

ACTA CLASSICA UNIV. SCIENT. DEBRECEN.	L.	2014.	pp. 45–72.
--	----	-------	------------

**“READ THE EDGE”:
ACROSTICS IN VIRGIL’S SINON EPISODE¹**

BY NEIL ADKIN

Abstract: Virgil’s famous Sinon episode at the start of *Aeneid* II contains four hitherto unidentified acrostics. Examination of these particular instances sheds light on Virgil’s acrostical practice in general.

Keywords: acrostic, *crimen*, Homer, Virgil.

An acrostic has recently been identified by Grishin in *Eclogue IX*.² Grishin posits only two further acrostics in the whole of Virgil. The first occurs in *Georgics* I, where lines 433, 431 and 429 begin respectively with *pu-*, *ve-* and *ma-* (= *Publius Vergilius Maro*). New evidence in connection with this acrostic will be

¹ Unless otherwise stated, none of the acrostics mentioned in the present article would appear to have received attention from commentators. With the exception of the ones in the Sinon episode, it is proposed to deal with all of them more fully in a series of separate papers, where additional acrostics in Virgil himself and in other authors will also be discussed. In the present article 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, who is however unable to explain the acrostic in question (*Ecl.* IX 34–38: *undis*). It will be argued elsewhere that here Virgil is etymologizing *litus* as where “waves” do not “play” (39: *ludus*), but “strike” (43: *feriant = lidant*; for both etymologies cf. Maltby 1991, 344). This “etymological” acrostic would appear to be particularly significant, since it evidently concerns the politics of land-confiscation round “wave-circled” Mantua (cf. *Serv. Auct., Ecl.* IX 10). The further point will be made that a mere half-dozen lines later the unidentified acrostic *Oeni* (51–4) glosses *Bianoris* (60; cf. *Serv., Ecl.* IX 60), of which it is also the etymological antonym: if *Oeni* = *ὄκνει* (“he’s a coward”), the etyma of *Bianor* (cf. Maltby 1991, 79) were regarded as *βία* and *ἡνορέη*. Commentators duly note that l. 51 (*omnia fert aetas*; start of the acrostic) imitates [Plato], *AP* IX 51, 1 (*αἰῶν πάντα φέρει*). It may be added that the epigram continues with *δολιχὸς χρόνος οἶδεν ἀμείβειν / οὔνομα*. Virgil evidently intends this “change of name” to be seen in conjunction with his own exercise in nuncupatory transmogrification: *Oeni* / *Bianoris*. Reference to a further unidentified acrostic in the same section of this same *Eclogue* (IX 46–51) will be made below (cf. n. 44).

adduced in a future paper.³ Grishin's third and final acrostic is located in the middle of the *Aeneid* (VII 601-604: *Mars*): again fresh data will be presented elsewhere.⁴ Even more recent than Grishin's article on *undis* in *Eclogue IX* is a contribution by Castelletti, who posits a similarly aqueous acrostic at the start of the first *Eclogue: fons*.⁵ Once again additional evidence will be set out in a separate article.⁶ The most important addendum apropos of *fons* would however seem to be its political reference: like Grishin's *undis* this "watery" acrostic evidently has to do with the land-confiscations round waterlogged Mantua.⁷

³ Here three points may be briefly made. In the first place the problematic *Panopeae* (l. 437) for Parthenian *Νηρεϊ* ("Whence Panopea?" asks Thomas 1988, 141; his suggestion of a Callimachean source is rejected by Erren 2003, 233) would appear to be an etymologizing pointer to this discontinuously threefold acrostic ("see it all"). Secondly unusual *suspecti* "st. *expectati*" (Erren 2003, 237) in l. 443 (*suspecti tibi sint*) would seem to be a hint to "look upwards" (so *Oxf. Lat. Dict.*² 2084 [s.v. *suspicio*, 1a]), when one reads this "upward" acrostic. Thirdly this acrostic, which is indebted to Aratus (783-787), is preceded by a hitherto unidentified acrostic (409-414: *pin[n]ati*; cf. *pinnis* [409]; for acrostical "Einfachschreibung von Gemina-ten" cf. Koster 1988, 103), which would similarly appear to have been inspired by Virgil's Aratean source-text, where it glosses a *hapax* (1009: *ἄπτερόνται*, Virgil's acrostic evidently signals his view that here the prefix is not privative, but intensive). Finally it may be observed that this nomenclative acrostic (*ma-*, *ve-*, *pu-*) would seem to find a counterpart in the same passage of *Eclogue IX* as Grishin's acrostic, where *undis* is immediately followed by *hic ver purpureum* (40): if *hic* is Mantua (cf. n. 2 above), here we have exactly parallel *ma- ve- pu-* (cf. 38: *neque est ignobile carmen*, where *ignobile* is etymologically "without a *nomen*"; cf. Maltby 1991, 293). In such a political context this onomastical *sphragis* would seem to be especially significant.

⁴ In particular it will be argued that the acrostic continues with hitherto unidentified *has* (605-607), which is confirmed by identical and anacoluthically salient *has* at the beginning of l. 611: the sense of the acrostic is *Mars has* (sc. *portas* [cf. 607: *sunt ... Belli portae] habet*).

⁵ *Ecl.* I 5-8; cf. Castelletti 2012, 90-91.

⁶ Here attention may be summarily drawn to three words in the passage. In the first place *f[orm]ons-* at the beginning of the first line (5) generates a species of gamma-acrostic. Secondly in the acrostic's last line (8) the problematical *imbuet* (cf. Serv. ad loc.) with its matchingly liquid associations (cf. Servius' gloss *perfundo*; for *fundo* as etymon of *fons* cf. Var., *L.* V 123) provides a sort of horizontal corroboration. Since thirdly in l. 11 (*non equidem invideo*) *equidem* was explained as *ego quidem* (cf. Maltby 1991, 207-208) and *invideo* was etymologized from *video* (cf. Var., *L.* VI 80; so *invidere* = *ἔσιδεῖν* [Theoc. VIII 11; same *sedes* before caesura in same eleventh line]), these words could also bear the pawky sense "I don't see (sc. the acrostic)" (cf. 9: *ut cernis*).

⁷ In the same connection one might also call attention to *Eclogue VI*, where the unnoticed acrostic *laesis* ("for those who have been hurt") goes both upwards (14-19) and downwards (19-24): the directly foregoing lines (6-12) "praise" the land-confiscator Alfenus Varus. It may be noted that this acrostic solves two cruxes in these lines. Firstly puzzling *Aegle* (20), which is "not a pastoral name" (Clausen 1994, 186), is due to the occurrence of the same word in the same final *sedes* in Aratus (779), where it immediately precedes the acrostic imitated in *Georg.* I 429-433 (cf. n. 3 above). Secondly *satis est potuisse videri* (24), which commentators find a "rather cryptic remark" (so Clausen 1994, 187), becomes perfectly clear when one realizes that it occurs in

The present article owes its title (“Read the Edge”) to a pair of unidentified acrostics which likewise concern politics, though in these cases the issue is not land-confiscation.⁸ The first extends over the whole of the dedication to *Eclogue* VIII (6-13): *tu⁹ si es, ac[c]¹⁰i[pe]*.¹¹ This acrostic in *Eclogue* VIII clears up the crucial issue of the identity of the poem’s dedicatee: Octavian or Pollio. The ambivalence is intentional: “If it’s you, accept!”. For the purposes of the present article however the most important line is the one that begins the acrostic proper (7): *sive oram Illyrici legis aequoris, –*.¹² Since *legere* is not found before this passage in the sense of “eundo ... stringere”,¹³ here the natural meaning of *oram ... legis* is “you read the edge” – i.e. the acrostic.¹⁴ The other passage in which you are subtextually invited to “read the edge” is another dedication, which this time occurs near the start of *Georgics* II (44):¹⁵ *primi lege litoris oram*.¹⁶ When you do “read the edge” here, you find that this line

the last line of an acrostic. This line begins with amphibolous *solvite me*: for the “solution” of this two-way acrostic “it is enough to have been able to be seen”.

⁸ Both acrostics will be discussed more fully elsewhere.

⁹ This *tu* is the first word of l. 6.

¹⁰ For such “Einfachschreibung von Geminaten” cf. Koster 1988, 103.

¹¹ Here *ac[c]i[pe]* is confirmed by identical *accipe* in l. 11: this line starts with the “a” of acrostical *ac[c]i[pe]*. An exact parallel for such truncation of an acrostic after the third letter is supplied by an earlier *Eclogue* (II 23-25), where *canto* at the start of l. 23 is partially reproduced by the gamma-acrostic *can-* (ll. 23-25; this undetected acrostic will be given full treatment in an article entitled “Corydon’s Acrostical Can-Can”). Here it may be observed that this acrostic solves the notorious crux of the physical impossibility of “seeing oneself in the sea” (cf. Servius on 25, which is the last line of the acrostic and reads: *nec sum adeo informis: nuper me in litore vidi*): the truncated (cf. *informis* [*nondum formatus*: *Gloss.* IV 93,25]) gamma-shaped acrostic is cutely looking at itself “at the edge” (for this “acrostical” use of *litus* cf. the discussion later in this paragraph). Imitation of Virgil’s employment here of *informis* would seem to account for his friend Horace’s puzzling (cf. Romano 1991, 673) use of the same epithet at *Carm.* II 10, 15, where it occurs in the same lexical form in the same pre-caesural *sedes* in the same third line of a similarly unobserved acrostic (*sap/is*; confirmed by post-caesural *sapienter* [22]).

¹² “The coast of Illyria ... would be a very roundabout route” (Coleman 1977, 228).

¹³ Cf. *Thes. Ling. Lat.* 7,2,2 col. 1127,50 (s.v. 2. *lego*).

¹⁴ For the basic sense of *ora* as “the outside edge” cf. *Oxf. Lat. Dict.*² 1389 (s.v. *ora*¹, 1a). For *legere* meaning “to read” as already well-attested in Plautus and the Elder Cato cf. *Oxf. Lat. Dict.*² 1116 (s.v. *lego*², 8a).

¹⁵ At the very beginning of this second *Georgic* (3) it will be argued elsewhere that problematic (cf. Mynors 1990, 100) *virgulta* is a *jeu étymologique* on Virgil’s own name (cf. Prisc., *Gramm.* II 135, 14-15: *virgula Virgilius* [miscited in Maltby 1991, 637]), in which Virgil is imitating Aratus’ similarly onomastic pun (ἄρρητον) in the same initial *sedes* in the same “second” line (Virgil’s first line can be discounted as a mere summary of the previous book). This sneakily etymologizing imitation is confirmed by Virgil’s ensuing *omnia plena* (4), which echoes Aratus’ similarly ensuing *μεστὰί ... πᾶσαι* (2).

¹⁶ This line “clashes with the imagery” of l. 41 (*pelagoque volans da vela patenti*); thus Conington, Nettleship, Haverfield 1898, 229 (on 41).

coincides with the start of a similarly hortative acrostic: *fias* (44-47). This overlooked acrostic is evidently urging the dedicatee Maecenas to “become” what has just been said of him: *o decus, o famae merito pars maxima nostrae* (40).¹⁷ It would therefore seem clear that Virgil himself does “read the edge” and expect his reader to do likewise.¹⁸ The evidence adduced in the present article would appear to indicate that Virgil’s use of acrostics is more widespread and significant than has hitherto been thought: while some acrostics are no doubt fortuitous and without significance, others are evidently not.¹⁹

The actual subject-matter of the present article is an episode from the beginning of the *Aeneid*’s second Book: the “memorabilem narrationem Sinonis”.²⁰ Here the purport of the four unrecognized acrostics in question is not politics, but philology. The first of this acrostical foursome starts in the very first sentence of the Sinon episode: *ac[c]uso*.²¹ The aim of this acrostic is glosso-graphic, since *ac[c]uso* glosses *crimine* in its last line: *crimine ab uno / disce omnis* (65-66). This renowned clause²² about the equally renowned Trojan Horse is however problematical,²³ because scholarship has hitherto been unable to make up its collective mind about the meaning of *crimen* here: “accusation”

¹⁷ The acrostic would also appear to shed light on its enigmatic central lines (45-46): *non hic te carmine ficto / atque per ambages et longa exorsa tenebo* (“It is difficult ... to see the point of these lines”; so Conington, Nettleship, Haverfield 1898, 229 [on 45]). Here “insincere” (*ficto*), “roundabout” (*ambages*) and “long-drawn-out” (*longa*) are the opposite of frank, straight and brief *fias*.

¹⁸ A final point may be made in this regard. The last word before the above-mentioned dedication to Maecenas is *corna* (*Georg.* II 34; “cornels”), which on pomicultural grounds is found “odd” by Thomas 1988, 162. *Cornum* is however the exact homonym of *cornu(m)*; for the widely attested form *cornum* instead of *cornu* cf. *Thes. Ling. Lat.* 4 col. 962,74-82 [s.v. *cornu*], which is in turn regularly used in the sense of *latus* (cf. *Thes. Ling. Lat.* 4 coll. 970,78-971,11 [s.v. *cornu*]). For the use of *cornu* with particular reference to an acrostic cf. (e.g.) *Aen.* IX 629 (*cornu petat*; subtextually “seek the edge”), which is the last line of the similarly overlooked acrostic *ieci* (626-629), an etymological gloss on *Iulus* as *ἰοβόλος* (cf. Maltby 1991, 317).

¹⁹ In rhetorical terms acrostics are a form of *emphasis*; cf. (e.g.) Quint., *Inst.* IX 2, 64: *est emphasis ... , cum ... latens aliquid eruitur*. He continues (66): *eius triplex usus est: unus si dicere palam parum tutum est, alter si non decet, tertius qui venustatis modo gratia adhibetur et ipsa novitate ac varietate magis quam si relatio sit recta delectat*. The first of these categories (*parum tutum*) covers the political instances adduced above, the second (*non decet*) the scatological ones to be adduced below, the third (*venustatis ... gratia*) the rest.

²⁰ So de la Cerda 1642, 154. For the bibliography on Sinon cf. Horsfall 2008, 93.

²¹ *Aen.* II 61-65. This acrostic goes upward, like *pu- ve- ma-* (*Georg.* I 429-433; cf. n. 3 above) and *laesis* (*Ecl.* VI 14-19; cf. n. 7 above). For the spelling of *ac[c]uso* with one “c” cf. n. 10 above.

²² It “has become proverbial” (Mackail 1930, 52).

²³ “Un verso difficile” (Thomas 1984, 932).

or “crime”.²⁴ Here we evidently have a case of deliberate *ambiguitas*.²⁵ At the same time the solution to the “problem” which Virgil himself has purposely created is supplied by his own slyly exegetic and handily concomitant acrostic: *ac[c]uso*.²⁶

The same acrostic also calls for a number of further observations. In the first place the verb *accuso* is “unpoetical”.²⁷ It is never used by Virgil²⁸ – except in this acrostic. Virgilian acrostics are in fact often characterized by a stylistic register that differs from the text proper: they open the door to *sermo humilis*. Since such cases may accordingly involve lexemes and lexical forms that are otherwise absent from the poet’s *œuvre*, they are highly significant for his linguistic *usus*. Further such instances will be adduced below. For the present, attention may be drawn to the previous sentence but one, where an acrostic has recently been identified: *icis* (50-53).²⁹ Just as *accuso* glosses a *zetema* in Virgil’s own text, so *icis* glosses one in Homer’s.³⁰ The active of *ic(i)o* is likewise avoided elsewhere by Virgil, who only ever uses the past participle.³¹

The second point to be made in connection with *ac[c]uso* is that Virgil has been at some pains to encourage his reader to “look” for this acrostic.³² The very next pair of complete lines after *crimine* and the “a” of glossographically acrostical *ac[c]uso* read: *namque ut conspectu in medio turbatus, inermis / constitit atque oculis Phrygia agmina circumspexit* (sc. Sinon; 67-68). Here no less than threefold reference to “looking” (*conspectu / oculis / circumspexit*) in sig-

²⁴ While for example the afore-mentioned Thomas 1984, 932 argues for “accusation”, Horsfall 2008, 100 has recently championed “crime”. The same perplexity is already to be found in Servius (ad loc.).

²⁵ For such *ambigua* as smart cf. Cic., *De orat.* II 253: *ambigua sunt in primis acuta*.

²⁶ Acrostical *ac[c]uso* (ll. 61-65) disposes of the view of Günther 1996, 42 that ll. 63-66 are a “Zusatz”.

²⁷ Cf. *Thes. Ling. Lat.* 1 col. 350,11-12 (s.v.): “deest fere poetis praeter comicos”.

²⁸ Cf. Wetmore 1979, 5.

²⁹ Cf. Adkin 2012, 426. Like *ac[c]uso*, this acrostic goes upwards.

³⁰ It will be argued more fully elsewhere that acrostical *icis* is a gloss on *Od.* VIII 507 (what should the Trojans do with the Horse?), where Aristarchus changed *τυῆξαι* to *πλήξαι*. Virgilian *icis* signifies approval of the Aristarchan emendation (cf. *Gloss.*^L II Philox. IC: *icit: ... πλήττει*). The same glossographic purpose would appear to be served by Virgil’s replacement of prosodically unexceptionable *ferae* by *feri* in l. 51 (= the Horse): the masculine of the noun is a homograph of the imperative of the verb (*ferio*) that is an exact synonym of *ic(i)o* (cf. *Thes. Ling. Lat.* 7,1 col. 161,52 [s.v. *ic(i)o*]: “syn.: ... *ferire*”).

³¹ Cf. Wetmore 1979, 219.

³² A similarly “spectatorial” hint is already found in Aratus (778: *σκέπτεο*); there it occurs just before the acrostic to which Virgil alludes in *Georg.* I 429-433, where the latter’s surprising *Panopeae* is evidently a comparably “panoptic” clue (cf. n. 3 above).

nificant *sedes* in such brief compass is noteworthy.³³ Especially eye-catching is epitrite *circumspexit*, which generates a dispondaic clausula.³⁴ Other cases of such prompts to “look” for the acrostic will be instanced below. For present purposes one early passage may be cited which evinces two conveniently adjacent illustrations of this phenomenon. In *Eclogue IV aspice* opens verses 50 and 52. It will be argued elsewhere that these imperatives supply the penultimate and final “a”s of a deliberately aeschrologous acrostic: *cacata* (47-52).³⁵

Virgil has not merely prompted the reader to “look” for acrostical *ac[c]uso*: he has also embedded a specific hint to “look upward” when reading this particular acrostic. The *crimine* (65) that *ac[c]uso* glosses has been directly juxtaposed with *Danaum insidias*. According to the online *Library of Latin Texts* the particular collocation *Danaum insidias* is found nowhere else in the whole of Latin literature except precisely thirty lines earlier in this same book (II 36),³⁶ where this time it is directly juxtaposed with *suspectaque dona*. This juxtaposition of *insidias* and *suspecta* is noteworthy on grounds of both style³⁷ and se-

³³ While *conspectu* has been purposely employed to signify no more than mere *praesentia* (cf. *Gloss.*^L I Ansil. CO 1519), the ensuing “pléonasme” in *oculis ... circumspexit* is noted by Heuzé 1985, 542.

³⁴ Here the fifth foot is the only spondee in an otherwise holodactylic line, which is in turn the only *spondeiazon* in the whole book. With this Virgilian *circumspexit* Norden 1995, 446 n. 3 compares Aratus 297 (*περιπαπταίνοντες*) in similarly final *sedes*. One might add that Aratus’ very next line continues with *ἐπ’ αἰγιαλοῦς τετραμμένοι*: *αἰγιαλός* is regularly glossed as *litus* (cf. Loewe, Goetz 1899, 651), which Virgil is in turn accustomed to use in connection with acrostics (cf. n. 11 above).

³⁵ The first of these imperatives accordingly urges the reader to “look” at the first complete word (*caca*), while the second of them urges you to “look” at the completed acrostic (*cacata*). Three further points may be briefly made here. Firstly *cacare* certainly fits the afore-mentioned characteristic of acrostical *sermo humilis* (a further acrostic involving the same verb will be adduced in n. 147 below). Here a horizontal and necessarily euphemistic confirmation is provided indirectly by the last line’s (52) post-caesural *laetentur*, predicate of the *omnia* with which *cacata* agrees; for *laetare* “i. q. stercorare” cf. *Thes. Ling. Lat.* 7,2 col. 879,37-44 (s.v. 1. *laeto*). Secondly “shit” also fits the “ridiculousness” (so Thornton 1988, 226) of the technicoloured sheep in the immediately preceding lines (43-45). Thirdly and finally this political acrostic fits the acrostical cheek (*tu si es, ac[c]i[pe]*) of another *Eclogue* (VIII 6-13), which may likewise be addressed to Pollio. Attention will be drawn later (cf. n. 153 below) to a further passage where Pollio is the butt of similarly acrostical impertinence, which this time comes from Horace (*Carm.* II 1, 22-26: *nepia*).

³⁶ On both occasions the phrase occupies exactly the same *sedes* from *trihemimeres* to *hephthemimeres*, thereby precluding a 3rd-foot caesura and blurring the 2nd diaeresis through *ecthlipsis*.

³⁷ On the desirability of avoiding this cacophonous collocation of final and initial “s” cf. (e.g.) Quint., *Inst.* IX 4, 37. Further sigmatism is caused by the stem-initial “s” that marks both lexemes (*in-s ... -s / su-s ...*).

mantics.³⁸ The phrase *suspectaque* has been placed in precisely the same *sedes* as *et crimine*.³⁹ The purpose of this use of *suspicio* is evidently a cue to “look upwards”⁴⁰ in reading the acrostic that glosses *crimine*.⁴¹ Ambiguous *crimine* is accordingly glossed by “anabatically” acrostical *ac[c]uso*, which is in turn glossed by “anableptic” *suspecta*: such two-tier glossography is notable.

Such a hint to “look upward” when reading such an ascending acrostic can be paralleled elsewhere. Attention has already been called to an earlier example in connection with the scandently nuncupative acrostic in *Georgics* I (429-433: *ma-*, *ve-*, *pu-*), which is then followed by surprising *suspecti* (443) in same initial *sedes*.⁴² The same verb *suspiciere* would appear to be used in a similar way with reference to an unidentified acrostic in *Eclogue* IX between the one detected by Grishin (34-38) and the one identified at the start of the present article (51-54).⁴³ The acrostic at issue this time reads *dea Dio-* (46-51): it glosses *Dionaei* in its second line (47).⁴⁴ The first line of this acrostic asks: *quid antiquos signorum suspicis ortus?* On *signorum ... ortus* Clausen compares *Georgics* I 257,⁴⁵ where however the verb governing this collocation is significantly not *suspiciere*, but simple *speculari*. It might therefore be thought that in asking “Why do you look up?” Virgil is again indulging his taste for grammatical *espièglerie*: this acrostic is not to be read “up”, but “down”. Virgil does in fact use *despicere* in connection with acrostics that go “down”: one example is the

³⁸ Cf. (e.g.) Horsfall 2008, 75: “The exact relationship between *s[suspectaque] d[ona]* and *insidias* is not perfectly clear”.

³⁹ Both units constitute an *ionicus a maiore* that starts at the *hepthemimeres*.

⁴⁰ For this basic sense of the verb cf. *Oxf. Lat. Dict.*² 2084 (s.v. *suspicio*, 1a).

⁴¹ The line immediately before *suspecta* contains the syntagm *melior sententia* (35), whose noun shares both the metrical shape and *sedes* of *suspectaque*. One might therefore see here a subtextual reference to the gloss on *crimine*: if you “look up”, you will find the “better opinion / meaning”, viz. “accusation”, not “crime” (for these nuances of *sententia* cf. *Oxf. Lat. Dict.*² 1913-1914 [s.v., 1a and 7a]). A similar undertext concerning the alternative meanings of *crimine* might be thought to mark the last line of the same section: *scinditur incertum studia in contraria vulgus* (39). This sonorous *epiphonema* as to the fate of Troy would thus contain an archly hypotextual allusion to a philological quibble (for *studium* denoting “intellectual activity, esp. of a literary kind” cf. *Oxf. Lat. Dict.*² 2019 [s.v., 7a]).

⁴² Cf. n. 3 above. Exactly the same participial form (*suspectus*) is found in the passage of *Aen.* II currently at issue.

⁴³ Cf. n. 2 above.

⁴⁴ Servius’ comment on *Dionaei* is: *longe repetitum* (on l. 46). Virgil’s acrostical *dea Dio-* evidently alludes to *Il.* V 381: *Διώνη, διὰ θεάων* (the only passage where Homer mentions Dione). For Virgilian acrostics involving such a quinqueliteral word (*Dio/ne*) which is truncated after the third letter cf. n. 11 above. Virgil’s *Dionaei* is immediately preceded by line-initial *ecce*, which is regularly glossed as *ἰδοῦ* (cf. [e.g.] *Gloss.* III 147,18), which in turn glosses *aspice* (cf. *Gloss.* II 24,15), which is used by Virgil as a pointer to acrostics (cf. n. 35 above).

⁴⁵ Clausen 1994, 282.

similarly truncated *can/to* in *Eclogue II*.⁴⁶ In *Eclogue IX* a form of *spicere* that is “neither up nor down” (to quote the Duke-of-York nursery rhyme) then rounds off the series of acrostics constituted by *undis, dea Dio-* and *Ocni*. Significantly it is a line-initial imperative (57-58): *omnes, / aspice, ventosi ceciderunt murmuris aurae*. Here *aspice* is problematical:⁴⁷ you cannot “see” the “sound of wind”. If however *aspice* does not make meteorological sense, it does fit an acrostic admirably.⁴⁸

In *Aeneid II* the *suspecta* that glosses acrostical *ac[c]uso* which is itself a gloss on *crimine* is separated from this noun by thirty lines. Such “long-distance” glossography can likewise be paralleled elsewhere in Virgil. An earlier example may be cited that involves both an unidentified acrostic and an injunction to “look” at it. *Eclogue V* contains ascendantly acrostical *fes[s]i* (18-21),⁴⁹ which is corroborated by pre-caesural *fessis* (46).⁵⁰ The “third” line of this acrostic, when one reads upwards, ends with the phrase *successimus antro* (19).⁵¹ Exactly the same phrase (*antro succedere*) occurs in l. 6,⁵² where it is directly juxtaposed with *aspice*.⁵³ This *aspice* is evidently meant as a long-distance hint to “look” at the ensuing acrostic: the *antro succedere* juxtaposed with *aspice* (6) is then repeated within the space of the acrostic itself (19), just as in *Aeneid II* the *Danaum insidias* that was juxtaposed with *suspecta* (36) is then repeated within the acrostic *ac[c]uso* (65).

Three further instances of such a long-range gloss may be adduced that are earlier than the case at issue in *Aeneid II*: each of the three, which all involve etymology, comes from a different Virgilian work.⁵⁴ The first concerns the above-mentioned “dedicatory” acrostic at the start of *Eclogue VIII*: *tu si es,*

⁴⁶ Cf. n. 11 above. Here the section containing *can/to* begins with *despicere* in initial position (19): *despectus tibi sum* (as in l. 25, the acrostic itself is subtextually made to speak). A further instance of acrostical *despicere* will be adduced in n. 183 below.

⁴⁷ Cf. (e.g.) Serv. Auct. ad loc.

⁴⁸ Precisely the same lexical form (*aspice*) in the same initial *sedes* is employed twice in connection with an acrostic at *Ecl. IV* 50-52; cf. n. 35 above. The conundrum of “seeing the wind” is comparable to that of “seeing yourself in the sea” (*Ecl. II* 25; cf. n. 11 above): the solution to both brain-twisters is supplied by the respective acrostics.

⁴⁹ For the single “s” cf. n. 10 above.

⁵⁰ Horizontal *fessis* is located in the second line of Menalcas’ speech, just as the “P” of acrostical *fes[s]i* is placed in the correspondingly second line of Mopsus’ immediately preceding speech.

⁵¹ The prefix in *succedere* is the same as in *susplicere* (*Aen. II* 36): both of the pertinent acrostics go “up”.

⁵² No further instance of the syntagm *antro succedere* in all Latin is provided by the online *Library of Latin Texts*.

⁵³ This imperative is highlighted by its position immediately after the bucolic diaeresis.

⁵⁴ All three passages will be treated more fully elsewhere.

ac[c]i[pe] (6-13). The first line of acrostical *ac[c]i[pe]* (11) contains corroborative *accipe*, which is then picked up in similarly penultimate *sedes* in l. 39: *alter ab undecimo tum me iam acceperat annus*.⁵⁵ The correspondence is underlined by the oddly periphrastic specificity of *alter ab undecimo*: evidently the “next after the eleventh” is subtextually the next line after the eleventh one, which contained the afore-mentioned *accipe*. This “twelfth” line ends with *tempora circum*. The only earlier instance of this *iunctura* is found in the famous Lucretian passage on Hell’s imaginary torments from the end of his third book:⁵⁶ the Virgilian *tempora circum* is evidently due to Lucretius.⁵⁷ At the same time Virgil is using the Lucretian sense of both *tempora* and *circum* at the end of his “twelfth” line to provide a long-distance etymological gloss on the *annus* that similarly ends the line (39) beginning with *alter ab undecimo*: as Ateius Capito puts it,⁵⁸ *annum a circuitu temporis* (cf. Lucretian and Virgilian *tempora circum*) ... *quia* ... “an” pro “circum”.

The last two cases of long-range glossography may be treated more briefly. One involves a hitherto unrecognized acrostic shortly after *pu- ve- ma-* in Georgics I: both go “up”. This time the etymological acrostic is *Osci* (452-455),⁵⁹ which was regarded as one possible etymon of *obscenus*,⁶⁰ which Virgil duly employs in appropriately initial position in l. 470.⁶¹ The last of these instances of a gloss that is remote from the text it glosses occurs in the very first line of the second book of the *Aeneid* currently at issue. It will be argued more fully elsewhere that here “tricky”⁶² *ora tenebant* is in fact an etymological gloss on ensuing *Tenedos* (21) as *tenet*⁶³ *os*: “keeps quiet”.⁶⁴ Each of these three Vir-

⁵⁵ Such use of the collocation *annus accipit* is not attested anywhere else in all Latin literature according to the online *Library of Latin Texts*.

⁵⁶ III 1005-1006: *quod faciunt nobis annorum tempora, circum / cum redeunt*. Here *circum redire* is “kühn” (Heinze 1897, 189): it will have caught Virgil’s attention.

⁵⁷ Virgil’s modification of both the sense (“times” to “temples”) and the syntax (adverb to anastrophe preposition) to fit the new context is piquant.

⁵⁸ Ap. Macr. I 14, 5.

⁵⁹ The acrostic is framed by *videmus* (451) and *videbis* (455); for Virgil’s use of *videre* as a pointer to an acrostic cf. n. 7 above.

⁶⁰ Cf. Maltby 1991, 421, where the evidence assembled shows that the etymology of *obscenus* was a contemporary *zetema*. Again Virgil is using an acrostic to signal his own view; cf. n. 30 above.

⁶¹ This is Virgil’s first use of *obscenus*; it is also his only one outside the *Aeneid*. Here the acrostical etymon *Osci* shows that the correct reading in l. 470 is correspondingly masculine *obsceni*, not the variant *obscenae*.

⁶² So Horsfall 2008, 46.

⁶³ On “d” for “t” cf. Sommer, Pfister 1977, 202-203.

⁶⁴ The adjacent and problematic (cf. Horsfall 2008, 65) *notissima famā* is therefore an antiphrastic gloss. The same etymology would seem to shed light on the other two occurrences of

gilian references to Tenedos, which frame the Sinon episode, is positioned precisely five lines after hitherto unidentified acrostical matter.⁶⁵ Virgil's first mention of Tenedos takes the following form (21): *est in conspectu Tenedos*. This is not true.⁶⁶ If however Virgil's statement is a topographical untruth, it is subtextually true of an acrostic, which, like a well-behaved Victorian child, is "seen" (*in conspectu*), but "not heard" (*tenet os*). The point of Virgil's novel *jeu étymologique* on Tenedos is evidently "acrostical".

Virgil has employed not only a "long-distance" gloss like *suspecta* to draw the reader's attention to acrostical *ac[c]uso*: the lines that form this acrostic are themselves marked by language which serves as a hint. While on the whole this language is perfectly at home in its context, the vicinity of an acrostic naturally sensibilizes the reader to an additional "resonance" that has a certain appropriateness to the acrostic. Every line of *ac[c]uso* in fact contains such wording. The "first" line of this ascendant acrostic (61)⁶⁷ starts with *obtulerat* (in full: *se ... ultro / ... / obtulerat* [59-61]). In this final line (61) the acrostic subtextually "offers itself" to the reader. The collocation *ultro / obtul-* occurs in just one other Virgilian passage (*Aen.* VIII 611), where it likewise "ends" an acrostic.⁶⁸

Tenedos in Virgil, which are likewise *difficile*: *Aen.* II 203 (*a Tenedo tranquilla per alta*, but in the very same sentence Virgil speaks "as if the seas were mountainous" [Austin 1964, 103; on l. 207]) and II 255 (*a Tenedo tacitae per ... silentia lunae*, where *tacitae* is changed to *tectae* by Dietsch 1853, 22 and to *pelagi* by Baehrens 1885, 391). Here problematical *tranquilla* and *tacitae* are just etymological glosses ("quiet") on contiguous *Tenedos*; for such "coupling" as an etymological marker cf. Cairns 1996, 33 (= id. 2007, 317).

⁶⁵ The first mention of Tenedos (l. 21) occurs five lines after acrostical *idia* (13-16), which is exactly coextensive with Virgil's problematic account of the construction of the Trojan Horse from *abies*. It has been argued elsewhere that here Virgil is etymologizing *abies* from *abire* ("you will depart"); cf. Adkin 2011a. A separate paper will argue that the acrostic in question (*idia*) refers to this very "personal" interpretation (cf. Liddell, Scott, Jones 1996, 818 [s.v. ἰδιος, I,1: "personal"]). The second mention of Tenedos (l. 203) occurs five lines after the epiphonematic conclusion to the Sinon episode (195-198). The crucial phrase in this *epiphonema* is line-initial *credita res* (196), which picks up the two acrostics (*pithi* = *πειθερ*, 103-107 and 142-146) to be considered later in the present article (it may be noted that l. 103 [*pithi*] is exactly 100 lines before l. 203 [*Tenedos*]). The third and final mention of Tenedos (l. 255) occurs five lines after a twofold acrostic: upward *vino* (247-250; cf. *vino* in l. 265) and downward *siet* (243-246; cf. noteworthy *futuris* at the end of the last line [246], since Virgil generally avoids the substantive verb in such final *sedes* [cf. Norden 1995, 401]). If the morphological archaism of *siet* provides another illustration of the "non-standard" lexicon of Virgilian acrostics, objurgatory *vino* corrects Virgil's text itself by rebutting the view that "non moratur poeta in comissionibus Troianorum" (Heyne, Wagner 1832, 304 [on 250-253]; quoted with approval by Clausen 2002, 73 n. 69 [ib. "Virgil's pious Trojans"]). This final pair of acrostics will receive further treatment both below (cf. n. 114) and in a separate article.

⁶⁶ Tenedos is not in fact visible from the site of the Greek camp; cf. Della Corte 1972, 14.

⁶⁷ It gives the "last" letter of *ac[c]uso*.

⁶⁸ Viz. *tu das* (607-611). This acrostic will be treated more fully below (cf. n. 167).

Similarly the combination *ultra* / *offer*- is found on only one further occasion in Virgil, where it again marks the end of an acrostic.⁶⁹

In the present passage of *Aeneid* II the line that begins with *obtulerat* (61) ends with *in utrumque paratus*. This phrase has to be glossed repeatedly.⁷⁰ Here *utrumque* in the first line of the acrostic occupies precisely the same *sedes* before the fifth trochee as *crimine* in its last line. Since the acrostic clarifies which of “both” possible senses of *crimine* is meant, *utrumque* would seem to invite the reader to see in it a subtextual reference to “both” options. An exact parallel would appear to be supplied a mere dozen lines earlier by the strikingly homoeoteleutic *quidquid id est* at the start of l. 49, where the language suggests a hypotextual allusion to the “alternative” readings in the Homeric text at issue in the immediately ensuing acrostic.⁷¹ If *utrumque* points subtextually to “both” meanings of *crimine*, line-initial *hoc ipsum* (60)⁷² between *se ... ultra* and *obtulerat* would seem to provide hypotextual confirmation of the acrostic’s answer (*ac[c]uso*) to which of “both” is meant.⁷³ A similarly confirmative formula that is likewise positioned in initial *sedes* in the line immediately after an acrostic is found in a contemporary imitation by Horace of another Virgilian acrostic.⁷⁴

After *obtulerat* in the first line of acrostical *ac[c]uso* (61), each of its next three lines likewise includes a lexeme that evinces a similar “resonance” suitable to the acrostic:⁷⁵ *dolos* (62),⁷⁶ *visendi* (63),⁷⁷ *includere* (64).⁷⁸ The last line

⁶⁹ *Ecl.* III 66, where *offert ultra* is directly juxtaposed with *meus* and signals the end of an acrostical sequence consisting of upward *mei* (61-63) and downward *mea* (64-66). This early *Eclogue* in fact evinces an unusually large number of acrostics: similarly two-way *cis* (23-27), which etymologizes *vicissim* in final *sedes* in 28; *debui* (32-36), which glosses antithetically the *non ausim ... deponere* of its first line (32); *deni* (55-58; cf. corroboratory *decem* [71]); *petad* (78-82; on “d” for “t” cf. n. 63 above). Here *petat* is confirmed by *cornu petat* (87; cf. n. 18 above), which is significantly preceded by *Pollio* (cf. n. 35 above). All of these overlooked acrostics in *Eclogue* III will be discussed more fully elsewhere.

⁷⁰ Cf. *Gloss.*^L I Ansil. IN 2064 (*in utrumque: in alterutrum*; so *Gloss.*^L III Abol. IN 306); 2065 (*i. u. paratus: ad dubios eventus praeparatus*).

⁷¹ Cf. n. 30 above. The same undertext would seem to characterize the previous line’s remarkable use of *error* (48: *aut aliquis latet error*), which Servius is forced to gloss as follows: *id est dolus*. For *error* used with such “scribal” reference cf. *Thes. Ling. Lat.* 5,2 col. 817,56-57 (s.v.: “de errore scribentis”).

⁷² The inspecificity of this phrase prompts a puzzled gloss from Servius Auctus.

⁷³ For this “confirmatory” sense of *hoc ipsum* cf. *Oxf. Lat. Dict.*² 1061 (s.v. *ipse*, 8: “to emphasize identity”; esp. 8b: “freq. w. *hic ... is*”, citing *inter alia* the similarly substantiative use at *Ter., Eu.* 907-908: *an quia pudet? / – id ipsum*).

⁷⁴ Cf. n. 11 above, referring to Horace’s acrostical *sapis* (*Carm.* II 10, 13-17), which is immediately followed by confirmatory *sic erit* (18).

⁷⁵ While the first two of these items are placed in emphatically ante-caesural *sedes*, the third occupies the same 5th-foot *locus* as *crimine* in the next line.

of acrostical *ac[c]uso* (65) starts with *accipe*, which has to be glossed.⁷⁹ *Accipe* is further highlighted by anadiploic *derivatio* (64-65): *capto. / accipe*.⁸⁰ Just as *accipe* is immediately preceded by *capto*, it is also followed directly by *nunc*, which fits the start of an acrostic.⁸¹ Imperative *accipe* had moreover been employed already by Virgil in exactly the same lexical form as part of an acrostic accompanying the dedication to *Eclogue VIII*.⁸² If however the *accipe* of *Aeneid II 65* is a Virgilian self-reference to an earlier acrostic of his own, the *disce* in the same initial *sedes* in the very next line (66) would seem to be a reference to an acrostic of his friend Horace.⁸³

Disce as gamma-acrostic is found in the first book of Horace's *Odes*.⁸⁴ Fresh evidence regarding this Horatian acrostic itself will be adduced in a future article.⁸⁵ Here the pertinence of this *Ode*'s acrostic to Virgil's own acrostic in *Aeneid II 61-65* may be considered. Horace's horizontal *disce* at the start of l. 11

⁷⁶ For the use of *dolus* in an acrostic cf. *Ecl.* VI 23 (with n. 7 above).

⁷⁷ *Viso* was duly recognized as the desiderative of *video* (cf. Adkin 2005, 96), which in turn was regularly employed in connection with acrostics; cf. nn. 7 and 59 above.

⁷⁸ For *ludere* with reference to acrostics cf. *Ecl.* I 10 (with n. 6 above); *Ecl.* VI 19 (with n. 7 above); *Aen.* IX 634 (with n. 18 above; here *inlude* with confirmatorily line-initial *traicit*). The unassimilated orthography (*inludo*) helps to point the reference, as in *Aen.* II 64, where this verb requires a gloss (cf. *Gloss.*^L I Ansil. IN 1030: *inludere: insultare*).

⁷⁹ Cf. *Gloss.*^L II Arma A 100: *accipe: agnosce*.

⁸⁰ On the figure of *derivatio* cf. Lausberg 2008, 328 ("die etymologisierende Stammwiederholung"). *Accipere* had been duly etymologized from *capere* by Varro (*L.* VII 90); this etymology is missing from both Maltby 1991 and Marangoni 2007.

⁸¹ For *nunc* "introducing a fresh topic" cf. *Oxf. Lat. Dict.*² 1326 (s.v., 9c). *Nunc* similarly "introduces" an acrostic in Hor., *Carm.* I 37, 1-5, where acrostical *pota* is both imperative (cf. l. 1: *est bibendum*) and adjective (cf. l. 12: *ebria*).

⁸² VIII 11-13: *ac[c]i[pe]*, with confirmatory *accipe* (l. 11); cf. n. 11 above.

⁸³ Since Virgil's *disce* starts an "unfinished" line that stops at the *trihemimeres*, he evidently attached importance to this word, which is noteworthy enough to necessitate a gloss: cf. *Thes. Ling. Lat.* 5,1,2 col. 1332,51 (s.v.: "i. intellege").

⁸⁴ I 18, 11-15. On this acrostic cf. Morgan 1993.

⁸⁵ For the moment three points may be briefly made. Firstly Horace's horizontal *disce* (l. 11) is immediately followed by "oddly unspecific" (Nisbet, Hubbard 1970, 234) *avidi*, which does however match *invideo* (*Ecl.* I 11) in same pre-caesural *sedes* in same eleventh line, since *avidus*, like *invideo* (cf. n. 6 above), was etymologized from *video* (cf. Maltby 1991, 66-67); both of these lexemes are also directly juxtaposed with *non ego* (cf. n. 6 above). Secondly Horace's line-initial *cornu* (14) was regularly used with reference to acrostics (cf. nn. 18 and 69 above): so *tene ... / cornu* (13-14) = subtextually "grasp mentally" (cf. *Oxf. Lat. Dict.*² 2117 [s.v. *teneo*, 23a]) the edge". Thirdly the *vitrum* of *perlucidior vitro* (16) was etymologized from *visus* (cf. Maltby 1991, 650), which was in turn regarded as the etymon of *video* (cf. Maltby 1991, 644), which can be shown to have been commonly used in acrostics; cf. nn. 7 and 59 above. The point may also be made that this *Ode* is evidently addressed to Alfenus Varus (cf. Nisbet, Hubbard 1970, 227), who significantly is likewise named in connection with acrostics at *Ecl.* VI 6-12 (cf. n. 7 above) and *Ecl.* IX 26-29 (cf. n. 2 above).

constitutes the first five letters of decemlitteral *discernunt*. *Discernere* is a *compositum* of *cernere*,⁸⁶ of which the past participle is *certus*,⁸⁷ which is in turn the etymon of *certare*.⁸⁸ It is therefore noteworthy that Virgil should employ both *certae* and *certant* in the middle of ll. 62 and 64 respectively.⁸⁹ Here the employment of *certare* is surprising.⁹⁰ This use of *certant* is evidently due to the etymological link with foregoing *certae*.⁹¹ The same line that contains post-caesural *certant* ends with *capto*, which recurs shortly afterwards in exactly the same form in the same emphatically final *sedes* (75). This time *capto* is vertically juxtaposed with *cretus* (74),⁹² which besides *certus* is the other past participle of *cernere*.⁹³ On its first occurrence *capto* is similarly linked to *crimine* at the end of the contiguous line (65), which is exactly ten lines from the one similarly ending with *cretus* (74). *Cernere* had recently been posited by Varro (*L. VI* 81) as the etymon of *discrimen*, which could be regarded as just a *compositum* of *crimen*. It would seem therefore that Virgil is here suggesting very subtly that this same *cernere* is likewise the etymon of the noun whose meaning is the subject of the first acrostic in the Sinon episode: *crimen*.

The next acrostics to be considered in this episode form a pair. The *Trugrede* that constitutes the third section of the quadripartite speech which Sinon then proceeds to deliver is framed by acrostical *pithi*,⁹⁴ which goes both upwards (103-107) and downwards (142-146).⁹⁵ The source of this unidentified pair of acrostics is the *Odyssey*, where the same verb *πείθειν* is used twice ap-
 ropos of Penelope's web in the unusual sense of "jem.n ... *bereden* (etw. zu

⁸⁶ Cf. *Thes. Ling. Lat.* 5,1,2 col. 1296,12 (s.v. *discerno*). For Virgil's use of *cernere* in connection with an acrostic cf. *Ecl.* I 9 (with n. 6 above).

⁸⁷ Cf. *Thes. Ling. Lat.* 3 col. 899,58 (s.v. *certus*).

⁸⁸ Cf. *Thes. Ling. Lat.* 3 col. 891,65 (s.v. 2. *certo*).

⁸⁹ These two virtual homophones articulate the structure of the acrostic: they enclose its central line, while each is also one line from its beginning and end respectively.

⁹⁰ Cf. most recently Horsfall 2008, 99, who is clearly unsure of the word's reference: "The picture seems to be that of Trojans competing for the wittiest ... insult".

⁹¹ *Certus* itself is highly appropriate to an acrostical context, since it confirms that the acrostic is "certain"; cf. *Oxf. Lat. Dict.*² 334 (s.v., 4a: "about which there is no doubt, certain, indisputable"). For similarly "confirmatory" use of *certus* in an acrostic cf. *certissimus auctor* at the end of *Georg.* I 432. It will be argued elsewhere that *quarto* at the end of the first hemistich in the same line is a subtextual allusion to the "four" nuncupatory clues, viz. *pu-*, *ve-*, *ma-* with *virgineum* (430), which together make the author "most certain", i.e. Virgil.

⁹² Here *cretus* has to be glossed by Servius.

⁹³ *Cretus* is the participle of both *crescere* and *cernere*.

⁹⁴ = *πείθει* ("he persuades"). On the digraph "th" for "θ" in 1st c. BC cf. Allen 1978, 26-27; on the contemporaneous graphy "ι" for "ει" cf. Allen 1987, 69-75.

⁹⁵ The similarly twofold acrostic at *Ecl.* VI 14-24 likewise first goes up, then down (cf. n. 7 above).

tun) od. ... von e. Sachverhalt *überzeugen*, Konnot. von List, Täuschung”:⁹⁶ ἔληθε (sc. Penelope) δόλω καὶ ἔπειθεν Ἀχαιοῦς. This line is employed conspicuously at the very beginning and end of the *Odyssey*: II 106 and XXIV 141. These line-numbers correspond exactly with the start of Virgil’s two *pithi*-acrostics: II 106 and 141.⁹⁷ Such stichometric correlation has been identified elsewhere.⁹⁸ Here the twofold numerical correspondence is decisive proof that Virgil’s pair of acrostics are a deliberate imitation of the *Odyssey*.⁹⁹

This acrostical imitation would seem to have a number of consequences for the interpretation of Virgil’s treatment of the Sinon episode: three points may be made. In the first place Sinon is being implicitly compared to Penelope. Secondly the start of the penultimate line in each of these acrostics exculpates the Trojans: here Aeneas’ narrative shifts responsibility to his fellow-Trojans’ ignorance (106: *ignari*) and to Sinon’s tears (145: *his lacrimis*).¹⁰⁰ Acrostical *pithi* on the other hand puts the blame firmly on the Trojans themselves: they allowed themselves to be “deceived”.¹⁰¹ While thirdly a direct horizontal confirmation of the acrostic is precluded by its use of Greek as well as by its disapprobatory import, an indirect signal is provided in the last sentence of the Sinon episode:¹⁰² *credita res* (196).¹⁰³ Unlike however the pair of *pithi*-acrostics, *credita res* instead evinces an extenuatingly impersonal form.

⁹⁶ So *Lex. frühgr. Epos* 3,2 col. 1100 (s.v.: B I, 2).

⁹⁷ In the first of the *Odyssean* texts the book-number tallies as well: II 106. This series of correspondences proves that *Aen.* II 76, which is defended by (e.g.) Henry 1878, 58-64, is in fact an interpolation: hence ll. 107 and 142 in modern edd. of *Aen.* II should be 106 and 141.

⁹⁸ Cf. Morgan 1999, 223-229, where it is argued that *Georg.* IV 401 (= 400) matches *Od.* IV 400. Morgan’s case is corroborated by the Virgilian *pithi*. He observes that stichometrical marks tended to occur every 100 lines: “106” is very near such a mark (“102”, which is the “start” of Virgil’s acrostic, is even nearer; moreover it is the very first “100” that is at issue).

⁹⁹ The words on either side of Homer’s ἔπειθεν (viz. δόλω and Ἀχαιοῦς) would also appear to have influenced Virgil’s language at the beginning and end of his first acrostic. When this *pithi* is read upwards, the very next word at the end of l. 102 is, as in Homer, *Achivos* (for Virgilian *Achivos* as etymologically identical with Homer’s similarly line-end Ἀχαιοῦς cf. Adkin 2006, 463). In the same acrostic’s “last” line (107) the antepenultimate word is *ficto*, which renders Homeric δόλω (cf. *Thes. Ling. Lat.* 6,1 col. 780,25-26 [s.v. *fungo*]).

¹⁰⁰ In the latter passage (*his lacrimis vitam damus*) it would seem that those commentators (e.g. Horsfall 2008, 147-148) who make *lacrimis* indirect object of *damus* are wrong. The parallel with the matching acrostic would appear to indicate that here *lacrimis* is instead ablative of cause.

¹⁰¹ For another case in which the acrostic offers a similarly inculpatory corrective to the Virgilian text cf. n. 65 above.

¹⁰² The first sentence of this episode ring-compositionally starts the first acrostic (61: *ac[c]uso*). Horsfall 2008, xv identifies two “clear divisions” of the episode (104 and 144): each comes immediately after the third line of each *pithi*-acrostic.

The first *pithi* resembles *ac[c]uso* in being an ascendant acrostic. Again Virgil has here embedded a long-distance clue to read “up”, which again involves the repetition of notable vocabulary.¹⁰⁴ The central line of *pithi* (105) contains *scitari* in emphatically central *locus* at the start of the second hemistich. This verb occurs nowhere else in the whole of Virgil except just a decad of lines later (114) in exactly the same post-caesural *sedes*:¹⁰⁵ *suspensi Eurypyllum scitatum oracula Phoebi / mittimus*. This time *scitari* is juxtaposed with line-initial *suspensi*, which requires a gloss from Servius. Here this participle would seem to hint at the “upward” acrostic accompanying the first use of *scitari*, since *suspendo* is a *compositum* of *pendo* (“hang”) and *sub-*, which is used to denote “movement from below”.¹⁰⁶ *Suspendo* would already appear to have been employed by Virgil as such a cue to an “upward” acrostic.¹⁰⁷ A similarly acrostical dimension would seem to mark the adjacent *Eurypyllum*¹⁰⁸ and *oracula*.¹⁰⁹

A further long-range clue to this pair of *pithi*-acrostics is located in a distich that with notable equidistance is exactly twenty lines from the end of each of them (126-127): *bis quinos silet ille dies tectusque recusat / prodere voce sua ...*. The collocation *bis quini* is never used anywhere else in Virgil (or in any

¹⁰³ For *credo* = *πειθομαι* cf. *Gloss.* II 390,2. While *credita res* is placed at the start of the second line after the end of Sinon’s last speech, the second *pithi*-acrostic similarly ends in the second line after the end of Sinon’s penultimate speech (146).

¹⁰⁴ In the case of *ac[c]uso* Virgil had repeated *Danaum insidias*, which was juxtaposed with “analeptic” *suspecta* (36).

¹⁰⁵ On this rare lexeme cf. Austin 1964, 67: “Virgil seems to have introduced this verb into elevated poetry; ... later epic avoids it altogether”. Both Virgilian instances have to be glossed by Servius as *inquirere*.

¹⁰⁶ So *Oxf. Lat. Dict.*²2023 (s.v. *sub-*, prefix).

¹⁰⁷ It will be argued elsewhere that in *Georg.* IV 307 *suspendat* points to the unidentified “upward” acrostic *ped-* (312-314), which in turn glosses line-initial *trunca pedum* (310), to which this “truncated” acrostic (cf. n. 11 above) supplies a wittily verbal counterpart.

¹⁰⁸ Cf. Austin 1964, 69 (ad loc.): “Eurypylos is probably the man named in *Il.* II 736”. It is therefore noteworthy that “Eurypylos” is there enclosed by *λευκά* in the immediately foregoing line (735) and by *λευκήν* at the “edge” of l. 739: there is no other occurrence whatsoever of *λευκός* in the whole of the 400-line “Catalogue”. Presumably therefore in the acrostical context of the corresponding passage of the *Aeneid* Virgil will have had in mind the famous *λευκή*-acrostic at the start of the *Iliad*’s last book (XXIV 1-5), which also inspired Aratus’ *λεπτή*-acrostic (783-787; cf. n. 3 above). It may be noted that these Virgilian allusions to the second and twenty-fourth books of the *Iliad* match his similar allusions to the second and twenty-fourth books of the *Odyssey* in connection with his adjacent *pithi*-acrostics.

¹⁰⁹ *Oraculum* was etymologized from *oras* (“you pray”; cf. Maltby 1991, 432), which is a homograph of *oras* (“edges”; for Virgil’s use of this word with reference to acrostics cf. n. 14 above). Here the Virgilian *scitatum oracula* could accordingly be felt as a subtextual invitation “to search out the edges”, i.e. the acrostics. For Virgil’s sensitivity to such philological nuances in the immediately ensuing passage (116-121) cf. Adkin 2011b, esp. 599 n. 45.

contemporary whatever).¹¹⁰ *Decem* on the other hand is employed by Virgil on no fewer than five occasions. It would seem therefore that otherwise inexplicable *bis quinos* is a subtextual pointer to the “two quinqueliteral” *pithi*-acrostics,¹¹¹ which are acrostically “silent” (*silet*).¹¹² Such arithmetical clues to an acrostic can be shown to occur elsewhere. Two examples may be cited here. The first is found shortly after the Sinon episode: in ll. 242-243 twofold *quater*¹¹³ introduces the twofold quadriliteral acrostics *siet* and *vino*.¹¹⁴ The other instance of such a numerical hint, which this time is from an earlier Virgilian work, resembles *bis quinos* in being positioned exactly twenty lines from the text to which it refers. *Georgics* I 410-411 imitate Aratus 1004: however Virgil has replaced Aratean *δισσάκις* with *ter ... / aut quater*. His purpose is evidently an allusion to the “threefold” onomastic *pu- ve- ma-* (429-433), supplemented by “quaternal” *virgineum* (430), which is located precisely twenty lines after *quater* (411).¹¹⁵

If the clause beginning with *bis quinos* is a clue to twofold *pithi*, the very next clause (126-127) would appear to contain further hints. The first word of this second clause is a notorious crux: *tectus*.¹¹⁶ It would seem that *tectus* is in fact a subtextual reference to acrostical “secretiveness”.¹¹⁷ *Prodere* in initial *sedes* in the next line (127) likewise has hypotextual germaneness to acrostics.¹¹⁸ Adjacent *voce sua* is moreover qualified by the most recent commentator as “startlingly pointless”.¹¹⁹ the phrase does however fit a “silent” acrostic. If this clause that immediately follows *bis quinos ...* can accordingly be shown

¹¹⁰ *Bis quini* has to be explained as *decem*; cf. *Gloss.*^L I Ansil. BI 140.

¹¹¹ Like the acrostics, *bis quinos* occupies initial position.

¹¹² For the semantic associations of ensuing *dies* cf. Maltby 1991, 187 (s.v.), where this word is etymologized from *deus*, which in turn was etymologized from *θεᾶσθαι* (cf. Maltby 1991, 185): *θεᾶσθαι* itself glosses *aspice* (*Gloss.* II 24,15), which Virgil employs twice over (*Ecl.* IV 50 and 52) in order to draw attention to one and the same acrostic (cf. n. 35 above).

¹¹³ The first *quater* is glossed by Servius as simply *saepius*.

¹¹⁴ Cf. n. 65 above.

¹¹⁵ Cf. also *quarto* in l. 432. For Virgil’s imitation of Aratus throughout this passage cf. nn. 3 and 91 above.

¹¹⁶ “The enigmatic *tectus*” ... “has puzzled commentators ancient and modern” (so Russell 1973, 818). Russell’s own interpretation as a reference to a veiled Agamemnon at the sacrifice of Iphigenia is rejected by Horsfall 2008, 139. Multiple attempts at elucidation had been made by Servius Auctus.

¹¹⁷ Cf. *Oxf. Lat. Dict.*² 2105 (s.v. *tectus*, 2b: “secretive [... of speech, etc.]”). Both Austin 1964, 72 and Horsfall 2008, 139 compare *Aen.* VII 600: *saepsit se tectis*. They both fail to note that this hemistich significantly comes immediately before acrostical *Mars has* (601-607; cf. n. 4 above).

¹¹⁸ Cf. *Oxf. Lat. Dict.*² 1620 (s.v., 8a: “to reveal the existence of”).

¹¹⁹ Horsfall 2008, 139.

to have subtextual relevance to acrostics, the same would also appear to be true of the immediately preceding sentence (124-125): *mihi iam multi crudele canebant / artificis scelus et taciti ventura videbant*. These lines are another problem, since the combination of *canebant* and *taciti* is *contrarium*.¹²⁰ Again the solution would appear to be the subtextually acrostical reference of these words: acrostics do “sing silent”. The further point may be made that here the collocation *taciti ... videbant* (125) would appear to evoke the same acrostically appurtenant crisis of “silence” and “visibility” found earlier in the unveracious *est in conspectu Tenedos (= tenet os)*.¹²¹

Besides such “long-distance” glosses, the lines that make up the *pithi*-acrostics are themselves characterized by phraseology with a certain “resonance” that is conferred by the acrostics and that in turn serves as a pointer to them: the same was true of acrostical *ac[c]uso*. The first sentence of the first *pithi*-acrostic reads as follows (101-103): *sed quid ego haec autem nequiquam ingrata revolve, / quidve moror, si omnis uno ordine habetis Achivos, / idque audire sat est*.¹²² At the end of the first of these lines (101) *revolve* means “go back over”,¹²³ which fits the “backward” acrostic *pithi* that is separated by only a single versicle. In the next line (102) the collocation *uno ordine*¹²⁴ with its noteworthy stress on deprecable *uno* might be taken as a subtextual hint at the “twofold” *pithi*-acrostic.¹²⁵ Similarly in the last of these three verses (103), which starts the acrostic itself, the phrase *idque audire*, whose reference is unclear,¹²⁶ implies a contrast to the “seeing” associated with acrostics.¹²⁷ in this

¹²⁰ So Servius (on 124).

¹²¹ *Aen.* II 21. Cf. n. 66 above. Finally mention may be briefly made of another passage with similarly subtextual reference to the *pithi*-acrostics. This one occurs in ll. 157-159 a mere dozen lines after second *pithi*: *fas mihi Graiorum* (cf. Greek *pithi*) *sacrata resolvere* (for simplex *solvere* in an acrostic cf. n. 7 above) *iura, / fas ... omnia ferre sub auras (= sub divum [Gloss.¹ I Ansil. SU 46], used in Hor., Carm. I 18, 13; on this acrostical intertext cf. n. 83 above), / si qua tegunt* (cf. ambivalent *tectus* in l. 126).

¹²² This punctuation (so [e.g.] Ussani 1952, 53), which links *si ... est* to what precedes rather than to what follows, is to be preferred, since it gives greater prominence to acrostically significant *uno ordine* and *audire sat*.

¹²³ So *Oxf. Lat. Dict.*² 1818 (s.v., 2c). Horsfall 2008, 124 (ad loc.) observes: “Apparently first thus here; the image of winding back a roll to some extent present”.

¹²⁴ Cf. Lenaz 1987, 880: this syntagm “innova rispetto al comune *eodem loco*”.

¹²⁵ For the basic meaning of *ordo* as the acrostically appropriate “a line of things placed next to each other” cf. *Oxf. Lat. Dict.*² 1394 (s.v., 1a); for the word’s particular application to letters of the alphabet cf. *Thes. Ling. Lat.* 7,2,2 col. 1517,48-51 (s.v. *littera*).

¹²⁶ Cf. Austin 1964, 66-67.

¹²⁷ For *verba videndi* in connection with acrostics cf. n. 77 above. For *audire* as the “oppositum” of verbs meaning “to see” cf. *Thes. Ling. Lat.* 2 col. 1292,2 and 4 (s.v. *audio*). This application of *audire* shows that commentators who think it here means “to be called” (so [e.g.]

context of “seeable” acrostics, “hearing” is *not* “enough” (*sat*). In the same line the next sentence starts at the *penthemimeres* with *iam*, which like *nunc*¹²⁸ suits the beginning of an acrostic. The next line (104) starts with *hoc Ithacus velit*. Here *hoc*, which is part of the acrostic, could be seen as a subtextual reference to *pithi* itself: this “persuasion” is just what Odysseus would want from his cousin Sinon.¹²⁹ At the end of the acrostic’s penultimate line (106) the syntagm *artisque Pelasgae* (“Greek artistry”)¹³⁰ fits a “Greek” acrostic.¹³¹ The acrostic’s final line is then framed by a pair of lexemes with similarly acrostical “resonance”. This line begins with noteworthy *prosequitur*.¹³² *Prosequi* can bear the acrostically appropriate meaning “to follow (with the eyes)”,¹³³ which is also shared by the simplex *sequi*.¹³⁴ Virgil in fact evinces a certain propensity to employ *sequi* and its compounds in the last line of an acrostic. Here four instances may be adduced: *Eclogue* III 58,¹³⁵ *Georgics* I 439,¹³⁶ *Aeneid* IV 361,¹³⁷ *Aeneid* IV 421.¹³⁸ If *prosequitur* occupies the initial position in the last line of

Jordan 1999, 38) are wrong. On further possible “resonances” of *audire* and other words in this passage cf. Adkin 2011c, 160-164. Such polyvalence is typically Virgilian.

¹²⁸ Cf. n. 81 above.

¹²⁹ It is also just what Odysseus would want from his wife Penelope, who is the original referent of *pithi*.

¹³⁰ So *Oxf. Lat. Dict.*² 192 (s.v. *ars*, 8a).

¹³¹ Line-initial and acrostic-forming *ignari* would then evoke the sense of “unaware (of)”; cf. *Oxf. Lat. Dict.*² 903 (s.v., 1).

¹³² Cf. Sabbadini 1905, 52 (ad loc.): “In questo uso assoluto si trova (sc. *prosequitur*) qui solamente”. Servius Auctus comments: *mire*. The word, which “ends” the acrostic, is further highlighted by asyndeton.

¹³³ So *Oxf. Lat. Dict.*² 1650 (s.v., 1c).

¹³⁴ So *Oxf. Lat. Dict.*² 1920 (s.v., 18b).

¹³⁵ Cf. n. 69 above.

¹³⁶ It will be argued elsewhere that ll. 439-443 contain the hitherto unrecognized “upward” acrostic *scies*, which starts with the initial “s” of *suspecti (tibi sint; 443)*; for the combination of these two verbs as conversational idiom cf. (e.g.) Plaut., *Bac.* 1023 (*em specta, tum scies*).

¹³⁷ The acrostic at issue here will be treated below (cf. n. 157).

¹³⁸ A future article will argue that ll. 421-424 exhibit the unidentified ascendant acrostic *iste*, which glosses *ille* (= Aeneas) at the end of l. 421. A number of points may be briefly made here. This acrostic’s “last” line (421) starts with *exsequere*, which picks up *exsequitur* (396), which is directly juxtaposed with *classemque revisit*, about which Conington, Nettleship 1884, 291 note with puzzlement: “It does not appear that Aeneas had been to the fleet before”. It would seem therefore that here we have another “long-distance” hint, which this time prompts the reader “to take another look at” (*Oxf. Lat. Dict.*² 1816 [s.v. *reviso*, 2d]) the “upward” acrostic “ending” with *exsequere*. The meaning of this acrostical *iste* is “That person ... (that you ... have)” (so *Oxf. Lat. Dict.*² 1068 [s.v., 5a]; cf. 5b: “often w. contemptuous or derogatory connotation” and *Thes. Ling. Lat.* 7,2,1 col. 494,36 [s.v.]: “[vox] quodammodo sermonis cotidiani propria fuisse videtur” [on acrostical *Umgangssprache* cf. n. 35 above]). Here the acrostic would seem to elucidate the lines it spans (“un grosso problema” [D’Anna 1984, 180]), which deal with Aeneas’ problematic rela-

the first *pithi*-acrostic (107), this line ends with *pectus*,¹³⁹ which was etymologized from *aspectus*.¹⁴⁰ The whole of this first *pithi*-acrostic is accordingly framed by an acrostically “resonant” pair: *audire* at the start of its first line (103) and (*as*)*pectus* at the end of its last one (107).

The lines of the second *pithi*-acrostic (142-146) likewise contain wording with acrostical “resonance”. Here the line-initial words that make up the acrostic itself also evince a certain parallelism with the corresponding lexemes in the first *pithi*: *per* (142) ~ *pro*[*sequitur*] (107),¹⁴¹ *intemerata* (143) ~ *ignari* (106),¹⁴² *tantum* (144) ~ *tum* (105),¹⁴³ *his* (145) ~ *hoc* (104),¹⁴⁴ *ipse* (146) ~ *id* (103).¹⁴⁵ The first of these lexemes in the second *pithi* (*per*: 142) is immediately preceded by *conscia ... veri* (141). Here *veri*, which is the very last word before the acrostic, invites interpretation as a subtextual reference to the acrostically told “truth”: “he deceives them”. *Veri* in turn depends on *conscia*, whose basic sense of “sharing knowledge (esp. secret knowledge)”¹⁴⁶ makes it highly appropriate to an acrostic context. Such “acrostical” use of *conscius* can be paralleled elsewhere.¹⁴⁷ If acrostically “resonant” *conscius* marks the beginning of

tionship with Dido’s sister Anna. Evidently more is involved here than “that Anna had acted as a go-between” (Pease 1935, 351 [on 421]). Dido’s acrostical *iste* (= “That person ... that you [= Anna] ... have”) indicates that Anna and Aeneas are lovers.

¹³⁹ The word has to be glossed by Servius: *pectus pro verbis posuit*.

¹⁴⁰ Cf. Maltby 1991, 458. No fewer than ten examples of the *jeu étymologique* on *pectus* and *aspectus* are adduced by Michalopoulos 2001, 140, who also cites a Plautine variant (*Trin.* 81-82) involving *susplicere*, which is highly pertinent to the “upwards” acrostic currently at issue.

¹⁴¹ These particles are related etymologically; cf. Walde, Hofmann 2007, 364 (s.v. 2. *pro*). The *per* (142), which starts the acrostic, is highlighted by *attractio inversa*; cf. Forbiger 1873, 198 (“quasi absolute posita”).

¹⁴² *Ignarus* = *in* + *gnarus*. *Intemerata*, which needs no fewer than four glosses at *Gloss.*^L I Ansil. IN 1702-1704, is a Virgilian neologism (so Norden 1995, 332).

¹⁴³ These words are linked etymologically; cf. Walde-Hofmann 2007, 646 (s.v. *tam*).

¹⁴⁴ *His lacrimis* (145) has to be glossed as *istiusmodi fletibus* at *Gloss.*^L I Ansil. HI 217.

¹⁴⁵ *Ipse* is just *is* + *pse*.

¹⁴⁶ So *Oxf. Lat. Dict.*² 451 (s.v., 1a).

¹⁴⁷ At *Aen.* XI 812 *conscius* is problematical: *conscius audacis facti* (sc. *lupus*; “an unconvincing carnivore in inner crisis” [Horsfall 2003, 432]). In this passage Virgil is imitating *Il.* XV 586: ἔτρεσε θηρὶ κακὸν ῥέξαντι ἐοικώς. An article entitled “Some Acrostic Shit in *Aeneid* XI” will argue that Virgil is echoing Homer’s κακὸν in an acrostic (*Il.* 808-811), which takes the form of a hair-raising homonym: *caco* (“I shit”). *Conscius* at the start of the next line (812) accordingly alludes to this acrostic: the “audacious deed” (*conscius audacis facti*) is just a (fear-induced; cf. *metu* [807]) crap. This acrostic is then corroborated by the *Acca* (anagrammatically *Caca*) episode (820-827), which is exactly coextensive with a diglot acrostic: ascending *cacat* (“she shits” [820-824]; for “q” = “c” cf. *Thes. Ling. Lat.* 3 col. 1,39-44 [s.v. “c”]; for the widespread view that “h” does not count as a “letter” cf. *Thes. Ling. Lat.* 6,3 col. 2391,26-55 [s.v. “h”]), followed by the descending and exactly synonymous (cf. Loewe, Goetz 1899, 159) *cesi* = χέζει (824-827; for “c” = “χ” cf. *Thes. Ling. Lat.* 3 col. 1,36-38 [s.v. “c”]; for “s” = “ζ” cf. *Oxf.*

the second *pithi*, the end of the same acrostic evinces language of similar pregnancy. The penultimate line (145) ends with *ultra*, which Virgil tends to avoid in such final position.¹⁴⁸ Since *ultra* was regularly etymologized from *ultra*,¹⁴⁹ here this adverb could be taken as a hypotextual hint that there is one more line of acrostic “farther on”.¹⁵⁰ In the acrostic’s last line (146) the first hemistich is framed by the collocation *ipse ... primus*, which is “very rare”.¹⁵¹ *Primus* tends to be used by Virgil in connection with acrostics.¹⁵² In this second *pithi*-acrostic *primus* draws attention to this line’s “first” letter, which is *ipse*’s “i”, which corresponds to the “i” of etymologically identical *id* in the first *pithi*’s “first” line (103), which in this ascendant acrostic has to be read last: this *primus* in the last acrostic’s last line is accordingly a typically subtle and scampish pointer to the first acrostic’s first line.

Since *pithi* is a Greek acrostic in a Latin text, this noteworthy phenomenon would appear to deserve brief exemplification from other Virgilian texts, all of which will be treated more fully elsewhere. Discussion may however begin with a previously mentioned acrostic in his friend Horace:¹⁵³ it will be argued elsewhere that unidentified *nepia* (*Carm.* II 1, 22-26) resembles Virgil’s *pithi* in imitating an early book of the *Odyssey*.¹⁵⁴ A parallel of Virgil’s own to *pithi* is

*Lat. Dict.*² 2343 [s.v. “z”]). Just as the “t” that “ends” *cacat* (820) is positioned exactly ten lines after the “o” that ends *caco* (811), so the pivotal “c” of *cacat / cesi* (824) is positioned exactly ten lines before horizontally corroborative *deiecta* (833), which unlike impermissibly aeschrologous *cacata* is decorously double-sensed; for *deicio* = “to evacuate (through the bowels)” cf. *Oxf. Lat. Dict.*² 554 (s.v., 3a). Acrostical *cacata* had already been employed by Virgil in pastoral (viz. *Ecl.* IV 47-52; cf. n. 35 above), where the unmentionable verb had likewise been glossed horizontally by similarly amphibolous *laetentur* (52). For similar smut in exalted epic cf. *Aen.* VI 406 (*aperit ramum qui veste latebat*; cf. the puzzled comment of Austin 1977, 148: “Here it is the Sibyl who carries the Bough; in 636 it is Aeneas who has it”). A future article will argue that here *ramus* is being used with similar equivocality (“He exposes his ‘branch and berries’ that were hidden in his clothes”); for *ramus* = “penis” cf. *Oxf. Lat. Dict.*² 1732 (s.v., 2b). In these words Austin 1977, 148 sees only “high drama” (recently repeated verbatim by Johnston 2012, 61): it needs to be pointed out that the “high drama” is impishly undercut by low porno.

¹⁴⁸ Cf. Norden 1995, 401. In the present case *ultra* requires explanation by Servius.

¹⁴⁹ Cf. Adkin 2008, 277; Adkin 2009a, 56; Adkin 2010, 491.

¹⁵⁰ Cf. *Oxf. Lat. Dict.*² 2299 (s.v. *ultra*¹, 1b: “to a point beyond, farther on”).

¹⁵¹ So Horsfall 2008, 148.

¹⁵² Cf. (e.g.) *Georg.* II 44 (cf. n. 16 above); *Aen.* VII 603 (cf. n. 4 above). *Πρῶτον* had likewise been employed by Aratus in l. 778 (cf. n. 32 above). In all of these four cases “first” is placed at the main caesura. In the present instance *primus* is highlighted by nearly homonymous *Priamus* in same *sedes* in the next line (147).

¹⁵³ Cf. n. 35 above.

¹⁵⁴ Viz. line-end *νήπια βάζεις* at *Od.* IV 32. Horace’s *nepia* receives etymologizing corroboration from *nepotes* at the end of the next line (27), since both *nepos* and virtually homonymous *νήπιος* were etymologized from *νεός*; cf. Maltby 1991, 408 and *Etym. Gud.* p. 408,48-49 (Sturz) for the respective evidence.

supplied by an acrostic that evinces exactly the same inflectional form¹⁵⁵ of a similarly disyllabic Greek verb: shortly before the above-mentioned acrostic *iste*¹⁵⁶ Virgil ends Aeneas' speech to Dido with the unidentified acrostic *didi*.¹⁵⁷ A future paper will argue that Virgil etymologizes Dido from the verb $\delta\epsilon\iota\delta\omega$:¹⁵⁸ hence acrostical *didi* piquantly applies to Aeneas the etymon of "Dido", whom he is addressing.¹⁵⁹ This *didi* also elucidates a problematic text that occurs exactly thirty lines later: *linquens* (sc. *Dido*) *multa metu cunctantem* (sc. *Aenean*) *et multa parantem / dicere* (390-391). Here enigmatic *metu* in pre-caesural *sedes* discomfits commentators.¹⁶⁰ *Metu* in fact turns out to be another "long-distance" gloss on the acrostical *didi* that ends Aeneas' speech.¹⁶¹ The last words of this speech (l. 361) by Dido's new "husband" are placed exactly 100 lines before the words of her old husband (460-461): *exaudiri voces et verba vocantis / visa viri*. It will be argued elsewhere that what these words actually were is indicated in an ensuing acrostic (473-476): *cede*. If the first line of this acrostic (473) evinces a parallel with the same line-number in Book VI (473: Dido's *coniunx ... pristinus*), the afore-mentioned line 460 of Book IV (*verba vocantis* [sc. *Sychaei*]) evinces a similar parallel with the same notorious line-number in Book VI (460: *invitus, regina, tuo de litore cessi*).¹⁶² Here *cessi* matches the acrostical *cede* that constitutes the *verba vocantis*: as with *didi*, language associated with Dido is piquantly applied to Aeneas.

While *didi* resembles *pithi* in being a Greek verb, reference may also be made to a Virgilian acrostic that instead employs a Greek adjective. It will be

¹⁵⁵ Viz. 3rd pers. sing. pres. ind. act.

¹⁵⁶ *Aen.* IV 421-424 (with gloss at 396); cf. n. 138 above.

¹⁵⁷ = $\delta\epsilon\iota\delta\epsilon\iota$ ("he fears"; IV 358-361). Both of the *pithi*'s likewise end speeches.

¹⁵⁸ Cf. *Aen.* I 561-562 (*Dido / metum* in same pre-caesural *sedes*; Dido's very first words in the poem); I 670-671 (*Dido / vereor* round *penthemimeres*; both = "I fear"); IV 164-165 (*metu / Dido* round *trihemimeres*; *metus* a strangely strong word for the reaction of the flower of Tyrian and Trojan manhood to a mere cloudburst [161: *nimbus*; cf. Serv. ad loc.: *poterat nimbus contemni*]); IV 450 (line-end *exterrita Dido*, where Servius has to gloss this participle as *praecipitata, turbata*; cf. the same line's subtextual *vero* ["truly"; *Oxf. Lat. Dict.*² 2246 (s.v., 2)]). This etymology of Dido is absent from both O'Hara 1996 and Paschalis 1997. In view of Serv. Auct., *Aen.* I 340 (*Dido ... id est virago Punica lingua, quod ... forti se animo ... interfecerit*) $\delta\epsilon\iota\delta\omega$ as etymon is archly antiphrastic.

¹⁵⁹ For a similar *jeu étymologique* in an earlier Virgilian acrostic involving a similarly disyllabic Greek verb that likewise means "he fears" cf. n. 2 above (*ocni*).

¹⁶⁰ Cf. most recently MacLennan 2007, 130: "What we think Aeneas is afraid of will depend on what sort of Aeneas we think Virgil is presenting".

¹⁶¹ The verb $\delta\epsilon\iota\delta\omega$ was etymologized from $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\varsigma$ (cf. [e.g.] *Etym. Magn.* p. 260,5), which was in turn glossed as *metus* (cf. [e.g.] *Gloss.* III 423,61).

¹⁶² These numerical correspondences within Virgil's own work find a counterpart in the ones with Homer that were identified above (cf. n. 97).

argued in a future article that in Book VIII the Alexandrianly historical and ethnographic section of the ephrastic account of Aeneas' new shield ends with the unidentified acrostic *lepte* (664-668). This acrostic would appear to be particularly significant, since it exactly reproduces Aratus' own famously programmatic *λεπτή*-acrostic (783-787).¹⁶³ Antiphrastic corroboration of the Virgilian acrostic is then provided by *tumidi* (671), which matches Aratus' semantically identical and similarly anapaestic *παχίων* in the same pre-caesural *sedes* (785).¹⁶⁴ Aratus' *λεπτή* is inspired by the *λευκή*-acrostic at the beginning of the *Iliad*'s final book (XXIV 1-5).¹⁶⁵ Barely a score of lines after the Homeric *λευκή*¹⁶⁶ the poem makes its only reference to the notorious Judgment of Paris. Here the Homeric text is marked by an equally notorious crux: *τήν* (sc. Aphrodite) *δ' ἦνθησ'* (sc. Paris) *ἢ οἱ πόρε μαχλοσύνην ἀλεγεινήν* (30), where Aristophanes' text of the second hemistich reads instead: *κεχαρισμένα δῶρ' ὀνόμηνε*. It will be argued elsewhere that Virgil's introduction of Venus at the start of the *aspidopoeia* currently at issue evinces an ascendant acrostic which has so far escaped notice (VIII 607-611): *tu das*.¹⁶⁷ Here Virgil is using an acrostic to state his own position in a Homeric *zetema*:¹⁶⁸ if line-initial *dona* (609) corresponds to Aristophanic *δῶρα*,¹⁶⁹ acrostical *tu das* signals support for the *ἦ ... πόρε* of the paradosis.¹⁷⁰ The point may also be made that this acrostic exhibits a certain parallelism with the *Mars*-acrostic in the previous book.¹⁷¹

¹⁶³ Virgil had already alluded indirectly to this Aratean acrostic at *Georg.* I 429-433 (cf. n. 3 above). This time however the imitation is explicit.

¹⁶⁴ For *παχύς* = *tumidus* cf. *Gloss.* II 464,36. For *παχύς* and *λεπτός* as terms of literary polemic cf. (e.g.) Callim., *Aet.* I fr. 1, 23-24 (Pf.). For the same polemical use of *tumidus* cf. (e.g.) Catull. 95, 10. Finally it may be pointed out that this Virgilian acrostic occurs near the end of the book, which ends with l. 731 (this Book VIII is the only one in the second half of the poem with fewer than 800 lines): exactly the same line-number (731) marks the end of Aratus' own *Phaenomena* proper, if the evidently spurious 138 is discounted.

¹⁶⁵ For Virgil's earlier debt to Homer's acrostic cf. n. 108 above.

¹⁶⁶ Ll. 6-9 of *Il.* XXIV were athetized by the Alexandrians.

¹⁶⁷ The "first" line of this acrostic (607) starts with *succedunt fessi*. The same collocation had already been used in connection with a similarly "upward" acrostic at *Ecl.* V 18-21 (cf. n. 51 above). In the present passage of *Aen.* VIII prefixal *suc-* in *succedunt* evidently serves once again as a hint to read this acrostic "upwards".

¹⁶⁸ For a comparable instance cf. n. 30 above.

¹⁶⁹ *Δῶρα* is regularly glossed as *dona* (cf. [e.g.] *Gloss.* III 238,54), which was also etymologized from it (cf. Maltby 1991, 195).

¹⁷⁰ *Πόρ-* is glossed as *dare dono* by Ebeling 1880, 211.

¹⁷¹ Book VIII's l. 607, which marks the "end" of *tu das*, is also the line-number which marks the end of *Mars has* in Book VII (cf. n. 4 above). Both are two-word acrostics consisting of subject and trilateral predicate. The subject in both is a deity: Mars / Venus (linked by a sensational

A future paper will argue that acrostical *tu das* is immediately followed by a similarly ascendant and similarly unidentified acrostic (613-619): *mei ad[d]am*.¹⁷² The meaning of this acrostic is “I (the poet) shall add (something) of my own”,¹⁷³ which is especially appropriate to an acrostic.¹⁷⁴ *Addere* is duly deployed in “edge” position in the central line of the *lepte*-acrostic (666). It will also be argued elsewhere that the same verb marks the start of the second line of a further acrostic which begins exactly thirty lines after the “beginning” (607) of acrostical *tu das*. This time the acrostic is *carpas* (636-641), which by the rhetorical figure of *transumptio*¹⁷⁵ is equivalent to *legas*,¹⁷⁶ i.e. “you should read” (sc. the acrostic).¹⁷⁷ Finally attention may be drawn to an ascendant acrostic that “ends” exactly twenty lines after the end of *lepte*: *ac[c]uba* (687-691).¹⁷⁸ It will be argued elsewhere that this unidentified acrostic, which forms part of the climactic account of Actium, is meant as a gloss on the description of Cleopatra as Antony’s *coniunx* at the end of its second line (688).¹⁷⁹

love-affair). Finally both gloss a literary text: if the Mars-acrostic glosses Ennius (*Ann.* 156 [Skutsch]; cf. Hendry 1994), the Venus-acrostic has just been shown to gloss Homer.

¹⁷² For the orthography with a single “d” cf. n. 10 above. The line between *tu das* and *mei ad[d]am* (612) starts with *en* (= *ἰδού* [cf. *Gloss.*¹ II Philox. EN 5] = *aspice* [cf. *Gloss.* II 24,15], which is Virgil’s acrostics-pointer *de choix* [cf. n. 35 above]). The same line’s first hemistich ends with corroborative *mei*.

¹⁷³ For such use of *addo* with partitive genitive cf. *Thes. Ling. Lat.* 1 col. 587,70-72 (s.v.). *Ad[d]am* forms an apt sequel to *das*, since *addere* was etymologized from *dare*; cf. Adkin 2006, 463.

¹⁷⁴ For *addo* meaning “to attach or add (to) as an embellishment” cf. *Oxf. Lat. Dict.*² 41 (s.v., 1c).

¹⁷⁵ This figure invests one of two partial synonyms with a meaning peculiar to the other. Identification of its use exactly 300 lines earlier (*Aen.* VIII 342-343) elucidates a notorious crux (*quem* [sc. *lucum*] *Romulus ... asylum / rettulit*); cf. Adkin 2001.

¹⁷⁶ For *carpo* as synonymous with *lego* in the sense of “pick” cf. *Thes. Ling. Lat.* 10,1 col. 2604,25-30 (s.v. *pomum*).

¹⁷⁷ Cf. *Georg.* II 44: *lege ... oram* (“read the edge”, title of the present article), with n. 16 above. Acrostical *carpas* is equipped with a “long-distance” gloss, since it is followed exactly ten lines later by line-initial *aspiceres* (650; cf. n. 172 above) in the same line as infinitival *vellere*, which is a synonym of *carpere* (cf. *Gloss.* IV 30,34).

¹⁷⁸ For the single “c” cf. n. 10 above. *Thes. Ling. Lat.* 1 col. 338,36 (s.v. *accuba*) cites *Gloss.* V 589,35, where this word is explained as *succuba*, which means “a woman who occupies a man’s bed in place of his wife” (*Oxf. Lat. Dict.*² 2048 [s.v.]).

¹⁷⁹ Here *coniunx* is immediately preceded by *nefas*, on which cf. (e.g.) Eden 1975, 184: “This *nefas* is the faintest echo of the vicious propaganda put out ... before Actium; Cleopatra was then called ‘... a harlot’”. The acrostic identified above would seem to show that Virgil’s “echo” is considerably less “faint” than has hitherto been thought: if the text calls Cleopatra a “wife”, the acrostic calls her a “whore”. This acrostic finds a parallel at the very end of the poem (XII 931-937), where the undetected acrostic *puta era* (“an out-and-out *fille de joie*”) likewise glosses *coniunx* (= Lavinia) at the end of its last line (937): in finally renouncing Lavinia, Turnus calls

If *lepte* resembles *pithi* in reproducing acrostically the Greek wording of a Greek author in a Latin text, the point may be made that Virgilian acrostics also comprise Latin translations of the wording of Greek authors. A Homeric instance is supplied by the passage mentioned in the previous note (*Aen.* XII 931-934), where *puta* is both adjective (“out-and-out”) and imperative (“ponder!”).¹⁸⁰ Imperative *puta* is evidently a hitherto unperceived translation of the Homeric *φράζω* (*Il.* XX 358), which is the pivotal word of Hector’s dying curse on his killer.¹⁸¹ An acrostical translation of a Greek author other than Homer is provided by *Eclogue* VIII, the beginning of which contains another acrostic, whose first line (7) supplied the title of the present paper: “read the edge”.¹⁸² A later passage of the same *Eclogue* (VIII 32-35) evinces an unidentified gamma-acrostic (*odin?*),¹⁸³ which is a translation of Theocritean *ἦ ῥά με μισεῖς*; (*Id.* III, 7).¹⁸⁴

The first *pithi*-acrostic is separated by only two lines from acrostical *spicin?* (95-100), which is the last of the acrostics to be considered in the present article in connection with the Sinon episode: this unidentified acrostic (“do you see?”) evidently refers to “seeing” adjacent *pithi*. *Spicio* is just the simplex of *aspicio*,¹⁸⁵ which is Virgil’s acrostical *Lieblingsfingerzeig*:¹⁸⁶ this time *spicin?* is the acrostic itself.¹⁸⁷ Such use of a verb meaning to “see” invests ensuing *audire*

her (in similarly acrostical terms) a Helen-like “whore”. On this last acrostic cf. further Adkin (forthcoming).

¹⁸⁰ For such a double meaning in an acrostic cf. the example adduced in n. 81 above (Hor., *Carm.* I 37, 2-5, which, like the above-mentioned *Aen.* VIII 687-691, is a “Cleopatra”-acrostic).

¹⁸¹ Commentators are surprised that Virgil fails to imitate these “impressive last words” of Hector (so de Jong 2012, 149) in Turnus’ own last words: however the acrostic shows that Virgil does imitate them after all (cf. further Adkin (forthcoming)).

¹⁸² Cf. n. 14 above.

¹⁸³ Cf. the first line’s (32) “tip-off” *despicis* (cf. n. 46 above) and the second line’s (33) corroboratory *odio*. For the third line’s (34) disregardable “h” cf. n. 147 above. For the form *odis* cf. *Thes. Ling. Lat.* 9,2 col. 454,73-82 and for acrostically colloquial *-in?* cf. Norden 1995, 319 (a further instance will be adduced below; cf. n. 187).

¹⁸⁴ Virgil’s *promissaque barba* at the end of the third line (34) reproduces Theocritus’ *προγένειος* (9) at the end of the sesquistich immediately following *μισεῖς*. For the particular forms *μισεῖς* and *odis* as equivalents cf. *Gloss.* III 413,16. Finally it may be noted that Theocritus’ *μισεῖς* occurs in his seventh line. This is the same line-number that in Virgil’s eighth *Eclogue* starts this poem’s earlier acrostic and also contains the phrase “read the edge” (*Ecl.* VIII 7). Virgil’s *odin?*-acrostic is moreover followed after the refrain and just two more verses by the line (VIII 39) that is similarly linked with the penultimate line of this other acrostic (VIII 12; cf. n. 55 above). This *odin?*-acrostic and its context will be discussed more fully elsewhere.

¹⁸⁵ Cf. Paul. Fest. p. 2 (M.: *quod nos cum praepositione dicimus “aspicio”, apud veteres sine praepositione “spicio” dicebatur*), with Adkin 2006, 464.

¹⁸⁶ Cf. n. 172 above.

¹⁸⁷ For *-in?* cf. n. 183 above.

(103)¹⁸⁸ with particular “resonance”.¹⁸⁹ As was the case with both of the *pithi*-acrostics and with acrostical *ac[c]uso*, phraseology in the lines making up the *spicin?*-acrostic itself is again marked by a certain acrostically-related “resonance”. *Spicin?* is immediately preceded by a line (94) starting with the phrase *nec tacui*, which is inconsistent with the context¹⁹⁰ and therefore acrostically *fingerzeighaft*. The rest of the language here that is pertinent in this respect may be listed summarily: *verbis* (96),¹⁹¹ *prima* (97),¹⁹² *labes* (97),¹⁹³ *voces* / ... *ambiguas* (98-99),¹⁹⁴ *consciis* (99).¹⁹⁵ The last line of this *spicin?*-acrostic (100) then contains the verb *requievit*, which is glossed as *cessavit*, i.e. “stopped”.¹⁹⁶ Such use of a verb meaning “to stop” in order to mark the point at which an acrostic “stops” can be paralleled elsewhere.¹⁹⁷ This is also a good spot for this article to “stop”.

Bibliography

- Adkin 2001 = Adkin, N.: A Virgilian Crux: *Aeneid* VIII 342-343. *AJPh* 122, 527-531.
 — 2005 = Adkin, N.: Some Additions to Maltby’s *Lexicon of Ancient Latin Etymologies*. In: Deroux, C. (ed.): *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History* 12. Coll. Latomus 287. Brussels, 74-96.

¹⁸⁸ Cf. n. 127 above.

¹⁸⁹ It also provides a further reason for rejecting the athetization of l. 95 proposed by Nauck 1868, 535-536, since this line is the first of the acrostic. Nauck’s emendation of *hinc* (97) to *haec* (ib. 537) is likewise shown to be wrong, since it would eliminate the acrostic’s third letter (“i”; for disregarable “h” cf. n. 147 above). For more discussion of Nauck’s treatment of this passage cf. Adkin 2011c, 154-157.

¹⁹⁰ So Servius on l. 93.

¹⁹¹ For the etymology of *verbis* from *verum* and *bis* cf. Adkin 2011c, 159-160: such “truth twice” fits the twofold *pithi*-acrostic. On further possible “resonances” of *verbis* and of other wording in this passage cf. Adkin 2011c, 159-161: such multivalence is entirely characteristic of Virgil.

¹⁹² On Virgil’s employment of *primus* in association with acrostics cf. n. 152 above.

¹⁹³ *Labes* was etymologized from *labi* (cf. Maltby 1991, 322), whose basic sense is “de motu deorsum facto” (*Thes. Ling. Lat.* 7,2,2 col. 780,22), like an acrostic. Here Virgil merely wants to say “beginning” (Page 1894, 215).

¹⁹⁴ Since *ambiguum* was etymologized as *quod in ambas potest agi partes* (cf. Adkin 2009b, 408), it fits the pair of “two-directional” *pithi*-acrostics.

¹⁹⁵ For *consciis* used in connection with an acrostic cf. n. 147 above.

¹⁹⁶ *Gloss.*¹ I Ansil. RE 1387. For *cesso* = “stop” cf. *Oxf. Lat. Dict.*² 336 (s.v., 2c).

¹⁹⁷ Cf. *Ecl.* VIII 11: *tibi desinam* (“stop”; so *Oxf. Lat. Dict.*² 577 [s.v., 1a]), where *desinam* is highlighted by “unparalleled” (Clausen 1994, 243) hiatus before corroboratory *accipe*. The *tibi* before *desinam* is then repeated (in same [4th *biceps*] *sedes* as *desinam*) in the line (13) in which the acrostic does “stop”. This acrostic is the one from which the present paper started: the acrostic starts (l. 7) with this article’s title (“Read the edge”).

- 2006 = Adkin, N.: Further Additions to Maltby's *Lexicon of Ancient Latin Etymologies*: Priscian. In: Deroux, C. (ed.): *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History* 13. Coll. Latomus 301. Brussels, 462-478.
- 2008 = Adkin, N.: Further Supplements to Marangoni's *Supplementum Etymologicum*: The Commentators on Horace. *InvLuc* 30, 261-277.
- 2009a = Adkin, N.: More Additions to Maltby's *Lexicon of Ancient Latin Etymologies* and Marangoni's *Supplementum Etymologicum*: The Scholia to Statius. *ACD* 44, 45-56.
- 2009b = Adkin, N.: Further Supplements to Marangoni's *Supplementum Etymologicum*: The Collections of *Differentiae* Published by Beck and Brugnoli. *Euphrosyne* n.s. 37, 407-414.
- 2010 = Adkin, N.: Further Supplements to Marangoni's *Supplementum Etymologicum*: Servius and Servius Auctus on Virgil. In: Deroux, C. (ed.): *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History* 15. Coll. Latomus 323. Brussels, 473-491.
- 2011a = Adkin, N.: Virgil's Wooden Horse: Which Wood? *Arctos* 45, 11-26.
- 2011b = Adkin, N.: Virgil, *Aeneid* II 116-121: An Etymological "Cluster". *BStudLat* 41, 594-600.
- 2011c = Adkin, N.: Sinon on His "Pal" Palamedes (Virgil, *Aen.* II 81-104). *ACD* 47, 151-165.
- 2012 = Adkin, N.: Laocoon's Shot: A Note on *Aen.* II 50-53. *Maia* 64, 424-428.
- forthcoming = Adkin, N.: Rev. of M. C. J. Putnam, *The Humanness of Heroes: Studies in the Conclusion of Virgil's Aeneid*. Forthcoming in *Latomus*.
- Allen 1978 = Allen, W. S.: *Vox Latina: A Guide to the Pronunciation of Classical Latin*. 2nd ed. Cambridge. Repr. 2004.
- 1987 = Allen, W. S.: *Vox Graeca: A Guide to the Pronunciation of Classical Greek*. 3rd ed. Cambridge. Repr. 1998.
- Austin 1964 = Austin, R. G.: *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos liber secundus*. Oxford. Repr. 1991.
- 1977 = Austin, R. G.: *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos liber sextus*. Oxford. Repr. 1992.
- Baehrens 1885 = Baehrens, E.: Emendationes Vergilianae. *JKPh* 31, 385-401.
- 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).
- Castelletti 2012 = Castelletti, C.: Following Aratus' Plow: Vergil's Signature in the *Aeneid*. *MH* 69, 83-95.
- Clausen 1994 = Clausen, W.: *A Commentary on Virgil, Eclogues*. Oxford. Repr. 2003.
- 2002 = Clausen, W.: *Virgil's Aeneid: Decorum, Allusion, and Ideology*. Beitr. z. Altertumskunde 162. Munich – Leipzig.
- Coleman 1977 = Coleman, R.: *Vergil: Eclogues*. Cambridge. Repr. 2003.
- Conington, Nettleship 1884 = Conington, J., Nettleship, H.: *The Works of Virgil* 2. 4th ed. London. Repr. Hildesheim – New York 1979 (= *Conington's Virgil: Aeneid, Books III-VI*. Exeter 2008).
- Conington, Nettleship, Haverfield 1898 = Conington, J., Nettleship, H., Haverfield, F.: *The Works of Virgil* 1. 5th ed. London. Repr. Hildesheim – New York 1979 (= *Conington's Virgil: Georgics*. Exeter 2007).
- D'Anna 1984 = D'Anna, G.: Anna. In: *Enciclopedia Virgiliana* 1, 178-182. Repr. 1996.
- de Jong 2012 = de Jong, I. J. F.: *Homer: Iliad, Book XXII*. Cambridge.
- de la Cerda 1642 = de la Cerda, J. L.: *P. Virgilii Maronis Aeneidos libri sex priores*. Cologne.
- Della Corte 1972 = Della Corte, F.: *La mappa dell'Eneide*. Florence. Repr. 1985.
- Dietsch 1853 = Dietsch, R.: *Theologumenon Vergilianorum particula*. Grimma.
- Ebeling 1880 = Ebeling, H. (ed.): *Lexicon Homericum* 2. Leipzig. Repr. Hildesheim – New York 1987.
- Eden 1975 = Eden, P. T.: *A Commentary on Virgil: Aeneid VIII*. Leiden.

- Erren 2003 = Erren, M.: *P. Vergilius Maro: Georgica 2*. Heidelberg.
- Forbiger 1873 = Forbiger, A.: *P. Vergili Maronis opera 2*. 4th ed. Leipzig.
- Grishin 2008 = Grishin, A. A.: *Ludus in undis: An Acrostic in Eclogue 9*. *HSPH* 104, 237-240.
- Günther 1996 = Günther, H.-C.: *Überlegungen zur Entstehung von Vergils Aeneis*. Hypomn. 113. Göttingen.
- Heinze 1897 = Heinze, R.: *T. Lucretius Carus, De Rerum Natura Buch III*. Leipzig. Repr. Boston 2006.
- Hendry 1994 = Hendry, M.: A Martial Acronym in Ennius? *LCM* 19,7-8, 108-109.
- Henry 1878 = Henry, J.: *Aeneidea 2*. Dublin. Repr. New York 1972.
- Heuzé 1985 = Heuzé, P.: *L'image du corps dans l'œuvre de Virgile*. Coll. de l'École française de Rome 86. Rome.
- Heyne, Wagner 1832 = Heyne, C. G., Wagner, G. P. E.: *P. Virgili Maronis opera 2*. 4th ed. Leipzig – London. Repr. Hildesheim 1968.
- Horsfall 2003 = Horsfall, N.: *Virgil, Aeneid 11: A Commentary*. Mnem. Suppl. 244. Leiden - Boston.
- 2008 = Horsfall, N.: *Virgil, Aeneid 2: A Commentary*. Mnem. Suppl. 299. Leiden - Boston.
- Johnston 2012 = Johnston, P. A.: *Vergil: Aeneid, Book 6*. Newburyport, Mass.
- Jordan 1999 = Jordan, R. H.: *Virgil: Aeneid II*. London. Repr. 2003.
- Koster 1988 = Koster, S.: *Ille ego qui: Dichter zwischen Wort und Macht*. Erlang. Forsch. A,42. Erlangen.
- Lausberg 2008 = Lausberg, H.: *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik*. 4th ed. Stuttgart.
- Lenaz 1987 = Lenaz, L.: *Ordo*. In: *Enciclopedia Virgiliana* 3, 879-880. Repr. 1996.
- Liddell, Scott, Jones 1996 = Liddell, H. G., Scott, R., Jones, H. S.: *A Greek-English Lexicon*. 9th ed. Oxford.
- Loewe, Goetz 1899 = Loewe, G., Goetz, G.: *Corpus glossariorum latinorum* 6. Leipzig. Repr. Amsterdam 1985.
- Mackail 1930 = Mackail, J. W.: *The Aeneid*. Oxford.
- Maclennan 2007 = Maclennan, K.: *Virgil: Aeneid IV*. London. Repr. 2009.
- 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.
- Morgan 1999 = Morgan, L.: *Patterns of Redemption in Virgil's Georgics*. Cambridge. Repr. 2010.
- Mynors 1990 = Mynors, R. A. B.: *Virgil: Georgics*. Oxford. Repr. 2003.
- Nauck 1868 = Nauck, A.: Kritische Bemerkungen V. *Bulletin de l'Académie Impériale des Sciences de Saint-Petersbourg*, sér. 3, 12, 481-546.
- 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.
- O'Hara 1996 = O'Hara, J. J.: *True Names: Vergil and the Alexandrian Tradition of Etymological Wordplay*. Ann Arbor.
- Page 1894 = Page, T. E.: *The Aeneid of Virgil: Books I-VI*. London – New York. Repr. 1970.
- Paschalis 1997 = Paschalis, M.: *Virgil's Aeneid: Semantic Relations and Proper Names*. Oxford.
- Pease 1935 = Pease, A. S.: *Publi Vergili Maronis Aeneidos liber quartus*. Cambridge, Mass. Repr. Darmstadt 1967.

- Romano 1991 = Romano, E.: *Q. Orazio Flacco: Le Opere* 1,2. Rome.
- Russell 1973 = Russell, J.: *Calchas tectus: An Interpretation of Aeneid II 126. Latomus* 32, 818-823.
- Sabbadini 1905 = Sabbadini, R.: *Vergilio: L'Eneide, libri I, II, III*. 4th ed. Turin.
- Sommer, Pfister 1977 = Sommer, F., Pfister, R.: *Handbuch der lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre* 1. 4th ed. Heidelberg.
- Thomas 1984 = Thomas, Y.: *Crimen*. In: *Enciclopedia Virgiliana* 1, 932-933. Repr. 1996.
- Thomas 1988 = Thomas, R. F.: *Virgil: Georgics* 1. Cambridge. Repr. 2002.
- Thornton 1988 = Thornton, B.: A Note on Vergil, *Eclogue IV* 42-45. *AJPh* 109, 226-228.
- Ussani 1952 = Ussani, V.: *Virgilio: Eneide, libro II*. Rome. Repr. 1961.
- Walde, Hofmann 2007 = Walde, A., Hofmann, J. B.: *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* 2. 6th ed. Heidelberg.
- Wetmore 1979 = Wetmore, M. N.: *Index verborum Vergilianus*. 4th ed. Hildesheim.

(ISSN 0418 – 453X)