

Another echo of Lucretius occurs in Isidore *Etymologiae* 12. 2. 14 “rostrum autem proboscida dicitur, quoniam illo pabulum ori admovet; et est angui similis, vallo munitus eburno,” where *angui similis* recalls Lucretius’ *anguimanus* and *vallo munitus eburno* whimsically transforms the Lucretian image of a palisade formed by a line of elephants into the idea of an individual elephant’s tusks protecting its own trunk.<sup>24</sup> As employed by Florus (*Epit.* 1. 24. 16 “elephantis ad hoc immensae magnitudinis, auro purpura argento et suo ebore fulgentibus, aciem utrimque vallaverat”), the idea seems less pointed—one of defense in general, without Lucretian reminiscence or the visual image of an array of tusks.

ROBERT BROWN  
Vassar College

24. I see no need to amplify and emend the text along the lines proposed by Maas (see Bailey, *Titi Lucreti Cari*, vol. 3, p. 1753).

#### DODONA RENEGES: A NEGLECTED OXYMORON IN *GEORGICS* 1. 149

In *Georgics* 1. 147–49, relating how man first learned agriculture, Vergil finds the immediate cause in a famine of acorns and arbutes:

prima Ceres ferro mortalis vertere terram  
instituit, cum iam glandes atque arbuta sacrae  
deficerent silvae et victum Dodona negaret.

In the last of these lines, although commentators have given to the syntax of *silvae* the attention that it deserves, they have in general withheld comment on the oddity of *victum Dodona negaret*. Why should an acorn famine at Dodona have driven mankind worldwide to take up agriculture? Alternatively, if the famine was universal, why should Dodona in particular be singled out for special mention? In the preceding clause, no comparable specificity is applied either to acorns and arbutes or to the woods in which they failed to grow. And why should an oracle be blamed in any case for a famine for which oaks were responsible?

Ancient commentators on *Georgics* 1. 149 fully appreciated the problem inherent in *Dodona*. Some of them tried, characteristically, to rationalize this problem out of existence by claiming that the prophetic oak at Dodona had the same name as the shrine (so the Scholia Bernensia and Pseudo-Probus). The correct solution, however, required a poet to perceive it. Lucan, “one of Virgil’s most careful readers and adapters,”<sup>1</sup> recognized a type of metonymy that might be labeled “locus ferens

I wish to express my gratitude to M. Halleran and A. Henrichs for helpful commentary on a draft of this note.

1. R. F. Thomas, “Tree Violation and Ambivalence in Virgil,” *TAPA* 118 (1988): 268. Thomas does not mention Lucan’s imitation of Vergil’s metonymy.

pro re lata,"<sup>2</sup> and in *Pharsalia* 3. 441 he was moved to imitate this metonymy by referring to oaks near Massilia as a *silva Dodones*. The scholiast's correct exegesis of *Dodones* would also apply, mutatis mutandis, to Vergil's *Dodona*: "non Dodonaea, sed similis, hoc est quercus."<sup>3</sup>

Thus, our initial quandary is resolved once it is recognized that in *Georgics* 1. 149, *Dodona* = *quercus* by metonymy. In this case, however, an answer to one question only leads to another question, for we are next obliged to consider what might have been Vergil's intent in writing *Dodona* in a context that favors the noun *quercus* instead. To this question, the easy answer may also be the best answer. *Dodona* has a dual association with both Jupiter and the oak; so *victum Dodona negaret* could serve to imply that Jupiter was responsible for the dearth of acorns that marked the end of the Golden Age. The four lines under discussion would thus cohere with the "theodicy" immediately preceding, the major theme of which is Jupiter's responsibility for bringing the Golden Age to an end. Nevertheless, if this is the best answer, it is not on that account the only good answer.

"Unüberhörbar das Spiel mit der Paradoxie, die im Zusammentreffen von *victum negare* und dem doppelt aufklingenden Laut DO (Wortstamm für 'geben') liegt" (W. Richter, ed., *Vergil: "Georgica"* [Munich, 1957], p. 140). "Unüberhörbar" is an overstatement. No commentator before Richter had mentioned this feature of the name *Dodona*, nor has Williams, Della Corte, Thomas, or Mynors since; and even Richter himself did not go far enough. Among shrines of Zeus, Dodona ranks second only after Olympia, and the name itself in all its forms suits a hexameter line admirably well. Yet in all of Latin poetry, *Dodona* occurs only nine times, and only five times in poetry earlier than Juvenal.<sup>4</sup> This anomaly could conceivably have something to do not only with the fact noted by Richter, but more specifically with the coincidence that the name *Dodona* is identical, and hence able to be confused, with the Latin phrase *do dona*.<sup>5</sup>

Although a speaker of Latin could have surmised from his own language a derivation of the name *Dodona* from the verb "to give," he could also have found the same etymology in the scholarship of Hellenistic Greece. Writing roughly one cen-

2. This type occurs with some frequency in Martial, who, in 2. 16. 3, 2. 29. 3, and 11. 1. 2, substitutes the place name *Tyros* or *Sidon* for the name of the local product *murex*; also cf. Mart. 6. 11. 7. In our day, the appellations *contrôlées* of the wine trade constitute a familiar and abundant example of this usage.

3. Cf. Forbiger's note on *G.* 1. 149: "*Dodona*, poëtice pro quercetis." As far as I know, Forbiger's exact observation is unique.

4. Verg. *G.* 1. 149 (nom.), Prop. 2. 21. 3 (abl.), Ov. *Tr.* 4. 8. 43 (nom.), Luc. 6. 427 (nom.), Stat. *Theb.* 3. 106 (nom.). The remaining four are Avien. *Descr. orb.* 590 (gen.), Prudent. *Apoth.* 441 (nom.), Licent. *Carm. ad Aug.* 123 (nom.), Sid. Apoll. *Carm.* 5. 265 (nom.). The Greek form of the name is found in *Aetna* 6, *Priap.* 75. 1, Luc. 3. 441, Claud. 7. 117, Prisc. *Periherg.* 444. In the aggregate, adjectival derivatives are no less frequent than the Latin form of the name: *Dodonaeus* occurs four times (Verg. *Aen.* 3. 466, Ov. *Met.* 7. 623, Auson. 418. 23, Claud. 26. 136), *Dodonis* four times (Ov. *Met.* 13. 716, *Fast.* 6. 711, V. Fl. 1. 302, Sil. *Pun.* 3. 680), and *Dodonius* once (Claud. *Rapt. Pros.* 1. 31). The first two of these adjectives are also attested in Greek.

5. The occurrences of *donum* in combination with the verb *dare* are too frequent to require documentation: "usquequaque per totam Latinitatem" (*TLL*, 5. 1: 2023. 26). For another proper name liable to be mistaken for a verb, cf. this exegesis of Trimalchio's abuse of the name of his carver, Carpus: "itaque quotienscumque dicit 'Carpe,' eodem verbo et vocat et imperat" (Petron. 36. 8).

It bears mentioning that Cicero makes no allowances for context when he claims in *Orat.* 45. 154 that the postposition of *cum* with *nobis* is due to the obscenity that would be heard in *cum nobis* (i.e., *cunno-bis*, with proclisis and assimilation of the preposition). It is conceivable that the relative paucity of homonyms in Latin (as compared to English, for example) may have made speakers of Latin especially sensitive to them, even when the context precluded a double entendre.

tury before Vergil, Apollodorus of Athens, in the first book of his treatise *Περὶ θεῶν*,<sup>6</sup> derived the epithet of Zeus Dodonaeus as follows (*FGrH* 244, frag. 88): καθάπερ οἱ τὸν Δία Δωδωναῖον μὲν καλοῦντες ὅτι δίδωσιν ἡμῖν τὰ ἀγαθὰ, Πελασγικὸν δὲ ὅτι τῆς γῆς πέλας ἐστίν.<sup>7</sup> From the wording of the old scholia b AT (Erbse) on *Iliad* 16. 233, it is clear that the phraseology no less than the substance of Apollodorus' gloss was well known: τινὲς δὲ "Ἀναδωδωναῖε" ὕφ' ἑν, παρὰ τὴν ἀνάδοσιν τῶν ἀγαθῶν. . . . τινὲς δὲ Δωδώνην τὴν γῆν, παρόσον πάντα δίδωσιν.

There is more than Vergil's prodigious erudition to suggest that he knew not only the derivation of *Dodona* from *διδόναι*,<sup>8</sup> but also the particular formulation of that etymology by Apollodorus of Athens. Not only is it firmly established that Vergil was familiar with the Hellenistic scholia on Homer,<sup>9</sup> but the treatise in which the aforementioned etymology is given was, its title notwithstanding, "primarily a work of Homeric scholarship" (Rusten, *Dionysius Scytobrachion*, p. 32, n. 9). More generally, the works of no Hellenistic scholar were better known or more widely consulted by the Roman intelligentsia than were those of Apollodorus of Athens.<sup>10</sup> As early as the turn of the century, it is reasonably certain that Apollodorus' *Chronica*, comprising four books of iambic trimeters (*sic*), was known to Q. Lutatius Catulus—firsthand, one might suppose, given Catulus' philhellenism and literary interests. Some decades later, Cornelius Nepos relied on the same work to such a degree that Felix Jacoby characterized Nepos' treatment of Greek history in his own *Chronica* as a veritable translation of Apollodorus.<sup>11</sup> Catullus may have known the same Apollodorean history well enough to echo its dedication in his own dedication to Nepos. For the historical data that he desired, Cicero, writing to Atticus in Vergil's twenty-sixth year (45 B.C.), referred to Apollodorus in an offhand manner that assumes familiarity: "quae etiam ex Apollodori [*sic*] puto posse inveniri" (*Att.* 12. 23. 2). Finally, Philodemus is also included among those Italians who made use of the writings of Apollodorus of Athens, which are regularly cited in Philodemus' various works. Apollodorus' treatise *Περὶ θεῶν*, in which *Dodona* is derived from *διδόναι*, was Philodemus' principal source for mythological lore in his own treatise *De pietate*.<sup>12</sup> But widely used though his *Chronica* was, Apollodorus was known in antiquity principally as a philologist, one of whose specialties was a rationalizing brand of etymology. Ancient sources most often refer to him as ὁ γραμματικός. Thus, Vergil's familiarity with Apollodorus' researches may be inferred not only

6. For this work and a summary of current knowledge concerning its nature and contents, see J. S. Rusten, *Dionysius Scytobrachion* (Opladen, 1982), pp. 30–33, where a full bibliography of earlier work is also to be found. More accessible is R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship: From the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age* (Oxford, 1968), pp. 261–63. The surviving fragments are collected in *FGrH* 244, frags. 88–153, to which may be added two papyri described by Rusten, p. 31.

7. I owe to A. Henrichs the ingenious suggestion that *δίδωσιν* may gloss both *Δία* and *Δωδωναῖον*. This possibility did not occur to the author of the scholium quoted next, wherein the same verb form glosses *Δωδώνη* alone.

8. It has recently been suggested that Vergil's knowledge of this etymology is also reflected in *G.* 1. 127–28, where "offenkundig haben wir bei Vergil noch eine Reminiszenz an die alte Bedeutung des Wortes Dodona, die uns ausdrücklich durch Glossen bezeugt wird" (H. Petersmann, "Demeter in Dodona und Thrakien: Ein Nachtrag," *WS* 100 [1987]: 8).

9. See R. R. Schlunk, *The Homeric Scholia and the "Aeneid"* (Ann Arbor, 1974), pp. 1–7.

10. As late as Gell. *NA* 17. 4. 4, Apollodorus is still a "scriptor celebratissimus."

11. *Apollodorus Chronik: Eine Sammlung der Fragmente* (Berlin, 1902), p. 34.

12. For Apollodorus (ca. 180–ca. 120 B.C.) and Catullus (ca. 150–87 B.C.), see *ibid.* and *FGrH* 244, frag. 7. For bibliography, Nepos' indebtedness to Apollodorus, and the status of the latter as a philologist, see F. Decreus, "Catulle, c. 1, Cornelius Nepos et les *Aitia* de Callimaque," *Latomus* 43 (1984): 848–53,

from the fact that Apollodorus was the common cultural property of educated Romans living in the first century B.C., but also from Apollodorus' focus on language and, in *Περὶ θεῶν*, on Homeric nomenclature in particular. This specialization, we may suppose, will have made the *Περὶ θεῶν* required reading for a poet who knew the Homeric scholia as well as Vergil demonstrably did.

Nevertheless, despite the abundant external evidence suggesting that Vergil knew the *Περὶ θεῶν* of Apollodorus, perhaps the strongest support for this conclusion lies in *Georgics* 1. 149 itself, where *victum . . . negaret* is an exact inversion of Apollodorus' gloss on the name *Dodona*, δίδωσιν . . . τὰ ἀγαθὰ. Although only the learned among his readers could have caught his particular allusion to Apollodorus' etymology, Vergil here suggested even to Greekless speakers of Latin that there was once a time when Dodona belied its name.

Vergil shared with Latin poets in general a fondness for juxtaposing a proper name with a synonym of the stem, whether real or imagined, contained within that name. Even when one considers only those cases in which, as in *Georgics* 1. 149, the name is Greek and the juxtaposition located at the end of the line, there are at least four examples of this conceit in Vergil.<sup>13</sup> In *Georgics* 1. 149, however, *Dodona* is paired with an antonym of its stem.<sup>14</sup> For this there are few parallels in Latin verse, and apparently none at all elsewhere in Vergil.<sup>15</sup>

There is, however, Hellenistic precedent for the antithetical pairing of *Dodona* and *negare*. Preserved among the fragments of the poetry of Simmias of Rhodes (fl. 300 B.C.) is this hexameter (frag. 10 Powell):

Ζηνὸς ἔδος Κρονίδαο μάκαιρ' ὑπεδέξετο Δαδῶ.

wherein it is proposed that Catull. 1. 10 echoes Apollodorus' dedication of his *Chronica* to Attalus II of Pergamum. For Philodemus and Apollodorus in general, see Jacoby, *Apollodors Chronik*, p. 31. For Philodemus' dependence on *Περὶ θεῶν* in particular, see E. Rawson, *Intellectual Life in the Late Roman Republic* (Baltimore, 1985), p. 301, n. 16, and A. Henrichs, "Philodemus *De pietate* als mythographische Quelle," *BCPE* 5 (1975): 5–38. Although Philodemus once cites *Περὶ θεῶν* by title and book number (*FGRH* 244, frag. 103), this does not prove that he used the treatise firsthand. For the most part, if not entirely, Philodemus drew from *Περὶ θεῶν* via the same Epicurean intermediary used by Cicero in *De natura deorum*. Apollodorus' monograph on the Catalogue of Ships is the likeliest case of Philodemus making direct use of Apollodorus (Jacoby, *Apollodors Chronik*, p. 5, n. 3).

For the 132 lines of Apollodorus' *Chronica* that are preserved in Philodemus' so-called *Academicorum philosophorum index Herculaneensis*, see T. Dorandi, *La "Cronologia" di Apollodoro nel P. Herc. 1021* (Naples, 1982), esp. p. 15. For a connection between Philodemus' *De pietate* and a fragment of Apollodorus' *Περὶ θεῶν* preserved in a Cologne papyrus (inv. 5604), see A. Henrichs, "Ein Meropisizitat in Philodemus *De pietate*," *BCPE* 7 (1977): 124–25. A papyrus fragment discovered in Egypt may belong to a Roman copy of Apollodorus: Schlunk, *Homeric Scholia*, p. 5. These papyri indicate that Apollodorus' writings were in circulation not only in Rome, as their use by the aforementioned Romans would lead one to expect, but even in the region where Vergil wrote the *Georgics*. Indeed, as Henrichs has shown, *Περὶ θεῶν* was a standard reference in the Epicurean milieu of that region, with which Vergil was closely connected.

13. *Ecl.* 8. 83 (*Daphnide laurum*), and *Aen.* 3. 689 (*Thapsumque iacentem*), 698 (*stagnantis Helori*), and 705 (*palmosa Selinus*), for which see G. J. M. Bartelink, *Etymologiserend bij Vergilius* (Amsterdam, 1965), pp. 48, 55, 57–58, 64. Also cf. *Aen.* 11. 790 (*pulsaeve tropaeum*), where the Greek element is a common noun (*ibid.*, pp. 90–91).

14. Those demanding chapter and verse will find *negare* (*de-* in the second citation) opposed to *dare* in Sen. *Contr.* 1. 1. 11 and Ambr. *In psalmum* 36, 58 (Migne, vol. 14, p. 995. 34).

15. *G.* 1. 462 (*umidus Auster*) does not count, for the derivation of *Auster* from a root meaning "dry" is probably incorrect and certainly too sophisticated to have occurred to any ancient philologist, Vergil included. Thus, it is found in no ancient source. See Bartelink, *Etymologiserend*, pp. 103–4, where the Horatian parallel *pauper Opimius* is adduced from *Sat.* 2. 3. 142. To this may be added *immitis Glycera* (*id. Carm.* 1. 33. 2) and *prasinus Porphyryon* (*Mart.* 13. 78. 2).

Here the scholar-poet not only puts on display his acquaintance with a *recherché* (and for us unparalleled) variant of the name *Dodona*,<sup>16</sup> but he also parades his knowledge of the supposed etymology of that name, by placing next to it an antonym (ὑποδέχεσθαι) of the verb “to give.”

Yet what is perhaps the *ne plus ultra* of such antithetical punning is to be found in these lines (284–85) from the *Hymn to Delos* of Callimachus:

ἅ Δωδώνηθι Πελασγοὶ  
τηλόθεν ἐκβαίνοντα πολλὴ πρότιστα δέχονται

The first line ends with two proper names that are putatively derived from διδόναι and πέλας respectively,<sup>17</sup> and antonyms of each of these words frame the following line. This pair of semantic antitheses is complemented by an equivalent number of structural oppositions. The sequence of the antonyms runs counter to the order of the proper names to which they are opposed (AB followed immediately by b . . . a), and τηλόθεν . . . δέχονται, maximally separated, contrasts with the juxtaposition Δωδώνηθι Πελασγοί.

For his juxtaposition of Δωδώνηθι and Πελασγοί followed by τηλόθεν, Callimachus found a prototype in *Iliad* 16. 233, a line much discussed since antiquity:<sup>18</sup>

Ζεῦ ἄνα, Δωδωναῖε, Πελασγικέ, τηλόθι ναίων

Perceiving an etymological pun between τηλόθι and the stem of Πελασγικέ, Callimachus borrowed this presumed play on words<sup>19</sup> and augmented it by adding a similar pun on the other epithet in Homer, Δωδωναῖε. Vergil in his turn ignored the Pelasgians and imitated only the nature of Callimachus' pun on *Dodona*. He noted and imitated the Callimachean antithesis in Δωδώνηθι . . . δέχονται, but for the opposition between “give” and “receive” found here and in Simmias, he substituted another, that between “give” and “refuse.” Callimachus' structural antitheses he glossed over entirely—*non omnia possumus omnes*—and, like Simmias, he rather placed *Dodona* and its etymological opposite in the final two and a half feet of the line. Finally, to the opposition between *Dodona* and *negaret* he added an *oppositio in imitando* in the phrase *victum Dodona negaret*, recalling by inversion the single Apollodorean gloss that holds the key to both of Callimachus' etymological puns.<sup>20</sup>

CLIFFORD WEBER  
Kenyon College

16. The history of the forms *Dodo*, *Dodona*, and *Dodon* is discussed in detail in H. Petersmann, “Demeterhymnus, Dodona und südslawisches Brauchtum,” *WS* 99 (1986): 69–85.

17. In the fragment of Περὶ θεῶν quoted above, Apollodorus derives Zeus' epithet Πελασγικός from the fact ὅτι τῆς γῆς πέλας ἐστίν.

18. See H. W. Parke, *The Oracles of Zeus: Dodona, Olympia, Ammon* (Cambridge, Mass., 1967), pp. 1–7 (p. 6 on Apollodorus).

19. Callimachus' etymological focus here may also be inferred from the fact that τηλόθεν is “remarkably vague” (W. H. Mineur, *Callimachus “Hymn to Delos”: Introduction and Commentary* [Leyden, 1984], p. 228). As Mineur notes, a historian would have been more specific, as Callimachus himself was elsewhere.

20. It is useless to speculate whether Apollodorus' derivation of Δωδώνη and Πελασγοί owes something to Callimachus' play on these names, or whether Callimachus and Apollodorus independently exploited an etymology that was already in circulation. Nevertheless, the first alternative is at least theoretically possible, for Apollodorus knew the works of Callimachus well enough to cite them (*FGrH* 244, frag. 353), and in Περὶ θεῶν he “passim Callimachi libris utebatur” (R. Pfeiffer, ed., *Callimachus*, vol. 1 [Oxford, 1949], p. 353; see also p. 455).