Abstract: The cacata-acrostic (Ecl. IV 47-52) is considered accidental, as being inconsistent with the dignitas of this “Messianic” Eclogue. It is however possible to demonstrate that Virgil employs such acrostics on other occasions with the object of undercutting such political panegyric. The intentionality of this cacata-acrostic is further buttressed by clues in the lines it spans as well as by winks tipped in other parts of the poem. Pointers to this acrostic are also embedded in the foregoing third Eclogue, especially in the section devoted to Pollio, dedicatee of Eclogue IV. Problematic passages in both these Eclogues are elucidated by the presence of the cacata-acrostic.
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“This (sc. Ecl. IV) is the most famous of the Eclogues (indeed perhaps the most famous piece of Latin literature)". In this Eclogue’s tail the cacata-acrostic (47-52) is dismissed as an “accident” in the recent overview of Virgilian acrostics by Joshua Katz. Here Katz refers to Danielewicz’ similar dismissal of cacata as accidental on the grounds that intentionality would entail “hypocrisy, even blasphemy” in a poem that is an encomium of Pollio. Virgil can however be shown to deploy similar acrostics elsewhere with the aim of subverting such political eulogy. Two examples may be cited. The first occurs in the next Eclogue but one (VI 14-24), where the unidentified up-and-down acrostic laesis ("for those who have been hurt"; first up, then down) runs counter to the imme-

---

1 The present writer apologizes for unavoidable recourse to the profane tetagrammaton. Here he is merely following Virgil, as will soon become clear. The method of 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 at http://www.thesaurus.badw.de/pdf/addenda.pdf. 2 So begins the Introduction to Ecl. IV in Williams 1979, 104. 3 Katz 2013, 5-6. On Katz’ own discovery (6-10) of an acrostic in Aen. VI 77-84 cf. Adkin 2015a. The cacata-acrostic is not mentioned at all in the recent commentaries of Cucchiarelli 2012 and Casanova-Robin 2014. The former conveniently assembles the secondary literature on this Eclogue. For recent additions cf. www.niklasholzberg.com/Homepage/Bibliographien.html. 4 Danielewicz 2005, 324.
diately antecedent éloge of Varus (6-12), who like Pollio was involved in the “hurtful” land-confiscations. The second instance of a political acrostic that negatives the homage starts in the opening line (Georg. I 466) of the passage in which Virgil purports to wring his hands at the murder of Pollio’s supportee Caesar, while the same deed is simultaneously enjoined by this unidentified acrostic: “Strike Caesar with a sacrificial axe”.

Pollio is evidently the object of similarly acrostical procracy in the dedication to Eclogue VIII, where the unidentified acrostic tu sì es, ac[ê][l]pe! (“If it’s you, accept!”; 6-13) shows that the much-debated identity of the dedicatee (Pollio or Octavian) has been left deliberately indeterminate. Here the acrostic is flagged by oram ... legis (7), which bears the subtextual sense “you read the (acrostical) edge”6. The same subtextual cue (lege ... oram) marks the start of the overlooked acrostic fias (Georg. II 44-47), where dedicatee Maecenas is partly bidden to “become” what the politely commendatory dedication has just told him he already is: o decus, o famae merito pars maxima nostrae (40). Pollio himself would also appear to be subjected to acrostical dicacy by Virgil’s friend Horace, whose tribute to Pollio’s History of the Civil Wars is gain-said by the undetected acrostic nepiá7. In view of all the afore-mentioned acrostics that undercut the praise of laudandi in general and Pollio in particular, it would be unsurprising to find another such instance in the “Pollio”-Eclogue’s cacata-acrostic.

In this fourth Eclogue the undercutting is given a specifically coprological form: cacata. Here Danielewicz’ above-cited article sees an “inconsistency of

---

5 On this acrostic cf. Adkin 2015c. A similarly land-confiscatory reference would seem to mark the acrostical pair fons (Ecl. I 5-8) and undis (Ecl. IX 34-38), since the land at Mantua was waterlogged (cf. Serv. Auct., Ecl. IX 10). On the undis-acrostic cf. Adkin 2015d.

6 Read 466-470 downwards (icitio), then continue reading normally (470: o-[b]scena[ê]). O[b]scena (for expendable “b” cf. Conte 2013, 142 [ad loc.]) had lately been etymologized by Varro (L. VII 96) from the scena (“stage”) that is homonymous with scena (“sacrificial axe”); cf. Fest. p. 318 M. and p. 330 M., referring to Liv. Andr., Com. 2: ictus scena). This acrostic is discussed more fully by Adkin 2015c, 454, n. 192, where long-range clues are assembled, including the line-numerically corresponding passage of the next Georgic but one (III 466-470), especially 468, where bizarrely judgmental calpam ferro compesce does not suit a surtextual sheep, but a subtextual Caesar.

7 Acrostical ac[ê][l]pe is corroborated in its first line (11) by horizontal accipe, which is itself spotlighted by “non-Virgilian” (Levi 1966, 76) non-elision in antecedent desinam. For single “c” in ac[ê][l]pe cf. Koster 1988, 103; for decuration after the third letter cf. Adkin 2014, 47, n. 11; 51, n. 44; 59, n. 107.

8 Oran ... legis is highlighted by the ensuing anacoluthon that starts with wink-tipping en (= ἐδεῖ [Gloss.] II Philox. EN 5); cf. line-initial en [9].

9 Carm. II 1, 22-26, corroborated by imitation of Od. IV 32 (ὄτικα βαζεγος) and by nepotes (27), since the virtual homographs nepos and ντικα were in addition regarded as etymologically linked (cf. Maltby 1991, 408; Etym. Gud. p. 408,48-49 St.).
tone”, which he takes to be another reason for thinking this acrostic an “accident”\textsuperscript{10}. It can however be shown that Virgil uses acrostical cacare not only in pastoral, but also in the most distinguishé and decorous of the genres, epic: here the passage at issue is moreover the climactic and intensely moving death of the noble Camilla. Her dying address to Acca (Aen. XI 820-827) is exactly coextensive with an unidentified pair of acrostics: upward cacat (820-824)\textsuperscript{11}, then synonymously downward cesi (= ἄχαρι, 824-827)\textsuperscript{12}. These acrostics that span the Acca-episode accordingly gloss this nomen proprium (Acca = slightly anagrammed Caca) as “she shits”. Confirmation is supplied by similarly acrostical caco (Aen. XI 808-811), which ends exactly ten lines before the “end” (820) of ascendant cacat. Just as cacat glosses Acca, so similarly overlooked caco glosses the homonymous κακῶν Ἰλιάδ XV 586 (θηρί κακῶν ῥέξαντι ἕοκυδα), which Virgil is imitating here: the κακῶν is a crap\textsuperscript{13}. A pawkly allusion to acrostical caco is embedded in Virgil’s next line (812), where conscius audacis facti is problematic\textsuperscript{14}: the crisis of conscience is a crap\textsuperscript{15}. If acrostical caco is located at the start of the narrative of Camilla’s death, this account rounds off with deiecta (833), which is positioned exactly ten lines after the pivotal “c” (824) of cacat / cesi, of which deicere can be a synonym\textsuperscript{16}: here euphemistically double-sensed deicere accordingly provides horizontal corroboration of the dysphemistically unsayable acrostics\textsuperscript{17}. If Virgil can thus employ acrostic “shit”

\textsuperscript{10} Danielewicz 2005, 324.

\textsuperscript{11} For “q” (822) = “c” cf. Thes. Ling. Lat. 3 col. 1,39-44 (s.v. “c”); for ignorable “h” (823) cf. Thes. Ling. Lat. 6,3 col. 2391,26-55 (s.v. “h”).

\textsuperscript{12} For “c” (824) = “χ” cf. Thes. Ling. Lat. 3 col. 1,36-38 (s.v. “c”); for “s” (826) = “ζ” cf. Oxf. Lat. Dict. 2343 (s.v. “s”). For such a two-way acrostic cf. afore-mentioned laesis (n. 5 above). For such use of Greek in a Virgilian acrostic cf. Adkin 2014, 57-68, where attention is drawn to unidentified pithi (= πρεθη = “he [sc. Sinon] persuades”) at Aen. II 103-107 (=106 [76 is interpolated]; up) and 142 (=141)-146 (down), which correspond line-numerically with Homer’s use of the same verb in the same uncommon sense of “deceive” at Od. II 106 and XXIV 141.

\textsuperscript{13} Just as Virgil replaces the Odyssey’s βηρι with lupus, so his choice of Acca is “clearly suggested” (Horsfall 2003, 434) by Acca Larentia, who was a “prostitute (lupa)” (Graf 2016): both Virgilian “wolves” shit.

\textsuperscript{14} An unconvincing carnivore in inner crisis” (Horsfall 2003, 432).

\textsuperscript{15} Consicius audacis facti is immediately followed by caudamque remulcens, where remulcens (“apparently a coinage, only here in V.” [Horsfall 2003, 432]) needed elucidation (cf. Gloss.\textsuperscript{1} Ansil. RE 1043: remulcens: reducens). Since a wolf’s anus is right below his tail, which he extends horizontally while defecating, in the line immediately after acrostical caco the eye-catching phrase caudamque remulcens is evidently a scampishly subtextual allusion to his tail’s post-defecatory retraction.

\textsuperscript{16} Cf. Oxf. Lat. Dict.\textsuperscript{2} 554 (s.v. deicio 3a: “To evacuate [through the bowels]”).

\textsuperscript{17} The subtextually “BM” connotation of sentence-initial deiecta is borne out by immediately ensuing crudescit, which required explanation (Gloss.\textsuperscript{1} II Arma C 238: crudescit: renionatus); cf. Oxf. Lat. Dict.\textsuperscript{2} 307 (s.v. crudus 3a: “[Of food in the stomach]”). If deiecta supplies crosswise
no fewer than three times in his epic’s soul-stirring account of Camilla’s death, he can use it once in an Eclogue.

In the Eclogue at issue acrostical cacata spans the passage which forms the climax to Virgil’s description of the Golden Age: here he accordingly tempers eschatology with scatology. This passage, which is duly indented at both start and finish in the new Teubner18, may be quoted in full:

“talia saecla”, suis dixerunt, “currite”, fusi
concordes stabili fatorum numine Parcae.
adgrede o magnos (aderit iam tempus) honores,
cara deum suboles, magnum Iovis incrementum!
aspice convexo nutantem pondere mundum,
errasque tractusque maris caelumque profundum;
aspice venturo laetantur ut omnia saeclo! (Ecl. IV 46-52)

Talia saecla (46) opens this passage, which also ends with exactly the same noun: saeclo (52)19. Here talia saecla is noteworthy: since on the one hand this phrase as accusative would be “exceedingly harsh”20, and since on the other hand talia as vocative is “unusual”21, this “unusually” vocatival talia is evidently a prompt to see it as being glossed by immediately ensuing cacata22; these saecula are not aurae, but cacata. A further clue to cacata would seem to be supplied by the immediately preceding tableau of technicoloured sheep (43-45), which are “ridiculous”23. The verse between Virgil’s pavonine sheep and his confirmation of the acrostics, the customary hint to “look” at them (cf. Adkin 2014, 49-52) is furnished by line-initial prospexit (839; red-flagged by the immediately preceding μετάληγος σιδηροτατος of in clamore and positioned exactly 20 lines after the “start” [820] of cacat), which governs the noteworthy (cf. Serv. Auct.) mulcatam (sc. Camillam) that recalls paronomastic and similarly noteworthy remulcens immediately after caco (cf. n. 15 above; this hook-up shows that [e.g.] Conte 2009, 363, is wrong to replace mulcatam with multatam).

18 Ottaviano 2013, 54-55.
19 The next line (53) reads: o mihi tum longae maneat pars ultima vitae, where the “slightly entangled and elaborated” language (Sidgwick 1890, II, 21) would appear to be an unidentified nod to Varro’s recent etymology of immediately foregoing saeculum (L. VI 11): dictum a sene, quod longissimum spatium senescendorum hominum id putarunt. O’Hara’s (1996) pandect of Virgil’s use of etymology lists no instance whatever in Ecl. IV.
21 So Papillon – Haigh 1892, II, 19.
22 For talis “referring to what follows” cf. Oxf. Lat. Dict.2 2097 (s.v. 2b).
23 So Thornton 1988, 226. Since these lines contain two unidentified jeux étymologiques, they may be cited in extenso:
   ipse sed in pratis aries iam suave rubenti
   murice, iam croceo mutabit vellera lato;
   sponte sua sandyx passcentis vestitet agnos.
Here vellera and vestiet occupy the same sedex in adjacent lines, which is an etymological signpost (cf. Michalopoulos 2001, 5): vesitis had just been etymologized from vellus by Varro (L. V
acrostical *cacata* (viz. 46: “*talia saecla*” ...) alludes to Catullus 64 (321; 327; 382-383). It is therefore natural that Virgilian *cacata* itself should allude to another Catullan poem (36), which is likewise “framed” by this same word in the same transferred sense\(^{24}\), the same lexical form (*cacata*) and the same “marginal” position (first and last lines: 1 and 20).

A further wink-wink at acrostical *cacata* is supplied by twofold *aspice* in the same *sedes* at the start of alternate lines (50; 52)\(^{25}\). This kind of nudge-nudge to “look” at an acrostic is S.O.P\(^{26}\). Here the second *aspice* is positioned at the end of the completed acrostic (*cacata*), while the first *aspice* coincides with the end of the first complete word: *caca*\(^{27}\). This twofold use of *aspice* would also seem to evoke a debt to Aratus’ similarly twofold employment of *σκέπτεο* as a similarly acrostical signpost\(^{28}\): *aspice* and *σκέπτεο*, which are linked etymologically\(^{29}\), also resemble each other as imperative singulars that on both occasions fill the dactylic first foot and mean “look!”\(^{30}\). The second *aspice* in the acrostic’s last line is followed by *laetantur* in emphatically post-caesural position: *aspice* ... *laetantur ut omnia*\(^{31}\). Since *laeto* can also mean *stercoro*\(^{32}\), here *laetantur* matches above-mentioned *detecta*\(^{33}\) as bluenosedly amphibolous corroboration.

\(^{130}\) *Vellera* is juxtaposed with *līto*, which is remarkable enough to require a gloss from Servius. *Lūteus* was etymologized from *dīlatus* (cf. Maltby 1991, 353, who however omits the alternative derivation from *lūtum* [cf. Schol. Hor. Epod. X 16], which was in turn derived from *lotus* [cf. Maltby 1991, 353]). If *līto* (etymologically “wet”) is placed last in l. 44, in the preceding line the post-caesural *sedes* (on both positions as etymological markers cf. Michalopoulos 2001, 5) is occupied by *aries*, which had recently been etymologized by Varro (L. V 98) from *aires* (“you are dry”): “dry” becoming “wet” accentuates Virgil’s ovine marvel. For additional play on the etymology of *aires* cf. Adkin 2009 (the etymological joke in *aries* ... *vellera līto* recurs in modified form in the previous *Eclogue* [III 95]: *aries* ... *vellera siccat*).

\(^{24}\) Cf. *Thes. Ling. Lat.* 3 coll. 8.58-59 (s.v. *caco*): “2: transitive; a: i. q. concacare; in imagine”.

\(^{25}\) Such line-initial repetition of *aspice* is without parallel elsewhere in Augustan poetry.

\(^{26}\) Cf. n. 17 above. Since in the present case it might be thought a tall order to expect a newborn babe to “look” at all the cosmic phenomena described in these lines, the acrostical reference of *aspice* is all the clearer.

\(^{27}\) This imperatival form matches similarly imperatival *aspice*.

\(^{28}\) Viz. *Phaec.* 778 and 799, where *σκέπτεο* points respectively to the gamma-acrostics *Λέπτης* (783-787) and *πάντα ... σζιο* (803-811).

\(^{29}\) *Aspicio* is a *compositum* of *specio* (cf. Adkin 2006, 464), whose *spec*—corresponds to the *σκέπ* of *σκέπτομαι*, cf. Walde – Hofmann 2008, II, 570 (s.v. *specio*): “*σκέπ* umgestellt aus *σπέκ*”. For the very large number of synonyms that could have been used instead of Virgilian *aspicio* cf. *Thes. Ling. Lat.* 2 coll. 829,74-84; 832,81-833,16 (s.v. *aspicio*).

\(^{30}\) Cf. *Oxf. Lat. Dict.* 202 (s.v. *aspicio* 2a); *LSJ* 1606-1607 (s.v. *σκέπτομαι*).

\(^{31}\) Here *laetantur* is further highlighted by postposition of *ut*.

\(^{32}\) Cf. *Thes. Ling. Lat.* 7.2.2 coll. 879,37-44 (s.v. 1. *laeto*).

\(^{33}\) Cf. nn. 16-17 above.
of acrostical and horizontally no-no cacata\textsuperscript{34}. The subject of laetantur is omnia\textsuperscript{35}, which as neuter plural fits cacata\textsuperscript{36}: “all” can be used with acrostical reference\textsuperscript{37}.

Besides this concluding line (52) all the other lines in cacata can be shown to contain clues to the acrostic. Its first line (47) introduces the Fates with the phrase stabili ... numine. Varro (L. VII 85) had recently derived numen from nutus. The corresponding verb (nutantem) is employed in saliently post-caesural sedes just three lines later (50). Nuto means “to move unsteadily”\textsuperscript{38}, where “unsteadily” is the opposite of the “steady” denoted by the stabili\textsuperscript{39} that here qualifies numine. Virgil’s collocation stabili numine is accordingly an etymological self-contradiction appropriate to the start of an acrostic that contradicts the text. The next line of the acrostic (48) is framed by the similarly notable expression adgredere ... honores, where the verb needed a gloss: idest incipe ascendere\textsuperscript{40}. Equally noteworthy here is the grouping adgredere o, since elsewhere Virgil thus places this interjection immediately after an imperative on only one occasion\textsuperscript{41}: in the present case the aim is evidently to facilitate the acrostic, to which this postposition also draws attention.

Line three of an acrostic is especially important\textsuperscript{42}. The third line of the Mars-acrostic (Aen. VII 601-604) ends with corroboratory Martem. The same final sedes in the same third line of cacata contains a similarly confirmatory hint, which however because of this acrostic’s aeschrologia cannot resemble Martem in being explicit: instead it has to match the demure circumlocution of afore-mentioned laetantur (52). This time the lexeme at issue is incrementum

\textsuperscript{34} For synonymous alternatives that were available for use in lieu of laetor cf. Thes. Ling. Lat. 7,2,2 col. 879,62-68 (s.v. laetor).

\textsuperscript{35} Whereas laetor is very frequently used of “animantes” to mean “rejoice” (cf. Thes. Ling. Lat. 7,2,2 coll. 879,77-881,66 [s.v.]), this sense of the verb is seldom applied to “res naturales” like omnia (cf. ibid. 881,67-81): such disproportion facilitates a subtextual sense of laetantur here as stercorantur.

\textsuperscript{36} Since cacare is here used in the sense of concacare (cf. n. 24 above), mention may be made of Sen., Apoc. 4, 3, where this compound is similarly employed in conjunction with omnia: [Claudius] omnia ... concacavit.

\textsuperscript{37} Cf. (e.g.) Georg. I 437, where problematic Panopeae (“see all”) in place of Parthenian Παρθένους is evidently a hint to “see all” the foregoing acrostic (429-433): here the “see all” of Panopeae matches the aspice ... omnia of the present passage.

\textsuperscript{38} So Oxf. Lat. Dict.\textsuperscript{2} 1329 (s.v. 4a), citing the present passage.

\textsuperscript{39} Cf. Oxf. Lat. Dict.\textsuperscript{2} 1998 (s.v. 1a).

\textsuperscript{40} So Schol. Verg. Bern. (ad loc.). No other instance of honor as object of adgredior is furnished by Thes. Ling. Lat. I coll. 1315,26-1321,31 (s.v. adgredior).

\textsuperscript{41} Viz. Aen. IX 234.

\textsuperscript{42} Cf. n. 7 above.
(49), which stands out as a fourth epitrite that makes the line a *spondeiazon*\(^{43}\), this word’s “vulgarity”\(^{44}\) is accentuated by the grandiloquent context\(^{45}\). At the same time the doubtful meaning of *incrementum*\(^{46}\) invites the reader to toy with the prefix: “vulgar” *in-crementum* easily evokes still more: “vulgar” *excrementum* – acrostic-matching “shit”\(^{47}\). Here *incrementum* is matched in untypical parison by pre-caesural *suboles* (49), which in such a “shitty” context naturally suggests its exact homonym: “you smell somewhat”\(^{48}\). Here the gravevolent *cacemphaton* of *suboles* might easily have been avoided by recourse to a large number of available synonyms\(^{49}\). Finally, just as the next line’s (50) *aspice* would appear to be indebted to Aratus\(^{50}\), so Virgil’s subtextual “you smell” may evince a debt to Theocritus\(^{51}\).

The next line (50) bids the child perlustrate the entire universe (*aspice convexo nutantem pondere mundum*!), thus engendering a kicky contrast between lofty body-text and lowly acrostic, which by this line has reached *caca*: “shit!”. The three weighty trisyllables (*convexo nutantem pondere*) framed by this line’s first and last words all carry the connotation of “downwardness” ap-

---

\(^{43}\) In the *Eclogues* there are only two other *spondeiazontes*, neither of which is created, as here, by a quadrisyllable.

\(^{44}\) So Serv. (ad loc.: *est vulgare*). Virgil “dares” (so Clausen 1994, 142) to introduce *incrementum* into poetry.

\(^{45}\) Cf. Traina 1986, 220-221.

\(^{46}\) Cf. the review of opinion in Traina 1986, 219-220.

\(^{47}\) Cf. *Thes. Ling. Lat.* 5.2 col. 1283,47-56 (s.v. 1. *excrementum*): “i. q. … stercus”.

\(^{48}\) *Oleo* is the etymon of *oletum*, which is synonymous with *excrementum*. The “you” of subtextual *suboles* (“you smell”) is vocatival *suboles* (“you child”), to which the acrostic’s imperative *caca* (47-50) and then participial *cacata* (47-52; = *concacata* [cf. n. 24 above]) might be thought applicable: shitty kids pong.

\(^{49}\) Cf. *Synon. Cic.* p. 422,19-20 B.; p. 426,32 B. In particular Virgil might have availed himself of prosodically equivalent *proles*, as he does in *Aen.* VI 322 (*deum ... proles*, matching the present *deum suboles*): *proles* is used with far greater frequency than *suboles*, especially in poetry (cf. *Thes. Ling. Lat.* 10,2 coll. 1819,73-1820,5 [s.v. *proles*]). *Proles* and *suboles* are cited by Cicero (*De orat.* III 153) as making the discourse appear *grandior*: in the present passage this “grandeur” makes the subtextual “you smell” (*suboles*) all the more piquant, especially since the “child” (*suboles*) is here divine.

\(^{50}\) Cf. n. 28 above.

\(^{51}\) Cf. *Id.* V 52 (*δέβης*), where the line-number (52) matches the last line of *cacata* (52); for such line-correspondences cf. n. 12 above. Theocritean *δέβης* and Virgilian *-oles* are also linked etymologically, since *oleo* was etymologized from *odor*, which was in turn etymologized from *ὀξύς* (cf. Maltby 1991, 425; 427 [s.vv.]). The Theocritean passage that starts (61) just ten lines after *δέβης* (52) would similarly appear to have been in Virgil’s mind in connection with *cacata*; cf. n. 122 below. In such a subtextually whiffy context one cannot resist pointing out postscript-wise that the Beatles’ “I Am the Walrus”, when backmasked, says: “You smell like bullshit”.
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propriate to a “downward” acrostic\textsuperscript{52}, \textit{convexus}, which is glossed as \textit{declinatus}\textsuperscript{53}, qualifies \textit{pondus}, which was etymologized from \textit{pendeo}\textsuperscript{54}, while intervenient and “assai discusso” \textit{nutare}\textsuperscript{55} is explained by La Cerda as “se devehere”\textsuperscript{56}. This line ends with \textit{mundum}, which had recently been etymologized by Varro from both \textit{moveo} and adjectival \textit{mundus}\textsuperscript{57}. Since the child is being told to “look” (\textit{aspice}) simultaneously at \textit{mundum} and acrostical \textit{caca}\textsuperscript{58}, Virgil would seem to be signalling rejection of \textit{mundus} (“clean”) as etymon of nounal \textit{mundus}: “shit” is not “clean”. Instead Virgil would appear to be endorsing the alternative derivation of \textit{mundus} from \textit{moveo} by his employment here of synonymous \textit{nuto} in emphatically post-caesural \textit{sedes} in the same line\textsuperscript{59}. \textit{Mundum} occupies the same final position as notably homoeteleutic \textit{profundum} in the next line (51)\textsuperscript{60}. Here the collocation \textit{caelumque profundum} is remarkable: “\textit{profundum} ‘high’ shows a rare, perhaps innovatory, use of the converse to its normal meaning”\textsuperscript{61}. The “normal meaning” of \textit{profundus} is “extending a long way down”\textsuperscript{62}, which certainly fits an acrostic extending no fewer than six lines down: Virgil’s odd use of \textit{profundus} here in \textit{caca}’s penultimate line would accordingly appear to be another subtextual clue to this acrostic.

Besides such clues within the \textit{caca}-acrostic itself Virgil has also embedded pointers outside it: here three passages in this \textit{Eclogue} are pertinent. The first to be considered is the tetrastich that ends the poem:

\begin{quote}
60 \textit{incipe, parve puer, risu cognoscre matrem:}
\textit{matri longa decem tulerunt fastidia menses.}
\textit{incipe, parve puer: qui non risere parentes}\textsuperscript{63},
\textit{nec deus hunc mensa, dea nec dignata cubili est. (Ecl. IV 60-63)\textsuperscript{64}}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{52} For such acrostically-related “resonance” in language used in the vicinity of an acrostic cf. Adkin 2014, 54-55; 61-64; 68-69.
\textsuperscript{53} So Paul. Fest. p. 58 M.
\textsuperscript{54} Cf. Maltby 1991, 484.
\textsuperscript{55} So Cucchiarelli 2012, 272.
\textsuperscript{56} De la Cerda 1608, 83.
\textsuperscript{57} Cf. Maltby 1991, 396.
\textsuperscript{58} Line-final \textit{mundum} is also aligned vertically with \textit{in(ex)-crementum}; for such vertical juxtaposition as an etymological marker cf. Michalopoulos 2001, 5.
\textsuperscript{59} For these two verbs as synonyms cf. Gloss. V 469,12: \textit{nutat: ... movet}. For such use of synonyms in etymologizing cf. Michalopoulos 2001, 11.
\textsuperscript{60} This is the line before the acrostic’s last one (52), which was discussed above.
\textsuperscript{61} So Coleman 1977, 146.
\textsuperscript{62} So Oxf. Lat. Dict.\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{1}} 1627 (s.v. 1).
\textsuperscript{63} Thus the text of Ottaviano 2013, 56.
\textsuperscript{64} The immediately preceding line (59) reads: \textit{Pan ... dicat se ... [victum].} Since \textit{Pan} (“all”) can be used with reference to an acrostic (cf. n. 37 above; Adkin 2015c, 453), the aforesaid line
In the first of these lines (60) *risu cognoscere* is problematical: “Unfortunately the lines (viz. 60-61) do not make clear to whom the laugh at line 60 belongs”.\(^{65}\) This uncleanness would seem to be intentional: déraciné *risu cognoscere* is evidently a subtextual hint to us readers ourselves to “notice” the acrostic and to “smile” at its scatological scurrility.\(^{66}\) The second line of this concluding tetrastich (61) contains two lexemes that are marked by an acrostically-related “resonance”. The first is pre-caesural *decem*, which qualifies line-final *menses*: here Virgil might instead have employed metrically equivalent *novem*.\(^{67}\) It may therefore be pointed out that *decem* is placed exactly ten lines after the end of acrostical *cacata* (52): Virgil can be shown to have been in the habit of inserting such numerical clues to an acrostic.\(^{68}\) The other acrostically “resonant” item in this line is the next word but one: *fastidia*. This noun, which here needed explication, is used “de graviditate” only on this occasion, whereas the same term is employed in Classical Latin no fewer than five times “de odo”\(^{71}\), which fits malodorous *cacata* admirably. The final point may be made that in this tetrastich’s closing line, which is also the last line of the entire Eclogue (63: *nec deus hunc ...*), Virgil puckishly makes the gods reward subtextual laughter at their own expense: this shitty kid is theirs (*deum suboles ...*; 49).

The second passage in this Eclogue to serve as a subtextual pointer to the *cacata*-acrostic is positioned at the exact mid-point (l. 23) between the start of the poem and the line that introduces the acrostic (46: *“talia saecla”* ...). This line 23, which reads *ipsa tibi blandos fundent cunabula flores*, is athetized in the new Teubner edition:\(^{72}\) on the one hand a cradle is out of place between *liberae* the subtextual sense “all (the acrostic) would say itself” ─ which, because *cacata* is aeschrologous, it mustn’t. Such pawky subtextuality favours the reading *dicit* against *dicet*.\(^{69}\)

\(^{65}\) Scafoglio 2013/14, 78.

\(^{66}\) For *cognosco* with this acrostically idoneous sense of “to become aware of, discern, detect, see” cf. *Oxf. Lat. Dict.* 380 (s.v. 7a). For *cognosco* used with specific reference to an acrostic cf. (e.g.) *CIL* XII 631,5-8: *nomen dulce, lector, si forte defunctae requires, a capite per litteras deorsum legendo cognoscis*. The problematicality of *risu* (60) is shared by *risere* (62; cf. the apparatus in Ottaviano 2013, 56), where this verb would seem to be similarly hintful. Lines 60 and 62 each start with *incipe*, just as lines 50 and 52 each open with *aspi*, which corresponds exactly to *incipe ... cognoscere* (60): in all of these lines the subtextual reference is evidently to the acrostic.


\(^{68}\) Cf. Adkin 2014, 59-60.

\(^{69}\) Cf. Philarg., *rec. I: fastidia: idest contemptiones, vitae labores*.

\(^{70}\) So *Thes. Ling. Lat.* 6,1 col. 316,73-83. The other passages listed are merely patristic imitations of the present one.

\(^{71}\) So *Thes. Ling. Lat.* 6,1 col. 316,3-7.

\(^{72}\) Ottaviano 2013, 53.
ons (22) and snakes (24), while on the other a cradle that sprouts is “grotesque”\(^{73}\). The oddness of this misplaced and bloomy cradle would however appear to be a deliberate clue to Virgil’s ulterior purpose in his use of this word here. \textit{Cunae} was linked etymologically with \textit{cunire}, which is a synonym of \textit{cacare}\(^{74}\). Hence Virgil’s \textit{cunabulum} is etymologically “the place you shit”\(^{75}\). The \textit{cunabula} of line 23, which is exactly 30 lines before the end of \textit{cacata} (52), would accordingly appear to be a pointer to this acrostic, while the acrostic itself evidently serves in turn as an etymological gloss on \textit{cunabula} (< \textit{cunire} = \textit{cacare})\(^{76}\). Malodorously cacatory \textit{cunabula} finds a piquant foil in the same line’s pre-caesural \textit{blandos}, which “s’applique ici … à l’odeur”\(^{77}\).

\textit{Blandos} is separated from \textit{cunabula} by \textit{fundent}, which picks up the same verb three lines earlier (20), where it is separated by one word from \textit{ridenti}\(^{78}\), which in turn anticipates afore-mentioned \textit{risu} and \textit{risere} (60; 62). This \textit{risu} (60) is directly juxtaposed with acrostically hintful \textit{cognoscere}, which in turn picks up the same verb in the same lexical form in the same metrical position in line 27, where it is placed exactly five lines after \textit{cunabula} in the same \textit{sedes} from hephthemimeres to fifth diaeresis. This time (l. 27) \textit{cognoscere} is juxtaposed with \textit{legere}, which “fällt … aus dem Stil der Umgebung heraus”\(^{79}\). Since however \textit{legere} can be used with subtextual reference to “reading” an acrostic\(^{80}\), such would seem to be the point of “stilistisch herausfallendes” \textit{legere} here. The \textit{simul}-clause containing \textit{legere et … poteris cognoscere} is then followed by a main clause containing circum-caesural \textit{rubens pendebit} (29): \textit{pendeo} can allude subtextually to an acrostic\(^{81}\), and \textit{rubeo} to its rubrication\(^{82}\).

\begin{itemize}
  \item \(73\) Thus Campbell 1938, 55.
  \item \(75\) For suffixal -\textit{bulum} “denoting … places” cf. \textit{Oxf. Lat. Dict.}: 267 \textit{(s.v.)}.
  \item \(76\) For such long-distance glosses that likewise involve both etymology and acrostics cf. Adkin 2014, 52-54. In the present case Virgil could always dodge the subversive implications of \textit{cacata} by insisting that the reference is not to politics, but potties: it’s all “as innocent as a babe” – in nappies.
  \item \(77\) Benoist 1884, 41. Similarly the next line but one (25) ends with rare \textit{amomum}, which Servius glosses thus: \textit{herba est suavissimi odoris}.
  \item \(78\) This participle requires an extensive gloss from Servius Auctus.
  \item \(79\) So the canonical German commentary by Ladewig – Schaper – Deuticke – Jahn 1973, 31. Both \textit{legere} and \textit{cognoscere} depend on \textit{poteris}, the subject of which is the \textit{puer} of the \textit{cacata}-acrostic.
  \item \(80\) Cf. n. 8 above (with text).
  \item \(81\) Cf. Adkin 2015c, 441; 448, n. 141.
  \item \(82\) Cf. Adkin 2015c, 447; 453. \textit{Rubens} is used again (43) in final \textit{sedes} exactly five lines before the start of \textit{cacata}.
\end{itemize}
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The third and last of this Eclogue’s cues to the cacata-acrostic is placed shortly before it at the end of line 41: *iuga solvet arator*. The only other instance of *arator* in the entire Eclogues is to be found in the immediately preceding poem (III 42), where this *nomen agentis* is evidently meant as a clue to the name of the *anonyme* in line 40: *quis fuit alter?* – Aratus83. If then the *qui* of III 41 (*descriptis ... qui ... orbem*) is the Aratus suggested by *arator*, in the very same line in the very next poem (IV 41) the very same *arator* is evidently meant to suggest the same Aratus84. This Aratus-suggesting *arator* in IV 41 is positioned exactly ten lines before the acrostically semaphoric *aspite* (50), which corresponds to Aratus’ similarly acrostical semaphore ἀκροστία.85 The *arator* of IV 41 is also juxtaposed directly with *solver*86. *Solve* is likewise acrostically “loaded”, since it bears the subsense “to solve”87. Virgil’s aforesaid onomastic ma- ve- pu- (Georg. I 429-433), which is inspired by Aratus’ λεπτή-acrostic and ἄρρητον-onomastic, is evidently meant as a sphragis endorsing acrostical “Strike Caesar with a sacrificial axe”88. The Virgilian allusion to Aratus’ name in the *arator* of IV 41 is evidently preceded by an allusion to Virgil’s own name, which is again meant to endorse similarly political cacata. Exactly ten lines before this acrostic Virgil inserts the notable line (38) *cedet et ipse mari vector, nec nautica pinus ...*89, where middle and end, when read à reculons90, give P(ublius)91 Ve(rgilius)92 Mar(us).93 In this onomastical connec-

---


84 For Virgil’s attentiveness to such line-correlations cf. n. 12 above.

85 Cf. n. 28 above.

86 Here the collocation *iuga solvet* necessitates a gloss from Philargyrius (rec. II): *idest non arabit*.

87 For Virgil’s use of *solver* with this hypotextual connotation cf. Ecl. VI 24 (last line of the laesis-acrostic); *Georg.* I 399 (before the similarly unidentified pin(n)lati acrostic [409-414; up]; here *solutos* is problematic [cf. Mynors 1990, 85]); *Georg.* I 436 (after acrostical ma- ve- pu- [429-433]).

88 Cf. n. 6 above. For similarly onomastical endorsement of the laesis-acrostic cf. Adkin 2015b; Adkin 2015c, 452-454. For an onomastic that endorses the undis-acrostic cf. Adkin 2015d, 51-54.

89 This line requires large-scale explication by *Schol. Verg.* *Bern.*

90 All the onomastics mentioned in n. 88 above are similarly to be read à rebours.

tion a final word may be said about the Vergilium in the last sentence of the Georgics (IV 563), where it occupies the second line of telestichal otia (562-565)\textsuperscript{93}, which picks up the otia of Eclogue I 6\textsuperscript{95}, which is the similarly second line of acrostical fons (5-8), which evidently alludes to the land-confiscations round sopping-wet Mantua\textsuperscript{96}. The onomastical Vergilium of Georgic IV 563 would accordingly appear to be a sphragis that similarly endorses political fons. This Vergilium is then followed in the last line of telestichal otia (565) by line-final audaxque iuven\textsuperscript{97}a, which is difficil\textsuperscript{e}: this puzzling “audacity” would in fact appear to contain a reference to Virgil’s political acrostics – including cacata.

As well as the three afore-mentioned tip-offs re cacata within the fourth Eclogue itself, further such verba sap. are also to be found in the previous poem: Eclogues III and IV are linked by mention of Pollio, who is not named anywhere else in Virgil. The passage of the third Eclogue which introduces Pollio reads thus:

D(amoetas) Pollio amat nostram, quamvis est rustica, Musam:
85 Pierides, vitulum lectori pascite vestro.
M(enalcas) Pollio et ipse facit nova carmina: pascite taurum,\textsuperscript{98}
iam cornu petat et pedibus qui spargat harenam. (Ecl. III 84-87)

In prominently post-caesural sedes in the second of these lines (85) Pollio is described as lectori, which invites criticism as both inappropriate\textsuperscript{98} and fuzzy\textsuperscript{99}. When however one realizes that legere can refer to reading acrostics\textsuperscript{100}, here lector instead becomes highly appropriate and perfectly fuzz-free: Pollio is being given a subtextual hint to read an acrostic. This hint to Pollio would then

\textsuperscript{92} Here vector is an “ungewöhnlicher Ausdruck” (Holtorf 1959, 255); cf. Serv. Auct. (ad loc.).
\textsuperscript{93} It may be observed that the three parts of this onomastic (P-Ve-Mar-) become progressively longer (1:2:3). The point may also be made that in the next line’s second hemistich omnis in strikingly polyptotic geminatio invites interpretation as a subtextual prompt to see “all” the antecedent onomastic; cf. nn. 37; 64 above.
\textsuperscript{94} Identified by Schmid 1983, 317, who notes that this telestich is confirmed by horizontally line-final otia (564).
\textsuperscript{95} Ecl. I 1 is likewise picked up by Georg. IV 566.
\textsuperscript{96} Cf. n. 5 above.
\textsuperscript{97} Cf. (e.g.) Heyne – Wagner 1830-33, I, 690: “Tenue enim genus est bucolicum”.
\textsuperscript{98} Cf. (e.g.) Heyne – Wagner 1830-33, I, 117: “Pastor … non … legitur”. These words are repeated approvingly by Forbiger 1872-75, I, 56, who also finds fault with pascite immediately after lectori: “Etiam Musae vitulam … pascentes vix placere possunt”. Here however Virgil is playing on the derivation of line-initial Pierides from πιερίς, cf. Adkin 2015c, 448, n. 142.
\textsuperscript{99} Cf. (e.g.) Perret 1970, 43: “Lectori: … le sens du mot reste obscur”.
\textsuperscript{100} Cf. nn. 8; 80 above.
seem to be reinforced in the next line but one (87) by *cornu petat*, which carries the subtextual sense “let him seek the (acrostical) edge”\(^{101}\). This subtextual interpretation of *cornu petat*\(^{102}\) is facilitated by two circumstances: on the one hand the striking postponement of *qui* to sixth position makes the subject of *petat* indeterminate, while on the other this rare use of *peto* in an absolute sense\(^{103}\) enables *cornu* to be taken as object\(^{104}\). This subtextual injunction to Pollio to “seek the (acrostical) edge” (87: *cornu petat*) is positioned exactly ten lines after the start of an unidentified acrostic (78-82: *petad*), which repeats the *petat* of *cornu petat*\(^{105}\); Pollio is again being enjoined to “seek” an acrostic.

That the acrostic which this twofold nudge is prompting Pollio to “seek” is *cacata* is indicated by a subtextual hint which Virgil inserts a line but one after *petad* (viz. 84), where Pollio is first introduced: *Pollio amat nostram, quamvis est rustica, Musam*\(^{106}\). Here indicatival *est* after *quamvis* is “une incorrection”: this is the only such indicative among the no fewer than 13 instances of *quamvis* in the *Eclogues* and *Georgics*. Part of the paradox is accordingly reads instead *sit*, which is also found in Servius\(^{108}\). Even if *est* is retained, its “incorrection” invites the reader to make a *sotto-voce* substitution of correct *sit*: this mental rectification imprints the resultant *quamvis sit* all the more sharply on the mind. This collocation *quamvis sit* however entails the cacemphatically

---

\(^{101}\) For the widespread use of *cornu* in the sense of *latus* cf. *Thes. Ling. Lat.* 4 coll. 970, 78-971,11 (s.v. *cornu*).

\(^{102}\) This phrase, like foregoing *lector*, again incurs the disapprobation of Heyne – Wagner 1830-33, I, 117.

\(^{103}\) Cf. *Oxf. Lat. Dict.*\(^2\) 1507 (s.v. 3a). Virgil’s use of *peto* here has to be glossed by Philargyrius (rec. 1): *petat: idest feriat*.

\(^{104}\) This same *iam cornu petat* is again employed at *Aen.* IX 629 in the last line of the overlooked acrostic *ieci* (626-629; corroborated by noteworthy [cf. Dingel 1997, 238] *traicit* [634] in “edge” position). This acrostic plays on the etymology of *Iulus* (< ἵππος; cf. Maltby 1991, 317) in order to play on the etymology of *Iuppiter* (< iuvans pater; cf. Maltby 1991, 319), who is the wrong god to invoke (cf. *Serv.* on 624 [621]) in a prayer for a successful bow-shot. The acrostic (“I’ve shot already”), which is coextensive with the prayer, shows this prayer for Jupiter’s “help” with the “shot” is pointless. This impishly “audacious” impiety would seem to be subtextually signalled by *audacibus adnue coeptis* (625), which is a *Selbstzitat* from *Georg.* I 40, which corresponds line-numerically to *Georg.* II 40, which describes Maecenas as the *beau idéal* (ο decus ...) which the overlooked acrostic *fias* (II 44-47) then “audaciously” tells him to “become” (cf. n. 8 above [with ensuing text]). This “acrostical” use of *audax* would appear to be pertinent to the employment of the same epithet at *Georg.* IV 565 (cf. n. 97 above).

\(^{105}\) For “d” = “t” cf. *Thes. Ling. Lat.* 5.1.1 col. 1,46-52 (s.v. “d”): “ponitur d pro t”.

\(^{106}\) This is the line immediately before hintful *lector* (85).

\(^{107}\) So Perret 1970, 43.

\(^{108}\) This lection *sit* is also adopted by (e.g.) Coleiro 1979, 312.
homonymous quam vissit: “how (s)he farts”\textsuperscript{109}. This line could accordingly be read thus: \textit{Pollio amat nostram (quam vissit rustica!) Musam}, where the parenthesis means “how she, uncouth, farts!”\textsuperscript{110}. This subtextual allusion to musal [af]flatus is evidently meant to direct Pollio’s attention to the Virgilian Muse’s similarly coprological \textit{caca}-acrostic\textsuperscript{111}. This line (III 84) in which Virgil’s Muse subtextually breaks wind as a hint at the “Aratus-esque” \textit{caca}-acrostic is exactly double the line-number (III 42) of Virgil’s allusion to Aratus himself in \textit{arator}\textsuperscript{112}. A subtextual hint at this “in-the-middle-ness” of Aratean \textit{arator} (III 42) would seem to be supplied by the problematic \textit{in medio} that opens this sentence (III 40)\textsuperscript{113}. This same \textit{in medio} is then repeated shortly afterwards at III 46, which matches the line in the next poem (IV 46: “\textit{talia saecla}” ...) that introduces the \textit{caca}-acrostic\textsuperscript{114}. “In the middle” between this line 46 in \textit{Eclogue IV} and the start of this poem is the afore-mentioned line 23, which contains the “shitty” \textit{cunabula} that is a further hint at acrostical “shit”. In \textit{Eclogue III} this same line 46 is itself “in the middle” between the start of this poem and line 92, which is framed by \textit{qui legitis ... fraga}. A mere lines after attention-grabbing \textit{lectori} (85) this \textit{legitis} naturally invites the subtextual construe “read”\textsuperscript{115}. Here \textit{legitis} governs \textit{fraga}, which are lexically odd, since strawberries were regarded by the Romans as “a wild fruit unfit for consumption”\textsuperscript{116}. It would therefore seem pertinent that para-prosdocetic \textit{fraga} were etymologized from \textit{fragro}\textsuperscript{117}, which accordingly constitutes an antiphrastic gloss on pongo “shit”.

\textsuperscript{109} For the susceptibility of Roman ears to such cacemphaton involving \textit{vissio} cf. Cic., \textit{Fam. IX 22. 4: non honestum verbum est “divisio”? at inest obscenum, cui respondet intercapedo”.

\textsuperscript{110} For this nuance of rusticus cf. \textit{Oxf. Lat. Dict.} 2 1843 (s.v. 5).

\textsuperscript{111} \textit{Quam vissit} and the immediately following line’s \textit{lectori} occupy precisely the same \textit{sedes} from main caesura to fourth diaeresis.

\textsuperscript{112} Cf. n. 83 above. Here \textit{arator} is qualified by \textit{curvus}, which has to be explained by commentators; cf. (e.g.) Plessis – Lejay 1919, 20: “\textit{curvus: le laboureur se courbe sur la terre pour la travailler}”. It may therefore be observed that this same \textit{curvus} had just been identified by Varro (\textit{L. VII 25}) as the etymon of acrostically winking \textit{cornu} (87).

\textsuperscript{113} On the problematicality of \textit{in medio} cf. (e.g.) Cucchiarelli 2012, 215-216.

\textsuperscript{114} The same line in the next \textit{Eclogue} but one (V 46) contains pre-caesural \textit{fessis}, which evidently corroborates the unidentified acrostic \textit{fes}s[s]i\textit{i} (18-21 [up]; cf. Adkin 2014, 52). Since the “Daphnis” of \textit{intra-acrostical} I. 20 evokes Julius Caesar (cf. Cucchiarelli 2012, 281-283), this acrostic is evidently saying: “we are ‘sick’” (cf. \textit{Oxf. Lat. Dict.} 2 761 [s.v. \textit{fessus} 5b]) of Caesar” (cf. n. 6 above [with text]).

\textsuperscript{115} For such use of \textit{leger} with subtextual reference to “reading” an acrostic cf. nn. 8; 80 above.

\textsuperscript{116} So Morgan 1984/85, 579.

\textsuperscript{117} Cf. \textit{Thes. Ling. Lat.} 6,1 col. 1239,28-29 (s.v. \textit{fragum}).
If Eclogue III 46 corresponds to acrostic-introducing IV 46, then III 50 corresponds to IV 50, where *aspice* signals the end of the acrostic’s first complete word (caca): in Eclogue III this cyrnusurial semi-centenary “line 50” introduces the last acrostic-signposting passage to be discussed in this article. Eclogue III 50 runs: *audiat haec tantum – vel qui venit ecce Palaemon*. Here Palaemon is “a very strange name … to find in this context.”118 The point may therefore be made that Palaemon recurs at Aeneid V 823: *Inousque Palaemon* ("P., son of Ino"). Palaemon is identical with Melicertes, who is likewise qualified as *Inous* at Georgic I 437 immediately after acrostical ma-ve-pu- (429-433). Here Ino *Melicertes* is directly juxtaposed with surprising *Panopeae*, which is evidently an etymological wink to “see all” of this onomastical acrostic.119 The same acrostically wink-tipping function would appear to be served by juxtapositional and similarly surprising *Inous*.120 Ino is identical with Leucothea, who in such an acrostically loaded context perforce suggests the etymology "clear view".121 Since the “very strange name” Palaemon in Eclogue III 50 is accordingly son of “clear-view” Leucothea, here we evidently have a subtextually “clair-voyant” hint that matches *aspice* in the corresponding line of the next poem (IV 50): in both lines we are nudged to “see” the acrostic.122 After the *Palaemon* of III 50, where this name is immediately preceded by acrostically charged *ecce*, the same *Palaemon* is then repeated in the same *sedes* in III 53, where this time *Palaemon* is immediately preceded by *vicine*, which here might be taken as a subtextual allusion to the “neighbouring” fourth Eclogue: *tantum, vicine Palaemon*, / sensibus haec imis (res est non parva) reponas. Since *res est non

---

118 So Clausen 1994, 104.
119 Cf. n. 37 above.
121 Cf. LSJ 1042 (s.v. ἄτρομος I,1); 786 (s.v. ἱππας I,1a).
122 Ecl. III 50 is indebted to Theoc., Id. V 62 (cf. Clausen 1994, 104), where Ἀκώπας in same final *sedes as Palaemon* will have suggested to Virgil “keen-eyed”.
123 For *ecce* (= *έκοιτο* [cf. Gloss. III 147,18] = *aspice* [cf. Gloss. II 24,15]) as a pointer to Virgilian acrostics cf. Adkin 2014, 51, n. 44. At the start of this same line (III 50) *audiat haec tantum* might be taken as referring subtextually to hearing “only" *caca* instead of *cacata*: acrostical *caca* ends in the corresponding line (IV 50).
124 This repetition of *Palaemon* parallels the repetition of similarly hintful *aspice* in similarly “edge” position (IV 50; IV 52).
125 This term warrants a gloss from Servius.
126 Cf. Oxf. Lat. Dict. 2266 (s.v. vicinus 2a).
127 Since this *tantum* occurs in the line (53) that in Ecl. IV comes immediately after the completed acrostic (52), here this term might be thought to bear the subtextual sense of “that’s all” – to the acrostic (cf. Oxf. Lat. Dict. 2101 [s.v. tantum 2a]); cf. also *tantum* in III 50 (with n. 123 above).
parva is surprising\footnote{Cf. (e.g.) Conington – Nettleship – Haverfield 2007, 48.}, we might see here one last subtextual hint at the acrostic, which is verily “no small matter”: the Golden Age that starts with Pollio is “shit”.
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