

THE TREATMENT OF THE HYLAS MYTH
IN APOLLONIUS RHODIUS
ARGONAUTICA 1.1172-1272

MEIS PARENTIBUS CARISSIMIS

**THE TREATMENT OF THE HYLAS MYTH
IN APOLLONIUS RHODIUS
ARGONAUTICA 1.1172-1272**

by

Noreen Mary Humble, B.A

**Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies
in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements
for the Degree
Master of Arts**

McMaster University

© copyright by Noreen Mary Humble, July 1990

MASTER OF ARTS

(Classics)

McMASTER UNIVERSITY

Hamilton, Ontario

TITLE: The Treatment of the Hylas Myth in Apollonius
Rhodius Argonautica 1.1172-1272.

AUTHOR: Noreen Mary Humble, B.A. (University of Alberta)

SUPERVISOR: Professor P. Murgatroyd

NUMBER OF PAGES: vi, 113

ABSTRACT

The earliest extant detailed accounts of the story of Heracles and Hylas date from the Hellenistic Age when it is treated by Apollonius (Arg. 1.1172-1272) and by Theocritus (Id. 13). While scholars, have discussed the episode in the Argonautica, no one, to my knowledge, has undertaken to investigate the passage in great detail. Rather Kohnken, for example, attempts to prove that Theocritus' Idyll was written first and that Apollonius' treatment is artistically superior and Lawall is specifically concerned with Apollonius' characterisation of Heracles.

While this thesis does not neglect the relationship of the episode to the Argonautica as a whole, its greater concern is the episode itself: the mythological background to the Hylas myth, the structure, chronology and pace of Arg. 1.1172-1272, how Apollonius deals with setting, the characterisation of both Hylas and Heracles, and finally a detailed critical appreciation of the whole passage.

There is no attempt here to determine whether Apollonius or Theocritus wrote first or whose work is superior. Theocritus' account (Id. 13) as well as the later

version by Propertius (1.20) are considered briefly at the end.

It is hoped that this analysis will provide a greater understanding and appreciation of the Hylas myth in Argonautica 1.1172-1272.

Acknowledgments

I would like to express my heartfelt gratitude to my supervisor, Dr. P. Murgatroyd, for his helpful suggestions, patience and encouragement.

I would also like to express my thanks to the members of my supervisory committee, Dr. P. Kingston and Dr. H. Jones, for their comments and advice.

Hamilton, Ontario. July, 1990.

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iii
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	
Section A: Heracles.....	1
Section B: Hylas.....	13
CHAPTER TWO: <u>ARGONAUTICA</u> 1.1172-1272	
Section A: Structure.....	22
Section B: Chronology, Order and Pace.....	36
Section C: Setting.....	40
Section D: Characterisation of Hylas.....	42
Section E: Characterisation of Heracles.....	47
Section F: Detailed Appreciation 1.1172-86.....	60
Section G: Detailed Appreciation 1.1187-1206.....	66
Section H: Detailed Appreciation 1.1207-1239.....	72
Section I: Detailed Appreciation 1.1240-60.....	86
Section J: Detailed Appreciation 1.1261-72.....	96
Section K: Comparative Study of Theocritus <u>Idyll</u> 13 and Propertius 1.20.....	102
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	109

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

SECTION A: HERACLES

The story of Hylas and Heracles is only a minor incident in the life of Heracles. However, to appreciate it properly some background information concerning Heracles' character must be set forth. This section will give a brief overview of a) the establishment of the body of myth surrounding Heracles, b) his major characteristics, c) his portrayal as a comic figure, d) his connection with the voyage of the Argo (particularly in Apollonius' version), and e) his amatory side. The last three aspects are of particular relevance to the accounts that will be studied in this thesis.

The myths surrounding Heracles developed over time, probably originating in the Mycenaean period.¹ The evidence available suggests that Heracles' adventures were more popular in art than in literature to begin with (at least seven of the Labours appeared in art first²) and that some episodes seem to have appeared solely in art, for example,

¹ NILSSON, pp.187-220.

² BROMMER, p.56.

Heracles' struggle with Old Age.³ The standard group of twelve Labours does not seem to have been an early tradition. The first occurrence of the twelve together in art or literature appears to be on the Metopes at Zeus' temple at Olympia (c. 460 B.C.)⁴ In literature it is not until the third century B.C. that the Labours are specifically said to be twelve in number (Theocritus, Idyll 24.82 and Apollonius, Argonautica 1.1317).⁵ There seem to have been attempts at a comprehensive account of Heracles' life as early as the seventh/sixth century B.C. but only fragments remain.⁶ Extant versions covering his whole life come much later (between the first century B.C. and the

³ SHAPIRO, p.8.

⁴ BRÖMMER, pp.55-64. Brömmer discusses the problem of when the group of twelve Labours became canonical.

⁵ BRÖMMER, p.64. Sophocles, Trachiniae 1089ff. only mentioned six of the Labours and while Euripides, Heracles 360ff. listed twelve deeds they are not the canonic twelve. Cf. MATTHEWS, p.22, n.3 for possible evidence of twelve deeds mentioned by Panyassis in the fifth century B.C.

⁶ Peisander of Rhodes, an epic poet in the seventh/sixth century B.C., wrote a Heraclea as did Cinaethon, also an epic poet and probably of the same time period. Panyassis, an epic poet in the fifth century B.C., is said to have written a Heraclea in fourteen books (see MATTHEWS, p.21). MATTHEWS, pp.44-5 also gives evidence for another fourteen book (or larger) Heraclea by the poet Rhianos in the third century B.C.

Cf. also Aristotle, Poetics 1451a: ὅτι πάντες ἐδίδαξαν ἀμαρτάνειν ὅσοι τῶν πολιτῶν Ἡρακλήϊδα καὶ Θησεϊδα καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα πολέματα πεπολέκασιν· οὐδὲν γὰρ, ἔπειτα εἰς ἣν ὁ Ἡρακλῆς, ἕνα καὶ τὸν μῦθον εἶναλ προσήκειν.

KIRK, p.180 also notes that fifth century antiquarians and local historians, particularly Pherecydes of Athens, dealt with Heracles' life.

second century A.D.) - the three major accounts done by Apollodorus (primarily 2.4.5 - 2.7.7), Diodorus Siculus (4.8-39) and Hyginus (Fab. 29-36).

The tradition that Heracles attained divine status seems to be in place by the seventh century B.C., possibly earlier⁷, and by the sixth century B.C. most of the adventures of the heroic Heracles were established. These became more elaborate over the years as a result of literary embellishments and local variations.⁸

Heracles is unique among Greek heroes in the manner of his death and cremation, and because he attained immortality upon his death. Many places were free to worship him because there was no grave-site for him which could become the centre of his worship. Therefore the body of myth surrounding him is enormous, greater than for any other Greek god or hero.⁹ His heroic adventures are usually divided into three categories: a) erga, which were the

⁷ At Od. 11.601-8 Homer places Heracles in Hades but says that it is only his εἶδωλον and that he himself is dwelling on Olympus: τὸν δὲ μετ' εἰσενόησα βίην Ἑρακλήϊην εἶδωλον· αὐτὸς δὲ μετ' ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσι τέρπεται ἐν θαλίῃσ' καὶ ἔχει καλλίσφυρον Ἑβην, παῖδα Διὸς μεγάλου καὶ Ἥρης χρυσοπέδιλου. (Od. 11.601-4)

KIRK, pp.177-8, approves the view expressed by some in antiquity that lines 602-4 were interpolated. He suggests that the purpose of the interpolation was to reconcile the statement that Heracles was in Hades with the conflicting tradition that he dwelt on Olympus after his death. KIRK uses the same reasoning to explain Hesiod, Catalogue of Women fr.25.20ff. (OCT).

⁸ KIRK, pp.180,188.

⁹ SHAPIRO, p.7.

Labours performed under the orders of Eurystheus, king of Tiryns, b) parerga, which were other deeds accomplished while carrying out the Labours, and c) praxeis, which were yet other independent exploits. The vast number of adventures attributed to him helped to increase his popularity. First, because they took place over the whole ancient world, not just in Greece, many places as far away as Mauretania (modern Morocco)¹⁰ could claim some connection with him. Secondly, because he was a mortal hero who was granted divine status on account of his great accomplishments and the suffering he endured, he was an ideal character to be emulated.

Heracles' character seems to be composed of contradictory elements. He is primarily a strongman-hero - the type of hero who is physically stronger, has greater endurance and is more courageous than ordinary heroes, without necessarily possessing an overly subtle intellect.¹¹ He accomplishes his deeds, many of which are connected with the destruction of monsters and evil-doers, generally by means of physical action rather than wiliness, for example, when he strangles the Nemean lion. Sometimes, however, he has to resort to ingenuity rather than brawn, as he does

¹⁰ MACKENDRICK, pp.287ff. The Gardens of the Hesperides are said to be in the region of Lixus. Also, bronze statues of Heracles and mosaics of his deeds are found at various sites in Morocco.

¹¹ PIKE (1977), p.73.

when he diverts two rivers to clean out the Augean stables. While in many of his deeds his strength is put to good use by destroying evil creatures, it often results in blatant brutality, for example, when he mutilates the envoys of King Erginus or kills Linus in a rage.¹² This same uncontrollably violent man, on the other hand, is said to have founded the Olympic Games and is associated with healing and medicinal hot springs, an association which arose from the fact that he made the world a safe place to live in by destroying evil.¹³

With his superhuman strength Heracles is beyond the bounds of convention and law if he chooses to be. Sometimes the bestial element in his character rules, at other times the human element. The fact that he can overcome convention and law at will contrasts with the periods of slavery in his life, to Eurystheus and to Omphale.

At various times in the ancient world different parts of his nature were stressed and he did become a figure to emulate. The notion that he had attained immortality because he led a life of toil became popular in the fifth and fourth centuries B.C.¹⁴ Pindar in particular glorifies him and ignores any of the bestial elements in his

¹² KIRK, pp.184,201.

¹³ FARNELL, p.150.

¹⁴ LIMC, Vol.4.1, p.731.

character.¹⁵ A story of Prodicus, preserved in Xenophon's Memorabilia (2.1.21ff.), relates how Heracles had to choose between a life of ease and pleasure, and one of hard work and suffering to rid the world of evil forces. He chose the latter and because of this, despite his more bestial and violent aspects, he was regarded as the paradigmatic savior of the Greek world.¹⁶ This all led to the idea that if a man were to act in such a way as Heracles did, that is, as a civilising force, he might reasonably hope for immortality. Alexander the Great was perhaps the first to exploit this idea and the Romans also took advantage of it.¹⁷

The Cynic and Stoic schools also picked up this idea of Heracles as a selfless savior of mankind who disdained pleasure, and used him as a paradigm in their philosophies.¹⁸ Obviously they were ignoring the bestial side of his nature which was ably exploited in comedy.

D.L. Pike points out that Heracles has immense potential as a comic figure precisely because "by virtue of his very greatness, he is likely to appear ridiculous in

¹⁵ See GALINSKY, pp.29ff. for a discussion of Pindar's depiction of Heracles. Heracles' character was composed of so many elements that one or more aspects could be highlighted according to an author's purposes or tastes.

¹⁶ ANDERSON, p.9.

¹⁷ ANDERSON, pp.13ff.

¹⁸ OCD, p.499.

situations where greatness is incongruous."¹⁹ The evidence from extant classical plays suggests that he was more often portrayed as a burlesque figure than a tragic one.²⁰ Just as his strength and endurance are much greater than in ordinary men, so too by extension are his eating and drinking habits and his womanising, and these unheroic qualities can be manipulated in comic ways.

Portraying Heracles as a glutton was popular.²¹ Aristophanes in the Birds not only plays up this characteristic but also reduces Heracles' intellectual capacity to heighten the humour.²² He is once again the glutton in the Lysistrata and the Wasps and his obsession with sexual matters as well as food and drink is exploited in the Frogs.²³ In all these examples it is the incongruity of showing the great heroic figure obsessed with unheroic activities that provides the humour. However, portraying him as a glutton and drunkard is not always done for comic effect. These elements are shown in the Alcestis of

¹⁹ PIKE (1980), pp.37-8.

²⁰ KIRK, p.203; PIKE (1980), pp.41-2.

²¹ Heracles was also portrayed in an unheroic way, as a drunkard, glutton, womaniser, etc., in art as well as in literature; see LIMC, Vol.4.1, pp.770ff.,817ff.

²² PIKE (1980), p.39.

²³ PIKE (1980), pp.40-1.

Euripides as a natural part of his character along with his most heroic aspects, his courage, selflessness etc.²⁴

The tradition that Heracles was one of the Argonauts extends right back to Hesiod, who says that Heracles left the Argo to fetch water and was left behind in Aphetæ near Magnesia (Scholia Ap. Rhod. 1.1289).²⁵ In the fifth century B.C. Herodotus (7.193) follows Hesiod's version, Pindar (Pythian Ode 4.171f.) includes Heracles as one of the Argonauts, and the poet Antimachus and the historian Pherecydes both say that Heracles was made to leave the Argo because he was too heavy (Scholia Ap. Rhod. 1.1289).²⁶

The earliest extant detailed account of Heracles on the voyage of the Argo is found in Apollonius' Argonautica.

²⁴ PIKE (1980), pp.42-3.

²⁵ Hesiod, frag. 263 (OCT).

BEYE, p.53, "There was an early tradition of his [Heracles'] participation in the voyage of the Argo; no gathering of heroes would be complete without him. Just as early, there is the tradition of his leaving the ship; no gathering of heroes could function with him."

²⁶ Apollodorus 1.9.19 recounts that Pherecydes said that the point at which Heracles was made to leave the Argo was Aphetæ in Thessaly (likely the same place as in Hesiod's version) and that it was the Argo herself who said that he had to leave (cf. Aristotle Politics 3.8.3). The third century B.C. epigrammatist Posidippus appears also to have followed this story (Scholia Ap. Rhod. 1.1289).

Also according to Scholia Ap. Rhod. 1.1289, Herodorus (a fifth/fourth century B.C. historian) said that Heracles never sailed on the Argo and Ephorus (a fourth century B.C. historian) said that he had been left behind with Queen Omphale. Apollodorus 1.9.19 says that Herodorus also said that the reason Heracles did not sail was because he was a slave at Queen Omphale's court. Presumably Herodorus and Ephorus were following the same tradition.

Apollonius had a long tradition upon which to draw when considering how to portray Heracles, for example, the selfless, civilising Heracles who was a model to emulate, Heracles the superman, the comic Heracles and the brutal, violent Heracles.

Heracles joins the expedition of the Argonauts in the midst of one of his Labours, the capture of the Erymanthian Boar (1.122ff.), so this episode is one of the parerga. Heracles however does not really belong among the heroes of the Argo and in fact exits in a rather unheroic fashion soon after the voyage has begun (1.1172ff.). He is a far greater warrior than any of the heroes assembled for the voyage and is readily acknowledged as such when, for example, he is chosen unanimously to be their leader (1.338ff.), although Heracles himself suggests that Jason should lead instead. It is clear that he could have captured the golden fleece single-handed with brute strength rendering the rest of the Argonauts unnecessary, hence his early departure from the voyage.²⁷ So in one sense Heracles is a foil for Jason and Jason's preference for words over action.²⁸

Although Apollonius' Heracles sometimes appears comic it is only because of the situation he is in, not because he is deliberately made out to be a burlesque

²⁷ LEVIN (1971), p.58.

²⁸ LEVIN (1971), p.47.

figure. The incongruity of placing Heracles, the ultimate superman-hero among men who are dependent upon one another and whose strength is far inferior to his creates humour.²⁹ As Pike demonstrates, Apollonius manages to show admiration for Heracles' strength and humour at the same time in his description of Heracles rowing the Argo alone, unceremoniously falling over and pouting when his oar breaks (1.1169ff.).

Heracles' brutality is also attested to in the Argonautica (4.1432ff.) by Aegle who witnessed his ruthlessness when he seized the golden apples.

Apollonius' Heracles then is a complex character created from many traditional elements. Some traditional characteristics, however, like his amatory side are brought to mind by their absence.³⁰ Theocritus develops this characteristic in Idyll 13 and ends not by having the Argonauts revering Heracles as they do in Apollonius' account but by calling him a deserter for abandoning the voyage because of his passion for a boy.

Heracles is better known for his heterosexual than for his homosexual relationships. Many people in various places throughout the ancient world claimed descent from Heracles resulting from his amatory adventures during his

²⁹ PIKE (1980), p.42.

³⁰ LEVIN (CJ,1971), p.25. Levin likens Apollonius' disregard of Heracles' amatory nature in the Argonautica to Pindar's method of "expurgating what he thinks unseemly".

extensive travels. Apollodorus lists a number of his offspring (2.7.8). Indeed such excessive virility from a superman-hero is to be expected.³¹ On the whole he seems to have been unsuccessful at lasting relationships. His two marriages were disastrous, his lust for Iole ended in wholesale destruction, and he is again seen as violent and bestial in his relationships with Auge and Xenodice.³² In the Argonautica, Heracles' sexual nature is suppressed and he is shown rebuking the other Argonauts for dallying with the women of Lemnos (1.853ff.).

Heracles' homosexual relationships are fewer, the most well-known being the one with Hylas although it is not always agreed that their relationship was sexual (see the next section). He is said to have had many male lovers (Scholia Ap. Rhod. 1.1207b): Hylas, Philoctetes, Diomus, Perinthus, and Trinx.³³ All except Hylas are obscure. K. Dover has found evidence that Iolaos, who helped Heracles kill the Lernian Hydra, and Eurystheus were portrayed as

³¹ PIKE (1977), p.73.

³² PIKE (1977), pp.75-81.

³³ WENDEL, p.109.

Philoctetes is presumably the one who carries Heracles' bow in the Iliad. Heracles' pyre in some accounts was lit by Philoctetes, in others by his father Poias (see ROSE, p.249, n.12).

Heracles' lovers³⁴, but these are by no means standard portrayals.

³⁴ DOVER, p.199, is not specific about the reference to Iolaus and Heracles (merely stating that "The Boiotians turned Iolaos, the comrade-in-arms of Herakles, into his eromenos...") but cites Diotimos (a minor epic poet, c. third century B.C.) in Athenaeus for the reference to Eurystheus and Heracles: Διότιμος δ' ἐν τῇ Ἡρακλείᾳ Εὐρυσθέα φησὶν Ἡρακλέους γενέσθαι παιδικά, διόπερ καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ὑπομείναι (603d).

SECTION B: HYLAS

After setting out the story of how Hylas disappeared, Apollonius states that in his day the Cians still searched for Hylas (1.1354ff.). Nicander (in Antoninus Liberalis 26) adds that the residents of the area sacrificed to Hylas at the spring where he disappeared. Strabo 12.564 mentions the festival and the Second Vatican Mythographer mentions sacred rites. In all these accounts the authors refer to the cult of Hylas after describing how Hylas and Heracles were left behind in Mysia by the Argonauts (for the variation in Nicander see n.40). It can be reasonably inferred from this evidence that Hylas was worshipped as some sort of minor local god. Some modern scholars are of the opinion that he was, more specifically, a vegetation god, but this may be stretching the evidence too far³⁵.

Hylas is rarely mentioned in Greek literature before the Hellenistic period. In two instances lines from plays have been interpreted by other ancient writers as allusions to him. The lexicographer Hesychius interpreted a line from

³⁵ For Hylas as a type of vegetation god see ROSE, p.200; FARNELL, pp.23,27,140; COWELL, pp.44ff.

FRAZER makes no mention of Hylas in The Golden Bough.

Aeschylus' Persians as referring to a ritual dirge for Hylas although there is no mention of Hylas in the line (1055 καὶ στέρν' ἄρασσε κάπιβόα τὸ Μύσιον). Hesychius, however, writing in the fifth century A.D., had a long tradition of Hylas stories upon which to draw.³⁶ Similarly the scholiast on Aristophanes' Plutus took an even more general line (1127 ποθεῖς τὸν οὐ παρόντα καὶ μάτην καλεῖς) and connected it to the Heracles/Hylas myth and further tried to prove his point by quoting Theocritus 13.36 (κῶχεθ' ἑγλας ὁ ξανθὸς ὕδωρ ἐπιδόριον οἴσων). Neither of these two cases provides strong evidence for early knowledge of the Hylas myth.³⁷

There are two pre-Hellenistic references that do mention Hylas by name. One is assigned to Cinaethon (Scholia Ap. Rhod. 1.1357), a poet associated with the epic

³⁶ FARNELL, p.405, n.27, adds Aeschylus, Persians 1054 and Hesychius, s.v. ἐπιβόα τὸ[ν] Μύσιον as evidence for a cult of Hylas but the connection is too tenuous. BROADHEAD (see his notes on Aeschylus, Persians 938 and 1054) comments on the general popularity of oriental styles of mourning suggesting that line 1054 could simply be referring to the fact that the Mysians were known generally for singing dirges not specifically for a Hylas-dirge.

In addition to the references mentioned already for a cult/festival of Hylas, Philostratus (second/third century A.D.), Heroicus 197.23 (Teubner, p.59) mentions dirges to Hylas.

³⁷ A further wild surmise was made by Hemsterhuis who regarded Ovid, Tristia 2.406-7 as referring to a lost Greek tragedy on Hylas and claimed that a line from the Plutus (1127) parodied a line from this lost play. See under Hylas (p.111) in PAULY-WISSOWA.

Vergil, Georgics 3.6 (cui non dictus Hylas puer) suggests that a lot of references prior to Vergil have been lost. It is impossible to know whether Vergil was referring to Hellenistic references, when the myth appears to be popular, or still earlier references.

cycle who wrote a poem entitled Heracleia. The scholiast relates that Cinaethon said Heracles took hostages from the Cians and settled them in Trachis to force them to keep looking for Hylas. There is some controversy over this citation.³⁸ If it is an early account of the story, as it seems to be, the evidence of extant literature shows that it is virtually ignored until the Alexandrians take it up. The only other mention of Hylas before the Hellenistic period is that made in the fifth century B.C. by the historian Hellanicus (Scholia Ap. Rhod. 1.131 and 1.1207). He says that Hylas was the son of Theiomenes. Unfortunately the context is completely unknown. The evidence available then gives very little clue as to what was known about Hylas prior to the third century B.C., enough to invite speculation but not enough to confirm it.

When the story is taken up by the Alexandrians it is dealt with in some detail. Its expanded treatment by these authors fits well with the tendency of Hellenistic authors to deal with obscure and unusual myths. It is possible that

³⁸ See under Hylas (pp.2792-3) in ROSCHER, where SEELIGER questions its authenticity arguing that it is too similar to Apollonius 1.1348ff., and that Cinaethon could be emended to Conon (a first century A.D. mythographer) or even Cianon. There seems, however, no solid reason for so emending. WENDEL reads Cinaethon at both 1.1357 and 1.1165 (where the name is also questioned by SEELIGER). Cf. DOVER (1971), p.181. DOVER also believes that there is no reason for emendation, suggesting that Heracleia is a more suitable title for the type of epic poem Cinaethon would write than "any part of Conon's aetiological miscellany".

their source was Cinaethon or just knowledge of a local Cian festival for which an action could be developed.³⁹

The bare outlines of the Heracles/Hylas myth now become: Hylas accompanies Heracles on the voyage of the Argo; when the Argonauts put in at Mysia, Hylas goes off to fetch water for dinner and is seized by a nymph or nymphs who had fallen in love with him; he is drawn into the spring and, at some point in the abduction, cries out; Heracles searches in vain for him. These components of the story are found in all the major accounts of the myth down to Augustan times (Apollonius 1.1172ff., Theocritus, Idyll 13, Nicander in Antoninus Liberalis 26, and Propertius 1.20).⁴⁰

³⁹ DOVER (1971), pp.180-1; FARNELL p.23 also hints at this.

There is no evidence of any artistic representation of the Hylas myth that might have influenced the Hellenistic poets. LING, p.786 remarks, "There seems to be no place for a putative Greek "old master" before the Hellenistic Age...the total absence of theme, so far as we know, in Attic and South Italian vase-painting implies that no iconographic tradition yet existed. Perhaps its appearance in art followed the popularisation of the myth in the third century, a popularisation illustrated, if not brought about, by the poetry of Theocritus and Apollonius Rhodius."

⁴⁰ Both Apollonius and Theocritus say that Heracles was left behind by the Argonauts. Nicander, however, says that Heracles did sail with the Argonauts, leaving Polyphemus behind to look for Hylas. Propertius does not mention Heracles' fate. Some later accounts also follow this basic outline: Apollodorus 1.9.19; Hyginus, Fab. 14; Myth. Vat. 1.49 and 2.199 (all adhering more closely to Apollonius' version than to any of the others).

Not all accounts of the voyage of the Argo after Apollonius include the Hylas myth. Demaratus (who is thought to be later than Apollonius) and Dionysius Scytobrachion (c. second/first century B.C. grammarian) say

Hylas' lineage is one area in which ancient authors were at variance. No later writers seem to follow Hellanicus in calling Hylas the son of Theiomenes. Callimachus is said to have told how Heracles killed Hylas' father Theiodamas (Scholia Ap. Rhod. 1.1212)⁴¹ and Apollonius gives a similar account (1.1211-1220).⁴² Mnaseas (a third/second century B.C. historian) concurs with Apollonius and Callimachus (Scholia Ap. Rhod. 1.131). Theocritus, however, makes no mention of Hylas' father and Nicander (in Antoninus Liberalis 26.1 and Scholia Theoc.

that Heracles sailed with the Argo to Colchis and took part in the snatching of the golden fleece (Scholia Ap. Rhod. 1.1289 and Apollodorus 1.9.19). Diodorus Siculus following Dionysius Scytobrachion (cf. HUNTER (1989), p.20) also ignores the Hylas episode and makes Heracles the leader of the expedition (4.41).

⁴¹ Cf. Callimachus Aetia 1, frag.24 (Pfeiffer). There is no mention of Hylas in this fragment.

Both GOW (1973), Vol.2, p.231 and COWELL, p.47 believe that Callimachus dealt with the Heracles/Hylas myth based on Scholia Ap. Rhod. 1.1207 and 1.1212. However, the brief citation in 1.1207 (πλοθαιώτερον δὲ ἦν ἀμφοτέρω εἰπεῖν, ὡς Κκαλλίμαχος) is unlikely to pertain to the myth at all but like the Homeric reference that immediately precedes it (Od. 7.20) probably pertains only to water-bearers. The citation in 1.1212 certainly gives a detailed story of how Hylas came to be in Heracles' care but there is no evidence to suggest that Callimachus took the story any further. In fact it is possible that it is just an aetion concerning how the Dryopians came to be settled in the Thessalian city of Trachis. In addition, surely the Scholia would have mentioned it if Callimachus had written a prior version of the myth of Hylas' abduction.

⁴² If it is true that Books 1 and 2 of the Aetia are earlier than the Argonautica as HUTCHINSON, p.40, n.27 and HUNTER (1989), p.7 suggest might be the case then Apollonius could have written his account with Callimachus' version before him.

13.7) says Ceyx was Hylas' father.⁴³ Socrates Argivus (an historian, probably late Hellenistic) says that Hylas was actually the son of Heracles (Scholia Theoc. 13.7) and Anticleides (a third century B.C. historian) confused the issue further by saying that not Hylas but Hyllos (who actually was a son of Heracles) went out to fetch water and disappeared (Scholia Ap. Rhod. 1.1207b). These variants likely resulted from confusion between the two names. Theiodamas, however, seems to be the most popular name despite the other variations, as it is also found in Propertius 1.20.6, Apollodorus 1.9.19, and Hyginus, Fab. 14. But the story told by Callimachus (apparently) and Apollonius about how Heracles came to kill Hylas' father did not become a standard part of the myth.

The relationship between Heracles and Hylas also varies. While Apollonius only explicitly describes Hylas as Heracles' personal attendant, Theocritus makes it clear that there is a love interest between the two. Nicander calls Hylas *νέον δὲ καὶ καλόν* but does not mention whether or not Heracles was infatuated with him and Heracles' return to the

⁴³ PAPATHOMOPOULOS, p.128, suggests that Nicander made Ceyx Hylas' father to make the connection between him and Heracles more probable since Heracles had killed Theiodamas. But perhaps there is a connection here to Ceyx, king of Trachis, with whom Heracles was well acquainted (cf. Hesiod, frag. 264 (OCT)). In addition, the earliest extant reference showing that Heracles was a member of the Argo's crew is from Hesiod's Marriage of Ceyx (see n.25). Cf. also Apollodorus, 2.7.7 where Ceyx is closely linked to the Theiodamas story.

Argonauts would suggest that he was not (see n.40). Propertius however brings the love interest to the fore once again. Two other ancient writers, Socrates Argivus (Scholia Ap. Rhod. 1.1207b) and Euphorion (Scholia Theoc. 13.7), state that it was another of the Argonauts, Polyphemus (who is prominent in Apollonius' version) who was Hylas' lover.⁴⁴ Later accounts and references to the myth vary as to how much they stress the love interest.

Apollonius' inclusion in the story of a second Argonaut, Polyphemus, seems then to be followed by Socrates Argivus and Euphorion and also by some subsequent authors.⁴⁵ Other variants in the story down to Augustan times are not as popular with later authors. Nicander says that the nymphs changed Hylas into an echo because they feared Heracles would find him (in Antoninus Liberalis 26.4). Conversely Onasas (c. second/first century B.C.) dispenses with fanciful notions and maintains that Hylas simply fell into the water and drowned (Scholia Ap. Rhod. 1.1236b and Scholia Theoc. 13.48).⁴⁶ Propertius then adds the next variation into the story when he tells how the Boreads tried

⁴⁴ Under Hylas (p.110) in PAULY-WISSOWA it is suggested that Socrates Argivus said that Heracles was Hylas' father in order to justify Heracles' agitation over Hylas' disappearance since Polyphemus was Hylas' lover not Heracles.

⁴⁵ Apollodorus 1.9.19; Hyginus, Fab. 14; and to a lesser degree Orphica Argonautica 657f.

⁴⁶ Servius later picks up on this in his commentary on Aeneid 1.619.

to attack Hylas while he was going to fetch water (1.20.25-32).⁴⁷

After Propertius there are numerous references to Hylas⁴⁸ but there are only two major variations on the basic

⁴⁷ Under Hylas (p.111) in PAULY-WISSOWA there is a suggestion that Rhianus had already connected the Boreads to the Hylas episode in his Heracleia. This is based on pure conjecture by MAASS, pp.336-7, n.4 "Rhiani 'Heracleam' utrique [=Apollonius and Propertius] conicimus praesto fuisse ob puerilem amorem vel in heroum vita moribusque a Rhiano expressum". There is however absolutely no evidence from the fragments of Rhianus to suggest that Hylas and the Boreads were connected or even mentioned.

Further in the same article (p.112) there is a similar conjecture regarding Phanocles Erotes suggesting that because Phanocles had a poem dealing with the love of gods and heroes for boys he must have dealt with Heracles and Hylas.

⁴⁸ Later references to Hylas excluding those already mentioned in this section (cf. under Hylas in PAULY-WISSOWA and ROSCHER): Vergil, E. 6.43; Ovid, A.A. 2.110; Seneca, Medea 646ff.; Pliny, Naturalis Historia 5.144; Memnon, in Jacoby, FGrH 3.B 434.28; Petronius, Satyricon 83.3.5; Statius, Silvae 1.1.199, 1.5.20ff., 2.1.113, 3.4.40ff., Thebaid 5.443; Martial, Epigrams 5.48.5, 6.68.7f., 7.15.1f., 7.50.7f., 9.25.7, 9.65.13f., 10.4.3, 11.43.5; Plutarch, Bruta Animalia Ratione Uti 7; Dionysius Periegetes, 805ff; Cephalio, in Jacoby, FGrH 2.A 93.F 1; Juvenal, Satire 1.163-4; Lucian, Navigium 43.a.E, Verae Historae 2.17; IG 14.2131; Clement of Alexandria, Protrepticus 2.33; Tertullian, Ad Nationes 2.14; Philostratus, Heroicus 165.28 (Teubner), Epistolai Eroticai 8; Solinus, 42.2; Arnobius, Ad Nationes 4.26; Avienus, Descriptio Orbis Terrae 3.976ff.; Prudentius, Contra Symmachum 1.116ff.; Nonnus, Dionysiaca 11.227ff.; Servius ad E. 6.43, G. 3.6, Aeneid 11.262; Scholia Bernensia ad E. 6.43-4, G. 3.6; Martianus Capella, 6.687; Dracontius, Carmina Profana 2; Priscianus, Periegesis 773ff.; Lactantius Placidus, Thebais 5.443, Achilleida 397; Myth. Vat., 3.3.8; Eustathius, Paraphrase of Dionysius Periegetes 791.805ff.; Zenobius, 6.21; Suda, s.v. Ὑλάαν κρηναῖα ἕλν .

The reference to Simylos, E.M. 135.30 (Μυσία πύοντα παρὰ ῥέον Ἀργανθώνης) in PAULY-WISSOWA does not mention Hylas.

Other references not listed in PAULY-WISSOWA or ROSCHER: Ammianus Marcellinus, 22.8.5; Ausonius, Epigrams 97,98; see also P.J. Parsons, "Eine neugefundene griechische

outline of the story. Valerius Flaccus in his Argonautica deals differently with the myth (3.481ff.) by emphasising the role of Juno who was traditionally Heracles' enemy. Hylas, instead of going off for water, goes with Heracles into the woods to hunt. Juno sends a deer to draw him away from Heracles into the arms of a nymph. From there the story returns to the basic outline: Heracles searches in vain and is left behind by the Argonauts. The other account with a major variation is the Orphica Argonautica (642ff.). Again, instead of going for water, Hylas secretly follows Heracles, who has gone hunting, and while wandering is seized by some nymphs in a cave.

CHAPTER 2: ARGONAUTICA 1.1172-1272

SECTION A: STRUCTURE

The "Hylas-episode" in Apollonius' Argonautica is only one small story within a long epic. This section will look at a) how smoothly Apollonius has integrated it into the main narrative both structurally and by means of subsequent explanations of its aftermath, and b) how complex the structure of the episode itself is. There seems to be no clear agreement on what the precise boundaries of the episode are¹, but for the purposes of this examination they

¹ GOW (1938), p.10 (and passim) limits the "Hylas-episode" to 1.1207-1272 (from Hylas setting out to fetch water to Heracles' distraught reaction upon hearing of Hylas' disappearance). GARSON, p.260 suggests that the "Hylas-episode" encompasses a far greater range of events and extends it to 1.1161-1344 (from the point when Heracles breaks his oar to the reconciliation between Telamon and Jason after the Argonauts have left Mysia and discovered that Heracles is missing). KÖHNKEN (1965), p.17 sets his boundaries at 1.1172-1279 because he finds ring-composition in these lines (starting with the Argonauts' arrival at Mysia and ending with their departure from Mysia). LEVIN (1971), pp.110-1, like GARSON, sets wide limits by suggesting that the episode starts at 1.1153 (when the rowing contest begins) and "the story-proper terminates (1284ff.) with the Argo at sea once more and with a dispute having broken out over whether to turn back to search for Heracles, Hylas, and Polyphemus...[sic]". VIAN, p.42 extends the limits from 1.1153 to the end of the book because "son véritable sujet est l'abandon d'Héraclès". HURST, p.64 also sets the limits at 1.1153-1362. KOCH, pp.2-3 suggests that 1.1153-71 and 1.1358-62 are transition

will be limited to Hylas' actions and any other events directly related to Hylas and, therefore, set at 1.1172-1272. This includes the arrival of the Argonauts at Mysia, at which time Heracles goes off to look for a suitable tree for an oar and Hylas departs to fetch water for Heracles, the abduction of Hylas and the subsequent searches for him by Polyphemus and Heracles.

That the "Hylas-episode" is carefully tied in to the main narrative can be clearly shown. A. Köhnken finds the following ring-composition in 1.1172-1279,

- A Arrival at Mysia (1.1172-1186)
- B Heracles' successful search for a tree (1.1187-1206)
- C Hylas' search for water and his abduction (1.1207-1239)
- D Polyphemus' search for Hylas (1.1240-1260)
- B Heracles' unsuccessful search for Hylas (1.1261-1272)
- A Departure from Mysia (1.1273-1279)

and to this D. Levin adds another outer ring: the friendly rowing competition (1.1153ff.) countered by the angry argument about whether or not to go back for Heracles (1.1284ff.).² Levin notes³ that around the nucleus

"pairs of incidents are symmetrically deployed in such a way that in each case the positive action which precedes has as its counterpart some later action of far greater significance."

sections and that 1.1172-1272 and 1.1273-1357 make up the two parts of the story.

² KÖHNKEN (1965), p.17. VIAN, p.42 concurs with this structure as does LEVIN (1971), p.111, n.1 and p.124.

³ LEVIN (1971), p.124.

This view corresponds with that of A. Hurst⁴ who finds in 1.1153-1362 groups of symmetrical events that play with opposing forces, for example one such group is,

- A The winds are calm (1.1153ff.)
- B Heracles breaks his oar (causes damage) (1.1167-69)
- C Heracles is inactive (1.1170-1)
- D Landing at Mysia and supper preparations (1.1172-86)
- C Heracles is active (1.1187ff.)
- B Heracles uproots a tree (repairs the damage) (1.1196-1200)
- A Simile in which strong wind breaks a mast (1.1201-4)

In addition to such structural links, subsequent to the "Hylas-episode", Apollonius explains the fates of Heracles, Hylas and Polyphemus which were left unresolved at 1.1272, a device which further links this episode with the main narrative. At 1.1315-25 the sea-deity Glaucus tells the Argonauts not to worry about the three companions. Heracles is to go back to complete his labours for Eurystheus, Polyphemus is to found a city among the Mysians and Hylas is to become the nymph's husband. This is the final mention of Hylas' fate. Further on at 1.1344ff. the fates of Polyphemus and Heracles are repeated and Heracles' actions after the disappearance of Hylas are elaborated. This last reference to his Labours (1.1347-8) forms a simple ring-composition with 1.122ff. where Heracles is shown abandoning the Erymanthian boar to join the Argonauts.

⁴ HURST, pp.64-66. Also diagram 6 at the end of the book shows his structural breakdown for 1.1153-1362.

Still connected with the "Hylas-episode" is a further mention of Polyphemus at 4.1470ff., where his actions after his search for Hylas are described in more detail than at either 1.1315-25 or 1.1344ff.

Subsequently Apollonius not only elaborates things previously left unexplained but also sets forth two aetia directly connected with the "Hylas-episode": Polyphemus' foundation of Cios (mentioned at both 1.1321-2 and 1.1345-7) and the origins of the Hylas festival, explained by the elaboration of Heracles' actions at 1.1347ff. G.O. Hutchinson, upon examination of Apollonius' use of aetia, notes⁵

"There are about forty aitia in the books of voyaging (1,2,4); they are normally placed at the very end of the episode in question. Although in fact they are sparse in some stretches and densely clustered in others, the reader feels them to have some sort of significant structural function..."

Indeed the "Hylas-episode" and its accompanying aetia seem to be part of a larger structural pattern. For example, the landing in the territory of the Dolians 1.961-1052, immediately prior to the landing in Mysia, also resulted in two aetia (1.1075-77 and 1.1138-9). In fact the actual landing and welcome in Mysia (1.1179-86), as Köhnken points out, strongly echoes that at the Dolian kingdom (1.961-

⁵ HUTCHINSON, p.93. In his chapter on Apollonius, HUTCHINSON surveys the complex structure of the whole epic.

969).⁶ All of which suggests a general parallel structure between both episodes.

These examples should suffice to show that the "Hylas-episode" is carefully integrated into the main narrative. Of more immediate concern, however, for this study is the structure of the episode itself.

Within the set parameters of the episode (1.1172-1272), the subject matter breaks down naturally and easily into five major sections (cf. Loeb and OCT texts) and these divisions are further reinforced by structural features (e.g. ring-composition). The five sections are as follows:

- A1 The arrival at Mysia (1.1172-86: 15 lines).
- B1 Heracles' successful search for a tree (1.1187-1206: 20 lines).
- C Hylas' search for water and abduction (1.1207-39: 33 lines).
- B2 Polyphemus' unsuccessful search for Hylas (1.1240-60: 21 lines).
- A2 Heracles' unsuccessful search for Hylas (1.1261-72: 12 lines).

Although Heracles proves to be the dominant character in the episode and Hylas, as F. Vian states, "n'est que l'instrument momentané du destin qui interdit à Héraclès de poursuivre sa route",⁷ the abduction of Hylas is given the central position in the episode, is the longest section, and is preceded and followed by a nearly identical number of

⁶ KÖHNKEN (1965), p.37. The descriptions of both landings mention the hospitality of the natives, the wine and sheep given to the needy heroes, and the sacrifice to Apollo Ecbasius.

⁷ VIAN, p.42.

lines. The centrality of the abduction is appropriate given that it results in the loss of Polyphemus and, more particularly, Heracles to the Argonauts.⁸

The first section, A1, is symmetrically structured with three equal parts. The initial temporal clause/comparison (5 lines), the actual arrival at Mysia and the hospitable welcome (5 lines) and finally the division of labour among the Argonauts (5 lines). This last part of A1 is strikingly juxtaposed with section B1. The Argonauts, as a group, divide up the simple task of meal preparation in contrast to Heracles who goes off alone to uproot a tree single-handed.

Section B1 (1.1187-1206) contains an elaborate ring-composition further emphasising the division between it and the previous section (A1) and the following section (C), neither of which have such ring-composition.

- A Heracles wanders off and finds a suitable tree (1.1187ff.).
- B Heracles drops his bow, arrows, and lion-skin and employs his club which he then presumably drops in order to grasp the tree with both hands (1.1194-7).
- C Heracles uproots (ἐξήειρε) the tree (1.1198-1200).
- D Simile comparing Heracles to a gust of wind (1.1201-4).
- C Repetition of the fact that he raised (ἤειρεν) the tree (1.1205a).

⁸ Note 1.1284ff: ἐν δέ σφιν κρατερόν νεῖκος πέσεν, ἐν δέ κολῳός| ἄσπετος, εἰ τὸν ἄριστον ἀποπρολιπόντες ἔβησκν σφωιτέρων ἑτάρων. It is because of Heracles alone that the quarrel arises when the companions are discovered missing after the Argonauts have left Mysia.

B Heracles picks up his bow, arrows, lion-skin and club (1.1205b-1206a).

A Heracles starts back to the ship (1.1206b).

The third and central section (1.1207-39) contains parallels and contrasts with the second section, as has been noted by Levin.⁹ Both Heracles and Hylas go off alone (implied in 1.1188 for Heracles and specified in 1.1207 for Hylas, νόσφιν ὀμίλου); both are seeking something: Heracles a tree for an oar (1.1188-9 ὡς κεν ἐρετμόν | οἱ αὐτῷ φθαίη καταχείρων ἐντύνασθαι) and Hylas some water (1.1208-9 ὡς κέ οἱ ὕδωρ φθαίη ἀφυσσάμενος ποτιδέρπων); both are doing this before anything else (emphasised by φθαίη in both 1.1189 and 1.1209); both carry something made of bronze: Heracles a bronze-covered club (1.1196 χαλκοβαρεῖ ῥοπάλῳ) and Hylas a bronze pitcher (1.1207 χαλκῆν σὺν κάλπιδι).

The parallelism, however, as Levin points out, serves also to heighten the differences.¹⁰ Heracles is a fully-armed strongman going off to uproot a tree, in contrast to Hylas, an unarmed youth going off to get a pitcher of water. Heracles completes his task; Hylas is abducted by the nymph.

This central section is structurally more complex than either of the two previous scenes and either of the two subsequent scenes. The description of Hylas' progress to the spring is interrupted by a digression explaining how he

⁹ LEVIN (1971), pp.120-1.

¹⁰ LEVIN (1971), p.121.

came to be with Heracles (1.1211-20). Köhnken suggests that there is a ring structure in this digression but he is not convincing.¹¹ What he considers the central section (1.1215-17) is in fact an elaboration of 1.1213-4. A more reasonable suggestion concerning the structure of the passage is made by H. Fränkel who sees a kind of reverse chronological sequence working back to the true reason why Heracles killed Hylas' father and subsequently took Hylas into his care.¹² Following the digression is a brief return to Hylas' progress and then another digression on the activities of the nymphs in the area (1.1222b-1227). Line 1.1223 is the middle of section C and it is in fact after this that disaster first strikes. The description of the group here does contrast also with the previous description of Hylas who is alone (particularly 1.1221) and the subsequent description of the solitary nymph (particularly 1.1228-9a). Hurst suggests a ring-composition here,¹³

¹¹ KÖHNKEN (1965), pp.47-8. In particular "Zwei Verse am Anfang (1213f.), in denen der Streit Herakles-Theiodamas und der Tod des Theiodamas zunächst nur festgestellt werden, und zwei Verse am Ende (1218f.), die die Ursache für die Auseinandersetzung nennen, bilden den Rahmen für drei Verse 1215-1217 im Zentrum, die die Situation der entscheidenden Streitszene, deren Resultat in V.1213f. schon verweggenommen war, kurz rekapitulieren" (p.48).

¹² FRÄNKEL (1968), p.144, notes on 1.1211-20. "Der ruckblickende Exkurs steigt mit jedem Schritt tiefer in die Vorgeschichte hinab." Some of Fränkel's other observations on this digression are, however, more fanciful but will be discussed in the detailed appreciation of these lines.

¹³ HURST, diagram 6 at the end of the book.

- A Heracles' acquisition of Hylas.
 B Description of the nymphs.
 A The nymph's acquisition of Hylas.

but he does not take into account the rest of the section, completely leaving out Hylas' search for water and background from his elaborate structure.

For the description of the abduction (1.1228-39), Köhnken again has worked out a complicated structure,¹⁴

- a the water nymph (1.1228-9a)
 a+b the nymph sees the boy (1.1229b)
 b the boy's beauty (1.1230-2a)
 a the nymph falls in love (1.1232b-3)
 b the boy fetches water (1.1234-6a)
 a the nymph wraps her arms around him (1.1236b-9a)
 a+b the nymph pulls the boy into the stream (1.1239b)

However, like his analysis of the digression on Hylas' background he is trying to see a complex structure where there is none. The lines 1.1229b-1233 are more logically one group as are 1.1237-9. In both cases the nymph and the boy are interacting. This then reduces the structure to a-ab-b-ab which is far simpler and more effective.

Just as section B1 was set off from section C by a strong ring-composition so also is section B2 (1.1240-60) in which Polyphemus' actions are described.¹⁵ This ring-

¹⁴ KÖHNKEN (1965), pp.61ff.

¹⁵ FRÄNKEL (1968), pp.146-7 emends the text so that 1.1250-2 are placed after 1.1242. His reasons are that ἀΐψα and ὤρω διεσθαι cannot logically follow 1.1243-9 as they describe the immediate reaction to the cry and also that the search and call (1.1249) belong at the end of the description. LAWALL, p.127, n.15 seems to find the argument for ἀΐψα particularly convincing. However as HURST, p.65, n.2 puts it "sa [Fränkel's] justification est tendancieuse". Most other scholars reject the emendation, cf. particularly

composition has been discussed by both Köhnken and Hurst¹⁶, and its basic form is as follows,

- A Polyphemos hears Hylas' cry as he is out searching for Heracles and is compared to a wild beast in his search (1.1240-9).
- B Polyphemos assumes that wild beasts or robbers have seized Hylas and so rushes off with his sword drawn (1.1250-2).
- C He meets with Heracles who is returning to the ship (1.1253-56).
- B Polyphemos tells him the bad news and his assumption that Hylas was probably seized by robbers or wild beasts (1.1257-60a).
- A Polyphemos again recounts that he heard Hylas cry (1.1260b).

This ring-composition is notably reinforced by verbal similarities such as that between the opening and closing phrases of the section: 1.1240 τοῦ δ' ἦρως ἰάχοντος ἐπέκλυεν and 1.1260 ἐγὼ δ' ἰάχοντος ἄκουσα ; and also the chiasmic arrangement of Polyphemos' thoughts concerning Hylas' fate: 1.1251-2 ἢ θήρεσιν ἔλωρ πέλοι, ἢέ μιν ἄνδρες | μῶνον ἔόντ' ἐλόγησαν, ἄγουσι δὲ ληΐδ' ἐτοίμην and 1.1259-60 ἐ ληιστῆρες ἐνιχρίμψαντες ἄγουσιν | ἢ θῆρες σίνονται .

This section also, as section B1 did previously, contains parallels and contrasts with section C. Polyphemos like Hylas is initially alone (1.1240 οἶος ἐταίρων), then is joined by one person (as Hylas was by the nymph, so Polyphemos is by Heracles); he too is searching - for Hylas (1.1243ff.); and just as Hylas failed in his task so too does Polyphemos fail in his task (trying to find Hylas after

KÖHNKEN (1970), pp.69-79 and also ARDIZZONI, p.267.

¹⁶ KÖHNKEN (1965), pp.69ff. and HURST, pp.129ff.

hearing his cry). Again the contrast is clear: Hylas is an unarmed youth, Polyphemus is an aging hero (cf. 1.40-44) armed with a sword.

The final section A2 (1.1260-1272) describes Heracles' reaction to the disappearance of Hylas and is therefore parallel to Polyphemus' reaction in the previous section (B2). Both heroes are compared to animals: Polyphemus to a wild beast (1.1243-7) and Heracles to a bull (1.1265-9); both heroes rush about and shout out (Polyphemus at 1.1243, 1248-9; Heracles at 1.1263-4, 1270-2). Polyphemus however reacts rationally; Heracles reacts irrationally.

This section also has an elaborate ring-composition,

- A Sound (1.1261a ἔΩς φάτο)
- B Heracles is standing still (1.1261b-3a)
- C Heracles is running (1.1263b-4)
- D The bull is stung by a gadfly (1.1265)
- E Inner portion of the simile (1.1266-8)
- D The bull is stung by a gadfly (1.1269)
- C Heracles is running (1.1270-1a)
- B Heracles is standing still (1.1271b)
- A Sound (1.1272 ...αὐτῆ)

The chiasmic arrangement of 1.1265 (μύωπι τετυμμένος) and 1.1269 (βεβολημένος ὄστρω) reinforces this arrangement.¹⁷

The division into five sections also seems to have some sort of overall pattern. The middle section is the longest (33 lines), surrounded by B1 and B2 which are within one line of being the same length (20 and 21 lines

¹⁷ KÖHNKEN (1965), p.76 notes that this chiasmic arrangement frames the simile and also that Apollonius avoids repetition here through the use of synonyms.

respectively), and are in turn surrounded by A1 and A2, which are again shorter and roughly the same length (15 and 12 lines respectively). There are some links between A1 and A2: γούνατ' ἔκαμψεν (1.1174) is echoed by γούνατ' ἔπαλλεν (1.1270), with both phrases in the same metrical position in their lines; there is cessation from toil both for the labourer (1.1172-6) and Heracles (1.1271 μεταλλήγων καμάτωσ). However there are stronger correspondences between B1 (Heracles' search for a tree) and B2 (Polyphemus' search for Hylas): both have internal ring-composition and they parallel one another for the same reasons that each of them is parallel to and contrasts with the central section: both heroes go off alone, both are searching for something, and both carry weapons (as opposed to the unarmed youth structurally set between them).

There are also other structural patterns that can be discerned tying the whole "Hylas-episode" together. The description of the Argonauts (1.1182-6) followed by that of Heracles (1.1187ff.), that is, the juxtaposition of a group with an individual, is strongly parallel to the description of the nymphs (1.1222b-27) followed by that of the one nymph of Pegae (1.1228ff.). The nymphs parallel the Argonauts in two ways. In both cases there is an act of piety carried out at night: by the Argonauts at 1.1186 (Ἐκβασίῳ ῥέξαντες ὑπὸ κνέφας Ἀπόλλωνι) and by the nymphs at 1.1223-5 (μέλε γάρ σφισι πάσαις ... Ἄρτεμιν ἐννυχίησιν ἀεὶ μέλπεσθαι αἰδαῖς);

in both cases the groups are divided into smaller groups: the Argonauts divide up the duties for the preparation of the meal and a place to sleep (1.1182-6), and the nymphs had been allotted haunts in various places (1.1226f. αἶ μέν, ὄσαι σκοπιᾶς ὀρέων λάχον ἤ καὶ ἐναύλους ...).

In turn, the single nymph at Pegae is parallel to Heracles. Neither is involved in the activities of his/her companions: Heracles does not help the Argonauts to prepare dinner etc., and the nymph does not join in the worship of Artemis; and just as Heracles took Hylas away from his homeland so the nymph takes Hylas away from Heracles. Hurst remarks on the contrast here¹⁸,

"au caractère rude de l'enlèvement par Héraclès, accompagné d'une intention guerrière, s'oppose la grâce de l'enlèvement par une nymphe accompagné d'une intention amoureuse."

In addition Hurst has found a ring-composition encompassing both section B2 and section A2, further setting them off from section C.¹⁹

It is evident then that Apollonius was very conscious of how he structured this episode (as he was with

¹⁸ HURST, p.64.

¹⁹ HURST, pp.64-5 and diagram 6.

A Cri d'Hylas.

B Polyphème l'entend. Comparaison: lion.

C Recherche.

D Rencontre d'Héraclès. Discours.

C Recherche.

B Comparaison: taureau.

A Cri d'Héraclès.

the structure of the whole epic²⁰). He has intricately linked each scene within the episode while smoothly integrating the episode itself into the larger epic²¹, and as Hutchinson remarks, "the sequence of Apollonius' narrative produces contrasts of great force dramatically and poetically".²²

²⁰ HUTCHINSON, pp.85-142 passim.

²¹ CRUMP suggests that the Argonautica "is not an epic", that "Apollonius had no gift for epic construction" (p.249) and that the "Hylas-episode" which she suggests covers 1.1207-1357, is an epyllion (p.247). However certain features which modern scholars have assigned to epyllia can also apply to other genres and the intricate linking of the "Hylas-episode" to the rest of the epic (as shown above) does not suggest epyllion technique. CRUMP'S contention that "The Argonautica, in fact, is little more than a collection of epyllia..." (p.147) is simplistic.

²² HUTCHINSON, p.193.

SECTION B: CHRONOLOGY, ORDER, AND PACE

The chronology of the "Hylas-episode" is also complex. Immediately after the Argonauts land there seem to be four things happening virtually simultaneously: a) the Argonauts prepare an evening meal and a place to sleep (1.1182-6), b) Heracles goes off to find a tree for an oar (1.1187ff.), c) Hylas goes off to fetch water for Heracles' dinner (1.1207ff.), and d) the nymphs engage in their night worship of Artemis (1.1222-5).²³

The next set of events take place shortly after the above. Hylas appears not to have taken long to reach Pegae (1.1221-2 αἰψα δ' ὄγε κρήνην μετεκίαθεν ἢν καλέουσιν | Πηγὰς), and soon thereafter was pulled into the spring by the nymph, at which time Polyphemus having ventured out to meet Heracles heard Hylas cry out (presumably Polyphemus had already finished his duties with the Argonauts although his motive for going to meet Heracles is unclear). Finally Heracles finishes his task and runs into Polyphemus, who has already spent some time searching for Hylas. So it is apparent that three of the four initial events took

²³ There does in fact also appear to be a structural chiasmus here between these four initial events: group (Argonauts), individual (Heracles), individual (Hylas), and group (nymphs).

different lengths of time to complete, the second one (Heracles' search for a tree) taking the longest. Of the nymphs' nightly worship there is no further mention.

Since the whole "Hylas-episode" takes place between nightfall (1.1172ff.) and the rising of the morning star (1.1273-4), Köhnken suggests that one reason for including the digression on Heracles and Theiodamas (1.1211-20) was to emphasise the length of time it took for Hylas to find Pegae²⁴, but this argument seems to ignore $\alpha\dot{\iota}\psi\alpha$ in 1.1221. Again ignoring $\alpha\dot{\iota}\psi\alpha$ he suggests that Hylas was wandering in unfamiliar territory and therefore took some time to find the spring.²⁵ However the fact that he did arrive quickly suggests rather that perhaps the hospitable Mysians (1.1179) gave him directions, or the spring was not that far from the camp. Köhnken further argues that a great length of time must have passed before Polyphemus would have been "unruhig" at Heracles' absence²⁶, but again there is no evidence in the text for Polyphemus being worried or uneasy (see below under the detailed appreciation of 1.1240-60).

It is clear that the events described in 1.1172-1272 could not have covered the time period from dusk to the morning star, nor could Apollonius have meant them to as

²⁴ KÖHNKEN (1965), pp.41-2. KOCH, p.22 makes the same suggestion.

²⁵ KÖHNKEN (1965), p.42.

²⁶ KÖHNKEN (1965), p.42.

Köhnken suggests. The purpose of the episode is not to account for every hour of the night in question but to establish how it happened that Heracles left the Argonauts. The whole episode lasts only a short time and presumably Heracles and Polyphemus then spent the rest of the night searching for Hylas.

The narrative pace is slow due to many lengthy descriptions, comparisons and similes which highlight carefully chosen details. This slow pace is typical of epic poems and lends an air of dignity to the actions.

The episode opens with an expansive temporal clause/comparison noting the time of day (the importance of which is seen at 1.1231f.), followed by a full description of the Argonauts' welcome in Mysia and their dinner preparations etc. This leisurely pace continues on into the next section (1.1187ff.), the content of which (Heracles uprooting the tree) does not particularly advance the plot. There is an elaborate description of the size and appropriateness of the tree (1.1190-3), Heracles' equipment (1.1194-5), and how he uprooted the tree (1.1196-1200), followed by a simile (1.1201-4) stretching out the description even more. This lengthy description is used to stress aspects of Heracles' character, particularly his strength.

The opening of the central section on Hylas describes in some detail (1.1207-10) what Hylas was doing

and why as Heracles was uprooting the tree, and the pace is kept slow by the digression on Heracles and Theiodamas (1.1211-20). Another digression (concerning the nymphs) continues to retard the plot and leads into the finely detailed abduction scene which is described almost as though it happened in slow motion (1.1228ff.), appropriately enough since this is the key point in the whole episode. In fact twelve lines pass from when Hylas reaches the spring (1.1221) until he dips his pitcher (1.1234ff.) suggesting an actual pause in his actions.

Polyphemus' reaction to Hylas' cry (1.1240-60) is told in great detail in order to emphasise the rationality of his behavior and the importance of the loss. It is drawn out by both a simile (1.1243-7) and direct speech (1.1256-9). Likewise Heracles' reaction (1.1260-72) is described in detail to bring out the tragedy of the loss again and reveal Heracles' character. Again there is a simile to slow the pace down (1.1265-9) and to focus on and heighten the differences between the reactions of Polyphemus and Heracles. Although these last two sections are long and detailed, none of the urgency of the search is lost.

SECTION C: SETTING

Apollonius utilizes details of setting only as much as is necessary for his purposes and as a result those details are scattered throughout the whole episode. Two lines suffice to explain the land to which the Argonauts had come. The land is that of the Cians and at the spot where they arrive there are houses at the foot of a mountain, called Arganthone, by the mouth of the river Cios²⁷ (1.1177-8). The land is clearly inhabited (1.1177 ἦθεα ; 1.1179-80... Μυσοὶ ... ἐνναέταλ κείνῃς χθονός ; 1.1222 ἀγχίγυοι περὶναέταλ). More specifically the land is said to be a lovely headland inhabited by nymphs (1.1224); when indicating that there are forest nymphs and mountain nymphs (1.1226) Apollonius also reveals more about the setting: there seems to be more than one mountain, with lookouts and streams ; there are meadows (1.1183); a forest (1.1188,1.1227); a fair-flowing spring called Pegae (1.1221-2,1.1227) and a path (1.1241, 1.1253). The exact proximity of these geographical features is unclear but this is not

²⁷ KOCH, pp.13 & 15, suggests that Apollonius specifically names the river here in preparation for the action concerning Polyphemos' founding of the city Cios (1.1315ff., 1344ff.).

important for the advancement of the plot nor for characterisation.

Apollonius does however place more emphasis on the time of day. There are five references to the fact that it is night-time (1.1172-7;1.1186;1.1225;1.1231-2;and 1.1255). The fourth reference (1.1231-2) is the most important, revealing that there is a full moon shining. This detail is not divulged at the beginning of the episode but withheld until it has the most impact - shining on Hylas and highlighting his beauty and charms with its delicate light so that the nymph cannot help but fall in love. Once she falls in love she seizes Hylas, the action which leads to Heracles' departure from the Argonauts. Therefore it is crucial that Hylas, a mortal, appears extraordinarily beautiful to the nymph, an immortal. Presumably this moonlight has also aided Heracles in his search to find an appropriate tree (1.1187ff.) and will help Polyphemus to recognise Heracles as he comes rushing down the path (1.1254-5). Stressing the darkness is also important because it is not until the light of day that the three companions are discovered missing (1.1280ff.).

SECTION D: CHARACTERISATION OF HYLAS

Apollonius has deftly presented Hylas in a very economical manner. Although the whole episode under examination centres around Hylas, he is without doubt a very minor character in the Argonautica as a whole and his role is functional. Apollonius has only developed his character as much as is necessary a) to advance the plot in the "Hylas-episode" and b) to emphasize some aspects of Heracles' nature. The picture of Hylas that emerges is one of an obedient squire and an extremely handsome youth, characteristics which result in his search for water and his abduction respectively. The actual loss of Hylas as an Argonaut is of little consequence to the expedition but it results in the removal of Heracles from the voyage, which has far greater significance for the Argonauts.²⁸

Prior to the "Hylas-episode" Hylas is mentioned only once in the Argonautica. In the catalogue of heroes he is described as Heracles' young companion and weapons-bearer

²⁸ The Argonauts up until this point in the story have been relying on Heracles for, among other qualities, his strength: see for example 1.992ff. where he kills the giants and 1.1161ff. where he rows the Argo single-handed after the other heroes have tired. Also Heracles is the only one of the three left behind at Mysia for whom the Argonauts think of turning back (1.1284ff.).

(1.131-2 σὺν καὶ οἱ Ἕγλας κίεν, ἔσθλός ὁπάων | πρωθήβης, ἱῶν
 τε φορέυς φύλακός τε βλοῦο). According to Liddell and Scott
 ἔσθλός can have several meanings, most of which seem to be
 implied here: "good" at his work, "faithful" and perhaps
 even "noble". Thus the characteristics highlighted here
 (emphatically placed at the end of 1.131 and the beginning
 of 1.132) are those that will be of significance later on:
 that he is a faithful squire and in the prime of his youth.
 Subsequent to the episode there are three brief mentions of
 Hylas all in connection with his disappearance but none
 reveal anything further about his character (1.1324-5;
 1.1349-50; 1.1354-5).

Within the boundaries of the episode (1.1172-1272)²⁹
 Hylas' own actions are set in the middle (1.1207-39),
 opening with him setting off to fetch water (1.1207ff.) and
 closing with his abduction by the nymph (1.1239). Of these
 33 lines only half deal with Hylas directly, reflecting the
 lack of importance Apollonius placed on developing Hylas'
 character. Much more emphasis is placed on other aspects
 such as structure and characterisation of Heracles.

For background Apollonius relates that Heracles
 killed Hylas' father Theiodamas, a Dryopian, and took Hylas,
 who was only a young child at the time, from his father's
 house (1.1212-13). At the time of the voyage Hylas is a
 youth (1.132 πρωθήβης), so the encounter between Heracles

²⁹ See the section on structure.

and Theiodamas had taken place some years prior. Hylas' parentage is not itself of particular importance to the story but Apollonius by mentioning it can more easily introduce a story that will illustrate a certain facet of Heracles' nature.

The one overwhelming characteristic of Hylas which does emerge from this section is unquestioning obedience. Almost nine lines are devoted to Hylas carrying out his duties for Heracles. The four initial lines (1.1207-10) in which his intention to fetch water and prepare everything for Heracles' dinner is described show this obedience. Hylas' quick journey to the spring (1.1221) and his act of dipping the pitcher into the spring (1.1234-36a) subsequently reinforce this characteristic.³⁰ That he intends to be and actually is quick and efficient in carrying out his duties is stressed also (1.1210 ὀτραλέως κατὰ κόσμον and 1.1221 αἶψα).³¹ Apollonius even offers an explanation of why Hylas acts in this way (1.1211 δὴ γὰρ μὲν τοίοισιν ἐν ἡθέσιν αὐτός ἔφερβε) although it is not always agreed by modern scholars to be a strong enough motive for

³⁰ 1.132 is also concerned with Hylas performing his duty - carrying Heracles' arrows and guarding his bow.

³¹ KÖHNKEN (1965), p.43 notes also "dass nicht die Dienstleistungen selbst, sondern die Art und Weise, wie sie ausgeführt werden, nämlich ὀτραλέως und κατὰ κόσμον , betont werden soll."

Hylas to go off alone.³² This dominant characteristic of obedience then serves to advance the plot towards the abduction and ultimately to Heracles abandoning the Argonauts.

The physical description of Hylas (1.1229b-1232a) is also given primarily to advance the plot by supplying the nymph of Pegae with a motive for abducting him. It is in fact a rather vague description (1.1230 *κἀλλεῖ καὶ γλυκερῆσιν ἔρευθόμενον χαρίτεσσιν*) because he is seen by the light of the moon but since what is given is sufficient to explain

³² For example, KÖHNKEN (1965), pp.36ff. suggests that there is a motivation problem "wenn die Myser die Argonauten schon mit *μηλα* und *μέθυ* ἄσπετον (1181) und offenbar auch mit Wasser (denn ein Teil der Argonauten ist schon vor Hylas' Weggang mit dem 'Mischen' des Weins beschäftigt: 1185) versorgt haben." [his emphasis]. He cites Knaack, GGA 1896 as having already exploited "das Fehlen dieser Einzelheit" (p.36,n.5). KÖHNKEN however is working from the premise that Apollonius inserted 1.1179-81 as an expansion of Theocritus' version. FRÄNKEL (1968), p.144 suggests, in keeping with his proposition that Heracles is presented as a stoic hero (see below n.51), that "Vielleicht wünschte (der stoisch enthaltsame...) Herakles seinem Trunk 'zum Essen' überhaupt keinen Wein zuzusetzen, und dann kam es umso mehr auf den Geschmack des Wassers an; jedenfalls wollte ihm Hylas besonders frisches und (in jedem Sinne) reines 'heiliges' Wasser vorsetzen. VIAN, pp.44-5 to answer the question "Pourquoi Hylas prend-il la peine d'aller si loin chercher de l'eau, alors que les Argonautes sont accueillies 'hospitalièrement' (v.1179) par les Mysiens qui leur apportent vivres et boisson? suggests that Apollonius is trying to reconcile two traditions a) one (maybe from Cinaethon) in which the Mysians were hostile, and b) the other which attributes the founding of Cios to Polyphemus, in which the Mysians are friendly. However VIAN does not seem to answer his own question. LEVIN (1971), p.118 however accepts 1.1211 as sufficient motivation for Hylas' actions, and this seems to be the most reasonable viewpoint, in view of the fact that the whole episode was fated anyway (1.1315ff.).

why an immortal nymph fell in love with him, he must have been extremely handsome. Emphasis is given to his beauty and graces (of which there are more than one) by their position in the line (first and last).

The actual abduction scene (1.1236b-1239) reveals little about Hylas except that he has a tender mouth, which the goddess desires to kiss (1.1238). It is only indirectly through Polyphemus that it is learnt that Hylas cried out as he was drawn into the spring (1.1240). The immediate importance of the abduction however is not Hylas' fate (it is discovered at 1.1324-5 that he did not die but became the husband of the nymph) but the reaction to it by Polyphemus and Heracles whereby Apollonius again draws attention to Heracles' character in particular.³³

³³ There is no explicit mention of any amorous relationship between Hylas and Heracles (or Hylas and Polyphemus). Cf. VIAN, p.41 who states that "Rien, non plus, ne suggère explicitement qu'Héraclès éprouve pour Hylas un sentiment autre que la virile affection qu'un héros doit porter au jeune 'page'...dont il a la charge morale (v.1211)". He also adds that the epic tradition generally did not speak of homosexual love (p.41,n.2). Cf. also DILLER, p.420: "Bei Apollonios dagegen wird Hylas von Herakles nur zu 'ordentlichen Dienstleistungen' erzogen; es ist viel mehr von einem Besitzverhältnis als von einer Bindung durch Liebe die Rede (1208/1214)." and HUTCHINSON, p.193: "Apollonius' Heracles is not in love with Hylas".

A strong reaction (1.1261-72) need not have an erotic basis. In fact Heracles' relationship with Hylas bears certain resemblances to Achilles' affection for Patroclus. Achilles' reaction to Patroclus' death is also frenzied (Il. 18.22ff.) and his one thought is to slay Patroclus' murderer (Il. 18.90ff.) just as Heracles' one thought is to discover Hylas' fate (1.1348ff.). Heracles in fact echoes Achilles in certain other respects, for example, both men are the strongest and best warriors but subordinate technically to lesser warriors, Agamemnon and Jason. Later

SECTION E: CHARACTERISATION OF HERACLES

In contrast to Hylas, Heracles is a highly developed character. Since he plays an active role in the voyage

Vergil shows Aeneas reacting to Pallas' death with a frenzy of killing, again with only one object in mind - to kill Turnus (Aen. 10.510ff.). Again this is not a homosexual relationship.

LEVIN (CJ, 1971), pp.24-5 on the other hand suggests that Apollonius hints at the tradition which made Polyphemos Hylas' lover by comparing Polyphemos to a predatory aggressor, as in Theocritus 13.61ff., where Heracles is compared to a lion (cf. also LEVIN (1971), p.118,n.3 and pp.127-8). KÖHNKEN (1965), pp.43-4 likewise finds that "Apollonios beschränkt demnach die Hinweise auf eine Liebesverbindung Herakles-Hylas (und Polyphem-Hylas) auf den Schlussakkord der Erzählung 1.1261ff. und vor allem auf die Gleichnisse (1265ff. und 1243ff.), wo er hinter der hemmungslosen Wut des Herakles (und vorher der Sorge Polyphemos) etwas von der beim Leser anscheinend als bekannt vorausgesetzten Liebe erkennen lässt." (see also below n. 114). HURST, p.132 similarly states "si nous voyons deux héros se lancer successivement à la recherche d'Hylas, c'est que la tradition rapportait au sujet de l'amant d'Hylas deux faits contradictoires (cf. Schol.A.,1207b)" and that Apollonius combines all the available information on the story into his own version. KOCH, pp.22,29ff. believes that Apollonius implies that Hylas and Heracles are lovers through Heracles' reaction at 1.1161-72. His remark, however, that "Liebesschmerz...den gewaltigen Helden Herakles völlig überwindet" (p.37) seems to pertain more to Theocritus Idyll 13 than to this account. WHITE, p.68 suggests that "by not explicitly mentioning the well-known love-relationship between Heracles and Hylas, Apollonius has complied with one of the fundamental rules of Hellenistic poetry" - i.e. allusiveness. OSMUN, p.56 goes the furthest by saying that the only account that does not deal with the homosexual aspect is Valerius Flaccus'.

While it is possible that Apollonius is making allusions to other traditions of the story which include amorous relations between Hylas and Heracles or Polyphemos he has chosen not to make homosexuality an issue here.

throughout the first book of the Argonautica until he is left behind in Mysia, his character in the "Hylas-episode" must be considered in light of the characteristics already set out in Book 1. As Lawall remarks³⁴,

"Of the Argonauts listed in the catalogue, Heracles, even after being left behind in Mysia, plays the most extensive role in Apollonius' exploration of character and action. He serves as a foil not only to Jason, but also to the rest of the Argonauts as a group. In a company of youths, Heracles stands out as the only man of maturity and experience, the only 'hero' left from the old order."

In spite of the fact that Heracles is "from the old order" and obviously must be removed from the voyage especially because he could obtain the golden fleece single-handed, rendering the other Argonauts unnecessary, and also because it is Zeus' will that he return to complete his Labours (1.1315)³⁵, Apollonius has clearly given him an important

³⁴ LAWALL, pp.123-4. However LAWALL (p.124,n.7) also contradicts this by stating that Polyphemus is also of Heracles' generation and has experience. Heracles however does command more respect and certainly plays a larger role than the aged (1.40ff.) hero Polyphemus.

³⁵ Cf. MOONEY, p.40 "Heracles is left behind in Mysia early in the voyage, a version of the legend which must have been well-pleasing to our poet, avoiding, as it does, the difficulty of subordinating his dominant individuality to the weakness of Jason throughout the adventure.". VIAN, p.43 notes that "il [Heracles] n'avait pas sa place... dans une entreprise dont le succès dépend d'Aphrodite et d'une femme". This view seems to echo that previously stated by Blumberg, Untersuchungen zur epischen Technik des Apollonios von Rhodos, Diss. Leipzig 1931 (as found in CARSPECKEN, p.120) "Sein [Heracles'] Benehmen anlässlich des lemnischen Aufenthaltes zeigt, dass es unmöglich war diesen Frauenhasser, wie er hier geschildert ist, mit nach Kolchis zu nehmen, wo alles von weiblicher Hilfe abhängt."

role in Book 1. Even after his departure, he is still in the Argonauts' minds and occasionally helpful to them.³⁶

Heracles is introduced in the catalogue of heroes:

οὐδὲ μὲν οὐδὲ βίην κρατερόφρονος Ἡρακλῆος
 πευθομένοθ' Αἰσονίδαο λιλαιόμενων ἀθερίξαι·
 ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ ἄε βάξιν ἀγειρομένων ἡρώων
 νεῖον ἀπ' Ἀρκαδίας Λυρκήιον Ἄργος ἀμείψας,
 τὴν ὁδὸν ἢ ζωὸν φέρε κάπριον ὅς ῥ' ἐνὶ βήσσης
 φέρβετο Λαμπείης Ἐρυμάνθιον ἀμ' μέγα τίφος,
 τὸν μὲν ἐνὶ πρῶτοισι Μυκηναίων ἀγορήσει
 δεσμοῖς ἰλλόμενον μεγάλων ἀπεσείσατο νύτων
 αὐτὸς δ' ἢ ἰότητι παρέκ νόον Εὐρυσθέως
 ὤρμηθην.
 (1.122-131)

He joins the voyage immediately after carrying out one of his labours for Eurystheus (the capture of the Erymanthian boar) and the initial picture focuses on his great strength (1.122 βίην κρατερόφρονος Ἡρακλῆος etc.) which will again be highlighted in the "Hylas-episode". Though Heracles is bound to carry out twelve Labours for Eurystheus, he is here seen to follow his own will and neglects his duty for the

³⁶ Well into Book 2 the Argonauts recall with sadness the loss of Heracles from their expedition: 2.145ff.; 2.766f.; 2.772f.; (cf. also 3.1231ff.). Twice Heracles' actions indirectly aid the Argonauts: a) when the Arcadian Amphidamas recalls how Heracles drove away the Stymphalian birds, the Argonauts use the same method at the island of Ares (2.1047ff.), and b) when parched with thirst (4.1395) the Argonauts find water at a spring created by Heracles after he had stolen the Golden Apples of the Hesperides (4.1445ff.). Even near the end of the voyage (4.1458ff.) the Argonauts make a desperate search for Heracles who had recently been in the same area.

heroic mission³⁷; and it will require divine intervention to turn him back to his Labours.³⁸

There are four major events before the "Hylas-episode" in which Heracles plays an important role. A brief analysis of these events is central to an understanding of Heracles' character since this episode is the climax of Heracles' involvement in the voyage and cannot be divorced from what has gone before.

The first time Heracles' presence serves an important purpose occurs when the Argonauts are selecting a leader for the voyage (1.336ff.). They unanimously choose Heracles. He, however, refuses and says that he will not permit anyone but Jason to be the leader (1.345ff.). The respect accorded to Heracles prevents any altercation from breaking out over the decision.³⁹

³⁷ Presumably Heracles sees the voyage as a chance to gain more glory for himself, cf. 1.869-70 οὐ μάλ' ἐυκλειεῖς γέ συν ὀθνεῖησι γυναιξίν | ἐσόμεθ' ὥδ' ἐπι δηρὸν ἐελμένοι, ... (Heracles speaking to the Argonauts on Lemnos).

³⁸ 1.1315ff. Τίπτε παρέκ μεγάλο Διὸς μενεκίνετε βουλήν
Αἰήτεω πολίεθρον ἄγειν θρασὺν Ἡρακλήα;
"Ἀργεῖ οἱ μοῖρ' ἐστὶν ἄτκσθάλω Εὐρυσθέη
ἐκπλήσαι μογεόντα δυώδεκα πάντας κέθλους.
It is certain that no mortal could win a battle of wills with Heracles. As LEVIN (CJ, 1971), p.22 notes "Whose intention was being violated clearly makes a difference. Heracles could bypass for a time the duties forced upon him by a mere mortal who wished him ill. He could not, however, avoid acceding to the designs of his parent Zeus...".

³⁹ Jason is certainly not the most experienced warrior among the companions but being the bravest is only one of the specifications set out by Jason himself that the leader must have (1.338ff. τούνεκα νῦν τὸν ἄριστον ἀφειδήσαντες ἔλεσθε | ὄρχαμον ἡμείων, ᾧ κεν τὰ ἕκαστα μέλοιτο, | νείκεα συνθεσίης τε μετὰ

Heracles' presence is again of consequence when the Argonauts are delaying on Lemnos.⁴⁰ He chastises the Argonauts for dallying with women when there is the fleece to seize and glory to be won (1.861ff.). Again because of the respect they have for Heracles the Argonauts are shamed into action. Heracles himself shows no interest in the women but is more anxious to get on with the expedition, motivated not by concern for the group but self-interest and desire for glory.⁴¹

Of less importance perhaps than the previous two incidents is Heracles' saving of the Argo from being destroyed by the Earthborn men (1.989ff.). Here Heracles displays his bravery and his superiority as a warrior,

ξείνοισι βαλέσθαι). It turns out that Jason is a more suitable leader because he does take on responsibility for the group. For example, when Heracles is discovered to be missing Jason grieves (1.1286ff.) but does not immediately abandon the expedition as Heracles does when he learns of Hylas' disappearance. LAWALL, pp.148ff. suggests that "the episodes of the voyage represent a process of education" for Jason and that Heracles often intervenes in the first book because Jason is so inexperienced.

⁴⁰ CARSPECKEN, p.121 feels that this episode is Heracles' "unique contribution to the adventure" and that "His fame arouses discord at the beginning". However, as noted above, his fame seems rather to prevent discord and thus his contribution to the voyage does not rest with one event only.

⁴¹ Heracles again shows how anxious he is to get on with the voyage: a) by rowing the Argo alone when the others are tired (1.1161ff.) and b) by rushing off to make a new oar without having supper first when they reach Mysia (1.1187ff.).

See also n.49.

characteristics which will be sorely missed by the Argonauts after he is left behind in Mysia.⁴²

The final time that Heracles directly aids the Argonauts occurs when he rows the Argo alone (1.1161ff.).⁴³ This scene serves not only to show Heracles' strength and the extent to which it surpasses that of the other Argonauts, but also the limits of his strength.⁴⁴ Once the oar is broken Heracles' strength is rendered useless, as it will be again later when Hylas goes missing. The picture here however of Heracles sulking (1.1170-1) is not without humour⁴⁵ and this indignity makes him a more sympathetic character.

The "Hylas-episode" is next and Heracles is the main character. There is insufficient space to fully develop the

⁴² Cf. 2.145ff and well on in Book 3 is another reminder of how superior Heracles' strength is to that of the other Argonauts (cf. HUTCHINSON, p.113):

ἄν δὲ πολύρρινον νῶμα σάκος, ἄν δὲ καὶ ἔγχος,
δεινόν, ἀμαίμακτον· τὸ μὲν οὐ κέ τις ἄλλος ὑπέστη
ἀνδρῶν ἡρώων, ὅτε κάλλιπον Ἡρακλῆα,
τῆλε παρέξ, ὃ κεν οἶος ἐναντίβιον πτολέμιζεν. (3.1231 ff.) .

⁴³ Immediately upon embarking on the Argo Heracles was given the middle bench (along with Ancaeus) for rowing (1.396ff.) - another sign of the respect accorded him and his strength. 1.531ff. relate how the Argo sank under his weight, a comment this time on his size, and perhaps a reference to the tradition that Heracles could not sail with the Argo because he was too heavy (see Chpt. 1, n.26).

⁴⁴ Cf. KOCH, p.5 "Der V. 1163 veranschaulicht trefflich, wie ungestüm der Zeussohn ans Werk geht - ein bewusster Gegensatz zu der Ermattung der übrigen Besatzung."

Cf. LAWALL, pp.125ff. and GALINSKY, p.109 "Brawn... even has purely physical limitations."

⁴⁵ PIKE (1980), p.42.

other characters (such as Hylas, the nymph and Polyphemus) and so development of them is used generally either to further the plot or highlight some aspect of Heracles' nature. Most of Heracles' characteristics that have already been depicted will be shown again: his strength, the limits of his strength, his tendency to act in his own self-interest rather than for the group (so far his interests have corresponded with those of the group), and his habit of acting alone and in a different way from the group.⁴⁶ It is ironic that Heracles, who in the Lemnian episode kept the Argonauts mindful of their quest completely forgets it himself when Hylas disappears.

Heracles is first mentioned in the "Hylas-episode" at 1.1187ff.⁴⁷ where because he has just broken his oar (1.1166ff.) he goes off to find a tree to make a new one. It has already been shown that there is a strong contrast between the solitary Heracles and the picture of the Argonauts previously given (1.1182-6) (see above under structure). Drawing attention to the Argonauts' dependence

⁴⁶ Heracles acts contrary to the group and for his own reasons particularly when the leader is chosen. CARSPACKEN, p.120 sees this as a magnanimous gesture on Heracles' part, a subjection of his ego; and indeed Heracles is said to speak μέγα φρονέων (1.348) but he is acting here of his own will just as he does when on Lemnos where he chooses not to join the other Argonauts with the Lemnian women (see n.37).

⁴⁷ Although Heracles is not actually named until 1.1242 it is clear that he is the actor in this scene (see below under the detailed appreciation of 1.1187-1206). Naming him υἱὸς Διὸς is suggestive of the respect accorded him as is the greeting used by Polyphemus (1.1257 Δαιμόνιε).

upon one another serves to highlight Heracles self-sufficiency.⁴⁸ Fränkel interprets this action of Heracles as putting his duty towards the Argonauts (by replacing his oar) before his own physical needs (eating supper).⁴⁹ However Heracles is in fact, to some degree, shirking his duty as an Argonaut by not helping out with the dinner preparations before repairing his oar. As always Heracles

⁴⁸ KOCH, p.16 suggests another contrast here between Heracles and the Argonauts: Heracles, having broken his oar, is irritated and in a hurry to fix it in contrast to the unconcern of his companions whose suffering (weariness from rowing) has been removed.

⁴⁹ FRÄNKEL (1968), p.143 writes of 1.1187-9 "hier ist er...der Held den die Stoa als ihr Ideal verehrte...Er fordert die Kameraden auf...'wohl zu speisen', während er selbst davon geht...ein Ruder zu beschaffen...:die Pflicht geht vor." and invites comparison with the Lemnian episode (p.115 of 1.855f.): "Das Heraklesbild des Ap. steht dem stoischen nahe...und somit in scharfen Gegensatz zu der traditionellen Figur eines Helden der auch in seiner wüsten Sinnlichkeit das Äusserste an strotzender Manneskraft verkörpert". The 'Stoic' characteristic which FRÄNKEL is attributing to Heracles here appears to be the subordination of physical needs (whether it be hunger or sexual desire) to duty. There are two problems with this interpretation: 1) This notion of Heracles placing duty before pleasure is not exclusively a stoic one and seems to extend back at least as far as Prodicus (a fifth century sophist) (cf. GALINSKY, pp.102-3). In fact the Stoics themselves are said to have "followed closely the teaching of their predecessors the Cynics" in using Heracles as a model of a virtuous man (ARNOLD, p.295); 2) It is questionable whether duty is the driving force behind Heracles' actions or whether he is motivated by self-interest (1.1189 οἱ κέρτῳ) and the quest for glory (see n.37). Certainly Apollonius' Heracles is not characterised by exaggerated physical appetites (cf. HUTCHINSON, p.137) but neither does he subordinate himself to the group. Certainly CARSPECKEN exaggerates when he says "Apollonius has added transfiguring characteristics, virtual denials of traditional traits [i.e. his "famed sensuality" and "voracious appetite"], for which previous literature offers no precedent" [my emphasis].

acts for himself. To see him as dutiful would be to ignore the fact that by the very action of taking part in the voyage he disregards his duty to Eurystheus. Apollonius is not presenting this as something wrong but rather as something alien to the group- concept of the voyage.

Once more in 1.1187-1206 Heracles' strength is emphasised. The descriptions of the size of the tree (1.1192-3), of its deep roots (1.1199-1200), of the need to shake it loose with his club (1.1196) etc. all serve to emphasise what a prodigious feat it was to uproot the tree. The accompanying simile (1.1201-4) stresses the great force that was required. Heracles' strength is initially noted in the catalogue of heroes (1.122ff.) and subsequently reinforced over and over during the course of Book 1 (1.196f.; 1.395ff.; 1.531ff.; 1.992ff.; 1.1161ff.). This cumulative picture serves to contrast with and highlight his helplessness when faced with Hylas' disappearance (1.1261ff.).

Strength is not the only characteristic brought out in this section. Heracles is shown as very efficient and resourceful in his search for a suitable tree. For the most part Heracles has acted this way since the voyage began. There is an exception: when his oar breaks. That was the first instance depicting the limits of his strength and the accompanying frustration, and foreshadows his coming emotional reaction to Hylas' disappearance.

Also highlighted in this passage are Heracles' traditional attributes: bow and arrows, club and lion-skin (1.1194-6 and 1.1205-6), which are also suggestive of his martial qualities, strength and self-sufficiency, all of which are again soon to be useless in the face of personal disaster. The sharp contrast between the strong-man Heracles and his faithful squire (1.1207ff.) has already been noted (see above under structure)⁵⁰, the juxtaposition of the scenes of their respective activities serving to highlight further Hylas' vulnerability.

Within the central section of the episode (1.1207-39) the digression (1.1211-20), which is introduced to explain Hylas' behavior, for the most part focuses on the argument between Heracles and Theiodamas. Apollonius in 1.1211 suggests that Heracles has been responsible and conscientious in his upbringing of Hylas (over a long period of time), which contrasts with his unreliability where his own tasks are concerned (abandoning the Labours (1.122ff.) and abandoning the Argo (1.1261ff.)). Also in sharp contrast to his care for Hylas is his pitiless (1.1214 $\nu\mu\lambda\epsilon\iota\omega\varsigma$)⁵¹ action against Theiodamas whom he killed because

⁵⁰ See also below under the detailed appreciation of 1.1207-39).

⁵¹ I do not accept FRÄNKEL's (1968) own emendation of $\nu\mu\lambda\epsilon\iota\omega$ for $\nu\mu\lambda\epsilon\iota\omega\varsigma$ in 1.1214 or of $\delta\eta\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu$ for $\delta\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu$ in 1.1213 which seem to be for the purpose of whitewashing Heracles. He also suggests that there is a line missing after 1.1217 explaining why Heracles demanded the oxen from Theiodamas (for example, as suggested in the apparatus criticus, OCT,

Theiodamas refused to give him an ox. This action however then is said to have been only a pretext (1.1218) for starting a war against the lawless Dryopians (1.1219).⁵²

p.51, 1217A - πείνη τελομένην παύρην δόμεν "γλήω ἐδωδήν.") because it would be unsuitable for the 'Stoic' Heracles, who engages in civilising activities, "wenn ihn Ap. bei dieser Gelegenheit den ganzen Ochsen in einer einzigen Sitzung hätte verzehren lassen, wie das ein stehender Zug der Sage war [Cf. Philostr., *Imag.* 2.24; Nonnos Abbas, *Hist.* 1.41; and Callimachus, *Hymn* 3 160f.]" (pp.144-5). Gluttony however is not mentioned here (see n.82). FRÄNKEL with this proposed emendation seems to be trying to align Apollonius' story more closely with the version related in the Scholia (see n.80) and/ or Callimachus, *Aetia* 1 frag. 24-5 (see n.81).

LAWALL, p.126, n.13 points out that there is no need for any emendations because "the text as it stands is wholly intelligible and confirmed by the papyri". The text however is not completely intelligible (see n.85) but the problem is not enough to make such drastic emendations since *νηλεῶς* is confirmed by the papyri and KÖHNKEN (1965), p.46, n.5 and p.48 shows there is no problem with accepting *δίον* as applying to Theiodamas (see n.84). LEVIN (1971), pp.117-8, n.5 concurs with KÖHNKEN though he offers no further arguments.

⁵² Violence and force are characteristic methods with which Heracles confronts problems in contrast to Jason and thus highlight Jason's methods which must be more varied primarily because he does not have the same superhuman strength that Heracles has. For example, at 1.1348 Heracles threatens to ravage the Mysians' land if they do not find Hylas; at 4.541 there is a reminder that Heracles killed his own children; and at 4.1396ff. the Argonauts discover that Heracles has used violence to seize the Golden Apples of the Hesperides (in sharp contrast to Jason's method of seizing the golden fleece).

Heracles is perhaps more complex however than LAWALL would allow (p.131 "he [Heracles] has defined the lowest and most primitive level in the poet's metaphysical study of character and action"). LAWALL has characterised Heracles as a "man of brawn" (p.123) but Heracles is shown to have more resources than simply strength as LEVIN (*CJ*, 1971), pp.26-7 notes: a) his non-violent method of getting Hippolyte's girdle (2.966-9) and b) his use of reason in the Labour of the Stymphalian birds.

Apollonius here seems to conflate various traditions because the justification for the war and ultimate depiction of Heracles as a civilising force, while consistent with the general tradition of Heracles, contradicts a) his pitiless treatment of Theiodamas and b) the way in which he has been depicted so far in the epic as a more Homeric type of hero who puts personal glory above everything else.

The violent emotion of Heracles which has been hinted at in 1.1170f. when he broke his oar and still more recently in 1.1213ff. when he killed Theiodamas, comes to the fore in 1.1261-72 when he hears of Hylas' disappearance. His reaction is forceful and frenzied, in complete contrast to his earlier business-like search for a tree.⁵³ The irrationality of his reactions is brought out by the simile in which he is likened to a bull maddened by the sting of a gadfly (1.1265-9), and further highlighted by the contrast with Polyphemus' reaction (1.1240-60). Although both men rush around and shout, Heracles' actions are more intense and not motivated by reason as Polyphemus' are⁵⁴ but rather by anger (1.1263 *χωόμενος* and 1.1270 *μαρμύων*) (see below under the detailed appreciation of 1.1240-60 and 1.1261-72).

The final scene in the episode then shows Heracles' great strength, which has been emphasised over and over

⁵³ Cf. KOCH, p.20.

⁵⁴ Polyphemus' reaction lacks the strong emotion of Heracles' reaction which is not surprising as it is Heracles who has raised Hylas not Polyphemus.

throughout Book 1, rendered useless by a rather minor incident. He is here as powerless to find Hylas as Hylas was to save himself. Heracles, who has been referred to in this episode as *πελώριον* (1.1242), is no longer mighty but is here characterized by "utter demoralization"⁵⁵. The final picture of Heracles shows him at the height of his desperation and rage - standing still, bellowing with all his might - and this is the picture which remains in the reader's mind as the narrative switches abruptly back to the Argonauts (1.1273ff.).

So Heracles is depicted as a mighty hero whose extraordinary strength and valour are regarded with awe by the other Argonauts. His abstinence from sensual pleasures serves only to heighten their respect for him. He does, however, tend to act in his own self-interests in pursuit of personal glory, as a Homeric hero would, and to be ruthless when he takes a notion to be. His strength has its limits and his frustration knows no bounds when he is helpless.

⁵⁵ LEVIN (1971), p.126.

SECTION F: DETAILED APPRECIATION 1.1172-86

The opening lines of the "Hylas-episode" (1.1172-86) as already noted above under structure are divided neatly into three sub-sections each five lines long⁵⁶. The first five lines form an ἤμος clause which also functions as a comparison⁵⁷. They are a sharp departure from what preceded: the rowing contest which ended with Heracles sulking after his oar broke (1.1153-71). The rustic scene removes the reader from the epic mission and in fact is not immediately recognisable as a comparison.⁵⁸ As Carspecken notes⁵⁹, in contrast to Homer,

⁵⁶ Both THIERSTEN, p.50 and PREININGER, p.3 prefer to see this section as breaking down 5-2-3-5.

⁵⁷ HUNTER (1988), p.451 notes that ἤμος ...τῆμος is often used by Apollonius as a simile (cf. HUNTER (1986), p.54). In addition, FRÄNKEL (1968), p.141 notes that each time ἤμος ...τῆμος is used in the Argonautica it is to mark a transition from day to night or *vica versa*.

⁵⁸ By contrast the ἤμος clause in the Iliad (11.86ff.) to which this bears a resemblance (as noted by MOONEY, p.142, KOCH, p.11 and FRÄNKEL (1968), p.141) does not act as a simile: ἤμος δὲ δρυτόμος περ ἄνῃρ ὠπλίσατο δείπνον οὐρεὸς ἐν βήσσησιν, ἐπεὶ τ' ἐκορέσσατο χεῖρας τάμνων δένδρεα μάκρᾳ, ἄδος τε μιν ἴκετο θυμόν, σίτου τε γλυκεροῦο περιφρένας ἕμερος αἰρεῖ.

KOCH, p.13 also notes a resemblance to Od. 13.31-54 which is not a temporal clause but which compares Odysseus to a hard-working labourer who is happy to see the end of the day.

⁵⁹ CARSPACKEN, p.67.

"Apollonius has chosen to vary his introductory particles as much as possible, that his reader may not be made instantly aware of the approaching simile."

The τῆμος clause and the following three lines (1.1177-81) complete the temporal clause/comparison. The Argonauts land in Mysia, are welcomed by the friendly inhabitants and are given food and drink. The major explicit points of comparison are a) the time: the Argonauts land in Mysia at the same time as the labourer arrives home after a hard day of work, and b) the weariness and hunger of the labourer and Argonauts. Apollonius tells of the weariness of the Argonauts at 1.1161ff. and then follows by emphasising the weariness of the labourer in the temporal clause (1.1174 τετρυμένα and 1.1175 περιτρύβεις). Besides having a strenuous day of work, both the labourer and Argonauts are hungry. The labourer desires his dinner (1.1173) and curses his belly (1.1176) while the Argonauts are given food and drink by the Mysians because they are in need of it (1.1181 δευομένους).

Carspecken⁶⁰ points out that, in the Argonautica,

"it not infrequently happens that details useful to or significant for the action are, in fact, not stated in the narrative but suggested to the imagination by a simile."

and the same thing holds true for this temporal clause/comparison. Additional information about the Argonauts can be inferred from the description of the

⁶⁰ CARSPECKEN, pp.87-8.

labourer. Likely they are as glad to reach land as the labourer is to reach his home (1.1173 ἀσπασίως); their hands, possibly rubbed raw from rowing correspond to the labourer's work-worn hands (1.1175); their appearance is likely as dishevelled as that of the labourer who is parched with dust (1.1175). These oblique references serve to enrich the narrative and bind it more closely with the temporal clause itself.

The points of contrast however are equally important if not more so. First, the contrast is made between the lone labourer and the company of heroes. Also Fränkel rightly points out that the reasons why the labourer and Argonauts are tired and hungry are contrary, "die Helden haben sich so angestrengt nicht um ihrem 'Bauch' zu dienen sondern um der sportlichen Ehre willen".⁶¹ Further, for the labourer this is a never-ending daily occurrence while for the Argonauts it is a single incident;⁶² all of which serves to emphasise how far removed the voyage is from daily life.

Emphasis is also placed on the fact that the labourer is going to his own home (1.1173 αὐτῶν ἐστίν ; 1.1174 αὐτοῦ ... προμοδῆ) whereas the Argonauts are arriving in a strange land. The latter is stressed by the use of proper names which designate remote geographical features (1.1177-8 ... Κλανίδος ἤθεα γαίης | ἀμφ' Ἀργυρῶνελον ὄρος προχόας τε Κίολο;

⁶¹ FRÄNKEL (1968), p.142.

⁶² FRÄNKEL (1968), p.141.

1.1179 *Μυσοί*). The artful presentation of 1.1178 with the chiasmus involving proper names which thus draws attention to the names, assonance (ο), alliteration (α), and juxtaposition of ὄρος προχόας further highlights the fact that this is a strange remote land. The description of the labourer is in fact given with much more intimate detail than the more general description of the Argonauts.

The remaining five lines (1.1182-6) of this opening section deal with the Argonauts' actions once they have landed and received provisions from the Mysians. The division of labour and co-operation among the Argonauts is described at 1.1182ff. and emphasised by the following chiasmus: οἱ ... τοῖ (1.1182)... τοῖ (1.1184)... οἱ (1.1185); and the imperfect verbs (1.1183 φέρον, 1.1184 δυνεύεσκον, 1.1185 πονέοντο) seem to have a continuous force giving the impression of a busy, active scene. The recitation of the rather mundane tasks is enlivened by various poetical devices: alliteration in 1.1183 (φ and α), and in 1.1185 (κ); homoeoteleuton in 1.1183 (ον); assonance in 1.1185 (η and ε); juxtaposition in 1.1185 (οἶνον κρητῆρσι); chiasmus in which the μῆλα and μέθυ given by the Mysians (1.1181) turn into οἶνον and δαῖτα for the Argonauts (1.1185), and fifth foot spondees in 1.1183, 1184, 1186.⁶³

⁶³ HUNTER (1989), p.42 writes "Verses, and particularly a successive pair of verses, with fifth-foot spondees are a favoured Hellenistic mannerism".

KÖHNKEN (1965), p.35 notes a correspondence between 1.1182b-1184a and Callimachus Hymn 3.163-165 (... παρὰ δέ

The last reported action (1.1186) was in fact the first carried out but by its position it is given impact. The Argonauts, before carrying out all their duties listed in 1.1182-5, had sacrificed to Apollo Ecbasius. This position of the line as well as the emphatic positions of Ἐκβασίῳ and Ἀπόλλωνι (framing the line) serve to emphasise the careful consideration of the Argonauts for the gods, particularly the appropriate god, in this case the god of landing.

It is worthwhile here to illustrate Hunter's remark that "When the same thing has to be said twice - a situation Apollonius is at pains to avoid - variety of expression is the guiding principle."⁶⁴ In this first section, for example, Apollonius has described the land and its inhabitants in three separate ways: 1.1177 κλανίδος ἤθεα γαίης ; 1.1179 Μυσοῖ ; 1.1180 ἐνναέται κείνης χθονός (cf. also 1.1222 ἀγχίγυοι περιναίεται). Rare repetition in expression then must be meant to highlight some aspect, for example, ἄσπετον in 1.1181 and 1.1183 (in the same metrical position both times) seems to be emphasising the wealth of the Mysians and their land, as well as the relative luxury

σφισι πουλὴ νέμεσθαι | Ἥρης ἐκ λειμῶνος ἀμυσάμεναι φορέουσιν |
 ὠκύθοον τραπετήλον ...) and suggests that Apollonius is showing dependence on Callimachus here. If this is so the learned allusion would add further interest to the passage.

⁶⁴ HUNTER (1989), p.39. Cf. also ELDERKIN, pp.198-201.

enjoyed by the Argonauts, all compared to the poverty of the labourer.

The overall tone of this opening section is calm and relaxed. The friendly relations between the Argonauts and Mysians, emphasised in 1.1179-80 (ἐν ξείνῳ Μυσοῖ φιλότιτι κίωντας | δευδέχεται), give the reader a false sense of security. Just as in the previous incident with the Doliones where the similar friendly welcome (1.961ff.) belied the coming war, the peaceful reception here belies the tragic loss of Heracles. This section then serves to heighten the impact of what is to come, and makes Heracles' treatment of the friendly Mysians over Hylas' disappearance (1.1348ff.) seem even more excessive.⁶⁵

Hutchinson⁶⁶ remarks that,

"Hellenistic poets commonly derive their effects and their impact from piquant combination of, or delicate hovering between the serious and the unserious, the grand and the less grand."

Here in this first section this is seen not only in the combination of the description of the labourer's daily life with that of the heroes' unique voyage but also by the combination of the mundane tasks with the mystical far-off land of the Mysians (1.1177ff.).

⁶⁵ KÖHNKEN (1965), p.37 suggests that the Mysians are introduced to confirm from where the provisions for the meal came.

⁶⁶ HUTCHINSON, p.11.

SECTION G: DETAILED APPRECIATION 1.1187-1206

In the second section of the "Hylas-episode" the focus shifts from the Argonauts as a group to Heracles as an individual. This along with the elaborate ring-composition (see above under structure) serves to set this section off from what has preceded. The opening lines (1.1187-9) highlight Heracles' special position among the Argonauts at the last time he will have direct contact with them as a group. The suggestion here is that the Argonauts still regard Heracles as their unofficial leader and he acknowledges it by giving a command (1.1187 ἐπιτεῖλας emphatically placed last in the line). So it comes as no surprise in 1.1284ff. that the Argonauts feel the loss of Heracles so keenly.

It is however not immediately clear who is giving the command in 1.1187 and this further highlights Heracles' position. It might initially be assumed to be Jason, who as leader would presumably be the one issuing commands. The delayed νῆος Διός in 1.1188 dispels that notion and narrows the choice to Polydeuces, Castor or Heracles⁶⁷ but there is no doubt after 1.1188b-89 that it is Heracles to whom the

⁶⁷ LEVIN (1971), p.30 lists these three as the Argonauts who can claim Zeus as their father.

in 1.1187 refers, as he is the one who recently broke an oar.

The ensuing description of Heracles' task-uprooting a tree - is given in great detail. This a) keeps the narrative pace slow, b) suggests that some time was required to carry out the task (allowing time for Hylas to be abducted) and c) contributes to the calm atmosphere established in the previous section, giving no hint of the extraordinary drama which follows.

The next four lines (1.1190-3) describe the tree (1.1190 ἐλάτῳ) that Heracles found for his oar. The stress seems to be upon the suitability of the tree - few branches, little foliage, and as tall and broad as a poplar shaft. From Homer it is known that pine was a suitable material for oars (Il. 7.5; Od. 12.172)⁶⁸ but why Apollonius included the comparison to the poplar is not as clear.⁶⁹ It is also mentioned by Homer, along with fir and alder, as suitable for ship building (Od. 5.239). It cannot add much to stress the notion of height because pine trees are often said to be

⁶⁸ Pine is also suitable for boats (Od. 5.239). In fact the Argo herself, although Apollonius does not specifically say so (only 2.1188 δούρατα Πηλίου ὄρους) was supposedly made from the pine trees on Pelion (Catullus 64.1ff.).

⁶⁹ I am not sure that this can be classified as anything other than a comparison although WILKINS, p.164 lists it as a simile. CARSPECKEN, p.61 does not include it in his list of extended similes (i.e. one or more hexameter lines) but on the other hand he includes 1.1172-6 which is not strictly a simile either.

tall (Il. 5.560, 14.287; Od. 5.239).⁷⁰ It is possible that it allows for a clearer picture of the position of the few branches on the tree (cf. Il. 4.482ff. πέσεν αἴγελρος ὡς, | ἢ ῥά τ' ἐν εἰαμενῆ ἔλεος μέγαλοιο πεφύκελ | λείγ, ἀτάρ τέ οἱ ὄζοι ἐπ' ἀκροτάτῃ πεφύασι) and thus highlights the tree's suitability.⁷¹

Once Heracles has found the tree he acts quickly (1.1194 ῥίμφα) but Apollonius' lengthy description of Heracles' actions contrasts with the use of the word ῥίμφα . Two lines are required to explain that Heracles laid down his quiver, bow and lion-skin with each item slightly emphasised by its position (1.1194 φάρετρην ; 1.1195 λέοντος at the end of their respective lines and 1.1195 τόξοισιν at the end of its clause). These lines, as well as the ensuing ones on his strength, build up a picture of Heracles as the mighty hero; thus providing a greater contrast to the coming event in which Heracles' weapons and strength will be useless.

The action of pulling up the tree is described over the course of five lines (1.1196-1200) and further elaborated by a four line simile (1.1201-4). As already noted (see above under Heracles' character) these nine lines

⁷⁰ For tall poplars cf. Od. 7.106, 10.510.

⁷¹ MOONEY, p.143 has noted the similarity between 1.1193 and Od. 9.324 (τόσσον ἔην μήκος, τόσσον πάχος εἰσ — οράσθαι). Perhaps then this is a learned allusion used by Apollonius to enliven the description of the tree.

highlight Heracles' great strength. His bronze-laden club is required to shake loose the tree (1.1196) but thereafter he relies on his own strength (1.1198 ἤνορέῃ πίσυνοσ , the noun emphatically placed at the beginning of the line, the adjective stressed by placement at the end of the clause). Great attention is given to Heracles' physical position as he raises the tree: his legs (1.1199), his shoulders (1.1198) and most particularly his hands (1.1197). The word order in 1.1197 seems to mimic Heracles' action: the words ἀμφοτέρῃσι and χερσίν surround στύπος .

1.1200 opens with another word describing Heracles' physical position (προσφύς) and initially has a preponderance of long syllables which suggests that this portion of the task was a bit slower. The reason for this is explained in the second half of 1.1200 (σὺν αὐτοῖς ἔχμασι γαίης).

Heracles' action is compared to a sudden gust of wind tearing a mast off a ship (1.1201-4). The obvious correspondences are the following: the tree to the mast of the ship (1.1201 ἴστων νεός)⁷²; the roots of the tree to the forestays (1.1204 προτόνων); the clumps of earth attached to the roots to the wedges (1.1204 σφήνεσιν), a correspondence heightened by a verbal echo (1.1200 αὐτοῖς

⁷² 1.1193 was noted to be similar to Od. 9.324, part of a simile in which a tree was being compared to a mast on a ship. Apollonius could therefore be making a second allusion to this Homeric passage as both 1.1193 and 1.1201 are compared to the same tree (1.1190 ἐλάτῃν).

and 1.1204 ἀντοῖσι); Heracles himself to the wind; his quick action (1.1194 ῥίμφα) to the wind's swiftness (1.1203 θοῇ); and his great strength to the wind's force which is stressed by the reference to Orion (1.1202).⁷³ Carspecken notes that Apollonius tends to compose "similes with multiple points of comparison, paralleling the narrative as closely as possible"⁷⁴ and this can certainly be seen here in this simile.

A. James has noted that this simile bears some resemblance to a line in Homer (Od. 12.409 ἴστού δὲ προτόνους ἔρρηξ' ἀνέμοιο θύελλα)⁷⁵, and he and other scholars have noted other similarities to Aratus and Callimachus⁷⁶, but in none of these is there a parallel for 1.1202. It is a particularly well-crafted, well-balanced line (abab, nominative/genitive cases; aabb adjective/noun;

⁷³ For Orion's connection with storms see Hesiod, Works and Days 621ff. (as noted by MOONEY, p.143 and VIAN, p.107).

⁷⁴ CARSPECKEN, p.85. Cf. also JAMES (1969), p.77. Not everything however is parallel, for example, the wind strikes unexpectedly (1.1201 ἀπροφάτως), is destructive and purposeless whereas Heracles' action is deliberate and premeditated.

⁷⁵ JAMES (1981), p.61.

⁷⁶ Aratus, Phaenomena 422ff. (εἰ δὲ κε νηὶ | ὑψόθεν, ἐμπλήξῃ δεινῇ ἀνέμοιο θύελλα | αὐτῶς ἀπροφάτως τὰ δὲ λαίφρα πάντα τινάξῃ) and Callimachus, Hecale fr.238.29 Pfeiffer (θοῇ βορέαο κατάξ). Cf. JAMES (1981), p.61; MOONEY, p.143; FRÄNKEL (1968), p.143; VIAN, p.107; ARDIZZONI, p.258. The Homeric reference is perhaps stronger evidence for doctrina in this passage since dependence on either Aratus or Callimachus would be difficult to prove.

juxtaposition of the adjectives; and assonance of ο, ω and υ which seems to elevate the style of the simile.

The final two lines of this section as already discussed above under structure provide a ring-composition making the section self-contained. They help to emphasise that the task was carried out successfully and there is still little reason to suspect the disaster that follows. They further highlight by repetition Heracles' might and accoutrements, both of which are soon to be of no use. Also Heracles has been portrayed as efficient and unemotional in this passage, aspects of his character that will be completely inverted in the following event when he becomes helpless and emotional (1.1261-72).

SECTION H: DETAILED APPRECIATION 1.1207-1239

The complex structure of the central section of the "Hylas-episode" has already been discussed, as have the major parallels and contrasts between it and the preceding and following sections, but it remains to examine in detail how Apollonius specifically develops these points.

The focus shifts here from Heracles whose enormous physical power has just been highlighted to his youthful attendant Hylas. The general content of the first four lines (1.1207-10) corresponds to the first three lines of the previous section (1.1187-9) and to the first three lines of the following section (1.1240-2). Each group of lines identifies who the principal figure in the passage is and what his task is. Hylas is named (1.1207) immediately after the explanatory adverb $\tau\acute{o}\phi\rho\alpha$ (which itself indicates that the action is simultaneous to that of Heracles). He has no attributes such as Heracles has (1.1194-6, 1.1205-6) by which he might be identified, he is not of divine parentage as Heracles is (1.1188) and because this is only his second appearance in the epic he cannot be easily identified by some preceding event such as Heracles is (1.1188-9). This accentuates the contrast between the great hero and his young companion.

Like Heracles Hylas is alone (1.1207 νόσφιν ὀμίλου)⁷⁷. A similar phrase in the succeeding section about Polyphemus (1.1240 οἶος ἑταίρων) is given the same position in the line, subtly linking the two sections. Also the object of his search - water for Heracles (1.1208 ὡς κέ οἱ ὕδωρ) is highlighted by being in the same metrical position (occupying the last two feet of the second line of the section) as the object of Heracles' search (1.1188 ὡς κεν ἔρετμόν). This parallel structure serves to emphasise further the disparity between their tasks.

Hylas is of course acting not for himself as Heracles is (1.1189 οἱ κούρω) but for Heracles (1.1208 οἱ ...1.1210 ἰόντι).⁷⁸ That Heracles has someone to carry out his supper preparations etc. for him further sets him apart from the other Argonauts who must divide up the duties among themselves.

There is still no sign of the coming disaster at this point. 1.1207-10 describe a mundane task just as 1.1182-6 did and add to the calm, peaceful atmosphere already established in the opening sections of the episode.

⁷⁷ For other parallels and contrasts between Hylas and Heracles see the section on structure.

⁷⁸ Heracles is still not named presumably because it is clear that as Heracles' squire (1.131 ἐσθλὸς ὀπάων) Hylas would only be carrying out such duties for Heracles himself. In addition Heracles has been the only one said to have left the camp; therefore he is logically the only one who could be returning.

Cf. n.32 for the question of Hylas' motivation.

Next Apollonius embarks on a digression concerning Hylas' past (1.1211-20), the opening lines of which (1.1211-12) provide an explanation for Hylas' activities. R.L. Hunter speaks of Callimachus using "a narrative technique which avoids the expected both in logic and chronology" and says that Apollonius employs this technique to a lesser degree.⁷⁹ This technique seems to be in use in this digression as Apollonius a) employs a flashback and b) switches the focus back to Heracles.

Apollonius' version of the story of Theiodamas and Heracles is different both from that given in the Scholia on 1.1212-19a⁸⁰ and those of his contemporary Callimachus, primarily in the reason behind Heracles' murder of Theiodamas. Köhnken suggests that Callimachus himself gives three versions of the story⁸¹, all different from

⁷⁹ HUNTER (1989), p.35.

⁸⁰ The story related by the scholiast is as follows: After killing the centaur Nessus, Heracles arrives in the land of the Dryopians with his wife Deianeira and his son Hyllos. As his son was hungry he asked Theiodamas for food, was refused, and so killed one of Theiodamas' oxen. Theiodamas then led a force of Dryopians against Heracles and Heracles was forced even to arm his wife. Heracles won the battle, killed Theiodamas, received Theiodamas' son Hylas and resettled the Dryopians because of their piracy.

⁸¹ KÖHNKEN (1965), p.52 distinguishes the following different accounts: a) Aetia 1 frag. 24-5 Pfeiffer, in which Heracles meets with Theiodamas and begs food for his hungry son. When Theiodamas refuses Heracles kills him. This bears some resemblance to the story related in the Scholia (see n.80), b) Aetia 1 frag. 22-3 Pfeiffer, in which Heracles demands food from a poor Lindian farmer, is refused, and in turn kills an ox anyway and eats it. KÖHNKEN presumes this is a variant of the Theiodamas story

Apollonius', and he further surmises that Apollonius borrowed from all three in creating this version.⁸² Whether or not this is true it is difficult to prove, and it is likely that there were earlier traditions upon which Apollonius could also have drawn.⁸³

perhaps influenced by the later confusion (e.g. Philostratus, Imag. 2.24) of Theiodamas with the Lindian farmer (cf. Apollodorus 2.5.11 and FRAZER'S note pp.226-7 in the LOEB edition (reprint 1976)) and bases his argument (for Callimachean influence on Apollonius) on the verbal echoes between frag.22 and Argonautica 1.1214-5. That this is truly a version of the same story is questionable, and c) Hymn 3, 159-61 in which it is said that οὐ γὰρ ὁ γέ φρυγίη, περ ὑπὸ δρυὶ γυῖα θεωθεῖς | παύσατ' ἀδηφαγίης· ἔτι οἱ πάρα νηδὺς ἐκείνη | τῇ ποτ' ἀροτρίωντι συνήντετο Θελοδάμαντι which seems to give a different motive for killing Theiodamas (i.e. gluttony) than that given in Aetia 1 frag. 24-5 (finding food for his hungry son).

⁸² KÖHNKEN (1965), pp.53ff., suggests, rather fancifully I think, that Apollonius relied most heavily on the account in Hymn 3, basing his evidence on vague verbal echoes and the fact that he already has connected (p.35) some earlier lines in the passage (1.1182b-84a) to this same hymn (3.163-5) (see n.63). The account in Hymn 3 however centers around Heracles' gluttony and there is no notion of this in Apollonius' account. KÖHNKEN believes that Apollonius meant for Heracles' gluttony (as a pretext for demanding the ox) to be understood.

VIAN, pp.46-7, believes that "sa source principale est le récit callimacheen relatif à Theiodamas (Aitia, fr.24-25 Pf.)" and also that "Il [Apollonius] emprunte quelques traits à l'histoire du paysan de Lindos qui précédait immédiatement dans les Aitia." In conclusion however he does suggest (p.48) that "Les sources d'Apollonios sont trop mal connues pour autoriser une conclusion assurée; il paraît du moins certain que la poète a tenté une synthèse entre la version de Callimaque et des traditions antérieures."

⁸³ HUNTER (1989), p.7. It is thought that Aetia 1 predates the Argonautica (cf. HUTCHINSON, p.40, n.27) but it is not certain, and the evidence for the Hymns predating the Argonautica seems even slimmer.

As noted above the focus switches back to Heracles in the digression (1.1211 αὐτὸς). It is however not an abrupt switch as each line logically proceeds back in time from the next until 1.1214 and Hylas is still part of the picture in 1.1211-12. That Hylas was very young when Heracles took him is highlighted by νηπίαχον (1.1212), and the length of time during which Heracles has raised him to be his attendant (see above under Hylas' character; and 1.1211 τοιοῦσιν ἐν ἡθεσιν) further explains his quickness and efficiency in carrying out his duties. Heracles' action towards Hylas (1.1211 ἔφερβε) strongly contrasts with his action towards Hylas' father (1.1213 ἔπεφνεν). Heracles' pitiless (1.1214 νηλεῶς) slaying of noble (1.1213 δίου)⁸⁴ Theiodamas seems more shocking in light of his treatment of Hylas particularly in view of 1.1214-17. In these four lines the reason why Heracles slew Theiodamas is curiously repeated twice and several verbal echoes highlight this: a) 1.1214 βροῦς and 1.1217 βροῦν, b) 1.1214 γεωμόρου and 1.1215 γῆρας τέμνεσκεν, c) 1.1215 ἀρότρῳ and 1.1217 ἀρότην and d) particularly the notion of Theiodamas' resistance 1.1214 ἀντιόωντα and 1.1217 οὐκ ἐθέλοντα . At this point the only

⁸⁴ KÖHNKEN (1965), p.48 poses the problem of Theiodamas' identity: "wenn seinetwegen ein Krieg zwischen Herakles und den Dryopern entstehen konnte (1218), muss er eine bedeutende Rolle in diesem Volk gespielt haben". Then after some examination of the problem he notes that while this cannot be determined from Callimachus, the Scholia on Hymn 3,161 call Theiodamas βασιλεύς Δρυόπων (p.55 and cf. p.46, n.5). ARDIZZONI, p.261 concurs. The adjective δίου seems to support this view.

motive given explaining why Heracles killed Theiodamas seems to be that he did not get his way, recalling the more primitive side of Heracles' nature which Apollonius seems to have suppressed up until this moment. It comes as a surprise then to learn in 1.1218-19 that Heracles actually had a higher motive and that the argument over the bull was only a pretext in order to start a war against the lawless Dryopians, which implies that Heracles knew that Theiodamas would refuse to give him the bull.⁸⁵

⁸⁵ It is puzzling that Apollonius provides two motives for Heracles' actions when either one would suffice. The notion that Heracles wishes to wage war against the Dryopians because of their lawlessness seems to undercut his own statement that Heracles acted *νηλεῶς*, which itself is emphasised by the repetition of the argument over the bull. This apparent contradiction has not been satisfactorily addressed by a) KÖHNKEN (1965), pp.48ff., who raises and answers five problems in connection with the text but relies perhaps too heavily on Callimachean influence. If Apollonius was trying to make reference to all three Callimachean versions of the story it might explain the awkwardness but it seems more likely that an earlier tradition existed. For example, according to the Scholia (Schol. Ap. Rhod. 1.1212-19a) the historian Pherecydes (c. fifth century B.C.) wrote of the Dryopians - *ληστρικὸν δὲ τὸ ἔθνος ὁμοροῦν τοῖς Μηλιεῦσιν*. It is possible therefore that Apollonius is referring to this in 1.1219, b) LAWALL, p.126, skirts the issue by simply saying "In order to have a pretext for war on the insolent Dryopians, Heracles acts against Theiodamas without pity or moral justification. The man of indomitable brawn emerges as a harsh servitor of justice, and in so doing he again reveals his primitive nature." The problem is that it is emphasised that he acts without moral justification and then contradicted (1.1218-9). Surely the fact that the Dryopians were living lawlessly was reason enough to start a war. For example, Heracles needed no other pretext to mutilate King Erginus' envoys than that Erginus was acting unjustly towards the Thebans (Apollodorus 2.4.11), c) LEVIN (1971), chapter seven, *passim*, does not particularly deal with Theiodamas at all (cf. p.117, n.5) and d) FRÄNKEL (1968), pp.144-5, as already noted (see n.51) sidesteps the issue by emending the

κρήνην in 1.1221). This return to the main narrative is short, just long enough to note that Hylas has reached the spring (1.1221-22a). By naming the spring (1.1222 Πηγὰς , emphatically placed first in the line) and stating that it is so called by the people living in the area, Apollonius not only shows geographical erudition but also grounds the scene firmly in reality, thereby setting up a sharper contrast with the following description of a supernatural world. Thus naming the spring at 1.1222 has more impact than if it had been named at 1.1208.

Apollonius then digresses for five and a half lines (1.1222b-1227) on the activities of the nymphs in the area, setting the stage for the supernatural world which Hylas is soon to join. This digression like the previous one (1.1211-20) slows the pace of the narrative. It also sets up a structural parallel between the real world and the supernatural world (as noted in the section on structure). The nymphs are parallel to the Argonauts and the nymph of Pegae to Heracles.

Köhnken notes that the description of the nymphs goes from the general to the specific⁸⁸: beginning with all the nymphs of the headland (1.1222b-1225), then the division of the nymphs by their haunts (1.1226-7) and finally the one nymph of the spring (1.1228ff.). This is also true for the

⁸⁸ KÖHNKEN (1965), pp.57f., compares this method of description to the focusing of a camera.

description of the Argonauts (1.1177ff.).⁸⁹ In both cases the focus narrows to the most important figures, highlighting Heracles (1.1187ff.) and likewise the nymph (1.1228ff.).

Emphasis is placed on the nymphs as a group (πάσας last in 1.1223 and ὄσσε first in 1.1224) in order to contrast them with the single nymph in 1.1228ff. (emphasised by ἡ̄ (first in 1.1228) and the delayed νύμφῃ (first in 1.1229)). Also emphasised is the goddess whom the nymphs are worshipping - Ἄρτεμιν (first in 1.1225). This contrasts with the later revelation that the solitary nymph is inflamed by Aphrodite (1.1233 Κύπρις - highlighted by its initial position in enjambement). Levin notes that the "performance of rites to the chaste goddess Artemis (1222-1227) forms an ironic background to the amorous scene being enacted close by".⁹⁰

1.1228-29a describe the nymph of Pegae. Köhnken suggests that the introduction of a single nymph is not surprising here because Apollonius has already established that nymphs are common on the Mysian headland.⁹¹ However there does seem to be a slight surprise to find a nymph

⁸⁹ The breakdown of 1.1177ff. is as follows: all the Argonauts (1.1177-81), the Argonauts divided into groups by activity (1.1182-6), and the single Argonaut Heracles (1.1187ff.).

⁹⁰ LEVIN (1971), p.117.

⁹¹ KÖHNKEN (1965), p.58.

alone after *πάσκις* in 1.1223 particularly after the nymphs are said to be far off (1.1227 *ἀπόπροθεν ἐστιχόωντο*).

The remainder of this section (1.1229b-39) is full of suspense and delays before the action to which it all builds - the abduction of Hylas - is completed (in the last half line, 1239b). Apollonius skilfully slows the narrative pace by elaborating every small detail. Köhnken suggests that the tension and suspense are also increased by the pause at the end of the phrase in 1.1229 *νύμφη ἐφ'ὕδατι* and the "Klangeffekt des doppelten Upsilon".⁹²

As already noted there is little description of the setting. Vian writes⁹³,

"Apollonius ne relève que deux détails utiles à l'action: le charme de l'eau, symbolisant la beauté de la Nymphé, et la clair de lune, dont les rayons transfigurent Hylas."

The description of the spring (1.1228 *καλλιπάρωλο*) is as vague as the part of the following description of Hylas which echoes it (1.1230 *κάλλιεῦ*). The scene seems to freeze here in 1.1229b-1232a as the nymph catches sight of Hylas standing at the spring. Apollonius portrays Hylas through the nymph's eyes in a line (1.1230) heightened by the considered placement of Hylas' attributes (see the section on Hylas' character), internal rhyme, repetition of *κ* and *χ*

⁹² KÖHNKEN (1965), p.62.

⁹³ VIAN, p.42.

sounds and literary reminiscence.⁹⁴ The importance of the moonlight which is here mentioned for the first time (1.1231-2) - the subject *σεληναίη*, held back until the end of the clause for emphasis - is discussed in the section on setting.

The phrase immediately following the description of the moonlight on Hylas (1.1232 *τῆς δὲ φρένας ἐπτοίγησεν*) strongly echoes the construction of the phrase immediately before (1.1229 *τὸν δὲ σχεδὸν εἶδενόησεν*) as noted by both Fränkel and Köhnken.⁹⁵ This serves to frame the scene, the second phrase (1.1232) relating what resulted from the first (1.1229) - the nymph saw Hylas and fell in love because he looked so beautiful in the moonlight.

Köhnken's suggestion⁹⁶ that Apollonius gives the nymph time to recover from her *ἄμνηχανίη* (1.1233) before she attacks Hylas by describing Hylas fetching water seems fanciful. The time frame of the whole scene is short and purposely slowed down to create a more suspenseful effect,

⁹⁴ ARDIZZONI, p.264, notes a resemblance between 1.1230 and *Od.* 6.237 (*.κάλλει καὶ χάρισι στίλβων ...*) said of Odysseus as Nausicaa looks on. Cf. also KOCH, p.27 who notes that the intervention of Athena heightened Odysseus' charms whereas here Apollonius makes the moonlight heighten Hylas' charms, "um im Bereich des Natürlichen zu bleiben". ARDIZZONI also notes that further on in the *Argonautica* it is said of Jason (3.443-4 *μετέπρεπεν Αἴσονος υἱὸς | κάλλει καὶ χαρίτεσσιν*) as Medea looks on. Medea, like the nymph (1.1233) is struck by Aphrodite (through Eros)(3.276ff.). Cf. LEVIN (1971), p.127,n.2.

⁹⁵ FRÄNKEL (1968), p.146; KÖHNKEN (1965), p.63.

⁹⁶ KÖHNKEN (1965), p.64.

not to reflect the actual time of the action. 1.1233 seems merely to describe symptoms of love and Apollonius does not mention any ceasing of these symptoms as the narrative progresses.⁹⁷

Hylas' physical position is stressed in 1.1235 (λέχρις ἐπιχρημφθείς) and Köhnken suggests that this unbalanced position explains why it was so easy for the nymph to pull him in.⁹⁸ It also makes for a more real and vivid picture. That Hylas actually got water in the pitcher is confirmed not only by ἔρεισε⁹⁹ but also by 1.1235b-1236a in which is described the sound the water made inside the pitcher (1.1235 ἔβραχεν ...1.1236 χαλκὸν ἐς ἡχήμεντα). This is the only sound in the whole scene (1.1228ff.) and contrasts sharply with the otherwise eerie silence. It adds further to the suspense by describing the action in agonizing detail as the pace seems to get slower and slower.

Finally in great detail Apollonius relates the movements of the nymph as she reaches to grab Hylas (1.1236b-39). First she places her left arm around his neck and the action is echoed by the word order in 1.1237 as λαῖὸν

⁹⁷ ARDIZZONI, p.264, again notes a resemblance to a Homeric line: *Il.* 21.417 μόλις δ' ἐσκαίρειτο θυμόν ; and a later reference in the *Argonautica* 3.634 μόλις δ' ἐσκαίρειτο θυμόν, significantly again applied to Medea (cf.n.94).

KOCH, p.24 remarks on the charming contrast between the unsuspecting boy and the nymph who is dazed with love.

⁹⁸ KÖHNKEN (1965), p.65.

⁹⁹ KÖHNKEN (1965), p.64.

... πῆχυν not only frame the line but also enclose ἀγχένος .¹⁰⁰ Further slowing down the chain of events, adding more suspense by breaking up the physical description, Apollonius marks the nymph's thoughts as she is attacking Hylas (1.1238 κύσσει ἐπιθύουσα τέρεν στόμα). She then draws down Hylas' elbow with her right hand and again the clause is framed (1.1238 δεξιτερῆ ...1.1239 χειρί) and the elbow (ἀγκῶν) enclosed within as the words mimic the action.¹⁰¹ There is a pause at the end of this clause and then an abrupt final comment (1.1239 μέσση δ' ἐνὶ κάββαλε δίνη) which comes as something of a surprise as there is no hint of struggle from Hylas. It does however reflect reality. The motion of the nymph, while described slowly, is in fact swift and Hylas would have been completely taken by surprise and therefore unable to react. This last clause is again framed (μέσση ...δίνη) and although Hylas has been drawn down into the middle of the spring the absence of any pronoun etc. denoting his presence in this last action is perhaps indicative of his physical disappearance from sight. There is also a tricolon decrescendo in these last three and one half lines (1.1236 αὐτίκα ...1.1238 στόμα; 1.1238 δεξιτερῆ ...

¹⁰⁰ This observation was made independently of KOCH, who also notes it (p.24).

¹⁰¹ The great attention to anatomical detail here recalls the description of Heracles pulling up the tree and adds realism to this other-worldly event.

KOCH, p.26 remarks that the motivation of the rape κύσσει ἐπιθύουσα ... is framed by the "Werkzeugen" of the rape, i.e. the left and right arms.

1.1239 χερσί ; 1.1239 μέση...δίνη) which also contributes to the picture of Hylas disappearing. Hylas at this point totally vanishes from the narrative (apart from mention of his cry 1.1240 and 1.1260) which also reflects his sudden physical disappearance.

The actual abduction of Hylas is the key event that will part Heracles from the Argonauts and is therefore appropriately treated in detail (three lines 1.1237-9) and is the climax to which this section advances. The pace is extremely slow because of digressions and detailed description and this has a dreamlike quality; everything seems to be happening in slow motion. There is an eerie quality to the events once the world of the nymphs is entered and this is emphasised by the moonlit night, the unnatural silence (which the ringing bronze pitcher serves only to heighten), and by the suspenseful manner in which Apollonius presents the scene.

SECTION I: DETAILED APPRECIATION 1.1240-60

The eerie silence with which the previous scene ended is broken here in 1.1240 (τοῦ ... ἰάχοντος) as the narrative returns abruptly to the real world from the supernatural world of the nymph. As Köhnken points out,¹⁰² by positioning the cry at the beginning of this section Apollonius a) attains a smooth transition from the previous scene, and b) provides a motive for the following events.¹⁰³

R.W. Garson suggests that "Structurally Polyphemus' presence is dispensible" and that "the second simile [1.1265-9] loses force" because the dismay over Hylas' disappearance is spread between Polyphemus and Heracles.¹⁰⁴ However a) it has been clearly shown (see above under structure) that the Polyphemus scene is essential to the overall structural design of the episode, b) had this scene been omitted Apollonius would have lost the opportunity for ingeniously including another action (the founding of Cios), c) this scene provides Apollonius with a chance to highlight

¹⁰² KÖHNKEN (1965), p.67.

¹⁰³ KOCH, p.28 suggests that the cry is more effective here than where it logically occurred in the narrative (i.e. after 1.1239a).

¹⁰⁴ GARSON, p.262.

further Heracles' character by contrasting his reaction to Hylas' disappearance with Polyphemos' reaction, d) having two reactions to Hylas' disappearance heightens the impact of the tragic event, contrary to what Garson thinks, and finally e) from the point of view of plot-development, the addition of Polyphemos allows Apollonius to present the news of Hylas' disappearance in a dramatic way.¹⁰⁵

This section constitutes Polyphemos' only reported action in the whole Argonautica. He is mentioned outside this passage a) in the catalogue of heroes (1.40ff.)¹⁰⁶ where he is established as an aged hero who, like Heracles,

¹⁰⁵ Also if there was an existing tradition of a love affair between Hylas and Polyphemos (see chapter 1, n.44) the inclusion of Polyphemos here would have an added interest.

¹⁰⁶ 1.40ff. Λάρσιαν δ' ἐπὶ τοῖσι λιπῶν Πολύφημος ἔκκενεν
Εἰλατίδης, ὃς πρὶν μὲν ἐρωσθενέων Λαπιθάων,
ὅπποτε Κένταυροις Λαπίθαι ἐπὶ θωρήσσοντο,
ὀπλότερος προμάχιζε· τὸτ' αὖ βαρὺ θεσκέαι ἤδη
γυῖα, μένεν δ' ἔτι θυμὸς ἀργίλος ὡς τὸ πάρος περ·

Theseus is usually the hero associated with the battle of the Lapiths and Centaurs. He however is not one of the Argonauts because he is in the underworld with the Lapith king Peirithous at the time of the voyage (1.101ff.). In the following standard accounts of the Lapith/Centaur battle there is no mention of Polyphemos: Diod.Sic. 4.70.3; Plutarch, Theseus 30; Apollodorus, Epitome 1.(Z)21; Pausanius 5.10.8; Hyginus, Fab. 33; Ovid, Met. 12.210-535 (cf. FRAZER'S note in the Loeb edition of Apollodorus, vol.2, p.146).

The implication here is that Polyphemos is past his prime (cf. LEVIN (1971), p.128,n.2), unlike Heracles, which suggests perhaps that he would have been of little use to the Argonauts anyway (with respect to his physical prowess) - hence their lack of dismay at his absence. Later (4.1467ff.) it is discovered that one of the Argonauts, Canthus, was indeed upset over Polyphemos' disappearance but Canthus himself only appears briefly in the epic at this late point.

and unlike the other youthful Argonauts, has already established his heroic prowess¹⁰⁷, and b) in three other places where what happened to him after he was left behind in Mysia is stated (1.1321ff.; 1.1345ff.; and 4.1470ff.).

The first three lines (1.1240-2), as in the previous two sections, set out the principal character in the section - Polyphemus (1.1241) - and his initial task - waiting for Heracles (1.1241-2).¹⁰⁸ Apollonius has, as he did when introducing Heracles (1.1187ff.), delayed actually naming Polyphemus. As far as the reader is aware, Heracles and Hylas have been the only ones to this point who have left the Argonauts' camp and 1.1240 could in fact refer to Heracles as he is both a ἥρως and οἶος ἑταίρων. Therefore it comes as a surprise when the hero is revealed to be Polyphemus (his name effectively positioned last in the clause, 1.1241).

Polyphemus is said to be alone awaiting the arrival of Heracles. No particular motive is given for his actions. Köhnken suggests that Polyphemus has become upset over the

¹⁰⁷ LAWALL, passim.

¹⁰⁸ For a correspondence with 1.1187-9 and 1.1207-10 see above under the detailed appreciation of 1.1207-39.

There are verbal echoes which bind the opening scene of this section to that of the previous section even though this passage is structurally separate because of internal ring-composition: 1.1240 οἶος ἑταίρων and 1.1207 νόσφιν δμίλου (in the same metrical position of the opening lines of their respective sections); 1.1242 ἕκοιτο and 1.1210 ἴοντι (again both in the same position, at the end of the opening passages of the two sections and each time referring to Heracles).

long absence of Heracles and has gone a fair distance to search for him.¹⁰⁹ However Apollonius does not say that Polyphemus is worried nor that he is searching for Heracles but rather that he is waiting for him (1.1242 δέκτο). As already noted (above under chronology and pace) the actual amount of time that has passed since Heracles and Hylas have left the camp cannot have been long as each is going about his task quickly (1.1194 ῥίμφοι, 1.1210 ὀτραλεώς and 1.1221 αἰψα). It is clear also that Polyphemus is not waiting for Heracles at the behest of the Argonauts since the Argonauts do not even realise that either Polyphemus or Heracles is missing until they have sailed away (1.1280ff.). The most reasonable explanation that has been offered for Polyphemus' behaviour in light of the evidence is simply that he was Heracles' friend as both heroes belong to an older generation.¹¹⁰ At any rate, it was fated that he remain behind to found Cios (1.1315ff.).

These opening lines, in addition to introducing Polyphemus, contain the first use of the name Ἡρακλῆς in this episode (1.1242). The adjective which is attached here

¹⁰⁹ KÖHNKEN (1965), p.68.

¹¹⁰ This is suggested by LAWALL, p.124,n.7, and also by FRÄNKEL (1968), p.147 although he arrives at the conclusion by suspect means (see below n.114).

That Polyphemus did belong to an older generation might suggest also that he therefore had a set of values closer to those of Heracles (i.e. more those of a Homeric hero) and also had to be removed from the voyage for that reason. Polyphemus however, unlike Heracles, tried to rejoin the Argo after being left behind (1.1472ff.).

to his name, πελώριον , reinforces the general picture of Heracles that has been given to this point in the epic and anticipates the ironic reversal in Heracles' behavior when he is faced with Hylas' disappearance.¹¹¹

The following seven lines (1.1243-9) describe Polyphemus' initial reaction to the cry with an elaborate simile accounting for four and one half of these lines. Polyphemus is said to rush off to the area where the sound came from, near Pegae (1.1243a), and to shout out when he cannot find Hylas (1.1248-9).

The simile is very closely connected to the narrative. The corresponding elements are as follows: Polyphemus to the wild beast (1.1243-4 θῆρ | ἄγριος)¹¹²; Hylas

¹¹¹ WACE & STUBBINGS, p.31 note that "When the size and strength of some great warriors call for a moment's attention, the usual epithets are abandoned and their place is taken by πελώριος" (e.g. *Il.* 21.527, 22.92). It is very possible that Apollonius is also using πελώριος in the same way here thus emphasising the respect accorded Heracles by the Argonauts and heightening the contrast with his coming helplessness.

¹¹² KÖHNKEN (1965), p.72 specifically calls the θῆρ a lion and cites the Scholia on Apollonius as further evidence (Schol. Ap. Rhod. 1.1243: κυρίως οἱ ποιεῖται τὸν λέοντά φασι θῆρα ὡς καὶ Καλλίμαχος (fg.211 Schn.); "θηρὸς ἀεργάτων δέρμα κατωμάδιον". He suggests that it must be a lion because Theocritus used a lion simile and Köhnken's theory is that Apollonius followed Theocritus. The dictionary (Liddell and Scott) definition of θῆρ is "'a beast of prey' esp. a lion". There seems however no necessity to define what type of wild animal this is (it could be a wolf) since Apollonius effects an interesting twist by comparing Polyphemus to a θῆρ and then having Polyphemus think that Hylas is carried off by wild beasts (see below).

KOCH, pp.30ff. notes that Apollonius does not specify what type of animal the θῆρ is but suggests that it is meant to be understood that it is a lion through Homeric

to the sheep (1.1244 μῆλων); Hylas' cry to the sheep's bleating (1.1244 γῆρυς); the nymph to the herdsmen (1.1246 νομῆες); the spring (1.1243 Πηγέων) to the sheepfolds (1.1246 σταθμοῖσι). The major characters in the simile (1.1243 θῆρ ; 1.1244 μῆλων ; 1.1245 νομῆες) are all placed emphatically at the end of their respective lines. Also Polyphemos' actions closely correspond to the beast's: both go off in the direction of the cry, both fail to find the object of their search and both groan and roar loudly¹¹³ (reinforced by verbal echoes 1.1247 στενάγων and 1.1248 ἔστενεν), and the nymph, like the herdsmen, encloses the object sought (1.1239 for the nymph, and 1.1246-7 for the herdsmen).

The beast is motivated to go in search of the sheep because of hunger (1.1245 λιμῶ δ' αἰθόμενος). Several scholars see this as representative of Polyphemos' sexual desire for Hylas¹¹⁴ but it seems more likely that this is

reminiscences such as Il. 11.544, Od. 6.130-34 from which Apollonius draws the general picture and then adapts it for his own purposes.

¹¹³ Polyphemos is 'roaring' for a different reason: the lion roars because it has been frustrated and is hungry, Polyphemos is calling out Hylas' name in an effort to find him.

¹¹⁴ KÖHNKEN (1965), p.73,n.2 also cites 1.1248 μεγάλ' ἔστενεν and 1.1249 κεκληγώς as alluding to Polyphemos' desire for Hylas. LEVIN (1971), p.128 writes obscurely "his [Polyphemos'] figurative lust is audible". KOCH, p.29,n.1 denies this interpretation, saying that the way Polyphemos reacts is meant to reflect how any of the Argonauts would have acted under the circumstances. BEYE, p.94 says opaquely "Apollonius introduces the bestial eroticism principally through the notion of distraught lovers". His claim that the similes (both Polyphemos' and

simply to explain that the beast's behavior is at least instinctual and can be rationally explained. Polyphemos' action is similarly motivated - he hears the cry of someone he knows and goes to help. Both Polyphemos and the beast are driven by a strong force and are reacting naturally under the circumstances.

Apollonius takes two lines to describe Polyphemos' shouting and groaning (1.1248-9). Each of the words denoting sound is emphasised by being placed last in its clause (1.1248 ἔστεινεν; 1.1249 κεκλήγῳς ; 1.1249 αὐτή).

1.1250-2 then describe Polyphemos' second set of actions and thoughts.¹¹⁵ Upon finding nothing at the spring he fears that Hylas (whom he knows is out alone: 1.1252 μοῦνον ἔοντ') might be the prey of wild animals or that men are carrying him off, and draws his sword only after his calls are met with silence.¹¹⁶ This is entirely logical and shows that Polyphemos is responding rationally to the crisis.

Heracles' (1.1265-9) "are conventional expressions of highly distraught lovers" is unsubstantiated. FRÄNKEL (1968), p.147 conjectures wildly that λιμῶ refers to Polyphemos' actual physical hunger because he has foregone his supper out of companionship for Heracles. There is no evidence for this in the text.

¹¹⁵ See n.15 in the section on structure for a discussion concerning FRÄNKEL'S unnecessary emendation of these lines.

¹¹⁶ Cf. HURST, p.130.

That Polyphemos suspects wild beasts (1.1251 θήρεσσιν) might seize Hylas is rather ironic as he himself has just been compared to one (1.1243 θήρ). From Polyphemos' point of view the real situation is the reverse of what has been set out in the simile. Now, as Levin writes¹¹⁷,

"Not the nymph, but Polyphemos is comparable to the sollicitous shepherd; not Polyphemos, but the nymph deserves to be likened to the despoilers of the flock."

This adds an interesting twist to the simile.¹¹⁸

Within these three lines again there are verbal links with other sections binding the episode together. For example, αἶψα in 1.1250 echoes αἶψα in 1.1221 where it describes Hylas' actions and also ὤρτο δίεσθαι (1.1250) recalls ὤρτο νέεσθαι (1.1206) said of Heracles (both are in the same metrical positions in their respective lines).¹¹⁹

The next four lines (1.1253-6) describe Polyphemos' meeting with Heracles. There is a lot of repeated information here which serves to keep the pace slow and delay the actual report of Heracles' reaction. In 1.1253

¹¹⁷ LEVIN (1971), p.127.

¹¹⁸ As FRÄNKEL (1952), pp.145-6 has noted "many similes in Apollonius may at first seem conventional, but on closer inspection they are novel and piquant."

¹¹⁹ There are also links between this section and the opening passage, particularly from within the simile: μήλων (1.1244) echoes μήλα (1.1181); the themes of hunger (1.1245 λιμῶ; cf. FRÄNKEL (1968), p.147) and weariness (1.1247 κάμησιν) recall the hunger and weariness of the poor labourer and the Argonauts (see above under the detailed appreciation of 1.1172-86).

Polyphemus meets with Heracles on the path, which is what he set out to do in 1.1241. The fact that Polyphemus is brandishing his sword (1.1254) confirms his action in 1.1250. Repeated also is the fact that Heracles is hastening back to the ship (1.1255, cf.1.1206) as if nothing were wrong, and that it is dark (1.1186,1.1231-2,1.1255). An emphatic position is given to ἄτην in 1.1255 and it also has the same adjective λευγαλέην that was applied to the pretext for Heracles' war against the Dryopians (1.1219). This foreshadows the coming reversal - 'mighty' Heracles who was the bane of the Dryopians (1.1213-9) now himself will be ruined by this ἄτην - and perhaps could be said to be poetic justice - Heracles who took Hylas from his father has here had Hylas taken from him by the nymph.¹²⁰ Finally, adding further realism to this scene is the statement that Polyphemus is out of breath (1.1256 βεβαρημένος ἄσθματι θυμόν) from running around and shouting.

The final four lines of this section present the news that causes Heracles to desert the voyage. The change of narrator from Apollonius to Polyphemus creates a more vivid picture and aptly highlights the fateful news. As the only instance of direct speech in the whole episode it adds

¹²⁰ This symmetry between the two events - Heracles taking Hylas from his father, the nymph taking Hylas from Heracles - is further reinforced by the verbal echo in 1.1216 and 1.1269 of βεβλημένος. Also the bull in the simile (1.1265ff.) recalls the oxen which Heracles demanded from Theiodamas (1.1214ff.).

to the drama of the situation. The chiasmic construction of ἄτην...λευγαλέην (1.1255-6) and στυγερὸν...ἄχος (1.1257) not only bridges the narrative and direct speech but also serves to emphasise what a disaster this is. The relatively short clauses (particularly in 1.1258) are consistent with Polyphemus' physical state, breathlessness (1.1256), and give a sense of urgency. Polyphemus imparts the information in such a way that he first prepares Heracles for bad news (1.1257), then relates the facts (as he knows them, 1.1258), next what he thinks has happened (1.1259f.) and finally, how he came to know of the disaster is appended after a strong pause (1.1260 ἢ θῆρες σίνονται· ἐγὼ δ' ἰάχοντος ἄκουσα) as if he was hesitant to reveal this fact. 1.1259-60 not only create the strong ring-structure found in the scene (see above under structure) but also highlight once more how logical and rational Polyphemus' behavior is under the circumstances.¹²¹

¹²¹ I do not agree with LEVIN (1971), p.127 who suggests that "Polyphemus' words serve...to correct the erroneous impression fostered by a simile which...confused the personalities of his [Hylas'] protector and his ravisher".

SECTION J: DETAILED APPRECIATION 1.1261-72

The final scene in the "Hylas-episode" describes Heracles' reaction to the news of Hylas' disappearance. It presents a startling reversal from the efficient strong-man seen previously in the episode (1.1187-1206). That this section like the previous one has an elaborate ring-composition has already been discussed (see above under structure). This ring structure serves to enclose and set off Heracles' reaction from Polyphemos' reaction; however the two passages are not unconnected: the first two words (1.1261 $\epsilon\tilde{\omega}\varsigma$ $\phi\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron$) provide a link as do some of the actions which each engages in (see above under structure). 1.1261 is the last reference to Polyphemos in the episode as the focus now switches back to Heracles.

The opening two lines (1.1261-2) are a dramatic account of Heracles' physiological reaction - $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\iota\varsigma$ $\iota\delta\rho\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ $\kappa\acute{\eta}\kappa\lambda\epsilon\nu$... $\kappa\epsilon\lambda\kappa\iota\nu\acute{\omicron}\nu$... $\zeta\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ $\alpha\acute{\iota}\mu\alpha$ (with 'sweat' and 'blood' emphatically placed at the end of their lines).¹²² The

¹²² WHITE, p.64 suggests that sweating is "a symptom of love" and cites as an example Sappho, Lobel-Page, fr.31, line 13f.: $\dagger \epsilon\kappa\alpha\delta\epsilon \mu' \iota\delta\rho\omega\varsigma \psi\acute{\omega}\chi\rho\omicron\varsigma \kappa\alpha\kappa\chi\acute{\epsilon}\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota \dagger \tau\rho\acute{\omicron}\mu\omicron\varsigma \delta\acute{\epsilon}$
 $\pi\alpha\tilde{\iota}\sigma\alpha\nu \acute{\alpha}\gamma\rho\epsilon\iota, \chi\lambda\omega\rho\omicron\tau\epsilon\rho\alpha \delta\acute{\epsilon} \pi\omicron\iota\alpha\varsigma | \epsilon\mu\mu\iota \kappa\tau\lambda.$
(and also Theocritus, Id. 2.106-7). She also notes (following GOW, Commentary, p.366) that the verb $\zeta\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ denotes emotion (p.65). Cf. also HUTCHINSON, p.156,n.22, "Blood is common in descriptions of the imagined physical effects of

verbs κήκεν and ζέεν are themselves suggestive of a violent and excessive reaction (cf. 1.540ff.).¹²³ At first Heracles is motionless but the intensity of his wrath causes him to act physically - hurling down the tree he is carrying and rushing around aimlessly (1.1263-4). χλώμενος is placed first in 1.1263, stressing the emotion which causes Heracles to act as he does.¹²⁴ His anger completely overrides his reason and the simple act of throwing away the pine tree which he had recently chosen so carefully indicates that he

passion. This does not necessarily mean however that the emotion is that of a distraught lover (although it could be an added nuance) but rather, as Apollonius himself states, the emotion is anger (cf. 1.1263 χλώμενος and 1.1270 μαμύων).

¹²³ LAWALL, p.127 calls the reaction "instant, terrible and grotesque in its exaggeration". It is 'instant' and 'terrible' certainly, but highly emotional would perhaps be a better description than 'grotesque'. FOWLER, p.38 calls this description of Heracles "baroque", a term which is applied to art of the Hellenistic period, distinguished by "dramatic contrasts, the exaggerated and even distorted forms, and the heightened expressions of emotion..." (p.32). While this may be true it provides little insight on the description and as HUTCHINSON, p.4 notes "It might be expected that the character of the literature would be illuminated by the visual art of the time. Yet it seems exaggerated to assume that the arts always develop in the same way and always reflect some universal spirit of the age". He further goes on to point out that there is very little art dated to the time period 280-240 B.C. so it is difficult to find instances of specific influence of one branch of art on another in Apollonius' time.

¹²⁴ There have already been hints of Heracles' tendency to anger quickly, as when he breaks the oar (1.1170f.) and possibly also when he pitilessly slays Theiodamas (1.1213ff.).

By comparison, Polyphemus' emotions are not mentioned stressing the fact that Polyphemus is governed by reason, Heracles by emotion.

is no longer concerned with the heroic voyage of the Argonauts but is totally consumed with his own problem.¹²⁵ There is an abundance of harsh κ, χ sounds throughout the opening three lines which seem to highlight the forcefulness and violence of his reaction.

Since the simile interrupts Heracles' actions it is better to look briefly at the final three lines of the section (1.1270-2) before examining the simile. There is again mention of Heracles' maddened state of mind (1.1270 *μαλμῶων*; cf. 1.1263) followed by a description of how Heracles sometimes runs continually (1.1270-1a) and other times stops and roars piercingly (1.1271b-2).

The five-line simile (1.1265-9) compares Heracles' actions to those of a bull which has been stung by a gadfly. The simile is very closely tied to the narrative, as Apollonius' similes tend to be¹²⁶, and in fact suggests one point in particular (Heracles' abandonment of the voyage)

¹²⁵ LEVIN (1971), p.125 remarks "the rejection of the oar-to-be ironically foreshadows the more immediate consequence of the Mysian adventure for Heracles. Separated from his fellow Argonauts, he will have no use for an oarsman's equipment".

¹²⁶ CARSPECKEN, pp.87-8. Cf. JAMES (1969), p.77 who notes that the theme of cattle maddened by a gadfly occurs in the *Odyssey* (22.299ff.) where Odysseus and Telemachus are the gadfly pursuing the suitors (the cattle), and he concludes that "there are no verbal reminiscences beyond what was almost unavoidable" and "the seemingly original way in which Apollonius elaborates his simile [is] clearly determined by the paramount consideration of creating a precise parallel with the narrative."

which is not actually given in the narrative (although it is hinted at through his act of throwing away the tree).

The elements correspond as follows: Heracles to the bull (1.1265 *ταῦρος*); the news of Hylas' disappearance to the gadfly (1.1265 *μύωπι* and 1.1269 *οἴστρω*); Jason to the herdsmen (1.1266 *νομήων*); the Argonauts to the herd (1.1267 *ἀγέλης*). Heracles' actions are also similar to the bull's: Heracles rushes along (1.1264 *ἄλυσσοντα*) as does the bull (1.1265 *ἔσσυτο*); Heracles at times runs unceasingly, at times stops and bellows (1.1270-2), like the bull (1.1267b-9a). Finally just as it is mentioned twice that Heracles is enraged (1.1263 and 1.1270) so also the same is stated twice about the bull (1.1265 and 1.1269).

The simile is set up in such a way that the central point is highlighted between two balanced pairs of comparisons:

- A Heracles rushes along, maddened (1.1263-4)
- A The bull rushes along, maddened (1.1265)
- B The bull leaves behind the meadows etc. with no regard for the herdsmen or herd (1.1266-7a)
- C The bull, maddened, sometimes runs, at other times stops to bellow (1.1267b-9)
- C Heracles, maddened, sometimes runs, at other times stops to bellow (1.1270-2)

Thus Apollonius without explicitly stating that Heracles leaves behind Jason and the Argonauts with no care for them, implies this by means of this carefully crafted simile. The simile also suggests some other minor points of comparison: Heracles like the bull is both impressive in size and in strength, and both are helplessly overcome by a very small

thing: the bull by the gadfly and Heracles by Hylas' disappearance.¹²⁷

The contrasts with Polyphemus' reaction are obvious. To begin with, Polyphemus is actually searching for Hylas and trying to think what could possibly have happened to him whereas Heracles is simply rushing around madly. He does not think to ask Polyphemus from where the cry came or how long ago it happened etc. This contrast is heightened by the repetition of Polyphemus' reasoning (1.1251-2 and 1.1259-60 - that robbers or wild beasts had seized Hylas) and the repetition of Heracles' rage (1.1263 and 1.1270).¹²⁸ Both Polyphemus and Heracles cry out but Polyphemus' cries (1.1248-9) appear to be deliberate calls to find Hylas whereas Heracles' appear to be wild cries of anger and despair. Polyphemus' reaction is nowhere near as emotional as Heracles'. As Fränkel remarks "his [Heracles'] wild scampering and yelling [are] more an outlet for feelings than a methodical search."¹²⁹ Both Köhnken and Hurst have

¹²⁷ For bull-like anger cf. Eur. Med. 188.

¹²⁸ HURST, p.130 also sees a contrast between Heracles' action of hurling down the tree and Polyphemus' action of drawing his sword but he is not clear on the point of contrast. Heracles does not appear to have discarded his weapons and presumably his club was still in his hand. The obvious point then seems to be the rationality of the action: Heracles drops the tree that he had been at pains to find - an illogical action; Polyphemus draws his sword once he suspects foul play - a logical action.

¹²⁹ FRÄNKEL (1950), p.116.
FRÄNKEL (OCT text) seems to be the only one who in 1.1249 substitutes ἀυτή for φωνή (cf. MOONEY's and SEATON's

suggested that the grammatical construction of the two similes also accentuates the contrasting reactions: for example, the second simile (1.1265-9) has many more verbs and participles of action and is therefore more suggestive of agitation than reason.¹³⁰

Thus the episode ends with Heracles gone berserk, a complete reversal from how he was portrayed near the beginning of the episode (1.1187ff.). The action breaks off abruptly at the height of Heracles' rage and leaves the reader with a powerful picture of Heracles standing still, bellowing loudly with frustration, all his great strength rendered useless. It is not until later on in the narrative that what happened after this point is determined (see above under structure).

texts). $\phi\omega\nu\eta$ would seem to be more suggestive of the type of cry Polyphemus is uttering (just as $\lambda\upsilon\tau\eta$ in 1.1272, implying something more like a war-cry, is more suggestive of Heracles' sound).

¹³⁰ HURST, p.130 and KÖHNKEN (1965), pp.76-7, who also notes that the subject in the wild beast simile changes (it is not always the beast) whereas the subject in the bull-simile is always the bull, and that this combined with the previous point "ein eindrucksvolles Beispiel für das Zusammenspiel von Form und Inhalt bietet" (p.77). Presumably he must be suggesting something along the lines that Heracles' self-centered reaction is reflected by the fact that all the verbs are referring to him; however, his point seems a bit unclear.

SECTION K: COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THEOCRITUS IDYLL 13 AND
PROPERTIUS 1.20

The basic outline of the Hylas myth down to the time of Propertius has already been established (see Chpt.1): Hylas accompanies Heracles on the voyage of the Argo; when the Argonauts put in at Mysia Hylas goes off to fetch water for dinner and is seized by a nymph or nymphs who had fallen in love with him; he is drawn into the spring and at some point in the abduction cries out; Heracles searches in vain for him.

This outline appears in the accounts of Apollonius (Arg. 1.1172-1272), his contemporary Theocritus¹³¹ (Idyll

¹³¹ The question of who wrote first, Apollonius or Theocritus, is much debated and far too complex for any certainty to be possible. GOW (1938), p.10 goes back as far as the late nineteenth century and cites six scholars (including himself) supporting Apollonius' priority, four supporting Theocritus' priority and one who found the question insoluble. Since that time numerous scholars have expressed their views, the most detailed of which seem to be: a) for Theocritus' priority, H. TRÄNKLE, "Des Graslager der Argonauten bei Theokrit und Apollonios", Hermes 91(1963) 503-5 and KÖHNKEN (1965), particularly pp.26-31, and b) for Apollonius' priority, KOCH, passim; WEBSTER, p.76; DOVER (1971), pp.179ff.; SERRAO, Problemi di Poesi Alessandrina I (Rome, 1971), pp.109-50; and HUTCHINSON, pp.192f.

Concerning the question of whose account is better (on which many of the "priority" arguments are based), HUTCHINSON, p.192 (&ff.) rightly notes "One of the two accounts clearly draws on the other. Which does so we are unlikely to discover from internal weaknesses. A poet of such skill as Apollonius or Theocritus will hardly have

13) and in the Augustan poet Propertius (1.20) who draws on both Hellenistic predecessors (especially Theocritus) but still produces a distinctly Propertian account. The purpose of this section is to comment on the more striking differences in the ways in which each poet presents the myth in order to try to shed more light on why Apollonius chose to present the myth as he did. The elements to be examined are: innovations, pace, chronology, the relationship between Heracles and Hylas, setting, the number of nymphs involved in the abduction, the length of the abduction scene, the degree of contact between Hylas and Heracles after the abduction, and Heracles' reaction.

Several elements are unique to Apollonius: a) the description of Heracles uprooting a tree (1.1187-1206), b) the digression on Theiodamas (1.1211-20), and c) the inclusion of Polyphemus (1.1240-60). Besides injecting freshness into the story and keeping the pace slow (see below) these elements have structural considerations within the episode itself (see above under structure). Unlike Theocritus and Propertius for whom the myth is the whole focus of their poems, Apollonius has to integrate the

adopted an element without noticing that it sounded unnatural in his own work."

There is of course the slight possibility that there were already two different traditions of the Hylas myth from which Theocritus and Apollonius could have drawn but the evidence prior to the Hellenistic age (see Chpt. 1, section B) is far too slight even to establish one tradition conclusively.

"Hylas-episode" into the larger story of the Argonautica. For example, Heracles' act of uprooting the tree results from his breaking an oar just prior to the "Hylas-episode", thus providing a logical connection. The ingenious inclusion of Polyphemus as an intermediary character undoubtedly stems at least partially from Apollonius' penchant for aetia (see Chpt.2, n.5).

These three additions account for 51 lines (half of Apollonius' account) and, as mentioned, slow the pace notably. Theocritus' version is less than half the lines (essentially Id. 13.25-67) and therefore much faster than Apollonius' but still considerably slower than Propertius' account, which has an even narrower focus and quicker pace. Excepting the introduction (1.20.1-16) and concluding remarks (1.20.51-2), Propertius' account is only 34 lines long and this includes his apparently unique addition of the Boreads' attack on Hylas (1.20.25-32). Apollonius however is concerned with accentuating certain aspects of Heracles' character and the lengthy descriptions, digressions, and similes accomplish this. This leisurely pace not only is fitting for an epic but also allows Apollonius to build a false sense of security before the disastrous abduction, and to accentuate (through the use of two reactions and their respective similes) the resulting misfortune.

Both Theocritus and Propertius present the myth for

the most part in a straightforward chronological manner.¹³² Apollonius on the other hand presents many simultaneous events successively and structurally sets off scenes by such devices as ring-composition (see above under structure). This again allows Apollonius to build up a calm before the storm and delay the coming calamity: 56 lines (1.1172-1227) pass from the beginning of the episode until the point at which the nymph(s) is/are introduced, compared with 28 lines (1.20.17-43) in Propertius and 18 lines (Id. 13.25-42) in Theocritus.

The relationship between Heracles and Hylas is established early on in the accounts of Theocritus and Propertius. Theocritus spends a full eleven lines (Id. 13.5-15) stressing the fact that the relationship is homosexual, and Propertius makes the same point clear in his introductory section (1.20.1-16). Apollonius at no point exploits this possibility and instead at 1.122-132 (which is outside the actual "Hylas-episode", but which sheds light on the relationship between Heracles and Hylas) and 1.1207ff. makes it clear that this relationship is a long-standing one of master and servant. This may simply be in keeping with, as Vian notes, "la tradition épique [which] répugne à parler

¹³² In Idyll 13, the episode wherein the Argo sails through the moving Symplegades which thereafter remain fixed (13.22-4) actually takes place after the "Hylas-episode" but before the Argonauts reach Phasis.

In Propertius 1.20, Heracles' reaction to Hylas' loss (1.20.13-16) is described before the event even takes place (though not in the actual narrative itself).

de l'amour homosexuel"¹³³ particularly as Heracles is an example of an older "Homeric" type of hero (see Chpt. 2, n.33).

The setting, particularly of the spring, is of more importance to Theocritus (Id. 13.39-42) and Propertius (1.20.33-38) than to Apollonius. Propertius' account is especially detailed and stands in sharp contrast to Apollonius' brief *καλλιπάρωλο* (1.1228), and while both approaches build up a picture of solitude, Apollonius' vagueness creates mystery and a misty, other-worldly atmosphere in comparison with Propertius' realism. Apollonius further heightens the sense of mystery by focussing on the moonlight (1.1229-30), a detail which is absent from the other two accounts.

The actual abduction of Hylas in Idyll 13 is accomplished by three nymphs (13.43ff.) and in Propertius' account by an unspecified number of nymphs (1.20.45-6) compared to only one nymph in Apollonius' version (1.1228ff.). Apollonius by further juxtaposing the detail that all the other nymphs were busy elsewhere (1.1222-7) heightens the solitude of the scene and brings into sharper focus the two principal characters - Hylas and the nymph.

Theocritus' abduction scene (Id. 13.43-54) is as long as Apollonius' (1.1228-39) but although it has many similar details, it is noticeably different in tone (e.g.

¹³³ VIAN, p.41, n.3.

the humour in Id. 13.53-4). Propertius however takes only three lines to introduce his nymphs and have them draw Hylas into the spring (1.20.45-47). Again, Propertius and Apollonius achieve a similar result - an abrupt disappearance of Hylas - but Apollonius manages to build up much more suspense and a sense of impending doom by describing in such detail and with dream-like slowness the nymph's emotions and actions.

After Hylas' abduction in Theocritus' account, a glimpse is given into the underwater world of the nymphs (Id. 13.53-4) and also Hylas is able to hear Heracles cry out his name and himself to answer from the depths of the spring (Id. 13.58-9). There is, however, no such contact with Hylas after his abduction in Apollonius and Propertius is rather ambiguous about the matter (1.20.49-50).¹³⁴ Apollonius tells how Polyphemus was shouting while in the vicinity of Pegae (1.1248-9) and there is no indication that Hylas could hear, or even what happened to him. By allowing nothing to be known of Hylas' fate (until of course the intervention of the sea-god Glaucus at 1.1324-5) Apollonius effectively separates the supernatural world of the nymph from the reality of the Argonauts' world and emphasises the abruptness and finality of Hylas' disappearance.

¹³⁴ It is not exactly clear whether 1.20.50 refers to Hylas' faint reply to Heracles' cry or the breezes are echoing Heracles' shouts (cf. CAMPS, p.50).

Finally, Propertius in his narrative ignores Heracles' reaction after the disappearance of Hylas, although before actually relating the story he does indirectly mention that Heracles endured miserable wanderings: 1.20.13-16. For both Apollonius and Theocritus, however, Heracles' reaction is of central importance (cf. Arg. 1.1261-72 and Id. 13.55-67 and 70-71) and both expand their descriptions with expressive similes. In addition, Apollonius heightens the impact of the tragic loss of Hylas by giving two reactions, that of Polyphemus (1.1240-60) as well as Heracles'.

Obviously each of the three authors had a different purpose in mind when creating his version of the myth. Theocritus Idyll 13 and Propertius 1.20 are both mythological exempla, Apollonius' account is not. They are interested in charm, humour and wit, Apollonius is not. While its inclusion in an epic poem dictates that it be subject to epic style, Apollonius has successfully created an intriguing dramatic account not only of the Hylas myth but also of Heracles' departure from the Argonauts - a point about which neither Theocritus (who in fact has Heracles rejoin the Argonauts: Id. 13.73-5) nor Propertius (who makes no mention of it one way or another) is unduly concerned.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson, A.R. "Heracles and his successors. A study of a heroic ideal and the recurrence of a heroic type", Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, 39 (1928), 7-58.
- Ardizzoni, A. Le Argonautiche. Libro 1. Rome: Bibliotheca Athena, 1967.
- Arnold, E.V. Roman Stoicism. New York: The Humanities Press, 1958.
- Beye, C.R. Epic and Romance in the Argonautica of Apollonius. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1982.
- Broadhead, H.D. The Persae of Aeschylus. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1960.
- Brommer, Frank. Heracles: The 12 Labors of the Hero in Ancient Art and Literature. Translated by S.J. Schwarz. New York: Aristide D. Caratzas, 1986.
- Butler, H.E. and Barber, E.A. The Elegies of Propertius. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1933.
- Campbell, M. Echoes and Imitations of Early Epic in Apollonius Rhodius. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1981.
- Camps, W.A. Propertius Elegies Book 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1961 (reprint, 1988).
- Carspecken, J.F. "Apollonius Rhodius and the Homeric Epic", Yale Classical Studies, 13 (1952), 33-143.
- Colton, Robert.E. "Some Greek and Latin Poets on the Abduction of Hylas", The Classical Outlook, (1979), 107-8.
- Cowell, J. "Hylas and Heracles", Pegasus, 12 (1969), 44-8.
- Crump, M.M. The Epyllion from Theocritus to Ovid. New York:

- Garland Publishing Inc., 1978. Reprint of 1931 edition.
- Delage, E. La Geographie dans les Argonautiques D'Apollonios de Rhodes. Paris, 1930.
- Diller, H. "Herakles und Hylas - Theokrit und Properz" 419-431 in Monumentum Chiloniense. Studien zur augusteischen Zeit. Keiler festschrift Fur Erich Burck zum 70. Geburtstag. Amsterdam: A.M. Hakkert, 1975.
- Dover, K.J. Greek Homosexuality. London: Duckworth & Co. Ltd., 1978.
- Dover, K.J. Theocritus. Select Poems. London: McMillan Education Ltd., 1971.
- Elderkin, G.W. "Repetition in the Argonautica of Apollonius", American Journal of Philology, 34 (1913), 198-201.
- Farnell, L.R. Greek Hero Cults and Ideas of Immortality. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1921.
- Fowler, B.H. The Hellenistic Aesthetic. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1989.
- Frankel, H. Apollonii Rhodii Argonautica. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1969.
- Frankel, H. "Apollonius Rhodius as a Narrator in Argonautica 2.1-140", TAPA, 83 (1952), 144-55.
- Frankel, H. Noten zu den Argonautika des Apollonios. Munich: C.H. Beck'sche, 1968.
- Frankel, H. "Problems of Text and Interpretation in Apollonius' Argonautica", American Journal of Philology, 71,2 (1950), 113-133.
- Frazer, J.G. Apollodorus. The Library. London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1976. Vol. I & II.
- Frazer, J.G. The Golden Bough. London: MacMillan & Co. Ltd., 1907-30.
- Galinsky, G.K. The Herakles Theme: The Adaptations of the Hero in Literature from Homer to the Twentieth Century. Oxford: B. Blackwell, 1972.
- Garson, R.W. "The Hylas Episode in Valerius Flaccus' Argonautica", Classical Quarterly, 13 (1963), 260-7.

- Gow, A.S.F. Theocritus. Vol. I & II. Second Edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973.
- Gow, A.S.F. "The Thirteenth Idyll of Theocritus", Classical Quarterly, (1938), 10-17.
- Gutzwiller, K.J. Studies in the Hellenistic Epyllion. Meisenheim am Glan: Anton Hain, 1981.
- Hammond, N.G.L. and Scullard, H.H. The Oxford Classical Dictionary. 2nd Edition. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987.
- Hunter, R.L. "Apollo and the Argonauts: Two Notes on Ap. Rhod. 2,669-719", Museum Helveticum, 43 (1986), 50-60.
- Hunter, R.L. Apollonius of Rhodes. Argonautica Book III. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Hunter, R.L. "Short on Heroics: Jason in the Argonautica", Classical Quarterly, 38,2 (1988), 436-53.
- Hurst, A. Apollonios de Rhodes: Manière et Cohérence. Switzerland: Journal de Geneve, 1967.
- Hutchinson, G.O. Hellenistic Poetry. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988.
- James, A.W. "Apollonius Rhodius and His Sources: Interpretative Notes on the Argonautica", 59-86, in Corolla Londiniensis edited by G. Giangrande, Amsterdam, 1981.
- James, A.W. "Some examples of imitation in the similes of later greek epic", Antichthon, 3 (1969), 77-90.
- Kirk, G.S. The Nature of Greek Myths. London: Penguin Books, 1988.
- Koch, H.H. Die Hylasgeschichte Bei Apollonius Rhodius, Theokrit, Properz und Valerius Flaccus. Diss. Kiel, 1955.
- Köhnken, A. Apollonios Rhodios und Theokrit. Hypomnemata 12. Göttingen: Denhoek & Ruprecht, 1965.
- Köhnken, A. "Der Schrei Des Hylas", Rheinisches Museum Für Philologie, 113 (1970), 69-79.
- Lawall, G. "Apollonius' Argonautica: Jason as Anti-Hero", Yale Classical Studies, 19 (1966), 121-169.

- Levin, D.N. Apollonius' Argonautica Re-examined. I: The Neglected First and Second Books. Mnemosyne Supplement 13. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1971.
- Levin, D.N. "Apollonius' Heracles", The Classical Journal, 67 (1971), 22-8.
- Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae. Vol. 4,1 Eros-Herakles, Zürich: Artemis Verlag, 1988.
- Ling, R. "Hylas in Pompeian Art", Mélanges de L'Ecole Française de Rome. Antiquité, 91 (1979), 773-816.
- Maass, E. Aratea. Berlin: Weidmannsche buchhandlung, 1892.
- MacKendrick, P. The North African Stones Speak. London, 1980.
- Mastrorarde, D.J. "Theocritus' Idyll 13. Love and the Hero", Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association, 99 (1968), 272-290.
- Matthews, V.J. Panyassis of Halikarnassos. Text and Commentary. Mnemosyne Supplement 33. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1974.
- McGready, F. "Heracles' Love for Hylas", Corolla Londiniensis, 3 (1983), 79-80.
- Mooney, G.W. The Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1912.
- Nilsson, M.P. The Mycenaean Origin of Greek Mythology. New York, 1932.
- Osmun, G.F. "The Abduction of Hylas, Again", Classical Bulletin, 59 (1983), 56-9.
- Otis, B. Virgil. A Study in Civilized Poetry. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964.
- Papathomopoulos, M. Antoninus Liberalis. Les Métamorphoses. Paris: Société d'édition <<Les Belles Lettres>>, 1968.
- Pauly, A., Wissowa, G., and Kroll, W. Real Encyclopedie der Klassischen Alterumswissenschaft. Stuttgart: J.R. Metzler, 1894-.
- Pike, D.L. "Heracles: The Superman and Personal Relationships", Acta Classica, 20 (1977), 73-83.

- Pike, D.L. "The Comic Aspects of the Strongman-hero in Greek Myths", Acta Classica, 23 (1980), 37-44.
- Preininger, J. Der Aufbau der Argonautika des Apollonios Rhodios. Diss. Graz, 1976.
- Roscher, W.H. Ausführliches Lexicon der Griechischen und Romischen Mythologie. Leipzig: Teubner, 1884-90.
- Rose, H.J. A Handbook of Greek Mythology. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1965. Reprint.
- Seaton, R.C. Apollonius Rhodius. The Argonautica. London: William Heinemann, 1912.
- Shapiro, H.A. "Heros Theos. The Death and Apotheosis of Herakles", Classical World, 77 (1983), 7-18.
- Thierstein, P. Bau der Szenen in den Argonautica des Apollonios Rhodios. Bern: Herbert Lang & Cie AG, 1971.
- Vian, F. Apollonios de Rhodes. Argonautiques. Vol.1 Bks.1&2. Paris, 1974.
- Wace, A.J. & Stubbings, F.H. A Companion to Homer. London: MacMillan & Co. Ltd., 1962.
- Webster, T.B.L. "Chronological Problems in Early Alexandrian Poetry", Wiener Studien, 76 (1963), 68-78.
- Wendel, C. Scholia in Apollonium Rhodium Vetera. Berlin: August Raabe, 1958.
- White, H. Studies in Theocritus and Other Hellenistic Poets. Amsterdam: J.C. Gieben, 1979.
- Wilkins, E.G. "A Classification of the Similes in the Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius", The Classical Weekly, Vol.14 #21 (1921), 162-166.