Classical Quarterly **48** (ii) 456–469 (1998) *Printed in Great Britain*

THE POETICS OF AETHALIDES: SILENCE AND *POIKILIA* IN APOLLONIUS' *ARGONAUTICA*

When the Argonauts reach the island of Lemnos, Apollonius of Rhodes tells us, they send their herald Aethalides to the ruler of the island. Such a means of establishing contact and requesting safe passage was the norm in the Homeric world; there heralds acted as intermediaries between commanders and subordinates or between groups of people. In preliterate societies, heralds facilitated communication: messages were transmitted through memorization and repetition rather than by means of writing. While verbatim repetition was no doubt a necessary feature of this form of communication, its wholesale transference into Homeric poetry was not necessarily the logical corollary. Nonetheless, we know of such repetitions precisely because of their appearance in the Homeric poems. It is now widely accepted that such passages are a result of the oral style of composition in which the oral poet repeats passages just as he uses shorter formulaic phrases.[1] The debate embedded in the A-scholia of the *Iliad* suggests that repeated passages were a source of contention already in antiquity. While it is more common to see the scholiasts trying to decide which passage is 'correct' and which should be athetized, this provides evidence that athetization was not a unanimous impulse. The scholiast defends 2.60–71, part of which (65–9) is repeated for the third time, against Zenodotus:

τὰ δὲ ἀπαγγελτικὰ ἐξ ἀνάγκης δὶς καὶ τρὶς ἀναπολεῖται ταῖς αὐταῖς λέξεσι. καὶ οὐκ δυσωπητέον· ἀναγκαῖον γὰρ καὶ τοῖς συγκεκλημένοις βουλευταῖς διηγήσασθαι.

His defence is based on context: it is necessary for the passage to be repeated for the sake of internal coherence. Clearly not all scholars believed all repetitions to be spurious padding.

Repeated passages demonstrate the importance of memory in an illiterate society; status is accorded those who traffic in spoken language. The accuracy with which messenger speeches were reported testifies to the messengers' memory as well as to the memory of the poet in whose poetry the messengers' speeches are reported, and suggests the important role of people who were able to transmit words by virtue of their superior memories.[2] In this way the poet aligns the messenger with himself: both are charged with making exact reproductions of strings of authoritative words. Apollonius finds new expression of these ideas in his messenger-figures, most notably Aethalides, a herald who does not speak. Composing in a literate age, he did not have the same need for formulaic repetitions as the poets who orally composed their works. As one would expect, Apollonius typically avoids the Homeric oral style of repeating messages altogether. Whether or not he approved of such athetizations, he studiously

[1] The general acceptance of the Parry-Lord theory of oral composition has saved many Homeric repetitions from athetization. As B. Fenik remarks in *Studies in the Odyssey* (Wiesbaden, 1974), p. 145, 'The repeated use of larger narrative units, like the smaller dictional formulae themselves, is part and parcel of the poet's technique. He repeats larger units just as he repeats the smaller phrase and sentence formulae.' I. J. F. De Jong, *Narrators and Focalizers: The Presentation of the Story in the Iliad* (Amsterdam, 1987), p. 180 offers a set of norms for the transmission of messages.

[2] For the status conceded to those who can recall past events accurately, see R. P. Martin, *The Language of Heroes: Speech and Performance in the Iliad* (Ithaca, 1989), pp. 77–88.

avoids the use of repetition in the *Argonautica*. The Hellenistic fondness for variety, and for unexpected variations on traditional themes, was antithetical to Homeric repetition.[3] In the *Argonautica*, the preference for *poikilia* means that messages are sometimes so severely abbreviated that the narrator only gives them in summary. In doing so, Apollonius negotiates between conventional characters and contemporary aesthetics and questions the long-standing connection between memory and the commemorative function of poetry. The appearance of a herald in the *Argonautica* demonstrates Apollonius' response to a Homeric phenomenon. Although avoiding verbatim repetition, the passage introducing Aethalides is infused with the language of memory and re-presentation, characterizing him as a privileged figure with the ability to look forwards and backwards in time. Aethalides embodies the Hellenistic interest in and uneasiness with the poetic legacy. His silence, as well as the variations on Homeric messenger conventions throughout the *Argonautica*, suggests a tension between past and present that becomes manifest in the figures most associated with memory.[4]

Aethalides, the herald of the Argonauts, first appears in the catalogue when he is introduced along with his two half-brothers (1.51–5). They are unusual only in that their immortal father, Hermes, is named, whereas the majority of the other Argonauts are linked to mortal fathers.[5] The paternity of Aethalides is again emphasized in the digression that introduces him into the action of the poem (1.640–9):[6]

> τείως δ' αὖτ' ἐκ νηὸς ἀριστῆες προέηκαν
> Αἰθαλίδην κήρυκα θοόν, τῷ πέρ τε μέλεσθαι
> ἀγγελίας καὶ σκῆπτρον ἐπέτρεπον Ἑρμείαο
> σφωιτέροιο τοκῆος, ὅς οἱ μνῆστιν πόρε πάντων
> ἄφθιτον. οὐδ' ἔτι νῦν περ ἀποιχομένου Ἀχέροντος
> δίνας ἀπροφάτους ψυχὴν ἐπιδέδρομε λήθη·
> ἀλλ' ἥ γ' ἔμπεδον αἰὲν ἀμειβομένη μεμόρηται,
> ἄλλοθ' ὑποχθονίοις ἐναρίθμιος, ἄλλοτ' ἐς αὐγάς

[3] Apollonius and his contemporaries show no signs of being aware that the Homeric poems were the result of oral composition. The Hellenistic avoidance of repetition, therefore, is not a conscious affirmation of literary composition but rather the reflection of Hellenistic aesthetic preferences. For the infrequency of Apollonian repetition, see G. W. Elderkin, 'Repetition in the *Argonautica* of Apollonius', *AJP* 34 (1913), 198–201; L. Deubner, 'Ein Stilprinzip hellenistischer Dichtkunst', *NJbb* 47 (1921), 361–78; W. Moskalew, *Formular Language and Poetic Design in the Aeneid* (Leiden, 1982), pp. 60–72. For the response of Alexandrian scholarship to Homeric repetition, see R. Janko's commentary on *Iliad* 13–16 (Cambridge, 1992), pp. 22–9.

[4] I will not discuss poet-figures such as Orpheus and Phineus in this article. See S. Goldhill, *The Poet's Voice* (Cambridge, 1991); R. L. Hunter, *The Argonautica of Apollonius: Literary Studies* (Cambridge, 1993); and, most recently, R. V. Albis, *Poet and Audience in the Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius* (Boulder, 1996), pp. 28–31 on the affinities between poets and the bards whom they depict.

[5] A point noted by F. Vian at *Argonautiques* I (Paris, 1976), p. 7; comparison with Pindar's approach makes it clear that Apollonius emphasizes the mortality of his heroes. Pindar groups the Argonauts according to divine parentage, and at the end of his catalogue names Mopsus as the only non-divine participant (*Pyth.* 4.172–90). Apollonius, in contrast, chooses a mortal parent for as many heroes as possible. Castor and Polydeuces, for instance, are called the sons of Leda who grew up in Tyndareus' home. Zeus is mentioned briefly but not as their father (1.146–50). The impact of having an immortal father may be lessened because, as D. N. Levin comments in *Apollonius' Argonautica Re-examined: The Neglected First and Second Books* (Leiden, 1971), p. 63, Erytus and Echion are introduced first as sons of Hermes while Aethalides is called their γνωτός (1.53).

[6] All quotes from the *Argonautica* follow the text established by F. Vian and E. Delage (Paris, 1974–81).

ἠελίου ζωοῖσι μετ' ἀνδράσιν. ἀλλὰ τί μύθους
Αἰθαλίδεω χρειώ με διηνεκέως ἀγορεύειν;

Aethalides is presented as a conventional herald with a traditional epithet (κήρυκα θοόν, 641) and the sort of lineage one might expect for a herald. The emphasis on the gifts from his father establishes his credentials; Hermes is, after all, the premier messenger of the *Odyssey*. Nevertheless, Aethalides' name does not indicate his abilities, while in the *Iliad* the names of the heralds reflect their line of work and particular abilities.[7] The ostensibly patronymic ending, in fact, points to an unknown father and clashes with the alleged paternity of Hermes.[8] The digressive account of his Underworld experiences, together with the self-conscious abruptness of the narrator's break-off, highlights Aethalides, inviting further examination of the passage.[9] In the following sections, I will examine the digression in three ways: the story itself, the language within the digression, and its immediate context, before going on to discuss it in the larger context of the *Argonautica*.

At first glance it appears that Apollonius' narrator has finished the story already, and thus the meta-narrative question that closes the digression—why am I telling this story?—shows off his rhetorical abilities with the figure of *praeteritio*. An educated audience, however, would recognize that the self-censoring question is not truly a case of *praeteritio*.[10] The narrator does not in fact tell the facts while pretending to pass over them; instead he leaves out some facts by stopping himself. The outline of the story is complete, however, and the essential matters of the myth have been told. A scholium cites Pherecydes as confirmation: he, too, told a story in which Aethalides split his time between upper and lower worlds. When the narrator tells of Aethalides' alternations, however, he alludes to the well-known theory of metempsychosis promulgated by Pythagoras.[11] According to this theory, souls undergo successive lives, constantly returning through the cycles of upper and lower worlds. Apollonius omits a crucial bit of information in his version: he speaks of Aethalides alternating between worlds, but does not specify that these are cycles of reincarnation. Thus he omits the fact that Aethalides was said to have been an earlier incarnation of the soul that became Pythagoras himself. The words ἔτι νῦν περ

[7] For instance, Odius, Eurybates, and Thoötes. The name Talthybius may signify his relationship with the Talthybiadae, a family or guild of heralds; G. S. Kirk in his commentary on *Iliad* 1–4 (Cambridge, 1985), at *Il.* 1.320, presumes that the guild existed from pre-Homeric times on. The generic nature of Eurybates' name is shown by the appearance of a second Eurybates in the *Iliad*, a herald attached to Odysseus (*Il.* 2.184). Aristonicus at 1.320a makes it clear that these are separate characters.

[8] It may be that this name arises from a mortal father; unfortunately, Aethalides is so little attested that this hypothesis is impossible to prove. The only other source for the myth of Aethalides is Pherecydes as quoted in the scholia to Apollonius at 1.645. In this version, Hermes allowed Aethalides to live half of his time in Hades and half in the world above.

[9] G. Genette, *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method* (Ithaca, 1980), pp. 194–8 discusses the change in focalization that occurs when less information than necessary is given. Such paralipses break the poetic code without destroying it; instead, they call attention to its existence. See also M. Bal, *Narratology: Introduction to the Theory of Narrative* (Toronto, 1985), pp. 142–9 on the relationship of primary and embedded texts.

[10] *Pace* Goldhill (n. 4), pp. 290–2.

[11] The allusion to Pythagoreanism was recognized in antiquity; the scholia at 1.643–8e state that the Pythagoreans believed that Aethalides was reborn as Euphorbus in Trojan times, then Pyrrus the Cretan, followed by an unknown Elian and then Pythagoras. Their belief formed a direct link with the mythic past.

(644), elsewhere markers of aetia, are not linked to a recognizable aetiological story and thus are left hanging.[12] They should project the cycle of reincarnation from the mythical world of Aethalides into Apollonius' present. The narrator's question cuts off the reach into the time of Apollonius, and thus omits Pythagoras, who would have been the point of the aetion: as a later incarnation of Aethalides, Pythagoras would have linked the mythical past with Apollonius' contemporary world.

The incomplete aetion creates a puzzle for the audience of the *Argonautica*. Their knowledge of the *Nachleben* of Aethalides invites them to fill in the missing name, while his silence allows Apollonius to preserve the norms observed elsewhere in the poem: he never mentions non-fictional persons by name.[13] In truth, the abrupt termination of the story saves the narrator from offering specifics about Aethalides' lives, thus allowing multiple interpretations of his tale. Pythagoras is not named, but neither is anyone else; the fact that Orphic doctrine embraced a theory of purificatory reincarnation as well is allowed to colour the episode.[14] Orpheus was, unlike Pythagoras, a fictional character, and so he could have been named in connection with the cycles of reincarnation. Such an identification, however, might have caused a jarring anachronism because of his presence on the Argo as one of Aethalides' shipmates.

The words used to describe Aethalides' experiences signal a self-conscious understanding of poetics. His ability to remember (even in unusual circumstances) triggers the digression; the narrator includes this story in order to emphasize Aethalides' authority as a messenger. In this way, memory and re-presentation are highlighted. The herald does not simply descend to the Underworld and return; unlike other souls, he specifically remembers what he sees in the lower world.[15] Forgetfulness

[12] H. Fränkel, *Noten zu den Argonautika des Apollonios* (Munich, 1968) at pp. 641–9 considers this to be an inverted aetion since it explains the origin of something in the past rather than something in the author's present. The latter is the normal pattern of usage. Both the narrator and characters within the narrative employ the phrase ἔτι νῦν περ, as well as variations such as ἔτι νῦν or ἔνθεν νῦν. In six out of seven occurrences of the original phrase in the *Argonautica*, it appears as part of an aetion (1.644, 825, 1061; 2.1214; 3.312; 4.480, 599). The seventh instance occurs when Hypsipyle gives her half-truthful version of the events on Lemnos. At 1.825, she claims that ἔτι νῦν περ the Lemnian men live in Thrace, covering her lie with a false aetion and perhaps attempting to give her story the illusion of credibility.

[13] The avoidance of non-fictional characters may have distinguished Apollonius' work from historical and panegyric epics of this period. Whether or not Alexandrian scholars differentiated between historical and mythological epic, however, remains debatable. The long-standing belief that the Hellenistic period saw an explosion of historical epics gained much of its momentum from K. Ziegler's book, *Das Hellenistische Epos* (Leipzig, 1934). This view has fallen into disfavour of late; see S. M. Goldberg, *Epic in Republican Rome* (Oxford, 1995), p. 53 and especially A. Cameron, *Callimachus and his Critics* (Princeton, 1995), pp. 263–302. I prefer the broader definition of epic used by D. C. Feeney, *The Gods in Epic* (Oxford, 1991), p. 266, where he has collected convincing evidence for historical and panegyric epic of the Hellenistic period by expanding his field of vision to include shorter poems. These works were perhaps not 'full' epics, but they undoubtedly existed and most likely were known by Apollonius.

[14] For the association of Pythagoras with Orpheus and Orphic writings, see Ion of Chios, *Triagmoi* DK 36 B 2; Herodotus 2.81; Plato, *Cratylus* 400c, and *Phaedo* 62b. Many fantastic stories became attached to the name of Pythagoras in later times; see G. S. Kirk *et al.*, *The Presocratic Philosophers*[2] (Cambridge, 1983), pp. 228–9; M. L. West, *The Orphic Poems* (Oxford, 1983), pp. 1–38; and H. S. Schibli, *Pherekydes of Syros* (Oxford, 1990), pp. 10–13 for some of the far-fetched tales connected to Pythagoras and his conflation with Orpheus and Pherecydes.

[15] Apollonius appears to have conflated two Homeric accounts to describe Aethalides' experience. The Dioscuri alternate between upper and lower worlds (*Od.* 11.302–4) and Teiresias was allowed to retain his φρένες (*Od.* 10.491–5). The Dioscuri return, and Teiresias has the ability

becomes an antagonist that Aethalides is able to defeat (*οὐδ' . . . ἐπιδέδρομε λήθη*, 1.644–5) because of his superior abilities. Apollonius finishes the digression with a meta-narrative question, punctuating the self-conscious literariness of the passage with a conspicuously self-conscious thought.

Aethalides' ability to remember throughout cycles of death and rebirth suggests that memory is linked to immortality. Indeed, Goldhill has noticed the parallels between the *μνῆστιν ἄφθιτον* of Aethalides and the *κλέος ἄφθιτον* sought by Achilles (*Il.* 9.413).[16] An imperishable memory is the means to an imperishable fame since memory allows poetry to be remembered and repeated. Finally, poetry is a means of immortality, both for the poet and his subject. Aethalides' memory, being imperishable, both parallels and commemorates the *κλέος* of others. He can retain and repeat tales, as an *aoidos* does, thus ensuring a poetic continuity. At the same time, his memory *is* his *κλέος*; it is the reason that his story is given in the digression. It is ironic that he can ensure the *κλέος* of others, but not his own: the narrator stops himself, depriving Aethalides of part of his *κλέος* by refusing to tell more of the tale. The poet consciously decides what to include and what to exclude from a particular poem. His choices have serious consequences for a character's chance at immortality.

The forces that oppose memory are not merely those of suppression, but also the failure of memory. The opposition between remembrance and forgetfulness can be seen in the words ending lines 642 and 645: *Ἑρμείαο* and *λήθη*. Aethalides is said to be protected from *λήθη* by the gift of memory from his father, Hermes. This is not the first time these two entities were opposed; in the Iliadic theomachy, Hermes battles with Leto (*Il.* 20.72). The scholia, and also later the work of 'Heraclitus', associate Hermes with *λόγος* and memory on the one hand, and Leto with her near-homonym *Λήθη* on the other.[17] With the juxtaposition of *Ἑρμείαο* and *λήθη*, Apollonius appears to nod to such allegorical interpretations of the Homeric theomachy. Aethalides received his memory from the god who is most emblematic of the power of memory, and thus is least likely to succumb to the forgetfulness that most mortals must face—even in that part of the Underworld called *Λήθη*.

Such meta-poetic language in the Aethalides digression mirrors issues of repetition and continuity that are found throughout the *Argonautica*. The ideas of memory and return that inform this passage reflect the continuity of poetic tradition, a constant concern of Hellenistic poetry with its self-conscious relationship with the literary past. For Apollonius, the story is not to be presented as an immutable truth; instead, he offers a palimpsestic experience with glimpses of the many alternate paths through the story.[18] The meta-narrative break-off line calls attention to his act of narrating and opens up the possibility of other narrative strands.

Apollonius had a number of literary models for the self-censorship, including Homer, Pindar, and perhaps Callimachus.[19] The Homeric heroes occasionally engage

to remember, but none of them do both in the way that Aethalides can; for a closer parallel, see the myth of Er in Plato, *Rep.* 614d.

[16] Goldhill (n. 4), p. 291. Not surprisingly, the adjective *ἄφθιτος* is normally used to describe immortals and their world. However, it also describes the fame attained through poetry as at Theognis 246, *ἄφθιτον ἀνθρώποις αἰὲν ἔχων ὄνομα.*

[17] See F. Buffière, *Les Mythes d'Homère et la Pensée Grecque*[2] (Paris, 1973), pp. 290f. This interpretation is expressed by Plutarch in *Vit. Hom.* 102: *ὅτι ὁ μὲν λόγος ἀεὶ ζητεῖ καὶ μέμνηται, ἡ δὲ λήθη τούτῳ ἐστὶν ἐναντίον.*

[18] For an excellent discussion of poetic paths through the *Argonautica*, see Albis (n. 4), pp. 43–66.

[19] He may also have been thinking of the cryptic question that ends the proem of Hesiod's

in inner struggles that are represented by monologues addressed to the hero's θυμός.[20] In the *Iliad*, there are five times when a hero stops himself mid-monologue to ask the question:

ἀλλὰ τίη μοι ταῦτα φίλος διελέξατο θυμός;

Odysseus (11.407), Menelaus (17.97), Agenor (21.562), and Hector (22.122) all ask themselves this question when they are tempted to flee a particularly dangerous rival. In this way they remind themselves of the honour of bravery, and all but Menelaus hold their ground. The fifth instance inverts this theme: Achilles asks himself the same question when vaunting over Hector's body (22.385). The question reminds him that Patroclus' corpse remains to be buried and for that reason Achilles turns from battle. The result of these questions is that the possibility of an alternative outcome is raised: if these individuals decided differently, the Trojan War might not have continued as it did. Achilles' question in particular directs his actions and therefore the course of the *Iliad*. It points towards the poem's closure with burial and lament, rather than warfare, which makes the *Iliad* an *Iliad* and not an *Iliupersis*.[21]

Apollonius' narrator follows a similar pattern. He also halts the flow of a narrative with a question. In doing so, he admits to two (or more) possible paths for his act of narration, just as the Homeric figures admit to multiple courses of action. Pindar's narrator likewise redirects the course of some of his poems in order to avoid certain topics for religious or moral reasons.[22] By Pindar's time, such protestations had already lost much of their original religious force and appeared instead to be more of a literary commonplace. The Hellenistic period saw the continued blurring between the religious and the literary.[23] Their pious exclamations of horror can never be wholly devoid of the religious beliefs that shaped the tradition, no matter how self-conscious the context. Thus Callimachus' admonishment to himself during the Acontius and Cydippe story (fr. 75.4–7), while ostensibly motivated by religious awe, is strongly

Theogony: ἀλλὰ τίη μοι ταῦτα περὶ δρῦν ἢ περὶ πέτρην; (*Th.* 35). The self-conscious question ends one narrative, thereby allowing the narrator to begin again, in this case with a second invocation to the Muses.

[20] See S. Scully, 'The language of Achilles: the *OXΘHΣAΣ* formulas', *TAPA* 114 (1984), 11–27 for discussion of the formulaic opening phrase ὀχθήσας δ' ἄρα εἶπε πρὸς ὃν μεγαλήτορα θυμόν. For the deliberation between two choices as a 'type-scene' of Homeric poetry, see W. Arend, *Die Typischen Scenen bei Homer* (Berlin, 1933), pp. 108f; also W. Schadewalt, *Monolog und Selbstgespräch* (Berlin, 1926), especially pp. 189ff, and B. Fenik, *Typical Battle Scenes in the Iliad: Studies in the Narrative Technique of Homeric Battle Description* (Wiesbaden, 1968), pp. 96–8.

[21] My thanks to Denis Feeney for pointing out this Homeric self-referentiality.

[22] For instance, he avoids the story of Pelops' being eaten (ἐμοὶ δ' ἄπορα γαστρίμαργον μακάρων τιν' εἰπεῖν· ἀφίσταμαι, *Ol.* 1.52) as well as other stories that show the gods in a negative light (. . . ἀπό μοι λόγον/ τοῦτον, στόμα, ῥῖψον . . ., *Ol.* 9.35–9). On the *Abbruchsformel* in Pindar, see W. H. Race, 'Some digressions and returns in Greek authors', *CJ* 76 (1980), 1–8; N. J. Richardson, 'Pindar and later literary criticism in antiquity', *PLLS* 5 (1985), 383–401, at pp. 395f; M. A. Harder, 'Untrodden paths: where do they lead?', *HSPh* 93 (1990), 287–309, at p. 296; and P. Kyriakou, 'A variation of the Pindaric break-off in *Nemean* 4', *AJP* 117.1 (1996), 17–35. See also the comments of Feeney (n. 13), pp. 17–19 regarding Pindar's collapse of religious and literary distinctions.

[23] A. W. Bulloch in his commentary on Callimachus' fifth hymn (Cambridge, 1985) on pp. 55–6 calls such protestations 'a stylistic *topos* in Hellenistic poetry', while T. Fuhrer, 'A Pindaric feature in the poems of Callimachus', *AJP* 109 (1988), 53–68, at p. 53 finds Callimachus' use of them to be τέχναι borrowed from Pindar. Neither interpretation attributes much religious motivation to them.

flavoured by allusion to the literary *topos*. Such self-censorships interject the poet's personality into the poem; they characterize him as a pious figure, one ostensibly unwilling to blaspheme.[24] However, by mentioning these blasphemous ideas he flirts with them, expressing them even while disclaiming. This *topos* informs Apollonius' self-censorship, and so it seems that Apollonius is applying the traditional idea of propriety to narrative technique. The narrator apologizes for his breach of poetic code. In this way he raises his aesthetic sensibility to the level of a religion (or, alternatively, secularizes religion to the status of his aesthetic preferences).

The way in which the narrator stops the digression is significant. He does not merely stop; instead, he asks a question (1.648–9):

> ἀλλὰ τί μύθους
> Αἰθαλίδεω χρειώ με διηνεκέως ἀγορεύειν;

The story itself does not cause offence. It is the narration of the story in a continuous manner (διηνεκέως) that is problematic. The adverb suggests that the narrator is avoiding a detailed, blow-by-blow description of the entire Aethalides myth; however, an intertext with Callimachus offers an extra meta-narrative layer. Callimachus famously rejected ἓν ἄεισμα διηνεκές (*Aetia* 1.1.3), presumably a repudiation of overblown epic.[25] Although Callimachus may have been signalling his departure from Homeric style, he did not altogether reject it; in fact, his *recusatio* and particularly his use of the word διηνεκές borrows a Homeric usage since Odysseus says much the same thing when he speaks to the Phaeacians (*Odyssey* 7.241–2):[26]

> ἀργαλέον, βασίλεια, διηνεκέως ἀγορεῦσαι
> κήδε', ἐπεί μοι πολλὰ δόσαν θεοὶ οὐρανίωνες.

Apollonius' refusal to continue the story about Aethalides, then, although perhaps a declaration of allegiance to Callimachean aesthetics, cannot be a snub against Homer. Apollonius was not faced with an either–or situation in which he had to choose one, and only one, model for his epic. He was free to borrow, modify, and innovate as he wished. His self-censoring comment about the Aethalides story takes both Callimachean and Homeric language as inspiration, thus creating a meta-narrative moment that boldly shows off the mental processes behind his composition.

Context plays a further role in our understanding of the digression and its abrupt ending. Immediately after the narrator's question, and still in the spirit of wishing to

[24] N. Hopkinson, *A Hellenistic Anthology* (Cambridge, 1988), p. 105; see also A. Cameron, 'Genre and style in Callimachus', *TAPA* 122 (1992), 305–12.

[25] Much ink has been spilled over the meaning of Callimachus' words. Hopkinson (n. 24), p. 87 and ad loc. suggests that Callimachus was against 'a single theme treated with smooth narrative progression'. Cameron (nn. 13 and 24) is much more specific, arguing forcefully that Callimachus was taking a stance against narrative elegy such as Antimachus' *Lyde*. I find that Hunter (n. 4), pp. 190–5 offers the most persuasive interpretation of this passage when he suggests that Callimachus alludes to Aristotle's theories of epic. My thanks to Stephen Heyworth for drawing my attention to Callimachus fr. 26.8, in which the poet explains his composition of the *Aetia* with the words ἠνεκές ἀείδω; see S. J. Heyworth, 'Some allusions to Callimachus in Latin poetry', *MD* 33 (1994), 51–79 at pp. 72–5.

[26] Despite the repetitions and thoroughness of speech elsewhere in the Homeric poems (as evidenced by Nestor's assurance ἐξείπω καὶ πάντα διίξομαι, *Il.* 9.61), Circe and the dream that comes to Penelope both use this adverb in describing the kind of prophecy they refuse to give (*Od.* 4.836, 12.56).

hurry on, Aethalides' embassy to the Lemnian women is summed up in one word: μειλίξατο 'he persuaded' (1.650). The brevity of this statement offers a striking contrast with the Homeric convention of messenger speeches. Not only are we missing Aethalides' speech, but the message instructing him what to say is also omitted.[27] The choice of words, furthermore, calls to mind the metaphorical use of honey (τὸ μέλι) to describe the production of poetry. Hellenistic aesthetics preferred poetry that was λεπτός and γλυκύς, and thus it became a literary *topos* to attribute honey-like sweetness to poetry in order to praise it.[28] Aethalides appears the perfect Hellenistic herald: he avoids the tedium of repeating a long speech while couching his words in the honeyed manner preferred by Hellenistic poetics. Unfortunately, the two techniques are not mutually compatible. The deletion of the speech means that his honeyed words, too, are erased, not even summarized in indirect speech for the audience.

The extremely abbreviated account of Aethalides' message on Lemnos is striking because of its proximity to the self-censoring statement about the Aethalides story. The narrator declares there that extended stories are not desirable; in the next line he quietly avoids the traditional (and rather unwieldy) device of the messenger speech. It would appear that the narrator is not content with wielding editorial power over his own narrative, and so he extends his censorship over speech-narrative as well. In this way he displays his control over the text. The text is the result of narration, and the *fabula* (along with the characters inside it) has no existence apart from the act of narrating.[29]

Apollonius may have been adapting a specific Homeric episode in his creation of a silent herald. The first time we see heralds at work in the *Iliad* is when Agamemnon sends Talthybius and Eurybates to fetch Briseis from Achilles' tent. He prepares them with a command-speech; they go reluctantly, and when they reach Achilles they are struck dumb (*Iliad* 1.329–33):

> τὸν δ' εὗρον παρά τε κλισίῃ καὶ νηῒ μελαίνῃ
> ἥμενον· οὐδ' ἄρα τώ γε ἰδὼν γήθησεν Ἀχιλλεύς.
> τὼ μὲν ταρβήσαντε καὶ αἰδομένω βασιλῆα
> στήτην, οὐδέ τί μιν προσεφώνεον οὐδ' ἐρέοντο·
> αὐτὰρ ὁ ἔγνω ᾗσιν ἐνὶ φρεσὶ φώνησέν τε·

[27] J. J. Clauss, *The Best of the Argonauts: The Redefinition of the Epic Hero in Book 1 of Apollonius's Argonautica* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1993), pp. 114f suggests that the story about Aethalides' imperishable memory serves as a replacement for the traditional messenger repetition; the fact that the narrator dwells so long on the source and abilities of mental agility suggests that his report must be verbatim. This is a neat explanation; however, the meta-narrative language of the digression suggests to me that the omission of Aethalides' speech is more significant than Clauss allows. Furthermore, his explanation does not account for the absence of the original speech as well.

[28] Callimachus fr. 11 singles out these qualities as desirable for poetry, a *topos* from lyric poetry that H. White, *New Essays in Hellenistic Poetry* (Amsterdam, 1985), pp. 20–3 and 69–75 traces to a Hellenistic epigrammatic tradition. Levin (n. 5), p. 63 notes that the connotations of this word are appropriate for the herald of Jason, a hero who uses 'honeyed words' to get his way with Medea (see 3.985, 3.1102, 4.394).

[29] My separation of the story and the act of narrating derives from Genette's (n. 9), p. 27 division of *histoire*, *narrative*, and *narration*. I translate *histoire* using Bal's (n. 9), p. 5 term *fabula* to describe 'a series of logically and chronologically related events that are caused or experienced by actors'. I prefer *fabula* because of its etymological association with the English word 'fable', thus acting as a reminder that the subject of Apollonius' poem is in fact a myth lacking a definitive account; our reception of the story is filtered through the narrator's narration. The characters within the *fabula* still repeat messages, for example, but the narrator generally chooses not to include such repetitions in the text.

Many elements of this scene are traditional. The heralds work in pairs, a fact that is emphasized by the repeated use of duals. The names of the heralds are generic and appropriate to their work.[30] Once they reach their destination, however, they break from tradition. Contrary to normal etiquette, Achilles (perhaps taking pity on the hapless heralds) speaks first, thereby establishing the extreme irregularity of the heralds' unhappy task.[31] The prominent placement of this episode, along with the heralds' almost exact reversal of their traditional actions, would have piqued Apollonius' interest. He turns this brief episode of speechlessness into a silence that stretches throughout his epic.

Shortly after our introduction to Aethalides, we meet a second herald. All the women on Lemnos have killed all the men, and so the Lemnian ruler, Hypsipyle, is a woman, as is her herald, Iphinoë. The narrator seems to relent and allows her a near-verbatim repetition of Hypsipyle's message, the most exact repetition of its kind in the *Argonautica* (1.703–8, 1.712–16):[32]

> ὄρσο μοι, Ἰφινόη, τοῦδ' ἀνερος ἀντιόωσα
> ἡμέτερόν δε μολεῖν ὅς τις στόλου ἡγεμονεύει
> ὄφρα τί οἱ δήμοιο ἔπος θυμηδὲς ἐνίσπω·
> καὶ δ' αὐτοὺς γαίης τε καὶ ἄστεος, αἴ κ' ἐθέλωσι,
> κέκλεο θαρσαλέως ἐπιβαινέμεν εὐμενέοντας.
>
> κούρη τοί μ' ἐφέηκε Θοαντιὰς ἐνθάδ' ἰοῦσαν
> Ὑψιπύλη καλέειν νηὸς πρόμον ὅς τις ὄρωρεν
> ὄφρα τί οἱ δήμοιο ἔπος θυμηδὲς ἐνίσπῃ·
> καὶ δ' αὐτοὺς γαίης τε καὶ ἄστεος, αἴ κ' ἐθέλητε,
> κέκλεται αὐτίκα νῦν ἐπιβαινέμεν εὐμενέοντας.

Besides the changes of personal endings necessary to retain sense, the only alteration occurs in the adverb in the last line, through which the messenger reveals her personal view.[33] By subtly changing the original message, Iphinoë shows herself to be a good ambassador. While θαρσαλέως may have suggested to the Argonauts that they would face a reception that required boldness, the substitution of αὐτίκα νῦν offers a more neutral encouragement.[34]

[30] On the use of the dual to describe the actions of heralds, see J. B. Hainsworth's commentary on *Iliad* 9–12 (Cambridge, 1993), at *Il.* 9.170. For significant names of heralds see n. 7 above.

[31] Heralds are supposed to go right up to the recipient and deliver the message. The incongruity of Talthybius' and Eurybates' action is noted by the scholiast, who comments *ad* 1.332b: οὐδέ τί μιν προσεφώνεον: τὸ μὲν γὰρ εἰπεῖν τι παροξυντικόν, τὸ δὲ φωπεῦαι δουλοπρεπές. πρῶτος δὲ Ὅμηρος πρόσωπα κωφὰ παρήγαγεν εἰς τὴν τραγῳδίαν. Although silence can be a rhetorical tool (see O. C. Cramer, 'Speech and silence in the *Iliad*', *CJ* 71 [1975], 300–4), the narrator's specific mention of the heralds' fear and awe make rhetoric an unlikely source for their silence. Talthybius gives an appropriate repetition of a message a little later in the epic (*Il.* 4.193–7 ~ 204–7), showing that this initial silence was anomalous: he *does* in fact know what he is supposed to do.

[32] The only other speech that is near its length is Jason's two-line repetition of Aeetes' description of the bulls (3.09–10 ~ 3.495–6). Nevertheless, Iphinoë's speech, although by far the longest piece of text that is repeated verbatim in the *Argonautica*, is far shorter than many of the Homeric repeated speeches. Apollonius perhaps prepares for Iphinoë's feat with his repetition of her name at the beginning of two successive lines, 1.702–3.

[33] De Jong (n. 1), p. 185 explains that such adjustments are common in repeated speech: 'Like all speaking characters, messengers are (secondary) focalizers and as such they often select, add to and interpret the information they have to convey.'

[34] The change in adverb has been explained in various ways. F. Stössl, *Apollonios Rhodios: Interpretationen zur Erzählungskunst und Quellenverwertung* (Leipzig, 1941), p. 40 posits that her haste is an element remaining from a proecdosis. E. V. George, 'Poet and characters in Apollonius

Although her repetition is relatively brief, the fact that it is the only one of its kind in the *Argonautica* connects Iphinoë with the Homeric tradition of verbatim messenger speeches. Her editing is the mark of a good messenger; Odysseus, too, tactfully emends Agamemnon's orders when he speaks to Achilles.[35] Iphinoë's emphasis on haste, furthermore, links her to Iris, another female herald, since Iris' epithets in the *Iliad* typically mention her quickness.[36] Perhaps most importantly, her verbatim repetition demonstrates to Aethalides how the job of herald should be fulfilled.

Apollonius' use of this Homeric convention is not a statement that the Homeric convention is preferable to *poikilia*, however. The single usage of this device, coupled with its context, suggests otherwise. The role reversals on Lemnos undermine Iphinoë's apparent superiority. Actually, the events on the island have rendered gender roles obsolete rather than simply reversed. The women have continued to do their own work, presumably, while taking over traditionally male jobs as well. Thus they are seen arming for battle (635), and their agricultural work is mentioned by the narrator (628–30). Hypsipyle presides over an assembly of women from the king's stone seat, advised by an aged counsellor, Polyxo. That this counsellor happens to be her old nurse contributes to the humour of an episode that is already predisposed to comedy, having strong echoes of Aristophanes' *Ecclesiazusae*.[37] In this topsy-turvy world, it is not surprising (at least to the audience) that a woman acts as a herald for the Lemnians. What *is* surprising, and therefore funny, is that the Argonauts appear not to notice the unusual appearance of a female herald even before they learn of the events that have taken place on Lemnos.

The extreme proximity of Hypsipyle's command and Iphinoë's message, furthermore, is noteworthy. Not only does her quick repetition depart from Homeric norms,[38] but it may indicate that Iphinoë had to blurt out the message quickly before she forgot it—exactly counter to the memory so necessary for Homeric messengers and for Aethalides in particular. The comparison of Iphinoë and Aethalides, however, does not create a neat dichotomy of messenger-types; both owe their livelihood to the

Rhodius' Lemnian episode,' *Hermes* 100 (1972), 47–63, at pp. 60f claims that αὐτίκα may show her emotional agitation, contrasting with Aethalides who is emblematic of the traditional objective herald. Two more recent readings support my interpretation. Clauss (n. 27), p. 116 suggests that it reflects Iphinoë's ability to speak with μύθοισι αἱμυλίοισι as her mistress does (1.792), while R. Hunter, *Jason and the Golden Fleece* (Oxford, 1993), ad loc. believes that it is a significant variation that demonstrates Iphinoë's sensitivity to the women's desires.

[35] Odysseus repeats Agamemnon's offer (9.122–57 ~ 9.264–99), but by changing and expanding the final verses (9.158–61 ~ 9.300–6) he demonstrates his awareness of Achilles' emotional state.

[36] Of course, in this case Iphinoë is urging the Argonauts to hurry, not herself. This represents a transferral of the messenger's epithet onto the people for whom she works. In 40 appearances in the *Iliad*, Iris is named with an epithet or some sort of qualifier 34 times. Of these, 24 refer to speed: ποδήνεμος ὠκέα ten times, πόδας ὠκέα nine times, ὠκέα once (following Monro and Allen's text which reads ὦκα, not ὠκέα, at 23.198), ταχεῖα four times. Eight of her other epithets have to do with message-carrying: ἀελλόπος ἀγγελέουσαν (which may also carry connotations of speed) three times, χρυσήπτερον ἀγγελέουσαν twice, ἄγγελος once and μεταγγελος twice. In contrast, in both the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* Hermes' epithets emphasize his lineage (Διός υἱέ, Μαιάδος υἱεί) and his past deeds (ἀργεϊφόντης). When he *does* receive epithets that refer to his work as a herald, they do not specifically signify rapidity (χρυσόρραπις, διακτόρος, ἐριούνης).

[37] Discussed by Stössl (n. 34), p. 40.

[38] In the *Iliad*, De Jong (n. 1), pp. 241–2 counts 24 instances of repeated messages. The shortest pause between initial and relaying speeches is three lines (*Iliad* 4.65–67 ~ 4.70–73), with the second shortest being six lines (*Iliad* 12.343–350 ~ 12.356–63). The separations range from three to 2782 lines, with an average separation of 202.8 lines. Thus Iphinoë's six-line pause, although not anomalous, is comparatively brief.

Homeric tradition, but neither follow the pattern exactly.[39] Aethalides is a male herald who is carefully connected to the heroic tradition. Despite his impeccable credentials, however, his message receives a brief synopsis, while Iphinoë, his female counterpart, is the one allowed to speak with a Homeric repetition.[40]

Such variations offer a glimpse at Apollonius' debt to and distance from the Homeric poems. Apollonius may prefer *poikilia* to Homeric style, but he cannot show his innovation without evoking the aesthetics from which he was departing. Thus the Homeric poems are still the touchstone of his narrative. Iphinoë's message both reflects Homeric repetition and contrasts the Homeric and Hellenistic treatments of messenger-speeches. Apollonius problematizes the conventions of message-relaying by juxtaposing different styles and by placing the messages in the mouths of widely divergent characters. The fact that Iphinoë may be a more Homeric herald than Aethalides, then, does not suggest that Apollonius is celebrating the Homeric pattern; rather he uses Iphinoë to demonstrate the gap between the Homeric conception of the mythical past and his own view. The Lemnian women are not very good in their unfamiliar roles. Apollonius depicts Hypsipyle as a woman whose uncertainty in ruling leaves her easily swayed by Polyxo's advice. Fortunately for the Lemnian women, Polyxo offers sound advice and Hypsipyle admirably accomplishes her plan. Likewise, the women swiftly arm for battle but then hesitate in fear and ἀμηχανίη (1.633–9); they are lucky that the Argonauts are not hostile. It appears that they know their new roles because they have read their Homer, but their reading gave them too few practical details. Despite this lack of knowledge and lack of practice, however, their city is recognizable as a re-creation of a Homeric society. Iphinoë is perhaps the most successful of the women, repeating the message faithfully because that is how Homer depicts the transmission of messages. However, the poet lets her stumble: he depicts her repeating it too soon after the original speech to fit the exact Homeric mode, although she does a good job of suggesting Homeric communication. The scene cannot reject Homeric norms since it is based on them. Instead Apollonius offers a picture of a contemporary rendering of archaic ideas, with all its inexactitudes and misinterpretations. In this way, he reveals the discontinuity between past and present and suggests that the new style of message-relaying reflects Hellenistic aesthetics.

The depiction of heraldic action is not limited to Aethalides and Iphinoë; Jason, too, appears in the role of the messenger on Lemnos. The juxtaposition of these episodes invites a comparison of their abilities. After Hypsipyle and Jason meet, Hypsipyle sends Jason off to tell the other Argonauts what they have decided. Her words echo those with which she sent off Iphinoë at 1.705, placing Jason in the role of the herald (1.832–3):

> Ἀλλ' ἄγε νῦν ἐπὶ νῆα κιὼν ἑτάροισιν ἐνίσπες
> μύθους ἡμετέρους, μηδ' ἔκτοθι μίμνε πόληος.

[39] This is why I do not agree with the assertion of M. M. DeForest, *Apollonius' Argonautica: A Callimachean Epic* (Leiden, 1994), pp. 86–90 that the quick repetition mocks Homeric naïveté or her suggestion that Apollonius describes Iphinoë in such a way as to denigrate Jason's abilities. While I agree that Iphinoë's repetition emphasizes Aethalides' silence, I find DeForest's argument untenable because it posits the Homeric pattern as the only 'correct' one. Apollonius clearly used the Homeric poems as models, but they certainly were not his only sources of inspiration, and he certainly sought to rework the originals.

[40] B. Pavlock, *Eros, Imitation, and the Epic Tradition* (Ithaca, 1990), pp. 45–51 has been very influential for my reading of the Lemnian episode. The ongoing dialogue between the sexes that she sees can, I believe, be applied to Iphinoë and Aethalides.

In response, he promises to relay her decision faithfully, according to proper form (*εὖτ' ἂν ἕκαστα ἐξείπω κατὰ κόσμον*, 838–9). Jason is not a professional herald, so he specifies that he will repeat the message verbatim.[41] In contrast, Aethalides is *expected* to speak *ἕκαστα . . . κατὰ κόσμον*, and so it is not necessary for it to be mentioned. The narrator does not give Jason the chance to repeat the message, however; the content of the message is mentioned only allusively (847–8):[42]

> *μῦθον ὅτ' ἤδη πάντα διηνεκέως ἀγόρευσε*
> *τόν ῥα καλεσσαμένη διεπέφραδεν Ὑψιπύλεια.*

Nevertheless, Jason's thoroughness cannot be in doubt. The narrator, although blocking our access to his speech, nonetheless signals that Jason follows the traditional heraldic pattern by including the phrase *πάντα διηνεκέως*.[43]

This same adverb links Jason with the narrator's self-censoring comment after the Aethalides story.[44] The phrase *μῦθον ἀγόρευσε* echoes the narrator's *μύθους ἀγορεύειν* (1.648–9), the only two occurrences of this phrase in the poem, and the adverb *διηνεκέως* appears in the same metrical position in both phrases. The verbal echoes suggest that within the *fabula* Jason is making a verbatim repetition of Hypsipyle's decision, or rather the modified plan that he suggests to her (1.840–1). The narrator's synopsis of Jason's speech both criticizes Jason's verbosity and edits out the offending speech. The echo of the Aethalides self-censorship appears to be something of a tease: the narrator comments upon Jason's style of presentation without subjecting the audience to it, thereby calling attention to his own act of editing.

The audience has a chance to observe Jason's ability as a narrator later in the poem. In the land of the Mariandynoi, Jason offers a synopsis of their adventures so far. While this is not a message *per se*, it nonetheless offers a glimpse of Jason's narrative gifts and elides the distinction between messenger and bard (2.762–71):

> *Αἰσονίδης μέν οἱ γενεὴν καὶ οὔνομ' ἑκάστου*
> *σφωιτέρων μυθεῖθ' ἑτάρων, Πελίαό τ' ἐφετμάς,*
> *ἠδ' ὡς Λημνιάδεσσιν ἐπεξεινοῦντο γυναιξίν,*
> *ὅσσα τε Κύζικον ἀμφὶ Δολιονίην τ' ἐτέλεσσαν,*
> *Μυσίδα θ' ὡς ἀφίκοντο Κίον θ' ὅθι κάλλιπον ἥρω*
> *Ἡρακλέην ἀέκοντι νόῳ· Γλαύκοιό τε βάξιν*
> *πέφραδε, καὶ Βέβρυκας ὅπως Ἄμυκόν τ' ἐδάιξαν·*
> *καὶ Φινῆος ἔειπε θεοπροπίας τε δύην τε,*
> *ἠδ' ὡς Κυανέας πέτρας φύγον, ὥς τ' ἀβόλησαν*
> *Λητοΐδῃ κατὰ νῆσον.*

He faithfully narrates the events of the *Argonautica* in miniature, but in fact we do

[41] The ability to repeat messages verbatim was not limited to professional heralds in the Homeric epics; any hero should be able to remember and repeat messages. See Martin (n. 2) for a discussion of heroes as performers, with memory as a heroic characteristic.

[42] Stössl (n. 34), p. 44 notes that this is an odd omission, since the parallel scenes of arrival and departure suggest that Apollonius was not adverse to writing doublet scenes, while George (n. 34), p. 60 reads Jason's speech as a parody of a herald speaking verbatim.

[43] Jason is not the only one whose words are edited by the narrator. When Medea pours out her troubles to her aunt Circe, the narrator states that she tells her everything (*τὰ ἕκαστα . . . κατέλεξε*, 4.730), and yet he only gives a brief summary of her speech (4.730–6). He further demonstrates his dominance over the narrative by mentioning a subject that Medea leaves out: Apsyrtus' murder (*φόνον δ' ἀλέεινεν ἐνισπεῖν/ Ἄψύρτου, τὴν δ' οὔ τι νόῳ λάθεν*, 4.736–7).

[44] DeForest (n. 39), p. 89 notes these similarities, but draws a different conclusion: she sees the juxtaposition of these phrases as further evidence for Jason's failure as a hero.

not hear Jason's account. Although the internal audience is learning about their adventures for the first time, the external audience has been involved in the narrative from the beginning. Thus the narrator avoids redundancy by presenting Jason's summary in a summary of his own. He signals Lycus' pleasure in the narration by using the word 'enchant' (*θέλγετ'*), the traditional response to a talented bard (*ὁ δ' ἐξείης ἐνέποντος θέλγετ' ἀκουῇ θυμόν*, 2.771–2).[45] It appears that whatever Jason said in *oratio recta* within the *fabula* was pleasing; his narration does its job by provoking enchantment.[46]

Jason once again plays the herald upon reaching Colchis. He takes the *Ἑρμείαο σκῆπτρον* (3.197–8) when he visits Aeetes, presumably to signal his sacrosanct status as herald.[47] This also reminds us of Aethalides, since he too carried the *σκῆπτρον . . . Ἑρμείαο σφωιτέροιο τοκῆος* (1.642–3). Once again Jason speaks in *oratio recta* (3.386–95), as he did when he addressed Hypsipyle (1.836–41). This time his speech is both instruction-speech and relaying-speech rolled into one, since he is acting as herald for himself; it is striking that he casts himself as a messenger again when he promises to broadcast the story of Aeetes' generosity throughout Hellas (3.391–2). Aeetes' response is not what he might have wished, however; after deciding not to attack them on the spot, the Colchian king asks (3.401):

ξεῖνε, τί κεν τὰ ἕκαστα διηνεκέως ἀγορεύοις;

thereby indicating that, in his view at least, Jason has been speaking as a Homeric herald does—that is to say, more repetitiously and verbosely than either he or the narrator would care for: when the narrator caught himself speaking in such a manner, he censored himself (1.648–9); when Jason spoke thus, the narrator suppressed his speech (1.847). Now a character within the *fabula* directly criticizes Jason for speaking at length, *διηνεκέως*, reminding us of the Hellenistic preference for *poikilia*.[48]

Aethalides, the traditional herald, never obtains either criticism or approbation from the narrator. Nor does he ever say a word anywhere in the *Argonautica*. In the two instances in which he is depicted doing his job, his language is omitted. For a herald, one who traffics in language, this silence is a peculiar but logical result of Apollonius' decidedly Hellenistic spin on the heroic world. Aethalides is undistinguished in the catalogue; he is the third of three sons of Hermes who join the quest. On Lemnos, Apollonius omits the opening message of command as well as the messenger speech: there is a sense that the message is doubly censored. The audience learns the result of

[45] Within the *Argonautica*, Orpheus soothes the quarrel of Idas and Idmon with his cosmogonical song, with the result that *τοῖόν σφιν ἐνέλλιπε θελκτὺν ἀοιδῆς* (1.515); see E. Schwartz, *Aspects of Orpheus in Classical Literature and Mythology* (Harvard diss., 1984), pp. 63–90 for a broader perspective on Orpheus' powers. Albis (n. 4), pp. 81–7 draws a connection between the *θέλξις* of Apollonius' poetry and Medea's sorcery in Book 3; also see G. B. Walsh, *The Varieties of Enchantment: Early Greek Views of the Nature and Function of Poetry* (Chapel Hill, 1984), pp. 3–21 and especially pp. 14–19 on *θέλξις* as the goal of Homeric bards.

[46] Albis (n. 4), pp. 52–3 sees the use of the verb *θέλγω* as a sign of Apollonius' self-approbation rather than praise of Jason's abilities.

[47] See R. Mondi, '*ΣΚΗΠΤΟΥΧΟΙ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΣ*: an argument for divine kingship in early Greece', *Arethusa* 13 (1980), 203–16 for a discussion of the sceptre as a twofold symbol, that of kingship and of the authority of the speaker holding it.

[48] The only other character to use this word is Phineus, who is shown to be wise in refusing to speak *τὰ ἕκαστα διηνεκὲς* because it is a sin against Zeus (2.390–1).

the speech (that Hypsipyle received the travellers), but not its content. In Colchis, his final appearance in the poem,[49] there is no indication that he speaks at all; there again only the result—the transfer of the dragon's teeth from Aeetes to Jason—is told. His paternity is affirmed for the third time when he is called *υἷα κλυτὸν Ἑρμείαο* (3.1175). Hunter's observation that Apollonius generally applies the adjective *κλυτός* only to immortals is a valuable insight.[50] The adjective *κλυτός* recalls the undying fame—*κλέος ἄφθιτον*—that Aethalides received because of his *μνῆστιν ἄφθιτον*. A subject cannot be famed without a poetic memory that preserves the deeds that provoked the fame. For Aethalides, this is doubly true: without *his* (poetic) memory he would have no fame. Nonetheless, the audience does not have the opportunity to observe this memory because of the exclusion of Aethalides' speech.

Aethalides is a traditional herald at the mercy of the literate, self-conscious poetics that are at work in the *Argonautica*. Apollonius depicts heralds in situations wherein their specific talents are not used to their fullest potential. He does this by limiting their appearances in his epic and then by undercutting their effectiveness. As a result, the narrator's role is foregrounded since he, not the messenger, controls the passage of messages. The messenger's memory, earlier so significant for oral technique, becomes less important than Hellenistic *poikilia*; this signals a self-conscious selection of variation over repetition. Aethalides thus is presented as a marginalized figure who is far less significant than his Homeric counterparts. At the same time, as a herald he is an important symbol for the disjunction between the styles of Homeric oral composition and of the literate epic that adapts it. In an illiterate society, heralds are one of the few means of communication between distant areas; the exactitude of their memory preserves the accuracy of transmission. Thus they, like bards, are repositories of the spoken word. Such figures become functionally obsolete with the rise of literacy; their abilities may be entertaining or amazing but ultimately are not necessary for the retention of information.

There is a tension between Apollonius' rejection of heraldic conventions, in particular verbatim repetition, and his engagement with traditional epic forms. Not content with a wholesale absorption of the Homeric poems, Apollonius sifts through his models, selecting and rejecting certain techniques and ideas. The digression about Aethalides is infused with the language of poetic continuity and the ideas of memory and return. Its abrupt meta-narrative ending serves as a link to the poetic past while expressing impatience with the conventions of ancient epic, calling attention to his act of composition and therefore to his choices for inclusion and exclusion. Aethalides, a herald by birth and by gift, is a casualty of the narrator's choices.

Arizona State University JULIE NISHIMURA-JENSEN
jnishjen@asu.edu

[49] When Medea suggests luring Apsyrtus to his death, she mentions sending heralds (*κήρυκας*, plural) to persuade him to come alone (4.417). A few lines later at 4.435, the narrator reiterates that Medea sent heralds (*κηρύκεσσιν*, following Vian's text). In neither case do the heralds speak, but their action is summarized at 436 by *θελγέμεν*. It is unclear who these heralds are, since Aethalides and Iphinoë were the only named heralds, and surely Iphinoë remained on Lemnos. Thus, there must have been at least one unheralded herald who accompanied the Argonauts on their voyage, and who also was denied the opportunity to speak verbatim.

[50] R. L. Hunter's commentary on *Argonautica* 3 (Cambridge, 1989), at 3.1175. The only other instance of *κλυτός* applied to a mortal occurs when Jason asks Argos his background, *ὄνομα κλυτὸν ἠδὲ γενέθλην* (2.1139).