Hayden Pelliccia

Aeschylean ἀμέγαρτοϲ and Virgilian *inamabilis*

Aeschylean ἀμέγαρτος and Virgilian *inamabilis*[1]

In a learned article (ZPE 78 [1989] 1-29) Albert Henrichs explains Virgil's application of the word *inamabilis* to the waters of the underworld (G. 4.479 and A. 6.438)[2] as based upon Aeschylus' use of ἀμέγαρτον to describe the water of the Styx (Frg. 273.11-13 A Radt).[3] I offer a different proposal.

The question "why did Virgil call the waters of the underworld *inamabilis*?" can be divided into two: (1) why did Virgil wish to use an *in*-compound?, and (2) why did he think *amabilitas* or its lack pertinent? Henrichs has answered the first question admirably: privative compounds are typical in descriptions of the underworld in general and of Stygian waters in particular (e.g. Hades is ἀμείλιχιος ἠδ' ἀδάμαστος at Il. 9.158, and the water of the Styx ἀμείλικτον at h. Dem. 259; see Henrichs, 25ff.). The cogency of Henrichs' answer to question (2), that Virgil's use of the *ama*-stem reflects Aeschylus' μέγ-/μεγαίρ-, is, however, more doubtful, for the meanings of the two stems are not close.

There are two possible answers to question (2): the first is that Virgil simply wanted a word meaning "hateful" and was not particularly choosy about which one. This proposal might be rendered more attractive by supposing that Virgil used *inamabilis* as a synonym for ϲτυγερόϲ, and appealed to his readers to make an etymological connection: *inamabilis*: ϲτυγερόϲ: Στύξ. The weaknesses of this suggestion are (a) that as a translation of ϲτυγερόϲ *inamabilis* is not conspicuously superior to other Latin words for "hateful" (e.g., *invisus* and *detestabilis*),[4] and therefore is unlikely to have stimulated anyone to think of the Greek word; and (b) that ϲτυγερόϲ as a word-formation states a quality positively, when, as Henrichs has shown, the Greek tradition that *inamabilis* clearly reflects is that of negative formations. Ultimately, then, this first line of explication will rest on the presumption of a reduced meaning for the *ama-* stem in the adjective: not "un-lovable," but simply "loathsome" or the like. In support of such a reduced, non-erotic meaning is the use elsewhere in Latin of *ama-* compounds (see the *OLD* entries for *amabilis* and *inamabilis*). This argument is two-edged, however. As Axelson has pointed out, *amabilis* is in general non-poetic; Horace, for whom it is a "Lieblingswort," uses it 7 times, more often than all other classical poetic instances com-

---

[1] I wish to express my gratitude for the advice and criticisms of F. Ahl, Albert Henrichs, Ian Rutherford, Danuta Shanzer, and Richard Thomas.

[2] *Cocyti tardaque palus inamabilis unda* and *fas obstat, tristi(s)que palus inamabilis unda(e)* (I print the latter with the variants included after Henrichs, 2; for discussion, see *ibid.*).

[3] Οὗ τόδ' ἀπορρὼξ ἀμέγαρτον ὕδωρ | κἀχέρνιπτον | Στυγίοιϲ ναϲμοῖϲιν ἀνεῖται. Note that the text of the crucial word is uncertain; ἀμέγαρτον Gronewald: τομεγαρτο̣ Pap.

[4] As suggested by Heyne (quoted in Henrichs, 4 n. 5), though, as F. Ahl points out to me, *detestabilis* is an improbable epithet for a river on which oaths were customarily sworn. *Invisus* is, incidentally, a more suitable translation of ἀμέγαρτοϲ than is *inamabilis*.

bined.[5] Virgil is unlikely to have used a word that is both unpoetic and, in its use elsewhere, etymologically debased, unless he had reason to believe that he could use it in such a way as to renew it.

This idea of renewal leads to the second possible answer to question (2): Virgil was using the *ama-* stem in a strong sense, that is, one that granted full force to its amatory connotations. In what sense is the underworld *palus*—that is, the water of the Styx—incapable of participating in the activity of *amor*? In order to answer this question it will first be necessary to recollect that Greco-Roman rivers, like other numinous geographic entities, enjoy a changeable status. We may distinguish three possibilities: (1) rivers conceived as personified deities; (2) rivers conceived as waters; and (3) the free interplay between (1) and (2). This last characteristic, the most puzzling to the modern mind, is illustrated by the behavior of Scamander in *Il.* 21, where first (212f.) the river takes on human appearance in order to address Achilles (ἀνέρι εἰcάμενος, βαθέης δ’ ἐκ φθέγξατο δίνης), but later (307ff.) is able to speak to the river Simoeis without any such transformation;[6] all the while Scamander remains identified with the waters inundating Achilles.

Characteristics (1) and (2) will require no general illustration; I point out a possibility for paronomasia by means of which they can be combined in order to produce (3). As personified deities rivers are capable of sexual intercourse with humans or other anthropomorphic beings; a standard verb is μείγνυμι/μίcγω. Thus *Il.* 21.143: τῇ γάρ ῥα μίγη ποταμὸс βαθυδίνης. Similarly, the personified Styx herself in Hesiod *Th.* 383: Στὺξ δ’ ἔτεκ’ Ὠκεανοῦ θυγάτηρ Πάλλαντι μιγεῖcα κτλ. Rivers conceived as waters, on the other hand, can combine with other bodies of water; the verb is again μείγνυμι/μίcγω and compounds. This usage is too common to require exemplification, and I quote only a passage of Herodotus (7.129.2-3) which influenced Lucan in a passage to be discussed later:

ὥcτε ὦν ποταμῶν ἐc αὐτὴν καὶ ἄλλων cυχνῶν ἐcβαλλόντων, πέντε δὲ τῶν δοκίμων μάλιστα τῶνδε, Πηνειοῦ καὶ Ἀπιδανοῦ καὶ Ὀνοχώνου καὶ Ἐνιπέοc καὶ Παμίcου, οἱ μέν νυν ἐc τὸ πεδίον τοῦτο cυλλεγόμενοι ἐκ τῶν ὀρέων τῶν περικληιόντων τὴν Θεccαλίην ὀνομαζόμενοι δι’ ἑνὸς αὐλῶνος καὶ τούτου cτεινοῦ ἔκροον ἔχουcι ἐc θάλαccαν, προcυμμίcγοντεc τὸ ὕδωρ πάντεc ἐc τὠυτό. ἐπεὰν δὲ cυμμειχθέωcι τάχιcτα, ἐνθεῦτεν ἤδη ὁ Πηνειὸc τῷ οὐνόματι κατακρατέων ἀνωνύμουc τοὺc ἄλλουc εἶναι ποιέει.

We see, then, two distinct uses of μείγνυμι/μίcγω, the one sexual, the other not. What we need now is evidence for paronomasia between the two different senses. I first look at some possible instances in contexts that do not concern rivers, and then present a passage that may have been decisive for Virgil.

---

[5] B. Axelson, *Unpoetische Wörter* (Lund 1945) 102f.: "Einen sehr poetischen Klang kann das von Verg. Tib. Prop. Sen. Luc. Val. u.a. ganz verschmähte *amabilis* kaum gehabt haben." On Vergil's use of such compounds, see, e.g., Austin on *A.* 5.541.

[6] Cf. Pindar *P.* 9.1-6: Ἐθέλω --- γεγωνεῖν | ὄλβιον ἄνδρα διωξίππου cτεφάνωμα Κυράναc· | τὰν ὁ χαιτάειc ἀνεμοcφαράγων ἐκ Παλίου κόλπων ποτὲ Λατοΐδαc | ἅρπαc’, where Cyrene appears in the same sentence first as the victor's city and then, without any transition or explanation, as the Thessalian maiden raped by Apollo.

A famous "eugenicist" passage in Theognis (183-192) assigns the cause of social corruption to cross-class marriages:

κριοὺς μὲν καὶ ὄνους διζήμεθα Κύρνε καὶ ἵππους
εὐγενέας, καί τις βούλεται ἐξ ἀγαθῶν
185 βήσεσθαι· γῆμαι δὲ κακὴν κακοῦ οὐ μελεδαίνει
ἐσθλὸς ἀνήρ, ἤν οἱ χρήματα πολλὰ διδῷ,
οὐδὲ γυνὴ κακοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἀναίνεται εἶναι ἄκοιτις
πλουσίου, ἀλλ' ἀφνεὸν βούλεται ἀντ' ἀγαθοῦ.
χρήματα μὲν τιμῶσι· καὶ ἐκ κακοῦ ἐσθλὸς ἔγημε
190 καὶ κακὸς ἐξ ἀγαθοῦ· πλοῦτος ἔμειξε γένος.
οὕτω μὴ θαύμαζε γένος Πολυπαΐδη ἀστῶν
μαυροῦσθαι· σὺν γὰρ μίσγεται ἐσθλὰ κακοῖς.

What is of interest for our inquiry is Theognis' down-to-earth identification of social order with correct breeding practices; order is maintained by preserving class distinctions; class lines are identical to blood lines; blood lines are confused by cross-class breeding. The argument predicates an identification of sexual intermingling with social intermingling (ἔμειξε as in line 190: "wealth brings it about that the race is mixed"), for the latter follows inevitably from the former: "thus do not marvel at the obscuring of the race."

The range of meaning to be given to συμμίσγεται in 192 must be considered. The language is similar to the non-sexual language of such passages as *Il*. 24.527-531 (cf. ἀμμίξας in 529) and especially Hesiod *Op*. 179 μεμείξεται ἐσθλὰ κακοῖσιν, where the referents of the two adjectives or adjectival substantives are unspecified, as in Thgn. 192. It is clear, however, that Theognis cannot have meant simply "good things are mixed with bad," which is the sort of meaning that the Hesiodic passage requires;[7] nonetheless, his wording was probably influenced by traditional phraseology as evidenced in the Hesiodic line (cf. West *ad loc*., referring to Stesichorus *SLG* 150 i 4). The easiest noun to supply would be γένη. At any rate, since there can be no doubt but that Theognis is speaking of the results of miscegenation in the μὴ θαύμαζε clause, with σὺν γὰρ μίσγεται ἐσθλὰ κακοῖς he must be referring to the act itself, and the earthy comparison of 183-185 certainly encourages the inference of sexual meaning here. This passage therefore can be justly accounted evidence for the deliberate exploitation of the dual application of meaning for verbs of the μείγνυμι/μίσγω stems.

The idea of miscegenation is present also in the earliest occurrences of συμμείγνυμι in an unambiguously sexual sense: in the *Homeric hymn to Aphrodite* the verb (together with the *simplex* and the ἀνα-compound) is repeatedly used of the unions of gods with mortals (39, 46, 50, 52, 250). These unions provide Aphrodite with amusement for so long as she is the one causing others to form them; when Zeus impels her to fall in love and sleep with Anchises, she is deeply ashamed (247-255). The source of shame is in part at least the Theognidean concern with eugenics (254f.): ἀπεπλάγχθην δὲ νόοιο, παῖδα δ' ὑπὸ ζώνῃ ἐθέ-

---

[7] Apart from the presence of the sexual reference, the sense of the Theognis differs from that of the Homer and Hesiod in that these represent the admixture of good with bad positively as a palliation of the latter. The precise meaning of Hesiod's words is not entirely clear (179-181 have been sometimes condemned; see West *ad loc*.), but note that they occur in a discussion of γένη.

μην βροτῷ εὐνηθεῖcα. The shame and sorrow felt by gods in regard to these conjunctions and the mongrel offspring produced by them is well known from Thetis' laments in the *Iliad*, especially that addressed to Hephaestus in 18. 429-441.[8] The shame is a natural consequence of divine disdain for mortals: Aphrodite forbids Anchises to tell anyone that she is Aeneas' mother (*h. Aphr.* 281-288: ἢν τιc εἴρηταί cε καταθνητῶν ἀνθρώπων κτλ.), and according to Calypso, Zeus, following a well-known double standard, actively intervenes to prevent goddesses from such intercourse (*Od.*5.118-129).[9] I stress that the anxieties caused by these conjunctions have to do with the horror of miscegenation, the mixing of diings that, according to some either natural or conventional standard, do not belong together.

A passage that may have been of the greatest importance for Virgil is Parthenius 640 *SH*:

> παρθένοc ἢ Κιλίκων εἶχεν ἀνακτορίην,
> ἀγχίγαμοc δ’ ἔπελεν, καθαρῷ δ’ ἐπεμαίνετο Κύδνῳ,
> Κύπριδοc ἐξ ἀδύτων πυρcὸν ἀναψαμένη,[10]
> εἰcόκε μιν Κύπριc πηγὴν θέτο, μῖξε δ’ ἔρωτι
> Κύδνου καὶ νύμφηc ὑδατόεντα γάμον.

Here again we see Aphrodite perform the role assigned her in the Homeric hymn: she effects the sexual union of different orders of being. The passage furnishes my argument with two crucial pieces of evidence: (1) the meeting of waters is explicitly presented as a sexual union, and the verb used is μείγνυμι, and (2) the author is one known to have been of unique importance for the Roman new poets and their heirs; in short, we can feel some confidence that Virgil knew this passage.[11]

To return to *inamabilis* in *Georgics* 4.479: Parthenius' word play combining the non-sexual and sexual meanings of μείγνυμι/μίcγω in reference to rivers explains their *amabilitas*. What would make Stygian water lack this quality? The most important evidence is *Il.* 2.751-755:

> οἵ τ’ ἀμφ’ ἱμερτὸν Τιταρήcιον ἔργα νέμοντο
> ὅc ῥ’ ἐc Πηνειὸν προΐει καλλίρροον ὕδωρ,
> οὐδ’ ὅ γε Πηνειῷ *cυμμίcγεται* ἀργυροδίνῃ,
> ἀλλά τέ μιν καθύπερθεν ἐπιρρέει ἠΰτ’ ἔλαιον·
> ὅρκου γὰρ δεινοῦ Στυγὸc ὕδατόc ἐcτιν ἀπορρώξ.

Line 753 οὐδ’ --- cυμμίcγεται may have been the model for Virgil's negative formation *in-amabilis*.

------

[8] See especially 431-433: ἐκ μέν μ’ ἀλλάων ἁλιάων ἀνδρὶ δάμαccεν ǀ Αἰακίδῃ Πηλῆϊ, καὶ ἔτλην ἀνέροc εὐνὴν ǀ πολλὰ μάλ’ οὐκ ἐθέλουcα.

[9] This policy would seem to stand in contradiction to his role in the mating of Aphrodite and Anchises; but the ultimate purpose of Aphrodite's humiliation is to cause her to desist from causing further such unions (the success of this plan is clearly implied by πρίν in 249 and by cυνέμιξα's past reference in 250, guaranteed by ποτέ in 249). Likewise, Zeus' traditional role in the mating of Peleus and Thetis responds to a unique predicament.

[10] Lloyd-Jones and Parsons translate line three "amoris flammam cum concepisset."

[11] In general, see Wendell Clausen, "Callimachus and Latin Poetry" *GRBS* 5 (1964) 181-196 (esp. 188ff.); on Virgil's debt, see the same author's "Virgil and Parthenius" *HSCP* 80 (1976) 80.

This passage of the *Iliad* was famous. The earliest surviving reference would seem to be Pindar *Paean* 10 (a). 4, where the Peneios[12] is called Στυγὶ cύνδετος; the scholium attached quotes the Iliadic passage in explanation. The word cύνδετος is apt for describing the relationship between rivers running in the same course without mingling their waters.

The "myth" at the end of Plato's *Phaedo* concerns the disposition of souls in the underworld, and includes a lengthy description of the four great rivers, Ocean, Acheron, Pyriphlegethon, and Cocytus; the last three are the rivers of the underworld, and the last two have the property of unmixability: Pyriphlegethon (113b) arrives παρ' ἔcχατα τῆc Ἀχερουcιάδος λίμνης, οὐ cυμμειγνύμενος τῷ ὕδατι; then (113b6-c8):

τούτου δὲ αὖ καταντικρὺ ὁ τέταρτος ἐκπίπτει εἰς τόπον πρῶτον δεινόν τε καὶ ἄγριον, ὡς λέγεται, χρῶμα δ' ἔχοντα ὅλον οἷον ὁ κυανός, ὃν δὴ ἐπονομάζουcι Στύγιον, καὶ τὴν λίμνην ἣν ποιεῖ ὁ ποταμὸς ἐμβάλλων, Στύγα· ὁ δ' ἐμπεcὼν ἐνταῦθα καὶ δεινὰς δυνάμεις λαβὼν ἐν τῷ ὕδατι, δὺς κατὰ τῆς γῆς, περιελιττόμενος χωρεῖ ἐναντίος τῷ Πυριφλεγέθοντι καὶ ἀπαντᾷ ἐν τῇ Ἀχερουcιάδι λίμνῃ ἐξ ἐναντίας· καὶ *οὐδὲ* τὸ τούτου ὕδωρ *οὐδενὶ μείγνυται*, ἀλλὰ καὶ οὗτος κύκλῳ περιελθὼν ἐμβάλλει εἰς τὸν Τάρταρον ἐναντίος τῷ Πυριφλεγέθοντι· ὄνομα δὲ τούτῳ ἐcτίν, ὡς οἱ ποιηταὶ λέγουcιν, Κώκυτος.

Plato draws upon the two Homeric passages describing offshoots (ἀπορρῶγες) of the Styx; the one (*Il.* 2.751-755) gave him the idea of unmixability,[13] the other (*Od.* 10. 513f.) gave

_____

[12] Snell/Maehler's text of lines 3-4 reads ἐνάτα[ˌεἰς ποταμόν τινα˺ | Στυ[γὶ ˌcύνδετον˺ with the restorations taken from the scholia, which read as follows: ὅρ]κου γὰρ δ[εινοῦ Σ]τυγὸς ὕδ(ατος) --- 'τινὰ' λέγει Πηνειόν· ['c]ύνδετ[ο]c' λ[έγετα]ι [ὅτ]ι ἔcχε cυνάφειαν τῷ Τιταρηcίῳ, [ὃc ἀ]πόρροιαν ἀπὸ Στυγὸς ἔχει. It is probable that the scholiast had independent reasons for identifying the river as Peneios: the previous scholia speak, apropos of ἐνάτα in line 3, of an enneateris, i.e., a festival taking pla'ce every eight years. On the basis of the presumed Delphic context (i.e., a paean), Snell suggested that this festival might be the Delphic Septerion, which involved pilgrimage to Peneios. R. Führer has plausibly argued (*Formproblem-Untersuchungen zu den Reden in der frühgriechischen Lyrik* [*Zetemata* 44 (1967)] 125) that lines 11-22, at least, are a genealogical prophecy, and Ian Rutherford (in his forthcoming commentary) has extended Führer's observation, concluding from the future tense in line 11 and from the absence of introductory or concluding speech formulae throughout that the entire fragment belongs to this speech. I would add that the failure to specify the river's name in 3-4 is in keeping with prophetic speech convention; for Pindar's use of a "prophetic" τιc to refer to someone whose name is known in the present to himself and his audience, but was unspecified by or unknown to the prophet depicted, see *N.* 5.36, where Zeus grants the virtuous Peleus a reward, ὥcτ' ἐν τάχει ποντίαν χρυcαλακάτων τινὰ Νηρεΐδων πράξειν ἄκοιτιν (Thetis had already been named 11 lines previous); see also *N.* 1.64 and *N.* 7.44, and cf. *O.* 2.59 and *P.* 1.52. It thus seems likely that the scholiast's report of the text εἰc ποταμόν τινα is accurate, since it coheres with the prophetic conventions manifest in the remainder. Given the way this kind of τιc is applied to a subject whose name is presumed to be known, it also seems likely that the scholiast had independent reasons for identifying the river as Peneios:: either he would have known the details of the story from another source (especially plausible if the passage was concerned with a festival as famous as the Septerion), or else the Peneios was named elsewhere in *Paean* 10 outside of this conventionally vague prophetic speech (as Thetis is named earlier in *N.* 5). Either way, assuming that the identification is correct, his explanation of the phrase Στυγὶ cύνδετον relies, so far as we can see, entirely upon *Il.* 2.751-755.

[13] Bluck (R.S. Bluck, *Plato's Phaedo* [London 1955] 185) thinks that Plato invented this himself; Burnet on 114a5 points out that Plato gives the waters' unmixability a practical function in keeping the different types of souls borne by the rivers separate from one another when the rivers combine.

him the names: ἔνθα μὲν εἰς Ἀχέροντα Πυριφλεγέθων τε ῥέουςι | Κώκυτός θ᾽, ὃς δὴ Στυγὸς ὕδατος ἐςτιν ἀπορρώξ.[14]

In Latin poetry Lucan (6.371-380) combined many of the elements we have seen so far.[15] Herodotus' account of the Thessalian rivers that combine with and lose their names to Peneios; Homer's description of Titaresios' failure (in this case, refusal) to mix its waters with Peneios; and the divine disdain of union with mortals which we spoke of in reference to the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite:*

	et quisquis pelago per se non cognitus amnis
	Peneo donavit aquas: it gurgite rapto
373	Apidanos numquamque celer nisi mixtus Enipeus;
375	solus, in alterius nomen cum venerit undae,
	defendit Titaressos aquas lapsusque superne
	gurgite Penei pro siccis utitur arvis.
	hunc fama est Stygiis manare paludibus amnem
	et capitis memorem fluvii contagia vilis
380	nolle pati superumque sibi servare timorem.[16]

Other mentions of the unmixability of Titaresios' waters are to be found in Strabo (9.5.20; a rationalizing account), Pliny *NH* 4.31 (where the river is called Orcus, but the identification with the Homeric Titaresios is secured by *ut dictum Homero*[17]), Aelius Aristides (18.253), and Pausanias (8.18.4-5). All of these authors depend on *Il.* 2.751-755, which bears all the earmarks of having been a Hellenistic ζήτημα. Unfortunately, the scholia on this part of the catalogue do not survive.[18] Likely places for Hellenistic treatment are Callimachus' περὶ Νυμφῶν (*frg.* 413, containing discussion of the extraordinary properties of the Arcadian Styx; see further below) and περὶ [τῶν ἐν τῇ οἰκουμένῃ] ποταμῶν (*frgs.* 457-460). At any rate, there can be little doubt but that Virgil was familiar with the extensive and distin-

---

[14] Plato refers or alludes to Homer elsewhere in this passage; besides the passages mentioned in the text: at 112a3 he quotes *Il.* 8.14 on Tartarus; the inclusion of Ocean in the group with Acheron, Pyriphlegethon and Cocytus may reflect *Od.* 11.157f. (as per Burnet on *Phd.* 112e5, but cf. Heubeck on *Od. loc. cit.*); and δεινόν τε καὶ ἄγριον, ὡς λέγεται in 113b7 may be based upon Circe's comment about Charybdis at *Od.* 12.119: δεινόν τ᾽ ἀργαλέον τε καὶ ἄγριον οὐδὲ μαχητόν. It is clear that Virgil in *G.* 471-480 was also looking to the Homeric model (Thomas *ad loc.* refers to *Od.* 11.34-43). Virgil's placement of the word *Cocyti* at the beginning of line 479 may or may not be a nod, like Plato's, to *Od.* 10.514 (quoted above in the text, and the only Homeric instance of the name; cf. also Lycophron 705f. for the idea if not meter); at any rate, though the earliest surviving instance of the name *Cocytus* in Latin poetry is in Virgil, he himself places it first in the line also at *G.* 3.38, *A.* 6.132, 323, and 7.562; in Greek cf. Euphorion 43.1 Powell and Hermesianax 7.9 Powell; in post-Virgilian Latin, cf. Juvenal 2.150, Petronius 120. line 69, and Sil. 12.117 and 13.426; cf. Nonnus 44. 262. Note that Plato's account has other features in common with Virgil's at *G.* 478-490: the confluence of the infernal waters, the marshes (λίμνη, *limus, palus*), the dark color (οἷον ὁ κυανός, *niger*), and the encircling movement of the rivers (περιελιττόμενος κύκλῳ περιελθών, *novies...interfusa*).

[15] Housman *ad loc.* notes the debt to Herodotus. For other passages from the Neronian age in which the Styx and Titaresios are discussed, see n. 24 below.

[16] I follow the text of Shackleton Bailey (Stuttgart 1988), including Housman's transposition of 374 to follow 368.

[17] Discussed below, n. 23.

[18] There is discussion in Eustathius.

guished tradition about the unmixability of Stygian waters and with the Iliadic passage standing at its head.

We are now in a position to try to reconstruct Virgil's procedure and its effects, which can be assumed to be its purpose. In the *Georgics* passage as a whole (4.471-480) he is characterizing the underworld briefly and in as pathetic a fashion as this brevity will allow: note the prominence given to "boys and unmarried girls, and youths placed upon pyres before the eyes of their parents" (476f.). On the other hand, he is following traditional models; Thomas points to *Od.* 11.34-43, and other traditional features have been pointed out here (see n. 14). Given the pathetic context, it is certain that the primary meaning of *inamabilis* is "hateful;" Henrichs has shown how the formation of the word itself is traditional for the underworld. The question I have raised is "why the *ama*-stem?" The answer is first that it communicates directly the required meaning "hateful." For the learned in Virgil's audience, however, there will have been something richer and more specific: the notion that the hatefulness of the Styx has a physical manifestation: its unmixability. *Inamabilis*, as applied to the Styx, will have acquired the meaning "unmixable" from *Il.* 2.751-755 *via* Parthenius 640. Virgil took from Parthenius the word play on μείγνυμι, by which the mingling of river waters was equated with sexual intercourse (μῖξε ἔρωτι), and from *Il.* 2.751-755 the information that Stygian water οὐδ' — cυμμίcγεται. Parthenius 640 enabled Virgil to understand *Il.* 2.753 οὐδ' --- cυμμίcγεται as οὐδ' --- cυμμίcγεται ἔρωτι; this introduction of the erotic element into *Il.* 2.753 will have been encouraged by the application of the epithet ἱμερτόc[19] to Titaresios in 751: the river is desirable (ἱμερτόc), but erotically unattainable (οὐδ' --- cυμμίcγεται): *inamabilis*.[20] This is precisely the situation described in Parthenius 640; compare also Nonnus 40.141-143, on the maiden Comaetho, who apparently was another who enjoyed conversion to water (2.144 νεόρρυτα χεύματα) for the sake of love.[21]

<div align="center">

οἷα Κομαιθώ,

ἢ πάρος ἱμερόεντος ἐραccαμένη ποταμοῖο

τέρπεται ἀγκὰc ἔχουcα καὶ εἰcέτι Κύδνον ἀκοίτην[22]

</div>

---

[19] Applied to ὕδατα at Ap. Rhod. 2.939. Cf. *Anth. Pal.* 14.23 Νηρέοc ὄντα με παῖδα φέρει γαιήϊοc υἱόc | τὸν Στυγὸc ἱμερτοῖc νάμαcι δυόμενον. See the next note.

[20] On the semantics of the word (*in-*)*amabilis*: it should be noted that such *-bilis* adjectives reflect (1) the transitive use of the verb as passives ("lovable"), and (2) the intransitive use of the verb as active/intransitives ("capable of participating in love"); thus, e.g., *mobilis* (both "movable" and "mobile"); likewise *mutabilis*. In the case of *amabilis* the intransitive includes the idea of reciprocity: being receptive to someone else's love and returning it. The absence of this quality (*inamabilis*) is best illustrated by cases in which there is an object of desire who does not reciprocate that desire, and who is thus, viewed from the outside, impossible, to love reciprocally, e.g., the Euripidean Hippolytus. For the use of *amabilis,* see line 10f. of the Pyrrha ode: *qui semper vacuam, semper amabilem sperat*. It goes without saying that Pyrrha will continue to be an object of her wretched lover's desire; what he hopes is that she will always be loving in the sense of responding favorably to his initations of love and love making: she will be receptive to his love and reciprocate it; but, of course, on Horace's prediction, she will not do this: she will cease to be *amabilis*, and thus become *inamabilis*. Likewise the unmixable—but ἱμερτόν—water of fthe Styx.

[21] The two Nonnus passages are quoted by Lloyd-Jones and Parsons on Parthenius 640.

[22] R.J. Tarrant draws my attention to Ovid, *Met.* 5.635-638, where Arethusa tells how, when she was pursued by Alpheus in human form, Diana changed her into a spring; Alpheus then reverted to river form, *ut se mihi misceat.*

It may be objected that allusion to Parthenius 640—a witty and playful passage—is unsuitable to the emotional tone of *G.*4.479ff. Allusion is not really the procedure I envision, however. We need not think of Virgil as directing attention to Parthenius' poem; rather, Parthenius, by making explicit the connection between aquatic mixability and the physical love of rivers, enabled his successors to exploit that equation in whatever context they might wish. The solemnity of *G*. 4.471-80 is established by the whole subject matter, and that of *inamabilis* in 479 by the Styx itself. Oblique reference to the unmixability of Stygian water will not have been an otiose and inappropriate display of erudition. We saw earlier how Plato used the same concepts in his "myth" about the rivers of the underworld; he maintained the Homeric detail about the unmixability of Pyriphlegethon's and Cocytus' waters because he could exploit that quality as contributing to the rivers' function of keeping different types of souls separated (see Burnet, cited in n. 13 above). Virgil also lays stress on Styx' restraining of the souls (480 *coercet*). Furthermore, it seems quite possible that the unmixability of Stygian water was a functional aspect of its deadliness; there is a well established tradition about the spring Styx in Arcadia and the destructive properties of its waters. It was said by Callimachus (among others) to have been uncontainable in any material other than horn (*frg.* 413): Στύξ· ἐν Νωνακρίνῃ τῆς Ἀρκαδίας ὕδωρ ἐςτὶ τὸ διακόπτον πάντα τὰ ἀγγεῖα πλὴν τῶν κερατίνων.[23] This quality—what might be called its "unfriendliness" to other elements—is consistent with that of unmixability. There is every reason to think that the unmixability of the Styx—its *inamabilitas* — was a very serious and dire matter.[24]

Finally, there is the question of my proposal's plausibility. The answer to this question will depend on the reader's conception of Virgil's artistry. I hope to have made it clear, in both the texts and the footnotes, that the relevant ideas about Stygian water were not merely available, but were celebrated; they were a part of the literate public's consciousness, as they are not part of ours; any estimation of plausibility must take that fact into account.

Cornell University   Hayden Pelliccia

---

[23] In addition to the passages collected by Pfeiffer, see Pausanias 8.17.6ff. (with Frazer's note), Seneca *QN* 3.25.1, which discusses the deadliness of the Arcadian Styx and adds that *est aeque noxia aqua in Thessalia circa Tempe, quam et fera et pecus omne devitat*; that this refers to Titaresios seems probable, as shown by Pliny, *NH* 2.231, also on the deadliness of Arcadian Styx, and 31.27, on the same subject, but this time citing the Arcadian Styx as representative of a group of certain things which *blandiuntur aspectu* (cf. ἱμερτός); he then goes on (31.28): *aliter circa Thessalia Tempe, quoniam virus omnibus terrori est, traduntque aena etiam ac ferrum erodi illa aqua. Profluit, ut indicavimus, brevi spatio*... The reference is to 4.31, where we find discussion of Peneus and Titraresios (under the name Orcus): (the Vale of Tempe) *hac labitur Peneus, vitreus calculo, amoenus circa ripas gramine, canorus avium concentu. accipit amnem Orcon, nec recepit, sed olei modo supernatantem, ut dictum est Homero, brevi spatio portatum abdicat, poenales aquas Dirisque genitas argenteis suis misceri recusans.* All of which demonstrates that the unmixibility of the Styx and Titaresios was associated with their deadliness.

[24] *CAF Adesp.* 373 may contrast the ideas of mixability with those of harshness and hatefulness: (You were created not out of flesh and) οὐχ αἵματος καὶ τῶν ὅσα τούτοις κίρναται | ἀλλ᾽ ἐξ ἀδάμαντος καὶ πέτρας εἶ καὶ Στυγός. Cf. Plato, *Prt.* τυποῦςιν αὐτὰ θεοὶ γῆς ἔνδον ἐκ γῆς καὶ πυρὸς μίξαντες καὶ τῶν ὅςα πυρὶ καὶ γῇ κεράννυται.