FOLLOWING AFTER HERCULES, IN VIRGIL AND APOLLONIUS*

In creating a Hercules for his Aeneid, Virgil had a great deal of material to hand, even in the field of epic alone. The archaic period saw many epic poems on Heracles, of varying length, covering his whole life, or episodes from it: we have half a dozen titles, some with fragments, of which the Heracleia of Herodotus' uncle Panyassis was the best known.[1] Later times saw little slackening in production. Aristotle refers dismissively to `those who write an epic about Heracles or about Theseus' (1451a21f.), while the hellenistic period leaves testimony to the existence of, again, something over half a dozen epic poems on the hero.[2] Doubtless some poems have left no trace at all. Since they are lost virtually in their entirety, we cannot really assess the contribution these poems made to the Aeneid (although I shall be making some claims for the so-called Shield of Hercules, preserved in the Hesiodic corpus). One epic poem does survive intact, however, in which Heracles figures prominently, and that is the Argonautica of Apollonius of Rhodes -- the only epic, in fact, that survives entire out of the multitude produced between Homer and Virgil. Even amongst Hellenists, Apollonius has only recently begun to emerge from his unjustifiably underrated position, and students of Virgil, generally speaking, still tend to be insufficiently alive to the pervasive influence exerted upon Virgil by this very fine poet.[3]

As an introduction, and a demonstration of just how far-reaching and systematic Virgil's adaptations of Apollonius can be, let us consider the section of the Aeneid which most

(+) Feeney PVS 18.1986.47/85 - Unit 7.

extensively concerns Hercules: Aeneas' visit to Pallanteum, the site of Rome.

Even as Aeneas' ships make their way up the Tiber, an Apollonian note is immediately sounded (8. 91f.). The gleam of the men's shields comes from Apollonius' description of the very first sailing of Argo,[4] while the whole atmosphere recalls Apollonius, through a Catullan filter: this is the first time a ship has ever passed here (cf. A.R. 4. 316-22; Catullus 64.1 f.). One may also be reminded of the end of Argonautica 2 (itself adapted from Odyssey 5. 451-3), where the Argonauts finally arrive at Colchis, and row at night up the river, which makes way before them (1264-6) -- a hint magnified by Virgil, who has Tiber cooperate with the Trojans, easing his flow and aiding their passage (86-9). Aeneas, like Jason, is arriving at the true goal of the quest, at the τέλος (although, characteristically of Virgil, Aeneas does not know that Pallanteum is Rome: he arrives at his telos in ignorance). The allusion to Rome as the true telos of the expedition is reinforced at the end of the book, as Aeneas looks at his divine armour. The cuirass is compared to a dark cloud that kindles with the rays of the sun, and gleams far and wide (622 f.); the simile is taken from Apollonius' description of the golden fleece, as Jason looks at it for the first time (4.125 f.).

Aeneas arrives as Evander's people are performing the annual celebration of their deliverance by Hercules from the monster Cacus. King Evander tells Aeneas of how he remembers the visit of Anchises to Arcadia, when Evander was young, when the first stage of manhood was covering his cheeks with the flower of

youth (160). He makes a treaty with the Trojans -- a foedus (169). He invites Aeneas to join in the feasting, and tells him the story of how Hercules liberated them from Cacus, on his return from the far West, with the cattle of Geryon: `attulit et nobis aliquando optantibus aetas / auxilium aduentumque dei' (200 f.). Aeneas is another god-sent deliverer from evil, as Evander recognises further on: `fatis huc te poscentibus adfers' (477). The people of Evander fight continuous war with the Latins (55, 473 f.), and in defeating the Latins, Aeneas will emulate Hercules, performing a similar -- indeed, a greater -- deed of preservation. King Evander promises to send his son along with Aeneas, on the expedition.

At the beginning of Argonautica 2, Polydeuces has his celebrated boxing-match with Amycus, brutish king of the brutish Bebryces. Amycus is killed, and his people shattered in a pitched battle. Some 600 lines further on, the Argonauts arrive in the land of King Lycus and his people, the Mariandyni, the neighbours of the Bebryces. News of the killing of Amycus has already arrived. Apollonius says:

> The Mariandyni made a treaty with the Argonauts because of their killing of Amycus, and Polydeuces himself they welcomed as a god, flocking in from all around -- for they themselves had been waging war for a long time with the overbearing Bebryces (755-8).

King Lycus entertains the Argonauts with feasting. He tells them a story of how Heracles delivered his people from troublesome neighbours. Heracles had passed by on his return

from the far East, with the girdle of the Amazonian queen, at a time when Lycus was just starting to get the down of manhood on his cheeks (779). Heracles subdued, for Lycus' father, the Mysians, the Phrygians, the Bithynians, and the Paphlagonians (786-91). Now Lycus says that it was not without the will of the gods that Polydeuces waged war on the Bebryces.[5] He will set up a temple to Castor and Polydeuces, and dedicate land to them, as to gods (806-10). Finally, Lycus will send his son along with the Argonauts on their expedition.[6]

These are very provocative parallels; and there are others in the area.[7] The extent to which these parallels are embedded in Book 8 of the Aeneid is shown by the way in which Virgil invites the reader, in his characteristic fashion, more familiar to us from his Homeric adaptations, to supplement the text by reference to the model. Most conspicuous and important is the claim to divinity, founded on the basis of emulating Hercules, who won his immortal reward as a benefactor of mankind, an ἀλεξίκακος. This claim is never explicitly asserted for Aeneas in Book 8, but the many hints in this direction are strongly reinforced when the reader is invited to read in, from the Apollonian model, the explicit and overt references to the way in which Polydeuces receives divine honours as a result of following the example of Heracles.

As always with Virgil, however, recognition of similarity immediately provokes awareness of departure and difference. Both Aeneas and the Argonauts are following in the footsteps of Heracles, but in the Argonautica, Heracles is personally known to the listeners as well as to the speaker; he was the Argonauts' dear and trusted shipmate, and when they meet King

Lycus, only seven weeks have gone by since he was accidentally left ashore on the coast of Mysia. Aeneas has never met Hercules. To him, Hercules is a remote figure, and a Greek -- what is more, a Greek who sacked Troy, as we are allusively reminded in Evander's first speech (157 f.), and as the Salii commemorate in their hymn:

ut bello egregias idem disiecerit urbes,
Troiamque Oechaliamque (290 f.).

Such difference impels us to inquire more closely into what Virgil is making of Apollonius' Heracles. Indeed, the admiring reaction of such an abnormally sensitive and intelligent critic as Virgil should make us wish to inquire more closely into what Apollonius himself is making of Heracles. Heracles was, after all, the most ambivalent creature in Greek myth. He was ambivalence itself -- heros-theos, receiving divine and heroic sacrifice in cult,[8] lying, as M.S.Silk well puts it, 'on the margins between human and divine, [occupying] the no-man's-land that is also no-god's-land,...a marginal, transitional, or, better, interstitial figure'.[9] That is, he occupies the interstices, the zones of transition, neither one thing nor the other. He may be the hero in epic, tragedy, or comedy. He is at home in the shared feast,[10] sometimes as a glutton, and he is also famous for violating the holy laws of hospitality. He is the ultimate expression of Greek virility, and spends a year as the slave of a woman , the Asiatic Omphale. He is physical strength incarnate, and also a philosopher's paradigm of intellectual resource and self-control. He is the great civilizer, who wears the skin of an animal. His very name is a

paradox: the glory of Hera, the glory of the goddess who persecuted him all his life. It would be surprising if an artist of Apollonius' wit and zest failed to make something of this remarkable figure.[11]

We are not disappointed. Even the very first mention of Heracles, in the catalogue of Argonauts, repays close attention as an index of Apollonius' high craft, and as a marker of certain of his basic preoccupations:

οὐδὲ μὲν οὐδὲ βίην κρατερόφρονος Ἡρακλῆος
πευθόμεθ' Αἰσονίδαο λιλαιομένου ἀθερίζαι

Nor, indeed, nor did the force of strong-minded Heracles, so we hear, make light of Jason's earnest desire [that he come on the expedition] (1.122 f.).

The first line, as so often in Apollonius, is a tissue of Homeric phraseology; and, as so often, the impact of the line in the third century is one that is uniquely unhomeric, conditioned by the intellectual transformations of the intervening years. Homer, in variations on stock phrases, says βίη Ἡρακλείη, (Il. 2.658 etc.), and he says κρατερόφρονα Ἡρακλῆα (Il. 14.324). He never combines the two. By the time of Apollonius, Heracles had become the stock example of the antithesis between βία and φρονῆσις: sometimes, as in Pindar, the supreme embodiment of both qualities; sometimes, as in the comic tradition, held up as the exemplar of physical force alone; while sometimes, as in Isocrates' Letter to Philip, or in certain Stoic and Cynic circles, he was praised for his φρονῆσις above all, in preference to his physical might.[12] Antisthenes, regarded as the founder of the Cynic school, wrote three works on Heracles, of which one was entitled Ἡρακλῆς, ἢ περὶ φρονήσεως

ἡ ἰσχύος.[13] Shortly before him, Herodorus wrote a seventeen-volume work on the hero, and in one allegorising fragment mention is made of his καρτερικῆς ψυχῆς and his θρασυτάτου σώφρονος λογισμοῦ.[14] Apollonius' collocation of these homeric phrases makes them do completely new work, provoking the reader into wondering which of these capacities Heracles will embody in this poem -- or will he embody both? In Homer, Heracles had stood for, above all, βία, and the infatuations of βία.[15] Will he do the same in Apollonius? As we ponder these questions, we may note that the men immediately preceding Heracles in the catalogue are the sons of Bias (118).

Also very important in this line is another Homeric reference. The line recalls very closely a verse from Achilles' great speech in Iliad 18, when he finally makes his irrevocable choice between glory or a long life. To his mother he says, `Let me die soon!´(98). `Not even´, he says, `not even the might of Heracles escaped death´-- οὐδὲ γὰρ οὐδὲ βίη Ἡρακλῆος φύγε Κῆρα (117). To Homer, of course, Heracles was mortal: it was a later tradition that inserted a reference to his apotheosis into the Homeric nekyia. If there is force in the allusion, it may be that we are alerted to the issue of Heracles' immortality: which way is Apollonius going to go?

The Virgilian density of Apollonius' allusions, then, already provokes questions concerning Heracles' status and significance. Before passing on, we must note that Heracles' participation in the expedition is represented as an interruption of his cycle of labours. He has just captured the Arcadian boar, and he joins the expedition `on his own initiative, in opposition to the will [or purpose] of Eurystheus´ (130). Since the tradition tells

us that Heracles was doomed to serve the will of Eurystheus until the cycle of labours was complete, we recognise that his participation is anomalous. Further, Apollonius' poetic and scholarly tradition was virtually unanimous in saying that Heracles did not actually go on the expedition, since Argo spoke, saying that she could not carry his weight.[16] Apollonius hints at this tradition when Heracles steps into Argo before they set off: 'the keel sank down underneath his feet' (532f.).[17] Only eight lines before, Argo had given a cry, to start the expedition (525). As her keel gives way, we must wonder whether she will give another cry, and whether Heracles will have to get out. All is well, and they set off, but Apollonius has left the impression that Heracles should not really be there. In various ways, it will become increasingly and significantly apparent that Heracles does not belong in this company.[18]

There may be a hint at the tradition of the oafish Heracles in the stress on his great weight (although we moderns are out of sympathy with the ancients in finding ridiculous their notion that pondus was a proper attribute of gods and heroes). There may be a hint at this tradition later on in the book, when Heracles rows so powerfully that he snaps his oar (1168-71). But the remarkable thing about the picture of Heracles in the first book is Apollonius' fixed concentration on the Heracles of the philosophers, the exponent of φρονῆσις and σωφροσύνη. We see him high-mindedly refusing to take command of the expedition, selflessly leaving the job to Jason (345-9). Above all, we see him on Lemnos virtually as cast in the Parable of Prodicus, steadfastly choosing Virtue rather than Vice, staying

at the ship with a few companions, rather than stewing in the fleshpots with Jason and the others (855 ff.).[19] Since Apollonius may well be the first writer to bring Heracles to Lemnos, it is all the more striking that Heracles conforms to this model here, when he might have succumbed to the wine and the women that provide so many pitfalls for him in the alternative tradition. It is his self-control which salvages the expedition, as he shames the others into reapplying themselves to their task (861 ff.).

Such is the picture we have of Heracles as we approach the moment where he is finally to leave the expedition, which he should never have been on in the first place. And as the events are introduced which will lead to his separation from the Argonauts, Apollonius fills in, tangentially, the first truly direct references to the `other Heracles', who has so far been suppressed. The result is a passage, and an impression, of one antithesis after another.

Hylas, Heracles' attendant, goes off to fetch water, so that he can get everything quickly ready for Heracles, in due order (κατὰ κόσμον, 1210). Such, says Apollonius, were the habits in which Heracles was bringing up the boy (1211) -- the habits of κόσμος. Well and good. We then learn how Heracles acquired Hylas:

> He first snatched him as a child from his father's house, from god-like Theiodamas, whom he pitilessly killed in the land of the Dryopes, in a quarrel over a ploughing ox...Heracles demanded that he provide a ploughing ox, but Theiodamas was unwilling. For Heracles wanted a grievous pretext for war against

the Dryopes, since they lived without a thought for justice (1212-19).

One antithesis after another. In an act of rape, Heracles seized the boy from his father, whom he killed pitilessly, in a dispute over an ox. It is from this squalid incident that he got his title `Bouthoinas', `feaster on oxen', as was told in Callimachus' Aetia (Book 1, fr.24). Apollonius conflates here two farmer-killing ox-related episodes which were adjacent in the first book of Callimachus' Aetia, doing away with the kindly motive of the second Callimachaean story, in which Heracles asked Theiodamas for food for his little son Hyllus.[21] In Apollonius, there is nothing of this. Next, however, we learn that Heracles' real motive was to start a war against the people of Theiodamas, because they cared nothing for justice. After Heracles the bully and glutton, we have Heracles the civilizer and upholder of δίκη against barbarism. It is all rather disorientating, especially after the one-sidedly elevated picture we have had so far; and the impression is reinforced when we read of Heracles' frenzied reaction to the news of Hylas' disappearance (1261-72). We have now seen both sides of the Heraclean spectrum.

Unwittingly, the Argonauts sail off, leaving behind both Heracles and his friend Polyphemus. At this point we move into territory which is more closely tied in situation to the Aeneid, for from now on Heracles is not one of the company. He is someone who the Argonauts talk about, and hear about; in a strange sense, as we shall see, they are following in his footsteps, and the question of the distance -- physical and otherwise -- between the Argonauts and Heracles, comes to be of

increasing significance. Likewise, in the Aeneid, Hercules is a figure to be spoken of, and followed after, but not encountered.

The first thing we hear about Heracles after he is abandoned is something told us by the poet, some 25 lines later: namely, that he will kill two of his erstwhile shipmates, the sons of Boreas, because they stopped Telamon from turning the ship around to go back and pick him up (1299-1309). Heracles' killing of the sons of Boreas was a given `fact' in legend, but there were various versions of motive and occasion, and Apollonius' version is unique.[22] No mention need have been made at all: it is significant that Valerius Flaccus suppresses the story, just as he had suppressed any mention of Heracles' killing of the father of Hylas. These two grim anecdotes frame the narrative of Heracles' marooning. They are both stories told by the poet in parenthesis: Apollonius is starting to feed in snippets of information which reveal new facets of Heracles, and they are snippets which are not necessarily available to the Argonauts.

One remarkable piece of news the Argonauts do hear. As they quarrel away over whether or not to go back to look for Heracles, the sea-god Glaucus appears from the depths, and says these words:

> Why are you eager, contrary to the plan of great Zeus, to take bold Heracles to the city of Aeetes? At Argos it is his fate to toil at fulfilling all his twelve labours, for presumptuous Eurystheus, and to live with the gods, sharing their hearth, if he can fulfil the few labours left (1315-20).

First of all they hear what the reader has known all along, that Heracles' arrival at Colchis is not part of tradition and not part of the plot. He has to complete his twelve labours -- in Argos. Ἄργει receives some stress, and I think that the reader at this point is entitled to assume that the Argonauts will not cross Heracles' path again. Most importantly, they hear Glaucus almost offhandedly declare that Heracles is going to become a god -- if he achieves his few remaining labours successfully. That conditional is crucial. He is not guaranteed immortality -- he may even yet not attain it -- but he will win it as his reward, if he completes the allotted cycle. The phrasing makes the reader concentrate on the tradition that saw Heracles' immortality as a reward for what the labours signified -- a reward, that is, for endurance, and for the beneficent cleansing of evils from the world.[23]

Cleansing an evil from the world is precisely what Polydeuces does in the very next episode, when he kills Amycus; this close linking of Polydeuces' deed with Glaucus' speech on Heracles' immortality may owe something to a tradition that Glaucus prophesied to the Argonauts when Heracles and the Dioscuri were all present, promising all three immortality (Diod. Sic. 4. 48. 6). As we saw at the beginning, to King Lycus and his Mariandyni, this is an act worthy of Heracles, and one deserving divine honours. Even as he prepares to fight Amycus, Polydeuces is compared to the star he will later be as a god (2.40-2); his opponent is compared to a giant (38-40), a breed which Heracles specialises in exterminating (even in this poem; cf. 1.999-1011). King Lycus, however, sets up a temple, not to Polydeuces alone, but also to his brother Castor. The immortality of the

Dioscuri is a very odd thing. Sometimes, they alternate in sequence between Hades and Olympus; sometimes, only one is immortal, and the other for ever dead.[24] Apollonius stresses their shared divinity (cf. 1.150); for Castor receives a share of the reward that his brother has merited as a result of, unwittingly, emulating Heracles. It may be that their immortality is not of the same calibre as Heracles'. Certainly, their association in immortality is markedly different from Heracles' solitary apotheosis; Heracles too, after all, had a twin brother.

King Lycus tells the Argonauts that he had seen Heracles as the hero was returning from the East with the girdle of Hippolyte. As the Argonauts move westwards up the coast of the Black Sea, they are following the trail Heracles has blazed. They pass by the very spot where he craftily won the girdle, by ambushing Hippolyte's sister and holding her hostage (964 ff.). If they had tarried there, says Apollonius, they would have had to fight the Amazons, and they would have taken casualties (985 f.); but Zeus sends favourable winds, and they manage to pass by without incident (993-5). The divine agency extricates the Argonauts from having to cope with a crisis which Heracles had managed to overcome. Shortly before, they likewise fail to avail themselves of the opportunity to follow Heracles' example, when they camp for a number of days at the mouth of the river Acheron (728 ff.). According to one tradition, this is the place where Heracles descended to the underworld to fetch Cerberus, the hound of Hades.[25] Apollonius, alert as ever to surprise us, refrains from introducing an epic underworld scene here: such an ordeal is not for the Argonauts. It is,

of course, within the capacity of Aeneas, who has greater hope of attaining to the standard of Heracles. Jason's steersman dies at this place (854 ff.); is it fortuitous that Aeneas' steersman Palinurus dies just before Aeneas makes his descent (Aen. 5.833 ff.)?

Heracles can still be an inspiration to the Argonauts, however. They approach the island of Ares, populated by vicious birds, which shoot their feathers at them (1030 ff.). Just like the Stymphalian birds that Heracles had to deal with, thinks the reader. Sure enough, one of the Argonauts had been there with Heracles, and recalls Heracles' trick of scaring the birds with bronze rattles. 'Heracles', he says, 'did not have the strength to drive off the birds with arrows....We must devise μῆτις as he did' (1053-8). Heracles is held up here as a paradigm of using skill, wisdom to devise a plan when mere strength is not sufficient. This use of μῆτις is one field in which the Argonauts can hope to emulate their former shipmate.

As they make their way up the coast, they encounter visible traces of Heracles' earlier expedition. They pass the tomb of Sthenelus, one of Heracles' companions. In one of the most moving passages in the poem, Sthenelus' shade is granted a brief glimpse of his fellow Greeks, and stands on his barrow, looking at the ship (915-20). In following Heracles, he had met death, and piteous isolation. More fortunate are three brothers whom the Argonauts meet on their next stop. They, too, had been on the expedition against the Amazons, and had been separated from Heracles (957): the Argonauts give them the companionship and the safe journey home which Heracles had not been able to provide. Heracles' prodigious self-sufficiency has its reverse

side. He is a figure of fundamental isolation. We have already seen him losing Hylas and being cut off from the Argonauts; now we have seen four other men who lost touch with him on an earlier journey.

The second book, then, shows the Argonauts, in varying ways, coming close to Heracles, or falling short of him. Polydeuces comes closest of all; in the use of brains, the crew approximate him; but in his invulnerability and isolated self-sufficiency, Heracles remains unique.

Book 3 is the book of Jason's victory, and Heracles is mentioned once only. Apollonius lets us understand, with his tongue in his cheek, why he had disposed of Heracles -- because with him there would have been no poem; Heracles could have won the fleece by outright superior force. As Medea's father takes up his mighty spear, Apollonius says:

> No other of the heroes could have withstood it, once they had left Heracles behind far away, who alone could have fought him, force against force (1232-4).

Book 4 describes the home leg. At the beginning of the book, Jason and Medea commit the shabby murder of Medea's brother. Eventually they will be ritually purified by Circe, and then married on the island of Phaeacia. On the way, they stop at the city of the Hylleans. Here, after a long lapse, we hear again the name of Heracles, for the people are named after a son of his, called Hyllus. This is not the son of Deianeira, but of another woman, whom Heracles had 'broken in' (ἐδάμασσεν, 542). He had met this lady on the island of Phaeacia, where Jason and Medea are headed. What had he been doing on Phaeacia? Being purified for the deadly slaughter of his children (541). We

have had to wait a long time to hear about this most terrible of Heracles' actions. We hear about it as Jason and Medea head towards their purification, for the murder of Medea's brother; and as they head, beyond the action of the poem, towards Medea's own murder of the children she will have with Jason. Book 4 is very much Medea's book (she is the subject of the book's invocation): Heracles is polyvalent enough to be a paradigm even for her.

Hyllus, the son of Heracles, is already dead when the Argonauts arrive, killed, as befits a son of Heracles, in a dispute over oxen (551). These deeds of Heracles lie, then, far in the past. 850 lines later, in Libya, when they are desperate with thirst, at the other end of the Mediterranean from where they had last seen Heracles,[26] the Argonauts, to their great surprise and ours, only just miss Heracles, to find themselves literally in his footsteps -- and in no other sense than literally. They come tantalisingly close to meeting him again, for only on the previous day he had passed through this very stretch of desert (1436). The Argonauts are in the Garden of the Hesperides: there is the dragon, killed only the day before by Heracles (1400); there is the tree, despoiled of its golden apples (1397); there are the Hesperides, bemoaning their loss (1406 f.). One of the Hesperides tells them the story, bitter with anger against the bestial Heracles, whom she calls 'dog-like' (1433), and compares to a beast of the field, as he fills his great belly from the spring he has caused to flow by kicking a rock (1449). This spring is the salvation of the Argonauts, as one of them observes: 'Friends, even in his

absence Heracles has saved his companions, afflicted with thirst' (1458 f.). The best-qualified of the Argonauts dash off to find him (1464-7): the sons of Boreas, who can fly; Euphemus, the fastest runner; Lynceus, with the spectacular eyesight, who, as the story went, could see even under the earth (1.153-5). One unmarvellous Argonaut also goes -- Canthus, of whom more in a moment. All fail. 'Only Lynceus thought he could see Heracles, far off, on the limitless land, seeing him as you see the moon, or think you see the moon, on the first day of the month, all obscured' (1477-80; following the text and interpretation of Vian-Delage). Lynceus rejoins his companions, swearing to them that none of the searchers would be able to catch up with Heracles on his route (1481 f.).

What does all this mean? Above all, it means that Heracles has managed to fulfil the conditions stated by the sea-god Glaucus at the end of Book 1. He has completed his labours, he has taken the golden apples of eternal life, which represent his final labour, and won his prize of immortality.[27] He has gone virtually all the way down the path towards becoming a god, and that is the extraordinary interstitial point which Apollonius captures in that beautiful moment when Lynceus sees him in the far distance, or thinks he sees him. In this last mention of him in the poem, he is passing out of the world of men, and into the world of gods. In saving his companions, even in his absence, he has already begun to fulfil the functions of a god.[28]

At the moment when the Argonauts come closest to him, they are in fact further away from him than they have ever been; as Lynceus says, they will never catch him up. The vast difference

between their principal achievement and his is heightened by a systematic series of correspondences.[29] Heracles, in the furthest West, takes golden μῆλα from a tree guarded by a serpent, which he kills. The rationalisers of myth claimed that these μῆλα were really sheep.[30] Jason, in the furthest East, takes the golden fleece of a ram from a tree guarded by a serpent, which is lulled into sleep by the magic of Medea. Jason's unwitting 'anticipation' of Heracles' deed reveals the difference and the distance between them.

In this last scene, Apollonius luxuriates in the paradoxes at his command. Just when Heracles lays his hands on his guarantee of apotheosis, Apollonius casts him at his most brutish, a creature of violence, wearing the raw untanned hide of a beast (1438 f.). Heracles causes misery to the Hesperides, but as the ἀλεξίκακος he saves the Argonauts. Brutish and thirsty, he can still use his wit (or be thought capable of it; cf. 4.1445 with 2.1058 f.). We may begin to see here another reason why Heracles does not belong with the Argonauts. He is, certainly, a relic from an earlier generation, both of heroes and poetry. He also approximates all too closely to certain of the more unsettling conceptions of divinity, in his power, his invulnerability, his self-sufficiency, his apartness and otherness.[31] He may be beneficent, but he is so much 'himself' that he moves eventually into total isolation. In the course of the poem, he is separated from the Argonauts, from Hylas, from Polyphemus. In the second book, we see four of his companions from the Amazonian expedition who were cut off from him in Asia Minor. As Heracles moves out of the poem for good, Canthus tries to follow him, but is prevented from doing so; he is

killed by a local shepherd, as he tries to steal the sheep for his fellow Argonauts (1487-9). Unsuccessful in Heracles' metier of rustling, or in stealing μῆλα, Canthus fails to catch up with Heracles in any sense. His death, by a ring-pattern, takes us back to the moment when Heracles first disappeared, at the end of the first book, for Canthus is trying to find out where Heracles left Polyphemus, after the two had been stranded together. Heracles did not protect Polyphemus either: Polyphemus followed along the coast of Asia Minor looking for Argo, and died there.[32]

A god, says Aristotle, is self-sufficient,[33] and does not need friends (Eud. Eth. 7.12.1-3); it is, indeed, not possible to be friends with a god (Nic. Eth. 8.7.4). Aristotle also sheds light on what lies behind Apollonius' dramatic polarities of Heracles as god and beast. `Man is by nature', says Aristotle, `an animal intended to live in a polis. He who is without a polis, by reason of his own nature and not of some accident, is either a poor sort of being, or a being higher than man' (Pol. 1.1.9). Heracles does not belong with the Argonauts, or with any human company: he has no fixed polis -- does he belong to Tiryns, Argos, or Thebes? --;[34] he cannot tie in successfully with a family, for he kills his children and is killed by his wife. And when he becomes a god, unlike Polydeuces, he takes no one with him. Aristotle further says, `The man who is isolated -- who is unable to share in the benefits of political association, or has no need to share because he is already self-sufficient -- is no part of the polis, and must therefore be either a beast or a god' (Pol. 1.1.14. The Argonautica is not a commentary on Aristotle, but

some such preconceptions lie behind Apollonius' paradoxes here, as he tells us of the bestial and god-like Heracles striding off alone across the desert, towards divinity.[35]

Virgil's exploitation of the figure is less systematic, and less flamboyant, but scarcely less intriguing.

The first time Hercules is named in the Aeneid, Virgil is, as it were, picking up where Apollonius left off. Apollonius' Heracles had been moving away into remoteness, and that is how we first encounter Hercules in the Aeneid, as a figure so remote that Aeneas is unsure whether or not to believe what he has heard about him. Just after landing on Italian soil for the first time, the Trojans catch sight of Tarentum:

> hinc sinus Herculei (si uera est fama) Tarenti
> cernitur (3.551 f.).

Aeneas has heard stories about this distant figure, but that is all. It is a brief reference, but it is worth observing that Hercules is described, on first mention, as the founder of a city, as Aeneas hopes to be. It is, however, a Greek city: the Trojans are in Magna Graecia at this point, 'Graiugenum...domos suspectaque...arua' (550). Still, despite their differences of nationality, the context reminds us that Aeneas and Hercules have some things in common. Four lines before Hercules' name occurs, we see the Trojans offering appeasing sacrifice to their bitter enemy, Juno (547). Aeneas, like Hercules, is hounded by this goddess: the language used in the poem's exordium already invites comparison between his lot and Hercules'.[36]

Two books go by, and Aeneas now comes much closer to Hercules, talking to men who had seen him, and walking on the same ground. What is more, for the first time we see someone

attempting, as had various of the Argonauts, to measure up to Hercules, to emulate him. And we see that person failing.

The episode concerned is the boxing-match in the funeral games of Book 5. The Trojan Dares stands up first (368 f.). At Hector's funeral games, we learn, he had finished off a man who had boasted of being one of the tribe of the Bebryces, the tribe of Amycus (371-3). Promising form, in Apollonian terms: this man could be the new Pollux. His opponent is a local man, Entellus, who was taught boxing by King Eryx. Entellus still has Eryx's boxing-gloves, and we learn from his mouth about Eryx's last fight: he was killed by Hercules, on this very spot (410-4).

To Aeneas, this is a disquieting story. As Entellus pointedly reminds him, Eryx was Aeneas' half-brother, the son of Venus and Butes (412; cf. 24). We are seeing Hercules `from the other side', from the point of view of relatives and friends of his victims. To Aeneas, Hercules is still an enemy.

Entellus is, in a way, a toned-down version of King Amycus, and his fight with the Trojan Dares is closely modelled on the fight between Amycus and Polydeuces in Argonautica 2 (with elements from Theocritus 22).[37] Entellus is the more brutish of the two, while Dares, like Polydeuces, is younger, more nimble, relying on craft, not solely on strength.[38] The climax of the fight is especially close to Apollonius (and to Theocritus). The older man aims a massive blow, which the younger man deftly evades (443-5; cf. Arg. 2. 90-3, Theoc. 22. 118-23). At this point, in Apollonius and Theocritus, the younger man puts home the winning blow -- but Virgil turns the tables, and has the older man recover from his ignominy to destroy his opponent

(453-60). The Trojan Dares, in his literary and mythical pedigree, had had everything on his side. In defeating one of the Bebryces, he had followed the example of Polydeuces, who had, in his turn, emulated Heracles. Now Dares is himself directly emulating Hercules, arriving from overseas, like him, standing on the same ground, and squaring up to the successor of the man whom Hercules had defeated.[39] But Dares confounds prediction, and is beaten by the new Amycus. Hercules remains an enemy of Trojan kin-folk: he is too vast a figure to be assimilated by the likes of Dares. Dares, like virtually all the Argonauts, can follow in Hercules' footsteps only literally: Aeneas, as we have already seen, is to be the new Pollux, the new imitator of Hercules, when he goes to the site of Rome.

The next man to follow in Hercules' footsteps is, indeed, Aeneas himself, who follows his path down to the Underworld, a feat twice described as a labor (6.129, 135; cf. 103). No Argonaut ever attempted as much. `A few descendants of the gods', says the Sibyl, `have managed to come back up again; those whom impartial Jupiter loved, or whose blazing virtue carried them to heaven' (129-131). Hercules is the prime example of this category, and Aeneas will follow him, even to celestial immortality, as Jupiter has promised in Book 1 (259 f.). During the parade of heroes, we receive the first intimation that the future Augustus is in this line also. Indeed, he is cast as even superior to Hercules in the range of his might: `nec uero Alcides tantum telluris obiuit...' (801-3). The enormous geographical range of Hercules' labours is drastically pruned back, and three comparatively trivial labours are chosen, involving certain beasts. There is a Lucretian

tinge to these lines: what difference would it make to anyone if the Arcadian boar and Lernaean hydra were still alive? -- compare Lucr. 5. 22-44. A note of emulous rivalry, not present in the Argonautica, begins to emerge: the political achievements of the family of Aeneas are not necessarily inferior to the labours of the Greek hero.[40]

The connections between Hercules, Aeneas, and Augustus await their full development in Book 8. Before then, we have another Dares-figure, another character who has Herculean associations, without being able to live up to them. Dares had had good claims to be a follower of Hercules; this man has even better, for he is the second hero mentioned in the catalogue of Italians in Book 7 (655-79), and he is Hercules' son.

He is, it appears, an invention of Virgil's. His name is Aventinus, and the name declares his `Roman' origin. While Hercules was staying at the site of Rome with the cattle of Geryon, he impregnated a priestess, and she gave birth on the Aventine hill (659-63). Aventinus' shield bears the Hydra, an emblem of his father (657 f.); he wears his father's distinctive costume, the lion-skin (666). So `Herculean' is he that he anticipates in various ways Romulus, whom Ennius had made into another Hercules. His mother has the same name as Romulus' mother, Rhea (note the play on the full name, Rhea Silvia, in 659, `silua quem Rhea sacerdos...'). The son, like Romulus, of a priestess, he is also, like Ennius' Romulus, the pulcher son of a pulcher god (Annales 38 & 75 Skutsch). He is born on Romulus' hill, the Aventine, where Romulus won the auspices contest (72-91 Skutsch). This is potentially a very dangerous antagonist, son of the sacker of Troy, who might stop

the new Troy rising in Italy. But his threat is totally subsumed by Aeneas, the true new Hercules, who will be at Aventinus' birthplace within 250 lines, to be equipped with his own Herculean shield. There, Aeneas listens as the Salii praise Hercules for his sack of Troy (290 f.). The words might have been a threat, but Aeneas, having left Troy to stand on the site of Rome, has drawn their sting. Aventinus is never mentioned again. This pseudo-Hercules is a false alarm, a token of inadequacy in the face of Aeneas' increasing ability to assimilate past symbols of Trojan failure and convert them into future symbols of Roman success.[41]

In Book 8 we get closer still to Hercules. As in Book 5, Aeneas is in exactly the same spot as Hercules had been in some years before, but this time he is, as we saw at the beginning, walking in the footsteps of Hercules in the true sense, conforming to the Apollonian prototype which stamps him as an emulator of Hercules, winning immortality through being a saviour, an averter of evil. Aeneas is coming closer to Hercules all the time. In particular, never before have Aeneas and the audience heard about Hercules in any detailed and characterized fashion. In Book 5, we have only the uncharged epithet magnum (414), with no description from Entellus of the tristis pugna (411) of which he had been the eyewitness; in Book 8, we have ninety lines from Evander, with a minute account --for the first and only time in the poem -- of Hercules in action (185-275).

What do we see? We receive a picture which, although muted, recalls above all the Heracles of Apollonius' fourth book, in the Garden of the Hesperides. There is a formal correspondence,

in that both scenes concern the action by which the hero comes into possession of divine status; but there are more extensive correspondences between what we hear from the nymph and what we hear from Evander. The standpoint of the two speakers is very different, for the nymph loathes the hero, while Evander venerates him. This divergence makes it all the more striking that Evander, like the speaker in Apollonius, concentrates on the frenzy and power of Hercules, while maintaining an extreme distance from him, so that Hercules is as isolated as he had been in the desert of Libya.

Let me develop these two points. It is very remarkable that Evander's speech describes no meeting between Hercules and himself, no hospitality or contact of any sort.[42] Virgil is concentrating on the exploit, of course, but the form of the aition virtually demands a description of hospitality. For Apollonius, Heracles is a figure from an earlier, rougher kind of poetry; for Virgil, Hercules is also a creature of Hellenistic epyllion, and against this background, within his own aition, Virgil's decision to excise the hospitality motif so dear to Callimachus is indeed noteworthy.[43] As in Apollonius' fourth book, Hercules arrives and does his deed without a word spoken.[44]

Virgil's typical concern for compression is partly responsible. Aeneas is now receiving the hospitality that Hercules received (in the 'story', and in the Aetia, Virgil's aition model),[45] and Virgil does not want a close doublet. Further, allusion will be made later in the book to the hospitality Evander gave Hercules. Nonetheless, within

Evander's speech, Hercules' utter self-sufficiency and remoteness, the sense that he does not belong among normal men, are certainly striking, and very reminiscent of the impression left by the fourth book of Apollonius.

Likewise very reminiscent of Apollonius is the way in which Virgil has chosen this juncture to emphasise Hercules' physicality and his furor. He does not polarise a whole range of paradoxes, as does Apollonius, even though it was open to him. In Livy, for example, Hercules is drunk when his cattle are stolen (1. 7. 4); again, Virgil could have alluded once more to the seduced priestess, the mother of Aventinus. Nonetheless, the focus on the madly violent face of the Herculean prism is unmistakable.[46] When Hercules hears the lowing of his stolen cattle, `hic uero Alcidae furiis exarserat atro / felle dolor' (219 f.). He rushes to Cacus' lair: `ecce furens animis aderat Tirynthius.../ dentibus infrendens' (228-30). He dashes around the hill: `ter totum feruidus ira / lustrat Auentini montem' (230 f.). The impression, even more strongly than in Apollonius, is one of terrific, manic violence. Even when saviour and candidate for apotheosis, Hercules is uis, βία, incarnate. As we contemplate the picture of Aeneas listening to the exemplum spoken by Evander, we must wonder what it means for him, whether this is part of the paradigm which he will also emulate. The other aspect of Hercules stressed here, his isolation, may appear not to correspond to Aeneas' situation, as he is being entertained by Evander. Yet the meal which Aeneas shares with Evander is the last one Virgil will narrate in the poem; Aeneas, as we shall see, is moving towards a solitude of a sort which Hercules never knew.

Hercules is not all uis. We hear praise of his ratio (μῆτις) in the hymn of the Salii (299), and another facet of the paradigm is offered Aeneas shortly afterwards, when Virgil alludes to the Hercules of the philosophers, as Evander welcomes Aeneas to his poor palace, enjoining self-restraint and self-sufficiency, in emulation of Hercules:

aude, hospes, contemnere opes et te quoque dignum
finge deo, rebusque ueni non asper egenis (364 f.).

Hercules here is a paradigm for moral victory, over self, and the temptations of the world. The dichotomies are as sharp as anything in Apollonius; sharper, perhaps, since in Virgil the two different Hercules-traditions are in the mouth of the same speaker, within a hundred lines of each other.

Models are there to be outstripped as well as matched. And, inasmuch as he is the embodiment of an historical force, Aeneas does indeed outstrip his model, and himself provides a model for his descendant Augustus, who has inherited control of the historical force first given expression by Aeneas.[47] The moment that shows us most clearly that Aeneas has caught up with Hercules, and overtaken him, comes at the end of Book 8, when he looks at his shield and picks up on his shoulder the fame and fate of his descendants (729-31). The scene is prefigured in miniature at the beginning of Aeneas' mission, in Book 2, when he drapes himself in a lion-skin (721-3), and takes up his father on his shoulders: ipse subibo umeris nec me labor iste grauabit' (708).[48] At the end of Book 8, the burden he takes up is incomparably greater. He takes up the historical burden that will issue in an imperium over the entire world; he is picking up a world, if not the world. In this he approximates to his

ancestor, Atlas,[49] and outdoes Hercules, who had briefly acted as Atlas' surrogate.[50]

And yet, at this definitive moment, it is, in a way, Hercules' own shield that Aeneas is picking up. The shield of Achilles in Iliad 18 is commonly referred to as Virgil's model here, and that shield was undoubtedly the most famous paradigm available. The so-called Shield of Heracles, however, preserved in the Hesiodic corpus, is also behind Virgil's picture. The Hesiodic shield is itself extensively modelled on the Homeric one, but certain links with Virgil's shield bear mention. In Homer, we see Achilles' shield as it is being made by Hephaestus; but in the Scutum we see it, as in Virgil, at the moment the hero picks it up. In the middle of Aeneas' shield is Discordia (702); in the middle of Heracles', Ἔρις (148). There is no sea on Achilles' shield, but Aeneas' and Heracles' shields both have sea, and dolphins (A. 671-4; Sc. 207-15). The Scutum has a harbour, which is like a `heaving' water (κλυζομένῳ ἴκελος, 209); Virgil's sea is tumidi (671). Above all, the shield of Achilles is generalised, without individual characters; but Heracles' shield describes a specific battle, with the contestants named (between Centaurs and Lapiths, 178-90).

Now that Aeneas has reached this climactic point, I imagine that no reader of the Aeneid would express surprise if Hercules received no further mention in the poem. Virgil, however, continues his closing-in movement, reversing the direction of Apollonius, who had taken the character of Heracles out of the body of the narrative, and turned him into a figure of anecdote

and report. In the middle of Book 10, Virgil actually introduces Hercules into the narrative as a character in his own right; Virgil traces Hercules down that path where even Lynceus could not see, and shows him to us at its far end, as a god.

Hercules' reimbodiment in the narrative is flanked by two authorial references to him. Let us take these passages as they occur.

When Aeneas first enters battle, he dispatches four men within eight lines. The third and fourth are brothers, armed with Hercules' weapon, the club:

> nihil illos Herculis arma
> nec ualidae iuuere manus genitorque Melampus,
> Alcidae comes usque grauis dum terra labores
> praebuit (319-22).

It would seem that these two are, like Aventinus in the catalogue, false aspirants to the status of Hercules: their associations with Hercules are unavailing when they confront the true new Hercules. The passage appears to be, comparatively, unproblematical.

The focus switches to Pallas. After various combats, he is confronted with a certain Halaesus, and prays to Father Tiber for help (421-3). `audiit illa deus´ (424); Pallas kills the man. Some thirty lines later, he faces a greater enemy, Turnus, and prays to a greater god, Hercules, basing his plea (ominously?) on <u>hospitium</u>:

> per patris hospitium et mensas, quas aduena adisti,
> te precor, Alcide, coeptis ingentibus adsis (460 f.).

The response is extraordinary: `audiit Alcides iuuenem' (464). Not the way Father Tiber was able to do. Virgil introduces Hercules into the action itself, hearing Pallas, but unable to do anything but weep; he is unable even to speak, so that the poem goes by without our hearing a single word from him:

audiit Alcides iuuenem magnumque sub imo
corde premit gemitum lacrimasque effundit inanis (464 f.).

We actually see the god who was recently a man, and we see him powerless to honour the ties he established as a man.

Jupiter, however, has never been anything but a god, and he tells the newcomer how a god regards these things:

stat sua cuique dies, breue et inreparabile tempus
omnibus est uitae; sed famam extendere factis,
hoc uirtutis opus (467-9).

A short life for all, but fame for the virtuous. Hercules should know, for he had been one of Anchises' models in Book 6, along with Bacchus (801-5), when Anchises urged Aeneas on to his mission: `et dubitamus adhuc uirtutem extendere factis?' (806). Virgil refers directly to the Homeric model when Jupiter goes on to mention Sarpedon, who was his son, and who nevertheless died at Troy (470 f.).[52] In the Iliad, however, when Sarpedon was about to die, it was not Zeus who insisted upon the inviolability of Fate, but Hera, acting as an inflexible foil to Zeus' pity and grief (16. 441 ff.). Now the tables are turned, as Hercules is overcome, and Jupiter enunciates --dictis amicis (406) -- the lesson he has learnt from Hera.[53] These few lines represent a shattering collision of human and divine perspectives, as the most human of the gods is told by the father of the gods how to regard the action.

Once again, Aeneas fits into the paradigm offered by Hercules, as he too fails to protect the young man tied to him by the bonds of **hospitium**,[54] repeating Hercules' disastrous propensity to fail those closest to him. When he attempts to avenge Pallas, he is likewise very close to βίη Ἡρακλείη (as he is, again, when he actually kills Turnus in the end)[55]: furit (545); desaeuit (569); dira frementem (572); furens (604); feruidus (788); furit (802); saeuae irae (813).

One scene remains, a mirror to the one which began the sequence of references to Hercules in this book. In that first scene, two enemies of Aeneas found their Herculean associations unavailing; in this scene, an ally of Aeneas encounters the same fate. Mezentius throws a spear at Aeneas: it ricochets off the great shield, and hits a certain Antores, who is standing some distance away (777 f.):

> Herculis Antoren comitem, qui missus ab Argis
> haeserat Euandro atque Itala consederat urbe.
> sternitur infelix alieno uulnere, caelumque
> aspicit et dulcis moriens reminiscitur Argos (779-82).

Once a comes of Hercules, now a comes of Aeneas, Antores dies by the spear that was meant for Aeneas, in a foreign country which he would never have seen if not for Hercules. Aeneas and Hercules are both jointly 'responsible' for his death. Only twenty lines before, Virgil tells us that the gods are spectators of the battle (758 f.). Antores is the first subsequent casualty; one assumes that Hercules is with the other gods, still watching, as his comrade dies.

Hercules is a very complex phenomenon, and being a follower of Hercules is a very complex process. As in the Argonautica,

there is more than one character following after Hercules; and, as in the Argonautica, the component paradoxes of Hercules are opened out and displayed in their separate aspects, which it is open to various of the characters to try to emulate. Aeneas, however, is the prime focus, in a way none of the characters is in Apollonius, and Aeneas comes closer to some of Hercules' aspects than to others. He is quite different from Hercules, for example, in his human responses; he is a far more sympathetic 'character'.[56] He is, after all, a Jason as well as a Hercules, as he shows when he comes to his Lemnos, in Carthage. And although he goes berserk in Book 10, he returns to himself when he kills Lausus (820-32). If, then, his nature is not very Herculean, his status and function are much more so. As an ἀλεξίκακος, a victorious saviour, and a wielder of great power, he even outstrips Hercules, and will become, like him, a god. Yet, in adopting a Herculean status, and discharging Herculean functions, he also finds himself being assimilated to some of the more forbidding aspects of his paradigm. In his exercise of uis and furor, and in his frightful solitude, Aeneas comes all too close to another side of Hercules.[57]

It is the historical and political dimension of the Aeneid which conditions the major differences between Virgil's use of Hercules and Apollonius'. The way in which the initially hostile Greek Hercules is absorbed and tamed by the growth of Aeneas may be seen as emblematic of the Romans' accretive urge for assimilation. The political perspective of the Aeneid, virtually entirely absent in the Argonautica,[58] produces new ways of viewing Hercules and his imitators, and generates its own distinctive paradoxes. The isolation of Hercules and

Aeneas, for example, is one of their most striking similarities, a function, partly, of their incipiently divine status.[59] Yet Hercules is ἄπολις, while Aeneas lives for the urbs; Hercules is alone because he cannot belong with any organisation, while Aeneas is alone because he is wholly identified with an organisation.[60] This historical dimension sets Aeneas and Augustus quite apart from the Greek god-hero; yet their power, function and status place them, even on earth, as close to the boundary of the divine as it is possible to be. And some things about being on the boundary of the divine do not change.

D.C. FEENEY

University of Edinburgh

FOOTNOTES

*For their help and criticisms I thank Dr.R.L. Hunter, Dr.N.M. Horsfall, Dr.W.S.M. Nicoll, Mr.J.G. Howie, Mr.R.M. Pinkerton, and Dr.J.Y. Nadeau.

The following books are referred to by author's name alone: H. Fränkel, Noten zu den Argonautica des Apollonius (Munich, 1968); G.Karl Galinsky, The Heracles Theme (Oxford, 1972); F. Vian and E. Delage, Apollonios de Rhodes. Argonautiques Tome 1 (Paris, 1976); K.W. Gransden, ed. Virgil. Aeneid Book 8 (Cambridge, 1976); J. Henry, Aeneidea 1 (London, 1873).

1. G.L. Huxley, Greek Epic Poetry (London, 1969), pp. 99-112, 177-88.

2. Supplementum Hellenisticum, edd. H. Lloyd-Jones and P. Parsons (Berlin, 1983), nos. 393-4, 669, 715, 948, 1166 (and 1168 ?).

3. The words of Knauer are still valid: `Übrigens ist trotz mancher Vorarbeiten...der Einfluss des Apollonios noch nicht sicher zu fassen´, Die Aeneis und Homer (Göttingen, 1979), p. 56 n. 2.

4. 1. 544 f.; cf. Gransden on 91-2; M. Hügi, Vergils Aeneis und die hellenistische Dichtung (Bern, 1952), p. 75. Mr. Howie informs me that Apollonius goes back to Homer for the gleam of weapons as a portent of victory: cf. T. Krischer, Formale Konventionen der homerischen Epik (Zetemata 56, Munich, 1971), pp. 36-8.

5. The text of 796-8 is disputed; A. 8.200 f. and 477 appear to show that Virgil took the passage as the scholiast does, and I translate what I think Virgil's

text would have been. Fränkel's account of the scholion is remarkable special pleading (p. 234).

6. Noted by the standard commentators.

7. Note, in particular, the structural similarities between the hymns in 2. 700-19 and A. 8. 287-302; see, e.g., Gransden here.

8. cf. W. Burkert, Greek Religion (Eng. trans., Oxford, 1985), p. 208.

9. p. 6 of `Heracles and Greek tragedy´, G&R n.s. 32 (1985), 1-22.

10. Burkert, p. 211.

11. On these aspects of Heracles, see Burkert, pp. 208-11, and Galinsky, pp. 1-39.

12. cf. Galinsky, pp. 23-39, 101-8; R. Höistad, Cynic Hero and Cynic King (Uppsala, 1948), pp. 22-73.

13. Diog. L. 6. 16 ff.

14. Jacoby, FGH I 218, fr. 14. This Herodorus was an important source for Apollonius, as Dr. Hunter points out to me; cf. P. Desideri, `Studi di storiografia eracleota´, SCO 16 (1967), 366-416.

15. Galinsky, pp. 10-12.

16. cf. Vian-Delage, p. 44 n. 2, and note on 1. 123.

17. Another hint comes when he breaks his oar (1. 1168); see Vian-Delage ad loc.

18. He is out of place with these epigoni. 1. 992 says as much, with a reference to the proem of the Cyclic Epigoni (a famous text; cf. Ar. Pax 1270): ἀλλὰ γὰρ αὖθι λέλειπτο σὺν ἀνδράσιν ὁπλοτέροισιν.....

19. cf. Fränkel, p.115; Vian-Delage on 1. 856. A further consideration is shown by Mr. Howie, remarking that Apollonius cannot afford to have Heracles impregnate a Lemnian, for that might cause difficulties with the claims of the kings of Cyrene, descended from Euphemus (Pind. P. 4. 256 ff.).

20. Fränkel rewrites the text to obliterate the antithesis (pp. 144 f.).

21. cf. Vian-Delage, pp. 46-8.

22. cf. Vian-Delage, p. 122 n. 2.

23. Though with συνέστιος, as Dr. Hunter suggests, Apollonius may again be hinting at Heracles' gluttony (see LSJ s.v. for the word's close association with feasting); from Homer on, writers often stress Heracles' eating with the gods (itself an oxymoronic concept for a 'human'): cf. Od. 11. 603; Theoc. 17. 22; Call. Hymn 3. 144-61.

24. cf. Burkert, op. cit. n. 8, pp. 212 f.

25. Xen. Anab. 6. 2. 2; see Frazer on Apollodorus 2. 5. 12.

26. n.b. 1. 80 f.

27. On the significance of the apples, see Bond on Eur. Her. 394-9.

28. cf. Od. 4. 444; and compare 4. 1436 with Od. 2. 262. When Virgil adapts the Lynceus simile for Dido in Book 6 (451-54), the sense of a vast and uncrossable gulf is redeployed for a diffent use.

29. cf. G. Lawall, YCS 19 (1966), 129; C.R. Beye, Epic and Romance in the Argonautica of Apollonius (Southern Illinois U. P., 1982, p. 149.

30. Diod. Sic. 4. 26. 2.

31. His apartness already stressed in the Homeric nekyia, Od. 11. 601-27.

32. Argo makes three consecutive stops on this section of coast, all involving comrades left by Heracles: the first is at Sthenelus' tomb; the second is to pick up the three brothers; and the third is the site where Polyphemus later dies (2. 1001, 4. 1474 f.).

33. The self-sufficiency of the divine is an idea that goes back to Xenophanes, A 32. 23 ff. DK.

34. Apposite here may be the tragic fragment, very likely on Heracles, often quoted by Diogenes the Cynic: ἄπολις, ἄοικος, πατρίδος ἐστερημένος... (Nauck, TGF Adesp. 284).

35. Those who write on Heracles in Apollonius tend to opt for one Heracles or the other as being solely present. Fränkel sees only the noble Heracles of the philosophers; most insist on Heracles as the archaic figure of violence: Galinsky, pp. 108-12 (some qualifications at pp. 112 f.); Beye, op. cit. n. 29, p. 96; Lawall, art. cit, n. 29, 124-8. But everything depends on acknowledging both sides. D. N. Levin does so, though without any development, CJ 67 (1971), 22-8.

36. cf. Galinsky, p. 132; Henry, 188-95.

37. cf. F. Rütten, De Vergilii Studiis Apollonianis (Diss. Münster, 1912), pp. 16-19. Entellus, however, as Dr. Nicoll points out, goes some way towards clearing himself of the image of a loser by refusing to wear the gloves of Eryx (419).

38. Note arte, Aen. 5. 442; ἦν διὰ μητιν, Arg. 2. 75; ἰδρείῃ, Theoc. 22. 85.

39. It may also be a good omen that the Bebrycian whom Dares defeated at Troy had the same name as Eryx's father -- Butes (372).

40. cf. B. Otis, Virgil: A Study in Civilized Poetry (Oxford, 1964), p. 302.

41. On this tendency, see W. Suerbaum, Poetica 1 (1967), 176-204.

42. cf. E. V. George, Aeneid VIII and the Aitia of Callimachus (Mnemosyne Suppl. 27, Leiden, Brill, 1974), pp. 67 f.

43. Contrast Ovid, Fasti 1. 545, 5. 647.

44. Apollonius is perhaps already turning tradition in a similar way, for the Hesperides normally cooperate with Heracles: see E. Livrea, ed. Argonauticon Liber Quartus (Florence, 1973), p. 408.

45. In the Molorchus story, fr. 55-9.

46. Thus Gransden, correctly, p. 20; ignored by Otis, op. cit. n. 40; glossed over by Galinsky, AJPh 87 (1966), 41f.

47. This is brief allusion to a very contentious topic, with a large bibliography: for an account that I would largely agree with, I refer only to W. A. Camps, An Introduction to Virgil's Aeneid (Oxford, 1969), pp. 98-104.

48. cf. Galinsky, pp. 133 f.

49. cf. Gransden, pp. 17 f.

50. cf. Henry, 193.

51. The words recall 4. 449, where Aeneas is equally powerless before Fate.

52. We may be meant to think of the usual tradition concerning Pallas, that he was the son of Hercules (D. H.

Ant. 1. 32. 1); note, then, the effect of Turnus' words, 'cuperem ipse parens spectator adesset', 443.

53. The Iliadic scene is even more systematically reversed at 621-7, where Jupiter tells Juno that she cannot, in the long run, save her favourite.

54. cf. Henry, 191 f. (a valuable paragraph).

55. cf. Gransden, p. 20.

56. Henry, 188-95, is very good on the differences between Aeneas and Hercules.

57. On the solitude of Aeneas, see CQ n.s. 33 (1983), 204-19.

58. Although one cannot help seeing, for example, contemporary political practice in the cult offered to Polydeuces in Book 2, while the claimed Heraclean descent of the Ptolemies (Theoc. 17) no doubt has some impact on Apollonius' portrayal of this grand figure, as Mr. Howie points out to me.

59. I retract, accordingly, my uncomprehending criticism of Highet's remarks on Aeneas and Augustus, art. cit. n. 57, 218 n. 94.

60. See here D. J. Stewart, Ant. R. 32 (1972-3), 649-64.