introduce the concept of *paucitas*, which is the philosophical concept in Cicero's description of *partitio*. The passage is the following:

Expositio est, cum res, quibus de rebus dicturi sumus, exponimus breuiter et absolute. (1.17)[9]

Cicero's claim to originality seems to be well grounded, even if *Rhetorica ad Herennium* is only one of *De Inuentione*'s contemporary handbooks of rhetoric.[10] Again, I am aware that the introduction of the concept of *paucitas* in rhetoric could be due to Cicero's direct source rather than to himself. But, in the light of the existing evidence, any further discussion on this point would be purely speculative.

What, however, I intend to stress in conclusion is that Cicero in the section on *partitio* recognizes and correctly illustrates how the qualities of a speech may be improved by using philosophical devices. In so doing, the young Cicero shows an early anticipation of his later programme of blending rhetoric and philosophy as the aim of the orator. And it is an achievement with which he seems to be very pleased.

*University of Leeds* SARA RUBINELLI
s.rubinelli@tiscali.it

[9] Text after F. Marx (ed.), *Ad C. Herennium libri IV* (Lipsiae, 1894). Marx, differently from Achard (n. 3), places commas after *res* and *sumus* and makes the text easier to understand.

[10] Achard (n. 3), 88, claims that the author of *Rhetorica ad Herennium* presents a precept that is similar to Cicero's *paucitas* in 2.34, but this claim can be challenged. The passage underlined by Achard reads: *Item uitiosa expositio est quae constat ex falsa enumeratione, si, cum plura sunt, pauciora dicamus, hoc modo: Duae res sunt, iudices, quae omnes ad maleficium inpellant, luxuries et auaritia* (*Rhetorica ad Herennium* 2.34). The author does warn orators not to present as separate concepts that are connected. However, he does not introduce the distinction between genera and species, which is fundamental to understanding and appling Cicero's precept. Moreover, the author does not himself seem to be aware of such a distinction, for he presents an example that, from a logical point of view, is wrong. He argues that 'distress' (*aegritudo*) is necessarily conjoined with 'fear' and 'desire', but this is evidently false. 'Distress' is neither a genus of 'fear' nor of 'desire'. It is simply a different species of passion.

## *VERGILIUM VESTIGARE*: *AENEID* 12.587–8

Do objects have a soul? Or perish must
Alike great temples and Tanagra dust?

The last syllable of 'Tanagra' and the first three letters of 'dust' form the name of the murderer whose *shargar* (puny ghost) the radiant spirit of our poet was soon to face. 'Simple chance!' the pedestrian reader may cry. But let him try to see, as I have tried to see, how many combinations are possible and plausible. 'Lenin*grad us*ed to be Petrograd?' 'A pri*g rad* (obs. past tense of read) *us?*' (Vladimir Nabokov, *Pale Fire*)

In 1963 Edwin Brown (*Numeri Vergiliani*, Latomus 63) noted the possibility of an acrostic at *G.* 1.429–33. The would-be onomastic comprises five interlocked lines, each of which either begins with the initial syllable of one of the poet's three names (Publius Vergilius Maro) or ends with a characteristic autobiographical detail:

Luna, revertentis cum primum colligit ignis,
si nigrum obscuro conprenderit aera cornu,
**ma**xumus agricolis pelagoque parabitur imber;
at si virgineum suffuderit ore ruborem,

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/52.2.615 Published online by Cambridge University Press

**ve**ntus erit; vento semper rubet aurea Phoebe.
Sine ortu quarto, namque is certissimus auctor,
**pu**ra neque obtunsis per caelum cornibus ibit. (*G.* 1. 427–33)

Virgil had a model for this kind of technopaignia in his Alexandrian predecessors. Here he may have conflated Aratus' vertical λεπτή acrostic (*Phaen.* 783–7) with Nicander's well-known *NIKANΔPOΣ* onomastic (*Ther.* 345–53). Since the content and placement of the above passage corresponds to that of the Aratus in question (lunar signs), Thomas (commentary ad loc.) has endorsed Brown's idea. Mynors passes over the possibility in silence. Although Courtney is more interested in Greek acrostics, he includes in his thorough survey a Latin example that functions on the level of the syllable.[1]

If indeed Virgil intended to signal his own name in such a clever way, he may have done so elsewhere. I believe this is the case with *Aen.* 12.587–8:

[arma ferunt alii et pergunt defendere muros]
*inclusas* ut cum *latebroso* in **pu**mice pastor
**ve**stigavit apes fumoque implevit a**maro**.

This unit is extremely compact, and almost every word plays a part. The relevant syllables occur in normal name-order (praenomen, cognomen, nomen), more pointedly than at *Georgics* 1. The last two are placed emphatically at the ends of a single verse, while the first is announced by *inclusas* and *latebroso*, which indicate that something is being encrypted. *latebroso* thus becomes metapoetical, since it is the word *pumex* itself that is 'full of hiding places'. *Vestigare* 'to track, search out' [= follow the *vestigia* of] and *implevit* also participate in this network of signals. Possible words beginning in *ma-* are foregone to accommodate the poet's full nomen in a neat trick. It is pertinent that the conjunction *fumus amarus* occurs nowhere else in classical literature.[2]

As in the other onomastic, the interspersed words function as autobiographical details: we think of the poet of the *Eclogues* [pastor] and especially the *Georgics* [apes, cf. *Pastor Aristaeus* at 4.317].[3] The retrospective quality of these verses also suggests a link with the sphragis of *G.* 4.559–66:

Haec super arvorum cultu pecorumque canebam
et super arboribus, Caesar dum magnus ad altum
fulminat Euphraten bello victorque volentis
per populos dat iura viamque adfectat Olymp**o**.
Illo *Vergilium* me tempore dulcis aleba**t**
Parthenope studiis florentem ignobilis **oti**,
*carmina qui lusi pastorum* audaxque iuvent**a**,
Tityre te patulae cecini sub tegmine fagi.[4]

[1] E. Courtney, 'Greek and Latin acrostichs', *Philologus* 134 (1990), 6 cites *Priapeia* 67, where the first syllables of Penelope, Dido, and Cacus (possibly Cadmus) are to be combined to form *pedicare*. See also Horsfall, *Virgil,* Aenid *7: A Commentary*, *Mnemos.* Suppl. 198 (2000), *ad Aen.* 7.601.

[2] It may be objected that the initial syllable of *Maro* is naturally short (e.g. at Statius, *Silv.* 2.6.20, 5.3.63), unlike the medial syllable of *amaro*. However, the comparable syllable in the *Georgics* acrostic (***ma****xumus*) is long only by position. Evidently the rigours of prosody did not deter our onomast in either instance.

[3] This inclusive richness adds another dimension to Virgil's revision of his chief model for this simile (Apoll. *Arg.* 2.130–6).

[4] As indicated in bold, the last letters of lines 562–5 spell out *otia*, as noticed by Walter

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/52.2.615 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Virgil not only injects his name at an extremely prominent point in his text, but also links that name explicitly with one poetical topic in particular: *pastores*. He provided this overt autograph at the end of one phase of his career; he may have composed the lines in *Aeneid* 12 as a subtler autograph at the end of another. If not, I follow in the footsteps of Nabokov's deluded caricature of a commentator, Dr Charles Kinbote.

*Lincoln College, Oxford* MATTHEW A. S. CARTER
matthew.carter@classics.ox.ac.uk

Schmidt in his *Vergil-Probleme*, Göppinger Akademische Beiträge 120 (1983), 317. I am grateful to Richard Thomas of Harvard University for the reference. Perhaps Virgil offers this as evidence for (and a byproduct of) his *ignobile otium*. The 'telestich' is, I believe, corroborated by the presence of *lusi* (functioning metapoetically), and especially by *Ecl*. 1.6 *O Meliboee deus nobis haec* ***otia*** *fecit*. As he playfully recollects that prominent verse, Virgil deepens our appreciation of the circularity he achieves in the last line of the *Georgics* (recapitulating *Ecl*. 1.1). Might the presence of *Caesar* in the sphragis be a clue to the identity of Meliboeus' *deus*?

## COLD-BLOODED VIRGIL: BILINGUAL WORDPLAY AT *GEORGICS* 2.483–9

Much recent work on Virgil has focused on the poet's extensive use of significant wordplay.[1] One such example comes in a particularly striking passage at the end of *Georgics* 2, where the poet discusses his preferences for his career. These lines have broad implications for the interpretation of the poem as a whole, and because a full analysis of the passage is tantamount to a complete interpretation of the *Georgics*, I will confine myself to noting the example of wordplay and suggesting a few of the ways in which its presence might influence a fuller interpretation of the poem.

Interrupting the famous 'praises of country life' which end the second book of the *Georgics*, Virgil claims (2.475–82) that his first ambition is to compose inspired verse dealing with cosmology and natural philosophy:[2]

> me uero primum dulces ante omnia Musae,
> quarum sacra fero ingenti percussus amore,
> accipiant caelique uias et sidera monstrent,
> defectus solis uarios lunaeque labores;
> unde tremor terris, qua ui maria alta tumescant
> obicibus ruptis rursusque in se ipsa residant,
> quid tantum Oceano properent se tingere soles
> Hiberni, uel quae tardis mora noctibus obstet. (2.475–82)[3]

Immediately after these lines, the poet admits the possibility that his talents may lie

[1] See in this regard J. J. O'Hara, *True Names: Virgil and the Alexandrian Tradition of Etymological Wordplay* (Ann Arbor, 1996), esp. 1–7 and 57–111, and M. Paschalis, *Virgil's Aeneid: Semantic Relations and Proper Names* (Oxford, 1997), esp. 1–8. The precursor of these studies is G. J. M. Bartelink, *Etymologisering bij Vergilius* (Amsterdam, 1965).

[2] On the finale to Book 2, I find the analysis of Clay largely persuasive; see J. S. Clay, 'The argument of the end of Vergil's second *Georgic*', *Philologus* 120 (1976), 232–45. See also P. R. Hardie, *Virgil's Aeneid: Cosmos and Imperium* (Oxford, 1986), 33–51. For the literary background to these lines and especially their context, the *laudes uitae rusticae*, see G. Williams, *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry* (Oxford, 1968), 165–70. The classic study is still F. Klingner, 'Über das Lob des Landlebens in Virgils *Georgica*', *Hermes* 66 (1931), 159–89.

[3] Quotations are taken from Mynors's Oxford text; all translations are my own.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/52.2.615 Published online by Cambridge University Press