

AMONG THE FRAGMENTARY EPICS of archaic Greece is a poem known as the *Naupaktia* or *Naupaktika*.<sup>1</sup> We know very little about the poem, the author of which is uncertain; he is generally referred to as *ὁ τὰ Ναυπακτικά ποιήσας*, or a similar phrase.<sup>2</sup> The poem is mentioned by Pausanias, who refers to two traditions about its authorship (10.38.11):

τὰ δὲ ἔπη τὰ Ναυπάκτια ὀνομαζόμενα ὑπὸ 'Ελλήνων ἀνδρὶ ἐσποιοῦσιν οἱ πολλοὶ Μιλησίῳ· Χάρων δὲ ὁ Πυθεῷ (FGrHist 262F4) φησι αὐτὰ ποιῆσαι Ναυπάκτιον Καρκίνον. ἐπόμεθα δὲ καὶ ἡμεῖς τῇ τοῦ Λαμψακηνοῦ δόξῃ. τίνα γὰρ καὶ λόγον ἔχοι ἂν ἔπεισαν ἀνδρὸς Μιλησίου πεποιημένους ἐς γυναικας τεθῆναι σφισιν ὄνομα Ναυπάκτια;

Thus Pausanias dismisses the commonly-held tradition that the epic was composed by a Milesian. In so doing, he was perhaps influenced by the name of the poem, on the analogy of the *Kypria* attributed to Stasinus of Kypros, and also by its nature, *ἔπη ἐς γυναικας πεποιημένα*, which suggests a mainland epic of the Hesiodic catalogue type (cf. Paus. 4.2.1, where he mentions the *Naupaktia* along with the *Eoiai* and the genealogical works of Kinaithon and Asios).

The claim for Milesian authorship seems weak, although it may be argued that in the period of colonization, the Milesians would be interested in the Argonaut myth,<sup>3</sup> a major theme in the poem, and that a Milesian could have come to compete in a festival at Naupaktos, perhaps against local poets like Karkinos.<sup>4</sup> But no name is ever attached to the proposed Milesian author, and the very title *Naupaktia* presupposes some connection with Naupaktos. Charon of Lampsakos is an early authority, and we ought to accept Pausanias' opinion that Karkinos was the author of the *Naupaktia*.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Fragments (*Epicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* ed. G. Kinkel [Leipzig 1877] 198–202) will be cited in the form F1K, etc. The poem has been discussed by G. L. Huxley, *Greek Epic Poetry from Eumelos to Panyassis* (London 1969) 68–73. References to Huxley's book in the text and footnotes will be by page number only.

<sup>2</sup>E.g., Schol. Ap.Rhod. 2.299: *ὁ (δὲ) τὰ Ναυπακτικά ποιήσας*; 3.240: *ὁ τὰ Ναυπακτικά πεποιηκῶς* (also 4.66a; 4.86); 4.87: *ὁ δὲ τὰ Ναυπακτικά γράψας*. On the title, cf. Schmid-Stählin, GGL 1.1.293, n. 1; *The Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius* ed. G. W. Mooney (Dublin 1912, repr. Amsterdam 1964) 20 (d) and "Addenda and Corrigenda".

<sup>3</sup>Cf. Huxley 69. For Milesians and the *Argonautica* cf. P. Friedländer, "Kritische Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Heldensage. I. Argonautensage," *RhM* 69 (1914) 299–317.

<sup>4</sup>Cf. Huxley 69. There seems to have been a school of genealogical poetry in the area (see *RE* 16.1984 s.v. Naupaktos). Cf. the story of the Milesian who shared accommodation with Hesiod in Lokris (Plut. *Mor.* 162B) and the tale of Hesiod's death and burial at Naupaktos (Paus. 9.38.3; cf. 9.31.6; Thuk. 3.96.1; Tzetzes *Vita Hesiodica* 34 ff.).

<sup>5</sup>Huxley (69) seems inclined to accept the Milesian authorship.

For the date of the poem there is really no evidence, although Huxley suggests that it is unlikely to have taken shape before the settlement of Kerkyra by Eretrians in the mid-eighth century.<sup>6</sup> The nature of the poem suggests a date close to that of the Hesiodic corpus.

Apparently the *Naupaktia*, like the Hesiodic *Erōiai*, fitted legendary heroines into a genealogical framework, and described their exploits as well as those of their offspring (Paus. 4.2.1; 10.38.11). This Hesiodic character is clear from F1K (= Schol. *Il.* 15.336):

δμοίως τῷ ποιητῇ καὶ 'Ελλάνικος (FGrHist 4F121) τὴν 'Εριώπην μητέρα Αἰαντός  
φησιν· Φερεκύδης (FGrHist 3F24) δὲ ἐν ε' καὶ Μυασέας ἐν η' 'Αλκιμάχην. ὁ δὲ τῶν  
Ναυπακτικῶν ποιητῆς δῶνυμον αὐτὴν φησι

τὴν δὲ μέθ' ὀπλοτάτην 'Εριώπην ἐξονόμαζεν,  
'Αλκιμάχην δὲ πατὴρ τε καὶ 'Αδμητος καλέεσκεν.

The first line contains a formula also found in Hesiod F26.31 M-W, τοὺς δὲ μέθ' ὀπλοτάτην τέκετο ξανθὴν 'Ιόλειαν (cf. West's reconstruction of F35.13). The doublet of the name is clearly a way of compromising two diverse traditions, and there is a Homeric parallel at *Il.* 6.402–403, where we are told that Hektor called his son Skamandrios, but other people called him Astyanax.<sup>7</sup>

Huxley (70) asserts that the subject of the first line is Oileus, father of the lesser Ajax, and the outstanding Lokrian hero. It would not be surprising to find him in a Naupaktian poem. Moreover, both Oileus and Admetos were among the Argonauts (Ap. Rhod. 1.74, 1.49), and it was with this myth that the *Naupaktia* seems to have been particularly concerned. The father of Eriope/Alkimache was Pheres (Schol. *Il.* 13.697), and Admetos was the girl's brother.<sup>8</sup> However, it is unlikely that Oileus can be the subject of ἐξονόμαζεν. If he was, he was also the subject of the previous verb, and while his marriage to Eriope is well-established (*Il.* 13.697 = 15.336), it is difficult to see what connection he might have had with her sister (a connection suggested by Huxley's

<sup>6</sup>Huxley 73. See Plut. *Quaest. Graec.* 11.

<sup>7</sup>The doublet Eriope/Alkimache seems to have caused an interesting confusion on an animal-rython belonging to the Panagjurischte Treasure (end of 4th century B.C.). Along with Dionysos there is represented a maenad bearing the name ΗΠΙΟΠΗ (a mis-spelling for ΕΠΙΟΠΗ). Eriope/Alkimache, wife of Oileus, has no known association with Dionysos, but there was another Alkimache, daughter of Harpalion of Lemnos, a maenad who accompanied Dionysos to India (Nonn. *Dionys.* 30.192 f.; 210 f.). The artist (or his client) has made an erroneous conflation of the two characters. See J. G. Griffith, "The siege scene on the gold amphora of the Panagjurischte Treasure," *JHS* 94 (1974) 40 and Plate IIc.

<sup>8</sup>Two other Naupaktian fragments (F11 and 12K), about Asklepios and his punishment, belong to the story of Admetos. The chain of events leading to Admetos has been traced by Huxley (70).

interpretation). Given the nature of the *Naupaktia* and the mention of the girl's father and brother in the next line, the most likely candidate to be the subject of *ἐξονόμαζεν* would be her mother, Periklymene (Hyg. *Fab.* 14.2), or Klymene (Schol. Eur. *Alc.* 16), daughter of Minyas. Most of the Argonauts were Minyai (Ap. Rhod. 1.229–130), and the many daughters of Minyas (Schol. Ap. Rhod. 1.230–233b) must have afforded great genealogical opportunity to the Naupaktian poet. The elder daughter of Pheres and Periklymene alluded to in the first line could well be Eidomene, who married her uncle Amythaon and became the mother of Melampous and Bias (Apollod. *Bibl.* 1.9.11), the latter the father of three Argonauts, Talaos, Areios, and Leodokos (Ap. Rhod. 1.118–119).

*Naupaktia* F2K (= Herodian *περὶ μον.* λέξ. 15, 2.922 Lentz<sup>2</sup>) tells of a man living in prosperity by the seashore:

ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν οὖν ἐπὶ θινὶ θαλάσσης εὐρυπόροιο  
οἰκία ναιετάασκε πολύρρην, πουλυβοῶτης.

ἐπὶ θινὶ *Cramer* (cf. *Od.* 3.5) ἐπινευσὶ *codd.*

Huxley suggests (73), rather rashly, that these lines may refer to the same north-west area of Greece as F10K, namely the district opposite Kerkyra. He compares the lines with a Hesiodic fragment (F240 M-W) about Hellopia, a land in Epeiros:

ἐστὶ τις Ἑλλοπία πολυλήιος ἥδ' εὐλείμων  
ἀφνειή μῆλοισι καὶ εἰλιπόδεσσι βόεσσιν·  
ἐν δ' ἄνδρες ναίουσι πολύρρηνες πολυβοῦται  
πολλοὶ ἀπειρέσιοι φύλα θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων·

Huxley goes on to suggest that if the Naupaktian lines do refer to Hellopia or Thesprotia, the subject of them will be Jason's son Mermeros, who died hunting on the mainland (F10K), and whose son Ilos lived at Ephyre (*Od.* 1.259). ὁ μὲν implies that the subject of the fragment is contrasted with someone else, and Huxley puts forward Mermeros' brother Pheres or Jason his father as likely candidates. However at F10K it is not said that Mermeros settled on the mainland, only that he died hunting there. But it does say that Jason settled in Kerkyra, and it is possible that F2K refers to that event. In that case, Mermeros, of course, could still be the subject, but a more likely candidate is Jason himself, the lines being part of the description of him settling in the island.

However, the north-west region is not the only part of Greece to be described in the early epics as "rich in sheep and rich in cattle." The third line of Hesiod F240 M-W, ἐν δ' ἄνδρες ναίουσι πολύρρηνες πολυβοῦται, is found at *Il.* 9.154 (= 296), in the passage where Agamemnon offers Achilles seven towns *νέεται* Πύλου (9.149 ff. = 291 ff.), but this district

can perhaps be ruled out as unlikely to be mentioned in the *Naupaktia*, as can the Arimaspians πολύρρηνας, πολυβούτας of Aristeas (F4 Bolton = F3K) and the island Syrie described by Eumaios at *Od.* 15.403 ff. Arkadia, described as πολύμηλος in Hesiod F23a.32 M-W, and Arkadian Orchomenos, given the same epithet at *Il.* 2.605, can be disregarded, since they lie inland. Two areas which fulfil the requirements of being close to the sea, famous for sheep and cattle, and possibly mentioned in the *Naupaktia* are Pylos itself, called μήτηρ μήλων at *Od.* 15.226, and described as possessing Nestor's bulls (*Od.* 3.6 ff.), and, more significantly, the district around Iolkos and Pherai in Thessaly.<sup>9</sup>

Numerous references attest to the reputation of this region. At *Od.* 11.256–257, Pelias is described as living πολύρρηνος in wide Iolkos, and in *Ap. Rhod.* 3.1086 Jason tells Medeia that Iolkos is εὐρρηνός τε καὶ εὖβοτος. As for Pherai, Apollonios (1.49) speaks of Φεραῖς Ἀδμητος εὐρρήνεσσιν ἀνάσσων. Admetos had cattle too (Hesiod F256 M-W), and Apollo of course served as his herdsman (Apollod. *Bibl.* 3.10.40). In the Homeric Catalogue, the contingent from Pherai, Boibe, Glaphyrai, and Iolkos is led by Admetos' son, who bears the significant name of Eumelos (*Il.* 2.714, 764). From a neighbouring area come the sons of Iphiklos πολύμηλος (705), himself the son of Phylakos, famed for his cattle (Apollod. *Bibl.* 1.9.12). This domain also included the city of Iton, μήτηρ μήλων (696). Other people bearing significant names in the area are Polymele, mother of Jason (Hesiod F38 M-W), and Primele, daughter of Admetos (Hesiod F256 M-W).

This area is closely associated with the Argonauts and the *Naupaktia*, as has been seen in our discussion of Fl. It is possible that F2 belongs to a similar context and was thus correctly numbered by Kinkel. The person who dwelt by the sea, rich in sheep and cattle, could be Admetos, his father Pheres (cf. F1K), Jason's father Aison, an uncle of Eriope/Alkimache, or another Argonautic character such as Pelias (cf. *Od.* 11.256–257). If ὁ μὲν refers to Admetos, he could be contrasted with his brother Lykourgos, who went to live at Nemea (Apollod. *Bibl.* 1.9.14). If Pheres or Aison is meant, the poet could be listing the sons of Tyro and Kretheus, the founder of Iolkos, namely Aison, Amythaon, and Pheres (cf. *Od.* 11.259; Schol. *Od.* 12.69; Apollod. *Bibl.* 1.9.11). Tyro was also the mother, by Poseidon, of Pelias and his twin Neleus (*Od.* 11.254 ff., Schol. *Od.* 12.69; Apollod. *Bibl.* 1.9.8) and is a likely person to be mentioned in the *Naupaktia* (cf. *Od.* 11.235 ff., Hesiod F 30.24 ff. and F31 M-W). If she was, the poet may have gone on to tell the story of the quarrel between Pelias and Neleus, which led to the latter's going to Messenia and founding Pylos (Apollod. *Bibl.* 1.9.9), a circumstance which

<sup>9</sup>One might also think of Boiotia and Euboia, but neither is described as famous for cattle in Homer or extant Hesiod.

presents us with another possible setting for *Naupaktia* F2K, namely one paralleled at *Od.* 11.256–257:

Πελίης μὲν ἐν εὐρυχώρῳ Ἰαωλκῶ  
ναῖε πολύρρηγος, ὃ δ' ἄρ' ἐν Πύλῳ ἡμαθόεντι.

It is less likely, but still possible, since Pylos was famous for cattle and sheep, that ὃ μὲν in F2K is Neleus, and that he is afterwards contrasted with Pelias (cf. Hesiod F33a. 1–6 M-W).

Most of the Naupaktian fragments referring to the Argonaut myth are found in the scholia to Apollonios. In Apollonios (2.273 ff.), the Boreads Zetes and Kalais chased the Harpies who were harassing Phineus to the Strophades islands. There they were forced to swear that they would leave him in peace, and then they disappeared into a cave in Minoan Crete (2.299). The *Naupaktia* F3K (= Schol. Ap. Rhod. 2.299) says that they fled to a cave in Crete under the hill Arginous:

κευθμῶνα Κρήτης· κοιλάδα τῆς Κρήτης κατέδυσαν. τοῦτο δέ φησι καὶ Νεοπτόλεμος (FGrHist 702F4a). ὃ <δὲ> τὰ Ναυπακτικά ποιήσας καὶ Φερεκύδης ἐν σ' (FGrHist 3F29) φασὶν εἰς τὸ σπέος αὐτὰς φυγεῖν τῆς Κρήτης τὸ ὑπὸ τῷ λόφῳ τῷ Ἀργινούντι.

Huxley (70–71) suggests that Apollonios may be following the *Naupaktia* here, and that in that poem the Harpies also went to the Strophades on their way to Crete. He would then interpret this as a local allusion in the *Naupaktia*, since the Strophades (Echinades) are not far from Naupaktos.<sup>10</sup> But perhaps one should question whether the Strophades played any part in the Naupaktian version. Concerning the cave in Crete, under the hill Arginous, the *Naupaktia* gives the same version as Pherekydes. The coincidence between the two sources on the destination perhaps indicates that Pherekydes was drawing on the *Naupaktia*, and his description of the route (3F28) may also have been derived from the epic poem:

ὑπὲρ πόντοιο· ὅτι διὰ τοῦ Αἰγαίου πόντου καὶ τοῦ Σικελικοῦ αὐτὰς ἐδίωκον, Φερεκύδης ἐν σ' φησί.

Thus in Pherekydes, and perhaps in the *Naupaktia*, the Boreads pursued the Harpies across the Aegean and Sicilian Seas, and finally took refuge in the Cretan cave. There is no direct reference to the Strophades, in contrast with the usual story given by Hesiod, Antimachos, and Apol-

<sup>10</sup>Huxley (71) presumably takes the Strophades to be islands off Akarnania, also known as Echinades (cf. Apollod. *Bibl.* 1.9.1; Pomp. Mela 2.7.10). Hesiod seems to have placed them in the same area, near Kephallenia (F156b and 150.30 M-W). But others put them elsewhere, e.g., in the Aegean (Hyg. *Fab.* 14, cf. Schol. Ap. Rhod. 2.285 on the νῆσοι Καλυδοναί near Kos mentioned at *Il.* 2.677). There are also the islands still called Strophades west of Messenia. But if Pherekydes and the *Naupaktia* mentioned the Strophades at all, they ought to have placed them in the Sicilian Sea, still further to the West (cf. Pher. FGrHist 3F28; Schol. Ap. Rhod. 2.285; Eust. *ad* Dion. Per. 591).

lonios (2.296; Schol. Ap. Rhod. 2.296–7 = Hesiod F156 M-W, Antimachos F60 Wyss). Now these same three authors are also said by Schol. Ap. Rhod. 2.296–297a to have told that the Harpies were not killed. On the Phineus episode, Hesiod, Antimachos, and Apollonios seem to represent one tradition, and the *Naupaktia* and Pherekydes another. Hence, if the three authors cited by Schol. Ap. Rhod. 2.296–297a said that the Harpies were not killed, it seems a reasonable assumption that in the *Naupaktia* and Pherekydes they *were* killed, perhaps in the Cretan cave. This suggestion need not be contradicted by Philodemos *περὶ εὐσ.* 46b, 18 Gomperz:

\* \* γέγραφα φεν ὁ [τὰ Ναυπάκτια] ποῆσα[ς καὶ Φερεκύ]δης ὁ Ἀ[θηναῖος] (3F165). Αἰσ[χύλος] δ' [ἐν Φινεῖ] (F260 Nauck<sup>2</sup>) καὶ Εἰβ[υκος] (F292 Page) καὶ Τε[λέστης] (F812 Page) [ποιοῦσιν] τὰς Ἀρπ[υίας θνησκ]ούσας ὑπ[ὸ τῶν Βορέου παί]δων.<sup>11</sup>

It cannot be absolutely certain that this is in fact a reference to the Harpies, but it seems highly probable.<sup>12</sup> While one might suppose that, because Aischylos, Ibykos, and Telestes told that the Harpies were killed, the *Naupaktia* and Pherekydes said that they were not, a better explanation would be that the *Naupaktia* and Pherekydes only differed from the other three sources in the manner in which the Harpies met their deaths. Presumably they were killed by someone other than the Boreads, e.g., by Zeus. Indeed Schol. Ap. Rhod. 2.299 merely says that the Harpies fled to Crete, with no indication that the Boreads pursued them all the way.

There are some interesting Naupaktian fragments (F5–9K) concerned with events at Aietes' city. According to Apollonios (3.504–539), after Aietes had imposed the tasks on Jason, six heroes offered their services, while the rest shrank back in fear, but then Argos thought of obtaining the aid of Medeia. In the scholia to this passage, we find two consecutive references to the *Naupaktia*:

Schol. Ap. Rhod. 3.515–521, 234 Wendel (= F5K):

ὁ μὲν Ἀπολλώνιος τοὺτους (i.e., the six) φησὶ προαιρεῖσθαι ζεύξαι τοὺς βόας.  
ὁ δὲ τὰ Ναυπακτικὰ πάντας ἀριθμεῖ τοὺς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ φερομένους ἀριστεῖς.

ποιήσας *post* Ναυπ. *add.* P ὑπ' Ἀργούς Robert, *Die griech. Heldensage* (Berlin 1921) 795, n. 2.

Schol. Ap. Rhod. 3.523–524, 234 Wendel (= F6K):

ἀλλὰ τιν' οἷω μητρὸς ἐμῆς: δύναται, φησὶν, ἡ μήτηρ ἡ ἐμὴ πείσαι τὴν Μήδειαν συνεργῆσαι τὸν ἄθλον. ἐν δὲ τοῖς Ναυπακτικοῖς Ἰδμων ἀναστὰς Ἰάσονι κελεύει ὑποστῆναι τὸν ἄθλον.

<sup>11</sup>The agreement between the *Naupaktia* and Pherekydes on the Phineus episode seems to confirm the supplement [τὰ Ναυπάκτια].

<sup>12</sup>See Jacoby, *FGrHist* la Kommentar, 428.

In F5K ποιήσας as supplied by Cod. P. should be read.<sup>13</sup> The accepted interpretation of these two fragments is that, while Apollonios mentioned only six heroes offering to yoke the bulls, the poet of the *Naupaktia* listed the whole crew, but then Idmon rose and told Jason to do it himself.<sup>14</sup> No one seems to question the absurdity of such a catalogue of crewmen at this stage in the narrative. Even if, in the *Naupaktia*, the crew was considerably smaller than in the *Argonautika*, to list everyone here would surely greatly impede the narrative at a most unsuitable place. The accepted interpretation appears to depend on Robert's conjecture ὑπ' Ἀργούσ, but this should be rejected, since, in sixteen other instances of the name Ἀργῶ in the scholia, there is not a single one in which the article is not used.<sup>15</sup> Nor is it easy to suppose that ὑπὸ τῆς Ἀργούσ could have been corrupted to ὑπ' αὐτοῦ. But if αὐτοῦ is retained, how is it to be understood? If the sentence does mean that the *Naupaktia* listed the whole crew, αὐτοῦ would have to refer to Jason ("all the heroes brought by him"), which is hardly acceptable. I suggest that we read ἀπ' Ἀργους or ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀργους and translate: "all the heroes who came from Argos." Of sixteen references to Argos in the scholia, in six the article is present and in ten it is not.<sup>16</sup> With or without the article, corruption to ὑπ' αὐτοῦ can be readily explained. For example: ἀπ' Ἀργους > ἀπ' αὐτοῦ > ὑπ' αὐτοῦ (the latter step through a misinterpretation of φερομένους) or ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀργους > ἀπ' αὐτοῦ Ἀργους > ἀπ' αὐτοῦ > ὑπ' αὐτοῦ.

In Schol. Ap. Rhod. 3.523–524, the train of thought is rather difficult to follow, since the statement about Idmon (F6K) does not fit very well with the previous sentence. It is better to adopt the reading of Cod. P in the matter of vv. 515–522:

ἔτι δὲ ὁ μὲν Ἀπολλώνιος Ἀργον φησὶν ἐμποδίσαι τοὺς ἥρωας ὑποστῆναι βουλομένους τὸν ἀγῶνα· ἐν δὲ τοῖς Ναυπακτικοῖς Ἰδμῶν ἀναστὰς Ἰάσονα κελεύει ὑποστῆναι τὸν ἄθλον.<sup>17</sup>

The distortion of the scholion can be explained as follows: a) the first part of the second gloss to the lemma 3.515–522 was mistakenly omitted, because of the similarity of ὁ μὲν Ἀπολλώνιος and ἔτι δὲ ὁ μὲν Ἀπολλώνιος; b) the remainder of the gloss ἐν δὲ τοῖς Ναυπ . . . ἄθλον was then transposed to follow δύναται . . . ἄθλον because of the presence of the words τὸν ἄθλον

<sup>13</sup>Cf. note 2 above.

<sup>14</sup>Cf., e.g., *The Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius: Book III* ed. M. M. Gillies (Cambridge 1928) 59; *Apollonios de Rhodes: Argonautiques Chant III* ed. F. Vian (Paris 1961) 77–78; Huxley 71.

<sup>15</sup>Schol. Ap. Rhod. 1.1–4e; 224–226a, b; 238; 526–527; 551a; 1167–1168b; 1289–1291a; 2.319; 341; 896; 4.257–262b; 282–291b; 507–521; 585–588; 839–841a.

<sup>16</sup>With article, Schol. Ap. Rhod. 1.87; 118–21; 124–129a; 580b; 3.1241; 4.1091; without article, 1.14; 124–129b; 139–144b; 747–751a, b; 3.993; 4.1091 (four times).

<sup>17</sup>Kinkel 200, n. 2 (not in Wendel).

in both clauses, which led a copyist to infer that they dealt with the same topic.<sup>18</sup>

These scholia should be restored as follows:

3.515–22: ὁ μὲν Ἀπολλώνιος . . . βόας. ὁ δὲ τὰ Ναυπακτικὰ ποιήσας πάντας ἀριθμεῖ τοὺς ἅπ' Ἀργούς φερομένους ἀριστεῖς. ἔτι δὲ ὁ μὲν Ἀπολλώνιος Ἀργὸν φησὶν ἐμποδίσαι τοὺς ἥρωας ὑποστῆναι βουλομένους τὸν ἀγῶνα· ἐν δὲ τοῖς Ναυπ. . . ὑποστῆναι τὸν ἄθλον.

3.523–4: ἀλλὰ τιν' . . . ἐμῆς: δύναται . . . συνεργῆσαι τὸν ἄθλον.

Thus the situation in the *Naupaktia* is different in substance, but parallel in structure to that in Apollonios. In the latter, it is Argos who intervenes after the six heroes have volunteered; in the *Naupaktia*, where all the volunteers were from Argos, it is Idmon. His intervention need not be surprising, since he came from Argos himself (Ap. Rhod. 1.139) and may have been reluctant to see his countrymen risk their lives. Indeed in Apollonios, he is catalogued last of six men from Argos, Talaos, Areios, Leodokos, Herakles, Nauplios, and Idmon. Although Apollonios did not follow the *Naupaktia* in making all the Argives volunteer, it is possible that he drew on the poem for his list of Argives. Idmon of course did appear in the *Naupaktia*, and it is striking that, except for Herakles, all the heroes are presented in the context of genealogies, contrary to Apollonios' usual practice of mentioning only a hero's father: Talaos, Areios, and Leodokos (1.118–120); Nauplios (133–138); Idmon (142–144). The language in these passages suggests genealogical poetry such as the *Naupaktia*. The mention of Pero, the mother of three heroes (1.119) and of Amymone, the ancestor, through six generations, of Nauplios (1.137), reminds one of Pausanias' comment ἐπεσιν . . . πεποιημένοις ἐς γυναικας. Since the three sons of Bias (and nephews of Melampous) are related to the family of Eriope/Alkimache mentioned in F1K, they could have been included in the *Naupaktia*.

Whether or not Apollonios' genealogical passage is derived from the *Naupaktia*,<sup>19</sup> it is probable that his reference to Herakles is not. First, the awkward introduction of Herakles into an otherwise homogeneous passage suggests that he is an intruder in the list of Argives. Secondly, Herodoros (31F41) states that Herakles did not sail with the Argonauts. All earlier extant sources from Hesiod had included Herakles at least at the start of the voyage,<sup>20</sup> so Herodoros must have had some grounds for

<sup>18</sup>Cf. other confused glosses transposed by Wendel, e.g., Schol. 3.240 from 242; 3.1354–1356 from 1373 ff.; 4.66a from 59–61a.

<sup>19</sup>Hesiod is not a likely source, since in F37.8 M-W Talaos seems to be the only son of Pero and Bias. None of the other four heroes is mentioned in extant Hesiod.

<sup>20</sup>E.g., Antim. F58 Wyss; Hdt. 7.193; Pindar *Pyth.* 4.172; Pher. 3F111; Hesiod F263 M-W. Only in the late Alexandrian Dionysios Skytobrachion (*FGrHist* 32F6) and Demaratos (42F2) does Herakles go all the way to Kolchis.



taking this stand, and such could only have been found in a very early epic such as the *Korinthiaka* or the *Naupaktia*. There is no evidence that Herodoros drew on Eumelos for any other features of his story, but there are signs that he did take information from the *Naupaktia* (cf. F8K, where he apparently gave an identical version). We may tentatively suggest that, in the *Naupaktia*, Herakles played no part in the Argonaut myth.

As for Idmon, a man of initiative in F7 and 8K, as well as F6K, Apollonios' story of his birth may reflect a tradition from the *Naupaktia*. Apollonios (1.142 ff.) tells that Idmon was not a true son of Abas, but of Apollo. Here he is referring to two traditions, for Pherekydes (3F108) said that Idmon's parents were Apollo and Asteria, daughter of Koronos, while Herodoros (31F44) said that his father was Abas. This latter version may reflect the *Naupaktia*, since Abas was the son of Melampous, son of Amythaon (Schol. Ap. Rhod. 1.139-144d), and so linked to the family of Eriope/Alkimache. The very presence of Idmon at Kolchis in the Naupaktian version is interesting because, in Apollonios, he does not reach Kolchis at all, but dies on the outward voyage (2.815 ff.). It is an odd feature of Apollonios' crew that it includes two seers, Idmon and Mopsos, who dies on the return voyage (4.1502 ff.). In earlier accounts, only one seer seems to have been present; Pindar, for example, has Mopsos (*Pyth.* 4.190-191), but not Idmon; Pherekydes (3F108), Eumelos (F9K), and the *Naupaktia* all have Idmon, but apparently not Mopsos.<sup>21</sup> Apollonios seems to have combined two different traditions, and attempted to reconcile them by having one seer die on each journey.

In addition to F6K, Idmon also appears in the *Naupaktia* F7 and 8K (describing a single incident), again found in the scholia to Apollonios:

Schol. Ap. Rhod. 4.66a, 266 Wendel (= F7K):

⟨τὴν δ' αἶψα πόδες φέρον⟩: παρὰ [δὲ] τῷ τὰ Ναυπακτικά πεποιηκότε οὐκ ἔστι κατὰ τὴν ἰδίαν προαίρεσιν ἐξιούσα ἡ Μῆδεια, ἀλλ' ἐφ' ἐστίασιν καλουμένων τῶν Ἀργοναυτῶν κατ' ἐπιβουλήν, ἐνστάντος τοῦ τῆς ἀναιρέσεως αὐτῶν καιροῦ, προτραπομένου δὲ τοῦ Αἰήτου ἐπὶ τὴν Εὐρυλύτης τῆς γυναικὸς συνουσίαν, Ἰδμονος ὑποθιμένου τοῖς Ἀργοναύταις ἀποδιδράσκειν, καὶ Μῆδεια συνεκπλεῖ.

Schol. Ap. Rhod. 4.86, 266-267 Wendel (= F8K):

φεύγωμεν, πρὶν τόνδε θοῶν: ὁ μὲν Ἀπολλωνίος φησὶ νυκτὸς πεφευγῆναι τὴν Μῆδειαν ἐπὶ τὴν ναῦν, Αἰήτου συνέδριον ἔχοντος Κόλχων περὶ διαφθορᾶς τῶν ἡρώων· ὁ δὲ τὰ Ναυπακτικά πεποιηκὼς ὑπὸ Ἀφροδίτης φησὶ τὸν Αἰήτην κατακοιμηθῆ-

<sup>21</sup>In Eumelos too (F9K) Idmon apparently reached Kolchis. There obviously he was not an eye-witness, and Medeia apparently described to him how Jason accomplished the tasks. Perhaps he had been left in the *Argo* to ensure that no harm befell her. Idmon's presence at Kolchis in the *Naupaktia* argues against Huxley's suggestion (67) that in Eumelos Medeia is speaking to the dead Idmon in a *nekyomanteia*.

ναι, ἐπιθυμήσαντα τῇ αὐτοῦ γυναικὶ συγγενέσθαι, δεδειπνηκότων παρ' αὐτῷ τῶν Ἀργοναυτῶν καὶ κοιμωμένων, διὰ τὸ βούλεσθαι αὐτὸν τὴν ναὺν ἐμπρῆσαι·

δὴ τότε ἄρ' Αἰήτη πόθον ἔμβαλε δὶ Ἀφροδίτῃ  
Εὐρυλύτης φιλότῃ μιγήμεναι, ἥς ἀλόχοιο,  
κηδομένη φρεσὶν ἦσιν, ὅπως μετ' ἄεθλον Ἴησων  
νοστήσῃ οἰκόνδε σὺν ἀγχεμάχοις ἐτάροισιν.

ὁ δὲ Ἴδμων συνῆκε τὸ γεγονός καὶ φησι·

φευγέμεναι μεγάροιο θοὴν διὰ νύκτα μέλαιναν.

τὴν δὲ Μῆδειαν τὴν ποδοσοφίαν ἀκούσασαν ἀναστᾶσαν συνεξορμήσαι. λέγει δὲ καὶ Ἡρόδωρος (31F53) ταῦτα.

φευγέμεναι *codd.* φευγέμεν ἐκ *Meineke*

It is clear from these fragments that the situation in the *Naupaktia* was again very different from that described by Apollonios. Medeia did not go out on her own decision to urge the Argonauts to escape as she does in Ap. Rhod. 4.83 ff. In the *Naupaktia*, Aietes had deliberately invited the Argonauts to a banquet, apparently intending to burn their ship, and kill them when they fell asleep. But just in time Aphrodite intervened, filling Aietes with desire to sleep with his wife. Idmon noticed what had happened and urged the Argonauts to make their escape. When Medeia heard them going, she got up and went with them (cf. Huxley 71). Herodorus apparently told the same story.

F8K affords us a rare opportunity to examine the diction of this early epic. In the first line, δὴ τότε ἄρ' is a formula also found at *Od.* 8.381 δὴ τότε ἄρ' Ἀλκίνοον. The verb ἔμβάλλω is used in the sense, common in the Homeric poems, of inspiring mental or physical states (e.g. *Il.* 3.139; 4.444; 10.366, etc.). A close metrical parallel occurs at *Il.* 17.118 φόβον ἔμβαλε Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων. The word πόθος used in a sexual sense seems to be paralleled in extant epic only in Hesiod *Aspis* 41, where πόθος is found in the same position in the line. The formulaic line-ending δὶ Ἀφροδίτῃ occurs at *Il.* 2.820; 3.389; 413; 4.370; and *Od.* 20.68, but is not found in the Hesiodic corpus. In the second line, the phrase φιλότῃ μιγήμεναι occurs in the same metrical position as in *Il.* 6.161 and 165, while *Aspis* 36 has φιλότῃ μίγῃ. The formula ἥς ἀλόχοιο is also found as a line-ending at *Il.* 2.292; 24.305; *Od.* 3.235; and Hesiod F257.2 M-W. There appears to be no close metrical parallel to κηδομένη at the beginning of the third line, but it is found in a similar sense at *Il.* 1.196–209 θυμῷ φιλέουσά τε κηδομένη τε. However φρεσὶν ἦσιν occurs under the same metrical conditions quite often in Homer, e.g. *Il.* 11.794; 18.430; 19.19; *Od.* 1.444; 13.320. In line 4, νοστήσῃ οἰκόνδε is metrically identical to *Il.* 5.687 νοστήσας οἰκόνδε, which seems to be the only other occurrence of νοστεῖν with οἰκόνδε in extant epic. The line-ending σὺν ἀγχεμάχοις ἐτάροισιν is a close parallel to *Il.* 16.248 ξὺν πᾶσι καὶ ἀγχεμάχοις ἐτάροισιν. In the line spoken by Idmon,

Meineke's conjecture *φευγέμεν* *ἐκ* seems unnecessary. While *φεύγειν* with genitive only is rather rare (e.g., *Od.* 1.18; Hes. F257. 3 M-W; Soph. *Phil.* 1044), the closest Homeric parallels to *φευγέμεν* *ἐκ*, namely *φεύγοντ'* *ἐκ ποταμοῦ* (*Il.* 21.52) and *φεύγων* *ἐκ πόντοιο* (*Od.* 5.446), fail to convince. These participial forms, unlike *φευγέμεν(αι)*, cannot be lengthened to the unit –  $\omega$ –, so that another metrical solution, in this case the addition of *ἐκ*, becomes necessary. The form *φευγέμεναι* occurs in the same metrical position at *Il.* 10.359 and 21.13, and can be retained here. The latter part of the line, *θοὴν διὰ νύκτα μέλαιναν*, is a striking epic phrase found in both Homer and Hesiod (*Il.* 10.394; 468; 24.366; 653; *Theog.* 481), always with a verb of motion expressed or implied (cf. *Od.* 12.284 *διὰ νύκτα θοὴν*; *Il.* 12.463; 14.261 *Νυκτὶ θοῇ*). As West remarks, *θοὴν* is strange, and the problem has received a full discussion from Buttmann, who concludes that, besides "swiftness," the epithet bears also an association of terror and danger.<sup>22</sup> West suggests as an alternative that *ιέναι* *θοὴν διὰ νύκτα μέλαιναν* originally meant "to go swiftly through the dark night" and that *θοὴν* came to be taken as an epithet of *νύκτα*, hence the Homeric *Νυκτὶ θοῇ*. The association of danger is very suitable for the Naupaktian context.

The banquet to which Aietes invited the Argonauts is a feature not found in any source other than the *Naupaktia* and Herodorus, but it is a good epic motif, and indicates a well-developed story. Of great interest in this episode is the part played by Aphrodite. In Apollonios' *Argonautika* (3.55 ff.), Hera persuades Aphrodite to make Medeia fall in love with Jason. In the *Naupaktia* too Aphrodite may have made Medeia love Jason, but the Naupaktian version suggests a much closer relationship between this goddess and the hero than is the case in Apollonios' epic. In the Naupaktian banquet scene, Hera plays no part and Aphrodite acts on her own initiative, *κηδομένη φρεσὶν ἦσιν, ὅπως μετ' ἄεθλον Ἰήσων/ νοστήσῃ οἰκόνδε σὺν ἀγχεμάχοις ἐτάροισιν* (F8K). This is reminiscent of Hera helping the *Argo* past the *Planktai*, *ἐπεὶ φίλος ἦεν Ἰήσων* (*Od.* 12.72), and strongly suggests that, in the *Naupaktia*, Aphrodite, not Hera, may have been the protectress of the expedition.<sup>23</sup> Aphrodite had a strong cult in Thessaly, the home base of the Argonauts (cf. the month name *Ἀφρῖος*, and her cult titles *Ποντιά* and *Εὐπλοία*<sup>24</sup>). Hera is not mentioned in the surviving fragments of the *Naupaktia*, and her prominence in the later tradition may be due to the Corinthian Eumelos (cf. Paus. 2.3.10 ff. = F3K).

<sup>22</sup>Hesiod, *Theogony*, ed. M. L. West (Oxford 1966) 299, commentary on 481; P. Buttmann, *Lexilogus*, transl. J. R. Fishlake (London 1869<sup>3</sup>), 365–370. For the idea of terror, cf. Antim. F187 Wyss *Ἄιδος ἐκπρολιπούσα θοὴν δόμον*.

<sup>23</sup>Cf. Eur. *Med.* 527–528:

*Κύπριν νομίζω τῆς ἐμῆς ναυκληρίας  
σώτειραν εἶναι θεῶν τε κἀνθρώπων μόνην.*

<sup>24</sup>See RE 1.2729 and 2774 s.v. Aphrodite.

In the matter of the name of Aietes' wife, Eurylyte, fragments 7 and 8 differ from the Hesiodic tradition, which knew her as Iduia (*Theog.* 958–960). With these fragments we should associate F4K: ὁ τὰ Ναυπακτικὰ πεποιηκὼς Εὐρυλύτην αὐτὴν λέγει. Kinkel mistakenly treats this as a scholion to Ap. Rhod. 3.242 τὸν μὲν (i.e., "Ἀψυρτον) Καυκασίῃ νύμφῃ τέκεν Ἀστερόδεια, with the result that Eurylyte is taken as the name of the mother of Apsyrtos.<sup>25</sup> But Wendel has transposed the scholion to the correct lemma, 3.240 σὺν ἑῇ ναίεσκε δάμαρτι, and the fragment merely confirms what we know from F7 and 8, i.e., that in the *Naupaktia* Aietes' wife was called Eurylyte. We do not know whether the poem mentioned Apsyrtos.<sup>26</sup>

Both the *Naupaktia* and Herodorus gave Idmon a significant role in events at Aietes' court, and in fact he seems, in the extant fragments, to have been the most important Argonaut after Jason. Since Herodorus apparently followed the *Naupaktia* for his story of the events at Kolchis, including the presence of Idmon, it is likely that he also gave the Naupaktian version when he told of Idmon's death among the Mariandyni (31F50), a story also found in Apollonios (2.815 ff.) and Pherekydes (3F108). In Apollonios, of course, this happens on the outward voyage to Kolchis. In Herodorus and the *Naupaktia* at least, it must have happened on the return voyage, which, according to Herodorus (31F10), was by the same route as the outward journey. Thus the Argonauts may have visited the Mariandyni twice. Supporting evidence for Idmon's death on the return trip can be deduced from Apollonios 2.854 ff., where Tiphys dies just after Idmon, for the scholiast tells us that, according to Herodorus (31F54), Tiphys died not on the outward voyage, but on the return.<sup>27</sup> Idmon was clearly a prominent figure in the early versions, and Apollonios may have been alone in removing him from the scene so soon. The reason, of course, was the presence in Apollonios' version of two seers, Idmon and Mopsos.

Neither of these two fragments mentions the fleece, the object of the whole expedition, but we learn what happened from Schol. Ap. Rhod. 4.87, 267 Wendel (= F9K):

δώσω δὲ χρύσειον: ὁ μὲν Ἀπολλώνιος μετὰ τὸ φυγεῖν τὴν Μήδειαν ἐκ τοῦ Αἰήτου οἴκου πεποιήται ὑπισχνουμένην τὸ κῶας τῷ Ἰάσονι· ὁ δὲ τὰ Ναυπακτικὰ γράφας συνεκφέρουσιν αὐτὴν τὸ κῶας κατὰ τὴν φυγὴν, κατὰ τὸν αὐτοῦ οἶκον κείμενον [τοῦ Αἰήτου]· ὁ δὲ Ἡρόδωρος (31F52) μετὰ τὴν ἀνάσσειν τῶν ἀγρίων ταύρων ἀποσταλῆναι τὸν Ἰάσονα ὑπὸ τοῦ Αἰήτου ἐπὶ τὸ κῶας, τὸν δὲ πορευθέντα φονεῦσαι τε τὸν δράκοντα καὶ τὸ κῶας ἀπενεγκεῖν πρὸς Αἰήτην, τὸν δὲ δόλῳ καλέσαι αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ δεῖπνον.

<sup>25</sup>Cf. L. R. Farnell, *The Works of Pindar* 2 (London 1930–1932) 146, who states that the author of the *Naupaktia* knew of the murder of Apsyrtos.

<sup>26</sup>The earliest extant reference to Apsyrtos appears to be Pherekydes 3F32.

<sup>27</sup>Cf. Jacoby, *FGrHist* 31F50; C. Robert, *Die griechische Heldensage* (Berlin 1921) 775.

In Apollonios' story, Medeia flees to the Argonauts before the fleece has been obtained, but the *Naupaktia* told that she brought it with her from Aietes' palace when she joined the Argonauts in their escape. We can hardly imagine that the Argonauts forgot about the fleece; presumably someone, perhaps the vigilant Idmon, had instructed Medeia to bring it, or perhaps Aietes had hidden it in a place unknown to the Argonauts. It may be that the *Naupaktia* depicted the fleece as being kept permanently in the palace, but it is very probable that the version of Herodoros is derived from the *Naupaktia*. The Naupaktian story of the banquet and the escape of the Argonauts (F7–8K) was also told by Herodoros (31F53), perhaps drawing on the earlier work. The motif of the invitation to dinner in Herodoros 31F52 (τὸν δὲ δόλφ καλέσαι αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ δεῖπνον) strongly suggests that the *Naupaktia* was his source here too, cf. ἐφ' ἐστίασιν καλουμένων τῶν Ἀργοναυτῶν κατ' ἐπιβουλὴν (F7K). In Schol. Ap. Rhod. 4.87, the *Naupaktia* and Herodoros are not in fact cited as separate or contradictory authorities for a single event. The Naupaktian fragment tells of Medeia taking the fleece with her in the escape of the Argonauts, and that it was in Aietes' house. The Herodoros fragment refers to earlier events, ending with the fleece's being brought to Aietes and the invitation to the banquet; i.e., its context is that of *Naupaktia* F7–8 rather than F9.<sup>28</sup> The scholiast, discussing the actions of Medeia in the escape, refers first to the Naupaktian version of those events, but then, for a short synopsis of how the fleece came to be in Aietes' house, he cites Herodoros. The logographer seems at this point of his narrative to have presented, in effect, a prose epitome of the *Naupaktia*. It seems reasonable to assume that, in the Naupaktian version, before the banquet, Jason had successfully yoked the bulls, killed the dragon, and brought the fleece to Aietes. Aietes' plan to kill the Argonauts at the banquet was, therefore, a last desperate attempt to keep the fleece.

Several features of this version of events at Aietes' court are worth noting. First, only one trial, the yoking of the bulls, appears to have preceded the confrontation with the dragon.<sup>29</sup> Robert twice remarks that the only task facing Jason in the *Naupaktia* was to kill a dragon, and this is strange, since he mentions elsewhere the yoking of the bulls.<sup>30</sup> He presumably interprets ἀεθλον in F8.3–4K ὅπως μετ' ἀεθλων ἴησων/νοστήσῃ οἰκονδε as a reference to the killing of the dragon. But the word should properly be regarded as referring to the whole task imposed by Pelias, the fetching of the fleece; cf. Apollonios 1.15–17:

<sup>28</sup>Cf. Jacoby, *FGrHist* 31F52–53.

<sup>29</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>30</sup>Robert, *op. cit.* (above, n. 27) 791, n. 4 and 796 (the yoking of the bulls in the *Naupaktia*, 795).

. . . , καὶ οἱ ἀέθλον  
 ἔντυε ναυτιλῆς πολυκῆδεος, ὅφρ' ἐνὶ πόντῳ  
 ἦέ καὶ ἀλλοδαποῖσι μετ' ἀνδράσι νόστον ὀλέσσει.<sup>31</sup>

Robert also asserts that, in the *Naupaktia*, the dragon was not the guardian of the fleece,<sup>32</sup> presumably because F9K tells of Medeia's bringing it from Aietes' house. But as we have seen, Jason himself had brought it there after killing the dragon.

The story of the ploughing and the sowing of the teeth appears to have entered the myth too late to have been included in the *Naupaktia*. Apollonios' story of the sowing of the teeth and the slaughter of the Spartoi (3.1179 ff.) appears to be derived from Pherekydes. Apollonios tells that the teeth were those of the serpent which Kadmos killed at Thebes, half of them being given to Kadmos and the rest to Aietes. The same story is given by Pherekydes, who also told how Kadmos threw stones among the Spartoi, causing them to kill each other (3F22). Apollonios has transferred the stone-throwing motif from the Theban to the Kolchian Spartoi (3.1372). In the Theban story, Kadmos must originally have sown all the teeth, and the story of the division is only a means of creating a doublet. For this, Pherekydes himself may have been responsible.<sup>33</sup>

In the extant fragments, neither Herodoros nor the *Naupaktia* mentions the magic of Medeia. It may well be that, in the early tradition, Jason yoked the bulls without her aid. Certainly Herodoros 31F52 seems to imply that Jason killed the serpent on his own. Apollonios (4.145 ff.) has Medeia put the beast to sleep, following Antimachos (F63 Wyss = Schol. Ap. Rhod. 4.156–166a), while Pindar (*Pyth.* 4.249) says that Jason killed it τέχναις, which suggests Medeia's magic (cf. Schol. ταῖς τῆς Μηδείας τέχναις). Pherekydes (3F31), in apparent agreement with Herodoros, says that the dragon was killed by Jason. It seems likely that there was no magic in the older tradition.

The links between Herodoros and the *Naupaktia* suggest that it would be worthwhile to look at some other fragments of the logographer which may also be derived from the epic. Here it will be best to examine features fundamental to the myth, especially if the details supplied by Herodoros

<sup>31</sup>Cf. Ap. Rhod. 1.362 ἀεθλεύων βασιλῆι, with Mooney's note (*op. cit.* [above, n. 2] 93), where he compares *Il.* 7.453 Λαομέδοντι . . . ἀθλήσαντε, used of Poseidon and Apollo in the service of Laomedon, and remarks that this Homeric parallel is decisive against the old rendering of Ap. Rhod. 1.362 "in my struggle with the (Kolchian) king."

<sup>32</sup>Robert, *op. cit.* (above, n. 27) 791, n. 4.

<sup>33</sup>The sowing of the teeth and the birth of the Spartoi may have been described by Eumelos (F9K = Schol. Ap. Rhod. 3.1354–1356, transferred from 1372 ff. by Wendel, 257–258). Cf. Huxley 66. I am not convinced that the Eumelian reference has been correctly located, but further elucidation is beyond the scope of this article.

differ from the Apollonian version or those of his predecessors other than the *Naupaktia*.

One such feature, already noticed in passing, is the return voyage by the same route as the outward one (31F10). This differs from all other extant versions,<sup>34</sup> and to take such a definite stand Herodoros must have had good authority—probably the *Naupaktia*. It is certainly likely that, in the early form of the myth, the return voyage would be the same as the outward one. It would later be changed to add more interest to the tale, especially when geographical knowledge widened during the period of colonization (cf. Huxley 72).

A fundamental feature for the *Naupaktia* would be names and genealogies, especially of women, and we have already noticed how the poem differed from Hesiod's in the name of Aietes' wife. Another name difference is found in Schol. Ap. Rhod. 2.1122a, who tells us that Herodoros (31F39) called the mother of Phrixos' sons Chalkiope. This is the name used by Apollonios (2.1149), but the scholiast adds that Akousilaos (2F38) and Hesiod (F255 M-W) called her Iophossa, while Pherekydes (3F25) knew her as Euenia. Hence the most likely source for the name Chalkiope would be Eumelos or the *Naupaktia*, and in view of Herodoros' reliance on the latter, especially for events at Aietes' court, it is possible that the source was the *Naupaktia*. Herodoros also diverged significantly from tradition in the name he gives to Jason's mother. Schol. Ap. Rhod. 1.45–47a (= 31F40) shows that he named her as Polypheme, daughter of Autolykos, while Apollonios (1.47 and 282) and Pherekydes (3F104) both called her Alkimede, daughter of Phylakos, and Hesiod (F38 M-W) called her Polymele or Polymede. The name Polypheme too may come from the *Naupaktia*.

An interesting family is given by Herodoros 31F38 (= Schol. Ap. Rhod. 2.1144–1145a):

Ἡρόδωρος δὲ φησιν ἐξ Ἀθάμαντος καὶ Θεμιστοῦς γενέσθαι παῖδας Σχοινέα, Ἐρίθρον, Λεύκωνα, Πτοῖον, νεωτάτους δὲ Φρίξον καὶ Ἑλλην, οὓς διὰ τὴν Ἰνούς ἐπιβουλήν ἐκχωρήσαι.

The first wife of Athamas and mother of Phrixos and Helle is normally known as Nephele (e.g., Apollod. *Bibl.* 1.9.1; Nonn. *Dionys.* 302 ff.), and Herodoros is the only source to give her the name Themisto. Pherekydes (3F98) assigns that name to the stepmother,<sup>35</sup> but it was usually given to the third wife of Athamas, as it is by Apollodoros (*Bibl.* 1.9.2).<sup>36</sup> In his

<sup>34</sup>I.e., Apollonios 4.254 ff., and Antimachos F65 Wyss, Hekataios 1F18, Pindar *Pyth.* 4.25 ff., Hesiod F241 M-W (all in Schol. Ap. Rhod. 4.257–262b).

<sup>35</sup>Cf. Hyg. *Fab.* 1 (who has Ino as third wife); Ath. 13.560c; *Anonym. Tract. de Mulieribus in Paradoxographi Graeci* ed. A. Westermann (1839, repr. Amsterdam 1963) 218, 17.

<sup>36</sup>Cf. Nonn. *Dionys.* 302 ff.; see Höfer in Roscher 5.607.

account, Themisto becomes the mother of four children whose names are Leukon, Erythrios, Schoineus, and Ptoos; i.e., the account is essentially the same as that given by Herodotos (cf. for other slight variants Tzetzes *ad* Lyc. 22; Nonn. *Dionys.* 314–318). All of them are eponymous Boiotian heroes (cf. Huxley 93). The only one named by an early source is Ptoios/Ptoos, known as a son of Athamas and Themisto by Asios of Samos (Paus. 9.23.6 = F3K). Asios of course wrote poetry similar to the *Naupaktia* (cf. Paus. 4.2.1), but we do not know whether he made Phrixos too a son of Themisto. Herodotos himself may have combined the families of two of Athamas' wives, or amalgamated two traditions concerning the children of Themisto, i.e., that she was (a) the mother of Schoineus, Erythros, Leukon, and Ptoios and (b) the mother of Phrixos and Helle. If Asios was the source of the first tradition, the *Naupaktia* may have been responsible for the second. The unanimity of the other sources on the name Nephele for the mother of Phrixos, a basic character in the story, suggests that Herodotos was drawing on an old tradition. Whether this was the *Naupaktia* or Asios is difficult to say, but since the subject was the Argonaut myth, and Asios' interest in Athamas and Themisto seems to be concerned mainly with Boiotian myth (cf. Huxley 92–93), the *Naupaktia* is the more likely source.

Herodotos also tells an interesting story involving the sons of Phrixos (31F9 = Schol. Ap. Rhod. 3.594–598a and 605). An oracle was given to Aietes that he would perish at the hands of his own descendants, and for that reason he thought up the task of yoking the bulls.<sup>37</sup> A trace of this version is found in Apollonios 3.597 ff., where the king refers to a hint he had received from his father Helios to beware of treacherous plots in his own family. He sent the sons of Phrixos on a long journey to Achaia, but thinks that he has nothing to fear from his daughters or his son Apsyrtes. Only Chalkiophe's sons were a problem. In Herodotos' version, the task of yoking the bulls was designed as a protection against any unrecognised kinsmen who might arrive. Since Phrixos' sons, the children of Aietes' own daughter, were there at his court, the king must have sent them away, just as he does in Ap. Rhod. 3.601–602. Indeed the return voyage of the sons of Phrixos is referred to by Herodotos 31F47 (= Schol. Ap. Rhod. 2.531–532):

Ἡρόδωρος δὲ ἐπὶ τοῦ βωμοῦ φησι τεθυκέναι τοὺς Ἀργοναύτας, ἐφ' οὗ Ἄργος ὁ Φρίξου ἐπαγίων ἐτεθύκει.

This suggests that the Argonauts did not meet the sons of Phrixos on their voyage, as in Apollonios 2.1090 ff., but that the sons had returned

<sup>37</sup>Robert (op. cit. [above, n.27] 766 n. 1) suggests ὑπὸ τῶν Αἰόλου ἐγγόνων for ὑπὸ τῶν αὐτοῦ ἐγγόνων in Schol. Ap. Rhod. 3.594, but Schol. Ap. Rhod. 3.605 ὑπὸ συγγενῶν argues otherwise.



to Greece before the Argonauts set sail. This version must also have been known to Pherekydes (3F106), who said that the *Argo* was named after Argos, son of Phrixos.<sup>38</sup> Hesiod too may have known of the return of the sons of Phrixos. Apollodoros (*Bibl.* 1.9.21) mentions the story, saying that Phineus was blinded *ὅτι τοῖς Φρίξου παισὶ τὸν ἐκ Κόλχων εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα πλοῦν ἐμήνυσεν*, with which cf. Hesiod F157 = 254 M-W: *πεπηρώσθαι δὲ Φινέα φησὶν Ἡσίοδος ἐν Μεγάλαις Ἠοίαις, ὅτι Φρίξω τὴν ὁδὸν ἐμήνυσεν*. Since no other source connects Phineus with Phrixos, it is better to accept Robert's conjecture *ὅτι (τοῖς) Φρίξου* (*De Apoll. Bibl.* 82) or J. Schwartz's *Φρίξου (παισὶ)* (*Pseudo-Hesioda* [Leiden 1960], 163). But although the return of the sons of Phrixos may have been told by Hesiod, Herodorus' story about the origin of the yoking of the bulls is not found in the extant Hesiodic fragments. Since the yoking was Aietes' sole defence against the would-be murderer in Herodorus, and was apparently also the only trial facing Jason in the *Naupaktia*, it is possible that the story of the oracle and the yoking was included in the epic poem.<sup>39</sup>

*Naupaktia* F10K refers to events after the return of the *Argo* (= Paus. 2.3.9):

*Ἐπεὶ δὲ ἔστιν ἐν Ἑλλήσιν Ναυπάκτια ὀνομαζόμενα· πεποιήται δὲ ἐν αὐτοῖς Ἰάσονα ἐξ Ἴωλκοῦ μετὰ τὸν Πελίου θάνατον ἐς Κόρκυραν μετακίῃσαι, καὶ οἱ Μέρμερον μὲν τὸν πρεσβύτερον τῶν παίδων ὑπὸ λεαίνης διαφθαρῆναι θηρεύοντα ἐν τῇ πέραν ἡπείρῃ· Φέρητι δὲ οὐδὲν ἔστι ἐς μνήμην προσκείμενον.*

Hence, in the Naupaktian version, Jason did not remain at Iolkos after his return. Other sources too indicate that Jason did not settle at Iolkos, e.g., Pindar *Nem.* 4.54 ff. (cf. *Nem.* 3.57); Pherekydes 3F62; Hesiod F208, 299, 211 M-W; but none of them tell where Jason went after he left the city.<sup>40</sup> All of them depict Akastos, son of Pelias, as king at Iolkos, and this was probably so in the *Naupaktia* too. It seems strange that the *Naupaktia* made Jason leave after Pelias' death, since we would expect that Jason would then have become king. It can hardly be that Pelias was murdered and Jason compelled to leave the city, for the murder is unlikely to have been in the myth at such an early date, and the word *θάνατον* does not imply it.<sup>41</sup> Akastos was an Argonaut, and Jason may have given up his claim to the throne in his favour. If so, it should not be surprising that Jason would leave Iolkos to allow the new king a free

<sup>38</sup>According to Apollodoros (*Bibl.* 1.9.16), Argos, son of Phrixos, built the *Argo*.

<sup>39</sup>Cf. Jacoby's commentary on 31F52–53.

<sup>40</sup>Eumelos (F3K = Paus. 2.3.10) tells that Jason left Iolkos with Medea when she was invited to become ruler at Korinth, but that he returned after quarrelling with her. Jason of course could have left Iolkos a second time.

<sup>41</sup>The earliest literary references to the murder of Pelias appear to be Pindar *Pyth.* 4.250, where Medea is called *τὴν Πελίου φόνον*, and Pherekydes 3F105, where she is *τῷ Πελῖα κακὸν* (cf. Ap. Rhod. 3.1135 *κακὸν Πελῖη*).

hand. However, it is possible that in the early versions Jason had no claim to the throne at all, but was a mere adventurer or the instrument of an oracle, like the "one-sandalled" man (Pindar *Pyth.* 4.75, with scholia; Pherekydes 3F105). Certainly, no source earlier than Pindar (*Pyth.* 4.109 ff.) states explicitly that Jason had a legitimate claim. Hesiod (*Theog.* 995–996) describes Pelias as a despotic ruler, but does not indicate that he was a usurper (cf. F33a.1–5 M-W). At *Od.* 11.256–257, Pelias is depicted as ruling in prosperity over Iolkos, and there is nothing to suggest that he is anything other than the legitimate ruler. If he were the rightful king, then Akastos would be his legitimate successor, and Jason would have no claim to the throne and no future at Iolkos. Such a situation would be in keeping with the tradition that Jason did not stay there.

The comparative *πρεσβύτερον* in F10K makes it clear that in the *Naupaktia* Jason had only two sons. The name Mermeros is interesting, because at *Od.* 1.259 Athena, disguised as Mentes, tells of seeing Odysseus ἐξ 'Εφύρης ἀνιόντα παρ' Ἴλου Μερμερίδαο. The context here indicates that Athena is speaking of somewhere in north-west Greece, not far from Ithaka. Hence the Ephyre referred to is probably the one in Thesprotia, which lay opposite Kerkyra.<sup>42</sup> The reason for the visit to Ilos, son of Mermeros, is given in the following lines (260–262):

οἷχετο γὰρ καὶ κέλσε θοῆς ἐπὶ νηὸς Ὀδυσσεὺς  
φάρμακον ἀνδροφόνον διζήμενος, ὅφρα οἱ εἴη  
ἰὸς χρίεσθαι χαλκῆρας·

Similarly at *Od.* 2.328–330, one of the suitors, commenting on Telemachos' decision to go in search of his father, says:

ἡὲ καὶ εἰς Ἐφύρην ἐθέλει, πείραν ἄρουραν,  
ἐλθεῖν, ὅφρ' ἔνθεν θυμοφθόρα φάρμακ' ἐνέικῃ  
ἐν δὲ βάλλῃ κρητῆρι καὶ ἡμέας πάντας ὀλέσσει.

Thus Ephyre was well-known to the poet of the *Odyssey* as the place to go if one wanted to obtain poison. How did the city acquire such a reputation? Odysseus is said to have gone specifically to Ilos, son of Mermeros, that is, to the grandson of the magician Medeia, who apparently passed on her skills to her descendants. When the Homeric poet mentions Ilos as a person from whom poison could be obtained, he must have known the tradition that Mermeros was a son of Jason and Medeia, and presumably

<sup>42</sup>Cf. Schol. *Od.* 1.259; Apollod. 244F180; Thuk. 1.46.4; Strabo 7.7.5 (the latter two possibly drawing on Hekataios; see N. G. L. Hammond, *Epirus* [Oxford 1967] 446–447; Huxley 61 ff.).

also that this pair had settled in north-west Greece.<sup>43</sup> It must have been somewhere close to Ephyre where Mermeros met his death in the Naupaktian story.

Thus the reconstructed Naupaktian version of the *Argonautika* gives quite a complete story. There are signs that the poem included the preliminary Phrixos episode and told that Phrixos' sons had returned to Greece before the *Argo* sailed. During her voyage, the Boreads chased away the Harpies for Phineus. On arrival at Aietes' city, Jason was confronted with only one task, the yoking of the bulls, which he undertook at the urging of Idmon, the seer for the voyage and the most notable crew member. Next Jason killed the serpent and brought the fleece to Aietes, who then treacherously invited the Argonauts to a banquet, intending to kill them and burn their ship. But through the aid of Aphrodite and the vigilance of Idmon the Argonauts made their escape, and Medeia joined them, bringing the fleece with her. Probably they returned home by the route by which they had come, but both Idmon and the steersman Tiphys died on the way. Then, after Pelias' death, Jason and Medeia went off to Kerkyra.

The scanty fragments of the *Naupaktia* furnish us with several significant instances where the poem differed from our other sources for the Argonaut myth. Some fragments, such as those telling of the banquet and the escape of the Argonauts, may cause us to regret that nothing more substantial remains from what must have been one of the more interesting epics of archaic Greece.

<sup>43</sup>Medeia is also associated with Ephyre by Eumelos (F1K = Schol. Ap. Rhod. 4.1212; F2K = Schol. Pindar *Ol.* 13.74), who exploits the existence of the several Ephyres to introduce her to Korinth. See T. J. Dunbabin, "The Early History of Corinth," *JHS* 68 (1948) 66; Huxley 61 ff.