In 925 the *quippe ubi*-clause provides an explanation for the assertion that the body would die if the whole *anima* had departed from it in sleep; *ubi* refers to the suppressed protasis *si omnis anima eiecta esset*, which is to be supplied with *corpus … iaceret* in 923–4, and *unde*, the relative, has as it antecedent *nulla animai pars*.

University of Pittsburgh D. MARK POSSANZA
possanza@pitt.edu
doi:10.1017/S0009838808000797

AENEID 3. 635–7

et telo lumen terebramus acuto
ingens quod torva solum sub fronte latebat,
Argolici clipei aut Phoebeae lampadis instar

As commentators have long observed, the comparison of the Cyclops' eye to a shield goes back to Callim. *Hymn* 3.52–3,[1] where the point of comparison seems to be the glare that emanates from both the shield and the solitary eye. Commentators on and translators of the Virgilian text justifiably assume that Virgil's comparison of the shield and the sun to Polyphemus' eye points primarily, if not exclusively, to the large size of the giant's eye.[2] *Instar* commonly refers to size and here *ingens* makes that beyond much doubt.[3] Still, more needs to be said.

First, Virgil is here playing off the ancient (but not only ancient) notion that the sun sees, most frequently found in its being dubbed e.g. *πανόπτης*. Occasionally the sun is actually called an 'eye'. Ovid calls the sun *mundi oculus* (*Met*. 4.228) and an Orphic Hymn addresses Helios as *κόσμου τὸ περίδρομον ὄμμα* (8.14). Thus, Virgil inverts the commonplace simile or metaphor. The eye is like the sun, rather than that the sun is like an eye.

Second, to say that Polyphemus' eye was as large as the sun may place Virgil in the middle of an ancient scientific controversy. We know that the sun is some hundred times the size of the earth. Ancient scientists, while debating the sun's exact size, also knew that it was far larger than the earth.[4] Thus, to say that Polyphemus' eye was the size of the sun would not be impressive but rather be ludicrous. Virgil, needless to say, was not trying to be ridiculous. Rather, he was following the Epicurean view, mocked by Cicero at *Fin.* 1.6.20, *Acad.* 2.26.82, that the sun was more or less the size that it appears to be.[5] On such a view, it is impressive but scarcely ridiculous to say that the giant's eye was the size of the sun. Virgil would have known the Epicurean view at the

[1] At least since J.L de la Cerda, *P. Virgilii Maronis Priores Sex Libri Aeneidos* (Leiden, 1612), 368.

[2] Servius (ad 3.637) interestingly thinks that the shield concerns size and the sun glare.

[3] J. Henry is expansive, 'As large, round, and glaring as an Argolic shield, or the sun' (*Aeneidea* [Dublin, 1878] ad 3.631–49, vol. 2, 504). N. Horsfall's recent commentary on *Aeneid* 3 (Leiden, 2006) has nothing of interest to say on these lines.

[4] On ancient views of the size of the sun, see the essay by J. Barnes, *Acta Classica Debrecen.* 25 (1989), 29–41. Thus, Archimedes thought the sun's diameter thirty times that of the earth, Eudoxus nine times, *alii alia*.

[5] On Epicurus' view of the size of the sun, see now R. Bett, 'Sceptic Optics', *Apeiron* 40 (2007), 112–17.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838808000803 Published online by Cambridge University Press

least from Lucretius (5.564ff.), and perhaps also from Epicurus himself (*Pyth.* 91).[6]

University of Illinois, Urbana HOWARD JACOBSON
doi:10.1017/S0009838808000803

[6] I am indebted to Prof. Stephan Heilen, who read an earlier version of this note and offered helpful suggestions, and to CQ's reader for useful comments.

THE 'PRAETOR' OF PROPERTIUS 1.8 AND 2.16 AND THE ORIGINS OF THE PROVINCE OF ILLYRICUM

The identity of the 'Praetor' from Propertius 1.8 and 2.16 has not been the subject of significant scholarly debate in the past, as Propertius did not reveal any details of significance about his rival for Cynthia's affection, except for the most obvious facts: that the rival was rich, a member of the upper social echelons and the lover of Cynthia. The opinions of scholars on his identity are divided. Some in effect deny his existence, as some scholars repudiate the existence of Cynthia.[1] Others have recognized him as Cynthia's husband.[2] The overwhelming majority of scholars see him as one of her lovers. His position, as a governor of Illyricum, and the relatively precise dating of Propertius' Books 1 and 2, have not been used as evidence for an individual provincial command in Illyricum after the battle of Actium. This paper sets out to determine the significance of the evidence from Propertius, and whether the 'Praetor' can be recognized as Cn. Baebius Tamphilus Vála Numonianus, who has been dated to roughly the same period as one of the first pro-consuls of Illyricum after the inscription from Iader (Zadar, Croatia).

The date when Illyricum was established as a separate province is unknown. According to the Lex Vatinia, Caesar received *imperium* for Illyricum in addition to Cisalpine Gaul in 59 B.C., and during the 40s B.C. different magistrates were entrusted with *imperium* for Illyricum as their *provincia* to fight in the Civil War.[3] Some scholars argue that the province was not established in the 40s B.C. as an organized territory governed annually by a pro-magistrate.[4] However, it should be noted that Roman

* Note: the works in languages other than English, French, or German are quoted by titles of appended summaries and marked with *. I would like to thank my colleagues from the University of Adelaide Dr. R.F. Newbold and Dr. J.R. Clarke for their assistance and Ms Barbara Sidwell for help in editing. Also, I am very grateful to an anonymous referee for the constructive criticism and useful suggestions that significantly improved the quality of the original paper.

[1] E.g. P. Veyne, *Roman Erotic Elegy. Love Poetry and the West* (trans. D. Pellauer) (Chicago, 1988); M. Wyke, 'Written women: Propertius' *scripta puella*', *JRS* 77 (1987), 47–61; ead., 'The elegiac women at Rome', *PCPhS* 33 (1987), 153–78; B.K. Gold, ' "But Ariadne was never there in the first place": finding the female in Roman poetry', in N.S. Rabinowitz and A. Richlin (edd.), *Feminist Theory and the Classics* (New York, 1993), 75–101.

[2] G. Williams, *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry* (Oxford, 1968), 529–34.

[3] It is difficult to maintain the opinion that the command of Illyricum remained connected to Cisalpina after Caesar, as recently argued in B.M. Kreiler, *Statthalter zwischen Republik und Prinzipat* (Frankfurt am Main, 2006), 65–9. Q. Cornificius, P. Sulpicius Rufus and P. Vatinius are attested as independently acting pro-magistrates in Illyricum in the 40s B.C., cf. *Bell. Alex.* 42–7.

[4] M. Šašel Kos, *Appian and Illyricum* (Situla 43) (Ljubljana, 2005), 337–8, 462, 465; ead.,

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838808000803 Published online by Cambridge University Press