

him.²⁵ Earlier in the book, too, Aeneas had become a violator of the body of Polymestor (3.22–48), his violence recapitulating that of the treacherous king Polymestor and even of the Greeks themselves. By the end, however, the unthinking violence of the rash young man gives way as he steps into his father's position, as he, not Anchises, must guide his people.²⁶

Helenus, the Trojan prince and prophet who gives Aeneas so much specific information about his journey and his destiny, seems to hint at Anchises' death in words that may also recall the underlying tension between the leadership roles of father and son that manifests itself throughout Book 3:

‘coniugio, Anchisa, Veneris dignate superbo,
cura deum, bis Pergameis erete ruinis,
ecce tibi Ausoniae tellus: hanc arripe uelis.
et tamen hanc pelago praeterlabare necesse est:
Ausoniae pars illa procul quam pandit Apollo.
uade’, ait ‘o felix nati pietate. quid ultra
prouehor et fando surgentis demoror Austros?’

(3.475–81)

‘Anchises, deemed worthy of Venus’ proud marriage, dear to the gods, and twice rescued from Troy’s destruction, behold your Ausonia: take it under sail. And yet it is necessary that you pass it by on the sea—that part of Ausonia which Apollo reveals is the farther side. Go’, he said, ‘you who are happy in your son’s *pietas*. Why should I be carried on further and delay the rising winds by speaking?’

Aside from the suggestion that Anchises himself will know very little of Ausonia, there is also the last address Helenus makes to him: *o felix nati pietate*, ‘you who are happy in your son’s *pietas*'. *Felix*, like *laetus*, has associations of fertility as well as emotional happiness: Anchises may indeed be *felix* in his son’s *pietas*, while Uranus was *infelix* (in both senses of the word) in the *impietas* of his, but ultimately both their sons have succeeded because of $\tau\ddot{o}\ \delta\rho\acute{e}\pi\alpha\nu\sigma$.

University of Minnesota

CHRISTOPHER NAPPA

cnappa@umn.edu

doi:10.1093/clquaj/bmh072

²⁵ For this aspect of *Aeneid* 3, see Putnam (n. 24), 13.

²⁶ This does not, of course, imply that violence is gone hereafter from the character of Aeneas, whose blind violence manifests itself most strongly in Books 10 and 12.

ITALIAM CONTRA TIBERINAQUE LONGE/OSTIA: VIRGIL’S CARTHAGO AND ERATOSTHENIAN GEOGRAPHY

The phrase cited above, used by Virgil to characterize the location of Carthago as the city makes its first appearance in the *Aeneid* (*Aen.* 1.13–14), is seen as calling for explanation already in Servius’ commentary: *Constat tria latera habere Italianam, superi maris, inferi, Alpium: unde tollendi erroris causa adiecit ‘contra Tiberina ostia’, quae in infero mari sunt*. The meaning of *contra* would thus be geographic, *Tiberina ostia* would specify the Italian coast facing which Carthago is situated. A

different understanding is documented in Servius Danielis: *aut certe ideo 'Italianam contra', quasi de aemula dictum accipiamus, ut non tantum situ quantum et animis contra.* According to this interpretation, *contra* alludes principally to the political opposition between Carthago and Italy, that is, Rome destined to spring up at the mouth of the Tiber.¹

Servius' explanation cannot be considered satisfying: would any of Virgil's first readers have been tempted to place Carthago facing Italy's north-eastern coast in Dalmatia? To add *Tiberinaque . . . ostia* to prevent an error no one is likely to commit would not make sense. Nor can one be fully convinced by Servius Danielis: his comment on the symbolic, political meaning of the phrase is perceptive and certainly true, but contrary to what he seems to assume (*aut certe ideo*), this meaning can be no substitute for the literal, geographical one. Rather the latter must be the basic meaning, providing the foundation for the reader's political associations. It is this elusive geographical significance of *Italianam contra Tiberinaque longelostia*, missed by Servius and disregarded by Servius Danielis, that we should try to understand in the first place. None the less modern Virgilian criticism, in so far as it sees a problem in *Aen.* 1.13–14 at all, tends to eschew this point: while rightly believing, as Austin ad loc. puts it, that 'the geographical opposition suggests the historical conflict', it leaves unanswered the question how this 'geographical opposition' is to be understood.

Why Carthago is put *Italianam contra* is comparatively easy to explain: Virgil and his contemporaries imagine the Apennine peninsula stretching almost exactly from west to east, that is, virtually parallel to the North African coast.² Thus from their perspective Carthago not only lies on the other side of the Mediterranean, but also frontally faces Italy.

But why exactly *contra Tiberina ostia*? As far as I know, the only serious attempt to solve this more intricate part of the problem was made by Pietro Janni,³ who sees Virgil's use of *contra* as simply reflecting the habits of ancient geographers in general: thinking 'hodologically', that is, proceeding from the concrete experiences of the traveller rather than aspiring to a cartographically correct view of the earth, they label seaports as 'facing' each other if these are connected by a common sea route, their relative situation on a map notwithstanding. But was *Colonia Iulia Carthago*, newly founded in 44 B.C., already important enough to be linked to Ostia by a real trading route only two decades after (as it certainly was in the later empire)? More problematic still, Janni's explanation would imply a strong anachronism. Why should Virgil want to remind his readers of the new, Roman, rather than of the Punic Carthago?

Yet for all the difficulties it creates, Janni's recourse to ancient geographical thinking seems a promising approach, and it can be made less problematic and more fruitful by shifting the focus from popular to scientific geography: although in reality Carthago and Rome lie on 10°20' and 12°30' E respectively, Eratosthenes' *Geographia*, to Strabo's indignation, puts them on the same meridian (fr. III A 40 Berger = Strab. 2.1.40). For places on the same geographical longitude Greek geography uses the

¹ For a parallel to this, cf. *Aen.* 6.23 (Athens vs. Crete; but there the geographical situation is mediated through a relief). The other *loci Vergiliani* to describe the relative situation of places lying by the sea with *contra* (*Aen.* 3.552, 692; 5.124; 8.711) all seem to mean a simple geographical opposition without further implications.

² Cf. e.g. P. Janni, *La mappa e il periplo* (Rome, 1984), 76.

³ Ibid. 110.

*terminus technicus ἀντικεῖσθαι.*⁴ That Virgil knows Eratosthenes is illustrated by his long-noticed adaptation of the astronomic-geographic fr. 16 Powell of the latter's *Hermes* in G. 1.231–56. Of course his knowledge of this poem is no guarantee that he would have read the *Geographia* too, but since, as he himself writes to Augustus (*Macr. Sat.* 1.24.11) and modern scholarship has been able to verify over and over again,⁵ he accumulated a vast amount of learning to prepare himself for the task of writing the *Aeneid*, and since the *Geographia* was a well-known and authoritative work,⁶ the idea that he could have done so is perfectly plausible. (On the other hand, he probably ignored Eratosthenes' critics Hipparchus, the source of Strabo's above-mentioned censure, and Serapion.)⁷ This being so, *contra* in *Aen.* 1.13 can be understood as a rendering of ἀντικεῖσθαι.⁸ Virgil adopts the view held by Eratosthenes: having declared 'Carthago faces Italy', he then adds 'to be precise, it lies on the same meridian as the *Tiberina ostia*, exactly facing them and Rome'.⁹

This renders the 'geographical opposition' of both cities as neat as one could wish and makes it an ideal symbolic basis for their 'historical conflict'. More importantly, it points to a hitherto neglected aspect of Virgil's geographical thinking:¹⁰ the Roman epic poet, in a way consonant with his attitude in other fields and in the whole of the *Aeneid*, introduces himself at the very beginning of his work as *poeta doctus*¹¹ and even as *aemulus Homeri in geographicis*. As in all other branches of human knowledge, antiquity regarded Homer as a virtually omniscient authority in geographical matters too, and the only one to reject emphatically such a view was no other than Eratosthenes.¹² To style oneself as a follower of the one famous scientist who found

⁴ Cf. Ptol. *Geog.* 1.4.1; 14.7; 15.1, 2, 4, 5. In the first of these passages Ptolemaeus introduces the word in the context of a discussion of Hipparchus (middle of the second century B.C.) and his followers and advises the reader not to confuse it with his own more common use of ἀντικεῖσθαι to designate northern and southern parallels situated at the same distance from the equator. This shows the use in question (ignored, by the way, in all modern lexica) to be not his own invention but a heritage from the older geographical tradition.

⁵ Cf. e.g. P. Hardie, *Virgil's Aeneid: Cosmos and Imperium* (Oxford, 1986).

⁶ Cf. Cic. *Att.* 2.6.1; Caes. *BGall.* 5.13.3 (cited without name; fr. II C 12 Berger), 6.24.2; Varro *Rust.* 1.2.3; Vitr. 1.1.17, 1.6.9; H. Berger, *Die geographischen Fragmente des Eratosthenes* (Leipzig, 1880), 361.

⁷ Of the very few mentions of Hipparchus in Roman literature, only Cic. *Att.* 2.6.1 pre-dates the *Aeneid*, and Cicero only read him—after Eratosthenes, whom he already knew—because he planned a geographical work himself. Virgil's *œuvre* shows no signs of acquaintance with him. Serapion seems to have been still less known (Cic. *Att.* 2.4.1, 2.6.1). (There is no criticism of Eratosthenes' knowledge of the western Mediterranean in Posidonius.) Even if Virgil was familiar with Hipparchus or Serapion as well as with Eratosthenes, he still would have been free to select the authority who suited his poetic intentions best.

⁸ Another Latin translation, *ex adverso*, had already been given by Cornelius Nepos (Plin. *HN* 6.199); cf. Berger (n. 6), 208–9.

⁹ -que is thus to be taken as epexegetic (as presumed by the attempts of Servius and Janni too), a use dear to Virgil: cf. e.g. *Aen.* 2.722, 5.399, 9.306; 2.19, 51, 7.499 (in the last three cases -que introduces a local specification); J. Henry, *Aeneidea* (New York, 1873–92), 2.38–9 ('our author's usual habit to present in the first clause of his sentence no more than the sketch or skeleton of his thought, and then in the subsequent clause to fill up and clothe with flesh and life such previous sketch or skeleton').

¹⁰ Most studies focus on chorographical and toponomastical questions (for an overview see F. Corsaro, 'Geografia', *EncVirg* 2 [1985], 659–61).

¹¹ The beginning of the work's second half is marked by a similar incorporation of non-poetic sources to display *doctrina*: cf. the historiographical detail in *Aen.* 7.37–57 and Horsfall ad loc.

¹² The best evidence for Homer's prestige as a geographer as well as for Eratosthenes' criticism of it is to be found in Strabo's *Geographia*; cf. e.g. D. Dueck, *Strabo of Amaseia. A Greek Man of Letters in Augustan Rome* (London, 2000), 31–40, 57.

fault with Homer's geography must surely be considered a most elegant and effective way to challenge the great model's claim to primacy in this field and to prove oneself superior in geographical *πολυμάθεια*.

Universität Bern

MARTIN KORENJAK
martin.korenjak@kps.unibe.ch
doi:10.1093/clquaj/bmh073

PROPERTIUS 3.4, 1.1, AND THE *AENEID* INCIPIT

In a recent note in these pages F. Cairns¹ argued that the words *arma* (1), *uir* (3), and *cano* (9) in Propertius 3.4 allude to *arma uirumque cano* in the incipit of the *Aeneid*:

Arma deus Caesar dites meditatur ad Indos,
et freta gemmiferi findere classe maris.
magna, **uir**, merces: parat ultima terra triumphos;
Tigris et Euphrates sub tua iura fluent; 5
sera, sed Ausoniis ueniet prouincia uirgis;
assuescent Latio Partha tropaea Ioui.
ite agite, expertae bello, date lintea, prorae,
et solitum armigeri ducite munus equi!
omina fausta **cano**. Crassos clademque piate! 10
ite et Romanae consulite historiae!

I quote Cairns: 'The combination can hardly be coincidental, since Propertius' allusive terms not only appear in the same order as the *Aeneid*'s *arma uirumque cano* (1.1), but each of them occupies the same *sedes* as its Virgilian counterpart (310).' That is true, though some may not agree that *uir* 'men' immediately suggests *uirumque* 'the man', or that *cano*, following nine lines past *arma*, is a powerful allusion. It is also true that Cairns's interpretation requires the reading *uir* rather than the emendation preferred by the most recent editors, *Quiris*.

But to continue: 'Recognition of this pattern confirms (although confirmation is hardly needed) the spurious nature of the alternative *Ille ego . . . incipit* of the *Aeneid* (310).' Yet if we accept this line of reasoning, how are we then to regard Propertius 1.1.13ff:

ille etiam Hylaei percussus uulnere rami
saucius Arcadii rupibus ingemuit.
ergo uelocem potuit domuisse puellam: 15
tantum in amore preces et benefacta ualent.
in me tardus Amor non ullas cogitat artes,
nec meminit notas, ut prius, ire uias.
at uos, deductae quibus est fallacia lunae
et labor in magicis sacra piare foci, 20
en agedum dominiae mentem conuertite nostrae,
et facite illa meo palleat ore magis!
tunc **ego** crediderim uobis et sidera et amnis
posse Cytnaeis ducere carminibus.
et uos, **qui** sero lapsum reuocatis, amici, 25

when compared with the first line of the 'alternative opening' of the *Aeneid*, *ille ego qui quondam gracili modulatus auena . . .*? I would point out that Propertius' *ille*, *ego*, and *qui*, also, to use Cairns's words, 'not only appear in the same order as the *Aeneid*'s *ille ego qui* (1.1), 'but each of them occupies the same *sedes* as its Virgilian

¹ F. Cairns, 'Propertius 3.4 and the *Aeneid* incipit', *CQ* n.s. 53 (2003), 309–11.