

Virgil's *Cacus* and Etymology

NEIL ADKIN

Virgil's *Cacus*-epyllion, in which this Aventine troll misappropriates the cattle of the en-route Hercules, begins thus (*Aen.* 8,193-212):

hic spelunca fuit vasto summota recessu,
semihominis Caci facies quam dira tenebat
solis inaccessam radii; semperque recenti 195
caede tepebat humus, foribusque adfixa superbis
ora virum tristi pendebant pallida tabo.
huic monstro Volcanus erat pater: illius atros
ore vomens ignis magna se mole ferebat.
attulit et nobis aliquando optantibus aetas 200
auxilium adventumque dei. nam maximus ultor
tergemini nece Geryonae spoliisque superbus
Alcides aderat taurosque hac victor agebat
ingentis, vallemque boves amnemque tenebant.
at furis Caci mens effera, ne quid inausum 205
aut intractatum scelerisve dolive fuisset,
quattuor a stabulis praestanti corpore tauros
avertit, totidem forma superante iuencas.
atque hos, ne qua forent pedibus vestigia rectis,
cauda in speluncam tractos versisque viarum 210
indiciis raptor saxo occultabat opaco;
quaerenti nulla ad speluncam signa ferebant.

In the pivotal line 205 the MSS are divided between *fūris* and *furiis*. Editors are similarly split: while Geymonat for example adopts *furiis*¹, Conte opts instead for *furis*². The pros and cons that have been so far adduced for both sides are inconclusive³. No attempt has hitherto been made to argue on grounds of etymology, which supports *furis*⁴. This *furis* forms part of a phrase which reads thus: *at furis Caci mens effera*. This unit is accordingly framed by *furis* and *effera*, for the latter of which a very large number of synonymous al-

¹ Geymonat 2008, 468.

² Conte 2009, 237.

³ They are conveniently summed up by Eden 1975, 79-80.

⁴ O'Hara's (2017) brand-new pandect of Virgilian etymologizing contains nothing about the line in question (8,205), but merely mentions the previous line (204), on which O'Hara refers (p. xxix) to his forthcoming commentary on this book for discussion of the allusion here to the etymology of the Forum Boarium.

ternatives could have been used instead⁵. This word (*ef*)*ferus* was etymologized from *ferre*⁶. This etymology of (*ef*)*ferus/fera* from *ferre* can be shown to have been exploited by Virgil on quite a few occasions⁷. For the purposes of the present article reference may be made briefly to four passages of the *Aeneid* where a textual problem is cleared up by recognition of a *jeu étymologique* on *ferre* as etymon of (*ef*)*ferus/fera*.

The first passage to be considered in this connection occurs in the immediately preceding book (*Aen.* 7,489), where Virgil's description of Silvia's tame stag as *ferus* is «singularly inappropriate»⁸. The explanation for this «inappropriateness» is evidently to be found in the next line but two (492), where in emphatically final *sedes* this *ferus* is qualified with etymonic *se ... ferebat*, which has to be glossed as *remeabat* by Ti. Claudius Donatus (*Aen.* 7,490 p. 74,21 G.). The second of these passages is located in the book immediately following the Cacus-episode: «this [viz. *Aen.* 9,551] is the only animal simile in the epic where the zoological referent is left unidentified [viz.: *ut fera*]⁹. Again the reason for this bafflingly unique inspecificity is to be sought in the verb that is attached to this *fera* at the end of the next line but one (553): [*ut fera*] ... *supra venabula fertur*¹⁰. Here *fertur* itself is problematic¹¹. It is however etymologically unproblematic for a *fera* to *ferri*.

The last two of these four passages are both to be found in the *Aeneid*'s second book. In the first of these two texts (*Aen.* 2,51) the Trojan Horse is described as a *ferus*. Here Horsfall's recent and amplitudinous commentary is

⁵ Cf. *Synon. Cic.* p. 424,14-17 B. (listing no fewer than 23 synonyms). Here this Virgilian *effera* is further highlighted by the bucolic diaeresis that follows immediately.

⁶ Cf. Maltby 1991, 230 (s. v. *ferus*), citing Serv. *Aen.* 2,51 ('*feri*' ... : *ab eo quod toto corpore feratur*), to which should be added Adkin 2010, 479. Cf. also Maltby 1991, 228 (s. v. *fera*), citing inter al. Serv. *Aen.* 1,215 (*feras dicimus aut quod omni corpore feruntur, aut quod naturali utuntur libertate et pro desiderio suo feruntur*).

⁷ It is proposed to deal fully with this question elsewhere. All three words ((*ef*)*ferus/fera*) are wholly absent from the indexes in O'Hara 2017, Michalopoulos 2001 and Paschalis 1997.

⁸ So Conington-Nettleship 2008, 50.

⁹ Fratantuono 2012-13, 82.

¹⁰ This *fertur* is underscored by the immediately ensuing anacoluthon, which is «höchst ungewöhnlich» (Berres 1982, 101-102). This same line-final *fertur* and line-initial *ut fera* accordingly «frame» this tristichic simile; on such «framing» as an etymological marker cf. O'Hara 2017, 82-86.

¹¹ The latest commentator (Dingel 1997, 208) notes with perplexity «dass das umzingelte Tier von seinem bevorstehenden Tod weiß, dass es dennoch springt und dass der Sprung so geschildert wird, als gelinge dem Tier die Flucht».

clearly surprised by this choice of language¹²: «hardly “wild” except as a dangerous enemy to the Trojans». This surprising employment of *ferus* is evidently to be seen in conjunction with the use at the end of the previous line but one (49) of etymonic *ferentis* (sc. *dona*), which has to be glossed as *offerunt* by Servius Auctus (on 48): the reference of both *ferentis* and *ferus* is the same, viz. «the horse». It may also be observed that *ferri* as etymon of *ferus* is the conceptual opposite of *stare* (next l. [52]: «immobility» versus «mobility»), which is the etymon of *hasta* (next l. [50] after *ferentis* [49] in same final *sedes*)¹³. The last of these four texts occurs somewhat later in this same Book II. Here (2,326-327) Aeneas is told: *ferus omnia Iuppiter Argos / transtulit*. Once again Horsfall is surprised by *ferus*¹⁴: «not a standard epithet of gods in general ..., and certainly not of Jup[iter]»¹⁵. Once again we evidently have here a *jeu étymologique* on *ferus* and etymonic (*trans*)*ferre*¹⁶: both words frame the sentence¹⁷.

Since therefore Virgil does demonstrably play on *ferus* and *ferre*, this same etymological *jeu* would be unsurprising in the line about Cacus (*Aen.* 8,205) currently at issue. This line begins with *at furis*. One of the reasons for rejecting this *furis* in favour of *furiis* is that «*fur* is not an epic word and does not occur elsewhere in the *Aen.*»¹⁸. However this very «unepicness» puts the reader on the *qui vive* for word-play. The possible etymology of *fur* had already engaged Virgil's attention in the *Georgics*, where (3,407) his *nocturnum ... furem* would seem to be an allusion to the derivation of *fur* from *furvus*¹⁹. This etymology from *furvus* was however rejected by Gellius (1,18,5), who instead preferred the alternative derivation from φῶρ, which was in turn derived from φέρω²⁰. Virgil himself is partial to such either-or etymologies²¹. It would seem possible to show that in a number of passages of the *Aeneid* Virgil is exploiting this alternative derivation of *fur(tum)* from *fero*.

¹² Horsfall 2008, 89.

¹³ For (*a*)*stare* as etymon of *hasta* cf. Maltby 1991, 270.

¹⁴ Horsfall 2008, 277.

¹⁵ Not surprisingly *ferus* here has to be glossed; cf. (e. g.) *Gloss.*¹ II *Arma* F 70: *ferus Iupiter: malus Iovis*.

¹⁶ *Tulit* was regarded as a form of *fero*; cf. (e. g.) Cairns 1979, 99.

¹⁷ For such «framing» as an etymological signpost cf. O'Hara 2017, 82-86.

¹⁸ Gransden 1976, 111. Cf. Heyne-Wagner 1833, 203 («*furis* vero vocabulum epica gravitate indignum et exile»); Forbiger 1875, 144 («*furis*, satis languide»).

¹⁹ Cf. O'Hara 2017, 280.

²⁰ Cf. Maltby 1991, 248-249 (s. vv. *fur*; *furtum*), citing inter al. Paul. *dig.* 47,2,1 *praef.* (*furtum ... a ferendo*).

²¹ Cf. O'Hara 2017, 92-93.

Three passages may be adduced in this connection beside the current one about Cacus (*Aen.* 8,205). The first (*Aen.* 9,546-547) is separated by just three lines from afore-mentioned *ut fera ... fertur* (551-553): *quem ... Licymnia furtim / sustulerat*. Here *furtim* occupies the same final *sedes* as *fertur*, while the *-tul-* of *sustulerat* is placed in the same initial *locus* as *fer(a)*. *Furtim* and *sustulerat* are moreover positioned at the end and beginning of consecutive lines: such «coupling across a line boundary» is an etymological marker²². A further nudge-nudge would seem to be supplied by the *Licymnia* that immediately precedes *furtim* and is the subject of *sustulerat*²³. The other two passages of the *Aeneid* in which Virgil is evidently playing on the etymological link between *fur(tum)* and *ferre* are 6,568-569 (*quae quis apud superos furto laetatus inani / distulit in seram commissa piacula mortem*) and 10,734-735 (*seque viro vir / contulit, haud furto melior sed fortibus armis*): on each occasion Servius is obliged to explain *furto*²⁴.

If therefore Virgil does play on the derivation of *fur(tum)* from *fero* elsewhere in the *Aeneid*, an allusion to the same etymology would be no surprise in 8,205: *at furis Caci mens effera*. It has however been shown above that Virgil also etymologizes (*ef*)*ferus* as well as said *fur* from this same *fero*. Hence this unit (*furis ... effera*) is framed by two words that derive from the same etymon: *fero*. However in each case this etymonic *fero* is used in precisely the opposite sense: if a *fur* «carries off», an *efferus* «is carried off». This etymological artfulness is lost if *furis* is replaced by *furiis*. Heyne-Wagner are accordingly wrong to frown on *furis* as a «*vocabulum exile*». The etymological spissitude which it generates here is the very opposite of «exility»: this is Lucullan stuff.

That Virgil is indeed alluding here to the etymology of *fur* from *fero* would seem to be corroborated by a clue he has embedded shortly beforehand. *At furis* is positioned at the beginning of the line (205). Just six lines earlier (200)²⁵ the same initial *sedes* is occupied by *attulit*²⁶. This kind of verti-

²² Cf. Michalopoulos 2001, 5. Both words (*furtim / sustulerat*) draw attention to themselves by their semantic idiosyncrasy; cf. Dingel 1997, 206.

²³ This *Licymnia* is a nod to Hor. *carm.* 2,12,13; cf. Hardie 1994, 176. It is therefore worth noting that this ode's opening line has *ferae* in the middle, while the stanza immediately following the mention of *Licymnia* likewise has *ferre* in the middle of its opening line (17): both *ferae* and *ferre* are placed third in their respective lines, where each of them is located in the first element of a matching string of negatives.

²⁴ Viz. as *latebra* and *insidiis* respectively. In connection with the second passage (10,735: *fortibus armis*) it may be observed that *fortis* was likewise etymologized from *ferre*; cf. Maltby 1991, 241.

²⁵ On the importance Virgil attaches to such sexilinear spacing cf. Thomas 1988, 153-154; 176.

cal alignment at the start of the line is an etymological red flag²⁷. Initial *at-* in *at-tulit* exactly matches similarly initial *at* in *at furis*, while medial *-tul-* (< *fero*) likewise corresponds to similarly medial *fur-* (< *fero*). To achieve this correlation Virgil has evidently gone to some trouble. Here *attulit* needs to be glossed as *advexit* by Ti. Claudius Donatus (*Aen.* 8,200 p. 145,3 G.)²⁸. As to *at furis*, Virgil could have expressed himself without recourse to *at*. He could also have inverted the order of the nouns: *at Caci furis*. If then *at furis* is glossed by *attulit* in the same *sedes*, this same *at furis* is also glossed by *effera* in the same line. If however *attulit* and *effera* both come from *ferre*, they exhibit a piquantly contrastive prefix: *ad / ex*.

If this *attulit* is highlighted by its immediately antecedent paronym *ferrebat* (199), this same juxtaposition also highlights *ferrebat* itself. It would seem in fact that the function of this *ferrebat* is not just to give prominence to *attulit*. Here *ferrebat* and *semihominis* (194) frame the passage that introduces Cacus²⁹. Such a «passage frame» is an etymological red light³⁰. *Semihominis*, which is a Virgilian hapax³¹, is glossed as *semiferi* by Ti. Claudius Donatus (*Aen.* 8,190 p. 143,30 G.)³². It would seem that «framing» *ferrebat* (199) is meant to provide an etymological gloss on the similarly «framing», but «suppressed» *semiferi* that is to be supplied for substitutive *semihominis*³³. Henry notes that *semihominis Caci facies ... dira* (194) corresponds exactly to *furis*

²⁶ This verb is set off further by its initial position in the sentence as well as the line. Here *attulit* is also spotlighted by direct juxtaposition with the very same verb (*ferrebat*), which is located at the end of the previous line (199): such polyptotic anadiplosis over verse-end is very striking.

²⁷ Cf. Cairns 1996, 33 (= Cairns 2007, 317).

²⁸ The sentence begun by this *attulit* is itself noteworthy: *attulit et nobis aliquando optantibus aetas / auxilium adventumque dei*. The *aetas* that is the subject of this *attulit* has to be explained by both Servius (*beneficium temporis*) and by Ti. Claudius Donatus (*Aen.* 8,200 p. 145,2 G.: *oportunum ... tempus*). A comparable play on another compound of *ferre* (*rettulit*) occurs shortly afterwards in this book (8,343); cf. Adkin 2001.

²⁹ While *semihominis* is positioned at the start of the first line (194), *ferrebat* is placed at the end of the last line (199).

³⁰ Cf. O'Hara 2017, 83-86.

³¹ Here the word is brought into particular relief by postposition of the relative (*quam*) until the hephthemimeres.

³² *Semiferi* is also the word used in the last line of the Cacus-episode (8,267).

³³ For such «suppression» in etymologizing cf. O'Hara 2017, 79-82. The further point may be made that *semihom-* (= *semifer-*; 194) occupies the same initial position as the *attul-* (200) that is juxtaposed with paronymous *ferrebat* (199). This *semihom-* (= *semifer-*; 194) is moreover separated by exactly six lines from etymologizing *ferrebat* (199), just as similarly etymologizing (*at*)*tulit* (200) is separated by the same six-line spacing from the (*at*) *fur-* (205) it etymologizes.

Caci mens effera (205)³⁴. Since *semihominis* is evidently meant to evoke *semiferi*, which shares with *fur* the etymon *fero*, this «correspondence» is closer than Henry thinks.

It may be asked why Virgil should have substituted *semihominis* for *semiferi*. The reason would again appear to be etymology. *Homo* was etymologized from *humus*³⁵. *Humus*, for which a large number of possible synonyms were available³⁶, is the word Virgil chooses to employ when describing Cacus' cave in the clause starting in the line immediately after the one beginning with *semihominis*. Here (195-196) *humus* is placed in saliently ante-caesural position: *semperque recenti / caede tepebat humus*. *Humus* was in turn etymologized from *humor*³⁷. If then Virgil's *humus* (196) would seem to be an allusion to this word as etymon of *homo* in his foregoing *semihominis* (194), an allusion to *humor* as etymon of *humus* itself would seem to be contained in his use of *caede* (196), which here means «sanguis vel cruor»³⁸. *Humor* is the «opposite» of *ignis*³⁹. This *ignis* is placed in the concluding line of Virgil's description of Cacus: *illius* (sc. Cacus' father Vulcan) *atros / ore vomens ignis magna se mole ferebat* (198-199). Virgil's piquantly etymological point is evidently that this (*semi*)*homo* is not the progeny of «wet» *humus*, but of «igneous» Vulcan⁴⁰. If in this last line *ignis* occupies pre-caesural *sedes*, final *sedes* is occupied by the *ferebat* which supplies an etymological gloss on the (*semi*)*ferus* that is «suppressed» by said (*semi*)*homo*.

If this *ferebat* points up adjacent *attulit* (200), which is in turn an etymological gloss on similarly line-initial *at furis* (205), a similar gloss on *fur* is evidently provided by *avertit* at the start of line 208. *Averto* is a synonym of *aufero*⁴¹. Such synonyms are regularly employed in etymologizing⁴²: hence *avertit* is evidently being used here in place of synonymous *aufert* to gloss *fur*

³⁴ Henry 1883, 665.

³⁵ Cf. Maltby 1991, 281.

³⁶ Cf. *Synon. Cic.* p. 427,7 B.

³⁷ Cf. Maltby 1991, 285.

³⁸ Cf. *ThLL* III, 51,10-60, s. v. *caedes*. This line-initial *caede* is separated by just one word from the pre-caesural *humus* it describes: for such «framing» of a hemistich as an etymological marker cf. Michalopoulos 2001, 5. This same *caede* is itself qualified by *recenti*, which here is used «less in the sense of "fresh" ... than in that of "wet"» (Henry 1883, 663).

³⁹ So *ThLL* VII,1, 289,45, s. v. *ignis*.

⁴⁰ It may be observed that Varro had recently etymologized *ignis* from (*g*)*nasci* (*ling.* 5,70).

⁴¹ Cf. *OLD* I, 232, s. v. *averto* (sect. 9): «To carry away (the property of others), (mis)appropriate, steal»; *ibid.*, I, 232, s. v. *aufero* (sect. 5a): «To take away (what is not one's own), appropriate, steal».

⁴² Cf. Michalopoulos 2001, 11.

as a derivative of *fero*. For this glossographic purpose *avertit* has been carefully foregrounded. Like *attulit* (200), *avertit* (208) is vertically aligned with the *at furis* (205) which both these verbs gloss: such plumb-line juxtaposition in verse-initial *sedes* is an etymological *Fingerzeig*⁴³. This *at furis* moreover opens the sentence whose last line begins with *avertit*, which is further accentuated by enjambment with strong sense-break: here antibacchic *avertit* becomes by position an attention-grabbing molossus. Since furthermore the subject of *avertit* is the non-personal *furis Caci mens effera*, the resultant anacoluthon invests this hintful verb with extra salience⁴⁴.

Besides afore-discussed *at furis* (8,205) there is a second passage involving Virgil's Cacus where etymology is at issue. O'Hara twice expresses surprise that Virgil does not allude to the natural etymology of «Cacus» from *κακός* («bad»)⁴⁵. It would however seem possible to show that Virgil does in fact make specific reference to *κακός* as etymon of «Cacus»⁴⁶. The Cacus-text at issue here occurs near the end of the epyllion some forty lines after aforesaid *at furis*. This second passage, which describes how Hercules breaks open Cacus' cave, may again be quoted in full (*Aen.* 8,241-249):

at specus et Caci detecta apparuit ingens
regia, et umbrosae penitus patuere cavernae,
non secus ac si qua penitus vi terra dehiscens
infernās reseret sedes et regna recludat
pallida, dis invisā, superque immane barathrum 245
cernatur, trepident immisso lumine manes.
ergo insperata deprensū luce repente ...
desuper Alcides telis premit.

Manes (246), which occurs only here in the third quarter of the *Aeneid*, is conspicuously positioned as last word of last line of the long period that be-

⁴³ Cf. Cairns 1996, 33 (= Cairns 2007, 317).

⁴⁴ The final point may be made that after a space of just three lines after *avertit* the last word of the last line of the last sentence of this passage is *ferebant* (212), after which Geymonat 2008, 469 rightly indents. Reeve 1970, 134-135 is accordingly wrong to delete this line, which ends with the last of the hints (*ferebant*) at the etymology of *fur*.

⁴⁵ O'Hara 2017, 73; 204. For the derivation of «Cacus» from *κακός* cf. Maltby 1991, 90.

⁴⁶ For Virgil's interest in word play on *κακός* elsewhere cf. Adkin 2016, 23-24, where it is argued that the *κακόν* perpetrated in *Il.* 15,586 becomes acrostical *caco* («I s—t»; *Aen.* 11,808-811). The excretory wit continues with «Acca» (820), which is anagrammatical *caca* («s—t!»), confirmed by the acrostics in 820-827 (upward *caq*[=c]at, downward *cesi* [= χέζει]).

gan back in 241 (*at specus ...*)⁴⁷. This word *manes* was etymologized from *mānus*, an old synonym of *bonus*⁴⁸. This etymology was frequently understood antiphrastically: *per antiphrasin 'manes' inferi, quia non sint boni*⁴⁹. Virgil himself alludes to this etymology at *Aen.* 12,646-647: *vos o mihi, manes, / este boni*⁵⁰. The *manes* of the Cacus-passage is preceded in the directly antecedent line (245) by the glaringly paronomastic *immane* (*superque immane barathrum*)⁵¹. *Immanis*, like *manes*, was etymologized from *mānus*⁵²: *'immane' pro malo ...; nam 'manum' bonum*⁵³. Virgil has accordingly crafted a chiasmic formulation (*immane ... cernatur, trepident ... manes*) that is framed by two words with exactly the same etymon (*immane ... manes*)⁵⁴. It was shown above that *furis ... effera* (205) evinces a precisely analogous instance of a circumjacent noun and adjective that share the identical etymon: just as framing *furis / effera* were linked by the etymon *fero*, so similarly circumferential *immane / manes* are united by similarly etymonic *mānus*.

This twofold use of etymonic *mānus* in contiguous lines (245-246: *immane ... manes*) is exactly paralleled by the similarly «blatant»⁵⁵ twofold use of post-caesural *penitus* in similarly contiguous lines (242-243) that are separated by just one line from said *immane ... manes*. These two instances of *penitus* are immediately preceded by a line (241) in which «Cacus», who has not been named for twenty lines, is positioned in prominently pre-caesural *sedes*⁵⁶. Similarly the two lines containing *immane / manes* (245-246) are im-

⁴⁷ After *manes* Geymonat 2008, 470 actually starts a new paragraph.

⁴⁸ Cf. Maltby 1991, 364.

⁴⁹ So (e. g.) Serv. *Aen.* 1,139.

⁵⁰ Cf. Bartelink 1965, 108. The further point may be made that the immediately preceding line (645: *terga dabo et Turnum fugientem haec terra videbit?*) evidently contains an unidentified reference to the derivation of *tergum* from *terra*; cf. Maltby 1991, 605.

⁵¹ Here *immane* is further highlighted by the ambiguity of immediately foregoing *super*; cf. Eden 1975, 88.

⁵² Cf. Maltby 1991, 295.

⁵³ So (e. g.) Serv. Auct. *Aen.* 1,110.

⁵⁴ The chiasmus in *immane ... cernatur, trepident ... manes* is an argument for syndetic *trepident* (against variant *trepidentque*) and for not taking this verb as apodotic (as [e. g.] Eden 1975, 89 does). Since the etymological *jeu* in *immane ... manes* is absent from the Homeric source-text (*Il.* 20,61-65), here we have a case of «enrichment» (on which cf. Michalopoulos 2001, 10).

⁵⁵ So Eden 1975, 88.

⁵⁶ This line (241) is itself prominent: on the one hand it starts the lengthy period that ends with *manes* (246), while on the other it introduces the description of the breaching of Cacus' cave.

mediately followed by a line (247) which likewise refers to Cacus⁵⁷. This time however Cacus is not directly named, but is instead qualified as *depremsum*⁵⁸. The twofold etymologies of *immane* / *manes* as «not good» in the two preceding lines (245-246) are evidently meant to suggest a similar etymology for «suppressed» Cacus in the immediately following line (247)⁵⁹. Cacus too is being etymologized as «not good», which is a «synonym» for «bad»: κακός⁶⁰.

Further pointers to this etymology have been embedded in the Virgilian text. The *depremsum* (247) that stands in for «suppressed» Cacus after twofold *immane* / *manes* (245-246) finds an exact counterpart in the synonymous and similarly post-caesural *detecta* (241) that before similarly twofold *penitus* (242-243) is directly juxtaposed with selfsame and this time full-frontally explicit «Cacus»: *Caci detecta*⁶¹. This same *depremsum* is itself directly juxtaposed with *luce* (247), which picks up synonymous and similarly ablatival *lumine* in same *sedes* after fourth diaeresis in the previous line (246)⁶². This *lumine* is directly juxtaposed with *manes*: hence the reader is nudged to link *lumine manes* (246: «not good») with *depremsum luce* (247: sc. Cacus, similarly «not good»)⁶³. To sum up: in etymologizing «Cacus», *malus* / *bonus* is too *ingēnu*. Smart <*non*> *mānus* is much «better».

⁵⁷ Like l. 241 (cf. n. 56 above), this line (247) is also salient, since it begins a section.

⁵⁸ Designation of Cacus by such a mere participle (*depremsum*) after a long simile (243-246) and the start of a new section in the line at issue (247) encourages readers to make the attention-focusing effort of supplying the name «Cacus» for themselves.

⁵⁹ Here «suppressed» Cacus accordingly matches similarly «suppressed» *semiferi* (l. 194); cf. n. 33 above (with lit. on etymological «suppression»).

⁶⁰ Here «not good» as a «synonym» for «bad» accordingly parallels the use of *averto* for similarly «synonymous» *aufero* (l. 208); cf. n. 42 above (with lit. on etymological «synonymity»).

⁶¹ For *detego* as a synonym of *deprendo* cf. *ThlL* V,1,1, 795,44, s. v. *detego*. In the present passage both verbs are matching p. p.'s (*detect-* / *deprend-*).

⁶² For *lumen* as a synonym of *lux* cf. *ThlL* VII,2,2, 1811,14-44, s. v. *lumen*. This parallelism of *luce* with similarly prepositionless *lumine* is an argument against the variant *in luce*.

⁶³ The first three lexemes of this last line (247: *ergo insperata depremsum ...*) would seem to invite subtextual interpretation as the type of etymological marker that «consists of words ... which point to the presence of an etymology» (Michalopoulos 2001, 4-5). While *depremsum* itself, which denotes Cacus, would thus refer to «detection» of this name's etymology (cf. *OLD* I, 572, s. v. *deprehendo* [sect. 4a]: «to detect, recognize»), *insperata* (cf. *OLD* I, 1019, s. v. [sect. 1]: «unexpected») would suggest the «unexpectedness» of such etymologizing here; thirdly *ergo* immediately after *manes* would hint at the «conclusion» (cf. *ThlL* V,2, 763,19, s. v.: «*ergo* notat conclusionem logicam») that is to be drawn about the etymology of «Cacus» from the two foregoing cas-

Bibliography

- Adkin 2001 = N. Adkin, *A Virgilian Crux: Aeneid 8,342-343*, «AJPh» 122, 2001, 527-531.
- Adkin 2010 = N. Adkin, *Further Supplements to Marangoni's Supplementum Etymologicum: Servius and Servius Auctus on Virgil*, in C. Deroux (ed.), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History*, 15, Brussels 2010, 473-491.
- Adkin 2016 = N. Adkin, *Acrostic Shit (Ecl. 4,47-52)*, «ACD» 52, 2016, 21-37.
- Bartelink 1965 = G. J. M. Bartelink, *Etymologisering bij Vergilius*, Amsterdam 1965.
- Berres 1982 = T. Berres, *Die Entstehung der Aeneis*, Wiesbaden 1982.
- Cairns 1979 = F. Cairns, *Tibullus: A Hellenistic Poet at Rome*, Cambridge 1979.
- Cairns 1996 = F. Cairns, *Ancient «Etymology» and Tibullus: On the Classification of «Etymologies» and on «Etymological Markers»*, «PCPhS» 42, 1996, 24-59 (= id., *Papers on Roman Elegy: 1969-2003*, Bologna 2007, 308-340).
- Conington-Nettleship 2008 = J. Conington - H. Nettleship, *Conington's Virgil: Aeneid, Books VII-IX*, Exeter 2008.
- Conte 2009 = G. B. Conte, *P. Vergilius Maro: Aeneis*, Berlin - New York 2009.
- Dingel 1997 = J. Dingel, *Kommentar zum 9. Buch der Aeneis Vergils*, Heidelberg 1997.
- Eden 1975 = P. T. Eden, *A Commentary on Virgil: Aeneid VIII*, Leiden 1975.
- Forbiger 1875 = A. Forbiger, *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*, 3, Leipzig 1875⁴.
- Fratantuono 2012-13 = L. Fratantuono, *A Poetic Menagerie: The Animal Similes of Virgil's Aeneid*, «Eranos» 107, 2012-13, 67-102.
- Geymonat 2008 = M. Geymonat, *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*, Rome 2008.
- Gransden 1976 = K. W. Gransden, *Virgil: Aeneid, Book VIII*, Cambridge 1976.
- Hardie 1994 = P. R. Hardie, *Virgil: Aeneid, Book IX*, Cambridge 1994.
- Henry 1883 = J. Henry, *Aeneidea*, 3, Dublin 1883.
- Heyne-Wagner 1833 = C. G. Heyne - G. P. E. Wagner, *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*, 3, Leipzig - London 1833⁴.
- Horsfall 2008 = N. Horsfall, *Virgil, Aeneid 2: A Commentary*, Leiden - Boston 2008.
- Maltby 1991 = R. Maltby, *A Lexicon of Ancient Latin Etymologies*, Leeds 1991.
- Michalopoulos 2001 = A. Michalopoulos, *Ancient Etymologies in Ovid's Metamorphoses: A Commented Lexicon*, Leeds 2001.
- O'Hara 2017 = J. J. O'Hara, *True Names: Vergil and the Alexandrian Tradition of Etymological Wordplay*, Ann Arbor 2017.
- Paschalis 1997 = M. Paschalis, *Virgil's Aeneid: Semantic Relations and Proper Names*, Oxford 1997.
- Reeve 1970 = M. D. Reeve, *Seven Notes*, «CR» n. s. 20, 1970, 134-136.
- Thomas 1988 = R. F. Thomas, *Virgil: Georgics*, 1, Cambridge 1988.

Abstract: The present note deals with two passages that frame Virgil's Cacuspyllion: *Aen.* 8,193-212 and 241-250. It is argued that in both these texts etymology is at issue.

NEIL ADKIN
nadkin3489@aol.com

es of etymologically parallel «not good» (*immane / manes*).