

ACTA CLASSICA UNIV. SCIENT. DEBRECEN.	LI.	2015.	pp. 43–58.
--	-----	-------	------------

**QUIS EST NAM LUDUS IN UNDIS?
(VIRGIL, ECLOGUE IX 39–43)¹**

BY NEIL ADKIN

Abstract: The *undis*-acrostic that has recently been discovered in *Eclogue* IX 34-38 has proved problematic. The present article argues 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 exceedingly scarce *lidant*). This acrostic is accordingly hot-potato politics, since it pertains to the land confiscations round Virgil's "wave"-begirt Mantua. The poet also provides endorsement in the form of an unidentified onomastic.

Keywords: acrostic, etymology, land-confiscation, *litus*, onomastic.

Recently Virgil's ninth *Eclogue* has been found to contain an acrostic:² the initial letters of lines 34-38 give *undis*. Corroboration for this acrostic's intentionality is supplied by the occurrence of the same word *undis* in the very next line (39): *quis est nam ludus in undis*?³ While Grishin correctly identifies the presence of this acrostic, he acknowledges that he is unable to give a satisfactory explanation for the particular choice of the word *undis*.⁴ The aim of the present article is accordingly to suggest a solution for this conundrum.

Hitherto it has escaped notice that Virgilian acrostics can have to do with politics. In this regard particular importance attaches to an unidentified acrostic

¹ 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 Grishin 2008.

³ This acrostic has now been accepted by Katz 2013, 6. Here Katz surveys the recent scholarship on Virgilian acrostics, though he does not give further discussion to *undis* itself. Katz does however draw attention (6-10) to a new acrostic at *Aen.* VI 77-84 (*abeo os os*; "I go away; mouth, mouth", where the ingemination unfortunately generates double Dutch). It would seem therefore that this acrostic should instead be construed as *abeo oso(=u)s* (for *-os = -us* cf. Neue – Wagener 1902, 104-105): "I go away hating", which accordingly picks up the foregoing description of similar Sibyl-consulters at *Aen.* III 452: *abeunt ... odere*. Cf. further Adkin (forthcoming).

⁴ His article ends with the following admission: "no firm assertions can be made at present" (Grishin 2008, 240).

at *Eclogue* VI 14-24, where *laesis* (“for those who have been hurt”) goes both up (14-19) and down (19-24): the immediately antecedent lines (6-12) are ostensibly an encomium of the land-confiscator and tenant-“hurter” Alfenus Varus.⁵ Two-way *laesis* is corroborated by surprising *Aegle* (20):⁶ this capitonym merely reproduces *αἴγλη* in same final *sedes* in the sentence immediately before Aratus’ famous *lepte*-acrostic at 783-787 (cf. 779).⁷ The *οκέπτεο* of Aratus’ previous line (778) finds a similarly corroborative parallel in the last line of this acrostic (*Ecl.* VI 24: *satis est potuisse videri*), which “has presented an enigma to readers over the centuries”.⁸ The “enigma” however vanishes when the reader grasps that *videri* refers to “seeing” the foregoing acrostic, which can now be “solved” (cf. amphibologically line-initial *solvite me*).⁹

⁵ On Varus and Virgil cf. Liebs 2010, 42-51. Such a “two-way” acrostic finds a parallel in *Aen.* II, where similarly unidentified *pithi* (= *πείθει* = “he [sc. Sinon] persuades”) likewise goes first up (103-107), then down (142-146). This time corroboration is furnished by stichometric correspondence: since *Aen.* II 76 is rightly athetized, the start of these acrostics (106 and 141) tallies exactly with the *Odyssey*’s use of the same verb *πείθειν* at the same line-numbers (II 106 and XXIV 141; both *re* Penelope’s web) in the same rare sense of “jem.n ... *bereden* (etw. zu tun) od. ... von e. Sachverhalt *überzeugen*, Konnot. von List, Täuschung” (*Lex. frühgr. Epos* 3,2 col. 1100 [s.v., B I, 2]). Cf. further Adkin 2014, 57-68.

⁶ “Not a pastoral name” (Clausen 1994, 186 [ad loc.]).

⁷ It will be argued elsewhere that Aratus’ own *lepte* is directly reproduced in the unidentified Virgilian acrostic *lepte* at *Aen.* VIII 664-668 (shield-ecphrasis; cf. corroboratively antiphastic *tumidi* [671], answering to Aratean *παχίον* in same ante-caesural position [785]). The point may also be made that this same Book VIII has precisely the same number of lines (731) as Aratus’ *Phaenomena* proper (whose l. 138 is interpolated).

⁸ So Egan 1980, 379. Egan’s own *éclaircissement* involves, not acrostics, but leprechauns.

⁹ A similar (twofold) invitation to “see” would appear to indicate the intentionality of acrostical *cacata* (*Ecl.* IV 47-52), which has now been dismissed as an “accident” by Katz 2013, 5: cf. ll. 50 and 52, where line-initial *aspice* concludes imperatival *caca* and participial *cacata* respectively. Further corroboration would seem to be supplied by the last line’s (52) euphemistically amphibolous *laetentur* (sc. *omnia*; for *laeto* “i.q. *stercorare*” cf. *Thes. Ling. Lat.* 7,2 col. 879,37-44 [s.v. 1. *laeto*]). Like *laesis*, *cacata* in this “Pollio”-*Eclogue* would accordingly appear to be a deliberately political acrostic. For another instance of Virgil’s *gout* for acrostical *cacare* cf. the unidentified pair at *Aen.* XI 820-827, where *Acca* (anagrammatically *Caca*) is glossed by upward *cacat* (820-824) and downward *cesi* = *χέζει* (824-827): this diglotically bivious acrostic thus gives us battological “she shits” (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”]; for “c” [824] = “χ” cf. *Thes. Ling. Lat.* 3 col. 1,36-38 [s.v. “c”]; for “s” [826] = “ζ” cf. *Oxf. Lat. Dict.*² 2343 [s.v. “z”]; besides corroboratively twofold *Acca* [820 and 823] cf. similarly corroboratory *deiecta* [833], which like above-mentioned *laetentur* is again a house-trained amphiboly [for *deicio* = “to evacuate (through the bowels)” cf. *Oxf. Lat. Dict.*² 554 (s.v., 3a)]. It will also be argued elsewhere that in 808-811, which imitate *Il.* XV 586-588, Homer’s *κακόν* (586) is reproduced by homonymously acrostical *caco*: hence problematic *consciis audacis facti* (sc. *lupus*; 812) pertains to an enfant-terrible-ish “I shit” (cf. same line’s tail-retracting *caudamque remulcens* after cacatory extension).

It was noted above that acrostical *laesis* (*Ecl.* VI 14-24) is immediately preceded by mention of Alfenus Varus (6-12).¹⁰ It is therefore noteworthy that acrostical *undis* (*Ecl.* IX 34-38) should likewise be preceded immediately by similar mention of the same Varus (26-29). This time Varus is explicitly linked with the land-confiscations at Mantua. In this connection it would appear germane to cite a remark of Servius Auctus (on *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"*. "Water" was therefore very important in the land-confiscations round Mantua. This political "wateriness" (a Roman "Watergate") would seem to be the clandestine context of acrostical *undis*.¹¹

Water is divided from land by a *litus*.¹² Round marshy Mantua however it might be asked just what constituted a *litus*. Different answers were available in the form of different etymologies of *litus*. On the one hand Cicero makes the following statement:¹³ *solebat ... Aquilius*¹⁴ *... , cum de litoribus ageretur ... , quaerentibus eis quos ad id pertinebat, quid esset litus, ita definire, qua fluctus eluderet.*¹⁵ An alternative to (*e*)*ludo* as the etymon of *litus* was (*e*)*lido*.¹⁶ It would seem that these alternative etymologies of *litus* are what is at issue in Virgil's *undis*-acrostic.¹⁷ Etymologically speaking, what do these acrostical

¹⁰ In ll. 9-10 (*si quis tamen haec quoque, si quis / captus amore leget*) problematic *haec quoque* and *captus amore* would appear to be subtextual hints to read "in addition this" acrostic and to do so "with love" for the *laesi*. Exactly the same string *tamen haec quoque si quis* is redeployed at *Georg.* II 49, where it is again positioned precisely six lines from the commencement of another dedicatory acrostic; cf. text annotated by n. 41 below.

¹¹ The same issue of "water politics" would appear to lie behind the *fons*-acrostic at the very start of the *Eclogues* (I 5-8), where the land-confiscations are again in question. This acrostic is accepted by Katz 2013, 6.

¹² Cf. Serv., *Aen.* III 389: *litus dicitur quicquid iuxta aquam est.*

¹³ *Top.* 32. Cicero's *Topica* was written in 44, shortly before the *Eclogues*.

¹⁴ The jurist Aquilius Gallus taught Ser. Sulpicius Rufus, who in turn taught the Alfenus Varus addressed just before the *undis*-acrostic.

¹⁵ This derivation of *litus* from (*e*)*ludo* is also found in Quint., *Inst.* V 14, 34, which is missing from both Maltby 1991, 344 (s.v. *litus*), and from Marangoni 2007.

¹⁶ Cf. Maltby 1991, 344 (s.v. *litus*). To Maltby and to Marangoni 2007 should be added the *testimonia* adduced in Adkin 2009, 411 (*litora dicuntur ... ab inlisione fluctuum*).

¹⁷ Etymology would likewise appear to be at issue in an unidentified acrostic which occurs barely half a dozen lines later (*Ecl.* IX 51-54), where *Ocni* (= *ὄκνεϊ* = "he's pusillanimous") is an antiphrastic gloss on *Bianoris* (60; cf. Serv. ad loc.), which was etymologized *ἀπό τῆς βίας καὶ ἠνωρέης* (so Serv. *ibid.*). Two further observations may be made about acrostical *Ocni*. Firstly, while commentators apprise us that line 51 (the "o" of *Ocni: omnia fert aetas*) reproduces [Plato], *AP* IX 51, 1 (*αἰών πάντα φέρει*), Virgil evidently wants readers to take the next words of this epigram (*δολιχὸς χρόνος οἶδεν ἀμείβειν / οὔνομα*) as a pointer to his own "name-

“waves”, which are the politically contentious “waves” round Mantua, actually do on this *litus* – “play” or “pound”?¹⁸

Virgil’s acrostical *undis* is confirmed by the second hemistich of the immediately following line (39): *quis est nam ludus in undis?* Here *ludus* is an odd word to use: Virgil’s putative source in Theocritus (*Id.* XI 62) instead has simply *ἀδύ*. Servius Auctus is accordingly obliged to supply the embarrassed gloss *voluptas*, which is also employed by Servius himself. No parallel however for such a sense of *ludus* is to be found in the no fewer than a dozen columns devoted to this one lexeme by *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*.¹⁹ It is therefore noteworthy that Virgil’s surprising *ludus* should be used here in exactly the same sense as the Aquilian *eludo* that etymologizes *litus*.²⁰ It may also be noted that Virgil has employed *ludus* instead of semantically and prosodically equivalent *lusus*:²¹ Virgil’s choice of *ludus* points up the morphological link with (*e*)*ludo*. It might therefore be thought that here Virgil is in fact alluding to Aquilius’ notion of (*e*)*ludo* as etymon of *litus*, which he simultaneously rejects: *litus* is not, etymologically speaking, where waves “play”. The answer to the question *quis est nam ludus in undis?* is “None – as far as the etymology of *litus* is concerned”.

change” from Ocnus to Bianor. Secondly, this *Eclogue*’s antepenultimate line (65: *ego hoc te fasce levabo*) evidently alludes to Aesop. 90 Halm (for the referent here as Ocnus cf. most recently Käppel 2015): *διὰ δὲ τὸν κόπον τῆς ὁδοῦ ἀποθέμενος τὸ φορτίον ... “ἵνα τὸ φορτίον ἄρῃς”*. Finally etymology would also seem to be the key to the remarkable *laniabor*-acrostic (Val. Fl. IV 177-184), which concerns Amycus (< *ἀμύξ* < *ἀμύσσω* = *lanio*): so by a niftily etymological pun “Tearer” says “I’ll be torn”. Castelletti’s recent review (2012, 369) of Murgatroyd’s (2009) commentary on this Valerian book criticizes the reviewee for failing to notice this acrostic, but the reviewer himself fails to notice this etymological *jeu*.

¹⁸ Rhetorically speaking, we have here the figure of *emphasis*, which Quintilian defines thus (*Inst.* IX 2, 65): *per quandam suspicionem quod non dicimus accipi volumus, ... aliud latens et auditori quasi inveniendum*. He then proceeds (*ibid.* 66) to specify this figure’s first use as *si dicere palam parum tutum est*, which certainly fits the parlous politics of Varus’ land-confiscations. At Hor., *Carm.* I 18, 11-15 an acrostic (*disce*) addressed to “Varus” (for Alfenus Varus as addressee cf. Nisbet – Hubbard 1970, 227-228) was discussed by Morgan 1993. It may now be suggested that this imperatively acrostical *disce* could allude to the above-mentioned and similarly didactic acrostics *laesis* and *undis* that are directed at the same Varus by Horace’s confidant, Virgil. To this Horatian *disce* there would in turn appear to be an allusion in Virgilian *disce* at *Aen.* II 66 (cf. Adkin 2014, 56-57), where Virgil’s *disce* immediately follows acrostically upward *ac[c]uso* (61-65; for acrostical “Einfachschröbung von Geminaten” cf. Koster 1988, 103); this *ac[c]uso* in turn glosses ambiguous *crimine* (65; “crime” or “accusation”), which is third word before the *disce* in question.

¹⁹ Viz. 7,2,2 coll. 1783,13-1794,46.

²⁰ On Aquilius’ etymological *eludo* cf. Boeth., *In Top. Cic.* 3 p. 333,9-10 Orelli: *hoc “eludere” ab iis translaturum est, qui agitatione aliqua causa lusum moventur*.

²¹ For the two nouns as synonymous cf. *Gloss.* V 643,50: *ludus: lusus*.

The impression of such etymological polemic is corroborated by the last line of this same pentastich (39-43), whose first line asks *quis est nam ludus in undis?* Both of these lines are linked by initial *huc ades*. The last line then continues: *insani feriant sine litora fluctus*. Here *fluctus* corresponds to synonymous *undis* in similarly final *sedes* in line 39.²² *Fluctus* itself is juxtaposed with *litora*, which like *ludus* in 39 starts at the fifth arsis.²³ *Litora* in turn is juxtaposed with *feriant* after the main caesura.²⁴ It would seem therefore that here *ferio* is being used in place of synonymous and very rare *lido* to etymologize adjacent *litus*, which is accordingly not where waves “play”, but “strike”.²⁵

Commentators duly note that this last line of Virgil’s pentastich is indebted to a line of Theocritus.²⁶ However just as Theocritus’ *ἀδύ* was adapted to serve the aims of Virgil’s own etymological polemic in the first line of his pentastich, so again in this last line the earlier poet’s language undergoes similar modification for the same purpose. The Theocritean line at issue here reads: *τὰν γλαυκὰν δὲ θάλασσαν ἔα ποτὶ χέρσον ὄρεχθειν*. Every one of these words is subjected to alteration by the Virgilian *insani feriant sine litora fluctus* with the exception of ho-hum *sine*, which matches Theocritean *ἔα*.²⁷ In particular Theocritus’ *θάλασσα* and *χέρσος* have been replaced by the *fluctus* and *litus* of Aquilius Gallus.²⁸ *Fluctus* and *litus* are linked by *feriant*, which takes the place of Theocritean *ὄρεχθειν*, which the Scholiast explains thus: *παρὰ τὸ*

²² For *fluctus* and *undae* as synonyms cf. *Gloss.* IV 402,55: *undas: fluctus*. For line-end as an etymologically significant *locus* cf. Michalopoulos 2001, 5; Cairns 1996, 33 (= id. 2007, 317). Line-end *fluctus* (43) is located precisely ten lines after the start of the line-initial *undis*-acrostic (34).

²³ On such vertical juxtaposition as an etymological signpost cf. Michalopoulos 2001, 5; Cairns 1996, 33 (= id. 2007, 317).

²⁴ The *sine* in *feriant sine* may be discounted as a mere adjunct of the foregoing *feriant*, which is itself highlighted by the paratactic anastrophe. For such “coupling” (*feriant ... litora*) and for such post-caesural position (*feriant ...*) as etymological markers cf. Michalopoulos 2001, 5; Cairns 1996, 33 (= id. 2007, 317).

²⁵ For such use of synonyms in etymologization cf. Michalopoulos 2001, 11, where a large number of examples are given. For *ferio* as a synonym of a compound (*elido*) of the extremely uncommon simplex *lido* cf. *Thes. Ling. Lat.* 6,1 coll. 509,84-510,1 (s.v. *ferio*; *Thes. Ling. Lat.*’s twofold “6” should be corrected to “5”). In the present passage of *Eclogue IX* use of synonymous *ferio* avoids a somewhat inconcinuous parechesis (*lid- / lit-*), while at the same time it gives readers the intellectual pleasure of cracking the cipher themselves.

²⁶ It may be added that each of the lines in question is the forty-third line of its respective poem: *Ecl.* IX 43 = *Id.* XI 43. For such stichometric correlation in an acrostical context cf. n. 5 above.

²⁷ Cf. *Gloss.* II 321,43: *ἔω: sino*.

²⁸ The Scholiast glosses Theocritus’ *χέρσος* as *γῆ*, whereas Virgilian and Aquilian *litus* is invariably glossed instead as *αἰγιαλός* (cf. Goetz 1899, 651 [no fewer than a dozen instances]). Theocritus’ wording would have been matched by (e.g.) *aequora terram*.

ὀρέγεσθαι ἢ γοῦν ἐκτείνεσθαι. Here Virgil's choice of a verb meaning "to strike" is spotlighted by his contiguous use of *insanus* in lieu of Theocritean *γλαυκός*: *insani feriant*.

Here *insanus* is problematic. Like foregoing *ludus*, *insani* has to be glossed by Servius: *id est magni*. However no such meaning of *insanus* is given by the hexad of columns dedicated to this epithet in *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*.²⁹ Subsequent attempts to explain *insani* have recently been reviewed by Schlegelmilch, who finds them all unsatisfactory.³⁰ Bentley maintained that *insani* should be emended to *incani*, which exactly matches Theocritean *γλαυκός*.³¹ Since only a single letter differentiates *incanus* from *insanus*, Virgil must have had a very good reason for preferring the latter. What can this reason have been?

When *insanus* is used "of natural forces", as it is here (*insani ... fluctus*), it means "furious".³² *Furo* is the opposite of *ludo*.³³ Virgil's *insani* is the first word in the sentence that reopens the *zetema* of the etymology of *litus*. It thereby functions as a direct response to the foregoing question that made up the matching sentence: *quis est nam ludus in undis?* Applied to *fluctūs*, *insani* is accordingly an antiphrastic gloss on *ludus*: these waves are not "playful", but "furious". *Insani* is therefore an eminently appropriate term to precede contiguous *feriant* (= *lidant*), since the epithet underlines the sense of this verb as the alternative to *ludo* as etymon of *litus*: waves that do not "play", but "strike", are aptly "furious".

These two etyma of *litus* would appear to be the object of two further unidentified allusions in Virgil. The first of this pair of passages is *Eclogue* V 83: *nec percussa iuvant fluctu tam litora*.³⁴ Here the juxtaposition *percussa iuvant* is odd. A flummoxed Philargyrius for example (Verg., *Ecl.* V 83 rec. I) has to take recourse to the following lame gloss on *percussa*: *id est strepitu leni*. It might accordingly be felt that "delight" (*iuvo*) would have found a fitter complement in a reference to "play" (*ludo*) instead. It would seem therefore that

²⁹ Viz. 7,1 coll. 1832,42-1836,56.

³⁰ Schlegelmilch 2008, 17-19. Schlegelmilch himself (18) sees no alternative but "zu dem ... unpopulären Hilfsargument der verlorenen Zwischenquelle Zuflucht zu nehmen".

³¹ Bentley – Grotius 1760, 145. For (*in*)*canus* as equivalent to *γλαυκός* cf. *Gloss.*^L IV Plac. G 2: *legimus nonnumquam et maris colorem glaucum dici, sed tum quando canescit fluctibus*.

³² So *Oxf. Lat. Dict.*² 1011 (s.v., 4a), where the present passage is cited. For this nuance of *insanus* cf. also *Synon. Cic.* p. 426,11 B.: *furiosus, insanus*.

³³ Cf. (e.g.) August., *De civ. D.* VI 9 p. 263,18 D./K.: *ludunt ... non furiunt*.

³⁴ *Litora* here is highlighted by punctuation after fifth dactyl and by two monosyllables in the last foot (*nec quae*).

here Virgil's problematic *percussa* is an allusion to the other derivation of *litus*: not *ludo*, but *lido*.³⁵

The other passage at issue here is *Aeneid* III 280: *Actiaque Iliacis celebramus litora ludis*. The collocation *litora ludis*³⁶ necessarily entails an allusion to *ludo* as etymon of *litus* in view of Virgil's earlier preoccupation with this very issue. The *Actia* at the beginning of this same line has recently been seen as an allusion to acrostical *ἄκτια* in Apollonius Rhodius (*Argon.* I 415-419).³⁷ Virgil was presumably aware of this Apollonian acrostic when he produced his own *undis*-acrostic in *Eclogue* IX.³⁸

"Waves" form a particularly appropriate acrostic: just as waves are located at the edge of the shore, so acrostics are located at the edge of the page. It will be argued elsewhere that on a number of occasions in his early works Virgil in fact uses "shore" in order to denote a hitherto unidentified acrostic. Three instances may be mentioned. The first is *Eclogue* II 25: *nuper me in litore vidi*. Since you can't see yourself in the sea (cf. Serv. ad loc.), here the gamma-acrostic *can-* (23-25) would seem with cute subtextuality to be looking at itself "on the edge".³⁹ The second case of an acrostical "shore" is *Eclogue* VIII 7: *sive oram Illyrici legis aequoris*. Since according to *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* (7,2,2 col. 1127,54-55) *lego* is first used here to mean "eundo ... stringere", *oram ... legis* perforce invites the subtextual construe "you read the (acrostical) edge", which is here coextensive with the ambiloquous dedication (6-13; Pollio or Octavian?) and says: *tu si es, ac[c]i[pe]* – "If it's you, accept!"⁴⁰ The last of

³⁵ For *percussi* as the perfect of *ferio* cf. *Thes. Ling. Lat.* 6,1 col. 508,51-57 (s.v. *ferio*); Virgil uses *ferio* as a synonym for *lido* at *Ecl.* IX 43. For *percutio* itself as a synonym of *elido* cf. *Thes. Ling. Lat.* 5,2 col. 375,29 (s.v. *elido*).

³⁶ For such "coupling" as an etymological signpost cf. n. 24 above. The similarly final *sedes* in the immediately preceding line (III 279: *incendimus aras*) would appear to evince a similarly juxtapositional *jeu étymologique* that has likewise escaped notice: Varro had recently etymologized *ara ... ab ardore* (*L.* V 38).

³⁷ Stewart 2010, 403.

³⁸ The Virgilian acrostic would accordingly be a species of *oppositio in imitando*: here the acrostic is not the Apollonian "shore", but the "waves" whose action on the "shore" determines its etymology.

³⁹ The *informis* of the last line (25: *nec sum adeo informis*) might accordingly be taken as a hypotextual reference to the incompleteness of the acrostic: *can(to)*; cf. *Gloss.* IV 93,25: *informis: nondum formatus*. This Virgilian *informis* would appear to be reproduced by Horace at *Carm.* II 10, 15, where the lexically identical *informis* (in same ante-caesural *locus*) is likewise placed in the third line of another unidentified acrostic: *sap/is* (corroborated by *sapienter* [22; with similarly second-person verb], exactly ten lines after the start of the acrostic). This Horatian *informis* is problematic (cf. Romano 1991, 673): the "problem" would however appear to be resolved by recognition of the Virgilian intertext.

⁴⁰ This hitherto undetected acrostic accordingly shows the indeterminacy of the dedicatee to be deliberate. *Ac[c]i[pe]* is corroborated in its first line (11) by the occurrence there of the same

this triad of “littoral” acrostics involves another dedication. At *Georgics* II 44 Maecenas is told: *primi lege litoris oram*. When Maecenas does “read the edge” here, he finds that this line begins an acrostic (44-47: *fias*) which tells him to “become” what the encomiastic body-text itself has just told him he is already: *o decus, o famae merito pars maxima nostrae* (40).⁴¹

The prime reason for the *undis*-acrostic in *Eclogue* IX is to highlight the ensuing etymology of *litus*, which is so named because of what these “waves” do to it – not “play”, but “pummel”. Acrostically-underpinned etymology is accordingly superadded to a Theocritean appeal to a sea-nymph to leave the sea (*Id.* XI 43 and 62).⁴² Since moreover the etymologization of *litus* bears upon the issue of land-confiscation round “wave”-washed Mantua, politics as well as etymology is here being superimposed on the one-eyed woo to a Theocritean water-nymph by her cutely uncouth beau. Round merely marshy Mantua “waves” merely “play”, not “pound”. If however *litus* is etymologized from *lido*, not *ludo*, there can be no *litus* round Mantua: this is evidently germane to the question where the land to be confiscated actually starts.⁴³ The reference to *aqua* at the start of this *Eclogue* (IX 9: *usque ad aquam*) should evidently be seen in the same politico-aquatic context.⁴⁴

accipe. For its ungeminated “c” cf. n. 18 above. For such decurtation of an acrostical quinqueliteral after its third element cf. n. 39 above.

⁴¹ For a similar case in which the acrostic redresses the text cf. n. 5 above, where the *pithi*-acrostics (*Aen.* II 103-107 and 142-146) inculcate the Trojans for letting themselves be “deceived”, whereas the text itself (in the same penultimate line of each respective acrostic) instead refers exculpatorily to Trojan trustfulness (106: *ignari*) or Sinonian sob-stuff (145: *lacrimis*).

⁴² For another instance of Virgilian use of Theocritus for such acrostical purposes cf. *Ecl.* VIII 32-35, where the unidentified gamma-acrostic *odi/odin* reproduces *Id.* III 7 (ἦ ῥά με μισεῖς); cf. corroborative *odio* (33) and *promissaque barba* (34 = προγένειος [9]). For the form *odin* cf. *Thes. Ling. Lat.* 9,2 col. 454,73-82 with Norden 1995, 319 (on *Aen.* VI 779); for acrostically clueful “look down” (32) and for skippable “h” (34) cf. n. 9 above. The Theocritean words imitated in this acrostic occupy the same line-number (*Id.* III 7) as the start of the other acrostic at the beginning of this *Eclogue* (VIII 7; cf. n. 40 above); for such acrostically numerical correspondencies cf. nn. 5 and 26 above.

⁴³ These littoral etymologies (*ludo* / *lido*) would also appear germane to the question whether the verses they frame (39-43) should be assigned to Menalcas (so [e.g.] Clausen 1994, 268) or to Moeris (so [e.g.] Ottaviano 2012, 213): the politico-etymological subtext would seem to favour Menalcas (for his identification with Virgil cf. Coleman 1977, 274).

⁴⁴ This line (9) is placed exactly thirty lines before the end of the *undis*-acrostic (38), which begins at the poem’s exact midpoint (34; thus Virgil’s inclusive reckoning). Just as the *undis*-acrostic (IX 34-38) is followed in the very next line (39) by corroborative *undis*, so it may be noted that the afore-mentioned *aquam* (IX 9) corroboratively follows the *fons*-acrostic (I 5-8; cf. n. 11 above) in the very next line (9), but in the matching poem instead (IX): *Eclogues* I and IX are a land-confiscatory combo. Similarly the *undis*-acrostic (IX 34-38) is followed by corroborative *fontes* in the very next line (39), but in the matching poem instead (I), where, just like *aquam*, *fontes* is likewise positioned at the beginning of the line after a disyllable and a monosyl-

The last line of the *undis*-acrostic (38) ends with a phrase that introduces the pentastichic “song” (39-43) which is framed by the two etymologies of *litus*. This introductory phrase, which occupies the whole of the second hemistich, is notably litotic: *neque est ignobile carmen*. No further instance of the collocation *ignobile carmen* is supplied by the online *Library of Latin Texts*. For *ignobilis* a large number of synonymous alternatives was moreover available.⁴⁵ *Ignobilis* was etymologized from *nomen*.⁴⁶ Etymologically speaking, *neque est ignobile carmen* accordingly means “the song is not ‘without a *nomen*’”. It would not therefore be surprising to find that the song does in fact contain a “name” – the poet’s own.

Virgil’s name was identified by Brown at *Georgics* I 429, 431 and 433 in reversed order and abbreviated form: *ma-*, *ve-*, *pu-* = *Pu(blius) Ve(rgilius) Ma(ro)*.⁴⁷ Bing then argued that in this passage of the *Georgics* Virgil’s particular choice of his name is an echo of Aratus’ similarly self-nuncupatory ἄρρητον at *Phaenomena* 2.⁴⁸ This same Aratean onomastic has also been identified as the inspiration for the appellative *aporia* re Aratus at *Eclogue* III 40 (*quis fuit alter?*), since ἄρρητος bears the aptly elusive sense of “l’Innomé”.⁴⁹ It will be argued elsewhere by the present writer that Aratus’ nomenclative *calembour* is echoed not only in the afore-mentioned text near the end of *Georgics* I (429-433), but also at the start of the next book (*Georg.* II 3).⁵⁰ Just as the *Georgics* contain two nods to the *Phaenomena*’s ἄρρητον, so in the *Eclogues* Virgil would similarly appear to nod twice to the same Aratean *jeu ono-*

lable. Further cases of such “long-distance” glossography will be discussed below; cf. nn. 65 and 78.

⁴⁵ Cf. *Synon. Cic.* p. 427,4-5 B. For additions cf. *Thes. Ling. Lat.* 7,1 col. 301,1-7 (s.v. *ignobilis*).

⁴⁶ Cf. Maltby 1991, 293. Such recourse to etymology is in place here, since *ludus* as etymon of *litus* is placed in the very next line (39) in the very same fifth-foot *sedes*. *Ignobilis* is moreover located in the second line of Moeris’ speech, just as the similarly second line (27) of his immediately preceding speech likewise contains etymonic *nomen*, which is there limelighted by pre-caesural *sedes* and by directly ensuing and strongly hyperbatic parataxis.

⁴⁷ Brown 1963, 102-105. These Virgilian lines imitate Aratus’ *lepte*-acrostic at *Phaen.* 783-787.

⁴⁸ Bing 1990, 284.

⁴⁹ Prioux 2005, 313-314. The same opening passage of the *Phaenomena* (1-2) is imitated shortly afterwards in the same *Eclogue* (III 60).

⁵⁰ Virgil’s next line (II 4: *omnia plena*) clones Aratus’ *μεστὰί ... πᾶσαι* (2) in the same line as ἄρρητον, which occupies the same line-initial *locus* as *virgulta* (II 3: here an odd word, cf. Mynors 1990, 100 [ad loc.]). Since *virgulta* was regarded as the etymon of “Virgil” (cf. Maltby 1991, 637 [s.v. *Vergilius (Virg-)*], where Priscianic *virgulta* should be corrected to *virgula*), it would appear that here Virgilian *virgulta* is onomastical *imitatio* of Aratean ἄρρητον. both terms start the respective “second” line, since Virgil’s detachable “first” line merely recaps the preceding book.

mastique: besides the above-mentioned passage of *Eclogue* III, the text of *Eclogue* IX that is currently at issue would likewise seem to be another *hommage* to Aratus' ἄρρητος.

Aratean ἄρρητον is a molossic word in initial *sedes* in the poem's second line. The same initial position in the same second line of the song that is "not without a name" in *Eclogue* IX evinces a similarly molossic sequence (40): *hic ver pur(pureum)*. Virgil's imitation of the same Aratean ἄρρητον in *Georgics* I 429-433 deploys the first two letters of each of his own *tria nomina* in alternate lines and in retrograde order: *ma-*, *ve-*, *pu-*. It would seem possible to show that *Eclogue* IX is playing the same onomastical *jeu*, though this time the elements are directly juxtaposed. One may start with the collocation *ver purpureum*, where the oddness of the language puts the reader on the *qui vive* for an ulterior purpose.⁵¹ *Ver purpureum* gives the same initial digrams in the same back-to-front order as *Georgics* I: *ve-*, *pu-*. The parallelism between the two texts would appear to extend to the first element as well, which in *Eclogue* IX is *hic*. This line-initial *hic* is placed in direct juxtaposition with line-end *undis* (39), which is in turn contrasted with *huc* at the start of the same line in the same initial *sedes* as *hic* in the next line. If *undis* are the waves round Mantua, *hic* is accordingly Mantua itself.⁵² Mantua's first two letters are *ma-*: hence *ma-*, *ve-*, *pu-*.⁵³

Further clues to the Virgilian *jeu* would appear to have been embedded in the context. Firstly, if the *ignobile* (38) that points to the "name" in this song picks up *nomen* in the same second line of the same speaker's antecedent speech (27), then this *nomen* is itself directly preceded by a noteworthy hemistich (26): *necdum perfecta canebat*. The surprising detail *necdum perfecta* does however fit an "uncompleted" onomastic that consists of just the first syllables of the respective names.⁵⁴ Secondly, if the afore-mentioned *ignobile* occurs in the last line of the *undis*-acrostic (38), the first line of this acrostic (34) contains *vatem* ("poet"), which is placed in the same emphatically initial *sedes* as the "poet"'s onomastic (40: [*ma-*], *ve-*, *pu-*). Since this onomastic immediately follows *undis* (39), which restates the acrostic that occupies the immedi-

⁵¹ A possible debt here to Greek epigram is mooted by Schlegelmilch 2008, 19-20. If such is the case, Virgil is simply adapting his source-material for his own ends, just as this same "song" exploits Theocritean matter for the etymology of *litus*.

⁵² Emphatically geminated *Mantua* significantly occupies initial position in the second line of Moeris' immediately preceding "song" (28), just as *hic* now occupies similarly initial position in the similarly second line of his present "song" (40).

⁵³ Since both "suppression" and "synonymity" are involved here, such an "unspoken" *jeu onomastique* is highly appropriate imitation of similarly "unspoken" ἄρρητον.

⁵⁴ The same penultimate *sedes* as *perfecta* is occupied in the very next line (27) by *Mantua*, which shares this line with semantically loaded *nomen*.

ately preceding lines (34-38) and starts with aforesaid *vatem* (34), this acrostic is thus framed by the “poet” (*vatem*) and his “name” ([*ma-*], *ve-*, *pu-*).⁵⁵

Onomastical (*ma-*), *ve-*, *pu-* is followed in the very next line (41) by surprising *pōpulus*,⁵⁶ which is qualified as *candida*,⁵⁷ which makes *pōpulus* the equivalent of *λευκή* (“white poplar”),⁵⁸ which is the acrostic at the start of the *Iliad*’s last book (XXIV 1-5), which inspired Aratus’ *lepte*-acrostic (*Phaen.* 783-787), which is in turn imitated in Virgil’s onomastical acrostic at *Georgics* I 429-433: *ma-*, *ve-*, *pu-*. In this *Georgics* text the *ve(ntus)* and *pu(ra)* in question are linked etymologically with the corresponding terms in the onomastic in *Eclogue* IX: *ve(r)*⁵⁹ and *pu(rpureum)*.⁶⁰ It would seem that such play on the connection between *purpureus* and etymonic *purus* is also to be found in the present passage of *Eclogue* IX itself. Exactly five lines after *purpureum* Virgil uses *pura* in the same emphatic position immediately before the penthemimeres (44): *pura solum sub nocte*.⁶¹ Clausen (ad loc.) points out that these words echo Aratus (*Phaen.* 323): *καθαρή ὑπό* (sic pars codd.) *νυκτί*.⁶² Here the *Eclogue*’s imitation of Aratus would accordingly seem to serve as corroboration of Virgil’s precursively “Aratean” onomastic, which ends with the *purpureus* etymologized from “Aratean” *purus*. Since moreover *purpur(eus)* is just “double” *pur(us)*, one might see Virgil’s addition of *solum* (*pura solum*) as a wry gloss on this etymology: *pur(us)* is just “single” *purpur(eus)*.⁶³

Since Virgil’s onomastic in *Eclogue* IX occurs immediately after acrostical and then horizontally corroborative *undis* (34-39), the chief purpose of this *sphragis* is evidently to signal not only Virgil’s own involvement in the land-

⁵⁵ *Vatem* (34) is immediately preceded by *dicunt* (33), which can have the connotation “to name”; cf. *Oxf. Lat. Dict.*² 590 (s.v., 9).

⁵⁶ Cf. Clausen 1994, 281 (ad loc.), who notes that by contrast “Polyphemus’ cave in Homer is shaded by bays (*Od.* IX 183)”.

⁵⁷ If *pōpulus* is preceded by *candida*, it is followed by *antro*, which was etymologized from chromatically antithetic *ater* (cf. Maltby 1991, 40).

⁵⁸ For the equivalence cf. *Thes. Ling. Lat.* 10,1 col. 2737,22-32 (s.v. 2. *pōpulus*).

⁵⁹ *Ver* and *ventus* were etymologized from *vis*, which was also deemed the etymon of *Vergilius*; cf. Maltby 1991, 635; 637; 647; 648 (s.vv. *ventus*; *ver*; *Vergilius* [*Virg-*]; *violentus*; *virga*; *virgultum*).

⁶⁰ *Purpura* was etymologized from *purus*, which was also regarded as the etymon of *pupilla(-us)*, which was in turn the etymon of *Publius*; cf. Maltby 1991, 506; 508; 509 (s.vv. *Publius*; *pupilla*; *purpura*).

⁶¹ Here *pura* has to be glossed by Servius as *serena*.

⁶² Clausen, who instead gives *ἐνί*, fails to mention the variant *ὑπό*, which exactly matches Virgilian *sub*.

⁶³ For this sense of *solum* cf. *Oxf. Lat. Dict.*² 1973 (s.v., 5c): “only one, a single”. Such philological finicalities are calculated to engage the attention of such a dyed-in-the-wool *grammaticus* as Virgil.

confiscations round “wave”-washed Mantua but also his own endorsement of the accompanying etymology of *litus* as where waves “strike”, not “play”. A parallel would appear to be supplied by the unidentified two-way *laesis*-acrostic (*Ecl.* VI 14-24), which is likewise politically peril-fraught and likewise prefaced by mention of Varus. This sixth *Eclogue* would similarly seem to contain an unidentified onomastic (67-69): *ut Linus haec illi (sc. Gallo) divino carmine pastor*⁶⁴ / *floribus atque apio crinis ornatus amaro*⁶⁵ / *dixerit*. This onomastic is immediately followed by an unidentified acrostic (70-72), which exactly repeats the acrostical *ac[c]i[pe]* of *Eclogue* VIII 11-13:⁶⁶ just as in *Eclogue* VIII, here corroboration is supplied at the start by horizontal *accipe* (69).⁶⁷ Just as acrostical *ac[c]i[pe]* in *Eclogue* VIII is an invitation to “accept” that poem as dedicatee, so in *Eclogue* VI similarly acrostical *ac[c]i[pe]* is evidently a similar invitation to Gallus from Linus / Virgil to “accept” this poem as dedicatee instead of the Varus mentioned just before acrostical *laesis* (a poem “for those who have been hurt”), of whom Virgil is one.⁶⁸

In *Eclogue* IX the song that is not “without a *nomen*” would seem to contain subtextual references to other names besides the poet’s afore-mentioned own. It was pointed out above that this Virgilian onomastic is itself an allusion to Aratus’ similar ἄρρητον. The (*ma-*), *ve-*, *pu-* in question is directly juxtaposed at the main caesura with strongly hyperbatic *vario(s)*, which picks up pre-

⁶⁴ Cf. Serv. Auct. ad loc.: *quaeritur cur “pastor” dixerit*. If however Linus himself is not a *pastor*, Virgil expressly identifies himself as such in line 4. For *pastor* (and *amaro*; cf. next n.) in a Virgilian onomastic cf. Carter 2002, 616.

⁶⁵ Cf. Clausen 1994, 203 (ad loc.): “*Amarus* (‘Unde Epithetum?’), La Cerda is not elsewhere applied to *apium*”. Clausen also notes that here Virgil has in mind the second half of Calv., *Fr.* 9 B.: *a virgo infelix, herbis pascere amaris*. The first half of the same Calvan verse had been quoted at the start of lines 47 and 52, where on both occasions *virgo* is a misfit (cf. Serv. on 47). It might therefore be felt that initial *virgo* is instead meant to be supplied subtextually at the start of the line currently at issue (68), which then ends symmetrically with Calvus’ similarly final *amarus*; for such “long-distance” technique cf. nn. 44 above and 78 below. The result here is a clean-limbed onomastic: *P.(astor) / [Virg](ilius) ... (a)Maro /*.

⁶⁶ Cf. n. 40 above. For disregarable “h” (72) cf. n. 9 above.

⁶⁷ This time *accipe* is immediately preceded by hintful *en* (Clausen 1994, 203 [ad loc.]: “here first with the imperative”), which is glossed as *ἰδοῦ* (*Gloss.*^L II Philox. EN 5); cf. n. 9 above. After acrostically incomplete *aci-* the very next line (73), which is the last of the speech, starts with *ne ... plus*, which might be taken as a similarly subtextual hint that there is “no more” to this truncated acrostic.

⁶⁸ As *laesis* starts fourteen lines from the start of the poem, so *ne ... plus* (73), which marks the end of acrostical *ac[c]i[pe]*, is placed fourteen lines from the end. It may be recalled (cf. Serv. Auct. on *Ecl.* IX 10) that Gallus had delivered a speech “Against Varus” on the issue of “water” in the “land”-confiscations round squishy Mantua.

caesural *Vario* exactly six lines earlier (35).⁶⁹ If Lycidas / Virgil had been unequal to Varius on the latter's earlier mention in this poem,⁷⁰ juxtaposition of *vario(s)* with (*ma-*), *ve-*, *pu-* would now seem to imply equality after all.

If (*ma-*), *ve-*, *pu-* is juxtaposed with *vario(s)* in the same line, it occupies the same ante-caesural *sedes* as *o Galatea* in the preceding one (39). This line's second hemistich consists of Aquilius Gallus' etymology of *litus*. Here *o Gal-* accordingly suggests homoeocatactic *o Gal(le)*.⁷¹ *O Gal(le)* accordingly resembles (*ma-*), *ve-*, *pu-* as a further instance of names that are *necdum perfecta*.⁷² "Aquilius Gallus" evinces further paronomastic parallels with "Galatea", whose sweetheart Acis was turned into a spring called "Acilius",⁷³ a virtual homonym of the jurist,⁷⁴ while Galatea's son Galas was eponym of the "Gauls" (App., *Ill.* 2, 3). In the *Eclogues* the nymph Galatea is mentioned on only one other occasion (VII 37), where however she is addressed instead as *Nerine Galatea*: hence there is no chance here of taking the first syllable of her name as a subtextual *Gal(le)*. As in *Eclogue IX*, Galatea is here being invited to "come": whereas however the invitation here takes the form of a *venito* after her name (VII 40), *Eclogue IX* instead evinces an *ades* immediately before the name.⁷⁵ It would therefore seem pertinent that *adesse* was applied specifically to lawyers, like Aquilius Gallus.⁷⁶ Barristerial *ades* might accordingly be taken as a subtextual invitation to lawyer Gallus to address the legal question of his immediately ensuing etymology of *litus* from *ludo*: *quis est nam ludus in undis?* The same *ades* is then repeated in the last line of this "song" (43), where the *sine* of immediately ensuing *insani feriant sine litora fluctus* might be taken

⁶⁹ On such six-line spacing in such repetitions cf. Thomas 1988, 153-154 (on *Georg.* I 509) and 176 (on *Georg.* II 114). Virgil's *vario(s)* is in the same line (40) as the Theocritean line (*Id.* VII 40) that serves as model of Virgilian *Vario* (35). The epithet *varius* is used on only one other occasion in the whole of the *Eclogues* (IV 42).

⁷⁰ 35-36: *neque adhuc Vario videor ... dicere ... / digna*.

⁷¹ Cf. Clausen's remark (1994, xxiii; likewise in connection with [other] names in the vocative in the *Eclogues*): "Virgil's Roman reader read aloud, read slowly, and had been trained from boyhood in the discipline of rhetoric". Here we accordingly have a further instance of the rhetorical figure of *emphasis*; cf. n. 18 above. For interjectional *o* with a cognomen cf. (e.g.) Priscianic *o Cicero* (*Gramm.* II 330,18; III 223,4).

⁷² This phrase (26) is directly juxtaposed with *Varo* (cf. 27: *Vare, tuum nomen*). *O Gal(le)* accordingly matches *Vare* as another address by vocative cognomen to another contemporary jurist in the same opening line of two adjacent "songs".

⁷³ So Serv. on *Ecl.* IX 39 (Serv. Auct. adds: *ab illius* [sc. *Acidis*] *nominis derivatione*).

⁷⁴ "Aquilius" was spelt in Greek with kappa; cf. *Thes. Ling. Lat.* 2 col. 375,6 (s.v.).

⁷⁵ The Theocritean model (*Id.* XI 42) has just *ἀφίκευσο* without a name.

⁷⁶ Cf. *Thes. Ling. Lat.* 2 col. 923,20-79 (s.v.), citing inter alia Don., *Ter. Ph.* 313, 2: *adesse ... dicuntur advocati*.

as a similarly subtextual invitation to Gallus to “grant” the alternative etymology of *litus* – from *lido*.⁷⁷

Finally attention may be drawn to a “long-distance” gloss on acrostical *undis*.⁷⁸ Exactly twenty lines after the last line of the *undis*-acrostic (38) we read: *nunc omne tibi stratum silet aequor* (57). On Virgil’s use here of *sterno* Heyne compares Theocritean *στόρνυμι* (*Id.* VII 57).⁷⁹ It may be pointed out that both verbs occur at exactly the same line-number in their respective poem: 57.⁸⁰ The direct object that Theocritean *στόρνυμι* governs is adjacently sequent *κύματα* on the other side of the caesura. Virgil’s own use of *sterno* is itself directly followed by a clause which reads thus: *et omnes, / aspice, ventosi ceciderunt murmuris aurae* (57-58). This injunction is problematic: you can’t “see” wind, much less its “sound”, which is in any case here said to have stopped completely.⁸¹ Here the off-keyness of *aspice* is evidently a cue to “look” instead at the (Theocritean) waves evoked in the immediately antecedent clause. Since however these waves are now no longer visible,⁸² *aspice* evidently tips the acrostically S.O.P wink⁸³ to “look” instead at the acrostical waves that are still clearly visible just twenty lines earlier (34-38). When Virgil’s readers do “look”, they see that here acrostic and etymology unite to make hot-as-pepper politics – “Hands off my marshy Mantua!”

⁷⁷ For *sino* meaning “to grant, admit, allow” cf. *Oxf. Lat. Dict.*² 1951 (s.v., 2b). The final point may be made that similarly twofold *ades* occurs at *Georg.* II 39 and 44, where Maecenas is addressed in conjunction with a similarly political acrostic; cf. text annotated by n. 41 above. Here the first *ades* is positioned at exactly the same line-number (39) as in *Ecl.* IX; for such numeric correlation cf. n. 42 above. The second Maecenan *ades* (44) is just one line after the correspondingly second Gal(1)(ate)an *ades* (43). It was however pointed out above (n. 50) that the first line of this *Georgic* is detachable.

⁷⁸ An exact parallel for such long-range glossography in connection with an acrostic may be adduced from *Aen.* II, where the upward acrostic *ac[c]uso* (61-65; cf. n. 18 above) glosses double-sensed *crimine* (65; “crime” or “accusation”). This *crimine* is juxtaposed with hapactic *Danaum insidias*, whose sole other occurrence is exactly thirty lines earlier (36), where it is now juxtaposed with *suspecta*, which is evidently a prodromal prod to “look upward” when reading upward *ac[c]uso*.

⁷⁹ Heyne – Wagner 1830, 231. Both of these verbs are highlighted by their respective position at the main caesura. Very recently *sterno* had been etymologized from *στόρνυμι* by Varro (*L.* VI 96).

⁸⁰ Exactly twenty lines before Theocritus’ line 57 is the line (38) that is imitated in the opening line (34) of Virgil’s *undis*-acrostic that ends with the same “line 38”.

⁸¹ The problem is akin to “seeing yourself in the sea” (*Ecl.* II 25; cf. text annotated by n. 39 above).

⁸² On *nunc ... stratum* (57) cf. *Oxf. Lat. Dict.*² 2005 (s.v. *sterno*, 6b: “to cause [waves] to subside”).

⁸³ Cf. n. 9 above.

Bibliography

- Adkin 2009 = Adkin, N.: Further Supplements to Marangoni's *Supplementum Etymologicum*: The Collections of *Differentiae* Published by Beck and Brugnoli. *Euphrosyne* n.s. 37, 407-414.
- 2014 = Adkin, N.: "Read the Edge": Acrostics in Virgil's Sinon Episode. *ACD* 50, 45-72.
- forthcoming = Adkin, N.: On a New Virgil Acrostic: *Aen.* VI 77-84. forthcoming in *Mnemosyne*.
- Bentley – Grotius 1760 = Bentley, R. – Grotius, H.: *M. Annaei Lucani Pharsalia*. Strawberry Hill.
- Bing 1990 = Bing, P.: A Pun on Aratus' Name in Verse 2 of the *Phaenomena*? *HSPH* 93, 281-285.
- Brown 1963 = Brown, E.: *Numeri Vergiliani: Studies in Eclogues and Georgics*. Coll. Latomus 63. Brussels.
- Cairns 1996 = Cairns, F.: Ancient "Etymology" and Tibullus: On the Classification of "Etymologies" and on "Etymological Markers". *PCPhS* 42, 24-59 (= id., *Papers on Roman Elegy 1969-2003*. Eikasmos, Stud. 16. Bologna 2007, 308-340).
- Carter 2002 = Carter, M. A. S.: *Vergilium vestigare: Aeneid XII* 587-588. *CQ* n.s. 52, 615-617.
- Castelletti 2012 = Castelletti, C.: Rev. of Murgatroyd 2009. *Gnomon* 84, 367-369.
- Clausen 1994 = Clausen, W.: *A Commentary on Virgil, Eclogues*. Oxford. Repr. 2003.
- Coleman 1977 = Coleman, R.: *Vergil: Eclogues*. Cambridge. Repr. 2003.
- Egan 1980 = Egan, R. B.: *Satis est potuisse videri. CW* 73, 379-383.
- Goetz 1899 = Goetz, G.: *Thesaurus Glossarum Emendatarum* 1. Leipzig. Repr. Amsterdam 1985.
- Grishin 2008 = Grishin, A. A.: *Ludus in undis*: An Acrostic in *Eclogue* 9. *HSPH* 104, 237-240.
- Heyne – Wagner 1830 = Heyne, C. G. – Wagner, G. P. E.: *P. Virgili Maronis opera* 1. 4th ed. Leipzig–London. Repr. Hildesheim 1968.
- Käppel 2015 = Käppel, L.: Ocnus. In: *Brill's New Pauly*. Brill Online.
- Katz 2013 = Katz, J. T.: The Muse at Play: An Introduction. In: Kwapisz, J., Petrain, D., Szymański, M. (edd.): *The Muse at Play: Riddles and Wordplay in Greek and Latin Poetry*. *Beitr. z. Altertumskunde* 305. Berlin–Boston, 3-30.
- Koster 1988 = Koster, S.: *Ille ego qui: Dichter zwischen Wort und Macht*. Erlang. Forsch. A,42. Erlangen.
- Liebs 2010 = Liebs, D.: P. Alfenus Varus – Eine Karriere in Zeiten des Umbruchs. *ZRG* 127, 32-52.
- Maltby 1991 = Maltby, R.: *A Lexicon of Ancient Latin Etymologies*. ARCA 25. Leeds. Repr. Cambridge 2006.
- Marangoni 2007 = Marangoni, C.: *Supplementum etymologicum latinum* 1. Polymnia 8. Trieste.
- Michalopoulos 2001 = Michalopoulos, A.: *Ancient Etymologies in Ovid's Metamorphoses: A Commented Lexicon*. ARCA 40. Leeds.
- Morgan 1993 = Morgan, G.: *Nullam, Vare ...*: Chance or Choice in *Odes* I 18? *Philologus* 137, 142-145.
- Murgatroyd 2009 = Murgatroyd, P.: *A Commentary on Book 4 of Valerius Flaccus' Argonautica*. *Mnem. Suppl.* 311. Leiden–Boston.
- Mynors 1990 = Mynors, R. A. B.: *Virgil: Georgics*. Oxford. Repr. 2003.
- Neue – Wagener 1902 = Neue, F. – Wagener, C.: *Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache* 1: *Das Substantivum*. 3rd ed. Leipzig. Repr. Hildesheim 1985.
- Nisbet – Hubbard 1970 = Nisbet, R. G. M. – Hubbard, M. E.: *A Commentary on Horace: Odes, Book 1*. Oxford. Repr. 2001.
- Norden 1995 = Norden, E.: *P. Vergilius Maro: Aeneis, Buch VI*. 9th ed. Stuttgart–Leipzig.

- Ottaviano 2012 = Ottaviano, S.: *Ars et ratio*: Problemi di struttura e proporzione nelle Bucoliche (*Ecl.* VII 45-68; IX 37-55). *MD* 69, 199-216.
- Prioux 2005 = Prioux, É.: Deux jeux de mots sur le nom d'Aratos: Note sur Virgile, *B.* III 42 et Aratos, *Phaen.* 2. *RPh* 79, 309-317.
- Romano 1991 = Romano, E.: *Q. Orazio Flacco: Le Opere* 1,2. Rome.
- Schlegelmilch 2008 = Schlegelmilch, U.: *Ommia fert aetas*: Fragmentierte Epigramme und ver-rätselte Sterne in Vergils *Bucolica*. In: Id., Thanner, T. (edd.): *Die Dichter und die Sterne: Beiträge zur lateinischen und griechischen Literatur für Ludwig Braun*. WJA N.F. Beih. 2. Würzburg, 13-37.
- Stewart 2010 = Stewart, S.: "Apollo of the Shore": Apollonius of Rhodes and the Acrostic Phenomenon. *CQ* n.s. 60, 401-405.
- Thomas 1988 = Thomas, R. F.: *Virgil: Georgics* 1. Cambridge. Repr. 2002.

(ISSN 0418 – 453X)