QUIS EST NAM LUDUS IN UNDIS?
(VIRGIL, ECLOGUE IX 39–43)
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Abstract: The undis-acrostic that has recently been discovered in Eclogue IX 34–38 has proved problematic. The present article argues that the acrostic’s point is the etymology of litus as the place where these “waves” do not “play” (39: ludus), but “strike” (43: feriant for synonymous but exceedingly scarce lidant). This acrostic is accordingly hot-potato politics, since it pertains to the land confiscations round Virgil’s “wave”-begirt Mantua. The poet also provides endorsement in the form of an unidentified onomastic.
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Recently Virgil’s ninth Eclogue has been found to contain an acrostic: the initial letters of lines 34-38 give undis. Corroboration for this acrostic’s intentionality is supplied by the occurrence of the same word undis in the very next line (39): quis est nam ludus in undis? While Grishin correctly identifies the presence of this acrostic, he acknowledges that he is unable to give a satisfactory explanation for the particular choice of the word undis. The aim of the present article is accordingly to suggest a solution for this conundrum.

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

---


2 Grishin 2008.

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

4 His article ends with the following admission: “no firm assertions can be made at present” (Grishin 2008, 240).
at Eclogue VI 14-24, where laesis (“for those who have been hurt”) goes both up (14-19) and down (19-24): the immediately antecedent lines (6-12) are ostensibly an encomium of the land-confiscator and tenant-“hurter” Alfenus Varus. Two-way laesis is corroborated by surprising Aegle (20); this caption merely reproduces ἄφθαρου in same final sedes in the sentence immediately before Aratus’ famous lepte-acrostic at 783-787 (cf. 779). The σκέπτεο of Aratus’ previous line (778) finds a similarly corroborative parallel in the last line of this acrostic (Ecl. VI 24: satis est potuisse videri), which “has presented an enigma to readers over the centuries”. The “enigma” however vanishes when the reader grasps that videri refers to “seeing” the foregoing acrostic, which can now be “solved” (cf. amphigologically line-initial solvit me).

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

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

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

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

9 A similar (twofold) invitation to “see” would appear to indicate the intentionality of acrostical cacata (Ecl. IV 47-52), which has now been dismissed as an “accident” by Katz 2013, 5: cf. ll. 50 and 52, where line-initial aspis concludes imperatival caca and participial cacata respectively. Further corroboration would seem to be supplied by the last line’s (52) euphemistically amphibolous laetentur (sc. omnia; for laeto “i.q. stercorare” cf. Thees. Ling. Lat. 7,2 col. 879,37-44 [s.v. 1. laeto]). Like laesis, cacata in this “Pollio”-Eclogue would accordingly appear to be a deliberately political acrostic. For another instance of Virgil’s goût for acrostical caca cf. the unidentified pair at Aen. XI 820-827, where Acca (anagrammatically Caca) is glossed by upward cacata (820-824) and downward cesi = χέση (824-827): this diglotically bivious acrostic thus gives us battological “she shits” (for “q” [822] ≠ “c” cf. Thees. Ling. Lat. 3 col. 1,39-44 [s.v. “c”]; for ignorable “b” [823] cf. Thees. Ling. Lat. 6,3 col. 239,26-55 [s.v. “h”]; for “c” [824] = “χ” cf. Thees. Ling. Lat. 3 col. 1,36-38 [s.v. “c”]; for “s” [826] ≠ “ζ” cf. Oxf. Lat. Dict.2 2343 [s.v. “z”]; besides corroboratorily twofold Acca [820 and 823] cf. similarly corroboratory deiecta [833], which like above-mentioned laetentur is again a house-trained amphibol [for deicio = “to evacuate (through the bowels)” cf. Oxf. Lat. Dict. 2 554 (s.v., 3a)]. It will also be argued elsewhere that in 808-811, which imitate ll. XV 586-588, Homer’s κακόν (586) is reproduced by homonymously acrostical caco: hence problematic conscius audacis facti (sc. lupus; 812) pertains to an enfant-terrible-ish “I shit” (cf. same line’s tail-retracting caudamque remulcens after cacatory extension).
It was noted above that acrostical *laesis* (Ecl. VI 14-24) is immediately preceded by mention of Alfenus Varus (6-12). It is therefore noteworthy that acrostical *undis* (Ecl. IX 34-38) should likewise be preceded immediately by similar mention of the same Varus (26-29). This time Varus is explicitly linked with the land-confiscations at Mantua. In this connection it would appear germane to cite a remark of Servius Auctus (on Ecl. IX 10): *quod Mantuanis per iniquitatem Alfeni Vari, qui agros divisit, praeter palustria nihil relictum sit, sicut ex oratione Corneli in Alfenum ostenditur: “cum iussus tria milia passus a muro in diversa relinquere, vix octingentos passus aquae, quae circumdata est, admetireris, reliquisti”*. “Water” was therefore very important in the land-confiscations round Mantua. This political “wateriness” (a Roman “Watergate”) would seem to be the clandestine context of acrostical *undis*.

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

17 Etymology would likewise appear to be at issue in an unidentified acrostic which occurs barely half a dozen lines later (Ecl. IX 51-54), where *Ocni* (= ὀκνή = “he’s pusillanimous”) is an antiphrasic gloss on *Bianorius* (60; cf. Serv. ad loc.), which was etymologized ἀπὸ τῆς βίας καὶ ἱρορόζ (so Serv. ibid.). Two further observations may be made about acrostical *Ocni*. Firstly, while commentators apprise us that line 51 (the “o” of *Ocni: omnia fert aetas*) reproduces [Plato], AP IX 51. 1 (*αἰών πάντα φέρει*), Virgil evidently wants readers to take the next words of this epigram (δολιχὸς χρόνος οἶδεν ἀμείβειν / οὖνομα) as a pointer to his own “name-
“waves”, which are the politically contentious “waves” round Mantua, actually do on this litus – “play” or “pound”\(^9\) Virgil’s acrostical undis is confirmed by the second hemistiche of the immediately following line (39): quis est nam ludus in undis? Here ludus is an odd word to use: Virgil’s putative source in Theocritus (Id. XI 62) instead has simply ἀδιό. Servius Auctus is accordingly obliged to supply the embarrassed gloss voluptas, which is also employed by Servius himself. No parallel however for such a sense of ludus is to be found in the no fewer than a dozen columns devoted to this one lexeme by Thesaurus Linguae Latinae.\(^9\) It is therefore noteworthy that Virgil’s surprising ludus should be used here in exactly the same sense as the Aquilian eludo that etymologizes litus.\(^10\) It may also be noted that Virgil has employed ludus instead of semantically and prosodically equivalent lusus.\(^21\) Virgil’s choice of ludus points up the morphological link with (e)ludo.

It might therefore be thought that here Virgil is in fact alluding to Aquiliius’ notion of (e)ludo as etymon of litus, which he simultaneously rejects: litus is not, etymologically speaking, where waves “play”. The answer to the question quis est nam ludus in undis? is “None – as far as the etymology of litus is concerned”.

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

\(^19\) Viz. 7.2.2 coll. 1783,13-1794,46.


The impression of such etymological polemic is corroborated by the last line of this same pentastich (39-43), whose first line asks *quis est nam ludus in undis?* Both of these lines are linked by initial *huc ades.* The last line then continues: *insani feriant sine litora fluctus.* Here *fluctus* corresponds to synonymous *undis* in similarly final *sedes* in line 39.\(^{22}\) *Fluctus* itself is juxtaposed with *litora,* which like *ludus* in 39 starts at the fifth arsis.\(^{23}\) *Litora* in turn is juxtaposed with *feriant* after the main caesura.\(^{24}\) It would seem therefore that here *ferio* is being used in place of synonymous and very rare *lido* to etymologize adjacent *litus,* which is accordingly not where waves “play”, but “strike”.\(^{25}\)

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

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


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

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

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

\(^{27}\) Cf. *Gloss.* II 321,43: έδως: *sino*.

\(^{28}\) The Scholiast glosses Theocritus’ *χέρσος* as *γη,* whereas Virgilian and Aquilian *litus* is invariably glossed instead as *αιγυαλός* (cf. Goetz 1899, 651 [no fewer than a dozen instances]). Theocritus’ wording would have been matched by (e.g.) *aequora terram.*
Here Virgil’s choice of a verb meaning “to strike” is spotlighted by his contiguous use of insanus in lieu of Theocritean γλαυκός: insanī feriant.

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

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

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

29 Viz. 7,1 coll. 1832,42-1836,56.
30 Schlegelmilch 2008, 17-19. Schlegelmilch himself (18) sees no alternative but “zu dem ... unpopulären Hilfsargument der verlorenen Zwischenquelle Zuflucht zu nehmen”.
32 So Oxf. Lat. Dict.2 1011 (s.v., 4a), where the present passage is cited. For this nuance of insanus cf. also Synon. Cic. p. 426,11 B.: furiosus, insanus.
33 Cf. (e.g.) August., De civ. D. VI 9 p. 263,18 D./K.: ludunt ... non fariunt.
34 Litora here is highlighted by punctuation after fifth dactyl and by two monosyllables in the last foot (nec quae).
here Virgil’s problematic *percussa* is an allusion to the other derivation of *litus*: not *ludo*, but *lido*.\(^{35}\)

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

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

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

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

\(^{37}\) Stewart 2010, 403.

\(^{38}\) The Virgilian acrostic would accordingly be a species of *oppositio in imitando*: here the acrostic is not the Apollonian “shore”, but the “waves” whose action on the “shore” determines its etymology.

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

\(^{40}\) This hitherto undetected acrostic accordingly shows the indeterminacy of the dedicatee to be deliberate. *Ac[c]l[pe]* is corroborated in its first line (11) by the occurrence there of the same
this triad of “littoral” acrostics involves another dedication. At Georgics II 44 Maecenas is told: *primi lege litoris oram*. When Maecenas does “read the edge” here, he finds that this line begins an acrostic (44-47: *fias*) which tells him to “become” what the encomiastic body-text itself has just told him he is already: *o decus, o famae merito pars maxima nostrae* (40).41

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

---

41 For a similar case in which the acrostic redresses the text cf. n. 5 above, where the pithi-acrostics (*Aen*. II 103-107 and 142-146) inculpate the Trojans for letting themselves be “deceived”; whereas the text itself (in the same penultimate line of each respective acrostic) instead refers exculpatorily to Trojan trustfulness (106: *ignari*) or Simonian sob-stuff (145: *lacrimis*). For another instance of Virgilian use of Theocritus for such acrostical purposes cf. *Ecl.* VIII 32-35, where the unidentified gamma-acrostic *odilodin* reproduces *Id.* III 7 (*δέ δὲ με μοσεί*); cf. corroborative *odio* (33) and *promissaque barba* (34 = *προγένειος* [9]). For the form *odin* cf. *The*.* Ling. Lat.* 9,2 col. 454,73-82 with Norden 1995, 319 (on *Aen*. VI 779); for acrostically clueful “look down” (32) and for skippable “hi” (34) cf. n. 9 above. The Theocritean words imitated in this acrostic occupy the same line-number (*Id.* III 7) as the start of the other acrostic at the beginning of this *Eclogue* (VIII 7); cf. n. 40 above; for such acrostically-numerological correspondencies cf. nn. 5 and 26 above.

42 These littoral etymologies (*ludo / lido*) would also appear germane to the question whether the verses they frame (39-43) should be assigned to Menalcas (so *e.g.* Clausen 1994, 208) or to Moeris (so *e.g.* Ottaviano 2012, 213); the politico-etymological subtext would seem to favour Menalcas (for his identification with Virgil cf. Coleman 1977, 274).

43 This line (9) is placed exactly thirty lines before the end of the undis-acrostic (38), which begins at the poem’s exact midpoint (34; thus Virgil’s inclusive reckoning). Just as the undis-acrostic (IX 34-38) is followed in the very next line (39) by corroborative *undis*, so it may be noted that the afore-mentioned *aquam* (IX 9) corroboratively follows the fons-acrostic (1 5-8; cf. n. 11 above) in the very next line (9), but in the matching poem instead (IX): *Eclogues* I and IX are a land-confiscatory combo. Similarly the undis-acrostic (IX 34-38) is followed by corroborative *fontes* in the very next line (39), but in the matching poem instead (I), where, just like *aquam, fontes* is likewise positioned at the beginning of the line after a disyllable and a monosyl-
The last line of the undis-acrostic (38) ends with a phrase that introduces the pentastichic “song” (39-43) which is framed by the two etymologies of litus. This introductory phrase, which occupies the whole of the second hemistich, is notably litotic: neque est ignobile carmen. No further instance of the collocation ignobile carmen is supplied by the online Library of Latin Texts. For ignobilis a large number of synonymous alternatives was moreover available.\(^45\) Ignobilis was etymologized from nomen.\(^46\) Etymologically speaking, neque est ignobile carmen accordingly means “the song is not ‘without a nomen’”. It would not therefore be surprising to find that the song does in fact contain a “name” – the poet’s own.

Virgil’s name was identified by Brown at Georgics I 429, 431 and 433 in reversed order and abbreviated form: ma-, ve-, pu = Pu(blius) Ve(rgiliius) Ma(ro).\(^47\) Bing then argued that in this passage of the Georgics Virgil’s particular choice of his name is an echo of Aratus’ similarly self-nuncupatory ἀπορητον at Phaenomena 2.\(^48\) This same Aratean onomastic has also been identified as the inspiration for the appellative aporia re Aratus at Eclogue III 40 (quis fuit alter?), since ἀπορητος bears the aptly elusive sense of “l’Innomé”.\(^49\)

It will be argued elsewhere by the present writer that Aratus’ nomenclative calembour is echoed not only in the afore-mentioned text near the end of Georgics I (429-433), but also at the start of the next book (Georg. II 3).\(^50\) Just as the Georgics contain two nods to the Phaenomena’s ἀπορητον, so in the Eclogues Virgil would similarly appear to nod twice to the same Aratean jeu onom-atable. Further cases of such “long-distance” glossography will be discussed below; cf. nn. 65 and 78.


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

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

\(^48\) Bing 1990, 284.

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

\(^50\) Virgil’s next line (II 4: omnia plena) clones Aratus’ μεσσαι ... πάσαι (2) in the same line as ἀπορητος, which occupies the same line-initial locus as virgulta (II 3: here an odd word, cf. Mynors 1990, 100 [ad loc.]). Since virgulta was regarded as the etymon of “Virgil” (cf. Maltby 1991, 637 [s.v. Vergilius (Virg.-)], where Priscianic virgulta should be corrected to virgula), it would appear that here Virgilian virgulta is onomastical imitatio of Aratean ἀπορητος: both terms start the respective “second” line, since Virgil’s detachable “first” line merely recaps the preceding book.
ma\^stique: besides the above-mentioned passage of Eclogue III, the text of Eco-
logue IX that is currently at issue would likewise seem to be another hommage
to Aratus’ \^d\^\*r\^\*h\^\*t\^\*\^s\^t\^o\^s.

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

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

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

\textsuperscript{52} Emphatically geminated Mantua significantly occupies initial position in the second line of
Moeris’ immediately preceding “song” (28), just as hic now occupies similarly initial position in
the similarly second line of his present “song” (40).

\textsuperscript{53} Since both “suppression” and “synonymity” are involved here, such an “unspoken” jeu
onomastique is highly appropriate imitation of similarly “unspoken” \^d\^\*r\^\*h\^\*t\^\*\^s\^t\^o\^s.

\textsuperscript{54} The same penultimate sedes as perfecta is occupied in the very next line (27) by Mantua,
which shares this line with semantically loaded nomen.
ately preceding lines (34-38) and starts with aforesaid vatem (34), this acrostic is thus framed by the “poet” (vatem) and his “name” ([ma-], ve-, pu-).55

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

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

55 Vatem (34) is immediately preceded by dicunt (33), which can have the connotation “to name”; cf. Osf. Lat. Dict.2 590 (s.v. 9).
57 If pōpulus is preceded by candida, it is followed by antro, which was etymologized from chromatically antithetic ater (cf. Maltby 1991, 40).
58 For the equivalence cf. Thes. Ling. Lat. 10,1 col. 2737,22-32 (s.v. 2. pōpulus).
59 Ver and venus were etymologized from vis, which was also deemed the etymon of Vergiliius; cf. Maltby 1991, 635; 637; 647; 648 (s.vv. venus; ver; Vergilius [Virg.]; violentus; virga; virgilium).
60 Purpura was etymologized from purus, which was also regarded as the etymon of papilla(-us), which was in turn the etymon of Publius; cf. Maltby 1991, 506; 508; 509 (s.vv. Publius; papilla; purpura).
61 Here pura has to be glossed by Servius as serena.
62 Clausen, who instead gives ēvi, fails to mention the variant ὑπό, which exactly matches Virgilian sub.
63 For this sense of solus cf. Osf. Lat. Dict.2 1973 (s.v., 5c): “only one, a single”. Such philological finicalities are calculated to engage the attention of such a dyed-in-the-wool grammaticus as Virgil.
confiscations round “wave”-washed Mantua but also his own endorsement of the accompanying etymology of litus as where waves “strike”, not “play”. A parallel would appear to be supplied by the unidentified two-way laesis-acrostic (EcL. VI 14-24), which is likewise politically peril-fraught and likewise prefaced by mention of Varus. This sixth Eclogue would similarly seem to contain an unidentified onomastic (67-69): ut Linus haec illi (sc. Gallo) divino carmine pastor\(^{64}\) / floribus atque apio crinis ornatus amaro\(^{65}\) / dixerit. This onomastic is immediately followed by an unidentified acrostic (70-72), which exactly repeats the acrostical ac[c][pe] of Eclogue VIII 11-13.\(^{66}\) Just as in Eclogue VIII, here corroboration is supplied at the start by horizontal accipe (69).\(^{57}\) Just as acrostical ac[c][pe] in Eclogue VIII is an invitation to “accept” that poem as dedicatee, so in Eclogue VI similarly acrostical ac[c][pe] is evidently a similar invitation to Gallus from Linus / Virgil to “accept” this poem as dedicatee instead of the Varus mentioned just before acrostical laesis (a poem “for those who have been hurt”), of whom Virgil is one.\(^{68}\)

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

---

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

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

\(^{66}\) Cf. n. 40 above. For disregarding “it” (72) cf. n. 9 above.

\(^{67}\) This time accipe is immediately preceded by hintful en (Clausen 1994, 203 [ad loc.]: “here first with the imperative”), which is glossed as ἐδέχεται (Gloss 12 II Philox. EN 5); cf. n. 9 above. After acrostically incomplete aci- the very next line (73), which is the last of the speech. starts with ne … plus, which might be taken as a similarly subtextual hint that there is “no more” to this truncated acrostic.

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

54
caesural Vario exactly six lines earlier (35). If Lycidas / Virgil had been une-
qual to Varius on the latter’s earlier mention in this poem, juxtaposition of
vario(s) with (ma-), ve-, pu- would now seem to imply equality after all.

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

---

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

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

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

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


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

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

76 Cf. Thes. Ling. Lat. 2 col. 923,20-79 (s.v.), citing inter alia Don., Ter. Ph. 313, 2: adesse ...
dicuntur advocati.
as a similarly subtextual invitation to Gallus to “grant” the alternative etymology of litus – from lido.\textsuperscript{77}

Finally attention may be drawn to a “long-distance” gloss on acrostical \textit{undis}.\textsuperscript{78} Exactly twenty lines after the last line of the \textit{undis}-acrostic (38) we read: \textit{nunc omne tibi stratum silet aequor} (57). On Virgil’s use here of \textit{sterno} Heyne compares Theocritean \textit{στόρνυμι} (\textit{Id}. VII 57).\textsuperscript{79} It may be pointed out that both verbs occur at exactly the same line-number in their respective poem: 57.\textsuperscript{80} The direct object that Theocritean \textit{στόρνυμι} governs is adjacent sequent \textit{kύματα} on the other side of the caesura. Virgil’s own use of \textit{sterno} is itself directly followed by a clause which reads thus: \textit{et omnes, l aspicε, ventosi ceciderunt murmuris aurae} (57-58). This injunction is problematic: you can’t “see” wind, much less its “sound”, which is in any case here said to have stopped completely.\textsuperscript{81} Here the off-keyness of \textit{aspicε} is evidently a cue to “look” instead at the (Theocritean) waves evoked in the immediately antecedent clause. Since however these waves are now no longer visible,\textsuperscript{82} \textit{aspicε} evidently tips the acrostically S.O.P wink\textsuperscript{83} to “look” instead at the acrostical waves that are still clearly visible just twenty lines earlier (34-38). When Virgil’s readers do “look”, they see that here acrostic and etymology unite to make hot-as-pepper politics – “Hands off my marshy Mantua!”

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

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

\textsuperscript{79} Heyne – Wagner 1830, 231. Both of these verbs are highlighted by their respective position at the main caesura. Very recently \textit{sterno} had been etymologized from \textit{ορέξεωσι} by Varro (\textit{L. VI} 96).\textsuperscript{80} Exactly twenty lines before Theocritus’ line 57 is the line (38) that is imitated in the opening line (34) of Virgil’s \textit{undis}-acrostic that ends with the same “line 38”.

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

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

\textsuperscript{83} Cf. n. 9 above.
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