

Etrusca is highly irregular. This adverb, which occurs 240 times throughout the poem, is only elided once elsewhere, at 7.616 (*hoc et tum Aeneadis indicere bella Latinus*), where the appearance of the choriambic patronymic *Aeneadis* and the idiomatic pairing *et tum* effectively necessitates the use of this licence. Furthermore, the occurrence is mitigated by the preceding monosyllable *et* (with which it coheres), a device commonly employed by Virgil and other poets when eliding monosyllables.¹ Indeed, the elision of monosyllables is comparatively restricted in the *Aeneis*, and most commonly found in the case of pronouns and conjunctions; with the exception of *iam*, it is very rare in adverbs or declinable words. More significantly, of 132 elided monosyllables in the poem, only twice elsewhere does such an elision occur with the initial word of a sentence: at 2.102 *si* is elided (before *omnis*) at the impassioned close of Sinon's speech to the Trojans, perhaps reflecting feigned conversational familiarity, and at 7.295 *num* is elided (before *incensa*), which thus allows rhetorical anaphora, *num* having already occurred twice at the beginning of both clauses of the preceding sentence (294-5).

In the present passage, however, where 503 introduces not only a new sentence but also a change of speaker, the elision of *tum*, which here bears emphasis and an accent,² would be doubly irregular and not evidently motivated by any stylistic factor.³ The appearance of *Etrusca* does not provide a cogent explanation for the licence, for a simple alternative to this adjective was available to Virgil, namely *Tusca*. Virgil employs *Tusca* several times elsewhere in the sense of *Etrusca*,⁴ either in his poetic narrative or in the mouth of others. It thus

¹ JEAN SOUBIRAN, *L'Élision dans la poésie latine*, Paris 1966, at pp. 409-410, building on the work of JOSEPH HELLEGOUARC'H's *Le Monosyllable dans l'hexamètre latin* (Paris 1964), highlighted the frequency with which a monosyllable precedes the elided monosyllable in dactylic poetry. He then proceeded to observe (*ibid.*, p. 411) that 70% of monosyllables elided by Virgil stand in the second place of a syntactic phrase; that the only elisions of *nam* (1.308) and *ne* (8.39, 10.11) occur at the beginning of a short parenthetical phrase suggests that their delivery was more casual and colloquial in nature.

² Of the three other monosyllables ending in *-um* which Virgil elided (5.693 *cum*, 7.71 *dum*, 295 *num*, 528 *cum*, 10.503 *cum*, 11.540 *cum*, 12.38 *sum*, 941 *cum*) none bears an accent. Twice in the *Georgica* Virgil elided *tum* but in both cases it coincided with a preceding *iam* (1.360 *iam sibi tum*, 2.405 *iam tum*), thus mitigating the elision (cf. n. 5 below).

³ Since *Etruscus* scans in the *Aeneis* not only with a long first syllable (as at 9.150, 10.180 and 11.598) but also a short (as at 8.480, 9.521, 10.148, 238 and 429), and *Etruria* with a long first syllable at 12.232 but a short at 8.494, it was suggested by CARL ZANDER (*Eurythmia vel compositio rhythmica prosae antiquae*, Leipzig 1910-1914, vol. II p. 602) and later *suo Marte* by SOUBIRAN (as n. 1, p. 411, thereby rejecting the possibility that *tum* could be elided under these circumstances), that the scansion should be *tūm Etrusca*, i.e. with *tum* standing in prosodic hiatus. This is highly improbable. Such a metrical licence is not attested in Virgil with another monosyllable ending in *-m*, and is only found once at all, in the case of an unaccented pronoun: at 6.507 the poet wrote *tē āmice*, a technique imitating conversational diction (as *amice* itself attests), and thus appropriate to Aeneas' loving words to Deiphobus; for a use of this same licence to convey informality in Vergil's earlier works, one may compare *Ecl.* 2.65 (*o*) and 8.108 (*qui*). It is unthinkable that this licence was employed with *tum* at 8.503.

⁴ 10.164, 203, 11.629, 12.551; in addition, at 8.473 (Evander speaking), 10.199 and 11.316 (Latinus speaking), and *Geo.* 1.499, *Tusca* is used of the river Tiber, since it rose in Etruria.

seems perfectly possible that Virgil here wrote *tum Tusca resedit*, thus avoiding both metrical irregularity⁵ and metrical ambiguity (see n. 3). Just as Evander can casually use *Tyrrhena* of the Etruscan *regna* at 8.507, so too could he here speak of their army as *Tusca... acies*. A simple accidental expansion by a scribe to the slightly commoner⁶ *Etrusca* (perhaps under the influence of 480 *Etruscis* and/or 494 *Etruria*) need simply have occurred at some point in the following few centuries.

Aen. 9.570

Ilioneus saxo atque ingenti fragmine montis
 Lucetium portae subeuntem ignisque ferentem, 570
 Emathiona Liger, Corynaeum sternit Asilas...
 (9.569-571)

Virgil here recounts the slaughter of Trojan forces by Rutulian warriors led by Turnus, who have filled up trenches outside the Trojan camp and begun to hurl brands at it. The name of one of Ilioneus' victims, Lucetius, appears only once in the poem, here at 9.570. Yet this figure is not only absent from the rest of the *Aeneis* but also from other Latin accounts. Servius explicitly notes of Lucetius (*ad* 9.567) that *solum hoc nomen est quod dictum a Vergilio in nullo alio reperitur auctore*. To judge from the literature that survives to the modern day, Servius' statement (whether based upon contemporary evidence or earlier testimony to the same effect) could well have been accurate. It may therefore be worthwhile to enquire what motivated Vergil to conjure up this name (about whose form the major manuscripts are in complete agreement).

If we continue with Servius' account *ad loc.*, he states that *Lucetius* was an Oscan name for Jupiter, bearing an etymology associated with light (*a luce*), just like Latin *Iuppiter* does with *dies*.⁷ Two centuries prior, Aulus Gellius (5.12.6) likewise observed that *Lucetius* was a name employed of Jupiter *quod nos die et*

⁵ More generally, the elision of *tum* is extremely rare among all dactylic poets from the first century B.C. onwards. It is very scarce in the verses of Lucretius (5.855) and Catullus (68b.87 *nam tum*, 86.6, 100.6), despite their comparative metrical freedom; thereafter, it is found almost exclusively in the idiomatic pairing *iam tum*: this Vergil used in the first two feet of the line (*Geo.* 1.360, 2.405) and was taken up later by Ovid (*Met.* 13.921; *tum est* at 11.71 is rather a case of prodelision), Valerius Flaccus (2.103, 3.515) and Silius Italicus (11.116, 16.179). Beyond these cases, *tum* is only elided in Propertius (2.26a.9, where *quae tum* is repeated in both halves of the pentameter), the *Ilias Latina* (294), and in the more colloquial style of Horace's *Sermones* (1.5.84, 2.8.77).

⁶ *Etruscus* occurs eight times elsewhere in the poem, *Tuscus* seven.

⁷ *sane lingua Osca Lucetius est Iuppiter, dictus a luce, quam praestare hominibus dicitur. ipse est nostra lingua Diespiter, id est dei pater.*

*luce quasi uita ipsa afficeret et iuuaret.*⁸ Interestingly, Gellius adds *Lucetium autem Iouem Cn. Naevius libris Belli Poenici appellat* (ibid. 7), thus providing the only evidence that the name occurred in any other poetry (no such fragment of Naevius survives). This evidence, bolstered by ample epigraphic data, shows that *Lucetius* was indeed regarded as a cult name of Jupiter, primarily outside Rome but still known to its citizens. Nevertheless, it remains difficult to see what role such associations of *Lucetius* with Jupiter could have played in the cameo appearance of this name amidst a rapid account of slaughter in battle.⁹

Several critics have instead attempted to give the name significance by observing that the popular (and probably correct)¹⁰ etymology that derives *Lucetius* from *lux* may be echoed by the fact that he is said to be *ignis ferens* at the line's close, his fire-bearing activity thus suiting his own name.¹¹ Although this may well be the case, I would like to suggest another possible motivation behind to Virgil's choice. To carry a firebrand and to attempt to enter the gate of the camp are, of course, necessary initial phases in attempting to storm the Trojans' defences; it may well be, therefore, that the name *Lucetius* was chosen to carry out this significant activity of 570 rather than the activity fashioned from the name. This pioneering deed ascribed to *Lucetius* (although ultimately unsuccessful) seems reminiscent of a description penned a generation before by the poet who had the greatest influence on Virgil, namely Lucretius.

In the proem to Lucretius' *De rerum natura*, after the opening address to Venus, Lucretius lavishly praises his philosophical guide, Epicurus (1.62-79). At verse 70, he records the Greek philosopher's fervent eagerness *effringere ut arta / naturae primus portarum claustra cupiret*.¹² Epicurus thus strove, as

⁸ Paul the Deacon's abbreviation of Festus' *De uerborum significatu* provides a similar gloss (102L: *LVCETIVM Iouem appellabant, quod eum lucis esse causam credebant*), which may originate from the original Augustan work of Verrius Flaccus. Cf. also Macr. *Sat.* 1.15.14 *nam cum Iouem accipiamus lucis auctorem (unde et Lucetium Salii in carminibus canunt)... ipsi quoque Romani Diespitrem appellant ut dei patrem*. This assertion about the presence of *Lucetius* in *carmina Saliaria* seems to be borne out by the Saturnian preserved by Terentius Scaurus (*GLK* 7 28,9-11) *ut Numa in Saliari carmine: quome tonas, Leucesie, prae tet tremonti* (as restored by Bergk and tweaked by Morel), where the vocative *Leucetie* perhaps ought to be read: see A. ERNOUT, *Notes de philologie latine*, Paris 1971, pp. 84-86, although the gloss *Lucerius* Ζεύς in the glossary of Pseudo-Philoxenus (*CGL* II.124) may be a rhotacised form of *Lucesius*.

⁹ More profitable in this respect would be to identify Virgil's *Lucetius* with the *Leu-* or *Loucetius* (no doubt the same word in origin) employed as an epithet for Mars, attested in several Celtic inscriptions (see, e.g., H. DESSAU, *ILS* II.2 4572, 4572a, 4573, 4586a, 4586b, and III 9136); however, it is doubtful whether Virgil would have known of this particular association, or would have distinguished it from Jupiter's cult title if he did.

¹⁰ *Lucetius* is almost certainly derived from the IE root **leuk-*, and thus cognate with *lux* and derivatives.

¹¹ For more on Virgil's playful punning with names, see M. PASCHALIS, *Virgil's Aeneid: Semantic Relations and Proper Names*, Oxford 1997, at pp. 313-314 for *Lucetius*, and J.J. O'HARA, *True Names: Vergil and the Alexandrian Tradition of Etymological Wordplay*, Ann Arbor 1996, at p. 220 for *Lucetius*.

¹² Vergil appears to echo this very verse when he records, as an unexpected detail, that *portarum ingentia claustra* hung in Latinus' palace (7.185).

primus, to burst through the very gates of Nature, armed not with fire but rather with his ardent intellect; in the following two lines (71-72) this intellectual vigour is duly contrasted with the flaming universe that his mind succeeded in surveying: *ergo uiuida uis animi peruicit et extra / processit longe flammantia moenia mundi*.

In the dramatic context of an Italian warrior being the first to storm the gate of a fortified camp bearing fire,¹³ and thus aiming to enter into the *flammantia moenia* of the camp,¹⁴ is it mere chance that Virgil chose to employ the name *Lucetius*, only one letter removed from that of *Lucretius*, the poet who repeatedly emphasised his own primacy in his poetic and intellectual mission of iconoclasm?¹⁵ I suggest not. At 11.543 Virgil explicitly records that the virago *Camilla*'s name was taken from that of her mother, *Casmilla*, with a partial alteration (the removal of the letter *s*): *nomine Casmillae mutata parte*.¹⁶ The selfsame association – via the detraction of a consonant – may here be hinted at with *Lucetius* ~ *Lucretius*.¹⁷ If so, yet another, more explicit, allusion to *Lucretius* can be found in this intertextually dense passage,¹⁸ and we find yet further evidence of Virgil's playful employment of names.¹⁹

djb89@cam.ac.uk

¹³ *subeuntem* presumably means 'nearing', since the gate is not opened until 672-6 (and is closed once more at 722-6).

¹⁴ The efforts of the Italians (9.521-522, 535-537) had succeeded in setting the camp's defensive walls and towers on fire.

¹⁵ The verse has some verbal correspondence with Virgil's account of the death of *Laocoon*, himself a prophet whose words were not happily received by his audience (2.216 [sc. *Laocoonta*] *auxilio subeuntem ac tela ferentem*).

¹⁶ Contrast the opposite alteration of *Ilus* to *Iulus* recorded at *Aen.* 1.267-268.

¹⁷ The difference in scansion (*Lūcētius* versus *Lūcrētius*) need not trouble the reader: etymological derivations and verbal punning almost invariably turned a blind eye to quantity (cf., e.g., *Cāmilla* not *Cāmillā*, as would be expected from *Casmilla*). It is not possible to scan *Lucetius* with synizesis as a molossus.

¹⁸ For instance, Virgil appears to imitate *Lucretius*' famous depiction of animals being able to recognise the calls of their young (*DRN* 2.355-360) in verses 565-566 two sentences before this passage. Equally, the suggestion of 9.569, that *Ilioneus* has torn out a huge fragment of a mountain, is reminiscent of another passage from *DRN* 1 (199-204), where *Lucretius* rejects the existence of giants who could *magnos manibus diuellere montis* (201). Finally, regarding this same gate of the Trojan camp, Virgil speaks of *Turnus*' failure (as *uictor*, cf. *DRN* 1.71 *peruicit*) *rumpere claustra manu sociosque immittere portis*, further highlighting verbal correspondences with *Lucretius*' praise of *Epicurus* (cf. n. 12 above).

¹⁹ Another name that has puzzled commentators is that which Virgil chose for the bard who sings of astrological and meteorological matters in *Dido*'s court, viz *Iopas* (1.740). This name is likewise unattested elsewhere, in both Latin and Greek. *Servius*' claim (*ad* 1.738) that *Iopas* was a *rex Africorum*, *unus de procis Didonis, ut Punica testatur historia*, for which no other evidence survives as support, probably originated either from an attempt to explain the Virgilian oddity or confusion with *Iarbas*, king of *Gaetulia* and *Dido*'s most persistent suitor (*Aen.* 4.36, 196, 326); the case for the name being Phoenician, and cognate with *Joppa* (modern *Jaffa*), made in brief by *J.H. Leopold* ("Ad Verg. Aen. I 740",

PhW 42 (1922), coll. 887-88), is unpersuasive. The Homeric models for Iopas' song (1.740-6), of Phemius singing for Penelope's suitors (*Od.* 1.325-9), and Demodocus singing at the Phaeacian banquet of Alcinous (8.43-45, 62-94, 266-366, 487-520), are of course unavoidable, as is reminiscence of the song of Orpheus in Apollonius Rhodius (1.496-515). Yet Virgil also incorporated two similar songs in his earlier works, namely that of Silenus in *Ecl.* 6 (cf. esp. 31-40) and his own programmatic declaration in *Geo.* 2.475-489. In particular, Virgil highlights the similarity of Iopas' song with the latter of these passages by repeating *verbatim* verses 481-2 from it when describing the bard's performance at *Aen.* 1.745-746. Such an intimate link between Iopas' public performance, and Virgil's own assertions in his earlier didactic work (here sung once more), suggests the Augustan poet's awareness that his *Aeneis* remains a performance to be judged by others. The presence of Lucretius seems to lurk behind Iopas' song as well, just as that in the second *Georgicon* implicitly highlighted his indebtedness to the Epicurean (see, most obviously, 490 *felix qui potuit rerum cognoscere causas*). For the Lucretian nature of Iopas' song is inescapable, treating as it does the course of heavenly bodies (742, 744), the evolution of man and animals (743), weather systems (743) and the explanation of the seasons (745-6); the similarity in content is such that Quintilian's view (*Inst.* 1.10.9-10) that Iopas represents the idealised philosopher-musician of old must be dismissed as too simplistic. The explicit assertion that Atlas taught Iopas his skill (741) need not be pressed, as it probably reflects only the tradition that the Titan invented astronomy (cf. Plin. *Nat. Hist.* 7.203).

If Iopas does somehow represent Virgil's own poetic career, as argued by THEODORE DUKE ("Virgil: a bit player in the *Aeneid*?", *CJ* 45 (1950), pp. 191-193) and several scholars in his wake, could there be any significance to the choice (or invention) of the bard's name? Perhaps it is designed to conjure up the cry *io Pan* (for which see, e.g., Soph. *Ai.* 694), evoking the rustic god of pipe music and the rival of Apollo and his lyre, thus suggesting the potential poetic rivalry Virgil met with predecessors and contemporaries? We may note that Lucretius in his sole mention of Pan (4.586) spoke of him (albeit dismissively) as playing songs on his pipe to keep the *siluestris musa* alive (586-589), as had Vergil's *Eclogae*. If the association were rather with Apollo directly, and divine poetic inspiration, *Iopas* may hint at the ritual cry *io Paeon* (for which see, e.g., Soph. *Trach.* 221, Ar. *Ach.* 1212 and *Ov. Ars.* 2.1); it is perhaps significant that Apollo, like Iopas (740), is similarly described as *crinitus* at 9.638 (cf. also the same collocation in Ennius' *Alcmeo* (*Sc.* 28J), and Homer's Φοῖβος ἀκροσεκρόμης (*Il.* 20.39)) and that Iopas wields a gilt-edged lyre (cf., e.g., Pindar *Pyth.* 1.1 and Hor. *Carm.* 4.3.17). Of course, the name could itself simply serve as a poet's call to attention ("listen, everyone!"): cf. Soph. *OC* 884 ἴὸ πᾶς [λαῶς]. These are only tentative suggestions about Virgil's motivation(s), which would perhaps have been more natural to a Roman reader than the only other etymological suggestion I have encountered from the past eighty years, namely ALEXANDER MCKAY's association of *Iopas* with Juba II ("Dido's court philosopher", R.B. Egan & M.A. Joyal (edd.), *Daimonopylai: Essays in classics and the classical tradition presented to Edmund G. Berry*, Winnipeg 2004, pp. 297-307), which seems too removed from *Iopas* in both spoken and written form, despite the neat link of *crinitus* with *iuba*.

It remains a strange coincidence that another name employed and reinvented by Virgil in the *Eclogae*, viz *Iollas* (2.57, 3.76, 79), is so similar to *Iopas* in form; the claim of LÉON HERRMANN (*Les masques et les visages dans les Bucoliques de Virgile*, Brussels 1930, and "*Crinitus Iopas* (Virgile, *Énéide*, I, 740)", *Latomus* 26 (1967), pp. 474-476), that Maecenas is alluded to in the persons of both *Iollas* and *Iopas*, is much too fanciful to persuade, not least since Vergil employed *Iollas* of a Trojan warrior at *Aen.* 11.640 without any apparent significance.