

Princeton/Stanford Working Papers in Classics

**Distant Landmarks: Homer and Hesiod**

Version 1.0

February 2012

Richard P. Martin

Stanford

Abstract: The techniques of the Hellenistic epic poem as seen from the perspective of archaic Greek poetry. A revised version of this essay will appear in the *Cambridge Companion to Apollonius* (edit J. Murray and C. Schroeder).

© [rpmartin@stanford.edu](mailto:rpmartin@stanford.edu)

The *Argonautica* demands to be read as a latter-day Homeric epic that constantly draws attention to un-Homeric and para-Homeric themes and techniques. Recreating the aesthetic tastes of Apollonius and his audience means that we must explore a more complex hermeneutic negotiation than the static notions of “imitation” or “playfulness,” “intertextuality” or “*emulatio*” can encompass.<sup>1</sup> Instead, it may help to imagine the poem dynamically miming what it celebrates--a voyage, a vessel, and a crew of characters. It forges through a sea of traditions, deftly sailing between the clashing rocks of Homer and Hesiod, sighting the smaller (at least to us) islands like Antimachus and the Cyclic epics, skirting the shores of drama and lyric, even stopping off at exotic prose genres. From every such landfall this *Argo*-like poem takes on a self-conscious awareness of its own simultaneous belatedness and innovation.

Consequently, the most important overarching technique in the poem is double vision: that is, the reader’s experience is enriched through being made constantly to observe similarities and contrasts, especially, although far from exclusively, with Homeric and Hesiodic verse, the poetic corpora that are the focus of this chapter.<sup>2</sup> Or, to continue the nautical metaphor: every landmark--speech expression, descriptive phrase, even prepositional use-- brings into view yet another, more distant, enabling the reader to get a sense of relative depth and distance, along the moving line of the literary horizon. The total effect of such calibrations makes one sense just how new the *Argonautica* is. This novelty can be analyzed in terms of two essential categories: the crafting of a particular narrative *voice*, and the manipulation of *expectation* by way of major and minor narrative components.

Before examining in brief many of the landmark types that went into this creation, as a sort of mariner’s guide to the epic, we must first pause to recollect how wide the literary prospect stretched for Apollonius and his audience, lest we rush into mapping limited one-to-one

---

<sup>1</sup> Within the ever-accumulating work on intertextuality in Classical literature, I have made most use of these key volumes that articulate and advance theory: Barchiesi (1984), Conte (1986), Bonanno (1990), Hinds (1998), Thomas (1999), Edmunds (2001), and Tsagalis (2008).

<sup>2</sup> Stephens (2000) examines a different and equally fertile sort of double vision involving Greek literary traditions and Egyptian realities in the Hellenistic period. Combining these perspectives perhaps we should speak of Apollonian “vision squared.”

correspondences between the poem and the full-scale archaic compositions that happen to survive to our era. The possibility must remain open that any apparent imitation or allusion was intended to evoke not primarily our *Iliad*, *Odyssey* or *Theogony* or *Homeric Hymns*, but some other significant poetic moment or monument now vanished. Apart from the works now attributed to Homer and Hesiod at least three sorts of hexameter poetic materials were accessible to Apollonius. First, there existed epics on the Theban saga, including the stories of Oedipus and his descendants, on Herakles, and on the heroic generation of Argos, Corinth, northwestern Greece and the Peloponnese. Some of these were later labeled “Cyclic” epics, a title whose exact meaning and valence for later generations of Greek authors has been disputed.<sup>3</sup> Second, there existed a number of poetic treatments of the Argonaut story. Some of these, whether oral traditions in poetry or (less likely) written accounts were already available to audiences before the composition of the Homeric *Odyssey*, judging by the reference at *Od.*12. 70 to “the Argo, of interest to all” (*Argô pasi melousa*).<sup>4</sup> The category of Argonaut tales overlaps somewhat with the “Cyclic” tales since individual crewmembers for the expedition led by Jason featured as protagonists in further adventure stories.<sup>5</sup> As far as attested hexameter poetry goes, we have evidence that “Argonautic” material existed in the *Corinthiaca* of Eumelus (mid 6<sup>th</sup>.c BC); the *Carmen Naupactium* (fr. 3-9 West), and a 6500-line epic attributed to the legendary Cretan sage Epimenides.<sup>6</sup> Third, there existed epics from the classical period and later which were themselves highly imitative of archaic poems. The works of Antimachus of Colophon (fl. 400 BC) are a prime example.<sup>7</sup> Pisander and Panyassis, Choerilus of Samos, Philitas of Cos and Simias of Rhodes also write hexameters-- only fragments survive--that could have been imitated

---

<sup>3</sup> For texts, see West (2003). On the importance of “Cyclic” poems see Hunter (2008) 144-46; Huxley (1968), 39-50, 165-72, Burgess (2001) and Fantuzzi (1988) 7 and Sistakou (2007). For treatment of the Cycle in Alexandria, see Severyns (1928) esp. 254-9 (on *Arg.*4.866-79).

<sup>4</sup> See Scherer (2006) 12-22.

<sup>5</sup> The *Carmen Naupactium* (7thc BC?) seems to have been of this sort, dealing extensively with genealogical but also Argonautic traditions. See Matthews (1977), Huxley (1969) 69-75 and Scherer (2006) 19-20.

<sup>6</sup> On these see West (2005) 40-41.

<sup>7</sup> Scherer (2006) 34-35, Matthews (1996).

by Apollonius.<sup>8</sup> Nor should we forget that even the authoritative names “Homer” and “Hesiod” signified quite different accumulations of poetry in the Hellenistic period: the former was often taken as author of the comic poem *Margites* (even by Aristotle: *Poetics* 1448b28-38) and of various heroic epics such as the *Sack of Oichalia*, *Thebaid*, and *Epigoni*, as well as poems of the Trojan cycle, while the latter became a cover term for disparate hexameter poetic traditions ranging from mantic poetry to didactic.<sup>9</sup> A consolation for modern interpreters faced with so much missing material is that Hellenistic poets themselves at least appear to have privileged Homer and Hesiod as their major influences, as is made clear by well-known programmatic statements from Theocritus (16.20):

‘τίς δέ κεν ἄλλου ἀκούσαι; ἄλις πάντεσσιν Ὅμηρος.’  
 ‘οὔτος ἀοιδῶν λῶστος, ὃς ἐξ ἐμεῦ οἴσεται οὐδέν.

and Callimachus (*AP* 9.507):

Ἡσιόδου τό τ’ ἄεισμα καὶ ὁ τρόπος· οὐ τὸν ἀοιδῶν  
 ἔσχατον, ἀλλ’ ὀκνέω μὴ τὸ μελιχρότατον  
 τῶν ἐπέων ὁ Σολεὺς ἀπεμάξατο. χαίρετε, λεπταὶ  
 ῥήσιες, Ἀρήτου σύμβολον ἀγρυπνίης.

Even in the scanty remains of the other hexameter works that we do possess, it is possible to find unusual phrases or word-forms resembling those in Apollonius, making it probable that the author of the *Argonautica* cast his net very wide. It is *a priori* likely that he deployed phrases from the pre-existing Argonaut stories--either for reminiscences or for stark contrasts--as much as he did Homeric or Hesiodic material, and here the quite learned scholia to Apollonius are helpful in pointing out the poet’s innovations or borrowings at the level of individual words,

<sup>8</sup> On Philitas e.g. see Spanoudakis (2002). The rare word ὄμπνιον appeared in his poetry and philological work: see Dettori (2000) 113-24, Spanoudakis (2002) 142-44; Apollonius employs it at *Arg.* 4.989.

<sup>9</sup> Pfeiffer (1968) 43-44, Lamberton (1988) 134-44.

characters, motifs or other plot elements. Several examples will be cited under the appropriate headings below.

To begin at the most elementary poetic level: **metrical practice** would seem to be the least likely medium for distinguishing Apollonius's work, as the sea of dactylic hexameter--from Homeric poems through to Nonnus--at first sight looks uniform. Exhaustive metrical studies beginning with early 19<sup>th</sup> century critics, from Gottfried Hermann on, have shown how uncannily consistent the artificial art-language of the poetic hexameter has remained, even while the Greek language itself changed drastically from tonal to stress-accented.<sup>10</sup> Nevertheless, we can detect small differences between archaic and Hellenistic usage, and further more, between Apollonius and contemporaries, that point to more significant ways in which the verses of the *Argonautica* creates a different flow and sound.

If one takes account of the distribution of spondees vs. dactyls in the five feet of the hexameter where dactyls are allowed (i.e. all but the last foot), *Argonautica* lines, with an average of 3.85 dactyls per verse, are more rapid than Homeric (average 3.7). A similar rapidity can be detected in the relative numbers of lines containing three spondees (7.95% *Iliad* vs. 4.52% *Argonautica*) and, less commonly, four spondees (0.58% *Iliad* vs. 0.12% *Argonautica*). There is also a significant difference in the localization of spondaic feet within poetic lines: Homeric practice allows more in the 4<sup>th</sup> foot (22.8% of the total number of spondees, contrasted with 15% in Apollonius), while Apollonius favors *versus spondaici* (i.e. verses with 5th-foot spondees): 7.6% of his spondees are thus located vs. 3.8% in Homer.<sup>11</sup> While it is risky to

---

<sup>10</sup> O'Neill (1942) provides a good review of earlier studies. A thorough analysis of metrical habits from Homer through Tzetzes in 12<sup>th</sup>-century Byzantium is Rzach (1882). Wifstrand (1933) shows how metrical habits of Callimachus, were retained even by Nonnus, six centuries later, with some adjustments made for linguistic changes. Mooney (1912) 411-28 surveys the major metrical and prosodic peculiarities in the poem.

<sup>11</sup> Figures from Sicking (1993) 72-74. Callimachean hexameters average 3.91 dactyls, have three spondees in 3.53% of lines, place 17.7% of the total number of spondees in the 4<sup>th</sup> foot of the line and 6.3% in the 5<sup>th</sup> foot. By the last measure, Apollonius thus stands out even among Hellenistic contemporaries. At the same time, he sounds more Homeric than Callimachean by neglecting the niceties of preserving 3<sup>rd</sup>-foot caesura and bucolic diaresis when there exists a diaresis after the 3<sup>rd</sup> foot ("Bulloch's Law"); and in his more frequent violations of "Meyer's Law" regarding word-end in the second foot (0.9% of lines vs. 0.06% in Callimachus). See Bulloch (1970) and Magnelli (1995).

extrapolate a poetic ethos from stylometrics, it is remarkable that a poem so bound thematically to movement over the sea might have itself moved more quickly in recitation, and when it did slow down its verses with spondaic sequences, was more likely to do so toward the close.

A quirk possibly related to this notable fondness for *spondaici* is Apollonius's unusual deployment of certain metrical word-shapes. From the 1000-line samples of archaic and post-Classical hexameters analyzed by Eugene O'Neill, Jr., it emerges that the *Argonautica* has the highest number of words (294) with the shape of a choriamb ( $\bar{\text{~}}\text{~}\bar{\text{~}}$ ), the most (104 words) shaped as an adonic ( $\bar{\text{~}}\text{~}\bar{\text{~}}\text{~}$ ), and the most words of two related shapes:  $\text{~}\bar{\text{~}}\bar{\text{~}}\text{~}$  (63 in Apollonius as opposed to 31 in the *Iliad* sample) and  $\text{~}\bar{\text{~}}\text{~}\bar{\text{~}}\text{~}$  (30, contrasted with once in the *Iliad* sample). These two lattermost metrical word-types are functional variants of the same underlying metrical segment, that which occupies the slot in the hexameter after the "trochaic" caesura (the word-break after the first short of the third foot) and leaves a three-syllable space at the end of the line.<sup>12</sup> Of course, it is implausible that either the archaic or Hellenistic poets worked consciously at localizing certain shapes within the line: instead, bare abstract statistics like these reflect poetic choices made at the level of formula and phrasing, which in turn are mostly determined by the shaping of discourse over a run of several lines (or "paragraphs," if we think in terms of topic and content). Yet statistics, when they show such wide variations across authors, potentially point us to significant higher-level stylistic devices. In the case of Apollonius, the device in question is most likely his frequent four-word lines. Consider the following lines near the start of the catalogue of Argonauts, which cap the mention of the first and most significant recruit, Orpheus (1.32-34):

Ὅρφέα μὲν δὴ τοῖον ἑὼν ἐπαρωγὸν ἀέθλων

- ~ ~ - - - ~ ~ - ~ ~ - ~ ~ - - -

<sup>12</sup> O'Neill (1942) 147-49. Hagel (2004) updates O'Neill's tables using full-text data but his more precise breakdown of the results in terms of "appositive groups" and surrounding metrical environments is somewhat more cumbersome for stylistic analysis. If we take as a control one shape listed by Hagel ( $\bar{\text{~}}\text{~}\bar{\text{~}}\text{~}$ ) it appears that Apollonius uses it 43 times as contrasted with 85 times in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* combined, or, proportionately to the size of the corpora, once every 135 lines vs. once every 325 Homeric lines.

### Αἰσονίδης Χείρωνος ἐφημοσύνησι πιθήσας

- ~ ~ - x

δέξατο, Πιερίη Βιστωνίδι κοιρανέοντα·

Line 33 contains the metrical word-type that, as we have seen, is much more frequent in Apollonius than in Homer (~ - ~ ~ - ~), in the midst of a four-word hexameter. The following line (1.34) is also formed of only four words and features another frequent metrical type in Apollonius, a single word filling the adonic segment (after the bucolic diairesis, the word-break between the fourth and fifth feet). Even though the lines are mostly dactylic, their construction lends a stately solidity and closure appropriate for the narrative moment. Line 33 further echoes another four-word line, from the proem, featuring the same diction and theme, obedience to the command of another (1.3):

Ἀρχόμενος σέο Φοῖβε παλαιγενέων κλέα φωτῶν  
 μνήσομαι οἷ Πόντοιο κατὰ στόμα καὶ διὰ πέτρας  
**Κυανέας βασιλῆος ἐφημοσύνη Πελῖαο**  
 χρύσειον μετὰ κῶας εὐζυγον ἤλασαν Ἀργῶ.

Meanwhile, between lines 3 and 33 comes a couplet with another heavy four-word hexameter, describing the instructional role of Athena in crafting the Argonauts' ship (1.19):

Νῆα μὲν οὖν οἱ πρόσθεν ἔτι κλείουσιν ἀοιδοί  
**Ἄργον Ἀθηναίης καμέειν ὑποθημοσύνησι·**

Thus, a series of metrically similar lines swiftly highlights the major figures directing the expedition. Such patterning is hardly accidental.<sup>13</sup>

Aside from their utility in drawing attention to poetic content at key points, the frequent four-word verses provide Apollonius with a more archaic architecture, like Cyclopean walls of

<sup>13</sup> Two more four-word hexameters occur in the biography of Orpheus: 1.24,31. Further clustering of four-word lines occurs in Book 2, for example (list not exhaustive): 3-4; 72, 80, 100, 129, 170, 224; 626, 667, 677, 700, 706, 758; 968, 988, 1060; 1249. According to Bassett (1919), the *versus tetracolos* occurs in 200 verses of the *Argonautica* (once per 29 lines) as contrasted with 431 verses of Homer (once every 64 lines).

massive stone. It is significant, as well, as Hermann Fränkel observed, that such lines most clearly articulate the four major segments of the Greek hexameter.<sup>14</sup> Bearing in mind this distillation of essential metrical structure, it is worth observing that the greatest frequency of such *tetracolos* verses occurs in the collection of Orphic Hymns (1st-3<sup>rd</sup> c. AD).<sup>15</sup> The hymnic aggregation of praise adjectives produces such lines as these from the Orphic *Hymn to Hecate* (4-5):

Περσεΐαν, φιλέρημον, ἀγαλλομένην ἑλάφοισι,  
νυκτερίαν, σκυλακίτιν, ἀμαιμάκετον βασιλείαν.

We shall return to this stylistic device at the conclusion of the chapter when we attempt to identify more closely the narrative voice behind the poem.

Tightly bound to the meter of the epics is **diction**. Since the path breaking studies by Milman Parry, the “formula”—although it eludes exact definition—has been increasingly recognized as an essential component of Homeric artistry, capable of bearing “immanent” meaning, so that the occurrence of even a few words triggers reminiscence of entire narrative scenes, situations and plot-outcomes.<sup>16</sup> One sort of familiarity, on which such recollection depends, is established by repetition of phrases, whether at the level of noun plus epithet (cloud-gathering Zeus) or more loosely connected “flexible” formulae, where nouns and adjectives regularly co-occur but are not necessarily contiguous.<sup>17</sup> For the latter type, one gets the sense from the frequent appearance of common-noun-and-epithet pairings that the *Argonautica* is “formulaic” at this level, but closer examination shows how novel the poet’s combinations actually are. A test sample of the first 50 lines of Book 2, for instance, shows 14 common nouns with adjectives, only two of which are attested in Homer, Hesiod, or the Homeric *Hymns* (*Arg.*

---

<sup>14</sup> Fränkel (1968) 4,10; his remarks come in an expanded discussion of his widely followed earlier analysis (1926) of hexametric cola.

<sup>15</sup> Bassett (1919) 230 observes that 1 out of 8 hymn verses is of this type.

<sup>16</sup> On formulas in Apollonius see the basic study by Fantuzzi (1988) updated and expanded in Fantuzzi (2008). For an overview of Parry’s work and the concept of “immanent” meaning, see Foley (1988) and (1991).

<sup>17</sup> On which see Hainsworth (1968).

2.18 κρατερῆ...ἀνάγκη, cf. *Il.*6.458; and 2.32 δίπτυχα λώπην, cf. *Od.*13.224). A third pair (2.40-41, οὐρανίῳ...ἀστέρι) echoes a frequent Homeric formula (*ouranos asteroeis*, *Il.*5.769 etc.) but reverses the roles of adjective and noun.

As for the former phrase-type, Apollonius clearly does not employ a dictional system marked by the oral-traditional characteristics of economy and extension, providing for every major figure in each metrical *sedes* one and only one epithet. In fact, Parry chose Apollonius to illustrate exactly this difference between Homeric and later written hexameters.<sup>18</sup> It is generally acknowledged that such systems evolved for the sake of rapid spontaneous composition in performance (of a type subsequently observed in fieldwork). A more nuanced contrast between archaic and Apollonian usage would see the latter as *partially* formulaic, not because the *Argonautica* was orally composed but because the poet desired a certain patina—“Homeric” at the same time as it is obviously not. Whereas Homeric epic is filled with repetitions, those in the *Argonautica* stand out for their scarcity.<sup>19</sup> The scores of formulaic systems within Homeric poetry produce for its audiences a type of predictability that can be summoned—and even violated—to produce special effects. The *intratextual* relationships within Homeric epics are themselves already quite complex, given the working of “traditional referentiality” to use J.M. Foley’s term).<sup>20</sup> Reading Apollonius, then, adds another dimension, the *intertextual*, to an already dense configuration of meanings in his source texts.

Since the crew of the Argo flourished a generation before the heroes of the Trojan War, we would not expect to find the Homeric **epithet system** transferred as a whole to them; these are different characters with names of differing metrical shapes, in a different plot. Teasingly, the two times that the future hero Achilles is named in the *Argonautica*, he is given resonant Iliadic epithets: “son of Peleus” (*Arg.*1.558 Πηλεΐδην Ἀχιλῆα; cf. *Il.*23.542 and frequently elsewhere, usually in this *sedes*), at the moment when the toddler watches from a hillside the departing ship of his Argonaut father; and “glorious” (4.868 Ἀχιλῆος ἀγαυοῦ’ cf. *Il.*17.557) in a flashback to the near-immortalization of the infant Achilles by his mother Thetis (which Peleus aborted).

<sup>18</sup> Parry (1971) 18-30, 264-75.

<sup>19</sup> Fantuzzi (1988) 61-77 meticulously analyzes the most formulaic of lines--speech-introduction- in terms of their variation from Homeric models

<sup>20</sup> Foley (1991). For magisterial analysis of intra- and inter-textual formulaic connections see Muellner (1996).

Apollonius thereby forecasts and confirms the Homeric glories of the next generation. Since the gods, however, remain the same through all generations, in describing them Apollonius might have chosen to play up continuity by conspicuously using Homeric epithets. Instead, he draws on this system only partially, and –characteristically—in order to introduce subtle variations. A detailed accounting remains to be done of the later poet’s re-purposing of the entire divine-epithet system. But even a preliminary analysis of two divinities illustrates the technique in operation.

Homeric epic has twenty-three different epithets that are applied exclusively to Zeus. Of these, Apollonius uses only one, the patronymic *Kronidês* “Son of Kronos.” What might be thought the blandest way to designate the father of the gods is in fact, a means of emphasizing the theogonic past, keeping the audience in mind of the divine struggle for succession (a theme embedded also in the poem’s allusions to Prometheus). As a result of this epithetic narrowing, however, the impressive Homeric picture of an authoritative sky-god Zeus who is cloud gatherer, aegis-bearer, clever-deviser and wide-voiced is abandoned; in the *Argonautica*, Zeus is “Olympian” precisely once, at 4.95 (vs. 28 times in Homer). Closer analysis of how the poet does employ his chosen Homeric epithet for Zeus reveals some patterned variations on the older epics. For example, Apollonius uses the dative form of the epithet twice:

*Arg.* 2.524

ἰερά τ’ εὖ ἔρρεξεν ἐν οὔρεσιν ἀστέρι κείνῳ  
 Σειρίῳ αὐτῷ τε **Κρονίδῃ Διί**. τοῖο ἔκητι  
 γαίαν ἐπιψύχουσιν ἐτήσιοι ἐκ Διὸς αὔραι

*Arg.* 2.1147.

τὸν μὲν ἔπειτ’ ἔρρεξεν ἐῆς ὑποθημοσύνησιν  
 Φυξίῳ ἐκ πάντων **Κρονίδῃ Διί**· καί μιν ἔδεκτο  
 Αἰήτης μεγάρω, κούρην τέ οἱ ἐγγυάλιξεν

*Intratextually*, this is constructed to sound “formulaic” inasmuch as the phrase repeats exactly within the space of one book, in the same metrical slot (between the penthemimeral caesura and bucolic diarexis). But *intertextually*, the Apollonian “formula” is subtly unlike its Homeric

predecessor: in the three passages where the older epics use the dative, once it is coupled with the name *Dii* (as in Apollonius), but in a verse which switches the order of noun and epithet and uses a different metrical *sedes*:

*Il.* 9.172. ὄφρα **Διὶ Κρονίδῃ** ἀρησόμεθ', αἶ κ' ἐλέησῃ.

The other two times, the metrical positioning of the dative *Kronidêi* is the same as in Apollonius, but the epithet accompanies a line-initial *Zêni* (a morphologically “newer” dative of the name Zeus) and a further epithet “of the dark cloud”:

*Od.* 9.552 (= *Od.* 13.25): **Ζηνὶ κελαινεφέϊ Κρονίδῃ**, ὃς πᾶσιν ἀνάσσει.

Diachronically, we could describe this method of Apollonius as “splitting” the older Homeric phrases and re-assembling the pieces in semi-Homeric manner. Yet it may be more interesting to imagine Apollonius synchronically, as a creative poet working with complete control within an established epic tradition, executing the same sort of formulaic innovation that occurs even *within* the Homeric corpus, as we saw in the examples just cited (morphological and metrical variants *Zêni/ Dii*; word-order variation). Homeric formulaic practice was itself not monophonic; or, put more paradoxically, Apollonius is most “Homeric” when choosing to be *para*-Homeric in such ways.<sup>21</sup>

At times, Hellenistic cleverness turns even the level of formulaic diction into an occasion for erudite display. In another line employing the “son of Kronos” epithet (this time in the nominative case), Apollonius tells how Zeus gave the bronze giant Talos to be warder of Crete. The poet places the god’s patronymic next to the proper name of the recipient, Europa (*Arg.* 4.1643):

**Εὐρώπῃ Κρονίδῃς** νήσου πόρην ἔμμεναι οὐρον.

Though probably not related in etymology, “Eurôpa” closely resembles in sound “*europa*,” “having a wide-sounding voice” — with 23 occurrences, one of the most frequent particularized

---

<sup>21</sup> For more examples of handling of Homeric formulae see Fantuzzi (2008).

epithets for Zeus in Homeric poetry. What is more, several Homeric lines juxtapose this epithet with his patronymic, e.g. *Il.*15.152 (cf. 1.498, 24.98):

εὔρον δ' εὐρύοπα Κρονίδην ἀνὰ Γαργάρω ἄκρω

In short, Apollonius while conspicuously omitting the epithet *euruopa* throughout his composition manages to smuggle in a close facsimile, in a *callida iunctura* that echoes Homeric phrasing. Like Argonauts glimpsing the slightest traces of Herakles, we see a ghost of the older poet in an unlikely place.

Both Zeus and Apollo several times bear distinctive epithets that never occur in Homer. Zeus is “of flight” (*Fuxios* 2.1147), “cleansing” (*Katharsios* 4.708) “kind to guests” (*Euxeinos* 2.378) and “overseeing” (*Eropsios* 2.1123), while Apollo is known as “of embarkation” (*Embasion* 1.359,404), “prophetic” (*Manteios* 2.493), and “ship-saving” (*Néosoos* 2.927) among other titles. Through this strategy, Apollonius binds the gods more closely to cult, on the one hand, and on the other to the lineaments of his own plot, which actualizes and gives aetologies for the titles in terms of the Argonauts varied encounters. This close relationship of epithets to religious ritual within the poem might offer a starting-place for further analysis regarding the generic affiliations of Apollonius’ diction. To take one example: the poet uses 17 times the name *Phoibos* for Apollo, but, quite jarringly in comparison with Homer, only once as an epithet. By contrast, in the *Iliad*, *Odyssey* and Homeric *Hymns* taken together, *Phoibos* occurs 81 times; out of this number, it is paired with *Apollon* 61 times, most often in the familiar line-end formula Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων (e.g. *Il.*1.43). It is significant that the single place in which Apollonius adheres to the usual Homeric pairing comes in the elaborate description of divinities depicted on Jason’s cloak (*Arg.*1.759-60):

Ἐν καὶ Ἀπόλλων Φοῖβος ὀιστεύων ἐτέτυκτο,  
βούπαις, οὐπω πολλός, ἐὼν ἐρύοντα καλύπτρης

In other words, the formal, formulaic style of conjoined Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων, appearing in a reversed word-order also found formulaically in Homer (*Il.*16.700, 20.68, 21.515), highlights the god’s appearance in the most highly-crafted artistic creation within the *Argonautica*, as if

acknowledging the traditional “art-language” use of the epithet in older epic (even at the precise moment the *younger* Apollo οὔπω πολλός is being described). What does it signify, meanwhile, that Apollonius in the other 16 instances of *Phoibos* uses it without the god’s proper name? Here, too, older hexameter poetry provides clues. The bare *Phoibos* occurs 20 times in Homer and the *Hymns*; 13 of these are vocatives, and more than half (7) of that number come from the *Hymns*. In other words, in Apollonius we can expect the repeated use of *Phoibos* (alone) to create the sound of sacral language--fittingly in a poem so concerned with ritual establishments.<sup>22</sup>

Just as one cannot disentangle metrical factors from dictional, so these cannot be separated entirely from linguistic changes, prompting further questions of dialect, archaisms, and by-forms. On the level of **morphology and syntax**, we can find interesting differences that make Apollonius sound less archaic. To appreciate these fully, we have to highlight again the general principle that, as a whole, the background of his verse does sound almost uncannily Homeric and/or Hesiodic. In general linguistic usage, he copies the older epics as closely as possible.<sup>23</sup> Contracted forms, for example, appear alongside contracted-- *aethlon* (1.15) and *athlôn* (1.1304) *hieron* (1.960) and *hiron* (4.1691) just as in Homer. He widely uses apocope of prepositions and preverbs, e.g. of *ana* in *Arg.*1.1061 ἄμ πεδίον Λειμώνιον (cf. *Il.*5.96); has old epic forms with initial *pt-* (*ptolin*, *ptoliethron*) or double *-pp-* (*hoppote*); uses uncontracted endings such as *-ao* for masculine genitive singular and *-aôn* for feminine genitive plural; employs dialect variants such as Aeolic *pisures* (1.671) alongside Ionic *tessares* (1.946); and Aeolic *ummi* along with Ionic *humin*; omits verb augments when metrically convenient; often resorts to epic infinitive endings in *-menai* and subjunctive 3rd person singular *-si*; and in general, only uses tense formations of particular verbs if they have already been attested in Homer or Hesiod.<sup>24</sup>

The nearly pitch-perfect imitation even extends to frequent lengthening of an otherwise short syllable in places where a once-existent digamma in a following word had combined with a second consonant. This feature marked archaic verse where the digamma sound (/w/) had been recently alive in poetic tradition (and was still spoken in many dialects other than Ionic and

<sup>22</sup> This also fits with evidence for the epithet of Zeus examined above: the uncontracted genitive *Kronidao* (*Arg.* 2.1211, 4.753, 4.520) occurs nowhere in Homeric epic but is in the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* (408) and in the opening invocation to the Muses at Antimachus fr.1.1 Wyss, on which see Matthews (1996) 80.

<sup>23</sup> See examples in Rzach (1878) 8-30; La Roche (1899).

<sup>24</sup> Full listings and analyses in Rzach (1878).

Attic). By the time of Apollonius the effect was a learned archaism. He gives the preposition *epi* a long second syllable before *d(w)eos* “fear” in such lines as 1.639:

ἄφθογγοι, τοῖόν σφιν ἐπὶ δέος ἠωρεῖτο

entirely in accord with what the linguistically correct treatment found in Homer (e.g. *Il.*1.515 οὗτοι ἔπι δέος). Similarly, he lengthens *gar* “for” at 1.969 (and elsewhere) before *hoi* “to/for him” which originally had the initial *w-* sound:

μηγά θ' ὀμοῦ. δὴ γάρ οἱ ἔην φάτις, εὖτ' ἄν ἴκωνται.

This is an exact imitation of Homeric phrases like *Il.*5.188: ἤδη γάρ οἱ ἐφήκα βέλος.<sup>25</sup> As often, Apollonius is here following a tradition of archaizing, since already Panyassis in the 5<sup>th</sup> century used the same lengthening (fr.14.6).<sup>26</sup>

On the other hand, a fine-grained analysis discovers significant differences. There are enough new forms in his poetry, new extensions of old forms no longer understood, and new applications of familiar words, that an experienced reader of archaic poetry would have perceived a continual undertone of novelty. At the level of morphology, Apollonius uses, for example, in lieu of the regular Homeric *-iato* the more familiar Classical 3<sup>rd</sup> plural present optative form in *-ointo* (only once in Homer, in the suspect line *Il.*1.344).<sup>27</sup> He freely extends the use of the middle voice--without apparent semantic difference--to many verbs that in Homer appeared only in the active, and uses the dative case with a greater number of verbs, and more often without prepositions.<sup>28</sup> Apollonius often extrapolates from existing Homeric forms creating futures (such as *damassei* 3.353) or presents (e.g. *ameiro* (3.186) on the basis of (sometimes

<sup>25</sup> See further data in Rzach (1882)

<sup>26</sup> Noted by Rzach (1882) 372; on the Panyassis fragment see Matthews (1974) 76-87. Archaizing lengthening in such phrases also permeates later Greek poetry, into the Byzantine period.

<sup>27</sup> See Boesch (1908) 12

<sup>28</sup> Boesch (1908) 18-21; on cases, Linsenbarth (1887) 48-56.

false) analogies derived from other verb stems.<sup>29</sup> New noun forms are scattered throughout the poem, such as the word for “child” in *Arg.* 1.276 (παῖν) and for ship 1.1358 (νηῦν) vs. inherited *paida* and *nêa*.<sup>30</sup> Paradoxically, at times the innovations of Apollonius seem intended to make his poetic texture look older, by over-developing formations that he apparently considered archaic. Thus, the widespread use of adverbs in *-dên* (e.g. 2.826 ἀίγδην; 1.1017 ἀρπάγδην).<sup>31</sup> Putting prepositions after the nouns they modify (postposition) reflects archaic syntax, but Apollonius does this once for every 9 occurrences of a preposition, whereas Homer was more restrained (once out of 13 times).<sup>32</sup> Such a longing for archaic patina may explain the poet’s indiscriminate deployment of prepositional forms like *h(e)os* that are properly restricted to the 3<sup>rd</sup> person in older epic usage: Apollonius, liking their antique ring, uses them for *all* persons (e.g. for 1<sup>st</sup> person in 3.99: ἀτεμβοίμην **ἐοῖ ἀντῆ**).<sup>33</sup> His fondness for adjectives in *-aleos* and abstract nouns in *-sunê* also overextends distinctive but fleeting epic usages, although this may have resulted from imitating tragic poetic diction.<sup>34</sup>

Emblematic of this schizoid approach are his infinitives. Apollonius copies archaic epic usage only half the time, the other 50% of these forms being variations, sometimes widely different, and often reflecting tragic or lyric poetic habit.<sup>35</sup> In a prominent passage, for instance, he uses *kleio* to introduce an accusative and infinite construction: (1.18-19):

Νῆα μὲν οὖν οἱ πρόσθεν ἔτι **κλείουσιν** ἀοιδοί  
**Ἄργον** Ἀθηναίης **καμέειν** ὑποθημοσύνησι·

The verb existed in Homer, but the closest Homeric syntactical equivalent occurs with a slightly different verb, *aeidein* (*Od.* 8.516).<sup>36</sup> Other infinitive constructions imitate instances that occur only once in all Homeric poetry (e.g. the use of *mutheomai* with infinitive at *Arg.* 2.458-60; cf.

<sup>29</sup> Marxer (1935) 8-13: the new *ameiro* is by analogy with *keiro*, the aorist of which (*kersai*) resembled an attested aorist (*amersai*).

<sup>30</sup> Marxer (1935) 22.

<sup>31</sup> Marxer (1935) 32

<sup>32</sup> Haggett (1902) 71, who notes also (p.36) the poet’s fondness for certain compound prepositions (*diek*, *parek*) used in un-Homeric ways.

<sup>33</sup> Marxer (1935) 61.

<sup>34</sup> Redondo (2000) 135-41.

<sup>35</sup> McLennan (1973), categorizing all occurrences, notes that epexegetic infinitives after adjectives in the *Argonautica* are almost always un-Homeric.

<sup>36</sup> See further on *kleio* and related verbs Linsenbarth (1887) 24

*Il.*21.462). In short, the voice being represented through such syntactic choices is both deeply epic-sounding but also conspicuously speaks like other times and genres.

Appreciation of the ways in which Apollonius manipulated Homeric diction must recognize that he was refining a poetic habit begun at least a century earlier, as evidenced by the fragmentary extant works of Antimachus. A Homeric scholar, like Apollonius, this author of a *Thebais* in hexameters and of the long elegiac poem *Lyde* sought out rare words from archaic epic to lend the air of antiquity to his own verses.<sup>37</sup> To take one example: in all of Homer the word *kalauirops* (“herdsman’s crook”) occurs only once, near the end of the *Iliad*, in lines comparing a heroic iron-toss to the bucolic instrument thrown to separate cattle (23.845): ὄσσόν τις τ’ ἔρριψε **καλαύροπα** βουκόλος ἀνήρ. The scholiast to the passage preserves a line in which Antimachus copied this *hapax legomenon*, in the same metrical position (schol. bT Erbse): καὶ Ἀντίμαχος

“πάντες δ’ ἐν χεῖρεσσι καλαύροπας οὐατοέσσας” (fr. 91 Wyss= 64 Matthews).

Given this background, when Apollonius twice uses the word in his epic, again in the same *sedes* (2.33, 4. 974), we imagine that he depends on a connoisseur audience knowing not just Homer but also the Homeric *imitators* of the intervening centuries. The absence of context in the Antimachus fragment prevents us from assessing what poetic overtones the double reminiscence might have carried.<sup>38</sup> Perhaps significantly, Amycus, who throws down his olive-wood *kalauirops* in 2.33, is about to *lose* a boxing contest, while the Homeric occurrence appeared in an image celebrating athletic *success*. Whether this similarity is conscious or accidental, it illustrates one type of flashback recollection triggered by the subtle repetition of rare words.<sup>39</sup>

Such compressed notes from the margins of medieval manuscripts also are a rich source of observations about the ways in which Apollonius varies Homeric usage. When the narrator declines to speak further of the Samothracian mysteries, τῶν μὲν ἔτ’ οὐ προτέρω μυθήσομαι,

<sup>37</sup> For the activity of Antimachus as Homeric scholar, see Wyss (1936) fr. 131-48 and Matthews (1996) 373-403. For Apollonius’ use of Antimachus, extending even to conjunction usage, see Matthews (1996) 88-91.

<sup>38</sup> A cattle-raid? Matthews tentatively ties the line to fr. 55 (=49 Wyss). If this was the case, *Arg.* 2.33 would then fuse athletic (Homeric) with martial (Antimachean) potential reminiscences, a typically Apollonian destabilizing allusion.

<sup>39</sup> Kyriakou (1995) offers detailed readings of the effects of Homeric *hapax legomena* in Apollonius.

(1.919-21), a scholiast explains that the adverb means “forwards” εἰς τοῦμπροσθεν citing *Od.* 9.64, where it describes the movement of ships. But Apollonius, the commentator adds, has misapplied it to speech (καταχρηστικῶς ἐπὶ τοῦ λόγου. (*Schol. Ap.Rhod.*p78 line 20 Wendel). Even more importantly, it is the scholia, both to Homer and Apollonius, that enable us to appreciate how the poet made use of the most exacting critical work on the text of Homer. To take one telling example: at *Arg.* 1.1081, a line describes how “the other” Argonauts were sleeping:

ὦλλοι μὲν ῥα πάρος δεδμημένοι εὐνάζοντο

The scholiast observes that because the combined form ὦλλοι (*hoi alloi*) is “newer Ionic,” the Homeric scholar Zenodotus was criticized for seeking to read this form in place of Ἄλλοι (i.e. without definite article *hoi*) at *Il.*2.1: Ἄλλοι μὲν ῥα θεοὶ τε καὶ ἄνδρες ἵπποκορυσταὶ/ εὐδὸν παννόχοι.). The line in Apollonius is clearly modeled on the opening of Book 2 of the *Iliad*, a similar sleep-scene. But the choice of the “un-Homeric” ὦλλοι, insignificant as it might seem, was in context actually a bold statement, showing Apollonius conspicuously taking sides in what must have been ongoing text-critical debates. The poetic payoff from the form itself is unclear-- did the poet mean to highlight the belatedness of his text, or was his (and Zenodotus’s) choice based on the fact that by their time, normal Greek (as in classical Attic) used definite articles (a rarity in Homer)?<sup>40</sup> In another passage from the scholia (to *Arg.* 2.1005), we learn that Apollonius uses an adjective describing “hard” land (στυφελήν) that Zenodotus in a monograph on unusual words (*Glossai*) had identified as coming from the archaic dialect of the Arcadian city Clitor.<sup>41</sup> It is clear that Apollonius was abreast of the latest work being carried out by scholars whom he knew personally in Alexandria, or had read. Zenodotus, after all, preceded him

<sup>40</sup> See *schol. Ap.Rhod* p. 95.20 Wendel. Cf. *schol. Il.*2.1 (A): ἄλλο: ὅτι Ζηνόδοτος γράφει “ὦλλοι,” which suggests further that Zenodotus acknowledged the psilotic nature of Ionic (loss of initial h-, so that *hoi* was pronounced /oi/) even as he sought to import the definite article into the Homeric text.

<sup>41</sup> More such dialect words might be detectable in Apollonius, had we more of the *Ataktoi Glossai* of Philitas (teacher of Zenodotus), on which see the editions of Dettori (2000) esp. 20-38 and Spanoudakis (2002) 347-400.

in the post of Librarian at Alexandria; Apollonius himself is said to have written a book “against Zenodotus,” as well as critical works on Archilochus and Hesiod.<sup>42</sup>

The extent to which the poet’s composition was permeated with reference not just to Homeric poetry but to the specific scholarly works thereon has been increasingly recognized.<sup>43</sup> This can occur at several levels of artistry. Individual rare words, as we have seen, can signal to audiences a fruitful textual relation with archaic epic. Apollonius not only uses more than 100 words attested only once each in Homer (*hapax legomena*), but also drops into his poem-- precisely two times apiece-- another 50 words attested only *twice* in the older poet (*dis legomena*), and, in another fit of ingenuity, employs *once* in his own poem yet another 157 words that Homer used just *twice*.<sup>44</sup> If nothing else, the poet displays to his contemporaries admirable counting skill. At a slightly higher level of scholarly comment, Apollonius employs a “lexicographic technique” with scores of more obscure Homeric words by using them in his own poem with varied significations, each of which represents a meaning assigned to the lexical item by one or another ancient critic.<sup>45</sup> Thus, to take just a single adjective, the exact meaning of Homeric *têlugetos*, as we can gather from the scholia, was disputed. Apollonius uses it in the course of one book to mean “born to a father in old age” (1.99), “beloved” (1.149) and “only-begotten” (1.719)--exactly the range of possible meanings discussed in antiquity.<sup>46</sup> This technique turns the *Argonautica* into “a kind of poetic dictionary of Homer.”<sup>47</sup> At yet another level, the arming of Aietes (*Arg.* 3.1225-1234), with its sequence of breastplate-helmet-shield-spear, has been seen to parallel not the standard Homeric arming protocol (in which shield precedes helmet) but the revised version of *Il.*3.330-339 (Paris arming) attributed to the textual activity of Zenodotus.<sup>48</sup> Finally, and most striking, it has long been acknowledged that the final line of the *Argonautica*, announcing the crew’s return (*Arg.* 4.1781):

---

<sup>42</sup> Pfeiffer (1968) 144–8; on the fragments of *Pros Zenodoton* see Mooney (1912) 50-51 and Rengakos (2008) 256-61.

<sup>43</sup> The leading analyst is Rengakos (1994, 2008).

<sup>44</sup> Rengakos (1994) 174n.31 and (2008) 252n.43.

<sup>45</sup> Rengakos (1994) 175-78, crediting Livrea with the term.

<sup>46</sup> See Mooney (1912) 75, Rengakos (1994) 154; cf. on other examples Seaton (1890) 7-9. Zacco (1996) is a fine case-study.

<sup>47</sup> Rengakos (2008) 253.

<sup>48</sup> Rengakos (2008) 259.

ἄσπασίως ἀκτὰς Παγασηίδας εἰσαπέβητε

echoes the going to bed of Odysseus and Penelope (*Od.*23.296):

ἄσπάσιοι λέκτροιο παλαιοῦ θεσμὸν ἴκοντο·

While the latter does not conclude the *Odyssey* as we have it, the line was notoriously an object of critical discussion in Alexandria, with the scholia reporting that Aristophanes of Byzantium and Aristarchus (Homeric scholars flourishing later than Apollonius) considered it the end of the epic.<sup>49</sup> Apollonius would seem to be in favor of such a romantic denouement for the earlier adventure poem. Given such exacting employment of Homeric scholarship on his part, an interpretive puzzle remains concerning the “voice” of the *Argonautica* narrator. To what extent does the generalized use of familiar Homeric diction and motifs harmonize with this fussy attention to epic *hapax legomena* and arcane (at least to us) allusions to text-critical or linguistic controversies in 3<sup>rd</sup>-century Alexandria? Is there an intentional dissonance? Or should we attune ourselves to hear not one voice, but something more polyphonic--a naïve “Homeric” (or even more archaic) bardic-narrator in concert with a sophisticated, opinionated scholar-poet--Ossian ventriloquized by Nabokov?<sup>50</sup>

This navigation of the vagaries of “voice” has by-passed thus far the conventional starting-point for most examinations of Apollonius’s intertextuality--the **episode**. Relations of specific scenes to Homeric precedents are often semi-transparent, and have been extensively studied. More helpful might be a summary of the modes of this technique, and how they interact, rather than an attempt to inventory resemblances.<sup>51</sup>

First, episodes can be brought into suggestive relation by the recurrence of a single detail of description, plot, or character. As the *Argo* reaches Lemnos (*Arg.* 1.601-10) the island is called

<sup>49</sup> See Heubeck (1992) 342-45 on whether this reflects the state of the Homeric *Odyssey* in the early Hellenistic era and whether *telos* should mean “end” rather than “conclusion of the main action.” Apollonius could allude to more radical critical treatments known later but not approved by Aristophanes or Aristarchus.

<sup>50</sup> The total amount of these familiar phrases in Apollonius may have been increased somewhat through bias on the part of those copying the text toward Homeric over non-Homeric diction: see Haslam (1978) 55 for examples of such “invasion.” As he shows, scribal preference for more common Homeric forms (or even Homeric –sounding nonce formations) sometimes ousted from later MSS the original use of a *hapax legomenon* by Apollonius (e.g. at 1.1300, where a Milan papyrus preserves the Homeric hapax *anamormurousin*; cf. *Od.*12.238).

<sup>51</sup> See work by Knight (1995), Clare (2002), Hunter (1993), Levin (1971) and the useful phrase inventory by Campbell (1981).

“Sintian” (*Sintêida Lêmnon* 608), offering a reminder to the audience of an earlier mythical landing at sunset there, when Hephaistos, hurled from Olympus, was taken in by the “Sintian men” (*Il.1.594*). The newcomers will be cared for, as was the god, but the sense of danger animated by the past textual and mythical example is not far off, especially when the story of the intervening homicide by the Lemnian women is now narrated (1.609-32).<sup>52</sup> Related to this sort of recall is a second mode, the use of *hapax legomena* to lend dramatic overtone to an episode. The Homeric participle *amphipesousa* (*Od.8.523*) occurs once, describing how a wailing woman embraces her husband’s corpse, in a simile about Odysseus’s tears upon hearing the bard sing the sack of Troy. In the *Argonautica* (1.270), the word, in the same form and *sedes*, occurs in a simile about a distraught girl clutching at her nurse, which in turn describes the posture and emotion of Jason’s mother Alkimede. The linkage thus produces a multi-dimensional reference: Odysseus resembles Alkimede (one returned almost home, after leaving his own mother in the underworld; the other watching her son leave); but the mother, in turn, is shifted into other imaginary roles--widow, orphan--that we will soon see made real during Jason’s battle at Cyzicus (1.1053-77) and that inevitably recall Andromache and Penelope, among other Homeric grieving women. A further resonance of this departure scene is triggered by another *hapax*, the line-initial *entupas* (*Arg* 1.264), describing the grief-stricken father of Jason, “wrapped tightly” in his bed: ἐντυπᾶς ἐν λεχέεσσι καλυψάμενος γοάασκεν. The description of Priam, ἐντυπᾶς ἐν χλαίνῃ κεκαλυμμένος, in public self-abasement over the death of his son Hector (*Il.24.163*) provided the template. The result is a darker coloration for what otherwise might have been a less ominous event.<sup>53</sup>

A third mode involves Homeric type-scenes. These function differently from the *hapax*-enhanced episodes, inasmuch as the creation of meaning pivots upon frequently repeated sequences (arming, embarking, feasting etc.), rather than on a unique source passage in earlier epic. Using his audience’s awareness of such scenes, Apollonius can craft significant changes. When the Argonauts sacrifice to Apollo at 1.402-38, the extended ritual actions, along with their placement within the poem, recall similar scenes at *Od.3.32-66* and *Il.1.446-74*, albeit with dictional variants. The divinity’s approving reaction, however, prominent in the Homeric version (*Il.1.457,474*; cf.

<sup>52</sup> For a full explication, see Clauss (1993)103. A similar resonance provided by small detail comes in the epiphany of Apollo at Thunias (*Arg.2.676-79*; cf.*Il.1.46*), on which see Feeney (1991) 75.

<sup>53</sup> On the entire scene, see Clauss (1993) 40-47 and Cusset (1999) 270-72 with further bibliography.

*Od.*3.62) is conspicuous by its absence.<sup>54</sup> A related technique characterizes the most expansive narrative of battle and its aftermath in the *Argonautica*, 1.1026-78. The poet synthesizes a number of typical Iliadic scenes, complete with similes to mark the start and the conclusion, description of wounds, a run of killings (with typical *variatio* of verbs), flight, and the death of the lead fighter.<sup>55</sup> All this a reader of Homer might expect, but the abrupt nature of the telling makes for an epic *reductio* that reads more like a parody of Homeric style, while the heroization of the dead Doliones through cult lends the passage an aetiological distance completely foreign to the *Iliad*.<sup>56</sup>

The mode of imitation-with-difference perhaps most difficult to articulate is what we may call “multiple overlay,” through which two or more Homeric scenes are subtly combined to produce multiple possibilities for interpreting a given Apollonius passage.<sup>57</sup> For instance, the boxing match between Amykos and Polydeukes (2.67-97) gestures both toward the funeral games of Patroclus (*Il.*23.683-99) and the fight of Odysseus with the beggar Iros (*Od.*18.25-109), making the Argonautic version teeter between an heroic event and a boorish entertainment. The reception at the palace of Aietes (3.210-74) carefully combines elements of Odysseus’s approach to the house of Alkinoos (*Od.*7.4-138) with his arrival on Ithaca (*Od.*13.189-91; 18.86,374), thus teasing out through phrasal and situational reminiscence the simultaneous opportunity and threat posed to Jason.<sup>58</sup> The cosmogonic song of Orpheus (1.496-511) manages to combine key themes from all three of the songs of Demodocus in Book 8 of the *Odyssey*.<sup>59</sup> The technique tempts the poet to be kaleidoscopic--the speech by the goddesses of Libya to the hopeless crew (*Arg.*4.1318-29) overlays no fewer than four Odyssean subtexts: Ino to Odysseus (5.339); the description of Calypso (5.60-70); the song of the Sirens (12.184-91) and the instructions of Teiresias (11.110).<sup>60</sup> In this case, almost cinematic montage aims at a cumulative effect, signaling one outcome (survival) rather than heightening the suspense.

At yet another level, epic source-texts are diffused more broadly throughout the *Argonautica* and the *déjà vu* thereby induced establishes more general narrative directions. A series of resemblances has been seen to link Book 3 of the *Argonautica* with Book 10 of the *Odyssey*,

<sup>54</sup>The scene is well analyzed by Feeney (1991) 69-70; cf. Cusset (1999) 264-66; on this episode and type-scene intertexts in general, see Knight (1995) 49-91.

<sup>55</sup>Detailed references in Knight (1995) 84-93.

<sup>56</sup>For this reading, see Goldhill (1991) 317-18.

<sup>57</sup>Cusset (1999) 276 suggests the term *surimpression*; others speak of multiple hypotexts, or *contaminatio*.

<sup>58</sup>See Bettenworth (2005), who stresses the enriching rather than destabilizing force of the overlay.

<sup>59</sup>Nelis (1992).

<sup>60</sup>Clare (2002)154.

staging as it were Jason as an Odysseus, Aietes as his sister Circe, Eros as a Hermes figure, and ultimately, Medea as her own enchantress aunt (a meeting that will take place later in the poem).<sup>61</sup> The Lemnian episode is tethered to varied Odyssean predecessor texts as different points, letting us glimpse Hypsipyle as Nausicaa, as Alcinoos, and even as Telemachus, vulnerable inheritor of his father's island state.<sup>62</sup> At the highest level, of course, and particularly in Book 4 of the poem, the shape of the entire *Odyssey* provides the coastline along which the Argo travels, and from which it veers away. Critical responses tend to fall on either side of that navigational divide, with some scholars cataloguing the dozens of similar elements that link Jason's voyage with that of Odysseus, while others highlight the bold departures from the Homeric script.<sup>63</sup> Typically, even on the choice of sailing directions, "Apollonius treads a fine line between adaptation of an Odyssean itinerary and rejection of the geographical implausibility of such a route."<sup>64</sup> The *Argonautica* "Odyssey" merges fantasy islands with the down-to-earth perspective of Hellenistic *periplous* literature.

Intertextual references of the types listed above operate just below the surface of each episode, with the occasional *hapax* or familiar Homeric phrase jutting up to orient the reader. By contrast, three other closely related categories of epic imitation overtly proclaim their relationship to earlier poetry: the catalogue, *ekphrasis*, and similes. Through these poetic devices, audiences are explicitly invited to compare the art of Apollonius with his models. All three are highly self-conscious supplements, pausing the forward movement of the narrative while calling attention to its literariness. As three distinct techniques aimed at *enargeia*--the urge for precise and vivid description so prized by ancient critics--they create meaning through their conspicuous placement, their links to the action of the poem, and their obvious divergence from Homeric and Hesiodic congeners.

The **catalogue** of *Arg.*1.23-233 immediately distinguishes itself from the renowned Catalogue of Ships (*Il.*2.484-760) by giving a list of young warriors rather than a roll-call of regional contingents. It thus naturally flows from the narrator's stated goal of recalling the expedition to Colchis that brought fame to "men of long ago" (*palaiogeneôn..phôtôn*). Two aspects of this personalization stand out: the equal status of the crew members (unlike the Homeric warriors, these are not leaders but Jason's *summêstores* "co-devisers," 1.228); and the

---

<sup>61</sup> Correspondences worked out in Knight (1995)176-8.

<sup>62</sup> Bulloch (2006).

<sup>63</sup> Knight (1995)122-266 tends toward the former, Clare (2002) 125-42 the latter.

<sup>64</sup> Clare (2002) 139. Dufner (1988) remains unsurpassed for detailed analysis of the Odyssean geographic intertexts.

individuality of their motives and fates (e.g. Idmon [141] wanting not to be deprived of fame, Augeas wishing to see exotic lands [175], Mopsus and Canthus [77-80] doomed to die). The *Iliad* reserves mention of future fate for the catalogue of Trojan warriors (*Il.*2.860-1, 874-75). While both the Iliadic and Argonautic catalogues appear near the start of their respective poems (i.e. in narrative time), they are at opposite ends of the spectrum in *narrated* time: the gathering at Iolcus happens, as it were, in real time, at the *Argo's* departure, whereas the Homeric listing comes when ships have been beached for nine years (a vexing conundrum for later Analyst critics of the *Iliad*). The *Iliad* catalogue spirals outward geographically, from Boeotia; that of the *Argonautica* is also structured by place, closely mapped onto the Thessalian segment of the Catalogue of Ships.<sup>65</sup> But atop this topographical layer is placed a binary structure, not found in Homer, with Orpheus and Herakles dominating their respective halves of the list.<sup>66</sup> Finally, the rhythm of the two catalogues, through a similar crescendo effect, highlights a difference in content. Toward the end of the Catalogue of Ships, pain and loss are thematized by a triad of figures missing-in-action (Achilles 2.687-88, Protesilaos 698-702, Philoctetes 721-26). Apollonius responds with a quartet of magical warriors, who see through earth (Lynceus, 154-55) run on water (Euphemos 182-82), change shape (Periclymenus, 159-60) and fly (the Boreads, 219-23). This contrast alone speaks volumes about the tone of either epic.<sup>67</sup>

The extended *ekphrasis* of Jason's cloak (1.721-767) reverses the protocols of digressive placement, in comparison with the Iliadic description of Achilles' shield, for the latter is a natural entailment of the plot (the hero has lost his own armor) and a brilliant prologue to the poem's concluding movement. Jason's artifactual equivalent makes him a lover, rather than fighter; focuses us on the moment when his is still untried, even at this art; and is functionally superfluous. Thematically, on the other hand, the cloak makes richly suggestive connections to its immediate context and the rest of the poem, and has rightly drawn the attention of many interpreters. The reflexive nature of the finely woven work is clear in many ways, starting with the underlying metaphor of poetry as textile.<sup>68</sup> That this is a textual moment to be gazed upon is hinted at through the third of its seven vignettes, Aphrodite's alluring image reflected on Ares' shield (neatly

---

<sup>65</sup> See Scherer (2006) 57-134 for the most detailed analysis of narrative and structuring devices, including a study of geographic intertexts. Also useful is the typological study by Sistakou (2001). Antimachus may have composed his own catalogue of Argonauts: Matthews (1996) 71n.34.

<sup>66</sup> For further details of this structure see Clauss (1993) 26-34.

<sup>67</sup> On the "destabilizing" function of catalogues in Apollonius, see Clare (2002) 264. For the key subtext of the Homeric "catalogue of women" (*Od.*11.225-330) see Bulloch (2006) 59-67.

<sup>68</sup> Hunter (1993) 56.

embedding the Homeric model for this very *ekphrasis*: 1.745-46).<sup>69</sup> At the same time, as Goldhill acutely observed, the cloak raises questions of the deceptiveness of appearances, the difficulty of viewing, the gap between the visual and verbal, and the possibilities of disconnection, through its apparently unstructured sequence of scenes.<sup>70</sup> Like the ram of Phrixus standing at the distant origin of the expedition (1.764-67) the episode seems to speak but one would wait in vain to understand. Here, the most obvious Iliadic intertext might itself be a red herring, since the cloak's Empedoclean pairing of love and strife, programmatic for the *Argonautica*, is closer to Odyssean concerns, as in Demodocus' song of Ares and Aphrodite (*Od.*8.266-366), already evoked by the song of Orpheus (*Arg.* 1.496-511). The resemblances to the garb of Odysseus (*Od.*19.225-35), like Jason's in its attractiveness to women, make this secondary Homeric model all the more resonant.<sup>71</sup>

**Similes**, the third epic device for producing "vividness," take new, sometimes strange, directions at the hands of Apollonius. As with his use of formulas, word-forms, and type-scenes, just enough familiarity is established to make the innovations stand out all the more. Similes occur at a rate near that of the *Iliad* (1 per 71 lines vs. *Iliad* 1 per 76; cf. 1 per 271 lines in the *Odyssey*), but are more evenly spread throughout the poem. Half of them begin with such typical Homeric introductions as *hōs hote*--but half use non-Homeric framing devices. Seven similes extend syntactically into the line resuming the "real" narrative as at 1.578-79:

καλὰ μελιζόμενος νόμιον μέλος—ὥς ἄρα τοίγε  
ὠμάρτευν· τὴν δ' αἰὲν ἐπασσύτερος φέρεν οὔρος

an effect that occurs only once in Homeric epic (*Od.*10.414) and emblemizes the permeable boundary between this device and flow of the epic action in the *Argonautica*.<sup>72</sup> Of the two primary roles played by similes in Homer--rhythmic punctuation of extended narrative, and emotional

<sup>69</sup> Cf. Feeney (1991) 70 on the oddity of this representational *mise en abyme*.

<sup>70</sup> Goldhill (1991) 308-11, with a penetrating survey of earlier interpretations.

<sup>71</sup> Yet another resonance comes from the phrasal recollection of Helen's web (*Il.*3.125-8) in *Arg.*1.722: see Cusset (1999) 281-82. On the complex thematic ties of the cloak as well as the "amatory" context for the cloak of Odysseus, see Hunter (1993) 52-55. On the parallels with the song of Demodocus--allegorized in antiquity as concerning love and war--see Nelis (1992).

<sup>72</sup> See Carpsacken (1952) 60-67 for specifics on all these points. In general on Apollonius' similes see Hunter (1993)129-37, Reitz (1996), Cusset (1999) 117-257, and Matone (1999).

highlighting--Apollonius most often chooses the latter.<sup>73</sup> After Jason dons his cloak and starts out for the city of the Lemnian women, the poet compares him to a shining star (1.774-81):

Βῆ δ' ἴμεναι προτὶ ἄστν, φαεινῶ ἀστέρι ἴσος,  
 ὄν ῥά τε νηγατέησιν ἐεργόμεναι καλύβησιν  
 νύμφαι θηήσαντο δόμων ὑπερ ἀντέλλοντα,  
 καί σφισι κυανέοιο δι' αἰθέρος ὄμματα θέλγει  
 καλὸν ἐρευθόμενος, γάννυται δέ τε ἠιθέοιο  
 παρθένος ἰμείρουσα μετ' ἄλλοδαποῖσιν ἐόντος  
 ἀνδράσιν, ᾧ κέν μιν μνηστὴν κομέωσι τοκῆες—  
 τῷ ἴκελος προπόλοιο κατὰ στίβον ἦιεν ἥρωσ·

Immediately, the simile places other viewers within our ken--young brides (*numphai*) whose eyes are enchanted by the rising red star (clearly, but tacitly, Hesperus, with all its erotic associations), and a young maiden, who longs for her distant husband to be. Not only does this dual reference suggest an evolving relationship, from unwed to married, relevant to the hero's encounters with Hypsipyle and Medea. The simile as a whole also overflows its immediate signified (Jason's appearance) to recall the brightness of his cloak (red, like a rising sun: 1.725-27) and to gesture proleptically to his welcome by marriageable women (1.784) including their blushing queen (1.791: παρθενική ἐρύθηνε παρηίδας). The Homeric background darkens the picture, as most star similes in the *Iliad* are baneful harbingers (cf. *Il.*22.26-32: Priam viewing the approaching killer of his son).<sup>74</sup> The audience must recall this image when, later on, Medea's anxious weeping is described (3.656-64) as like that of a *numphê* (newly married or betrothed) who laments her recently dead love.<sup>75</sup> The vision of ruddy celestial glow recurs in a simile at the moment Jason seizes the Fleece (4.125-26). Distant recall of an originating simile like that in (1.774-81) is further enabled by the exquisite care with which Apollonius carves such lyric gems, even phonically (note ἄστν...ἀστέρι and the meaningful echo of ἠιθέοιο by ἦιεν ἥρωσ).

The evocation of mixed emotions and viewpoints by way of simile is, of course, not missing from Homeric art: one thinks of *Il.*16.7-11 (Patroclus compared to a small girl) or

<sup>73</sup> On these roles in relation to the history of Homeric simile interpretation see Martin

<sup>74</sup> On the simile see Reitz (1996) 16-19 with further bibliography.

<sup>75</sup> Cf. Hunter (1989) 168-69 on this simile. For a similar linking to actions outside the simile, see Feeney (1991) 74 on *Arg.*2.600 (ship like an arrow) picking up 2.591-2 (oars bent like bows).

*Od.5.394-98* (Odysseus's sight of land like children's sight of their recovered father). Nor does Apollonius make longer similes. Instead, his are marked by a density and breadth of allusion and atunement perceptible in the finer details. Thus, the Homeric Nausicaa, leading her age-mates in song, is like Artemis (*Od.6.102-9*):

οἷη δ' Ἄρτεμις εἴσι κατ' οὔρεα ἰοχέαιρα,  
 ἢ κατὰ Τηϋέγοντον περιμήκετον ἢ Ἐρύμανθον,  
 τεροπομένη κάπροισι καὶ ὠκείησ' ἐλάφοισι·  
**τῇ δέ θ' ἅμα Νύμφαι**, κοῦραι Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο,  
 ἀγρονόμοι παίζουσι· γέγηθε δέ τε φρένα **Λητώ**·  
 πασάων δ' ὑπὲρ ἢ γε κάρη ἔχει ἠδὲ μέτωπα,  
 ῥεῖά τ' **ἄριγνώτη** πέλεται, καλαὶ δέ τε πᾶσαι·  
 ὥς ἢ γ' ἀμφιπόλοισι μετέπρεπε **παρθένος** ἀδμήης.

The description of Medea is a highly conscious imitation, prompting many resonances (*Arg.3.876-86*):

οἷη δέ, λιαροῖσιν ἐν ὕδασι **Παρθενίοιο**  
 ἠὲ καὶ Ἄμνισοῖο λοεσσαμένη ποταμοῖο,  
 χρυσεῖοις Λητωῖς ἐφ' ἄρμασιν ἐστηυῖα  
 ὠκείαις κεμάδεσσι διεξελάησι κολώνας,  
 τηλόθεν ἀντιώσα πολυκνίσου **ἐκατόμβης**·  
**τῇ δ' ἅμα νύμφαι** ἔπονται ἀμορβάδες, αἱ μὲν ἀπ' αὐτῆς  
 ἀγρόμεναι πηγῆς Ἄμνισίδες, αἱ δὲ λιπούσαι  
 ἄλσεα καὶ σκοπιὰς πολυπίδακας, ἀμφὶ δὲ θήρες  
 κνυζηθμῶ σαίνουσιν ὑποτρομέοντες ἰοῦσαν—  
 ὥς αἶγ' ἐσσεύοντο δι' ἄστεος, ἀμφὶ δὲ λαοὶ  
 εἶκον **ἀλευάμενοι** βασιληίδος **ὄμματα** κούρης.

But the differences are telling. Leto is the viewer within the Odyssean simile, and Artemis/Nausicaa is an object of the gaze, “easily recognizable” (ἀριγνώτη) while at the same time essentially like her beautiful companions. In the *Argonautica*, Artemis/Medea is Leto's daughter, but the would-be viewers of the girl (as the simile melts into narrative) conspicuously *refuse* to look, out of fear for her gaze. Unlike the choral ethos of the Homeric scene, the Apollonius version celebrates a divine

power dynamic: nymphs from all over gather, animals fawn, and the goddess herself is driving to receive her hecatomb. This theme extends to the mention of rivers, for we are not far from the dangers associated with Artemis bathing, as developed in the myths of Teiresias and Actaeon (and Hellenistic versions thereof). Furthermore, the *Argonautica* simile packs in at least two other hypotexts featuring the jubilant arrival of gods and animal reactions: Poseidon (*Il.*13.27-8) and Aphrodite (*Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite* 69-74)--the latter a typically ironic gesture toward the erotic charm of this particular parthenos.<sup>76</sup>

**Character** construction remains an under-theorized area of study regarding epic, archaic as well as Hellenistic. Unlike readers of 19<sup>th</sup>-century novels, we must look to features beyond realistic psychological depiction, since the hexameter poets in their creation of fictional persons worked within more formal conventions--traditional diction, type-scenes, set speeches. Even simile, as we have seen, can aid in implying character traits. Through situational and dictional echo, Medea can be characterized as another Nausicaa, but also a Circe, Penelope, Andromache, or Helen.<sup>77</sup> A related form of overlay applied to the erring seer Phineus conflates Circe and Teiresias, leading the audience to assemble his "character" through reminiscence of these Odyssean roles.<sup>78</sup> When Apollonius at other times employs an already complicated Homeric template, the layering produces a more convincing (albeit exasperating) protagonist. Not only is Jason, as we piece him together from other appearances, "jealous of honor but incapable of asserting it, passive in the face of crisis, timid and confused before trouble."<sup>79</sup> He also bears the scars of earlier imperfect heroes. Thus, Jason's peculiar blend of hesitation, anxiety, and confidence as encapsulated in his "test" of the crew after their passage through the Clashing Rocks (2.621-47) is shadowed by the behavior of Agamemnon and his nearly disastrous *peira* of the troops in *Il.*2.56-154.<sup>80</sup> When Jason and Medea do finally settle on action (e.g. the latter at 3.751-824), it is never represented in the clear-cut Homeric schema of decision-making, but rather after a succession of random ideas, flustered thinking, and even discussion with other people about various alternatives, a departure from the tradition made all the more striking by a sprinkling of typical phrases from the older model.<sup>81</sup>

Apart from these techniques, flowing from intertextual awareness, the primary means for constructing character in Homeric epic was direct speech. Even though Apollonius can employ

---

<sup>76</sup> On these connections and further analysis of this simile, see Hunter (1989) 194-96.

<sup>77</sup> Knight (1995) 181-184.

<sup>78</sup> Hunter (1993) 90-5; cf. Clare (2002) 75.

<sup>79</sup> Carspecken (1952) 101.

<sup>80</sup> Hunter (1988) 445-47; Kyriakou (1995) 122-31.

<sup>81</sup> Fine analysis in Rosenmeyer (1992).

with deft awareness the two main Homeric words distinguishing speech (*epos* and *muthos*) to create meaningful allusions to the dynamics of the Ptolemaic court, his reporting of character's words throughout the composition is radically reduced: 71% of the lines in the *Argonautica* are in the poet's voice, as contrasted with 55% in the *Iliad*.<sup>82</sup> This alone conduces to the sense that a very different sort of narrator lurks behind the poem's facade. Or, to put it in terms used in this essay, the overarching *expectation* created by all the levels of epic imitation in this poem--that the narrator, given his uncanny ventriloquism, will behave like his Homeric counterpart-- turns out to be frustrated by the distinctively un-Homeric *voice*.

It is a more dominating, more interactive, and more emotionally involved voice than that heard in the *Iliad* or *Odyssey*. Indeed, it is most like that of a character within the epic, rather than an all-knowing distant narrator's.<sup>83</sup> Individual words that encode attitudes in Homer primarily if not exclusively within character-speech (*oloos*, "baneful," *stugeros* "hateful") are used by the narrator in the *Argonautica*.<sup>84</sup> Homeric speakers can call each other, or the gods "merciless" or "headstrong" (*skhetlios*, e.g. *Od.13.293*), but in Apollonius it is part of the narrator's vocabulary (as at *Arg.2.1028*, where it means rather "unfortunate").<sup>85</sup> At the level of discourse habit, the voice that tells the tale exhibits the sort of avoidance strategies seen in the speeches by Homeric characters, whether it is vagueness about naming particular gods as responsible for action, or failure to pinpoint the source of changes in wind and weather.<sup>86</sup> Even at the level of discourse particles, the emotional tone and approach of a Homeric speaker is reflected in the use of *pou* "somehow, no doubt" and related forms, as he narrator speculates on the motives and feelings of his characters. Cyzicus is slain "doubtless (*pou*) thinking he was free from cruel destruction" (1.1037). The effect is as if the narrator "engages in a pervasive and variegated dialogue with his narrates."<sup>87</sup> Such staging of the narrator's thoughts and feelings accords with the frequent use of moralizing maxims, as in the same passage: "for mortals can never

---

<sup>82</sup> On *epos* and *muthos* see Mori (2001); for the relative rates of speech, see Hunter (2008) 141.

<sup>83</sup> On interactivity of Apollonius' narrator with his characters and audience see Morrison (2007) 271.

<sup>84</sup> Hunter (1993) 110-11

<sup>85</sup> Morrison (2007) 284

<sup>86</sup> Feeney (1991) 87-89 on e.g. 3.540 *theoi*.

<sup>87</sup> Cuypers (2005) 35 for the quote; *passim* for examples.

escape fate”(1.1035).

And so we are encouraged to wonder: *who does* voice the *Argonautica*? The self-constrained nature of the narrator’s performance has led to comparisons with the figure of the seer Phineus within the poem, who warns his listeners that they are not permitted to know everything “exactly” (*atrekes*, 2.312), thus aligning himself with the selective and even misleading revelations by Zeus through oracles. Just so, the narrator eschews full disclosure, especially of sacred or magic ritual: he will not “make a *muthos*” of the rites of Samothrace (1.919-21) nor sing of Medea’s propitiatory sacrifices to Hecate (4.247-50).<sup>88</sup> At the same time, this narrator is remarkably knowledgeable, throughout the poem, in detailing the aitiologies of cult sites and practices.<sup>89</sup> We are initiated into this lore just as the Argonauts were instructed by Orpheus: the mantic voice of the narrator could well be that of the musician-hero. A near-identification does, after all, take place in the sudden break-off that marks Orpheus’ *paian* to Apollo *Heðios* (2.707-10):<sup>90</sup>

κοῦρος ἔων ἔτι γυμνός, ἔτι πλοκάμοισι γεγηθώς  
**(ἰλήχοις· αἰεὶ τοι, ἄναξ, ἄτμητοι ἔθειραι,**  
 αἰὲν ἀδήλητοι, τῶς γὰρ θέμις, οἴοθι δ’ αὐτῇ  
 Λητῶ Κοιογένεια φίλαις ἐνὶ χερσὶν ἀφάσσει).

Furthermore, an Orphic voice would harmonize with the overall hymnic framing of the poem, as marked out even in the invocation of 1.1-2:<sup>91</sup>

**Ἀρχόμενος σέο Φοῖβε παλαιγενέων κλέα φωτῶν**  
**μνήσομαι ...**

The often remarked failure to begin with the Muse can be taken several ways, among them as an assertion of authority equalling that of the daughters of Mnemosyne (and Orpheus himself is offspring of a Muse, as we are told immediately after the proem: 1.23-34). That Orpheus has divine gifts is implied even syntactically, when his name is conjoined, in the genitive, with the verb “let us recall”: Πρῶτά νυν **Ὀρφῆος μνησώμεθα**, for which the first line of the *Homeric Hymn to*

<sup>88</sup> Clare (2002) 274, Feeney (1991) 61, 64-5, 94.

<sup>89</sup> On aitiologies in the poem see Köhnken (2010) 136-37.

<sup>90</sup> On the complex merging, see Goldhill (1991) 297-98, building on Fränkel (1968) 227-8.

<sup>91</sup> On hymnic influence in the proem see Clare (2002) 21 and Hunter (2008) 115; also Clauss (1993) 16-19, Goldhill (1991) 287.

*Apollo* offers the closest model ( **Μνήσομαι** οὐδὲ λάθωμαι Ἀπόλλωνος ἐκάτοιο.)<sup>92</sup> Orpheus as Muse-substituting narrator can even be detected in the parallel functions assigned in this passage, with the Muses (belatedly and indirectly) invoked as “interpreters” (Μοῦσαι δ’ ὑποφήτορες εἶεν ἀοιδῆς 1.22) and the Muse’s son commemorated as “helper” (ἐπαρωγὸν ἀέθλων 1.32).<sup>93</sup> The gradual occlusion of the narrator’s authority in favor of the Muses’ can then ironically be read as a type of *agôn* between divine and human singers, in which the latter loses (yet escapes the fate of *Thamyris*).<sup>94</sup> That a similar *agôn* has already been depicted in the poem, when Orpheus drowns out his cousins the Sirens (4.891-911), adds to the plausibility.

These mythopoeic multiforms bring us finally to a coda that deserves a treatise to itself: the relation of Apollonius to Hesiod. The formulation by Frederick Griffiths contrasts this succinctly with the Homeric influence: “Apollonius’ *alter ego* Orpheus is more a Hesiod than a Phemius.”<sup>95</sup> In the Alexandrian milieu, the archaic Boeotian was a crucial figure for imitation, as is clear from the *Aitia* and *Hymns* of Callimachus, as well as the *Phainomena* of Aratus.<sup>96</sup> As model for a divinely inspired poet not entangled with human kings and wars, the proem to the *Theogony* was especially good for Alexandrians to think with, even as they further mythologized it: a version of Hesiod’s encounter with the Muses underlies the Argonautic meeting with the Libyan *hêrôssae* (4.1312-36).<sup>97</sup> The Hesiodic model, like the Homeric, was mediated through the contemporary scholarly activity of Alexandria, traces of which remain.<sup>98</sup> Significantly, Apollonius was one of those who wrote on Hesiod: his opinion that a line is missing in the proem after *Theogony* 26 is mentioned in the *scholia vetera ad loc.* (diGregorio).<sup>99</sup> Equally tantalizing is the information from an ancient *hypothesis* that he considered the [pseudo]-Hesiodic *Aspis* (*Shield of Heracles*) to be genuine, on the basis of its stylistic *kharaktêr*. That at times bizarre composition provides at least one

<sup>92</sup> The syntax of 1.1-2 offers ironic contrast, as the genitive is governed by *arkhomenos* “starting from you” but the verb *mnêsomai* “I will recall” this time aims at humans, taking the accusative phrase *klea phôtôn* “the glories of men”.

<sup>93</sup> Morrison (2007) 288-95 summarizes the debate over the meaning of 1.22 *hupophêtores*.

<sup>94</sup> On the slippage of the narrator’s of authority see Feeney (1991) 90-91, Goldhill (1991) 292-3, Morrison (2007) 272.

<sup>95</sup> Griffiths (1995) 188.

<sup>96</sup> Hunter & Fantuzzi (2004) 51-60, 351-55 and Stephens (2003) 253-56.

<sup>97</sup> Feeney (1991) 92, noting the relevance of the dream-like atmosphere in both scenes.

<sup>98</sup> On Zenodotus edition of the Hesiodic text, see Schroeder (2009).

<sup>99</sup> On Apollonius’ scholarly work on Hesiod see Pfeiffer (1968) 144 and Cusset (1999) 17.

decoration (a chariot race) for his own *ekphasis* of Jason's cloak (*Arg.* 1.752-58; cf. *Scutum* 305-13).<sup>100</sup>

Given the epic ambitions of the *Argonautica* one might anticipate a weaker intertextual bond with this non-epic source but Hesiod's magnetism might in fact account for some of the distinctive qualities that differentiate the Alexandrian epic. In terms of structure, the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*—as much as emerges from the extant fragments—was a prime hypotext for the *Catalogue of Argonauts*: Pero, mother of Talau and Areius (1.118-121) and Periklumeons (cf. *Arg.* 1.156-60) featured in both texts (cf. *Catalogue* fr.37, fr 33.11-36). The Apollonian version blazons its generic connection at 1.230-32 by pointing to a matriarchal genealogical bond uniting the Minyans. The *Catalogue*-like list of the “race of goddesses” ending the *Theogony* includes the mother of Aristaeus (*Theog.* 977), yet another figure found prominently in Apollonius (in the embedded aetiology for the etesian winds: 2.506-52).

Human blood-ties in the poetry of Hesiod flow easily from theogonic materials. The inclusion of Orpheus among Jason's crew opens up the most opportunities for the latter genre to take root. The calming cosmogonic song of Orpheus (1.496-511) is the poem's most obvious debt to Hesiod, but strikingly deviates both in its philosophical beginning (“earth” and “sky” seeming to be unpersonified natural elements) as well as its subsequent “Orphic” lines of succession (Ophion and Eurynome as first inhabitants of Olympus). Only in its closing verses about the Cyclopes and young Zeus does the song align itself with our *Theogony* (*Theog.* 139-46; 477-506); even then the Hesiodic narrative is still in the future, in terms of this Orphic time-frame.<sup>101</sup>

The *Theogony* narrative haunts the *Argonautica* the closer the heroes approach Colchis. Events from deep time—the rise of Zeus—are here horizontally displayed, so that “early” and “far” coincide. As we progress, Amycus is compared to the *Theogony*'s Typhoeus, offspring of Gaia (*Arg.* 2.38-40; cf. *Theog.* 820-68); another challenger, the snake that guards the Fleece, was nourished by Gaia with the blood of Zeus's monstrous enemy Typhaon (2.1209-13). The *Argo* sails past the spot where, before the rise of Zeus, Kronos mated with Philyra, begetting the centaur Cheiron (2.1231-41). Prometheus, though his fate elapsed generations ago, is still a living presence in this landscape (2.1248-59). The liver-gnawing eagle is a daily sight, and the root

<sup>100</sup> Hunter (1993) 55-56; see further Cusset (1999) 20 and on the stylistic character of the *Shield*, Martin (2005).

<sup>101</sup> Clare (2002) 55; cf. Feeney (1991) 67-8, who also adduces the Cyclopean scene on Jason's cloak (1.730-34).

nourished by his bloody *ichor* will go toward protecting Jason in his great trial (3.851-57). The Cyclops of Orpheus's song were "earth-born" (*gêgenees*, 1.510) just as the story ran in Hesiod (*Theog.* 139, though without this adjective). But it is the other Hesiodic offspring of Gaia—Typhoeus, the Erinyes-- that we are reminded of while moving east: the six-armed men of Bear Mountain (*Arg.* 1.943), and ultimately the teeth-sprung warriors of Aietes (3.499). Jason, in effect, struggles still with theogonic time; it is not accidental that his own contest to subdue the fire-breathing oxen (3.1299-1305, 1326-29) resonates with diction from the *Theogony's* conquest of the Titans (*Theog.* 689-700) and Typhoeus by Zeus (*Theog.* 853-68).<sup>102</sup> Although the terms of that struggle are reversed--it is Zeus who smites with burning fire, like the oxen Jason must overcome—this only underlines the hero's own heritage: he comes from the territory of Zeus's rival Prometheus (as he tells Medea: 3.1086-95), from whom he himself can claim descent.

Jason's vanquishing of the oxen enables him to plow and sow, as if moving immediately from a *Theogony* to the *Works and Days*. Words from a central section of that poem (*Erga* 415-473) spring up in his cutting of furrows (3.1330-45) and in the imagery used to describe Jason's harvesting of the earth-born warriors (3.1386-90 cutting unripe crop; 1396-1403 crop damaged by rain).<sup>103</sup> Perhaps such diction is only to be expected in a scene related (if weirdly) to agricultural life, yet it reminds us that the "realism" of Apollonius had already been exploited in the poetic tradition by the Boeotian bard whose many wisdom works (whether *Astronomy*, *Bird-Signs*, or *Precepts of Cheiron*) presented "an archaic model for a poetics of information".<sup>104</sup>

The image of the farmer with a newly sharpened sickle (3.1388) that describes Jason at work, in this Hesiodic context might summon up the *Theogony*, and the *harpê* of Kronos, given to him by his oppressed mother Gaia (*Theog.* 175, 179). The bloody episode might have remained deep beneath this text, were it not for the explicit evocation of it by the *Argonautica* narrator in the next book of the poem (*Arg.* 4.982-992):

Ἔστι δέ τις πορθμοῖο παροιτέρη Ἴονίοιο

<sup>102</sup> The defeat of Typhoeus is followed by description of the threatening winds that arise from the monster (*Theog.* 869-79); the last fiery gasp of the oxen prompts a wind simile (cf. 3.1327 *epipneionte* and *Theog.* 872 *epipneiousi*)

<sup>103</sup> Compare *Arg.* 3.1381 and *Erga* 431 (*histoboiei*); 1325 and *Erga* 467 *ekhetlê*; 1331 and *Erga* 463-4 *neios*; cf. also *Scutum* 286-290; 1347 and *Erga* 439, 443 *aulaka*; 1399 and *Erga* 415 *ombrêsantos*

<sup>104</sup> Lamberton (1988) 151.

ἀμφιλαφῆς πείρα Κεραυνίη εἰν ἄλι νῆσος,  
 ἦ ὑπο δὴ κείσθαι δρέπανον φάτις (ἴλατε Μοῦσαι,  
**οὐκ ἐθέλων ἐνέπω προτέρων ἔπος**) ᾧ ἀπὸ πατρός  
 μήδεα νηλειῶς ἔταμε Κρόνος (οἱ δέ ἐ Διὸς  
 κλείουσι χθονίης καλαμητόμον ἔμμεναι ἄρπην·

This remarkable apology for repeating “the epos of those who came before” clearly refers to the castration episode at *Theog.* 176-82. In classic Hellenistic fashion, the narrator recalls the story only to counteract the myth by another, in which people “repeat as *kleos*” (*kleiousei*) that the island is actually associated with the scythe of Demeter, who taught the Titans to cut grain. Furthermore, the island is home to the Phaeacians, who boast a very un-Hesiodic (and un-Homeric) origin, as descendants of the blood of Ouranos (4.992). Whereas the *Theogony* knows of Erinyes, Giants, and nymphs called *Meliai* emerging from the bloody droplets off the severed genitals (and Aphrodite from the organ itself), this version would ally Jason with protectors who, like him, are connected to powerful figures before or outside the Olympian regime—Ouranos and Prometheus. In other words, the apparently innocent alternative version is, politically and poetically, subversive. We could say that Apollonius here treats the martial side of Hesiod—his cosmogonic woundings and slaughters—to a challenge from the agricultural—the celebration of Demeter and her works. The terms of such a contestation were long familiar to Greeks at a metapoetic level. A traditional generic split is contained in the view of Aeschylus, as staged by Aristophanes (*Frogs* 1030-36): Hesiod teaches men the working of the earth, harvest and plowing; Homer teaches troop formation, armings, and glorious exploits. The later *Contest of Homer and Hesiod*—a 2<sup>nd</sup> century AD composition with roots going back to the 6<sup>th</sup> century BC—has Hesiod proclaimed the winner in his singing match against Homer, since his lines speak of land-working (*georgia*), not wars and slayings.<sup>105</sup> Given the danger in assuming that Apollonius was governed by a binary opposition-- if not Homer than Hesiod. It is perhaps best, as with so many features of this astounding poet, to triangulate.<sup>106</sup> Orpheus has a contest with Sirens and, perhaps by implication, with the Muses in the *Argonautica* (if it is indeed his “voice” we hear behind the narrator). That Homer and Hesiod can abide in such close complementarity in this new epic, rather than be drawn up according to their traditional opposition, shows a compositional skill akin to that of the singer of cosmogonies (1.496-

<sup>105</sup> Allen (1912) lines 205-210. On the 4<sup>th</sup> century BC and earlier forms of the story see Richardson (1981).

<sup>106</sup> Morrison (2007)11.

515), the man who by his all-encompassing craft enchants his listeners and puts to rest their quarrels.

### Bibliography for R. Martin “Distant Landmarks”

- Allen, T.W. (1912) *Homeri Opera*, vol. 5. Oxford.
- Barchiesi, A. (1984) *La traccia del modello: Effetti omerici nella narrazione virgiliana*. Pisa.
- Bassett, S. (1919) “Versus Tetracolos,” *Classical Philology* (14) 216-233.
- Bettenworth, A. (2005) “Odysseus bei Aietes: primäre und sekundäre intertexte bei Apollonios Rhodios,” in Harder and Cuppers (edit.) 1-17.
- Boesch, G. (1908) *De Apollonii Rhodii elocutione*. Göttingen.
- Bonanno, M. G. (1990) *L'allusione necessaria, ricerche intertestuali sulla poesia greca e latina*. Rome.
- Bullock, A. (1970) “A Callimachean Refinement to the Greek Hexameter,” *CQ* (20) 258-68.
- Bullock, A. (2006) “Jason’s Cloak,” *Hermes* (134) 44-68.
- Burgess, J. S. (2001) *The Tradition of the Trojan War in Homer and the Epic Cycle*. Baltimore.
- Cameron, A. (1995) *Callimachus and His Critics*. Princeton.
- Campbell, M. (1981) *Echoes and Imitations of Early Epic in Apollonius Rhodius*. Leiden.
- Carspecken, J. F. (1952) *Yale Classical Studies* (13) 33–143.
- Clare R. J. (2002) *The Path of the Argo: Language, Imagery and Narrative in the Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius*. Cambridge.
- Clauss, J. (1993) *The Best of the Argonauts. The Redefinition of the Epic Hero in Book One of Apollonius’ Argonautica*. Berkeley.
- Conte, G. B. (1986) *The Rhetoric of Imitation: Genre and Poetic Memory in Virgil and Other Latin Poets*. Ithaca, NY.
- Cusset, C. (1999) *La Muse dans la bibliothèque. Réécriture et intertextualité dans la poésie alexandrine*. Paris.
- Cuppers, M. (2005) “Interactional Particles and Narrative Voice in Apollonius and Homer,” Harder and Cuppers (edit.)
- Danek, G. (2009) “Apollonius Rhodius as an (anti-)Homeric Narrator: Time and Space in the Argonautica,”

- n Jonas Grethlein & Antonios Rengakos (edit.). *Narratology and Interpretation. The Content of Narrative Form in Ancient Narrative*. Berlin: 275-91.
- Dettoni, E. (2000) *Filologia grammatica. Testimonianze e frammenti*. Rome.
- Dufner, C. (1988) *The Odyssey in the Argonautica. Reminiscence, Revision, Reconstruction*. Diss. Princeton University.
- Edmunds, L. (2001) *Intertextuality and the Reading of Roman Poetry*. Baltimore.
- Fantuzzi M., (1988) *Ricerche su Apollonio Rodio*. Rome.
- Fantuzzi, M and Pretagostini, R. (1995-1996) edit. *Struttura e storia dell'esametro Greco* (Studi di metrica classica 10) Rome. 2 vols.
- Fantuzzi, M. & Hunter R. (2004) *Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry*. Cambridge.
- Fantuzzi, M. (2008) "Homeric" Formularity in the Argonautica of Apollonius of Rhodes," in Theodore D. Papanghelis & Antonios Rengakos (edd.). *Brill's Companion to Apollonius Rhodius*. Second, revised edition. Leiden: 221-42.
- Feeney, D. C. (1991) *The Gods in Epic: Poets and Critics of the Classical Tradition*. Oxford.
- Foley, J. M. (1988) *The theory of oral composition. History and methodology*. Bloomington, IN.
- Foley, J. M. (1991) *Immanent art. From structure to meaning in traditional oral epic*, Bloomington, IN
- Fränkel, H. (1926) "Der homerische und der kallimachische Hexameter." Originally published in Göttinger Nachrichten 1926, rev. version in *Wege und Formen frühgriechischen Denkens* ed 3, 1968, Munich, 100-56.
- Fränkel, H. (1968) *Noten zu den Argonautika des Apollonios* Munich
- Goldhill, S. (1991) *The Poet's Voice: Essays on Poetics and Greek Literature*. Cambridge.
- Griffiths, F.T. (1995) review of Hunter (1993) *CP* (90)187-91.
- Hagel, S. (2004) "Tables beyond O'Neill," in F. Spaltenstein et al. edit. *Autour de la césure. Actes du colloque Damon des 3 et 4 novembre 2000*. Bern: 135-215.
- Haggett, A. (1902) *A Comparison of Apollonius Rhodius with Homer in Prepositional Usage*. Baltimore.
- Hainsworth, J. B. 1968. *The Flexibility of the Homeric Formula*. Oxford.

- Harder, A. and Cuypers, M. (2005) edit. *Beginning from Apollo: Studies in Apollonius Rhodius and the Argonautic Tradition*. Caeculus #6. Leuven.
- Harder, M. A. Regtuit R. F. and Wakker G. C. (2000) edit. *Apollonius Rhodius*. Leuven.
- Haslam, M W. (1978) "Apollonius Rhodius and the Papyri," *Illinois Classical Studies* (3) 47-73.
- Heubeck, A. , Russo, J. and Fernandez-Galiano, M. (1993) edit. *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey*. Volume III: Books XVII-XXIV. Oxford.
- Hinds, S. (1998) *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry*. Cambridge.
- Hutchinson, G. O. 2006. "Hellenistic Epic and Homeric Form," in M. J. Clarke, B. Currie & R.O.A.M. Lyne (edit.). *Epic Interactions. Perspectives on Homer, Virgil, and the Epic Tradition presented to Jasper Griffin by former pupils*. Oxford.
- Hunter, R. L (1988) "'Short on Heroics': Jason in the *Argonautica*," *CQ* (38) 436-53.
- Hunter, R. L. (1989) edit. *Apollonius of Rhodes: Argonautica. Book III*. Cambridge.
- Hunter, R. L. (1993) *The Argonautica of Apollonius: Literary Studies*. Cambridge
- Hunter, R. L. (2008) "The Poetics of Narrative in the *Argonautica*," in Theodore D. Papanghelis & Antonios Rengakos (edd.). *Brill's Companion to Apollonius Rhodius*. Second, revised edition. Leiden:115-46.
- Huxley, G.L.(1969) *Greek Epic Poetry: From Eumelos to Panyassis*. Cambridge, MA.
- Knight, V. (1995) *The Renewal of Epic: Responses to Homer in the Argonautica of Apollonius*. Leiden.
- Köhnken, A. (2010) "Apollonius' *Argonautica*," in J. Clauss & M. Cuypers (edit.) *A Companion to Hellenistic Literature*. Malden, MA: 136-50.
- Kyriakou, P. (1995) *Homeric Hapax Legomena in the Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius: A Literary Study*. Stuttgart.
- Lamberton, R. 1988. *Hesiod*. New Haven
- Levin, D. N. (1971) *Apollonius' Argonautica Re-examined [I]. The Neglected First and Second Books*. Leiden.
- Linsenbarth, O. (1887) *De Apollonii Rhodii casuum syntaxi comparato usu homerico*. Leipzig.
- LaRoche (1899) "Der Hexameter bei Apollonios, Aratos und Kallimachos," *WS* (21)161-97.

- Magnelli, E. (1995) "Le norme del secondo piede dell'esametro nei poeti ellenistici e il comportamento della parola metrica," *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici*, (35)135-164.
- Martin, R. P. (1997) "Similes and Performance," in E. Bakker and A. Kahane *Written Voices, Spoken Signs*. Cambridge, MA: 138-66.
- Martin, R. P. (2005) "Pulp Epic: The Catalogue and the Shield," pulp in R. L. Hunter (edit.) *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women: Constructions and Reconstructions*. Cambridge: 153– 75
- Marxer, G. (1935) *Die Sprache des Apollonios Rhodios in ihren Beziehungen zu Homer*. Zürich.
- Matone, C. (1999) *The Heart on the Sleeve. Image and Emotion in the Argonautica*. Diss. Columbia University, New York.
- Matthews, V. (1977) "Naupaktia and Argonautika," *Phoenix* (31)189-207.
- Matthews, V. (1974) *Panyassis of Halikarnassos: text and commentary*. Leiden
- Matthews, V. (1996) *Antimachus of Colophon. Text and commentary*. Leiden.
- McLennan, G. (1973) "The Employment of the Infinitive in Apollonius Rhodius," *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica* (15) 44-72.
- Mooney, G. (1912) *The Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius*. Dublin.
- Mori, A. (2001) "Personal Favor and Public Influence: Arete, Arsinoë II, and the *Argonautica*," *Oral Tradition* (16) 85-106.
- Morrison, A. (2007). *The Narrator in Archaic Greek and Hellenistic Poetry*. Cambridge.
- Muellner, L. (1996) *The Anger of Achilles: Mênis in Greek Epic*. Ithaca, NY.
- Nelis, D. 1992 "Demodocus and the Song of Orpheus," *Museum Helveticum* (49) 153–70
- O'Neill, (1942) "The Localization of Metrical Word-Types in the Greek Hexameter: Homer, Hesiod and the Alexandrians," *YCS* (8) 102-76.
- Parry, A. (1971) edit. *The Making of Homeric Verse The Collected Papers of Milman Parry*. Oxford.
- Peiffer, R. (1968) *History of Classical Scholarship: From the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age*. Oxford.

- Redondo, J. (2000) "Non-epic Features in the Language of Apollonius Rhodius," in M. A. Harder et al. (edit.) 129-54.
- Reitz, C. (1996) *Zur Gleichnisteknik des Apollonios von Rhodos*. Frankfurt am Main.
- Rengakos, A. (1994) *Apollonios Rhodios und die antike Homererklärung*. Munich. (Zetemata 92)
- Rengakos, A. (2008) "Apollonius Rhodius as a Homeric Scholar," in T. Papanghelis and A. Rengakos (edit): 243-66.
- Richardson, N. J. (1981) "The Contest of Homer and Hesiod and Alcidamas' *Mouseion*," *CQ* (31) 1-10.
- Rosenmeyer, T. (1992) "Apollonius Lyricus," *SIFC* (10) 177-98.
- Rzach, A. (1878) *Grammatische Studien zu Apollonios Rhodios*. Vienna
- Rzach, A. (1882) "Neue Beiträge zur Technik des nachhomerischen Hexameters," *Sitzungsberichte Wien Phil.-hist. Kl.* (100) 307-432.
- Scherer, B. (2006) *Mythos, Katalog und Prophezeiung. Studien zu den Argonautika des Apollonios*. Stuttgart.
- Schroeder, C. M. (2009). "Zenodotus' Text of Hesiod," *CQ* (59) 271-274.
- Seaton, R. (1890) "On the Imitation of Homer by Apollonius Rhodius," *Journal of Philology* (19) 1-13.
- Severyns, A. (1928) *Le Cycle epique dans l'ecole d'Aristarque*. Liège (repr. 1967 Brussels).
- Sicking C. (1993). *Griechische Verslehre*. with Marlein van Raalte. *Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft*, 2. Abt., 4. Teil. Munich.
- Sistakou, E. (2001) "Paradosê kai neoterikotêta ston katalogo tôn Argonautôn (Apoll. Rhod. *Arg.* 1.23-233)," *Hellenika* (51) 231-64.
- Sistakou, E. (2007) "Cyclic stories? The reception of the *Cypria* in Hellenistic poetry," *Philologus* (151) 78-94.
- Spanoudakis, K. (2002) *Philitas of Cos*. Leiden.
- Stephens, S. (2003) *Seeing Double. Intercultural Poetics in Ptolemaic Alexandria*. Berkeley:
- Thomas, R. F. (1999) *Reading Virgil and his texts: studies in intertextuality*. Ann Arbor.
- Tsagalis, C. (2008) *Oral Palimpsest: Exploring Intertextuality in the Homeric Epics*. Washington, DC.

- Wendel, C. (1935) *Scholia in Apollonium Rhodium Vetera*. Berlin.
- West, M.L. (2003) *Greek Epic Fragments from the Seventh to the Fifth Centuries BC*. Cambridge, MA.
- West, M.L. (2005) "Odyssey and Argonautica," *CQ* (55) 39–64.
- Wifstrand, A. (1933) *Von Kallimachos zu Nonnos. Metrisch-stilistische Untersuchungen zur späteren griechischen Epik und zu verwandten Gedichtgattungen*. Lund.
- Wyss, B. (1936). *Antimachi Colophonii Reliquiae*. Berlin.
- Zacco, A. (1996) "Sull'uso di "apêlegeos" nel racconto omerico e nelle *Argonautiche* di Apollonio Rodio," *Levum* (9) 151-75.