SINON ON HIS "PAL" PALAMEDES

(VIRGIL, *AENEID* II 81-104)[1]

BY NEIL ADKIN

Abstract: Sinon's speech to the Trojans falsely represents him as Palamedes' friend. The present article endeavours to show how in this connection Virgil avails himself of etymology.
Keywords: Sinon, Palamedes, Ulysses, etymology, ambiguity.

Sinon's speech in book II is the first long speech of the *Aeneid* and the longest of the whole epic: on it depends the outcome of the entire war.[2] After an opening *procatalepsis*[3] the second sentence of this speech reads:

> *fando aliquod si forte tuas pervenit ad auris*
> *Belidae nomen Palamedis et incluta fama*
> *gloria, quem falsa sub proditione Pelasgi*
> *insontem infando indicio, quia bella vetabat,*
> *demisere neci, nunc cassum lumine lugent:*
> *illi me comitem et consanguinitate propinquum*
> *pauper in arma pater primis huc misit ab annis* (*Aen*. II 81-87).

Here Sinon claims to have been Palamedes' "pal": he is lying.[4] Palamedes' death "galt … im ganzen griechisch-römischen Altertum als das Schulbeispiel eines Justizmordes".[5] The means whereby Palamedes' execution was contrived by his enemy Ulysses are conveniently described in Servius' note on the first line of the afore-cited sentence (81):

---

[1] Citation follows *Oxf. Lat. Dict*.'s "Authors and Works" (ix-xx); 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] Cf. Erdmann 2000, 25. The bibliography on Sinon himself is conveniently assembled in Horsfall's recent commentary on *Aen*. II: Horsfall 2008, 93.

[3] Cf. Lausberg 2008, 425.

[4] On *consanguinitate propinquum* in the penultimate line Servius Auctus comments: *hoc totum falsum est*. It "may well be an idea of Virgil's own to bring [the story of Palamedes] into this context" (so Austin 1964, 60).

[5] So Wüst 1942, 2503.

fictam epistolam Priami nomine ad Palamedem, per quam agebat gratias proditionis et com-
memorabat secretum auri pondus esse transmissum, dedit (sc. *Ulixes*) *captivo, et eum in itinere*
fecit occidi. haec inventa more militiae regi adlata est et lecta principibus convocatis. tunc
Ulixes cum se Palamedi adesse simularet, ait, si verum esse creditis, in tentorio eius aurum
quaeratur. quo facto invento auro, quod ipse per noctem corruptis servis absconderat, Palame-
des lapidibus interemptus est.

In line 83 *falsa sub proditione* is glossed by Servius as *sub falso crimine proditionis*. This explication of the text prompted Sidgwick to the following verdict: "The old int. 'under false charge of treachery' is plainly wrong: it cannot be got out of the Latin words".[6] It would seem that here etymology can be of help. O'Hara's great study says nothing whatsoever about this speech, which is likewise completely ignored by Paschalis.[7] It is however noteworthy that the *falsus* used by Virgil had recently been etymologized from *fari*.[8] *Fari* was a striking archaism by Virgil's day.[9] It is therefore significant that *fari* should open the sentence of the *Aeneid* at issue here: *fando*. The next line ends with *fama*, which Varro had likewise etymologized from *fari*.[10] *Fari* and *fama* accordingly frame the distich: these initial and final *loci* are etymological markers.[11] The next line contains the *falsa* currently at issue, which occupies the same emphatically medial *sedes* as the *fando* of *infando* in the immediately following line.[12] Since *falsa* is accordingly located in a sequence of four successive lines in each of which a form of *fari* or its derivatives occurs in an ety-

---

[6] Sidgwick 1890, 170; cf. Conington-Nettleship 1884, 98 ("*falsa sub proditione* means not 'under a false charge of treason'…, a sense which the words would hardly bear"); Page 1894, 214 ("*falsa proditio* cannot mean 'a false charge of treachery'"). Conington's view has been restated very recently by Horsfall 2008, 113 ("Con. rightly protested against Serv.'s … explanation").

[7] O'Hara 1996; Paschalis 1997.

[8] Cf. Maltby 1991, 222, citing Var., *L*. VI 55: *ab eodem* (sc. *fari*) *falli, sed et falsum et fallacia, quae propterea, quod fando quem decipit ac contra quam dixit facit.*

[9] Cf. Cic., *De orat*. III 153 (cod. Laud.). Reference may also be made in this connection to Quint., *Inst*. VIII 3, 27.

[10] Cf. Maltby 1991, 222.

[11] Cf. Cairns 1996, 33 (= id. 2007, 317): "the beginning and end of the … group of lines". It may be noted that here both *fando* and *fama* are strictly superfluous. They are also tautologous; cf. (e.g.) Plessis-Lejay 1919, 296: "*fando = fama*". Opening *fando* is further highlighted by grammatical irregularity; cf. (e.g.) *Schol. Verg. Veron. Aen*. II 81 (ad loc.): *itaque hic patiendi vim, non agendi habet.*

[12] On the importance of "the same *sedes* in successive lines" as an etymological marker cf. Cairns 1996, 33 (= id. 2007, 317). Both *falsa* and the *fando* of *infando* start at the second biceps; *falsa* receives further emphasis from the anastrophe. On *for* as the etymon of *infandus* cf. Adkin 2009, 411. In the present passage *infando* is clearly meant to echo homoeoteleutic *fando* in the first line of the sentence.

152

mologically significant *sedes*,[13] it may be supposed that here Virgil intends to draw attention to the derivation of *falsus* from *fari*.[14] In this passage *falsa* will thus mean "alleged".[15] In *falsa sub proditione* "alleged treachery" is accordingly equivalent to "allegation of treachery": hence the Servian *sub falso crimine proditionis* can after all be "got out of the Latin words" – when they are understood etymologically.

In the next line *infando indicio* is explained by Servius as follows: *propter aurum clam suppositum*. The meaning of Virgil's ablatival phrase would accordingly be "on monstrous evidence".[16] The point was however made above that the *fando* of *infando* occupies exactly the same emphatic *sedes* as the etymologically related *falsa* in the immediately preceding line, where the latter epithet had concluded the first hemistich. It would therefore be natural to expect further etymologizing that involves words of "saying".[17] The *indicio* that directly succeeds *infando* is in turn immediately followed by *quia bella vetabat*. These words are annotated by Servius thus: *hoc falsum est*.[18] Servius Auctus glosses *indicio* as *delatione*: "accusation".[19] *Indicium* had recently been etymologized from *dicere*.[20] Something "said" (*indicium*) that "cannot be said" (*infandum*)[21] is however a contradiction in terms. This oxymoronic conundrum ("an unsayable saying") can only be resolved if the "saying" was not in fact "said". Accordingly the Greeks did not say Palamedes tried to stop the war: this is an accusation they did *not* make – unlike the allegation of treachery. The antithesis is pointed by the etymology: if the Greeks did say (*falsa*) Palamedes

---

[13] Such homoeocatarcton of "f" is noteworthy, since this letter was the most cacophonous to the Latin ear; cf. Cic., *Orat*. 163; Quint., *Inst*. XII 10, 29. After *infando* in l. 84 there is no case of initial "f" for the next ten verses until l. 94, where *fors* is significantly due to etymological considerations (*fors … tulisset*); cf. Bartelink 1965, 96-97. The next ten verses then contain no further instance of word- or stem-initial "f" down to the very end of the speech.

[14] As in the present passage of the *Aeneid*, *falsus* had also been placed straight after *fama* in Varro's discussion of the derivatives of *fari* at *L*. VI 55.

[15] Cf. Maltby 1991, 222 (s.v. *falsitas*), citing Isid., *Orig*. V 26, 9: *falsitas appellata a fando aliud quam verum est*.

[16] So Papillon-Haigh 1892, 143. For these renderings of *infandus* and *indicium* respectively cf. *Oxf. Lat. Dict*. 894 (s.v. *infandus*); 882 (s.v. *indicium*, 1b).

[17] Terminal *infando* is intended as an antonym of the *fando* that opens this etymologizing quatrain: "saying" is capped antithetically by "not saying".

[18] *Quia bella vetabat* is "apparently a Virgilian detail" (Austin 1964, 60).

[19] So *Oxf. Lat. Dict*. 507 (s.v., 1a). Lately the *indicio* of this passage has been mis-cited as *iudicio* by Scafoglio 2007, 81.

[20] Cf. Maltby 1991, 300, citing Var., *L*. VI 61. For *dicere* as a synonym of *fari* cf. (e.g.) *Gloss*. IV 341,18.

[21] Cf. (e.g.) Loewe-Goetz 1901, 449, where *infandus* is glossed as ἄλεκτος.

betrayed Greece, they did not say (*infando*) he opposed the war. Here etymology is being employed to blow the gaff on Sinon's lie.

After an interval of just one sentence Sinon then goes on to describe Palamedes' demise and its alleged consequences for himself:

> *invidia postquam pellacis Ulixi*
> *(haud ignota loquor) superis concessit ab oris,*
> *adflictus vitam in tenebris luctuque trahebam*
> *et casum insontis mecum indignabar amici.*
> *nec tacui demens et me, fors si qua tulisset,*
> *si patrios umquam remeassem victor ad Argos,*
> *promisi ultorem et verbis odia aspera movi* (*Aen*. II 90-96).

Nauck athetizes the penultimate line of this passage (95: *si patrios umquam remeassem victor ad Argos*).[22] Nauck's arguments are not without weight. Virgil must accordingly have had very good grounds for inserting this "undesirable" verse. Again they would appear to have to do with etymology: here *remeare* is evidently being etymologized from *me*.

---

[22] Nauck 1868, 535-536. Since Nauck sets out the case against this line with admirable concision, his argument may be reproduced verbatim: "Es erscheint als höchst wunderlich, wenn Sinon, der den Tod des Palamedes zu rächen droht, die Vollziehung der Rache vertagen will bis er als Sieger nach Argos zurückgekehrt sei. Zunächst ist es unklug dass er den Trojanern gegenüber hervorhebt, er habe die Absicht und die Hoffnung gehegt das Troische Reich zu stürzen. Diese Notiz konnte um so eher fortbleiben, da nach der folgenden Darstellung des Sinon das Griechische Heer sich in einer höchst bedrängten und völlig verzweifelten Lage befand, so dass man nicht mehr an die Eroberung der Stadt Troja, sondern lediglich an das Aufgeben des ermüdenden Krieges und an schleunige Rückkehr in die Heimath dachte. Sodann setzt Sinon, indem er die Ermordung des Palamedes nach der Ueberwindung Trojas rächen will, voraus dass Troja fallen muss auch ohne den Palamedes; er betrachtet den Tod des Palamedes als irrelevant für den Erfolg des ganzen Unternehmens, er verringert die Schuld des Ulixes und seiner Helfershelfer ohne allen Zweck und gegen alle psychologische Wahrscheinlichkeit. Ferner konnte Sinon einen unpassenderen Augenblick zur Ausführung seiner Rachegedanken nicht wählen als die Zeit nach der Rückkehr in die Heimath, wo über den Mord schon Gras gewachsen war, wo die Siegesfreude die früheren persönlichen Kränkungen vergessen liess, wo die Urheber der That den Augen und der Hand des Rächers entzogen waren. Endlich ist es psychologisch unmöglich dass der rachedürstende Sinon, der in heissblütiger Aufwallung so unklug ist seine bösen Absichten selbst zu verrathen, die Ausführung des Vorhabens verschieben soll *ad Graecas Calendas*, nämlich bis nach der glücklichen Beendigung eines Krieges, dessen Ende sich gar nicht absehen liess. In den kurzen Worten *fors si qua tulisset* ist genau das enthalten was hier am Platze ist, dass Sinon bei erster Gelegenheit sich rächen wollte; der nachhinkende Vers *si patrios umquam remeassem victor ad Argos* ist eine in keiner Hinsicht wünschenswerthe, in mehr als einer Hinsicht störende Specialisierung".

In the line immediately before *remeassem* it is *me* that occupies the same emphatic central *sedes*.[23] This monosyllabic *me* is highlighted by its syntactic isolation immediately after the copulative following the previous main clause and immediately before two conditional clauses that fill the next line and a half. The huge hyperbaton which results obliges commentators to offer help in construing.[24] The line that in turn precedes the one containing *me* evinces a polyptotic *mecum*, which this time matches *remeassem* in beginning directly after the strong 3rd-foot caesura.[25] *Ecthlipsis* of the *-um* of *mecum* at the third diaeresis draws attention to the word itself, while at the same time giving particular prominence to its first half: homophonous and homophenic *me*.[26] Again Virgil must have had a good reason for employing *mecum*, since on the one hand the word is superfluous,[27] while on the other it flatly contradicts the immediately following *nec tacui*.[28] It would accordingly appear that here the function of *mecum* is to introduce the idea of *me* as the etymon of *remeo*. This notion is then buttressed by the occurrence of *me* itself in the line immediately after *mecum* and immediately before *remeo*: all three words are placed in the same etymologically significant *locus* in mid-line.

Remeo is in fact unique in this particular speech as the only verb to be brought into relief by a position straight after the main caesura and exactly in the centre of the clause. Here a large number of synonymous verbs might have been employed instead.[29] Virgil's choice of *remeo* in the present passage needed to be glossed.[30] The syncope here (*remeassem*) makes the *me* all the more prominent. The stem of this verb in fact consists of just *me* plus prefix: *reme-*. While moreover vowel length is essentially unimportant in ancient etymologizing,[31] the long "e" in *me* as etymon of *remeare* is necessarily shortened

---

[23] For "the same *sedes* in successive lines" as an etymological marker cf. Cairns 1996, 33 (= id. 2007, 317).

[24] Cf. (e.g.) Ussani 1952, 50 ("*me*: unisci con *ultorem*, v. 96"); Speranza 1964, 30 ("*me*: da unire a *promisi ultorem* v. 96"). The dislocation elicits the following comment from Forbiger 1873, 189: "In promptu est, in prosa oratione verba ita collocanda fuisse: 'Promisi, si unquam in patriam remeassem et fors si qua tulisset, me ultorem fore'".

[25] On the special importance of this *locus* in etymologizing cf. Cairns 1996, 33 (= id. 2007, 317), where reference is also made to the occurrence of the afore-mentioned phenomenon "in lines separated by one … [line]", as here.

[26] For *ecthlipsis* cf. (e.g.) Don., *Gramm. mai.* III 4 p. 662, 11-13: *ecthlipsis est consonantium cum vocalibus aspere concurrentium quaedam difficilis ac dura conlisio, ut "multum ille"*.

[27] No parallel is to be found in *Thes. Ling. Lat.* 7,1 col. 1185,27 (s.v. *indignor*).

[28] As Servius points out (*Aen.* II 93; ad loc.).

[29] Cf. (e.g.) *Synon. Cic.* p. 441,32-33: *redit. remeat. revertit. revertitur. regreditur. recedit. pedem refert*.

[30] Cf. (e.g.) *Gloss.*[L] III Abol. RE 70: *remeassem: redissem*.

[31] Cf. O'Hara 1996, 61-62.

in the verb on the principle of *vocalis ante vocalem*. It would appear therefore that here Virgil is indeed deriving *remeo* from *me*: this verb's etymological sense is to "put me back" to where I was.[32] Austin's note on *remeassem* states that it seems to have been Virgil who "promoted the verb to epic".[33] It would also seem to have been Virgil who at the same time provided this verb with an etymology.

Virgil employs *remeo* on just one further occasion. In the penultimate book of the *Aeneid* Arruns prays to Apollo for success in his attempt to kill Camilla. His words are the following:

> *da, pater, hoc nostris aboleri dedecus armis,*
> *omnipotens. non exuvias pulsaeve tropaeum*
> *virginis aut spolia ulla peto, mihi cetera laudem*
> *facta ferent; haec dira meo dum vulnere pestis*
> *pulsa cadat, patrias remeabo inglorius urbes* (*Aen*. XI 789-793).

Although Paschalis devotes a whole section to this speech, he fails to deal with *remeare*, which is similarly absent from O'Hara's study.[34] Here Virgil's use of the verb is a *Selbstzitat* from Sinon's speech. Again *remeare* occupies the same emphatic *locus* immediately after the strong 3rd-foot caesura; this time however the verb is placed conspicuously in the speech's very last line. Again *remeare* is enclosed by hyperbatic *patrius* and a "city" that here too is preceded by a predicative adjective agreeing with the subject of the verb. Both texts involve a "vow". In the immediately antecedent line of the present passage the *sedes* after the main caesura is filled by *meo*.[35] The syntagm *meo ... vulnere* is noteworthy enough to need glossing: *ut meo vulnere, meo telo cadat*.[36] Here the "risk of ambiguity" in such use of the pronominal adjective for a subjective genitive is noted in Horsfall's recent commentary on this book.[37] For such inconcinnity there must once again have been good reason, which here too is evidently to be sought in Virgil's desire to etymologize *remeo* from *me*: this pronoun was in turn regarded as the etymon of *meus*.[38] It may be noted that the *meo* of this passage has the same form as the first person singular present of the simplex of this

---

[32] This meaning is underpinned by the *patrios* in hyperbatic *patrios ... Argos* which frames the line with *remeassem* in the middle.

[33] Austin 1964, 63.

[34] Paschalis 1997, 368; O'Hara 1996, 233.

[35] On this *locus* as an etymological marker of particular moment cf. Cairns 1996, 33 (= id. 2007, 317). Exactly the same *sedes* in the next line is occupied by *remeabo*. It may be observed that *meo* is further accentuated by postponed *dum* which follows it in hyperbaton.

[36] So (e.g.) de la Cerda 1642, 646.

[37] Horsfall 2003, 423-424 (ad loc.).

[38] Cf. Adkin 2006, 471.

verb, just as the next line's *remeabo* is the first person singular future of the compound. Significantly *meus* is not used in Arruns' previous sentence, which instead employs *noster* (l. 789): *nostris ... armis*.[39]

If Sinon's speech is using *me* to etymologize *remeo* in the same *sedes* in the adjacent line, it would be no surprise if this pronoun were also being employed to etymologize the adjacent word in the same line: *demens*.[40] *Demens* might be thought surprisingly strong language ("out of one's mind, mad, frenzied, insane")[41] to be used of oneself in a *commendatio* designed to produce *commiseratio*.[42] Here a more suitable epithet might seem to be *infelix*;[43] this term would also be especially appropriate to this particular juncture.[44] Virgil's preference for *demens* would accordingly appear to have been prompted by etymological considerations: since this line's axial *me* is being used as the etymon of *remeassem* in the next one and its second half contains a *jeu étymologique* on *fors / ferre*,[45] this distich constitutes an etymological "cluster".[46] *Demens* was customarily derived from *mens*.[47] Here however Virgil would seem to be proposing an alternative etymology from *me*, which besides following *demens* in the same line also occurs with affixes in both the preceding and succeeding lines (*mecum / remeassem*). It would appear that another such affixal form is here

---

[39] Very recently a twofold explanation of the use of *noster* in this passage has been proffered by Fratantuono 2009, 267. On the one hand we may have in *nostris* "a hint that Arruns is speaking 'in character', as one of the Hirpini, imitating a wolf, ready to kill the she-wolf" (i.e. Camilla). Alternatively Fratantuono asks: "Is *nostris* historically proleptic, with reference to the Romans of Virgil's own day, who would be incensed at the notion of a female warrior?" It would seem however that *noster*'s real *raison d'être* is the simple wish to avoid the etymologizing *meus*. Fratantuono's note on *remeabo* itself declares it to be "somewhat presumptuous" (269). When however *remeare* is etymologized as signifying merely "to put me back to where I was", it does not appear "presumptuous".

[40] For such "coupling" ("i.e. where the two words etymologically linked are placed side by side") as an etymological marker cf. Cairns 1996, 33 (= id. 2007, 317).

[41] So *Oxf. Lat. Dict.* 511 (s.v.).

[42] Ti. Claudius Donatus accordingly feels obliged to justify the use of the word here (*Aen.* II 95 p. 159,22-25): *cogitabam, inquit, defendendum esse amicum…, sed nimius dolor tantum potuit, ut me fecisset insanum*.

[43] It would be a perfect match for Sinon's self-description as *miser* in ll. 70, 79 and 131; cf. also *miserorum* (140), *miserere* (143 and 144) and *miserescimus* (145). *Infelix* would scan in this *sedes*.

[44] Cf. *Diff.* ed. Beck p. 64,15: *infelix est in una re, miser in omni*.

[45] Cf. n. 13 above.

[46] For the term cf. O'Hara 1996, 92. For another case in which the same etymon is proposed for two different words cf. Adkin 2011; here too the words etymologized are respectively placed straight in front of the etymon and straight after the main caesura in the adjacent line.

[47] Cf. Maltby 1991, 181 (citing *inter alios* Paul. Fest. p. 159: *demens, quod de sua mente decesserit*). For supplementary evidence cf. Adkin 2005, 79 (citing *Diff.* ed. Uhlfelder 12: *demens ... dictus quasi deminuta parte mentis*); Adkin 2009, 409.

being suggested as the etymon of *demens*: *de me*.[48] The final syllable of *demens* had moreover been recently proposed by Caesar as the present participle of *esse*: *ens*.[49] The full etymology of *demens* would accordingly be *de me ens*: "being away from myself".[50] Such an etymon is morphologically preferable, since it matches similarly adjectival *demens* better than a noun like *mens*, whose nominatival form is incompatible with the foregoing *de* that should instead take an ablative: *de mente*. Finally the sequence of affixes in *mecum*, *de me-* and *reme-* is piquantly apt: the speaker represents himself as initially "with myself", then moving "away from myself", and in the end going "back to myself".

If these lines propose such a further derivative of *me*, it would also seem possible to show that they propose a further form of the present participle of *esse*. In the line immediately before *demens* the same *sedes* at the end of the first hemistich is occupied by *insontis*. *Sons* "a la forme du participe présent de *sum*".[51] The same point that *sons* is the present participle of *sum* would seem to be Virgil's intention here in locating this word in exactly the same emphatic position as *ens*, which is the other present participle of the same verb.[52] If then *sons* is the present participle of "to be", the etymological meaning of *insons* is "not being". Here the term is applied to *amicus*: Sinon speaks of Palamedes as his *insontis … amici*. As well as "innocent friend" this syntagm could accordingly mean "friend that isn't". As with *infando indicio*, the resultant ambiguity is very clever.[53] This time Sinon is using etymology to blow the gaff on an alleged tribulation that is his own: if Palamedes is not his pal, then the whole of the ensuing narrative (ll. 94-144) of the affliction which Sinon says he endured on Palamedes' account is exposed as bogus. The piquancy of *insontis … amici* is enhanced by direct juxtaposition of this participial adjective with *mecum*, whose implication is "close to my heart": contiguous *insontis* however beto-

---

[48] In rhetorical terms *demens* before *me* would accordingly be an example of anadiplosis with *derivatio* (on the latter cf. Lausberg 2008, 328-329 ["die etymologisierende Stammwiederholung"]). Nauck 1868, 536-537 wished to emend the *et* separating these two words to *set*; however the etymological link between them would seem to indicate that *et* is right.

[49] *Anal. frg. Prisc. gramm*. III 239, 7-9.

[50] For this basic sense of *de* cf. *Oxf. Lat. Dict*. 485 (s.v., 1a: "away from"). For the psychological background cf. (e.g.) Dodds 1951, 13-14: "'I didn't really mean to do that!' – from which it is a short step to saying, 'It wasn't really I who did it'".

[51] So Ernout-Meillet-André 1985, 636 (s.v.). The association of *sons* with *sum* is further corroborated by similarly participial *sens* in the compounds of this verb: (*ab*)*sens*; (*prae*)*sens*. For the "o" in *sōns* cf. ὤν.

[52] Besides the participial forms of *esse* at the end of *insons* and *demens* these words are also linked by the privative element in the prefix: *in-* / *de-*.

[53] Cf. Cic., *De orat*. II 253: *ambigua sunt in primis acuta*.

158

kens the exact opposite. Austin notes how in this speech Virgil "characterize[s] Sinon's style with uncanny skill".[54] It would seem however that Virgil's skill is even more "uncanny" than Austin thinks.[55]

If *insons* is the first of the *jeux étymologiques* in this passage, the last of the cluster would seem to be provided by *verbis* in the closing line (96: *promisi ultorem et verbis odia aspera movi*). Here *verbis* is highlighted by initial position in a main clause and by emphatic medial position in the line. The word might however be deemed superfluous.[56] It would seem therefore that once again etymological considerations have determined the presence of a lexeme which might otherwise be dismissed as merely παραπληρωματικόν. Varro had recently derived *verbum* from the *ver-* in *verum*; however the question was also raised as to the possible origin of the second half of the word.[57] Here Virgil would appear to be proposing his own solution to the problem of the etymology of *verbum*. On the one hand he accepts the Varronian etymon *verum* for the first half.[58] On the other hand the *verbis* of this Virgilian text would seem to be etymologizing the word's second syllable from *bis*: here *ver*(*um*) *bis* is "truth twice".[59] The "twofold truths" at issue in this context are evidently the twofold meanings generated by the etymologizing in the three immediately foregoing lines:[60] *insons* = "innocent" and "not being"; *demens* = "*de mens*" and "*de me ens*"; *remeo* = "I return" and "I re-me". Here it is accordingly "by words" (*ver* / *bis*) that we reach such "truth twice" (*ver*[*um*] *bis*). This etymology is espe-

---

[54] Austin 1964, 61 (on 86).

[55] No less an authority than Heinze 1995, 11 classes among the "edelste Eigenschaften des Redners" that are revealed by this speech the speaker's "Treue gegen den Freund (93)". Virgil would however appear to have been more subtle. The fact that he is at such pains to invalidate Sinon's claim to *amicitia* would seem to indicate that here *amicus* signifies more than "semplicemente il compagno d'armi o il conterraneo" (so Bellincioni 1984, 135).

[56] Cf. (e.g.) the awkward attempt to justify it in Austin 1964, 64 ("*verbis*: in contrast with the silence that he should have kept if he had not been *demens*"). In particular the immediately antecedent *promisi* might be felt to render pointless an explicit statement that the result had been produced "with words": for the specifically "verbal" reference of *promitto* cf. (e.g.) Isid., *Diff*. I 439 (*pollicemur scriptura, promittimus verbo*).

[57] For etymologizing of *verbum* cf. Maltby 1991, 636. For supplementation of his evidence cf. Adkin 2005, 95.

[58] It is perhaps possible that in this hemistich (*verbis odia ... movi*) Virgil is thinking of a celebrated line from the opening scene of Terence's *Andria* (68: *veritas odium parit*), which had recently been quoted by Cicero (*Amic*. 89). In both Virgil and Terence the words occur in the same order and fill the latter half of the verse.

[59] For Virgil's similar use of *bis* as etymon of the second half of *Virbius* cf. O'Hara 1996, 198-199. On the unimportance of vocalic quantity cf. ibid. 61-62.

[60] It may be recalled that *etymologia* had recently been rendered as *veriloquium* by Cicero (*Top*. 35).

cially piquant coming from Sinon, since his own "words" are not "truth twice", but whopping lies.

Sinon then concludes this speech as follows:[61]

> *hinc mihi prima mali labes, hinc semper Ulixes*
> *criminibus terrere novis, hinc spargere voces*
> *in vulgum ambiguas et quaerere conscius arma.*
> *nec requievit enim, donec Calchante ministro…*
> *sed quid ego haec autem nequiquam ingrata revolvo?*
> *quidve moror, si omnis uno ordine habetis Achivos*
> *idque audire sat est? iamdudum sumite poenas:*
> *hoc Ithacus velit et magno mercentur Atridae* (*Aen*. II 97-104).

In the opening line of this passage the first two words of the phrase *prima mali labes* break the rule *ne syllaba verbi prioris ultima et prima sequentis sit eadem*.[62] In the disyllables *prima mali* not only is the peccant syllable in each word uniformly short (*-ma ma-*);[63] in addition the other vowel is on both occasions a long "i". It might accordingly be supposed that Virgil would have eschewed this particular vocabulary, unless he had very good reasons for using it; at the same time the breach of the rule draws attention to the wording at issue. Significantly Williams' foundational commentary[64] cannot make up its mind whether in the unit *prima mali labes* pivotal *labes* means either "a slip"[65] or "a stain".[66] It would seem however that Virgil is seeking deliberate ambiguity:[67] such a further instance of "truth twice" is no surprise in a word occupying exactly the same central *sedes* as the immediately preceding line's *ver / bis*.

The next line then proceeds to describe Ulysses' hostility: *hinc spargere voces in vulgum ambiguas*. Here *ambiguas* requires a gloss from both Servius and Servius Auctus. Austin notes that Virgil could instead have written *in vul-*

---

[61] It may be noted that the section of the speech just discussed (ll. 93-96) closely resembles the one examined at the start of the present article (ll. 81-84) in being a four-line block permeated by etymologizing: as the earlier quatrain was pervaded by *fari* and its derivatives, so the etymon *me* has dominated this one.

[62] So Quint., *Inst*. IX 4, 41. The prescription is already found in Isoc., *Tech. fr*. 6 Blass (μηδὲ τελευτᾶν καὶ ἄρχεσθαι ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς συλλαβῆς [sc. δεῖ], οἷον "εἰποῦσα σαφῆ", "ἡλίκα καλά", "ἔνθα Θαλῆς").

[63] This collocation before the caesura cannot be justified by the need to generate a dactyl in the fifth foot.

[64] Williams 1972, 223-224.

[65] So Servius, *Aen*. II 97 (ad loc.).

[66] This is the meaning in the only other place Virgil uses the word (*Aen*. VI 746).

[67] On the one hand ordinal *primus* fits the idea of gradation inherent in *labi* (cf. *Oxf. Lat. Dict*. 991 [s.v., 9a: "to … lapse … (into an inferior state)"]), while on the other the concreteness of *malum* suggests a similarly concrete sense of *labes*: "a stain".

gus dubias; he would thereby have avoided the *ecthlipsis* entailed by the "very unusual" masculine *vulgum*.[68] Again there must accordingly have been good grounds for the use of *ambiguus*. This epithet was etymologized as *quod in ambas agi partes animo potest*.[69] It would seem therefore that the syntagm *voces ... ambiguas* is intended as a gloss on *ver / bis* in the previous line but one: here we have another reference to "truth twice". Virgil is thus making Sinon himself use *voces ... ambiguas* at the same time as the latter accuses Ulysses of the selfsame vice.[70]

The clause which ends emphatically with *ambiguas* is followed by another historic infinitive: *et quaerere conscius arma*. Here *conscius* is a crux: already both Servius Auctus and Servius himself offer multiple attempts at a solution. It would seem however that the clue to *conscius* is in fact to be sought in *ambiguas*: each of these words is symmetrically positioned one foot away from the beginning and end respectively of the same line. The basic meaning of *conscius* is "sharing knowledge (esp. secret knowledge), privy".[71] It would accordingly appear that here the reference is to the "secret knowledge" connoted by *voces ... ambiguas*: Ulysses is "privy" to this "secret knowledge" of double entendres, as others are not. Significantly *voces* occupies the same emphatic final *sedes* as the *arma* in *quaerere conscius arma* at the end of the next line. *Arma* are defined in Servius' note on this text as *instrumenta cuiuslibet rei*. Because Ulysses is amphibologically *conscius*, these *voces* can accordingly be his *arma*.[72] It is also noteworthy that the verb which Virgil applies here to *voces* is *spargere*, on which Horsfall has recently observed: "Apparently a Virgilian invention thus".[73] The same verb had however been already applied by Ennius to *hasta*.[74] Hence *spargere* is especially appropriate to *voces* qua *arma*.

In this connection reference may also be made to *criminibus*, which opens the line that ends with the semantically related *voces*. Here *criminibus* is qualified by *novis*. This epithet prompts Servius Auctus to glossographic superfetation.[75] *Novis* stands in saliently terminal position in the clause. More importantly this term occurs immediately after the main caesura in the line; the word

---

[68] Austin 1964, 64-65. On *ecthlipsis* as a *difficilis ac dura conlisio* cf. n. 26 above.

[69] Cf. Maltby 1991, 28 (citing Paul. Fest. p. 17). For additional evidence cf. Adkin 2009, 408.

[70] In particular it may be noted that *ambiguas* occupies exactly the same *sedes* as *insontis*. Both words conclude the first hemistich; they also follow a disyllable whose final *-um* is obscured through *ecthlipsis* at the first diaeresis. The point may also be made that here *voces* itself is a case of *ambiguum*; cf. Lewis-Short 1879, 2015 (s.v., I: "a voice"; II: "a word").

[71] So *Oxf. Lat. Dict.* 411 (s.v., 1a).

[72] *Conscius* is tellingly placed immediately before *arma*.

[73] Horsfall 2008, 122.

[74] Cf. *Oxf. Lat. Dict.* 1796 (s.v., 2a).

[75] Cf. also *Schol. Verg. Veron. Aen.* II 98 (ad loc.).

thereby occupies the same *sedes* as *verbis*, from which it is separated by only a single verse. The second half of these two disyllables (*novis / verbis*) is moreover virtually homophonous: *-vis / -bis*.[76] Each of the syllables in question also fills the fourth arsis. It would seem therefore that Virgil's object is to establish a connection between the two lexemes: the "new" meanings that result from the anterior etymologizing generate "truth twice" (*ver / bis*).[77]

Sinon then interrupts his account of Ulysses' oppugnant activity with an aposiopesis: *nec requievit enim, donec Calchante ministro…* (100). It is noteworthy that Virgil should have made Sinon stop at this particular point: the very next word after *Calchante ministro…* would have been the present participle of the substantive verb, had Latin resembled Greek in possessing such a form. This aposiopetic break accordingly draws attention to the lexical gap which Caesar's *De analogia* had recently endeavoured to fill. In Caesar's train Virgil himself has been toying with a solution to the same problem in his antecedent etymologizing of *insons* and *demens*.

Sinon himself justifies his sudden obmutescence at some length over the next three lines: *sed quid ego haec autem nequiquam ingrata revolvo? / quidve moror, si omnis uno ordine habetis Achivos / idque audire sat est?* (101-103). In this passage the syntagm *uno ordine* calls for particular consideration: here Lenaz points out that Virgil "innova rispetto al comune *eodem loco*".[78] The phrasing *uno ordine* also requires explication in *Oxford Latin Dictionary*'s article on *ordo*, which fails to supply a parallel for *uno*.[79] It is therefore noteworthy that *uno* shares with *verbis* exactly the same high-relief *locus* straight after the strong 3rd-foot caesura: here *uno* is evidently being used as an antiphrastic gloss on the *bis* in *verbis*.

In the same self-apology for Sinon's aposiopesis particular significance would also seem to attach to the immediately ensuing *idque audire sat est*. These words are strictly superfluous; they have also caused trouble to commentators.[80] The clause would in fact appear to be a further antithetic reference to the etymology of *verbis*: *audire* and *sat* suggest *verba* and *unus* respectively. What is at issue here is not "truth twice", but just "once": Sinon is insinuating that the Trojans are content with just a single, surface meaning, whereas the Greeks are privy to biplanar ones. His apology would accordingly appear to contain a subtextual reference to the twofold meanings produced by etymology.

---

[76] On the close link between "v" and "b" cf. (e.g.) Sturtevant 1940, 142-143.

[77] Much of this etymologizing pertains specifically to *crimina*; cf. *falsa sub proditione* (83; glossed by Servius as *sub falso crimine proditionis*); *indicio* (84); *insontis* (93).

[78] Lenaz 1987, 880.

[79] *Oxf. Lat. Dict*. 1267 (5b). *Uno* is highlighted by the directly preceding *omnis*.

[80] Cf. Austin 1964, 66-67.

He is in effect saying: "If you are impervious to etymological double entendres, why bother with them?"[81] Sinon's words are accordingly an instance of the rhetorical figure of *emphasis*.[82]

By way of conclusion a word may be said about the Trojan reaction to Sinon's lying tale. This response is described thus: *tum vero ardemus scitari et quaerere causas,* / *ignari scelerum tantorum artisque Pelasgae* (105-106). At the end of the first of these verses the precise sense of unqualified *causas* is elusive.[83] Virgil's imprecision in the use of *causas* may however be deliberate. It is noteworthy that the same plural had recently been employed by Varro in the sense of "derivation (of a word)".[84] After so much etymologizing in the foregoing speech it is not impossible that Virgil's immediately succeeding *causas* should also include a playful allusion to Varro's "etymological" sense. The Trojans' new interest in *causae* (*tum ... ardemus ... quaerere causas*) would then introduce a piquant contrast with the presumption of their etymological disinterest that had prompted Sinon's aposiopesis.

A similar reference to etymology may also be intended in the second of these lines. As the first one ends with *causas*, so the same final *sedes* in the next is occupied by *artisque Pelasgae*. If Varro had recently used *causae* to mean "etymologies", even more recently he had likewise maintained that "etymology" itself was an *ars* (*L*. VII 109). Here "Pelasgian" is a suitable epithet, since the etymology of *etymologia* shows the word to be "Greek"; simultaneously there is a certain wit in applying the term "Greek art" to Latin etymologies. *Ignari* too is appropriate (*ignari ... artis ... Pelasgae*), since the speakers acknowledge that their interest is new (*tum vero ardemus ... quaerere cau-*

---

[81] The question mark should accordingly be placed after *sat est*, not after *moror*. This interpretation also goes against taking *audire* as *appellari*: the objection that "hear" is "tame" (so [e.g.] Page 1894, 216) is rebutted by the etymological polemic.

[82] Cf. Lausberg 2008, 450-453, citing *inter alios* Quint., *Inst*. IX 2, 64: *est emphasis…, cum ex aliquo dicto latens aliquid eruitur*. The presence of such an etymological subtext is also supported by indefinite *haec* (101) and absolute *moror* (102). The point was made above that the aposiopesis itself is meant to evoke the antecedent etymologizing of *insons* and *demens*. In the same connection reference may also be made to the *epiphonema* in the last line of this speech (104): *hoc Ithacus velit et magno mercentur Atridae*. This statement could be taken as also entailing an allusion to Ulysses' more general delight at the incapacity of the single-minded Trojans for such semantic biplanarity in contrast to his own flair for being duplicitously *conscius*; the Atridae on the other hand would need to "buy" what Ulysses' brains give him for free.

[83] An 18-line paragraph is devoted exclusively to discussion of this one text by Cipriano 1984, 715. Attempts to explain the use of *causas* here are also made by Servius and Ti. Claudius Donatus (p. 161, 18-20). The variant *casus* is adopted instead by (e.g.) Ribbeck 1895, 278; hence this is also the reading given by the online *Library of Latin Texts*.

[84] Cf. *Oxf. Lat. Dict*. 289 (s.v. *causa*, 10a).

sas).[85] In these last two lines such a pair of double entendres involving etymological nomenclature forms an apt conclusion to a passage devoted to precisely such double meanings.[86]

Bibliography

Adkin 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.

Adkin 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.

Adkin 2009 = Adkin, N.: Further Supplements to Marangoni's *Supplementum Etymologicum*: The Collections of *Differentiae* Published by Beck and Brugnoli. *Euphrosyne* n.s. 37, 407-414.

Adkin 2011 = Adkin, N.: Etymologizing in Virgil, *Eclogue* 1, 11-15. forthcoming in *AC* 80.

Austin 1964 = Austin, R. G.: *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos liber secundus*. Oxford. Repr. 1991.

Bartelink 1965 = Bartelink, G. J. M.: *Etymologisering bij Vergilius*. Meded. Kon. Ned. Akad. Wetensch., Afd. Letterk., N.R. 28,3. Amsterdam.

Bellincioni 1984 = Bellincioni, M.: Amicizia [*amicitia*]. In: *Enciclopedia Virgiliana* 1, 135-136. Repr. 1996.

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).

Cipriano 1984 = Cipriano, P.: *Causa*. In: *Enciclopedia Virgiliana* 1, 714-716. Repr. 1996.

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 I-II*. Exeter 2007).

de la Cerda 1642 = de la Cerda, J. L.: *P. Virgilii Maronis Aeneidos libri sex posteriores*. Cologne.

---

[85] For this sense of *ignarus* cf. *Oxf. Lat. Dict*. 822 (s.v., 2b: "ignorant [of a skill, etc.], unpractised"). For the future nuance cf. *Thes. Ling. Lat*. 7,1 col. 272,34 (s.v.): "aliquotiens etiam de eo qui aliquid nondum scit".

[86] At the same time Sinon's immediately ensuing speech also contains further etymologizing. Its opening sentence explains the Greeks' failure to leave Troy: *saepe illos aspera ponti / interclusit hiemps…*; / *praecipue, cum iam hic trabibus contextus acernis / staret equus, toto sonuerunt aethere nimbi* (II 110-113). Here *acernis* is a notorious crux, since this adjective flatly contradicts the statement at II 16 that the horse was made of *abies*. A future paper will argue that *abies* is here being etymologized from *abire* (cf. Maltby 1991, 1; i.e. "you will go away"). If however in ll. 110-113 bad weather prevents such a departure, the horse cannot there be described as made of *abies*. In ll. 258-259 Sinon opens a horse made of *pinus*, which is equivalent to *abies* (cf. Edgeworth 1981, 142 n. 6). *Pinus* was etymologized from *pinnus*, an obsolete term for *acutus* (cf. Maltby 1991, 476). *Acutus* is synonymous with adjectival *acer*, which is the obvious etymon of the noun *acer* (cf. Walde-Hofmann 2008, 6-7). Hence nominal *acer* corresponds etymologically to *pinus*, which in turn corresponds dendrologically to *abies*: Sinon's perennial conundrum of a horse of *abies* that is simultaneously one of *acer* is thus resolved by etymology.

Dodds 1951 = Dodds, E. R.: *The Greeks and the Irrational*. Sath. Class. Lect. 25. Berkeley. Repr. 2004.

Edgeworth 1981 = Edgeworth, R. J.: "Inconsistency" in Vergil and in Homer. *Glotta* 59, 140-142.

Erdmann 2000 = Erdmann, M.: *Überredende Reden in Vergils Aeneis*. Stud. z. klass. Phil. 120. Frankfurt am Main-New York.

Ernout-Meillet-André 1985 = Ernout, A.-Meillet, A.-André, J.: *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine: Histoire des mots*. 4th ed. Paris. Repr. 2001.

Forbiger 1873 = Forbiger, A.: *P. Vergili Maronis opera* 2. 4th ed. Leipzig.

Fratantuono 2009 = Fratantuono, L.: *A Commentary on Virgil, Aeneid XI*. Coll. Latomus 320. Brussels.

Heinze1995 = Heinze, R.: *Virgils epische Technik*. 8th ed. Stuttgart.

Horsfall 2003 = Horsfall, N.: *Virgil, Aeneid 11: A Commentary*. Mnem. Suppl. 244. Leiden-Boston.

Horsfall 2008 = Horsfall, N.: *Virgil, Aeneid 2: A Commentary*. Mnem. Suppl. 299. Leiden-Boston.

Lausberg 2008 = Lausberg, H.: *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik*. 4th ed. Stuttgart.

Lenaz 1987 = Lenaz, L.: *Ordo*. In: *Enciclopedia Virgiliana* 3, 879-880. Repr. 1996.

Lewis-Short 1879 = Lewis, C. T.-Short, C.: *A Latin Dictionary*. Oxford. Repr. 2005.

Loewe-Goetz 1901 = Loewe, G.-Goetz, G.: *Corpus glossariorum latinorum* 7. Leipzig. Repr. Amsterdam 1985.

Maltby 1991 = Maltby, R.: *A Lexicon of Ancient Latin Etymologies*. ARCA 25. Leeds. Repr. Cambridge 2006.

Nauck 1868 = Nauck, A.: Kritische Bemerkungen V. *Bulletin de l'Académie Impériale des Sciences de Saint-Pétersbourg*, sér. 3, 12, 481- 546.

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.

Papillon-Haigh 1892 = Papillon, T. L.-Haigh, A. E.: *P. Vergili Maronis opera* 2. Oxford. Repr. New York 1950.

Paschalis 1997 = Paschalis, M.: *Virgil's Aeneid: Semantic Relations and Proper Names*. Oxford.

Plessis-Lejay 1919 = Plessis, F.-Lejay, P.: *Oeuvres de Virgile*. Paris. Repr. 1981.

Ribbeck 1895 = Ribbeck, O.: *P. Vergili Maronis opera* 2. Leipzig. Repr. Hildesheim 1966.

Scafoglio 2007 = Scafoglio, G.: Elementi tragici nell'episodio virgiliano di Sinone. *A&A* 53, 76-99.

Sidgwick 1890 = Sidgwick, A.: *P. Vergili Maronis opera* 2. Cambridge. Repr. 1934.

Speranza 1964 = Speranza, F.: *Virgilio: Eneide II*. Speculum, Sez. Comm. 2. Naples.

Sturtevant 1940 = Sturtevant, E. H.: *The Pronunciation of Greek and Latin*. 2nd ed. Philadelphia. Repr. Westport, Conn. 1977.

Ussani 1952 = Ussani, V.: *Virgilio: Eneide, libro II*. Rome.

Walde-Hofmann 2008 = Walde, A.-Hofmann, J. B.: *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* 1. Indogerm. Bibl. 1,2,1. 6th ed. Heidelberg.

Williams 1972 = Williams, R. D.: *The Aeneid of Virgil: Books 1-6*. London. Repr. 1996.

Wüst 1942 = Wüst, E.: Palamedes. 1). In: Pauly, A.-Wissowa, G.-Kroll, W. (edd.): *Real-Encyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* 18,2, 2500-2512.