

THE *AITION* AND VIRGIL'S *GEORGICS*

STANLEY SHECHTER

John Jay College

The *aition* is a curious phenomenon. In the abstract its definition has long been known; yet Latin adaptations of it are not always easy to uncover. Propertius in the fourth book of his elegies and Ovid throughout the *Fasti* copiously set forth identifiable versions of *aitia*, and both poets give ample evidence by allusion to the Callimachean *Aetia*-prologue that their versions adhere to a Greek tradition, whatever modifications they may have made to it. In Virgil's *Georgics*, on the other hand, the adaptations are hidden, and the analysis or appraisal of them may easily become elusive. Even if Virgil actually alludes to the Callimachean prologue now and then, he does not explicitly reveal an intention of imitating *aitia*. The didactic coloring of the device and Virgil's fondness for Hellenistic models are beside the point. Such impulses may help explain inclusion, but they do not positively identify Virgilian adaptations. These nevertheless can plausibly be made recognizable through comparison with Greek examples. This paper will discuss instances in the *Georgics* when there seems to be patterning after *aitia*, though the latter need not have been directly used as sources.¹ Propertius and Ovid are here treated only peripherally, and mainly so far as they aid in defining the *aition* from the standpoint of antiquity. A complete history of the *aition* is not attempted,² and no attempt to examine in detail the relation of the *aition* to Virgil's

¹ In an unpublished dissertation I previously inquired into the problems of whether the *aition* is a stylized form and whether, as such, it has any relation to the *Georgics*. I have not duplicated that material in this study, although a number of details are drawn from it. Résumé in *HSCP* 69 (1965) 349-50. The fullest prior treatment was in W. Richter's commentary (*Vergil, Georgica* [Munich 1957]); see his remarks on 2.380 ff.; 3.113 ff.; 3.269 f.; 4.149 ff.; 4.315 ff., if a misprint; cf. 4.284 ff., and pp. 105, 108, and 112.

² For the *aition* as Propertius treats it, as well as discussion of Callimachus, see J.-P. Boucher, *Études sur Propertius* (Paris 1965) 143-53; 194-204. A full-scale study of Ovid's use of the device has yet to be published.

other poems is made.³ Where possible, Virgil's own contribution is determined, but the loss of many possibly relevant ancient works may often make it difficult to say whether Greek or Latin tradition was kept or revamped or spontaneously developed anew.

Callimachus does not expressly define the *aition*, and definition by examples must be indirectly arrived at, if at all. Ultimately, the modern definitions are predicated mostly on summations of the Callimachean poem, the *Aetia*, or its extant remains. By wide agreement the narratives in this work are labeled "aetiological" or "*aitia*" and are thought of as offering causal or temporal explanations for topics bearing upon, as E. Rohde would have it, "customs, sacred and profane, obscure appellations for places and gods, and other curiosities."⁴ From the outset Rohde's definition was applied to non-Callimachean works. The tales are sometimes classified further, though still mainly by their topics, and Rohde, for instance, divides them into "regional legends" ("Ortssagen"), which are chiefly about cult and names, and into "transformation myths" ("Verwandlungssagen"), which largely concern peculiarities of nature, although both categories may be found in tandem, as he also observes.⁵ Rohde's efforts at defining the *aition* are pioneering and they have remained essentially valid; previously, however, L. Mercklin had arrived at a kindred definition from a few scholiastic notices, not exclusively relating to Callimachus, which he assembled and treated in connection with Varro's putative *Aetia*.⁶ In definitions after Rohde the extensiveness of topics may vary—as for example in Nilsson's treatment, where the scope is far broader—yet the underlying categorization is never appreciably altered.⁷ In any event, the gist of Rohde's definition was soon linked up by

³ Cf. Serv. on *Aen.* 7.778 (= Callim. fr. 190); R. Heinze, *Virgils Epische Technik* (Leipzig 1914) 56–57; 104; 373; E. Norden's *P. Vergilius Maro Aeneis Buch VI* (Leipzig 1927) 197–98; 229–31; E. George, *Aeneid VIII and the Aitia of Callimachus* (Leiden 1974).

⁴ E. Rohde, *Der griechische Roman und seine Vorläufer* (Leipzig 1914³, reprinted Hildesheim 1960) 84–85.

⁵ *Ibid.* 84; 91–92. But the exemplification is scanty.

⁶ "Aetia des Varro," *Philologus* 3 (1848) 267–77, and cf. H. Dahlmann, s.v. "M. Terentius Varro," *RE Suppl.* 6 (1935) 1246.

⁷ See M. Nilsson, *Geschichte d. griech. Religion I* (Munich 1957) 26–35, but his examples are disputable if they lack intrinsic explanations; cf. further G. Kirk, "Aetiology, ritual, charter; three equivocal terms in the study of myths," *YCS* 22 (1972) 84–88. See also R. Pfeiffer, "The Image of the Delian Apollo," *JWI* 25 (1952) 25 = *Ausgewählte Schriften* (Munich 1960) 62; A. Lesky, *Geschichte d. griech. Lit.* (Bern 1963) 763.

Ries with a Propertian verse, 4.1.69, *sacra diesque canam et cognomina prisca locorum*, which, as he noticed, is also surrounded by allusion to the *Aetia*-prologue.⁸ Taken in conjunction with similar statements in Ovid, some of which Ries was aware of, this verse seems in fact to be an epitomizing definition. From a generic point of view, the Propertian topics comprise sacred things, and occasions, presumably festal, and names, chiefly for places. A connection with remote antiquity is apparent from *prisca*, and there is emphasis upon cult and geography. A slight dissidence, moreover, points to a traditional or unchangeable grouping. In the preceding context (57 ff.), as Propertius dwells on his expectations as an elegiac poet, an opposition is developed. It is initially stated with *moenia* and *pio* (*versu*) at 57. Afterwards *patriae* (60) and *Bacche* (62) reiterate the same thought, and at 63, *Umbria* again sums up *moenia* and *patriae*, whereas *nostris libris* resumes (*pio*) *versu*. Assuming that in line 69 *sacra* and *dies* are reflective of sacral matters, Propertius regards the category of names (*cognomina*) as unavoidably associated with the other two categories since at 57 *moenia* and *pio*, and their elaboration (cf. also 65–68: *arces, muros, fave, omina, dextera avis*), foreshadow *sacra*, *dies*, and *locorum*, but not *cognomina* directly. The recapitulation of themes at line 69 is also expressed analogously by Ovid in the opening portion of the *Fasti*, as Ries remarks: *tempora cum causis Latium digesta per annum / lapsaque sub terras orta que signa canam / . . . sacra recognoscens annalibus eruta prisca, / et quo sit merito quaeque notata dies* (cf. 2.7).⁹ Ovid's topics all pertain to the calendar; yet at bottom they are similar to those adverted to by the Propertian *sacra*, *dies*, and *cognomina*. As in Propertius, cult and geography are implied. Ovid also happens to indicate that the distant past is involved, though in relation to a specific category (cf. *prisca*; *prisca*)—and conventionally as well (cf. *annalibus* 7). When stating the topics, Ovid consistently evokes items in the *Aetia*-prologue, such as mention of Apollo, quantitative contrast, youth, and travel-imagery (e.g., 1.13 ff., 1.4–5; 2.3–4, 2.6; 4.9–10; cf. Callim. fr. 1 *passim*). The Propertian allusion to Callimachus is of course more obtrusive (cf. 4.1.64). The modern definition is thus largely in line with what must

⁸ G. Ries, *De aetiologicorum Propertii carminum fontibus*. (Diss., Tübingen 1900) 4–5; cf. Boucher (above, note 2) 195.

⁹ *Ibid.* 4; cf. *Fasti* 1.657–61; 4.11–12.

have stood for its counterpart among the ancients. But there are still a few important particulars to be noted.

Virgil's sixth *Eclogue* contains reminiscence of the *Aetia*-prologue, and in line 72 (*Grynei nemoris dicatur origo*) an aetiological sense is undoubtedly present. Ordinarily *causa* was the Latin translation for αἴτιον, as a comment in Servius (*Aen.* 1.408) affirms: . . . *maiorum . . . salutatio: cuius rei τὸ αἴτιον i.e. causam Varro, Callimachum secutus, exposuit*.¹⁰ In one elegy by Propertius, *causas* precedes an allusion to a Callimachean travel-motif and is evidently the Latin equivalent: . . . *Iovis incipiam causas aperire Feretri / armaque . . . magnum iter ascendo . . . / non iuvat e facili lecta corona iugo*, 4.10.1–4 (cf. Callim. fr. 1.25–28; *causa Feretri* 45).¹¹ In the first line of Ovid's *Fasti*, the word *causis* is presumably intended to stand for the Greek term—it too is soon followed by Callimachean reminiscence (5 ff.).¹² Any of the nouns governed by *causa* in its special usage ought to indicate subject matter that Propertius and Ovid would consider proper to *aitia*—and to match the three major categories; e.g., *Iovis . . . causas . . . Feretri* (Prop. 4.10.1; cf. 49: *Feretri . . . ara . . . Iovis*), and *causae dierum* (*Fasti* 4.17), and *nominis causa* (*ibid.* 1.319). In the *Fasti* Ovid sometimes makes use of *origo* instead of *causa*. Thus he writes *nominis origo* beside *causam / nominis* (5.445–50) or he has *causas . . . sacrorum* (1.465) as well as *sacrorum origo* (2.269). Other nouns accompanying *origo* or *causa* occur, but they still fall into the same three categories, in effect, *sacra*, *dies*, and *nomina*, and confirm that these are basic (e.g., *Fasti* 1.133, 189, 233, 611; 3.839, cf. 847; 4.783, 807; 5.277, 494, 697; 6.11). To some extent metrical requirements affect the choice between *origo* and *causa*, or their forms. As translations, *origo* or *causa* might unequally approximate the sense of the Greek term. The plurals can be summarizing, as at *Fasti* 1.1 (*tempora cum causis . . . canam*) or 4.11 (*tempora cum causis . . . cano*), where they apply to Ovid's subject matter generally (cf. 3.723–25). Yet otherwise the plurality by its very existence shows that the *aition* might include more than one explanation of a topic.

Needless to say, examples are still called for, and there should be

¹⁰ Callim. fr. 189. Occasionally, *ratio* is used; cf. Mercklin (above, note 6) 272–73.

¹¹ Cf. Ries (above, note 8) 6.

¹² Cf. 3.725; H. Fränkel, *Ovid a Poet between Two Worlds* (Berkeley 1945) 240 note 1.

little or no doubt that the proposed instances represent actual *aitia*. The categorizing topics inferred from Propertius and Ovid do not automatically delineate the Hellenistic device. Yet the Latin formula (in effect, *sacra, dies, cognomina*) can function as a guidepost. If Propertius or Ovid should render "*aition*" with *causa* or *origo*, the probable limits of the subject matter they discuss therewith can be marked off, and versions of *aitia* may thus be picked out; these, in turn, can orient a further search for likely Greek examples. But what if only one Greek specimen as a possible precedent for a Virgilian imitation can be adduced? And what if post-Virgilian reflexes are inexact? Apart from literary losses and even if Virgil's innovations were precisely ascertainable, is a cumulative or spiraling argument necessarily unsound? Virgil's allusions in the *Georgics* to the *Aetia*-prologue may be aetiological in purport, but allusion is not proof (3.289-94, and, more figuratively, 3.8-15, 40 f.; fr. 1.21-28).¹³ Likelihood is the best that can be hoped for; the Virgilian and Greek passages ought to conform to an abstracted definition, and recurrent similarities in pattern should furnish sufficient evidence of their validity, even if Virgil does not overtly label the adaptations. The true *aitia* begin with Callimachus, presumably, and are confined to poetry, if the title of his work, the *Aetia*, is any evidence. This inference does not rule out interrelations with other genres; nor were the ancients prevented from believing that prior or similar presentations stood for *aitia*, although within larger chronological periods differences in substance are discernible. The nomenclature adopted is inescapably an arbitrary preference. At any rate, as a generalizing term *aition* will here refer to a stylized device occurring in Hellenistic poetry and proposing origins for objects, practices, and words, either singly or in combination. The permutations can vary considerably, but normally they are not overly elaborate. The actual topics are dependent upon a poet's intention and they may of course be more specific than an abstracted categorization might allow. The purpose of any *aition* is to explain the contemporaneous, and fundamentally it utilizes temporal contrasts to fulfill this aim. A "beginning" is regularly attributed to a later

¹³ For the reminiscence see R. Pfeiffer, "Ein neues Altersgedicht des Kallimachos," *Hermes* 63 (1928) 323 = *Ausgewählte Schriften* 116; W. Wimmel, *Kallimachos in Rom* (Wiesbaden 1960), especially 106; 177-87; cf. U. Fleischer, "Musentempel und Oktavianehrung des Vergil," *Hermes* 88 (1960) 280-331.

item or event, and the process of explaining is put analogically and in terms of "time," seldom without mention of the beginning and the continuation; however, a causal standpoint or explanation is occasionally found. The limits of an *aition* are usually not difficult to isolate, and there hardly ever is any question that a stylized unity is portrayed. Unless relevant, pre-Alexandrian aetiological narratives and later paraphrases of the *aition* will not be discussed. The Greek examples have been selected for purposes of illustrating the Virgilian presentations rather than the entire gamut of *aitia*. Stress is placed on elucidating Virgil's own contributions, historically where practicable. The aim is to open up structural perspectives on the *Georgics*.

Callimachus, at *Hymn* 2.58–64, describes an altar whose base and walls Apollo had first set up on Delos when he was four years old; Artemis had brought together goat-heads she had collected on the island, and from the horns of them Apollo built the altar along with its foundation and walls. At 58 and 64 the words τὰ πρῶτα θεμεΐλια, which are plainly temporal, help separate off the contours of the *aition* by the sheer emphasis they bestow; the repetition additionally of θεμεΐλια Φοῖβος at 57–58 and Φοῖβος at 56 and 64–65 (cf. Φοῖβω 55) helps show where the entire *aition* is joined to its neighboring context, after ἄνθρωποι (56). Lines 55–56 (Φοῖβω—ἄνθρωποι) are introductory to 65 ff., as well as to 56–64. As in this example (that is, only 56 ff.), *aitia* are normally larger than any requisite or minimal components that could in themselves recount an origin. Callimachus does not here limit the *aition* to only a single or brief statement of a beginning, which might for instance be either line 58 or 64 alone. The classifying topic is noticed in summary at 56–57, where the two main segments of the *aition* (56–64) are reflected, the break being after κτιζομένης. The construction of "cities"—collectively an "object"—is being explained, in a foreshadowing way in line 57 (αὐτὸς—ὑφαίνει) and then explicitly at 58–64. Apollo's constructing of the altar of goat-horn on Delos exemplifies a type of founding (θεμεΐλια), and it also serves as an archetype for justifying his participation in the founding of cities (cf. 56–57). The poet's aim is to propose a beginning to which Apollo's current delight or presence in the founding of cities can be ascribed, and thereby to "explain" the later participation by tracing it back to a precedent from which it implicitly might derive.

The peculiar altar presumably represents the first known founding, or at a minimum the earliest that Callimachus was able to track out through his research.

In the opening proem of the *Georgics* several discoveries are given, yet only the horse is depicted as originating, springing up from the earth when it was struck by Neptune's trident (12-14): . . . *tuque o, cui prima frementem / fudit equum magno tellus percussa tridenti, / Neptune*. The whole proem particularizes various subject matters Virgil writes about in the *Georgics* and is a prayer to gods and heroes, any of whom might favor an agricultural poem.¹⁴ Virgil promises didactic poetry (1-5); the ritualistic idiom *vos* (5) announces the prayer, which is concluded in like manner by the address to Octavian (*tu* 24; *vois* . . . *adsuesce vocari* 42). As a plea, the prayer seeks approval for Virgil's undertaking (cf. 40). The anticipated apotheosis apart (cf. *adeo* 24), agricultural divinities are invoked as tutelary and immanent participants (5-23; cf. *praesentia* 10; *adsis* 18), and none is overlooked (*dique deaeque omnes* 21). The divinities, whether named or not, are each assigned a special function or province, which may be of their own establishing. From line 21 on Virgil shifts attention back to the content of the first book (*segetes* . . . *sidere terram* 1; *arva* . . . *fruges* . . . *imbrem* 21-23; *terrarum* . . . *frugum tempestatum* 26-27; cf. 2.1). The interlocking order of *munere* (7), *inventis* (9) *munera* (12), *inventrix* (19) is emblematic of a common aetiological theme, intimated in 5-12 and made more strongly evident in 12-20. The parallelism in 5 and 12 serves to distinguish the two groupings. A eulogistic motif is probable, though chiefly by implication. Virgil's Liber and Ceres must have inspired the bestowal of wine and wheat as replacements for simpler fare (7-9), and there is a hint at aetiological reference, as at least the phrase *vestro si munere* shows.¹⁵ By way of contrast, Lucretius, at 5.1 ff., after praising the godlike ancestry and actions of Epicurus, compares the philosopher's discoveries to those of Ceres and Liber (13-15), which are alleged to be grain (*fruges*) and wine (*liquoris / vitigeni laticem*). The Lucretian purpose is not fundamentally or solely to propose an origin, but to assert relative merits as part and parcel of

¹⁴ Cf., generally, C. Disandro, "Las Géorgicas de Virgilio. Estudio de estructura poética," *Bol. Acad. Argentina de Letras* 22 (1957) 475-83.

¹⁵ Cf. Callim. *Hy.* 4.83, in context; Nic. *Ther.* 10; 309; Rohde (above, note 4) 97 note 3.

an encomium, for which such ranking is a requisite ingredient.¹⁶ Virgil's comparison (7-9) is less blatant (i.e., *Chaoniam . . . glandem; pocula . . . Acheloia*); he merely points to changes—and elsewhere he does not always regard these as benefactions. The exploit at 12-14 is not necessarily a "gift" or eulogized. Virgil stresses the temporal primacy with which the horse is created. The stylization is unmistakably like that of an *aition*.¹⁷ The horse is traced back to its earliest inception, which is signaled by *prima tellus* (sc. *fudit*)—the qualifier for *equum* is non-temporal (*fremementem*). Striking, which is a concomitant of some *aitia*, is present (cf. Callim. *Hy.* 4.30 f.: . . . τὰ πρῶτιστα . . . θεὸς [Poseidon] οὐρεα θείνων / ἄορι τριγλώχινι). At 3.122, on the other hand, *Neptunique ipsa deducat origine gentem*, Virgil is simply embroidering a pedigree for a horse (cf. 1.163-66). At 1.18-19 Minerva is the discoverer of the olive (*oleaeque Minerva / inventrix*), but Virgil does not declare when or for what motivation this came about. The same holds for the allusion to Triptolemus (*uncique puer monstrator aratri* 19). In both instances an explicit "beginning," which is typical of *aitia*, is missing. Nor does there appear to be a demonstrably traditional link between Neptune's act and the portrayal of the other divinities (14-20), even if a tacit reference to the contest between Poseidon and Athena were allowable (cf. Hyg. *Fab.* 164; Servius, *ad loc.*). The format of 12-14 is appropriate for emphasizing the inventive faculty of the divinity to whom Virgil is praying and who must, if he is to give heed, be unambiguously recognizable (cf. 2.1-8; 3.1-2; 4.6-7). At Nicander, *Ther.* 1-20, a brief announcement of theme is followed by aetiological treatment. The whole Virgilian prayer recalls Lucretian proems; yet Virgil possibly wished to maintain symmetry with his own third preface, where at 10-15 he claims to be an innovator.¹⁸

As literary conventions, *aitia* are apt to be offered for their own sake, and consequently they may retain their characteristic features

¹⁶ For the encomium see O. Regenbogen, *Lukrez* (Leipzig 1932) II, 2 = *Kl. Schr.* 321; cf. E. Norden, "Ein Panegyrikus auf Augustus in Vergils Aeneis," *RhM* 54 (1899) 466-68 = *Kl. Schr.* 422-24.

¹⁷ Cf. Antim. fr. 32 W.; *Il.* 23.346-47; Callim. fr. 223; W. Frentz, *Mythologisches in Vergils Georgica* (Meisenheim am Glan 1967) 5-38, especially 27-29.

¹⁸ Cf. F. Jacoby, "Das Prooemium des Lucretius," *Hermes* 56 (1921) 35-40 = *Kl. Schr.* II 37-42; C. Disandro, "El proemio III de las Géorgicas," *AFC* 6 (1953-54) 57-73.

even if these are inappropriate to a poet's argument. At Callimachus, *Hymn* 6.19-21, Demeter is the first to gather and thresh wheat, at the time when this practice or "art" is learned by Triptolemus. The anaphora of *κάλλιον* at 18-19 and 22 etches out the limits, although such repetition need not, of course, accompany all possible *aitia*. The generalizing and contemporary "laws" (*ἐαδότα τέθμια* 18) are explained at 19-20 with a specific earlier practice—"harvesting," cf. *τέχνην*—from which they must derive. In the Homeric *Hymn. ad Cer.*, which was composed several centuries before the Callimachean poem, the function of Demeter is to preside over the fertility of land (305-307); her protégé Triptolemus is there depicted as one of the "ministers of law" (473) rather than as a recipient of agricultural skills.¹⁹ By the fifth century B.C., however, Triptolemus is represented as having learned about agricultural matters from the goddess herself; afterwards, but before Callimachus, the idea became prevalent that Demeter taught such knowledge to Triptolemus first.²⁰ Some details in the Callimachean version were therefore already traditional. But the temporal aspect is nevertheless somewhat incongruous with the rest of the Callimachean argument. Lines 19-21 are descriptive of the permitted cutting down of Demeter's property and the rewarding of the pious. The counterpoise is the portrayal (32 ff.) of the misconduct of Erysichthon in chopping down a tree situated in Demeter's precinct and the punishment the goddess metes out to him for this crime. Yet Callimachus does not merely moralize at 19-21 since the implied contrast within the poem between correct and sacrilegious behavior—or favor from the goddess or its withholding—does not require that Demeter's instruction of Triptolemus should have a beginning. Its inclusion is extraneous if it is set against the needs of the overall context and if tradition is ignored. With *πράτα* (19) and *ἀνίκα* (21) especially emphatic because they are correlated, the intention of presenting an *aition* becomes all the more evident.

While Virgil may reproduce the outer shell of the *aition*, he often slightly alters the details of tradition he places within it. The differences, when perceptible, point to an aetiological purpose. At *Georg.*

¹⁹ See A. Kleingünther, *ΠΡΩΤΟΣ ΕΥΡΕΤΗΣ. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte einer Fragestellung* (Leipzig 1933) 7.

²⁰ *Ibid.* 6-7; 18-19.

1.118–59 he portrays several “ages” commencing with Saturn’s, or—what amounts to the same thing—the Golden Age. In this myth as it is propounded by most previous authors, technological instruments can make their appearance as the ages pass from Golden to Iron, but such instruments are inveighed against as tokens of further deterioration in the cycle.²¹ Improvement in technology is paradoxically condemned. At 129–45 the numerous discoveries Virgil takes notice of are consequences of a teleological decree from Jupiter and they illustrate the benefits resulting from divinely ordained need and mankind’s ingenuity in adapting to it. Each “age” Virgil holds forth on brings increased want and ameliorated technology. At 147–49 Virgil says that plowing was introduced “when the sacred forests would not supply sufficient acorns and arbutus berries, and Dodona refused food” (*prima Ceres ferro mortalis vertere terram / instituit, cum iam glandes atque arbuta sacrae / deficerent silvae et victum Dodona negaret*). Virgil does not scorn the iron plowshare, so far as it is a technological discovery, but he is here affirming that its initial use came about through mankind’s avoidance of famine. Nevertheless, the first plowing had already been localized at Eleusis, on the Rarion Pedion.²² Dodona was not generally taken to be the locality for this event. But *Dodona* with *victum negaret* is suggestive of a concluding phase of primeval largess,²³ and therefore of an inducement for a discovery of plowing. Virgil puts its setting back into the remote past (*cum-negaret*), and with foreboding semi-abstractness. No hero, such as Triptolemus, is on hand. “Ceres” herself first establishes plowing among mankind, and this art remained among them thereafter. Their lives are thought of as shortened (*mortalis*), as if a new “age” had arrived. The noun itself, *Ceres*, is employed metonymously, too. When the need for “food” (i.e., *Ceres*) arose, the “cultivation of grain” (*Ceres*) led mortals to plow with iron. It is the inventive power of *duris urgens in rebus egestas* (146) that is being exemplified by 147–49. The advent of plowing is viewed from the perspective of myth, during the worsened milieu preceding the last age in the cycle begun with Saturn, or during the age preceding Virgil’s own era of irksome toil, which he delineates

²¹ Generally after Hesiod, however; cf. Kleingünther (above, note 19) 15; Aratus 110 ff.; Lucr. 5.910 ff.

²² Kleingünther (above, note 19) 7.

²³ Cf. Richter on 1.149; Callim. *Hy.* 6.132–33.

at 150-59.²⁴ Jupiter's decree has induced the discovery of plowing, but not by means of his direct instigation. Ceres, though half-personified, is obviously a different divinity. She is restrained in her bountifulness, and as grain itself she brings about an improvement in man's circumstances, through want. The tabulation of discoveries at 129-45 is aetiological in drift; but whereas all the discoveries support the teleological argument, only lines 147-49 seem stylistically distinctive and almost extraneous. The insertion of an *aition* within the entire cyclic myth is sanctioned by previous usage, mainly post-Hesiodic. The discoveries at 129-45 prepare for 147-49, but are not part of it.

When compared to Lucretian statement, lines 147-49 become all the more noticeably modeled after the externals of an *aition*. The primitive food that Virgil tells of is reminiscent of Lucretian description both at 5.965 (cf. *glandes atque arbuta*) and at 939-42, where early man feeds on the produce of oak trees and the arbutus. At 5.933-34 Lucretius makes the remark that the plow had not yet been invented when such food was consumed: *nec robustus erat curvi moderator aratri / quisquam, nec scibat ferro molirier arva*. Virgil separately reworks both lines, presumably. Thus at 1.19 he has *uncique puer monstrator aratri*, which alludes to Triptolemus and is more precise than Lucretius (cf. *quisquam*). The other Lucretian portion, soon after which *terram* appears (5.935), could emerge as the Virgilian *ferro mortalis vertere terram* at 1.147. Virgil archaizes (cf. *mortalis*) and his verb *vertere* intimates less arduous effort (cf. *molirier*). His comment on food at 148-49 suggests a Lucretian tag (5.965). But Lucretius cannot qualify his assertions (at 5.933 ff.) with an expression such as *prima Ceres instituit* and still be consistent with the Epicurean view that civilization has gradually developed from savage life through the impulse of *usus* and *experientia mentis* (5.1452; cf. *Georg.* 1.133), and without help from the gods. Virgil entertains the belief that the advance of civilization has resulted from the will of a god (121 ff.), which evidences itself by implanting both need and cunning in mankind. Lucretian thought is not altogether adhered to by Virgil at 147-49; yet the verbal patches are comparable, and the additions or changes indicate strengthening of a pattern.

²⁴ Cf. F. Klingner, *Virgils Georgica* (Stuttgart 1963) 41; Frenztz (above, note 17) 6-17 and 47-54.

Etymologies explain or derive words and focus on the relation between intrinsic form and meaning, with the ancient variety relying mostly on semantic and acoustical analogies and, sometimes, historical study of usage as well.²⁵ Etymologies in their entirety obliquely advance origins, and in works where aetiological intent is otherwise strong they may seem to be virtually *aitia*. But an etymology standing by itself is not an *aition*. Etymologies may, however, be included within *aitia* and be one of their defining components. As a rule, the etymologies within a given historical period have distinctive tendencies. From Homer to the Hellenistic age they mostly are diffuse and for names of heroes and divinities, and they are easy to understand, except, rarely, when unintentional semantic or linguistic change has cloaked their intelligibility.²⁶ In the Hellenistic period, personal names are not often etymologized but place or cult names more prevalently are treated and the presentation typically is rigidly stylized, involving recondite allusion or avoidance of the obvious.²⁷ Within the two periods overlap of these characteristics can occur, but it is infrequent.

In the case of Callimachus, especially, a few etymologies whose context is now incomplete may reflect features once favored by him in lost portions of his poetry, and which are now normally not found in his other *aitia*. One such feature is the employment of a "gloss," that is, a rare or foreign word, as one of two appositives, both of which help fulfill the function of an etymology, however obscurely. At *Hecale* fr. 288, the abstruse *κατακᾶσα*, denoting "wanton," aids in

²⁵ See the discussions by L. Rank, *Etymologiseering en verwante verschijnselen bij Homerus* (Assen 1951) 9–27, and G. Bartelink, "Etymologisering bij Vergilius," *Mededelingen d. kon. Nederl. Akad. van Wetensch. Afd. Letterk.* N.R. 28.3 (1965) 147–69, with extensive bibliographies.

²⁶ By way of illustration, at *Il.* 22.506–507 the root *-ααξ* in *Ἀστυνάαξ* signifies "protector" not "ruler" (see P. Kretschmer, in Gercke-Norden, *Einleit. in d. Altertumsw.* I 6, 42–43; cf. Callim. fr. 64.15); Rank (above, note 25) 40–41, 61, 85–88; at Soph. *Aj.* 430–33 the name is more perceptible if the verb is pronounced *αἰδοσθην*, as in antiquity; for the Hellenistic tendency cf. Euphorion fr. 57 P.; cf. Rank, *ibid.* 35 and 61 note 107.

²⁷ The tendency to rely on the *recherché* can be carried to extremes. At Nicander, *Ther.* 166–67, the twisting asp "swirls upon the ground into a wheel-like ring, and, in the center, bristling death, it raises its head." The snake is coiled in an outline resembling a shield (*ἀσπίς*) and the head is put where a boss might occur. At 168–71 the asp is compared to a hunting spear; cf. 164–65, where a "strange din" and a "gleam" hint at fighting. Cf. *Ther.* 666–75 (for the "herb of Alcibiades," with 674–75).

explaining *Σκύλλα* in the sense "shameless bitch:" *Σκύλλα γυνή κατακάσα καὶ οὐ ψύθος οὔνομ' ἔχουσα / πορφυρέην ἤμησε κρέκα*. The phrase *οὐ ψύθος οὔνομ'* acts as a signpost, alike traditional and choicely put, and it attracts attention to another literal meaning of *Σκύλλα*, which *ἤμησε κρέκα* ("cut the hair") also etymologizes—as if "Snipper" were meant (cf. Nic. *Alex.* 410, *σκύλαιο κάρη*, "shave the head").²⁸ Probably *κατακάσα* is a Semitic borrowing, if it is not also obsolete.²⁹ Its relation to *Σκύλλα* is not acoustical but semantic, and it is not immediately apparent. The other appositive, though perhaps less unusual, is similarly erudite. The same technique in etymologizing recurs at *Aetia* fr. 11.5–6. There Callimachus remarks on the founding of a city, "which a Greek might call 'Exiled,' yet the tongue of the Colchians had named 'Polae':" *ἄστυρον ἐκτίσαντο, τό κεν "Φυγάδων" τις ἐνίσποι / Γραικός, ἀτὰρ κείνων γλῶσσ' ὀνόμηνε "Πόλας."* Judging from Strabo 5.216, who uses *φυγήν* in quoting a part of the fragment, the lost context might have etymologized *Φυγάδων* with a cognate. The ancient geographers recognize *Πόλαι* as the actual name of the city. Callimachus, perhaps associating the root of "Polae" with "motion" (cf. *πολέω*), may have thought *Φυγάδων* appropriate for capturing the sense of the Colchian word. In any event, *Φυγάδων* was less in currency as a name for the city than *Πόλαι*.

Some *aitia* not only include etymologies but openly give a genesis for whatever entity a designation being etymologized may signify. "Naming," or a similar expression, such as for "calling," is not sufficiently explicit in this regard. A plain, though highly allusive specimen of this type of *aition* occurs at Nicander, *Ther.* 685–88, where both *θέρων* and *ἐπυράκτεεν* allude to *-ακες* and *Φλεγ-* in *πάνακες Φλεγυήιον* (685), which is etymologized as a single concept, and Nicander says additionally that Asclepius (*Παιήων*) was the first to cull "Phlegyan Allheal" as a medicine. A beginning is thereby attributed to a substance, whose name is also etymologized. The etymology here allots or derives meaning for only the purely verbal aspect of the name; the medicine itself originates when its earliest gathering takes place.

²⁸ Cf. *Georg.* 1.405, and for the etymological signpost cf. Aesch. *PV* 85; see Rank (above, note 25) 136–43.

²⁹ See Boisacq, s.v. *κάσας*, and J. Whatmough, *Poetic, Scientific and Other Forms of Discourse* (Berkeley 1956) 77.

Two temporal qualifiers—*εὐτε* and *πρῶτος*—bear the brunt of assigning this beginning; the myth further underscores the remoteness of the occurrence.

In *aitia* of this type, furthermore, the etymologizing does not always have to be so curtailed. The etymological allusion can even be extended throughout the whole *aition*, as at Callimachus, *Hymn* 2.97–104. The phrase *ἰὴ ἰὴ* supplements a cult name, *παιῶν*, for Apollo. The Delphians first discovered this epithet when Apollo revealed his prowess at archery. Gradually *ἰὴ ἰὴ* takes on meaning—as it were, *ἔει ἔα*, “hurl arrows.”³⁰ Apart from any etymologizing, this epithet mimics an actual religious cry of exultation, for which a definite meaning would not always be necessary. When introduced at 97, *ἰὴ ἰὴ* represents no more than an ecstatic shout. Not until line 99 is a meaning offered for its components through both *ἐκηβολίην* and *ἐπεδείκνυσο τόξων*. Etymological parallels are reiterated as the *aition* develops thereafter (100 ff.). Apollo goes to Pytho, where he encounters a dread serpent, which he slays with his arrows. At 102 the parallel of both *βάλλων* and *οἷστόν* is less ambiguously an equivalent. At 97, *παιῶν* is a vocative. At 102–103 the onlookers exhort the god, but *ἰὴ ἰὴ* is grammatically an appositive. It still is a shout; yet its earliest meaning, which has already been increasingly suggested from 97 on, is now clinched with *ἔει βέλος*. In lines 100–104 the myth repeats with less universalizing detail the content at 97–99. Both segments establish the meaning of *ἰὴ ἰὴ* and the way this expression originated; yet only the mythological portion tangibly associates the contemporaneous religious cry with its earliest counterpart. The notions of time and discovery are most in evidence at 98, despite the duplication of narrative at 97–99 and 102–104.

Two of Virgil's adaptations of the *aition* bear this kind of imprint. One of them is put forward at 3.146–53, but in its opening portion the construction is perplexing (*est lucos Silari circa ilicibusque virentem / plurimus Alburnum volitans, cui nomen asilo /* (148) *Romanum est, oestrum Grai vertere vocantes, / asper, acerba sonans, quo tota exterrita silvis / diffugiunt armenta*). The obscurities are summed up by Richter (*ad loc.*) with “ist doch die Stelle bis heute nicht befriedigend erklärt.”

³⁰ Cf. Pfeiffer on Callim. fr. 18.6; D. Kolk, *Der pythische Apollonhymnus als aitiologische Dichtung* (Meisenheim am Glan 1963) 43 note 11; L. Radermacher, “Griechischer Sprachbrauch,” *Philologus* 60 (1901) 500–501.

He and other commentators, generally, assume that *oestrum* translates *asilo* and they see difficulties in *vertere*—the problems were already known to Servius. An easy solution is possible, however. Both *asilo* and *oestrum* refer to *volitans*, which, as Servius (*ad loc.*) has observed, is substantival. Its meaning is "flyer;" cf. *Aen.* 6.239, *volantes*, with *Lucr.* 6.742–43; 833. Both *asper* and *acerba sonans* are nominatives in apposition to *volitans*. The two clauses in 147–48 are syntactically unified by a zeugma of *asilo* and *oestrum* to *cui*, and therefore to *volitans*, and by an asyndeton after *est*, and by an antithesis of *Romanum* and *Grai*; cf. 2.372 ff.: *frons . . . cui . . . uri . . . capreae . . . / inludunt, pas-*
cuntur oves . . . iuvencae; similarly 4.271–72.³¹ These clauses, because they are so closely knit together, separate off *volitans* as the more important term. The object of *vertere* is *oestrum*, and *Grai* is an adjective modifying *vocantes*, which is substantival and continuative in its effect; cf. 3.90: *quorum Grai meminere poetae*. "Greek callers have translated it (that is, the *volitans*; cf. *cui*) with *oestrus*."

Virgil clarifies the meaning of *volitans* with two synonyms, *asilo* and *oestrum*, one of which, though transliterated, is patently from a different language. With *nomen* helping, an etymological connection between *asilo* and *Silari* is suggested, as though *asilo* were from a *Sil(ar)o*. The positioning before a caesura isolates *Silari* slightly (cf. 3.219). In Virgil's day *asilus* was innovative or already obsolescent, and *tabanus* was the regular word for "gadfly." Nigidius, a contemporary, glosses *asilus* (cf. Servius *ad loc.*) with *musca varia*, *tabanus*, which presupposes that *tabanus* was more widely known than *asilus*; Varro uses *tabanus* (*Rust.* 2.5.14); Seneca a few generations later quotes Virgil's use of *asilo* at 147 and asserts that the word had become obsolete (*Ep.* 58.2).³² Possibly *asilus* was a dialect word borrowed from Etruscan, as well.³³

³¹ For this kind of syntactical unit cf. E. Fraenkel, "Kolon und Satz," *NGG Phil.-hist. Kl.*, 1932, 197–312; 1933, 319–54 = *Kleine Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie* (Rome 1964) 73–130, with addendum 131–39. For *cui*—*vocantes* and Calvus' *Io* see S. Sudhaus, "Die Ciris und das römische Epyllion," *Hermes* 42 (1907) 482.

³² Cf. Plin. *HN* 11.100; Ernout-Meillet, s.v. *tabanus*: "demeuré dans les l. romanes." Cf. C. Engelke, *Quae ratio intercedat inter Vergilii Georgica et Varronis rerum rusticarum libros* (Diss., Leipzig 1912) 42–43; H. Georgii, *Die antike Vergilkritik in den Bukolika und Georgika* (Leipzig 1904) 298–99.

³³ Cf. Walde-Hofmann and Ernout-Meillet on *asilus*; W. Krause, "Zu den Namen der Etrusker in Vergil's Aeneis," *Commentat. Vindobonenses* 3 (1937) 35.

The terms *pestem* (153) and *iras* point back to *hoc monstro*, which resumes *volitans* and its appositional names at 146–49. But *pestem* alone governs the genitives *Inachiae* and *iuvencae*, and the linkage indicates that *Iuno* goes more closely with *meditata* than *exercuit*. In previous tradition and by the time of Aeschylus, Hera creates the gadfly or *μύωψ* to harass Io, and it persecutes her when Argus is alive, but after he dies his chthonic spirit becomes her tormentor and is known as an *οἷστρος* (*Supp.* 306–308; *PV* 566 ff.; 589–92; 673–82).³⁴ The distinction between the two kinds of punishment is recognized by some writers after Aeschylus, but the zoological names are on occasion rejected. Io's scourge can be a harsh emotion deriving from the goddess: *κείνην βαρὺς χόλος ἤλασεν* "Hpas (*Anth. Pal.* 7.169.3), or a Fury from the netherworld: *Erinyēn* / *paelicis Argolicae* (*Ov. Met.* 1.725–26); *Io . . . Tisiphonen vidit* (*Val. Fl.* 4.392–94), or ambiguously both: *Iuno formidinem ei misit* (*Hyg. Fab.* 145.4; cf. *Servius ad loc.*; *Apollod.* 2.1.3).³⁵ The Virgilian *monstro* and *iras* and *pestem* (152–53) imply avenging visitations (cf. *Aen.* 3.214–15, *tristius haud illis* [that is, *Celaeno*; *Harpyiae*] *monstrum, nec saevior ulla / pestis et ira deum Stygiis sese extulit undis*; 12.845; 862 ff.). The punishment Juno devises within the distant setting of myth is *pestem* (cf. *meditata*), and this word refers back ultimately to *volitans*, the insect, basically. Virgil puts *oestrum* to use in a less common sense—given the harassment of Io by the visitation (152–53). Indeed, all the terms describing the gadfly are boldly used, not to say increasingly sinister (cf. *volitans*, *asilo*, *oestrum*, *asper*, *acerba sonans*). Gadflies are in reality quiet, but the sibilants and droning vowels in Virgil's text conjure up a flying insect. After the devastating attack on the herds (149–51), the terms are less applicable to the insect itself but they still remain uncommon (cf. *monstro*, *iras*, and *pestem*).³⁶

³⁴ For *μύωψ* as insect cf. the modifiers at *Supp.* 307; *PV* 674. Perhaps the term is punned on at *PV* 568. In some versions Argus dies and becomes a peacock and the "eyes" may persist; e.g., *Ov. Met.* 1.720–23. At *Supp.* 557 the winged *βουκόλος* is very likely the avenging ghost of Argus.

³⁵ See Rose on Hyginus (*ad loc.*). For the zoomorphism see C. Jossereand, "Io et le Taon," *AC* 6 (1937) 259–63; cf. Wellmann, *RE*, s.v. "Bremse," 828.

³⁶ At *Od.* 22.299–301 the gadfly lurks in no specific habitat; for the possible Virgilian models cf. P. Jahn, "Aus Vergils Dichterwerkstätte (Georgica III 49–470)," *RhM* 60 (1905) 372–73. At Callim. fr. 301 (*Hecale*), *βουσόον* is etymologized with *βοῶν* (i.e., *βου-*) and *μύωπα* ("goad", i.e., *-σόον*); *Ap. Rhod.* 3.277 omits this procedure, but at

Virgil's other adaptation in which the topic centers on words is at 3.266-83, dealing with the phrase *furor equarum*. Virgil etymologizes *furor equarum* (266) by dint of several allusions; in this process only the intrinsic meaning of *furor equarum* and its paraphrases is functional. At 267-68 *mentem* and *Venus* correspond in sense to *furor*, while *Potniades* and *quadrigae* are the parallels for *equarum*. The next etymological equivalent is *illas* and *amor* at 269. Later, *hippomanes* (280; 282) restates what *furor equarum* by itself denotes, seemingly with a Greek counterpart. Contextually, however, *furor equarum* signifies the lust mares experience when they are in heat. Both *mentem Venus* and *Potniades quadrigae* are requisite to the legend about Glaucus (267 f.), and in this capacity their meanings are not determined by the etymologizing. Likewise, *illas* and *amor* in their contextual meaning refer to a portrayal of the effect passion has on mares in compelling them to mate (269-79). At 280 (cf. 282) *hippomanes* is a technicalism for *virus*, a potency "that herdsmen when using its actual name call *hippomanes*," and it indicates a substance. Thus the etymologizing takes place in spite of the meanings required by the context or narrative itself. Virgil borrows zoological doctrine from Aristotle (*HA* 6.18.572A19 ff.);³⁷ yet while the anaphoric *hippomanes . . . dicunt / pastores . . . / hippomanes* resembles the Aristotelian wording (*καλοῦσι δὲ καὶ τοῦτο . . . ἵππομανὲς . . . καὶ ζητοῦσι τοῦτο . . . αἱ περὶ τὰς φαρμακείας*), the inclusion of herdsmen (*pastores*) recalls a Hellenistic etymologizing formula (cf. *κλείουσι νομῆες*, Ap. Rhod. 3.277, with e.g., Nic. *Alex.* 346; Euphorion fr. 96 P.). Virgil's *vero nomine* has no analogue in Aristotle's exposition, although it clearly shores up the

1.1265 (cf. 1269) ἔσσυτο ταῦρος after μύωπι is not unlike βουσόον. The term may be a substantive; see Pfeiffer *ad loc.*; cf. Oppian *Hal.* 2.529; *Anth. Pal.* 6.334.3; Virgil's *volitans . . . quo . . . diffugiunt armenta*; at 149 *asper, acerba sonans* functions similarly; cf. *Lucr.* 5.33. Callim fr. 363 has *πίσρα* of watery pasturelands, perhaps for the Marathonian bull, and at Ap. Rhod. 1.1266 the haunts are "meadowlands," i.e., *πίσρα*, and "marshlands." Virgil's gadfly has its habitat near river-groves and trees (146-47; 151; cf. 143-44). The combination is post-Aristotelian, appearing at *Σ Od.* 22.299 (cf. *Σ Ap. Rhod.* 1.1265) and propounded by Sostratus (alive when Virgil composed the *Georgics*) and in connection with which the Callimachean fragment (301) is cited; see M. Wellmann, "Sostratos, ein Beitrag zur Quellenanalyse des Aelian," *Hermes* 26 (1891) 344-46; 338-39; C. Wendel, "Überlieferung und Entstehung der Theokrit-Scholien," *AGWG Phil.-hist. Kl. N.F.* 17.2 (1921) 138.

³⁷ See Jahn (above, note 36) 378-79; Richter 294-95.

etymological relation between *hippomanes* and *furor equarum*.³⁸ But in context the meaning of *vero* is "true" in the sense "factual" rather than "etymological" (literally), and *vero nomine* maintains the floating or superimposed allusiveness of Virgil's etymologizing. The ambiguity throughout Virgil's narrative is a means of heightening and seeking after the abstruse.

Lines 267–68 recount the creating of *furor equarum*, but in its sheerly contextual rather than its allusive sense. The repeated etymologizing appears to be a feature called for or predetermined by the type of *aition* being imitated. At 284–85 Virgil may even be playfully acknowledging the constraints necessitated by the already traditional format. In any event, *furor equarum* designates the sexual heat that mares may undergo. Venus brought this "madness" into being (*mentem . . . dedit*) in the mythological past (*quo tempore*) for the punishing of Glaucus. At 3.152–53 and 3.267–68 there are recurrent similarities, and this suggests a kindred function. Frenzy is implied (*iras* and *mentem*) and brutalizing creatures are the chastising instruments; a Greek proper name (*Inachiae* and *Potniades*) modifies a term for an animal (*iuvencae* and *quadrigae*) and within the hexameter the position is alike. Virgil does not record how Glaucus offended Venus, but the insult must have been religiously associated with mares since Servius speaks of Glaucus as having tried to augment their racing speed by preventing them from indulging in sexual congress.³⁹ The demise of Glaucus is presumably to be connected with *hippomanes* as well as *furor equarum*. Etymologically, both terms have identical meanings. In characterizing *hippomanes* as a secretion from the genitalia of mares (281), Virgil is not at variance with one of Aristotle's discussions about the substance (*HA* 6.18.527A21 ff.). But *hippomanes* was also known to be a plant, and it too could rouse horses to madness (cf. Theoc. 2.48–49),⁴⁰ though such frenzy was not always sexual. According to one tradition, the mares belonging to Glaucus ate a certain plant growing near Potniae,

³⁸ See Wendel (above, note 36) 69.

³⁹ In one of the accounts in Servius, Glaucus unwittingly let the mares drink from a sacred spring at Potniae and they later became maddened during a chariot race and destroyed him; cf. H. Usener, "Göttliche Synonyme," *RhM* 53 (1898) 351 = *Kl. Schr.* IV 280; cf. Paus. 6.20.19.

⁴⁰ See Gow *ad loc.*; Wendel (above, note 36) 140; Pease on *Aen.* 4.515, pp. 426–27. Cf. Gruppe, *Griech. Myth.* 83, with a slip of the pen.

after which they became wild and tore their master apart.⁴¹ Mythological details about Glaucus are scantily attested, and the name of the plant cannot be ascertained, but Pliny the Elder (*NH* 25.94) cites a plant affecting horses near the *limes Diomedis*, and Diomedes was sometimes confused with Glaucus.⁴² At 280 *hippomanes* is not a plant—Servius is wrong⁴³—yet at 283 *herbas* signifies indeterminate magical plants (cf. *Aen.* 4.514–16). At Euripides, *Phoen.* 1124–27, an etymology for “hippomanes” occurs and colts from Potniae are spoken of: *Ποτνιαδες . . . πῶλοι δρομάδες . . . μαινέσθαι*. Probably, in myths about Glaucus, the plant that the mares consumed before becoming maddened was eventually called “hippomanes.” Until Virgil, however, there seems to have been no attempt at coupling the term in its reference to a fluid with the myth about the destruction of Glaucus. In all likelihood, Virgil is conflating prosaic Aristotelian data with detail from a rare myth in which “hippomanes” was not a secretion. The verses at 269–79 by illustrating the uncontrolled traveling of mares during their heat develop easily after 267–68. The unit also develops organically from the myth to the actuality.⁴⁴

Two or more statements that might individually be regarded as *aitia*, whether for objects or practices or words, may be combined within a unit making up a single *aition*, with etymologies counting as essential parts of such units. There exist, so to speak, “simple” and “composite” *aitia*, and in the latter group the possibilities of variation are numerous, though obviously never without limit. By and large, within the composite units the features each normally single *aition* or etymology might possess if it were separately given are found, but recurrence of characteristic or defining items is not always obligatory. The tendency, evidently, is to economize on detail. At *Aetia* fr. 110.47–50, the classifying topics are an object (iron) and a practice (the craft of shaping the metal), but *πρῶτοι* is used only once. The special needs of the context require the verbs of “revealing” and

⁴¹ See *Σ* Eur. *Orest.* 318; *Et. Mag.* s.v. *Ποτνιαδες θεαι*.

⁴² Roscher s.v. “Glaukos” 1690; cf. *NH* 28.181 and M. Wellmann, “Die Φυσικά des Bolus Demokritos und der Magier Anaxilaos von Larissa,” *Abh. d. Pr. Akad. d. Wiss., Phil.-hist. Kl.* 7 (1928) 53, 78, with Dioscorides 4.80 (possibly concealing *ὄνις*, cf. *Nic. Ther.* 628); 4.81; 2.173. Cf. also Frentz (above, note 17) 58–60.

⁴³ See Wendel (above, note 36) 59. For *legere* at 282 cf. *Prop.* 4.5.18.

⁴⁴ Cf. Richter *ad loc.*, who takes 267–68 to be the *aition*.

“showing,” and here and elsewhere they are not defining elements (cf. fr. 46; possibly fr. 64.9–10; fr. 191.58–62). Aratus, at *Phaenomena* 129 ff., asserts that in the age of Bronze the people first hammered out the knife and first consumed their plow-oxen (131 f.). In this instance, of course, there is anaphora of *πρῶτοι*. The backdrop is mythological, with a temporal tie-in (*ὅτε* 129; *τότε* 133), but the disparaged eating of ox-flesh could mirror a Pythagorean or historical taboo, and hence a conscious quest for stating an exact beginning. There also seems to be a punning (rather than a definitely etymologizing) objective, possibly to effect a transition: *χαλκείη* 130; *Βωώτεω* 136; cf. 131–32. In narrating the age of Gold (96 ff.) Aratus happens to etymologize “Astraeus” (98–99) and “Dike” (113), and at 105–106 word-play is present, but this is probably incidental. The whole myth (96–136) does not represent an *aition* (which may often have a bearing on etymologizing) although at 129–36 it contains one. This kind of inclusion appears to be unattested before Aratus. Hesiod’s version of the age of Bronze (*Op.* 143 ff.) does not utilize a similar temporal device, nor is it as technologically oriented.

Virgil, at *Georg.* 3.113–17, talks of the four-horsed racing chariot and the training of warhorses by the Lapiths. Several compendia of the *Catasterismi* by (presumably) Eratosthenes relate that Erichthonius first yoked a chariot to four horses in emulating the sun-god, or, at heart, that he discovered a special kind of chariot, and that he also initiated celebrations in honor of Athena (Robert 98 f.). Naturally, the résumés do not transcribe Eratosthenes word for word, but within the abridgement the shape of an *aition* is still perceptible. The two Virgilian segments at 113–17 are composed in much the same vein. At 113–14 the activity of Erichthonius is described (*primus Erichthonius currus et quattuor ausus / iungere equos rapidusque rotis insistere victor*). Previously, at 103–12, a chariot race is pictured. The transition to 113–14 is easy, therefore, but since *primus* is abrupt the entire description about Erichthonius as an originator may at first glance seem a divergent intrusion. Yet *primus* helps vouch for imitation of an *aition*. Virgil’s remarks at 115–17 may also seem out of joint with their immediately foregoing context (113–14), and not solely because of *primus*. Eratosthenes, as preserved, touches on a festival honoring Athena. But Virgil disregards this event, and he writes about a practice instituted

by the Pelethronian Lapiths, the training of warhorses. Very possibly Virgil is relying on an awareness of differing though related traditions as the means of affiliating 113-14 and 115-17. Pliny the Elder, in listing a series of inventors, ascribes "reins and saddles to Pelethronius, and fighting on horseback to Thessalians called Centaurs . . . , and the four-horsed chariot to Erichthonius" (7.202). Pliny's Centaurs are humans. Horses may be indispensable in honoring Athena, but Eratosthenes, as reconstructed, does not specify Centaurs. It must be that the very presence of Virgil's *Pelethronii* justifies the collocation of *Erichthonius* and *Lapithae*, and on a broader scale both 113-14 and 115-17, as being within the bounds of received, if obscure, tradition. With this adjective, which involves eponymous hero as well as localization, Virgil can foist off on the Lapiths some at least of the discoveries of Pelethronius himself, since the discoveries, too, undergo partial modification—assuming that Pliny transmits the older data. Virgil's choice of *Lapithae* obviates a confusion with the half-animal Centaurs of myth, who would be inappropriate as trainers if the warhorse (*equitem*; cf. *sub armis*; Aul. Gell. 18.5.7) is to be maneuvered by riders. In Pliny the juxtaposition of Pelethronius, Thessalian Centaurs, and Erichthonius is hardly improvised, even supposing that Virgil's treatment were being deliberately excerpted and contradicted. The Virgilian sequence (*Erichthonius/Pelethronii*) is closer to the Eratosthenic order than to Pliny's. Virgil must have conflated or changed an established tradition. In any case, Virgil takes pains to blend 113-17 into the surroundings, and it would be a mistake to suppose that this portion is tacked on as an ornamental supplement.⁴⁵ The training of warhorses (115-17) is not in disharmony with the statements on the racing of chariots (103 ff.) or on "youth" and "mettle" (118 ff.). A thematic pendant is met with at 3.266-83, though the mares when racing with chariots (*quadrigae*) or experiencing passion (cf. *furor* sc. *equarum*) do not submit to constraint.

Toward the close of the second book Virgil says that farmers might live as happily as Romans of old if they would be cognizant of rustic deities and be industrious (493 ff.). The farmer "plucks the fruits that the fields willingly produce" (500 f.), and he avoids the woes of

⁴⁵ Cf. Richter *ad loc.*; the myth goes back to Hellanicus, see Kleingüntner (above, note 19) 33, 129-30, cf. Frenzt (above, note 17) 54-58.

his speculative and more fitful compatriots. Farming provides a joyful and carefree life resembling that led during the age of "golden Saturnus" (536-40). The idyllic Saturnian age came to an end when Jupiter held sway and mankind slew its oxen and feasted. Until then the war-trumpet had not resounded and swords were not being fashioned. Virgil is conjuring up the well-known cyclic myth (i.e., 495 ff.) and enclosing the pattern of an *aition* within it. Unlike 1.118-59, however, an aetiological build-up is absent although verbal echoes may surface—e.g., among other things, *teritur Sicyonia baca trapetis, / glandes laeti redeunt, dant arbusta silvae* 519-20, after *Cerealis* 517; cf. 1.147-49 (plowing)—and there is also correlation with the ending of the first book (466 ff.; cf., especially, *et curvae rigidum falces conflantur in ensem* 508). In the Hesiodic Bronze age both warfare and food are delved into although without stark aetiological shading (οἶσιν Ἀργος / ἔργ' ἔμελεν . . . οὐδέ τι σῆτον / ἥσθιον, *Op.* 145-47). The sinfulness of eating meat is in conformity with a Pythagorean belief, but Virgil might have been mindful of Aratus, *Phaenomena* 129-32,⁴⁶ where the Bronze age brings with it the robber's knife and the eating of plow-oxen. Whatever the views held by Hesiod and Aratus, the formulation Virgil employs is more Hellenistic than classical. The guileless Golden age (538) is contrasted with the depravity of the ensuing periods (536-37; 539-40), which entail wrongful gain and the search for luxury. It would appear from the temporal arrangement in 536-40 that the war-trumpet (539) should be traced back to Jupiter's arrogation of the scepter (536), and that the fashioning of swords (540) is a development from a primitive slaying (*caesis* 537) carried out for purposes of feasting. Swords are not restricted to warfare; they may have many functions. They are noisily forged on the anvil, and their persistent manufacture is heard among nations once the Golden age is over. Swords were not made when Saturn ruled, yet *caesis* involves a cutting instrument, and *impia gens* (537) must embrace the populace living when Jupiter's wrongful accession took place. Usually in *aitia* having a plurality of topics the contemporary practice is still observed and the contemporary object is in an already finished state. The existence of the war-trumpet is inferable from its being sounded (539), whereas

⁴⁶ Cf. P. Boyancé, "Sur quelques Vers de Virgile (*Géorgiques*, II, v. 490-492.)," *RA* 25 (1927) 364-79.

the swords, as objects, are beaten out in an unceasing process (540). The war-trumpet and the making of swords are the specialized and current analogues of the vaguer forerunners of myth. The repeating of *ante* and *ante* (*quam*) and *necdum* and *necdum* sets Saturn's Golden age off from Jupiter's epoch as well as Virgil's own era. In the more established or accepted legend, Saturn swallows his offspring and castration is an associated motif. Virgil omits these frills, and no blame falls on Saturn, whose innocence is exemplary; yet with Jupiter's usurpation, heinous eating and cutting are in evidence. The sacrilegious discoveries (539-40) commence with the cessation of the Golden age, and they do not lead to teleological betterment; the doctrine is conventional, and Virgil does not keep to the position he elsewhere takes (I. 121 ff.).

Etymologies may be merged with other types of topics within *aitia*—for instance, a practice and an etymology might be combined. Callimachus, at *Hymn* 5.33 ff., has it that the maidenly descendants of Arestor are the worshipers of Athena, venerating her with an Argive custom, which Eumedes had started, of carrying forth the shield of Diomedes, an offshoot supposedly of the Palladium. Eumedes had learned that the populace was determined to condemn him to death; he fled with Athena's "holy image" and lived on the Creion Hill (37-40). His behavior, his flight with the image, constitutes the precedent (*πόκα* 38) for the subsequent practice. A rarefied etymology terminates the *aition*; the rocky crags, *Παλλαρίδες*, take their name from Athena's image, or the Palladium, which Eumedes had concealed there (41-42).⁴⁷ Another more complicated *aition*, despite the brief functional portions, is *Aetia* fr. 43.56-83, which is delimited by the recital of the Muse Clio.⁴⁸ By the placing of towers around a hidden sickle, the city Zancle is constructed; its name is omitted but two synonymous terms, *δρέπανον* and the Sicilian word *ζάγκλον*, are sufficient to etymologize it (68-71). A dispute among the two founders of the city arose, and when they consulted Apollo he decreed that the city was not to be called after either of them; "from that time on" (*ἐκ δ' ἔτι κείνου* 78) the custom of anonymously invoking the founder of Zancle is pursued during the sacrificial offerings (72-83).⁴⁹

⁴⁷ Cf. *RE* s.v. "Palladion" 174-75. Another instance at Nic. *Ther.* 305-19.

⁴⁸ As often; Pfeiffer on fr. 3.1; cf. Nic. *Ther.* 334-58.

⁴⁹ For the components cf. Nic. *Alex.* 98-105.

At *Georgics* 4.149–52 Jupiter himself has granted to bees their idiosyncratic habits as a reward for feeding him during his sojourn in the cave at Mt. Dicte. At lines 153–227, Virgil elaborates upon the “inborn way of life” (*naturas*) of the bees, which with *expediam* 150, he has already promised to do (cf. 147 ff.). The section at 149–52 is thus transitional. Yet it also evokes an *aition*. The narrated myth along with both the tense of *addidit* and the poet’s presence (150) furnishes a beginning for the bestowal of the habits (*naturas*) and their perpetuation. At Callimachus, *Hymn* 1.49 ff., the bees yield honeycombs as nourishment, and the Curetes dance and incessantly beat upon their armor to prevent Cronus from paying heed to the wailing infant Zeus. The Corybantes (cf. 46) are the Asiatic attendants of the goddess Cybele, and strictly they differ from the protectors of Zeus, despite not infrequent confusion between them. During worship the Corybantes would follow the image of Cybele and clash cymbals, strike drums, and play the flute. Virgil’s Curetes do not hit swords against shields and helmets to produce noise; instead, as if musicians,⁵⁰ they preside over “melodious sounds” and “rattling bronze” (*canoros / Curetum sonitus crepitantiaque aera*), which the bees trail after (*secutae*). The locality (*Dictaeo . . . antro*) is Cretan,⁵¹ however. At 4.64–65 the bees are all but devotees of the Asiatic cult: *tinnitusque cie et Matris quate cymbala circum: / ipsae* [sc. bees] *consident*.⁵² Callimachus, *Hymn* 1.46 ff., etymologizes *Κούρητες* with *κουρίζοντος*, “to make infant sounds” (cf. Aratus 32; 35).⁵³ The unconventional Virgilian twist at 4.150–51 is motivated for a similar purpose. With *canoros sonitus* and *cre(pitantia)* Virgil explanatorily derives the name *Curetum*, while presupposing an association with *κουρίζω*. Lucretius, 2.629–39, had set forth etymologies for *Curetes*, adhering to accepted Greek beliefs about the name (cf. *Grai* 629), whether for Asian celebrants (cf. *capitum . . . cristas* 632) or Cretan warriors (cf. *vagitum . . . Creta* 634). Virgil, however, has opted for a rarer application.

At 1.50–59 Virgil spells out the productive capacities of various

⁵⁰ On the Curetes cf. K. Reinhardt “Der Ursprung der Musik,” *Orient und Antike* 6 (1928) 34–36 = *Vermächtnis der Antike* (Göttingen 1966) 425–27; cf. Kleingünther (above, note 19) 32 note 51; Frentz (above, note 17) 60–66 *ad fin.*

⁵¹ Cf. *RE* s.v. “Kureten” 2206–07.

⁵² Cf. Richter *ad loc.*

⁵³ Cf. F. Jan, *De Callimacho Homeri Interprete* (Strasbourg 1893) 80.

regions, after which, at 60–63, this diversity is sanctioned. Nature's apportioning of "laws and decrees to definite places" extends back to a starting point in myth, when Deucalion was active, and the covenants are thereafter everlasting (cf. *aeterna* 60). Equivalent meanings for *homines* are supplied (62–63) by way of *durum genus* and *lapides*; the appositional phrase by signifying "hard" and "race" facilitates the recognition of the Grecized and ambiguous root in *la(pides)*, for which *λᾱοι* and *λαοί* are tacit approximations (cf. Callim. fr. 496).⁵⁴ Mankind itself, moreover, is said to originate when "Deucalion first threw stones onto the uninhabited earth" (*unde homines nati*).

Virgil is here adapting from Lucretius, and the differences make Virgil's zeal for *aitia* plain. According to Lucretius, 5.925–26, the hard earth had formerly created rugged tough men (*at genus humanum multo fuit illud in arvis / durius, ut decuit, tellus quod dura creasset*). Neither *tempore quo primum* a few lines previously at 917 nor *foedere naturae certo* at 924 completes the assertion at 925–26. Yet Virgil's *quo tempore primum* (1.61) and *foedera certis / . . . natura* (60–61) induce or belong to the profile of an *aition*. Lucretius holds to an Epicurean (or perhaps Democritean) dogma⁵⁵ whereby as a result of a series of evolutionary events the earth itself cast mankind forth; Lucretius must in his capacity as philosopher reject a mythological creator, such as Deucalion (cf. 5.780 ff.). For Virgil, Deucalion's presence fulfills a unifying aim. His act of hurling stones onto the earth in creating the "tough race" of man not only makes for ease of comprehension but is, in the aggregate, like Nature's decisive imparting of lasting qualities to each land; traditionally, at the completion of the Golden age Deucalion becomes a figure of importance, and with the Silver age the lands were initially partitioned, possessed, and tilled (cf. 1.125 ff.). The verbal echoing of *natura* and *nati* is an additional bond between the segments, as are *continuo* and *quo tempore primum* (cf. 4.149–52, with *naturas* 149, and *natos* 153).

Within some *aitia*, protracted temporal analogy may in itself be the chief means of explanation. At Apollonius of Rhodes, 1.496–511,

⁵⁴ Cf. Servius *ad loc.*; 2.340–41; Ov. *Met.* 1.393; 414–15; Rank (above, note 25) 101–103; Frentz (above, note 17) 39–46.

⁵⁵ Cf. K. Reinhardt. "Hekataios von Abdera und Demokrit," *Hermes* 47 (1912) 492–513 = *Vermächtnis der Antike* (Göttingen 1966) 114–32; R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship* (Oxford 1968) 43 note 6.

Orpheus sings of the evolvement of the universe. An amorphous primal mass once (*τὸ πρῶν* 497) existed, and from it through "strife" (*νείκεος* 498) the basic elements are eventually separated off—earth, sky, and sea. Various beings then rise forth from these elements, with which they nevertheless retain a kinship; for instance, the rivers and the godlike Oceanids are engendered from the element water (*θάλασσα* 496), and they are almost identical with it. The divinities, too, evolve, and in the process they undergo disputes and division of functions. Here the creative impulse is virtually intrinsic to the basic elements themselves. Again, Apollonius in still another *aition* at 4.676–81 says that from a rudimentary ooze (*προτέρης . . . ἰλύος*) the earth blossoms out with shapeless creatures and that thereafter they solidify into discernible entities; as such, they always consist of the element from which they have issued forth; they furthermore are like the men (672 ff.) who later were transformed into freakish beasts by Circe.⁵⁶ Often, too, the details within the precedent are simpler or less universalizing than the subsequent actuality with which they seem to correspond. An example is the *aition* at Callimachus, *Hymn* 4.300–15. When Theseus and the Athenian youths who accompanied him had confronted the Minotaur and were sailing back to Athens from Crete, they landed at Delos and set up a statue of Aphrodite, and there, to the sound of a cithara, they held circular dances around the goddess' altar. This worship may memorialize the lowing of the Minotaur, the love-crazed son of Pasiphaë, and the configuration of the labyrinth (310–11), but the entire activity is explanatory of essentially two later ceremonies. The men of Delos sing (304 f.) and the maidens dance and garlands are placed on a statue of the goddess (306–308); additionally, each year the Athenians send ropes as offerings to Apollo, and these are from the ship in which Theseus was reputed to have made his voyage from Athens (314–15). The earlier stages are signaled at 308–309 (*ποτε . . . ὅτε*). The contemporary aspect of the sailing mission (*ἀνέπλει* 309) is emphasized with *ἀειζώνοντα* (314); both *ἔνθεν* and the separate positioning of 314–15 also ensure that it is noticed. An

⁵⁶ The thought seems Empedoclean in both passages (1.496 ff.; 4.678 ff.); cf. *Lucr.* 1.712 ff., *Ecl.* 6.31 ff.; see, however, H. Schwabel, s.v. "Weltschöpfung," *RE* Suppl. 9 (1962) 1468, 1470, 1545–46; H. Fränkel, *Noten zu den Argonautika des Apollonios* (Munich 1968) 521; W. Spoerri, "Zur Kosmogonie in Vergils 6. Ekloge," *MH* 27 (1970) 144–63; H. Herter, s.v. "Apollonios," *RE* Suppl. 13 (1973) 47.

allusion suffices to connect the Athenian custom with the prior myth, which was already something of a commonplace (cf. Plato, *Phaedo* 58b)—probably to dress up what otherwise might appear hackneyed.

A farmer should wait for unfrozen land if his crops are to thrive, says Virgil at 2.315 ff.; the rains in the springtime enable the seeds to grow, and plants are the issue of a mating between the Sky and his spouse, the Earth (323 ff.). In this season, birds and beasts, too, seek to proliferate (328 f.). With aging, the delicate plants are able to defy the warm and cold rains and the sun (330–35), yet they need mitigating interims to survive such toil (343–45). The yearly resumption or continuance of life finds a precursor in the dawning of the universe, enlarged upon at 336–42. When it starts, light was steadfast and it had the warmth of spring; in this vernal and bright warmth the "first flocks took in light, and the earthy breed of men extruded its head from the tough fields, and wild beasts were sent into forests, and stars into the sky." The imagery of the primordial cosmic setting (*prima . . . origine mundi / inluxisse dies . . . ver illud erat* 336 ff.) and of the accessory birth (seeing, breathing, extrusion of head, and release 340–42) serves as a paradigm for the rampant and more seasonal mating and growth, which each year the personified Sky and Earth foster (315–35).⁵⁷ At 336–42 deities are absent from the universe; light, if anything, ultimately incites the burgeoning of life during the warm springtime. The Sky incarnate (*pater Aether*) at 325 is correspondingly a less abstract fructifying source.

At Lucretius, 5.818 ff., the temperate seasons keep company with the "newness of the world" (*novitas mundi*), and the earth is mother of human and animal life (cf. 5.780 ff.). Virgil's outlook is Lucretian in tone; yet he may be tincturing it with a Stoic or neo-Pythagorean idea according to which fiery star-like particles could amalgamate with the inert element earth to generate living beings. The earth itself was commonly thought to be the parent of mankind, but heat and light are not any the less inherent in *ver* (338) and *inluxisse dies . . . lucem* (337; 340). At 4.219–27 the philosophical concept is applied to bees in explaining their immortality;⁵⁸ the expression *haustus / aetherios*

⁵⁷ On the mating-imagery see L. P. Wilkinson, *The Georgics of Virgil* (Cambridge 1969) 192–93.

⁵⁸ Klingner (above, note 24) 234–39; cf. K. Reinhardt, s.v. "Poseidonios," *RE* 22 (1953) 602–604.

(4.220–21) duplicates the metaphor of *lucem . . . hausere* (2.340), though this and a few other verbal resemblances—*pecudes*, *viros*, *ferarum* 4.223, cf. *pecudes*, *virum*, *ferae* 2.340–42; or *sideris . . . caelo* 4.227, cf. *sidera caelo* 2.342—may fall short of technical connotation.

Virgil, at 2.371 ff., remarks that even more than by frost or heat the bite of pasturing herds (*greges*) can ruin the delicate vine. “On account of no other damage a goat is sacrificed on every altar to Bacchus and the old-time games enter the theater, and in the countryside the sons of Theseus have pledged prizes for ability, and jubilant amidst their drinks they have leaped among oiled hides in the soft meadows” (380–84). The last three lines, 382–84, concern the Ascolia. In Attica young farmers would jump upon oiled and inflated *ἄσκοί*, which were obtained from goats sacrificed to Dionysus because his cherished plant, the vine, was habitually injured by these animals.⁵⁹ The best performers would receive prizes, perhaps the goatskin bags themselves or the bags filled with wine.⁶⁰ A few abridgements of Eratosthenes’ *Erigone*, for which Hyginus is a crucial witness,⁶¹ narrate events inaugurating this diversion. Dionysus visited Attica and taught the cultivation of the wine-grape to Icarius. The vine was planted, but a goat ate its leaves. Icarius killed the goat and made a bag from its skin, which he inflated and threw onto the ground, and “he compelled his comrades to leap around it” (fr. 32 Hiller): . . . *suosque sodales circa eum saltare coegisse. Itaque Eratosthenes ait: Ἰκαριοῖ τόθι πρῶτα περὶ τράγον ὠρχήσαντο*. In conjunction with the excerpted verse, *eum* is given by Hyginus as the antecedent for *utrem vento plenum*; consequently *τράγον* should pertain to an inflated goatskin.⁶² Eratosthenes

⁵⁹ Cornutus, *Theol. Graec.* 30, p. 60.20 Lang; *Σ Ar. Plut.* 1129; Herondas 8.41 ff., on which see R. Herzog, “Der Traum des Herondas,” *Philologus* 79 (1924) 390–91; 401–404; K. Latte, “Ἀσκολιασμός,” *Hermes* 85 (1957) 387–88 (= *Kl. Schr.* 702–704).

⁶⁰ Cf. *Σ Ar. Ach.* 1000–03; Suidas, s.v. *ἄσκος*. On the pictorial representations see O. Jahn, “Die Askolien,” *Arch. Zeitung* 9 (1847) 129–35, and plate 9; Herzog (above, note 59) 410–11. The opinion that Virgil’s *praemia* (382) refers to a goat is already in Probus (*ad loc.*), but there is no guarantee that this animal was really the prize in the Ascolia; cf. F. Solmsen, “Eratosthenes’ *Erigone*,” *TAPA* 78 (1947) 271–72 (= *Kl. Schr.* I 244–45). For the term with *ingeniis* cf. *Aen.* 5.292 (*invitat pretiis animos et praemia ponit*); *Ecl.* 3.31 ff.

⁶¹ For these see E. Maass, “De Eratosthenis *Erigone*,” *Phil. Unters.* 6 (1883) 59–104; cf. G. Keller, *Eratosthenes und die alexandrinische Sterndichtung* (Zurich 1946) 53–92; cf. Solmsen (above, note 60) 258–67 (= 231–40).

⁶² For *eum* see M. Nilsson, “Die Anthesterien und die Aiora,” *Eranos* 15 (1915) 196; cf. Latte (above, note 59) 389 (= 704).

must be recording the ceremony to which he assigned the start of the later or prevalent Ascolia (πρῶτα). Drama was regarded as having developed from a dance around a goat, and the verse from Eratosthenes might also impute the genre of tragedy, and perhaps through a literal sense, to the primitive Ascolia he is describing.⁶³ The tense of Virgil's *posuere* and *saluere* after *ineunt* (381) implies a beginning for the sacrificing of goats and the staging of drama (380–81). The jumpers are *Thesidae*—hence they are from remote times and they live near the Icarians. The Ascolia, as it is pictured by Virgil, could stand for what he, in his own judgment, conceived as its earliest occurrence. He is perhaps following the *Erigone*⁶⁴ although the details are dissimilar; an acquaintance with the story is at any rate presupposed. At line 381 current drama is extended back to the past (*veteres*—*ludi*); the Ascolia at 382–84 would represent its inception among the Greeks. The goat (380) is not the immediate culprit; it is offered up to Bacchus though several other species of browsing animals also injure the vine.⁶⁵ Many goats may be killed if there are many altars, yet in accounting for the initial Ascolia a single offering would be appropriate. The widespread sacrificing of these animals is what Virgil is justifying; his statement at 380–81 refers to contemporary and universal practices, whether Greek or Roman.

At 385–96 Virgil elaborates upon the content of 380–81. The sequence of sacrifice and festivity (380–81) is reversed at 393–96, and the Roman aspect is stressed in 385–96. The practices (393 ff.)—festal chant and sacrifice—if carried out may exert an effect on the flourishing of the vineyard (390 ff.); Roman farmers indulge in "crude verse and uncontrolled laughter and they don terror-inspiring masks of hollow bark" (385 ff.). Comedy and tragedy are evidently meant, and they are subsumed within a primitive and rural celebration, which, as the present tense shows (cf. also 385), does not predate the Virgilian Ascolia (382–84). Bacchus, moreover, may be worshiped by the farmers; they summon the god "with happy songs and in his honor

⁶³ Cf. Maass (above, note 61) 113–15; Keller (above, note 61) 41; 89; F. Solmsen (above, note 60) 270–71 (= 243–44); Latte (above, note 59) 389–90 (= 704–705); Pfeiffer (above, note 55) 169 note 2.

⁶⁴ Cf. Maass, *ibid.*, 114–15; Solmsen, *ibid.*, 270–71 (= 243–44); R. Merkelbach, "Die Erigone des Eratosthenes," *Miscellanea di Studi Alessandrini in memoria di Augusto Rostagni* (Torino 1963) 496–97.

⁶⁵ Meant are *uri*, *caprae*, *oves*, *iuvencae*.

they hang up little soft masks from a tree" (388 f.). The songs and masks could both bear upon countrified drama—there is a broad similarity between *versibus . . . ora* (386 f.) and *carmina . . . oscilla* (388 f.)—but manifestly they are utilized in the supplication of Bacchus. In consequence of the religious festivities (385–89), the vineyards reach maturity through the god's epiphany (390–92; cf. Hor. *Epod.* 2.17–18). Virgil therefore urges the glorifying of Bacchus with ancestral song and the sacrificing of goats (393–96). The ceremonial details (393 ff.) promote vividness; they do not bar a correlation with 380–81 (cf. *Baccho . . . carminibus patriis . . . stabit . . . hircus ad aram* (393 ff.); *Baccho caper . . . aris / caeditur . . . veteres ludi* (380 f.).

No single Greek or Roman festival is being portrayed with lines 380–96, as *omnibus* (380) and *Thesidae* (383) prove. Nevertheless, at both 385–89 and 393–96 the Liberalia is in substance characterized, as E. de Saint-Denis almost solitarily maintains.⁶⁶ The Liberalia included drunken ribaldry, as a verse from Naevius (*CRF* fr. 5) makes clear (*Libera lingua loquemur ludis Liberalibus*). The "cakes" (*liba* 394) were ritually part of the Liberalia (Varro, *Ling.* 6.14). During its observance, a goat was sacrificed to Bacchus with song "because, as Varro says, 'they feed on the vine':" *hircus praemium cantus proponebatur, qui Liberalibus . . . Libero patri . . . immolabatur, quia, ut Varro ait, depascunt vitem* (fr. 304, p. 320 Fun.). Ovid in treating of the Liberalia (*Fasti* 3.725 ff.) uses wording like Virgil's: *liba . . . arae . . . honore* (726–27; *honorem, liba, aram* 393–95); cf. *corticibusque cavis* (750; *corticibus . . . cavatis* 387); *mite caput, pater, huc . . . vertas* (789; *quocumque deus circum caput egit honestum* 392). Despite the plausible clues, K. Meuli would reject the Liberalia; he summarizes the arguments of Saint-Denis with the comment "Beweise . . . alle so evident nichtig, dass sich eine Widerlegung erübrigt," and supposes that at 386–89 the Compitalia is intended.⁶⁷ Meuli's beliefs have found enthusiastic acceptance, for instance by Richter (*ad loc.*), among others. In this festival "shapes" (*effigies*) probably resembling masks and made of wool or a pliable substance were indeed hung up at crossroads;⁶⁸ however, there is no extant evidence that during the Compitalia the Romans either sacrificed a goat to Bacchus or hung *oscilla* (in any sense) from trees in

⁶⁶ "A propos du Culte de Bacchus," *RBPh* 27 (1949) 708–12.

⁶⁷ "Altrömischer Maskenbrauch," *MH* 12 (1955) 206–35; on St.-Denis, 212 note 23.

⁶⁸ W. Ehlers, *RE* 18 (1942) s.v. *oscilla*, 1567–78.

venerating the god himself. Virgil most likely is not etymologizing *tragoedia* or *comoedia* with *caper . . . ludi . . . pagos* (κώμη) 380–82, notwithstanding any appeals by Diomedes to Varro (fr. 304 and 305 Fun.; cf. Horace, *Ars P.* 220 ff.). The ancient commentators (such as Donatus, *de Comoedia* 5.2; 6–8) may have incorporated Virgil's own phraseology as they sought to comprehend the meaning at 380 ff., which they knew to be about drama (cf. *prosaenia* 381), but which puzzled them. Meuli's arguments from the ancient etymological testimony⁶⁹ should hence be approached with scepticism. Meuli also holds that the Compitalia and the Liberalia were historically alike.⁷⁰ At Ovid, *Fasti* 3.785–86, however, Bacchus once shared his festivities with Ceres. If Meuli's hypothesis were correct, the Cerealia and the Compitalia ought formerly to have been related to each other. It is uncertain whether *oscilla* did belong to the Liberalia since Virgil—and Virgil alone—attests their use in the worship of Bacchus. The Virgilian description only suggests the festival; lines 380–96, in their entirety, are clearly not restricted to the Liberalia.

In the *Erigone*, Eratosthenes must have inquired into the Athenian Aiora, or "Festival of Swings;" the *oscilla* are masks, and during Greek worship of Dionysus masks were hung up on trees, and in Virgil's text the *oscilla* are akin to swings so far as they are suspended from trees.⁷¹ Virgil might have assumed that his audience would be acquainted with the story of Icarius as Eratosthenes had reported it. Servius (*ad loc.*) felt there was an affinity to it and wrote down a résumé from it. The Liberalia, even if it is merely intimated at 385–89 and 393–96, is truly Roman cult. Yet the archaic rustic ceremonies at 385–89 might be a Roman counterpart to the Ascolia depicted at 382–84, although they are not prior to it. Virgil's exhortation at 393–96 to sing reverentially and offer up a single goat to Bacchus, though put into the future, exemplifies the universalized customs at 380–81 more definitely than does the section at 385–89. It is uncertain whether the wooden masks (386) in any way commemorate the sacrificing of goats and whether

⁶⁹ Meuli (above, note 67) 210, 223–24; 228; cf. Bartelink (above, note 25) 228–29; 231–32.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.* 218–22.

⁷¹ Cf. W. Wrede, "Der Maskengott," *AM* 53 (1928) 75–94; M. Nilsson, *The Dionysiac Mysteries of the Hellenistic and Roman Age* (Lund 1957) 28–29; H. R. Immerwahr, "Choes and Chytroi," *TAPA* 77 (1946) 254–58.

Virgil is associating the *ludi Osci* with the masks or the *oscilla* through superficial punning (cf. *ludunt* 386). For source material he probably made use of Varro as well as Eratosthenes, if not other authors too; a vestige is discernible from Livy, at 7.2.5 ff., where he is accounting for the evolution of the *ludi scenici*: . . . *inconditis* . . . *iocularia fundentes versibus* . . . *versu* . . . *incompositum* . . . *risu ac soluto ioco* . . . *ludus*; in all likelihood, he did not here borrow from Virgil's *versibus incompitis ludunt risuque soluto* (386).⁷² The practices at 380–81 pertain to Greeks and Romans alike; only an Athenian precedent (382–84) traces back a beginning for them. The applicability to Romans is disclosed through structural parallelism (385 ff.). The totality of 380–96 is modeled after an *aition*. Virgil seems to be interrelating Greek and Roman traditions about injury to the vine and the origins of goat-sacrifice and drama—Ascolia, Liberalia, Aiora, suspension of *oscilla* from trees—matters already partially dealt with by Eratosthenes and presumably Varro.

At Apollonius of Rhodes, 4.1513–17, an alternate name for Perseus is Eurymedon, and a portion of it, that is, *-μέδων*, along with *Γοργόνος*, alludes to the word Medusa; when Perseus brought back the Gorgon's head, drops of blood struck the ground and from this event serpents originated.⁷³ The juxtaposing of the names of Perseus and Eurymedon verges on metonymasia, by which current and former usage is contrasted; metonymasias are peculiar kinds of etymologies, explaining and deriving meaning or form, and as such they may be found within *aitia*.⁷⁴ Apollonius is perhaps "correcting" a tradition about Perseus by including the rarer alternative and simultaneously tying it up with Medusa, and thus with the myth more typically associated with Perseus; yet there might also be a trace of the epic convention of placing the language used by gods and men in antithesis (*ἰσόθεος* . . . *Περσεὺς* 1513; *Εὐρυμέδων* . . . *κάλεσκέ μιν* . . . *μήτηρ* 1514), the humans having a

⁷² Cf. J. Waszink, "Varro, Livy and Tertullian on the History of Roman Dramatic Art," *VChr* 2 (1948) 240–42; see also C. A. Van Rooy, *Studies in Classical Satire and Related Literary Theory* (Leiden 1966) 2, with the bibliography n. 8 (p. 21); cf. also Wrede (above, note 71) 87; W. Beare, "The Italian Origins of Latin Drama," *Hermathena* 54 (1939) 40; 44–46.

⁷³ Cf. Callim. *Hy.* 2.38–41; Ap.Rhod. 3.844–57; Euphron fr. 40 P.; Mosch. *Eur.* 56–61.

⁷⁴ E.g., Callim. *Hy.* 4.30–54; cf. 3.47 ff.; fr. 601; Ap. Rhod. 1.623–26; 4.567–71; already in Hesiod, fr. 296 M.–W.; cf. Rank (above, note 25) 122.

predilection for the meaningful and less unusual term.⁷⁵ The serpents are not directly part of the etymologizing treatment, but the Medusa had snake-like hair. Often in *aitia*, as here, the earth may be struck by a liquid (or staff or the like) and undergo a sublimated or symbolic mating, after which it gives birth, and in such *aitia* temporal emphasis is almost invariably present or implied through myth.⁷⁶

The opening portion of *Georgics* 4.271-86 treats of the term *flos*. At 271 *amello*, which elsewhere seldom occurs and is probably a Celtic borrowing,⁷⁷ identifies *flos* in a preliminary way and serves as a synonym for it. A plant (*herba* 272) is meant; the botanical manifestations are catalogued at 272-78. Both *amello* and *herba* are linked to *flos* by zeugma with *cui*, which the asyndeton in 272 aids in fostering (cf. 3.147-48). As nominatives, *aureus ipse* (274) and *asper in ore sapor* (277) are in apposition to *flos*. With *nomen fecere agricolae* attention is drawn to *amello* as a name. The notion of "culling" in *legunt* (278) suggests removal and thereby the preposition *a*. This implication and (*flumin*)a Mellae etymologize *amello*. Servius (*ad loc.*) cites an apposite parallel from Lucan: *populi habitantes iuxta Lemannum fluvium Alemanni dicuntur*: <1.396> *deseruere cavo tentoria fixa Lemanno*.

Sometimes *amellus* is equated with *μελίφυλλον* (ThLL s.v.), for which normally, however, *apiastrum* would be the rendering. This at least is Varro's tendency (*Rust.* 3.16.10: *apiastro, quod alii meliphyllon, alii melissophyllon, quidam melittaenam appellant*), hence *amellus*, *apiastrum*, and *μελίφυλλον* are one and the same plant, but *amellus* is its less prevalent designation. Attributes of the *apiastrum* and *meliphyllon* (as well as the *melissophyllon* and *melittaena*) should be characteristic of the *amellus*. According to Dioscorides 3.103, the plant (as *melissophyllon*) has blossoms encircling its stem, and (as *meliphyllon*) the stem and leaves are black. From the ground upwards the Virgilian *flos* has a profuse outgrowth and many encircling leaves, which alone are dark; the rest of the plant is golden. Probably at 274 *aureus* and *foliis*,

⁷⁵ See generally H. Güntert, *Von der Sprache der Götter und Geister* (Halle 1921); Rank (above, note 25) 113-29; J. Friedrich, "Sprachgeschichte und Wortbedeutung," *Festschrift A. Debrunner* (Bern 1954) 135-39. Cf. 2.686-719, where Apollonius corrects the Callimachean *aitia* in *Hy.* 2.58 ff.; 97 ff.; cf. also his imitation of Callim. fr. 43.60-71 at 4.982-92.

⁷⁶ Cf. Callim. *Hy.* 1.29-41; 42-43; Aratus 216-21.

⁷⁷ See Walde-Hofmann s.v. *amellus*.

with *aureus* indicative of the color of honey, play on *meliphyllon* as an alternate appellation for the *amellus*, which Virgil is describing. If *a-* in *amello* is taken as privative, *asper in ore sapor* furnishes an additional meaning, that is, "not honied," "bitter to taste." The allusions anticipate the verbal bond between *amello* and *Mellae*. At 275 *nigrae* (cf. *purpura*) might also with *foliis* strengthen this tie, though with a different sense (cf. Catullus 67.33: *flavos . . . flumine Mella*).

Prior to lines 271–78 Virgil enumerates several symptoms of ailing bees (251–63) and prescribes remedies (264 ff.). His etymologizing of *flos* (271–78) introduces a therapeutical regimen since the roots of the plant are ingredients of a medicine for sick bees (279–80): *huius odorato radices incoque Baccho / pabulaque in foribus plenis appone canistris*.⁷⁸ Bees may not only sicken but die (281 ff.), and the recourse the farmer has for replenishing his stock is summarily declared at 281–86; bees arise from the bloody gore of slain oxen, and Virgil will dilate on this method of acquiring new swarms. The combination of topics at 271–86—etymologizing and avowal of miraculous offspring—is already prefigured at 4.198–201: *neque concubitu indulgent . . . ipsae e foliis natos, e suavis herbis / ore legunt*. But the underlying structure at 271–86 is more elaborately embellished and it is representative of an *aition*. Nicander, *Alex.* 443–51, despite differences, is comparable. In a series of allusions ἔργα μελίσσης (445; "honeycombs") is there etymologized *seriatim*, with μέλοιο (443), "care," i.e., semantically like ἔργα and in form like the μέλ- in μελίσσης, and again with ἔργων / μνησάμεναι Διοῖ at 449–50, respectively for ἔργα and as an abstruse periphrasis for μέλισσαι, Demeter's "priestesses."⁷⁹ Furthermore, what the etymologized phrase signifies in reality, "combs from the bee," receives a beginning, though inversely: bees came forth from the body of a dead calf (αἶ τ' ἀπὸ μόσχου / σκήνεος ἐξεγένοντο δεδουπότος ἐν νεμέεσσιν 446–47), after which they built their chambers and stored their honey (ἐκτίσσαντο πρῶτόν που θαλάμας . . . ἤνυσαν ὄμπας 448 ff.).⁸⁰ Although ἔργα μελίσσης is not a plant, it is to be administered with boiled wine to men who have become comatose from poppy liquid (433 ff.). In like fashion, the Virgilian *flos*

⁷⁸ Cf. Dioscor. 3.104; cf. also *Georg.* 4.63–64; Engelke (above, note 32) 19–20.

⁷⁹ Cf. Callim. *Hy.* 1.47, 50–51; see Pfeiffer (above, note 55) 284.

⁸⁰ Cf. also Nic. *Ther.* 738–42 (text uncertain).

becomes a decoction for the cure of sluggish bees (264 ff.; 279 f.). Virgil even seems to evoke Nicander verbally: *Cecropiumque thymum* (270) and Ὑμησίδος . . . θύμα (446; 451); *rosas* (268) and ῥοδέοιο (452). There may have been reminiscence, too, of other Nicandrian writings; *Ther.* 554 ff., τὴν . . . μελίφυλλον ἐπικλείουσι βοτῆρες . . . φύλλα μέλισσαι is much like *cui nomen amello / fecere agricolae . . . aureus . . . foliis* 271 ff., (cf. *Ther.* 503 f.); μελίκταιναν (555; a "gloss:" -κτ- > ττ) . . . μέλιτος . . . ἔνται (556) resembles *amello . . . legunt -a Mellae* (271 ff.; cf. *Ther.* 686); βαρύοδος . . . χαλβάνη (*Ther.* 51-52) is like *galbaneos . . . odores* (264) and *grave olentia* 270. Virgil, at 281-86, promises supplemental narration (cf. 4.150), while putting stress on temporal contrast. Lines 281-82 refer to the loss of bees (cf. 279-80). The clauses that are dependent upon *pandere* (et . . . -que) take notice of the "discoveries of the Arcadian keeper"⁸¹ and emphasize with *iam saepe* that they were frequently afterwards employed for purposes of generating the bee. At 285-86, with *altius—famam*, Virgil will strive to explain at greater length what is known of the procedure, whose antiquity he firmly underscores. Thus at 283-86 the earliest implementation is twice contrasted to the later or current practice.

The type of temporal antithesis within 283-86 is encountered again, though on a much grander scale, in two other passages that are set within and belong to a single unit, 287-558, in spite of an intervening narrative within it. At 295-314 Virgil describes the Bugonia—or the actual practice to be followed for creating the bee from the bodies of dead oxen. The practice is already sketched in at 284-85 (*quoque—cruor*); the very first occurrence is not recounted until lines 538-58, with which the later Bugonia (295 ff.) is correlated. The concluding segment (538 ff.) is gradually led up to by the events within 315-537, which it completes, though it too has already received preliminary mention at 283-84 (*et—pandere*) and 295-314. Lines 287-94 tell of Egypt, and this portion is decidedly appropriate to the Bugonia (295-314) since for Virgil it was often ventured upon there.

When the bees kept by Aristaeus are destroyed (315 ff.), he visits his mother, Cyrene, who advises him to compel the seer Proteus to explain the loss and be favorable to a happy outcome. Aristaeus learns from Proteus what the fate of Orpheus and Eurydice was

⁸¹ For the sense of *magistri* cf. 4.327 (*frugum et pecorum custodia sollers*).

(453–527), and the divinations are interpreted by Cyrene (530–47), who has listened while concealed nearby (424). The Dryads are offended by the death of Eurydice (532–34; 460–61) and have destroyed the bees (*exitium misere apibus* 534). They can be restored if the woodland nymphs are duly propitiated (534–36). Cyrene counsels him on the method (538–44); success also requires appeasement of Orpheus and sacrifice to Eurydice (545–47). Proteus does not say that the loss of the bees resulted from the grief of the Dryads, and Cyrene does not know in advance of their sorrow. She clarifies the sea-god's obscure response and proffers a remedy. In Cyrene's instructions (538 ff.) four bulls and four cows are to be sacrificed at four altars and their bodies left in a leafy grove, and nine days later Orpheus should receive an oblation of poppy and a black sheep, after which Aristaeus may visit the grove. Aristaeus (548 ff.) builds the altars, sacrifices four bulls and four cows, or eight victims, and, on the ninth day, makes an offering to Orpheus, and revisits the grove with Cyrene, where they observe the bees flitting forth from the liquefied flesh. A calf might now be slain in homage to the obviously appeased Eurydice (cf. 547), but the episode ends.

At four altars, Aristaeus has sacrificed eight victims, and a ninth victim to Orpheus on the ninth day. The number thirteen is intimated, and the omissions fortify the persistence of nine therewith: *quattuor aras* 541; *monstratas aras* 549; *papavera . . . nigram . . . ovem* 546; *inferias* 553; *Eurydicen vitula veneraberis caesa* 547. The differences are not without motivation, if all of 287–558 conforms to the design of an *aition*. The Bugonia at 295–314—the actuality—must have evolved from, and therefore be traceable to, the precepts of Cyrene at 538–47 and their fulfillment by Aristaeus (548–58), the beginning in myth. In the Bugonia, a hut with four windows is needed and the number four is anaphorically repeated (*quattuor addunt*, / *quattuor . . . fenestras* 297–98). Cyrene insists upon the number four twice in stipulating the quantity of bulls and altars (538; 541), but additional victims were to be sought (*totidem . . . iuvenas* 540). Only a single calf (*vitulus* 299) is pummeled to death (299–302) in the Bugonia. Cyrene has specified at line 547 that a calf (*vitula*) is to be sacrificed to Eurydice. This offering is to be made after visiting the grove, if the bees are restored, but Aristaeus does not, according to Virgil, honor Eurydice

with a sacrifice when the bees are generated (cf. 546-47; 553 ff.). In the Bugonia (295 ff.) the calf implies a ninth item. The beaten animal is presumably a reminder of the calf that Aristaeus was enjoined to offer up to Eurydice. Apart from any nuance of magic, the changes in number suggest an evolving process and help correlate 538-58 and 295-314 with each other. Other differences induce the same kind of effects.

In the Bugonia the precepts tend throughout to be appreciably more specialized than at 538-58. Cyrene says that blood should flow during the killing of the oxen (*demitte cruorem* 542). Her words may entail what is inescapable, but when Aristaeus sacrifices the oxen this substance goes unmentioned (*ducit* 551; cf. 553; 546). At 302 the hide of the beaten calf is to remain intact (*integram . . . pellem*). The *ramea fragmenta* and *thymum casiasque* (303 f.) are like *frondoso* and *papavera* (543; 545), but less restricted. The springtime (305-307) is ornately painted in, yet it is like the much simpler rising of Dawn (544; 552). At 308-309 the "warm moisture seethes" within marrow (*tepefactus in ossibus umor / aestuat*); at 555-56 the active moist warmth is not so precisely localized (*liquefacta boum per viscera . . . ruptis effervere costis*). At 309 the new organisms become visible in awesome manner (*visenda modis animalia miris*); the detail is more specific than the "sudden and strange portent" at 554 (*subitum ac dictu mirabile monstrum*). At 557 the bees as they leave collect into "huge clouds," but at 312-13 they are compared to "torrential rain bursting forth from summer clouds." Even the chronology differs since the Parthians (314) must plainly be later than Aristaeus and Cyrene (cf. 561). The actual practice at 295-314 and the precedent from myth are in temporal antithesis (cf. 4.283-86), but the discrepancies point to development from simple to more complicated precept. The instructions in the Bugonia (295 ff.) in themselves most likely belong to already prescriptive lore since elsewhere they seem to be exactly insisted upon and recorded independently of Virgil.⁸² A past action and a current practice are in a similarly

⁸² *Geoponica* 15.2.21 ff., probably from Democritus Bolus, a Hellenistic writer of the third-century B.C.; see M. Wellmann, "Die Georgica des Democritus," *Abh. d. Preuss. Akad. d. Wiss. Phil.-hist. Kl.* 4 (1921) 1-17, 19, 24-25, 43; text 57-58; cf. Richter on 4.284 ff. The instructions in the *Geoponica* lack historical references; the reports in Servius on *Ecl.* 10.1 and *Georg.* 4.1 are disputable, but they suggest a relatively late completion of the ending of the fourth book, as might *Parthi* (314); for the added "sign-off" at 4.559-66 see P. van de Woestijne, "Notes sur la chronologie des Géorgiques de Virgile," *RBPh* 10 (1931) 42, 48-49.

fashioned contrast at Apollonius of Rhodes, 2.498–527,⁸³ though within a much briefer and uninterrupted narrative. Aristaeus had put an end to a heat spell at Ceos by building an altar for Zeus Icmacus and by making sacrifice to Sirius and to Zeus. From this “the Etesian winds from Zeus cool the earth for forty days. And even now the priests at Ceos sacrifice in advance of the rising of the Dog-star” (524 ff.). The surviving customs result from the ministrations of Aristaeus, and they are more complex than their humbler prototypes. The names Nomius and Agreus are etymologized within this *aition* as well (507; cf. 501; 509; 513; 520).

Virgil introduces lines 287–558 with 271–86, which concentrates etymologically on the plant *flos*, or the *amellus*, a purported remedy for sick bees, and on the creating of bees from ox-gore, if death has reduced their number. The section at 287–558 is representative of still a larger additional *aition*. The literal meanings of *amello* (271) and (a) *Mellae* (278) could sardonically presage the loss of the bees—“no honey,” “no bees”—at 281–82 and 317–18. But the statements at 283–86 are openly transitional. Virgil will relate the “whole story, searching back to its first beginning.” The context holds out an aetiological bias for *famam* (286), but the sense is rather “myth” (*μῦθος*), as the resumptive *nam* (287) and the echo with (*ut*) *fama* (318) indicate. At 315–18 the reiterated questions put to the Muses together with the poet’s reply appear to launch brusquely into an untried exposition. But *artem* (315) with *quis deus hanc . . . nobis extudit* must signify the procedure from which the Bugonia at 295–314 had taken its start and developed. The science or pragmatic art has come down from the deity to mankind (316): *unde nova ingressus hominum experientia cepit?* The god is Aristaeus (317), and *nova . . . experientia* refers to his discovery. Virgil will probe into the relation between the precedent in myth and its aftermath, the Bugonia, as if from source to result. The words *hanc artem* (315) pick up *hac . . . arte* (294), which precedes the Bugonia (295–314); furthermore, *nova experientia* and *pastor Aristaeus* (317) match the components in *Arcadii memoranda inventa magistri* (283). The shifts in setting from Arcadia to Egypt to Thessaly

⁸³ Klingner (above, note 24) 199 note 2; for the traditions about Aristaeus see L. Malten, *Kyrene* (Berlin 1911) 26; 77–85; E. Norden “Orpheus und Eurydice,” *SB Berl. Ak.* 1934, pp. 644–50 (= *Kl. Schr.* 488–96); R. Coleman, “Gallus, the Bucolics, and the Ending of the Fourth Georgic,” *AJP* 83 (1962) 63–64.

(283; 287; 317 ff.) are not without purpose. The death of Eurydice cannot, from the standpoint of the known legend, occur in Egypt. But when Aristaeus has completed the propitiation (548 ff.), the ritualistic sacrifice owed to Eurydice (547) might be transferred to Egypt, where it could abide as Bugonia. The oldest home for Aristaeus and Cyrene before they went to Egypt was Thessaly; Proteus too had lived near Thessaly before he migrated to Egypt (cf. Servius on 4.387; a reflex at 4.293, *ab Indis*; 425-26). Thus, all in all, a connection between 315-18 and 281-86 is perceptible even if their functions vary. The "whole story" (*omnem . . . famam* 286) commences at 287 and is amplified on (cf. *ut fama* 318) right up to the epilogue at 559-66. With *expediam* (286) Virgil speaks in his own person; he regards the juncture as important.

The transitions both at 287-94 (after the introductory 271-86) and at 315-18 are jarring simply because they are undisguised. The Muses, especially, are decisively appealed to, and since 295-314 and 538-58 are, though interrelated, each distinct, it would be easy to ignore 287-314 as organically necessary and be enticed into thinking that 315-558 is a more important segment, and in fact many scholars have skipped unawares along this path. Occasionally the term *aition* is loosely (and inaccurately) attached to this portion (315 ff.), but mostly it is spoken of as the "Aristaeus epyllion," although "Aristaeus episode" might be more appropriately suited to it. The questions with which Callimachus plies the Muses or his informants in the *Aetia* (cf. fr. 3; 7.19; 79) may mark out transitions for some *aitia* (fr. 43.84-87; 178.21-31), but this stylistic quirk does not establish the Virgilian limits (cf. 315 ff.). The "epyllion," or the short learned poem the Neoterics championed, contains a digression or "story within a story," generally; the utterances Proteus makes to Aristaeus illustrate this feature, and there are other resemblances to the genre.⁸⁴ Nevertheless, the epyllion is normally a finite or individual poem. At Apollonius of Rhodes, 1.1153-1357, the story of Hylas is preceded and concluded by *aitia* (1112-52, cf. 1092 ff.; 1344-57). Prior to Virgil such positioning of *aitia* survives only here, and Virgil's presentation at 271-86 and 287-558 (cf. 315-537) is similar. But the concluding *aition* Apollonius gives is separate in

⁸⁴ See, generally, M. Marjorie Crump, *The Epyllion from Theocritus to Ovid* (Oxford 1931); Wilkinson (above, note 57) 108-20; 325-26.

itself and does not belong to a staggered unit, whereas in Virgil's arrangement the substance of 295-314 and 538-58 has extensively mutual analogy, and it plausibly conjoins the two portions, in spite of the interlude between them. Within smaller *aitia* mythological narrative may be placed between the descriptions of a current practice and its precedent. The portion at 315-537 is essentially myth and it provides the means whereby 295-314 and 538-58 are brought into coherent relation with each other. Lines 287-94 are largely preparatory for 295-314, yet requisite to it. The preface to 287-558 is 271-86 (*flos*; bees from dead oxen). But, though 287-558 as a whole is structured after an *aition*—in effect, actuality (287-314), myth (315-537), and precedent (538-58)—the large central part has characteristics like those admired by the Neoterics in their epyllia. In the story of Hylas at Apollonius of Rhodes, 1.1153 ff., there are motifs ostensibly shared with Virgil. Glaucus (1310 ff.), like Proteus, is a sea-divinity and seer and he plunges into the sea after speaking; Virgil and Apollonius lingeringly depict the diving (528-29; 1326-28), but the corresponding Homeric description is much briefer (*Od.* 4.570). There are no doubt other parallels, such as for example the catalogues of water nymphs, to which amatory themes are appended (1222 ff.; 334 ff.). The Neoterics looked to Apollonius' *Argonautica* for purposes of imitation; thus, let alone others, Catullus 64 (Peleus and Thetis), an epyllion, contains much reminiscence of it. Virgil was acquainted with the work of either poet;⁸⁵ his own narrative at 315-537 has a kinship with the epyllion because, in all probability, his Neoteric ideals had virtually compelled him to adopt motifs from, or smacking of, similar Hellenistic poetry. The resemblance to the epyllion must hence be incidental; his overriding purpose is to delineate an *aition* (287-558), whatever the refurbishments.

Not every type of *aition* finds its exemplification within the *Georgics*, and certainly some of the salient features turn up in other partly related genres, notably the "metamorphosis" and the "catasterismus." Virgil, in fact, could have borrowed from a vast repository of aetiological writings, portions of which of course no longer exist. Additional

⁸⁵ See F. Klingner, "Catullus Peleus-Epos," *SB Bayer. Akad. d. Wiss. Phil.-hist. Kl.* 6 (1956) 6-81 (= *Studien z. griech. u. röm. Lit.* [Zurich 1964] 157-216), especially 72-77 (= 208-212); cf. also P. Händel, "Vergils Aristaeus-Geschichte," *RhM* 105 (1962) 88-91.

illustration is not essential, however, since the *aition*, no matter how intricately complex, is always made up of basic components like those previously discussed, and after Virgil other adaptations or *aitia* do not of themselves prove his reliance on the genre. Yet Virgil constantly stays within the bounds of tradition, notwithstanding his innovations.

In poetry antedating Callimachus some peculiarities of the *aition* are already manifest, but such poetry, though aetiologically flavored, did not (at least when composed) stand for an identifiable device. All the same, *aitia* must sooner or later have grown out of writings of this kind, even if the developmental sequence is not precisely retrievable. The continual references to cult and geography are signs of a long-standing matrix, presumably sacral. In *Iliad* 19.85-139 the name Ate is etymologized (88 ff.) and a mythological justification (95 ff.) is offered for the expelling of the divinity from Olympus. The Homeric *Hymns* also advance similar aetiological statements, though the topics may be more diverse or variegated.⁸⁶ Even historical events may be aetiologically presented, not irrefutably from poetry quoted at first hand. The Delphians, as Herodotus remarks, honored the wind with an altar built in a region named for Thyia, and this veneration was perpetuated thenceforth (7.178).⁸⁷ Several Euripidean tragedies have endings that are much like *aitia*, but despite the latent resemblance these endings mainly serve as strongly rational formulations of the *deus ex machina*.⁸⁸ Antimachus of Colophon gives etymologies for place or cult names, and in the process he may employ dialect words; his other aetiological assertions, too, though rare,

⁸⁶ E.g., *Hom. Hy. Ap.* 382-87; cf. 331-74; 493-96. In *Hom. Hy. Merc.* 24-25; 46-51, the infant Hermes creates a seven-stringed lyre, though not for the sake of the creating itself but as a proof of his cunning and as a conciliatory offering to Apollo (474 ff.); see Kleingünther (above, note 19) 29-30. Callim. *Hy.* 4.249-54 is an *aition* for the seven strings the lyre may have. Here too an earlier event justifies Apollo's later action. Cf. Kleingünther, *ibid.*, 31. For Hesiod's aetiological interest cf. E. Risch, "Namensdeutungen und Worterklärungen bei den ältesten griechischen Dichtern," *Eumusia. Festgabe für E. Howald* (Zurich 1947) 72-79.

⁸⁷ Cf. further in Herodotus: 2.122.1-3, 156.2-6; 3.48.1-4; 4.8.1 to 10.3; 15.2-4; 179.1-3; 5.58.1-3; 67.1 to 68.2; 6.130.1; 7.170; 192.2; 193.1-2; 197.1-4 (from a "local story"); 8.134.2; 9.73; 92.2 to 94.3. Cf. Kleingünther (above, note 19) 46-65; Norden on *Aen.* 6.337 ff., p. 229.

⁸⁸ E.g., *Hipp.* 1416-36; *Supp.* 1196-1226; *HF* 1322-39; *Ion* 1571-1605; *IT* 1446-74; *Hel.* 1662-79; *Or.* 1643-52; cf. Aesch. *Eum.* 681-90; Eur. *Antiope* fr. 48.53-70 Kambitsis; Kleingünther (above, note 19) 93-94.

are comparably tempered.⁸⁹ Once fully evolved, the *aition* often possesses such content. In addition, *aitia* tend to explain with temporal analogies, whereas prior to the Alexandrian era the aetiological presentations incline toward a causal outlook, and the distinction seems to be crucial though each author may interpose his own modifications. Virgil usually holds to generally similar procedures even when his topics are somewhat outlandish (e.g., 3.146–153).

In the *Georgics*, as a rule, Virgil adopts only the characteristic externals of the *aition* as it might or does occur among various Hellenistic poets; the contents placed within this framework must be representative of the *aition*, but they may come from any source befitting Virgil's needs or be structurally arranged to his will. As might be expected, the topics are consistently appropriate to a poem about agriculture. Each also has to do with items whose very existence is necessary for survival. The adaptations, even if stereotyped, are never purely ornamental spangles, and Virgil does not show preference for the obscure and narrowly parochial; he universalizes and transcends the scope of his often conventional or unfocused models. Thus, in one treatment (2.336–42) he suppresses mythological coloring, and the agency by which the creating is effected is all but impersonal. More frequently he broadens the range or the applicability by placing Greek and Roman data side by side, e.g., 2.380–96; 3.146–53; 3.266–83. In the first *Georgic* the origins recounted for the horse (12–14), pacts and mankind (60–63), and plowing (147–49) might loosely be affiliated with *aitia*, while glancing supplementarily at Hesiod (*Theog.* 6 ff.; *Op.* 59 ff., 423 ff., cf. 90 ff.) and perhaps Aratus (cf. 216–21, 96 ff.), Lucretius (cf. 5.925 ff., 910 ff.), and Callimachus (e.g., *Hy.* 6.19 ff.), but in the rest of the *Georgics* the guiding spirits are not so steadfastly apparent.⁹⁰ At any rate, Virgil's aesthetic allegiance is to the Neoteric movement and its Hellenistic norms, an allegiance he previously took up and never

⁸⁹ Cf. fr. 3 W., with the tmesis showing the intention (see also Wyss on fr. 60); fr. 67 (cult); more complicated is fr. 53: Adrastus is said to have "first established an altar" for Nemesis, whose cult name is dealt with; cf. further Callim. fr. 299, with Pfeiffer's comments.

⁹⁰ For the probable source material see J. van Wageningen, *De Vergilii Georgicis* (Diss., Utrecht 1888) 126–42; P. Jahn, "Die Quellen und Muster des ersten Buchs der Georgika Vergils," *RhM* 58 (1903) 395–407; cf. U. Albini, "Struttura e motivi del primo libro delle Georgiche," *SIFC* n.s. 25 (1951) 49–64.

discarded thereafter. In the sixth *Eclogue* (3-9) Virgil alludes to the *Aetia*-prologue (fr. 1.21-24), and with 31-42 (cf. 72) he simulates an *aition*; in the eighth *Eclogue* the same type of collocation recurs (6-13; 24, cf. 2.32-33).⁹¹ Virgil is as yet less willing to utilize natively Roman aetiological material, in comparison, that is, with his acceptance of it within the *Georgics*.⁹² On the other hand, in the *Aeneid* the outer configuration of *aitia* is retained, but the inner substance seems to have become even more decidedly Roman (e.g., 7.761-82). Propertius, too, adopts the Greek trappings, yet his subject matter is altogether indigenously Roman; in the *Fasti* Ovid mostly follows suit, although he also factors in Greek content.⁹³ The adaptations in the *Georgics* already point the way to the subsequent development.

With the disposition or arrangement of the adaptations, moreover, Virgil appears to have pursued a methodical plan, both on a miniature and a larger scale. In each of the four books there are three versions of *aitia*, making a total of twelve in all. Their subject matter (and that of the four books) is perhaps adumbrated in lines 1-12 of the opening proem.⁹⁴ Together, *segetes* and *terram* (1) could associatively refer to 1.12-14 (horse) and 1.60-63 (pacts, mankind), while *segetes . . . terram / vertere* (1-2) and *Ceres—arista* (7-8) might betoken 1.147-49 (plowing). Again, *sidere* at line 1 and *mundi / lumina—annum* at 5-6 might point ahead to 2.336-42 (universe). Both *vitis* (2) and Liber's gift of wine (7; 9) could take notice of 2.380-96 (sacrificing of goats; drama). The terms *Fauni* and *Dryades* (10-11), as symbols of the Golden age, could be pertinent to 2.536-40 (war-trumpet; making of swords).⁹⁵

⁹¹ Cf. Pfeiffer (above, note 13) 115 (= 322); *λεπταλέος* can mean "shrill" sounding or "sheer" of weave (cf. Callim. *Hy.* 3.242-43; fr. 383.15; *Anth. Pal.* 6.174.2; Pfeiffer (above, note 55) 137, and on fr. 532; Virgil's *deductum carmen* denotes "finely woven" while hinting at *Camenae* (differently 8 and 71; cf. *Ecl.* 10.70-72; 3.59-61; 84-85); see further Wimmel (above, note 13) 132-47; J. Vahlen, *Opusc. Acad.* I (Leipzig 1907) 388-92; K. Büchner s.v. "P. Vergilius Maro," *RE* 8A (1955) 1229-30; cf. also 1219-20.

⁹² Cf. C. Hardie, *The Georgics: a Transitional Poem* (Abingdon-on-Thames 1971) 14-31.

⁹³ Ries (above, note 8) 7-8; cf. *Ov. Fasti* 4.61-132; cf. L. Malten "Aus den Aitia des Kallimachos," *Hermes* 53 (1918) 174-79.

⁹⁴ Lines 5-12 of the first book restate the announcement of subject matter at 1-4. Lines 12-20 again restate the subject matter completely if the allusion to Aristaeus (14-15) is allotted to the fourth book; cf. Engelke (above, note 32) 50-51; Richter 118-19.

⁹⁵ At *Aen.* 8.314-27, simple food is eaten by the Fauns and Nymphs; Saturn, "fleeing the weapons of Jupiter," settles among them and gives laws (322), and the age of Gold ensues (324-25); the next age brings war and rapine (326-27). Cf. Richter 117-18.

At 1.3-4 *boum* and *pecori* might be reflective of 3.146-53 (gadfly) and 3.113-17 (chariots; trained warhorse) and 3.266-83 (*furor equarum*). At 1.4 *apibus* could give an inkling of 4.149-52 (nature of bees; Curetes) and 4.271-86 (*flos*; bees) and 4.287-558 (Bugonia).

Even if the twelve instances were anticipated in the opening lines by coincidence, the symmetrical ordering can hardly be adventitious. The versions are each imbued with major themes treated in the *Georgics*: cycles of growth, toil, sport, life, death, and love. In each book each series of three encompasses a shift from pristine ease to hardship. In a twinkling the powerful Neptune brings forth the horse; man must till the soil because of want. At mankind's creation, springtime was constant; the Golden age is succeeded by war-trumpet and swords. Erichthonius guides his chariot to victory; Glaucus is devoured by his frenzied mares. Bees feed Jupiter and he grants them enduring capabilities; mankind must seek to resuscitate bees from slain oxen. The shift is also apparent within the versions themselves, internally, since each finishes on a note of toil. Further, in each book the content in its entirety shades off from relative effortlessness to adversity, and the four series and the individual versions blend into and repeat the rhythmic alternation. The idea that discoveries go hand in hand with increased burdens is Hesiodic (*Op.* 90 ff.), as Virgil himself undoubtedly knew; yet within *aitia* it is rare, although Virgil resorts to it systematically. There even seems to be ironical counterpointing of the adaptations or of Virgil's overall intention. Besides the Glaucus at 3.266 ff., another, the sea-god, is mentioned at 1.437; horses, too, may be "greyish" or *glauca* (3.82), and a runaway chariot is elsewhere a motif (1.512-14; cf. 4.147-48). At 2.371 ff., grazing animals damage the vine; goats are consequently offered to Bacchus, and Virgil's exposition (380 ff.) presupposes the discovery of wine (cf. *pocula laeti* 383). Much in the same vein is 3.349 ff.; the Northern Scythians must break their frozen wine-jugs apart with an ax; the herds are overwhelmed by the cold; deer are immobilized in the heavy snows and they can be slaughtered without effort; whole elm trees are rolled onto the hearths; during the night the Scythians "joyfully revel and wine-cups are mimicked with sour beer" (379-80). Even though *origo* can often translate *αἰτίον* (cf. *Ecl.* 6.72), it has a different meaning in the *Georgics*; nevertheless, the term crops up in bizarre places, within 2.336-42

(336), immediately after 3.113-17 (122), and within 4.271-86 (286), and Virgil might be toying with the technical sense. In addition, each series is clustered within the first or second half of each book, and each group is contiguous to references either to the poet's arduous efforts at composing his work or to travel-imagery, not necessarily directly Callimachean (1.40-42, cf. 1.1-5; 2.541-42; 3.284-94; 4.116-48, cf. 4.559-66). But irony of this sort is parenthetical to the several versions.⁹⁶ They themselves are grim and of a far-reaching import. They tell of activities that sustain existence, and they express the inevitability of human travail. In the sequential arrangement by theme Virgil differs from his predecessors. Their *aitia* are seldom integrally related either to important motifs of the poem in which they are included or to each other as vehicles that might cumulatively reinforce a poet's message. Virgil's *Georgics* thus might be thought of as being profoundly oriented toward the *aition*.⁹⁷

⁹⁶ Cf. 1.338-50, combining an unusual dancing ceremony in honor of Ceres with possible punning (*Cereri . . . quercu / . . . carmina* 349-50); cf. E. Burck, "Die Komposition von Vergils Georgika," *Hermes* 64 (1929) 302. 1.118-159 (147-49) and 2.495-540 (536-40) are roughly alike. Mere benefactions do not always betoken *aitia*; cf. 1.351 ff.; Richter 50.

⁹⁷ Cf. Hardie (above, note 92) 5; 11-14.