The Latin Translations of the Prooemium (ll.1–18) of Aratus' *Phaenomena*. Reception and Interpretation[*]

Vasileios Dimoglidis

*Περίληψη_* Βασίλειος Δημογλίδης | Οι λατινικές μεταφράσεις του προοιμίου (στ.1–18) των *Φαινομένων* του Αράτου. Ζητήματα πρόσληψης και ερμηνείας

Στην παρούσα εργασία εξετάζω δύο λατινικές μεταφράσεις του προοιμίου (στ.1–18) των *Φαινομένων* του Αράτου, και συγκεκριμένα το ποίημα *Aratea* του Γερμανικού, και το ποίημα *Aratus* από τα *Carmina* του Αβιηνού. Θεωρώντας ότι κάθε μετάφραση είναι ουσιαστικά αποτέλεσμα πρόσληψης και ερμηνείας του πηγαίου κειμένου, επικεντρώνομαι στο ποίημα του Αράτου και εξετάζω τη μεταφραστική ποιητική των δύο λατίνων ποιητών (verbum de verbo μετάφραση, ερμηνευτική προσέγγιση, αποκλίσεις από ή/και προσθήκες στο αρχικό κείμενο). Ερευνώ επίσης τους τρόπους με τους οποίους ο Γερμανικός και ο Αβιηνός «διαβάζουν» τους πολιτικούς υπαινιγμούς στο προοίμιο του Αράτου, πώς το πολιτικό πλαίσιο του πολιτισμού υποδοχής επηρεάζει τη μεταφορά αυτών των υπαινιγμών στη λατινική γλώσσα, και τελικά πώς οι λατίνοι μεταφραστές αναπαράγουν τις μεταλογοτεχνικές στιγμές του ελληνικού προοιμίου. Υποστηρίζω ότι τόσο ο Γερμανικός όσο και ο Αβιηνός προβαίνουν σε μία διαδικασία δημιουργικής επανεγγραφής του Αράτου, ενώ ταυτόχρονα λαμβάνουν υπόψη τους τις νέες κοινωνικοπολιτικές συνθήκες καθώς και το διαφορετικό γλωσσικό περιβάλλον. Δίνουν έμφαση στη δική τους συγγραφική (και μεταφραστική) ευφυΐα, και σ᾽ ένα πλαίσιο «μεταφραστικού ανταγωνισμού» παρέχουν στους αποδέκτες τους τη δική τους «ποιητική της μετάφρασης».

Aʀᴀᴛᴜs composed his *Phaenomena* probably between 280 and 260 BCE,[1] and while he was in Pella, at the court of Antigonus Gonatas.[2] *Phaenomena* is a didactic epic poem relied upon both Hesiod's *Works and Days*[3] and the treatises

---

[1] Fantuzzi and Hunter 2004, 224 date the poem between 280 and 260 BCE, while Avgerinos 2014, 1 between 280 and 270 BCE.

[2] Cf. Kidd 1997, 3–5. Hutchinson 1988, 214, n.1 doubts about the reliability of the testimonies of Aratus' life, and stresses that "the only datum on Aratus' life which merits much confidence is that he lived at the court of Antigonus Gonatas". For Antigonus as a patron of a circle of philosophers and poets, see Weber 1995, 306–313.

[3] Cf. Possanza 2004, 112 who observes that "Hesiod is the most important influence of Aratus'

written by Eudoxus, *Phaenomena* and *Enoptron*. Aratus' *Phaenomena*, although considered by some scholars not to bring the gravity of Homeric poetry or ancient tragedy, nevertheless managed to survive, spread, and greatly influence Roman literature.[4] This is manifested both by its implicit or explicit impact upon Roman poets (cf. Lucretius, Vergil, Manilius, etc.), and by Roman authors who translated Aratus' *Phaenomena* into Latin.[5]

The aim of this paper is to examine the Latin translations of the prooemium (ll.1–18) of the *Phaenomena*. More concretely, the Latin texts to be studied are Germanicus' *Aratea* and the poem *Aratus* from Avienus' *Carmina*. Cicero's poem *Aratea*[6] has survived only in fragmentary form,[7] and I shall discuss only Fr.1 since it is the only fragment corresponding to Aratus' ll.1–18. In examining Aratus' prooemium line by line, I will focus on the translational poetics of the two Latin poets (*verbum de verbo* translation, interpretive approach, deviations from and/or additions to the source-text), and on the translational attitude towards Aratus' linguistic techniques, ambiguities and their interpretive connotations. The subtitle of my paper, "Reception and Interpretation", explains my research intention. I posit that every translation is essentially the outcome of receiving and interpreting the source-text. However, the term "interpretation" here needs to be further explained. In this paper, "interpretation" is a twofold concept: first I examine how Latin authors interpret Aratus, and second, I, in turn, interpret these translations, taking into account both the source-text and the new literary products, thus offering a commentary on the Latin versions. The interpretation of the interpretation of the source-text constitutes a meaningful whole where the connections of all its parts (that is, Aratus, Germanicus, and Avienus) are first established and finally explained.

---

epic predecessors".

[4] In terms of Aratus' fame in both Greece and Rome, Ovid (*Amores* I15.16) notes: *Cum sole et luna semper Aratus erit*. Cf. Almirall 2002, 66. For the widespread popularity of the *Phaenomena*, see Kidd 1961; Sale 1966; Gee 2013, 5–7. For Latin authors that used Aratus in their works, see for instance Ewbank 1997, 22. For an overview of the reasons of Aratus' popularity, see Lewis 1992.

[5] According to Fantuzzi and Hunter 2004, 465, "even more remarkable is the success at Rome enjoyed by Aratus' *Phaenomena*. This was translated by the young Cicero in the first of a line of Latin versions (Germanicus, Ovid, Avienus)". Cf. Avgerinos 2014, 615.

[6] For the title and date of Cicero's poem, see Ewbank 1997, 22–24; Pellacani 2015, 6–15; Ciano 2019, 24. Convincingly, Ciano places the *Aratea* around 90 BCE.

[7] Something that complicates here my research since it is rather certain that the intermediary translation is that of Cicero. Cf. Ewbank 1997, 22–24; Michalopoulos 2001, 300. Cicero's survived translation makes clear that in translating Aratus, he romanized to a great extent his source-poem. For Cicero's tendency to romanize the source-poem, see Kaimio 1979, 280. According to Gasti 2003, 135, n.4, in his *Aratea*, Cicero applies a kind of interpretive romanization of Aratus' *Phaenomena* by introducing interpretive comments into his translation in order to facilitate the understanding of Aratus' puzzling moments. Thus, I tend to believe that it is very likely that Cicero approached Aratus' prooemium in this very way. This new, now romanized, Cicero's prooemium could have an influence upon Germanicus and Avienus and upon their process of translating the Greek poem.

In terms of the Latin translations examined here: Germanicus[8] wrote his poem after the death of Augustus,[9] and it has survived in fragmentary form. This poem is not a "faithful translation" of Aratus' *Phaenomena*, but actually a "sense-for-sense translation", that is, a paraphrase of it,[10] while its deviation from the source-text is evident even in its prooemium. On the other hand, Avienus[11] (ca. 4th century AD) composed a paraphrase of the *Phaenomena* as well, which is 724 lines longer than the source-text.[12] According to Taub (2003, 53), "of the three surviving Latin versions of Aratus' *Phaenomena*, that of Avienus is the most complete". Based on previous scholars,[13] she notes that "it should be emphasized that Avienus' version is not merely a translation. Avienus' poem is much longer than that of Aratus; this is credited, in part, to Avienus' verbosity",[14] and that "Avienus did not hesitate to cut material from Aratus' section on weather signs, and to add material from the scholiasts".[15]

---

[8] For Germanicus' life and works, see for instance von Albrecht 1997, 985–989. Gain 1976, 20 discusses the question of the poem's author, and argues that if the author is Tiberius, then the emperor who is addressed is Augustus; if the author is indeed Germanicus, then the emperor is Tiberius. Gain concludes by noting that "the evidence does not allow one to say whether the author was Tiberius or Germanicus". On the other hand, von Albrecht 1997, 986, n.2 believes that Gain's conjecture that Tiberius is the author of this poem is not convincing. For a detailed discussion on this issue, see Baldwin 1981; Possanza 2004, 219–243. The analysis of Possanza is exemplary and convincing. He concludes (Possanza 2004, 235) that Germanicus Julius Caesar, the adopted son of Tiberius, is the author of the *Aratea* which he composed sometime between the years 4–14 AD. For a thorough review and overview of the main points of Possanza's book, see Gee 2005.

[9] See Michalopoulos 2001, 295, who also observes that Germanicus was composing the translation probably until the end of his life. According to von Albrecht 1997, 986, Germanicus' work was written after 14 while Augustus had already been deified, and Germanicus uses Manilius. Von Albrecht suggests that Tiberius is the addressee of the *Phaenomena*.

[10] Michalopoulos 2001, 295 mentions that Germanicus paraphrases Aratus with several omissions, corrections and additions, and that Germanicus' ll.1–725 are based upon Aratus' ll.1–73, while the fragments 2–6 are based on another work on astronomy. Taub 2003, 51 observes that when Germanicus "corrects" Aratus, he is apparently based on Hipparchus' commentary. Moreover, she stresses that "in addition to lines 1–725, which comprise the bulk of the poem, five smaller fragments survive (in various manuscripts). While several of these are largely concerned with weather, the fragments are not based on the section of Aratus' poem which deals with weather signs. It is not clear whether Germanicus was relying on another source here, or whether the fragments on weather represent his own work and interests". Cf. Gain 1976, 13.

[11] For Avienus' life, see Rose ³1954, 440–441; Soubiran 1981, 7–20. For Avienus' name and identity, see Soubiran 1981, 16–19; Cameron 1995. For a recent scholarly discussion about Avienus' life and works, see Dorfbauer 2012.

[12] Rose ³1954, 440 notes that Avienus' poem is 724 lines longer than that of Aratus.

[13] Taub 2003, 53 and 203, n.165 cites Soubiran 1981, 41–42 and Zehnacker 1989, 325.

[14] For Zehnacker's comparison of parallel sections of Aratus' and Avienus' poems, see Taub 2003, 53–54; esp. 53.

[15] Taub 2003, 53.

Aratus' *Phaenomena*, ll.1–18

ἐκ Διὸς ἀρχώμεσθα, τὸν οὐδέποτ' ἄνδρες ἐῶμεν
ἄρρητον. μεσταὶ δὲ Διὸς πᾶσαι μὲν ἀγυιαί,
πᾶσαι δ' ἀνθρώπων ἀγοραί, μεστὴ δὲ θάλασσα
καὶ λιμένες· πάντη δὲ Διὸς κεχρήμεθα πάντες.
τοῦ γὰρ καὶ γένος εἰμέν· ὁ δ' ἤπιος ἀνθρώποισιν   5
δεξιὰ σημαίνει, λαοὺς δ' ἐπὶ ἔργον ἐγείρει
μιμνήσκων βιότοιο, λέγει δ' ὅτε βῶλος ἀρίστη
βουσί τε καὶ μακέλῃσι, λέγει δ' ὅτε δεξιαὶ ὧραι
καὶ φυτὰ γυρῶσαι καὶ σπέρματα πάντα βαλέσθαι.
αὐτὸς γὰρ τά γε σήματ' ἐν οὐρανῷ ἐστήριξεν   10
ἄστρα διακρίνας, ἐσκέψατο δ' εἰς ἐνιαυτὸν
ἀστέρας οἵ κε μάλιστα τετυγμένα σημαίνοιεν
ἀνδράσιν ὡράων, ὄφρ' ἔμπεδα πάντα φύωνται.
τῷ μιν ἀεὶ πρῶτόν τε καὶ ὕστατον ἱλάσκονται.
χαῖρε, πάτερ, μέγα θαῦμα, μέγ' ἀνθρώποισιν ὄνειαρ,   15
αὐτὸς καὶ προτέρη γενεή. χαίροιτε δὲ Μοῦσαι,
μειλίχιαι μάλα πᾶσαι· ἐμοί γε μὲν ἀστέρας εἰπεῖν
ᾗ θέμις εὐχομένῳ τεκμήρατε πᾶσαν ἀοιδήν.

"Let us begin with Zeus, whom we men never leave unspoken. Filled with Zeus are all highways and all meeting places of people, filled are the sea and harbours; in all circumstances we are all dependent on Zeus. [5] For we are also his children, and he benignly gives helpful signs to men, and rouses people to work, reminding them of their livelihood, tells when the soil is best for oxen and mattocks, and tells when the seasons are right both for planting trees and for sowing every kind of seed. [10] For it was Zeus himself who fixed the signs in the sky, making them into distinct constellations, and organised stars for the year to give the most clearly defined signs of the seasonal round to men, so that everything may grow without fail. That is why men always pay homage to him first and last. [15] Hail, Father, great wonder, great boon to men, yourself and the earlier race! And hail, Muses, all most gracious! In answer to my prayer to tell of the stars in so far as I may, guide all my singing." (Kidd's (1997, 73) translation)

1) ἐκ Διὸς ἀρχώμεσθα… (l.1, "Let us begin with Zeus")

The verb ἀρχώμεσθα is a metanarrative term in the sense that it signals the beginning of the narrative, while the phrase ἐκ Διὸς underlines the core-theme of the beginning of the narrative, which is Zeus. The translational question here is whether the Latin versions retain or eliminate the phrase ἐκ Διός, and, if they do eliminate it, then how they justify the narrative focus on Zeus.

Fr.1[16] of Cicero's version, *ab Iove Musarum primordia*, is of great interest.[17]

---

[16] For Fr.1 of Cicero's *Aratea*, see Ewbank 1997, 78 and 129–130; Pellacani 2015, 22–23, and 85.

[17] This line is cited in Cicero's *De Legibus* 2.7, where Marcus is made by Cicero to say *'A Iove*

Cicero does translate Aratus' phrase ἐκ Διὸς and places it at the beginning of the line, thus transcribing into Latin the focus of the source-text on Zeus. Moreover, Cicero embeds a *scholium* into his own version. Ancient comments on Aratus' l.1 comment on the phrase ἐκ Διός, and one of them writes that ἀπὸ τοῦ Διὸς ἐπειδὴ καὶ τῶν Μουσάων ἀρχηγέτης αὐτός ἐστιν.[18] Pellacani (2015, 22–23)[19] insightfully observes that the intrusion of exegetic comments into translations of Greek texts has been a part of Latin literature since Livius Andronicus' translation of the *Odyssey*, and an aspect of the vital interweaving between poetry and philology that has characterized Latin literature since its origins. By his choice, Cicero combines Aratus' line and the tradition of invoking the Muses at the beginning of a poem, interpreting at the same time (or rather repeating the interpretation given by the *scholium*) Aratus' reference to Zeus. The ancient *scholium* explains (ἐπειδὴ) – or even justifies – Aratus' choice to start his poem with Zeus and not the Muses, and Cicero's repeats this explanation.

Germanicus deviates from his source-text. In his very first, meta-translational line *Ab Iove principium magno deduxit Aratus* (l.1 "Aratus began with mighty Jupiter"), he reveals his translational process: he names the source-poet he is about to translate (*Aratus*),[20] maybe assumes that the recipients of his translation should be aware of the original version, and acknowledges that the narrative focal point of the source-text is Zeus (*Ab Iove…magno*), while indicating at the same his dependence upon the Aratean text, and making a comment of literary criticism of Aratus since the "verb *deducere* had become, in Augustan poetics, a term that designated composition in that 'refined style' for which Aratus himself was praised".[21]

On the other hand, in ll.2–4 Germanicus highlights his deviations:[22]

> *carminis at nobis, genitor, tu maximus auctor,*
> *te veneror tibi sacra fero doctrique laboris*
> *primitias. probat ipse deum rectorque satorque.*

> "My poem, however, claims you, father, greatest of all, as its inspirer. It is you that I reverence; it is you that I am offering sacred gifts, the first fruits of my literary efforts. The ruler and begetter of the gods himself approves."

The term *at* ("but", "however") has here metapoetic resonances in the sense that by using it, Germanicus programmatically declares in a self-referential way that

---

Musarum primordia', sicut in Aratio carmine orsi sumus. For this passage, see the comments of Dyck 2004, 265–266.

[18] For this ancient *scholium*, see Martin 1974, 44–45.

[19] Cf. Ciano 2019, 27–28.

[20] According to Kaimio 1979, 282, the first two lines of Germanicus' prooemium clearly indicate his dependence upon the source-text.

[21] Possanza 2004, 107 and 157, n.5 for further bibliography on *deducere*.

[22] Pöhlmann 1973, 863 stresses that Germanicus begins his poem by referring to what Aratus did in his own poem in order to state immediately in the next lines his own deviations from the source-text.

he will bring changes and modifications to the text he is translating.[23] Possanza (2004, 228) observes that through the terms *genitor* and *auctor*, Germanicus represents a recasting in Roman terms of Aratus' invocation of Zeus as the source of his poem. I believe that in deviating (*at*) from the original text, Germanicus draws a comparison between the sources of inspiration. Germanicus states that Aratus' source is *magnus* (*ab Iove…magno*, l.1), but his own is *maximus* (*tu maximus auctor*, l.2). The Aratean references to Zeus and to the role this god plays in the poetics of the source-text are summarized (within the frame of Germanicus' *recusatio* established by the *at*) in the line *probat ipse deum rectorque satorque* (l.4) which here turns into a seal of divine approval (*probat*) of Germanicus' choice to shift the source of inspiration to Tiberius.

    I argue that Aratus' invocation to Zeus has been completely romanized and turned into an invocation of the princeps, that is, Tiberius.[24] In the prooemium of his *Phaenomena*, Aratus does not refer to any person-addressee. However, it is very likely that Germanicus used the Roman convention[25] of invoking the *princeps* in the preface of a poem, because he might have "read" the implicit political connotations behind Aratus' text.[26] The shift which Zeus (according to Germanicus) approves of hints at the Roman tradition of replacing a god, or the Muses, or a god related to the Muses at the beginning of a poem. One of the most characteristic examples occurs in Propertius 2.1.3-4 where he claims *non haec Calliope, non haec mihi cantat Apollo. / ingenium nobis ipsa puella facit* ("It is not Calliope, not Apollo that puts these songs in my mind: my sweetheart herself creates the inspiration", Loeb's translation).[27] This new tradition gives Germanicus the chance to accentuate the political dimension of his prooemium. He focuses on the target culture of his text, while incorporating Aratean poetics into his version in order to smooth this transition to the new Roman literary principles. The fact, however, that the name of Zeus is not explicitly mentioned in l.4 underlines that for Germanicus what essentially matters most is paying homage to the political ruler.

    Moreover, though Germanicus, using initially the pronoun *nobis*, transcribes in some way the first-person plural ἀρχώμεσθα, he immediately gives prominence to his own poetic "I", as it is indicated by the first-person singular verbs *veneror*,

---

[23] Possanza 2004, 107 writes that the adversative *at* and the pronoun *nobis* in l.2 imply that Greek must be heard in counterpoint to the Latin.

[24] Cf. Gain 1976, 80 *ad* 1–16.

[25] Von Albrecht 1997, 278–279 mentions that "there were editions with dedication to the ruler, as became customary later at Rome" and that "in Manilius the *princeps* was the source of inspiration, although the Muses also played their part".

[26] Fakas 2008, 108–109, n.75 observes that the explicit praise to the *princeps* both in Vergil's prooemium of *Georgics* (1.24–42) and in the prooemium of Germanicus' translation of the *Phaenomena* suggests that both Roman poets probably saw political hints behind Aratus' prooemium. Cf. Fakas 2001a, 201, n.55. For the political dimension of Aratus' prooemium, see for instance Fakas 2001a, 21–22.

[27] For Propertius' lines that disclaim divine inspiration, see Miller 1986, who comments on Propertius, Ovid and Persius as instances claiming that the traditional divine inspiration has no role in the creation of their works.

and *fero* (l.2). The shift from the first-person plural to first-person singular ties in with the change of the perspective of the person who speaks, and at the same time "seals" the deviation from the "poetics" of the original source-text.[28] Kaimio (1979, 282) has observed that the first two lines of Germanicus' prooemium "have also been interpreted to mean that by attaching himself to the Emperor more closely than to his original, the poet has taken it upon himself to modernize, correct and add to the poem of Aratus".

In his prooemium, Avienus returns to the Greek text, acknowledges the thematic domination of Zeus, and accentuates it. More concretely, in the very first line of his poem, although – unlike Germanicus – he does not state that he is translating Aratus, Avienus does mention that his poetic inspiration is to be traced back to Zeus: *Carminis incentor mihi Iuppiter*… (l.1 "Jupiter inspires my poem…"). The prominence of Zeus is highly pointed out by the repetition of the demonstrative pronouns *hic* (ll. 5, 9, 21, 22, 24, 25, 28, 29, 43, 44, 53)[29] and *iste* (ll. 5, 6, 15, 25, 43)[30] which, as signals of textual deixis, refer to Zeus.

2) …τὸν οὐδέποτ᾽ ἄνδρες ἐῶμεν/ ἄρρητον… (ll.1–2, "whom we men never leave unspoken")

By using the term ἄρρητον, Aratus, on the one hand, emphasizes that all people talk about Zeus,[31] which he confirms textually since he refers to the name of Zeus

---

[28] Cf. Gasti 2003, 13.

[29] Ll.5–6 (*hic statio, hic sedes primi patris. iste paterni / principium motus, vis fulminis iste corusci*, "This is the guardpost, this the seat of the First Father. He is the beginning of generative motion, he the power of the scintillating lightning bolt"); ll.9–10 (…*hic tener aer / materiaeque gravis concretio*…, "He is the gauzy air and the weighty coagulation of matter"); ll.21–23 (… *hic chaos altum / lumine perrupit, tenebrarum hic vincula primus / solvit et ipse parens rerum fluvitantia fixit;*, "He exploded deep chaos with his light, he was who first loosed the chains of darkness, and, in his own generative role stabilized what was in flux"); ll.24–26 (*hic dispersa locis statuit primordia iustis, / hic digestorum speciem dedit; iste colorem / imposuit rebus*…, "he set the scattered particles in their right places, he gave shape to what had been separated; he conferred colour on things"); ll.28–29 (…*rerum opifex hic, / hic altor rerum, rex mundi*…, "He is the craftsman of the universe, the one who brings it to fruition, king of the world"); ll.43–45 (*iste modum statuit signis, hic rebus honorem / infudit; tenebris hic interlabitur aethrae / viscera et aeternos animat genitalibus artus*, "He placed a limit on the signs, he imbued everything with its own status, he interweaves his shadowy form into the innards of the ether and vivifies its everlasting limbs as a creative force"); ll.53–54 (*hic primum Cnidii radium senis intulit astris / mortalemque loqui docuit convexa deorum*, "he first directed the instrument of Eudoxus to the stars and taught him, though mortal, to describe the vaults of the gods").

[30] Ll.5–6 (*hic statio, hic sedes primi patris. iste paterni / principium motus, vis fulminis iste corusci*, "This is the guardpost, this the seat of the First Father. He is the beginning of generative motion, he the power of the scintillating lightning bolt"); ll.15–17 (…*iste calorem / quo digesta capax solidaret semina mundus / inseruit*…, "He himself instilled the heat by means of which the world, full of potential, might amass the disjunct seeds of things"); ll.25–26 (…*iste colorem / imposuit rebus*…, "he conferred colour on things"); l.43 (*iste modum statuit signis*…, "He placed a limit on the signs…").

[31] Kidd 1997, 164 *ad* 2 observes: "Here he means that we continually glorify Zeus, and presum-

three times (l.1, l.2, l.4). At the same time, however, he creates here a pun[32] playing between the word ἄρρητος and his own name. According to Kidd (1997, 164 *ad* 2), this pun "would serve as a sort of signature at the outset of the poem, modestly positioned in the second line after Zeus in the first."[33] Provided that this is true, then Aratus indicates in a self-referential way[34] his hope that his poem should not remain ἄρρητον; he underlines, in other words, his own "anxiety of influence".[35] The translational question here is whether the Latin poets understand the pun and, if so, how they transcribe it into Latin.

Germanicus eliminates this pun since he does not translate this very line at all. In any case, he could not reproduce the pun into Latin; nevertheless, in mentioning the name of Aratus (*Ab Iove principium magno deduxit Aratus*, l.1 "Aratus began with mighty Jupiter"), Germanicus finds another way to reproduce the seal of the authorship of his source-text.[36] Avienus, on the other hand, does not perceive the term ἄρρητον as a "seal" of Aratus, but seems to obey a command of the original text that he must not leave Zeus ἄρρητον ("unspoken"). In the first four lines of his prooemium, Avienus mentions the name of Zeus six times:

> *Carminis incentor mihi* **Iuppiter**: *auspice terras*
> *linquo* **Iove**, *excelsam reserat dux*[37] **Iuppiter** *aethram,*
> *imus in astra* **Iovis** *monitu,* **Iovis** *omine caelum*
> *et* **Iovis** *imperio mortalibus aethera pando.*　　　(ll.1–4)

> "**Jupiter** inspires my poem. Under the prophetic guidance of **Jupiter** I leave the earth, **Jupiter** as leader unlocks the lofty ether, we enter the stars under

---

ably he is thinking both religious ceremonies and everyday language with expressions like νὴ Δία".

[32] Cf. Kidd 1997, 164 *ad* 2; Hopkinson 1988, 139 *ad* 2. Katz 2008, 107 stresses that a long time passed by for scholars to recognize this very pun, and notes that this pun evidently harks back to Hesiod's line ῥητοί τ᾽ ἄρρητοί τε Διὸς μεγάλοιο ἕκητι (*Works and Days*, l.4). Avgerinos 2014, 337 writes that nowadays it is considered certain that through the term ἄρρητον at the beginning of the second line Aratus alludes to his own name. For a detailed scholarly discussion on this pun, see Bing 1990, esp. 281–282. For puns and wordplays as stylistic tools of Hellenistic authors and their Roman imitators (especially Virgil), see O'Hara 1996.

[33] For the relation between Aratus' pun and the traditional technique of *sphragis*, see Fakas 2001a, 51–53.

[34] For the metapoetic dimension of Aratus' prooemium, see Fakas 2001a, 43–58.

[35] My argument is further strengthened by Katz 2008, 116–117, who posits: "Aratus says, 'Let us begin with Zeus' and then, in the second verse, slips himself in, too: evidently it is not just Zeus whose name men should never leave 'unspoken'." As Fakas 2008, 86 notes, the oldest and most widespread ancient literary theory ignored didactic epic poetry as a distinct poetic genre. Fakas 2008, 87 also argues that in Aristotle's *Poetics* this literary genre stops being considered a genuine form of poetic discourse due to its mimetic character (for mimetic elements in Aratus, see Fakas 2001b). It is likely, then, that Aratus was aware of the Aristotle's theory about didactic epic poems, and therefore implicitly claims for literary survival. Cf. Fakas 2008, 102.

[36] Cf. Possanza 2004, 60–61.

[37] One might assume here that in using the term *dux* as being attributed to Zeus, Avienus is probably influenced by ancient comments on Aratus (e.g. *scholia* MQDΔKVA *ad* 1: βασιλεὺς δὲ τῶν ὅλων ὁ Ζεὺς καὶ πατὴρ (Martin 1974, 38)). See also Gee 2013, 172.

instruction from **Jupiter**, under the omen and the order of **Jupiter** I lay open
the ether to mankind".

He doubles the number of the Aratean references to Zeus (3 in Aratus, 6 in
Avienus), and in this way, he multiplies the intention of the source-text not to leave
Zeus ἄρρητον. At the same time, in these lines, Avienus seems to "answer" Ger-
manicus,[38] provided of course that the former "read" both the latter and German-
icus' choice to substitute Zeus with the *Princeps*. By turning back to the original
text, and by accentuating the importance of Zeus, it is as though Avienus rejected
any deviation from the Aratean version.

　　Moreover, Avienus does not reproduce the pun of the original text, but he refers
both to Aratus (*que rursum ingenio numerisque Solensibus idem / Iuppiter efferri
melius dedit, incola Tauri / Musa ut Cecropios raperetur et Aonas agros*, ll.64–66
"That same Jupiter, in turn, gave greater facility in telling these things to the intel-
ligent verses of Aratus, so that the Muse who lives in the Taurus Mountains should
speed across the fields of Aonian and Athenian poetry") and to Aratus' source,
Eudoxus of Cnidus (*hic primum Cnidii radium senis intulit astris / mortalemque
loqui docuit convexa deorum*, ll.53–54 "he first directed the instrument of Eudoxus
to the stars and taught him, though mortal, to describe the vaults of the gods").
Avienus generates an authorial sequence in which he not only excludes German-
icus, but also criticizes him for his translational choices. Through this authorial
sequence, it is as though Avienus considered himself (*me quoque*, l.67) the Roman
continuation of the Greek tradition of astronomical poetry.[39]

3) …πάντη δὲ Διὸς κεχρήμεθα πάντες (l.4, "in all circumstances we are all de-
pendent on Zeus")

Through the repetition (πάντη – πάντες) Aratus creates a ring composition
which encircles the narrative focus on Zeus (Διὸς κεχρήμεθα), and foreshadows
a broader ring composition of the text. This is indeed true since the astronomi-
cal part of the *Phaenomena* (ll.1–757) begins and ends with a reference to Zeus
(ἐκ Διὸς ἀρχώμεσθα…, l.1 – οἵ τε Ποσειδάωνος ὁρώμενοι ἢ Διὸς αὐτοῦ/ ἀστέρες
ἀνθρώποισι τετυγμένα σημαίνουσιν, ll.756–757). This ring composition is sealed
by verbal parallels, for l.12 (ἀστέρας οἵ κε μάλιστα τετυγμένα σημαίνοιεν) and
l.757 (ἀστέρες ἀνθρώποισι τετυγμένα σημαίνουσιν) are almost identical.

　　The translational question that arises here is whether the repetition, and con-
sequently the ring composition, is transcribed into the Latin translations. In Ger-
manicus' version, Zeus of Aratus' prooemium was replaced, as I have already not-
ed, by the *Princeps*. Although the Roman poet paraphrases the Aratean text, the
strength – of the emperor this time –, similar to that of Zeus of the source-text is

---

[38] Pöhlmann 1973, 878 notes that in his prooemium, Avienus develops his implicit criticism
against those who modified Aratus' poem, and underlines repeatedly that Jupiter inspired him.
[39] Cf. Possanza 2004, 157 n.6, who stresses that "by means of the authorial sequence Eudoxus
– Aratus – Avienius (*me quoque* 67), Avienius writes himself into the history of Greek astrono-
my and astronomical poetry".

quite obvious. Germanicus emphasizes the power of the emperor through contin-uous repetitions of the second person personal pronoun (*tu* l.2, *te* - *tibi* l.3, *tuque* l.16), and through the possessive adjective (*tua* l.16).[40] The pronoun *tu* both in l.2 and in l.16 seems to transcribe into Latin the Aratean ring composition, but turns it, at the same time, from one occurring in one line (Aratus) to one occurring in the prooemium in general. Moreover, Germanicus places the characterization *genitor* (l.2), which he attributes to the emperor, right in the middle of the line,[41] thus breaking this line down into two hemistiches of equal syllables (six syllables before the *genitor* and six syllables after that). Thus, it reminds of the Aratean line where the genitive Διός was placed almost in the middle of the line and encircled by the repetition πάντη – πάντες.

Avienus refers to the name of Zeus twice and with two cases, one time in the first line and a second time in the fourth line of his prooemium, thus turning the repetition into a *polyptoton* (perhaps to lay emphasis upon the name of Zeus), and in this way he transcribes the ring composition of the source-text:

> *Carminis incentor mihi **Iuppiter**: auspice terras*   (l.1)
> "**Jupiter** inspires my poem. …"

> *et **Iovis** imperio mortalibus aethera pando*   (l.4)
> "under the order of **Jupiter** I lay open the ether to mankind"

Avienus opted for a bigger textual distance (4 lines) between the terms creating his own ring composition. His choice to eliminate the terms πάντη – πάντες and replace them with the name of the god, on whom Aratus focuses in his narrative, may underline Avienus' intention to demonstrate that he understood both the Aratean figure of speech and its interpretive connotations.

4) τῷ μιν ἀεὶ πρῶτόν τε καὶ ὕστατον ἱλάσκονται (l.14, "That is why men always pay homage to him first and last")

The narrative focus on Zeus pointed out both in the prooemium and at the end of the astronomical part of the *Phaenomena* is sealed by two terms of narrative organization which are attributed to Zeus: πρῶτον ("first") and ὕστατον ("last"). These two terms essentially anticipate that both the beginning and the end of the narrative[42] will refer to Zeus, who is deliberately placed by Aratus at the center of his narrative focus.[43]

---

[40] L.2 *Carminis at nobis, genitor, tu maximus auctor* ("My poem, however, claims you, father, greatest of all, as its inspirer"); l.3 *te veneror tibi sacra fero doctique laboris* ("It is you that I rev-erence; it is you that I am offering sacred gifts, the first fruits of my literary efforts"); l.16 *pax tua tuque adsis nato numenque secundes* ("May your presence and the peace you have won aid your son").

[41] And more concretely, between two caesurae.

[42] According to Kidd 1997, 170 *ad* 14, the phrase πρῶτόν τε καὶ ὕστατον is a traditional for-mula meaning "from beginning to end".

[43] This wording here referring to Zeus in Hesiod (*Theogony* l.34) refers to the Muses. Cf.

Germanicus does not translate this line at all. Avienus, while not translating this very line, does mention in terms of Zeus that this god is the one who is being invoked by a secret/private voice: …*rite hunc primum, medium atque secundum/ vox secreta canit*… (ll.17–18 "It is right that the awed voice sings him first, middle and following"). These lines recall Aratus' l.14. Avienus, like Aratus, implies that there will be constant (*primum, medium, secundum*) references to Zeus, something which is textually confirmed since besides the prooemium the references to the god are numerous throughout the poem. Gee (2013, 152) notes that Avienus increases the terms of the praise of Zeus from two to three, and that through the phrase *vox secreta* he changes the public praise to Zeus to something private.

5) …χαίροιτε δὲ Μοῦσαι,/ μειλίχιαι μάλα πᾶσαι. ἐμοί γε μὲν ἀστέρας εἰπεῖν/ ᾗ θέμις εὐχομένῳ τεκμήρατε πᾶσαν ἀοιδήν (ll.16–18, "Hail, Muses, all most gracious! In answer to my prayer to tell of the stars in so far as I may, guide all my singing.")

In a context of poetic self-referentiality, Aratus greets and invokes the Muses as the source of his poetic inspiration.[44] At the same time, however, he emphasizes his own contribution to the composition of the poem. His authorial role in writing the poem is sealed by the personal pronoun ἐμοί and the enclitic particle γε (l.17), which puts emphasis upon the word preceding (ἐμοί).[45] The translational question which arises here is whether the Latin translations perceive and transcribe this combination (Muses and Aratus' "I"). Germanicus drastically changes Aratus' prooemium, and the invocation of the Muses is eliminated. The word *Musa* is mentioned in the penultimate line, but as a synonym of the word "line, verse".

> haec **ego** dum Latiis **conor** praedicere Musis,
> pax tua tuque adsis nato numenque secundes   (ll.15–16)

> "May your presence and the peace you have won aid your son; grant your
> divine power, to favor me as I attempt to tell of this in Latin verse."

Hopkinson 1988, 139 *ad* 14.

[44]   Aratus requests the favor of the Muses for his poem. Through this invocation, which is emphatically placed after the invocation of Zeus, Aratus reverses the order we see in Hesiod (*Theogony* ll.36–37), who invokes the Muses and asks them to praise Zeus (Kidd 1997, 161). Cf. Hopkinson 1988, 139–140 *ad* 14 and *ad* 16. Through this invocation, Aratus does declare his literary affinities (that is, Hesiod), but at the same time emphasizes his deviations from them. Cf. also Kidd 1997, 171 *ad* 15–18. According to Pöhlmann 1973, 845, Aratus invokes the Muses as a source not only of poetic ability, but of cognitive as well.

[45]   Kidd 1997, 173 *ad* 17 notes that Aratus here introduces himself with the strong form of the pronoun (ἐμοὶ) instead of the traditional μοι we meet in Homer (*Iliad* 2.484; *Odyssey* 1.1), while "further emphasis is to be seen in γε μέν". Cf. Pöhlmann 1973, 845 where he observes that Aratus, although not mentioning his name clearly anywhere, nevertheless annotates his presence at the end of his prooemium.

By choosing this word, Germanicus recognizes and refers to the Muse of the source-text, and explicitly states at the same time his deviations from it. To be more concrete, through the pronoun *ego* and the first-person singular *conor*, he emphatically highlights his own poetic "I", his own *ingenium*.[46] The role of the Muses has now been taken over by the *princeps*,[47] whose presence is prominent in l.16 of the prooemium. The *princeps* is mentioned here not as a source of poetic inspiration, but as a source that will provide the poet with those favorable conditions – that is, the peace treaty (*pax tua*) – in order that he can compose his poem.[48] Additionally, through the term *Latiis* (l.15), he focuses on the new linguistic environment (that is, that of the Latin language), and the verb *conor* highlights Germanicus' (literary and translational) labor to transfer Aratus' text into the new sociolinguistic frame, in other words, his labor to romanize it.

In his translation, Avienus combines the Greek Musa (***Musa ut Cecropios raperetur et Aonas agros***, l.66 "so that the Muse…should speed across the fields of Aonian and Athenian poetry."), the Roman Musa (*O per multa operum mea simper cura Camenae!* l.72 "Muses, always my concern throughout many works!"), and himself (*me* l.67, *mihi* l.71, *mea cura* l.72, *mihi* l.76).[49] The multiple references to himself underline his own contribution and role in the connection of the Greek (*Musa*) and the Roman Muse (*Camenae*); a connection which consequently results in translating the Aratean text with the intention to romanize it. At the same

---

[46] Possanza 1990, 363 mentions that Germanicus departs completely from the text of the *Phaenomena* and especially in his prooemium gives prominence to his own *ingenium*. In arguing that the author of the *Aratea* is Germanicus while the dedicatee of these lines (Germanicus' ll.15–16) is Augustus, Possanza 2004, 106 translates Germanicus' ll.15–16 (*haec ego dum Latiis conor praedicere Musis*, / *pax tua tuque adsis nato numenque secundes*) as "while I make my attempt to foretell these things, may your peace and you yourself be by the side of your son, and may you make your divine majesty favourable". Gee 2005, 133 writes that "Possanza creates a disjunction between the authorial 'I', the subject of *conor* (I attempt), and the 'son', arguing that the son and the author of the proem are two different individuals, Tiberius and Germanicus respectively. … In Possanza's version, three separate things are happening in these lines: (a) the poet is writing (temporal clause, related to what follows only in terms of its contemporaneity); (b) the poet is asking the dedicatee to favour his son (not the poet); and (c) the poet is asking for this person to make his numen (divine presence) generally favourable".

[47] Cf. Pöhlmann 1973, 864.

[48] Ševcikova 2016, 451 writes that whenever Germanicus' *Aratea* were carried out, he "enjoyed life during a peaceful period of Roman history. His literary production was not burdened with any kind of a "mission" and it reflects the youthful joy of composing a poem and translating a work of such a writer as Aratus".

[49] Ll.67–69: *me quoque nunc similis stimulat favor edere versu* / *tempora cum duris versare ligonibus* / *arva conveniat*… ("Likewise his indulgence now drives me to set forth in verse the times when it is proper to turn the earth with hardy mattocks"); ll.71–72: *O **mihi** nota adyti iam numina Parnasei!* / *O per multa operum **mea** semper cura, Camenae!* ("O deities of the Parnassan grotto, already known to me! Muses, always my concern throughout many works!"); ll.74–76: …*maior,* / *maior agit mentem solito deus, ampla patescit* / *Cirrha **mihi** et totis Helicon inspirat ab antris* ("A greater – yes, a greater – god than usual galvanizes my mind, broad Cirrha is open to me, and Helicon breathes upon me from all its caves").

time, the next two lines (ll.73–74) recall Germanicus' ll.11–12. It should be mentioned that in this case, both Germanicus' ll.11–12 and Avienus' ll.73–74 do not constitute a translation of Aratus, but an addition made by the Roman authors to the source-text. The strong resemblance (with verbal parallels) between Avienus and Germanicus might be a signal that Avienus, during the process of romanizing the source-text, used Germanicus' version, or at least that he had read Germanicus before starting his own translation.

> *Iam placet in superum visus <u>sustollere caelum</u>*
> *atque oculis reserare viam per <u>sidera</u>…*   (Avienus, ll. 73–74)
> "Now I am pleased to raise my gaze to highest heaven and lay bare with my eyes a path through the stars!"

> *nunc vacat audacis <u>ad caelum tollere</u> vultus*
> *<u>sideraque</u> et mundi varios cognoscere motus*   (Germanicus, ll.11–12)
> "At last there is an opportunity to lift one's gaze boldly to the sky and learn of the celestial bodies and their different movements in the heavens"

6) …ἐμοί γε μὲν ἀστέρας εἰπεῖν/ ἧ θέμις εὐχομένῳ τεκμήρατε πᾶσαν ἀοιδήν (ll.17–18, "In answer to my prayer to tell of the stars in so far as I may, guide all my singing")

The phrase ἧ θέμις of the last line of the prooemium is of translational interest. According to Hopkinson (1988, 140 *ad* 18), "the words are ambiguously placed, and might qualify εἰπεῖν ('to give a right account of the stars') or εὐχομένῳ ('praying as it right <at the beginning of a poem'> or τεκμήρατε (sc. 'I am not praying to be told things which are οὐ θέμις')." Considering that the same syntactic ambiguity of the Greek text cannot be just repeated in Latin language, one is here wondering how Germanicus and Avienus deal with the source-text and how they use the syntax of the target-language in rewriting Aratus' ambiguity. What syntactic structure do they choose for their translations, that is, which term(s) does the utterance ἧ θέμις modify, and consequently what are the semantic connotations resulting from their choice? Germanicus does not translate these very lines, but having replaced the Muses (and Zeus) with Tiberius, he addresses to the latter a short prayer in which he wishes that Tiberius' presence and the peace he has assured help him in the process of composing his poem: *pax tua tuque adsis nato numenque secundes* (l.16 "May your presence and the peace you have won aid your son"). One might assume that in reading Aratus' prooemium, Germanicus connected, syntactically speaking, the utterance ἧ θέμις with the term εὐχομένῳ and took this combination for Aratus' prayer to the Muses. Avienus does not translate these lines, and eliminates the Aratean prayer.

Conclusions

To sum up, by focusing on the Aratean source-text, and examining the translational poetics[50] of Germanicus and Avienus, I conclude that both Roman authors

---

[50] For a brief, but very interesting, historical overview of the Latin translational practice from

do not produce a *verbum de verbo* translation of the source-text. They "embark on a program of rewriting"[51] Aratus, while they take into account the new sociopolitical context and their different linguistic environment; they lay emphasis upon their own authorial (and translational) *ingenium*, and in a frame of – one might say – translational competition they provide their recipients with their own poetics of translating. More concretely,

(1) Germanicus, in paraphrasing Aratus' *Phaenomena*, brings modifications, additions or substitutions to the source-text, deviates from it, and he finally romanizes it. In his prooemium, he stresses on the one hand that he is dependent upon Aratus, but, on the other hand, that he is not about to produce a "faithful translation" of the source-text. The host-culture and the new conventions affect the process of writing poetry. The political dimension, less explicit in Aratus, here is prominent. The power of the Roman emperor and the favorable conditions he has assured for the poet are greatly emphasized in his prooemium.

(2) In his translation, Avienus expands the original text by adding a great deal of lines, while his intention to romanize Aratus is quite obvious. It also seems that he is aware of both Aratus' figures of speech and their interpretive connotations. At the same time, in his poem there are implicit signals functioning as comments of his literary criticism of his predecessor Germanicus, and strong indications that during the process of writing the translation he had already read his Roman predecessor.

Bibliography

Albrecht, von, M. [Schmeling, G. (rev.)] 1997. *A History of Roman Literature: From Livius Andronicus to Boethius*, Vol. I (translated with the assistance of F. and K. Newman); Vol. II (translated with the assistance of R. R. Caston and R. F. Schwartz). *Mnemosyne*, Suppl. 165. Leiden/New York/Köln: E. J. Brill.

Almirall, J. 2002. Το διδακτικό ποίημα του Αράτου: "Τα *Φαινόμενα.*" In: T. Mandala (ed.), *Ελληνικά ιστορικά εκπαιδευτήρια στη Μεσόγειο: από την αρχαιότητα μέχρι σήμερα. Πρακτικά συνεδρίου: Χίος, 18-21/10/2001.* Chios: Ministry of National Education and Religious Affairs & Municipality of Chios, 66–70.

Avgerinos, Ch. E. 2014. *Τα Φαινόμενα του Αράτου στους συγχρόνους και τους μεταγενεστέρους του.* Πονήματα, 8. Athens: Academy of Athens.

Baldwin, B. 1981. The Authorship of the *Aratus* ascribed to Germanicus. *QUCC* 7: 163–172.

Bing, P. 1990. A Pun on Aratus' Name in Verse 2 of the *Phainomena*? *HSCP* 93: 281–285.

Cameron, A. 1995. Avienus or Avienius? *ZPE* 108: 252–262.

---

its outset (Livius Andronicus) until the 16th century (Victorius, Stephanus, Erasmus), see Lockwood 1918. For the importance of Latin translational practices in modern theories of translation, see for instance Hadjigeorgiou 2003, 510–511.

[51] Possanza 2004, 111.

Ciano, N. 2019. *Gli Aratea di Cicerone: saggio di commento ai frammenti di tradizione indiretta con approfondimenti a luoghi scelti (frr. 13 e 18)*. Bari: Edipuglia.

Dorfbauer, L. J. 2012. Der Dichter und zweimalige Proconsul Postumius Rufius Festus signo Avienius. *Mnemosyne* 65: 251–277.

Dyck, A. R. 2004. *A Commentary on Cicero, 'De Legibus'*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Ewbank, W. W. 1997 [1933]. *The Poems of Cicero. Edited, with introduction and notes*. Classic Commentaries. London/Bristol: Bristol Classical Press (= London: University of London Press, 1933).

Fakas, C. 2008. Ο Άρατος και η ελληνιστική διδακτική ποίηση. In: F. Manakidou & K. Spanoudakis (eds), *Αλεξανδρινή Μούσα. Συνέχεια και νεωτερισμός στην ελληνιστική ποίηση*. Σήματα, 2. Athens: Gutenberg, 85–122.

_____, 2001a. *Der hellenistische Hesiod: Arats* Phainomena *und die Tradition der antiken Lehrepik*. Serta Graeca, 11. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

_____, 2001b. Arat und Aristoteles' Kritik am Lehrgedicht. *Hermes* 129: 479–483.

Fantuzzi, M. & Hunter, R. 2004. *Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gain, D. B. (ed.) 1976. *The Aratus ascribed to Germanicus Caesar. Edited with an introduction, translation and commentary*. University of London Classical Studies, 8. London: The Athlone Press.

Gasti, H. 2003. Κικέρωνος *Tusc. Disp.* 2.VIII.20-IX.22: Η ποιητική του πρωτοτύπου (Σοφοκλής *Τραχίνιαι* 1046-1102) και η μεταφραστική ποιητική. In: *Μεταφραστική θεωρία και πράξη στη λατινική γραμματεία. Πρακτικά Ζ΄ Πανελληνίου Συμποσίου Λατινικών Σπουδών (Θεσσαλονίκη, 16-19 Οκτωβρίου 2002)*. Thessaloniki: University Studio Press, 134–143.

Gee, E. 2005. The Prince and the Stars: Germanicus' Translation of Aratus. [Review of Possanza 2004.] *Scholia* 14: 132–137.

_____, 2013. *Aratus and the Astronomical Tradition*. Classical Culture and Society. New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hadjigeorgiou, L. 2003. Η συμβολή των λατίνων μεταφραστών στη θεωρία της μετάφρασης. In: *Μεταφραστική θεωρία και πράξη στη λατινική γραμματεία. Πρακτικά Ζ΄ Πανελληνίου Συμποσίου Λατινικών Σπουδών (Θεσσαλονίκη, 16-19 Οκτωβρίου 2002)*. Thessaloniki: University Studio Press, 507–516.

Holder, A. (ed.) 1965. *Rufi Festi Avieni Carmina*. Hildesheim: Georg Olms.

Hopkinson, N. (ed.) 1988. *A Hellenistic Anthology*. Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hutchinson, G. O. 1988. *Hellenistic Poetry*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Kaimio, J. 1979. *The Romans and the Greek Language*. Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum, 64. Helsinki: Societas Scientiarum Fennica.

Katz, J. T. 2008. Virgil Translates Aratus: *Phaenomena* 1-2 and *Georgics* 1.1-2. *MD* 60: 105–123.

Kidd, D. A. 1961. The Fame of Aratus. *AUMLA* 15: 5–18.

_____, (ed.) 1997. *Aratus, Phaenomena: Edited with Introduction, Translation, and Commentary*. Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries, 34. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lewis, A. 1992. The Popularity of the *Phaenomena* of Aratus. In C. Deroux (ed.), *Stud-*

ies in Latin Literature and Roman History, VI. Collection Latomus, 217. Bruxelles: Peeters, 94–118.

Lockwood, D. P. 1918. Two Thousand Years of Latin Translation from the Greek. *TAPA* 49: 115–129.

Martin, J. (ed.) 1974. *Scholia in Aratum vetera*. Stuttgart: B. G. Teubner.

Michalopoulos, A. N. 2001. Τα *Aratea* του Γερμανικού και οι πρόδρομοί τους. Μια ετυμολογική προσέγγιση. In: *Η πνευματική ζωή στο ρωμαϊκό κόσμο: από το 14 ως το 212 μ.Χ.: ΣΤ΄ Πανελλήνιο Συμπόσιο Λατινικών Σπουδών, Ιωάννινα 11-13 Απριλίου 1997: Πρακτικά*. Ioannina: University of Ioannina, 295–307.

Miller, J. F. 1986. Disclaiming Divine Inspiration: A Programmatic Pattern. *WS* 99: 151–164.

O'Hara, J. J. 1996. *True Names. Vergil and the Alexandrian Tradition of Etymological Word Play*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

Pellacani, D. 2015. *Cicerone. Aratea e Prognostica. Introduzione, traduzione e note*. Pisa: Edizioni ETS.

Pöhlmann, E. 1973. Charakteristika des römischen Lehrgedichts. In: H. Temporini et al. (eds), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt (ANRW) / Rise and Decline of the Roman World*. Vol. 3: *Sprache und Literatur (1. Jahrhundert v. Chr.)*. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, 813–901.

Possanza, D. M. 1990. Notes on Germanicus Caesar's *Aratea*. *AJPh* 111.3: 361–369.

_____, 2004. *Translating the Heavens: Aratus, Germanicus, and the Poetics of Latin Translation*. Lang Classical Studies, 14. New York and Washington: Peter Lang.

Rose, H. J. ³1954. *A Handbook of Latin Literature. From the Earliest Times to the Death of St. Augustine*. London and New York: Bolchazy-Carducci.

Sale, W. M. 1966. The Popularity of Aratus. *CJ* 61: 160–164.

Ševcikova, T. 2016. The Didactic Strategy in Germanicus' Translation of Aratus' *Phaenomena*. *Acta Ant. Hung.* 56: 449–458.

Soubiran, J. (ed.) 1981. *Aviénus : Les Phénomènes d'Aratos*. Collection Budé, 252. Paris : Les Belles Lettres.

Taub, L. 2003. *Ancient Meteorology*. Sciences in Antiquity. London/New York: Routledge.

Weber, G. 1995. Herrscher, Hof und Dichter. Aspekte der Legitimierung und Repräsentation hellenistischer Könige am Beispiel der ersten drei Antigoniden. *Historia* 44.3: 283–316.

Zehnacker, H. 1989. D'Aratos à Aviénus : Astronomie et idéologie. *ICS* 14.1-2: 317–329.

Vasileios Dimoglidis
Ph.D. Candidate in Classics (Ancient Greek and Latin Philology)
University of Cincinnati (OH, USA)
dimoglvs@mail.uc.edu