

ACTA CLASSICA UNIV. SCIENT. DEBRECEN.	LVIII.	2022.	pp. 67–100.
--	--------	-------	-------------

## ACROSTIC CONVERSATION: HORACE, ODE I 18<sup>1</sup>

BY NEIL ADKIN

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, USA  
nadkin3489@aol.com

*Abstract:* This article argues that gamma-acrostical *disce* in Horace's *Ode I 18* (ll. 11–15) alludes to the land-confiscatory acrostics recently identified in Virgil's *Eclogues* (I 5–8; VI 14–24; IX 34–38). Horace has carefully signposted his acrostical intent. Virgil himself interfaces with this Horatian cryptography by means of other acrostics of his own. The result is an 'acrostic conversation'.  
*Keywords:* acrostics, Horace, Virgil, *disce*

Horace *Ode I 18* reads:

<i>nullam, Vare, sacra vite prius severis arborem circa mite solum Tiburis et moenia Catili. siccis omnia nam dura deus proposuit, neque mordaces aliter diffugiunt sollicitudines. quis post vina gravem militiam aut pauperiem crepat?</i>	5
<i>quis non te potius, Bacche pater, teque, decens Venus? ac ne quis modici transiliat munera Liberi, Centaurea monet cum Lapithis rixa super mero debellata, monet Sithoniis non levis Euhius, cum fas atque nefas exiguo fine libidinum</i>	10
<i>discernunt avidi. non ego te, candide Bassareu, invitum quatiam, nec variis obsita frondibus sub divum rapiam. saeva tene cum Berecynthio cornu tympana, quae subsequitur caecus Amor sui et tollens vacuum plus nimio Gloria verticem arcanique Fides prodiga, perlucidior vitro.</i>	15

<sup>1</sup> For the term 'acrostic conversation' cf. Kronenberg 2018, sect. 1. She also speaks in the same connection of 'acrostic intertextuality' (ib., sect. 71). In the present article citation follows *Oxf. Lat. Dict.* 2nd ed. Oxford 2012 ('Authors and Works': xviii–xxix); material not found there is cited according to *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae: Index librorum scriptorum inscriptionum*. 2nd ed. Leipzig 1990, and its online *Addenda*.

Over a quarter of a century ago Gareth Morgan demonstrated on statistical grounds that in ll. 11–15 the quinqueliteral gamma-acrostic *disce* must be deliberate.<sup>2</sup> This gamma-acrostical *disce* is however ignored in Roland Mayer’s recent commentary on *Odes* I for the Cambridge ‘green and yellow’ series.<sup>3</sup> Morgan himself laments that his statistical demonstration of this acrostic’s intentionality does not leave him much wiser as to its point.<sup>4</sup> The aim of the present article is to provide this gamma-acrostic with a *raison d’être*.

Nisbet and Hubbard’s magisterial commentary on *Odes* I argues cogently for identifying the Varus to whom this poem is dedicated with P. Alfenus Varus,<sup>5</sup> who was involved in the land-confiscations which affected Virgil. Reference is twice made by Virgil to this Varus.<sup>6</sup> Recently it has been argued that both these mentions of Varus occur in conjunction with acrostics that concern the aforesaid land-confiscations. The first of these acrostics is the two-way *laesis* at *Ecl.* VI 14–24 (first up, then down): ‘for those who have been hurt (sc. by the confiscations)’.<sup>7</sup> The other acrostic is *undis* at *Ecl.* IX 34–38.<sup>8</sup> Horace’s acrostical message (*disce*) to Varus would accordingly appear to be an injunction to ‘learn’ the similarly acrostical messages that his confidant Virgil had addressed to this same Varus. The horizontal wing of Horace’s gamma-acrostical *disce* continues as *disce-runt*, of which the object is *fas atque nefas* (10): the ‘distinction’ (*discern-*)

---

<sup>2</sup> Morgan 1993, 144–145. Morgan wrongly states (p. 144 n. 5) that this gamma-acrostic was first identified in ‘Minos’ (= anagrammatic allonym of Simon) 1901. In fact this acrostic had already been detected by Simon 1899, who deals with it there on no fewer than three occasions (pp. 9; 71–72; 129). Morgan is also wrong to assert (p. 145) that in the same lines as downward *disce* (11–15) Simon posited an upward *ludit(e)* ‘in (approximately) the fifth letter’. What Simon in fact posited (1899, p. 71) was instead *luit(e)* (Morgan’s *ludit[e]* is not to be found in Horace’s text at all); moreover Simon observes (rightly) *à propos* of this *luit(e)* that its ‘Absichtlichkeit stark bezweifelt werden muss’.

<sup>3</sup> Mayer 2012, 155–156.

<sup>4</sup> Morgan 1993, 145: ‘I am not certain that this tells me much about the present poem’.

<sup>5</sup> Nisbet and Hubbard 1970, 227–228. We are duly directed to Nisbet and Hubbard’s argument here in (e. g.) the new edition of Horace by Shackleton Bailey 2010, 370 (*Index nominum* s. v. ‘Varus amicus Horatii’: ‘v. N.–H.’).

<sup>6</sup> Viz. *Ecl.* VI 6–12; IX 26–29.

<sup>7</sup> On this acrostic cf. Adkin 2015a.

<sup>8</sup> On this acrostic, which is confirmed by horizontal *undis* (l. 39), cf. Adkin 2015b, where it is argued that the acrostic’s point is the etymology of *litus* as the place where these ‘waves’ do not ‘play’ (39: *ludus*), but ‘strike’ (43: *feriant* for synonymous but extremely rare *lidant*). The issue is therefore how Varus should define *litus* (where ‘land’ starts) when he is confiscating land round Virgil’s ‘wave’-washed Mantua (cf. Serv. auct., *Ecl.* IX 10: *quod Mantuanis per iniquitatem Alfeni Vari, qui agros divisit, praeter palustria nihil relictum sit, sicut ex oratione Cornelii in Alfenum ostenditur: ‘cum iussus tria milia passus a muro in diversa relinquere, vix octingentos passus aquae, quae circumdata est, admetireris, reliquisti’*).

between ‘right’ and ‘wrong’ (*fas / nefas*) is just what a land-confiscator like Varus needs to ‘learn’.

Such political acrostics have recently been detected elsewhere in Virgil. Here reference may be made to the dedication of *Eclogue* VIII (ll. 6–13), where the acrostic reads: *tu si es, ac[c]i[pe]* (‘if it’s you, accept [sc. the dedication]’).<sup>9</sup> This acrostic accordingly solves the hotly debated question of this poem’s dedicatee — Pollio or Augustus. This ambiguity is thus deliberate (‘if it’s you ...’). It may also be noted that here, as with aforesaid *disce* in *Ode* I 18, the acrostic is an imperative addressed to the dedicatee: *accipe*. Another Virgilian acrostic which likewise concerns Pollio is found in *Ecl.* IV 47–52: *cacata*.<sup>10</sup> Hence the Golden Age that is to start in Pollio’s consulship is shit. It will be argued elsewhere that this acrostical *cacata* that Virgil applies to the Pollionic millennium is matched by the similarly acrostical *nepia* applied by Horace to the same Pollio’s History of the Civil Wars.<sup>11</sup> It will also be argued elsewhere that this acrostical *nepia*, which occurs at the beginning of Book II, is itself matched by similarly acrostical but semantically opposite *sapis* in the middle of the same book.<sup>12</sup> In rhetorical terms all these political acrostics are a form of *emphasis* (cf. Quint., *Inst.* IX 2, 64–99), in which *quod non dicimus accipi volumus* (65; cf. *sed aliud latens* [ib.]): the prime reason for resort to this figure is *si dicere palam parum tutum est* (66). Horace’s message to Varus in *Ode* I 18 is only outwardly viticulture: inly it is ticklish politics.

This poem contains a number of clues to its acrostical purpose.<sup>13</sup> Attention may first be drawn in this connection to the line (7) which starts the second half of the poem<sup>14</sup> and which also starts the sentence that ends with the start of acrostical *disce*. This line 7 reads: *ac ne quis modici transiliat munera Liberi*. Here *transiliat*, which is spotlighted by its inter-caesural position, is ‘recht ungewöhnlich’.<sup>15</sup> The oddness of ‘overstepping the gifts of Bacchus’ accordingly

---

<sup>9</sup> On this acrostic cf. Adkin 2017a.

<sup>10</sup> On this acrostic cf. Adkin 2016a.

<sup>11</sup> *Ode* II 1, 22–26, where *nepia* echoes Homeric νήπια βάζεις (*Od.* IV 32). Horace’s acrostical *nepia* is corroborated by *nepotes* at the end of the next line (27): *nepos* and virtually homonymous νήπιος were in fact regarded as etymologically linked (cf. Maltby 1991, 408; *Etym. Gud.* p. 408, 48–49 Sturz).

<sup>12</sup> *Ode* II 10, 13–17, where this *sapis* is confirmed by post-caesural *sapienter* in l. 22. This poem is addressed to a Licinius who may be Caepio’s fellow-conspirator against Augustus (cf. Nisbet and Hubbard 1978, 151–158). The point may also be made that in the third line of this acrostical *sapis* (II 10, 15) *informis*, which is problematic (cf. Romano 1991, 673), is evidently an echo of Virgil’s use of lexically identical *informis* in the same ante-caesural *sedes* in the same third line of a similar acrostic (*Ecl.* II 25), on which cf. Adkin 2019b.

<sup>13</sup> For this practice of embedding tip-offs to the presence of an acrostic cf. Adkin 2021, 132–136.

<sup>14</sup> So (e. g.) Romano 1991, 557 (‘vv. 7–16’).

<sup>15</sup> So Syndikus 2001, 199.

led Müller to emend *munera* to *munia*.<sup>16</sup> It would seem however that emendation is not the answer. This odd language is instead meant as a heads-up.<sup>17</sup> Here the reader is being nudged to think of *transilire*'s more usual meaning: not 'to overstep', but 'to overlook'.<sup>18</sup> Since this sense of 'overlook' fits an acrostic perfectly, we have here in *ne quis ... transiliat* ('don't overlook') a variant of the 'look!'-type cue to an acrostic.<sup>19</sup> *Transiliat* is here followed by its object *munera*, which was etymologized from *monere*,<sup>20</sup> which Horace deploys twice in the same pre-caesural locus in the two immediately succeeding lines: the reader is accordingly being tipped the wink not to 'overlook' the acrostical 'advice'. This *munera* is in turn followed by the dependent genitive *Liberi*, which in Horace's unicas script ([*l*]iberi) could mean 'of a candid man',<sup>21</sup> which fits Horace's 'candid' acrostic.<sup>22</sup> For *Liber* numerous synonyms were available:<sup>23</sup> from all these synonyms Horace here chooses *Liber*, which alone makes possible the aforesaid equivoque. Since this line 7 begins the sentence, its wording (*ac ne quis modici transiliat munera [l]iberi*) can be taken on its own to convey the acrostically charged sense: 'And don't let anyone overlook the gifts/advice of a moderate,<sup>24</sup> candid man'.

This line 7 not only begins the sentence which ends with the beginning of acrostical *disce*. This same line also supplies the middle letter of the unidentified acrostic *q(=c)*<sup>25</sup> - *a* - *c* (6–8). This acrostical *cac*-<sup>26</sup> is evidently a nod to Virgil's similarly acrostical *cacata* (*Ecl.* IV 47–52); the point was made above that this Virgilian *cacata* in a poem to Pollio finds another parallel in Horace's similarly acrostical *nepia* in a poem to the same Pollio (*Ode* II 1, 22–26). The acrostical *q(=c)-a-c-* of the present *Ode* (I 18, 6–8) can be read upwards as well as downwards: it is therefore akin to similarly bi-directional *laesis* at *Ecl.* VI 14–24.<sup>27</sup> The medial 'a' of this two-way *q(=c)-a-c-* is moreover supplied by *ac*, which

<sup>16</sup> Müller 1900, 82–83. This Müllerian emendation is viewed sympathetically by Nisbet and Hubbard 1970, 232, who also suggest *moenia*.

<sup>17</sup> For such use of fishy phraseology to red-flag an acrostic cf. Adkin 2021, 135–136.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. *OLD*<sup>2</sup>, II, 2166 (s. v. *transilio*; sect. 4a).

<sup>19</sup> For such 'spectatorial' prompts cf. Adkin 2021, 133–134.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. Maltby 1991, 397.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. *OLD*<sup>2</sup>, I, 1126 (s. v. *liber*<sup>1</sup>; sect. 11a).

<sup>22</sup> Horace himself had already played on the link between *Liber* and *liber* at *Sat.* I 4, 89–90 (... *condita cum verax aperit praecordia Liber. / hic tibi comis et urbanus liberque videtur*). *Liber* and *liber* were also linked etymologically; cf. Maltby 1991, 337.

<sup>23</sup> Three are employed in this poem itself; viz. *Bacche* (6), *Euhius* (9), *Bassareu* (11). For additional ones cf. (e. g.) *Bromius*, *Dionysus*, *Lenaeus*, *Lyaeus*, *Thyoneus*.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. *OLD*<sup>2</sup>, II, 1235 (s. v. *modicus*; sect. 8a).

<sup>25</sup> For 'q' = 'c' cf. *TLL*, III, col. 1, ll. 39–44 (s. v. 'c').

<sup>26</sup> For such truncation of an acrostic after the third letter cf. Adkin 2021, 136, where one of the examples adduced is the afore-mentioned *ac[c]i[pe]* (*Ecl.* VIII 11–13; cf. n. 9 above).

<sup>27</sup> Cf. n. 7 above.

accordingly generates a species of ‘gamma’-acrostic that likewise goes both downward (horizontal *ac* / descendent *ac*) and upward (horizontal *ac* / ascendent *aq[=c]*).<sup>28</sup> *Ac* tends furthermore to be avoided by poets:<sup>29</sup> here *et* would have fitted perfectly well instead.<sup>30</sup> Horace’s choice here of *ac* together with its initial position<sup>31</sup> would seem to confirm the intentionality of this acrostical *cac*-.

This *cac*- acrostic has been duly red-flagged. Not only is the mid-point of its middle line occupied by aforesaid *transiliat*, which is a subtextual adhortation ‘not to overlook’ (*ne quis ... transiliat*) the acrostic. This same *cac*- acrostic is also preceded immediately by a further hint. The end of the line just before the start of the acrostic is conspicuously occupied by *crepat* (5). This notable lexeme, which is favoured by the comic poets but is avoided altogether by Cicero, clearly puzzled the ancient commentators here.<sup>32</sup> Since however this verb is used both of tummy-rattles<sup>33</sup> and of farts,<sup>34</sup> such a stomach-related term aptly introduces and signposts a similarly bowel-based acrostic (*cac*-). Here *crepat* is furthermore modified by antecedent *post vina* (5). The only other instance of this collocation *post vina(-um)* in Augustan (and Republican) literature is to be found shortly beforehand in Horace himself (*Sat.* II 4, 59–60): *lactuca innatat acri / post vinum stomacho*. Here the language is noteworthy: the *acri* that qualifies *stomacho* has been variously emended.<sup>35</sup> A phrase (*post vina*) which Horace has just used with such colicky connotations (*acri post vinum stomacho*)<sup>36</sup> is admirably suited to similarly dyspeptic *crepat* as cue to acrostical *cac*-.

The first line of this *cac*- acrostic (6) contains the phrase *quis non te ... Bacche*, [*canit*]<sup>37</sup>? Here *te ... Bacche*, [*canit*] is a close copy of the *te, Bacche, canam*

<sup>28</sup> This ‘gamma-esque’ acrostic due to *ac* is an argument against the *at* that is transmitted by some MSS and preferred by some edd.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. Axelson 1945, 82–83.

<sup>30</sup> Mayer 2012, 154 (ad loc.) states: ‘*ac* has a slight adversative sense (*OLD* 7)’. (For ‘7’ read ‘9’). However *et* too can be used in such a way; cf. *OLD*<sup>2</sup>, I, 683 (s. v. *et*; sect. 14a: ‘with slight adversative force’); cf. also *TLL*, V, 2, coll. 893, l. 4 – 894, l. 3 (s. v. *et*: ‘vi adversativa’). Plenty of other ‘adversative’ particles were available; cf. *Corp. Gloss. Lat.*, II, p. 266, 55 Goetz: δέ: *ast, at, autem, ceterum, certe, verum*.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. Comm. Cruq. (ad loc.): *ordo est: Centaurea rixa super mero debellata cum Lapithis, monet ne quis transiliat munera modici Liberi*.

<sup>32</sup> Cf. Ps.-Acro (ad loc.): *crepat: increpat, accusat, commemorat*.

<sup>33</sup> Cf. *OLD*<sup>2</sup>, I, 502 (s. v. *crepo*; sect. 1a).

<sup>34</sup> Cf. *OLD*<sup>2</sup>, ib. (sect. 1d); cf. further Adams 1982, 249–250.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. the Oslo database of conjectures on Horace ([www.tekstlab.uio.no/horace/](http://www.tekstlab.uio.no/horace/)), which lists the following emendations: *acris, acre, lasso*.

<sup>36</sup> For the *innatat* that governs *stomacho* cf. *TLL*, VII, 1, col. 1694, ll. 11–16 (s. v. *innato*: ‘i. q. non concoqui’).

<sup>37</sup> Thus the supplement of (e. g.) Maclean and Chase 1856, 264.

in the first hemistich of the second line of Virgil's second *Georgic*.<sup>38</sup> This second book of Virgil's *Georgics* is about viticulture, which is also the subject of Horace's *Ode* I 18.<sup>39</sup> Since this *Ode* contains acrostics (*cac-*, *disce*) which allude to Virgilian acrostics, it is natural that this Horatian poem about viticulture should also allude to his friend Virgil's own acrostically-coloured treatment of exactly the same viticultural theme in the *Georgics*. Virgil's afore-mentioned *te, Bacche, canam* (*Georg.* II 2) is followed at the start of the very next line by *virgulta* (II 3). It has recently been argued elsewhere<sup>40</sup> that this problematic *virgulta*<sup>41</sup> is an imitation of Aratus' similarly onomastical *jeu* (ἄρρητον) in similarly line-initial position in the similarly 'second' line<sup>42</sup> of the *Phaenomena*: 'Virgil' was etymologized from *virgultum*.<sup>43</sup> This Aratean *jeu onomastique* (2: ἄρρητον) that has inspired Virgilian *virgulta* at the start of his second *Georgic* (II 3) also accounts for Virgil's recourse to a similar onomastic (*MA VE PU*) shortly beforehand in his acrostic at the end of his first *Georgic* (I 429–433),<sup>44</sup> where Virgil is imitating Aratus' λεπτή-acrostic (783–787), which in turn imitates Homer's λευκή-acrostic (*Il.* XXIV 1–5).<sup>45</sup>

<sup>38</sup> Since the first line (*Georg.* II 1: *hactenus arborum cultus et sidera caeli*) merely sums up the previous book, this second line is in effect the attention-grabbing exordium of the whole book. For Virgil's form of expression here (*te, Bacche, canam*) no further parallel is supplied by the online *Library of Latin Texts*.

<sup>39</sup> Cf. esp. the poem's opening line: *nullam ... sacra vite prius severis arborem*.

<sup>40</sup> Cf. Adkin 2018, 78.

<sup>41</sup> For the arboricultural problem cf. Mynors 1990, 100.

<sup>42</sup> Virgil's merely recapitulatory first line may be discounted; cf. n. 38 above.

<sup>43</sup> Cf. Maltby 1991, 637 (s. v. *Vergilius*[*Virg-*]) with Adkin 2018, 78. Virgil's imitation of Aratus continues in the next line (*Georg.* II 4), where *omnia plena* echoes Aratean μεστὰι ... πᾶσαι in the same line (2) as aforesaid ἄρρητον. An allusion to this onomastical switch from 'Aratean' ἄρρητον to 'Virgilian' *virgulta* would appear to elucidate an enigmatic passage later in this same second *Georgic* (II 238–240: *perhibetur amara* [cf. 247: (*a*)*m*(=*M*)*aro*] / ... *arando* [evoking participial *a*(=*A*)*ratus*] / *nec ... sua nomina servat* /); cf. Adkin 2018, 78–79. This same *virgulta* is again deployed in this same *Georgic* (II 328) in an onomastical acrostic (*P*[*ublius*; 321] *VER*[*gilius*; 324] *MA*[*ro*; 327]); cf. Adkin 2018, 79–80.

<sup>44</sup> Cf. Bing 1990, 284–285.

<sup>45</sup> If Virgil's use of an onomastic (*MA VE PU*; *Georg.* I 429–433) is due to Aratus' onomastical ἄρρητον, it will be argued elsewhere by the present writer that here Virgil's upward, skipped-line format has been inspired by an unidentified λεπτή-acrostic (*Apoll. Rhod.* II 675–678), which is likewise upward and also 'skipped-line', because intertwined (λ-π-ε-τη, i. e. λ-ε-π-τη [for syllabic τη cf. *MA VE PU*]); cf. the 'how-to-read' hints in (e. g.) *πλοχμοί* (677: 'entwining'; this Homeric hapax supplies the 'π' of the acrostic), *δερκόμενοι παράμειβον* (660) and *ῥήματα ... / λοξὰ παραστρωφῶνται* (664–665), while for horizontal confirmation cf. *λεπτόν* (670) and for the idea behind this convoluted format cf. the lines immediately following Aratus' λεπτή-acrostic and Homer's λευκή-acrostic (viz. *Phaen.* 788–790 [esp. 789 (ὕπτίωσα)] and *Il.* XXIV 5–11 [esp. 5 (ἔστρέφετ' ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα) and 10–11 (ἄλλοτε δ' αὐτε / ὕπτιος, ἄλλοτε δὲ πρηγής); intervenient 6–9 were athetized by the Alexandrians]).

Virgil's afore-mentioned *virgulta* is followed shortly afterwards by a line which reads thus: *pōpulus et glauca canentia fronde salicta* (*Georg.* II 13). Line-initial *populus* is glossed as λευκή,<sup>46</sup> which is the similarly 'line-initial' acrostic that prominently opens the last book of the *Iliad* (XXIV 1–5): reference was made above to this famous Homeric λευκή-acrostic.<sup>47</sup> Virgil's *populus* is here followed immediately by *glauca canentia*, which, as Servius duly points out, entails cacemphatic *-ca ca-*: this cacemphaton is rightly regarded as deliberate.<sup>48</sup> *Caneio* is first found here, while contiguous (*g*)*lauca* is a virtual homonym of acrostical λευκή.<sup>49</sup> This line at the start of viticultural *Georgic* II (*populus et glauca canentia* ...) is accordingly a further reason besides the acrostical *cacata* of *Eclogue* IV (47–52) for Horace's recourse to acrostical *cac-* in similarly viticultural *Ode* I 18 (6–8).

It is the middle line of this Horatian acrostic (18, 7) that introduces wine's negative aspect, which then occupies the rest of the poem. The point may therefore be made that this very same reference to the drawbacks of wine is also to be found in *Georgic* II (454–457): we accordingly find in both *Ode* I 18 and *Georgic* II exactly the same transition from a celebration of the vine to a caveat about the mischief it can cause. In *Georgic* II this warning is particularly eye-catching, since here it is unexpected.<sup>50</sup> Moreover in both *Ode* I 18 and *Georgic* II this warning about wine takes exactly the same form — the affray between Lapiths and Centaurs. In both passages the order of these *nomina propria* is furthermore the same: line-initial *Centaur-* is followed respectively by a lexically identical *Lapithis*.<sup>51</sup> If then the first line of this Horatian *cac-* acrostic (18, 6) echoes the beginning of *Georgic* II (l. 2: *te, Bacche, canam*), the last line of this same acrostic (18, 8) echoes the end of the same *Georgic* (II 456–457: *Centauros ... Lapithis*): this Horatian acrostic is accordingly framed by Virgilian *imitatio*.

<sup>46</sup> So (e. g.) *Corp. Gloss. Lat.*, II, p. 539, 7 Goetz: *populus*: λευκή.

<sup>47</sup> The widespread influence of this Homeric acrostic has recently been investigated by Kronenberg 2018, sect. 58–70, who does not however discuss the present passage of *Georgic* II or the other pertinent texts of Virgil and Horace to be dealt with below.

<sup>48</sup> So (most recently) Erren 2003, 286. Here the cacemphaton is highlighted by its position at the caesura.

<sup>49</sup> *Glaucus* is glossed as *albus* (*Corp. Gloss. Lat.*, VI, p. 495 Goetz), which is in turn glossed as λευκός (ib., p. 48).

<sup>50</sup> Cf. Thomas 1988, 242–243. The issue is conveniently set out by Peerlkamp 1861, 154: 'Quid iam de poeta dicamus, qui, quod brevi ante scripsit, finito carmine, sic contemnit et *dona Baccheia* fere abominatur, quasi eum commendatae vitium culturae poeniteat?'

<sup>51</sup> Only one earlier instance of this combination of names is provided by the online *Library of Latin Texts* (viz. Cic., *Pis.* 22): there the order is however the opposite (*Lapitharum et Centaurorum convivium*).

If Horace's *cac*-acrostic has been thus influenced by Virgil's second *Georgic*, it would seem possible to show that this same Horatian acrostic has in turn influenced a passage in the eleventh Book of Virgil's *Aeneid*.<sup>52</sup> The passage of the *Aeneid* at issue (XI 820–827), which is Camilla's *chant du cygne*, reads thus:

*tum sic exspirans (sc. Camilla) Accam ex aequalibus unam*      820  
*adloquitur, fida ante alias quae sola Camillae*  
*quicum partiri curas, atque haec ita fatur:*  
*'hactenus, Acca soror, potui: nunc vulnus acerbum*  
*conficit, et tenebris nigrescunt omnia circum.*  
*effuge et haec Turno mandata novissima perfer:*      825  
*succedat pugnae Troianosque arceat urbe.*  
*iamque vale'.*

It has recently been argued elsewhere<sup>53</sup> that here *Acca* (= slightly anagrammed *Caca*) is being glossed by a pair of acrostics: anabatic *c-[h]a<sup>54</sup>-q(=c)<sup>55</sup>-a-t* (820–824), then synonymously catabatic *c-e-s-i* (= χέζει;<sup>56</sup> 824–827) — 'she shits'.<sup>57</sup>

Virgil's defecatory acrostic in *Aen.* XI 820–827 resembles Horace's similarly BM-acrostic in *Ode* I 18 in going both upwards and downwards. When Virgil's ascendent *c-[h]a-q(=c)-a-t* (820–824) is duly read upward, its 'first' three letters (*c-[h]a-q*) correspond exactly to Horace's own *c-a-q* (6–8), when it too is read upward. In Virgil's *c-[h]a-q* the 'q' is supplied by *quicum* (822). For *quicum* here Virgil could instead have used *cum qua*: the 'c' of this *cum* would then have generated acrostical *c-[h]a-c-a-t*, in which the third element evinces standard 'c' instead of non-standard 'q'. It might therefore be thought that Virgil's preference here for *quicum*, which entails acrostical 'q' for 'c' (*c-[h]a-q*), is a nod to the

<sup>52</sup> The Horatian *Ode* in question (I 18) will have been the particular object of Virgil's attention because of the references it contains to Virgil's own acrostics (*cac-*, *disce*).

<sup>53</sup> Cf. Adkin 2016a, 23–24.

<sup>54</sup> For ignorably non-letter 'h' cf. *TLL*, VI, 3, col. 2391, ll. 26–55 (s. v. 'h': 'in numero litterarum fere non relata'). In this acrostic the word at issue is moreover *hac-tenus*: in *hic*, *haec*, *hoc* the 'h' is often left out altogether (cf. *TLL*, VI, 3, col. 2694, ll. 18–25 [s. v.: 'de aspiratione']).

<sup>55</sup> For 'q' = 'c' cf. n. 25 above.

<sup>56</sup> For 'c' = 'χ' cf. *TLL*, III, col. 1, ll. 36–38 (s. v. 'c'); for 's' = 'ζ' cf. *OLD*<sup>2</sup>, II, 2343 (s. v. 'z').

<sup>57</sup> This diglottically cacatory acrostic is corroborated by similarly acrostical *caco* exactly ten lines earlier (XI 808–811), where Virgil is imitating *Il.* XV 586–588: however Homeric κακόν (586; 'an evil') is puckishly converted into the homonymous acrostic *caco* ('I shit'). This change from Greek (κακόν) to Latin (*caco*) is evidently pointed up by the Greco-Latin diglottism of acrostical *cacat / cesi* (= χέζει; 820–827).



exactly parallel ‘q’ in Horace’s own acrostical *c-a-q*. In Horace this ‘q’ is moreover generated by *quis* (6), which exhibits the very same stem as Virgil’s similarly acrostic-generating *qui-cum* (822).<sup>58</sup>

A similar debt to Horace’s acrostical *c-a-q* is evidently to be found in the very next line of this Virgilian stool-acrostic (823). This line begins thus: ‘*hactenus, Acca*’. The point was made above that in this passage *Acca* is being footnoted acrostically as anagrammatic *Caca*. In the same connection the further point was made that the initial ‘h’ in *hac-* could be omitted.<sup>59</sup> Hence the present syntagm *[h]ac(tenus) Ac(ca)* is marked by a striking homoeocatarcton.<sup>60</sup> For *hactenus* ample synonyms were at hand.<sup>61</sup> The *[h]ac-tenus* for which Virgil does opt<sup>62</sup> answers exactly to Horace’s *ac*: in both poets this same *ac* supplies the central ‘a’ in acrostical *c-a-q*. Virgil’s choice of *[h]ac-tenus* also produces exactly the same doubly ‘gamma-esque’ acrostic that is found in Horace: ll. 823–824 (horizontal *[h]ac* / downward *[h]ac*) and ll. 822–823 (upward *[h]aq[=c]* / horizontal *[h]ac*). Thus Virgil’s acrostical gloss of *Acca* as ‘shit’ argutely references Horace’s own ‘shit’-acrostic.

In this Virgilian crap-acrostic the reference to Horace would seem to be marked by a further wrinkle. It was noted above that *hactenus* is first introduced into poetry by Virgil. The passage in which he does so is the very first line of *Georgic* II: *hactenus* in fact grabs attention by being the very first word of this book. Here *hactenus* occurs in the line immediately before the one containing the words *te, Bacche, canam* (*Georg.* II 2), which it was argued above are echoed in the first line (6) of Horace’s *c-a-q* acrostic. It was also pointed out above that these same Virgilian words (*te, Bacche* ...) are separated by just ten lines from *pōpulus et glauca canentia* ... (*Georg.* II 13), where *populus* evokes the acrostically loaded λευκή, while *glauca canentia* involves cacemphatic *-ca ca-*, which has evidently influenced Horace’s similarly cacatory *c-a-q*. It may therefore be thought that, when Virgil uses this same *[h]actenus* in his *c-a-q* acrostic (*Aen.* XI 822–824), which looks back to Horace’s own *c-a-q* acrostic, Virgil is simultaneously looking back to the same passage of *Georgic* II to which this Horatian

<sup>58</sup> This Virgilian *quicum* is itself highlighted by the immediately following *partiri*, which is Virgil’s sole instance of a ‘historic infinitive’ in a subordinate clause.

<sup>59</sup> Cf. n. 54 above.

<sup>60</sup> This *[h]ac-* is further accentuated by the ‘unusual pleonasm’ (so Mackail 1930, 457) entailed by the (polypotitic; cf. *[h]ac-*) collocation *haec ita* immediately beforehand (822).

<sup>61</sup> Cf. *Corp. Gloss. Lat.*, VI, p. 510 Goetz (s. v. *hactenus*): *usque hac, usque nunc, huc usque, usque modo*. The *hactenus* of the present passage is paraphrased as *usque ad hoc tempus* by Claud. Don., *Aen.* XI 820 p. 533, 18 *Georgii*.

<sup>62</sup> Virgil is the first to introduce this word to poetry.

passage was itself looking back.<sup>63</sup> Evidently therefore we are dealing here with a ‘window reference’:<sup>64</sup> in this case the author on either side of the Horatian ‘window’ is Virgil himself.

It has recently been shown that Virgil often endorses his acrostics with a self-nuncupatory *sphragis*.<sup>65</sup> In this connection particular reference may be made to the afore-mentioned onomastic *MA VE PU* at the end of *Georgic* I (429–433). It has been argued elsewhere that this *MA VE PU* is meant as an endorsement of an undetected acrostic which begins shortly afterwards in the first line of Virgil’s professed threnody for Caesar’s murder (466–470) — ‘Strike Caesar with a sacrificial axe!’<sup>66</sup> The point was made above that this *MA VE PU* has been inspired by Aratus’ similarly onomastical *jeu* (ἄρρητον; *Phaen.* 2), which has also inspired Virgil’s onomastical *virgulta* shortly afterwards at the start of *Georgic* II (3). Since it was argued above that this opening passage of the second *Georgic* with its play on Virgil’s name is echoed in Horace’s own *cac-* acrostic, it would be appropriate for this same acrostic with its Virgilian content to avail itself of this Virgilian technique of endorsing an acrostic with Virgil’s name. Such can be shown to be the case.

In Horace’s *cac-* acrostic the last word of the last line is *mero* (8): *rixa super mero*. Here Nisbet and Hubbard observe: ‘Oudendorp proposed *super merum*, which would be normal’.<sup>67</sup> This ‘abnormality’ of *mero* does however red-flag this word, while at the same time converting it into a virtual homonym of Virgil’s own cognomen: *Maro*. Synonymous alternatives to *merum* were at Horace’s disposal.<sup>68</sup> *Maro* itself was in fact etymologized from *mero*.<sup>69</sup> In a ‘vinous’ context such as this Horatian *Ode*, which also references Virgil’s ‘viticultural’ *Georgic* II, it is moreover natural to think of the precisely homonymous ‘Maro’ who gives Odysseus the plot-developmentally vital wine (*Od.* IX 196–215), which the latter then famously employs to make the Cyclops drunk before blinding him: this

---

<sup>63</sup> In both *Aen.* XI 823 and *Georg.* II 1 [*h*]actenus is the first word of the first line of the respective section (viz. Camilla’s speech; book II of the *Georgics*). It may also be noted that in *Georg.* II 1 the word is spelled *actenus* by the Codex Mediceus.

<sup>64</sup> On this technique of simultaneous reference to a model and its source cf. Thomas 1986, 188–189.

<sup>65</sup> Cf. Adkin 2016a, 31–32.

<sup>66</sup> Read 466–470 downward as acrostical *icito!*, then from this final *o-* (470) read horizontal *o-[b]scena*, recently etymologized from *scena* (‘stage’; cf. Varro, *Ling.* VII 96), homonym of *scena* (‘sacrificial axe’; cf. Liv. Andr., *Com.* 2: *ictus scena*). Cf. further Adkin 2018.

<sup>67</sup> Nisbet and Hubbard 1970, 233. Cf. Peerlkamp 1862, 70: ‘*Rixa super mero* significat *de mero*, propter *merum*, cui *merum*, in mensa positum, in praedam cederet’.

<sup>68</sup> Cf. *Synon. Cic.* p. 427, 29 Barwick.

<sup>69</sup> Cf. Marangoni 2007, 78 (s. v. *Maro*).

Maro (or his father) is himself a son of Bacchus,<sup>70</sup> who is named in the first line of Horace's acrostic (6).<sup>71</sup>

If cognominal *Maro* is thus evoked at the end of Horace's *cac-* acrostic, a reference to Virgil's praenomen and nomen is to be found at the beginning. It was noted above that the word immediately before acrostical *cac-* is hintful *crepat*, which is in turn modified by *post vina* (5): this particular *iunctura* is a hapax in Republican and Augustan texts. This *post vina* is immediately preceded by *quis*, which is linked anaphorically to the similarly line-initial *quis* that in the very next line (6) opens acrostical *q(=c)ac-*: hence *post vina* is connected very closely to this acrostic. Here *post vina* is highlighted by ellipse.<sup>72</sup> *Post* was regularly abbreviated to 'p',<sup>73</sup> which was also the regular abbreviation for *Publius*.<sup>74</sup> Here *post* governs *vina*, which was etymologized from *vis*, which was in turn regarded as the etymon of *Vi(=e)rgilius*.<sup>75</sup> This *cac-* acrostic is accordingly framed by onomastical *p- vi- m[a]ro*, which thus forms a deft *tricolon crescens*. The final point may be made that this *m[a]ro* occupies the same emphatically terminal *sedes* as *[l]iberi* in the immediately antecedent line: hence the 'candid' adviser could be Virgil as well as Horace.

The line with the second *monet* ('advise'; 9) that glosses the *munera* on which *[l]iberi* depends in the middle of the *cac-* acrostic is immediately followed by *cum fas atque nefas exiguo fine libidinum / discernunt avidi* (10–11), where *discernunt* starts this poem's other acrostic: *disce* (11–15). Here *avidi*, which is underscored by the strong break after it, is problematic. If this word is construed with *libidinum*, the result is a very awkward hyperbaton in enjambment together with a curious use of *libidines* for Horace's day. If on the other hand *avidi* is understood absolutely, it is 'oddly unspecific'.<sup>76</sup> Ps.-Acron has to attempt the following explanation: '*avidi*': *in luxuriam proni, scilicet propter ebrietatem*. This *avidi* has in fact been emended to *madidi*.<sup>77</sup> For *avidi* plenty of synonymous

---

<sup>70</sup> Cf. Kruse 1930, col. 1911.

<sup>71</sup> For Virgil's own exploitation of his exact Homeric homonym ('Maro') in his own self-referential onomastics cf. Adkin 2020, 485–486.

<sup>72</sup> Cf. (e. g.) Peerlkamp 1862, 69: '*Post vina*. Omissum est participium verbi alicuius'.

<sup>73</sup> Cf. *TLL*, X, 2, col. 156, ll. 23–32 (s. v. *post*).

<sup>74</sup> Cf. *TLL*, X, 1, col. 3, l. 53 (s. v. 'p': 'passim'). For 'p' standing for *P(ublius)* in Virgilian onomastics cf. (e. g.) n. 43 above; Adkin 2015a, 452; Adkin 2016a, 31.

<sup>75</sup> Cf. Maltby 1991, 637; 647–648 (s. vv. *Vergilius*[*Virg-*]; *vinum*; *virga*). *Vis* was also seen as etymon of afore-mentioned and similarly onomastical *virgulta* (*Georg.* II 3); cf. Maltby 1991, 648 (s. v. *virgultum*).

<sup>76</sup> So Nisbet and Hubbard 1970, 234.

<sup>77</sup> Cf. the Oslo database of conjectures.

alternatives were available.<sup>78</sup> In particular Horace could have used the semantically and metrically identical *cupidi*. Why then should Horace have instead employed the odd *avidus*? The answer would appear to be imitation of Virgil: the oddness signposts the debt.

In Virgil's first *Eclogue* the eye-catching first exchange between Meliboeus and Tityrus contains the following passage:

(M.)	<i>formonsam</i> <sup>79</sup> <i>resonare doces Amaryllida silvas.</i>	5
(T.)	<i>O Meliboee, deus nobis haec otia fecit.</i>	
	<i>namque erit ille mihi semper deus, illius aram</i>	
	<i>saepe tener nostris ab ovilibus imbuet agnus.</i>	
	<i>ille meas errare boves, ut cernis, et ipsum</i>	
	<i>ludere quae vellem calamo permisit agresti.</i>	10
(M.)	<i>Non equidem invideo, miror magis.</i>	

It has been argued elsewhere<sup>80</sup> that here the *fons*-acrostic (5–8) resembles the afore-discussed *undis*-acrostic (*Ecl.* IX 34–38; cf. n. 8 above) in referring to the land-confiscations round uliginous Mantua.<sup>81</sup> This *fons*-acrostic is accordingly part of the acrostically political message that Horace's similarly acrostical *disce* is urging Varus to 'learn' when 'distinguishing' (*discern*-) 'right' and 'wrong' (*fas* / *nefas*) *qua* land-confiscator. Here the point may be made that Virgil's *f[orm]ons*- at the start of the first line (5) of this acrostical *fons* generates a species of gamma-acrostic that resembles Horace's *disce[rnunt]* at the start of the similarly first line (11) of his own *disce*-acrostic: on each occasion the acrostical word is contained within the word that supplies the acrostic's first letter — a 'joey' (so to say) within a 'kangaroo'-word.

This Virgilian *fons*-acrostic is followed in the very next line (9) by the phrase *ut cernis*. Here we accordingly have a further instance of the *de rigueur* dog-whistle to 'look' at the acrostic.<sup>82</sup> For *cernere* in this sense of 'to see' synonyms galore were available.<sup>83</sup> *Cerno* is however particularly appropriate for an acrostic, since it had very recently been etymologized from *creo*:<sup>84</sup> when an acrostic has been 'created', it can then be 'seen'. This same Virgilian *cerno* was also

<sup>78</sup> Cf. *TLL*, II, col. 1429, ll. 30–33 (s. v. *avidus*). For additional synonyms cf. ib., col. 1424, ll. 28–30; *Synon. Cic.* p. 414, 11–12 Barwick.

<sup>79</sup> For the spelling with 'n' cf. Coleman 1977, 39 and 43.

<sup>80</sup> Cf. Adkin 2014, 46.

<sup>81</sup> Cf. l. 3: *nos patriae finis et dulcia linquimus arva.*

<sup>82</sup> Cf. n. 19 above.

<sup>83</sup> Cf. *TLL*, III, col. 875, ll. 11–15 (s. v. *cerno*). *Cernere* is a hapax in the *Eclogues*.

<sup>84</sup> Varro, *Ling.* VI 81: *dictum cerno ... a creando; dictum ab eo quod cum quid creatum est, tunc denique videtur.*

regarded as the etymon of *discerno*,<sup>85</sup> which starts Horace's *disce*-acrostic. This Horatian *discernere* could, just like Virgil's *cernere*, mean 'to see'.<sup>86</sup> Horace's use here of *discernere* can therefore be taken as a subtextual hint to 'see' the acrostic: Horatian *discerno* thus serves the same acrostically wink-tipping purpose as Virgilian *cerno*. This passage of the *Odes* is the only certain instance of *discerno* in all Horace.<sup>87</sup> It may accordingly be felt that here we have a further Horatian nod to Virgil's *fons*-acrostic: Horace's *discernunt* looks back to Virgil's *cernis*.<sup>88</sup>

If this Virgilian *cernis* has been placed in the line immediately after the *fons*-acrostic, the next line but one after *cernis* is occupied by *invideo* (11). If *cernis* has moreover influenced Horace's *discernunt*, this Virgilian *invideo* would likewise appear to have exercised an influence on Horatian *avidi*, which is positioned immediately after *discernunt*: the point was made above that this *avidi* is problematic. Virgil's own *invideo* similarly requires explanation by Servius. Such lexical not-quite-kosherness is often a sign that etymology is at issue.<sup>89</sup> Such would appear to be the case in the present passage.<sup>90</sup> The *invideo* that Virgil employs here had evidently been very recently etymologized from *videre*.<sup>91</sup> Virgil's *in-vid-* in this text is accordingly an exact calque of the ἐσ-ιδ- that [Ps.-]Theocritus had used in *Id.* VIII 11.<sup>92</sup> It is possible to show that Virgil here is in fact thinking specifically of this passage of *Idyll* VIII: Horace's own *avidi* then proceeds to allude to these texts of both Virgil and [Ps.-]Theocritus by a 'window reference'.<sup>93</sup>

This [Ps.-]Theocritean *Idyll* VIII is thoroughly familiar to Virgil. In particular the lines in it that begin with the one containing said ἐσ-ιδ- (VIII 11–27) are

<sup>85</sup> Cf. *TLL*, V, 1, 2, col. 1296, l. 12 (s. v. *discerno*).

<sup>86</sup> Cf. *TLL*, V, 1, 2, col. 1305, ll. 30–31 (s. v. *discerno*): 'i. q. dispicere'.

<sup>87</sup> Participial *discretus* is a *varia lectio* in *Ode* II 13, 23.

<sup>88</sup> This same Virgilian *cernis* in his first *Eclogue* would also appear to have influenced a passage in Horace's similarly first *Ode* (I 1, 32–34), which likewise contains an (inverted) 'gamma'-acrostic, this time unidentified: *secernunt populo, si neque tibias / Euterpe cohibet nec Polyhymnia / Lesboum refugit tendere barbiton*. Here horizontal *Les-boum* is reproduced in the upwardly acrostical *l-e-s* (for such 'bobtail' acrostics that stop at the third letter cf. n. 26 above). In the 'first' line of this acrostic Horace's line-initial *se-cernunt* evidently echoes Virgil's *cernis* as a subtextual nudge to 'see' the acrostic: for the very large number of possible synonyms for *secerno* cf. *Synon. Cic.* pp. 421, 28–32; 445, 29–30 Barwick.

<sup>89</sup> Cf. Adkin 2016b, 8 n. 11.

<sup>90</sup> Etymology is also at issue in the next two lines (12–13); cf. Adkin 2011.

<sup>91</sup> Cf. Varro, *Ling.* VI 80 with Riganti 1978, 175. For the derivation from this same *videre* of further lexemes with the same stem *invid-* cf. Maltby 1991, 311 (s. vv. *invidia*; *invidiosus*; *invidus*).

<sup>92</sup> For Roman awareness that Latin *vid-* derived from Greek *ιδ-* cf. Maltby 1991, 644 (s. v. *video*).

<sup>93</sup> Cf. n. 64 above.

imitated in Virgil's third *Eclogue* (28–51).<sup>94</sup> The first hemistich of this [Ps.-]Theocritean line 11 that is currently at issue reads: *χρήσδεις ὧν ἐσιδεῖν*; This [Ps.-]Theocritean *ἐσιδεῖν* and the *invideo* of Virgil's first *Eclogue* accordingly occupy exactly the same emphatic *sedes* immediately before a strong sense-break at the strong main-caesura in exactly the same eleventh line of their respective poems. Both these verbs are also the third word of the first line of a speech following a change of speaker: in [Ps.-]Theocritus this new speaker, who utters the word *ἐσιδεῖν*, is no other than Menalcas, who 'is' Virgil.<sup>95</sup> Attention may finally be drawn to a further point of contact: [Ps.-]Theocritean *ἐσιδεῖν* and Virgilian *invideo* are both positioned after an acrostic.

In [Ps.-]Theocritus this unidentified acrostic ends in the line (11) containing *ἐσιδεῖν*. The passage (ll. 9–11) that comprises the acrostic reads thus: 'ποιμῆν εἰροπόκων οἴων ... / οὔποκα νικασεῖς μ' ...' / [Menalcas] *χρήσδεις ὧν ἐσιδεῖν*; These lines accordingly generate acrostical p-o-k(h).<sup>96</sup> In the lines spanned by this acrostic (pok-) Virgil will have found twofold confirmation of its intentionality in the -pok- near the start of both line 9 and line 10. This acrostical pok- also evinces the habitual apocopation after the third letter.<sup>97</sup> In this line 11 (*χρήσδεις ὧν ἐσιδεῖν*;) Menalcas (= Virgil) is accordingly saying (subtextually): 'Do you want to see (viz. the acrostic)?' [Ps.-]Theocritus' very next line (12) then repeats this *ἐσιδεῖν* in exactly the same pre-caesural position: *χρήσδω τοῦτ' ἐσιδεῖν*. This *geminatio* in same *sedes* in two successive lines ensures that *ἐσιδεῖν* is highly impactful.

On this second occasion on which *ἐσιδεῖν* is used its auxiliary is however first-person: *χρήσδω*. This form accordingly matches Virgil's similarly first-person *invideo*. If however [Ps.-]Theocritus' mode of expression is affirmative ('I do ...'), Virgil's by contrast is negatory: *non equidem invideo*. Here we accordingly have a case of *oppositio in imitando*. The *equidem* that Virgil uses here was moreover etymologized as *ego quidem*.<sup>98</sup> *Equidem* accordingly forms a contrast with somebody else: 'I for my part'.<sup>99</sup> In the present passage the 'other' person is the 'you' in the *cernis* of the previous line but one (9). To this *cernis* ('you see [sc. the acrostic]') Meliboeus replies with piquantly pawky subtextuality: 'I don't see it'. Unlike sharp-eyed and sophisticated readers with the text written down

<sup>94</sup> Cf. Clausen 1994, 98.

<sup>95</sup> On this identification cf. most recently Gagliardi 2014, 132–133.

<sup>96</sup> The pronunciation of 'χ' in Theocritus' (and Virgil's) day was 'as "c" in English "cat"' (so Allen 1987, 178).

<sup>97</sup> Cf. n. 26 above.

<sup>98</sup> Cf. Maltby 1991, 207–208 (s. v. *equidem*).

<sup>99</sup> So *OLD*<sup>2</sup>, I, 674 (s. v. *equidem*; sect. 1a); cf. *TLL*, V, 2, col. 721, ll. 41–63 (s. v. *equidem*): 'distinguitur expressis verbis ab altera persona'.

in front of them, a hick goatherd like Meliboeus cannot ‘perceive’ the acrostic, but is merely ‘perplexed’.<sup>100</sup>

Like Virgil’s *invideo*, Horace’s *avidī* was etymologized from *video*.<sup>101</sup> This Horatian *avidī* also resembles Virgilian *invideo* in being placed in the same emphatically ante-caesural *sedes* before a sense-break in exactly the same eleventh line of the poem. In both cases the prefix indicates that the attention is focused: if Virgil’s *in-vid-* corresponds to Greek ἐσ-ιδ-, Horatian *a-vid-* finds a parallel in ἀπ-ιδ-, which signifies ‘to look away from all others at one, have in view’.<sup>102</sup> Horatian *avidī* and Virgilian *invideo* are moreover both directly juxtaposed with *non ego*.<sup>103</sup> If however Virgilian *non ego* qualifies *invideo*, Horace by contrast transfers *non ego* to the next sentence (... *avidī. non ego* ...): here we accordingly have a further *oppositio in imitando*. It would seem moreover that here Horace is at the same time looking back beyond Virgil to [Ps.-]Theocritus himself: hence we are also dealing here with a further ‘window reference’. If Virgil expresses himself negatively (*non ... in-video*), [Ps.-]Theocritus’ language had instead been affirmative (χρήσδω ... ἐσ-ιδεῖν): Horace now goes back to [Ps.-]Theocritus’ positive form of expression (*a-vidī*).<sup>104</sup> Horatian *avidī* might in fact be thought to contain an etymological nod to [Ps.-]Theocritus’ aforesaid χρήσδω, since *avidus* was not only etymologized from *video*, but also from *aveo*,<sup>105</sup> which exactly matches χρήσδω in signifying ‘I desire’.<sup>106</sup>

Three further points may be made about Horace’s *discernunt avidī*. Firstly, if both prefixes are removed, we have here two *verba videndi* cheek by jowl: [*dis*]cernunt [*a*]vidī — ‘they see, I saw’.<sup>107</sup> In the second place Horace’s [*dis*]cernunt [*a*]vidī corresponds precisely to Virgil’s *cernis* / [*in*]video (ll. 9; 11): both poets place the same verbs in the same order in the same eleventh line in the same hookup with a gamma-acrostic.<sup>108</sup> The third and final point concerns a further ‘eleventh line’: it would seem that here Horace not only has his eye on a ‘line eleven’ in Virgil and [Ps.-]Theocritus, but also in Aratus. It was argued above that Horace’s previous sentence (l. 6: *te ... Bacche, [canit]*) echoes a passage of

---

<sup>100</sup> *Non equidem invideo, mirror magis* (11). For this sense of *mirror* (‘I am perplexed’) cf. *OLD*<sup>2</sup>, II, 1227 (s. v.; sect. 1a).

<sup>101</sup> Cf. Maltby 1991, 66–67 (s. v. *avidus*).

<sup>102</sup> So *LSJ*<sup>9</sup>, 292 (s. v. ἀφοράω; sect. 11a).

<sup>103</sup> Virgil’s *non equidem* = *non ego quidem*; cf. n. 98 above.

<sup>104</sup> We accordingly have the sequence: ‘do see’ – ‘don’t see’ – ‘do see’.

<sup>105</sup> Cf. Maltby 1991, 67 (s. v. *avidus*).

<sup>106</sup> Cf. *LSJ*<sup>9</sup>, 2004 (s. v. χρήζω; sect. 12a: ‘to desire’); *OLD*<sup>2</sup>, I, 230 (s. v. *aveo*; sect. 1: ‘to desire’). On the vogue for such alternative etymologies cf. O’Hara 2017, 92–93.

<sup>107</sup> This ‘spectatorial’ pair is itself conspicuous by an enjambment that fills the first hemistich.

<sup>108</sup> While in Virgil these verbs occur at the end of the acrostic, in Horace they are located at its start.

the *Georgics* (II 2–3), which in turn echoes the prologue of Aratus’ *Phaenomena* (2: ἄρρητον). Exactly ten lines after this Aratean ἄρρητον we have the following ‘line eleven’ about this same ‘unspoken’ Zeus: ἄστρα διακρίνας, ἐσκέψατο δ’ εἰς ἐνιαυτὸν / ἀστέρας. Here emphatically circum-caesural διακρίνας ἐσκέψατο answers precisely to Horatian *discernunt a-vidi*: διακρίνειν was glossed as *discernere*,<sup>109</sup> while σκέπτεσθαι, which in this Aratean line 11 is particularly eye-catching,<sup>110</sup> is the term used by Aratus (778) to signal his famous λεπτή-acrostic (783–787).<sup>111</sup>

Horace’s *discernunt* governs the direct object *nefas* (10). Here we have a subtextual hint at the ‘injustice’ of Varus’ land-confiscations.<sup>112</sup> It would seem however that here *nefas* is semantically even more loaded: two points may be made in this connection. In the first place *nefas* was etymologized from *fari*.<sup>113</sup> Hence the meaning of *nefas* is, etymologically speaking, ‘unspoken’. Such a sense is perfectly fitting for an acrostic, which is *ipso facto* ‘not spoken’. This connotation is moreover suited especially to a political acrostic such as *disce* in this poem: risky politics call for politic reticence. *Nefas* is again used by Horace in conjunction with such a political acrostic in his famous ‘Cleopatra’ *Ode* (I 37, 5), where *nefas* is positioned immediately after the last word of the acrostic.<sup>114</sup> A further political acrostic likewise involving Cleopatra is employed in the same combination with *nefas* by Virgil himself at *Aen.* VIII 687–691.<sup>115</sup> In connection with *ne-fas* (= ‘un-spoken/speakable’) it may also be noted that the exactly corresponding *in-fandum* had been used by Virgil in *Georg.* I 479, where this line-

<sup>109</sup> Cf. *Corp. Gloss. Lat.*, II, p. 272, 5; III, p. 279, 47 Goetz.

<sup>110</sup> Cf. Σ’s operose gloss (ad loc.): ἐσκέψατο δὲ ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐθεώρησεν, ἐτήρησεν, ἐνόησεν, ἔγνω ποιῆσαι.

<sup>111</sup> Aratus again employs σκέπτεσθαι shortly afterwards (799) to signpost the acrostics in 803–812.

<sup>112</sup> Cf. Serv. auct., *Ecl.* IX 10: *per iniquitatem Alfeni Vari, qui agros divisit*.

<sup>113</sup> Cf. Maltby 1991, 407 (s. v. *nefas*).

<sup>114</sup> On this acrostic (ll. 2–4: *p-o-t-a*) cf. Adkin 2019a. This ‘Cleopatra’-acrostic is placed at the end of the *Odes*’ first book, the midpoint of which is occupied by the ‘Varus’-acrostic currently at issue.

<sup>115</sup> On this acrostic, which concerns the nature of Cleopatra’s relationship with Mark Antony (not ‘missis’, but ‘mistress’), cf. Adkin 2014, 67–68. Here upward *a-c[c]-u-b-a* (687–691; = *succuba* [cf. *Corp. Gloss. Lat.*, V, p. 589, 35 Goetz] = ‘a woman who occupies a man’s bed in place of his wife’ [*OLD*<sup>2</sup>, II, 2048 (s. v. *succuba*)]) glosses *coniunx* (sc. Cleopatra) at the end of its ‘second’ line: this *coniunx* (688) is juxtaposed with said *nefas*. The ‘start’ of this *ac[c]uba*-acrostic (687) is moreover exactly 20 lines from the end of a similarly unidentified *lepte*-acrostic (664–668; cf. Adkin 2014, 65–66), which directly imitates Aratus’ own celebrated *λεπτή*-acrostic (783–787), which had already been imitated indirectly in Virgil’s onomastical acrostic at *Georg.* I 429–433 (*MA VE PU*), which also imitates Aratus’ ἄρρητον (2).



initial ‘un-speakable!’ is placed precisely ten lines after partially acrostical and similarly line-initial *icito scena*!<sup>116</sup>

The second point regarding Horace’s own use of *nefas* as object of *discernunt* in *Ode* I 18, 10 concerns its derivative *nefastus*, which was glossed as ἄρρητος,<sup>117</sup> which is Aratus’ self-nuncupative *sphragis* at *Phaen.* 2, which Horace already has in mind here.<sup>118</sup> This Aratean ἄρρητος is itself indebted to Hesiod’s similarly proemial ῥητοῖ τ’ ἄρρητοῖ τε,<sup>119</sup> which exactly matches Horace’s *fas atque nefas*:<sup>120</sup> evidently therefore we have here another ‘window reference’. It would seem however that in this Horatian *fas atque nefas* there is a further influence in play. At the end of the foregoing paragraph the point was made that Virgilian *infandum* (*Georg.* I 479) glosses the antecedent acrostic (466–470: ‘Strike [Caesar] with a sacrificial axe!’).<sup>121</sup> The further point may now be made that this *infandum* is itself followed shortly afterwards by *quippe ubi fas versum atque nefas* (505).<sup>122</sup> This Virgilian *fas versum atque nefas* is linked directly to mention of Octavian’s death, which matches the mention of Julius Caesar’s death in acrostic-starting line 466.<sup>123</sup> In this *fas versum atque nefas* the *vertere* means ‘to invert’.<sup>124</sup> It might therefore be felt that here we have a subtextual hint at the ‘inversion’ of the ‘un-spoken’ acrostic (466–470: ‘Murder Caesar!’) and the ‘spoken’ body-text (466: Caesar’s murder monstrous): each of these two conflicting statements ‘inverts’ the other. It might furthermore be noted that Virgil’s *versum* finds a direct opposite in the *discernunt* which in Horace governs the same *fas*

<sup>116</sup> 466–470 (‘Strike [Caesar] with a sacrificial axe!’); cf. n. 66 above, where it is also noted that this acrostic is endorsed by aforesaid *MA VE PU* (429–433).

<sup>117</sup> Cf. *Corp. Gloss. Lat.*, II, p. 245, 55 Goetz.

<sup>118</sup> Cf. the preceding paragraph but one, where it was argued *inter alia* that Horatian *avidus* (16) has been influenced by this Aratean prologue. This *avidus* occupies the same pre-caesural *sedes* as previous-line *nefas*.

<sup>119</sup> *Op.* 4. Cf. I. 3: ἄφατοῖ τε φατοῖ τε.

<sup>120</sup> This Horatian phrase requires elucidation by Ps.-Acron (ad loc.): *licitum et illicitum*. In both Horace and Hesiod (l. 4) the words occupy the first half of the line, where they also evince the same order. On the other hand in Hesiod’s l. 3 (cf. previous n.) the words are placed instead at the end of the line, where they are moreover marked by the opposite order.

<sup>121</sup> Cf. n. 66 above.

<sup>122</sup> This l. 505 is exactly ten lines from the end of Book I: Horace’s own *fas atque nefas* correspondingly occupies ‘line ten’ of his poem. Virgil’s immediately ensuing Book II starts moreover with a passage (cf. ll. 2; 13) that Horace imitates in this *Ode*; cf. above. The parallelism between this Horatian *Ode* I 18, 10 and Virgil’s *Georg.* I 505 is very close: in both texts *fas* and *nefas* are connected by *atque* (for synonymous alternatives cf. [e. g.] Prisc., *Gramm.* III 93, 17–18 Keil: ‘et’, ‘que’, ‘ac’, ‘atque’, ... ‘quoque’, *quando pro ‘que’ ponitur*), while both authors locate this phrase (*fas atque nefas*) at the start of the line in a subordinate clause (placed after main clause) that is introduced by an explanatory particle (Virgilian *quippe ubi* = Horatian *cum*).

<sup>123</sup> Both passages are linked by the striking repetition of *Caesar* (466; 503).

<sup>124</sup> Cf. *OLD*<sup>2</sup>, II, 2252 (s. v.; sect. 6c).

*atque nefas*: if Virgilian *versum* can be glossed as *confusum*,<sup>125</sup> Horatian *discernere* means by contrast ‘to distinguish ..., separate’.<sup>126</sup> Here we accordingly have another *oppositio in imitando*. At the same time Horace’s *fas atque nefas* in an acrostical context evidently references a Virgilian use of this phrase to gloss a similar acrostic — ‘Murder Caesar!’<sup>127</sup>

Horace’s *nefas* is directly juxtaposed with *exiguo fine* (10): both words are acrostically charged. The whole phrase *exiguo fine* has to be explained by Comm. Cruq. as *nulla differentia, nullo discrimine*.<sup>128</sup> *Finis* can however mean ‘ora, margo’,<sup>129</sup> while *exiguus* can signify ‘angustus, artus’.<sup>130</sup> such a ‘narrow edge’ is a subtextual smoke-signal *à propos* of the acrostic.<sup>131</sup> This *fine* is then followed by the dependent genitive *libidinum* (10). This *libidinum* is problematic.<sup>132</sup> It may therefore be observed that, just like above-mentioned [*l*]iber in exactly the same final *sedes* just three lines earlier (7), this *libido* was likewise etymologized from *libet*.<sup>133</sup> The basic sense of *libido* is accordingly ‘i. q. impetus appetens id quod libet’.<sup>134</sup> In particular *libido* can be used with specific reference to ‘outspokenness’.<sup>135</sup> It might accordingly be felt that in this Horatian line we have here a subtextual allusion to his ‘outspoken’ acrostics. The plural (*libidinum*) fits the plurality of the acrostics (*cac-*; *disce*): here cockily cruddy *cac-* is especially ‘outspoken’. This *libidinum* accordingly rounds off a line (10) in which every word is marked by acrostical ‘resonance’.<sup>136</sup>

<sup>125</sup> So Heyne and Wagner 1830, 382 (ad loc.).

<sup>126</sup> So *OLD*<sup>2</sup>, I, 603 (s. v.; sect. 2a).

<sup>127</sup> The defeat of Caesar’s murderers by Octavian was the occasion for Varus’ land-confiscations.

<sup>128</sup> Cf. Müller 1900, 83: ‘*exiguo*, urban für *nullo*’.

<sup>129</sup> So *TLL*, VI, 1, coll. 790, l. 46 – 791, l. 16 (s. v. *finis*).

<sup>130</sup> So *TLL*, V, 2, col. 1475, ll. 16–41 (s. v. *exiguus*).

<sup>131</sup> *Finis* was moreover etymologized from *funiculus* (cf. Maltby 1991, 234 [s. v. *finis*): a ‘little rope’ ‘hangs down’ — like an acrostic. Furthermore, in the present context of a poem to a land-confiscator like Varus this *fine* (cf. *OLD*<sup>2</sup>, I, 772 [s. v. *finis*; sect. 1a]: ‘the boundary of a territory’) invites the reader to see in addition a subtextual reference to the land-confiscations; cf. (e. g.) *Ecl.* I 3 (*nos patriae finis ... linquimus*; just before *fons*-acrostic [5–8]); Serv. auct., *Ecl.* IX 1 (*lis ... de finibus*).

<sup>132</sup> Cf. (e. g.) Nisbet and Hubbard 1970, 234.

<sup>133</sup> Cf. Maltby 1991, 337; 338 (s. vv. *liber*[2]; *libido*).

<sup>134</sup> So *TLL*, VII, 2, 2, col. 1330, l. 49 (s. v. *libido*).

<sup>135</sup> Cf. *TLL*, VII, 2, 2, col. 1334, ll. 68–75 (s. v. *libido*).

<sup>136</sup> For such acrostically-related ‘resonance’ attaching to diction employed in the environment of an acrostic cf. Adkin 2014, 54–55; 61–64; 68–69. For a line which resembles the present one (*Ode* I 18, 10) in evincing such ‘resonance’ in every one of the words it contains cf. Virgil’s *Ecl.* IV 50, which is within the afore-mentioned *cacata*-acrostic (47–52); on this Virgilian line cf. Adkin 2016a, 27–28.

Such ‘resonance’ also marks the next line (11). While this line begins with the *discernunt* that starts the *disce*-acrostic, it ends with *candide Bassareu*. Here again *candide* is problematic: whereas the canonical German commentary of Orelli, Baiter and Hirschfelder pronounced (ad loc.) ‘Est (sc. *candidus*) “pulchritudine splendens, formosus”, non “simplex et apertus”’,<sup>137</sup> just three years later Schütz objected: ‘Wenn Bacchus ... *candidus* heisst, so kann es schwerlich von seiner jugendlichen Schönheit gemeint sein, nachdem er kurz vorher *pater* genannt ist: es ist auf die *candida mens*, seine Offenheit, zu beziehen’.<sup>138</sup> This ‘problematicity’ of *candide* does however red-flag this epithet, which is regularly glossed as λευκός:<sup>139</sup> this Horatian *candide* in the first line of his *disce*-acrostic accordingly evokes Homer’s celebrated λευκή-acrostic which starts in the similarly first line of the *Iliad*’s last book.

This same term *candidus* had recently been employed by Virgil himself in the very same way: ‘white’ used in connection with an acrostic of the poet’s own in order to put the reader in mind of Homer’s own ‘white’-acrostic. Thus *Ecl.* IX 41 had contained the syntagm *candida populus*: both elements are glossed as λευκή.<sup>140</sup> Here *candida populus* was used in conjunction with the *undis*-acrostic (34–38), which concerns the land-confiscations carried out by Varus,<sup>141</sup> who is named in ll. 26–27. This same technique (‘white’ linked to an acrostic as a nod to Homer’s acrostical ‘white’) is evidently employed again by Horace himself in the very next book of the *Odes* (II 3, 9–11: *quo pinus ingens albaque populus / umbram hospitalem consociare amant / ramis?*). The *alba* used here by Horace is regularly glossed as λευκή,<sup>142</sup> which is also the gloss for *populus*.<sup>143</sup> As in *Ode* I 18, 11 (aforesaid *candide*), a word for ‘white’ is here placed in the first line of an acrostic, for which it serves as a wink-tipper. This time the acrostic in question is the unidentified *q-u-r*<sup>144</sup>, which evidently glosses knotty *quo* at the start of this acrostic’s opening line (9).<sup>145</sup>

The ‘white’ (*candide*) in the first line of the *disce*-acrostic (I 18, 11) qualifies *Bassareu*. This strikingly polysyllabic *Bassareus*, which is the fourth and last of this *Ode*’s names for ‘Bacchus’, is very unusual: ‘non attestato altrove in latino

<sup>137</sup> Orelli, Baiter and Hirschfelder 1886, 118.

<sup>138</sup> Schütz 1889, 84–85.

<sup>139</sup> Cf. *Corp. Gloss. Lat.*, VI, p. 173 Goetz (s. v. *candidus*).

<sup>140</sup> Cf. nn. 46 (re *populus*) and 139 (re *candidus*) above.

<sup>141</sup> Cf. n. 8 above.

<sup>142</sup> Cf. *Corp. Gloss. Lat.*, VI, p. 48 Goetz.

<sup>143</sup> Cf. n. 46 above.

<sup>144</sup> For this spelling of *cur* cf. *TLL*, IV, coll. 1438, l. 83 – 1439, l. 2 (s. v. *cur*).

<sup>145</sup> For the problem entailed by this *quo* cf. the Oslo database of conjectures. For such ‘grammatical’ acrostics cf. Adkin 2021, 128–129.

e molto raro anche in greco'.<sup>146</sup> It is therefore tempting to see this *recherché* term as invested with acrostical 'resonance'. The first syllable of this Greek word (Βασσ-) is identical with the similarly first syllable (and stem) of βάσσω-ων, which is the Doric comparative of βαθύς, which is explained by the online *Diccionario Griego-Español* as meaning 'que llega hondo' (sect. AII2). Such an 'adown' sense is highly appropriate at the end of this first line (11) of an acrostic that similarly 'goes down'.<sup>147</sup> If then this *Bass-* in the top line of the acrostic is a hint to look 'down', the bottom line (15) of this same acrostic contains a corresponding hint to look 'up': this line 15 is enclosed by *tollens ... verticem* — 'head up!'<sup>148</sup>

This *Bassareu* is part of a clause that reads as follows (11–12): *non ego te, candide Bassareu, / invitum quatiam*. Here the phrase *invitum quatiam* is 'hard'.<sup>149</sup> Instead of line-initial *invitum* Horace could moreover have employed the semantically and prosodically identical *nolentem*.<sup>150</sup> Evidently therefore Horace has been at some pains to ensure that the first letter of this line supplies the 'i' of acrostical *disce*. A similar acrostically-motivated concern would appear to mark his choice of language at the beginning of the next line (13): *sub divum*. After *invitum quatiam* this sentence continues thus (12–13): *nec variis obsita frondibus / sub divum rapiam*. Here *sub divum rapiam* has to be elucidated by Ps.-Acron as follows: *hoc est: ... in publicum proferam*.<sup>151</sup> This *sub divum rapiam* is moreover adduced by Conington and Nettleship in their commentary on *Aen.* II 158: *omnia ferre sub auras*.<sup>152</sup> This Virgilian *omnia ferre sub auras* is placed after an unidentified upward acrostic (II 61–65: *ac[c]uso*), which is immediately followed in line-initial position by the same *disce* (66) as in Horace's

<sup>146</sup> So Romano 1991, 559 (ad loc.).

<sup>147</sup> In this connection reference may also be made to Latin *bassus*, which likewise carries the suggestion of 'down'; cf. *Corp. Gloss. Lat.*, IV, p. 210, 17 Goetz: *bassum: non altum*.

<sup>148</sup> Here *verticem*, which has to be glossed by Porphyrio (ad loc.) as *cerebrum*, occupies the same line-final *sedes* as *Bassareu*. Thus this pair of implicitly antithetic terms neatly frames the acrostic.

<sup>149</sup> So Quinn 1980, 161. Cf. Nisbet and Hubbard 1970, 235: 'The exact meaning is uncertain'. This incertitude is also shared by the ancient commentators; cf. (e. g.) Comm. Cruq.: '*invitum quat.*': *ultra modum non bibam, non plus bibam quam oportet. aut certe, 'invitum quatiam' ideo dixit, quia in sacrorum renovatione commovebantur sacra*.

<sup>150</sup> For the exact interchangeability of these two terms cf. *TLL*, VII, 2, 1, col. 235, ll. 48–53 (s. v. *invitus*).

<sup>151</sup> *À propos* of *sub divum* Mayer 2012, 155 (ad loc.) observes that this particular phrase 'occurs nowhere else in the classical language'; hence it 'may have sounded slightly unusual'.

<sup>152</sup> Conington and Nettleship 2007, 106. The similarity between these two texts is in fact closer than Conington and Nettleship suppose: Horatian *rapere* is glossed as Virgilian *ferre* (cf. *Corp. Gloss. Lat.*, IV, p. 160, 29; V, p. 478, 37 Goetz), while Virgil's *sub auras* is likewise glossed as Horace's *sub divum* (*Gloss. Lat.* I Ansil. SU 46 Lindsay).

own acrostic.<sup>153</sup> Both Horace's *sub divum rapiam* and Virgil's *ferre sub auras*<sup>154</sup> would accordingly appear to be subtextual nudges regarding the 'disclosure' of the respective acrostics.

Horace's line-initial *sub divum rapiam* is immediately preceded by its direct object, *variis obsita frondibus* (12). These words oblige the ancient commentators to attempt enucleation.<sup>155</sup> Here the collocation *variis obsita* merits particular attention.<sup>156</sup> It may be noted that this *variis obsita* reprises the *Vare ... severis* of this poem's opening line: the same-stemmed dactyls *obsita* and *severis* both occupy the same penultimate *sedes* before the respective line's final dactyl.<sup>157</sup> In this connection it may also be observed that this Horatian linkage of *Vare* and *variis* had already occurred in Virgil, who in *Eclogue IX* had placed *Varo* (l. 26)<sup>158</sup> precisely ten lines before *Vario* in same pre-caesural *sedes* (l. 35).<sup>159</sup> The further point may be made that this Virgilian [v]ari- had occurred in the middle of the second line of acrostical *undis*, just as Horatian *vari-* has been positioned in the middle of the similarly second line of his own acrostical *disce*: both the *undis-* and the *disce-*acrostics concern Varus' land-confiscations.<sup>160</sup> The final point may be made that just six lines after this [v]ari-o<sup>161</sup> Virgil had employed

---

<sup>153</sup> This Virgilian acrostic with ensuing *disce* will be discussed more fully below.

<sup>154</sup> This Virgilian *ferre sub auras* is glossed as *prodere* (cf. *Gloss. Lat.* I Ansil. FE 318 Lindsay), just as Horatian *sub divum rapiam* is glossed by Ps.-Acron as *in publicum proferam*.

<sup>155</sup> Whereas Porphyrio explains this phrase as *mysteria tua ... latentia alioquin ac secreta*, Ps.-Acron instead exegetes it as *arcana naturae vel quae celare vis*.

<sup>156</sup> For *obsere*, which is a Horatian hapax, there were plenty of synonymous alternatives; cf. *Synon. Cic.* p. 416, 6–7 Barwick (cf. also ib., p. 416, 9–11; *Corp. Gloss. Lat.*, VII, p. 8 Goetz [s. v. *obsitus*]). A similarly large number of synonyms were available for *varius*; cf. *Synon. Cic.* pp. 420, 24–26; 421, 25; 431, 25–26; 449, 18–19 Barwick. No further instance of the combination of this adjective with Horace's *frons* is supplied by *TLL* (s. v. 1. *frons*).

<sup>157</sup> This echo (*Var-e / var-iis*) indicates that Nisbet and Hubbard (1970, 229) are wrong to affirm that Horace 'dedicates the poem to Varus ... , and then ignores him'. Their dictum is also belied by the *disce-*acrostic itself, which begins in the line before this *var-iis*: the 'You' here (*disce!*) is Varus.

<sup>158</sup> Vocative *Vare* (spoken by Menalcas [= Virgil; cf. n. 95 above]), which exactly matches Horace's own *Vare*, had been used in Virgil's next line (27).

<sup>159</sup> In Virgil's unicas script this [v]ari- was indistinguishable from Horace's *vari-*. Since moreover Virgil's [v]ari- and Horace's *vari-* are both placed at the beginning of their respective clauses, their particular reference is in both cases marked by an indeterminacy which encourages the reader to connect the two words.

<sup>160</sup> Virgil's [v]ari- and Horace's *vari-* evince further similarities: both are the fourth word in their respective line (Virgilian *nam neque adhuc* [v]ario / Horatian *invitum quatiam nec variis*); both are placed after *neque / nec*; both are ablatives (Virgilian [v]ari-o / Horatian *vari-is*).

<sup>161</sup> For the importance Virgil attaches to such sexilinear spacing cf. Thomas 1988, 153–154; 176.

*varios* (l. 40), which exactly parallels Horace's *variis*:<sup>162</sup> just as this Virgilian *varios* had occurred in the middle of the line immediately after confirmatorily horizontal *undis* at the end of line 39, so Horace's *variis* is likewise placed in the middle of the line immediately after similarly confirmatory *disce-rnunt* at the start of line 11.<sup>163</sup> It may accordingly be concluded that in Horace's *Var-e / vari-is* we have a further imitation of Virgil.

In the *Vare ... severis* of Horace's first line this *severis* would appear to call for closer examination. Here *severis* corresponds to Alcaeus' φυτεύσης (342 LP). *Serere* is not however among the five Latin verbs which gloss φυτεύειν in *Corp. Gloss. Lat.* (VII, p. 677 Goetz); *serere* itself is regularly glossed instead as Greek σπείρειν or Latin *seminare* (ib., p. 260).<sup>164</sup> Horace's perfect subjunctive (*nullam ... severis*) is moreover only one of many possible ways of expressing a negative imperative.<sup>165</sup> The resultant form (*se-veris*) does however generate a strikingly paronomastic link with the foregoing *Varus*.<sup>166</sup> This *severis* is furthermore an exact homonym of the dat. pl. of *severus* ('for the severe').<sup>167</sup> It might therefore be thought that this '*severis*' is also a subtextual hint at the 'severity' of Varus' land-confiscations. *Severus* was moreover etymologized as *saevus verus*.<sup>168</sup> It may therefore be observed that this same *saevus* is strikingly employed in line 13,<sup>169</sup> where *saeva* is placed emphatically in the middle of the line immediately after the similarly line-central *variis obsita* that picks up the first line's *Vare ...*

<sup>162</sup> This Virgilian *varios* again occupies the same line-central position as fourth word. Adjectival *varius* is found on just one other occasion in the whole of the *Eclogues* (IV 42). The proper name *Varius* (l. 35) occurs nowhere else in all Virgil.

<sup>163</sup> It may also be noted that just as this Horatian *variis* qualifies *frondibus*, so this Virgilian *varios* had qualified the paronomastic and matchingly botanic *flores*, which is separated by just one word from *candida populus* (both glossed as acrostically loaded λευκή; cf. n. 140 above), which in turn matches Horace's own *candide* in the line immediately before his *frondibus*.

<sup>164</sup> In the present Horatian passage *severis* has to be explained by Ps.-Acron as *posueris* (cf. *Comm. Cruq.* [ad loc.]: '*severis*': *plantaveris, posueris*).

<sup>165</sup> Cf. Kühner, Stegmann and Thierfelder 1955, 202–206. The present Horatian text is the only such instance in the lyrics besides I 11, 1; Virgil has only two (cf. Handford 1947, 48 [*'ne feceris'*]).

<sup>166</sup> *Se-veris* and *Vare* are placed respectively one foot from the end and beginning of this first line.

<sup>167</sup> The sense of '*severis*' as 'sow' is not made fully clear until *arborem*, which with a consequential degree of ambivalence is made to follow it. All the other instances of '*severis*' in classical poetry are the adjective, not the verb. In the present Horatian text a cue to this subtextual sense of 'severe' is to be found in the next line's *mite* (l. 2), which requires clarification (cf. Ps.-Acro [ad loc.]: '*mite solum*': *fecundum, excultum*). For *mitis* (here separated from *severis* by just two words) as the 'opp.' of *severus* cf. *TLL*, VIII, coll. 1156, l. 15; 1157, l. 18 (s. v. *mitis*).

<sup>168</sup> Cf. Maltby 1991, 564 (s. v.).

<sup>169</sup> Here *saeva* is highlighted by 'hartes Asyndeton' (so Müller 1900, 84). This *saeva* also needs explication; cf. (e. g.) Orelli, Baiter and Hirschfelder 1886, 119 ('*saeva*': *propter terribilem sonum*).

*severis*: the *-va* of this *saeva* occupies precisely the same *sedes* as the homonymous *va-* of *variis*. If the *saevus* in etymonic *saevus verus* (> *severus*) is evoked in this way, it may also be pointed out that the similarly etymonic *verus* can be detected in *se-veris* (i. e. ‘without truth’):<sup>170</sup> this first line’s *nullam, Vare, ... se-veris* accordingly hints that this poem’s political *disce*-acrostic to Varus is ‘not without truth’.<sup>171</sup>

Above-mentioned *saeva* is the first word in a clause that reads thus (ll. 13–14): *saeva tene cum Berecynthio / cornu tympana*. Here line-initial *cornu* is marked by acrostical ‘resonance’.<sup>172</sup> For this use of *cornu* several synonyms were available.<sup>173</sup> *Cornu* differs however from such synonymous alternatives in being able to bear the accessory sense of ‘*latus*’.<sup>174</sup> It is therefore natural that *cornu* should be commonly used with subtextual reference to an ‘edge’-positioned acrostic.<sup>175</sup> Such is evidently the case here too, where the ‘c’ of this *cornu* actually provides the penultimate letter of acrostical *d-i-s-c-e*. This *cornu* is moreover preceded by *tene*, which was felt to need elucidation: ‘*tene*’: *idest ... reprime* (so [e. g.] Ps.-Acron [ad loc.]). Here *tene ... cornu* could accordingly bear the subtextual sense of ‘grasp mentally<sup>176</sup> the edge’ — i. e. the acrostic.

This line that starts with *cornu* (14) also contains two further words that are likewise invested with acrostical ‘resonance’. This line 14 continues thus: *quae subsequitur caecus Amor sui*. Here *subsequitur* merits attention. For this word Nisbet and Hubbard cite two parallels (viz. Anacr. 12, 4 P; Sil. XV 96), which however use instead the respective terms *συνπαίζουσιν* and *comes*. The *sequi* (and its compounds) that Horace himself employs is by contrast regularly used

<sup>170</sup> For *se* = ‘without’ cf. *OLD*<sup>2</sup>, II, 1891 (s. v. *se*<sup>2</sup>; sect. α). On the *goût* for such alternative etymologies cf. n. 106 above. *Vera* (‘truth’) is moreover just a metathesized *Vare* (for *varus* = ‘curvus, pravus’ [hence ‘counter-“truth”’] cf. Forcellini 1940, IV, 917 [s. v.; sect. I2]).

<sup>171</sup> A final remark may be made about the *arborem* that comes immediately after this *severis*. The same word *arbos* had been used as an equivalent of the acrostically charged *λευκή* at *Georg.* II 66 (for the influence exercised by the beginning of this book on this Horatian *Ode* cf. above); nor did a ‘vine’ (what is at issue in this Horatian line) need to be regarded as an *arbor* (cf. [e. g.] Cic., *Nat. deor.* II 85: *vitis aut arboris*). It might accordingly be felt that Horace’s *arborem* at the end of the first line of this acrostic-laden poem is an acrostically ‘programmatic’ pointer to Homer’s paradigmatic and semantically equivalent *λευκή*-acrostic in similarly ‘edge’-position in the similarly ‘first’ line of the *Iliad*’s final book.

<sup>172</sup> On such ‘resonance’ cf. n. 136 above.

<sup>173</sup> Cf. Nisbet and Hubbard 1970, 236 (ad loc.): “‘*cornu*’: a Phrygian *tibia*’. A further synonym is the metrically equivalent *buxus*; cf. *TLL*, II, col. 2264, ll. 11–31 (s. v. *buxus*). *Calamus* had been used instead at Catull. 63, 22.

<sup>174</sup> Cf. *TLL*, IV, coll. 970, l. 78 – 971, l. 11 (s. v. *cornu*).

<sup>175</sup> For some examples cf. Adkin 2016a, 32–33.

<sup>176</sup> So *OLD*<sup>2</sup>, II, 2117 (s. v. *teneo*; sect. 23a).

in conjuncture with an acrostic:<sup>177</sup> here the reader is accordingly being nudged subtextually ‘to follow (with the ... eye)’<sup>178</sup> — the acrostic. This *subsequitur* is placed immediately before *caecus*, which again had to be explained.<sup>179</sup> This *caecus* is moreover applied to *Amor*, although the ‘conception of Love as a blind god ... is highly unusual in antiquity’.<sup>180</sup> This ‘highly unusual’ treatment of *caecus* does however invite us to read into this term here the acrostically ‘resonant’ subsense of ‘obscure’,<sup>181</sup> which fits a still unfinished (and so ‘obscure’) acrostic (*d-i-s-c-*) admirably.

The next line (15) reads as follows: *et tollens vacuum plus nimio Gloria verticem*. This line is the last line of the acrostic. The point was made above that the *tollens ... verticem* (subtextually ‘look up!’) which frames this final line of the acrostic forms a correlate to the *Bassareu* (subtextually ‘look down!’) in the acrostic’s first line (11).<sup>182</sup> For *et tollens* at the start of this last line the variant *attollens* has found some favour.<sup>183</sup> Since however *et (tollens)* supplies the final ‘e’ of acrostical *d-i-s-c-e*, this acrostic provides convenient proof that this reading (*et*) must be the right one. Conversely the variant *attollens* shows that Horace was not obliged to employ *et*.<sup>184</sup> Horace’s use here of *et* has accordingly been influenced by his desire to generate the acrostic. A final word may be said about this same line 15. The subject of this *tollens ... verticem* is *Gloria*, which was etymologized from *claritas*.<sup>185</sup> Hence in each line of the acrostic a *nomen*<sup>186</sup> connoting ‘brightness’ or ‘darkness’ opens the penultimate foot.<sup>187</sup> The arrangement is moreover chiasmic: *candide* (11), *obsita* (12),<sup>188</sup> *caecus* (14), *Gloria* (15). Such chiaroscuro (‘bright’ / ‘dark’) is appropriate to a hard-to-spot acrostic.<sup>189</sup>

<sup>177</sup> Cf. Adkin 2014, 62. In all but one of the texts adduced there, *sequi* is placed in the acrostic’s fourth line, as in the present passage of Horace.

<sup>178</sup> So *OLD*<sup>2</sup>, II, 1920 (s. v. *sequor*; sect. 18b).

<sup>179</sup> Cf. (e. g.) Ps.-Acro (on v. 13): ‘*caecus*’: *per ebrietatem nescius sui*.

<sup>180</sup> So Gow 1952, 198 (on Theoc., *Id.* X 20).

<sup>181</sup> So *OLD*<sup>2</sup>, I, 274 (s. v. *caecus*; sect. 10a).

<sup>182</sup> Cf. n. 148 above.

<sup>183</sup> Cf. the Oslo database of conjectures. With this reading the previous line (14) ends thus: *sui et*.

<sup>184</sup> *Attollens* would in fact have been the natural reading here, since its object is *verticem*, which is used here ‘pro capite’ (so [e. g.] Dillenburger 1881, 77 [ad loc.]): this phrase *caput attollo* is exceedingly common (cf. *TLL*, II, col. 1150, ll. 12–21 [s. v. *attollo*], where no fewer than 13 instances of this syntagm are cited).

<sup>185</sup> Cf. Maltby 1991, 260 (s. v. *gloriosus*).

<sup>186</sup> On the lack of distinction between noun and adjective cf. (e. g.) Don., *Gramm. min.* 1.

<sup>187</sup> In the middle line (13) this *sedes* is occupied by the non-nominal *cum*.

<sup>188</sup> Cf. *OLD*<sup>2</sup>, II, 1347 (s. v. *obsitus*; sect. b): ‘enveloped in (darkness, etc.)’.

<sup>189</sup> Especially in light of Homer’s iconic λευκή-acrostic; cf. *LSJ*<sup>9</sup>, 1042 (s. v. λευκός; sect. II: ‘bright, clear’).



After this acrostic-completing line 15 the next line is the final one of the entire poem (16): *arcanique Fides prodiga, perlucidior vitro*. This last line too is brimful with acrostically ‘resonant’ language. The line’s first word (*arcani*) is highly appropriate to an *ipso facto* ‘cryptical’ acrostic. The next word (*Fides*) is ‘strange’.<sup>190</sup> Two points may therefore be made in this connection. Firstly this term *fides* had very recently and repeatedly been etymologized by Cicero from *fieri*: [*appellatam fidem*] *quia fiat quod dictum est*.<sup>191</sup> If the *disce*-acrostic began with *discernunt* in line 11,<sup>192</sup> this same acrostic has now ‘been done’: hence *fides* (<*fit*) fittingly alludes to the acrostic’s ‘completion’. The second point regarding *fides* has to do with the *prodiga* which is then placed after it. *Fides* can mean ‘*taciturnitas*’,<sup>193</sup> which suits a ‘mute’ acrostic perfectly.<sup>194</sup> In the present *Ode* however the addition of *arcani ... prodiga* means that this sense of *taciturnitas* is here being used ‘κατ’ ἀντίφρασιν’<sup>195</sup>: once the acrostic ‘is complete’, it no longer ‘keeps mum’, but ‘blabs’.

This *arcanique Fides prodiga* is then followed by the phrase *perlucidior vitro*. Each of these two words, which are the last of the poem, is acrostically ‘resonant’. The strikingly polysyllabic *perlucidior*, which has to be explained as *omnia nudans* (so Ps.-Acron [ad loc.]), is highly noteworthy: on the one hand this passage is the very first instance of this word’s very rare metaphorical use,<sup>196</sup> while on the other hand this same passage is also the only instance of the comparative of this word in a poetic text.<sup>197</sup> In the present passage moreover this *perlucidior* eliminates the caesura that is to be expected after *per*.<sup>198</sup> Such an attention-grabbing term as *perlucidior* is accordingly a highly effective way of

<sup>190</sup> So Nisbet and Hubbard 1970, 237 (ad loc.).

<sup>191</sup> So (e. g.) Cic., *Off.* I 23. Cf. further Maltby 1991, 232 (s. v. *fides*[1]). This etymology from *fieri* proved enormously popular. In addition to the *testimonia* in Maltby cf. also Marangoni 2007, 47 (s. v. *fides*).

<sup>192</sup> It was argued above (cf. n. 84) that this *dis-cerno* contains an allusion to Varro’s equally recent derivation of *cerno* from *creari* (*Ling.* VI 81: *cum quid creatum est, tunc denique videtur*). Varro’s *creatum est* accordingly matches Cicero’s similarly etymonic *fit*.

<sup>193</sup> Cf. *TLL*, VI, 1, coll. 681, l. 78 – 682, l. 20 (s. v. 1. *fides*). The present passage of Horace is adduced here at coll. 681, l. 84 – 682, l. 4.

<sup>194</sup> One might compare the above-discussed use of *nefas* (l. 10: ‘unspoken’), which likewise is a subtextual reference to this *disce*-acrostic.

<sup>195</sup> So Eduard Fraenkel in the afore-mentioned *fides*-article in *TLL* (n. 193; col. 682, l. 1).

<sup>196</sup> Cf. *TLL*, X, 1, col. 1520, l. 32 (s. v. *perlucidus*: ‘*translatē*’).

<sup>197</sup> Ovid instead uses *magis perlucidus* (*Epist.* XV 157; *Met.* II 856). One might also cite the comment of the grammarian Pompeius on Horace’s wording here (*Gramm.* V 157, 6–7 Keil): ‘*lucidior comparativus gradus est, et tamen dixit ‘perlucidior’; tale est ac si dicas ‘valde lucidior’, ‘multum lucidior’.*

<sup>198</sup> This is ‘the only exception’ to the rule (Nisbet and Hubbard 1970, XXXIX).

affirming the ‘clarity’ of the completed acrostic.<sup>199</sup> This *perlucidior* is followed by an ablative of comparison (*vitro*), which is the poem’s very last word. This *vitrum* was etymologized from *visus*.<sup>200</sup> This closural *vitrum* accordingly forms a counterpart to the acrostic’s opening *a-vidi* (11), which was likewise etymologized from *video*: the acrostic is thus framed etymologically by subtextual hints to ‘see’.<sup>201</sup>

Besides the *disce* and *cac-* acrostics, this Horatian *Ode* also contains an unidentified telestich: *mi est si*<sup>202</sup> *os, mus[s]o*<sup>203</sup> *imo* (‘if I have a voice,<sup>204</sup> I whisper in the lowest one’). This telestich, which is exactly coextensive with the entire poem,<sup>205</sup> is evidently an allusion to the *cac-* and *disce* acrostics on the opposite ‘edge’. *Musso* is highly appropriate for such use with reference to a ‘hush-hush’ acrostic, since its meaning is conveniently defined by Nonius Marcellus thus: *mussare hominum [est] occulte quid et pressa voce loquentium, quod celatum velint* (p. 427, 12–14 Mercier<sup>2</sup>).<sup>206</sup> This *mus[s]o* is directly followed by *imo* (sc. *ore*), which likewise fits a ‘hushed’ acrostic admirably: Horace himself had already used *imus* of *vox*.<sup>207</sup> If however the wording of this telestichal main clause

<sup>199</sup> The further point may be made that this Horatian (*per*)*luc(idior)* shares a homonymous stem with Homer’s acrostical λευκ(ή). For the etymological link between λευκός and (*per*)*lucidus* cf. Walde and Hofmann 2008, 823–824 (s. v. *luceo*). Just as Horace’s *perlucidior* stands in the poem’s very last line, so Homeric λευκή starts in the book’s very first line.

<sup>200</sup> Cf. Maltby 1991, 650 (s. v. *vitrum*).

<sup>201</sup> This Horatian *vitro* (< *video*) as last word in last line finds a parallel in Virgil’s *videri* (*Ecl.* VI 24) in similarly line-final *sedes* in the last line of the *laesis*-acrostic (cf. n. 7 above).

<sup>202</sup> For postponement of *si* to 3rd position cf. (e. g.) the exactly contemporaneous *Aen.* I 321–322: *mearum / vidistis si quam ... sororum*. In the Horatian text this deferment of *si* gives suitable salience to initial *mi*.

<sup>203</sup> For *musso* written with just one ‘s’ cf. *TLL*, VIII, col. 1708, ll. 44–45 (s. v.). For ‘cryptographic’ one-time spelling of geminates in general cf. Koster 1988, 103.

<sup>204</sup> For *os* = ‘the mouth as the organ of speech, ... “voice”’ cf. *OLD*<sup>2</sup>, II, 1401 (s. v.; sect. 2, esp. 2b: ‘[of a poet]’). Here the first example cited is Virgil’s *Georg.* III 294: *magno nunc ore sonandum*. For Horace’s own partiality for such use of *ore* with a characterizing epithet, as in the present telestich, cf. *TLL*, IX, 2, col. 1081, ll. 62–69 (s. v. 1. *os*).

<sup>205</sup> Similarly the afore-mentioned acrostic at *Ecl.* VIII 6–13 (*tu si es, ac[c]i[pe]*; cf. n. 9 above) is precisely commensurate with this poem’s dedication, which is the acrostic’s reference. This Virgilian acrostic also resembles Horace’s telestich in being a grammatically ‘complex’ sentence in which the subordinative conjunction is *si*: both acrostic and telestich are in addition political.

<sup>206</sup> The line that starts this telestichal *mus[s]o* (10) also contains (in penultimate position) the ‘loaded’ term *fine*, which is especially appropriate to the right-hand (telestichal) ‘edge’, since *finis* can also mean ‘ultima littera’; cf. *TLL*, VI, 1, col. 793, ll. 33–40 (s. v.).

<sup>207</sup> *Sat.* I 3, 7–8: *modo summa / voce, modo hac resonat quae chordis quattuor ima*. Porphyrio glosses thus: *id est: modo clara voce, modo pressa*. For *pressus* cf. *OLD*<sup>2</sup>, II, 1599 (s. v. *pressus*<sup>1</sup>; sect. 5a: ‘[of sound] subdued, low’). In this connection reference may also be made to Virgil’s use at *Georg.* I 410 of *presso ... gutture* (‘with half-hushed utterance’ [Page 1898, 232]), which occurs in the ‘second’ line of the upward acrostic *pin[n]ati* (409–414; on which cf. Adkin 2017b) and

(*mus[s]o imo*) has been chosen because it suits an acrostic, the foregoing conditional clause (*mi est si os*) has been inspired by Homer: εἴ μοι ... στόματ' εἶεν (*Il.* II 489).

Homer is not however the only influence on this Horatian telestich. Evidence was adduced above to show that this *Ode* imitates the beginning of Virgil's second *Georgic*.<sup>208</sup> A further passage from the initial section of this same *Georgic* has evidently influenced Horace's telestich. This Virgilian text, which is the poet's address to his dedicatee Maecenas, may be quoted in full:

<i>tuque ades inceptumque una decurre laborem,</i>	
<i>o decus, o famae merito pars maxima nostrae,</i>	40
<i>Maecenas, pelagoque volans da vela patenti.</i>	
<i>non ego cuncta meis amplecti versibus opto,</i>	
<i>non, mihi si linguae centum sint oraque centum,</i>	
<i>ferrea vox. ades et primi lege litoris oram;</i>	
<i>in manibus terrae. non hic te carmine ficto</i>	45
<i>atque per ambages et longa exorsa tenebo.</i>	
<i>sponte sua quae se tollunt in luminis oras,</i>	
<i>infecunda quidem, sed laeta et fortia surgunt;</i>	
<i>quippe solo natura subest. tamen haec quoque, si quis</i>	
<i>inserat ...</i>	50

Lines 44–47 of this passage contain an acrostic: *fias* ('become — what you, Maecenas, have just been described as being already [viz. l. 40: *o decus, o famae merito pars maxima nostrae*]').<sup>209</sup> This acrostical *fias* in *Georgic* II (44–47) is introduced by the previous line's *mihi si linguae centum sint oraque centum* (43).<sup>210</sup> This striking introduction to Virgil's *fias*-acrostic is now cleverly converted by Horace into his own telestich. Whereas however Virgil had increased Homer's 'ten' mouths to '100', Horace here reduces the number to 'one': for a 'mussitant' telestich 'one' voice — and that 'the lowest' (*imo*) — is enough. Horace's telestich evinces a close similarity to Virgil's wording: *mi est si os /*

---

exactly 20 lines before acrostical *MA VE PU* (429–433), to which this *presso ... gutture* evidently alludes (cf. Adkin 2018, 77–78 with n. 35).

<sup>208</sup> Cf. in particular lines 2 and 13 of the book.

<sup>209</sup> This acrostic is red-flagged by *lege ... oram* in its first line (44: subtextually 'read the edge'). The same phrase had already been employed to signal the afore-mentioned (and similarly dedicatory) acrostic at *Ecl.* VIII 6–13 (*tu si es, ac[c]i[pe]*; cf. l. 7: *oram ... legis*). The present acrostic (*Georg.* II 44–47) is followed in l. 49 by *tamen haec quoque, si quis*. Precisely the same phrase in precisely the same *sedes* had been used in conjunction with the afore-mentioned *laesis*-acrostic (*Ecl.* VI 14–24), where these words (l. 9) were placed exactly 6 lines from the start of the acrostic, as is again the case at *Georg.* II 49. This line 9 of *Ecl.* VI is surrounded by threefold naming of dedicatee Varus (ll. 7; 10; 12), who is also the 'dedicatee' of Horace's *disce*-acrostic.

<sup>210</sup> This line's 'epic grandeur is an incongruous introduction to the care of the olive and grape' (Robinson 2011, 141). The line accordingly stands out.

*mihi si ... sint ora.*<sup>211</sup> At the same time the famous phrasing of the Homeric original is naturally in Horace's mind.<sup>212</sup> In this above-quoted section of *Georgic* II (39–50) attention may finally be drawn to three texts that take on additional 'resonance' when seen as Horatian intertext.<sup>213</sup>

Besides the just-discussed *Georg.* II 43, the only other passage in which Virgil employs this '100-mouths' *topos* is *Aen.* VI 625, where the phrasing of the *Georgics*-text is reproduced *litteratim* (*mihi si linguae centum sint oraque centum*).<sup>214</sup> These '100 mouths' (*Aen.* VI 625) are positioned precisely six lines<sup>215</sup> after a 'startling'<sup>216</sup> one-line speech which begins thus (620): '*discite iustitiam*'.<sup>217</sup> Here line-initial *discite* matches Horace's gamma-acrostical *disce*, while the object of this Virgilian *discite* (*viz. iustitiam*) likewise finds a parallel in the object of Horace's *disce-rnunt* (*viz. fas atque nefas*), which refers subtextually to the land-confiscations. This Virgilian *discite iustitiam* is moreover followed immediately by *moniti*, while same-stemmed *admonet* in the previous line (619) introduces this '*discite ...*': Horace himself had likewise used twofold *monet* in similarly

<sup>211</sup> While *mi / mihi* and *os / ora* are positioned respectively at beginning and end, Virgilian *sint* has become Horatian *est* to meet the new context — a single, unhypothetical voice.

<sup>212</sup> Here particular reference may be made to Homer's next line (*Il.* II 490: φωνή δ' ἄρρηκτος), where ἄρρηκτος is a virtual homonym of ἄρρητος (for play on these two words elsewhere cf. Kronenberg 2018, sect. 29). It may therefore be noted that (etymologically speaking) this ἄρρητος ('unspoken') is the (fit-for-[unspoken]-telestichs) sense of the *nefas* that Horace employs in pre-caesural *sedes* in the line immediately after telestichal *os*, just as Homer employs similarly pre-caesural ἄρρη(κ)τος in the line immediately after similarly line-final and 'oral' στόματ'. The point was made above (cf. n. 120) that this Horatian *nefas* is also a nod to Hesiodic ἄρρητοι (*Op.* 4), where this ἄρρητοι is placed in the same ante-caesural *locus* as Homeric ἄρρη(κ)τος: these passages of Hesiod and Homer are further linked by being invocations of the Muses.

<sup>213</sup> The first is the line (42) immediately before '100 mouths' (*viz. non ego cuncta meis amplecti versibus opto*), where *non ... cuncta ... amplecti* finds a certain deprecatory parallel in telestichal *mus[s]o imo* (*sc. ore*). The second is the line (44) immediately after said '100 mouths' (*viz. ... primi lege litoris oram*), where 'first' contrasts with 'last' in a 'tele'-stich. The third and final one is the next line (45), where *non ... carmine ficto* finds a counterpart in *nullam ... se-veris* ('none ... without truth') in the telestich's (and poem's) first line (cf. n. 170 above).

<sup>214</sup> These words are part of the Sibyl's description of Tartarus. The present sentence ends with *omnia poenarum percurrere nomina possim* (627). It has been argued elsewhere (cf. Adkin 2020) that here *nomina*, which is not the right word, is in fact a subtextual hint at the onomastical acrostic in *Il.* 641–657 (cf. Damschen 2004, 107–108 [n. 63]), which can in turn be shown to endorse an anti-Caesarian subtext in *Il.* 812–841, which is itself marked by further acrostics.

<sup>215</sup> On such sexilinear spacing cf. n. 161 above.

<sup>216</sup> So Austin 1977, 197.

<sup>217</sup> This warning 'was useless in the underworld' (Johnston 2012, 81 [on l. 619]).

contiguous lines (8–9) immediately before said *fas atque nefas* (10).<sup>218</sup> The subject of this Virgilian *admonet* is ‘Phlegyas’ (618), which is ‘unexpected’.<sup>219</sup> This name-to-note is the father of Ixion, who in the similarly noteworthy line 601<sup>220</sup> is directly juxtaposed with the Lapiths, who happen to be the only mythological figures in Horace’s own *Ode* I 18, where they are directly juxtaposed with the first of the aforesaid *monet*’s (8).

Virgil’s *discite iustitiam moniti* (620) is immediately followed by a sentence which reads thus (621–622): *vendidit hic auro patriam dominumque potentem / imposuit*. These words echo Varius’ *De morte: vendidit hic Latium populis agrosque Quiritum / eripuit*.<sup>221</sup> In Virgil’s *vendidit hic auro patriam* the ‘*hic*’ is evidently Antony, while the ‘*dominumque potentem*’ whom he ‘*imposuit*’ may well be Caesar.<sup>222</sup> This Virgilian *dominumque potentem / imposuit* has been substituted for Varius’ *agrosque Quiritum / eripuit*. Virgil’s learned readership will however have been aware of the Varian original,<sup>223</sup> where Varius refers (*agrosque Quiritum / eripuit*) to the land-confiscations to which reference is also made in *Ode* I 18 as well as in *Eclogue* I, VI and IX. If then Virgil’s *vendidit ...* and *dominum ...* are respectively anti-Antony and anti-Caesar, the *agros ...* behind this *dominum ...* is anti the confiscator of Virgil’s own ‘*acres*’.<sup>224</sup> Virgil’s *discite*, like Horace’s *disce*, has land-confiscatory import.

Virgil’s *discite* also resembles Horace’s *disce(rnunt)* in supplying the ‘d’ of an acrostic. The Virgilian lines in question (*Aen.* VI 616–622) read as follows:

*saxum ingens volvunt alii, radiisque rotarum  
districti pendent; sedet aeternumque sedebit  
infelix Theseus, Phlegyasque miserrimus omnis  
admonet et magna testatur voce per umbras:*

<sup>218</sup> Virgil’s *admonet* (619) is followed by *magna ... voce*, which forms a contrast to *imo* (sc. *ore*) in Horace’s telestich.

<sup>219</sup> So Horsfall 2013, 428.

<sup>220</sup> This line, which is exactly 20 lines before ‘*discite ...*’, was (wrongly) athetized by Ribbeck.

<sup>221</sup> Varius, *Carm. frg.* 1. This Varian fragment continues with *fixit leges pretio atque refixit*, which Virgil proceeds to cite verbatim (622).

<sup>222</sup> Cf. Horsfall 2013, 429–430. For another Virgilian echo of Varius’ *De morte* in connection with an attack on Caesar cf. *Georg.* III 467. This whole section (*Georg.* III 466–470) is in fact full of pointers to the ‘Kill Caesar’ acrostic (on which see n. 66 above) that is to be found in the corresponding lines (466–470) of *Georgic* I; for these ‘pointers’ cf. Adkin 2018, 85–86.

<sup>223</sup> In particular the two verbs (*eripuit / imposuit*) are a matching pair of enjambed choriambes with exactly opposite meaning.

<sup>224</sup> This back-door reference to *agros ...* is accordingly a form of the ‘deafening silence’ ploy, using ‘suppression ... as a means of emphasis’; cf. Haslam 1992, 202. The point may also be made that here a reference to ‘Varius’ is placed in the line immediately after ‘*discite ...*’, just as Horace places *variis* in the line (I 18, 12) immediately after *disce-* (and in *Ecl.* IX 40 *varios* is placed in the line immediately after acrostic-confirming *undis*; cf. n. 162 above, with accompanying text).

'discite iustitiam moniti et non temnere divos'.  
vendidit hic auro patriam dominumque potentem  
imposuit; ...

620

Here lines 617–620 contain the unidentified acrostic *d-i-a-d(ema)*.<sup>225</sup> As with Horace's acrostical *disce*, here horizontal *disc-* delimits the acrostic: whereas however this same horizontal *disc-* forms the beginning of the Horatian acrostic, it ends Virgil's truncated one. Such truncation is here appropriate, because the next line (621) opens with a quotation of Varius: *vendidit* .... The next line (622) then opens with strikingly enjambed *imposuit*. If this *imposuit* is construed with foregoing *diad(ema)* ('he [Antony] put a diadem on [Caesar]'),<sup>226</sup> we have here a reference to Antony's notorious attempt to 'crown' Caesar.<sup>227</sup>

Some further remarks may be made about this acrostical *d-i-a-d(ema)*. A large number of synonymous alternatives were available for each of the words that generate the acrostic: *d(istricti)*,<sup>228</sup> *i(nfelix)*,<sup>229</sup> *a(dmonet)*,<sup>230</sup> *d(iscite)*.<sup>231</sup> This four-letter acrostic (*d-i-a-d[ema]*) matches the similarly quadriliteral one at *Georg.* II 44–47 (*f-i-a-s*), which was discussed above:<sup>232</sup> both of these acrostics are used in conjunction with the '100-mouths' *topos*, which is otherwise absent from Virgil.<sup>233</sup> Virgil's acrostical *d-i-a-d(ema)* in *Aeneid* VI is a lexeme which

<sup>225</sup> For such docked acrostics cf. Adkin 2021, 136. In the present case the *-ema* is nothing more than a nounal suffix.

<sup>226</sup> For this syntactic sort of (inverted) gamma-acrostic cf. the exact parallel at *Georg.* I 466–470 (*icito scena!*; 'Strike [Caesar] with a sacrificial axe!'), on which see n. 66 above. Both texts concern Caesar.

<sup>227</sup> For *diadema imponere* in this connection cf. Cic., *Phil.* II 85; II 86; III 12; V 38; X 7; XIII 17 (*Caesari diadema imponens Antonius ... nobis dominum cur imponebat?*; cf. Virgil's *dominum ... / imposuit* [621–622]). Virgil's acrostical 'diadem' shows that his *dominum* (621) is indeed Caesar. Horsfall (2013, 430) asks in this regard: 'Could V[irgil] ever have been so vehemently critical of Caesar?'. The answer is: 'Yes'.

<sup>228</sup> For synonyms cf. *TLL*, V, 1, 2, col. 1552, ll. 15–19 (s. v. *distingo*). Virgil's *districti* is immediately followed by *pendent*, which is acrostically 'resonant', since acrostics 'hang down'; for other Virgilian instances of this acrostically charged use of *pendeo* cf. Adkin 2015a, 441; 448 n. 141.

<sup>229</sup> Cf. *Synon. Cic.* p. 430, 5–9 Barwick. Here *infelix* is not a natural choice; cf. Horsfall 2013, 428 (ad loc.), who wonders: 'Why precisely *i(nfelix)*?'

<sup>230</sup> Cf. *Synon. Cic.* p. 414, 22–23 Barwick.

<sup>231</sup> Cf. *Synon. Cic.* pp. 418, 2–3; 447, 26–28 Barwick.

<sup>232</sup> Cf. n. 209.

<sup>233</sup> An Ovidian use of an acrostic in connection with this same '100-mouths' *topos* has recently been identified by Robinson 2019, 296–297: *Met.* VIII 533 (*non mihi si centum deus ora sonantia linguis ...*) starts acrostical *n-i-t-i-d-o*, which Robinson understands as a verb. It would seem however that this *nitido* should instead be taken as a dative agreeing with *mihi*, second word in this acrostic's first line. Here we accordingly have a piquant contrast between orotund '100-mouthed-

occurs nowhere else in this poet: Virgilian acrostics are in fact often Virgilian *hapax legomena*.<sup>234</sup> This same *diadema* is also a hapax in Horace. The Horatian passage at issue is *Ode* II 2, 21–22: *diadema tutum / deferens uni* (sc. *Virtus*). Here Nisbet and Hubbard are inclined to see an allusion to the diadem that Antony offered Caesar.<sup>235</sup> Perhaps Horace is also thinking of his confidant Virgil’s acrostical use in *Aen.* VI of this same ‘unpoetical’ word<sup>236</sup> to describe the same very hot-button matter.<sup>237</sup>

If this Virgilian *d-i-a-d(ema)* acrostic ends with the *d(iscite)* that matches Horace’s similarly acrostical *disce*, it would seem possible to show that there is another passage in Virgil that evinces a similar link with this same Horatian *disce*-acrostic: this second Virgilian passage again involves an acrostic, which is again political. This time the text of Virgil in question (*Aen.* II 59–66) introduces Sinon’s perfidious tale about the Trojan Horse:

se ...	60
... <i>obtulerat</i> (sc. <i>Sinon</i> ), <i>fidens animi atque in utrumque paratus,</i> <i>seu versare dolos seu certae occumbere morti.</i>	
<i>undique visendi studio Troiana iuventus</i> <i>circumfusa ruit certantque inludere capto.</i>	
<i>accipe nunc Danaum insidias et crimine ab uno</i>	65
<i>disce omnis.</i>	

Here Virgil’s eye-catchingly enjambed *disce*, which needs a gloss,<sup>238</sup> corresponds exactly to Horace’s gamma-acrostical and lexically identical *disce*. This Virgilian *disce* is immediately preceded by the syntagm *crimine ab uno*. This term *crimen* could be regarded as just a simplex of *discrimen*,<sup>239</sup> which had recently been etymologized by Varro (*Ling.* VI 81) from *cernere*, which is just the simplex of *discernere*,<sup>240</sup> which forms the horizontal wing of Horace’s

---

ness’ and Ovidian *nitior* (for the latter cf. Aratus’ similarly acrostical *λεπτή* [*Phaen.* 783–787], which is in turn inspired by Homer’s acrostical [and similarly ‘nitid’] *λευκή* [*Il.* XXIV 1–5]).

<sup>234</sup> Cf. Adkin 2014, 49.

<sup>235</sup> Nisbet and Hubbard 1978, 49.

<sup>236</sup> For ample synonyms cf. *TLL*, V, 1, 1, col. 946, ll. 70–72 (s. v. *diadema*).

<sup>237</sup> In Horace’s next line but one (23) the same final *sedes* is occupied by *oculo inretorto*. This notorious coinage *inretortus* (cf. [e. g.] Nisbet and Hubbard 1978, 50: ‘seems nonsensical’) may be a subtextual allusion to ‘(not) looking back’ to the (left-edge) acrostic. For such use of ‘looking back’ in connection with an acrostic cf. Adkin 2018, 73–74.

<sup>238</sup> Cf. *TLL*, V, 1, 2, col. 1332, l. 51 (s. v. *disco*): ‘i. intellege’. ‘The phrase *ab uno disce omnes* ... has become proverbial’ (Mackail 1930, 52).

<sup>239</sup> Cf. *TLL*, IV, col. 1195, l. 34 (s. v. *crimen*).

<sup>240</sup> Cf. n. 85 above.

gamma-acrostical *disce: disce-rnunt*.<sup>241</sup> It would seem therefore that this Virgilian *crimine ... / disce* alludes to Horace's gamma-acrostical *disce-rnunt*.<sup>242</sup> This same Virgilian *crimine* is however ambiguous: 'crime' or 'accusation'.<sup>243</sup> The solution to this self-created crux can be shown to be provided by an accompanying acrostic (*ac[c]uso*; ll. 61–65 [up!]), which accordingly matches Horace's similarly acrostical *disce*.<sup>244</sup> If however Virgil's acrostical *ac[c]uso* supplies a glossographic scholium on amphibolous *crimine*, this same first-person-singular verb ('I accuse') on Virgil's own lips is also a political indictment that looks back to the land-confiscatory acrostics (*Ecl.* I 5–8; VI 14–24; IX 34–38) to which Horace's own *disce*-acrostic refers.

It will be appropriate to conclude the present article by returning to its starting-point. When nearly thirty years ago Gareth Morgan proved with mathematical precision that Horace's *disce*-acrostic must be intentional, he could provide it with no why and wherefore. Morgan ends his article by quoting the sentence that also ends Nisbet and Hubbard's introduction to this *Ode*.<sup>245</sup> Here Nisbet and Hubbard affirm that the poem 'points no moral'. It would however appear that this poem does indeed point a moral — one that is highly political. Nisbet and Hubbard's last words then read: 'one may admire all the same the ποικιλία of the needlework'. It would appear that this ποικιλία is more 'admirable' than they suppose. Here we have a palmary instance of the newly identified and very important phenomenon of 'acrostic conversation'.

---

<sup>241</sup> This link between (*dis*)*cerno* and *crimen* would appear to have been signalled here by Virgil himself, who places *crimine* (l. 65) precisely ten lines before *cretus* (l. 74: *sanguine cretus*), since this *cretus* is also the participle of *cerno* (as well as of *cresco*); the link is further underlined by use of lexically selfsame *capto* in same emphatically line-final *sedes* in contiguous lines in each of the respective passages (ll. 64 and 75). The same purpose is evidently served by use of *certae* (62) and *certant* (64): *certus* is the other participle of *cernere* (cf. *TLL*, III, col. 899, l. 58 [s. v. *certus*]), as well as being in turn the etymon of *certare* (cf. *TLL*, III, col. 891, l. 65 [s. v. 2. *certo*]). Here this use of *certare* (*certantque inludere capto*) is odd (cf. [e. g.] Horsfall [2008, 99], who speculates unconfidently: 'The picture seems to be that of Trojans competing for the wittiest ... insult').

<sup>242</sup> It might be thought that Virgil's simple *disce* is more likely to be an echo of Horace's elaborate gamma-acrostic than vice versa. Of course bosom-buddies like Horace and Virgil had pre-publication access to each other's contemporaneous work.

<sup>243</sup> Cf. (e. g.) Thomas 1984, 932: 'Un verso difficile che ha diviso i commentatori' (cf. already Serv. ad loc.).

<sup>244</sup> On this *ac[c]uso*-acrostic cf. further Adkin 2014, 48–57. Virgil's *crimine* (< *cerno*) is placed in the 'first' line (65) of this upward acrostic, just as Horace's *discernunt* is placed in the similarly first line (11) of his own *disce*-acrostic.

<sup>245</sup> Morgan 1993, 145, quoting Nisbet and Hubbard 1970, 229. Morgan states here that this concluding sentence of Nisbet and Hubbard is marked by 'their usual perception'.



## Bibliography

- Adams 1982 = Adams, J. N.: *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary*. London.
- Adkin 2011 = Adkin, N.: Etymologizing in Virgil, *Eclogue* I 11–15. *AC* 80, 163–166.
- 2014 = Adkin, N.: ‘Read the Edge’: Acrostics in Virgil’s Sinon Episode. *ACD* 50, 45–72.
- 2015a = Adkin, N.: A Political Acrostic in Virgil (*Ecl.* VI 14–24). *BStudLat* 45, 433–455.
- 2015b = Adkin, N.: *Quis est nam ludus in undis?* (Virgil, *Eclogue* IX 39–43). *ACD* 51, 43–58.
- 2016a = Adkin, N.: Acrostic Shit (*Ecl.* IV 47–52). *ACD* 52, 21–37.
- 2016b = Adkin, N.: The Etymology of Elysium in Virgil. *InvLuc* 38, 7–12.
- 2017a = Adkin, N.: Who is the Dedicatee of Virgil’s Eighth *Eclogue*?: A New Acrostic. *Latomus* 76, 1065–1067.
- 2017b = Adkin, N.: An Unidentified Acrostic in Virgil (*Georg.* I 409–414). *Maia* 69, 501–506.
- 2018 = Adkin, N.: *MA VE PU* Again: Kill Caesar! (*Georg.* I 424–471). *ACD* 54, 73–90.
- 2019a = Adkin, N.: Horace’s ‘Cleopatra’ Ode: A Crapulent Crux (I 37, 23–24). *Latomus* 78, 192–196.
- 2019b = Adkin, N.: Corydon’s Can-Can: A ‘Gammy’ Gamma-Acrostic (Virgil, *Ecl.* II 23–25). *InvLuc* 41, 7–15.
- 2020 = Adkin, N.: A Virgilian Onomastic (*Aen.* VI 641–657). *BStudLat* 50, 482–497.
- 2021 = Adkin, N.: Virgilian Acrostics: A Typology. *BStudLat* 51, 128–136.
- Allen 1987 = Allen, W. S.: *Vox Graeca: A Guide to the Pronunciation of Classical Greek*. 3rd ed. Cambridge.
- Austin 1977 = Austin, R. G.: *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Sextus*. Oxford.
- Axelsson 1945 = Axelson, B.: *Unpoetische Wörter: Ein Beitrag zur Kenntnis der lateinischen Dichtersprache*. Lund.
- Bing 1990 = Bing, P.: A Pun on Aratus’ Name in Verse 2 of the *Phaenomena*? *HSPH* 93, 281–285.
- Clausen 1994 = Clausen, W.: *A Commentary on Virgil, Eclogues*. Oxford.
- Coleman 1977 = Coleman, R.: *Vergil: Eclogues*. Cambridge.
- Conington and Nettleship 2007 = Conington, J. and Nettleship, H.: *Conington’s Virgil: Aeneid, Books I–II*. Exeter.
- Damschen 2004 = Damschen, G.: Das lateinische Akrostichon: Neue Funde bei Ovid sowie Vergil, Grattius, Manilius und Silius Italicus. *Philologus* 148, 88–115.
- Dillenburger 1881 = Dillenburger, G.: *Q. Horatii Flacci Opera Omnia*. 7th ed. Bonn.
- Erren 2003 = Erren, M.: *P. Vergilius Maro: Georgica* II. Heidelberg.
- Forcellini 1940 = Forcellini, A.: *Lexicon Totius Latinitatis* I–VI. Padua.
- Gagliardi 2014 = Gagliardi, P.: *Commento alla decima ecloga di Virgilio*. Hildesheim–Zürich–New York.
- Gow 1952 = Gow, A. S. F.: *Theocritus: Edited with a Translation and Commentary* II. 2nd ed. Cambridge.
- Handford 1947 = Handford, S. A.: *The Latin Subjunctive: Its Usage and Development from Plautus to Tacitus*. London.
- Haslam 1992 = Haslam, M.: Hidden Signs: Aratus *Diosemeiai* 46ff., Vergil *Georgics* I 424ff. *HSPH* 94, 199–204.
- Heyne and Wagner 1830 = Heyne, C. G. and Wagner, G. P. E.: *P. Vergili Maronis Opera* I. 4th ed. Leipzig–London.
- Horsfall 2008 = Horsfall, N.: *Virgil, Aeneid II: A Commentary*. Leiden–Boston.
- 2013 = Horsfall, N.: *Virgil, Aeneid VI: A Commentary*. Berlin.
- Johnston 2012 = Johnston, P. A.: *Vergil: Aeneid, Book VI*. Newburyport (MA).
- Koster 1988 = Koster, S.: *Ille ego qui: Dichter zwischen Wort und Macht*. Erlangen.

- Kronenberg 2018 = Kronenberg, L.: Seeing the Light, Part II: The Reception of Aratus's *LEPTE* Acrostic in Greek and Latin Literature. *Dictynna* 15 (no pagination).
- Kruse 1930 = Kruse, B. G.: Maron (2). *PWK* 14, coll. 1911–1912.
- Kühner, Stegmann and Thierfelder 1955 = Kühner, R., Stegmann, C. and Thierfelder, A.: *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache: Satzlehre* I. 3rd ed. Darmstadt.
- Mackail 1930 = Mackail, J. W.: *The Aeneid*. Oxford.
- Macleane and Chase 1856 = Maclean, A. J. and Chase, R. H.: *The Works of Horace*. Cambridge (MA).
- Maltby 1991 = Maltby, R.: *A Lexicon of Ancient Latin Etymologies*. Leeds.
- Marangoni 2007 = Marangoni, C.: *Supplementum Etymologicum Latinum* I. Trieste.
- Mayer 2012 = Mayer, R.: *Horace: Odes, Book I*. Cambridge.
- Minos 1901 = Minos, J.: *Ein neuentdecktes Geheimschriftsystem der Alten*. Leipzig.
- Morgan 1993 = Morgan, G.: *Nullam, Vare ...: Chance or Choice in Odes I 18*. *Philologus* 137, 142–145.
- Müller 1900 = Müller, L.: *Q. Horatius Flaccus: Oden und Epoden* II. St. Petersburg–Leipzig.
- Mynors 1990 = Mynors, R. A. B.: *Virgil: Georgics*. Oxford.
- Nisbet and Hubbard 1970 = Nisbet, R. G. M. and Hubbard, M.: *A Commentary on Horace: Odes, Book I*. Oxford.
- Nisbet and Hubbard 1978 = Nisbet, R. G. M. and Hubbard, M.: *A Commentary on Horace: Odes, Book II*. Oxford.
- O'Hara 2017 = O'Hara, J. J.: *True Names: Vergil and the Alexandrian Tradition of Etymological Wordplay*. 2nd ed. Ann Arbor.
- Orelli, Baiter and Hirschfelder 1886 = Orelli, J. K. von, Baiter, J. G. and Hirschfelder, W.: *Q. Horatius Flaccus* I. 4th ed. Berlin.
- Page 1898 = Page, T. E.: *P. Vergili Maronis Bucolica et Georgica*. London.
- Peerlkamp 1861 = Peerlkamp, P. H.: Ad Virgilium. *Mnemosyne* 10, 113–163.
- 1862 = Peerlkamp, P. H.: *Q. Horatii Flacci Carmina*. 2nd ed. Amsterdam.
- Quinn 1980 = Quinn, K.: *Horace: The Odes*. London–New York.
- Riganti 1978 = Riganti, E.: *Varrone: De Lingua Latina, Libro VI*. Bologna.
- Robinson 2011 = Robinson, M.: *A Commentary on Ovid's Fasti, Book II*. Oxford.
- 2019 = Robinson, M.: Looking Edgeways: Pursuing Acrostics in Ovid and Virgil. *CQ* 69, 290–308.
- Romano 1991 = Romano, E.: *Q. Orazio Flacco: Le Opere* I, 2. Rome.
- Schütz 1889 = Schütz, H.: *Q. Horatius Flaccus* I. 3rd ed. Berlin.
- Shackleton Bailey 2010 = Shackleton Bailey, D. R.: *Q. Horatius Flaccus: Opera*. 4th ed. Berlin.
- Simon 1899 = Simon, J. A.: *Akrosticha bei den augustischen Dichtern*. Cologne–Leipzig.
- Syndikus 2001 = Syndikus, H. P.: *Die Lyrik des Horaz: Eine Interpretation der Oden* I. 3rd ed. Darmstadt.
- Thomas 1984 = Thomas, Y.: *Crimen. EV* 1, 932–933.
- 1986 = Thomas, R. F.: Virgil's *Georgics* and the Art of Reference. *HSPH* 90, 171–198.
- 1988 = Thomas, R. F.: *Virgil: Georgics* I. Cambridge.
- Walde and Hofmann 2008 = Walde, A. and Hofmann, J. B.: *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* I. 6th ed. Heidelberg.

**DOI 10.22315/ACD/2022/5**  
**ISSN 0418-453X (print)**  
**ISSN 2732-3390 (online)**  
**Creative Commons BY-NC-ND 4.0**