

8

Siliana*

W. S. WATT

The following editions are referred to: G. A. Ruperti (Göttingen 1795–98); W. C. Summers (in Postgate's *Corpus Poetarum Latinorum*, vol. 2, London 1905); J. D. Duff (Loeb edition, London 1934).

Heinsius = N. Heinsius, in A. Drakenborch's edition (Utrecht 1717).

S. B. = D. R. Shackleton Bailey, *Classical Quarterly* 9 (1959), 173–80.

Delz = J. Delz, *Gnomon* 55 (1983), 211–20.

4. 248: Crixus, ut in tenui spes *exiguumque* salutis,
armat contemptu mentem necis.

With *exiguum* one must presumably supply *est*; so *TLL* 5. 2. 1477. 67. This is not satisfactory for two reasons: (a) one would expect *salutis* to be governed by *spes*, (b) *exiguus* is a natural epithet for *spes*. Both of these considerations still apply if (with Summers and some of the early editors) one believes that a line has been lost after 248. I suggest that *exiguae* (*spes* being plural, as frequently in Silius) would be an improvement, despite the tautology with *in tenui*.

6. 485: exposcunt Libyes, nobisque dedere
haec referenda, pari libeat *si pendere* bellum
foedere et ex aequo geminas conscribere leges.

Regulus addressing the Roman senate.

* I am very grateful to Professor J. Delz for commenting on an earlier version of these notes.

"The Carthaginians demand . . . that you should weigh this war in equal scales" (Duff). I say nothing about this translation of *pari foedere*; what is even more startling, indeed impossible, is that *exposcere* should be construed with *si* instead of with *ut*. I suggest *libeat suspendere*, referring to a truce which would in due course be followed by a treaty of peace (*conscribere leges*). With *exposcunt libeat* compare 16. 601 f., "deturque potestas / orat," and Livy 2. 35. 5, "exposcentes . . . donarent." Silius may have had in mind Lucan 4. 531 f., "temptavere prius *suspensio* vincere bello / foederibus."

7. 515: dividitur miles Fabioque equitumque magistro
 imperia aequantur. *penitus cernebat* et experts
 irarum senior magnas ne penderet alti
 erroris poenas patria inconsulta timebat.

penitus LOV: *gemitus F*

Fabius's reaction to the division of power between himself and his Master of Horse.

"*penitus cernebat*, vor allem ohne Objekt, ist kein Latein," Delz (p. 220). *gemitus*, although it is not the paradosis, is much more likely to be right: Fabius groaned at the mistake which his country was making and feared its consequences. But he kept his temper and (presumably) suppressed his groans; Summers's *retinebat* or Postgate's *frenabat* would seem to give the sense which is required, but neither is palaeographically probable. Better, I suggest, *clau(d)ebat*; cf. Lucan 8. 634, "claude, dolor, *gemitus*" (with Postgate's note); Silius himself uses *claudere* with *metus* (6. 381) and with *pavor* (10. 377).

8. 502: sed populis nomen posuit metuentior hospes,
 cum fugeret *Phrygios* trans aequora Marsya *frenos*
 Mygdoniam Phoebi superatus pectine loton.

The Marsi in central Italy derive their name from the Phrygian Marsyas, who was forced to flee after being defeated by Apollo in a musical contest; in the usual version of the story he did not flee but was flayed alive by Apollo.

The vulgate is *Phrygias* . . . *Crenas* (= Aulocrene in Phrygia), but this conjecture is (to my mind convincingly) disposed of by L. Håkanson (*Silius Italicus: kritische und exegetische Bemerkungen*, Lund 1976, p. 21), who proposes *Phrygios* . . . *finis*: a possible solution, but not one which commands instant assent. I suggest *Phrygius* (so Ruperti) . . . *poenas*: Marsyas fled from the punishment (presumably flaying) which threatened him as a result of his defeat by Apollo. The

nominative *Phrygius* is an easy change, and is appropriate to the context (an Italian people derives its name from a Phrygian fugitive); and *poenas* assumes the quite common confusion of *p* and *f* (some examples are given by Håkanson, p. 15).

8. 604: nec non cum Venetis Aquileia *superfuit* armis.

From Silius's "gathering of the clans" for the battle of Cannae.

There is no doubt that *superfuit* (FL) is the paradosis and *superfluit* (OV) a further corruption. I think there is equally little doubt that Silius wrote *supervenit*; prosaic though it is, this is the *mot juste* to express the sense (OLD sense 2b); *Venetis* is an adjective with *armis*, as is pointed out by Delz (p. 220). The corruption of *venit* to *fuit* is found in Cicero's Letters (*Att.* 4. 4. 1; 8. 11D. 4; 10. 16. 1) and no doubt elsewhere.

9. 649: abrumperet cuncta
iamdudum cum luce libet, sed comprimit ensem
nescio qui deus et *meme* ad graviora reservat.

From a soliloquy of Varro at the battle of Cannae.

I agree with S. B. (p. 174) in replacing *meme* with a pyrrhic word followed by *me*, and suggest *et ma(la) me*, comparing Seneca, *Oed.* 31, "cui reservamur malo?"

10. 228: squalentem rumpens ingestae torvus harenae
ingreditur nimum ac *ritu iam moris* Hiberi
carmina pulsata fundentem barbara caetra
invadit.

At the battle of Cannae Paulus breaks through a thick cloud of sand and slays a Spaniard called Viriathus.

"*ritu moris* mira dictio. Forte leg. *ritu victoris*," Ruperti. Postgate, followed by Summers and Duff, preferred to replace *ritu iam* by the man's name *Viriathum*. Against both of these readings, apart from palaeographical considerations, it can be objected that *iam* should not be dispensed with (the Spaniard was *already* celebrating victory); *ritu* also appears sound, since Silius is particularly fond of that word with a genitive (or adjective equivalent to a genitive). So it must be *moris* that is corrupt; I suggest *Martis*, "after the fashion of Spanish warfare," i.e. Spanish fighters; cf. 11. 24 *Tyrus Marti* = "Poenis." The corruption of *Martis* to *moris* is easy enough in itself but here it has been helped by a psychological factor: *ritu* has suggested to a scribe its synonym *mos*.

11. 291: namque Iovem et laetos per furta canebat amores

Electraeque toros Atlantidos, unde creatus,
proles digna deum, *tum* Dardanus.

It might be difficult to find a more otiose *tum* than this one. It looks to me as if it had been inserted to fill the gap left by the loss of another monosyllable, perhaps *sit*.

11. 356: hoc iugulo dextram explora; namque haec tibi *ferrum*,
si Poenum invasisse paras, per viscera *ferrum*
nostra est ducendum.

A Capuan father threatens to interpose his own body if his son tries to assassinate Hannibal.

Heinsius found the repetition of *ferrum*, at the end of two consecutive lines, "elegant." In *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 13 (1967), 23 f. A. Ker disagrees, and thinks that one *ferrum* must be corrupt; he tentatively proposes *fili* in 356. Better, I suggest, *saevum*, if change is required; for this epithet of *ferrum* see 13. 284, Lucan 7. 313, Seneca, *Thy.* 573. The two words are not unlike.

12. 630: tandem post clades socium caelique ruinam,
non *hoste* in nimbis viso, non *hoste*, referri
signa iubet castris.

Hannibal is thwarted by a terrible storm in his attack on the city of Rome.

One of the two occurrences of *hoste* must be wrong. It has been usual to replace the second by *ense*, which is an impossibly feeble guess. Much better is Blass's *urbe*, in support of which one could adduce 614 f., "hostique propinquo / Roma latet." Another possibility, I suggest, is *sole* (preferably replacing the first occurrence of *hoste*); cf. 612 f., "caelumque tenebris / clauditur et terras caeco nox condit amictu"; contrast 637 (when the storm ends), "serenato clarum iubar emicat axe."

12. 684: rursus in arma vocat trepidos clipeoque tremendum
increpat atque †uenus† imitatur murmura caeli.

The subject is Hannibal.

The old correction *armis* has usually been accepted, despite *arma* (in a different sense) in the previous line, and despite the fact that it repeats *clipeo*. Other suggestions are *amens*, *tumens*, *fremens*, *sonans*, *minis*. Better than any of these, I think, would be *tonans*; cf. 9. 423 (also of Hannibal), "ingentis clipei tonitru praenuntiat iram," 13. 10 (words of Hannibal), "armorum tonitru" (half metaphorical). Unelid-

ed *atque* is not a serious objection; Silius has 17 instances of this, of which seven are in the second foot.

14. 580: nec mora quin trepidos hac clade inrumpere muros
 signaque ferre deum templis iam iamque *fuisset*,
 ni subito importuna lues inimicaque pestis
 invidia divum pelagique labore parata
 polluto miseris rapuisset gaudia caelo.

After a victory at sea the Romans would have made an immediate assault on the city of Syracuse but for a sudden outbreak of plague.

It makes good sense to take *fuisset* as the equivalent of *licuisset*; so already Ruperti, referring to l. 163, "sistere erat"; this would be an extension of the impersonal use of *est* or *erat* dealt with by Hofmann-Szantyr, *Lat. Synt. u. Stil.*, p. 349. There is therefore no need for Heinsius's emendation *ruisset* (sc. *Marcellus*), which in any case is open to the objection that, although Silius is very fond of *ruo*, he never construes it with an infinitive.

In 583 there is no doubt that S. B. (p. 179) is right in taking *pelagi labore parata* with the following *gaudia*, not with the preceding *pestis*, but it is not clear that *invidia divum* should likewise be taken thus (in what sense was the victory at sea won "through the jealousy of the gods"?). It is much more probable that *invidia divum* goes with what precedes; in that case it would appear that a line has dropped out after 582, e.g. *pestis / (orta graves multis morbos mortesque tulisset) / invidia divum, pelagique* etc.

15. 51: aberunt sitis aspera et haustus
 sub galea pulvis *partique minore labores*.

Pleasure (*Voluptas*) promises Scipio freedom from the hardships of military life.

For the last three words S. B. (p. 180) lists nine conjectures of previous scholars, none of which he likes, and then adds three more of his own. All twelve are, in varying degrees, remote from the paradosis. Yet good sense can be obtained at the cost of little more than the insertion of one letter: *preti(o)que minore labores*, "toils that are poorly rewarded" (Silius is quite fond of *pretium* in this sense). I hesitate to suggest that Silius may have remembered Lucan l. 282 (a disputed line), "par labor atque metus, pretio maiore petuntur."

15. 726: tunc aversi *turgentia* colla
 disicit ense Mosae; percussit pondere terram
 cum galea *ex alto* lapsum caput, at residentem
 turbatus rapuit sonipes in proelia truncum.

Livius slays a tall Gaul in a cavalry engagement.

turgentia colla is appropriate of a snake (2. 546) but not obviously of a human being; Duff's notion that it refers to goitre is quite fantastic. Heinsius's *fugientia* is a poor conjecture, despite 2. 250, *terga fugientia*, and 8. 1, *cedentia terga*.

Read *surgentia*, "towering aloft" on his horse; cf. 715, *procerae . . . cohortes*, and 728, *ex alto*. For this meaning of *surgere* cf. *OLD* sense 7 and Silius 1. 103, "*surgentes . . . flammis*," 5. 133 f., "*vertice surgens / triplex crista*," 6. 598 (of Jupiter), "*Albana surgens (= altus or sublimis) . . . arce*."

16. 170: Massylis regnator erat ditissimus oris
nec nudus virtute Syphax; *quo* iura petebant
innumerae gentes extremaque litore Tethys.

If sound, *quo* must mean *a quo*; so Ruperti, quoting Curtius 5. 7. 8, "*regia totius Orientis, unde tot gentes antea iura petebant*"; but *quo* cannot mean *unde*. Summers adopts Schrader's *quem*, but the use of *peto* with two accusatives is very doubtful; see C. F. W. Müller, *Synt. d. Nom. u. Akk.* (Leipzig and Berlin 1908), 148 f. I can only suggest that *quo* is a stopgap to repair the loss of *hinc*.

Aberdeen, Scotland