroes and Doliones is Apollonius' innovation, are these names then part of the fiction? Σ ad 1.1040-1 would say so, citing the opinion of Lucillus of Tarrhae that Telecles and Megabrontes are not historically attested. Σ ad 1.1039, however, cites Dei[l]ochus as the source. In the face of the impossibilities of verification, Goldhill asks: 'Are these names in the battle-list signs of language's power to invent, to fictionalize? The *Argonautica*'s constant deployment of details of fiction, details of uncovered history, details of fantasy

³³⁸ There is a lexical echo in the Dolionian roll-call and the narrative preceding Hector's speech. 'Artaces, leader of men' sounds bizarre in the context, and the reader's puzzlement could be a clue to a subtle connection. Hector asks to face ἐκ πάντων πρόμος, Il. 7.75.

³³⁹ Alternatively, this is what happens here in its own muddled way. Jason kills Cyzicus - the burial mound is built (ἐνθ' ἔτι νῦν περ | ἀγέχεται τόδε σῆμα καὶ ὀπιγόνοισιν ἰδέσθαι, 1061-2) - a hero-cult established. Pushing the parallel, it was Hector who was killed by a better man and whose funeral closed the *Iliad* just as Cyzicus' funeral closes this episode.

implicates the reader - collusively - in the search to order, to explain, to determine the stratifications and accretions within the *muthoi* of the epic.³⁴⁰

Now Clauss, for example (following Hasluck 1910: 240 n.2), would have ten being from Dei[l]ochus and the two specifically cited Σ ad 1040-1 (Telecles and Megabrontes) as inventions, the total twelve being significant to an equation. The number of the Dolionian dead = the number of days detained by storm on the island.³⁴¹ Whilst his reading of the return as enforced due to need for propitiation is plausible, I am sceptical of a further Dolionian motivation for Rhea's anger.³⁴² It hinges upon whether the adverse weather which arises to prevent them from leaving after the funeral, τρηχεῖαι ἀνηέρθησαν ἄελλαι (1.1078), is considered an extension or addition to that which sent them back in the first place, θύελλαι | ἀντίαι (1016-17). And whether and where we have seen in (or read into) the young Cyzicus a young vegetation god 'who, like Atys and Adonis, favourites of the earth-goddess, dies in his prime.'³⁴³

It seems to my mind somewhat perverse that the return, if engineered, should then suffer additional penalty for what inadvertently follows. Such a reading suggests divine bungling more than anything (not being allowed to leave for killing the Earthborn, being blown back and killing the Doliones and in doing so making Rhea doubly furious). The second battle has in any case a resolution in the funeral (See 1057-62n.). The gods were angry with Achilles too until he gave Hector's body back (and Achilles was loved by Zeus). If searching for a numbers parallel, we could just as well, considering the Hector allusions in the Cyzicus funeral scene, count the twelve days requested by Priam for cessation of hostilities in order for him to complete Hector's funeral rites (*Il.* 24.663-7).

Amongst the Doliones, only Cyzicus can be considered a character. Even his wife Cleite exists at this point only as a pathetic extension of his backstory. But when the king falls, he needs a retinue to die alongside him and the names tumble out to be inscribed beneath his.

1047-8: Cf. πάντας κυδαίνων, *Il.* 10.69. The allusion is to Agamemnon's instructions

³⁴⁰ Goldhill 1991: 329. For his discussion on the scholarly debate over these names *ibid.*: 317-9, 328-9.

³⁴¹ Clauss 1993: 166 n.38.

³⁴² Clauss 1993: 166-7.

³⁴³ Clauss 1993: 165 n.35 following Vian 1951.

to Menelaus to call each man by name and give due honour. Though impatiently proleptic, the battle narrative is shifting to a narrative of heroization. But what kind? Goldhill (1991: 318) comments: ‘The barely listed victims of the heroes of this epic turn out to be heroes for the Doliones. Hero cult is unknown in Homer... The shift from Homeric parody to aetiological tale of the hero cults of this area of the Propontis is, then, not merely a scholarly addition to the narrative but sets in tension two sets of heroes, two sorts of heroization.’ The narrative is working against its Iliadic intertexts, against C.’s reading.

Οἱ δ' ἄλλοι εἷξαντες ὑπέτρεσαν, ἥ τε κίρκους
 ὠκυπέτας ἀγέληδὸν ὑποτρέσσωσι πέλειαι. 1050
 Ἐς δὲ πύλας ὁμάδῳ πέσον ἄθροοι· αἶψα δ' αὐτῆς
 πλῆτο πόλις στονόεντος ὑποτροπὴν πολέμοιο.
 A.R. 1.1049-52

1049-52: Lemnos too was filled with excited cries, ἐν δ' ἀγορῇ πλῆτο θρόου (697). Warming thoughts of sex and salvation provoked the outburst in the *agora*. The city of Cyzicus echoes back the groans of war. Another condensed version of the simile of doves and hawks will recur when the Argonauts set about slaughtering Apsyrtus' Colchian crew (4.485-6) but for C. the tenor and vehicle have an intertextual model, a specific dove and a specific hawk which bring to the rout the fanfare of the *Iliad*'s climactic encounter and Hector fleeing from Achilles, ‘ἥ τε κίρκος...’, *Il.* 22.139-42.

Andromache had led the women of Hector's house in lamenting while he still lived: οὐ γάρ μιν ἔτ' ἔφαντο ὑπότροπον ἐκ πολέμοιο | ἵξεσθαι, (*Il.* 6.501-2). The actions of Doliones and doves here are ὑπέτρεσαν (1049) and ὑποτρέσσωσι (1050), just as Hector, following the simile, runs (τρέσε δ' Ἑκτωρ, *Il.* 22.143). The Doliones flee as doves flee, as Hector fled.

C7. ‘Cyzicus and Cleite’ (1053-77).

The episode culminates in a series of three markers. The first is the burial mound of the dead king (1. Cyzicus). His death provokes the wife's suicide and her death prompts an

appearance by the Nymphs whose tears metamorphose into a fountain, the queen's marker (2. Cleite). The double tragedy causes the mourning Doliones to survive solely on uncooked grains - a product of grief which evolves into a tradition (3. People). The whole conclusion is a curious blend of the pathetic, the fantastical, and the scholarly.

i. *A King Dies*

Cyzicus is given a hero's funeral as the Argonauts attempt to rectify their error. Following his death, comes a switch of character-models. Cyzicus died a 'Protesilaus' or an 'Iphidamas,' a minor character with his touching tale, but dead the king undergoes an intertextual elevation and becomes a 'Patroclus' or better, a 'Hector'.³⁴⁴

On Lemnos, Hypsipyle's speech effectively rewrote Lemnian history, her version of events becoming the accepted version (as far as the Argonauts were concerned) which would ensure Lemnian survival. Here we witness the Argonauts engage in a revision of their own. The slaughter cannot be undone, nor the manner in which it occurred, but glorify the victims and the legacy changes. What is left behind when the Argonauts move on, what remains visible to future generations, is the burial mound of a hero. However, as with the various allusions evoked during the battle, they might equally well draw attention to the differences - that this is a minor skirmish affecting this particular island with no wider ramifications that does not stand up well against the grander backdrop erected by its intertexts.

ἦῶθεν δ' ὅλοῃν καὶ ἀμήχανον εἰσενόησαν ἀμπλακίην ἄμφω· στυγερὸν δ' ἄχος εἶλεν ἰδόντας ἦρωας Μινύας Αἰνίηιον υἷα πάροιθεν Κύζικον ἐν κονίῃσι καὶ αἵματι πεπτηῶτα. ῥήματα δὲ τρία πάντα γόων τίλλοντό τε χαίτας αὐτοὶ ὁμῶς λαοὶ τε Δολῖονες. Αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα τρὶς περὶ χαλκείοισι σὺν ἔντεσι δινηθέντες τύμβῳ ἐνεκτερείξαν, ἐπειρήσαντό τ' ἀέθλων, ἦ θέμις, ἄμ πεδῖον Λειμώνιον· ἔνθ' ἔτι νῦν περ	1055 1060
--	--------------------------------------

³⁴⁴ Mori (2008: 201) suggests a parallel with the story of Trambelus whose identity Achilles discovers after killing him in a raid and subsequently erects a tomb in his honour. This episode is not Homeric but from the Cycle. Mori *ibid.* n.35 cites its recording by Istrus, a pupil of Callimachus (*FrGrH* 334 F 57).

1053-6: ἡῶθεν is more than a marker of time. In the night all was inference (Οὐδέ τις... ἐπιφραδέως ἐνόησεν, 1021), and misreading the situation led to misguided violence. ἡῶθεν illuminates the text. Dawn brings first recognition and then a revision. The deadly and hopeless mistake is the focalisation of both parties (ἄμφω εἰσενόησαν). Looking (ἰδόντας) at that mistake, at Cyzicus, someone's son (the patronymic is not idle), lying in the dust and the blood the response of the heroes is hateful grief. How pointed! ἄχος was the grief that the Argonauts felt on hearing Idmon prophesy his fate (449). It is here evaluated by the adjective στυγερός, the same qualification Idmon had used there in relating the prophecy of his death (443). It is the same qualification used by the narrator of Pelias' fate (6, there likely the king's own embedded focalisation). Pain and hate and fate swirl in the eyes of the onlookers.³⁴⁵

1056: Any reminder of Idmon's speech invokes a shared pathos, but any reading back from that prophetic context to Pelias and the more subversive interpretations put forward creates a problem. A. steered by the narrated reactions feels for the dead king. C. might want to (given the emotional evaluation of the narration) but has another intertext to negotiate. When Odysseus had slain the suitors, he surveyed the house for survivors hoping to avoid their fate ἀλύσκων κῆρα μέλαιναν (22.382), but found all were dead: τοὺς δὲ ἶδεν μάλα πάντας ἐν αἵματι καὶ κονίῃσι (22.383).

The suitors violated guest-host relations and suffered accordingly. The Doliones and Argonauts are ostensibly linked by *xenia* (see 1021-5n.). Why should Cyzicus lie there like the Ithacan dead? The simile that followed immediately after Odysseus' discovery likened their bodies to fish caught and heaped on the shore – an echo of the fate of the Earthborn. Cyzicus and his dead countrymen lie in the dust and the blood like the suitors who lie like fish heaped on the shore like the Earthborn.

The experienced reader has to decide whether the network is accidental or

³⁴⁵ It was also used by Polyxo of old age (684). The old woman's evaluation of her own decrepitude is now the heroes' evaluation of a life cut accidentally short.

whether the Doliones have done something transgressive. Odysseus mocked the blinded Polyphemus for his violation of *xenia*: σχέτλι', ἐπεὶ ξείνους οὐχ ἄζεο σῶ ἐνὶ οἴκῳ | ἐσθήμεναι· τῶ σε Ζεὺς τίσατο καὶ θεοὶ ἄλλοι (*Od.* 9.478-9). Or perhaps Fate is simply unavoidable and like Adrastus in the Herodotean intertext the Argonauts are the unwitting instruments. Did Zeus Xeinius guide the fatal spear or was it solely the work of Jason Amēchanos?³⁴⁶

1057-62: The Argonauts thus fulfil the duties of *xenoi* and Cyzicus' funeral establishes a model for those to come in the narrative. When Idmon dies, he will likewise have three-day funeral rites and due honours (2.837f), as is θέμις (2.840, though the *sēma* there is later mistaken for an Agamestor's, and his own *kleos* unrecognised, 2.850!). On its employment here, Goldhill comments, 'As if there were a model for the proper or usual behaviour.'³⁴⁷

It is a problematic funeral but links it in to an ongoing concern with burial rites/rights. Polyxo employed the term specifically of her own burial (v.692), Hypsipyle of Lemnian men acting contrary to what is θέμις (v.822, for which they were killed and we never found out what happened to the bodies) and it occurs in the narrator's intrusion following the death of Cyzicus that mortals cannot escape destiny (See 1034-9n.). Whether he actively tried to avoid the moment or not, it was not θέμις, but he can still have a funeral that is.

For three days they mourned and three times they circled him. They entombed him with honours and held games.³⁴⁸ The narrative has sound Homeric precedent. Three times around the body of Patroclus circled the Achaeans (*Il.* 23.13), Achilles instructed them to build a suitable tomb (23.245) and after the Achaeans constructed the mound (23.256-7), the funeral games were held (23.257f.). Posterity will remember this man - Cyzicus, the hero son of Aeneus and remember him as a hero should be remembered, as

³⁴⁶ On ἀμήχανος as epithet of Jason, see 638-9n. The manner of the kill, the identity of the victim and the evaluation in daylight of it as a mistake that was ἀμήχανος do make it tempting to poke fun at the hero. However, he does make amends. Just as the Lemnian women shook off their ἀμηχανία, got together and came up with a plan, here the heroes bury the king and try to make things θέμις.

³⁴⁷ Goldhill 1991: 318-9.

³⁴⁸ For the weeping and tearing of hair, cf. e.g. the reaction of Odysseus' crew to hearing they have to consult Tiresias in Hades: ἐζόμενοι δὲ κατ' αὐθι γόων τίλλοντό τε χαίτας (*Od.* 10.567).

Hector promised his victim would be remembered (See 1039-47n.).

Yet Goldhill (1991: 319) rightly calls attention to how posterity might read this *sēma*: ‘the barrow of the hero Cyzicus, killed at night by mistake, by a guest-friend, before he had produced children’. One story is left to posterity but posterity can read others into a *sēma* (See 966-8n.).

Do we look and see a Patroclus, a Hector? C. might see an Elpenor. Cyzicus’s death was an accident. The ghost of Elpenor requested Odysseus heap a mound by the sea that men to come know of him: *σῆμά τέ μοι χεῦναι πολιῆς ἐπὶ θινὶ θαλάσσης, | ἄνδρὸς δυστήνοιο, καὶ ἐσσομένοισι πυθέσθαι* (*Od.* 11. 75-6). He was the youngest of the crew who woke drunk, fell off a roof and broke his neck (*Od.* 10.552-60). Cyzicus’ memorial can likewise be read as a death by misadventure. Within the *Argonautica*, there is another accidental death and the last death in the poem (4.1535). Mopsus dies from a snakebite and three times round his body the grieving Argonauts go.

Hero-cult is a post-Homeric practice that is seeping into the story-world of the generation of heroes who fathered those of Homeric epic and brings with it a narrative tension (as noted above by Goldhill). A narrative of mistaken death is not necessarily problematic to the hero-cult it creates, if that is the narrative.

I have suggested varying actorial motivations for the dealings of Cyzicus with the Argonauts. Interpretation of why he acts as he does affects the readings of the death which in turn affects the readings of the funeral. Burying him with due honours does not make those problems go away and it’s rather apt that in attempting to do so the verb calls attention to itself - *ἐνεκτερείξαν* is a *hapax*.

ii. *A Queen Dies*

We met Cyzicus on the morning when his life was brightest in potential, a young man with his new bride. In the models, the bride existed to make poignant the young warrior’s death. In Phylace, Protesilaus’ unnamed wife tore her cheeks in lamentation (*Il.* 2.700-1). The Homeric narrator omits any mention of Laodamia or the curious turn

her tale takes after Protesilaus' death.³⁴⁹ Cleite has been named and given a family (for A. only Merops, for C. two doomed Iliadic brothers). Cyzicus led her from her father, brought her to his home. Now his narrative is over but Cleite is still *here*, in their room where he left her. The narrative of her life was an extension of his, the narrative of her death an extension of his.

Οὐδὲ μὲν οὐδ' ἄλοχος Κλείτη φθιμένοιο³⁵⁰ λέλειπτο
οὐ πόσιος μετόπισθε· κακῶ δ' ἐπὶ κύντερον ἄλλο
ἦνυσεν, ἀψαμένη βρόχον αὐχένι. Τὴν δὲ καὶ αὐταὶ 1065
Νύμφαι ἀποφθιμένην ἄλσῆιδες ὠδύραντο·
καὶ οἱ ἀπὸ βλεφάρων ὅσα δάκρυα χεῦαν ἔραζε,
πάντα τάγε κρήνην τεῦξαν θεαί, ἦν καλέουσι
Κλείτην, δυστήνοιο περικλεῆς οὔνομα νύμφης.
A.R. 1.1063-69

1063-66: As I noted above, Troy had come to Cyzicus, and in Troy was the wife. The narrative of Cleite's suicide is brief and breathless, verse spilling into verse (1063-5). For C., however, especially caught up in the evocation of Troy, an already emotional presentation is laden with Iliadic pathos. When Hector fell, Andromache was the last to hear the news: ἀλλ' ἢ γ' ἴστων ὕφαινε μυχῶ δόμου ὑψηλοῖο | δίπλακα πορφυρέην, *Il.* 22.440-1). The wife was in her room doing as he had instructed (*Il.* 6.490-2) after she had begged him to stay and not make her a widow (*Il.* 6.429-32). The ἄλοχος (22.437) knew nothing yet for no messenger had brought news of her πόσις (22.439). The cries brought her to the walls and when she saw, she knew.

³⁴⁹ After his death, Laodamia transfers her love to his likeness, a bronze statue. Her father Acastus throws it into a fire. She jumps in after it and burns to death. For this elaboration, we are again reliant on later mythographers, see Hyg. *F.* 104. On her love for Protesilaus, see Ov. *Her.* 13, a moving account which reminds Isbell (1990: 116-7), in its preoccupation with husband and wife, love and war, of Homer's Hector and Andromache.

³⁵⁰ This form is often found in compounds in Homer: ἀποφθιμένοιο (*Il.* 18.89 Achilles of his death, 19.322, 19.337 Achilles of his father's death and his own death), καταφθιμένοιο (*Il.* 22.288 Hector of Achilles' death, *Od.* 3.196 Nestor of Agamemnon's death). φθιμένοιο only occurs at *Od.* 11.558 (Odysseus tells the ghost of Aias they still mourn his death). All of these are examples of character-speech. The compound καταφθιμένοιο is used at A.R. 1.718 of Thoas, and is there the narrator's supposition for why Argonaut's thought Hypsipyle ruled. In the context of *sēma* it occurs in Simonides: σῆμα καταφθιμένοιο Μεγακλῆος εὐτ' ἂν ἴδωμαι (fr. 16.1 W.).

τὴν δὲ κατ' ὀφθαλμῶν ἐρεβεννὴ νύξ ἐκάλυπεν,
 ἥριπε δ' ἐξοπίσω, ἀπὸ δὲ ψυχὴν ἐκάπυσσε.
 τῆλε δ' ἀπὸ κρατὸς βάλε δέσματα σιγαλόεντα,
 ἄμπυκα κεκρύφαλόν τε ἰδὲ πλεκτὴν ἀναδέσμη
 κρήδεμνόν θ', ὃ ρά οἱ δῶκε χρυσῇ Ἀφροδίτῃ *470
 ἥματι τῷ ὅτε μιν κορυθαίολος ἠγάγεθ' Ἑκτώρ
 ἐκ δόμου Ἡετίωνος, ἐπεὶ πόρε μυρία ἔδνα.
Il. 22.466-72

Night covers her eyes and she breathes out her soul. She flings away her glittering bindings and her bridal veil. The last object triggers an analepsis as we are taken back to her wedding day, to Hector leading her from her father's house and the countless bride-price he paid for her. Andromache does not die, she faints but the language is suggestive of death and her life effectively ended with his. In her following speech she recalls her childhood; always it is 'You' and 'I' and their narrative is one, σύ τ' ἐγώ τε δυσάμμοροι (22.485). The wife becomes the widow and remembers when she was a bride, when she was a Cleite.

Under Andromache's influence, the bride of Cyzicus bypasses married life (and motherhood) and becomes the widow of a Hector. Ἄλοχος is not simply a mark of the relationship between these women and their husbands but of the relationship between these two women. The anonymous wife of Protesilaus was ἄλοχος (τοῦ δὲ καὶ ἀμφιδρυφῆς ἄλοχος Φυλάκη ἐλέλειπτο, *Il. 2.700*) and so too in lamentation Aegialeia, wife of Diomedes (*Il. 5.415*). Paris refers to Helen as ἄλοχος (*Il. 6.337*) and so too is Hera ἄλοχος of Zeus (21.512). But the one woman in the *Iliad* who is repeatedly ἄλοχος and frequently ἄλοχος φίλη is Andromache (by Hector, *Il. 6.366* and by poet - when Hector returns to Troy, when he dies, when his body is returned, 6.394, 482, 495, 22.437, 24.710).

Andromache's physical reaction to the husband's death simulated her own death. She speaks as though her narrative had ended with his but it goes on. In contrast, Cleite's sole positive action, the one time she is active and in control, is a negative one, Οὐδὲ μὲν οὐδ'. Unable to separate her life from her husband's (and perhaps unable to bear the intertextual pressure) she puts a noose around her own neck. She will not be left behind.

The narrator expresses his shock with character-language, κακῶ δ' ἐπὶ

κύντερον ἄλλο | ἤνυσεν. The husband's death is κακός and to evil she adds something 'more dog-like.'³⁵¹ κύντερον too is character language, though not in this context. It was used by Zeus of Hera (ἐπεὶ οὐ σέο κύντερον ἄλλο, *Il.* 8.483) and by Agamemnon's ghost of Clytemnestra (*Od.* 11.427). Perhaps closest in usage is by Odysseus when speaking of the troubles his heart has endured *Od.* 20.18, though he also uses it of his hateful (στυγερός) belly (*Od.* 7.216).

κύντερον is not employed in the context of suicide and it is difficult to find such a context in epic. There is only one reference to a woman's suicide in Homer: Epicaste whom Odysseus sees in the Underworld (*Od.* 11.271f.) and whose hanging herself he evaluates as a μέγα ἔργον (*Od.* 11.272). Epicaste tied a noose around her neck just as Cleite does (ἀψαμένη βρόχον ~ ἀψαμένη βρόχον αἰπὺν, *Od.* 11.278). And as did Phaedra, βρόχον κρεμαστὸν ἀγχόνης ἀνήψατο, (*E. Hipp.* 802). Yet those are instances of a transgressive love, not of a broken-hearted bride. There is one closer parallel that can be pulled from myth but first, I'd like to consider how Cleite's action transforms her into a model herself.

On Lemnos, the reaction of the women to Jason was compared to the desire of brides shut up in their rooms yearning for their promised husbands still far away (See 774-81n.). It is a simile which foreshadows and is recalled by the simile attached to Medea's turmoil (3.656-66) when desperate to tell her sister her feelings for Jason but held back by shame (3.645f.). That second simile is dark, the girl in it advanced from bride to recently married and, as the simile progresses, recently and unknowingly widowed. In between these two similes, the Lemnian one optimistic and the Colchian one pessimistic, hangs Cleite. Only days ago, she was like the girls of the Lemnian simile but with the arrival of the Argonauts she is transformed and becomes in death an intratext to be read into the Colchian simile. Medea too will contemplate suicide and but for Hera's intervention, might have put a noose around her own neck: ἢ λαίμῳ ἀναρτήσασα μελάθρῳ (3.789). When the attentive reader comes to Medea, they think of Cleite, of what happened on Cyzicus, of the potentially destructive effects of love and

³⁵¹ See Griffin (1986: 39) 'For forms of κακός itself, a count produced the totals of 253 appearances in speech 48 in narrative (5 to one).' Cf. de Jong's (2001: 225) figures '238 times in speech, nineteen times in embedded focalisation, and forty-six times in simple narrator-text.' There is some discrepancy between the two tallies but the adjective is clearly favoured in the subjective style of character-text.

(loving) Argonauts.

Love returns us to the last *exemplum*. One woman who did commit suicide following the death of a lover is the nymph Oenone. The method varies: throwing herself from a height (πύργων ἀπ' ἄκρων πρὸς νεόδητον νέκυν | ῥοιζηδὸν ἐκβράσασα κύμβαχον δέμας, Lyc. *Alexandra*, 65-66), hanging (καὶ καταλαβοῦσα αὐτὸν νεκρὸν ἑαυτὴν ἀνήρτησεν, Apollod. 3.155), or uncertain (πολλὰ κατολοφυραμένη διεχρήσατο ἑαυτήν, Parth. *Mythographi Graeci* 4.7). Oenone is a jilted lover of Paris who is a lover like Jason who will go on to have a mutually destructive relationship (and break-up) with Medea.

1066-9: It is nymphs who create Cleite's *sēma*. An *aition* and an etymology follow as a scholarly narrator disrupts the pathos I was reading into her death. The image is cleverly contained, Νύμφαι... νύμφης. The frame links creators and their created memorial. It is not only encased but contains a wordplay 'Κλείτην... περικλεές οὔνομα' that includes the coinage περικλεές 'equivale all'attico κλεινόν e all'omerico περικλυτόν, e non si trova prima di A.,'³⁵² to which a further coinage in ἄλσηίδες 'of the grove.' I take comfort here in a favourite quote from Hutchinson 'Hellenistic poets commonly derive their effects and their impact from piquant combinations of, or delicate hovering between, the serious and the unserious, the grand and the less grand.'³⁵³

Cleite's death touches *even* the divine (καὶ αὐταὶ | Νύμφαι) but the transformation of tears into the fountain is reported without wonderment, rather as a footnote to her death.³⁵⁴ Unlike in Colchis where a narrator (backed by Erato) immerses himself in Medea's narrative, here he pulls back. The death was touching but reading on into the *aition*, the reader is confronted with more scholarly concerns (and games).³⁵⁵

It also prompts the question; where is this fountain? Where is her marker

³⁵² Ardizzoni 1967: 239. Having introduced it here, it is again used with οὔνομα at A.R. 3.330 of Phrixos.

³⁵³ Hutchinson 1988: 11.

³⁵⁴ Another transformation of tears is drily related at A.R. 4.605f., where the amber found in the Eridanus is formed from the tears the Heliades shed for Phaethon. For a semantic parallel to their weeping, cf. *Od.* 4.114, Telemachus weeping at Odysseus' unknown fate.

³⁵⁵ Goldhill (1991: 328) observes how the narrative 'with its combination of scholarship, fantasy, scholarly fantasy, scholarship about fantasy (etc.) explores (the boundaries of) representing the real.'

located? We know where Cyzicus' burial mound is because the narrator placed it firmly on the Leimonian plain (1061). 'ἄλσηίδες' recurs 4.1151 amongst the nymphs who attend the marriage of Jason and Medea (αἱ δ' ἔσαν ἐκ πεδίων ἄλσηίδες). Are these then likewise nymphs of the plain? That would place fountain besides mound and unite the lovers again side by side in death. To restore to Cleite some emotion in closing, the reader witnessing that wedding in Phaeacia and the involvement of nymphs in celebration might recall sadly their role as Cleite's mourners. Though, conversely, this scene of lamentation could contribute some foreboding to our reading of that shotgun wedding.³⁵⁶

iii. *A People Grieve*

Αἰνότατον δὴ κεῖνο Δολιονίησι γυναιξὶν 1070
 ἀνδράσι τ' ἐκ Διὸς ἥμαρ ἐπήλυθεν· οὐδὲ γὰρ αὐτῶν
 ἔτλη τις πάσασθαι ἐδητύος· Οὐδ' ἐπὶ δηρὸν
 ἐξ ἀχέων ἔργοιο μυληφάτου ἐμνώνοντο,
 ἀλλ' αὐτῶς ἄφλεκτα διαζώεσκον ἔδοντες.
 Ἔνθ' ἔτι νῦν, εὖτ' ἄν σφιν ἐτήσια χύτλα χέωνται 1075
 Κύζικον ἐνναίοντες Ἰάονες, ἔμπεδον αἰεὶ
 πανδήμοιο μύλης πελάνους ἐπαλετρεύουσιν.
 A.R. 1.1070-77

1070-77: The third and final *aition* is a tradition. There are visible markers for the dead king and queen, but for the survivors a custom passed down and still practised by the island's inhabitants even into the narrator's own time. The pathos continues (or resumes) in the qualification Αἰνότατον – the worst day sent by Zeus. Byre wonders, 'Could it, then, have been Zeus who sent the winds that brought the Argonauts back to the island in order that Cyzicus might be killed by them? Was Cyzicus perhaps guilty of some offence against the gods?'³⁵⁷ If the reader pursues a Pelian Cyzicus reading, then Zeus Xeinius working via the Argonauts is possible. It does seem incredibly explicit of

³⁵⁶ A feeling certainly bolstered by the narrator's comment at 4.1165-7!

³⁵⁷ Byre 2002: 29-30. There is, however, a supporting intertext for C. pursuing a Pelian Cyzicus. At *Od.* 20.105f. upon hearing the thunder answering Odysseus' prayer, an old woman at a mill prays to Zeus in turn to make this day the last and final feast of the Suitors (μνηστήρες πύματόν τε καὶ ὕστατον ἥματι τῷδε | ἐν μεγάροις Ὀδυσῆος ἐλοίατο δαῖτ' ἐρατεινήν, *Od.* 20.116-7).

this narrator though to confirm here after an episode which has relied on constant inference that it was Zeus after all!

For the Homeric scholar and auditor, two famous passages on fasting are suggested by the Dolionian response to the royal deaths - Achilles' deployment of Niobe as a mythological paradigm to get Priam to eat in *Iliad* 24.602f. and Demeter mourning for her stolen daughter (*h.Cer.* 49-51, 200-1). These intertexts of lamentation and grief can only underscore the communal sorrow of the tragedy on Cyzicus. Unless that is, C., taking an omnivorous approach to allusion, spots in the description of grinding at a public mill, a comic type-scene. The mill is a place that women of lax morals frequent!³⁵⁸ For C. recognition of such an echo (and there were plenty of possible innuendoes on Lemnos) if it does not entirely puncture the pathos here, it does, at the least, destabilise the reading. As with the 'happily ever after' of the Lemnian women (see L8 above), C. is again left unsure and unable to commit wholeheartedly.

Ἐνθ' ἔτι νῦν (1075) provides an accompanying destabilisation of time. Temporal levels merge again with reference to the island's future colonists who maintain the tradition even to this day. With the Ionians, the *sēma* come full circle. Those colonists referred to in the first of the episode's *aitia* (959) mark and seal the last.

³⁵⁸ Wilkins 2000: 62 citing *Clouds* 1358 and *Ecclesiazusae* 214-32.

Bibliography

- Albis, R. V. (1996) *Poet and Audience in the Argonautica of Apollonius*. Lanham, Md. and London.
- Ardizzoni, A. (1967) *Le Argonautiche: libro I*. Rome.
- Bakker, E. J. (2002) 'The Making of History: Herodotus' *Histories* Apodexis' in *Brill's Companion to Herodotus*, ed. E. J. Bakker, I. J. F. de Jong, H. van Wees. Leiden: 1–32.
- Bal, M. (1985) *Narratology: introduction to the theory of narrative*. Toronto and London.
- Barlow, S. A. (1989) 'Stereotype and Reversal in Euripides' *Medea*', *G&R* 36: 158-71.
- Berkowitz, G. (2004) *Semi-Public Narration in Apollonius' Argonautica*. Leuven.
- Beye, C. R. (1969) 'Jason as Love-Hero in Apollonios' *Argonautika*', *GRBS* 10: 31-55.
- Beye, C. R. (1982) *Epic and Romance in the 'Argonautica' of Apollonius*. Carbondale, Ill.
- Beye, C. R. (1993) *Ancient Epic Poetry*. Ithaca, New York and London.
- Bing, P. (1988) *The Well-Read Muse*. Göttingen.
- Block, E. (1982) 'The narrator speaks: apostrophe in Homer and Vergil', *TAPA* 112: 7-22.
- Block, E. (1986) 'Narrative Judgment and Audience Response in Homer and Vergil', *Arethusa* 19: 155–69.
- Bond, G. W. (1969) *Euripides: Hypsipyle*. Oxford.
- Bongie, E. B. (1977) 'Heroic Elements in the Medea of Euripides', *TAPA* 107: 27-56.
- Braswell, B. (1988) *A Commentary on the Fourth Pythian Ode of Pindar*. Berlin.
- Brelinski, T. (2015) 'Medon meets a Cyclops? *Odyssey* 22.31-80', *CQ* 65: 1-13.
- Byre, C. (2002) *A Reading of Apollonius Rhodius' "Argonautica": The Poetics of Uncertainty*. Lewiston, New York.
- Campbell, M. (1981) *Echoes and Imitations of Early Epic in Apollonius Rhodius*. Leiden.
- Campbell, M. (1983) *Studies in the Third Book of Apollonius Rhodius' 'Argonautica'*. Hildesheim.
- Campbell, D. A. (1982) *Greek Lyric*. London.
- Carey, C. (1995) 'Pindar and the victory ode' in *The Passionate Intellect*, ed. L. Ayres. New Brunswick: 85–103.

- Carspecken, J. F. (1952) 'Apollonius Rhodius and the Homeric epic', *YCS* 13: 35-143.
- Chatman, S. (1978) *Story and Discourse*. Ithaca, New York and London.
- Clare, R. J. (2002) *The Path of the Argo*. Cambridge.
- Clauss, J.J. (1993) *The Best of the Argonauts*. Berkeley, Calif.
- Clay, J. S. (1989) *The Politics of Olympus. Form and Meaning in the Major Homeric Hymns*. Princeton.
- Cohn, D. (1990) 'Signposts of Fictionality: A Narratological Perspective', *Poetics Today* 11: 775-804.
- Conrad, C. (1965) 'Traditional Patterns of Word-Order in Latin Epic from Ennius to Vergil', *HSCP* 69: 195-258.
- Conte, G. B. (1986) *The Rhetoric of Imitation* (ed. C. Segal). Ithaca, New York.
- DeForest, M. M. (1994) *Apollonius' Argonautica: A Callimachean Epic*. Leiden.
- de Jong, I. J. F. (1987) *Narrators and Focalizers*. Amsterdam.
- de Jong, I. J. F. (1988) 'Homeric Words and Speakers: An Addendum', *JHS* 108: 188-189.
- de Jong, I. J. F. (1991) 'Narratology and Oral Poetry: The Case of Homer', *Poetics Today* 12: 405-423.
- de Jong, I. J. F. (1992) 'The Subjective Style in Odysseus' Wanderings', *CQ* 42: 1-11.
- de Jong, I. J. F. (1993) 'Studies in Homeric denomination', *Mnem.* 46: 289-306.
- de Jong, I. J. F. (2001) *A Narratological commentary on the Odyssey*. Cambridge.
- de Jong, I. J. F. (2002) 'A Narratological Commentary on the *Odyssey*: Principles and Problems' in *The Classical Commentary*, ed. R. Gibson and C. Kraus. Leiden: 49-66.
- de Jong, I. J. F. (2005) 'Convention versus Realism in the Homeric Epics', *Mnem.* 58: 1-22.
- de Jong, I. J. F. (2014) *Narratology and Classics: A Practical Guide*. Oxford.
- Dewald, C. (2012) 'Myth and Legend in Herodotus' First Book' in *Myth, truth, and narrative in Herodotus*, ed. E. Baragwanath and M. de Bakker. Oxford: 59-86.
- Duckworth, G.E. (1966) *Foreshadowing and Suspense in the Epics of Homer, Apollonius and Vergil*. New York.
- Edmunds, L. (2001) *Intertextuality and the Reading of Roman Poetry*. Baltimore, MD.
- Edwards, M. E. (1975) 'Type-Scenes and Homeric Hospitality', *TAPA* 105: 51-72.
- Fantuzzi, M., Hunter, R.L. (2004) *Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry*. Cambridge.

- Feeney, D. (1991) *The Gods in Epic*. Oxford.
- Feldman, L. H. (1998) *Studies in Josephus' rewritten Bible*. Leiden.
- Fowler, D. P. (1991) 'Narrate and Describe: The Problem of Ekphrasis', *JRS* 81: 25-35.
- Fränkel, H. (1968) *Noten zu den Argonautika des Apollonios*. Munchen.
- Fusillo, M. (1985) *Il Tempo Delle Argonautiche*. Rome.
- Galinsky, K. (1972) *The Heracles Theme*. Oxford.
- Genette, G. (1980) *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method*. Oxford.
- George, E. V. (1972) 'Poet and Characters in Apollonius Rhodius' Lemnian Episode', *Hermes* 100: 47-62.
- Giangrande, G. (1967) "'Arte Allusiva" and Alexandrian Epic Poetry', *CQ* 17: 85-97.
- Gibson, R. (1999) 'Aeneas as *Hospes* in Vergil, Aeneid 1 and 4'. *CQ* 49: 184-202.
- Gibson, R. (2002) "'Cf. e.g": A Typology of "Parallels" and the Role of Commentaries on Latin Poetry' in *The Classical Commentary*, ed. R. Gibson and C. Kraus. Leiden: 331-57.
- Glei, R. F. (2001) 'Outlines of Apollonian Scholarship 1955-1999' in *A Companion to Apollonius Rhodius*, ed. T. Papanghelis and A. Rengakos. Leiden: 1-26.
- Goldhill, S. (1991) *The Poet's Voice*. Cambridge.
- Gowers, E. (2005) 'Vergil's Sybil and the 'Many Mouths' Cliché (*Aen.* 6.625-7)', *CQ* 55: 170-182.
- Green, P. (2008) *The Argonautika*. Berkeley, Calif.
- Griffin, J. (1977) 'The Epic Cycle and the Uniqueness of Homer', *JHS* 97: 39-53.
- Griffin, J. (1980) *Homer on Life and Death*. Oxford.
- Griffin, J. (1986) 'Homeric Words and Speakers', *JHS* 106: 36-57.
- Griffith, M. (1983) 'Personality in Hesiod', *CA* 2: 37-65.
- Harder, M. A. (1990) 'Untrodden Paths: Where Do They Lead?', *HSCP* 93: 287-309.
- Harder, M. A. (1994) 'Travel descriptions in the *Argonautica* of Apollonius Rhodius' in *Travel fact and travel fiction*, ed. Z. von Martels. Leiden: 16-29.
- Henderson, J. (1991) *The Maculate Muse*. Oxford.
- Herman, G. (1993) *Ritualised Friendship and the Greek City*. Cambridge.
- Hershkowitz, D. (1998) *The Madness of Epic*. Oxford.
- Hinds, S. (1998) *Allusion and Intertext*. Cambridge.
- Hopkinson, N. (1988) *A Hellenistic Anthology*. Cambridge.
- Hunter, R. L. (1988) "'Short on Heroics": Jason in the *Argonautica*', *CQ* 38: 436-453.

- Hunter, R. L. (1989) *Apollonius of Rhodes: Argonautica Book III*. Cambridge.
- Hunter, R. L. (1993) *The "Argonautica" of Apollonius: Literary Studies*. Cambridge.
- Hunter, R. L. (2001) 'The Poetics of Narrative in the *Argonautica*' in *A Companion to Apollonius Rhodius*, ed. T. Papangelis and A. Rengakos. Leiden: 93-125.
- Hutchinson, G. O. (1988) *Hellenistic Poetry*. Oxford.
- Hutchinson, G. O. (2001) *Greek Lyric Poetry*. Oxford.
- Isbell, H. (1990) *Ovid's Heroides*. London.
- Iser, W. (1978) *The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response*. Baltimore.
- Jackson, S. (1992) 'Apollonius' Jason: Human Being in an Epic Scenario', *G&R* 39: 155-162.
- Jauss, H. (1982) *Towards an Aesthetic of Reception*. Minnesota.
- Klein, T. M. (1974) 'The Role of Callimachus in the Development of the Concept of the Counter-Genre', *Latomus* 33: 217-231.
- Klein, T. M. (1983) 'Apollonius' Jason: Hero and Scoundrel', *QUCC* 13: 115-126.
- Klooster, J.J.H. (2007) 'Apollonius of Rhodes' in *Time in Ancient Greek Literature*, ed. I. J. F. de Jong and R. Nünlist. Leiden: 63-80.
- Knight, V. (1995) *The Renewal of Epic*. Leiden.
- Konstan, D. (1997) *Friendship in the Classical World*. Cambridge.
- Laird, A. (1993), 'Sounding out Ecphrasis: Art and Text in Catullus 64', *JRS* 83: 18-30.
- Laird, A. (1999) *Powers of Expression, Expressions of Power*. Oxford.
- Lawall, G. (1966) 'Apollonius' *Argonautica*: Jason as Anti-Hero', *YCIS* 19: 121-69.
- Levin, D. (1971a) *The Argonautica Re-examined*. Leiden.
- Levin, D. (1971b), 'Apollonius' Heracles', *CJ* 67: 22-28.
- Long, C. R. (1987) *The Twelve Gods of Greece and Rome*. Leiden.
- Lyne, R. O. A. M. (1994), 'Vergil's 'Aeneid': Subversion by Intertextuality. Catullus 66.39-40 and Other Examples', *G&R* 41: 187-204.
- Mackay, C. J. (2013), 'Iliad 24 and the Judgement of Paris', *CQ* 63: 1-16.
- Mooney, G. W. (1912) *The Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius*. London.
- Mori, A. (2008) *The Politics of Apollonius Rhodius' Argonautica*. Cambridge.
- Morrison, A. D. (2007) *The Narrator in Archaic Greek and Hellenistic Poetry*. Cambridge.
- Morrison, A. D. (2012) 'Performance, re-performance and Pindar's audiences' in *Reading the Victory Ode*, eds. P. Agócs, C. Carey, R. Rawles. Cambridge: 111-33.

- Morrison, A.D. Clio and Calliope. *Forthcoming*.
- Morrison, J. V. (1992) *Homeric Misdirection*. Michigan.
- Newman, J. K. (1986) *The Classical Epic Tradition*. Wisconsin.
- Olson, S. D. (1989) 'The stories of Helen and Menelaus (*Odyssey* 4. 240-89) and the return of Odysseus', *AJP* 110: 387-94.
- Page, D. L. (1951) 'Simonidea', *JHS* 71: 133-142.
- Parker, R. (1991) 'The "Hymn to Demeter" and the Homeric Hymns', *G&R* 38: 1-17.
- Pavlock, B. (1990) *Eros, imitation, and the epic tradition*. Ithaca and London.
- Pazdernik, C. F. (1995) 'Odysseus and His Audience: *Odyssey* 9.39-40 and Its Formulaic Resonances', *AJP* 116: 347-369.
- Phinney, E. Jr. (1967) 'Narrative Unity in the *Argonautica*, The Medea-Jason Romance', *TAPA* 98: 327-41.
- Plantiga, M. (2007) 'Hospitality and Rhetoric: The Circe Episode in Apollonius Rhodius' *Argonautica* 1', *CQ* 57: 543-564.
- Polleichtner, W. (2005) 'The Bee Simile: How Vergil Emulated Apollonius in His Use of Homeric Poetry', *GFA* 8: 115-60.
- Race, W. (2008) Apollonius Rhodius: *Argonautica*. Harvard.
- Reece, S. (1993) *The Stranger's Welcome*. Ann Arbor, MI.
- Richardson, S. D. (1990) *The Homeric Narrator*. Nashville, Tenn.
- Roochnik, D. (1990) 'Homeric Speech Acts: Word and Deed in the Epics', *CJ* 85: 289-299.
- Rose, G. P. (1969) 'The Unfriendly Phaeacians', *TAPA* 100: 387-406.
- Rossum-Steenbeek, M. V. (1998) *Greek Readers' Digests?: Studies on a Selection of Subliterary Papyri*. Leiden.
- Rutherford, R. B. (1992) *Odyssey. Books XIX and XX*. Cambridge.
- Schmitz, T. A. (1999), "I Hate All Common Things": The Reader's Role in Callimachus' *Aitia* Prologue', *HSCP* 99: 151-178.
- Schmitz, T. A. (2007) *Modern Literary Theory and Ancient Texts*. Oxford.
- Seaton, R. C. (1967) *The Argonautica*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Sens, A. (2003) 'Pleasures Recalled: A. R. 3.813-814, Aclepiades, and Homer', *HSCP* 101: 303-309.
- Shapiro, H. A. (1980) 'Jason's Cloak', *TAPA* 110: 263-286.

- Sharrock, A. R. (2000) 'Intratextuality: Texts, Parts and W(holes) in Theory' in *Intratextuality: Greek and Roman textual relations*, ed. A. Sharrock and H. Morales. Oxford: 1-39.
- Sheets, G. A. (1981) 'The Dialect Gloss, Hellenistic Poetics and Livius Andronicus', *AJP* 102: 58-78.
- Sistakou, E. (2007) 'Cyclic Stories? The Reception of the *Cypria* in Hellenistic Poetry', *Philologus* 151: 78-94.
- Sistakou, E. (2012) *The Aesthetics of Darkness*. Leuven.
- Slater, W.J. (1982) 'Aristophanes of Byzantium and Problem-Solving in the Museum', *CQ* 32:336-49.
- Stephens, S. (2003) *Seeing Double. Intercultural Poetics in Ptolemaic Alexandria*. Berkeley, Calif.
- Stephens, S. (2011) 'Ptolemaic Epic' in *A Companion to Apollonius Rhodius*, ed. T. Papanghelis and A. Rengakos. Leiden: 95-114.
- Sternberg, M. (1978) *Expositional Modes and Temporal Ordering in Fiction*. Baltimore.
- Stoddard, K. (2004) *The Narrative Voice in the Theogony of Hesiod*. Leiden.
- Thalmann, W. G. (2011) *Apollonius of Rhodes and the spaces of Hellenism*. Oxford.
- Thomas, R. F. (1982) 'Catullus and the Polemics of Poetic Reference (Poem 64.1-18)', *AJP* 103: 144-164.
- Thomas, R. F. (1983) 'Virgil's Ecphrastic Centerpieces', *HSCP* 87: 175-84.
- Thomas, R. F. (1986) 'Virgil's Georgics and the Art of Reference', *HSCP* 90:171-98.
- Vergados, A. (2013) *The "Homeric Hymn to Hermes": Introduction, Text and Commentary*. Berlin.
- Verity, A., Instone, S. J. (2007) *Pindar: The Complete Odes*. Oxford.
- Vian, F. (1974) *Apollonios de Rhodes: Argonautiques*. Paris.
- Wecowski, M. (2004) 'The Hedgehog and the Fox: Form and Meaning in the Prologue of Herodotus', *JHS* 124: 143-64.
- Wendel, C. (1935) *Scholia in Apollonium Rhodium Vetera*. Berlin.
- West, S. (1989) 'Laertes revisited', *PCPS* 35: 113-43.
- Wheeler, G. (2002) 'Sing, Muse...: The Introit from Homer to Apollonius', *CQ* 52: 33-49.
- Wilkins, J. (2000) *The Boastful Chef*. Oxford.
- Willcock, M. M. (1964) 'Mythological Paradeigma in the Iliad', *CQ* 14: 141-54.

Wyatt Jr., W. F. (1982) 'Homeric ATH', *AJP* 103: 247-76.