Philology and dresses share the tendency to follow fashion; at the moment Germanicus seems to be fashionable: after Peter Steinmetz' excellent article and W. Ludwig's reply to it a commentary on Germanicus was announced by me, without too much hope, however, that such an announcement would be taken notice of; a French edition and an English one with numerous notes appeared; and in 1975 I wrote an article on Ophiuchus in Germanicus.

The aim of the present article is firstly to show that the abovementioned editions are merely superficial, and secondly to demonstrate how a commentary should in my opinion, be written: that is, with the aim of understanding the author's intentions and methods. Besides, something has to be done in order to attain once again the high level of interpretation reached by P. Steinmetz, not to mention the splendid work done by M. Erren for the understanding of Aratus. The following remarks are meant to point in that direction.

PART ONE.

I

V. 393 erecta torquet qua spicula cauda: the tail is raised and the sting is 'turned', apparently forward, in order to sting. Germanicus is not entirely correct
astronomically,9 but the image thus presented may have been what he had in mind; so he 'arranged' the stars a little. *Spicula* was actually the tip of a missile (Cic. fam. 5,12,5 Purser and Moricca), but Vergil used it of the sting of a bee (Ge. 4,327) and Ovid of the Scorpion's sting.10 In other words: G(ermanicus) uses a very modern twist of the word's meaning. *Torquet*: Torqueo is normally a horizontal movement (left, right or in a circle), but the meaning 'hurl' presupposes a vertical movement (Cic. de or. 1, 242 and passim). By using *Torqueo spicula* G. depicts the sting as a missile hurled against the enemy. *Qua*: in the fourth place as in 204.

V. 394 *turibulum*: Vitruvius (9,5,1) seems to have been the first to use this translation of the Greek θυμιατήριον. G. adopts this expression in order to introduce a novelty (Cicero: *Ara*); to follow Aratus as nearly as possible may have been a minor motivation. For such altars see G. Thiele, Antike Himmelsbilder (Berlin 1898), 126 sq. *Vicinum austris*: this is almost a verbal translation of δ'γ'χι νότου, 404. *Austris*: the plural for the region of this wind was, for G., a modernism (Vergil and Ovid., fast. 5,381; see Tües. L.L. 2,1555,53; 1556, 34 sqq.). *Sacro igne*: G. dropped Aratus' αἰθόμενοι in favour of the sanctity, for him the stars are deities, cf. 165, etc.)11 *Videbis*: G. was very free with the expression of demonstration of which Aratus had been so fond (Erren, Die Phain. 126 sqq.); at times he drops it (89, 97, 142, etc.), at times he introduces it (147 e.g.), on the whole using fewer formulas of this sort than his model. This may seem trifling, yet it shows that G. had different aims.12

V. 395 *Arcturum contra*: the postposition had been a common device since Lucretius (6, 715, etc., Thes.L.L.4,751,61 sqq.). The origin was the postposition behind a pronoun (Leumann-Hoffmann-Szantyr, Latein, Grammat. 2,229), as we find in Cicero. The postposition after a noun was, then, an innovation (see Verg. Aen. 1, 13). The actual meaning of *contra* (translating Aratus' δυνατόν προς, 405) is that the altar 'ebenso weit südlich des Aquators steht wie der Arktur nördlich':13 G. left Aratus' slightly enigmatic formulation dark (a cirumscription would perhaps have been too long and clumsy); in other places, it is true, he explains similarly enigmatic expressions (cp. 78,90 sqq., 141 sqq.).

V. 395 *sed quanto tardius . . . tanto magis*: the actual words say this: 'The more slowly Arcturus touches the horizon in setting, the closer to each other are the turning posts of the altar'. *Tardus* and *tangere*, a word of motion and a word of action (without local movement) seem to exclude each other. One has, therefore, to add the connotation of reluctance and of 'slowing-down' to *tardus,*

---

10. Fast. 5, 542 *fuit impetus illi curva gemelliparae spicula ferre deae*, where Frazer (Loeb edition) as well as Boemer understand that the *spicula* means the 'fangs'; incorrectly, I believe.
12. Cp. Ar. 157 sqq. with G. 157 sq.; Ar. 168 with G. 174; Ar. 198 with G. 201, etc.
13. Erren, Die Phain. 66, cf. also Hipp. 1, 8, 14 sq. who gives a very clear account of the fact.
itself placed in a poetically pleasant contrast to tangere. Arcturus is, then, 'slow in touching' the horizon.—Arta, however, has narrow turning-posts; of course, G. does not mean the turning points of the orbit, he indicates just the two points on the horizon, 'puncta ἁνταλλικῶν et δυτικῶν, quae in Horizonte imaginamur' (Grotius). There is, therefore, another pleasant contrast, that of slow motion and narrow distance, modified, of course, by the common connotation of setting and rising. Tanto et: Le Boeuffe does not even mention Grotius’ deletion; he elegantly glosses over the strange et in his translation. Gain deleted the copula which means, in his opinion: ‘The slower Arcturus sets, the quicker the Altar does’ which seems to be nonsense. Strangely enough, neither Le Boeuffe nor Gain consulted Thes. L.L. 5,2; 914, 16 where there are some passages that lead one to wonder, whether et should not be kept (the Thes. even calls this usage ‘frequent’).

V. 396 sq.: artae . . . metae: artus is ‘limited in space’ and ‘pressed together’ the second meaning being, as it seems, the older one.14 It was Lucretius who supplanted the too common angustus by the transferred us of artus. Artae metae is a striking innovation: Ovid (trist. 1,10,47) had called the Symplegades so, and G. followed suit.

V. 397 sq.: vix . . . et iam: this is an emphatic variation of Vergil’s dixerat . . . , et iam (Aen. 2,705) by means of vix. This is the first instance in Latin apart from Aetna 613 (vixdum): another modernism.15 Caelum suspicit: an ultimately Ennian expression, but it had later become almost commonplace. Normally it was said of a man looking up; here it is used of a constellation: a slight personification to strengthen the impression of suffering.16

V. 398: tractu: Lucretius had already described the way across the sky by tractus (2,207). The word approaches the meaning ‘path’ (Bömer on Ov. met. 2, 320, p. 322 above). Praeceps: a gross exaggeration for the gentle wandering of this constellation. G. strove for expressions of violent motion, of pathos. It was J. C. Schwartz, Carmina et Fragmenta Familiae Caesareae, etc.17 who on p. 83 introduced the obvious correction demittitur; he was followed in Chr. F. Schmid’s edition (Lüneburg 1728, v.395) and others, a commonplace corruption.18 Vastis: an addition giving momentum to the pathetic description. The dative of direction was an Augustan invention (Leumann-Hofm.-Sz. p. 100).

16. Ad rem cf. Ovid., met. 2, 139. One is reminded of the immatura mors topic.
17. Grossly misquoted by Le Boeufle p. LIV. For the persons see e.g. Zedler 35, 1937 sqq., resp. 367 sqq.
18. Thes. L.L. 5, 1; 488, 41 and 1207, 54.
For Aratus the sting is burning and the Scorpion is a τερπας μεγας,\(^{19}\) 402. In 84 it had been μεγας θηριον. Τερπας it is because of its size, its dangerous character and also because it indicates the month that brings toil and danger for the seafarer; all these connotations were eliminated by G. Possibly he did not want to spoil the favourable impression created by the account of Turibulum; there should not be a dangerous monster in the sky.

Aratus had introduced a fine contrast: Thyterion is far down south, yet it αιωρηται (which should not be glossed over as is often done; the oxymoron-like expression is typical of Aratus). This sign can be discerned although it raises itself from below the horizon for but a short while every night. 'Ολιγων is stressed by the μεν pendens, the γάρ therefore naturally links up with the genit. absol. clause: Thyterion is ‘opposite’ Arcturus. And this suggests that he circles high up in the sky and is therefore visible for a long time whereas Thyterion ‘dives quickly into the evening sea’. Here we see once again the postponement of the main noun that gives so much homely simplicity\(^{20}\) to the language of Aratus.\(^21\) In Aratus the passage ends without a great deal of pathos; it closes with a μεν—δε disjunction that does not allow of a tertium and is, therefore, suitable for a fermata. But despite the syntactical simplicity and the deliberate lack of much emotion a very refined homericism adds charm to the close of this passage: ὑπὸ ζῷον νῖκομαι; in II. 23, 51 is changed to ὅφει... ἄλα νεῖται, and in addition we find an appealing enallage (ὑπερπην).\(^{22}\)

If we look back we find another embellishing feature: the apparent incongruity of μετήριον κέλευθοι\(^{23}\) set against θάσον: a little thought is necessary before it is seen that being ‘high up’ means extended visibility whereas θάσον implies limited visibility. A. was not obtrusive in the adornment of his language. G. was far ‘louder’, but it must be stressed that he managed to render Aratus’ contrast between Arcturus and the Altar equally well and equally as charmingly as the model itself; we shall have to assess his endeavour to add much pathos to the end of the passage a little later.—There is really nothing in the recent editions that has any bearing on the explanation of the text beyond its surface meaning. Gain’s translation has eliminated much of the vigour of Germanicus’ close of the passage, although he calls G.’s sea (vastis) ‘immense, seething’: the latter is a quite unnecessary addition.

---

19. ‘Burning’ and ‘huge’ are meant to indicate that this constellation is easy to discern (Erren, Die Phain. 70, note 1).
21. Cp. v. 85, 173, 234, 242, 283, etc.
22. Cp. e.g. the ἴσπεριται δεδομένη in Pind. Pyth. 3, 19.
23. Nat. deor. 2, 95 and 98; I do not think that Pease (p. 787 above) hits the nail on the head (‘the result of thought’), cp. the combination of cerius and ratus in 2, 97.
III

Germanicus v. 399–413.

V. 399 natura: in Aratus it was Nyx who established the rata signa (408); she had been a poetical substitute, one may argue, for the real donor of eternal signs, Zeus. G. replaces his model's personal deities by the impersonal natura. We shall deal with this later; it may suffice at present to say that this substitution avoids the impression that the heavenly region has more than one ruler. Rata signa: ratus, said of the paths of the stars, occurs also in Cicero. The word has not been translated by Le Boeuffle ('sure signs', Gain correctly).

V. 400 notis cladem depellere: nota for signum seems to have been rather rare (Ov. met. 11, 466 dantem sibi signa maritum / prima videt redditiique notas, where signa and notae must be almost identical; see also Cic. Arat. 346): G. avails himself of this novelty, as he ventured a calida iunctura when he said cladem depellere, for which there is no parallel in the dictionaries. It is strange to see in Thes. L.L. 3, 1245 that clades was apparently rather rarely coupled with a word meaning 'avert' (Cic. carm. fr. 3,59 vitare is almost the only instance). G.'s expression must have been extremely innovative. Suasit: 'persuaded', Gain 64; 'advised' seems to be better, because 'persuade' leads us to presuppose a process of talking, insinuating, prompting that is quite alien to G.'s thought here. The signs cannot advise one to avoid a clades 'that is coming': if the disaster is inevitable (and this is implied by the fut. partic. one cannot do anything; what is meant is that the natural phenomenon (storm) with all its detrimental effects must be avoided:24 the storm will come, but man can do something about it, he can prepare to avoid its detrimental effects.

V. 401: certa . . . cavenda: the third expression for 'sign' within three verses; cavenda seems to be the substantive (Thes. L.L. 3,632,8) in the sense of evitanda as in v. 13 (Thes. L.L. 1,c.57).

V. 402: sordebut: as in 211 it means 'to be dark', see Plaut. Poen. 1179 and esp. Enk on Truc. 381. This word came to mean 'obscure' and 'dark', cf. Sen. nat. qu. 1,12,2 nubes sordidae; Stat. Silv. 4,8,39. Cetera caeli: the neuter of an adj. used as a substantive and coupled with a genitive was a fashion with the Augustans; cetera in this sense, however, seems to have been rare (Thes. L.L. 3,969,6).

V. 403: obductis: cp. Verg. Aen. 2,604; this, too seems to be a fairly modern expression (Thes. L.L. 9,2; 39,76).

V. 404: pacem . . . solvat: solvo in this combination is not paralleled in the dictionaries. Vitam solvere, metum solvere however are not uncommon in poetry. G. used the direct opposite to pacem componere, etc. Pacem turbare is in Tac. ann. 12,65, leges solvo is quite common, pacem solvere seems a novelty. Violentiur: 'stronger than normal' may be the meaning; for such comparatives

24. Gain's 'pressing upon him' oversimplifies; the full meaning of the fut. partic. should be brought out.
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see Leum.-Hofm.-Sz. § 100, b on p. 168; see further p. 162 which stands in direct contrast to H. Fraenkel, Grammatik und Sprachwirklichkeit (München 1974), 453: there is still scope for another inquiry. It may suffice to say that these comparatives were not too frequent and apparently for G. even a modernism.

V. 405: siccentur: Grotius' ingenious conjecture spissentur ('thickened by the sail bound around it', Gain) has been adopted by Housman (Cl. Rev. 14, 1900,32), Le Beufulle, Gain. It does not seem to be omnibus numeris absolutum. For firstly, the meaning is a little strained, and secondly, the conjecture entails a transposition (circumpectly put by Gain in a very good note). Serventur, figantur, demantur and the like may be alternatives. But is siccentur really so bad? The yard-arms may, indeed, dry when the sails are bound to them (and when they have, so to speak, a rest): this meaning is no more strained than that of spissentur. Substricto: Gain's commentary in which he quotes Sil.1,689 is entirely correct. In passing I may mention that the reading of the Vossianus is indeed substricto, as Breysig had said and as Gain says, and not substricto as Baehrens and Le Bouffle printed in their apparatus. Cornua: actually the ends of the yard-arms, but already Horace (epo. 16,59, see Heinze) had used it to mean the whole yard-arm; so had Ov. met. 11,482: G. avails himself of a rare modernism.

V. 406: emittant: for transmittand; Thes. L.L. 5,2; 510, 19 sq. (where read 'Sen. a.q.1,12,2') quotes only the single passage from Seneca: a very audacious use. Per inane: this expression of course makes sense (per spatia vacua postquam vela remota sunt); but it is by no means arresting; rather, it lacks any visual impact. Incubuit...sinu laxo: normally incumbo takes in with accus.; here the dative renders the word more subtle. The sense too is somewhat exceptional (Thes. L.L. 5,1; 1074,73: Verg. Aen.1,84) and rather modern it would seem.

V. 409: sorbet: as if the ship would set itself to drink the water. This usage seems an innovation, but it is more important to note the touch of grim irony, especially since the word is coupled with inimicum: the ship sucks in its own enemy. Cf. Val.Flacc. 1,637 sq. Nerea: as a metonymy for 'sea' since [Tib.] 3,7,58 (see Bömer on Ov. met. 1,187: imitation of Callimachus). G. uses a choice and rare circumscription of a very modern character.

V. 410: Si: for etiamsi, see Leum.-Hofm.-Sz. § 370. Servator: in Greece, a Zeus Sotér was well known (Nilsson, Griech. Relig. 12, 414 sqq.). In Rome no Jupiter Servator ever had a cult or a temple; the only witness as to te name is CIL 9, 4852, but the text is lacking in authenticity; it was reported to have been seen, and Mommsen, who ultimately persuaded himself that it was genuine, still uttered well-founded doubts. Pliny attributes a temple in Piraeus to Jupiter Servator, but this is a mere translation of Sotér. Conservator was the name of Jupiter who was honoured by a temple on the Capitol, but as late as Domitian. Servator then is a non-typical denomination coined here as a characterisation, not as a ritual name.

V. 411: ultima . . . vota: the storm-tossed sailors are scarcely able to fulfil their vota; they are scarcely granted the opportunity; this stands for the simple 'they scarcely reach land' (for ultima vota Gain aptly points to Ov. pont. 4, 14, 5 sq. G. imitates Aratus' technique of expressing something obvious by something very particular and in a very skilful way.

V. 412: metus . . . fugit: no parallel in Thes. L. L. 8, a very strong synonym for 'leave'. This is an example of the application of an over-strong word in such a way that it loses its usual strong connotation (that of fleeing headlong) and retains only the basic notion of 'going away' (Thes. L. L. 6, 1; 1483, 75 sqq., esp. 1484, 44 sqq.; cp. also Horace's fuge quaerere).

V. 412: pars: ea is omitted, a rare and audacious ellipse; see Leum.-Hofm.-Sz. p. 556, γ, where only two passages from Seneca are quoted, and those not without some doubt; this passage therefore offers a valuable corroboration. Effulserit: I believe that there is something of an ingressive connotation to this word (as in Livy 22, 1, 11; Sen. n. q. 2, 59, 11). Gain's 'is visible' is, perhaps, not specific enough; Le Boeuffe's 'avant de voir fulminer la partie du ciel' strains to bring in Aratus' ἀντράγη, 427, but without much success. There is no indication of lightning flashes in this word. Orbis: for sky as in Ov. am. 1, 8, 10; Prop. 4, 9, 37: a very rare extension of use, and very modern too.

IV

Aratus, v. 408–430.

Normally G. tries to write as many verses on a subject as Aratus had done; here Aratus had written 23, G. writes only 15:26 there must be very specific reasons why G. refrained from equalling the number of Aratus' verses. (It is difficult to understand why neither Gain nor Le Boeuffe pays any attention to Aratus and the differences between the two authors).

'Ancient night'27 weeps28 because of man's toil; shipwreck is not what she looks for—one should not try to solve logically the riddle that here it is Nyx that sets up the signs, whereas at the beginning of the poem it was Zeus;29 it may be that these deities (Nyx as well as Dike) feel pity for man, although mankind is so

26. V. 393–413 are not 'onze vers' (Le Boeuffe on p. 65, note 10 on 'page 27' which must be changed to 'page 26'). This is all he has to tell the interested reader about the vast differences between the two authors.

27. Cf. Hes. theog. 20, 107, 211, etc., see Erren, Die Phain. 67.

28. Already Aristophanes used κλῖεια in a weakened sense (Plut. 612), it may well be that 'weeps' is too strong here. ἀπὸ ὕπαινος is a variation of the well-known phrase ἀπὸ ὕμιμος (see e.g. Martin p. 62).

29. Erren, Die Phain. correctly warns that logic should not be strained here.
depraved. Nyx is not evil as she had been in Hesiod (δλονή); she has human emotions and 'shows forth' signs that help the sailor.\textsuperscript{30} Nobody should, however, wish that anyone should be out on the sea (see Hes. op. 369) when the rest of the sky is clouded and only the altar shines brightly,\textsuperscript{31} 'oppressed' by heavy clouds,\textsuperscript{32} in the same way in which the autumn-storm drives the clouds before it. This means that when the storm starts blowing from the south that part of the horizon will be cleared and will therefore show forth Thyterion. This is the sign for the onset of the gale.

This, then is all that Nyx can do for mankind; what is the reaction on the part of man? He should obey and cast overboard whatever encumbers the ship; he should furl the sails. Because, if the storm hits the ship and the skipper is unprepared it will 'disturb' (almost a euphemism) the sails, and the crew may well continue their voyage under water—an ironical touch meant to alleviate the gruesome intimation of shipwreck.\textsuperscript{33} If, by chance, it so happens that Zeus 'passes by' the crew may get off with a fright and, only after hard work, it may reach land after the horizon has brightened in the north.\textsuperscript{34} This concept of 'reaching land' Aratus found too commonplace; he offered a circumlocution for the fact that the crew was saved by saying 'they can see each other again' (i.e. after the preceding darkness): he expresses something obvious in a very particular way.\textsuperscript{35}

The meaning of all this has been correctly explained by Erren p. 70 sqq.: the divine powers, limited in their freedom, grant signs, and man must obey; more the gods cannot do according to the Stoic doctrine.\textsuperscript{36} In other words: Aratus does no less here than proffer his opinion on suffering and its justification, i.e. his theodicy. In this light Zeus 'that passes by' seems a circumlocution for the sky that brightens; but this is no proof of Aratus' belief that prayers bring Zeus near to those who pray: nature cannot be guided; its effects come, but the deities have set up signs that help man to recognise what is to happen and to prepare himself for it.

\textsuperscript{30} For πιστάσω in this sense see Aesch. Pers. 662, where the scholia explain by δικτύωκα (a epic word, transferred into tragedy by Aeschylus only; see Frenkel on Ag. 23).

\textsuperscript{31} Not 'in the middle of the sky', as Cicero was to understand (p. 131 at n. 44), but amidst the clouds in the sky.

\textsuperscript{32} Πέλαγος and θλίβομαι occur equally near to each other at the beginning of Aristophanes' Ranœ: is this mere accident or did this allusion help in creating an ironical atmosphere counterbalancing the horrible?

\textsuperscript{33} This point was rightly stressed by Erren 72.

\textsuperscript{34} Erren, Die Phain. 73 rightly stresses the fact that there is a good deal of good luck involved and that praying does not help at all. I prefer to translate ἀπράση as 'brightens' instead of 'if there should be lightnings', because there is no point in stating that there is a thunderstorm in the north. I prefer to think of one of those usages in which connotation is dropped and only the basic meaning retained (here that of brightness). But I may be wrong.

\textsuperscript{35} Ὄτιδω is a Hellenistic derivation from the tragic ὄτλως. A very rare and choice expression that should be relished. Martin 65 thinks that 'βορέαν ἀντίμοιο ν'est qu'une localisation géographique'; he is (I think) not entirely correct, I have given my reason above.

\textsuperscript{36} Cleanth., Hymn. in Jovem 17 sqq., cp. also Sen. prov., ch. 6.
Germanicus and Aratus.

Certainly, G.'s text reflects many of Aratus' formulations, often masked: ἀρτια, v. 421 is reflected by ῥίγη v. 406; ὀπίσθεν (407) contains ἀπρόφεατος (42437). But here the problem appears: ἀπρόφεατος stems from the idea that Nyx 'tells beforehand', and this whole complex of Nyx being moved, feeling pity, etc. has been dropped by G. For all this he substitutes natura whose only 'human' feature is that the suasit homini (the motives being left unmentioned). In other words, G. discards Aratus' theodicy altogether. There is no anthropomorphic deity (suasit should not be over-emphasised). In the same way G. has done away with Dike's human emotions.38 For G., then, the relationship between god and man is far more factual.

On the other hand, this elimination of the Stoic viewpoint is compensated for by the introduction of a Juppiter servator: Jupiter is accessible to prayers (see respexit, 410) and saves the sailor, not however without severe punishment.39 This one may call a return to the traditional religion, in this case to the accepted Roman thinking.

These observations point to a difference between the two authors so deep and fundamental that one wonders how on earth Gain and Le Boeuffle could fall short so far of the standard achieved by Erren and Steinmetz.

There is furthermore not a single indication in these commentaries of how far the Greek and Roman authors differ in form. Aratus begins at once with the description of his Thyeton (408) whereas G. starts with general introductions: nature gave signs of salus (the northwind and the light in its region, 413) and advised man to avert disaster (which points to the storm in the south). Only now the particulars come, and in a chiastic form: first the south-wind, at the end the brightening in the north. This technique is so typical of G. that one should have expected Le Boeuffle and Gain to perceive it at least in part.40 Further, Aratus had formed a circle-structure around Nyx, v. 408–10 corresponding with 418 sq., G. discarded this, too: obviously because he did not intend to stress natura's character in the same way as Aratus had done.

In Aratus followed the strange 'Inkonznitität der Antithese' which G. avoided by saying: 'if the Altar appears amid heavy clouds, timeto', etc. This is a

37. ἀπρόφεατος is very strange: 'if the skipper obeys' should actually be continued by an 'if he disobeys'; instead we read 'if Nyx had not foretold'. This means that Aratus replaced the obvious 'in case of disobedience' by a description of what would happen if there were no signs; now there are signs, and all this need not happen—a little involved, but Aratus is prone to such startling inconsistencies. Erren 71 mentions the 'Inkonznitität der Antithese' without offering any solution.

38. This may be implied in P. Steinmetz' expression on p. 459 'ein warmer Schimmer'. Otherwise this observation should be added to his very apt remarks.

39. The idea of punishment is clearly visible in G., see Steinmetz 473–5 and 477, where he often speaks about 'Strafe'.

40. See v. 76, 82, 160, 205, 295, etc.
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further characteristic of G.: he at times tends to make things far clearer and simpler. He placed, e.g. the general ‘introductory’ *mergitur* before his audacious description of how the ship ‘sucks in its enemy’ and he explained the actual significance of that brightening in the north: *borean . . . ortum* (413). And he explains why the ship will ‘drink Nereus’: it will become *prona*. Yet he ably imitates Aratus’ enigmatic41 style: the crew can make its sacrifices, can fulfil the *vota*, which is a way of saying: ‘they will ultimately reach the land’. G. replaces the obvious, as Aratus had done, by a very particular instance of what is to happen. He even tried, as it seems, to imitate Aratus’ touch of irony, if there is indeed any irony in the ‘drinking of the hostile Nereus’. And this leads us to the last characteristic of G., his attempts to introduce a little erudition into the *Phaenomena: Nereus* for ‘sea’ was a very choice metonymy and displays the *doctus labor* (see v. 3).

But of course, G. here and there admittedly falls a little short of his model’s qualities: the *pacem pelagi solvere* smacks of rhetoric and lacks any visual reality, as does *per inane* (405).

Before casting a quick glance at Cicero’s translation one final question should be raised: why did G. who elsewhere is so inclined to introduce *pathos* into his verses exercise so much restraint here: is this not a magnificent opportunity of describing a sea-storm with all the colours at his disposal? Indeed it is, but G. had done this about a hundred verses before, and so he here leaves much unsaid: this shows his keen sense of economy.

Now at last we can answer the question raised at the beginning of this chapter (namely, why G. shortened the text): he used 15 verses to translate 23 because the sea-storm had been described before and because he eliminated the entire theodicy.

VI

In order to gain the proper perspective let us quickly glance at Cicero: he follows Aratus very closely at the beginning, but soon inflates his text considerably: the *spiritus Austri* ‘caresses’ the Altar with its *flatus*; *spiritus—flatus* is a somewhat redundant combination, and the caressing is nothing but a vain attempt to say picturesquely what Aratus had left factual; what a gross blunder! Besides, this *permulcere* presents in far too gentle a light *Auster* soon to be called ‘horrible’ (see 195, 198 sqq.).

In a similar way Cicero changes Aratus’ ‘the Altar is above the horizon for a short while’ to ‘it is swimming through the lights of the gods for a short while only’: he stresses the movement by adding much colour to it although it is not

41. Erren, Die Phain. 43 called this ‘verräteln’ (‘enigmatizing’). There are many instances of this tendency, in phrases as well as in single words which a future commentator should follow up meticulously.
the fact that *Ara* wanders that matters, but the extent of *time*: his addition is redundant. I do not intend to dwell upon the *otiose procul* or the ugly repetition of *in . . . parte* (v. 186, 188), but to draw the attention to yet another expansion of the kind mentioned: Night 'visits these parts during her eternal route' (189) and gives signs 'that any of the skippers can notice'; once again the stress is laid on unimportant aspects, on *συμβεβηκότα*. And why *undique casus* (191)? This is merely an expansion. But is, e.g. *πολυρροθίον* in *Aratus* (412) not a purely characterising epithet and therefore dispensable too? Certainly not, because it limits to the horrors of shipwreck the pity Nyx feels (she does not deal with disasters on the land), and besides, *Aratus* applies the word transferred from Homer by Aeschylus, with a twist of its meaning in a more Homeric way; this is an aim in itself and adds to the poetical quality of the translation.43

To be sure, G. had also expanded *Aratus*’ text (he painted a picture of Scorpio’s tail and sting, he called the sky ‘holy’, he added many general sentences and words to clarify the text), but G. never displayed the bad taste of his forerunner. Take e.g. the expansion at the end of the first passage, v. 396 sqq.: he adds *pathos*, it is true; but this *pathos* contains a personification that is fundamental to G.’s program (since he applies this principle throughout his text), a program that is far more reasonable than Cicero’s constant attempts merely to puff up the text at random. And besides, G.’s image here is skilful whereas Cicero’s language creates the impression of unpolished clumsiness.

Clumsiness; but here and there one finds blunders that have the quality of howlers: e.g. *sub medii caele regione*, v. 193, makes the Altar appear high up in the sky.44 One could continue in this way indefinitely;45 but let us reach some conclusions.

VII

There was nothing particularly striking about *Aratus*’ first six verses, apart perhaps from the pleasing, seemingly incoherent contrast in v. 406 sq. (‘high up—swifter’). M. Erren spoke about a ‘sachlich mitteilender Ton’ (67). *Aratus* used these verses as a preparation keeping the tension low, the language and imagery simple in order to be able to rise *ex interval/ a* (Sen. ep. 46). Now he raises the curtain and shows with a grand gesture—Hesiod’s *Nyx*, but—behold! —a completely changed one. And now, with images vivid and yet restrained,

42. I do not see any necessity for accepting Buescu’s transposition in v. 190, nor, in fact, does Traglia.
43. See Sept. 7 and D. van Nes. Die maritime Bildersprache des Aeschylus. Groningen 1963, 47.
44. See Buescu’s note 7 on p. 220. Already G. Sieg. De Cicerone, Germanico Avieno Arati Interpretibus, Diss. Halle 1886, 10 had noticed the mistake: ‘cum Aratus divers velit “mediis in nubibus”, etc.’.
45. V. 200 sq. contains amusing absurdities; firstly, *Aeg* cannot calm the storm; and secondly, it is not the Altar that chases away the clouds. What a ridiculous ‘translation’!
with irony counterbalancing the terrible, he describes the toil of man at sea, a description that is no less than a theodicy.

Cicero retains, it is true, the fiction of Nyx setting signs in commiseration, but he does not imitate the gently ascending course of Aratus; he plunges headlong into every kind of extravagance puffing up the text with unnecessary details that stress unimportant side-issues. He omits Aratus' idea of prayers being of no avail; whether deliberately or not, I cannot say. But it seems that he wished to purge the text of Aratus of all unpleasant philosophumena; he discards the deities and their emotions, he drops the inherent discussion of prayers; to him the sky and nature are as factual and 'natural' as to G. Besides, he stuffs his lines with errors.

G. is far more conscientious. He begins with a painting that had not been in Aratus (Scorpio): there is danger, Scorpio aims at Orion (the story will be told only afterwards v. 644 sqq.). Yet the sky is sacred and holy (besides, the attack of the scorpion too is nothing but punishment). For G., the sky is sacrosanct, there is e.g. no 'dust' up there (see Ar. 253) and there are no human feelings. What there is in respect of features known to mortals, is fides and iustitia (cf. 33, 200, 137). He does away with Aratus's anthropomorphism, but he compensates for this by a personification of the pitiable Altar that must so soon vanish; G. adds pathos here as he has done in the case of Scorpio. Since the sky is holy and iustitia governs small wonder that he introduces the un-Aratean concept of a Jupiter servator, a complete reversal of Aratus' theology.

As to the form, G. changes the circular structure because he has no intention of stressing the attitude of Nyx that had been emphasised by Aratus' arrangement. He replaces this structural finesse by another: the two general sentences in 399 sq. stand in a chiastic relationship to the details that follow. He did away with Aratus' theology and he restricted himself to a restrained description of the storm because he had given a highly pathetic one before; this, and the fact that G. dwells upon the rudentes while Aratus and Cicero had paid more attention to the sails (although G. mentions them too), shows his sense of economy.

G. explains Aratus here and there by introducing general remarks and orientating words, but he also strives for a truly congenial translation when he imitates Aratus's irony and his replacement of the obvious by the particular.

In this way we are led towards an understanding of G.'s program; it consisted, as far as we have hitherto been able to see, in adding pathos where it was suitable: in elucidating (and correcting) his model; and all this by means of a deliberately modern and not too grand language; he avoided Vergil's lofty style without shunning modest Vergilianisms.
PART TWO.

1

Aratus, with one of his smooth transitions, glides over to Centaurus. 'If his shoulder is in the middle of its (his) path from the point of rising in the east towards the point of setting in the west (well explained by Hipp. 1.8.20) and if a faint mist covers it (not him) while the sky shows in respect of his hindquarters, the equine parts, the same signs as in the case of Turibulum, one has to beware of an easterly storm, not (this points back) of a southerly one'. Very factual, very much 'sachlich mitteilend' again: Aratus lowers the style after the great rise.

One will see this constellation under Scorpio and Chelae. Near the Scorpion lies what is human in this beast, the horselike part (πεταλοεια being a neologism) is 'held fast' by the Claws, as Aratus puts it with a gentle change of the subject to avoid tediousness. The right hand he 'always' extends towards the opposite Altar, in it he holds an 'animal' stretched out and squeezed together.

Here we have already left the Centaur; the subject is (grammatically) the Therion. No. name, no explanation, the attitude Aratus adopts is that of some wonder at this gesture and perhaps too at his being firmly held. The main stress lies on the Centaur's wild character, on his uncouth monstrosity (Erren 100).

II


Sunt etiam: this sounds like the beginning of a new item in a catalogue; G. seems deliberately to cut off this new passage from a preceding text. A parallel: in v. 24 G. opens the new passage with Axem which points back to axem in 21; there is a deep incision between 23 and 24, and this anaphoric

46. Schol. Arat. 352, 1; Steinmetz 458.
47. Hipparch. 1. 8, 18 sqq. criticised Aratus, from his point of view of course correctly, for not having indicated which shoulder he meant.
48. That this interpretation is possible, and even necessary, has been well brought out by Gain on v. 423 (after Courtney, Cl. Rev. 20, 1969, 138 sqq.). This interpretation was suggested even in antiquity: Achol. Arat. 423, 4 sqq.
49. Note the change of syntax concerning πεταλοεια (Schwyzer 2, 104 sq.).
50. Which is not correct; see Hipparch. 1. 8, 18.
51. ἐνθαδέω is a choice Homerism: Il. 21, 317.
52. Aratus omits, as Hipparchus criticises, all the many stars that are between the Altar and the Centaur: Aratus undoubtedly omitted the intermediate constellation on purpose: he wanted to bring out the strange contrast between the wild animal and the gesture directed towards the Altar; the impression is created that Centaurus wants to sacrifice, he, the monster.
53. Aratus adorns these verses with two rare words, ἄρτος and στρεκόω; the first expression occurs in Plato and Polybius, but is, on the whole, rare; the second occurs only in Anacr. PMG 388, 1 and in Hellenistic authors.
opening brings it out very clearly. Aratus, on the other hand, formed a smooth transition, the new passage beginning in the middle of the verse.

**Flammis comissa:** A little involved for 'made a star among stars', but it carries the connotation that the other stars should take care of it (Thes. L.L. 3,1906,46). For *commissus* in this sense see fr. 4,3. **Immania:** something like a general introductory remark before the two series of details are mentioned. Such guiding insertions have occurred before (408 *mergitur*, 413 *borean ortum*, etc.).

**V. 415:** *capite*, etc.: with head, chest and abdomen he is placed under the Claws, the chest being *hirsuta*: a play of the phantasy depicting the centaur as wild. Besides, G. wants to outdo Aratus by painting a picture (cf. 393 as a parallel).

**V. 416:** *candentis*: a little superfluous, but it should be borne in mind that Aratus had called the Claws 'void of light' (v. 90) and that it is characteristic of G. to enhance what Aratus had 'slandered' (v. 233 on *Aries*: 251 about Perseus; cf. v. 280, etc.). **Reddentia:** syntactically a precise rendering of *εὐκότα* (437). *Reddere* means 'to represent' or the like, see 160, 215; Mart. 11.9.2 *Apellea redditus arti*.

**V. 417:** *per*: alternative to *abl. instrum.* and as such very rare (Leum.-Hofm.-Sz. 240 below; J. Vahlen, Hermes 15.1880.270). The rhythm of this line is exceedingly good. **Ingentis:** this recalls *immania*. Apparently it was G.'s intention to stress its vast size and overwhelming grandeur. **Costas—armos:** the eye of the spectator had been led from the head to the belly in 415; here it is led from the flanks (*costae* being the ribs as seen from the spine) to the thighs and forward to the chest where the lines thus drawn meet.

**V. 418:** *nascitur*: transferred usage signifying *provenire*, cp. Verg. Ge. 3.278 and Caes. b.g. 2,18,2 where Meusel remarks: 'selten so gebraucht'. **Sub virgine:** G. here corrects Aratus according to Hipparchus I,8,21. Aratus had placed the hind quarters under the Claws.

**V. 419:** *praedam*: a very rare identification; apparently it presupposes an identification of *Centaurus* not with 'mild Chiron', but with a beast of prey; *e silvis* stresses this.

**V. 420:** *cultor Jovis*: it may have been Cato who coined this word (Thes. L.L. 3,1317,81 and Cicero who for the first time transferred it to the religious sphere (cf. Tusc. 1,69); at least he alleviates the translation by a *quasi*; later writers did not feel the need to do so. Until Tacitus a purely poetical word, it has here a ring of stateliness. In other words: a moment ago *Centaurus* had seemed to be a wild beast, now, with an elegant twist he turns out to be the pious Chiron.

**V. 421:** *hic erit*: the future contains a faint allusion to uncertainty in order to exploit the sudden change: in 423 this scepticism will have been abandoned completely.

---

**V. 422: iustissimus:** this conjecture for *tutissimus* seems fairly safe. Burmann's *mitissimus* is excellent as it stresses the fact that this Centaur is by no means wild: yet *iustissimus* is better, see II. 11,832 and Ov. fast. 5,384 (see Börner p. 314). *Iustissimus* may further have indicated why he had been transported to heaven, and is (generally speaking) in keeping with G.'s idea that there is *iustitia* and *fides* in the sky.

**V. 422: nubigenas:** Gain quotes Pind. Pyth. 2, 35 sqq. Snell-Maehler for the myth; he could also have adduced Ol. 10,3 (see Roscher 21, 1063). Le Boeuffle mentions Ov. met. 12,211; more aptly, because G. certainly drew on Ovid for information; it was from Ovid that he borrowed the detailed and erudite description of Ixion begetting the centaurs on a cloud. **Doctor:** rare in poetry, once in Lucr., once in Hor. c. 4.6.25. As to the myth see again Ov. fast. 5,385 and Eur. Iph. Aul. 705, etc.

**V. 423: medium scindens iter:** if this is the correct reading it stands for *scindens iter in ipso medio in duas partes aequales*.

**V. 424: traxit nubem:** as if he, the Centaur, had the power of attracting clouds: here G. seems to be on the verge of following Cicero's tasteless attempts to make the text more vivid than Aratus had done. **Stellasque recondit:** 'qui enveloppe ses étoiles', Le Boeuffle, 'ses' meaning the stars of *Centaurus*; 'if a thin cloud accompanies him when his shoulder lies at the midpoint of his journey in the sky above and hides his human parts', Gain. *Ses* meaning the whole of Centaur is absurd; the contrast 'accompanies him' and 'hides the human parts' (only) calls for comment. In the meantime, it may be noted that *traxit nubem* gives the cause, *recondit stellas* the effect.

**Toto clarus equo:** if the centaur shines *totus equo* he cannot be covered by clouds entirely; therefore *recondit stellas* must, as was said in antiquity, as well as recently, (Courtney apud55 Gain), refer to the shoulder. The question becomes complicated if we become aware of the fact that *scand-* has been transmitted unanimously (-ens in O, -it in Z), apart from two 15th cent. manuscripts that display the humanists' conjecture *scandens*. The problem becomes even more involved when the meaning of the whole passage is sought. There are two possibilities; 1. If *Centaurus* culminating in the south (this was Aratus' meaning) covers his upper part and leaves his equine parts bright one has an effect similar to that of *Ara* (clouds above, itself shining brightly). This forebodes an easterly storm. 2. If one asks what this apparition means and comes to the realisation that the fact that the lower parts of *Centaur* are visible, the upper parts not, indicates that this part of the horizon is clear, whereas the 'higher' parts of the sky are still overcast, because the wind has only started to

---

55. Gain defends Courtney's interpretation (Cl. Rev. 20, 1969, 139) but I think that *umerus* as the subject of *traxit* is unnecessarily strange, though by no means impossible. Did Gain really mean to convince anybody that Aratus 'imitated' Hom. II. 21, 318 sq. (when he wrote *μυ-αδήρος* in 423 sq.). a text that has nothing to do with his theme? Was Aratus when he wanted to write *μυ αδήρος* compelled to resort to Homer? Such far-fetched ideas should be eschewed.
blow and clear that part of the horizon (as had been the case with the south wind
in respect of Turibulum), then it might be surmised that these apparitions could
only be brought into harmony with the text if the text spoke of Centaur still
being near the east from which part the wind is to blow. This would seem to
plead for *scandens* and for the assumption that G. corrected Aratus.

I do not plead for a new conjecture; I wish only to make it very clear that there
are more difficulties here than meet the eye. Yet I believe one should not press
the similarity to *Ara* too hard and should accept that G., following Aratus,
wanted to say this: if *Centaurus* is covered from above, his lower parts shining
brightly from a clear sky in the south where he is culminating, an easterly wind
is about to blow. Aratus had spoken about the shoulder (which one? asked
Hipparchus) culminating; this shoulder is high up, then, and becomes overcast
with clouds (*nubem* being singular for plural). To bring this out reasonably
clearly from the text one should change the punctuation: *hic umero, medium
scandens iter aetheris alti, si tenuem traxit nubem*, etc. There are parallels for
such a singular position of *si*. Further, *scandens* does not notably deviate from
Aratus (*scam/ens* would be even more distinct, but probably a little too
mannered).

Let us cast another brief glance at Cicero's *Aratea*.—He describes the centaur's
culmination with *medium caelum* instead of *media in via* or the like. In Cicero,
*Centaurus* covers—*Turibulum* with clouds! Cicero tried to be succinct, but
contracted everything the wrong way. And why mention that he, Centaurus, is
covered, too (*caligans*)? Further there is no good reason to excuse Cicero for
having confused *Eurus* with *Favonius* (206); he who has committed so many
blunders could well have made this mistake also. Besides, *Favonius* is, in
Cicero, a *vis . . . Favoni* (cf. Arat. 286). This tendency to embellish Aratus' text
led him to place Centaurus *in alta sede* where he never is, to ascribe a stately gait
to Scorpio (207), to make Centaurus *praeportans partem virilem cedere* (209
sq.) and as rushing to join the equine parts to the Claws (210); he tried to depict
movements and became verbose and rather lacking in taste. Cicero retained the
wild character of Centaurus (*truculentus*, 213), but did not correct his model
according to Hipparchus. Nor did G., it is true; but Cicero outdid Aratus by

56. Cp. fr. 4, 147 for a postponed *si*; v. 98 sqq. for a *si*-clause separated by a participle
from its main sentence; esp. 235.
57. *Umeros habere in coelo* smacks of rank prose; Thes. L.L. 6, 3; 2430, 59 sqq.
58. If one does not, with Turnebus, play with the thought that there may even be a
mistake in Aratus himself (see Traglia on Cic. Arat. 206). I think, therefore that Buescu's
*fera Euri* is to be dismissed.
59. Why Buescu p. 222, note 6 said that G. substituted *Virgo* for *Ara* is not very clear;
it seems that he merely made a mistake.
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making Centaurus even *march* towards the Altar with the ‘vast animal’ in his hand.\(^{60}\)

Cicero found Aratus’ text on the one hand too long, on the other void of vivacity. So he contracted by dropping what did not suit his feelings: Nyx being full of pity was, to Cicero’s way of thinking, exploited in too long-winded a way; he discarded the blasphemous wish, as did G., by the way; he dropped the disjunctive enumeration of Aratus (‘obey or disobey’, v. 420–4); he omitted the strange but beautiful expression of Αἰδης παρανοσομένοιο, etc. But he added that Auster ‘caresses’ the Altar; that *Ara* ‘swims’ through the divine lights; Nox ‘visits’ according to Cicero ‘these quarters’; her signs are ‘visible to all sailors’; he added the broken masts after having thoroughly muddled up logic; he added the futile idea that the south-storm can be calmed and that *Ara* can *pellere nubes*. Similarly, Centaurus can, in Cicero, *cover* the Altar; he is placed in a high seat; *Scorpio* *esse inferit*, Centaur carries his human parts ‘in front of himself’, rushes to join his equine parts to *Chelae* and walks up to *Ara*—Cicero wanted to add motion, but plunged from one blunder to the next, distorted logic and images and came to pen such absurdities as *Aram, quam fiat permulcet spiritus Austri* and *Quadrupes, quam nemo certo donavit nomine Graium*. In this line *nemo Graium* is high-sounding; it resembles high tragic or epic style, and this is what G. tried to avoid.

Germanicus differs from Cicero in many respects, but perhaps most of all in respect of diligence. Let us, e.g. examine his structuring. I do not mean the 5–3–5 harmony,\(^{61}\) but should like to raise the question why G. transposed Aratus’ vv. 431–5 to the end of the passage. I shall answer this question later (note 63); here it may suffice to point out that G. often severs a limb from the body in this way. Aratus had seen to it that the passage on Centaurus that forms so to speak a limb belonging to the large body (403–30) was joined to the preceding text smoothly and naturally; G. cuts it off. I should further like to draw attention to the beautiful and very original structural pattern of an unexpected contrast: G. depicts Centaurus as a wild animal first and makes it become Chiron afterwards. All this calls for comment, but such comment can only be given in a survey.

---

\(^{60}\) Buesco writes *dignavit* for *donavit* in v. 212 (*Quadrupes, quam nemo certo donavit nomine Graium*), evidently in order to improve the author himself. *Donavit* is exaggerated and puffed-up, but so is the whole of Cicero’s contribution.

\(^{61}\) Compare also the harmonious structure of *immania membra* followed by *capite,pectore, alvo* with its parallel *ingentis*, followed by *costas, crura, armos*: v. 414–17.
PART THREE.

Some Conclusions.
There are clear indications that G., when he set about 'translating' Aratus did so with a clearly definable program: he wanted to correct, but also to re-interpret Aratus in his attempt to write a poem of the genus medium.

To begin with the latter part of this statement: G.'s language is decidedly more pathetic than that of Aratus, it is true; but he keeps at a safe distance from Vergil's lofty style. This can be proved by the simple fact that he never uses archaisms, e.g., Ennianisms. This would have brought him too near the elevated style; and wherever he does use Vergilianisms or words that Ennius may have anticipated, these words and phrases are in a low key; there is nothing turgid in Germanicus. He tried to write a very modern language: the number of passages where he quotes Vergil and esp. Ovid using new words and turns is very great.

He did on various occasions form some neologisms and *callidae iuncturae* by himself, but he never (as far as I can see) fell into the pitfalls of Cicero, who tried so very hard to make Aratus livelier than he intended to be and in doing this wrote so many odd and absurd things. Cicero's language resembles fireworks: the rockets flash in the dark and form wonderful lights but leave the centre obscure; G. tried to concentrate his *lumina* around the centre. But what was his centre?

The re-interpretation of Aratus. It is true that he very often translates *verbum e verbo*, but even here he displays some originality when he translates in a veiled and allusive way. He often limits himself to correcting his model as to astronomical data; he often elucidates it by insertions or recasting; but here the re-interpretation starts: he often does away with Aratus' cryptic expressions; he further discards many expressions of astonishment and of irony: for G., there was nothing enigmatic in heaven or absurd that would call for ironical comment (like Aratus' 'dust of God'). But before answering the question where this points to, let us examine the structure of the poem.

G. often dissects Aratus' skilfully connected passages into independent items; he often combines these items by forming new units (cp. Steinmetz 479). This was not done in random fashion; we have seen how carefully G. balances his passages (he declined to exploit the chance of describing a sea-storm in 401 sqq. because he had already availed himself of this opportunity in 291 sqq.). If he dissects the closely knit units he makes the new items stand out independently (to some extent at least). His descriptions at times gain more weight than they had had in Aratus; and this links up with the endeavour to paint pictures where Aratus had left the text unembroidered in order to concentrate on what really mattered to him (e.g., v. 393, the picture of Scorpio's sting: 417, the picture of Centaurus, etc.). P. Steinmetz on p. 467 has formulated this with complete clarity: 'Arat sieht vor allem Sterne, . . . er sieht *Sternbilder*. . . . Germanicus sieht vor allem *Sternbilder*'. This further links up with another characteristic of G.'s re-interpretation.
G. introduces myths where there were none in Aratus' text. This, too, adds much weight to the individual scenes and makes them stand out and in relief. These myths, of course, display some erudition and make this poem a *doctus labor* (see v. 3); but the main aim of these myths is not *doctrina*; it is the poet's endeavour to describe the constellations as *exempla*. For just too many of these myths are narrated so as to persuade the reader that these figures up there were transported into the sky deservedly, either for punishment or because of some *meritum* (see, e.g. v. 33). Therefore G. introduced much *pathos* into Aratus (he could not help being an author of the 1st cent. A.D. who had a foible for high *pathos*); because of this he stressed his conviction, not very often but often enough, that there is *iustitia* and *fides* in the sky.

This implies that for G. the sky had a very different character from what it had had for Aratus. Above all, the sky is holy and *sanctum*; therefore G. makes many stars and constellations brighter than they had been in Aratus, which explains why he eschews the attitude of wonder (*habet miracula nulla*, v. 316 corroborates this view). G. discards Aratus' Stoicism in that he makes Jupiter more than merely a deity who sets up signs in loving providence: Jupiter is a *servator*.

Perhaps the conclusion is too bold, but the following idea suggests itself when one assembles all this into an overall impression: as the earth is governed by *pietas, fides, iustitia* and due punishment; the sky too is ruled by the same principles. Here on earth it is the *princeps* who holds the reins in his hand and sees to it that these principles are maintained; in the sky it is Jupiter who performs the same task. It may therefore be that the passage in v. 5 sqq. (where God and Emperor are said to govern jointly) expresses G.'s view of the sky and the earth. If this is his 'theology' the harmony between prooemium and text now becomes apparent and it is clear why G. introduced all the changes: he re-interpreted Aratus in a way that describes the outlook on the world of those who in his days adhered to the principles of the emperor cult which brought heaven and earth into a closer contact than before and envisaged God and Emperor as sharing the power over the universe in a harmonious way.

G. certainly wanted to be 'der römische Arat' (Steinmetz 452), but he also wished to be the 'Roman Aratus' of his specific century using a modern language and displaying a modern 'Weltanschauung'.

---

62. Steinmetz mentions the 'Strafe' on several occasions (cp. p. 747 sqq.).

63. *Virgo, for G.*, is *iustitia*, see v. 137 *iustissima Virgo, v. 200 non iusta piacula:* actually the mother had to be punished, but Andromeda will be saved: *servatae puellae* in 249 is an addition of G. (see the excellent interpretation of the Cepheus-scenes by Steinmetz p. 477 sqq.). As to *fides* see e.g. v. 46 and 34 *fidae comites*; further 167.

If it is correct to say that G. divided Aratus' units in order to make the single 'scenes' stand in relief we understand at last why G. transferred Aratus' v. 431-5 to the *end* of the passage: he wanted to make it clear that here a new item begins, and therefore he had to cut the connections by transferring that cluster of verses which in Aratus had made the transition so smooth and natural.
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