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For modern humans, love and toil may not appear to be conflicting concepts. Many of us strive to merge our individual passions with our work, balance our personal relationships with our ambitions, and with concentrated and deliberate effort, hope to achieve success in our goals. Since the publication of Vergil’s *Georgics*, many critics have viewed the ideals of *amor* and *labor* as opposing forces represented within the text. In the nineteenth century, many have argued that Vergil’s *Georgics* primarily praised the dignity of *labor*. Instead of exploring these two as conflicting forces, I see them on the same side of a greater issue, as seen primarily in the Aristaeus-Orpheus episode of the Fourth Book of the *Georgics*. This epyllion is the key to the true tension in the conclusion of the *Georgics*: the disparity between *amor* and *labor* versus obedience.

Considering, as Thomas aptly notes that Vergil’s *Georgics* “is infinitely more complex and subtle than it was once thought to be,” I will not pretend to address all of the complexities within the whole of the *Georgics*. Instead, I will focus on an issue residing in the final book. In order to explore this distinction, it is necessary first to examine the work itself, as well as the key terms and history of scholarship surrounding these issues. Vergil’s *Georgics*, a four book poem concerning agriculture, was published in 29 B.C.E, during the early reign of Octavian in what would become the Roman Empire. Throughout his life, Vergil experienced relentlessly bloody civil wars, coinciding with violent riots, battles, and the subsequent end of the Roman Republic. Considering all that he went through in his life, the poet wrote meticulously and in terms of the composition of this masterpiece, Thomas proclaims, “Few Latin poems draw so extensively, or so creatively, from
their inherited tradition.” The poem has long been believed to be didactic in its purpose, specifically that it was written “to restore an interest in Italian agriculture;” realistically, however, Roman farmers likely consulted more practical wisdom on the subject, such as Varro’s *Res Rusticae*. It is believed even that Vergil himself used the *Res Rusticae* to inform the *Georgics*.

As with any subject, literary critics have posited a variety of theories regarding the themes and major issues within Vergil’s *Georgics*, many of which involve a few specific concepts: labor, amor, sacrificial practices, political commentary, and cultural interdependence. As Marincic asserts, “The two characters Aristaeus and Orpheus seem to represent not only abstract principles such as culture and nature, but different individual choices and destinies, different ways of life: agriculture and love, politics and poetry, obedient acceptance of (agricultural) teaching and self-sufficient love, agriculture and nomadism.” Habinek argues similarly, asserting that the contrast between the two figures is vast in all accounts.

One aspect of human nature, amor, permeates the poem. Segal, Miles, Gall, and Gale discuss the relevance of amor in relation to various topics within the text. For instance, Segal and Merguet concern themselves mainly with the relation of humankind and nature—of amor and labor. Miles is mainly concerned with the notions of various types of control or lack thereof. Gale examines amor in the context of the backward glance, highly influenced by Kranz’s work discussing facing backwards in the text, the noting parallels between the poet, the politician, and the story’s characters. Historically, the *Georgics* have also been characterized as poetry
praising the dignity of labor, as seen within Wilkinson, Thomas, Pitts, and Bradley. The latter argues on multiple fronts, primarily focusing on productivity.

Some scholars primarily examine the *Georgics* in entirely metaphorical terms. For instance, Frankel, Marincic, Horsfall, and Polleichtner draw parallels to other poets within the Greco-Roman poetic tradition, others, like Dahlmann, Bradley, Griffin, Wimmel, and Miles, to the political climate of the emerging Augustan Rome. Upon examining the Fourth Book of the *Georgics*, however, other aspects of human nature emerge: success, failure, and their relation to obedience. These assessments, though they may tell part of the story, lack an essential contrast between the two when it comes to the question of obedience.

In some ways, Aristaeus and Orpheus appear to be almost as different from one another as possible. The greatest difference between the two, however, lies not specifically in their work ethic, but in whether or not they follow directions effectively. In Book IV of Vergil’s *Georgics*, the toil of Orpheus to retrieve his love, when juxtaposed against both the toil of the bees and Aristaeus’ method of regaining his hive, affirms that hard work, whether excluding or resulting from *amor*, has no bearing on the success of an individual or society as a whole. I will argue that Vergil, through the Fourth *Georgic*, reveals that neither hard work nor talent assures success; instead, it is simply obedience, as Aristaeus demonstrates, that insures it.

Success is an individualized and ever-evolving notion. Generally, it can be defined by achieving a set objective or a series of objectives. Not only does success depend on the goals of the laborer, but its achievement can be evaluated and
interpreted both by the individual as well as outside parties. Themes of success and failure permeate the *Georgics*. In Book IV of the poem, this is particularly evident. Through the stories of the bees, Orpheus, and Aristaeus, readers witness the goals and struggles of each worker, together with results of his work. These ideas of success and failure are, as Thomas notes, “Themes which reflect on a higher and more lyrical level the very essence of the poem.” These concepts of what success means and by what means it is achieved dominate the Fourth Book and, likewise, inform the entirety of this discussion.

This paper, therefore, will address the success or failure of these three subjects and the role of obedience in their success. Beginning with bees, before moving to Orpheus and Aristaeus, I will examine how each is presented within the *Georgics*. I hope to explain how Vergil subtly included an emphasis on obedience within the Orpheus-Aristaeus epyllion and that this emphasis demonstrates Aristaeus’ success due to his obedience and Orpheus’ failure due to his lack of obedience. I will also address figures such as Proteus and Cyrene within my argument. Finally, I will draw parallels between my findings about the characters and episode to Octavian’s emerging Rome.

First, a brief discussion of Orpheus’, Aristaeus’, and the bees’ varying aims, to place the ultimate success or failure in context, is in order. Because the objective for each varies, the scale by with each outcome is measured also varies. For the bees, success depends entirely upon their *labor*. Not only do the bees work tirelessly for the good of the whole community, but they also toil for the survival of their hive and continuation of their species. Orpheus, a poet and widower, works to regain his
sanity, his life, and his love by retrieving his deceased bride, Eurydice, from the underworld. Orpheus’ story, as presented in the *Georgics*, ties the bees, Orpheus, and Aristaeus together. Interestingly, it is believed that this version of Orpheus’ story involving Aristaeus is an invention of Vergil and first introduced within the poem.\(^{15}\) Lastly, Aristaeus attempts to regain his swarm of bees after his actions unknowingly cause their demise.

Though the first three books feature various subjects and deal primarily with agriculture, Vergil shifts his focus from those of the previous books primarily to bees in *Georgics* Book IV. Vergil dedicated a large portion of the poem, approximately 300 lines,\(^{16}\) to bees and beekeeping. Marincic suggests that historically critics have been confused by this decision;\(^{17}\) this confusion initiated speculation about Vergil’s personal life by ancients, but modern scholars tend to focus on the significant role bees play throughout classical literature and in the *Georgics*, which, like Vergil’s other *opera*, is a highly referential work. Here, bees are characterized as both hardworking and as symbols for poetic inspiration. There exists in this dual characterization, therefore, no tension between hard work and poetic inspiration, despite the close association with *amor* of some forms of poetry, such as elegiac, and likewise, its common opposition to *labor*. Before exploring bees’ specific characterization within the book, however, we must examine the literary tradition Vergil followed.

The association of bees within ancient poetry is strong and well-documented. Poetic devices, common symbols, and associations in early Greece inspired the poetry of later Greek and Roman authors. Early on, bees play an important role as symbols
representing both humans and poets in Greek poetry. “It is no surprise,” Horsfall states, that “bees are one of the principal symbols in the self-referential language of ancient poets.” Horsfall enumerates a number of classical literary sources associating bees with poets and poetry, including Homer, Pindar, Callimachus, Horace, and Varro. Pollichtner, too, spells out numerous parallels Vergil draws between himself and the epic tradition of Homer and Apollonius, emulating their styles and poetic choices. Like his many models, Vergil uses bees in the Georgics to represent poetic achievement and bees as a metaphor in what Horsfall refers to as “Roman poetic language.”

Not all scholars agree that Vergil consciously employs this association, however. Griffin argues, “Virgil does not make any such connection, and by choosing to suppress it he makes us realize that the society represented by the bees is one from which the arts are consciously excluded...” This stance, based primarily on the nature of bees, including their lack of amor, seems extremely limited. Their nature, as I shall demonstrate, is complex and varied.

While maintaining their poetic and symbolic significance, Vergil meticulously summarizes the nature of bees, their characteristics, and their inclinations in the Fourth Georgic. For instance, in lines 150-2, Vergil explains the direct relationship between Jupiter and bees:

pro qua mercede canoros
Curetum sonitus crepitantiaque aera secutae
Dictaeo caeli regem pauere sub antro

for which repayment they followed the melodious noise and clattering bronze shields of the Curetes they fed the king of heaven within a cave on Mt. Dicte (Geo. 4.150-152).
While being concealed from Saturn, bees kept Jupiter alive in the Dictean cave on Crete. Bees, as Vergil establishes, are of the age of Jupiter. The *natura* and *mores* of bees, bestowed on them by Jupiter as a reward for their service, is one of *labor.* This characterization contrasts with the animals presented within the previous books of the *Georgics.* As Miles asserts, “The grace and fecundity of carefully disciplined animals [such as bees] are juxtaposed to the violent behavior which animal lust stimulates in them.” Also, there clearly existed a confusion surrounding the reproduction of bees throughout classical antiquity; this lack of understanding allows Vergil to emphasize bees’ true *amor,* as opposed to that of other creatures: *labor.* The bees, he says, possess *tantus amor florum et generando gloriandi gloria mellis* (‘a great love of flowers and glory in creating honey,’ 4.205). This is the primary focus of bees. Citing *omnibus una quies operum, labor omnibus unus* (‘for all, one rest from toil, one labor for all,’ 4.184), McDonald adds, “For bees, there is peace after *labor.*”

Many scholars suggest, like Wilkinson and Dahlmann, that bees are “quite exceptional, not merely for their usefulness… but for their *mores et studia*…Whereas other animals are moved only by *hormai* [impulses] and *pathe* [what has happened], they share with men in the divine *logos.*” Lines 220-221 validate this notion, they read: *esse apibus partem diuinae mentis et haustus/ aetherios dixe* (‘have said that the bees have a share of divine intelligence and drink heavenly ether’). In fact, throughout lines 219-227, Vergil explores the shared divine intelligence of bees and the immortality of their species. These features of bee culture have been suggested
throughout the literary tradition, possibly dating back to Aristotle, as Wilkinson and Thomas note.\textsuperscript{32}

Vergil supplies another reading of this immortality in lines 208-209, \textit{at genus immortale manet, multosque per annos/ stat fortuna domus} (‘the race remains immortal, and through many years the fortune of the house stands,’ 4.208-209). As many classicists have argued, bees exemplify the \textit{genus immortale}, an element of Roman religious thought relating to their own society. Romans believed this immortality was attained through the generations. J. B. Carter states, in Roman society, it was “the family \textit{idea}, so fundamental in the social structure of Roman life, that triumphed over the grave and possessed an immortality which the individual failed to obtain.”\textsuperscript{33} Family life and lineage, therefore, provide Romans themselves with the same possibility of immortality. Griffin agrees, saying, that bees “with their collective virtues and their lack of individuality and art, serve as a counter-part to the old Roman character. Their patriotism and self-denial … are admirable.”\textsuperscript{34} As shall be examined, the \textit{bugonia} contributes yet another element to the discussion of immortality in its revival of Aristaeus’ hive after the bees die as Aristaeus’ punishment for his lustful actions.

In addition to their association with the divine and their immortality as a species, bees are also often understood as a symbol for humanity. Vergil’s \textit{Georgics} demonstrate how closely paralleled bee and human societies are to one another. As previously noted, bees possess a drive to \textit{labor}, but many other parallels exist as well. For instance, as Pitts effectively outlines, Vergil articulates the following characteristics of bees in very human terms:
some ... exert themselves in the fields (agris), while others labor within their homes (domorum) (4.159-160); they live according to laws (4.154) and educate their young (4.162-63); they build towns (oppida, 4.178), fortify trenches (4.179) and fashion daedal architecture (4.179); they are described as little Romans, parvos...Quirites (4.201); and, they demonstrate fيد (fealty) toward their king (rege) (4.212-14), who is the guardian or caretaker (custos) of their works (operum, 4.215), who is admired by all (4.215), and whom all the bees will defend in war by lifting him upon their ‘shoulders,’ shielding him with their bodies, and seeking out a ‘glorious death’ in battle (et saepe attollunt umeris et corpora bello/ obiectant pulchramque petunt per vulnera mortem, 4.217-218).

Wilkinson goes so far as to assert that the lifestyle of bees is “exemplary.” Here, again, a positive assessment of the characteristics central to bee nature. This is, perhaps, is one of Vergil’s aims in comparing the two. Through bees, Vergil allows his audience a glimpse into a human-like, but also more perfect society. Furthermore, Vergil shows that bees and humankind share similar fortunes through his examination of bees’ diseases and their remedies in lines 251-280.

Through the military imagery and diction attributed to bees throughout Book IV, Vergil extends the association between bees and humans and offers a parallel to the military metaphors used in previous books of the Georgics. For example, when conflict arises, of bees Vergil states, ingentis animos angusto in pectore versant (‘mighty spirits seethe in their tiny chests,’ 4.83). This image would likely resonate with Romans, having been through years of war and civil unrest. Furthermore, in regards to the leadership of their kings, Vergil says, non illis quisquam cunctantibus altum/ ire iter aut castris audebit vellere signa (‘if they [the kings] hold back, no one will dare to venture on journeys aloft or snatch up the standards from the camps,’
4.107-108). Their devotion to their leader, in lines 210-218, also evokes this military imagery. The juxtaposition of these images and those of the previous books—warring bees as compared to warring, amor-influenced animals and men—provides an additional parallel between the two. Although bees are characterized as lacking amor, their propensity to behave like the amor-induced creatures of Book Three provides a link between them. The first half of the Fourth Book, therefore, reveals that humans and bees are not so different—both hard-working, civilized, and noble, while, at the same time, remaining at times frail, aggressive, and vulnerable.

Within the first portion of this book, bees represent humankind, but there is a clear shift in the later half. In the second half of Book IV, Segal argues that this is no longer the case, stating “the human narrative, with human values and human suffering, breaks through.” Similarly, Habinek suggests, “The life and times of the bees serve as an extended metaphor in which the similarities between tenor (humanity) and vehicle (bees) are alternately stressed and ignored.” This is evident, as I will explore in the coming pages, through the characters of Orpheus and Aristaeus, their relationship and juxtaposition to bees, as well as to one another.

The sad story of Orpheus, the archetypal singer, within Book IV demonstrates how, as Thomas asserts, “Mythology serves throughout the poem both to embellish and, more importantly, to suggest connections between the immediate world of the farmer and higher levels of meaning.” As will be examined, this retelling of the Orpheus myth brings Orpheus, Aristaeus, and Proteus together in a complex and meaningful way. First, however, we must inspect the specific aspects of Orpheus’ condition and circumstances within the larger narrative.
From Proteus, beginning with line 453, the reader learns that Orpheus has lost his love, Eurydice, as a result of another man’s pursuit of her. Mourning his loss and attempting to console himself on the shore, Orpheus sings continuously. Soon he even enters the underworld to retrieve Eurydice. Lyre in hand, Orpheus dares to approach (adīt 4.469) the gods of Dis. With his music ringing throughout Hades, the entirety of the underworld responds to his song. All deceased shades are cantu commotae (‘stirred by the song’), as recounted in lines 471-480, as are Cerberus, the Furies, the wind, and the halls themselves, in lines 481-484. In line 4.470, Vergil describes the gods of the Underworld, nesciaque humanis precibus mansuescere corda (‘and hearts not knowing how to become gentle at human prayers’). As with the other residents of Hades, Orpheus’ song has the ability to move the hearts of the gods of the Lower World to pity—a daunting and difficult task.

Orpheus’ uncanny ability to stir the hearts of the gods becomes more significant when another Vergilian passage is considered. Because of Vergil’s practice of self-reference, scholars often use the Aeneid to inform their readings of the Georgics. One such reference is in Aeneid, Book Six; as Horsfall observes, “We find Orpheus himself, we find pii uates who utters things worthy of Phoebus himself.” This is particularly notable considering the following three points: (1.) Vergil’s description of Orpheus, though in a later work, informs the juxtaposition, to be discussed in the following pages, between Orpheus, the greatest human poet, and Aristaeus, the farmer, symbolic statesman, and son of Apollo; (2.) the specific comparison of Orpheus to Apollo underscores the importance of the cult of Apollo among musicians and poets; and (3.) this comparison gains further meaning when
considering that the cult of Apollo was “held in much honor by the Emperor Augustus.” These matters will be discussed as they become relevant, but the significance should be stated at this time.

The gods’ new experience, namely feeling pity, does not, however, ensure Orpheus’ successful execution of his plan. As mentioned, the actions and challenges of Orpheus to regain Eurydice come to us through the narrative of Proteus. He tells Aristaeus, as well as all subsequent audiences, that after Orpheus persuades Proserpina to allow Eurydice to leave the underworld with Orpheus, she commands that Orpheus may not look back at his bride until they both return to the earth. Though she is a goddess and need not provide justification for her commands, the question remains: What is Proserpina’s purpose in commanding Orpheus in such a way? Does she have any reasoning for this commandment? It is almost as if, though temporarily softened by Orpheus’ song, the goddess does not want to see the laws of death unbroken. Unfortunately, and almost more quickly than he achieves his success, Orpheus’ downfall occurs as he returns home with Eurydice. Proteus reveals how it transpires:

cum subita incautum dementia cepit amentem, ignoscenda quidem, scirent si ignoscere Manes: resttitit, Eurydicensque suam iam luce sub ipsa immemor heu! victusque animi respexit. **ibi omnis effusus labor atque immitis rupta tyranni foedera.**

when suddenly, a madness seized the incautious lover, a pardonable madness, indeed, if the gods of the Lower World knew how to pardon, he stopped, and already under the light—alas! forgetful and conquered in his mind, he looked back at his own Eurydice. and **there all of his labor**
drained away and the treaty of the cruel tyrant was broken  
(Geo. 4.488-493).

Instead of the traditional interpretation of *amor* overwhelming Orpheus, the 
emphasis need not be on *amentem* (4.488), but rather *subita incautum dementia* 
(4.488). Vergil’s use of *subita, incautum*, and *dementia* (4.488), as well as 
*immemor* (4.491) suggest that perhaps, as Miles asserts, “It is too much to expect of 
Orpheus, inasmuch as he is human, to have been more alert and self-possessed than 
he was.” Also, *ignoscenda* (4.489) reveals that under different circumstances, his 
mistake may not have lost him everything. The most significant words in this 
passage, I argue, are *immemor* and *victus animi* (4.491). *Immenor*, ‘forgetful’ 
and *victus animi*, ‘conquered of mind’ indicate that the glance occurred as a split-
second decision. Perhaps believing, as Proteus later states, that the error could be 
overlooked, Orpheus, almost successfully home with his love, decides to break the only commandment of Proserpina. Of this line and the next, Thomas says that these 
words are essential, “indicating one of the main connections between Orpheus and the 
participants of the agricultural *Georgics.*” Here, Orpheus’ ‘forgetful and conquered 
mind’ and the decision to look back, result in the loss of his *labor*, the second loss of 
Eurydice.

Classical scholars have argued, almost universally, that Orpheus’ loss of 
Eurydice results from his *demens*, resulting from *amor*, but I argue it was his *amor* 
that gave him the courage and ability to enter Hades to negotiate her return. 
Likewise, his *amor* inspired the creation of the music that persuaded the gods to 
release Eurydice. It was his *amor* that drove him to *labor*. Orpheus toiled to control 
the natural world though his poetry and music; he worked hard to bring his bride
home, and almost did so successfully. Proteus’ narrative pinpoints the moment of Orpheus’ failure, the loss of all of his efforts: *ibi onmis/ effusus labor* (‘there, all of his labor drained away,’ 4.491-2). Thomas refers to this as an “emotional lapse,” one “which results in the extinction of his labor.”

Classicists examining the conflict between *labor* and *amor* in the *Georgics* have suggested that *labor*, in essence, is completed for the good of society, not simply for one’s own interest. For instance, Bradley asserts that work “is a serious activity that results from practical necessity and issues in profit of some kind when it is successful … It clearly is not an activity that is self-fulfilling. It is on the contrary a means to an end.” Referring to examples earlier in the *Georgics*, Pitts provides an important connection between *amor* and *labor*, claiming that “*furor* under the influence of *amor* can ruin all the accomplishments produced by man’s *labor*.“ With this reading of line 3.244, *in furias ignemque runt: amor omnibus idem* (‘into madness and flame they hurl themselves: love is same thing for all’), we see the unfortunate danger, which happens to be Orpheus’ even more unfortunate reality: *furor* has instantaneously and without warning undone his *labor*. Miles, however, makes a key distinction regarding the *amor* in Book III, asserting:

> When Virgil introduces his condemnation of animal lust, he refers, significantly, to ‘blind love,’ *amor caecus* (3.210). For it is not so much *amor* itself which leads to destruction as the blindness induced by it. Even that blindness may serve a useful end, but only when subject to some higher order of control.

This separation of *amor* and *amor caecus* helps to inform the discussion and fuel further discussion.
Though Orpheus’ act has been considered selfish, or at least amor-driven, Eliade argues, “Orpheus’ katabasis is not undergone, like so many other mythic heroes, for his own ‘spiritual perfection’ (i.e., the conquest of immortality), but ‘for the salvation of others.’” His labor to retrieve his bride, is neither planned and executed simply for his own ends, like Aristaeus’ rescue of the bees, nor on the basis of some sexual impulse, but as an act for himself, for Eurydice, and for their love. It is this point, therefore, that demonstrates that Orpheus’ failure to retrieve Eurydice does not come, solely, as Thomas argues, “from amor,” but instead from a simple—and sudden—inability to follow directions. As seen through Orpheus’ story, amor and labor are not fundamentally opposed forces. Though poets and musicians are often dismissed as inspired by the gods, they, too, can and do work hard to achieve their goals, as Orpheus does. Unfortunately, Orpheus’ hard work is ultimately done in vain.

Eurydice, largely absent from commentary surrounding Book IV, responds immediately and directly to Orpheus’ mistake. In lines 4.494–498, she desperately cries to Orpheus,

illa ‘quis et me’ inquit ‘miseram et te perdidit, Orpheu, quis tantus furor? en iterum crudelia retro fata uocant, conditque natantia lumina somnus. iamque uale: feror ingenti circumdata nocte inualidasque tibi tendens, heu non tua, palmas’

‘Who has destroyed both miserable me and you, Orpheus’ she said, ‘What madness so great? Behold, the cruel Fates summon me back a second time and sleep restores my floating eyes. And now goodbye; I am carried off, enveloped by a vast night and extending my weak hands to you, alas, not yours’ (Geo. 4.494–498).
As Eurydice identifies, Orpheus’ furor (4.495) certainly plays a role, but it is ultimately the impetuous decision to look back (immemor...victusque animi respetit, 4.491), which thereby breaks Proserpina’s command (namque hanc dederat Proserpina legem, 4.487); this disobedient act unravels his plans of being with Eurydice again.

The backward glance, and Orpheus’ resulting failure, has been discussed by many scholars. Gale discusses the glance and possible alternate interpretations at length. She suggests that backward glances result from dwelling on the past. She asserts that poets often use their lives and experiences to fuel their creative endeavors, therefore constantly reflecting and dwelling on their pasts, while statesmen tend to look to the future in anticipation of progress. Instead of looking forward like Aristeaus (or Augustus), both Orpheus (and Vergil) “face backward.” This metaphorical perspective causes the literal backward glance, resulting in his second and final loss of Eurydice. Gale attributes Orpheus’ glance occurs due to two factors: (1.) love and (2.) inspiration. To examine the first point, as outlined, Orpheus is desperately in love with Eurydice, so much so that he went down to Hades to retrieve her. Secondly, like all poets, Orpheus draws inspiration from his own personal experiences, hence the propensity to look into the past. In this instance, Eurydice had been both an inspiring memory and also physically walking behind him. In the end, although Orpheus falls victim to furor and decides to glance backwards, he is, Gale argues, “able to transcend, through the emotive power of poetry, the finality of death.”
The *amor* of the bees compared to that of Orpheus is strikingly different. Orpheus is desperately and unfortunately longing for his love, willing even to enter Hades to negotiate her return, while the bees are lustless by nature, primarily concerned with productivity and *labor*.\(^\text{85}\) Considering the widely held notion that bees in Vergil’s *Georgics* represent human beings, the juxtaposition of Orpheus’ toil to retrieve Eurydice and that of the bees within the context of the age of Jupiter raises the question of whether hard work does in fact result in the realization of one’s goal. As seen through their failures, neither love (or lack thereof) nor toil guarantees success. The *labor* of the bees as compared to the toil of Orpheus seem to reaffirm that hard work, whether excluding or resulting from *amor*, has no bearing on the success of an individual or society as a whole. The bees die despite their dedication and hard work, as a result of something beyond their control; their dedication does not save them. Orpheus fails, despite his *labor*, due to his impulsive decision to disobey Proserpina’s command. Orpheus and his work embody *amor*, artistic expression, nearly the exact opposite of what the bees *labor* for, but in the end, despite their loveless and sacrificial mindset, hard work does not exempt them from destruction or failure.\(^\text{86}\)

Though hard work is often revered and praised within our own society as well as in Vergil’s time, Vergil demonstrates throughout the Fourth *Georgic* that it does not always end in success nor is it necessary to gain what one wants from life. Aristaeus, as we will examine, attains the knowledge to achieve his ends and ultimately regains his bees, as Pitts notes, “a little too easily” and without hard work on his part.\(^\text{87}\) Via Aristaeus, we find *labor* almost unnecessary, particularly when one
is astute in following directions. Hard work, rather than an admirable and essential component of success, seems even at times to be a force holding Orpheus and the bees back.

Before we learn of Orpheus from Proteus, Vergil recounts the loss of Aristaeus’ bees and his subsequent decision to approach his mother concerning the situation. As punishment by the gods for his dira cupido (‘violent lust,’ 1.37) and pursuit of Eurydice, which resulted in her early death and Orpheus’ sorrow, Aristaeus loses his bee hive. Instead of working hard to formulate a plan, Aristaeus approaches his divine mother to fix the situation.

In the first portion of his lament to his mother, si modo, quem perhibes, pater est Thymbraeus Apollo (‘if indeed, as you say, Thymbrean Apollo is my father’ 4.323), Vergil reveals that Aristaeus was the son of Apollo and Cyrene.88 As briefly aforementioned, Aristaeus’ foil, Orpheus, is characterized as pii uates (‘a pius poet’) and, as Horsfall realls from the Aeneid, Orpheus’ songs are Phoebus digna locuti, 6.662] “worthy of Phoebus himself.”89 This association links the two figures in an interesting way; though Apollo is primarily associated with creative practices, he is, as Brown puts it, the “god of sublimation…the god of form—of plastic form in art, of rational form in thought, of civilized form in life.”90 Here Brown distinguishes the meaning of these alternate epithets by explaining that “the Apollonian form is form as the negation of instinct… says the Delphic wisdom: ‘Observe the limit, fear authority, bow before the divine.’”91 While Aristaeus lacks the artistic and creative associations with the god, the same ones that Orpheus exemplifies, he shares not only Apollo’s lineage, but also the associations noted by Brown, namely his adherence to practical
thought, his respect for authority, and his reverence for the wisdom of the gods.
Likewise, another parallel between Aristaeus and Augustus emerges when
considering Augustus’ interest and careful association of himself with the cult of
Apollo. This extended simile, stretching through multiple Vergilian works, helps to
better distinguish these opposing figures and their values. In doing such, it also sheds
light on the major issue of Book IV: the important role of obedience in bringing about
success.

After feeling (sensit, 4.334) Aristaeus’ cry, Cyrene calls for her son, suggests
offering a libation to Ocean (Oceano libemus 4.381), she gives Aristaeus clear
directions in order to resolve his troubles,92 and formulates a plan. These include
capturing and chaining (uinclis capiendus, 4.396) the prophet Proteus,93 before
questioning him on the loss of Aristaeus’ bees. Vergil tells us, also, that Cyrene is
present throughout (ipsa procul nebuls obscura resistit, 4.424). Obedient Aristaeus
follows her directions and completes them exactly as instructed.94

Some scholars have interpreted Aristaeus’ obedience as an act combining
pietas and labor. For example, McDonald, in a comparison between the Georgics
and the Aeneid, states, “Aristaeus keeps bees and recovers them through labor when
they are lost. Aeneas, like Aristaeus, follows his mother’s dictates and shows pietas
by devotion to labor.”95 This interpretation of pietas, however, does not distinguish
the purposes and motives of the act. Aristaeus, unlike Aeneas, does not devote
himself to anything greater than himself. He does not labor to build a city,96 provide
for his family, sacrifice his own amor; instead, he obediently executes his divine
mother’s orders in order to achieve a personal goal. No noble or collective aim is
present. As will be discussed, he sacrifices and performs *bugonia* simply because he is following directions and he wants to regain his bees.

Much like the way in which Cyrene instructs Aristaeus to capture and chain Proteus⁹⁷ to submit to his will, Aristaeus’ pursuit of Eurydice is an attempt to dominate her. Both of these attitudes align with a sentiment shared in Book II. Here, for example, Vergil shares how man must use force to achieve control over nature:

```
inde ubi iam validis amplexae stirpibus ulmos
exierint, tum stringe comas, tum brachia toned
(ante reformidant ferrum), tum denique dura
exerce imperia et ramos copesce fluentis
```

But when they’ve shot up and are holding the elms in strong embrace,
Dock the leaves, lop the branches:
Till now they could not bear the steel; now you must show them Greater severity, curbing their frisky wanton growth

*(Geo. 2.367-70)*.⁹⁸

Of this and analogous passages, Bradley says, “Order and productivity themselves are to be achieved only through a process that is analogous to warfare, that is, in fact, a sublimation of it. Nature is portrayed as the reluctant object of man’s control and domination.”⁹⁹ This passage, in addition to Bradley’s explanation, relates to Aristaeus in two important ways: (1.) It provides another connection between Aristaeus and Augustus, juxtaposing Aristaeus’ attempted domination of Eurydice and eventual defeat of *natura* through *bugonia* to Augustus’ pacifying of Asia in Book IV.¹⁰⁰ (2.) It parallels the punishment inflicted on Aristaeus by the gods after the wanton act of chasing Eurydice, illustrating that the gods control man with their severity in the same way man attempts to control nature. Similarly, the passage mirrors Aristaeus’ decision to asking for seek guidance and assistance from more
knowledgeable instructors, namely Cyrene and Proteus, further proving that man requires the gods’ insight and guidance in order to be successful.

Once Aristaeus understands how to appease the gods through sacrifice, he follows it exactly, thereby allowing them to control him after his lustful behavior. He does not take matters into his own hands or invest in labor to solve his problem. He relies entirely on the instruction of his mother and Proteus. Despite having been punished, Aristaeus’ road to retrieval and revival appears fairly easy, especially when compared to Orpheus’ difficulties.

Aristaeus states his objective as lassis quaestum oraculare rebus (‘to seek oracular solutions for our weary fortunes,’ 4. 449). Instead of provide specific solutions for Aristaeus, as Cyrene suggests that he will, Proteus concentrates his efforts on recounting Orpheus’ troubles and ultimate failure in his response. Proteus reveals that it was Aristaeus’ lustful pursuit of Eurydice that initiated the destruction of his hive. Stating illa quidem… dum te fugeret (‘if only she [Eurydice] might escape you’ 4.457). Through lines 454-6 and 532-534, Proteus explains that this action roused the anger of both Orpheus and the nymphs and must be appeased. It also ultimately resulted in the loss of Aristaeus’ hive. Although here he reveals the causa morbi of Aristaeus’ bees, as Thomas observes, Proteus does not, in fact, supply a solution to Aristaeus’ issue. It is, therefore, Orpheus’ attempt and ultimate loss of Eurydice, instead of solutions regarding Aristaeus’ lost bees, on which Proteus primarily focuses throughout. If any remedy exists for Aristaeus in Book IV, it is bugonia used, in the end, to recover his bees. Overall, Proteus’ song exhibits a number of “distinctive stylistic features, chiefly those designed to create emotional
effect,” according to Thomas. Considering this assessment, as well as the content of his account, it is no wonder that a reader of Book IV would be sympathetic to Orpheus’ plight.\footnote{110}

In addition to the beauty and poetic quality of Proteus’ words,\footnote{111} the physical description of Proteus’ song includes images in lines 4.450-52:

\begin{verbatim}
ad haec uates vi denique multa
ardentis oculos intorsit lumine glauco,
et grauiter frendens\footnote{112} sic fatis ora resoluit.
finally under the compulsion of great force
twisted blazing eyes with sparkling light,
and gnashing [teeth], thus opened his mouth with a prediction.
\end{verbatim}

These “rolling eyes” and “gnashing” teeth are characteristic of the “state of ecstasy,” according to Gale.\footnote{113} This implies a few points concerning the relationship between poetry and order. Not only is contacting, or more specifically capturing, the poetic and prophetic figure Proteus essential for Aristaeus to regain his hive, but this spectacle of Proteus’ \textit{furor} plays an integral part in the recovery as well. Pushing this image even further, the reader can see a connection between the order-seeking farmer/ statesman and the service of poetry.\footnote{114} Gale asserts, “Virgil is deeply concerned throughout the poem with the conflict between, on the one hand, order and control, and on the other, the unruly forces of passion, unreason, and uncultivated nature.”\footnote{115} All at once, we see that within the Fourth Book of the \textit{Georgics} both that passion contributes to order and also that obedience is essential to success.

Though Orpheus was unsuccessful in his attempt to retrieve his bride, Aristaeus’ success relies not only on his decision to follow directions, but actually his dependence on Proteus and his words. As Cyrene reveals, Proteus’ words are
essential to her ability to provide the necessary directions for Aristaeus’ mission.

Following Proteus’ song, Cyrene outlines what Aristaeus will do in order to regain his hive. She tells him:

nate, licet tristis animo deponere curas.
haec omnis morbi causa, hinc miserabile Nymphae,
cum quibus illa choros lucis agitabat in altis,
exitium misere apibus. tu munera supplex
tende petens pacem, et facilis uenereare Napaeas;
amque dabunt ueniam uotis, irasque remittent.

Son, it is permitted that you set aside the sad cares from your mind. this is the cause of the whole death, hence the Nymphs, with whom that girl danced in the tall woods, miserably sent destruction on your bees. You as suppliant, present gifts asking for peace, and easily you will appease the Nymphs of the vales and they will remit their anger (Geo. 4.531-536).

As he did earlier, Aristaeus obeys the orders of his mother (matris praecepta facessit 4.548) to sacrifice to the nymphs and Orpheus. Cyrene instructs Aristaeus to inferias Orphei... papauera mittes (‘send poppies of Lethe as funeral offerings to Orpheus,’ 4.545-6); this reveals that the purpose of Aristaeus’ sacrifices are not to make amends for the harm he has caused miserable Orpheus, let alone Eurydice, but rather simply to prompt the singer to forget his anger.¹¹⁶

The sacrifice he performs has aroused debate among scholars. Some, like Habinek,¹¹⁷ believe it helps reconcile Aristaeus to Orpheus, restores balance, and absolves Aristaeus of his misdeeds, while others, like Thomas, believe, “There is absolutely nothing in the poem to suggest that Aristaeus is in any way affected by the story of Orpheus.”¹¹⁸ Likewise, of Aristaeus’ reasons for completing the sacrifice, Otis states, “We cannot quite take his atonement seriously; the sacrifice to the nymphs seems hardly sufficient and there is no real evidence of contrition in
Aristaeus himself.\textsuperscript{119} From these, Aristaeus’ obedience is clear. He follows orders not because he feels responsible or guilty, wants to make peace with Orpheus or the nymphs, but because he wants to get his bees back, but he follows orders nonetheless.\textsuperscript{120}

In addition to the sacrifice he must perform, Aristaeus uses \textit{bugonia} (‘spontaneous regeneration’) to regain his bees. Vergil attributes the discovery of this process to Aristaeus; before providing a description of the process\textsuperscript{121} and true origin he says:\textsuperscript{122}

\begin{center}
\textit{tempus et Arcadii memoranda inuenta magistri}
\textit{pandere, quoque modo caesis iam saepe iuuencis}
\textit{insincerus apes tulerit cruor}
\end{center}

It is the time to spread out the needing to be recounted invention of the Arcadian teacher and the manner by which now often the corrupt blood of young bulls has produced bees (\textit{Geo.} 4.283-285).

With Aristaeus revealed as the inventor of the practice, we learn how he discovered \textit{bugonia} and used it to regain his lost bees.\textsuperscript{123} Notable, also, is Vergil’s inclusion of the word \textit{memoranda} (‘needing to be recounted’) in this passage, particularly because it is an antonym of \textit{immemor} (‘forgetful’) the cause for Orpheus’ disobedience and loss of Eurydice.

Soon after, like so many poets before him, Vergil poses the following question to the Muses:\textsuperscript{124} \textit{Quis deus hanc, Musae, quis nobis extudit artem?} (‘What god, Muses, produced this art for us?’ 4.315).\textsuperscript{125} This not only implies Aristaeus’ loftiness, but also elevates the poem and reinforces the connection of the \textit{Georgics} within the Greco-Roman poetic tradition. Again, in contrasting Aristaeus to Orpheus,
it is noteworthy that Vergil decides to address the Muses here and does not do so for Orpheus’ *katabasis*. Perhaps this ties back to the emphasis on Aristaeus’ obedience, while deemphasizing the rouge action of Orpheus.

The language of Orpheus’s account provides a noteworthy contrast to the *bugonia* of lines 528-558. As Griffin perfectly states,

A dry and matter-of-fact tone succeeds to the languorous beauty of Orpheus and Eurydice, emphasized by the exact repetition of lines (538, 540, 544, with 550-62, as if to say: This is what he was told to do, and this is what he did). The bees are reborn.¹²⁶

Vergil’s accounts of how to create a swarm of bees from decaying oxen, according to Habinek, “frame the story of Aristaeus’ transgression against Eurydice, Orpheus’ hopeless attempt to rescue her from the Underworld, and Aristaeus’ search for the proper means of appeasing the powers he has offended.”¹²⁷

In several ways, like Orpheus, Aristaeus also transcends the finality of death. Each of these figures does so by making the arduous journey of *katabasis* in some way, though with varying degrees of success. Aristaeus’ *katabasis* is in the replacement of his bees through the invention of *bugonia*. As suggested by Johnston and repeated by Marincic, the “*bugonia aition*, is largely patterned on the story of Kore/Persephone.” He argues, “As Proserpia must ‘die’ every year for grain to be renewed and for agriculture to be ‘rediscovered,’ Eurydice’s death leads to instruction in the art of acquiring a new hive of bees.”¹²⁸ This discovery allows Aristaeus to be successful in a way that his bees and Orpheus are not.¹²⁹ Although Orpheus’ *labor* is ultimately unsuccessful in achieving his end, Aristaeus is successful only as a result of the reliance on and execution of the directions of others. In the end, Aristaeus, as
Pitts eloquently states, “the guilty party whose prolonged, rampaging furor in his lust for Eurydice initiated the chain of events that culminated in Orpheus’ split-moment of ‘almost pardonable’ furor in his attempt to bring her back to life,” regains his bees almost effortlessly. Instead of success resulting from merit, intellect, amor, or labor, Aristaeus’ successful reinstatement of his swarm seems to come simply from being excellent at taking orders and following through with them.

As we have discussed, Orpheus and Aristaeus contrast one another in numerous ways. Orpheus and Aristaeus doubtless each represent competing ideologies. For this reason, Habinek contends, “Orpheus is the perfect foil to the ‘civilized’ world of Aristaeus and his bees.” Though, in some respects this is true, overall the more accurate juxtaposition, I argue, is as follows: Orpheus and Aristaeus most importantly represent the conflict between working to achieve your goals, on your own terms, and blind obedience to a higher authority. Extending the comparison to include Orpheus and the bees as compared to Aristaeus can contribute to the conversation even further. The simple fact that Aristaeus’ main goal involves them, meaning that he owns, inadvertently kills by his misdeeds, and finally regains the bees, does not necessarily demand that the bees retain association with him. They resemble more closely, in their own helplessness and ultimate failure to survive and continue their lineage despite their own labor, Orpheus and his plight instead of their master’s.

Proteus brings together these two divergent characters, as we have seen, into one song. According to Segal, the destinies of Aristaeus and Orpheus are both opposed and linked in Georgics IV. Vergil’s decision to conflate several myths to
join them together lends some to read the epyllion a key to the whole poem, and in
many ways it is. Bradley notes that it,

implies this kind of causality—it is Aristaeus, after all, who
sets in motion the whole tragic sequence of events leading to
Orpheus’ death. And we are made to feel that the latter’s
sufferings and death come about because he neglects totally
the imperatives of the culture Aristaeus represents: [for example,]
he doesn’t acknowledge law (the injunction not to look back). ¹³⁴
This distinction between obedience and negligence is essential to the Fourth Book of
the poem. ¹³⁵

Marincic asserts that the inclusion of the myth is “enigmatic,” but also “seems
to offer a simple alternative between two antagonists, the farmer and the lover, the
statesman and the poet, the winner and the victim.” ¹³⁶ Aristaeus’ success clearly
comes at the expense of Eurydice, Orpheus, and his own bees. Aristaeus is not just a
beekeeper—he is successful in multiple agricultural avenues. ¹³⁷ Thus, the question
raised in the end of the Georgics: is this what obedience earns you, personal success
at the expense of others?

McDonald reminds us, “The Homeric hero acts for himself, whereas the
Augustan leader acts on behalf of society.” ¹³⁸ This assessment complicates the
matter in that it implies that Aristaeus’ goal to retrieve his swarm of bees is for the
good of humanity, rather than a selfish act achieved through his obedience. It does,
however, demonstrate that if interpreted as a benefit to society, Aristaeus is again
aligned with Augustan values, and by extension, the importance of obedience.

“It is not the restoration of the bees in and of itself that constitutes the end of
the Georgics,” Habinek claims, “but the victory of Aristaeus as against the failure of
And, though Habinek seemed to celebrate this fact, it may, indeed, be the most heartbreaking aspect of the poem. Aristaeus does actually win. Not only does he not labor to achieve his goal—getting his mother to lay out a plan to execute and Proteus to articulate his misdeeds—but he regains his swarm of bees! He has even been hailed the inventor of bugonia. Meanwhile, Orpheus, the greatest poet of his time, loses tragically. He initially loses his bride to the lusty Aristaeus and to death, he then loses his self-control during his assent due to his momentary lapse in judgement, and thereby loses Eurydice a second time, despite his hard work. His lack of obedience, particularly concerning an arbitrary commandment, utterly destroys him.

Similarly, Segal reminds us that within the juxtaposition of these two, Aristaeus “does almost nothing unaided;” Aristaeus even must be told how significant his crimes have been (magna Iuis commissa, 4.454). Orpheus, on the other hand, “takes on himself, alone, both action and atonement,” proving that he is “distinctly and nakedly human.” Gale agrees, stating that Vergil emphasizes “Aristaeus’ beneficent role as ‘first inventor,’ and his success in ‘resurrecting’ his swarm of bees is evidently to be contrasted with Orpheus’ failure to disobey divine commands and consequently bring Eurydice back.” In all of these comparisons, the central issue is Aristaeus’ obedience versus Orpheus’ disobedience and self-reliance.

As previously stated, both amor and furor factor into the characterization of Orpheus and his symbolism in the text; this is, however, contrasted with the regulation and obedience of Aristaeus. Gale states, “The poet is overwhelmed by the
furor of inspiration, whereas the farmer, like the statesman in the sphragis, attempts to impose order and control on his ‘subject.’”¹⁴⁵ In the same way, scholars, such as Bradley, see Vergil’s underlying commentary regarding Orpheus and Aristaeus, and by extension poets and Augustus. First, even Orpheus’ actions (both his amor and labor), can be seen as a threat to order, to peace, and to how the world operates. Therefore, his unsuccessful attempt to disrupt the natural order, by attempting to retrieve Eurydice from the Underworld, as well as his pathetic and horrible death, further demonstrates the notion that Augustan values are central to the interpretation of the poem.¹⁴⁶ Meanwhile, much like Augustus subduing nature and pacifying Asia and easily “reviving the Roman Republic,” Aristaeus carefully follows his instructions thereby conquering not only his punishment, but nature and death themselves, by easily regaining his bees through bugonia.

Even after all of this, the following questions, throughout my research, plagued me still: If Vergil subtly argues that hard work is not essential, but following orders is, how exactly does that contribute to Augustan Rome? Could someone who worked tirelessly on his own opus believe this to be true or might it be a commentary on the progression of freedom and expression within Rome during the ascent of Octavian Augustus? Although I have not yet found definite answers to these questions, I wanted to touch on some of what I have learned briefly now and would like to explore further in the future.

Among the more practical advice, particularly regarding farming, distributed throughout the Georgics, Vergil includes some suggestions that point to a secondary
understanding. It is indeed true that scholars have argued that the advice within the
*Georgics*, meaning the agricultural instruction, has political implications.\(^{147}\) One example, *tu regibus alas/ eripe* (‘snatch away the wings from the king [bee],’ 4.106-107) is advice Vergil presents to his farmer [audience] regarding how to maintain
dominance over the worker bees and control their movement. This, if read as
symbolic of human society, is an avenue of control for a leader [the farmer/
statesman]. All he must do is *eripe* ‘snatch away’ the influence of a powerful
community leader, like a poet or another statesman, to gain control. Bradley claims
that like the instructions to take the bees’ wings, man’s activities are “directed to
organizing nature and society and forever must contend with the disruptive forces that
menace what those activities strive for, that is order and productivity.”\(^{148}\) This can be
seen as aligning entirely with Octavian’s aims for order, control, and peace, which
itself follows the avenue to power paved by his predecessor Julius Caesar.

Similarly, Miles argues that the *Georgics* demonstrate that control and order
are essential.\(^{149}\) Returning to Vergil’s distinction in the *Georgics* between *amor*
(‘love’) and *amor caecus* (‘blind love’), present also is a significant distinction
between control and lack thereof. Miles states, “It is not warfare itself, but blind,
uncontrolled warfare which is criticized.”\(^{150}\) By examining *amor caecus* and
comparing it to Vergil’s commentary on warfare, specifically the civil wars of his
time, a parallel to Vergil’s own lifetime emerges. Though Octavian is a controlling
figure in much of the poem, particularly through his association with the farmer,
statesman, and Aristaeus, even his uncontrolled actions and aspiration, here, are
called into question.
As we have seen throughout much of the *Georgics*, Octavian and his authority have been directly addressed or implied through various figures. Even Orpheus’ initially successful, though short-lived, attempt at softening the hearts of the gods of the Underworld (*nesciaque humanis precibus mansuescere corda*, 4.470) can be interpreted, as Pitts suggests, as directly associated with Vergil’s attempt to placate Octavian “whom Vergil asks at the beginning of the poem to be moved by prayers and approve his new poem” by saying: *ingredere et uotis iam nunc adsuesce uocari* (‘undertake our pledges, even before your deification grows accustomed to be called upon successfully,’ 1.42).

Mixing metaphors somewhat, and returning to Vergil’s brief characterization of Orpheus in *Aeneid*, Book VI, *pii uates Phoebi digna locuti* (*Aen*. 6.662), we see other meanings for and explanations of this comparison. In the reference to Orpheus as another Apollo, the poet defies the law of the gods and risks everything for his love. This characterization emphasizes Apollo’s opposing characteristics and illuminates the high regard that Augustus felt for Apollo’s cult. To Vergil, is Apollo the patron of poets or is he, as Brown suggests, and as Octavian may have particularly appreciated, an authority to be feared, a divinity, much like Augustus, to which all humans must bow? The answer, maybe, is both. Just as he included the bees to represent both poetry and order, by including this association of Orpheus to Apollo and all he represents, Vergil offers a possible link between Augustus and Apollo. By extension, perhaps the association could emphasize Octavian’s growing expectation that his authority elicit the same attitudes: obedience and worship. Book I of the *Georgics*, in particular, suggests that humans, as Gale asserts, “are
unruly and subject to violent passions; they need to be governed with a firm hand in order to prevent these destructive passions from wreaking havoc.”

This reading suggests that obedience to authority and power underlies all interactions within the text and the increasing importance of it overshadows all other, previously valued traits.

Or maybe Vergil warns Augustus here that he should respect the *ars*, as well as specific artists, thereby implying that freedom concerning material and content be up to the creator. Agreeing with this sentiment, Griffin states, “The bees… with their collective virtues and their lack of individuality and art, serve as a counter-part to the old Roman character. Their patriotism and self-denial… are admirable.” This old Roman culture is the one to which Octavian wishes to return.

In the same way, Vergil juxtaposes the poet and *princeps* in the final lines of Book IV, demonstrating an interdependence between the two; one the one hand, as Gale notes, “the poet’s *otium* depends on the peace imposed by Octavian, just as Octavian’s ‘divinity’ depends on his immortalization in Virgil’s verse,” but at the same time an antagonistic relationship is revealed in that there is a contrast also present between the budding emperor’s imposed “peace” and the poet’s true peace. Here we can see Vergil speaking on behalf of himself, but also voicing a judgement between the relation of any poet, perhaps Gallus, and the statesmen in power.

Yet another possibility is that the success Aristaeus enjoys comes as a result of the good farmer, statesman, son of Apollo, demonstrating his obedience, as Apollo demands, and adherence to traditional values, such as sacrifice; Orpheus,
meanwhile, though talented and revered in the arts, someone who tries to circumvent death itself, definitively does not. Scholars such as Polleichtner admit that the Aristaeus epyllion can be viewed as “an attempt to parallel the Augustan renewal of the Roman people after the long period of civil wars.”¹⁶² Vergil, as so many other times within the Georgics, leaves his audience contemplating and questioning.

As we discussed on pages 11-12, Pitts enumerates the similarities between human and bee societies mentioned within Book IV. Similarly, and extending the comparison even further, McDonald notes, again citing the Aeneid, “These ideals seem Augustan and seem to relate to the precepts given Aeneas by Anchises in Aeneid 6.8.”¹⁶³ Like other unarticulated parallels, the masterful and multifaceted connections and contradictory associations Vergil weaves together between the bees, Orpheus, Aristaeus, as well as all they each represent is stunning. Not only do they, at times, represent each other in one-to-one comparisons, but they contain deeper, more complex, often tenuous¹⁶⁴ connections.

As I have labored to illustrate, in the Fourth Georgic, the poet implies that when it comes to success, obedience surpasses both hard work, talent, and even love. Through the stories of the bees, Orpheus, and Aristaeus, Vergil demonstrates that labor does not necessarily achieve goals in the way that obeying directions does. No other aspect of human nature surpasses obedience in importance within Book IV. By this, perhaps Vergil meant to question the rising power and control he saw Octavian exercise. Especially considering Gallus’ unfortunate fall from grace, Vergil may have worked to subtly inspire contemplation in the emperor and contemporary
Roman society, while allowing him to remain a leading power of the blossoming Empire and beyond. Vergil’s Orpheus, Eurydice, as well as Aristaeus and his bees have shaped the Western literary tradition and our understanding of success, failure, and the importance of obedience.
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creatures” [Note 23: RR 3.16.7] (42); Horace “compares himself to the bee” [Note 24: C.4.2.27] (42); Homer aissousin [Note 39: Od.10.495].

20 Monica Gale, “Poetry and the Backward Glance in Virgil’s Georgics and Aeneid,” Transactions of the American Philological Association 133 (2003): 329: Gale also mentions the “common image” of the “poet as a bee.”


22 Horsfall, “Bees in Elysium,” 42: “uoito uiuo ’ per ora uirum uolitare per ora ‘to fly victorious through the mouths of men’” [G.3.9] (42); “nec morti esse locum/ sed uiuu ulolare sideris in numerum ‘there is no place for death, but all flies up to join the number of the stars’” [G.4.226f].

23 J. Griffin, “The Fourth Georgic. Virgil and Rome,” G&R 26 (1979): 64. He continues this quote as such: “Virgil did not want to connect his bees, inspired though they are, with poetry or song. They exhibit many great virtues, but they are not poetical, and they are free from the bitter-sweet pains and pleasures of love (Buc. 3.110; G. 4.198 ff.). In both they contrast clearly with Orpheus, the fabulous singer who dies for love.”

24 In their commentaries, both Wilkinson, Georgics, 104 and Thomas, Vol. 2, 175-176 draw a parallel in these lines to Callim. Hymn I. 45-53.

25 Vergil, Georgics, 4.149-50, 154, 177, 178-9, 193.

26 Wilkinson, Georgics, 104: he calls this an “aition for the special favor.”

27 Vergil, Georgics, 4.149-57, 184.


32 Thomas, Vol. 2, 186-187; Wilkinson, Georgics, 105: “This section culminates in a philosophic deduction of a Platonic-Stoic nature…”


34 Griffin, “The Fourth Georgic, Virgil and Rome,” 69; also, here, in parenthesis, Griffin adds, “and devotion to their ‘king’ is only devotion to the state and to authority, not an encouragement to emperor-worship,” 69.

35 This “division of labor” is also emphasized in F.X. Quinn, “Vergil and Today’s Bee Culture,” Classical Bulletin XXXIV (1957): 5 and Wilkinson, Georgics, 104. Quinn says, “Colony life is based upon the division of labor accompanied by corresponding specialization and adaptation” (5).


38 Vergil, Georgics, 4.251-280; Wilkinson, Georgics, 105.

# This also serves as additional references into the Greco-Roman poetic tradition.

40 I use “king” here, because it is debated within the scholarship I consulted as to Vergil’s understanding of the gender of the hive and its leader. For example, Polleichtner states, “The gender of the leader of a beehive was debated in antiquity,” stating on the same page that Vergil believed the rulers to be male: he adds, however, that in the Georgics 4.210 “Aegyptus” could be seen as a hint at Cleopatra in Aeneid 8.688 “Aegyptia conium” (“The Bee Simile,” 130).


42 Wilkinson, Georgics, 105.


44 On the topic of frailty and collective effort: Habinek states, through the story of the bees, Vergil demonstrates “the interrelatedness of individuals, the interdependency of generations, the fragility of community life. In this context, social interaction and human culture come to be seen in a positive light, and, with them, the institution of sacrifice that makes their existence possible” (“Sacrifice, Society, and Vergil’s Ox-Born Bees,” 216).

45 Pitts, “Poetics of Silence,” 8: Georgics 4.54-55; 4.255-56; 4.281-82.
Noted by critics, as previously discussed, including Segal, “Orpheus and the Fourth Georgic,” 310: “The significance of the bees lies, as Dahlmann has shown, in their similarity to and difference from man and man’s political community.”

Segal, “Orpheus and the Fourth Georgic,” 310: “[In the second half of Book IV] the metaphor does not hold. And where the metaphor gives way, the human narrative, with human values and human suffering, breaks through.” Segal also argues that Book IV lacks the practical advice present in the previous three books.

Habinek, “Sacrifice, Society, and Vergil’s Ox-Born Bees,” 210-211.

Thomas, Vol. 1, 27.

…as well as Eurydice

Vergil, Georgics, 4.464-466.

Thomas, Vol. 2, 228.

This practice is wise, because as Thomas notes, “Virgil is the more referential and self-referential Latin poet, and he expects much of his reader” (Vol. 1, ix). Though this paper focuses primarily on Book IV of the Georgics alone, I have chosen to include the most relevant of such references and observations.


University of Queensland, Vergil, Aeneid (Book VI) page: uq.edu.au/hprcflex/It2250/vergil4.htm. Citation reads: JH, line 709, Note.


Miles, “Amor and Civilization,” 192: made and explained the insertion of dementia here.

Thomas, Vol. 2, 230: “Orpheus’ failure is emotional, a loss of control caused by amor.”

Thomas, Vol. 2, 230: Thomas’ note continues with a reference to Georgics 2.303, incautum, “where heedlessness leads to the destruction of the farmer’s labor.”


Thomas also states, “Orpheus, paradigm for the man who controls not only nature, but even the powers of the Underworld, finds his own labor destroyed by a momentary lapse” (Vol. 2, 230).

Demens, such as the quality of Dido in Vergil’s Aeneid, is often attributed to Orpheus when discussing this passage.

McDonald, “Aeneas and Turnus: Labor vs. Amor,” 47. McDonald poses the following question regarding Orpheus’ motives: “Could one also call this amor Homeric, that is, heroic, primitive, wild: the sort of amor that caused the Trojan war?”

Vergil, Georgics, 4. 469: adiit (‘he dared to approach’, ‘he actually approached’) 66

Alternately, another view of Orpheus’ amor is presented in J. Scott Cambell, “Labor improbus and Orpheus furor hubris in the Georgics,” L’Antiquite Classique, 236: “In order to conquer death, Orpheus’ amor had to become furor. Only a love so excessive that it is in fact madness can overcome nature.”


Bradley, “Augustan Culture and a Radical Alternative,” 348.

Pitts, “Poetics of Silence,” 6.

Wilkinson, Georgics, 105: referring to Georgics 3.242-283: the “ubiquitous and destructive power of sexual lust.”

Miles, “Amor and Civilization,” 183. Also, Miles reemphasizes this point by adding, “Amor caecus is amor unseen by its victim as well as unseeing” (Miles, 191). Additionally, he acknowledges Servius’ assessment (Endnote 21 in Miles, 196).

The distinction also provides substance to the distinction between following orders and blind obedience. Although these specific terms do not appear in the text, they certainly are present throughout.

The great, epic labor completed by both Odysseus and Aeneas

Pitts, “Poetics of Silence,” note 8, 107, primarily in Pitts’ words.

Thomas, Vol. 1, 23: “For all his artistic perfection and ability to control the natural world through song, Orpheus fails, and his failure comes from amor, the same destructive natural force which impeded success in Book 3. Eurydice and all his efforts, his toil, are lost (omnis/ effuses labor, 491-2), like those of the farmer in Books 1 and 3, like those of the plague-stricken ox itself (quid labor aut benefacta iuuant? 3.525).”

In the research and readings that I conducted and read.

Pitts, “Poetics of Silence,” 6: “This idea of furor is developed earlier in the poem, connecting the thematic development of book three to Orpheus’ backward glance and second loss of Eurydice.” Also, Monica Gale, “Poetry and the Backward Glance in Virgil’s Georgics and Aeneid,” Transactions of the American Philological Association 133 (2003): 323: she suggests that Orpheus is “both immensely powerful and entirely helpless in the face of his own passion, the furor that motivates his backward glance”; in regards to his “power,” she says, “He very nearly succeeds in bringing Eurydice back from the dead, not to mention the casual reference in 510 to his taming the tigers and animation of oak-trees.”

Aristaeus, here, stands as a symbol for all farmers/ politicians/ “forward-thinking” men.

Perhaps it is also true that we can, as Gale suggests, “posit a symbolic connection between Orpheus’ fateful backward glance and the characteristic stance of the poet, as well as the lover’s inability to face the future after the [second] loss of his beloved” (“Poetry and the Backward Glance,” 335).

Similarly, McDonald notes: “R. Frank, "Catullus 51: Otium versus Virtus" TAPhA 99 (1968) 233-239. Frank has pointed out the attitude in Roman antiquity towards love as a social disaster, with numerous corroborating classical citations,” 47.


Gale, “Poetry and the Backward Glance,” 347.

Vergil, Georgics, 4: amor ... habendi, 177; tantus amor florum et generandi gloria mellis, 205.

Similarly, Segal, “Orpheus and the Fourth Georgic,” 310: “Hence the selfless and sexless love of the bees contrasts with the passionate and all-absorbing love that man can feel.”

Pitts, “Poetics of Silence,” 17.

Vergil, Georgics 4.323; Also, Marincic, “Bees of Demeter,” 25, which includes a note: Clauss (1988): 313.


Brown, Life Against Death, 174.

Thomas, Vol. 2, 216: “Cyrene’s instructions, and Aristaeus’ execution of them, are based closely on the famous incident from Homer Od. 4.341-570.”

In my research, as well as our roundtable discussion, I have also learned about the parallels here to Menelaus holding Proteus, but for the purposes of this paper, have decided not to expand on this similarity; one such example is Thomas, Vol. 2, 218: these references refer specifically to Odyssey 4.417-18, 456-8, where Proteus transforms from creature to creature—in an order reversed by Vergil in this scene.

Gale, “Poetry and the Backward Glance,” 322: Aristaeus “receives didactic instruction from his mother, Cyrene, which he carries out to the letter, and also consults the prophet Proteus.”


I would also argue that what Aristaeus does in regaining his swarm does and could not even qualify as labor. The labor seen throughout the Georgics involves difficult work, as seen in Jupiter’s decision to give certain qualities to and requirements of creatures after the Golden Age. Likewise, Bradley argues, “Work … is a serious activity that results from practical necessity and issues in profit of some kind when it is successful; it is useful to the individual and to the society. It clearly is not an activity that is self-fulfilling. It is on the contrary a means to an end” (“Augustan Culture and a Radical
Alternative,” 348). Therefore, Aristaeus’ achievement of his goal comes not as the result of labor, but rather his ability to obey the orders of his powerful and knowledgeable mother. Though the words imply violence, the action of catching Proteus, as instructed, however, does not seem to be achieved through a long, laborious process. Referring to 4.437, Thomas says, “The expression is rather odd: ‘as soon as the opportunity of [catching] him offered itself to Aristaeus’” (Thomas, Vol. 2, 224).


Vergil, Georgics, 4.559-562.

And perhaps curbing that behavior in the future.

Translation by Bradley, “Augustan Culture and a Radical Alternative,” 348.


Vergil, Georgics, 4.559-562.

On this subject, Servius also notes: duo enim ista requiruntur in oraculis, causa mile et remedium (Thomas, Vol. 2, 218).


Georgics 453 and 4.532-535: non te nullius exercent numinis irae/ facilis uenerare Napaeas (‘not of nothing the anger of divine will enforces on you easily appeased the Nymphs of the vales’).

Georgics 453-527, itself a poem with strong affinities to Virgilian bucolic and doubtless to the poetry of Gallus.” (Thomas, Vol. 2, 223.)

Gale, “Poetry and the Backward Glance,” 331.

According to Thomas, this verb appears only in Vergil in this instance. Thomas, Volume 2, 225.

This can mean both Orpheus and Aristaeus as well as perhaps Vergil (or Gallus) and Augustus within the Georgics. Also, as previously stated, both amor and furor factor into the characterization of Orpheus and his symbolism in the text; this is, however, contrasted with the regulation and obedience of Aristaeus. Gale states, “The poet is overwhelmed by the furor of inspiration, whereas the farmer, like the statesman in the sphragis, attempts to impose order and control on his ‘subject’” (Gale, “Poetry and the Backward Glance,” 331).

Gale, “Poetry and the Backward Glance,” 331.

This relates back to Orpheus’ second loss of Eurydice in his momentary lapse, immomor, heu.

Habinek, “Sacrifice, Society, and Vergil’s Ox-Born Bees,” 215: he claims: “At risk in Aristaeus’ violation of Eurydice is the entire society celebrated by Vergil throughout the poem and concentrated in the imagery of the bees… the sacrifice performed by Aristaeus restores the order of his world, and leads to the re-creation of the swarm of bees, suggestive as they are of reborn human society.”

In terms of the sacrifice, Habinek does, however, recognize that “Aristaeus’ sacrifice is an incomplete, one might even say, perverted one, for it incorporates the element of slaughter without the supplementary actions of distribution and consumption of flesh” (“Sacrifice, Society, and Vergil’s Ox-Born Bees,” 219).

Vergil, Georgics 4.295-314.

Wilkinson, Georgics, 106, referring to Book IV, 281-314: here he says that Vergil, “locates the practice [of bugonia] in Egypt, the proverbial land of wonders.” In this section, Vergil spells out the story of the derivation of this practice, revealing the prima... ab origine (‘[from] the first origin/source,’ 4.286) was, in fact, the Pellaei gens fortunata Canopi (‘fortunate people of the Pellaean Canopus,’ 4.287) who perfected this practice, yet he still refers to bugonia in relation to Aristaeus by saying the inuenta magistri (‘invention/discovery of the teacher,’ 4.283). It seems many scholars have taken this to mean Aristaeus as the original performer of the act and that it is something actually subsequently practiced around Egypt. Likewise, Polleichtner asserts, “The connection of the bee with Egypt would be an additional way to explain why Vergil gave much more prominence to the bees in his work than other epic poets did” (150).

Marincic, “Bees of Demeter,” 33: he observes, “In reality, half of Book four is occupied by the mythic aition of bugonia;” he also speculates, “as far as we know, Vergil was not only the first to make a connection between Aristaeus and bugonia but also the first who attributed the death of Eurydice to the lustfulness of the agricultural hero Aristaeus. He also notes, see; Norden, 1934.

Penelope Murray, “Poetic Inspiration in Early Greece,” The Journal of Hellenic Studies, 101 (1981): 87-100. Murray explores the history and concept of poetic inspiration. Here she dedicates a section to the Muses, stating, “They symbolize the poet’s feeling of dependence on the external: they are the personification of his inspiration...in two main ways: (a) they give him permanent poetic ability; (b) they provide him with temporary aid in composition” (89). She also states, “Undoubtedly ancient poets use invocations to establish their authority, to guarantee the truth of their words, and to focus the attention of the audience at strategic points” (90).

Though I have argued that Aristaeus’ efforts in Book IV do not constitute true labor, in the sense that he did it to benefit himself and he did not true “discover” the process for which he has been awarded credit, I acknowledge that this verb, extudit, appears to mean not only ‘produce,’ but, more specifically, ‘produce with effort.’ Also, he clearly exemplifies labor as a farmer to gain all that he’s lost, as we see in 4.327-328.


Johnston restated in Marincic, “Bees of Demeter,” 33-34. Also, as Griffin, “The Fourth Georgic, Virgil and Rome,” 70: “The bees, patriotic, rational, and impersonal, are brought back from death by the device of bugonia. In the fullest sense, genus immortale manet (G. 4.208): ... multiosque per annos stat fortuna domus, et avi numerantur avorum” (Griffin, 70).

* The bees are “saved,” but are not successful in that their labor does not produce its desired end.

Pitts, “Poetics of Silence,” 17.


“Blind obedience” refers to discussion in footnote 70.

Segal, “Orpheus and the Fourth Georgic,” 314: “…separate and opposed destinies are interwoven

Bradley, “Augustan Culture and a Radical Alternative,” 357.

Yet another interpretation, one that I wish I had more time to pursue: because Vergil has included and reinterpreted the Orpheus myth in Georgics, Book IV, particularly with the inclusion of Aristaeus, perhaps it is implicitly state that, according to the attitudes of Augustan Rome, love is social disaster. Even labor cannot raise amor up to succeed over obedience.


Thomas, Vol. 1, 23: “At 4.329-30 he [Aristaeus] is active in the three areas of agriculture, the areas which are the theme of Georgics 1-3; his success is that of the agricola in general. But at what cost?”

McDonald, “Aeneas and Turnus: Labor vs. Amor,” 47.
140 *All?
141 Due to the focus and constraints of this paper, I have decided not to address Orpheus’ death, though it certainly reemphasizes how badly Orpheus suffers.
144 Gale, “Poetry and the Backward Glance,” 336. Also, instead of the traditional interpretation of the Orpheus/ Aristaeus epyllion as a conflict between amor and labor, the true issue of obedience verses both amor and labor tied to one another. Gale later suggests that Vergil contrasts the “ideal of dutiful obedience embodied in Aristaeus and the willful passion of Orpheus” (346).
146 Bradley uses the following passage to further illustrate this point: “In Book III a sick sheep must be ruthlessly killed off to prevent the spread of disease: contiuo culpam ferro compesce priusquam/ dira per incautum serpent contagia vulgus [Geo.3.468-69] “You must nip that evil in the bud, you must use your knife and kill / Before its dread contagion creeps through the oblivious flock” (“Augustan Culture and a Radical Alternative,” 350).
147 Gale, “Poetry and the Backward Glance,” 328.
149 Miles, “Amor and Civilization,” 188.
150 Miles, “Amor and Civilization,” 188.
151 Pitts, “Poetics of Silence,” 14.
152 Thomas, Vol. 1, 75: in note 42, suggests translations given for uocari and iam nunc
154 Brown, Life Against Death, 174.
155 Similarly, Pitts argues, “Eurydice lost through the tantus furor of glancing backward may be read as a sympathetic warning against looking backward, against resisting the potential that Octavian heralds by focusing too narrowly on the loss, bloodshed, and devastation that Octavian’s ambitious political career brought to pass. The Orphic narrative contemplates the ethics of suffering with regard to the artistic enterprise when the poet’s vision is directed (he may not glance backward) by a most formidable and unpitying overlord” (“Poetics of Silence,” 114).
157 Such as the debated inclusion and subsequent expulsion of Gallus from his poem.
158 Griffin, “The Fourth Georgic, Virgil and Rome,” 69; here, in parenthesis, he says: “(and devotion to their ‘king’ is only devotion to the state and to authority, not an encouragement to emperor-worship)”
159 Segal, “Orpheus and the Fourth Georgic,” 308: introduces the idea that the content of the fourth book, specifically the Aristeus-Orpheus episode, was included as a replacement for “an earlier passage that praised Gallus,” which Augustus had ordered removed after Gallus “came to a bad end as prefect of Egypt.” Segal references both Servius and Eduard Norden and the history of Vergilian studies. Also, Pitts, “Poetics of Silence, 5: Vergil “use[d] the myth of Orpheus to contemplate the relationship between the poet and his art amidst these profound changes that defined an epoch.”
160 Just as we see an opposing relationship between poet and statesmen in this example, Gale states, “Virgil offers us a series of different and conflicting models for the relationship between poet and princeps...Sometimes it is suggested that the two can cooperate harmoniously, sometimes they are mutually opposed” (“Poetry and the Backward Glance,” 331). She later adds, “The poet seems to hint at different ways of understanding the value and nature of poetry (and the visual arts) and different models for the relationship between poet and statement in different parts of the poem” (344). As my focus is primarily the fourth book of the Georgics, I will not address all of these conflicting examples, but suffice it to say that the relationship depicted fluctuates throughout the text.
161 * And, by extension, Augustus
164 And debatable.
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