

BLESSED HEROES: APOLLONIUS' *ARGONAUTICA* AND THE *HOMERIC HYMNS*

Brian D. McPhee

A dissertation submitted to the faculty at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Department of Classics.

Chapel Hill
2020

Approved by:

Patricia A. Rosenmeyer

William H. Race

James J. O'Hara

James J. Clauss

Suzanne Lye

© 2020
Brian D. McPhee
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

ABSTRACT

Brian D. McPhee: *Blessed Heroes: Apollonius' Argonautica and the Homeric Hymns*
(Under the direction of Patricia A. Rosenmeyer)

This dissertation centers on Apollonius Rhodius' *Argonautica*. My study expands the scope of more than a century of scholarship on Apollonius' Homeric reception by exploring his engagement with the understudied but crucial model of the *Homeric Hymns*. Through a series of close readings informed by the theories of intertextuality and narratology, I reveal Apollonius' poetic strategy of uniting the two streams of the Homeric hexameter tradition, the epics and hymns, into one innovative package, an epic hymn in honor of the Argonauts in their capacity as both mortal and divinized heroes. I argue that for Apollonius, the *Homeric Hymns* stood alongside the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* as an indispensable part of his Homeric inheritance and an equally authorizing model for his innovative poem.

Part I of this study explores the *Argonautica*'s generic affiliations. Chapter 1 scrutinizes its beginning and ending, which, I argue, frame the poem as a hymn dedicated to the Argonauts as divinized cult heroes. Chapter 2 delves further into the poem's portrayal of hero cult, which, my analysis shows, serves an important metapoetic function: the poem's generic hybridity as an "epic hymn" is facilitated by the ambivalence of the Greek concept of the hero, who is at once the subject of epic memorializing and the object of religious veneration in cult, including in hymns. Part II of this study is narratological in nature, investigating the hymnic dimension of Apollonius' complex narratorial persona. Chapter 3 focuses on narratorial techniques, such as overt intrusions into the narrative or loud displays of piety, that find "Homeric" precedent not in

the Homeric epics, but in the *Homeric Hymns*. Chapter 4 examines instances of hymnody within Apollonius' epic narrative. I detail the Apollonian narrator's marked tendency to blend his own voice with that of his characters when they are invoking deities, thereby creating the impression that he is himself enthusiastically joining in his characters' prayer or worship. I conclude by identifying avenues for future research and by reflecting on the significance of my study for two larger topics in Apollonian studies: the *Argonautica*'s fraught portrayal of heroism and its contextualization in Ptolemaic Egypt.

illis heroibus veris
qui adversum minas nostrorum temporum geminas
et pestem novam et veteres iniustitias
perseveranter pugnant

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is a genuine pleasure to express my appreciation to the countless people who have helped me along the long road to the doctorate. Thus, at the risk of provoking κόρος, I here indulge in some perhaps fulsome acknowledgements of the many debts I have accrued along the way.

I must begin with my Committee, and first of all with my wonderful director, Patricia Rosenmeyer. I could not have anticipated what an incredibly kind and supportive mentor I would be gaining when Patricia came to UNC, but I could not be happier with the steadfast guidance and incisive feedback on my work that I continue to receive from her. Really, I count myself incredibly lucky, because in addition to Patricia, I have yet another amazing mentor in Bill Race, who first introduced me to Apollonius in his seminar of Fall 2015. I thought I would specialize in Greco-Roman religion when I first arrived at Carolina, but Bill's appreciation for Greek poetry proved contagious, and his personal store of judicious criticism and encouragement seems to be truly endless. I benefited enormously as well from studying under Jim O'Hara, whose rigorous courses on sophisticated Latin poetry showed me many sophisticated new ways of reading ancient literature, in Greek as well as Latin. To Jim Clauss, whose work long inspired me before I had the pleasure of meeting him, I say: *ti ringrazio per tutto!* And last, I am so glad that my Committee could be Suzanne Lye's first. Her shrewd comments on my drafts challenged me to sharpen my thought on a number of fronts, and she particularly helped to orient

me to the bibliography on hero cult. This dissertation has been immeasurably improved by the entire Committee's critique, and they all have my deepest thanks.

In fact, I owe a tremendous debt of gratitude to all of my professors at UNC, and I would like to single out three more who were not on my Committee: Sharon James, whose "Ovid and Literary Theory" class especially has informed my approach to allusion, intertextuality, and reader-response; Jennifer Gates-Foster, whose course on "Greeks in Egypt" made me think about Apollonius' sociohistorical context; and Emily Baragwanath, who has generously supported me in many ways, but here deserves thanks for introducing me to narratology. And if I may extend the field to my undergraduate professors as well, I cannot forget Susan MacManus, Dell deChant, Ava Chitwood (*requiescat in pace*), and Ippokratis Kantzios. But no one deserves to be thanked more richly than Casey Moore, an incredible scholar and educator who inspired me to pursue graduate studies in the first place.

I presented ideas related to this dissertation at several conferences and talks over the years—twice at the annual graduate colloquium held between the Classics departments of UNC and King's College, London (at Chapel Hill in 2016, London in 2017); at the 2017 CAMWS meeting in Kitchener, Ontario; at the 2019 Groningen Workshop on Hellenistic Poetry; in a Babcock Lecture at the Intercollegiate Center of Classical Studies in Rome (2019); in a shoptalk at the American Academy in Rome (2019); and, via Zoom, in Jim Clauss's graduate Apollonius seminar at the University of Washington in Seattle (2020). These opportunities to explore this topic before different types of audience and in varying formats were invaluable for developing my thinking, and I am delighted to report, in all earnestness, that on each occasion my arguments benefited from questions and comments from the audience and from co-presenters and presiders.

I am very fortunate to have been exempted from teaching duties as I wrote, thanks first to a Royster Society Fellowship at UNC and then to a Rome Prize Fellowship in the following year. I could hardly have dreamt up a more congenial or stimulating environment than the American Academy in Rome in which to complete my dissertation—the outbreak of COVID-19 notwithstanding! The one-of-a-kind setting, sites, and, most importantly, the community there have expanded my horizons in ways that, I expect, will only become more apparent to me over time.

The pandemic did mean that my library access was considerably limited in the final months of writing and editing, but it was incredibly affirming to witness the generosity of the international scholarly community in sharing materials electronically in this trying time. For help with procuring pictures and scans of some key bibliography, I must express my gratitude to the Classicists' PDF Society, and particularly to Marco Pelucchi, Viola Palmieri, Verity Platt, Marie Zöckler, Tomasz Mojsik, and Georgios Tsomis.

For assistance on individual points, I am also pleased to thank Robert Babcock, my fellow AAR Fellow Matthew Brennan, and, once again, Hip Kantzios. I owe special thanks as well to Jackie Murray and Aniek van den Eersten for graciously sharing some of their work with me.

Finally, I come to the friends and family who have provided so much encouragement, even as I undertook *πόντοι* whose value could not have been obvious to many of them! First, year after year, the amiable grad students at UNC have made the grueling process of pursuing a PhD as enjoyable as could be hoped for. I look forward to celebrating together in person when this pandemic is behind us! If they are reading, they are probably surprised that I have not yet mentioned my dear cat Percy, whose constant presence on my lap in Chapel Hill was an

important (and comfortable) part of my writing process. And then there is Max: we only see each other a few times a year now, but I don't know what I would do without our conversations, which I think were one of the real springboards that originally got me excited about dissecting narrative art. I know this much: this dissertation would be much improved if I could analyze a book or film with half the insight that he can.

My family deserves more thanks than I can give. I give it first to my sisters Laura and Sarah, who have both given me models of academic and professional success to emulate—and who have thoughtfully left the humanities lane open to me! Second, to my mother Susan and my father David, who so insisted upon education, who taught me the value of hard work, who supported me whatever profession I chose (even Classics!), and who, in a word, did what good parents do: sacrifice so that their children could realize their dreams. Mom and Dad, I will never, ever be able to repay you. And last, to Hannah, my partner, my *χαρή*, my soon-to-be wife. Only God and the omniscient Homeric narrator know where I would be without you. If I never find a job in Classics, if I never read another line of Greek, it will all have been worth it just to have met you one autumn evening in a Herodotus seminar in Murphey 221.

ὄπποτε κ' ἔνδοθι εἰλίσσω, πῶς ὄλβιός εἰμι,

ἄγνωται αὐδὴ ἐμή, θάλλονται τ' ὄψεις.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

NOTE ON TEXTS, TRANSLATIONS, AND ABBREVIATIONS.....	xiv
INTRODUCTION.....	1
I. Topic and <i>Status Quaestionis</i>	2
II. The <i>Homeric Hymns</i> : An Overview.....	6
a. The Collection.....	6
b. Structure.....	10
c. Performance Context.....	18
d. Attribution of Authorship.....	20
e. The Appeal of the <i>Homeric Hymns</i> in Third-Century Alexandria.....	27
III. Method and Terminology.....	30
IV. A Survey of Exemplary Allusions to the <i>Homeric Hymns</i>	36
a. The <i>Homeric Hymns</i> as Sources for Myth.....	37
b. Epic World-Building.....	43
c. The Reception of the Homeric Gods.....	47
d. Allusive Characterization.....	49
e. Localized Effects of Allusions to the <i>Hymns</i>	52
V. Outline of Chapters.....	56

PART I: THE *ARGONAUTICA* AS EPIC HYMN

CHAPTER 1. A DIACHRONIC READING OF THE <i>ARGONAUTICA</i> 'S HYMNIC FRAME.....	61
I. The Introit.....	65
a. What Kind of Hymn?.....	65
b. The “Hymnic Proem” Interpretation.....	70
c. The Ambiguity of “Beginning with You, Phoebus”.....	76
d. The Case for the “Hymnic Proem” Interpretation.....	85
e. A Hymnic Proem or a Hymn to Apollo?.....	95
II. The Envoi.....	100
a. The Rhetorical Structure of the Envois of the <i>Argonautica</i> and the <i>Homeric Hymns</i>	100
b. Further Parallels for the Envoi from the <i>Homeric Hymns</i>	108
c. Apollonius’ Envoi and <i>HH</i> 3.165–176.....	112
d. The Text and Significance of <i>Arg.</i> 4.1773.....	116
III. Re-Reading the Introit in Light of the Envoi.....	121
Conclusion.....	127
CHAPTER 2. HEROIZATION AND GENERIC HYBRIDITY.....	130
I. The Duality of the Concept of the Hero in Greek Culture.....	133
II. Hero Cult and Immortalization in the <i>Argonautica</i>	143
a. Explicit References to Hero Cult.....	144
b. Ambiguous Cases of Hero Cult.....	152
c. Hesiodic Heroization.....	157
d. Apotheosis.....	160

III. The Duality of the Hero and Generic Hybridity.....	166
a. Idmon and Agamestor.....	170
b. Polydeuces in Bebrycia.....	174
c. The Syrtis and the Envoi.....	180
Conclusion.....	190
PART II: THE APOLLONIAN NARRATOR'S HYMNIC VOICE	
CHAPTER 3. NARRATOLOGICAL FEATURES WITH PRECEDENT IN THE <i>HOMERIC HYMNS</i>	194
I. The Overt Narrator.....	197
II. The Narrator's Piety.....	202
a. Pious Similes.....	203
b. Pious Silences.....	209
c. Apologies to the Gods.....	216
III. Etiology.....	220
IV. Further Hymnic Techniques.....	233
Conclusion.....	238
CHAPTER 4. HYMNIC MOMENTS WITHIN THE EPIC.....	240
I. Contagious Hymnody.....	241
II. Other Apostrophes.....	249
a. Apostrophes to Mortals.....	249
b. Other Hymnic Addresses.....	255
III. Hymnic Narratization.....	260
IV. Orpheus' Hymn to Apollo: The Thynias Episode (<i>Arg.</i> 2.669–719).....	276
a. Summary of the Episode.....	277

b. Allusions to Apolline Hymns.....	280
c. Representing Hymnic Speech.....	289
Conclusion.....	300
CONCLUSION.....	302
I. Major Findings and Directions for Future Research.....	302
II. Final Reflections.....	308
a. The Ptolemaic Context.....	308
b. Heroization and Heroism.....	318
APPENDIX I. GLOSSARY OF HYMNIC TERMINOLOGY.....	326
APPENDIX II. DIVINE EPITHETS IN THE <i>ARGONAUTICA</i>	332
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	338

NOTE ON TEXTS, TRANSLATIONS, AND ABBREVIATIONS

Unless otherwise noted, all Greek and Latin texts and their English translations are taken from the most up-to-date editions of the Loeb Classical Library. Full citations can be found in the Bibliography. Translations are sometimes adapted, especially in the case of the *Homeric Hymns*. For these, I have consulted both Evelyn-White 1914 and West 2003a, often updating the archaizing language of the former and modifying the idiosyncrasies of the latter.

Abbreviations for ancient authors and works follow the conventions of the 4th edition of the *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, with two exceptions. First, I do not abbreviate the major *Homeric Hymns* (1–5) differently from the rest of the collection, preferring instead to identify each *Hymn* by its conventional number (as, e.g., in West 2003a). Thus:

<i>HH</i> 1	The major <i>Homeric Hymn to Dionysus</i> (“ <i>HH Dion.</i> ”)
<i>HH</i> 2	The major <i>Homeric Hymn to Demeter</i> (“ <i>HH Dem.</i> ”)
<i>HH</i> 3	The major <i>Homeric Hymn to Apollo</i> (“ <i>HH Ap.</i> ”)
<i>HH</i> 4	The major <i>Homeric Hymn to Hermes</i> (“ <i>HH Herm.</i> ”)
<i>HH</i> 5	The major <i>Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite</i> (“ <i>HH Aph.</i> ”)

Second, I have adopted the following shorthand, which is reintroduced at first usage in each chapter, for some oft-repeated terms:

AR narrator	Apollonian narrator (i.e., the narrator of the <i>Argonautica</i>)
<i>Arg.</i>	<i>Argonautica</i>
HE	Homeric epic (referring to the <i>Iliad</i> and <i>Odyssey</i>)

HH

Homeric Hymn

Bibliographical abbreviations are given at the beginning of the Bibliography.

INTRODUCTION

This dissertation seeks to shed new light on Apollonius of Rhodes' third-century BCE epic poem, the *Argonautica* (hereafter, *Arg.*) by investigating his engagement with the corpus of hexametric hymns attributed in antiquity to Homer, the so-called *Homeric Hymns* (hereafter, *HHs*). This Introduction is meant to contextualize this study from a number of angles. Section I defines the research question and situates the study at the crossroads of an enduring scholarly interest in Apollonius' reception of the Homeric epics (hereafter, HEs) and a more recent interest in the reception that Homer's other hexameter poems, the *HHs*, enjoyed in antiquity. Section II establishes some of the basic facts about the *HHs*, especially vis-à-vis Apollonius: the contents of the hymnic collection itself, the structural features of the individual hymns, the likelihood that they were originally recited as "Hymnic Proems" to epic performances,¹ the *HHs*' attribution to Homer in antiquity, and the appeal that these *Hymns* manifestly held for Alexandrian poets in the first century of the Hellenistic period. Section III is devoted to the question of methodology. The theory of allusion and intertextuality provides the primary lens of analysis for this study, and in addition to explaining what I mean by these terms, in this section I discuss the role that hypothetical "readers" play in staging my arguments. Section IV moves us from the abstract to the concrete, as I offer a select survey of Apollonian allusions to individual *HHs*. In addition to demonstrating my method, this survey is intended to showcase the great range of uses to which

¹ I capitalize "Hymnic Proems" and other terms related to hymnody to distinguish them as technical terms, which are defined for the reader's convenience in Appendix I as well as in Section II.b below.

Apollonius put allusions to the *HHs*. I conclude in Section V by outlining the contents in the remainder of this dissertation.

I. Topic and *Status Quaestionis*

The primary objective of this study is, in a word, to determine how and why Apollonius might allude to the *HHs* in his Alexandrian epic. There are several forms that such a project might take, ranging from a comprehensive investigation of the *HHs*' influence on Apollonius' poetic technique, complete with indices listing parallel passages,² to a survey of the major episodes of the epic and hymns and their verbal and typological interconnections,³ to a collection of more loosely united literary-interpretative essays that each broach this relationship in a different way.⁴ All of these methods are valuable and will find moments of exemplification at various points in this project, but as we will see momentarily, the state of research on the relationship between these particular texts is still so embryonic at present as to necessitate a more broad-based approach that focuses on Apollonius' engagement with the *HHs* at the most general, generic level. It is my hope that this study will establish a context for the *Arg.*'s allusions to the *HHs* in which future studies that broach this relationship may be grounded.

For well over a century, the poetic antecedents that have received the lion's share of Apollonian scholars' attention are undoubtedly the HEs.⁵ Numerous studies are devoted solely

² Knauer 1964 is the classic example of this approach.

³ E.g., as one finds in much of Knight 1995 or Nelis 2001.

⁴ E.g., see many of the papers in Faulkner, Vergados, and Schwab (FVS) 2016.

⁵ By "Homeric epic" I mean the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* as distinct from the *HHs*, though this category could in principle embrace the Cycle poems, which were sometimes attributed to Homer in antiquity (see, e.g., Burgess 2001: 129–131 and West 2013: 26–40). When I wish to refer to the Cycle poems, however, I will denote them as such. *N.b.* that while the *Margites* is sometimes described as a "mock-epic," its mixed hexameter and iambic meter

to this topic,⁶ while still more use HE intertextuality as a primary method of analysis.⁷ This is, on the whole, as it should be. Apollonius was himself a Homeric scholar of such stature as to succeed Zenodotus as head of the Royal Library of Alexandria. Indeed, one of his few treatises of which we know the name is an “Against Zenodotus” (Πρὸς Ζηνόδοτον), recording its author’s disagreements with Zenodotus’ critical edition of the HEs; hence, presumably, Apollonius’ philological judgments are sometimes recorded in the Homeric scholia.⁸ As a poet, Apollonius worked in multiple genres, including epigram,⁹ hexameter narratives treating the foundation legends of cities (Κτίσεις),¹⁰ and a poem in choliambics called *Canobus*, which seems to have told the story of the death of Menelaus’ helmsman in Egypt.¹¹ But these poems and his philology notwithstanding, Apollonius was best remembered in antiquity as the author of the *Arg.*, which is his only work that survives entire today.¹² Homer is inevitably the chief generic exemplar for any ancient epic poet, and in Apollonius’ case, every page of his work announces

distinguishes it from the other epic poems attributed to Homer. As for the *Batrachomyomachia*, I believe that it postdates (and indeed, alludes to) Apollonius, as I touch on in Chapter 1, Section I.c.

⁶ Important entries in the vast bibliography include Seaton 1890; Carspecken 1952; Händel 1954; Garson 1972; Lennox 1980; Dufner 1988; Fantuzzi 1988, 2008a; Knight 1995; and Fantuzzi and Hunter 2004: 89–132, 266–282.

⁷ E.g., Clauss 1993, Hunter 1993, and Clare 2002.

⁸ For Apollonius’ scholarly activities, see the convenient overview in Pfeiffer 1968: 140–148. The fragments and testimonia are collected in Michaelis 1875: 16–23, 40–56. For the evidence for Apollonius’ philological scholarship from his own poetry, see, e.g., Michaelis 1875: 23–40; Giangrande 1967, 1970a: 56–61; Livrea 1972; Nelis 1992; and Rengakos 1994.

⁹ See fr. 50 *SH*. The one epigram attributed to Apollonius that we possess (fr. 13 Powell = *AP* 11.275) is of dubious authenticity, reflecting as it does the questionable ancient biographical tradition that Apollonius feuded with his “teacher” Callimachus. Lefkowitz 2008 is a good starting-place within the enormous bibliography on this controversy.

¹⁰ Frs. 4–12 Powell. For introductions to these fragmentary poems, see Levin 1962, Krevans 2000, Smith 2001, and Sistakou 2008.

¹¹ Frs. 1–3 Powell. The genre of this poem is far from clear; see esp. Krevans 2000, esp. 76–78, 82–83. Curiazi 1979 proposes Apollonian authorship for an anonymous choliambic fragment.

¹² See, e.g., Levin 1962: 161–162.

its author as a creative adapter of the HE tradition. Thus, as Beye declares, “The first and most important element in the criticism of the *Argonautica* ... must be a pervasive knowledge of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*.”¹³

The *Iliad* and *Odyssey* represent the *Arg.*'s most important poetic models, bar none, but it is curious that in pursuing the question of Apollonius' engagement with “Homer,” scholars have largely left the *HHs* out of consideration. Apollonius himself signals their programmatic importance for the *Arg.* by beginning his epic (1.1–2) with an unmistakable allusion to the *Homeric Hymn to Selene* (32.18–19),¹⁴ and his poem ends with a hymnic Envoi to the Argonauts with several points of contact with the *HHs* (*Arg.* 4.1773–1781).¹⁵ But beyond a great number of almost perfunctory acknowledgments of the *Arg.*'s “hymnic frame,”¹⁶ the *HHs* do not occupy anything like the prominent place in Apollonian scholarship that these programmatic allusions would seem to recommend. A number of studies adduce particular *Hymns* in passing, especially with reference to certain well-known *loci*.¹⁷ The *Hymns* also comprise part of the repertory of

¹³ Beye 1982: 11; for similar pronouncements, see further Händel 1954: 7, Lloyd-Jones 1984: 70, and Nelis 2005a: 354.

¹⁴ Cf. Claus 1993: 16, who interprets this allusion not as flagging the importance of the *HHs* specifically as poetic models but rather as Apollonius' way of “mak[ing] it clear that he will not be restricted in the exposition of his epic theme by considerations of genre.” For the pre-Apollonian date of *HH* 32, see Hall 2013. I plan to expand upon his arguments in a future paper, but for now *n.b.* that Apollonius' replacement of the hymn's ἄσομαι (“I shall sing,” *HH* 32.19) with μνήσομαι (“I shall recall,” *Arg.* 1.2) is a transparent example of “memory as trope for literary allusion” (Faber 2017, who discusses this example on p. 85). The doubt expressed by Fantuzzi and Hunter 2004: 91 n. 10 that the phrase to which Apollonius alludes in the *Hymn* “may have been much more widespread in hymnic poetry than we can now establish” is unlikely given the unique status of *HH* 31–32 as a celestial diptych with singularly epic affiliations and a drive toward careful lexical *variatio*, as I plan to show in a future paper.

¹⁵ I discuss this Envoi, and its connections with the *HHs*, particularly in Chapter 1, Section II.

¹⁶ For this term, see the introductory section of Chapter 1.

¹⁷ For examples beyond the hymnic frame, see, among others, Boesch 1908: 3–4, 39–42; Richardson 1974: 69–70; Campbell 1977; Janko 1979; Nelis 1991: 101; Claus 1993: 69–74, 83–84 (revisited in *idem* 2016: 62–65); Hunter 1996: 144; and Vergados 2013: 113–117. A cluster of allusions in Book 4 to the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* is particularly well-recognized; see n. 154 in Chapter 2.

early Greek ἔπος with which Apollonius’ phraseology is regularly compared, particularly in the commentaries; Campbell has done an especial service to students of Apollonius in cataloguing a huge number of “echoes and imitations” of early Greek epic, including the *HHs*, in the *Arg*.¹⁸ But to my knowledge, only two full-scale articles (let alone books) are devoted wholly to Apollonius’ engagement with a *HH*.¹⁹ While both represent valuable contributions, clearly much work remains to be done.

In part the neglect of the *HHs* by Apollonian critics is part of the much larger story of neglect suffered by these “sub-epic” poems until the past thirty years or so,²⁰ when Clay’s *Politics of Olympus* revitalized the *Hymns* as poems worthy of study in their own right.²¹ Recently, the *Hymns*’ rich history of reception by later authors and artists has inspired the publication of a 2016 collection of essays on this topic;²² the editors themselves trace scholarly interest in the afterlife of the *HHs* to a 1999 article on Ovid’s adaptations thereof in the *Metamorphoses* by Barchiesi, who first pointed out what fertile but untilled ground this area represented for future research.²³ My project thus stands at the intersection of two major trends

¹⁸ Campbell 1981.

¹⁹ The first is Pace 2004, who demonstrates that Apollonius’ brilliant portraits of the petulant Eros and put-upon Aphrodite at the beginning of Book 3 are partly modeled on Hermes and Maia in the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes*; see further Campbell 1983a: 18–19, 1994 ad *Arg*. 3.129f.; and Vergados 2013: 115. The second is Clayton 2017, who builds on Hunter 1993: 40–41 to offer a sensitive reading of the Hylas episode in light of the abduction of Persephone in the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*. As the same intertext has been put forward for Theocritus’ rendition of the Hylas episode in *Id.* 13 (Gutzwiller 1981: 26–27), we may be dealing with a two-tier allusion (for this term, see n. 138 below).

²⁰ The term “sub-epic,” from Hoekstra 1969, was not intended as a value judgment, but it naturally carried with it a negative connotation (Clay 2006: 4).

²¹ Clay 2006, first published in 1989.

²² FVS 2016. The volume focuses on Roman and Imperial Greek receptions, but Apollonian interactions with the *HHs* are catalogued on pp. 10–12 and figure into Clauss’s chapter; see further Faulkner 2011b: 193–195.

²³ FVS 2016: 2, referring to Barchiesi 1999.

in classical scholarship: a longstanding interest in Apollonius' engagement with "Homer" and a newfound interest in the reception of the *HHs*.²⁴ Above all, I take seriously Apollonius' programmatic allusions to the *Hymns*, most clearly signaled in his hymnic frame, and argue accordingly that these poems served alongside the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* as equally authoritative and authorizing "Homeric" models for the *Arg*.

II. The *Homeric Hymns*: An Overview

a. *The Collection*

It will be useful to review some of the basic facts concerning the *Hymns* to establish the context for analyzing Apollonius' allusions thereto.²⁵ The *HHs* are a collection of thirty-three hexameter hymns whose "[f]ormal elements of diction, style, and narrative technique link the hymns to *epos*, of which they form a subset."²⁶ They are, in other words, "Rhapsodic Hymns," whose relatively impersonal manner and consistent set of formal features distinguish them from "Cultic Hymns," with their more intimate tone and flexible structure.²⁷ The *HHs* range in length considerably—from 3 lines to 580—and are often divided into "major," "mid-length," and "minor" subgroups on this basis.²⁸ Many of the *Hymns*, including all of the major ones, include

²⁴ I might also point to the marked interest in the past few decades in Hellenistic poets' revival of and allusion to archaic forms; see, e.g., Hunter 1996 and Acosta-Hughes 2010a.

²⁵ Good introductions to the *HHs* can be found in Clay 1997 and the essays in Faulkner 2011. The introduction of Allen, Halliday, and Sikes (AHS) 1936 remains valuable on the manuscript tradition and ancient testimonia.

²⁶ Clay 2006: 15. For all hexameter poetry as belonging to one "super-genre" in ancient conceptions of genre, see Hutchinson 2013: 20–24; cf. the earlier use of the term by Martin 2005: 17. For the likelihood that many more Homeric-style hymns, including the longer hymns, once existed than have survived, see Parker 1991: 1.

²⁷ For the distinction between Rhapsodic and Cultic Hymns, see Meyer 1933: 2–7, Lenz 1975: 10–13, Miller 1986: 1–5, Race 1992: 19–31. Wunsch in *RE* 9.1. s.v. "Hymnos" uses the terms "objektiv" and "subjektiv" (142).

²⁸ The major category includes *Hymns* 1–5; the first of these is now fragmentary, but probably contained as many as 411 lines (West 2001: 1). Of the remaining *Hymns*, two are noticeably longer (7, 19) than the rest, but the line

mythical narratives, which are marked by certain recurrent themes such as a god's birth or appearance in epiphany.²⁹ Clay has argued that the major *Hymns*, which she considers a subgenre unto themselves, are specially concerned with the gods' acquisition of new divine prerogatives (τιμῆαι), which results in a permanent reordering of relations within the pantheon and between gods and men. On the temporal continuum of mythological poetry, she sees the major *Hymns* as filling the gap between Hesiod's *Theogony*, which describes the earliest origins of the Zeus' reign, and the HEs, which take for granted a fully-developed and permanent Olympian order.³⁰

The *Hymns'* dates of composition are difficult to determine, especially for the shorter pieces, though one recent study has concluded that there is no compelling reason to date any of them later than the early Classical period.³¹ Some seem to fit in particularly well in this period; for instance, the *Homeric Hymn to Hephaestus* (20), with its narrative of cultural progress, has often been associated with the philosophical and poetic speculations on this subject in Classical Athens.³² But the collection also includes some of the oldest extant works in all of Greek literature. Indeed, according to Janko's statistical analysis of archaisms in the language of early Greek hexameter, the major *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite* (5) predates even the *Odyssey* and the

dividing the mid-length and short examples is rather hazy. Fröhder 1994, a study devoted exclusively to the mid-length *Hymns*, sets the boundary at about 20 lines.

²⁹ See, e.g., Janko 1981: 13–14. For common epic and folkloric themes in the narratives of the *Hymns*, see Sowa 1984, with a summary of results on pp. 281–284; see further the schematic index of themes in Pavese 1993. Miller 1986: 5–9 applies the encomiastic terminology of ancient rhetorical theory to the content of the *HHs*.

³⁰ Clay 2006; this thesis is summed up on p. 15. Clay's approach is anticipated somewhat by Rudhardt 1978. For the major *Hymns* as their own genre, see further Clay 1997: 494–498, 2011: 240; cf. Haubold 2001: 23–24.

³¹ Hall 2012: ch. 2.

³² See, e.g., Haubold 2001: 32–33.

Hesiodic corpus.³³ One hymn, however, is manifestly much later than the rest—*Hymn 8, to Ares*. Somehow this hymn found its way into the Homeric collection from another source—perhaps the *Hymns* of the fifth-century CE Neoplatonist philosopher Proclus, as West argues.³⁴ In any case, it can safely be disregarded for the purposes of this study. As for places of composition, we are wholly reliant on internal evidence from the *Hymns* themselves; for instance, the mention of Salamis in the minor *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite* (10.4) suggests that it was originally performed in the Cypriote town of that name.³⁵

It is unknown when the *Hymns* were collected into an edition approximating the one that we have today.³⁶ van der Valk speculates that rhapsodes might have collected these poems themselves in the Archaic period to serve as a handbook for performance.³⁷ Most scholars, however, assume that the *HHs* were collected and edited in the Hellenistic period as part of the work of the Alexandrian philologists. The earliest datable reference to “the hymns” of Homer is in the first-century BCE historian Diodorus Siculus (τὸν Ὅμηρον ... ἐν τοῖς ὕμνοις, 4.2.4; see also 1.15.7, 3.66.3), though there is evidence that he may be drawing on the third-century mythographer Dionysius Scytobrachion.³⁸ Though less explicit, allusions in Callimachus’ own Rhapsodic *Hymns* provide precious evidence that he knew a collection beginning with the longer

³³ Janko 1982, whose results (summarized p. 200) are revisited and defended in Janko 2012. For a summary of earlier attempts at dating on the basis of linguistic criteria, see Clay 1997: 490.

³⁴ West 1970; for further suggestions, see Faulkner 2011b: 176 n. 4. van der Valk 1976: 438–445 went against the grain in considering the hymn authentically archaic, but cf. Bona 1978: 226.

³⁵ Shackle 1915: 164, West 2003a: 17, Olson 2012: 291 and n. ad loc.; cf. AHS 1936: 391.

³⁶ Hall 2012: 4–12 provides a useful survey of theories.

³⁷ van der Valk 1976: 445.

³⁸ See AHS 1936: lxxvii–lxxix and Faulkner 2011b: 176.

hymns in the order 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, at least.³⁹ Given Apollonius' extensive allusions to individual *HHs* throughout the corpus, it is likely that he knew a collection very similar to our own in terms of content, and perhaps, in light of the evidence from Callimachus, even in order.

The ordering of the *Hymns* in the collection as it has come down to us is idiosyncratic, but general patterns are recognizable, especially a principle of organization according to length.⁴⁰ The collection begins with the major hymns (1–5); one of the shorter hymns to Aphrodite (6) has been attracted to its major counterpart (5),⁴¹ but then the longest of the mid-length *Hymns* follows (7). After the interloper hymn to Ares (8), a subgroup of short hymns for goddesses follows (9–14), itself followed by a subgroup of hymns for deified heroes (15–17). A subgroup of short hymns for gods follows next (18, 20–23), punctuated by the mid-length *Hymn to Pan* (19), which has apparently been attracted to the eighteenth hymn, to Pan's father Hermes. After two odd hymns (24–25), the collection ends with a series of hymns that are a bit longer, each 13–22 lines long (26–33); this series may conclude with a sort of celestial subgroup dedicated to the Sun (31), Moon (32), and the Dioscuri, whose epiphany at sea takes the form of St. Elmo's Fire (33).⁴² Some manuscripts end with a Homeric epigram (Εἰς Ξένους, "To Strangers"), which is entitled using the same conventions employed for the other *HHs* (εἰς + the name of Hymnic Subject in the accusative case), as though it were another hymn. Pfeiff has plausibly interpreted

³⁹ See Faulkner 2011b: 180–181, 205; see further Hall 2012: 68–71 who surveys evidence for Callimachus' knowledge of some of the minor *HHs* (13, 15 and/or 20, 21, and 24) and concludes that the collection known to the Cyrenian contained at least some of the minor *Hymns* as well. For the likelihood that Callimachus arranged his own hymnic collection, see esp. Henrichs 1993 and Haslam 1993: 115.

⁴⁰ This paragraph is substantially based on van der Valk 1976, though I am not convinced by his overarching thesis that the organization of the collection reflects an "archaic" mindset; for critique, see Bona 1978: 225–227.

⁴¹ In fact, in two manuscripts these hymns to Aphrodite have actually been merged into one continuous poem (Clay 1997: 495 n. 27).

⁴² Other scholars would include the thirtieth hymn, to the Earth, within this subgroup, which they understand as "cosmic" in scope.

this poem as a sort of *sphragis* sealing the collection, because this epigram is associated with the *Homeric Hymns* in the *Life of Homer* attributed to Herodotus.⁴³

b. Structure

Greek hymns are possessed of the most consistent rhetorical structure of any brand of archaic poetry, and in its basic form it persisted as long as Greek religion itself. This structure is perhaps best described by the tripartite schema *invocatio—laudatio—preces*:⁴⁴ contact with the god is established through an Invocation, praise is offered in order to incline the deity to be propitious, and finally a request is made for a divine boon. This structure is eminently logical, in that the *laudatio* is intended to lay the groundwork for the hymnist's petition by securing the god's good will. This structure is keyed to the ultimate aim of a Greek hymn, which is to establish *χάρις* between the speaker and the addressee—that “relationship ... of reciprocal pleasure and goodwill”⁴⁵ that ties hymnist and god together in a mutual bond of gratitude and grace.⁴⁶

Rhapsodic Hymns like the *HHs* abide by even more standardized formal principles—indeed, they are the only type of archaic *ἔπος* (cf. theogonic, heroic, and didactic poetry) with a

⁴³ Pfeiff 2002: 196–197; cf. Càssola 1975b, who argues that the epigram was included in the collection by an accident of transmission (p. 216). In *Vita Homeri* 2.9 West, this epigram represents the first verses that Homer ever recited, and with it he wins the hospitality of a cobbler named Tychius in the city of Neonteichos, near Smyrna. At Tychius' workshop he then performs “Amphiaraus' Expedition to Thebes, and the Hymns that he had composed to the gods” (Ἀμφιάρεώ τε τὴν ἐξελασίαν τὴν ἐς Θήβας, καὶ τοὺς ὕμνους τοὺς ἐς θεοὺς πεποιημένους αὐτῷ); evidently we are to understand that Homer had begun work on these poems while still in Smyrna (2.8), but that their first public display was at Neonteichos. The author claims that the Neonteichians still show the spot where Homer would recite.

⁴⁴ I here follow Furley and Bremer 2001: 1.50–64 (esp. p. 51), who provide plentiful bibliography on earlier attempts to label these parts of Greek hymns.

⁴⁵ Race 1982: 8.

⁴⁶ On this fundamental concept in Greek hymns, see, e.g., Keyssner 1932: 131–135; Bundy 1972: 49–54; Race 1982: 8–10; Furley 1995: 45–46; and Furley and Bremer 2001: 61–63.

definite structure, of which the opening and closing formulas are especially invariable.⁴⁷ This rigidity is particularly useful for the alluding poet (as for the scholar studying such allusions), for it means that in the right context even a single word can be distinctive enough to serve as a “system reference” to the rhetoric of the *HHs*, as I argue, for instance, for the verb *μνήσομαι* (*Arg.* 1.2) in Chapter 1.⁴⁸ I would also observe that, in light of these formal distinctions, it makes sense for the purposes of this study to use the anachronistic category of “genre” to distinguish the *HHs* from the *HEs*,⁴⁹ for while these two corpora share many salient characteristics, including the hexameter,⁵⁰ archaic poets evidently knew to shape their compositions according to a different set of formal criteria when hymning a god than they would observe in composing another type of song.⁵¹ And besides, from the perspective of a philologist like Apollonius in third-century Alexandria, “hymns” (ῥυμοί) had become a recognized (if capacious) generic term denoting songs dedicated to the gods, including several Cultic subtypes such as processional hymns (προσόδια), hymns performed beside an altar (παραβώμια), and so on.⁵²

⁴⁷ See, e.g., Janko 1981: 23 and Clay 1997: 493, 2011: 235. Haubold 2001: 24–25 emphasizes the *HHs*’ fixed closural formulas as their most distinctive element, because, as we will see, heroic epic shares its own opening formulas with Rhapsodic Hymnody.

⁴⁸ Edmunds 2001: 143–150 defines “system references” as allusions (or “quotations,” in his terminology) to “verbal categories, literary and nonliterary, larger than single texts” (143)—e.g., legal discourse, the Oenotropae myth, Roman love elegy, etc.

⁴⁹ For the idea that performance context, not formal features, distinguished different types of song in the Archaic period, see, e.g., Ford 2002: 10–13, with earlier bibliography.

⁵⁰ Farrell 2003: 384 notes that in antiquity, “meter was “the primary marker of generic identity.” For the *HHs* as belonging to the super-genre of ἔπος, see n. 26 above.

⁵¹ So Fowler 1987: 95: “‘Hymn’ as a general term for poetry that is sung is not itself the name of a genre, but it is reasonable to suppose that the praises of gods were recognized as a genre by archaic poets. At least these compositions had elaborate characteristics to which the poets adhered.”

⁵² See the discussion of the term ῥυμος in Chapter 2, Section III.b.

Like Greek hymns generally, the *HHs* can be divided into three major sections, each of which is characterized by its own typical conventions.⁵³ In this study I will be capitalizing the names for the constituent parts of these *Hymns*, in order to mark them off from ordinary usage as technical terms relating to hymnody; moreover, all of these terms are defined in the glossary in Appendix I. Following Miller, I will call the first section of *HHs* the Exordium,⁵⁴ which functions to identify by name the Hymnic Subject, i.e., the god to be honored in the hymn. Whereas Cultic Hymns tend to invoke the god in the second-person, Rhapsodic Hymns can be said to evoke the god in the third-person.⁵⁵ If metrically feasible, the god’s name will normally occur as the first word of the hymn, typically in the accusative case as the direct object of a first-person Evocatory Verb of singing, as in “Of Hermes I sing” (Ἐρμῆν ἀείδω, *HH* 18.1).⁵⁶ In ten of the *HHs*, however, the Evocation is rather achieved with an Appeal to the Muses, as in “Sing of Hermes, Muse” (Ἐρμῆν ὕμνει, Μοῦσα, 4.1).⁵⁷ In either case, the theonym is typically dignified by a number of Honorific epithets or appositive phrases, as in “With ivy-haired Dionysus the mighty roarer I begin my song, Zeus’ and glorious Semele’s splendid son” (κισσοκόμην Διόνυσον ἐρίβρομον ἄρχομ’ ἀείδειν, | Ζηνὸς καὶ Σεμέλης ἐρικυδέος ἀγλαὸν υἱόν, 26.1–2). This

⁵³ The following analysis is based on Janko 1981, with some slight modifications and additions to his terminology. For more on the structure of the *HHs*, see, e.g., Lenz 1975: 9–13; Miller 1986: 2–4; Pavese 1991, 1993; Clay 1997: 493–494; and Nünlist 2004: 35–37. Important earlier studies include Friedländer 1914 and Meyer 1933: 6–7, 19–24.

⁵⁴ Miller 1986: 3.

⁵⁵ Calame (2005: 22–24, 2011: 334 n. 2) distinguishes *evocatio*, in which the god is “evoked” in the third-person, from *invocatio*, which “invokes” the god with a second-person address.

⁵⁶ The Invocatory Verbs used include ἄρχομ’ ἀείδειν (2.1, 11.1, 13.1, 16.1, 22.1, 26.1, 28.1), ἀείσομαι (10.1, 15.1, 23.1, 30.1), ᾄσομαι (6.2), ἀείδω (12.1, 18.1, 27.1), and μνήσομαι (7.2). More irregular constructions appear in 3.1 (μνήσομαι οὐδὲ λάθωμαι + gen.) and 25.1 (ἄρχομαι + gen.).

⁵⁷ *HH* 4.1, 5.1, 9.1, 14.2, 17.1, 19.1, 20.1, 31.1–2 (singling out Calliope), 32.1–2, 33.1. I prefer Janko’s term “Appeal to the Muses” to distinguish Invocations of the Hymnic Subject from invocations of the Muse.

third-person manner of singing of the god is called “Er-Stil,” which is typical of the first two sections of Rhapsodic Hymns. Three *HHs*, however, are irregularly cast entirely in the second-person, addressed to the god in Du-Stil (21, 24, 29), which is more typical of Cultic Hymns.⁵⁸ Accordingly, these *Hymns* begin exceptionally with the Subject’s name in the vocative, which is not supplemented by epithets or other Honorifics. The transition out of the Exordium into the next section, the *Laudatio*, is accomplished by a “Hymnic Relative”—usually a relative pronoun, though the conjunction ὡς, “how,” plays this role in *HH* 7.2.⁵⁹ Thus the Exordium of *HH* 10, for example, can be analyzed as follows:⁶⁰

- a. Evocation of Hymnic Subject with Honorific: “Of Cyprus-born Cytherea”⁶¹
- b. Evocatory Verb: “I will sing,”
- c. Hymnic Relative: “who gives mortals kindly gifts...”

I may pause at this point to note that the conventions surveyed so far should be familiar from the beginning of many epic poems, which, indeed, may have derived their introductory formulas from the conventions of Rhapsodic Hymns.⁶² For instance, both the *Iliad* (1.1–2) and the *Odyssey* (1.1) begin by naming their subject, or “theme,” in the accusative (μῆνιν; ἄνδρα), with one epithet modifying it (οὐλομένην; πολύτροπον); this first word is the direct object of a

⁵⁸ For Du-Stil vs. Er-Stil, see Norden 1956: 149–160, 163–166, and for its application to the *HHs*, Miller 1986: 2–3. This narratological distinction appears already in ancient scholarship; see Nünlist 2009: 110–112.

⁵⁹ On the Hymnic Relative, see Norden 1956: 168–176. The irregular *HH* 25 transitions into the *Laudatio* with γάρ; the second-person *Hymn* 21, with the pronoun σε; and the minor *Hymn* 13 lacks a midsection altogether.

⁶⁰ Κυπρογενῆ Κυθέρειαν αἰέσομαι, ἥ τε βροτοῖσιν | μείλιχα δῶρα δίδωσιν..., *HH* 10.1–2.

⁶¹ *N.b.* that Aphrodite’s name cannot fit at the beginning of a hexameter, hence the use of the periphrasis “Cytherea” and the placement of the Honorific first in the line *metri causa*.

⁶² On the resemblances, see, e.g., Meyer 1933: 19–20, Richardson 1974 ad *HH* 2.1–3, L. Lenz 1975: 9–10, A. Lenz 1980: 21–26, and Evans 2001: 147–148. For the view that the epic convention is derived from hymnody, see, e.g., Janko 1981: 23 and Clay 2006: 5 (with earlier bibliography).

verb of singing or telling (ᾄειδε; ἔννεπε), in this case combined with an Appeal to the Muses (θεά; Μοῦσα); and it is the antecedent of a relative pronoun that accomplishes the transition to a summary of the main narrative (ἧ; ὅς). Because the Iliadic “theme-word” is, unusually, an abstract concept (“wrath”) rather than a concrete entity, it is further modified by Achilles’ name (itself modified by a patronymic epithet) in the genitive case (Πηληϊάδεω Ἀχιλῆος); we find the same construction in the Exordium to the major *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite* (ἔργα πολυχρύσου Ἀφροδίτης, 5.1), as well as the *Arg.* itself (παλαιγενέων κλέα φωτῶν, 1.1).⁶³ The fragmentary *Little Iliad* showcases an alternate introduction-type, which dispenses with the Appeal to the Muses in favor of a first-person verb of singing:

Ἰλιον ᾄείδω καὶ Δαρδανίην εὖπωλον,
ἧς πέρι πόλλα πάθον Δαναοὶ θεράποντες Ἄρης.

Of Ilios I sing, and Dardania land of fine colts, over which the Danaans, servants of Ares, suffered much.

The *Little Iliad*’s use of two theme-words in the accusative, only the latter of which serves as the antecedent for the relative pronoun, is paralleled by the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* (2.1–3):

Δήμητρ’ ἠὔκομον σεμνήν θεὸν ἄρχομ’ ἀείδειν,
αὐτήν ἠδὲ θύγατρα τανίσφυρον, ἣν Αἰδωνεύς
ἤρπαξεν...

With Demeter the lovely-haired, the august goddess I begin my song, with her and her slender-ankled daughter, whom Aïdoneus seized...

Within a small compass of divergences, this opening formula is remarkably stable across the Greek tradition, and it is consciously replicated by Vergil in *Aeneid* 1.1 (*arma virumque cano*,

⁶³ The beginning of the *Odyssey* is also unusual because it does not reveal its subject immediately, but denotes him only mysteriously as “the man,” who is slowly described in greater and greater detail in the succeeding lines. Apollonius can be seen to imitate this device in designating his subject as “the people of old,” whose identity then becomes clear in the appended relative clause.

Troiae qui...). As we will see in Chapter 1, Apollonius exploits the identity of the Rhapsodic-Hymnic and epic introductory formulas to fashion an introduction to the *Arg.* that could be appropriate to commence either an epic or a Homeric-style hymn.

But to return to the structure of the *HHs*: the second section, the *Laudatio*, is designed to praise the god so that she or he will be well-disposed toward granting the hymnist's ultimate request at the end of the hymn. In the *HHs*, it takes one of two major forms, which are sometimes juxtaposed within one hymn: an Attributive Section, describing the god's "appearance, possessions, haunts and spheres of activity"⁶⁴ in the omnitemporal present tense,⁶⁵ or a Myth, recounting the deity's birth or deeds in the past tense.⁶⁶ In several cases, Myths end in a "Prolongation," which brings the mythic narrative into the omnitemporal present (e.g., at *HH* 4.576–578, we transition from the past narrative of the acquisition of Hermes' τιμῆς to a description of his recurrent activities in the present).⁶⁷ Myths in particular are responsible for the variable length of the *HHs*. As Janko notes, Attributive Sections are never developed beyond about twenty-five lines, whereas Myths vary from five to 580 lines in length.⁶⁸

⁶⁴ Janko 1981: 11.

⁶⁵ This use of the present tense denotes activities that are "time-bound, but temporally unrestricted," for propositions to the effect that "something has been, is and always will be so" (Lyons 1977: 2.680), such as the habitual activities of the immortal gods. In narratological terms, this tense is characteristic of "simultaneous iterative narration," which is commonly employed in hymns (Nünlist 2007: 53–55).

⁶⁶ For an analysis of each of the *HHs* in these terms, see Janko 1981: 16–20, 23–24.

⁶⁷ The term "Prolongation" belongs to Janko 1981: 14, though the technique is recognized already by Richardson 1974 ad *HH* 2.483–489.

⁶⁸ Janko 1981: 12, 14.

I refer to the final section of an *HH* as the *Envoi*. In the *HHs*, it contains up to three elements, which almost always occur in a set sequence.⁶⁹ The first is the Salutation, which is introduced by a Salutatory Verb—usually *χαῖρε* or *χαίρετε*, but *ἴληθ[ι]* in three cases (1D.8, 20.8, 23.4)—followed by a vocative address to the god, often using a periphrasis instead of the theonym proper.⁷⁰ In most of the *HHs*, then, the *Envoi* is marked by a transition from *Er-Stil* in the Myth or Attributive Section to *Du-Stil* in the Salutation. In just over half of the *HHs*, a Prayer is included next, which is usually expressed by a second-person imperative verb.⁷¹ In three hymns, however, we rather find indicative declarations of the type, “I supplicate you with my song” (*λίτομαι δέ σ’ αἰοιδῆ*, 16.5; see further 19.48, 21.5). The Prayers are as a rule brief and only loosely coordinated with the content of the foregoing *Laudatio*, in contrast to the more personalized Prayers of Cultic Hymns.⁷²

Thirdly and finally, seventeen of the *HHs* conclude with a promise to transition to another song, an element that Janko terms the “Poet’s Task.” In twelve cases, it takes the stereotyped form, “And I will remember both you and another song” (*αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ καὶ σεῖο [or, αὐτὰρ ἐγὼν ὑμέων τε] καὶ ἄλλης μνήσομ’ αἰοιδῆς*);⁷³ in three cases, a different formula is used: “After beginning from you, I will pass over to another song” (*σέο δ’ ἐγὼ ἀρξάμενος μεταβήσομαι ἄλλον ἐς ὕμνον*, 5.293, 9.9, 18.11). And in two more cases, this formula is

⁶⁹ *N.b.*, however, that in the unusual *HH* 29, the Prayer actually precedes the Salutation. *Hymn* 12 is unique in lacking an *Envoi* entirely.

⁷⁰ Only three *HHs* lack a Salutation (2, 12, 24), though in 2.493–494 and 24.1–3 prominent vocative addresses may make up for this lack (Janko 1981: 15–16).

⁷¹ Fifteen *HHs* lack a Prayer (1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 12, 14, 17, 18, 23, 27, 28, 32, 33), though I argue in Chapter 1, Section II.a that a request is implicit in *Hymn* 1D.8–10, 7.58–59. There is also a hint of entreaty in the epithet *πρόφρον* at *HH* 32.18 and perhaps in the epithets emphasizing Hermes’ generosity at 18.12 (*χαριδῶτα ... δῶτορ ἑάων*).

⁷² See, e.g., Meyer 1933: 5–6, 22; Miller 1986: 4; and Hall 2012: 113.

⁷³ This formula occurs at 2.495, 3.546, 4.580, 6.21, 10.6, 19.49, 25.7, 27.22, 28.18, 29.14, 30.19, 33.19.

developed, with different wording in each case, into a promise to transition from the current hymn to a song whose genre is specified as heroic epic. These are *HH* 31.18–19:

ἐκ σέο δ' ἀρξάμενος κλήσω μερόπων γένος ἀνδρῶν
ἡμιθέων, ὧν ἔργα θεοὶ θνητοῖσιν ἔδειξαν.

After beginning from you, I will celebrate the race of human heroes, whose deeds the gods have disclosed to mortals.

and *HH* 32.18–20:

σέο δ' ἀρχόμενος κλέα φωτῶν
ἄσομαι ἡμιθέων, ὧν κλείουσ' ἔργματ' ἀοιδοί
Μουσάων θεράποντες ἀπὸ στομάτων ἐροέντων. 20

Beginning from you, I will sing the famous deed of heroes, whose deeds are celebrated by singers, the Muses' servants, from their enchanting mouths.

Just seven of the *HHs* include all three of these closural elements—Salutation, Prayer, and Poet's Task—in their Envois.⁷⁴ A full example is provided by *HH* 6.19–21:

χαῖρ' ἑλικοβλέφαρε, γλυκυμείλιχε, δὸς δ' ἐν ἀγῶνι
νίκην τῷδε φέρεσθαι, ἐμὴν δ' ἔντυνον ἀοιδίην. 20
αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ καὶ σεῖο καὶ ἄλλης μνήσομ' ἀοιδῆς.

This Envoi may be analyzed as follows:

- a. Salutation: “Hail, quick-glancing, sweetly gentle goddess!”
- b. Prayer (twofold): “Grant me victory in this competition, and order my singing.”
- c. Poet's Task: “And I will remember both you and another song.”

⁷⁴ These are *HH* 6.19–21, 10.4–6, 19.48–49, 25.6–7, 29.10–14, 30.17–19, 31.17–19. We could include in this category *HH* 2, if we consider the elaborate vocative address at 493–494 equivalent in function to a Salutation (Janko 1981: 15–16), as well as *Hymn* 18 and 32, if we understand the epithets in the Salutations as hinting at Prayer; see n. 71 above. The Envois of *Hymn* 1, 7, and 13 are analyzed in Chapter 1, Section II.a.

c. Performance Context

The Poet's Task allows us to transition from considerations of the formal features of the *HHs* to their original performance contexts. Aside from a few scattered hints as to the performance venue or occasion, such as the reference to "this competition" (ἀγῶνι ... τῷδε) that we just encountered at *HH* 6.19–20,⁷⁵ the Poet's Task formula provides our only evidence for the original context of these hymns.⁷⁶ The formula αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ καὶ σεῖο καὶ ἄλλης μνήσομ' αἰοιδῆς has been variously interpreted—is the poet promising to remember the god with another hymn to be delivered on a future occasion,⁷⁷ or is the "other song" to follow presently upon the completion of the hymn he is now concluding? The latter interpretation corresponds with the less ambiguous rendering of the Poet's Task that is found already in the oldest hymn in the collection, the major *Hymn to Aphrodite* (5.293): σέο δ' ἐγὼ ἀρξάμενος μεταβήσομαι ἄλλον ἐς ὕμνον. And as noted above, in *Hymns* 31–32, which are likely to be relatively late entries in the collection, the Poet's Task is explicit in envisioning a transition from the hymn to a specifically epic composition.

The Poet's Task formula is an important piece of evidence supporting what we might call the "Proem theory" of the *HHs*' original performance context. First presented by Wolf in his 1795 *Prolegomena to Homer*, this view holds that the *HHs* served as preludes to epic lays in

⁷⁵ *N.b.* also the reference to an annual Dionysiac festival at *HH* 26.12–13. See Hall 2012: 135–139 for an overview of the evidence for festivals with musical contests as the settings for the performance of Rhapsodic Hymns.

⁷⁶ On this formula, see Richardson 1974: 324–325, De Martino 1980: 232–240, Fröhder 1994: 58–59, and Calame 2005: 28–30. For μνήσομαι in the formula as a technical term for the introduction of an epic tale, see Moran 1975, esp. his conclusion on pp. 210–211.

⁷⁷ Theoc. *Id.* 17.135–136 evidently understood the formula (or at least adapted it such as) to refer to celebrating the god in question again on another occasion, presumably with another hymn (Fantuzzi 2001: 233 n. 1).

rhapsodic performances.⁷⁸ The internal evidence provided by the Poet’s Task formula in the *Hymns* themselves can be supplemented by a range of external testimonies; the most decisive are those of Pindar, who refers to the rhapsodic practice of beginning with a προοίμιον (“proem, prelude”) to Zeus (*Nem.* 2.1–3), and of Thucydides, who expressly refers to the major *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* (3) as a προοίμιον (3.104.4, 5).⁷⁹ The convention of prefacing an epic with a Hymnic Proem is well-attested across the Greco-Roman epic tradition,⁸⁰ and it is particularly revealing that both Hesiod’s *Theogony* (1–115) and *Works and Days* (1–10) are prefaced by Hymnic Proems that follow the same structural conventions as the *HHs*.⁸¹ Much remains uncertain about the exact connection between the *HHs qua* hymnic προοίμια and the epic performances that followed them,⁸² and it is unclear whether the *HHs* that lack a Poet’s Task served a Proemial function.⁸³ Nevertheless, in its broad outlines, Wolf’s hypothesis has achieved

⁷⁸ Wolf 1985: 112–113. More recently, this thesis has been elaborated by Koller 1956 and Aloni 1980; more briefly, see also Richardson 1974: 3–4 and Càssola 1975a: xii–xvi.

⁷⁹ For hymns as προοίμια, see also, e.g., Pl. *Phd.* 60d. For this designation for a *HH*, see Faulkner 2011a: 17–19, Clay 2011: 237–240, and Nagy 2011: 324–329.

⁸⁰ E.g., Aratus *Phaen.* and Theoc. *Id.* 17 begin with Proems to Zeus; Lucr. 1, with a Proem to Venus; and [Oppian] *Cyn.* 1, with a Proem to the divine Caracalla. On this practice, see, e.g., West 1966 ad Hes. *Th.* 1–115, *idem* 1978 ad Hes. *Op.* 1–10.

⁸¹ See Janko 1981: 20–22, with earlier bibliography.

⁸² See Hall 2012: 140–148 for a good overview of this debate.

⁸³ A few scholars have raised the possibility that these *Hymns* without the Poet’s Task formula might have served instead as *postludes*, that is, as epilogues to another performance (Càssola 1975a: xxi–xxii, Haubold 2001: 26, and Hall 2012: 134–135). It may be, however, that the hymnist and his audience could simply take for granted the convention that another performance would follow his προοίμιον without declaring so explicitly.

near consensus in contemporary scholarship,⁸⁴ and in Chapter 1 I argue that Apollonius' opening allusion to *HH* 32.18–19 in his own epic introit alludes to the Proemial function of the *HHs*.⁸⁵

d. Attribution of Authorship

The true origins of each of the *HHs* is unknown, but I have already suggested that one of the most salient aspects of the *HHs* for Apollonius must have been their attribution to Homer, the very font of Greek ἔπος and the Alexandrian poet's chief literary model. Here, I would like to review some of the most important evidence for the belief in the *Hymns*' Homeric authorship, which was not consistently credited in antiquity.⁸⁶ The earliest evidence for this claim appears in the *HHs* themselves. In a famous *sphragis* in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* (3.165–176), the narrator identifies himself as a blind man from Chios (τυφλὸς ἀνὴρ, οἰκεῖ δὲ Χίῳ ἐνὶ παιπαλοέσση, 172), in what is most likely a reference to the traditional image of Homer;⁸⁷ Thucydides (3.104.4–6), in any event, accepts Homeric authorship of this *Hymn* in the course of

⁸⁴ There is one notable exception: some scholars have thought that the major *HHs* are too long to have been recited as preludes to yet further song (e.g., Wunsch in *RE* 9.1 s.v. "Hymnos," pp. 149, 151; AHS 1936: xcvi; Nagy 1982: 53–54); Clay (2006: 7, 2011: 252–253) has speculated that they might have been performed for their own sake at festivals or symposia, along the lines of Demodocus' second lay (*Od.* 8.268–367). Richardson 1974: 4 questions whether such doubts might underestimate the "powers of endurance" of the audiences for early epic; see further Lenz 1975: 278–286 and Hall 2012: 157.

⁸⁵ In order to avoid confusion with hymns *qua* προοίμια, I use the term "introit" instead of the more common "proem" to denote the opening section of an epic poem (cf., e.g., Gainsford 2003: 1; cf. also Wheeler 2002: 33, who uses "introit" for a similar purpose, but only of "the prayer for inspiration found at the beginning of Greek epic poems"). For instance, the "introit" of *Arg.* 1 is 1.1–22. For added clarity, I use the modifier "Hymnic" when referring to hymns that function as Proems, and I capitalize each word to indicate that I am using the term in a technical, hymnodic sense.

⁸⁶ For ancient testimonies regarding the authorship of the *HHs*, see AHS 1936: lxxiv–lxxxii.

⁸⁷ See Dyer 1975, Burkert 1987: 54–55, and West 1999: 369–371. Even if the *Hymn* did not originally mean to refer to Homer (see the cautious assessment of Graziosi 2002: 62–66), later Greeks like Apollonius would doubtless have taken it this way, as already Thucydides had done. The tradition of Homer's blindness, at any rate, is likely very old, because, as Beecroft 2011 shows, several later writers struggled with the idea that Homer could have both been blind and composed his poems, which they assumed to require literacy and hence sight. The tradition of blindness assumes an oral poet.

a discussion that quotes these very lines, “in which [Homer] also mentions himself” (ἐν οἷς καὶ ἑαυτοῦ ἐπεμνήσθη, 3.104.5). Less well-known is the subtle claim to Homeric authorship made by the minor *Homeric Hymn to Artemis* (9), whose geography embraces the city of Smyrna and, significantly, its local river, the Meles (3–4). The banks of the Meles represent another of the traditional birthplaces of Homer (who is sometimes even made the son of the river god himself), but this stream is mentioned nowhere else in early Greek epic.⁸⁸

In the introduction to their commentary on the *Hymns*, Allen, Halliday, and Sikes (AHS) list some twenty-five testimonia affirming a belief in the *HHS*’ Homeric authorship, ranging in time from Thucydides (*loc. cit.*) in the fifth century BCE to the twelfth-century Byzantine scholar Tzetzes (*praef. ad Lycoph. Alex.* p. 3.27–4.1 Scheer).⁸⁹ A few of these testimonia imply some measure of doubt about their Homeric authenticity by referring to “the hymns ascribed to Homer” (e.g., τοῖς εἰς Ὅμηρον ἀναφερομένοις ὕμνοις, Σ ad Nic. *Alex.* 130).⁹⁰ A Pindaric scholiast (ad *Nem.* 2.1c Drachmann) actually asserts that one of the Homeridae, a Chian named Cynaethus, wrote the major *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* and passed it off as Homer’s; Athenaeus 1.22b probably alludes to this same notion when he specifies the *Hymn*’s author as either “Homer or one of the Homeridae” (Ὅμηρος ἢ τῶν Ὀμηριδῶν τις).⁹¹ Most severely, one text expressly denies Homeric authorship of the *HHS* generally (*Vita Homeri* 9.3 West):

⁸⁸ A reference to the Meles may be intended, however, in Asius’ elegiac fragment (*ap.* Ath. 3.125b-e). For this interpretation of the hymn’s reference to the Meles, see Graziosi 2002: 72–77.

⁸⁹ AHS 1936: lxx–lxxviii. They comment of this testimony, “Compared to the vast mass of quotation from the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* it is slight” (*ibid.* lxxix), but as FVS (2016: 3) rejoin, “The attention . . . paid to the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* is a disproportionate stick against which to measure the reception of any other ancient work.” See further Faulkner 2011b: 176–178.

⁹⁰ See further Ar. fr. 590 fr. A col. 1.26–27 Henderson (= *POxy.* 2737), *Vita Homeri* 6.6 West, Suda s.v. Ὅμηρος.

⁹¹ For an overview of both the Homeridae and Cynaethus in particular, see Graziosi 2002: 208–217.

οὐδὲν δὲ αὐτοῦ θετέον ἔξω τῆς Ἰλιάδος καὶ τῆς Ὀδυσσεΐας, ἀλλὰ τοὺς Ὑμνοὺς καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν εἰς αὐτὸν ἀναφερομένων ποιημάτων ἡγητέον ἀλλότρια καὶ τῆς φύσεως καὶ τῆς δυνάμεως ἕνεκα.

Nothing is to be acknowledged as his apart from the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*: the *Hymns* and the rest of the poems attributed to him are to be reckoned alien, in regard both to their nature and their effectiveness.

On the whole, many more sources credit the *Hymns* to Homer than imply doubt, deny their authenticity, or attribute them to alternate authors.⁹² Where the Alexandrians are concerned, however, AHS make an argument from silence that nevertheless carries real weight. No ancient commentary tradition survives for these works, and on multiple occasions when the Iliadic scholia might have elucidated Homeric usage by citing materials from the *HHs*, they fail to do so.⁹³ For instance, ΣΑ ad *Il.* 9.246 reports the opinion that Homer does not know the term “Peloponnesus,” even though the word occurs at *HH* 3.250, 290. There is, in truth, but a single testimony implying the belief of an Alexandrian scholar in the *Hymns*’ Homeric authorship: Apollodorus, a pupil of the celebrated grammarian Aristarchus, is once cited in the scholia Genevise ad *Il.* 21.319 as making an argument from the appearance of the phrase γαῖα φερέσβιος “in Homer” (παρ’ Ὀμήρῳ); the phrase does not occur in the HEs but only at *HH* 3.341.⁹⁴ For AHS, the Alexandrians did not take the usage of the *HHs* into account because they rejected their authenticity; Faulkner, Vergados, and Schwab (FVS) have more generously used the term “deuterocanonical” to describe the view that Hellenistic scholars may have held regarding the

⁹² Cf. the situation of the Epic Cycle, whose claim to Homeric authorship was much weaker (see n. 5 above).

⁹³ AHS 1936: lxxix–lxxii. They note similar tendencies in Strabo, Apollonius the Sophist, Lydus, Macrobius, and the *Etymologica*.

⁹⁴ AHS 1936: lxxiii–lxxiv. See further Faulkner 2011b: 176 n. 7 on ΣΤ ad *Il.* 16.163 for evidence that this argument goes back to Aristarchus himself.

HHs.⁹⁵ Regrettably, Apollonius' own judgment on the authorship of the *HHs* is unknown, if indeed he ever did pronounce upon the subject. From what little we know of Apollonius' scholarship, he does not seem either exceedingly skeptical or credulous: he defended the authenticity of the Hesiodic *Scutum* (fr. 21 Michaelis = arg. *Scuti* 1), but he athetized the work attached in antiquity to the end of the *Works and Days*, the Ὀρνιθομαντεία (fr. 20 Michaelis = Σ ad Hes. *Op.* 828a Pertusi).

But as FVS amply demonstrate, even if Homeric scholarship in the Hellenistic period left the *HHs* largely out of account, these poems were hardly neglected by Alexandrian poets—many of whom, like Apollonius, were scholars themselves.⁹⁶ I would thus introduce an important distinction: his own professional opinion notwithstanding, Apollonius' sustained program of allusion to the *HHs* shows that, *qua* poet, he treats the *HHs* as on a par with the HEs and thus at least notionally ascribes them to Homer, his primary generic model.⁹⁷ Or to put the matter more precisely, regardless of the views of the historical Apollonius of Rhodes, the *Arg.*'s “implied author”—that is, “the author-image contained in a work and constituted by the stylistic, ideological, and aesthetic properties for which indexical signs can be found in the text”⁹⁸—invests the *HHs* with the same authority as the HEs.

⁹⁵ FVS 2016: 3.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.* For overviews of allusions to the *HHs* in Hellenistic poetry, see *ibid.* 6–15 and Faulkner 2011b: 181–196.

⁹⁷ Although Apollonius regularly alludes to many non-Homeric poets (e.g., Hesiod, as I discuss in the Introduction, Section IV.a; Chapter 1, Section II.d; Chapter 2, Section II.c; and Conclusion, Section I), the natural inference from the prominence of allusions to the *HHs* in the *Arg.* is that Apollonius treats them alongside the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* as Homeric.

⁹⁸ Schmid 2009: 161. Or as Chatman puts it, perhaps more accessibly, the implied narrator is “‘implied,’ that is, reconstructed by the reader from the narrative. He is not the narrator, but rather the principle that invented the narrator, along with everything else in the narrative, that stacked the cards in this particular way, had these things happen to these characters, in these words or images” (1978: 148). The term goes back to Booth 1983: 70–74. I assume in this study that the work of allusion to prior texts lies in the domain of the implied author, though Morrison 2007: 279–280 raises the intriguing possibility that the scholarly Apollonian narrator himself might be thought

This contention gains support from the sheer volume of Apollonian allusion to the *HHs*, and particularly the prominence of such allusions in the poem’s most programmatic passages. I discuss allusions to the *HHs* in the *Arg.*’s hymnic frame in Chapter 1; here, I would like to point to one other programmatic passage in which Apollonius seems to set the *HHs* alongside the *HEs* among his most important poetic models. The passage in question is Appeal to the Muse that opens Book 4 (1–5):

Αὐτὴ νῦν κάματόν γε, θεά, καὶ δήνεα κούρης
 Κολχίδος ἔννεπε, Μοῦσα, Διὸς τέκος· ἧ γὰρ ἐμοὶ γε
 ἀμφασίῃ νόος ἔνδον ἐλίσσεται ὀρμαίνοντι,
 ἠέ μιν ἄτης πῆμα δυσίμερον ἧ τό γ’ ἐνίσπω
 φύζαν ἀεικελίην, ἧ κάλλιπεν ἔθνεα Κόλχων. 5

Now, goddess, you yourself tell of the distress and thoughts of the Colchian girl, O Muse, daughter of Zeus, for truly the mind within me whirls in speechless stupor, as I ponder whether to call it the lovesick affliction of obsession or shameful panic, which made her leave the Colchian people.

Uniquely, in this Appeal, the Muse is dignified by three vocatives: “goddess,” “Muse,” and “daughter of Zeus.” Since Rossi, these first two Honorifics have commonly been interpreted as allusions to the openings of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*: θεά recalls the Muse-invocation of *Il.* 1.1 (μῆνιν ἄειδε, θεά) while ἔννεπε, Μοῦσα recalls *Od.* 1.1 (where the phrase appears in the same *sedes*: ἄνδρα μοι ἔννεπε, Μοῦσα).⁹⁹ But as van den Eersten points out, while these allusions account for θεά and Μοῦσα, the third vocative, Διὸς τέκος, remains unexplained.¹⁰⁰

capable of making such allusions. I would think, however, that the “oralist fiction” of the epic (*ibid.* 295 n. 97) militates against this view.

⁹⁹ See, e.g., Rossi 1968: 159–160, Livrea 1973 ad loc., Feeney 1991: 91, Green 2007 ad loc., Morrison 2007: 300, and Hulse 2015 ad loc. The objection of Campbell 1983b: 155 that this diction is not especially distinctive overlooks the fact that “the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* have privileged status for later poets” (Hunter 1987: 134 n. 32).

¹⁰⁰ van den Eersten 2013: 53.

Muses are commonly called “daughters of Zeus” according to various formulas (e.g., Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο | θυγατέρες, *Il.* 2.491–492; θύγατερ Διός, *Od.* 1.10; τέκνα Διός, Hes. *Theog.* 104, *HH* 25.6),¹⁰¹ and the phrase Διὸς τέκος is often applied in the HEs to gods such as Athena (e.g., *Il.* 1.202) or Apollo (e.g., *Il.* 21.229; likewise *Thgn.* 1). But before Apollonius, the only passage in which a Muse is so addressed is the Exordium of the *Homeric Hymn to Helius*: “And now, O Muse Calliope, daughter of Zeus, begin to sing of glowing Helius, whom...” (ἥλιον ὕμνεῖν αὖτε Διὸς τέκος ἄρχεο Μοῦσα, | Καλλιόπη, φαέθοντα, τὸν..., 1–2).¹⁰² As with the phrase ἔννεπε, Μοῦσα, both passages set Διὸς τέκος in the same *sedes*, before the bucolic diaeresis.

An allusion to this *HH* would be especially appropriate here for two reasons. First, together with the *Homeric Hymn to Selene* (32), the *Homeric Hymn to Helius* forms a celestial diptych with a uniquely epic texture.¹⁰³ I have already noted that these are the only *Hymns* in the Homeric collection whose Poet’s Tasks explicitly present the performances to follow as epic (31.18–19, 32.18–20). *HH* 31 invokes by name Calliope, the Muse of epic poetry, while *HH* 32 begins with a play on the opening words of the *Iliad*: “Sing of the Moon” (Μήνην ἀείδειν, 32.1) echoes “Sing of the wrath” (μῆνιν ἄειδε, *Il.* 1.1).¹⁰⁴ These hymns with epic features likely attracted Apollonius’ attention as he was writing an epic with hymnic features, as I argue in Chapter 2.¹⁰⁵ Second, and relatedly, I have already mentioned that Apollonius prominently

¹⁰¹ *Od.* 1.10 also addresses the Muse as θεά, and thus *Argon* 4.1–2 has also been viewed as a conflation of *Od.* 1.1, 10, in recognition of the Odyssean character of Book 4 (Livrea 1973 ad loc., Albis 1996: 93, Acosta-Hughes 2010a: 43–44).

¹⁰² Livrea 1973 ad loc. and Hunter 2015 ad loc.

¹⁰³ For these hymns as a diptych, see, e.g., Càssola 1975a: 440. For their date, see n. 14 above.

¹⁰⁴ Hunter 1993: 129 n. 110. Editors who would emend away ἀείδειν at *HH* 32.1 and thus destroy this allusion fail to appreciate the affiliations with epic that this pair of hymns is at pains to cultivate.

¹⁰⁵ So Hunter (*ibid.*): “[T]he transmitted opening of the Hymn to Selene ... transfers an epic opening to a hymnic situation; the opening of *Arg.* reverses the process.”

alludes to the Envoi of the *Selene* hymn in the introit of *Arg.* 1; that allusion turns out to be balanced by an echo of its companion piece’s Exordium in the introit of *Arg.* 4.¹⁰⁶ I would thus propose that with the three vocatives in *Arg.* 4.1–2, Apollonius programmatically alludes, perhaps in the conventional order,¹⁰⁷ to Muse-invocations from all three of his major Homeric models: the *Iliad* (θεά), the *Odyssey* (Μοῦσα), and the *HHs* (Διὸς τέκος)—this last as represented by a hymn with epic affiliations eminently suitable for the *Arg.*’s own experiments with genre.¹⁰⁸

A final word on the purported Homeric authorship of the *HHs*. One reason for the scholarly neglect of ancient receptions of the *HHs* until quite recently has to do, I suspect, with our superior knowledge vis-à-vis antiquity with regard to Homeric poetry. We know today that “Homer” was not a historical individual but a name assigned to many works with diverse origins, ranging from the crystallization of centuries of oral tradition to Hellenistic pseudepigraphy.

¹⁰⁶ Apollonius is evidently playing with beginnings and endings: he alludes to the end of the diptych’s second hymn in the introit of his first book and the beginning of its first hymn in the introit of his last book. For similar literary games in Apollonius and Callimachus, see Harder 1993: 106–107, 109. *N.b.* that, although we cannot know how the collection of *HHs* available to Apollonius arranged these hymns, there are internal indications in their Exordia marking the *Hymn to Helios* as first and the *Hymn to Selene* as second: ἤρχεο (31.1) and αἰεΐδεν ... ἔσπετε (32.1). “Sun and Moon” is also the order that one could expect given the binary habits of Greek thought.

¹⁰⁷ For modern scholars, it is natural to think of these poems in the order *Iliad*—*Odyssey*—*HHs*, but the opinion of antiquity on this matter is not entirely clear. In the narrative of the *Certamen Homeri et Hesiodi*, Homer writes the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* first (16 West) and later performs the major *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* on Delos (18); this narrative may imply a belief that Homer wrote the *Hymns* later in life (cf., perhaps, Pl. *Phd.* 60d). By contrast, the pseudo-Herodotean *Vita Homeri* has Homer write his *Hymns* first in this sequence (2.9 West); notably, there may be an allusion to this very tradition in the inclusion of the “Strangers” epigram in some manuscripts of the *HHs*, if its presence in the collection is not accidental (see n. 43 above). For the tradition that Homer wrote the *Iliad* before the *Odyssey*, see further [Longinus] *Subl.* 9.11–15 with Russel 1964 ad loc.; cf. Sen. *Dial.* 10.13.2, who indicates that this question was a common matter of contention in antiquity, and Lucian *True Story* 2.20, who claims that most people (οἱ πολλοί) held that the *Odyssey* was written first.

¹⁰⁸ Many other resonances have been found in these lines, which I survey here. Paduano and Fusillo 1986 ad loc. and Vian 2002: 3.147 ad *Arg.* 4.2 see an allusion to the *Aetia* in the question posed to a Muse; with Vian, Valverde Sánchez 1996: 263 n. 570 also compares Call. *Hymn* 1.4–5. Hunter 1987: 134 compares Pind. *Nem.* 11.22–25, in which the speaker poses another disjunctive question concerning a woman’s motivation for a shameful action. Acosta-Hughes 2010a: 43 points to epic and lyric passages featuring hesitation between two options, particularly *Il.* 16.435–438. Uncertainty over a character’s motive also has historiographic precedent: see Fränkel 1968 ad loc., Priestley 2014: 175–176, Hunter 2015 ad loc.

Insofar as the terms “Homer” and “Homeric” are retained, they tend to be reserved only for the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*.¹⁰⁹ Thus, for instance, in the *Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative* series published by Brill, the first chapter is invariably titled “Homer,” though really, it is a study of the HEs, as is clear even from the Table of Contents: “The Homeric Hymns” are sequestered off to their own chapter. I certainly do not object to the practice of treating the *Hymns* separately from the epics, but I do worry that this labeling practice tends to make us forget that for many ancients, “Homer” was a heading under which all of these works could be filed. In the realm of Apollonian scholarship, I would posit that a bias against the *Hymns* as “Homeric” rather than “Homer” has disinclined scholars from paying them the level of attention that their rich reception history would warrant.

e. The Appeal of the Homeric Hymns in Third-Century Alexandria

I would like to conclude this overview of the *HHs* with a few remarks about what might have made the *Hymns* attractive to third-century Hellenistic poets for emulation and engagement. For evidently they were attractive, and to all three of the major Alexandrian poets, not just Apollonius. Callimachus seems to have revived the Rhapsodic Hymn as a genre with a collection of one elegiac and five hexameter *Hymns*, which are deeply engaged with the *HHs*.¹¹⁰ Theocritus, too, has several hymnic *Idylls* that imitate the Rhapsodic form (esp. 17, 22, 24).¹¹¹ This observation raises an important methodological point: the relative chronology of these

¹⁰⁹ There are, to be sure, some exceptions; see, e.g., Giangrande 1971: 356.

¹¹⁰ For Callimachus’ adaptation of the *HHs* in his own *Hymns*, see, e.g., Vamvouri Ruffy 2004, Acosta-Hughes and Cusset 2012, and Werner 2013.

¹¹¹ See, e.g., Hunter 1996: 12, 46–57; *idem* 2003: 8–9, 142–145; and Sens 1997: 13, 75–79. *Idyll* 26 is hymnic, but with fewer Homeric features.

poets and of their several works (and multiple editions thereof) has been endlessly debated. In this study, for heuristic purposes and convenience's sake, I will follow Köhnken's chronology of Theocritus—Callimachus—Apollonius.¹¹² Thus whenever Apollonius appears to be in dialogue with one of these two, I will assume that he is the alluding poet. Köhnken's arguments will not have convinced everyone, but luckily, most of the interpretations offered here that take Theocritean or Callimachean priority for granted are easily reversible if so desired. If there is truth to this assumption, then these contemporary Rhapsodic Hymns, and perhaps particularly Callimachus',¹¹³ will have greatly influenced Apollonius, both in their own right and for the interest that they took in the *HHs*.

Scholars have proposed both political and aesthetic explanations for the popularity of hymns, and particularly the *HHs*, in our period. Hunter points to the utility of hymnic poetry at a time when ruler cult and other divine honors for human beings precipitated renegotiations of the limits separating mortals and gods: “The ‘Homeric hymn’, which identified the areas of a god’s power and placed him or her within the overall scheme of the divine, seems in retrospect an obvious vehicle for describing these shifting boundaries of power.”¹¹⁴ This thesis accounts well for a poem like Theocritus *Id.* 17, an “Encomium for Ptolemy Philadelphus” cast in the form of a Homeric-style hymn and constantly flirting with the idea that its subject might indeed deserve a hymn proper to a god rather than the encomium due to a mortal man;¹¹⁵ or for those

¹¹² See Köhnken 1965, updated and defended in *idem* 2008.

¹¹³ So, e.g., Sistikou 2001: 259: “Η αναβίωση του υμνικού είδους με νεότερικούς όρους από τον Καλλίμαχο επηρεάζει και το έπος του Απολλωνίου” (“The revival of the hymnic genre in neoteric terms by Callimachus also influences Apollonius’ epic”).

¹¹⁴ Hunter 1996: 47. See also FVS 2016: 7: “The popularity of the *Hymns* in this period may be due in part to their suitability as a medium for encomiastic praise of patrons who themselves claimed divinity.”

¹¹⁵ See Section II.a of the Conclusion.

Callimachean *Hymns* that compare the Ptolemaic king with a god, both explicitly (2.26–27, 4.160–190) and allusively—for instance, the *Hymn to Zeus* (1.87–88) praises Ptolemy in lines directly modeled on *HH* 4.17–18.¹¹⁶ I shall have something to say about the possible connections between ruler cult and Apollonius’ interest in the *HHs* in the Conclusion to this study.

The *HHs* must also have been appreciated as “Homeric” poems that appeared more in tune with the stylistic and thematic preferences of the Hellenistic age than did the *HEs*.¹¹⁷ Here it may suffice to quote a few scholars who have put the matter well. Bing has observed what Callimachus—and, we may add, Apollonius—might have seen in the *HHs*:

They were pleasing in their limited size and lack of epic bombast, yet they could be viewed as genuinely ‘Homeric.’ Their use as a model would permit Callimachus to turn the Homeric tradition to productive use without trying to rival it, for here he would find those aspects that were less known, atypical, unfaded.¹¹⁸

Indeed, with their “small-scale epic” narratives, the major *HHs* may be justly viewed as forerunners to the Hellenistic epyllion,¹¹⁹ to which Apollonius’ episodic narratives have often been compared.¹²⁰ Newman emphasizes some of the motifs and narrative devices that anticipate certain recurrent Hellenistic fixations:

The *Homeric Hymns* too look as though they supplied valuable hints to a poet eager for fresh approaches. The *Hymn to Demeter*, for example, contains far more that is redolent of ‘Hellenistic’ epic

¹¹⁶ See Clauss 1986. I have not yet been able to access Brumbaugh 2019, on the theme of kingship in Callimachus’ *Hymns*.

¹¹⁷ Bornmann 1968: xxiv–xxvi, Hunter 2006: 25, FVS 2016: 7.

¹¹⁸ Bing 2009: 34.

¹¹⁹ See, e.g., Baumbach 2012 and Petrovic 2012. As Nünlist 2004: 38 observes: “Even the longest among the Homeric hymns are short (max. 580 lines) compared to other narrative texts.”

¹²⁰ Crump 1931: 247 once remarked, “The *Argonautica*, in fact, is little more than a collection of epyllia.”

than one might expect from compartmentalized histories of literature. The whole poem is a kind of *aetion*, and in its richness again calls Ovid to mind. The flowers, the golden chariot, the feeling for the child, the riot of proper names, the use of repetition are not so much “Hellenistic” as Ionian devices destined to enjoy a long history.¹²¹

FVS have also pointed to the playful tone of several of the *HHs*, especially of the major *Hymns to Hermes* and *Aphrodite*.¹²² Finally, I would add here that for Apollonius, the *HHs* were particularly attractive in comparison to other potential hymnic models because of their close affinities with epic poetry: the *HHs* represent, in a way, a happy medium between the generic features of the HEs and Cultic Hymns.¹²³ They were thus ideal for allusive engagement and adaptation in an epic poem while simultaneously permitting certain narrative techniques, such as conspicuous intrusions by an “overt narrator,” that were foreign to the HEs, as we will see in detail in Chapter 3.

III. Method and Terminology

Intertextuality provides the major methodological framework for a study such as this one, and here, I would like to introduce some key theoretical issues and explain my use of certain terms throughout this study. To begin with, I use the term “intertext” in this study to refer to any

¹²¹ Newman 1986: 95. For the childhood motif, see esp. Pace 2004: 96–97, who points out that, with its depiction of the infant god, the major *Homeric Hymn to Hermes* provided Alexandrian poets with one of the only Archaic or Classical models of the child figure so beloved in the Hellenistic period.

¹²² FVS 2016: 7–8.

¹²³ See on this score Hall 2012: ch. 3; for the *HHs*’ self-reflection on their own status as a mixture of hymnody with epic, see Haubold 2001: 24–25.

text that recollects, or “echoes,” another;¹²⁴ the features of the text that facilitate this recollection shall be termed “parallels.” I use the term “allusion” for instances of intertextuality that appear to be deliberate—that is, to me, the author seemingly intends to recollect an earlier text. With the idea of intention, I enter fraught theoretical territory, because for a variety of reason, an author’s intention is historically irrecoverable and thus unavailable to the literary critic.¹²⁵ But even if in theory, as Barthes declared, the author is dead,¹²⁶ nevertheless, in practice, its revenant survives, as readers deploy the Foucauldian “author function” to limit the proliferation of meaning in a given text.¹²⁷ In our discipline, Hinds describes this process well in his influential book on allusion and intertextuality:

The axiom that meaning is constructed at the point of reception becomes a better tool for dealing with the kinds of case which interest students of philological allusion if it embraces the fact (i.e. rather than occluding it) that one of the most persistent ways in which both Roman and modern readers construct the meaning of a poetic text is by attempting to construct from (and for) it an intention-bearing authorial voice, a construction which they generally hope or believe (in a belief which must always be partly misguided) to be a reconstruction; and the author thus (re)constructed is one who writes towards an implied reader who will attempt such a (re)construction.¹²⁸

Yet as Hinds goes on to say, circumlocutions like “reader-constructed intention-bearing authorial voices” are both inefficient and unintuitive, epistemologically sound though they may be.

¹²⁴ Classical philology has departed considerably from the Kristevan use of the term, but for an attempt at recuperating some aspects of its original import, see Edmunds 2001: 8–16. For an overview of Kristeva’s semiotics, see Eagleton 2008: 162–166.

¹²⁵ With reference specifically to intertextuality in classical (Roman) poetry, Edmunds 2001: ch. 2 provides a good survey of the problems with divining an author’s intention.

¹²⁶ Barthes 1977: 142–148. In fact, the “intentional fallacy” goes back to New Criticism; see Wimsatt and Beardsley 1946.

¹²⁷ Foucault 1984: 110, 118–119.

¹²⁸ Hinds 1998: 49.

Accordingly, in this study I use the language of “allusion” or “imitation,” sometimes with cautious hedging (“Apollonius appears to allude to such-and-such text”), to mean that I am projecting my own construction of an intention-bearing Apollonius onto the text as a notional guarantor of the validity of my proposed reading, in hopes that my reading is indeed historically viable (i.e., Apollonius really could have intended it). When I do not (yet) feel comfortable doing so at a given stage of argument, I will speak in the intention-neutral language of “intertexts,” “parallels,” or “echoes” (“There is an intertextual relationship between these two passages”; “Such-and-such a parallel connects these passages”; etc.).

The limits on my readerly fantasy life—for I could in principle project onto the text any construction of Apollonius that I want¹²⁹—are provided by the “interpretive community” in which I air my views: as a scholar, I aim to make my arguments as persuasive as possible to other scholars.¹³⁰ Fortunately, the rules of this game are fairly standardized. Thomas identifies two “absolute criteria” for recognizing allusions (or “references,” in his terminology): “[T]he model must be one with whom the poet is demonstrably familiar, and there must be a reason of some sort for the reference—that is, it must be susceptible of interpretation, or meaningful.”¹³¹ The first condition is easily met in the case of Apollonius, who must have had access to the *HHs* in the Library of Alexandria, though as I have already noted, it is unknown in what form he would have known the collection. The second criterion will be the real test: my intention is not to collect a list of parallels between the *Arg.* and the *HHs*, but to use these parallels to enrich our

¹²⁹ Cf. the pop culture concept of “headcanons”—idiosyncratic beliefs or interpretations held by fans that are not endorsed by the official “canon” of that fictional universe.

¹³⁰ On interpretive communities, see Fish 1980, esp. 167–173. Consigny 2001: 17–21 provides a shrewd description of how scholarly discourses function as such interpretive communities.

¹³¹ Thomas 1986: 174.

readings of Apollonius' poem by bringing to light features of the text that other analyses might miss.¹³²

Beyond these two conditions, the strength of the argument is based on the strength of the parallels adduced to support it, and these gain in strength based on the correspondences in diction, theme, motif, and context that connect the two passages. The rarer and more detailed the correspondences, the stronger the argument. For Hellenistic poetry, however, these criteria need to be adjusted somewhat to allow for *oppositio* or *variatio in imitando* (or *imitatio cum variatione*), that is, an allusion that involves a pointed departure from the source text. In a classic article on Apollonius' "arte allusiva," Giangrande catalogues many examples of such allusions to Homer in Alexandrian epic.¹³³ As he remarks in another article, "Plain echoing of the model was ... felt as far too rudimentary by the Alexandrian poet: therefore his reminiscence will, as a rule, imply a slight change in the wording of the model."¹³⁴ As Giangrande notes, Apollonius does this when alluding to the *HHs* as well as the *HEs*. For instance, Matteo has shown that Apollonius follows Homer in using two synonymous nouns to denote "hunting," ἄγρη and θήρη, but that in his imitations of these usages he regularly reverses the Homeric choice in deploying one noun or the other. This policy applies equally to *HE* models (e.g., κύνε εἰδότε θήρης [*Il.* 10.360] ~ κύνες δεδαημένοι ἄγρης [*Arg.* 2.278], both line-final) and to one model from the *HHs* (ἄγρης ἐξανιών [*HH* 19.15] ~ θήρης ἐξανιών [*Arg.* 3.69; θήρη only here in

¹³² So Knight 1995: 15: "Generally a reader can suggest there is an allusion if recollection of the Homeric context contributes (by similarity or difference) to a reading of the poem."

¹³³ Giangrande 1967; he traces this insight all the way back to Haacke 1842: 14–18, 29.

¹³⁴ Giangrande 1970: 46.

the *Arg.*], both line-initial).¹³⁵ In addition to this lexical variety, Giangrande also recognizes a species of “conceptual *oppositio in imitando*,”¹³⁶ which involves pointed changes to a myth as given in a model text. We will encounter a good example of this in Chapter 4, Section IV.b: in alluding to the Pythonomachy narrative of the major *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* (3.300–374), Apollonius also departs markedly from his model in a number of details (*Arg.* 2.705–714).

In addition to the terms surveyed so far, I use the whole panoply of analytical tools that have been formulated and developed in Classical scholarship on intertextuality, such as multiple allusions,¹³⁷ “two-tier allusions,”¹³⁸ “Alexandrian footnotes,”¹³⁹ “system references,”¹⁴⁰ and so forth. But in addition to these concepts that center around the perceived intention of an alluding author, in this study I also frequently invoke the construct of the “reader” or of “readers,” as

¹³⁵ Matteo 2002: 158–159; she shows that Apollonius makes the same sort of allusion to Callimachus as well (159–160).

¹³⁶ Giangrande 1967: 90.

¹³⁷ Thomas 1986: 193 defines “multiple reference” (or “conflation”) as an allusion to “a number of antecedents” at once. This technique, once known under the older, pejorative-sounding name *contaminatio* (cf. Du Quesnay 1979: 44 with n. 86), is discussed already by Kroll 1924: 171–174.

¹³⁸ The term “two-tier allusion” goes back to Hinds 1987: 151 n. 16, though the underlying concept of a poet alluding simultaneously to passages from predecessors that are themselves in dialogue is earlier (e.g., Du Quesnay 1977: 55 with n. 213 and addendum on p. 99, Cairns 1979: 121; see also the bibliography given in Nelis 2001: 5 n. 24). McKeown 1987: 37–45 uses the term “double allusion” for much the same thing, but I prefer the former to avoid confusion with “multiple allusion.” The term “window reference,” as originally defined by Thomas 1986: 188, has a more specific definition and is thus of more limited utility for my purposes: “It consists of the very close adaptation of a model, noticeably interrupted in order to allow reference back to the source of that model.... In the process the immediate, or chief, model is in some fashion ‘corrected.’” For allusions as “corrections,” see Thomas 1982: 146–154; cf. the concept of *aemulatio* (Conte 1986: 26, 36).

¹³⁹ That is, expressions such as λέγεται, ὡς φασί, or ὡς ἀκούομεν that serve to distance the narrator from a particular claim by appealing to some unspecified authority (such as earlier literary traditions). A classic article that broaches this subject is Stinton 1976, though the term was coined by Ross 1975: 77–78, building on the extensive notes in Norden 1957: 123–124. For the earlier history of the concept, see the bibliography in Horsfall 1988: 32 n. 13, 1990: 60–61 n. 3.

¹⁴⁰ See n. 48 above.

another way of thinking through the process by which I find meaning in Apollonius' text.¹⁴¹

Sharrock has recently distilled well the practical function of "readers" in literary analysis: "readers' in criticism are always heuristic tools, which we use to help us conceptualise the effects of a text, and in turn to help create larger interpretations, which in their own turn depend for their success on their acceptance, at least partial, by interpretative communities."¹⁴²

Hypothetical readers are in many ways the mirror image of the modern critics' construction of an "intention-bearing authorial voice," but the category of "readers" is often particularly useful because of its essential plurality and mutability: we can imagine different sorts of readers who react to a given text in different ways, and in different circumstances. For instance, in Chapter 1, I imagine several different interpretations that readers might apply to *Arg.* 1.1–2 on an initial encounter with the text; I then propose a new interpretation that those same readers could advance if they finish their first reading of the work and then *re-read* *Arg.* 1.1–2 in light of their memory of the poem's ending (*Arg.* 4.1773–1781).¹⁴³ We can also imagine readers with specific characteristics that might affect their response to a text, such as gender, ethnicity, or varying levels of access to the several contexts (cultural, historical, literary, etc.) in which Apollonius composed his work. In this study, I tend to use "readers" in a fairly broad, generic sense, but I would add two stipulations. First, there are huge differences between the reading practices of antiquity and modern philological scholarship,¹⁴⁴ but as with my reconstruction of Apollonius' authorial intention, I would hope that the interpretations that I attribute to my

¹⁴¹ I lay out my reasons for using the term "readers" rather than (listening) "audiences" on p. 74 in Chapter 1, though this distinction is not crucial to the argument of this study.

¹⁴² Sharrock 2018: 20–21.

¹⁴³ I outline this "diachronic" method in the introductory section of Chapter 1.

¹⁴⁴ See, e.g., Sharrock 2018: 21–22, 26–29.

readers are plausible reconstructions of readings that might actually have been made in antiquity by flesh-and-blood individuals with high degrees of access to Apollonius' context—for example, a contemporary Alexandrian reading public, Romans well-acquainted with the Greek literary tradition, etc.¹⁴⁵ Second, and relatedly, because of the intertextual nature of this study, I typically take the so-called “learned reader” as my primary model—not because I subscribe to the dated view that most Alexandrian poetry was intended only for a select audience of *literati*, but because I am interested here in readers at least “learned” enough to catch Apollonius' allusions to the *HHs* or to other texts.

IV. A Survey of Exemplary Allusions to the *Homeric Hymns*

The foregoing discussion has established in abstract terms my approach to studying Apollonius' engagement with the *HHs*. Other methodological considerations and *termini technici* will be discussed elsewhere as they become relevant, especially as regards narratology in Chapters 3 and 4. In this section, however, I would like to survey a small number of more or less probable allusions to the *HHs* scattered throughout the *Arg.*, for two reasons. First, this survey shows in practice some of the criteria that establish the difference between an intertext and an allusion. Second, this brief survey is organized around five concrete functions that allusions to the *HHs* can serve in Apollonius' poem. In most of this dissertation, I focus on allusions that speak to the generic affiliations of the *Arg.* as a whole, and this macroscopic orientation does not permit much consideration of the smaller-scale allusions to the *HHs* that are

¹⁴⁵ In some cases, we have the testimony of actual ancient readers as to how they understood a text—for instance, some of the interpretations of *Arg.* 1.1 that I canvass in Chapter 1 are recorded by the ancient scholiast *ad loc.* or seem to be presupposed by later poets' imitations of Apollonius' opening. Such testimony helps to confirm the plausibility of readings advanced in modern scholarship, but it is a luxury unavailable in most interpretative situations.

ubiquitous in the poem. This survey does not compensate for that gap, but it should demonstrate that Apollonius looked to the *Hymns* to serve the same broad range of functions that he achieved with allusions to the HEs.

a. The Homeric Hymns as Sources for Myth

First, when Apollonius mentions a myth extraneous to his primary Argonautic narrative, he often cites one or more of his sources through a carefully-crafted lexical allusion.¹⁴⁶ Partly it seems that he chooses to cite particular sources because he considers their treatments of the myth more or less “canonical,” early versions thereof, but he does not follow these sources slavishly. Quite the opposite: he typically “updates” the source that he cites with mythological details that appear later in the tradition. For instance, when the Argonauts pass by the enchained Prometheus as they approach Colchis, Apollonius designates his “galling bonds” with the word ἀλυκτοπέδησι (*Arg.* 2.1249). As commentators regularly note, before the time of Oppian (*Hal.* 2.385) and the lexicographers, this word occurs only here and in Hesiod—precisely in his account of the Titan’s imprisonment at the hands of Zeus (*Th.* 521).¹⁴⁷ But rather than signaling a straightforward reliance on Hesiod’s account, Apollonius’ citation actually underscores his divergences from the Boeotian poet on certain details;¹⁴⁸ in particular, Apollonius enhances Hesiod’s rather hazy picture of the Titan’s punishment with some borrowings from Aeschylus’

¹⁴⁶ For a Pindaric example of this practice (vis-à-vis Cronus’ siring of Chiron), see n. 17 in Appendix II.

¹⁴⁷ West (2001: 5, 6) conjectures that the word also occurred in the now-fragmentary major *Homeric Hymn to Dionysus* (1C.5) to refer to the bonds that Hephaestus crafted for Hera’s throne. In this context, however, the allusion must be to Hesiod.

¹⁴⁸ Notably, his Prometheus is not chained to a pillar, as in Hesiod (*Th.* 522), but to the Caucasian cliffs themselves (*Arg.* 2.1248–1249).

Prometheus trilogy, such as his setting of the imprisonment in the Caucasus.¹⁴⁹ The archaic source is duly cited, but fleshed out with variants from another authority on the myth.

We find that Apollonius' procedure is much the same when he touches upon certain myths featured in the *HHs*, such as the story of Athena's birth in full armor from the head of Zeus. Thus Apollonius describes the Libyan Herossae, "who once upon a time met Athena, after she leapt gleaming from her father's head, by lake Triton's waters and bathed her" (αἶ ποτ' Ἀθήνην, | ἦμος ὄτ' ἐκ πατρὸς κεφαλῆς θόρε παμφαίνουσα, | ἀντόμεναι Τρίτωνος ἐφ' ὕδασι χυτλώσαντο, 1309–1311). If we compare the longer *Homeric Hymn to Athena's* description of the goddess's birth, "out of [Zeus'] august head, wearing battle armor of shining gold" (σεμνῆς ἐκ κεφαλῆς, πολεμῖα τεύχε' ἔχουσιν, | χρύσεια, παμφανόωντα, 28.5–6), it emerges that Apollonius has condensed its description of the same event, with the single participle παμφαίνουσα (cognate to παμφανόωντα) serving by itself to conjure up Athena's flashing martial arms.¹⁵⁰

A few more parallels further strengthen the link between these passages. Apollonius' brief reference is designed to explain the epithet Tritogenia by the name of the Libyan lake where Athena was bathed after being born; this very epithet appears at the end of the *Hymn's* Exordium, immediately before the Myth of Athena's birth begins (Τριτογενῆ, τὴν αὐτὸς ἐγείνατο μητίετα Ζεὺς | σεμνῆς ἐκ κεφαλῆς, 4–5).¹⁵¹ Apollonius applies another of Athena's Honorifics

¹⁴⁹ See, e.g., Páskiewicz 1981: 266; Vian 2002: 1.236 n. 1; Matteo 2007 ad *Arg.* 2.1246–1259, 1248–1249. This blending heightens the uncertainty that Byre (1996: 278) detects in the Titan's characterization: "We are not told enough to know whether the Apollonian Prometheus is the Hesiodic or the Aeschylean figure, whether he is the cunning trickster and hapless source of mankind's woes punished by Zeus, the supreme master of the universe, or the proud defier of a harsh and insecure tyrant and the benefactor, and indeed the savior and civilizer, of mankind." See also Williams 1991: 103.

¹⁵⁰ Livrea 1973 ad *Arg.* 4.1310. *N.b.* that Apollonius uses παμφαίνω only once elsewhere (1.732).

¹⁵¹ For Apollonius' play with the identity of the Tritonian body of water associated with Athena, see n. 10 in Appendix II. For Athena's connection to Libya, see Manakidou 2017: 194–196. The hymn's juxtaposition of Τριτογενῆ with the story of Athena's birth from Zeus' head may allude to a different etymology for the epithet that

from the *Hymn*, the relatively rare epithet κυδρός, “glorious,” paired with the substantive “goddess” (κυδρῆν θεόν, 1),¹⁵² to the Herossae themselves a few lines later (κυδραὶ θεαί, *Arg.* 4.1333), in the same *sedes* before the bucolic diaeresis. The allusion may suggest that the Herossae have derived a part of their own “glory” from the service they once rendered to the glorious Athena. Notably, the motif of a goddess’s attendance by three (4.1347) minor divinities at her birth is reminiscent of a scene from another *HH*, namely, the Horae’s reception of the newborn Aphrodite on her arrival at Cyprus in *HH* 6.5–15.¹⁵³ As with Hesiod’s Prometheus, Apollonius has departed from his hymnic model by incorporating variants from other traditions—notably, he alters the myth’s localization to Libya, perhaps with a nod toward Callimachus,¹⁵⁴ and introduces the Herossae to the story.¹⁵⁵

I present a final example of the citation of the *HHs* as sources for myth, because this example involves a simultaneous citation of one of the HEs, among other sources, and ably illustrates the sheer density of Apollonian allusion. When Aphrodite finds Ganymede playing

interpreted the τριτο- element as a dialect word for “head,” thus yielding the meaning “head-born” (see Borthwick 1970: 21 n. 3).

¹⁵² The adjective is a *hapax* in the *Arg.* It is common in the HEs in its superlative form as a vocative (κύδιστε), but in its positive degree it occurs only at *Il.* 18.184 and *Od.* 11.580, 15.26; see also Hes. *Th.* 328, 442; *Op.* 257; *Cat.* 1.16. It is relatively commoner in the *HHs* (2.66, 179, 292; 4.461; 12.4; 28.1; forms of κυδίστη occur at 3.62, 5.42).

¹⁵³ Cf. Hes. *Th.* 201–202, where it is Eros and Pothus that attend to the newborn Aphrodite. *N.b.* a possible case of *oppositio in imitando*: in the *Hymn* the Horae dress the goddess as she emerges from the sea; by contrast, the Herossae immediately bathe Athena, who is born in full armor. The Graces bathe Aphrodite on Cyprus before her tryst with Anchises at *HH* 5.58–63.

¹⁵⁴ The *Hymn* seems to set the birth on Olympus (28.9–10); for the setting by Libyan Triton, Apollonius seems to borrow from Call. *Aet.* fr. 37 Pfeiffer (where *n.b.* Τρίτωνος ἐφ’ ὕδασι in the same *sedes*) (Hunter 2015 ad *Arg.* 4.1309–1336).

¹⁵⁵ These “heroines” appear also at Call. fr. 602 Pfeiffer and Nicaenetus *AP* 6.225, though in neither place are they associated with Athena.

knucklebones with her son Eros, Apollonius briefly narrates the boy's backstory in the space of a single relative clause (3.115–117).

...μετὰ καὶ Γανυμήδεα, τὸν ῥά ποτε Ζεὺς 115
οὐρανῷ ἐγκατένασεν ἐφέστιον ἀθανάτοισιν,
κάλλεος ἱμερθεῖς.

...[Aphrodite found Eros not alone,] but with Ganymede, whom Zeus had once settled in heaven to live with the immortals, smitten with longing for his beauty.

The Homeric corpus relates the story of Ganymede's abduction twice. The first occurs in Aeneas' account of his own genealogy (*Il.* 20.232–235):

...τε καὶ ἀντίθεος Γανυμήδης,
ὃς δὴ κάλλιστος γένητο θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων·
τὸν καὶ ἀνηρείψαντο θεοὶ Διὶ οἰνοχοεῦειν
κάλλεος εἵνεκα οἴο, ἴν' ἀθανάτοισι μετεῖη. 235

...and godlike Ganymede, who was born the fairest of mortal men; and the gods caught him up on high to be cupbearer to Zeus because of his beauty, so that he might dwell with the immortals.

In the second instance, Ganymede occurs as an exemplum of the Trojan race's godlike beauty in Aphrodite's long speech to Anchises (*HH* 5.202–206):

ἦτοι μὲν ξανθὸν Γανυμήδεα μητίετα Ζεὺς
ἦρπασεν ὄν διὰ κάλλος, ἴν' ἀθανάτοισι μετεῖη
καὶ τε Διὸς κατὰ δῶμα θεοῖς ἐπινοχοεῦοι,
θαῦμα ἰδεῖν, πάντεσσι τετιμένος ἀθανάτοισιν, 205
χρυσέου ἐκ κρητῆρος ἀφύσσων νέκταρ ἐρυθρόν.

Resourceful Zeus seized flaxen-haired Ganymede because of his beauty, so that he should be among the immortals and serve drink to the gods in Zeus' house, a wonder to see, esteemed by all the immortals as he draws the red nectar from the golden bowl.

If we compare these three accounts, it emerges that Apollonius has drawn distinctive elements from both of his Homeric models at a fairly granular level. He has derived the general syntax of his brief aside from the Iliadic passage: καὶ + Ganymede's name + a relative clause (*Il.* 20.232–

233). To provide the motive for the abduction, Apollonius also enjambes κάλλεος in *Arg.* 3.117 (κάλλεος ἡμερθεῖς) in imitation of *Il.* 20.235 (κάλλεος εἵνεκα οἴο; cf. the unenjambled ὄν διὰ κάλλος, *HH* 5.203). Apollonius agrees with the *Hymn*, however, in making Zeus alone abduct Ganymede, not “the gods” generally, as at *Il.* 20.234 (θεοί). Indeed, his placement of Ganymede’s and Zeus’ names at the end of line 115 (Γανυμήδεα, τόν ῥά ποτε Ζεύς) replicates precisely the meter of *HH* 5.202 (Γανυμήδεα μητιέτα Ζεύς).¹⁵⁶ Apollonius may also clarify a point in the *Hymn*’s presentation of the Ganymede story by emphasizing Zeus’ erotic interest in the boy (κάλλεος ἡμερθεῖς, 117). As the scholiast ad *Arg.* 3.114–117a notes, Zeus’ relationship with Ganymede is not clearly sexual in the *Iliad*.¹⁵⁷ In context, however, the *Hymn* implies that the nature of Zeus’ relationship with Ganymede is analogous to that of Aphrodite’s with Anchises, i.e., erotic, as later versions, including Apollonius’, make completely clear.¹⁵⁸

Arg. 3.116, however, varies the formulations of both Homeric passages with a likely allusion to the early Hellenistic poet Moero, who had used a similar phrase to describe Zeus’ immortalization of the eagle that fed him nectar as a child on Crete (Ζεὺς | ἀθάνατον ποίησε καὶ οὐρανῶ ἐγκατένασσε, fr. 1.7–8 Powell).¹⁵⁹ Not only will Ganymede function in a similar cup-

¹⁵⁶ The nice color contrast of *HH* 5.206 also recurs in the Argonautic scene; cf. line-initial χρυσεύου (of a golden bowl) with line-initial χρυσεῖοις (*Arg.* 3.118, of golden knucklebones) as well as ἐρυθρόν (of nectar) with ἔρευθος (*Arg.* 3.122, of Eros’ blush). *N.b.* also the line-final ἀθανάτοισιν in both *Arg.* 3.116 and *HH* 5.205.

¹⁵⁷ Dover 1989: 196–197.

¹⁵⁸ E.g., Thgn. 1345–1348, a passage that Apollonius may also have had in mind (Campbell 1994: 104); Soph. *Colchian Women* fr. 345 Radt must also be important for Apollonius’ choice to include Ganymede in his narrative at all (cf. Hunter 1989 ad *Arg.* 3.115–118). Σ ad *Arg.* 3.114–117b may indicate that Apollonius has derived this erotic emphasis from Ibycus (fr. 289 Campbell), who may himself have drawn on the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite* (see Barron 1984: 18). The issue is vexed because in the manuscripts this scholium is attached to *Arg.* 3.158; Wilamowitz’s transposition to its current location is accepted by Wendel 1935 and Lachenaud 2010 but rejected by, e.g., Campbell 1994 ad *Arg.* 3.158f.

¹⁵⁹ Gillies 1928 ad loc. The other half of Apollonius’ expression in line 116 represents an intratextual echo of his own earlier description of Heracles’ destined apotheosis (ναίειν δ’ ἀθανάτοισι συνέστιον, *Arg.* 1.1319), which is itself

bearing capacity for the adult Zeus (cf. ἀφύσσων νέκταρ, *HH* 5.206),¹⁶⁰ but in the conventional form of the myth—though not in either of the Homeric passages¹⁶¹—Ganymede is himself abducted by Zeus’ very eagle (or by Zeus turned into an eagle).¹⁶² Apollonius’ procedure in these intensely allusive two-and-a-half lines is complex, but revealing of his attitude toward the *HHs*. He carefully alludes to and harmonizes both the Iliadic and hymnic versions of the Ganymede story, apparently because he considered both to be authoritative, Homeric accounts of the myth. He “corrects” each account, however, on a number of points (Zeus as sole abductor; Zeus’ erotic motivation; abduction via eagle), and notably, the last of these corrections is made subtextually, via an allusion to the earlier Hellenistic poet Moero. Apollonius’ brief treatment of the Ganymede story represents in microcosm his approach to the *HHs*, which, like the *HEs*, he dutifully cites where relevant but is not above subverting, updating, and fleshing out, in typical Alexandrian fashion.

Before moving on, I would like to speculate briefly about another passage, in one of Apollonius’ lost works, in which the poet may have alluded to the *HHs* in combination with other models. According to the manchette to Antoninus Liberalis’ *Metamorphoses* 23,¹⁶³

curiously close to the beginning of Aesop 111 Perry (Ἡρακλῆς ἰσοθεοθεὶς καὶ παρὰ Διὶ ἐστῳόμενος...). Perhaps this “hearth” language is traditional for describing a god’s integration into the Olympian community.

¹⁶⁰ Apollonius may allude to Ganymede’s role as Zeus’ cupbearer by setting his game of dice with Eros “in Zeus’ fertile ἀλωή” (Διὸς θαλερῆ ἐν ἀλωῆ, 3.114), using a word which can denote a vineyard (or a “nectar-yard,” where the gods are concerned?). At the same time, a “garden” would be a suitably erotic setting in which to find both Ganymede and Eros himself (Hunter 1989 ad loc., Campbell 1994 ad loc.). For different interpretations of ἀλωή here, see Gillies 1928 ad *Arg.* 3.158, Ardizzoni 1970: 40–41, and Campbell 1983: 100 n. 48.

¹⁶¹ *HH* 5.208 has Ganymede abducted by means of a “miraculous whirlwind” (θέσπις ἄελλα); for possible interpretations of this phrase, see Faulkner 2008 ad loc.

¹⁶² See Campbell 1994 ad loc.

¹⁶³ For these manchettes (brief notes appended to the narratives in Antoninus Liberalis and Parthenius indicating other works in which their stories can be found), see Lightfoot 1999: 246–256.

Apollonius treated the story of Battus, the old man turned to stone by Hermes, in his epigrams (fr. 50 *SH*).¹⁶⁴ We know from Antoninus himself and from Ovid *Met.* 2.687–707 that this story is set during the same sequence of events treated in the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes* (4.87–94, 187–212)—Battus is the name supplied by later tradition for the old man who sees the infant Hermes in the act of stealing Apollo’s cattle and who later reports what he has seen to Apollo.¹⁶⁵ It is not difficult to imagine how such a subject would lend itself to epigrammatic treatment—perhaps the petrified Battus tells the story of his fate as a speaking object—and Apollonius may have used the opportunity to update or perhaps even “correct” the story in the *Hymn*, which does not mention any punishment for Battus’ divulgence of Hermes’ secret.¹⁶⁶ Unfortunately, in the absence of a new papyrological discovery, the foregoing must remain speculation.

b. Epic World-Building

Another use that Apollonius made of the *HHs* is perhaps easy to overlook, but it represents a notable type of system reference that is related to what I call epic “world-building”: Apollonius’ consistent representation of the norms, practices, and other *Realien* associated with the mythical Age of Heroes.¹⁶⁷ World-building represents an important part of Apollonius’

¹⁶⁴ On Apollonius’ epigrams, see Bowie 2000: 4–5. For the improbable theory that Apollonius used this epigram to advance his polemic against Callimachus, the “son of Battus” (*ep.* 37.1 = *AP* 7.415.1), see Papatomopoulos 1968: xii.

¹⁶⁵ The old man is unnamed in the hymn, but “Battus” could be derived from his occupation in that text: Apollo addresses him as a culler of brambles (*βατοδρόπε*, 190) (Celoria 1992: 168 n. 277).

¹⁶⁶ Apollonius may have combined the hymnic narrative with a version of the story in one or more of the other authors mentioned in the manchette to *Ant. Lib. Met.* 23, such as Hesiod or Antigonos (of Carystus?); Didymarchus’ date is unknown, while Nicander and Pamphilus postdate Apollonius.

¹⁶⁷ Distinctive elements of heroic society as projected by the HEs are already commented upon by Plato (*Resp.* 4.404b–c) and figured into a great deal of ancient scholarship; see, e.g., Schmidt 1976 for such discussions in the bT scholia to the *Iliad*, or Heath 2000 on ancient debates over the Homeric diet.

evocation of the “Homeric code,”¹⁶⁸ in Conteian terms, but the mythical world in which the heroic sagas were set was in fact the common property of ancient mythological poetry, including the *HHs*. Thus Apollonius seems to draw on Homer’s *Hymns* as a supplement to the epics as sources of phraseology and “scene-setting” details that conjure a suitably “heroic” atmosphere in his poem.¹⁶⁹ For example, Apollonius consistently depicts the Argo in the archaizing manner of a Homeric ship rather than a contemporary vessel.¹⁷⁰ For the most part, Apollonius’ depiction of seafaring is indebted to the HEs, but the contribution made by the *HHs* is shown, for instance, by Apollonius’ use (1.379, 389) of the nautical term σκαλμός (the “*pin* or *thole* to which the Greek oar was fastened by the τροπωτήρ,” per LSJ), which is unexampled in all of early Greek epic except for *HH* 7.42.¹⁷¹ Or, for another example, it has been observed that the poet’s description of the Argonauts’ preparation of a fire at Mysia (1.1182–1184) draws on the description of Hermes’ sacrifice in his major *HH* (3.111–113, 136),¹⁷² but to what end? There is perhaps some purposeful connection between these passages,¹⁷³ but the primary effect of Apollonius’ borrowing, in my view, is to imbue this section of his narrative with a properly archaic character

¹⁶⁸ Conte’s idea of “Model as Code” bears certain resemblances to what Edmunds calls a “system reference” (see n. 48 above) vis-à-vis genre. As Segal summarizes it, a literary “code” consists of “the objective narrative structure, conventions, expectations defined by . . . a literary genre”; for instance, “heroic combat, divine interventions, [and] extended similes” all represent parts of the “epic code” (in Conte 1986: 13; see further pp. 31, 142–143). This useful concept could be invoked often in this study; e.g., passages that scholars often label “(quasi-)hymnic” may be analyzed as invoking elements of the “(Homeric) hymnic code.”

¹⁶⁹ Cf. Agosti 2016 on the use of “tags,” or distinctive phraseology, from the *HHs* as system references for HE and hymnody among Late Antique poets. For the term “tag,” see Hunter 2014: 15–16.

¹⁷⁰ As was demonstrated at length by Ville de Mirmont 1895; see also Naber 1906: 1–2 and Peschties 1912: 34–44.

¹⁷¹ Peschties 1912: 41

¹⁷² Vergados 2013: 115.

¹⁷³ E.g., we could say that Apollonius is making a learned allusion to the πρώτος εὔρετής of fire-sticks, as the *Hymn* presents Hermes (111). For another Apollonian intertext with the *Hermes* passage, see Clauss 1993: 69–74, 2016: 62–65 (cf. Vergados 2013: 113 with n. 75).

suggestive of the world of Homeric ἔπος. The *Iliad* and *Odyssey* both feature descriptions of kindling fires, but the fullest account in early hexameter poetry belongs to the *Hymn to Hermes*, and so Apollonius has chosen it as a source for this practice.¹⁷⁴

To take a more complex example: the internal narrative of Paraebius’ father (2.468–489), probably invented by Apollonius in answer to Callimachus’ account of Erysichthon in his sixth *Hymn*, treats the tale of a Hamadryad nymph (ἁμαδρυάδος νόμφης, 477) who curses a mortal man for cutting down “an oak tree that was as old as she, in which she had continually lived her long life” (δρυὸς ἡλικός, ἧ ἔπι πουλὺν | αἰῶνα τρίβεσκε διηνεκές, 479–480).¹⁷⁵

Nymphs receive frequent mention in the HEs, but their precise nature—especially their lifespans and connection with trees—is clarified in a digressive passage in the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite* (256–273):¹⁷⁶

τὸν μὲν ἐπὶν δὴ πρῶτον ἴδη φάος ἡελίοιο, νόμφαι μιν θρέψουσιν ὄρεσκῶσι βαθύκολποι, αἶ τόδε ναιετάουσιν ὄρος μέγα τε ζῆθεόν τε· αἶ ῥ’ οὔτε θνητοῖς οὔτ’ ἀθανάτοισιν ἔπονται. δηρὸν μὲν ζώουσι καὶ ἄμβροτον εἶδαρ ἔδουσι,	260
καὶ τε μετ’ ἀθανάτοισι καλὸν χορὸν ἐρρώσαντο, τῆσι δὲ Σειληνοί τε καὶ εὐσκοπος Ἀργειφόντης μίσγοντ’ ἐν φιλότητι μυχῶ σπείων ἐροέντων. <u>τῆσι δ’ ἄμ’ ἡ’ ἐλάται ἠὲ δρύες ὑνικάρηνοι</u> γεινομένησιν ἔφυσαν ἐπὶ χθονὶ βωτιανείρη·	265
καλαὶ τηλεθάουσαι ἐν οὔρεσιν ὑψηλοῖσιν ἐστᾶσ’ ἠλίβατοι, τεμένη δέ ἐ κικλήσκουσιν ἀθανάτων· <u>τάς δ’ οὔ τι βροτοὶ κείρουσι σιδήρω.</u> ἄλλ’ ὅτε κεν δὴ μοῖρα παρεστήκη θανάτοιο,	

¹⁷⁴ Notably, πυρεῖον and related forms do not occur in the HEs, but in the form πυρήια it does occur as a *hapax* in both the *HHs* (3.111) and the *Arg.* (1.1184). Theocritus’ Argonauts also use fire-sticks once (*Id.* 22.33), in what is yet another piece of the chronological puzzle surrounding these two poets (e.g., Gow 1942: 11 n. 3).

¹⁷⁵ With the phrase πουλὺν | αἰῶνα cf. *Arg.* 2.508–509, where Apollo makes his consort Cyrene a “long-lived nymph” (νόμφην | ... μακραίωνα).

¹⁷⁶ Larson 2001: 20–34 collects the evidence for the conception of nymphs in the HEs, *HHs*, and Hesiod, noting that the *Hymn to Aphrodite* passage is “the most detailed and lengthy description of nymphs in all of early Greek literature” (31), though it is paralleled in some particulars by the Hesiodic corpus.

ἀζάνεται μὲν πρῶτον ἐπὶ χθονὶ δένδρεα καλά,
φλοιὸς δ' ἀμφιπεριφθινύθει, πίπτουσι δ' ἄπ' ὄζοι,
τῶν δέ θ' ὁμοῦ ψυχὴ λείπει φάος ἡελίοιο.
αἷ μὲν ἐμὸν θρέψουσι παρὰ σφίσιβ υἷὸν ἔχουσαι.

270

As for the child [Aeneas], as soon as he sees the light of the sun, the deep-breasted mountain Nymphs who inhabit this great and holy mountain shall bring him up. They rank neither with mortals nor with immortals: long indeed do they live, eating heavenly food and treading the lovely dance among the immortals, and with them the Sileni and the sharp-eyed Slayer of Argus mate in the depths of pleasant caves; but at their birth pines or high-topped oaks spring up with them upon the fruitful earth, beautiful, flourishing trees, towering high upon the lofty mountains (and men call them holy places of the immortals, and never mortal lops them with the axe); but when the fate of death is near at hand, first those lovely trees wither where they stand, and the bark shrivels away about them, and the twigs fall down, and at last the life of the Nymph and of the tree leave the light of the sun together. These Nymphs shall keep my son with them and rear him.

This passage lays out the same information regarding nymphs that Apollonius' account presupposes; moreover, certain details suggest that Apollonius had it particularly in mind when composing the Paraebius narrative. For one, line 264 suggests an etymology for "Hamadryad" (τῆσι δ' ἄμ' ἠ' ἐλάται ἠὲ δρύες) that Apollonius' own diction points up (2.477, 479).¹⁷⁷ But most important is the *Hymn*'s warning against cutting down trees sacred to the nymphs (268)—the very crime committed by Paraebius' father. Lexical parallels are lacking, so that we cannot be sure that Apollonius is directly alluding to this passage. Nevertheless, the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite* fills out some important details of the epic world that Apollonius has inherited from early Greek ἔπος, and this passage may well have inspired Apollonius' substitution of Callimachus' Demeter with a Hamadryad nymph.

¹⁷⁷ Murray 2004: 211 with n. 12; see also Michalopoulos 2003: 166–169.

c. The Reception of the Homeric Gods

Another key concept for this study is reception—a term that, in its disciplinary sense within Classics, was once largely limited to periods that postdate “Late Antiquity,” but which can also embrace “receptions in antiquity.”¹⁷⁸ In its Iserian sense, the word “reception” can be used broadly to refer to “how any reader reads any text,”¹⁷⁹ Here, I would like to use the word in its narrower Jaussian sense as it has developed in the interdisciplinary field of “reception studies.” In this context, the mantra that “meaning is always realized at the point of reception” takes on specifically historical dimensions, locating the “point of reception” in particular social and cultural contexts that determine the “horizon of expectations” with which readers come to the text—contexts that, importantly, include earlier receptions of that text.¹⁸⁰ For my study, the reader in question is Apollonius himself, insofar as allusions in the *Arg.* reveal him as a reader of the *HHs*; but what distinguishes the study of reception from that of intertextuality is that the former approach seeks to understand Apollonius’ intertextual engagement with the *Hymns* in the context of his position as part of a reading public in a particular milieu—namely, that of third-century Ptolemaic Alexandria.¹⁸¹

I examine some of the potential political dimensions of Apollonius’ reception of the *HHs* in the Conclusion to this study. Here, I would like to highlight just one example from the

¹⁷⁸ See, e.g., Hardwick 2003: ch. 2, Porter 2008: 471–473. In recent years, many companions on the reception of classical authors have begun to appear, and typically, these begin with chapters on receptions in antiquity.

¹⁷⁹ Hardie 2013: 191, in a discussion of the two senses of the term.

¹⁸⁰ The “mantra” (so Murnaghan 2007) quoted here is adapted from Martindale 1993: 3, a book that introduced “reception studies” as such to Classics and whose methodology I attempt to outline here. For the “horizon of expectations,” see Holub 1995: 322–324. A good, succinct description of the methodology of reception studies can be found in Hardwick 2003: 5; see also her list of key terms (9–10).

¹⁸¹ Thus Hardie 2013: 193–194 responds to Goldhill’s critique of reception studies that focus on individual authors’ reception of earlier works (Goldhill 2010).

domain of more purely “literary” history. Barchiesi, in a seminal article highlighting the need for further research into the *Hymns*’ literary influence, emphasizes that for later authors, the *Hymns* offered attractive character sketches of several of the major gods in the Olympian pantheon, distilling and, in some measure, fixing their “orthodox” personalities and attributes. In this capacity, the *Hymns* provided “a panorama of divine operations, an indispensable complement to Hesiod and to the epic Homer.”¹⁸² Barchiesi’s points were made in reference to Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*, but they apply just as well to the humanizing portrayals of the gods in the *Arg.* Especially in the finer details, Apollonius’ characterization of the gods often derives from post-HE representations of the divine as found in the *HEs*.

For instance, when Hera proposes that Aphrodite be recruited to bewitch Medea with love for Jason, Athena responds (3.32-35):

Ἥρη, νήϊδα μὲν με πατήρ τέκε τοῖο βολάων,
οὐδέ τινα χρεῖᾶ θελκτῆριον οἶδα πόθοιο·
εἰ δέ σοι αὐτῇ μῦθος ἐφανδάνει, ἧ τ’ ἂν ἐγὼ γε
ἔσποιμην, σὺ δέ κεν φαίης ἔπος ἀντιόωσα. 35

Hera, my father bore me without knowledge of [Eros’] arrows, nor do I know of any enchantment to induce desire. But if you yourself approve of the plan, truly I would follow along, but please do the speaking when making the request.

In this humorous passage, Apollonius innovatively connects Athena’s quasi-parthenogenic birth narrative (Hes. *Th.* 924–929t; *HH* 3.308–325, 28) with her own status as a perpetual virgin.¹⁸³

Athena’s virginity is not stressed in the *HEs*; rather, the *locus classicus* for this motif is *HH* 5.8–

¹⁸² Barchiesi 1999: 123–126 (quotation from p. 123).

¹⁸³ The humor is enhanced by the fact that Athena’s reference clumsily reminds Hera of a reality that, traditionally, inspires tremendous fury in her: Zeus had given birth to Athena without her help (Hes. *Th.* 928, 929a; *HH* 3.308–325).

15,¹⁸⁴ a passage to which Callimachus and other poets also allude in reference to Athena's celibacy.¹⁸⁵ Apollonius thus continues a sequence of allusions to the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite* here¹⁸⁶ and thereby reintroduces the theme of love vs. war, so prominent in the third book of the poem. Examples like this could be multiplied, but suffice it to say that, at least until Lucan, the gods are an indispensable part of the machinery of the epic plot from the *Iliad* on, and the literary portrayal of the gods of post-Homeric epic had to be filtered through the *HHs*, too. Or put in terms of reception theory: the reception of the gods in the *HHs* had become a part of all subsequent receptions of the HEs.

d. Allusive Characterization

Apollonius often uses allusion as a technique for characterization by evoking Homeric models against which his own characters can be measured; it is my contention that Apollonius deploys this same technique using models drawn from the *HHs* as well as the HEs. Apollonius' characterizing allusions are often comparative, but just as frequently contrastive: surface similarities with a Homeric predecessor often serve to emphasize the deeper differences that set Apollonius' characters apart.¹⁸⁷ For example, one of the most sustained and best recognized character-analogies in the poem serves to liken Medea to Nausicaa, the Phaeacian princess of

¹⁸⁴ So Hunter 1989 ad loc. Campbell 1994: 43 notes that Aeschylus had connected Athena's birth narrative with a different character trait, her pro-male bias (*Eum.* 736–738). Cf., perhaps, fr. 11 Powell, probably from Apollonius' lost *Foundation of Rhodes*, in which the poet is supposed to have connected Athena's fireless sacrifices on Rhodes to her disdain for Hephaestus, the fire god, because of his rape attempt in the Erichthonius myth.

¹⁸⁵ See, e.g., Hunter 1992: 12, Hadjittofi 2008: 26–27, and Faulkner 2010 on Call. *Hymn* 5; and Malten 1910: 520 (cf. Hinds 1987: 154 n. 12) on Ovid *Met.* 5.

¹⁸⁶ See, e.g., Campbell 1994: 43.

¹⁸⁷ So Pavlock 1990: 67–68: “[Apollonius] revealed the potential for creative imitation by inverting the ethical implications of the Homeric originals and offered a model for creating a context in which characters could be fully played out against their originals.” See further Newman 1986: 81 n. 23, 85; and Klooster 2018: 82–83.

Odyssey 6–8, but as Campbell observes, “Medea is anything but a normal girl.... Indeed, the Nausicaa-Medea equation is not an equation at all. It is carefully set up only to be swept aside”.¹⁸⁸ Clauss has even called Medea “the Mephistophelean Nausicaa,” a young girl who turns out to be “the helper-maiden from Hell.” To achieve success, Jason must make a deal, not quite with the devil, but at any rate with a “Hecatean power.”¹⁸⁹ By invoking the standard of the Homeric Nausicaa, Apollonius sets Medea’s otherness in relief.¹⁹⁰

Here, I present a single parallel example from the *HHs*, staying with Medea but turning from Nausicaa to another maiden from the Homeric corpus, the Persephone of the major *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*.¹⁹¹ The analogy between Medea and the goddess is most obviously intimated in the scenes that preface Medea’s meeting with Jason at the temple of Hecate. As she awaits his arrival, she proposes to pass the time first by playing (μολπή, 897) with her group of attendant handmaidens, like Nausicaa before meeting Odysseus (*Od.* 6.100–101),¹⁹² but she also suggests gathering flowers (τὰ δὲ καλὰ τερείνης ἄνθεα ποίης | λεξάμεναι, *Arg.* 3.898–899)—a suggestion laden with allusive significance. In Greek literature, the motif of a girl’s flower-gathering, especially with playmates of like age, serves as a common prelude to rape or abduction.¹⁹³

¹⁸⁸ Campbell 1983: 60.

¹⁸⁹ Clauss 1997; quotations are from the title of his chapter and pp. 175, 176, respectively.

¹⁹⁰ Clauss 1997: 177. For more on the Medea-Nausicaa analogy, see esp. Pavlock 1990: 51–63 and Knight 1995: 224–244.

¹⁹¹ For more on Apollonius’ use of models from the *HHs* for the purpose of characterization, see McPhee (forthcoming), on which this subsection is based.

¹⁹² *N.b.*, however, that Apollonius characterizes Persephone’s activities before her abduction as play using the cognate word μελόμεναι (4.898) in his own reference to this myth.

¹⁹³ See, e.g., Richardson 1974 ad *HH* 2.6ff., Campbell 1983: 61, and Rosenmeyer 2004: 176 n. 29 (who notes the Apollonian passage).

The *locus classicus* for this motif is *HH* 2.5–6 (see also 425), where Persephone picks flowers with a group of Oceanids prior to her abduction by Hades. Substantial verbal parallels are lacking, but we can be confident that Apollonius wanted to evoke the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* because of the “collective security” afforded by other marked allusions to the *Hymn* in the lead-up to this scene.¹⁹⁴ For instance, Medea’s riding out to the temple of Hecate for this meeting with Jason is likened to Artemis’ driving her chariot to receive a sacrifice (*Arg.* 3.876–886). In this simile, Artemis’ “golden chariot” (χρυσείοις ... ἄρμασιν, *Arg.* 3.878) finds direct Homeric precedent in the “golden chariot” (ἄρμασι χρυσείοισι, *HH* 2.431) in which Hades abducts Persephone.¹⁹⁵ Suffice it to say, Medea’s meeting with Jason is anticipated by a series of allusions that have the effect of suggesting an analogy between the relationship of Medea and Jason and that of Persephone and Hades. The difference is that, while Persephone is abducted against her will but in accordance with her father’s wishes, Medea’s flight aboard the *Argo* is the direct result of her own love for Jason and the aid that she surreptitiously lends him in opposition to her father.¹⁹⁶ As with Nausicaa, Apollonius does not set up a simple equivalence between Medea and Persephone; rather, the analogy that he draws between the two throws into relief the question of Medea’s agency in departing from Colchis with Jason.

¹⁹⁴ “Collective security” refers to the idea that one clear allusion to a work increases the likelihood that another less clear allusion to the same work is also intentional (Hinds 1998: 28).

¹⁹⁵ *N.b.* ἄρμασι(ν) in the same *sedes* in each passage. The motif of the golden chariot also resonates with *Call. Hymn* 3.111, though the wording there is different (χρύσεον ... δίφρον). Cf. *Sappho fr.* 1.8–9, where χρύσιον may go with ἄρμ’.

¹⁹⁶ It is thus significant, for instance, that in the *Hymn*, it is the rapist Hades who drives the chariot that bears off Persephone (2.431), whereas at *Arg.* 3.878, Apollonius likens Medea, who should be the maiden Persephone’s counterpart, to a goddess driving her own chariot of her own volition.

e. Localized Effects of Allusions to the Hymns

I conclude this survey by examining a few miscellaneous allusions that relate the content of the target text in the *HHs* to the immediate context within the *Arg.* Each of the following “echoes and imitations” is noted by Campbell,¹⁹⁷ but to my knowledge none of them has been interpreted as a potentially meaningful allusion that enriches our understanding of the relevant *loci* in the *Arg.*

i. When Polyxo is introduced to the narrative of the Lemnian episode, she is immediately described as “tottering on feet shriveled with age” (γήραϊ δὴ ῥικνοῖσιν ἐπισκάζουσα πόδεσσιν, *Arg.* 1.669). The adjective ῥικνός, “wrinkled,” is a Homeric *hapax* that occurs only at *HH* 3.317: Hera explains that she bore “Hephaestus, with his withered feet” (Ἥφαιστος ῥικνὸς πόδας), and consequently hurled him from Olympus into the sea.¹⁹⁸ Apollonius uses this same phrase once elsewhere to describe Phineus’ “withered feet” (ῥικνοῖς ποσίη, *Arg.* 2.198). That parallel is formally stronger because the phrases occur in the same metrical *sedes*, but there are contextual parallels with the Polyxo passage that better satisfy Thomas’ second criterion for the identification of an allusion, that it “be susceptible of interpretation.”¹⁹⁹ In the Iliadic version of the myth, it is the fall from heaven itself that seems to lame Hephaestus, and he lands not in the sea, but on the island of Lemnos, where “the Sintian men” nursed him back to health (Σίντιες ἄνδρες, *Il.* 1.594).²⁰⁰ Apollonius alludes to this myth at the very beginning of the Lemnian episode when he introduces the island as “Sintian Lemnos” (Σιντηίδα Λῆμνον, *Arg.* 1.608), and

¹⁹⁷ See Campbell 1981 ad locc.

¹⁹⁸ The adjective occurs once in Call. *Hecale* fr. 260.51, of Hecale’s skin.

¹⁹⁹ See n. 131 above.

²⁰⁰ The term Σίντιες recurs, again in connection with Hephaestus, at *Od.* 8.293.

he recalls the smith god’s connection with the island again when he records that Aphrodite inspires love between the Argonauts and the Lemnian women “as a favor to Hephaestus” (Ἡφαίστοιο χάριν, 851), that his island might be repopulated. In this context, Polyxo’s resemblance to Hephaestus is striking, for it is she who plays the plot-critical role of advising the Lemnian women to welcome the heroes into the city and reminding them of their need to procreate (675–696). The allusion hints that, fittingly, Hephaestus’ will is done through an agent who resembles him.

ii. At *Arg.* 3.535–536, Argus suggests that the heroes solicit Medea’s aid in Aeetes’ ordeal through the intermediary of his mother, and Medea’s sister, Chalcioppe, in hopes that she “might be able to persuade her to help in the contest” (εἴ κε δύναίτο ... πεπιθεῖν ἐπαρῆσαι ἀέθλω). In the event, Chalcioppe plays an important role in the plot insofar as her sisterly appeal on behalf of her sons gives Medea “plausible deniability” for helping Jason,²⁰¹ though her true motive lies in her newfound love for the handsome stranger than in concern for her family’s welfare. There is thus a good deal of dramatic irony in the fact that, unbeknownst to Argus or the Argonauts, the words he has chosen echo a phrase repeated twice in the major *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*, specifying of the goddess that there are only three persons “whose minds she cannot persuade or outwit” (οὐ δύναται πεπιθεῖν φρένας οὐδ’ ἀπατῆσαι, 5.7, 33).²⁰² Almost in the manner of *kleonomania*, the allusion ominously corrects Argus and anticipates the bird-sign that follows immediately on his speech (*Arg.* 3.540–543), which, indeed, reminds the Argonauts of Phineus’ oracle (2.423–424) that their “return would lie with the goddess Cypris” (θεῆ ἐνὶ

²⁰¹ See, e.g., Byre 2002: 81–84.

²⁰² The collocation of a form of *δύναμαι* with *πειθω* occurs also at *HH* 2.328, but Apollonius’ use of the reduplicated aorist infinitive *πεπιθεῖν* in the same *sedes* makes the parallel to *HH* 5.7, 33 much stronger.

Κύπριδι νόστον ... ἔσσεσθαι, 549–550). This allusion is a good example of *oppositio in imitando*, for while Aphrodite may not be able to persuade the minds of Athena, Artemis, or Hestia, she can certainly persuade Medea’s.

iii. In her effort to convince Thetis to help the Argonauts through the Wandering Rocks, Hera claims, among her past services to the Nereid, to have arranged for her to marry Peleus, “the best of the mortals” (τὸν ἄριστον ἐπιχθονίων, *Arg.* 4.805)—a striking assertion, given the contestation of the status of “the best of the Argonauts” that is prominent in the poem’s first book above all.²⁰³ But as with Argus in the previous example, Hera’s words are ironically undermined by an echo of an earlier work: the only other place in all of Greek literature in which this phrase occurs is *HH* 15.1–2, where it is Heracles who is “far the finest of men on earth” (μέγ’ ἄριστον . . . ἐπιχθονίων).²⁰⁴ It serves Hera’s rhetorical interests to present Thetis’ mortal husband in the best possible light (cf. e.g., *Il.* 18.429–441), but the allusion to the *Homeric Hymn to Heracles* exposes Hera’s appraisal of Peleus as self-interested and biased: Heracles, whom she detests (*Arg.* 1.996–997), is unarguably the true best of mortals.²⁰⁵

iv. When Aphrodite saves the Athenian Argonaut Butes from the Sirens and resettles him on Cape Lilybaeum in Sicily, she is identified by the periphrasis “Cypris, the goddess who rules over Eryx” (θεὸν Ἐρυκος μεδέουσα | Κύπρις (*Arg.* 4.917–918). The reference to Eryx constitutes an allusion to the son that Butes and Aphrodite will have together, the eponym of Mt. Eryx and

²⁰³ See on this subject above all Claus 1993. *N.b.* that the best of the Argonauts is *a fortiori* the best of all mortals (see *Arg.* 1.548).

²⁰⁴ The collocation of forms of ἄριστος and ἐπιχθόνιος otherwise occurs only in a proverb (Thgn. 425 = *Certamen* 7) and quotations thereof, in a very different context: “It is best of all for mortals not to be born” (πάντων μὲν μὴ φῶναι ἐπιχθονίοισιν ἄριστον).

²⁰⁵ Notably, Cuypers 1997: 47 n. 18 makes the same objection to Hera’s assessment without recourse to the *HH*. I do not mean to imply that Heracles would make a better leader of the expedition than Jason, but he does seem better to fit the bill for an unqualified “best of mortals.”

founder of the temple there dedicated to Aphrodite Erycina.²⁰⁶ But Apollonius’ formulation also alludes to the Salutation of the minor *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*: “Hail, goddess, ruler of well-built Salamis and sea-girt Cyprus”(χαῖρε, θεά, Σαλαμῖνος ἐκτιμένης μεδέουσα | εἰναλῆς τε Κύπρου (*HH* 10.4–5). There is a less precise parallel (from, however, a more prominent *Hymn*) in the Salutation of the major *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite* (χαῖρε, θεά, Κύπρωιο ἐκτιμένης μεδέουσα, 5.292). All three passages feature line-final μεδέουσα in apposition to θεά, but I consider 10.4–5 the closer parallel because of the reference of two of Aphrodite’s cult sites (Salamis/Eryx and Cyprus) and the enjambment of the phrase εἰναλῆς τε Κύπρου, which corresponds to the enjambed Κύπρις of *Arg.* 4.918. The allusion does honor to Eryx by adding it subtextually to the number of Aphrodite’s oldest cult sites,²⁰⁷ but I would draw attention to the fact that in his adaptation, Apollonius has left the epithet “well-built” (ἐκτιμένης) unaccounted for. This omission may serve to acknowledge the fact that, in the “narrative present” of the Argonautic narrative, Eryx has not yet been born and thus his eponymous city, proleptically mentioned at *Arg.* 4.917, has not yet been built (let alone well built).

This short survey should indicate the depth of Apollonius’ engagement in the *HHs*, to which he alludes thoughtfully and in a variety of ways throughout the *Arg.* Naturally, given the subject matter of the *Hymns*, most of Apollonius’ allusions relate to his portrayal of the gods and of divine influence on human affairs, but our poet is also capable of mining the *Hymns* for more human details with which to flesh out his epic world and, perhaps more substantively, of using the character models of the *HHs* as lenses through which to view his own multifaceted creations.

²⁰⁶ See n. 104 in Chapter 2.

²⁰⁷ For the identity of the Salamis mentioned at *HH* 10.4, see n. 35 above.

IV. Outline of Chapters

By reviewing the essential facts surrounding the *HHs*, especially their formal features, and by establishing Apollonius' thoroughgoing interest in initiating an allusive dialogue with Homer's corpus of *Hymns*, this Introduction has prepared the way for the analysis to come. In the chapters that follow, I detail the *Arg.*'s formal affinity with the genre of hymnic as well as heroic ἔπος and reveal Apollonius' overarching poetic strategy of uniting the two streams of the Homeric hexameter tradition—Homer's epics and his hymns—into one innovative work, an “epic hymn” in honor of the Argonauts. This generic hybridity is encoded above all by the poem's hymnic frame, but is also reflected in certain metapoetic passages scattered throughout the work. Furthermore, the poem's affiliation with hymnody conditions the presentation of the epic narrative itself through a variety of narrative devices that can be associated with the Apollonian narrator's “hymnic voice.” Demonstrating these theses will be the burden of the next four chapters, whose contents I will now preview.

The body of the dissertation is divided into two parts of two chapters each. The first is dedicated to establishing the *Arg.*'s generic hybridity on formal grounds; the second, to a narratological study of the narrator's hymnic voice.

Chapter 1 scrutinizes the *Arg.*'s beginning and ending, those places in a poem where generic signals tend to cluster most densely. I argue that these passages (esp. *Arg.* 1.1–2, 4.1773–1775) frame the poem as a Homeric-style hymn dedicated to the Argonauts themselves in their capacity as the divinized objects of hero cult; the hymn's Myth in this case is blown up to the proportions of a four-book epic narrative. My analysis relies on a diachronic method of reading and re-reading: on a first-time, linear reading of the *Arg.*, its introit can be understood in a variety of ways, including as a Hymnic Proem dedicated to Apollo. The hymnic Envoi at the end of the

Arg. is, however, unambiguously addressed to the Argonauts and thus retrospectively reveals the poem as a hymn dedicated to its own epic protagonists. With this insight, the re-reader is equipped to reinterpret the epic conventions of the *Arg.*'s introit as their nigh-identical brethren, the formal features of the Exordium to a *HH*. My analysis of the *Arg.*'s hymnic frame also includes a survey of its numerous intertexts, especially from the *HHs*.

The second chapter builds on the first by examining Apollonius' depiction of hero cult within his epic narrative. In a marked departure from Homer, Apollonius portrays the practice of hero cult repeatedly and explicitly. In a series of close readings, I interpret several of these passages as metapoetic commentaries on the dual generic significance of the *Arg.* as both epic and hymn; this generic hybridity is facilitated by the ambivalence at the heart of the Greek cultural concept of the "hero," who is at once the subject of epic memorializing and the object of religious veneration in cult that includes, *inter alia*, worship in hymns. These metapoetic passages also suggest a possible motive for Apollonius' decision to render the introit so ambiguous and to reveal the hymnic status of the *Arg.* in full clarity only at the end of the poem: the great heroes of myth conventionally win heroization through their commission of great labors (ἄεθλοι), and it is only when the Argonauts' trials have finally come to an end (*Arg.* 4.1775–1777) that the narrator openly acknowledges their present status as divinized heroes.

The second half of the dissertation constitutes a study of the hymnic dimension of the Apollonian narrator's multi-textured voice. As such, Chapters 3 and 4 treat narratological issues, although intertextuality with the *HHs* remains an ever-present tool of analysis. Chapter 3 begins by examining features of Apollonius' epic narrative that find precedent not in the *HEs*, but in the *HHs*. Many of these narrative devices are associated with broader trends in Hellenistic poetry, and especially with Callimachus, such as the narrator's conspicuous interventions in the narrative in

his own person or etiological “external prolepses” (i.e., “flash-forwards” past the time of the Argonautic narrative) that declare that “to this day” (ἔτι νῦν) some trace of the mythical expedition still persists in the places touched by the Argo. My thesis is that Apollonius might have looked to the *HHs* for Homeric authorization of these “Hellenistic” literary devices; indeed, in some cases, I show that Apollonius uses “two-tier” allusions to signal his debt to the *HHs* as well as his Alexandrian contemporaries as models for a given device.

Chapter 4 turns to the clearest manifestations of the Apollonian narrator’s hymnic voice: the numerous passages within the *Arg.* in which the narrator or his characters engage in hymnody themselves. The narrator adopts a hymnic tone in his apostrophes to Eros (4.445–449) or to the Argonauts in the Libyan episode (4.1383–1387), but what is especially noteworthy is how often Apollonius blurs the boundary between his characters’ hymnic speech and that of his narrator (in narratological terms, this device is a species of “metalepsis”). In some passages, the narrator seems to get swept up in his characters’ religious enthusiasm and joins in their praise of a god *in propria persona*, in a device that I call “contagious hymnody”; in others, the voices of the narrator and the character invoking a god can hardly be distinguished, in a device that I have dubbed “hymnic narratization.” Many of the narrative techniques surveyed in both Chapters 3 and 4 come together in the Argonauts’ worship of Apollo in the Thynias episode (*Arg.* 2.669–719), which is perhaps the poem’s most complex passage from a narratological perspective. Here, more than anywhere else in the poem, the Apollonian narrator’s hymnic voice is on full display, and Apollonius’ hymnic narrative techniques are integrated with a sophisticated program of allusions to other rhapsodic hymns to Apollo, namely, the Homeric (3) and Callimachean (2).

Finally, in the Conclusion to this dissertation, I meditate on two issues raised obliquely by the analysis of the body chapters but which are of central importance in any interpretation of the

Arg. First, I would build on the body of recent scholarship that has sought to contextualize Apollonius' epic within third-century BCE Alexandria by pointing to the political overtones of the poet's transfiguration of the "secular" genre of Homeric epic into an "epic hymn" dedicated to its own divinized heroes. I argue that this generic innovation may correlate to the contemporary divinization of the Ptolemies, who were at once Greco-Macedonian kings frequently eulogized in heroic-epic terms and also divine Pharaohs at the head of a profoundly multicultural state. The second issue I would ponder is the relationship between the Argonauts' heroization and their often-problematic heroism, especially with regards to their leader Jason. I show that Apollonius, far from shying away from this problem, actually throws it into relief on more than one occasion by juxtaposing some of the heroes' shabbiest behavior with foreshadowing of their destined heroization. These two issues are interrelated, insofar as Jason especially has increasingly been read as a model of leadership aligned with the Ptolemaic dynasty. What are the political implications of a nuanced portrayal of the Argonauts' heroism if their heroization is analogous to the Ptolemaic ruler cult? It my hope that this line of inquiry may reframe from a new perspective a longstanding debate in Apollonian studies on the status of heroism in the *Arg.*

PART I
THE *ARGONAUTICA* AS EPIC HYMN

CHAPTER 1: A DIACHRONIC READING OF THE *ARGONAUTICA*'S HYMNIC FRAME

This chapter is devoted to hardly more than thirty verses, and the real focus falls on only about five of them; despite their brevity, however, they are critically placed at the beginning and end of the *Argonautica* (hereafter, *Arg.*) and have major ramifications for our construal of the poem's hybrid genre.¹ Consequently, they are some of the most widely discussed passages in the poem, though it is my hope that a new approach may add something new to the conversation. I refer to the poem's so-called "hymnic frame,"² comprised of the opening Invocation of Apollo in the introit³ (1.1–22, esp. 1–2) and the Salutation and Prayer to the Argonauts themselves at the conclusion of the narrative (4.1773–1781). Despite a sizeable bibliography on these passages, some basic questions still remain. For example, what sort of hymn does the *Arg.* present itself as? I argue that the poem possesses not merely a "hymnic" frame, but more specifically, a "Homeric-hymnic" frame. Other critical questions include: where does the "hymn" end and the "epic" begin? What (fictional) performative or discursive context(s) does the poet's hymnic

¹ Genre-markers tend to cluster especially around the beginning of a work (see Fowler 1982: ch. 6), but in Apollonius' case, the beginning of the *Arg.* is highly ambiguous, as we will see, and it is the work's ending that clarifies the poem's generic affiliations.

² A term used, e.g., by Goldhill 1991: 287, Hunter 1996: 46, and Vox 2002 ("cornici innodiche"); similar "framing" terminology is used by Belloni 1996: 148 ("incorniciare") and Hitch 2012: 156 ("a sort of pious frame around the whole poem").

³ For my use of the term "introit," see n. 85 in the Introduction.

frame conjure up? And if the poem has a hymnic frame, who, precisely, is being hymned—Apollo, invoked at the beginning, or the Argonauts, hailed at the end?

In this chapter, I hope to lay out a coherent answer to all of these questions through a close reading of the hymnic frame and its intertexts. More particularly, I hope to shed new light on these problems through a diachronic approach to the text, which distinguishes first-time readers, who do not possess knowledge of later parts of the poem as they read through it in linear fashion, from re-readers, whose memory of the entire poem can enable them to make connections with later portions of the poem as they re-read earlier ones.¹ In my view, most scholars have missed the true complexity of the hymnic frame either because they read one passage in isolation from the other or, on the contrary, because they read synoptically, viewing both passages at once from the lofty vantage point of the critic well-acquainted with the whole poem. This analysis misses the dynamic quality of Apollonius' introit, whose potential meanings change over time as readers are presented with new data about the poem's genre at its conclusion.²

Notably, this diachronic approach is not only truer to the way that most readers actually experience a given text, but it is almost explicitly endorsed by Apollonius himself at the end of

¹ The classic example of this “diachronic” method within the discipline of Classics is Winkler’s groundbreaking narratological study of Apuleius’ *Golden Ass* (1985); see esp. the exposition of the method on pp. 10–11. See further Sharrock 2018 for valuable insights on the importance of memory and re-reading in forming literary interpretations. Among Apollonian studies, Byre 2002 adopts a linear style of reading the poem, though he does not explore the ramifications of re-reading.

² In this chapter, I assume for simplicity’s sake a hypothetical reader who reads and re-reads the entire *Arg.* essentially as we know it today, but the poem’s actual publication history during Apollonius’ lifetime was probably much more complicated than my model assumes. For instance, Apollonius may well have given readings or otherwise circulated excerpts of the poem while composition was still underway, and the scholia even offer quotations of an earlier edition (προέκδοσις) of the *Arg.* in a few places (see Pfeiffer 1968: 141–142). But as important as these considerations are for a variety of issues (such as establishing the relative date[s] of the *Arg.*’s “publication[s]”), I sidestep these vexed questions here by basing my analysis on the *Arg.* in the “finalized” form in which it has come down to us.

the *Arg.*, where the narrator effectively prays that first-time readers will become re-readers:

“[M]ay these songs year after year be sweeter for men to sing” (αἶδε δ’ αἰοδαὶ | εἰς ἔτος ἕξ ἔτος
γλυκερότεραι εἶεν ἀεῖδειν | ἀνθρώποις, 4.1773–1775).³ How would the *Arg.* become “sweeter”
and sweeter with each passing year? One answer, I would posit, is that the poem becomes
hermeneutically richer each time it is re-read; and indeed, if our putative first-time readers
answer the narrator’s Prayer and return to the beginning, their readings really will become
enriched as the introit begins to take on new meanings.⁴ I propose that such a dynamic reading
and re-reading of the hymnic frame does justice to its carefully-crafted complexity.

I will proceed as a real first-time reader would, beginning in Section I with an analysis of
the introit without presupposing knowledge of the Envoi at the other end of the poem. I show
that several elements of the introit do indeed resonate with the rhetoric of Greek hymnody, and
specifically with the subcategory of the *Homeric Hymns* (hereafter, *HHS*), but I also show that
the introit itself is engineered to achieve a high degree of ambiguity for a first-time reader. The
hymnic elements in the introit could be taken to support the widespread view that the *Arg.* begins
with a Hymnic Proem dedicated to Apollo, but the introit can equally be understood in other
ways with no connections to hymnody; two of the most prominent views hold that Apollo is
invoked as the god who inspires the *Arg.*’s composition or as the god whose oracle to Pelias
catalyzes the poem’s plot. Nevertheless, the “Hymnic Proem” interpretation is powerfully

³ Although Apollonius’ text here speaks of “singing,” it is conventionally understood to refer to *reading*—whether for the reason that Fränkel 1968: 621 n. 356 provides (“Lesen’ heißt hier αἰεῖδειν [*sic*]: im Altertum las man in der Regel laut, und Hexameter wurden nicht gesprochen sondern im Singsang vorgetragen”; for reading aloud in antiquity, see, e.g., Knox 1968 and Svenbro 1993), or because αἰοδαὶ and cognates in Apollonius can be interpreted as a literary “conceit,” according to the stylized manner in which epic refers to itself, even after it has ceased to be sung (González 2000: 283 n. 37). But on the question of written-ness vs. performance see further below.

⁴ See further Clare 2002: 284–285. Hunter 2000 has quite fittingly used the phrase εἰς ἔτος ἕξ ἔτος γλυκερότεραι as the title for his survey of scholarship on the poem since Fränkel’s 1961 OCT edition, for the passage of time has certainly enriched our reading of the *Arg.*

supported by an allusion to the *Homeric Hymn to Selene* (32.18–19), among a number of other intertexts, including Aratus' Hymnic Proem to Zeus and several other Hymnic Proems in honor of Apollo. I conclude this reading of the introit by considering the (in my opinion) mistaken view that the Invocation of Apollo functions not as a Hymnic Proem to Apollo, but as an Exordium to the entire *Arg. qua* hymn dedicated to this god.

Section II turns to the *Arg.*'s Envoi. Through a careful consideration of the structure and rhetoric of this passage, read in light of a number of important intertexts, I locate Apollonius' Envoi, just like his introit, firmly within the tradition of the *HHs*. I then make note of the significance of Apollonius' Envoi, which cannot be overstated: the narrator's Salutation and Prayer to the Argonauts presupposes their postmortem divinization as cult heroes—a key piece of information that had been unavailable to the reader experiencing the introit for the first time. Accordingly, in Section III I return to the introit to reevaluate it in light of the new interpretative data presented in the Envoi. I argue that the Envoi retrospectively recasts the entire *Arg.* as a hymn to its own heroized protagonists, and to confirm this hypothesis, I show that the introit can indeed be read as the Exordium to a hymn to the Argonauts on the model of the *HHs*. Such a reading would hardly occur to a first-time reader, still ignorant of the cult status that will ultimately be claimed for the Argonauts, but it is available to the re-reader in light of the poem's Envoi. To the extent that the *Arg.* is now recognized as a hymn to the Argonauts, the "Hymnic Proem" interpretation of the introit will turn out to have been a red herring. I conclude by drawing some preliminary inferences about Apollonius' approach to using the *HHs* as poetic models.

I. The Introit

a. *What Kind of Hymn?*

The *Arg.* begins with a relatively long introit of 22 lines,⁵ whose structure is conventionally divided into three parts of unequal length: a statement of the general theme (1.1–4), a summary of the “prehistory” of the Argonautic narrative (5–17), and the announcement of the poem’s narrative program (18–22):⁶

Ἀρχόμενος σέο, Φοῖβε, παλαιγενέων κλέα φωτῶν
μνήσομαι, οἱ Πόντοιο κατὰ στόμα καὶ διὰ πέτρας
Κυανέας βασιλῆος ἐφημοσύνη Πελῖαο
χρύσειον μετὰ κῶας εὐζυγον ἤλασαν Ἄργῳ.
τοῖην γὰρ Πελῖης φάτιν ἔκλυεν, ὥς μιν ὀπίσσω. 5
μοῖρα μένει στυγερή, τοῦδ’ ἀνέρος, ὃν τιν’ ἴδοιτο
δημόθεν οἰοπέδιλον, ὑπ’ ἐννεσίησι δαμῆναι.
δηρὸν δ’ οὐ μετέπειτα τειὴν κατὰ βάζιν Ἰήσων
χειμερίοιο ρέεθρα κιῶν διὰ ποσσὶν Ἀναύρου
ἄλλο μὲν ἐξεσάωσεν ὑπ’ ἰλύος, ἄλλο δ’ ἐνερθεν 10
κάλλιπεν αὐθιπέδιλον ἐνισχόμενον προχοῆσιν.
ἴκετο δ’ ἐς Πελίην αὐτοσχεδὸν ἀντιβολήσων
εἰλαπίνης, ἣν πατρὶ Ποσειδάωνι καὶ ἄλλοις
ρέξε θεοῖς, Ἥρης δὲ Πελασγίδος οὐκ ἀλέγιζεν.
αἶψα δὲ τόν γ’ ἐσιδὼν ἐφράσσατο, καὶ οἱ ἄεθλον 15
ἔντυε ναυτιλῆς πολυκηδέος, ὄφρ’ ἐνὶ πόντῳ
ἦε καὶ ἄλλοδαποῖσι μετ’ ἀνδράσι νόστον ὀλέσσει.
νῆα μὲν οὖν οἱ πρόσθεν ἔτι κλείουσιν αἰοῖδοι
Ἄργον Ἀθηναίης καμέειν ὑποθημοσύνησιν.
νῦν δ’ ἂν ἐγὼ γενεὴν τε καὶ οὖνομα μυθησαίμην 20
ἠρώων, δολιχῆς τε πόρους ἄλός, ὅσσα τ’ ἔρεξαν
πλαζόμενοι· Μοῦσαι δ’ ὑποφήτορες εἶεν αἰοιδῆς

Beginning with you, Phoebus, I shall recall the famous deeds of people born long ago, who, at the command of King Pelias, sailed the well-benched Argo through the mouth of the Black Sea and between the Cyanean rocks to fetch the golden fleece.

For such was the oracle that Pelias heard, that a horrible fate awaited him in the future: to perish through the designs of that man

⁵ In this respect Apollonius imitates (and outdoes) the *Odyssey*, with its 21-line introit (see Gainsford 2003), rather than the *Iliad*, whose introit is only seven lines long.

⁶ For a structural analysis of the introit, see, e.g., Hurst 1967: 39–44, Fusillo 1985: 365, and Clauss 1993: 22–23.

whom he would see coming from the people with only one sandal. And not long afterwards, in accordance with your prophecy, as Jason was crossing the streams of the wintry Anaurus on foot, he rescued one sandal from the mud, but left the other there in the depths, held back by the current. He came right away to Pelias to share in the banquet that the king was offering to his father Poseidon and the rest of the gods, but to Pelasgian Hera he paid no regard. As soon as he saw Jason, he took note, and arranged for him the ordeal of a very arduous voyage, so that either on the sea or else among foreign people he would lose any chance of returning home.

As for the ship, the songs of former bards still tell how Argus built it according to Athena's instructions. But now I wish to relate the lineage and names of the heroes, their journeys on the vast sea, and all they did as they wandered; and may the Muses be inspirers of my song.

As we will see, Apollonian scholarship is nearly unanimous in deeming this introit, and particularly its first line and a half, “hymnic.”⁷ More specifically, these lines contain several elements that collectively constitute a “system reference” to the Greek genre of hymns broadly conceived.⁸ Signals to this effect include, for instance, the sustained address to a god (σέο, Φοῖβε, 1; τεῖν, 8)⁹ or the use of οἷ in line 2, which in this context can be interpreted as a Hymnic Relative that facilitates the transition from the initial Evocation to the Attributive Section or Myth.¹⁰

In this subsection, however, I argue that a well-read ancient audience would have interpreted the system reference even more specifically as a reference to a particular subset of Greek hymns, namely, the *HHs*—not least because, as is well-known, the epic begins with an

⁷ Cf. Köhnken 2000: 56 n. 5 for a firm exception.

⁸ For “system references,” see n. 48 in the Introduction.

⁹ Emphasized particularly by Collins 1967: 7. Interestingly, many critics have objected to the transmitted τεῖν in line 8 on the grounds that “it is not in accordance with epic convention that, after the invocation, reference should be made to it” (Seaton 1914: 17), overlooking the fact that Apollonius here mixes epic with hymnic conventions; cf. Campbell 1971: 402.

¹⁰ See the discussion of the structure of the *HHs* in Section II.b of the Introduction.

allusion to the Envoi of the *Homeric Hymn to Selene*: “Beginning with you [Selene], I will sing the famous deeds of demigods” (σέο δ’ ἀρχόμενος κλέα φωτῶν | ᾄσομαι ἡμιθέων, 32.18–19). I will return to this allusion later in this chapter, but for now, suffice it to say that it signals the importance of the *HHs* for Apollonius’ project.¹¹

But for the reader who does not recognize the specific allusion to *Selene*, there is another distinctive reference to the diction of the *HHs* in the second line’s μνήσομαι, the verb with which Apollonius replaces the *Selene* hymn’s ᾄσομαι.¹² This verb in this form is characteristic of the “Poet’s Task”¹³ formula with which many of the *HHs* conclude: “And I will remember both you and another song” (αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ καὶ σεῖο καὶ ἄλλης μνήσομ’ αἰοιδῆς).¹⁴ Significantly, the verb is also used in two exceptional cases to introduce the subject of the hymn.¹⁵ The first instance occurs in the major *Hymn to Apollo* (3); the second, in the midlength *Hymn to Dionysus* (7):¹⁶

Μνήσομαι οὐδὲ λάθωμαι Ἀπόλλωνος ἐκάτοιο...

Let me call to mind and not forget Apollo the far-shooter...
(*HH* 3.1)

Ἄμφι Διώνυσον Σεμέλης ἐρικυδέος υἱόν
μνήσομαι, ὡς ἐφάνη παρὰ θῖν’ ἀλὸς ἀτρυγέτοιο...

¹¹ See further the brief discussion of this allusion on pp. 25–26 above.

¹² Morrison 2007: 287 generally compares the use of a first-person verb in the introit to the practice of the *HHs*.

¹³ For the term, see Janko 1981: 15.

¹⁴ The Poet’s Task formula is adduced as a parallel to *Arg.* 1.1–2 by De Marco 1963: 351, Collins 1967: 3, Romeo 1985: 21, Goldhill 1991: 287 n. 7, Belloni 1996: 140 n. 19, DeForest 1994: 38, Sistikou 2001: 259 n. 69, Wheeler 2002: 45–46, Scherer 2006: 116 n. 391, and Faulkner 2011: 193.

¹⁵ Cf. Evans 2001: 63. The equivalence of μνήσομαι and forms of αἰδῶ in this context may reflect the Homeric usage of μμνήσκομαι as “a kind of technical term” within “the vocabulary of epic verse-making” that denotes the bard’s use of his recollective faculties in oral composition; see Moran 1975 (quotations from p. 198).

¹⁶ These hymns that use μνήσομαι as their Evocatory Verb are adduced as parallels by Stenzel 1908: 14, Romeo 1985: 21, Fantuzzi 1988: 22 n. 35, Goldhill 1991: 287 n. 7, Sistikou 2001: 259 n. 69, Berkowitz 2004: 60 n. 27, Scherer 2006: 116 n. 391, and Faulkner 2011: 193 with n. 80.

Concerning Dionysus, glorious Semele's son, I will remember how
he appeared by the shore of the barren sea...

(*HH* 7.1–2)

The *Dionysus* hymn matches the *Arg.* introit in its placement of the enjambed verb and thus provides an exact precedent for Apollonius' usage. The parallel with the *Apollo* hymn is perhaps less precise on formal grounds,¹⁷ but its use of μνήσομαι as the first word of one of the major *Hymns* grants it special prominence, especially because the verb's object is Apollo, the addressee of *Arg.* 1.1.

The *Arg.*'s first word, ἀρχόμενος, also resonates with the *HHs*. This present-tense participle is drawn directly from the Envoi of the *Selene* hymn (σέο δ' ἀρχόμενος, 32.18), but it has further parallels in the Envois of several other *HHs* that use its aorist form (σεῦ δ' ἐγὼ ἀρξάμενος; 5.293, 9.9, 18.11; ἐκ σέο δ' ἀρξάμενος, 31.18).¹⁸ It is also true that many hymns in the collection begin with a form of ἄρχομαι, though here the parallel is less precise: the *Hymns* typically employ the introductory formula ἄρχομ' αἰεῖδεν with the name of the god to be celebrated in the accusative, as in “With Demeter the lovely-haired, the august goddess I begin my song” (Δήμητρ' ἠύκομον, σεμνήν θεόν, ἄρχομ' αἰεῖδεν, 2.1).¹⁹ Apollonius' construction, with the name of the god in the genitive is almost unparalleled in the collection of *HHs*,²⁰ but it does find precedent in the irregular *Hymn* 25, which, perhaps notably, features Apollo among its

¹⁷ In this case, μνήσομαι is line-initial but not enjambed, and because it is paired with λάθωμαι, it should be construed as a short-vowel subjunctive rather than a future indicative (hence West's translation, “Let me call to mind”). Campbell 1983: 128 notes that Apollonius' μνήσομαι could be taken as subjunctive as well, though it is usually regarded as a performative future.

¹⁸ These Envois that use the phrase σεῦ/σέο ἀρξάμενος are adduced as parallels by, e.g., Carspecken 1952: 111 n. 26, DeForest 1994: 38, Belloni 1996: 140 n. 18, and Pietsch 1999: 69 n. 163.

¹⁹ *HH* 2.1, 11.1, 13.1, 16.1, 22.1, 26.1, 28.1; cf. 9.8, 31.1 (ὕμνεῖν . . . ἄρχο Μοῦσα).

²⁰ So Clay 2011: 238: “[T]he use of the genitive of the god to be celebrated with ἄρχομαι does not seem hymnic.” See further *ibid.* n. 25 and Rijksbaron 2009: 242 n. 4.

Hymnic Subjects: “With the Muses let me begin, and Apollo and Zeus” (Μουσάων ἄρχωμαι Ἀπόλλωνός τε Διός τε, 1).

Nevertheless, in this context, and especially in light of the Homeric-hymnic μνήσομαι, Apollonius’ use of ἀρχόμενος is still reminiscent of the ἄρχομ’ αἰδεῖν formula found in so many *HHs*. Not only have many modern scholars felt this connection;²¹ so did another ancient Greek poet who imitated Apollonius, namely, Dionysius the Periegete.²² His introit affords an excellent illustration of a critical principle once articulated by Martindale, and to which I have recourse more than once in this chapter: “Numerous unexplored insights into ancient literature are locked up in imitations, translations and so forth.”²³ Dionysius’ poem begins (1–3):

Ἀρχόμενος γαῖάν τε καὶ εὐρέα πόντον αἰδεῖν
καὶ ποταμούς πόλιός τε καὶ ἀνδρῶν ἄκριτα φύλα,
μνήσομαι Ὠκεανοῖο βαθυρρόου.

Beginning to sing of the earth and the broad sea, and of cities and rivers and the countless tribes of men, I shall recall deep-flowing Ocean.²⁴

In the manner of a “two-tier allusion,” Dionysius’ adaptation of the opening of the *Arg.* also clarifies its background in the *HHs* by melding together their distinctive styles.²⁵ Dionysius keeps Apollonius’ participle ἀρχόμενος, but instead of providing it with a genitive object as

²¹ The ἄρχομ’ αἰδεῖν formula is adduced as a parallel to Apollonius’ ἀρχόμενος by, e.g., De Marco 1963: 351, Collins 1967: 3, Goldhill 1991: 287, DeForest 1994: 38, Albis 1996: 6–7, and Wheeler 2002: 45.

²² Dionysius’ imitation is adduced by Stenzel 1908: 14, and Vox 1999: 163, and is discussed at length by *idem* 2002: 154–159.

²³ Martindale 1993: 7.

²⁴ The text of Dionysius is from Lightfoot 2014; the workmanlike translation is my own.

²⁵ For this term, see n. 138 in the Introduction.

Apollonius does (σέο),²⁶ he folds it into a version of the hymnic ἄρχομ' αἰεῖδεν formula, to which a series of accusative objects (his geographical subjects) are attached. He thus frames the first line with an allusion first to Apollonius with line-initial ἀρχόμενος and then to the *HHs* with αἰεῖδεν at line-end. In light of Dionysius' adaptation, it is safe to say that in addition to recalling the Envoi of the hymns to *Selene* and others, Apollonius' ἀρχόμενος also evokes in a more general way the most common introductory formula in the *HHs*, ἄρχομ' αἰεῖδεν.

Accordingly, whether or not Apollonius' introit activates memories of any specific passages (e.g., *HH* 32.18–19, 3.1, or 7.1–2), his readers will likely have caught its particularly “Homeric-hymnic” tone. I stress this point because it should serve as a guide to “hymnic” interpretations of the introit and indeed, of the epic as a whole: the programmatic allusions to the *HHs* at the beginning of the *Arg.* suggest that Apollonius privileges them specifically among many potential hymnic models, just as the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* are particularly privileged among the *Arg.*'s epic precursors. Critics should not be discouraged from pursuing possible allusions to non-Homeric hymnic material (e.g., *Thgn.* 1–4, considered below), but the allusions at the beginning of the *Arg.* do add some argumentative weight to interpretations that adduce the *HHs*.

b. The “Hymnic Proem” Interpretation

Having established the Homeric-hymnic tone of *Arg.* 1.1–2, I now turn to the question of the interpretation of these lines, particularly for a reader encountering them for the first time. Critical opinion on this question is divided into several camps, with many idiosyncratic variants as well as areas of overlap among them. The key phrase on which the debate turns is the poem's

²⁶ Dionysius recoups the genitive, however, with the object of μνήσομαι (Ὠκεανοῖο βαθυρρούου). In essence, Dionysius has artfully reversed the Apollonian syntax, incorporating ἀρχόμενος into a formula that takes accusative objects and using μνήσομαι, as is in fact more usual, with the genitive (Lightfoot 2014 ad loc.).

first three words, “Beginning with you, Phoebus” (ἀρχόμενος σέο, Φοῖβε). In context, this phrase has inspired at least three major interpretations, which can each boast of supports both in antiquity and in modern scholarship. I will examine each in detail presently, but for orientation, I first summarize them as follows:

- 1) *The “Hymnic Proem” interpretation*: Apollo is the addressee of a Hymnic Proem (προοίμιον) that prefaces the epic.
- 2) *The “inspiration” interpretation*: Apollo inspires the composition of the poem.
- 3) *The “narrative catalyst” interpretation*: Through his oracle to Pelias, Apollo sets off the chain of events that launch the poem’s plot.

I begin with the first, hymnic interpretation of these lines, which comes naturally given the pointed evocations of the *HHs* that we have already encountered. Indeed, the oldest explicit interpretation²⁷ of the passage on record belongs to the ancient scholiast’s comment on the lemma ἀρχόμενος (ad 1.1–4a Wendel), and his analysis has been influential in modern scholarship:

Ἀρχόμενος: ἀπὸ περιεκτικοῦ ῥήματος ἢ μετοχῆ ἐσχημάτισται. περιεκτικὰ δέ εἰσιν, ὅσα <καὶ> δρᾶσιν καὶ πάθος ἐμφαίνουσιν, οἷον βιάζομαι, δωροῦμαι, σφαγιάζομαι. οὕτω καὶ τὸ **ἄρχομαι** τὸ μὲν τι σημαίνει ‘ἀπὸ σοῦ τὴν ἀρχὴν ποιοῦμαι’—ἔθος γὰρ ἀπὸ θεῶν προοιμιάζεσθαι: ‘ἐκ Διὸς ἀρχώμεσθα’ (Arag. *Phaen.* i; Theocr. XVII i)—, τὸ δέ τι σημαίνει ‘ἀρχαιρεσιαζόμενος ὑπὸ σοῦ’ οἷον ἐνθουσιῶν. παραπλησίως γὰρ τοὺς ποιητὰς τοῖς μαινομένοις ἐνθουσιῶν λέγεται. κέχρηται δὲ ἐπὶ τοῦ **ἀρχόμενος** παρατατικοῦ μετοχῆ, ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀρξάμενος.

“**Beginning**”: the participle is conjugated from a “comprehensive” verb. “Comprehensive” verbs are those that exhibit both active

²⁷ I say “explicit” interpretation to distinguish “implicit” readings of *Arg.* 1.1–2 that may be reflected in imitations of the passage by other poets; see p. 69 above. Scholia are always difficult to date, but the notice at the end of the Book 4 scholia claims that they are collated from commentaries by Theon of Alexandria (first century BCE), Lucillus of Tarrha (mid-first century CE), and a grammarian named Sophocleus (second century CE); see Dickey 2007: 62–63.

and passive meanings, such as βιάζομαι, δωροῦμαι, and σφαιγιάζομαι. So, too, on the one hand, “**I begin**” means something like “I make a beginning from you”—for it is customary to make a prelude from the gods; e.g., “Let us begin with Zeus” (Arat. *Phaen.* 1; Theocr. *Id.* 17.1)—but on the other hand, it means something like “elected by you,” i.e., “inspired.” For <it is said> that poets are inspired almost like madmen. With “beginning” rather than “having begun,” the participle uses the present tense.²⁸

With the phrase “make a prelude from the gods” (ἀπὸ θεῶν προοιμιάζεσθαι), the scholiast refers to the practice of prefacing a poem or collection of poetry with a Hymnic Proem (a προοίμιον) dedicated to a god.²⁹ There are many examples of such hymnic προοίμια in ancient Greek literature of all periods, with or without the particular verb ἄρχομαι.³⁰ For instance, Hesiod’s *Works and Days* begins with a short Hymnic Proem to Zeus (1–10), and by the same token, the scholiast suggests, Apollonius begins his epic with a brief Hymnic Proem dedicated to Apollo.³¹ But Apollonius’ introit bears particular comparison with the Hymnic Proem to Zeus that begins Aratus’ *Phaenomena*, which may be the source of the scholiast’s quotation (ἐκ Διὸς ἀρχόμεσθα), if he does not have in mind Theocr. *Id.* 17.1. Aratus’ Proem has long been recognized as the likely inspiration for a peculiar structural feature of Apollonius’ introit, which delays the traditional wish for inspiration from the Muses until the end (*Arg.* 1.22), reserving its first line instead for “beginning with” a god (ἀρχόμενος σέο, Φοῖβε, 1). Aratus likewise begins his introit

²⁸ Text of the *Arg.* scholia is taken from Wendel 1935; the translation is my own. For both text and translation, I have also consulted Lachenaud 2010.

²⁹ It is in this restricted, hymnic sense that I use the term “Proem” in this project; see n. 85 in the Introduction.

³⁰ Kidd 1997 ad Arat. *Phaen.* 1 collects several examples that specifically use the verb ἄρχομαι.

³¹ The scholiast’s gloss of ἀρχόμενος as ‘ἀπὸ σοῦ τὴν ἀρχὴν ποιούμεναι’ makes it clear that he considers Apollo, as the narrator’s addressee and the object of the participle, to be the recipient of the Hymnic Proem.

with Zeus (with a form of ἄρχομαι) and ends it with a prayer to the Muses to guide his song (*Phaen.* 16–18).³²

I refer to the view outlined by the scholiast as the “‘Hymnic Proem’ interpretation,” and in addition to the ancient scholiast, it has numerous modern supporters to its credit. There is some disagreement, however, as to what parts of the introit constitute the Hymnic Proem: the first few words, the first few lines, or the entire prelude. Phinney, for instance, takes the first tack, considering the opening phrase ἀρχόμενος σέο, Φοῖβε alone to execute the Proemial function.³³ Others appear to view the entire first sentence (1.1–4) as the Proem,³⁴ whereas for Collins, the whole of the introit is a hymn: lines 1–4 comprise the Exordium of the hymn, lines 5–17 (the “prehistory”) function as the equivalent of the central narrative section of a hymn (the “myth”), and the Appeal to the Muses in line 22 takes the place of the hymnic Envoi.³⁵ Of these views, I find Phinney’s the most plausible, since after the word Φοῖβε the Argonauts become the narrator’s primary focus—though admittedly the second-person address to Apollo is maintained until line 8.³⁶ At any rate, Phinney’s view has been the most prominent in scholarship, though

³² For Aratus’ Hymnic Proem as a model for Apollonius’ introit, see De Marco 1963: 351–352, Hurst 1967: 40 n. 3, Tarditi 1989: 41, Clauss 1993: 18–20, Solomon 1998: 24–25, and Vox 2002: 156.

³³ The Hymnic Proem = ἀρχόμενος σέο, Φοῖβε: see Phinney 1963: 1–3. He is followed by DeForest 1994: 38–40, who views the compression of an entire Proemial Hymn into three words as a programmatic example of “Callimachean brevity” (38), as well as by Nishimura-Jensen 1996: 11.

³⁴ The Hymnic Proem = 1.1–4: see, e.g., Mooney 1912: 67, Levin 1971: ch. 1, and Sistakou 2001: 259.

³⁵ The Hymnic Proem = 1.1–22: see Collins 1967: 3–10; cf. Fusillo 1985: 33 and Murray 2005b: 91. For the correspondence of Apollo and the Muses at either end of the introit, see further Collins 1967: 30, Hurst 1967: 40, Vian 1974: 3, De Martino 1984–1985: 104, and Clauss 1993: 22–23.

³⁶ See n. 12 above.

most critics do not explicitly delimit the boundaries of the Hymnic Proem to Apollo so precisely.³⁷

The “Hymnic Proem” interpretation figures well into what may be termed “performative” readings of the *Arg.* As a matter of historical fact, we do not know how or even whether the *Arg.* might have been performed. Scholars have often assumed that Apollonius intended his bookish epic strictly for a reading, not listening, public, and indeed, the presence in his poem of such “purely visual phenomena” as acrostics do show that he expected at least some segment of his audience to experience his poetry in written form.³⁸ Accordingly, I refer throughout this study to Apollonius’ “readers,” assuming a textual engagement with the poem. Nevertheless, recent scholarship has emphasized the persistence of poetic performance in the Hellenistic period,³⁹ and for Apollonius we do possess ancient references, in the poet’s *vitae*, to his recitation of the *Arg.* in public ἐπιδείξεις.⁴⁰ Most importantly, it must be stressed that regardless of the medium in which the poem was consumed, its own references to itself in the traditional epic language of “song”⁴¹ would at least evoke the conceit of an oral performance, even for someone reading the text.⁴² Apollonius’ procedure is an example of the common Hellenistic poetic technique of

³⁷ Scholars who implicitly endorse Phinney’s view include Blumberg 1931: 7, Färber 1932: 89, Händel 1954: 9, De Marco 1963: 351–352, Goldhill 1991: 287, Albis 1996: 7, Green 2007 ad *Arg.* 1.1, and Faulkner 2011: 193–194; cf. also Morrison 2007: 287.

³⁸ Cf. Bing 2008: 15 (whence the quotation); for acrostics in the *Arg.*, see, e.g., Danielewicz 2005: 330–332, Stewart 2010, Cusset 2013, McPhee 2017: 115–119, and Adkin 2019.

³⁹ The two poles of the debate over Hellenistic “book culture” vs. poetic performance are conveniently represented by Bing 2008 (originally published in 1988) and Cameron 1995.

⁴⁰ On this testimony, see Belloni 1995: 183, 1996: 136–138.

⁴¹ ἀοιδῆς (1.22, 1220; 4.451), ἀείδειν (1.921, 4.249), ἀείδω (4.1381), αἶδε δ’ ἀοιδαί ... ἀείδειν (4.1773–1774). The narrator also refers frequently to other poets as singers; Caneva 2007: 105 n. 1 collects examples.

⁴² Belloni 1996, Cuypers 2004: 51 (cf. 57, 62), and Caneva 2007: ch. 8; see also Morrison 2007: 275.

encoding the once-integral performance contexts of the archaic “song culture” into the fictive world projected by the text.⁴³

In the last few decades, many scholars have recognized that the specific performance context conjured up by Apollonius’ text is that of the archaic bard or rhapsode.⁴⁴ The introit provides much evidence for this idea. For example, the μὲν-δέ contrast in 1.18–20 between “former bards” who still acclaim the Argo’s construction (νῆα μὲν οὖν οἱ πρόσθεν ἔτι κλείουσιν ἄοιδοί, 18; cf. 59) and the narrator himself, with his own poetic agenda (νῦν δ’ ἄν ἐγὼ ... μυθησαίμην, 20), implicitly identifies him as a present-day ἀοιδός in the same tradition.⁴⁵ The introit’s allusions to the performances of Demodocus and Phemius, the two professional bards depicted in Homer’s *Odyssey*, support this interpretation.⁴⁶

Of particular interest for the present argument is the introit’s echo of *Od.* 8.499, which describes how Demodocus began his song on the sack of Troy (ὄρμηθεις θεοῦ ἤρχετο). Ancient scholars evidently debated how the phrase in question should be taken. According to the T scholiast ad loc., either Demodocus “having been moved by the god, began,” or “having been

⁴³ The term is from Herington 1985: ch. 1; see also Kurke 2000 for an introduction to Greek “song culture.” Callimachus’ “mimetic” *Hymns* (2, 5, 6) offer a splendid example of the Hellenistic practice mentioned here, for whether they were performed or not, they at least textually recreate the cultic atmosphere appropriate to a hymnic performance; see, e.g., Bulloch 1985: 6–8, 44–45, Harder 1992, Depew 1993, Cameron 1995: 63–67, Bing 2009: ch. 2, Acosta-Hughes and Stephens 2012: 145–47, and Stephens 2015: 11–12.

⁴⁴ Cf., however, Duncan 2001, esp. 49–51, who argues that through the figure of Medea, Apollonius likens his poetry to a witch’s spellcasting and conjures up the pretense of a magic ritual as his performance context. Cf. also Murray 2005a: chapters 1, 4, who argues that by means of metapoetic imagery, Apollonius establishes his fictional performance context as that of a paean.

⁴⁵ See also Hunter 1989 ad *Arg.* 3.1 for evidence from the introit of Book 3.

⁴⁶ For Demodocus, see Nuttall 1992: 12–13, Hunter 1993: 121, and Albis 1996: 17–19; for Phemius, Claus 1993: 20–21, Vox 2002: 157–158, and Hunter 2008: 116 n. 6. Additional evidence from beyond the introit would include the well-known sympathy between the Argonauts’ own bard, Orpheus, and the narrator (see n. 193 in Chapter 4).

moved, began with the god.”⁴⁷ That is, he either received divine inspiration and then began his song, or he offered a hymn to “the god” before his primary composition, in the manner of the archaic rhapsodes.⁴⁸ Notably, the other scholiasts *ad loc.* discover the same ambiguity in the word ἤρχετο alone, irrespective of ὀρμηθείς, just as the Apollonian scholiast believes that Apollonius’ ἀρχόμενος in *Arg.* 1.1 might serve both to commence a Hymnic Proem to Apollo and to announce the poet’s inspiration from that god.⁴⁹ Indeed, perhaps Apollonius meant to tap into this ancient debate with his ambiguous use of a form of ἄρχομαι + the name of a god in the genitive.⁵⁰ In any event, according to the “Hymnic Proem” interpretation of the introit, the *Arg.* itself structurally replicates the rhapsodic practice of prefacing an epic performance with a hymnic προοίμιον. In the words of Albis, the chief exponent of this interpretation:

The *Argonautica* presents itself not just as a text of an epic poem but as the equivalent of an epic poem as performed in its appropriate context. Apollonius’ hymnic proem can be viewed as compensation for the loss of the social context in which epic had once been performed.⁵¹

The allusions to the *HHs* in the poem’s opening lines would strengthen this interpretation, given the evidence (discussed in the Introduction) for the rhapsodic practice of reciting the *Hymns* as προοίμια for epic song.

⁴⁷ My own translations are provided for the sake of illustration.

⁴⁸ See Hainsworth’s comment *ad loc.* in Heubeck, West, and Hainsworth 1988.

⁴⁹ Nuttall 1992: 13–14. On the “inspiration” interpretation of Apollonius’ introit, see the next subsection.

⁵⁰ I wonder as well if the debate recorded in the Pindaric scholia over the meaning of ἐξ Ἀπόλλωνος (*Pyth.* 4.176) could be relevant: does Orpheus join the Argonauts as the “son of Apollo,” or with musical skills “imparted by Apollo”? See the scholia *ad Pind. Pyth.* 4.313a, b Drachmann; for Orpheus as a figure of the Apollonian narrator, see n. 193 in Chapter 4.

⁵¹ Albis 1996: 8. For the introit’s replication of the structure of a rhapsodic performance as a textual recuperation thereof, see *idem* 1–8 and his expansion on the idea in Ch. 2 (esp. pp. 19–20). Albis’ basic idea is anticipated in a passing observation by Goldhill 1991: 287, and Belloni 1996 (esp. 148) comes close to it contemporaneously. See further Cuypers 2004: 44.

c. *The Ambiguity of “Beginning with You, Phoebus”*

The first interpretation of ἀρχόμενος σέο, Φοῖβε proffered by the ancient scholiast quoted above is the “Hymnic Proem” interpretation, but what is so interesting about this scholium is that its author does not commit to just a single reading of this phrase. Instead, ambiguity predominates from the very beginning of the phrase’s history of explication. The scholiast actually presents two interpretations: a hymnic interpretation on the one hand (τὸ μὲν), but also what I will term an “‘inspiration’ interpretation” on the other (τὸ δέ).⁵² According to this second view, Apollo is invoked for inspiration as the god of poetry, much as the Muses are standardly invoked at the beginning of epic and other types of poetry.⁵³ Other scholia to the *Arg.* assume this understanding elsewhere as well,⁵⁴ and many modern scholars stand in agreement.⁵⁵ Epic-generic expectations could easily lead our putative first-time readers to this understanding of the phrase, especially since the god’s name in the vocative appears in more or less the same place occupied by the address to the Muse in the first lines of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*.⁵⁶

⁵² Notably, the scholiast does not even say that ἀρχόμενος could mean one thing or the other; he apparently thinks that both meanings are “there” in the word (τὸ μὲν τι σημαίνει... τὸ δέ τι σημαίνει). Many modern scholars, too, are willing to see in the phrase multiple meanings that are not mutually exclusive; see n. 69 below.

⁵³ The extension of the apostrophe to Apollo all the way to line 8 via the second-person possessive pronoun τῆν is no obstacle to this interpretation; cf. the opening of the *Odyssey*, where the address to the Muse is maintained for ten lines.

⁵⁴ See the scholia ad 1.1–4b, 3.1–5c.

⁵⁵ Advocates of the “inspiration” interpretation include Blumberg 1931: 7; Färber 1932: 49 with n. 4; Händel 1954: 11; Drögemüller 1956: 128, 232; Collins 1967: 5–6; Livrea 1973 ad *Arg.* 4.1–2; Preininger 1976: 118; Heiserman 1977: 14; Nuttall 1992: 10–14; and Caneva 2007: 106 with n. 7; see further n. 69 below.

⁵⁶ *N.b.* the identical rhythmical articulation of the Appeal to the Muse in *Od.* 1.1 (Ἄνδρα μοι ἔννεπε, Μοῦσα) and of Apollo in *Arg.* 1.1 (Ἀρχόμενος σέο, Φοῖβε). Likewise, in *Il.* 1.1, the word “goddess” (= “Muse”) appears, like Φοῖβε, in the vocative case as the third word in the line (Μῆνιν ἄειδε, θεά). Cf. Grillo 1988: 42.

Indeed, allusions in later poets show that the “inspiration” interpretation of ἀρχόμενος σέο, Φοῖβε must have arisen quite naturally for ancient readers. This sense of the phrase is plainly the one imitated by Valerius Flaccus in his Flavian-era Latin *Argonautica*. His narrator asks Phoebus for inspiration after announcing his Argonautic theme in the first four lines (1.5–7):⁵⁷

Phoebe, mone, si Cymaeae mihi conscia vatis
stat casta cortina domo, si laurea digna
fronte viret.

Phoebus, be my guide, if there stands in a pure home the tripod
that shares the secrets of the Cymaeian prophetess, if the green
laurel lies on a worthy brow.

The “inspiration” interpretation also seems presupposed by the likely allusion at the beginning of the late Hellenistic Homeric parody, the *Batrachomyomachia* (1–8):⁵⁸

Ἀρχόμενος πρώτης σελίδος χορὸν ἐξ Ἑλικῶνος
ἐλθεῖν εἰς ἔμδν ἦτορ ἐπέυχομαι εἴνεκ’ ἀοιδῆς,
ἦν νέον ἐν δέλτοις ἐμοῖς ἐπὶ γούνασι θῆκα,
δῆριν ἀπειρεσίην, πολεμόκλονον ἔργον Ἴαριος,
εὐχόμενος μερόπεσσι ἐς οὐατα πᾶσι βαλέσθαι, 5
πῶς μύες ἐν βατράχοις ἀριστεύσαντες ἔβησαν,
γηγενέων ἀνδρῶν μιμούμενοι ἔργα Γιγάντων,
ὥς λόγος ἐν θνητοῖς ἐην· τοίην δ’ ἔχεν ἀρχήν.

As I begin on my first column, I pray for the chorus from Helicon
to come into my heart for the song that I have just set down in
tablets on my knees, bidding to bring that boundless conflict, the

⁵⁷ See, e.g., Kleywegt 2005: 11–12. The address to Phoebus in this vatic mode also recalls the role of Apollo’s oracle at the beginning of Apollonius’ narrative; see below on the “narrative catalyst” interpretation. Lines 5–6 have been taken to mean that the historical Valerius was numbered among the *quindecimviri sacris faciundis*, a college of Roman priests charged with preserving and consulting the Sybilline Books (see Boyancé 1964; cf. Spaltenstein 2002: 12 and ad VF *Arg.* 1.5); if so, he would have special reason to invoke Apollo toward the beginning of his epic, beyond Apollonius’ precedent. Barchiesi 2001: 327 intriguingly suggests that the Valerian narrator’s self-presentation as a priest of Apollo responds to one of the Apollonian scholiast’s glosses of ἀρχόμενος (*Arg.* 1.1), ἀρχαιρεσιαζόμενος ὑπὸ σοῦ (“elected by you”).

⁵⁸ I consider the decision to commence an epic poem with the participle ἀρχόμενος and a genitive object to be sufficiently striking to constitute an allusion to Apollonius, especially given how densely allusive such introits are. The use of τοίην to introduce the narrative (8) is perhaps reminiscent of *Arg.* 1.5 (τοίην γὰρ Περίης φάτιν ἐκλυεν). For the influence of the *Arg.* on other parts of the *Batrachomyomachia*, see, e.g., Hosty 2013: 8 and Kelly 2014.

war-rousing work of Ares, to the ears of all mortals: how the mice went triumphant among the frogs, emulating the deeds of those earthborn men, the Giants, as the tale was told among men. And this is how it began.⁵⁹

Through his Appeal to the Muses for inspiration and his references to the physical act of writing, the poet of the mock-epic firmly connects ἀρχόμενος to the process of poetic composition. Indeed, the allusion to the prologue of Callimachus' *Aetia* in the third line (fr. 1.21–22: “when I put a writing-tablet on my knees for the first time” [ὅτιε πρώτιστον ἐμοῖς ἐπὶ δέλτον ἔθηκα | γούνασι,ν]) even evokes the image of Apolline inspiration, in addition to the inspiration from the Muses that is explicitly mentioned in the text (χορὸν ἐξ Ἑλικῶνος, 1).⁶⁰ Notably, however, the word ἀρχήν (8), with which the poet neatly brackets the introit in ring composition, refers rather to narrative beginning—the events that catalyze the conflict between the frogs and mice that constitutes the poem's plot (“And this is how it began”). This observation leads my discussion into a third possible understanding of Apollonius' ἀρχόμενος: one that the scholiast does not consider, but which is probably the most popular understanding of the term in modern scholarship.

This third sense is that of selecting a starting-point (ἀρχή) for a narrative or other sort of utterance.⁶¹ According to this “narrative catalyst” interpretation, Apollo provides the narrative's

⁵⁹ Text and translation are from West 2003a.

⁶⁰ Text and translation of the *Aetia* are taken from Harder 2012. Conceivably Apollo is comprehended in the phrase “chorus from Helicon,” since he is often represented as the “chorus-leader” (χορηγός) of the Muses as Apollo Μουσαγάγετης; see, e.g., Nagy 1990: 360–361, and the various parallels assembled by Stenzel 1908: 15 n. 1.

⁶¹ See Race 1982: 6 n. 3. A non-narrative example of this usage of ἀρχή is Aesch. *Choeph.* 85.

ἀρχή,⁶² because (*n.b.* γάρ, 5) it is his oracle to Pelias that sets the plot in motion.⁶³ Apollonius effectively answers the question that launches the main thread of Pindar’s version of the Argonautic myth: “What beginning took them on their voyage, and what danger bound them with strong nails of adamant?” (τίς γὰρ ἀρχὰ δέξατο ναυτιλίας, | τίς δὲ κίνδυνος κρατεροῖς ἀδάμαντος δῆσεν ἄλλοις; *Pyth.* 4.70–71).⁶⁴ Indeed, Pindar, too, had begun his narrative with Apollo’s oracle to Pelias (71–78), and Apollonius self-consciously replicates this beginning, even as his elliptical account (*Arg.* 1.5–17) avoids too much overlap with the lengthy treatment of Pelias’ imposition of the labor on Jason in *Pythian* 4 (78–168).⁶⁵

These are, in sum, the three major explanations scholars have offered for why Apollo represents a suitable beginning for the poem: he is either honored with a Hymnic Proem, invoked for inspiration, or selected as a starting-point for the narrative. I would make two points about these three possible interpretations. First, they need not be mutually exclusive; for instance, a great number of scholars endorse, with varying emphases, both the “inspiration” and “narrative catalyst” interpretations: Apollo represents the starting point of the poem both from a narrative and compositional perspective.⁶⁶ Or to take another combination: the Late Antique

⁶² So Zissos 2008 ad Val. Flac. *Arg.* 1.1–4: “[I]n accordance with Aristotelian prescriptions, [Apollonius] provides an indication of the narrative beginning or ἀρχή.”

⁶³ Advocates of the “narrative catalyst” interpretation include Mooney 1912 ad *Arg.* 1.1; Wilamowitz 1924: 2.217; Eichgrün 1961: 104–105; De Marco 1963: 352–353; Ardizzoni 1967 ad *Arg.* 1.5; Hurst 1967: 39 with n. 2; Zyroff 1971: 46, 76–77; Kühlmann 1973: 158–159; Fusillo 1985: 364, 366 (but cf. 33 with n. 42); Paduano and Fusillo 1986 ad *Arg.* 1.1; Grillo 1988: 16, 42; Gummert 1992: 119; Belloni 1996: 140; Valverde Sánchez 1996: 93 n. 1; Theodorakopoulos 1998: 193–194; Vian 2002: 1.3–4; Berkowitz 2004: 59, 61; and Morrison 2007: 287; see further n. 69 below.

⁶⁴ Scholars who connect the two passages include Campbell 1983: 128, Gummert 1992: 119, and Hunter 1993: 124.

⁶⁵ For Apollonius’ desire to avoid duplicating too much of the Pindaric backstory, see, e.g., Händel 1954: 14, De Marco 1963: 353, Collins 1967: 26, and Cuypers 2004: 44. For a comparison of Apollonius’ “prehistory” with Pindar’s account, see Köhnken 2000: 57–58.

⁶⁶ Scholars who endorse both the “inspiration” and “narrative catalyst” interpretations include Herter 1944–1955: 336, Collins 1967: 5–10, Fränkel 1968: 35, Goldhill 1991: 288, Williams 1991: 297–299, Nyberg 1992: 61, Claus

Orphic Argonautica begins with a hymnic Invocation to Apollo followed by a request for the god’s inspiration. “Orpheus” begins his song (1–6):

Ἵναξ Πυθῶνος μεδέων, ἑκατηβόλε, μάντι,
ὄς λάχες ἠλιβάτου κορυφῆς Παρνασσίδα πέτρην,
σὴν ἀρετὴν ὑμνῶ· σὺ δέ μοι κλέος ἐσθλὸν ὀπάσσαις·
πέμπε δ’ ἐπὶ πραπίδεσσιν ἐμαῖς ἐτυμηγόρον αὐδήν,
ᾧφρα πολυσπερέεσσι βρότοις λιγύφωνον ἀοιδίην
ἠπύσω Μούσης ἐφετμαῖς καὶ πηκτίδι πυκνῆ.⁶⁷ 5

O Lord who rules over Pytho, Far-shooter, Seer, whose lot is
Parnassus’ rock with its lofty peak, your excellence do I hymn!
May you grant me goodly fame, and send truth-proclaiming speech
into my heart, that I may utter a clear-voiced song to far-flung
mortals at the commands of the Muse and to the accompaniment of
my close-built harp.

Fittingly for such an “Orphic” poem, the first two lines invoke Apollo in the fulsome manner of an Orphic rather than a Homeric hymn;⁶⁸ in the third line, the three words σὴν ἀρετὴν ὑμνῶ succinctly accomplish the praise of the god while underscoring the “hymnic” mode of this introit,⁶⁹ and this miniature hymn would seem to conclude with a Prayer for the poet’s fame in the latter half of line 3. Appended to this Prayer, however, is another directive to the god, namely, a request for inspiration (4–6). Quite plausibly, this complex opening gesture could

1993: 19, Harder 1993: 106, DeForest 1994: 37, Albis 1996: 25–26, Glei and Natzel-Glei 1996: 1.147 n. 1, Pietsch 1999: 69–70, Sansone 2000: 158, Wray 2000: 250–251, Dräger 2002 ad *Arg.* 1.1, Vox 2002: 157, Cuypers 2004: 44, Klooster 2007: 64, Green 2007 ad *Arg.* 1.1, and Lye 2012: 233–234. See further González 2000 and Köhnken 2000: 56–57, for whom this dual reading illuminates the notorious crux of *Arg.* 1.22: the Muses serve as the “interpreters” (ὑποφῆτορες) not of Apollonius, but of the oracular-poetic god Apollo.

⁶⁷ Text of the *Orphic Argonautica* is taken from Vian 1987; the translation is my own.

⁶⁸ For the Hymnic Proem of the *OA*, see Wunsch in *RE* 9.1 s.v. “Hymnos,” p. 172, and esp. Schelske 2011: 26, 190, and his comments ad loc.

⁶⁹ These words constitute “eine *praedicatio* bzw. *Aretalogie in nuce*” (Schelske 2011: 26).

reflect its author's understanding of lines 1–2 of Apollonius' introit, which she or he unpacks according to a combination of the "Hymnic Proem" and "inspiration" interpretations.⁷⁰

The second point I would make about Apollonius' ambiguous introit is that it is also easy to imagine the interpretations of first-time readers evolving as they progress through the passage. The first words might give rise to one impression, but readers may enrich or revise their first impressions as new data are presented in the subsequent lines, especially lines 5–8, where Apollo's priority in the narrative is made clear. Beye offers a nice illustration of this process in action, combining the "inspiration" and "narrative catalyst" interpretations:

The initial phrase sets up the conventional combination of poet and divine inspiration. After four lines of general introduction, the poet tells of the oracle which motivates Pelias to send Jason after the fleece. The oracle, which of course comes from Apollo's shrine at Delphi, suddenly offers additional meaning to *Archomenos seo Phoibe*, that is, the poet shall begin the narrative with its original motivator, the prophetic god, Apollo.⁷¹

Still, we cannot say that lines 5–8 make the "narrative catalyst" interpretation inevitable, as Beye's account might imply. One reading of line 5 ("For such was the oracle that Pelias heard" [τοιήν γάρ Πελίης φάτιν ἔκλυεν]) holds that the poet had begun from Apollo (ἀρχόμενος σέο, Φοῖβε, 1) because (γάρ, 5) his oracle catalyzes the narrative. This reading is supported by the second reference to "your [*sc.* Apollo's] prophecy" (τεῖν ... βάζιν) in line 8, which keeps Apollo's role in inaugurating the narrative in the reader's mind. But another reading would take the γάρ of line 5 to imply a different logical connection between lines 1–4 and what follows:

⁷⁰ For the poet's interaction with Apollonius in these opening lines, see Schelske 2011 ad *Orph. Arg.* 1–2. Ziegler (*RE* 18.1.1318) suggests that the *Orphic Argonautica* begins with Apollo in order to allude to an Orphic theogony that began with an elaborate apostrophe to Apollo-Helios, who is the poet's source for his mystical knowledge (fr. 102.1 in Bernabé 2004). I would not doubt it, but the precedent of Apollonius' *Arg.* must loom large as well. In general on the *Orphic Argonautica*'s debt to Apollonius, see Venzke 1941 and Vian 1987: 18–21; interesting comments as well in Hunter 2005 and Nelis 2005b.

⁷¹ Beye 1982: 13; see further Romeo 1985: 21 and Clare 2002: 24–25.

King Pelias ordered the Argonautic expedition (βασιλῆος ἐφημοσύνη Πελῖαιο, 3) because (γάρ, 5) he had heard an oracle from Apollo to the effect that Jason would prove to be his doom. This reading is supported by the larger purpose of the “prehistory” narrative of lines 5–17, which serve to explain Pelias’ motivation for ordering the mission.⁷² Apollonius’ introit turns out to be stubbornly ambiguous: the text offers support to all three of the major interpretations I have outlined, allowing the first-time reader to adopt any or all of them, but it does not compel the reader to adopt any one of them in particular; they all “work”—at least on a first reading.

In addition to these three major interpretations, scholars have advanced several other explanations for Apollonius’ decision to “begin with Apollo.”⁷³ Of these, I will mention one that can claim ancient authority, being presupposed by an allusion in Ovid: through use of the alternative theonym “Phoebus,” Apollonius “suppresses” the form of the god’s name (Ἀπόλλων) after which he himself is named (Ἀπολλώνιος).⁷⁴ In this way, Apollonius obliquely embeds the

⁷² For this second interpretation of γάρ in line 5, see, e.g., Blumberg 1931: 7 and Levin 1971: 9, 13. The twofold function of γάρ here is recognized by Gummert 1992: 119, Köhnken 2000: 57, and particularly Berkowitz 2004: 57–61, who offers a full discussion.

⁷³ For example, Apollo may be highlighted because:

1) he is a model for Jason’s characterization (Collins 1967: 6, Williams 1991: 300–301, and Cuypers 2004: 44);

2) the opening is meant to establish a parallel between the narrator and Jason, who also claims to begin his voyage with Apollo (οὗ ἔθεν ἐξάρχῳμαι) at 1.362 (Vox 2002: 157; the parallel is commonly noted and is part of Apollonius’ larger strategy of presenting his narrative as coterminous with the Argonauts’ voyage [see n. 240 in Chapter 2]);

3) Apollo symbolizes Callimachean poetics, as in the *Aetia* prologue and the Envoi of the *Hymn to Apollo* (Goldhill 1991: 288, Williams 1991: 299–300, DeForest 1994: 37, Albis 1996: ch. 6, and Belloni 1996: 141, Wheeler 2002: 45, and Mori 2008: 40–41; cf. Preininger 1976: 118); or

4) Apollo is chosen for his role in the Hellenized Pharaonic ideology of the Ptolemies (Vox 1999: 165 and Stephens 2003: 236).

⁷⁴ For Apollo as Apollonius’ eponym, see, e.g., Collins 1967: 10, Cuypers 2004: 43, 44, and Klooster 2011: 91, who also notes the relevance of Apollonius’ “function as a ‘priest of the Muses and Apollo’ in the Museum of Alexandria.” For the concept of “suppression” in etymological wordplay, see O’Hara 2017: 79–82. Albis 1996: 22 effectively explains how this technique works here: “Apollonius invokes Phoebus, whose other name, Apollo, forms

derivation of his own name in the opening of his poem as a sort of *sphragis*, rather as Aratus (Ἄρατος) paradoxically puns on his own name with ἄρητον, “unspoken,” in the second line of the *Phaenomena*.⁷⁵ Ovid bears witness to this interpretation in his own tribute to Apollonius in *Metamorphoses* 7.365, when he has Medea fly over the toponymous island of one of his major sources for this section of his narrative, “Phoebean Rhodes” (*Phoebeamque Rhodon*).⁷⁶ This phrase conceals the name of “Apollonius of Rhodes” in much the same way that ἀρχόμενος σέο, Φοῖβε could be taken to signal the derivation of Apollonius’ name. Read thus, “beginning with Apollo” becomes a way of incorporating a poetic signature of sorts into the introit of the new poem.⁷⁷

What this survey of different interpretations of the introit shows is that despite the allusions to the *HHs* in *Arg.* 1.1–2 surveyed in the previous subsection of this chapter, first-time readers can reasonably understand the introit in any of several ways, most of which are not “hymnic.” This is an important point to which I will be returning later in this chapter. Nevertheless, as I argue in the next subsection, a number of allusions to other Hymnic Proems in these lines constitute strong *prima facie* evidence that Apollonius positively wants his first-time readers to embrace this understanding of his poem’s opening lines. Ultimately, I argue that this interpretation is essentially a red herring, for as we will see, it is incompatible with certain data that will be presented in the poem’s hymnic Envoi—but the first-time reader cannot know that

the base of the poet’s own name. In his proem, he addresses his divine patron as Phoebus rather than Apollo, perhaps to avoid making the play on names too obvious.”

⁷⁵ A common comparison: see, e.g., Williams 1991: 304 n. 29, Albis 1996: 22, and Vox 2002: 157. On Aratus’ pun, see Bing 1990.

⁷⁶ See McPhee 2018: 56 n. 6, with bibliography.

⁷⁷ See also Albis 1996: 22–23, who connects the name pun to Apollo’s role in inspiring the poet, just as, e.g., Musaeus is a legendary poet named for his relationship to the Muses.

yet. Accordingly, I devote the remainder of Section I of this chapter to fleshing out the evidence for reading *Arg.* 1.1–2 as a Hymnic Proem to Apollo. I first examine a number of the introit’s intertexts that would seem to point in this direction, and I then consider a related but, in my opinion, erroneous view that sees *Arg.* 1.1–2 not as a Hymnic Proem to Apollo, but as an Exordium to the *Arg.* itself, which is understood as a full-blown hymn to Apollo.

d. The Case for the “Hymnic Proem” Interpretation

The evidence in favor of the “Hymnic Proem” interpretation of *Arg.* 1.1–2 is considerable, and indeed, some of it has already emerged earlier in this chapter. The likelihood that Apollonius structured his introit after the Aratus’ Hymnic Proem to Zeus is highly suggestive, for if Apollonius designed his own introit on the model of a Hymnic Proem, it stands to reason that he meant for it to be construed as a Hymnic Proem as well. Moreover, the allusions to the *HHs* in these lines (examined in Section I.a above) make this reading even more attractive, as the *HHs* functioned as Hymnic Proems for epic performances and were thus called προοίμια (*n.b.* the Apollonian scholiast’s verb, προοιμιάζεσθαι).⁷⁸ The most important piece of evidence in this regard is Apollonius’ allusion to the Envoi of the *Homeric Hymn to Selene*, for along with the *Homeric Hymn to Helios* (31), *Selene* is the only hymn in the Homeric collection that makes its function as a Hymnic Proem for an epic performance totally explicit,⁷⁹ and it does so in precisely the passage to which Apollonius alludes. *Selene* ends by promising to transition from hymning the goddess to an epic theme: “Beginning with you [Selene], I will sing the famous deeds of demigods” (σέο δ’ ἀρχόμενος κλέα φωτῶν | ἄσομαι ἡμιθέων, *HH* 32.18–19). If

⁷⁸ See Section II.c of the Introduction.

⁷⁹ See Introduction, Section II.b.

the logic of Apollonius' allusion is pursued, Selene would correspond to Apollo, i.e. the god who is currently receiving a Hymnic Proem; the "famous deeds of demigods" promised in *Selene* will correspond to the *Arg.*'s primary epic narrative about the Argonauts that follows the introit.⁸⁰ That is, Apollonius' allusion establishes a parallel between the structure of the *Selene* hymnist's putative performance and that of his own epic poem. Just as the hymnist transitions from a Hymnic Proem (*Selene*) to an epic song (the promised κλέα φωτῶν), so we are encouraged to view Apollonius' introit as a Hymnic Proem dedicated to Apollo as a preface to the epic Argonautic narrative. For the first-time reader savvy to it, this allusion incontrovertibly affirms the "Hymnic Proem" interpretation of *Arg.* 1.1–2.

There is, moreover, a sizeable pool of further intertexts for Apollonius' introit from which the "Hymnic Proem" interpretation stands to gain even further support: other Hymnic Proems addressed to Apollo in earlier Greek literature. *Ipsa facto*, all of these passages lie in the intertextual background of *Arg.* 1.1–2; if, however, any of them rise to the level of a probable deliberate allusion on Apollonius' part,⁸¹ they have great potential to clarify his poetic intention for the first-time reader; for if Apollonius alludes to a Hymnic Proem at the beginning of his work, it is probable that he might have meant for his introit to be read precisely as such. Certain gods commonly receive the honor of being invoked at the "beginning" (and often, the end), such as Zeus or Hestia,⁸² but Apollo, too, gets his fair share of Hymnic Proems in extant literature, and these will be reviewed here.

⁸⁰ Phinney 1963: 2; see also Levin 1971: 11 with n. 1 and Vox 2002: 157.

⁸¹ For my use of the terms "intertext" and "allusion," see Section III of the Introduction.

⁸² For "beginning with" Zeus, see Gow 1952 ad Theocr. *Id.* 17.1 and Kidd 1997 ad Arat. *Phaen.* 1; cf. Apollonius' ephrasis of Jason's cloak, which in a sense begins with Zeus as well (1.730–734; cf. Lawall 1966: 155 n. 8). For Hestia, see Diggle 1970 ad Eur. *Phaethon* 249–250. In the *HHs*, Dionysus also receives this honor (1D.8–9).

One of the better parallels for Apollonius' introit is the opening of the Theognidean corpus (1–4), which thematizes the practice of “beginning with Apollo”:⁸³

ὦ ἄνα, Λητοῦς υἱέ, Διὸς τέκος, οὔποτε σεῖο
λήσομαι ἀρχόμενος οὐδ' ἀποπαυόμενος,
ἀλλ' αἰεὶ πρῶτόν τε καὶ ὕστατον ἔν τε μέσοισιν
ἀείσω· σὺ δέ μοι κλῦθι καὶ ἐσθλὰ δίδου.

O lord, son of Leto, child of Zeus, I will never forget you at the beginning or at the end, but I will ever sing of you first, last, and in between; and do you give ear to me and grant me success.

The vocative address to the god⁸⁴ paired with the participle ἀρχόμενος makes this passage a good comparandum for the *Arg.* introit,⁸⁵ especially because Apollonius directly quotes Theognis' opening words elsewhere in the poem, in Phineus' apostrophe to Apollo (ὦ ἄνα Λητοῦς | υἱέ, *Arg.* 2.213–214).⁸⁶ Moreover, the phrase οὔποτε σεῖο | λήσομαι (“I will never forget you”) corresponds semantically with Apollonius' μνήσομαι (literally something like “I will bring to memory”),⁸⁷ while the verbs rhyme and match in position (enjambéd in the second verse), although the object of each verb differs. If Apollonius intends to allude to Theognis, perhaps the substitution of μνήσομαι for οὐ ... λήσομαι was suggested by the synonymous use of different forms of these expressions in another of his intertexts, namely, the beginning of the major *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, quoted above (μνήσομαι οὐδέ λάθωμαι Ἀπόλλωνος ἑκάτοιο, 3.1).

⁸³ Scholars who cite this parallel include De Marco 1963: 351, Phinney 1963: 3, Collins 1967: 3 n. 8, and Cuypers 1997: 238.

⁸⁴ The hymnic second poem of the collection (5–11) also begins with a vocative address to Apollo, this time as Φοῖβε, as in *Arg.* 1.1.

⁸⁵ In these respects, cf. also Alcman fr. 48 Campbell: “Son of Leto, (beginning with?) you (I . . .?) the choir” (Λατοῖδα, τέο δ' ἀρχόμενος χορόν).

⁸⁶ This allusion is noted by Giangrande 1968: 54 and Cuypers 1997 ad loc., who connects the phrase to *Arg.* 1.1 as well.

⁸⁷ De Marco 1963: 351.

This Theognis passage exemplifies the practice of beginning a poetry collection with a Proemial Hymn, and in this connection, I would note that the Alexandrian edition of Alcaeus evidently began with a hymn to Apollo. Because, however, Aristophanes’ editorial work most likely postdates the composition of the *Arg.*, we do not know in what form Apollonius knew Alcaeus’ poetry,⁸⁸ and in any case, the preserved opening line of the hymn (“Lord Apollo, son of great Zeus” [ὦναξ Ἄπολλον, παῖ μεγάλω Δίος, fr. 307a Campbell]) has nothing in common with *Arg.* 1.1 beyond the second-person address to the god.

More tantalizing is an alternate first line of the *Iliad* apparently preserved in an old copy of the poem owned by the early first-century BCE book-collector Apellicon of Teos:⁸⁹

Ἡ δοκοῦσα ἀρχαία Ἰλιάς, λεγομένη δὲ Ἀπελλικῶντος, προοίμιον ἔχει τοῦτο· ‘Μούσας αἰίδω καὶ Ἀπόλλωνα κλυτότοξον,’ ὡς καὶ Νικάνωρ μέμνηται καὶ Κράτης ἐν τοῖς Διορθωτικοῖς.

What is considered the old *Iliad*, the one known as Apellicon’s, has this proem: “Of the Muses I sing, and Apollo famed for his bow,” as recorded both by Nicanor [a grammarian of the second century CE] and by Crates [the Pergamene grammarian, second-century BCE] in his *Text-critical Notes*.⁹⁰

The quoted line serves as a brief Hymnic Proem for the *Iliad*, and it is important for hymnic interpretations of *Arg.* 1.1 for several reasons. First and foremost, if Apollonius was aware of it, this alternate opening line would provide direct Homeric epic (hereafter, HE) precedent for

⁸⁸ On the Alexandrian editions of Alcaeus’ works, see Liberman 2002: 1.xl–lxi, esp. lv–lvi on the hymns. *N.b.* that Acosta-Hughes 2010: 105 finds “no discernible traces of Alcaeus in Apollonius’s *Argonautica*.” Horace, at least, seems to have alluded in his *Odes* 9–11 to the ordering of Alcaeus’ opening poems in the Alexandrian edition; see Lyne 2005: 547–552.

⁸⁹ This alternate Iliadic opening is adduced by Campbell 1983: 128 n. 1, Wheeler 2002: 45, and Faulkner 2011: 193–194; cf. Hunter 1993: 119, Vox 2002: 158, and Nelis 2005a: 356 on Apollonius’ beginning his narrative with Apollo, just as the *Iliad* does.

⁹⁰ I quote the text and translation of West 2003a: 454–455. On this Hymnic Proem and its relationship to the mainstream Iliadic introtit, see Nagy 2010: 109–119.

heroic poetry that begins with a Hymnic Proem addressed to Apollo (as well as the Muses, whom Apollonius also evokes at the end of his introit). Second, it is striking just how succinct the quoted Proem is. Evidently even so short a Proem as this—or, indeed, ἀρχόμενος σέο, Φοῖβε, on Phinney’s reading—might be adequate to introduce so grand an epic as the *Iliad*. Lastly, it should be noted that the gods invoked are those with whom the epic begins: the Muse(s),⁹¹ from whom the bard claims inspiration (*Il.* 1.1), and Apollo, the god whose anger against Agamemnon sets the plot in motion (8–9).⁹² This alternate beginning to the *Iliad* thus combines all three of the functions that we have seen dispersed in the major interpretations of Apollonius’ introit surveyed above: the line is a Hymnic Proem that begins both with the poem’s inspiring deities and with the god who catalyzes its plot.⁹³

Additionally, there are several intertexts from the *HHs* themselves, which, as noted earlier, were called προοίμια (cf. the Apollonian scholiast’s verb, προοιμιάζεσθαι) and were recited as preludes to epic performances. I have already cited the beginning of the major *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* (3.1), to which Apollonius’ use of the verb μνήσομαι may allude. In this context at least three further passages from the *HHs* deserve to be mentioned. The first is

⁹¹ The fluctuation between the singular Muse (the “goddess” of *Il.* 1.1) and the plural “Muses” is quite common; cf. Rhianus’ dictum that an Appeal to one Muse is an Appeal to them all (fr. 19 Powell = Σ ad Apoll. Rhod. *Arg.* 3.1–5c). There would be no fluctuation, however, if this Hymnic Proem preceded the alternate “Cyclic” introit for the *Iliad* (printed in Bernabé 1987: 64).

⁹² So much is clear from Apollo’s epithet κλυτότοξον, “famed for his bow,” which reflects his use of arrows in sending the plague against the Achaean camp at the beginning of the Iliadic narrative (1.44–53; cf. lines 21, 37, 42).

⁹³ In this connection, I might add that the phrase σέο, Φοῖβε (*Arg.* 1.1) echoes two other Iliadic passages that Apollonius’ learned readers might have recalled. Among the characters apostrophized in the HEs (Patroclus, Menelaus, Eumaeus, etc.), Apollo is the only god so addressed, both times as “you, archer Phoebus” (σύ/σέ, ἦε Φοῖβε, *Il.* 15.365, 20.152; the phrase recurs in a hymnic context at *HH* 3.120). These passages provide good epic precedent for a narratorial apostrophe to Apollo, particularly under the title of “Phoebus.” See De Martino 1984–1985: 105, with his appendix (pp. 116–117) for a list of apostrophized characters in the epics; see further Grillo 1988: 43–44 with n. 107 and Vox 2002: 158 n. 25. The latter also notes Callimachus’ use of the vocative Φοῖβε in his first Argonautic *aition* (σὴν, Φοῖβε, κατ’ αἰσιμίην, fr. 18.9), in a line to which Apollonius probably alludes in *Arg.* 1.8 (τεῖην κατὰ βάζιν) (Hunter 1993: 123).

not itself a Hymnic Proem, but rather a description of the marvelous performance of the Delian maidens at the Panionia in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* (3.156–161):

πρὸς δὲ τόδε μέγα θαῦμα, ὅου κλέος οὐ ποτ' ὀλεῖται,
κοῦραι Δηλιάδες Ἑκατηβελέταο θεράπναι·
αἶ τ' ἐπεὶ ἄρ' πρῶτον μὲν Ἀπόλλων' ὑμνήσωσιν,
αὐτίς δ' αὖ Λητώ τε καὶ Ἄρτεμιν ἰοχέαιραν,
μνησάμεναι ἀνδρῶν τε παλαιῶν ἠδὲ γυναικῶν
ῶμνον ἀείδουσιν, θέλγουσι δὲ φῶλ' ἀνθρώπων. 160

And besides, this great wonder, the fame of which will never perish: the maidens of Delos, the servants of the Far-shooter, who, after first hymning Apollo, and then in turn Leto and Artemis profuse of arrows, turn their thoughts to the men and women of old and sing a song that charms the peoples.

The connections between this passage and the *Arg.* introit are remarkable.⁹⁴ Both passages emphasize the priority of Apollo (cf. πρῶτον μὲν Ἀπόλλων', 158) and strikingly use a line-initial form of the verb μνάομαι with reference to “the men and women of old” in the genitive case (cf. μνησάμεναι ἀνδρῶν τε παλαιῶν ἠδὲ γυναικῶν, 160, with παλαιγενέων κλέα φωτῶν | μνήσομαι, *Arg.* 1.1–2).⁹⁵ Moreover, while the Delian maidens’ performance is choral and not rhapsodic,⁹⁶ the *Hymn*’s reference to a song for Apollo and his family that precedes a song about the ancient heroes is reminiscent of the rhapsodic tradition of using Hymnic Proems as preludes for epic performances—precisely the tradition evoked by the “Hymnic Proem” interpretation of *Arg.* 1.1–2.

The strength of this intertext is such that I would deem it a conscious allusion on Apollonius’ part, especially given the ongoing interest that he evinces in the *Apollo* hymn’s

⁹⁴ The passage is adduced as a parallel by Albis 1996: 41 and Vox 2002: 158.

⁹⁵ For φωτῶν as inclusive of both genders in *Arg.* 1.1, see Goldhill 1991: 288, DeForest 1994: 39, Albis 1996: 41, Vox 2002: 158 with n. 28, and McPhee 2017: 115.

⁹⁶ As emphasized by Clay 2006: 48; cf. her comment on the next page: “The order of their [sc. the Delian maidens’] song—first gods, then men—appears to be canonical and is common to both epic/rhapsodic and choral poetry.”

“Delian maidens” passage elsewhere in the *Arg.*, as I discuss later in this chapter (Section II.c). At least two significant conclusions follow from this finding. First, this allusion joins the poet’s allusion to the *Selene* Envoi in lending support to the “Hymnic Proem” interpretation, for here again we have Apollonius alluding to a passage that makes explicit the rhetorical structure underlying that reading: a song for gods precedes a song about the ancient heroes. Second, it is striking that by means of this allusion, Apollonius connects his narratorial persona to the model of the Delian maidens. I would add this chorus of women to the ranks of Phemius and Demodocus as “Homeric” performers whom Apollonius programmatically invokes by means of allusions in his introit.⁹⁷ As performers, the maidens’ chief distinction—the μέγα θαῦμα mentioned in line 156 of the *Hymn*—is the way in which they imitate the speech of all peoples (162–164),⁹⁸ and there are potentially many ways in which we could relate this amazing mimetic ability to Apollonius’ poetics. Albis relates it to the Apollonian narrator’s characteristic “empathy” for his characters, whose experiences he often mirrors in the manner of his own narration; for instance, the narrator metaphorically “wanders off” on a digression (ἀποπλάγξειεν, 1.1220) just as Heracles et al. literally wander off from Jason’s crew in the Mysian episode (ἀποπλαγθέντες, 1.1325).⁹⁹ We might also think of the many different voices that the Apollonian narrator adopts as he frequently imitates different predecessors at different points in his multi-textured narrative.¹⁰⁰ The enchanting quality of the Delian maidens’ song (θέλγουσι,

⁹⁷ For Phemius and Demodocus as models for the Apollonian narrator, see n. 49 above.

⁹⁸ The meaning of this skill is much debated; for different interpretations, see Bing 2009: 47–48.

⁹⁹ Albis 1996: 41. One of Albis’ chief contributions to Apollonian studies is to delineate precisely this narratorial “empathy,” which he describes as an “assimilation of poet and character that is ubiquitous in the *Argonautica* and is one of the poet’s essential narrative devices” (95). Albis discusses the Heracles example on pp. 61–62; see further “empathy between poet and characters” in his index.

¹⁰⁰ On this point, see the introductory section of Chapter 3.

HH 3.161) also finds ready parallels in Apollonius’ own description of the effects of his characters’ songs (1.26–31, 515, 740–741; 4.894; cf. 1.570–579, 2.162, 4.150, 1665 [if θέλγει is read]) and narratives (2.772). As these passages are often regarded as cases of *mise-en-abyme*, reflecting Apollonius’ own desire to bewitch his audience with his poetry,¹⁰¹ the captivating performance of the Delian maidens provides him with an apt model explicitly praised by “Homer” himself in *propria persona*.¹⁰²

Two more *HHs* furnish further parallels of *Arg.* 1.1–2 that might support the “Hymnic Proem” interpretation. *Homeric Hymn* 21 is a short hymn to Apollo, only five lines in length:¹⁰³

Φοῖβε, σὲ μὲν καὶ κύκνος ὑπὸ πτερύγων λίγ’ αἰεῖδει
 ὄχθη ἐπιθρόσκων ποταμὸν πάρα δινήεντα
 Πηνειόν· σὲ δ’ αἰοῖδος ἔχων φόρμιγγα λίγειαν
 ἠδυεπῆς πρῶτόν τε καὶ ὕστατον αἰὲν αἰεῖδει.
 καὶ σὺ μὲν οὕτω χαῖρε, ἄναξ· ἴλαμαι δέ σ’ αἰοῖδῃ. 5

Phoebus, of you the swan too sings in clear tones to the accompaniment of its wings¹⁰⁴ as it alights on the bank beside the eddying river Peneus; and of you the bard with his clear-toned lyre and sweet verse ever sings in first place and last. So hail to you, lord, and seek your favor with my singing.

Two features make this passage stand out in the field of potential precursors to Apollonius’ introit. First, there is the hymn’s unusual opening with a vocative address to Apollo as “Phoebus” (Φοῖβε). Cultic Hymns regularly begin in the so-called “Du-Stil” by announcing their

¹⁰¹ For this metapoetic interpretation of θέλξις in the *Arg.*, see, e.g., Albis 1996: ch. 4 and Spentzou 2002: 109. Fränkel 1968: 623 offers an exemplary reading of the end of the *Arg.* as replicating the enchanting effect of Orpheus’ cosmogony. See further Duncan 2001 for Medea *qua* enchantress as an analogue to the Apollonian narrator.

¹⁰² In this same passage of the *Hymn*, the narrator identifies himself as a blind bard from Chios, i.e., as Homer; see Section II.c below.

¹⁰³ Adduced as a parallel by Romeo 1985: 21 n. 11.

¹⁰⁴ ὑπὸ πτερύγων refers to the ancient belief that a swan’s music is at least partly produced by the movement of its wings; see AHS 1936 ad loc.

subject in the vocative,¹⁰⁵ but such a beginning is in fact atypical of Rhapsodic Hymns like the *HHs*: the only other ones to do so within the Homeric corpus are the two short hymns to Hestia (24, 29).¹⁰⁶ Beginning with Φοῖβε is thus noteworthy within the collection, and it is suggestive that Apollonius uses the same theonym in the vocative in his introit. Second, it is notable that, like the Theognis passage discussed above (1–4), this hymn thematizes “beginning with Apollo” in line 4. Indeed, the first-time reader will not know so yet, but Apollonius, too, might be said to sing of Apollo “in first place and last” (πρῶτόν τε καὶ ὕστατον, 4): he explicitly begins with Apollo, but he also gives the god a place of prominence near the very end of the poem, when he has him rescue the Argonauts from the eerie “shroud” of darkness on the sea near Anaphe (4.1694–1730).¹⁰⁷ As Phinney notes, by making Apollo the first and the last god to appear in the poem, “Apollonius shapes his plot in accordance with a hymnal formula.”¹⁰⁸ Indeed, by giving this pride of place to the god, the Apollonian narrator plays the part of an αἰοιδὸς ἠδυεπιῆς according to the hymn’s description thereof.

The last intertext from the *HH* collection is *Homeric Hymn 25*, a pastiche of Hesiodic quotations adapted from the Hymnic Proem of the *Theogony*:¹⁰⁹

¹⁰⁵ See Race 1982: 5–6.

¹⁰⁶ See Janko 1981: 10 and Calame 2005: 22. To this list could be added the *Homeric Hymn to Ares* [8], were it not a late intruder in the collection, as discussed in the Introduction.

¹⁰⁷ For the climactic status of this episode, cf. Clauss 1993: 77, Chuvin 2003, and Sistakou 2012: 60. *N.b.* that Apollo’s oracle to Jason is mentioned in the next episode (4.1747) and that the Hydrophoria, whose establishment serves as the poem’s final *aition*, was a festival dedicated to Apollo, although the narrator does not mention this fact.

¹⁰⁸ Phinney 1963: 3; cf. Hunter 1993: 85. Phinney specifically has Theognis 1–4 in mind, but it is unclear to me whether Apollonius does what Theognis promises to do, viz. to sing of Apollo first, last, and in the middle (πρῶτόν τε καὶ ὕστατον ἔν τε μέσοισιν, 3), given Apollo’s absence from the plot from 2.714 all the way to 4.1702. But cf. Grillo 1988: 45 n. 113, who supposes that the poet does sing of Apollo “in the middle” by means of Orpheus’ internal hymn to the god in Book 2.

¹⁰⁹ Adduced by Händel 1954: 9, Campbell 1983: 128 n. 1, Williams 1991: 298, Belloni 1996: 140 n. 18, Pietsch 1999: 69 n. 162, and Berkowitz 2004: 59–60 n. 26.

Μουσάων ἄρχωμαι Ἀπόλλωνός τε Διός τε·
 ἐκ γὰρ Μουσάων καὶ ἐκηβόλου Ἀπόλλωνος
 ἄνδρες ἀοῖδοι ἔασιν ἐπὶ χθονὶ καὶ κιθαρισταί,
 ἐκ δὲ Διὸς βασιλῆες· ὃ δ' ὄλβιος, ὃν τινα Μοῦσαι
 φίλωνται· γλυκερὴ οἱ ἀπὸ στόματος ῥέει αὐδὴ.
 χαίρετε, τέκνα Διός, καὶ ἐμὴν τιμήσατ' ἀοιδῆν·
 αὐτὰρ ἐγὼν ὑμέων τε καὶ ἄλλης μνήσομ' ἀοιδῆς.

With the Muses let me begin, and Apollo and Zeus. For from the
 Muses and far-shooting Apollo men are singers and lyre-players on
 earth, and from Zeus they are kings. He is fortunate whom the
 Muses love: sweet is the voice that flows from his mouth. Hail,
 children of Zeus! And honor my singing. And I will remember
 both you and another song.

The main point of contact between this hymn and the *Arg.* introit is the use of a form of ἄρχωμαι with Apollo's name in the genitive (cf. ἀρχόμενος σέο, Φοῖβε)—a unique mode of Evocation within the *HHs* that is adapted from the *Theogony*.¹¹⁰ If Apollonius' construction using ἄρχωμαι + gen. is enough to remind his readers of this peculiar hymn, it would add an interesting Hesiodic resonance to the opening line, in keeping with a clearer allusion to the introit of the *Works and Days* (10) at *Arg.* 1.20.¹¹¹

The various intertexts considered so far vary in strength, but several of them offer quite persuasive parallels for Apollonius' introit. To me, the most convincing cases for a deliberate allusion are *HHs* 32.18–19 (*n.b.* σέο δ' ἀρχόμενος κλέα φωτῶν | ἄσομαι) and 3.156–161 (*n.b.* esp. μνησάμεναι ἀνδρῶν τε παλαιῶν ἠδὲ γυναικῶν, 160), both on lexical grounds and because they thematize beginning with the gods before singing of heroes, in accordance with Apollonius'

¹¹⁰ Clay 2011: 238 n. 25. *Theog.* 1 (“Let us begin our song with the Heliconian Muses,” Μουσάων Ἐλικωνιάδων ἀρχόμεθ' ἀείδειν) combines the name of the gods to be hymned in the genitive with a version of the ἄρχωμ' ἀείδειν formula common in the *HHs*, but a likelier model for *HH* 25.1 is *Theog.* 36 (“Let us begin with the Muses,” Μουσάων ἀρχόμεθα), where the hymn to the Muses essentially restarts. On the complex structure of the *Theogony* Proem, see, e.g., Minton 1970, Verdenius 1972, Nünlist 2004, and Rijksbaron 2009, with bibliography.

¹¹¹ On this last allusion, see Livrea 1966: 462–463, Ardizzoni 1967 ad loc., Rossi 1968: 161, Campbell 1981: 1, Grillo 1988: 18 n. 25, Belloni 1996: 143–144, Clare 2002: 263, and Vox 2002: 156.

procedure at the beginning of the *Arg.*¹¹² Aratus' Hymnic Proem (1–18) offers a clear structural precedent for Apollonius' introit, which begins (with a form of ἄρχομαι) with a god and ends with a wish for inspiration from the Muses. Finally, because of the *Iliad*'s privileged status as a model for Apollonius' epic, its alternate opening with a Hymnic Proem to the Muses and Apollo would constitute an undeniable paradigm for Apollonius' decision to begin with Apollo, if we could be sure that he knew of it.¹¹³ The case for conscious allusions to the other passages surveyed here are less decisive, but—at the risk of overdetermining the potential sources of *Arg.* 1.1–2—it may be that some of these texts nuanced certain of Apollonius' usages—for instance, his vocative Φοῖβε may reflect the precedent of *HH* 21.1. In any event, the conclusion that Apollonius meant to deploy allusions to earlier Hymnic Proems in order to style his own opening lines as a Hymnic Proem to Apollo seems unavoidable.

e. A Hymnic Proem or a Hymn to Apollo?

Before moving on from the introit to examine the *Arg.*'s hymnic Envoi, I would like to pause to examine another reading of the introit that seems to be gaining in support in more recent scholarship. I have reserved consideration of it until now because, unlike the three major interpretations outlined above, I consider it a critical misreading. This interpretation draws on much of the same evidence for the hymnic subtext of Apollonius' introit adduced so far in this chapter, but it takes this evidence in a different direction: rather than reading the introit as a

¹¹² Cf. Thgn. 1–4, which thematizes beginning with Apollo, but with weaker lexical parallels.

¹¹³ Similarly, Pind. *Pyth.* 4.70–78 very probably stands behind Apollonius' introit because of that poem's importance among our poet's chief models for the *Arg.*

Hymnic Proem in honor of Apollo, this view regards the entire *Arg.* as a hymn dedicated to the god, which the introit serves to introduce in the manner of an Exordium.

It was, to my knowledge, Williams who introduced the idea that the *Arg.* constitutes “a quasi-hymn in honor of the god Apollo.”¹¹⁴ It would seem odd that so much of the *Arg.* is not about Apollo if the poem is a hymn in his honor, but for Williams, because of the god’s role in catalyzing the expedition, he delights in hearing of the Argonautic narrative. She argues that there is an “*aretalogia* of the god himself ... embedded sporadically in the poem” in the form of episodes or digressions (e.g., 1.759–762, 4.611–618) that feature him. Moreover, various Honorific epithets used of the god throughout the poem redound to his honor, and he is the subject of several prayers and celebrations both in the narrative proper and within similes.¹¹⁵ In this way, it is as though an originally autonomous hymn to Apollo has been diced up and sprinkled throughout a narrative (admittedly somewhat tangentially-related to him) intended for the god’s delectation. This thesis connects to the subject of Williams’ book, *Landscape in the Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius*, insofar as Apollo is a god particularly appreciative of natural beauty, and the *Arg.*’s loving descriptions thereof are meant especially for him.¹¹⁶ Nine years later, González articulated the same basic view, apparently independently, adding more evidence of Apollo’s “pervasive influence” throughout the poem, such as the high profile of seers in the epic.¹¹⁷ Murray develops another form of this argument, proposing that “the poem defines itself as a paean” according to a metapoetic interpretation of what she takes to be the programmatic

¹¹⁴ Williams 1991: ch. 13; the quotation is from p. 302.

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.* 303–304.

¹¹⁶ *Ibid.* 305–316.

¹¹⁷ González 2000: 278–280 (quotation from p. 279).

simile of 1.536–541, which compares the Argonauts to a chorus of young men worshipping Apollo as they row to Orpheus’ accompaniment.¹¹⁸ Several other scholars have also advanced the claim that the *Arg.* is a hymn to Apollo, though without in-depth arguments.¹¹⁹

These scholars have made the strongest case possible for construing the *Arg.* as a hymn to Apollo, but many of these arguments are tenuous. For instance, I suspect that if one were so inclined, similar arguments could be mounted for the subtle-but-pervasive influence of gods like Hera, Athena, or Aphrodite and Eros—but the *Arg.* is not a hymn to any of these deities.¹²⁰ As to Apollo, his role in the poem should be kept in the proper perspective, which the spotlight of the poem’s opening verse tends to distort.¹²¹ Although he is firmly connected to the beginning of the narrative and plays an important role in the poem’s backstory (as revealed in several external analepses),¹²² Apollo actually figures into the plot much less often than his initial prominence might suggest.¹²³ Even the Argonauts themselves seem to have been misled: they sacrifice to no

¹¹⁸ See Murray 2005a, esp. 6–7, 26–27, 42, 82; the quotation is from p. 6.

¹¹⁹ Besides Williams, González, and Murray, scholars who regard the *Arg.* as a hymn to Apollo include Pietsch 1999: 70, Cuypers 2004: 43–44, 59 (but cf. 45), and Nagy 2010: 117; cf. Klooster 2011: 87–91, 2013a: 163. This view also seems implicit in Theodorakopoulos 1998: 199 and Clauss 2016a: 69, and Morrison 2007: 287 could be taken to support it.

¹²⁰ E.g., if it is true that, because of a pair of early similes connecting the two (1.307–311, 536–541), Apollo is “subtly called to mind” whenever Jason appears in the text (González 2000: 279), we might equally say that Athena maintains a background presence throughout the poem by virtue of the *Argo*, since it is her handiwork. I rather think that real-life readers would need other cues to recall the absent Apollo during Jason’s scenes.

¹²¹ Phinney 1963: 2: “The invocation does not imply that Apollo will often appear again or that he will have a central place in the action. His role throughout the poem is, in fact, nebular.”

¹²² References to Jason’s consultation of the Delphic oracle prior to the voyage are scattered throughout the poem; see Fontenrose 1978: 389–390 for a reconstruction of the incident.

¹²³ See Vian 1974: 3 and Heiserman 1977: 36 (who, however, is prone to confuse Apollo and Helios), as well as the comment of Albis 1996: 40 n. 62: “This [sc. Williams’ argument] is an attractive idea but for the fact that the god is conspicuously absent throughout all of Book 3.” Theodorakopoulos 1998: 193 offers a much stronger formulation of my argument: “Apollo is, deceptively, set up at the opening as a form of guide and protector, but he fails spectacularly to fulfil this role.” See also Byre 1997: 111.

god more than Apollo, but, largely unbeknownst to them, Hera, who never receives sacrifices of her own from them, is actually their greatest benefactor (cf. 2.216–217, 3.383).¹²⁴ Apollo decisively saves the Argonauts once, when he makes Anaphe appear to them;¹²⁵ otherwise, the Far-worker helps them only indirectly, through a pair of talismanic tripods he had given to Jason, which the Argonauts give away to secure guidance (4.526–536, 1547–1550), and arguably through the prophecies he inspires in Phineus.¹²⁶ It is unclear whether Apollo’s mysterious appearance to the Argonauts at Thynias, which the crew celebrates with hymns and the institution of new cults (2.669–719), is even intentional on his part: they catch sight of him seemingly at random, and he takes no notice of his mortal onlookers, who themselves receive no tangible benefit from the experience.¹²⁷ Apollo is mentioned in numerous digressions and similes and is given many epithets over the course of the poem, but then so are other gods (e.g., the conspicuously absent Zeus), in keeping with the poet’s learned style.¹²⁸ Apollo is

¹²⁴ The crew makes offerings specifically to Apollo on eight separate occasions (Mori 2007: 463 with n. 21); Hera receives her portion only amidst general sacrifices to the Olympians (2.531–532). On the Argonauts’ comparative neglect of Hera (and, to a lesser extent, Athena), see Phinney 1963: 43, Vian 1976: 4, Knight 1995: 269, and Clare 2002: 161; see also Pavlock 1990: 32–33.

¹²⁵ Even the reality of this intervention has been doubted by some skeptical critics (Theodorakopoulos 1998: 195–196 and Clauss 2016b: 147); cf. Hunter’s interpretation of the Thynias epiphany, mentioned in n. 130 below.

¹²⁶ See Albis 1996: 111, Pietsch 1999: 224–225, Clare 2002: 75, and McPhee 2017: 117 n. 34.

¹²⁷ See Feeney 1991: 75–77, Theodorakopoulos 1998: 194–195, and Clauss 2016b: 147; see further Hunter 1986: 52–53 for the idea that Apollo’s epiphany could be understood as the weary Argonauts’ misinterpretation of the sunrise. Even if the epiphany does not directly aid the Argonauts, there are nonetheless subsidiary social benefits from the crew’s joint religious worship, which includes inaugurating an altar to Concord (Ὁμόνοια); see Hunter 1986: 53–54 and Lye 2012: 234. Cf. Albis 1996: 111–112 for the argument that “Apollo’s epiphany here is a sign of his benevolence” (111) before his temporary withdrawal from the poem (similarly Lawall 1966: 160–161).

¹²⁸ It is true, per Williams 1991: 304, that in at least one episode Apollonius substitutes Apollo for a god who plays the homologous role in earlier treatments of the myth; she adduces Jason’s prayer at Pagasae, which is directed to Zeus in Pindar’s version (*Pyth.* 4.194–200) but to Apollo in Apollonius’. But elsewhere such substitutions promote other gods, as when Athena intervenes at the Clashing Rocks (2.598–603) instead of the Pindaric Poseidon (cf. *Pyth.* 4.204–211). And in one case, Apollonius actually eliminates Apollo where Pindar has him, as the father of Orpheus (*Pyth.* 4.176–177 with scholia; *Arg.* 1.25); see further Murray 2018: 212, 216–218. All of these changes could instead reflect Apollonius’ well-known reluctance to involve the major gods (with the prominent exception of Hera)

undoubtedly an important character in the *Arg.*, but for all these reasons, it strains credulity to think of him as the true recipient of the poem *qua* hymn. Indeed, I can think of no other hymn, quasi- or otherwise, in which the subject is so submerged as Apollo would be according to this interpretation.¹²⁹

To be sure, first-time readers will not know any of the things I have just said as they first encounter the introit, and perhaps they might initially interpret ἀρχόμενος σέο, Φοῖβε as the poem's declaration of its genre as a (quasi-)hymn, sung in honor of Apollo—certainly this reading has seemed sensible to several modern scholars. Even so, the text itself works against this reading. Grammatically speaking, the use of the participle, “beginning,” whose action is subordinated to the main verb, “I shall recall,” suggests that Apollo is precisely not the focus of the poet's song:¹³⁰ the god is a starting-point, but the object of the poet's recollection is “the famous deeds of people born long ago,” which, the reader will soon discover, is indeed the poem's theme.¹³¹ Moreover, we have seen that the allusion to *Selene* here implies that Apollo is the recipient of a Hymnic Proem, not of the entire epic *qua* hymn. But the most decisive evidence against the idea that the whole *Arg.* in an Apolline hymn is presented in the poem's hymnic Envoi, and it is to this passage that I now turn.

in his narrative—in each case, major deities are replaced by figures who rank lower on the great chain of being. For the distanced representation of the high gods and the relative prominence of lesser divinities, see n. 232 below.

¹²⁹ Cf. the concession of González 2000: 279: “Apollo's hymnic function in the *Argonautica* may indeed be regarded as non-traditional, insofar as the poem does not focus on him or his exploits.” In these circumstances, “non-traditional” is an understatement.

¹³⁰ Cf. Grillo 1988: 17 n. 33, who refers to Phoebus as “invocato *en passant* al v. 1 mediante un sintetico costruito participiale.”

¹³¹ See further De Marco 1963: 352, who notes that it is not in the hymnic style for the objects of μνήσομαι and forms of ἄρχεσθαι to refer to different entities. For the affiliations of this phrase with epic poetry, see the introductory section of Chapter 2.

II. The Envoi

a. *The Rhetorical Structure of the Envois of the Argonautica and the Homeric Hymns*

Now that the hymnic elements in the *Arg.*'s introit have been examined, the other end of the poem's hymnic frame may be analyzed. At 4.1770–1772, an etiology marks off the end of the brief episode of the Argonauts' stopover on Aegina (4.1765–1772), deep into the narrative of the crew's return journey that has occupied the bulk of Book 4. Then, rather abruptly,¹³² the narrator ends the poem by addressing the Argonautic crew collectively (4.1773–1781):¹³³

ἴλατ' ἀριστήων¹³⁴ μακάρων γένος· αἶδε δ' αἰοῖδαι
εἰς ἔτος ἐξ ἔτεος γλυκερώτεραι εἶεν αἰεῖδεν
ἀνθρώποις. ἤδη γὰρ ἐπὶ κλυτὰ πείραθ' ἰκάνω
ὑμετέρων καμάτων, ἐπεὶ οὐ νύ τις ὑμῖν ἄεθλος
αὐτίς ἀπ' Αἰγίνηθεν ἀνερχομένοισιν ἐτύχθη,
οὔτ' ἀνέμων ἐριῶλαι ἐνέσταθεν, ἀλλὰ ἔκηλοι
γαῖαν Κεκροπίην παρά τ' Αὐλίδα μετρήσαντες
Εὐβοίης ἔντοσθεν Ὀπούντιά τ' ἄστεα Λοκρῶν,
ἀσπασίως ἀκτὰς Παγασηίδας εἰσαπέβητε.

Be gracious, you race of blessed heroes, and may these songs year after year be sweeter for men to sing. For now I have come to the glorious conclusion of your toils, since no further trial befell you as you returned home from Aegina, nor did any storm winds block your way, but after calmly passing by the Cecropian land and Aulis within Euboea and the Opuntian towns of the Locrians, you gladly set foot on the shores of Pagasae.

¹³² Regarding the sudden ending of the *Arg.*, it is customary to quote Hadas 1932: 53, who labels our passage “the most abrupt stop in literature.” I sympathize with this (hyperbolic) reaction, though I think that once the Argonauts reach Aegina, we can sense that the end is in sight; could the poet really “just as easily have continued riffing aetiologies,” as Wray 2000: 242 supposes, so close to the Argo's destination? *N.b.*, with Paduano and Fusillo 1986 ad *Arg.* 4.1773–1781, that the narrator ends precisely where he had promised (1.20–22), with the completion of the Argonauts' there-and-back-again voyage.

¹³³ See Vox 2002: 162 n. 44, 164–165 for interesting comments on the effect that this transition might have on a first-time reader: Book 4 is so full of apostrophes and prayers with forms of ἴλατ[ε] that this passage might not be recognized initially as a hymnic Envoi—indeed, the Salutation to the Argonauts in line 1773 might, for a second, be taken as an Aeginetan ritual Invocation of the Argonauts as mythic founders of the Hydrophoria.

¹³⁴ I here follow the manuscript reading of ἀριστήων in line 1773, though many scholars follow Fränkel's emendation to ἀριστήες. For a defense of the transmitted text, see the discussion at the end of this Section.

Structurally, this passage begins with a Salutation (1773a), followed by a Prayer (1773b–1775a), which is identifiable as such by its volitive optative verb (εἶεν, 1774).¹³⁵ This combination represents a standard closural device in Greek hymns, and so in the following γάρ clause (1775b–1776a), the poet acknowledges that he is indeed concluding the narrative and explains his decision to do so with an appended ἐπεὶ clause (1776b–1778a). From there, the poem ends with a brief catalogue of the final phases of the Argonauts’ νόστος (1778b–1781).¹³⁶ Throughout this passage, the narrator maintains an extended apostrophe to the Argonauts through the use of the vocative case (γένος) and a series of second-person plural verbs (ἴλατ’, εἰσαπέβητε) and pronouns (ὕμετέρων, ὑμῶν), just as the poem had begun with a sustained address to Apollo (1.1–8).¹³⁷

The *Arg.* ends, in other words, with a recognizably hymnic conclusion, complete with a Salutation and Prayer.¹³⁸ More specifically, I argue that in the Envoi, Apollonius follows the structuring conventions governing the conclusions of the *HHs*. Probably his Envoi’s most striking Homeric-hymnic feature is its (sudden) transition from a mythic narrative in Er-Stil to a

¹³⁵ In the *HHs*, the Prayer is always expressed by a second-person imperative verb; in using an optative verb, Apollonius perhaps avails himself of the precedent set in some Hellenistic Rhapsodic Hymns (Call. *Hymn* 2.113 [also third-person], Theocr. 22.215 [second-person]). Cf. also the affectation of casting the Salutatory Verb in “a deferential optative” that “suggests the tone of a suppliant” (Kidd 1997 ad Arat. *Phaen.* 16); see further Theocr. *Id.* 26.33, 35; and esp. Call. *Hymn* 4.326, which is likely based precisely on the precedent set by the third-person optative in the quasi-Salutation at *HH* 3.165 (see Mineur 1984 ad loc.; on this passage, see Section II.c below).

¹³⁶ ἄσπασίως in line 1781 effectively signals closure; see Hunter 1993: 120 n. 77. In the same place, Hunter also provides an even-handed overview of the argument of Rossi 1968 that the line alludes to *Od.* 23.296, the verse considered to be the original ending of the epic by Aristophanes and Aristarchus.

¹³⁷ As Fränkel 1968: 625 notes, at nine verses, Apollonius’ closing apostrophe to the Argonauts is the longest in the poem, exceeding even apostrophes to the gods. Grillo 1988: 53 n. 142 argues that the apostrophe to Canthus should be construed as just as long, but even by his count, it is only 8.5 lines long (from 4.1485 to the first half of 1493).

¹³⁸ See further Gummert 1992: 129 with n. 41, commenting on the “hymnische Ton” of the sound patterns in 4.1773–1774.

conclusion in Du-Stil.¹³⁹ Such a transition is atypical of Cultic Hymns, which often maintain Du-Stil throughout, but is one of the most prominent characteristics of Rhapsodic Hymns, like those attributed to Homer.¹⁴⁰ Notably, the resumption of the narrative of the Argonauts' voyage in lines 4.1775b–1781 is not in the usual hymnic style, since ordinarily the poet's Salutation marks the definitive end of the narrative. Nevertheless, by casting these lines in Du-Stil, Apollonius has managed to subsume the conclusion of his epic narrative within the hymnic style of his Envoi, thus achieving a remarkable generic fusion in the last lines of the poem.¹⁴¹

Apollonius' Salutation and Prayer recognizably reproduce rhetorical patterns found in the *HHs*, but another *HH* element in the passage lies somewhat concealed, and hence needs further explanation. Apollonius' Envoi lacks one element that is distinctive of the Envois of the *HHs* (though hardly present in all of them): the "Poet's Task," or promise to remember the god as the rhapsodic speaker moves from Proemial Hymn to epic performance.¹⁴² It would have been odd (if humorous) for Apollonius to speak explicitly of transitioning to another song in the style of the *HHs*,¹⁴³ as if his 6,000-line poem had really been a *προοίμιον* for another epic all along.¹⁴⁴

¹³⁹ Belloni 1995: 181.

¹⁴⁰ See Section II.b of the Introduction.

¹⁴¹ Cf. Vox 2002: 162 on the persistence of the first and second persons past the hymnic conclusion proper (4.1773–1775a).

¹⁴² Once again, see Section II.b of the Introduction.

¹⁴³ Cf., however, the announcement of a transition to the *Iambi* at the end of Callimachus' *Aetia* 4 (fr. 112 Pfeiffer), which itself draws on the *HH* "Poet's Task" formula (Harder 2012 ad fr. 112.9).

¹⁴⁴ In fact, some scholars have read the Envoi in this way, such as Goldhill 1991: 287: "[I]t is as if the complete *Argonautica* has been a (hymnic) prelude; as if the pretext to end is—playfully—an epic to come"; see also Wheeler 2002: 46. In a related vein, Joseph Bringman has suggested to me that Apollonius' poem might function as a *προοίμιον* for Euripides' *Medea*. My own view is different: if the *Arg.* poses as a prelude to any "epic to come," it would be itself, in reperformance (4.1773–1775); cf. McNelis 2003: 160, who makes a similar argument about Callimachus' *Hecale*. Cf. also the paradoxical notion of Belloni 1996: 141–142 that the poem's hymnic frame seems to constitute "un proemio alle *Argonautiche* che però include le *Argonautiche* medesime."

Perhaps for this reason a complete statement of the Poet’s Task is absent from his hymnic conclusion.¹⁴⁵

Nevertheless, I posit that Apollonius’ Prayer for continual reperformances of his songs effectively combines the aspect of the Poet’s Task still applicable to his own agenda, i.e. the promise of remembrance, with another, ordinarily discrete element of an Envoi, the Prayer to the deity.¹⁴⁶ Apollonius’ Prayer is quite hermeneutically rich, because it can be interpreted from the perspective both of the poet and of his divine addressees.¹⁴⁷ On the one hand, in making this Prayer, Apollonius wishes for his own literary immortality as the author of a perennial classic; on the other, this request will also benefit the Argonauts (and thus they will be inclined to grant it), because every reperformance of the *Arg.* bolsters their own κλέος as the poem’s heroic subjects.¹⁴⁸ This Prayer thus neatly combines “the hymnic terminology of closure with a sense of epic memorializing among men,” as Goldhill puts it, reflecting the *Arg.*’s generic hybridity as both epic and hymn;¹⁴⁹ and in so doing, it exemplifies the sort of χάρις-relationship of mutual benefit that Greek hymns strive to establish between mortal and god. In praying for the enduring

¹⁴⁵ Perhaps owing to Apollonius’ example, both the imitations of Dionysius the Periegete (1181–1186) and Pseudo-Manetho (*Apotelesmatica* 6.751–754) also omit the “Poet’s Task” formula from their Envois, but do include a Salutation and Prayer to the subjects of the poem. For Dionysius’ allusion to the Apollonian Envoi, see Vox 2002: 159–168 and Lightfoot 2014: 507–508; for Pseudo-Manetho’s, see Stenzel 1908: 14 and Vox 2002: 164, 165 n. 56.

¹⁴⁶ So Lightfoot 2014: 508 n. 11: “Given that the prayer is for a reiteration of the poem, it could also be seen as an allusion to the third traditional element [sc. in the Envois of *HHs*]..., namely the transition to another song.” See also Wheeler 2002: 46.

¹⁴⁷ For the Prayer’s dual aspect, see Fränkel 1968: 620–621 and Hunter 1991: 90, 2008: 122, and 2015 ad loc.

¹⁴⁸ Cf. *κλυτὰ πείραθ*, 1775, harkening back to the κλέα φωτῶν of 1.1 (see further p. 188 below). This dual reading would, I suspect, have been intuitive for Apollonius’ ancient readers, since the reciprocity between the κλέος of poets and their subjects is a traditional topos in Greek poetry. For comparisons of such passages to Apollonius’ Prayer, see Fränkel 1968: 621 n. 354 (citing Bacchyl. 13.228–231, Pind. *Nem.* 9.53–55), Belloni 1995: 175–176 (citing Bacchyl. 3.96–98), and *idem* 1996: 147 n. 43 (citing Ibyc. fr. 282.47–48); cf. Valverde Sánchez 1996: 337 n. 824 (citing Pind. *Pyth.* 6.10–17). Cf. further the elaborate working-out of this motif in the Envoi of Theocritus’ Homeric-style *Hymn to the Dioscuri* (22.214–223).

¹⁴⁹ Goldhill 1991: 295.

success of a song that glorifies the Argonauts, Apollonius incorporates into his Envoi the most important part of the Poet's Task, namely, the promise that the deity will not be forgotten even though the hymn is ending.¹⁵⁰

There is some precedent in the *HHs* for this “subliminal” execution of the Poet's Task. The one-line Envoi of the minor *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* lacks a Poet's Task, but its second Prayer, because it is concerned with the hymnist's next song, seems to discharge that function: “Hail, goddess! Keep this city safe, and give my song its beginning” (χαῖρε, θεά, καὶ τήνδε σάου πόλιν, ἄρχε δ' αἰοιδῆς, 13.3).¹⁵¹ Moreover, two of the *Hymns to Dionysus* end without a formal Prayer or Poet's Task, instead substituting a maxim about the impossibility of singing for those who would forget the god. Thus the fragmentary *Hymn to Dionysus* concludes (1D.8–10):

ἴληθ', Εἰραφιῶτα γυναιμανές· οἱ δέ σ' αἰοιοί
ἄδομεν ἀρχόμενοι λήγοντές τ'· οὐδέ πη ἔστιν
σεῖ' ἐπιληθόμενον ἱερῆς μεμνηῖσθαι αἰοιδῆς. 10

Be propitious, bull god, women-frenzier! We singers sing of you as we begin and as we end; there is no way to remember holy song while heedless of you.

The Envoi to the seventh *HH* is similar (58–59):

χαῖρε, τέκος Σεμέλης εὐώπιδος· οὐδέ πη ἔστι
σεῖό γε ληθόμενον γλυκερὴν κοσμηῖσαι αἰοιδῆν.

Hail, child of fair Semele; there is no way to adorn sweet song while heedless of you.

¹⁵⁰ Hunter 2015 ad *Arg.* 4.1773 notes, “ἴλατ’ both bids farewell to the Argonauts and begs them to be understanding if he is now going to stop his poetic celebration of them”; the Prayer for the epic's continual reperformance then offers the Argonauts further consolation (Fränkel 1968: 619–621). For the connection noted by Hunter between the conciliatory note struck by ἴλατ[ε] and the cessation of praise, cf. Pseudo-Manetho's imitation of our passage (see n. 148 above): that poet uses the same Salutatory Verb (ἴλατε, *Apotelesmatica* 6.754) after explicitly announcing the end of his “hymn” (εὐξάμενος λγὸν ἕμνον ἐμὴν καταπαύσω αἰοιδῆν, 752; text from Köchly 1858; *n.b.* that εὐξάμενος here has the unusual meaning of *consecrans*, per the 1698 translation of Gronovius, and the “sweet-sounding hymn” in question here is the entire foregoing poem).

¹⁵¹ See Calame 2005: 29–30.

Janko hesitates whether to call the statements with which these Envois close a Prayer or a version of the Poet’s Task.¹⁵² Especially in the latter passage, we might understand the point of the maxim in lines 58–59 to be an indirect expression of the hymnist’s desire for the god, now duly honored, to “adorn” his “sweet song.” That this is the rhetorical purpose of these lines is suggested by parallel Prayers in other *HHs* that concern the aesthetic success of the hymnist’s song: “order my song” (ἐμὴν δ’ ἔντυνον ἀοιδίην, 6.20),¹⁵³ “grant me beautiful song” (δὸς δ’ ἱμερόεσσαν ἀοιδίην, 10.5); and “bestow beauty on my song” (χάριν δ’ ἄμ’ ὄπασσον ἀοιδῆ, 24.5).¹⁵⁴ At the same time, the emphasis on not forgetting Dionysus and, at 1D.10, remembering song (μυμνήσθαι ἀοιδῆς), evokes the most typical Poet’s Task formula: “And I will remember both you and another song” (αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ καὶ σεῖο καὶ ἄλλης μνήσομ’ ἀοιδῆς). Effectively, these maxims meld together by implication the functions of both the Prayer and the Poet’s Task, in a way that bears comparison to Apollonius’ procedure at *Arg.* 4.1773–1775. Moreover, as we will see in the next subsection, there is independent reason to think that Apollonius might have had his eye on both of these passages in composing his Envoi.

To bolster this interpretation further, I here present two parallel passages from Theocritus and Catullus that adapt the traditional formulas of *HH* Envois in ways that illuminate certain aspects of Apollonius’ rhetoric. The first passage is the Envoi of Theocritus’ encomium to Ptolemy Philadelphus, which is itself styled after a *HH* (*Id.* 17.135–137):

Χαῖρε, ἄναξ Πτολεμαῖε· σέθεν δ’ ἐγὼ ἴσα καὶ ἄλλων
μνάσομαι ἡμιθέων, δοκέω δ’ ἔπος οὐκ ἀπόβλητον

¹⁵² Janko 1981: 15.

¹⁵³ Adduced as a parallel for Apollonius’ Prayer by Fränkel 1968: 620 and Harder 1993: 105 n. 29.

¹⁵⁴ Cf. also “honor my song” (ἐμὴν τιμήσατ’ ἀοιδίην, *HH* 25.6). All of these Prayers are followed by a full enunciation of the Poet’s Task; cf. *HH* 13.3. As per Harder 1993: 105 n. 30, Theocritus’ *Herakliskos* probably ended with a similar Prayer to the hymned hero (Heracles) for the success of the poet’s song; see Gow 1952 ad *Id.* 24.141ff.

φθέγξομαι ἐσσομένοις· ἀρετήν γε μὲν ἐκ Διὸς αἰτεῖ.

Farewell, lord Ptolemy! I shall make mention of you just as much as of the other demigods, and I think my account will not be rejected by future generations. As for virtue, you should request that from Zeus.¹⁵⁵

The underlined portion represents Theocritus' version of the "Poet's Task," promising Ptolemy future remembrance. But notably, Theocritus has joined a straightforward enunciation of the "Poet's Task" motif ("I shall make mention of you...") with a non-standard element, a prediction of his song's enduring legacy ("and I think my account will not be rejected by future generations"). The addition of this prediction demonstrates, I argue, the close logical connection between the Poet's Task and the hope for the hymn's future survival. They are, really, two sides of the same coin. The Poet's Task focuses on the poet's own remembrance of the addressee while the hope for survival highlights the addressee's remembrance by the audience, but both function to assure the addressee that she or he will indeed enjoy remembrance in song.¹⁵⁶

Theocritus' unusually explicit, bipartite version of the Poet's Task shows that Apollonius' Prayer for his song's continual reperformance can be readily comprehended as the functional equivalent of the traditional Poet's Task, even if it represents an innovation within the rhetoric of the *HHS*.

Catullus' adaptation of Apollonius' Envoi sheds further light on how it could have been interpreted in antiquity.¹⁵⁷ The bulk of Catullus' celebrated epyllion (c. 64) is taken up with a description of the wedding of Peleus and Thetis (25–46, 267–383) and the lengthy ecphrasis that

¹⁵⁵ For the adaptation of the closural formulas from the *HHS* here, see Perrotta 1978: 182. Notably, lines 135–136 may allude to the Envois of the *Homeric Hymns to Helios* and *Selene* (see Hunter 2003: 196), the latter being the same passage that Apollonius adapts at the beginning of his hymnic introit.

¹⁵⁶ For the idea that hymns presuppose a threeway discursive situation—the hymnist and the Hymnic Subject, but also the hymn's mortal audience—see, e.g., Miller 1986: 2.

¹⁵⁷ For the principle that allusions to a text by other poets can unlock new interpretations thereof, see n. 26 above.

punctuates it (47–266). The poem begins, however, in a rather misleading fashion, as though launching upon an Argonautic narrative (1–24),¹⁵⁸ and it is closely engaged with Apollonius’ *Arg.* throughout.¹⁵⁹ Fittingly, Catullus ends the poem’s Argonautic prologue with an elaboration of Apollonius’ concluding address to the Argonauts (c. 64.22–24):

o nimis optato saeculorum tempore nati
 heroes, salvete, deum genus! o bona matrum
 progenies, salvete! iter<um, salvete, bonarum!> 23b
 vos ego saepe, meo vos carmine compellabo.

O, hail, heroes, offspring of gods, born in the happiest time of the
 ages! O noble children of <noble> mothers, hail <and hail ag>ain!
 You, yes, you I will often invoke in my song.¹⁶⁰

Catullus’ adaptation produces a more enthusiastic effect by modulating some of the proportions of the Apollonian original: the vocative address is lengthened to encompass all of line 22 and half of 23; the Salutation is expanded to include an impressive double- or, if the restoration of 23b is correct, even triple-*salvete*;¹⁶¹ and Anaphora of *vos* in 24 ratchets up the emotional intensity and effectively achieves two Ich-Du juxtapositions, arranged chiasmically almost back-to-back (*vos ego, meo vos*).¹⁶² Additionally, whereas Apollonius’ Envoi lacks a proper Poet’s

¹⁵⁸ For this misleading beginning, see especially Clare 1996: 60–65, who works out the complexities of Catullus’ “manipulation of reader expectation” (63) with particular nuance.

¹⁵⁹ Studies devoted to Catullus’ adaptation of the *Arg.* in c. 64 include Avallone 1953, Clare 1996, DeBrohun 2007, and now a full monograph, Calzascia 2015. Thomas 1982, which does not focus solely on Apollonian allusion, represents another major contribution.

¹⁶⁰ The restorations are those printed in Thomson 1997.

¹⁶¹ In defending this supplement, Thomson 1997 ad loc. compares the triple-*χαίρε* at the end of Callimachus’ *Hymn to Zeus* (91, 94). I have wondered if Callimachus’ triple Salutation could have been inspired in turn by the presence of “Rhapsodenvarianten” in his text of the *HHs* (Lenz 1975: 10 n. 2), which would have led to the doubling of the Salutation in a couple of hymns (1D.8–12, 18.10–12). Vox 2002: 162 n. 41 notes that Catullus’ use of *salvete* in this adaptation shows that he recognized *χαίρετε* and *ἴλατ[ε]* as interchangeable; see n. 170 below.

¹⁶² Catullus may be drawing out the much less prominent Ich-Du juxtaposition in his model, namely, Apollonius’ phrase *ἰκάνω | ὑμετέρων* (4.1775–1776), a first-person verb with enjambed second-person possessive pronoun (noted by Clare 2002: 284).

Task, Catullus' lacks a Prayer. Nevertheless, despite these differences, the core allusion to the *Arg.* is unmistakable in the phrase *heroes, salvete, deum genus* (23), an adaptation of Apollonius' Salutation (ἴλατ' ἀριστήων μακάρων γένος, 4.1773).¹⁶³ Line 24 evidently reworks the Apollonian Prayer for continued reperformances of the poet's songs in the future, but, as many Catullan commentators have noted (if not in these terms), the Roman poet's promise to invoke the Argonauts often in his song is also plainly a version of the Poet's Task, modeled on those in the *HHs*.¹⁶⁴ Catullus' adaptation may thus function as a two-tier allusion, clarifying the *HH* background of Apollonius' Prayer to the Argonauts.¹⁶⁵

b. Further Parallels for the Envoi from the Homeric Hymns

In sum, both internal evidence and comparison with parallel passages show that Apollonius' Envoi replicates the structure of those of the *HHs*, though our poet has followed the less common precedent of only a few *Hymns* that meld together the Poet's Task and the Prayer. In the next few pages, I continue to pursue the relationship between Apollonius' Envoi and those of the *HHs* by examining Apollonius' diction, in order to clarify the traditional background of his rhetoric here. I discuss four key words and phrases: 1) ἴλατ[ε], 2) μακάρων, 3) ἀοιδαὶ | ... γλυκερώτεραι, and 4) εἰς ἔτος ἐξ ἔτεος.¹⁶⁶

¹⁶³ West 1965. See further Section II.d below.

¹⁶⁴ In addition to the commentaries ad loc., see Perrotta 1931: 187 and Klinger 1964: 167–168.

¹⁶⁵ On two-tier allusions, see n. 138 in the Introduction.

¹⁶⁶ To be sure, Apollonius' Envoi does have important intertexts beyond the *HHs*. Worthy of mention here is Call. *Aetia* fr. 7.13–14, which uses the same Salutatory Verb (in a different dialect form: ἔλλατε) and prays to a group of divinities (the Charites) for a long afterlife for the poet's work (Gercke 1889: 249 with nn. 4–5, Fränkel 1968: 620, Vox 2002: 163, Hunter 2008: 122, and Harder 2012: 2.134). This passage occurs at the end of the first *aition*; tellingly, the poem's second *aition* concerns the Argonauts, and we can be confident that Apollonius does allude to this passage elsewhere (see n. 19 in Chapter 3).

1. Apollonius' Salutory Verb, ἴλατ[ε], is not restricted in its usage to the *HHs*; many Cultic Hymns use the verb ἰλάομαι and its cognate verbs (ἰλάσκομαι, ἰλήκω) and adjective (ἴλαος) in their Salutations. Indeed, this Salutory Verb is quite rare in the *HHs*, the great majority of which introduce the Salutation with either χαῖρε or χαίρετε. A few *HHs* do, however, use ἰλάομαι or ἰλήκω as the functional equivalent of χαίρω.¹⁶⁷ One example, which we have just encountered in a different connection above, is even aurally reminiscent of Apollonius' Envoi. The first *Homeric Hymn to Dionysus* concludes: "Be propitious, bull god, women-frenzied! We singers sing of you as we begin and as we end." (ἴληθ', Εἰραφιῶτα γυναιμανές· οἱ δέ σ' αἰδοί | ἄδομεν ἀρχόμενοι λίγγοντές τ', 1D.8–9). Line 8 ends after the bucolic dieresis with a clausula (οἱ δέ σ' αἰδοί) remarkably like that of *Arg.* 1773 (αἶδε δ' αἰδαί),¹⁶⁸ and the *figura etymologica* in αἰδοί | ἄδομεν may be picked up by Apollonius' αἰδαί ... αἰδεῖν (*Arg.* 4.1774–1775). In the next subsection of this chapter, I canvass Giangrande's view that Apollonius' Salutory Verb may be influenced by *HH* 3.165.

2. The Salutation hails the Argonauts as "blessed heroes" (ἀριστήων μακάρων), using an Honorific for which there is precedent in the Envois of some *HHs*, such as in the Prayer to Poseidon at *HH* 22.7.¹⁶⁹ A slightly more precise parallel is to be found, yet again, in the

¹⁶⁷ *HH* 1D.8, 3.165, 20.8, 23.4, passages variously adduced by Stenzel 1908: 13–14, Phinney 1963: 158 n. 3, Fränkel 1968: 620, Albis 1996: 39 n. 61, and Haubold 2001: 26 n. 20; see also Vox 2002: 163 n. 46, 164 for these and other parallels. Additionally, two Envois include the formula "I seek your favor with my song" (ἴλαμαι δέ σ' αἰδοί, 19.48, 21.5; adduced by Fränkel 1968: 620). For the equivalence between forms of χαίρω and ἰλάομαι in this context, see Bundy 1972: 51 and Janko 1981: 16.

¹⁶⁸ The echo is duly cited by Campbell 1981: 90.

¹⁶⁹ Stenzel 1908: 13 n. 1. *HH* 22.7 is a weak parallel for *Arg.* 4.1773, but the context, a Prayer for sailors, is at least suggestive for the *Arg.*; *n.b.* that the Argonauts erect an altar to Poseidon just some 150 lines before the Envoi (at 4.1620–1622). *N.b.* that μακάρια also appears in one manuscript (M) in a variant reading of the Salutation to Aphrodite at *HH* 10.4. Beyond the *HHs*, Vox 2002: 163 adduces as a parallel fr. ep. adesp. 10 Davies (= the "hymn fragment" printed in West 2003a: 220–221), which the lexicographer Aelius Dionysius (*Attic Lexicon* α 76 Erbse) quotes as a typical example of how a rhapsode begins an Envoi: "But now, blessed gods, be unstinting of blessings" (νῦν δὲ θεοὶ μακάρεσσι τῶν ἐσθλῶν ἄφθονοι ἔσστε). This fragment provides an interesting glimpse of Rhapsodic Hymns that were not included in the Homeric collection—if, that is, Aelius has not made it up himself *exempli gratia*.

Homeric Hymn to Apollo—this time in the Salutation that rounds off its prelude, which is itself structured as a miniature hymn: “Hail, O blessed Leto” (χαῖρε μάκαρ’ ὦ Λητοῖ, 3.14). Here the form of μάκαρ occurs in the Salutation itself, as in *Arg.* 4.1773. There is another reason to think that Apollonius might have had his eye on this verse of *Apollo*. Humans never use the emotive particle ὦ in addressing deities in the HEs,¹⁷⁰ but a handful of exceptions can be found in two of the *HHs* (3.14, 179, 526; 26.11), on whose authority Apollonius seems to have allowed himself three such usages, which are limited to just two passages (2.213; 4.1411, 1414).¹⁷¹ Of these, the Salutation to Leto, together with the Salutation to Dionysus at *HH* 26.11 (another intertext for the Envoi, quoted below), is significant for Apollonius because it features a postponed ὦ (χαῖρε μάκαρ’ ὦ Λητοῖ). The HEs have some “secular” examples of this anastrophe in addresses to mortals,¹⁷² but in an address to deities, postponed ὦ is a decidedly “hymnic” affectation suggestive of religious enthusiasm.¹⁷³ It is thus telling, given Apollonius’ fastidious use of the particle, that he permits postponed ὦ in only one passage, namely, Orpheus’ Invocation of the Hesperides at *Arg.* 4.1411 (δαίμονες ὦ καλαὶ καὶ εὐφρονες);¹⁷⁴ he may well have done so under the auspices of *HH* 3.14 and 26.11.

If this line really is the very beginning of an Envoi, the lack of a separate Salutation is surprising, and the generic address to the “blessed gods” rather than an individual addressee is strikingly un-Homeric.

¹⁷⁰ See Gildersleeve and Miller 1903: 197.

¹⁷¹ See Giangrande 1968: 52 on the (major) *HHs* and 53–54 on the *Arg.*

¹⁷² See *Il.* 4.189 and *Od.* 8.408 (= 18.121, 20.199), and Harder 2012: 2.775 for further examples and references for postponed ὦ.

¹⁷³ See the parallels collected by AHS ad *HH* 3.14.

¹⁷⁴ Giangrande 1968: 57, who notes in the same place that Callimachus admits this usage once in his *Hymns* as well, in his Salutation to Delos (4.325). This passage, it should be pointed out, concludes by mentioning Leto in the next line (326). Is Callimachus pointing up the source of his usage (*HH* 3.14)? *N.b.* that another postponed ὦ occurs in an apostrophe to Pelion in line 118—in a speech spoken by Leto herself.

3. The motif of the “sweetness” of song (ᾠοῖδαι | ... γλυκερώτεραι, *Arg.* 4.1773–1774) is not very striking in itself, finding numerous parallels in lyric poetry.¹⁷⁵ In early hexameter poetry, however, this noun-adjective pairing particularly recalls the Envoi of another hymn I have already had occasion to quote above, the midlength *Hymn to Dionysus* (7.58–59): “[T]here is no way to adorn sweet song while heedless of you [*sc.* Dionysus]” (οὐδέ πη ἔστι | σεῖό γε ληθόμενον γλυκερὴν κοσμηῆσαι ᾠοιδίην, 7.58–59).¹⁷⁶ I argued above that this statement can be interpreted at least partly as a Prayer for Dionysus to adorn the speaker’s song, given the other *HHs* that offer Prayer for the aesthetic success of the hymnist’s song.¹⁷⁷ If Apollonius did not have *HH* 7.58–59 itself in mind in composing his Envoi, he could at least draw on this category of Prayer in the *HHs* as precedent for his Prayer for the increasing sweetness of his songs.

4. One final element that may derive from the *HHs* is Apollonius’ reference to the reperformance of his songs “year after year” (εἰς ἔτος ἐξ ἔτεος, 4.1774). This temporal expression could represent a studied variation on a pair of comparable phrases in the Envoi of yet another of the *Dionysus* hymns (26.11–13):¹⁷⁸

καὶ σὺ μὲν οὕτω χαῖρε, πολυστάφυλ’ ὦ Διόνυσε·
 δὸς δ’ ἡμᾶς χαίροντας ἐς ὥρας αὖτις ἰκέσθαι,
 ἐκ δ’ αὖθ’ ὥράων εἰς τοὺς πολλοὺς ἐνιαυτούς.

And so hail to you, Dionysus of the abundant grape clusters! Grant
 that we may come again in happiness at the due time, and time
after time for many a year.

¹⁷⁵ E.g., see Livrea 1973 ad loc.

¹⁷⁶ Campbell 1981: 90, Gummert 1992: 130, and Belloni 1995: 174–175. The lattermost scholar finds programmatic significance in Apollonius’ use of this adjective to describe his songs. See further Phinney 1963: 159 n. 4, who cites some Prayers from the *HHs* and further parallels from lyric poetry.

¹⁷⁷ See pp. 104–105.

¹⁷⁸ Adduced by Fränkel 1968: 620 and De Martino 1984–1985: 104. The phrase appears also in seemingly unrelated passages in Theocritus (*Id.* 18.15, 25.124); see the comment of Gow 1952 on the former passage.

The parallel is semantic rather than lexical: where the hymn has ἐς ὥρας ... | ἐκ ... ὥράων, Apollonius has the tighter expression εἰς ἔτος ἐξ ἔτεος, using a different noun that is synonymous, however, with the hymn's other temporal noun, ἐνιαυτούς. But the real value of this parallel lies in the hymn's reference to an annual religious festival as the context for its performance,¹⁷⁹ because the hymnic style of Apollonius' Envoi combined with a wish for yearly reperformance may evoke just such a fictive performance context as the setting of his narration. Indeed, as Hunter notes, annual reperformances would be particularly appropriate to the worship of heroes like the Argonauts, as Hunter suggests: "It is tempting to associate the hoped-for annual repetition of the epic (4.1774) by men (ἄνθρωποις), as distinguished from the μακάρων γένος, with the annual performances which characterised hero-cult."¹⁸⁰

c. Apollonius' Envoi and HH 3.165–176

Another intertext from the *HHs* for Apollonius' Envoi deserves its own discussion. Giangrande has advanced as Apollonius' primary model in the Envoi the famous *sphragis* from the major *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*.¹⁸¹ We have already noted an intertext with Apollonius' introit in the section of the hymn that describes the marvelous performance of the Delian maidens (3.156–161).¹⁸² A few lines after that passage, the hymnist modifies and "secularizes"

¹⁷⁹ See Section II.c in the Introduction.

¹⁸⁰ Hunter 1993: 128. Vox 2002: 166 n. 59 notes the reference to a religious festival, the Hydrophoria, in the αἴτιον immediately preceding the Envoi. I would emphasize that Apollonius here conjures a probably fictive performance context, since no cults for the Argonauts as a collective are known; see McNelis 2003: 159: "recollection of hero-cult in Alexandrian literature need not be tied to actual religious practice." For the Envoi's presupposition of the Argonauts' cultic status, see below, in Section II.d.

¹⁸¹ Giangrande 1968: 56 n. 1, followed by James 1981: 83, De Martino 1984–1985: 104, Grillo 1988: 58 n. 157, Albis 1996: 40–42, Vox 2002: 166, and Green 2007 ad *Arg.* 4.1773.

¹⁸² See pp. 89–92 above.

the typical *HH* Envoi formulas, applying them not to gods but to the Delian maidens themselves, in order to dismiss them as subjects of praise (165–176):¹⁸³

ἀλλ' ἄγεθ' ἰλήκοι μὲν Ἀπόλλων Ἀρτέμιδι ζύν,	165
χαίρετε δ' ὑμεῖς πᾶσαι· ἐμεῖο δὲ καὶ μετόπισθε	
μνήσασθ', ὅπποτε κέν τις ἐπιχθονίων ἀνθρώπων	
ἐνθάδ' ἀνείρηται ξεῖνος ταλαπεῖριος ἐλθών·	
“ὦ κοῦραι, τίς δ' ὑμῖν ἀνὴρ ἥδιστος ἀοιδῶν	
ἐνθάδε πωλεῖται, καὶ τέω τέρπεσθε μάλιστα;”	170
ὑμεῖς δ' εὖ μάλα πᾶσαι ὑποκρίνασθαι ἀφήμως·	
“τυφλὸς ἀνὴρ, οἰκεῖ δὲ Χίῳ ἐνὶ παιπαλοέσση·	
τοῦ πᾶσαι μετόπισθεν ἀριστεύουσιν ἀοιδαί.”	
ἡμεῖς δ' ὑμέτερον κλέος οἴσομεν, ὅσσον ἐπ' αἴαν	
ἀνθρώπων στρεφόμεσθα πόλεις εὖ ναιεταώσας·	175
οἱ δ' ἐπὶ δὴ πείσονται, ἐπεὶ καὶ ἐτήτυμόν ἐστιν.	

But now, may Apollo be favorable, together with Artemis, and hail, all you [Delian maidens]! Think of me in future, if ever some long-suffering stranger comes here and asks, “O maidens, which of the singers who visit here do you consider sweetest, and whom do you enjoy most?” Then you must all answer with one voice, “It is a blind man, and he lives in rocky Chios; all of his songs remain supreme afterwards.” And we will carry your reputation wherever we go as we roam the well-ordered cities of men, and they will believe it, because it is true.

That Apollonius took an active interest in this passage is proved by his allusion to it in Orpheus’ hymn to Apollo in Book 2, which uses a very similar form of the *hapax legomenon* ἰλήκοι with reference to the same god (ἰλήκοις, “be gracious,” 2.708).¹⁸⁴ Giangrande even suggests that the hymn’s ἰλήκοι influenced Apollonius’ cognate Salutatory Verb ἴλατ[ε] (4.1773). In any case, this passage is well-known for its identification of the narrator as a blind man from Chios, i.e., as

¹⁸³ On the rhetoric of this passage, see the careful analysis of Miller 1979 (summarized in *idem* 1986: 60–62).

¹⁸⁴ Vox 1999: 166, who further notes a pair of two-tier allusions in later texts that connect *Arg.* 2.708 to its hymnic model. The verb ἰλήκω is quite rare, a *hapax* in Apollonius as well as both the *Odyssey* and the collection of *HHs*. Remarkably, in all three cases Apollo is the grammatical subject, but the *Odyssey* passage, in which the suitors revile Eumaeus (21.363–365), seems to have little in common with Apollonius’ usage. *N.b.* that before Apollonius, Arat. *Phaen.* 637 uses the verb ἰλήκοι, evidently also with an eye to *HH* 3.165. Kidd 1997 ad loc. suggests that Apollonius imitates Aratus’ usage in a different passage (*Arg.* 4.984–985), as do Livrea 1973 ad *Arg.* 4.984 and Vian 2002: 3.112 n. 4.

Homer himself,¹⁸⁵ and for that reason it might be expected to have caught the interest of a Homeric scholar like Apollonius.

Giangrande proffers a few specific parallels between our passages: “the motifs of sweetness of epic” (γλυκερώτεραι, *Arg.* 4.1774; ἥδιστος ἀοιδῶν, *HH* 3.169)¹⁸⁶ “and of survival of such epic” (ἀοιδαὶ | εἰς ἔτος ἐξ ἔτεος, *Arg.* 4.1774; τοῦ πᾶσαι μετόπισθεν ἀριστεύουσιν ἀοιδαί, *HH* 3.173). He notes that the nominative plural form ἀοιδαί occurs only here in both the *Arg.* (4.1773) and all of Homeric ἔπος (*HH* 3.173); indeed, I would add that ἀοιδαί occupies the same metrical *sedes* in both passages,¹⁸⁷ and in each case a line-initial ἀνθρώποις or ἀνθρώπων follows two lines later.¹⁸⁸ More generally, it is notable that here the *Apollo* hymnist apostrophizes a group—a relative rarity in both the HEs and the *HHs*, which are generally addressed to only one or sometimes two divinities;¹⁸⁹ moreover, both groups consist of mortals (whether heroized or not) who are addressed with formulas otherwise reserved for the gods in the *HHs*. It is furthermore striking that the hymnist envisions a reciprocal χάρις-relationship between himself and his plural addressees of the very sort that Apollonius’ Prayer does: the hymnist and his (current) subjects, the Delian maidens, are to spread each other’s κλέος, much as Apollonius hopes that the Argonauts will grant his poem, written in their honor, an enduring afterlife.

¹⁸⁵ See further n. 87 in the Introduction.

¹⁸⁶ Cf. Belloni 1995: 175.

¹⁸⁷ The same could be said of ἀοιδαί in Theocr. *Id.* 22.223, also adduced by Giangrande; this passage in fact explicitly refers to Homer as “the Chian bard” (Χῖος ἀοιδός, 218).

¹⁸⁸ The hymnist’s ἀριστεύουσιν ἀοιδαί (173) may also find an echo in Apollonius’ ἀριστήων ... ἀοιδαί (4.1773).

¹⁸⁹ In fact, the HE narrator never apostrophizes any plurality other than the Muses (Grillo 1988: 52 n. 139). A few *HHs* are dedicated to pairs of divinities: both hymns to the Dioscuri (17, 33), to be sure (Gummert 1992: 129–130 n. 43), but also the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, which is really also “to Persephone” (*n.b.* 2.1–2, 490–495; Suter 2002: 11); cf. the *Homeric Hymn to Hestia* (29), which introduces Hermes as a second Hymnic Subject in its latter half. The one *HH* to address more than two deities is the irregular twenty-fifth, which is dedicated to Zeus, Apollo, and the Muses.

Before moving on from this passage, I would like to venture a tentative suggestion. The referent of the pronoun ἡμεῖς in line 174 may be regarded as the hymnist (“Homer”), using the first-person plural for singular;¹⁹⁰ but this passage has also been interpreted as a reference to the Homeridae, the group of Chian rhapsodes who took their name from the original bard whose poetry they supposedly inherited and performed.¹⁹¹ This possibility is striking because Apollonius’ Prayer to the Argonauts can be interpreted in an analogous way. The wording of his wish (αἶδε δ’ ἀοιδὰι | εἰς ἔτος ἔξ ἔτεος γλυκερώτεραι εἶεν ἀείδειν | ἀνθρώποις, *Arg.* 4.1773–1775) is ambiguous: it could mean “[M]ay these songs year after year be sweeter for men to sing” or “[M]ay these songs year after year be sweeter to sing to men.”¹⁹² Moreover, both of these possibilities can be imagined in different ways: we might think of a reader “singing” or reciting the text aloud, as the ancients typically did, either alone or with others listening along;¹⁹³ or we could picture a performer singing Apollonius’ material before an audience, in a number of different contexts, such as an ἐπίδειξις or a rhapsodic performance.¹⁹⁴ This last option is especially intriguing given Albis’ argument that Apollonius’ introit evokes a rhapsodic performance context. Thus interpreted, Apollonius’ hope that other singers will perform his songs into the indefinite future finds a good parallel in the Homeridae’s claim to pass down and

¹⁹⁰ For the interchangeability of the first-person plural and singular in certain contexts in Homer, see Floyd 1969.

¹⁹¹ For this reading, see Dyer 1975 and Graziosi 2002: 65. This interpretation may be further related to the view, attested in a scholium to Pindar (ad *Nem.* 2.1c Drachmann), that the “Homeric” *Hymn to Apollo* was forged in Homer’s name by one Cynaethus, a prominent Homerid; see n. 91 in the Introduction.

¹⁹² Race 2008: 471 with n. 204.

¹⁹³ See n. 6 above.

¹⁹⁴ See n. 43 above.

reperform the songs of Homer, which “remain supreme afterwards (μετόπισθεν).”¹⁹⁵ Could Apollonius’ conclusion (boldly? facetiously?) suggest his desire to inaugurate his own rhapsodic tradition—a clan of “Apolloniadae,” as it were, singing his songs forevermore?¹⁹⁶ The parallel with the *sphragis* of the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* raises this possibility.

d. The Text and Significance of Arg. 4.1773

In the foregoing subsections, I hope to have shown that several major structural and rhetorical parallels with the Envois of the *HHs* recognizably establish Apollonius’ own Envoi within the Rhapsodic Hymnic tradition. Now, I wish to address a major point of interpretation that I have so far left to the side: how can the Argonauts be saluted and prayed to in the style of the *HHs* if they are mortals? The answer, as many critics have seen, lies in the distinctive Greek institution of “hero cult.”¹⁹⁷ I take this point up at length in Chapter 2, but for now suffice it to say that the Greeks worshipped the powerful dead as “heroes,” who were thought capable of exercising their supernatural influence from beyond the grave and who were sometimes actually envisioned as living out an immortal afterlife in a paradise like Elysium or the Islands of the Blessed. By saluting the Argonauts in hymnic style and even praying to them, the narrator makes clear that in these lines he regards his protagonists precisely in their present-day capacity as “cult heroes” who have been divinized after death.¹⁹⁸

¹⁹⁵ Cf. Pindar’s description of the preservation of Ajax’s fame through rhapsodic reperformances of Homeric poetry for future generations (*Isthm.* 4.37–39, with Currie 2005: 76).

¹⁹⁶ Cf. Albis 1996: 42: “Apollonius envisions for his *Argonautica* a future of performance, such as he knew had been granted Homer since the distant past.”

¹⁹⁷ See, e.g., George 1977: 363 n. 5; Hunter 1993: 8, 128; and the studies cited below in connection with the text of *Arg.* 4.1773.

¹⁹⁸ *N.b.* that the Apollonian narrator has just emphasized the temporal distance between the Argonauts’ mortal careers and his own time with the Hydrophoria etiology that immediately precedes the Envoi (at 4.1770–1772). We

This insight has direct relevance to a vexed textual problem in the Salutation at *Arg.* 4.1773. The manuscripts all read ἴλατ' ἀριστήων μακάρων γένος (“Be gracious, you race of blessed heroes”),¹⁹⁹ which is the reading I have adopted in this dissertation and, indeed, in its title. But in his 1961 OCT, Fränkel emended ἀριστήων from a genitive modifying γένος to an independent vocative in apposition to it: ἴλατ' ἀριστήες, μακάρων γένος (“Be gracious, heroes, offspring of the blessed ones”).²⁰⁰ Fränkel explains the emendation in his app. crit.:

μάκαρες apud Apollonium (17ies) dei sunt, at Argonautae non dei erant sed deorum proles (e.gr. iii. 402 θεῶν γένος [i.e., “descendants of gods”], ii. 1223 μακάρων σχεδὸν αἵματος ἐκγεγαῶτας [i.e., “closely related by blood to the blessed gods”]), neque aliter turba illa poterat vocari γένος (v. ad i. 548). [bracketed translations added]

Fränkel’s first point, that it would be inappropriate to apply the adjective μάκαρες (“blessed”) to the Argonauts when Apollonius uses it elsewhere only of gods,²⁰¹ precisely misses the hymnic context of *Arg.* 4.1773, where the Argonauts are no longer regarded as mortal heroes of the age of myth but as divinized heroes capable of worship in the narrator’s present.²⁰² Indeed, Livrea points out that Apollonius’ Salutory Verb ἴλατε, in this form, is associated exclusively with

might interpret this passage as a “Prolongation,” a section at the end of some Mythic narratives in the *HHs* that bridges the Myth and the Envoi by transitioning from the past tense into the omnitemporal present. See n. 67 in the Introduction.

¹⁹⁹ I quote Race’s translation here, as elsewhere, but *n.b.* that ἀριστήες does not literally mean “hero” but something like “best men” or “excellent men”; it is one of several terms by which Apollonius regularly denotes the Argonauts.

²⁰⁰ Fränkel’s emendation has been adopted in the editions and translations of Vian, Paduano and Fusillo, Gleis and Natzel-Gleis, Green, and Hunter, whereas Livrea, Valverde Sánchez, Dräger, and Race retain the traditional reading.

²⁰¹ This argument is reproduced by Vian 2002: 3.222 and Hunter 2015 ad loc.

²⁰² Phinney 1963: 158 n. 1, Giangrande 1968: 56 n. 1, and James 1981: 83–84. Curiously, Beye 1982: 14 does not consider the Argonauts to have been divinized, but he is nevertheless untroubled by the application of the epithet μάκαρ to the Argonauts in light of the “hymnlike” quality of the poem’s ending. Cuypers 2004: 45 likewise denies the full weight of “race of blessed ones” by interpreting it metaphorically: “The Argonauts, it is suggested, have become immortal; not because, as their one-time companion and all-time *exemplum*, Heracles, they have gained a seat on Olympus, but because Apollonius has immortalized them with his epic, which he prays will be ‘sung’ forever.”

deities elsewhere in the *Arg.* (4.984, 1333, 1411),²⁰³ so that Fränkel’s emendation would not even remove the perceived problem of diction appropriate only to divinities in this passage—to say nothing of the Prayer made to the Argonauts in the following sentence, which presupposes their divinization.

Fränkel’s second point, that the Argonauts cannot be called a γένος except in the sense of “offspring,”²⁰⁴ is contradicted by one of the passages that he himself cites: at *Arg.* 1.548–549, at the launch of the Argo, the gods look down upon “the race of demigods, the best of men who then were sailing over the sea” (ἡμιθέων ἀνδρῶν γένος, οἱ τότε ἄριστοι | πόντον ἐπιπλώεσκον).²⁰⁵ The key to interpreting Apollonius’ use of γένος in this passage is his close adaptation therein of the phrase that denotes the heroes in Hesiod’s myth of the Five Ages: “the godly race of men-heroes, who are called demigods” (ἀνδρῶν ἡρώων θεῖον γένος, οἱ καλέονται | ἡμίθεοι, *Op.* 159–160).²⁰⁶ Thus at the beginning of their voyage (*Arg.* 1.548), Apollonius portrays the Argonauts as representatives of Hesiod’s entire Age of Heroes;²⁰⁷ it is eminently fitting that Apollonius would evoke this macroscopic conception again at the end of their voyage, and of his narrative.²⁰⁸ Notably, Catullus brings out this dimension of Apollonius’ Salutation in his

²⁰³ *N.b.*, however, the use of the singular ἴλαθι at *Arg.* 4.1014, in Medea’s supplication of Arete, and of the infinitive ἰλάεσθαι at 4.479 for the expiation of bloodguilt. See further George 1977: 363 n. 5 and Hitch 2012: 141 n. 32, 157.

²⁰⁴ Vian 2002: 3.222 ad loc. repeats this argument as well.

²⁰⁵ Fränkel’s note in the app. crit ad 1.548 glosses the phrase in context as ‘[dei] suam prolem . . . spectabant,’ which can hardly work with the genitive phrase ἡμιθέων ἀνδρῶν attached to γένος. See further James 1981: 84 and Hitch 2012: 157 n. 71.

²⁰⁶ Fränkel himself used the Hesiodic allusion here to argue for the reading γένος in 1.548 over the variant μένος (1964: 134–137). For more on this allusion, see Section II.c of Chapter 2.

²⁰⁷ Apollonius may have felt entitled to take such license in light of *Il.* 12.23, where those who died at Troy cannot constitute literally the entire ἡμιθέων γένος ἀνδρῶν. On this passage, see Chapter 2, Section II.c.

²⁰⁸ For *Arg.* 4.1773 as evoking Hes. *Op.* 159, see Händel 1954: 48, Livrea 1983: 426, Grillo 1988: 58 n. 154, Belloni 1995: 178, Vox 2002: 162–163, Martin *ap.* Vian 2002: 3.145–146 n. 5, and Green 2007 ad loc. Theocritus’ hymn to the Dioscuri (*Id.* 22) similarly broadens out in its Envoi to embrace the heroes (ἡρώεσσιν, 216) of the Trojan War

imitation of *Arg.* 4.1773 at c. 64.22–23, quoted already above: “O, hail, heroes, offspring of gods, born in the happiest time of the ages!” (*o nimis optato saeculorum tempore nati* | *heroes, salвете deum genus!*). The “happiest time of the ages” is the Hesiodic Age of Heroes, for which the Catullan narrator feels a strong nostalgia amidst the present degeneracy of the Iron Age.²⁰⁹ The internal echo of *Arg.* 1.548 at 4.1773 can also be appreciated as reflective of the change in status that the Argonauts have undergone after death: whereas in life they were a “race of demigods” (ἡμιθέων ἀνδρῶν γένος), in death they have become a “race of blessed heroes” (ἀριστήων μακάρων γένος).²¹⁰ The adjective *μάκαρες* signals their transformation into cult heroes and suggests their present existence on the Islands of the Blessed, which Hesiod specifies as the fate of the heroes immortalized by Zeus in his myth of the Five Ages (ἐν μακάρων νήσοισι, *Op.* 171).²¹¹

In sum, Fränkel’s arguments for emending ἀριστήων are not persuasive. Fränkel’s procedure is also vulnerable to criticism in its own right. As Livrea argues, the emendation can be rejected on text-critical grounds according to the principle of *utrum in alterum abiturum erat?* (also formulated as *lectio difficilior potior*): ἀριστήων μακάρων γένος is a more difficult and

era generally (214–223). The Salutation of Aratus’ Hymnic Proem to Zeus might likewise end by pairing its proper Hymnic Subject with the heroes, at least on one ancient interpretation of the phrase *προτέρη γενεή* (see Σ and Kidd 1997 ad *Arat. Phaen.* 16). *N.b.* further those *HHs* whose Salutations are extended from the Hymnic Subject announced in the Exordium to include “all goddesses as well” (θεαί θ’ ἅμα πᾶσαι, 9.7, 14.6; see also 27.21).

²⁰⁹ See on this theme, e.g., Harmon 1973.

²¹⁰ Hitch 2012: 146, 156–157, and Belloni 2017: 94–96. *N.b.* as well the argument that ἀριστήων μακάρων represents a pointed reversal, or *oppositio in imitando*, of the Homeric phrase ἄνδρες ἀριστῆες (Giangrande 1968: 56 n. 1 and Livrea 1973 ad *Arg.* 4.1773). Campbell 1976: 338 dismisses this view as “bizarre” without argument.

²¹¹ Dräger 2002 ad loc. and Hitch 2012: 157. See further the discussion of Hesiodic heroism in Chapter 2, Section II.c. The name “Islands of the Blessed” likens the immortalized heroes’ postmortem existence to that of the “blessed” gods (Roloff 1970: 98). See further, e.g., Pind. *Pyth.* 5.94–95, of Battus, the founder of Cyrene: “He was blessed while he dwelt among men, and afterwards a hero worshiped by his people” (μάκαρ μὲν ἀνδρῶν μέτα | ἔβαιεν, ἦρως δ’ ἔπειτα λαοσεβής).

unusual phrase and thus, if it were not the accurate reading, would have likelier been altered to the easier (and, as Livrea says, “banalizzante”) ἀριστῆες, μακάρων γένος than vice versa.²¹²

Nevertheless, Fränkel’s emendation has found a strong ally in West, who first adduced Catullus’ adaptation at *c.* 64.23 (*heroes, salвете, deum genus!* [“Hail, heroes, offspring of gods”]) to support Fränkel’s correction (ἴλατ’ ἀριστῆες, μακάρων γένος, *Arg.* 4.1773).²¹³ The correspondence is indeed striking; Catullus seems virtually to have translated Apollonius’ text precisely as Fränkel has corrected it. I am not convinced, however, of the methodological validity in this case of using an allusion in a later text to correct its model, especially when the reasons brought against the validity of the original, much richer reading have turned out to be dubious. Can Catullus’ imitation “confirm” an emendation that has nothing else to recommend it? As students of intertextuality well know, allusions regularly involve transformations or even “corrections” of their models, and Catullus might have had any number of reasons to make the slight tweak from “race of blessed heroes” to “heroes, offspring of the blessed ones.” For instance, he could be “contaminating” *Arg.* 4.1773 with another Apollonian *locus*, such as 3.402 (θεῶν γένος, “descendants of gods”).²¹⁴ Such an alteration would be of a piece with his strong thematic interest in the birth of his heroes in *c.* 64 (*n.b. nati*, 21), for their very existence testifies to the unions of gods (*deum*, 22) and mortals (*matrum*, 22) that used to transpire in former times (cf. 382–396), and of which the marriage of Peleus and Thetis is a banner example. Catullus’

²¹² Livrea 1983: 426.

²¹³ West 1965. Vian 2002: 3.145 n. 5 seems to view this argument as particularly decisive in favor of Fränkel’s emendation. Köhnken 2010: 143 asserts that Apollonius modeled ἀριστῆες, μακάρων γένος on Medea’s address to the heroes at the beginning of Pindar’s Argonautic narrative (παῖδες ὑπερθύμων τε φωτῶν καὶ θεῶν [“sons of great-hearted men and gods”], *Pyth.* 4.13), but the parallel is not especially compelling.

²¹⁴ Adduced by, e.g., Perrotta 1931: 188 and Thomson 1997 ad Catull. *c.* 64.23.

transformation would also serve to deemphasize the motif of hero cult, which was an essentially Greek, not Roman, phenomenon.²¹⁵

Ultimately, this debate is not the most consequential, because, even in the reading ἀριστῆες μακάρων γένος, both the meanings “heroes, offspring of the blessed ones” and “heroes, race of blessed ones” are possible.²¹⁶ Thus Hunter opines, “Fränkel is correct that the basic meaning is ‘offspring of the gods’, but the Hesiodic background adds the resonance ‘race of blessed heroes.’”²¹⁷ My preference is for the arresting expression “blessed heroes” of the manuscript tradition, but the major point I would emphasize here is that the Envoi presents the Argonauts as heroes divinized after death.

III. Re-Reading the Introit in Light of the Envoi

The foregoing section has fleshed out the traditional background provided by the *HHs* for the structure, diction, and substance of Apollonius’ Envoi. Much more could be said about the Envoi, but at this point, I would like to underline two essential points that have emerged from my analysis:

- 1) The *Arg.* ends with a hymnic conclusion on the model of the *HHs*; and
- 2) This Envoi unambiguously salutes and prays to the Argonauts, who now must be regarded in their capacity as divinized heroes.

²¹⁵ See, e.g., *ThesCRA* 2.151, 186–187.

²¹⁶ Cuypers 2004: 45. As she notes (*ibid.* n. 7), the latter interpretation gives point to the enjambed ἀνθρώποις (1775), “for humans” (as opposed to μάκαρες); see further Hunter 1993: 128.

²¹⁷ Hunter 1993: 128 n. 108. Thus Belloni 2017: 95, for instance, follows Fränkel’s text but apparently understands μακάρων γένος at 4.1773 as “race of blessed ones,” in a purposeful variation on the similar phrase at 1.548. See further Green 2007 with his note ad loc.

These data have important ramifications for the reader's re-interpretation of the introit and, indeed, the poem as a whole. Both the introit and the Envoi of the *Arg.* have "hymnic" elements and thus jointly make up the poem's "hymnic frame," but the introit is, as we have seen, highly ambiguous: it is capable of multiple interpretations, some of which are not "hymnic" at all. The Envoi, however, clarifies the import of the "hymnic frame" considerably. If the *Arg.* ends with a hymnic conclusion, then the reader may safely assume that the entire poem has been a hymn "all along," for the simple reason that this highly distinctive closural device is characteristic of this type of discourse (the *HH*) and thus marks the poem as such.²¹⁸ And as the recipients of the poet's Salutation and Prayer, the subject of that hymn must be the Argonauts. In light of the Envoi, Williams et al. are not wrong to consider the entire *Arg.* to be a sort of hymn, but the poem cannot be construed as a hymn to Apollo, since if it were, the god would have been named in the hymn's Salutation.²¹⁹ The Envoi rather presents the *Arg.* as a Homeric-style hymn to the Argonauts themselves, who have, indeed, been the poem's subject throughout.²²⁰

²¹⁸ Haubold (2001: 24, 39) emphasizes that within the body of early Greek hexameter poetry, the *HHs* alone possess a fixed ending, which is thus the most distinctive characteristic of their structure; see further Ford 2011: 107, and cf. the open-endedness of early epics (Valverde Sánchez 1996: 33–34). An interesting parallel that shows the difference an ending can make is presented by the transmission history of Theocritus' incomplete twenty-fourth *Idyll*. The *Herakliskos* was long considered purely an epyllion until a papyrus find turned up its hymnic Envoi and retrospectively revealed that the poem had been a hymn all along (Barber 1968: 269).

²¹⁹ Williams 1991: 304 actually cites the hymnic conclusion of the *Arg.* as evidence for her interpretation of the poem as a quasi-hymn to Apollo, but with a revealing concession: "The epic closes with an invocation (ἵλατ' IV.1773) which is standard at the end of hymns, although here it is addressed to the heroes, not to Apollo" (emphasis added). Cf. also the intermediate position of Cuypers 2004: 45: "The epilogue resumes the genre of the poem: hymn. However, what started out as a hymn to Apollo now ends as a hymn to the Argonauts." Klooster 2013a: 163 expresses a similar view. I have argued in Section I.e, however, that whereas the introit can be regarded as a Hymnic Proem, there are serious problems with reading it as an Exordium to the poem *in toto* as a hymn to Apollo. Moreover, this "mixed hymn" view misses the flexibility of the introit, which can be read without hymnic overtones or, indeed, as the Exordium of a hymn to the Argonauts, as I argue below. Finally, whereas *HH 29* shows that a second Hymnic Subject can be introduced and hailed in the Salutation, the original Subject is never left out of the Envoi (Janko 1981: 17), as Apollo would be at *Arg.* 4.1773.

²²⁰ Scholars have been surprisingly reluctant to declare outright that the *Arg.* is a hymn to the Argonauts, but for this view, see Phinney 1963: 158, Sistikou 2001: 260 with n. 71, and especially Hunter 1996: 46, who also notes the "Homeric" inflection of the poem *qua* hymn. Klooster 2011: 88 asserts that "surely it goes too far to claim, as some have done, that the whole *Argonautica* is intended as one long hymnic proem"—I would prefer "one long hymn"—

This interpretation seems to me demanded by the Envoi, but its real “test” is its compatibility with the hymnic elements in the introit. After all, it is easy to imagine our first-time readers thoroughly surprised and perhaps confused by the poem’s sudden hymnic ending. If they now decide to become re-readers of Apollonius’ epic, will it be possible for them to fit the introit into a coherent understanding of the whole *Arg.* as a unified, Homeric-style hymn to the Argonauts? No less than their Envois, the Exordia of *HHs* abide by a more or less fixed set of conventions that we should expect the *Arg.* introit to follow if it does indeed possess, as I claim, a Homeric-hymnic frame.

Accordingly, I now revisit the introit in order to demonstrate that it can indeed be read as an Exordium to an Argonautic hymn. The focus will be the critical portion of the introit in which most of its “hymnic” elements are concentrated, 1.1–2:²²¹

Ἀρχόμενος σέο, Φοῖβε, παλαιγενέων κλέα φωτῶν
μνήσομαι, οἷ...

Beginning with you, Phoebus, I shall recall the famous deeds of
people born long ago, who...

As discussed in the Introduction, both Archaic epics and rhapsodic hymns begin according to the same conventions, and so on a first reading it would be easy to regard Apollonius’ introit as more or less standardly epic.²²² In light of the poem’s hymnic Envoi, however, this line and a half can be appreciated anew. In proper Homeric-hymnic style, the Argonauts are named as the Hymnic

but she offers no argument as to how or why “it goes too far.” Klooster’s own view is that the hymnic frame is designed to link Apollonius’ poetry to the songs of Orpheus, which are frequently hymnic (*ibid.* 87–91). I agree that Orpheus is important as an internal “alter-ego” of the hymnic narrator (see Chapter 4), but I see no reason why this parallel should prevent us from interpreting the hymnic frame as, precisely, a framing device that structures the *Arg.* as a hymn.

²²¹ The only potentially “hymnic” element not found in these lines is the second-person pronoun *τεῖν* in line 8, though as noted above in the discussion of *HH* 21, most of the *HHs* restrict the use of Du-Stil to their Envois.

²²² As, e.g., Händel 1954: 9–10 does.

Subject in Er-Stil using an oblique case (παλαιγενέων ... φωτῶν, to be qualified further in the relative clause). μνήσομαι serves as the Evocatory Verb—an unusual usage in the *HHs*, to be sure, but one that is paralleled by *HH* 3.1 (Μνήσομαι οὐδὲ λάθωμαι Ἀπόλλωνος ἑκάτοιο) and 7.1–2 (Ἀμφὶ Διώνυσον Σεμέλης ἐρικυδέος υἱόν | μνήσομαι), as we saw at the beginning of the chapter. Likewise, the *HHs* normally name their subjects as the first word of the poem (if metrically feasible) and in the accusative case, as the object of the Evocatory Verb; but in fact, there is a solid precedent for Apollonius’ alternative construction in the major *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite* (5.1–2):

Μοῦσά μοι ἔννεπε ἔργα πολυχρύσου Ἀφροδίτης
Κύπριδος, ἦ...

Muse, tell me of the deeds of Aphrodite rich in gold, the Cyprian,
who...²²³

Apollonius may have been attracted to this construction by his desire to include (an adapted form of) the phrase κλέα ἀνδρῶν in his opening line.²²⁴ The hymnic subject is modified, as usual, with an epithet, παλαιγενέων. The relative pronoun οἷ in *Arg.* 1.2 can now be understood as a standard example of the “Hymnic Relative,” effecting the transition from the Exordium to the middle section, or *Laudatio*, of the hymn—much like the ἦ in the second line of the *Aphrodite* hymn quoted above.

Arg. 1.1–2 can thus be satisfactorily understood as the Exordium to a hymn about the Argonauts, even if it does not positively demand such an interpretation on a first reading. But what of the very first words, ἀρχόμενος σέο, Φοῖβε? How do they fit into this revised understanding of the introit? To begin with, I think it is still possible to regard these three words,

²²³ On this peculiar announcement of the Hymnic Subject, see Clay 2006: 155–157, with earlier bibliography.

²²⁴ See the discussion of genre in the next chapter.

with Phinney and others, as a Hymnic Proem in their own right. Other versions of the “Hymnic Proem” interpretation, which posit a Proem consisting of lines 1.1–4 or even the entire introit (1.1–22), are effectively ruled out by the view that *Arg.* 1.1–2 introduces the poem as an Argonautic hymn; for how can the same lines function simultaneously as part of a Hymnic Proem to Apollo that precedes an epic composition about the Argonauts and as the Exordial section of a hymn to the Argonauts? But Phinney’s view can survive such a rethinking of the *Arg.* introit: the Hymnic Proem is cordoned off to the poem’s first phrase (Ἀρχόμενος σέο, Φοῖβε), while the next phrase serves to introduce the poem *qua* hymn (παλαιγενέων κλέα φωτῶν | μνήσομαι, οἴ...). It is admittedly awkward to imagine a hymn, even an “epic” one, endowed with its own hymnic prelude, but Phinney himself seems to have subscribed to this view, to judge from his separate comments on the introit and the Envoi;²²⁵ such a conceit might even be understandable as a sort of Alexandrian *jeu d’esprit*.

Nevertheless, I suspect that most readers who had subscribed to the “Hymnic Proem” interpretation will now wish to discard it, acknowledging that μνήσομαι (1.2), one of the principal “hymnic” markers in the introit, really “goes with” the Argonauts as the poem’s Hymnic Subject, not with the apostrophized Apollo.²²⁶ More important, perhaps, is the reader’s sense that the very genre of the poem has shifted. On a first reading, it was possible to think that the *Arg.* was an ordinary epic that happened to be prefaced by a Hymnic Proem, like Hesiod’s *Theogony*. Now that the poem has turned out to be a hymn to the Argonauts, the “hymnic” interpretation that makes the most sense regards the introit not as a Proem, but as the Exordium

²²⁵ See Phinney 1963: 1–2 (on the introit as a Hymnic Proem to Apollo) and 158 (on the poem as a hymn to the Argonauts).

²²⁶ It is thus not fully accurate to say, as Williams 1991: 302 does, that the poem “begins with an invocation to Apollo which includes μνήσομαι (I.2) and ἀρχόμενος (I.1),” just as a hymn might, because μνήσομαι is not connected to the Invocation to Apollo.

of a hymn. Does this reading leave room for a Hymnic Proem to Apollo?²²⁷ For many readers, to the extent that ἀρχόμενος σέο, Φοῖβε at first seemed hymnic, the phrase will now appear to have been characteristic case of Apollonian misdirection.²²⁸ The elements of the phrase that at first appeared very obviously hymnic—the use of a form of ἄρχομαι and especially the vocative address to a deity, which is extended to line 8 by means of the second-person possessive pronoun τεῖν—now feel incompatible with the true Hymnic Subject of the poem.²²⁹

The genius of Apollonius' introit, however, is that the phrase ἀρχόμενος σέο, Φοῖβε need not be understood according to the "Hymnic Proem" interpretation. As we saw in Section I of this chapter, a great deal of ambiguity is built into the introit, such that this phrase can be understood from a number of angles; the two major alternatives to the "Hymnic Proem" interpretation are the "inspiration" and "narrative catalyst" interpretations. Thus, on realizing that the *Arg.* is "actually" a hymn to the Argonauts, re-readers are free to revise their understanding of this phrase and adopt either or both of these alternatives. The "inspiration" interpretation may be especially attractive on a re-reading, for about a third of the *HHs* open with second-person Appeals to the Muses, just as in epic introits.²³⁰ The introit's ambiguity thus facilitates both the first-time reader's potential "misreading" and the re-reader's revised reading.

²²⁷ Goldhill 1991: 287 appears to dramatize this change of heart over the space of a few sentences.

²²⁸ Apollonius' use of such "red herrings" is well-documented; see, e.g., Knight 1995: 114–117 on the multiple instances in which an epic battle seems to loom on the horizon and yet never materializes, or Byre 1997 and 2002: *passim*, on the misleading character of the beginning of the poem, which seems to promise high heroic epic filled with divine intervention and feats of valor. For another red herring in the introit itself, which seems to suggest that Poseidon may reprise his Odyssean role as the poem's divine antagonist, see Wray 2000: 255–256.

²²⁹ The refocusing of the Argonauts as the Hymnic Subject of the entire *Arg.*, in preference to Apollo as the Subject of a Hymnic Proem, is in keeping with Apollonius' tendency to set his major gods in the background in favor of minor and new divinities. On this phenomenon, see, e.g., Herter in *RE Suppl.* 13 s.v. "Apollonios," p. 34; Feeney 1991: ch. 2; Hunter 1993: 78–79; Knight 1995: ch. 5; and Claus 2016b: 142–149.

²³⁰ See n. 57 in the Introduction.

Conclusion

To summarize, these are the main points I have attempted to demonstrate in this chapter:

- The *Arg.*'s hymnic frame is modeled specifically on the formulas that characterize the Exordia and Envois of the *HHs*, which are thus marked as the poet's privileged generic models within the wider category of ὕμνος.
- Apollonius' introit is highly ambiguous, especially on a first reading. "Beginning with you, Phoebus" may initially suggest a Hymnic Proem to Apollo, and this reading is supported by a number of intertexts with other Hymnic Proems. But there are other interpretative options as well:
 - The two major alternatives: Apollo could be invoked for inspiration, or as a starting-point in the narrative; these possibilities are not mutually exclusive.
- The poem's Envoi, however, unambiguously marks the whole poem out as a hymn to the Argonauts.
- Thus in hindsight, the introit can be re-read as the Exordium of a hymn, invoking the Argonauts in Er-Stil as the subject of a long "epic hymn."
 - The suggestion of a Hymnic Proem in the words ἀρχόμενος σέο, Φοῖβε thus turns out to have been misdirection (unless the reader is prepared to view the *Arg.* as a hymn to the Argonauts with its own Hymnic Proem to Apollo).

The *Arg.*'s hymnic frame is complex and densely textured, and this chapter has hardly exhausted its hermeneutic riches, to which I will be returning in the next. But before moving on, I would like to pause to reflect on what we can learn so far about Apollonius' poetic technique from his adaptation of the formulas and other precedents provided by the *HHs* to his own hymnic Exordium and Envoi. My overwhelming impression is that Apollonius was keenly interested in

exceptional constructions and irregular variants on common formulas. Furthermore, I think that it must be by design that in every case, Apollonius' practice is not unprecedented, and is indeed recognizable as deriving from the *HHs*, but nevertheless consistently combines a series of rare usages to create completely unique formulations. To wit: Apollonius eschews the common Evocatory Verbs in favor of the unusual *μνήσομαι* (as in *HHs* 3.1, 7.1–2); the object of that verb is not the name of the Hymnic Subject in the accusative but a neuter plural noun to which the honorand is attached in the genitive (as in 5.1); his Salutatory Verb is a form of *ἰλάομαι* instead of the much commoner *χαῖρε* (as in 1D.8, 3.165, 20.8, 23.4);²³¹ he omits a formal Poet's Task formula, but executes the same essential function in his Prayer to the heroes (as in 1D.8–10, 7.58–59);²³² and his Exordium confusingly invokes Apollo even as it evokes the Argonauts—perhaps in the same way that several *Hymns* appeal to the Muses in their Exordia (4.1, 5.1, 9.1, 14.2, 17.1, 19.1, 20.1, 31.1–2, 32.1–2, 33.1). In apostrophizing Phoebus, moreover, Apollonius uses two rare constructions applied specifically to Apollo in the *Hymns*: *ἄρχομαι* + gen. (as in 25.1) combined with a vocative address to Phoebus (as in 21.1).²³³

This allusive method is characteristically Alexandrian, and is also consonant with Apollonius' approach to the HEs—he is everywhere drawn to rare usages and revels in modifying Homeric formulas, avoiding overly-close borrowings.²³⁴ Whether he adapts the HEs or *HHs*, the result is a recognizably Homeric texture that is nevertheless fresh and striking. We

²³¹ Indeed, Apollonius uses a form of the verb that never appears in the *Hymns* as such, the plural imperative *ἴλατ(ε)*.

²³² *N.b.* as well that Apollonius' use of the optative instead of imperative in the Prayer could be based on the precedent of Callimachean or Theocritean Rhapsodic Hymns; see n. 138 above.

²³³ Apollonius could also have found precedent in the *HHs* for his decision to hymn a large collectivity, the entire crew of the *Argo*. The *HHs* provide a few examples of hymns dedicated to pairs of divinities (2, 17, 29, 33), and exactly one to a larger group (25: Zeus, Apollo, and the Muses).

²³⁴ See esp. on this point Giangrande 1967, 1970.

have also seen another example of a *hapax legomenon* that Apollonius draws from the *HHs* (ἰλήκοις, 2.708, from *HH* 3.165). The results of this chapter support the hypothesis that Apollonius treats the *HHs* just as he does the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*: as authoritative models to be invoked and creatively transformed.

CHAPTER 2: HEROIZATION AND GENERIC HYBRIDITY

The diachronic reading advanced in the previous chapter highlights the ambiguous generic affiliations of Apollonius' poem, which shifts from epic to hymn as it is read and re-read. As we have seen, on a first reading, the introit may be regarded as conforming to purely epic standards of composition, like the beginning of the *Iliad* or *Odyssey*. Even reading the introit as a Hymnic Proem will not change this fact, as Goldhill observes:¹

This hymnic invocation at the beginning of the epic is often taken as a wilful 'mixing of genres'—an effect which turns the familiar recognition of a generic sign to a defamiliarized recognition of difference. Yet the performance of Greek epic poetry was normally preceded by a short hymn, and the *Theogony* of Hesiod—an author to whom the Hellenistic poets indicated an especial affiliation—offers a fine example of the hymnic proem as an integral part of a hexameter poem.

Thus, on a first reading, the introit's "hymnic" qualities can be entirely incorporated within and subordinated to an epic macrostructure: no "mixing of genres" need be involved.² With the Envoi, however, Apollonius wryly flips this hierarchy on its head. The entire poem will now be seen as a hymn to the Argonauts, and the epic narrative—from the *oĩ* in 1.2 all the way up to the hymnic Salutation at 4.1773—turns out to have been the "mythic" section of that hymn. As Hunter puts it, the *Argonautica* (hereafter, *Arg.*) becomes "a 'Hymn to the Argonauts', that is a

¹ Goldhill 1991: 287.

² By this phrase Goldhill alludes to the "Kreuzung der Gattungen," a term coined by Kroll 1924: ch. 9 to describe the experiments with generic hybridity so characteristic of Hellenistic poetry. More recent discussions of this phenomenon include Fantuzzi 1980 and Rossi 2000.

hymn on the traditional ‘Homeric’ model in which the central mythic narrative has been greatly extended, but in which the hymnic frame remains.”¹

But even if, formally speaking, the *Arg.* is structured as a hymn, it would be difficult to deny the poem’s strong *de facto* affiliation with the genre of epic. The length of the poem alone would suggest as much,² not to mention the fact that its protagonists are, for the most part, mortal heroes whose eventual divinization comes firmly into focus only in the poem’s final lines (4.1773–1781). Most tellingly, perhaps, Apollonius insists upon his poem’s status as epic when he declares his theme to be κλέα φωτῶν (1.1),³ an artful variation⁴ on a generic term for the subject of epic poetry already in use in Homer, κλέα ἀνδρῶν (*Il.* 9.189, 524;⁵ *Od.* 8.73).⁶ Indeed,

¹ Hunter 1996: 46. *N.b.* that there is precedent for epic subject matter in the Myth of a *HH* in the *Homeric Hymn to Heracles* (15.4–6).

² For length as a generic marker, see Fowler 1982: 62–64. Apollonius’ poem, it is true, is much shorter than either of the Homeric epics (so Klein 1975: 22: the *Arg.* “must...be given the credit for being one of the shortest ancient epics”), but it is several times longer than even the longest of the *HHs*; we might view it as a happy medium between the two forms. For the idea that the *Arg.* satisfies Aristotelian prescriptions for the proper length of an epic poem, see, e.g., Pfeiffer 1968: 143, Heiserman 1977: 36, Beye 1982: 7, Green 1988: 2, Nelis 2005a: 355, and Caneva 2007: 71; cf. Fusillo 1985: 156 n. 94.

³ This point is made, e.g., by Zanker 1979: 53, Schwinge 1986: 93–94, Albis 1996: 17, Pietsch 1999: 66, and Nelis 2005a: 356; see also the studies mentioned in the following pair of notes. Cf. Guinee 1999: 16 for the interesting idea that Apollonius could be framing his own *Arg.* as the κλέα ἀνδρῶν that Achilles “will” sing, so to speak, at *Il.* 9.189. The Argonautic quest is indeed one of the major heroic myths of which Achilles might have sung; see Stat. *Achil.* 190–191.

⁴ For κλέα φωτῶν as a programmatic example of Apollonian *imitatio cum variatione* in adapting Homeric diction, see Beye 1969: 35 and Giangrande 1977: 273.

⁵ At *Il.* 9.524, Phoenix in fact uses the phrase “the glorious deeds of men of old” (τῶν πρόσθεν ... κλέα ἀνδρῶν) to preface his Meleager *exemplum*, which is explicitly cast in parallel with the plot of the *Iliad* itself. The phrase is very close semantically to Apollonius’ παλαιγενέων κλέα φωτῶν.

⁶ For κλέα ἀνδρῶν as a generic term for epic, see, e.g., Conte 1986: 70–72, Fantuzzi and Hunter 2004: 90–91, and O’Hara 2007: 45; for some caveats, cf. Ford 1992: 57–67; and for the term κλέος in general, see Nagy 1974: 244–255. Notably, the variant ἀνδρῶν can be found in place of φωτῶν in codex E—to be sure, an inferior reading (likely derived from a gloss), but one that reflects the inevitability with which Apollonius’ phrase recalls Homer’s. Cf. also *AP* 2.378: Christodorus’ highly epicizing description of Herodotus’ work casts the historian’s subject as ὠγυγίων κλέα φωτῶν (“the glorious deeds of ancient men”), an epic tag modeled closely on Apollonius’ παλαιγενέων κλέα φωτῶν (Tisconi 2000a: 241, 2000b: 217).

the nesting of this epic tag in between two markers of pointedly hymnic terminology (ἀρχόμενος σέο, Φοῖβε and μνήσομαι) reproduces the structure of the entire poem in miniature: epic deeds enclosed by a hymnic frame. Thus I would argue that the introit does announce a genuine mixing of genres. The *Arg.* is, in a word, an “epic hymn,” an innovative fusion of the two branches of Homeric poetry, both the epics and the *Hymns*, into a unique generic hybrid, a hymn that celebrates its divinized addressees by recounting their deeds in a self-consciously epic register.⁷

In the realm of extant Greek literature, Apollonius’ bold generic experiment is almost unparalleled:⁸ no poem before the *Arg.*, and perhaps only one after it, could be considered an epic hymn in the same fashion, namely, Dionysius’ *Periegesis*, a product of the Hadrianic era that frames itself as a sort of “didactic epic hymn” in imitation of Apollonius.⁹ Nevertheless, this blending of epic and hymn hardly arose in a sociocultural vacuum. In this chapter, I seek the conceptual underpinning of this conceit in the duality of the Greek concept of the hero, whose double valence as both a secular figure of myth and poetry and as the object of cultic veneration

⁷ See further Romeo 1985: 22–23. I consider the *Argonautica* generically hybrid in that it combines the formal features of epic and Rhapsodic Hymnody at the macro-level, but I would also acknowledge the influence of a wide range of genres on Apollonius’ narrative, including, *inter alia*, lyric (see, e.g., Rosenmeyer 1992, Acosta-Hughes 2010a: *passim*, Kampakoglou 2019: chapters 3, 9), historiography and ethnography (e.g., Clauss 2012, Priestley 2014: chapters 3–4), and tragedy (e.g., Cusset 2001, Schmakeit 2003, Sistakou 2016: ch. 6; Stoessl 1941 shows its age, but is still suggestive for the abundance of tragic material in the *Arg.*). Apollonius’ other, lost poems may have revealed a similar penchant for generic experimentation; see, e.g., Sistakou 2008: 336–340.

⁸ Cf. Grillo 1988: 56–59 on Apollonius’ unprecedented Envoi to his epic heroes. From the *Arg.*, this device enters the repertoire of closural gestures used in later epic (though *n.b.* already Hes. *Th.* 963–964 for a χαῖρε-formula used to dismiss one subject and transition to the next, as at *Arg.* 1.920). Silius Italicus’ *Punica* furnishes a good example: this historical epic ends with a hymnic address to its protagonist, Scipio Africanus, and affirms his divine lineage (17.651–654). Notably, the poem’s first word, *ordior*, “I begin,” may reflect ἀρχόμενος in Apollonius (Stenzel 1908: 15). Somewhat surprisingly, Nonnus’ *Dionysiaca*, an epic about a god, ends without a Salutation or Prayer; the poet maintains epic *Er-Stil* throughout the ending.

⁹ For allusions to the *Arg.*’s hymnic frame in Dionysius, as well as in Pseudo-Manetho’s *Apotelesmatica*, see n. 148 in Chapter 1.

corresponds to the *Arg.*'s own generic hybridity as both epic and hymn.¹⁰ I proceed, first, with an overview of the concept of the hero in Greek literature and culture generally in Section I. Section II then offers a survey of the evidence for hero cult and related phenomena within the *Arg.* This survey demonstrates the thematic importance of heroization in the poem, in stark contrast to the Homeric epics (hereafter, HEs), and identifies many passages in which the Argonauts' own divinization is foreshadowed. Section III concludes with close readings of a series of passages in which, I argue, Apollonius self-consciously conflates secular-Homeric and religious heroism as a way of expressing metapoetically his poem's hybrid generic affiliations: as an epic, the *Arg.* commemorates its protagonists' deeds in the style of the HEs, but as a hymn, it acknowledges their cultic status as heroes divinized and worshipped after death.

I. The Duality of the Concept of the Hero in Greek Culture

The *Arg.*'s dual status as epic and hymn is made possible by, and, indeed, capitalizes on, the duality of the concept of the "hero" (ἥρωες) in Greek culture. *In nuce*, this term can be used in a secular, literary way or with reference to immortalized human beings worshipped in what modern scholars have labeled hero cult.¹¹ My argument is that Apollonius combines these two

¹⁰ I use the thoroughly modern religious/secular dichotomy as a convenient shorthand for "with/without a view to cult honors." This distinction may be anachronistic, but it is useful given the fact that HEs tend to suppress references to hero cult and in this sense "secularize" the concept of the hero, whereas other sources, including Apollonius, openly acknowledge the cultic dimension of heroism; see the next section of this chapter.

¹¹ West 1978: 370–373 and Nagy 1999: 114–117 are fundamental on the distinction between epic and cultic heroes. For these two types as located on a continuum, see Whitley 1995: 52. A notable dissenting view is that of van Wees 2006: 366–370, who argues that ἥρωες never possesses a secular sense in early Greek epic (cf. Hadzisteliou Price 1973: 130). His arguments have been challenged (e.g., Bravo 2009: 26–27, nn. 21, 32; see also Currie 2005: 62–70), but even if correct, we could still speak of a "mythic" vs. a "cultic" way of representing heroes that would approximately correspond with the epic/cultic distinction, especially given Homer's reticence to acknowledge the worship of his heroes in cult (see below in this section). van Wees also acknowledges that Hellenistic scholarship struggled with Homer's use of the term (p. 369; see also Rohde 1925: 142 n. 26, Jones 2010: 3 with n. 3), and Apollonius' own usage seems pointedly to contrast the cultic with the Homeric usage, as I argue below.

ways of understanding heroes in the *Arg.* because each resonates with one of his hybrid poem's generic affiliations: as an epic, the *Arg.* commemorates the Argonauts in traditional Homeric terms, while as a hymn, it celebrates them in their capacity as the divinized objects of cult. In order to contextualize this claim and inform the analysis that follows, in this section I offer a brief sketch of these two ways of being a hero in Greek culture.

I begin with the earlier-attested usage: in a great deal of Greek poetry, and especially in the HEs, the word ἥρωες is used generally of freeborn men¹² who lived in the age of myth—that is, of the generations born roughly before the fall of Troy. More specifically, to quote West's formulation, ἥρωες is, in the *Iliad*, “used for warriors generally, and later, in the *Odyssey*, for almost anyone respectable who played a part in the narrative”—for example, elites like Laertes (e.g., *Od.* 1.189) or Telemachus (4.21), but also characters like the bard Demodocus (8.483) or the herald Mulus (18.423). In every case, the word is used without “any hint of a religious significance, [or] a connection with cult after death.”¹³ Heroes of this sort were especially prominent in epic, whose very meter, the dactylic hexameter, could be identified as “heroic” as early as Plato (*Leg.* 12.958e).

In Homer, heroes are almost uniformly mortal, a fact that distinguishes the *Iliad* and, to a lesser extent, the *Odyssey* from the poems of the Epic Cycle, in which several heroes are granted

¹² In Homer, heroes are exclusively male; the category of heroine (ἥρωίς, ἥρωίη, ἥρωσσα) is first attested only with Pindar (*Pyth.* 4.11). Curiously, this term has a wider semantic range in Greek than its male counterpart, embracing both (onetime) mortal women as well as minor female divinities who were never human (see, e.g., Kearns 1989: 22–23, 126–127). Apollonius' own Libyan heroines are a case in point (Nock 1944: 165 n. 81 = 1972: 2.596 n. 81): these heroines (ἥρωσσαι, 4.1309, 1323, 1358) are identified both as daughters of the eponymous nymph Libya (4.1323, 1358; cf. 2.504–505) and as local goddesses (χθόνια θεαί, *Arg.* 4.1322; cf. 1316, 1333, 1347); cf. Call. fr. 602 Pfeiffer, Nicaenetus 3 Powell = *AP* 6.225. On Greek heroines generally, see Larson 1995, Lyons 1997, and Kearns 1998.

¹³ West 1978: 373, 370. See further Barrigón 2000: 2, Bravo 2009: 13–15, and, for extensive citations from Homeric epic, van Wees 2006: 367–369.

immortality.¹⁴ There are, to be sure, a few exceptions to this generalization.¹⁵ For instance, the Catalogue of Ships already mentions annual sacrifice in Athens to Erechtheus (*Il.* 2.550–551), evidently conceived of as a hero who lives on to receive cult.¹⁶ In the *Odyssey*, Menelaus is destined to enjoy an immortal life of ease in the Elysian Field at the ends of the earth, simply because he is the son-in-law of Zeus (4.561–569), and different forms of deification have been granted to Heracles (11.601–604) and the Dioscuri (11.300–304). I might add in this connection that the *Homeric Hymns* (hereafter, *HHs*) contain one sure reference to hero cult, in Demeter’s prophecy of the Eleusinians’ annual worship of her nursling Demophon (2.263–267).¹⁷ Many more debatable examples could be marshalled,¹⁸ but nevertheless, a Homeric critic as sensitive as Apollonius must have been struck by the rarity of these passages, and by their exceptional

¹⁴ See Griffin 1977: 42 and Burgess 2001: 167. Nagy 2005: 81 notes that the motif of heroic immortalization appears in the Hesiodic and Orphic corpora as well.

¹⁵ The extent to which the Homeric epics refer to or presuppose the existence of hero cult is controversial. For proposed acknowledgments of the practice, see, e.g., Hack 1929, Hadzisteliou Price 1973, Dué 2001: 44–45, Currie 2005: 50–57, and Nagy 2012, all of whom argue that while for one reason or another Homer mostly avoids explicit references to hero cult, its implicit presence can be detected in many passages. See also van Wees 2006: 372–375.

¹⁶ See on this passage Kirk 1985 ad *Il.* 2.547–551, 549–551. Earlier scholars intent on denying any trace of hero cult in Homer often explained this passage as interpolated or late, or claimed that Erechtheus was originally regarded as a god, not a hero; see Hadzisteliou Price 1973: 130–132, 135–137, 140. Apollonius, in any event, would most likely have seen a reference to hero cult in this passage, whose authenticity does not appear to have been questioned in antiquity.

¹⁷ On Demophon’s cult, see Richardson 1974 ad *HH* 2.265–267. Apollonius prominently alludes to the Demophon episode at *Arg.* 4.867–879; see n. 154 below. The *Hymns* also mention other well-known cult heroes without, however, making note of their heroized status; e.g., Triptolemus (2.153, 474, 477) or Trophonius and Agamedes (3.296).

¹⁸ See n. 17 above. I note one further example of the “evidence” for hero cult in Homer that Apollonius may have recognized, even if scholars today might not. On at least one ancient interpretation, Homer alludes to Achilles’ immortal afterlife on the White Island subtextually, by means of the ΛΕΥΚΗ (“White”) acrostic at *Il.* 24.1–5. For this tradition, see Burgess 2001: 163–166 and West 2013: 156; for this interpretation of the acrostic, see Korenjak 2009. But this acrostic was interpreted in different ways and often through an Aratean lens, including by Apollonius himself; see Kronenberg 2018a and 2018b: 3–4, 9, 12–13, 17–18. *N.b.* also that “Homer” seems to reject the White Island tradition at the beginning of the final book of his other epic: at *Od.* 24.11, the narrator mentions the White Rock (Λευκάδα πέτρην) among the landmarks en route to the underworld, where he goes on to locate Achilles and the other heroes (Lye 2016: 57; cf. Edwards 1985).

status within the HEs. Indeed, as a Homeric scholar, Apollonius was probably aware of certain ancient philological debates that went to the heart of the “authentic” Homeric view of life after death.¹⁹ In the main, Homer lays an unusual amount of stress on his heroes’ mortality, which supplies the major moral and emotional stakes in his narratives.²⁰ A classic statement of this aspect of the Homeric worldview is Griffin’s:

In the *Iliad* no rule is more ineluctable than that expounded by Patroclus’ ghost, xxiii 69 ff.: the dead do not return. Even Heracles could not evade death: *Il.* xviii 117 οὐδὲ γὰρ οὐδὲ βίη Ἡρακλῆος φύγε κῆρα, | ὅς περ φίλτατος ἔσκε Διὶ Κρονίῳνι ἄνακτι. Hector the favourite of Zeus and Sarpedon his son must die; they can receive no more than the honours of burial. Achilles himself is under the shadow of death, and that fact is vital for the *Iliad*, especially its latter books... This is what makes the *Iliad* both true and tragic, and the very different procedure of the Cycle indicates profoundly different attitudes to the fundamental nature of human life and death, and consequently to human heroism and the relation of men to the gods.²¹

This emphasis on the finality of death partly explains the crucial place of glory in the Homeric economy of values. Denied the literal immortality enjoyed by the happy few like Menelaus, most Homeric heroes can only hope for the metaphorical immortality of “imperishable renown”

¹⁹ For instance, for a number of reasons many ancient critics considered the passage describing Heracles’ apotheosis (*Od.* 11.602–604) to be an interpolation, including the fact that Homer elsewhere has Achilles affirm that not even Heracles could escape death (*Il.* 18.117–119). See Petzl 1969: 28–37, esp. 28–31. Apollonius actually alludes to *Il.* 18.117 in the very words that introduce Heracles to the *Arg.* (1.122), perhaps to foreground the question of heroic (im)mortality, which he will approach very differently from Homer (Feeney 1987: 53).

²⁰ On the centrality of death in the *Iliad* especially, see, e.g., Reinhardt 1960: 5–15, Marg 1976, and Schein 1984: ch. 3. On the HE view of death generally, see, e.g., Rohde 1925: ch. 1, Sourvinou-Inwood 1995: ch. 2, Clarke 1999: ch. 6, Johnston 1999: 7–16, and Albinus 2000: 21–97.

²¹ Griffin 1977: 42–43. In a section of the quotation I have excised, Griffin observes of the other HE: “Even in the less austere *Odyssey*, where by his own account Menelaus is exempted from death ‘because he has Helen and is son-in-law of Zeus’, iv 561, Achilles is really dead, and bitterly does he deplore his lot, xi 488 ff.”

(κλέος ἄφθιτον, *Il.* 9.413) as their consolation for death.²² In this respect, the Homeric heroes are as human as Theognis' beloved Cyrnus, whose only recourse against death is the same figurative immortality granted by poetic memory (*Thgn.* 243–252). Homer thus typifies what Currie calls the “‘exclusive’ conception of immortality”: the only sort of “life” after death vouchsafed his heroes is that furnished by κλέος.²³

Whatever the reasons behind it, Homer's conception of the hero as stubbornly mortal is in fact highly idiosyncratic from the perspective of later Greek culture.²⁴ In other sources, the term ἥρωος regularly denotes an intermediate ontological category between gods and mortals, as in the question that commences Pindar's second *Olympian* ode: “What god, what hero, and what man shall we celebrate?” (τίνα θεόν, τίν' ἥρωα, τίνα δ' ἄνδρα κελαδήσομεν; *Ol.* 2.2).²⁵ In the realm of Greek religion, heroes were a type of divinity generally less powerful than the Olympian gods²⁶ and more firmly tied to a given locality.²⁷ Perhaps the clearest line of demarcation separating them from gods was the experience of death: heroes were held to have

²² For this aspect of the Homeric worldview, see, e.g., Fränkel 1975: 84, King 1987: 32–37, Edwards 1987: 150–152, Nagy 1999: 118–119. Griffin 1980: 95–102 offers a nuanced reading of this theme in Homer, concluding that ultimately “the consolation of glory is a chilly one” (102).

²³ Currie 2005: 72–74.

²⁴ The traditional explanation of Homer's difference in this regard is that the Homeric bardic tradition was simply ignorant of hero cult, for chronological or geographical reasons, but many other scholars have proposed that particular literary aims precluded acknowledgements of hero cult in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* (see n. 17 above).

²⁵ An example quoted by Kearns 1989: 1, who also cites Lucian *Dial. mort.* 340; for further parallels, see Rohde 1925: 141 n. 25 and Currie 2005: 60 n. 7, 176 n. 94. Cf. Ekroth's schema, which places cult heroes on a spectrum between the gods and the ordinary dead (2002: 330–334, 2007: 113–114; cf. *Pl. Resp.* 427b, *Leg.* 717a–b). For the intermediate position of the hero in the ontological hierarchies of Greek philosophy, see Rodríguez Moreno 2000.

²⁶ Artemidorus (*On Dreams* 2.40, 4.78) makes this power differential explicit; see also Paus. 10.31.11 (Rohde 1925: 150 n. 91).

²⁷ As Larson 2007: 197 puts it: “In many cases, heroes and heroines were simply ‘little gods,’ concerned for the most part with the daily comings and goings in their own neighborhoods.” For the cult hero's strong sense of locality, see, e.g., Nilsson 1967: 187–188, Ekroth 2009: 138–139, and Parker 2011: 104; cf. Hall 1999.

been mortals who had died.²⁸ They were also, however, believed to live on somehow after death in a state of immortality.²⁹ As a result, both death and immortalization are key themes in the ideology of hero cult.³⁰ Although firmly located in their graves, cult heroes could possess a certain degree of mobility, appearing, for example, in epiphany to aid their people in battle,³¹ and they were often thought to live on simultaneously in paradisiacal realms such as the Islands of the Blessed or Elysium, located at the ends of the earth or in the underworld.³²

Cities and other groups propitiated these numinous powers, often annually,³³ with a distinctive type of “hero cult.”³⁴ The origins of this practice have long been controversial.³⁵ On surviving evidence, the term ἥρως itself is first used in a clearly religious sense in the late sixth

²⁸ See, e.g., Brelich 1958: 80–90, Seaford 1994: 114–120, and Ekroth 2002: 20, 2007: 100, 2015. For the much rarer (and in many cases, controversial) instances of heroic honors for the still-living, see Currie 2005, esp. ch. 9, and Jones 2010: 93–95; cf. Widzisz 2007: 275.

²⁹ Kearns 1989: 128–129, who notes that heroes may even be said to have escaped death by virtue of their immortalization. Other heroes do not strictly “die” but are translated to the Islands of the Blessed, are swallowed by the earth, or simply disappear (Brelich 1958: 87–88, Johnston 1999: 13).

³⁰ So Nagy 2005: 84, 86: “To say that the *hēmitheoi* are mortal is not to say that heroes do not become immortal: they do, but only after they have experienced death. After death, heroes are eligible for a life of immortality... The hero was considered *dead*—from the standpoint of the place where the hero’s *sōma* (body) was situated; at the same time, the hero was considered simultaneously *immortalized*—from the standpoint of the paradisiacal place that awaited all heroes after death” (italics original). See further Rohde 1925: 117 and Nagy 1999: 174–175.

³¹ See, e.g., Brelich 1958: 90–92 and Pritchett 1979: ch. 2.

³² Farnell 1921: 371–372. As postmortem paradises for cult heroes, Elysium and the Islands of the Blessed are functionally interchangeable and possess similar characteristics; see, e.g., Roloff 1970: 93–101; Heubeck, West, and Hainsworth 1988 ad *Od.* 4.563ff., and West 1978 ad *Hes. Op.* 171.

³³ See Eitrem in *RE* 8.1 s.v. “Heros,” p. 1125.47–50.

³⁴ One of the best overviews of this phenomenon, with extensive catalogues of ancient evidence, is to be found in *ThesCRA* 2.125–214, esp. 125–159. See further Ekroth 2007, Jones 2010, and Parker 2011 for accessible introductions.

³⁵ Useful overviews of the scholarly debate surrounding the origins of hero cult can be found in, e.g., Kearns 1989: 129–137, Parker 1996: 36–39, Ekroth 2002: 335–431, and Bravo 2009.

century BCE (Heraclitus B 5 DK),³⁶ but in the archaeological record, the practice can be traced back at least to the eighth century.³⁷ Its emergence, crystallization, and/or spread at this juncture has been connected to various historical factors, including the influence of Homeric and other epic poetry,³⁸ the rise of the *polis*,³⁹ tensions over land ownership,⁴⁰ and the desires of other communities, including colonies, to reinforce group identity or to stake territorial claims.⁴¹ Hero cult is a diverse phenomenon, however, and none of these theories individually can explain every sort of hero cult,⁴² nor are these explanations necessarily mutually exclusive.⁴³

Hero cult could include various rites, including processions, games, and especially sacrifice.⁴⁴ Insofar as heroes were dead and buried, it was once thought that chthonic elements predominated in hero cult; and indeed, in some limited cases contact with the dead hero was

³⁶ Bremmer 2006: 18. This date can be pushed back earlier if certain later testimonies can be relied upon; e.g., Porph. *Abst.* 4.22 attributes legislation concerning the worship of gods and heroes to the seventh-century Athenian lawgiver Draco (Rohde 1925: 115, Burkert 1985: 205, Antonaccio 1994: 390). *N.b.* that, *pace* Bremmer, there is no reason to think that the associated beliefs and practices of hero cult could not have preexisted the religious usage of the term ἥρως itself (Snodgrass 1988: 20–22).

³⁷ See Antonaccio 1993, 1994, 1995, who emphasizes the difference between the recurrent practice of hero cult and the earlier, more provisional phenomenon of tomb cult.

³⁸ The idea that epic poetry was crucial in promoting the rise of the hero cult is especially associated with Farnell 1921: ch. 11 (with conclusions on pp. 340–342), Cook 1953, and Coldstream 1976. Against this opinion, see, e.g., Hadzisteliou Price 1979, Snodgrass 1988, and Antonaccio 1994, 1995.

³⁹ See particularly Bérard 1982 and de Polignac 1995: ch. 4.

⁴⁰ See esp. Snodgrass 1977: 30–31, 1980: 38–40, 1982.

⁴¹ See, e.g., Whitley 1988 and Malkin 1993, both of whom offer insightful critiques of Snodgrass's theory.

⁴² For attempts to taxonomize the different categories of hero (e.g., culture heroes, epic heroes, eponymous heroes, etc.), see, e.g., Farnell 1921: 19.

⁴³ A point emphasized in the surveys cited above, n. 37. See also, e.g., Whitley 1988, who notes the need to take regional factors into consideration, and Morris 1988, who argues for a range of meanings that hero cults could have possessed for different communities.

⁴⁴ Ekroth 2002: 13.

thought to render worshippers ritually impure.⁴⁵ Nevertheless, Ekroth’s study of the sacrificial rituals of hero cult has shown that in most cases, heroes and the Olympian gods were worshipped in analogous fashion: “Ritually speaking, the heroes belonged with the gods.”⁴⁶ Indeed, heroes are sometimes said to be worshipped like gods (e.g., Pind. *Ol.* 7.79, Diod. Sic. 29.18, Paus. 3.16.6);⁴⁷ “gods and heroes” is a common pairing in Greek prose to denote the divine in general (e.g., Hdt. 2.45.3, Thuc. 2.74.2, Pl. *Ion* 531c–d, Dem. *De cor.* 184, Polyb. 3.48.9, etc.); and many earlier sources casually refer to heroes as gods.⁴⁸ This evidence suggests that the Greeks could imagine heroes and gods in broadly analogous terms as divine, superhuman entities.

As with the gods, the cult of heroes could also include the singing of hymns—a crucial fact for the *Arg.*’s construal as an epic hymn. One ancient definition of the hymnic genre actually specifies that heroes as well as gods were celebrated in hymns: “the ‘hymn’ is a poem comprising praises of the gods and heroes with thanksgiving” (“Ὑμνος ἐστὶ ποίημα περιέχον θεῶν ἐγκώμια καὶ ἡρώων μετ’ εὐχαριστίας).⁴⁹ Unfortunately, although we possess several ancient references to the place of hymns within hero cult,⁵⁰ few examples of such heroic hymns

⁴⁵ Parker 1983: 39.

⁴⁶ Ekroth 2002: 341. Ekroth’s study builds on the classic work of Nock 1944 (reprinted in *idem* 1972: 2.575–602), who also emphasizes the continuity between sacrifices to heroes and gods.

⁴⁷ On such phrases, see, e.g., Ekroth 2002: 206–212 and Pirenne-Delforge 2008: 150; cf. Currie 2005: 184–189.

⁴⁸ For the slippage between the terms “hero” and “god,” see the examples collected by, e.g., Rohde 1925: 150 n. 90, Nock 1944: 163–164 (= 1972: 2.594), Kearns 1989: 125, Ekroth 2002: 21 n. 28, Harrison 2002: 159–162, and Parker 2011: 110.

⁴⁹ Σ Dion. Thrax p. 451.6–7 Hilgard (translation from Furley and Bremer 2001: 1.9). Much is uncertain about the date of the Τέχνη γραμματική ascribed to Dionysius (2nd cent. BCE), and consequently, of its commentary tradition; see Dickey 2007: 77–78. See also Aelius Theon Rhet. *Prog.* p. 109.20–26 Spengel (1st cent. CE).

⁵⁰ See Deneken 1884–1890: 2503.30–50 and Lozynsky 2014: 58, 261–262, adding to their citations Hdt. 4.35.3.

have survived.⁵¹ Pindar may furnish an early example with his fifteenth *Paeon*, which is entitled “for the Aeginetans, to Aeacus” (A[ι]γινῆταις εἰς] Αἴακον). The title evidently indicates that the poem honors the hero Aeacus in hymnic fashion; indeed, the *HHs* follow a similar titling convention, with the formula εἰς + the name of the god to be celebrated in the accusative.⁵²

Cultic heroes could be historical figures, like the Spartan general Brasidas at Amphipolis (Thuc. 5.11.1) or the Athenian tyrannicides Harmodius and Aristogeiton,⁵³ and city-founders (οἰκιστᾶι) in particular enjoyed regular hero cult in their settlements.⁵⁴ But they could also be the great men and women of the mythic age—an Achilles, Hector, or Alcestis, or indeed, a Jason or Medea.⁵⁵ And it is with this category that the two types of heroism outlined so far converge:⁵⁶ the same heroes whose mortality the Homer epics are at pains to stress were thought to be living a second life as immortalized objects of cult throughout the Greek world. The worship of Homeric heroes has occasioned much debate in modern scholarship about the relationship between early epic and the rise of hero cult,⁵⁷ but the conflation of epic and religious heroism seems not to have posed a problem for Greeks of a later age. Pindar, for instance, often presents mythic heroes in recognizably “Homeric” terms, but also acknowledges their receipt of cultic

⁵¹ E.g., Helioid. *Aeth.* 3.2 (= *AP* 9.485) is a literary representation of a processional hymn sung at Delphi: it begins with an Evocation of Thetis as its Hymnic Subject but embraces in its praises Peleus, Achilles, and finally Neoptolemus, to whom the Prayer is addressed as local cult hero.

⁵² Cf. *Paeon* 18, which has the name “Electryon” in the title, though probably without εἰς preceding (Rutherford 2001: 427). On these and other possible instances of hymning heroes in Pindar’s *Paeans*, see Lozynsky 2014: 58.

⁵³ On this duo, see, e.g., Kearns 1989: 55, 150. For surveys of heroized historical personages, see Farnell 1921: 420–426, Connolly 1998: 21, and Currie 2005: 85–200.

⁵⁴ For the cult of founders, see above all Malkin 1987: chapters 5–8.

⁵⁵ Farnell 1921: 408–413 provides a convenient list of “heroes of epic and saga” who received cult worship.

⁵⁶ Snodgrass 1988: 24 and Whitley 1994: 220.

⁵⁷ See above, n. 40

honors.⁵⁸ The same may be said of Attic tragedy, which in some cases even re-stages Homeric episodes with the added promise of hero cult for the slain, as in the Euripidean *Rhesus* (962–973). Especially striking examples of this sort of conflation are stories in which Homer himself interacts with the divinized versions of the heroes of whom he sang, as in the story of Helen’s blinding him for maligning her virtue in his poems.⁵⁹

In sum, Greek ἥρωες possessed a literary existence as the protagonists of epic and other genres of mythological storytelling, but the HEs are unique in stressing their mortality almost without exception. In the realm of Greek religion, heroes quite literally had a second life as an intermediate grade of divinity constituted by the powerful dead, who were thought to live on in some capacity and to influence events in the mortal plane from beyond the grave. Crucially, these heroes were comprised of women and men from all periods, including the mythic Age of Heroes, and they received cult that included the singing of hymns. The generic duality of the *Arg.* as both epic and hymn maps neatly onto these two significations borne by the term ἥρωες.

⁵⁸ Cf., e.g., the presentation of Pelops in *Ol.* 1 (Currie 2005: 74–75): in life he is an exponent of a basic tenet of Homer’s heroic ideology (“But since men must die, why would anyone sit in darkness and coddle a nameless old age to no use, deprived of all noble deeds?” 82–84); in death, however, he is a recipient of hero cult at Olympia (90–93).

⁵⁹ The story first appears for us in Pl. *Phdr.* 243a–b, in his account of Stesichorus’ famous *Palinode*. Plato does not explicitly identify the divine agency at work here, but most other sources cite the wrath of the divine Helen; see also his contemporary Isocrates on Stesichorus’ parallel punishment (*Hel.* 64–65). For an overview of these blinding stories, see Graziosi 2002: 147–150. Owing to his encomiastic agenda, Isocrates speaks of Helen as if she were fully a goddess, not a heroine (see Edmunds 2011), but *n.b.* that a couple of sources explicitly refer to Helen in this story as a “heroine” (ἡρωϊνῆς, Homeric *Vita* 7.5 in West 2003a; Hermias ad Pl. *Phdr.* 243a [p. 75.9 Couvreur]); cf. Helen’s appearance on the White Island with other Homeric heroes in another version of the story (Conon *Narr.* 18, Paus. 3.19.11–13, Hermias ad Pl. *Phdr.* 243a [p. 75.10–26 Couvreur]; see also Lucian *Ver. hist.* 2.15).

II. Hero Cult and Immortalization in the *Argonautica*

For Apollonius, the worship of Homeric heroes was a centuries-old practice that was taking on increasing prominence in the Hellenistic period.⁶⁰ It is thus no surprise that, in addition to depicting his heroes—however problematically—in an epic mold,⁶¹ Apollonius also freely acknowledges the practice of hero cult, in a significant departure from Homeric precedent.⁶² The Argonauts themselves are made to participate in hero cult;⁶³ the learned narrator mentions other hero cults both contemporaneous with the Argonauts and belonging to the historical period; and the poem foreshadows the Argonauts’ own heroization, both as a group and, in some cases, individually, in several places and in multiple ways. These frequent, often casual references to hero cult partly reflect Apollonius’ typically Alexandrian interest in etiology and in religious rites,⁶⁴ but they also have the effect of normalizing the practice within the epic world that the poem constructs. I have argued in the previous chapter that the hymnic Salutation and Prayer to the Argonauts in the poem’s Envoi (4.1773–1775) presuppose their heroization. The Argonauts’ sudden transformation into divinized heroes in the Envoi may be abrupt, but it

⁶⁰ For the surge of interest in epic hero cult in the Hellenistic period, reflected particularly in the veneration of epic heroes at Mycenaean tombs, see Alcock 1997. The Hellenistic age witnessed several other developments in hero cult that were not directly related to the epic heroes; these included the establishment of private cults by family members, the use of the term “hero(ine)” on the gravestones of the ordinary dead, and an increase in the frequency of public heroizations. For overviews, see, e.g., Rohde 1925: 527–533 and Hughes 1999. I discuss the phenomenon of Ptolemaic ruler cult in Section II.a of the Conclusion.

⁶¹ I consider the question of how the Argonauts’ heroization bears on the (often-problematic) portrayal of their heroism in Section II.b of the Conclusion of this study.

⁶² A point made by, e.g., Händel 1954: 47–48, Goldhill 1991: 318, Said 1998: 18–19, and Hitch 2012: 131.

⁶³ Cf. the situation in Homer: “[W]hile both the Greeks and the Trojans in the *Iliad* on several occasions make sacrifices to the gods, pray to them, and vow future sacrifices and offerings to them, not once do they perform any ritual for a dead mortal” (Bravo 2009: 16).

⁶⁴ Cf. Hitch 2012: 133.

comes only after the groundwork has been carefully laid.⁶⁵ Hero cult is an ordinary part of the Argonauts' religious world, and something that the readers can confidently expect for heroes of their caliber.

In the following sections, I survey the passages in the poem that touch on hero cult and related phenomena. I proceed first with the most explicit references to hero cult in the poem; second, with some more ambiguous cases that seem to envision hero cult without explicit signals to that effect; third, with Hesiodic allusions that implicitly present the Argonauts as heroes destined for an immortal afterlife; and finally, with the poem's references to the related phenomenon of apotheosis, which obliquely sheds light on the hero cult theme.

a. Explicit References to Hero Cult

The poem's clearest references to hero cult are here presented in list format with key religious terminology given in the Greek.⁶⁶

- 1) As the Argonauts pass the tomb (τύμβος, 585) of a certain Dolops on the Magnesian coast, adverse winds cause them to put in at evening.⁶⁷ At nightfall,⁶⁸ they honor Dolops

⁶⁵ Cf. Hitch 2012. By tracking a set of motifs that she connects to divinity, including adoration by admiring crowds and astral imagery, she argues that the Argonauts are increasingly presented as godlike figures over the course of the poem. This ongoing process of heroization culminates, Hitch argues, with the Salutation to the heroes in the poem's Envoi (154).

⁶⁶ This list is largely derived from Hitch 2012 (cf. the briefer list of Currie 2005: 55 n. 56), though I include only the most unambiguous examples of hero cult in the poem, excluding more subtle hints of heroization for which Hitch argues, such as "the god-like effect the heroes have upon other people" (134).

⁶⁷ The identity of this Dolops is debated, but the scholiast ad *Arg.* 1.587 claims that he is a Magnesian son of Hermes whom Apollonius took over from Cleon's *Argonautica* (fr. 339 *SH*). For other possible identifications, see Delage 1930: 78–79 and Brelich 1958: 144 (eponym of the Dolopians) and Livrea 1979: 151–152 (brother of Chiron). Fränkel 1968: 88 suspects that this episode serves as an etiology for a local cult to Dolops.

⁶⁸ For sacrifices to heroes "towards evening or at night," see Rohde 1925: 140 n. 9.

(κυδαίνοντες, 1.587) with burnt offerings of sheep (ἔντομα μίλων | κείαν, 587–588).⁶⁹

These details suggest a stereotypically “chthonic” sacrifice, thus emphasizing Dolops’ status as a dead hero and lending this episode an uncanny air.⁷⁰ The Argonauts’ motive for making this sacrifice is not stated, but they presumably want to avert the bad weather.⁷¹ Two days later, the weather evidently clears up and they set sail again, perhaps because of their propitiation of Dolops.⁷² The port where they had been detained is now called Ἀφέται Ἀργοῦς (“launching of the Argo”) because of their visit (1.583–591).

- 2) Apollo directs the Ionian colonists of Cyzicus to “dedicate” the Argo’s original anchor stone “as a holy offering, as was proper, in the temple of Athena Jasonia” (ιδρύσαντο | ιερόν, ἢ θέμις ἦεν, Ἰησονίης ἐν Ἀθήνης, 1.959–960).⁷³ Relics of this sort often figure in

⁶⁹ Ekroth 2002: 270 glosses this procedure as “a killing and bleeding of sheep and then burning them.” ἔντομα is a neuter plural substantive related to the verb ἐντέμνειν, a technical term for the slitting of a victim’s throat so as to make a blood offering; see Casabona 1966: 225–229 and Rudhardt 1992: 285–286.

⁷⁰ Cf. the sacrifices to Sthenelus cited below. It is doubtful whether nighttime sacrifices were in fact normative in the early centuries of hero cult, as later sources assert (Parker 2005: 41 with n. 22). Likewise, wholly-burnt offerings were typical for the dead, though not necessarily typical of hero cult, as was once thought (Ekroth 2002: 307–310). But regardless of real-world praxis, these details constitute a literary evocation of the chthonic type of ritual; cf. esp. Jason’s sacrifices to Hecate at *Arg.* 3.1029–1041, 1194–1223, which are closely modeled on the Homeric *Nekyia* (*Od.* 10.516–534, 11.15–47).

⁷¹ Allusions to the Aulis myth (Clauss 1989: 196–198) and to Herodotus (see next note) suggest this motive, as does Apollonius’ description of the sacrifice itself (see Fränkel 1968: 87; cf. Livrea 1979: 152 n. 2, Vian 2002: 1.77 n. 4).

⁷² The Dolops episode is modeled on an incident in *Hdt.* 7.188–191, in which a storm wrecks much of the Persian fleet when it, too, is moored at Magnesia. The Magi cast spells and make sacrifices (the same rare word, ἔντομα, is used [191.2]) to the wind as well as to Thetis and the Nereids, and on the fourth day the wind dies down. Herodotus explicitly raises the possibility, however, that the wind had abated of its own accord (ἢ ἄλλως κως αὐτὸς [*sc.* ὁ ἄνεμος] ἐθέλων ἐκόπασε, *ibid.*), not for any supernatural reason. Apollonius quietly reproduces the Herodotean uncertainty as to what causes the change in weather by inserting a two-day delay between the Argonauts’ sacrifice and the resumption of sailing; cf. 1.1151–1152: when the Argonauts propitiate Cybele in the night, the winds detaining them at Cyzicus have already died down by dawn. For the Herodotean background of the Dolops episode, see esp. Priestley 2014: 149–155.

⁷³ On this temple, cf. Ehrhardt 1995: 29–30. Jason also lends his name to a path (Ἰησονίη ... ὁδός, 1.988) and to a fountain (Ἰησονίην ... κρήνην, 1148–1149) in the etiology-rich Cyzicus episode. *N.b.* 1.966: the Argonauts dedicate an altar to Apollo Ecbasius; according to the scholiast ad loc., however, the local historian Deiochus of

hero cult,⁷⁴ and the cult title “Jasonia” may imply that Jason was worshipped in conjunction with Athena at Cyzicus.⁷⁵

- 3) The rock to which the Argonauts attached their ship-cables on their second landing at Cyzicus is still called “Sacred Rock” (Ἱερὴ ... πέτρα, 1.1019), evidently because it has come into contact with the heroes, who are thus conceived of as holy themselves.⁷⁶
- 4) To this day, the people of Cyzicus “glorify with heroes’ honors” (τιμαῖς ἡρώοισι κυδαίνουσιν, 1.1048) those Dolionians slain by the Argonauts.⁷⁷ The inhabitants “pour annual libations” (ἐτήσια χύτρα χέωνται, 1075)⁷⁸ and ritually abstain from grinding meal

Cyzicus (*FGrH* 471 F 5) spoke of a ἱερόν dedicated to Apollo Jasonius in the same place. Cf. Pliny *HN* 36.99 with Fränkel 1968: 124 n. 257.

⁷⁴ See Pfister 1909: 331–339, who notes this anchor stone on p. 335.

⁷⁵ So Farnell 1921: 410 n. 77, Paduano and Fusillo 1986 ad loc., and Hitch 2012: 138. For this sort of cult title, *n.b.*, e.g., Zeus Ἐκάλειος, worshipped in tandem with the heroine Hecale (Plut. *Vit. Thes.* 14.2–3 = Philochorus *FGrH* 328 F 109); further examples in Farnell 1921: 17 and Currie 2005: 138 n. 112. For the worship of heroes in the shrines of goddesses in particular, see Price 1973: 136. See further on god-hero pairings in cult, e.g., Kearns 1992: 77–93 and Lyons 1997: 71–77.

⁷⁶ Cf. *Arg.* 4.1153–1154, where the narrator observes of the cave in which Medea and Jason are wed: “To this day that holy cave is called Medea’s cave” (καὶ εἰσέτι νῦν ἱερόν κληίζεται ἄντρον | Μηδείης). We could also translate, “That cave is to this day called the sacred cave of Medea” (Seaton), which rendering would imply that the cave’s sacredness stems from its connection with Medea, who must therefore be conceived of as a holy heroine. The cave had already been ἱερόν, however, because of its association with Macris; see below in this section. Hitch 2012: 155 thinks that Medea replaces Macris as the heroine associated with the cave.

⁷⁷ For the religious sense of τιμή as “worship,” see Nagy 1999: 118–119 and esp. Mikalson 1991: 183–202. Ekroth 2002: 200 argues that in the context of hero cult, τιμαί will refer to “some kind of cult with sacrifices taking place,” whether of animal victims or bloodless offerings.

⁷⁸ For libations of various sorts in hero cult (wine, water, milk, honey, oil, blood, and other liquids), see Henrichs 1983: 93–100, esp. 99 n. 58.

at home in remembrance of the community's grief (1071–1076).⁷⁹ Elements of King Cyzicus' funeral rites (1058–1062) may be meant to suggest features of his cult.⁸⁰

- 5) After navigating the Clashing Rocks, the Argonauts sail past the “shrine” (ἱερόν, 2.658) of one Dipsacus, the son of a meadow nymph and the river Phyllis.⁸¹
- 6) Apollo directs the colonists of Heraclea Pontica to found their city around the Argonautic seer Idmon's tomb and to worship (ἰλάεσθαι, 2.847) him as their “city guardian”

⁷⁹ The heroized Dolionians presumably include King Cyzicus himself, whose death is treated more expansively (1.1030–1039) before the catalogue of the other slain warriors (1040–1047) to which this etiology is appended. At 1075–1076, the narrator mentions the annual offerings given to these dead, who now seem to include as well Cyzicus' wife Cleite, whose suicide has just been described (1063–1069) (so Hasluck 1910: 240 with n. 1 and Paduano and Fusillo 1986 ad *Arg.* 1070–1077). In addition to the royal couple, Apollonius identifies the twelve other slain Dolionians by name, and several of these appear to represent eponyms for authentic Cyzicene places and institutions; see Hasluck 1910: 240 and Cuypers in *BNJ* 471 F 8b. The scholiast ad 1039 asserts that Apollonius took these names over from Deiochus (*FGrH* 471 F 8b), while the scholiast ad 1040–1041 claims that Apollonius invented at least two of them. On this problem, see Wendel 1932: 106; Fränkel 1968: 129; Vian 2002: 1.99 n. 1; Goldhill 1991: 316–319, 328–329; Clauss 1993: 166 n. 38; and Cuypers in *BNJ* 471 F 8b.

⁸⁰ Cyzicus is mourned by the whole community (Hitch 2012: 139; cf. n. 110 below), though we could expect as much of a king. Perhaps more saliently, Cyzicus' funeral rites generally follow Homeric precedent, with one important exception (Saïd 1998: 17–19): his funeral games are held at the site of his tomb (*Arg.* 2.1060–1062). Funeral games for important personages are a typical part of the epic world that Apollonius has inherited from Homer, and they are presented as standard practice within the *Arg.* Thus Cyzicus' games are held “as is fitting” (ἢ θέμις, 1.1061), and elsewhere the narrator mentions funeral contests for Pelias (1.1304), Priolas (2.780–783; on this figure, see the next subsection), and a generic king in a simile (3.1273); of these, Pelias' funeral games are a traditional part of the Argonautic saga (see Davies and Finglass 2014: 213–218). But in Homer, these games occur away from the honorand's tomb (Saïd 1998: 18). Apollonius' setting of the games by Cyzicus' barrow is an innovation possibly consistent with his un-Homeric presentation of the hero's tomb as the focus of cult activity (*ibid.* 18–19). In this context, Apollonius may be alluding to the (both mythic and historical) practice of institutionalizing a hero's funeral games as a recurrent contest to be held in perpetuity (cf. Call. fr. 384.30 Pf.); see, e.g., Rohde 1925: 116–117, Roller 1981: 6–10, 12, and Seaford 1994: 120–123. Cf. Hasluck 1910: 159, who assumes that Apollonius refers to just such an institution of games in Cyzicus' honor.

⁸¹ Fränkel 1968: 223 emends ἱερόν to ἠρίον, on analogy with the “tomb” of Aegaeon, similarly passed by the Argonauts at 1.1165, but Campbell 1973: 78 is right to point out that we do not know enough about the obscure Dipsacus to justify changing the text. The term ἱερόν itself does not reveal much about Dipsacus' ontological status. In some contexts, ἱερόν can be contrasted with ἠρώων to denote the shrines proper to gods and to heroes, respectively (e.g., Thuc. 2.17.1, Conon *Narr.* 45 *fin.*; cf. *Arg.* 2.807). But ἱερόν is also the more general term of the two (cf., e.g., schol. ad Ar. *Vesp.* 819: θῆρώων: τὸ ἱερόν τοῦ ἠρώος Λύκου) and can be used with reference to heroes' shrines (e.g., Strabo 9.2.10: τὸ ἱερόν τοῦ Ἀμφιαράου), especially those lacking tombs; see further Kearns 1992: 65–68 and Pirenne-Delforge 2008: 150–151, 168–170. Dipsacus, who has apparently lived and died (*n.b.* the imperfect verbs in 2.655b–657), seems more like a hero than a god. Perhaps he was immortalized for hosting Phrixus; cf. the category of “hospitality heroes” (Larson 1995: 36). *N.b.* as well that the prosaic ἠρώων is never used in Greek epic; ἱερόν may therefore provide a poetic equivalent. Apollonius also follows the poetic practice of using σηκός for sanctuaries generally (4.1285), not precincts for heroes specifically (Casevitz 1984: 94).

(πολισσοῦχον, 846),⁸² but to this day the city honors (κυδαίνουσιν, 850) a certain Agamestor instead.⁸³

7) The Argonauts witness the epiphany of the “soul” (ψυχὴν, 2.916) of Sthenelus,⁸⁴ a warrior who died during Heracles’ quest for Hippolyta’s belt,⁸⁵ and the seer Mopsus

⁸² On this title, common in the cult of city-founders, see Malkin 1987: 75–76, 1993: 231–232. Heroes commonly “possess” (with ἔχω and other verbs) the city or land that worships them: see Rohde 1925: 155 n. 137. Elsewhere, another Argonaut, Polyphemus, founds the city of Cius (1.1322, 1346; 4.1472), though he is not said to be worshipped there. In fact, his grave is located elsewhere (1.1323, 4.1474–1477), and the city takes its name not from him, but a local river (Foster 2007: 259–260). The tradition of his founding of the city seems to have been rather tenuous; see Ehrhardt 1995: 30–35.

⁸³ Who is this Agamestor? The scholiast ad 2.844–847a, citing Apollonius’ probable source Promathidas (*FGrH* 430 F 3), interprets the passage to mean that the Boeotian and Megarian colonists did not know the identity of the hero whom Apollo directed them to worship; consequently, they wrongly assumed that Agamestor, a certain local hero, was the one buried under Idmon’s funeral mound (see also Σ ad 848–850b, Cuypers in *BNJ* 430 F 3). Quint. Smyrn. 6.464 seems to make Agamestor a local hero as well (Cuypers, *ibid.*; cf. Wilamowitz 1924: 2.237 n. 4). Fontenrose 1978: 300 speculates that the legend of Idmon’s confusion with Agamestor arose to account for the existence of two competing traditions about the occupant of the tomb; one of these traditions was authentically local (Agamestor), while the other was an attempt to anchor the Argonautic legend in the real-world topography of the Euxine coast (Idmon); cf. Händel 1954: 73. Other proposed identifications of Agamestor include:

- Either a preexisting local hero who was syncretized with Idmon or an individuation of one of Idmon’s epithets, since the name Agamestor (“Excellent Counselor”) is synonymous with Idmon’s (“The Knowing One”): Robert 1921: 775, Rohrbach 1960: 58, Giangliulio 1981: 21–22 with n. 102, and Malkin 1987: 76;
- A reflex of a local Bithynian god: Fontenrose 1959: 480–481;
- A son of the Theban king Laius, honored as an ancestor of the Boeotian colonists: Fraser 1972: 1.631 and Jackson 1995: 64 n. 22 (but see Ehrhardt 1995: 38–39 on this supposed Boeotian contingent of colonists);
- An Athenian king: Roux 1949: 69;
- One of the colony-founders, perhaps particularly the Boeotian leader: Jacoby in his commentary with n. 15 on *FGrH* 430 F 2–3, Saïd 1998: 19, Vian 2002: 1.162 n. 1, Lachenaud 2010: 304 n. 250. Burstein 1976: 103 n. 103 objects, however, that “the cult of a founder would have preserved his identity” (see further Ehrhardt 1995: 40); and
- A generic name (“Excellent Counselor”) conjured up for a hero whose name the colonists did not know: Thalmann 2011: 108–109.

⁸⁴ Sthenelus must in some sense remain under the power of Persephone like any ordinary spirit of the dead, for it is this goddess who mercifully sends forth his soul (2.915–916), “begging to behold even for a moment men of his own kind” (λίσσομένην τυτθὸν περ ὁμήθεας ἀνδρας ἰδέσθαι, 917). There is something numinous about the idea that Sthenelus could tell that “men of his own kind” were about to pass by his tomb, as if he could somehow sense their presence from within his grave; cf. the treatment of Valerius, who evidently felt the need to explain Sthenelus’ knowledge of the Argonauts’ imminent approach, via the “κλέος-reaching-even-unto-Hades” topos (5.82–89).

⁸⁵ The scholiast ad 2.911–914 claims that Apollonius adopted the figure of Sthenelus from the local historian Promathidas of Heraclea (*FGrH* 430 F 4), but that he invented his epiphany to the Argonauts. Fränkel 1968: 246 and Vian 2002: 1.163 n. 6 compare Achilles’ apparition over his tomb in the *Nostoi* and in the Polyxena myth; for further parallels, see Hitch 2012: 142 n. 34. As Cuypers in *BNJ* 430 F 5 points out, the Sthenelus apparition rounds out the quasi-κατάβασις represented by the Argonauts’ stay in Acherusia (cf. esp. 2.735, 743) and is immediately preceded by a reference to Dionysus’ “unsmiling orgies” (ὄργιάσαι, 907; ἀμειδίτους, 908), that is to say, mystic

directs them to propitiate him with libation offerings (λοιβῆσί τε μελίξασθαι, 923). In the event, the Argonauts “paid homage to Sthenelus’ tomb” (Σθενέλου τάφον ἀμφοπένοντο, 925)⁸⁶ both with drink offerings (χύτλα τέ οἱ χεύαντο, 926)⁸⁷ and with the sacrifice of sheep (ἤγγισαν ἔντομα μίλων, 926).⁸⁸ “Then, apart from the libations” (ἄνδιχα δ’ αὖ χύτλων, 927), the Argonauts erect an altar to Apollo, and Orpheus dedicates his lyre, whence the place is now called Lyra (2.911–929).⁸⁹

- 8) On arriving in Colchis, Jason makes a libation (χέε λοιβάς, 2.1272) of honey⁹⁰ and neat wine to Gaia, the local gods, and “the souls of the dead heroes” (ψυχαῖς τε καμόντων | ἠρώων, 1273–1274) native to the land,⁹¹ beseeching (γουνοῦτο, 1274) their aid before the next major leg of his adventure.

rites concerning death and the afterlife.” The whole sequence from Idmon’s heroization to Sthenelus’ epiphany hints at the possibility of life after death for the Argonauts themselves.

⁸⁶ Páskiewicz 1981 ad loc. notes that the phrase echoes the last line of the *Iliad* (ἀμφίεπον τάφον, 24.804), concerning Hector’s burial. Characteristically, Apollonius has transferred the phrase from a heroic funeral to hero cult.

⁸⁷ These offerings are denoted by the same *figura etymologica* used earlier for the annual offerings made to the Dolionian heroes in Cyzicus (χύτλα χέωνται, 1.1075). This intratext, along with several marked parallels with the Dolops episode (see Clauss 1989: 198), suggests that Sthenelus is the recipient of hero cult, not merely a restless ghost who must be propitiated.

⁸⁸ Cf. the Argonauts’ earlier sacrifices to Dolops (ἔντομα μίλων | κεῖαν, 1.587–588). In this sacrificial context, ἀγνίζω will likewise mean “burn” (Páskiewicz 1981 and Matteo 2007 ad loc.; cf. Rudhardt 1992: 171). Again, Apollonius presumably intends to represent this sacrifice as chthonic; *n.b.* that when the Argonauts proceed to sacrifice to Apollo, they burn only the thigh pieces (μῆρ’ ἔφλεγον, 2.928), as per the normal mode of sacrifice.

⁸⁹ Valverde Sánchez 1989: 93 pairs this episode with that of Dolops as examples of etiologies connected to hero cult. It is unclear, however, to whom Orpheus dedicates his lyre: Apollo, Sthenelus (cf. VF 5.98–100), or both? The sacrifices to Apollo are conceived of as separate from those to Sthenelus (cf. ἄνδιχα δ’ αὖ χύτλων, 2.927), and Orpheus’ dedication, which follows Apollo’s sacrifices, may therefore be made only to the god (Händel 1954: 49, Fränkel 1968 ad *Arg.* 2.911–935, and Cuypers in *BNJ* 430 F 5).

⁹⁰ The libations are qualified with the adjective μελισταγέας (1272), which may only mean “sweet as dropped honey” (LSJ s.v. A.2) but might also refer to an offering of honey mixed with wine.

⁹¹ In this ritual context and in light of parallel passages (e.g., Xen. *Cyr.* 3.22; see further Guthrie 1950: 29), the heroes in question must be local Colchian ones (so Dräger 2002 ad loc.), not the Argonauts who have died along the way, as Vian assumes (2002: 1.175).

- 9) Hera predicts to Thetis the future marriage of her son Achilles to Medea in the “Elysian Field” (Ἠλύσιον πεδῖον, 4.811), a paradise reserved for immortal heroes.⁹²
- 10) Dogged by Hera, Dionysus’ nurse Macris, daughter of Aristaeus, settled in a “sacred cave” (ἄντρον ἐν ἠγαθέῳ, 4.1131; ἱερῷ ἐνί ... ἄντρον, 1139; ἱερόν ... ἄντρον, 1153) on Phaeacia “and bestowed immense prosperity on the inhabitants” (πόρεν ὄλβον ἀθέσφατον ἐνναέτησιν, 1140). This latter detail suggests the benefaction of a local heroine,⁹³ perhaps with a cult centered around her holy cave.⁹⁴

These ten unambiguous references to hero cult or heroization follow an interesting pattern of distribution. At least five are connected to αἴτια (#1, 2, 3, 4, 6),⁹⁵ and the frequent citations of local historians in the scholia to these passages show that these references are the product of Apollonius’ researches. Almost more interesting, however, are the seemingly unmotivated references to hero cult, especially in the casual mention of Dipsacus’ shrine in example #5. This passage shows what a natural part of the epic world hero cult has become in

⁹² This passage alludes to *Od.* 4.561–569, where another god, Proteus, similarly prophesies Menelaus’ fated afterlife in paradise; *n.b.* the occurrence of the phrase ἐς Ἠλύσιον πεδῖον in the same *sedes* at *Od.* 4.563 and *Arg.* 4.811; νημερτέα at *Arg.* 4.810 may allude to Proteus’ stock epithet νημερτής (*Od.* 4.349, 384, 401, 542; 17.140; cf. *Hes. Th.* 235). But whereas Menelaus himself is the recipient of this prophecy in the *Odyssey*, Apollonius has, characteristically, kept Medea ignorant of her fate.

⁹³ A similar phrase is used of Aetes’ enriching of Phrixus at *Arg.* 2.1181, but for a nurse to enrich the population of an entire island she would presumably need to be a deity of some kind (Weinberg 1986: 67, Hitch 2012: 155, and Hunter 2015 ad loc.). Cf. *Hes. Op.* 379 (πόροι Ζεὺς ἄσπετον ὄλβον, noted by Campbell 1981: 40 ad *Arg.* 2.1181) and, though verbal parallels are lacking, Zeus’ enriching of the island of Rhodes at *Il.* 2.670 (καί σφιν θεσπέσιον πλοῦτον κατέχευε Κρονίων). Hera’s hostility toward Macris is reminiscent of the myth of Ino, another of Dionysus’ nurses, who is herself transformed into the goddess Leucothea.

⁹⁴ For sacred caves, see Weinberg 1986: ch. 4, Roux 1999: ch. 15, and Ustinova 2009: ch. 2.

⁹⁵ For the ambiguity of the connection of the etiology for the name Lyra in example #7, see n. 91 above. Hunter 1993: 128 comments, “The pervasive aetiological interests of the *Argonautica*, which present us with tangible, continuing evidence for past lives, make heroes (in the ‘religious’ sense) and their cult an obvious source of interest.”

Apollonius' hands.⁹⁶ Absent from this survey is the ever-exceptional Book 3; its tight plotting, setting in a single land (Colchis), and paucity of ἀῖτια perhaps explain this disparity. It is also suggestive that only two examples occur in Book 4. The exotic and sometimes fantastical geography of the return journey may not have accommodated hero cult, with its strong local aspect, quite as easily as the outward itinerary. The relevance of hero cult to the Argonauts' own futures is suggested by the fact that both of the instances in Book 4 (#9, 10) relate directly or obliquely to the future of Jason and Medea's marriage. In #9, Hera reveals that Medea will marry Achilles in Elysium—following the failure of her marriage to Jason, we may infer.⁹⁷ Likewise, Macris' sacred cave in passage #10 provides the setting for Jason and Medea's wedding, but an earlier narratorial digression (4.539–541) had revealed that Heracles once came to this same Macris in order to be purified for the murder of his children. By means of this almost subliminal association, Apollonius contrives for Jason and Medea's marriage to take place under the sign of child-murder, a grisly portent of the destined fruit of their newfound union.⁹⁸

It is also significant that the Argonauts themselves participate in hero cult on three occasions (#1, 7, 8), including in their first stop following the departure from Pagasae (#1). Valerius and "Orpheus" evidently saw little point in Apollonius' Dolops episode and thus have the heroes of their *Argonauticas* pass by Dolops' tomb without stopping and without comment (VF *Arg.* 2.10, *Orph. Arg.* 461). Apollonius is no doubt partly attracted to this setting by the

⁹⁶ For an interpretation of Dipsacus' pastoral vignette, see, e.g., Fusillo 1985: 171–172.

⁹⁷ Feeney 1991: 63.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.* and Hunter 1993: 74.

possibility for etiology and mythological harmonization,⁹⁹ but arguably more is at stake here, too: the Argonauts' participation in hero cult here serves to foreshadow their own heroization, which, in the manner of ring-composition, Apollonius finally acknowledges at the very end of their journey (4.1773–1775).¹⁰⁰ This, I believe, is the programmatic significance with which Apollonius invests this minor episode by making it the first incident of the outward journey.

b. Ambiguous Cases of Hero Cult

In addition to these relatively clear-cut examples, there are several more ambiguous passages in which hero cult is not as explicit, but could be implied by some combination of allusion and the reader's potential knowledge of the local traditions that inform Apollonius' narrative.¹⁰¹ For instance, when the Argonaut Butes is about to succumb to the Sirens' alluring song, Aphrodite “who rules over Eryx” (Ἐρυκος μεδέουσα, 4.917) snatches him up (ἀνερέψατο, 918) from the sea to dwell at Cape Lilybaeum in Sicily (4.912–919); there, tradition holds, he is to become by Aphrodite the father of Eryx, eponym of the Sicilian city and mountain and the founder of the goddess's famous temple there.¹⁰² Hunter has pointed out a probable allusion in this passage to Hes. *Th.* 988–991, where Aphrodite similarly snatches up (ἀνερειψαμένη, *Th.* 990) the young Phaethon, whom she makes “her innermost temple-keeper in her holy temples, a divine

⁹⁹ See Händel 1954: 29.

¹⁰⁰ See further Hitch 2012: 136–137.

¹⁰¹ In addition to the passages discussed below, in Chapter 4, Section II.a I discuss the possibility that *Arg.* 4.1763–1764 alludes to hero cult for Theras, the eponymous founder of Thera.

¹⁰² For ancient sources, see Wernicke in *RE* 3.1 s.v. “Butes,” p. 1082. The myth is examined from the perspective of Greek colonization by D'Aleo 2012.

spirit” (ζαθέοις ἐνὶ νηοῖς | νηοπόλον μύχιον ποιήσατο, δαίμονα δῖον, 990–991).¹⁰³ For Hunter, the same fate has “plainly” befallen Butes,¹⁰⁴ and the intertext does encourage us to think so; perhaps we are to imagine Butes being buried in or near the temple that Eryx will found for his mother.¹⁰⁵

Another passage suggestive of hero cult occurs in the Mariandynian King Lycus’ recollections of Heracles’ earlier adventures in his realm, in the course of which he mentions two local champions, Priolas and Titias, the eponyms for a pair of towns in the area (2.780–785):¹⁰⁶

ἔνθα δ’ ἐπὶ Πριόλαο κασιγνήτιο θανόντος	780
ἡμετέρου Μυσοῖσιν ὑπ’ ἀνδράσιν, ὃν τινα λαὸς	
οἰκτίστοις ἐλέγοισιν ὀδύρεται ἐξέτι κείνου,	
ἄθλευων Τιτίην ἀπεκαίνυτο πυγμαχέοντα	
καρτερόν, ὃς πάντεσσι μετέπρεπεν ἠθέοισιν	
εἰδός τ’ ἠδὲ βίην, χαμάδις δέ οἱ ἤλασ’ ὀδόντας.	785

Then he [*sc.* Heracles], competing in the games held when my brother Priolas was killed by the Mysians, whom the people have mourned ever since with most sorrowful dirges, defeated in boxing mighty Titias, who surpassed all the young men in beauty and strength, and knocked his teeth to the ground.

In this passage, Lycus’ brother Priolas is remembered with public mourning (λαός ... ὀδύρεται, 781–782; *n.b.* the present tense, indicative of habitual action) accompanied by threnodies (οἰκτίστοις ἐλέγοισιν, 782). The phrase ἐξέτι κείνου (“ever since,” 782) sounds an etiological

¹⁰³ On this passage’s relation to hero cult, see West 1966: 428–429.

¹⁰⁴ Hunter 2015 ad *Arg.* 4.918. In light of this intertext, I would add a parallel passage in Theocritus: *Id.* 17.46–50 describes Aphrodite’s snatching (ἀρπάξασα, 48) Queen Berenice I out of Hades before she could cross the Acheron; the goddess then immortalizes her and installs her in her own temple to share cult honors. Berenice’s fate resembles a mixture of those of Apollonius’ Butes and Hesiod’s Phaethon. If Apollonius does imitate Theocritus here (or vice versa), it would strengthen the argument for a cultic subtext in Butes’ translation to Lilybaeum.

¹⁰⁵ In the case of the other Argonauts who are separated from the crew (Hylas, Polyphemus, and Heracles), Apollonius is careful to relate their fates in some detail (1.1317–1325, 1345–1357; 4.1472–1477). The poet only hints at Butes’ fate, however, by mentioning Eryx in line 917 and, perhaps, by alluding to the parallel fate of Phaethon in the *Theogony*.

¹⁰⁶ Their eponymous status is noted by Σ ad *Arg.* 2.780–783a.

note¹⁰⁷ that reinforces the impression that Lycus is describing the origin of a cultic ritual. Hitch does not discuss this particular passage, but her comment on the cult afforded the slain Dolionians is equally apt here: “[A]cts of mourning performed by communities, rather than families, and repetitive ritual are some of the characteristic features which distinguish hero cult from tendence [*sic*] of the dead.”¹⁰⁸

Notably, the scholiast ad 780–783b claims that Apollonius is unique (ιδίως) in making Priolas, not Titias’ son Borimus (or “Bormus”), the subject of the Mariandynians’ lament.¹⁰⁹ Indeed, Apollonius is our only source for the honors afforded to Priolas, but several ancient testimonies mention comparable rituals for Borimus, whose very name denoted a Mariandynian style of θρηῆνος (Poll. *Onom.* 4.54–55, Hesych. s.v. Βῶρμιον).¹¹⁰ This Borimus was a Hylas-like figure with agricultural associations; the Mariandynians began to hold a ritual search and lament for him every summer following his disappearance while he was out either looking for water or on a hunt. Apollonius will likely have known the Borimus story from reading Nymphis (*FGrH* 432 F 5), a local Heracleote historian who was probably his older contemporary.¹¹¹ At the very

¹⁰⁷ See Páskiewicz 1981 ad loc.

¹⁰⁸ Hitch 2012: 139; see *ibid.* 140, 143–144 for similar points vis-à-vis Idmon and Jason. For ritual mourning in hero cult, see Brelich 1958: 82–86, Nilsson 1967: 187, and Seaford 1994: 139 nn. 151–152.

¹⁰⁹ See van der Kolf in *RE* 22.2 s.v. “Priolas,” p. 2317, for an important discussion of this scholium. She argues that the scholiast does not equate Priolas and Borimus (e.g., as comparable vegetation deities) but rather shows himself familiar with the Mariandynians’ ritual lament for the one figure (Borimus) but not the other (Priolas) based on his knowledge of the local historians Nymphis and Callistratus. Burstein 1976: 104 n. 110 assumes from this scholium that Apollonius invented these rites for Priolas, but as van der Kolf notes, he might equally have borrowed them from a source unknown to the scholiast.

¹¹⁰ For the confused traditions surrounding Priolas, Titias, and Borimus, see, e.g., Robert 1921: 836 n. 5 and Vian 2002: 1.277–278.

¹¹¹ The *Arg.* scholia mention Nymphis repeatedly and once observe that the poet seems to have taken material directly from him (παρ’ οὗ Ἀπολλώνιος ἔοικε ταῦτα μεταφέρειν, Σ ad 2.729–735a = Nymphis fr. 3). For Apollonius’ probable use of Nymphis, see Desideri 1967: 380–387, with earlier bibliography. Possibly Apollonius has used Nymphis’ Borimus as a partial model for his version of Priolas and Titias. With Apollonius’ description of Titias (2.784–785), cf. Nymphis’ description of Borimus: “They say that ... in his beauty and his comeliness at its

least, we may be confident that the poet’s reference to οἰκτίστοις ἐλέγοισιν (*n.b.* the superlative) reflects his awareness of the Mariandynians’ reputation for threnody, attested already in Aeschylus (*Pers.* 938) and closely associated with the figure of Borimus.¹¹² If Apollonius did know the Borimus myth, it is curious that he dispensed with it in favor of the story that he tells about Priolas.¹¹³ Certainly the latter is more typically “epic” and better accommodates Lycus’ Heracles narrative.¹¹⁴ Priolas’ death in battle provides both a venue for Heracles’ boxing match with Titias and, more importantly, a reason for Heracles to avenge the Mariandynians by subduing the Mysians and several other neighboring peoples on their behalf (2.786–791).¹¹⁵ But regardless of his precise relationship to Borimus, Apollonius does appear to present Priolas as a local cult hero, and he has been interpreted as such by modern scholars.¹¹⁶

Interestingly, however, it is Heracles’ boxing opponent Titias whom we actually know to have been a local hero, though Apollonius makes no reference to this fact. In discussing the homonymous Cretan Dactyl named Titias, the scholiast ad *Arg.* 1.1126–1131a quotes a fragment

height he far surpassed the rest” (τοῦτον δὲ λέγουσιν ... τῷ δὲ κάλλει καὶ τῇ κατὰ τὴν ἀκμὴν ὄρα πολὺ τῶν ἄλλων διενεγκεῖν, *FGrH* 432 F 9b; translation my own).

¹¹² In fact, the Aeschylean scholiast ad loc. is one of our sources for Borimus’ story.

¹¹³ Apollonius’ “creative selectivity” in his choice and combination of mythic variants has been stressed by Jackson, particularly in his 1993 monograph.

¹¹⁴ Cf. Páskiewicz 1988: 60, who suggests that Apollonius has invented some details in his Priolas narrative in order to justify Heracles’ war against the Mysians.

¹¹⁵ As Lycus makes clear, the Argonauts continue Heracles’ work by killing the Bebrycian king Amycus, who had been a thorn in the Mariandynians’ side since Heracles’ departure (792–798). For a good overview of Heracles’ various conquests in this region, see Páskiewicz 1981 ad *Arg.* 2.786. For the political subtext of this narrative, see Wilamowitz 1924: 2.237 n. 2, Fränkel 1968: 232 n. 218, Palombi 1993: 162–163, and Vian 2002: 1.159–161.

¹¹⁶ E.g., van der Kolf in *RE* 22.2 s.v. “Priolas,” pp. 2316.26–28, 2317.62–67; Páskiewicz 1988: 59; and Matteo 2007: 519.

of Domitius Callistratus (= *FGrH* 433 F 2), another local historian of Heraclea Pontica, as follows:

Καλλίστρατος δὲ ἐν τῇ β' τῶν Καθ' Ἡράκλειαν περὶ Τιτίου φησίν·
'ὁ δὲ Τιτίας ἥρωος ἐγγώριος, ὃν οἱ μὲν μυθεύουσι παῖδα Διός, οἱ δὲ
τὸν πρεσβύτατον τῶν Μαρριανδυνοῦ τοῦ Κιμμερίου παίδων, δι' ὃν
μάλιστα τὸ ἔθνος ἠϋξῆται καὶ προάγεται ἔτι εἰς εὐδαιμονίαν·
ἀπεθεώθη δὲ ὑπὸ Μαρριανδυνῶν.' Καὶ Προμαθίδας δὲ ἐν τοῖς Περὶ
Ἡρακλείας [*FGrH* 430 F 1] λέγει περὶ Τιτίου ὅστις ἦν, καὶ
Θεοφάνης [188 F 2].

Callistratus, in Book 2 of *On Heraclea*, says of Titias: “Titias is a local hero, whom some say is the son of Zeus, others, the eldest of the children of Mariandynus the Cimmerian. It was chiefly because of him that his people have grown in power and continue to increase in prosperity, and he was deified by the Mariandynians.” Promathidas also discusses who Titias was in his *About Heraclea* [*FGrH* 430 F 1], as does Theophanes [188 F 2].¹¹⁷

Apollonius has evidently cast a local cult hero (or god? *n.b.* ἀπεθεώθη) for a minor role in Lycus' Heracles narrative, though nothing in his text would suggest this destiny for Titias. The same phenomenon may be observed at *Arg.* 2.955–961, when the Argonauts pick up the three sons of Deimachus, who had been left behind at Sinope¹¹⁸ during the course of Heracles' Amazonian labor (cf. 2.912–913). Apollonius names all three of these brothers (956) without letting on that at least one of them, Autolycus, was in fact worshipped as the founder (οἰκιστής) of Sinope and had an oracle attributed to him there.¹¹⁹ In the footnotes to the list of definite

¹¹⁷ Text is taken from Wendel 1935; the translation is my own. The phrase ἀπεθεώθη δὲ ὑπὸ Μαρριανδυνῶν has been transposed from its original place at the end of this quotation, where it seems inorganic; see Wendel's apparatus.

¹¹⁸ The foregoing digression (946–954) on the city's eponymous nymph, the abducted Asopid Sinope (see Jackson 1999), serves to identify the site by name and put the reader in mind of foundation narratives (*n.b.* καθίστατο, 947). Sinope thus emerges as doubly Greek through the Deimachids and its transplanted nymph. If he knew the story, Apollonius may have consciously suppressed an alternate story that connected Sinope to an eponymous Amazon; see Ehrhardt 1995: 44.

¹¹⁹ See Páskiewicz 1981 ad *Arg.* 2.955, Malkin 1987: 207–208, and Vian 2002: 1.280–281 ad *Arg.* 2.961. Besides Autolycus, another of the Deimachids, Phlogius, is apparently mentioned in a dedicatory inscription from Sinope (*CIG* 4162 = Robinson 1905: 306), which suggests that he received cult there too. On the basis of this evidence,

references to hero cult above, I noted several cases in which the scholia claim that Apollonius has incorporated an obscure cult hero (Dolops, the slain Dolionians, Agamestor, Sthenelus) from a poetic predecessor (Cleon of Curium) or local historian (Deiochus, Promathidas); probably other obscure cult heroes (Dipsacus?) derive from similar sources. It is a testament to Apollonius' enthusiasm for hero cult that he has filled out the population of his epic world with several cult heroes drawn from his extensive reading.

c. Hesiodic Heroization

Another important means by which Apollonius hints at the Argonauts' destined immortalization is through allusion to Hesiod, and particularly to an influential passage from the *Works and Days*. In his account of the fourth of the Five Ages, the Ages of Heroes, Hesiod explains how many of the mythic heroes came to be immortalized after death; I quote his account in full (*Op.* 156–173):¹²⁰

αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ καὶ τοῦτο γένος κατὰ γαῖα κάλυψεν, αὐτίς ἔτ' ἄλλο τέταρτον ἐπὶ χθονὶ πουλυβοτείρῃ Ζεὺς Κρονίδης ποίησε, δικαιοῦτερον καὶ ἄρειον, ἀνδρῶν ἡρώων θεῖον γένος, οἳ καλέονται ἡμίθεοι, προτέρη γενεὴ κατ' ἀπείρονα γαῖαν.	160
καὶ τοὺς μὲν πόλεμός τε κακὸς καὶ φύλοπις αἰνὴ τοὺς μὲν ὑφ' ἑπταπύλῳ Θήβῃ, Καδμηίδι γαίῃ, ᾧλεσε μαρναμένους μῆλων ἔνεκ' Οἰδιπόδαο, τοὺς δὲ καὶ ἐν νήεσσιν ὑπὲρ μέγα λαῖτμα θαλάσσης ἔς Τροίην ἀγαγὼν Ἑλένης ἔνεκ' ἠυκόμοιο.	165
ἔνθ' ἦ τοι τοὺς μὲν θανάτου τέλος ἀμφεκάλυψεν, τοῖς δὲ δίχ' ἀνθρώπων βίον καὶ ἦθε' ὀπάσσας Ζεὺς Κρονίδης κατένασσε πατὴρ ἐς πείρατα γαίης,	168

Ehrhardt 1995: 43 infers that all three of the brothers named by Apollonius were likely worshipped as κτίσται in Sinope.

¹²⁰ With this passage cf. also Hes. *Cat.* fr. 155.64–65 Most (= fr. 204.102–103 MW). The question of the authenticity of line 166, and more generally whether Hesiod limited translation to the Islands of the Blessed to only some of the fourth generation, is much debated; see, e.g., West 1978 ad loc., Solmsen 1982: 21–24, Koenen 1994: 5 n. 12.

καὶ τοὶ μὲν ναίουσιν ἀκηδέα θυμὸν ἔχοντες 170
 ἐν μακάρων νήσοισι παρ' Ὠκεανὸν βαθυδίνην·
 ὄλβιοι ἥρωες, τοῖσιν μελιηδέα καρπὸν
 τρὶς ἔτεος θάλλοντα φέρει ζεῖδωρος ἄρουρα.

When the earth covered up this [bronze] race too, Zeus, Cronus' son, made another one in turn upon the bounteous earth, a fourth one, more just and superior, the godly race of men-heroes, who are called demigods, the generation before our own upon the boundless earth. Evil war and dread battle destroyed these, some under seven-gated Thebes in the land of Cadmus while they fought for the sake of Oedipus' sheep, others brought in boats over the great gulf of the sea to Troy for the sake of fair-haired Helen. There the end of death shrouded some of them, but upon others Zeus the father, Cronus' son, bestowed life and habitations far from human beings and settled them at the limits of the earth; and these dwell with a spirit free of care on the Islands of the Blessed beside deep-eddying Ocean—happy heroes, for whom the grain-giving field bears honey-sweet fruit flourishing three times a year.

Hesiod's account may presuppose, but is not explicit about, the cult worship of these heroes.¹²¹

Hesiod's switch from aorist to present-tense verbs in lines 170–174 indicates his belief in the heroes' eternal life (cf. βίοντος ... ὀπάσσης, 167): even now they enjoy their carefree existence at the ends of the earth.¹²² In one instance, Homer appears to presuppose a comparable conception of a mythic Age of Heroes, retrospectively referring to the warriors who died at Troy as “the race of men half-divine” (ἡμιθέων γένος ἀνδρῶν, *Il.* 12.23).¹²³ Tellingly, though, the context of this reference is the elimination of any lasting trace of the Achaean army in the Troad by a godsent flood—a far cry from Hesiod's notion of the demigods' continued vitality as immortalized

¹²¹ See Bravo 2009: 15–16, with earlier references. Apollonius would have been familiar with later Greek literature that does testify to cultic honors for those who dwell on the Islands of the Blessed (e.g., Pl. *Resp.* 540b–c).

¹²² Later accounts certify that the inhabitants of the Islands of the Blessed are indeed immortal (e.g., Hellanicus *FGrH* 4 F 19b, scolion 894 Campbell).

¹²³ de Jong 2004a: 88–89. Homer's view of his protagonists as a distinct race of yore emerges also from the unfavorable comparisons he sometimes draws between the strength of his heroes and “men as they are now” (*Il.* 5.302–304; 12.381–383, 447–449; 20.285–287) (Hack 1929: 68–69, van Wees 1992: 8).

heroes.¹²⁴ In any case, Hesiod’s account of the race of heroes is the *locus classicus*, and was imitated at length in the Hellenistic period by Apollonius’ predecessor Aratus (*Phaen.* 96–136).

Hesiod’s importance to the mythological chronology that undergirds the *Arg.* has increasingly been recognized in recent years, particularly in light of a series of important studies by Clauss.¹²⁵ Apollonius explicitly adopts the Hesiodic framework near the end of the epic, when Talos is referred to as “the last of the bronze race of men born from ash trees still living in the time of the demigods” (τὸν μὲν χαλκείης μελιγενέων ἀνθρώπων | ρίζης λοιπὸν ἔοντα μετ’ ἀνδράσιν ἡμιθέοισιν, 4.1641–1642).¹²⁶ Long before this point in the text, however, Apollonius allusively locates the Argonauts in the Heroic Age by referring to them with variations of Hesiod’s identifying phrase, “the godly race of men-heroes, who are called demigods” (ἀνδρῶν ἠρώων θεῖον γένος, οἱ καλέονται | ἡμίθεοι, *Op.* 159–160). Most prominent is the scene of the Argo’s launch, where the narrator describes the gods as looking down at “the race of demigods, the best of men who then were sailing over the sea” (ἡμιθέων ἀνδρῶν γένος, οἱ τότε ἄριστοι | πόντον ἐπιπλώεσκον, *Arg.* 1.548–549).¹²⁷ Apollonius’ wording carefully combines Homer’s single reference to “demigods,” quoted above (ἡμιθέων γένος ἀνδρῶν, *Il.* 12.23),¹²⁸ with the syntax of Hesiod’s phrase, with its expansion by means of a relative clause (γένος, οἱ...).¹²⁹ This combination may be taken as emblematic of Apollonius’ synthesis of two types of heroism:

¹²⁴ On this passage, see, e.g., Reinhardt 1961: 267–269, Scodel 1982, Saïd 1998: 17, and Nagy 2005: 83.

¹²⁵ See especially Clauss 2000 and 2016b, the latter of which builds on Clauss 1990.

¹²⁶ Vox 2002: 158 n. 30 and Hitch 2012: 146.

¹²⁷ The Hesiodic echo is noted, e.g., by Hunter 1993: 128 and Hitch 2012: 146.

¹²⁸ For other Homeric echoes in Apollonius’ phrase, see Campbell 1981: 10.

¹²⁹ Cf. also *HH* 31.18–19, 32.18–19 (cited by Hitch 2012: 146 n. 46).

Homeric and Hesiodic, epic and cultic.¹³⁰ Twice elsewhere as well, Apollonius transparently reworks Hesiod’s phrase, referring to the Argonauts as “a god-like expedition of heroic men” (ἀνδρῶν ἡρώων θεῖος στόλος, *Arg.* 1.970; ἀνδρῶν ἡρώων θεῖον στόλον, 2.1091).¹³¹ Finally, several scholars have heard an echo of Hesiod in the Salutation to the Argonauts in the poem’s Envoi, “race of blessed heroes” (ἀριστήων μακάρων γένος, 4.1773). Certainly the Argonauts are here addressed in a hymnic mode as divinized heroes, and in this context the epithet “blessed” may allude to Hesiod’s description of the Islands of the Blessed (μακάρων νήσοισι, *Op.* 171) as the home of the heroes rendered immortal by Zeus.¹³² These sustained allusions to Hesiod’s Age of Heroes encourage the reader to understand the Argonauts in Hesiodic as well as Homeric terms: they are mortal heroes destined for an immortal afterlife.

d. Apotheosis

I round out this survey of hero cult and related phenomena in the *Arg.* by examining a final category that is distinct from heroization but closely related to it, namely, the deification of select mortals.¹³³ Like their heroized counterparts, these figures have surpassed the limits of their mortality, but they have attained a higher ontological status that makes them closer to the

¹³⁰ Cf. Hitch 2012: 145, speaking of Apollonius’ terminology for his protagonists in general: “Apollonius combines Homeric and Hesiodic epic diction to demonstrate that the Argonauts are both Homeric heroes (*herôes* [*sic*], *aristoi*) and members of Hesiod’s fourth race (*hêmitheoi*) in anticipation of their future blessed afterlife.” Vilchez 1986: 84 rather suggests that Apollonius’ use of the term ἡμιθεῶν may evoke Pindar, who uses this word only with reference to the Argonauts (*Pyth.* 4.12, 184, 211).

¹³¹ Hunter 1993: 128 and Hitch 2012: 145 n. 45.

¹³² Hitch 2012: 146.

¹³³ “Beiden Phänomenen [*sc.* heroization and apotheosis] lag also ein bestimmter Glaube an die Möglichkeit einer Veränderung zugrunde, die dem Menschen unter bestimmten Voraussetzungen von Leistung und Anerkennung (menschlicher- und göttlicherseits) den Zugang zu höheren Stellungen der spirituellen Weltordnung offen hielt” (Buraselis et al. in *ThesCRA* 2.126). For a survey of deified mortals in Greek myth, see Sourvinou-Inwood 2005: 332–345.

gods than to cult heroes. In the *Arg.*, they serve an important function as models for the Argonauts' own destined transcendence of their human stations, even if most of the crew cannot follow them all the way to full deification. The inimitable Heracles is the most important paradigm for the Argonauts in this regard. The sea god Glaucus explicitly prophesies Heracles' apotheosis upon his separation from the rest of the crew in Mysia, making clear that the hero will actually join the Olympian gods (1.1317–1320)—the highest possible form of immortalization.¹³⁴ As Feeney has shown, in the wake of Heracles' departure from the crew at the end of Book 1, the Argonauts often replicate collectively and in a minor key the feats that Heracles had accomplished without them.¹³⁵ This pattern climaxes in the Libyan episode with Heracles' final intervention in the plot, as the Argonauts literally follow in his footsteps¹³⁶ and are saved by him as by a god, even in his absence.¹³⁷ As in Pindar, Heracles represents a heroic standard that the other Argonauts cannot hope to match.¹³⁸ Nevertheless, the Argonauts' partial

¹³⁴ In fact, there is evidence that Heracles sometimes received cult as a hero instead of, or concurrently with, his worship as an Olympian (Burkert 1985: 208 with n. 3), though Lévêque and Verbanck-Piérard 1992 argue that the Greeks mainly worshipped Heracles as a god; see further Larson 2007: 183–184 and Stafford 2010, both with earlier bibliography. *Arg.* 1.1317–1320 makes it clear that Apollonius, at least, envisions deification, not heroization, as Heracles' fate.

¹³⁵ Feeney 1987: 56–66.

¹³⁶ Feeney 1987: 59 notes that the Argonauts also partly “[follow] the trail Heracles has blazed” in his Amazonian labor as they proceed along the Black Sea littoral in Book 2.

¹³⁷ Heracles had uncovered a spring in Libya that indirectly “saves his companions, even though he is far away” (ἦ καὶ νόσφιν ἐὼν ἐσάωσεν ἑταίρους, 4.1458), when the Argonauts are dying of thirst. This formulation suggests that, like a god, he is already saving mortals from afar (Feeney 1987: 63). Rostropowicz 1990: 34 notes that the verb ἐσάωσεν could constitute a nod to Heracles' cult epithet Σωτήρ, “Savior,” though cf. Hunter 1993: 29 n. 79. Feeney 1987: 63 reads Heracles' final appearance in this episode—Lynceus' hazy vision of Heracles marching off into the distance after he has retrieved the Golden Apples—as a premonition of his apotheosis: “[H]e is passing out of the world of men, and into the world of gods.” For the slim evidence that these apples symbolized immortality, see, e.g., Gantz 1993: 413; Stafford 2005: 78 with n. 27, 2010: 238, 2012: 47.

¹³⁸ See, e.g., Pike 1984: 16.

emulation of their onetime crewmate culminates in their heroization, which represents a more muted form of his singular destiny.¹³⁹

The other paradigms of immortalization in the epic are the Dioscuri, Polydeuces and Castor. More than Heracles, the divine twins occupy a gray area between hero and god.¹⁴⁰ Already in the *Odyssey*, they are said to live and die on alternate days below the earth, an honor they have received from Zeus (11.301–304; cf. *Il.* 3.243–244). Pindar takes a similar view, though his Dioscuri alternate between their tombs at Therapna and the company of Zeus on Olympus (*Nem.* 10.55–59, 83–90). Still other sources, following the tradition that only Polydeuces is Zeus’ son, Castor being the son of the mortal Tyndareus, assert that Castor is buried beneath the earth but that Polydeuces has become an Olympian god (e.g., Plut. *Quaest. Graec.* 23).¹⁴¹ Cult practice presents a similar range of opinion. The twins were sometimes worshipped as heroes, especially at the site of their grave in Therapna, but at other times as gods. They had a special connection to their Spartan homeland, where they served a number of typically heroic functions,¹⁴² but their powers were also universal in scope, as befits the gods. As “Saviors” (Σωτῆρες), the twins were thought to appear in epiphany to help mortals in acute distress, especially at sea.¹⁴³ Notably, the *HHs* include two hymns for the Dioscuri (17, 33),

¹³⁹ Hitch 2012: 135. Feeney 1987: 49–50, 58–59 focuses on Heracles’ immortalization as a paradigm for that of the Dioscuri, but he does not connect either of these apotheoses to the general heroization of the Argonauts.

¹⁴⁰ The ambiguous status of the Dioscuri is documented well by Farnell 1921: ch. 8. In general on this duo, see further Nilsson 1967: 406–11 and Burkert 1985: 212–213.

¹⁴¹ On the different paternities assigned to the Dioscuri, see, e.g., Gantz 1993: 318–319.

¹⁴² The Dioscuri were closely associated with Sparta’s dual monarchy and were thought to accompany the army into battle alongside Menelaus (*Hdt.* 5.75.2; cf. Simon. fr. 11 W², in which the Dioscuri as well as Menelaus lead the Spartan forces at Platea and are explicitly dubbed “heroes,” ἥρωσι, 31).

¹⁴³ On this epithet, which attaches to a great range of Greek divinities and rulers, see, e.g., Nock 1972: 1.78, 2.720–735.

Notably, the narrator here casts the Dioscuri as “guardians” of “that voyage” in its entirety, not only for this stretch of the journey in Book 4;¹⁴⁶ the Argonautic voyage *in toto* thus becomes the basis of their deification and their special patronage of sailors. At the same time, the Dioscuri thus become a promising paradigm for the other Argonauts, who have participated in the same labors aboard the Argo and will win a lesser grade of immortality for themselves, namely, heroization.

Besides Heracles and the Dioscuri, a few other figures appear sporadically who seem to have become gods, or at least to have been immortalized in a non-heroic manner:

- The nymph who seizes Hylas presumably immortalizes him when she makes him her husband (1.1324–1325), as Calypso had wanted to do for Odysseus (*Od.* 5.206–224, 7.256–258, 23.335–337).¹⁴⁷ In response to Hylas’ disappearance, Heracles establishes a ritualized search for his erstwhile page among the Cians that continues to this day (1.1348–1357).¹⁴⁸

¹⁴⁶ ἔποντο (652) shows decisively that κείνης ... ναυτιλίας refers to the whole Argonautic voyage, not just a particular leg of it. This verb is frequently used to denote a hero’s participation in the expedition (1.71, 163, 470, 771; 2.802; 3.58; cf. 4.349, 369), which the Dioscuri did indeed “accompany” in its entirety.

¹⁴⁷ This parallel is proposed by Clayton 2017: 154 n. 34. Indeed, echoes of the Homeric Calypso in these lines do imply that Hylas has succumbed to the fate refused by Odysseus and become the nymph’s immortal consort. Apollonius identifies Hylas’ nymph, like Calypso (e.g., *Od.* 1.14), as both a nymph and a goddess (θεά ... νύμφη, *Arg.* 1.1324), and the phrase φιλότητι ... ποιήσατο ... ὄν πόσιν (1324–1325) recalls Calypso’s phrase, φίλον ποιήσεται ἀκοίτην (*Od.* 5.120, noted by Campbell 1981 ad loc.).

¹⁴⁸ For a reconstruction of this Cian ritual, see Sourvinou-Inwood 2005: 74–79. Sourvinou-Inwood argues that Hylas is deified rather than heroized (330–331, 343–345), as, e.g., Larson 2001: 68 assumes. Still others speak only of Hylas’ death (e.g., Beye 1982: 30).

- Apollonius mentions several aspects of the cult of Aristaeus, including his titles Ἀγρεύς (“Hunter”) and Νόμιος (“Shepherd”; 2.506–507).¹⁴⁹ He also attributes to him skill in healing and prophecy (512), which may reflect elements of the god’s cult.¹⁵⁰
- Apollo makes his consort Cyrene “a long-lived nymph” (ποιήσατο νύμφην | ... μακραίωνα, 2.508–509). Poets can call gods “long-lived” (e.g., δαροβίοισι θεοῖσιν, Aesch. *Sept.* 524), but in this case Cyrene’s epithet probably implies that she is not immortal, in keeping with Apollonius’ portrayal of nymphs elsewhere in the poem.¹⁵¹
- The narrator mentions “Ganymede, whom Zeus had once settled in heaven to live with the immortals” (Γανυμήδεα, τὸν ῥά ποτε Ζεὺς | οὐρανῷ ἐγκατένασεν ἐφέστιον ἄθανάτοισιν, 3.115–116).
- The Moon’s reference to her consort Endymion (4.57–58) may presuppose the myth of his immortalization.
- Ariadne’s relationship with Dionysus comes into view at 4.430–434 (cf. 3.1001–1002); in the traditional myth, Zeus renders her “immortal and ageless” (ἄθανατον καὶ ἀγήρων, Hes. *Th.* 949) as part of her marriage to his son.

¹⁴⁹ These lines (καλέουσιν | Ἀγρέα καὶ Νόμιον) allude to Pindar’s account of Aristaeus’ immortalization in *Pyth.* 9.59–65 (Ἀγρέα καὶ Νόμιον ... καλεῖν, 65; Levin 1969: 499). The rustic god’s deification occurs also in the euhemerizing account of Diod. Sic. 4.81.2–3; 82.5, 6 (cf. Hes. *Cat.* fr. 159–160 Most, Serv. ad Verg. *G.* 1.14), and Paus. 8.2.4 explicitly refers to Aristaeus as a mortal who became a god. Elsewhere in Apollonius, the Phaeacian “precinct of Apollo Nomius” (Νομίσιον ... ἱερὸν Ἀπόλλωνος, 4.1218) may in fact belong to Aristaeus, given his daughter Macris’ connection to the area; see Green 2007 ad *Arg.* 4.1217–1222.

¹⁵⁰ There is some evidence for Aristaeus’ association with healing beyond this passage (*RE* 2.1, p. 857.39–48), but I am not aware of other attestations of his prophetic powers. Apollonius may have derived both of these traits from Aristaeus’ father Apollo (*ibid.*, Matteo 2007 ad *Arg.* 2.498–530). In light of Aristaeus’ beekeeping (*Arg.* 4.1132–1133), cf. also the association of bees with prophecy in Greek thought (Scheinberg 1979: 16–26).

¹⁵¹ Matteo 2007 ad loc.; cf. Páskiewicz 1981 ad loc., and see the discussion of the story of Paraeubius’ father in the Introduction (Section IV.b). The same epithet is applied to nymphs generally at Soph. *OT* 1099 (τᾶν μακραίωνων), where Jebb 1883 ad loc. sees a reference to the notion of nymphs’ mortality.

- Though Apollonius' Achilles is destined for heroization (*Arg.* 4.811), I should note here that the poet mentions Thetis' failed attempt to immortalize him as a baby (4.869–879), in a section of the narrative based on Demeter's aborted immortalization of the infant Demophon in the *HHs* (2.233–291).¹⁵²

Like Heracles and the Dioscuri, all of these figures help to normalize the theme of the hero's passage from mortality to a higher grade of being within the epic world that Apollonius creates. They thus serve as oblique reminders of the Argonauts' own destined heroization, if not actual deification.

III. The Duality of the Hero and Generic Hybridity

In light of the foregoing survey of the immortalization theme in the *Arg.*, it is clear that Apollonius, unlike Homer, felt no compunction about alluding to the immortalization of his epic heroes. This observation prompts Hitch, author of the only study of hero cult in the *Arg.* to date, to make the following claim near the beginning of her article:

[T]here is no distinction between heroes of epic and heroes of cult for an epic poet in the third century BC, even if such a distinction can be argued for the presentation of heroes in the Homeric poems. For Apollonius, the Argonauts were well-established heroes of both epic and cult.¹⁵³

Hitch is right to recognize that Apollonius' heroes are both "heroes of epic and heroes of cult," but I would therefore conclude that for Apollonius, "there is no distinction" between the two. It is *a priori* probable that Apollonius was conscious of the extent to which his own usages

¹⁵² This passage's debt to the *HHs* is among the best-known in the scholarly literature. See, e.g., Livrea 1973 ad *Arg.* 4.868, Bulloch 1977: 119–120, Jackson 1990, and Mackie 1998: 330–331, Vian 2002: 3.178, and Mirto 2011.

¹⁵³ Hitch 2012: 131.

departed from those of his chief generic exemplars, the HEs. But more importantly, Apollonius must have been conscious of the duality of the hero within Greek culture because it is this crucial distinction that informs his generic innovation. That is, the generic hybridity of the *Arg.* as an epic hymn is directly tied to the duality of the Greek category of hero. In their mortal aspect, heroes can be the subject of epic poetry; in their immortal aspect, heroes can be hymned like the gods. This double nature serves as the basis for Apollonius' merger of epic and hymn within the framework of a single poem that honors the Argonauts in both of these capacities. Apollonius' un-Homeric acknowledgment of the cultic aspect of his epic heroes should thus be regarded not as a kind of automatic or unthinking effect of the state of Greek religion in his day but as a meaningful artistic choice reflective of the *Arg.*'s generic hybridity.

Indeed, I would argue that Apollonius' very use of the term ἥρωϝ points to his awareness of the difference between epic and cultic heroism even as he sometimes seems to conflate the two. On the one hand, Apollonius frequently imitates the Homeric usage of ἥρωϝ, which he regularly employs without obvious religious significance to denote Jason,¹⁵⁴ the Argonauts as a body,¹⁵⁵ and various other men of the mythic age.¹⁵⁶ On the other hand, Apollonius also uses ἥρωϝ and the related adjective ἥρωϝϝ at least twice in an incontrovertibly religious sense,¹⁵⁷ and

¹⁵⁴ Jason: 1.781; 2.410; 3.509; 4.477, 750, 784, 1162, 1528. A few other individual Argonauts are also dubbed ἥρωϝ in the singular: Polyphemus (1.1240), Heracles (2.766, 967), and Clytius (2.1042).

¹⁵⁵ The Argonauts (in whole or in part): 1.21, 100, 124, 196, 243, 397, 552, 970, 1000, 1012, 1023, 1055, 1329; 2.97, 144, 241, 270, 429, 592, 668, 852, 1091; 3.167, 348, 638, 993–994, 1166, 1194, 1233, 1255, 1293; 4.69, 77, 251, 254, 485, 515, 522, 594, 682, 733, 831, 998, 1099, 1127, 1192, 1226, 1619, 1690, 1725, 1728. At least once, the plural “heroes” is used generally to denote the race of demigods (3.921); see also Medea's wish at 3.464–466: “Whether he [Jason] goes to his death as the best of all the heroes or the worst, let him go” (εἶθ' ὃ γε πάντων | φθίσεται ἠρώων προφερέστατος εἴτε χερείων, | ἐρρέτω).

¹⁵⁶ Cyzicus: 1.948; Apsyrtus: 4.471; Nausithous: 4.550; and Triton disguised as Eurypylus: 4.1564. On this last scene, see the discussion in Section II.a of the Conclusion.

¹⁵⁷ Valverde Sánchez 1989: 93.

both times in ways that signal his self-conscious departure from Homeric usage. First, when the Argonauts arrive at the Phasis River, Jason pours libations “in honor of Earth, the indigenous gods, and the souls of the dead heroes” (Γαίη τ’ ἐνναέταις τε θεοῖς ψυχᾶς τε καμόντων | ἥρώων, 2.1273–1274). The phrase “souls of heroes,” with enjambed ἥρώων, echoes the introit of the *Iliad*: Achilles’ wrath “sent down to Hades many valiant souls of heroes” (πολλὰς δ’ ἰφθίμους ψυχὰς Ἄϊδι προΐαψεν | ἥρώων, 1.3–4).¹⁵⁸ These lines from the very opening of the *Iliad* exemplify the Homeric view of his heroes’ postmortem fate: their “souls flutter down to a meaningless existence in Hades.”¹⁵⁹ Apollonius’ radical transformation of the Iliadic context underlines the *Arg.*’s difference from the Homeric worldview here: the Iliadic heroes doomed to oblivion in the model text have instead become local divinities to be propitiated in adaptation.¹⁶⁰ Second, after a barebones, Iliadic-style catalogue of the Dolionian warriors slain by the Argonauts at Cyzicus (1.1040–1047), the narrator observes that these victims still receive “heroes’ honors” (τιμαῖς ἥρωϊσι, 1.1048) from the inhabitants to this day. As Goldhill observes, the juxtaposition of this cultic αἴτιον with such a perfunctory version of a Homeric kill catalogue (ἀνδροκτασία) “sets in tension two sets of heroes, two sorts of heroization.”¹⁶¹

Because the *Arg.*’s twin generic affiliations each exert their own pressures on Apollonius’ representation of his heroes, the Argonauts appear sometimes in an epic, sometimes in a hymnic

¹⁵⁸ A TLG search reveals no examples of this collocation anywhere else before Apollonius. Interestingly, we happen to know from the B and T scholia ad loc. that Apollonius *qua* philologist read κεφαλὰς in place of ψυχὰς in *Il.* 1.3, a reading which implies that he probably followed Zenodotus in athetizing lines 4–5 as well; see Rengakos 1993: 50 and Cusset 2017: 145–146. Nevertheless, Apollonius arguably alludes to the vulgate text of *Il.* 1.3–5 elsewhere, too (see Romeo 1985: 25 and Hunter 1993: 119 n. 76), in keeping with the Alexandrian penchant for alluding to variant readings of the Homeric text (see, e.g., Giangrande 1970: 47–56).

¹⁵⁹ Bravo 2009: 15.

¹⁶⁰ Notably, the Apollonian scholiast ad 2.1273 compares Jason’s offerings to Alexander’s propitiation of the local divinities and heroes on his visit to Troy.

¹⁶¹ Goldhill 1991: 318. See further Hunter 1993: 43.

guise. Accordingly, on a metaliterary level, we can associate markers of Homeric heroism like the catalogue of slain Dolionian warriors with the poem's status as epic, whereas Apollonius' acknowledgments of hero cult correspond to his poem's hymnic intentions; and passages that juxtapose these competing drives can be read metapoetically as illustrations of the poem's status as an epic hymn that unites them both. For instance, the heroization motif traced in the previous section stems from the "hymnic" dimension of the poem, but it stands in tension with the κλέος motif that the *Arg.* has inherited from the HEs. As a strictly metaphorical remedy against death, κλέος in Homer is conceptually opposed to the sort of literal immortalization presupposed by hero cult.¹⁶² And yet despite the prevalence of hero cult in his poem, Apollonius' heroes are as eager to win κλέος as any of their Homeric forebears; indeed, the pursuit of glory provides the motive for most of them to join the expedition.¹⁶³ Apollonius thus subscribes to what Currie calls "an 'inclusive' model of immortality": he imagines that his heroes will live on both metaphorically through poetic memory and literally in cult.¹⁶⁴ The complementarity of the drives to celebrate the Argonauts in poetry and to worship them as eternal divinities is directly tied to the *Arg.*'s dual status as both epic and hymn. Below, I explore four particularly instructive examples of this sort of juxtaposition in light of the poem's generic hybridity: in the description of Idmon's tomb, in the celebration of Polydeuces' victory over Amycus, in the nadir of despair in the Syrtes episode, and finally, in the Envoi.

¹⁶² See in this regard esp. Sarpedon's famous speech to Glaucus at *Il.* 12.322–328; see also on this opposition van Wees 2006: 373–375.

¹⁶³ For references, see Pietsch 1999: 90–93. For other motivations for joining the crew, see the summary in Carspecken 1952: 54. Pindar's Argonauts, too, are motivated by the pursuit of glory like typical Homeric heroes (*Pyth.* 4.184–187, with the interpretation of Race 1985).

¹⁶⁴ See Currie 2005: 72–78.

a. Idmon and Agamestor

As the poet underlines twice before the voyage gets underway, the Argonautic seer Idmon leaves Argos to embark on the Argonautic expedition knowing full well that he is destined to die in Asia, but he accepts his fate nonetheless with a typically epic motive: “so that his people would not begrudge him glorious fame” (μή οἱ δῆμος ἐκλείης ἀγάσαιτο, 1.141; cf. 443–447). The motif of the seer who knowingly goes to his death is a mythic archetype—Amphiaraus is an obvious parallel¹⁶⁵—but Idmon’s decision finds a close Homeric precedent in Achilles, whose foreknowledge comes from his divine mother Thetis and who submits to an early death with the promised consolation of undying fame (*Il.* 9.410–416).¹⁶⁶

But whereas Homer’s Achilles is destined for Hades like any other mortal, Idmon’s postmortem fate turns out to be different, as Apollonius reveals in a fascinating passage following his account of the seer’s death at the future site of Heraclea Pontica. After a burial scene reminiscent of the funerals of the HEs (2.835–840), the poet adds the following, thoroughly un-Homeric details about the future of Idmon’s tomb (841–850):¹⁶⁷

καὶ δὴ τοι κέχυται τοῦδ’ ἀνέρος ἐν χθονὶ κείνῃ
τύμβος· σῆμα δ’ ἔπεστι καὶ ὀψιγόνοισιν ἰδέσθαι,
νηίου ἐκ κοτίνοιο φάλαγξ· θαλέθει δέ τε φύλλοις
ἄκρης τυτθὸν ἔνερθ’ Ἀχερουσίδος· εἰ δέ με καὶ τὸ
χρειῶ ἀπηλεγέως Μουσέων ὑπο γηρύσασθαι, 845

¹⁶⁵ Indeed, there are other connections between the *vitae* of these seers, who were both sometimes Argonauts and may have been rivals of sorts; see Fowler 2013: 214 and Cuypers in *BNJ* 471 F 2; see also Jackson 1993: 9 n. 26. Amphiaraus’ foreknowledge of his own death also figures into Euripides’ *Hypsipyle* (fr. 752k.17–21), a tragedy closely connected to the Argonautic saga. For Apollonius’ debt to this play, see Giaquinta (forthcoming).

¹⁶⁶ *N.b.* that the proximate cause of Achilles’ decision is his desire to avenge Patroclus (Finkelberg 1995: 1 with n. 3). For Idmon as an Achilles or Amphiaraus figure, see Hensel 1908: 9–13. Klooster 2007: 73 n. 39 further compares the Iliadic seer Merops, whose story features the motif of foreknowledge of (his sons’) death, though not the motif of a self-chosen death (*Il.* 2.830–834, 11.328–335). See further Lawall 1966: 140 for interesting comments on Idmon’s motivation.

¹⁶⁷ For the Homeric-epic reminiscences in Idmon’s burial, see Páskiewicz 1981 ad *Arg.* 2.836ff., Hunter 1993: 44 and Saïd 1998: 17–18; for the scene’s departures from the standard Homeric funeral—principally in the acknowledgment of hero cult centered around the tomb—see Saïd 1998: 18–19.

τόνδε πολισοῦχον διεπέφραδε Βοιωτοῖσιν
Νισαίοισι τε Φοῖβος ἐπιρρήδην ἰλάεσθαι,
ἀμφὶ δὲ τὴν γε φάλαγγα παλαιγενέος κοτίνιοιο
ἄστῳ βαλεῖν, οἱ δ' ἄντι θεουδέος Αἰολίδαο
Ἴδμονος εἰσέτι νῦν Ἀγαμήστορα κυδαίνουσιν.

850

And so this man's burial mound was raised in that land, and upon it stands a marker for future generations to see, a trunk of wild olive used for shipbuilding. It flourishes with leaves, a little below the Acherusian headland. And if I must, at the Muses' insistence, forthrightly declare this fact as well, Phoebus explicitly¹⁶⁸ directed the Boeotians and Nisaeans to worship this man as "city guardian" and to establish a town around the trunk of ancient wild olive, but instead of the god-fearing Aeolid Idmon, to this day they honor Agamestor.

The word ἥρωες is not used,¹⁶⁹ but Idmon is here conceived of as an immortalized hero and the rightful recipient of cult, though one Agamestor appears to have appropriated his honors. The fact that the wild olive trunk is made of wood used for shipbuilding (νηίου, 843) serves as proof of the buried hero's connection to sailing, and thus of his identity as the Argonaut Idmon rather than Agamestor.¹⁷⁰ But the trunk is also significant because, just like Idmon himself and the rest of the mythic Argonauts (cf. παλαιγενέων ... φωτῶν, 1.1),¹⁷¹ it is "ancient" (παλαιγενέος, 2.848)

¹⁶⁸ Race's translation takes ἐπιρρήδην ("explicitly," "by name"; 847) with διεπέφραδε in the previous line, in which case Apollo may have revealed Idmon's name directly to the colonists; such is also the interpretation of, e.g., Mooney 1912 ad loc. and Händel 1954: 73. Others, however, take the adverb with ἰλάεσθαι, in which case Apollo may have instructed the colonists to propitiate Idmon "by name" without actually revealing it to them—a typical case of oracular obscurity (Fränkel 1968: 237 with n. 231, Matteo 2007 ad loc., Thalmann 2011: 108 n. 83). The latter scenario seems to be presupposed in Promathidas, Apollonius' probable source for the story of the Idmon-Agamestor mixup; see n. 85 above.

¹⁶⁹ The Argonauts, however, are so identified two lines later (ἥρωες, 852), in a description of their burial of a second comrade who dies in Heraclea, the helmsman Tiphys. This juxtaposition may recall the destined heroization of the rest of the Argonauts as well as Idmon.

¹⁷⁰ Fränkel 1968 ad *Arg.* 2.841–848.

¹⁷¹ Cuypers 2004: 55 and Hitch 2012: 141.

and yet continues to flourish down to the present (n.b. present-tense θαλέθει, 843), thus symbolizing Idmon’s continuing life after death as an immortal hero.¹⁷²

The juxtaposition of a typically Homeric heroic burial with such an extended and complex notice of hero cult already suggests a type of generic synthesis: the conventions of epic have been enriched with a “hymnic” recognition of Idmon’s status as a cult hero. But the reverse is true as well: the episode’s hymnic dimension is complemented by the traditional Homeric conception of the hero that is revealed in the way that the narrator speaks of this cult. To wit: Apollo directs the colonists to “worship” Idmon (ἰλάεσθαι, 2.847), but instead they “honor” Agamestor (κυδαίνουσιν, 850). These line-final verbs are cast in parallel as if equivalent in meaning, but in this context, a difference in their semantic ranges may be significant. ἰλάεσθαι is properly religious,¹⁷³ and κυδαίνω, likewise, can be used of the worship of cult heroes, as Apollonius’ own usage twice elsewhere attests (1.587, 1048).¹⁷⁴ But this verb derived from κῦδος belongs first and foremost to the semantic field of “glory,” much like the “glorious fame” (ἐγκλείης, 1.141; cf. 447) for which Idmon gives his life.¹⁷⁵ A good illustration of this resonance

¹⁷² For this vegetal motif, cf. Cohen 1998: 135 with n. 53. The religious dimension of this grave-marker is further suggested by the scholiast’s report ad 2.843: the φάλαγξ was in fact one of the Argo’s rollers (denoted by the same word at 1.375–376, 388; cf. the oar marking Elpenor’s grave at *Od.* 11.77, 12.15), which the Argonauts erected at the direction of Orpheus—their regular guide in spiritual matters. The roller sprouted (miraculously, apparently; cf. *Il.* 1.234–237) and is still shown today. See also Malkin 1987: 75. Cf. the white poplar by Polyphemus’ tomb (*Arg.* 4.1476) with the analysis of Foster 2007: 261, and cf. also the Boreads’ grave markers (1.1305–1308), one of whose continued motion (n.b. present-tense κίνυται, 1308) in the wind might similarly signify ongoing life after death.

¹⁷³ Notably, Apollonius uses the same verb to introduce his hymnic Envoi to the Argonauts (ἴλατε, 4.1773).

¹⁷⁴ This usage with reference to cult honors is not, however, altogether common; I have been able to trace no example before our passage and Lycoph. *Alex.* 721, 929, 1213. Apollonius’ use of the verb in this relatively unusual way at 1.587 and 1048 may similarly serve to link hero cult with epic celebration.

¹⁷⁵ κλέος and κῦδος originally represented distinct concepts, namely, “glory” and a kind of talismanic charisma, respectively (Benveniste 1969: 2.57–69, Scodel 2008: 25–26). In Apollonius’ usage, however, κῦδος has the meanings “Ehre, Ansehen, Würde” (Reich and Maehler 1991: 522) or *gloria* (Pompella 2002: 392). N.b. esp. 1.287, where κῦδος is set in parallel with ἀγλαΐην (“splendor”; cf. 4.1027–1028) and ἀγρητή (“admired,” 1.285); 1.1292, where Heracles’ κῦδος would have obscured (καλύψει) Jason’s; 4.205, where we have a contrast between κῦδος and κατηφείη, “dejection”; and 4.1749, where κῦδος is qualified as ἀγλαόν, “glorious.”

of *κυδαίνω* can be found in a passage from Lycophron’s *Alexandra* that describes cult honors for another epic hero, in this case Hector. Cassandra prophesies that Zeus will oversee the transfer of Hector’s remains from the Troad to Thebes (1189–1211), and she concludes her apostrophe to her brother: “And the chiefs of the Ectenes [i.e., Boeotians] shall with libations celebrate your glory in the highest, even as the immortals” (*κλέος* δὲ σὸν μέγιστον Ἐκτῆνων πρόμοι | λοιβαῖσι κυδανούσιν ἀφθίτοις ἴσον, 1212–1213). Lycophron makes the close connection between cult honors and epic glory quite obvious here by setting up *κλέος* as the direct object of *λοιβαῖσι κυδανούσιν*.¹⁷⁶ I argue that Apollonius establishes the same connection, if more subtly, by setting the clearly cultic verb *ἰλάεσθαι* in parallel with the epic-tinged *κυδαίνουσιν*.

This observation possibly helps to explain why the Muses, the daughters of Memory (*Μνημοσύνη*) and the guarantors of poetic remembrance, insist that the Apollonian narrator relate this history of cultic confusion. It is not just that Idmon has been deprived of the rites denoted by *ἰλάεσθαι*. In Homer, the hero’s tomb is supposed to function as the physical instantiation and medium of his *κλέος*;¹⁷⁷ and indeed, Apollonius describes the *φάλαγξ* atop Idmon’s barrow as “a marker for future generations to see” (*σημα ... καὶ ὀψιγόνουσι* *ιδέσθαι*, 2.842). This detail serves to draw our attention to the dual function of Idmon’s tomb, which should rightfully constitute both an epic memorial for him and the center of his cult. The worship of Agamestor in Idmon’s stead thus also means that the seer has been forgotten at the

¹⁷⁶ The epic resonance of *κλέος* (1212) at the beginning of this sentence is enhanced by the poet’s use of *ἀφθίτοις* at its end. The final lines of Cassandra’s address to Hector are thus framed in such a way as to recall the “imperishable renown” (*κλέος ἄφθιτον*, *Il.* 9.413) that lay in store for his killer, Achilles (McNelis and Sens 2011: 63–64). Cassandra, however, makes her brother the beneficiary of such renown, in a polemical correction of Homer. On the complementarity of glory and cult worship in the *Alexandra*, see Biffis (forthcoming).

¹⁷⁷ Saïd 1998: 12–15.

very site of the death that he willingly embraced for the sake of renown.¹⁷⁸ The “Muses’ insistence” (χρειώ ... Μουσέων, 845) that the record be set right can thus be seen as a recuperative intervention on behalf of Idmon’s κλέος,¹⁷⁹ which Apollonius represents as bundled together with his cult. That is, through the medium of the *Arg.*, the Muses apparently hope to restore both Idmon’s fame and his cultic honors in Heraclea, because the two are inextricably linked.¹⁸⁰ Both are the rightful rewards of the mythic hero, and indeed, cult and poetry are both ways of remembering a hero’s legacy. This passage can thus be read as a paradigmatic example of the complementarity of epic κλέος and religious worship, the very conceit on which the *Arg.*’s generic hybridity is founded.¹⁸¹

b. Polydeuces in Bebrycia

We may derive additional insight into Apollonius’ self-conscious mixture of the epic and hymnic modes of praising his heroes by examining his lone use of the word ὕμνος, in a context charged with metapoetic potential.¹⁸² ὕμνος is an interesting word to consider in Hellenistic

¹⁷⁸ Fusillo 1985: 369–370 notes that this passage represents the only Apollonian etiology that marks discontinuity between the mythic past and the present time of the audience, and he interprets the Muses here as “portatrici della storia argonautica, ma soprattutto ... ipostasi delle norme e delle convenzioni epiche” (370). Perhaps fancifully, I would suggest that Idmon’s loss of glory may be reflected in Agamestor’s very name, which seems to recall the phrase μή ... ἀγασαίτο from Idmon’s Catalogue entry (1.141). *N.b.* that ἄγαμαι is a hapax in the poem.

¹⁷⁹ Goldhill 1991: 324 and Barnes 2003: 93–94.

¹⁸⁰ Cf. Ehrhardt 1995: 24, 45, who raises the possibility that the *Arg.* could have had an actual effect on the cities whose local traditions it mentions. In point of fact, however, the *Arg.*’s impact was probably minimal, as both Idmon and Agamestor were later eclipsed by Heracles *qua* mythical founder of Heraclea Pontica (*ibid.* 46).

¹⁸¹ Hitch 2012: 154–155 makes a similar argument vis-à-vis the wedding of Jason and Medea, which, she argues, is described in both cultic and epic language (4.1142–1143).

¹⁸² Hunter 1996: 46 with n. 2 describes the “hymn to Polydeuces” as one of “many hymnic elements within the main body of the narrative ... that recall the hymnic status of the whole [*Arg.*].”

poetry because, like ἦρωϲ, it is capable of straddling the secular/religious divide.¹⁸³ In archaic and early classical Greek, ὕμνοϲ could refer to any “song,” perhaps with connotations of praise or celebration, whether the subject of that song was divine or not. For example, in the *HHs*, ὕμνοϲ occurs thrice in a Poet’s Task formula to denote the next “song” to which the speaker promises to transition, which, according to Wolf’s Proem theory, will have been an epic lay (*HH* 5.293, 9.9, 18.11). The only other usage of ὕμνοϲ in the corpus, in the major *Hymn to Apollo*, denotes a song explicitly concerned with mortals (3.161).¹⁸⁴ In the *HEs*, ὕμνοϲ is a *hapax*, used to denote Demodocus’ singing (*Od.* 8.429), which mixes mortal and divine subjects.¹⁸⁵ As early as the fourth century, however, the word had become a generic term for songs in praise of gods, as is apparent from Plato’s distinction in *Resp.* 10.607a (ὕμνοϲ θεοῖϲ καὶ ἐγκώμια τοῖϲ ἀγαθοῖϲ).¹⁸⁶

By the Hellenistic period, poets could avail themselves of both the archaic meaning of ὕμνοϲ that they had inherited as part of the poetic *Kunstsprache* as well as the more technical generic term that was even then being elaborated and formalized in Alexandrian scholarship.¹⁸⁷

¹⁸³ Regarding the term ὕμνοϲ, I have benefited from the discussions of, *inter alia*, Bremer 1981: 193–194, Fowler 1987: 94–95, Furley and Bremer 2001: 1.10–11, Calame 2005: 20–21, Carey 2009: 26, Hall 2012: 81–85, and Lozynsky 2014: 259–263. See further the studies cited in the following notes.

¹⁸⁴ The verb form ὑμνέω, however, occurs seven times, always with a god as its object (3.19, 4.1, 9.1, 14.2, 19.27, 27.19, 31.1); cf. the adjectives εὐῦμνοϲ (3.19) and πολύῦμνοϲ (26.7), applied to Apollo and Dionysus, respectively.

¹⁸⁵ To be specific, Queen Arete uses this word in a prospective reference to Demodocus’ third lay, which will turn out to concern the sack of Troy, a thoroughly epic topic. For the idea, however, that Demodocus’ second lay is a modified version of a Homeric-style hymn, see Evans 2001, with earlier bibliography.

¹⁸⁶ For Plato’s use of ὕμνοϲ here and in the *Laws*, see Ford 2002: 12, 259–260.

¹⁸⁷ The Alexandrian use of ὕμνοϲ as a generic term is illustrated by the classification of subsets of the old lyric poetry under this heading; for instance, one book of Pindar’s collected poetry was devoted to his ὕμνοι, but specific subsets of this genus each received their own books: paeans, dithyrambs, prosodia, and perhaps also the (quasi-hymnic?) partheneia and hyporchemata (Pfeiffer 1968: 184, Willcock 1995: 3); thus ὕμνοι must have indicated a sort of “miscellaneous hymns” category (Furley and Bremer 2001: 11). For ὕμνοϲ as an umbrella term, see further Harvey 1955: 165–168, Rutherford 2001: 92, Cairns 2007: 91–92, Nagy 2011: 332–333, and Hall 2012: 161–162.

They could also exploit the resultant ambiguity for their own purposes. Thus, for instance, Theocritus uses the word in an unmarked way to refer to Thyrsis’ bucolic song (*Id.* 1.61; cf. *Ep.* 2.2 = *AP* 6.177.2),¹⁸⁸ whereas his use of the same noun and the related verb form throughout his hymn to the Dioscuri has a marked religious inflection (*Id.* 22.1, 4, 26, 135, 214).¹⁸⁹ And when he uses the same vocabulary in characterizing his encomium for Ptolemy II Philadelphus (17.8), he “exploits, indeed plays with, the semantic breadth of ὕμνεῖν to bring Ptolemy closer to the gods.”¹⁹⁰

Apollonius plays with the ambiguity of ὕμνος in much the same way as Theocritus does in *Idyll* 17. Like the HEs, the *Arg.* employs this noun just once: in the aftermath of the Bebrycian episode, the Argonauts sing a “ὕμνος to the accompaniment of Orpheus’ lyre in beautiful harmony” (Ὀρφεΐη φόρμιγγι συνοίμιον ὕμνον ἄειδον | ἐμμελέως, 2.161–162) in order to “celebrate Zeus’ son from Therapna” (κλεῖον δὲ Θεραπναῖον Διὸς υἱά, 2.163). Here, ὕμνος is being used in its more general sense and must specifically refer to a kind of epinician “song” praising Polydeuces’ success in his boxing match with Amycus.¹⁹¹ Indeed, Fränkel suggests that this episode might be meant to function as an etiology for the epinician genre.¹⁹²

¹⁸⁸ See Hunter 1999 ad *Id.* 1.61, and cf. his comment ad 143–145.

¹⁸⁹ As Dover 1971 ad Theoc. *Id.* 22.4 observes, “In line 1, ὕμνέομεν amounts to, ‘This poem is a hymn to the Dioskouroi.’” In line 219, however, the verb is used with the subject matter of the *Iliad* as its object.

¹⁹⁰ Hunter 2003 ad loc.; see further his introductory comments ad *Id.* 17.1–12. I discuss this passage in greater detail in Section II.a of the Conclusion. Similar examples occur in *Idyll* 16, which begins with an ostentatious juxtaposition of two uses of the verb ὕμνέω, first with gods, then with the deeds of men as object (ὕμνεῖν ἀθανάτους, ὕμνεῖν ἀγαθῶν κλέα ἀνδρῶν, 2). Line 50 repeats the verb with reference to epic poetry, and 103 with reference to the praise of the poem’s dedicatee, Hiero II.

¹⁹¹ Cf. the Argonauts’ celebration of Jason’s victory in Aeetes’ contest (Köhnken 2000: 67 n. 45).

¹⁹² Fränkel 1968 ad *Arg.* 2.161–163. Cf. Pindar’s projection of the singing of epinician odes into mythical times (*Ol.* 10.76–79, *Nem.* 8.50–51).

Nevertheless, many scholars have detected the presence of this term's modern resonance ("religious hymn") hiding behind its literal signification here, especially given the persistent link that Apollonius establishes between the Bebrycian episode and the Dioscuri's destined apotheosis.¹⁹³ To summarize the hints that point toward Polydeuces' deification: first, during the boxing match, the narrator compares Amycus to a child of Typhoeus or Gaia, brought forth in her anger at Zeus (2.38–40). This comparison likens the boxing match to a Giganto- or Typhonomachy and implies that Amycus' opponent is, accordingly, playing the role of Heracles, an Olympian god, or even of Zeus himself. Second, and in contrast, the narrator likens Polydeuces to a star (2.40–43), in a transparent anticipation of his future catasterism. Third, later in Book 2, Apollonius has King Lycus and the Mariandynians bestow godlike honors on the Dioscuri in gratitude for Polydeuces' slaying of the Bebrycian king, their longtime enemy (2.752–758, 806–810). These favors include both a temple (ἱερόν, 807) situated on a headland, so that sailors may see it from the sea and beseech (ἰλάζονται, 808) the Dioscuri, and also fields set apart for them "as for gods" (οἷα θεοῖσιν, 809).¹⁹⁴ Fourth, in the victory celebration itself, Orpheus' lyre-playing (2.161) is suggestive in light of his usual function among the Argonauts as the crew's religious advisor.¹⁹⁵ Finally, the exalted title "Zeus' son from Therapna" is also

¹⁹³ See Rose 1984: 125–126, Hunter 1991: 89, and Cuypers 1997 ad *Arg.* 2.163.

¹⁹⁴ On these first three points, see Cuypers 1997 ad *Arg.* 2.38–45, section A and under B.Id.

¹⁹⁵ Cf. esp. 2.704, where Orpheus hymns Apollo on the lyre. See n. 110 in Chapter 4 for more on Orpheus' character in the *Arg.*

suitably “hymnic.”¹⁹⁶ Indeed, out of context, the phrase could denote Polydeuces or, equally, Apollo himself, whom the scholiast *ad loc.* implausibly understands as the referent.¹⁹⁷

As a part of this consistent program of foreshadowing Polydeuces’ deification, Apollonius’ use of the *hapax* ὕμνος has strong “hymnic” undertones in addition to what must be its meaning in context, namely, “song.” But the poet also characterizes this celebration with κλειῖον (263), a verb evocative of epic κλέος, and one that, indeed, Apollonius uses elsewhere in the *Arg.* to denote epic song (cf. *Od.* 1.338; *HH* 31.18, 32.19). For instance, the introit contains a *recusatio* on the construction of the Argo, which “earlier bards still celebrate” (οἱ πρόσθεν ἔτι κλείουσιν αἰδοί, 1.18);¹⁹⁸ the poet pointedly contrasts these old songs with his own epic agenda (20–22), in lines that allude to the introits of both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*.¹⁹⁹ The Bebrycian episode thus ends with a musical performance characterized in quick succession by a pair of words (ὕμνον, 261; κλειῖον, 263) each related to one of the *Arg.*’s primary generic affiliations: hymn and epic, respectively.²⁰⁰

The resultant effect of *mise-en-abyme* encourages the (re-)reader to understand the foregoing episode as generically hybrid, just like the *Arg.* itself. Polydeuces’ boxing match can

¹⁹⁶ Cf. the discussion of “hymnic narratization” in Chapter 4, Section III. Hitch 2012: 149 notes in this connection that as the site of their burial, Therapna was one of the Dioscuri’s principal cult sites.

¹⁹⁷ The scholiast may have been misled by the mention of the laurel crowns the Argonauts are wearing in this celebration (2.159)—an Apolline plant, to be sure, but one that is also appropriate to this epinician context.

¹⁹⁸ An exactly parallel usage occurs at 1.59. This verb (or its cognate κλήζω) also appears in the sense of “make famous” (3.993, 4.1202) and “tell (a story)” (4.618, 987). These same verbs are often used in the more mundane sense of “to call (by a certain name)”: 1.217, 238; 2.687, 977; 3.277, 357, 1003; 4.267, 829, 990, 1153; cf. 2.296, 1156; 3.246.

¹⁹⁹ See Romeo 1985: 25 and Hunter 1993: 119 n. 76.

²⁰⁰ That this play of epic and religious language is deliberate is suggested by its recurrence in the scene of the Argonauts’ reception in the court of King Lycus. The Mariandynians have heard the report (κλέος, 2.754) of their enemy Amycus’ death and thus honor Polydeuces like a god (ὡς τε θεόν, 756); soon, as noted above, Lycus even promises to build a temple and dedicate certain crop fields to the Dioscuri (806–810) (Hitch 2012: 147–148).

be appreciated both as one of the many “famous deeds of people born long ago” (παλαιγενέων κλέα φωτῶν, 1.1) promised in the introit—that is, as an epic ἀριστεία²⁰¹ for the mortal hero Polydeuces—and as a miniature hymnic narrative celebrating one of the many exploits of Zeus’ now-deified son.²⁰² As I argued above, Polydeuces and his brother are, like Heracles, destined for a more exalted form of divinity than are the other Argonauts, but their example also sets a precedent suggestive of the honors that the rest of the crew will receive upon heroization.²⁰³ Likewise, this episode starring Polydeuces suggests a way of reading every other episode in the poem in which the talents of just one or two Argonauts are allowed to shine. For example, in the very next episodes, the helmsman Tiphys skillfully steers the Argo out of harm’s way when a monumental wave threatens (2.164–176), and soon thereafter the winged Boreads rescue Phineus from harassment by the Harpies (262–300). These episodes, too, can be understood both as epic ἀριστεῖαι and as chances for individual heroes to receive special hymnic praise within the poem’s collective hymn to the Argonauts.²⁰⁴

A final word on the Bebrycian episode. Modifying ὕμνον in line 261 is the adjective συνοῖμιον, which occurs nowhere else in Greek literature. Based on context and etymology it should mean something like “harmonious,” relating to a “strain of song” (οἶμος) that is “together with” (συν-) something else—in this case, Orpheus’ lyre (Ὀρφεῖη φόρμιγγι, 261); the term is

²⁰¹ I borrow the language of ἀριστεῖαι for those episodes that spotlight individual Argonauts from Kyriakou 1995: 191 (cf. Lawall 1966: 134).

²⁰² Cf. Theoc. *Id.* 22, in which the very same episode does feature as a hymnic narrative.

²⁰³ See Section II.d above.

²⁰⁴ I thank Suzanne Lye for the suggestion that the *Arg.* can be read as a sort of “anthology” of hymns, with many individual Argonauts receiving the hymnist’s attention at different points.

effectively glossed by the adverb ἐμμελέως (“in beautiful harmony”) in the next line.²⁰⁵ Yet the word also evokes—and is even glossed by the *Suda* as—προοίμιον, the technical term for a hymn of the Homeric type that precedes an epic performance.²⁰⁶ Apollonius’ use of συνοίμιον is thus a further pointer to the hymnic, and particularly the Homeric-hymnic, dimension of the Argonauts’ praise of Polydeuces. But if I may speculate somewhat, I wonder if in this context, the prefix συν- might also point to the generic hybridity of the episode and, indeed, of the poem as a whole as hymn *cum* epic. To go even further: if a προοίμιον precedes an epic performance, could συνοίμιον indicate a performance that is both hymnic and epic at once? As an epic hymn, the *Arg.* is simultaneously a Homeric-hymnic προοίμιον and the epic performance that such hymns typically promise.²⁰⁷ Perhaps Apollonius invented this term, if it is indeed his coinage, to reflect the duality of his own inventive experiment with the epic and hymnic genres.

c. The Syrtis and the Envoi

My final two examples of passages that reflect the poem’s generic hybridity may be considered together, for both passages conceptualize the relationship between epic deeds and heroic hymnody in a revealing way. I begin with the earlier passage. Near the end of their adventure, the Argonauts find themselves stranded in the Syrtis, a vast, barren sandbar off the coast of Libya. With no way to return to the sea, it seems that they will waste away and perish—a possibility that prompts the following counterfactual statement from the narrator (4.1305–1307):

²⁰⁵ Hunter 1996: 143 n. 14 wonders if συνοίμιον adds a “quasi-technical flavour” to the description.

²⁰⁶ See the discussion of Wolf’s “Proem theory” in the Introduction.

²⁰⁷ Cf. n. 147 in the previous chapter.

καί νύ κεν αὐτοῦ πάντες ἀπὸ ζωῆς ἐλίσσθην
νώνυμοι καὶ ἄφαντοι ἐπιχθονίοισι δαῖναι
ἡρώων οἱ ἄριστοι ἀνηγύστῳ ἐπ' ἀέθλω.

And so in that place all the best of the heroes would have departed from life, leaving no names and no traces for humans to know of them, with their mission unfulfilled.

Ultimately, the Argonauts do survive to complete their task, but this counterfactual is nevertheless interesting because it establishes the stakes of the Argonauts' mission: if they die, they will leave no trace to be remembered by. The fear of being forgotten is deep-rooted in epic poetry, in whose value system such a fate is tantamount to a second death.²⁰⁸ In fact, Jason elsewhere expresses a similar fear when the Argonauts are stranded not in Libya, but in Acherusia in Book 2: “An evil fate will bury us here without fame as we grow old in vain” (κατανόθι δ' ἄμμε καλύψει | ἀκλειῶς κακὸς οἶτος ἐτώσια γηράσκοντας, 2.892–893).²⁰⁹ Both of these passages, in Libya and Acherusia, are essentially tied up with the memorializing function of epic and are markedly metatextual: if the Argonauts really had failed in their quest, they would have won no κλέος for themselves and the *Arg.* itself, as well as other epics about them (cf. 1.18–19), would never have been written.²¹⁰ The narrator's counterfactual in the Libya passage thus jolts the reader out of the preceding mythological narrative to consider her place in the ongoing “reception history” of the poem: each new generation of readers (cf. 4.1773–1775)

²⁰⁸ Glei and Natzel-Glei 1996: 2.201 n. 127.

²⁰⁹ Hutchinson 1988: 135. For the comparable situations in Acherusia and Libya, see further, e.g., Fantuzzi and Hunter 2004: 123 and Morrison 2007: 307.

²¹⁰ See, e.g., Morrison 2007: 304. Wray 2000: 254 puts it well: “The *fact* that contradicts the epithets νώνυμοι and ἄφαντοι, we could say, is precisely the bookroll in the reader's hands, proving not only that the Argonauts made it safely home (for otherwise there could be no κλέος and no poem) but also that the safe end is in sight (there are no more rolls in the case, and this one is very near its spool).”

takes their place among the ἐπιχθόνιοι who learn (δαῖναι) of the Argonauts through the medium of this very poem.²¹¹

In this sense, this counterfactual statement is really about the function of epic in preserving the memory of great achievements from the past. But in addition to commenting on the role of epic poetry, I would argue that this passage also comments on the nature of heroic hymns through its use of the very rare adjective νόνημοι in line 1306. The translation I quote renders this word as “leaving no names,” interpreting the adjective as a form of the privative prefix νη- combined with the word for “name,” ὄνομα.²¹² But in fact, the meaning of this word was debated in antiquity, and some grammarians preferred to parse it instead as a combination of the privative prefix with the word ὕμνος, “song, hymn.”²¹³ In order to explain the adjective’s use at *Il.* 12.70 = 13.227 = 14.70, they interpreted the ὕμνος element that they found in the word as equivalent to the θρήνος (“dirge”) specifically, and thus they understood νόνημος to mean “unlamented.” Apollonius plainly alludes to this interpretation by pairing νόνημοι with ἄφαντοι, which at *Il.* 6.60 is similarly paired with ἀκήδεστοι, “unmourned.”²¹⁴ Be that as it may,

²¹¹ Cf. the metapoetic interpretation of the speech of the Libyan heroines, who are soon to save the Argonauts, advanced by Feeney 1991: 92 and Hunter 1993: 126, in which it is the Argonauts’ epic κλέος that motivates the goddesses to rescue them. As Hunter comments, “It is poetry which secures the real ‘success’ of the voyage by saving the Argonauts and retelling the story for each generation.”

²¹² Apollonius uses the adjective with this sense indisputably at 2.982.

²¹³ See Merkel and Keil 1854: clxxxiii–clxxxiv, Livrea 1973 ad loc., Rengakos 1994: 118. The relevant ancient sources include Apoll. Soph. 117.20 Bekker, Σβ ad *Il.* 12.70, and ΣΤ ad *Il.* 13.227.

²¹⁴ Vian 2002: 3.218 ad *Arg.* 4.1306 objects that “leaving no names” is more salient in this context than being “unlamented,” and he cites the imitation at *Orph. Arg.* 1161–1162 to support his interpretation. I believe that Apollonius is showing his awareness of both of the adjective’s possible meanings. The recollection of *Il.* 6.60 suggests the sense “unlamented,” but *n.b.* that the phrase immediately following νόνημοι (ἄφαντοι ἐπιχθονίοισι δαῖναι) effectively glosses its other proposed meaning, “leaving no names” (i.e., “obscure”). There is no need to decide between these two options but only to recognize the connotative richness of Apollonius’ diction. I will say, for what it is worth, that “leaving no names and no traces for humans to know of them” is essentially redundant, whereas Apollonius’ model in *Il.* 6.60 offers the semantically differentiated pairing ἀκήδεστοι καὶ ἄφαντοι, “unmourned and unseen,” in Agamemnon’s wish that the Trojans be utterly annihilated (cf. Apollonius’ simile of the

I propose that beyond entering into a learned glossographical debate, in this metapoetic context Apollonius' allusion to an etymology from ὕμνος may be particularly salient, resonating as it does with the “hymnic” form of the *Arg.* itself.²¹⁵ If we try to read νόνημοι in its more radical sense of “leaving no ὕμνοι,” then this passage establishes a parallelism between the conditions under which heroes are honored in epic and hymnody. Just as a premature death would have robbed the Argonauts of epic κλέος, this passage suggests that failure to accomplish their task, their ἄεθλος, would have also made the heroes unworthy of worship in cult—and consequently, for celebration in Apollonius' epic hymn to the Argonauts.

I want to focus on the connection presented here between the receipt of hymns and the completion of ἄεθλοι, for I would argue that this nexus of ideas taps into the widespread ancient belief, which was gaining more currency in the Hellenistic period, that regarded the attainment of cultic honors as a reward for personal merits.²¹⁶ As we noted above, in the *Odyssey*, Menelaus' destined heroization is premised on nothing more than the fact that he is Zeus' son-in-law (4.561–569); nepotism is all the justification needed for his receipt of a blessed afterlife.²¹⁷ In later Greek literature, however, different explanations for the heroization and apotheosis of select mortals begin to be put forward. These blessed few have somehow earned their immortalization,

doomed city just earlier, 4.1280–1289); *n.b.* also the pair of non-synonymous adjectives with privative prefixes in another of Apollonius' models, Emped. 31 B 12.2 D.-K. (ἀνήγυστον καὶ ἄπυστον).

²¹⁵ Cf. Hunter 2015 ad loc., who argues that the meaning “unmourned” does not fit in this context, but that the adjective's radical sense of “without ὕμνοι” works well; he further points out that, like the *Arg.*, these ὕμνοι may be understood both as epic “songs” and as proper “hymns,” in accordance with the multiple meanings of the term ὕμνος (see the discussion of this term in the previous subsection of this chapter).

²¹⁶ For explicitly articulated logical justifications for divinization on the basis of εὐεργεσία, especially in the Hellenistic period, see *ThesCRA* 2.161–162.

²¹⁷ Roloff 1970: 100; Heubeck, West, and Hainsworth 1988 ad *Od.* 4.563ff; see further Scodel 1982: 37 n. 10.

either because of their moral worth or because of their tremendous accomplishments on earth.²¹⁸ For example, Pindar mixes the doctrine of metempsychosis with a belief that those who have lived righteous lives win heroization as their (final?) reward (*Ol.* 2.68–80, fr. 133), while Isocrates speaks generally of the people of prior ages who won immortalization because of their virtue (δι’ ἀρετήν, 9.70).²¹⁹ Apollonius’ own contemporary Istrus, another reputed pupil of Callimachus (*FGrH* 334 T 1–2, 6), applies the same language to a historical figure, claiming that the Athenians honored the poet Sophocles with hero cult (under the name Dexion) “because of his virtue” (διὰ τὴν τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἀρετήν, *FGrH* 334 F 38 [51]).²²⁰ The same discourse of divinization as a type of reward is reflected in Euhemerist speculations about the origins of religion in the postmortem apotheosis or heroization of great rulers and inventors of the past in recognition of their achievements and benefactions to humanity.²²¹

But the hero who best exemplifies this logic of apotheosis is Heracles. Beginning potentially as early as Hesiod,²²² the tradition is increasingly explicit in regarding his deification

²¹⁸ These two reasons are not mutually exclusive in light of the typical Greek belief that “virtue” (ἀρετή) manifests itself in “deeds of excellence” (ἀρεταῖ).

²¹⁹ For such sentiments, see further Currie 2005: 177–178. Euripidean tragedy furnishes a few etiologies for hero cults in which heroization is justified by the recipient’s virtue; e.g., in Eur. fr. 446 Collard and Cropp, from *Hippolytus Veiled*, the chorus explicitly proclaims that the titular character’s heroization is a reward (χάρις) for his piety (εὐσεβίας) and virtue (ἀρετῆς), in particular his chastity (σωφροσύνην). For self-sacrificing, patriotic heroines (and occasionally heroes) like Macaera in the *Heracleidae*, see Larson 1995: 101–109.

²²⁰ Connolly 1998 doubts the authenticity of this tradition, but that matters little for my purposes here.

²²¹ *N.b.* Diod. Sic. 1.2.4, a euhemerist passage that mentions men becoming gods and heroes for their inventions or other benefactions to humanity. Notably, Hecataeus of Abdera (*ap.* Diod. Sic. 1.13) expresses similar opinions about the deification of the early Pharaohs; see further Section II.a of the Conclusion.

²²² Hes. *Th.* 954–955 speaks of Heracles’ attainment of divinity after accomplishing an unspecified great deed among the immortals (μέγα ἔργον ἐν ἀθανάτοισιν ἀνύσσας, 954); the implication seems to be that the former is the reward for the latter. West 1966 *ad loc.* suggests a reference to Heracles’ participation in the Gigantomachy, which is elsewhere associated with his deification, including in the cited Pindaric passage; perhaps Apollonius has this episode chiefly in mind among the “few more” labors that Heracles must complete to win Olympus at *Arg.* 1.1319–1320 (quoted below). Cf. Apollonius’ reference to the hero’s battle with the Giant-like earthborn men at Cyzicus as another “labor” (ἀέθλιον, 1.997) Hera might have devised for him.

as, in Pindar’s words, “the choicest recompense for his great labors” (*Nem.* 1.70, καμάτων
μεγάλων | ποινὰν ... ἐξαίρετον).²²³ Notably, Apollonius himself has the sea god Glaucus foretell
Heracles’ apotheosis in the following terms upon his separation from the crew at Mysia (*Arg.*
1.1317–1320):

Ἄργεϊ οἱ μοῖρ’ ἐστὶν ἀτασθάλαφ’ Εὐρυσθηῖ
ἐκπλήσαι μογέοντα δώδεκα πάντα ἀέθλους,
ναίειν δ’ ἀθανάτοισι συνέστιον, εἴ κ’ ἔτι παύρουσ
ἐξανύση. 1320

At Argos it is his [Heracles’] destiny to toil for arrogant
Eurystheus and accomplish twelve labors in all, and to dwell in the
home of the immortals if he completes a few more.

As Feeney observes, the conditionality of Glaucus’ prophecy serves to present Heracles’
deification as “a reward for what the labours signified—a reward, that is, for endurance, and for
the beneficent cleansing of evils from the world.”²²⁴

I have already noted above the Argonauts’ emulation of the inimitable Heracles following
his departure at the end of Book 1.²²⁵ Here we may extend this analysis by noting that Jason’s
quest, too, is frequently framed in Heracleian terms as an ἄεθλος or a series of ἄεθλοι,²²⁶ and that
these Argonautic labors frequently effect the same sort of “beneficent cleansing of evils from the

²²³ For Heracles’ winning immortality through his labors, see further Soph. *Phil.* 1418–1422, Isoc. 1.50, and Apoll. Rhod. *Arg.* 1.1317–1320; cf. Theoc. *Id.* 24.79–85 (where the participle τελέσαντι may be conditional); and for later citations, see, e.g., Pease 1958 ad Cic. *Nat. D.* 2.62 s.v. *hinc* (p. 700) and Nisbet and Rudd 2004 ad Hor. *Carm.* 3.2.21–22, 3.3.9.

²²⁴ Feeney 1987: 58. Similarly, Páskiewicz 1981 ad *Arg.* 2.849 argues that Apollonius presents Idmon’s piety and ancestry as the grounds for his receipt of cult honors; cf. Händel 1954: 72–73.

²²⁵ See Section II.d above.

²²⁶ For the Argonautic expedition generally as an ἄεθλος or a series of ἄεθλοι, see 1.15, 32, 255, 362, 414, 442, 841, 903; 2.411, 424, 617, 869, 877, 1217; 4.1031, 1307; cf. 1.469). Most commonly, this terminology is applied specifically to the ordeal imposed by Aeetes (3.407, 428, 480, 502, 522, 536, 561, 580, 619, 624, 720, 778, 788, 906, 942, 989, 1050, 1177, 1189, 1211, 1255, 1268, 1279, 1407; 4.8, 68, 342, 365, 733; cf. 3.1082); it also refers once to the battle with the earthborn men of Cyzicus (1.1012). For the Heracleian resonance of these terms, see 1.997, 1318, 1347; Galinsky 1972: 112; Finkelberg 1995: 4. At *Arg.* 3.997 the term is applied to Theseus’ labors.

world” as do Heracles’; in Greek terms, the Argonauts frequently function, like Heracles, as ἀλεξίκακοι, “averters of evil.”²²⁷ The principal benefit conferred by the Argonautic expedition on humankind is the pacification of the Clashing Rocks, whose neutralization opens routes for trade and colonization between the Black Sea and the Mediterranean.²²⁸ A number of other collateral benefits also accrue to various localities through which the crew passes; for instance, Crete becomes accessible to future travelers through the elimination of Talos (4.1636–1693),²²⁹ and the Boreads drive the Harpies who had been harassing Phineus back into their cave (2.298–300).²³⁰ In several cases, the Argonauts’ εὐεργεσία is directly linked to Heracles’ own. The Argonauts join Heracles in what begins, essentially, as his individual labor (ἀέθλιον Ἡρακλῆι, 1.997)²³¹ against the earthborn men of Cyzicus, which thus becomes in the end a collective labor for all of the heroes (cf. ἥρωες δ’, ὅτε δὴ σφιν ἀταρβῆς ἔπλετ’ ἄεθλος, 1012).²³² King Lycus

²²⁷ For heroization as a reward for the completion ἄεθλοι, see Finkelberg 1995: 5–12. For the Argonauts as ἀλεξίκακοι, see, e.g., Claus 2000: 26 (who, however, does not use this term).

²²⁸ *Arg.* 2.604–606. The successful navigation of the Symplegades represents the Argonautic achievement par excellence; see Fantuzzi 1989. Ironically, however, in Apollonius’ account, the first beneficiaries of the decommissioning of the Clashing Rocks turn out to be the Colchian fleet that pursues the Argonauts through the Bosphorus, on a route that their targets had themselves only recently opened up (4.303–304, 1001–1003; Natzel 1992: 113, Nishimura-Jensen 2000: 307); this Colchian contingent later settles in Phaeacia before a series of further migrations (4.1206–1216). Thus the first wave of colonization to follow from the Argonautic expedition is not in fact Greek, but “barbarian” (cf. also 4.507–521); the Bosphorus is a two-way street, as it were.

²²⁹ There may be a chronological contradiction in the fact that Theseus had already sailed to and from Crete before the Argonauts had dispatched Talos (3.1000–1001, 4.434). He was presumably freely allowed onto Crete in order to be served up as prey to the Minotaur, and perhaps he was allowed to leave the island unharmed because he had Princess Ariadne in tow—or because Minos really did consent to her marriage with Theseus, as Jason claims (3.1000–1001, 1100–1101).

²³⁰ I here focus on the Argonauts as ἀλεξίκακοι, but their mission also has other important world-historical ramifications, such as repopulating Lemnos or setting in motion the future colonization of Cyrene.

²³¹ The narrator does not specify whether the younger men with whom Heracles had been guarding the ship join the battle with him (1.992).

²³² I thus disagree with DeForest 1994: 60–61 that Apollonius’ object in having the Argonauts join this battle is to criticize their assistance as “unnecessary [and] unwanted” (61); see further Stoessl 1941: 16–17. Of course, the almighty Heracles may not have strictly needed his comrades’ help, but I would rather view the Argonauts’

casts the Argonauts' killing of the tyrannical Amycus and their defeat of his forces as a sequel to Heracles' own services to the Mariandynians some decades earlier (2.774–798).²³³ Most explicitly, the Argonauts' strategy for driving the birds of Ares from their island is modeled directly on Heracles' method of routing the Stymphalian birds (2.1047–1067);²³⁴ the Argonauts thus render Aretias safe for further human exploitation just as Heracles had liberated Stymphalus from its avian pests.²³⁵

The persistent modeling of the Argonauts' beneficent ἄεθλοι on those of Heracles, combined with Glaucus' conditioning of Heracles' apotheosis on his completion of such ἄεθλοι, suggests the operation of a simple syllogism: the Argonauts, too, can expect to be rewarded for their heroic labors. To be sure, theirs will be a lesser grade of divinity, in proportion to the magnitude of their (collective) achievements relative to Heracles' (primarily individual) ones; they will be heroized, not deified.²³⁶ Nevertheless, we are now equipped to understand why the Argonauts would have been “unhymned” (νόνημοι, 4.1306) had their labor remained unaccomplished (ἀνηνύστω ἐπ' ἀέθλω, 1307): their heroization is predicated precisely on their commission of heroic deeds.

participation in what begins as a solo fight as a way of leaguings them alongside Heracles as allies and continuators of his cosmic project of rendering the world safe for human exploration and habitation.

²³³ Feeney 1987: 49–50, 58.

²³⁴ Indeed, if we identify the Stymphalian birds with the birds of Ares, as several other sources do (Timagetus fr. 4 Müller; Hyg. *Fab.* 20, 30.6; Serv. ad Verg. *Aen.* 8.299; Tzetz. *Chil.* 2.292), we can see the Argonauts as directly continuing Heracles' salvational work in the wider world beyond Greece.

²³⁵ The first beneficiaries of the Argonauts' cleansing of Aretias are the sons of Phrixus, who can thus safely meet and join the heroes following their shipwreck (3.320–326). But it is ironic that the other beneficiaries of the Argonauts' action are, once again, their would-be enemies (2.985–995) the Amazons, whose discontinued use of this island (*n.b.* 2.1172–1173) is presumably linked to the arrival of the monstrous birds.

²³⁶ With the exception of the Dioscuri, discussed above (Section II.d).

This insight, in turn, sheds new light on the poem's Envoi. For convenience, I quote once more its opening lines (4.1773–1777):

ἴλατ' ἀριστήων μακάρων γένος· αἶδε δ' αἰοῖδαι
εἰς ἔτος ἔξ ἔτεος γλυκερώτεραι εἶεν αἰεῖν
ἀνθρώποις. ἤδη γὰρ ἐπὶ κλυτὰ πείραθ' ἰκάνω
ὕμετέρων καμάτων, ἐπεὶ οὐ νύ τις ὕμιν ἄεθλος
αὐτίς ἀπ' Αἰγίνηθεν ἀνερχομένοισιν ἐτύχθη... 1775

Be gracious, you race of blessed heroes, and may these songs year after year be sweeter for men to sing. For now I have come to the glorious conclusion of your toils, since no further trial befell you as you returned home from Aegina...

It would be tautological to observe that this Envoi activates the poem's affiliations with hymnody; indeed, the preceding chapter demonstrated how crucial these lines are for the poem's construal as a hymn addressed to the Argonauts. In this chapter, however, a couple of further points should be stressed. First, I underline the adjective κλυτὰ because with this word Apollonius again injects an epic sensibility into a markedly hymnic context.²³⁷ It is the “conclusion” of the Argonauts' labors that is particularly “glorious” because it marks the successful completion of their undertaking; the sentiment here is the opposite of that expressed in Libya, that the Argonauts would have become unknown (ἄφαντοι ἐπιχθονίοισι δαῖναι, 4.1306) had their labor been left unfulfilled (ἀνηνύστω ἐπ' ἀέθλω, 1307). Again, as we saw in Chapter 1, the narrator's Prayer for the continual reperformance of his songs would further propagate the epic glory that the Argonauts have won. Moreover, by ending his poem here, at the conclusion of his subject's toils, Apollonius shows epic to be coterminous with heroic labor; he reminds us that glorious deeds, the κλέα φωτῶν promised in 1.1, are the proper subject of epic.²³⁸

²³⁷ Goldhill 1991: 295, already quoted in an earlier discussion of the Envoi in Chapter 1 (n. 152). The metapoetic implications of κλυτὰ are further analyzed, e.g., by Hunter 1993: 122 and Clare 2002: 284.

²³⁸ Fränkel 1968: 621, Klooster 2007: 78; see also the poet's program at 1.20–22. That the poet's “journey” and “labors” are coterminous with those of his subjects is often observed in Apollonian scholarship. See, e.g., Beye

The passage evokes the idea that glorification in epic song is the hero's just reward for great achievements. The second point I would like to make, though, once again concerns the relationship between ἄεθλοι, heroization, and hymnody. The Envoi's Salutation hails the Argonauts as a "race of blessed heroes" (ἄριστῶν μακάρων γένος, 4.1773). As Belloni has argued, this phrase recalls the Argonauts' identification as "the race of demigods, the best of men who then were sailing over the sea" (ἡμιθέων ἀνδρῶν γένος, οἱ τότε ἄριστοι | πόντον ἐπιπλώεσκον, 1.548–549) at the outset of their journey, in the scene of the Argo's first departure from Pagasae.²³⁹ The intratextual echo of this phrase at 4.1773 marks, via ring-composition, the very end of the Argo's voyage as the crew returns to Pagasae, but with a crucial difference. The Argonauts who began their adventure as "demigod men" return home transformed into "blessed heroes." What has made the difference in the interim? It is the journey itself, and all the trials (cf. ἄεθλος, 1776) overcome along the way. The Argonauts' labors have, in other words, elevated them to a new ontological status, from the secular heroes of epic to the divinized heroes of cult.²⁴⁰ The mixture of hymnic and epic elements in the Envoi tells us that to complete a heroic labor means both to win epic fame and to receive worship after death in hero cult, and as an epic hymn, the *Arg.* instantiates both of these rewards for "the best of the heroes" (ἡρώων οἱ ἄριστοι, 4.1307).

1982: 14; Goldhill 1991: 295; Hunter 1993: 84, 120–121; DeForest 1994: 42; Albis 1996, esp. chapters 3–4; Wray 2000: 240–247, Clare 2002: 283–284, Vox 2002: 167; Cuypers 2004: 45, and Morrison 2007: 305–306.

²³⁹ Belloni 2017, esp. 94–96. Formally, such careful variations reflect Apollonius' flexible, "quasi-formulaic" style in adapting the conventions of early Greek epic (Fantuzzi and Hunter 2004: 266–267, Fantuzzi 2008a: 232).

²⁴⁰ Belloni 2017: 95. For the Argonauts' winning heroization through their deeds, see further Green 2007 ad *Arg.* 4.1773, Hunter 2015 ad *Arg.* 4.1773–1781; *n.b.* particularly Hitch 2012: 150 on ἄεθλος as "the programmatic term for the labors of heroes which lead to their immortalization"; she mostly has in mind Jason's ordeal, but she notes that the term is repeated in the Envoi.

In light of the foregoing analysis, perhaps we can now understand why Apollonius decided to play a sort of trick on his first-time readers in his framing of his poem as a hymn. As was argued in Chapter 1, the introit is susceptible to many different interpretations on an initial reading, and it is only when the reader reaches the very end of the poem, with its Salutation and Prayer to its own protagonists, that the design of the poem as a hymn to the Argonauts is finally and fully clarified. Apollonius might have engineered this effect for any number of reasons—for instance, to treat his readers to a surprising twist or to enrich his poem’s capacity for re-reading (cf. 4.1773–1775). But there could also be a thematic reason at play. Since it is only by virtue of accomplishing their ἄεθλος that the Argonauts win for themselves heroization and the right to be worshipped in hymns, it is in a sense only fitting that Apollonius would wait for the final passage of the *Arg.*, when, he says, “no further trial (ἄεθλος) befell” his protagonists, to reveal in equivocal terms their transformation into cult heroes and consequently the hymnic status of his epic. Thus the “hymnicization” of the poem on a generic level appears in tandem with the heroization of its protagonists on a narrative level—after the successful completion, and narration, of their labors.

Conclusion

In sum, the evidence explored in this chapter suggests that in crafting the *Arg.*, Apollonius has self-consciously united a series of elements that could otherwise be opposed according to a secular-religious binary, like so:

	Heroes	Heroic Poetry	Homeric ἔπος
Secular	Figures of myth	Epics <u>about</u> heroes	<i>Iliad & Odyssey</i>
Religious	Figures of cult	Hymns <u>to</u> heroes	<i>Homeric Hymns</i>

Apollonius recognized that heroes could be both mortal figures restricted to the age of myth, as in the HEs, and cult figures with enduring vitality down to the present. Accordingly, they might equally be the subject of epics and hymns. Apollonius was also aware that Homer had written both epics and hymns, and thus, it seems, an innovative synthesis suggested itself. The *Arg.* represents a conflation of all of these categories—an epic hymn that incorporates both the secular and religious dimensions of Greek heroism and of Homeric poetry into its very generic fabric.

In some ways, this merger did not actually require any great stretch of the imagination, given the close interconnections between epic poetry and Rhapsodic Hymns in terms of meter, diction, narrative style, and even certain structural features, in the case of their common introductory formulas.²⁴¹ Moreover, we have seen more than once in this chapter how Apollonius strives to demonstrate the complementarity of the traditional themes and motifs he has inherited from the HEs with those introduced by the hymnic dimension of his poem. For instance, Idmon's grave is the rightful focal point both of his remembrance (an epic motif) and cult worship (a hymnic one). Similarly, the Argonauts' ἄεθλοι are fit subjects for epic song, but these achievements also justify the crew's heroization and subsequent worship in hymns.

The hymnic aspect of the *Arg.* largely complements rather than conflicts with its status as epic, but it does introduce some elements and emphases that really do represent a significant departure from the models of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. For instance, the *Arg.*'s extensive theme of hero cult and apotheosis, surveyed in Section II of this chapter, is essentially alien to the tone and tenor of the HEs, and the *Iliad* especially. In view of the prospect of literal immortality, both the specter of death and the promise of κλέος as compensation for death arguably lose some of

²⁴¹ See Section II.b of the Introduction.

their thematic purchase in the *Arg.* In this respect, Apollonius, so famous for his “pessimism,”²⁴² in fact holds out a much cheerier vision of the fate of his protagonists than the severe outlook of the HEs.²⁴³ But the *Arg.*’s frequent and prominent references to hero cult represent just one example of the encroachment of the poem’s hymnic perspective into the epic texture of the narrative. It is to these moments of difference, in which the poem’s hymnic side asserts itself in ways foreign to the HEs, that I now turn in Part II of this study, on the hymnic voice of the Apollonian narrator.

²⁴² See, e.g., Lawall 1966: 167–169, Paduano 1971: 67, Opelt 1978: 187–188, Clack 1982: 405, Newman 1986: 94, Grillo 1988: 39, Cuypers 2004: 53, Nelis 2005a: 361.

²⁴³ Cf. Griffin 1977, an influential article (referenced above in Part I) that made the triviality of death one of his major critiques of the Epic Cycle in comparison with the HEs.

PART II
THE APOLLONIAN NARRATOR'S HYMNIC VOICE

CHAPTER 3: NARRATOLOGICAL FEATURES WITH PRECEDENT IN THE *HOMERIC HYMNS*

Part I of this dissertation was devoted to establishing the overarching generic affiliations of the *Argonautica* (hereafter, *Arg.*). I argued that the poem is framed as an “epic hymn” dedicated to the Argonauts, a conceit that exploits the duality of the Greek concept of the “hero” in order to bring together the two genres of Homeric hexameter poetry, epic and hymn, into one hybridized composition. Part II moves away from the poem’s structural features in order to concentrate on some aspects of its content. This chapter and the next examine the poem from a narratological perspective: I consider how the hymnic dimension of the poem conditions the narrator’s voice and affects his presentation of the narrative—his interests, emphases, and especially his exploitation of such devices as apostrophe and the “metaleptic” blending of the voices of narrator and character.¹ As we shall see, besides the *introit* and *Envoi*, sundry passages in the poem have been labeled “hymnic” in character in the scholarly literature, and one scholar has even claimed that “into every part of the poem he [Apollonius] breathes a unity of mood . . . , until the whole assumes . . . almost the quality of a hymn.”² The goal of these chapters is to substantiate these widespread impressions and to integrate them into a more holistic understanding of Apollonius’ narratological techniques.

¹ For the term “metalepsis,” see Chapter 4, Section I.

² Carspecken 1952: 138.

Happily, I am aided in this endeavor by a number of high-quality narratological studies both of the *Homeric Hymns* (hereafter, *HHs*)¹ and of the *Argonautica*, which was in fact one of the first texts to receive extended narratological analysis within the discipline of Classics, in a trailblazing monograph by Fusillo.² My endeavor is complicated, conversely, by the sheer complexity of Apollonius' narratorial voice, which blends together an astonishing number of influences from the whole gamut of earlier Greek literature. Cuypers, for instance, parses Apollonius' "Protean narrative *persona*" as "an amalgam of (at least) the Homeric singer of epic, the hymnic and Pindaric singers of praise, the Herodotean historian, and the Callimachean scholar."³ This complexity stems partly from Apollonius' well-known penchant for generic experimentation, an innovatory drive that we have already seen on full display in Part I of this study. Another important factor is Apollonius' evident desire to "update" the traditional mythological epic by incorporating an enormous range of "learned" materials, drawn from the domains of science, philosophy, ethnography, geography, and beyond.⁴ Even cutting-edge Alexandrian medical and physiological theories find their place in Apollonius' work.⁵ Study of the Apollonian (hereafter, AR) narrator is further complicated by the fact that he is in many respects a moving target, developing dynamically over the course of the poem's four books.

¹ The chief studies are Nünlist 2004, 2007; de Jong 2012, 2018; Richardson 2015; and Faulkner 2015.

² Fusillo 1985; for its place in the history of our discipline, see de Jong 2014: 9. Studies of narrative time in the *Arg.* include Fusillo's monograph as well as Rengakos 2004, Caneva 2007, and Klooster 2007; studies of space in the poem include Thalmann 2011 and Klooster 2012, 2013b. Danek 2009 and Klooster 2014 straddle both of these categories. Studies focusing on the Apollonian narrator include, *inter alia*, Grillo 1998, Albis 1996, Byre 2002, Berkowitz 2004, Cuypers 2004, and Morrison 2007. Klooster 2018 studies Apollonius' methods of characterization from a narratological perspective.

³ Cuypers 2004: 43 (*italics original*).

⁴ I draw this "updating" language from Fusillo 1994: 100 ("actualiza el mito").

⁵ See, e.g., Solmsen 1961: 195–197.

Thus Morrison has identified a narratorial arc of increasing reliance on the authority of the Muses over the course of the poem, a phenomenon that he has called the narrator's "crisis of confidence."⁶

For all of these reasons, generalizations about the AR narrator frequently hold good only for select portions of the poem. I have argued that the *Arg.* is, from a formal point of view, an epic hymn, and thus the hymnic mode is necessarily important in the poem. Nevertheless, in a poem so multifaceted and experimental, no single generic affiliation—not even a hybrid one—can be said to determine all of the poem's contents. Given these intricacies, in this study I do not pretend to do full justice to Apollonius' rich store of narrative modes and personas. Instead, I wish to examine only the dimension of the AR narrator that Cuypers calls "the hymnic singer of praise," in isolation from his other personalities so far as is possible.

This chapter is devoted to narrative techniques that find "Homeric" precedents not in the Homeric epics (hereafter, HEs), but in the *HHs*, including the AR narrator's conspicuous intrusions in the narrative (Section I), his loud displays of piety (Section II), his interest in etiology (Section III), and his use of several other devices with antecedents in the *Hymns* (Section IV). It is not always certain that the *HHs* represent the proximate influence on Apollonius' narratorial technique in each case, and some specific devices that I analyze in this chapter, like the pious apology to the gods, find only limited exemplification in the hymnic collection. By a similar token, in several cases, the various strands of Apollonius' multitextured

⁶ Morrison 2007 (quotation from p. 35). Morrison provides the most thorough exposition of this idea (see esp. pp. 286–310), but it has many antecedents in prior scholarship. Earlier scholars sensed oscillations (or, more harshly, contradictions, or even recantations) in the narrator's attitude to the Muses throughout the poem (Gercke 1889: 135–136; Eichgrün 1961: 104–107; Paduano Faedo 1970: 380 n. 9; and Livrea 1971: 47–48, 1973 ad 4.1381), but it remained for later scholars to realize that these different attitudes rather reflected a *diachronic development* as the poem progressed (Beye 1982: 15–17, Hunter 1987: 134, Feeney 1991: 90–91, Goldhill 1991: 294, Brioso Sánchez 1995, Albis 1996: 119–120, Clare 2002: 268, Powers 2002: 99–100, and Nelis 2005a: 356).

persona often appear tangled together, and one cannot be considered in strict isolation from the other. For instance, we will see that scholars have connected Apollonius' "pious silences" not only to the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, but also to Pindar, Herodotus, and Callimachus. I will try to make note of such cases to avoid oversimplifications. Nevertheless, the perceived Homeric authority of the *Hymns* could have made them attractive models for an epic poet seeking sanction for practices that departed markedly from those of the HEs. Moreover, in some cases, as in his pointing of αἴτια, Apollonius alludes to the *Hymns* in such a way as to show his awareness of the precedent that they furnished for some of his typically "Hellenistic" affectations.

I. The Overt Narrator

To begin with, one of the most remarked-upon differences between the HE and AR narrators has to do with their relative prominence in their own narratives.⁷ The HE narratorial persona is famously submerged. Only rarely does he draw attention to himself as narrator or focalizer; when he does, it is primarily through such devices as Appeals to the Muses, apostrophes, or the occasional use of editorializing language that is normally restricted to character-text, like νήπιος ("fool").⁸ To be sure, no story tells itself, and the HE narrator can always be seen behind the scenes, masterfully manipulating his audience's responses to the

⁷ Indeed, Fusillo 1985: 383 views the greater prominence of the AR narrator as Apollonius' most radical innovation vis-à-vis the HEs, which he sums up as a transformation of an "onniscienza neutra" into an "onniscienza dell'autore-editore." On this difference between the HE and AR narrators, see further, e.g., Beye 1982: 18; Grillo 1988: 13 and ch. 1 *passim*; Hunter 1993: 101–119; Cuypers 2004: 43; Rutherford 2005: 32–33; and Morrison 2007: 271–272.

⁸ See on this score the useful overviews in Richardson 1990: chapters 6 and esp. 7; and de Jong 2004b: 13–18.

narrative. For the most part, however, he does so in an indirect way, by implication, rather than asserting his own point of view as a character might.⁹

If the HE narrator is thus “covert,” the AR narrator is decidedly “overt”—one of those narrators who “refer to themselves and their narrating activity, tell us about themselves, and openly comment upon their story.”¹⁰ For instance, the Alexandrian poem ostentatiously commences in the first-person (ἀρχόμενος ... μνήσομαι, 1.1–2);¹¹ the narrator’s personal control over the enunciation is further emphasized by first-person references in line 20 (νῦν δ’ ἄν ἐγώ ... μυθησαίμην), and by the deferral of the (third-person) Appeal to the Muses until line 22 (Μοῦσαι δ’ ὑποφῆτορες εἶεν ἀοιδῆς).¹² The AR narrator continues to assert his control over the narrative with first-person verbs in the Catalogue (μνησώμεθα, 23; πευθόμεθ’, 123; ἴδμεν, 135) and beyond,¹³ and, in sum, throughout the poem he frequently breaks the “epic illusion”¹⁴ and draws attention to himself *qua* narrator in the act of narrating through such multifarious devices as Appeals to the Muses, apostrophe,¹⁵ second-person addresses to the narratee,¹⁶ his citation of

⁹ So de Jong 2004b: 17–18. See further Minchin 1999: 60–62 on the distinction between explicit” external evaluation,” which the HE narrator generally avoids, and the indirect mode of “internal evaluation,” which he favors.

¹⁰ de Jong, Nünlist, and Bowie 2004: xvii.

¹¹ See, e.g., Goldhill 1991: 287: “[I]t is ... significant that the beginning word of the epic is ‘beginning’. It focuses attention on the act of narration; and this self-reflexiveness is without doubt programmatic.”

¹² See, e.g., Zyroff 1971: 46–47, Clare 2002: 261–268, Fantuzzi and Hunter 2004: 119, and Morrison 2007: 287. It is beyond the scope of the present analysis to intervene in the longstanding debate over the significance of the wish that the Muses be the ὑποφῆτορες of song. Morrison 2007: 286–293 offers an even-handed overview of the problem; my own view is that Apollonius does indeed envision a startling “inversione del rapporto poeta-Musa” (Paduano Faedo 1970) vis-à-vis Homeric poetry.

¹³ The narrator’s use of the first-person is catalogued by De Martino 1984–1985: 113–114.

¹⁴ I borrow the terminology of Bassett 1938.

¹⁵ The AR narrator’s Appeals to the Muses and apostrophes are catalogued and discussed in Grillo 1988: ch. 1.

¹⁶ For second-person addresses to the narratee, see Byre 1991.

sources, especially via the so-called Alexandrian footnote,¹⁷ the use of interactional particles like *πῶς* in his own voice,¹⁸ instances of *mise-en-abyme*,¹⁹ and even explicit metapoetic commentary on his own song.²⁰ Most of these devices have precedents in the HEs, but their relative frequency and conspicuousness in the *Arg.* are in each case considerably higher. For instance, the AR narrator occasionally pronounces his characters *νήπιοι* (2.66, 137; 4.875) or *σχέτλιοι* (1.1302; 3.1133; 4.916, 1524; cf. 4.445), but he also uses a wide range of other affective terms that the HEs would restrict to character-text;²¹ the AR narrator's apostrophes are not only proportionally more common, but they can be maintained for many more lines than the HE narrator would allow.²²

The AR narrator's conspicuous interventions in the narrative have been well-studied, so that I hardly need to catalogue them all here.²³ Rather, I would like to underline the overtness of another "Homeric" narrator, namely, that of the *HHs*. As Bing observes apropos of Callimachus, the *HHs* "provided the only 'Homeric' model that permitted the unmediated involvement of the

¹⁷ See, e.g., Cuypers 2004: 49–51.

¹⁸ See Hunter 1993: 108–109, Cuypers 2004: 51, 56; *eadem* 2005: 41–45; and Morrison 2007: 275–278.

¹⁹ See Fusillo 1985: 361–363.

²⁰ Beyond the introits and the end of the poem (where metapoetic commentary is expected), see *Arg.* 1.648–649, 1220; 4.451.

²¹ See, e.g., Zyroff 1971: 309–313; Hunter 1993: 107–113, 118; and Morrison 2007: 271 n. 4, 284–286. See also Hunter 1993: 104–106 and Morrison 2007: 281–282 on the AR narrator's γνώμαι cast in the first person, in contrast to HE practice.

²² Grillo 1988: 41 considers Apollonius' long apostrophes perhaps his most important narratorial innovation, and he points to the *HHs* as well as Callimachus' *Hymns* as potential models (*ibid.* 46 n. 115).

²³ In addition to the studies cited in the previous notes, many of these phenomena are surveyed as well in Beye 1982: ch. 1 and Fusillo 1985: ch. III B.

poet's persona apart from the formulaic first person of the opening and closing of the poem."²⁴

The *HHs* foreshadow the overtness of the AR narrator in several respects, such as an increased tendency vis-à-vis the HEs to use evaluative language,²⁵ but Bing has particularly in mind the long *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*. As he mentions, after their Exordia and before their Envois, most of the *HHs* resemble the HEs in their lack of any first- or second-person references.²⁶ The *Hymn to Apollo*, however, exhibits a number of narratological features that are more or less unique within the collection:²⁷

- Frequent narratorial uses of the first person (19, 166, 174, 177, 207, 208), even outside the bounds of the Exordium (1) and Envoi (546);
- Regular apostrophes to Apollo (19–29, 120, 127–129, 140–149, 179–181, 207–215), Leto (14), and the Delian maidens (166–167, 171, 174), even before the Envoi (545–546).

Furthermore, the narrative of Apollo's search for a suitable location for his temple is almost entirely cast in Du-Stil (216–246, 277–282).²⁸

²⁴ Bing 2009: 34–35. Likewise for Redondo 2000: 131 n. 8, "The Homeric Hymns provide a clear model" for the greater prominence of Apollonius' narratorial persona. See further Bornmann 1968: xxiv–xxvi, Grillo 1988: 58 n. 156, Hunter 1993: 116.

²⁵ Hunter 1993: 110, drawing on Kraup 1948.

²⁶ See also Nünlist 2004: 36.

²⁷ For the anomalous narrative strategies of this hymn, see Nünlist 2004, esp. 40–42. The same author comments in another article, "The *Hymn to Apollo* really is a narrative text *sui generis*" (2007: 54).

²⁸ This second-person travel catalogue is reminiscent of the final lines of the *Arg.* (4.1775–1781); see also 4.1706. Nünlist 2004: 36 notes that that the fragmentary *Homeric Hymn to Dionysus* seems to have employed Du-Stil much as the *Hymn to Apollo* does, as one of the fragments includes a stretch of six lines in this mode (1A.2–7). In addition, the non-narrative *HHs* 21, 24, and 29 are entirely in Du-Stil, and 30.4–16 features a lengthy apostrophe to Gaia before the Envoi.

- The address of two rhetorical questions to Apollo himself (not the Muses) about the direction that the narrative should take (19, 207–208),²⁹ and
- The inclusion of a remarkable *sphragis* that identifies the author as a blind man from Chios, i.e., as Homer (166–178).

These narrative strategies may be anomalous within the collection, but there is good reason to think that Apollonius would have paid special regard to the major *Hymn to Apollo*, as indeed his older contemporary Callimachus seems to have done.³⁰ The hymn’s *sphragis* amounts to a claim to Homeric authorship (credited by Thuc. 3.104.5) that would certainly have attracted the attention of a Homeric scholar of Apollonius’ caliber. Moreover, we have seen in Chapter 1 that there is strong evidence that Apollonius alludes to this passage in the context of Orpheus’ own hymn to Apollo (*HH* 3.165 ~ *Arg.* 2.708), and that a case can be made that he reworks elements of the passage in his final Envoi to the Argonauts (esp. 4.1773–1775), not to mention other more or less probable allusions to other parts of the hymn (*HH* 3.1 ~ *Arg.* 1.1–2, and perhaps *HH* 3.14 ~ *Arg.* 4.1411, both featuring postponed $\tilde{\omega}$).³¹ There are, to be sure, overt narrators in a great deal of Greek poetry,³² but the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* provides an example in hexameter poetry with a claim to Homeric authorship.³³ In the following section, we will see

²⁹ Both questions are examples of the ἀπορία topos: the hymnist struggles to isolate just one of the innumerable themes by which he could praise the god. See Race 1982: 6–8; and Miller 1986: 20–21, 70–71.

³⁰ As Hunter 2006: 25 remarks, “Callimachus himself reworked the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* no less than three times in his hymns to Apollo, Artemis, and Delos.”

³¹ For potential Apollonian allusions to this passage in the introit, see pp. 89–92; in the Envoi, see Chapter 1, Section II.c. For potential allusions to *HH* 3.1 and 14, see pp. 67–68 and 110, respectively.

³² Morrison 2007: 271–272, 280 associates the overtness of the AR narrator with Theocritus and especially Callimachus, particularly where his scholarly persona is concerned. The allusion to Hes. *Op.* 10 at *Arg.* 1.20 (see n. 114 in Chapter 1) might also programmatically flag Hesiod as an important model for the overt AR narrator.

³³ Notably, Cuypers 2004: 43 connects the overtness of the AR narrator to the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*.

that some of the specific devices by which the AR narrator inserts himself into his narrative can be traced back to the *HHs*.

II. The Narrator's Piety

Among the clearest manifestations of the AR narrator's hymnic voice are the assorted passages that seem to advertise his piety or his expertise in matters of cult and theology. This aspect of the AR narrator's persona may not seem especially striking given that the HE narrator is hardly impious himself. For instance, the HE narrator constantly shows the reverence due to the gods through his abundant use of divine epithets, which (like his use of epithets in general) is much more extensive than Apollonius'.³⁴ From time to time, the HE narrator voices pious sentiments *in propria persona* (e.g., "But ever is the mind of Zeus stronger than that of men" [ἀλλ' αἰεὶ τε Διὸς κρείσσων νόος ἢ ἐπερ ἀνδρῶν, *Il.* 16.688]),³⁵ and he is intimately acquainted with the particulars of Greek sacrificial ritual (e.g., *Il.* 1.458–474). Nevertheless, in several respects, the AR narrator goes beyond Homeric practice in his pious self-fashioning. For instance, in his numerous etiological digressions, the AR narrator exhibits an interest in cultic practice *per se* unlike anything in HE narrator-text; he is not afraid to offer vocal criticisms of his characters for their impiety,³⁶ his use of expressions like ἡ θέμις (ἐστὶ), which the HE narrator limits to character-text,³⁷ positions him as a competent arbiter of correct ritual usages; and he

³⁴ See Appendix II.

³⁵ For narratorial γνώμη in the HEs, see, e.g., Lardinois 1997: 230–232.

³⁶ E.g., the narrator repeatedly underlines the ὕβρις of Amycus and the Bebrycians in *Arg.* 2.1–129. As Cuypers 2004: 61 observes, "Congruous with his aim of 'hymning' the Argonauts. . . , the narrator shows a strong awe for the gods and for the heroes of the past about whom he narrates, and an outspoken disapproval of those who oppose either."

³⁷ Morrison 2007: 271 n. 3. The AR narrator uses such expressions twice each to describe libation offerings (1.517, 4.1129), funerary rites (1.1061, 2.840), and foreign customs (2.1174, 3.205). See also 1.921 (where θέμις is used of

chooses the seer Phineus to serve as one of his most prominent narratorial “alter egos,” in addition to more traditional avatars like the bardic Orpheus (in the manner of Homer’s Demodocus).³⁸

To be sure, Apollonius is far from alone in constructing a pious persona for his narrator. For instance, with regard specifically to the AR narrator’s proclivity to voice his moral and emotional reactions to his own narrative, Morrison observes that Apollonius’ “moralising persona recalls those we find in Hesiod, Archaic monody, elegy, *iambos*, and in Pindar.”³⁹ In the analysis that follows, I try to keep this rich literary background in mind in assessing some of the passages in which the AR narrator’s piety is most to the fore. My primary purpose, however, is to establish that an important place in this background is occupied by the *HHS*, which establish Homeric precedent for each of the narratorial experiments surveyed here.

a. Pious Similes

Apollonius often introduces alternatives into the vehicle of his similes to suggest the arbitrariness of any given comparison, as in the famous simile that compares Medea’s fluttering heart to a shifting sunbeam “as it leaps from water freshly poured into a cauldron or perhaps into a bucket” (ὕδατος ἐξανιοῦσα, τὸ δὴ νέον ἤε λέβητι | ἤε που ἐν γαυλῶ κέχεται, *Arg.* 3.757–

maintaining mystic secrecy), 960 (of a dedication), 1035 (in a gnome about the ineluctability of destiny); 2.1019 (of thing proper to do in public); 4.479 (of the *μασχαλισμός* ritual), 700 (of purification for bloodguilt), 1511 (of uttering an irreverent hyperbole). It is debatable who speaks line 2.709 (of Apollo’s unshorn hair); see Section IV.c of Chapter 4.

³⁸ For Phineus as a surrogate for the narrator, see McPhee 2018: 62–63, with earlier bibliography. *N.b.* that Orpheus, too, is a spiritual guide to the Argonauts; for his status as a narratorial alter ego, see n. 193 in Chapter 4.

³⁹ Morrison 2007: 273. On pp. 280–284 he particularly emphasizes Pindar as a model for the AR narrator’s projection of moral authority.

758).⁴⁰ In certain passages with a divine vehicle, however, Apollonius takes this mannerism to the extreme by listing two, three, four, or even seven (!) alternate cult places or other typical haunts, to or from any of which the god might be traveling. Each of the poem’s major characters (including the Argonauts as a collective) receives their own such simile:⁴¹

1) Jason departs from his home for Pagasae (*Arg.* 1.307–311):

οἶος δ’ ἐκ νηοῖο θυώδεος εἶσιν Ἀπόλλων
Δῆλον ἀν’ ἠγαθέην ἢ Κλάρον, ἢ ὄ γε Πυθῶ
ἢ Λυκίην εὐρείαν ἐπὶ Ξάνθοιο ροῆσιν·
 τοῖος ἀνὰ πληθὺν δήμου κίεν, ὄρτο δ’ ἀυτὴ
 κεκλομένων ἄμυδις. 310

And as Apollo goes from his fragrant temple through holy Delos or Claros, or through Pytho or broad Lycia by the streams of Xanthus, so [Jason] went through the crowd of people, and a shout went up as they cheered with one voice.⁴²

2) The Argonauts depart from Pagasae (*Arg.* 1.536–541):

οἱ δ’, ὥς τ’ ἠίθεοι Φοῖβω χορὸν ἢ ἐνὶ Πυθοῖ
ἢ που ἐν Ὀρτυγίῃ ἢ ἐφ’ ὕδασιν Ἴσμηνοῖο

⁴⁰ There is HE precedent for this device (Schellert 1885: 15 n. 2); see, e.g., *Il.* 2.460 or 4.142.

⁴¹ Studies of epic similes often classify them according to type of vehicle, so that most of the similes listed here are grouped with passages such as *Arg.* 1.636, 2.38–40, or 3.1282–1283 (all with “mythological” vehicles), whereas my passage #2 might be grouped separately because of its strictly “human” vehicle (e.g., Goodwin 1891: 2–3, Kerekes 1913, Wilkins 1920). This approach obscures the connections among these four “pious similes,” which are only rarely recognized as a distinctive subtype of simile based on their geographic content and style (Bulloch 1985 ad *Call. Hymn* 5.60–65 and Hunter 1989 ad *Arg.* 3.1240–1245; see also Schellert 1885: 15 with n. 2 and Broeniman 1989: 69 n. 160, 73–74, 83–84). Nevertheless, interconnections between individual similes within this group, especially passages #1 and 4, are commonly noted: see, e.g., Kofler 1890: 24–25 with n. 51, 51–52; Walther 1894: 103; Kerekes 1913: 405; Faerber 1932: 49; Drögemüller 1956: 127–128; James 1981: 76; Stanzel 1999: 267 n. 64; and Niedergang-Janon 2002: 212. More particularly, passages #1 and 2 are often connected as matching Apolline similes; see, e.g., Clausing 1913: 43–44, Carspecken 1952: 96–97, and Fusillo 1985: 344 n. 14. Similarly, passages #1 and 3 are often read as a thematic pairing as well (Jason: Apollo :: Medea: Artemis); see, e.g., Newman 1986: 85, Broeniman 1989: 80–81, Nelis 1991: 102, Natzel 1992: 71 n. 139, Nyberg 1992: 119–120, Pietsch 1999: 236 n. 253, and Stanzel 1999: 267.

⁴² Clarus is not mentioned in the HEs, but appears as Apollo’s cult site at *HH* 9.5 (see also 3.40). Lycia and Delos also occur in a list of Apollo’s sanctuaries at *HH* 3.179–181 (compared by Wellauer 1828, Mooney 1912, and Vasilaros 2004 ad loc; and Vian 2002: 1.64 n. 2). Our passage bears a strong resemblance to Ananias fr. 1 (a parodic prayer to Apollo summoning him from various of his cult sites, including Delos, Pytho, and Clarus; see, e.g., Carey 2016: 132–133). The “fragrant temple” of line 307 finds a direct model in *HH* 2.385 (νηοῖο ... θυώδεος, of Demeter’s temple at Eleusis). *κεκλομένων* reinforces the religious coloring of the passage, as this verb can be used to denote divine Invocation (as at *Arg.* 3.1211).

στησάμενοι, φόρμιγγος ὑπαὶ περὶ βωμὸν ὀμαρτῆ
 ἐμμελέως κραιπνοῖσι πέδον ῥήσσωσι πόδεσσιν·
 ὧς οἱ ὑπ' Ὀρφήος κιθάρῃ πέπληγον ἑρετμοῖς
 πόντου λάβρον ὕδωρ, ἐπὶ δὲ ῥόθια κλύζοντο. 540

And they, as when young men form a chorus to honor Phoebus
either in Pytho, or perhaps in Ortygia, or by the waters of Ismenus,
 and around the altar to the lyre's accompaniment with swift feet
 they beat the ground all together in rhythm—thus to the
 accompaniment of Orpheus' lyre did they smite the rushing water
 of the sea with their oars, and the surge washed over the blades.⁴³

3) Medea drives to meet Jason at Hecate's temple (*Arg.* 3.876–886):

οἴῃ δὲ λιαροῖσιν ἐφ' ὕδασι Παρθενίοιο,
ἢ καὶ Ἀμνισοῖο λοεσσαμένη ποταμοῖο
 χρυσείοις Λητωῖς ἐφ' ἄρμασιν ἐστηυῖα
 ὠκείαις κεμάδεσσι διεξέλαησι κολώνας,
 τηλόθεν ἀντιόωσα πολυκνίσου ἑκατόμβης· 880
 τῇ δ' ἅμα νύμφαι ἔπονται ἀμορβάδες, αἱ μὲν ἀπ' αὐτῆς
ἀγρόμεναι πηγῆς Ἀμνισίδος, αἱ δὲ λιποῦσαι
ἄλσεα καὶ σκοπιᾶς πολυπίδακας· ἀμφὶ δὲ θῆρες
 κνυζηθμῶ σαίνουσιν ὑποτρομέοντες ἰοῦσαν·
 ὧς αἱ γ' ἐσσεύοντο δι' ἄστεος, ἀμφὶ δὲ λαοὶ 885
 εἶκον ἀλευάμενοι βασιληίδος ὄμματα κούρης.

And as when by the warm waters of Parthenius, or after bathing in
the Amnisus river, Leto's daughter stands in her golden chariot
 drawn by swift deer and drives through the hills, coming from afar
 to partake of a savory hecatomb, and with her follow nymphs in
 attendance—some gathering from the very source of the Amnisus,
others having left groves and peaks with many springs—and all
 around wild animals fawn on her, cowering with whimpers as she
 makes her way; thus did they hasten through the city, and all
 around them the people gave way as they avoided the eyes of the
 royal maiden.⁴⁴

⁴³ The hymnic resonance of these lines is enhanced by Apollonius' allusive recombination of *Il.* 18.567, 569–572 (the description of the Linus-song on the shield of Achilles) with *HH* 3.510, 516–517 (Apollo's priests process to his temple, singing the paean). The phrase ἐν Ὀρτυγίῃ (537) occurs in the same *sedes* at *HH* 3.16, which contrasts Ortygia as Artemis' birthplace to Delos as Apollo's. Apollonius' adaptation (if that is what it is) may be meant to affirm his view, shared by Callimachus and others (see Williams 1978 ad Call. *Hymn* 2.59), that these were alternate names for the same island; see also *Arg.* 1.419, 4.1705.

⁴⁴ This simile alludes to *HH* 5.68–74, and line 878 to *HH* 2.431; see McPhee (forthcoming). In addition, line 884 likely adapts *HH* 3.2 (a description of the trembling that Artemis' brother inspires at his coming). The categorization of the nymphs by typical haunt in *Arg.* 3.881–883 recurs in a non-simile context in 1.1226–1229. Similar passages occur at *Il.* 20.9–10, *Od.* 6.123–124, *HH* 5.97–99 (*n.b.* σκοπιῇ in line 100). The fact that the simile

4) Aeetes rides to the field of Ares to observe Jason’s ordeal (*Arg.* 3.1240–1244):

οἶος δ’ Ἴσθμιον εἴσι Ποσειδάων ἐς ἀγῶνα 1240
 ἄρμασιν ἐμβεβαῶς, ἢ Ταίναρον ἢ ὄ γε Λέρνης
 ὕδωρ ἢε καὶ ἄλσος Ὑαντίου Ὀγγηστοῖο,
 καὶ τε Καλαύρειαν μετὰ δὴ θαμὰ νίσσεται ἵπποις,
 Πέτρην θ’ Αἰμονίην ἢ δενδρήεντα Γεραιστόν·
 τοῖος ἄρ’ Αἰήτης Κόλχων ἀγὸς ἦεν ιδέσθαι. 1245

Like Poseidon, when he goes to the Isthmian games mounted in his chariot, or to Taenarus or Lerna’s waters or to his precinct at Hyantian Onchestus, and often travels with his horses to Calauria and Haemonian Petra or forested Geraestus—such was Aeetes, leader of the Colchians, to behold.⁴⁵

Apollonius found some precedent for this device in the HEs: one of the models for passage #3 is the famous simile comparing Nausicaa to Artemis, in which the goddess is imagined hunting “along the ridges of lofty Taygetus or Erymanthus” (κατ’ οὐρεα ... ἢ κατὰ Τηϋγέτον περιμήκετον ἢ Ἐρύμανθον, *Od.* 6.102–103).⁴⁶ But Apollonius’ adaptations differ quantitatively⁴⁷ and, more importantly, qualitatively from this HE model because of their religious

begins without choosing between the Parthenius or the Amninus (*Arg.* 3.876–877) but goes on to take the Amninus for granted (882) is a good illustration of the “continuity of thought” principle (Nünlist 2004: 41 n. 20), according to which the poet embraces the most recently mentioned alternative.

⁴⁵ *N.b.* that ἄρμασιν ἐμβεβαῶς (1241) echoes *Il.* 5.199 almost exactly (ἄρμασιν ἐμβεβαῶτα), but the synonymous ἵπποις ἐμβεβαῶς occurs in the same *sedes* at *HH* 31.9 (Helios rides in his chariot) and is a much richer parallel in context, because Aeetes’ resemblance to his father Helios has been pointed up just a few lines earlier (*Arg.* 3.1228–1230). ἄλσος ... Ὀγγηστοῖο in line 1242 echoes two nearly identical lines, *Il.* 2.506 and *HH* 3.230, but the latter may connect more significantly to the Apollonian context because 1) it describes the travel of a god (Apollo) to Onchestus and 2) this passage introduces a digression on a religious ritual in which chariots are dedicated to Poseidon.

⁴⁶ See, e.g., Hunter 1989 ad *Arg.* 3.876–877, 1993: 78 n. 14. Another probable model is Call. *Hymn* 5.60–65, which features the motif of a goddess riding to cult places that are listed disjunctively, just as in passages #3 and 4; see Bulloch 1985 ad loc. See also Call. *Hymn* 3.170–176 (a disjunctive list of cult sites where nymphs dance for Artemis), which is closer to passage #2 (DeForest 1994: 43 n. 16).

⁴⁷ Händel 1954: 59 n. 1 notes that the HEs never list more than two or three alternatives in a simile.

content,⁴⁸ and especially the listing of a god’s various sanctuaries, which “gives the simile[s] a tone of prayer.”⁴⁹ Indeed, it is common to invoke a god by their several domains, as in the prayer to Pan in Thyrsis’ Daphnis song in Theocritus’ first *Idyll*: “O Pan, Pan, whether you are on the high mountains of Lycaeus or are ranging over great Maenalus, come to the island of Sicily...”⁵⁰ This device pleases and flatters the god by mentioning their favorite domains, and often it emphasizes the devotee’s personal connection to the god in one of their local aspects, as in Chryses’ prayer to Apollo as ruler of Chryse, Cilla, and Tenedos at the beginning of the *Iliad* (1.37–38).⁵¹ Often, as in the Theocritean example, this device serves the practical function of summoning the god to come or to hearken to the prayer from wherever they may be.⁵²

Apollonius’ similes differ from these passages, however, in that these latter occur in character-text, not in primary narration. For this reason, Apollonius’ similes bear more direct comparison to the Attributive Sections of a hymn, in Janko’s terminology—those sections that describe the god in terms of “appearance, possessions, haunts and spheres of activity,” generally in the omnitemporal present.⁵³ Beyond these verbal parallels, the general motif of a god’s regular travel to or from their cult sites recurs several times in the *HH* corpus. Here, I would

⁴⁸ Even in passage #3, which naturally is closest to the HE model, Artemis is no longer hunting but is participating in her cult, traveling to one of her temples to partake of a sacrifice. Moreover, passage #3 gains in religious solemnity from its intratextual correspondence to these other “pious similes,” esp. passage # 1; see n. 43 above.

⁴⁹ DeForest 1994: 49. See further *ibid.* 43 as well as, e.g., Drögemüller 1956: 128, 232; Broeniman 1989: 69 n. 159; and Hunter 1989 ad *Arg.* 3.3.876–877, 1240–1245. Gillies 1928 ad *Arg.* 3.1244 particularly compares Apollonius’ tendency to pile up cult epithets in certain passages; see the discussion of “hymnic narratization” in the next chapter.

⁵⁰ Theoc. *Id.* 1.123–125 (ὃ Πάν Πάν, εἴτ’ ἐσσι κατ’ ὄρεα μακρὰ Λυκαίῳ, | εἴτε τύγ’ ἀμφιπολεῖς μέγα Μαίναλον, ἔνθ’ ἐπὶ νῆσον | τὰν Σικελάν...).

⁵¹ Race 1982: 10 n. 18.

⁵² See, e.g., Bulloch 1985 ad Call. *Hymn* 5.60–65, Furley and Bremer 2001: 1.54–55.

⁵³ Janko 1981: 11. For this feature of the *HHs*, see de Jong 2012: 41. For “omnitemporal present,” see n. 65 in the Introduction.

point to just one example that may have caught Apollonius' eye, the shorter *Homeric Hymn to Artemis* (9):

Ἄρτεμιν ὕμνει, Μοῦσα, κασιγνήτην Ἐκάτοιο,
παρθένον ἰοχέαιραν, ὁμότροφον Ἀπόλλωνος,
ἧ θ' ἵππους ἄρσασα βαθυσχοίνοιο Μέλητος
ρίμφα διὰ Σμύρνης παγχρύσειον ἄρμα διώκει
ἐς Κλάρον ἀμπελόεσσαν, ὅθ' ἀργυρότοξος Ἀπόλλων 5
ἦσται μιμνάζων ἑκατηβόλον Ἰοχέαιραν.
καὶ σὺ μὲν οὕτω χαῖρε θεαί θ' ἅμα πᾶσαι ἀοιδῆ·
αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ σέ τε πρῶτα καὶ ἐκ σέθεν ἄρχομ' ἀείδειν.

Sing, Muse, of Artemis, sister of the Far-shooter, the virgin profuse of arrows, fellow nursling of Apollo; who after watering her horses at the reedy Meles drives her chariot all of gold swiftly through Smyrna to vine-terraced Claros, where silverbow Apollo sits awaiting the far-shooting one, the profuse of arrows. And so hail to you in my song and to all goddesses as well! With you and from you I begin my song.

From a literary-historical perspective, this hymn's significance lies in the subtle claim to Homeric authorship constituted by the mention of the Smyranean Meles River (3–4)—one of the traditional birthplaces of Homer, but mentioned nowhere else in early Greek epic.⁵⁴ For this reason alone, it might have drawn Apollonius' critical attention. As noted in the footnote to passage #1 above, Clarus is never mentioned in the HEs, but it appears in this hymn as one of Apollo's cult sites (5), thus justifying, perhaps, its inclusion in the list of Apollo's cult sites at *Arg.* 1.308. But I would particularly connect this hymn with passage #3: both passages envision Artemis' riding in a golden chariot from a river to a cult site.⁵⁵ But especially intriguing is the notion that Artemis is riding to meet Apollo; in the context of *Arg.* 3, Medea is in fact riding to

⁵⁴ A reference to the Meles may be intended, however, in Asius' elegiac fragment (*ap.* Ath. 3.125b-e). For this interpretation of the hymn's reference to the Meles, see Graziosi 2002: 72–77.

⁵⁵ Apollonius has replaced, however, the rather masculine motif of Artemis' watering her horses (*HH* 9.3) with the more erotically-charged (and potentially dangerous) motif of Artemis' bathing (*Arg.* 3.877); he has also replaced Artemis' horses with deer, with a nod toward Call. *Hymn* 3.110–112. *N.b.* that Artemis also rides to Delphi, another of Apollo's cult sites, in *HH* 27, where she leads a dance among the Muses and Graces.

meet Jason, who had been likened to Apollo himself in the first of these “pious similes” (passage #1), which, as we have seen, has Clarus in common with our hymn.⁵⁶ If I am right to see connections between this unassuming hymn and passages #1 and 3, it may be that Apollonius is signaling that such passages in the *HHs* constitute one of his models for this unique subgroup of similes.

b. Pious Silences

In two passages, the AR narrator describes the Argonauts’ participation in religious rites whose particulars he refuses to divulge:

- 1) The Argonauts are initiated into the Samothracian Mysteries (*Arg.* 1.915–921):

ἐσπέριοι δ’ Ὀρφεὺς ἐφημοσύνησιν ἔκελσαν	915
νῆσον ἐς Ἥλέκτρης Ἀτλαντίδος, ὄφρα δαέντες	
ἀρρήτους ἀγανῆσι τελεσφορήσι θέμιστας	
σωότεροι κρυόεσσαν ὑπεῖρ ἄλα ναυτίλλοιντο.	
τῶν μὲν ἔτ’ οὐ προτέρω μυθήσομαι, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὴ	
νῆσος ὁμῶς κεχάροιτο καὶ οἱ λάχον ὄργια κείνα	920
δαίμονες ἐνναέται, τὰ μὲν οὐ θέμις ἄμμιν ἀείδειν.	

At evening, on Orpheus’ instructions, they put in at the island of Electra, Atlas’ daughter, so that by learning secret rites through gentle initiations they might sail more safely over the chilling sea. Of these things, however, I shall speak no further, but bid farewell to the island itself and to the local divinities, to whom belong those mysteries of which I am forbidden to sing.

- 2) The Argonauts propitiate Hecate beside the Halys (4.244–252):

ἠοῖ ἐνὶ τριτάτῃ πρυμνήσια νηὸς ἔδησαν	
Παφλαγόνων ἀκτῆσι πάροιθ’ Ἄλυος ποταμοῖο·	245
ἢ γάρ σφ’ ἐξαποβάντας ἀρέσασσθαι θυέεσσιν	
ἠνώγει Ἐκάτην. καὶ δὴ τὰ μὲν, ὅσσα θυηλὴν	
κούρη πορσανέουσα τιτύσκετο—μήτε τις ἴστωρ	
εἴη μήτ’ ἐμὲ θυμὸς ἐποτρύνειεν ἀείδειν—	

⁵⁶ There is a reversal, however, in that whereas Apollo waits for Artemis at his own temple in the hymn (6), it will be Medea who waits for Jason at her own temple in the *Arg.* (3.948–956).

ἄζομαι ἀυδῆσαι· τό γε μὴν ἔδος ἐξέτι κείνου,
ὃ ῥα θεᾶ ἥρωες ἐπὶ ῥηγμῖσιν ἔδειμαν,
ἀνδράσιν ὀψιγόνοισι μένει καὶ τῆμος ἰδέσθαι.

250

On the third morning they secured their ship's cables to the shore of the Paphlagonians at the mouth of the Halys river, because Medea ordered them to disembark and propitiate Hecate with sacrifices. Now all the things that the girl prepared in order to carry out the sacrifice—may no one know them, nor may my heart urge me to sing of them—I dread to tell, and yet from that time the sanctuary which the heroes built on the shore for the goddess remains even to this day for later generations to see.

In both of these passages, the Argonauts stop at the urging of a religious expert to participate in some cultic practice,⁵⁷ and the narrator declines to describe the rites in detail, citing a general religious prohibition.⁵⁸ In passage #1, the narrator's statement that it would not be θέμις for "us" to sing of these matters alludes to the mystery cult's injunction to secrecy; the first-person plural ἄμμιν adds the suggestion that he is obeying a sanction of general applicability. Likewise, in passage #2 the narrator wishes that "no one [may] know of" Hecate's rites and presents himself as obliged by religious compunctions not to reveal them (ἄζομαι | ἀυδῆσαι, 250). In point of historical fact, it is unclear if Hecate's rites in Paphlagonia actually were mystic,⁵⁹ but there are ancient references to mystery cults for this goddess,⁶⁰ including, notably, one cult centered

⁵⁷ Orpheus' Thracian background and general association with mystery cults are both relevant to his role in passage #1; see Schroeder 2012: 321.

⁵⁸ For the connections between these passages, see, e.g., Livrea 1973 ad *Arg.* 4.250, Paduano and Fusillo 1986 ad *Arg.* 4.247–252, Vian 2002: 3.156 ad *Arg.* 4.250, Clare 2002: 251–252, and Cuypers 2004: 49.

⁵⁹ For this reason I have wondered if the narrator's motive could be dread of Medea's occult rites more than pious circumspection *per se*. There is also the practical (authorial) consideration that Hecataean rituals have already been described in elaborate detail in Book 3. Cf. Fusillo 1985: 374, who attributes the silence regarding Hecate's rites to Apollonius' discomfort with "la sfera magico-irrazionale e gli elementi fantastici" (likewise p. 378). In a similar vein, Fantuzzi 2008b: 296–297 argues that Apollonius deploys the silence motif because of the irrelevance of this episode to the overarching plot, his interest in Medea's magic fading after its plot function has been fulfilled with the acquisition of the fleece.

⁶⁰ See, e.g., Strabo 10.3.10, 20; Paus. 2.30.2.

around the cave of Zerynthus on Samothrace.⁶¹ Hecate does not seem to have been identified with one of the Μεγάλοι Θεοί, but her Samothracian cult is associated with theirs in some literary sources.⁶² This link would further enhance the parallelism between these two (quasi-)mystic initiations near the outset of both the Argonauts' outward and return journeys.⁶³

Scholars agree that the narrator's silence in these passages contributes to our impression of his piety,⁶⁴ but they differ as to which poetic precedents they emphasize for Apollonius' procedure. Morrison compares the Pindaric practice of rejecting or cutting short unseemly stories about gods and heroes, but despite superficial resemblances (e.g., cf. αιδέομαι ... εἰπεῖν [*Nem.* 5.14] with ἄζομαι ἀδῆσαι [*Arg.* 4.250]), the motivations for these silences and the content so concealed are quite different.⁶⁵ Cuypers highlights the model of Herodotus, who several times in his Egyptian λόγος withholds theological details that he considers would be impious (οὐκ ὄσιον ποιεῖν, 2.86.1, 170.1) to reveal, such as the identity of the god lamented at Bubastis (οὐ μοι ὄσιον ἐστὶ λέγειν, 2.61.1; cf. *Arg.* 1.921). At other points, he mentions the existence of a ἱρὸς λόγος that explains the rationale for a certain ritual, but he does not deign to

⁶¹ See Hornblower 2015 ad Lycoph. *Alex.* 77.

⁶² See Schroeder 2012: 315–316 with nn. 40, 42.

⁶³ These silences represent another example of the frequent parallels between the outward and return journeys (e.g., the death of two pairs of Argonauts in quick succession, the navigation of two sets of moving rocks, the two appearances of Apollo, the loss of Heracles and the failure to reunite with him, etc.), though in other respects the two voyages stand in tension (e.g., linearity vs. circuitousness). See on this phenomenon, e.g., Beye 1982: 146–150; Hutchinson 1988: 128–129, 130–132, 133–134, 135, 137–139; Williams 1991: ch. 12; and Köhnken 2003: 209–210.

⁶⁴ E.g., Hunter 1993: 101, Cuypers 2004: 49, and Klooster 2007: 77, who also notes (n. 51) internal parallels with the concealment of some portion of Zeus' will by Phineus, one of the AR narrator's alter egos (see n. 40 above); cf. *Arg.* 1.919 with 2.425; 1.921 with 2.311.

⁶⁵ Morrison 2007: 282–284. Ironically, Morrison particularly highlights this *Nemean* passage as a model for the AR narrator's pious silences (283), but the particular story that Pindar refrains from telling there—Telamon and Peleus' murder of their half-brother Phocus—is actually one that the AR narrator himself does not scruple to mention in the Catalogue (*Arg.* 1.90–93). This difference shows that, unlike the Pindaric speaker, the AR narrator's sense of religious propriety does not necessarily extend to heroic behavior.

explain it (e.g., 2.62.2), in one case explaining that it would be improper for him to do so (οὐκ εὐπρεπέστερος ἐστὶ λέγεσθαι, 2.47.2).⁶⁶ In Apollonius, however, it is the rites themselves that must be kept secret (ἀρρήτους ... θέμιστας, *Arg.* 1.917), not the divinity to whom they are dedicated or the myth that lies behind them. For this reason, the closest parallel to the AR narrator's silences in Herodotus is the historian's refusal to reveal the particulars of the rituals that the Egyptians allegedly call the "Mysteries" (μυστήρια, 2.171.1), as well as those of their Greek equivalent in the Thesmophoria.⁶⁷

Parallels in Alexandrian poetry have also been proposed. In the story of Acontius and Cydippe, the Callimachean narrator stops himself from telling an inappropriate myth about Hera (*Aet.* fr. 75.4–9 Pfeiffer):⁶⁸

Ἥρην γάρ κοτέ φασι—κύον, κύον, ἴσχεο, λαιδρέ
 θυμέ, σύ γ' αἰεὶσι καὶ τὰ περ οὐχ ὀσίη· 5
 ὦναο κάρτ' ἔνεκ' οὐ τι θεῆς ἴδες ἱερὰ φρικτῆς,
 ἐξ ἂν ἐπεὶ καὶ τῶν ἥρυνγες ἱστορίην.
 ἢ πολυιδρεΐη χαλεπὸν κακόν, ὅστις ἀκαρτεῖ
 γλώσσης· ὡς ἔτεδον παῖς ὄδε μαῦλιν ἔχει.

For they say that once upon a time Hera—dog, dog, refrain, my shameless soul! you would sing even of that which is not lawful to tell. It is a great blessing for you that you have not seen the rites of the dread goddess, or else you would have spewed up their story too. Surely much knowledge is a grievous thing for him who does not control his tongue; this man is really a child with a knife.

⁶⁶ Cuypers 2004: 49. For a catalogue and classification of these passages in Herodotus, see Mora 1981; the same author identifies further parallels in Attic drama in *idem* 1983.

⁶⁷ See further 2.3.2, where Herodotus claims that he is not willing to relate (οὐκ εἰμι πρόθυμος ἐξηγέεσθαι) the stories he has heard about the gods; cf. *Arg.* 4.249 (μητ' ἐμὲ θυμὸς ἐποτρύνειεν αἰεΐδεν). Herodotus also mentions the Samothracian Mysteries at 2.51.

⁶⁸ Adduced as a parallel by, e.g., Fusillo 1985: 393 n. 36; Klooster 2007: 77; and Morrison 2007: 294, 302. Fusillo also compares Theoc. *Id.* 3.50–51, which may have a connection to the Samothracian Mysteries (see Hunter 1999 ad loc.), but has little in common with our Apollonian *loci* otherwise. See also Schroeder 2012: 324–326 on Call. *Ia.* 9.

This passage draws an interesting connection between the concealment of potentially unseemly *ἱεροὶ λόγοι* and the secrecy demanded by the Mysteries in a way that recalls and combines elements from some of the Herodotean passages cited above (*n.b.* the Herodotean tag *ἱστορίην* in line 7), while the address to the speaker's own *θυμός* and the device of the “spontaneous” break-off are reminiscent of Pindar.⁶⁹ Some of Callimachus' phrases find mild echoes in Apollonius,⁷⁰ and the relatively rare term *ἴστωρ* in *Arg.* 4.248 may reflect Callimachus' *ἱστορίην* in particular. Nevertheless, Callimachus' tone is far less reverent,⁷¹ and it is interesting that while the Callimachean narrator claims to know the story about Hera,⁷² he presents himself as uninitiated in the Eleusinian Mysteries. The AR narrator maintains a solemn tone and implies that he knows, but should not say, what rites the Argonauts undertook in Samothrace and Paphlagonia; some scholars have even taken this passage to mean that Apollonius himself had been an initiate in the Samothracian Mysteries.⁷³

As Hunter notes, there is archaic precedent for “adopting the conventional piety of the hymnal voice” by “ostentatiously refus[ing] to divulge secret rites” in the *Homeric Hymn to*

⁶⁹ In addition, the mention of the Eleusinian Mysteries may allude to the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*; see below in this section.

⁷⁰ μήτ' ἐμὲ θυμὸς ἐποτρύνειεν ἀεΐδειν (*Arg.* 4.249; ἀεΐδειν also at 1.921) ~ ἴσχεο, λαιδρὲ | θυμέ, σύ γ' ἀείσῃ... (*Aet.* fr. 75.5); τὰ μὲν οὐ θέμις (*Arg.* 1.921) ~ τὰ περ οὐχ ὀσίη (*Aet.* fr. 75.5).

⁷¹ *N.b.* the joke that, because of his big mouth, the narrator has actually benefitted from *not* being initiated into the Mysteries.

⁷² Apparently it is in circulation (φασί, 4). If Callimachus is referring to a written source, we might compare *Arg.* 4.985 (discussed below).

⁷³ See Schroeder 2012: 308 (with references in n. 3), 319, 322.

Demeter,⁷⁴ in the most extensive passage to feature overt evaluative language in the narrator’s own voice in the *HH* collection (473–482).⁷⁵

ἦ δὲ κιοῦσα θεμιστοπόλοις βασιλεῦσιν
 δεῖξεν, Τριπτολέμῳ τε Διοκλεῖ τε πληξίπῳ
 Εὐμόλπου τε βίῃ Κελεῶ θ’ ἡγήτορι λαῶν, 475
 δρημοσύνην ἱερῶν, καὶ ἐπέφραδεν ὄργια καλά
 Τριπτολέμῳ τε Πολυξείνῳ <τ’>, ἐπὶ τοῖς δὲ Διοκλεῖ,
 σεμνά, τά τ’ οὐ πως ἔστι παρεξ[ίμ]εν οὔ[τε] πυθέσθαι
 οὔτ’ ἀχέειν· μέγα γάρ τι θεῶν σέβας ἰσχάνει αὐδὴν.
 ὄλβιος ὃς τὰδ’ ὅπωπεν ἐπιχθονίων ἀνθρώπων· 480
 ὃς δ’ ἀτελὴς ἱερῶν ὃς τ’ ἄμμορος, οὔ ποθ’ ὁμοίων
 αἴσαν ἔχει φθίμενός περ ὑπὸ ζόφῳ εὐρώεντι.

She went to the lawgiver kings, Triptolemos and horse-goading Diocles, strong Eumolpos and Keleos leader of hosts, and taught them the sacred service, and showed the beautiful mysteries to Triptolemos, Polyxenos, and also Diocles—the solemn mysteries which one cannot depart from or enquire about or broadcast, for great awe of the gods restrains us from speaking. Blessed is he of men on earth who has beheld them, whereas he that is uninitiated in the rites, or he that has had no part in them, never enjoys a similar lot down in the musty dark when he is dead.

The verbal parallels with Apollonius’ passages are mainly negligible,⁷⁶ with the notable exception of a Homeric *dis legomenon*: the reference to “those mysteries” (ὄργια κείνα, *Arg.* 1.920) on Samothrace occurs in the same *sedes* as that to the “beautiful mysteries” (ὄργια καλά, *HH* 2.476) in Eleusis. ὄργια does not occur in the HEs, but it occurs twice in the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*: in this passage concerning the Eleusinian Mysteries and earlier in an internal prolepsis announcing their establishment (2.273). The term occurs just twice in the *Arg.* as

⁷⁴ Hunter 1993: 91 with n. 80. This passage is adduced as well by Fusillo 1985: 393 n. 36.

⁷⁵ Nünlist 2004: 37.

⁷⁶ ἄζομαι αὐδῆσαι (*Arg.* 4.250) ~ σέβας ἰσχάνει αὐδὴν (*HH* 2.479); θέμιστας (*Arg.* 1.917) may reflect θεμιστοπόλοις βασιλεῦσιν (*HH* 2.473), given that these kings will begin to “administer θέμιστας” in a cultic as well as regal sense after their induction into Demeter’s Mysteries.

well:⁷⁷ in the Samothracian episode and, tellingly, in a reference to the cult of Hecate (ἴστω νυκτιπόλου Περσηίδος ὄργια κούρης, 4.1020)⁷⁸—the same rites that had inspired the narrator’s silence in passage #2. Apollonius’ use of this Homeric *dis legomenon* twice in his own work, once in one of his own deployments of the “pious silence” motif and once again in reference to the other goddess whose rites he keeps secret, strengthen the probability of a purposeful allusion to the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*. If so, there may be a theological as well as literary point to these allusions: as mentioned above, Hecate had her own mystery cult on Samothrace, and the third-century BCE periegete Mnaseas of Patras identified three of the Μεγάλοι Θεοί with the Eleusinian triad of Demeter, Persephone, and Hades, though Mnaseas’ work probably postdates Apollonius.⁷⁹ In this sense, the ὄργια κείνα, ὄργια καλά, and ὄργια κούρης might really all be the same. A hymnic intertext with passage #1 also makes sense given its hymnic-style dismissal of Samothrace and its gods as potential subjects of song with the third-person κεχάροιτο (1.920), comparable to the second-person χαῖρε of a hymn’s Salutation.⁸⁰ But whatever one makes of these connections, the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* vests Apollonius’ pious silences concerning the Mysteries with Homeric authority.

⁷⁷ The cognate verb ὀργιάζω also occurs at *Arg.* 2.907, in reference to Bacchic cult.

⁷⁸ Again, the phrase occurs in the same *sedes*. Here ἴστω may be playing with ἴστωρ at 4.248.

⁷⁹ Mnaseas fr. 17 Cappelletto; see, e.g., Schroeder 2012: 319–320. As a reputed pupil of Eratosthenes of Cyrene, Apollonius’ successor at the Library of Alexandria, Mnaseas’ floruit is probably later than Apollonius’. Cole 1984: 2–3 believes that Mnaseas (or the scholiast reporting his view) invented these *interpretationes graecae* himself, but if he did not, Apollonius could possibly have been aware of them.

⁸⁰ *Arg.* 1.920 also recalls Hes. *Th.* 963–964.

c. *Apologies to the Gods*

A final device that I want to consider as an index of the AR narrator's piety are passages in which he begs a god's pardon for a perceived offense, a rhetorical move that paradoxically heightens rather than diminishes our estimation of his religiosity. For instance, the narrator expresses misgivings over a hyperbolic reference to a wound that the medicine god Paeëon himself could hardly heal—"if it is right for me to say this openly" (εἴ μοι θέμις ἀμφοδὸν εἰπεῖν, 4.1511).⁸¹ Because of this aside, the narrator's irreverent exaggeration in fact advertises his piety all the more powerfully.⁸² That Apollonius traced this technique back to the *HHs* is suggested by the potential narratorial apology to Apollo at *Arg.* 2.708. This line alludes to *HH* 3.165, where the hymnist gently asks Apollo's pardon for seeming to stray from praising him (the proper Hymnic Subject) in order to hymn the Delian maidens.⁸³ I examine this passage from *Arg.* 2 in detail in Chapter 4, Section IV.c.

For now, I would like to focus on the narrator's apology to the Muses in the double-etiological passage that introduces the Phaeacian episode (4.982–992):

ἔστι δέ τις πορθμοῖο παροϊτέρη Ἴονίω
ἀμφιλαφῆς πίειρα Κεραυνίη εἰν ἀλί νῆσος,
ἧ ὕπο δὴ κεῖσθαι δρέπανον φάτις—ἴλατε Μοῦσαι,
οὐκ ἐθέλων ἐνέπω προτέρων ἔπος—ᾧ ἀπὸ πατρὸς 985
μήδεα νηλειῶς ἔταμε Κρόνος· οἱ δέ ἐ Διοῦς
κλείουσι χθονίης καλαμητόμον ἔμμεναι ἄρπην·
Διὶ γὰρ κείνῃ ἐνὶ δὴ ποτε νάσσατο γαίῃ,
Τιτῆνας δ' ἔδαε στάχυν ὄμπνιον ἀμήσασθαι,

⁸¹ The narrator evidently does not feel the need to excuse a similar hyperbole, comparing the speed of the *Argo* favorably to Poseidon's horses (1.1157–1158). In fact, Clauss (1993: 181–183, 189, 196–197) has seen Poseidon's wrath operative within this episode, which sets in motion the events leading to Heracles' departure from the heroic company.

⁸² For such hyperboles, see Headlam 1922 ad Herod. 2.90, who cites, among many other comparanda, *Il.* 17.398–399 (in narrator-text) and *HH* 5.149–152 (in character-text). For the apology, Morrison 2007: 282 with n. 45 points to Pindar as a model, perhaps with passages like *Pyth.* 3.2 in mind.

⁸³ See n. 186 in Chapter 1.

Μάκριδα φιλαμένη. Δρεπάνη τόθεν ἐκλήισται
οὔνομα Φαιήκων ἱερὴ τροφός· ὧς δὲ καὶ αὐτοὶ
αἵματος Οὐρανίου γένος Φαίηκες ἔασιν.

990

There is a fertile, expansive island at the entrance of the Ionian strait in the Ceraunian sea, under which is said to lie the sickle—forgive me, Muses, not willingly do I repeat my predecessors' words—with which Cronus ruthlessly cut off his father's genitals. Others, however, say it is the reaping scythe of indigenous Demeter. For Demeter once lived in that land and taught the Titans how to harvest the bountiful grain, out of devotion to Macris. Since then the divine nurse of the Phaeacians has been called by the name Drepane, and thus the Phaeacians themselves are descended from Uranus' blood.

Apollonius' immediate model for the apology to the Muses is a passage in Aratus in which the didactic speaker asks Artemis' pardon (Ἄρτεμις ἰλήκοι, *Phaen.* 637) before relating another προτέρων λόγος (637), the story of her attempted rape by Orion.⁸⁴ Aratus' story, however, quickly becomes a tale of divine punishment of mortal hubris (641–644). By contrast, in the *Arg.*, the offending story is not given a morally edifying ending (e.g., Cronus' just punishment by his own son in turn), but only its vile climax is mentioned in passing. Many have thought that the point of Apollonius' inclusion of this ghastly αἴτιον here is to “correct” Callimachus (*Aet.* fr. 43.69–71) on two counts: the Cyrenian had cited the same myth, castration and all, to explain the name of Zancle (Sicilian for “scythe”), and he had put this gruesome story in the mouth of Clio—one of the Muses themselves. In one fell swoop, Apollonius transfers the αἴτιον from Zancle to Drepane and reprimands Callimachus for attributing this indecorous tale to the Muses.⁸⁵ But likely as this allusion to the *Aetia* is, dialogue with (or correction of) Callimachus

⁸⁴ See, e.g., Livrea 1973 ad *Arg.* 4.984, Kidd 1997 ad loc., and Vian 2002: 3.112 n. 4. This Aratean passage is also alluding to *HH* 3.165; see Kidd *loc. cit.*

⁸⁵ See, e.g., Harder 2012 ad Call. *Aet.* fr. 43.70–71, with earlier bibliography.

would not explain why the AR narrator imagines that the Muses should be offended by this story in the first place.

It has been thought that in this passage, as Cuypers put it, “the narrator piously apologizes to the Muses for telling a discrediting story about the gods.”⁸⁶ But the Aratean model should make us pause: why should he apologize to the Muses rather than to one of the gods actually discredited by this story—Uranus or Cronus—or even to the gods generally?⁸⁷ The narrator’s apostrophe to the Muses, together with the explicit reference to his poetic predecessors in *προτέρων ἔπος*,⁸⁸ suggests that the relevant impropriety is essentially literary in nature. My own interpretation, however, is subtly different from that of Cuypers et al.: the narrator is not apologizing because the story is discreditable to the gods, but because he feels bound by tradition to mention a story that is false⁸⁹—and its falsity is evidenced first and foremost by the fact that it is discreditable to the gods. To my mind, the key to understanding this passage is the insight that the narrator is not just choosing between two *αἴτια* for the name of Drepane here, but between two versions of the theogonic succession myth, and with it, two different attitudes toward mythological poetry. This passage demands to be contextualized in a long tradition of Greek literary criticism, stretching back at least to Xenophanes, that took archaic epic to task for presenting images of the gods engaged in immoral behavior. Among all the “false tales”

⁸⁶ Cuypers 2004: 47. Other explanations have relied more on gender stereotypes: the AR narrator is apologizing for bringing up such a grisly and sordid tale “in the presence of ladies,” as it were.

⁸⁷ Cf. Zyroff 1971: 54, who believes that the Muses would be offended because they are themselves descendants of Uranus and Cronus.

⁸⁸ Klooster 2007: 73 n. 37 interprets *προτέρων ἔπος* as a “tale of olden days” (similarly Zyroff 1971: 54), but I think we should understand *προτέρων* to refer to earlier poets. The narrator does not feel compelled to mention the myth because it is set in times primordial—indeed, the story may not even be true, given the alternate *αἴτιον* offered in the following lines—but because it is hallowed by long tradition.

⁸⁹ As Cuypers 2004: 47 notes, it is Herodotean to mention a story even when one disagrees with it.

(μύθους . . . ψευδεῖς, Pl. *Resp.* 2.377d) that Homer, Hesiod, and the other poets proclaimed about the gods, these myths of dynastic succession in heaven are the first that Socrates condemns in the *Republic* (2.377e–378a). This story of genital mutilation was grisly and sordid enough,⁹⁰ but more than that, it was morally offensive, in that it involved a son’s remorselessly (νηλειῶς, 986) injuring his own father (πατρός, 985).⁹¹

In Book 1, however, Orpheus’ cosmo-theogonic song had envisioned a very different history of Mt. Olympus from that presupposed in the first αἴτιον: the bard begins with the differentiation of Gaia and Uranus from the primordial chaos (496), but he makes the first rulers of the universe the obscure Ophion and his wife, the Oceanid Eurynome (503–504). It is this king that Cronus eventually expels from the throne of heaven “through force of hand” (βίη καὶ χερσίν, 505); the substitution of Ophion for Uranus eliminates perhaps the most scandalous aspect of the Hesiodic succession myth, the son’s maiming of his own father.⁹² The character of Orpheus has often been understood as a stand-in for the narrator,⁹³ but nevertheless, the AR narrator never endorses the “Orphic” theogony *in propria persona*. It is telling, however, that the alternate αἴτιον under consideration in Book 4 features none other than the Titans coexisting peacefully with one of Cronus’ Olympian daughters—a harmonious alternative, it would seem, to the violent generational struggles taken for granted by Homer and Hesiod. I am thus inclined to understand the apology to the Muses as related to their status as the traditional guarantors of

⁹⁰ Plato’s Socrates refers to it only euphemistically as “how Cronus took revenge” on Uranus (ὅ τε αὖ Κρόνος ὡς ἐτιμωρήσατο αὐτόν, *Resp.* 377e–378a).

⁹¹ Plato makes this criticism explicit at *Euthyphr.* 6a, *Resp.* 2.378b.

⁹² What is more, Cronus does not chain Ophion up in Tartarus, but the ousted ruling couple return to the Ocean (506). The end of Orpheus’ song alludes to the destined conflict between Cronus and Zeus, but the bard tactfully stops short of this phase of his narrative (508–511). The specter of father-son conflict recurs at 4.800–804.

⁹³ See n. 193 in Chapter 4.

poetic truth. As the daughters of Memory, they know what any devout Greek should realize anyway, that this προτέρων ἔπος of paternal castration in heaven is a μῦθος ψευδής,⁹⁴ and the AR narrator is accordingly embarrassed that his etiological instincts have forced him to give this story oxygen.

The implications of this reading for the *Arg.*'s presentation of the gods are far-reaching, but for present purposes, suffice it to say that this passage shows the AR narrator to be even more pious than interpreters have heretofore imagined. The specific device of narratorial apology to a god is not amply attested in the *HHs*, though Apollonius does allude to its one instantiation (*HH* 3.165) at *Arg.* 2.708.⁹⁵ Apollonius likewise seems to allude to the pious silence in the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* in one of his own deployments of this topos, and his pious similes seem to interact with the *HHs* at both the level of verbiage⁹⁶ and motif, such as Artemis' riding from a river to meet Apollo.

III. Etiology

The Homeric-hymnic pedigree of the ubiquitous Apollonian motif of etiology may be surprising, since αἴτια are so strongly associated with Callimacheanism. The *Arg.* includes some eighty etiologies, a type of “external prolepsis,” or flash-forward beyond the time of the primary narrative, in which some feature of the narrator's contemporary reality is explained with

⁹⁴ This reading suggests a new interpretation of *Arg.* 4.991–992. In context, the phrase αἵματος Οὐρανίου γένος (992) recalls the Hesiodic myth that when the blood from Uranus' castration fell to the earth, there emerged, among others, the Giants (*Th.* 183–187), whom the *Odyssey* presents as kin to the Phaeacians (7.205–206). With the second αἴτιον, Apollonius suggests an alternative explanation for the Phaeacians' kinship with Uranus: they are descended from the Titans, the children of Uranus, who once inhabited their island.

⁹⁵ Mentioned above, p. 216.

⁹⁶ See nn. 44–47 above.

reference to events in the age of myth. Fusillo has called Apollonian etiology a “‘betrayal’ of Homeric epic”⁹⁷—a dramatic turn of phrase, but one that accurately conveys just what “a *radical* departure from Homeric practise” it was to “poeticize aetiology in the epic *genre*.”⁹⁸ The HEs contain no explicit examples of this practice,⁹⁹ and the *Iliad* even contains a passage that was understood in antiquity as something of an anti-etiology: the account of the destruction of the Achaean wall at the beginning of Book 12 was interpreted as a justification for the fact that this fortification did not leave a trace in the historical Troad.¹⁰⁰

This divergence on the matter of etiology is related to deeper differences in the temporal frameworks of Homeric and Apollonian epic. With hardly a reference to the narrator’s present time beyond the omnitemporal similes and some fleeting (and unfavorable) comparisons between the mythic heroes and “men as they are now,”¹⁰¹ the HEs probably come closest of all the epics of Greco-Roman antiquity to fulfilling Bakhtin’s conception of the “epic past” as “walled off absolutely from all subsequent times, and above all from those times in which the

⁹⁷ “L’eziologia come ‘tradimento’ dell’epos omerico” names the concluding subsection of Fusillo’s discussion of etiology in the poem (1985: 136–142). By “betrayal,” Fusillo means a fundamental generic transgression: etiology undermines the pastward orientation of epic and thus reduces the fluidity of the mythic narrative and sacrifices its pretense of distanced objectivity.

⁹⁸ Klein 1975: 23–24 (italics original). Similarly, for Klein 1974: 228–229, Apollonian etiologizing participates in the *Arg.*’s paradoxical incorporation into epic of its own “counter-genre,” i.e. Callimachean etiological poetry.

⁹⁹ Some HE passages have been read as etiological (see, e.g., Nagy 2002: 89–90, Currie 2005: 53–54), but these are not flagged as such by the narrator. Cf. the common heroic hope of leaving behind a tomb or reputation for future generations to learn of (Fusillo 1985: 137–138).

¹⁰⁰ Saïd (1998: 17, 19) uses this example to illustrate the difference between HE and Apollonian attitudes to etiology; see further Hunter 1993: 103–104. For this interpretation of the destruction of the Achaean wall in antiquity, see Scodel 1982: 33 n. 2; see further Porter 2011 for interesting reflections on the implications of this view for fictitiousness in Homer. The permanent isolation of the Phaeacians from the outside world in the *Odyssey* (13.125–187) is analogous in several regards (Scodel 1982: 48–50); I would further compare the destruction of Cygnus’ tomb at the end of the Hesiodic *Scutum* (472–480).

¹⁰¹ See *Il.* 5.302–304, 12.381–383, 12.447–449, 20.285–287, with Edwards 1991 *ad Il.* 19.387–391 and van Wees 1992: 315 n. 9. For the term “omnitemporal,” see n. 65 in the Introduction.

singer and his listeners are located.”¹⁰² Apollonius may begin his epic by emphasizing the antiquity of his subject, the *παλαιγενέων κλέα φωτῶν* (1.1), but through its near-constant stream of *αἴτια*, his poem insists again and again on the enduring effects that the voyage of the Argo has had on the contemporary world.¹⁰³ Countless names, rituals, material monuments, and even natural phenomena are cast as the fruit of this heroic expedition, from the relatively trivial, like the color of the pebbles on the beaches of Elba (4.654–658), to the consequential indeed, like the Greek colonization of Libya.¹⁰⁴ So central is etiology to Apollonius’ project that oftentimes the drive to incorporate Argonautic *αἴτια* seems to determine the very shape of his plot.¹⁰⁵

The sheer prominence of *αἴτια* in the *Arg.* makes it natural to associate Apollonian etiologizing with the example of Callimachus, who wrote his own four-book poem with this very title devoted exclusively to the mythical “causes” of contemporary institutions across the Greek world. Indeed, several passages in the *Arg.* have been plausibly interpreted as tributes to Apollonius’ reputed mentor, and particularly in the matter of etiology.¹⁰⁶ I would not dispute the fact that in etiological passages, it is primarily the Callimachean texture of the AR narrator’s voice that we are hearing, but I would make a couple of additional points. First, there is a rich

¹⁰² Bakhtin 1981: 15–16. For the applicability of Bakhtin’s concept of the epic to Greco-Roman exemplars of the genre, see Nagy 2002: 80–91. In discussing HE temporality, Fusillo 1985: 137 cites the dictum of Goethe and Schiller that “the Epic poet presents the event as *perfectly past*” (in Calvert 1845: 379; italics original).

¹⁰³ Hunter 1993: 105. For etiologies as links between past and present, see, e.g., Fränkel 1957: 5; Hurst 1964: 235; Beye 1982: 75; Fusillo 1985: 116–117; Zanker 1987: 120–124; Fantuzzi and Hunter 2004: 92–93; and Klooster 2007: 66, 2012: 60.

¹⁰⁴ See, e.g., Stephens 2003: 180–182.

¹⁰⁵ See, e.g., *Arg.* 4.552–556 with the analysis of Caneva 2007: 75–76 and Klooster 2012: 62–63. Fitch 1912 offers another fine demonstration of how the several *αἴτια* connected to Cyzicus “conditioned the narrative of Apollonius” (46); that is, the Cyzicus episode had to assume a certain shape in order to incorporate all of the traces of the Argonauts provided by Apollonius’ sources.

¹⁰⁶ See Albis 1995 and Köhnken 2003, 2008: 79 (in the latter place, building on the argument of Harder 1993: 108–109).

store of precedent for etiology in Greek poetry that forms part of the intertextual background of both Apollonius' and Callimachus' deployment of this motif. On this point, the opening paragraph of Páskiewicz's article on etiology in *Arg. 2* is worth quoting in full:

One of the most unHomeric features of Apollonius' poem are its many aitia, a type of subject absent from the Homeric epics, though well-established elsewhere. In non-epic poetry aitia appear in the Homeric hymns (e.g. *h. Dem.* on the origin of the Eleusinian mysteries), Pindar (e.g. *O. 10* on the institution of the Olympic Games), tragedy (Euripides' plays often end with the foundation of some Attic cult, e.g. in *Hipp.* 1425 ff.) and very often in Hellenistic poetry, above all in Apollonius' contemporary Callimachus, who devoted an entire work in elegiac verse to the subject. Aitia are not lacking in earlier epic poetry, either, in Hesiod (e.g. *Aegimios* fr. 296, which explains the name Euboia, *Eoiai* fr. 233), Peisander of Cameirus (*Heracleia* fr. 7 Kinkel on the springs at Thermopylae) and Antimachus (*Thebais* fr. 35 on the cult of Demeter *Erinys*, frs. 44, 53).¹⁰⁷

My second point flows directly from Páskiewicz's quotation: it is telling that he cites the *HHs* first of all in his survey of etiology in Greek poetry. Other than Hesiod,¹⁰⁸ the *Hymns* represent the earliest poetic corpus not only to feature etiology, but to make it a central poetic concern.¹⁰⁹ As Clay has argued, all of the major *Hymns* are broadly etiological in nature, explaining how crises in the Olympian pantheon *in illo tempore*¹¹⁰ precipitated the permanent reordering of divine and human relations into those recognizable in the present day of the

¹⁰⁷ Páskiewicz 1988: 57.

¹⁰⁸ We do not, with Páskiewicz, need to cite the *Aegimius* or even the *Ehoeae* to find etiology in Hesiod: the entire *Theogony* and certain passages of *Works and Days* (e.g., 109–201) possess general etiological significance, explaining the origin of the present-day order of the cosmos; we can also find therein etiologies for particular ritual usages, such as the Greek mode of sacrifice in the Mecone episode (e.g., *Th.* 535–564). Etymological etiology is well-attested in the earliest Hesiodic poetry, too (e.g., *Th.* 195–200).

¹⁰⁹ For etiologies in the *Hymns*, see, e.g., Lenz 1975: 1975: 16–17 and Miller 1986: 25–26. Many of these are implicit; e.g., Borgeaud 1988: 101–102 plausibly connects the frightened reaction of Pan's nurse to his appearance (*HH* 19.38–39) to his role as the god of panic.

¹¹⁰ This is Eliade's term for the mythical time of origins, when the deeds of gods and heroes inaugurated prevailing natural phenomena and cultural institutions by which the world is still configured today (see Eliade 1959: ch. 1).

hymn's enunciation.¹¹¹ For instance, the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* explains, *inter alia*, the origin of the seasons (2.398–403, 445–456),¹¹² the *Hymn to Apollo*, the founding of an oracle to communicate the will of Zeus to mortals (3.287–293); etc. Moreover, the *Hymns* contain many smaller-scale αἴτια for names, local cults, inventions, and perhaps even features of the Delphic landscape.¹¹³ There is thus solid Homeric precedent for this innovative feature of Apollonius' epic in the *HHs*, which, indeed, have been recognized as a major influence on Callimachean etiologizing.¹¹⁴

We can go further still, for I would argue that there is positive evidence for the direct influence of the *HHs*' etiologizing on Apollonian practice. For instance, many etiologies in the *Hymns* occur in character-text, taking the form of prophecies or promises (e.g., Delos' status as Apollo's cult site, 3.51–60, 84–88) or direct commands to mortals to found an institution (e.g., the foundation of the Eleusinian mysteries: 2.270–274). Others, however, occur in narrator-text, and in some cases, the verbal formulations employed bear comparison with Apollonian *loci*. For example:

- Hecate, who had aided Demeter in the search for her daughter (*HH* 2.24–25, 51–62), embraces Persephone upon her return, and “because of that [or, “from that time”] the

¹¹¹ Clay 2006; this thesis is laid out on p. 15.

¹¹² *N.b.*, however, that Persephone's return from the underworld is correlated with, but not explicitly said to cause, the advent of spring (see Foley 1994: 58–59, 99–100).

¹¹³ For names, see, e.g., *HH* 3.493–496, for Apollo's cult title Delphinus, or 19.47, for the etymology of Pan's name. For local cults, see 1D.1–3 with Càssola 1975a: 14–15 for an unidentified biennial festival, or Richardson 1974 ad 2.265–267 for the etiology the annual mock battle (the βαλλητός) held in Eleusis in honor of Demeter's nursling Demophon. For inventions, see 4.25, 111 (the lyre and fire-sticks), 5.12–15 (chariots and women's work), 20.2–7 (civilizational arts). For a landscape feature, see 3.382–383, which seems to explain the disposition of rocks in the stream of Telphusa. Many seeming etiologies in the *Hymns* are not explicitly flagged as such; e.g., 7.53 may explain the origin of dolphins, as in later-attested versions of this myth (e.g., Oppian *Hal.* 1.649–653).

¹¹⁴ See, e.g., Bornmann 1968: xvi–xvii, Depew 1993: 62–63, and Fantuzzi and Hunter 2004: 366.

goddess became her attendant and servant” (ἐκ τοῦ οἱ πρόπολος καὶ ὀπάων ἔπλετ’ ἄνασσα, 440). Apollonius uses precisely this formulation in one of his own etiologies, for the site at which Orpheus dedicates his lyre: “For that reason, Lyra is the name of the place” (ἐκ τοῦ δὲ Λύρη πέλει οὔνομα χώρω, *Arg.* 2.929).

- Apollo has the sun rot (πύθειν) the Delphic serpent’s remains; “hence the place is now called Pytho, and the people give the god the title Pythios” (ἐξ οὗ νῦν Πυθῶ κικλήσκειται, οἱ δὲ ἄνακτα | Πύθειον <αὐ> καλέουσιν ἐπώνυμον, *HH* 3.372–373). Likewise, Apollonius explains a pair of names connected to Dionysus’ travels back to Thebes from India: “[S]ince then, the local inhabitants have called the river by the name of Callichorus and the cave Aulion” (ἐξ οὗ Καλλίχορον ποταμὸν περιναιετάντες | ἡδὲ καὶ Αὐλίον ἄντρον ἐπωνυμίην καλέουσιν, *Arg.* 2.909–910).
- Hermes stretches the hides of two slaughtered cows on a rock near the Alpheus, “as even now afterwards, a great length of time after these events, they have remained through many ages and unceasingly” (ὡς ἔτι νῦν τὰ μέτασσα πολυχρόνιοι πεφύασιν | δηρὸν δὴ μετὰ ταῦτα καὶ ἄκριτον, *HH* 4.125–126; see also ὡς ἔτι καὶ νῦν in line 508).¹¹⁵ The phrase (εἰς-)ἔτι νῦν is one of the commonest formulas marking etiology in the *Arg.* (1.1061, 1354; 2.526, 717, 850, 1214; 4.277, 480, 599, 1153, 1770; cf. 1.644, 825; 2.1145; 3.203, 312; 4.534).¹¹⁶

¹¹⁵ The passage is manifestly etiological, but what sort of relics or landmark is meant remains unclear. Given our ignorance concerning this etiology, I retain the manuscript reading ἄκριτον in favor of West’s emendation ἄκριτοι, according to which the cowhides would be “in a fused mass.”

¹¹⁶ Similar expressions occur at Call. *Aet.* fr. 59.21 Pfeiffer, *Hymn* 3.77. For the related formula ἐξέτι κείνου (“ever since that time”), see Williams 1978 ad Call. *Hymn* 2.47. The *Hermes* passage’s (emphatic) deployment of the “long after” motif, noting the many centuries between “then” and “now” bridged by the αἴτιον, finds some parallel in Apollonian etiologies in which the narrator breaks off a digression because the ramifications of the Argonauts’ deeds that he is tracing are so far removed from the time of his mythic narrative (4.1216, 1764; cf. 1.1309; see

Apollonius' entire Anaphe episode is in close dialogue with Callimachus' treatment thereof in the first book of his *Aetia*. The passage relevant to the Anaphaeian sacrifices runs as follows

(Call. *Aet.* fr. 21 Pfeiffer):

τόφρα δ' ἀνήσουσα λόφον βοὸς ἔγρετο Τιτώ	
Λαομεδοντείῳ] παιδὶ χροῖσσοαμ[ένη	
]μετὰ δμοῦσι[5
]ξείνιον Ἀλκίνο[ο	
δ[] Φαιηκίδας, αἶ ῥα τ[
τερπ . . . υ .. ισ .. τινος ἠδομέναις	
χλεύ . . δει ος ἀπεκρύψαντο λα[
νήστ[ι]ες ἐν Διοῦς ἡμασι Ῥαριάδος	10

But when Tito [i.e., Eos], having slept with the son (of Laomedon), arose to set a chafing yoke on the neck of the ox ... among the slave women ... gift of (the wife of) Alcinoüs ... (and) the Phaeacian maids ... amused ... mocking ... had hidden ... fasting on the sacred days of the Rarian Demeter...

That Apollonius alludes to this portion of Callimachus' Anaphe αἴτιον is demonstrated by his use of two Homeric *hapaxes* in his passage. One of these, ἐπεσβόλος (“scurrilous”) at *Arg.* 4.1727 (a *hapax* from *Il.* 2.275), answers Callimachus' use of the cognate ἐπεσβολίη (“scurrility”) in his line 11 (itself a *hapax* from *Od.* 4.159).¹¹⁷ As Harder comments, “This kind of slightly oblique interaction between Callimachus and Apollonius agrees with the way in which they are carrying on an ‘intertextual dialogue’ all through the story of Anaphe.”¹¹⁸ The second *hapax* is the word χλεύη, “joke, jest,” some form of which is discernible at the beginning Call. fr. 21.9¹¹⁹ and which

¹¹⁷ Newman 1998: 115–116 suggests that the use of these words derived from ἔπος βάλλω (“hurl words”) may allude to an etymology for ἴαμβος from ἰὸν βάλλω (“shoot an arrow”).

¹¹⁸ Harder 2012 ad Call. *Aet.* fr. 21.11.

¹¹⁹ See Harder 2012 ad loc.

Apollonius uses, likewise, at the beginning of *Arg.* 4.1726. This word does not appear in the HEs; before the Hellenistic period its only occurrence is at *HH* 2.202.¹²⁰

Unfortunately, Callimachus' account is so fragmentary that it is difficult to determine how closely its plot matched Apollonius' or, conversely, that of an alternate version of the story preserved by the Augustan-era mythographer Conon (*Narr.* 49) and by Pseudo-Apollodorus (*Bib.* 1.9.26). These mythographers differ from each other on a few minor details, but they both depart from Apollonius' version on some substantial points. In their versions, when Apollo saves the Argonauts from a storm,¹²¹ the heroes take anchor at Anaphe and celebrate with sacrifices¹²² and a feast—evidently this version envisions no scarcity of victims or wine. In Pseudo-Apollodorus, Medea's Phaeacian slave women¹²³ then begin to jest with the Argonauts (ἔσκωπτον μετὰ παιγνίας), apparently unprovoked. Conon explains the motive for the jesting in his rendition: Medea and her attendants had gotten drunk (μετὰ μέθην) amid the festivities, which are specified as an all-night celebration (ἐν τῇ παννυχίδι).¹²⁴ Conon also specifies that the men jeer right back, and thus that both sexes at Anaphe taunt each other at these sacrifices to this

¹²⁰ In other Hellenistic poetry, the word is used in an epigram of Aeschryon (*AP* 7.345.4) and in Lycoph *Alex.* 1386. Newman 1998: 115–116 connects the usage of this word in Apollonius, Callimachus, and the *Hymn.* For the abusive connotations of the cognate verb χλευάζω, see Rosen 1988a: 54.

¹²¹ Cf. the mysterious shroud of darkness in Apollonius (4.1694–1698) and probably also Callimachus (fr. 18.8, 20). Both mythographers mention a flash of lightning in tandem with Apollo's shooting ([Apollod.] or raising (Conon [as at *Arg.* 4.1709]) his bow. In Conon, Anaphe does not simply appear to the Argonauts as a result, but actually emerges from the sea. It is tempting to think that this detail, which resonates strongly with the Egyptian cosmogonic myth of the primeval island arising from the sea, could go back to Callimachus' version. Stephens 2003: 209 has argued that Apollonius' Thera and Anaphe episodes allude to this Egyptian cosmogony, but Conon's version offers an even neater parallel. For Callimachus' possible allusions to this Egyptian myth elsewhere in his corpus, see Stephens 2003: ch. 2.

¹²² The word θυσίαις represents a very probable supplement in Conon's text by Henye.

¹²³ Medea's own participation is not specified here, just as in Apollonius' version.

¹²⁴ Text of Conon is taken from Brown 2002.

day,¹²⁵ whereas Pseudo-Apollodorus, like Apollonius, only mentions the women’s ribaldry during these rites.

The matter must remain uncertain, but what clues we have suggest that it is Callimachus’ version that Conon and Pseudo-Apollodorus are summarizing.¹²⁶ One considerable piece of external evidence is the fact that the only two Argonautic episodes included in Conon’s miscellaneous assortment of fifty *Narratives* are precisely those that Callimachus incorporates into the *Aetia*: the αἴτια for the rites at Anaphe and for the Argonauts’ anchor at Cyzicus (*Narr.* 41 ~ Call. fr. 108–109 Pfeiffer).¹²⁷ In her commentary on this passage, Harder also (cautiously) notes several internal indications that point to a context for the fragment similar to that of the mythographers’, and particularly Conon’s. For instance, τόφρα in line 3 “suggests that the Argonauts were doing something, presumably celebrating and sacrificing, and that in the meantime a new day began,”¹²⁸ à la Conon’s παννυχίς. The fact that the women’s mockery begins in line 5, immediately after this time-indication, again, “would agree with its taking place at the end of a night of celebrations.”¹²⁹ The words μετὰ δμῶῃσι in line 5 “suggest that Medea was the subject of these lines”¹³⁰—I would note in this connection that Conon is the only ancient source to specify Medea’s participation in the fun.

¹²⁵ Likely this was Callimachus’ view as well, for he begins this αἴτιον with the question, “And why, goddesses, does a man at Anaphe [ἀνὴρ Ἀναφαιῶς] sacrifice with insults?”

¹²⁶ For his part, Pseudo-Apollodorus, who normally follows Apollonius for Argonautic material, deviates from him significantly in this section of his narrative in other ways as well, eliminating the entire Libyan episode and setting the Talos episode after Anaphe rather than before it (Frazer 1921: 1.117 n. 4).

¹²⁷ Brown 2002: 339.

¹²⁸ Harder 2012 ad loc.

¹²⁹ *Ibid.* ad lines 5–8.

¹³⁰ *Ibid.* ad loc.

This attempt at reconstructing the plot of Callimachus' Anaphe narrative may seem to have taken us far afield from Apollonius, but my essential purpose in pursuing this question is to make the point that Apollonius, by contrast, seems to have invented a new motivation for the ribaldry that sets the αἴτιον in motion. In the Callimachean version, it seems, no shortage of supplies hampered the Argonauts' celebration, and it was the festive atmosphere, if not the drunkenness of Medea (!) and her attendants, that occasioned the aeschrology. Apollonius appears to be alone in tracing the cause, so much more innocently, to water-libations, which appeared ridiculous to royal slaves used to opulent offerings in Alcinous' palace. Why might the poet have preferred this version? Certainly Apollonius' variant is much the more decorous, perhaps as befits an epic treatment of the myth.¹³¹ Apollonius does not specify Medea's participation in the ribaldry, let alone her or her slaves' drunkenness, and, uniquely, he makes sure that the men begin the jeering (1725); before that, the women's only impropriety is their inability to contain their laughter at the risible sight of the sacrifices (1723).¹³²

I have discussed this problem at such length, however, in order to argue for a deeper motive: this change is part of a "two-tier allusion" that Apollonius is making to the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* through the lens of Callimachus' own allusion thereto.¹³³ Let us recall the Homeric *hapax* χλεύη that both Alexandrian poets use in their respective treatments. With this word, Callimachus is unmistakably alluding to the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, for not only is the

¹³¹ We may compare the decorous treatment of Iambe's (traditionally lewd) humor in the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*; see, e.g., Richardson 1974 ad *HH* 2.202f., Brown 1997: 20, and O'Higgins 2003: 44. The hymnist may also have chosen Iambe in conscious preference to Baubo (O'Higgins 2003: 38, 51–53), who plays an identical plot function in Eleusinian myth except that she cheers up the grieving goddess by exposing herself rather than by using ribald language. On this figure, see, e.g., Olender 1990.

¹³² This despite the fact that on present-day Anaphe, the AR narrator tells us, it is rather the women who aggress against the men (γυναῖκες | ἀνδράσι δηριόωνται, 1728–1729).

¹³³ For "two-tier allusions," see n. 138 in the Introduction.

word incredibly rare,¹³⁴ but he goes on to mention the “fasting on the sacred days of the Rarian Demeter” in the very next line (fr. 21.10).¹³⁵ Fasting and scurrility are precisely what we find combined in the original context in the *Hymn*, which served as “almost the authorizing epic text for ritual mockery.”¹³⁶ The goddess has just arrived in her disguise as an old nurse at the home of King Celeus of Eleusis and remains depressed by the loss of her daughter. “Diligent Iambe” (Ἰάμβη κέδν’ εἰδυῖα, 195), who seems to be a *δμωή* herself,¹³⁷ prepares a seat for Demeter and tries to brighten the goddess’s mood (197–205):

ἔνθα καθεζομένη προκατέσχετο χερσὶ καλύπτρην·
 δηρὸν δ’ ἄφθογγος τετιημένη ἦστ’ ἐπὶ δίφρου,
 οὐδέ τιν’ οὔτ’ ἔπει προσπύσσετο οὔτε τι ἔργω,
 ἀλλ’ ἀγέλαστος ἄπαστος ἐδητύος ἠδὲ ποτήτος 200
 ἦστο, πόθῳ μινύθουσα βαθυζώνοιο θυγατρὸς,
 πρὶν γ’ ὅτε δὴ χλεύης μιν Ἰάμβη κέδν’ εἰδυῖα
 πολλὰ παρασκώπτουσ’ ἐτρέψατο πότνιαν ἀγνήν
 μειδῆσαι γελάσαι τε καὶ ἴλαον σχεῖν θυμόν·
 ἦ δὴ οἱ καὶ ἔπειτα μεθύστερον εὔαδεν ὀργαῖς. 205

There she sat, holding her veil before her face, and for a long time she remained there on the seat in silent sorrow. She greeted no one with word or movement, but sat there unsmiling, tasting neither food nor drink, pining for her deep-girt daughter, until at last diligent Iambe with ribaldry and many a jest diverted the holy lady so that she smiled and laughed and became benevolent—Iambe who ever since has found favor with her moods.

¹³⁴ See n. 122 above.

¹³⁵ As Harder 2012 points out ad loc., the epithet “Rarian” serves to identify Demeter’s Eleusinian cult as the venue for this fasting; the plain of Rarium near Eleusis features prominently in the *HH* (2.450–456). For the use of a god’s name to signpost an allusion to their *HH*, cf. Jackson 1990.

¹³⁶ Hunter 2015 ad *Arg.* 4.1726.

¹³⁷ Brown 1997: 18. Later sources make this status explicit; see Rotstein 2010: 173 n. 24.

The adverbial phrase καὶ ἔπειτα μεθύστερον (205) marks this passage as etiological,¹³⁸ explaining why initiands into the Mysteries break their fast with ritual ribaldry.¹³⁹ It was probably in this connection that Callimachus brought up the Eleusinian fast days, because these concluded in a form of aeschrology just like that practiced at Anaphe.¹⁴⁰ Indeed, insofar as Iambe is the personification and eponym of ἴαμβος, Callimachus is essentially citing the Homeric account of the origin of aeschrology itself.¹⁴¹

What Apollonius has done in his turn is to change the nature of the Argonauts' sacrifices to Apollo Aegletes the better to suit the context of this passage from the *HH*. In particular, we may compare the immediate sequel to the lines I have just quoted: Queen Metaneira offers the newly cheery Demeter some “honey-sweet wine” (μελιηδέος οἴνου, 206), but the goddess refuses on the grounds that it would not be proper (οὐ γὰρ θεμιτόν, 207; see also ὀσίης ἔνεκεν, 211) for her to drink red wine (οἶνον ἐρυθρόν, 208).¹⁴² Instead, she requests and is served the

¹³⁸ Parker 1991: 8.

¹³⁹ For Iambe and ritual aeschrology at Eleusis, see Richardson 1974: 22–23, 213–217. It is debated whether all of the rites implicitly etiologized in the *Hymn* belong to the Eleusinian Mysteries, or if some could belong to the Thesmophoria; for the latter possibility, see Clinton 1992: 28–37, 96–99 (cf. *idem* 1986); and Suter 2002: 4–7. In fact, aeschrology figured into many cults of Demeter; see, e.g., Olender 1990: 94–96.

¹⁴⁰ And, indeed, at Lindos, the subject of the next αἴτιον and which Callimachus has already implicitly compared to the Anaphaeian rites (fr. 7.19–21).

¹⁴¹ On Iambe and her invention of ἴαμβος, see, e.g., Fowler 1990: 18–19 and Rotstein 2010: p. 120 and ch. 6. Other Hellenistic poets also seem to be aware of Iambe's metapoetic import as the πρῶτος εὐρέτης of ἴαμβος. She figures prominently into Philicus' fragmentary *Hymn to Demeter* (*SH* 680.54–62), which was written in stichic choriambic hexameters; Philicus thus implicitly traces the pedigree of his novel meter back to the Myth celebrated in his hymn, even as he emphasizes his own metrical innovation (*SH* 677). There is likely a similar programmatic significance in Herodas' allusions to Iambe (and her Orphic equivalent Baubo) in *Mimiambos* 1 and 6; see, e.g., Stern 1979, 1981; Miralles 1992: 99; and Piacenza 2014. For a different Iambe associated with Hipponax's initiation as an iambic poet, see Brown 1988, Rosen 1988b, and Fowler 1990; for possible connections to the *Homeric Hymn's* Iambe, see Ormand 2015: 46–54.

¹⁴² Lines 207 and 211 all but explicitly cast this scene as an etiology for the abstentions practiced in the actual Mysteries (Parker 1991: 8). For the prohibition on wine and the drinking of the κυκεών, see Richardson 1974: 213, 224–226.

Eleusinian ritual drink called *κυκεών*, specifying the ingredients as water mixed with barley and pennyroyal (ἄλφι καὶ ὕδωρ ... μείξασαν πέμεν γληχῶνι, 208–209). Apollonius naturally dispenses with the distinctively Eleusinian ingredients of the *κυκεών* in his adaptation, but the substitution of water for wine and the omission of any explicit reference to animal victims¹⁴³ serves to assimilate the Argonauts' humble sacrifices at Anaphe with the solemn fasting at Eleusis—both to be enlivened by the outbreak of playful aeschrology. Apollonius' primary purpose may have been to “correct” Callimachus' account by more closely connecting the Anaphaeon rite to the origins of iambic abuse as given by the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, but Apollonius' procedure here is also a wonderful illustration of the way that he looked not only to Callimachean etiology as a model for his own αἴτια, but also back to Callimachus' own sources of inspiration in the *HHs*.

IV. Further Hymnic Techniques

Beyond the exceptions noted so far, the narrative technique of the *HHs* is substantially the same as that of the *HEs*.¹⁴⁴ They do, however, exhibit several minor departures from *HE* practice that intriguingly anticipate directions that Apollonius would explore more insistently, and I would like to note a few of these here.¹⁴⁵ For instance, we may note the higher proportion of indirect speech in the *Hymns* compared to the *HEs*, a change that, as Nünlist notes, “inevitably

¹⁴³ Hunter 2015 ad *Arg.* 4.1719–1720 argues that “there is no reason to think that [the Argonauts] did not have a sheep to be killed (cf. 1593–1602),” but whether we assume the sacrifice of sheep or vegetarian offerings, there seems to be a contrast intended with the expensive βουκτασία carried out in Alcinous' palace (1724).

¹⁴⁴ Nünlist 2004: 39.

¹⁴⁵ Clay 1997: 492 suggests that “the familiarity of the material” covered in their myths and the “smaller scale” of the *Hymns* “may have invited experimentation and innovation in both diction and narrative technique” vis-à-vis the *HEs*.

leads to greater salience of the narrator's controlling function."¹⁴⁶ Precisely the same observation has been made of the increased prominence of indirect speech in the *Arg.*¹⁴⁷ Another interesting example has to do with what Nünlist calls "confidence in the cooperation of their narratees." He explains:

For they [the *Hymns*] show a tendency to leave rather substantial 'gaps' (*Leerstellen*) in the narrative, which the narratee is to fill in for himself or herself. An instructive, because 'un-Homeric', example is a passage from the *Hymn to Hermes*: Apollo's actual discovery that his cattle have been abducted from Pieria, a cornerstone of the story, is left out of the narrative (between 183 and 184), but can be 'reconstructed' from Apollo's speech to the old man in Onchestus (190–200).¹⁴⁸

In fact, some of the gaps in the hymnic narratives are quite considerable—for instance, Demeter's motivation for becoming a nurse at Eleusis is never made explicit.¹⁴⁹ Similarly, Apollonius exploits such *Leerstellen* to a degree unthinkable in the HEs regarding major plot points, especially as regards character motivation (e.g., does Jason really plan to betray Medea as she alleges at 4.355–390?).¹⁵⁰

Another device that Apollonius may have borrowed from the *HHs* is one very dear to his narrator's heart, the narratorial digression. Other than in exceptional contexts like the Catalogue of Ships,¹⁵¹ the HEs tend to put digressive material in the mouths of characters,¹⁵² but the AR

¹⁴⁶ Nünlist 2004: 38; see also *idem* 2007: 58.

¹⁴⁷ See esp. Hunter 1993: 143–151.

¹⁴⁸ Nünlist 2004: 39.

¹⁴⁹ See, e.g., Parker 1991: 8, 10–11; Foley 1994: 91, 98–103, 113–114; Clay 1997: 504; and O'Higgins 2004: 39.

¹⁵⁰ Byre 2002 is fundamental on this aspect of Apollonius' narrative technique.

¹⁵¹ E.g., the Thamyris digression at *Il.* 2.594–600. It is comically apt that this digression occurs in the entry for the Pylians, whose leader Nestor is famous for his geriatric digressions.

¹⁵² Nünlist 2009: 120.

narrator is quite comfortable introducing them in his own voice, sometimes even flagging a passage as a digression with a break-off formula.¹⁵³ The *HHs* are hardly riddled with digressions, but a pair of them in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* are particularly noticeable. One is an external analepsis on the birth of Typhoeus (3.305–355), the other, an omnitemporal description of a certain rite observed at Onchestus, and this latter example is especially suggestive of the AR narrator’s practice. Apollo is traveling the Greek world in search of a suitable site at which to establish his oracle (229–239):

ἔνθεν δὲ προτέρω ἔκιες, ἑκατηβόλ’ Ἄπολλον, Ὀγγηστὸν δ’ ἴξεις, Ποσιδῆϊον ἀγλαὸν ἄλσος·	230
ἔνθα νεοδμῆς πῶλος ἀναπνέει ἀχθόμενος περ ἔλκων ἄρματα καλά, χαμαὶ δ’ ἐλατήρ ἀγαθός περ ἐκ δίφροιο θορῶν ὁδὸν ἔρχεται· οἱ δὲ τέως μὲν κεῖν’ ὄχεα κροτέουσιν ἀνακτορίην ἀφιέντες.	
εἰ δέ κεν ἄρματ’ ἀγῆσιν ἐν ἄλσει δενδρήεντι, ἵππους μὲν κομέουσι, τὰ δὲ κλίναντες ἑῶσιν·	235
ὥς γὰρ τὰ πρῶτισθ’ ὅσῃ γένεθ’· οἱ δὲ ἄνακτι εὐχονται, δίφρον δὲ θεοῦ τότε μοῖρα φυλάσσει. ἔνθεν δὲ προτέρω ἔκιες, ἑκατηβόλ’ Ἄπολλον...	

From there you went on, far-shooting Apollo, and reached Onchestus, Poseidon’s bright grove, where the new-broken colt takes breath from the burden of pulling a fine chariot: the driver, good as he is, jumps down from the car and walks, while they continue to rattle the empty vehicle along, having discarded their master. If the chariot gets smashed in the wooded grove, they take care of the horses but tip the chariot down and leave it; for so the rule was established in the beginning. They pray to the deity, and the chariot is kept as the god’s property. From there you went on, far-shooting Apollo...

¹⁵³ See, e.g., Fusillo 1985: 377 and Cuypers 2004: 49.

I am tempted to call this interest in the details of a local cult, apparently for their own sake,¹⁵⁴ Alexandrian *avant la lettre*.¹⁵⁵ The deployment of this digression in a travel catalogue is particularly reminiscent of the ethnographic sections toward the end of *Arg.* 2: there the AR narrator digresses to describe the customs of the various peoples of the Black Sea littoral whom the Argonauts pass by—without actually encountering any of them—as they approach Colchis.¹⁵⁶ It may thus be no coincidence that ἵππους ... κομέουσι at *HH* 3.236 finds a nice echo in a digression on Amazonian rites at *Arg.* 2.1176 (ἵππους ... κομέουσαι),¹⁵⁷ though with a startling transformation from the original context: the Amazons would “tend to” their horses only in order to sacrifice them.¹⁵⁸ In part this allusion is playful (and xenophobic), but it may also make the literary-historical point that narratorial digressions on local cult practices are sanctioned by the example of Homer.

I will indulge in pointing to two further hymnic techniques that may have left their mark on Apollonius. The first is what Hopkinson calls the “antiquarian ‘flashback’,”¹⁵⁹ in which the setting of the narrative in the ancient past is emphasized by noting what has not yet happened. There is slight precedent for this device in *Il.* 20.216–218, but a much more notable example

¹⁵⁴ So, e.g., West 1975: 161: “When he gets to Onchestus, the poet cannot refrain from describing a curious ceremony to be seen there, although it has nothing to do with Apollo.” But for possible reasons for the digression, see Janko 1986: 54–55 and Clay 2006: 59.

¹⁵⁵ See n. 167 at the end of this chapter.

¹⁵⁶ See also the *HH* narrator’s adverse, quasi-ethnographic comments about the Phlegyae as Apollo passes this tribe (*HH* 3.278–280).

¹⁵⁷ Elsewhere in Homeric poetry, the collocation of ἵππος and κομέω occurs only at *Il.* 8.112.

¹⁵⁸ The verb δαίτρευον implies that the Amazons eat the horses as well, as typically in sacrifice.

¹⁵⁹ Hopkinson 1984 ad Call. *Hymn* 6.24.

promises to build temples to the Dioscuri, “which all sailors on the sea will behold from very far away and seek their favor” (τὸ μὲν μάλα τηλόθι πάντες | ναυτίλοι ἅμ πελάγος θεεῦμενοι ἰλάζονται, *Arg.* 2.807–808). Apollonius’ use of eternal prolepsis here points to one function of his mythic narrative, so common in the *HHs*, of furnishing the αἴτιον for a new addition to the ranks of the gods.¹⁶⁴

Conclusion

Narratological studies of the *Arg.* rightly stress the novel features with which Apollonius has endowed his narrative vis-à-vis the precedent set by the HEs, but these innovations are typically viewed as Alexandrian mannerisms in line with trends discernible above all in his major contemporaries, Callimachus and Theocritus. In fact, many of these features have rich pedigrees in earlier Greek literature¹⁶⁵ that often extend, as we have seen, back to the *HHs*, which could have given Homer’s blessing to a variety of devices alien to the HEs. In analyzing each potential instance of this phenomenon, I have traced potential allusions to the *Hymns* in order to assess the likelihood that Apollonius is imitating them specifically in his deployment of these narrative devices. The evidence is not overwhelming in each case, but the privileged status of the *HHs* within the *Arg.* makes the case for direct influence more probable. Moreover, certain allusions seem to underline Apollonius’ debt to the *Hymns* for specific devices. Thus his two uses of the Homeric *dis legomenon* ὄργια may point to the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* as a model for his pious silences, and a two-tier allusion in his etiology for the ritual ribaldry on Anaphe

¹⁶⁴ See further 4.649–653 with my analysis in the previous chapter.

¹⁶⁵ Acosta-Hughes 2010b offers a salutary reminder of the degree to which “Hellenistic” features can already be detected in Archaic and Classical poetry. See further on this score Hopkinson 1988: 7–8 and Parsons 1993: 154–155.

may show that Apollonius associated Callimachean etiologizing with that of the *HHs*. But if this chapter proves anything, it is that the *HHs* did indeed supply Homeric precedent for many of the most “un-Homeric” features of Apollonius’ narrative.

CHAPTER 4: HYMNIC MOMENTS WITHIN THE EPIC

In the previous chapter, I tried to establish that a great number of “un-Homeric” features in Apollonius’ narrative do, in fact, find authorization in Homeric models so long as we expand the category of “Homeric” poetry to include the *Homeric Hymns* (hereafter, *HHs*). In some cases, the analysis focused on passages with a genuinely “hymnic” tone, such as the pious similes. In others, the Apollonian (hereafter, AR) narrator’s hymnic voice was discernible only behind different layers representing other aspects of his complex personality, such as his scholarly-Callimachean mode in etiological passages. In this chapter, we will continue to see examples of the phenomena surveyed in Chapter 3, such as the narrator’s overtness or piety, and I will continue to cite precedents from the *HHs* where relevant. This chapter focuses, however, squarely on the phenomenon of hymnic praise itself in the *Argonautica* (hereafter, *Arg.*)—those passages in which gods and heroes are verbally invoked in prayer or celebration, whether by the AR narrator himself, his characters, or some indeterminate combination of the two. Apollonius’ innovative approaches to representing hymnic praise, and the sheer frequency with which he does so, constitute one of the major ways in which the hymnic affiliation of the *Arg.* makes itself felt within his epic narrative.

Section I begins by analyzing the AR narrator’s tendency to join in his characters’ praise of a god by apostrophizing them himself in a device that I call “contagious hymnody.” Section II moves onto the hymnic subtext of other apostrophes, reserving for special consideration the “hymnic” Appeals to the Muses in the introits of Books 3 and 4 as well as the narrator’s

apostrophe to Eros (4.445–449). Section III rounds out this survey by considering a distinctive device that I call “hymnic narratization”: the AR narrator’s practice of applying to a god hymnic Honorifics that are otherwise uncharacteristic of his poetic style when describing their Invocation by a character. Section IV concludes the analysis by bringing the various strands of both this chapter and the last together in a close reading of Apollonius’ Thynias episode (*Arg.* 2.669–719), in which Orpheus sings his famous hymn to Apollo. More than in any other part of the poem, it is here that the AR narrator’s hymnic voice shines at its brightest and highlights its literary heritage with prominent allusions to both the Homeric and Callimachean *Hymns to Apollo*. Appended to the end of the chapter is a brief overview of Apollonius’ technique for applying epithets to the gods; this survey provides context for the special claims I make for “hymnic narratization” in Section III.

I. Contagious Hymnody

I begin with a technique that greatly contributes to the AR narrator’s pious self-presentation, namely, a phenomenon that I term “contagious hymnody.” By this term I intend to group together a variety of devices that, in narratological terms, feature metalepsis in a hymnic context. Metalepsis (μετάληψις, “sharing”) is a phenomenon in which “the narrator enters (‘shares’) the universe of the characters or, conversely, a character enters (‘shares’) the universe of the narrator.”¹ A common example of metalepsis is the device of apostrophe (ἀποστροφή): in apostrophizing his own characters, the narrator by definition “turns away” from his usual narratees and thus violates the ordinary boundaries separating the external narrator from

¹ de Jong 2009: 89; her article gives many examples from both ancient and postmodern literature.

characters.² My point in devising the term “contagious hymnody” is largely to underscore the AR narrator’s tendency to intervene in his narrative when his characters are invoking the gods in a hymnic fashion. These interventions create the impression that the pious narrator is himself swept up in the religious fervor of his own narrative and wants personally to participate (μεταλαμβάνειν) in his characters’ hymns.

I will discuss some other possible instances of this technique below, in my analyses of the phenomenon of “hymnic narratization” and of Orpheus’ hymn to Apollo. For now, I cite the two other passages in which the AR narrator apostrophizes the same god whom a character in the narrative is invoking, a technique that produces a decidedly hymnic effect even in the absence of other markers of hymnody, such as Honorific epithets:

- 1) The Phaeacian nymphs celebrate the wedding of Jason and Medea (4.1196–1200):

νύμφαι δ’ ἄμμιγα πᾶσαι, ὅτε μνήσαιντο γάμοιο,
 ἱμερόενθ’ ὑμέναιον ἀνήπτουν· ἄλλοτε δ’ αὖτε
 οἰόθεν οἶαι ἄειδον ἐλισσόμενα περι κύκλον,
 Ἥρη, σεῖο ἔκητι· σὺ γὰρ καὶ ἐπὶ φρεσὶ θῆκας
 Ἀρήτη πυκινὸν φάσθαι ἔπος Ἀλκινόοιο. 1200

And all the nymphs together, whenever the men sang of marriage,
 sounded forth the lovely wedding song. But at other times they
 sang by themselves and danced in a circle, in your honor, Hera,
 because it was you who put the thought in Arete’s mind to
 communicate Alcinous’ wise words.

- 2) Jason prays to Apollo amidst the “shroud” of darkness on the Cretan Sea (4.1701–1710):³

αὐτὰρ Ἴησων
 χεῖρας ἀνασχόμενος μεγάλη ὀπί Φοῖβον ἀύτει,
 ῥύσασθαι καλέων· κατὰ δ’ ἔρρεεν ἀσχαλόωντι
 δάκρυα· πολλὰ δὲ Πυθοῖ ὑπέσχετο, πολλὰ δ’ Ἀμύκλαις,

² See de Jong 2009: 93–97. For other uses of the term ἀποστροφή in ancient scholarship, see Nünlist 2009: 114.

³ This passage represents Jason’s prayer in indirect discourse, but the Anaphora of πολλά in lines 1704–1705 conveys the hymnic tone of his “actual” words (Hunter 1993: 140 n. 144, Albis 1996: 118) in a way that prepares for the contagious hymnody in the following lines; cf. *Arg.* 2.707–710 (discussed below).

πολλὰ δ' ἐς Ὀρτυγίην ἀπερείσια δῶρα κομίσσειν. 1705
Λητοῖδῃ, τὴν δὲ κατ' οὐρανοῦ ἵκεο πέτρας
 ῥίμφα Μελαντείους ἀρήκοος, αἶ τ' ἐνὶ πόντῳ
 ἦνται· δοιάων δὲ μιῆς ἐφύπερθεν ὀρούσας,
 δεξιτερῇ χρύσειον ἀνέσχεθες ὑψόθι τόξον·
 μαρμαρέην δ' ἀπέλαμψε βιὸς περὶ πάντοθεν αἶγλην. 1710

And Jason raised his hands and in a loud voice cried out to Phoebus, calling on him to save them, and the tears poured down in his distress. Many gifts he promised to bring to Pytho, many to Amyclae, and many to Ortygia—countless gifts. And you, Son of Leto, a ready listener, came swiftly down from the sky to the Melanteian rocks, which lie in the sea. And alighting on one of the twin peaks, you raised aloft in your right hand your golden bow, and that bow sent out a dazzling gleam in all directions.

As Fränkel observes, by intervening in the second-person in his own voice, the narrator appears to participate personally in the praise of the god that he attributes to his characters.⁴ I may note here in passing that the device of contagious hymnody would be put to good effect, and much more extensively, by both Vergil and Ovid.⁵

Fränkel traces this technique back to the ending of Bacchylides 17, which similarly transitions from the description of the ululations and paean raised by Theseus' companions (125–

⁴ Fränkel 1968 ad *Arg.* 3.861f.; see further Zyroff 1971: 101–102, Beye 1982: 18–19. Fränkel suggests that in the case of 4.1199–1200, it is actually impossible to tell if it is the narrator who pronounces these words or if the nymphs are suddenly quoted in direct speech; see further his comments on pp. 227–228. In my view, the preposition ἔκκῃ (1199), indicating why the nymphs are singing, belongs to the syntax of the previous sentence and thus signals that it is the narrator who speaks here.

⁵ Scholars have particularly connected Vergil's Salian hymn (*Aen.* 8.285–304) to Orpheus' hymn to Apollo in the *Arg.* (e.g., Miller 2014: 447–450), which I discuss below. Another large-scale example in Ovid is the narrator's hymn to Bacchus at *Met.* 4.17–30, which grows directly out of a description of his Invocation by his Theban bacchantes (see further n. 100 below). Many more passages in these authors (listed by Zyroff 1971: 494) rather correspond to the Callimachean practice of apostrophizing gods when aspects of their cults are mentioned, without explicit reference to a character's speech act (see n. 18 below): Verg. *Aen.* 6.18, 251; 8.84; 10.540; 11.7–8; Ov. *Met.* 4.754, 756; 15.731; see also Verg. *Aen.* 3.119, 371 (with Aeneas as internal narrator). These passages could represent a more oblique type of contagious hymnody, in that “the natural [i.e., presumable] invocation by the dedicator [or sacrificer, *vel. sim.*] is echoed in an apostrophe by the poet in the context of the narrative” (Eden 1975 ad Verg. *Aen.* 8.84f.). Verg. *Aen.* 7.389–391 imitates such passages as Call. *Aet.* fr. 18.5–10 and Apoll. Rhod. *Arg.* 4.1383–1387, on which see below in this section.

129) to the speaker’s own Prayer to Apollo (130–132).⁶ The comparison is apt, but I believe that examples of contagious hymnody, including examples featuring apostrophe, in fact already occur earlier in the *HHs*. By “already occur earlier” I mean, first, that all of the *Hymns*, as “Homeric” compositions, notionally ought to predate Bacchylides from Apollonius’ point of view,⁷ and, second, that at least some of them actually must have in historical fact—particularly the major *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*.⁸ We may note the following passages:⁹

3) A group of goddesses attend to Leto at Apollo’s birth (*HH* 3.119–122):

ἐκ δ’ ἔθορε πρὸ φώσδε· θεαὶ δ’ ὀλόλυξαν ἅπασαι.
 ἔνθα σέ, ἦε Φοῖβε, θεαὶ λόον ὕδατι καλῶ 120
 ἀγνῶς καὶ καθαρῶς, σπάρξαν δ’ ἐν φάρεϊ λευκῶ,
 λεπτῶ, νηγατέω· περὶ δὲ χρύσειον στρόφον ἦκαν.

Then the child leaped forth to the light, and all the goddesses raised a cry. Straightway, *ἔϊος Phoebus*, the goddesses washed you purely and cleanly with sweet water, and swathed you in a white garment of fine texture, new-woven, and fastened a golden band about you.¹⁰

⁶ Fränkel 1968: 575; see *idem* 1975: 452. For the question of whether Bacchyl. 17 is itself a paean or a dithyramb, see Rutherford 2001: 98–99, Maehler 2004: 172–173.

⁷ For the question of Apollonius’ attitude to the authorship of the *Hymns*, see the Introduction.

⁸ Even analysts who would divide the poem into Delian and Pythian halves would date their present redaction to 523 BCE (e.g., Burkert 1979: 59–60, Janko 1982: 112–113, West 2012: 241). The shorter *HHs* are more difficult to date; see the brief discussion of the date of the *Hymns* in the Introduction (Section I.a).

⁹ In addition to the passages cited here, de Jong 2009: 113 points to *HH* 3.544–546 and 7.55–59, in which “the absence of a capping formula makes it appear as if the narrator’s salutation *chaire* responds directly to the speeches of Apollo and Dionysus respectively.”

¹⁰ In the context of the plot, as Richardson 2010 ad *HH* 3.119 notes, “The ὀλολυγή (a women’s ritual cry) marks the moment of relief after the tension of the birth”; for this practice, see further Frazer 1913: 46. The term also has a hymnic resonance, however, as the ὀλολυγή can be understood as the female equivalent to the male paean-cry (Deubner 1941: 1–2), which, indeed, is suggested by the male hymnist’s vocative address to the newborn god, ἦε Φοῖβε (for the derivation of ἦιος from the ritual cry ἦ or ἦ ἰέ, see Janko 1994 ad *Il.* 15.365–366). For the combination of ὀλολυγή and παιάν, see, indeed, Bacchyl. 17.125–129. The complementarity of the goddesses’ cry and the hymnist’s vocative is perceived by Miller 1986: 48; see also Clay 2006: 43.

- 4) The hymnist describes sounds that please Cybele, including those involved in her worship (*HH* 14.3–6):

ἦ κροτάλων τυπάνων τ' ἰαχὴ σὺν τε βρόμος αὐλῶν
 εὐαδεν ἠδὲ λύκων κλαγγὴ χαροπῶν τε λεόντων
 οὔρεά τ' ἠχήμεντα καὶ ὑλήεντες ἔναυλοι. 5
 καὶ σὺ μὲν οὕτω χαῖρε θεαί θ' ἅμα πᾶσαι ἀοιδῆ.

She is well-pleased with the sound of rattles and of timbrels, with the voice of flutes and the outcry of wolves and bright-eyed lions, with echoing hills and wooded haunts. And so hail to you in my song and to all goddesses as well!

- 5) The nymphs sing of Pan's birth and introduction to Olympus (*HH* 19.27–49):

ὕμνεῦσιν δὲ θεοὺς μάκαρας καὶ μακρὸν Ὀλυμπον·
 οἷόν θ' Ἑρμείην ἐριούνιον ἔξοχον ἄλλων
 ἔννεπον, ὤς... 29
 καὶ σὺ μὲν οὕτω χαῖρε, ἄναξ, ἴλαμαι δέ σ' ἀοιδῆ· 48
 αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ καὶ σεῖο καὶ ἄλλης μνήσομ' ἀοιδῆς.

They sing of the blessed gods and high Olympus and choose to tell of such an one as luck-bringing Hermes above the rest, how [he sired Pan and brought him to Olympus]... And so hail to you, lord! I seek your favor with a song. And now I will remember you and another song also.

- 6) A hymn to Apollo, itself entirely in Du-Stil, describes how swans and bards sing of the god (*HH* 21):

Φοῖβε, σέ μὲν καὶ κύκνος ὑπὸ πτερύγων λίγ' ἀεῖδει,
 ὄχθη ἐπιθρόσκων ποταμὸν πάρα δινήεντα,
 Πηνειόν· σέ δ' ἀοιδὸς ἔχων φόρμιγγα λίγειαν
 ἠδυεπῆς πρῶτόν τε καὶ ἕστατον αἰὲν ἀεῖδει.
 καὶ σὺ μὲν οὕτω χαῖρε, ἄναξ, ἴλαμαι δέ σ' ἀοιδῆ. 5

Phoebus, of you even the swan sings with clear voice to the beating of his wings, as he alights upon the bank by the eddying river Peneus; and of you the sweet-tongued minstrel, holding his high-pitched lyre, always sings both first and last. And so hail to you, lord! I seek your favor with my song.

- 7) The nymphs who nursed Dionysus process behind their full-grown ward (*HH* 26.7–11):¹¹

αὐτὰρ ἐπειδὴ τόνδε θεαὶ πολύμνον ἔθρεψαν,
δὴ τότε φοιτίζεσκε καθ' ὑλήεντας ἐνάλους,
κισσῶ καὶ δάφνη πεπυκασμένος· αἶ δ' ἄμ' ἔποντο
Νύμφαι, ὃ δ' ἐξηγεῖτο· βρόμος δ' ἔχεν ἄσπετον ὕλην. 10
καὶ σὺ μὲν οὕτω χαῖρε, πολυστάφυλ' ὦ Διόνυσε...

But when the goddesses had brought him up, the much-hymned god, then he began to wander continually through wooded haunts, thickly wreathed with ivy and laurel. And the Nymphs followed in his train with him for their leader; and the boundless forest was filled with their outcry. And so hail to you, Dionysus, god of abundant clusters...

- 8) The Muses and Graces hymn Artemis as she dances at Delphi (*HH* 27.18–22):

αἶ δ' ἀμβροσίην ὄπ' ἰεῖσαι
ὑμνεῦσιν Λητῶ καλλίσφυρον, ὡς τέκε παῖδας
ἀθανάτων βουλῇ τε καὶ ἔργασιν ἔξοχ' ἀρίστους. 20
χαίρετε, τέκνα Διὸς καὶ Λητοῦς ἠγκόμοιο·
αὐτὰρ ἐγὼν ὑμέων τε καὶ ἄλλης μνήσομ' αἰοιδῆς.

They [the Muses and Graces] utter their heavenly voice, singing how neat-ankled Leto bore children supreme among the immortals both in counsel and in deed. Hail, children of Zeus and rich-haired Leto! And now I will remember you and another song also.

In most of these passages (#4–8), an omnitemporal description of the god's worship in song immediately precedes the hymnist's own Salutation to the god,¹² in a device that de Jong calls “metaleptic fade-out.”¹³ The Salutation thus seems to cap both the overarching poem itself *qua* hymn and the hymnic worship described in the foregoing narrative; the resultant *mise-en-abyme*

¹¹ The βρόμος in line 10 may include a processional hymn for the πολύμνος (7) god.

¹² Exceptions: passage #7 describes a recurrent situation in Dionysus' past rather than the present. In passages #4 and 7, there is not explicit mention of hymnody in the god's worship, though I would propose, at the risk of begging the question, that in these hymnic contexts its presence must be implied.

¹³ See de Jong 2009: 106–113. By this term she means a “type of metalepsis [that] features the merging of the world of the narrated and the world of the narrator at the end of narratives” (106). In effect, “[t]he worlds of narrated and narrator merge, the metalepsis serving to bring together past and present and to show the continuity between myth and actuality” (107).

aligns the present *HH* with a timeless hymnic tradition of recurrent songs in praise of the god. This device has a definite metaleptic effect, but probably the passage closest to the Apollonian examples quoted above is #3, in which, in the midst of a mythical narrative, the narrative mode switches from Er-Stil to Du-Stil in tandem with the mention of the attendant goddesses' ritual cry.¹⁴ The same dynamic plays out in the Apollonian passages (#1–2), in which the mention of the nymphs' worship of Hera and Jason's prayer to Apollo seems to trigger the narrator's own apostrophes to these deities.

One can hardly prove that Apollonius derived this technique, so foreign to HE practice, directly from the *HHs*. Indeed, for passage #2, at least, Apollonius' proximate influence for this device is very likely Callimachus' own treatment of the Anaphe episode in the *Aetia*:¹⁵

- 9) As darkness envelops the Argo, Jason supplicates Apollo and reminds him that it was in obedience to his oracle that they launched the expedition (Call. *Aet.* fr. 18.5–10):

ἀλλ' ὄγ' ἀνι]άζων ὄν κέαρ Αἰσονίδης	5
σοὶ χέρας ἠέρ]ταζεν, Ἰήϊε, πολλά δ' ἀπειλεί	
ἐς Πυθῶ πέ]μψειν, πολλά δ' ἐς Ὀρτυγίην,	
εἴ κεν ἀμιχ,θαλόεσσαν ἀπ' ἠέρα νηὸς ἐλάσσης:	
]. ὅτι σήν, Φοῖβε, κατ' αἰσιμίην	
πείσματ'] ἔλυσαν ἐκ[λ]ηρώσαντό τ' ἐρετμά...	10

but the son of Aeson, troubled in his heart, lifted his hands to you, addressed with *hie*, and promised solemnly to send many gifts to Pytho, and many to Ortygia, if you would drive the misty haze from the ship,... that in accordance with the destiny decreed by you, Phoebus, they loosened the ropes and allotted the oars...¹⁶

¹⁴ Since this vocative address to Apollo is the first in the narrative proper, it is also possible to interpret it as a recognition that the newborn god has now emerged into the narrative as a full-fledged character: “Solange Apollon noch nicht geboren ist, wendet sich also der Dichter nicht mit unmittelbarer Anrufung ihm zu” (Altheim 1924: 434). I like this interpretation, but I would add that the hymnic undertone achieved by the juxtaposition of the ὀλοολυγή with the epithet ἦμιος (see n. 10 above) is suggestive of contagious hymnody.

¹⁵ Massimilla 1996 ad Call. *Aet.* fr. 20.6–15 (= fr. 18 Pfeiffer, Harder).

¹⁶ Text and translation are taken from Harder 2012.

Callimachus' technique is distinctive in that his internal narrator Calliope incorporates her apostrophe to Apollo within Jason's indirect statement, thus blending their voices together.¹⁷ In passage #2, the AR narrator (like the *HH* narrators) rather effects a transition from indirect speech (4.1701–1705) to an address to the god in his own voice (1706–1710).¹⁸ Nevertheless, *Aet.* fr. 18 is a fine example of contagious hymnody, and Apollonius unambiguously alludes to this fragment both in passage #2 and elsewhere in the *Arg.*¹⁹ There is an intriguing possibility that in passage #9, Callimachus is himself imitating the device of contagious hymnody in passage #3 (ἦϊε Φοῖβε, *HH* 3.120) with his use of the (cognate) epithet Ἴηϊε paired with Φοῖβε;²⁰ possibly Apollonius perceived this reworking.²¹ Beyond that, all we can say is that there is indeed “Homeric” precedent for contagious hymnody and that Apollonius' technique is slightly closer to that of the *HHs* than to Callimachus' in this instance.

¹⁷ Harder 2012 ad Call. *Aet.* fr. 18.6–13. Apollonius himself adopts this procedure at *Arg.* 4.1383–1387; see also Verg. *Aen.* 7.389–391. For other apostrophes in Callimachus, see Harder 2012 ad Call. *Aet.* fr. 18.6–13 and Klooster 2013a.

¹⁸ The closest Callimachean parallels I have found for this procedure are a few passages in which the narrator apostrophizes a divinity when mentioning their festival, though without explicit reference to a speech act (*Aet.* fr. 67.5–6, 178.3–4, possibly 186.31; see further n. 5 above); cf. fr. 23, which juxtaposes a second-person address in character-text to a narratorial address, though the reproachful context suggests, if anything, a parody of hymnody. There are some passages in the *Hymns* in which a switch to Du-Stil may correspond with reference to a god's cult (*Hymn* 2.69, 98; cf. 4.300–313, 316–321); likewise, *Hymn* 3.136–142 is strikingly metaleptic, though neither in this case nor in the *Hymn to Delos* passages just cited can we speak of a “switch” into Du-Stil. Because of the frequency of apostrophe in Callimachus' oeuvre, and the lack of explicit reference to hymnody or prayer in most of these passages, I would hesitate to call any of them clear examples of contagious hymnody per se.

¹⁹ See, e.g., the notes in Pfeiffer 1949, Hutchinson 1988: 87–88, Clauss 1993: 77–79, Massimilla 1996, and Harder 2012 ad loc. (fr. 18 Pfeiffer, Harder = fr. 20 Massimilla). Harder 1993 and Albis 1995 make convincing cases for Callimachean priority.

²⁰ For the rough breathing mark in Ἴηϊε, see, e.g., Harder 2012 ad loc.

²¹ There is a faint connection between the epithet that the AR narrator employs at 4.1706 (Λητοῖδην) and the context of passage #3, which narrates Apollo's birth by Leto, but no firm evidence connects the two *loci*.

II. Other Apostrophes

a. *Apostrophes to Mortals*

Apostrophe to a god is a natural venue for the exhibition of the AR narrator's hymnic voice, but the example of apostrophes to mortal characters provides a splendid illustration of the way that the generic affiliations of the *Arg. qua* epic hymn may breathe new life into the conventions of traditional epic. The HE narrator apostrophizes a limited group of characters with some frequency (Menelaus 7x, Patroclus 8x, Eumaeus 15x), as well as Apollo twice (*Il.* 15.365, 20.152) and Achilles (*Il.* 20.2) and Melanippus (*Il.* 15.582–583) once each.²² Modern scholars have debated the purpose of these apostrophes, which seem so selectively employed and curiously distributed,²³ but to the ancient scholiast, the HE narrator's apostrophes reflect his emotional involvement in the narrative, signaling his sympathy or affection for the apostrophized character.²⁴ This interpretation is quite natural for a passage like *Il.* 16.786–789:

ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ τὸ τέταρτον ἐπέσσυτο δαίμονι ἴσος,
ἔνθ' ἄρα τοι, Πάτροκλε, φάνη βιότιοιο τελευτή·
ἦντετο γάρ τοι Φοῖβος ἐνὶ κρατερῇ ὑσμίνῃ
δεινός· ὁ μὲν τὸν ἰόντα κατὰ κλόνον οὐκ ἐνόησεν...

But when for the fourth time he [Patroclus] rushed on like a god,
then for you, Patroclus, did the end of life appear; for Phoebus met
you in the mighty combat, a terrible god. And Patroclus observed
him not as he passed through the turmoil...

All of the HE narrator's apostrophes to Patroclus occur in *Iliad* 16, the book devoted to Patroclus' tragic demise.

²² For a catalogue of the apostrophes in both the HEs and A, see De Martino 1984–1985: 116–117.

²³ For a survey of opinions, see, e.g., Yamagata 1989: 91–92 and de Jong 2009: 94–97.

²⁴ For ancient citations, see Yamagata 1989: 91 n. 1.

The AR narrator’s apostrophes, too, often seem to reflect his emotional reaction to his own narrative²⁵—patently so in the case of an exclamation like “Father Zeus!” (Ζεῦ πάτερ, 4.1673), his tragic outburst in the Lemnian episode (“O wretched women, sad victims of insatiable jealousy!” [ὦ μέλαια ζήλοιο τ’ ἐπισμυγερῶς ἀκόρητοι, 1.616]), or his overwrought prayer to Eros at *Arg.* 4.445–449. I have also discussed above the impression of religious enthusiasm created by the device of contagious hymnody in the apostrophes to Hera (4.1196–1200) and Apollo (4.1701–1710). There is, however, a notable difference between apostrophes in the HEs and the *Arg.*: whereas the HE narrator apostrophizes a god (Apollo) only twice,²⁶ the AR narrator actually apostrophizes divine subjects (6x)²⁷ more often than mortal ones (3 or 4x).²⁸ This difference in addressee matters when evaluating the metaleptic effect of the apostrophe, for apostrophes as ordinarily understood function to collapse the temporal divide between the narrator and his characters—“between the here-and-now of his performance and the there-and-then of his tale.”²⁹ Unlike other characters, however, gods are eternal and really can be addressed in the narrator’s present; divine apostrophes thus do less to erase the distance between past and present than to demonstrate the continuity between the two as bridged by the god’s

²⁵ Exceptions: the emotional valence, if any, of the Invocation of Apollo at 1.1 is unclear to me, and emotion is not easy to detect at 4.1763–1764 (if that passage really does feature an apostrophe; see below in this section).

²⁶ See n. 96 in Chapter 1.

²⁷ In addition to the apostrophes to Eros, Hera, Zeus, and Apollo, mentioned in the text, the introit apostrophizes Apollo (1.1–8; for various interpretations of this apostrophe, see Chapter 1), while the Envoi salutes the Argonauts in their capacity as divinized heroes (4.1773–1781). 2.708–710 is an ambiguous case, to be discussed below. I leave out of account here Appeals to the Muses, which, because metaliterary, I consider a distinct category; *n.b.* that many interpreters consider the Invocation of Apollo at 1.1 a claim to inspiration along the lines of an Appeal to the Muses (see Chapter 1, Section I.c).

²⁸ Besides the apostrophe to the Lemnian women (1.616), there are apostrophes to the Argonauts in Libya (4.1383–1387) and to Canthus (4.1485–1489). The case of Theras (4.1763–1764) is ambiguous because of a textual issue; see below in this section.

²⁹ Mackay 2001: 18; see further de Jong 2009: 96.

immortal existence.³⁰ HE apostrophes, in contrast, frequently emphasize precisely the mortality of their addressee; indeed, we have seen that ancient scholars considered the fact of Patroclus' fast-approaching death an important factor in motivating the HE narrator's sympathetic apostrophes to him in *Iliad* 16.³¹

Now, if we remember that Apollonius embraces the reality of hero cult in the *Arg.*, and that the poem is itself framed as a hymn to its own heroized protagonists,³² the foregoing analysis has important ramifications for our assessment of the AR narrator's apostrophes to human beings. These apostrophized characters may indeed have been mortal at the time of the story, but some of them, like the Argonauts, have since been immortalized; accordingly, like gods, these heroes can now be conceived of as fully capable of being invoked at the present time of the narration, as the Salutation and Prayer to them in the poem's Envoi demonstrate (4.1773–1781). That is, in the context of an epic hymn, apostrophe to a hero is transformed from a literary mannerism into an actual address to a still-living divinity.³³

This interpretation is supported, I would argue, by the “hymnic” tone of the AR narrator's apostrophe to the Argonauts as they port the Argo across the wasteland of the Syrtis for twelve

³⁰ See, e.g., de Jong 2009: 95–96 (cf. Albis 1996: 118).

³¹ Apollonius imitates the Patroclus-type apostrophe in his address to Canthus, which similarly begins with a proleptic notice of his impending doom (“But you, Canthus, the Fates of Death seized in Libya” [Κάνθε, σὲ δ' οὐλόμεναι Λιβύη ἐνὶ Κήρεσ ἔλοντο, 4.1485]); see, e.g., Zyroff 1971: 150.

³² As I argue in Chapter 2.

³³ Cf. Eustathius' observation that in *Il.* 16.692–693 (“Then whom first, whom last did you slay, Patroclus, when the gods called you deathward?”), Homer is “both exalting [Patroclus], almost like a divine character, and showing him pity” (σεμνόνων τε αὐτὸν ἅμα ὡς θεῖόν τι πρόσωπον καὶ οἰκτιζόμενος, *Il.* 3.915.25–26 van der Valk; translation my own). See further De Martino 1984–1985: 112 and de Jong 2009: 96.

days on end.³⁴ This feat is so impressive that the AR narrator defers all authority for the tale to the Muses (4.1381–1388):³⁵

Μουσάων ὄδε μῦθος, ἐγὼ δ' ὑπακουὸς αἰείδω
Πιερίδων, καὶ τήνδε πανατρεκέες ἔκλυον ὀμφήν,
ὕμέας, ὃ̄ περί δὴ μέγα φέρτατοι νῆες ἀνάκτων,
ἧ̄ βίη, ἧ̄ ἀρετῇ Λιβύης ἀνὰ θῆνας ἐρήμους
νῆα μεταχρονίην, ὅσα τ' ἔνδοθι νηὸς ἄγεσθαι, 1385
ἀνθεμένους ὥμοισι φέρειν δυοκαίδεκα πάντα
ἧμαθ' ὁμοῦ νύκτας τε. δύην γε μὲν ἦ καὶ οἰζὺν
τίς κ' ἐνέποι, τὴν κείνοι ἀνέπλησαν μογέοντες;
ἔμπεδον ἀθανάτων ἔσαν αἵματος, οἷον ὑπέσταν
ἔργον ἀναγκαίη βεβημένοι. 1390

From the Muses comes this story, and I sing in obedience to the Pierides; and this account I heard in all accuracy: that you, O far mightiest sons of kings, by your strength and your valor lifted high the ship and everything that you brought in the ship on your shoulders and carried it over the desolate dunes of Libya for twelve whole days and as many nights. And yet who could recount the pain and suffering those men endured in their toil? They were assuredly of the blood of the immortals, such was the task they undertook when forced by necessity.

The second-person address begins with ὕμέας in line 1383, which introduces the content of the Muses' μῦθος in indirect speech. Despite this distancing device, however, the narrator immediately involves himself by interrupting the indirect speech construction with a vocative address to the Argonauts, which must be spoken in his own voice. In part the vocative is necessary to identify the referent of the pronoun, since the narrator had not been apostrophizing anyone. But the rhetoric of the passage suggests that more is in play here: the decision to cast

³⁴ E.g., Pietsch 1999: 80 observes, “Der Ton hebt sich nach der Berufung auf die Musen zu hymnischem Preis der Helden.” Cuypers 2004 considers the narrator’s praise of the Argonauts generally as a hymnic/encomiastic feature of the poem.

³⁵ This elaborate Alexandrian footnote may serve to underline the marvelous nature of the deed and does not necessarily imply serious skepticism on the narrator’s part (Stinton 1976, Morrison 2007: 275; *n.b.* πανατρεκέες in line 1382). Nevertheless, this passage has been connected to the AR narrator’s rational, scholarly persona (e.g., by Zyroff 1971: 56).

the indirect statement in the second-person at all; the sudden switch from the Muses’ focalization in indirect speech to the narrator’s in a vocative address; the exuberant praise contained in the address; and the marked Anaphora (ἦ βίη, ἦ ἀρετῆ, 1384)³⁶—all of these features create an ecstatic effect suggestive of enthusiastic hymnody. The indirect statement ends in line 1387 (*n.b.* the third-person verbs and the distal demonstrative κείνοι, 1388), but the narrator’s encomium continues into line 1390: the Argonauts were not only “sons of kings” (υἱεὺς ἀνάκτων, 1383); to accomplish such a physically demanding task, they must also have been of divine descent (ἀθανάτων ... αἵματος, 1389). This ontological upgrade, from princes to demigods, may in turn foreshadow the Argonauts’ final transformation into a divinized “race of blessed heroes” (ἀριστήων μακάρων γένος, 4.1773) as revealed at the end of Book 4, in the next apostrophe addressed to them.³⁷

A final passage that may reflect an interconnection between hero cult and apostrophe occurs near the very end of the poem—just ten lines before the apostrophe to the heroized Argonauts themselves in the Envoi. The AR narrator concludes the episode of Euphemus’ dream with an external prolepsis tracing the colonial migrations of Euphemus’ descendants from Lemnos to Sparta to the island of Calliste, which emerged from the clod that Triton had given the Argonaut in Libya (4.1757–1761). The prolepsis closes with an etiology for the island’s change of name before a break-off formula returns us to the main story of the Argonauts (1761–1764):

ἐκ δὲ λιπόντας
Σπάρτην Αὐτεσίωνος ἐὺς πάϊς ἤγαγε Θήρας
Καλλίστην ἐπὶ νῆσον, ἀμείψατο δ’ οὖνομα Θήρης

³⁶ Noted by Hutchinson 1988: 136. *N.b.* also the repetition of νῆα ... νηός (1385) and the semantic redundancy of lines 1381–1382, which express the idea “This story is the Muses’, not mine” thrice in two lines. The phrase “twelve whole days and as many nights” (δουκαίδεκα πάντα | ἡμαθ’ ὁμοῦ νύκτας τε, 1386–1387) strikes me as rhetorically fulsome as well.

³⁷ Cuypers 2004: 47 also connects these passages. For the relationship between heroic achievement and heroization, see Chapter 2, Section III.c.

ἐξ ἔθεν. ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν μετόπιν γένετ' Εὐφήμοιο.

When they [the descendants of Euphemus] left Sparta, Theras, the noble son of Autesion, led them to the island of Calliste, and he changed the name to Thera after his own name. But these things happened long after Euphemus.

I have quoted the text of this passage as the manuscript tradition hands it down, but Wendel and Fränkel have drawn attention to the fact that the scholiast ad *Arg.* 4.1760–1764b paraphrases lines 1763–1764 as though the text contained an apostrophe to Theras: “The island of Calliste changed its name and was named Thera after you, Theras, son of Autesion” (ἤλλαξε δὲ τὸ ὄνομα ἢ Καλλίστη νῆσος, καὶ ὠνομάσθη Θήρα ἀπὸ σοῦ, ὃ υἱὲ Αὐτεσίωνος Θήρα; translation my own).³⁸ These scholars have thus proposed that the scholiast’s text read ἀμείψατο δ’ οὖνομα, Θήρα, | ἐκ σέθεν, “It took its name from yours, Theras.”³⁹

Most editors since Fränkel have adopted this reading,⁴⁰ and Cuypers points out that a vocative Θήρα “allows a wordplay hinging on the formal identity of the vocative of his name and the name of the island called after him (*Thera*).”⁴¹ Certainly there is wordplay here; indeed, this feature, together with the near-homeoteleuton in lines 1762–1763, is probably responsible for the uncertain state of the text.⁴² I would only add that as a colony-founder (οἰκιστής), Theras would

³⁸ See the *apparatus critici* ad loc. in Wendel 1935 and Fränkel 1961.

³⁹ Translation per Race 2008: 469 n. 200.

⁴⁰ These include Livrea, Vian, Paduano and Fusillo, Glei and Natzel-Glei, Valverde Sánchez, and Hunter.

⁴¹ Cuypers 2004: 48 n. 12. Cf. Hunter’s notion (2015 ad *Arg.* 4.1762) that “Ap. encourages us to see that the words might suggest ‘the excellent son of Autesion led them to the very beautiful island of Thera’” if we read Θήρας in line 1762 as the genitive form of Θήρα (the island) rather than the nominative of Θήρας (the man). For a similar wordplay in Callimachus, see Clauss 2019: 80. This type of wordplay is the key to solving the riddle in *AP* 14.18, on which see Luz 2013: 97 and Gardella Hueso 2018: 7.

⁴² Hunter 2015 ad *Arg.* 4.1763–1764.

have received worship in his settlement.⁴³ More than a “mark of honour,”⁴⁴ this apostrophe could function as a subtle acknowledgment of Theras’ continuing vitality as a cult hero down to the present day.⁴⁵ This evocation of hero cult in the case of Theras at 4.1763 would then pave the way for the hymnic Salutation to the Argonauts just ten lines later.

b. Other Hymnic Addresses

I transition from apostrophes addressed to mortals to consider three of Apollonius’ addresses to gods: the Appeals to the Muses that launch Book 3 and 4 and the apostrophe to Eros at 4.445–449. These passages are interesting to consider because Appeals to the Muses represent a traditional epic device, while the apostrophe to Eros offers a narratorial comment on the developing plotline of Apsyrtus’ murder. Nevertheless, scholars have noted the hymnic style of all three of these passages, which thus provide further examples of the way that the AR narrator’s hymnic voice can be bleed over into the texture of his epic narrative.⁴⁶

⁴³ See the overview of hero cult in Chapter 2, Section I. *N.b.* as well that the emendation considered here would introduce a sudden change of subject in the middle of line 1763, from Theras to the island of Thera; such a change is hardly foreign to Apollonius’ style, but it may have caused further confusion for copyists.

⁴⁴ Hunter 2015 ad *Arg.* 4.1763–1764.

⁴⁵ Apollonius is consciously varying Pindar’s account of the foundation of Cyrene by Euphemus’ descendants in *Pythian* 4.3–64; *n.b.* that the Theban poet highlights the oecist cult of Battus, the founder of Cyrene proper, in his next *Pythian* ode (5.93–95). Apollonius, having no reason to eulogize the defunct Battiad dynasty (Stephens 2003: 180), leaves the founding of Cyrene only implicit in his narrative and stops his historical prolepsis at an earlier founder figure (Hunter 2015 ad *Arg.* 4.1731–1764).

⁴⁶ I may note here as an aside that we should not be troubled if in these passages the AR narrator lavishes hymnic praise on divinities other than the Argonauts, the proper Hymnic Subjects of his poem, for the piety of a Greek hymnist is such that other worthy subjects may also be praised in passing. For instance, before its primary mythic narrative, the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite* pauses to list the attributes of Athena (5.8–15) and Artemis (16–20), to relate a myth concerning Hestia’s virginity (21–32), and finally to praise Zeus (36–37) and particularly Hera (40–44). The piety of the AR narrator is equally capacious.

The Appeal to Erato in the Book 3 Introit

Arg. 3 begins with an “introit in the middle”⁴⁷ that signals a transition to an important new phase of the narrative, in which Medea and the love theme will loom large (3.1–5):

Εἰ δ' ἄγε νῦν, Ἐρατώ, παρά θ' ἴστασο καί μοι ἔνισπε,
ἔνθεν ὅπως ἐς Ἴωλκὸν ἀνήγαγε κῶας Ἴήσων
Μηδείης ὑπ' ἔρωτι· σὺ γὰρ καὶ Κύπριδος αἴσαν
ἔμμορες, ἀδμηήτας δὲ τεοῖς μελεδήμασι θέλγεις
παρθενικάς· τῷ καὶ τοι ἐπήρατον οὔνομ' ἀνήπται. 5

Come now, Erato, stand by my side and tell me how from here
Jason brought the fleece back to Iolcus with the aid of Medea's
love, for you have a share also of Cypris' power and enchant
unwed girls with your anxieties; and that is why your lovely name
has been attached to you.

The HEs never invoke a Muse by name, though one *HH* (31, *to Helios*) does provide Homeric precedent: “And now, O Muse Calliope, daughter of Zeus, begin to sing of glowing Helios, whom...” (ἥλιον ὑμνεῖν αὐτε Διὸς τέκος ἄρχεο Μοῦσα, | Καλλιόπη, φαέθοντα, τὸν..., 1–2). The hymnic tone of the passage is mainly owed to lines 3–5, in which the AR narrator explains (γάρ, 3) his decision to invoke Erato of all Muses with reference to her specialty as the Muse of love poetry.⁴⁸ The poet maintains Du-Stil in lines reminiscent of the Attributive Section of a hymn.⁴⁹ The theme of a god's acquisition of her or his τιμή is prominent in both Hesiod's *Theogony* and

⁴⁷ To adapt a phrase from Conte 1992 (“proem in the middle”).

⁴⁸ See, e.g., Zyroff 1971: 50 and van den Eersten 2013: 52.

⁴⁹ Though Attributive Sections are generally cast in the omnitemporal present (for this term, see n. 65 in the Introduction), the aorist verb ἔμμορες (4) is no exception because it refers to the acquisition of a sphere of influence that continues to define the deity's activity eternally, as commonly in the Attributive Sections of hymns (Janko 1981: 12).

the *HHs*;⁵⁰ Hardie has shown that in these lines Apollonius particularly alludes to Hesiod's description of Aphrodite's τιμαί (203–205) and to his Hymnic Proem to the Muses (67).⁵¹

To these insights, I would add only one possible hymnic undertone that may be implicit in the AR narrator's Appeal to Erato. The explicit justification for her selection as the Muse of the second half of the poem is her association with love poetry, which is attested as early as Plato (*Phdr.* 259d).⁵² Other sources, however, assign her to other domains of poetry, including dance and lyric,⁵³ but intriguingly, one anonymous epigram in the Palatine Anthology makes Erato the inventor of hymnody (ῥῆμνος ἀθανάτων Ἐρατὸ πολυτερπέας εὔρε, *AP* 9.504.6). This is but one of the several idiosyncratic associations between a Muse and a given sphere of poetry that appear exclusively in this epigram.⁵⁴ Consequently, I would not press this point further, but if the connection to hymnody presented in the epigram goes back to Apollonius' time, Erato might also have been a singularly appropriate Muse for the AR narrator to single out for invocation in this hymnic fashion and within an epic hymn.

⁵⁰ For this theme in the *HHs*, see above all Clay 2006, whose argument is summarized in the Introduction (Section II.a).

⁵¹ See Hardie 2009: 16–17.

⁵² See further, e.g., *Ov. Ars am.* 2.16, *Plut. Mor.* 746f, *Ath.* 13.555b (cf. *Diod. Sic.* 4.7.4, *Ov. Fast.* 4.195–196, Cornutus *Theol. Graec.* 14). For the role of etymology in assigning functions to the Muses, see Hardie 2009.

⁵³ For sources, see the useful chart in *RE* 16.1 s.v. “Musai,” pp. 727–730; *n.b.* also that Erato's attribute in artistic representations is eventually the cithara or lyre (Taback 2002: 81, 87).

⁵⁴ Taback 2002: 42–43. The closest precedent I can find for this idea is a potentially interesting juxtaposition of Erato's name with the word ῥῆμνος (in the generic sense of “song”) in *Stes. fr.* 327 Finglass, though the text is corrupt.

The Appeal to the Muse in the Book 4 Introit

Book 4 begins with another introit, which thematizes Medea’s mixed motivations for departing from Colchis aboard the Argo (4.1–5):⁵⁵

Αὐτὴ νῦν κάματόν γε, θεά, καὶ δήνεα κούρης
Κολχίδος ἔννεπε, Μοῦσα, Διὸς τέκος· ἧ γὰρ ἐμοὶ γε
ἀμφασίῃ νόος ἔνδον ἐλίσσεται ὀρμαίνοντι,
ἦέ μιν ἄτης πῆμα δυσίμερον ἧ τό γ’ ἐνίσπω
φύζαν ἀεικελίην, ἧ κάλλιπεν ἔθνεα Κόλχων. 5

Now, goddess, you yourself tell of the distress and thoughts of the Colchian girl, O Muse, daughter of Zeus, for truly the mind within me whirls in speechless stupor, as I ponder whether to call it the lovesick affliction of obsession or shameful panic, which made her leave the Colchian people.

This passage is less strikingly hymnic than the Book 3 introit, but we may note that here, uniquely, the Muse⁵⁶ is dignified by three vocatives: “goddess,” “Muse,” and “daughter of Zeus.”⁵⁷ As with the Erato passage, I would add only the possibility of a further hymnic subtext, for which I have already argued in the Introduction to this dissertation:⁵⁸ these first two Honorifics have often been connected to the opening words of the *Iliad* (μῆνιν ἄειδε, θεά, 1.1) and the *Odyssey* (ἔννεπε, Μοῦσα, 1.1). I would propose that Διὸς τέκος is drawn from the Exordium of the *Homeric Hymn to Helios*, already quoted above in connection with the Erato-invocation: “And now, O Muse Calliope, daughter of Zeus, begin to sing of glowing Helios,

⁵⁵ For Medea’s mixed motives here, Hunter 1987 is fundamental.

⁵⁶ Scholars often assume that this Muse is Erato (e.g., Zyroff 1971: 48, Campbell 1983: 2, Fusillo 1985: 367), and in fact there is good reason to suppose that Erato remains the Muse of 4.1: she had been invoked as the Muse of the *entire* second half of the poem, which involves bringing the fleece back to Iolcus in Book 4 (3.2) through the love of Medea won in Book 3 (3.3) (Hunter 2015 ad *Arg.* 4.1–5). The narrator hedges his bets, however, by invoking an unnamed Muse, because he ostensibly does not know whether lovesickness (the especial domain of Erato) or panicked fear caused Medea to abandon Colchis. The shift from Erato to an unnamed Muse who may or may not be Erato thus mirrors the complication of Medea’s motivations in Book 4. Cf. De Martino 1984–1985: 109–110 and Köhnken 2000: 56 n. 4.

⁵⁷ Thus, e.g., Zyroff (1971: 50) says that our passage has “several of the traditional elements of prayer.”

⁵⁸ See pp. 24–26.

whom...” (ἥλιον ὑμνεῖν αὐτε Διὸς τέκος ἄρχεο Μοῦσα, | Καλλιόπη, φαέθοντα, τὸν..., 1–2).

Together, these three vocatives pragmatically allude to all three of Apollonius’ major Homeric models: the *Iliad* (θεά), the *Odyssey* (Μοῦσα), and the *HHs* (Διὸς τέκος).

The Apostrophe to Eros

My final example of a hymnic address to a deity occurs in the the Apsyrtus episode, which is punctuated by an apostrophe to Eros that locates the ultimate cause of Medea’s brother’s murder in the god’s malign influence (4.445–449):

σχέτλι Ἔρωσ, μέγα πῆμα, μέγα στύγος ἀνθρώποισιν, 445
ἐκ σέθεν οὐλόμεναί τ’ ἔριδες στοναχαί τε γόοι τε,
ἄλγεά τ’ ἄλλ’ ἐπὶ τοῖσιν ἀπείρονα τετρήχασιν.
δυσμενέων ἐπὶ παισὶ κορύσσειο, δαῖμον, ἀερθεῖς,
οἶος Μηδείη στυγερὴν φρεσὶν ἔμβαλες ἄτην.

Cruel Love, great affliction, great abomination for humans; from you come deadly quarrels and groans and laments, and countless other pains besides these are stirred up. May it be against my enemies’ children, O god, that you rise up and arm yourself, being such as when you cast abominable madness into the mind of Medea.

The tone of this passage is described as “tragic” as often as it is “hymnic,”⁵⁹ and appropriately so, as tragic choral odes hymning Eros represent an important group of intertexts.⁶⁰ As Zyroff has pointed out, this apostrophe systematically reverses the rhetoric of hymnody: Eros is invoked with hateful rather than Honorific epithets (445); an Attributive Section outlines his

⁵⁹ Tragic: see, e.g., Faerber 1932: 105 n. 3, Corbato 1955: 15, and Natzel 1992: 104–105. Hymnic: see, e.g., Zyroff 1971: 50–51, Livrea 1973 ad *Arg.* 4.445, and Hunter 1993: 116 n. 68. Stoessl 1941: 110 rightly notes the passage’s affiliations with both genres.

⁶⁰ For such hymns, see Cerbo 1993. Soph. *Ant.* 781–800 and Eur. *Hipp.* 525–564 are particularly comparable, the former because it relates to strife among family (*n.b.* σὺν καὶ τόδε νεῖκος ἀνδρῶν | ξύναιμιον ἔχεις ταράξας, 793–794), the latter because it includes a negative wish regarding Eros (528–529), though not precisely an apopemptic prayer as in Apollonius (Hunter 2015 ad loc.). For other important intertexts, see the notes ad loc. in Hunter 2015.

baleful rather than beneficial effects on humanity (446–446); and the concluding Prayer is not a request for a boon but an apopemptic wish for harm to the AR narrator’s enemies instead of himself and his own (448–449). The effect is enhanced by the maintenance of the address over five lines and by the Anaphora of μέγα in line 445, which seems to be modeled on a line from the Hymnic Proem of Aratus’ *Phaenomena* (15).⁶¹ This apostrophe is often related to the invocation of Erato at the beginning of Medea’s love story (*Arg.* 3.1–5).⁶² The hymnic cast of both passages constitutes a further point of connection, but the negativized form that this “hymn” to Eros takes reflects the bloody turn that this love story has taken.

III. Hymnic Narratization

I now turn to an exceptional use of multiple Honorific epithets by the AR narrator in narrative contexts in which a god is invoked by a character. The piling-up of epithets, together with expansion via relative clause, is one of the most distinctive markers of the Greek hymnic style, especially within an Exordium.⁶³ The *Orphic Hymns*, which often consist of almost nothing but lists of epithets, take this tendency to an extreme,⁶⁴ but it is also already found in the *HHs* (*n.b.* esp. *HH* 12.1–4, 27.1–3, 28.1–4).⁶⁵ With the exception of extraordinary passages like his apostrophe to Eros (*Arg.* 4.445–449), the AR narrator does not generally apply so-called

⁶¹ See, e.g., Vian 2002: 3.166 ad *Arg.* 4.449; the echo enhances the hymnic tone of the passage (Hunter 1993: 116 n. 68). *N.b.* also the echo of στύγος (445) in στυγερήν (449).

⁶² E.g., Morrison 2007: 302–303.

⁶³ Furley and Bremer 2001: 52–54.

⁶⁴ As Athanassakis 1977: viii–ix observes, these hymns “give the impression of being the work of a religious antiquary who had ready access to some sort of concordance from which he marshaled forth hosts of epithets which he then linked together as hexameters.”

⁶⁵ For accumulated epithets generally in the *HHs*, see Richardson 1974 ad *HH* 2.31.

“ornamental” epithets to divinities (or, to a lesser extent, to other characters) with the high degree of frequency found in early Greek epic, a tendency that stems from Apollonius’ larger aesthetic program of avoiding an overly-formulaic style.⁶⁶ One significant exception to this rule occurs with marked consistency when mortal characters in the poem praise gods in a hymnic fashion, usually when invoking them in prayer or worship.⁶⁷ In some cases this praise is quoted directly, as in Mopsus’ exuberant description of Rhea’s power and status on Olympus (1.1098–1102);⁶⁸ in other cases it is conveyed second-hand with an indirect speech construction, as in (the beginning of) Orpheus’ hymn to Apollo (2.705–707).⁶⁹

In most cases, however, the AR narrator’s manner of conveying this sort of hymnic praise takes a rather more curious form, as in the following example.

1) Orpheus hymns Artemis as the Argonauts set sail from Pagasae (1.569–572):

τοῖσι δὲ φορμίζων εὐθήμονι μέλπεν ἀοιδῆ
 Οἰάγροιο πάϊς Νηοσσόον εὐπατέρειαν 570
 Ἄρτεμιν, ἣ κείνας σκοπιὰς ἀλὸς ἀμφιέπεσκεν
 ῥυομένη καὶ γαῖαν Ἴωλκίδα.

The son of Oeagrus played his lyre for them and in a well composed song sang of Artemis Ship-Preserver, child of a great father, the goddess who watched over those peaks by the sea and protected the land of Iolcus.

⁶⁶ For Apollonius’ approach to formularity, see, e.g., Ciani 1975 and Fantuzzi 2008a. The comparative rarity of epithets in Apollonius vis-à-vis Homer has been observed by, e.g., Parry 1971: 24–29, Beye 1982: 23, Vilchez 1986: 101, and van den Eersten 2013: 10 (cf. 38).

⁶⁷ van den Eersten 2013: 51.

⁶⁸ Other cases of quoted hymnic praise include *Arg.* 1.411–412; 2.213–214, 258–260, 693; 3.467, 715–716, 986; 4.95–96, 382, 1019–1020, 1333, 1411–1414, 1597–1600.

⁶⁹ More on Orpheus’ hymn below. Other cases of hymnic praise conveyed using an indirect speech construction include 3.1211 and 4.145–148 (discussed below).

It is helpful to analyze this passage with reference to Genette’s three categories for the “states” that the representation of a character’s speech may assume within a narrative.⁷⁰ The Apollonian narrator describes Orpheus as singing (μέλπεν), but he does not follow this verb up with a direct quotation of what Orpheus sang—a technique that would exemplify Genette’s category of “reported speech.”⁷¹ Nor does the narrator follow the verb with an indirect speech construction summarizing the contents of Orpheus’ song—Genette’s category of “transposed speech.”⁷² Instead, μέλπεν simply takes an accusative direct object denoting the goddess about whom Orpheus is singing (Ἄρτεμιν).⁷³ These data would suggest that we are dealing with what Genette calls “narratized speech”: Orpheus’ speech is reduced to just another event in the narrative (“Orpheus sang of Artemis”), hardly different from the non-discursive events immediately preceding it (e.g., “Orpheus played his lyre”).⁷⁴ In terms of speech act theory, the narrator minimizes the locutionary aspect of Orpheus’ song (i.e., what the bard said) and focuses on the illocutionary (i.e., what he did, namely, sing).⁷⁵ But what is so peculiar about Apollonius’ technique here is that the narrator appends to the goddess’s name a pair of Honorific epithets (Νηοσσόον εὐπατέρειαν) and even a relative clause (ἧ ... Ἴωλκίδα) that differ markedly from the texture of the surrounding narrative, but which, crucially, *would be at home in the hymn that we can imagine Orpheus singing in this context*. And yet we can be sure that Orpheus’ words are

⁷⁰ Genette 1980: 171–173.

⁷¹ This is the technique at *Arg.* 1.410–412.

⁷² This technique occurs at *Arg.* 1.885.

⁷³ This device occurs at *Arg.* 1.1225 (Ἄρτεμιν ... μέλπεσθαι αἰοδαῖς); 2.493 (κεκλόμενοι Μαντήιον Ἀπόλλωνα), 700 (ἐπικλείοντες Ἐώιον Ἀπόλλωνα).

⁷⁴ Genette 1980: 170–171. de Jong 2004a: 114–115 calls this mode of speech representation a “speech-act mention.”

⁷⁵ For these terms, see Chatman 1978: 161–166.

not being quoted, for the accusative (as opposed to the vocative) case and the distal deictic adjective *κείνας*, “those,” betray the distanced perspective of the narrator.

This technique for representing Orpheus’ song to Artemis, which I here dub “hymnic narratization,” is far from an anomaly in the *Arg.* Rather, the phenomenon I have just outlined could justly be called Apollonius’ standard technique for narrating a character’s Invocation (or Evocation) of a deity, as the following survey of comparable passages attests:⁷⁶

- 2) The Argonauts and the Lemnian women offer celebratory sacrifices to the gods (*Arg.* 1.858–860):

ἔξοχα δ’ ἄλλων
ἀθανάτων Ἥρης υἷα κλυτὸν ἠδὲ καὶ αὐτὴν
Κύπριν ἀοιδῆσιν θυέεσσι τε μειλίσσοντο. 860

...and beyond all other immortals they propitiated Hera’s famous son [sc. Hephaestus] and Cypris herself with songs and sacrifices.

- 3) The Argonauts supplicate Rhea-Cybele on Cyzicus (1.1123–1131):

βωμόν δ’ αὖ χέραδος παρενήγεον· ἀμφὶ δὲ φύλλοις
στεψάμενοι δρυῖνοισι θυηπολῆς ἐμέλοντο,
Μητέρα Δινδυμῖν πολυπότνιαν ἀγκαλέοντες, 1125
ἐνναέτιν Φρυγίης, Τιτίν θ’ ἅμα Κύλληνόν τε,
οἱ μούνοι πολέων μοιρηγέται ἠδὲ πάρεδροι
Μητέρος Ἰδαίης κεκλήαται, ὅσσοι ἕασιν
Δάκτυλοι Ἰδαῖοι Κρηταιέες, οὓς ποτε νύμφη
Ἀγγιᾶλη Δικταῖον ἀνὰ σπέος ἀμφοτέρησιν 1130
δραξαμένη γαίης Οἰαξίδος ἐβλάστησεν.

Nearby they piled up an altar of stones and, wearing crowns of oak leaves, conducted their sacrifice around it [*sc.* a carved image of the goddess], as they called upon the Dindymian Mother, the much-revered mistress who dwells in Phrygia, along with Titias and Cyllenus, who alone of the many Idaean Dactyls on Crete are called dispensers of destiny and ministers of the Idaean Mother.

⁷⁶ This list builds on that of Vian 2002: 3.152 ad *Arg.* 4.148, although his list also includes examples in indirect discourse (4.146–148) and quoted character-speech (1.1098–1102, 3.1035), which I would distinguish on strict narratological terms. Other scholars who have connected some of these passages include Fränkel 1968 ad *Arg.* 3.861f.; Dickie 1990: 270 with n. 20; and Hunter 1993: 140 n. 144, 2015 ad *Arg.* 4.146–148.

The nymph Anchiale once bore the Dactyls in the Dictaeon cave while clutching the ground of Oaxus with both hands.

- 4) The Argonauts continue to worship Rhea-Cybele (1.1150–1151):

καὶ τότε μὲν δαῖτ' ἀμφὶ θεᾶς θέσαν οὔρεσιν Ἄρκτων, 1150
μέλποντες Ῥεῖην πολυπότνιαν.

Then they held a feast in honor of the goddess on Bear mountain and hymned Rhea, the much-revered mistress.

- 5) The Argonauts celebrate Polydeuces' victory over Amycus (2.161–163):⁷⁷

Ὀρφεὶή φόρμιγγι συνοίμιον ὕμνον ἄειδον
ἐμμελέως· περὶ δέ σφιν ἰαίνετο νήνεμος ἀκτὴ
μελπομένοις· κλειὸν δὲ Θεραπναῖον Διὸς υἱῶν.

...and [they] sang a hymn to the accompaniment of Orpheus' lyre in beautiful harmony, and round about them the windless shore was charmed by their singing; and they celebrated Zeus' son from Therapna.

- 6) The Argonauts worship Apollo Heoïus (2.701–703):

ἀμφὶ δὲ δαιομένοις εὐρὺν χορὸν ἐστήσαντο,
καλὸν Ἰηπαιῶν Ἰηπαιῶνα Φοῖβον
μελπόμενοι.

Around the burning offerings they formed a broad choral dance and chanted the beautiful "Iêpaiêon, Phoebus Iêpaiêon."⁷⁸

- 7) The Argonauts build a shrine to Concord (2.715–719):⁷⁹

λοιβαῖς εὐαγέεσσιν ἐπώμοσαν, ἧ μὲν ἀρήξειν 715
ἀλλήλοις εἰσαιὲν ὁμοφροσύνῃσι νόοιο,
ἀπτόμενοι θεῶν· καί τ' εἰσέτι νῦν γε τέτυκται
κεῖσ' Ὀμονοίης ἱρὸν εὐφρονος, ὃ ρ' ἐκάμοντο
αὐτοὶ κυδίστην τότε δαίμονα πορσαίνοντες.

⁷⁷ In fact, the Argonauts are here celebrating the still-mortal rather than the deified Polydeuces, but the passage contains hymnic undertones, including the device currently under investigation; see Chapter 2, Section III.b. This hymnic subtext warrants the passage's inclusion in the present list.

⁷⁸ I analyze this passage as a debatable example of hymnic narratization in Section IV.c below.

⁷⁹ See Section IVc for this passage an example of hymnic narratization despite the lack of a *verbum dicendi*.

They swore an oath with holy libations as they laid hands upon the sacrifice, that they would forever aid one another in singleness of mind. And still to this day a shrine stands there to kindly Concord, which they themselves built at that time to honor the most glorious goddess.

- 8) The narrator describes the effects of Medea's Promethean drug (3.846–847):

τῷ εἰ κ' ἐννυχίοισιν ἀρεσσάμενος θυέεσσιν
Δαῖραν μονογένειαν ἐὸν δέμας ἱκαίνοιτο...

If, after appeasing the only-begotten Daira with nocturnal sacrifices, a man should anoint his body with this drug...

- 9) Medea harvests the sap of a flower to manufacture her Promethean drug (3.858–862):

τῆς οἴην τ' ἐν ὄρεσσι κελαινήν ἱκάδα φηγοῦ
Κασπὴ ἐν κόχλῳ ἀμήσατο φαρμάσσεσθαι,
ἐπτὰ μὲν ἀενάοισι λοεσσαμένη ὑδάτεσσιν, 860
ἐπτὰκι δὲ Βριμῷ κουροτρόφον ἀγκαλέσασα,
Βριμῷ νυκτιπόλον, χθονίην, ἐνέροισιν ἄνασσαν...

Its sap, like the black juice of a mountain oak, she had collected in a Caspian shell to prepare the drug, after bathing herself seven times in ever-flowing streams, and calling seven times on Brimo the youth-nourisher, Brimo the night-wanderer, the infernal goddess, queen of the nether dead...

- 10) Circe purifies Jason and Medea (4.700–702, 707–709):

τῷ καὶ ὀπιζομένη Ζηνὸς θέμιν Ἰκεσίοιο, 700
ὄς μέγα μὲν κοτέει, μέγα δ' ἀνδροφόνοισιν ἀρήγει,
ῥέζε θυηπολίην...
... αὖτις δὲ καὶ ἄλλοις 707
μείλισσεν χύτλοισι Καθάρσιον ἀγκαλέουσα
Ζῆνα, παλαμναίων τιμήορον ἱκεσιάων.⁸⁰

Therefore, out of reverence for the ordinance of Zeus, Protector of Suppliants—who mightily hates murderers, but mightily protects them—she began making the sacrifice... And again, with other libations she propitiated Zeus, invoking him as the Purifier, defender of supplications by murderers.

⁸⁰ For the alternate reading Παλαμναῖον, which would constitute a third epithet for Zeus here (“of Murderers”), see Vian 2002: 3.173–174 ad *Arg.* 4.709.

11) Medea bewitches the bronze giant Talos (4.1665–1669):

ᾠοιδῆσιν μελίσσετο, μέλπε δὲ Κῆρας 1665
θυμοβόρους, Αἶδαο θαῶς κύνας, αἶ περι πᾶσαν
ἥερα δινεύουσαι ἐπὶ ζωοῖσιν ἄγονται.
τὰς γουναζομένη τρίς μὲν παρακέκλετ' ᾠοιδᾶϊς,
τρίς δὲ λιταῖς...

She propitiated with songs and chanted the praises of the heart-devouring Fates of Death, the swift hounds of Hades, who roam throughout the air and hunt down the living. In her supplications she summoned them three times with songs, three times with prayers...⁸¹

12) The Argonauts worship Apollo for saving them from the “shroud” (4.1714–1717):

τοὶ δ' ἀγλαὸν Ἀπόλλωνι
ἄλσει ἐνὶ σκιερῷ τέμενος σκιάεντά τε βωμὸν 1715
ποίηον, Αἰγλήτην μὲν εὐσκόπου εἶνεκεν αἰγλῆς
Φοῖβον κεκλόμενοι.

They built a glorious precinct for Apollo and a shaded altar in a shady grove, invoking Phoebus as Aegletes because of his far-seen gleam.⁸²

13) The Argonauts' ribaldry provides an etiology for a continuing ritual (4.1727–1730):

ἐκ δέ νυ κείνης
μολπῆς ἡρώων νήσῳ ἐνὶ τοῖα γυναῖκες
ἀνδράσι δηριόωνται, ὅτ' Ἀπόλλωνα θηλαῖς 1730
Αἰγλήτην Ἀνάφης τιμήρορον ἰλάσκονται.

And so, from that jesting of the heroes, the women on the island hurl similar taunts at the men, whenever in their sacrifices they propitiate Apollo Aegletes, guardian of Anaphe.

14) Euphemus has a prophetic dream (4.1731–1733):

ἄλλ' ὅτε δὴ κάκεῖθεν ὑπεύδια πείσματ' ἔλυσαν,

⁸¹ The manuscripts, and modern editors, are divided in whether to read μέλπε (Seaton, Mooney, Vian, Paduano and Fusillo, Dräger, Race, Hunter) or θέλγε (Fränkel, Livrea, Gleis and Natzel-Gleis) in line 1665, but the former is favored by the parallel passages featuring hymnic narratization that use forms of μέλπω (1.569, 1151; 2.703; cf. 2.163).

⁸² The causal prepositional phrase εὐσκόπου εἶνεκεν αἰγλῆς, because it explains the Argonauts' rationale, is a marker of character-focalization; see de Jong 2004a: 118.

μνήσατ' ἔπειτ' Εὐφημος ὄνειρατος ἐννυχίοιο
ἄζόμενος Μαίης υἱά κλυτόν.

But when, from that place too, they had loosed their cables in good weather, then Euphemus remembered that night's dream out of respect for Maia's famous son.⁸³

Some of these passages are marked by greater degrees of hymnic expansion with epithets or relative clauses than are others, but all of them exhibit the same basic structural features:

- a) The narrator is narrating a character's Invocation of a deity.
- b) The Invocation is denoted by a declarative verb of singing, praying, calling upon, etc.
- c) The verb takes the name of the divinity being invoked as its accusative direct object.
- d) Appended to the divinity's name is an Honorific epithet—in most cases, two or more.⁸⁴
 - i. In some cases, these epithets are supplemented by one or more relative clauses that give information that could be considered appropriate to a hymn (e.g., because they define the divinity's genealogy, domain, powers, etc.).

Item “d” in this list is especially decisive for identifying the phenomenon in question. Piled-up Honorifics are characteristic of divine Invocations in character-speech,⁸⁵ but for all the Apollonian narrator's piety, such epithets (to say nothing of Hymnic Relative clauses) are otherwise atypical of his style, as I demonstrate in detail in Appendix II. A comparison with the HE narrator is once again illuminating here. When Chryses prays to Apollo at the beginning of the *Iliad*, the narrator introduces his prayer in a way that almost exactly corresponds to the schema just outlined: “[T]he old man prayed earnestly to the lord Apollo, whom fair-haired Leto

⁸³ This example is interesting because ἄζόμενος does not imply speech on Euphemus' part but rather his internal attitude of reverence toward Hermes, god of dreams.

⁸⁴ *N.b.* that in two cases, the name of the divinity (item “c”) is actually omitted; instead, the Honorific epithets (item “d”) serve to identify the deity periphrastically (1.859, 2.163).

⁸⁵ See n. 68 above.

bore” (πολλὰ δ’ ... ἠρᾶθ’ ὁ γεραιὸς | Ἀπόλλωνι ἄνακτι, τὸν ἠύκομος τέκε Λητώ, *Il.* 1.35–36).

Quoted out-of-context, these lines look like an example of narratized prayer (ἠρᾶθ’) with a god as the (in this case, indirect) object; Apollo is dignified by the Honorific title ἄναξ and even a genealogical relative clause. As with Orpheus at *Arg.* 1.569–572, we could imagine that these Honorifics would have been appropriate to the address that Chryses “really” made to Apollo on this occasion. But if we keep reading, we find Chryses’ actual prayer quoted beginning in the very next line: “Hear me, you of the silver bow, who...” (κλῦθί μεν, ἀργυρότοξ’, ὄς...). It turns out that lines 35–36 had really served to introduce direct speech, which gives us Chryses’ actual words; there is thus no sense that the Honorific epithet and relative clause in line 36 are somehow conveying the flavor of Chryses’ prayer. Rather, these Honorifics are unambiguously spoken by the narrator *in propria persona*, and in fact, such *amplitudo* is a regular feature of the HE narrator’s style.⁸⁶

In Apollonius, by contrast, the situation is not so clear-cut. Scholars have interpreted the phenomenon of hymnic narratization in various ways, sometimes attributing primacy to the voice of the narrator, sometimes to that of the characters in question. Thus Hunter comments of passage #9, “The narrative imitates the piled epithets of an actual prayer,”⁸⁷ an assessment that seems to make the AR narrator “responsible” for these striking strings of Honorific epithets and relative clauses: he is mimicking the style of discourse in which his characters are engaged. This interpretation recalls Albis’ notion of the AR narrator’s “empathy” for his characters: the narrator often manipulates the style of his narration in order to mirror the experiences or emotions of his characters, thus effecting an “assimilation of poet and character that is ubiquitous

⁸⁶ See, e.g., Hoekstra 1981: 51–53, 81–89; and Vivante 1982: *passim*.

⁸⁷ Hunter 1989 ad *Arg.* 3.862.

in the *Argonautica* and is one of the poet’s essential narrative devices.”⁸⁸ Albis himself interprets hymnic narratization as an instance of poetic ἐνθουσιασμός: “Apollonius’ narrative persona is possessed, as it were, by his character. By not separating [the character’s] speech into a direct quote, Apollonius creates the impression that he has lost some of his own identity and has become ἔκφρων.”⁸⁹ To use a term coined earlier in this chapter, this interpretation would classify hymnic narratization as a type of contagious hymnody—as in the two apostrophes examined above (4. 1196–1200, 1701–1710), the characters’ action of invoking a god triggers a hymnic reaction on the part of our pious narrator.⁹⁰

Another interpretation is also possible, however, and elsewhere Hunter himself describes the narrator’s technique as a “mingling of direct and indirect speech in the narrative of invocations,” which creates the impression that “what [the character] ‘actually said’” has been “transposed into narrative.”⁹¹ According to this interpretation, the Honorific epithets ultimately descend from the words that the characters themselves “really” used. Indeed, several scholars have taken this interpretation of these passages for granted. For example, Dickie summarizes passage #11: “Before Medea bewitches Talos she supplicates the Keres, invoking them thrice in incantation and prayer and appealing to them as the swift dogs of Hades...”⁹² Strictly speaking,

⁸⁸ Albis 1996: 95. See further Morrison 2007: 306–311, with additional references.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.* 35.

⁹⁰ For Fränkel 1968: 575 n. 259, these two types of passages (i.e., what I call hymnic narratization and the two apostrophes featuring contagious hymnody) are in some senses opposite: in the former, the narrator seems to adopt the words of the character and maintains Er-Stil; in the latter, he participates in their praise of the god by adding his own voice in Du-Stil. Nevertheless, Fränkel recognizes that the effect of both techniques is similar (“mit einem ähnlichen Ergebnis”).

⁹¹ Quotations from Hunter 2015 ad *Arg.* 4.1666 and ad 4.146–148, respectively; see also Vian 2002: 3.152 ad *Arg.* 4.148.

⁹² Dickie 1990: 269; see further *ibid.* 270 with n. 20 and Paduano 1971: 52.

But as it was coiling, the girl rushed to look it in the eye, and in a sweet voice called to her aid Sleep, highest of the gods, to enchant the monster, and invoked the queen of the underworld, the night-wanderer, to grant a favorable venture.

This passage is often classed with the examples of hymnic narratization that I have listed above,⁹⁴ with which it does share notable characteristics. As in those passages, in narrating a character’s calling upon a pair of deities, the narrator appends to each verb of Invocation (καλέουσα; αὔε) Honorific epithets (θεῶν ὕπατον;⁹⁵ ἄνασσαν | νυκτιπόλον, χθονίην) that are uncharacteristic of his ordinary style but appropriate to the Prayer being described. But the placement of an infinitive following these epithets (θέλξαι; δοῦναι) marks an important formal difference: these Honorifics turn out to be incorporated into indirect speech constructions.⁹⁶ We might also cite as evidence a passage like 1.409–412:

αὐτὰρ Ἴήσων

εὔχετο κεκλόμενος πατρώιον Ἀπόλλωνα· 410
 “κλῦθι ἄναξ, Παγασάς τε πόλιν τ’ Αἰσωνίδα ναίων,
 ἡμετέροιο τοκῆος ἐπώνυμον...

Jason called on Apollo of his fathers and prayed: “Hear me, lord, you who dwell in Pagasae and the Aesonian city named for my father...”

There are close correspondences between the narratization of Jason’s prayer in line 410 and the content of Jason’s actual prayer as quoted in the following lines: the narrator’s epithet πατρώιον

⁹⁴ E.g., Albis 1996: 34–35 with n. 51, Vian 2002: 3.152 ad *Arg.* 4.148, and Hunter 2015 ad *Arg.* 4.146–148.

⁹⁵ I understand ἄοσσητήρα, “helper,” not as an Honorific epithet for Sleep (who, I would think, is not usually or inherently a “helper”) but as part of the indirect command: Medea calls on Sleep “to be a helper and enchant the monster” (or “as a helper to enchant the monster,” *vel sim.*). In the words of de Jong 2004a: 119, I would term ἄοσσητήρα “a substantive used in predicative apposition and with a final nuance” (so also Harder 2012 ad *Call. Aet.* fr. 18.4). εὐαντέα, “favorable,” could be interpreted in the same way if it is taken with the preceding adjectives as an epithet for Hecate instead of with ἐφορμήν (see Hunter 2015 ad loc.). The construction is like that of 4.229–230 (Aeetes’ Invocation of Zeus and Helios in indirect speech), which contains no hymnic elaboration.

⁹⁶ I would interpret 3.1211 in the same way: Jason “invoked Hecate Brimo to be a helper in the contest” (Βριμῶ κικλήσκων Ἐκάτην ἐπαρωγὸν ἀέθλων [*sc.* εἶναι]).

is effectively glossed by Jason’s Invocation of Apollo in his epichoric aspect as lord of Aesonis, the city of which his father is the namesake. This early passage—the first prayer in the poem⁹⁷—almost programmatically suggests that when the AR narrator mentions a character’s speech act, his summaries cleave close to their actual words.

On the other hand, in certain of the examples of hymnic narratization listed above, there is a disjunction between the description of the character’s Invocation and the Honorifics that the narrator actually uses. For instance, in passage #9, Medea is said to call upon Hecate seven times (ἐπτὰκι, 3.861), and there follows the longest string of epithets in the poem (Βριμῶ κουροτρόφον ἀγκαλέσασα | Βριμῶ νυκτιπόλον, χθονίην, ἐνέροισιν ἄνασσαν, 861–862). Anaphora of Βριμῶ within this series not only enhances the passage’s “hymnic” atmosphere but gestures specifically toward the repetitious effect of calling on the goddess multiple times. Yet if we stop to count, Βριμῶ hardly occurs seven times in this series, and even adding up each of the epithets taken individually yields a total of only six (1. Βριμῶ; 2. κουροτρόφον; 3. Βριμῶ; 4. νυκτιπόλον; 5. χθονίην; 6. ἐνέροισιν ἄνασσαν)—one shy of Medea’s seven addresses. It would have presumably been easy to add one further entry to this list (“Hecate” comes to mind) and thus render the parallel between Medea’s sevenfold Invocation and the narration thereof more exact. But with this only-partial replication of Medea’s prayer, it is as though the narrator has deliberately tried to mark the distortion that his mediation has on our access to the events of the

⁹⁷ Apollonius underlines this fact by modeling Jason’s Invocation on the beginning of Chryses’ prayer to the same god near the opening of the *Iliad* (Hunter 1993: 84 n. 43): Chryses’ Invocation likewise begins with the imperative κλῦθι (*Il.* 1.37) and names multiple of Apollo’s local domains (37–38), including Chryse, of which Chryses himself is presumably the eponym (cf. Aesonis).

narrative.⁹⁸ In this subtle way, he makes us aware of *his own* hymnic voice, through which Medea’s Invocation is irrecoverably filtered.⁹⁹

Ultimately, we cannot and do not need to decide one way or the other whether hymnic narratization is best understood as a type of FID or as a type of contagious hymnody in which the narrator himself adopts the hymnic style of the the narratized Invocation—that is, whether the hymnic epithets and relative clauses reflect the “personal language situation” of the character invoking the deity or of the worshipful narrator caught up in praising the god.¹⁰⁰ In another poem, this device might read unambiguously as FID, but the AR narrator’s ἦθος as a pious singer of hymnic praise raises the possibility that it is his voice that we are hearing instead of or, perhaps, as well as, that of his character.¹⁰¹ This ambiguity is itself another type of metalepsis, which de Jong calls the “blending of narrative voices”: the voices of character and narrator cannot be distinguished.¹⁰²

⁹⁸ Likewise, *n.b.* the repetition of τρίς, “three times,” only twice at 4.1668–1669.

⁹⁹ At a more general level, Apollonius can be seen to reflect on a basic problem with “transposed discourse”: indirect speech, of which FID is a subspecies, purports to convey the gist of what a character “actually” said, but the exact degree of fidelity to the character’s *ipsissima verba* is always unknowable. As per Chatman 1978: 201, with this device, the narrator “may equally summarize, epitomize, interpret, or otherwise alter the exact words of the quoted speaker”; see further, e.g., Genette 1980: 171–172.

¹⁰⁰ Ovid may reflect on this ambiguity in his own imitation of hymnic narratization at *Met.* 4.11–17. This passage makes clear that the list of epithets for Bacchus are those by which the Theban bacchantes invoked the god (*pace* Syed 2004: 107): *n.b.* the phrases *additur his* [*sc. nominibus*] (13) and *cum Lenaeo* (14). But Ovid then transitions from listing the epithets employed by the bacchantes into a prominent example of contagious hymnody, as the narrator begins to hymn the god *in propria persona* (17–30). The Prayer of this hymn, however, is conceded to the bacchantes back at the level of character-text, as their Invocation is at last quoted in direct speech that is only introduced in line 31 (Führer 1999: 365); thus Ovid does effect a kind of blending of the voices of narrator and characters after all.

¹⁰¹ I say “as well as” because there is an intermediate possibility: the AR narrator’s piety could be taken to account for his decision to represent hymnic character-speech via FID with such frequency.

¹⁰² de Jong 2009: 99–106. In contagious hymnody, by contrast, the narrator unambiguously joins in his own voice in the hymnic praise of his characters.

As a confirmation of this interpretation, we can compare the similar indeterminacy produced when hymnic narratization occurs in character-speech, as when Mopsus and Medea instruct Jason respectively to “propitiate the mother of all the blessed gods on her fine throne” (ἐύθρονον ἰλάξασθαι | μητέρα συμπάντων μακάρων, 1.1093–1094) and to “appease Hecate, the only child of Perses” (μουνογενῆ δ’ Ἑκάτην Περσηίδα μελίσσοιο, 3.1035). Are these characters using these hymnic Honorifics to suggest a sort of template that Jason could follow in his actual Invocation of these deities,¹⁰³ or is their own piety affecting their language? After all, Mopsus is a seer and one of the crew’s religious experts,¹⁰⁴ while Medea is Hecate’s own priestess.¹⁰⁵ In the case of the AR narrator, too, the ambiguity produced by Apollonius’ technique of hymnic narratization is an effect of character—to be specific, an effect only made possible by the hymnic texture of the AR narrator’s multifaceted voice.

I would like to conclude this discussion by cautiously suggesting a passage in the *HHs* that Apollonius might have taken as a model for the technique of hymnic narratization. It occurs near the beginning of the *Hymn to Pan* (19.1–7):

Ἀμφί μοι Ἑρμείαιο φίλον γόνον ἔννεπε, Μοῦσα,
 αἰγοπόδην δικέρωτα φιλόκροτον, ὅς τ’ ἀνά πίση
 δενδρήεντ’ ἄμυδις φοιτᾷ χορο<γ>ηθέσι νύμφαις,
 αἶ τε κατ’ αἰγίλιπος πέτρης στείβουσι κάρηνα
 Πᾶν’ ἀνακεκλόμεναι, νόμιον θεὸν ἀγλαέθειρον

5

¹⁰³ In both cases, Jason’s actual Invocation is only paraphrased in indirect speech (1.1132–1133, 3.1211).

¹⁰⁴ In addition to the quoted passage, see *Arg.* 2.922–923; 3.543–554, 938–947. Later in the quoted passage, Mopsus in fact goes on to pronounce upon Cybele’s power in a sort of miniature hymn to the goddess (1.1098–1102).

¹⁰⁵ There is perhaps a similar ambiguity in Eur. *Bacch.* 723–726, which Fränkel 1968 ad *Arg.* 3.861f. has aptly compared to Apollonius’ device of hymnic narratization. The context is a messenger’s speech about the activities of the bacchantes: “They, at the appointed hour, began to wave the thyrsus in their revelries, calling on Iacchus, the son of Zeus, Bromius, with united voice” (αἶ δὲ τὴν τεταγμένην | ὄραν ἐκίνουν θύρσον ἐς βακχεύματα, | Ἰακχον ἀθρόω στόματι τὸν Διὸς γόνον | Βρόμιον καλοῦσαι). Most likely the Honorifics included here represent FID, which adds some of the flavor of the Bacchic rites to the narrative, but as the messenger does evince sympathies for the Dionysiac cult (711–712, 764, 769–774), his decision to include these Honorifics could be affected by his own attitude to the god.

αὐχμήενθ', ὃς πάντα λόφον νιφόεντα λέλογγεν
καὶ κορυφὰς ὄρέων καὶ πετρήεντα κέλευθα.

About Hermes' dear child tell me, Muse, the goat-footed, two-horned, rowdy, who roams about the wooded fields together with the dance-merry nymphs: along the precipitous crag they tread the summits, calling on Pan, god of the pastures with splendor of rough hair, who has been assigned every snowy hill, the mountain peaks, and the rocky tracks.

The first two lines offer a more or less typical Exordium: Pan is introduced as the Hymnic Subject under the periphrasis “Hermes' dear child” and is dignified by a series of three Honorific epithets (αἰγοπόδην, δικέρωτα, φιλόκροτον, 2); a Hymnic Relative pronoun then opens out into an Attributive Section detailing Pan's typical haunts and activities (2–3). But shortly after Pan's Evocation in line 1, we get a description of how Pan's attendant nymphs regularly invoke him in the wilderness. The verb used to denote their Evocation (or Invocation), ἀνακεκλόμεναι (5), is cognate to some of those that Apollonius himself uses to introduce hymnic narratization (ἀγκαλέοντες, *Arg.* 1.1125; ἀγκαλέσασα, 3.861; ἀγκαλέουσα, 4.708; κεκλόμενοι, 4.1717). Its direct object, the theonym “Pan,” is once again dignified by three Honorific epithets (νόμιον θεόν, ἀγλαέθειρον, αὐχμήενθ', *HH* 19.5–6) before another Hymnic Relative clause delineates Pan's domains (6–7), again in the manner of the Attributive Section of a hymn.

Ordinarily, I would hesitate to read too much into a string of epithets or even a relative clause like those in lines 5–6, for as we saw with the Chryses example above, these are typical features of the style of Homeric narrative. They are doubly appropriate within a hymn, and we have just seen the hymnist praise Pan in precisely this way in lines 1–3. But given that the narrator later transposes a full-scale hymn to Pan sung by these same nymphs in a way that

strikingly blends together their voices with the hymnist's own,¹⁰⁶ it is tempting to view the Honorific epithets and the relative clause in lines 5–7 as mediating the hymn that the nymphs are actually supposed to sing to the pastoral god, in the manner of FID. In fact, we can take this interpretation further. The Exordial gestures of the hymn are repeated so precisely and in such close proximity to the hymn's actual Exordium, it is as though at the nymphs' Evocation, the hymn recommences. Thus from line 6 onward, the voice of the speaker and the nymphs merge: the timeless hymn of the nymphs unites with the particular hymn of the speaker. This effect, which we might call "metaleptic fade-in,"¹⁰⁷ is not quite like anything in Apollonius, but this experiment with different voices and levels of narration in narratizing hymnic speech remains a suggestive precursor for Apollonius' technique.

IV. Orpheus' Hymn to Apollo: The Thynias Episode (*Arg.* 2.669–719)

The description of the Argonauts' worship of Apollo following his epiphany at the island of Thynias represents one of the most complex passages in the poem from a narratological point of view. I have saved analysis of this episode for last because it so beautifully brings together most of the narratorial traits and techniques that have been under consideration in Part II of this study: the narrator's overtness and piety, his drive to etiology, and such devices as contagious hymnody, hymnic narratization, and allusion to other hymns, both Homeric and Callimachean. Scholarship has especially focused on Orpheus' hymn to Apollo (*Arg.* 2.701–716), but I believe that Apollonius' experiments with voice in representing this hymn can only be properly

¹⁰⁶ See the discussion of the passage labeled #5 in Section I of this chapter, which is analyzed further on pp. 297–298 below.

¹⁰⁷ See the discussion of metaleptic fade-out above, n. 13.

understood within the wider context of the entire episode, which is really a tour de force exploration of the various methods at a Greek poet's disposal for representing character-speech in narrative. After a brief summary of the episode and a lengthier consideration of the passage's hymnic intertext, I present a survey of each of the speech acts therein, which culminates with an analysis of Orpheus' famous hymn.

a. Summary of the Episode

Our episode follows the Argonauts' arduous navigation of the Clashing Rocks (2.533–606), Jason's *πειρα* of his crew's morale (607–648), and virtually a full day and night's worth of rowing (649–668). In the twilight hour before dawn, the exhausted sailors row into the harbor of the desert island of Thynias (2.669–673).¹⁰⁸ Upon disembarking, the crew catches sight of Apollo as he makes one of his regular trips from Lycia to the land of the Hyperboreans (674–676); the verb *ἐξεφάνη* (“[he] appeared,” 676) virtually glosses the ensuing scene as an epiphany (cf. *φαάνθη*, 687; *φαιανθείς*, 693). There follows a description of the god partly focalized by the Argonauts, partly by the narrator, for the mortal onlookers quickly avert their gaze to the ground until Apollo has departed (676–684).¹⁰⁹ After some time, Orpheus—here as often playing the role of the crew's religious guide¹¹⁰—breaks the silence and bids the men raise an altar on the

¹⁰⁸ As Hunter 1986: 50 n. 2 notes, the episode is demarcated by symmetrical time-notices (669: *ἤμους δ' οὐτ' ἄρ πο φάος ἄμβροτον*; 720: *ἤμους δὲ τρίτατον φάος ἦλυθε*). The first (669–671) is especially significant because Apollo's appearance at *dawn* is key to the etiology for his new cult.

¹⁰⁹ E.g., “No one dared to look directly into the beautiful eyes of the god” (*οὐδέ τις ἔτλη | ἀντίον ἀγάσασσθαι ἐς ὄμματα καλὰ θεοῖο*, 681–682) betrays the perspective of the narrator rather than the characters, who are explicitly not looking into the god's eyes. For the description of Apollo here, see, e.g., Páskiewicz 1981: 157; Hunter 1986: 51, 52; and Green 2007 ad *Arg.* 2.678–680.

¹¹⁰ For Orpheus' religious functions in the poem, see, e.g., Busch 1993, Scherer 2006: 117–124, Karanika 2010. The *Argonautica* does not, in fact, make Orpheus “Apollo's son” (*pace* Páskiewicz 1981 ad *Arg.* 685ff.; see *Arg.* 1.23–25, and, in our passage, 2.703), but there is a special appropriateness nevertheless to Orpheus' leading the rites here,

shore and sacrifice to Apollo under the title Heoïus (Ἠώϊος, “of the Dawn”) because of his epiphany to them at daybreak (684–693).

The Argonauts execute Orpheus’ commands, constructing an altar (694–695), hunting quarry (providentially provided by Apollo) for the sacrifice (695–697), and finally burning the thigh-pieces while invoking the god under his new title (698–700). During the offering, the Argonauts form a chorus around the altar and begin chanting the paean (701–703).¹¹¹ Orpheus then takes up his lyre and sings a hymn on the subject of Apollo’s conquest of the Delphic serpent (703–714), which I quote in full:

σὺν δέ σφιν ἐὺς πάϊς Οἰάγροιο
 Βιστονίη φόρμιγγι λιγείης ἤρχεν ἀοιδῆς·
 ὥς ποτε πετραίη ὑπὸ δειράδι Παρνησσοῖο
 Δελφύνην τόξοισι πελώριον ἐξενάριξεν,
 κοῦρος ἐὼν ἔτι γυμνός, ἔτι πλοκάμοισι γεγηθώς—
 ἰλήκοις· αἰεὶ τοι, ἄναξ, ἄτμητοι ἔθειραι,
 αἰὲν ἀδήλητοι· τὼς γὰρ θέμις· οἴοθι δ’ αὐτῇ
 Λητὼ Κοιογένεια φίλαις ἐνὶ χερσὶν ἀφάσσει—
 πολλὰ δὲ Κωρύκλαι νύμφαι, Πλειστοῖο θύγατραι
 θαρσύνεσκον ἔπεσσιν, ἰὴ ἰὲ κεκληγυῖαι·
 ἔνθεν δὴ τόδε καλὸν ἐφύμνιον ἔπλετο Φοῖβω.
 αὐτὰρ ἐπειδὴ τὸν γε χορεΐη μέλψαν ἀοιδῆ...

And among them the noble son of Oeagrus led off a clear song on his Bistonian lyre, telling how once upon a time beneath Parnassus’ rocky ridge the god killed monstrous Delphyne(s) with his arrows, when he was still a naked boy, still delighting in his long locks— be gracious! Ever unshorn, lord, is your hair, ever unharmed, for such is right; and only Leto herself, Coeus’ daughter, strokes it with her dear hands—and often did the Corycian nymphs, the daughters of Pleistus, encourage him with their words, as they shouted *iê ie*. From there arose this beautiful

given the alternate genealogy that does assign him Apolline paternity (see, e.g., Bömer 1980 ad Ov. *Met.* 10.89) and given other myths that make him a zealous devotee of Helios-Apollo (see Hunter 1986: 53).

¹¹¹ We should imagine that the Argonauts keep intoning the paean chant as Orpheus sings, per Miller 2014: 448; *n.b.* the plural verb and the reference to “choral song” in the capping formula at line 714 (χορεΐη μέλψαν ἀοιδῆ).

refrain for Phoebus. But when they had celebrated him with their choral song...¹¹²

As the train of thought in this passage can be difficult to follow, I here present a brief analysis of just these lines.¹¹³ Nine lines are devoted to Orpheus' hymn, and these are easily divisible into three subsections. In the first section (705–707), Orpheus' narrative is related in indirect speech, introduced by ὥς in line 705; the indefinite temporal adverb ποτε marks what follows as an external analepsis. But then ἰλήκοις at the head of line 708 signals a jarring transition into a second-person mode of address.¹¹⁴ The eulogistic intent of line 707 had been to emphasize Apollo's youthfulness when he vanquished the dragon, for as in the myth of baby Heracles strangling the snakes, the juvenile vanquishing of a monster testifies all the more powerfully to the god's impressive power.¹¹⁵ As signs of Apollo's youth, line 707 points to his nakedness¹¹⁶ and to the fact that he was “still delighting in his long locks,” πλόκαμοι being a symbol of youth because of the function of hair-cutting as a rite of passage for Greek boys. The adverb ἔτι, however, betrays an unduly mortal perspective on the god's aging: to say that Apollo was “still” rejoicing in

¹¹² I have adapted Race's text and translation in several ways. First, I have placed parentheses around the 's' in the serpent's name, Delphyne(s) (706), for reasons that will become clear below. Second, I have reinterpreted αἰεὶ—ἀδήλητοι in lines 708–709 as a statement rather than a wish, as Race translates (“be gracious, lord, may your hair always remain unshorn, always unharmed”), though Race's interpretation finds support from a parallel with Tib. 2.5.121–122. Finally, I print the paeon formula ἦ ἰέ in line 712 rather than Race's Ἰήιε, which looks like the vocative form of Apollo's epithet Ἰήιος (hence Seaton's translation: “And often the Corycian nymphs, daughters of Pleistus, took up the cheering strain crying ‘Healer’”; see also *Etym. Magn.* s.v. Ἰήιε). For the emendation ἦ ἰέ, with rough breathing marks, see the discussion of etymological wordplay below.

¹¹³ On this passage's train of thought, see, e.g., Fränkel 1968 ad loc. and Hunter 1986: 56–57.

¹¹⁴ For ἰλήκοις as an allusion to *HH* 3.165, see Chapter 1, Section II.c.

¹¹⁵ The same motif occurs in one of Apollonius' likely models, Eur. *IT* 1250–1251 (ἔτι νιν ἔτι βρέφος, ἔτι φύλας | ἐπιματέρος ἀγκάλαισι θρόσκων); elsewhere, Apollonius also has Apollo shoot the giant Tityus “as a mighty youth, not yet fully grown” (βούπαις, οὐ πω πολλός, *Arg.* 1.760).

¹¹⁶ For a survey of interpretation of γυμνός, see Hunter 1986: 56–57. I agree with Hunter's own view that the adjective envisions Apollo as still a naked babe-in-arms when he slays the Python, as in other versions of the myth, but that the ambiguous use of the word κοῦρος in this line alludes to an alternate version in which Apollo is an ephebe at the time of the Pythonomachy.

his long locks implies that he would one day cut them, whereas Apollo is an eternal ephebe who will never come of age.¹¹⁷ ἰλήκοις in the next line is intended to beg the god's pardon for this insinuation, and what follows are reassurances that Apollo's hair is never cut—indeed, only his mother can stroke his hair, let alone cut it.¹¹⁸ This brief digression on Apollo's hair constitutes the second subsection (708–710). The third subsection (711–713) returns us to the Pythonomachy narrative, which concludes, as often in the *Arg.*, on an etiological note. Line 714 offers a capping formula that formally marks the end of the Argonauts' choral song, including Orpheus' hymn.

The episode concludes with the establishment of a second new cult on the island. Following the song, the crew swears an oath over libations to maintain perpetual concord among themselves (715–717). The narrator then tells us that the Argonauts had built a second altar to Concord (Ὁμονοία) “at that time” (τότε, 719), though where precisely this incident fits into the sequence of events just outlined is left hazy.¹¹⁹ Possibly the shrine to Concord is built on the Argonauts' second day on Thynias, because the very next lines indicate that they leave at dawn on their third day there (720–721), thus bringing the episode to a close.

b. Allusions to Apolline Hymns

This episode includes a hymn to Apollo and the inauguration of two cults, but its hymnic tone is enhanced even further by a persistent program of allusion to other hymns dedicated to Apollo, particularly those of Homer (*HH* 3) and Callimachus (*Hymn* 2). We may begin by

¹¹⁷ For Apollo's eternal youth and unshorn hair, see Williams 1978 ad Call. *Hymn* 2.36, 38. Matteo 2007 ad loc. sees an Apollonian allusion to these Callimachean lines.

¹¹⁸ The “Leto alone” motif is reminiscent of *HH* 3.5.

¹¹⁹ For connections between Apollo and Concord that may be relevant to their juxtaposition in this episode, see Hunter 1986: 53–54.

observing the overall shaping of this episode’s plot. At a general level, I would note that the instinct to erect an altar after witnessing a god’s epiphany is alien to the HEs.¹²⁰ The *Iliad* and *Odyssey* tend to describe epiphanies with certain conventional elements, some of which are reproduced here, such as reactions in the natural world (*Arg.* 2.679–680)¹²¹ or the stupefied wonder produced in the mortal onlookers (681).¹²² They typically feature minimal ephrastic detail, however, and are deployed to serve concrete plot functions, such as encouraging a mortal character to take or refrain from some course of action (e.g., *Il.* 1.193–222, *Od.* 1.96–324).¹²³ The narrative pattern in the Thynias episode is much more characteristic of the *HHs*, in which epiphanies tend to be prominent, spectacular, and etiological in nature, often eventuating in the foundation of a new cult.¹²⁴ Thus, for instance, the passage describing Demeter’s epiphany to Queen Metaneira is filled with sensuous detail, prophesies the establishment of Demophon’s hero cult, and includes a command to the Eleusinians to establish a temple in the goddess’s honor (*HH* 2.256–280).¹²⁵

¹²⁰ Notably, the epiphany of Apollo may represent Apollonius’ innovation on the version of the foundation of this cult given by Herodorus 31 *FGrH* 48 *ap. Σ* ad *Arg.* 2.684–687 (*pace* Blakeley in *BNJ* ad loc., who misconstrues *προσαγορεύεσθαι* in the scholium as if deponent; see, e.g., Páskiewicz 1981: 157, Lachenaud 2010: 289 n. 210).

¹²¹ Páskiewicz 1981 ad *Arg.* 2.680, who compares the action of the waves to the sea’s reaction to Apollo’s birth at *HH* 3.27–28.

¹²² See Páskiewicz 1981: 157. For the conventions of HE epiphanies, many of which recur in the *HHs*, see further Pfister in *RE* Suppl. 4 s.v. “Epiphanie,” pp. 282–283, and Richardson 1974 ad *HH* 2.188–190. For the Argonauts’ averting their gaze, Páskiewicz (*loc. cit.*) aptly compares *HH* 5.181–182 (where *n.b.* ὄμματα καλ’, 181*).

¹²³ See de Jong 2018: 71, with earlier bibliography; for the difference with Apollonius here, see Páskiewicz 1981: 157–158 and Paduano and Fusillo 1986 ad *Arg.* 2.669–684.

¹²⁴ On epiphanies in the *HHs*, see, e.g., Pfister in *RE* Suppl. 4 s.v. “Epiphanie,” pp. 288–290; Lenz 1975: 19–20; Sowa 1984: ch. 9; Parker 1991: 2; Platt 2011: 60–76; and de Jong 2018: 71–77.

¹²⁵ See further Rives 2018: 73, who notes Anchises’ initial desire to erect an altar to the disguised Aphrodite when he suspects that she might be a goddess (*HH* 5.100–102). It has been thought that these lines provide the etiology for an otherwise unattested cult of Aphrodite on Ida, but the hymn does not suggest that Anchises actually builds the altar (Clay 2006: 174 n. 73).

But the sequence of events in Apollonius is especially comparable to that at *HH* 3.388–544, a passage that explains how Apollo, having rid the land of the Python, recruits a priesthood for his newbuilt Delphic temple from a group of Cretan merchants sailing to Pylos.¹²⁶ The form that Apollo’s epiphany takes in the *Hymn* is quite different from that in Apollonius: the god jumps aboard the Cretan ship in the form of a dolphin and miraculously redirects their course to Crisa. From there, however, we begin to see some notable parallels. The Cretan sailors, exhausted from their journey (460), disembark and on the god’s orders raise their own seaside altar to Apollo (490, 505). Standing around the altar (492, 510), they pray to the god under his new cult title Delphinus (Δελφίνιος, “of the Dolphin”), in recognition of the nature of the epiphany that they had witnessed (493–496). After feasting and pouring libations to the Olympians (497–499, 511–513), the priests process to Delphi chanting the paeon (500, 517), led by Apollo himself as he plays the lyre (514–517). Finally, after showing them the temple, Apollo reassures his new priests that life will be easy for them there, but he warns them against hubristic behavior (524–544). These structural parallels are enhanced by several verbal parallels that further connect these passages, including the use of the term Ἰηπαιήων to designate the paeon that the Cretan sailors (500, 517) and Argonauts (*Arg.* 2.702) chant.¹²⁷ With the exception of the *Arg.* and its scholia, this word occurs nowhere else in extant Greek literature.¹²⁸ Finally,

¹²⁶ This resemblance is noted by Hunter 1986: 56.

¹²⁷ Adduced by, e.g., Matteo 2007 ad loc. Oddly, a few scholars note the parallel with *HH* 3.272 (where Apollo is denoted by the epithet Ἰηπαιήων), but not the much stronger parallel with lines 500, 517: Mooney 1912 ad loc., Hunter 1986: 56, and Vian 2002: 1.276 ad *Arg.* 2.703.

¹²⁸ Ἰηπαιήων also occurs as an epithet for Apollo earlier in the hymn (272). At *Arg.* 2.702, Apollonius will have had his eye on *Il.* 1.472–474 as well; see also *Il.* 18.569–570. Another verbal echo concerns the lyre-playing of Apollo (ἦρχε δ’ ἄρα σφιν ἄναξ Διὸς υἱὸς Ἀπόλλων | φόρμυγγ’ ἐν χεῖρεσσιν ἔχων, ἐρατὸν καθαρίζων, *HH* 3.514–515) and Orpheus (σὺν δέ σφιν ἐὺς πάϊς Οἰάγροιο | Βιστονίη φόρμυγγι λυγείης ἦρχεν ἀοιδῆς, *Arg.* 2.703–704). *Arg.* 2.726, slightly after the Thynias episode, echoes *HH* 3.403. Elsewhere Apollonius reworks other elements of the *Apollo* passage: the Argonauts’ shoreside sacrifices at Thynia to the twelve gods (*Arg.* 2.531–532) echoes *HH* 3.490, 508; and the description of Triton’s human form at *Arg.* 4.1551–1552 resembles that of Apollo’s similar disguise at Crisa

we should note that Orpheus' hymn treats the preliminary events of this very episode from the *HH*, namely, Apollo's conquest of the Delphic serpent (*HH* 3.300–374). Together, these evocations of the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* suggest that the establishment of a new cult to Apollo Heoïus by Orpheus and the Argonauts is the newest in a series of cultic foundations inaugurated by Apollo himself and his crew of Cretan sailors at Delphi.¹²⁹

Orpheus' hymn is a particular hotbed of Apolline allusivity, and we may begin the analysis by considering the name that Apollonius chooses for the beast. Just by calling this serpent Delphyne(s) (706), Apollonius enters into a number of ancient debates over various mythological ζητήματα that intersect with the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* and the Callimachean corpus in some fascinating ways. In the *HHs*, the dragon is unnamed; our first evidence for the name Delphyne(s) comes from a fragment of Callimachus and the third-century historian Meandrius.¹³⁰ Apollonius' choice of this rare name in favor of the commoner "Python" (Πύθων)¹³¹ probably represents the influence of Callimachus,¹³² but in one respect Apollonius

(*HH* 3.449). *N.b.* also that Phineus' thanksgiving to Apollo at *Arg.* 2.213–214 echoes the hymn's Salutation (*HH* 3.545), just after our passage. Most of these parallels are noted by Campbell 1981.

¹²⁹ *N.b.* further Orpheus' promise of future sacrifice to Apollo if he grants the crew a safe return to Greece (689–691). This vow links the present sacrifices to Jason's similar promises at 1.415–419 and 4.1704–1705 (Páskiewicz 1981: 161), where Apollo's principal cult sites are specified. In effect, the new Argonautic cults of Apollo Actius, Heoïus, and Aegletes take their place alongside the god's established cults at Pytho, Amyclae, and Ortygia; see further McPhee 2017: 119. For the connections between the Thynias and Anaphe episodes, see Hunter 1986: 50, with earlier references.

¹³⁰ Call. *Aet.* fr. 88 Pfeiffer, Meandrius 492 *FGrH* 14a. Variants on this name, including Δελφίνη(ς) and Δελφίν, occur in some scholia (Σ ad Eur. *Phoen.* 232, 233; Tzetz. ad Lycoph. *Alex.* 207; paraphrase of Dion. Per. 437–446.10); Δελφύς (fem.) occurs in *Etym. Gud.* s.v. Ἐκατηβελέτης. Tzetzis actually cites Apollonius' line (2.706) with the reading Δελφίνην (PQ) or the unmetrical Δελφίνα (H).

¹³¹ Simon. fr. 573 Campbell may have used this name (Fontenrose 1959: 15), but its first sure occurrences hail from the fourth century: Arist. fr. 637.16 Rose; Ephorus 70 *FGrH* 31a, b; Theopomp. 115 *FGrH* 80.31; Xenocrates fr. 225.14 Parenti. The name Python seems invariably masculine.

¹³² So, e.g., Harder 2012 ad Call. *Aet.* fr. 88, though *n.b.* that Harder is mistaken in thinking that Apollonius unambiguously embraces the feminine variant of the name.

parts company with his reputed mentor. Ancient authorities differed as to the serpent’s sex, as evidently did Meandrius and Callimachus. The scholium that reports their opinions (Σ ad *Arg.* 2.705–711b) is less than lucid, but it definitely asserts that Meandrius endorsed the masculine tradition and thus called the snake Δελφύνης,¹³³ whereas Callimachus, preferring a dragoness, called her Δέλφονα (or perhaps Δελφύνη) on some unknown occasion,¹³⁴ though he may sometimes have conjured a male dragon in other works.¹³⁵ If Callimachus was “correcting” his prose source, he may have done so with the benefit of Homeric authority, as the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* (our earliest account of the myth) makes its dragon unambiguously female.¹³⁶ But for his part, “Apollonius himself found a suitably playful way to remain learnedly agnostic,” namely, by casting the serpent’s name in the accusative case (Δελφύνην) and modifying it with the carefully-chosen adjective πελώριος.¹³⁷ The accusative forms of a masculine Delphynes and a feminine Delphyne would both be Δελφύνην,¹³⁸ and the adjective πελώριος, since it can be treated as two-

¹³³ Σ ad *Arg.* 2.705–711g, however, claims that Meandrius’ serpent was female. Wendel 1935 ad loc., however, seems correct in his assumption that this scholium is based on a misreading of Σ ad loc. b.

¹³⁴ Δέλφονα, with short alpha, occurs only in the Apollonius scholia. The feminine form Δελφύνη, with eta, occurs in the P scholium ad loc. (see Schafer 1813) as well as [Apollod.] *Bib.* 1.6.3, Dionys. Per. 442 (and Eust. ad loc.), John of Antioch fr. 21 Roberto (referring to a Delphic heroine), Tzetz. ad Ar. *Plut.* 213.7, and in various lexicographers.

¹³⁵ For different understandings of the scholium, see Harder 2012 ad Call. *Aet.* 4. fr. 88, who also offers many citations of the male and female variants of the myth. Fontenrose 1959: 14 n. 4, who offers further citations, argues that masculine adjectives and pronouns at Call. *Hymn* 2.100–101, 4.91 show that in these passages, at least, Callimachus considers the serpent male, but these may owe rather to the poet’s use of the generic masculine noun ὄφις to denote the serpent (see Sancassano 1996: 49–50, 63); *n.b.* that at 4.91–92, he uses the neuter, in agreement with θηρίον. Cf. *Dieg.* 2.24–25 (printed under *Aet.* 4 fr. 86 Pfeiffer) = fr. 89a.15–16 Harder, which uses the masculine term δράκων of the snake. It is possible that here we have a generic use of the masculine term to denote any member of the species; see, e.g., Dionys. Per. 441–442 (δράκοντος | Δελφύνης), Nicephorus Blemmydes *Conspectus geographiae* p. 461 col. 2 line 43 Müller (τῆς Δελφύνης τοῦ δράκοντος).

¹³⁶ As Ogden 2013: 42 notes, the *Apollo* hymnist identifies the dragon as a δράκαινα (3.300) and even casts it as the nurse of Typhoeus (305–306).

¹³⁷ See Fontenrose 1959: 14–15 n. 4 and Ogden 2013: 42 (whence the quotation).

¹³⁸ See Σ ad *Arg.* 2.705–711a (where a preference for a female dragon is declared).

termination,¹³⁹ does not shed any light on the matter. Possibly by cultivating this ambiguity Apollonius means to point up the contradiction between Callimachus and his source. In any event, this manner of foregrounding a mythological dilemma while reserving any judgment of his own is completely characteristic of Apollonian allusivity and of his “poetics of uncertainty.”¹⁴⁰

The choice of the name Delphyne(s) in line 706 has a further dimension beyond the sex of the serpent: it strongly implies a derivation of the toponym Delphi (Δελφοί) from the name of the slain beast.¹⁴¹ Since the description of the site of the future Delphi in line 705 borrows directly from the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*,¹⁴² Apollonius can be seen pointedly to distance himself from the etymology from δελφίς, “dolphin,” endorsed by his own model in the *HH*. Elsewhere, however, Apollonius plays with another etymology in the *Hymn* that involves the Delphic dragon. The hymnist derives Apollo’s title Πύθιος and Delphi’s poetic toponym Πυθώ from the fact that there the dragon’s corpse “rotted” (πύθειν, 3.363; πύσει, 369; κατέπυσ’, 371; πῦσε, 374). Apollonius mentions no rotting here, but he does affirm this tradition indirectly by transferring the motif to another dragon: at *Arg.* 4.1405, we hear of the “festering wounds” (πυθομένοισιν ...

¹³⁹ E.g., Hes. *Theog.* 179 (πελώριον ... ἄρπην). Vian 2002: 1.276 ad *Arg.* 2.706 thinks Apollonius must have a male dragon in mind, because elsewhere he uses the unique feminine form πελωρίη at 4.1682 (see also Quint. Smryn. 5.112), which would imply that he considers πελώριος three-termination; thus πελώριον at 2.706 is masculine. But Apollonius’ penchant for using the same word in different ways in different places is well-known; see also Matteo 2007 ad loc. As Matteo and others have noted (e.g., Hunter 1986: 59 n. 48), πελώριον may recall the serpent’s label πέλωρ at *HH* 3.374.

¹⁴⁰ To quote the subtitle of Byre 2002, who treats some much more significant examples of this phenomenon in Apollonius, like the future of Jason and Medea’s relationship.

¹⁴¹ Hunter 1986: 56 and Klooster 2007: 69 n. 24. This etymology is explicit in, e.g., Σ ad Eur. *Phoen.* 232, Tzetz. ad Lycoph. *Alex.* 207, Suda s.v. Δελφοί.

¹⁴² ὑπὸ δειράδι Παρνησοῖο (*Arg.* 2.705) adapts δειράδα ... ὑπὸ Παρνησόν (*HH* 3.281–282); *n.b.* that δειράς is a *hapax* in all the Homeric poems (Páskiewicz 1981 and Matteo 2007 ad loc.). The other model adduced by Matteo, Eur. *Phoen.* 206–207 (ὑπὸ δειράσι ... Παρνασοῦ), is closer to Apollonius’ expression verbally but less apropos contextually.

ἔλκεσι) of Ladon, the erstwhile guardian of the golden apples of the Hesperides, piteously slain by Heracles the day before the Argonauts’ own arrival at this Libyan oasis.¹⁴³ And yet earlier in Book 4, Apollonius points to an alternate derivation of Pytho from πυνθάνομαι (“learn by inquiry”) via *figura etymologica*: Jason “went to holy Pytho to inquire” about his mission from the oracular god (Πυθῶ | ἰρὴν πενθόμενος, *Arg.* 4.530–531).¹⁴⁴ Apollonius thus engages in a series of etymological wordplays that apparently respond to the etymologizing found in the Python episode of the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*.¹⁴⁵

A final piece of potential etymologizing relates to Callimachus’ treatment of the same episode in his own *Hymn to Apollo* (97–104).¹⁴⁶ Callimachus also offers an etymology for the paen-cry, which he traces to the Delphian population’s shout of encouragement to Apollo, ἦ ἦ παιῖον, ἦ ἦ βέλος (“*Hië, Hië, Paeëon*, shoot an arrow!” 103)—that is, he interprets the cry as if from ἦ ἦ, παιῖ, ἰόν (“Shoot, boy, an arrow!”).¹⁴⁷ Similarly, perhaps, Apollonius has the Corycian nymphs¹⁴⁸

¹⁴³ The allusion is already noted by the scholiast ad loc.; see also Ogden 2013: 38. I am reminded of Campbell 1969: 281–282, who notes how Apollonius often “scatters the details given in the single Homeric passage over a wider stretch of the poem... spreading out details so as to make the borrowings less obtrusive” (281–282).

¹⁴⁴ A similar *figura etymologica* occurs in the same *sedes* in the oracle *ap.* Paus. 10.18.2. For these two etymologies, see, e.g., Eust. *Il.* 1.420.6–11 van der Valk, *Etym. Magn.* s.v. Πυθῶ.

¹⁴⁵ Alluding to an earlier text while offering competing etymologies is also a feature of Ovidian etymologizing; see O’Hara 1996: 268–273.

¹⁴⁶ For connections between these passages and other relevant Callimachean *loci*, see, e.g., Pfeiffer 1934: 11 n. 2, Páskiewicz 1981: 165, Vian 2002: 1.276 ad *Arg.* 2.703, and Matteo 2007 ad *Arg.* 2.702. Euphorion seems to have connected the two passages, imitating both Call. *Hymn* 2.98 and *Arg.* 2.702, 712 at fr. 116 Lightfoot (Páskiewicz 1981: 164). I have been noting other connections between our passage and other parts of Callimachus’ *Hymn to Apollo* in the footnotes as they become relevant, but here I will point specially to Williams 1978 ad Call. *Hymn* 2.97–104 (an intriguing suggestion about the metapoetic significance of Callimachus’ Python episode) and Matteo 2007 ad *Arg.* 2.687.

¹⁴⁷ This translation is from Race 2008: 169 n. 58. On this and other etymologies, see, e.g., Rutherford 2001: 25–27. Callimachus may have believed that the etymology was implicit in *HH* 3.357, describing Apollo’s shooting the serpent with the words ἰὸν ἐφῆκε.

¹⁴⁸ These nymphs occur in a different context at Call. *Aet.* fr. 75.56 Pfeiffer.

encourage Apollo in his archery (*n.b.* τόξοισι, 706) by shouting ἦ ἰέ (712), which gives rise to the famous refrain.¹⁴⁹ Fränkel would go so far as to emend the transmitted text to the aspirated ἦ ἰε to facilitate the allusion to this etymology,¹⁵⁰ though others have been less impressed by the connections between these passages.¹⁵¹ They have in common the rare term ἐφύμνιον in the same *sedes* (*Arg.* 2.713, *Call. Hymn* 2.98); this term also occurs in one of Callimachus’ likely sources for the paean etymology, Clearchus of Soli (fr. 64 Wehrli).¹⁵² Both poets emphasize Apollo’s youth and envision a drawn-out encounter, in contrast to the *HH*,¹⁵³ and each brings up Leto after describing the combat, though in different connections (*Arg.* 2.709–710, *Call. Hymn* 2.103–104). It is notable, too, that Apollonius refers to the relatively obscure Pleistus River at *Arg.* 2.711 using

¹⁴⁹ So already Σ ad loc. and Apollonius’ Late Republican translator, Varro of Atax, who adds the phrase *te ... tendentem spicula* (“you [Apollo] as you were shooting arrows,” my translation) to the Greek original in his adaptation of *Arg.* 2.711–712 (fr. 5 Blänsdorf); he thereby glosses the supposed etymology of *ieie* from ἦμι, “shoot” much more clearly than does Apollonius (see Polt 2013: 629, O’Hara 2017: 56). This is not, however, the whole story of Varro’s adaptation. Varro also adds a second element to the nymphs’ cry of *ieie*, namely, *o Phoebe* (~ *Arg.* 2.702). The pairing of *ieie* with this address may suggest how the former could have given rise to one of Apollo’s most unusual epithets: the cry ἦ ἰέ was interpreted in antiquity as a vocative of ἦϊος (Janko 1994 ad *Il.* 15.365–366). *N.b.* that with the addition of *te* (referring to Apollo), Varro has cast these lines in Du-Stil (~ *Arg.* 2.708–710: Courtney 1993: 241), thus creating an interesting metaleptic effect when the nymphs also address Apollo.

¹⁵⁰ Fränkel 1961 in his apparatus ad loc.; he also suggests Ἰηπατήον Ἰηπατήονα as an emendation for line 702. Fränkel is followed by, e.g., Páskiewicz 1981 ad *Arg.* 2.702–703, Paduano and Fusillo 1986 ad *Arg.* 2.701–713, Gleii and Natzel-Glei 1996: 1.179, Valverde Sánchez 1996: 181 n. 309, and Vian 2002: 1.276 ad *Arg.* 2.703.

¹⁵¹ See, e.g., Wilamowitz 1924: 2.85, Blumberg 1931: 43–44, and Eichgrün 1961: 168.

¹⁵² The etymology is also presupposed by Duris of Samos 76 *FGrH* 79. Rutherford 2001: 26 n. 14 suggests that Ephorus of Cyme (70 *FGrH* 31b) may have suppressed it because Apollo’s boyhood did not fit into his rationalized version of the myth. See also Macrobian *Sat.* 1.17.20 and Hunter 1986: 59, who could be right that an etymology from ἦμι (“shoot”) is already implicit in Timotheus (fr. 800 Campbell).

¹⁵³ In the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, the god seems to be a young man (see 3.449–450), but his age is not stressed. Callimachus, conversely, implies that his Apollo is an infant (see *Hymn* 2.103–104 with Williams 1978 ad line 103), as in one popular version of the myth. Apollonius seems to have a foot in both of these camps; see Hunter 1986: 56–57. As to the combat: the iterative imperfect θαρσύνεσκον (*Arg.* 712), together with the adverbial πολλὰ in the previous line, shows that Apollonius imagines an extended engagement, as in *Call. Hymn* 2.101–102 (ἄλλον ἐπ’ ἄλλω | βάλλων ὠκὸν ὀιστόν); this version can be traced back to Simon. fr. 573 Campbell. In the *HH*, by contrast, a single “strong arrow” (ἰόν ... | καρτερόν, 3.357–358) suffices to bring the monster down.

the same form in the same *sedes* as Callimachus uses in another *Hymn* when mentioning the Pythonomachy (4.92).¹⁵⁴

Together with the name Delphyne(s), it turns out that there are several strong Callimachean resonances in the passage, and in light of the Callimachean precedent, I would consider it legitimate to see subtle etymologizing of ἦ ἰέ from ἦμι (“shoot”) in line 712, hinted at by τόξοισι several lines earlier. It is striking, however, that, absent Fränkel’s emendation, Apollonius hardly demands this interpretation of ἦ ἰέ.¹⁵⁵ We might equally assume that the Corycian nymphs encouraged Apollo with ecstatic, and meaningless, cries of ἦ ἰέ,¹⁵⁶ which, after all, the Greeks considered suitable to chant before battle.¹⁵⁷ That is, an etymology from ἦμι is not necessary to understand the nymphs’ cry. Apollonius’ reticence in embracing Callimachus’ etymology may, once again, stem from a reluctance to stake a firm position in a relevant philological debate: should the paeon-cry have a rough breathing, per Callimachus, or a smooth breathing, as other authorities had it?¹⁵⁸ But however we resolve these specific problems of interpretation,

¹⁵⁴ The only earlier mention of the river is in Aesch. *Eum.* 27, as part of a prayer that recounts the history of the Delphic oracle—notably, without mentioning the Python. This Delphic river’s name, suggestive of πλεῖστος, “greatest,” may relate to an etymology connecting Apollo’s name to πολύς; Apollonius plays on this etymology earlier at *Arg.* 1.759–760 (see Hunter 1986: 53 n. 22, 1993: 151 n. 186).

¹⁵⁵ Hunter 1986: 60 posits that the Callimachean etymology might have been so well-known that Apollonius could afford to be elliptical in alluding to it.

¹⁵⁶ So Blumberg 1931: 43.

¹⁵⁷ This is essentially the view of Ephorus of Cyme (70 *FGrH* 31b), who connects the origin of the paeon to the Delphians’ encouragement of Apollo in his battle with the Python, but without (apparently) positing an etymology for the cry. For the paeon’s military uses, see Rutherford 2001: 42–47.

¹⁵⁸ For the debate, see Ath. 15.701d–e. This controversy is related to divided opinions on the paeon’s etymology: a derivation from ἦμι (“shoot”) presupposes a rough breathing; from ἰάομαι (“heal”) or ἰέναι (“go”), a smooth breathing. See, e.g., ΣA, bT ad *Il.* 15.365, Macrob. *Sat.* 1.17.16–20, *Etym. Magn.* s.v. Ἰήε, and Rutherford 2001: 25 n. 8. The debate is also adumbrated, notably, at Σ ad *Arg.* 2.702.

Apollonius’ extensive dialogue with earlier hymns to Apollo by Homer and Callimachus has the effect of placing Orpheus’ composition in the same august company.¹⁵⁹

c. Representing Hymnic Speech

With this background in mind, we may now turn to the representation of speech in this episode. Orpheus’ first speech, in which he proposes the erection of an altar to Apollo Heoïus, is given in direct quotation, complete with speech-introductory and capping formulas (685–694). Orpheus’ speech ends, notably, in an exuberant hymnic mode marked by Anaphora, which sets the tone for the scene to follow: “Be gracious, lord, be gracious, you who appeared to us” (ἀλλ’ ἴληθι, ἄναξ, ἴληθι φανθείς, 693).¹⁶⁰ In the description of the rites that follows, we encounter another method for representing character speech: from each victim the Argonauts “piously burned two thighs on the holy altar, as they invoked Apollo Heoïus” (εὐαγέως ἱερῶ ἀνὰ διπλόα μηρία βομῶ | καῖον, ἐπικλείοντες Ἐώιον Ἀπόλλωνα, 699–700).¹⁶¹ This last phrase is an example of Genette’s “narratized speech”: we are given no indication of the Invocation’s content beyond the identity of its object, Apollo under his new title Heoïus.

This bare instance of narratized speech appears here as if to highlight by contrast the device we find next (2.701–703):

ἀμφὶ δὲ δαιομένοις εὐρὸν χορὸν ἐστήσαντο,
καλὸν Ἰηπαῖον Ἰηπαῖονα Φοῖβον
μελπόμενοι.

¹⁵⁹ Notably, Apollonius thus aligns Orpheus’ hymn (like the *Arg.* itself) with the Rhapsodic Hymnic tradition, even though we are probably supposed to imagine his singing a paean here.

¹⁶⁰ Apollonius has increased the religious fervor of his model (*Od.* 3.380 [ἀλλὰ ἄνασσ’ ἴληθι], noted by Páskiewicz 1981 ad loc.) by doubling the imperative.

¹⁶¹ *N.b.* also the evaluative terms εὐαγέως and ἱερῶ, which suggest the AR narrator’s religious expertise and create a “solemn, reverent tone” (Páskiewicz 1981 ad loc.). I would add that εὐαγής does not occur in the HEs, though this adverb in this *sedes* occurs twice in the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* (2.274, 369; Matteo 2007 ad loc.).

Around the burning offerings they formed a broad choral dance and chanted the beautiful “Ἰηπαῖον, Phoebus Ἰηπαῖον.”

Earlier in this chapter, I classified this passage as an example of hymnic narratization, but in fact, it is possible to analyze it in different ways, largely because of the semantic ambiguity of the word Ἰηπαῖων (or ἰηπαῖων) and the syntactic ambiguity of the use of the adjective καλός.¹⁶² As noted above, other than in the *Arg.* and its scholia, Ἰηπαῖων occurs only in Apollo’s major *HH*: once (3.272) as an “epith. for Apollo” (LSJ s.v. I) and twice to denote the “*hymn* sung to him” (LSJ s.v. II): ἰηπαῖον’ ἀεΐδεν/ᾄειδον (3.500, 517).¹⁶³ As we have seen, these latter passages constitute important models for Apollonius’ usage. Moreover, the same semantic range is observable in the Homeric use of Παῖων/παῖων, sometimes to denote the god (e.g., *Il.* 5.401; see also *Arg.* 4.1511), at other times to denote the paeon sung in his honor, as in another of Apollonius’ models for this passage, *Il.* 1.473–474 (καλὸν ἀεΐδοντες παῖονα, κοῦροι Ἀχαιῶν, | μέλποντες ἐκάεργον).¹⁶⁴

The question is, which usage is presupposed at *Arg.* 2.702? On the one hand, the hymnic repetition and the juxtaposition with the epithet Φοῖβος strongly suggest that Ἰηπαῖων is functioning as an epithet, too: one would not say “chanting the paeon-song, the paeon-song” or place “Phoebus” in apposition in such a phrase. The interpretation of Ἰηπαῖων as an epithet would be consistent with other examples of hymnic narratization in the poem, in which strings of

¹⁶² In another of Apollonius’ potential models—Orpheus’ singing of an ἔλεγον ἠῆον in his capacity as the Argo’s boatswain (Eur. *Hypsipyle* fr. 752g.9 Collard and Cropp)—the adjective ἠῆος is ambiguous in a different way: does this phrase mean “mournful plaint” or “hymn of thanks (for making landfall)”? See the note on this line in Collard and Cropp 2008.

¹⁶³ Hunter 1986: 58 further compares Call. *Hymn* 2.21 (ὀππὸθ’ ἰῆ παῖον ἰῆ παῖον ἀκούση), which has a strikingly similar shape to *Arg.* 2.702.

¹⁶⁴ *N.b.* also that παῖων in the sense “paeon-song” is used in *HH* 3.518 as a synonym for ἰηπαῖων.

Honorific epithets are often attached to a verb of singing, invocation, etc., and as we have seen, in those cases it is difficult to be certain whether the epithets represent character-speech in FID or the narrator's own enthusiastic participation in the hymnody.

On the other hand, *καλόν* at the head of the verse permits another interpretation. Although it could be taken as an adverbial (or internal) accusative with *μελπόμενοι* (i.e., “beautifully chanting”),¹⁶⁵ there are strong grounds for considering *καλόν* an adjective modifying the Argonauts' chant.¹⁶⁶ The difference is that whereas in the *Iliad*, *καλόν* modifies the single word *παιήονα*, in the *Arg.* it apparently modifies the entire phrase Ἴηπαιήον Ἴηπαιήονα Φοῖβον—hence Race's translation, “[they] chanted the beautiful ‘Iēpaiēon, Phoebus Iēpaiēon.’”¹⁶⁷ To be sure, the Argonauts are not being directly quoted; this phrase rather stands in the accusative as the direct object of *μελπόμενοι*.¹⁶⁸ Nevertheless, with the repetition of Ἴηπαιήων and the adjoining epithet Φοῖβος, this phrase could represent the entire refrain in the Argonauts' “real” paean: “Hail to the Healing God, hail to the Healing God Phoebus.”¹⁶⁹ Indeed, this understanding is probably what has led Race to place quotation marks around the phrase in his translation. On this interpretation, we effectively have an example of narratized speech whose “actual” wording is so

¹⁶⁵ As, e.g., at 4.1399 (*ἐφίμερον* αἰείδουσαι).

¹⁶⁶ Line 713, which gives the etiology for the paean formula that the Argonauts chant at line 702, repeats the words *καλόν* (*n.b.* also Φοῖβω) from that line and uses it unambiguously as an adjective, modifying *ἐφύμνιον* (“refrain”). This usage suggests that Apollonius considers *καλόν* adjectival in line 702 as well (Hunter 1986: 56 n. 31, Matteo 2007 ad *Arg.* 2.702–703). *Arg.* 4.1197 presents another comparable case involving a ritual chant: the Phaeacian nymphs “sounded forth the lovely wedding song” (*ἱμερόενθ' ὕμναιον ἀνήπυον*). Here *ἱμερόενθ'* is unambiguously adjectival. These parallels reduce the probability that *καλός* might be modifying Phoebus, as many have thought (for references, see Matteo 2007 ad *Arg.* 2.702–703). Cf. the more ambiguous use of *καλόν* at *Il.* 1.473.

¹⁶⁷ We might compare such English expressions as, “He said a few quick Hail Marys.”

¹⁶⁸ Cf. *ἦ ἰέ κεκληγυῖται* below (712), where the direct object is an indeclinable exclamation.

¹⁶⁹ As Race 2008: 168 n. 58 translates Ἴηπαιήον Ἴηπαιήονα Φοῖβον.

re-constructible, because of the more or less standardized form of the paean-chant, that it borders on direct quotation.¹⁷⁰

Before turning to Orpheus' hymn, I would like to jump ahead to consider the end of the episode out of order, because it features another ambiguous example of hymnic narratization. The Thynias episode closes with the Argonauts' oaths of mutual goodwill (ὁμοφροσύνησι νόοιο, 716) and their establishment of a "shrine to kindly Concord" (Ὀμονοίης ἱρὸν ἐύφρονος, 718), the goddess who personifies this Argonautic virtue. The oath, transposed with an infinitive construction (ἀρήξειν), is introduced with a verb of swearing (ἐπώμοσαν) and by the asseverative particles ἦ μὲν (715–716), precisely on the model of *Il.* 1.76–77.¹⁷¹ We thus get another brand of indirect speech in the episode's concluding αἴτιον (cf. the ὡς-clause used at 705). Earlier in this chapter, I listed the episode's final lines as an example of hymnic narratization: the Argonauts "themselves built [the shrine] at that time to honor the most glorious goddess" (ὃ ῥ' ἐκάμοντο | αὐτοὶ κυδίστην τότε δαίμονα πορσαίνοντες, *Arg.* 2.718–719). Unlike most examples of hymnic narratization, however, the verb in this instance, πορσαίνοντες, does not imply speech,¹⁷² and in this context of building a shrine rather than directly invoking the goddess, it would be natural to assign the Honorific κυδίστην (and, perhaps, ἐύφρονος) to the reverential perspective of the AR narrator, as he once again participates personally in the Argonauts' act of worship. But Apollonius is using πορσαίνω, whose basic sense is "prepare" or "provide," in an extended sense

¹⁷⁰ For similar deployments of the hymeneal chant, see Bion *Ep. Adon.* 88–89 and Oppian *Cyn.* 1.341.

¹⁷¹ As noted by, e.g., Campbell 1981 ad loc. In context, Calchas is extracting an oath from Achilles to support him when he counsels Agamemnon to return Chryseis; notably, perhaps, Achilles swears to do so by Apollo (86). The fact that Achilles' intervention ultimately proves disastrous for the Greek army may add an ominous note to the Argonauts' oath here; in fact, many of the crewmembers will later go on to kill each other after the expedition (see, e.g., Feeney 1991: 77 with n. 66).

¹⁷² Perhaps for this reason, the scholiast ad loc. notes the alternate reading *κυκλήσκοντες*, "invoking."

denoting an act of care or an internal attitude of esteem¹⁷³—hence the scholiast’s gloss of τιμῶντες, “honoring.”¹⁷⁴ For this reason, we could also view these Honorifics as focalized by the worshipful Argonauts, and possibly even reflecting a speech act related to the inauguration of the shrine.

But all of the mythological, philological, and narratological uncertainties we have encountered so far in this passage reach their height in the description of Orpheus’ hymn. It may be useful to print this passage once again here (703–714):

σὺν δὲ σφιν ἐὺς πάϊς Οἰάγροιο	
Βιστονίη φόρμιγγι λιγείης ἤρχεν ἀοιδῆς·	
ὥς ποτε πετραίη ὑπὸ δειράδι Παρνησσοῖο	705
Δελφύνην τόξοισι πελώριον ἐξενάριζεν,	
κοῦρος ἔων ἔτι γυμνός, ἔτι πλοκάμοισι γεγηθώς—	
ιλήκοις· αἰεὶ τοι, ἄναξ, ἄτμητοι ἔθειραι,	
αἰὲν ἀδήλητοι· τὼς γὰρ θέμις· οἴοθι δ’ αὐτῇ	
Λητῶ Κοιογένεια φίλαις ἐνὶ χερσὶν ἀφάσσει—	710
πολλὰ δὲ Κωρύκiai νύμφαι, Πλειστοῖο θύγατραι	
θαρσύνεσκον ἔπεσσιν, ἠὲ ἰὲ κεκληγυῖαι·	
ἔνθεν δὴ τότε καλὸν ἐφύμνιον ἔπλετο Φοῖβῳ.	
αὐτὰρ ἐπειδὴ τὸν γε χορείη μέλψαν ἀοιδῆ...	

And among them the noble son of Oeagrus led off a clear song on his Bistonian lyre, telling how once upon a time beneath Parnassus’ rocky ridge the god killed monstrous Delphyne(s) with his arrows, when he was still a naked boy, still delighting in his long locks— be gracious! Ever unshorn, lord, is your hair, ever unharmed, for such is right; and only Leto herself, Coeus’ daughter, strokes it with her dear hands—and often did the Corycian nymphs, the daughters of Pleistus, encourage him with their words, as they shouted *iē ie*. From there arose this beautiful refrain for Phoebus. But when they had celebrated him with their choral song...

¹⁷³ LSJ s.v. πορσύνω III cites Pind. *Ol.* 6.33 for the meaning “treat with care, tend” and *Pyth.* 4.278 for the meaning “regard, esteem.” For our passage, they gloss the verb with “honour, adore.” Apollonius uses the verb in this sense again at 3.1124; see further Matteo 2007 ad loc.

¹⁷⁴ We may compare *Arg.* 4.1733 as another example of hymnic narratization in which the verb indicates an attitude of reverence rather than speech (ἄζόμενος Μαίης υἱά κλυτόν, “out of respect for Maia’s famous son”).

The narratological complexity of this passage boils down to one difficult question: who speaks? The conjunction ὥς in line 705 introduces the first subsection unambiguously as a transposition of Orpheus' narrative into indirect speech. Even here, however, the Anaphora of ἔτι in line 707 in two more or less redundant participial phrases (both emphasizing Apollo's youth) effects an "excited style" that would be at home in the hypothetical hymn that Orpheus "actually" sang to Apollo.¹⁷⁵ In the terminology I propose in this chapter, line 707 would constitute a small example of contagious hymnody: the AR narrator's own religious enthusiasm seems to color his transposition of Orpheus' narrative. It is with the advent of ἰλήκοις the next line, however, that real uncertainty as to the speaker sets in. It is clear, on any interpretation, that the switch from Er-Stil (705–707) to Du-Stil (708) constitutes a change in narrative mode out of indirect speech, but who is begging the god's pardon for the faux-pas of line 707?

One longstanding interpretation holds that in line 708, the AR narrator steps in to correct the previous line's mistake, which is attributable either to Orpheus' actual hymn or to the narrator's own accidental distortion thereof in summarizing it.¹⁷⁶ This interpretation suits the piety of Apollonius' narratorial persona; in particular, we have noted how phrases like τὼς γὰρ θέμις (709) contribute to our impression of his religious expertise,¹⁷⁷ and the AR narrator's apology to the

¹⁷⁵ Hunter 1993: 150; see also Wifstrand 1929: 82.

¹⁷⁶ For the view that Orpheus errs and the narrator corrects him, see, e.g., Páskiewicz 1981 ad *Arg.* 2.707, Beye 1982: 18–19 (comparing apostrophes from the *HHs*), and Matteo 2007 ad loc. Conversely, Fränkel 1968 ad loc. doubts that Apollonius would attribute a theological error to Orpheus and notes the tradition of poets' correcting themselves, evident as early as Sappho fr. 105a L.-P. For the idea that the narrator errs and corrects himself, see further Wifstrand 1929: 82, Paduano and Fusillo 1986 ad loc. ("un'autocorrezione dell'autore ... sembra più probabile"), and Vian 2002: 1.210 n. 3. *N.b.* that Fränkel's position seems to be misunderstood by Green 2007 and Matteo 2007 ad loc. It may be relevant that line 707 echoes 1.508 (Ζεὺς ἔτι κοῦρος, ἔτι φρεσὶ νήπια εἰδώς; see also 3.134), from the narrator's transposition of Orpheus' cosmogony, though there again the voices of narrator and character may be blended; see n. 189 below.

¹⁷⁷ θέμις is an interesting word to use in this context given the myth that the Delphic oracle had previously been in the possession of Themis (e.g., Aesch. *Eum.* 2–4), the goddess who personifies this very concept.

Muses at 4.984 (with the cognate verb ἔλατε) has often been raised as a parallel.¹⁷⁸ Moreover, the hymnic mode of these lines would amplify the hint of contagious hymnody found already in line 707: the narrator intervenes in a hymnic style suited to the narrative context.¹⁷⁹ Another possibility, however, is that in line 708, Apollonius switches into direct speech, and it is in fact Orpheus who apologizes to Apollo.¹⁸⁰ Ancient scholars recognized HE precedent for the sudden switch from indirect to direct discourse (*Il.* 4.301–309, 15.346–349),¹⁸¹ and Pseudo-Longinus praises this technique as an effective “sort of outbreak of emotion” (ἐκβολή τις πάθους, 1.27.1), commenting, “This figure is useful, when a sudden crisis (ὄξυς ὁ καιρὸς ὧν) will not let the writer wait, and forces him to change at once from one character to another.”¹⁸² It is not impossible that Apollonius, a noted collector of Homeric curiosities, is imitating this rare procedure here to achieve a comparable degree of πάθος after the “sudden crisis” constituted by the theological slight to the god in line 707. Moreover, the hymnic style of lines 708–710 is suited first and foremost to Orpheus’ own “personal language situation” as he hymns Apollo, and in fact, there are notable echoes in both verbiage and style between lines 708–710 and Orpheus’ prayer to Apollo as given

¹⁷⁸ E.g., Páskiewicz ad *Arg.* 2.707 and Matteo 2007 ad loc. The AR narrator uses the same verb in his Salutation to the Argonauts (4.1773).

¹⁷⁹ The hymnic effect of these lines is achieved through direct Prayer to the god (ἰλήκοις); the use of Du-Stil (ἰλήκοις, τοι), including the Honorific vocative ἄναξ; Anaphora of forms of αἰεὶ paired with semantically redundant privative adjectives in ἀ- (responding directly to the doubled ἔτι of the previous line); and the genealogical epithet Κοιογένεια for Leto. For Anaphora of αἰεὶ in hymns, see Keyssner 1932: 39–45.

¹⁸⁰ Hunter 1993: 151 admits the possibility that “an Alexandrian Orpheus” might err and then correct himself, and this interpretation is positively embraced by Green 2007 ad loc. As Wifstrand 1929: 82 notes, this understanding is also implicit in Ville de Mirmont 1894: 458, who quotes lines 707–710 as “[d]ans le chant d’Orphée.” The remaining interpretative possibility—that the narrator errs and Orpheus corrects him—seems to be too postmodern for anyone to have championed.

¹⁸¹ See Fantuzzi 2008a: 223 with n. 7 and Nünlist 2009: 104–105.

¹⁸² 1.27.2: ἡ πρόσχησις τοῦ σχήματος τότε, ἡνίκ’ ἂν ὄξυς ὁ καιρὸς ὧν διαμέλλειν τῷ γράφοντι μὴ διδῶ ἀλλ’ εὐθὺς ἐπαναγκάζῃ μεταβαίνειν ἐκ προσώπων εἰς πρόσωπα.

in direct speech at line 693 (ἀλλ' ἴληθι, ἄναξ, ἴληθι φαανθείς): Anaphora of ἴληθι (cognate to ἰλήκω) and the Honorific address ἄναξ (in the same *sedes*).¹⁸³ These resemblances might suggest we have Orpheus' direct speech in lines 708–710, too, though one might equally argue that these similarities in expression reflect the AR narrator's well-known sympathy with the legendary bard.¹⁸⁴

The third subsection (711–713) hardly resolves the matter. Here the Pythonomachy narrative begun in 705–707 continues, which may suggest that the narratorial digression of 708–710 has ended and that the transposition of Orpheus' hymn has resumed. Yet in the absence of a sure marker like another ὥς, we cannot be sure that these lines represent indirect speech; they might equally continue Orpheus' narrative in direct speech, if we think that the bard utters the previous lines.¹⁸⁵ A third possibility is that in these lines, Apollonius imitates a distinctive narrative device found already in the *Odyssey*, in which a transposed narrative begins in a dependent construction that ultimately gives way to an independent construction that is essentially indistinguishable from narrator-text.¹⁸⁶ The most famous example is Demodocus' second lay, on Aphrodite's affair with Ares: after an initial ὥς introducing the narrative in indirect discourse (he sings “how [ὥς] first they lay together in the house of Hephaestus

¹⁸³ Orpheus' prayer to the Hesperides at 4.1411–1421 betrays a similar style and includes the phrase ἴλατ', ἄνασσα in its opening line.

¹⁸⁴ See the discussion at the end of the present section.

¹⁸⁵ Some scholars assert that line 713 cannot represent Orpheus' words because the deictic τὸδε indicates that the etiology contained therein is addressed to the reader (Hunter 1993: 151 n. 185, Vian 2002: 1.210 n. 3, Matteo 2007 ad loc.). I do not understand this argument: if Orpheus is speaking, cannot τὸδε ἐφύμνιον refer to the formula that the Argonauts are presently chanting (702)? As we have seen, etiology is an important part of the AR narrator's hymnic voice, but this motif is also appropriate to hymnody in general (Hunter 1993: 151). For his part, Orpheus actually fashions two new *aitia* in this very episode (see 686–689 with Fränkel 1968 ad loc.), and an etymology for Delphi is pointed up in lines that transpose his speech (705–706).

¹⁸⁶ See de Jong 2009: 99–106 for a narratological account of this device (her third type of metalepsis, the “blending of narrative voices”). What follows is based on her analysis of Demodocus' second lay (99–101).

secretly...” *Od.* 8.268–269), almost one hundred lines pass with no further indications that this story is Demodocus’, not the HE narrator’s; we even get direct speech from the internal characters (292–294, 306–320, and dialogue from 329–358). Only the capping formula at line 367 (“This song the famous minstrel sang”) reminds us that the foregoing narrative has been Demodocus’ transposed speech. To that point, it is unclear whether the narrator is still transposing the bard’s speech or if he has taken over the tale himself, and in this sense, their voices temporarily blend together.¹⁸⁷ Notably, the capping formula at *Arg.* 2.714 uses a plural verb (μέλψον) and makes reference to the “choral song” (χορείη ... ἀοιδῆ) that all the Argonauts, not just Orpheus, have been singing since line 701.¹⁸⁸ It thus marks the end of an entire scene and does not necessarily imply that lines 711–713 represent the contents of Orpheus’ hymn in the same way that *Od.* 8.367 does for Demodocus’ lay.

It has been argued that Apollonius imitates the metaleptic technique from the *Odyssey* passage in transposing another of Orpheus’ songs into indirect speech, his cosmo-theogony in Book 1, which takes Demodocus’ second lay as one of its primary models.¹⁸⁹ In the case of Orpheus’ hymn to Apollo, we might particularly point to another model, the *Homeric Hymn to Pan* (19), where the same device occurs within an internal hymn to the goat god sung by his attendant nymphs: after an initial ὥς introducing the narrative of Pan’s birth in indirect speech (29), the

¹⁸⁷ So de Jong 2009: 100: “Due to the change from a dependent construction to an independent one, we can no longer determine whether we are hearing the primary narrator, ‘Homer’, or the reported narrator, Demodocus: their voices merge.”

¹⁸⁸ The vocabulary of line 714 picks up elements from both the Argonauts’ chant (χορόν, 701; μελπόμενοι, 703) and Orpheus’ song (ἀοιδῆς, 704) in order to mark the end of both elements of the performance.

¹⁸⁹ See esp. Nelis 1992. At first the repeated conjunction ὥς keeps the mediation of Orpheus’ cosmogonic song in indirect speech firmly in view (1.496, 499, 501 [2x], 503, 505; Hunter 1993: 148). The final sentences are not so introduced (507–511), however, so that it may be possible to see a blending of Orpheus’ voice with that of the narrator (Hunter 1993: 149).

narrative continues right up to the Salutation that marks the conclusion of the *HH* itself (48) with no further indications of transposed speech—there is not even a capping formula this time.¹⁹⁰ Especially because the subject of the nymphs’ hymn is so congenial to the speaker’s own hymnic agenda, their voices naturally blend, and the Salutation seems to cap both the internal and external hymns.¹⁹¹ There is thus good Homeric precedent for the blending of the narrator’s voice with that of an internal hymnist in transposed speech that transitions into an independent construction.

In the last analysis, like so many other issues of interpretations we have encountered in the Thynias episode, the matter of who is speaking in each of these lines is not finally resolvable.¹⁹² The style and content of lines 708–713 suit both Orpheus and the AR narrator too well to make a determination, and there are Homeric and Apollonian precedents for construing either as speaker of these lines, or, indeed, to hear a blend of both their voices in lines 711–713. Our inability to disentangle character from narrator in this passage in fact reflects Orpheus’ status as one of the AR narrator’s most visible alter egos.¹⁹³ For example, Orpheus receives pride of place as the first Argonaut listed in the Catalogue (1.23–34);¹⁹⁴ his voice and the narrator’s blend earlier at 1.507–

¹⁹⁰ de Jong 2009: 105.

¹⁹¹ See above on “metaleptic fade-out” (n. 13).

¹⁹² Hunter 1993: 151.

¹⁹³ For Orpheus as a narratorial alter ego, see, among others, Beye 1982: 14, 18–19; Fusillo 1985: 362–363; Hopkinson 1988 ad *Arg.* 1.540; Hunter 1993: 127, 149; Cuypers 2004: 58–59; Klooster 2011: 91, 2012: 63. Cf. Pavlock 1990: 31–33, who detects some irony in this sympathetic identification, and Murray 2018, who argues that the relationship between the narrator and Orpheus is agonistic.

¹⁹⁴ Köhnken 2010: 145 is right that Orpheus’ importance is signaled both by his priority and by the considerable length of his entry, but he is mistaken that his is the longest in the Catalogue: that honor goes to the final entry, for the Boreads (1.211–223).

511;¹⁹⁵ and at least two of his musical performances are capable of metapoetic interpretation.¹⁹⁶ As to the present passage, although I disagree with those who would interpret the poem *in toto* as a hymn to Apollo,¹⁹⁷ the fact that the *Arg.* is a hymn (to the heroized Argonauts) that begins with an Invocation of Apollo does generate an unmistakable effect of mise-en-abyme. Indeed, it has been argued that the verb ἤρχεν in line 704, marking the beginning of Orpheus' hymn to Apollo, should remind us of the poem's opening words (ἀρχόμενος σέο, Φοῖβε, 1.1).¹⁹⁸ By a similar token, the nymphs' cries of ἠ ἰέ within the Pythonomachy narrative (712) are themselves a hymnic refrain (ἐφύμνιον, 713) that mirror the Argonauts' own choral paeon-chant at 702.¹⁹⁹ In other words, at line 712, we have a hint of a hymn (the nymphs' refrain for Apollo) within a hymn (the Argonauts' refrain and Orpheus' hymn to Apollo) within a hymn (the AR narrator's hymn to the Argonauts, which begins with Apollo). In this passage, the AR narrator certainly seems interested in binding together past hymnic performances with his own in the present day. It is only natural that the AR narrator would want to associate himself with the premier bard in the Greek mythological tradition,²⁰⁰ but as a holy man, Orpheus is a particularly desirable model for the AR narrator's pious self-fashioning.

¹⁹⁵ See n. 189 above.

¹⁹⁶ E.g., see Klooster 2012: 63 on *Arg.* 1.26–31 and Fränkel 1968: 623–625 on *Arg.* 1.494–515.

¹⁹⁷ See Chapter 1, Section I.e.

¹⁹⁸ See, e.g., Matteo 2007 ad loc., who further compares the use of forms of ἄρχω in *HH* Exordia; Páskiewicz 1981 ad loc. compares the Prayer of *HH* 13.3 (ἄρχε δ' αὐοῦης).

¹⁹⁹ Paduano and Fusillo 1986 ad *Arg.* 2.701–713.

²⁰⁰ See, as a comparandum, de Jong's comments on the effects of the HE narrator's self-identification with Demodocus (2009: 100–101).

Conclusion

In a poem that presents itself as an “epic hymn,” we could expect to find signs of hymnody in more than just the work’s hymnic frame. In Part I, the poem’s open acknowledgments of the institution of hero cult were correlated with the poem’s status as a hymn dedicated to divinized heroes, and some of these passages were interpreted as metapoetic reflections on the *Arg.*’s generic hybridity. The burden of Part II, conversely, has been to flesh out the hymnic voice of the narrator himself as an integral aspect of Apollonius’ complex narratorial persona. In Chapter 3, I have argued that Apollonius’ hymnic voice can often be heard when the poet exploits narratorial strategies that have been primarily associated with other types of poetry beyond the realm of ἔπος, such as Callimachean etiology or Pindaric piety, because these devices can claim the sanction of Homeric authority by way of the *HHs*. This chapter has surveyed numerous passages in which the hymnic voice takes center stage. In some of these passages, such as the introits in Books 3 and 4, we can observe hymnic transformations of standard epic conventions—in this case, the programmatic Appeal to the Muses. But in the cases of contagious hymnody and hymnic narratization, the AR narrator exhibits a striking tendency toward metalepsis, or the blurring the boundaries between his own hymnic voice and that of his characters. This tendency reaches its apex in the Thynias episode, where I have argued it is impossible to disentangle the voices of the characters and the narrator; both seem to join in hymning Apollo. In the last analysis, this blending of voices suggests that the portrait of Apollonius’ hymnic narrator that we have been sketching is ultimately a portrait of Orpheus himself, projected from the level of the story to the narration itself. Indeed, given the generic affiliations of the two major songs that Orpheus performs in the poem, an “epic” cosmogony and a hymn to Apollo, Orpheus might emblemize the hybrid identity of the *Arg.* itself

as an epic hymn. It only remained for an anonymous poet of the Imperial era to literalize this conceit in penning the *Orphic Argonautica*, in which Orpheus really does become the poem's homodiegetic narrator.

One issue that this analysis has only brushed up against here and there is the relationship between the narrator's hymnic voice and the characterization of his Hymnic Subjects, the Argonauts. For instance, I have argued that the apostrophe to the Argonauts in Libya (4.1381–1388) represents a hymnic development of the epic-style apostrophe to mortals that anticipates the Argonauts' heroization as revealed in the poem's Envoi. Nevertheless, a critical question remains: does the fact that the *Arg.* is a hymn to the Argonauts bear on the question of their portrayal, and particularly of their often-problematic brand of heroism? I have already had occasion in a footnote above to quote Cuypers' observation, "Congruous with his aim of 'hymning' the Argonauts..., the narrator shows a strong awe for the gods and for the heroes of the past about whom he narrates, and an outspoken disapproval of those who oppose either."²⁰¹ Cuypers is right that, with only a few (notable) exceptions, the AR narrator frequently presents his Hymnic Subjects almost in hagiographic terms and hardly ever criticizes them outright. And yet for anyone acquainted with the Apollonian bibliography, I need hardly point out that countless scholars have heard a "further voice," as it were, criticizing the heroes, especially their leader Jason, and often quite vociferously. I can hardly hope to resolve the question of the Argonauts' heroism here, but its connection with heroization and hymnody, along with the potential political subtext of these complex issues, are two of the major questions that will preoccupy us in the Conclusion to this dissertation.

²⁰¹ Cuypers 2004: 61.

CONCLUSION

I proceed first by summarizing the primary results of this inquiry and then by indicating some directions in which future research might fruitfully be conducted (Section I). I finish in Section II by offering some preliminary thoughts as to how this study relates to two broader topics in Apollonian criticism: the longstanding question of the Argonauts' heroism and the more recent interest in situating the *Arg.* within its Ptolemaic context.

I. Major Findings and Directions for Future Research

In this dissertation I have had occasion to comment upon a good number of passages in the *Arg.*, and I hope to have offered many new insights in the process. The following three items, however, represent the most important contributions of this study to Apollonian scholarship.

1. Apollonius' Use of the *HHs*. The programmatic allusions to the *Hymns* at both the beginning and end of the *Arg.*,¹ the metapoetic import of several passages in the poem,² the sheer variety of functions that allusion to the *Hymns* can play in the *Arg.*,³ and the likelihood that Apollonius traced some of his most distinctive narrative devices back to the *Hymns*⁴—all this

¹ See Chapter 1, esp. Sections I.a, d; II.a–c.

² See Chapter 2, Section III

³ See Introduction, Section IV, and *passim*.

⁴ See, e.g., the discussion of etiology in Chapter 3, Section III.

evidence supports the fundamental thesis of this dissertation that the *HHs* should be placed alongside the *HEs* among Apollonius' primary poetic models. In keeping with larger trends in the Hellenistic reception of Homer, Apollonius shows an especial interest in the atypical features of the *HHs*. We have encountered multiple instances in which he employs *hapax* or *dis legomena* from the *HHs* that do not occur in the *HEs*,¹ and when given his own chance to adapt the formulas that characterize the *HHs*' Exordia and Envois—their most unvarying structural elements—he systematically opts for the most exceptional usages that still find precedent in the hymnic collection.² The natural inference from these data is that Apollonius (or, more cautiously, the implied author of the *Arg.*) paid such regard to the *HHs* because of their perceived Homeric authority, which in turn authorized the poem's departures from the conventions of the *HEs* on a number of points.³

2. The Genre of the *Arg.* I have argued that the hymnic frame of the *Arg.* casts the poem as a Homeric-style hymn dedicated to its own protagonists, the Argonauts, in their capacity as cult heroes divinized after death. Although the introit is ingeniously engineered to facilitate several possible interpretations on a first-time reading, the Envoi retrospectively clarifies the status of the poem as a hymn to the Argonauts and enables a reinterpretation of the introit consistent with this insight. The epic narrative, too, is revealed anew as corresponding to the central section of a hymn (the *Laudatio*), which in this case takes the form of a Myth—the Argonauts' quest for the Golden Fleece—that has been extended to the length of four epic

¹ See pp. 52 (on ῥικνός), 227–228 (on γλεύη), and McPhee (forthcoming) (on βρίμη); see also p. 113 with n. 187 (on ἰλήκω, which occurs in the *Od.*, but which Apollonius has taken from *HH* 3).

² See the conclusion to Chapter 1.

³ See esp. Chapter 3.

books.⁴ The result of this procedure is a poem that unites the two branches of hexametric poetry attributed in antiquity to Homer, his epics and hymns, into a hybrid “epic hymn” that evinces features of both of these genres. This merger of epic and hymnody finds its logical justification in the duality of the Greek concept of the hero, who is at once a mythical figure whose deeds are commemorated in epic verse and a cult figure whose worship includes, *inter alia*, celebration in hymns. Accordingly, Apollonius departs from the precedent of the HEs in acknowledging the institution of hero cult repeatedly in the *Arg.*, and often in ways that are capable of metapoetic interpretations that relate to the poem’s generic duality.⁵

3. The Apollonian Narrator’s Hymnic Voice. The Apollonian (or “AR”) narrator’s persona is a complex construct that combines a variety of influences, including the HEs, Pindar, Herodotus, Callimachus, and more. One of these voices directly corresponds to the *Arg.*’s generic affiliations with hymnody, namely, the AR narrator’s “hymnic voice,” and Part II of this dissertation constitutes a study of this aspect of Apollonius’ narratorial persona. Chapter 3 demonstrates that many of the narrative techniques that distance the *Arg.* from the HEs in fact find precedent in the *HHs* or are bolstered by allusions thereto. For instance, the AR narrator’s personal intrusions into his own narrative are particularly reminiscent of the major *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*; his pious self-presentation is built upon recollections of devices from the *HHs*, like “pious silences” concerning mystery cults, or by redeploing hymnic phraseology in new contexts, as in his “pious similes”; and Apollonius may signal his debt to the *HHs* in the matter of etiology through, *inter alia*, a two-tiered allusion to Callimachus’ *Aetia* and the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* in his Anaphe episode. Chapter 4 examines passages in which the narrator

⁴ See Chapter 1 and the introductory section of Chapter 2.

⁵ See Chapter 2.

either engages in hymnic speech himself or portrays his characters as doing so. The most interesting result of this portion of the study is that Apollonius enhances the AR narrator's pious self-presentation through the use of two techniques, "contagious hymnody" and "hymnic narratization," both of which are preceded in the *HHs*. What these devices have in common is the metaleptic effect of breaking down the barrier that normally separates narrator from characters, thus creating the impression that the AR narrator enthusiastically joins in the religious celebrations of his subjects.

These findings, especially as regards the construal of the poem's hybrid genre, have the potential to reshape our basic understanding of the *Arg.* itself, and I hope that by illuminating the fundamental trilateral relationship between the *Arg.*, the HEs, and the *HHs*, I have provided the necessary backdrop against which future studies of Apollonius' allusions to Homer's *Hymns* can be contextualized—for a great deal of work remains to be done on the subject of "Apollonius' *Argonautica* and the *Homeric Hymns*." Here, I would like to lay out some of the avenues of inquiry that seem like the natural next steps following the present study.

The raw material for future research into Apollonian intertextuality with the *HHs* is conveniently assembled in Campbell's *Echoes and Imitations*, which records a huge number of intertexts that unfortunately found no place for analysis here.⁶ Many of these intertexts will have been fortuitous, but many others likely constitute purposeful allusions whose significance awaits interpretative unpacking. I have tried to indicate something of the promise that these intertexts hold for interpreters of the *Arg.* in Section III of the Introduction, but this dissertation constitutes but an inkling of the rich vein of scholarship that we have to look forward to. A more comprehensive study of the intertexts that Campbell has assembled also has the potential to

⁶ See Campbell 1981: 119–122.

unlock insights into the state of the collection of *HHs* as Apollonius knew them. We have already seen in this study that Apollonius appears to allude to a considerable range of *Hymns*, and not just the major ones.⁷

Yet even more than the rather small-scale engagements with the *Hymns* in localized contexts, I would be particularly keen to see larger literary-interpretative essays that read entire scenes or that conduct character studies or thematic analyses in light of the models provided by the *Hymns*.⁸ I am planning two such studies for future projects: the first reads the *Homeric Hymn to Heracles* (15) as a model for the *Arg. qua* “epic hymn,” while the second seeks to unpack the thematic (rather than structural) significance of the poem’s opening allusion to the *Homeric Hymn to Selene* (32), which I relate to the poem’s larger concerns with matters of gender and ethnicity. This kind of work would also enrich the study of the reception of the *HHs* among, for instance, the Roman poets, whose receptions of the *Hymns* were often self-consciously mediated by their intervening receptions in their Hellenistic forebears,⁹ including Apollonius.¹⁰

Theocritus’ hymnic *Idylls* and especially Callimachus’ *Hymns* have come up numerous times in this study, both to be used as intertextual comparanda and because in many cases, they seem to be participants in a genuine allusive dialogue with the *Arg.* This fact reveals the need to take the Rhapsodic Hymns of the Hellenistic period into fuller account: if the *Arg.* does postdate

⁷ E.g., I canvass likely allusions to *HH* 10 and 15, both “minor” hymns, in Section IV.e of the Introduction, and of course, the *Arg.* begins with a marked allusion to the minor *Homeric Hymn to Selene* (see esp. Chapter 1, Section I.d).

⁸ See, e.g., Pace 2004, Clayton 2017, and McPhee (forthcoming).

⁹ For examples, see Faulkner, Vergados, and Schwab 2016: 3–4 with n. 13.

¹⁰ See already on this score Clauss 2016a.

these works by his contemporaries, as I have assumed throughout this study simply as a matter of convenience, then Apollonius' reception of the *HHs* must inevitably have been filtered through their earlier receptions of the same. Theocritus and Callimachus present further evidence for the state of the *HH* collection in third-century Alexandria, and both poets' oeuvres include smaller-scale antecedents for the mixture of epic and hymnody that define Apollonius' *Arg.*, as I plan to argue in a future project.

Finally, I would note that a full-scale study concerning Apollonius' reception of Hesiod, that other great Archaic hexameter poet, remains a desideratum, as Vox already noted almost twenty years ago.¹¹ Hesiod enjoyed a high regard in the Hellenistic period,¹² and unlike the *HHs*, we know that Apollonius engaged the Hesiodic poems in his scholarly work as well as in his poetry.¹³ More work has been done on Apollonian allusion to Hesiod than to the *HHs*,¹⁴ and Hesiod's portrayal of the Age of Heroes in the *Works and Days* has surfaced more than once in the present study.¹⁵ Nevertheless, it would be very gratifying to see further systematic studies investigating Apollonius' reception of specific literary predecessors.¹⁶

¹¹ Vox 2002: 156 n. 16.

¹² See, e.g., Reitzenstein 1931: 41–52.

¹³ See p. 23 in the Introduction.

¹⁴ Clauss 1990, 2000, and 2016b represent important steps toward a Hesiodic reading of the *Arg.* See further, e.g., Campbell 1981: 117–119, Newman 1986: 95, Roth 2004, and Mason 2016.

¹⁵ See Chapter 1, Section II.d, and Chapter 2, Section II.c.

¹⁶ I would note that, to my knowledge, a systematic study even of the use that Apollonius made of Pindar's fourth *Pythian* or of Euripides' *Medea* has yet to appear.

II. Final Reflections

a. *The Ptolemaic Context*

Over the last thirty years, the sociopolitical context of Apollonius' composition of the *Arg.* in third-century BCE Alexandria as a Ptolemaic court poet has attracted increasing scholarly interest.¹⁷ Here, I would like to contribute to this scholarly conversation by expanding upon an idea that Hitch already presented in *nuce* in her article on hero cult in the *Arg.*, namely, that “[the Argonauts’] process of immortalization would have resonated with the ongoing deification of the Ptolemaic rulers during their lifetimes.”¹⁸ It is certainly tempting to connect the increasing divinization of the Ptolemies to Apollonius’ transfiguration of the “secular” HEs, which emphasize their heroes’ mortality, into an epic hymn dedicated to its own divinized protagonists. Before expanding on this idea, I here briefly present an overview of the Ptolemaic ruler cult, which took different forms as a direct corollary to the Ptolemies’ dual status as βασιλεῖς in the Macedonian tradition and as the new Pharaohs of Egypt.¹⁹

To begin with, the Ptolemies inaugurated ruler cults aligned with trends in the broader Hellenistic world.²⁰ The focal point of these Greek-facing cults was the cult of Alexander the Great instituted by Ptolemy I Soter in Alexandria, where the dead king was worshipped as something like the national god of the Ptolemaic state.²¹ The importance of this cult is illustrated

¹⁷ Particular milestones include Hunter 1993: ch. 6, Stephens 2003: ch. 4, and Mori 2008.

¹⁸ Hitch 2012: 133 n. 7; see further *ibid.* 158.

¹⁹ In what follows, I summarize a great deal of work on the combination of Hellenistic ruler cult and Pharaonic ideology that defined the religious role of the Ptolemaic dynasts. On this subject, see, e.g., Bulloch 1984: 212–214; Koenen 1993; Hölbl 2001: ch. 3; and Pfeiffer 2008, 2016.

²⁰ For Hellenistic ruler cult generally, see, e.g., Chaniotis 2003. That developments in Greek religion rather than Egyptian theology provided the main impetus for the Ptolemaic ruler cult is underlined by, e.g., Fraser 1972: 214 and Walbank 1991: 108–110.

²¹ For Alexander’s divinity during his own lifetime, see, e.g., the summary in *ThesCRA* 2.167–171.

by the fact that the annual tenure of the “eponymous” priest of Alexander was used to identify the year for purposes of dating in official documents. During his own lifetime, Ptolemy II Philadelphus expanded this cult to incorporate himself and his second wife and sister Arsinoe II as the “Sibling Gods” (Θεοὶ Ἀδελφοί). Each living royal couple thereafter followed suit, so that the cult of Alexander effectively became a cult of the Lagid dynasty.²² Furthermore, several members of the Ptolemaic family enjoyed independent cult. For instance, after their deaths, Philadelphus deified his father Soter and his mother Berenice I as the “Savior Gods” (Θεοὶ Σωτῆρες), who would only be incorporated into the Alexander cult under Ptolemy IV Philopator; the cult of Soter included the provision of lavish quadrennial games in Alexandria, the Ptolemaea, which provided the occasion of Philadelphus’ famously opulent grand procession.²³ Of the several independent cults for Ptolemaic queens and other Ptolemaic women, the most notable was that dedicated to Arsinoe II, who enjoyed crossover Greek and Egyptian appeal and was largely independent from her attachment to Philadelphus as one of the Sibling Gods.

In addition, the Ptolemies actively collaborated with the ancient Egyptian religious traditions that regarded the Pharaoh as the spiritual son and “living image” of Amun-Ra on earth. Before the Ptolemies, the Pharaoh was not regarded as a living god, but the office itself was divine, as every Pharaoh stepped anew into the role of Horus, the falcon-headed god of kingship. In this role, he mediated between gods and humankind and maintained cosmic order (Maat) through the central role he played in the conduct of religious rites; in death, the Pharaoh was assimilated with Osiris, god of the underworld.²⁴ A paradigm shift began to take shape in the

²² *ThesCRA* 2.173 notes that the Ptolemies were the first of the Diadochi to institute ruler cult as a dynastic practice and institutionalized method of ideological legitimation. See further on this cult, e.g., Fraser 1972: 213–226.

²³ On this procession, see, e.g., Rice 1983 and Thompson 2000.

²⁴ See, e.g., Frankfort 1948: ch. 10.

wake of Arsinoe II's death, when Philadelphus had her image installed as a "temple-sharing goddess" (σύνναος θεά) in all the temples of Egypt to receive worship alongside the shrine's primary god. Beginning under Ptolemy III at the latest, each living royal couple was likewise installed as θεοὶ σύνναοι throughout the country and thereby received worship as Egyptian gods.

As this brief overview suggests, the ruler cult expanded over time from the postmortem deification of Alexander and Soter to the worship of the living king under Philadelphus, while the Pharaoh transformed from a mediator between gods and humankind to a living god himself, co-worshipped in every major temple in Egypt. Greek literature of this period provides a tantalizing glimpse into the contemporary discourse surrounding the ontological status of the Ptolemies, as poets and other intellectuals tried to make sense of these new and shifting phenomena in the terms of traditional Greek religion. Two historians of Egypt in the court of Ptolemy I offer intriguing reflections on the office of the Pharaoh in describing the earliest origins of the institution. First, Hecataeus of Abdera claims that the earliest Pharaohs were gods (Diod. Sic. 1.26.1, 1.44.1),²⁵ but he describes them as "gods, they say, who were terrestrial, having once been mortals, but who, by reason of their sagacity and the good services which they rendered to all men, attained immortality."²⁶ Hecataeus is here tapping into another Hellenistic discourse keenly interested in the connection between kingship and divinity, namely, Euhemerism, which argued that the gods were originally historical kings and queens who came to be deified in commemoration of their great achievements or public benefactions.²⁷ Second, in

²⁵ For Diodorus' adaptation of Hecataeus' work, see, e.g., Murray 1970: 144–150; *n.b.* that Murray considers 1.44.1 Diodorus' own insertion into the material he borrowed from the Abderite (see his table on p. 146). For further attestations of the idea that the first Pharaohs were gods, see Hdt. 2.144.2, Diog. Laert. 1.2, Athenagoras *Leg.* 28.

²⁶ [*sc.* θεοῦς] ἐπιγείους γενέσθαι φασίν, ὑπάρξαντας μὲν θνητούς, διὰ δὲ σύνεσιν καὶ κοινὴν ἀνθρώπων εὐεργεσίαν τετευχότας τῆς ἀθανασίας (Diod. Sic. 1.13.1).

²⁷ In fact, Murray 1970: 151 argues that Hecataeus preceded and influenced Euhemerus.

the chronicle attributed to the Egyptian priest Manetho, the earliest Pharaohs were the gods themselves, followed by a group that the author refers to as “the dead demigods” (νέκυνες ἡμίθεοι)—an evident attempt at rendering the Greek concept of the cult hero.²⁸

Beside these prose writers we might set a poem like Theocritus’ encomium for Ptolemy II Philadelphus (*Id.* 17), which plays with several competing possibilities for locating the king within the Greek chain of being: is he man, hero, or god?²⁹ Thus, for instance, the poem begins (1–8):

Ἐκ Διὸς ἀρχώμεσθα καὶ ἐς Δία λήγετε Μοῖσαι,
 ἀθανάτων τὸν ἄριστον, ἐπὴν μνασθῶμεν ἀοιδᾶς·
 ἀνδρῶν δ’ αὖ Πτολεμαῖος ἐνὶ πρώτοισι λεγέσθω
 καὶ πύματος καὶ μέσσοις· ὁ γὰρ προφερέστατος ἀνδρῶν.
 ἥρωες, τοὶ πρόσθεν ἀφ’ ἡμιθέων ἐγένοντο, 5
 ῥέξαντες καλὰ ἔργα σοφῶν ἐκύρησαν ἀοιδῶν·
 αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ Πτολεμαῖον ἐπιστάμενος καλὰ εἰπεῖν
 ὑμνήσαιμ’· ὕμνοι δὲ καὶ ἀθανάτων γέρας αὐτῶν.

With Zeus let us begin, Muses, and with Zeus you should end
 whenever we are minded to sing, since he is best of the immortals;
 but of men let Ptolemy be mentioned first and last and in the
 middle, since of men he is the most excellent. Past heroes, the sons
 of demigods, found skillful poets to celebrate their fine deeds, but
 my skill in praise will make a hymn for Ptolemy: hymns are an
 honor given even to the immortals themselves.

Philadelphus is first identified as a man (ἀνδρῶν) in lines 3 and 4, but in the context of an analogy with Zeus. He is implicitly likened to the heroes in lines 5–8, but the poem is emphatically characterized as a “hymn” through the *figura etymologica* in line 8 (ὕμνήσαιμ’· ὕμνοι), with a direct comparison to the hymns offered to the immortal gods.³⁰ This

²⁸ See Waddell 1940: 5 n. 5. Cf. Hdt. 2.50.3, who had claimed that the Egyptians do not worship heroes.

²⁹ See, e.g., Hunter 2003: 93–96.

³⁰ For the dual valence of ὕμνος in the Hellenistic period, see Chapter 2, Section III.b.

kaleidoscopic effect continues virtually throughout the poem, as Theocritus likens Ptolemy to various gods (58–76, 128–134) and heroes (53–57, 118–120) and dwells at length on the deification of his parents, the previous king and queen (13–52, 121–128). Finally, he concludes the poem with another twist, saluting Ptolemy in an Envoi modeled on those of the *HHs* and identifying the king explicitly as a latter-day demigod (135–137):

χαῖρε, ἄναξ Πτολεμαῖε· σέθεν δ' ἐγὼ ἴσα καὶ ἄλλων
 μνάσομαι ἡμιθέων, δοκέω δ' ἔπος οὐκ ἀπόβλητον
 φθέγξομαι ἐσσομένοις· ἀρετὴν γε μὲν ἐκ Διὸς αἰτεῦ. 135

Farewell, lord Ptolemy! I shall make mention of you just as much as of the other demigods, and I think my account will not be rejected by future generations. As for virtue, you should request that from Zeus.

Like Manetho and Hecataeus, Theocritus in his own way presents a range of modes for conceptualizing the place of the Ptolemaic Pharaohs in the Greek hierarchy of gods, heroes, and mortals.

The fuzziness of these speculations and innuendos about the nature of the Pharaoh and of the contemporary Pharaohs, the Ptolemies, show that the leap from hero cult to ruler cult was not far to make. Indeed, modern scholars have often seen Hellenistic ruler cult as an outgrowth of the heroization of living persons,³¹ especially since in this period, “[g]ottgleiche und heroische Ehren für Könige existierten jetzt nebeneinander... Im Kult der Herrscher und Politiker war die Trennung zwischen Götter- und Heroenkult beseitigt.”³² Indeed, I might note in this connection that in Alexandria, Alexander was worshipped both as a state god and with hero cult as the city’s

³¹ See, e.g., Hölbl 2001: 92 and Currie 2005: 9–11, with earlier bibliography. For ruler cult’s earlier roots in the godlike view of kings, visible already in Homer and Hesiod, see, e.g., Habicht 2017: 3–10.

³² Schuller and Leschhorn in *ThesCRA* 2.151. For the erosion of the distinction between divine and heroic honors for historical personages, especially rulers and other politicians, see further Leschhorn 1984: 339–343.

οἰκιστής.³³ Koenen thus observes of Callimachus’ role in promoting the divinity of the Ptolemaic family, “[t]he hero of old was the thing closest to a divine king on earth.”³⁴ As scholars have interpreted the apotheoses of Heracles or the Dioscuri in Alexandrian poetry as nods to the Ptolemaic ruler cult,³⁵ so we might interpret the Argonauts’ un-Homeric heroization as premonitions of the same. It is suggestive, moreover, that in raising this analogy, both Apollonius and, as we have seen, Theocritus would have recourse to the venerable tradition of the *HHs*, the oldest body of religious poetry in the Greek canon,³⁶ endowed with the authority of Homer himself.

But is there any positive evidence in the *Arg.* that suggests that Apollonius was alive to the possible connections between his heroization of the Argonauts and the Ptolemaic ruler cult? I believe that there is, though Apollonius presents it in characteristically subtle fashion. The first case occurs early in the poem, in the Catalogue: the Argonaut Nauplius is introduced according to a genealogy that stretches back seven generations to “divine Danaus” (θεῖοιο ... Δαναοῖο, 1.133). In the epic *Kunstsprache*, θεῖος is a formulaic epithet used of certain extraordinary individuals, rather than a recognition of true divine status;³⁷ it is interchangeable with other formulas meaning “godlike,” like ἀντίθεος or δαίμονι ἴσος. Indeed, Apollonius implies that he will make just such regular use of the epithet by applying it again to Neleus, the father of

³³ Leschhorn 1984: 204–212; see further Fraser 1972: 212 and Habicht 2017: 36. A good discussion of the fate of Alexander’s body can be found in Erskine 2002. Bérard (1982: 91) comments that the use of a prince’s remains to legitimate the current ruler’s authority hearkens back to archaic institutions of hero cult.

³⁴ Koenen 1993: 114.

³⁵ See, e.g., Sens 1997: 23, with further citations.

³⁶ Excepting the hymns attributed to mythical figures like Orpheus, Musaeus, etc., if Apollonius credited their authenticity.

³⁷ See, e.g., Bieler 1967: 9–13 and Buraselis in *ThesCRA* 2.164.

Periclymenus (and Nestor), just 25 lines later (Νηληϊός θείοιο, 1.158). In fact, however, Apollonius uses the epithet but sparingly; the only other mortals to whom he applies it are the Argonauts, in a phrase that I have argued foreshadows their heroization (1.970, 2.1091),³⁸ and Orchomenus, the eponymous founder of the city in Boeotia (2.1186). The rarity of these usages, together with Apollonius' general avoidance of purely "ornamental" epithets,³⁹ argues for their significance. Neleus and Orchomenus could both be considered "divine" in their capacity as city-founders, who regularly received hero cult in their settlements.⁴⁰ But what of Danaus?

Danaus is a fascinating figure to receive this epithet, because for the Greek rulers of Egypt, his famous flight with his fifty daughters provided an important mythological link between Egypt and Greece. He was, moreover, crowned the king of Argos, the city from which the (Macedonian) Ptolemies traced their descent and hence their "Greekness."⁴¹ Accordingly, Danaid ancestry played an important role in Ptolemaic self-fashioning⁴² and was exploited to this end more than once in the poetry of Callimachus, as Stephens and others have shown.⁴³ Given Danaus' identification with the Ptolemies, the application of the epithet θεϊός to the original Greco-Egyptian king may hint at the divinity of his present-day descendants. It is also notable that as the ancestor of the nautical Nauplius, Danaus is made a forerunner (or forefather) of the

³⁸ See Chapter 2, Section II.c.

³⁹ See, e.g., Fränkel 1968: 636 (§ I.42), 639 (§ I.81).

⁴⁰ *N.b.* that Neleus' city, Pylos, is mentioned together with him (1.132); for his foundation thereof, see Hes. *Cat. fr.* 31.5–6 Most, Diod. Sic. 4.68.6.

⁴¹ For a concise summary of the Ptolemaic claim to Argive descent, see Bulloch 1985: 12–13.

⁴² See Acosta-Hughes and Stephens 2012: 168–170.

⁴³ See Stephens 2002: 247–250; 2003: 8–9, 99; 2015: 238; and Acosta-Hughes and Stephens 2012: 185–187; see also Harder 2012: 2.400–401, Kampakoglou 2016, Boychenko 2017, and Manakidou 2017: 188–191 and *passim*.

Argonauts—especially since, in some traditions, Danaus was the inventor of the penteconter, which could accommodate his fifty daughters in their flight from Egypt to Greece.⁴⁴

The other instance of a possible allusion to Ptolemaic ruler cult occurs in the portion of the Libyan episode concerned with Triton (4.1537–1622). When the Argonauts cannot find passage out from Lake Triton to the sea, they make an offering of one of the tripods given them by Apollo to the “indigenous divinities” (δαίμοσιν ἐγγενέταις, 1549), whereupon Triton himself meets them “in the guise of a young man” (αἰζηῶ ἑναλίγκιος, 1551).⁴⁵ He offers them a clod of earth, in a gesture that invests the historical Greek claim to Cyrenaica with divine backing,⁴⁶ and introduces himself as King Eurypylus, son of Poseidon (1558–1561). Euphemus accepts the clod, and, addressing Triton as “hero” (ἥρως, 1564), asks for directions to Apis (Ἀπίδα, 1564), an old name for the Peloponnesus. The god gives the directions, but once the Argonauts have boarded their ship, he disappears with the tripod into the lake; thus they recognize his divinity and sacrifice a sheep to him over the stern of the Argo. Triton then reemerges in his true form as a marine god and guides the ship to the outlet to the sea; altars to Poseidon and Triton remain in the “harbor of Argo” (Ἀργῶος ... λιμὴν, 1620) as traces of these events.

Knight has already noted some of the religious undertones of this scene in which a god appears in the guise of a “hero”: “The only god to appear disguised as a human being, Triton, chooses the form of a young man (4.1551), making himself as similar as possible to the Argonauts and thereby further blurring the distinction between the Argonauts and the gods they

⁴⁴ See Jacoby 1904: 41–42 on the Parian chronicle (*FGrH* 239 A 9) and Eust. *Il.* 1.42 (1.60.37–61.1 van der Valk); see further Σ ad Aesch. *PV* 853a.

⁴⁵ For a possible allusion to the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* here, see n. 128 in Chapter 4

⁴⁶ See, e.g., Stephens 2003: 180–182.

honour.”⁴⁷ Indeed, the equivalence is enhanced by the fact that Triton and Euphemus are half-brothers, both sons of Poseidon (1.179–181).⁴⁸ We may justly see in this blurring of the boundaries between hero and god a hint of the Argonauts’ own destined heroization, but certain elements in the scene raise the possibility of Ptolemaic connection as well.

A major pointer in this direction is Apollonius’ designation of the Peloponnesus by the name “Apis.” This usage may point to Egyptian undertones in this scene, for already in Aeschylus there is evidence for the identification of this eponymous Argive hero with the Egyptian bull god of the same name.⁴⁹ Apollonius had played on this Egyptian resonance already toward the beginning of Book 4 in Argus’ reference to the “Apidanian Arcadians” (Ἀρκάδες Ἀπιδανῆες, 4.263), in a speech that insistently blurs the distinction between Greek and Egyptian.⁵⁰ Notably, in that same speech, “Triton” is twice given as an earlier name for the Nile (4.260, 269).⁵¹ Already in Pindar a god (identified as Triton only in the scholia) appears to the Argonauts by Lake Triton in the guise of Eurypylos, son of Poseidon (*Pyth.* 4.33–34),⁵² but Apollonius seems to have seized on the Egyptianizing potential of this idea. He makes the god’s

⁴⁷ Knight 1995: 277. See further Hitch 2012: 155–156.

⁴⁸ As noted already by Σ ad Pind. *Pyth.* 4.36c, 61 Drachmann.

⁴⁹ See Saïd 1993: 168–169, 175 on Aesch. *Supp.* 117, 128, 260–270; this identification is explicit in Aristippus *BNJ* 317 F 1 (*ap. Clem. Al. Strom.* 1.21.106.4–5), Apollod. *Bib.* 2.1.1, August. *De civ. D.* 18.5; see further Stambaugh 1967: 70–71, 1972: ch. 7; Stephens 1998: 176; Massimilla 2005: 14; and Kampakoglou 2016: 124–125.

⁵⁰ See Stephens 2003: 190.

⁵¹ This allonym for the Nile may be related to a theory that connects the waters of Lake Triton to a westerly source for the Nile; see Priestley 2014: 126–127.

⁵² The scholiast ad *Pyth.* 4.37 claims that this detail was Pindar’s innovation. Apollonius combines the Pindaric story of the clod with an alternate version featuring Triton and the tripod (see, e.g., Ottone 2002: 235).

identity as Triton explicit⁵³ and adds the detail that Eurypylus is the ruler of the Libyan coastland (ἀνάσσω | παρραλίας, *Arg.* 4.1559–1560). Apollonius thereby alludes to the myth that regarded Eurypylus or Triton himself (*Dido. Sic.* 4.56.6) as an early king of Libya.⁵⁴ In light of the episode’s subtle Egyptian connections, Triton’s presentation as a god either disguised as or identified with an early North African⁵⁵ king may constitute an allusion to the tradition, already encountered above, that Egypt’s first kings were gods—as, indeed, were her contemporary rulers, the Ptolemies. If so, Triton-Eurypylus’ resemblances to both the Argonauts and the Ptolemies would mutually reinforce a potential allusion to the heroization of the former and the deification of the latter.

It is hardly incontrovertible, but it turns out that there is some evidence that Apollonius drew a parallel between the Argonauts’ divinization and that of the Ptolemies. But even if he does not directly allude to Ptolemaic ruler cult, the prominence with which Apollonius brings hero cult into the poem—into its very generic fabric, and in a marked departure from the HEs—must have resonated with the contemporary reality that some select individuals could and did transcend the limits of ordinary humanity, as is evidenced first and foremost by the deification of the royal family. To this extent at least, ruler cult provides an important context in which to understand Apollonius’ unusual emphasis on the divinity of his epic heroes.

⁵³ See Jackson 1993: 54, who notes that Triton’s epiphany to the Argonauts in his true form is Apollonius’ own invention.

⁵⁴ Some sources may imply that Eurypylus is but an assumed identity or allonym for Triton, but others seem to view him as a real and distinct personage; see, e.g., Ottone 2002: 285–288. For a possible depiction of Eurypylus on a fourth-century votive relief sculpture from Euesperides, see Ferri 1976: 15–16.

⁵⁵ For the possibility that in Apollonius the Triton episode serves as an ἀῖτιον for the Greek presence not just in Cyrenaica, but in the entire “continent” of Libya, including Egypt, see Stephens 2003: 181–182.

b. Heroization and Heroism

I have spent a great deal of this study, above all in Chapter 2, discussing the Argonauts' heroization, as distinct from the question of their heroism, a topic that has long dominated Apollonian studies, especially with regard to the Argo's captain, Jason.⁵⁶ As Klein once remarked, "There is perhaps no more complex question in Hellenistic literature than this: in what does the heroism of the *Argonautica* reside?"⁵⁷ I can hardly resolve this problem here, but approaching it from a point of view of the heroization theme does present some of the pertinent issues in a fresh light.

To begin with, all but Jason's most ardent defenders would admit that in certain scenes, his behavior is presented in a critical light. The banner example is the moral low point of the narrative (*Arg.* 4.410–481): Jason's deadly ambush of Apsyrtus, lured to his doom by his own sister Medea, on a holy island (ἱερῆς ... νήσου, 458) and, indeed, in the very portico of the temple of Artemis (469–471).⁵⁸ This "wicked murder" (κακῶ ... ὀλέθρῳ, 450) provokes the explicit condemnation of the narrator in his apostrophe to Eros (445–451) as well as the wrath of the Furies and of Zeus himself (475–476, 557–561, 585–588, 700–717; cf. 4.1225–1226).⁵⁹ As commentators have observed, the scene of the murder is marked by an apparently ironic use of religious terminology and the ennobling epithet ἥρωες.⁶⁰ The hapless Apsyrtus is dubbed a

⁵⁶ For an overview of the enormous bibliography in this area, see Glei 2008: 6–12.

⁵⁷ Klein 1974: 229.

⁵⁸ *N.b.* that the narratee is invited to sympathize with Apsyrtus through the second-person address at 4.428–429 (Byre 1991: 225). Williams (1991: 113–114, 271) argues that the winter torrent simile at 4.460–461 underscores Jason's impiety in this scene by recalling his contrastingly virtuous service to Hera at the Anaurus (3.66–74).

⁵⁹ In one respect, the impious murder functions as a plot device, as the need for expiation allows Apollonius to take the Argonauts westward; see 4.552–561.

⁶⁰ For another potentially ironic deployment of ἥρωες, see Köhnken 1965: 45 n. 2 on *Arg.* 2.967.

“hero” (ἥρωσ, 471) as he breathes his last breath, slaughtered like a sacrificial ox (468). Jason then attempts to expiate the murder—ineffectively, as we soon learn—with the gruesome ritual of μασχαλισμός (477–479):

ἥρωσ δ' Αἰσονίδης ἐξάργματα τάμνε θανόντος,
τρὶς δ' ἀπέλειξε φόνου, τρὶς δ' ἐξ ἄγρος ἔπτυσ' ὀδόντων,
ἦ θέμις αὐθέντησι δολοκτασίας ἰλάεσθαι.

The hero Jason cut off the extremities of the dead man, licked up some of his blood three times and three times spat out the pollution through his teeth, which is the proper way for killers to expiate treacherous murders.

In the meantime, the rest of the Argonauts engage the crew of Apsyrtus' ship in a battle—really, a massacre—that Jason evidently misses while busy burying Apsyrtus' corpse (480–491).⁶¹ I need hardly explain why critics have felt that Jason comes off as less than a true “hero” in this scene, and the juxtaposition of the pious formula ἦ θέμις, which so often marks the AR narrator's religious expertise,⁶² with words for “pollution” (ἄγρος), “killers” (αὐθέντησι), and “treacherous murders” (δολοκτασίας) is deeply ironic.⁶³

I would propose that a similar type of irony is in evidence on one of the early occasions in which the AR narrator foreshadows the Argonauts' destined heroization. The Argonauts' two landings on Cyzicus are each associated with a different sort of rock that is rendered holy through its association with the heroes.⁶⁴ On their first landing, the Argonauts discard their

⁶¹ Race 2008: 367 n. 56.

⁶² See n. 39 in Chapter 3.

⁶³ See, e.g., Hutchinson 1988: 96 n. 15, 127; Newman 2008: 437, and van den Eersten 2013: 11–13. Cf. Cuypers 2004: 52, who seems as though she has to fight to resist the natural urge to see irony here: “In the last example, the emphasis on religious observance is particularly remarkable: the killing of Apsyrtus and the mutilation of his corpse are not beyond reproach. The narrator, however, insists on evaluating his heroes' behaviour in a positive way.” I see a similar irony in *Arg.* 4.701.

⁶⁴ See pp. 145–146.

anchor-stone, which the area's Ionian colonists later dedicate to Athena Jasonia (1.955–960).

When the Argonauts first depart from Cyzicus, they proceed with favorable winds at first, but soon their progress is reversed (2.1015–1022):

ἦ δ' ἔθεεν λαίφεσσι πανήμερος· οὐ μὲν ιούσης 1015
νυκτὸς ἔτι ριπὴ μένεν ἔμπεδον, ἀλλὰ θύελλαι
ἀντίαι ἀρπάγδην ὀπίσω φέρον, ὄφρ' ἐπέλασσαν
αὐτίς ἐυξείνοισι Δολίοισιν. ἐκ δ' ἄρ' ἔβησαν
αὐτονυχί· Ἱερὴ δὲ φατίζεται ἦδ' ἔτι πέτρη,
ἣ περὶ πείσματα νηὸς ἐπεσσύμενοι ἐβάλοντο. 1020
οὐδέ τις αὐτὴν νῆσον ἐπιφραδέως ἐνόησεν
ἔμμεναι...

The ship sped under sail all day long, but when night came on the rushing wind no longer remained steady, but contrary storm winds seized the ship and carried it back, until they reached once again the hospitable Doliones. That same night they disembarked, and the rock is still called Sacred rock, around which they hastily cast the ship's cables. But no one took care to notice that it was the same island...

This αἴτιον for the name of Sacred Rock is jarring, given the events that are about to unfold as a direct consequence of the Argonauts' second landing at Cyzicus. Indeed, the etiology is flanked on either side by hints of the horror to come: the epithet “hospitable” for the Doliones (ἐυξείνοισι Δολίοισιν, 1018) and the notice of the heroes' ignorance concerning their whereabouts (1021–1022) foreshadow the Argonauts' tragic slaughter of their erstwhile hosts in the confusion of the ensuing nighttime battle (1022–1052). Only at dawn do the two sides “recognize their deadly and irrevocable mistake” (ὄλοην καὶ ἀμήχανον εἰσενόησαν | ἀμπλακίην, 1053–1054).

Unlike the murder of Apsyrtus, the Argonauts' ξενοκτονία at Cyzicus is unwitting and, accordingly, less morally problematic. Nevertheless, the national calamity that the Argonauts' return precipitates—commemorated “to this day” (ἔτι, 1047; ἔτι νῦν, 1075) in the hero cult afforded their Dolionian victims (1047–1048, 1070–1077)—sits ill at ease with the sacrality that

the crew's arrival confers upon the site of their second landing, or, in retrospect, even upon the anchor-stone associated with their first landing. The awkwardness of this juxtaposition points up a troubling facet of heroization in the *Arg.*: it is not, apparently, inconsistent with the commission of grave errors (ἁμαρτίαι), as in the Cyzicus episode, or even of sacrilegious, treacherous murder, as in the Apsyrtus episode. In Chapter 2, I argued that the *Arg.* presupposes the common notion that heroes merited their heroization through their completion of great labors (ἄεθλοι), but the Cyzicus and Apsyrtus episodes raise a different problem with a long history in Greek theological speculation on hero cult: what is the relationship, if any, between the receipt of heroic honors and the normative value of the hero's actions in life?

Greek hero cult has often been compared to the Christian cult of the saints, but it is also a commonplace of scholarship on the subject to note a crucial difference between these conceptions: "To qualify as a saint, one had to behave in an exemplary fashion and to be a paragon for other believers. To qualify as a hero in ancient Greece, one had to be extreme, in every sense of the term, in life or death; virtue was not necessarily a qualification."⁶⁵ This generalization is true so far as it goes: Aristotle cites this idea as a popular notion about apotheosis in his day,⁶⁶ and it is a simple matter to find examples of cult heroes who were downright despicable human beings in life.⁶⁷ From this perspective, problematic behavior is no obstacle to the Argonauts' heroization.

⁶⁵ Ekroth 2009: 121; see further, e.g., Nilsson 1967: 189–190 and Parker 2011: 104.

⁶⁶ "Hence if, as men say, surpassing virtue changes men into gods..." (ὥστ' εἰ, καθάπερ φασίν, ἐξ ἀνθρώπων γίνονται θεοὶ δι' ἀρετῆς ὑπερβολῆν, *Eth. Nic.* 1145.22–23). The context makes clear that by ἀρετῆς ὑπερβολή Aristotle means an amoral state that transcends the human distinctions between good and evil (see Gigon and Nickel 2001: 505).

⁶⁷ E.g., Ekroth 2009: 140 n. 1 adduces the Megarians' worship of Tereus (Paus. 1.41.9), a man who raped, imprisoned, and mutilated his sister-in-law and unwittingly consumed his own son's flesh.

Nevertheless, we should not overlook a frequent countervailing desire in the Greek religious imagination to league the hero with moral right. Thus in the Myth of the Five Ages in the *Works and Days*, whose framework Apollonius adopts in the *Arg.*,⁶⁸ Hesiod’s characterization of the heroes of the fourth age as “more just and superior” (δικαιότερον καὶ ἄρειον, 158) to their predecessors in the Bronze Age may imply that their blessed afterlife constitutes in some measure a reward for their goodness in life;⁶⁹ and the heroes’ righteousness stands out all the more sharply in view of the destined degeneracy of the Iron Age that succeeds them (174–201). The moral dimension of heroization becomes clearer in Pindar, who explicitly reserves the Island of the Blessed for the righteous (*Ol.* 2.68–83, fr. 133 Race); *n.b.* that we owe this latter fragment to an approving quotation from Plato (*Meno* 81b). These Pindaric passages reflect a wider discourse in the Classical and Hellenistic periods that regarded heroization or deification as a reward, often in explicitly moral terms.⁷⁰ And after heroization, heroes could continue to be connected with morality; Aristophanes, for instance, likely reflects popular religious belief when the titular chorus of his *Heroes* claim to punish the wicked and, presumably, reward the good (fr. 322 Henderson).⁷¹

Apollonius’ Argonauts often appear as righteous avengers of the wicked and benefactors of humanity,⁷² but they occasionally commit transgressions as well, both unwitting and

⁶⁸ See Chapter 2, Section II.c.

⁶⁹ Jones 2010: 6.

⁷⁰ I also discuss this discourse in Chapter 2, Section III.c.

⁷¹ Aristophanes’ *Heroes* call themselves the dispensers of good and ill (ἡμεῖς ἐσμεν οἱ ταμίαι | τῶν κακῶν καὶ τῶν ἀγαθῶν, 3–4), but the fragment as it stands only lists some of the punishments that they dole out.

⁷² Book 2 especially promotes this view of the heroes: *n.b.* their punishment of Amycus, their liberation of Phineus from the Harpies’ harassment, their neutralization of the Symplegades, and the aid that they lend to two sets of brothers stranded abroad, the Deimachids and the Phrixids.

intentional. Jason’s moral integrity and heroic mettle fall under particular suspicion in numerous passages, as Apollonius hints at the possibility that he may become the scoundrel of Euripides’ *Medea*,⁷³ and yet his personal heroization is foreshadowed by the reference to the cult of Athena Jasonia at *Arg.* 1.960.⁷⁴ Likewise, Medea’s individual fate is specified as the eternal bliss of Elysium (4.811–815), despite her violations of the patriarchal norms of the Greek family in Book 3 and her betrayal of her own brother to death in Book 4. As I have said, the Greeks generally did not demand absolute purity of their heroes, and it is telling that the only hymn in the Homeric collection to countenance its deified subject’s pre-apotheosis career as a mortal hero (in strikingly epic terms) frankly admits its Hymnic Subject’s moral failings. The *Homeric Hymn to Heracles* summarizes the hero’s labors thus (15.4–6):

ὃς πρὶν μὲν κατὰ γαῖαν ἀθέσφατον ἠδὲ θάλασσαν
 πλάζόμενος πομπῆσιν ὕπ’ Εὐρυσθηῶς ἀνακτος
 πολλὰ μὲν αὐτὸς ἔρεξεν ἀτάσθαλα, πολλὰ δ’ ἀνέτλη. 5

Formerly he roamed the vast land and sea at the behest of King Eurystheus, committing many reckless deeds himself and enduring many.⁷⁵

Even an acknowledgment of Heracles’ (many!) “reckless deeds,” it seems, is not incompatible with the hymnist’s eulogistic agenda. Likewise, through the ironic juxtapositions analyzed here, Apollonius seems positively to draw attention to the failure of his heroes to live up to the

⁷³ For Euripides’ *Medea* as one possible “sequel” to the *Arg.*, see the nuanced discussion of Byre 2002: chapters 3–4.

⁷⁴ See pp. 145–146.

⁷⁵ I follow Athanassakis 2004 in translating ἀτάσθαλα with “reckless deeds”; Evelyn-White 1914 (“deeds of violence”) and West 2003a (“suffering”) both downplay the moral import of this weighty word, evidently uncomfortable with the hymn’s attribution of such deeds to Heracles “himself” (αὐτός, 6).

idealized image that one strain of Greek thought projected onto the recipients of hero cult.⁷⁶

Catullus, we may note, would make much the same point in a more potent and concentrated form in his celebrated epyllion (c. 64), which simultaneously extols the superiority of the Heroic Age to the Iron Age while demonstrating that it suffered from the same ethical lapses that characterize the present day.⁷⁷

At this point, we can perhaps see how the question of heroization and heroism impinges upon the *Arg.*'s potential connections with the Ptolemaic ruler cult. As Newman has shown, a critical reading of an unheroic Jason could have had subversive political implications in third-century Alexandria;⁷⁸ we can imagine how much more subversive such a reading could become if we extend this analysis to encompass the issues of heroization and ruler cult. To put the matter in extreme terms: the Argonauts and their morally-checked leader especially are not “heroes” but ordinary human beings like you or me—or, indeed, like the Ptolemaic dynasts and all the rest who appropriate divinity for themselves. The theme of hero cult and the hymnic format of the *Arg.* are just so much window dressing, or lip service, meant to disguise their fundamental moral and ontological equivalence to “men as they are now.” More charitably (and plausibly, I would think), we could say that Apollonius presents his heroes in a realistic light as flawed individuals whose occasional mistakes and transgressions nevertheless pale in comparison before their extraordinary achievements, which fully justify their heroization.⁷⁹ Such a view could leave

⁷⁶ Whereas the AR narrator is evidently concerned to present the gods in a favorable light, he does not show the same concern for his heroes; see n. 67 in Chapter 3.

⁷⁷ For this interpretation of Catullus c. 64, see, e.g., Konstan 1977, 1993; for this connection between Hesiod, Apollonius, and Catullus, see Clauss 2000: 23–25.

⁷⁸ See Newman 2008: 439–441, whose account is rather fanciful (because based on the ancient biographical tradition) but illustrative of the subversive potential of certain readings of the *Arg.*

⁷⁹ Cf. Jackson's view that “Jason is, in fact, *not* a hero of non-human proportions at all, but a man, with all man's qualities and faults” (1992: 155; emphasis original).

open the possibility of divinization for the great women and men of the Hellenistic present, whose accomplishments similarly raise them above the inevitable imperfections of their human station and closer to that of the gods.⁸⁰

⁸⁰ For the idea that the *Arg.* leaves room in its divine economy for new deities, like the Ptolemies, see Clauss 2016b: 150–151.

APPENDIX I: GLOSSARY OF HYMNIC TERMINOLOGY

In order to facilitate precise analysis, it has been necessary in this study to employ a fair number of technical terms that denote specific formal features of Greek hymns or that otherwise relate to hymnody. For convenience, a list of this terminology with brief definitions is provided here. A good many of these have been culled from a number of different sources,¹ while others are of my own devising. Terms marked with an asterisk (*) are defined in other entries in the glossary. Hymnic terms that are defined in this glossary are capitalized throughout the dissertation in order to mark them out as technical usages.

Anaphora: The repetition of a word at the beginning of successive clauses,² as in, “Often [Pan] runs through the long white mountains, and often he drives the wild creatures through the glens, killing them” (*HH* 19.12–13).³ This device creates an enthusiastic effect that is especially at home in hymnody.

Appeal to the Muses: The term by which I denote the requests for the Muses’ assistance that begin both the HEs and many *HHs*, in order to avoid confusion with the term Invocation*.

¹ I have drawn especially on Bremer 1981; Janko 1981; Race 1982, 1992; Furley and Bremer 2001; Calame 2005; and Hall 2012: ch. 3. For further discussion and bibliography, see Section II.b of the Introduction.

² *N.b.* that “anaphora” is often used more loosely to designate any sort of repetition (e.g., Richardson 2010 ad *HH* 4.373–374).

³ πολλάκι δ’ ἀργινόντα διέδραμεν οὔρεα μακρά, | πολλάκι δ’ ἐν κνημοῖσι διήλασε θήρας ἐναίρων. On this example, see Germany 2005: 190 with n. 9. Another possible example from the *Hymns* is *HH* 24.4, where, however, the text is uncertain; see AHS 1936 and Olson 2012 ad loc. Generally, however, Anaphora is probably more common in Cultic Hymns*; see, e.g., Fehling 1969: 169, 173, 174–176.

Attributes: All the materials that hymnists use to describe a deity in the present tense (e.g., their “appearance, possessions, haunts and spheres of activity”⁴), typically placed in the central section of a hymn as an “**Attributive Section**”; contrast Myth*.

Charis (χάρις): The “relationship... of reciprocal pleasure and goodwill”⁵ that the hymnist tries to establish with the god by means of the hymn. A good deal of common hymnic diction refers to this hoped-for bond between god and mortal (e.g., χαῖρε, πρόφρων, ἰανθείς, γηθόσυνος).

Contagious Hymnody: My term for a range of poetic devices that give the impression that the narrator himself is swept up in religious fervor as he describes his own characters’ Invocation (or Evocation) of a god. E.g., a narrator might be paraphrasing a hymn in indirect speech before switching to direct speech, as if he were joining in the praise of the god in his own voice. On one interpretation, Hymnic Narratization* could also be understood as a subtype of Contagious Hymnody.⁶

Cultic Hymns: Most Greek hymns were “Cultic,” in that their performance accompanied religious rituals such as processions (προσόδια) or were associated with particular cults, such as the paeon (παιάν) for Apollo and related deities.⁷ These hymns are characterized by different stylistic conventions from those of Rhapsodic Hymns* like the *HHS*, such as a preference for Du-Stil* and a more personal tone.

⁴ Janko 1981: 11.

⁵ Race 1982: 8.

⁶ See Chapter 4, Section I.

⁷ Moreover, most “literary hymns” (i.e., those embedded in non-hymnic literary genres) tend to imitate Cultic Hymns, such as those featured in the choruses of Attic drama (see, e.g., Fränkel 1931: 3–11, Bremer 1981: 213 n. 67) or in lyric poetry (see Danielewicz 1974).

Du-Stil and **Er-Stil**: Two hymnic styles; in the former, the god is spoken *to*, in the second-person; in the latter, the god is spoken *of*, in the third-person. The *HHs* tend to maintain Er-Stil except in the Envoi, which is typically marked by a sudden switch to Du-Stil.

Envoi: The conclusion of a hymn, which typically consists of any combination of the following: a Salutation*, a Prayer*, and (in the *HHs*) the Poet’s Task*.

Evocation: See **Invocation***.

Exordium: The material at the beginning of a hymn up to the Hymnic Relative*; component parts typically include the Evocation* and a string of Honorific* epithets appended to the name of the god, and sometimes an Appeal to the Muses*.

Honorific: I employ this term for a range of epithets, appositive phrases or periphrases, and descriptive relative clauses or participial phrases whose use is designed to honor and please a god in a hymn.⁸ They are frequently deployed throughout a hymn, but they are virtually requisite in the Exordium* and Salutation*; e.g., “I will never stop singing far-shooting Apollo, wielder of the silver bow, whom fine-haired Leto bore” (*HH* 3.177–178).⁹

Hymnic Subject: The divinity to whom the hymn is dedicated.

Hymnic Narratization: My term for a device common in Apollonius in which the Evocation* or Invocation* of a god is “narratized” (i.e., the speech act is mentioned but not represented in either direct or indirect speech), but in which the god nonetheless receives one or more Honorifics* characteristic of actual hymnody. On one interpretation, this device could be understood as a type of Contagious Hymnody*.¹⁰

⁸ For a useful delineation of typical epithets used in hymns, see Bremer 1981: 195.

⁹ ἐγὼν οὐ λήξω ἐκπρόβουλον Ἀπόλλωνα | ὑμνέων ἀργυρότοξον, ὄν ἠῦκομος τέκε Λητώ.

¹⁰ See Chapter 4, Section III.

Hymnic Proem: A hymn that is sung before an epic performance, as the *HHs* are believed to have functioned, or a hymnic introit that launches an epic poem (e.g., Hes. *Op.* 1–10). By this somewhat cumbersome phrase I mean to avoid confusion with the common use of the term “proem” to refer to any introductory section of an epic poem (or other work of literature).

Hymnic Relative: The device, usually a relative clause with the Hymnic Subject as its antecedent, by which hymns transition from their Exordium* to the *Laudatio**.

Ich-Du: This term refers to the tendency in addresses to the god to juxtapose first-person and second-person verbs and pronouns. Race explains the effect of one example of this technique thus: “This climactic juxtaposition of the god (second person) and man (first person) dramatizes the desire of the hymnist to bring together god and man in common delight.”¹¹

Introit: The term I will be using (uncapitalized) to designate the introductory section of an epic poem, in order to avoid confusion with the term Proem*.

Invocation and Evocation: The formal beginning of the hymn, in which the god to be honored (the Hymnic Subject*) is named. In an Invocation, this naming is achieved with a vocative address to the god in Du-Stil*, but the *HHs* regularly feature the Evocation of the god as the third-person object of a first-person **Evocatory Verb** of singing, telling, commemorating, etc. (e.g., ἀείσομαι; ἄρχομ’ ἀείδειν; μνήσομαι). In some cases, the Evocation is accomplished instead by an Appeal to the Muses* (e.g., ἔννεπε, Μοῦσα).

Laudatio (εὐλογία): The central section of a hymn, whose rhetorical function is to prepare for the petition in the Prayer* by winning the god’s favor. In the *HHs*, the *Laudatio* may take the

¹¹ Race 1982: 13 n. 28.

form of a narrative (Myth*), a description of the god's attributes (Attributive Section*), or a composite of the two.¹²

Myth: A narrative in the central section of a hymn that recounts the deity's birth or deeds, characterized by past tenses; contrast Attributes*. The myth may be recounted quickly or over hundreds of verses.

Poet's Task: Janko's term for a frequent element in the conclusions of the *HHs* in which the poet promises to remember the god as he transitions to another song. This formula is a key piece of evidence supporting the hypothesis that the *HHs* were sung as Hymnic Proems* to the recitation of epic lays in rhapsodic performance.

Prayer: A request to the deity in the hymn's Envoi*; in the *HHs*, the verb that constitutes the petition is always imperatival, but other hymns use verbs in the optative mood as well.

Proem, Proemial Hymn: See Hymnic Proem*.

Prolongation: The transition out of a Mythic narrative and back to the present tense.

Rhapsodic Hymns*: A general term for the genre of hexameter hymns exemplified by the *HHs*, so-called because of their likely recitation as Hymnic Proems* in rhapsodic performances. The term is also used for later compositions, such as Callimachus' *Hymns*, that more or less subscribe to the same formal conventions.¹³ Contrast Cultic Hymns*.

¹² For other terms by which scholars have designated this part of a hymn, see Furley and Bremer 2001: 1.51. Probably Bremer's term "argument" is preferable in describing the central section of Greek hymns generally (1981: 196); by this term he refers to any line of reasoning, which could be narrativized or not, intended to predispose the god to granting the hymnist's petition. He classifies four typical arguments: 1) *da quia dedi*; 2) *da ut dem*; 3) *da quia dedisti*; 4) *da quia hoc dare tuum est*. But as the *HHs* prefer to win the god's favor through straightforward praise rather than the explicit articulation of such logically worked out arguments, I prefer the term *laudatio* for the present study.

¹³ For these conventions and particularly the structural elements of a Rhapsodic Hymn, see section II of the Introduction.

Salutation: An address to the deity in the vocative case in the Envoi* of the hymn, coupled with a **Salutatory Verb**. In the *HHS*, this verb is almost always a form of *χαῖρε* or *ἴληθι*, but Cultic Hymns* also use imperatival verb forms requesting the god's attention (e.g., *κλῦθι*) or presence (e.g., *ἴκεο*, *έλθέ*, *φάνηθι*).¹⁴

¹⁴ Menander Rhetor gives the label *κλητικὸς ὕμνος* to hymns that request the god's presence (1.2.2 *Race*).

APPENDIX II: DIVINE EPITHETS IN THE *ARGONAUTICA*

In this appendix, I detail the AR narrator's standard practice for applying epithets to deities in order to contextualize the striking departures from the norm constituted by his technique of "hymnic narratization," in which gods receive a string of Honorific epithets or relative clauses when a character is described as invoking them.¹ The AR narrator often uses the bare name of a god without any ornamentation:² "Nor was their going forth unnoticed by Athena" (οὐδ' ἄρ' Ἀθηναίην προτέρω λάθον ὀρμηθέντες, 2.537); "but all those things had been accomplished by Zeus' designs" (τὰ δὲ πάντα Διὸς βουλῆσι τέτυκτο, 2.154); etc.³ The narrator deploys a handful of theonym-epithet pairings of a type common in early Greek epic, like "Apollo Phoebus" (Ἀπόλλων Φοῖβος, 1.759) or "early-rising Dawn" (ἠριγενῆς Ἥως, 3.1224, 4.981),⁴ but for the most part, he uses a single such epithet or phrase independently as a substitute for the god's name. For example, Apollo is frequently designated simply by "Phoebus," beginning from the opening line of the poem (1.1, 536; 2.506, 847; 4.529, 1493, 1550, 1702,

¹ I discuss hymnic narratization in Chapter 4, Section III. I make no attempt here at a rigorous definition of the term "epithet," but I generally have in mind those adjectives, nouns, and phrases, whether used alone as a "periphrastic denomination" for a given entity or whether modifying or set in apposition to it, that indicate an inherent or recurrent quality or that delineate some aspect of that entity's identity. For a survey of definitions and interpretations of the epithet, ancient and modern, see Vivante 1982: chapters 20–21; for ancient definitions, see also Bécaries Botas 1985 s.v. ἐπίθετος.

² Furley and Bremer 2001: 1.53 refer to the god's "first name" in such cases.

³ In several passages, it is striking just how little the narrator seeks to vary a god's name across a series of repeated occurrences. E.g., the name "Ares" occurs three times in as many lines at 2.989–991, twice in the same case and *sedes*; in the Olympian colloquy at 3.6–111, the narrator uses the names "Hera" (8, 10, 23, 55, 77, 83, 106) and "Athena" (8, 10, 17, 30, 111) over and over with hardly a single variation (they are θεαί at line 100), even if we include variants in character-speech (11, 79); etc. But cf. n. 8 below.

⁴ *N.b.* also "Zeus son of Cronus" (Κρονίδη Δί, 2.524; Διὸς Κρονίδαο, 4.520; Κρονίδαο Διὸς, 4.753), "Enyalios Ares" (Ἐνυαλίου ... Ἄρεος, 3.1366), "Muse, daughter of Zeus" (Μοῦσα, Διὸς τέκος, 4.2), and "Leto's son Apollo" (Ἀπόλλωνος ... Λητοΐδαο, 4.612).

1718);⁵ Dawn can appear solely as “the early-riser” (2.450, 3.824); and so on.⁶ In some cases, this technique of “periphrastic denomination” (ἀντωνομασία, *pronominatio*)⁷ seems to be motivated by a desire for lexical *variatio*,⁸ but for the most part, this technique serves to furnish the poet with a handy set of alternative appellatives and circumlocutions for designating the gods, just as with mortal characters (e.g., Jason is frequently Αἰσονίδης; the Argonauts are frequently ἥρωες, ἀριστῆες, νέοι, or Μινύαι; etc.).

Otherwise, the narrator’s use of divine epithets generally falls into only a few, limited categories:

- a) Identifying the particular cultic aspect of the god that is relevant to the context, as when, e.g., the Argonauts sacrifice to “Apollo of Embarkation” before departing on their journey.⁹

⁵ “Phoebus” also occurs at 2.713, in a narratologically complex passage; see Chapter 4, Section IV.c.

⁶ Apollo also appears simply as “Leto’s son” (1.66, 144, 439; 2.181, 674, 698; 4.1706; cf. 2.771, in indirect speech), “the Far-shooter” (Ἐκίβολος; 1.88; Ἐκατος; 1.958, 2.518, 4.1747), and perhaps as “Paeëon” (4.1511), though Homeric scholarship recognized a separate deity under this title in Homer and Hesiod (Hunter 2015 ad loc.). Likewise Aphrodite appears as “Cypris” (1.615, 850, 860, 1233; 3.3, 37, 80, 90, 127; 4.918) and “Cytherea” (1.742); Athena, as “Pallas” (1.723,) and under the periphrases “the Itonian goddess” (1.721), “Zeus’ daughter” (2.547), and “the Tritonian goddess” (3.1183); Rhea-Cybele, as “the mountain goddess” (1.1119) and, when she grants the Argonauts’ prayers, “the amenable goddess” (1.1141); Dionysus, in an etymologizing gloss, as “Zeus’ Nysean son” (Διὸς Νυσηίου υἱά, 2.905, 4.1134); Artemis, as “Leto’s daughter” (2.938, 3.878, 4.346) and “Zeus’ daughter” (4.334); Zeus, as “son of Cronus” (2.1083, 4.1643); Hera, as “Zeus’ wife” (3.922; 4.753, 959, 967, 1152); and the Muses, as the “Pierides” (4.1382). For Leto as “Coeus’ daughter” (Κοιογένεια, 2.710), see the analysis of Orpheus’ hymn in Chapter 4, Section IV.c. I have not included in this list periphrases of a “contextual” type, whether representing embedded focalization (e.g., “his father,” i.e., Apollo vis-à-vis Aristaeus, 2.519) or anaphoric reference (e.g., “the goddess,” i.e., Hera, just mentioned two verses earlier: 4.648).

⁷ de Jong 2001: xvi defines this technique as “a reference to a character not by proper name but by a form of indirect description (e.g., ‘father’ or ‘master’ instead of ‘Odysseus’).”

⁸ E.g., in the Aristaeus digression, Apollo’s unadorned name (Ἀπόλλων, 2.502) is varied with “Phoebus” (Φοῖβος, 506), “the god” (θεός, 508), “the Far-shooter” (Ἐκάτοιο, 518), and “[Aristaeus’] father” (πατρός, 519) in less than twenty lines. See also, e.g., 2.432–433 (in indirect speech).

⁹ Thus Iphias is a priestess specifically of “city-protecting Artemis” (1.312); the Argonauts raise altars to Apollo under the titles of Actius (1.404), Embasius (1.404), Ecbasius (1.966, 1186), and Neossos (2.927), all in littoral, seafaring contexts; the Ionian colonists of Cyzicus possess a temple to Athena Jasonia, mentioned in an etiological context (1.960); Poseidon Genethlius (2.3) is a relevant title in its genealogical context, and may designate Poseidon as an ancestral god of the Bebrycians (Cuypers 1997 ad loc.); Jason and the Boreads call on Apollo Manteius at the

- i. Frequently such epithets denote an epichoric aspect of the deity relevant to a particular setting (e.g., Pelias, king of Iolcus, disrespects “Pelasgian Hera” specifically, 1.14).¹⁰
- b) In a few cases the epithet suggests a character’s focalization¹¹ or motivation.¹²
- c) As descriptors for physical phenomena that are identified with a deity (e.g., “radiant Dawn”).¹³
- d) In etiologies explaining the origin of the epithet in question.¹⁴

bidding of the seer Phineus (2.493); the refugee Phrixus set up an altar to “Zeus, Protector of Fugitives” (4.119); Circe purifies Jason and Medea out of reverence for the ordinance of “Zeus, Protector of Suppliants” (4.700); on Phaeacia Demeter is “indigenous” (4.986–987); and Medea sets up altars in the precinct of “Apollo Nomius” (4.1218). “Zeus the king” at 1.731 is a special case; here the epithet serves to situate the scene within the chronology of myth, at a time after Zeus’ ascension to power (cf. 1.508–511).

¹⁰ Thus Hera is also Imbrasian (1.187); Athena is Itonian (1.551, 721, 768) and Minoan (4.1691); Zeus is Genetaean (2.1009); and Aphrodite is once “the goddess who rules over Eryx” (θεὰ Ἐρυκος μεδέουσα, 4.917). Another epithet that should probably fall into this category occurs at 1.410, where Jason calls on “Apollo of his fathers” (πατρώιον Ἀπόλλωνα) at Pagasae, i.e., from within his own ancestral territory. Cf. Apollo’s epithet “Lycorean” (4.1490), which the scholiast ad loc. connects to Delphi, though Apollonius uses it in a Libyan context. Whatever its true significance, the epithet appears to be connected to an acrostic, ΛΥΚΕ (1489–1492), identified by Danielewicz 2005: 332. Athena’s epithet “Tritonian” (1.109, 3.1183) presents another interesting case: it is apparently chosen in both of the cited passages to connect the goddess to the Triton River in Boeotia (Race 2008: 12 n. 20), but in Book 4 the narrator rather sets Athena’s birth by Lake Triton in Libya (4.1309–1311; cf. 1495). In addition, “Tritonian” rather than “Itonian” is the manuscript reading at 1.768 and a variant at 1.551, 721; if read in any of these passages, the epithet would presumably refer to another Triton River in Thessaly, the homeland of Jason and the starting-point of the Argonautic expedition. For these various “Tritonian” connections, see Kirk 1985 ad *Il.* 4.513–516; cf. Paus. 8.26.6 for an Arcadian claimant to being Athena’s Triton River. Finally, cf. also “Thracian” Boreas, whose epithet appears even in contexts where the wind’s northerly source is not obviously pertinent (1.214, 1300; 2.427; 4.1484).

¹¹ Thus Hades is “hateful” to Medea as she remembers all of life’s pleasures (στυγεροῖο ... Αἶδαο, 3.810); Hecate is “the dread goddess” in her terrifying epiphany that Jason is not to look upon (δεινὴ θεός, 3.1213); “mother earth” represents the earthborn men’s perspective (γαῖαν | μητέρα, 3.1374–1375); and the Furies are “terrible” to Circe as she attempts to placate their anger (σμερδαλέας ... Ἐρινύας, 4.714; *n.b.* that purpose clauses inherently represent character-focalization: de Jong 2004a: 118); and Night is a “giver of rest from labors” as it comes to the weary Argonauts (εὐνήτειρα | νύξ ἔργων, 4.1058–1059).

¹² Thus Hera’s status as “Zeus’ wife” (Ἥρη, Ζηνὸς ἄκοιτις) is relevant at 1.997 because it suggests her motivation for preparing a trial for Heracles—her abhorrence for her husband’s bastard.

¹³ Eos is “radiant” at 1.519 (αἰγλήσσσα ... Ἥώς) and “light-brining” at 4.885 (φαεσφόρος ... Ἥώς). See n. 10 above on “Thracian Boreas.”

¹⁴ The derivation of the epithet is in each case clear from context but is explained with varying degrees of explicitness: Aristaeus Agreus and Nomius (2.507; see Levin 1969), Zeus Icmæus (2.522), Apollo Heoïus (2.700), and Apollo Aegletes (4.1716).

e) As markers of moments of high drama or gravity.¹⁵

The comparatively few divine epithets that fall outside the norms of usage outlined here are generally well-suited to their contexts,¹⁶ and in some cases they seem to be chosen to generate unique effects,¹⁷ including irony.¹⁸ Only a very few epithets are not immediately significant in context,¹⁹ and one example thereof is probably due to textual corruption.²⁰

¹⁵ Thus when Jason and Medea murder Apsyrtus, “the all-subduing, pitiless Fury” (πανδαμάτωρ ... νηλειῆς ... Ἐρινύς, 4.475–476) takes notice. The same explanation holds true for “Zeus himself, king of the gods” (αὐτόν ... Ζῆνα, θεῶν βασιλῆα, 4.557–558).

¹⁶ Often such epithets have something of an explanatory purpose or serve to emphasize important points in the narrative. Thus Iris is “swift” (ὠκέα Ἴρις, 2.286) when she intervenes just in the nick of time to stop the Boreads from slaying the Harpies; when the Argonauts erect a shrine to “kindly Concord” (Ὀμονοίης ... εὐφρονος, 2.718), εὐφρονος may be meant as a cultic epithet; Eros is “greedy” (μάργος Ἔρωσ, 3.120) as he beats Ganymede in a game of dice; Hephaestus is “the craftsman” (τεχνήεις Ἥφαιστος) at 3.229, in a catalogue of his Colchian handiwork; “Apollo of the golden sword” (χρυσασόφω Ἀπόλλωνι, 3.1283) is motivated by the god’s comparison with the sword-wielding Jason (Race 2008: 317 n. 110); “man-destroying Ares” (Ἄρηος ... φθισιμβρότου, 3.1357) occurs in a martial context; the Loves—if we choose to personify them (Feeney 1991: 83)—are “bold” when they urge Medea on in her scheme to help Jason (θρασέες ... Ἐρωτες, 3.687); at 3.765, they are “tireless” as they perturb her through the night (ἀκάματοι ... Ἐρωτες); and Terpsichore is “beautiful” in an erotically-charged passage (εὐειδής ... Τερψιχόρη, 4.895–896).

¹⁷ Thus the epithet pairing “Uranus’ son Cronus” (Ὀυρανίδης ... Κρόνος, 2.1232) constitutes an allusion to Pind. *Pyth.* 3.4, which uses the same phraseology in referring to the same myth of Chiron’s parentage; this is the only other *locus* where these words are paired in this way. At 4.1552, the epithet “wide-ruling Triton” (Τρίτων εὐρυβίης) seems to be chosen to connect with Triton’s alias when he approaches the Argonauts, Eurypylos (1561).

¹⁸ Thus Hephaestus is dubbed “resourceful” at 1.851 (Ἥφαιστοιο ... πολυμήτιος), though it is in fact the god’s wife who is actually exhibiting μήτις in this episode (cf. 1.802, where, however, the text is uncertain). He is likewise Cypris’ “lame husband” (πόςις ἀμφιγυήεις) at 3.37, in a scene that seems designed to make us think of Demodocus’ second lay (see, e.g., Knight 1995: 224–225), which stresses Hephaestus’ besting of the physically much more impressive Ares.

¹⁹ Thus Selene is “the Titanian goddess, the Moon” at 4.54–55 (Τιτηνίς ... θεά ... Μήνη); Dionysus is the “Nysaeen king” (ἄναξ ... Νυσήιος, 4.431), in an evident attempt to vary his name at 4.424; Persephone appears as “Demeter’s mighty daughter” (Δηοῦς | θυγατέρ’ ἰφθίμην, 4.896–897); and the smith god is styled as “lord Hephaestus” at 4.956–958 (ἄναξ ... Ἥφαιστος, with considerable hyperbaton). *N.b.* also Apollonius’ mannerism, inherited from early Greek epic (e.g., in the formula θεὰ γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη [*Il.* 1.206, 2.166, etc.]), of applying a rather superfluous θεά to the name of a goddess (van den Eersten 2013: 19). Thus Athena is “the goddess Athena” at 1.226; she is “the Itonian goddess Athena” at 1.768. Likewise Hera is “the goddess Hera” at 4.241–242, 781, and “goddess” is added superfluously also at 1.996. Both the “Muses” and the “Graces” are “goddesses” at 2.511 and 4.425, respectively; a singular Muse is a goddess at 4.1.

²⁰ In many editions, Zeus appears as “mighty” at 3.158 (μεγάλοιο Διός). It has long been recognized that the epithet μέγαλοιο would have no special relevance here (Gerhard 1816: 78, Mooney 1912 ad loc., Platt 1914: 27–28, Ardizzoni 1958 ad loc.; cf. Campbell 1994 ad loc., van den Eersten 2013: 24), and the Apollonian narrator’s conservative use of divine epithets would tell against such a seemingly unmotivated usage. On the other hand, the proposal of Levin 1963, who would read μέγαλοιο θεοῦ based on Π²⁰, is more consistent with Apollonian technique:

Notably, Apollonius' procedure in applying epithets to mortal characters generally agrees, *mutatis mutandis*,²¹ with the practices I have just outlined, except that the AR narrator actually tends to be more sparing in his application of epithets to gods than to mortals.²² For instance, the narrator once refers to “the Minyan son of Athamas” (Μινυήιον υἱῆ Ἀθάμαντος, 4.117), identifying him two lines later as “the Aeolid Phrixus” (Αἰολίδης ... Φρίξος). The point of these genealogical epithets is not immediately apparent in context,²³ but they add a degree of rhetorical *amplitudo* to this mention of Phrixus that most Apollonian divinities never enjoy. One major reason for this difference in treatment of gods and mortals must be the narratee's greater familiarity with the former than with the latter. Especially on a mortal character's first appearance (or reappearance after some time), they may receive multiple epithets or even a relative clause as a means of introducing or identifying them: e.g., “the son of Aeneus, the hero Cyzicus, whom Aenete bore, the daughter of noble Eusorus” (ἥρωος Αἰνήτιος υἱός ... Κύζικος, ὃν κούρη δίου τέκεν Εὐσώροιο | Αἰνήτη, 1.948–950). Apparently “Ancaeus, the bold son of Lycurgus” (Ἀγκαῖος Λυκοόργου θρασὺς υἱός, 2.118) is so identified to avoid confusion with the other “Ancaeus, whom Astypalaea bore to Poseidon by the waters of the Imbrasmus” (Ἀγκαίῳ ... ὃν Ἴμβρασίῳσι παρ' ὕδασιν Ἀστυπάλαια | τίκτε Ποσειδάωνι, 2.865–867). By contrast, the AR

this periphrasis for “Zeus” at the end of the passage would vary the mention of the god in the same capacity at the beginning of the passage (3.114; Hunter 1989 ad *Arg.* 3.158, *pace* Vian 2002: 2.158). Moreover, διὲκ μέγαλοιο could be appreciated as a typically Apollonian *variatio in imitando* of the Homeric διὲκ μέγαροιο, which is in fact the reading of the *codd.* The alternate conjecture of Reitzenstein 1900: 607, μέγαλοιο θεῶν (or θεῶν), introduces a contradiction into Apollonius' narrative (Levin 1963: 108).

²¹ I include this caveat because, for instance, mortal characters do not have particular “aspects” that an epithet serves to identify, as in the case of gods, and Apollonius rarely needs to explain the origin of a human being's epithet or metonym (though cf. 1.229–233, 3.245–246).

²² See further van den Eersten 2013: 50. For an exhaustive account of Apollonius' applications of epithets to his heroes, with a view to their traditionality or divergence from archaic usages, see Vélchez 1986.

²³ Perhaps they serve to heighten the epic atmosphere of this climactic scene, in which the Fleece is finally acquired.

narrator seems to assume that his narratees are already familiar with the major gods and thus gives them no elaborate introduction; they appear in his narrative relatively unadorned as “Zeus,” “the Far-Shooter,” “Cypris,” and so on.²⁴ But my essential point is this: under no circumstances, except in the extraordinary case of hymnic narratization, would the narrator refer to a goddess in the style of “Artemis Ship-Preserver, child of a great father, the goddess who watched over those peaks by the sea and protected the land of Iolcus” (1.570–572).

²⁴ Minor divinities do, however, receive these sorts of “introductory” epithets, in some cases expanded by relative clauses. Thus the sea god Glaucus is introduced to the narrative as “the wise interpreter of divine Nereus” (Νηρηῶς θεῖοιο πολυφράδμων ὑποφήτης, 1.1311); Cyrene’s son is styled as “clever Aristaeus, who discovered the keeping of bees and the oil of the olive, gained with much labor” (Ἀρισταίιο περίφρονος, ὅς ῥα μελισσέων | ἔργα πολυκμήτοιο τ’ ἀνεύρατο πῖαρ ἐλαίης, 4.1132–1133); and the Libyan heroines receive a full three lines of introduction (4.1309–1311).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Note: Periodicals are abbreviated according to the conventions of *L'année philologique*. *N.b.* the following additional abbreviations:

AHS Allen, T. W., W. R. Halliday, and E. E. Sikes. 1936. *The Homeric Hymns*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon.

CUP Cambridge UP.

FVS Faulkner, Andrew, Athanassios Vergados, and Andreas Schwab, edd. 2016. *The Reception of the Homeric Hymns*. Oxford: OUP.

HG *Hellenistica Groningana* series ([vol. 1–3] Groningen: Egbert Forsten; [vol. 4–present] Leuven: Peeters; edd. [vol. 1–23] M. A. Harder, R. F. Regtuit, and G. C. Wakker; [vol. 24] J. J. H. Klooster, M. A. Harder, R. F. Regtuit, and G. C. Wakker; [forthcoming vol.] J. J. H. Klooster and M. A. Harder). Vol. 1 = *Callimachus*; Vol. 3 = *Genre in Hellenistic Poetry*; Vol. 4 = *Apollonius Rhodius*; Vol. 7 = *Callimachus II*; Vol. 16 = *Gods and Religion in Hellenistic Poetry*; Vol. 21 = *Past and Present in Hellenistic Poetry*; Vol. 23 = *Drama and Performance in Hellenistic Poetry*; 24 = *Callimachus Revisited*; forthcoming vol. = *Women and Power in Hellenistic Poetry*.

HUP Harvard UP.

OUP Oxford UP.

SAGN *Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative* series (Leiden: Brill). Vol. 1 = Jong, Irene J. F. de, René Nünlist, and Angus Bowie (eds.), *Narrators, Narratees, and Narratives in Ancient Greek Literature* (2004); Vol. 2 =

Jong, Irene J. F. de, and René Nünlist (eds.), *Time in Ancient Greek Literature* (2007); Vol. 3 = Jong, Irene J. F. de (ed.), *Space in Ancient Greek Literature* (2012); Vol. 4 = De Temmerman, Koen, and Evert van Emde Boas (eds.), *Characterization in Ancient Greek Literature* (2018).

UP or U. ... P. University (...) Press.

Texts and Translations¹

Athanassakis, Apostolos N. 2004 [1977]. *The Homeric Hymns*. 2nd ed. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP.

Bekker, Immanuel. 1833. *Apollonii Sophistae Lexicon Homericum*. Berlin: Reimer.

Bernabé, Alberto. 1987. *Poetae epici graeci: Testimonia et fragmenta*. Vol. 1. Leipzig: K. G. Saur.

———. 2004. *Poetae epici graeci: Testimonia et fragmenta*. Vol. 2.1. Leipzig: K. G. Saur.

*Campbell, David A. 1982–1993. *Greek Lyric*. 5 vol. Cambridge, MA: HUP.

*Collard, Christopher, and Martin Cropp. 2008. *Euripides. Fragments*. 2 vol. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

*Couvreur, P. 1901. *Hermiae Alexandrini in Platonis Phaedrum scholia*. Paris: Émile Bouillon.

*Erbse, Hartmut. 1950. *Untersuchungen zu den attizistischen Lexika*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.

Evelyn-White, Hugh G. 1914. *Hesiod, the Homeric Hymns and Homerica*. Cambridge, MA: HUP.

Fränkel, Hermann. 1961. *Apollonii Rhodii Argonautica*. Oxford: Clarendon.

*Gerber, Douglas E. 1999. *Greek Elegiac Poetry from the Seventh to the Fifth Centuries BC*. Cambridge, MA: HUP.

Gronovius, Jakob. 1698. *Manethonis Apotelesmaticorum libri sex*. Leiden: Frederik Haarung.

¹ Items marked with an asterisk represent the editions from which texts and translations have been taken throughout the dissertation. See further the Note on Texts, Translations, and Abbreviations. Items cited both as critical texts and as commentaries are included both here and under “Secondary Scholarship.”

- Harder, Annette. 2012. *Callimachus. Aetia*. 2 vol. Oxford: OUP.
- *Hilgard, A. 1901. *Grammatici graeci*. Vol. 1.3. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Hollis, Adrian. 2009 [1990]. *Callimachus. Hecale*. 2nd ed. Oxford: OUP.
- Köchly, Hermann. 1858. *Manethonis Apotelesmaticorum qui feruntur libri VI*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Lachenaud, Guy. 2010. *Scholies à Apollonios de Rhodes*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Lightfoot, J. L. 2014. *Dionysius Periegetes. Description of the Known World*. Oxford: OUP.
- Lloyd-Jones, Hugh, and Peter Parsons. 1983. *Supplementum Hellenisticum*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- *Most, Glenn W. 2006. *Hesiod. Theogony, Works and Days, Testimonia*. Cambridge, MA: HUP.
- *Mozley, J. H. 1936 [1934]. *Valerius Flaccus. Argonautica*. Rev. ed. Cambridge, MA: HUP.
- *Murray, A. T. 1995 [1919]. *Homer. Odyssey*. 2 vol. Rev. George E. Dimock. Cambridge, MA: HUP.
- . 1999 [1924]. *Homer. Iliad*. 2 vol. Rev. William F. Wyatt. Cambridge, MA: HUP.
- *Paton, W. R. 2014 [1916]. *The Greek Anthology: Books 1–5*. Rev. Michael A. Tueller. Cambridge, MA: HUP.
- *———. 1917. *The Greek Anthology: Book 9*. Cambridge, MA: HUP.
- *Perry, Ben Edwin. 1952. *Aesopica*. Urbana: U. of Illinois P.
- Powell, J. U. 1925. *Collectanea alexandrina*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- *Race, William H. 1997. *Pindar*. 2 vol. Cambridge, MA: HUP.
- *———. 2008. *Apollonius Rhodius. Argonautica*. Cambridge, MA: HUP.
- *———. 2019. *Menander Rhetor; [Dionysius of Halicarnassus]. Ars rhetorica*. Cambridge, MA: HUP.
- *Scheer, Eduard. 1908. *Lycophronis Alexandra. Vol. 2: Scholia continens*. Berlin: Weidmann.
- Seaton, R. C. 1912. *Apollonius Rhodius. The Argonautica*. London: Heinemann.
- *Spengel, Leonhard von. 1854. *Rhetores graeci*. Vol. 2. Leipzig: Teubner.
- *Vian, Francis. 1987. *Les Argonautiques Orphiques*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- *Waddell, W. G. 1940. *Manetho*. Cambridge, MA: HUP.

- *Wendel, Carl. 1935. *Scholia in Apollonium Rhodium vetera*. Berlin: Weidmann.
- West, M. L. 1998 [1971]. *Iambi et elegi graeci ante Alexandrum cantati*. 2 vol. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon.
- . 2003a. *Homeric Hymns, Homeric Apocrypha, Lives of Homer*. Cambridge, MA: HUP.
- *———. 2003b. *Greek Epic Fragments: From the Seventh to the Fifth Centuries BC*. Cambridge, MA: HUP.

Secondary Scholarship

- Acosta-Hughes, Benjamin. 2010a. *Arion's Lyre: Archaic Lyric into Hellenistic Poetry*. Princeton: Princeton UP.
- . 2010b. "The Prefigured Muse: Rethinking a Few Assumptions on Hellenistic Poetics." In Clauss and Cuypers: 81–91.
- Acosta-Hughes, Benjamin, and Christophe Cusset. 2012. "Callimaque face aux *Hymnes Homériques*." *Hymnes de la Grèce antique: Approches littéraires et historiques*. Edd. Richard Bouchon, Pascale Brillet-Dubois, and Nadine Le Meur-Weissman. Lyon: Maison de l'Orient et de la Méditerranée. 123–133.
- Acosta-Hughes, Benjamin, and Susan A. Stephens. 2012. *Callimachus in Context: From Plato to the Augustan Poets*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Adkin, Neil. 2019. "An Acrostic in Apollonius of Rhodes (*Arg.* 3.1008–1011)." *Mnemosyne* 72: 1–7.
- Agosti, Gianfranco. 2016. "Praising the God(s): *Homeric Hymns* in Late Antiquity." In *FVS*: 221–240.
- Albersmeier, Sabine, ed. 2009. *Heroes: Mortals and Myths in Ancient Greece*. Baltimore: Walters Art Museum.
- Albinus, Lars. 2000. *The House of Hades: Studies in Ancient Greek Eschatology*. Aarhus: Aarhus UP.
- Albis, Robert V. 1995. "Jason's Prayers to Apollo in *Aetia* 1 and the *Argonautica*." *Phoenix* 49.2: 104–109.
- . 1996. *Poet and Audience in the Argonautica of Apollonius*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

- Alcock, Susan E. 1997. "The Heroic Past in a Hellenistic Present." *Hellenistic Constructs: Essays in Culture, History, and Historiography*. Edd. Paul Cartledge, Peter Garnsey, and Erich Gruen. Berkeley: U. of California P. 20–34.
- Allen, T. W., W. R. Halliday, and E. E. Sikes (= AHS). 1936. *The Homeric Hymns*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Aloni, Antonio. 1980. "Prooimia, Hymnoi, Elio Aristide e i cugini bastardi." *QUCC* 4: 23–40.
- Altheim, Franz. 1924. "Die Entstehungsgeschichte des homerischen Apollonhymnus." *Hermes* 59.4: 430–449.
- Andersen, Øivind, and Dag T. T. Haug, edd. 2012. *Relative Chronology in Early Greek Epic Poetry*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Antonaccio, Carla. 1993. "The Archaeology of Ancestors." *Cultural Poetics in Archaic Greece: Cult, Performance, Politics*. Edd. Carol Dougherty and Leslie Kurke. New York: OUP. 46–70.
- . 1994. "Contesting the Past: Hero Cult, Tomb Cult, and Epic in Early Greece." *AJA* 98.3: 389–410.
- . 1995. *An Archaeology of Ancestors: Tomb Cult and Hero Cult in Early Greece*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Ardizzoni, Anthos. 1958. *Le Argonautiche: Libro III*. Bari: Adriatica.
- . 1967. *Le Argonautiche: Libro I*. Rome: Ateneo.
- . 1970. "Note sul testo di Apollonio Rodio e Callimaco." *GIF* 22.2: 40–46.
- Athanassakis, Apostolos N. 1977. *The Orphic Hymns: Text, Translation and Notes*. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- . 2004 [1976]. *The Homeric Hymns*. 2nd ed. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP.
- Avallone Riccardo. 1953. "Catullo e Apollonio Rodio." *Antiquitas* 8.3–4: 8–75.
- Bakhtin, M. M. 1981. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Transs. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: U. of Texas P.
- Barber, E. A., with an appendix by G. Giangrande. 1968 [1954]. "Hellenistic Poetry." *Fifty Years (and Twelve) of Classical Scholarship*. Rev. ed. Oxford: Blackwell. 267–291.
- Barchiesi, Alessandro. 1999. "Venus' Masterplot: Ovid and the Homeric Hymns." *Ovidian Transformations: Essays on the Metamorphoses and its Reception*. Edd. Philip Hardie, Alessandro Barchiesi, and Stephen Hinds. Cambridge: Cambridge Philological Society. 112–126.

- . 2001. “Genealogie letterarie nell’epica imperiale: Fondamentalismo e ironia.” *L’histoire littéraire immanente dans la poésie latine*. Edd. Ernst August Schmidt, François Paschoud, Claudia Wick, and Lavinia Gilli Milić. Geneva: Fondation Hardt. 315–354.
- Barnes, Michael H. 2003. *Inscribed Kleos: Aetiological Contexts in Apollonius of Rhodes*. Diss. Missouri-Columbia.
- Barrigón, Carmen. 2000. “La désignation des héros et héroïnes dans la poésie lyrique grecque.” In Pirenne-Delforge and Suárez de la Torre: 1–14.
- Barron, John P. 1984. “Ibycus: *Gorgias* and Other Poems.” *BICS* 31.1: 13–24.
- Barthes, Roland. 1977. *Image Music Text: Essays selected and translated by Stephen Heath*. London: Fontana.
- Bassett, Samuel Eliot. 1938. *The Poetry of Homer*. Berkeley: U. of California P.
- Baumbach, Manuel. 2012. “Borderline Experiences with Genre: The Homeric *Hymn to Aphrodite* between Epic, Hymn and Epyllic Poetry.” In *idem* and Bär: 135–148.
- Baumbach, Manuel, and Silvio Bär, edd. 2012. *Brill’s Companion to Greek and Latin Epyllion and Its Reception*. Leiden: Brill.
- Bécares Botas, Vicente. 1985. *Diccionario de terminología gramatical griega*. Salamanca: Ediciones Universidad de Salamanca.
- Beecroft, Alexander. 2011. “Blindness and Literacy in the *Lives* of Homer.” *CQ* 61.1: 1–18.
- Belloni, Luigi. 1995. “Ultimi accordi alla spinetta (Apoll. Rhod. *Arg.* IV 1773–1781).” *Studia classica Iohanni Tarditi oblata*. Vol 1. Edd. Luigi Belloni, Guido Milanese, Antonietta Porro. Milan: Vita e Pensiero. 171–185.
- . 1996. “Esordio e finale delle *Argonautiche*: Reminiscenze di una *performance* in Apollonio Rodio.” *Aevum(ant)* 9: 135–149.
- . 2017. “Sulla rotta degli argonauti: Diacronia di un *genos* (Apoll. Rhod. 1.536–585; 4.1773 ss.).” *Prometheus* 43: 89–96.
- Benveniste, Émile. 1969. *Le vocabulaire des institutions indo-européennes*. 2 vol. Paris: Minuit.
- Bérard, Claude. 1982. “Récupérer la mort du prince: Héroïsation et formation de la cité.” In Gnoli and Vernant: 89–105.
- Berkowitz, Gary. 2004. *Semi-Public Narration in Apollonius’ Argonautica*. Leuven: Peeters.
- Beye, Charles Rowan. 1969. “Jason as Love-hero in Apollonios’ *Argonautika*.” *GRBS* 10.1: 31–55.

- . 1982. *Epic and Romance in the Argonautica of Apollonius*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP.
- Bieler, Ludwig. 1935. *Θεῖος Ἄνθρωπος: Das Bild des "göttlichen Menschen" in Spätantike und Frühchristentum*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Biffis, Giulia. Forthcoming. "Lycophron's Cassandra: A Powerful Female Poetic Voice." *HG* (forthcoming).
- Bing, Peter. 1990. "A Pun on Aratus' Name in Verse 2 of the *Phainomena*?" *HSPH* 93: 281–285.
- . 2008 [1988]. *The Well-Read Muse: Present and Past in Callimachus and the Hellenistic Poets*. Rev. ed. Ann Arbor: Michigan Classical Press.
- . 2009. *The Scroll and the Marble: Studies in Reading and Reception in Hellenistic Poetry*. Ann Arbor: U. of Michigan P.
- Blumberg, Karl Wilhelm. 1931. *Untersuchungen zur epischen Technik des Apollonios von Rhodos*. Diss. Leipzig.
- Bömer, Franz. 1980. *P. Ovidius Naso Metamorphosen*. Vol. 5 (*Buch X–XI*). Heidelberg: Winter.
- Boesch, Georg. 1908. *De Apollonii Rhodii elocutione*. Diss. Göttingen.
- Bona, Giacomo. 1978. "Inni omerici e poesia greca arcaica: A proposito di una recente edizione e di un convegno." *RFIC* 106: 224–248.
- Booth, Wayne C. 1983 [1961]. *The Rhetoric of Fiction*. 2nd ed. Chicago: U. of Chicago P.
- Bornmann, Fritz. 1968. *Callimachi Hymnus in Dianam*. Florence: Nuova Italia.
- Borthwick, E. K. 1970. "P. Oxy. 2738: Athena and the Pyrrhic Dance." *Hermes* 98.3: 318–331.
- Bowie, E. L. 2000. "The Reception of Apollonius in Imperial Greek Literature." *HG* 4: 1–10.
- Boyancé, Pierre. 1964. "La science d'un *quindecemvir* au I^{er} siècle ap. J.C." *REL* 42: 334–346.
- Boychenko, Leanna. 2017. "Callimachus' *Bath of Pallas* and the Greco-Egyptian Danaids." *HG* 21: 161–180.
- Bravo, Jorge J., III. 2009. "Recovering the Past: The Origins of Greek Heroes and Hero Cults." In *Albersmeier 2009*: 10–29.
- Brelich, Angelo. 1958. *Gli eroi greci: Un problema storico-religioso*. Rome: Ateneo.
- Bremer, J. M. 1981. "Greek Hymns." *Faith, Hope and Worship: Aspects of Religious Mentality in the Ancient World*. Ed. H. S. Versnel. Leiden: Brill. 193–215.
- Bremmer, Jan N. 2006. "The Rise of the Hero Cult and the New Simonides." *ZPE* 158: 15–26.

- Brioso Sánchez, Máximo. 1995. "Las musas y el poeta: Su problemática relación en Apolonio de Rodas." *Fortunatae* 7: 51–62.
- Broeniman, Clifford Scott. 1989. *Thematic Patterns in the Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius: A Study in the Imagery of Similes*. Diss. Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
- Brown, Christopher G. 1988. "Hipponax and Iambe." *Hermes* 116.4: 478–481.
- . 1997. "Iambos." *A Companion to the Greek Lyric Poets*. Ed. Douglas E. Gerber. Leiden: Brill. 11–88.
- Brown, Malcolm Kenneth. 2002. *The Narratives of Konon*. Munich: K. G. Saur.
- Brumbaugh, Michael. 2019. *The New Politics of Olympos: Kingship in Kallimachos' Hymns*. Oxford: OUP.
- Bulloch, A. W. 1977. "Callimachus' Erysichthon, Homer and Apollonius Rhodius." *AJPh* 98.2: 97–123.
- . 1984. "The Future of a Hellenistic Illusion: Some Observations on Callimachus and Religion." *MH* 41: 209–230.
- . 1985. *Callimachus. The Fifth Hymn*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Bulloch, Anthony, Erich S. Gruen, A. A. Long, and Andrew Stewart, edd. 1993. *Images and Ideologies: Self-definition in the Hellenistic World*. Berkeley: U. of California P.
- Bundy, Elroy L. 1972. "The 'Quarrel between Kallimachos and Apollonios' Part I: The Epilogue of Kallimachos's *Hymn to Apollo*." *CSCA* 5: 39–94.
- Burgess, Jonathan S. 2001. *The Tradition of the Trojan War in Homer and the Epic Cycle*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP.
- Burkert, Walter. 1979. "Kynaihos, Polycrates, and the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*." *Arktouros: Hellenic Studies Presented to Bernard M. W. Knox on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*. Edd. Glen Warren Bowersock, Walter Burkert, and Michael C. J. Putnam. Berlin: De Gruyter. 53–62.
- . 1985. *Greek Religion: Archaic and Classical*. Trans. John Raffan. Oxford: Blackwell.
- . 1987. "The Making of Homer in the Sixth Century B.C.: Rhapsodes versus Stesichoros." *Papers on the Amasis Painter and His World*. Malibu: J. Paul Getty Museum. 43–62.
- Burstein, Stanley Mayer. 1976. *Outpost of Hellenism: The Emergence of Heraclea on the Black Sea*. Berkeley: U. of California P.
- Busch, Stephan. 1993. "Orpheus bei Apollonios Rhodios." *Hermes* 121.3: 301–324.

- Byre, Calvin S. 1991. "The Narrator's Addresses to the Narratee in Apollonius Rhodius' *Argonautica*." *TAPhA* 121: 215–227.
- . 1996. "Distant Encounters: The Prometheus and Phaethon Episodes in the *Argonautica* of Apollonius Rhodius." *AJPh* 117.2: 275–283.
- . 1997. "On the Departure from Pagasae and the Passage of the Planctae in Apollonius' *Argonautica*." *MH* 54.2: 106–114.
- . 2002. *A Reading of Apollonius Rhodius' Argonautica: The Poetics of Uncertainty*. Lewiston: Edwin Mellen.
- Cairns, Francis. 1979. "Self-Imitation within a Generic Framework: Ovid, *Amores* 2.9 and 3.11 and the *renuntiatio amoris*." *Creative Imitation and Latin Literature*. Edd. David West and Tony Woodman. Cambridge: CUP. 121–141.
- . 2007 [1972]. *Generic Composition in Greek and Roman Poetry*. Rev. ed. Ann Arbor: Michigan Classical Press.
- Calame, Claude. 2005. "Relationships with the Gods and Poetic Functions in the *Homeric Hymns*." *Masks of Authority: Fiction and Pragmatics in Ancient Greek Poetics*. Trans. Peter M. Burk. Ithaca: Cornell UP. 19–35.
- . 2011. "The *Homeric Hymns* as Poetic Offerings: Musical and Ritual Relationships with the Gods." In Faulkner: 334–357.
- Calvert, George H., trans. 1845. *Correspondence between Schiller and Goethe, from 1794 to 1805*. New York: Wiley and Putnam.
- Calzascia, Sonja Caterina. 2015. *Il carme 64 di Catullo e le Argonautiche di Apollonio Rodio*. Bologna: BraDypUS.
- Cameron, Alan. 1995. *Callimachus and His Critics*. Princeton: Princeton UP.
- Campbell, M. 1969. "Critical Notes on Apollonius Rhodius." *CQ* 19.2: 269–284.
- . 1971. "Further Notes on Apollonius Rhodius." *CQ* 21.2: 402–423.
- . 1973. "Notes on Apollonius Rhodius, *Argonautica* II." *RPh* 47: 68–90.
- . 1976. Review of Livrea 1973. *Gnomon* 48.4: 336–340.
- . 1977. "Βώσεσθε Again." *CQ* 27.2: 467.
- . 1981. *Echoes and Imitations of Early Epic in Apollonius Rhodius*. Leiden: Brill.
- . 1983a. *Studies in the Third Book of Apollonius Rhodius' Argonautica*. Hildesheim: Georg Olms.

- . 1983b. “Apollonian and Homeric Book Division.” *Mnemosyne* 36.1/2: 154–156.
- . 1994. *A Commentary on Apollonius Rhodius Argonautica III 1–471*. Leiden: Brill.
- Caneva, Stefano. 2007. “Raccontare nel tempo: Narrazione epica e cronologia nelle *Argonautiche* di Apollonio Rodio.” *Il lavoro sul mito nell’epica greca: Letture di Omero e Apollonio*. Edd. *idem* and Victoria Tarenzi. Pisa: ETS. 67–132.
- Carey, Chris. 2009. “Genre, Occasion and Performance.” *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Lyric*. Ed. Felix Budelmann. Cambridge: CUP. 21–38.
- . 2016. “Mapping *Iambos*: Mining the Minor Talents.” *Iambus and Elegy: New Approaches*. Edd. Laura Swift and Chris Carey. Oxford: OUP. 122–139.
- Carspecken, John Frederick. 1952. “Apollonius Rhodius and the Homeric Epics.” *YClS* 13: 33–143.
- Casabona, Jean. 1966. *Recherches sur le vocabulaire des sacrifices en grec, des origines à la fin de l’époque classique*. Aix-en-Provence: Editions Ophrys.
- Casevitz, M. 1984. “Temples et sanctuaires: Ce qu’apprend l’étude lexicologique.” *Temples et sanctuaires: Séminaire de recherche 1981–1983*. Ed. G. Roux. Lyon: GIS—Maison de l’Orient. 81–95.
- Cassola, Filippo. 1975a. *Inni Omerici*. 6th ed. Milan: Fondazione Lorenzo Valla.
- . 1975b. “Note sul primo epigramma omerico e su Era ninfa.” *Studi triestini di antichità in onore di Luigia Achillea Stella*. Trieste: EUT. 215–219.
- Celoria, Francis. 1992. *The Metamorphoses of Antoninus Liberalis: A Translation with a Commentary*. London: Routledge.
- Cerbo, Ester. 1993. “Gli inni ad Eros in tragedia: Struttura e funzione.” *Tradizione e innovazione nella cultura greca da Omero all’età ellenistica: Scritti in onore di Bruno Gentili*. Vol. 2. Ed. Roberto Pretagostini. Rome: GEI. 645–656.
- Chaniotis, Angelos. 2003. “The Divinity of Hellenistic Rulers.” *A Companion to the Hellenistic World*. Ed. Andrew Erskine. Malden, MA: Blackwell. 431–445.
- Chatman, Seymour. 1978. *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film*. Ithaca: Cornell UP.
- Chuvin, Pierre. 2003. “Anaphé, ou la dernière épreuve des Argonautes.” *Des Géants à Dionysos: Mélanges de mythologie et de poésie grecques offerts à Francis Vian*. Edd. Domenico Accorinti and Pierre Chuvin. Alessandria: Edizioni dell’Orso. 215–221.
- Ciani, Maria Grazia. 1975. “Ripetizione ‘formulare’ in Apollonio Rodio.” *Bollettino dell’Istituto di Filologia Greca* 2: 191–208.

- Clack, Jerry. 1982. *An Anthology of Alexandrian Poetry*. Pittsburgh: Classical Association of the Atlantic States.
- Clare, R. J. 1996. "Catullus 64 and the *Argonautica* of Apollonius of Rhodes: Allusion and Exemplarity." *PCPhS* 42: 60–88.
- . 2002. *The Path of the Argo: Language, Imagery and Narrative in the Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Clarke, Michael. 1999. *Flesh and Spirit in the Songs of Homer: A Study of Words and Myths*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Clausing, Adolf. 1913. *Kritik und Exegese der homerischen Gleichnisse im Altertum*. Diss. Freiburg im Breisgau.
- Clauss, James J. 1986. "Lies and Allusions: The Addressee and Date of Callimachus' *Hymn to Zeus*." *CA* 5.2: 155–170.
- . 1989. "Two Curious Reflections in the Argonautic Looking-Glass (*Argo*. 1.577 and 603)." *GIF* 41: 195–207.
- . 1990. "Hellenistic Imitations of Hesiod *Catalogue of Women* fr. 1, 6–7 M.-W." *QUCC* 36.3: 129–140.
- . 1993. *The Best of the Argonauts: The Redefinition of the Epic Hero in Book 1 of Apollonius' Argonautica*. Berkeley: U. of California P.
- . 1997. "Conquest of the Mephistophelian Nausicaa: Medea's Role in Apollonius' Redefinition of the Epic Hero." *Medea: Essays on Medea in Myth, Literature, Philosophy, and Art*. Edd. *idem* and Sarah Iles Johnston. Princeton: Princeton UP. 149–177.
- . 2000. "Cosmos without Imperium: The Argonautic Journey through Time." *HG* 4: 11–32.
- . 2012. "The Argonautic *Anabasis*: Myth and Hellenic Identity in Apollonius' *Argonautica*." *Mythe et pouvoir à l'époque hellénistique*. Edd. C. Cusset, N. Le Meur-Weissman, and F. Levin. Leuven: Peeters. 417–437.
- . 2016a. "The Hercules and Cacus Episode in Augustan Literature: Engaging the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes* in Light of Callimachus' and Apollonius' Reception." In Faulker et al.: 55–78.
- . 2016b. "*Heldendämmerung* Anticipated: The Gods in Apollonius' *Argonautica*." *The Gods of Greek Hexameter Poetry: From the Archaic Age to Late Antiquity and Beyond*. Edd. *idem*, Martine Cuypers, and Ahuvia Kahane. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner. 135–151.

- . 2019. “The Near Eastern Background of Aetiological Wordplay in Callimachus.” *HG* 24: 65–96.
- Clauss, James J., and Martine Cuypers, edd. 2010. *A Companion to Hellenistic Poetry*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Clay, Jenny Strauss. 1997. “The Homeric Hymns.” *A New Companion to Homer*. Edd. Ian Morris and Barry Powell. Leiden: Brill. 489–507.
- . 2006 [1989]. *The Politics of Olympus: Form and Meaning in the Major Homeric Hymns*. 2nd ed. London: Bristol Classical Press.
- . 2011. “The *Homeric Hymns* as Genre.” In Faulkner: 232–253.
- Clayton, Barbara Leigh. 2017. “Heracles, Hylas, and the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* in Apollonius’s *Argonautica*.” *Helios* 44.2: 133–156.
- Clinton, Kevin. 1986. “The Author of the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*.” *OAth* 16: 43–49.
- . 1992. *Myth and Cult: The Iconography of the Eleusinian Mysteries*. Stockholm: Svenska Institutet i Athen.
- Cohen, Beth. 1998. “The Nemean Lion’s Skin in Athenian Art.” *Le bestiaire d’Héraclès: IIIe rencontre héracléenne*. Edd. Corinne Bonnet, Colette Jourdain-Annequin, and Vinciane Pirenne-Delforge. Liège: Centre International d’Étude de la Religion Grecque Antique. 127–139.
- Coldstream, J. N. 1976. “Hero-Cults in the Age of Homer.” *JHS* 96: 8–17.
- Cole, Susan Guettel. 1984. *Theoi Megaloi: The Cult of the Great Gods at Samothrace*. Leiden: Brill.
- Collins, John Francis. 1967. *Studies in Book One of the Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius*. Diss. Columbia.
- Connolly, Andrew. 1998. “Was Sophocles Heroised as Dexion?” *JHS* 118: 1–21.
- Conte, Gian Biagio. 1986. *The Rhetoric of Imitation: Genre and Poetic Memory in Virgil and Other Latin Poets*. Ed. with foreword by Charles Segal. Ithaca: Cornell UP.
- . 1992. “Proems in the Middle.” *YCS* 29: 147–159.
- Consigny, Scott. 2001. *Gorgias: Sophist and Artist*. Columbia: U. of South Carolina P.
- Cook, J. M. 1953. “The Cult of Agamemnon at Mycenae.” *Γέρας Αντωνίου Κεραμοπούλλου*. Athens: Myrtide. 112–118.
- Corbato, Carlo. 1955. *Riprese callimachee in Apollonio Rodio*. Trieste: Istituto di filologia classica.

- Couat, Auguste. 1882. *La poésie alexandrine sous les trois premiers Ptolémées (324-222 av. J.-C.)*. Paris: Hachette.
- Courtney, Edward. 1993. *The Fragmentary Latin Poets*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Crump, M. Marjorie. 1931. *The Epyllion from Theocritus to Ovid*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Curiazi, Dalilia. 1979. "Choliamb. Fragm. Novum." *Museum Criticum* 13–14: 333–336.
- Currie, Bruno. 2005. *Pindar and the Cult of Heroes*. Oxford: OUP.
- Cusset, Christophe. 2001. "Apollonios de Rhodes, lecteur de la tragédie classique." *Lectures antiques de la tragédie grecque*. Lyon: Université Jean Moulin. 61–76.
- . 2013. "Souffrance et vaillance: Sur un acrostiche méconnu au chant III des *Argonautiques* d'Apollonios de Rhodes." *REG* 126.2: 623–633.
- . 2017. "Apollonios de Rhodes et Ératosthène de Cyrène: Bibliothécaires et poètes à Alexandrie." *The Library of Alexandria: A Cultural Crossroads of the Ancient World*. Edd. Christophe Rico and Anca Duncan. Jerusalem: Polis Institute. 141–162.
- Cuypers, M. P. 1997. *Apollonius Rhodius Argonautica 2.1–310: A Commentary*. Diss. Leiden.
- . 2004. "Apollonius of Rhodes." *SAGN* 1: 43–62.
- . 2005. "Interactional Particles and Narrative Voice in Apollonius and Homer." In Harder and Cuypers: 35–69.
- D'Aleo, Alessia. 2012. "Butes in Eryx: Constructions and Religious Interpretation of an *Oikistes* between Hellenes, Phoenicians, and Natives." *Mediterraneo Antico* 15.1–2: 71–82.
- Danek, Georg. 2009. "Apollonius Rhodius as an (anti-)Homeric Narrator: Time and Space in the *Argonautica*." *Narratology and Interpretation: The Content of Narrative Form in Ancient Literature*. Edd. Jonas Grethlein and Antonios Rengakos. Berlin: De Gruyter. 275–291.
- Danielewicz, Georgius. 1974. "De elementis hymnicis in Sapphus Alcaei Anacreontisque Carminibus Obviis Quaestiones Selectae." *Eos* 62: 23–33.
- Danielewicz, J. 2005. "Further Hellenistic Acrostics: Aratus and Others." *Mnemosyne* 58.3: 321–334.
- Davies, M., and P. J. Finglass. 2014. *Stesichorus: The Poems*. Cambridge: CUP.
- De Marco, Vittorio. 1963. "Osservazioni su Apollonio Rodio I 1–22." *Miscellanea di Studi Alessandrini in Memoria di Augusto Rostagni*. Edd. Leonardo Ferrero, Carlo Gallavotti, Italo Lana, Antonio Maddalena, Arnaldo Momigliano, and Michele Pellegrino. Turin: Bottega d'Erasmus. 350–355.

- De Martino, Francesco. 1980. "Ἄλλη ᾠοιδή (in coda all'inno omerico *Ad Apollo*, 545–546)." *AC* 49.1: 232–240.
- . 1984–1985. "Note apolloniane." *AFLB* 27–28: 101–117.
- de Polignac, François. 1995 [1984]. *Cults, Territory, and the Origins of the Greek City-State*. Trans. Janet Lloyd. Chicago: U. of Chicago P.
- DeBrohun, Jeri Blair. 2007. "Catullan Intertextuality: Apollonius and the Allusive Plot of Catullus 64." *A Companion to Catullus*. Ed. Marilyn B. Skinner. Malden, MA: Blackwell. 293–313.
- DeForest, Mary Margolies. 1994. *Apollonius' Argonautica: A Callimachean Epic*. Leiden: Brill.
- Delage, Émile. 1930. *La géographie dans les Argonautiques d'Apollonios de Rhodes*. Bordeaux: Feret.
- Deneken, F. 1884–1890. "Heros." *Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie*. Ed. W. H. Roscher. Vol. 1. Leipzig: Teubner. 2441–2589.
- Depew, Mary. 1993. "Mimesis and Aetiology in Callimachus' *Hymns*." *HG* 1: 57–77.
- Desideri, Paolo. 1967. "Studi di storiografia eracleota, I: Promathidas e Nymphis." *SCO* 16: 366–416.
- Dickey, Eleanor. 2007. *Ancient Greek Scholarship*. Oxford: OUP.
- Dickie, Matthew. 1990. "Talos Bewitched: Magic, Atomic Theory and Paradoxography in Apollonius *Argonautica* 4.1638–88." *Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar: Sixth Volume*. Edd. Francis Cairns and Malcolm Heath. Leeds: Francis Cairns. 267–296.
- Dover, Kenneth J. 1971. *Theocritus: Select Poems*. Bristol: Bristol Classical Press.
- . 1989 [1978]. *Greek Homosexuality*. 2nd ed. Cambridge, MA: HUP.
- Dräger, Paul. 2002. *Apollonios von Rhodos: Die Fahrt der Argonauten*. Stuttgart: Reclam.
- Drögemüller, Hans-Peter. 1956. *Die Gleichnisse im hellenistischen Epos*. Diss. Hamburg.
- Du Quesnay, Ian M. Le M. 1977. "Vergil's Fourth *Eclogue*." *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar, 1976: Classical Latin Poetry, Medieval Latin Poetry, Greek Poetry*. Ed. Francis Cairns. Leeds: Francis Cairns. 25–99.
- . 1979. "From Polyphemus to Corydon: Virgil, *Eclogue* 2 and the *Idylls* of Theocritus." *Creative Imitation and Latin Literature*. Edd. David West and Tony Woodman. Cambridge: CUP. 35–69.
- Duè, Casey. 2001. "Achilles' Golden Amphora in Aeschines' *Against Timarchus* and the Afterlife of Oral Tradition." *CPh* 96.1: 33–47.

- Dufner, Christina Marie. 1988. *The Odyssey in the Argonautica: Reminiscence, Revision, Reconstruction*. Diss. Princeton.
- Duncan, Anne. 2001. "Spellbinding Performance: Poet as Witch in Theocritus' Second *Idyll* and Apollonius' *Argonautica*." *Helios* 28.1: 43–56.
- Dyer, Robert. 1975. "The Blind Bard of Chios (*Hymn. Hom. Ap.* 171–76)." *CPh* 70.2: 119–121.
- Eagleton, Terry. 2008 [1983]. *Literary Theory: An Introduction*. Anniversary ed. Minneapolis: U. of Minnesota P.
- Eden, P. T. 1975. *A Commentary on Virgil: Aeneid VIII*. Leiden: Brill.
- Edmunds, Lowell. 2001. *Intertextuality and the Reading of Roman Poetry*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP.
- . 2011. "Isocrates' *Encomium of Helen* and the Cult of Helen and Menelaus at Therapnē." *Electronic Antiquity* 14.2: 21–35.
- Edwards, Anthony T. 1985. "Achilles in the Underworld: *Iliad*, *Odyssey*, and *Aethiopsis*." *GRBS* 26.3: 215–227.
- Edwards, Mark W. 1987. *Homer: Poet of the Iliad*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP.
- . 1991. *The Iliad: A Commentary*. Vol. 5 (*Books 17–20*). Cambridge: CUP.
- Eersten, Aniek van den. 2013. "To this well-nightingaled vicinity? Epithets in Apollonius Rhodius' *Argonautica*." Amsterdam Master's thesis.
- Ehrhardt, Norbert. 1995. "*Ktistai* in den *Argonautika* des Apollonios Rhodios: Beobachtungen zur Entwicklung von Gründungstraditionen in Kyzikos, Kios, Herakleia Pontike und Sinope." *Studien zum antiken Kleinasien III*. Bonn: Habelt. 23–46.
- Eichgrün, Egon. 1961. *Kallimachos und Apollonios Rhodios*. Diss. Freie Universität Berlin.
- Ekroth, Gunnel. 2002. *The Sacrificial Rituals of Greek Hero-Cults in the Archaic to the Early Hellenistic Periods*. Liège: Centre international d'étude de la religion grecque antique.
- . 2007. "Heroes and Hero-Cults." *A Companion to Greek Religion*. Ed. Daniel Ogden. Malden, MA: Blackwell. 100–114.
- . 2009. "The Cult of Heroes." *Heroes: Mortals and Myths in Ancient Greece*. Ed. Sabine Albersmeier. Baltimore: The Walters Art Museum. 120–143.
- . 2015. "Heroes—Living or Dead?" *Oxford Handbook of Ancient Greek Religion*. Edd. Esther Eidinow and Julia Kindt. Oxford: OUP. 383–396.
- Eliade, Mircea. 1959 [1949]. *Cosmos and History: The Myth of the Eternal Return*. Trans. Willard R. Trask. New York: Harper.

- Erskine, Andrew. 2002. "Life after Death: Alexandria and the Body of Alexander." *G&R* 49.2: 163–179.
- Evans, Stephen. 2001. *Hymn and Epic: A Study of Their Interplay in Homer and the Homeric Hymns*. Turku: Turun Yliopisto.
- Faber, Riemer A. 2017. "The Hellenistic Origins of Memory as Trope for Literary Allusion in Latin Poetry." *Philologus* 161.1: 77–89.
- Fantuzzi, Marco. 1980. "La contaminazione dei generi letterari nella letteratura greca ellenistica: Rifiuto del sistema o evoluzione di un sistema?" *L&S* 15: 433–450.
- . 1988. *Ricerche su Apollonio Rodio: diacronie della dizione epica*. Rome: Ateneo.
- . 1989. "La censura delle Simplegadi: Ennio, *Medea*, fr. 1 Jocelyn." *QUCC* 31.1: 119–129.
- . 2001. "Heroes, Descendants of *Hemitheoi*: The Proemium of Theocritus 17 and Simonides 11 W²." *The New Simonides: Contexts of Praise and Desire*. Edd. Deborah Boedeker and David Sider. Oxford: OUP. 232–241.
- . 2008a [2001]. "'Homeric' Formularity in the *Argonautica* of Apollonius of Rhodes." In Papanghelis and Rengakos: 221–241.
- . 2008b. "Which Magic? Which Eros? Apollonius' *Argonautica* and the Different Narrative Roles of Medea as a Sorceress in Love." In Papanghelis and Rengakos: 287–310.
- Fantuzzi, Marco, and Richard Hunter. 2004 [2002]. *Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry*. English ed. Cambridge: CUP.
- Faerber, Horst. 1932. *Zur dichterischen Kunst in Apollonios Rhodios' Argonautica: Die Gleichnisse*. Diss. Friedrich Wilhelms-Universität.
- Farnell, Lewis Richard. 1921. *The Hero Cults and Ideas of Immortality*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Farrell, Joseph. 2003. "Classical Genre in Theory and Practice." *New Literary History* 34.3: 383–408.
- Faulkner, Andrew. 2008. *The Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite: Introduction, Text, and Commentary*. Oxford: OUP.
- . 2010. "Callimachus and His Allusive Virgins: Delos, Hestia, and the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*." *HSPH* 105: 53–63.
- , ed. 2011a. *The Homeric Hymns: Interpretive Essays*. Oxford: OUP.
- . 2011b. "The Collection of *Homeric Hymns*: From the Seventh to the Third Centuries BC." In *idem*: 175–205.

- . 2015. “The Silence of Zeus: Speech in the *Homeric Hymns*.” In *idem* and Hodkinson: 31–45.
- Faulkner, Andrew, Athanassios Vergados, and Andreas Schwab (= FVS), edd. 2016. *The Reception of the Homeric Hymns*. Oxford: OUP.
- Faulkner, Andrew, and Owen Hodkinson, edd. 2015. *Hymnic Narrative and the Narratology of Greek Hymns*. Leiden: Brill.
- Feeney, D. C. 1987. “Following after Hercules, in Virgil and Apollonius.” *PVS* 18: 47–85.
- . 1991. *The Gods in Epic: Poets and Critics of the Classical Tradition*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Fehling, Detlev. 1969. *Die Wiederholungsfiguren und ihr Gebrauch bei den Griechen vor Gorgias*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Ferri, S. 1976. “Fenomeni ecologici della Cirenaica costiera nel II millennio a. C. Nuovi dati archeologici su gli Argonauti a Euesperide.” *QAL* 8: 11–17.
- Finkelberg, Margalit. 1995. “Odysseus and the Genus ‘Hero.’” *G&R* 42.1: 1–14.
- Fish, Stanley. 1980. *Is There a Text in this Class? The Authority of Interpretive Communities*. Cambridge, MA: HUP.
- Fitch, Edward. 1912. “Apollonius Rhodius and Cyzicus.” *AJPh* 33.1: 43–56.
- Floyd, Edwin D. 1969. “The Singular Uses of Ἡμέτερος and Ἡμεῖς in Homer.” *Glotta* 47: 116–137.
- Foley, Helene P., ed. 1994. *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter: Translation, Commentary, and Interpretative Essays*. Princeton: Princeton UP.
- Foley, John Miles, ed. 2005. *A Companion to Ancient Epic*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Fontenrose, Joseph. 1959. *Python: A Study of Delphic Myth and Its Origins*. Berkeley: U. of California P.
- . 1978. *The Delphic Oracle: Its Responses and Operations, with a Catalogue of Responses*. Berkeley: U. of California P.
- Ford, Andrew. 1992. *Homer: The Poetry of the Past*. Ithaca: Cornell UP.
- . 2002. *The Origins of Criticism: Literary Culture and Poetic Theory in Classical Greece*. Princeton: PUP.
- . 2011. *Aristotle as Poet: The Song for Hermias and Its Context*. Oxford: OUP.

- Foster, Andrew. 2007. "Sema Polyphemou: A Case of Paraleipsis in the *Argonautica* of Apollonius Rhodius." *CB* 83.2: 247–264.
- Foucault, Michel. 1984. *The Foucault Reader*. Ed. Paul Rabinow. New York: Pantheon.
- Fowler, Alastair. 1982. *Kinds of Literature: An Introduction to the Theory of Genres and Modes*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Fowler, R. L. 1987. *The Nature of Early Greek Lyric: Three Preliminary Studies*. Toronto: U. of Toronto P.
- . 1990. "Two More New Verses of Hipponax (and a Spurious of Philoxenus)?" *ICS* 15: 1–22.
- . 2000–2013. *Early Greek Mythography*. 2 vol. Oxford: OUP.
- Fränkel, Hermann. 1957. "Das Argonautenepos des Apollonios." *MH* 14.1: 1–19.
- . 1968. *Noten zu den Argonautika des Apollonios*. Munich: Beck.
- . 1975. *Early Greek Poetry and Philosophy*. Trans. Moses Hadas and James Willis. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Frankfort, Henri. 1948. *Kingship and the Gods: A Study of Ancient Near Eastern Religion as the Integration of Society and Nature*. Chicago: U. of Chicago P.
- Fraser, P. M. 1972. *Ptolemaic Alexandria*. 3 vol. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Frazer, J. G. 1913. *Pausanias's Description of Greece*. Vol. 5. London: Macmillan.
- . 1921. *Apollodorus: The Library*. 2 vol. London: Heinemann.
- Friedländer, P. 1914. "Das Proömium der *Theogonie*." *Hermes* 49.1: 1–16.
- Fröhder, Dorothea. 1994. *Die dichterische Form der Homerischen Hymnen: Untersucht am Typus der mittelgrossen Preislieder*. Hildesheim: Georg Olms.
- Fuhrer, Therese. 1999. "Der Götterhymnus als Prahltrede: Zum Spiel mit einer literarischen Form in Ovids *Metamorphosen*." *Hermes* 127.3: 356–367.
- Furley, William. 1995. "Praise and Persuasion in Greek Hymns." *JHS* 115: 29–46.
- Furley, William D., and Jan Maarten Bremer. 2001. *Greek Hymns: Selected Cult Songs from the Archaic to the Hellenistic Period*. 2 vol. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Fusillo, Massimo. 1985. *Il tempo delle Argonautiche: Un'analisi del racconto in Apollonio Rodio*. Rome: Ateneo.
- . 1994. "El sueño de Medea." *Revista de Occidente* 158–159: 92–102.

- Gainsford, Peter. 2003. "Where does the Proem of the *Odyssey* End?" *Theatres of Action: Papers for Chris Dearden*. Edd. John Davidson and Arthur Pomeroy. Auckland: Polygraphia. 1–11.
- Galinsky, G. Karl. 1972. *The Herakles Theme: The Adaptations of the Hero in Literature from Homer to the Twentieth Century*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Gantz, Timothy. 1993. *Early Greek Myth: A Guide to Literary and Artistic Sources*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP.
- Gardella Hueso, Mariana. 2018. "Un enigma sobre el enigma: Safo de Lesbos y el acertijo de la carta." *Cuadernos de filosofía* 71: 5–18.
- Garson, R. W. 1972. "Homeric Echoes in Apollonius Rhodius' *Argonautica*." *CPh* 67.1: 1–9.
- Gelzer, Thomas. 1987. "Bemerkungen zum Homerische Ares-Hymnus (*Hom. Hy.* 8)." *MH* 44.3: 150–167.
- Genette, Gérard. 1980 [1972]. *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method*. Trans. Jane E. Lewin. Ithaca: Cornell UP.
- George, Edward V. 1977. "Apollonius, *Argonautica* 4.984–85: Apology for a Shameful Tale." *Rivista di Studi Classici* 25: 360–364.
- Gercke, Alfred. 1889. "Alexandrinische Studien." *RhM* 44: 127–150.
- Germany, Robert. 2005. "The Figure of Echo in the *Homeric Hymn to Pan*." *AJPh* 126.2: 187–208.
- Giangiulio, Maurizio. 1981. "Deformità eroiche e tradizioni di fondazione: Batto, Miscello e l'oracolo delfico." *ASNP* 11: 1–24.
- Giangrande, G. 1967. "'Arte Allusiva' and Alexandrian Epic Poetry." *CQ* 17.1: 85–97.
- . 1968. "On the Use of the Vocative in Alexandrian Epic." *CQ* 18.1: 52–59.
- . 1970. "Hellenistic Poetry and Homer." *AC* 39.1: 46–77.
- . 1971. Review of Bornmann 1968. *CR* 21.3: 354–357.
- . 1977. "Aspects of Apollonius Rhodius' Language." *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar, 1976: Classical Latin Poetry, Medieval Latin Poetry, Greek Poetry*. Ed. Francis Cairns. Leeds: Francis Cairns. 271–291.
- Giaquinta, Irene. Forthcoming. "Hypsipyle from Euripides to Apollonius Rhodius: New Perspectives regarding Female Power in Hellenistic Poetry." *HG* (forthcoming).
- Gigon, Olof, trans., and Rainer Nickel, ed. 2001. *Aristoteles. Die Nikomachische Ethik*. Düsseldorf: Artemis & Winkler.

- Gildersleeve, B. L., and C. W. E. Miller. 1903. "The Vocative in Apollonios Rhodios." *AJPh* 24.2: 197–199.
- Gillies, Marshall M. 1928. *The Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius: Book III*. Salem, NH: Ayer.
- Glei, Reinhold F. 2008 [2001]. "Outlines of Apollonian Scholarship 1955-1999." In Papanghelis and Rengakos: 1–28.
- Glei, Reinhold, and Stephanie Natzel-Glei. 1996. *Apollonios von Rhodos: Das Argonautenepos*. 2 vol. Darmstadt: WBG.
- Gnoli, Gherardo, and Jean-Pierre Vernant, edd. 1982. *La mort, les morts dans les sociétés anciennes*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Goldhill, Simon. 1991. *The Poet's Voice: Essays on Poetics and Greek Literature*. Cambridge: CUP.
- . 2010. "Cultural History and Aesthetics: Why Kant is No Place to Start Reception Studies." *Theorising Performance: Greek Drama, Cultural History and Critical Practice*. Edd. Edith Hall and Stephe Harrop. London: Duckworth. 56–70.
- González, José M. 2000. "Musai Hypophetores: Apollonius of Rhodes on Inspiration and Interpretation." *HSPH* 100: 268–292.
- Goodwin, Charles J. 1891. *Apollonius Rhodius: His Figures, Syntax, and Vocabulary*. Diss. Johns Hopkins.
- Gow, A. S. F. 1942. "The Twenty-Second *Idyll* of Theocritus." *CR* 56.1: 11–18.
- . 1952. *Theocritus*. 2 vol. 2nd ed. Cambridge: CUP.
- Graziosi, Barbara. 2002. *Inventing Homer: The Early Reception of Epic*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Green, Peter. 1988. "The Armchair Epic: Apollonius Rhodius and the Voyage of Argo." *Southern Humanities Review* 22: 1–15.
- . 2007 [1997]. *The Argonautika*. Expanded ed. Berkeley: U. of California P.
- Griffin, Jasper. 1977. "The Epic Cycle and the Uniqueness of Homer." *JHS* 97: 39–53.
- . 1980. *Homer on Life and Death*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Grillo, Antonino. 1988. *Tra filologia e narratologia: Dai poemi omerici ad Apollonio Rodio, Ilias Latina, Ditti-Settimio, Darete Frigio, Draconzio*. Rome: Ateneo.
- Guinee, David A. 1999. *The Roman Argonautica: Valerius Flaccus and the Epic Tradition*. Diss. Michigan.

- Gummert, Peter H. 1992. *Die Erzählstruktur in den Argonautika des Apollonios Rhodios*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Guthrie, W. K. C. 1950. *The Greeks and Their Gods*. Boston: Beacon.
- Gutzwiller, Kathryn J. 1981. *Studies in the Hellenistic Epyllion*. Königstein: Hain.
- Haacke, August. 1842. *Commentationis de elecutione Apollonii Rhodii particula*. Diss. Halle.
- Habicht, Christian. 2017 [1956]. *Divine Honors for Mortal Men in Greek Cities: The Early Cases*. Trans. John Noël Dillon. Ann Arbor: Michigan Classical Press.
- Hack, Roy Kenneth. 1929. "Homer and the Cult of Heroes." *TAPhA* 60: 57–74.
- Hadas, Moses. 1932. "Apollonius Called the Rhodian." *Classical Weekly* 26.6: 41–54.
- Hadjittofi, Fotini. 2008. "Callimachus' Sexy Athena: *The Hymn to Athena* and the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*." *MD* 60: 9–37.
- Hadzisteliou Price, Theodora. 1973. "Hero-Cult and Homer." *Historia* 22.2: 129–144.
- . 1979. "Hero Cult in the 'Age of Homer' and Earlier." *Arktouros: Hellenic Studies Presented to Bernard M. W. Knox on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*. Edd. Glen Warren Bowersock, Walter Burkert, and Michael C. J. Putnam. Berlin: De Gruyter. 219–228.
- Hägg, Robin, ed. 1999. *Ancient Greek Hero Cult*. Stockholm: Åström.
- Hall, Alexander E. W. 2012. *'To the Beguiling Dance of the Gods: ' Genre and the Short Homeric Hymns*. Diss. Wisconsin-Madison.
- . 2013. "Dating the *Homeric Hymn to Selene*: Evidence and Implications." *GRBS* 53: 15–30.
- Hall, Jonathan M. 1999. "Beyond the *Polis*: The Multilocality of Heroes." In Hägg: 49–59.
- Händel, Paul. 1954. *Beobachtungen zur epischen Technik des Apollonios Rhodios*. Munich: Beck.
- Harder, M. Annette. 1992. "Insubstantial Voices: Some Observations on the *Hymns* of Callimachus." *CQ* 42.2: 384–394.
- . 1993. "Aspects of the Structure of Callimachus' *Aetia*." *HG* 1: 99–110.
- . 2012. *Callimachus. Aetia*. 2 vol. Oxford: OUP.
- Harder, Annette, and Martine Cuypers, edd. 2005. *Beginning from Apollo: Studies in Apollonius Rhodius and the Argonautic Tradition*. Leuven: Peeters.

- Hardie, Alex. 2009. "Etymologising the Muse." *MD* 62: 9–57.
- Hardie, Philip R. 2013. "Redeeming *The Text*, Reception Studies, and the Renaissance." *Classical Receptions Journal* 5.2: 190–198.
- Hardwick, Lorna. 2003. *Reception Studies*. Oxford: OUP.
- Harmon, D. P. 1973. "Nostalgia for the Age of Heroes in Catullus 64." *Latomus* 32.2: 311–331.
- Harrison, Thomas. 2002. *Divinity and History: The Religion of Herodotus*. Oxford: OUP.
- Harvey, A. E. 1955. "The Classification of Greek Lyric Poetry." *CQ* 5.3–4: 157–175.
- Haslam, Michael W. 1993. "Callimachus' *Hymns*." *HG* 1: 111–125.
- Hasluck, F. W. 1910. *Cyzicus*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Haubold, Johannes. 2001. "Epic with an End: An Interpretation of *Homeric Hymns* 15 and 20." *Homer, Tragedy, and Beyond: Essays in Honour of P. E. Easterling*. Edd. Felix Budelmann and Pantelis Michelakis. London: Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies. 23–41.
- Headlam, Walter. 1922. *Herodas. The Mimes and Fragments*. Ed. A. D. Knox. Cambridge: CUP.
- Heath, Malcolm. 2000. "Do Heroes Eat Fish? Athenaeus on the Homeric Lifestyle." *Athenaeus and His World: Reading Greek Culture in the Roman Empire*. Edd. David Braund and John Wilkins. Exeter: U. of Exeter P. 342–352.
- Heiserman, Arthur. 1977. *The Novel before the Novel: Essays and Discussions about the Beginnings of Prose Fiction in the West*. Chicago: U. of Chicago P.
- Henrichs, Albert. 1983. "The 'Sobriety' of Oedipus: Sophocles *OC* 100 Misunderstood." *HSCP* 87: 87–100.
- . 1993. "Gods in Action: The Poetics of Divine Performance in the *Hymns* of Callimachus." *Callimachus*. *HG* 1: 127–147.
- Hensel, Ludwig. 1908. *Weissagungen in der alexandrinischen Poesie*. Diss. Giessen.
- Herington, John. 1985. *Poetry into Drama: Early Tragedy and the Greek Poetic Tradition*. Berkeley: U. of California P.
- Herter, Hans. 1944–1955. "Bericht über die Literatur zur hellenistischen Dichtung seit dem Jahre 1921. II. Teil: Apollonios Rhodios." *Bursians Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der Altertumswissenschaft* 285: 213–410.
- Heubeck, Alfred, Stephanie West, and J. B. Hainsworth. 1988. *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey, Volume I: Introduction and Books I–VIII*. Oxford: Clarendon.

- Hinds, Stephen. 1987. *The Metamorphosis of Persephone: Ovid and the Self-Conscious Muse*. Cambridge: CUP.
- . 1998. *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Hitch, Sarah. 2012. “Hero Cult in Apollonius Rhodius.” *HG* 16: 131–162.
- Hoekstra, A. 1969. *The Sub-Epic Stage of the Formulaic Tradition: Studies in the Homeric Hymns to Apollo, to Aphrodite and to Demeter*. Amsterdam: North-Holland.
- . 1981. *Epic Verse Before Homer: Three Studies*. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing.
- Hölbl, Günther. 2001 [1994]. *A History of the Ptolemaic Empire*. Trans. Tina Saavedra. London: Routledge.
- Holub, Robert. 1995. “Reception theory: School of Constance.” *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism, Volume 8: From Formalism to Poststructuralism*. Ed. Raman Selden. Cambridge: CUP. 319–346.
- Hopkinson, N. 1984. *Callimachus. Hymn to Demeter*. Cambridge: CUP.
- . 1988. *A Hellenistic Anthology*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Hornblower, Simon. 2015. *Lykophron. Alexandra*. Oxford: OUP.
- Horsfall, Nicholas. 1988. “Camilla, o i limiti dell’invenzione.” *Athenaeum* 66: 31–51.
- . 1990. “Virgil and the Illusory Footnote.” *Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar*. Vol. 6. Edd. Francis Cairns and Malcolm Heath. Leeds: Francis Cairns. 49–63.
- Hosty, Matthew. 2013. *An Edition with Commentary of the Batrachomyomachia*. Diss. St. John’s College, Oxford.
- Hughes, Dennis D. 1999. “Hero Cult, Heroic Honors, Heroic Dead: Some Developments in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods.” In Hägg: 167–175.
- Hunter, Richard. 1986. “Apollo and the Argonauts: Two notes on Ap. Rhod. 2, 669–719.” *MH* 43: 50–60.
- . 1987. “Medea’s Flight: The Fourth Book of the *Argonautica*.” *CQ* 37.1: 129–139.
- . 1989. *Apollonius of Rhodes: Argonautica Book III*. Cambridge: CUP.
- . 1991. “Greek and Non-Greek in the *Argonautica* of Apollonius.” *Ἑλληνισμός: Quelques jalons pour une histoire de l’identité grecque: Actes du Colloque de Strasbourg, 25–27 Octobre 1989*. Ed. S. Saïd. Leiden: Brill. 81–99.

- . 1992. “Writing the God: Form and Meaning in Callimachus, *Hymn to Athena*.” *MD* 29: 9–34.
- . 1993. *The Argonautica of Apollonius: Literary Studies*. Cambridge: CUP.
- . 1996. *Theocritus and the Archaeology of Greek Poetry*. Cambridge: CUP.
- . 1999. *Theocritus: A Selection*. Cambridge: CUP.
- . 2000. “εἰς ἔτος ἐξ ἔτεος γλυκερώτεροι: The *Argonautica* after Hermann Fränkel.” In Pretagostini: 63–77.
- . 2003. *Theocritus: Encomium of Ptolemy Philadelphus*. Berkeley: U. of California P.
- . 2005. “Generic Consciousness in the *Orphic Argonautica*?” In Paschalis: 149–168.
- . 2006. *The Shadow of Callimachus: Studies in the Reception of Hellenistic Poetry at Rome*. Cambridge: CUP.
- . 2008 [2001]. “The Poetics of Narrative in the *Argonautica*.” In Papanghelis and Rengakos: 115–146.
- . 2014. *Hesiodic Voices: Studies in the Ancient Reception of Hesiod’s Works and Days*. Cambridge: CUP.
- . 2015. *Apollonius of Rhodes: Argonautica Book IV*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Hurst, André. 1964. “Le retour nocturne des Argonautes.” *MH* 21.4: 232–237.
- . 1967. *Apollonios de Rhodes, manière et coherence: Contribution à l’étude de l’esthétique alexandrine*. Rome: Institut suisse de Rome.
- Hutchinson, G. O. 1988. *Hellenistic Poetry*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- . 2013. “Genre and Super-Genre.” *Generic Interfaces in Latin Literature: Encounters, Interactions and Transformations*. Edd. Theodore D. Papanghelis, Stephen J. Harrison, and Stavros Frangoulidis. Berlin: De Gruyter. 19–34.
- Jackson, Steven. 1990. “Apollonius of Rhodes and the Corn-goddess: A Note on *Arg.* 4.869–76.” *LCM* 15.4: 53–56.
- . 1993. *Creative Selectivity in Apollonius’ Argonautica*. Amsterdam: Hakkert.
- . 1995. “Apollonius of Rhodes: Author of the *Lesbou Ktisis*?” *QUCC* 49.1: 57–66.
- . 1999. “Apollonius of Rhodes: The Asopid Dichotomy.” *SIFC* 3.2: 137–142.
- Jacoby, Felix. 1904. *Das Marmor Parium*. Berlin: Weidmann.

- James, A. W. 1981. "Apollonius Rhodius and His Sources: Interpretative Notes on the *Argonautica*." *Corolla Londiniensis* 1: 59–86.
- Janko, R. 1979. "Βώσεσθε Revisited." *CQ* 29.1: 215–216.
- . 1981. "The Structure of the *Homeric Hymns*: A Study in Genre." *Hermes* 109.1: 9–24.
- . 1982. *Homer, Hesiod and the Hymns: Diachronic Development in Epic Diction*. Cambridge: CUP.
- . 1986. "The *Shield of Heracles* and the Legend of Cycnus." *CQ* 36.1: 38–59.
- . 1994. *The Iliad: A Commentary*. Vol. 4: *Books 13–16*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- . 2012. "πρῶτόν τε καὶ ὕστατον αἰὲν αἰεῖν: Relative Chronology and the Literary History of the Early Greek Epos." In Andersen and Haug: 20–43.
- Jebb, Richard Claverhouse. 1883. *Sophocles: The Plays and Fragments*. Vol. 1. Cambridge: CUP.
- Johnston, Sarah Iles. 1999. *Restless Dead: Encounters between the Living and the Dead in Ancient Greece*. Berkeley: U. of California P.
- Jones, Christopher P. 2010. *New Heroes in Antiquity: From Achilles to Antinoos*. Cambridge, MA: HUP.
- Jong, Irene J. F. de. 1993. "Studies in Homeric Denomination." *Mnemosyne* 46.3: 289–306.
- . 2004a [1987]. *Narrators and Focalizers: The Presentation of the Story in the Iliad*. 2nd ed. Bristol: Bristol Classical Press.
- . 2004b. "Homer." In *eadem et al.*: 13–24.
- . 2009. "Metalepsis in Ancient Greek Literature." *Narratology and Interpretation: The Content of Narrative Form in Ancient Literature*. Edd. Jonas Grethlein and Antonios Rengakos. Berlin: De Gruyter. 87–115.
- . 2012. "The *Homeric Hymns*." *SAGN* 3: 39–53.
- . 2014. *Narratology and Classics: A Practical Guide*. Oxford: OUP.
- . 2018. "The *Homeric Hymns*." *SAGN* 4: 64–79.
- Kampakoglou, Alexandros. 2016. "Danaus βουγενής: Greco-Egyptian Mythology and Ptolemaic Kingship." *GRBS* 56: 111–139.
- . 2019. *Studies in the Reception of Pindar in Ptolemaic Poetry*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

- Karanika, Andromache. 2010. "Inside Orpheus' Songs: Orpheus as an Argonaut in Apollonius Rhodius' *Argonautica*." *GRBS* 50: 391–410.
- Kearns, Emily. 1989. *The Heroes of Attica*. London: Institute of Classical Studies.
- . 1992. "Between God and Man: Status and Function of Heroes and Their Sanctuaries." *Le sanctuaire grec*. Ed. Jean Bingen. Vandœuvres: Fondation Hardt. 65–99.
- . 1998. "The Nature of Heroines." *The Sacred and the Feminine in Ancient Greece*. Edd. Sue Blundell and Margaret Williamson. London: Routledge. 74–86.
- Kelly, Adrian. 2014. "Hellenistic Arming in the *Batrachomyomachia*." *CQ* 64.1: 410–413.
- Kerekes, Pavlos. 1913. "Οἱ τρόποι τῶν Ἀργοναυτικῶν τοῦ Ἀπολλώνιου τοῦ Ῥοδίου." *Egyetemes Philologiai Közlöny* 37: 385–408.
- Keyssner, Karl. 1932. *Gottesvorstellung und Lebensauffassung im griechischen Hymnus*. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer.
- Kidd, Douglas. 1997. *Phaenomena*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Kirk, G. S. 1985. *The Iliad: A Commentary*. Vol. 1: *Books 1–4*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Klein, Theodore M. 1974. "The Role of Callimachus in the Development of the Concept of Counter-Genre." *Latomus* 33: 217–231.
- . 1975. "Callimachus, Apollonius Rhodius, and the Concept of the 'Big Book.'" *Eranos* 73: 16–25.
- Kleywegt, A. J. 2005. *Valerius Flaccus, Argonautica, Book 1: A Commentary*. Leiden: Brill.
- Klinger, Friedrich. 1964. *Studien zur griechischen und römischen Literatur*. Zurich: Artemis.
- Klooster, Jacqueline. 2007. "Apollonius of Rhodes." *SAGN* 2: 63–80.
- . 2011. *Poetry as Window and Mirror: Positioning the Poet in Hellenistic Poetry*. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2012. "Apollonius of Rhodes." *SAGN* 3: 55–76.
- . 2013a. "Apostrophe in Homer, Apollonius and Callimachus." *Über die Grenze: Metalepse in Text- und Bildmedien des Altertums*. Edd. Ute E. Eisen and Peter von Möllendorff. Berlin: De Gruyter. 151–173.
- . 2013b. "Argo was Here: The Ideology of Geographical Space in the *Argonautica* of Apollonius of Rhodes." *The Ideologies of Lived Space in Literary Texts, Ancient and Modern*. Edd. eadem and Jo Heirman. Gent: Academia Press. 159–173.

- . 2014. “Time, Space, and Ideology in the Aetiological Narratives of Apollonius Rhodius’ *Argonautica*.” *Von Ursachen sprechen: Eine aitiologische Spurensuche. = Telling Origins: On the Lookout for Aetiology*. Edd. Christiane Reitz and Anke Walter. Hildesheim: Georg Olms. 519–543.
- . 2018. “Apollonius of Rhodes.” *SAGN* 4: 80–99.
- Knauer, Georg Nicolaus. 1964. *Die Aeneis und Homer: Studien zur poetischen Technik Vergils, mit Listen der Homerzitate in der Aeneis*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Knight, Virginia. 1995. *The Renewal of Epic: Responses to Homer in the Argonautica of Apollonius*. Leiden: Brill.
- Knox, Bernard M. W. 1968. “Silent Reading in Antiquity.” *GRBS* 9.4: 421–435.
- Koenen, Ludwig. 1993. “The Ptolemaic King as a Religious Figure.” In Bulloch et al.: 25–115.
- . 1994. “Greece, the Near East, and Egypt: Cyclic Destruction in Hesiod and the *Catalogue of Women*.” *TAPhA* 124: 1–34.
- Kofler, Johann. 1890. “Die Gleichnisse bei Apollonios Rhodios.” *Jahresbericht des f.b.Privat-Gymnasiums am Seminarium Vincentinum in Brixen* 15: 1–58.
- Köhnken, Adolf. 1965. *Apollonios Rhodios und Theokrit: Die Hylas- und die Amykosgeschichten beider Dichter und die Frage der Priorität*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- . 2000. “Der Status Jasons: Besonderheiten der Darstellungstechnik in den *Argonautika* des Apollonios Rhodios.” *HG* 4: 55–68.
- . 2003. “Apoll-Aitien bei Kallimachos und Apollonios.” *Des Géants à Dionysos: Mélanges de mythologie et de poésie grecques offerts à Francis Vian*. Edd. Domenico Accorinti and Pierre Chuvin. Alessandria: Edizioni dell’Orso. 207–213.
- . 2008 [2001]. “Hellenistic Chronology: Theocritus, Callimachus, and Apollonius Rhodius.” In Papanghelis and Rengakos: 73–94.
- . 2010. “Apollonius’ *Argonautica*.” In Claus and Cuypers: 136–150.
- Konstan, David. 1977. *Catullus’ Indictment of Rome: The Meaning of Catullus 64*. Amsterdam: Hakkert.
- . 1993. “Neoteric Epic: Catullus 64.” *Roman Epic*. Ed. A. J. Boyle. London: Routledge. 59–78.
- Korenjak, Martin. 2009. “ΛΕΥΚΗ: Was bedeutet das erste ‘Akrostichon’?” *RhM* 152.3/4: 392–396.
- Kraup, P. 1948. “Verwendung von Abstrakta in der direkten Rede bei Homer.” *C&M* 10: 1–17.

- Krevans, N. 2000. "On the Margins of Epic: The Foundation-Poems of Apollonius." *HG* 4: 69–84.
- Kroll, Wilhelm. 1924. *Studien zum Verständnis der römischen Literatur*. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler.
- Kronenberg, Leah. 2018a. "Seeing the Light, Part I: Aratus's Interpretation of Homer's *LEUKĒ* Acrostic." *Dictynna* 15: 1–11.
- . 2018b. "Seeing the Light, Part II: The Reception of Aratus's *LEPTĒ* Acrostic in Greek and Latin Literature." *Dictynna* 15: 1–32.
- Kurke, Leslie. 2000. "The Strangeness of 'Song Culture': Archaic Greek Poetry." *Literature in the Greek and Roman Worlds: A New Perspective*. Ed. Oliver Taplin. Oxford: OUP. 58–87.
- Kyriakou, Poulheria. 1995. *Homeric Hapax Legomena in the Argonautica of Apollonius: A Literary Study*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
- Lardinois, André. 1997. "Modern Paroemiology and the Use of *Gnomai* in Homer's *Iliad*." *CPh* 92.3: 213–234.
- Larson, Jennifer. 1995. *Greek Heroine Cults*. Madison: U. of Wisconsin P.
- . 2001. *Greek Nymphs: Myth, Cult, Lore*. Oxford: OUP.
- . 2007. *Ancient Greek Cults: A Guide*. Routledge: New York.
- Lawall, Gilbert. 1966. "Apollonius' *Argonautica*: Jason as Anti-Hero." *YCS* 19: 121–169.
- Lefkowitz, Mary R. 2008. "Myth and History in the Biography of Apollonius." In Papanghelis and Rengakos: 51–71.
- Lennox, P. G. 1980. "Apollonius, *Argonautica* 3, 1ff. and Homer." *Hermes* 108.1: 45–73.
- Lenz, Lutz. 1975. *Der homerische Aphroditehymnus und die Aristie des Aineias in der Ilias*. Bonn: Habelt.
- Lenz, Ansgar. 1980. *Das Proöm des frühen griechischen Epos: Ein Beitrag zum poetischen Selbstverständnis*. Bonn: Habelt.
- Leschhorn, Wolfgang. 1984. *Gründer der Stadt: Studien zu einem politisch-religiösen Phänomen der griechischen Geschichte*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
- Lévêque, Pierre, and Annie Verbanck-Piérard. 1992. "Héraclès: Héros ou dieu?" *Héraclès: D'une rive à l'autre de la Méditerranée: Bilan et perspectives*. Edd. Corinne Bonnet and Colette Jourdain-Annequin. Brussels: Institut Historique Belge de Rome. 43–65.
- Levin, Donald Norman. 1962. "Apolloniana Minora." *TAPhA* 93: 154–163.

- . 1963. “Zeus’s Orchard without Zeus’s Palace.” *CPh* 58.2: 107–109.
- . 1969. “Two Epithets of Aristaeus.” *Hermes* 97.4: 498–501.
- . 1971. *Apollonius’ Argonautica Re-Examined, I: The Neglected First and Second Books*. Leiden: Brill.
- Liberman, Gauthier. 2002. *Alcée: Fragments*. 2 vol. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Lightfoot, J. L. 1999. *Parthenius of Nicaea: The Poetical Fragments and the Ἐρωτικὰ Παθήματα*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- . 2014. *Dionysius Periegetes: Description of the Known World*. Oxford: OUP.
- Livrea, Enrico. 1966. “Il proemio degli *Erga* considerato attraverso i vv. 9–10.” *Helikon* 6: 442–475.
- . 1972. “Una tecnica allusiva apolloniana alla luce dell’esegesi omerica alessandrina.” *SIFC* 44: 231–243.
- . 1973. *Apollonii Rhodii Argonauticon Liber Quartus*. Florence: La Nuova Italia.
- . 1979. “Da Pagasai a Lemnos.” *SIFC* 51: 146–154.
- . 1983. Review of Vian and Delage 1981 [= 2002.3]. *Gnomon* 55.5: 420–426.
- Lloyd-Jones, Hugh. 1984. “A Hellenistic Miscellany.” *SIFC* 3.2: 52–71.
- Lozynsky, Yuriy. 2014. *Ancient Greek Cult Hymns: Poets, Performers and Rituals*. Diss. Toronto.
- Luz, Christine. 2013. “What Has It Got in Its Pockets? Or, What Makes a Riddle a Riddle?” *The Muse at Play: Riddles and Wordplay in Greek and Latin Poetry*. Edd. Jan Kwapisz, David Petrain, and Mikołaj Szymański. Berlin: De Gruyter. 83–99.
- Lye, Suzanne. 2012. “Rewriting the Gods: Religious Ritual, Human Resourcefulness, and Divine Interaction in the *Argonautica*.” *HG* 16: 223–247.
- . 2016. *The Hypertextual Underworld: Exploring the Underworld as an Intertextual Space in Ancient Greek Literature*. Diss. California-Los Angeles.
- Lyne, R. O. A. M. 2005. “Horace *Odes* Book 1 and the Alexandrian Edition of Alcaeus.” *CQ* 55.2: 542–558.
- Lyons, Deborah. 1997. *Gender and Immortality: Heroines in Ancient Greek Myth and Cult*. Princeton: Princeton UP.
- Lyons, John. 1977. *Semantics*. 2 vol. Cambridge: CUP.

- Mackay, Elizabeth Anne. 2001. "The Frontal Face and 'You': Narrative Disjunction in Early Greek Poetry and Painting." *AC* 44: 5–34.
- Mackie, C. J. 1998. "Achilles in Fire." *CQ* 48.2: 329–338.
- Maehler, H. 2004. *Bacchylides: A Selection*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Malkin, Irad. 1987. *Religion and Colonization in Ancient Greece*. Leiden: Brill.
- . 1993. "Land Ownership, Territorial Possession, Hero Cults, and Scholarly Theory." *Nomodeiktes: Greek Studies in Honor of Martin Ostwald*. Edd. Ralph M. Rosen and Joseph Farrell. Ann Arbor: U. of Michigan P. 225–234.
- Malten, Ludolf. 1910. "Ein Alexandrinisches Gedicht vom Raube der Kore." *Hermes* 45.4: 506–553.
- Manakidou, Flora P. 2017. "Past and Present in the Fifth *Hymn* of Callimachus: Mimesis, Aitiology and Reality." *HG* 21: 181–210.
- Marg, Walter. 1976. "Kampf und Tod in der *Ilias*." *WJA* 2: 7–19.
- Martin, Richard P. 2005. "Epic as Genre." In Foley: 9–19.
- Martindale, Charles. 1993. *Redeeming the Text: Latin Poetry and the Hermeneutics of Reception*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Martindale, Charles, and Richard F. Thomas, edd. 2006. *Classics and the Uses of Reception*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Mason, H. C. 2016. "Jason's Cloak and the *Shield of Heracles*." *Mnemosyne* 69: 183–201.
- Massimilla, Giulio. 1996–2010. *Aitia*. 2 vol. Pisa: Giardini.
- . 2005. "Considerazioni su PSI inv. 1923." *Comunicazioni dell'Instituto papyrologico "G. Vitelli"* 6: 13–18.
- Matteo, Rocchina. 2002. "Note apolloniane." *ARF* 4: 155–165.
- . 2007. *Apollonio Rodio: Argonautiche Libro II*. Lecce: Pensa.
- McKeown, J. C. 1987. *Ovid. Amores*. Leeds: Francis Cairns.
- McNelis, Charles. 2003. "Mourning Glory: Callimachus' Hecale and Heroic Honors." *MD* 50: 155–161.
- McNelis, Charles, and Alexander Sens. 2011. "Trojan Glory: *Kleos* and the Survival of Troy in Lycophron's *Alexandra*." *Trends in Classics* 3.1: 54–82.

- McPhee, Brian D. 2017. "Numbers and Acrostics: Two Notes on Jason's Prayer at Pagasae in Apollonius' *Argonautica*." *Akropolis* 1: 111–120.
- . 2018. "Phineus' Perpetual Night: Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 7.2–4, and Apollonius, *Argonautica* 2.178–497." *Hermathena* 195: 55–69.
- . Forthcoming. "Power Divine: Apollonius' Medea and the Goddesses of the *Homeric Hymns*." *HG* (forthcoming).
- Merkel, R., and Heinrich Keil. 1854. *Apollonii Argonautica*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Meyer, Herbert. 1933. *Hymnische Stilelemente in der frühgriechischen Dichtung*. Düsseldorf: Triltsch.
- Michaelis, Julius Johann. 1875. *De Apollonii Rhodii fragmentis*. Diss. Halle.
- Michalopoulos, Andreas N. 2003. "Working on an Established Etymological Background: Ovid and his Hellenistic Predecessors." *Etymologia: Studies in Ancient Etymology*. Ed. Christos Nifadopoulos. Münster: Nodus. 165–175.
- Mikalson, Jon D. 1991. *Honor Thy Gods: Popular Religion in Greek Tragedy*. Chapel Hill: U. of North Carolina P.
- Miller, Andrew M. 1979. "The 'Address to the Delian Maidens' in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*: Epilogue or Transition?" *TAPhA* 109: 173–186.
- . 1986. *From Delos to Delphi: A Literary Study of the Homeric Hymn to Apollo*. Leiden: Brill.
- Miller, John F. 2014. "Virgil's Salian Hymn to Hercules." *CJ* 109.4: 439–463.
- Minchin, Elizabeth. 1999. "Describing and Narrating in Homer's *Iliad*." *Signs of Orality: The Oral Tradition and its Influence in the Greek and Roman World*. Ed. E. Anne Mackay. Leiden: Brill. 49–64.
- Mineur, W. H. 1984. *Callimachus. Hymn to Delos*. Leiden: Brill.
- Minton, William W. 1970. "The Proem-hymn of Hesiod's *Theogony*." *TAPhA* 101: 357–377.
- Miralles, Carles. 1992. "La poetica di Eroda." *Aevum(ant)* 5: 89–113.
- Mirto, Maria Serena. 2011. "Il nome di Achille nelle *Argonautiche* tra intertestualità e giochi etimologici." *RFIC* 139.2: 279–309.
- Mooney, George W. 1912. *The Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius*. London: Longmans, Green, and Co.
- Mora, Fabio. 1981. "I silenzi erodotei." *Studi storico-religiosi* 5: 209–222.

- . 1983. “Il silenzio religioso in Erodoto e nel teatro ateniese.” *Le regioni del silenzio: studi sui disagi della comunicazione*. Ed. Maria Grazia Ciani. Padua: Bloom. 54–76.
- Moran, William Stephen. 1975. “Μυμνήσχομαι and ‘Remembering’ Epic Stories in Homer and the *Hymns*.” *QUCC* 20: 195–211.
- Mori, Anatole. 2007. “Acts of Persuasion in Hellenistic Epic: Honey-Sweet Words in Apollonius.” *A Companion to Greek Rhetoric*. Ed. Ian Worthington. Malden, MA: Blackwell. 458–472.
- . 2008. *The Politics of Apollonius Rhodius’ Argonautica*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Morris, Ian. 1988. “Tomb Cult and the ‘Greek Renaissance’: The Past in the Present in the 8th Century BC.” *Antiquity* 62: 750–761.
- Morrison, A. D. 2007. *The Narrator in Archaic Greek and Hellenistic Poetry*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Murnaghan, Sheila. 2007. Review of Martindale and Thomas 2006. *BMCR* 2.19.
- Murray, Jackie. 2004. “The Metamorphoses of Erysichthon: Callimachus, Apollonius, and Ovid.” *HG* 7: 207–242.
- . 2005a. *Polyphonic Argo*. Diss. Washington.
- . 2005b. “The Constructions of the Argo in Apollonius’ *Argonautica*.” In Harder and Cuypers: 88–106.
- . 2018. “Silencing Orpheus: The Fiction of Performance in Apollonius’ *Argonautica*.” *HG* 23: 201–224.
- Murray, Oswyn. 1970. “Hecataeus of Abdera and Pharaonic Kingship.” *JEA* 56: 141–171.
- Naber, S. A. 1906. “Ad Apollonium Rhodium.” *Mnemosyne* 34.1: 1–39.
- Nagy, Gregory. 1974. *Comparative Studies in Greek and Indic Meter*. Cambridge, MA: HUP.
- . 1982. “Hesiod.” *Ancient Writers: Greece and Rome*. Vol. 1. Ed. T. James Luce. New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons. 43–72.
- . 1990. *Pindar’s Homer*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP.
- . 1999 [1979]. *The Best of the Achaeans: Concepts of the Hero in Archaic Greek Poetry*. Rev. ed. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP.
- . 2002. “Reading Bakhtin Reading the Classics: An Epic Fate for Conveyors of the Heroic Past.” *Bakhtin and the Classics*. Ed. R. Bracht Branham. Evanston, IL: Northwestern UP. 71–96.
- . 2005. “The Epic Hero.” In Foley: 71–89.

- . 2010. *Homer the Preclassic*. Berkeley: U. of California P.
- . 2011. “The Earliest Phases in the Reception of the *Homeric Hymns*.” In Faulkner: 280–331.
- . 2012. “Signs of Hero Cult in Homeric Poetry.” *Homeric Contexts: Neoanalysis and the Interpretation of Oral Poetry*. Edd. Franco Montanari, Antonios Rengakos, and Christos Tsagalis. Berlin: De Gruyter. 27–71.
- Natzel, Stephanie A. 1992. *Κλέα γυναικῶν: Frauen in den Argonautika des Apollonios Rhodios*. Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag.
- Nelis, Damien P. 1991. “Iphias: Apollonius Rhodius, *Argonautica* 1.311–16.” *CQ* 41.1: 96–105.
- . 1992. “Demodocus and the Song of Orpheus: Ap. Rhod. *Arg.* 1, 496–511.” *MH* 49.3: 153–170.
- . 2001. *Vergil’s Aeneid and the Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius*. Leeds: Francis Cairns.
- . 2005a. “Apollonius of Rhodes.” In Foley: 353–363.
- . 2005b. “The Reading of Orpheus: The *Orphic Argonautica* and the Epic Tradition.” In Paschalis: 169–192.
- Newman, John K. 1986. *Classical Epic Tradition*. Madison: U. of Wisconsin P.
- . 1998. “Iambe/Iambos and the Rape of a Genre: A Horatian Sidelight.” *ICS* 23: 101–120.
- . 2008 [2001]. “The Golden Fleece: Imperial Dream.” In Papanghelis and Rengakos: 413–444.
- Niedergang-Janon, Florence. 2002. *Mythes et représentations dans les Argonautiques d’Apollonios de Rhodes*. Diss. Paris Nanterre.
- Nilsson, Martin P. 1967 [1955]. *Geschichte der griechischen Religion*. 3rd ed. Vol. 1. Munich: Beck.
- Nisbet, R. G. M., and Niall Rudd. *A Commentary on Horace: Odes Book III*. Oxford: OUP.
- Nishimura-Jensen, Julie Mariko. 1996. *Tragic Epic or Epic Tragedy: Narrative and Genre in Apollonius of Rhodes’ Argonautica*. Diss. Wisconsin-Madison.
- . 2000. “Unstable Geographies: The Moving Landscape in Apollonius’ *Argonautica* and Callimachus’ *Hymn to Delos*.” *TAPhA* 130: 287–317.
- Nock, Arthur Darby. 1944. “The Cult of Heroes.” *Harvard Theological Review* 37.2: 141–174.

- . 1972. *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World*. 2 vol. Ed. Zeph Stewart. Cambridge, MA: HUP.
- Norden, Eduard. 1956. *Agnostos Theos: Untersuchungen zur Formengeschichte religiöser Rede*. Stuttgart: Teubner.
- . 1957. *P. Vergilius Maro Aeneis Buch VI*. 4th ed. Stuttgart: Teubner.
- Nünlist, René. 2004. “The *Homeric Hymns*.” *SAGN* 1: 35–42.
- . 2007. “The *Homeric Hymns*.” *SAGN* 2: 53–62.
- . 2009. *The Ancient Critic at Work: Terms and Concepts of Literary Criticism in Greek Scholia*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Nuttall, A. D. 1992. *Openings: Narrative Beginnings from the Epic to the Novel*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Nyberg, Lars. 1992. *Unity and Coherence: Studies in Apollonius Rhodius’ Argonautica and the Alexandrian Epic Tradition*. Lund: Lund UP.
- Ogden, Daniel. 2013. *Drakōn: Dragon Myth and Serpent Cult in the Greek and Roman Worlds*. Oxford: OUP.
- O’Hara, James J. 1996. “Vergil’s Best Reader? Ovidian Commentary on Vergilian Etymological Wordplay.” *CJ* 91.3: 255–276.
- . 2007. *Inconsistency in Roman Epic: Studies in Catullus, Lucretius, Vergil, Ovid and Lucan*. Cambridge: CUP.
- . 2017 [1996]. *True Names: Vergil and the Alexandrian Tradition of Etymological Wordplay*. Expanded ed. Ann Arbor: U. of Michigan P.
- O’Higgins, Laurie. 2003. *Women and Humor in Classical Greece*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Olender, Maurice. 1990. “Aspects of Baubo: Ancient Texts and Contexts.” *Before Sexuality: The Construction of Erotic Experience in the Ancient Greek World*. Edd. David M. Halperin, John J. Winkler, and Froma I. Zeitlin. Princeton: Princeton UP. 83–113.
- Olson, S. Douglas. 2012. *The Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite and Related Texts*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Opelt, Ilona. 1978. “Gefühlswörter bei Homer und in den *Argonautika* des Apollonios Rhodios.” *Glossa* 56.3/4: 170–190.
- Ormand, Kirk. 2015. “Toward Iambic Obscenity.” *Ancient Obscenities: Their Nature and Use in the Ancient Greek and Roman Worlds*. Edd. Dorota Dutsch and Ann Suter. Ann Arbor: U. of Michigan P. 44–70.

- Ottone, Gabrielle. 2002. *Libyka: Testimonianze e frammenti*. Tivoli: TORED.
- Pace, Cristina. 2004. "Il tizzone sotto la cenere: Apoll. Rh. 3.275 ss. e l'*Inno omerico a Hermes*." *La cultura ellenistica: l'opera letteraria e l'esegesi antica*. Edd. Roberto Pretagostini and Emanuele Dettori. Rome: Quasar. 95–111.
- Paduano, Guido. 1971. "L'episodio di Talos: Osservazioni sull'esperienza magica nelle *Argonautiche* di Apollonio Rodio." *SCO* 19–20: 46–67.
- Paduano, Guido, and Massimo Fusillo. 1986. *Apollonio Rodio: Le Argonautiche*. Milan: Rizzoli.
- Paduano Faedo, Lucia. 1970. "L'inversione del rapporto poeta-Musa nella cultura ellenistica." *ASNP* 39.3/4: 377–386.
- Palombi, Maria Garza. 1993. "Mito e storia in due episodi delle *Argonautiche* di Apollonio Rodio." *Prometheus* 19: 154–168.
- Papanghelis, Theodore D., and Antonios Rengakos, edd. 2008 [2001]. *Brill's Companion to Apollonius Rhodius*. 2nd ed. Leiden: Brill.
- Papathomopoulos, Manolis. 1968. *Antoninus Liberalis. Les Métamorphoses*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Parker, Robert. 1983. *Miasma: Pollution and Purification in Early Greek Religion*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- . 1991. "The *Hymn to Demeter* and the *Homeric Hymns*." *G&R* 38.1: 1–17.
- . 1996. *Athenian Religion: A History*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- . 2005. "ὥς ἦρωι ἐναγίζειν." *Greek Sacrificial Ritual, Olympian and Chthonian*. Edd. Robin Hägg and Brita Alroth. Stockholm: Åström. 37–45.
- . 2011. *On Greek Religion*. Ithaca: Cornell UP.
- Parry, Milman. 1971. *The Making of Homeric Verse: The Collected Papers of Milman Parry*. Ed. Adam Parry. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Parsons, Peter. 1993. "Identities in Diversity." In Bulloch et al.: 152–170.
- Paschalis, Michael, ed. 2005. *Roman and Greek Imperial Epic*. Herakleion: Crete UP.
- Páskiewicz, T. M. 1981. *A Commentary on the Second Book of the Argonautica by Apollonius of Rhodes*. Diss. Hertford College, Oxford.
- . 1988. "Aitia in the Second Book of Apollonius' *Argonautica*." *ICS* 13.1: 57–61.

- Pavese, C. O. 1991. "L'inno rapsodico: Analisi tematica degli *Inni omerici*." *L'inno tra rituale e letteratura nel mondo antico. Atti di un colloquio, Napoli 21–24 ottobre 1991*. Edd. Albio Cesaro Cassio. Rome: GEI. 155–178.
- . 1993. "L'inno rapsodico: Indice tematico degli *Inni omerici*." *AION(filol)* 15: 21–36.
- Pavlock, Barbara. 1990. *Eros, Imitation, and the Epic Tradition*. Ithaca: Cornell UP.
- Pease, Arthur Stanley. 1955–1958. *M. Tulli Ciceronis De Natura Deorum*. 2 vol. Cambridge, MA: HUP.
- Perrotta, Gennaro. 1931. "Il carme 64 di Catullo e i suoi pretesi originali ellenistici." *Athenaeum* 9.2, 3: 177–222, 370–409.
- . 1978 [1926]. "La chiusa del Tolomeo." *Poesia ellenistica: Scritti minori*. Vol. 2. Rome: Ateneo. 180–186.
- Peschties, Eric. 1912. *Quaestiones philologicae et archaeologicae de Apollonii Rhodii Argonauticis*. Diss. Königsberg.
- Petrovic, Ivana. 2012. "Rhapsodic Hymns and Epyllia." *Brill's Companion to Greek and Latin Epyllion and Its Reception*. Edd. Manuel Baumbach and Silvio Bär. Leiden: Brill. 149–176.
- Petzl, Georg. 1969. *Antike Diskussionen über die beiden Nekyiai*. Meisenheim an Glan: Hain.
- Pfeiff, Karl Arno. 2002. *Homerische Hymnen*. Edd. Gerd von der Gönna and Erika Simon. Tübingen: Stauffenburg.
- Pfeiffer, Rudolf. 1934. *Die neuen ΔΙΗΓΗΣΕΙΣ zu Kallimachosgedichten*. Munich: Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- . 1949–1951. *Callimachus*. 2 vol. Oxford: Clarendon.
- . 1968. *History of Classical Scholarship from the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Pfeiffer, Stefan. 2008. *Herrscher- und Dynastiekulte im Ptolemäerreich: Systematik und Einordnung der Kultformen*. Munich: Beck.
- . 2016. "The Ptolemies: Hellenistic Kingship in Egypt." *Oxford Handbooks Online*. DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199935390.013.23.
- Pfister, Friedrich. 1909–1912. *Der Reliquienkult im Altertum*. 2 vol. Giessen: Töpelmann.
- Phinney, Edward Sterl, Jr. 1963. *Apollonius Rhodius*. Diss. California, Berkeley.

- Piacenza, Nicola. 2014. "Eronda e la musa giambica ipponattea: per l'interpretazione del *Mimiambo* 1 (con un excursus sulle *Siracusane* di Teocrito)." *Annali Online di Ferrara. Lettere* 9.2: 167–187.
- Pietsch, Christian. 1999. *Die Argonautika des Apollonios von Rhodos: Untersuchungen zum Problem der einheitlichen Konzeption des Inhalts*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
- Pike, D. L. 1984. "Pindar's Treatment of the Heracles Myths." *AC* 27: 15–22.
- Pirenne-Delforge, Vinciane. 2008. "Le lexique des lieux de culte dans la *Périégèse* de Pausanias." *Archiv für Religionsgeschichte* 10: 143–178.
- Pirenne-Delforge, Vinciane, and Emilio Suárez de la Torre, edd. 2000. *Héros et héroïnes dans les mythes et les cultes grecs*. Liège: Centre International d'Étude de la Religion Grecque Antique.
- Platt, Arthur. 1914. "On Apollonius Rhodius." *JPh* 33: 1–53.
- Platt, Verity. 2011. *Facing the Gods: Epiphany and Representation in Graeco-Roman Art, Literature and Religion*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Pompella, Giuseppe. 2002. *Apollonii Rhodii Lexicon*. Hildesheim: Olms-Weidmann.
- Porter, James I. 2008. "Reception Studies: Future Prospects." *A Companion to Classical Receptions*. Edd. Lorna Hardwick and Christopher Stray. Malden, MA: Blackwell. 469–481.
- . 2011. "Making and Unmaking: The Achaean Wall and the Limits of Fictionality in Homeric Criticism." *TAPhA* 141.1: 1–36.
- Preininger, Johann. 1976. *Der Aufbau der Argonautika des Apollonios Rhodios*. Diss. Graz.
- Pretagostini, Roberto, ed. 2000. *La letteratura ellenistica: Problemi e prospettive di ricerca*. Rome: Quasar.
- Priestley, Jessica. 2014. *Herodotus and Hellenistic Culture: Literary Studies in the Reception of the Histories*. Oxford: OUP.
- Prince, Gerald. 2003. *A Dictionary of Narratology*. Rev. ed. Lincoln: U. of Nebraska P.
- Pritchett, W. Kendrick. 1979. *The Greek State at War*. Vol. 3. Berkeley: U. of California P.
- Race, William H. 1982. "Aspects of Rhetoric and Form in Greek Hymns." *GRBS* 23.1: 5–14.
- . 1985. "Pindar's Heroic Ideal at *Pyth.* 4.186–87." *AJPh* 106.3: 350–356.
- . 1992. "How Greek Poems Begin." *YCIS* 29: 13–38.
- Redondo, J. 2000. "Non-Epic Features in the Language of Apollonius Rhodius." *HG* 4: 129–154.

- Reich, Franz, and H. Maehler. 1991. *Lexicon in Apollonii Rhodii Argonautica*. Amsterdam: Hakkert.
- Reinhardt, Karl. 1960. *Tradition und Geist: Gesammelte Essays zur Dichtung*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- . 1961. *Die Ilias und ihr Dichter*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Rengakos, Antonios. 1993. *Der Homertext und die hellenistischen Dichter*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
- . 1994. *Apollonios Rhodios und die antike Homererklärung*. Munich: Beck.
- . 2004. “Die *Argonautika* und das ‘kyklische Gedicht’: Bemerkungen zur Erzähltechnik des griechischen Epos.” *Antike Literatur in neuer Deutung*. Edd. Anton Bierl, Arbogast Schmitt, and Andreas Willi. Munich: Saur. 277–304.
- Rice, E. E. 1983. *The Grand Procession of Ptolemy Philadelphus*. Oxford: OUP.
- Richardson, N. J. 1974. *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- . 2010. *Three Homeric Hymns: To Apollo, Hermes, and Aphrodite*. Cambridge: CUP.
- . 2015. “Constructing a Hymnic Narrative: Tradition and Innovation in the Longer *Homeric Hymns*.” In Faulkner and Hodkinson: 19–30.
- Richardson, Scott. 1990. *The Homeric Narrator*. Nashville: Vanderbilt UP.
- Rijksbaron, Albert. 2009. “Discourse Cohesion in the Proem of Hesiod’s *Theogony*.” *Discourse Cohesion in Ancient Greek*. Edd. Stéphanie Bakker and Gerry Wakker. Leiden: Brill. 241–265.
- Rives, James B. 2018. “Cult Practice, Social Power, and Religious Identity: The Case of Animal Sacrifice.” *Juden, Christen, Heiden? Religiöse Inklusion und Exklusion in Kleinasien bis Decius*. Edd. Stefan Alkier and Hartmut Leppin. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Robert, Carl. 1921. *Die griechische Heldensage* = Preller, Ludwig, ed. *Griechische Mythologie*. Vol. 2.3.1. Berlin: Weidmann.
- Robinson, David M. 1905. “Greek and Latin Inscriptions from Sinope and Environs.” *AJA* 9.3: 294–333.
- Rodríguez Moreno, Inmaculada. 2000. “Le héros comme μεταξύ entre l’homme et la divinité dans la pensée grecque.” In Pirenne-Delforge and Suárez de la Torre: 91–100.
- Rohde, Erwin. 1925 [1894]. *Psyche: The Cult of Souls and Belief in Immortality among the Greeks*. Trans. W. B. Hillis. London: Paul, Trench, Trubner.

- Rohrbach, Hans Hermann. 1960. *Kolonie und Orakel: Untersuchungen zur sakralen Begründung der griechischen Kolonisation*. Diss. Heidelberg.
- Roller, Lynn E. 1981. "Funeral Games for Historical Persons." *Stadion* 7: 1–18.
- Roloff, Dietrich. 1970. *Gottähnlichkeit, Vergöttlichung und Erhöhung zu seligem Leben: Untersuchungen zur Herkunft der platonischen Angleichung an Gott*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Romeo, Alessandra. 1985. *Il proemio epico antico: quattro capitoli*. Rome: Gangemi.
- Rose, Amy R. 1984. "Three Narrative Themes in Apollonios' Bebrykian Episode (*Argonautika* 2, 1–163)." *WS* 18: 115–135.
- Rosen, Ralph M. 1988a. *Old Comedy and the Iambographic Tradition*. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- . 1988b. "A Poetic Initiation Scene in Hipponax?" *AJPh* 109.2: 174–179.
- Rosenmeyer, Patricia A. 2004. "Girls at Play in Early Greek Poetry." *AJPh* 125.2: 163–178.
- Rosenmeyer, Thomas G. 1992. "Apollonius lyricus." *SIFC* 10: 177–198.
- Ross, David O., Jr. 1975. *Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry: Gallus, Elegy and Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Rossi, Luigi Enrico. 1968. "La fine alessandrina dell' *Odissea* e lo ζῆλος Ὀμηρικός di Apollonio Rodio." *RFIC* 96: 151–163.
- . 2000. "La letteratura alessandrina e il rinnovamento dei generi letterari della tradizione." In Pretagostini: 149–161.
- Rostropowicz, Joanna. 1990. "Das Heraklesbild in den *Argonautika* des Apollonios Rhodios." *Acta Classica Univ. Scien. Debrecen.* 26: 31–34.
- Roth, Peter. 2004. "Apollonios Rhodios zwischen Homer und Hesiod: Beobachtungen zum Argonautenkatalog." *Ἐγκύκλιον Κηπίον (Ründergarten): Zu Poesie, Historie und Fachliteratur der Antike*. Ed. Markus Janka. Munich: Saur. 43–54.
- Rotstein, Andrea. 2010. *The Idea of Iambos*. Oxford: OUP.
- Roux, Jean-Paul. 1999. *Montagnes sacrées, montagnes mythiques*. Paris: Fayard.
- Roux, R. 1949. *Le problème des Argonautes: Recherches sur les aspects religieux de la légende*. Paris: de Boccard.
- Rudhardt, Jean. 1978. "A propos de l'hymne homérique à Déméter." *MH* 35.1: 1–17 (= Foley 1994: 198–211 [English trans.]).
- . 1992 [1958]. *Notions fondamentales de la pensée religieuse et actes constitutifs du culte dans la Grèce classique*. 2nd ed. Paris: Picard.

- Russel, D. A. 1964. *'Longinus'. On the Sublime*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Rutherford, Ian. 2001. *Pindar's Paeans: A Reading of the Fragments with a Survey of the Genre*. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- Rutherford, Richard. 2005. *Classical Literature: A Concise History*. Malden: Blackwell.
- Saïd, Suzanne. 1993. "Tragic Argos." *Tragedy, Comedy and the Polis: Papers from the Greek Drama Conference, Nottingham, 18–20 July 1990*. Edd. Alan H. Sommerstein, Stephen Halliwell, Jeffrey Henderson, and Bernhard Zimmermann. Bari: Levante. 167–189.
- . 1998. "Tombe épiques d'Homère à Apollonios." *Nécropoles et Pouvoir: Idéologies, pratiques et interprétations*. Edd. Sophie Marchegay, Marie-Thérèse Le Dinahet, and Jean-françois Salles. Lyon: Maison de l'Orient. 9–20.
- Sancassano, Marialucia. 1996. "Il lessico greco del serpente: Considerazioni etimologiche." *Athenaeum* 84: 49–70.
- Sansone, David. 2000. "Iphigenia in Colchis." *HG* 4: 155–172.
- Schein, Seth L. 1984. *The Mortal Hero: An Introduction to Homer's Iliad*. Berkeley: U. of California P.
- Scheinberg, Susan. 1979. "The Bee Maidens of the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes*." *HSCPh* 83: 1–28.
- Schellert, Maximilian. 1885. *De Apollonii Rhodii comparationibus*. Diss. Halle.
- Schelske, Oliver. 2011. *Orpheus in der Spätantike: Studien und Kommentar zu den Argonautika des Orpheus: Ein literarisches, religiöses und philosophisches Zeugnis*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Scherer, Burkhard. 2006. *Mythos, Katalog und Prophezeiung: Studien zu den Argonautika des Apollonios Rhodios*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
- Schmakeit, Iris Astrid. 2003. *Apollonios Rhodios und die attische Tragödie: gattungsgüberschreitender Intertextualität in der alexandrinischen Epik*. Diss. Groningen.
- Schmid, Wolf. 2009. "Implied Author." *Handbook of Narratology*. Edd. Peter Hühn, John Pier, Wolf Schmid, and Jörg Schönert. Berlin: De Gruyter. 161–173.
- Schmidt, Martin. 1976. *Die Erklärungen zum Weltbild Homers und zur Kultur der Heroenzeit in den bT-Scholien zur Ilias*. Munich: Beck.
- Schroeder, Chad Matthew. 2012. "'To Keep Silent is a Small Virtue': Hellenistic Poetry and the Samothracian Mysteries." *HG* 16: 307–334.
- Schwinge, Ernst-Richard. 1986. *Künstlichkeit von Kunst: Zur Geschichtlichkeit der alexandrinischen Poesie*. Munich: Beck.

- Scodel, Ruth. 1982. "The Achaean Wall and the Myth of Destruction." *CPh* 86: 33–50.
- . 2008. *Epic Facework: Self-Presentation and Social Interaction in Homer*. Swansea: Classical Press of Wales.
- Seaford, Richard. 1994. *Reciprocity and Ritual: Homer and Tragedy in the Developing City-State*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Seaton, R. C. 1890. "On the Imitation of Homer by Apollonius Rhodius." *JPh* 19: 1–13.
- . 1914. Review of Mooney 1912. *CR* 28.1: 15–19.
- Sens, Alexander. 1997. *Theocritus: Dioscuri (Idyll 22)*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Shackle, R. J. 1915. "Some Emendations of the *Homeric Hymns*." *CR* 29.6: 161–165.
- Sharrock, Alison. 2018. "How Do We Read a (W)hole?: Dubious First Thoughts about the Cognitive Turn." *Intratextuality and Latin Literature*. Edd. Stephen Harrison, Stavros Frangoulidis, and Theodore D. Papanghelis. Berlin: De Gruyter. 15–31.
- Sistakou, Evina. 2001. "Παράδοση και νεωτερικότητα στον κατάλογο των Αργοναυτών (Απολλ. Πόδ. *Αργ.* 1.23–233)." *Hellenica* 51.2: 231–264.
- . 2007. "Cyclic Stories? The Reception of the *Cypria* in Hellenistic Poetry." *Philologus* 151.1: 78–94.
- . 2008. "Beyond the *Argonautica*: In Search of Apollonius' *Ktisis* Poems." In Papanghelis and Rengakos: 311–340.
- . 2012. *The Aesthetics of Darkness: A Study of Hellenistic Romanticism in Apollonius, Lycophron and Nicander*. Leuven: Peeters.
- . 2016. *Tragic Failures: Alexandrian Responses to Tragedy and the Tragic*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Smith, Janet M. 2001. "Firmer Foundations? A Note on the *ktiseis* of Apollonius Rhodius." *Essays in Honor of Gordon Williams: Twenty-five Years at Yale*. Edd. Elizabeth Tylawsky and Charles Weiss. New Haven: Henry R. Schwab. 263–281.
- Snodgrass, A. M. 1977. *Archaeology and the Rise of the Greek State*. Cambridge: CUP.
- . 1980. *Archaic Greece: The Age of Experiment*. Berkeley: U. of California P.
- . 1982. "Les origines du culte des héros dans la Grèce antique." In Gnoli and Vernant: 107–119.
- . 1988. "The Archaeology of the Hero." *AION(archeol)* 10:19–26.

- Solmsen, Friedrich. 1961. "Greek Philosophy and the Discovery of the Nerves." *MH* 18.3–4: 150–197.
- . 1982. "Achilles on the Islands of the Blessed: Pindar vs. Homer and Hesiod." *AJPh* 103.1: 19–24.
- Solomon, Elizabeth Melpomene. 1998. "Jason the Great? Reminiscences of Alexander in Apollonius' *Argonautica*." Georgia Master's thesis.
- Sourvinou-Inwood, Christiane. 1995. *'Reading' Greek Death to the End of the Classical Period*. Oxford: OUP.
- . 2005. *Hylas, the Nymphs, Dionysos and Others: Myth, Ritual, Ethnicity*. Stockholm: Åström.
- Sowa, Cora Angier. 1984. *Traditional Themes and the Homeric Hymns*. Chicago: Bolchazy-Carducci.
- Spaltenstein, François. 2002. *Commentaire des Argonautica de Valérius Flaccus (livres 1 et 2)*. Brussels: Latomus.
- Spentzou, Efrossini. 2002. "Stealing Apollo's Lyre: Muses and Poetic ἄθλα in Apollonius' *Argonautica* 3." *Cultivating the Muse: Struggles for Power and Inspiration in Classical Literature*. Edd. Efrossini Spentzou and Don Fowler. Oxford: OUP. 93–116.
- Stafford, Emma. 2005. "Vice or Virtue? Herakles and the Art of Allegory." *Herakles and Hercules: Exploring a Graeco-Roman Divinity*. Edd. Louis Rawlings and Hugh Bowden. Swansea: Classical Press of Wales. 71–96.
- . 2010. "Herakles between Gods and Heroes." *The Gods of Ancient Greece: Identities and Transformations*. Edd. Jan N. Bremmer and Andrew Erskine. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP. 228–244.
- . 2012. *Herakles*. London: Routledge.
- Stambaugh, John E. 1967. "Aristeas of Argos in Alexandria." *Aegyptus* 47.1/2: 69–74.
- . 1972. *Satrapes under the Early Ptolemies*. Leiden: Brill.
- Stanzel, Karl-Heinz. 1999. "Jason und Medea: Beobachtungen zu den Gleichnissen bei Apollonios Rhodios." *Philologus* 143: 249–271.
- Stenzel, Julius. 1908. *De ratione, quae inter carminum epicorum proemia et hymnicam Graecorum poesin intercedere videatur*. Diss. Wrocław.
- Stephens, S. A. 1998. "Callimachus at Court." *HG* 3: 167–185.
- . 2002. "Egyptian Callimachus." *Callimaque: Sept exposés suivis de discussions*. Geneva: Fondation Hardt. 235–270.

- . 2003. *Seeing Double: Intercultural Poetics in Ptolemaic Alexandria*. Berkeley: U. of California P.
- . 2015. *Callimachus. The Hymns*. Oxford: OUP.
- Stern, Jacob. 1979. "Herodas' *Mimiamb* 6." *GRBS* 20: 247–254.
- . 1981. "Herodas' *Mimiamb* I." *GRBS* 22: 161–165.
- Stewart, Selina. 2010. "'Apollo of the Shore': Apollonius of Rhodes and the Acrostic Phenomenon." *CQ* 60.2: 401–405.
- Stinton, T. C. W. 1976. "*Si credere dignum est*: Some Expressions of Disbelief in Euripides and Others." *PCPhS* 22: 80–89.
- Stoessl, Franz. 1941. *Apollonios Rhodios: Interpretationen zur Erzählungskunst und Quellenverwertung*. Bern: Haupt.
- Suter, Ann. 2002. *The Narcissus and the Pomegranate: An Archaeology of the Homeric Hymn to Demeter*. Ann Arbor: U. of Michigan P.
- Svenbro, Jesper. 1993. *Phrasikleia: An Anthropology of Reading in Ancient Greece*. Ithaca: Cornell UP.
- Syed, Yasmin. 2004. "Ovid's Use of the Hymnic Genre in the *Metamorphoses*." *Rituals in Ink*. Ed. Alessandro Barchiesi, Jörg Rüpke, and Susan Stephens. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner. 99–113.
- Taback, Natalie. 2002. *Untangling the Muses: A Comprehensive Study of Sculptures of Muses in the Greek and Roman World*. Diss. Harvard.
- Tarditi, Giovanni. 1989. "Le muse e le Chariti tra fede del poeta ed *ethos poietikon*." *Aevum(ant)* 2: 19–45.
- Thalman, William G. 2011. *Apollonius of Rhodes and the Spaces of Hellenism*. Oxford: OUP.
- Theodorakopoulos, Elena-Maria. 1998. "Epic Closure and Its Discontents in Apollonius' *Argonautica*." *HG* 3: 187–204.
- Thomas, Richard F. 1982. "Catullus and the Polemics of Poetic Reference (Poem 64.1–18)." *AJP* 103.2: 144–164.
- . 1986. "Virgil's *Georgics* and the Art of Reference." *HSPH* 90: 171–198.
- Thompson, Dorothy J. 2000. "Philadelphus' Procession: Dynastic Power in a Mediterranean Context." *Politics, Administration and Society in the Hellenistic and Roman World*. Ed. Leon Mooren. Leuven: Peeters. 365–388.
- Thomson, D. F. S. 1997. *Catullus*. Toronto: U. of Toronto P.

- Tissoni, Francesco. 2000a. *Cristodoro: Un'introduzione e un commento*. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso.
- . 2000b. "Cristodoro e Callimaco." *Acme* 53.1: 213–218.
- Ustinova, Yulia. 2009. *Caves and the Ancient Greek Mind: Descending Underground in the Search for Ultimate Truth*. Oxford: OUP.
- Valk, M. van der. 1976. "On the Arrangement of the *Homeric Hymns*." *AC* 45: 419–445.
- Valverde Sánchez, Mariano. 1989. *El aition en las Argonáuticas de Apolonio de Rodas: Estudio literario*. Murcia: Universidad de Murcia.
- . 1996. *Apolonio de Rodas. Argonáuticas*. Madrid: Gredos.
- Vamvouri Ruffy, Maria. 2004. *La fabrique du divin: les Hymnes de Callimaque à la lumière des Hymnes homériques et des Hymnes épigraphiques*. Liège: Centre international d'étude de la religion grecque antique.
- van Wees, Hans. 1992. *Status Warriors: War, Violence and Society in Homer and History*. Amsterdam: Gieben.
- . 2006. "From Kings to Demigods: Epic Heroes and Social Change, c. 750–600 BC." *Ancient Greece: From the Mycenaean Palaces to the Age of Homer*. Edd. Sigrid Deger-Jalkotzy and Irene S. Lemos. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP. 363–379.
- Vasilaros, Georgios. 2004. *Απολλωνίου Ροδίου Ἀργοναυτικά*. Athens: Κέντρον Ἑρεῦνης της Ἑλληνικῆς και Λατινικῆς Γραμματείας.
- Venzke, Helmut. 1941. *Die orphischen Argonautika in ihrem Verhältnis zu Apollonios Rhodios*. Diss. Berlin.
- Verdenius, W. J. 1972. "Notes on the Proem of Hesiod's *Theogony*." *Mnemosyne* 25.3: 225–260.
- Vergados, Athanassios. 2013. *A Commentary on the Homeric Hymn to Hermes*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Vian, Francis. 1987. *Les Argonautiques Orphiques*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Vian, Francis, ed., and Émile Delage, trans. 2002 [1974–1981]. *Apollonios de Rhodes: Argonautiques*. 3 vol. Rev. ed. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Vilchez, Mercedes. 1985. "Estructura literaria y métrica en la poesía de catálogo helenística." *Habis* 16: 67–94.
- Ville de Mirmont, H. de la. 1894. *Apollonios de Rhodes et Virgile: La mythologie et les dieux dans les Argonautiques et dans l'Énéide*. Paris: Hachette.

- . 1895. “Le navire Argo et la science nautique d’Apollonios de Rhodes.” *Revue internationale de l’enseignement* 30: 230–285.
- Vivante, Paolo. 1982. *The Epithets in Homer: A Study in Poetic Values*. New Haven: Yale UP.
- Vox, Onofrio. 1999. “Noterelle di epica ellenistica.” *Rudiae* 11: 161–172.
- . 2002. “Dionigi Alessandrino e Apollonio Rodio: cornici innodiche.” *Lexis* 20: 153–170.
- Walbank, Frank W. 1991–1992. “The Hellenistic World: New Trends and Directions.” *SCI* 11: 90–113.
- Walther, Richard. 1894. *De Apollonii Rhodii Argonauticorum rebus geographicis*. Diss. Halle.
- Weinberg, Florence M. 1986. *The Cave: The Evolution of a Metaphoric Field from Homer to Ariosto*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Wellauer, Augustus. 1828. *Apollonii Rhodii Argonautica*. 2 vol. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Wendel, Carl. 1932. *Die Überlieferung der Scholien zu Apollonios von Rhodos*. Berlin: Wiedmann.
- Werner, Erika. 2013. “Os hinos ‘rapsódicos’ de Calímaco: Tradição e inovação.” *Hellenistica*. Edd. Joao Angelo Oliva Neto, Alexandre Pinheiro Hasegawa, Fernando Rodrigues Junior, Breno Battistin Sebastiani. São Paulo: Humanitas. 117–165.
- West, M. L. 1966. *Hesiod: Theogony*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- . 1970. “The Eighth Homeric Hymn and Proclus.” *CQ* 20.2: 300–304.
- . 1975. “Cynaethus’ *Hymn to Apollo*.” *CQ* 25.2: 161–170.
- . 1978. *Hesiod: Works and Days*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- . 1999. “The Invention of Homer.” *CQ* 49.2: 364–382.
- . 2001. “The Fragmentary Homeric Hymn to Dionysus.” *ZPE* 134: 1–11.
- . 2012. “Towards a Chronology of Early Greek Epic.” In Andersen and Haug: 224–241.
- . 2013. *The Epic Cycle: A Commentary on the Lost Troy Epics*. Oxford: OUP.
- West, Stephanie. 1965. “Apollonius Rhodius 4, 1773.” *Hermes* 93.4: 491.
- Wheeler, Graham. 2002. “Sing, Muse...: The Introit from Homer to Apollonius.” *CQ* 52.1: 33–49.
- Whitley, James. 1988. “Early States and Hero Cults: A Re-Appraisal.” *JHS* 108: 173–182.

- . 1994. “The Monuments That Stood before Marathon: Tomb Cult and Hero Cult in Archaic Attica.” *AJA* 98.2: 213–230.
- . 1995. “Tomb Cult and Hero Cult: The Uses of the Past in Archaic Greece.” *Time, Tradition, and Society in Greek Archaeology: Bridging the ‘Great Divide.’* Ed. Nigel Spencer. London: Routledge. 43–63.
- Widzisz, Marcel. 2007. Review of Currie 2005. *CR* 57.2: 275–277.
- Wifstrand, Albert. 1929. “Kritische und exegetische Bemerkungen zu Apollonios Rhodios.” *Bulletin de la Société Royale des Lettres de Lund 1928–1929*. Lund: Gleerup. 73–107.
- Wilkins, E. G. 1920. “A Classification of the Similes in the *Argonautica* of Apollonius Rhodius.” *Classical Weekly* 14.21: 162–166.
- Willcock, M. M. 1995. *Victory Odes: Olympians 2, 7, 11; Nemean 4; Isthmians 3, 4, 7*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Williams, Frederick. 1978. *Callimachus. Hymn to Apollo: A Commentary*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Williams, Mary Frances. 1991. *Landscape in the Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Winkler, John J. 1985. *Auctor & Actor: A Narratological Reading of Apuleius’s Golden Ass*. Berkeley: U. of California P.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Ulrich von. 1924. *Hellenistische Dichtung in der Zeit des Kallimachos*. 2 vol. Berlin: Weidmann.
- Wimsatt, W. K., Jr., and M. C. Beardsley. 1946. “The Intentional Fallacy.” *Sewanee Review* 54.3: 468–488.
- Wolf, Friedrich August. 1985. *Prolegomena to Homer, 1795*. Princeton: Princeton UP.
- Wray, David. 2000. “Apollonius’ Masterplot: Narrative Strategy in *Argonautica* 1.” *HG* 4: 239–265.
- Yamagata, Naoko. 1989. “The Apostrophe in Homer as Part of the Oral Technique.” *BICS* 36: 91–103.
- Zanker, Graham. 1979. “The Love Theme in Apollonius Rhodius’ *Argonautica*.” *WS* 13: 52–75.
- . 1987. *Realism in Alexandrian Poetry: A Literature and Its Audience*. London: Croom Helm.
- Zissos, Andrew. 2008. *Valerius Flaccus’ Argonautica Book 1*. Oxford: OUP.
- Zyroff, Ellen Slotoff. 1971. *The Author’s Apostrophe in Epic from Homer to Lucan*. Diss. Johns Hopkins.