



'H Ololugwn - What Was It?

Samuel Grant Oliphant

Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association, Volume 47
(1916), 85-106.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0065-9711%281916%2947%3C85%3A%27O-WWI%3E2.0.CO%3B2-C>

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association is published by The Johns Hopkins University Press. Please contact the publisher for further permissions regarding the use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/jhup.html>.

Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association
©1916 American Philological Association

JSTOR and the JSTOR logo are trademarks of JSTOR, and are Registered in the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. For more information on JSTOR contact jstor-info@umich.edu.

©2003 JSTOR

VIII. — 'Η 'Ολολυγών — *What was It?*

BY PROFESSOR SAMUEL GRANT OLIPHANT

GROVE CITY COLLEGE

A SURVEY of the wide diversity of views that sundry men at divers times have held as to the identification of that elusive creature known as the ὀλολυγών reveals that we have in it one of those minor microbial cruces which are often of scarcely less interest than some of the greater ones that have for centuries baffled the wits of men.

In the monumental work of Dean Liddell we find the term defined as "*the croaking of the male frog*," and "an unknown animal, evidently named from its note; some take it for a small owl, others for the thrush, others again for the tree-frog." Still others have, as will appear later, defined it as "the night-ingle," "a creature like an earth-worm," "a small bird," "the proper name of a nymph," "urtica," "strix," "a foolish person," "a marsh creature," "a bird like the turtle-dove," etc. All these cannot be right unless the word is far more Protean than its limited occurrence warrants us in assuming.

The object of this paper is to trace the semantic history of the word and to show the essential unity underlying it in all instances. The writer can hardly hope that he has found every instance of the word in the extant literature. He has tried to do this so far as limited facilities allow, and having reduced chaos to order thus far, he is confident that no outlying instance of the word will be found which will not be readily adaptable to the results herein attained.

'Ολολυγών is in its origin an onomatopoeic name for the call of the male frog in the mating-season. This is shown by Aristotle (*H.A.* iv, 9, 5, p. 536 a 11): καὶ τὴν ὀλολυγὸν δὲ τὴν γιγνομένην ἐν τῷ ὕδατι οἱ βάτραχοι οἱ ἄρρενες ποιοῦσιν, ὅταν ἀνακαλῶνται τὰς θηλείας πρὸς τὴν ὀχέαν. . . . ποιεῖ δὲ τὴν ὀλολυγὸν, ὅταν ἰσοχειλῇ τὴν κάτω σιαγὸν ποιήσας ἐπὶ τῷ ὕδατι περιτείνῃ τὴν ἄνω. by Plutarch (*de Sol. Anim.* 982 E): οἱ δὲ βάτραχοι περὶ τὰς ὀχείας ἀνακλήσεσι χρῶνται, τὴν λεγομένην ποιοῦντες ὀλολυγὸν φωνήν, ἐρωτικὴν καὶ γαμήλιον

οὔσαν· and by Aelian (*N.A.* ix, 13): ἕγγας ἐρωτικὰς ἀνθρωποὶ φασιν εἶναι τινας, μίξεως δὲ ἀφροδισίου σύνθημα ὁ βάτραχος ἀφίησι πρὸς τὴν θήλειαν βοήν τινα, ὡς ἐραστὴς ᾧδὴν τινα κοωμαστικὴν, καὶ κέκληται ἥδε ἡ βοὴ ὀλολυγών, ὥς φασιν.

Pliny (*N.H.* xi, 172-173) describes how this call is made: Rānis prima (sc. lingua) cohaeret, intima absoluta a gutture, qua vocem emittunt mares, cum vocantur *ololygones*. stato id tempore evenit, cientibus ad coitum feminas. tum siquidem inferiore labro demisso ad libramentum aquae modice receptae in fauces palpitante ibi lingua ululatus eliditur.

Now it is to be noticed that Pliny expressly states that the male frogs are themselves called *ololygones* at this season. Here we have the natural semantic development of the second meaning of the word: the creature gets a name from its call or the sound made by it. Popular speech in such cases soon ignores limitations of season, sex, etc., and applies the name without discrimination to any and all members of the species. Compare *cuckoo*, *bobolink*, *phoebe*, *katydid*, etc., τέττιξ, ἔποςφ, τρυγών, κτλ.

It may be in the restricted sense given by Pliny, rather than as the general designation, that we should understand the ὀλολυγών of Aelian (*N.A.* vi, 19): τῶν δὲ ἐνύδρων ὀλολυγών οὐ σιωπᾶ· and also in Strabo (xvii, 2, 4): ὀστρακίων δὲ κοχλῆαι μεγάλοι φωνὴν ὀλολυγόσιν ὁμοίαν φθεγγόμενοι. In the latter, ὀλολυγόσιν is an obvious *comparatio compendiaria* for ὀλολυγόνων φωνῇ.

The frog of Plutarch (*l.c.*) is a prophet of rain: ἄλλως δὲ λαμπρύνουσι τὴν φωνήν, ὑετὸν προσδεχόμενοι. καὶ τοῦτο σημείον ἐν τοῖς βεβαιοτάτοις ἐστίν. Aelian (*N.A.* ix, 13) refers to this: ὅταν δὲ βάτραχοι γεγωνότερον φθέγγονται καὶ τῆς συνηθείας λαμπρότερον, ἐπιδημίαν δηλοῦσιν ὑετοῦ.

So the ὀλολυγών sings a song of storm in Theophrastus (*de Sig. Pluv.* iii, 5): καὶ ὀλολυγών ἄδουσα μόνῃ ἀκρωρίας χειμέριον. Aratus, too (*Phaen.* 946 ff.), includes among the signs of approaching storm:

ἢ μᾶλλον (δειλαὶ γενεαί, ὕδροισιν ὄνειαρ)
αὐτόθεν ἐξ ὕδατος πατέρες βοῶσι γυρίνων,
ἢ τρύξει ὀρθρινὸν ἐρημαίῃ ὀλολυγών.

We find the statement of Aratus reflected in Cassianus Bassus (*Geop.* i, 3, 11): καὶ ὀλολυγὼν τρύζουσα ἑωθινὸν καὶ τὰ ὄρνεα εἰς τὰ πρὸς πέλαγος μέρη φεύγοντα χειμῶνα προδηλοῦσι.

With Theophrastus we entered upon debated ground. Thus Salmasius (*Plin. exerc. in Solini Polyhist.* I, p. 942, ed. 1689) says: 'ὀλολυγὼν autem in prognosticis Arati avis est, non rana. nam apud Theophrastum, ex quo sumpsit Aratus, non aliter potest quam de ave accipi. (Quotes the passage cited above, but reads ἀκρωρείας.) ranae quippe in summis montibus non canunt. With the reading now accepted — ἀκρωρίας — the argument of Salmasius falls. Perhaps it never had its supposed validity, as Gadow (*Camb. Nat. Hist.* viii, 257) has found the *Rana temporaria* east of the Dovrefjeld at an elevation of 4000 feet, well-nigh the snow-line, and says that it ascends the Italian Alps up to 10,000 feet.

The question of the identity of the ὀλολυγὼν of Aratus is, however, far older. The ancient translators and scholiasts differ widely here. Cicero (*Progn. frag.* 6) renders verse 948 of Aratus:

Et matutinos exercet acredula cantus;

and in *de Div.* i, 8, 14, he paraphrases it thus:

Saepe etiam pertriste canit de pectore carmen
Et matutinis acredula vocibus instat,
Vocibus instat et adsiduas iacit ore querelas,
Cum primum gelidos rores aurora remittit.

This portion of the text of Aratus is not found in the extant fragments of the version made by Germanicus. Festus Avienus renders the verse:

Si matutinas ululae dant carmine voces. — 377.

Cicero's *acredula* occurs again, in the Auctor *de Philomela* (*Anth. Lat.* 762, 15 f. Riese.):

Vere calente novos componit acredula cantus
Matutinali tempore rurilans.

Here the *acredula* is mentioned in a long list of *aves*, but so also are the *cicada* (35) and the *apis* (36), not to mention the

mythical *strix* and the *vespertilio* (39), which every one of that day would have denominated a "bird."¹ In accordance with this, Lewis and Short define the word as "the name of an unknown bird; acc. to some, the *thrush* or the *owl*." Isidorus (xii, 7, 37) says of the *luscinia*: Eadem et acredula, de qua Cicero in Prognosticis. In xii, 6, 59, he has: Agredulae ranae parvae in sicco uel agris morantes; unde et nuncupatae. This is repeated by Placidus (*C.G.L.* v, 7, 21; 46, 1).

DuCange (*Gloss. Med. et Inf. Lat.*) has: "Accredula. Gale-rita, seu Alauda, Gall. *Alouïette*. Adhelelmus Episc. Sagiensis in *Mirac. S. Opportunae*, cap. 14: *Vidit aviculam nomine Accredulam quam vulgus vocavit Alaudam*." (He quotes *Gloss. Bitur.*: Aggredula, Rana parva in agro; also Placidus; and adds: "Haec forsitan eadem est ac illa *Acredula* de qua Cicero ex his Arati v. 948, etc.," quoting Aratus, Cicero, Pliny, and Auctor *de Phil.*). "Alii pro Monedula, Gall. *Chouette*, Festus Avienus pro Ulula, Constantinus in Supplem. pro Ave quadam, quam Galli vocant *Prêtre de montagne*, nemo praeter Adhelelmum pro Alauda."² [*Gloss. cod. reg.* 4778: *Acredula, luscinia, avis modica de qua Cicero*, etc.]"

Thus the *acredula* as a bird is owl, thrush, daw, nightingale, lark, titmouse,³ pelican, spoonbill, or what-not! Such diversity of opinion may have contributed to the fact that the editors of the *Thesaurus* ignored the bird and defined the word as "genus ranarum, ut videtur." As will appear from the sequel, all the data given by Cicero and the Auctor *de Philomela* fit the frog. Even if this or that bird was some-

¹ See the present writer in *T.A.P.A.* XLIV, 134, n. 4.

² Under *Acredula*, however, he cites the *Acta Sanctorum Ord. S. Benedicti*, saec. 3, tom. 2, p. 237, for the meaning "Alauda, Galerita."

DuCange has another rubric: "**Acredula*, [1° *Avis*, pelicanus, platea; 2° parve rane in agro vel *fico* manentes; 3° piscis dictus *calamita*, Dief.]"

³ I take the *Prêtre de montagne* to be the long-tailed titmouse (*Acredula caudata*). This bird is the αἰγίθαλλος, called by Aristotle (*H.A.* VIII, 3, 4, p. 592 b 19) δρεϊνός, διὰ τὸ διατρίβειν ἐν τοῖς δρεσι. It is found in the mountains of Switzerland as high as 5000 feet above the sea. As this bird sits, she curls her long tail back over her head which protrudes from a hole in the side of her oval nest. The resemblance of this to the cowl of a monk doubtless suggested the popular name. So the blue titmouse is called "the nun" from her banded head. See Rogers' *Birds of Aristophanes*, p. xxxv, and Newton's *Dict. of Birds*.

times called *acredula* in late or mediaeval times, this proves nothing for the meaning in Cicero.

Of the Aratean scholia, the oldest seems to be that of Theon. This is: καὶ ἡ Ὀλολυγών δὲ ὁμοίως (τοῖς βατράχοις) ἐπὶ τούτοις (τοῖς χειμῶσι) χαίρει καὶ κρᾶζει ἡμέρια. ἔστι δὲ ζῶον λιμναῖον φιλόψυχ(ρ)ον. The others, as given by Buhle, are: ἡ Ὀλολυγών ὄρνεόν ἐστι, κατὰ τὴν τρυγónα, τῇ ἐρήμῳ φιληδοῦν. ἐν ἐρήμοις τοῖνυν οὔσα, καὶ ὑπὸ ψυχροῖς τόποις, ἀντιλαμβάνεται τοῦ κρύους, καὶ τρύζει τὰ προσόρθρια. οἱ δὲ φασιν, ὅτι καὶ Ὀλολυγών ὁμοίως ἐπὶ τοῖς ὕδασι χαίρουσα κρᾶζει ἡμερίῳ, ζῶον οὔσα λιμναῖον καὶ φιλόψυχρον. ἔστιν οὖν ὑπόμηκες, ἀδιάρθρωτον, ὅμοιον γῆς ἐντέρω, πολὺ μέντοι ἰσχνότερον. Ἀριστοτέλης δὲ ταῦτα οὐκ οἶδεν, ἀλλὰ τὴν τοῦ ἄρρενος βατράχου φωνὴν σημεῖον εἶναι φησι πρὸς συνουσίας ὀργάντος ἐπὶ τὴν θήλειαν.

Scholiolatry is no longer a fashionable cult. The scholion is too often a mere expression of the more or less obvious, or of the really or supposedly inferrible. So here the bird κατὰ τὴν τρυγónα is only an inference from the fact that Aratus used the verb τρύζει which is especially predicable of “the voice of the turtle.” Moreover, the scholion of Theon, if it is really his, adds little lustre to his accredited learning. He seems to feel that the Ὀλολυγών must be distinguished from the πατέρες γυρίων of the preceding verse, and his indeterminate definition is probably an expression of as much of the truth as he knew. At any rate, he puts the Ὀλολυγών in the particular realm of the frogs; and so, as we shall see, do the other scholia here when rightly understood.

From Vedic times, when the frogs pealed forth their *akḥkḥala*-chorus⁴ to greet the approach of the monsoon, to the present day,⁵ this creature has been an eminent fore-

⁴ *Rig Veda*, VII, 103.

⁵ Cf. Gibson in *Ency. Brit.*⁹. (IX, 797): “Frogs have from remote times been regarded as weather-prophets, and at the present day, in some parts of Germany, the European Tree-frog (*Hyla arborea*) is used as a barometer.”

R. Chandler (*Travels in Asia Minor and in Greece*, II, 324): “The chirping or silence of the *Sporadaka*, or Tree-frog, is prognostic of change in the weather.” This was in Elis.

Buffon (*Hist. nat. des quad. ovip. et des serp.* [Paris, 1783], I, 510) suggests

caster of storm. As such we find it mentioned by Cicero (*de Div.* I, 9, 15): Quis est qui ranunculos hoc videre suspicari possit? sed inest in bestiis et ranunculis natura quaedam significans aliquid, per se ipsa satis certa, cognitioni autem hominum obscurior. Again, in a letter to Atticus (xv, 16 b), he writes: Equidem etiam pluvias metuo, si Prognostica nostra vera sunt, ranae enim ῥητορεύουσιν. Pliny (*N.H.* xviii, 361) remarks: Praesagiunt et animalia . . . tempestatis signa sunt. ranae quoque ultra solitum vocales. So the Pseudo-Plato (*Epigr.* 5) styles the frog τὸν Νυμφῶν θεράποντα φιλόμβριον. Theon (Schol. ad Arat. 946-947) suggests a reason: σημείον δὲ χειμῶνος αἱ φωναὶ τῶν βατράχων, ἐπειδὴ προαίσθάνονται μὲν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ ὕδατος μεταλλασσομένου εἰς ψυχρότητα.

We have seen that this attribute of the frog was remarked both by Plutarch and Aelian in the closest contextual relation to the ὀλολυγών. This is the special attribute of the ὀλολυγών in each of the three passages now under consideration. If it can be shown that all the other attributes and predicates of the ὀλολυγών in these passages apply to the frog, the identity of the ὀλολυγών of Theophrastus, Aratus, and Bassus can no longer be a subject of doubt.

The first of these is the ᾄδουσα of Theophrastus. It "sings." This is confirmed by Theophrastus himself (*op. cit.* I, 15): καὶ βάτραχοι μᾶλλον ᾄδοντες σημαίνουσιν ὕδωρ . . . ἔτι δὲ καὶ χλωρὸς βάτραχος ἐπὶ δένδρου ᾄδων ὕδωρ σημαίνει. Also by Aristotle (*de Mirab. Ausc.* 70): φασὶ δὲ καὶ

that there is some connection, either of pain or pleasure, between frogs and humidity, and that this is why they croak louder before rain and thereby foretell the approach of damp or rainy weather.

Gadow (*op. cit.* 193) refers to the reputation of *Hyla arborea* as a good weather-prophet and states that "the little creature, provided it is a male, often sounds its voice on the approach of a shower or when there is a thunderstorm in the air." He quotes the German rhyme:

"Wenn die Laubfrösch knarren
Magst du auf Regen harren."

A writer in *Farm and Fireside*, a few years ago, suggested that "variations in barometric pressure and the changes in the electrical conditions of the atmosphere" cause an uneasiness in the frogs.

ἐν Σερίφῳ τοὺς βατράχους οὐκ ᾄδειν· ἐὰν δὲ εἰς ἄλλον τόπον μετενεχθῶσιν, ᾄδουσιν. Compare also Aristophanes (*Ran.*):

εὐγερυν ἐμὴν δοιδάν . . . — 213

ὦ φιλψδὸν γένος, παύσασθε. — 240-241

χαίροντες ᾠδῆς . . . — 244.

In Vergil, too (*Georg.* 1, 378), the frog sings:

Et veterem in limo ranae cecinere querelam.⁶

Symposium (*Anth. Lat.* 286, 74 Riese) makes him say:

Cumque canam semper, nullus mea carmina laudat.

Gadow (*op. cit.* 268) says of the *Rana esculenta*: "The males are great musicians, singing for sheer enjoyment not only during the pairing time, but throughout the months of June and July."

The ὀλολυγών of Theophrastus is a solitary songster (ἄδουσα μόνη). Aratus calls it ἐρهماία. As adult frogs in general, whether water, land, or tree frogs, after the annual matrimonial season, live a monastic life, these adjectives are not inapposite. The frog soloist is not a *rara avis*.

Again, the ὀλολυγών of Theophrastus sings ἀκρωρίας, at the very tip of the day. Aratus represents this by ὀρθρινόν, and Bassus by ἑωθινόν. This reminds us of Athena's complaint against the frogs in the *Batrachomyomachia* (190 ff.):

ὕπνου δεινομένην οὐκ εἶασαν θορυβοῦντες

οὐδ' ὀλίγον καταμῦσαι· ἐγὼ δ' αὖπνος κατεκείμεν

τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀλγοῦσα, ἕως ἐβόησεν ἀλέκτωρ.

As the day of the Plutonian realms is our night, we may quote also from the frog chorus of Aristophanes:

ἀλλὰ μὴν κεκραξόμεσθ' ἄν

ἢ φάρυξ ὅποσον ἂν ἡμῶν

χανδάνη δι' ἡμέρας. — 258 ff.

Gadow (*l.c.*) speaks of the concert "beginning at sunset and continuing until the early dawn." Of the many other passages that might be quoted, the most picturesque is that in Thoreau's *Walden* (chapter on Sounds), concluding thus:

⁶ Note that we have here both the *canit* and the *querela* of Cicero's *acredula*.

"And the bowl goes round again and again until the sun disperses the morning mist, and only the patriarch is not under the pond, but vainly bellowing *troonk* from time to time and pausing for a reply."

In ancient Egypt, too, we find that Hiquît, the frog-goddess, was one of the midwives who was present at the birth of the Sun every morning.⁷

In Aratus and in the *Geoponica* we find the verb *τρύζω* is predicated of the *ὀλολυγών*. Pollux (v, 89), under the rubric *Ὀρνέων φωναί*, says: *εἴποις δ' αὖ . . . τρυγόνας τρύζειν.*" So far as the lexica show, this verb is used, except in metaphor, only of the *τρυγών* and the *ὀλολυγών*. Whether there is any degree of similarity in nature to warrant this or not, there is in the literature, at least, ample justification for the usage. Thus we find (*Iliad*, ix, 311) that at the time that the embassy was sent by Agamemnon to win Achilles back to the battle, after Odysseus has used his power of persuasion in a long speech of 82 verses, Achilles, in deprecating the like efforts that he naturally expects to follow from other members of the embassy, says,

ὥς μή μοι τρύζητε παρήμενοι ἄλλοθεν ἄλλος.

Homer, consummate master of simile and metaphor drawn from the world of nature, has here a most striking metaphor to depict the effort made in these long coaxing speeches, a sort of billing and cooing, as it were, of the recalcitrant hero.

The length of this speech and that of the longer one (172 verses) of Phoenix that follows amply warrant the explanation of Eustathius (*ἔστι δὲ τρύζειν τὸ πολυλογεῖν ἢ πολυφωνεῖν*) and his reference to the proverbial *τρυγόνος λαλίστερος*.⁸ This ceaselessness appears also in the metaphor applied to those chatterboxes, Gorgo and Praxinoë, in Theocritus (15, 88 f.):

*παύσασθ' ὧ δὺςτανοι, ἀνάνυτα κωτίλλουσαι
τρυγόνες.*

⁷ Maspero, *Hist. of Egypt*, Grolier Society, II, 213, n. 3.

⁸ Cf. Aelian (*N.A.* XII, 10): *τρυγόνος λαλίστερον ἔλεγον· ἡ γὰρ τοι τρυγών καὶ διὰ τοῦ στόματος μὲν ἀπαύστως φθέγγεται, ἥδη δὲ καὶ ἐκ τῶν κατόπιν μερῶν ὥς φασιν πάμπλειστα.*

The ceaseless, coaxing call of the *τρυγών* which has given us these metaphors by Homer and Theocritus (one of his "not infrequent reminiscences of Homeric phrase"?) eminently fits it for a third metaphor, the incessant coaxation of the *ὀλολυγών*. This is, I believe, the true explanation of another passage in Theocritus (7, 138 ff.):

τοὶ δὲ ποτὶ σκιαραῖς ὁροδαμνίσιν αἰθαλίωνες
τέττιγες λαλαγεῦντες ἔχον πόνον· ἃ δ' ὀλολυγών
τῆλόθεν ἐν πυκιναῖσι βάτων τρύζεσκεν ἀκάνθαις.

Homer, then, uses the verb *τρύζω* of the endless talk of men; Theocritus, the noun *τρυγόνες* of the ceaselessly chattering women, and the inceptive form of the verb of the incessant clamor of the frog. In the last we may have another "trace of connection between Theocritus and Aratus." We know that Bassus drew from Aratus here. It is, then, unnecessary to seek any actual physical resemblance of the notes of the *ὀλολυγών* and of the *τρυγών*.⁹ The connotation of ceaseless coaxing in its *ἐρωτικὴν καὶ γαμήλιον ῥῶδην* is as appropriate to the one as to the other.

Thus every attribute and every predicate of the *ὀλολυγών* of Theophrastus, Aratus, and Bassus holds good for the frog. A careful study shows that this is not true of any other interpretation ever given to either this word or to the *acredula* of Cicero.

We may arrive at another convincing demonstration of this identity in an entirely different way, by the "parallel column." Thus we have these signs of storm:

Theophrastus (*op. cit.* I, 15 f.)

ὄρνιθες λουόμενοι,
φρύνῃ λοιομένη,
βάτραχοι μᾶλλον ᾄδοντες,
σαλαμάνδρα φαινομένη,

Aratus (*l. c.*)

ὄρνιθες κλύζονται,
μᾶλλον πατέρες βοόωσι γυρίνων,

⁹ It would seem that a fair argument lies for this, if one wants such. A comparison of the natural notes indicated by the two verbs *τρίζω* and *τρύζω* and their respective compounds, so far as shown by Liddell and Scott and by Stephanus, warrants the distinction in Liddell and Scott that the two differ only in that the latter refers to *duller* sounds, the former to *sharper, shriller* sounds, and the consequent appositeness of *τρύζω* to the notes of the *τρυγών* and the *ὀλολυγών*. To this extent, at least, there is resemblance.

χλωρὸς βάτραχος ἐπὶ δένδρῳ
 ἄδων,
 χελιδόνες τῇ γαστρὶ τύπτουσαι
 τὰς λίμνας,
 βοῦς . . . ὀπλὴν λείξας,
 κορώνη ἐπὶ πέτρας . . . ἦν κῦ-
 μα κατακλύζει . . . καὶ κολυμ-
 βῶσα πολλάκις περιπετομένη.

τρύζει ὀρθρινὸν ἐρημαίῃ ὄλολυ-
 γών,
 χελιδόνες . . . λίμνην πέρι
 γαστέρα τύπτουσαι,
 —————
 κορώνη . . . παρ' ἡϊόνι προ-
 χούσῃ . . . πᾶσα κολυμβᾷ ἥ
 πολλὴ στρέφεται.

So closely does Aratus adhere to the thought, if not to the very words, of Theophrastus, in every instance except that of the *χλωρὸς βάτραχος*. For it he has taken the *ὄλολυγών* of ΠΙ, 5, and has turned the language of Theophrastus into a synonymous hexameter. Thus Aratus identifies the *ὄλολυγών* with the *χλωρὸς βάτραχος ἐπὶ δένδρῳ ἄδων*. Bassus follows Aratus. We may, then, safely conclude that the *ὄλολυγών* of these writers is the frog.

So also in the case of Theocritus the frog satisfies every condition. It is midday in midsummer (7, 3; 21 f.; 31 ff.; 143 ff.) and the *ὄλολυγών* is heard *τηλόθεν ἐν βάτοις*. Gadow (192 f.) says: "The European tree-frog spends most of its time in the summer, after the pairing is over, in trees. . . . The voice is a sharp and rapidly repeated note. . . . It is uttered at any time of the day, more frequently at dusk, and of course chiefly during the pairing season." The writer of the article "Rana" in Rees's *Cyclopaedia* says that the tree-frog inhabits woods during the summer months and that its note may be heard a vast distance, and that during its residence among the trees it is especially noisy on the approach of rain. Buffon (*op. cit.* 555) says: Leurs clameurs sont si bruyantes qu'on les prendroit de loin pour une meute de chiens qui aboient, & que, dans des nuits tranquilles, leurs coassemens réunis sont quelquefois parvenus jusqu'à plus d'une lieue, surtout lorsque la pluie étoit prête à tomber. Pliny (*N. H.* xxxii, 122) says of it: Quidam ex ea rana, quam Graeci calamiten vocant, quoniam inter harundines fruticesque vivat, minima omnium et viridissima . . . These are sufficient to show that the tree-frog meets all the conditions of the text of Theocritus.

Confirmation is found in the scholia on Theocritus. One of the oldest and best runs: Ὀλολυγών· ἀπὸ τοῦ ὀλολύζειν· ὁ γὰρ Ἀριστοφάνης¹⁰ φησὶν ὅτι πᾶν ὀλολύζει τὸ ζῶον μάλιστα ἐν τοῖς ἐλώδεσι τόποις καὶ κατὰ νύκτα.¹¹ Other *scholia vetera* have: εἶδος ὀρνέου· οἱ δὲ ζῶον τι βορβορώδεσι τόποις μάλιστα διάγον, ἢ ἀηδών. The ζῶον of both is evidently the frog.¹² The *scholia recentiora* have: ἢ ἀηδών ἢ τὸν Ἴτυν ὀλοφυρομένη.

Let us pause here to lay the ghost of this persistent "bird." In Theocritus, Aelian, Aratus, and Bassus, the ὀλολυγών is mentioned in close contextual relation with various birds, hence the easy inference that it, too, was a bird. The next step would be to attempt to identify the bird. As we have seen, the verb τρύζω would suggest the Aratean scholion, ὄρνεον κατὰ τὴν τρυγόνα. The very name ὀλολυγών would suggest the cognate ὀλολυγή, defined by Hesychius as ποιά φωνή λυπηρά, ὀδύνην καρδίας ἀσήμῳ τινὶ φθόγγῳ παριστώσα· and by Zonaras as φωνή γυναικῶν, ἣν ποιοῦνται ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς εὐχόμεναι. ἢ ἀπλῶς ὁ μετὰ ἤχου κλαυθμὸς καὶ θρήνος. Hence the inference of the mourning bird, which to a Hellene might easily suggest the ἀηδών mourning the lost Itys, and to a Latin, as Avienus, the lugubrious owl. Then, also, as well as now, there may have been misapprehension on the part of some as to the real nature of the creature that sang from the trees.¹³ Honest errors may thus have been made. Again, some jest, some ancient euphuistic pleasantry, akin to that by which the *Rana esculenta* has been dubbed "the Whaddon organ," "the Dutch nightingale," "the Cambridge nightingale," etc., may have contributed to the error.

This inference as to its avian nature was not, however, as

¹⁰ Other *scholl. vet.* read Ἀριστοτέλης.

¹¹ See Ziegler, *Schol. in Theocr.* The other scholia are quoted from the edition of Ahrens.

¹² Cf. *Batrach.* 12, λιμνοχαρής· 17, εἰμὶ δ' ἐγὼ βασιλεὺς Φυσίγναθος δὲ κατὰ λιμνὴν τιμῶμαι· and 277, ἔκτεινεν ἀμύμονα βορβοροκόλτην.

¹³ Since beginning this study I have found a goodly number of intelligent persons that supposed that the notes made by a tree-frog were made by some kind of bird. Several have stated that it was the "rain-crow," and some that knew it was the frog stated that the frog was called "rain-crow" in their communities, while others give this name to the cuckoo. One on hearing the croaking of a bullfrog was eager to see "what kind of bird was making such a peculiar noise."

well warranted as it might seem at first. A more careful examination of the passages might have caused *πολλὰς φροντίδων ἐπιστάσεις*. Thus in Theocritus we find in immediate context *τέττιγες, ὀλολυγών, κόρυδοι, ἀκανθίδες, τρυγών, and μέλισσαι*. In Aelian we have likewise *χελιδόνες, κόσσυφοι, τέττιγες, κίττα, ἀκρίς, πάρνοψ, τρωξάλλις, ἀλκύνες, ψιττακοί, and ὀλολυγών*. In Aratus we have *χελιδόνες, πατέρες γυρίνων, ὀλολυγών, and κορώνη*. In Bassus *λύκος* and *κύνες* precede *ὀλολυγών* and *ὄρνεα* follows. Thus no list is confined to birds, and so far as the lists are concerned there is no more reason to infer that the *ὀλολυγών* is a bird than there is to infer that the *τέττιξ*, or the *ἀκρίς*, or the *μέλισσα* is a bird. The *πατέρες γυρίνων* are naturally frogs. There is no good reason to doubt that the *ὀλολυγών* is in all these writers a frog. The Greeks were not wont to distinguish by name one kind of frog from another. Nor are we in all instances. We are not compelled to assume that the *ὀλολυγών* is the same kind of frog in each of the authors quoted, nor are we compelled to assign any particular kind of frog to any one of the passages. Even in Theocritus water is close at hand (136 f.) and a water-frog might be possible. Of particular frogs, however, the *Hyla arborea* seems best to meet the details in each instance.

We find an echo of Theocritus in an erotic epigram of Agathias (*Anth. Pal.* v, 291, 3 ff.):

ἐνθάδε δὲ κλάζουσιν ὑπὸ σκιερᾷς κυπαρίσσοις
 ὄρνιθες δροσερῶν μητέρες ὀρταλίχων,
 καὶ λιγυρὸν βομβεῦσιν ἀκανθίδες· ἥ δ' ὀλολυγών
 τρύζει, τρηχαλέας ἐνδιάουσα βάτοις.

There is nothing new here relative to the *ὀλολυγών*.

One of the scholia of Aratus still awaits examination. It is that which reads thus: *ἔστιν οὖν ὑπόμηκες, ἀδιάρθρωτον, ὅμοιον γῆς ἐντέρω, πολὺ μέντοι ἰσχυρότερον*. The definition of Hesychius is similar and briefer: *ὀλολυγών· ζώφιον γινόμενον ἐν ὕδασι ὅμοιον ἐντέρω*. Here we have a roughly accurate description of the young *γύρινος* or tadpole with its "elongated

and laterally compressed tail." Gadow (193) says that the tadpole of the *Hyla arborea* reaches a length of two inches owing to its long tail, which is nearly three times as long as its body. Similar proportions are shown to hold for the *Rana esculenta*, *Rana agilis*, and *Rana Graeca*, the common water and grass frogs of Greece. They are longish, without signs of articulation at first any more than the earthworm, than which the young tadpoles are thinner and like which their thin little tails wriggle. The tadpoles of all kinds of frogs live in the water. The description is not strikingly vivid, but such as it is, every detail holds true.

Thus far, then, the term ὀλολυγών has been generalized to apply to various kinds and to every age.

Eubulus, in his *Στεφανοπώλιδες* (fr. 104, Kock, II, 199 f.), makes mention of the ὀλολυγών :

ὦ μάκαρ ἥ τις ἔχονσ' ἐν δωματίῳ
 . . . στρούθιον ἀεροφόρητον
 λεπτότατον περὶ σῶμα συνίλλεται τε
 ἡδυνότατον περὶ νυμφίον εὐτρεχα
 κισσὸς ὅπως καλάμῳ περιφέεται
 αὐξόμενος ἔαρος ὀλολυγόνος
 ἔρωτι κατατετηκώς.

Here Kock takes ὀλολυγών to signify *luscinia* : "Hedera arbo-rem amplexitur, ut lusciniā in eius ramis canentem audiat." He quotes Meineke : "Ad incognitam nobis fabulam spectare videntur de Cisso (Nonn. XII, 97, 188 ; Paus. I, 31) Ololygonis nymphae amore tabescente." He cites also Lobeck (*Rhemat.* 324), who has : "ὀλολυγών, quod modo ululatum (ὀλολυγόν), modo ululam significat."

"Nightingale," unknown "nymph," and "owl," are mere indefensible guesses. It is far better to take ὀλολυγόνος as a subjective genitive and understand an allusion to the amatory habits of the frog in the springtime, which makes it the type κατ' ἐξοχήν of the Aphrodisian.¹⁴ The simile is due to facts

¹⁴ See the present writer in *T.A.P.A.* XLV, 54 f. To n. 20 there (*Rana esculenta*), add Buffon (*op. cit.* 515 f.) : Qu'il faut employer un peu de force pour les séparer, & qu'on n'y parvient pas en arrachant les pieds de derrière du mâle. M. l'Abbé Spallanzani a même écrit qu'ayant coupé la tête à un mâle qui étoit

of everyday observation in the vineyards and *καλαμοκόπια* of the viniculturist: as the ivy in its growth twines and clings to the reed (the smooth surface of which its claspers cannot penetrate) and languishes (because it both lacks the nutriment which it was supposed to derive in large measure from the tree embraced and must "spread its branches horizontally in full daylight" before it can bear flowers and fruit, its natural function) with the ardor of the *όλολυγών* which in the spring-time clings to its mate (for days without food, striving also to discharge its function of nature).¹⁵ A commentary on *έρωτι κατατετηκώς* may then be found in the words of Buffon (556): "Mais alors il arrive souvent que le mâle (*Hyla arborea*) lassé, & peut-être épuisé de fatigue, perdant son amour avec ses desirs, abandonne sa femelle, qui ne pond plus que des œufs stériles."

There is mention of the *όλολυγών* also in a fragment of the *Δύρκος* of Nicaenetus, preserved by Parthenius ('*Ερωτικά παθήματα*, xi, 2):

αὐτὴ δὲ γνωτὴ, ὀλολυγόνος οἶκτον ἔχουσα
Βυβλὶς ἀποπρὸ Πυλῶν Καίνον ὠδύρατο νόστον.

Here, too, we are in the domain of Aphrodite. We may consider that the *όλολυγόνος οἶκτος* consists in the long-continued emission of his "multitudinous croakings" prompted by the mating instinct, and see a comparison therewith of the cries of the lovelorn Byblis wailing for her brother's return; or better, we may take *όλολυγών* here as a metaphor

accouplé, cet animal ne cessa pas de féconder pendant quelque tems les œufs de sa femelle, & ne mourut qu'au bout de quatre heures. Quelque mouvement que fasse la femelle, le mâle la retient avec ses pattes, & ne la laisse pas échapper, même quand elle sort de l'eau; ils nagent ainsi accouplés pendant un nombre de jours d'autant plus grand, que la chaleur de l'atmosphère est moindre, & ils ne se quittent point avant que la femelle ait pondu ses œufs.

¹⁵ The detailed exposition, based upon a study of *κισσός* and *κάλαμος*, is too long for a note. Among its sources are: Arist. *H. A.* v, 30; Theophr. *H. P.* iii, 18, 8; Id. *C. P.* i, 4, 3; Pliny, *N. H.* xvi, 144. 151. 152; Schol. ad Ar. *Vesp.* 1291; Nonnus, xii, 97 ff., 188 ff.; *Geop.* ii, 6, 31. iii, 6, 6. v, 22, 2. v, 27. v, 29, 6. v, 53. xi, 29. xiii, 16, 4; Varro, *R. R.* i, 8; Eudocia, *Violarium*, 272, 121; S. Hibberd, *The Ivy*, *passim*; *Ency. Brit.*⁹. xiii, 527; H. Repton, *Trans. Linn. Soc.* xi, 27 ff.; Johnson's *Dict.*, ed. 1775, s. v. Ivy; Shakespeare, *Temp.* i, 2, 102 ff., *Com. Err.* ii, 2, 176 ff.

for one distraught with the hot passion of love, a metaphor easily derived from the amatory nature and habits of the frog. With this we may compare Ovid (*Met.* ix, 641 ff.):

Utque tuo motae, proles Semeleïa, thyrsos
 Ismariae celebrant repetita triennia bacchae,
 Byblida non aliter latos ululasse per agros
 Bubasides videre nurus.

As one crazed by Bacchus in the simile, distraught by Aphrodite in the metaphor, Byblis is the main sufferer even in those versions that assign the guilt to Kaunos.¹⁶

We find the same metaphor, now grown strongly pejorative, used to stigmatize the Aphrodisian *strix*, the bird-woman of the licentious orgies of the Sabat with its *concubitus daemounum*, in a Pseudo-Philoxenian gloss, *strix* Ὀλολυγών (*C.G.L.* II, 189, 29).

If the gloss, *ololygon urtica*, in the *Hermeneumata Amploniana* (*C.G.L.* III, 89, 60), is correct, it would seem to be used as a metaphor for the prurient passion of lust (cf. Juv. II, 168).¹⁷ The very name, erotic in connotation from its origin, is especially appropriate to erotic metaphors, just as the Egyptians in their ideographs made the tadpole a symbol for "hundreds of thousands."

Another characteristic of the frog gave extension to the meaning of Ὀλολυγών in another direction. This is its crass stupidity. Hesychius added to his definition of Ὀλολυγών, quoted in the foregoing, these words: καὶ τοὺς εὐήθεις δὲ οὕτως ἔλεγον. So we find Plato (*Theaet.* 161 D) saying of Protagoras: ὁ δ' ἄρα ἐτύγχανεν ὦν εἰς φρόνησιν οὐδὲν βελτίων

¹⁶ The unholy passion of brother and sister was, perhaps, mutual in the original story. Such an inference seems warranted from the account in Nicaenetus, Konon, 2 (*Myth. Gr.* p. 125 Westermann) and the Schol. ad Theocr. 7, 115, in which the guilt, as suggested also by the paroemiac Καύνιος ἔρωσ, is expressly attributed to Kaunos, but the context shows that the passion was reciprocated by her.

¹⁷ Hesychius (*s.v.* Ὀλολυγή) has a second meaning for this word: καὶ ἄνθος τι παρὰ λίμναις γινόμενον. I have found nothing more of this plant. If it was one of the *Urticaceae*, the *ololygon* of this gloss may be an error for the cognate name. Or, if the gloss is correct, such names as frog-cheese, frog-flower, frog-foot, frog-lily, frog-plant, frog-stool, frog-wort, etc., might suggest a reason for the name.

βατράχου γυρίνου, μὴ ὅτι ἄλλου του ἀνθρώπου. Εὐήθεια is an attribute especially ascribed to the frog in *Fable* 76 of Aesop, entitled Βάτραχοι αἰτοῦντες βασιλέα, and well illustrated in *Fables* 74, 75, 77, 78, and 298.¹⁸ It was the possession of this quality in a marked degree that led to the metamorphosis by Leto of the rude, unfeeling Lycian rustics into frogs, as told by Menecrates and Nicander (see Antoninus Liberalis, 35; and Ovid, *Met.* vi, 331–381).

Not only in fable and myth is there ample warrant for such apophthegmatic use of the term, but also in the characteristics of the real frog. Thus Gadow (193) says: "Tree-frogs are not very intelligent." Again (253) he says of the *Rana temporaria*, or grass-frog, that "when caught they are at first very impetuous, committing acts of astonishing stupidity without any apparent sense or appreciation of distance or height. The captive will not only jump off the table, whilst a toad stops at the edge and looks carefully down, but without hesitation he jumps out of the window, regardless of height above the ground. This is due to sheer fright; he loses his head." Then (270) we find that "recently caught water-frogs are wild beyond description, much more so than grass-frogs." It was probably the observation of such characteristics that led to this metaphoric usage rather than an ethical comment upon the amatory habits of the frog.

An equation of the words of Hesychius (see pp. 96 and 99) and of Plato will establish our interpretation of the definition given by the former. Comparison with fable and myth suggests that the comment of Plato expresses the acme of disparagement. If the frog is εὐήθης, much more so should we expect the γυρίνος to be.

A few glosses remain. Of these the Pseudo-Cyrrilan, ολολυγῶν *ulula* (*C.G.L.* II, 382, 30), and that of the *Herm. Montepessulana*, ολλυγῶν (*sic*) *ululat* (*C.G.L.* III, 305, 33), have been shown by the present writer (*T.A.P.A.* XLV, 53 f., n. 18) to be for an original *ululatus*. Here, then, we have the original meaning of the word. In the *Herm. cod. Vat.*

¹⁸ So also in *Pañcatantra* (IV, 1) and *Hitopadeśa* (IV, 12) we have stories illustrative of this.

reg. Christinae (C.G.L. III, 571, 29) we have *olilicon oluccus*. The collection in which this gloss is found belongs to the *Herm. medicobotanica vetustiora*, and its subject is the ten species of medicaments, of which the first two are *animalia terrena et marina*. There are not a half dozen birds in the glossary and none of these few are birds with which the ὀλολυγών has ever been conjecturally identified. The frog, however, had its place in the ancient *materia medica*. Pliny (N.H. xxxii, 70, 122, and 139) gives three remedial uses of the tree-frog, of which one is an aphrodisiac. Nicander (*Alex.* 563 ff.) esteems the frog very highly :

καί τε σύ γ' ἡ γερύνων λαιδροὺς δαμάσαιο τοκῆας,
 ἄμμιγα δὲ ῥίζας ἡρυγγίδας, ἡ καὶ ἐπαρκές
 θάλπε βαλὼν χύτρω σκαμμώνιον· οἷσι κορέσκοις
 ἀνέρα, καὶ θανάτοιο πέλας βεβαῶτα σαώσεις

Compare also his *Θηριακά*, 620 ff. In the light of this evidence we can hardly doubt the identity of the *olilicon* of our gloss.

The *Herm. Leidensia* (C.G.L. III, 17, 55) have ὀλολυγών (*sic*) *uluccus*; the *Herm. Amploniana* (C.G.L. III, 89, 60), *ololigonuluccus* (*sic*); the *Herm. Vaticana* (C.G.L. III, 435, 66), ὀλολογος (*sic*) *ululugus*. As these three are under the rubric *περιορνων*; and as Servius, *ad Ecl.* viii, 55, says: *ululae aves ἀπὸ τοῦ ὀλολύζειν*, id est, a fletu nominatae, quas vulgus *alucos* (var. lect. *ulucos*) vocant; and as Festus,¹⁹ in a scholion to Isidorus, xii, 7, 38, preserved in a Ms. numbered A 18 of the Vallicelli Library, Rome, has: *ulula nos olocum uocamus*; and as the cognate Skt. *úlūkas*, Lat. *ulula*, O.H.G. *ūwila*, O.N. *ugla*, A.S. *ūle* all mean "owl"; and as such evidence seems to have been sufficient to cause Walde (*Lat. etym. Wörterb.*) to define *ulucus* as "Kauz, Eule" — it might seem that we must here accept the bird and identify it with the owl.

The mere fact, however, that in all other instances we have found that the ὀλολυγών is either a denizen of the frog world or a metaphor from it and that opposing statements are rather palpably false when carefully scrutinized, will lead us to examine this last evidence for the bird with some care.

¹⁹ See *Class. Quart.* x, III.

Even a casual scrutiny of the glossaria containing this evidence will suggest their fallibility and untrustworthiness, and a more careful inspection will reveal that they are fairly bristling with errors of various kinds, errors of orthography and form, errors of identification, errors of classification, etc.

Thus in the *Leidensia*, in the same list as our gloss, we find:

- 17, 40, περδιξ = accipiter (accipiter)
- 42, κωλυος (κολοιός) = graulus (graculus)
- 44, βασιλισκος = gregnariolus (regaliolus)
- 45, κανθαρος = zimzario (?)
- 59, αηδων = querquedula
- 18, 3, κοριδαλλος = parrumla (parrula)
- 18, 5-16, μυια, μελισσα, σφηξ, ψυχη, ακρις, οιστρος,
κωνοψ, κανθαρος, σιλφη, κορις, φερειρ, ψυλλος.

To pass by the errors of form, what are we to think of the trustworthiness of a list that identifies the partridge with a hawk, the nightingale with a duck, the lark with a titmouse, and that includes among its birds a dozen insects, and that too such wingless and songless ones as the bedbug, flea, and louse? The insects come here at the end of the list but under the rubric *περὶ ὀρνέων*. In the *Amploniana* and *Vaticana*, however, the same insects are incorporated into the very midst of the list of "birds."

Then in the *Amploniana* we find such typical errors of identification as these:

- 89, 56, cycnos (swan) = ciconos (stork)
- 70, basiliscus (wren) = passer (sparrow)
- 71, spinnus (chaffinch) = regaliolus (wren)
- 90, 9, coridallus (lark) = bubo (owl).

The *Vaticana* are so replete with corrupted and late forms that identification is difficult and must in many instances be made largely by the Latin equivalents given. A few specimens will suffice:

- 435, 44, απαγη (ἀτταγήν) = attagena
- 46, κατανικτινος (? + ἰκτίνος) = miluus
- 60, εγυγαλλος (αἰγίθαλλος) = parra.

Here, too, we have such demonstrable errors of identification as these:

- 435, 55, κουκουβλος (κούκουφος) hoopoe = cuculus (cuckoo)
 57, κροταλλος (δνοκράταλος) pelican = ardea (heron).

Such errors, of which there are many in each of these glossaria, show that we can safely follow them only when they state a known or demonstrable identity.

Then as to the *ulucus* found as a variant in Servius. I have found this elsewhere only as a variant for *uluccus* in two codices of the *Leidensia*: Sangallensis 902 and Harleianus 5642. Vossius (*Observationes ad Catullum* [London, 1684], p. 90) argues that *alucos* is the correct reading in Servius and that the term is derived from *a* and *luceo*, as these nocturnal birds shun the light. One of the Pseudo-Cyrrillan glosses, as given by Stephanus, has νυκτικόραξ, *alicus*, *bubo*; and the Pseudo-Philoxenus has the reverse, *alicus*, νυκτικόραξ. DuCange knows only the forms *aluco* and *alucus*. *Oluccus* and *oloccus* are found only in the places already cited. More evidence is needed to establish the form, but the initial *a* seems the best attested.

Again, the cognates given do not identify the ὀλολυγών with either the *ulula* or the *ulucus*. The Skt. *ulas* "jackal" (?), *ulūta* "boa," *ulūli* and *ulūlu* "noisy," *ululis* "a cry of exultation"; the Greek ὑλάω and ὑλακτέω, used chiefly of dogs and wolves, sometimes of man; ὕλαγμα, ὕλακή, the bark, howl, or yelp of dogs; ὀλολυγή, ὀλόλυγμα, ὀλολυγμός, and ὀλολύζω, used of cries either of sorrow or joy, mainly of women; the Lat. *ululo*, of dogs, wolves, or man; the Lith. *ulūti*, which is not merely "rufen," as Uhlenbeck has it, but also "howl," of wolves²⁰—these forms, not to go farther afield, show that almost any howl, shriek, or piercing cry will suffice. We are in no wise limited to the owl or even to a bird.

²⁰ See Donalitus, *Žemės rūpesczei* (94):

Kėrdžaus ir pėmená, kàd jùs *ulūdami* báldo,

of which the subject is the vilkai in 72.

Then Walde shows his human fallibility when he tells us that the cognate *ὄλολυγαία* is a "Beiwort der Nachteule," as the one quotable instance of the word is in the metrical sepulchral inscription of the Roman Patron (*I.G.* xiv, 1934), beginning thus:

Οὐ βάτοι, οὐ τρίβολοι τὸν ἐμὸν τάφον ἀμφὶς ἔχουσιν
οὐδ' ὄλολυγαία νυκτερὶς ἀμπέταται.²¹

Thus *ὄλολυγαία* is an epithet, not of the owl, but of the bat; and not a single premise assumed to support the identification of the *uluccus* with the owl is flawless.

Should we then, divesting ourselves of any preconceptions, attempt to find a solution in the glossaria themselves, I imagine that we might proceed somewhat as follows. Remembering that we have already found *ὄλολυγών* equated with *ulula* and *ululat* in glosses in which we have the best of reasons for supposing these to represent an original *ululatus*, an onomatopoeic equivalent of *ὄλολυγών*, and noticing that in the *Vaticana* we have *ολολογος* in the same relative position as *ολολιγων* in the *Leidensia* and *Amploniana*, and inferring from this, along with the erroneous forms so general in this glossary, that *ολολογος* was intended to be the same as the *ολολιγων* of the other two, and observing that *ολολογος* is equated with *ululugus*, which is only a transliteration with slightly changed vocalism and obviously as onomatopoeic as the other, we would then equate the *ululugus* of this glossary with the *uluccus* of the other two, inasmuch as *ululugus* and *uluccus* are practically phonetic equivalents when the former is shorn of its reduplication. We might thus conclude that *uluccus*, too, was an echoic term for the call of the frog, or for the frog himself.²² The writer offers this only as a sug-

²¹ Verses 6-8 show something of the current conceptions of natural history:

καὶ τέττιξ γλυκεροῖς χεῖλεσι λειρὰ χέων
καὶ σοφὰ τραυλίζουσα χελειδονὶς ἢ τε λιγύπνους
ἀκρις ἀπὸ στήθους ἡδὺν χέουσα μέλος.

These may have been nothing more than traditional poetic figures, of course.

²² In support of such a conclusion we might point to the large part taken in Indo-European words for "frog" by the combination of the liquid *l* or *r* plus a vowel and a palatal or guttural, e.g. Skt. *maṇḍuka* (*mand-ruk-a, a form found in Prakrit),

gestion and not as a definitive solution. It seems to be the only way to defend the glosses in question.

It is not at all unlikely, however, that the glossographers are in error. In the face of their demonstrable errors we cannot assume that they were less impeccable than such an eminent scholar as Walde, for instance. We have seen in the epitaph of Patron that the τέπιξ and the ἀκρίς were spoken of in words that suggest birds rather than insects, in language that could not in fact have any real application to the latter. We have found the ὀλολυγών mentioned in close contextual connection with birds in the literature in which the frog is the only explanation that satisfies the requirements. We have found the scholiasts vainly trying to identify the supposed bird. The glossarists may have shared in the error²³ or may have been misled by figure of speech or by faulty exegesis. Nowhere else have we found any valid reason for identifying the ὀλολυγών with any bird. We are, then, not warranted by the nature of these three glossaria and the many probabilities of error in them, in concluding that here we have any creditable evidence for the "bird." The ὀλολυγών is still the cry of the frog or the frog himself either in fact or figure.

To summarize the results of this study, the word ὀλολυγών was used as follows:

Gk. bat-rach-os, Lat. *rana* (*rac-na), Goth. *frusqa (*f-ruh-sqa), O.N. f-rauk-r, A.S. f-rogg-a, and f-rocc-a, etc.; and to the attempts made to represent graphically the call of the frog, as the Skt. akhkhala, the Gk. brekekekex, koax, koax, the Lat. coaxit (Auct. de Phil. 64) and sub aqua (Ovid, Met. vi, 376), Thoreau's tr-r-roonk, the Australian Duguluk (Tucker, n. ad Ar. Ran. 209), the creek, creek, creek of the *Hyla arborea* (Gadow, 193), the l-l-l-l-luk of the *Hyla versicolor* (ib. 194), the wollunnkukuk of the *Phyllomedusa hypochondrialis* (ib. 204), etc. The writer does not claim for these anything more than an interesting parallel to more than one philological argument.

²³ We may cite a somewhat parallel instance. The writer has found many college and university men and some clergymen with a seminary training that have supposed that the "turtle" of Canticles, 11, 12, was the chelonian instead of the avian turtle. To be sure, they had never heard the voice of the former, yet some of them supposed that some species, at least, under some circumstances, did emit some sort of noise. They had never thought of the dove in this connection. To be sure, they had never thought much about it. Had they been writing scholia or glosses this "turtle" would not have been a bird.

A. As an onomatopoeic term for the *call of the male frog* at the mating season: Arist. *H.A.* iv, 9, 5; Plut. *Mor.* 982 E; Ael. *N.A.* ix, 13; *C.G.L.* II, 382, 30; III, 305, 33.

B. 1. As a name given to the *male frog* at this season from its call: Plin. *N.H.* xi, 173.

2. As a general designation for the *frog*, without limitation as to season or age: Theophr. *de Sig. Pluv.* 3, 5; Arat. 948; *Geop.* I, 3, 11; Theocr. 7, 139; Agath. *Anth. Pal.* v, 291, 5; Eubul. Στεφ. 104, 6, Kock, II, 200; Hesych. *s.v.* (tadpole). Usually the *tree-frog*.

C. By metaphorical extension, to denote:

1. From the amatory nature and habits of the frog —

a) *A person distraught with the hot passion of love*: Nicaenetus (*ap. Parth.* xi, 2).

b) *A confirmed Aphrodisian*: *C.G.L.* II, 189, 29.

c) The hot, stinging, *erotic passion, pruriency*: *C.G.L.* III, 89, 60. (Cf. Juv. II, 168.)

2. From the characteristic εὐήθεια of the frog —

The *simple-minded, stupid, or foolish person*: Hesych. *s.v.* (Cf. Plat. *Theaet.* 161 D.)²⁴

²⁴ Ael. *N.A.* vi, 19; Strab. xvii, 2, 4; and *C.G.L.* III, 17, 55; 89, 60; 435, 66; 571, 29 may belong to either B, 1 or B, 2.