

VI. Vergil's Linguistic Treatment of Divine Beings

E. ADELAIDE HAHN

HUNTER COLLEGE

I have written elsewhere, in the course of two articles, "A Source of Vergilian Hypallage"¹ and "A Linguistic Fallacy",² that certain types of departure from strict logic may enhance and enrich the variety of style and the appeal to the imagination that characterize the writings of such a poet as Vergil.³ One such departure is based on the application of the formula that if $a = b$ and $b = c$, then $a = c$;⁴ this is true in mathematics, where the symbol of equality has a rigid denotation, but not always in logic. It was one particular variety of this type that provided the fallacy discussed in the second of the two articles just cited: because a term denoting a people and a term denoting a place may often be used as parallels or equivalents,⁵ they come to be used interchangeably in passages where only one or the other is strictly appropriate.⁶ An additional inconcinnity was noted in the occasional collocation with place-names and/or people-names of names of rivers or mountains.⁷

At times an element of personification is introduced in the naming of the river or mountain. Thus in *G* 4.461–63,

¹ *TAPA* 87 (1956) 147–89; see especially 147, note 1a.

² *Studies Presented to Joshua Whatmough on His Sixtieth Birthday*, edited by Ernst Pulgram (The Hague 1957) 53–64; see especially 53. This article will henceforth be referred to simply as "Fallacy."

³ In citations from Vergil I designate passages from the *Eclogues* and the *Georgics* by *E* and *G* respectively; all passages not specifically designated are from the *Aeneid*. Passages are usually but not always given in their complete form; when they are not, I quote enough to show sense and syntax, with no indication of omitted words.

⁴ A second type is based on the fallacious notion that the relationship $a:b$ is inevitably equivalent to the relationship $b:a$. This type was the subject of the article cited above in note 1.

⁵ E.g. 4.40–43, 8.635–37, 11.428. Cf. on these "Fallacy" 55, 55, and 56 respectively.

⁶ E.g. *E* 1.62, *G* 2.138–39, 1.339, 6.59–60. Cf. on these "Fallacy" 59, 58, 63, and 62 respectively.

⁷ With respect to these, Vergil's usage varies. Sometimes they are definitely geographical terms and thus are logically parallel to the place-names, as in *G* 2.136–39. Sometimes they refer to the folk living on or near the mountain or river and thus are logically parallel to the people-names, as in *G* 1.56–59 and *G* 4.210–12. In *G* 1.509 and *G* 2.224–25, both the name of the river and the name of the country or city are poetical substitutes for the names of the inhabitants demanded by prosaic logic. On all these see "Fallacy" 58 and 59.

flerunt Rhodopeiae arces
 altaque Pangaea et Rhesi Mavortia tellus
 atque Getae atque Hebrus et Actias Orithyia,

not only countries and a people weep, but also the peaks of Rhodope and the River Hebrus; and in the case of the river at least, the juxtaposition of its name with that of the nymph Orithyia may effect a transition from the terminology of geography and ethnology to that of mythology and religion, and *Hebrus* may stand not so much for the river as for its tutelary genius. In *G* 2.224–25⁸,

talem dives arat Capua et vicina Vesevo
 ora iugo et vacuis Clanius non aequus Acerris,

Clanius not only as a parallel to *Capua* and *ora* applies to the district through which the river flows, and as the subject of *arat*⁹ applies to the people who live along its bank, but also in combination with the epithet *non aequus Acerris* presents the river as a sentient being.¹⁰ Personification is particularly natural when the mountain or river is named along with a group of conquered cities or peoples¹¹, as in *G* 3.30–31,

addam urbes Asiae domitas pulsumque Niphaten
 fidentemque fuga Parthum versisque sagittis,

and 8.724–28,

hic Nomadum genus et discinctos Mulciber Afros,
 hic Lelegas Carasque sagittiferosque Gelonos
 finxerat; Euphrates ibat iam mollior undis,
 extremique hominum Morini, Rhenusque bicornis,
 indomitique Dahae, et pontem indignatus Araxes.

Here again the epithets merit notice. *Pulsum* with *Niphaten* may refer either to the mountain or river (whichever *Niphaten* denotes), i.e. to the dwellers thereon, or to the tutelary genius; and *bicornis* with *Rhenus* may refer either to the river with its two mouths, or to the river-god with his twin horns. But *indignatus* with *Araxes* is particularly suitable when applied to the river-god; and on the other hand *mollior undis* with *Euphrates* is particularly suitable when applied to the river.

⁸ Already referred to in note 7.

⁹ Contrast the logical form of expression in 3.14, Thraces arant, and 7.797–98, qui Numici litus arant.

¹⁰ Like Jupiter in 6.129–30, quos aequus amavit Iuppiter.

¹¹ Cf. on these “Fallacy” 58–59.

This last detail brings us to an important point. The name of the geographical entity, whether spring, river, or mountain, and that of its presiding tutelary genius, are one and the same. Certain expressions apply specifically to the first, and certain others to the second. When Vergil, in keeping with the variety and allusiveness characterizing his style, unites both sets of expressions in the same passage, we have a medley far richer than would have been the precise sorting out of verbs and epithets according to rigorous logic.

Thus at the beginning of *Eclogue* 10, Arethusa is definitely the nymph in 1,

extremum hunc, Arethusa, mihi concede laborem;

but she is definitely the spring, just as Doris is definitely the sea, in 4-5,

sic tibi, cum fluctus subterlabere Sicanos,
Doris amara suam non intermisceat undam.

She is mainly the spring in 3.694-96,

Alpheum fama est huc Elidis amnem
occultas egisse vias subter mare, qui nunc
ore, Arethusa, tuo Siculis confunditur undis,

though perhaps the direct address to her in the third line may involve a suggestion that she is the nymph.

In the same way the river and the river-god are fused in 9.124-25

cunctatur et amnis
rauca sonans revocatque pedem Tiberinus ab alto,

where the Tiber roars like a river but withdraws his foot like a man. As Page says *ad loc.*, "Tiberinus turns back in terror, and when he does so causes the river also to stay its course."

In the magnificent long passage about the Tiber in Book VIII, the god is at first distinct from the stream. Note 31-35,

huic deus ipse loci fluvio Tiberinus amoeno
populeas inter senior se attollere frondes
visus (eum tenuis glauco velabat amictu
carbasus, et crinis umbrosa tegebat harundo),
tum sic adfari et curas his demere dictis.

Dressed in an appropriate costume for a river-god, a thin gray-green¹² robe and a crown of reeds, the deity rises from the stream among the poplars which border the bank.¹³ He is probably still separate from it when he says (57–58):

ipse ego te ripis et recto flumine ducam,
adversum remis superes subvectus ut amnem;

but he seems blended with it when he says (62–64):

ego sum pleno quem flumine cernis
stringentem ripas et pingua culta secantem,
caeruleus Thybris, caelo gratissimus amnis;

we may note especially *stringentem* and *caeruleus*.¹⁴ But in 66–67,

¹² It is hard to be certain exactly what color *glaucus* denotes in Vergil, whether blue-gray, green-gray, or blue-green. In regard to the poet's employment of it as the color (presumably gray) of a horse (G 3.82), Gellius (2.26.18) seems to suggest a kinship with both blue (*caerulum*) and green (*viridem*). Vergil also uses it of the willow (G 2.13 and G 4.182), the sedge (6.416), and the reed (10.205). At all events it is assuredly a color suitable for a water-deity, not only because willow-trees, sedge-grass, and reeds grow on the banks of streams, but because water itself often has a blue-gray or green-gray hue. The term is used of the veil of reeds worn by the river-god Min-cius (10.205–6), the mantle of the spring-nymph Juturna (12.885), the light in the eyes of the sea-god Proteus (G 4.451); and it is the name of a sea-god (G 1.437 and 5.823). Another epithet often used of water-divinities and water-monsters is *caeruleus*; on this see note 14.

¹³ Just so Neptune rises from the sea in 1.127 (*summa placidum caput extulit unda*). Neptune apparently emerges completely, for when he drives off in his chariot under the open sky (154–56) he seems to be on the surface of the water. It may be questioned whether the Tiber actually leaves the river, although he is certainly distinct from it. He does leave it if *fluvio amoeno* (8.31) is an ablative of place whence; but probably the word-order is against this, also the use of the same phrase in 7.30–32, *hunc inter fluvio Tiberinus amoeno verticibus rapidis et multa flavus harena in mare prorumpit*. Conington in his note on the latter passage explains the ablative in both instances as “abl. of circumstance, or, which is the same thing, a descriptive abl.” I would not call them the same thing: to me an “ablative of (attendant) circumstance” is adverbial, a “descriptive ablative” adjectival. I think *fluvio amoeno* in 7.30 really is a descriptive ablative, and perhaps the same phrase in 8.31 may be so also (possibly both are roughly equivalent to *tu cum flumine sancto*, in 8.72, quoted just below). But in other respects the two passages are quite different, for *Tiberinus* in 7.30 is the river (so too, probably, *ille* of the Tiber in 9.816–17, *ille suo cum gurgite flavo accipit venientem*) and in 8.31 is the god.

¹⁴ Cf. note 12. *Caeruleus*, the color of the sea (3.208 = 4.583, 7.198, 8.672, 10.209–10, 12.182), is also the color of the sea-god Proteus (G 4.388); the Nile's breast (8.713), i.e. probably the breast of his toga (see note 18); Scylla's dogs (3.432), and hence perhaps Scylla herself; the ship named Scylla (5.122–23); the stern of Charon's skiff (6.410), and hence perhaps the whole skiff (contrast 6.303, where the skiff is called *ferruginea*); and Neptune's chariot (5.819). Note too Ovid's *caeruleos deos* (*Mel.* 2.8) and Milton's *blue-haired deities* (*Comus* 29).

lacu fluvius se condidit alto
ima petens,

though he is called 'the river', he is certainly the god plunging into the river;¹⁵ and Aeneas separates the two in his invocation (72),

tuque, o Thybri tuo genitor cum flumine sancto.¹⁶

The subsequent keeping of his promise by the Tiber is reported in 86-87,

Thybris ea fluvium, quam longa est, nocte tumentem
leniit, et tacita refluxens ita substitit unda;

here it is impossible to tell with certainty whether *Thybris* refers to the god checking the current of the stream, or to the river checking its own current.

We may compare with this passage the shorter one about the Nile, 8.711-13,

contra autem magno maerentem corpore Nilum
pandentemque sinus et tota veste vocantem
caeruleum in gremium latebrosaue flumina victos.

Here the mourning and compassionate figure is certainly that of the god. He wears a loose robe that seems to resemble a toga with its folds or *sinus*; yet we should note that *sinus* can also suggest the bays of a great harbor, and these too might be opened up to rescue the refugees (in their ships). Indeed, the substantives in the two lines seem to follow a chiasmic arrangement; *veste* and *gremium* apply to the person, but *sinus* may, and *flumina* must, apply to the body of water. It should be noted, however, that *both* the nouns in the second of the two lines have adjectives that belong properly to the stream, not only *latebrosa* with *flumina*, but *caeruleum* with *gremium*, which may mean merely that he had a blue robe, but which rather, I think, suggests the blue waters of the Nile. It may be recalled that, as we noted in the previous paragraph, the Tiber's robe was gray-green (8.33, *glauco amictu*),¹⁷ but he spoke of himself as 'the blue Tiber' (64, *caeruleus Thybris*).¹⁸

¹⁵ Cf. 12.886, *se fluvio dea condidit alto*, of Juturna. Here there is no intrinsic connection between the goddess and the river into which she plunges; Juturna is the divinity of a spring, not of a river.

¹⁶ Cf. the rather similar language used of the Clitumnus in *G* 2.146-47, *albi, Clitumne, greges et taurus, tuo perfusi flumine sacro*.

¹⁷ See note 12.

¹⁸ See note 14. To be sure, in both cases the meaning may be that the gods themselves were actually blue, like Proteus in *G* 4.388; but this seems to me less likely, for I think it would inject a grotesque element into two superb passages.

A third passage which may possibly deal with a river-god is met in the catalogue of Aeneas's Etruscan allies, namely, 10.204-6,

hinc quoque quingentos in se Mezentius armat,
quos patre Benaco velatus harundine glauca
Mincius infesta ducebat in aequora pinu.

Mincius perhaps conveys the Mantuans in their ship as Tiberinus did the Trojans (compare his words to Aeneas, 8.57, *ipse ego te ducam*).¹⁹ Note that Mincius is dressed much as is Tiberinus in 8.33-34,

eum tenuis glauco velabat amictu
carbasus, et crinis umbrosa tegebat harundo;

both have crowns of reeds,²⁰ and furthermore *velatus* and *glauca*²¹ in 10.205 seem verbal echoes respectively of *velabat* and *glauco amictu* in 8.33. But the topographical aspect of the trip raises difficulties. Nettle-ship objects that the Mincius would have carried the ship down the Po into the Adriatic; and this is indeed, despite Vergil's usual carelessness or ignorance in matters geographical, a serious objection, for it does seem that the "Mantovano" must have been acquainted with the course of the Mincius, and of the Po too,²² and would have taken pains to be accurate about it in a passage that he seems to have introduced largely as a matter of local pride.²³ However, whether the Mantuans sailed down the Mincius or not, I would venture humbly to ask just how this northern Etruscan contingent of the fleet did get to the Trojan camp on the Tiber! Perhaps we should not inquire too nicely into details of geography in this passage.²⁴

Just as the river-god and the river are sometimes distinguished and sometimes fused, so too are the sea-god and the sea. In *E* 6.35-36,

¹⁹ Then *patre Benaco* (which Nettle-ship compares with *Clytio patre* used with *Euneum* in 11.666) might rather indicate place whence, in contrast with *in aequora*.

²⁰ Cf. Vell. Pat. 2.83, *caputque redimitus harundine*, of a person acting the part of Glaucus.

²¹ On this adjective cf. note 12.

²² He refers to the Po with apparent familiarity in *G* 1.481-83 and *G* 4.372-73.

²³ Cf. Nettle-ship's note on 10.201-3 concerning Vergil's glorification of Mantua.

²⁴ A more serious objection to this interpretation is that *quos Mincius ducebat* in 205-6 may well be parallel to *hunc vehit Trilon* in 209-10; we learn that Aulestes has a ship named *Trilon*, with a figure-head representing the sea-god (described in 209-12), and so the reference to Mincius may indicate that Ocnus had a ship named *Mincius*, with a figure-head representing the river-god.

discludere Nerea ponto coeperit, Nereus is absolutely separate from the sea, which he did not even inhabit to begin with. But in 2.418–19,

saevitque tridenti
spumeus atque imo Nereus ciet aequora fundo,

saevit applies equally to both the god and the sea, *spumeus* particularly to the sea,²⁵ and *ciet aequora* particularly to the god; and in the course of Venus' long plea to Neptune in Book V, she addresses him as the god in 781–82,

Iunonis gravis ira neque exsaturabile pectus
cogunt me, Neptune, preces descendere in omnis,

but as the sea in 796–97,

quod superest, oro, liceat dare tuta per undas
vela tibi, liceat Laurentem attingere Thybrim.

Iris and the rainbow are similarly treated. In 5.609–10,

illa viam celerans per mille coloribus arcum
nulli visa cito decurrit tramite virgo,

and in 5.657–58,

cum dea se paribus per caelum sustulit alis
ingentemque fuga secuit sub nubibus arcum

and the almost identical 9.14–15,

dixit, et in caelum paribus se sustulit alis
ingentemque fuga secuit sub nubibus arcum,

the rainbow seems to mark the path followed by the goddess²⁶ as she flies from heaven to earth and back again; but in 4.700–702,

²⁵ Page and Knapp consider *spumeus* applicable to the god as well as to the sea, but I question whether the adjective is normally used for persons. In Vergil at all events, *spumeus* and its synonym *spumosus* are used only of water or of rocks lashed by water, being associated with *pontus* (11.626), with *amnis* or *amnes* (2.496, 12.524), with *unda* (10.212), with *unda* or, possibly, with *saxa* (6.174), with *saxa* (7.589).

²⁶ In Ovid, *Met.* 6.63–64, *qualis ab imbre solet percussis solibus arcus inficere ingenti longum curvamine caelum*, the rainbow is said to carve out this path without any mention of the goddess; but Iris carves it out in 11.589–91, *induitur velamina mille colorum Iris, et arcuato caelum curvamine signans tecta petit*, and returns by it in 11.632, *remeat per quos modo venerat arcus*.

ergo Iris, croceis per caelum roscida pennis
 mille trahens varios adverso sole colores,
 devolat et supra caput astitit,

though in the third line Iris behaves as a goddess, in the first two lines she is said to do herself what the bow is said to do in 5.88–89,

nubibus arcus
 mille trahit²⁷ varios adverso sole colores,

and in particular *roscida* (4.700) and *adverso sole* (701), as Conington points out, belong to the physical rainbow.

As Iris comes to earth via the rainbow, so Jupiter comes to earth via a shower of rain. An interesting example is *E* 7.60,

Iuppiter et laeto descendet plurimus imbri.

Jupiter is certainly the god here, a beneficent divinity to balance the malignant Bacchus in the contrasted picture just above, 58,

Liber pampineas invidit collibus umbras.

If we had had only *Iuppiter descendet plurimus*, we might have been inclined to think that *Iuppiter* was simply the shower and not the deity, but the mention of rain as a separate adjunct²⁸ furnishes additional grounds for taking *Iuppiter* as the god. Actually, the adjective *plurimus* would have been more appropriately used with *imbri*, while *laetus* would have fitted well with *Iuppiter* (it is used of his spouse in *G* 2.326); it is like Vergil to invert them. We have a similar picture, with more marked personification, in *G* 2.325–26,

tum pater omnipotens fecundis imbribus Aether
 coniugis in gremium laetae descendit,

where *pater Aether* corresponds to *Iuppiter*, and *fecundis imbribus* to *laeto imbri*. And we have the same picture stripped of all personification in *G* 1.324, ruit arduus aether; cf. too 1.129, caeli ruina.

The stars are described partially as heavenly bodies and partially as divine beings in *G* 4.232–35,

²⁷ Such is the reading of the Codex Romanus. The Palatinus and Mediceus have the variant *iacit*, which most editors prefer; this introduces a slightly different treatment of the bow as compared with the goddess.

²⁸ Yet in 7.30, fluvio Tiberinus amoenus, the mention of the river as a separate adjunct does not force us to view Tiberinus as the god. See note 13.

Taygete simul os terris ostendit honestum
 Pleas et Oceani spretos pede reppulit amnis,
 aut eadem sidus fugiens ubi Piscis aquosi
 tristior hibernas caelo descendit in undas,

and 8.589–91,

qualis ubi Oceani perfusus Lucifer unda,
 quem Venus ante alios astrorum diligit ignis,
 extulit os sacrum caelo tenebrasque resolvit.

In *G* 1.217–18,

candidus auratis aperit cum cornibus annum
 Taurus et adverso cedens Canis occidit astro,

the constellations are described in terms of the animals which they are supposed to represent; Taurus is tacitly compared, as Keightley points out, to the snow-white bulls with gilded horns which had a place near the front of the Roman triumphal procession, and before him Canis backs away²⁹ and disappears. In *G* 3.303–4,

cum frigidus olim
 iam cadit extremoque inrorat Aquarius anno,

frigidus cadit refers to the sign of the zodiac, and *inrorat* to the figure, the water-carrier, which it is held to resemble.

Perhaps the most famous of all the passages in which a physical entity and a divine being, sharing a name, are also represented as sharing certain characteristics, is the description of Atlas³⁰ in 4.246–51,

iamque volans apicem et latera ardua cernit
 Atlantis duri caelum qui vertice fulcit,
 Atlantis, cinctum adsidue cui nubibus atris
 piniferum caput et vento pulsatur et imbri,
 nix umeros infusa tegit, tum flumina mento
 praecipitant senis, et glacie riget horrida barba.

²⁹ If we read *adverso*. If we accept the alternate lection *averso*, the Dog-Star turns tail; but *adverso* is truer to the relative position of the two constellations.

³⁰ Perhaps we may compare the effective picture in *E* 8.43–45 of the paternity of Amor: *duris in cotibus illum aut Tmaros aut Rhodope aut extremi Garamantes edunt*. Here the stony-hearted engenderers of Love named along with the remote and savage Garamantes are probably not merely the inhabitants of Tmaros or Rhodope, but the actual rocky mountains themselves. Cf. the earth-born men of Greek mythology, the reference to Achilles' supposed descent from 'the sheer cliffs' in *Il.* 16.35, and, in a quite different vein, Horace's *parturient montes* (*AP* 139).

Here *apicem*, *latera ardua*, *vertice*, and *piniferum caput* all refer especially to the mountain, though without the adjectives *latera* and *caput* would be perfectly natural of the man; *vertex* is possible, and so is *apex* in the sense of a kind of head-gear. On the other hand *umeros*,³¹ *mento*, *senis*, and *barba* refer especially to the man, and cannot apply to the mountain.³² The adjective *duri* applies to both.³³ Of course the basis of the confusion is the fact that *Atlas* is the name both of the giant and of the mountain into which he was changed; Vergil's lines seem to describe his state during the transition period posited by myth.³⁴

It is the same sort of confusion that leads to that common metonymy by which a god and his particular province or function are used interchangeably. We may note a few examples to illustrate a point that scarcely needs illustration. *Ceres* stands for *frumentum*³⁵ in 1.177,

³¹ English prose speaks of the *shoulders* of a mountain, but I doubt if Latin does.

³² Of such stuff are mythology and poetry made. This particular passage has been criticized as carrying the identification too far: it has been dubbed "ungraceful" and "grotesque" (Conington), "feeble" (Mackail), "childish" (Page). But we must remember that Vergil is *not* describing either an old man or a mountain; he is describing an old man that has turned into a mountain, or, if one prefers, a mountain that looks like an old man and somehow *is* an old man. And it is natural to trace human forms and features in rugged mountains. As the Greeks saw the giant Atlas holding up the sky in the tall African mountain that bore his name, so too they saw the weeping Niobe turned to stone in the Lydian rock formation with a stream trickling down it. I have seen mountainous formations that have been thought to resemble gigantic human beings, from Hestmannen the "Horseman" pursuing the "Seven Sisters" in far distant Norway, to the "Old Man of the Mountain" (one of the Catskills) in my native state of New York. Recall too Hawthorne's story, "The Great Stone Face," localized in New England (it is based on Profile Mountain, in New Hampshire). Then too there are Stone Mountain in Georgia and Mt. Rushmore in South Dakota, which inspired the gigantic carvings of the sculptor Gutzon Borglum — a combination of the natural and the artificial which seem to me to merit the epithet "grotesque" much more than Vergil's description of Mt. Atlas. Such rock carvings go back as far as the Hittites.

³³ Cf. *E* 8.43, *duris in cotibus* (quoted in note 30).

³⁴ Ovid's description is even more specific, and in consequence, in my opinion, more infelicitous, for (like Horace in *Carm.* 2.20) he gives the details of a transformation with tasteless precision: *Mel.* 4.657–60,

quantus erat, mons factus Atlas: nam barba comaeque
in silvas abeunt, iuga sunt umerique manusque;
quod caput ante fuit, summo est in monte cacumen;
ossa lapis fiunt.

³⁵ Conway in his note on this verse expresses the view that *Ceres* was originally a common noun signifying 'corn', just as *Venus* was originally a common noun signifying 'charm', and that "the concrete meaning of the words was deeply rooted in the language, more deeply than any belief in their personal character." It is true that the Sabines called bread *ceres*, according to Servius on *G* 1.7, if we accept the disputed

Cererem corruptam undis Cerealiaque arma, and *Bacchus* for *vinum* in *G* 4.129, nec pecori opportuna seges nec commoda Baccho,³⁶ and in 1.215, implentur veteris Bacchi. In regard to 9.336–37, multoque iacebat membra deo victus, Servius hesitates as to whether *deo* is equivalent to *vino* or to *somno*,³⁷ and modern commentators are divided. *Venus* probably means *amor* in 6.26, Veneris monumenta nefandae (since the poet would hardly apply the epithet *nefanda* to the goddess); and *Mars* certainly means *bellum* in 2.335, caeco Marte resistunt, 2.440–41, Martem indomitum cernimus, 8.676–77, instructo Marte videres fervere Leucaten, and 10.21–22, tumidusque secundo Marte ruat. The Muse suggests *carmen* in *E* 1.2, silvestrem Musam meditaris, and *E* 6.8, agrestem meditabor Musam, though *Musam* is doubtless more poetic. 8.123, nostris succede *Penatibus* seems to mean just the same as 1.627, *teclis* succedite nostris. *Vulcanus* denotes fire in 2.311, Vulcano superante domus. *Nereus* denotes the sea³⁸ in 10.764–65, per maxima Nerei stagna, i.e. the sea pure and simple, *mare* or *pelagus*; there is no question of the sea-god here, as there is in 2.419. *Iuppiter* stands for the atmosphere³⁹ in *G* 1.418, Iuppiter uvidus Austris, and for the rain in *G* 2.419, metuendus Iuppiter uvis; there is no question of the rain-god here, as there is in *E* 7.60.

It now remains to inquire how far all the instances of confusion⁴⁰ that have been discussed here are merely external matters, details of style; and how far they go deeper, and involve fundamental religious outlook. The relation of words and thoughts is a difficult one; many would say that words form our only clew to thoughts, and that hence we should not try to dissociate the two, but should confine all our investigations to words alone. Yet others would say that words at once reflect thoughts, and condition them; to put it differently, that there are two phenomena,

reading *panem* (*Pandam* is probably preferable); but I have found no evidence for the Latin use of *ceres* in the sense of 'grain' except as a figure of speech.

³⁶ Here Bacchus the vine, for whom the field is unfavorable, is in striking contrast with Liber the god, who is unfriendly to the slopes in *E* 7.58, Liber pampineas invidit collobis umbras (already cited three paragraphs earlier).

³⁷ In 5.854–56, ecce deus ramum Lethaeo rore madentem quassat, cunctantique natantia lumina solvit, *deus* is certainly Somnus, but here the god is definitely meant, and not sleep as a common noun.

³⁸ We have already noted above (58) that the same is true of *Doris* in *E* 10.5.

³⁹ Similarly, he stands for the sky in Horace, *Carm.* 1.1.25, sub Iove frigidus.

⁴⁰ I perhaps should repeat here what I said in "Fallacy" 54, note 4: in my use of *confusion* as a convenient cover-term, there are no derogatory implications; on the contrary, I believe that the departures from strict logic so characterized are frequently a feature of poetic style. Compare the opening paragraph of the present paper, and also that of "Fallacy."

which exercise a close mutual influence. Does the Roman mix the god and the river because they are both named Tiber, or because he believes that the god and the river are really one and the same? The first alternative is perfectly possible; I have shown both in the opening paragraph of this paper, and elsewhere,⁴¹ that there are abundant instances of the sort in Vergil, and of course the phenomenon is common in many authors and in many languages. Yet I believe that in matters involving religion, the second alternative is also to be recognized. We may compare W. Warde Fowler's interesting discussion of the Tiber passage (8.31–65) in *Aeneas at the Site of Rome* (Oxford 1918) 37–42. He says (39), "We must not separate too sharply the deity from the river; he *was* the river"; and again (40) he speaks of taking *domus* (in 8.65) "as the water-system which is at the same time the god and the god's habitation, as the sky was at the same time Jupiter and Jupiter's dwelling".

Thus in at least a very large number of the passages here discussed, one manifestation of human culture, language, not only provides a fertile and fascinating field for investigation in its own right, but also offers a possibly valuable clew to the interpretation of another manifestation of human culture, man's religious and superstitious ideas.

⁴¹ Particularly in "Fallacy."