UDC 821.14'02.08-1 Арат 821.14'02.03=124'02 COBISS.SR-ID 227631116

Marko Vitas
University of Lund
vitas.marko@gmail.com

The poet's new clothes: A study of Aratus' original style as reflected in the three Roman translations of his Φαινόμενα

Abstract: This paper explores the way three Roman translators of Aratus' Φαινόμενα (Cicero, Germanicus and Avienus) treated the style of the original and what were their reasons for treating in such a way. These considerations should, furthermore, be also revealing as to the general conceptions and ideas the translators had about their task. The three stylistic features of Aratus assessed in detail in this paper are: (1) word play (as a typically Hellenistic asset); (2) personification and comparison (understood in a way characteristic of Aratus' poem); (3) references to the poet-teacher and the pupil-reader (as a recurrent motive in didactic poetry).

Key Words: Aratus, *Aratea*, style, word play, personification, didactic poetry, translation.

1. Preliminary remarks

It is well-known that Aratus from Soli and his Φαινόμενα enjoyed immense popularity throughout Antiquity, as attested in numerous commentaries, citations, epigrammatical praises (most notably the one made by Callimachus: *Pal. Anthol*. 9.507), and, above all, translations. It seems, however, that later scholars never quite understood the outstanding success of Aratus' poem. On the contrary, many a harsh judgement was passed on it, ever since antiquity: Quintilian famously protested that Aratus' poem lacks life, variety, emotions, characters and speeches, and concluded with the unflattering remark that *sufficit tamen operi cui se parem credidit* "he was, however, good enough a match for what he set out to do", (Quint. *Inst. Or.* 10.1.55). The author of the treatise *On the Sublime* was hardly any more enthusiastic (Longin. 10.5–6). Aratus suffered severe blows even in the hands of modern scholars, who often refrain from passing value judgments on the ancients: cf. Lesky 1963, 803: "recht trockene Lektüre"; Sale 1966, 60: "in most of its parts te-

dious". Those particularly interested in Aratus have often tried to offer explanations or even excuses ranging anywhere between the astronomical or astrological purpose of the poem, the supposed stoicism of Aratus' prologue, and the poem's mythological relevance (Sale 1966, Lewis 1983, Gee 2013).

Although details of these discussions are largely immaterial for our purpose, we must mention the oft-quoted argument relying on Aratus' alleged literary merits, mostly – it would seem – in the domain of style (Sale 1966, 162; Lewis 1983, 24–28). It almost goes without saying that the type of stylistic beauty in question is largely beyond the reach of modern reader's understanding.

Aratus' style can be interpreted as a nice example of detached and light-hearted Hellenistic romanticism, although it does not lack serious overtones. It is, without any doubt, the work of a *poeta doctus* who uses a peculiar vocabulary and construction, sometimes archaic and Homeric, sometimes rather innovative; he is often allusive or even opaque, expecting from his readership considerable erudition and a serious effort towards interpretation; he relies on tradition but also uses every opportunity to twist it into something new.

In a relatively recent study Katharina Volk put forward a compelling argument that it is with Aratus that we should connect the principle of λεπτή, which has most often been associated with Callimachus. Aratus might indeed have thought "anybody can identify the Great Bear" and he should teach us "to distinguish more subtle signs – and the subtler, the better" (Volk 2010, 207). The same would go for his poem: it is neither straightforward nor easy to read, but it's through the reader's effort that it somehow becomes better.

In this study we shall take a look at Aratus' style (in a broad sense) in relation to his extant Latin translators: Cicero, Germanicus, and Avienus. The rendering of a style in another language has always been a vexed topic in translation studies (one can take discussions in Postgate 1922; Woodworth, 1938; Hill 1965 as examples). Our study may therefore be welcome, as it offers analysis of "fresh" material, one that has only rarely been approached systematically from the viewpoint that we shall adopt. This, however, will not be our primary concern. We will be somewhat less concerned with the phenomenon itself than with how the Roman

translators dealt with it and what their work can tell us generally about the business of translation as it was conceived and practiced in Antiquity.

Finally, it is beyond the scope of our study to try and cover all aspects of Aratus' style and their reflections in the Latin versions of *Phaenomena*. Our attempt to do so would probably be to no avail, as the sheer number of variables would impede the understanding of general forces that are at play.

This is why we decided to limit our research to three salient features: (1) word play; (2) personification (and comparison); (3) references to the poet and the reader. First of these was chosen because it readily illustrates the innate characteristics of the style of Aratus and, more generally, the style of Hellenistic poetry. The next one offers something characteristic of Aratus himself and his poem. Our third topic deals with a recurrent motive in didactic poetry. It is our hope that, as a whole, our sample will be both variated and characteristic enough to produce relevant results.[1]

Our corpus will comprise the first part of Aratus' poem and its translations by Cicero, Caesar Germanicus and Avienus (verses 19–453)[2] as a representative sample, since the analysis of the whole poem is prevented by the fact that only Avienus' translation of the third part is extant. The first part, being a coherent and consistent whole, united by the topic of the description of the fixed stars and constellations, will greatly lend itself to our purpose.

2. Word play

Although recent research has made serious effort and achieved substantial progress in its attempts to define and classify word plays and techniques available for their translations, the state of the question is still far from unambiguous. It seems safe to say that, by almost universal consent among experts in the field, the quintessential characteristic *sine qua non* of the word play would be the opposition between the form and

[1]Among studies which touch upon our research question, we can warmly recommend the judicious study by Anne-Marie Lewis on Aratus and his translators (Lewis 1983), which offers many invaluable insights, especially in the field of translation of meter and sound.

[2]Prologue is excluded since its translations are so free that they can hardly be called translations at all.

the meaning of the word or words engaged in a word play (Delabastita 2004, 601; Marco 2010, 265; Vandaele 2011, 180). It has also been claimed that by intentionally placing together units of the same form, but different meaning ("formal similarity and semantic difference", in Delabastita's terms: Delabastita 2004, 601), word plays refer to what Roman Jakobson classifies as "the Metalinguistic Function of language" (Jakobson 1960), i. e. language employed to describe itself (Henry 2003, 32), and thus most clearly expose *the conventionality of language*, ensuing in the surprise of the unsuspecting reader or listener, who is usually somewhat used to thinking of language as unambiguous and construed so as to adequately suit our communicative needs. (cf. Delabastita 2004, 602) This should, however, be carefully reconsidered before it is ready to be applied to the context of Ancient Literature. Namely, the conventionality of language is largely a concept of our contemporary linguistics. Varro's linguistic theories, elaborated in *De lingua latina*, as well as etymologies authoritatively proposed by Isidore of Seville, would without any doubt raise quite a few academic eyebrows, should someone have proposed them today. Nevertheless, that is the way Ancient people – and the most erudite among them – thought about language. In a very judicious analysis of one Varro's particularly revealing passage, Frederik Ahl writes that "if *canis* means 'you sing' and 'dog' there must be a *reason* for this resemblance. And there is, he [Varro] suggests" (Ahl 1985, 32, emphasis added). Modern theories about word plays and puns remain our theoretical background, but with necessary emendations. I would say that an ancient word play was most likely to provoke recognition and a kind of learned revelation in a reader, rather than surprise at the suddenly exposed incoherence of language. In accordance with that, we will see that folk etymologies have an important share in Aratus' work.

Now that we have clarified the nature and purpose of word plays to some extent, we should also devote a couple of lines to their division. Word plays have, in fact, been notoriously difficult to classify in a both comprehensive and logical manner, and the distinction between "word play", "pun" and "(to pun) rhetorically related device" has never really been made completely clear. For example, it comes as no surprise that in the scope of the same study alliteration is treated as a pun at one point, and as a rhetorically related device at the other. (for example, in Marco

2010, 267–268) In spite of that, many classifications have been offered, and whilst Henry's systematic division to concatenation, inclusion and substitution (*enchaînement*, *inclusion, substitution*: Henry 2003, 20–29) retains its value, for the purposes of the present study it will suffice to adopt Delabastita's (cited in Marco 2010, 265; Vandaele 2011, 180) basic distinction between *horizontal puns* (where two or more same or similar words or sequences provoke several meanings) and *vertical puns* (where only one word or sequence produces several meanings). These categories will guide our further discussion in this section.

At the outset, it must be noted that the present discussion on word plays in Aratus does not aim at exhaustiveness, since the full discussion of each instance would be far beyond the scope of this paper (especially in the light of such broad definitions of word plays which would yield an unrestrainable flood of instances). We deemed it much more fruitful to choose some of the characteristic examples and deal with them in more detail.

We turn to *the vertical puns* first. One of the most prominent types of word plays of that sort are the so-called *mots-valises* (Henry 2003, 24) or *portmanteau words* (Marcus 2010, 284), where two independent words are blended together in order to create a new word with a new meaning. Examples given by Henry and Marco are, respectively, *to galumph* (as a mixture of *to gallop* and *to triumph*, from *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*) and *motorvation* (a compound of *motor* and *motivation* from Graham's *Last orders*). Aratus was an innovative language user, and it is not surprising that *mots-valises* are found in his work. As an example we can take ἱππούραια (v.438), construed out of ἵππος and οὐραῖος. It is not a simple blend of two words since it does not mean "the horse tail", as LSJ suggests, according to Kidd (cf. Kidd 1997, 339), but, as it is clear from the context, the whole backside of a horse, as opposed to a human side in a centaur. The word play is cleverly conceived since it does not only denote Centaur's back (that is requested by the context, since Aratus strives to position human part of the Centaur under the Scorpion, and the horse part under the Claws), but also creates a witty and vivid picture of horse back with a tail. How do our Latin translators cope with this curiosity? Cicero translates plainly: *equi partes* (v.210). A partial compensation might have been meant by the verb *properat* in the same

verse, introduced independently of Aratus, which personifies our horse.[3] In any case, we should not think that Cicero refrained from introducing *mots-valises* into Latin language – already Nevius and Ennius had paved a path for that – and we hear that many new words were issued in his *Aratea*. (Soubiran 2002, 98) That might have been meant – apart from other purposes, like enrichment of the Latin language – as an overall compensation for Aratus' innovative vocabulary for which no adequate equivalent could be found in the exact verses where they occurred. On the other hand, Germanicus translated the passage with *per ingentis costas, per crura, per armos… sonipes* (v.417–418). The first part takes care of οὐραῖος, while *sonipes* makes sure that the horse is the animal in question. To be sure, *sonipes* was not as witty a compound as Aratus' ἱππούραια, since it was attested before (most notably, Verg. *A*. IV 135. *stat sonipes, ac frena ferox spumantia mandit*, and as early as in the fragment from Attius' *Thebais*: *mundule nitidantur pulvere quadrupedantum sonipedum*) and thus did not qualify as a word play, due to lack of crucial elements: novelty and certain awkwardness. It, however, did pay due respect to Aratus' liveliness by recalling the sound of horse hooves.[4] Avienus, finally, offers a slightly more periphrastic version: *at qua cornipedem media vir fundit ab alvo* (v.883). His *cornipes* (attested on numerous occasions in Augustan poets: cf. Verg. *A.* 6.591. *cornipedum… equorum*) is very similar in quality to Germanicus' *sonipes* – in fact, so similar that one might suggest that Avienus borrowed his predecessors' design of a

[3]I take the verb *properare* to be equivalent of the English verb *to harry* and to denote both what the subject is doing (moving quickly) and why he is doing it (he wants to get somewhere as soon as possible). A rock could also move quickly if rolled down the mountain, but only a rational being could do it with some goal on mind. Nice confirmation that *properare* was conceived in minds of Romans as a well-planned haste comes from Cato the Elder, who is cited by Aulus Gellius: *aliud est properare, aliud festinare. Qui unum quid mature transigit, is properat: qui multa simul incipit neque perficit, is festinat*. (Gel. 16.14) Our horse could be said to be in a diligent harry to fulfill his cosmically pre-determined path over the skies and arrive at his next station, under the Claws, in due time. That is why I think he is personified. More on that will, however, be said in the next section of this paper.

[4]One is, perhaps, also invited to note the triple repetition of *per* in the line 417, absent from Aratus' original, as a sort of auxiliary compensation for ἱππούραια, apart from *sonipes*.

solution for a tricky place in the original. In that case one could – though not necessarily *should* – see an allusion, which also sometimes qualifies as a word play (Henry 2003, 38).

Cases of intentionally implied polysemy are also considered to be a prominent type of vertical word play (cf. Henry 2003, 26–28: *calambours in absentia*; Delabastita 2004, 602: puns depending on lexical structure), and Aratus resorts to them quite often. Many instances of it have been cleverly construed around the word Ζεύς, relying on its multiple layers of meaning. The most baffling example might well be the one present in the description of the constellation of Perseus, where the young hero is said to harry ἐν Διὶ πατρί (v.253). Who are we supposed to see in the figure of πατὴρ Ζεύς in this instance? Is it the philosophical Zeus from the prologue, the father of all human kind (cf. v.5 τοῦ [Διὸς] γάρ καὶ γένος εἰμέν)? Or is it rather the mythological Zeus of Homer and Hesiod, Perseus' own father? Or should we adopt the most ancient layer of meaning and take that Zeus here simply denotes the clear night sky, as a natural pathway for Perseus the constellation? Regardless of whether we choose to weigh the options or point out the philosophical unity of all possible identifications (see Kidd 1997, 273; Martin 1998, 262), it is quite transparent how formidable a difficulty conservation of such a word play must have presented for a translator. The lord of Olympus thus provides Aratus with a welcome opportunity for variation and word play on meaning nuances, as we can readily see in other instances throughout the poem. In v.275 Aratus says that Ζενὶ παρατρέχει αἰόλος Ὄρνις ("a swift bird accompanies Zeus"), where both bird, messenger of Homeric Zeus and bird moving together with the sky Zeus could be meant. Moreover, in v.293 we learn from Aratus that sailors who find themselves on the open sea when Sun meets the Capricorn will beget κρύος ἐκ Διός (v.294 "icy chill from Zeus"), which presents us with the contrast against the benevolent deity Zeus usually is in Aratus, while at the same time retaining the simple meaning of the cold descending from heavens. Finally, a serious confusion ensues in v.426 where prayers of sailors caught in the storming sea may result in Διὸς παρανισσομένοιο, which can, in turn, be interpreted differently, either as "the approval of Zeus", the merciful god or "the passing of Zeus", Zeus understood merely as thunderstorm. Zeus is in any case omnipresent in Aratus' poem,

which famously begins by his invocation (v.1 ἐκ Διὸς ἀρχόμεσθα), and this has provoked many researchers to try and determine whether Roman translators attempted an ideological twist on that matter. Anne-Marie Lewis has tried to prove that Cicero might have been influenced by epicureanism in his writing, as he might have been in his youth, and that he in turn tried to suppress Jupiter and all the traditional mythology from his poem as much as he could (Lewis 1983, 271–293). Mark Possanza, on the other hand, claimed this to be true for Germanicus (for whom Lewis maintains that he supported traditional religion, in context of Augustan revival, cf. ibid, 259–260), in whose poem Jupiter would be in large measure suppressed by the unknown dedicatee of the poem, presumably Augustus himself. (Possanza 2004, 114–115) In our discussion on Roman translations of Aratus' Zeus-puns we will necessarily have to reevaluate the strength of those hypotheses. Turning first to Cicero, we may say that in the case of Aratus' v.253 he indeed does not mention Jupiter on the spot, but translates simply *in caelum* instead (v.25). In the beginning of the Perseus passage, however, he does note who the father of the hero is (*natum summo Iove Persea*, v.20), although the wording here allows only the meaning of Jupiter as Perseus' father, and not as general father of the humankind as well. In the next passage (*Arat*. 275) Cicero admittedly leaves out the pun altogether. On the third of our listed occasions he translates κρύος (v.68 *frigore*), but does not mention Zeus. Finally, in the verse corresponding to *Arat.* 426 the whole prayer is cut out. On three out of four occasions, we see, Zeus is not mentioned. If this should be taken to be the result of some mannered plan of the poem, however, one would expect that traditional divinity suffered rather systematical removal, and that was obviously not the case, as we see in our first example. Lewis' hypothesis is further weakened if we remember that in the very first of *Aratea* fragments, which corresponds to the beginning of the original, Cicero sets off with Zeus (frg.1 *a Iove Musarum primordia*), and that would be one rather clumsy beginning for a would-be epicurean. As regards Germanicus, he does not mention Zeus or make any other word play in the verse corresponding to *Arat.* 253, but just a few verses earlier, in the scope of the Perseus passage, he will mention Perseus' parentage both indirectly (v.250 *moles ipsa viri satis est testata parentem*) and directly (v.251 *tantum*

occupat ab Iove caeli "so much of the sky was granted to him by Jupiter").[5] Word play Aratus introduced in v.275 was understood by Germanicus as an invitation to elaborate the myth of Leda, who was sexually assaulted by Jupiter in the form of a swan (v.275–277). In the third instance, just as in the case of Cicero, only the cold is mentioned, and not Jupiter (v.293 *Tunc rigor aut rapidus ponto tunc incubat auster*). Finally, in the account about the horrors facing the sailors who find themselves on the sea when the constellation of the Altair is shining bright, while the rest of the skies are covered in darkness, Germanicus resolves Aratus' allusion in favor of Jupiter: *vel si respexit servator Iuppiter* (v.410). Although Possanza's case appears to be stronger than Lewis's, we must stress that mention of Jupiter was conserved in three out of four instances we analysed, while in the last one complementary adjective *servator* was added of Germanicus' own initiative. Finally, before we make any conclusions about the translation of polysemic *calambours* in general, we must devote a couple of lines to solutions Avienus came up with: in the case of Perseus, curiously, no mention of Zeus was made; neither is Zeus mentioned when it comes to the bird, although it is said to fly in *magno... Olympo* (v.643), which could, perhaps, be interpreted as an attempt to correlate the mythological lore and the simple designation of sky, although it must be admitted that by the time of Avienus use of *Olympus* for sky has for a long time been a mere poetic convention (already in Varro's *De lingua latina*, 7. 20 *caelum dicunt Graeci Olympum*, and then Verg. *A.* passim). In the third case, Avienus mentions sky as the source of the horrid frost, but Jupiter is nowhere to be found: *tum dirum caelo frigus redit* (v.663). In our final example, in the Altair account, allusion is, much like in the case of Germanicus, resolved in favor of Jupiter the Merciful: *si sera Iovem subeat miseratio rerum* (v.868). No one could seriously claim that Avienus had any remotely atheistic intentions – not after his seventy-seven verses long prologue dedicated almost exclusively to his mystical and complex conception of Jupiter – and yet he has suppressed Jupiter at three out of four occasions. The reason for his absence must therefore be searched

[5]If one were willing to speculate, one could also say that by putting *Iove* and *caeli* one after another Germanicus wanted to render the Greek Ζεύς in its primordial meaning of the "sky" in Latin, although the two words are not syntactically related in the Latin sentence.

elsewhere, rather than in the religious ideologies of the translators. I would propose that reasons for this absence are to be sought in the fact that Zeus-puns were, as I hope we have shown, notoriously hard to translate, which resulted, to borrow Marco's terminology, in "negative punning balance" (Marco 2010, 276). According to this view, it would be no coincidence that it is the third of our instances (*Arat.* 294), that has not been translated by any of our translators: it is there that Aratus' Ζεύς is more intricately than on other places connected with the sky, rather than the divinity, which in turn presents the fiercest challenge for Latin translators, due to the lack of formal equivalent. Finally, only from this standpoint can the absence of Jupiter from the version of the undoubtedly religious Avienus be satisfactorily explained. Arguments of Lewis and, especially, Possanza can still be correct, but we hope that by this investigation we have shown some limits to that approach and indicated that absence of Jupiter can, at least in some cases, be a problem of style and translation, rather than poet's ideology or religious viewpoints.

When it comes to *the horizontal puns*, homonymy seems to be the key word, and is indeed sometimes taken to represent the whole category (see Marco 2010, 266). It is a representative *par excellence* of disharmony between similar forms and different meanings (Delabastita 2004, 601) and classified in category of word plays by substitution by Henry (2003, 24–25). Aratus makes ample use of homonymy in his poem – as an example we might take v.165–166 ἀλλ᾽ ἡ [αἴξ] μὲν πολλή τε καὶ ἀγλαή: *οἱ* δέ *οἱ* αὐτοῦ / λεπτὰ φαείνονται Ἔριφοι "she [the Goat] is vast and shiny, while her Kids out there shine faintly". The pun lies in the twofold usage of *οἱ*, once as a third person singular pronoun in possessive dative (referring to the Goat), and once as a definite article in nominative plural (referring to the Kids). Although the dynamic playfulness of this word play is easy to grasp, it has not found its way into the Latin translations, probably due to simple linguistic impossibility. The world play in this case makes use of "intrinsic structure of the (source) language" (Delabastita 2004, 600), which makes it hard to find a decent equivalent in the target language. Germanicus might have tried compensating for this incapacity by epistrophe with *Haedos* and *Haedi* in v.169 and v.171 respectively.

Closely related to homonymies are the so-called *morphological puns*

(Delabastita 2004, 603), which rely on – often false – etymologies. We have already stressed at the beginning of this section the unusual importance morphological semblance had for Ancient people, who viewed accidental similarities between words as motivated and significant. The amazing world of ancient etymologies is opened wide to us in a most curious way already in Plato's *Cratylus*, where Socrates vigorously advocates for the motivated, natural origin of word names against Hermogenes' conventionalist viewpoint. As a rather indicative example, we may take Socrates' resourceful list of possible explanations of Poseidon's (Ποσειδῶν) name (Plat. *Crat*. 402e–403a), as a compound of either δεσμὸς and ποδῶν (name would thus mean "footbound", since water acted like chains and impeded Poseidon's progress), or πολλὰ and εἰδότος (as in one who knows much) or even as a developement of ὁ σείων ("the Shaker", referring to the god's seismic activities). Although some have tried to dismiss evidence from *Cratylus* arguing that Plato and Socrates are actually trying to expose the banality of such conceptions of language, the evidence in Varro's linguistic treatise shows that this cannot be true. (see Ahl 1983, 22–23) It is by bearing this in mind that we should approach the rich field of Aratus' etymological word plays and their translations in the hands of Romans. Our first example comes already from Aratus' v.27, in which he claims that the constellations of Great and Little Bear (Ἄρκτοι) are jointly known also as "the Wagon" (Ἅμαξαι), since they move together (ἅμα) around the celestial pole (ἄξις). It is rather clear that such a masterpiece of pseudo-etymological ingenuity is hardly translatable to any language at all. While most of the modern scientific translations resorts to the so-called *omission* (Marco 2010, 269), conserving the content, but losing the pun,[6] it comes as no surprise that there is a complete silence regarding this etymology in our Latin translations. It seems that Latin translators tried to compensate for their incapacity to account for this alternative name of the constellations

[6]Cf. Erren 1971, 7: "Zwei Bärinnen aber, ihn einfassend, rollen gemeinsam; darum werden sie denn auch Wagen gennant"; Martin 1998, 2: "Autour de lui deux Ourses se suivent de près. C'est pour cela qu'on les appelle Chariots". Note, however, the ingenious translation by Kidd (1997, 75): "On either side of it two Bears *wheel* in unison, and so they are called *the Wagon*" (emphasis added). See also Poochigian 2010, 1: "which are at times called *Wagons* since they roll like wagon-wheels".

by proposing that the shape of the constellation really does look like a Chariot: Cic. *Arat*. frg.5 *quem nostri Septem soliti vocitare Triones* (where the similitude would be expressed in the parallelism of seven stars and seven bulls in each of the constellations);[7] Germ. *Arat*. 26 *Plaustraque, quae facies stellarum proxima verae*; Avienus *Arat*. 104 *fabula namque ursas, species dat plaustra videri*. We find our next example in Aratus' v.32–35. where he describes how Kuretes (Κούρετες) made an effort to keep Zeus' residency on the mount Ida during his youth (κουρίζοντα) a secret.[8] This section of Cicero's version is not preserved, while in Avienus' text no trace of the word play is to be found. There is no obvious word play in Germanicus' translation either, unless we wont to accept the undoubtedly ingenious, but admittedly stretched assumption by Possanza (2004, 124–125), that in Germanicus' v.36–38 one should connect words *aerea* (for tools with the help of which Kuretes produced noise) and *Corybantes* with an obscure gloss by Servius, which suggests that the name *Corybantes* comes from the name of a mountain rich in copper (*aeris ferax*). This is, without any doubt, a very interesting hypothesis, but one which is next to impossible to corroborate. Failure to credit Aratus' word play is apparent in our next example (v.313–315) as well. There Aratus describes the way the constellation of the Eagle (ἀητός) is moved across the sky by forces of wind (ἄηται). The word play in this etymology is strengthened by the fact that, when the night approaches its end, the rise of the Eagle usually announces stormy weather. Cicero (v.87–90) and Avienus (v.698–699) resolve the word play, giving account of the name of the constellation and its presumed sinister effects on the weather separately, while Germanicus suppresses any mention of storm. It could further be claimed that the Romans tried to compensate for the loss of the pun by piling up epithets on the bird (Germ. *Arat*. 316 *Iovis ales*, 317 *Iovis armiger*; Av. *Arat*. 694 *Armiger... Iovis*), but there is no sure correlation between the two phenomena, and we will see in the next

[7]The conception of this constellation as Seven Bulls seems to have been pre-Hellenic. Varro connects the word *triones* to *terra* (since the bulls cultivate the soil), but it might be better to connect it to the verb *terere*, and consequently to bulls involved in threshing. (cf. Le Boeuffle 2010, 87–89).

[8]We find the same word play in Callimachus' *Hymn to Zeus*, v.53–55. The relative chronology of the two is, however, still highly debated.

section that supposed compensation of this kind could have belonged to a completely different tendency in Roman translations. Our final example comes from Aratus' v.331–332 in which he presents the infamous star Sirius (Σείριος) as flaring incessantly (σειριάει).[9] Cicero seems to have thought that the safest way to deal with yet another essentially untranslatable sequence was to omit it altogether, and he did so in such a complete way, that Sirius is not even named in his text, which has led some of the earlier editors to suppose that a verse or two have fallen out at the spot (Grotius). Germanicus and Avienus, on the other hand, offer a different kind of solution. They are both alluding to the ominousness of the name in an indirect way: *Sirion hanc Grai proprio sub nomine dicunt* (Germ. *Arat*. 335), *formidato sub nomine Sirius* (Av. *Arat*. 733). Sirius is, hence, the "proper" or the "horrible" name of the malevolent star. Both of these solutions clearly presuppose the existence of the pun involving the name of the star in the original language, but the readers are seemingly expected to get around it themselves, using their previous knowledge of Greek. One might see some form of macaronic word play (word play involving the use of several languages, cf. Delabastita 2004, 603) in these Latin translations, since resources of both Greek and Latin are activated to convey the effect.

To sum up. Although word plays have been a rather inappropriate ornament for high or serious literature for quite some time: Quintilian (*Inst. Or.* IX 3. 69) argued against them and gave some examples *vitandi potius quam imitandi gratia* and his judgement survived to the modern day (Henry, for example, names rhetorical handbooks from 18th and 19th century that adopt such an attitude, cf. Henry 2003, 17), Ahl's thorough study has, however, provided evidence that word play had an essential role in Greco-Roman mind, while an interesting study by Noegel, in which evidence about the translations of the so-called Janus parallelism in the Septuagint are provided (Noegel 1995), has already, if on a wholly peculiar material, dwelt on the question of their translation in Ancient times (but see also Katz 2008). I hope that in the scope of this section we have succeeded in showing that word play was an important and

[9]On these two words see a thorough discussion by Martin (1998, 288–289): while the name Σείριος is attested already in Hesiod's *Works and Days*, the verb σειριᾶν seems to have been taken over from medical terminology, where it indicated insolation.

integrated characteristic of Aratus' refined style and that it often did not just simply ornate the text, but also furnish it with some hidden meaning or pod-text. I hope that we have also managed to show that Roman translators were well aware of this characteristic of their original, that they approached the problem from various angles and with varying success, but that albeit sometimes examples of remarkable ingenuity can be found, the overall impression leans towards negative punning balance. It must be stressed, however, that word plays and puns are notorious for the pains they cause to translators, and that the topics of our next two sections will be able to show the stylistic approaches of Roman translator in a fairer way and from a different perspective.

3. Personification (and comparison)

Aratus' myths – most notably, the Dike passage and the legend of Orion – and their translated versions have received more than their fair share of scholarly attention. However, little or no systematic attention (at least to my knowledge) has been devoted to the less conspicuous elements he used in order to bring liveliness to his poem: first and foremost, his personifications. For Aratus and for the topic he has chosen personification was, nonetheless, an all-important device. For the purposes of this study, we have made a twofold division of Aratean personifications to *personifications of the first level* and *personifications of the second level*. This division necessarily demands some clarifications. It is often the case that Aratus speaks of the head, arms, legs or various other parts of constellational figures, which are, from his viewpoint, depicted in this way or another by stars visible on the night sky. Since in reality – reality he and his readers were doubtlessly aware of – the star αCMa (*Sirius*) is, to take but one example, not a chin of any dog, and yet Aratus calls it γένυς (v.330), we might safely say that he resorts to personification (in our division, this is *personification of the first level*). Since, however, the whole section of the poem we chose to analyse (v.19–453), and indeed the whole poem, deals with humans, animals, rivers and objects prefigured in the night sky, one could claim that the whole poem is in its various details and in its general conception is a very elaborated personification of this kind. If, however, in the scope of the same passage Aratus also says that the Dog is φρουρὸς ("the ward", v.326) of Orion, it seems that something else is on play. Stars can show various body-parts of the dog, but they cannot

represent him as a "guard" of anyone or anything. Therefore, presence of any characteristic of constellations which is not attested by stars and which in turn does not (and indeed *cannot*) have any relevance for relative positioning of stars, i.e. constellations, will be considered, for purposes of this study, to be *the personification of the second level*. These are very clearly delineated concepts, but sometimes not entirely easy to grasp, which is why I will give several provisional examples, to render the matter as clear as possible, before engaging in the further discussion. For instance, referring to the arm of Orion would be a *personification of the first level*, but describing that arm as strong, weather-beaten, hairy etc. would be a *personification of the second level*. To take another example, if one were to say that there is a man among the constellations, and that this man is bending his knees, one would not go beyond the limit of the first level, since there indeed is a group of stars constituting what is imagined to be the outline of the bending knees of a man. One would, however, move to the second level if one were to add that the man in question were subject to some kind of labour or suffering, since these information stand in no relation whatsoever with the stars of the night sky, nor can in any way be deduced from them.

The aim of this section will be to check how Aratus' *personifications of the second level* are rendered in the three translations or, more precisely, if there is a (quantitative)[10] difference in the measure they are represented in the original and in the translations. We recognize several ways in which a translation can react to the original in respect to this question:

Chart 1: Legend for Table 1

Original text of Aratus		Latin translations of Aratus	
A	personification of the second level	**1**	personification of the second level
		2	personification of the first level / verse missing
		3	ambiguity
B	personification of the first	**4**	personification of the second level

[10]I intentionally place "quantitative" between brackets, since, as it will become clear from the discussion about problems this approach raises, the numbers we will get are necessarily only indicative, and it is a matter of little doubt that different researchers would get a slightly different count in either direction. I strongly believe, however, that the results we obtain will be reliable and indicative enough to draw conclusions.

	level / verse missing/ mythology			**5**	ambiguity
				5a	comparison
				0	personification of the first level / verse missing
C	ambiguity			**6**	ambiguity
				7	personification of the second level
				8	personification of the first level / verse missing
A–C	personification of the first or second level, mythology, missing verse or ambiguity			**9**	mythology
D	comparison	**d1**	for the liveliness of the picture	**10**	comparison
				11	personification of the second level
		d2	comparing the constellation to its living counterpart	**12**	personification of the first level / verse missing

By ambiguity in this context we mean uncertainty whether the personification in question is of the first or of the second level. In the rest of this chapter we will refer to the letters and numbers used in the table for the sake of convenience.

It might be surprising at the first sight to see that comparison (category *d*) plays a role in this division. This requires clarification. Aratus sometimes (*d1*) compares his constellations, personified on the first level, to other items, just in order to create a livelier picture, as when, for example, the constellation of the Dragon is compared to the river flow (v.45, οἵη ποταμοῖο ἀπορρώξ). In other cases (*d2*), which are more numerous, Aratus seems to compare the stars and their layout to living items, as, for instance, when he says that the Dragon "looks as if he were winking towards the Great Bear" (v.58, νεύοντι δὲ πάμπαν ἔοικεν). This, however, only underlines the inanimate nature of the thing being compared, since the stellar Dragon cannot really wink, but can only seem to do so. This type of comparison is taken to the extreme in the case of Hydra, where Aratus claims that she looks "as if she were alive" (v.444, τὸ δὲ ζώοντι ἐοικὸς), which ultimately means that she is not at all alive in reality. We have taken into account all these types of comparisons, although the way translations handled this second type will naturally be more im-

portant for our purpose. Only those comparisons have been analysed which pertain to stars and constellations – the comparison of sailors cought in the stormy see to shearwaters (v.296 ἴκελοι δὲ κολυμβίσιν αἰθυίῃσιν) , for example, very interesting in itself as it may be, is beyond the scope of this paper.

The role of mythology in our study might also need some specifications. Namely, we have decided to exclude it and not to call its instances the occurrances of the second level personifications. The reason for this is that introducing myths into the narrative on constellations can have many motives (display of erudition in alluding to rare recherché myths, to name but one), only part of which overlaps with the motives available for the second level personifications (most notably, the wish to present constellations as more real than conventional). That is why we tought it best to create strictly delineated corpus of personifications, analysis of which would yield its own results which could then be compared to results gained by analysis of mythical instances in Aratus and his translators, previously done by others, and support or controvert those results.

Not everything in this research is, however, as straightforward as it might seem or, rather, as one might wish. Problems with identifying and counting personifications of the second level are considerable. At the first place, it sometimes occurs that the text of Aratus or of his translators is unclear either because of the issues in the text transmission, or because of the mannerist and vague style of the authors themselves, which makes it hard to determine whether certain verse contains the kind of personification we are looking for. To take but one illustrative example, when Aratus mentions the Dragon as the σκολιοῖο Δράκοντος (v.70), it seems probable that he refers to the specific zig-zag disposition of the stars in the aforementioned asterism. It is, however, nevertheless very tempting to assume that he calls on his readers to use their imagination and invoke the image of the twisted, winding members of the actual (one cannot say "real" in this case) Dragon's body. For this kind of problems, there is no clear-cut solution, and each case has to be judged on its own merit. For the most of such cases, however, we deemed it appropriate to introduce the category of *ambiguity*, that is uncertainty of attribution of a certain verse to personifications of either first or second level, all while

acknowledging that it necessarily belongs to at least one of them. Naturally, in the work of a poet such as Aratus and his learned successors, sought ambiguity is very possible, in some, many or all of the instances. It is, therefore, interesting to see how these ambiguities were treated in Roman translations: were they kept or were Latin poets prone to resolve them, and, if so, were they resolving them rather in the direction of the first or of the second level?

Category of *ambiguity* can indeed be pursued to a further use: it is intrinsically difficult to decide which stars belonged to a certain constellation in the view of Aratus and in the view of each of his Latin translators. Therefore, if one of them calls the constellation of the Rabbit *auritum* "long-eared" (cf. Germ. *Arat*. 341), we find ourselves faced with two possibilities: either some stars which denote the ears of the Rabbit are referred to (νλικLep would be the most probable candidates), in which case we have a clear case of the first level personification; or the poet rather refers to the long ears as the typical characteristic in representations of rabbits, which would, in turn, require us to interpret this word as the second level personification occurrence. Each of these cases will also have to be dealt with by itself.

Finally, apart from these and similar difficulties in identifying the occurrences of the phenomenon itself, there are also some issues concerning the ways they are to be counted. For instance, if an author would use two or more words which may be regarded as a second level personification in a row and when none of them exists in the original text – that is our case (*4*), cf. *supra* – are we to count them as one, or as several occurrences? The same question, in a somewhat altered form, could be applied to the original as well – if Aratus makes a row of second level personifications, referring to the same object, one after another, how many occurrences should we count? And if we count it as one, do we suppose that it is enough that the whole series is rendered in translation by a single second level personification item in order to prepare what we have previously defined as case (*1*)? For this issue we are forced to establish a convention, which is to be followed in our approach to all examples that conform to this structure. We, therefore, take that in case that if the row of the second level personifications is not intercepted by significant parts of text containing either exclusively personifications of

the first level or lacking any personification at all, that row is to be counted as one single occurrence of the second level personification in both original and translation. "Significant part of text" mentioned in the preceding definition will refer to an either independent or dependent clause. Also, if several personfying items are collected in one in Aratus, and are rendered by a single item in translation, it will be counted, for the purposes of this study, in the category *1*.

It is an issue of the similar type that sometimes we counted in the category indicated by the number 1 (translating original's second level by the second level) those instances in translations which are not direct equivalents of the original's second level, but present the second level personification at approximately same place in the text and apply it to the same constellation. A good example is perhaps to be found in translations of Aratus' verse 57, where he calls the constellation of the Dragon δεινοῖο πελώρου ("the horrible monster"): this personification meets its counterpart in Cicero's *trucibus... oculis* (fr. 9. 3). As we can see, we are not dealing with real translation, but the equivalent effect is achieved: it could in fact be called *compensation*, in the sense this term is used in translation studies. It must also be noted that, due to the freedoms assumed by Roman translators, counterparts of certain instances of personifications in Aratus cannot be sought at the exact same place they are in the original, and it must be allowed for the area of their presumed existence to be broader, while staying in the limits of the description of the same constellation as in the original.

Our results are presented in Table 1 below. It would have been possible to give just the final numbers and save a lot of space, but due to the issues discussed above, we deemed it more appropriate to allow our reader insight in decisions we made about each of the examples, so that he could have firm ground in agreeing or disagreeing with them. If we were counting something less fluctuant, as adverbs, place names or masculine caesuras etc., we would have given just the final count, noting perhaps some of the exceptions and vague instances faced along the way in the footnote. In this matter, however, to present the full table to the reader seems highly recommendable.

Table 1: First and second level personifications and comparisons in Aratus' original and the Latin translations

oc	v/c	Aratus	v/c	Cicero	v/c	Germanicus	v/c	Avienus
1	28	ἐπ᾽ ἰξύας		Ø	29	*horrida terga*	120	*flammis ardentia dorsa*
	b		-		4		0	
2	45	οἵη ποταμοῖο ἀπορρώξ	fr. 8. 1.	*veluti rapido cum gurgite flumen*	48	*abrupti fluminis instar*	139	*ceu circumflexo ... flumina lapsu*
	d1		10		10		10	
3	46	εἰλεῖται...	fr. 8. 2-3	*serpit... revolvens sese*	49	*volumina torquet*	140	*agmen agens ... volvitur*
	c		8		7		7	
4	46	μέγα θαῦμα Δράκων	fr. 8. 2	*torvu' Draco*	50	*mirabile monstrum ... squamigero lapsu*	140	*squameus... Draco*
	b		4		4		4	
5	48	ἄρκτοι... πεφυλαγμέναι ὠκεανοῖο		Ø	64	*semper inocciduis servantes ignibus axem*	115	*nescia signa salis*
	a		-		1		1	
6	50	ἄκρη οὐρὴ		Ø	52	*ultima cauda*	144	*ultima monstri agmina*
	b		-		0		4	
7	53	εἰλεῖται κεφαλὴν...		Ø	54	*explicat amplius orbes*	149	*vertitur*
	c		-		7		6	
8	54	ἀνατρέχει		Ø	55	*respicit*	150	*repetit*
	a		-		1		1	
9	56	δύο κροτάφοις	fr. 9.2	*tempora*	56	*cava tempora*	153	*saetosa... duo tempora*
	b		0		4		4	
10	57	δεινοῖο πελώρου	fr. 9. 3	*trucibus... oculis*	59a	Ø	160	*sibila ora*
	a		1		-		1	
11	58	νεύοντι δὲ πάμπαν ἔοικεν	fr. 9. 6. 1	*obtutum in cauda Maioris figere dicas*	61	*decline caput*	156	*in nutum veluti curvata*
	d2		10		12		10	

12	63	μογέοντι... ἀνδρὶ ἐοικὸς εἴδωλον... ὀκλάζοντι ἔοικεν	fr. 11. 1.	*velut maerentis imago*	0		172	*laboranti similis imago*
	d2		10		12		10	
13	66	ἐν γούνασι κάμνον	fr. 11	*defessa... imago*	65	*effigies defecta labore*	172	*(laboranti similis) imago*
	a		1		1		2	
14	68	χεῖρες ἀείρονται		Ø	68	*suppliciter passis ad numina palmis... figit*	191	*manus... in violenta verbera pendens*
	b		0		4		4	
15	70	σκολιοῖο Δράκοντος		Ø	69	*Serpentis*	193	*maculosi... Draconis*
	c		0		8		7	
16	0		0		0		200	*sibila... ora Draco*
			0		0		4	
17	73	κεκμηότος εἰδώλοιο		Ø	70	*fessi*	203	*defessi*
	a		-		1		1	
18	74	κεφαλῇ γε μὲν ἄκρῃ		Ø	74	*vertice... succiduis genibus lapsum et miserabile sidus*	205	*vertice... sideris innixi*
	b		0		4		0	
19	0		fr. 15.3.	*virum*	0		226	*ardens venas Ophiuchus*
	0		4		0		4	
20	82	ἀμφότεραι δ᾽ Ὄφιος πεπονήαται		Ø	79	*manus, per quas elabitur Anguis*	236	*serpens... elabitur ambas flexilis*
	a		-		1		1	
21	84	[ὀφιοῦχος] ἐπίθλίβει	fr. 15.5.	*ille... graviter vestigia ponit... urget*	81	*tangit*	240	*[Scorpios] efflictus*
	a		1		2		1	
22	84	μέγα θηρίον	fr. 15.5.	*Nepai*	81	*Scorpios*	240	*maculosa pectora*
	a		2		2		1	
23	88	[Ὄφιος] παρακέκλιται ἄκρα γένεια		Ø	86	*erigitur Serpens*	248	*[Serpens] lubricus*
	b		-		0		4	

24	89	νειόθι δὲ σπείρης	-	Ø	88	*qua... lubricus Anguis*	248	*post spiram*
	b				4		0	
25	0		0		0		248	*bracchia formidata truci ... Orioni*
	0		0		0		4	
26		μεγάλας ... χηλάς		Ø	89	*Chelae*	251	*falcata... cornua monstri*
	b		-		0		4	
27	91	ἐξόπιθεν δ᾽ Ἑλίκης	fr. 16.2.	*Arctum*	90	*Helicen*	254	*ferinam... effigiem*
	b		0		0		4	
28	91	ἐλάοντι ἐοικὼς Ἀρκτοφύλαξ... ἐπαφώμενος εἴδεται	fr. 16.2.	*prae se quatit Arctum*	90	*sequitur senior baculoque minatur*	259	*instanti similis silimilisque minanti*
	d2		11		11		10	
29	0		0		0		261	*in picturatae plaustra... matris*
	0		0		0		4	
30	136	πολυσκέπτοι ο Βοώτεω		Ø	139	*tardus Bootes*	352	*anhela astra Bootis*
	b		-		4		4	
31	137	τῆς ὑπὲρ ἀμφοτέρων ὤμων	fr. XX, 1.	*huic supera duplices umeros*	140	*Virginis... placidae... umeros*	353	*istius extremis umerorum partibus*
	b		0		4		0	
32	140	Ἄρκτου	fr. 20.1.	*huic*	141	*Helices*	368	*illa [Arctos] inscia piscosi semper salis*
	b		0		0		4	
33	143	πρὸ ποδῶν [ἄρκτου]		Ø	143	*priora vestigia*	361	*prima ferae vestigia*
	b		-		0		4	
34	144	εἷς δ᾽ ἰξυόθεν κατιόντων		Ø	144	*clunibus hirsutis*	362	*pedibus... clunalibus*
	b		-		4		0	
35	146	ἄλλοθεν ἄλλος		Ø	146	*sine honore feruntur*	366	*simul vulgi vice convolvuntur*
	b		-		0		5a	

36	147 b	οἱ Δίδυμοι	fr. 22, 1. 4	*natos Geminos*	148 0	*Gemini*	370 9	*Spartanam subolem*
37	147 b	Καρκίνος	fr. 22, 2. 0	*Cancer*	151 0	*in Cancro*	383 4	*[Cancer] duro... dorso*
38	0 0		0 0		0 0		387 4	*qualis praesepibus esse*
	0		0		0		5a	
39	148 b	Λέων	fr. 22, 3. 5	*magnu' Leo*	149 4	*horrentis iubas et fulvum Leonem*	392 5	*maxima... ora Leonis*
40	161 b	Ἑλίκης δέ οἱ ἄκρα κάρηνα	fr. 25, 2. 4	*caput huic Helice truculenta*	164 0	*Maiorisque Ursae... ora*	413 0	*Helices caput*
41	167 c	κεραὸν Ταῦρον	fr. 27 7	*corninger. .. valido corpore Taurus*	174 7	*trux... Taurus cornua... gerens... ore minaci*	422 6	*cornigeri... Tauri*
42	0 0		-	Ø	177 4	*patulis naris*	424 4	*saetosam pecoris... frontem... minaces... oculos*
43	170 a	κάρη βοός	-	Ø	182 1	*ruit Oceano bos*	430 1	*pecoris frons*
44	174 b	Ταύρου	-	Ø	178 0	*[Tauri]*	438 4	*pecoris*
45	176 b	εἷς ἀστὴρ ἐπέχει	-	Ø	180 4	*ligat conpagine divos*	438 0	*una stella tenet*
46	179 b	Κηφῆος μογερὸν γένος Ἰασίδαο	-	Ø	185 9	*cum conjuge Cepheus... totaque domo*	440 4, 9	*senem... Cephea... Iasiden*
47	185 b	ἐς πόδας ἀμφοτέρους	-	Ø	191 0	*Cepheos vestigia*	445 4	*pedes... seniles*
48	187 c	καμπῆς μεγάλοιο Δράκοντος	-	Ø	192 6	*ad flexum sinuosi... Anguis*	449 6	*flexi... spira Draconis*

49	188 b	τοῦ... προκυλίνδεται		Ø	193 4	*virum*	448 0	*rursum*
50	188 b	δαιμονίη... Κασσιέπεια		Ø	198 4	[*Cassiepia*] *horrida vultu*	450 9	*infortunatam ... Cassiepiam*
51	190 c	οὐ... μιν πολλοὶ καὶ ἐπημοιβοὶ γανόωσιν ἀστέρες	fr. 30 8	*obscura specie stellarum*	195 6	*paucis decorata ... flammis*	454 9	*maerenti... aegrae... matri*
52	192 d1	οἵῃ δὲ κληῖδι θύρην ἔντοσθ᾽ ἀραρυῖαν δικλίδ᾽ ἐπτπλήσσοντ ες ἀνακρούουσι ν ὀχῆας		Ø	196 10	*qualis ferratos subicit clavicula dentes, succutit foribus praeducti vincula claustri*	455 10	*qualem Caria quondam noverat intrantem per claustra tenacia clavem*
53	196 b	φαίης κεν ἀνιάξειν ἐπὶ παιδί		Ø	199 9	*ceu sit planctura...*	458 9	*natae fera fata retundunt*
54	201 b	ζώματα πάντα		Ø	204 4	*substricta... zonula palla*	464 0	*cingula... Andromedae*
55	203 b	δεσμὰ δέ οἱ κεῖται καὶ ἐν οὐρανῷ		Ø	205 4,9	*sed poenae facies remanet ceu duri teneantur robore saxi*	466 4,9	*vivax est poena dolenti... contortis nodis*
56	204 b	[Ἀνδρομέδης] οἱ καὶ κρατὶ		Ø	207 0	*Andromedae capiti*	470 4	*odorato crine ...Andromedae*
57	205 a	πέλωρ... ἵππος	fr. 32, 1. 1	*iubam quatiens*	207 1	*Sonipes... ales*	472 2	*Equi*
58	205 b	οἱ	fr. 32, 1. 0	*huic*	207 0	*Andromedae capiti... vertice*	473 4	*virginis*

59	205	κρατὶ	fr. 32, 2.	*summum. .. caput*	208	*vertice... Andromedae*	473	*in vertice coni vice surgit acuti*
	b		0		0		5a	
60	207	τοῦ μὲν ἐπ᾽ ὀμφαλίῳ	fr. 32, 2.	*alvo [Equi]*	209	*sub... alvo... Equi*	475	*sub absciso... ventre cornipedis... pecori*
	b		0		0		4	
61	215	ἱερὸς Ἵππος		Ø	212	*spumanti... ferus ore lupata*	486	*non... quadrupes*
	b		-		4		0	
62	223	ὁ Ἵππος ἐν Διὸς εἰλεῖται		Ø	223	*velocis agitat pennas et sidere gaudet*	506	*micat ille procul flagrantibus astris*
	b		-		4		0	
63	227	οὐδὲν ἀφαυρό-τερον τροχάει		Ø	228	*properat contingere metas*	510	*numquam... segnior ablapsu coventitor*
	b		-		4		0	
64	228	αὐτὸς	fr.33.	*contortis.. . cum cornibus*	229	*illi facies*	515	*Lanigeri... forma*
	b		4		0		4	
65	233	σῆμα	5	*signum*	234	*deum*	528	*Deltoton*
	b		0		4		0	
66	238	Κριοῦ	10	*Aries*	240	*Lanigeri tergum*	535	*in astro lanati ... pecoris*
	b		0		4		4	
67	0		0		0		545	*Laniger*
	0		0		0		4	
68	240	ἄλλου	0		241	*alter in austrum tendit*	550	*alter aquarum Troicus... quas fundit avidus*
	b		0		0		4,9	
69	242	ἠΰτε δεσμὰ οὐραίων	14	*velut esse catenas dicas*	244	*vincula cauda singula utrumque tenent*	555	*cingula... quasi... tenentur*
	d2		10		11		10	
70	246	ἀριστερὸς Ἰχθύος	19	*adpositum ... Piscem*	246	*Piscis*	560	*caerulus erigitur*
	b		0		0		4	

71	248 b	γαμβροῦ	20 9	*natum summo Iove*	248 4,9	*ales... effigies grata servatae*	564 9	*vindex*
72	0 0		21 4	*defixo corpore*	0 0		0 0	
73	250 c	περιμήκετος ἄλλων	26 9	*victor*	250 7	*moles ipsa viri*	564 6	*maxima... dextera*
74	252 b	ποσὶν	24 4	*pedes, vinctos talaribus aptis*	253 4	*aligeris... plantis*	564 4	*alato... pede*
75	253 a	κεκονιμένος	25 1	*pulver-ulentulus*	254 2	*purum aethera findere*	566 1	*vestigia passu pulverulenta ... pandit*
76	270 b	ἀπευθέος Εἰδώλοιο	45 0	*Nixi*	278 4	*defectum sidus*	631 0	*Adnixi... sidera*
77	271 b	σκελέεσσι πέτηλον	0 0		271 4	*labore devictam effigiem*	0 0	
78	0 0		0 0		272 5	*torti subjecta Draconis tempora... premit*	0 0	
79	272 b	κεφαλή... ἄκρη ἀντιπέρην Ὄρνιθος	46 0	*inter flexum genus et caput alitis*	275 0	*contra spectat Avem*	633 4	*ora canoros tenditur ad nervos*
80	275 a	αἰόλος ὄρνις	48 1	*serpens geminis secat aera pinnis*	275 9	*Phoebi... cygnus*	636 1	*secat aethera pinnis... volatum perfacilem... praepes*
81	278 d2	εὐδιόωντι ποτὴν ὄρνιθι ἐοικὼς	0 12		0 12		0 12	

82	279 b	κατὰ δεξιὰ χειρὸς Κηφείης	52 4	*dextram Cephei ... pellere... gestit*	280 9	*regalem Cepheos ulnam*	641 0	*Cepheida dextram*
83	281 a	σκαρθμὸς... Ἵππου... σκαίροντα... ἵππον	54 1	*fortis Equi propter... Equi vis... valido de pectore*	283 1	*instantem... Pegason*	645 1	*cornipedem*
84	281 b	λαιῇ δὲ πτέρυγι	54 4	*propter pinnati corporis alam*	283 4	*laeva fugit... ala*	642 0	*laevo*
85	283 b	Ὑδροχόοιο	56 0	*Aquari*	285 0	*Aquarius*	648 4	*Aquarius... pulcher*
86	284 b	ὀπίστερος Αἰγοκερῆος	59 4	*corpore semifero... Capricorn us*	286 0	*Aegoceros*	649 4	*hirsuti... Capricorni... hispida saetosi ... species Capricorni*
87	284 b	Αἰγοκερῆος τέλλεται	59 0	*Capricorn us ...*	286 5a	*Aegoceros semper properare videtur*	649 0	*Capricorni*
88	290 c	ἠ(Η)ὼς	66 6	*clari praenuntia solis*	292 8	*multum clamatos... ortus*	0 8	
89	301 b	[ὀϊστὸς]	78 4	*flexum vi corporis arcum*	306 4	*belligerum... arcum... ferum*	669 4	*sagitta... levis*
90	306 b	τοξευτὴς	78 4	*flexum vi corporis arcum*	312 5	*gravis Arcus*	683 4	*pigro... sidere ...Arquitenens ... tardos artus*
91	312 b	ἄτερ τόξου	84 4	*missore vacans*	315 4	*incertum quo cornu missa, Sagitta*	691 4	*inscia... domini*

92	312	παραπέπτατ αι Ὄρνις	85	*nitens pinna ... Ales*	0		692	*Ales, Ales Olor*
	b		4		0		4	
93	315	ἄητον	87	*Aquila... tremebun dis ... pinis*	316	*Iovis ales... Iovis armiger*	694	*armiger... Iovis*
	b		4		9		9	
94	316	Αἰγοκερῆϊ	91	*magni... Capricorn i corpora*	321	*Capricornum*	707	*auritum... Capricornu m*
	b		5		0		4	
95	322	Ταύροιο τομή	103	*truculenti corpora Tauri*	328	*Tauri*	720	*fera pectora Tauri*
	b		4		0		4	
96	323	κεῖνον	102	*Orion... nitens*	330	*virum*	724	*virum*
	b		4		4		4	
97	0		0		332	*sic vagina ensis*	723	*auratum... ensem*
	0		0		4		4	
98	326	φρουρὸς... ἀμφοτεροῖσι.. . ἐπὶ ποσσὶ	109	*vepres*	333	*custos... ore timendo*	724	*custos*
	a		1		1		1	
99	336	κείνου	109	[*Canis*]	334	[*Canis*]	745	*belua*
	b		0		0		4	
100	338	λαγῳός	121	*levipes Lepus*	341	*auritum Leporem... parvuum Leporem*	747	*parvulus... Lepus*
	b		4		4		4	
101	339	διώκεται... ἐπαντέλλει... καί μιν κατιόντα δοκεύει	121	*hic fugit, ictus horrificos metuens* etc.	341	*sequitur... fugit*	750	*effugit instantem, premit Sirius ore... auritum...*
	a		1		1		1	
102	340	μετιόντι ἐοικώς	124	*praecipit- antem agitans*	0		752	*minax*
	d2		11		12		11	
103	342	ἕλκεται	126	*prolabitur*	346	*trahitur*	758	*se... movet*
	c		8		6		7	
104	342	πρυμνόθεν	127	*convexam. .. puppim*	345	*aplustria puppis*	765	*rutilam... puppim*
	b		4		4		5	

105	343	οὐ γὰρ τῇ γε κατὰ χρέος εἰσὶ κέλευθοι	128	*non aliae naves ut in alto ponere proras ante solent*	346	*non recto... cursu*	757	*neque... sollemnem in faciem rostro movet*
	b		5a		0		0	
106	344	οἷα καὶ αὐταὶ νῆες	131	*sicuti*	347	*ut cum*	759	*velut*
	d2		10		10		10	
107	348	ἕλκεται	134	*vertitur*	0		766	*ducitur*
	c		6		8		6	
108	351	πηδάλιον κεχαλασμένον	137	*gubernaculum*	355	*demisso... clavo*	767	*gubernaculum in undas... merso in aequora... clavo*
	a		2		1		1	
109	354	μέγα κῆτος κατεπείγει... ἐχθρὸν	140	*fera... pistrix caerula vestigat*	356	*sequitur ... Pristis... illa terretur monstro pelagi et gaudet...*	770	*perterret Cetos ... belua dira ... ora inimica*
	a		1		1		1	
110	357	Ἰχθύσιν	143	*squamoso corpore Pisces*	361	*Pisces*	774	*Piscibus... duobus*
	b		4		0		0	
111	357	Κριῷ	143	*Aries*	361	*Aries*	773	*laniger*
	b		0		0		4	
112	0		0		0		778	*squalentia monstri terga*
	0		0		0		4	
113	0		139	*in tuto locatam Andromedam*	0		779	*pavidum caput [Andromedae]*
	0		4, 9		0		4, 9	
114	357	κῆτος	145	[*Pistrix*]	362	*belua... ponti*	775	*Nereia Pistrix*
	b		0		4		9	
115	358	Ποταμοῦ... ἀστερόεντος	144	*Fluminis... ripas*	362	*Amnem*	780	*caeruleo flumen ... gurgite*
	b		4		4		4	

116	360 b	λείψανον Ἠριδανοῖο	146 4	*Eridanus... funestum magnis cum viribus amnem*	368 4	*huius pars undae*	803 4	*Eridani... anfractibus*
117	0 0		0 0		367 4	*Eridanus... liquidis...astris*	804 4	*effusi vi gurgitis*
118	364 c	λοφίης... ἀκάνθῃ	154 8	*spina*	370 7	*cristam ... aequoreae pristis*	804 8	*cristae... apex*
119	368 b	πηδαλίου	157 0	*guber-naculum*	374 0	*clavumque carinae*	807 4	*demissum... clavum... depictaque terga carinae*
120	368 b	Κήτεος	156 0	*Pistricem*	0 0		809 4	*Pistrim undicolam*
121	369 a	γλαυκοῦ... Λαγωοῦ	158 1	*formidans acrem morsum Lepus*	373 2	*Leporis*	809 2	*Leporis... alvus*
122	384 a	διωκομένοιο Λαγωοῦ	0 2		0 2		821 1	*Leporem qua Sirius urget*
123	386 b	Αἰγοκερῆος	168 0	*Capricorn o*	381 0	*Aegoceri*	823 4	*saetosi... Capricorni*
124	387 b	ἐς Κῆτος	169 0	*Pistricem*	381 0	*Pristin... ad imam*	825 4	*in horrificam Pistrim*
125	392 c	ἀγαυοῦ Ὑδροχόοιο	172 8	*radiantis Aquari*	387 8	*Aquarius*	827 7	*pulcher Aquarius* (832. *ephebi*)
126	390 b	κήτεος αἰθερίοιο	171 0	*Pistricem*	383 4	*qua caudam belua flectit*	828 4	*cristato... belua dorso*
127	393 d2	οἵη τίς τ᾽ ὀλίγη χύσις ὕδατος	173 11	*amnem*	388 10	*imitata... erran-tis signa liquoris*	834 10	*species liquidarum... aquarum*
128	394 c	χαροποὶ	173 6	*obscurum. .. amnem*	391 8	*latices*	841 8	*aqua*

129	398 b	Ὑδροχόου	176 0	*Aquari*	390 5	*signi fundentis*	838 9	*Phrygium... ephebum*
130	398 b	ὁ	177 4	*gelido delapsum flumine fontis*	390 0	*altera*	839 0	*alii*
131	398 c	κυανέου ὑπὸ Κήτεος οὐρῇ	178 7	*spinigeram caudam... Pistricis*	390 7	*squamigerae Pristis*	839 8	*belua*
132	400 b	νειόθι Τοξευτῆρος	181 5	*vestigia magni Arquitenentis*	392 4	*Sagittiferi... pernicia crura*	842 4	*crura Sagittigeri... vestigia prima cornipedis*
133	402 a	αἰθομένῳ κέντρῳ τέραος μεγάλοιο σκορπίου	183 3	*Nepae... fulgentis acumen*	393 1	*Scorpios... torquet qua spicula*	845 1	*venenatae qua Scorpius agmine caudae*
134	403 b	Θυτήριον	184 0	*Aram*	394 4	*Turibulum... sacro igne*	847 0	*Aram*
135	408 a	ἀρχαίη Νύξ ἀνθρώπων κλαίουσα πόνον etc.	191 1	*conmiserans hominum metuendos undique casus*	399 1	*dedit natura... signa... cladem depellere suasit*	854 1	*luciparens nox, fata hominum miserata prius, miserata labores*
136	431 b	κενταύρου	203 0	*Centaurus* etc.	415 4	*hirsuto pectore [Centaurus]*	874 0	*Centaurum* etc.
137	437 d2	τὰ... ἀνδρὶ ἐοικότα	209 11	*partem virilem*	416 10	*hominem reddentia*	881 11	*hominem quadrupes sustollit*
138	438 b	Χηλαὶ	210 0	*equi partis properat subiungere Chelis*	416 0	*Chelas*	884 4	*venenati... bracchia signi*

139	0		0		418	*intacta... sub Virgine*	0	
	0		0		4		0	
140	438	ἱππούραια	210	*equi partis*	418	*sonipes*	881	*quadrupes*
	b		0		4		0	
141	440	δινωτοῖο Θυτηρίου	213	*inlustrem. .. ad Aram*	420	*Arae*	885	*Aram caelicolum*
	a		2		2		1	
142	440	ἀπρὶξ... ἐσφήκωται... θηρίον	211	*dextram porrigens. .. truculent us*	418	*dextra seu praedam e silvis seu dona (...) cultor Iovis, admovet Arae*	886	*iustae persolvit munera vitae agrestemque manu praedam gerit*
	a		1		1, 9		1	
143	443	ἕλκεται	215	*flexo cum corpore*	426	*trahitur*	891	*ingenti sese agmine porrigit*
	c		6		6		6	
144	444	τὸ δὲ ζώοντι ἐοικὸς	218	*lubrica cauda*	0		896	*quin vitam spirare putes*
	d2		11		12		10	
145	445	εἰλεῖται	215	*serpens*	427	*mulcet Centaurum*	897	*lubrica... linguam trisulcam*
	c		6		7		7	
146	447	Κενταύροιο	218	*Centauru m*	427	*Centaurum*	893	*feroci Centauri*
	b		0		0		4	
147	448	κρητὴρ	219	*Creterra*	431	*parvo pondere Crater*	899	*Cratera coruscum*
	b		0		4		0	
148	449	κόπτοντι ἐοικός	220	*plumato corpore... rostro tundit*	430	*vocali rostro... forat*	901	*intento fodiat vaga viscera rostro*
	d2		11		11		11	

In order to make the results of this detailed analysis more approachable, we shall now make use of descriptive statistics and express in numbers and percentages various relations between Aratus' original and the translations concerning personification and comparison:

Chart 2: Results of descriptive statistics for the results of Table 1

Original			**Translations**											
Aratus			Cicero				Germanicus				Avienus			
a	total n.		Cic. n.[11]	1	13	72,22%	15		68,18%		20		87%	
	23		18	2,9	4	22,22%	7		31,82%		3		13%	
				3	1	5,56%	0		0%		0		0%	
b		4	24		*133,33%*		43		*195,45%*		56		*243,48%*	
		5	3		*16,66%*		3		*13,63%*		2		*8,7%*	
		5a	1		*7,69%*		1		*6,25%*		3		*18,75%*	
c	total n.		Cic. n.	6	5	38,46%	4		25%		6		37,5%	
	16		13	7	2	15,38%	7		43,75%		5		31,25%	
				8,9	6	46,15%	5		31,25%		5		31,25%	
d	total n.		12	10	4	36,36%	5		41,66%		9		75%	
	d1		2		1	3	50 %	30 %	2	3	100 %	30 %	2	7
	d2		10	11	6	54,54%	3		25%		2		17%	
	Cic. n.		11		0	6	0%	60 %	0	3	0%	30 %	0	2
	d1		1	12	1	9%	4		33,33%		1		8%	
	d2		10		0	1	0%	50 %	0	4	0%	40 %	0	1

These results show the predominance of the second level personifications in the translations in a very transparent way. The analysis of the way translators treated the second level personifications already present in the original (category *a*) shows that all three of them retained the vast majority of these cases in their translations, with Avienus reaching up to 87 percent. When it comes to the second level personifications added in the translations, we see that each of the translators added more instances of the kind than were present in total in the original version (>100%),

[11]Since not the whole translation of Cicero has been conserved, a different total number of instances has to be produced if we are willing to follow the practice of sane statistics. May it also be noted that in case of Germanicus total number of *a* should be reduced by one point, since one of his verses is missing precisely at the point where his reaction to one of Aratus' second level personifications would be expected (see § 10). The same practice will be followed in the Chart 4 as well (see further).

while Germanicus and Avienus even succeeded in the twofold increase and beyond. When it comes to ambiguities, situation is somewhat less straightforward, especially in the case of Cicero. It remains true, however, that if we should join percentage for the ambiguity retention and for its resolution in favor of the second level personifications in any of our translators, they would always be above the 50 percent threshold. That being said, numbers of resolutions in favor of the second level personifications in Germanicus' translation are particularly commanding. Finally, in the case of comparisons, one can say with certainty that neither Cicero nor Germanicus retained a significant number, especially when it comes to that second type of comparisons, which we explained to be the more important one for our purpose. The situation is quite reverse in case of Avienus, since he did not only retain a large portion of pre-existing comparisons, but was the one to introduce the largest number of new cases as well (category *5a*).

What can we make out of these results? Considering the way we saw and defined the second level personifications, and in the light of their apparent predominance in the translations, it seems that there are several possible explanations of the phenomenon.

The explanation that seems to have been preferred by the previous researchers, although it has never been systematically pursued or backed with coherent theoretical and argumentative background, but is rather to be found here and there, scattered in the commentaries on Aratus and his translations, is that introduction of picturesque elements (which seem to overlap in a large measure with what we call second level personifications) must have been launched by some visual accessory, an illustrated map, atlas or manuscript available to the author. When Germanicus, for example, adds unaratean detail on Andromeda's outfit (v.204 *substricta... palla*), André Le Boeuffle says that it "doit provenir d'une illustration". He is somewhat less sure when it comes to Germanicus' curious addition of Pegasus' assault on the Swan (v.283 *fugit instantem sibi Pegason ala*), and only wonders "influence d'illustration?", but does not offer any alternative motivation. In the case of Cicero, similarly, Jean Soubiran wonders, with Leuthold, whether the details of Perseus' footgear (v.24 *vinctos talaribus aptis*) where influenced "d'une représentation figurée ou d'un globe céleste". And so on. This line of thought seems to go well with the proposal

that Aratus himself was under influence of a "Himmelsglobus" as his "Stoff" while he was writing (see Erren 1967, 7). However, although the explanation by influence of an illustrated template might seem appealing in some cases, it does nothing to explain the others (and that is why it is good that we offer a complete overview of the phenomenon, and not just its scattered instances) – there is no way of representing the dog as a "warden" (*Arat.* 326, Germ. 333, Av. 724) in an illustration, and even less for representing strings of a Lyra as "sonorous" (Av. 633) etc. For these poets had to look for resources in their own imagination. Finally, even in those occasions in which we can accept that the author was influenced by an illustration, the question remains: why? Should we assume that any of the translators integrated in his poem observations from various pictures just for the fun of it? It seems quite out of the question that he should have done so, especially in the case of Augustan poets (and it should not be forgotten that Germanicus indeed was one), who were taught to measure their words very diligently before writing them down. Therefore, notwithstanding the importance of the factor of illustrations, another more cohesive explanation must be sought.

Another factor that has to be taken into account when discussing possible reasons for the existence of this phenomenon is the influence of rhetorics and rhetorical education our translators without any doubt received. It is clear that rhetorics taught how to present things in strongest light possible and with as many details, in order to convince the reader to believe the state of affairs described to be the true one. This kind of influence of rhetorics to poetry could also be demonstrated by the fact that, for example, Homeric epics offer descriptions of nature only in scope of comparisons, while such descriptions, swelling with picturesque details, are very often found in Roman epic poetry (cf. Ovid. *M.* III 228–230, to take one example). One thinks first of all of *amplificatio* which, according to Lausberg, amounts to adding to the basis, given by nature the additions, provided by art. (see Lausberg 1960, 145) If we take that the stars were given by nature, and even constellations, defined in some distant and unknown past, then our second level personifications present just such artificial additions, required by rhetorical *amplificatio*. One should not, however, conclude too soon that *amplificatio* is the motive for the addition of all those personifying details. Poetry and

rhetorics were not mixed just for the value of doing it. They were two separate genres, and one has only to remember how Quintilian occasionally thundered against poets too rhetorical (see, for instance, the judgement he passed on Lucanus, cf. Quint. X 1. 90) to reconsider such postulations. It is much safer to say that rhetorics, more generally, and *amplificatio* specifically, was in fact the method by which Roman poets came to all those personifications – rhetorics gave them tools to build interesting, innovative and lively pictures, where in Aratus there was none, but it did not provide them with motive for doing so, which therefore has to be sought elsewhere.

Finally, the third option is that translators could have wished to present the constellations of the night sky as more real, and less conventional by personifying them in such a manner. This hypothesis was already advanced in the case of Germanicus by Steinmetz, who came to the conclusion that where Aratus saw "*Stern*bilder" Germanicus was rather able to see "Stern*bilder*". (Steinmetz 1966, 467 – emphasis original). Mark Possanza will later take on and redevelop this view, pointing out that many new myths have been introduced in Germanicus' translation that were not present in the original. (Possanza 2004, 169–173) Dominant presence of the second level personifications should be a good step towards corroborating such speculations, especially because myths are a specific field in itself, and their introduction can be interpreted in various ways. As Possanza himself does not fail to mention, Germanicus' poem was *doctus labor* and an endeavor of Augustan era (ibid, 170) – myths were also a well-found tool for asserting one's erudition and learning. Only when we combine the translators' treatment of myths with his treatment of second level personifications can we show that myths have this specific function of making the skies look livelier.

Other considerations may enlighten the matter even further. Possanza and the others have already noted that the fact that Germanicus avoids to translate the episode of the Old Astronomer, where Aratus seems to tell of ancient times, when constellations were first named. If we imagine constellations to be real, any such claims of conventionalized nomenclature are inadmissible (see Possanza 2004, 204; Martin 1998, 306). There are, however, other interesting instances in the texts, which have not – at least not to my knowledge – received similar attention. In his introduc-

tion to the presentation of the Cepheus branch of constellation, Aratus claims that they would not be passed in silence ἀλλ᾽ ἄρα καὶ τῶν / οὐρανὸν εἰς ὄνομ᾽ ἦλθεν (*Arat.* 180–181). This is generally taken to be one of the proofs that Aratus did not imagine constellations to be real, but only conventional – "names" (ὄνομα), in other words (Martin 1998, 236). Cicero is inconveniently missing at this point. Germanicus translates the passage without any mention of names or allusion to the symbolic value of the constellations (Germ. *Arat*. 184–185 *Iasides etiam caelum cum coniuge Cepheus / ascendit totaque domo...*).

Although by now the hypothesis about correlation of the second level personification and the level of liveliness of the constellations seems corroborated to a certain extent, it still does not go without some risk. At the first place, if we assume that Germanicus really did make a systematic effort in rewriting Aratus' constellations, it seems rather odd that on several occasions he failed to do so. For instance, in the verse 388, he calls the Water *imitata... errantis signa liquoris*, which bears a clear message that the water in question is not real, but conventional, made out of stars (*imitata*). It is very difficult to account for such aberrations – but no matter how insignificant in number they might seem, their mere existence should be enough to raise doubt. As well as that, there is an evident problem with Avienus. Although he remains the most compelling of all translators when it comes to the representation of the second level personifications (87% of original ones is retained, and almost two and a half times more is added), his treatment of Aratus' comparisons is surprisingly literal. Even those more problematic, such as the one about Hydra looking "as if she were alive", are rendered with all their implications (see Av. 896). As well as that, in the aforementioned case of the Cepheus family, Avienus sees no problem in claiming that it is in fact the name that has ascended to heaven (Av. 447 *non eget enim huius sedes sacra nominis*). Furthermore, in his confusing rendering of the Old Astronomer controversial passage, he does indeed replace the Astronomer with Jupiter, but nevertheless seems to keep the point that constellations as such were named and arranged by someone at an early point, whether it was an arch-astronomer or the supreme god himself, rather than that they were real living creatures roaming the night sky. We will return to these considerations in our final conclusion.

4. The Poet and his audience

Before we pass to the concluding section of this article, it seems beneficial to devote some attention to yet another stylistic feature of the Φαινόμενα which is characteristic of neither Hellenistic poetry and Callimachean poetics (as word-plays would be) nor of Aratus himself and his astronomical topic (as the second level personifications), but which characterizes *didactic poetry* as such, since its very inception in Greece with Hesiod and his ἔργα. This characteristic would be the presence, implied or explicit, of the poet-tutor and the pupil-listener. It has rightly been said that didactic poetry "must be written for someone, for instruction demands the role both of teacher and of student". (Konstan 1993, 12) This addressee is sometimes explicitly mentioned by name (Hesiod's Perses, Empedocles' Pausanias or yet Lucretius' Memmius) and sometimes rather vaguely implied from the usage of the second person, as is the case of Aratus, among the others. Studies of the addressee seem to have been flourishing lately, and many functions this didactic feature can (or can be said to) assume have been revealed: for example, if the addressee is scolded for his incapacity to adopt the principles exposed in the didactic poem, he brings relief to the real reader, who can rather identify himself with the poet or at least, as a student better than the scolded one (Konstan 1993, 12–14). In any case it has been recognized that the interaction with the addressee is a traditional and almost indispensable feature of didactic poetry, carrying high significance for the meaning of each of the poems.

There has been some polemics in the case of Aratus on the nature of his listenership. Manfred Erren has dwelt on the issue and suggested that Aratus did not intend to create an idyllic image of father standing on a field in company of his son, teaching him about stars, as has been proposed by Kaibel, or any sort of image of real contemplation of the night sky for that matter. He based that conclusion on the fact that our poet uses the aorist imperative very sparingly, preferring the present, and on the similar considerations of the tenses used. That is, he claimed that the tenses he chooses lack both intimacy and immediacy, which would be expected in the case of a night star-watching quest described above (cf. Erren 1967, 126–134). As Peter Bing summarized it, Aratus "conveys constant states of thinking, perceiving or being". He will later connect this conclusion to the possibility of Aratus talking behind the back of the rustics

and sailors, falsely imagined to be the immediate beneficials of the poem, and that to the learned listenership of his day, who would know how to appreciate sophisticated intricacies of his refined quill (Bing 1993, 102-108; see also Konstan 1993, 16). Erren has, on the other hand, stipulated that Aratus, at least formally, imagines one of his "table companions" (*Tischgenossen*) as the addressee of his poem (Erren 1967, 132), although this would demand a specific interpretation of Aratus' proem (especially v.14), such as which was launched by Maass and revised by Erren (ibid, 14–15), but remains highly problematic (see Martin 1998, 149).

That said, in the scope of the present paper, however, it would not be appropriate to attempt such questions. What we would like to know is how these references to the poet and the addressee (embodied in the instances of the first and second person) perceived and received in the Latin translations, that is if these references were kept and in what measure. We will try to see if there was any kind of system or strategy for dealing with this aspect of Aratus' multifaceted song. This we propose to do with the help of a list of instances, which should be followed by an interpretation of the results. We have taken into account only those instances of the second person which are meant for the unnamed reader (and not, for examples, those which serve to the poets – either Aratus or the Romans – in addressing divinities, Muses, the Virgin, Artemis etc.).

Several considerations should be made explicit before passing to the tables with results. At the first place, we should explain the way we coded the results. Legend is presented in the table below.

Chart 3: Legend for Table 2

Aratus		**Translators**	
1, 2, 3	person	**1**	complete retention
a	indicative	**2**	complete removal
b	imperative	**3a**	retention with change in person
c	optative	**3b**	retention with change in mode
		3ab	retention with change in both person and mode
		4	addition

We also thought it would be beneficial to specify each form with a full description, for which purpose following abbreviations were used: *p* – person; plural; present (there should be no confusion, since each of the three categories represented by *p* are of different type. It would be a

problem if perfect tense were also represented by *p*, but it has been dealt with) ; *s* – singular, *i* – indicative, *c* – subjunctive, *o* – optative, *r* – imperative, *e* – perfect, *a* – aorist, *f* – future, *fp* – future perfect.

As well as that, it is clear that *optative* could not be left in the same mode in Latin, due to the obvious reasons. Therefore, replacing optative with imperative, subjunctive or even future tense has been considered to belong to the category *1* above, rather than *3b*. In any case, as we will mention once again in final analysis in this chapter, mode changes will be considered less significant for the purposes of this study than changes in person, since differences in both disposition and meaning of modes and tenses in the two languages makes the straight-forward comparison next to impossible.

Table 2: References to the poet and to the reader in Aratus' original and the Latin translations

oc.	v.p.o.	Aratus	v.p.o.	Cicero	v.p.o.	Germ.	v.p.o.	Avienus
1	75	σκέπτεο		Ø	74	*hac... erit*	0	
	2.ps.rp.				-		-	
	2b		-		2		2	
2	76	ἐπι-φράσσαιο		Ø	75	*notabis*	205	*nosces*
	2.ps.oa.				2.ps.if.		2.ps.if.	
	2c		-		1		1	
3	89	ἐπιμαίεο		Ø	89	*perfundent*	249	*suspexeris*
	2.ps.rp.				-		2.ps.fp.	
	2b		-		2		3b	
4	96	σκέπτοιο	fr.16.5.	*profertur*	96	*subest*	276	*contemplare*
	2.ps.op.		-		-		2.ps.ip.	
	2c		2		2		1	
5	142	ἐπιτεκμήραιο		Ø	140	*signat*	359	*nec contemplandi labor anxius*
	2.ps.oa.				-		dep.	
	2c		-		2		3ab	
6	147	ἐστίν	f.22.2	*subiectus... est*	147	*respice*	379	*subvolvitur*
	-		-		2.ps.rp.		-	
	0		0		4		0	
7	154	μοι ἀρέσκοιεν		Ø	156	*ne mihi... pulset*	404	*otia sunt remis*
	3.ps.op.				3.ps.cp.		-	
	1c		-		1		2	

8	156f. 3.ps.ip. 3.ps.ia 2a	τοι... σκέπτεσθαι δοκέει ... τοι φάτις ἤλυθεν	 -	Ø	157 - 2	*est... facies*	405ff. dep. 3.ps.ie. 1	*sit... cura videre... tuas aures implevit fabula*
9	161 2.ps.ip. 2a	δήεις	fr.25.2. dep. 3a	*tuetur*	163 - 2	*abit*	412 - 2	*iacet*
10	168 2.ps.ip. 2b	μαίεσθαι	 -	Ø	174 - 2	*adiacet*	423f. 3.ps.ip. 1	*perquirere... esto memor*
11	169f. 3.ps.oa. 3c	οὐδέ τις ἄλλῳ σήματι τεκμήραιτο	 -	Ø	176 3.ps.if. 1	*docebit*	429f. dep. 1	*haud tibi... perquirenda*
12	186 2.ps.oa. 2c	μεταβλέψειας	 -	Ø	191 - 2	*ambit*	448ff. 2.ps.if. 1	*declivi si visum... tibi ... spectabis*
13	198f. 1.ps.ip. 1a	οὔ σε μάλ᾽ οἴω... περισκέψασθαι	 -	Ø	201f. dep. 3a	*cernere... licet*	461 - 2	*sponte oculos in membra rapit*
14	223f. 2.ps.ca.inf.a. 2c/2a	ὄψεαι... τοι πάρα θηήσασθαι	 -	Ø	223 - 2	*agitat sidere*	504f. 3.ps.if. (dep) 1	*haud tibi magni cura laboris erit*
15	229 inf.a. 2.ps.oa. 3d/2c	σκέψασθαι ... ἐπιτεκμήραιο	1 2.ps. cp. 1	*possis... cognoscere*	231 3.ps.if. (dep) 1	*quaerendus erit*	519ff. 3.pp.ip . (dep) 3b	*licet hunc oculis... sectare... tibi... susceptanda patent*
16	233 3.ps.ip. 2a	ἔστι δέ τοι... σῆμα	4 2.ps.f. 1	*conspicies*	234ff. 3.ps.ip/f. 3a	*est... cognoscere signo... si quis... notabit*	527 - 2	*est*
17	236f. dep. 3a	ἑτοίμη [εστί] εὑρέσθαι	9 - 2	*relucet*	238 - 2	*clarior ignis*	536f. - 2	*luce et fulgore facis praevertitur*

18	239 - 0		10 - 0	*est*	241 - 0		539 2.ps.cp 4	*flectaris lumina*
19	246 3.ps.rp. 2b	τοι... ἔστω σῆμα	18f. 2.ps.if. 3b	*si quaerere perges... poteris cognoscere*	247 3.pp.ip. (pass.) 3ab	*cernantur*	560 - 2	*erigitur*
20	248 - 0	ἐπισημαίνοιεν	20 2.ps.if. 4	*vises*	249 - 0		561 dep. 4	*par est tibi quaerere*
21	256 3.pp.ip. (dep.) 3a	ἐπισκέψασθαι ἀφαυραί	30 3.pp.ip. pass. 1	*cernuntur*	257 3.pp.ip. 1	*nec [sunt] faciles cerni*	607 3.ps.ip. (dep.) 1	*vix... fit spectabilis*
22	260 1.pp.ip. 1a	ἀκούομεν	31 3.pp.ip. 3a	*putari convenit*	259 3.pp.ip. (pass) 3a	*traduntur*	578 3.ps.ip. (dep) 3a	*fert fabula prisca*
23	287 2.ps.op. 2c	περικλύζοιο	62 2.sp. rp. 1	*cave*	0 - 2		655ff. 3.pp.ip. 3.ps.cp. 3a	*non tum mihi ... temptentur, non tum quis... petat*
24	289 2.ps.op. 2c	πειρήνειας... τοι...πεφοβημένῳ	63 - 2	*non longinquum spatium labere diurnum*	292 2.ps.if 1	*frustra speculaberis ortus*	657f. - 2	*angusto decurrit tramite... parva dies*
25	298 1.pp.ie. 1a	ἥμεθ᾽	0 - 2		300 3.pp.ip. 3a	*prospectant*	667f. 3.pp.ip. 3a	*quaerunt oculis distantia longe litora*
26	302 2.pp.op. 2c	κατάγοιο	72 2.ps.rf. 1	*navi pelagoque vacato*	308 - 2	*clausum ratione mare est*	669 3.ps.cp. 1	*par metus ex pelago tibi sit*
27	303 3.ps.ip. 2a	σῆμα δέ τοι [εστί/ἐστώ]	75,79 2.ps.if. 1	*hoc signum... nautae... cernes*	310 3.ps.if. 3a	*signum erit nobis*	673ff. 2.ps.ce. 2.ps.rp. 1	*spectaris... fuge*

28	323f. 3.ps.oe. 3c	μὴ κεῖνον ὅτις... πεποίθοι	104ff. 3.ps.ce. 3.ps.cp. 1	*quem qui... non viderit ... haud... se speret*	329f. - 2	*non ulla magis vicina notabit stella...*	721f. 3.ps.fp. 1	*neque quisquam... transierit*
29	336 1.pp.ip. 1a	ἀκούομεν	0 - 2		340 3.pp.ip. 3a	*speculatur*	743 1.pp.ip. 1	*capimus*
30	339 - 0	διώκεται	121 - 0	*iacet*	343 2.ps.ip. 4	*rimare*	747 - 0	*est*
31	359 - 0	φορεῖται	145 2.ps.if. 4	*cernes*	367 - 0	*interiacet*	780 - 0	*quin et...*
32	361 - 0	τείνει	149 2.ps.ip. 4	*cernere*	368 - 0	*ferit*	801 - 0	*subit*
33	389 - 0	ὑποκείμενοι	170 2.ps.if. 4	*conspicies*	383 - 0	*...sunt...*	830 - 0	*...sunt...*
34	405 2.ps.if. 2a	πεύσεαι	183 2.ps.if. 1	*cernes*	394 2.ps.if. 1	*videbis*	848 2.ps.if. 1	*suspicies*
35	413 2.ps.rp. 1b,2b	μή μοι... εὔχεο	192, 195 2.ps.if. 2.ps.rf. 3a,1	*cernes... fugito*	401–405 2.ps.if. 3.ps.cp. 1, 1	*numeres ... timeto ... tunc mihi spissentur*	857f. 863f. 3.ps.cp. 1, 1	*ne tibi... exstet... non sit Arae, non sit... vertex clarior*
36	430 2.ps.re. 2.ps.cp. 2b	δείδιθι, μέχρι... ἴδηαι	0 - 2		412 dep 3ab	*nec met-us ante fugit...*	870 3.ps.if. (dep.) 3ab	*certior ast ollis veniet spes*
37	434f. acc+inf. 2a	οὔ σε μάλα χρὴ... περισκοπέειν	206 peri.con.pass. 3a	*vis est metuenda*	425 - 2	*nuntiat*	875 2.ps.fp. 1	*videris*
38	436 2.ps.ip. 2a	δήεις	207 - 2	*locatus*	414 - 2	*commisa*	879 2.ps.cp. 1	*contemplator [sis]*

39	451	θηήσαιο	224	*cernes*	434	*trahitur*	904	*cernuntur*
	2.ps.oa.		2.ps.if.		-		3.ps.ip.	
	2c		1		2		3ab	

Now we shall quantify relations between the three Roman translators when it comes to retaining and using of the reader-poet references:

Chart 4: The results of descriptive statistics for Table 2

Aratus			Cicero			Germanicus		Avienus	
total num	total (Cic)	1	10	45,45%	9	27,27%	17	51,51%
		3b	1	4,55%	0	0%	2	6,06%
33	22	3a	4	18,18%	6	18,18%	3	9,09%
		3ab	0	0%	2	6,06%	3	9,09%
		2	7	31,18%	16	48,48%	8	24,24%
		4	4	*18,18%*	2	*6,06%*	2	*6,06%*

Obviously, Cicero and Avienus retain considerably more references than Germanicus. Moreover, if we take categories 1 and 3b together, since changes in the mood of the original reference should not be taken as seriously as changes in the person, differences between two languages taking their toll, we can see that both Cicero and Avienus mark 50% and 58% respectively, while Germanicus lags behind with only 27%. Furthermore, complete removal of the references (category 2) is relatively low in both poets (31% and 24% respectively) compared to almost 50% noticed in the text of Germanicus. We will try to motivate these results in our final conclusion, putting them in the context of the two previous chapters of this paper.

5. Conclusion

The present reseach may be relevant for several reasons. Methodologically, we hope to have shown that focusing on style of an original and its translation(s) brings up useful questions about the conception of the work itself, as existing interpretations are either controverted (this is what happened within our discussion of Zeus-puns) or corroborated (as in our interpretation of second-level personification in the translations).

It was particularly worthwhile to devote some attention to second-level personification and the way Aratus and his translators referred to themselves and their readership. This gave us insight not only into individual

habits of Aratus' translators and the minutiae of their style, but into the general idea each of them had about his task.

It appears clear that Germanicus had his own plans with *Phaenomena*. One element of this plan might have been to make the constellations seem much more alive than it was the case in the original. This is why Germanicus took care not only to conserve large portions of original second level personifications, but also to add many of his own making. His effective suppression of nearly all comparisons which could stand in the way of this novel conception of the sky could have been to the same avail. The same relation to the original can be seen in the fact that he heavily relied on Hipparchus' commentary on Aratus and made many changes in the poem in order to make it more accurate and up-to-date (whether those changes were proper or misplaced is of no importance here). It comes as no surprise, then, that Germanicus showed detached neglect in rendering Aratus' references, as is shown statistically in our fourth section. His aim was *not* to be faithful to Aratus: neither to his meaning nor to his wording, i.e. his style. Germanicus might have conceived his Hellenistic model as an old brand, with centuries of trust and respect that spoke for it. Under this name, however, he planted the seeds of his own ideas. One may even compare this to the modern practice of translating university textbooks, where the general plan and most of the contents are retained, but with many details modified to suit the book's new purpose and the style coming wholly or mostly from the translator (cf. e.g. Buzelin 2015).

Compared to Germanicus, Cicero and Avienus show themselves much closer to our usual image of the faithful translator. This is especially true of Avienus, whose scores are ever high when it comes to retaining Aratus' original features, be it in personification, comparison or reference. Curiously, he shares with Germanicus the tendency to invent second-level personifications, but this does change the overall picture. The large numbers in Germanicus and in Avienus may easily have completely different reasons. As we said, Germanicus was after his own vision of the universe, while Avienus appears to have simply liked the personifications he found in Aratus and added as many of his own as would fit his verses by way of an improvement on the original. It is usual for Avienus to take a feature Aratus had presented in his stern,

concise, discrete style, and make it more flashy and visible through multiplication and ornamentation; and it is unusual for him to invent anything from scratch or alter the core of Aratus' text: a clear proof of this lies in the fact that he made little or no notice of the progress astronomy had seen since Aratus. The term *augmentation* may subsume what Avienus did as much with Aratus' myths as with his vocabulary of light or a number of other features he had found in the original *Phaenomena*. We may think of this as a case of the traditional *aemulatio* – which, however, was perceived by Avienus mostly in terms of quantity and size.

Both Germanicus and Avienus tried to outdo Aratus, but each of them went about it in his own special way. Our conclusion that Germanicus, who strictly followed Aratus' plan and produced a volume about the size of the original, was less faithful than Avienus, whose version, swelling with novelties, is exasperatingly longer and infinitely more playful than the original — may certainly come as a surprise. This is but another proof that a book should never be judged by its covers.

Cicero, while having the spirit of faithfulness in common with Avienus', does not share Avienus' eagerness to surpass the original. Cicero might be the most faithful translator of the three, although with his work we are still very far from the modern idea of a faithful translation. Besides, large portions of Cicero's *Aratea* are lost: there's no telling how different the picture would be were the work preserved in its entirety.

Bibliography

Ahl, Frederick. *Metaformations: soundplay and wordplay in Ovid and other classical poets*. Ithaca, London: Cornell University Press, 1985.

Bing, Peter. "Aratus and His Audiences". *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici* 31 (1993), 99–109.

Buzelin, Hélène, Mylène Dufault, Cecilia Folgia. "On translating the 'bible of marketing'". *The Translator* 21/1 (2015), 24–49.

Delabastita, Dirk. "Wordplay as a translation problem: A linguistic perspective". In Harald Kittel & al. (eds.), *Übersetzung, translation, traduction*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2004, 600–606.

Erren, Manfred. *Die Phainomena des Aratos von Soloi: Untersuchungen zum Sach- und Sinnverständnis*. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag GmbH, 1967.

Gee, Emma. *Aratus and the Astronomical tradition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Henry, Jacqueline. *La traduction des jeux des mots*. Paris : Presse Sorbonne Nouvelle, 2003.

Hill, D. E. "What Sort of Translation of Virgil do we need?". *Greece & Rome* 25/1 (1978), 59–68.

Jakobson, Roman. "Closing statement: Linguistics and Poetics". In Tomas A. Sebeok (ed.), *Style in Language*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: The M.I.T. Press, 1964, 350–377.

Katz, Joshua T. "Vergil Translates Aratus: Phaenomena 1–2 and Georgics 1.1–2". *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici*, vol. 60 (2008), 105–123.

Kidd, Douglas (ed.) *Aratus: Phaenomena*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Konstan, David. "Foreward: To the reader". *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici* 31 (1993), 11–22.

Lausberg, Heinrich. *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik*. München: Max Hueber Verlag, 1960.

Le Boeuffle, André (ed.) *Germanicus: Les Phénomenes d'Aratos*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2003.

_____. *Les Noms latins d'astres et de constellations*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2010.

Lesky, Albin. *Geschichte der Griechischen Literatur*. Bern, München: Francke Verlag, 1957.

Lewis, Anne-Marie. *From Aratus to Aratus Latinus*. Hamilton: Diss. MacMaster University, 1983.

Marco, Josep. "The translation of wordplay in literary texts: Typology, techniques and factors in a corpus of English-Catalan source text and target text segments". *Target* 22/2. (2010), 264–297.

Martin, Jean (ed.) *Aratos: Phénomènes* 1–2. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2002.

Noegel, Scott. B. "Wordplay and Translation Technique in the Septuagint of Job". *Aula Orientalis* 14 (1995), 33–44.

Possanza, Mark. *Translating the Heavens: Aratus, Germanicus, and the Poetics of Latin Translation*. New York: Lang Classical Studies, 2004.

Postgate, John Percival. *Translation and Translations – theory and practice.* London: G. Bell and Sons LTD, 1922.

Sale, William. „The Popularity of Aratus". *The Classical Journal* 61/4 (1966), 160–164.

Soubiran, Jean (ed.) *Aviénus: Les Phénomènes d'Aratos.* Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2003.

_____ (ed.) *Cicéron: Aratea. Fragments poétiques*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2002.

Steinmetz, Peter. "Germanicus, der Römische Arat". *Hermes* 94/4 (1966), 450–482.

Vandaele, Jeroen. *Wordplay in translation*. In Yves Gambier & Luc van Doorslaer (eds.), *Handbook of Translation Studies: Volume 2*, University of Turku / Lessius University College, Antwerp; CETRA, University of Leuven: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2011, 180–183.

Volk, K. "Aratus". In James J. Clauss and Martine Cuypers (eds.), *A Companion to Hellenistic Literature*, Chichester & Malden: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010, 197–210.

Woodworth, Dorothea C. "The Unit of Sense with Especial Reference to Translation". *The Classical Journal* 32/6 (1937), 326–338.

Марко Витас
Универзитет у Лунду

Песниково ново одело: Студија о односу према стилу оригинала у три римска превода Аратових *Појава*

Апстракт

Циљ овог рада је да размотри начин на који су три римска преводиоца Аратових *Појава* (Цицерон, Германик и Авијен) приступали стилу свог изворника и шта их је могло определити за баш такав поступак. Расправа о овим питањима доноси просветљење и када је реч о општим замислима и идејама које су ови преводиоци гајили о свом задатку. Три стилске одлике Аратове одабране да буду предметом овога рада јесу: 1) игре речи (као одлика хеленистичког песништва уопште); 2) персонификације и поређења (или, боље рећи, њихова нарочита врста коју држимо за особену Аратовој песми); 3) истицање личности песника-учитеља и обраћање читаоцу-ученику (као стални мотив у поучној поезији).

Кључне речи: Арат, *Aratea*, стил, игре речима, персонификације, дидактичко песништво, превод.