The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Picus-Who-is-also-Zeus

W. R. Halliday

The Classical Review / Volume 36 / Issue 5-6 / August 1922, pp 110 - 112

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00016528, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00016528

How to cite this article:

W. R. Halliday (1922). Picus-Who-is-also-Zeus. The Classical Review, 36, pp 110-112
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00016528

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

in court, where anyone could stare at her as he liked: simply to stand forth in her rags is nothing that calls for the encouragement μηδὲν αἰσχύνειν or for assurances that the jury have minds as chaste as a father's or a brother's. Such language means that she is required to show ἃ κρύπτειν ὄμματ' ἀρσένων χρεών; and this is necessary in order that the jury may see for themselves

τὰ τίλλματ' αὐτῆς, καὶ κάτωθε κἀνωθεν
ὡς λεία ταῦτ' ἐτίλλεν ὠναγῆς οὗτος,

uolsuras eius, quam glabra haec (quae iam nudata digito demonstrat) et infra et supra euolsis pilis reddiderit.

The mere sense of the words is rightly understood by Buecheler, whose punctuation I have given, and by others if not by all; but I find no sign that anyone sees the joke, which for Herodas and his first readers was the best joke in the mime. When Crusius *Unters.* p. 42 says 'der Schlaupfopf spekuliert wohl nicht nur auf das Mitleid, sondern auch auf die Sinnlichkeit der Herrn Geschworenen,' and Hense *Rhein. Mus.* 1900 p. 230 repeats that explanation, they are far astray.

Had Myrtale been induced to surmount her bashfulness under the eyes of a British jury, they might have believed, at least for the moment, that they had ocular evidence of shocking maltreatment; and their horror at the ruffian's brutality would have been equalled or surpassed by their amazement at his thoroughness. The λειότης revealed was complete. But that was no surprise or mystery to burghers of Cos. It was none of Thales' handiwork, but an ordinary feature of the feminine toilet, *munditiae muliebres*, perpetuated in marble and still imposed as a convention on sculptors and painters of the nude by the prestige of antiquity. Any woman of Myrtale's trade who was careful of her person and solicitous to please her customers would be παρατετιμμένη. Battarus achieves the height of his impudence when he offers in proof of outrage a piece of evidence which really shows that the particular outrage alleged was an impossible and a proverbially impossible feat: φαλακρὸν τίλλειν, *nudo detrahare uestimenta*, taking the breeks off a Highlander.

A. E. HOUSMAN.

PICUS-WHO-IS-ALSO-ZEUS.

THE well-known passage in Suidas s.v. Πῆκος ὁ καὶ Ζεὺς has given rise to a good deal of bold speculation. It has inspired Miss Harrison to bring Picus to Crete,¹ and, relying upon her, Mr. Bailey now brings him back from Crete to Italy.

The conception of an animal deity is foreign to the strictly animistic notions of the old Roman religion, and we may naturally look to an alien origin. In the case of the woodpecker this is not hard to find: there is good evidence of the cult of the woodpecker (δρυκολάπτῃς) in Crete, where he ultimately became associated with the worship of Zeus.²

The statement that 'there is good evidence' is definitely a slip. Strictly speaking, there is no direct evidence at all that the woodpecker was worshipped in Crete at any period of history. The foundation of the hypothesis that the Greeks once worshipped woodpeckers

consists of a line of Aristophanes³ and the occurrence of the name Keleos in Greek mythology (a) as the father of Triptolemus,⁴ and (b) the only story specifically connected with Crete, as one of the bronze-clad ruffians who entered the cave of Zeus to steal honey, and in punishment were turned into birds.⁵ The line of Aristophanes no doubt refers to a piece of popular lore, but to found such a theory upon it is surely to attempt to break a butterfly on the wheel, and the interpretation of proper names is an exceedingly flimsy, if popular, foundation for hypotheses. Are we, for instance, to deduce from the *dramatis personae* of Varro's treatise on farming that the Romans formerly worshipped domestic animals? Indeed, when shorn of Miss Harrison's per-

¹ J. E. Harrison, *Themis*, pp. 100 ff.

² C. Bailey, *P. Ovidi Nasonis Fastorum Liber III.* p. 46.

³ Aristophanes, *Birds*, 480 οὐκ ἀποδώσει ταχέως ὁ Ζεὺς τὸ σκήπτρον τῷ δρυκολάπτῃ;

⁴ See Roscher s.v. Keleos.

⁵ Antoninus Liberalis XIX.

suasive eloquence, there is little to commend the theory that the worship of the woodpecker was indigenous in Crete.

Further, were it true that a woodpecker god had been worshipped in Crete in the Bronze Age, the Cretan origin of Italian *Picus* would need strong corroborative evidence. The assumption of homogeneity of culture in Italy and the Aegean area during the Bronze Age is often made, but it is hardly warranted. The archaeological evidence is pretty definitely against it.

On the whole it may be said that the evidence for Mycenaean influence in Italy is rather slender. It is beyond doubt that the south-eastern corner of the peninsula carried on a considerable trade with the Mycenaean Aegean, and if the Torcello vases can be trusted, this trade must have been continued up to the north shores of the Adriatic. Beyond this, and the fact that Sicily fell strongly under Mycenaean influence, little can be said.¹ Few who have surveyed the evidence collected by Professor Peet are likely to question his verdict.

The sacred bird of Mars from which the Picentines took their name belongs indisputably to an early stratum of Italian religion. At the same time it should be noted that *Picus* is prominent in mythology and folklore rather than in cult. There is, it is true, the oracle of Mars at Tiora Matiene mentioned at second-hand by Dionysius of Halicarnassus, at which a woodpecker perched upon a wooden post is said to have performed functions analogous to those of the doves at Dodona.² There is no evidence, however, that either the woodpecker or the doves were ever themselves the objects of cults. It is, in fact, extremely difficult to find examples of bird divinities in any part of the world,³ and the comparative evidence is quite conclusive that the attribution of magical or prophetic powers to a bird

or the adoption of a bird name or crest by no means necessarily implies bird worship.

With Miss Harrison and Mr. Bailey I should be disposed to agree that the woodpecker was probably regarded by the Italian peoples as the bird which foretold and even summoned the rain. Throughout Europe it enjoys this reputation in popular belief, partly on account of its cry, partly on account of its noticeable activity when the imminence of rain brings out the insects upon which it feeds.⁴ It was probably these peculiarities, rather than its martial appearance,⁵ which made it the bird of Mars.⁶

In Roman cult *Picus* figures not at all; he springs into prominence in the Augustan Age as the augur king or the rustic deity, and the reason for this prominence would seem to be the poverty of native mythology. Both this poverty and the amazing literary skill of Virgil are well illustrated in the Seventh Book of the *Aeneid*. This is not the place to attempt to analyse how a romantic atmosphere is created out of the most exiguous material by a dexterous ringing of the changes upon the few names available. Even such bloodless abstractions as *Italus* and *Sabinus* are made to contribute to the effect. But in fact the impression of age-long antiquity is so skilfully conveyed that the reader is liable to forget that there are but four generations descending from father to son—*Saturnus*, *Picus*, *Faunus*, *Latinus*.⁷

Euhemerism had taken firm root at Rome in the days of Ennius, and Virgil's list was no doubt popularly accepted before he set upon it the seal of his authority. Now the identification of *Saturnus* with the Greek *Cronos* was admitted. If *Saturnus* is another name for *Cronos*, it follows that *Picus* is another name for *Zeus*.

That is not, however, the whole story.

¹ Peet, *The Stone and Bronze Ages in Italy*, pp. 514-515.

² Dion. Hal. I. xiv. 5. This statement would be more helpful if we knew with any certainty what the doves at Dodona were and what they did, but we do not.

³ Borneo supplies examples of definite bird cults, but the actual worship of bird divinities is difficult to parallel elsewhere.

⁴ See Swainson, *Folklore of British Birds*, p. 162; Hopf, *Thierorakel und Orakelthiere*, p. 162.

⁵ Plutarch, *Quaest. Rom.* 21.

⁶ So far as it goes the connexion of *Picus* and the obscure *Picumnus* with *Stercutius* (e.g. Augustine, *De Civ. Dei*, xviii. 15) seems to support this view.

⁷ Virgil, *Aeneid*, VII. 45 ff.

Picus, who is also Zeus, is first mentioned in a fragment of Diodorus;¹ he is almost always² introduced under this rather cumbersome double-barrelled name; his appearance is uniformly in literature of a particular kind and in a particular context. He is the puppet of the chronographer, not an object of cult nor a factor in religious development. And in passing, an obvious but not unimportant point may be noticed. Πῖκος does not mean 'woodpecker' in Greek. It is the legendary king of Italy rather than the magical woodpecker who occupies the tomb of Zeus in Crete.

At the beginning of the second century B.C., a scheme of world history was proposed, possibly by Zeno of Rhodes, the main idea of which was a succession of four world empires—the Assyrian, the Persian, the Macedonian, and the Roman. A subsidiary but favourite feature of the scheme was the synchronising of the fall of the Assyrian empire with the foundation of Rome.³ This point appealed with especial force to Christian writers, for

¹ Diodorus, VI., 5.

² An exception is Pausanias of Damascus, Frag. 4. (*Hist. Graec. Min.* I. ed. Dindorf, p. 179) who tells us that Seleucus sacrificed ἐν τῇ ἱερῇ τῇ κτισθέντι ὑπὸ Περσέως τοῦ υἱοῦ Πίκου καὶ Δανάης τῇ θυτρί εἰς τὸ Σίλπιον ὄρος. Here the identification with Zeus is, of course, implied, and it is used to form a link between Oriental and European history (see Note 5 below).

³ Trieber, 'Die Idee der vier Weltreiche,' *Hermes*, XXVII. (1892), pp. 321-344. This idea was taken over by the medieval historians. Cf. at the end of the thirteenth century Higden, *Polychronicon* (Rolls Series, London, 1865), II., p. 256; at the end of the twelfth century the second recension of the *De Mirabilibus Urbis Romae* (Nichols, *The Marvels of Rome*, London, 1889, pp. 2 and 3) contains muddled reminiscences of the system.

whom Rome was the second Babylon of apocalyptic writing. Euhemerism enabled the scheme to be worked out in a single whole by means of identifications justified by the existing practice of polytheism as regards the identification of foreign with native gods. Thus Picus-who-is-also-Zeus is also Ninus, or the brother of Ninus. It is only, as far as I am aware, in passages connected with the alleged interrelation of the histories of Assyria and Rome that Πῖκος ὁ καὶ Ζεὺς figures.⁴

The association, therefore, is that of Picus, not of a woodpecker, with Zeus, and it takes place not in Crete, but in the study of the historians. This surely disposes of the value of Suidas as a witness for woodpecker-worship. If it be asked, why then should Crete come into the story, an answer is not difficult to find. The tomb of Zeus in Crete is the foundation-stone of Euhemerist doctrine, and observation suggests that it is difficult to mention Euhemerism without bringing it in. Both Servius and Mr. Bailey provide examples, the former *ad Aen.* VII. 150, the latter on p. 20 of his masterly introduction to the Third Book of the *Fasti*, with a minor detail of which I have ventured to disagree.

W. R. HALLIDAY.

⁴ Diodorus VI. 5; Ioannes Antiochenus, Frags. 4, 6 (*F.H.G.* IV. pp. 542-544); Malalas I. 19, II. 28, 34 (Migne, *Pat. Graec.* XCVII. pp. 85, 95, 104); *Chronicon Paschale*, 36-38, 44 (Migne, *Pat. Graec.* XCII. pp. 143 ff.); *Excerpta Barbari* in Frick, *Chronica Minora*, 243, 25. Picus-Zeus is identified with Ninus, or the brother of Ninus, and is the father of Perseus, the ancestor of the Persians. Faunus, his son=Hermes Trismegistus, and forms the link with Egyptian history. Io also plays a part in this systematisation of history. Antioch was founded on the site of Iopolis, to which she fled to escape Faunus—Hermes Trismegistus.

[ARISTOTLE] OECONOMICA.

It may be hoped that Mr. Forster's useful translation of the pseudo-Aristotelian *Oeconomica*, noticed in the *Classical Review*, Vol. XXXV. p. 70, will draw attention to that interesting compilation. The Second Book, with its collection of devices adopted by princes and potentates for raising

revenue, seems to have been suggested by *Politics*, 1259a 3 ff., 33 ff., when Aristotle wrote: 'It would be well also to collect the scattered stories of the ways in which individuals have succeeded in amassing a fortune; for all this is useful to persons who value the art of getting wealth. . . . And states-