

## THE NARRATOR'S ADDRESSES TO THE NARRATEE IN APOLLONIUS RHODIUS' ARGONAUTICA

CALVIN S. BYRE  
*University of Oklahoma*

The device of direct address by the narrator of a literary work to his hearer/reader was marked out for critical attention as long ago as [Longinus] *Subl.* 26, who describes the effect of such addresses in Homer and Herodotus in making the hearer more attentive and involved in the events that are narrated. But it is the work of modern narratologists concerned with the communicative structure of narrative<sup>1</sup> that has focused new attention on the device and provided a more precise critical vocabulary and conceptual framework for describing and analyzing its use in narrative literature.

The five occurrences of direct addresses by the narrator to his audience in the *Iliad* (*Il.* 4.223–25, 4.429b–31a, 5.85–86, 15.697–98, 17.366–67), have recently been examined from a narratological perspective by de Jong and by Richardson.<sup>2</sup> Little attention, however, has hitherto been given to the eight occurrences of direct address in the *Argonautica* of Apollonius Rhodius, addresses which, while they follow Homeric precedent in general form, differ from the addresses in the *Iliad* in the types of contexts in which they occur, in their semantic relationships to the surrounding narrative, and in their rhetorical and thematic functions. The present paper analyzes and interprets these addresses, viewing them in part against the background of the Homeric pattern, and hopes to show that they afford an interesting example of Apollonius' adaptation of an epic device to suit the changed narrative situation of his poem.

In narratological terms, the basic narrative situation that we will be concerned with here consists of an "extradiegetic" narrator (i.e. a "first level" narrator, who stands outside of the fictional world of the story and whose act of narration is not itself an event in another narrative (as, for example, Odysseus' *apologoi* are) telling a story to an extradiegetic audience, to the "narratee" who

<sup>1</sup> Out of the huge literature dealing with the theory of narrative, among the most pertinent to the kind of questions we will be dealing with here, as well as among the most comprehensive and influential, is the work of Gérard Genette, particularly *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method*, trans. Jane E. Lewin (Ithaca, N.Y. 1980) and *Narrative Discourse Revisited*, trans. Jane E. Lewin (Ithaca, N.Y. 1988). Genette draws upon the novels of Proust for most of the examples by which he illustrates and tests his theory; but what he has attempted to construct is a universal model of narrative.

<sup>2</sup> Irene J. F. de Jong, *Narrators and Focalizers: The Presentation of the Story in the Iliad* (Amsterdam 1987) 54–60; Scott Richardson, *The Homeric Narrator* (Nashville 1990) 174–78. Cf. Elizabeth Block, "The Narrator Speaks: Apostrophe in Homer and Vergil," *TAPA* 112 (1982) 12–15, and, for a discussion of the device primarily in the Latin historians, Kristine Gilmartin, "A Rhetorical Figure in Latin Historical Style: The Imaginary Second Person Singular," *TAPA* 105 (1975) 99–121.

is, as Suleiman says, "inscribed or encoded" in his narrative text itself.<sup>3</sup> It is now generally recognized that the narrator of a fictional work should be distinguished from the real author, and the narratee from the real audience. Theorists of narrative often make a further distinction between these and the implied author and the implied reader (or hearer). However, in the absence of indications to the contrary (e.g. when the narratee is endowed with individuating characteristics or is treated ironically or satirically), the implied audience and the narratee, like the implied author and the narrator, tend to become conflated, and the real audience tends to identify itself with the narratee.<sup>4</sup> Generally speaking, this is what happens in the case of the classical epic, where the distinction between the implied author and the narrator and between the implied reader and the narratee is neither easy nor useful to make.<sup>5</sup> Hence, in this paper, no attempt will be made to maintain these distinctions, and the terms "narrator" and "narratee" will generally be used as the "unmarked" terms for all three levels in the respective hierarchies.

In telling his tale, the narrator of course refers to the events and characters that make up the fictional world of his story, i.e. to the *énoncé*, or *narrated*. But his words may also refer to the act of narration itself, to its temporal and spatial circumstances and to its participants, the narrator and the narratee; in other words, the narrative may contain signs of the *énonciation*, or the *narrating*.<sup>6</sup> Direct addresses to the narratee contain the most explicit signs of the narratee<sup>7</sup> and, as such, they are among those passages in narrative works that contain the most explicit signs of the *énonciation*.

Direct address to the narratee in both Homer and Apollonius takes the form of a construction in which the narratee is addressed by a verb or verbs in the second person singular and in which an activity, usually a verbal or perceptual reaction to an event or object of the fictional world, is hypothetically attributed

<sup>3</sup> Susan R. Suleiman, "Introduction: Varieties of Audience-Oriented Criticism," in: Susan R. Suleiman and Inge Crosman, eds., *The Reader in the Text: Essays on Audience and Interpretation* (Princeton 1980) 14. A number of terms are used for the concept of the narratee, including "characterized reader" and, in German scholarship, "*fictiver Leser*"; see W. Daniel Wilson, "Readers in Texts," *PMLA* 96 (1981) 848–63. "Narratee," however, is the term that has gained the widest currency, and it is the most appropriate one to use when discussing narratives in Classical literature, since it is neutral as to whether the audience reads the text or listens to it; see Gerald Prince, "Introduction to the Study of the Narratee," trans. Francis Mariner, in: Jane P. Tompkins, ed., *Reader-Response Criticism: From Formalism to Post-Structuralism* (Baltimore 1980) 19.

<sup>4</sup> See Genette, *Narrative Discourse Revisited* (above, note 1) 130–134 and Geoffrey N. Leech and Michael H. Short, *Style in Fiction: A Linguistic Introduction to English Fictional Prose* (London 1981): 262–68.

<sup>5</sup> Massimo Fusillo, *Il tempo delle "Argonautiche": Un'analisi del racconto in Apollonio Rodio* (Rome 1985) 382.

<sup>6</sup> For the concepts of *énonciation* and *énoncé*, see Oswald Ducrot and Tzvetan Todorov, *Encyclopedic Dictionary of the Sciences of Language*, trans. Catherine Porter (Baltimore 1979), s.v. *enunciation*; Gérard Genette, *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method* (above, note 1) 212–215; Nomi Tamir, "Personal Narrative and Its Linguistic Foundation," *PTL* 1 (1976) 403–4.

<sup>7</sup> This and other "signals of the narratee" are discussed by Prince (above, note 3) 11–17.

to him.<sup>8</sup> In all cases except *Argon.* 4.927b–28a (see below), the second person verbs are in the optative mood accompanied by ἄν or κέν. In *Il.* 5.85 (Τυδείδην δ' οὐκ ἄν γνοίης ποτέ ποισι μετεῖν), the optative is clearly a potential of the past ("and you would not have known which side the son of Tydeus was on"); as Goodwin notes, "the feeling of past time is seen in the dependent verb."<sup>9</sup> In *Argon.* 2.171b (οὐδὲ κε φαίης), the optative is a potential of the future, for the present-tense description of the bore of the Bosphorus in which this address occurs concerns events that are typical of the area.<sup>10</sup>

The optatives + ἄν or κέν in the other addresses are often taken as past potentials, used to express a feeling or thought that one would have had if he had been present on the scene in the epic past.<sup>11</sup> These optatives would then be potentials from the vantage point of the *narrated* event. However, as Goodwin observes,

in the fluid state of the language..., it is easy to understand how φαίης κε (without a protasis) might have a vague potential force, *you might perchance say*, which could be felt as either past or future as the context demanded. We must, therefore, hold that the optative with κέ in such cases expresses merely what *could happen*, without any limitations of time except such as are imposed by the context; and according to the limitations thus imposed we translate such optatives (with more exactness than they really possess) either as past or as future.<sup>12</sup>

It is possible, therefore, that they are potentials from the vantage point of the time of *narrating*. If this is the case, the narrator is assuming that the fictional world is unfolding so vividly before the mind's eye of his narratee that the latter can contemplate it and react to it; the implicit protasis is then something like "if you were to look, if you were to express your feelings," etc.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>8</sup> See Jacob Wackernagel, *Vorlesungen über Syntax mit besonderer Berücksichtigung von Griechisch, Lateinisch und Deutsch*, 2d ed., vol. 1 (Basel 1926) 109–10.

De Jong (above, note 2) 57–60 believes that the hypothetical constructions involving what she calls an "anonymous focalizer," (an anonymous third-person spectator such as the one in *Il.* 4.539–542) are similar to the direct addresses to the narratee: the anonymity of the spectator in the former encourages the narratee, and through him the real reader/hearer, to identify with him and share his feelings. Thus, this spectator becomes comparable to the "you" addressed elsewhere. I agree with Richardson, however (above, note 2) 239–40n. 28 that, while the imaginary spectator also adds vividness to the narration, the two constructions are quite dissimilar, since "the second-person verb is responsible for involving the narratee in the scene in a way the others cannot."

<sup>9</sup> William Watson Goodwin, *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb*, rewritten and enlarged (Boston 1893) 162.

<sup>10</sup> Hermann Fränkel, *Noten zu den "Argonautika" des Apollonios* (Munich 1968) 166; cf. Charles Rowan Beye, *Epic and Romance: The "Argonautica" of Apollonius* (Carbondale and Edwardsville, Ill. 1982) 26.

<sup>11</sup> Pierre Chantraine, *Grammaire Homérique*, vol. 2 (Paris 1953) 220; cf. de Jong (above, note 2) 55.

<sup>12</sup> Goodwin (above, note 9) 162; cf. Kühner-Gerth, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*, 3d ed. (Hannover 1898) 396.2.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Richardson (above, note 2) 176, who says of the Homeric addresses that "the force of the second-person verb is that the clause functions as the apodosis,

In any case, what we seem to have in addresses to the narratee in Homer and Apollonius is, as it were, a sudden, split focus on both the *énunciation* and the *énoncé*, either of which may receive the greater emphasis as the address is elaborated. On the one hand, the narrator by addressing his narratee reminds him of his presence and of the fact that the narratee is attending to a story narrated by him; hence the address tends to disrupt the "epic illusion" of the reality of the story, while reaffirming the immediacy and intimacy of the relationship between narrator and narratee.<sup>14</sup>

At the same time, by placing the narratee in a hypothetical situation involving an event, setting, character, or object of that story, the narrator links the fictional world and the "real" world to which he and the narratee belong; in other words, a hypothetical world, containing elements of both the fictional and the real world, is briefly created to mediate between those worlds. The address also, therefore, highlights the relationship between the narratee and the fictional world.<sup>15</sup>

The addresses in the *Iliad* all occur in similar contexts, in the narration of swift-moving battle scenes.<sup>16</sup> In each instance, the narratee is hypothetically situated on the scene of an event in the story that is being narrated, and his relationship to that event is that of a witness placed near the center of the action. In two cases (*Il.* 4.223–25, 5.85–88), the focus of the narratee's attention is on the activity of an individual (Agamemnon and Diomedes, respectively); in the other three, on the activity of the massed armies.

In all the Homeric addresses, it seems to be presupposed that the narratee in the hypothetical situation in which he is an observer possesses none, or only a minimum, of the knowledge of the story that he has acquired thus far from the narrative. His perceptions in the hypothetical situation are correct, but he may judge or interpret the situation incorrectly because he does not have all of the

not so much to the implied protasis, 'if you could be present on the scene alongside the characters,' as to the protasis, 'if you could be the narrator and could see what I am seeing.'"

<sup>14</sup> On this effect of direct address to the narratee, cf. Robyn R. Warhol, "Toward a Theory of the Engaging Narrator: Earnest Interventions in Gaskell, Stowe, and Eliot," *PMLA* 101 (1986) 815–16 and the subsequent discussions of Warhol's article in Cynthia Bernstein, letter, *PMLA* 102 (1987) 218; Lilian R. Furst, letter, *PMLA* 102 (1987) 351; and Robyn R. Warhol, letter, *PMLA* 102 (1987) 351–52.

<sup>15</sup> On the introduction of hypothetical events into narrative texts, see Gerald Prince, "The Disnarrated," *Style* 22 (1988) 1–8.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Stephen P. Scully, "Studies of Narrative and Speech in the *Iliad*," *Arethusa* 19 (1986) 137, who says that the device "always occurs in similar situations, when the commotion on the battlefield becomes particularly bewildering and fast paced." Their distribution in the poem is thus rather similar to that of the similes. They are somewhat comparable, too, in effecting a break in the forward flow of the narrative and at the same time drawing the narratee's attention to it. As Mark W. Edwards (*Homer: Poet of the Iliad* [Baltimore 1987] 109) notes, the simile "is a technique of expansion, a means of creating a pause in the forward movement of the narrative. The action is held still for a moment and the focus of attention changed, and new thoughts or contrasting emotions can be added.... Similes regularly occur in passages describing general movements, where other elaborating techniques would be difficult to use, and to call attention to the sudden appearance of a new hero, who needs to catch our eye immediately."

relevant facts at his disposal. The addresses often depend for their effect on the contrast between the limited perspective afforded the narratee in the hypothetical situation posited in the addresses and the broader perspective and knowledge afforded in the narrative context. As de Jong points out, the negatives in these passages—alpha privatives (ἀκμηῆτας καὶ ἀτειρέας) occur in *Il.* 15.697–98, negated main verbs in the others)—enhance the contrast, through litotes (*Il.* 4.223–25), through having the narratee hypothetically not say or not perceive what is the case (*Il.* 4.429b–31a, 5.85–86, ), or through having him affirm what is not (*Il.* 15.697–98, 17.366–69).<sup>17</sup> Thus, in *Il.* 15.697–98, Φαίης κ' ἀκμηῆτας καὶ ἀτειρέας ἀλλήλοισιν / ἄντεσθ' ἐν πολέμῳ, ὥς ἐσσυμένους ἐμάχοντο ("You would say/have said that tireless and without fatigue they met in battle, so vehemently were they fighting"), the contrast is between what the narratee would say if suddenly confronted by the sight of the Greeks and Trojans fighting at the ships and the fact that they have been fighting all day. The effect of these Homeric addresses is relatively simple and straightforward: as de Jong argues, the narratee's becoming a temporary eyewitness involves him in the story more directly and arouses admiration in him for the individuals or masses that are the focus of attention.<sup>18</sup>

The addresses in the *Argonautica*, on the other hand, involve more complex roles of the narratee in the hypothetical situations that are posited, and they involve more complex effects than simple admiration. They are as follows:<sup>19</sup>

- (1) *Argon.* 1.725–26 (introduction to the ecphrasis on the mantle of Jason):

Τῆς μὲν ρηϊτερόν κεν ἐς ἡέλιον ἀνιόντα  
ὅσσε βάλοις ἢ κείνο μεταβλέψειας ἔρευθος·

("You would more easily look/have looked upon the rising sun than you would look/have looked upon that redness.")

- (2) *Argon.* 1.765–767 (part of the ecphrasis on the mantle of Jason, following the description of the image of Phrixus listening to the ram):

Κείνους κ' εἰσορώων ἀκέοις ψεύδοιό τε θυμόν,  
ἐλπόμενος πυκινὴν τιν' ἀπὸ σφείων ἔσακούσαι  
βάξιν, ὅτεν καὶ δηρὸν ἐπ' ἐλπίδι θηήσαιο.

("Seeing them you would be/would have been silent, and you would be deceived/have been deceived in your mind, expecting to hear some wise utterance from them, in expectation of which you would gaze/would have gazed on them for a long time.")

- (3) *Argon.* 2.171b–74 (description of the bore of the Bosphorus):

<sup>17</sup> De Jong (above, note 2) 56–57.

<sup>18</sup> De Jong (above, note 2) 55–60.

<sup>19</sup> The text of Apollonius quoted in this paper is Apollonios de Rhodes, *Argonautiques*, ed. Francis Vian, 3 vols. (Paris 1976–1981). Vian's commentary will be cited by his name.

οὐδὲ κε φαίης  
 φεύξεσθαι κακὸν οἶτον, ἐπεὶ μάλα μεσσόθι νηὸς  
 λάβρον ἐπικρέμαται ὥς τε νέφος, ἀλλὰ τό γ' ἔμπης  
 στόρνυται, εἰ κ' ἐσθλοῖο κυβερνητῆρος ἐπαύρη.

("And you would not say that you would escape an evil fate, since it boisterously overhangs the middle of the ship like a cloud, but it nevertheless becomes smooth, if you enjoy the services of a good pilot.")

(4) *Argon.* 3.1265–67 (Jason is filled with the might given him by the drugs of Medea, and leaps about brandishing his armor):

φαίης κεν ζοφεροῖο κατ' αἰθέρος αἴσσουσιν  
 χειμερίην στεροπὴν θαμινὸν μεταπαιφάσσεσθαι  
 ἐκ νεφέων, ἅ τ' ἔπειτα μελάντατον δῆβρον ἄγωνται.

("You would say/would have said that stormy lightning, shooting from the dark sky, is/was darting frequently from clouds, which next bring on a pitch-black rainstorm.")

(5) *Argon.* 4.238b–240 (the Colchians put out to sea in pursuit of the Argonauts):

οὐδὲ κε φαίης  
 τόσσον νηίτην στόλον ἔμμεναι, ἀλλ' οἰωνῶν  
 ἱλαδὸν ἄσπετον ἔθνος ἐπιβρομέειν πελάγεσσιν.

("And you would not say/would not have said that so large a force is/was a fleet of ships, but that it is/was an immense host of birds clamoring in troops upon the sea.")

(6) *Argon.* 4. 428b–429 (on the history of the peplos which Jason and Medea give to Apsyrtus):

Οὐ μιν ἀφάσσω  
 οὔτε κεν εἰσορώων γλυκὺν ἥμερον ἐμπλήσειας·

("Neither in touching it nor in looking at it would you satisfy/have satisfied your sweet desire.")

(7) *Argon.* 4.927b–28a (description of the Planctae, where, just before the arrival of the Argonauts, flame and thick smoke arose):

οὐδὲ κεν αὐγὰς  
 ἔδρακες ἠελίοιο.

("And you would not have seen the light of the sun.")

(8) *Argon.* 4.997b (the people of king Alcinoüs are welcoming the Argonauts):

φαίης κεν ἐοῖς ἐπὶ παισὶ γάνυσθαι.

("You would say/have said that they are/were rejoicing about their own children.")

(4), (5), and (8) are the only addresses within passages of narrative proper. All three are similar to Homer's in that they hypothetically place the narratee as a witness on the scene of an event in the story that is being narrated. They differ, however, in the point of view that they afford to the narratee and in how this point of view affects his attitude to the story.

In (5), the narratee stands, as it were, at the edge of the frame, looking from a "bird's eye" vantage point at the distant ships of the Colchians out at sea (the embarkation and its preparations have been narrated in rapid summary in 4.236b–38a). From this distance, the narratee would, it is hypothesized, not perceive the fleet as a fleet at all, manned by human beings, but rather as a flock of birds—a flock of birds, to be sure, with some military-like attributes (ἰλαδόν, ἔθνος). Here, unlike the perceptions embedded in the addresses in Homer, the narratee's perceptions of the situation are incorrect. The address serves to distance the narratee from the narrated event, figuratively as well as literally; the narratee's misperception moves the event from the world of epic toward the everyday world depicted in the epic simile. Indeed, like the similes a few lines earlier, comparing the assembled Colchians to sea waves in a storm and to autumn leaves (4.214–19), this address serves to create an impression of the immense numbers of the enemies of the fleeing Argonauts. But it is one thing to say that something is like something else, quite another to say that it is something other than it in fact is; this address is not a simile, as Fränkel rightly insists.<sup>20</sup>

Vian sees elements of humor in the entire episode, including the description of the frustrated wrath of Aeetes and the barbarian crowd of Colchians.<sup>21</sup> Indeed, there are surely humorous aspects to the momentary presentation of the Colchian fleet as a huge flock of raucous sea birds. The humor is compounded because the address echoes an address in Homer:

οἱ δ' ἄλλοι ἀκὴν ἴσαν, οὐδέ κε φαίης  
τόσσον λαὸν ἔπεσθαι ἔχοντ' ἐν στήθεσιν αὐδὴν,  
σιγῇ, δειδιότες σημάτωντορας· (Il. 4.429b–31a)

("But the others went in silence, and you would not say /have said that so large an army was following with the power of speech in their breasts, in silence, fearing their leaders.")

The Homeric situation, however, is reversed here: in Homer, the narrator draws attention to the praiseworthy silence of the Achaeans, which is in contrast to the polyglot noise of the Trojan force (described in *Il.* 4.433–38)<sup>22</sup>; here, it is the noise of the barbaric horde that is highlighted. But just as the indirect discourse in which the threats and commands of Aeetes to the Colchians are presented in vv. 231–35 serves to produce a distancing effect and to show the king

<sup>20</sup> Fränkel (above, note 10) 473. Beye, on the other hand (above, note 10) 25 sees this address as an example of cases in which Apollonius "encourages the reader to formulate a simile" by using his "imaginative capacities."

<sup>21</sup> Vian (above, note 19) vol. 3, p. 10.

<sup>22</sup> De Jong (above, note 2) 56–57.

as a dark and terrible power,<sup>23</sup> so this address serves also to present the pursuing Colchians as a vast and elemental force..

Somewhat related in form and in distancing effect is (4). Jason has sprinkled his armor and his body with the drugs given him by Medea, and they are now imbued with irresistible strength and power. In the situation hypothesized in this address, the narratee is placed near the center of the action, and views the action from a temporal and spatial point of view that is similar to that of the Argonauts, who are in attendance upon Jason. But, as in the address just examined, the narratee in the hypothetical situation interprets the event as something essentially different from what it "really" is; here, too, however, his misperception contains within it a germ of truth, an apprehension of an aspect of the true nature of the event. For a moment, during this address to the narratee, the armed Jason disappears to reveal the terrible, elemental force of nature that has been released through Medea's witchcraft, a force of which he is but the temporary vehicle.<sup>24</sup>

In the two addresses just examined, the narrator has the narratee misperceive an event in order to increase the aesthetic or sympathetic distance between the narratee and characters and in order to bring out thematically significant aspects of the event. In (8), the narrator has the narratee make an inference about the inner feelings of characters involved in an event in order to create a greater sympathy between the narratee and the characters and at the same time to bring out an ironic contrast between the event and the larger situation in the narrative. The arrival of the Argonauts and their welcome by the Phaeacians are narrated in a rapid summary (4.993–97a). The address then hypothetically places the narratee within the scene, giving him the point of view of a bystander, who must infer the Phaeacians' states of mind and feelings from their behavior. His attention is focused upon the Phaeacian side of the encounter with the Argonauts, and upon their humanity and hospitality; his attribution of parental feelings to them looks forward to the parental sympathy that Medea is able to arouse in Arete and to the kindly equity of Alcinous. This description of the feelings of the Phaeacians is mirrored in the description of the joy of the Argonauts; but here it is the narrator, himself adopting for a moment the point of view of a bystander, who makes the inference; he says that the Argonauts are as joyful as if they find themselves in Thessaly (τῶ ἵκελοι οἷόν τε μεσαιτάτη ἐμβεβαῶτες / Αἰμονίῃ. [999–1000a]). The two inferences strike up the themes of return to family and of return home only to make more poignant the fact that, as the

<sup>23</sup> On indirect discourse as a device used to characterize Aeetes, see Fusillo (above, note 5) 231–32.

<sup>24</sup> The distancing effect of this address—which, like the one just examined, is *not* equivalent to a simile—is thus comparable to that of the extraordinary accumulation of similes in the episode of Jason's contest. These similes, drawn from the world of everyday human activity or from the world of nature, suggest, as Fusillo (above, note 5) 333 points out, the artificiality of Jason's strength and courage, which are due entirely to Medea's drugs.

Malcolm Campbell ("Some Alexandrian Notes," *Studi italiani di filologia classica*, ns 46 [1974] 149) notes that the rain imagery in 1267 is recalled by the simile of the rain in 1399–1403, and thus foreshadows Jason's defeat of the warriors sown from the dragon's teeth.

narratee knows from the larger narrative, Medea, after her betrayal of her father and the murder of Apsyrtus cannot be, and never will be, welcomed home by her parents; and that the Argonauts, too, are yet far from home, a fact driven home with brutal abruptness when the narrator goes on to comment that the Argonauts are likely to arm for battle (1000b) and to narrate the arrival of part of the Colchian fleet.

The other five addresses, (1)–(3), (6), and (7) do not occur in passages of narrative proper at all; they do not hypothetically place the narratee upon the scene of an event in the main narrative, but rather place him in situations that are more or less independent of the narrative, situations in which his role may be rather more than that of a mere witness. Addresses (1) and (2) occur in an epiphysis, (3) in a geographical excursus in the present tense, and (6) in a history of the peplos given by Jason and Medea to Apsyrtus. (7) occurs in a clause that constitutes an analepsis, or flashback, to a time prior to the event that is being recounted in the narrative.

(3) and (7) occur in episodes that are thematically connected to the episode of the Argonauts' passage through the Symplegades at the northern end of the Bosphorus (*Argon.* 2.531–647), an episode that shows, in the skill of Tiphys, the triumph of human ability.<sup>25</sup> In both addresses, the narratee's hypothetical situation has the same spatial coordinates as those of the surrounding narrative, but different temporal coordinates.

The successful navigation of the bore at the southern end of the Bosphorus is a kind of dress rehearsal *in nuce* of the Symplegades episode.<sup>26</sup> Passage over the bore is dealt with in a rapid summary consisting of only 14 lines (2.164–77), of which 6 (169–74) are given over to a geographical excursus in the present tense and to the address to the narratee. As was pointed out above, the optative in this address is unambiguously a potential of the future, looking forward from the vantage point of the *énunciation*.

The description of the bore and the address, with its hypothetical situation—a situation in which the narratee is not only witness but also actor, a contemporary of the narrator travelling through the same part of the world as the Argonauts travelled long ago—to a large extent takes the place of the narrative of the Argonauts' own experiences; of them we are told only that they, like the narratee (Τῷ καί, 175) sailed through safe but afraid, thanks to the skill of their helmsman (175–76).

The effect of the address, thus, is not to heighten the narrative drama of the the Argonauts' passage over the bore, for there is none. Rather, it helps to create a sense of empathy for the Argonauts by making the narratee look at the fictional world of the past through the lens of the "real," contemporary world, and realize that the same situation as that in which he might find himself was once experienced by the Argonauts, who reacted to it in much the same way.<sup>27</sup>

<sup>25</sup> Fusillo (above, note 5) 199.

<sup>26</sup> Vian (above, note 19) vol. 1, p. 129 notes the symmetry of the two episodes, including parallelism in the use of motifs and phrases.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Beye (above, note 10) 26–27. On Apollonius' linking of the present world of the poet and his audience with the journey of the Argonauts, evident especially in his aetiologies, see Hermann Fränkel, "Das Argonautenepos des Apollonios," *MH* 14 (1957) 3–5.

Quite different is the effect of the address in (7). Whereas the brief episode dealing with the bore of the Bosphorus is parallel to that of the Symplegades, the episode dealing with the passage through the Planctae, on the Argonauts' return, is its antithesis. By this point in their travels, the Argonauts no longer have much control over what happens to them. Their success in making it through the Planctae is owed not to their own efforts but entirely to the intervention of Hera and to the sportive assistance of the Nereids; indeed, their passivity is highlighted by the avoidance in the narrative of any indication of the Argonauts' own actions and feelings.<sup>28</sup> The address to the narratee helps to deepen this theme. The episode begins with a background description, in imperfect tenses (924–28a), of the fearsome state before Hephaestus, on orders from Hera, ceased his labors<sup>29</sup>—a state that existed *before* the Argonauts arrived on the scene. The address to the narratee is included in this description; it is past counterfactual in form, with an aorist verb (ἔδρακες) accompanied by κέν. The narrative proper resumes (Τότ' αὖ, 928) with a description of how the sea was still steaming after Hephaestus stopped work, a faint trace of the violent upheaval that had been taking place just previously. The narratee hypothetically experiences what the Argonauts do not have to; and thus becomes all the more aware of how unheroic the episode is, and of how passive the Argonauts are.

In many ways the most interesting, and the most complex, of the narrator's direct addresses to the narratee in the *Argonautica* are the three that concern objects in the world of the poem—Jason's mantle (addresses [1] and [2]), and the peplos that Jason and Medea give to Apsyrtus (6). These objects are mentioned by the narrator when they play a role in the story, but he then digresses from his narrative to describe the object ([1] and [2]) or to recount its history (6). The addresses occur within these digressions; the hypothetical situations posited in them, in which the narratee perceives and reacts to the objects, do not place the narratee upon the scene of any particular events in the story that is being narrated, but rather make him an actor in independent mini-dramas connected to the larger poem by indirect and subtle thematic resonances.

When Jason and Medea have agreed to trick and kill Apsyrtus, and have sent gifts to him to induce him to meet Medea in secret on the island of Artemis, the narrator interrupts his narrative for an excursus on the history of one of these gifts, the peplos (4.424b–34). He first tells how the Charites made it for Dionysus, and how it passed from Dionysus to Thoas to Hypsipyle, who gave it to Jason as a *xenion*. He then addresses the narratee (6) before continuing with an additional historical sidelight on the garment, telling how its divine scent remained after Dionysus, half drunk with wine and nectar, lay with Ariadne, whom Theseus had abandoned on Dia. The narrative resumes with Medea's deceitful messages sent to her brother through heralds to lure him to a meeting; her words are reinforced by magic charms (435–44).

The address to the narratee, thus, occurs apropos of statements that are not part of the main narrative; and the narratee's hypothetical experience—he is enchanted by the sensuous and erotic tactile and visual beauty of the garment—

<sup>28</sup> Vian (above, note 19) vol. 3, p. 41.

<sup>29</sup> So Enrico Livrea, ed., *Apollonii Rhodii Argonauticon Liber Quartus* (Florence 1973) 269, note on πάροιθεν in line 925.

is not situated within any particular scene, or directly connected with any particular event, of the poem. Rather, it is implied that the erotic nature of the experience is similar to that of all of those who at some time or other had contact with the peplos, particularly—and here the emphases of the immediate context of the address limit the associations—Ariadne and Hypsipyle. This experience, thus, takes on tragic overtones, for the histories of Ariadne and Hypsipyle combined erotic ecstasy and the bitterness of a lover's abandonment, and foreshadow what happens to Medea in the near future.<sup>30</sup>

More important, the narratee's experience is implicitly analogous to that of Apsyrtus. His receipt of the peplos, and his reaction to it, is not narrated in the poem; but the description of the narratee's enchantment by it is a sort of surrogate for such a narrative. The narratee implicitly shares the point of view of Apsyrtus, and understands why he takes the bait offered him by Jason and Medea and how he thus himself becomes implicated in the dread power of Eros, the destructive bane apostrophized by the narrator in 4.445–49. The very indirection and suggestiveness of the device augments the horror of his murder.

The first two addresses to the narratee in the *Argonautica* are made apropos of Jason's mantle, which is described in a lengthy ecphrasis (1.721–68) as Jason attires himself before setting out to meet with Queen Hypsipyle of Lemnos. The description is introduced by a brief analepsis, or flashback, telling how Athena, who made the mantle, gave it to Jason when she was helping build the Argo (722b–24). This analepsis, like that recounting the earlier history of the peplos given to Apsyrtus, helps to bring the ecphrasis on the mantle outside the orbit of the "narrative present." The addresses to the narratee at the beginning and at the end of the ecphrasis, too, tend to develop into independent dramas that float free of the story, for they do not hypothetically place the narratee upon the scene of any particular event narrated or alluded to in the poem.

Although no one within the story is shown looking at the mantle, (1), like (6), is used subtly and indirectly to suggest the experience of characters in the story and to introduce important themes. Verbal echoes seem to suggest a similarity between the point of view of the narratee, who, the narrator hyperbolically says, could more easily look upon the rising sun than upon the redness of the mantle, and that of the Lemnian women as Jason advances toward the palace. Although Jason is not explicitly presented from the point of view of the women of Lemnos, he is compared in a simile to the bright star seen by embowered girls and by a maiden yearning for her distant betrothed (774–80). The star is red (καλὸν ἐρευθόμενος) as it rises (ἀντέλλοντα). Like the girls in the simile, the women of Lemnos, who have long been deprived of male company, are now, as the narrative has made clear, amorously disposed; and the joy that the women feel at seeing Jason (γηθόσυναι ξείνῳ, 784) is perhaps meant to parallel the joy of the girl in the simile (γάννυται) at seeing the star. Subtly and indirectly, thus, the narratee's experience, that of the girls of the simile, and that of the women of Lemnos are brought into comparison.<sup>31</sup>

<sup>30</sup> Cf. Fusillo (above, note 5) 308–10.

<sup>31</sup> The link established here between the imagery of light and the theme of erotic desire is important throughout the poem; see Amy Rose, "Clothing

The ecphrasis itself consists of a description of the seven mythological scenes represented on the mantle, scenes drawn from both the human and the divine spheres. To what extent these scenes are symbolically and thematically related to one another and to the events and themes of the rest of the poem is a much-perplexed question to which a long line of scholars have given answers that are as ingenious as they are diverse;<sup>32</sup> it will not concern us here. The last scene is the only one drawn from a myth directly connected to the story of the Argonauts; it depicts Phrixus listening to the ram, whose fleece is the object of their quest. It is apropos of the realistic effect of this scene, with Phrixus ὡς ἑτέον περ / εἰσάϊων κριοῦ, ὁ δ' ἄρ' ἐξενέποντι εὐκίως (763b–64), that the narrator addresses the narratee in (2).

The hypothetical situation posited in this address is more elaborate than in those of the other addresses. It lasts a long time (δῆρόν) and involves a complex of perception, behavior, and mental activity on the part of the narratee. This situation, in which the narratee silently contemplates and mentally reacts to the scene representing Phrixus listening and the ram speaking, has no analogue, expressed or implied, in any of the events narrated or alluded to in the poem. It is as though the mantle is suddenly translated from the fictional world of the epic events into a hypothetical world occupied only by the mantle and the narratee; or, more accurately, perhaps, from the world of the *énoncé* to the world of the *énonciation*, the world shared by the narrator and the narratee.

Thus, the *énonciation* becomes highlighted—the address contains, moreover, three verbs in the second person singular—and the communication between the narrator and the narratee becomes particularly intimate. In fact, the hypothetical situation posited in the address playfully thematizes the relationship between the narratee, the narrator and his narrative, and the fictional world. Phrixus listening to the ram is depicted on the mantle so realistically that the narratee, in his hypothetical situation, finds himself in a position like that of both the “real” Phrixus and the depicted Phrixus: contemplating the scene, he would, like the former, hearken to the ram; but, like the latter, he would experience the stasis of art, silently waiting in long and vain expectation of hearing the ram’s utterance. Moreover, this hypothetical situation of the narratee, as he views a scene drawn from the Argonautic saga, seems to mirror the actual situation of the narratee in hearing/reading the description of the scene on the mantle, and, beyond that, in hearing/reading the *Argonautica* and becoming caught up in the characters and events of its fictional world.

George believes that the ecphrasis encapsulates the ethos of the poem, in which, notwithstanding the activity of the gods, men think and act and suffer on their own; this address, he believes, which implies that it would be vain to wait for words from the represented ram, is a subtle suggestion on the part of the poet to “be on your guard in reading what I communicate”; a warning that,

Imagery in Apollonius’s *Argonautika*,” *Quaderni urbinati di cultura classica*, ns 20 (1985) 38–39.

<sup>32</sup> See Fusillo (above, note 5) 300–7 and notes for a discussion of the issues and citations of the literature. Fusillo himself believes that the connections between the ecphrasis and the narrative are varying, indirect, and largely connotative.

probably, is against "credulity toward the divine."<sup>33</sup> I would not go so far as that. I would say, rather, that here, in this early direct address in the first book of the epic, the narrator is playfully alluding to the narratee's enthrallment by what he communicates. As in the other addresses, the narrator points the narratee in two directions: toward the telling and toward the tale; reminding him that he is only hearing/reading a tale, but at the same time calling upon him to pay particular attention to particular aspects of that tale. Here, however, the two directions converge, and the tale tells of the telling: what the narratee's attention is drawn to is to a mirror image of his own activity. The scene with Phrixos wrought by Athena upon the mantle and the address to the narratee, thus, together become a *mise en abyme* of the *reception* of the poem, corresponding to the songs and narratives of characters within the poem which Fusillo identifies as *mises en abyme* of its *production*.<sup>34</sup>

Fusillo has called attention to the frequency of segments in the *Argonautica* that focus attention upon the narrator, the producer of the epic poem: e.g. the aetiologies, geographical and ethnographical excursuses, narratorial intrusions, and invocations to the Muses, segments typically marked by the presence of first person forms or present tense verbs. He argues that such segments, continually calling attention to the *énunciation*, constitute Apollonius' chief innovation in epic narrative, for they transform the epic into a work that is revealed in the process of becoming and that reduces the distance between the past of the mythic story and the present of its composition.<sup>35</sup> The narrator's direct addresses to the narratee can in many ways be seen as the complements of such passages. They, too, foreground the *énunciation*, but by focusing upon the other side of the communicative relationship, upon the recipient of the narrative. And, by positing a hypothetical world in which the narratee perceives and reacts to the events, characters, and objects of the fictional world, they, too, help to bring the world of the epic and the world of the narrator and the narratee, of the poet and his audience, into a closer but subtly nuanced relationship.<sup>36</sup>

<sup>33</sup> Edward V. George, "Poet and Characters in Apollonius Rhodius' Lemnian Episode," *Hermes* 100 (1972) 52.

<sup>34</sup> Fusillo (above, note 5) 361–63.

<sup>35</sup> Fusillo (above, note 5) 382–83. Cf. Beye (above, note 10) 18. Instances of first person forms referring to the narrator in Apollonius and Homer are conveniently assembled by Francesco De Martino, "Note apolloniane," *Annali della facoltà di lettere e filosofia di Bari* 27–28 (1984–1985) 113–14.

<sup>36</sup> I am grateful to the editor of *TAPA* and to the two anonymous referees for their helpful comments and suggestions.