

STOLEN FIRE: AESCHYLEAN IMAGERY AND THOREAU'S IDENTIFICATION OF THE
GRAIUS HOMO OF LUCRETIUS WITH PROMETHEUS

Robert A. Seelinger

Abstract

In his *Journal* for April 26, 1856, Thoreau noted that he had quickly looked over the first 200 lines of the *De Rerum Natura* but was "...struck only with the lines referring to Promethius (sic)—whose *vivida vis animi...extra/processit longe flammantia moenia mundi.*" (1.72–73) During this time (i.e., late April and into May) Thoreau was reading the Roman agricultural writers Columella and Palladius, and it is unclear what led him to pick up the *De Rerum Natura* and then discard it so quickly. Perhaps most curious is Thoreau's comment that lines 72–73 refer to Prometheus. No commentator in the context of Thoreau has noted that Lucretius is not actually referring to Prometheus in these lines but to Epicurus. The goal of this paper is to show how these lines in their wording and imagery may have reminded Thoreau of Aeschylus' description of Prometheus in *Prometheus Bound* and led him to conclude that lines 1.72–73 of the *De Rerum Natura* refer to Prometheus.

As he frequently demonstrates in his writings and as many of his friends and biographers have noted, Henry David Thoreau was well grounded in the Greek and Roman Classics and had a superior reading facility in both Greek and Latin.¹ Even after finishing his formal education at Harvard, he continued to read various Greek and Roman authors both in the original and in translation throughout his life. Moreover, Thoreau showed himself to be a capable translator, adaptor, and critic of Classical authors. His formal translations include Aeschylus' *Prometheus Bound* and the *Seven Against Thebes*² as well as poems of Pindar and those from the *Anacreontea*.³ In the first volume of *The Dial*, Thoreau also demonstrated his abilities as a literary critic in his comments on the Roman satirist Persius.⁴ Thoreau's reading interests in the Classics changed over the course of time.⁵ Although he seems to have maintained a

¹ For Thoreau's background in the Classics see esp. Seybold 1951 (1969); Gohdes 1928: 323–336; Foerster 1917: 192–212 = Ruland 1968: 34–49; Van Anglen 1986; Emerson 1862 = Atkinson 2000: 809–825; Sanborn 1917: 36–37; Uteley 1938: 171–180; Cameron 1958: 359–360 and 425–432; Cameron 1975; and Sattelmeyer 1988, 3–9, 27–29, 45, 81, and 90.

² The *Prometheus Bound* was published in *The Dial*, Vol. 3, July 1842–April 1843; although he finished a complete translation of the *Seven Against Thebes*, it was not published during his lifetime. See Seybold 1951: 35 and Van Anglen 1986: 168–170 and 245.

³ Seybold 1951: 18–21 and Van Anglen 1986: 200–219 for Thoreau's practices as a translator. As Van Anglen notes (165–166), Thoreau believed that the poems he translated from the *Anacreontea* were by Anacreon.

⁴ *The Dial*, Vol. 1, July 1840 – April 1841.

⁵ See esp. Seybold 1951, Gohdes 1928, and Sattelmeyer 1988. Seybold (1951: 15–16) distinguishes three periods of post-college reading in the Classics: 1) A "literary period" in the 1840s, with much re-reading of authors and a few new explorations—authors or particular works include Homer, Orpheus, Greek lyricists (esp. poems from the *Anacreontea* and Pindar), Aeschylus' *Prometheus Bound* and *Seven Against Thebes*, Plutarch's *Lives* and *Morals*, Jamblichus' *Life of Pythagoras*, and Porphyry's *On Abstinence from Animal Food*, Vergil, Horace, Persius, and Ovid. 2) In the early and mid-1850s, he read Roman agricultural writers—Cato, Varro, Columella, and Palladius, read Sophocles' *Antigone*, and approximately 200 lines of Book I of the *De Rerum Natura*. 3) In the late 1850s he was principally interested in the naturalists—Pliny, Aristotle, Theophrastus, and Aelian, and in 1861 he notes that he was reading selections of Herodotus and Strabo.

constant interest in the Homeric poems (at least the *Iliad*), he was attracted to different authors at different periods of his post-college days. Thoreau's interests and tastes in the Classics were eclectic, and from the various Classical authors he sought ideas and perspectives that helped him develop, clarify, and articulate his own thoughts and views of the world as they emerged over the course of his life.⁶

In the 1850s and up to his death, Thoreau was engaged with a diverse range of activities, and his late career may have been the most ambitious and intellectually daring period of his life. For many readers it has also been perhaps Thoreau's most perplexing period, which has now come into clearer focus as the result of recent critical attention and the publication of Thoreau's own *The Dispersion of Seeds* (1993). As his reading and own writings indicate, Thoreau was immersed in the study of natural history and scientific inquiry, deeply concerned with social and political issues of the world around him, and actively engaged with key intellectual movements of his day.⁷ During this period Thoreau developed extensively his technical and theoretical knowledge of the natural world, sharpened his observational skills, and sought ways to integrate his scientific, literary, and social interests in a holistic manner.⁸ Thoreau read widely in the area of natural history and science and seems to have been particularly attracted to the writings and ideas of Alexander von Humboldt and later Charles Darwin.⁹ As for Greek and Latin authors, Thoreau's interests included especially the naturalists (e.g., Pliny, Aelian, Aristotle, and Theophrastus) and Roman agricultural writers (e.g., Cato, Varro, Columella, and Palladius).¹⁰

In late April and into early to mid May 1856, Thoreau was busy with the text of Columella and then Palladius, and many of his journal entries of this period are filled with detailed comments, reflections, and transcriptions of passages from Columella. In the *Journal* for April 26, 1856, however, Thoreau indicated that he had quickly read the first two hundred lines of Lucretius' *De Rerum Natura*, but was strongly affected only by two lines which referred to Prometheus:

Although Seybold's observations provide a general overview of Thoreau's reading in the Classics, see esp. Sattelmeyer 1988 for a fuller and more complete discussion of how his reading fit into the intellectual interests and pursuits at different stages of his life.

⁶ Seybold 1951: 21, Thoreau "was not a classicist for the sake of classicism. He was a classicist, just as he was a naturalist or a hermit or a writer, only because and as far as his classicism furthered his search for reality."

⁷ On Thoreau's late career see esp. Sattelmeyer 1988: 78–110; Buell 1995: 362–369 and 412–423; Berger 2000; Walls 1995 and 2000; Milder 1995: 167–203; and Robinson 2004: 177–201.

⁸ On Thoreau's pursuit of natural history and scientific inquiry in an integrative manner, see esp. Sattelmeyer 1988: 78–92, Berger 2000; the comments of Nabhan and Richardson in Thoreau 1993 (ed. Dean): xi–xviii and 3–17, respectively; and Walls 1995 and 2000. Walls 1995 discusses at length how Thoreau adopted and incorporated key ideas of Alexander von Humboldt and uses the term "empirical holism" to describe the way in which Thoreau was able to interconnect the worlds of poetry, philosophy, and science—see esp. 4, 84–93, 131–134, and 246–252.

⁹ Some of the works Thoreau knew well include those of A. Agassiz and A. Gould, *Principles of Zoology*; A. Gray, *Manual of Botany*; A. von Humboldt, *Cosmos*, and *Aspects of Nature*; and C. Darwin, *On the Origin of Species*. In essence, Thoreau read widely and was sensitive to the dramatic changes that were taking place in the world of science and scientific theory. See esp. Sattelmeyer 1988: 79–90; Nabhan in Thoreau 1993 (ed. Dean): xiii; Walls 1995 and 2000; and Berger 2000: esp. 5–14 and 48–75.

¹⁰ See Seybold 1951: 15–16, 70–71, and 75–85 and Sattelmeyer 1988: 90.

Looked over hastily the 1st 200 lines of Lucretius—
but was struck only with the lines referring to Prometheus—
whose *vivida vis animi*-- -- -- “*extra/Processit longe*
flammantia moenia mundi”¹¹

Thoreau’s “brief excursion”¹² into the text of Lucretius raises some interesting and difficult questions, and we may never be able to answer with absolute certainty why Thoreau chose to read Lucretius at this particular time, when he had first read the *De Rerum Natura*, which text of Lucretius he used, and why he construed lines as 1.72–73 of Lucretius’ poem as referring to Prometheus.¹³ Of these questions I think the last one pertaining to Prometheus is the most fascinating and important. Up to this point no commentator in the context of Thoreau has noted or recognized that 1) Thoreau’s reference to Prometheus in Lucretius’ poem is in fact not literally accurate and 2) that Lucretius does not specifically refer to or mention Prometheus in these line (or for that matter anywhere in the *De Rerum Natura*). In this paper I would like to propose an explanation as to why Thoreau described lines 1.72–73 as referring to Prometheus.

My thesis is that in the context of the first two hundred (or so) lines of *De Rerum Natura*, lines 72–73 (*ergo vivida vis animi pervicit, et extra / processit longe flammantia moenia mundi*) evoked in Thoreau’s mind a recollection of Prometheus and his accomplishments and that on the basis of this recollection Thoreau concluded that the lines referred to Prometheus. As his translation of Aeschylus’ *Prometheus Bound* makes evident, Thoreau was well acquainted with the story of Prometheus. His familiarity

¹¹ Journal entry for April 26, 1856, *Manuscript Volume 21*, p. 17, online:
http://www.library.ucsb.edu/thoreau/writings_journals_pdfs/J11f1-f3.pdf (30 July 2011); also Thoreau 1906: 312; online:

http://www.walden.org/Library/The_Writings_of_Henry_David_Thoreau:_The_Digital_Collection/Journal (30 July 2011). In general see <http://www.library.ucsb.edu/thoreau/> for online texts.

¹² Although Seybold 1951: 16 concluded that “...Lucretius’ materialistic explanation could never interest a transcendentalist,” recent scholarship (for example Sattelmeyer 1988, Walls 1995 and 2000, Berger 2000, and Robinson 2004) has shown clearly how important the empirical study of the natural world was to Thoreau in the 1850s and 1860s. In light of the recent scholarship, it has now become even harder to understand Thoreau’s minimal interest in Lucretius’ *De Rerum Natura*. Both Thoreau and Lucretius exhibit a number of similar qualities and traits in their writing, and perhaps as individuals might have had much in common in terms of their perspective on the world and the style of life they extolled. For example, in their writing both authors demonstrated extraordinary powers of observation of the natural world and strived to find a pattern for ethical behavior that was based on the natural world; both extolled and defined friendship as a source of an individual’s growth and development—especially ethical; both had an exquisite sense and fascination with language; both often utilized epic modes and motifs; each resorted to elaborate and carefully constructed analogies to explain and underscore their key points; both urged the rejection of mainstream political and social values and extolled the pursuit of transcendent values; and each called into question the practices and values of conventional religious expression. This, however, is not to say that the views of each were in complete harmony with one another. Distinct differences did indeed exist in their attitudes towards science and scientific explanation, the exact use of observation, the subjective engagement with one’s observations, the primacy of sensual data, and the nature of the soul.

For Lucretius’ reception during the nineteenth century, see esp. Priestman 2007: 289–305; Johnson 2000: 103–133; and Turner 1993.

¹³ In reference to Thoreau’s foray into the *De Rerum Natura*, Gohdes 1928: 333 notes that “... no doubt, it was the rhetorical ingenuity of the liquid line that arrested his attention. Yet few men, even in those times, picked up Lucretius twenty years after their college days.” Although Gohdes is correct in recognizing Lucretius’ rhetorical flourish in these lines, it is hard to imagine that it was only the “rhetorical ingenuity” of this isolated line that caught Thoreau’s eye and ear.

with Lucretius, Epicurus, and the world of the *De Rerum Natura* was much less secure. To demonstrate how and why 1.72–73 of the *De Rerum Natura* struck him as “Promethean,” I will examine 1) the *Journal* entries for the period in which Thoreau was closely reading Columella’s *De Re Rustica* (ca. April 20 – May 7, 1856)—with special emphasis on April 26 when he read a section of the *De Rerum Natura*, 2) the opening 200 (or so) lines of Lucretius’ poem, and 3) relevant parts of Aeschylus’ *Prometheus Bound*, with special reference to Thoreau’s translation of this play. Finally, I would also like to suggest how the opening lines of the *De Rerum Natura* thematically or conceptually might have interested Thoreau, but did not apparently do so at this point of his life. By describing lines 72–73 of the *De Rerum Natura* as “referring to Prometheus,” Thoreau underscores the intellectually liberating accomplishments of the *Graius homo* and Lucretius himself. Although his interpretation and identification of the lines as being literally Promethean are not accurate, his comments are in their own way instructive and revealing. They contribute to our understanding of how Thoreau read and interpreted a text, especially an unfamiliar (or less familiar) one, and shed light on a certain aspect of the *De Rerum Natura*—namely how Lucretius’ description of the *Graius homo* has similarities to Aeschylus’ depiction of Prometheus in the *Prometheus Bound*.¹⁴

An examination of the *Journal* entries for late April and early May of 1856 tells us that when Thoreau chose to read the first two hundred lines of Lucretius’ *De Rerum Natura*, he was busy with a number of different activities.¹⁵ On most days he seems to have divided his time between reading, writing, carefully observing his nearby world (especially its streams, ponds, meadows, and fields), and visiting neighbors. It was spring, and Thoreau was very much engaged in observing and describing what was happening around him, e.g., which trees had begun to bud, which birds had been sighted, what stage of pollen the larches and other trees had reached, etc. Between April 20 and May 7, he was principally concerned with Columella’s *De Re Rustica*, which he read closely and commented on extensively. He had at his disposal both a Latin text and a translation by M. C. Curtius¹⁶ and at different times quotes and paraphrases from both the Latin and English version of Columella’s text.

On some occasions it is clear that Curtius’ comments on Columella’s text led Thoreau to consult or consider other texts and authors which illuminate or elaborate on specific details or concerns that appear in the *De Re Rustica*. Curtius, however, does not seem to have made any specific reference to Lucretius that prompted him to tackle the *De Rerum Natura*. In this particular case Thoreau is silent, and we do not know exactly what led him to Lucretius’ text. It may simply be that the general tenor of Columella’s text and the rich diversity of Curtius’ comments and references caused

¹⁴ Thoreau’s brief comment on these lines is both profoundly suggestive and elusive. My goal is to show how Thoreau’s familiarity with the Prometheus myth from the *Prometheus Bound* reasonably led him identify the *Graius homo* with Prometheus in the light of both their accomplishments. Although Thoreau’s comment suggests much about the accomplishments of the *Graius homo*, Prometheus, and Lucretius, its brevity and the absence of references to Lucretius in any of Thoreau’s other writings make it very difficult, if not impossible, to determine the whole range of ideas that Thoreau may have had in mind.

¹⁵ For a summary of Thoreau’s reading in Columella and Palladius in late April and early May, see Appendix A. In the case of Columella, Thoreau’s reading was particularly detailed.

¹⁶ Anon. 1595; Curtius 1745. According to Seybold 1951: 99, Thoreau borrowed the Latin text from Alcott in 1851 and still possessed it in spring 1856. He borrowed Curtius’ translation from the Harvard College Library on March 4, 1856. See also Utlely 1938.

Thoreau to recall Lucretius' text, which he had most likely read years ago (i.e., 1837), when he read Emerson's seminal essay *Nature*, a work that is much indebted to the *De Rerum Natura*.¹⁷ Whatever the case may be, Thoreau for one reason or another did choose to read Lucretius, but did not seem to have lingered over the first 200 lines or to have explicitly explored the various ways in which they may have been applicable to his interest in Columella and the general concerns at this point of his life. Although the opening lines of the *De Rerum Natura* (i.e., the first 200 lines or so) are critically important for introducing Lucretius' key ideas and scientific and philosophical methodology, Thoreau may not have found them to be closely connected to the particular type of agricultural detail that he was exploring in spring 1856 or perhaps even relevant to his wider interests in natural history and scientific inquiry during the 1850s and 1860s.

Nevertheless, Thoreau did linger long enough on these opening lines to associate them with the story of Prometheus, which he knew well from his translation of Aeschylus' *Prometheus Bound*. Through an examination of the opening 200 lines of Lucretius' poem and key sections of Aeschylus' play, I would like to offer an explanation of why Thoreau concluded that Lucretius was referring to Prometheus.

The opening lines of the *De Rerum Natura*

The opening 200 (or so) lines of the *De Rerum Natura* constitute the initial proem of Book 1 (1.1–145)¹⁸ and present some of Lucretius' initial discussion (1.146–214) of the fundamental qualities of the atomic world. Here Lucretius lays the foundation for the entire poem and introduces the reader to his key themes and methodology. Following the proem Lucretius begins his discussion of atomic theory (146–920) and in lines 159–214 presents six proofs that nothing can be produced from nothing and that there must exist generative seeds: *nullam rem e nihil gigni divinitus umquam*. Since Thoreau said that he had read only the first 200 lines of the *De Rerum Natura*, he must have stopped reading at some point during Lucretius' presentation of the six proofs.

¹⁷ Thoreau read *Nature* in spring 1837, and his friendship with Emerson blossomed in fall 1837; see Richardson 1986: 19–23 and Sattelmeyer 1988: 5. See esp. Shurr 1978 for a discussion of how Emerson responded to and reworked Lucretius' ideas in *Nature*. On the basis of library records for Mrs. Emerson's account at the Boston Library Society, Shurr on 155–156 notes that for Lucretius' poem Emerson had used either the text of Thomas Creech or John Mason Good. Thoreau may have initially read Lucretius during his days at Harvard and perhaps in conjunction with his reading of Emerson's *Nature*. Where Thoreau secured a copy of the *De Rerum Natura* is uncertain. He does not seem to have owned a copy of the poem, and there is no record of him borrowing the text from a friend or a library during either his years at Harvard or in 1856. During the 1830s the Harvard Library had several different editions of the *De Rerum Natura*, including that of Creech, and it is quite possible that he read the same edition that Emerson had. Editions of Lucretius available in the Harvard Library in 1830 include those of Fayus 1680; Creech 1712 and 1717; Haverkamp, Lamkin, Giffen, et al. 1725; and Bentley and Wakefield 1796–97. See Peirce 1830 for texts in the Harvard Library and Cameron 1945: 191–208 for books Thoreau borrowed from Harvard College Library.

¹⁸ An outline of the proem follows: 1) invocation to Venus (1–49), 2) address to Memmius (51–60), 3) praise of Epicurus (62–79), 4) wrongs committed in the name of religion (80–101), 5) the fear of death and reasons for accepting Epicurus' philosophy; qualified praise of Ennius (102–135), and 6) the difficulty of treating Greek philosophy in Latin (136–145). See Leonard and Smith 1942: 195.

The poem opens with a moving invocation to Venus and her magnificent force, which stirs all creatures with the procreative desire (see esp. 1.1–20). Lucretius asks for Venus’ help as he composes his verses to instruct and persuade the addressee of the poem, Gaius Memmius,¹⁹ of the meaning and benefit of his philosophical message. As Lucretius graphically describes it, Venus’ beguiling effect on powerful Mars is ample proof that her procreative powers are the counterbalance to the life-ending work of the fierce war god (1.31–40). In the next section Lucretius presents the Epicurean view of the gods and their detachment from human affairs (1.44–49) and urges Memmius to follow his discussion carefully and to be prepared to learn about “the highest law of the heavens and gods” (*de summa caeli ratione deumque*), the intricacies of the atomic world, and how Nature with the basic building blocks of the universe (i.e., atoms—called variously *corpora prima*, *materies*, *genitalia corpora*, *semina*, *principia*, *prima elementa*) creates and dissolves all mortal things in the world (1.50–61).²⁰

At this point (1.62–79) Lucretius praises Epicurus (referred to in 1.66 as *Graius homo* and not by name) and his accomplishments—especially his ability to free mankind from the oppression of religion.²¹ In contrast to others, Epicurus was not deterred by the reputation and stories of the gods or frightened by natural phenomena, but rather was provoked to be the first to break open the barred doors of nature.

*Humana ante oculos foede cum vita iaceret
in terris oppressa gravi sub religione,
quae caput a caeli regionibus ostendebat
horribili super aspectu mortalibus instans,
primum Graius homo mortalis tollere contra
est oculos ausus primusque obsistere contra,
quem neque fama deum nec fulmina nec minitanti
murmure compressit caelum, sed eo magis acrem
inritat animi virtutem, effringere ut arcta
naturae primus portarum claustra cupiret. (62–71)*

[While the human race (*vita*) before all eyes lay foully oppressed by grievous religion, who showed her head in all regions of the sky and glowered at mortals from above with her horrible appearance, a Greek man for the first time

¹⁹ Memmius was a prominent and well read, political figure whose career was marked by a combination of successes, frustrations, and setbacks. He was tribune in 66 B.C., praetor in 58 B.C., *propraetor* (serving as governor of Bithynia) in 57 B.C., an unsuccessful candidate for consul in 54, and ultimately exiled because of a conviction for bribery. See esp. J. Godwin in Latham 1994: 251–254; Brown 1984: xvi–xvii; and Johnson 2000: 6–11.

²⁰ See comments of Bailey 1947, with regard to 1.61, *corpora prima*.

²¹ Lucretius includes similar eulogies for Epicurus in the proems of Books 3 (1–30), 5 (1–54), and 6 (1–42), and each of the passages identifies and focuses attention on particular aspects of Epicurus’ achievements and significance. Lucretius refers to Epicurus by name in each of these proems. For the proems and Epicurus’ place in them, see esp. Barra 1953: 63–96; Cox 1971: 1–16, esp. 6–9; Clay 1983: esp. 96–97; Edelstein 1940: 78–90; Farrington 1965: 19–34; Furley 1989: 172–182, esp. 182 = Furley 1979: 55–64, esp. 64; Gale 1993–1994: 1–17; Gale 2000: esp. 27–28; Lenaghan 1967: 221–251, esp. 237–38; Minadeo 1965: 444–61, esp. 453–55; Nussbaum 1994: esp. 215 and 273–274; Sedley 1998: esp. 29–30; Segal 1989: 193–212, esp. 204; Segal 1990: esp. 76–81, 155, 163, 180–86, and 218–219; and Wormell 1965: 35–68, esp. 38–42. For imagery of 1.62–79, see West 1994: 57–63.

dared to raise mortal eyes in opposition and was the first to take a stand in defiance. Neither the fame of the gods, nor lightning flashes, nor the heaven with its threatening murmur held him back, but rather these things goaded even more the fierce strength of his mind so that he was the first to desire to shatter the tightly closed bars of Nature's gates.]²²

With the force of his mind and spirit, Epicurus proceeded beyond the flaming walls of the world and explored the entire universe. As a victor, he brings back to us the knowledge of the limit and scope of the world and the pattern that lies behind it. Through his accomplishments, we are freed from the restrictions imposed by religion, and his victory makes us equal to heaven and the world represented by it.

*ergo vivida vis animi pervicit, et extra
processit longe flammantia moenia mundi²³
atque omne immensum peragravit mente animoque,
unde refert nobis victor quid possit oriri,
quid nequeat, finita potestas denique cuique
qua nam sit ratione atque alte terminus haerens.
quare religio pedibus subiecta vicissim
obteritur, nos aequat victoria caelo. (72–79)*

[Therefore the lively force of his mind prevailed, and he proceeded far beyond the flaming walls of the world and with his mind and spirit passed through the entire universe. From here victoriously he brings back to us what is able to come forth, what cannot, and with what law at last there exists a limited power and deeply clinging limit for each thing. Therefore religion is crushed under foot, and his victory makes us equal to heaven.]

In the *Journal* Thoreau indicated that he was particularly fascinated (i.e., "...was struck only...") by lines 72–73, which in his mind referred to Prometheus. Lucretius, however, is actually referring to Epicurus and his achievements, but, as we will discuss later, aspects of Lucretius' description seem to have led Thoreau to conclude that the passage dealt with Prometheus. At this point I would like to underscore 1) what Lucretius lists as Epicurus' essential qualities and accomplishments, and 2) that he makes specific references to flames, fire, and thunder to emphasize the deeds 1.62–79):

Praise of Epicurus

1. Savior; benefactor of humans: responsible for advancement of humans (66–67)
2. Liberator: freed mankind from the oppression of religion (66–67, 75–79)

²² The text is that of Smith 1982; the English translations are my own.

²³ In his *Journal* for April 23, 1856, Thoreau specifically cited lines 72–73: *vivida vis animi-- -- extra / Processit longe flammantia moenia mundi*. *Manuscript Volume 21*, p. 21, available online: http://www.library.ucsb.edu/thoreau/writings_journals_pdfs/J11f1-f3.pdf (8 August 2011); also Torrey 1906: 312; online: http://www.walden.org/Library/The_Writings_of_Henry_David_Thoreau:_The_Digital_Collection/Journal (8 August 2011).

3. Victor: through the force of mind and spirit proceeded beyond flaming walls of the world, explored the entire universe, and brought back knowledge of the limit and scope of the world and the pattern behind it (72–77)
4. Defiant: opposed the established order; free thinker (62–67)
5. Intellectual and clever: intellectual (vs. physical) accomplishment (69–74)
6. Flames; fire; thunder (68–72, 72–74)

In the lines that follow (1.80 ff.) Lucretius encourages Memmius and emphasizes that the philosophy of Epicurus is the true path to understanding and stands in marked contrast to the crimes and lies associated with religion. As an example of the wrongs done in the name of religion, Lucretius gives a horrifying description of the death of Iphigenia at the hands of her father Agamemnon (84–101). Similarly he describes how priests duplicitously frighten and distract us with idle fears of death, and poets (even great ones like Ennius) present us with illogical and fanciful descriptions of the after-life and the nature of soul (102–135). Lucretius first assures Memmius that only the true appearance and intrinsic pattern of Nature (*naturae species ratioque*, 148) can dispel the terrors and darkness of the mind and then begins his discussion of the fundamental definitions of (Epicurus') atomic theory. The whole section ranges from 146–920, but according to his *Journal* entry, Thoreau ended his reading at approximately line 200.

In the fifty or so lines from this section that Thoreau read, Lucretius covers a limited number of details regarding the atomic world. First and foremost, he establishes the most fundamental principal that “nothing by divine influence is ever born from nothing” (*nullam rem e nihilo gigni divinitus umquam*, 150). Fear, however, paralyzes mortals because they are not able to explain the causes of natural phenomena; out of ignorance men attribute the processes of the world to divine action (151–154). As he describes it, all forms of life at appropriate times come forth and unfold from their own appropriate seeds of creation without divine intervention: *...unde queat res quaeque creari/et quo quaeque modo fiant opera sine divom*, 157–8. [...how various things are created and made without the attention of the gods.] In the lines that follow (159–214), Lucretius gives a series of six proofs that nothing can be produced from nothing and discusses reproduction and how specific types of life arise from specific types of generative material.²⁴

Although there is much in the first 200 (or so) lines of the *De Rerum Natura* that might have interested Thoreau, he did not engage himself with Lucretius' text in the same way that he did Columella's *De Re Rustica*, various authors Columella quotes, or some of the texts Curtius mentioned in his translation. In Columella Thoreau found a mine of information about the Roman agricultural process and seemed enamored with Columella's perspective on it. Although many of the details in the opening lines of Lucretius' text (e.g., the six proofs that nothing can be produced from nothing and

²⁴ An outline of Lucretius' atomic theory and six proofs that “nothing can be born from nothing” and that generative seeds exist with the result that: 1) every form of life comes forth from its own seed and with its own generic character, 159–173; 2) forms of life come forth at their proper time, 174–183; 3) all things grow gradually from their own seed and retain their particular character; 4) matter must be composed of bodies that are common to all (*multis communia corpora rebus*), 192–198; 5) specific generative material determines the character and limit of each form of life, 199–207; and 6) cultivation of the land would be unnecessary if there were not generative seeds lying in the earth, 208–214.

discussion on generative elements) can be applied to the world of agriculture, Lucretius is by no means an agricultural writer and does not pursue his topic in a fashion similar to that of Columella. When Lucretius discusses the natural world and specific agricultural details, it is to demonstrate or prove a philosophical principle or to shed light via analogy on the invisible world of atoms. Whereas Thoreau quoted and commented upon Columella's text at great length, his comments on Lucretius are very brief, yet still quite suggestive and striking. Rather than dwelling on a great number of individual details, Thoreau instead focused on the overall intellectual significance of the achievements of the *Graius homo* and their profound and liberating effects on the bondage caused by human ignorance. Regarding the first 200 lines of the *De Rerum Natura*, Thoreau noted that he was struck only by those referring to Prometheus. By this succinct statement Thoreau associates Prometheus with the *Graius homo* and his achievements.

Thoreau's translation of the *Prometheus Bound* attests to his familiarity with the myth of Prometheus, and his belief that 1.72–73 (and surrounding lines) of the *De Rerum Natura* referred to Prometheus is likely based on specific thematic and verbal cues in Lucretius' text that reminded him of Aeschylus' play.²⁵ Lucretius' description of Epicurus' accomplishments probably reminded Thoreau of those of Prometheus, especially those that emphasize his support of and benevolence toward humans; while his references to mental powers, the securing of victory, emancipation from repressive religion, and especially fire may have provided the specific prompts that led Thoreau to his conclusions. Although there is a limited range of action depicted in the *Prometheus Bound*, the play is imagistically rich, is thematically bold and suggestive, and presents a series of memorable scenes that highlight Prometheus' accomplishments. The play begins with Prometheus being chained to a mountain by Kratos, Bia, and Hephaistus at the order of Zeus in punishment for stealing fire and giving it to mortals. During the course of the play Prometheus is visited by a number of different individuals—a chorus of Oceanids, Oceanus himself, Io, and finally the god Hermes, who, like the figures Kratos and Bia, is only too eager to do Zeus' will and see Prometheus punished for his defiance and mortal loving ways. Through his interaction and dialogue with these characters, we learn how the antagonism of Zeus and Prometheus arose, the range of accomplishments claimed by Prometheus or attributed to him, and how Prometheus and Zeus will eventually be reconciled.

A comparison of the *Graius homo* (i.e., Epicurus) from 1.62–79 of Lucretius' *De Rerum Natura* and Prometheus from Aeschylus' *Prometheus Bound* is presented in two tables. The first table (below) presents the points of comparison in an abbreviated

²⁵ Thoreau refers to Prometheus or details of his story on several occasions, e.g., "Ktaadn." In Thoreau 1906: 70–71, available online:

<http://www.walden.org/documents/file/Library/Thoreau/writings/Writings1906/03Maine/Ktaadn.pdf> (25 July 2010). See Seybold 1951:35; Van Anglen 1986: 160–164 and 186–190; and Thoreau 1906: *Writings* III. 70; *Writings* VII. 116–117; *Writings* V. 156; *Writings* I. 67; *Writings*. VIII. 390. Seybold also notes that Thoreau on occasion compared Prometheus to Christ. For a comparison of Epicurus and Christ, see Cox 1971. Although issues of authenticity surround the play, Thoreau was unaware of these matters and assumed without question that the play was by Aeschylus; see esp. Griffith 1977. The other key Greek source for the Prometheus story is Hesiod's treatment of the myth in the *Theogony* (521–616) and the *Works and Days* (42–89). On the Prometheus myth, see esp. Griffith 1983: 1–2; and Havelock 1950 (reissued 1968). Thoreau gives no explicit indication of being familiar with Hesiod's versions; see Seybold 1951: 71.

format; the second (Appendix B) presents specific lines from both works to demonstrate the comparison.²⁶

Graius homo (Epicurus) and Prometheus.

Essential qualities and accomplishments; recurring imagery: flames, fire, and thunder

***Graius homo* (Epicurus): DRN 1.62–79**

- Savior and liberator; human benefactor; responsible for advancement of humans, 66–67, 75–79
- Defiant; opposes the established order; free thinker, 62–67
- Intellectual and clever; victor through intellectual accomplishments, 69–74; with force of mind and spirit he proceeded beyond flaming walls of the world and explored the entire universe; as victor, he brought back knowledge of the limit and scope of the world and pattern behind it, 75–79
- Recurring imagery: flames, fire, and thunder, 68–72, 72–74

Prometheus, *Prometheus Bound*

- Savior and liberator; benefactor of humans; responsible for advancement of humans; fire as a gift and means of progress, 7–8, 107–111, 236–238, 254–256, 439–506 (esp. 496–501 and 505–506), 612
- Defiant; opposes establishment (esp. Zeus); free thinker, 8–11, 236–238, 945–1093
- Intellectual and clever; victor via intellectual accomplishments, 107–111, 439–506. N.B. gifts of architecture, carpentry, meteorology, astronomy, letters and numbers, animal husbandry, sailing, medicine, sacrificial ritual, metallurgy; Prometheus to prevail vs. Zeus; mortals can fend for themselves
- Recurring imagery: flames, fire, and thunder, 358–362, 367–372, 496–501; N.B. esp. select lines from 945–1093, where Prometheus promises to endure a cataclysmic event from Zeus (thunder, lightning, earthquake, etc.) and to prevail, 992, 1016–1018, 1043–1045, and 1082–1084

In essence, both Prometheus and the *Graius homo* (i.e., Epicurus) of the *De Rerum Natura* were the benefactors and saviors of mortals and were responsible for the human intellectual advancement that changed the very dynamics between the gods and mortals. Both figures showed themselves to be defiant and willing to oppose the established divine order or the religious machinery associated with the worship of the gods. Both Prometheus and the *Graius homo* accomplished their deeds through their intellectual ability and cleverness. Likewise, neither figure was frightened by various natural

²⁶ The Greek text Thoreau used was that of Schaefer 1819; on this text see Van Anglen 1986: 160–164 and 235. The text cited in the table is that of Smyth 1926 and available online: <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3atext%3a1999.01.0009> (7 August 2011).

phenomena, namely the lightning shaft and threatening thunder, and each was responsible for providing mortals with scientific knowledge of the natural world.

In his comments on the *De Rerum Natura*, Thoreau does not show an inclination to explore how Lucretius' discussion could be applied to what he was currently reading and observing in April 1856—namely, the nuts and bolts of agriculture and annual rhythms of the natural world. For example, although Thoreau might have found relevance in Lucretius' discussion of reproduction and generative material in the six proofs that “nothing can be produced from nothing” (159 ff.), he made no comments to this effect. Instead, Thoreau's response to Lucretius' text seems to have worked in a different way. Rather than seeing a direct connection to the agricultural details in Columella or to his own observations on the emerging spring, Thoreau seems to have been struck by the heroic dimensions of Lucretius' description of the *Graius homo* and perhaps also the rhetorical flourish of at least two of the lines (1.72–73). Working from this general perspective, the nature of the accomplishments of the *Graius homo* and the way in which they were described may have reasonably led Thoreau to conclude that Lucretius was dealing with Prometheus.

Although there are many reasons why Thoreau might have been attracted to Lucretius, e.g., the epic qualities of his poetry, his intellectual boldness, and his enlightened and inspiring empiricism, there is not sound evidence that he ever became particularly enamored with the *De Rerum Natura* and its philosophical, scientific, and poetical strengths. Nevertheless, in the *Journal* for April 26, 1856, Thoreau noted that he had read the opening two hundred lines and made an interesting and intriguing observation. As we pointed out at the outset, commentators on Thoreau have not up to this point noted or recognized that Thoreau's description of lines 72–73 of Book 1 of the *De Rerum Natura* as referring to Prometheus is not literally correct. In our discussion we have addressed this oversight and offered an explanation for Thoreau's comment. That is to say, Lucretius' description of the *Graius homo* in the larger context of the first 200 lines of the *De Rerum Natura* may have reminded Thoreau of familiar themes, verbal cues, and imagery patterns from a text he knew quite well—i.e., Aeschylus' *Prometheus Bound*. In this light Thoreau's identification of the *Graius homo* as Prometheus is quite understandable and should prompt us to consider further the ways in which the accomplishments of Epicurus and Prometheus are similar to and different from one another.²⁷

Prof. Robert A. Seelinger
Westminster College
501 Westminster Avenue, Fulton, MO 65251, USA
E-mail: Robert.Seelinger@westminster-mo.edu

²⁷ I would like to express my thanks to Prof. Cathy Callaway, Prof. Pamela Draper, the anonymous reviewers, and the editors of *Studia Humaniora Tartuensia* for their judicious comments and suggestions for revision.

WORKS CITED

- Agassiz, L.; Gould, A. (1848) *Principles of Zoology*. Boston.
- Anonymous editor (1595) *Cato, Marcus Porcius, Columella, Varro, and Palladius. Rei rusticae auctores latini veteres*. Heidelberg.
- Atkinson, B. (ed.) (2000) *The Essential Writings of Ralph Waldo Emerson*. New York.
- Bailey, C. (ed.) (1947) *T. Lucreti Cari De Rerum Natura Libri Sex*, Vol. II. Oxford.
- Barra, G. (1953) 'Sul proemio primo di Lucrezio.' — *Annali della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia, dell'Università di Napoli* 3, 63–96.
- Bentley, R.; Wakefield, G. (eds.) (1796–1797) *Titus Carus Lucretius, De Rerum Natura*. London.
- Berger, M. (2000) *Thoreau's Late Career and "The Dispersion of Seeds": The Saunterer's Synoptic Vision*. Rochester.
- Brown, P. M. (1984) *Lucretius, De Rerum Natura I*. Bristol.
- Buell, L. (1995) *The Environmental Imagination: Thoreau, Nature Writing, and the Formation of American Culture*. Cambridge, MA.
- Cameron, K. (1945) *Emerson the Essayist*, 2 vols. Raleigh.
- Cameron, K. (1958) *The Transcendentalists and Minerva: Cultural Backgrounds of the American Renaissance with Fresh Discoveries in the Intellectual Climate of Emerson, Alcott and Thoreau*. Vol. 2. Hartford.
- Cameron, K. (1975) *Young Thoreau and the Classics: A Review*. Hartford.
- Clay, D. (1983) *Lucretius and Epicurus*. Ithaca and London.
- Cox, A. S. (1971) 'Lucretius and His Message, A Study in the Prologues of the *De Rerum Natura*.' — *Greece and Rome*, 2nd ser., 18, 1–16.
- Creech, T. (ed.) (1712) *Titus Carus Lucretius, De Rerum Natura*. London.
- Creech, T. (ed.) (1717) *Titus Carus Lucretius, De Rerum Natura*. London.
- Curtius, M. C. (transl./ed.) (1745) *L. Junius Moderatus Columella of Husbandry, in Twelve Books: and his Book concerning Trees*. London.
- Darwin, C. (1859) *On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection, or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life*. London.
- Edelstein, L. (1940) 'Primum Graius Homo.' — *TAPA* 71, 78–90.
- Emerson, R. W. (1862) 'Thoreau.' — *The Atlantic Monthly*, Vol. 10, no. 58; also in Atkinson, B. (ed.) (2000), *The Essential Writings of Ralph Waldo Emerson*. New York, 809–825.
- Farrington, B. (1965) 'Form and Purpose in the *De Rerum Natura*.' — Dudley, D. R. (ed.), *Lucretius*. London, 19–34.
- Fayus, M. (ed.) (1680) *Titus Carus Lucretius, De Rerum Natura*. Paris.
- Foerster, N. (1917) 'The Intellectual Heritage of Thoreau.' — *Texas Review* 2, 192–212; also in Ruland, R. (1968), *Twentieth Century Interpretations of Walden*. Englewood Cliffs, 34–49.
- Furley, D. (1989) 'Variations on Themes from Empedocles in Lucretius' Proem.' — Furley, D., *Cosmic Problems: Essays on Greek and Roman Philosophy of Nature*. Cambridge, 172–182; orig. in *Bulletin of the [London] Institute of Classical Studies* 17 (1979), 55–64.
- Gale, M. (1993–1994) 'The Proems of the *De Rerum Natura*.' — *PCPhS* 40, 1–17.
- Gale, M. (2000) *Lucretius and the Didactic Epic*. London.

- Gohdes, C. (1928) 'Henry Thoreau, Bachelor of Arts.' — *CJ* 23, 323–336.
- Gray, A. (1848) *A manual of the botany of the northern United States, from New England to Wisconsin and south to Ohio and Pennsylvania inclusive (the mosses and liverworts by Wm. S. Sullivant), arranged according to the natural system.* Boston.
- Griffith, M. (1977) *The Authenticity of Prometheus Bound.* Cambridge.
- Griffith, M. (ed.) (1983) *Aeschylus, Prometheus Bound.* Cambridge.
- Havelock, E. A. (1950) *Prometheus.* Seattle. (Reissued 1968.)
- Haverkamp, S.; Lamkin, D.; Giffen, H. et al. (eds.) (1725) *Titus Carus Lucretius, De Rerum Natura.* Leiden.
- Humboldt, A. von (1849) *Aspects of Nature.* Philadelphia.
- Humboldt, A. von (1849) *Cosmos: A Sketch of A Physical Description of the Universe.* London.
- Johnson, W. R. (2000) *Lucretius and the Modern World.* London.
- Latham, R. E. (transl.) (1994) *Lucretius, On the Nature of the Universe,* rev. by J. Godwin. London.
- Lenaghan, L. (1967) 'Lucretius 1.921–50.' — *TAPA* 98, 221–251.
- Leonard, W. E.; Smith, S. B. (eds.) (1942) *Titus Lucretius Carus, De Rerum Natura: Libri Sex.* Madison.
- Milder, R. (1995) *Reimagining Thoreau.* New York.
- Minadeo, R. (1965) 'The Formal Design of the *De Rerum Natura.*' — *Arion* 4, 444–61.
- Nussbaum, M. (1994) *The Therapy of Desire: Theory and Practice in Hellenistic Ethics.* Princeton.
- Peirce, B. (1830) *A Catalogue of the Library of Harvard University in Cambridge, Massachusetts.* Cambridge, MA.
- Priestman, M. (2007) 'Lucretius in Romantic and Victorian Britain.' — Gillespie, S.; Hardie, P. (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Lucretius.* Cambridge, 289–305.
- Richardson, R. (1986) *Henry Thoreau, A Life of the Mind.* Berkeley; London.
- Robinson, D. (2004) *Natural Life, Thoreau's Worldly Transcendentalism.* Ithaca; London.
- Ruland, R. (1968) *Twentieth Century Interpretations of Walden.* Englewood Cliffs.
- Sanborn, F. B. (1917) *The Life of Henry David Thoreau.* Boston.
- Sattelmeyer, R. (1988) *Thoreau's Reading: A Study in Intellectual History.* Princeton.
- Schaefer, G. H. (ed.) (1819) *Aeschylus, Tragoediae.* Leipzig.
- Sedley, D. (1998) *Lucretius and the Transformation of Greek Wisdom.* Cambridge.
- Segal, C. (1989) 'Poetic Immortality and the Fear of Death: The Second Proem of the *De Rerum Natura.*' — *HSCP* 92, 193–212.
- Segal, C. (1990) *Lucretius on Death and Anxiety.* Princeton.
- Seybold, E. (1951) *Thoreau, The Quest and the Classics.* (Yale Studies in English; 116.) New Haven. (Reissued 1969.)
- Shurr, W. E. (1978) 'Emerson and Lucretius on Nature: Questions of Method and Matter.' — *The American Transcendental Quarterly* 38, 153–165.
- Smith, M. F. (1982) *Lucretius, De Rerum Natura,* 2nd edition. Cambridge, MA; London.
- Smyth, H. W. (1926) *Aeschylus, Suppliant Maidens, Persians, Prometheus, Seven Against Thebes.* Cambridge, MA and London. Online: 7 August 2011.
<http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3atext%3a1999.01.0009>.
- Thoreau, H. D. (1840) 'Aulus Persius Flaccus.' — *The Dial* 1 (July), 117–121.
- Thoreau, H. D. (1856–1857) *Journal 11: 1856–1857.* Online Journal Transcripts, Manuscript Volume 21 (April 23 – September 6, 1856). Online: 8 August 2011.

- http://www.library.ucsb.edu/thoreau/writings_journals_pdfs/J11f1-f3.pdf;
http://www.walden.org/Library/The_Writings_of_Henry_David_Thoreau:_The_Digital_Collection/Journal. Online: 8 August 2011.
- Thoreau, H. D. (1906) *The Writings of Henry David Thoreau*. Ed. B. Torrey. Boston.
Online: 8 August 2011.
http://www.walden.org/Library/The_Writings_of_Henry_David_Thoreau:_The_Digital_Collection/The_Writings_of_Henry_David_Thoreau_%281906%29
- Thoreau, H. D. (1993) *Faith in a Seed, The Dispersion of Seeds and Other Late Natural History Writings*. Ed. B. Dean. Washington, D.C.; Covelo.
- Turner, F. M. (1993) 'Ancient materialism and modern science: Lucretius among the Victorians.' — Turner, F. M., *Contesting Cultural Authority: Essays in Victorian Intellectual Life*. Cambridge, 262–283.
- Utley, F. (1938) 'Thoreau and Columella: A Study in Reading Habits.' — *The New England Quarterly* 11, 171–180.
- Van Anglen, K. P. (1986) *The Writings of Thoreau: Translations*. Princeton.
- Walls, L. D. (1995) *Seeing New Worlds, Henry David Thoreau and Nineteenth-Century Natural Science*. Madison.
- Walls, L. D. (2000) 'Believing in Nature: Wilderness and Wildness in Thoreauvian Science.' — Schneider, R. (ed.), *Thoreau's Sense of Place, Essays in American Environmental Writing*. Iowa City, 15–27.
- West, D. (1994) *The Imagery and Poetry of Lucretius*. Norman.
- Wormell, D. E. (1965) 'The Personal World of Lucretius.' — Dudley, D. R. (ed.), *Lucretius*. London, 35–68.

Appendix A: Thoreau's engagement with the texts of Columella and Palladius as reflected in the *Journal* entries from April 20 – May 11, 1856

As reflected by the *Journal*, Thoreau's days were by no means totally uniform. For example, some days he seems to have spent more time out of doors tracking the emergence of spring (e.g., April 25, May 4); on some days he seems to have been mostly engaged with reading and writing (e.g., April 20, April 26), and on other days he seems to have been intensely involved with a combination of activities—observing the world around him and literary matters (e.g., April 22 and May 7). The *Journal* entries also vary in length from very short notices (e.g., May 2, 3, and 6) to long and detailed commentary (e.g., April 26, May 7). On some days Thoreau made or preserved no entries (April 21; May 6, 8, and 9). During this block of time (i.e., April 20 – May 7, 1856), Thoreau makes extensive comments on Columella's *De Re Rustica* on April 20, 22, 23, 26, and May 7; on May 7 Thoreau seems to have begun Palladius' *Opus Agriculturae* and made several detailed comments on this work on May 10 and 11. During this period Thoreau does not discuss at any length any author other than Columella and Palladius.

Thoreau seems to have begun reading Book 1 of Columella's *De Re Rustica* on April 20, during a span of days when Concord was experiencing heavy rainfall. In his preface to Book 1, Columella discusses various Greek and Roman writers on husbandry. Thoreau quotes extensively from Curtius' translation and also includes some of his comments regarding various writers, the preservation of their works, and their reliability. In Book 1.2–3, Columella discusses the location and physical qualities that are relevant and important for a successful farm. Thoreau quotes from both the Latin text and Curtius' translation and at one point even includes in Greek Columella's quote from Hesiod's *Works and Days* (348) concerning the importance of good neighbors (1.3). He also included Columella's quote from Vergil's *Georgics* (2.412–413), where advice is given to admire a large farm but to cultivate a small one (1.3).

There is no *Journal* entry for April 21, but on April 22 and 23 Thoreau gives a detailed description of what is happening out of doors (e.g., the rising of the river from the rain, the state of pollen and sap for various trees, the sound of a white-throated sparrow) and continues his commentary on Columella. On April 22 he focuses his attention on Columella's description of the layout of the villa (esp. 1.6) and on the selection and appointment of key workers and overseers for the farm (1.8). On this day Thoreau also began reading and commenting on Book 2 and notes how Columella's description of exhausted fields was relevant to some of the fields of Concord (2. 1). He also comments on and quotes the section that deals with the variety of soils and the clearing of "wild land" (2.2). On April 23 he continues his commentary on preparing an area for farming activities and discusses the appropriate ways to handle oxen for plowing (2.2–3). Thoreau seems to have spent much time out of doors on April 24 and 25, and in his journal entries for these days he concentrates on local events and what is unfolding in his local environment. He describes at length the state of flora and fauna at this point in the spring and also includes several anecdotes involving various neighbors, e.g., Warren Miles who found a mud turtle, David Minot who said that turtles ate his cucumbers, and a discussion involving his neighbor, Anne Karney, and his father regarding the shamrock and whether it grew locally. On these two days he makes no reference to Columella in the *Journal*.

Thoreau resumes his discussion of the *De Re Rustica* on April 26, and it is on this day that he indicated that he had read the first two hundred lines of the *De Rerum Natura*. Although he makes a few comments on what is happening locally, most of his attention is on Columella's text. After initially commenting on worm piles on his doorstep, he begins to address Columella's discussion of the variety of seeds (*de generibus seminum*, 2.6–7). As he has done previously, Thoreau quotes from both the Latin text and Curtius' translation. Thoreau was particularly fascinated by Columella's discussion of *farrago* (fodder) (2.7 and 2.10.25–26) and Curtius' commentary and etymological discussion of the word.

The main focus of 2.9 and 2.10 is on the nature of seeds and sowing, and Thoreau notes that Columella clearly appreciated the relationship between hardy plants and sturdy seeds (2.9). Thoreau also seems to have been intrigued by Columella's comments on *napus* and *rapum* (10.10.22; types of turnips), verbs for hoeing (2.12), and the variety of dung (2.13). At 2.16 Thoreau discusses the preparation and planting of a meadow (*pratium*), and as he has done previously, he quotes some of the Latin text and some of the English translation (2.16).

Thoreau interrupts his commentary on meadows with comments about his local environment. In particular, he notes that the white cedar that he had collected on April 23 is just now shedding its pollen and may do so in the swamp on the next day. In turn, the larch at Monroe's farm will apparently shed its pollen tomorrow, and the white birch, which he tapped previously, is partially covered with pink froth. Immediately following his comments on the state of his local environment, Thoreau noted that he had hastily read the first 200 lines of Lucretius' *De Rerum Natura*.

After his brief comments regarding the *De Rerum Natura*, Thoreau returns to Columella 2.17 and the care of a *pratium*—clearing, planting, mowing, etc. From 2.18 Thoreau includes in both Latin and English translation details regarding haying and comments that Columella's account is applicable to his local environment. Thoreau seems to have been fascinated by Columella's discussion of threshing and reaping via scythes and sickles (2.19–20) and Curtius' comments on threshing and the etymology of the word *merga*. At 2.21 Columella discusses the various activities which are permitted on holidays and under what conditions. Thoreau quotes both the Latin and English translation for 2.21.3–4 and seems to have been particularly intrigued and amused by the phrase *...nisi prius catulo feceris* ("...unless you have first sacrificed a puppy"), which is a *sine qua non* for performing what is permissible on holy days. Thoreau relates a personal anecdote in response to this passage: "This reminds me of my bringing home an apple tree on my shoulder one Sunday--& meeting the stream of meeting-goers who seemed greatly outraged—but they did not know whether I set it out or not that day—or but that I sacrificed a puppy if I did."²⁸ Columella also included a comment of Cato's to the effect that mules, horses, and asses never had holidays (2.21.5–6), to which Thoreau comments that "in this country they must drag their masters to meeting at least."

²⁸ Manuscript Volume 21, p. 24, available online: available online: http://www.library.ucsb.edu/thoreau/writings_journals_pdfs/J11f1.pdf (7 August 2011); also Torrey 1906: 312; available online: <http://www.walden.org/institute/thoreau/writings/Writings1906/14Journal08/Journal08.htm>. (7 August 2011).

Thoreau initially began Book 3 (regarding the care of trees and grape vines), but jumped quickly ahead to Book 5, for the discussion on how land was divided and organized according to *iugera*. He quotes or paraphrases at length Curtius' chart of English equivalents for the divisions of the *iugerum*, and this section must have been particularly interesting to Thoreau in light of his personal experience as a surveyor. Thoreau also treats some of Columella's discussion of various trees in sections 5.6, 5.10, and 5.12. His last entry for April 26 pertains to the preface of Book 6, where Columella notes that "...the ox ought to be honored above all other cattle," and Thoreau ends with a Latin quote from this section *De Re Rustica*.

His reading of Columella continued through May 7, and on the basis of the *Journal* entries Thoreau was most interested in Book 1, Book 2, the beginning of Book 3, the division of land and types of trees in Book 5, the preface of Book 6 regarding oxen, the section on dogs in Book 7, the types of hens and doves in Book 8, bees in Book 9, and cucumbers and melons (*cucurbita* and *cucumis*) in Book 11. In the course of reading Columella's account, Thoreau also read excerpts from a number of other authors. Some of these authors are quoted by Columella (e.g., Cato, Varro, Vergil), and others are mentioned and cited by the translator Curtius (e.g., Pliny the Elder).

On May 7, Thoreau also seems to have turned his attention to Palladius' *Opus Agriculturae*, which was included in Curtius' translation. There are no entries in the *Journal* for May 8 and 9. On May 10 and 11, Thoreau was principally concerned with the text of Palladius, but on May 11 twice mentions views of both Palladius and Columella—once regarding avoiding settlements in low valleys and swamps and once on keeping of bees. Although Thoreau seems to have spent at least parts of two (or perhaps three) days reading Palladius' text, his quotes and comments on this text are not very extensive as compared to those on Columella. On May 10 he quotes or cites Palladius in a brief and anecdotal manner on the risks of renting a farm or field to a neighbor, the optimum number of eggs for a hen during a waxing moon, the productivity of white geese, and how to protect bees by frightening away birds. On May 11 he focuses attention on Palladius' comments on beekeeping and locating the source of water and mentions in passing brief anecdotes on the preservation of apples and the quality of chestnut wood. Most of Thoreau's entries on Palladius on May 11 consist of quotes in Latin with little commentary on the text itself and significance. There are no further references to either Columella or Palladius after May 11.

Appendix B

Characteristic; quality	Aeschylus, <i>Prometheus Bound</i>	Thoreau's Translation of <i>Prometheus Bound</i>	Lucretius, <i>De Rerum Natura</i>
<p>Savior; benefactor of humans/mortals; responsible for advancement of humans/mortals; fire as a gift and means of advancement</p>	<p>τὸ σὸν γὰρ ἄνθος, παντέχνου πυρὸς σέλας, θνητοῖσι κλέψας ὤπασεν. 7–8</p> <p>...θνητοῖς γὰρ γέρα πορῶν ἀνάγκαις ταῖσδ' ἐνέζευγμαι τάλας. ναρθηκοπλήρωτον δὲ θηρῶμαι πυρὸς πηγὴν κλοπαίαν, ἢ διδάσκαλος τέχνης πάσης βροτοῖς πέφηνε καὶ μέγας πόρος. 107–111</p> <p>...ἀλλ' αἰστώσας γένος τὸ πᾶν ἔχρηζεν ἄλλο φιτύσαι νέον. καὶ τοῖσιν οὐδεὶς ἀντέβαινε πλὴν ἐμοῦ. ἐγὼ δ' ἐτόλμησ' ἐξελυσάμην βροτούς τὸ μὴ διαρραισθέντας εἰς Ἄϊδου μολεῖν. 236–238</p> <p>Προμηθεύς πρὸς τοιοδὲ μέντοι πῦρ ἐγὼ σφιν ὤπασα. Χορός καὶ νῦν φλογωπὸν πῦρ ἔχουσ' ἐφήμεροι; Προμηθεύς ἀφ' οὗ γε πολλὰς ἐκμαθήσονται τέχνας. 254–56</p> <p>Prometheus' gifts to mortals—including architecture and carpentry, knowledge of the seasons and patterns of nature, astronomy, numbers and letters, animal husbandry, sailing, medicine, prophecy, sacrifice/sacrificial ritual, and metallurgy. 439–506. See esp.</p> <p>κνίσθη τε κῶλα συγκαλυπτὰ καὶ μακρὰν ὀσφῦν πυρώσας δυστέκμαρτον ἐς τέχνην ᾧδωσα θνητούς, καὶ φλογωπὰ σήματα ἐξωμμάτωσα, πρόσθεν ὄντ' ἐπάργεμα. τοιαῦτα μὲν δὴ ταῦτ' ἐνερθε δὲ χθονὸς κεκρυμμέν', ἀνθρώποισιν ὠφελήματα...496–501</p>	<p>For thy flower, the splendor of fire useful in all arts, Stealing, he bestowed on mortals;</p> <p>...for a gift to mortals Giving, I wretched have been yoked to these necessities; Within a hollow reed by stealth I carry off fire's Stolen source, which seemed the teacher Of all art to mortals, and a great resource.</p> <p>...but of unhappy mortals account Had none; but blotting out the race Entire, wished to create another new. And these things none opposed but I, But I adventured; I rescued mortals From going destroyed to Hades.</p> <p>PR. Beside these, too, I bestowed on them fire. CH. And have mortals flamy fire? PR. From which indeed they will learn many arts.</p> <p>And the limbs concealed in fat; and the long Flank burning, to an art hard to be guessed I showed the way to mortals; and flammeous signs Explained, before obscure. Such indeed these; and under ground Concealed the helps to men...</p>	<p>primum Graius homo mortalis tollere contra est oculos ausus primusque obsistere contra. 66–67</p> <p>Unde refert nobis victor quid posit oriri, Quid nequeat, finita potesta denique cuique Qua nam si ratione atque alte terminus haerens. Quare religio pedibus subiecta vicissim Opteritur, nos aequat victoria caelo 75–79</p>

Characteristic; quality	Aeschylus, <i>Prometheus Bound</i>	Thoreau's Translation of <i>Prometheus Bound</i>	Lucretius, <i>De Rerum Natura</i>
	<p>βραχεῖ δὲ μύθῳ πάντα συλλήβδην μάθε, πάσαι τέχναι βροτοῖσιν ἐκ Προμηθέως. 505–506</p> <p>πυρὸς βροτοῖς δοτῆρ' ὄρας Προμηθεά, 612</p>	<p>None, I well know, not wishing in vain to boast. But learn all in one word, All arts to mortals from Prometheus.</p> <p>Thou seest the giver of fire to men, /Prometheus").</p>	
Defiance; opposition to establishment; free thinker	<p>...τοιᾷσδέ τοι ἀμαρτίας σφε δεῖ θεοῖς δοῦναι δίκην, ὡς ἂν διδαχθῆ τὴν Διὸς τυραννίδα στέργειν, φιλανθρώπου δὲ παύεσθαι τρόπου. 8–11</p> <p>...ἀλλ' αἰστώσας γένος τὸ πᾶν ἔχρηζεν ἄλλο φιλῦσαι νέον. καὶ τοῖσιν οὐδεὶς ἀντέβαινε πλὴν ἐμοῦ. ἐγὼ δ' ἐτόλμησ'· ἐξελυσάμην βροτοῦς τὸ μὴ διαρραισθέντας εἰς Ἄιδου μολεῖν. 236–238</p> <p>See esp. interaction between Prometheus and Hermes where Prometheus indicates that he prepared to endure whatever may come from Zeus and will ultimately prevail—lightning, various cataclysmic events, etc. 945–1093</p>	<p>...and for such A crime 't is fit he should give satisfaction to the gods; That he may learn the tyranny of Zeus To love, and cease from his man-loving ways.</p> <p>...but blotting out the race Entire, wished to create another new. And these things none opposed but I, But I adventured; I rescued mortals From going destroyed to Hades.</p>	<p>Humana ante oculos foede cum vita iaceret in terris oppressa gravi sub religione, quae caput a caeli regionibus ostendebat horribili super aspectu mortalibus instans, primum Graius homo mortalis tollere contra est oculos ausus primusque obsistere contra. 62–67</p>
Intellectual accomplishment; cleverness	<p>...θητοῖς γὰρ γέρα πορῶν ἀνάγκαις ταῖσδ' ἐνέζευγμαι τάλας. ναρθηκοπλήρωτον δὲ θηρώμαι πυρὸς πηγὴν κλοπαίαν, ἢ διδάσκαλος τέχνης πάσης βροτοῖς πέφηνε καὶ μέγας πόρος. 107–111</p> <p>See also esp. Prometheus' gifts to mortals— including architecture and carpentry, knowledge of the seasons and patterns of nature, astronomy, numbers and letters, animal husbandry, sailing, medicine, prophecy, sacrifice/sacrificial ritual, and metallurgy. 439–506.</p>	<p>...for a gift to mortals Giving, I wretched have been yoked to these necessities; Within a hollow reed by stealth I carry off fire's Stolen source, which seemed the teacher Of all art to mortals, and a great resource.</p>	<p>...sed eo magis acrem inritat animi virtutem, effringere ut arta naturae primus portarum claustra cupiret. ergo vivida vis animi pervicit, et extra processit longe flammantia moenia mundi atque omne immensum peragravit mente animoque, 69–74.</p>

Characteristic; quality	Aeschylus, <i>Prometheus Bound</i>	Thoreau's Translation of <i>Prometheus Bound</i>	Lucretius, <i>De Rerum Natura</i>
Recurring imagery: flames; fire; thunder as weapons and causes of fear	<p>ἀλλ' ἦλθεν αὐτῷ Ζηνὸς ἀγρυπνον βέλος, αταιβάτης κεραυνὸς ἐκπνέων φλόγα, ὃς αὐτὸν ἐξέπληξε τῶν ὑψηγῶρων κομπασμάτων. φρένας γὰρ εἰς αὐτὰς τυπεῖς ἔφειψαλώθη κάξεβροντήθη σθένος. 358–62</p> <p>κορυφαῖς δ' ἐν ἄκραις ἤμενος μυδροκυπεῖ Ἥφαιστος· ἐνθεν ἐκραγήσονται ποτε ποταμοὶ πυρὸς δάπτοντες ἀγρίαῖς γνάθοις τῆς καλλικάρπου Σικελίας λευροῦς γύας· τοιόνδε Τυφῶς ἐξαναζέσει χόλον θερμοῖς ἀπλάτου βέλεσι πυρπνόου ζάλης, καίπερ κεραυνῷ Ζηνὸς ἠνθρακωμένος. 367–72</p> <p>κνίσση τε κῶλα συγκαλυπτὰ καὶ μακρὰν ὄσφυν πυρώσας δυστέκμαρτον ἐς τέχνην ᾧδωσα θνητούς, καὶ φλογωπὰ σήματα ἐξωμμάτωσα, πρόσθεν ὄντ' ἐπάργεμα. τοιαῦτα μὲν δὴ ταῦτ' ἔνερθε δὲ χθονὸς κεκρυμμέν', ἀνθρώποισιν ὠφελήματα...496–501</p> <p>πρὸς ταῦτα ῥιπτέσθω μὲν αἰθαλοῦσσα φλόξ 992</p> <p>...πρῶτα μὲν γὰρ ὀκρίδα φάραγμα βροντῆ καὶ κεραυνία φλογὶ πατήρ σπαράξει τήνδε. 1016–1018</p> <p>πρὸς ταῦτ' ἐπ' ἐμοὶ ῥιπτέσθω μὲν πυρὸς ἀμφήκης βόστρυχος, αἰθὴρ δ' ἐρεθιζέσθω βροντῆ. 1043–1045</p> <p>βρυχία δ' ἤχῳ παραμυκᾶται βροντῆς, ἔλικες δ' ἐκλάμπουσι στεροπῆς ζάπυροι. 1082–1084</p>	<p>But there came to him Zeus' sleepless bolt, Descending thunder, breathing flame, Which struck him out from lofty Boastings. For struck to his very heart, His strength was scorched and thundered out.</p> <p>And on the topmost summit seated, Hephaistus Hammers the ignited mass, whence will burst out at length Rivers of fire, devouring with wild jaws Fair-fruited Sicily's smooth fields; Such rage will Typhon make boil over With hot discharges of insatiable fire-breathing tempest, Though by the bolt of Zeus burnt to a coal.</p> <p>And the limbs concealed in fat; and the long Flank burning, to an art hard to be guessed I showed the way to mortals; and flammeous signs Explained, before obscure. Such indeed these; and under ground Concealed the helps to men...</p> <p>Let there be hurled then flaming fire</p> <p>...for first this rugged Cliff with thunder and lightning flame The Father 'll rend...</p> <p>Therefore 'gainst me let there be hurled Fire's double-pointed curl, and air Be provoked with thunder</p> <p>And a hoarse sound of thunder Bellows near, and wreaths of lightning Flash out fiercely blazing.</p>	<p>quem neque fama deum nec fulmina nec minitanti murmure compressit caelum, sed eo magis acrem inritat animi virtutem, effringere ut arta naturae primus portarum claustra cupiret. 68–72</p> <p>...et extra processit longe flammantia moenia mundi atque omne immensum peragravit mente animoque. 72–74</p>