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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.
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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.’

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. 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. 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.’

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

---

2 Glei 2001: 3.
3 Ardizzoni 1967, Mooney 1912.
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). 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. 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 Glei 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, 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.

In terms of my overall approach, my own closest parallels are the works of Byre on Apollonius and Morrison’s monograph, Homeric Misdirection. 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. 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.
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*). 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).

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.’

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.

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.\textsuperscript{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’).\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{17} For example, correspondences of lexis which confirm an intertext for C. can

\textsuperscript{14} Hunter 1989: 38.\textsuperscript{15} For a discussion of parallels and ‘parellelomania’ (mea culpa) see Gibson 2002: 331–57. Cf. e.g.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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 (μὴν ἄνειδε θέα 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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{20} Berkowitz 2004: 24, Byre 2002: 2.
\textsuperscript{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 φωτόν
μνήσομαι, οἳ Πόντοιο κατὰ στόμα καὶ διὰ πέτρας
Κυανέας βασιλῆς ἐφημοσύνη Πελίσο
χρύσειον μετὰ κώς ἐὕζυγον ἠλασαν Ἀργώ.
Α.Ρ. 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**

\[\text{μὴνιν ἄειδε θεὰ Πηληϊάδεω Ἀχιλῆος | ὠὐλομένην}\n\[\text{Il. 1.1-2}\]

\[\text{ἄνδρα μοι ἔννεπε, μοῦσα, πολύτροπον, ὃς...}\n\[\text{Od. 1.1}\]

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.’

‘Ἄρχόμενος 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.

### i. *Beginning as Performance* 

In his first comment on the poem, Mooney writes ‘Ἅρχομαι was the *vox propria* for the opening invocation of a hymn.’ The use of hymnal phraseology is unmistakeable, the parallels copious. One C. will find remarkably close is *h.Hom. XXXII.18-19, σέο δ’ Ἀρχόμενος κλέα φωτόν | ἡσομαι ἠμιθέων ‘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


26 Cf. Hunter 1993: 120 n.78. ‘That Ἅρχομενος 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 *Ili. 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’.\footnote{Clauss 1993: 16, citing ibid. n.9, Klein 1974, Goldhill 1991: 286–300.}

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-Models\footnote{Here I include A. on the reading on the basis of the ubiquity of ἄρχωμαι and the language of beginnings in invocations to the gods.} creates an additional performative context: the hymns were a prelude to an epic recital.

The formula has incorporated the prelude to performance within the proem, 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).\footnote{On which see A. D. Morrison 2007: 109–15.} 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.\footnote{The performative atmosphere suggested by the hymnic intertexts thus incorporates the context of epic performance within the text itself.}

\textit{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 \textit{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
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. 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 Ἱλιόθεν the same point from where the Homeric narrator began his summary ἔπει Τροίης ίερὸν πτολείθρον ἔπερος ὃν Od. 1.2).

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

\[\dot{\omega} \varsigma \phiαθ', \ \delta' \ \dot{\omega} \rhoμηθεἰς \ \thetaεοῦ \ \dot{\eta}ρχετο, \ \phiαίνε \ \delta' \ \dot{\omega}νδῆν. \\
\dot{\epsilon}νθεν \ \dot{\epsilon}λὼν \ \omega' \ \omegaι \ \dot{\epsilon}υσσέλμων \ \epsilonπι \ \nuηδόν \ \\
\betaάντες \ \dot{\alpha}πετπλειον... \\
Od. 8.499-501\]

\[^{33}\] 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, δεῦ ὁ 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. 

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). 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).’ However, Callimachos should see her lurking.

Eithe φελ’ Ἀργοῦς μὴ διαπτάσθαι σκάφος
Κόλχων ἐς αἰαν 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).”’

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.

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

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*

Τοίην γὰρ Πελίς ψάτιν ἐκλυεν, ὡς μιν ὀπίσσωmoίρα μένει στυγερή, τοῦδ’ ἀνέρος, ὃν τιν’ ἴδοιτoδημόθεν οἰσπέδιλον, ὑπ’ ἐννεσίηςι δαμήναι.

Δηρὸν δ’ οὐ μετέπειται τείν κατὰ βάξιν Ἱῆσων,χειμερίοιο ἰέθρᾳ κιών διὰ ποσσίν Ἀναύρου,ἀλλο μὲν ἐξεσάωσεν ὑπ’ ἱλύος, ἀλλο δ’ ἐνερθὲνκάλλιτεν αὐθὶ πέδιλον ἐνισχύμενον προχοήσιν.

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. 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.

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 (Moira), 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 [Moira] (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).

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.

With verse 8, the narrator turns again to address Apollo directly τε ην κατὰ βάξιν (‘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.”’
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.’\textsuperscript{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.

\begin{quote}
 ἰκετὸ δ’ ἐς Πελίην αὐτοσχεδὸν ἀντιβολήσων εἰλατήνης, ἰν πατρὶ Ποσειδάωνι καὶ ἄλλοις ῥέξε θεοῖς, Ὑρῆς δὲ Πελασγίδος οὐκ ἀλέγιζεν. αἰσθᾶ δὲ τόν γ’ ἐστιδὼν ἐφράσσατο, καὶ οἱ άεθλον ἐντε ναυτιλίας πολυκηδεος, ὄφρ’ ἐνὶ πόντῳ ἧ καὶ ἄλλοδαποῖσι μετ’ ἀνδράσι νόστων ὀλέσσῃ.
Α.Ρ. 1.12-17
\end{quote}

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

\textsuperscript{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 οἴτον, A.R. 3.64, a recasting of the μοῖρας στυγερῆς 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 ὅς γὰρ τόδε μήδετο Ἡρη, | ὀφρα κακὸν Πελίη οἰρῆν ἐς Ἰολκὸν ἱκόιτο | Αἰολὴ 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. Oδ. 1.12). Secondly Pelias envisages the mission as οἱ ἀεθλὸν ἔντυε ναυτιλίης πολυκηδέος (A.R. 1.15-16), and Odysseus describes his own prospective homecoming to the Phaeacians as νόστον ἐμὸν πολυκηδέ (Oδ. 9.37). Thirdly in conversation with Penelope, Odysseus refers to their many trials πολέων κεκορήμεθ᾽ ἀεθλῶν, and his difficult homecoming ἐμὸν πολυκηδέα νόστον (Oδ. 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

\(^{48}\) 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*

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 (έτι). 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.’ The preoms of both the *Iliad* τίς τ’ ἄρ σφοε τευών ἔριδι ξυνέκε μάχεσθαι (*Il. 1.8*) and the *Odyssey* τῶν ἀμόθεν γε, θεά, θύγατερ Διός, εἰπὲ καὶ ἤμιν (*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 ἤμιν. | 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. 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.

\[ \text{ὡς φάθ’, ὦ δ’ ὀρμηθεὶς θεοῦ ἡρχετο, φαῖνε δ’ ἀοιδῆν,} \\
\text{ἔνθεν ἔλων ὡς οἱ μὲν ἐυσελμοὺν ἐπὶ νηῶν} \\
\text{βάντες ἐπέπλειον, πῦρ ἐν κλισίῃ βαλόντες,} \]

*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.’

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. 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.

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, ὑποφήτορες. 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.

ὑποφήτορες 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 ὑποφήτορες 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 ὅλη Ἑλικῆς, 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

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.’

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.* 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
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58 Chatman 1978.
happens in the order, angle, and patterns of presentation actually encountered by the reader.'

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*.

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*. With regard to the Argonautic narrator, finding him is not a problem. As my analysis of the proem 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
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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.’
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
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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. 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 φωτόν, 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 Mossynoeici (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. 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. 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
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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.”’


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, τοῖην γὰρ Πελίης φάτιν ἔκλυεν, ὡς 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 Polyxho’s use of the same adjective in character-text to describe old-age κουρότεραι δ’ ἄγονοι στυγερόν ποτὶ γῆρας ᾕκησθε (1.684) or point to the narrator choosing to leave the same noun unqualified in his account of Cyzicus’ death, ὃ δ’ ἐνὶ ψαμάθοισιν ἐλυσθεὶς | μοῖραν ἀνέπλησεν (1.1034-5, see 1034-9n.).

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

speculation as to whether fate was hated by the narrator or by Pelias (or by both).  
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 ἀστυγέρος 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.  
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 androktasai - 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).

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 ἀστυγέρος uncovers some potentially
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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, ἀστυγέρος occurs at 1.443 in character-text. Idmon prophesies his own death as ἀστυγερῆ ὑπὸ δαίμονος αἰσθ.

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. Polyxoe 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 (II. 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, II. 23.78-9) that awaited him since birth and prophesies to Achilles his own fate to die at Troy (καὶ δὲ σοὶ σὺν τὰ μοῖρα, θεοῖς ἔπιείκελ᾽ Ἀχιλλεύ, | τείχει ὑπὸ Τρώων εὕρεσθαι ἀπολέσθαι, II. 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 *androktasias* as a model of that type of scene, whilst within it are suggested parallels with specific Homeric *androktasias* (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
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\(^70\) 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.

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. 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 Contean 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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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

\textsuperscript{75} A. D. Morrison 2007: 284 n.47.
\textsuperscript{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.

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.’ 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
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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 fulness 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.\textsuperscript{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).\textsuperscript{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 \textit{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 \textit{oratio obliqua} in which ‘we are given the explicit impression that the

\textsuperscript{82} Laird 1999: xii–xv. See \textit{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.’

\textsuperscript{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 them with free indirect speech which has no introductory verb. An example from the Argonautica of the latter is the presentation of Medea’s thoughts after first seeing Jason, ἀυτός θ’ οἴος ἔην, οἶοι σί τε φάρεσιν ἔστο, | οἶα τ’ ἐειφ’, ὡς θ’ ἐζετ’ ἐπὶ θρόνου, ὡς τε θύραζε | ἔειν (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.’ 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.’ His examples of terse include ‘They agreed’, ‘He told them about the war’ and ‘Irim de caelo misit Saturnia Juno [Verg. Aen. 9.2]. ‘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

---

87 Laird 1999: 89.
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 ἀλλὰ 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 μειλιχίοις 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 - Ἀὐτὴμάρ κε δόμους ὀλοὺ πυρί δημώσειαν | Αἰήτεω, ὅτε μὴ σφίν ἐκὼν δέρος ἐγγυάλξη, (244-5). The speech is a general reaction, concluding ὅς φάσειν ἐνθὰ καὶ ἐνθὰ 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, ἀλλὰ 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 ὀφεὶ τῷ ἐμπῃς | ἠλυθεν (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 Πελίαο 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 Aeetes’ palace. Yet that is followed with a difficult to interpret ‘difficult,’ Ἀλλ’ οὐ φυκτὰ κέλευθα, πόνος δ᾽ ἀπρηκτος ἱοὺσιν (‘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.

Their 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 *nóstos* (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 μᾶλλα 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. 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. 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.

My position, evident from my analysis of the proem, 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
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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 ὀνείδεσιν 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). In isolation, that one correspondence of
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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 ὄνομαξον ἄνδρα ἐκαστον (*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. Approach 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 Alcimede 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, μύθος δ’ ἀνδρεσσι μελήσει | πᾶσι, μάλιστα δ’ ἐμοί· τοῦ γὰρ κράτος ἐστ’ 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 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.
Finally taking both possible intertexts together and matching up the structures of speech and speakers along with the characters, we can set the mournful Alcimedee/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 (II. 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

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).\(^\text{101}\)

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.’

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 (“Ἐσπετε νῦν μοι Μούσαι, *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, γῆμας δ’ ἐκ θαλάμοι (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.

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?’

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).

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. 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.

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. 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. 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). 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 persuade. 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. Yet, before

---

106 For the learned reader C., there are lexical markers. E.g. the formulaic Ναύσικάα, θυγάτηρ μεγαλήτυρος 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, Ὀη Ἕκ παιδίων γεραροῦ περιφείσατο πατρός | Υψιπύλεια Θόαντος. Daughters and kingly fathers share close proximity.

107 That marriage persists in Nausicaa’s mind is evident from her comments to her handmaids 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’ (μύθοις αἰμυλίσι, 792) of Calypso’s beguiling manner, and the phrase employed at Od. 1.56 in Athena’s first direct speech (μύθοις αἰμυλίσι~
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.’ 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.’

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). 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.

\[ \text{αἱμυλίσιν λόγοσιν} \] – 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 υπέρφιαλον ἀθεμίστων, 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’ ὕδε θεᾶς ἔρως οὐδὲ γυναικὸς θημὸν ἐνι στήθεσι περιπροχυθείς ἐδάμασσεν.

*Il. 14.315-6*

ἀλλ᾽ ὑπέρτολμον ἀν- δρός φρόνημα τις λέγοι καὶ γυναικῶν φρεσίν τλαμόνων καὶ παντόλμους ἔρωτάς ἀταισι συννόμους βροτῶν;

ξυζύγους δ᾽ ὀμαυλίας θηλυκρατὴς ἀπέρω-

τος ἔρως παρανικά 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’escale Lemnienne se présente comme un simple intermède [my italics] dans la narration, le poète a néanmoins réussi a 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, *II*. 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 (τετρηχός, 3.276). As Hunter notes there, τετρηχός is from the verb ταράσσω 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 (3.277ff.): ‘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 (1.1265ff.).\(^{120}\) 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, τραχείαν ὀργήν (*E. Med*. 447).

\(^{118}\) Hunter 1989: 128.


\(^{120}\) Cf. the wandering Io tormented by a gadfly, e.g. χρεία τις αὖ μὲ τάν τάλαιναν ὀστροφ, *A. Pr*. 567, *ibid*. 877ff. 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.’ 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 κριηδόν ἐμπέσομεν (Ar. Lys 309), ἀνοϊξαι τὰς πύλας | ταῦτας (Lys 250) and ὑπὸ τῶν γυναικῶν ἀποκέκλημαι ταῖς πύλαις (Lys 423). 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.”’ 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).
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.’

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). And given the prominence of Aphrodite in the episode and the challenges she presents to interpretation, 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.’ Amongst those listed is the complaint of Cinesias, (Myrrhine’s [Myrine’s?] sexually frustrated husband in the Lysistrata) τὰ δὲ τῆς Ἀφροδίτης ἱέρ’ ἀνοργίαστά σοι | χρόνον τοσοῦτον ἐστίν, 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.

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.
L1. ‘Previously on Lemnos’ (609-632).

With the Argonauts’ arrival at Lemnos (Λῆμνον ἴκοντο, 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 ἵστορούντων, 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 (Ἄμυνᾶν τ᾽ ἔθει γυναικῶν

---

¹²⁸ Berkowitz (2004: 45 n. 5) identifies this Myrsilus as Myrsilus of Methymna ‘a predecessor of Antigonus 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. ὑε ὁ ταντάλου, σὲ δ’, ἀντία προτέρον, 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· γοάται δὲ δὴ πάθος κατὰ-
πτυστόν· ἢκασεν δὲ τίς
τὸ δεῖνὸν αὐ Λημνίοις πήμασιν.
θεοστυγήτω δ’ ἄχει

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

"Ενθ’ ἀμυνὶς πᾶς δήμος ὑπερβασίμησι γυναικῶν νηλείως δέδμητο παροιχεμένω λυκάβαντι. 610
Δὴ γὰρ κουριδίας μὲν ἀπηνήναντο γυναῖκας ἀνέρες ἐγχήραντες ἔχον δ’ ἐπὶ λημάδεσα τριχῦν ἔρον, ᾧς αὐτοὶ ἀγίνεον ἀντιπέρηθεν Θηρικῆς δημούντες, ἐπεὶ χόλος αἰνὸς ὀπαζὲ Κύπριδος, οὖνεκά μιν γεράων ἐπὶ δηρὸν ἀτίσσαν. 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 μνηστήρας ὑπερβασίην ἀποτίσασα), 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 II. 3.107 when Menelaus urges the men not to violate oaths sworn by Zeus (ὑπερβασιών Διὸς ὀρκία δηλήσηται) 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

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 ἵππότα Πηλεύς (*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, νηλέι θυμῶ - 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 δέδμητο. The evaluative adverb νηλειῶς qualifies a nuanced verb.

δάμαζω ‘laying low, overcoming’ is used of subjecting another to one’s will. δέδμητο 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 χερσὶ 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’ ἀλλάξων ἀλιάσων 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 ἐχον δ’ ἔτι λημάδεσσι | 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 ἀνέρες ἐχθήραντες, the husbands who hate them. And these are not simply their women but immediately following the explanatory particle v.611 comes the qualification κουριδίας. 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 ἕν ἑκατον, σὺν κυνηγῇ, σὸν μὲν ἐξαίρων λέχος | καινῆς δὲ νύμφης ἱμέρῳ 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, χαί τοις άν οὐκ ἢν οὐδέν 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, τραχειόν ὀργήν (E. Med. 447).
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 (ἄλλα ἐ μοὴρα δάμασσε καὶ ἄργαλέως χόλος Ἦρης, Il. 18.119). And according to Nestor, Agamemnon tried but failed to placate Athena’s terrible rage (ὡς τὸν Ἀθηναίης δεινὸν χόλον ἐξακέσαιτο, Od. 3.145). Unlike μήνις, 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).’ It occurs qualified by σινός in a simile, Hector’s rage likened to a snake’s (χόλος σινός, 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 σινῆς, h.Cer 350), she devises a terrible deed (μέγα μήδεται ἔργον, 351) and she does not mingle with the gods for she holds a terrible rage (ἡ δ’ σινὸν 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... οὖνεκά μιν γεράων ἐπὶ δηρόν άτισσαν. 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, ἔτι δηρὸν. 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...’ 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? 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. 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 ὀπάζει h.Herm 120, Vergados (2013) ad loc notes the verb ‘normally accompanied by κύδος or δόλος, 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 αἰνός attends in its place.


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

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.’ 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.’

616: The exclamatory apostrophe creates a connection as the narrator reaches inside the narrative to its characters. The device is in itself subjective. This crossing of the boundary is a display of narratorial sympathy. 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.’
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 kinslaying or the threat posed by raiders now that their own manpower has been obliterated.\textsuperscript{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 Hyspipy’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 \textit{Medea} mentioned above and Jason’s comments (E. \textit{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 \textit{Argonautica} out as a male, and as a male commenting on the behaviour of women.’\textsuperscript{151} Is it sympathy then or exasperation?

\textbf{617-19:} The elaboration on the extent of the killing continues to be subjectively narrated. The men are not simply killed but shattered. \textit{ῥ\upsilon \alpha\iota\omicron\omega} ‘break’ or ‘shatter’ creates a vivid image of their destruction and the verb is commonly used of shipwrecks, e.g. \textit{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

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item 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.’
\item A. D. Morrison 2007: 286. See \textit{ibid.} 284-6, esp. the possible pun in v.616 (\textit{ἀκόρητος} \textit{ἀκόρη} ‘un-womanly’ as suggested in Hunter 1993: 112 n. 49).
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
odiousness of the women’s crime and that of the men’s pursuits which led to the crime.’

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, ἄμφει σὺν ἐνυφί. 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). 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.

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.’ The
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.\textsuperscript{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); Iphinoë 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 Iphinoë’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.

\textbf{623:} After describing how she sent her father to sea in a casket, the narrator volunteers her motivation, αἰ ψυγη ‘in the hope that he might escape.’\textsuperscript{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 δαδαλέ.\textsuperscript{157}


\textsuperscript{156} See Vian 1974: 21 for a reconstruction of the fragments of \textit{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. \textit{Theb} 5.200-39 and L4i.  

\textsuperscript{157} Simonides 543.1-2 \textit{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 (Κάτι 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. Attia 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.

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 Claus 1993: 112.

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.\textsuperscript{160} In effect, Oenoe is colonised, made male, becomes Sicinus.\textsuperscript{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 Polyxoe 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, ἀμείῳσο δ’ οὐνόμα Θήρης | εξ Ώθεν. ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν μετόπιν γένετ’ Εὐφήμῳο, ‘[Theras led them] to the island Calliste, and changed the name to Thera after himself. But these things happened after Euphemus’ (4.1763-4).\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{163} Stephens (2003: 180) notes the divergences of the Apollonian version from that of Pindar in \textit{Pythian} 4: ‘What is


\textsuperscript{161} For Pavlock (1990: 46) ‘a reinforcement of male supremacy.’ On travel aitia in the \textit{Argonautica}, see Harder 1994.


\textsuperscript{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.

\[\text{Tē̂si} \ δὲ \ βουκόλιαί} \ τε βο̂ν \ χάλκειά \ τε δύνειν \ τεύχεα \ πυροφόρους \ τε \ διατμήξασαι Αθηναίας \ πέλεν \ ἕργων \ οἷς \ αἱ \ τὸ \ πάροιθεν \ όμιλεον. \ Ἀλλὰ \ γὰρ \ ἕμπις \ \text{630} \ ἴ \ θαμὰ \ δὴ \ πάππαν \ ἔπι \ πλατύν \ ὀμμασι \ πότον \ δεῖματι \ λευγαλέῳ, \ ὀπότε \ Θρήικες \ ἵσα. \ \text{A.R. 1.627-32}\]

\textbf{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 (χάλκεια \ τε δύνειν | τεύχεα) adds an Iliadic colouring - the phrase τεύχεα ποικίλα χάλκῳ (‘the bronze of his crafted armour’) occurring e.g. \textit{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 Battiaides 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 \textit{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 (αὐτῷ ᾽Αθήνην ᾔργα διδάσκῆσαι, πολυδάιδαλον 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 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 (τρηχ ὑπὸ ἔρων, 613) and later manifested in the sweet desire that ensures prolonged love-making of Lemnian women with the Argonauts (γλυκ ὑπὸ ἔρων, 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: ηυδε θ᾽ αἰμιλίους τε λόγους καὶ ἐπίκλοτον ἤθος, 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 (οἴχεται ἐς Λήμνων μετὰ Σίντιας ἄγριοφώνος ~ Σιντηίδα Λήμνοι ἱκονιτά) becomes much the more dominant intertext, evident in the ecphrasis and 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 ἀπέμβησι θυμὸν ἐνι στήθεσιν Ἀχαιῶν (2.90), ἢ δὲ δόλων τὸν ἄλλον ἐνὶ φρεσκείας μερμήριξε (2.93), ὡς τρίτες μὲν ἠλήθε δόλῳ καὶ ἔπειθεν Ἀχαιοῦς (2.106).

This emphasis on cunning should remind C. of a further Homeric weaver whose self-characterisation as a manipulative bitch (δαμὴ ἐμεῖο κυνὸς κακομηχάνου ὅρμων ὡς, Il. 3.344) evokes the κυνεόν τε νόον Ἡρμῆς 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 πάσιν θεοίσι 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 ὑφήνω, 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, ἐργα 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, ἢ ἐς ἐνεκα πολλὰ Ἀργεῖοι Τρῳῶν ἱστηκτευτον, 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 II. 3.121-242, 383-447 esp. 164ff; 173-5,426-36.’ On ἄτη, see e.g. Wyatt Jr. 1982.
γυνακήια ούκ ἐμάθομεν, Hdt. 4.114.3). In the story he recounts (Σαυροματέων δὲ πὲρι ὦδε λέγεται, 4.110ff.), the Amazons are initially in conflict with Scythian men whose name for them is glossed as ἀνδροκτόνοι. 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 παρθένοις οὕδεμια πρὶν ἂν τῶν πολεμίων ἀνδραὶς ἀποκτείνη ὑμῖν ἄνδρα, τὸ δὲ πατὰ κτείνει, 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 οὐνομα τούτο κατὰ Ἑλλάδα χλῶσαν ἀνδροκτόνοι· οἶδρ 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 Themiscyrean 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 (ὦ μὲν οὐθ’ ἵστοιν παλιμβάμους ἐφίλησεν ὀδοὺς, *P.* 9.18) but in spears, swords and hunting wild beasts (βουσίν εἰρήναν παρέχοισα πατρόφασι, *P.* 9.23). Her keeping safe the herds is echoed in the description of the Lemnian women as βουκόλιαι 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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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 ἵσσει 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 ~ λευγαλέῳ) 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.

\textbf{1.2. ‘Lemnian action’ (633-639).}

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

\textsuperscript{174} Griffin 1986: 48.

\textsuperscript{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.
activity of scanning the sea for Thracians becomes the specific moment of sighting the Argo’s approach. It prompts an instant and unanimous action (αὐτίκα πασσυδίη, 634). The women arm and head towards the threat. The backstory has shifted the reader’s prior position. Its conclusion does not return the reader to the Argo who instead watches the Lemnian women and sees through their eyes the horizon populated by the incoming ship. However, whereas the women see raiders, the reader privileged to the surrounding narrative can correct the women’s supposition. Two sets of narratees watch the same horizon with different expectations. The Lemnian women perceive the Thracians that they’ve been anticipating, whereas the reader sees the ship he was smuggled away from when the narrator stepped to shore and back in time (vv.608-9, from scene to summary and now back to scene).

633-6: The viewpoint has been reversed but the temporal point of re-entry into the action is precise: εἰρεσίη κραναὶν Σιντηίδα Λῆμνον ἱκόντο (608) – ἐγγύθι νῆσου ἐρεσισμένην ἱδον Ἀργώ (633). What follows is wonderfully confused. Every single woman rushes from Myrine (the city named v.604 entering the story) to the shore. Their response time is foregrounded at the beginning of v.634, αὐτίκα. The reader progressing through the episode is left with the distinct impression that the Argonauts’ arrival has caused these women to do everything at pace – once they gather in assembly Hypsipyle speaks immediately (αὐτίκ’, 656) and states she’ll speed her messenger Iphinoe on her way (See 697-701n.). Frantic, their first action is to ‘Homer up’. They

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.’

177 On summary and scene, see e.g. de Jong 2014: 93.
don’t grab whatever is available and rush to ward off a perceived Thracian raid but don their bronze armour (δήια τεύχεα δῦσαι) and advance (ἐς αἰγιαλὸν προχέοντο, 635).

For a semantic arming parallel cf. e.g. ἀλλ’ ἤγε νῦν ἔτιμειν, Ἀρήΐα τεύχεα δύο, (II. 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 πεδίον προχέοντο (II. 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 (II. 2.462) and to the flies that buzz around the farmer’s milk-pails (II. 2.469-71) but for a specific Example-Model, Mooney cites II. 22.460: Andromache rushes from her hall μαίναδι ὀγκ.\(^{179}\)

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 (II. 22.440-1). And yet, like Andromache’s, theirs is a female response.\(^{180}\) They act like men but react like Maenads.

ὁμοβόρος ‘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 Cervantick 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, ἢ μαίνας ὀρος κάτα δάσκιον ὄλμη, h.Cer 386.

\(^{181}\) Returning again to the monster, cf. ὀμοβορός τ’ ὀρειβάτης | Κύκλωψ, ‘the flesh-eating, mountain-ranging Cyclops’ (E. Tr. 436-7).
unravelled. Are they deluded? At the first sign of trouble, their male mirage is dissolving.

636-7: φὰν γάρ τιν, ‘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, τιν.

Similarly, in the parallel situation on Cyzicus (vv.1023-4) the Doliones do attack the Argonauts because they do not recognise them: ἀλλὰ τιν ἄνδρῶν | Μακριέων ἐἴσαυτο Πελαγικόν Ἀρεα 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 νυκτί, 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).
The only mortal characters identified mentioned in the episode thus far are juxta posed, ‘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’ Ἑμα τῇ σε, 637) and not, defined by a patronymic and in relation to armour inherited from a father. The backstory singled her out from the collective (Οἴ η 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 (II. 2.477-83). 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 (II. 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. 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. Though, lest we get carried away, Phinney Jr.

185 See esp. II. 2.482-3: οὖν ζηρ’ Ἀτρέδην θῆκε Ζεὺς ἠματί κεῖνοι ἐκπρεπ᾽ ἐν πολλοῖς.
186 See ibid. n.1.
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 ἀμηχανία 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

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

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, ὡς ὁἱμνῆστιν πόρε πάντων ἀφθιτον (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’ (II. 2.485-6) which is followed by the ‘many mouths’ motif (II. 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 ἔγ wol ... μυθησοίμην (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 (σκήπτρον
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, ὃ λαοὶ τ' ἐπιτετράφαται καὶ τόσσα μέμηλε. Upon waking, Agamemnon prepared to call an assembly and took up his sceptre, ἐλετο δὲ σκῆπτρον πατρώϊον ἄφθιτον αἰσί, 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, μνήστις 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). 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 εἰδῶς (II. 24.88) and when Achilles famously speaks of his fate should he stay at Troy, ὀλέτο μέν μοι νόστος, ὀτὸρ κλέος ἄφθιτον ἔσται (II. 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, ὦ ὑμὰς ἐκλείσε γε σὺν ὄθνειμοι γυναιξὶν ἐσσόμεθ᾽ ὡδ᾽ ἐπὶ δηρόν ἐλιμένοι (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 κλέος, 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?’ 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 μνηστιν 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 ἄμημιν ἀείδειν (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 τῆλοκ κεῖν ἀποτελάγξειν ἀοιδής (1.1220), on which Morrison comments, ‘This stress on the ἀοιδή (‘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 τί μοι ταύτα περὶ δρύν 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 πρός ἄλλοδαπάν | ἄκραν ἐμὸν πλόον παραμείβεις;

Hesiodic epiphany on Helicon, as a symbol of his new calling the Muses give Hesiod a staff: καὶ μοι σκῆπτρον ἐδὸν δάφνις ἐριθηλέος ὡζον | δρέψαι, θηητόν- ἐνέπνευον δέ μοι αὐδήν | θέστιν, 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 parenthood (τὰς ἐν Πιερήι Κρονίδῃ τέκε πατρὶ μιγεῖσα | 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

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).
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 ἱόντας (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 ὁς τις στόλου ἰγεμονεύει (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.

I.4. ‘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 Polyxoe 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 Polyxoe suggests and what is agreed upon so enthusiastically is a new beginning. The covert Theran 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.  

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 ξείνε (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 [Hysipyle] 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*).  

---

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 modes 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: οὔδε ἂρ’ Ὀδυσσόμαι μεγαλῆτορα ἐνδον ἐτέμεν*, 81.
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 (ἄτρεκέως γνώσι, 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 κακή (661) precedes the subject, which is suspended in enjambment: βάξις (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 ἐργον, 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 [Ἄλλα ἄνε μοι τόδε εἴπε καὶ ἄτρεκέως κατάλεξον] shows how readily διηνεκέως and ἄτρεκέως, “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 ἐσσομένοις πυθέσθαι (II. 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 δίκᾳ τε μὴ κεκινδυνεμένον (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 κακή 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 (οὐδὲ τι πάμπαν | θυμηδὲς καὶ τοῖσι τὸ γ’ ἐσσεται) 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 ὁς τῆσδε γ’ ἀμείνονα μὴν ἐνίστοι, II. 14.107-8. There Diomedes [Polyxo]

205 Other instances of great/terrible deeds include e.g. δος δὲ πάλιν ἐπὶ νήσας ἑκλεῖς ἀφικέσθαι | ῥέξαντας μέγα ἔργον, ὅ κε Τρώωσι μελήσῃ (II. 10. 281-2 Odysseus invokes Athena’s assistance in the slaughter of Thracians), οἱ μέγα ἔργον ἐρέξαν ἀσωθαλήσαν κοκήσσι (Od. 24.458 Halitherses rebukes the Ithacans for bringing the slaughter upon themselves), ἣ μέγα ἔργον ἐρέξεν αἰδρεῖσα νόσιο | γημαμένη ὑιί (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, ἐπος 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 (ἀρείον ἐπος) and Hypsipyle will spin a better story to make it work and secure their future (and in so doing secure the future of the Theran 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

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 (ἀρουραι | 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, ὡς αὐτῇ περ ἐφανδάνει Ὑψιπυλείῃ, πέμπομεν ξείνοισιν, ἐπεὶ καὶ ἄρειον ὑπάσσαι. ὧμμιι γε μὴν τὶς μῆτις ἐπαυρέσθαι βιότοιο, αἵ κεν ἐπιβρισὶ Θρῆιξ στρατὸς ἥ τὶς ἄλλος δυσμενέων, ἃ τε πολλὰ μετ’ ἀνθρώποισι πέλονται, ὡς καὶ γυνὶν ὃδ’ ὅμιλος ἀνιστῶς ἐφικάνει; 675
Εἴ δὲ τὸ μὲν μακάρων τὶς ἀποτρέποι, ἀλλὰ δ’ ὑπόσσῳ μυρία δηιοτῆτος ὑπέρτερα πήματα μὴνει. Εὕρετ’ ἄν δὴ γεραρὰ μὲν ἀποφθινύθουσι γυναῖκες, κουρότεραι δ’ ἄγονοι στυγερὸν ποτὶ γῆρας ἱκισθε, πῶς τῆμος βώσεσθαι, δυσάμμοροι; Ὅε βαθείαις αὐτόματοι βῶς ὑμῖν ἐνιζευχθέντες ἀρούραις γειοτόμον νειοδιειρύσσουσι ἀροτρον, καὶ πρόκα τελλομένου ἐτεος στάχυν ἀμήσονται; Α.Ρ. 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). It is very evident what these women want and that these men are a gift not to be turned away.

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

iii. Hypsipyle’s Decision (697-708)

697-701: There is an emphasis on concord. Polyxo’s speech, the narrator informs us,
delights the women (εὔαδε γάρ σφι | μῦθος, 697-8) and Hypsipyle corroborates this (πάσησιν ἐφανδάνει ἦδε 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, ὦς ἔφαθ’, οἱ δ’ ἁρα τοῦ μάλα μὲν κλύον ἦδε πίθοντο (II. 14.133). In the Iliadic parallel, the men make no reply but simply act upon Diomedes’ suggestion. 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.

汫ὴ κεν μετὰ νῆα καὶ ἃγγελον 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 (ὦ κα 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 (εὔαδε γάρ σφι | μῦθος, 697-8 – πάντεσσι δ’ ἐναίσιμος ἦνδανε μῦθος, 717) and respond by dispatching Jason quickly (ὦ κα, 719).

210 Cf. e.g. ὦς Τρώων ἀλαλητός ἀνὰ στρατῶν εὐρόν ὀρώρει: ἐν γάρ πάντων ἔν ὧμος θρόος οὐδ’ ἵνα 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).
Hypsipyle asks for the man ὅστις στόλου ἰγεμονεύει, 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, δῆμοι 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 (Ὑψιπύλην δ᾽ ἴσαντο... 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 (παρθενικάς 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.).

L.5. ‘Iphinoe’s Message’ (709-720).

709-11: ὦ καὶ τούς γε (710) is picked up by ὦ καὶ τόν 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. ‘Ὑπιπύλη, καλέειν νηὸς πρόμον, ὡς ὡς ὡς ὡς ὡς (713) echoes but does not repeat τοῦδ’ ἄνερος ἀντιώσα | ἢμετερόν δε μολεῖν ὃς τις στόλου ἤγειμονεύει

---

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).

αὕτικα 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. ὅκα 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 (ἐὖος 697) the Lemnian women, the same proposal as reported by Iphinoe has a similar effect on the men, it is favourable to all - πάντεσι δ’ ἐναίσμος ἱνδανε 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 ἐἰσαντο (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 (II. 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. ὃς φάτο, τοῖς δὲ πάσιν ἐαρότα 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 (Ὑψιπύλην ~ Ὑψιπύλη, same metrical position) to death of father (καταφθιμένοι Θόαντος) to only daughter (τηλυγέτην γεγαυῖαν ~ Κούρη, both at beginning of line). τηλυγέτος ‘darling child’ is here equivalent to μονογενής ‘only child’, (so Σ ad 1.718-9). Then Ἀνασσέμεν occupies the same sedes as Θοαντιάς - in the report of their supposition, her rule 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 ὦ καὶ δὲ τὸν γε | πέμπον ἵμεν, (719-20). Heracles will ape the narrator’s manner when addressing the men, τὸν δ’ ἐνὶ λέκτροις | Ὑψιπύλης εἰσῆ 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. 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 παῖδα τε τηλυγέτην, of Hermione, the only daughter of Helen, II. 3.175.
215 Cf. Hypsipyle tells him to go back to the ship and report, Ἄλλη ἄγε νῦν ἐπὶ γῆς κιόνον ἐτάροισιν ἐνύστης | 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.’

Now, there was an urgency in Iphinoe’s message (ἀὐτίκα νῦν, 716) to which the Argonauts responded in kind (ὦ κα, 719) and Jason is not sluggish. His preparations involve only two actions, he puts on his cloak (αὔτὰρ ὀγ’ ἀμφ’ ὀμοιοὶ θεῶς Τριτωνίδος ἔργον, | διπλάκα πορφυρὲη περονήσατο, 721-2) and picks up his spear (Δεξιτερῇ δ’ ἔλεν ἔγχος ἑκῆβόλον, 769). Then he sets off in epic style (Βῆ ὃν ἤμεναι 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 dei 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 (τὸν ποτὲ οἱ Κινύρης δῶκε ξεινίηιον ἐῖναι, *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 (ἐἵλετο δ᾽ ἄλκιμα δοῦρε δύω, *Il*. 11.43-44).²¹８

Jason puts on his cloak as Agamemnon does his sword (Αὐτὰρ ὃ γ’ ἀμφ’ ὤμοισι, θεᾶς Ἡπωνίδος ἔργον, | διπλάκα πορφυρεὶν περονῆσατο, 721-2) and mirrors the final action in taking up his spear, to which is attached the guest-gift analepsis (Δεξιτέρῇ δ’ ἔλεν ἔγχος ἐκηβόλον, ὃ ῥ’ Ἀταλάντη | Μαινάλῳ ἐν ποτὲ οἱ ξεινήιον ἐγγυάξε, 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 ~ ὃ 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 (οἶκα τις αὐτῇ | ἀνθρώπων πολέων θαυμάσσεται, ὃς κεν ἵδηται, *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.
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.’

‘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.’

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 (εὔαδε 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 ἤνδανε 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.’ 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)

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

---

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). 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.

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, δίπλακα 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 (ἐθέν εἶνεκ’, 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 Τριτω-, 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 (II. 3.47-9) – gathering comrades, mixing with foreigners, bringing back a woman from a faraway land – has obvious parallels with the quest and Medea. And within the same passage Paris’ good looks are noted (II. 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 ecphralsis (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 ecphralsis ‘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.’

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.
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 ἠμμένοι ἔργῳ, 730
Ζηνὶ κεραυνῶν ἀνακτι πονεύμενοι· ὃς τόσον ἦδη
παμφαίνον ἐτέτυκτο, μὴς δ’ ἐτι δεύτεροι μούνον ἀκτίνος· τὴν οἱ γε σιδηρείς ἐλάσσον
σφυρήσιν, μαλερῶν πυρὸς ξείουσαν ἀντήμην.
Ἐν δ’ ἔσαν Ἀντιόπης Ἀσσωπίδος ὕεε δοιῶ,
Ἀμφίων καὶ Ζῆθος, Ἀπύργωτος δ’ ἐτι Θῆβη
κεῖτο πέλας, τῆς οἱ γε νέον βάλλοντο δομαῖς
ἐπωμαντὸν ἠέρταζεν ὡρος ἠλιβάτιο κάρη, μογέοντι ἑοικώς· 735
Ἀμφίων δ’ ἐτι οἱ χρυσείς φόρμιγγι λιγαίνων
ἡμε, δις τόση δὲ μετ’ ἵχνια νίσετο πέτρη.
Ἀ.Ρ. 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.

Ἑξείης δ’ ἰσκιτο βαθυπλόκαιος Κυθέρεια
Ἅρεος ὀχμάζουσα θοῦν σάκος· ἐκ δὲ οἱ ὄμοι
πῆχυν ἐπὶ σκαίον ἐνοχὴ κεχάλαστο χιτῶνος
νέρθε παρὲκ μαζοῖο· τὸ δ’ ἀντίον ἀτρεκῆς αὐτῶς
χαλκεὴ δείκηλον ἐν ἀστίδι φαίνετ’ ἰδέσθαι.
A.R. 1.742-46

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 ekphrasis 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 ekphrasis 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’ (πάρος, 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). 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

---

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 (καὶ σφισὶ κυανέοιο δὲ ἕρος ὀμματα θέλγει |καλὸν ἐρευθόμενος, 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, ἀπεκές (745). Hypsipyle’s fear was that the men come to know them exactly (ἀπεκέως, 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 ἐσκεν λάσιος νομός· ἀμφὶ δὲ βουσὶ Τηλεβόαι μάρναντο καὶ υἱὲς Ἡλεκτρύωνος, οἱ μὲν ἀμφότεροι, ἀτὰρ οἱ γ’ ἐθέλοντες ἀμέσως, λισταὶ Τάφιοι· τὸν δ’ αἴματι δεύτερο λειμών ἔρσης, πολεῖς δ’ ὀλίγους βιώντο νομίμας. Ἐν δὲ δύω δίφροι πεπονήσατο δηρίωντε. Καὶ τὸν μὲν προσπάροιθε Πέλοψ ἠθύνε τινάσσων ἤνια, σὺν δὲ οἱ ἐσκε παραιβάτις Ἡπποδάμεια. Τοῦ δὲ μεταδρομάδην ἐπὶ Μυρτίλος ἤλασεν ἵππους· σὺν τῷ δ’ Οἰνόμαος, προτενὲς δόρυ χειρὶ μεμαρπώς, ἅξιονος ἐν πλήμνῃ παρακλιόντας ἁγνυμένοι πιπτεν, ἐπεσυμφέρονες Πελοπήια νότα δαίξαι. Ἐν καὶ Ἀπόλλων Φοίβος ὀιστεύων ἐτέτυκτο, βοῦπαις, οὔ πολλὸς, ἡν ἐρύοντα καλύπτρῃς μητέρα θαρσαλέως Τιτυν μέγαν, ὥν ῥ’ ἐτεκέν γε δι’ Ἕλαρη, θῆρυεν δὲ καὶ ἦν ἐλοχεύσατο Γαία.

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 (II. 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 βουσίν | Τηλεβόαι μάρναντο καὶ υἱὲς Ἡλεκτρύωνος (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
Persians (including the abducted Medea).

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.

760-1: Lawall (1966: 156) sees Apollo depicted as dispenser of Olympian justice. The imagery, Tityos attempting to abduct/rape Leto, is again violent. The image of Apollo as protective/avenging son contrasts with Hypsipyle’s impending account of the behaviour of the Lemnian male children, the sons who no longer care if their mothers are insulted, vv.816-7.

763-7: The scene with Phrixos and the ram is presented as so realistic as to encourage the viewer to imagine the figures might animate. It deceives the heart (ψεύδοιό τε θυμόν, 765) and instils longing (ὅτευ δηρόν περ ἐπ’ ἐλπίδι θηήσαιο, 767). Jason wearing the cloak has this effect on the Lemnian women. He is like the star that beguiles the maiden’s gaze, v.777.

ii. Jason’s Spear (768-773)

Jason takes up the spear that Atalanta gave him. The accompanying external narratorial analepsis provides an explanation of why Atalanta is not on this voyage: Jason’s fear of the difficult rivalries love can cause ἀργαλέας ἔριδας φιλότητος ἐκητή (773, the Eris of Eros).
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. 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 οὐλόμεναί τ’ ἐρίδες (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)


228 Άταλάντη Σχοινέως is amongst the list of named Argonauts in Apollod. 1.9.16.
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 ὀμμάτα θέλγει, (777). The red star (καλὸν ἔρευθόμενος, 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). ἔρευθος 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.’

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.

Καὶ ρ’ ὅτε δὴ πυλέων τε καὶ ἄστεος ἐντὸς ἐβήσαν, δημότεραι μὲν ὄπισθεν ἐπεκλονέοντο γυναῖκες

γηθόσυναι ξείνῳ· ὣ δὲ ἐπὶ χθονὸς ὀμματ᾽ ἐρείσας νίσετ’ ἀπηλεγέως, ὄφρ’ ἀγλαὰ δώμαθ’ ἴκανεν
 ὃς προφανέντι θεράπναι δικλίδας, εὐτύκτοισιν ἀρηρεμένας σανίδεσσιν· ἔνθα μὶν Ἰφινόῃ κλισμῷ ἐπὶ παρφανῶντι ἐσσυμένως καλῆς διὰ παστάδος ἕστεν ἁγουσα ἀντία δεσποίνης. Ἡ δ’ ἐγκλιδὸν ὅσσε βαλοῦσα παρθενικὰς ἐρύθηνε παρηίδας· ἔμπα δὲ τὸν γε αἰδομένῃ 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 Achillēs 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 ἐἴλεν 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 Sirìus (a darker and closer match for Achillēs) ὃς ὅτι τοι καλὸς μὲν ἀρίζηλος τ’ ἐσιδέρθαι,
In spite of this flustering, she collects herself and speaks μύθοισι αἱμυλίοισιν (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, αἱμυλίοισι 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 αἱμυλίοισιν (A.R. 3.51). In Colchis, Medea will be won by a combination of Jason’s beauty and beguiling words, θυμός ὁμοὶς μορφῇ τε καὶ αἱμυλίοισι 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

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?).

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 Hypsiple 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. Willecock 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 Theran narrative.

i. A Royal Revision (793-833)

“Ξεῖνε, τή μίμοντες ἐπὶ χρόνον ἔκτοθι πῦργων ἦσθ’ αὖτως, ἐπεῖ οὐ μὲν ὑπ’ ἄνδράσι ναιέται ἄστυ, ἀλλὰ Θηρικῆς ἐπινάστηοι ἤπειροι πυροφόρους ἄροσι γύας; Κακότητα δὲ πᾶςαν ἐξερέω νημετές, ἵν’ εὐ γνῶιτε καὶ αὐτοί. έπε Θόας ἀστοίς πατήρ ἐμὶ ἐμβασίλευε, τινίκα Θηρικήν οἶ τ’ ἀντία ναιετάουσι δήμου ἀπορνύμεναι λαοὶ πέρθεσκον ἑναύλους εκ νηῶν, αὐτής δ’ ἀπείρονα ληίδα κούραις δεύρ’ ἄγον. Οὐλομένης δὲ θέας πορσύνετο μήνις Κύπριδος, ἢ τέ σφιν θυμοφθόρον ἐμβαλεν ἄτην-Α.Ρ. 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 πῦργων | μίμονεν, 659-60) into a question to the man.234 Already she is adapting. With ἔπει (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 | ἐξερέω, 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 Ὄημικῆς 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 ἄμφεν’ εὐνή (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 ὄρωσι 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, Ὄημικῆς ἐπινάστιοι ἵππεῖροι (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 ἔξερεω 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’ εὑρείη τα καὶ αὐτοὶ, 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 cognou (5).
unmistakable intertext for all readers.

μὴν ἔν... Ἀχιλῆς | οὐλομένη (II. 1.1-2) ... Διὸς δ᾽ ἔτελείτο βουλή (II. 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. τὶς τ’ ὁρὸς σφωνε θεῶν (II. 1.8) asked the Homeric narrator, before announcing Δητοὺς καὶ Διὸς νιός (II. 1.9), Apollo. Hypsipyle knows the source of the Lemnian misfortune. Or infers it based on the nature of what occurred: Οὐλομένης δὲ θεᾶς παροσύνετο μὴνις | 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 τίς θεῶς (820) but here she names μὴνις is the reading adopted by Vian, 240 but the alternative reading μὴτις 241 is still close enough I believe to support the intertext. Against its additional inclusion of the vocabulary of δόλος (and μὴτις evident) is traded the closer correspondence of lexis and Hypsipyle’s revision (and improvement) of the narrator’s χόλος αἰνός (614).

The βουλή Διὸς 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 (ἐξείπης τε καὶ ἔς τέλος, 2.314). He advises they look to Aphrodite’s wily assistance (δολόσεσσαν ἄρωγήν, 2.423) for the glorious accomplishment of their tasks (κλυτὰ πείρατα...ἄεθλων, 2.424) and when we come to the poem’s close, we find that he has accurately predicted the narrative’s end, ἣδη γὰρ ἐπὶ κλυτὰ πείρασθ’ ἱκάνω | 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.: μὴτις 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 μήτις, 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 (μήτις, 1.664) before asking who could devise a better one (ἀρετὸν ἔπος μητίσεται ἄλλη, 665) and when Polyxo did, Hypsipyle fabricates her way to its success (see 664-6n. & 697-701n.). μήτις 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 - μήτις in action.243

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.
804-9: δὴ γὰρ - Hypsipyle begins her explanation in the same manner as the narrator (δὴ γὰρ, 609) but revises certain elements of his selective account. She repeats his κουριδίας γυναίκας (609) adding the evaluation ματή ἐξαντες. In place of the harsh lust that they had for their captured women (611) she supplies the verb παρίαυον (806), repeating the narrator’s ληειάδεσσι (612) but qualifying with δορικτήταις.

For C., her amendments point to a specific intertext. παρίαυσίω occurs only here in the Argonautica and only once in Homer at Il. 9.326-7, τῇ παριαύσιον | τερπέσθω (Achilles’ reply to Odysseus). 244 δορίκτητος occurs only here in the text, though in the same intertext C. is already consulting, he finds ὠς καὶ ἔγῳ 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 Διὸς, 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᾽ Ἐρως, μέγα πτήμα, μέγα στύγος ἀνθρώποισιν, ἐκ σέθεν οὐλόμεναι τ᾽ ἐριδες στοναχαί τε γόοι τε

244 It does occur in tmesis e.g Il. 9.470, Od. 14.21.
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’ ἀνδρόσειν (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).

ἀδμήτες κοῦραι, χηραί τ’ ἐπὶ τῆσι | μητέρες (810-11). Her vocabulary recalls Polyxo’s advice in the assembly and the untamed women besides her (παρθενικαὶ ἀδμήτες 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 ἀμὴν ὑπὲρβιον 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 ήπι, 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.

827-33: For C. an echo of Nausicaa’s wish to her handmaidens that a man like Odysseus would be her husband, αἳ γὰρ ἔμοι τοιόσοδε πόεσις κεκλημένος εἶ | ἐνθάδε ναυστάων, καὶ οἶ ἄδοι αὐτόθι μιμεῖν (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 σίμουλίοισιν, 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 (άμαλδύνουσα, 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.

άμαλδύνουσα φόνου τέλος is to be explained as ‘glossing the coming to pass of the slaughter.’ In the Iliad άμαλδύνω is only ever ‘destroy.’ Of its three occurrences, two are in the same passage and offer another intertext for C. here. At II. 12.18 and 32, άμαλδύναι and άμαλδύνας 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’ θυμήδεος (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 θυμηδες), which she does (ἔπος θυμηδες, 714). 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 θυμηδες, 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, ἐξερέω 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 (ἀλλὰ με λυγροὶ ἐπισπέρχουσιν ἄθλοι,


247 Following Vian. θυμήρες ‘pleasing to the heart’ is the reading of Ω 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 (ἐγὼ γε μὲν ὄντος ὀδηγεῖτος, 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 (Δεξιτερῆς δ’ ἔλευς Ἑγχος, 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, ἐὰν 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 ὄρτο 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 μῦθους | ἰμετέρους (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, μῦθοισι… αἰμελίοισιν (792). There was also the μῦθος of Polyxo which pleased the Lemnian women (698). Iphinoe’s message was treated as an auspicious proposal, ἔνασιμος ἠνδαμεν 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) Ἄλλα τί μῦθους | Αἰθαλίδεω χρειό με διηνεκέως ἄγορευειν ~ μῦθον ὦτ’ ἤδη πάντα διηνεκέως ἄγόρευσεν (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.’ 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 κακή βίαξις (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 (ξεινήια, 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 γλυκὰν ἵμερον ὄροσεν (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. Vén. 2. 42, 53, 143). Its synonym πόθος will later occur.

qualified by γλυκύς when the Argonauts gaze at the fleece that serves as the marriage-bed of Jason and Medea: δαίε δ’ ἐν ὄφθαλμοῖς 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, Ἡφαίστοιο 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 Ἡφαίστοιο, 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:

εἰσαγ’ ἵμαν ἐς Λῆμνον, ἐυκτίμενον πτολείθρον, ἐὰν γαῖας τολύμα πολὺ φιλατή ἐστίν ἀπασέων (Od. 8.828-34) 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 (*II*. 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 is 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 οὕτις | ναίται μετόπισθ’εν ἄκηρατος ἄνδρασι Λήμνος, 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.\textsuperscript{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).\textsuperscript{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, συτίκα (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 ~ Ἡρῆς κυρίως κλητὸν ~ Ἡρακλέης (855, 859, 864).

\textsuperscript{255} A.D. Morrison \textit{Clio and Calliope}.
\textsuperscript{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 ἦμαρ ἄει ἐξ ἦματος ἦν | ναυτλίης, (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’ ἤδη νῦν μιμήσκεο πατρίδος αἴης, Od. 10. 472.

What follows (ἐμφύλιον σιμ’) 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. 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 παιδῶν ολοῦν 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.

But the irony goes on when with ὀνοσσάμενοι πολιτίδας (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 κουριάς 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 (II. 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). 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.’ What should be clear to the reader is that Heracles has no interest in ‘heterosexual diversions.’ His interest lies in the pursuit of kleos: Οὔ μᾶν εὐκλεεῖς γε σὺν ὁθείμοι γυναῖξι | ἐσσομεθ’ ὦδ’ ἐπὶ δηρὸν ἐξελεμένοι (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.


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), 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 πορέκ μεγάλοιο Δίος 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 κόας | 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’ ἐνι λέκτροις | Ὑψιπύλης εἰάτε 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 (ἀολίσσας ἑτάρους 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, οἶκαδέ τερ οὖν νησοὶ νεώμεθα, τόνδε δ’ εἶομεν | αὐτοῦ ἐνι 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 ὃς φάτο νεικείων Ἀγαμέμνονα ποιέοια λαῶν (Il. 2.243). Agamemnon was there and the manner of the speech is described with the same

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 Ἀχαιΐδες 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 (ὤμιλον, 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 ἤκηται (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 ἀλλὰ σῶτος ἁγορῆθεν 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 (κινυρόμεναί, 884) on the sudden and unwanted departure. And their last gesture, a
recorded speech act, contains another puzzle - ἀπῆμονα νόστον ὀπᾶσσαι (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 ἐλούσα 866, see 842-8n.) and elements of the speech which follows foreshadow those in Medea’s speech after she makes the same gesture (ἐιλέ τε χειρὸς | δἐξιτερῆς 3.1067-8). ‘Remember me’, says Hypsipyle, after taking his hand (μνώεο ... | Ὕψιπύλης 896-7), ‘Remember me’ says Medea (μνώεο δ’ ... | οὖνομι 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 Nausikaa 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 backdropped 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 (ἀλλὰ μὲ λυγροὶ ἐπιστήρχουσιν ἐθέλοι, 841), Hypsipyle’s rhetoric hints that the quest is more appealing to him than she is, ὡς ἐθέλεις καὶ τοι φίλον (890).

Again she demonstrates her capacity for emotional manipulation and reiterates her offer of the kingdom of her father, σκῆπτρα πατρὸς (891), with an open-ended invitation, should he desire δὴ ποτὲ νοστήσας ἐθέλης ὑφορρον ἱκέσθαι (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 δὲ μιν σφέτερον δόμον εἰσαγάγοιτο | κουριδίην παράκοιτιν). 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 (μνώεο, 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 - ἤν ἄρα δὴ μὲ θεοὶ δῶσοι 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 πάτρην μοι ἄλις Πελίαο ἔκητι | νοετάειν (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 λύσειν ἄĕθλῶν (903). The quest is presented to her as it was the first time, a trial imposed on him (ἄεθλω, 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 τοῦ 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: Ἡ 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, ἐνσχέρω ἐζόμενοι (912). ἐνσχέρω in a row is a hapax, a unique usage which should still call to mind the more usual ἐπισχέρω 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. 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: νῆς δ’ ἐκ Λήμνου παρέσταν οἴνον ἄγουσα | πολλαί, τάς προέκεν Ἰησονίδης Εὔνιος, | τόν ῥ’ ἔτεχ’ Ὑψιπύλη ὑπ’ Ἰησονι ποιμένι λαῶν (Il. 7. 467-9). Euneos, Jason’s son by the Lemnian queen, is a supplier of wine to the Achaeans. 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 ἁμιν 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 ὀργία κεῖνα | 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.’
Cyzicus (A.R. 1.922-1077).

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 ἀπωλόμεθ’ ἀφροδήσιν (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.
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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 ὁμών δύο, A.R. 1.945), and aggressive (ὑβρισταί τε καὶ ἀγριοί, 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

---

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 ‘Dolonian’ 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 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).

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.

C1. ‘To the Propontis’ (922-35).

922-35: The transitional passage through the Hellespont is rapid.\textsuperscript{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 ἰδίον | δυομένου, 924-5), by early morning (ἦρι, 929) they have navigated the Gulf of Saros and into (ἐννύξιοι, 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

\textsuperscript{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).\textsuperscript{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 \textit{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 \textit{Il}. 2.840). All these peoples and cities follow immediately on from Hector and the Trojans themselves at the head of the list, \textit{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). \textit{Σ} ad 1.922 notes \textit{Il}. 24.79, ἐνθορε μεῖλανι πόντῳ. Those black waters into which Iris sprang to give Zeus’ message to Thetis are in the same area, μεσσηγὺς δὲ Σάμου τε καὶ Ἰμβρον παιπαλόεσσης (\textit{Il.} 24.78). Epithet has become appellation but these are Homeric waters (on the understanding that Samos=Samothrace).\textsuperscript{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 \textit{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-

\textsuperscript{279} On the scholarly persona, see Morrison 2007: 273-80. See Introduction 2. \textit{Beginning and Beginnings}.  
\textsuperscript{280} On this identification in the \textit{Iliad}, see Macleod 1982: 97.
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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.
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, οἷπερ ἔνατον ἐν εὐρυχόρφ Υπερείη, ἀγχοῦ Δυνατῶν ἀνδρῶν ὑπερηνορεόντων (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 δὲ τις αἰπτεία Προποντίδος ἔνδοθι νῆσος, τυθόν ἀπὸ Φρυγίης πολυληίου ἤπειροι εἰς ἀλα κεκλιμένη ὄσον τ’ ἐπιμύρεται ισθμός, χέρσῳ ἐπιπρηνής καταειμένη ἐν δέ ὁι ἀκταί ἁμφίδυμοι· κεῖται δ’ ὑπὲρ ὕδατος Λίασηποίοι. Ἄρκτων μιν καλέουσιν Ὄρος περιναιετάοντες, 940 Λ.Ρ. 1.936-41

936-41: With the introductory formula "Ἔστι δὲ τις αἰπτεία... 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...'). 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).

The establishment of location ends on a puzzling note, 'Ἀρκτῶν μιν κολέουσιν Ὀρος περιναιετάοντες (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.

ii. Inhabitants

Καὶ τὸ μὲν ὑβρισταί τε καὶ ἄγριοι ἐνναέσκον Γιγενεές, μέγα θαῦμα περικτίνασθιν ἱδέσθαι· ἐξ γὰρ ἐκάστῳ χείρες ὑπέρβηοι ἴπτερον, αἱ μὲν ἀπὸ στὶμαρων ὠμοι δύο, ταὶ δ᾽ ὑπένερθεν τέσσαρες αἰνοτάτησιν ἐπὶ πλευρῆς ἀραρυμία.

Ἅθικον δ᾽ αὐτοῖο δολίον ὀμφενέμοντο ἄνέρες· ἐν δ᾽ ἦρος Αἰνίτης ὑιὸς ἄνασος Κύζικος ὁν κούρη διοῦ τέκεν Ἔυσσώροιο Αἰνίτη. Τοὺς δ᾽ οὗ τι, καὶ ἐκπαγλοῖ περ ἐόντες, Γιγενεές σίνοντο, Ποσειδάωνος ἄρωγή· τοῦ γὰρ ἐσαι τὰ πρώτα Δολίον ἐκγεγαώτες.

Ἀ.Ρ. 1.942-52

942-6: The narrator humorously begins his description of the inhabitants with a stock Odyssean phrase. Upon waking in Phaeacia, Odysseus speculates as to what kind of men inhabit the land, ἣ ρ᾽ οἴ τ᾽ ύβρισταί τε καὶ ἄγριοι οὐδὲ δίκαιοι, | ἣ φιλόξεινοι ἐπειδὴ οὐκ ἐσι πολισκάρθμον.
καὶ σφιν νόος ἑστὶ 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 ὑβρισταῖ 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, ὃ πότοι ἢ μέγα θαῦμα τὸ δ’ ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ὀρῶμαι (Il. 13.99, 15.286, 20.344, 21.54) and once in the Odyssey in the slight variant, ὃ πάτερ, ἢ μέγα θαῦμα τὸ δ’ 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 ἱδέσθαι (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 προσδέσθαι, θαῦμα δὲ καὶ παρεόντων ἄκούσαι (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.
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 ἰηρος (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, ὀ δὴ 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: ἰν ρό τε Πασιψάθη κούρη τέκεν Ἡλίοιο (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*, ἐκταιγλος 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.

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.

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 chiastic: 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 sêma, 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 sêma is moved inside a second sêma, the temple of Athena ‘Helper of Jason’ by these Ionian settlers, ἥ θέμις ἠν (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’ (II. 2.73), after which 9.33 (Diomedes to Ag.), 9.134 (Agamemnon speaks of

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 μιγῆσαι | ἐν δαί λευγαλέῃ, ἀλλὰ δέος ἵσχανε ἄνδρας (14.386-7), and subsequently in a comment on Apollo knocking the helmet from Patroclus before his death, πάρος γε μὲν ὦ θέμις ἤτεν (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.’

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 ἐννεσίῃσιν (956) is a curious phrase to associate with him. ἐννεσίῃσιν 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 (Hercules).

Now similar diction has been previously used of giving instructions, e.g. ὑποθημοσύνῃσιν 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 ἐννεσίῃσιν might not carry especial significance but does, I think, stand out for C. as a lexical choice not commonly used of

mortal. 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’ ἀμυδίς φιλότητι Δολίονες ἡδὲ καὶ αὐτὸς
Κύζικος ἀντήσαντες, ὅτε στόλον ἡδὲ γενέθλην
ἐκλυον οἳ τινες ἔιν, ἐυξείνως ἀρέσαντο·
καὶ σφας εἶρεσίη πέπιθον προτέρωσε κιόνας
ἀστεος ἐν λιμένι πρυμνήσια νήος ἀνάψαι. 965
Λ.Ρ. 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 ἐκλυον οἳ τινες ἔιν, 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.’\footnote{Levin 1971: 92.} 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.”\footnote{de Jong 2001: 17, see \textit{ibid.} : 21-3.} ‘Improper’ ‘visit’ scenes do occur in the Odyssey, \textit{e.g.} Circe drugs her guests (\textit{Od.} 10.314-7) and the Cyclops eats his (\textit{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 \textit{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 Argonatic 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).\footnote{Clauss (1993: 160 n.28) points out Vian’s objections to Levin in light of how such scenes play out in the \textit{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!}

Why do the Doliones need to know who these strangers are before extending hospitality according to \textit{xenia}?\footnote{For the answer, see below 969-71n.} 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.
The Doliones persuade (πέπιθον) 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. 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 Ardizzone 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 Ἐνθ’ (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 φιλότητι (961), ἐυξείνος (963) and later ἐυξείνοισι Δολίοσιν (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.\(^{304}\)

\[\text{Ἐνθ’ ο’ γ’ Ἐκβασίῳ βωμὸν θέσαν Ἀπόλλωνι εἰςάμενοι παρὰ θινα θυηπολίης τ’ ἐμελόντο. ΔῶIKE δ’ αὐτὸς ἄναξ λαρὸν μὲθύ δευουένοισι κῆλὰ θ’ ὁμοῦ δὴ γάρ οἱ ἔνθα φάτις, ἐὔτ’ ἄν ἰκωνται ἀνδρὸν ἠρώων θείος στόλος, αὐτίκα τὸν γε μείλιχον ἀντιάσαν μὴδὲ πτολέμοιο μέλεσθαι. \text{A.R. 1.966-71}}\]

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 σῆμα of

---

\(^{304}\) The pro-Doliones reader can look for support to the way in which the Argonauts greet the Mysians in the following episode φιλότητι κιόντας (1179) and are, as a result, welcomed ἐυξείνως (1179) and supplied ἢμα τε σφρί μηλὰ τε δευουένοις μὲθυ τ’ ἀσπετον ἐγγυάλξαν (1180-1). The pro-two harbour party should note Ἐνθα 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.
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 Αἰνήμως ὦ 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.’

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 μὲθυ (968) ~ ἢις καὶ μὲθυ λαρὸν (659). She was explicit in voicing her own motivation, μηδὲ ζύμε κατὰ χρείαν μεθέποντες | άτρεκέως γνώσι (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.

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 ἐυπλόκαμος, 976). 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. 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 (“Ἐσπετε νῦν μοι Μοῦσαι, II. 11.218), we are told the story of the Thracian youth Iphidamas, son of Antenor. He went to Troy with twelve ships, γῆμας δ’ ἐκ θαλάμων (11.227). The story is related just before he fights Agamemnon and dies.

ως δ’ μὲν αὐθί πεσὼν κοιμήσατο χάλκεον ὕππον

309 Ἐυπλόκαμος is common in Homer, cf. e.g. II. 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).
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 οἰκτρός ‘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 (II. 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 ἦν ἄκοιτις | ὀδίνων (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).
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, ἄντιπέρηθεν (976). Cyzicus gets his bride from the land opposite and so did the Lemnian men their Thracian concubines ἄντιπέρηθεν | Ὑπηκίπην (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 γάρ 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 ξείνον 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. 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 διφρὸν τε καὶ ἀνέρε δήμου ἄριστω
υἱὲ δύω Μέροπος Περκωσίου, ὃς περὶ πάντων

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

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.

182
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

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.\textsuperscript{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. \textit{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 Πελίσσω 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 \textit{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

\textsuperscript{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 (\textit{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).

985-88: The action begins at dawn, the next phase of the narrative introduced by the temporal marker Ἡοὶ. 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, the model was woven inside the model and the 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, λοχόωντες (*Od.* 4.847).

992-5: Heracles appears in this episode (albeit with his naming here in enjambment) subject to the same verb as in the Lemnian episode, Ἡρακλῆς ἄνευθεν· ὁ γὰρ παρὰ νη ἔλειπτο | αὐτὸς ἕκων παῦροι τε διακρινθέντες ἑταῖροι (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 ὑπλότεροι. 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 Laistrygonian 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 (II. 8.266). And Teucer again provides the model for an intertextual archer when following the short catalogue of his victims comes the summary πάντας ἐπασοστεροὺς πέλασε χθονί (II. 8.277) – τόξον, ἐπασοστεροὺς 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: ὅ δ’ ἐρεμνὴ νυκτὶ ἔοικός, | γυμνὸν τόξον ἔχουν καὶ ἐπὶ νευρῆφιν όιστόν, | δεινὸν παπταίνων, σιέι βολέοντι ἔοικός (Od. 11. 606-8). ἀψα (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 γὰρ που): it was likely a test for Heracles designed by Hera. The phrase σιένα 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: ἰν θρέψε θεὰ λευκόλενος Ἡρη | ἀπλητόν κοτέουσα βίν Ηρακληεί (Hes. Th. 314-5 ‘the Hydra’), τὸν ρ’ Ἰπ 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 (’Ἡρη Διὸς παράκοιτις ~ ’Ἡρη, Ζηνὸς ἀκοιτις). The motivation is left until last, suspended until

323 Cf. παλιντονος commonly used of bows (Il. 15.443, 10.459, Od. 21.11), also Hdt. 7.69 describing the bows used by the Arabsians. For τανύω, ‘stringing’ a bow cf. most famously, Odysseus, ῥηδίως δ᾿ ἐτάνυσε 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 Pl. N. 1. The lexical choice for wild creature there being κνώδαλον, 51).
line end. It is succinct and finds a parallel in Callimachus, Ἡρης ἐνεσίησιν, ἄθλιον Ἡρωκλῆι (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). 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 ἀνελθήσαν σκοπήν 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 feroxem 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. 188
σκοπιήν ἐς παταλόεσσαν ἀνελθὼν (Od. 10.97).

ἳρως ἀρήμοι (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, ἰρως Πρωτεσίλαος ἀρήμοι (II. 2.708). Perhaps there is a suggestion in the echo that the Argonauts are too keen for the slaughter. 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 ὀξέὶ δουρί (Il. 5.238, Pandarus), δεδεγμένος ἕγχει (Il. 15.745, Ajax) and τόξοις 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.

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 are cut down (as Talos’ demise is described at 4.1682f.) 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 μακρὰ (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. Αἰγισθὸς ὀπὸς δρῦν ὑλοτόμοι | σχίζουσι κάρα φονίο πελέκει (S. El. 98-99, Electra describing Agamemnon’s murder).
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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, ναυτηγικὴ δὲ διὰ τὴν κάμψιν ἐνικμοτέρα 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 (ἀμφο ἀμι οἰωνοῖσι καὶ ἱχθύσι 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 Τρῶς, αὐτοῖς δὲ ἐλώρια τεῦχε κύνεσσιν τοὺς τάσσι (Il. 1.4-5), though employing κύρμα rather than the proem’s ἐλώρια (they are sometimes found together, e.g. ἔλθορ 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: θρόσκοις τις κατὰ κῦμα μέλαιναν φρίχ’, ὑπατζεὶ καὶ ἱχθύς, ὡς κε φάγῃς 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 (ἔτειρ 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 C.f. ἰχθύς μὲν καὶ ἥροι καὶ οἰωνοῖς πετεῖοις ἔσθεμεν ἀλληλοὺς, ἐπεὶ οὐ δίκη ἐστὶ μετ’ αὐτοῖς (Hes. WD 277-8) & καὶ τὴν μὲν φῶκην καὶ ἱχθύσι κύρμα γενέσθαι (Od. 15.480. Eumaeus recounts the fate of the Sidonian woman).
C6. ‘Battle with the Doliones’ (1012-52).

i. Return to Cyzicus

"Ἡρως δ', ότε δή σφιν ἀταρβής ἔπλετ' ἄεθλος, δή τότε πείσματα νησὸς ἐπὶ πνοιῆς ἀνέμιοι λυσάμενοι προτέρωσε διεξ ἄλος οἴδιμα νέοντο. Ἡ δ' ἐθεὶν λαϊφεσθε πανήμερος· οὐ μὲν ἱοῦσιν νυκτὸς ἐπὶ ῥηπὶ μὲνεν ἐμίπεδον, ἀλλὰ θύελλα ἀντίαὶ ἀρτάγδην ὑπὸκεὶ φέρον, ὡφρ' ἐπέλασσαν αὐτὶς ἔυξείνοις Δολίσιν. Ἐκ δ' ἀρ' ἐβήσαν αὐτονυχὶ· ἱερὴ δὲ φατίζεται ἦδ' ἐπὶ Πέτρῃ ἦ πέρι πείσματα νησὸς ἐπεσούμενοι ἐβάλοντο. Οὐδὲ τις αὐτὴν νήσον ἐπιφραδέως ἐνόησεν ἐμμεναί· οὐδ' ὑπὸ νυκτὶ Δολίνοις ἄψ ἀνιόντας ἡρως νημερτῆς ἐπῆσαν· ἀλλὰ που ἄνδρῶν Μακρύδων εἰςαντὸ Πελασγικὸν Ἀρεὰ κέλσαι· τὸ καὶ τεύχεα δύντες ἐπὶ σφίσι χεῖρας ἀειραν.

1015 Ἡδ' ἔθεεν λαῖφεσθε πανήμερος· οὐ μὲν ἱοῦσιν νυκτὸς ἐπὶ ῥηπὶ μὲνεν ἐμίπεδον, ἀλλὰ θύελλα ἀντίαὶ ἀρτάγδην ὑπὸκεὶ φέρον, ὡφρ' ἐπέλασσαν αὐτὶς ἔυξείνοις Δολίσιν. Ἐκ δ' ἀρ' ἐβήσαν αὐτονυχὶ· ἱερὴ δὲ φατίζεται ἦδ' ἐπὶ Πέτρῃ ἦ πέρι πείσματα νησὸς ἐπεσούμενοι ἐβάλοντο.

1020 Οὐδὲ τις αὐτὴν νήσον ἐπιφραδέως ἐνόησεν ἐμμεναί· οὐδ' ὑπὸ νυκτὶ Δολίνοις ἄψ ἀνιόντας ἡρως νημερτῆς ἐπῆσαν· ἀλλὰ που ἄνδρῶν Μακρύδων εἰςαντὸ Πελασγικὸν Ἀρεὰ κέλσαι· τὸ καὶ τεύχεα δύντες ἐπὶ σφίσι χεῖρας ἀειραν.

Α.Ρ.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 ἀνέμιοι (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 θύελλα ένταὶ ἀρτάγδην ὑπὸκεὶ φέρον· τοὺς δ' ἄψ ἀρτάγδης 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: ἐρρέ, ἐπεὶ ᾧρα θεοῖσιν ἀπεθάνεμον τὸ ἰκάνεις (Od. 10.75). Aeolus refused to help them, οὐ γὰρ μοι ἔμεις 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, ἐνξεῖνοσι Δολίοσι (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, οὐδε τις ἤμμι βροτὸν ἐπιμισγεται 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, αὐτονυχί νηῶν ἐπιβησέμεν ὡκειάων, II. 8.197. Here, the Argonauts do the opposite and disembark.

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. Οὐδὲ τις αὐτήν νῆσον ἐπιφροδέως 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. II. 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. τὸ καὶ τεύχεα δύντες ἐπὶ σφίσι χεῖρας ἁπάτην ~ δήμα τεύχεα δύσαι ἐς αἰγιαλὸν προχέοντο (635). The Dolionian arming mirrors the Lemnian arming, which was followed v.v.636-7 by a similar supposition to that which precedes the Dolionian preparations, φᾶν γάρ που ἱκάνειν | Ὑπερήκας.

---

\(^{331}\) ἐπιφροδέως ‘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 (Ἀμηχανίῃ δ’ ἔσχοντο, 638) has become in the second half of v.1025 a decisive clash of arms. 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’ ἐλασαν μελίας τε καὶ ἀσπίδας ἀλλήλοισιν, ὄξει ἰκελοὶ ριπῇ πυρός, ἢ τ’ ἐνι θάμνοις αὐαλέοισιν, πεσοῦσα κορύσσεται. Ἐν δε κυδοιμὸς δεῖνός τε ξαμενής τε Δολιονίῳ πέπεσε δήμῳ. οὐδ’ ὡ γε δημοτῖτος ὑπέρ μόρον αὐτὸς ἐμελλέν ἡκαδε υψωμίδις θαλάμους καὶ λέκτρον ἱκέσθαι· ἀλλὰ μιν Αἰσονίδης τετραμμένον ἴδις ἐδώ πλήξεν ἐπάτξασι στῆθος μέσον, ἀμφὶ δὲ δουρὶ ὅπερ έρραίσθη: ὁ δ’ ἐνι ψαμάθοις ἀλύσθη τοῦ γαρ θέμις οὐ ποτ’ ἀλύξαι. θνητοὶ καὶ πάντῃ ἐνὶ θαλάμῳ πεσεται ἐρκος· ὡς τὸν ὤιμενὸν που ἄδεικνος ἐκτοθέν ἀτης εἶναι ἀριστήρας αὐτῆ 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 (II. 4.446ff.). The simile (1027-8) is a variation of ὡς δ’ ὅτε πῦρ... , II. 11.155ff. (Agamemnon). Ἐν δὲ κυδοιμός (1028) ~ ἐν δὲ κυδοίμον, (II. 11.52, 538, ‘evil din of war’). This phrase also occurs in the description of the ambush on the Shield of Achilles, II. 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 (II. 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. 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. ἐν δ’ ὦχαδ’ ἱκάσθαι, II. 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’ ἀλύξαι | θνητοίσιν. 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.

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. αἱ κε θάνης καὶ πότμον ἀναπλήσῃς βιότοιο, Il. 4.170 (Agamemnon to Menelaus) where πότμον is the reading of Aristarchus and μοίραν the reading of MSS.

\(^{336}\) See the discussion of τοῖν γὰρ Πελίης φάτιν ἔκλυν, ὡς μιν ὀπίσσω | μοίρα μένει στυγερή (1.5-6). in Introduction 3.2 Narratology.
episode as motivated by a need to atone for the slaying of the Earthborn. 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

Πολείς δ’ ἐπαρηγόνες ἄλλοι
ἐκταθέν· Ἡρακλέης μὲν ἐνήρατο Τηλεκλήα
ηδὲ Μεγαβρόντην· Σφόδριν δ’ ἐνάριξεν Ἄκαστος·
Πηλεὺς δὲ Ζέλυν ἐιλεν ἄρηθοον τε Γέφυρον·
αὐτάρ ἐμπελίς Τελαμῶν Βασιλῆα κατέκτα·
τ’ ἰδας δ’ αὐ Προμέα, Κλυτίος δ’ ὤκινθον ἐπεφρεν,·
Τυνδαρίδαι δ’ ἁμψω Μεγαλοσσάκεα Φλογίον τε·
1040
Οἴνειδῆς δ’ ἐπὶ τούτοιν ἔλε θρασύν Ἰτυμονῆα·
ηδὲ καὶ Ἀρτακέα, πρόμον ἀνάρων· οὐς ἐτὶ πάντας·
ἐναέται τιμαῖς ἠρωίσι κυδαίνουσιν.
Α.Ρ. 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.

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

καὶ ποτὲ τις έπημει καὶ ὑψιγόνων ἀνθρώπων νη’ πολυκλήιδι πλέον ἐπὶ οἴνοπτα πόντον· ἀνδρὸς μὲν τόδε σήμα πάλαι κατατεθνητός, ὅν ποτ’ ἀριστεύοντα κατέκτανε φαίδιμος Ἑκτωρ. 90 ὃς ποτὲ τις ἑρέει· τὸ δ’ ἐμὸν κλέος οὐ 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 Dolonian 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’ ἐπὶ νῦν περ ἅγκεχυται τόδε σήμα καὶ ὑψιγόνων ιδέοθαι, 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.\textsuperscript{340}

Now Clauss, for example (following Hasluck 1910: 240 n.2), would have ten being from Dei[ll]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 Dolonian dead = the number of days detained by storm on the island.\textsuperscript{341} Whilst his reading of the return as enforced due to need for propitiation is plausible, I am sceptical of a further Dolonian motivation for Rhea’s anger.\textsuperscript{342} It hinges upon whether the adverse weather which arises to prevent them from leaving after the funeral, τρηχεῖαι ἀνηρθησαν ἁελλασ (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.’\textsuperscript{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

\textsuperscript{340} Goldhill 1991: 329. For his discussion on the scholarly debate over these names ibid.: 317-9, 328-9.
\textsuperscript{341} Clauss 1993: 166 n.38.
\textsuperscript{342} Clauss 1993: 166-7.
\textsuperscript{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.

Ω蔼 δ᾽ ἄλλοι εἰξαντες ύπέτρεσαν, ἵπτε κίρκους
ὥκυπτας ἀγεληδὸν ύποτρέσσωσι πέλεαι. 1050
 Erot ας δὲ πύλας ὀμάδω πέσον ἀθρόου· αὖςα δ᾽ ἀυτῆς
πλήτο πόλις στονόεντος ύποτροπη πολέμῳ.
Α.Ρ. 1.1049-52

1049-52: Lemnos too was filled with excited cries, ἐν δ᾽ ἄγορὴ πλήτο 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, ‘ἵπτε κίρκος...’, II. 22.139-42.

Andromache had led the women of Hector’s house in lamenting while he still
lived: οὐ γὰρ μιν ἔτ’ ἐφοντο ύποτροπον ἐκ πολέμοιο ἰξεσθαι, (II. 6.501-2). The
actions of Doliones and doves here are ύπετρέσσαν (1049) and ύποτρέσσωσι (1050),
just as Hector, following the simile, runs (τρέσε δ᾽ Ἑκτωρ, II. 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.

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).
ἀγκέχυται τόδε σήμα καὶ ὄψιγόνοισιν ἱδέσθαι. 
Α.Ρ. 1.1053-62

1053-6: ἥδθεν is more than a marker of time. In the night all was inference (Οὐδὲ τίς... ἐπιφραδέως ἐνόησεν, 1021), and misreading the situation led to misguided violence. ἥδθεν illuminates the text. Dawn brings first recognition and then a revision. The deadly and hopeless mistake is the focalisation of both parties (ᾆμφω 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.

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 ἵδεν μάλα πάντας ἐν αἴματι 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 Ἴείνους οὗχ ἄζεο σφ ἐνὶ σικφ | ἐσθέμεναι τῷ σε Ζεὺς τίσατο καὶ θεοί 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 Xeinios guide the fatal spear or was it solely the work of Jason Amēchanos?  

1057-62: The Argonauts thus fulfil the duties of *xeno* 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.’

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. 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.
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: ἵπτοι δὲ κατ’ αὐθι γόρον τυλλοντό 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 σῆμα: ‘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 σῆμα (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: σῆμα τὲ μοι χεῖμαι πολιής ἐπὶ θινὶ θαλάσσης, ἄνδρὸς δυστήνοιο, καὶ ἐσσομένοιοι 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 - ἐνεκτερέιξαν 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. 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 φθιμένοιο λέειπτο οὐ πόσιος μετόπισθε· κακῷ δ’ ἐπὶ κύντερον ἄλλο ἤνυσεν, ἁψαμένι βρόχον αὐχένι. Τὴν δὲ καὶ αὐταῖ 1065 Νῦμφαι ἀποφθιμένην ἄλοχιδες ωδύραντο· καὶ οἱ ἀπὸ βλεφάρων ὅσα δάκρυα χεύαν ἔραζε, πάντα τάγε κρήνην τεῦξαν θεά, ἵνα καλέουσι Κλείτην, δυστήνοιο περικλεὲς οὖνομα 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’ ἱστὸν ὑφαινε μυχῷ δόμοι ύψηλοιο | 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: ἀποφθιμένοι (Il. 18.89 Achilles of his death, 19.322, 19.337 Achilles of his father’s death and his own death), καταφθιμένοι (Il. 22.288 Hector of Achilles’ death, Od. 3.196 Nestor of Agamemnon’s death). φθιμένοι 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 καταφθιμένοι 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 σῆμα it occurs in Simonides: σῆμα καταφθιμένοι Μεγακλέος ἐντ’ ἀν ἱδομα (fr. 16.1 W.).
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 him. In her following speech she recalls her childhood; always it is ‘You’ and ‘I’ and their narrative is one, σοί 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. Ἀλόχος 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 Ἀλόχος (τοῦ δὲ καὶ ἀμφιδρυφῆς Ἀλόχος Φυλάκῃ ἐλέλειπτο, II. 2.700) and so too in lamentation Aegialeia, wife of Diomedes (II. 5.415). Paris refers to Helen as Ἀλόχος (II. 6.337) and so too is Hera Ἀλόχος of Zeus (21.512). But the one woman in the Iliad who is repeatedly Ἀλόχος and frequently Ἀλόχος φίλη is Andromache (by Hector, II. 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, κακῷ δ’ ἔτι
κύντερον ἄλλο | ἰνυσεν. The husband’s death is κακός and to evil she adds something ‘more dog-like.’

κύντερον too is character language, though not in this context. It was used by Zeus of Hera (ἐπεὶ οὔ σέο κύντερον ἄλλο, II. 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 (ἐμπαμένη βρόχον ~ ἐμπαμένη βρόχον αἰττύν, Od. 11.278). And as did Phaedra, βρόχον κρεμαστὸν ἀγχόνης ἀνήσατο, (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 λαιμὸν 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 νεόδμιτον νέκυν | ῥοϊζηδὸν ἐκβράσασα κύμβαχον δέμας, Lyc. Alexandra, 65-66), hanging (καὶ καταλαβοῦσα αὐτὸν νεκρὸν ἐαυτήν ἀνήρτησεν, Apollod. 3.155), or uncertain (πολλὰ κατολοφυραμένῃ 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… περικλεὲς οὖνομα’ that includes the coinage περικλεὲς ‘equivale all’attico κλεινόν e all’omerico περικλυτόν, e non si trova prima di A.,352 to which a further coinage in ὀλσηίδες ‘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 οὖνομα 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). ‘ἀλσηίδες’ recurs 4.1151 amongst the nymphs who attend the marriage of Jason and Medea (αἱ δέ ἐσαν ἐκ πεδίων ἀλσηίδες). Are these then likewise nymphs of the plain? That would place fountain besides mound and reunite 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.  

iii. A People Grieve

Αἰνότατον δὴ κεῖνο Δωλιονήσι γυναιξίν
ἀνδρᾶσι τ’ ἐκ Διὸς ἱμαρ ἐπήλυθεν· οὐδὲ γὰρ αὐτῶν
ἐτήλη τις πάσσασθαι ἐδητύος· Οὐδ’ ἐπὶ δηρὸν
ἐξ ἀχέων ἐργοιο μυληφάτου ἐμνώοντο,
ἀλλ’ αὐτῶς ἄφλεκτα διαξόρκηκαν ἔδοντες.
‘Ἐνθ’ ἐτι νῦν, εὐτ’ ἂν σφίν ἐτήσια χύτλα χέωνται
Κύζικον ἐνναίοντες Ἰάονες, ἐμπεδον αἰεὶ
πανδήμοιο μῦλης 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?’ If the reader pursues a Pelian Cyzicus reading, then Zeus Xeinios 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 τύμιμοι τε καὶ ὑστατον ἠματι τράδε | ἐν μεγάροις ‘Οδυσσῆς ἐλοίατο δαίτ’ ἐρατινήν, 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! 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.

Ἔνθ᾽ 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.

---
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