

# A trio of country bumpkins : a note on the text of Verg. Aen. 5.300-301

Autor(en): **Rivero García, Luis**

Objektyp: **Article**

Zeitschrift: **Museum Helveticum : schweizerische Zeitschrift für klassische Altertumswissenschaft = Revue suisse pour l'étude de l'antiquité classique = Rivista svizzera di filologia classica**

Band (Jahr): **67 (2010)**

Heft 4

PDF erstellt am: **27.07.2024**

Persistenter Link: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-170304>

## **Nutzungsbedingungen**

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Inhalten der Zeitschriften. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern.

Die auf der Plattform e-periodica veröffentlichten Dokumente stehen für nicht-kommerzielle Zwecke in Lehre und Forschung sowie für die private Nutzung frei zur Verfügung. Einzelne Dateien oder Ausdrucke aus diesem Angebot können zusammen mit diesen Nutzungsbedingungen und den korrekten Herkunftsbezeichnungen weitergegeben werden.

Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Die systematische Speicherung von Teilen des elektronischen Angebots auf anderen Servern bedarf ebenfalls des schriftlichen Einverständnisses der Rechteinhaber.

## **Haftungsausschluss**

Alle Angaben erfolgen ohne Gewähr für Vollständigkeit oder Richtigkeit. Es wird keine Haftung übernommen für Schäden durch die Verwendung von Informationen aus diesem Online-Angebot oder durch das Fehlen von Informationen. Dies gilt auch für Inhalte Dritter, die über dieses Angebot zugänglich sind.

## A Trio of Country Bumpkins: A Note on the Text of Verg. *Aen.* 5.300–301

By Luis Rivero García, Huelva

*Abstract:* On the basis of the variants transmitted by the manuscripts, the text of *Aen.* 5.300 is discussed, centering on Virgil's *usus* of the language and his versification, as well as his recourse to etymologising with proper names.

*Aen.* 5.300–301:

*tum duo Trinacrii iuuenes Helymus Panopesque  
adsueti siluis, comites senioris Acestae*

Helymus *MP* : helymusque *Rp* : Elymus *Götte* | Panopesque *PR* : panospesque *M* : panopeusque *p* : panopesse *c* |

The manuscript transmission of this text presents us with variants which, in my view, are worthy of some consideration. For one thing, *Rp* offer a reading, *helymusque*, that cannot easily be explained as a mechanical copying error: *Panopes[que]* does not have the same ending, which might have explained a skip from like to like, nor is the possibility of a retroactive repetition plausible.

It is also symptomatic that the reading *helymusque* would give rise to a hypermeter, a favourable context for this type of regularization<sup>1</sup>, however much the resulting physiognomy of the line, with the two proper names linked by the polysyndeton of *-que ... -que*, might be consistent with Virgilian *usus*<sup>2</sup>. Naturally, in order to be able to read such a hypermetric hexameter, *Panopesque* would require a long *-o-*, when in fact it has a short one. Now, it so happens that the character Panopes appears in no other poetic text, either before or after this

\* This study forms part of Research Projects FFI2008-01843 and HUM-04534. The author wishes to express his gratitude to Profs. A. Ramírez de Verger, M. Librán, G. Luck, R. Maltby and J. O'Hara for reading a previous draft of the paper, and to Mr J.J. Zoltowski for the English translation.

1 For the case of *Aen.* 3.684, see L. Rivero – J.A. Estévez, "Further Remarks on Verg. *Aen.* 3.684–6", *Maia* 61 (2009) 93–100.

2 For the hypermetric hexameter and its high frequency in Virgil, see F. Cupaiuolo, "esametro", *Enciclopedia Virgiliana*, II (Roma 1985) 375–379, 377 (with copious bibliography on 378–379) and S.J. Harrison, *Virgil, Aeneid 10. With Introduction, Translation and Commentary* (Oxford 1991) 281 *ad Aen.* 10.895. As Cupaiuolo himself points out, there is a final *-que* in 16 of the 20 cases generally accepted (17 out of 21 if we add *Aen.* 3.684, and cf. also 11.631). For the specific form with polysyndeton in *-que ... -que*, very much to Virgil's taste (*Georg.* 2.344; 443; 3.242; 377; *Aen.* 1.332; 2.745; 4.558 [9.650]; 629; 5.753; 7470; 10.895), see N. Heinsius' note on *Aen.* 3.684, in P. Burman, *P. Virgilii Maronis opera. Accedunt ... praecipue Nicolai Heinsii notae nunc primum editae*. Ed. P. Burmannus et P. Burmannus junior (Amstelodami 1746) II, 452.

passage<sup>3</sup>, which means that this *-o-* is short because we *need* it to be, in accordance with the shape of the line as it has come down to us. Therefore, another reading generally ignored by the editors takes on special importance here, especially since it is from such an authoritative manuscript as *M*, a reading which is in itself metrically aberrant: *PANOSPESQ*<sup>4</sup>. In short, the name *Panōpes* in this line is conditioned by the demands of the verse and may well be a banalization created from the adjective *Panopeus* (and note the reading of codex *p*), the first appearance of which in the whole of Latin literature occurs exactly sixty lines above, during the ship-race (1.240 *Panopeaque uirgo*), and from the female name *Panope*, as well as from the Homeric form Πανοπῆος at *Il.* 23.665, corresponding to a character who certainly not by chance – of this there can be no doubt – is the father of the rival of Euryalos in the boxing contest. Let us analyse the passage, then, in case it contains indicators which might orient our final decision on the text.

From the dramatic point of view, Virgil is introducing us to two characters who share the condition of *iuuenes Trinacrii* and who are participating in the foot-race. But while Helymus was previously named in 5.73 as a representative of one of the age groups that were to take part in the competitions<sup>5</sup>, and would

- 3 See L. Polverini, “Panope”, *Enciclopedia Virgiliana*, vol. III (Roma 1987) 954–955. We re-encounter him, naturally following Virgilian lines, only in the isolated citation of the character in Hyg. 273.16 (*secundo deinde certamine cursu Nisus, Euryalus, Diores, Salius, Helymus, Panopes; uicit Euryalus, accepit praemium equum phaleris insignem, secundo Helymus Amazoniam pharetram, tertio Diores galeam Argolicam, Salio exuuias leonis donauit, Niso clipeum opus Didymaonis*), as well as in the *interpretatio ad loc.* of Tiberius Claudius Donatus, which we shall see below. It should be recalled, in any case, that for the text of Hyginus we depend, for this passage, on the authority of the edition by Mycillus (Basileae 1535), on the merits and limitations of which we would refer the reader to the *praefatio* of *Hyginus. Fabulae*, ed. P.K. Marshall, editio altera (Monachii et Lipsiae 2002), v–xiv, or to the clear summary in M.D. Reeve, “Hyginus”, in L.D. Reynolds, ed., *Texts and Transmission: A Survey of the Latin Classics* (Oxford 1983) 189–190.
- 4 As usual, it is Ribbeck (*P. Vergili Maronis opera*, recensuit Otto Ribbeck, vol. II, *Aeneidos Libri I–VI* [Lipsiae 1860] 264) who reports both readings, while the bulk of the editors limit themselves to giving only the first reading at most. I detect some interest in seeking sense in the readings only in Conington (*The Works of Virgil with a Commentary* by J. Conington and H. Nettleship (Hildesheim/New York 1979) [= London 41884], vol. 2 (*Aen.* I–VI) 358 *ad loc.*), as is also habitual in this splendid commentary: “Rom. ‘Helymusque’, Med. ‘Panospesque’, readings which might possibly stand if combined”.
- 5 See J.W. Mackail, *The Aeneid* (Oxford 1930) 171 *ad loc.* and Conington’s note *ad loc.* (see n. 4,335). For the character, see Servius’ and (in italics) DServius’ commentary *ad Aen.* 5.73: “HOC ELYMVS FACIT princeps Troianorum, qui dicitur tres in Sicilia condidisse ciuitates *Ascarn, Entellam, Egestam*. Alii dicunt eum post incensum Ilium cum *Aeste* in Siciliam uenisse eique participem fuisse. Alii Anchisae nothum filium tradunt. Fabius Helymum regem in Sicilia genitum, Erycis fratrem fuisse dicit”. Also *ad Aen.* 5.300: “HELYMVS ecce ubi subtiliter Helymum cum *Aeste* ad Siciliam dicit uenisse cum ait, *comites senioris Aestae*”. See also *P. Virgili Maronis opera varietate lectionis et perpetua adnotatione*. Illustratus a Ch.G. Heyne. Editio quarta. Curavit G.P.E. Wagner. Hildesheim/New York 1968 (= Leipzig/London 1832), vol. II (*Aen.* I–VI) 841–845; L. Polverini, “Elimo”, *Enciclopedia Virgiliana*, vol. II (Roma 1985) 199: “[C]erto è – in



then enjoy but slight protagonism during the race (ll.323,339), in that he ended up second – albeit somewhat accidentally –, yet Virgil completely forgets about his companion, without offering us the slightest detail to enable us to establish his *ethos*. And it is precisely this very *void*, this *waste* or passed-over dramatic opportunity offered by his characters that gives me grounds for suspicion, as it is so far from normal Virgilian poetic practice<sup>6</sup>. But, if Virgil is playing with the introduction of the characters, then the key must lie in the meaning of their names, or in their potential to evoke fresh meanings. So what are the names of these two runners meant to suggest to us?<sup>7</sup>

In the introduction of the group of *Teucrici mixtisque Sicani* (l.293) taking part in the foot-race, there is a *gradatio* that begins with the *insignes* Nisus and Euryalus (ll.294–296), indisputable protagonists of the competition, and closes (l.302) with *multi praeterea, quos fama obscura recondit*. The characters Helymus and Panopes thus occupy second-last position. Both appear, within the group of Sicilians, as youthful counterpoints to the aged Acestes, but it so happens that each of the names, *Helymus* and *Acestes*, has a corresponding toponym or *gens*

ogni caso – che egli ha voluto accentuare notevolmente la ‘sicilianità’ di E.” Dion. Hal. 1.52 already mentions Helymus as having come from Troy to Sicily together with Acestes; Strabo (13.1.53, 608) has him arrive with Aeneas; Fabius Pictor, as we have seen in the note by Servius Danielis, made him a native of Sicily. For another association of Helymus and Acestes as settlers of Sicily, cf. Sil. 14.45–47: *miscuerunt Phrygiam prolem Troianus Acestes | Troianusque Helymus, structis qui pube secuta | in longum ex sese donarunt nomina muris*.

- 6 Albeit with reference to the catalogue in *Aen.* 7.647–817, see the observation of Macr. 5.15.14–15: *in catalogo suo curavit Vergilius uitare fastidium [...] hic [sc. Vergilius] autem uariat uelut dedecus aut crimen uitans repetitionem*, and 5.16.1: *Vterque [sc. Homerus et Vergilius] in catalogo suo post difficilium rerum uel nominum narrationem infert fabulam cum uersibus amoenioribus, ut lectoris animus recreetur*. On similar lines, the *explicatio* of De la Cerda (*P. Virgillii Maronis priores sex libri Aeneidos argumentis, explicationibus, notis illustrati* auctore Ioanne Ludouico de la Cerda Toletano societatis Iesu [Lugduni 1612] 542) emphasises the technical adroitness of Virgil in livening up, by means of the inclusion of descriptive elements for the characters, what could merely have been a tedious list, and compare the procedure followed by the poet when introducing the participants in the ship-race (5.114–123) or in the archery contest (5.491–499) or in the *usus Troiae* (5.553–574). See also G. Monaco, *Il libro dei ludi* (Palermo 1972) 104–106 and N. Horsfall, *Virgil, Aeneid 7: A Commentary* (Leiden/Boston/Köln 2000) 416–417 (especially 417, paragraph “(iv)”).
- 7 For the exegetic line we are about to follow in the following pages, it may be of interest to read the consideration contained in O.S. Due, “Zur Etymologisierung in der Aeneis”, in O.S. Due *et alii*, edd., *Classica et mediaevalia F. Blatt septuagenario dedicata* (Köbenhavn 1973) 270–279, as well as the chapter “The Poetic Function of Vergilian Etymologizing” in J.J. O’Hara, *True Names. Vergil and the Alexandrian Tradition of Etymological Wordplay* (Ann Arbor 1996) 102–111 (and see on p. 6: “[M]y observation has been that when etymological wordplay is significant in an Augustan poet, it is almost always a self-conscious poetic device”). See also the general considerations and the somewhat more timid conclusions of R. Maltby, “The Limits of Etymologising”, *Aevum Antiquum* 6 (1993) 257–275 (esp. 257–264 and 275). For the relevance of proposing “multiple etymologies of the same name”, see the section with this same title *ibid.* 271–275 and in O’Hara (supra) 12.

name. As Thucydides recalls in a key passage on the settling of Sicily (6.2)<sup>8</sup>, the western part of the island was, until the arrival of the Greeks, occupied both successively and, at times, simultaneously by the different peoples in mutual dispute, by *Sicani* (who imposed the name of *Sicania* on the land previously called *Trinacria*), *Elymi*, *Siculi* (who imposed the definitive name of *Sicilia*) and Phoenician/Carthaginians, the latter being a people who, faced with the arrival of the Greeks, Μοτύην καὶ Σολόεντα καὶ Πάνορμον ἐγγυὸς τῶν Ἑλύμων ξυνοικήσαντες ἐνέμοντο (Th. 6.2.6). Now, *Helymus* obviously leads us to the *Elymi*<sup>9</sup>, and this name may even evoke on a phonic level the city of *Eryx*, founded by this same people (cf. Th. 6.2.3, Verg. *Aen.* 5.759–760) on the western edge of the island. The name *Acestes* recalls the neighbouring locality of *Acesta*, a variant on other forms such as *Egesta/Segesta*, also founded by the same ethnic group (Th. 6.2.3)<sup>10</sup>. Forming a geographical triangle with both, a name like *Panormes* could point us to the settlement of Πάνορμος<sup>11</sup> (cf. Sil. 14.261), thus conjuring up a kind of “national team” from the north-west of Sicily, facing in a sporting context the newly arrived Trojans, a Sicilian grouping whose two youngest representatives were to be introduced as a duo (the third one, after Nisus – Euryalus and Salius – Patron) by means of the polysyndeton *-que ... -que* (cf. Th. 6.2.6 ξυμμαχία τε πίσυνοι [sc. Φοίνικες] τῆ τῶν Ἑλύμων)<sup>12</sup>, reserving for another competition the oldest representative (1.301 *senioris Acestae*), this expression possibly containing an allusion to the greater age of Segesta over the two other localities (cf. 5.759–760).

However, I do not think it necessary to conjecture *Panormesque* (and that despite the fact that the reading of *M* could back it) because the traditional manuscript readings in themselves make sense<sup>13</sup>. First of all, it cannot be by chance that there is a link between ll.298–301 and the very opening of the *Georgics* (*Georg.* 1.16–20): “Salius ... Patron’ pick up ‘patrium saltusque’; ‘Panopes’ picks up ‘Pan’; ‘Tegeaeae’ echoes ‘o Tegeaeae’; ‘siluis’ picks up ‘Siluane’; and ‘Helymus’ relates to ‘aratri’ (cf. ἔλυμα, ‘stock of the plough’)”<sup>14</sup>. It is therefore not surprising

8 As was duly recalled by De la Cerda (n. 6) in his *nota ad loc.* (542–543).

9 A summary of the *status quaestionis* on this people in G.K. Galinsky, “Elimi”, *Enciclopedia Virgiliana*, vol. II (Roma 1985) 198–199. See also P. Ovidius Naso, *Metamorphosen*. Kommentar von F. Bömer. Buch XII–XIII (Heidelberg 1982) 153 *ad Ov. Met.* 12.460.

10 And recall that the form of the genitive *Acestae* is common to the anthroponym *Acestes* and the toponym *Acesta*.

11 I note that this hypothesis was put forward some time ago in H. Mørland, “Nisus, Euryalus und andere Namen in der Aeneis”, *SO* 33 (1957) 87–109 (103), and is taken up again by L. Polverini, “Panope”, *Enciclopedia Virgiliana*, vol. III (Roma 1987) 954–955.

12 See Galinsky (n. 9) 199: “È notevole la coincidenza cronologica tra la venuta dei Fenici in Sicilia e la genesi della ceramica cosiddetta elima”; see also G.K. Galinsky, *Aeneas, Sicily, and Rome* (Princeton 1969) 100–101.

13 What is more, the two are not incompatible, as the initial *Pano-* could in itself continue to evoke the name Πάνορμος.

14 M. Paschalis, *Virgil’s Aeneid. Semantic Relations and Proper Names* (Oxford 1997) 205, who adds in note 105: “The ἔλυμα, a cognate of εἰλόω, may have been curved (cf. also ἔλώω, ‘roll around’).



that in this rustic context “[t]he Sicilian youths Helymus and Panopes are accustomed to sylvan life (‘*adsueti siluis*’; picking up 288 ‘*siluae*’). The cluster ‘*Panopes siluis*’ evokes more specifically ‘Pan’, the forest deity, while the segment *-pes*, suggesting ‘pes’ (‘foot’), is especially appropriate for the swift god and for a participant in a foot-race”<sup>15</sup>. Again insisting on the rustic connection here, it is possible to interpret the meaning of the feminine form of ἔλυμος (“millet”), which, according to the gloss by Hesychius (ἔλεμος), is “σπέρμα ὅπερ ἔψοντες Λάκωνες ἐσθίουσιν”.

We referred above to a clear descending *gradatio* in the presentation of the runners. From this perspective, it can be understood that with the names of the Sicilians Virgil is evoking various points in the history and geography of the island while treating us to a pun with which these characters have humorous connotations and are made fun of. Helymus, while suggesting something as unathletic and unagile as a plough, evokes such appropriate concepts for a foot-race – albeit at the same time parodic – as some forms of the paradigm of ἔρχομαι, or ἤλυσις (“step”, “gait”) and ἤλυσίη (“way”), or else ἤλυσκάζω, a variant on ἤλασκάζω/ἤλάσκω (“wander”, “stray”, “roam”), but also “shun”, “flee from”, an idea reinforced by forms like ἤλυξα, from the paradigm of the synonymous verb ἀλύσκω<sup>16</sup>. From what we have seen so far, Helymus can be assumed to be a character marked by his country ways and by a lack of determination and directness in his gait: a kind of shy, country “girovagante”.

In a different semantic field, but one that is not irrelevant, as we shall see presently, this name may also refer us to ἠλυξ or ἠλύγη (“shadow”), which would turn the expression (l. 323) *Euryalumque Helymus sequitur* into a real joke (i.e. “[his] shadow follows E.”), while the incorporeal nature of a shadow may explain why Virgil decides to use *transeat elapsus* (l. 326) to overturn the παρέλασσ’ of his Homeric model (*Il.* 23.382 and 527)<sup>17</sup>. If one looks carefully, from this perspective

The name ‘Helymus’ combines with Circle and Cavity: in 72 he wreathes his brows with myrtle; and the price he is awarded is a quiver (cf. Hesychius’ gloss, ἔλυμος-quiver), encircled with a broad belt of gold (311 ff.). To this should perhaps be added the olive crown (ll. 308–309), for which the root ἐλαία may not be coincidental.

- 15 Paschalis (n. 14) 188, who in note 34, for the *Pan* – *silua* connection, rightly refers the reader to *Georg.* 2.494 *Panaque Siluanumque senem* (with the recurrence of *senex*) and to *Ecl.* 2.31 *in siluis ... Pana* and 5.58–59 *siluas ... Panaque*. The rustic nature of these characters had already been interpreted as *studium uenandi* by De la Cerda (n. 6) 542–543, both in his *explicatio* and in his *nota ad loc.*, following in turn the interpretations *ad loc.* of Tiberius Claudius Donatus (“qui essent adsueti siluis perindeque durati ad laborem et digni qui Acesti comites iungerentur, cum ipse quoque uenandi causa iret ad siluas”) and DServius (“*ADSVETI SILVIS id est uenatores*”).
- 16 For the limited relevance of vowel length in the etymologising of the ancients, see Varr. 5.6 and cf. Maltby (n. 7) 263 and O’Hara (n. 7) 61–62.
- 17 De la Cerda (n. 6) 550–551 recalls in his *nota ad loc.*: “*verbum transeo Circi est*”, i.e. applied to the *meta*, but not to a runner. Conington (n. 4) 360 *ad loc.*, too, attempts to explain the strange use of the verb in this context: “‘*transeat*’ = ‘*praetereat*’. Perhaps we may say that Dioreas in passing his predecessor *might have crossed his path* so as to place himself actually before him” (my italics).

the following expression *fama obscura recondit* is fully adapted to this new *ethos* of Helymus, as – of course – is his being described as *adsuet[us] siluis*, the woods being an appropriate place for shadow. Likewise, *transeat elapsus* could evoke the name *Diores* understood as *διά + ὄρος* (“boundary”) or else *ὄραω* (“see”)<sup>18</sup>. This etymology may also explain this character’s being *left in the shade* during the struggle for first place (ll.340–347), in which, in addition to Salius, we know of the participation of those who ended up in first (Euryalus) and third positions (Diores)<sup>19</sup>.

Finally, wrapping up all this negativity evoked by wandering, shunning and shade, I believe that it is certainly not by chance that Virgil has chosen to transcribe the name with an initial *H-*, that is, with the aim of evoking the destructive connotation of the well-known lexeme *Hel-* from the name of Helen (cf. *A. Ag.* 681–690)<sup>20</sup>.

But let us now look at the name of the second character. The hypothesis *Panormes* having been rejected, the form most generally transmitted, *Panōpesque*, might point us to *πανωπήεις*, an equivalent to adjectives like *πάνοπτος* and *πανόπιος* (*Hom. Il.* 21.397 *u.l.*)<sup>21</sup> with the passive sense of “seen by all, fully visible”<sup>22</sup>, as well as to the active *πανόπτης* (“all-seeing”), applied to characters such as the sun (*A. Pr.* 91), Zeus (*A. Eu.* 1045), or Argus (*A. Suppl.* 304, and cf. *DSeru. ad Aen.* 7.790). The illustrious nature of this character contrasts with the shy seclusion in which Helymus is depicted, and his assimilation to lofty figures of religion and myth becomes clearly caricaturesque<sup>23</sup>.

But this name also hints at an evocation of edible plant life, since it suggests the dialect form *Πανόψια*, connected with *Πυανόψια* or *Πυανέψια*, the Athenian

18 See Paschalis (n. 14) 206, and cf. *Serv. ad Aen.* 5.326 (“ELAPSVS PRIOR”): “satis licenter est dictum”.

19 In what is undoubtedly a curious *lapsus*, Paschalis (n. 14) 206 seems *not to see* this runner, when he states: “The role assigned to Diores in the race is that of following *hard on Euryalus*. Diores runs ‘just behind’ (‘sub ipso’) *Euryalus*, so closely that the distance *between them* almost disappears. The *two* runners approach the ‘very goal’ (‘sub ipsam finem’) together, and if there were more of the ‘course’ (‘spatium’) left, Diores would have outrun *Euryalus*” (my italics): *magus Vergilius*.

20 See O’Hara (n. 7) 142 *ad Aen.* 3.295. It might also be relevant to recall the paradigms of *ἔλιξ/ἔλίσσω*, which would have a bearing on the idea of circularity already pointed to by Paschalis (n. 14) 188.

21 Cf. *Call. Aet.* fr. 85.14–15, *Arat.* 258 *ἐπόπιος*, and see O’Hara (n. 7) 32. Compare also the *gens* name *Panotii* (*uid. R. Maltby, A Lexicon of Ancient Latin Etymologies* [Leeds 1991] 448, *s.u.*) and Isidore’s explanation (*Orig.* 11.3.19): *Panotios apud Scythiam esse ferunt, tam diffusa magnitudine aurium ut omne corpus ex eis contegant*.

22 Recall Paschalis (n. 14) 188: “Another component of the setting [i.e. the foot-race], in addition to Cavity/Circle and Vegetation, is Sight; the phrase ‘ora ... patrum’ (‘watching fathers’) evokes the etymology of ‘theatrum’ (θέατρον) from θεάομαι”.

23 A new pun arises from the comparison of Virgil’s line with the above-cited passage from *A. Pr.* 91 τὸν πανόπτην κύκλον ἡλίου. Another example of “etymological complementarity” between two characters can be found in the pair *Aeneas – Achates*: see S. Casali, “The King of Pain: Aeneas, Achates and ‘Achos’ in *Aeneid* 1”, *CQ* 58 (2008) 181–189.



festivals held in autumn in honour of Apollo and marked by the offering-up of a pulse stew, whence the interpretation πύλον ἐψειν (“boiling the bean”), which would make our characters something like the culinary tandem “millet–bean”.

There is, however, a third element<sup>24</sup> to this group of “country bumpkins”: *Acestes*, who had been depicted by Virgil in 5.35–41 as half-savage, dressed in the skin of a Libyan bear, and whose association with his father *Criniscus* (l. 38) presumably alludes to *crinis* and the associated “bristling appearance (‘horridus’)”<sup>25</sup>. But in addition we cannot ignore the fact that the name *Acestes*, apart from other etymological echoes which have already been pointed out<sup>26</sup>, may contain a pun on ἄ-κεστός, “not embroidered”, “not decorated”. It should be recalled that the adjective *κεστός* was used by Homer to describe no less than the girdle of Aphrodite (*Il.* 14.214) and that it was also used antonomastically as a noun to refer to Aphrodite as *κεστοῦ δεσπότις* (*Call. Aet. Oxy.* 2080.55, cf. *A.P.* 5.121.3 [Phld.]), in effect the equivalent of “charm” (see e.g. *Alciph.* 1.38 ἄπαντα τὸν κεστὸν ὑποζώσασθαι). When the three characters, then, are seen as a trio of boorish bumpkins, the lines take on a special comic force thanks precisely to the use of devices more in line with grand epic style: polysyndeton in *-que ... -que*<sup>27</sup>, reinforced by the hypermetric nature of the line, and the two-fold characterisation of the young men in accordance with their private life (*adsueti siluis*) and their social status as *comites* of a superior character: the *senior Acestes*<sup>28</sup>.

It might seem, then, that everything falls into place and we can feel happy with the results, but I believe that in doing so we would still not be giving a full explanation of the reading of codex *M*. For it is in the nature of the manuscripts to say much more than they actually state. The reading *PANOSPESQ* would allow us to conjecture for this name forms such as *Panoptes* and *Panopses*, in accordance with the Greek etyma commented on above, but I do not believe this to be necessary at this juncture. I believe, rather, that in this case the *codex Vergilianus Mediceus* once again contains the correct reading. We have seen that the reading *Panōpes* could evoke, according to the thesis of Paschalis, the god Pan<sup>29</sup> and the *pes* that is the focal point of the race, while at the same time

24 Observe the cluster (l. 300) *duo Trinacrii*, where a third element is clearly missing. See Paschalis (n. 14) 182.

25 See Paschalis (n. 14) 181–182. This character appears later on (5.759) associated to the adjective *Erycinus*, for the connection of which with *ericius* (“hedgehog”) see J.J. O’Hara, “The Significance of Vergil’s *Acidalia mater*, and *Venus Erycina* in Catullus and Ovid”, *HSCP* 93 (1990) 335–342 (339–342).

26 See O’Hara (n. 7) 165 *ad Aen.* 5.718 and Paschalis (n. 14) 181–185.

27 Cf. *Ov. Met.* 12.459–460 *Quinque neci Caeneus dederat Stypheumque Bromumque / Antimachumque Elymumque securiferumque Pyracmon*.

28 Following the terminology of O’Hara (n. 7) 59–60 (also 83–86 and 92), within the “clustering” of the introduction of all the runners, lines 300–301 would constitute an example of “Passage Frame”.

29 We should not rule out a link with *pānus*, which in any of its senses (“spool wound with thread”, “abscess” or “the peduncle of a panicle”) would maintain its comic effect.



*transcribing* the Greek form πανοπήεις and its entire semantic field, in addition to evoking the Πανόψια. But the fact is that the form *Panospes* would maintain both virtualities intact<sup>30</sup> and would also be *translating* the Greek etymon, since *os* (“face”) picks up ὄψ, ὀπός. In short, *Panospes* would be “he of the face-and-feet-of-Pan” and it is sufficient for us to imagine just such a physiognomy in order to understand the reason for his “visibility”<sup>31</sup>.

The text would thus read:

*tum duo Trinacrii iuuenes, Helymusque Panospesque,  
adsueti siluis, comites senioris Acestae*

Correspondence:

Luis Rivero García  
Departamento de Filologías Integradas  
Facultad de Humanidades  
Universidad de Huelva  
Campus del Carmen  
E-21071 Huelva  
Spain  
lrivero@uhu.es

30 Needless to say, a segmentation *Panos-pes* would justify the interpretation of Paschalis (n. 14) literally: “Pan’s foot”.

31 Nor should we rule out the possibility that this form opens the segment *-spes*, which might conjure up the hopes of the unrealistically optimistic runner who pictures himself with ample (*Pan-*) possibilities which in fact he does not have. Finally, the form *Panospes* would evoke on a phonic level a *Pan-hospes* that would necessarily recall semantically the adjective πάνορμος, with which we opened our considerations here.