QUID RESTAT PROFUGIS? EXILE AND POWER IN SILIUS ITALICUS' PUNICA

BY

CLAYTON ANDREW SCHROER

DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Classical Philology
in the Graduate College of the
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2020

Urbana, Illinois

Doctoral Committee:

Professor Antony Augoustakis, Chair
Associate Professor Raymond Marks
Associate Professor Angeliki Tzanetou
Assistant Professor Brian Walters

ABSTRACT

This dissertation argues that the epic poet Silius Italicus leverages exile and displacement as markers for the importance of the edges of imperial space. Writing roughly a century after Vergil, empire for Silius is no longer something that needs to be established by a morally excellent outsider like pius Aeneas. Rather, the Roman center has become a place of corruption, a city that forces its morally outstanding citizens to become outsiders, exiles. By creating new Romanized space and incorporating new peoples, the edges define most clearly the benefit of empire. Theories of space and Postcolonialism are therefore important touchstones for the argumentation of this project.

By examining the principal exilic figures of the poem (especially Scipio Africanus, Hannibal, Camillus, and Livius Salinator), the *Punica* is revealed to be a poem intent on focalizing the dynamics of power through exiles. Empire, therefore, is once again reified (just as in Vergil's *Aeneid*) not just through deciding who belongs where, but more importantly who does not belong where. In service of this analysis, the texts of other poets and prose authors who informed Silius' writing is also brought to bear, including Livy, Ovid, and Statius.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Dissertations are hard; the people in our lives make them easier. I began thinking about exile even before I arrived at Illinois as a fruitful topic for inquiry, but I never imagined that I would end up composing a dissertation on that theme…much less on Silius Italicus! As for the latter, for this and so many other things I must express my deepest gratitude to Antony Augoustakis—I will never find the words or gestures to thank him for his charity, his quiet (and often long-suffering) patience, and his gentle encouragement throughout my time at Illinois. The *libri Augoustakiani* and my favorite hummingbirds, once available to me every summer, will also be sorely missed, and I can only hope to be as influential of a benefactor for one person in my life as Antony is for myself and so many others every day. Brian Walters, despite never having me for a class, has always been remarkably giving of his time; he has also been a cheerful person with whom to discuss the difficulties in one's research and the quirks of early academic life. I wish I had had the time to take a Lucan or Cicero class of his. If you ever have to get lost, make sure to do so with Ray Marks; he whom I once knew only as a master of Silius, sharp prose, and the erudite and useful footnote, I now know to be a remarkably affable scholar who has been far more giving of his time than I, just recently a stranger, deserve. Angeliki Tzanetou may not know how much of my growth I owe to her; from her encouragement of an early conference at Illinois to her confidence in my Greek, she has made me much more comfortable amongst my students and my books. Without her, most importantly, my forays into critical theory, such as they are, would never have amounted to much.

Many others along the way have supported me in ways big and small. Sallie Spence and Braden Mechley instilled in me a love of Vergil and intertextuality that I have never quite been

able to outgrow; each in their own way has been the perfect exemplar of what it means to be a scholar, educator, and mentor. Sallie's gift of Said's collected essays clearly left its mark; Braden has been there from my *inceptum* and is still my pedagogical role model. Tom Strunk and Ariana Traill cannot go unmentioned. Sanjaya Thakur, along with my other colleagues and students at Colorado College, have provided me with a collegial space in which to finish my dissertation; more importantly, Sanjaya's friendliness and mentoring have made my transition from student to faculty member far less daunting.

Without Kostas Arampapaslis and Stephen Froedge, I could never have finished this dissertation. During the hard times, they were constant in their kindness to me; in the good times, our successes were all the sweeter for experiencing them together. Kostas was a welcome and jovial presence in an otherwise quiet, windowless cubicle of an office. Stephen always knew when I needed a beer, and I'm pretty sure I still owe him a few; he remains the only person who has gotten me to stay out until the bar closed. I can only hope they know how much it means when I say this: they are my friends.

My parents, Robert Schroer and Lynette Whitteberry, and Mary Margaret Kindel have been there for me through the good times and bad; they know better than anyone how unlikely it once seemed that I would be where I am today. All that I am, and all that I have and ever will accomplish is thanks to them. Of course, Jay Kiger was along for the ride, too; and even if he still doesn't know what *ubi est liber tuus* means, he's still the best friend—no, the best brother this Latinist will ever have.

Jen, *longi tu sola laboris conscia*. Thanks for picking me up off the floor when I'm stuck there. You deserve more; the next page (all of them, really) is rightly yours.

For Jen

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

QUID RESTAT PROFUGIS?

Roma perit! regnavit sanguine multo,
ad regnum quisquis venit ab exilio.
Suet. *Tib.* 59 vv. 13–14

In an otherwise unremarkable passage near the end of the fifth book of the *Punica*, the doomed and foolhardy general Flaminius exhorts his troops to stay their course during the battle at Lake Trasimene. The battle already is all but lost, and throughout the book our narrator has led us to believe that Flaminius' eagerness for battle, no matter the cost, is one of his primary character-defects.[1] And yet, during this one speech the foolish general proclaims what amounts to a keen metapoetic insight into Silius Italicus' epic project (Sil. 5.633–6):

> quid deinde, quid, oro,
> restat, io, profugis? vos en ad moenia Romae
> ducitis Hannibalem, vos in Tarpeia Tonantis
> tecta faces ferrumque datis.
>
> Alas! What, I pray, what space is there left, then, for exiles?! See how you are just leading Hannibal to the walls of Rome, how you are putting the walls of the Tarpeian Thunderer to the torch and sword!

Strictly viewed through the vantage of history, Flaminius' rhetoric is both dangerously naïve and disastrous; as Silius' readers will know well, a tactical retreat would have been far preferable to the decimation the Romans suffered during this battle in 217. For Silius' readers, Flaminius is our first glance at an archetype later taken up by Varro during the battle at Cannae: here is a general who does not know the wisdom of the Roman hero of the epic's first half, Q. Fabius Maximus, that *cunctator* who so well utilized tactical retreats to hem in the Carthaginian threat.

[1] On the Silius' characterization of Flaminius and the historical sources consulted in contructing him, see: Ahl, Davis, and Pomeroy (1986) 2519–31; Lucarini (2004) 112–14; Marks (2005) 17–19; Ariemma (2010) 242–50, 265–7; Gibson (2010) 50–1 with nn. 9–14; Marks (2010) 134 with n. 16; Pomeroy (2010) 30 with nn. 13–14, 40 with n. 42; Lovatt (2013) 63–5; Stocks (2014) 120–2.

Nonetheless, viewed through another lens, Flaminius' question reveals an almost Bloomian anxiety over Silius' late entry into the genre of Roman epic. Silius' most well-known predecessor had, after all, composed an entire epic around a single *profugus*, focalizing all of Roman history through the view of a single refugee seeking to establish the very same *altae moenia Romae* which Hannibal threatens to destroy in our Silian passage. A simple repetition of the *Aeneid*, or the defeat and retreat from Troy at its beginning, threatens to be an ineffectual strategy both on the battlefield and in Silius' attempt to compose a new Latin epic. What room is there left to be *profugi* in Roman (literary) history? That is the question that I intend to address—if not answer—in the remaining pages of this dissertation.

On its face, even this metapoetic reading of Flaminius' question might seem ill-founded. After all, Silius' epic is replete with examples of exiles who, in one way or another, played a role in Rome's final victory over the Carthaginians: Scipio and Hannibal are the most obvious examples. These protagonists of Silius' epic both would die in exile, indeed even during the same year as Livy tells us. One might also think of Livius Salinator, Metellus, and Camillus as exiles whose experiences in displacement frame Silius' narrative in major and minor ways. The *Punica* is, in many respects, proof that there is apparently quite a bit of room for exiles in Roman history. To what degree was Silius both aware of these figures' exiles and, more importantly, how intent was he in crafting his narrative around accounts of displacement? This is another major question I intend to address in the pages below.

But Flaminius' is also a question about power, about the supremacy of Rome vouched safe by the dominance of Jupiter thundering from high above his *Tarpeia tecta*. For our misguided general, the foundation of Roman power by a *profugus* is strictly a one-time event; that is to say, for Flaminius, the relationship between exile and power is a beneficial one only in

the case of historical exempla like Aeneas. Refugees have nothing left to offer the Roman imperial venture. And to be sure, there is something to this thinking: Hannibal, thinking of the victories he has accomplished, imagines that he has secured his own power by relegating Rome's heroes to the ends of the world as if they were in exile (Sil. 7.106–10):

> En, ubi nunc Gracchi atque ubi sunt nunc fulmina gentis
> Scipiadae? pulsi Ausonia non ante paventem
> dimisere fugam, quam terror ad ultima mundi
> oceanumque tulit; profugus nunc errat uterque
> nomina nostra tremens et ripas servat Hiberi.
>
> See?! Where now are the Gracchi? And where now are the thunderbolts of Scipio's family? Exiled from Italy! They did not cease from their fearful flight before their terror had brought them all the way to the edges of the world and the ocean. Now both of them wander, exiles, trembling at my name and keeping the shores of Iberia.

The vocabulary of exile places this series of lines within what Gaertner has termed "the discourse of exile:"[2] Hannibal's enemies are *pulsi Ausonia,* expelled from Italy, their homeland; they are also *profugi* who wander, *errat,* the former one a proper term for exile and the latter a traditional part of the imagery of exile in Latin literature already in Accius.[3] For Hannibal, his power is actualized not so much by his own victories but rather by the displacement and fear he inflicts upon his enemies at the edge of the world, *ultima mundi*, i.e. the place typically inhabited by exiles who are literally marginalized (see my remarks on Ovid and Hannibal in chapter 3).

And yet, Hannibal is clearly mistaken in this scene. On an intratextual and historical level, it is not Hannibal's enemies but rather Hannibal himself who will be inflicted with *terror* at the *ultima mundi* when he himself dies in exile, removed from the entire world and afflicted with the same fear he mistakenly thought to have wrought on his enemies (cf., e.g., Sil. 2.701–4:

[2] See Gaertner (2007).

[3] For wandering in Accius, see Dangel fr. 335 (*nunc per terras vagus, extorris*) with D'Anto (1980) 335 for the paronomasia.

vagus exul in orbe / errabit toto…saepe Saguntinis somnos exterritus umbris, "He will wander the whole world as a roaming exile after he has been cast out from his ancestral shores."). He has, furthermore, misunderstood the connotations which the word *profugus* carries for the Romans vis-à-vis their *imperium*: as Servius and Don Fowler have suggested, there is often a difference between a *profugus* and an *exul*, the former being someone who victoriously colonizes a place after leaving their home and the latter being someone exiled *simplicter*. Here is Fowler discussing another time when Hannibal likens the elder Scipio to an exiled *profugus*, and Servius on the difference between a *profugus* and an *exul*:

> [Sil. 6.]709–10 "*fugiat consul manante curore / Scipio et ad socios cervice vehatur*" ("let the consul Scipio with flowing blood take flight and be carried to his comrades on his son's neck")…Hannibal is not stupid: he has picked up the allusions to Aeneas, Anchises, and Iulus patent back in book 4, and with "his" *fugiat* takes us back to the opening of the *Aeneid* (1.2 *profugus*, "runaway"). It is a risky strategy, since we can see Scipio as, like Aeneas after Troy, having a glorious future in his descendants, but there is not much else you can do if you are an enemy of Rome and want to turn back the clock, turning a *consul* into a *profugus* rather than the other way around.[4]

> FATO PROFUGUS 'fato' ad utrumque pertinet, et quod fugit, et quod ad Italiam venit. et bene addidit 'fato', ne videatur aut causa criminis patriam deseruisse, aut novi imperii cupiditate. profugus autem proprie dicitur qui procul a sedibus suis vagatur, quasi porro fugatus. multi tamen ita definiunt, ut profugos eos dicant qui exclusi necessitate de suis sedibus adhuc vagantur, et simul atque invenerint sedes, non dicantur profugi, sed exules. sed utrumque falsum est. nam et profugus lectus est qui iam sedes locavit, ut in Lucano "profugique a gente vetusta Gallorum Celtae miscentes nomen Hiberis" (4.9), et exul qui adhuc vagatur, ut in Sallustio "qui nullo certo exilio vagabantur" : adeo exilium est ipsa vagatio.

> *FATO PROFUGUS* *fato* applies to both, including the fact that he fled and that he came to Italy. And our poet wisely adds *fato*, so that it not seem that Aeneas has either abandoned his fatherland because of a crime or out of a desire for a new empire. And yet, strictly speaking, *profugus* refers to someone who wanders far from their home, as if they have been put to flight far away. Many, at least, define it in such a way that they define *profugi* as those who still are wandering after they are shut out from their homes by necessity and who likewise also will find a new home, in such a way that *profugi* are not meant, but rather *exules*. But either

[4] Fowler (2000) 105 n. 53.

> interpretation is wrong. For *profugus* is found elsewhere as someone who has already established their home, as in Lucan 4.9 (*profugique a gente vetusta Gallorum Celtae miscentes nomen Hiberis*), and *exul* is found elsewhere as someone who is still wandering, as in Sallust's *qui nullo certo exilio vagabantur*: so, *exul* implies the very act of wandering.[5]

Regardless of whether Silius consistently follows Servius' strict denotative schema—and, indeed, one will rightly doubt that Silius can effectively follow it since exile is famously difficult to denote with precision—[6]it is clear to me that Fowler is correct in applying Servius' definition of *profugus* to Hannibal's vision of his Roman enemies. When we are speaking of power and *imperium*, Hannibal thinks that there is no meaningful distinction between being an *exul* and being a *profugus*: in either case, he believes that he has expelled his enemies from their *sedes*, their seat of imperial authority.

And yet, we will consistently revisit throughout this project the complex ways in which exile actually interacts with Roman power and authority in the *Punica*. Fowler is right, "Hannibal is not stupid" when he makes exile and flight a threat to Roman power; throughout the epic, as we shall see, exile is a dangerous part of Rome's past that she cannot simply repeat. And yet, as Servius' definition suggests, successfully completed exile, that is exile which results in the creation of new imperialized space, is a critical part of Rome's imperial vision. That is to say, I will argue that while exile is a threat to Rome's imperial aspirations as Hannibal suggests, it is also a critical part of empire's creation and spatial definition. Who is allowed to belong, and where? Who is barred from a place, and where are they allowed to find a resting place, a *sedes* as Servius would say? These are fundamental questions of both empire and exile, and Silius profitably blends them in his pursuit to define what Roman empire means and looks like, not just in his narrative temporal setting, but also his own day.

[5] Serv. *ad Aen*. 1.2.

[6] See further below.

To return to our beginning question, then, Flaminius' concern over the profitability of exile gives us, I think, a good lens through which to read Silius' epic; intertextually, it allows us to see the many ways in which Silius met the challenge of writing a post-Vergilian epic, one in which the story of *the* refugee, *profugus,* of Roman literature has already been written. But it also gives us critical insight into the characterization of the movers in Silius' political and military narrative. Finally, it allows us to see how the creation of imperial space in Roman thought not only found its impetus in exile, but also how displacement remains a necessary and constitutive element of the rhetorics of Roman power which Silius engages in his epic.

(Defining) Terms and Limits of Inquiry

The lexicon of exile is famously a difficult one to use precisely; what is the relationship between, for example, a "refugee" and an "exile?" Are all exiles the same? For a modern example, do former Catalonian president and exiled separatist Carles Puigdemont and novelist Salman Rushdie share in an experience that is meaningfully similar, and if so, to what degree? Depending on how broadly we construe the terms I will use in this dissertation, the denotative landscape of displacement might seem a monolithic thing. Modern theorists note this and must contend with it in their writings; but as Said admits, on some level, "anyone who is prevented from returning home is an exile."[7] And this is even more the case in the ancient world; for all

[7] Said (2000) 181. For an overview of definitions of exile in modern critical theory Sammond (2011) 253–9 is particularly useful, as it is aimed in part at an audience of classicists. He leans on a friction between nationalism and exile, which has its roots in the theorization of Homi Bhabha, and identifies a number of categories: those who willingly and eagerly move from one place to another, thereby rendering more clearly the spatial and ideological differences of those two spaces; those who are physically banished but reluctant to move on, who tend to create "limited (and limiting) readings of the past...which are often idealized representations of those places, spaces, and peoples from which they had come;" those who are "fully uprooted," becoming homeless wanderers stuck in an endless state of *vagatio,* as Servius might say; and finally those who willingly move on from their past, leaving it behind if not forgotten in order to "accept what fate has forced upon them and anticipate the future." Sammond's final definition serves as an archetype for Aeneas. Bhatt (2018) 215–8 is also profitable reading.

that Servius is interested in drawing a neat distinction between a *profugus* and an *exul*, the reality is that the terms of displacement in antiquity in fact discourage the types of distinctions Servius wants to make. The noun *fuga* would be used to describe the experiences of both *exules* and *profugi*. Or we might compare Seneca who can, apparently without committing any logical fallacy, draw a connection between his experience in exile and the experience of the thronging masses in Rome who have migrated to the city from elsewhere (whether forcibly or by choice is of course left unclear):[8] in this constellation of thought, exile and immigration are suitably close enough in logical proximity to encourage a more or less one-to-one comparison.[9]

This difficulty is compounded by the various legal and extra-legal scenarios which might lead one to a state of exile. This dissertation, however, is not the place for an analysis of these legal realities, not least because beginning in the imperial period, the various modes of legal displacement were all folded into the powers of the emperor: there is no mention in Martial or Statius, for example, of Claudius Etruscus' father's exile (see Conclusion) being an *interdictio* or *relegatio*. An analysis of the *Punica* will reveal that Silius nowhere emphasizes the type of exile inflicted on his characters, but rather simply the fact that they are exiled; nor does he ever specify whether or not the property of an exiled individual was confiscated or the types of allied cities barred to one, both important factors in various classifications of exile during the Mid- to Late-Republic. On such questions, I will point the reader to resources better equipped to handle

[8] See Sen. *ad Helv*. 6.1–3 with Edwards (1996) 110–12 and 125–9. Cic. *Pro Caec*. 100, cited by Gaertner (2007) 3, also displays a similar architecture of thought: *exilium...non supplicum est sed perfugium portusque supplici. nam quia volunt poenam aliquam subterfugere aut calamitatem, eo solum vertunt* ("Exile...is not a punishment, but it is a respite and port safe from punishment. For since they wish to flee some penalty or danger, on that account they change their land.").

[9] The flexibility of the ancient lexicon of exile is well studied; see Gaertner (2007) 2–3 with further bibliography.

them;[10] nevertheless, in the conclusion I will turn to the realities of exile in Silius' contemporary Rome in order to look at the ways in which the epic poetics of exile reflect the occasional poetics of Martial and Statius when they addressed poems to exiles. To this end, I have used what prosopographical resources are available to me, such as they are, in getting some basic awareness of who was exiled in the Republican and Imperial periods.[11]

What properties, then, will mark the typical exile-figure to be addressed in this project? An answer here is as difficult to precisely define as exile itself, but a number of general criteria will be readily apparent. In the first place, I have included discussions of most characters in the *Punica* who are described with what I call the "vocabulary of exile." Some words and ideas obviously are to be included in this vocabulary: *exilium*, *extorris*, *exul*, *fuga*, and *profugus* are obvious examples, but also words like *redeo*, *reduco*, and *advenio* which suggest a successful "return" from exile. The inclusion of the latter distinguishes my linguistic criteria from those of Gaertner (2007) and Doblhofer (1987). I will also focus on words less readily identifiable as exilic vocabulary, but which nevertheless were regular components of the discourse of displacement, such as Cicero's citation of the legal formula for exile, (*locum*) *vertere*/*mutare*.[12]

[10] Gaertner (2007) 2 n. 5 provides a full bibliography and should be supplemented with the complementary and more recent material in Bhatt (2018) 219–22.

[11] Kelly (2006) remains an invaluable asset for its collection of dates, places, and sources for Romans exiled between the end of the Second Punic War and the rise of Augustus. The imperial period lacks a comparable resource, but the dissertation of Rocovich (2004), and particularly the appendices at 229–59, is useful and informative with its collection of names, dates, and testimonia. For a recent and insightful analysis of the conceptual power and utility of exile in later imaginations of Flavian power (specifically vis-à-vis Domitian's exiling of the philosophers), see now Johnston (2019) 227–9 on the Odysseus-like exile and return to Rome of Dio Chrysostom; cf. Whitmarsh (2001) 270 (cited by Johnston): "There was considerable interest in exploring and expressing issues of cultural identity through the language of exile" in the literature of the Second Sophistic.

[12] Cf. Claassen (1999) 11 with Cic. *Pro Pub. Quinct*. 60 (*tracta edictum…qui exilii causa solum verterit*, "Take a look at the edict...'he who changed his land for the sake of exile.'") and *Pro Caec*. 100 (*solum vertunt hoc est sedem ac locum mutant*, "They change their land, that is, they change their place.").

This allows us to cast as wide a net as possible in an epic which is filled with those who meet Said's criterion of any person "prevented from returning home." This breadth of lexical focus denies a neat schema or quantitative chart in favor of *ad hoc* identification and discussion of language as it occurs, a decision I have made in order to avoid the types of pitfalls others have encountered in dealing with the language of exile.[13] To use a well-known line as an example of my method, consider the first line of Livius Andronicus' translation of the *Odyssey*, which utilizes the verb *vertere*—as I suggested above, a word which is part of a more extended Latin lexicon of exile: *virum mihi, Camena, insece versutum*. This line, indeed this very word, has attracted debate as to its meaning and metaliterary significance in both Homer's (cf. *Od.* 1.1: πολύτροπος) and Livius Andronicus' versions:[14] to my mind, the connotations of displacement which I have noted in the verb *vertere* suggests that, in addition to *versutus*' primary meanings, Livius Andronicus is reading Homer's adjective as a note on Odysseus' itinerancy: there was serious debate among Homer's commentators, after all, over whether πολύτροπος referred to Odysseus' wit or his far-flung wanderings throughout the Mediterranean world. To put this another way, does our recognition of *versutus*' place in the lexicon of displacement raise the possibility that Livius Andronicus engages in one of the fundamental exegetical debates concerning the text he is translating? To be perfectly clear, I know that this is speculative—but one should recall, as Feeney observes, that Livius and the other *patres* of Roman literature are

[13] Compare, for instance, Thakur's (2007) review of Gaertner (2005), noting that "the commentary focuses on a word's history and form, rather than on the implications of its use in the text and as a means to consider the thematic organization of Ovid's poems. G. often favors citing frequency statistics in comparing Ovid's word use to that of other authors or within his own corpus. This makes for a dense read, and fuller citations of selected parallels might have been more effective." Gaertner (2007), therefore, wisely eschews hewing too closely to a set lexical schema.

[14] On Livius Andronicus, see especially Hinds (1999) 58–63 and Feeney (2016) with further citations below; on the debates, ancient and modern, over Homer's πολύτροπος, see Heubeck, West, and Hainsworth (1988) 69–70.

steeped in "contemporary Hellenistic conditions of scholarship and education;"[15] I think it is a good example of the possibilities opened to us by thinking more broadly about the lexicon of displacement in our analysis of Silius' *Punica* (which thankfully renders more provable examples than this, thanks to a larger sample size). At the very least, under the right circumstances many cases like this one will present themselves, in which we must expand our lexicon of displacement in order to read one character or another as an exilic figure.

Status Quaestionis

The state of inquiry into exile in Latin epic, such as it is, can be broken down into two rough chronological groups, admittedly if only for the sake of convenience: there has been, in short, no sustained investigation of exile as a topic in Latin epic save for two unpublished dissertations focusing only on Vergil's epic—the only Latin epic to have received any study on the theme of exile. Therefore, any attempt to divide the scholarship along chronological lines denies the simple fact that all, or rather the overwhelming majority, of scholarship available to me is focused only on a single epic. One could, as is often easier with the Mantuan poet's vast bibliography, rather think about differences in analytic approaches in grouping the scholarship together, as I have tried to do here.

To begin, there have to date been two dissertations focusing on the topic of exile in Latin epic, but both of these have dealt strictly with Vergil's *Aeneid*. Bruwer's 1974 dissertation takes a transhistoric view of exile as "Vergil's epic *la condition humaine*,"[16] and while its targeted

[15] Feeney (2016) 124, cf. 57 on Livius balancing the demands of exegesis and translation and 157–8: "the bi- and trilingual poets were bringing to bear assumptions about literary systems that they had learned in their first education, as students of the institution of Greek literature.

[16] Bruwer (1974) 7.

readings of individual characters are sometimes helpful, it will only be rarely consulted. Conversely, one will find Sammond's 2011 dissertation to be a useful point of departure for studying exile in Latin epic. Sammond's argument centers on a comparison of British and Roman imperialism viewed through the lens of the exilic literature of Vergil and Salman Rushdie. Sammond's dissertation will be particularly helpful to classicists for his keen and judicious application of modern critical theory to ancient epic.

Beyond these projects, we will find a number of articles, chapters, and monographs which touch on the theme of exile in the *Aeneid*. Fletcher's recent monograph focusing on Aeneas' wandering towards and conception of Italy in the epic's first hexad is not necessarily interested in the experience of exile per se; nevertheless it provides a useful analysis of Aeneas as a hybrid Trojan/Roman whose itinerancy simultaneously complicates and encourages the hero's feelings of attachment to Italy.[17] Similarly, Cassin's brief chapter on nostalgia in the *Aeneid* situates Vergil's epic within the context of Odyssean *nostos* and analyzes the connection between displacement and the formation of a new identity.[18] In addition to this, a number of articles have touched more[19] or less[20] directly on displacement in the *Aeneid*.

Harrison's 2007 chapter on exile in Latin epic is an important starting point, for it analyzes a number of the key passages concerning exile in those extant Roman epics written between 30 BCE and 100 CE. Nevertheless, it does display two opportunities for expansion; in the first place, Harrison's interests are largely in locating a compendium of passages and

[17] Fletcher (2014).

[18] Cassin (2016) 29–40.

[19] Bettini (1997) on *Aeneid* 3 is an excellent analysis of the differences between Aeneas' and Andromache's exiles; cf. Khan (2001).

[20] Papaioannou (2002), Lieberg (1971).

characters who experience exile in these works. And yet, Harrison does not discuss Scipio Africanus' exile in the body or notes of his work; this is a critically missed opportunity as Scipio's exile was already by this time noted as an important theme by Marks and McGuire.[21] Furthermore, Harrison is particularly interested in "the emotional power of exile," that is exile's ability to elicit sympathy from the reader—although such a categorization is difficult to maintain.[22] The *Punica* in particular, then, seems a fruitful place to produce an in-depth investigation of a topic not yet given any substantial and sustained study in the genre of Latin epic.

Overview of Chapters

In Chapter 1, I argue that Silius responds against Vergil's formulation of a concept I call "victorious exile." According to this understanding of exile, displacement is a positive and in fact necessary constitutive element of Roman power. While in the *Aeneid*, exile is the precursor to Roman empire, Silius consistently imagines the possibility of Roman defeat as a return to the exilic state of the city's founding-figure, Aeneas. This is, I suggest, a curious move on Silius' part, as exile was a consistently positive element of Roman power throughout the Julio-Claudian age, from Propertius, Vergil, and Horace to Seneca. Silius instead suggests that exile can only benefit the growth of Roman empire if it is rectified by a *reditus*, a return, such as the one Camillus enjoys in an important simile in *Punica* 7. This matches with a growing interest in the goddess *Fortuna Redux* in Silius' day, who is not only responsible for overseeing the successful

[21] E.g. McGuire (1997) 101, Marks (2005) 202–3; cf. Ahl, Davis, and Pomeroy (1986) 2555.

[22] Harrison (2007) 142, cf. 146 ("Thus the main deployment of the theme of exile in the poem seems to be to use the idea's emotional weight to carry ideological disapproval or approval and sympathy"). This distinction seems at times arbitrary (an analysis of Livius Salinator would have helped to clarify things, cf. below in chapter 1). On the emotive connotations of exile in Flavian epic, cf. Augoustakis (2010a) 120 n. 71 on *advena*.

return of exiles to their homes but also, in the Flavian era especially, the *reditus* and *adventus* ceremonies celebrated by a triumphing emperor. All the more curious, then, is a number of problematic, violent, or unsuccessful returns to Rome throughout the epic, which suggests that Rome is much readier, as a collective, to banish rather than to accept outsiders and outcasts.

I continue with this last theme in Chapter 2, when I investigate Silius' brief allusions to the exile of Scipio Africanus in books 10 and 13. I provide the first sustained reading of the Sibyl's prophesy of Scipio's exile in book 13 (514–18), situating the lines not only within the larger context of the book but also within the tradition of exilic literature which Silius engages. I also point to a heretofore unnoticed allusion to Scipio's exile in book 10, wherein following the battle of Cannae Scipio is seemingly contrasted with the cowardly Metellus attempting to flee Rome in voluntary exile. Nevertheless, I suggest that Scipio's remarkable ethical exemplarity is undercut by the fact the he will end his life in exile, just as Metellus himself intends. If Scipio is an exemplary hero, I argue that his exile proves that his exemplarity has no home in a place like Rome following the Second Punic War; instead, Silius draws a connection between the exile which Scipio will suffer and Rome's decline into civil war as it is foretold at the conclusion of *Punica* 13.

In Chapter 3, I return to the concepts I analyzed in the first and second chapters in my analysis of Silius' portrayal of Hannibal's exile. It would be an odd thing, I posit, if Silius did not draw some positive connection between an Aeneas-like exile and the successful expansion of Roman empire. I therefore show that Hannibal himself becomes an Aeneas figure, whose hybrid-status as both a Carthaginian and Roman (just as Aeneas was both Trojan and Roman) allows Silius to draw a positive correlation between exile and empire. Using Homi K. Bhabha's conceptualization of the role of the hybrid and exile in the creation of national identities, I argue

that Hannibal's conflicted relationship with his alternative home in Rome renders him a very particular type of Aeneas-figure, one who is perhaps best understood in comparison with the exiled poet Ovid, himself another Aeneas-figure who draws a connection between his exile and Roman imperialism.

In my conclusion, I take on two objectives. In the first, I confront what is by now well-worn scholarly ground: the possible significance of Scipio's exile alluded to in the final lines of the *Punica*. Using the lessons learned throughout the dissertation, I argue that the ending is truly ambivalent vis-à-vis Scipio's exile. On the one hand, Scipio's triumphal *reditus* to Rome, so fitting for Silius' age as we see in Chapter 1, rectifies the young general's removal from Rome before it even happens: our final picture of Scipio is not so much a vision of a hero exiled *simpliciter*, but rather as an exiled hero who returns triumphantly as is appropriate for a hero of Silius' Flavian age. Nonetheless, I observe as yet unnoted allusions to Scipio's exile from elsewhere in the *Punica*'s coda, suggesting that the issue of Scipio's exile is not confined to the epic's final lines. These parallels suggest that Scipio's status as an ethical exemplar, emblematic of the Roman collective, is destined not to last, just as I suggest in Chapter 2. Finally, in the second portion of my conclusion, I gesture towards future avenues of investigating exile in Flavian poetry. I show that one of the only securely identifiable allusions by Silius' contemporary Statius to the *Punica* deals with the theme of exile in the real world and Silius' epic. I suggest that exile is a peculiarly common concern for poets of this day and age, and end with the supposition that the themes I have explored in my dissertation may be a better starting point than a final destination.

CHAPTER 1

VICTORIOUS EXILE AND RETURN IN THE PUNICA

> MARTIN: So what does this mean? I mean, who is the figure who emerges to lead Zimbabwe in this moment?
>
> QUIST-ARCTON: Depending on whose tweets you read, the governing ZANU-PF party is now saying that Emmerson Mnangagwa, who, by the way, when he went into exile after being ousted by the president said that he would come back to lead Zimbabwe.
>
> NPR interview on the "bloodless coup" in Zimbabwe, 11/15/17

Paradoxically, exile is often imagined as a hopeful moment of promise for the future. As the epigraph above attests, narratives of displacement frequently represent a successful transition to a new order: Mnangagwa would, indeed, return to lead Zimbabwe, making his promise before the fact to do so seem all the more marvelous. By departing (or being forced to depart) his home and the old power-structures governing it, Mnangagwa's promised return from exile becomes a symbolic validation of his place in power. Classicists know this as a teleological voice, one which retroactively validates power and authority through the challenges of their birth. In the ancient world, too, exilic narratives abound in these kinds of myths of power-making. Most familiar in Latin literature is Aeneas, whose story of ktistic exile stretches back at least to Hellanicus (*FGrHist* 4 F 84).[1] This teleological view of exile is an important part of Rome's identity and the myths justifying her power: one may think not just of Aeneas, but also of the *exul* Saturn's "hiding spot" in Latium (*Aen.* 8.320: *arma Iovis fugiens et regnis exul ademptis*: "fleeing the arms of Jupiter and an exile after being deprived of his reign") and Romulus'

[1] For some sources and variants on the Aeneas myth, see the list at Gaertner (2007) 7 n. 36.

establishment of Rome as an *asylum* (Sil. 15.90–91: *Roma…contentaque crescere asylo*: "Rome was content to grow from an asylum"). Such myths utilize what Seidel calls the "enabling fiction" of exile, that is, a function of exilic narratives concerned not so much with the pain of what is left behind but with the promise (and concomitant challenges) of what is to come.[2]

In this chapter I seek to examine this function of exile's "enabling fiction" vis-à-vis Roman power. I call "victorious exile" that positive and causal relationship between exile and Roman power, one which eschews the painful and negative associations of displacement. This emphasis on victorious exile, and particularly Aeneas' exilic journey ending in the foundation of future Roman power, is particularly common in the Augustan Age. As I argue, the Flavian epicist Silius Italicus responds to this understanding of exile by inverting it in the *Punica*. We shall see that Aeneas' foundational exile becomes a dangerous model for Silius' Romans, standing not for the growth of Roman power but rather the possibility of its downfall.

Victorious Exile in the Early Empire

Before we move to Silius, let us see just how commonly the Flavian poet's predecessors read Rome's foundational exile myths in this victorious fashion. Latin literature consistently locates the beginning of Roman power in paradoxically victorious exile-myths:[3] rather than emphasizing the pain and isolation of displacement, Roman authors point to the victorious conclusion of Aeneas' exile in the foundation of Roman *imperium*. Seneca puts it most

[2] Seidel (1986) xii.

[3] To be clear, it is by no means uniquely Roman to claim foundation in the story of an exiled hero. Exilic ktistic myths were the norm in the ancient Mediterranean: compare not just Cadmus/Thebes and Dido/Carthage with Lee-Stecum (2008) 69–70 nn. 1–2 (with extensive bibliography) but also the colonization-stories attached to Cyrene (by political exiles according to Menecles of Barca, *FGrH* 270 F6) and various other cities with Dougherty (1993) 31–41. What does seem unique is the sheer number and variety of Roman myths of foundational exile: Saturn, Evander, Aeneas, and Romulus' *asylum.*

succinctly at *ad Helv.* 7.7: *Romanum imperium nempe auctorem exulem respicit* ("Of course, Roman empire looks back to an exile as its founder").[4] Seneca, writing from exile on Corsica, has his own reasons for highlighting the positive aspects of Rome's exilic origins in this epistle,[5] but he is clearly utilizing a very common understanding of the exiles of Roman mythic history.

In particular, Seneca is probably looking back to the multitude of "ways in which writers of the Augustan age use refugee narratives as part of a discourse about Roman identity and power."[6] In a 2008 article, Parshia Lee-Stecum has collected a broad range of sources showing how common a victorious understanding of exile is in Augustan literature. She locates the *topos* in Livy's attribution of Roman power to Romulus' *asylum*;[7] in Evander's settling of the future site of Rome in the *Aeneid* and Ovid's *Fasti*;[8] and most significantly in the *profugus* Aeneas. A victorious reading of this last's exile is to be found everywhere in Augustan literature, but a few examples will suffice here. In Propertius 4.1.39 (*huc melius profugos misisti, Troia, Penatis*: "with a more favorable outcome did you, Troy, send your refugee-Penates here"), exile's negative associations are erased in service of the victorious foundation of Rome which Aeneas' flight produced. Note that Aeneas and his Penates are not "expelled" or "exiled", but rather are "sent" (*misisti*); moreover, Aeneas' exile is associated with good circumstances (*melius*), and the

[4] See Edwards (1996) 112 n.8.

[5] See Fantham (2007) 178–80.

[6] Lee-Stecum (2008) 71.

[7] Lee-Stecum (2008) 74. Liv. 1.8.5–6, especially *locum qui nunc saeptus escententibus inter duos lucos est asylum aperit. eo ex finitimis populis turba omnis sine discrimine, liber an servus esset, avida novarum rerum perfugit, idque primum ad coeptam magnitudinem roboris fuit* ("the space which now is hemmed in between two groves for those mounting the hill he opens as an asylum. There an entire throng without distinction, whether free or slave, fled from the nearby peoples, eager for new things, and that was the first time for Rome's undertaken greatness of strength." For a reading of Livy's *asylum*, both the origins of the myth and the very term, see Dench (2005) 15–20.

[8] Lee-Stecum (2008) 72–74; see especially *Aen.* 8.333–35, *Fasti* 1.477–96. Cf. also Prop. 4.1.4 (*Evandri profugae procubuere boves*, "the refugee cattle of Evandri reclined") with Lee-Stecum (2005) 22.

euphemistic reading of the Trojan's long wanderings is highlighted in the juxtaposition of *melius profugos*.[9] In a curious way, exile is a good thing for the Romans, a paradox which Horace encapsulates well in his third Roman Ode (*Carm.* 3.3.36–38):

> dum longus inter saeviat Ilion
> Romamque pontus, qualibet exules
> in parte regnanto beati.
>
> So long as a great expanse of ocean seethes between Troy and Rome, let those happy exiles rule in whatever part of the world they please.

As Nisbet and Rudd observe, the phrase *exules beati* is a striking oxymoron.[10] That does not mean, however, that Horace is doing something novel with his collocution; just like Propertius, he highlights the positive associations exile had, if not for Aeneas personally then for the future power of his descendants. *Qualibet in parte regnanto* may not be a full-throated endorsement of Roman power,[11] but the words nevertheless highlight the foundation of Roman *imperium* (*regnanto*) in the exile of Aeneas. Beyond the literary sphere, we also see victorious readings of Aeneas' exile like Horace's and Propertius' in the Augustan artistic program, and in Augustus' forum no less. The statuary group of the *summi viri* flanking the Temple of Mars Ultor, if we follow Suetonius, was intended to trace Roman power from its smallest roots to its greatness (Suet. *Div. Aug.* 31.5: *qui imperium p. R. ex minimo maximum reddidissent*: "[those] who made

[9] So Hutchinson (2006) ad loc.: "*misisti Troia* adds purpose to Aeneas' *feror exsul*" (*Aen.* 3.11); see Hutchinson also on the force of *melius*, with OLD sv *melius* 7a. That Troy's destruction and relocation was to Rome's benefit is a *topos*, as Fedeli, Dimundo, and Ciccarelli (2015) 228–9 observe. *Profugus* may have been associated with Aeneas, or at least foundation myths more generally, already in Ennius; see Gaertner (2005) *ad* Ov. *Epist.* 1.8.50, following Skard (1933) 47.

[10] Nisbet and Rudd (2004) 47. Ovid preserves a similarly paradoxical statement regarding Evander's happy exile to the future place of Rome (*Fast.* 1.540: *felix, exilium cui locus ille fuit!*, "Happy that man whose exile is that place!"). On Carmentis' "paradoxical" reading of Rome as Troy reborn, see Hardie (2009) 112 and *passim* on oxymora and Augustanism more generally. Boyle (1997) 12–13, following the argument (see 25 n. 1) that this line is one of those written in a post-exilic revision of the *Fasti*, argues that Evander's "exile lie[s] at the heart of what Rome is" for better (as in our Propertius and Horace passages) or for worse (for Ovid himself). Compare Fantham (1992) 170.

[11] As Nisbet and Rudd (2004), following Feeney (1984) 189 n. 67, rightly point out, Juno is not so much agreeing to the foundation of Roman power as she is bitterly reacting to its inevitability.

the empire of the Roman people the greatest from the smallest"). It is surely significant that Aeneas' statue included in this group, representing Suetonius' moment of *imperium minimum*, likely depicted the Trojan hero in flight from his home city.[12] A viewer of these statues, then, would have been able to read Rome's triumphant rise to imperial power, while at the same time tracing that power back to its birth in the exile of Aeneas.

The point is that victorious exile in general, and Aeneas' in particular, was a common and recognizable motif in Augustan literature and thought. In the following part of this paper we move chronologically to the end of the first century CE and the *Punica* to see that Aeneas' exile, in this Flavian epic, is not construed as the victorious foundation of Roman power, but rather as a dangerous model which might be repeated. As we shall see in each of the examples below, Silius alludes, with specific phrases and imagery borrowed from the *Aeneid*, to the teleologically victorious exile of Aeneas as Vergil presented it. The Flavian poet then inverts Vergil's victorious reading, showing how a repetition of Aeneas' exile spells the doom, and not the birth, of Roman *imperium*.

Leaving

Silius activates his inversions of victorious exile using "counterfactuals," a regular scene type in the *Punica* based on an alternative-historical premise: "what would the result have been if *x* had happened instead of *y*?"[13] One of the most frequently recurring premises is "what would have happened if Rome had lost the war to Carthage?" While the audience knows perfectly well that this did not happen, it provides narrative force to the poem from its opening lines (Sil. 1.7–8:

[12] Following Zanker (1990) 201–3; Lee-Stecum (2008) 73 n. 10 makes a similar observation. For more on the *summi viri*, see Shaya (2013) and Geiger (2008) with further bibliographies.

[13] Cowan (2010) coined the terminology and examines the scene-type in the *Punica*; cf. Cowan (2007b) 24 with n. 159.

quaesitumque diu, qua tandem poneret arce / terrarum Fortuna caput: "and it was long in question on which citadel Fortune would place the head of the world"). This alternative possibility of Roman defeat, the possibility that Rome should lose her *imperium* and not be the *caput terrarum* haunts Silius' characters, and when they confront that ahistorical possibility, they often equate a putative loss of Roman power with a repetition of Aeneas' exile from Troy. Let us turn to an example to see how this operates; Venus, in response to Hannibal's successful crossing of the Alps, lodges a fearful complaint to Jupiter (Sil. 3.559–69):

> quis poenae modus aut pereundi terminus, oro,
> Aeneadis erit, et quando terrasque fretumque
> emensis sedisse dabis? cur pellere nostros
> a te concessa Poenus parat urbe nepotes?
> Alpibus imposuit Libyam finemque minatur
> imperio. Casus metuit iam Roma Sagunti.
> quo Troiae extremos cineres sacramque ruinam
> Assaracique larem et Vestae secreta feramus?
> da sedem, genitor, tutisque iacere. parumne est
> exilia errantes totum quaesisse per orbem?
> Anne iterum capta repetentur Pergama Roma?
>
> What, pray tell, will be the limit of punishment or the end of wandering for the descendants of Aeneas, and when will you grant them, who have traversed both land and sea, to settle down? Why does the Punic leader prepare to cast out our descendants from the city you granted them? He has set Libya on top of the Alps and is threatening an end for empire. Rome already feared the fall of Saguntum. Where should we take the final ashes of Troy, the sacred ruins, the *lar* of Assaracus, and Vesta's mysterious rites? Allow us, father, a home and safely to settle down. Have they not wandered the whole world long enough in their search for refuge from exile? Or will Troy's capture be repeated again by Rome?

Venus' concerns are based on the counterfactual possibility that Roman *imperium* will come to an end (*finemque minatur / imperio*). This clearly looks back to her similar complaint to Jupiter in the first book of the *Aeneid*, in response to which the father of the gods had promised an "empire without end" (*Aen.* 1.279: *imperium sine fine*).[14] More importantly for our purposes,

[14] The allusion is widely noted in the scholarship. See Spaltenstein (1986) ad 3.557, Marks (2005) 211–21, with bibliography at n. 9. Silius clearly has the exchange in mind; Augoustakis and Littlewood (forthcoming) also add for

should this loss of *imperium* come about, Venus fears that the Romans would suffer exile, as her repeated language related to displacement and the loss of home reveals. She worries over endless wandering (*pereundi*) and the Romans' unsafe *sedes* (*sedisse, da sedem*) after traversing land and sea (*terrasque fretumque / emensis*); even the verb she uses to evoke the forced departure from Rome, *pellere*, is a part of the language of exile.[15]

More specifically, and in keeping with Silius' engagement with the *Aeneid* in this passage, it is not just any exile, but specifically a continuation of Aeneas' exile which Venus fears. She appropriately asks if the Romans, "the descendants of Aeneas" (*Aeneadis*) as she calls them, must continue their ancestor's exilic wanderings. Her implicit point is that the very premise of Jupiter's teleological promise of *imperium sine fine* was based on a victorious reading of Aeneas' exile. But this, Silius' Venus implies, is not Vergil's victorious vision of displacement. Venus' question at lines 567–68, whether the Romans must wander the whole world in exile, looks back to that moment in the *Aeneid* when Aeneas first set out from Troy (*Aen*. 3.4: *diversa exilia et desertas quaerere terras*, cf. Sil. 3.568: *exilia…quaesisse*).[16] For Aeneas, exile was the victorious beginning of empire: we know, if the Trojan hero does not, that

---

comparison Venus' *quem das finem…laborum* in the *Aeneid* (1.241) to Silius' *quis poenae modus aut pereundi terminus.*

[15] See OLD s.v. *pellere* 4a and 4b, cf. TLL 10.1.1011.72ff.

[16] Augoustakis and Littlewood (forthcoming). Cf. Jacobs (2009) 128.

Roman domination awaits his descendants at journey's end.[17] For Silius' Romans, however, repeating that exilic past represents the threat of losing *imperium*.[18]

Venus has inverted the optimism with which Vergil and his Augustan colleagues viewed Aeneas' exile; it is now an end, not a beginning of empire. Silius offers us a similar inversion in a scene related to this one in book 7. There, another female divinity, the Nereid Cymodoce, approaches another male divinity, Proteus, regarding Hannibal's threat to Roman power (Sil. 7.430–4):[19]

> quid Tyriae classes ereptaque litora nobis
> portendunt? num migrantur Rhoeteia regna
> in Libyam superis? aut hos Sarranus habebit
> navita iam portus? patria num sede fugatae
> Atalantem et Calpen extrema habitabimus antra?
>
> What do the Punic fleets and shores snatched away from us portend? Is Trojan/Roman rule really going to be displaced by the gods to Libya? Or will the Carthaginian sailor now hold these ports? Will we really be refugees from our ancestral seat and inhabit Atlas and Calpe, in caves at the edge of the world?

Evoking the counterfactual scenario in which Hannibal defeats the Romans (7.432–33: *Sarranus habebit / navita iam portus?*), the Nereid asks if she and her sisters will be exiled from their ancestral home (7.433 *sede fugatae*) to the ends of the world. Her concerns recall Venus' in their preoccupation with exile and the lack of a safe *sedes* (Sil. 7.433: *sede* cf. 3.566, 561), and just like Venus, she frames Roman defeat as a repetition of the city's exilic origins in Aeneas' Troy.

---

[17] Already in the *Aeneid*, Vergil recognizes that exile can stand not only for the birth of power, but also for its end. In book 4, Dido dreams that she *Tyrios deserta quaerere terra* (*Aen.* 4.468, echoing *Aen*. 3.4); as Kennedy (2016) 192 and 197 n. 26 observes, Dido's fears of an exilic future for the Carthaginians will be realized through the Punic Wars. The constellation of these two Vergilian passages elsewhere in Flavian epic is well-noted; cf. most recently Lovatt (2020) 33–4.

[18] While I do not agree with the aesthetic condemnation, Spaltenstein (1986) ad 3.559 comes to a comparable conclusion: "'sedisse' 561, naturel dans l'Enéide puisqu'Enée est en fuite, est ici artificial (même si l'on peut comprendre que l'errance des Troyens se poursuit tant que leurs descendants n'ont pas reçu un empire stable)."

[19] Harrison (2007) 145 and Jacobs (2009) 131–2 note that the theme of exile relates these two passages to each other. On the connections between Cymodoce's speech and Vergilian epic, as well as the scene's metaliterary allusivity, see Littlewood (2011) 163–73 and Biggs (2019) 216 n. 45.

Note that she refers to Roman imperial authority not as "Roman" but rather as Trojan (7.431: *Rhoeteia regna*) by using a geonymic referring to a promontory on the Troad.

We see Silius inverting Vergil's victorious vision of exile in that phrase *migrantur Rhoeteia regna*. On the one hand, it recalls the once fruitful transference of power from Troy to Rome, the victorious exile of Aeneas; but according to Cymodoce's counterfactual fears, Roman power will prove to be all too easily migratory, a thing which by nature moves from one place to another. While the forced relocation of *Rhoeteia regna* had once given birth to Roman power, it may now be lost through the same exilic process.[20] Indeed, commenting on a number of passages (not including ours), Ben Tipping has observed that Silius uses the adjective *Rhoeteius* "in contexts suggesting that Rome may suffer a repetition of Troy's defeat and destruction."[21] The same force is operative here, and Silius underlines that reversal of exilic fortune for the Trojans/Romans in two ways. First of all, note how Silius' Cymodoce reverses the itinerary of Trojan power's migration in comparison to Vergil's epic: the migration (*migrantur*) of Trojan power in Silius' Vergilian model was a beneficial one precisely because it was a journey *towards* Rome and, indeed, away from Carthage in *Aeneid* 4. For Silius, the opposite happens and Trojan power moves *away* from Rome and *towards* Libya (*in Libyam*). Silius seems to be making this very point intertextually with the verb *migrare*, looking back as it does to the only use of that verb in the *Aeneid*, where it describes the moment when the Trojans depart away from Libya and towards Rome (*Aen*. 4.401: *migrantis cernas totaque ex urbe ruentis*: "you could see them moving away and rushing from the whole city").[22] Movement from Libya (or anywhere else for

[20] Littlewood (2011) ad Sil. 7.430–32: Cymodoce "asks whether a kingdom once Trojan and now Roman might be destined to migrate a second time to Libya and become Carthaginian."

[21] Tipping (2010) 69 n. 50, rightly noting the programmatic importance of Sil. 1.115 (*Rhoetea…fata revolvam*). Cf. Jacobs (2009) 132 n. 20.

[22] The verb (including its compounds) occurs elsewhere in Vergil's corpus only at *Ecl*. 9.4 (*veteres migrate coloni*).

that matter) to Italy underpins Vergil's victorious vision of Trojan exile; in Silius' epic, that same exilic movement threatens to recur in the opposite direction and to the detriment of Roman *imperium*.

Silius could pick no better spokeswoman for this type of antiphrastic reasoning than the Nereid Cymodoce; for she is here associated with (or just simply is) Vergil's ship-turned-goddess Cymodecea, whose divinity Cybele won from Jupiter at *Aen.* 9.83–106.[23] Originally created from the trees on Mt. Ida (not far, we might note, from the Rhoeteian promontory Silius' Nereid mentions), Jupiter promises the fleet divine status after the successful completion of Aeneas' exilic wanderings (*Aen*. 9.98–100); Cymodoce(a), in other words, is a goddess precisely because Aeneas' exile was victoriously completed.[24] Silius' Cymodoce questions this prophecy: the putative failure of Roman empire becomes grounds for her renewed westward wandering in exile, now to the very ends of the earth since Hesperia was apparently not far enough (Sil. 7.433: *fugatae / Atalantem et Calpen extrema…antra*).[25]

These antiphrastic allusions to exile in the *Aeneid* are pervasive in the *Punica*. When, for instance, the Capuan leader Virrius is forced to admit defeat, he regrets that "the kingdom of Trojan Quirinus" did not "migrate" to Capua (Sil. 13.266: *Capuam Iliaci migrarent regna Quirini*). The collocution *migrarent regna,* connected as it is to a peculiarly Trojan (*Iliaci*) deified Romulus, reminds us of Cymodoce's counterfactual fears (Sil. 7.431: *migrantur Rhoeteia*

[23] The name ultimately derives from Greek epic, *Il.* 18.39 cf. Hes. *Th.* 252. While Vergil also has the name at *Aen*. 5.826 (=G. 4.338, apparently an interpolation, see Thomas (1988) ad loc.), as Littlewood (2011) and Spaltenstein (1986) ad loc. agree, Silius likely intends the ship-turned-Nereid: we should, along with Littlewood, sense an intertextual joke in Cymodoce speaking for the Nereids following her description at *Aen*. 10.225 (*fandi doctissima Cymodocea*).

[24] A point in which I am anticipated by Papaioannou (2002) 41: "The supernatural disappearance of the ships validates one more prophecy about the Trojan future." Vergil may here respond to the Greek notion that Nereids oversaw the successful completion of moments of transition: see Barringer (1995) 10.

[25] As Littlewood (2011) ad Sil. 7.434 notes, "reiterated spondees in the first half of the line emphasize the enormity of the Nereid's migration to the ends of the earth."

regna) of a repetition of Trojan/Roman displacement.[26] As van der Keur observes of this intratext, "the only other occurrence of *migrare regna* [is] another speculation of Rome's loss of supremacy in Italia."[27]

We might adduce any number of other scenes similar to this one,[28] and we might further solidify a pattern of antiphrastic allusion built around exile in the *Punica* as compared to Aeneas' exile in the *Aeneid*; I do not intend, however, to compile that list in this chapter. Such a catalogue would be a part of an already well-understood aspect of Silius' narrative, namely that, in the words of Randall Ganiban, "the recurrence of the past in the present defines the Carthaginian outlook."[29] Since the beginning of the epic, when Hannibal swore his childhood oath against Rome (Sil. 1.115: *ferro ignique sequar Rhoeteaque fata revolvam*: "I will pursue [the Romans] with sword and fire and I will repeat the destruction of Troy"), the prospect of Carthaginian victory has been aligned with the repetition of Trojan defeat. That oath is clearly aligned with the Vergilian Dido's curse in *Aen.* 4 (626: *qui face Dardanios ferroque sequare colonos*: "you who would pursue with torch and sword the Dardanian colonists").[30] Dido's threats, however, are levelled not against "Romans," as Hannibal's are (Sil. 1.114: *Romanos*), but Dardanian colonists

[26] So, also, Cowan (2007b) 26, connecting the scene to Cymodoce's in book 7: "This is the reason why Quirinus is specifically *Iliacus*; Virrius hoped that Trojan Rome had had its day and must give way to Trojan Capua, just as Trojan Alba had to her, its inhabitants compelled to migrate to a new city."

[27] Van der Keur (2015) 159.

[28] E.g. Sil. 12.514–17, where Hannibal exhorts his troops to attack Rome and avenge their Capuan allies (515: *Capuaeque repende ruinas*). A number of verbal parallels connect the speech with Virrius' in the following book: Hannibal, just like Virrius, portrays Rome as a new Troy (12.514–15: *incute muris / umbonem Iliacis*, cf. 13.266–7: *Iliaci...quaterent muros*). More significantly, Hannibal imagines Jupiter "emigrating" from the Capitoline (12.517: *demigrantem Tarpeia sede Tonantem*) just like Virrius intended to cause Roman power to "migrate" (13.266: *migrarent regna*) when he sent troops against the "Tarpeian walls" (13.267: *Tarpeiaque moenia*).

[29] Ganiban (2010) 80. This Carthaginian outlook plays on the hopes of Aeneas for a *Troia recidiva* in *Aeneid* 3, on which see especially Bettini (1997) 16–17: in the *Aeneid*, Roman power is not built on a simple repetition of the Trojan past (e.g. the failed *altera Troiae / Pergama* of Crete, *Aen.* 3.86–7) but rather a new city, with a new national identity, as Juno demands (*Aen.* 12.819ff).

[30] Ganiban (2010) 80–1 following Feeney (1982) 81.

(*Dardanios…colonos*) still looking for a home, a distinction which matters a great deal in the *Punica*: Juno finally dissuades Hannibal from continuing his attack on the city Rome by saying that he is *not* "dealing with a Phrygian or Laurentine colonist" (Sil. 12.706: *non tibi cum Phrygio res Laurentive colono*).[31] Displacement, in other words, might be part of Rome's Trojan past, but it is not part of its future.

As the *Punica* progresses, this becomes more and more clear: Rome, Silius' audience knows, would not suffer the same exilic fate as their Trojan ancestors and lose their power in displacement. Quite the opposite, in fact: if there is any character in Silius' epic who represents the negative relationship between power and exile from Italy, it is Hannibal, who withdraws for the last time in book 17 looking back on the Italian mainland tearfully as if he were going into exile (Sil. 17.216–17: *haud secus ac patriam pulsus dulcisque penatis / linqueret et tristis exul traheretur in oras*: "hardly otherwise would an expelled man leave his fatherland or sweet *penates* and as an exile be dragged to unhappy shores").[32] As many have observed,[33] Hannibal looks a lot like an anti-Aeneas here, as he often does in the epic; leaving the *penates* which Aeneas had successfully transferred there, Hannibal's journey from Italy to Carthage mirrors the geographical trajectory of Aeneas' trip to Carthage at the beginning of the *Aeneid*. And yet the parallel only highlights the difference that Aeneas will make it back to Italy to solidify Rome's future *imperium*, while Hannibal's departure from Italy signals the ultimate downfall of

[31] Cowan (2007a) 4–5.

[32] A simile which Silius has adapted from Livy (30.20.7): *raro quemquam alium patriam exilii causa relinquentem tam maestum abisse ferunt quam Hannibalem hostium terra excedentem* ("they say that hardly anyone else leaving his country in exile departed as sadly as Hannibal withdrawing from the enemy's land"); see also Marks (2003) 139 n. 23, Mills (2009) 52 n. 13 and Augoustakis (2010a) 152.

[33] On the parallels between Aeneas and Hannibal as exiles, see Ahl, Davis, and Pomeroy (1986) 2515–16, Marks (2003) 138–9, Mills (2009) 53–4, Bernstein (2017) 271–2, as well as Stocks (2014) 61 n. 24 (with further bibliography) and 205. The exile of Lucan's Pompey from Rome in Luc. 3.1–7 is also influencing Silius here: see Currie (1958) 49–50, Burck (1984) 129–33, Marks (2003) 138–43, Ahl, Davis, and Pomeroy (1986) 2516–18, Mills (2009), Tipping (2010) 89, and Stocks (2014) 69–70.

Carthaginian power in the *Punica*. Hannibal, not the Romans, ultimately repeats Aeneas' exile to disastrous consequences.

Getting Back

Exile is a dangerous thing in the *Punica*, as we have explored it so far, because it is unidirectional. While it may seem a facile point, "leaving" in exile is problematic for Silius' Romans in a way that it is not for Vergil's wandering Trojans: the Romans of the 3rd century have a definite *sedes*, a *locus* to which their power is tied. Rome's geographical and political place in the world are inextricably related: now a powerful city, Rome is the *caput terrarum* (Sil. 1.8)[34] and no longer a colony for homeless Trojans (Sil. 12.706). Rome, therefore, does not need an exiled hero like Aeneas who leaves, but rather an exile who can return;[35] such an action of returning in the *Punica* validates the individual power of the hero and the power of the state. In the *Punica*, exile is only victorious insofar as it is balanced with triumphant return to Rome.

The mytho-historical hero of the 4th Century BCE, M. Furius Camillus, plays this role of returning, exiled hero particularly well in an exemplum citing him in *Punica* 7.[36] In that passage, the dictator Q. Fabius Maximus must save his insubordinate Master of Horse Minucius from certain destruction; the famous *cunctator*'s son, however, urges his father to leave Minucius and his army to their deaths since they disobeyed orders. The dutiful Fabius corrects his son and

[34] See Marks (2008) 67–8 on the phrase's related geographical and metaphorical specificity.

[35] Vergil also emphasizes the importance of return in his epic, of course: Aeneas is not simply (or only) in exile, but is, as Polydorus' prophecy in book 3 reveals, actually "returning" to his ancestral home (*Aen.* 3.96 [sc. *prima tellus Dardani vos*] *accipiet reduces. antiquam exquirite matrem*, "[The first land of Dardanus] will receive you returning. Seek out your ancient mother.).

[36] We might also compare Livius Salinator (Sil. 15.596–600), who was exiled from Rome due to the mishandling of Illyrian spoils (Liv. 27.34). Initially bitter (Sil. 15.600: *iram*), Livius is an ultimately dutiful hero who returns to arms from exile (15.599: *revocatus ad arma*, with OLD *revoco* sv 3b) to defend his fatherland from a *gravior moles*. See further Marks (2005) 49–50 and 100, Augoustakis (2010a) 148, and Burck (1984) 88–90.

teaches him that it is *nefas* to nurse hatred against one's countryman (Sil. 7.555: *succensere nefas patriae*); Roman power, he muses, relies on heroes like Camillus, who can come to the aid of their fatherland even when it has wronged them. While this is an important passage in an important book which gives us insight into Silius' literary technique[37] and his analysis of Fabius' (ultimately limited) role as a successful leader,[38] let us turn to Silius' use of the type of counterfactual scenario explored in the previous section (Sil. 7.557–63):

> Quantus qualisque fuisti,
> cum *pulsus lare* et *extorris* Capitolia curru
> intrares *exul*! tibi corpora caesa, Camille,
> damnata quot sunt dextra! pacata fuissent
> ni consulta viro mensque impenetrabilis irae,
> mutassentque solum sceptris Aeneia regna
> nullaque nunc stares terrarum vertice, Roma.
>
> How great and excellent you (i.e. Camillus) were when you came back, although an *exile expelled from your home*, and entered the Capitoline *an exile* on your chariot! How many bodies you slayed, Camillus, how many you condemned with your right hand! And if that man's plans had not been pacified and his mind not immune to his anger, the kingdom of Aeneas would have changed the land for its scepters and you, Rome, would not now be standing at the top of the world.

On the simple grammatical level, of course, 560–63 constitute a counterfactual statement (*fuissent / ni*…/*mutassent*…/*stares*), but Joy Littlewood is surely correct in noting that the phrase *Aeneia regna* (562), while "evoking the Virgilian Aeneas' fulfillment of his ktistic destiny," is part of a broader pattern of counterfactuals "in *Punica* 7 [cf. Cymodoce cited above] suggesting the demise of Rome's seat of empire."[39] As elsewhere, Silius likens the possible loss of Roman

[37] There is a long tradition in Latin literature of likening Fabius to Camillus; for Silius' interaction with this tradition (e.g. Livy's Minucius who at 22.14.9 calls Fabius *hic novus Camillus*, although see Bernstein (2008) 231 n. 51) in *Punica* 7, see Littlewood (2011) 209–11, Tipping (2010a) 124, and Marks (2005) 25 nn. 33–4.

[38] Bernstein (2008) 139–59 is the best point of entry, cf. Littlewood (2011) 205 with a good bibliography; to selectively supplement and modernize, see especially Tipping (2010a) 120–31, Marks (2005) 277–8, and Augoustakis (2010a) 148 n. 133 with bibliography.

[39] Littlewood (2011) *ad* Sil. 7.562.

imperial power to the Trojan past, and more specifically to the exile of Aeneas; although here we will note that Camillus' tale was also "regularly evoked whenever the Romans give voice to their fears and anxieties about the final destruction of their city."[40] Again in the *Punica,* power based on the Trojan past threatens to invite the same destructive forces which initially drove Aeneas to Rome.[41] Divorced from its context, line 652 might perfectly describe Aeneas' successful transfer of power to Italy, but in Silius' new epic the important connection between Rome's physical place (*solum*) and her political place (*terrarum vertice*) in the world means that another Trojan exilic "change of place" must be warded off.

Camillus, in Fabius' exemplum, prevents such displacement from happening even though he himself is an exile, an irony which Silius emphasizes by triply repeating Camillus' status as *pulsus lare et extorris…/…exul* in a single sentence (558–59). But more important than his exile is the fact that Camillus returns victoriously to Rome: note on the one hand the balance between *intrares exul* (559) emphasizing Camillus' return from exile and on the other hand his entry as a *triumphator* on a chariot (558: *curru*).[42] Throughout the *Punica* Camillus serves as the quintessential hero of victorious return: his first appearance at Sil. 1.626 (*revertentis pompa…Camilli*) also highlights triumph (*pompa*, with Feeney ad loc.) and return from exile (*revertentis*, see note 39 on *vertere*). On a personal level, then, Camillus mirrors the connection

[40] Rebeggiani (2018) 241. We should note that Silius' *mutassent solum* recalls legal language attached to exile, *exilii causa solum vertere*; see Claassen (1999) 11 citing Cic. *Pro Pub. Quinct.* 60 ((*tracta edictum…qui exilii causa solum verterit*, "Take a look at the edict...'he who changed his land for the sake of exile.'") and *Pro Caec*. 100 (*solum vertunt hoc est sedem ac locum mutant*, "They change their land, that is, they change their place.").

[41] A point which Silius also makes intertextually; Littlewood (2011) *ad* Sil. 7.563 notes that the line is modelled on Aeneas' similar wish that Troy still stood (*Aen.* 2.56: *Troiaque nunc staret, Priamique arx alta, maneres*, "If only Troy still were standing, and if only you remained, lofty citadel of Priam.").

[42] Return, *reditus*, and triumph are commonly associated as two elements of the Roman triumph (see, e.g., *Aen.* 11.54: *hi nostri reditus exspectatique triumphi?*). Cicero seems to have likened his own *reditus* from exile to a triumphal *reditus* by comparing himself to Camillus, see e.g. *Dom.* 86 with Sumi (2005) 39–41. This association with return and triumph vis-à-vis exile is particularly important for the triumphing (yet soon-to-be exiled) Scipio in the epic's final scene.

between Rome's physical place (by his return) and political place at the top of the world (by his triumph).

By the time Silius composed the *Punica*, Camillus' return from exile had long been part of a literary *topos* concerning the importance of Rome's *locus* vis-à-vis her empire.[43] Silius opposes one side of that tradition which holds that Camillus' exile underwrites a mutability of Roman power in respect to its place, and the poet uses an antiphrastic allusion in our passage to respond to one example of such thinking, his epic forebear Lucan. In *Bellum Civile* 5 (27–34), the consul of the Pompeian faction Lentulus argues that his senate-in-exile has not lost its authority on account of a change of place (Luc. 5.30: *mutato…solo*, cf. Sil. 7.562: *mutassentque solum*; n.b. this phrase is a typical Ovidian "Schlüsselwort seiner Exildichtung"),[44] citing Camillus' time in exile before saving Rome from the Gauls as precedent: Rome, whose power at that time resided not in the city but in an exiled hero, might as well have been in Veii[45] with Camillus (Luc. 5.28–29: *Veiosque habitante Camillo / illic Roma fuit*: "when Camillus was living at Veii, Rome was there"). Since by this reasoning Roman power is validated by powerful individuals and not the physical place of Rome, Lentulus can turn Camillus into an exemplum underwriting civil factionalism; a tendentious argument, perhaps, but Lentulus' speech and use of the Camillus-exemplum (cf. Appian *B.C.* 2.50)[46] are well-established in the literary tradition.

---

[43] See Ogilvie (1965) 742 and especially Gaertner (2008) 43–5, who note Livy's use of Cicero in fashioning Camillus' speech against moving Rome in Liv. 5.54.

[44] So Helzle (2003) *ad Pont*. 1.1.79 (*inque locum Scythico vacuum mutabor ab arco*). Further philological analysis of the expression is to be found in Gaertner (2005) 135–6, adducing one example perhaps relevant to this discussion such as Liv. 5.46.11 (*quod nec iniussu populi mutari finibus posset*). The parallel between Silius and Lucan is also noted by Tipping (2010a) 127–8.

[45] A slip, Camillus was at Ardea; Masters (1992) 105 n. 90 suggests that there is confusion with some of the Romans who took refuge in Veii.

[46] See Gaertner (2008) 50–1 on Lucan's sources. Appian's Pompey (not Lentulus) makes a similar speech with the same point that the fatherland has no necessary connection to its place (πάντες τε οἱ εὖ φρονοῦντες τὴν ἐλευθερίαν, ὅπῃ ποτ᾽ ἂν ὦσιν, ἡγοῦνται πατρίδα, "Everyone who really knows what freedom is considers their fatherland to be

On the other end of the Camillus-tradition, Livy's version of the hero deeply influences Silius' and represents the strong connection between *imperium* and *locus* for Rome. Livy's Camillus says that he returned to Rome not so that he might be in his *patria* per se (Liv. 5.51.2: *non ut ego utique in patria essem*) but rather so that his *patria* might retain its *sedes* (*ut in sua sede maneret patria*); this significance of Rome's *sedes* runs contrary to Lentulus' thinking in the *Bellum Civile*. Silius adapts this in his Camillus-exemplum, arguing that the recursion of Trojan exile in Rome would lead to a devastating loss of both her *solus* and status as *vertex terrarum*. By returning to Rome and validating the connection between those two elements, Silius' Camillus shows how exile can have a positive relationship with power.

Punica 7 is, from an aerial view, all about this connection between return and power on both an individual and collective level. For example, at Sil. 7.381–2, Fabius, as dictator, must return to Rome in order to inaugurate the *Ludi Romani*, thereby being prevented from pursuing Hannibal. Joy Littlewood admits that the importance of returning to Rome in such a dire situation seems "odd," but along with Bernstein[47] rightly notes the precedent in Fabius' ancestor C. Fabius Dorsuo who died in the Gallic siege of Rome. That earlier Fabius, according to Livy (5.52.3), broke the siege and returned to the Quirinal to dedicate familial rituals. Significantly, Livy puts the story in the mouth of Camillus, freshly returned from exile, who cites C. Fabius Dorsuo's sacrifice as he argues against the Romans abandoning their city for Veii; as Chaplin puts it, "C. Fabius Dorsuo's sacrifice on the Quirinal shows that…Rome is full of sacred places with attendant ceremonies and rituals that cannot be relocated."[48] Rome's place, and the rituals

---

wherever they should be."). See also Barratt (1979) ad Luc. 5.27–9, Radicke (2004) 317 with n. 15, and Carsana (2007) 171–3.

[47] Littlewood (2011) *ad loc*.; Bernstein (2008) 231 n. 53.

[48] Chaplin (2000) 86.

associated with it, constitute a necessary element of her power. Silius surely had this association between return and power in mind when he so closely intertwined his Fabius/Camillus pairing with Livy's.[49] As both authors portrayed them, Camillus and the Fabii represent the necessary connection between Rome's place and her power; what's more, they all defend that connection by returning to Rome or emphasizing Roman heroes who do so.[50]

We return, then, to the beginning of this chapter, to Seneca's observation that Roman power is irrevocably attached to exile, for better or for worse. On the one hand, Aeneas' exilic wanderings around the Mediterranean in *Aeneid* 3, divinely sanctioned as they are, become a kind of tour of the boundaries of his descendants' *imperium*. So too Horace, Livy, and Propertius reflect the positive association between displacement and power which is implied in the statue of exiled Aeneas among Augustus' *summi viri*. But after the failure of Augustus' lineage brought about a year of civil wars, that program could be questioned. If Aeneas was an exile, so was Marius; for every Camillus, there was a Coriolanus. The problem with exile as a way of talking about the transfer of power is that it makes Roman *imperium* a mutable thing, something which can be vested in powerful individuals (leading to civil war, as Lucan's Lentulus makes all too clear) or removed from Rome entirely (as Venus and Cymodoce fear might happen in the *Punica*). Silius understands this all too well, and in his counterfactuals presents the dangerous aspects of Aeneas' exile as a metaphor for Roman hegemony; rather, the Flavian poet emphasizes the positive correlation between return and power. Perhaps it is for this reason that at the end of the *Punica* Silius hails his Roman hero *par excellence* Scipio Africanus—a hero who

[49] Or compare Cowan (2002) 114, discussing Metellus' intended voluntary exile from Rome following Cannae (Sil. 10.415–8): "as Camillus implies, it is the site of Rome which makes it Roman; cities...are walls, not men; Rome's fortune is tied up with its site."

[50] It is an excess of this quality which makes Silius' Fabius a less than ideal leader at the end of the epic; it will be Scipio, and not Fabius, who can lead the Romans to Africa and leave Italy, something which Fabius advocates against in book 16 (604–44). On the comparison of Fabius and Scipio as leaders in the *Punica*, see further Marks (2005) 47–55, Augoustakis (2010a) 95, and Fucecchi (2010).

would withdraw into voluntary exile and never return to Rome long after the events of the *Punica*—as a new Camillus (Sil. 17.651–2: *salve, invicte parens…/ laudibus ac meritis non concessure Camillo*, "Hail, indomitable father…in praise and worthiness never to yield to Camillus).[51]

Sed Revocare Gradum: The Promise and Danger of Return in the (Flavian) Punica

Exile, then, is simultaneously a historically attractive and notionally dangerous prospect for Silius' Romans in the *Punica.* Aeneas and Camillus show that exile can be put to the good, under the right circumstances. I have suggested that "return" is one key ingredient to capturing the promise of exile-narratives while eschewing their negative implications. In this section, I would like to pay closer attention, then, to that concept of "return" in the *Punica,* both in exilic and non-exilic connotations, to see how Silius both affirms and undermines the status of the *reditus* as the necessary, positive ingredient I found it to be in the previous section. I will also attempt to locate the concept of return within the broader context of Flavian ideology and culture. I will argue that Silius' contemporary audience would have understood a very particular series of cultural referents when hearing the vocabulary of return in the *Punica*; all the more intriguing, then, is that Silius often inverts the expectations raised by those referents. In the *Punica*, we find that return is more frequently frustrated than successfully completed; moreover, even when it is successfully completed, a *reditus* often hints at episodes of civil discord and internal conflict.

Silius frequently leans on the idea of return to connote the prospect of victory and success in military and other ventures. Although by no means originally Silian or Domitianic, the triumphal *reditus* and *adventus* are particularly prominent elements of both Domitianic and

[51] See Marks (2005) 202–3 with n. 99.

Flavian imperial ideology and iconography (as we have it, at any rate): the *profectio* and *reditus*/*adventus* were ceremonies commemorating the departure and return of commanders, both frequently associated with the triumph.[52] In those instances of the military *profectio* and *reditus*, important elements include the *mutatio vestis* and particularly the hailing of the general by the senate and people (typically at the *Porta Capena*).[53] These rituals, and particularly the *adventus*, seem to have been of particular importance for Domitian's self-presentation. Consider, for instance, the Cancelleria Reliefs:[54] if Relief A really does describe a *profectio* (as recent consensus holds)[55] and Relief B a triumphal *adventus*, we can see in iconographic terms how Domitian balanced the prospect of departing from Rome with victorious return. Furthermore, in addition to the Cancelleria Reliefs we can glean from one other frieze assigned to Domitian's reign that the triumphal return of the *adventus* was an important aspect of Domitianic imperial imagery.[56]

The connection of the *profectio* with the *adventus* and triumph sets up a very particular set of associations between departure, return, and military victory. The ideal proffered by this association of imagery suggests that the military departures of Romans setting out on campaign must be balanced with a concomitant *reditus* signifying victory. Curiously, however, Silius frequently focuses on inversions of that paradigm and highlights instances in which the absence of a *reditus* renders a *profectio* all the more tragic. So, for instance, Silius describes the Italian

[52] On the association between *adventus* and the triumph, see Arya (2002) 303; Sumi (2005) 35.

[53] On the ceremonies of the *profectio* and *adventus*, see Arya (2002) 301–2 and especially Sumi (2005) 35–41.

[54] On which, see Darwall-Smith (1996) 172–7 with bibliography.

[55] On the history of the debate, see Darwall-Smith (1996) 172–4 with bibliography; for recent interpretation of the Reliefs informed by literary criticism, see Augoustakis (2010a) 242–6; Henderson (2003).

[56] On the connection of the *reditus*/*adventus* with the Triumph, see Sumi (2005) 35–41. On the other Domitianic frieze now housed at Michigan, see Koeppel (1969) 138–40 and (1980) 18; on the imagery and themes which later developed around the *adventus*, see also Lehnen (1997).

soldiers under Scipio's (i.e. Africanus' father's) command at the battle of Ticinus with a long catalogue (4.219–27) culminating with a pair of lines that evoke the tragedy of setting out for a war and never returning (4.228–9):[57]

> ibant in Martem terrae dominantis alumni,
> damnati superis nec iam reditura iuventus.
>
> They were going to war, those wards of the dominant land, those youths damned by the gods above and destined never after to return.

Notice how Silius aligns by consonance the anticipation of military victory (***d*o*m*i*n***antis*) with the reality of defeat (***d*a*mn***ati*); we also see that the departure (*ibant*) from the *terra dominans* is ideally balanced by the promise of the triumph of the *reditus* (*nec iam reditura*). It is, in other words, natural to read departure and return side-by-side in a military and ideological context in Silius' contemporary Rome; "return" should nominally imply the triumph of the returning Roman general, but that is not the case here for Scipio's soldiers who are doomed never to celebrate a *reditus*.

Our poet regularly undermines the positive valence of the *reditus* in this way throughout the poem: for instance, he portrays these *proficientes* as simply that, people who will never return to their homeland, exiles if you will. Consider, also, the perverse "return" of Varro prophesied by Paulus before the disastrous battle at Cannae (8.347–8: *similemve videbit* / *Varroni Paulum <u>redeuntem</u> saucia Roma*): the implication is that Paulus will only "return" if triumphant, but Varro will return in flight and defeat to Rome's detriment (*saucia*).[58] Not only does this perversely associate the *reditus* with defeat rather than victory, but moreover, as Marks notes, Varro's perverse return is likened to civil discord by Silius' Lucanian intertext (Luc.

[57] On the lines, see also Kissel (1979) 81 n. 241.

[58] Cf. Ahl, Davis, and Pomeroy (1986) 2533.

6.320–1: *numquamque videbit* / *me nisi dimisso redeuntem milite Roma*, "Rome will never see me returning unless I've dismissed my army");[59] as we shall see later in this section, Silius regularly implies that perverse returns incur the penalty of civil discord. Admittedly, Silius surely did not intend to evoke exile, even on the level of a secondary reading,[60] with his depiction of departure and return in these lines; but that is not to say that the failure of returning to Italy cannot evoke both the experience of exile and the triumphal imagery of Domitianic Rome. Hannibal, for instance, is one noteworthy character who fails to secure a *reditus* to Rome in both triumphal and exilic contexts.

In a passage we will discuss in further detail in a later chapter, Hannibal is forced to depart for the final time from Italy seeming as if he is going into exile (17.216–17).[61] Upon departing, however, Hannibal feels the urge to come back to Italy, to "return" (17.221–23):

> mentisne ego compos et hoc nunc
> indignus reditu, qui memet finibus umquam
> amorim Ausoniae?
>
> Am I really of sound mind and now unworthy of this return? Me?! Who never removed myself from the borders of Italy?

The key word here is *reditus*, Hannibal's return; we might suspect that Hannibal would speak of returning to Carthage (as that is what he is doing here), but that is not the case. He speaks here of a return to Italy, *Ausonia*. Clearly he considers Italy to be an *altera patria* (see chapter 3), and so his desire for a *reditus* in line 222 counterbalances his "exile" from Italy just six lines previously;

[59] Marks (2010) 138; cf. the confusion of friend and foe in Varro and Paulus noted by Augoustakis (2010a) 102–3. The irony, of course, is that both men have lost their soldiers (Lucan's *dimisso milite*); while Pompey's promise is an attempt to distance himself from the connotations of civil war brought on by marching to Rome at arms (in comparison to Caesar himself), Varro's willingness to abandon his post and soldiers speaks to the disturbing possibilities of generals who put their own interest above that of the collective. Cf. Dominik (2018) 281 and n. 38.

[60] Except, perhaps, Varro since Silius likens him to the exiled Pompey.

[61] *haud secus ac patriam pulsus dulcisque penatis* / *linqueret et tristis exul traheretur in oras* ("Hardly otherwise would a man depart fatherland and sweet household gods and as an exile be dragged off to sad shores.").

his focus on the *fines Ausoniae* similarly cast this Carthaginian as an Italian exile looking from the outside in.

But Hannibal's language is also indebted to the imperial ideology of, as Joel Allen has recently analyzed, Domitian's focus on *digni triumphi* (e.g. Stat. *Silv*. 3.3.171; cf. *Silv*. 3.3.140–2; *Th*. 12.579; Mart. 8.65.11).[62] As has long been noted, whether or not Domitian's military victories were necessarily spectacular or viewed as worthy (cf. Domitian's fears over his *triumphus falsus* according to Tac. *Ag.* 39.1, proving the trend in negative),[63] the imperial pageantry and propaganda surrounding them focused on the emperor's victory being worthy of a triumph.[64] As the *reditus* was a key part of the symbolism of the triumphantly returning general, Hannibal's status as *indignus reditu* almost certainly harkens back to this particular brand of Domitian's self-presentation.[65] The epic's antagonist against Rome is therefore not just imagining a return from the "exile" he has just suffered, but also a triumphal return in the vein of an imperial triumph;[66] such a move is anticipated by Cicero, who also likened his own return from exile to a triumph.[67]

---

[62] The idea is certainly not originally Domitian's; cf. Cic. *Att.* 6.3; Ov. *Am*. 2.12.5.

[63] Strunk (2017) 41–2 explores Tacitus' biting criticism of false Domitianic triumphs, particularly against the Germans; on the accusations of *Ag.* 39.1, cf. the testimonia rightly noted by Strunk at Plin. *Pan*. 16.3 (unlike Domitian, Trajan will refuse *mimicos currus* and *falsae simulacra victoriae*) and Dio 67.7.4.

[64] Domitian celebrated between two and four triumphs; see Griffin (2000) 63 and the relevant ancient testimonia cited by Hulls (2011) 173 n. 21.

[65] Cf. the related notion of the Marcomani and Sarmatians not being worth a triumph by Domitian in Stat. Silv. 3.3.170–1, using language similar to Silius' (*quae modo Marcomanos post horrida bella vagosque* / *Sauromatas Latio non est dignata triumpho*, "which did not deem the Marcomani after horrible wars and the wandering Sauromatae worthy of a Latian triumph".). Cf. Mart. 8.15.5 for these *secreti triumphi*.

[66] The importance of triumph and return are clearly important themes for both Hannibal and Scipio at the end of Book 17; we will return to those dynamics in the dissertation's conclusion.

[67] On Cicero's vision of his return from exile as a triumph, see further Sumi (2005) 39–41. We might note, *inter alia*, Cicero's many claims to have returned from exile with his *dignitas* redeemed (Cic. *Dom.* 64: *summa cum dignitate reditum*, 87: *redii cum maxima dignitate*; *Red. Sen.* 23: *dolorem profectionis meae reditus dignitate consoler*).

But Hannibal is *indignus reditu*, "unworthy" of this "return" in an inversion of the imperial ideal of the "worthy triumph." As a figure deemed *indignus* and consigned to flight from a dominant power, Hannibal rather looks a good deal like Turnus at the conclusion of Vergil's *Aeneid*, whose soul in the poem's final line is deemed "unworthy," *indignata,* and flees, *fugit,* to the Underworld (*Aen*. 12.952: *vitaque cum gemitu fugit indignata sub umbras*, "and with a groan his soul, deemed unworthy, fled to the shades below."). Vergil's use of *fugit* need not necessarily summon to mind exile (*fuga*), although Philip Hardie has rightly observed that Turnus accepts displacement as a kind of substitute for the exile that was originally thrust upon Aeneas *profugus* at the poem's beginning.[68] Silius makes clear that he views Hannibal's exile after the poem's conclusion as a Turnus-like moment in book 13 when the Sibyl describes the Carthaginian's death in exile in lines reminiscent of the last line of the *Aeneid* (Sil. 13.875–6):

> non vita sequetur
> inviolata virum; patria non ossa quiescent.
>
> Nor will an unharmed life follow this man in the future: his bones will not find rest in his fatherland.

On first glance it may seem strange to tie this line to Vergil, but I agree with Jacobs and Van der Keur that Silius ultimately has *Aen*. 12.952 in mind with his *inviolata,* perhaps with a line of Cornelius Severus serving as an intermediary point of contact (Corn. Sev. fr. 13.24–5):[69] *nostraeque cadens ferus <u>Hannibal</u> irae / membra tamen Stygias tulit <u>inviolata sub umbras</u>* ("And savage Hannibal, though falling to our wrath, nevertheless bore limbs unharmed to the shades below"; cf. with Van der Keur also Sil. 2.706–7 *Stygias...ad undas / deformata*); as Edward

[68] Hardie (1997) 144: the poem ends "with a movement of departure (*fugit*), with the suggestion of a descent (into the Underworld), and with darkness. Much of this is in contrast to the continuation that the reader is now in a position to supply, the future story of Aeneas and his descendants, arrival in Italy confirmed and the end of the *fuga* theme."

[69] See also Van der Keur (2015) 469 and Jacobs (2009) 297 n. 36. Cf. Reitz (1982) 131 n. 2 rightly comparing Decius' death prophesied at 11.384: *accepit tellus ossa inviolata sepulcro*.

Courtney notes, Cornelius Severus also likely had Vergil's final line in mind.[70] Therefore, just as Turnus *indignus* flees Aeneas' ascendant power, so too does Hannibal, *indignus reditu*, suffer flight of a different kind under ascendant Roman *imperium*.

Hannibal's status as *indignus reditu* in the poem is therefore a doubly significant reminder of the importance of victorious return as an ameliorative response to flight. Intertextually, it recalls Turnus' unmitigated "flight" and role as a displaced substitute for the exiled Trojans. In its Flavian context, however, Hannibal's status is clearly that of a *triumphatus* rather than that of a *triumphator*: he can never secure a *reditus* to Rome. As an enemy of Rome, Silius portrays Hannibal's future as one in which the Carthaginian is ever in flight, always on the run from, rather than returning to the place of Rome and her power. Putatively, we might imagine that Silius regularly counterbalances Hannibal's failure to secure a *reditus* with Romans who successfully do so; and while that is the case in one instance at the poem's conclusion (which we will discuss in detail in a later chapter), it is more typical in the *Punica* to see the many ways in which a *reditus* to Rome is problematic and indeed dangerous.

Returning triumphantly to Rome is far rarer in the *Punica* than is unmitigated flight from the city or returning in defeat. One of the most well-known instances of a failed return in the *Punica* is that of Regulus, the hero of Rome's first war with Carthage. In book 6, Regulus returns from his torture at the hands of the Carthaginians as part of a (probably a-historical)[71] embassy regarding war captives.[72] But this is no return to his *patria* for Regulus; as Antony Augoustakis

[70] Courtney (2003) 327; as Van der Keur (2015) 469 points out, Silius' verses are a correction of Cornelius Severus: indeed, as the earlier poet suggests, the Romans did not violate Hannibal's body...he did it himself. We might also note that Silius is correcting Cornelius Severus' own correction of Vergil, whose Aeneas certainly does not leave Turnus' *vita inviolata*.

[71] So Williams (2004) 71, although cf. his citation of Le Bohec (1997).

[72] For sources on this episode before Silius' handling of it, see Augoustakis (2010a) 159–61.

has recently argued, Rome is not a home at all for Regulus.[73] At one critical moment in the episode, Regulus not only refuses to remain in Rome, but even inverts the entire idea of *reditus* for a Roman; indeed, according to him, Regulus' proper "return" in *Punica* 6 is to Carthage, not Italy (6.490–6):

> haec fatus Tyriae sese iam reddidit irae,
> nec monitus spernente graves fidosque senatu
> Poenorum dimissa cohors. quae maesta repulsa
> ac minitans capto patrias properabat ad oras.
> prosequitur vulgus, patres, ac planctibus ingens
> personat et luctu campus. revocare libebat
> interdum et iusto captum retinere dolore.
>
> Having so spoken now he returned himself to the wrath of the Tyrians, and since the Senate did not neglect Regulus' grave and trustworthy warnings, the envoy of the Phoenicians was sent away. And they, sadly expelled and hurling threats at their prisoner, were hurrying back to the shores of their fatherland. A crowd and the senators follow them, and the whole Campus Martius resounds with the beating of breasts and wailing. Sometimes they were wanting to recall him and to keep the captive there because of their just pain.

Admittedly, Regulus might not be an exile in any strict sense, but Silius certainly uses, in addition to *reditus*, the legal language of "recall (from exile)," *revocare* (6.496, cf. OLD s.v. 3b and below on Livius Salinator), for Regulus' removal from Rome to Carthage, suggesting that the latter, rather than the former, is the man's home.[74] Regulus views Carthage as the place where he must return, as the place to which he belongs: his use of the verb *reddidit* (6.490) recalls his initial oath earlier in this book that he would not fail to return to Carthage, emphasized doubly in the span of a few lines (6.469: *quos reditus testes iurata mente vocavi*, "whom I called upon as witnesses of my return when I swore my oath"; 6.471–2: *"ibo ad Tyrios non segnior" inquit "stante fide reditus*", "'I will go to the Tyrians no more slowly,' he said, 'with my promise

[73] The bibliography on Regulus is vast. See recently Augoustakis (2010a) 156–95, and 156–9, 181–2 on this point.

[74] On constructing Rome as a place of *exilium*, especially vis-à-vis moral excellence, see recently Bhatt (2018).

to return standing").[75] Returning to Rome is not important for Regulus, a curious thing coming from a Roman general;[76] for him, the *reditus* to Rome seems even to be divorced from its triumphal context, a telling reversal of thought upon which Silius capitalizes. Regulus' brave but headstrong denial of a *reditus* to Rome contrasts him all the more deeply with his foil in book 6, Fabius, whose chief moral quality according to the narrator is his joy at carefully securing the safe *reditus* of his troops (*redux patriae pubes*) after any *profectio* (6.620–2).[77] Silius may, I think, be highlighting one of the ways in which Regulus' model of Romanness is flawed: it does not prize the centrality of the place of Rome for Roman identity (compare our discussion of Camillus), nor does it seem a safe or effective model at assuring military triumphs.

This is not to say that Regulus is entirely lacking in praiseworthy traits; indeed, he is a hero strongly attached to the virtue of *fides*, one of the most important virtues in Flavian ideology.[78] In both cases when Regulus promises to "return" to Carthage, *Fides* is mentioned either circumstantially (6.491) or as the goddess upon whom he swore his oath to resubmit himself to torture (6.468); as Augoustakis, Buckley, and Stocks have shown in their recent volume, *fides* is a particularly important virtue for the Flavians.[79] What's more, Regulus' *fides*-

[75] On the role of *fides* in these lines, see Kissel (1979) 123, cf. Fröhlich (2000) 288.

[76] Cf. Augoustakis (2010a) 178: "Like Dido, Marcia questions Regulus' alienation, his search for a substitute country...Regulus turns all of sudden into the Roman general who needs to situate himself in the periphery, outside the center, in order to define his Romanness."

[77] *Fabius mirabile quantum* / *gaudebat reducem patriae annumerare reversus,* / *duxerat egrediens quam secum in proelia pubem* ("On returning to his fatherland again, he was rejoicing remarkably to count the same number of returned troops as he had departing had led into battle along with himself."). On this comparison between Regulus and Fabius along these lines, see Williams (2004) 80–1. Cf. Marks (2014) 151–2 who rightly points out that just a few lines after this, Silius contrasts our Fabius with the failure of his 300 famous ancestors to return after setting out against the forces of Veii.

[78] Although cf. Augoustakis (2010a) 158–9, 161–2; Williams (2004); Fucecchi (2019). On Regulus' status as a hero of *fides*, see Hardie (1993) 70–2; Ripoll (1998) 247–8; Fucecchi (2003) 272.

[79] Particularly relevant here, see Fucecchi (2019); the importance of *fides* in the poem has long been noted, see e.g. von Albrecht (1964) 55.

fueled "return" to Carthage sets up the Roman hero as a foil to Hannibal. Hannibal's exile from his home city, as we shall see in a later chapter, is foretold at the end of book 2 as an example of the danger of transgressing against *fides*; notice the collocation of *fides* and *vagus exul* in the prophetic warning, *nec regnis postferte fidem! vagus exul in orbe* (2.701).[80] This distinction, however, problematically juxtaposes the conflicting personal and collective ramifications of these heroes' differing valuations of *fides*. As Marco Fucecchi argues, "this ultimate foe of Rome and (Roman) *fides* will die alone in exile, away from his homeland and his relatives;" and yet Regulus suffers the very same consequences, dying "away from his homeland and his relatives." Fucecchi is onto more than he himself seems to realize when he admits that in this juxtaposition, Silius "invites us to consider the high cost of loyalty in terms of familiar affections" and that "*fides* is by no means reassuring or unproblematic."[81]

More broadly considered, Regulus' return from "exile" points to a disturbing trend in the *Punica* which is difficult to balance with the seemingly positive implications of Camillus' return in book 7.[82] Namely, while returning from exile may encode some public good (e.g. Camillus, Scipio in book 17), an exilic *reditus* often simultaneously suggests in its ramifications dire episodes of Rome's future/past. Consider, for example, the tragic return of Satricus. In a long scene detailed in book 9, the previously captured Satricus escapes from the Carthaginians and makes his way by night unarmed to the Roman camp (9.80–9); this native of Sulmo dons the arms of a fallen Roman soldier, whom Satricus does not notice to be his own son Mancinus (9.86). Satricus is subsequently intercepted by his other son Solymus who was seeking for the

[80] Fucecchi (2019) 202.

[81] Fucecchi (2019) 201–2.

[82] I address this in my conclusion.

remains of his brother (9.93–4), and Solymus subsequently mortally wounds his father with a spearcast (9.102–5). Son now stands, almost Aeneas-like,[83] over his unrecognized father and becomes enraged at the sight of his brother's weapons and armor (9.105–110, cf. *Aen*. 12.945–7). Crying out the name of his brother and presumed-dead father, he reveals his true identity to Satricus, who subsequently begs his son not to commit patricide (9.125–6: *sed sanguine nostro ne damnes, o nate, manus*, "But please do not contaminate your hands, my son, with my blood."). After the death of Satricus, Solymus takes his own life.

Now, to be clear, Satricus is never explicitly called an exile, but we are encouraged to view him as an Aeneas *profugus* figure throughout the episode.[84] His family, for example, is explicitly connected to Aeneas' band of Trojan exiles by his ancestor (and son's namesake) Solymus (9.73–4: *et Phrygio genus a proavo, qui sceptra secutus / Aeneae*, "and a race from a Phrygian ancestor who followed the authority of Aeneas."). We will not miss other telltale signs of explicit Vergilian interplay with phrases like the line-terminal collocation of *arma virum* (9.100)[85] or Satricus' attempt to cast himself as a latter day Aeneas in his claim that *patrias nunc primum advectus in oras*, recalling the end of *Aen*. 1.1 (*primus ab oris*).[86] Most important, however, is Satricus' evocation of the goddess *Fortuna Redux* in his description of his father's tragic *reditus* (9.157–60):

> sicine te nobis, genitor, Fortuna reducit
> in patriam? sic te nato natumque parenti
> impia restituit? felix o terque quaterque

[83] For a similar reading of Solymus along these lines, see Tipping (2010a) 37–8.

[84] Cf. Marks (2020), especially 103 who finds that, in addition to many other nods to Ovid, Satricus is likened to the exiled Ovid by Silius' allusion to the phrase *carmen et error*.

[85] See especially Landrey (2014) 632 on the theme of civil war endowed by this phrase to the Satricus-scene and other Aeneas-figures throughout the poem. For a detailed reading of the scene, see Dominik (2018).

[86] Cf. 9.159–60 cited below, alludes to Aeneas' characteristic *pietas* by the negative *impia* and also *Aen.* 94–5.

> frater, cui fatis genitorem agnoscere ademptum.
>
> Is this how Fortune returns you to us and your fatherland? Is this the impious way she restores you to your son your son to you? Oh thrice and four times blessed brother, you who were prevented by the Fates to recognize your father!

On the one hand, *Fortuna* is a perfectly reasonable goddess upon whom here to call: she is the force/goddess usually seen presiding over the circumstances of an exile's removal from and return to the *patria* (cf., e.g., Stat. *Silv*. 3.3.182–3 on the death of Claudius Etruscus' father after returning from exile: *cur nos, fidissime, linquis* / *Fortuna redeunte, pater*?, "Why, most faithful father, do you leave us with your Fortune returning?");[87] the phrase *Fortuna reducit / in patriam*, while not surprising, does suggest that Silius views Satricus as an exile.

Culturally relevant is the phrase *Fortuna reducit*; the capital, retained in modern editions, suggests the deity *Fortuna* rather than the concept is implied, and we might go one step further suggesting that Silius' contemporary audience would have noticed a reference to *Fortuna Redux*, to whom Domitian dedicated a temple sometime around 93/4 (perhaps to commemorate Domitian's Sarmatian campaigns) based on the evidence of Mart. 8.65.[88] Without going too far afield on dating the *Punica*,[89] book nine all but certainly was composed well before the construction of this temple. But Domitian's temple was not constructed in a vacuum; both Vespasian and Titus had minted numerous coins featuring *Fortuna Redux* (two bronze pieces

[87] It would be difficult, I suppose, to show this trend succinctly, but a few *exempla* may suffice. Evander claims that *Fortuna omnipotens* is the force which eversaw his exile (*me pulsum patria*) at *Aen.* 8.333–5. Dido, similarly, refers to her shared *fortuna* with Aeneas as an exile (*Aen.* 1.628: *me quoque per multos similis fortuna labores*). In his exilic writings, Seneca is constantly referring to *fortuna*, often as a force governing his own displacement from Rome; see, especially, Fantham (2007) 190 noting *Polyb.* 13.2 *impulsum a fortuna*.

[88] On the temple and its association with Augustus' *ara Fortunae Reducis*, see Darwall-Smith (1996) 130–3 with further bibliography. On the cult and concept of *Fortuna* more generally, see especially Arya (2002); Miano (2018) without reference to *Fortuna Redux*; König (2018) 171 n. 67 with further bibliography. On *Fortuna Redux* in Domitianic Rome, see especially Arya (2002) 316–36; Kajanto (1988).

[89] I cover this in some further detail in the beginning of the next chapter.

suggestting Vespasian minted such pieces in Rome already in early 70)[90] and the goddess featured broadly in imperial iconography since the Augustan age.[91] Silius' audience was well-versed, then, in reading *Fortuna Redux* as a deity overseeing the triumphant returns of the Flavian emperors.[92]

Striking in this web of literary and cultural allusions is that this episode focuses so heavily on civil discord; Satricus' "return," William Dominik has noted, brings back the specters of Silius' past in the civil wars of 68–9, and particularly Julius Mansuetus' killing of his own father related by Tacitus (*Hist*. 3.25).[93] To be clear, the Satricus-episode (and the Battle of Cannae it introduces) have long been noted for their Lucanian themes and intertexts.[94] The question, then, is why Silius should yoke together in such a way this clear evocation of contemporary Flavian ideology and the disasters of civil discord by way of exile and return. To be sure, Satricus' is not an isolated example of this: we might compare again the perverse return of Varro to Rome (10.634–9) in which Varro's return also summons to mind *Fortuna Redux* (634–5: *quod vero reduci tum se populusque patresque* / *offerrent* "Althought the Senate and people did come out at that time to meet him on his return") and the possibility of civil violence by the people against the consul (637: *ire videbantur laceranda ad consulis ora*, "they seemed like they were going to tear into the consul's eyes") as they come to meet him in a perversion of

[90] On dating these pieces, see Carriadice and Buttrey (2007) 20–2 and their coins 11 and 33.

[91] For Vespasian, see, e.g., RIC2.1 573 p. 101; for Titus, see, e.g. RIC2.1 421 p. 87. I have found no examples of Domitian minting such coins (he seems to have preferred other epithets such as *Fortuna Publica* and *Augusti*, see e.g. Carriadice and Buttrey (2007) 302 with n. 55); on the issue and counts for Vespasian, Titus, and Domitian, see Carriadice and Buttrey (2007) pages 59, 61, 63, 65, 71, 75, 78–9, 84, 87, 101 with n. 108, 103, 122, 124, 131, 142, 144, 146, 148 all only on Vespasianic coinage to my knowledge.

[92] On this association, see Arya (2002) 301–6.

[93] Dominik (2006) 124–5.

[94] See especially McGuire (1995), (1997) 134–5; Marks (2010) 137–8 with further bibliography, adding Hardie (1993b) 68–9; Marks (2005) 275 n. 104 with further earlier bibliography; Tipping (2004) 365–6, (2010a) 37–8.

the *salutatio* regularly offered by the people and senate during the *profectio* and *reditus* (*reduci...populusque patresque*).[95] Like the denied return of Scipio's soldiers in book 4 analyzed earlier in this section, Varro's perverse return is governed by the hatred he has earned from the gods (10.639: *damnatum superis*; cf. 4.229: *damnati superis*). Surely, the possibility of harm being done to the head of a Roman consular spurned by the gods should remind us of Lucan's Pompey, and all the more so since Silius (*damnatum superis*) seems to allude to Pompey's defeat at Pharsalus at Luc. 7.85–6 (*sensitque deorum* / *esse dolos*, "he sensed that this was the trap of the gods.").[96] Varro's is a *reditus* in name only, a perversion stripping any victorious connation return otherwise might have and replacing it with the despair of civil discord.

Perhaps we might read Satricus' tale as a cautionary one, that is we might read the "return" of a Roman soldier to the battlefield at home as a moment which can likely lead to instability. Satricus' return along this line of thinking might be rendered a warning, an example of how things ought not to proceed; indeed, the man casts himself as a kind of *monumentum* for the Roman consuls (9.134–5: *referre / ductori monitus Paulo*).[97] But for all that Satricus' exemplum insists that this is not how returns are supposed to work, his story reveals that returning to Rome need not be the moment of victorious reunification we find in imperial propaganda: just as Satricus' exile reifies his dissociation from his son and renders believable his exculpatory claim to have been a Carthaginian at the moment his son killed him (9.129–30: *iaceres in me cum fervidus hastam, / Poenus eram*, "I was a Phoenician when you impetuously

[95] For more on the theme of civil violence in this episode, see Dominik (2018) 281–2.

[96] On the intertext, see Ariemma (2010) 275 and Littlewood (2017) 236–7. On the importance of the head and decapitation in the *Punica*, see Marks (2008).

[97] Indeed, Satricus' warning of *fuge proelia, Varro*, indebted to Lucan, has long been noted for tying together this scene with the disaster at Cannae; see Marks (2010) 137–8. Cf. Marks (2005) 20 also drawing on a similar constellation of passages from books 4, 8, 9, and 10 when discussing Varro vis-à-vis Satricus.

hurled your spear at me"), so too does Silius blur the lines between friend and foe in a way strongly redolent of civil war. This is a confusion of identity all too common in experiences of return from exile, one in which *ira* (9.110: *flammatus ab ira*) can be (mis-)directed against the father(land) all too easily.

We witness another example of the possibility of misdirected *ira* after return from exile in the case of Livius Salinator, co-consul in 207 with C. Claudius Nero and victor over Hasdrubal at the battle at the Metaurus. Livius previously had served as consul in 219, but following charges of malfeasance of some kind after his Illyrian campaigns, he withdrew into voluntary exile until being recalled in 210.[98] Before turning to Silius' version, we should take particular note of Livius' anger and bitterness following his return from exile as related in the literary tradition preceding the *Punica*; his general disdain against the state is evident in Livy's description of his insistence to remain unkempt and present himself in tattered clothes to recall "in appearance and dress the remarkable account of the disgrace he had been inflicted."[99] In addition to refusing to perform most of his functions as a senator until 208, Livius famously nursed a particular hatred for his co-consul Nero for having played a role in his exile. This well-known antipathy is often cited as a source of general concern over the rivals' shared command in the battle at the Metaurus.[100] Even more shocking, and particularly relevant to Silius' version of Livius, is the consul's rejection of Fabius' advice of delay. Livius insists that he will put his

[98] See further Scullard (1973) 65–8; Kelly (2006) 5–6 with Liv. 27.6, on Livius' exile; on the circumstances of his election as consul, see Scullard (1973) 71–3 with sources.

[99] Liv. 27.34.5–6: *sed erat veste obsoleta capilloque et barba promissa, prae se ferens in voltu habituque insignem memoriam ignominiae acceptae* ("But he had ragged clothes along with uncut hair and beard, bearing before himself in his face and demeanor a pronounced memory of the wrong done to him."). We will note that mourning garb was one of the tools exiled elites used to garner sympathy from the Roman populace; see Kelly (2006) 75–6 with bibliography, 85, 110–11 on Cicero's use of mourning attire.

[100] E.g. V. Max. 2.9.6, 7.2.6, 9.3.1. For Livy's similar handling, see Levene (2010) 167–70.

soldiers on the line for a pair of reasons, one quite shocking: either he will enjoy getting to see the citizens who exiled him die (V. Max. 9.3.1: *aut ex civibus prostratis gaudium capiam*, "Or I will take pleasure from my fellow citizens laid low"), or he will achieve a victory and triumph for himself (*gloriam ex hostibus victis*). Both Valerius Maximus and Livy agree on this statement with remarkably similar language.[101] Turning to Silius, let us keep in mind that, as Livy says, Livius was *plenum adhuc irae in cives* (Liv. 27.40.8, "still full of anger against his fellow citizens") as he set out for battle.

Silius' Livius on first glance is completely lacking in such unsavory resentment of his fatherland; we might suspect that in a post-Cannae environment Silius is not interested in endowing in the Romans any hint of civil discord.[102] And yet, we still get a hint of the bitterness within Livius in Silius' depiction of the returning general (Sil. 15.596–600):

> mox falso laesus non aequi crimine vulgi
> secretis ruris tristes absconderat annos.
> sed postquam gravior moles terrorque periclo
> poscebat propriore virum, revocatus ad arma
> tot caesis ducibus patriae donaverat iram.
>
> Then, after falling prey to a frivolous charge of the fickle commoners he had withdrawn to the seclusion of the countryside for the sad years of his life. But after a more serious danger and fear was demanding the *vir* in the present danger, he was recalled to arms and, after so many generals had been killed, handed over his anger for his fatherland.

Silius does not mention Livius' exile in any explicit way, as is fitting for a man who did not technically undergo trial for his *crimen falsum*; his avoidance of trial via voluntary exile is

[101] Liv. 27.40.9: *Cum quaereretur quae causa festinandi esset,* "*Aut ex hoste egregiam gloriam*" *inquit* "*aut ex civibus victis gaudium meritum certe, etsi non honestum, capiam*" (When he was asking what the reason was for hurrying he said, 'Either I will get outstanding glory from the enemy or a joy, certainly worthy even if not upright, from my fellow citizens conquered."). Cf. V. Max. 9.3.1: "*ut quam celerrime*" *inquit* "*aut gloriam ex hostibus victis aut ex civibus prostratis gaudium capiam*" ("'so that as fast as possible,' he said, "I might get glory from the conquered enemy or joy from my fellow citizens laid low.'").

[102] So, for example, Marks (2010) reads the *Punica*'s engagement with the *Bellum Civile* as one in which at first the Romans and then, following Cannae, the Carthaginians are defined by the destruction of Lucanian civil violence.

therefore suggested by *secretis*, with *tristes annos* striking an exilic and perhaps even Ovidian note. *Revocatus*, however, is part of the technical language of exile (see OLD s.v. 3b); with this word Silius places Livius Salinator into the mold of returning-heroes like Camillus, Regulus, and even Satricus.

What kind of returning hero will Livius be:[103] one like Satricus whose return begets civil violence or one like Camillus, who puts aside his bitterness for the good of the state? The answer is clearly the latter, of course: on some level Camillus and Livius are both formerly exiled defenders of Rome who put aside or suppress their anger upon their return. And yet there is a stark difference: Livius is but a pale imitation of the ideal of Fabius and Camillus who are "immune to anger:" while Camillus is *impenetrabilis irae* (7.561) and Fabius is *expers irarum* (7.516–17), Livius is still here largely driven by his *ira*.[104] Admittedly, we seem to be a far cry from Livius' anger against his fellow *cives* in Livy and Valerius Maximus: Spaltenstein rightly observes that Silius seems to recall the connection Livy's senate makes between Camillus and Livius, particularly in their need to set aside anger (Liv. 27.34.14).[105] And yet I think it would be wrong to say Livius has "forgiven" his *patria* for his anger (so Spaltenstein mistakenly citing *ignoscere* at TLL 5.1.2014.75; cf. correctly Ruperti suggesting *condono* and TLL 2.1.2014.52

[103] For earlier interpretations which I here nuance, see Kissel (1979) 119 n. 56; Burck (1984b) 88–9; Marks (2005) 49–50, 100; Gibson (2010) 49–50.

[104] See Littlewood (2011) 210 on the intratext.

[105] *M. Furium memorantes revocatum de exilio patriam pulsam sede sua restituisse—ut parentium saevitiam, sic patriae patiendo ac ferendo leniendam esse* ("Recalling that M. Furius Camillus had been recalled from exile and restored the fatherland expelled from its own *sedes*—, that just like the severity of parents, so too the severity of the fatherland must be reconciled by suffering and enduring."). See Spaltenstein (1990) 382; on Silius' use of Livy in this scene, see Gibson (2010) 50.

citing our line);[106] rather, the verb *dono* suggests its redirection from one source (his *patria*) to another (the enemies of his *patria*).

Let us not be mistaken, Livius is no stoic saint who can be easily compared to Fabius or Camillus.[107] As Marks suggests, Fabius and Livius could not be more different in their demeanor or tactics on the battlefield.[108] That difference is subtly suggested by an intratextual nod: Livius' handing over of his anger after his exile is precipitated by the death of his fellow citizens, *tot caesis ducibus* (15.600), a nod back to Camillus' slaying of so many of Rome's enemies upon his own return from exile, *tibi corpora caesa, Camille, damnata quot sunt dextra* (7.560–1). Fabius' Camillus-*exemplum* is predicated upon putting aside anger at one's fellow citizens in order to save them; Livius only puts aside his anger after the death of so many of his compatriots. This contrast is all the more disturbing if we recall that Livius' eager anticipation of his fellow *cives*' death in Livy and Valerius Maximus is elicited in Livius' response to Fabius' guidance: that is to say, Livius' *ira* against his fellow citizens was tied in the historical record to the differences between the two generals. To put a finer point on this: we should take pause at a line that mentions both Livius' *ira* and the deaths of Roman citizens. That constellation of imagery carries with it a very particular reading of Livius' character that is prominent in Silius' sources: his *ira* makes him a mouthpiece for civil violence.

To be clear, I do not intend to undermine the vast majority of readings of Livius that find the formerly exiled consul to be a vindicated defender of Rome. Indeed, Silius makes clear that

---

[106] Ruperti (1795–98) *ad loc,* consulted through Lemaire's (1823) edition.

[107] *Pace* Kissel (1979) 119 n. 56 and Burck (1984b) 89 noting Livius' "Verzicht auf seinen Groll zugunsten des Vaterlands...—wie dies einst Cammillus getan hatte;" Augoustakis (2010a) 148 n. 143. cf. Fucecchi (2010) 224 n.22. Marks (2005) 100 n. 95 rightly is hesitant of a one-to-one comparison: the possibility of a connection, he says, "is also not out of the question."

[108] Marks (2005) 49.

his allegiance lies with Livius and not the *vulgus* who accused him (15.596); while the false charges, *crimen falsum*, suffered by Livius are something of a *topos*,[109] we should note that Livius' suffering under false accusation groups him in with two other important figures in the *Punica*: Scipio Africanus (13.514–15) whom we will cover elsewhere and Claudia Quinta in book 17. Claudia Quinta is an important parallel, I think, for how Silius is envisioning Livius' role as a returning outsider: just like Livius, she also suffers from the malicious lies of the commoners (17.34: *Claudia <u>non aequa populа</u> male credita <u>fama</u>*; cf. 15.596: *non aequi crimine vulgi*).[110] Claudia Quinta and Livius Salinator both represent the collective benefit of communal reintegration for the socially outcast: just as Claudia can save Rome by integrating a foreign goddess (the Magna Mater) in order to ward off the foreign enemy Hannibal, so too Livius is reintegrated in order to ward off Hasdrubal. As Cato the Elder[111] makes clear for Livius, if there is any blame in the scenario, it rests with the Roman collective rather than Livius himself (15.731–4):

> "si, primas" inquit "bello cum amisimus Alpes,
> hic iuveni oppositus Tyrio foret! ei mihi quanta
> cessavit Latio dextra, et quot funera Poenis
> donarunt pravi suffragia tristia campi."
>
> "If only," he said, "this man had been there in opposition to the young Tyrian general when first we lost the Alps! Alas! How great was that hand which Latium lacked?! And how many corpses did the sad bribery of the corrupt Campus Martius give to the Carthaginians?!

[109] So Spaltenstein (1990) 382; Livy also specifies that Livius fell victim to popular sentiment (viz. Liv. 27.34.3, 34.8). On Silius' sanitization of the potentially problematic actions of Roman generals, cf. Marks (2018)

[110] For more on Claudia Quinta's role in the *Punica* see Augoustakis (2010a) 231–7 whose reading I find persuasive.

[111] On Cato's involvement (perhaps a mistake on Silius' part reading Liv. 27.48.1) in the battle and characterization, see: Burck (1984b) 98 n.68; Spaltenstein (1990) 391–2; Fucecchi (2010) 224 n. 22.

Cato's speech ingeniously connects Livius' time in exile with the disaster at Cannae, the *pravus campus*:[112] the *suffragia tristia* of the people who condemned Livius anticipates the consular's *tristes anni* (15.597) in exile; the untold mass of Carthaginian bodies Livius would have slain at Cannae, *quot funera Poenis*, are balanced against the *tot caesis ducibus* (15.600) whom the Romans lost at Hannibal's hands; finally, Silius neatly contrasts the Roman populace's act of giving (*donarunt*) Livius exile with Livius redirecting his anger at the state (15.600: *donaverat*). These contrasting elements suggest that Silius views the Roman *vulgus* and not Livius as the guilty party; perhaps we might say that Silius is, after all, attempting to correct the civil violence Livius eagerly anticipated following his return from exile in the accounts of Livy and Valerius Maximus. And yet I find it more than a little disquieting that, whatever Livius' private virtues or vices, we are still faced with an equation in which his return from exile is tantamount to prodigious Roman suffering. Perhaps the conditions of Livius' return from exile are not painted quite so negatively as Satricus', but I would suggest that both are predicated upon accounts of civil discord. And unlike Camillus in book 7, we will note that Silius dwells to a much greater extent on the suffering incurred by the Roman people for her treatment of Livius.

As we shall see in the next chapter, that juxtaposition of private and public so evocatively portrayed in the *Punica* by her exiled characters points to what I find to be a problematic reality facing one of Rome's greatest heroes. While Regulus' dedication to *fides* sacrificed the private for the sake of the public good and while Camillus' exemplum downplays the latent dangers of civil discord, Satricus and Livius Salinator reveal a much more dangerous paradigm for the relationship between the exiled individual and the collective good of the state. Let us turn then to Scipio Africanus and examine in greater detail the way Silius handles his exile in light of what we have just learned.

[112] Ruperti (1795–98) *ad loc*. notes that the scenes are comparable, but does not make the connections explicit.

CHAPTER 2

OUTSTANDING OUTSIDER: SCIPIO'S EXILE IN THE PUNICA

Go tell the bureaucrats, passerby, that all is shipshape, fine.
The stuff that trickles from your eye is only a little brine.
A. E. Stallings, "Refugee Fugue"

Silius' *Punica*, *pace* the opinions of even one or two scholarly generations ago, has many virtues, but brevity is not one of them. Here is a massive work, its narrative spanning 17 books and as many years;[1] yet for all its thousands of lines, Silius consigns a key detail of his hero Scipio's life—his exile—to a short, four-line stichomythia in the epic's 13th book (13.514–15, 517–18). In this, the longest book (895 lines) of the longest surviving Latin epic, Silius clearly had more space to talk about such a critical point in Scipio's life. He chose not to.

The poet is making a radical choice, reacting to a tradition replete with commentary on Scipio's exile. Condensing that tradition into 4 lines means that Silius had to make careful editorial decisions: what he would cut and what he would highlight; what he would adapt and how. For example, when the Sibyl calls Rome an *urbs iniqua* (13.514) for leveling charges against Scipio, Silius is countering a tradition which held that Scipio's greatest fault and legal vulnerability was his failure to comply with *ius aequum* (Liv. 38.50.8–9; Sen. *Polyb*. 14.4), a trait which Livy's Scipio shares with Hannibal (Liv. 21.3).[2] Eschewing that undesirable parallel, Silius emphasizes Scipio's philosophical and ethical excellence in his calm reaction to his exile: Scipio is selfless and blameless, Rome is the guilty party in exiling her hero.

---

[1] Augoustakis (2010b) 9 following von Albrecht (1964) 133 n. 35. The structure and intended length of the *Punica* are much debated; Augoustakis (2010b) 8–10 with nn. provides a cogent overview of the issues and relevant bibliography. For a fuller analysis, see Fröhlich (2000) 18–28.

[2] Sen. *Plb*. 14.4 (*et quam impatiens iuris aequi pietas Africani fuerit*, "And how unsuffering of equality under the law the *pietas* of Africanus was"); Liv. 38.50.9 of complaints against Scipio (*qui ius aequum pati non possit, in eum vim haud iniustam esse*, "that force against him, whosoever is not able to suffer equality under the law, is hardly unjust"), cf. 21.3.6 of Hanno's complaint of Hannibal ([*istum iuvenem*] *docendum vivere aequo iure cum ceteris censeo*, "I reckon [that young man] must be taught to live under the equality of law along with everyone else"). Cf. Henderson (2004) 96–9.

Accordingly, in the first section I examine the philosophical and other sources which underpin Silius' rather hagiographic presentation of Scipio's exile in book 13. In the second section, I show by intratextual argumentation that a related passage in book 10 reveals a crucial limitation for the ethical model Scipio sets up in book 13; Scipio makes himself a moral exemplar for the whole state and thereby prevents it from dissolving into competing factions. Neither Rome nor Scipio himself, however, can live up to the young man's code of devotion to the state, hinting at a future of civil discord. In section 3, I argue that Scipio's resolute insistence on his private moral excellence is inextricably tied to the ethical dissolution of the Roman collective, which leads to the civil wars of the first century BCE as they are described by the Sibyl at the end of book 13.

Turning to Yourself: Scipio's Exile in Punica 13

We will begin with an in-depth examination of the five lines from *Punica* 13 in which the Sibyl predicts the exile of Scipio Africanus from Rome (13.514–18). My purpose in doing so is twofold. First, I would like to examine the rich history of exilic literature underpinning these lines. Perhaps owing to Silius' reticence to mention the exile of Scipio (only explicit in these lines),[3] relatively little attention has been given to their place in relation to their sources (rich and informative of Silius' aims) or their place in *Punica* 13. On the one hand, these five lines interact with a broad and rich tradition on the proper response of the wise person to their own exile in the philosophical and consolatory traditions: Scipio's brief, overtly stoic response shows that he has internalized the advice and wisdom often given to exiles in such treatises, revealing a level of

[3] Compare, for example, Hannibal, whose exile is mentioned explicitly twice in far more explicit and extended passages (Sil. 2.699–707, 13.874–93) and once in an evocative simile (17.213ff.); cf. Reitz (1982) 131: "insgesamt aber ist festzustellen, dass das Orakel über Hannibal nicht nur länger ist, sondern auch ausführlicher und konkreter informiert."

personal growth in the young general. On the other hand, within the structure of book 13, Scipio's response to his exile is placed relatively near the center: it looks both backwards (to his own immaturity at book's beginning) and forwards to the ultimate decline of Rome foretold by the Sibyl at book's end.[4] Our central question for the chapter, then: how are we to connect Scipio's admirable reaction to his own *sors durior aevi* (13.517) and the *ordo durus* (13.868) awaiting the Republic which Scipio laments at the conclusion of the book?[5]

First, however, the historical *realia* insofar as they can be reconstructed. We know that towards the end of his life, Scipio withdrew from Rome after his opponents threatened charges of malfeasance of some kind; rather than facing these charges, he retired to Liternum and died there. Beyond these details, specifics are difficult to reconstruct. A number of sources[6] are jumbled and yield an unclear picture. Between 187 and 184 perhaps[7] two charges were brought against Scipio and his family: Africanus' brother was attacked in the senate and probably accused in 187, possibly owing to his involvement in Scipio's own troubles regarding his handling of war funds; Africanus later came under increased scrutiny around 184. His withdrawal to and death in Liternum probably occurred in or shortly after 184/3. The reasons for Scipio's fall from grace and eventual trial are difficult to reconstruct; contributing factors include

[4] On this structuring of *Punica* 13, see von Albrecht (1964) 151, 209; Juhnke (1972) 292; Reitz (1982) 9–11, 46 ("Die erste Prophezeiung der Nekyia gilt also Scipio, die letzte Hannibal…Dadurch erreicht Silius zweierlei: er verleiht den Vorhersagen besonderen Nachdruck, und er setzt sie in Beziehung zueinander."); van der Keur (2015) xi–xviii, especially xiv ("The two prophecies of the Sibyl (about the futures of Scipio and Hannibal) frame the main part of the *Nekyia*"), 456 with n. 32. Cf. Jacobs (2009) 293.

[5] The intratext is also noted by van der Keur (2015) 458 n. 40, 466, who rightly compares Scipio's prayer for innocence (13.518: *culpa…cessent*) with Sulla's glory which issues from his *culpa* (13.858: *gloria culpae*). See further below.

[6] Scullard (1973) 290–303, and especially the list at 290 n.1, remains indispensable; cf. MRR 1.376; Scullard (1970) 222–4 gives a more concise and readable precise. Briscoe's (2008) commentary, especially 170–9, on the relevant Livian material (38.50.4–53.7) is also necessary reading; one must also consult Rich's comments on the problematic material of Antias in the relevant sections of *FRH* (1.302, 3.352–8). Stocks (2018) notes Silius' disinterest in Lucius.

[7] See Briscoe (2008) 176 on the second trial with further bibliography. On the issues of dating, see further Briscoe (2008) 395 on the date of Scipio's death; in general, see Scullard (1973) 290–303; cf. MRR 1.378.

a general suspicion among the Roman elite against his growing popularity and cult of personality as well as charges of embezzlement and, perhaps, illicit involvement with Antiochus III. Exacerbating the former was a generally haughty attitude towards the political norms of the elite reflected in various sources,[8] and any suspicions as to the latter were not alleviated by Scipio's success in winning his son's freedom from captivity to Antiochus.[9] Whatever the reality of the accusations against Scipio, it appears that he was not brought to trial nor officially exiled.[10] To be sure, though, this was effectively exile and came to be termed as such in the later tradition.[11]

Silius situates his allusion to Scipio's exile within the obligatory *Nekyia*-episode of his epic.[12] Having learned of the deaths of his father and uncle following the siege of Capua (Sil. 13.384–99), Scipio's overwhelming grief leads him to approach the Underworld in order to talk to his deceased relatives. Upon descending to the Underworld, he meets the Sibyl who promises to teach him his and the Romans' fates, the latter depending on the former (Sil. 13.504: *iam tua deque tuis pendentia Dardana fatis*). The prophecy concerning Scipio's life is brief but illuminates many of the high points of his career, particularly in the Punic campaigns: he will avenge his father after being entrusted with command in Spain (Sil. 13.507–10), hold a

[8] See Plb. 23.14 in which Scipio implies that he is above accusation since he had safeguarded the very civic institutions employed by his accusers (δι᾽ ὃν αὐτὴν τὴν τοῦ λέγειν ἐξουσίαν ἔχουσιν οἱ κατηγοροῦντες, "through [him, i.e. Scipio] his accusers had that very freedom of speech"); cf. Liv. 38.56.9 (*magis pie quam civiliter*), Sen. *Plb.* 14.4 (*et quam impatiens iuris aequi pietas Africani fuerit*).

[9] Scullard (1970) 223; cf. Briscoe (2008) 174.

[10] Kelly (2006) 6 and 27–8 on the irregularity of this in light of Roman law.

[11] E.g. Liv. 39.52.9: *Scipio etsi non exul neque damnatus, die tamen dicta ad quam non adfuerat reus, absens citatus, voluntarium…sibimet…exilium indixit* (Scipio, even if he was neither an exile nor condemned, even so on the appointed day on which he had not been present as a defender, being away at full speed he proclaimed voluntary exile for himself.").

[12] On the typical elements of the *Nekyia* particularly in Flavian epic and the *Punica*, see Juhnke (1972) esp. 215–16, 280–97; Reitz (1982); Billerbeck (1983); Grebe (1989) esp. 113–26; Ripoll (1998) 248–51; Hardie (2004) 151–3; Marks (2005) 133–47 esp. 133 n. 52 with bibliography; Bernstein (2008) 151–2; Augoustakis (2010a) 215–19 esp. 215 n. 35 with bibliography; Klaassen (2010) 113–26; Tipping (2010a) 154–56, 167–74 and (2010b); van der Keur (2015) xiv–xvi.

consulship in 205 (Sil. 13.511) and be victorious in his African campaign (Sil. 13.512–14). The Sibyl's conclusion to her prophecy, however, threatens to cast a shadow over the young man's rise to power; Scipio learns of his future exile, but responds with remarkable equanimity and self-control (Sil. 13.514–18):

> pudet urbis iniquae,
> quod post haec decus hoc patriaque domoque carebit.'
> sic vates gressumque lacus vertebat ad atros.
> tum iuvenis 'quaecumque datur sors durior aevi,
> obnitemur,' ait 'culpa modo pectora cessent.'
>
> "That after these events this mark of distinction will lack both fatherland and home is a source of shame for the unjust city." Thus the prophetess as she began to turn towards the black lakes. At that point the young man said, "Whatever harsher lot in life is given, I will put up with it so long as my chest is free of guilt."

The Sibyl chooses her words carefully and with purpose, setting off internal allusions to the rest of Silius' narrative. On the one hand, she refuses to cast Scipio in an unflattering light, instead denigrating Rome as an *urbs iniqua*. Now, charges of unfair treatment in stories of exile are not unheard of in Flavian epic[13] or elsewhere in Latin literature. What does stand out, as van der Keur rightly notes, is that the *urbs iniqua* here is Rome and not, as it usually is in the *Punica*, Carthage. The lines of distinction are thus blurred between the opposed cities, an issue only heightened when Scipio is referred to as a *decus* (so also 13.666 and 15.184), a term which is more often applied to Hannibal (Sil. 3.71, 10.88, 11.603, and 17.197): the implication is that Rome and Carthage are alike in their exiling of their respective generals in the Second Punic War, a theme Silius will return to at the end of Book 13 (see end of this chapter).[14] The Sibyl

[13] Cf. Sil. 15.596 of Livius Salinator (*falso laesus non aequi crimine vulgi*, "wounded by the false incrimination of the unfair mob") with Littlewood (2017) 69 and *Th.* 12.444–5 of Polynices (*tuque exul ubique, / semper inops aequi*, "and you, everwhere an exile and ever destitute of what is fair.").

[14] van der Keur (2015) 275; see also Augoustakis and Littlewood (forthcoming) *ad* 3.69–72; Littlewood (2017) *ad* 10.88. For Scipio as a *decus* in the context of his exile, cf. Sen. *Dial.* 10.17.6.

also does not call Scipio an *exul* but rather states that he will "lack both country and home;"[15] by so circumscribing Scipio's ordeals and instead focusing on Rome as the thankless, guilty party (all the more apparent by its contrast with Scipio's status as *ultor patriaeque domusque*, Sil. 16.593),[16] the Sibyl as sympathetic interlocutor sets up the remarkably even-keeled response of the young Scipio.

Scipio's response is magnanimous as he promises to bravely endure the vicissitudes of his life and aim for moral purity. The lines have, rightly, been pointed to as an example of Stoic thought influencing Scipio and his adoption of an ethics of *virtus*.[17] To the degree that these are lines about exile, however, things are not so clear. To be sure, our testimonia of Stoic thought do retain examples on the application of philosophy to the hardships of exile;[18] yet Scipio's dispassionate response to his displacement owes as much to the general strictures of exilic

[15] van der Keur (2015) *ad loc*. argues the phrasing to be Ovidian, citing the parallels of *Pont.* 4.4.7 (*domo patriaque carens*) and *Trist.* 3.7.45 (*patria caream...domoque*), but the phrase has its roots in Cicero (*Dom.* 146: *non solum domo, de qua cognostis, sed tota urbe careo*, "I lack not only a home, which you know about, but the whole city") and, after Ovid, Sen. *Ph*. 209–10 (*domum / patriamque fugias*?); cf. also Tac. *Ann.* 4.58. This last, along with the close parallel at Calp. *Decl.* 31 (*domo patria carendum est*)—on dating Calpurnius see most recently Santorelli (2017) arguing for the mid-2nd century—and Gel. 2.12.1 (*is domo, patria fortunisque omnibus careto, exul extorrisque esto*, "let him lack home, fatherland, and all his fortunes; let him be a displaced exile") suggests that by Silius' day the phrase was perhaps passing into a more common declamatory vocabulary.

[16] The contrast between *patriaque domoque carebit* and Scipio's future status as *ultor patriaeque domusque* (16.593) is apparent and presents Scipio as all the more selfless, Rome all the more thankless. See van der Keur (2015) 275; Bernstein (2010) 386 ("The narrator refers to him as *ultor patriae domusque*…, a phrase whose symmetry suggests that obligations in these two spheres will not cause conflict for Scipio;" cf. also Ripoll (1998) 51 and Marks (2005) 94 on the connection between books 13 and 16 vis-à-vis private/public obligations. However, along with Stocks (2014) 187 n. 17, we might flip that reading and note that Scipio's excessive devotion to his family (see n. 8 above) is precisely what causes him to "lack *patriaque domoque*" in most accounts of Scipio's exile. To be sure, I mostly agree with Bernstein and van der Keur; Silius clearly suppresses a negative reading, but I do not think it as univocal as they present it. A well-read audience would have known that Scipio' excessive devotion *was* a problem for him in, say, Livy; see Rossi (2004) 379–80.

[17] So Kissel (1979) 137, 167–8; Reitz (1982) 47–8 with nn. 1–2; Ahl, Davis, and Pomeroy (1986) 2550; Marks (2005) 136; Tipping (2010a) 11 with n. 35, 155 with n. 68; cf. Laudizi (1991) 14. On stoicism more generally in the *Punica*, see Billerbeck (1985) 342–9, esp. 345 citing Sil. 13.517–8; Matier (1990); Marks (2005) 149–50 with bibliography in nn. 97–8. Odysseus' response to his future sufferings at *Od*. 11.139 (Τειρεσίη, τὰ μὲν ἄρ που ἐπέκλωσαν θεοὶ αὐτοί, "Tiresias, the gods themselves ordained these things") are also a model: see Juhnke (1972) 285 n. 221. There is a key difference, however: unlike Homer's ur-Nekyia in which Odysseus seeks to return home, Silius' hero learns of his death in exile.

[18] Tipping (2010a) 155 compares *SVF* 1.118–19; cf., following Narducci (1997) 67 n. 34, *SVF* 3.599, 677–80.

philosophy which were well developed already in the Hellenistic age outside of, or only partially informed by, Stoicism.[19] Rather, I would like to suggest that Silius' portrayal of Scipio reflects the general advice given to exiles in the consolatory tradition. Such a reading will allow us to see how Scipio's self-reliance in these lines fits into the Sibyl's portrayal of the Roman future at the conclusion of the book.

A consolatory tradition addressing exile is assured, as Gaertner has observed, by Cicero's appeals to such a genre at *Tusc*. 3.81[20] and more importantly at *Tusc*. 5.106–9, which shows the influence of earlier philosophical and rhetorical treatises[21]—indeed, traces of epistolary exilic consolation can be traced back to even earlier in the first century thanks to a fragment of an epistle by Metellus Numidicus, exiled in 100.[22] The advice given in such consolations was, Cicero alleges in one of his letters, commonplace and in his case ineffectual (*Att*. 3.15.7: *communiter consolari desine*).[23] Indeed, if we compare some of the typical elements of consolation sent to and by Cicero in his letters and post-exilic writings, we can see that Scipio's response shows two of the typical elements of exilic consolatory advice: 1) in Silius' *quaecumque datur sors durior aevi / obnitemur* we see the theme of endurance (*durior*, *obnitemur*) in the face of averse *fortuna* (*sors*), cf., e.g., Cic. *Fam*. 5.7.3 (*sapienter ferres et*

[19] For example, the Cynic thought of Teles, e.g. 25H.8–10 displaying the roots of Cicero's claims that exile is not shameful for the innocent (οὔκουν ἀκλήρημά τι καὶ ὄνειδος ἐμόν, εἰ μὴ μετὰ πονηρῶν οἰκήσω, "So it is not some loss or disgrace for me if I do not live among base people."). The thought has a rich tradition in consolatory exilic philosophy and literature: see Fuentes González (1998) 324–5 with further examples applicable to the list given below. On the "Cynico-Stoic" (91) roots of exilic consolation, see Nesselrath (2007) 87–91; Gaertner (2007) 4.

[20] So Narducci (1997).

[21] Gaertner (2007) 15.

[22] Gell. 15.13.6: *at cum animum vestrum erga me video, vehementer consolor et fides virtusque vestra mihi ante oculos versatur* ("But when I see your mind disposed towards me, I really am consoled, and your promise and bravery are on full display before my very eyes."). On Metellus' exile and return, see Kelly (2006) 84–8; Tatum (2017) 69–75, (2018); on the fragments of Metellus, see Degli'Innocenti Pierini (2000). For the impact of Metellus' letters on Cicero, see Blom (2010) 195–203.

[23] On Cicero's negative response to consolation in the letters, see Claassen (1992) 29–31, (1999) 84.

dolori fortiter ac fortunae resisteres, "May you prudently endure and stand up bravely to grief and the vicissitudes of fortune"), *Fam*. 5.18.1 (*oro te colligas virumque praebeas et qua condicione omnes homines et quibus temporibus nos nati simus cogites*, "Please, control yourself, show yourself to be a real man, and think about what circumstances and times we all have been born into"); 2) by focusing on his inculpability, *culpa modo pectora cessent*, Scipio reflects the idea that exile is not shameful for the innocent as well as the appeals to the exile's clean conscience, cf., e.g., *Fam*. 7.3.3 (*nihil tolerabilius exilio, praesertim innocenti, ubi nulla adiuncta est turpitudo*, "Nothing is more tolerable than exile, especially for the innocent when no guilt has been assigned"),[24] *Tusc*. 5.107–8 (*de sapiente enim haec omnis oratio est, cui iure id accidere non possit; nam iure exulantem consolari non oportet*, "For this entire debate is about a wise man, to whom that could not legally happen; for we ought not to console someone exiled legally), *Fam*. 6.6.12 (*disputarem etiam quanto solacio tibi conscientia tui facti*, "I would also point to how much solace you can take in your clean conscience"), *Fam*. 5.18.2 (*et cuius unum sit iudicium ex tam multis quod reprehendatur, ut quod una sententia eaque dubia potentiae alicuius condonatum existimetur*, "And whose trial is the only one out of so many to be chastised, and to be thought to have been decided by one single vote, and a dubious one at that, under the influence of some powerful figure.").[25] Even the Sibyl's words are indebted to the philosophical roots of exilic consolation; that it is to Rome's shame, *pudet*, to exile a good

[24] Cohen (2007) 120 n. 128.

[25] Cf. also *Fam*. 6.6.11: *deinde ut in eam civitatem boni viri et boni cives nulla ignominia notati non revertantur in quam tot nefariorum scelerum condemnati reverterunt* ("And finally that good men and citizens found guilty of no crime should not return to that city to which have returned people condemned of so many unspeakable crimes."). Note also the use of the verb *verto* for returning from exile.

citizen, *decus*, has roots in the early Hellenistic philosophical roots of exilic consolation (cf. Tel. 26H.1–2).[26]

An appeal to the consolatory tradition makes a good deal of sense at this point in *Punica* 13 vis-à-vis the characterization of Scipio.[27] Earlier in book 13 Scipio's response to the death of his father and uncle revealed an excessive grief immune to the soothing power of consolation: *pietas irata sinistris / caelicolis furit atque odit solacia luctus. / iamque dies iterumque dies absumpta querelis* (Sil. 13.389–92). Most critics have condemned the immoderate, overly emotional response of the young man, with some going so far as to question the youth's potential as a leader or model-Roman in light of his outburst.[28] As many of these same critics counter, however, Scipio's response is not unexplainable or unforgivable;[29] indeed, Scipio's supposed breach of decorum does not square well with the evidence of poetic consolations contemporary to the *Punica* in Statius' *Silvae*[30] which regularly encourage addresses to ignore moderation in grief precisely as Scipio does here (e.g. *Silv*. 2.1.12–4: *mulceat insanos gemitus. stat pectore*

---

[26] ἢ οὐχ οὕτω μὲν σὸν ἔγκλημα; οὐθένα γὰρ ἀγνωμόνως καὶ ἀδίκως ἄνδρες ἀγαθοὶ φυγαδεύουσιν· οὐ γὰρ ἂν ἦσαν δίκαιοι ("Or is that not, then, the matter of your complaint? For good men exile no one senselessly and unjustly; for then they would not be just.")

[27] Scholars have long noted the consolatory function of the *Punica*'s Nekyia; so Juhnke (1972) 281 labels the episode as a "consolatio und ethische Katharsis;" cf. Reitz (1982) 19.

[28] See Juhnke (1972) 280 n. 196; Reitz (1982) 18; Ahl, Davis, and Pomeroy (1986) 2547; Marks (2005) 133–4 with nn. 54–7; Dietrich (2005); Tipping (2010a) 76 n. 70, 154; van der Keur (2015) 214–15.

[29] So Reitz (1982) 18; Ahl, Davis, and Pomeroy (1986) 2550; Laudizi (1989) 129–30; Marks (2005) 134; Bernstein (2008) 152.

[30] On the status of and influences on the consolatory tradition in Silius' day, see Gibson (2006) xxxi–xxxiv; Newlands (2012) 118–23. As Van der Keur (2015) 214 also notes, Silius' language here seems to recall Statius' consolations. Moreover, the combination of *pietas* and the need for *solacium* recalls a regular sequence of thought in the *Silvae*, for example *Silv.* 3 pr. 14–15 (*merebatur et Claudi Etrusci mei pietas aliquod ex studiis nostris solacium cum lugeret*, "And the *pietas* of my friend Claudius Etruscus deserved some consolation from my own poetic endeavors, since was grieving"), *Silv*. 3.3.31 (*macte pio gemitu! dabimus solacia*, "Well done with your loyal lamentantion! We will give consolations"), *Silv*. 5.1.3–4 (*hinc, Priscilla, tuo solacia grata marito / conciperem, namque egregia pietate meretur*, "Hence, Priscilla, I would take up welcomed consolations for your husband, for because of his outstanding *pietas* he is worthy..."), and *Silv*. 5.3.200–02 (*tu solacia…concinis ore pio*). See Gibson (2006) xx with n. 14.

demens / luctus… / nemo vetat; satiare malis, "…would ease your wild lamentations. Maddening mourning stands in your chest…no one is stopping you; take your fill of these ills") and link madness like Scipio's (*odit, furit*) with the healthy course of grief (e.g. Statius' *insanos gemitus* and *demens*).[31] The changing attitude towards (particularly elite male) grief in Silius' day warns against condemning Scipio's lamentation on the grounds of decorum, which, as Carol Newlands has argued, were changing at the end of the first century CE.[32] As Augoustakis observes (emphasis mine): "Scipio's grief and lament find an outlet conducive to the formation of the young man as the emerging hero and savior of Rome."[33]

Be that as it may, Scipio's grief at the beginning of book 13 does seem excessive, whatever its epic precedents (Achilles in *Il.* 18, e.g.)[34] or contemporary 1st-century sensibilities.[35] The youth's incapability to control his grief and be affected by consolation, however, is in stark contrast to the Scipio we see reacting to his own exile later in book 13. As we just observed, Scipio reveals himself in the latter case to have absorbed the typical advice given in exilic consolations; in fact, the young man does not even need to be told how he ought to act: he already knows! As Marks has argued, the contrast between Scipio's reaction to his father's death

[31] For this reading of *Silv*. 2.1.12–14, see Newlands (2011) *ad loc*.; cf. van Dam (1984) 83 with further comparanda. On the connection between madness and grief, see Gibson (2006) *ad Silv*. 5.1.22.

[32] See Newlands (2012) 118–22; Markus (2004). Although I disagree with his estimation of Claudius Etruscus' character in the poem, Hulls (2011) deftly navigates many of the same issues in Stat. *Silv*. 3.3 as I do here.

[33] Augoustakis (2016) 298.

[34] See, e.g., Laudizi (1991) 1 n. 1; cf. Marks (2005) 135 n. 58: "learning to practice self-control entails for Scipio being less like Achilles." As van der Keur (2015) 214 notes, Silius may also have in mind Aeneas' funeral for Pallas (Sil. 13.392: *solacia luctus* = *Aen.* 11.62: *solacia luctus*).

[35] As Newlands (2012) 119 citing Zeiner (2005) 166–7 observes of *Silv*. 5.5.56–7 (*nimius fortasse avidusque doloris / dicor et in lacrimis iustum excessisse pudorem*? "Perhaps I am said to be excessively eager for grief and to have overstepped the proper limit in my tears"), Statius is aware that there are still limits to the proper expression of grief.

and his own exile reveals a moment of growth during Scipio's "education" in the Underworld.[36] Scipio is cultivating an inner strength that will serve him and his *patria* well not just in his fight against Hannibal, but also in the hard circumstances of his life after the narrative-scope of the *Punica*.

I have in mind here the persuasive argument of Marks, following von Albrecht, on the "inward turn" the epic takes beginning in *Punica* 13. Scipio's (and, by extension, Rome's) enemies shift from external to internal—if Scipio can win his inner battles, if he can follow the example of *Virtus* (15.68–123) and fight on behalf of his country, then not just Scipio, but also through him alone, Rome will be victorious.[37] That turn inwards begins here, as Marks and von Albrecht point out, although I would like to add that it is not without its complications. Scipio's "inward" turn is, first and foremost, a response to his future status as an "outsider:" his inward orientation will not always be in line with the interests of Rome, and in the end his strong moral compass will lead to a rupture within the community. Or, to put it another way, von Albrecht's observation that "es geht darum, ob Scipios Brust von Schuld frei bleiben soll oder nicht" in his exile leaves half the point of these lines unsaid:[38] if Scipio is free from guilt, Rome is not. Silius emphasizes this point by having the Sibyl call Rome *iniqua*.

There is in this passage, then, a fracturing of the state and its most important individual, and the stakes of the disagreement are high: moral superiority, the wages through which Jupiter's

[36] Marks (2005) 137: "We should not forget that the same Scipio, who stoically accepts his fate here,…recently lamented his father's and uncle's deaths in a markedly unstoic fashion." On Scipio's trip to the Underworld as part of his "education," see Laudizi (1991) 14, Marks (2005) esp. 136–7, Augoustakis (2010a) 215–20.

[37] See Marks (2005) 63–67 for the idea and its development in Silian studies.

[38] See von Albrecht (1964) 82.

prophecy of Roman greatness is to be purchased in the *Punica* (Sil. 3.571–629). As Marks observes:[39]

> The war is won not by the force of arms, but by the inner strength of Rome's moral convictions, convictions that, to be sure, many of Scipio's fellow Romans share, but insight into which the poet does not give us to nearly the same degree.

Within the teleology of the poem, as we shall see in a later chapter, Silius aligns Scipio's and Rome's moral superiority at epic's end.[40] In book 13, whose scope expands beyond the narrative events of the *Punica*, this is not the case. Moral superiority in Silius' reading of Scipio's exile is a zero-sum game in which either Scipio is right and Rome wrong (so reads the *Punica*) or vice-versa: there is no middle ground. To portray the episode in such a way is not, of course, unprecedented, as van der Keur rightly observes.[41] But it is striking that Silius paints such a black-and-white picture as this; indeed, there seems to have been an even more hagiographic tradition available to the poet in which Scipio's voluntary exile is undertaken for the sake of *both* himself and Rome, as evidenced by a Senecan epistle (*Epist.* 86.3):[42]

> Quidni ego admirer hanc magnitudinem animi, qua in exilium voluntarium secessit et civitatem exoneravit? Eo perducta res erat ut aut libertas Scipioni aut Scipio libertati faceret iniuriam. Neutrum fas erat; itaque locum dedit legibus et se Liternum recepit tam suum exilium rei publicae inputaturus quam Hannibalis.

---

[39] Marks (2005) 65.

[40] Or, see the suggestion of Marks (2003) 144.

[41] Van der Keur (2015) 288 compares Liv. 38.50.7. In the exiled pair of Scipio and Hannibal, both Carthage and Rome are thankless, but Rome is *ingratior*: Carthage exiled a *victus*, but *Roma victrix victorem Africanum expellat*. Cf. Silius' words on Caesar and Pompey (13.867: *nec leviora lues quam victus crimina, victor*), which, in such close proximity to the description of Hannibal's exile, may be more than coincidental intertext. See also Ahl, Davis, and Pomeroy (1986) 2549 n. 43, but, importantly, cf. Marks (2003).

[42] See the similar remarks of Pomeroy (2016) 341, cf. (2010) 42 on this epistle vis-à-vis the importance of excellent moral character in the *Punica*. Cf. Stocks (2014) 20 n. 23. Henderson (2004) 93–104 offers a more subversive reading of Seneca's Scipio which in some ways anticipates my own reading of Silius'; see especially Henderson (2004) 98–9: "Scipio's only 'return,' the only return that matters, is philosophic-religious ascension of his spirit to rejoin its source in the heavenly aether (*animum…in caelum ex quo erat, redisse*). He will not descend to argue the toss with any primitivesque paraphernalia of genius cult at the manor."

> Why should I be amazed at the glory of this man's spirit, which led him to withdraw into voluntary exile and shed his citizenship? The case had reached such a point that either liberty bring harm to Scipio or Scipio to liberty. Neither option was acceptable; and so he gave way to the laws and conducted himself to Liternum, judging that his own exile was worth just as much to the Republic as Hannibal's.

Seneca's Scipio is interested not just in his own well-being, but also that of the Republic in a kind of self-effacing super-patriotism (cf. 86.2: *utere sine me beneficio meo, patria*): the wounded *libertas* of self or country is a horrible crime (*neutrum fas*), and we will note the juxtaposition of private sacrifice and public benefit in the phrase *suum exilium rei publicae.* Moreover, Scipio's obeisance to the laws of Rome (*locum dedit legibus*) and the impersonal construction which sets up the scenario (*eo perducta res erat*) avoids implying either Scipio or Rome as right or wrong in comparison to Silius' version,[43] where Scipio's interests lie squarely on his own innocence.[44] I do not want to make an argument from silence here on a choice Silius did not make; rather I want to investigate how the differences between Seneca's comparatively selfless (or outward oriented) and Silius' more self-centered (inward-oriented) portrayal impacts our understanding of Scipio and the events narrated to him in *Punica* 13. First, however, we need to look at how gingerly Silius approaches the difficult topic of Scipio's exile elsewhere in his epic, namely in a somewhat understudied episode of *Punica* 10.

[43] Cf. also the blatant disregard for *ius aequum* at Sen. *Plb.* 14.4: *et quam impatiens iuris aequi pietas Africani fuerit*.

[44] Pomeroy (2016) 341 observes that "the political battles of Scipio in the 180s BCE and his eventual withdrawal from public life to Liternum clearly became a standard *controversia,* with one side accusing Rome of ingratitude to its greatest general, the other declaring that the state was greater than its parts." Pomeroy is certainly correct that Silius favors the "first approach" in book 13 and not the second, for which he cites our Senecan epistle; he curiously elides (although cf. the postscript at Pomeroy (2016) 343) the distinction between these two versions, implying that in the *Punica*'s lines "Scipio is the model of the citizen who sacrifices himself to avoid threatening the state." That may be true in Silius' ultimate teleology as it is expressed in, say, book 17, but it also ignores the fact that Silius is *not* interested, in book 13, in exonerating Rome; after all, Silius' Scipio is still only interested in his own ethical excellence, not that of the collective.

The Best Laid Plans: Scipio and Metellus

Scipio operates as a check throughout the *Punica* to the threat of civil war, but his future in exile hints that the moral restraints he places upon his country, effective though they may be, can only work for so long. Before turning to Silius' description of Rome's complete descent into factious upheaval at the conclusion of book 13, I would like to turn to an episode in book 10 connected to the passage we just analyzed. The flight of Metellus and his companions reveals a moment when Scipio's strong moral compass is again applied to a moment of exile; this time, however, Scipio's virtuousness is aimed at preventing the civil discord which Metellus' plans represent. But how effectively, and for how long, can Scipio's noble demands of devotion to the state prevent the type of fracturing Metellus intends?

Following the disastrous battle at Cannae described by Silius in books 8–10, many of the Roman survivors muster at Canusium. One of these is L. Caecilius Metellus, who plots to abandon Rome along with a substantial group of followers (10.415–25); the historicity of the episode is assured by the parallel accounts in Livy, Valerius Maximus, Frontinus, and Dio Cassius (see below), on which former two Silius seems to have based his own account.[45] This plan is met with the righteous indignation of Scipio (10.426–32), who forces the group to follow him in swearing an oath of fealty to the fatherland (10.432–45) and cleansing themselves of guilt (10.446–8).

The theme of exile is subtly hinted at from the beginning of the episode and becomes more explicit throughout (10.415–25):

> ecce super clades et non medicabile vulnus
> reliquias belli atque imperdita corpora Poenis
> impia formido ac maior iactabat Erinys.

[45] See Liv. 22.53, Val. Max. 5.12.7, Front. *Strat.* 4.7.39, Dio 15.28–9. On Silius use of sources, see: Spaltenstein (1990) 88; Marks (2005) 131–2 with n. 50; Littlewood (2017) *ad loc*.

trans aequor Tyrios enses atque arma parabant
Punica et Hannibalem mutato evadere caelo.
dux erat exilio collectis Marte[46] Metellus,
sed stirpe haud parvi cognominis, is mala bello
pectora degeneremque manum ad deformia agebat
consulta atque alio positas spectabat in orbe,
quis sese occulerent, terras, quo nomina nulla
Poenorum aut patriae penetraret fama relictae.

But see, in addition to the destruction and untreatable wound, an impious fear and greater Fury was tormenting those leftovers from the war and the people not killed by the Carthaginians. They were readying to escape by a change of climate across the sea the Tyrian swords and Punic weapons and Hannibal. Metellus was the leader of those gathered for exile, but he was hardly of no name by lineage, he was pushing chests ill-disposed in war and a shameful group towards his disgraceful plans and he was looking for lands placed in a different part of the world in which they might hide themselves and where neither the names of the Carthaginians nor the story of the abandoned fatherland might reach.

In the aftermath of the destruction, an *impia formido* infects certain of the war's survivors, which Silius tellingly terms the *reliquiae belli*: a phrase favored by Livy particularly in the third decade,[47] a large group of these "leftovers" will attempt to "leave behind" their fatherland (10.425: *patriae...relictae*) in exile. The intent by these *reliquiae* to sail across the sea (10.418: *trans aequor*) reflects not just Silius' historical sources,[48] but more importantly recalls two of Silius' Augustan predecessors: one is Horace's famous sixteenth *Epode*, noted by Littlewood, in

[46] The final hemistich of this line is textually problematic; see further note 50 below. Delz's suggestion that two hemistiches have fallen out after *collectis* is attractive. In light of this, I have not translated *Marte*.

[47] The phrase occurs 8x in Latin literature >200 CE, 4x in Livy (9.29.3, 25.37.8, 25.40.5, 29.31.12). Compare also Livy's description of another group of Cannae-deserters who call other survivors of the battle at Liv. 25.6.8 as *ceteros item ex reliquiis cladis eius*; these described their enforced removal from Italy for the duration of the war as exile (25.6.17: *non solum a patria procul Italiaque sed ab hoste etiam relegati sumus, ubi senescamus in exilio*, "Not only have we been relegated far from our fatherland and Italy, but even from the enemy to a place where we might grow old in exile.").

[48] Spaltenstein (1990) and Littlewood (2017) *ad* 10.418 for Livy; it is worth noting that Valerius Maximus' account of this story also contains wordplay on *reliquiae*/*relictus* (Val. Max. 5.12.7: *reliquiae prostrati exercitus...relicturos patriam*). On the other hand, the word *reliquiae* may be a fossilized part of the literary tradition surrounding this episode (cf. Front. 4.7.39: *pars magna reliquiarum*).

which the Romans flee their strife-ridden homeland;[49] the other, of course, is Vergil's *Aeneid*. Just as Metellus and his group face the impending doom of their city by "gathering for exile" (10.420: *exilio collectis*), so too had Aeneas led a band of men (and women) gathered for the same purpose (*Aen*. 2.798: *collectam exilio pubem*; cf. with my next paragraph Luc. 8.258–9: *sequitur pars magna senatus / ad profugum collecta ducem*, "A large portion of the senate follows, having rallied to their refugee leader");[50] just as it is a group of *reliquiae*, notably a rare word in the *Punica*,[51] searching for a new homeland under Metellus, so Vergil's Aeneas regularly refers to his group of Trojans seeking a new city as the *reliquiae Danaum* (e.g. *Aen.* 3.86–7: *serva altera Troiae / Pergama, reliquias Danaum atque immitis Achilli*, "Keep safe this other Troy, keep safe these leftovers from the Danaans and ruthless Achilles"; cf. 1.30, 598; 5.787).[52] Indeed, the whole of line 416 is a pastiche of Vergil's terminology for the Trojans: Silius' description of Metellus' band as *imperdita corpora Poenis* is paralleled only by *Aen.* 10.430 (*et vos, o Grais imperdita corpora, Teucri*, "And you, Teucrians, bodies unharmed by the Greeks"), a particularly appropriate allusion in this book since Cannae is regularly associated with Diomedes in the *Punica*.[53]

[49] Littlewood (2017) 174–5. We just might also recall the opening of *Carm*. 2.1.1 (*motum ex Metello consule civicum*), describing the civil discord of the first century as one of "movement," more properly a disturbance; in contrast, Scipio urges a collective fixity in both space and focus, a key component of Silius' vision of Roman *salus* at the end of book 10 (10.643–4: *infixum est Aeneia regna / Parcarum in leges quacumque reducere dextra*).

[50] The text here is difficult; Delz compares *Aen.* 2.798 in defense of retaining the paradosis of the first hemistich of Sil. 10.420; for more on this issue, see Spaltenstein (1990) *ad* Sil. 10.420 and especially Casali's (2018) review of Littlewood (2017) for BMCR.

[51] cf. only Sil. 15.537–8: *miseras quaerentem exurere belli / reliquias* ("looking to burn the wretched leftovers of war.").

[52] For the phrase in Vergil, see esp. Horsfall (2006) *ad loc.*; Heyworth and Morwood (2017) *ad Aen.* 3.85–9; Fratantuono & Smith (2015) *ad Aen.* 5.787.

[53] Vergil is the first to use *imperditus*, see Harrison (1991) *ad Aen.* 10.430. Silius regularly refers to Cannae as the *Aetoli campi*, thereby alluding to Diomedes in Apulia; see Littlewood (2011) *ad* Sil. 7.484, (2017) *ad* Sil. 10.184; Augoustakis and Littlewood (forthcoming) *ad* Sil. 3.705–7; Pyy and van der Keur (2019) 257.

Both of these intertexts inform Silius' approach to his Metellus-episode. On the one hand, Horace's call to abandon a Rome overrun with civil strife anticipates the elements of civil discord in Metellus' plans to flee the city. Silius engages with Lucan when he has Metellus pine for "another world" (10.423–4: *alio positas spectabat in orbe.../ terras*),[54] recalling a number of similar desires in the first book of the *Bellum Civile*: at Luc. 1.252–3, Ariminum's placement has made it susceptible to enemies foreign (including Hannibal and the Carthaginians, properly Hasdrubal in 207 as Roche notes at 1.255: *vidimus et Martem Libyae*)[55] and now domestic, making the general populace wish for a new situation far to the east or north (*orbe sub Eoo...sub arcto*) in nomadic homes (*errantesque domos*). More disturbingly, in Lucan's epic the desire to seek foreign climes is associated with particularly nefarious atrocities of civil war: Silius' Metellus owes something to Lentulus' words at Luc. 8 (8.335–9), chiding Pompey for his intended *transfuga mundi* in search of Parthian aid and seeking foreign climates (*aversosque polos alienaque sidera quaeris*) only to become a *Parthorum famulus*. Metellus' intended flight also would have made him a *famulus* to a foreign king as Livy tells us (22.53.5: *ad regum aliquem transfugiant*).[56] The hope for a new homeland[57] in Roman history is often either the

[54] Littlewood (2017) *ad loc.* It is just possible that Silius has his eye on a fragment of the poet Albinovanus Pedo's epic on Germanicus preserved in Seneca's *Suasoriae* (1.15 vv. 18–19): *anne alio positas ultra sub cardine gentes / atque alium †bellis† intactum quaerimus orbem.* The context fits insofar as the sailors are likened to exiles (v. 2: *notis extorres finibus orbis*); the striking image of Metellus' desire for "another world" is reflected in the fr., and if the fragment really does refer to a putative world "untouched by war," it would reflect all the better Metellus' intent in our passage. The reading of that word, however, is famously problematic, and while *bellis* is one of the most commonly agreed-upon readings, there is no consensus on the crux; see Feddern (2013) 220. On Silius and Albinovanus Pedo, see: Augoustakis (2010b) 10 with nn. 26 and 28; Pogorzelski (2016) 227.

[55] Roche (2009) *ad* Luc. 1.255.

[56] Certainly a disturbing detail given the typical Roman hatred of monarchy, especially evident in the *Punica*; see Spaltenstein (1990) 86; Littlewood (2017) 175.

[57] On the development of this topos in the *Punica*, see Cowan (2007a) 17 n. 48, (2010) 339 with n. 59; Littlewood (2011) *ad* Sil. 10.562; more generally see Ceaușescu (1976); Kraus (1994). Cf. also Augoustakis (2010a) 100 and *passim*.

reaction to civil discord or is tantamount to it: *altera Roma* is never as simple or positive as Aeneas' hope for an *altera Troia*.[58]

The implicit civil strife in Metellus' intent to fracture the community is highlighted by the emotions which motivate him and his comrades to flee. As many have observed, Metellus is here an anti-Aeneas figure, driven not only by an *Erinys* but by a fear which is tellingly *impia* (*impia formido*). On the one hand, this contrasts Metellus with Aeneas, who undertook his own foundational exile out of a sense of *pietas*. Silius has made this point implicitly already by aligning Juno and Metellus earlier in book 10 when the goddess transforms into the cowardly Roman (10.47),[59] there urging *fuga* of a military rather than exilic variety to Paulus;[60] that episode is redolent of the *Aeneid* (e.g. Juno-Metellus' reference to the *Aeneia regna*, 10.50), and among other traditionally noted antecedents[61] recalls Juno's agent Iris transforming into Beroe in book 5 in order to convince the Trojan women to fire their ships and quit their wanderings (*Aen*. 5.604ff.). Silius inherits from his Vergilian archetype, refracted through Lucan, hints of civil discord when he has Juno-Metellus question Paulus' *vani furores* (Sil. 10.65–6: *quid vanos…/…furores*?), recalling not just Ascanius' chastisement of the Trojan women burning the ships (*Aen*. 5.670: *quis furor iste novus*, "What is this new rage of yours?!"),[62] but also Lucan's

[58] See Cowan (2002) 114, rightly comparing Camillus' prevention of Roman migration to Veii following the Gaul's sacking of the city (Liv. 5.51–4). Cf. also Littlewood (2017) 175; Augoustakis (2010a) 103–4.

[59] On the parallel between the two scenes, see Cowan (2007a) 17, Niemann (1975) 222 n. 2.

[60] Note the parallel between Varro and Metellus in their respective (attempted) evasions of Hannibal (Sil. 10.56: *evasit Varro*, cf. 10.419: *Hannibalem…evadere*). As Cowan (2007a) 16 ff. observes, Paulus notionally resembles Aeneas insofar as his flight from battle is synecdochically linked to the well-being of Rome; see esp. 18 n. 52.

[61] Esp. Juturna's transformation into Metiscus in her attempt to remove Turnus from his battle with Aeneas (*Aen.* 12.468–72), as noted by Littlewood (2017) *ad loc*. and Cowan (2007a) 17, following Juhnke (1972) 213, also noting the parallel of Athena assuming the form of Deiphobus.

[62] As Fratantuono and Smith (2015) *ad loc.* note, "The Trojan women are engaging in something of an act of civil war."

proem (Luc. 1.8: *quis furor, o cives*, "What is this rage, fellow citizens?!").[63] Juno's motivations, as usual, are largely the same ones she had in the *Aeneid*, to keep (*Aeneid*) or dislodge (*Punica*) the Trojans/Romans from their *sedes*, although here there is a twist:[64] in *Aeneid* 5, Juno attempted to undermine Aeneas' *fuga* to Italy, but in this case she is encouraging *fuga*. Paulus' response to Juno incarnate is telling in light of this reading: *i, demens, i, carpe fugam* (10.62, "Go! Go! Fly, you fool!"). At this juncture in Roman history, *fuga* is a mark of madness, not the noble quest it was for Aeneas (cf., e.g., *Aen*. 2.619: *eripe, nate, fugam*, "Take flight, my son!").[65] As a pair, Juno and Metellus in this book represent an attempt to undermine or invert Aeneas' successful exilic foundation of Rome.[66]

By becoming an anti-Aeneas in his intended flight from Rome, Metellus' *impietas* demands to be counterbalanced by a hero properly aligned with the *pius* proto-Roman. That hero is Scipio. Such a narrative architecture is hardly surprising given that Scipio's actions in this episode are, according to Valerius Maximus, prime exemplars of *pietas*: *pietatemque non solum*

---

[63] Cf. Littlewood (2017) 65–6; Marks (2010) 142 comparing the same lines from the *Aeneid* with Silius' similar phrase *quis furor* at Sil. 15.33. Hardie (1997) 147 with n. 36, while not noting the *Punica*'s debt to these lines, suggests that questions like these encode an anxiety about the limits of Roman imperial authority and the improper exercising of power by the Romans towards themselves in civil war. On these lines' relationship with the *Aeneid*, compare also with Fratantuono and Smith (2015) *ad Aen*. 5.690 and Littlewood (2017) *ad* Sil. 10.57–8 (*eripe leto*) and *Aen*. 5.690 (*eripe leto*): "The poet reinforces the idea that Rome's ancient civilization is on the brink of disaster by including, in its original *sedes*, *eripe leto*, a[n] allusion to Aeneas' impassioned prayer to Jupiter to spare the Trojan ships and with them the fortunes of the Trojan exiles." To be clear, Lucan's influence on this passage extends much more broadly than this intertext. 10.51–3 contains two allusions to Lucan's epic: with Littlewood (2017) 66–7, cf. Sil. 10.51: *Ausoniam tecum trahis* ≈ Luc. 7.654: *trahere omnia secum*; Sil. 10.53: *caput hoc abscidere* ≈ Luc. 8.674: *caput cervice abscisa recessit*). See also Marks (2010) 137 on a companion to the former at Sil. 8.333; on the connection between Paulus and Pompey vis-à-vis decapitation, see Marks (2008) 70–5, (2010) 138–9.

[64] On the relationship between Juno in the *Aeneid* and *Punica*, see von Albrecht (1964) 167–71; Häussler (1978) 187–211; Kissel (1979) 30–7; Küppers (1986) 61–92; Laudizi (1989) 73–92; Feeney (1991) 303–4; Marks (2005) 15 n. 4 with bibliography; Ganiban (2010) 73–84, 96–8; Tipping (2010a) 62 n. 25. Augoustakis (2010a) 129 n. 94 with further bibliography, 136–44.

[65] Cowan (2007a) 34.

[66] It is worth noting that Silius inherits the anti-ktistic thrust of his Metellus-episode also from Horace's *Ep*. 16.17–18, where the poet encourages the Romans to pursue ktistic exile anew like the Phocaeans (*Phocaeorum / velut profugit exsecrata civitas*, "Just as the desecrated city of the Phocaeans went into flight.").

ipse plenissimam exhibuit sed etiam ex pectoribus aliorum abeuntem revocavit ("Not only did he himself display the deepest devotion, but he also recalled it though it was departing from the others' chests.").[67] In Silius' account, Scipio's *pietas* is assured not just through his actions but by the powerful oath he swears binding himself and Metellus to Italy and reflecting the three spheres of the cardinal virtue: the gods (in this case the Capitoline triad: 10.432–6), his father (436–8), and his fatherland (438). In fact, by having Scipio call his fatherland the *Lavinia regna*, Silius aligns his hero with Aeneas arriving at those very shores, *Lavin*(*i*)*aque venit / litora* (*Aen.* 1.2–3). Unlike the anti-Aeneas figure Metellus, who intends to relive Aeneas' exile to Rome's detriment, Scipio here represents the successful completion of the Trojan hero's ktistic displacement never to be repeated by his descendants:[68] it is no coincidence that Silius makes a nod to Lavinium, near which a cult site dedicated in part to Aeneas Indiges (cf. 10.436: *Indigetes dei*) celebrated the Trojan hero's establishment as a local Italian divinity.[69]

Silius dwells on such disparities between Scipio and Metellus. Scipio understands Metellus' plans as marks of both moral turpitude and dangerous treason (10.429: *turpe malum Latioque extrema coquebant*). On the one hand, this casts Metellus and his followers as already outsiders who, if they persist in their plans to compromise the unity of their fatherland, are no longer even Romans; Scipio will kill them like the enemies of the state they are before he will allow them to fracture the state with their cowardice (10.444–5: *moriere, nec ullo / Poenorum*

[67] The contrast of Metellus' *impietas* with Scipio's *pietas* is widely noted in the scholarship (some simply noting the latter of the pair); see: von Albrecht (1964) 81; Kissel (1979) 131–2, 134, 219; Laudizi (1989) 128–9; Marks (2005) 132 with n. 49; Harrison (2007) 144; Littlewood (2017) xxxvi, 175, 181–2, 184; cf. Augoustakis (2010a) 103. See especially Hardie (1993) 97: "It is proper that this paragon of filial piety and successful successor to family virtue should also be the opponent after Cannae of the *degener* (10.422) Metellus' proposal to abandon Rome and transfer the Roman survivors overseas."

[68] So also Ahl, Davis, and Pomeroy (1986) 2547: "Scipio's reference to Rome as *Lavinia regna* evokes the Aeneas legend, and affirms his attachment to the city: the Trojans had come to Latium to settle permanently, not to move away when danger threatened." Cf. Laudizi (1989) 128.

[69] See Littlewood (2017) *ad* Sil. 10.436.

melior parietur gloria caeso, "You will die, and no greater glory will be gotten by slaying one of the Phoenicians.").[70] On the other hand, Scipio's bravery and moral resilience[71] in the face of adversity contrast with Metellus' *turpe malum* and his fearfulness. Metellus throughout book 10 has been represented by his fear: at the beginning of the book he is characterized as *pavidus* (10.47: *pavidi...Metelli*), then the narrator and Scipio himself remark on his cowardly motivations (10.417: *impia formido*, cf. 443: *tremis...formidine*). This reveals in Metellus a deficiency of character, a failure to live up to his ancestors[72] (422–3: *degeneremque manum ad deformia agebat / consulta*) which contrasts poorly with Scipio's quasi-religious devotion to his father (10.437: *perque caput nullo levius mihi numine patris*).[73] In almost every way that matters, Scipio and Metellus could not be more unalike.

For this reason, Scipio seems the perfect person to force Metellus and his colleagues to swear an oath, the objective of which is not just assuring fealty to the state but just as importantly maintaining that moral excellence which, as we saw in the previous section, Scipio zealously pursues (10.447–8):

> obstringunt animas patriae dictataque iurant
> sacramenta deis et purgant pectora culpa.
>
> They bind their souls to the fatherland and swear the prescribed oaths to the gods and cleanse their hearts of blame.

[70] On this exculpatory reading of Scipio's intended violence in this episode, see Littlewood (2017) *ad* 10.444–5; cf. Augoustakis (2010a) 103; Marks (2005) 131–3 convincingly against Ahl, Davis, and Pomeroy (1986) 2547; Laudizi (1989) 128–9; von Albrecht (1964) 81; Cowan (2002) 114, (2007a) 17.

[71] Cf. Marks (2010) 140 noting the pointed, antiphrastic allusion in Sil. 10.440 (*testare deos*) to Luc. 7.690: "When Scipio forces a group of deserters, led by Metellus, to stay true to the Roman cause…[he uses] the same phrase, *testare deos*….that Pompey uses to encourage his men to give up the fight at Pharsalus."

[72] Metellus' father, also L. Caecilius, was twice consul (251, 247 BCE) and an otherwise decorated member of the Roman elite; see Littlewood (2017) xxxvi n. 138.

[73] Latent in this statement is that Scipio is unwittingly swearing by his real father who actually is a god, Jupiter, as Bernstein (2008) 232 n. 87 observes. For Scipio as Jupiter's agent in this episode, see Marks (2005) 132.

The episode ends with Scipio's interest in maintaining moral purity. On the one hand, this reflects the Romans' eagerness, particularly during wartime, in maintaining the good will of the gods.[74] The collocation of *pectora* and *culpa* (cf. Sil. 12.305: *culpa Metelli*) reminds us, however, of another instance in which inculpability is foremost in Scipio's mind, namely his reaction to his own exile at 13.518 (*culpa modo pectora cessent*). This oft-observed intratextual nod has elicited praise for Scipio's consistent, patriotic dedication to his fatherland in both episodes; Tipping is mostly in the right when he argues that "under Scipio's influence, Metellus and his confederates free themselves of the guilt that stems from their attempt to side-step the kind of suffering that Scipio...in *Punica* 13 asserts he is prepared to tolerate."[75] And yet, in a context in which the terms of moral rectitude revolve around the proper dedication to one's fatherland (*obstringunt animas patriae*),[76] how are we to read that it is Scipio, of all people, forcing a band of would-be voluntary exiles to reaffirm their connection to the *patria*? Scipio, after all, would turn out to be a voluntary exile himself.

On the one hand, that is an unfair question to ask: right now—and indeed throughout the duration of the historical events on which Silius bases his narrative—Scipio is the hero Rome needs: his moral excellence and interest in keeping himself free of guilt are precisely what Rome demands in the face of desertion like Metellus'. So long as Scipio's moral compass and Rome's are pointed in the same direction, this analysis remains true. But as we saw in book 13, Scipio's values and Rome's will not always be so aligned; the type of moral excellence Scipio demands is

[74] On this scene, see Littlewood (2017) *ad* Sil. 10.447–8 and pp. 182–7 more generally; on Silius and Flavian epic more broadly, Fucecchi (2013).

[75] Tipping (2010a) 155; so similarly Littlewood (2017) 186: "In common with Fabius Scipio values his moral integrity more than popularity;" Marks (2005) 160: "Scipio has already...decided...to serve his *patria* (10.438–445, 13.517–518;" cf. van der Keur (2015) 288.

[76] Cf. Augoustakis (2010a) 103 on this scene: "The Romans' reconnection to their *patria*, however, and consequently their reclaiming of a hurt identity proves a lengthy process, subject to a faltering relationship between fathers, sons, and their fatherland."

incompatible with a future lying just beyond Silius' carefully crafted teleology. All the more telling, then, is the oath Scipio forces Metellus' band to take (10.438–9):

> iuro: numquam Lavinia regna
> liquam nec linqui patiar, dum vita manebit.
>
> I swear: I will never leave the Lavinian kingdom nor allow her to be left so long as I live.

As we observed above in commenting on the phrase *Lavinia regna*, this statement renders Scipio precisely the type of Aeneas-figure Rome needs to combat Metellus' role as an anti-Aeneas; Scipio affirms his everlasting connection to his fatherland, doubly emphasized by *numquam* and the ponderous epic formula *dum vita manebit*;[77] more importantly, the hero makes his private resolution never to leave (*linquam*) a model for proper conduct by the collective Roman populace (*nec linqui patiar*). We might consider this the nascent rise in Scipio of his synecdochic "inward" turn, making of his own moral excellence a model upon which Roman victory is established.[78] The problem, of course, is that Scipio cannot fulfill his end of the bargain: he *will* leave Rome. His model of ultimate dedication to the state, while perfectly valid for the duration of Silius' epic, cannot last. To be clear, Silius inherits this irony from his Livian source, and almost every other literary account of the episode implicitly looks forward to Scipio's exile (Liv. 22.53.10–12; Val. Max. 5.12.7, Front. *Strat*. 4.7.39, Dio 15.28–29):

> ex mei animi sententia" inquit, "ut ego rem publicam populi Romani non deseram neque alium civem Romanum deserere patiar; si sciens fallo, tum me, Iuppiter optime maxime, domum, familiam remque meam pessimo leto adficias. In haec verba, L. Caecili, iures postulo, ceterique qui adestis.
>
> Liv. 22.53.10–12

[77] Aside from Mart. 8.38.15, the formula is exclusively epic, occurring 6x: Vergil 3x, Silius 2x, Statius once.

[78] Littlewood (2017) xxxv: "While the episode at Canusium marks the beginning of Rome's resurgence, it also signals Scipio's ability to assume authority and follow his moral instincts in a crisis." Cf. Harrison (2007) 146: "only the inglorious proposed exile of Metellus and the unjust exile of Decius present exile as a contemporary event in the Second Punic War, which stresses its symbolic and ideological function."

> "It is my resolution," he says, "that I not desert the Republic of the Roman people nor that I allow any other Roman citizen to desert it; if I am knowingly lying, then may you, Jupiter Optimus Maximus, afflict me, my house, my family, and my estate with the worst kind of death. I bid you, L. Caecilius and the rest of you present, swear upon these words."
>
> iurare omnes numquam se relicturos patriam coegit pietatemque non solum ipse plenissimam exhibuit, sed etiam ex pectoribus aliorum abeuntem revocavit.
>
> Val. Max. 5.12.7
>
> He compelled them all to swear that they would never abandon the fatherland and not only himself displayed the deepest devotion, but also recalled it though it was departing from the others' chests.
>
> pronuntiavit manu se sua interfecturum, nisi qui iurasset non esse sibi mentem destituendae rei publicae; cumque ipse se primus religione tali obligasset...
>
> Front. *Strat*. 4.7.39
>
> He announced that he would kill with his own hand any except those who swore that they did not intend to abandon the Republic; and once he himself first had bound himself by such an oath…
>
> καὶ αὐτός τε ὀμόσας πάντα τὰ προσήκοντα καὶ λόγῳ καὶ ἔργῳ πράξειν, καὶ ἐκείνους ὁρκώσας ὡς παραχρῆμα ἀπολουμένους, ἂν μὴ τὰ πιστὰ αὐτῷ παράσχωνται.
>
> Dio 15.28–29
>
> And he himself swore that he would do all his duties both in word and deed; and he made them swear that they would die on the spot if they did not give him their pledge.

Scipio's status as a synecdochic hero is assured in the tradition by Valerius, who emphasizes that Scipio's application of *pietas* benefits not just himself (*non solum ipse*) but also the collective (*sed etiam...aliorum*), and by Frontinus who emphasizes Scipio's status as the "first," *primus,* to bind himself by oath. But how good of a representative hero is he? Is the Republic able to live up to the demands of his oath? Is Scipio himself able to? Only Valerius suppresses the irony (unless we include Scipio among *omnes*) that Scipio takes an oath never to leave the *patria*; by contrast, Livy emphasizes it by having Scipio unwittingly draw attention to his future in the ritually formulaic phrase *si sciens fallo* typical to Latin oaths (viz. *CIL* II 172: *si s[cie]ns fa[ll]o*

fefellerove).[79] Silius draws attention to this irony by linking the conclusion of this scene intratextually with his own description of Scipio's exile. In a disquieting way, Scipio and Metellus, for all their differences, have one thing in common: their decisions to leave behind their fatherland.

I do not wish to suggest some failure on Scipio's part morally or otherwise in his inability to live up to this oath. What we face is Scipio's imminent divergence from the declining moral character of Rome; a time when, in other words, Scipio's insistence on moral rectitude applies only to his own desires (13.518: *culpa modo pectora cessent*) and when the Romans refuse to bind themselves, as Metellus does (10.448: *purgant pectora culpa*), to the young man's strict moral code. Silius seems to suggest that if, after the conclusion of the Second Punic War, Scipio is no longer to be a hero representative of the Roman collective, it is because of a failure on the collective's part, not Scipio's.[80] Indeed, that is a reading that the poet himself makes in the famous portrayal of Scipio's Hercules-like decision between *Virtus* and *Voluptas* in *Punica* 15 (15.18–128).[81] Faced with the choice between moral and heroic excellence and sedentary *luxus*, Scipio opts for the former. The goddess *Voluptas* bitterly responds that her time will come,

---

[79] Cf. especially Cic. *Fam.* 7.1.2 (not of Scipio) on reading meaning into such irony: *is iurare cum coepisset, vox eum defecit in illo loco, 'si sciens fallo'* ("When he had begun to swear, his voice failed him at the point when he said, 'If I knowingly am lying.'"). For further discussion of *CIL* II 172, from the reign of Caligula, one of our only extant oaths of fealty, see Dee (2017) 12–13; we should note that the oath also prescribes exile as the punishment for breaking the oath (*me...di immortales expertem patria...faxint*, "May the immortal gods render me devoid of my fatherland"), giving us a hint of the types of things Livy's audience would have thought of on hearing the rather general *pessimum letum* Scipio foresees in that version of the oath.

[80] Cf. Tipping (2010b) 210, and particularly (2010a) 154: the Sibyl attributes Scipio's exile "not to any failings in Scipio, but to the injustice of Rome itself." Similarly Marks (2005) 203: "The Sibyl makes it very clear that blame for the unseemly affair [i.e. Scipio's exile] will lie squarely on the shoulders of the city, not Scipio;" Ahl, Davis, and Pomeroy (1986) 2553: "While Scipio may be able to avoid falling into the trap…his city will be less successful in resisting the charms of Voluptas once victory has been won." Cf. similarly Cowan (2010) 346.

[81] The scene can be traced back to Xenophon (*Mem.* 2.1.21–34) where it is attributed to Prodicus. The bibliography is massive; Marks (2005) 148–61 is the fullest analysis, Schultheiß (2012). See, selectively, von Albrecht (1964) 82–4; Kissel (1979) 136–8; Ahl, Davis, and Pomeroy (1986) 2553–4; Laudizi (1989) 136–8; Heck (1970) on Silius' use of sources, particularly Cicero's philosophical treatises; Tipping (2010a) 156–60; Littlewood (2011) 182–90; Klaassen (2010) 125; Fucecchi (2014) 316–19; Pyy and van der Keur (2019) 265–6.

venient mea tempora quondam, when Rome will serve her alone, *Roma / serviet...mihi habebitur uni* (15.125–7).[82] As Marks has keenly observed:

> Voluptas' promise that Rome will one day obey her suggests that the city has not already done so and, likely, will not as long as Scipio, the follower of Virtus, plays a prominent and active role in guiding her affairs, which he does through the end of the epic.[83]

Marks' argument in response to a famous crux in Silian scholarship—when we understand the poet to locate the onset of the Sallustian moral decline in Rome following the loss of her rival and concomitant *metus hostilis*[84]—is, I think, correct. The only caveat is that when Silius looks beyond the end of his epic to Scipio's exile as he does in books 10 and 13, the picture becomes much grimmer. The factious forces which Scipio is able to keep in check will burst forth when Rome turns away from the exemplary ideals Virtus and her agent Scipio represent; for example, the *decus* which the goddess promises accompanies her in book 15 (15.99) is precisely what Rome is robbed of when she exiles Scipio (13.514–15: *pudet urbis iniquae / quod post haec decus hoc patriaque domoque carebit*). Silius does his part, as we shall see in the next section, to connect Scipio's moral purity and Rome's moral decline into civil war in book 13 in a kind of

---

[82] Cf. Marks (2010) 142–3. These lines may in turn recall Silius' description of the complicated relationship between Rome and the rebellious Capua, which will one day happily incorporate itself within the system of Roman power (Sil. 11.123: *veniet quondam felicior aetas*, "Someday a happier age will come"); by extension these lines recall Lucan's description of Pompey's tomb at Luc. 8.869 (*veniet felicior aetas*). As Augoustakis (2010a) 112 notes, "Behind Silius' prediction about Capua's future and the idealistic incorporation of diverse peoples under one government, one may detect the reality of contemporary Roman politics: will this age be happier after all?" Vis-à-vis Scipio's exile and its role in Silius' view of Roman history, Augoustakis (2015) 167 observes that the idealized Campanian future is complicated "because Silius does not always paint a black and white picture in his poem[;] in the background, Campania is also the place of Scipio's own exile and eventual demise."

[83] Marks (2005) 256.

[84] Jacobs (2010) 124–6, esp. n. 8 on Silius, provides a useful overview and bibliography of the concept; cf. Levene (2010) 12 with n. 22; Pyy and van der Keur (2019) 263 with n. 50. The key passage for the issue is the conclusion to book 10 (657–8: *haec tum Roma fuit. post te cui vertere mores / si stabat fatis, potius, Carthago, maneres*). On these lines Fowler (2000) 123–7 is a touchstone; see also on 10.657–8 and 15.125–7 vis-à-vis the decline of Rome: Littlewood (2017) 243–6; Ahl, Davis, and Pomeroy (1986) 2510–11; McGuire (1997) 57; Pomeroy (2010) 329 with n. 30; Marks (2005) 252–6 with nn. 44–5, (2010) 128 n. 3, 140; Dominik (2003) 495, (2006) 114–15; Tipping (2004) 352, 363–70, (2007), (2010a) 33–4, 38–9, (2010b) 197–9 with bibliography at n.22; Augoustakis (2010a) 143; Gibson (2010) 41–2; van der Keur (2015) 455–6. Silius' vision of the exiles of Scipio and Hannibal are problematic for creating such a chronology, for as Harrison (2007) 142 notes, "most of the firmer references to exile in fact encompass events outside the story-time of the poem."

inverse relationship. We return, then, to book 13 to examine how Scipio's claim of moral purity, a private fracturing of the Republic from her representative hero, is correlated to (or, in a twisted way, even causes) Rome's decline into civil war.

Turning on Yourself: Scipio's Exile and Civil War

Ubi innocens damnatur, pars patriae exulat (Pub. *Sent*. V.33: "When an innocent person is convicted, part of the fatherland lives in exile"). This *sententia* from Publilius Syrus was perhaps not on Silius' mind as he composed book 13 of his epic;[85] yet it could not be more germane to our discussion of Scipio's exile and its repercussions in the *Nekyia*. Publilius' sentence involves a twofold dichotomy:[86] the *iuncturae* of *innocens/damnatur* and *patriae/exulat*. In an upside-down world where even the innocent are found guilty, the paradox arises that the *patria* itself dwells in exile: to be innocent is to be guilty, to be at home is to be in exile, insiders are outsiders. Even more significantly, the word *pars* hints at factionalism and points to a state divided against itself. These are issues that Silius addresses at the end of book 13 when, as we shall see, he links Scipio's prophesied exile and his concomitant moral resilience to the moral decrepitude that leads to civil war in the 1st century BCE.

Publilius is not, of course, creating this *sententia* in a vacuum, but rather is reacting to a common motif of his time period. Compare, for instance, Cicero's portrayal of his own exile as a dangerous moment for the unity, or even existence, of the *patria*;[87] Cicero never called himself

[85] On the aphorism, see Doblhofer (1987) 247–8 tracing the thought back to its roots in earlier Greek philosophy; see also Flamerie de Lachapelle (2011) 147 n. 731 citing Cic. *Brut*. 1.16.8 (*mihique esse iudicabo Romam ubicumque liberum esse licebit*, "I will judge that Rome is wherever I am allowed to be free.").

[86] Cohen (2007) reads Cicero's post-exilic self-posturing along precisely these lines, noting Cicero's linking of the paradoxes of civil war and the exiling of just individuals; Doblhofer (1987) 241–51 is necessary reading and a thorough collection of Late-Republic source material.

[87] Narducci (1997) 67 also notes the parallel.

an exile, indeed going so far as to imply in multiple works that his displacement proved that his *patria* was, itself, in exile (*e.g. Parad.* 30: *cum omnes meo discessu exulasse rem publicam putent*, "When everyone thinks that the Republic went into exile during the time of my departure.").[88] In the event of a just person's exile, there was a real danger that the wrongly convicted would avail themselves of military rather than legal self-defense: Cicero claims, albeit in a self-serving way, that his withdraw from Rome prevented civil bloodshed (*Red. in Sen.* 6: *ego meam salutem deserui, ne propter me civium vulneribus res publica cruentaretur*, "I did not overly emphasize my own well-being, lest the Republic be bloodied by civil violence on my account.").[89] In the waning days of the Republic—when still fresh in mind were actions like Sulla's bolstering of his army with recalled exiles, whom he paraded in his triumphal return to the city wearing wreaths and proclaiming him their savior (Plut. *Sul.* 24.1)[90]—sentiments like Cicero's were readily adduced to distance the patriotic, selfless exile from the factious dictators of the day (cf. Liv. *Per.* 69 of Metellus Numidicus: *qui cum a bonis civibus defenderetur, ne causa certaminum esset, in exilium voluntarium, Rhodum, profectus est*, "He, though he might have been defended by the good citizens, withdrew into voluntary exile at Rhodes so that there

[88] On Cicero's vocabulary for his own exile, see: Grasmück (1978) 117; Robinson (1994); Narducci (1997) 56 n. 4; Kelly (2006) 124.

[89] See Wallach (1990) 181–2; Cohen (2007) 116–18. Cf. *Vat.* 6–7 with Claassen (1999) 158–63, *Red. Sen.* 34 with May (1988) 93–4, *Red. Pop.* 14 with Cohen (2007) 111. We will note that Seneca's depiction of Scipio's withdraw into exile at *Epist.* 86.3 invokes a similar self-sacrificial patriotism (see pp. 11–12). Such thinking could be twisted, however, into an excuse for civil war; cf. the moral justification adduced by the Pompeian faction at Luc. 5.27–34, esp. 32–34 (*curia solos / illa videt patres plena quos urbe fugavit: / ordine de tanto quisquis non exulat hic est*, "That full curia sees only those senators whom it put to flight from the city: of that order, whoever is not in exile, is here") and App. *B.C.* 2.50 (πάντες τε οἱ εὖ φρονοῦντες τὴν ἐλευθερίαν, ὅπῃ ποτ᾽ ἂν ὦσιν, ἡγοῦνται πατρίδα, "Everyone who really knows what freedom is, considers their fatherland to be wherever they should be.").

[90] The bolstering of forces with exiles was de rigueur in the factionalism of the late Republic; see Kelly (2006) 98–100 on Marius' and Sulla's use of this tactic.

might not be reason for civil discord.").[91] We will note that it is specifically the *boni* who retreat in the face of collective turpitude in the exiles of Cicero and Metellus:[92] as Publilius also suggested, private virtue and collective wickedness, exile and civil war, often go hand-in-hand. I intend to prove that this is just what happens in Scipio's exile in *Punica* 13.

In the following pages, I argue that Silius links the exile of Scipio and the civil wars of the first century to a degree that has not yet been noted. I show striking intratextual parallels between the Sibyl's prophecy of Scipio's future at 13.504–15 and her foretelling of Marius and Sulla (13.853–60); this invites us to read a strong contrast between Sulla's *gloria culpae* (13.858) and Scipio's blamelessness (13.518: *culpa modo pectora cessent*) in his stoic pursuit of *gloria*. By becoming an outsider, Scipio leaves behind a Rome that becomes quite different than the one he fights to defend in the *Punica*; he alone, and not the populace he once represented, maintains his moral character. In all his moral righteousness, Scipio becomes "the truer version of the place from which he is barred;"[93] civil-war Rome, on the other hand, becomes a stranger (even an enemy) to itself and Scipio's proper moral code. I conclude by arguing that Silius' syncretic reading of Hannibal's and Scipio's exiles, à la Livy, reveals one of the few times when Silius shows any serious doubt in the capabilities of his hero—Scipio's perfection may not be tantamount to Rome's.

The Sibyl's predictions in the Underworld attach the events of Roman history to Scipio: the *fata* of the Republic and the young leader are intertwined, the former depending on the latter

[91] Note Kelly (2006) 87, 143 with nn. 28–30 with his observation that "Metellus is shown to have withdrawn from Rome not to preserve his own life, but to spare the state from civil war…Cicero borrowed this idea and used it to justify his own exile;" cf. Cohen (2007) 112 with n. 9 comparing the same dichotomy in the fr. of Metellus' letter (preserved at Gel. 17.2.7) claiming that his enemies were "interdicted" from *honos* and *ius*, while he in exile enjoys *summa gloria*.

[92] For a comparison of Cicero's and Metellus' rhetorical stance towards their own exiles, see Kelly (2006) 124; Tatum (2018), esp. 103–4.

[93] Seidel (1986) 9.

(13.504: *iam tua deque tuis pendentia Dardana fatis*). It follows that Silius would return to the consequences of Scipio's exile later in book 13. At the conclusion to his *Nekyia*, Silius details the civil discord which tore the Republic apart, alluding to the factious pairs of Marius and Sulla along with Caesar and Pompey. The first pair recalls similar language and the same leitmotifs that the Sibyl and Scipio employed in their portrayal of the young general's future (13.853–60):

> hic Marius; nec multa dies iam restat ituro
> aetheriam in lucem; veniet tibi origine parva
> in longum imperium consul. nec Sulla morari
> iussa potest, aut amne diu potare soporo;
> lux vocat et nulli divum mutabile fatum.
> imperium hic primus rapiet, sed gloria *culpae*,
> quod reddet solus, nec tanto in nomine quisquam
> exsistet, Sullae qui se velit esse secundum.
>
> Here, Marius; and not many days remain before he makes his way into the light above. From poor birth he as a consul will come for you into a long reign. Nor is Sulla able to delay the things ordained for him or for long to drink from the river of sleep; the light and fate changeable by none of the gods calls him. This man will be the first to seize power, but there is glory *in his wrong*, given that he alone will give it back; nor will there exist anyone in such a great position who would wish himself to be another example of Sulla.

A number of reminiscences recall the Sibyl's description of Scipio's future (13.503–15) and the young man's immediate reaction to it (13.517–18):

> 'verum age disce, puer, quoniam cognoscere cordi est,
> iam tua deque tuis pendentia Dardana fatis.
> namque tibi cerno properatum oracula vitae
> hinc petere et patrios visu contingere manes.
> armifero victor patrem ulcesceris Hibero,
> creditus ante annos Martem, ferroque resolves
> gaudia Poenorum et missum laetabere bello
> omen Hiberiacis victa Carthagine terris.
> maius ad imperium posthac capiere, nec ante
> Iuppiter absistet cura quam cuncta fugarit
> in Libyam bella et vincendum duxerit ipse
> Sidonium tibi rectorem. pudet urbis iniquae,
> quod post haec decus hoc patriaque domoque carebit.'
> sic vates gressumque lacus vertebat ad atros.
> tum iuvenis 'quaecumque datur sors durior aevi,

obnitemur,' ait '*culpa* modo pectora cessent.'

> "But come and learn now, boy, since you are resolved to do so, your fate and the fate of Rome which depends on your own. For I sense some haste on your part to seek from here the prophecies of life and to make visual contact with your father's shade. Victorious shall you avenge your father of the warlike Iberians; entrusted with the war before the proper age, you will restrain the joy of the Carthaginians with the sword, and you will rejoice that an omen has been sent after Carthage is conquered by war in Spain. After this, you will be elected to greater *imperium*, nor will Jupiter cease from his care before he has banished all war to Libya (van der Keur (2015) 274) and himself has led the Sidonian general destined to be conquered by you. That after these events this mark of distinction will lack both fatherland and home is a source of shame for the unjust city." Thus the prophetess as she began to turn towards the black lakes. At that point the young man said, "Whatever harsher lot in life is given, I will put up with it so long as my chest is free of *guilt*."

Marius' rise to the consulship recalls Scipio's election to the same office (13.855: *in longum imperium*≈13.511: *maius ad imperium posthac capiere*); there is, furthermore, a tension between Sulla's extrajudicial "seizing" of power (13.858: *imperium...rapiet*) and Scipio's legitimate "election" (13.511: *ad imperium...capiere*) to a constitutionally appointed office.[94] Similarly, Sulla's inability to restrain (*morari*) what is fated (*iussa*) to him (855–6) recalls Scipio's haste to learn his own future (13.505: *namque tibi cerno properatum oracula vitae*); the same Stoic, ineluctable fate must be met by both men (857: *nulli divum mutabile fatum*; cf. 13.504, 517: *quaecumque datur sors durior aevi*).[95] Exile, too, forms part of this intratextual program, as Marius was famously an exile (e.g. Luc. 2.70 and Juv. 1.49 for the collocation of *Marius exul*). The description of Marius' *longum imperium* as consul recalls his final consulship in 86, and the verb *veniet* thus signifies the general's return from exile in order to attain his final (brief) tenure

[94] Some have doubted that we should compare Scipio's characterization in the *Punica* with the description of the civil wars at the end of *Punica* 13, e.g. Horsfall (1995) 291; cf. Dominik (2018) 275–6.

[95] On the Stoic elements of the former, see Reitz (128), followed by van der Keur (2015) 462 noting Silius' nod to Lucan's Erichtho (6.611–14); on the stoic elements of the latter, see note 17 above. Cf. Kissel (1979) 61, 67. One might also recall *Aen.* 6.376 (*desine fata deum flecti sperare precando*, "Cease hoping to bend the fates of the gods by praying.").

of the office that year. Marius is thus an outsider, both geographically by his displacement and politically by his birth (854: *origine parva*), who becomes *the* insider of the Republican political system, the consul; this is a reversal, of course, of the trajectory of Scipio's life, who goes from being an insider of consular stock and rank to an outsider.

As commentators since Kissel have noted, Silius presents this passage as one of moral decline;[96] in large part he makes this point intertextually, for Marius, lacking a one-to-one parallel in Silius' Vergilian model (unlike Caesar and Pompey),[97] is modelled on Vergil's description of Numa (*Aen*. 6.811–12: *Curibus parvis et paupere terra / missus in imperium magnum*, "sent from the lowly Cures and a poor land to great power").[98] Marius and Numa are both outsiders (*Curibus parvis*≈*origine parva*) who arrive at Rome from elsewhere (*missus*≈*veniet*) to positions of power (*imperium magnum*≈*longum imperium*). Numa, however, was a foundational figure who established laws for the Roman state (*Aen*. 6.810–11: *qui legibus urbem fundabit*, "who will establish the city with laws)—indeed in his Sabine origins he is a precursor of Domitian's family elsewhere in the *Punica*.[99] Marius, like Numa, was hailed as a foundational figure, the *conservator patriae* (Cic. *Sest*. 37: *inimicum C. Marium, conservatorem patriae*, "hostile C. Marius, the preserver of the fatherland"; cf. Plut. *Mar*. 27.5: μάλιστα δὲ οἱ πολλοὶ κτίστην τε Ῥώμης τρίτον ἐκεῖνον ἀνηγόρευον, "But the vast majority of people were

[96] Kissel (1979) 182–3; van der Keur (2015) 452.

[97] It has long been noted that, in absence of a Vergilian passage on which to fashion his Marius and Sulla as civil warriors, Silius also turned to Lucan for inspiration; see Reitz (1982) 127–9; Marks (2010) 141–2; van der Keur (2015) 452.

[98] Van der Keur (2015) 461 following Grebe (1989) 120.

[99] See Augoustakis and Littlewood (forthcoming) *ad* Sil. 3.594–6.

proclaiming that man to be the third founder of Rome"),[100] but Silius tellingly elides this detail in his portrayal;[101] Silius' Marius rather overturns the laws of Rome by his illegally *longum imperium*, a phrase which aligns him with Rome's enemies and the civil war between Pompey and Caesar (cf. Luc. 1.333: *quem tamen inveniet tam longa potentia finem*? "Nevertheless, what end will such long-held power find?"). The intertextual association with Polynices' accusation of Eteocles' *longa imperia* in their duel (*Th*. 11.549–50: *longa sub umbra / imperia*), all the more attractive since Polynices like Marius (attempts to) come to power from meager means and exile (*Th*. 11.550–1: *exilio rebusque exercita egenis / membra*, "limbs trained by exile and meager circumstances"), further underpins the civil-war connotations of this passage.[102] Marius' "long reign" furthermore recalls Hannibal, whom Hanno accuses of extending his *longa imperia* in war (11.588: *longa imperia atque armatos proroget annos*, "[so that] he may prolong his long power and our years of war"). By overturning the legal structures underpinning Roman power, Marius shows a Rome that not only is an enemy to itself like Lucan's Rome and Statius' Thebes, but that also looks like its erstwhile enemy Carthage in Silius' own epic as its leaders take on disturbing Hannibalic traits.

[100] Van der Keur (2015) 461, to whom I owe many of the inter- and intratextual parallels in these lines; cf. Kaster (2006) *ad loc*. and Rawson (1974) on Marius as *conservator patriae*. On Marius as an exemplary exile, see Gaertner (2007) 16 n. 85 on Cicero's portrayal of him in his surviving prose and, likely, his lost poem on Marius' exile.

[101] Not all sense negative coloring in Silius' brief (in comparison to Sulla) description of Marius, see Reitz (1982) 128: "seine (i.e. Marius') niedrige Herkunft und sein langes Konsulat warden erwähnt, ohne dass er als Mensch oder Politiker irgendwie gewertet würde." Kissel (1979) 183 similarly reads Sulla in an exculpatory light, emphasizing the distinctions between Sulla and Pompey/Caesar: "Sulla wird die Alleinherrschaft an sich reissen, um sie allerdings—im Gegensatz zu Pompeius und vor allem Caesar—noch einmal freiwillig wieder abzulegen." To my mind, Silius is interested in forgiving none of these civil warriors, eliding as he does Marius' positive characterization in his favored model Cicero and qualifying Sulla's *gloria* with *culpae*.

[102] Bernstein (2017) xxxviii–xxxix argues this is a Statian passage which Silius may have consulted in the later books of his epic—although one must always exercise caution in assigning priority to such near contemporaries as Statius and Silius. Reitz (1982) points to the further Statian intertext *mutabile fatum* (Sil. 13.857=*Th*. 11.9.661). For more on the relationship between Silius and Statius see my Conclusion below; cf. Marks (2014) and Augoustakis (2010b) 8 with n. 16.

Silius' Sibyl is describing a Rome starkly at odds with Scipio's moral code of virtuous inculpability, a fact emphasized by the striking intratextual parallel in which the Sibyl describes Sulla's abdication of power: while Sulla was the first to seize power (858), he will be the only one to relinquish it (859–60). This amounts to a pointed oxymoron where Sulla's factional *culpa* is also the source of his *gloria* (858: *gloria culpae*).[103] Silius emphasizes both of these terms as elements of Scipio's moral code in book 13, and we will dwell on both in turn; in our analysis, we shall see that Sulla's *gloria culpae* is a pointed reversal of the ethical ideals Scipio embodies. First, let us turn to *gloria* in *Punica* 13.

G*loria* is not unambiguously positive in *Punica* 13. Elsewhere in the *Nekyia* glory is presented as a pleasant, but unnecessary—some have claimed dangerous—[104] component of Roman virtue (Sil. 13.664–6: *virtus sibimet pulcherrima merces; dulce tamen venit ad manes, cum gratia vitae / durat apud superos*, "*virtus* is its own sweetest reward; sweetly nevertheless it comes to the shades when the esteem of one's life endures among the living").[105] Some scholars argue that Scipio's interest in *gloria* reveals a possible character flaw latent in the young general's words to Alexander (13.768–70: *exsuperat tua gloria cunctos.../...similique cupidine rerum / pectora nostra calent*, "Your glory overcomes everyone else…and my chest is fired by a similar desire for accomplishments"), a debate with roots in our source-material on Stoic and Roman appropriations of the *exemplum Alexandri* (see n. 106 below). I do not think that kind of

[103] Cf. Blomgren (1938) 49: "what does him credit in his crime..." This collocation is striking in its originality and deserves detailed analysis; the only near parallel which Silius may have had his eye on is Sal. *Jug.* 94.7 (*sic forte correcta Mari temeritas gloriam ex culpa invenit*, "Thus by chance the corrected rashness of Marius found glory from blame") which immediately precedes Sulla's arrival in Africa. Sallust's condemnation of Marius is puzzling, but seems to anticipate the antagonism between Marius and Sulla; see Koestermann (1971) 338; Paul (1984) 233.

[104] See: Ahl, Davis, and Pomeroy (1986) 2551; Grebe (1989) 115–16; Laudizi (1989) 133; Tipping (2010a) 170–6.

[105] On the textual difficulty of *gratia* as opposed to the often adopted emendation to *gloria*, see van der Keur (2015) ad loc.

ambiguity applies to Silius' Scipio, however; I am more convinced by the arguments of another camp, recently advocated by Marco Fucecchi in his cogent argument that Silius is attempting to rehabilitate the Alexander model.[106] According to this reading, Scipio's *cupido rerum* does not imply the negative valences of *gloria*, for Silius is basing his presentation of *gloria* and *virtus* on Cicero's linking of those two virtues.[107] Silius rather makes it clear elsewhere what excessive *gloria* looks like in Imilce's foreboding allusion to her husband's boundless thirst for glory for himself alone (3.122–3: *tibi gloria soli / fine caret*, "for you alone does glory lack a limit").[108]

By contrast, Scipio's pursuit of *gloria* is upright, following in the stoic conceptualization of *gloria* as an avenue to celestial fame on which Silius centers his epic in the *Punica*'s proem (Sil. 1.1–2: *ordior arma, quibus caelo se gloria tollit / Aeneadum*, "I begin with the arms with which the glory of the descendants of Aeneas lifted itself to heaven.").[109] Scipio learns of this proper application of *gloria* from his mother Pomponia,[110] who urges Scipio to pursue glory and

[106] For most of the argument and bibliography below, see Fucecchi (2014) esp. 321–2: "What matters to him [i.e. Silius] is re-enacting a national archetype which could be successfully matched with the Alexander model. With his admirable synthesis of *magnitudo animi* and self-restraint, further illustrated by the charisma granted by divine blessing, the Flavian Scipio perfectly fits the type. His victory over Hannibal sanctions the birth of a new leadership, and, from the modern perspective of an imperial poet, it may represent the foundational act of a new idea of kingship."

[107] Although Cicero is somewhat ambivalent on the proper role of *gloria* (see e.g. *Amic.* 49), it is more often the happy attendant of *virtus*, see the citations at Billerbeck (1986a) 354 n. 12; cf. Reitz (1982) 113. Silius is influenced more by the latter position: see Marks (2005) 36–7, 158–60; Billerbeck (1986a) 343–5, (1986b) 3136–7; Matier (1990) 69; Ripoll (1998) 250–2, 538–9; Stocks (2014) 191–2; van der Keur (2015) 361, 408. All of this is to say nothing about many emperors' self-fashioning as a new Alexander beginning already in the *Aeneid* (6.788ff. and 801ff.) which clearly influences Silius' reading of Scipio as a proto-Domitian here; see: Billerbeck (1986a) 344–5; Rocca-Serra (1990) 385; van der Keur (2015) 331 with bibliography at n. 3, 406–7 with bibliography; cf. Tipping (2010a) 172.

[108] On the passage, see Augoustakis (2010a) 211 with n. 25; cf. Stocks (2014) 100: "Imilce's speech thus recognizes the man of excess that lies beneath Hannibal's superhuman, mythic persona." Van der Keur (2015) 407 n. 4, following Borzsák (1982) 166 observes that, in relationship to the *exemplum Alexandri*, "while Scipio adopts his positive traits, Hannibal may be modelled after Alexander's 'bad' side."

[109] See, e.g. Billerbeck (1986a) 345–6; Ripoll (1998) 80: "L'ascendance jovienne de Scipion est donc le fondement de son adhesion à l'idéal stoïcien du *caelum petere*;" Marks (2005) 158–61.

[110] The goddess Virtus urges Scipio to pursue *gloria* in a similar way in a passage in book 15 commonly compared to this one; see Ripoll (1998) 80–1; Marks (2005) 35; Klaassen (2010) 125; van der Keur (2014) 298–9, (2015) 343.

"lift himself to heaven by his deeds" (13.635: *in caelum...te attolere factis*). This aligns Scipio's *gloria* with the collective glory of the *Aeneadae* mentioned at the poem's beginning.[111] More importantly, Pomponia's vision of *gloria* counteracts the Lucanian forces of civil discord. As Augoustakis has shown, Pomponia is allusively contrasted with both factions of Lucan's civil war: she is a positive vision of Scipio's patriotic devotion to the *Roma* which Lucan's Caesar attacks (Sil. 13.622: *o magni mihi numinis instar*~Luc. 1.199–200: *summique numinis instar / Roma*), and, insofar as she urges defending the country rather than attacking it, she is an antithesis to Pompey's wife Cornelia, who urges her son Sextus to attack the fatherland (Luc. 9.84–7).[112] By such allusions, Scipio's glory becomes a corrective cure for the factious and destructive individualism displayed by other Roman civil warriors. Simply put, Scipio's pursuit of individual *gloria* serves to glorify and maintain the unity of the Roman collective.

Sulla's glory, on the other hand, is representative of the Sibyl's civil-war hellscape, a morally perverse defense of factional upheaval. Indeed, his *gloria culpae* seems to engage with a literary tradition attaching civil war to Sulla's paradoxical glory: the Neronian author of the *Bucolica Einsidlensia*, for instance, rejoices that the *infelix gloria Sullae* is a thing of the past (*Buc. Eins.* 2.32: *sed procul a nobis infelix gloria Sullae*, "but far away from us the unfortunate glory of Sulla"). Commenting on Silius' use of the phrase *infelix culpa* in the Saguntines' mass suicide in book 2 to which I owe this intertext (2.612–13: *nobile.../ aeternum invictis infelix gloria servat*), Neil Bernstein shows another instance in which Silius encodes (Lucanian) civil

[111] Van der Keur (2015) 334 ("The greatness Scipio is to seek for himself...[is] the culmination of the glory of Rome"), cf. 343 ("Scipio will realize what was said of Rome in the proem").

[112] Augoustakis (2010a) 218 and (2011) 198.

war within paradoxical *gloria*; we will note that in that passage, as here, there is a discomforting alignment of right and wrong, heaven (Hercules/Fides) and hell (Tisiphone).[113]

Sulla's inversion of Scipio's ethical code at the end of book 13 is all the more pointed because of the second element in the *iunctura* of 858 (*gloria culpae*), for as Spaltenstein has rightly observed *culpa* is properly an antonym of *gloria*.[114] This inversion of morality looks back to Silius' prophecy of looming moral degradation in book 10: *gloria culpae* proves that Rome's *mores* really have "(in)verted" (10.657: *vertere mores*). More importantly, that change is in direct opposition to Scipio's moral code: Scipio's ethics of inculpability had warded off Metellus' quasi-factional aims in book 10, as we observed above (10.448: *purgant pectora culpa*). Scipio's exile, however, shows that Rome is ultimately to become an "unjust city" (13.514), rendering his ethical code obsolete and inviting in the very factionalism his ethics aimed to prevent. Scipio's inward turn away from blame, then, foreshadows the rather more violent "inward turn" of the Republic against itself as it embraces *culpa* as a source of *gloria*. This leaves Rome at odds with itself, its moral identity robbed of it.

Scipio's exile, the fact that in all his moral righteousness he still becomes an outsider, reveals a Rome that loses its identity and moral character. In her description of the civil wars the

---

[113] On the ambivalence of Hercules and *Fides* in book 2, see Bernstein (2017) xxix–xxxiii and *ad loc*. with Ripoll (1998) 406–11 (esp. 410 on the oxymoron *infelix gloria*: "Tout ceci traduit la double sollicitation du poète, pris entre un souci esthétique de dramatisation et une intention morale de glorification, qui menaçent d'entrer en conflit dans ce passage."); Hardie (1993) 80–2; Dominik (2003) 485–90; Spentzou (2008) 136–7; Augoustakis (2010a) 133–4 following Keith (2000) 92 ("Silius both praises the Saguntines for their fidelity…and abhors the carnage with its overtones of civil discord"); Augoustakis (2011) 194–6; Tipping (2010a) 19–20; van der Keur (2015) 148 n. 13 ("the oxymoron conveys the paradox inherent in the perverted suicide"). Cf. Vessey (1974) 34; Kissel (1979) 91; Agri (2010) 147–51, esp. 149 on *infelix gloria.* See also Fucecchi (2013) 27–8 on the scene's representation of the "fruitlessness of perverse imperialism," an observation as applicable to our book-13 passage as it is to book 2. I only partially agree with McGuire (1990) 40 (cf. (1997) 39) that "the complete disorder operating at heavenly, earthly, and infernal levels" is connected by Hannibal's defeat to the civil wars of the future; to be sure, the confusion of right and wrong in books 2 and 13 are linked, but in book 13 that confusion rests in Rome's abandonment of (the soon to be divine) Scipio.

[114] Spaltenstein (1990) 278, who also notes that "cette tournure doit avoird'autant plus d'efficacité que 'gloria famae' et sim., comme redondances, ne sont pas rares (*TLL* [6.2.]2075.70)."

Sibyl shows that Rome is foreign to itself: the paradox of *gloria culpae* aligns the city with those paradoxical Punic perversions of Roman virtue such as *Punica fides*, Lucanian/Hannibalic *improba virtus*,[115] or, as van der Keur rightly suggests, the *pravum decus* (cf. Scipio's status as *hoc decus* at 13.515) of the traitor Dasius who deserted to the Carthaginian side (13.30: *at contra Argyripae pravum decus*).[116] Through Scipio—by which I mean his exile—Rome becomes unlike and hostile to itself and its own; it becomes its own enemy.[117]

This confounding of right and wrong aligns Rome not only with Carthage but also with that *altera Roma*, Capua.[118] In the *Punica*, Capua serves as a negative mirror of Roman righteousness, a place whose infectious depravity makes people other than what they once were (most importantly Hannibal, whose decline in the epic coincides with his leisure at Capua in book 11).[119] The turpitude of Capua is perhaps clearest in her treatment of one of her best citizens. Decius, like Scipio the *decus* of his city (11.158: *solum Decius Capuae decus*), condemns Capua's desertion of Rome on moral terms as an act which confuses right and wrong,

[115] Cf. Stocks (2014) 86 ("We see Hannibal defined by his excessive and oxymoronic behavioral traits") with 86–7 n. 3.

[116] Franke (1889) 127 lists a number of similarly paradoxical *iuncturae* in the *Punica*; cf. also Bernstein (2017) *ad* Sil. 2.612–13; van der Keur (2015) 148 with n. 13.

[117] So similarly Augoustakis (2010a) 108–9, responding to Sil. 13.514–15: "Within Silius' idealized vision of the Second Punic War as the most successful moment in Roman affairs, we get a glimpse of Rome's eventual decline and fall, as her children turn against one another or as the *patria* becomes increasingly ungrateful and 'kills' her own offspring."

[118] Cicero calls Capua *altera Roma* at *Agr.* 2.86 insomuch as it threatens Roman superiority; see Cowan (2007b) 25–6. Silius seems to echo Cicero who, like Livy (see next note), also notes that Capua was the place which "conquered" Hannibal; see *Agr.* 2.95 (*ea luxuries quae ipsum Hannibalem armis etiam tum invictum voluptate vicit*) with Pomeroy (1990) 134.

[119] Augoustakis (2010a) 100 astutely points out how Capua obfuscates unilateral identity; it is both an *altera Carthago* (Sil. 11.424, 13.100) and an *altera Roma*. For Hannibal, "this disorientation...is crucial...Hannibal is absorbed by that very *desidia*, which for so long has been destroying the Romans themselves." Silius inherits Capua's status as the beginning of Hannibal's downfall from Livy, who views the city along similar lines; see Liv. 23.45.4 (*Capuam Hannibali Cannas fuisse*) and Stocks (2014) 134 with n. 1. For Capua as a prelude of Roman victory at Carthage, see also: von Albrecht (1964) 32; Burck (1984a) 45, 52; Küppers (1986) 184–5; Pomeroy (1990) 127; van der Keur (2015) 75, 149–50; Biggs (2019) 215; Pyy and van der Keur (2019).

something Decius will not do: *non ita, non Decio permixtum fasque nefasque / haec ut velle queat* (11.185–6, "Not so badly has right and wrong been confused for Decius that he might be able to wish for this.").[120] Decius' praiseworthy moral excellence puts him at odds with the depravity of his fellow Capuans, and at Hannibal's instigation he is exiled. Just as Scipio's exile prefigures Roman (moral) decline into civil war, Decius' exile leads to the Capuan ethical bankruptcy which tears the city apart. Facing imminent Roman occupation in book 13, the Capuans replay a more perverse version of the Saguntine suicide in book 2,[121] recalling too late the example of Decius: *nunc menti Decius serae redit et bona virtus / exilio punita truci* (13.280–1, "Now too late does Decius and his brave *virtus* punished with harsh exile return to their minds."). Note the emphasis on an overturned model of ethical excellence, *bona virtus*,[122] of which the state is deprived through exile: Silius grammatically transfers Decius' "punishment with exile" from the man, *Decius*, to his status as a moral icon, *virtus / punita exilio*. Decius, like Scipio, has become "the truer version of the place from which he is barred"[123] and takes whatever moral excellence Capua had into exile with him: Capua is another example of a state

[120] For further analysis of Decius, see esp. Auhagen (2006); cf. Harrison (2007) 145; Mcguire (1997) 220–2; Bernstein (2017) xxxii; on the common collocation of *fas* and *nefas* (cf. 14.92, see Spaltenstein (1990) 116 and especially his attractive suggestion of Verg. *G*. 1.505 (*fas versum atque nefas*).

[121] The scenes are commonly analyzed in tandem, often emphasizing the motifs of civil war apparent in both through Silius' use of Lucanian and other intertextual parallels; see: von Albrecht (1964) 62; Kissel (1979) 97 n. 25; Burck (1984a) 45, (1988); Schenk (1989) 360; Ripoll (1998) 405–16; Dominik (2003) 487–8, (2006); Cowan (2007b) 26–30; Spentzou (2008) 136; Augoustakis (2010a) 132 n. 101; Marks (2010) 144 n. 46; van der Keur (2015) 146–9 and relevant commentary; Bernstein (2017) xxxii–xxxiii.

[122] Strikingly, the only other instance of *bona virtus* in the *Punica* is in Hannibal's self-description at 1.342–3 (*en bona virtus* / *primitiaeque ducis*), on which see Stocks (2014) 104. Kissel (1979) compares the *bona virtus* of Decius, "die sich eben am patriotischen Wohl der Heimatstadt orientiert und daraus ihre Begründung und Berechtigung gewinnt," and the *improba virtus* of Hannibal, but he does not note that Hannibal also claims to display *bona virtus*. Silius elsewhere contrasts the fates of Hannibal and Decius as exiles, see Auhagen (2006) for a general comparison and van der Keur (2015) 468–9 on exile specifically.

[123] Seidel (1986) 9.

whose downfall is linked with her exiling of a just citizen and the moral code that citizen represents.[124]

To be clear, I largely agree with Ripoll that Silius' prophetic vision of Rome in the *Nekyia* "s'achève sur un *topos* de la philosophie morale, la supériorité des valeurs éthiques sur les triomphes terrestres" and prizes "la quête de la perfection morale personnelle" as the avenue through which Roman greatness is to be won.[125] Sulla's overturning of Scipionic moral excellence does not, I think, elicit from Silius any misgivings over autocracy as a necessarily flawed form of governance, as some scholars have read this passage.[126] And yet, Sulla's *exemplum* contradicts those very terms through which Scipio's "quête de la perfection morale personnelle" is successful. The two chief virtues aligned with Scipio in his exile are later overturned in the Sibyl's descriptions of civil war: Sulla's *gloria* embraces *culpa* in the inverted moral universe brought on by factionalism, and the banishment of Scipionic *decus* (13.515: *decus hoc patriaque domoque carebit*) foreshadows Pompey's loss of his *decorum et gratum terris caput* (13.861–2), an allusion to Pompey's decorous, decapitated head in Lucan (Luc. 8.680: *generosa fronte decora*).[127] Perfect morals, it seems, fail all the more spectacularly in their inversion.[128]

---

[124] Many readings of this scene dissociate the Capuan suicide from a more noble (read, Stoic) one through moralizing readings: see Cowan (2007b) 27, with n. 184, and especially his point that "the particular nature of the suicide marks it out as typical of Capuan decadence, but that is rather emblematic, suggesting that the decadence is the cause of the downfall." So also Pyy and van der Keur (2019) 254. Cf. Ripoll (1998) 412 (cf. 413 n. 168 citing Decius) who reads the positive portrayals of the Capuans (e.g. their *constantia*) as a "porteur d'une certaine grandeur, mais tournée vers le mal." Cf. Bernstein (2018) 185–6.

[125] Ripoll (1998) 79–80 n. 284.

[126] See: Blomgren (1938) 49–50; Wistrand (1956) 50–2; Reitz (1982) 128; Tipping (2010a) 41; Penwill (2013) 49.

[127] The intertext is noted by Reitz (1982) 129; cf. Spaltenstein (1990) 278; Marks (2010) 142; van der Keur (2015) 463.

[128] Cf. Kissel (1979) 182–3; van der Keur (2015) 452, emphasis added, ("the sequence of [civil war] leaders is both rising (in power and greatness) and falling (in morals)." Cf. Marks (2010) 128 n. 3.

Put more simply, Silius is perfectly aware that individual power, indeed Rome's very need of those leaders in the empire, makes all the more imperative the broad inculcation of proper (Flavian) values, as Marks and Mezzanotte have argued.[129] If Rome turns away from those values, as she has in the past, there is little that an individual leader can do, and for Silius Scipio's exile is proof positive of this. The poet makes this very point in concluding his description of the civil wars. When Scipio hears the Sibyl's prediction of discord, he laments (Sil. 13.868–9):

> tum iuvenis lacrimans: "restare haec ordine duro
> lamentor rebus Latiis"
>
> Then in tears the youth replied: "I lament that these things lie in store for the State of Latium in her harsh fate."

The fact that Scipio "laments" (*lamentor*) is telling; of course it has its epic precedents, such as Anchises' mournful revelation of Marcellus in the *Aeneid* (*Aen*. 6.867). Measured as it is against his earlier outburst over the deaths of his father and uncle, Scipio's grief throughout book 13 also marks his patriotism and, as Augoustakis observes, "find[s] an outlet conducive to the formation of the young man as the emerging hero and savior of Rome, not as the autocrat and tyrannical ruler" in distinction to Marius, Sulla, Caesar and Pompey.[130] I agree with this interpretation, although I would stress that it only emphasizes the young general's happiness in the book's last line (13.895: *tum laetus...iuvenis*). If Silius' Scipionic reading of Roman fate is vouched safe in the young man's happiness at the end of the book, how are we to read his brief collapse back into

[129] Mezzanotte (2016); cf. Marks (2010) 152: "Silius understands that powerful individuals can do great harm too—one need only think of Flaminius, Varro, or the civil war shades in the *Nekyia*—but he also understands that powerful individuals, as long as they are good and just, can do great good and may even be necessary."

[130] Augoustakis (2016) 298; so also van der Keur (2015) 456: "if Hannibal's death parallels the end of the civil wars, we may also understand Scipio's reaction to both prophecies: his tears after hearing of Rome's future internecine struggle are counterbalanced by his joyful reaction to the prophecy of Hannibal's end."

lament here?[131] The answer, I would suggest, lies in the connection Silius makes between civil war and Scipio's exile.[132]

Scipio is lamenting the *ordo durus,* the "harsh fate," that awaits the Republic he is fighting to defend. As van der Keur suggests, this looks back to Scipio's response to his own fate, the *sors durior aevi* (13.517) that awaits him in exile.[133] Now on the one hand the alignment of Rome's collective and Scipio's private future is precisely the teleological reading of Roman history the Sibyl advertised at the beginning of her prophecy (13.504: *iam tua deque tuis pendentia Dardana fatis*); however, the similarity between Rome's *ordo durus* and Scipio's *sors durior aevi* highlights a difference between the two passages. In the earlier passage, Scipio's response emblematizes his stoic resilience and individual moral excellence: no tears in the earlier passage, just an admirable proclamation that he will continue to live up to his own ethical code in the bad times as well as the good. That calm and tearless response contrasts with Scipio's tears here. I would submit that Scipio is realizing the limits of his "inward turn:" his pursuit of individual moral perfection is his and his alone. In the face of the collective turpitude which leads to civil war (*gloria culpae*), Scipio's ethical code (13.518: *culpa modo pectora cessent*) is rejected. Scipio cannot react with that unshakeable stoic determination here as his values have no import at this juncture in Roman history: he can offer little more than his tears.

---

[131] For van der Keur (2015) 465, "the lack of *amor patriae* of Caesar and Pompey is central to the passage, and this is what Scipio will weep for." Cf. Agri (2010) 49: "the future turns out not to be a Virgilian vision of greatness and the coming of the promised one…but a Lucanic one of worldwide violence and civil war. Scipio weeps at the harsh reality here revealed." Cf. van der Keur (2015) 456 n. 29 contra Kissel (1979) 184.

[132] Silius hints at this in two ways, one of which I explore above. We will also note that Scipio refers to the endangered Republic as the *Latiae res,* recalling Aeneas (in the *Punica* cf. only 7.16–18, lines which also liken present Roman danger to its exilic Trojan past, 7.16: *regna iterum labentia Troiae*): Rome's future in civil war is somehow connected to her past in exile, another inversion of the victorious exile motif we explored in another chapter. Cf. Littlewood (2017) *ad* Sil. 10.643–4: "As a way of indicating the ancient heritage which is at stake, Silius frequently accompanies allusion to Rome's near extinction by an allusion to her ancient ancestry: *regna…labentiae Troiae* (7.16), *regna Evandria* (18)…" The intratext is noted by van der Keur (2015) 466; cf. also Littlewood (2011) 42–3.

[133] Van der Keur (2015) *ad loc.* Cf. Reitz (1982) 133.

To be fair, that is a one-sided reading. As we shall see in the next chapter, Scipio's lamentation and tears are stemmed by the Sibyl's revelation of Hannibal's impending exile: by emphasizing what Scipio *can* do in defense of Rome (defeat Hannibal), Silius is setting up the narrative teleology of his poem. Insofar as Scipio will be able to defeat Hannibal, he will also metaphorically conquer the forces of Lucan's civil wars, as Marks has shown.[134] The only problem is that from the vantage point of historical hindsight, such as is enjoyed by the intra- and extradiegetic audiences in this passage, Silius and Hannibal are ultimately very similar in their shared fate of exile. That is an association which Silius usually tries to downplay in his epic (see the introduction to this chapter), but not so in this case.

It is telling that the Sibyl consoles Scipio by telling him of Hannibal's exile, for such a move activates a literary nexus of syncretic readings of the heroes,[135] most importantly Livy's account. It is hardly an accident that Scipio's tears, recalling his own exile and coming immediately before the revelation of Hannibal's, are elicited by the Sibyl's closing *sententia* that in civil war victors pay no smaller a price than winners (13.867: *nec leviora lues quam victus crimina, victor*). This almost certainly looks back to Livy's presentation of the shared exilic fates of Hannibal and Scipio (Liv. 38.50.7):[136]

> duas maximas orbis terrarum urbes ingratas uno prope tempore in principes inventas, Romam ingratiorem, si quidem victa Carthago victum Hannibalem in exilium expulisset, Roma victrix victorem Africanum expellat.
>
> The two greatest cities in the world were found at nearly the same time to have been ungrateful towards their leaders, but Rome all the more so seeing as

[134] Marks (2010) 149; cf. van der Keur (2015) 452–7. For more on the role of the *Punica* in inculcating the values of Flavian Rome, see Mezzanotte (2016).

[135] On the *synkrisis* of Hannibal and Scipio in the *Punica*, see especially Stocks (2014) 182–217; Voisin (2016) with further bibliography; cf. Rossi (2004).

[136] This is especially true if we follow Spaltenstein (1990) 279 claiming that "Sil. fait allusion à leur [i.e. Pompey's and Caesar's] mort identique: ils furent tous deux tués par le fer."

> Carthage in defeat had driven defeated Hannibal into exile, but Rome in victory would expel victorious Africanus.

The ultimately negligible difference between *victor* and *victus* drives the thought in these two passages. Granted, as Spaltenstein notes, the juxtaposition of *victor*/*victus* is common;[137] in such close proximity to Hannibal's exile, however, it seems likely that Silius had his eye on this passage. Scipio and Hannibal, for all of their differences (cf. our discussion of Scipio and Metellus), share the same fate and die in exile; what's more, Scipio's victories, both morally and militarily over Hannibal, put in relief all the more starkly the destruction which is brought about by Rome's abandonment of its champion and his values. Rossi's sentiment about Livy seems applicable here, as well:[138]

> "Celebration of Scipio's *res gestae* comes with a forewarning of the challenges that Rome will face. Livy's final farewell to Scipio—so puzzlingly ambivalent—acknowledges that victory over Hannibal has come with a price for Scipio and for Rome itself."

Perhaps Silius is not "so puzzlingly ambivalent" as Livy; perhaps the Scipionic notes he sounds the loudest are the laudatory ones.[139] Silius' Scipio can do no wrong—he is free of all *culpa*—and his *gloria* shows his ultimate devotion to the state. But is that (simply) the case, or is Claire Stocks on to something in her observation that Scipio's "joy [i.e. at the end of book 13] is founded in a future that is…ignominious for him[?]"[140] I hope in these pages to have proven that

---

[137] Spaltenstein (1990) 279, cf. 264 with further exempla in the *Punica* and elsewhere.

[138] Rossi (2004) 379. On Livy's ambivalent view of Scipio, see Chaplin (2010) 70–1 who observes that Livy, like Silius but to different purpose, draws a comparison between Scipio and Marius, Sulla, Pompey, and Caesar.

[139] Cf. Lovatt (2013) 67–8: "Scipio's katabisis, on the other hand, offers a more complex picture, which he sums up as *ordine duro...rebus Latiis* ('a harsh destiny for the Roman state,' 13.868–9); it roughly reverses the Virgilian Underworld by offering positive reconciliation, along with an Ennian vision of Homer, but finishing with a negative (and distinctly Lucanian) look to the future-present, displaying Marius, Sulla, Pompey, and Caesar as those to come."

[140] Stocks (2014) 187, with n. 17 also pointing to the unsettling effects of Liv. 38.56 on our reading of Scipio in the *Punica.*

in becoming a morally outstanding outsider, Scipio reveals the limits of moral self-perfection: Scipio's greatness is, by his exile, Rome's baseness. As Seidel shows in modern exile literature, exile resulting from "contingent political circumstances or self-imposed ideological ones" leaves the righteous outsider "claim[ing] to possess the values of his native place…he is the truer version of the place from which he is barred."[141] Or, in Publilius' more compact version of the same thought, *ubi innocens damnatur, pars patriae exulat*. The future-past-Rome revealed to Scipio is an alien place to him and to itself, and he—or rather his exile—helped make it that way: small wonder he cries when he sees it.

[141] Seidel (1986) 9. This corresponds to a type of Claassen's (1999) 155 "first person" mode of exilic discourse in which the exile is interested in "self-justification and further self-exculpation" and "attempt[s] to rewrite history, giving a new and possibly more heroic coloring to the erstwhile exile's deeds."

CHAPTER 3

NOWHERE TO GO: SILIUS' EXILED HANNIBAL

"It's evident that for governing Catalonia you have to be in Catalonia, you can't do that via WhatsApp or as a hologram. A person who is fleeing justice can't be the president."

Ines Arrimadas, leader of Catalonian anti-independece party discussing exiled separatist Carles Puigdemont to the AP.

Heading Home (?): Hannibal's Exile from Italy in Punica 17

In the final book of the *Punica*, an utterly defeated Hannibal is forced to retreat from Italy in order to defend Carthage from Scipio's impending attack. In a widely studied passage, Hannibal turns back to the Italian mainland and desires to go back, feeling as if he is leaving his home in exile (17.211–17):

> omnis in altum
> Sidonius visus converterat undique miles;
> ductor defixos Itala tellure tenebat
> intentus vultus, manantesque ora rigabant
> per tacitum lacrimae, et suspiria crebra ciebat,
> haud secus ac patriam pulsus dulcesque penates
> linqueret et tristes exul traheretur in oras.
>
> All around, every Sidonian soldier had turned his gaze to the deep; but the leader kept his eyes attentively fixed on the land of Italy, and his tears, dripping silently, moistened his face, and he was letting out constant sighs. Hardly otherwise would a man depart fatherland and sweet household gods and as an exile be dragged off to sad shores.

This is a curious way for Hannibal to react; his home is Carthage, so why should he be likened to an exile here? *Quellenforschung* gives us answers of a kind, but they are inevitably incomplete: the obvious parallel noted by Spaltenstein and many others is Liv. 30.20.7 describing the same scene (*raro quemquam alium patriam exilii causa relinquentem tam maeustum abisse ferunt*

quam Hannibalem hostium terra excedentem: "they say that hardly anyone else leaving his country in exile departed as sadly as Hannibal withdrawing from the enemy's land").[1] This is an incomplete answer not just because it elides Silius' aims in including the simile, but also because Livy's *ferunt* shows already the limitations of our source-criticism: that "Alexandrian footnote" suggests that Livy had his own sources here which Silius is (likely) consulting over our heads and in addition to Livy; the storm-scene in *Punica* 17, for example, may also look back to Coelius Antipater's depiction of a storm in Scipio's crossing to Africa.[2]

But for all its historical sourcing, this passage has still induced confusion. For Frances Mills, "the sense of exile, of leaving home, does not fit the character whose progress we have followed throughout the *Punica*."[3] In the strictest sense, such misgivings are valid enough: Hannibal is not, after all, an Italian. But Silius' (and indeed Livy's) choice to portray Hannibal as an exile has a number of explanations: psychologically, for example, it is not surprising that a man who spent the vast majority of his adult life in Europe and Italy should react painfully to his departure.[4] At the very least, Silius is not operating in a vacuum in this portrayal; intratextually, for instance, Scipio has already likened the Carthaginians fleeing from Spain to *exules* who are now paradoxically relegated to their ancestral lands (Sil. 16.290–1: [sc. *Libys*] *axe relicto* /

[1] E.g. Spaltenstein (1990) 460; the parallel is ubiquitously noted by those discussing the passage. Moore (2010) argues that phrases like *ferunt* offload the burden of, or even question the authority of his earlier sources (e.g. 157 on our passage: "Livy limits his own responsibility for his account of Hannibal's words and feelings as he leaves Italy with both *dicitur* and *ferunt*").

[2] So Burck (1978) 14–15, (1984b) 129; cf. Stocks (2014) 63 n. 26 following Hoyos (2003) 273 n. 7; see also Moore (2010) 146. For more on Silius' (possible) relationship with Coelius Antipater, see: Pomeroy (2010) 28, although cf. 30–1; Lucarini (2004). On the "Alexandrian footnote," see Hinds (1998) 1–2.

[3] Mills (2009) 53.

[4] Ahl, Davis, and Pomeroy (1986) 2517 note that Hannibal "has spent more of his life in Italy than in Carthage which he left at the age of nine." Cf. Mills (2009) 56 and Liv. 30.37.9. On Silius' use of Livy in the scene see Marks (2005) 59 n. 115 with Nicol (1936) 121; von Albrecht (1964) 131; Brouwers (1982) 83; Burck (1984) 125–8 and Spaltenstein (1990) 460.

Hesperio patrias exul lustraret harenas, "[the Libyan], after Hesperia is abandoned, looks on the shores of his *patria* as an exile"). Numerous intertextual models, furthermore, have been put forward to explain Silius' presentation of Hannibal: Lucan's Caesar in the storm during book 5,[5] or Pompey departing from Italy in book 3.[6] But the parallel for which I would like to argue in this section is Aeneas.[7]

Vergil's pious hero is not a curious model, nor Hannibal's a curious exile, in Silius' presentation of the Carthaginian retreat from Italy in book 17; rather, I will argue in the pages below that Hannibal's Italian identity and conflicting pull between family and personal ambition match perfectly his Vergilian model. I will then show that Silius is filtering Hannibal as an exiled "anti-Aeneas" through Ovid's similar self-presentation in the first book of his *Tristia*, with both serving as representations of Rome's imperial authority through their displacement. I then conclude with a reflection on what we mean when we call Hannibal an "anti-Aeneas," a tricky term as it is most often employed because it relies on the assumption of a particular focalization (Carthaginian) that we cannot simply assume for Hannibal.

Curiously, Aeneas' status as a model here has been asterisked in the scholarship;[8] to be sure, the description of the storm which blows Hannibal to Carthage has long been noted as indebted to Vergil's similar scene in *Aeneid* 1[9]—although I will argue below that Ovid's *Tristia*

---

[5] See Burck (1984b) 130; Fucecchi (2006) 325–7, 329; esp. Mills (2009) 56–60; Stocks (2014) 207 n. 54.

[6] See Currie (1958); Brouwers (1982) 83–4; Burck (1984b) 128 n. 62; Ahl, Davis, and Pomeroy (1986) 2516–17; Fucecchi (1990) 159–60, (2006) 328–9, (2019) 199–201; Marks (2010) 148.

[7] E.g. Burck (1978) 15–19, (1984b) 129–33; Spaltenstein (1990) 461–4; Marks (2003) 138–9, (2005) 59 n. 115; Villalba Álvarez (2004); Augoustakis (2010a) 152–3; Manolaraki (2010) 319–20; Stocks (2014) 61–4 cf. 203–7. Cf. also Hardie (1989) 19 n. 51; Fucecchi (1990) 159–60, (2006) 324–7.

[8] Especially Mills (2009); cf., e.g., Marks (2005) 59 n. 115 (emphasis mine): "The image of the exile *may* also recall Virgil's Aeneas." Cf., however, Marks (2003) 139: "If...Hannibal, abandoning Italy, reminds us of Aeneas, abandoning his beloved Troy, this is no coincidence."

[9] E.g. von Albrecht (1964) 176–7.

are filtering that influence. But one less-often noted parallel will help to show how deeply connected Aeneas and Hannibal are in this episode. After a speech in which Hannibal resolves to return to Carthage, Silius describes the Carthaginian's preparation of his fleet (Sil. 17.201–2):

> haec ubi detonuit, celsas e litore puppes
> propellit multumque gemens movet aequore classem.
>
> Once he thundered these words, he thrusts the lofty ships from the shore and groaning much moves the fleet on the open water.

Hannibal's emotional response, *multumque gemens*, is telling.[10] In the context of launching a fleet on an itinerary between Italy and Carthage, these lines almost certainly look back to Aeneas launching his fleet from North Africa with a similar emotional response (*Aen*. 4.393–8):

> at pius Aeneas, quamquam lenire dolentem
> solando cupit et dictis avertere curas,
> multa gemens magnoque animum labefactus amore
> iussa tamen divum exsequitur classemque revisit.
> tum vero Teucri incumbunt et litore celsas
> deducunt toto navis.
>
> But dutiful Aeneas, although he desires to lighten the grieving queen's heart by consoling her and to do away with her troubles with his words, groaning much and weakened of his resolve by his great love, nevertheless he follows the commands of the gods and returns to the fleet. And indeed at that point the Trojans cast off to sea and draw the lofty ships out of the whole shoreline.

The verbal parallels speak for themselves. Silius' *celsae puppes* in a Vergilian context (cf. esp. *Aen*. 8.680: *stans celsa in puppi*, "standing on the lofty deck") deserve further treatment below at the end of this section. *Multum gemens*, although on first glance an unremarkable phrase, is

[10] Fucecchi (1990) compares Verg. *G.* 3.226. Burck (1978) 16 and (1984b) 127 also notes the Livian source at 30.20.1–5 (esp. *frendens gemensque*). In Livy's version, however, Hannibal seems to have anticipated a retreat (*iam hoc ipsum praesagiens animo praeparaverat ante naves*, "already having sensed this very thing in his mind he had prepared his ships in advance"); Silius does not follow that move, instead highlighting Hannibal's emotional reaction to an unforeseen development.

actually quite rare, occurring only nine times (eight of which are epic, five Vergilian; this the only use in Silius).[11]

Hannibal's emotional distress is the result of the conflicting demands of state, family, and personal pride, just as Aeneas' devotion to Ascanius and divine will pulled him away from his personal attachment to Dido. Hannibal's intense gaze at the receding Italian mainland (Sil. 17.213–4: *Itala tellure tenebat / intentus vultus*),[12] reflects the locked gaze of his wife Imilce in book 3 (3.155: *haerent intenti vultus et litora servant*, "her earnest eyes keep looking to the shores").[13] But, as Fucecchi and Tipping have observed, it also recalls Aeneas' last, stolen glance at the burning pyre of Dido at the opening of *Aeneid* 5 (*Aen*. 5.3–4: *moenia respiciens, quae iam infelicis Elissae / conlucent flammis*, "looking back at the walls which already gleam with the flames of wretched Dido").[14] Much as Aeneas wished he could remain in Carthage by ignoring the demands of gods and family, Hannibal wishes he could erase the familial demands represented by Carthage and his wife; indeed, he wishes that he could relive books 4–5 of the *Aeneid*. Better, he says, if Dido were forgotten (17.224: *potius cecidisset nomen Elissae*) and

[11] Phaed. 5.7.10 is the only non-epic use. Vergil employs *multa gemens*, always in initial *sedes*, 5x (*G.* 3.226; *Aen.* 1.465, 4.395, 5.869 with Fratantuono and Smith (2015) *ad loc*, 12.886 with Tarrant (2012) *ad loc*.). In addition to Silius' one use, Statius also employs the phrase at *Th.* 2.635 (see Gervais (2017) *ad loc*.) and *Ach.* 1.686.

[12] Hannibal alone looks back to Italy, in distinction to his troops looking homeward (17.211–14). This in part recalls Lucan's Pompey and Hannibal himself earlier in the poem; see Telg genannt Kortmann (2018) 317 with nn. 450–1. More generally, however, it is further indication of the feelings of isolation which are a typical part of the rhetoric of exile; see Bhatt (2018) 223 citing Said (2001) 177: "Piso's isolated attack on the courts, while those around him urge him to stay, is tinged with a sense of the exilic ('a solitude experienced outside the group')."

[13] N.b. Augoustakis (2010a) 152: "for a moment we are invited to visualize their parting, focalized from the perspective of both husband and wife...before we see the parting through Imilce's own eyes...In book 17, therefore, the use of *intentus vultus* centers on Hannibal's isolation." Cf. Stocks (2014) 201 comparing 17.167–8 (*terraeque ulnis amplexus utrisque haerebat Latiae*, "embracing it with both his arms he was clinging to the Latian land") to 3.155 to similar effect. Fucecchi (1990) 163 and (2019) 199–200 compares Cornelia at Luc. 5.801 (*litoraque ipsa tenet*).

[14] Fucecchi (1990) 160 n. 23 and (2006) 328 n. 56 on Hannibal's remorseful backwards-glance to Italy: "E in effetti la situazione tenderebbe ad assimilarlo piuttosto all'Enea che si volge a rimirare per l'ultima volta le mura di Cartagine." Cf., to the same point, Tipping (2010a) 87.

Carthage were put to the same torches (17.223: *subdita taedis*; *viz.* the reversal of 6.712–13: *flagrantem effinges facibus, Carthago, Libyssis / Romam*, "You, Carthage, will show Rome burning with Libyan torches") which so deceived Hannibal's epic Carthaginian ancestor (viz. *Aen*. 4.338–9: *nec coniugis umquam / praetendi taedas*, "I never held out the marriage torches"; 504–5: *At regina, pyra penetrali in sede sub auras / erecta ingenti taedis atque ilice secta*, "But the queen, when in the depths of her palace under the open airs was erected a giant pyre with pine logs and felled oak...").[15]

If, as Mills suggests, it seems odd to view Hannibal as an Aeneas, as an exile from Italy only because of his mistaken identity, that is because we forget that Aeneas, like Hannibal, fights against divine will and identifies himself as something he is not. In *Aeneid* 4, Aeneas has put aside the demands of child and history in his love for Dido; indeed, the hero has temporarily replaced his Trojan/Roman identity with a Carthaginian one when we encounter him directing the construction of Carthage in Punic dress (*Aen*. 4.260–4: *Aenean fundantem arces*; *Tyrioque ardebat murice laena*, "…Aeneas constructing citadels, and his cloak was gleaming in Tyrian purple").[16] Compare the deep affiliation Hannibal feels for Rome; so deep, in fact, that he prays, Aeneas-like in the face of a divine storm, that he could have died like his brother Hasdrubal in the place he so hoped to destroy (Sil. 17.260–7):

> felix, o frater, divisque aequate cadendo,
> Hasdrubal! egregium fortis cui dextera in armis
> pugnanti peperit letum, et cui fata dedere
> Ausoniam extremo tellurem apprendere morsu.
> at mihi Cannarum campis, ubi Paulus, ubi illae

[15] For more on problematic fire-imagery in sexual and other contexts in *Punica* 17, see Marks (2005) 241. For more on the famously ambivalent *taedae* of *Aeneid* 4 as they were received elsewhere in Latin literature, cf. Ov. *Her*. 7.23–4 with Knox (1995) *ad loc.*

[16] Compare Stocks' (2014) 64 observation that "what emerges from these two speeches is an Aeneas who, despite his credentials as a proto-Roman, aligns his hopes and ambitions with Troy, and a Hannibal who sums up his life's goal in Roman terms; momentarily, he emerges as the more Roman of the two."

> egregiae occubuere animae, dimmittere vitam
> non licitum vel, cum ferrem in Capitolia flammas,
> Tarpeio Iovis ad manes descendere telo.
>
> Happy, my brother Hasdrubal, and equal to the gods in your falling! Happy you whose brave right hand won an excellent death fighting in arms, and whom fate granted to grasp the land of Ausonia in dying bite. But I was not allowed to lose my life on the fields of Cannae, where Paulus and where those excellent souls fell, nor when I bore flames to the Capitol was I allowed to descend to the shades on the Tarpeian bolt of Jupiter.

Now, the parallels with Aeneas' prayer in *Aen.* 1 are clear and well-studied. In part, that model dictates that Hannibal desire to have died in Rome as Aeneas wishes he could have died in Troy; and yet, in the context of book 17, Hannibal's desire to die—and presumably be buried—at Rome is telling. In the first place, this desire matches what Hannibal should feel as an exile from Italy. Where one is buried is a traditional concern of Roman exiles, as Cicero tells us (Cic. *Rab. Per.* 37 and *Mil.* 104);[17] it is also a strong political statement, as Scipio Africanus' purported tomb at Liternum (and pointedly not Rome) demonstrates in the accounts of Valerius Maximus and Livy,[18] or as suggested by Augustus' denial for Julia to be buried in his mausoleum.

Hannibal's desire to be buried in Rome in 17 plays on both his exilic fears and his imperial ambitions: *for him,* being buried in Rome symbolically represents his wish that he had conquered the city, that he had made it a "home" in which he could be buried. Indeed, Hannibal here regrets that he could not fulfill his brother Hasdrubal's dying wish at 15.803–5: "I charge him [i.e. Hannibal] as victor to burn the Capitol and to mix my bones and ashes with those of

[17] *Rab. Per.* 37 and esp. *ne patrio sepulcro privetur laborat* ("he works so that he might not be deprived of his ancestral place of burial"). Cf. *Mil.* 104: *huius vos animi monumenta retinebitis, corporis in Italia nullum sepulcrum esse patiemini* ("Will you retain the exempla of this mind? Will you allow there be no burial for this body in Italy?")? On both, see Kelly (2006) 102.

[18] Liv. 39.52.9: *voluntarium non sibimet ipse solum sed etiam funeri suo exilium indixit* ("he decreed not only for himself but also for his place of burial voluntary exile"); cf. Val. Max. 5.3.2b: *eiusque voluntarii exilii acerbitatem non tacitus ad inferos tulit, sepulcro suo inscribi iubendo* "INGRATA PATRIA, NE OSSA QUIDEM MEA HABES" ("He did not silently bear his bitterness over his voluntary exile to the shades, by bidding to be inscribed on his tombstone 'Thankless fatherland, you do not even have my bones.'").

Jupiter."[19] Both Hannibal and Hasdrubal recognize the symbolic power of burial, the body's final "home;" moreover, they both seem to feel as if their burial in Rome would be conducive to the Carthaginian imperial enterprise. They are wrong.

Antony Augoustakis has rightly argued that Hannibal's and Hasdrubal's desired burials fulfill the necessary conditions of Roman imperial domination promised by the deified Italian *Tellus* in book 15 (15.538–41):

> tum me scindat vagus Afer aratro,
> et Libys Ausoniis commendet semina sulcis,
> ni cuncta, exsultant quae laetis agmina campis,
> uno condiderim tumulo.
>
> Then would the wandering African cleave me with his plow and the Libyan entrust his seed to Ausonian furrows, unless I bury in one grave all those armies which now *exsultant* in my fertile fields.

As Augoustakis observes:

> "During the epic, Virgilian storm that follows and leads Hannibal back to his *patria*, in an Aeneas moment, the Carthaginian goes as far as to call his brother, Hasdrubal, *felix* for having died on the Italian *tellus*...It is as though Tellus' appearance effectively set in motion the curse she promises in book 15."[20]

Hannibal and Hasdrubal, in other words, believe that their burials would signify a Carthaginian victory over Rome; but their burial actually marks their assimilation and subjugation to the structures of Roman power. Roman *imperium* can never be theirs because they are outsiders to be dominated and subsumed. The goddess marks the Carthaginians not just as "other," but as exiles, outsiders who are doomed to fail in their threat to coopt Italy's productive powers: by synecdoche Hannibal and all the Carthaginians, even were they to achieve their aim of "cultivating" their empire at Rome, would still be exiled "wanderer[s]," *vagus*, inhabiting a place

[19] *mando Capitolia victor / exurat cinerique Iovis permisceat ossa / et cineres nostros*. On the connection between Hasdrubal's words here and Hannibal's prayer in 17, cf. Pomeroy (1989) 136 n. 29 and Stocks (2014) 177 n. 27. On Hasdrubal as a substitute for Hannibal in the epic, see Augoustakis (2003a) and Stocks (2014) 170–8.

[20] Augoustakis (2010a) 153.

where they will never belong. Note the subtle contrast in Tellus' counterfactual vision of Carthaginian power: *exsultant* suggests that even in his happy domination of Italy, Hannibal is still an *exsul,* an outsider.[21]

This is an *adynaton* in fine Augustan-age fashion: Rome's empire will fall as soon as the outsider becomes the insider, and we are led to believe that will never happen on Tellus' watch. Silius has adopted this idealized vision of empire from Vergil's first *Eclogue,* and especially *Ecl.* 1.64–78. The *adynaton*-laden promise of empire's golden age, according to Vergil's Tityrus and Silius' Tellus, is that Rome's imperial glory will not fade before her enemies inhabit places not their own (e.g. *Ecl.* 1.61–2: *ante pererratis amborum finibus exul / aut Ararim Parthus bibet aut Germania Tigrim*). The creation of imperial space and boundaries (*fines*) keeps people where they "belong" and maintains Rome as the center of a geographical and conceptual empire. An outsider like Hannibal, or the Parthians, or whoever you please cannot topple Rome so long as her imperial borders stand. But civil war might do the trick. For Meliboeus, the *impius miles* who won empire's promise out of *discordia* (*Ecl.* 1.70–2) is now displacing him from his own *patrii fines* (67) to Africa or some other corner of the world. For Meliboeus, the assimilative process of Roman colonization and imperialism leads to a redefinition of who belongs where: he laments that a *barbarus* (71), a newly enfranchised foreigner whom Meliboeus cannot effectively distinguish from Tityrus' Parthians and Germans, will reap his crops. Silius' intertext subtly hints at the same misgivings and recalls his gloomy vision of Rome's future at the end of book 10: maintaining Carthage as an outsider and opponent was, in a way, more conducive to empire than her subjugation will be. Tellus "buries" the distinction between outsider and insider, she gives a final resting place/home to her enemies. Imperial colonization idealizes itself as a process

[21] For wordplay with *exul* and *exsulto,* cf. St. *Th.* 11.515–17.

of burying the "otherness" of those assimilated, of making same out of other;[22] *mutatis mutandis*, civil war operates along the same conceptual fault-line.

To put this more simply, Hannibal's imperial ambitions, though they are futile, match his attempt at constructing a Roman identity for himself, and more importantly in echoing the imperial ideology of Rome's foundational epic hero, Aeneas. Hannibal, as Stocks has argued, is becoming "Romanized," taking on an identity not his own in the service of imperial ambitions which are, themselves, not his own; as she puts it, "[T]he Romanization of Silius' Hannibal [confirms] that Rome's literary canon has created a Hannibal that is essentially rooted in its own ideology."[23] In practice, Hannibal looks like he is trying to create a seat of empire in Rome just like Aeneas did, and he looks strangely Roman as he does so; consider, for instance, what he wishes he could have done in Italy before being forced to depart (17.189–91):

> eversam iam pridem exscindere Romam
> atque aequasse solo potui, traducere captam
> servitum gentem Latioque imponere leges.
>
> Now already I would have been able to burn up Rome overturned and level her with the ground, to conduct a captured race to slavery and to place laws on Latium.

Hannibal's hope for destruction is surely typical of his Carthaginian, and particularly Barcid, outlook throughout the poem, with the desire to *exscindere Romam* looking back to the words of Hamilcar in book 1 and Hasdrubal in book 15.[24] But his view on achieving empire, of "placing

[22] Compare my thought here to that of Rimell (2015) 39: "To say that Roman power lies open is to underline that it has eradicated difference, that it has no rivals and therefore no need for guards, precisely because those lands 'beyond' it have been utterly mastered...the renewed thrust towards undiscovered, mysterious and dangerous new margins is paired with a fetishization of 'safe' interior spaces at the heart of empire."

[23] Stocks (2014) 149.

[24] e.g. 1.115 (*ferro ignique sequar Rhoeteaque fata revolvam*, "I will pursue with fire and sword and revive the fate of Troy."). Cf. 15.803–4 (*mando Capitolia victor / exurat*). I owe the observation to Stocks (2014) 177 n. 27 and Burck (1982) 268.

laws on Latium" (*Latioque imponere leges*), is one of the constitutive elements in Augustan imperial ideology as revealed by Anchises to Aeneas in *Aen*. 6 (850–1): *tu regere imperio populos, Romane, memento...pacique imponere morem* ("You, Roman, remember to rule your peoples with empire…and to impose a custom for peace"). To be sure, Hannibal's omission of Anchises' hope for *pax* is a telling perversion, but the final hemistich of Sil. 17.191 is clearly evocative of Rome's presentation of her imperial purpose.

Silius is curiously linking Hannibal's displacement from Italy to Roman imperialism by using Aeneas as a model; that is a strange move because Aeneas' model of exile dictates that an outsider's *inclusion* in Italy is part of Rome's power. Hannibal, therefore, plays the role of an "anti-Aeneas," an outsider whose *exclusion* from Italy is necessary for Roman power. Before we come back to how and why Silius is making this move, we need to note that the poet is not the first to attach an "anti-Aeneas" figure to Roman power in this way. He is, in fact, following the example of Ovid in the first book of his *Tristia*.[25]

The second, third, and fourth poems of *Tristia* 1 form an internal unit within the book. Structurally, 1.2 and 1.4 form a frame around 1.3.[26] The former describe storms at sea suffered by the poet as he attempts to make his way to Tomis; both are deeply indebted to the traditional storm-scenes of epic,[27] even down to (the decidedly un-warlike) Ovid's parodic remark that he would gladly die in battle at *Trist*. 1.2.53–4 (cf., e.g., *Aen*. 1.94–101). The frame is thus linked to the centerpiece of the unit, *Trist*. 1.3, in which Ovid explicitly compares the night of his

[25] Burck (1984b) 129 mentions Ovid's "Fahrt nach Tomis" as a possible comparandum but does not investigate any points of contact.

[26] On *Tr*. 1.2 and the structure of *Tr*. 1, see Ingleheart (2006) 73–4 and, on the frame of 1.2–4, 78–9.

[27] For a list of correspondences between Ovid's storm-poems in *Tristia* 1 and the epic (and broader literary) tradition, see Huskey (2002) 89–90 n. 7 with bibliography and particularly: Kröner (1970) esp. 391–4, 397–403; Griffin (1985); Bate (2004); Ingleheart (2006) 74–80. On the shared language between the storm scenes in *Tristia* 1, see Evans (1983) 35–6 with 185 n. 28.

departure from Rome to Aeneas' from Troy (*Trist*. 1.3.26: *haec facies Troiae, cum caperetur, erat*, "This is what Troy looked like when it was captured.").[28] More than parody, Bate has emphasized that the storms of the *Tristia*'s first book pit the "epic possibilities of the narratives" against the "prioritization of elegiac *topoi*" and thus act "as a powerful symbolic expression of the anxious mental states of the leading characters."[29] Silius, we shall see, utilized his storm-scene in a similar way.

A number of verbal and thematic parallels suggest that Silius had his eye on these poems. We first sense the *Tristia*'s influence in Silius' preference for the adjective *tristis* in the episode; while common in the *Punica* (used in nearly 70 instances), the word is used only three times in book 17, and only in this episode (17.176: *triste profatu*; 216: *tristes exul traheretur in oras*; 275: *miserandum et triste*).[30] While we can hardly know for certain the title under which the *Tristia* circulated in antiquity, Ovid himself uses *tristis* to allude to the collection as a whole (e.g. *Pont*. 1.1.16: *non minus hoc illo triste, quod ante dedi*, "this is no less sad than that work which I gave you previously");[31] we might also note that Silius' contemporary Statius also appears to tag one of his allusions to Ovid's exilic corpus by using the noun *tristitia*.[32]

---

[28] On the importance of the association, see Kenney (1965) 47 n. 1 and Huskey (2002), esp. 92 on the structural elements of *Tr.* 1.2–3.

[29] Bate (2004) 309.

[30] Villalba Álvarez (2004) 376 rightly compares 17.275 (*miserandum et triste*) to *Aen*. 1.111 (*miserabile visu*), although cf. *Trist*. 1.2.51 (*nec letum timeo; genus est miserabile leti*).

[31] On this point, see Helzle (2003) and Gaertner (2005) *ad Pont*. 1.1.16; cf. Schröder (1999) 87–8.

[32] *Theb*. 2.191–2, 194–5: *nondum laeta Venus, tamen omnis corde resedit / tristitia adfixique animo cessere dolores...amicam / puppis humum*, "Not yet have we experienced happy Venus, although all the sadness in our heart has come to a rest and the pains pierced to our soul have gone away…[than if a] ship [battered by the headlong Notus should spy] friendly land."). Cf. *Pont*. 1.3.79–80: *venit ad Adrastum Tydeus Calydone fugatus / et Teucrum Veneri grata recepit humus* ("After Tydeus was exiled from Calydon he came to the court of Adrastus and the land pleasing to Venus welcomed Teucer.").

One-to-one verbal parallels, however, are not particularly common.[33] The closest is a formulaic description of Hannibal's storm-tossed ship and the introduction to Hannibal's prayer (Sil. 17.255–9):

> ecce intorta Noto veniensque a puppe procella
> antemnae immugit (stridorque immite rudentum
> sibilat) ac simile monti nigrante profundo
> ductoris frangit super ora trementia fluctum.
> exclamat volvens oculos caeloque fretoque...
>
> But look! A gale spun up by the South wind and coming from the rear bellows into the yardarm, the shriek of the rigging hisses shrilly, and from the dark depths breaks a mountain-like wave over the trembling leader's face. Rolling his eyes between sky and sea he cries out...

The phrase *stridor rudentum* echoes a similar collocation in the first book of the *Tristia*. The rigging lets out a similar sound at *Trist*. 1.4.9–10 (*pinea texta sonant pulsu, stridore rudentes, / ingemit*), with Silius replacing the "groan" of Ovid's scene with the striking compound *immugit*. Nevertheless, such a formulaic element of the epic storm-scene, which is also paralleled at *Aen.* 1.87 (*insequitur clamorque virum stridorque rudentum*),[34] suggests a common source rather than an Ovidian allusion. Nevertheless, the image of the waves breaking over the trembling mouth of Hannibal, *ductoris frangit super ora trementia fluctum,* as he begins to make his prayer is not paralleled in the *Aeneid* or Caesar in *Bellum Civile* 5.[35] This image finds a closer parallel in Ovid's repeated use of it throughout his corpus (see note below): compare Hannibal's head

[33] Cf. Wilson (2004) 226 (Silius "prefers to signal the intertextual connection by alternative means, in particular, by coincidence of situation and detail rather than wording.") and Bruère (1959) 239 ("Silius tends not to repeat Ovid's words and phrases literally.").

[34] The verbal parallel is noted by Marks (2003) 139 and Villalba Álvarez (2004) 373.

[35] Fucecchi (2019) 200 views this episode as a "Caesarian moment."

buried in water as he is about to pray with Ovid's, upon whom the wave crashes after he prays (*Trist*. 1.2.33–6, 105–7):[36]

> scilicet occidimus, nec spes est ulla salutis,
> dumque loquor, vultus obruit unda meos.
> opprimet hanc animam fluctus, frustraque precanti
> ore necaturas accipiemus aquas.
>
> We are surely dead, nor is there any hope for safety. And as I speak, the wave overwhelms my face. The wave is going to overwhelm my soul, and I am going to take into my mouth praying in vain the water that is going to kill me.
>
> si fuit hic animus nobis, ita parcite divi!
> si minus, alta cadens obruat unda caput!
> fallor, an incipiunt gravidae vanescere nubes[?]
>
> If this was my intent, then spare me, gods! If not, let a wave falling from on high overwhelm my head! Am I wrong, or are the heavy clouds starting to clear[?]

This parallel is all the more attractive given the implications of both passages. Ovid pins his hopes for survival on the fact that only by living, not dying, will he reveal the full force of Caesar's punishment (e.g. *Trist*. 1.2.89–90: *iussae me advertite terrae: / suplicii pars est in regione mei*, "direct me towards the preordained land: part of my punishment is in its placement."). In a similar way, Silius allows Hannibal to live only by the divine intervention of Venus; he also must survive to be subjugated by a Roman authority figure, to be defeated by Scipio at Zama (Sil. 17.286–9).[37] Both men's lives symbolize the divinely sanctioned authority of Roman imperial dominance.

Of course, Ovid realizes that by praying to live through the storm he is effectively praying to reach Tomis, a place which he paradoxically should not wish to go (*Trist*. 1.2.83–4:

---

[36] Cf. also *Tr*. 1.2.14: *ipsa graves spargunt ora loquentis aquae* with Luck (1967) *ad loc*. noting the parallel Ov. *Ars* 2.92 (*clauserunt virides ora loquentis aquae*). Cf. also *Met.* 11.568 with Griffin (1997) *ad loc*. pointing to Prop. 3.7.56 (*cum moribunda niger clauderet ora liquor*); with *Tr*. 1.2.36, cf. Ov. *Am*. 2.16.26 (*fundit et effusas ore receptat aquas*).

[37] So, e.g., Hardie (1993) 13 on the *Punica.*

obligor, ut tangam laevi fera litora Ponti; / *quodque sit a patria tam fuga tarda, queror*, "I am bound to touch the savage shores of unpropitious Pontus; I am complaining about the fact that my exile from my fatherland is so slow."). The poet draws attention to the absurdity of his request (*Trist*. 1.2.81: *quis credere possit*?), and his emotions waver between leaving and staying in Italy against Caesar's wishes (*Trist*. 1.4.23: *timeo pariter cupioque repelli*). As Bate suggested above, Ovid's elegiac mental anguish is revealed by the "epic possibilities" of the winds as they frequently blow towards forbidden Italy (e.g. *Tr*. 1.2.92–3: *Ausonios fines cur mea vela volunt*? / *noluit hoc Caesar: quid, quem fugat ille, tenetis*? "Why do my sails wish for the borders of Ausonia? Caesar has forbidden this! Why do you tend towards the place which that man exiled me from?" cf. *Tr*. 1.4.18–22). The variability of the winds matches the conflicted feelings Ovid is expressing towards his own displacement at *Tr*. 1.4.23, allowing the poet's internal feelings to play out in the weighty imagery of the epic storm. There is, furthermore, an irony of reversal with Ovid playing an anti-Aeneas, being forced away from the *Ausonii fines* (cf. Sil. 17.222–3: *finibus...Ausoniae*) to which Aeneas was fated to return. But Ovid is still an exile playing a role similar to Aeneas vis-à-vis Roman *imperium*; Augustus' denial (*Tr*. 1.2.93: *noluit hoc Caesar*) of Italy to exiled Ovid is just as important (so the poet would have us believe)[38] to the emperor's projection of power in the public sphere as is his promulgation of Aeneas' divinely sanctioned exile to the same place in his artistic and cultural program. If Augustus thinks (Ovid's) exile is a

[38] Studies on Ovid's exilic corpus frequently note how the poet fashions himself as a necessary conduit of imperial authority from the periphery; see recently Pandey (2018) 215–39 and cf. Rimell (2015) 284 and Habinek (1998) 151–69, esp. 151: "Ovid's career, or, more precisely, the turn it took with his relegation to Tomis, is both a sorry consequence of Roman imperialism and an enabling condition of its continuation." I sympathize with those who express grave misgivings of some of the stances Habinek takes, e.g. Davis (2002): Habinek largely elides Ovid's presentation of the importance of the native Tomitans in the creation of Roman imperial ideology as it was actualized outside the center. For a remedy to this last point, see Pandey (2018) 215–39 as well.

necessary part of his display of imperial authority, then the poet cheekily suggests that he is coopting the emperor's earlier claim to power.[39]

Our understanding of Hannibal makes a good deal more sense when we compare him to Ovid. For instance, consider Hannibal's dream of his forced departure from Italy (Sil. 17.161–9), one of those rare instances when we can glimpse into the epic hero's mind; we would do well to recall here Richard Bruere's observation that when Silius embellishes his historical sources, he regularly turns to Ovid.[40] As Claire Stocks has argued,[41] Hannibal's visions of his previous victories over Flaminius, Gracchus, Paulus, and Cannae's dead only underpin his looming defeat as he is forced to flee Italy, *Itala depellere terra*, by the ghost-like visions, *umbrarum exercitus*, of those he previously conquered (161–5). The anxiety of his mind results in a paradoxical dream-state in which Hannibal both desires to flee and not to flee (Sil. 17.166–9):

> ipse fugam cupiens notas evadere ad Alpes
> quaerebat terraeque ulnis amplexus utrisque
> haerebat Latiae, donec vis saeva profundo
> truderet et rapidis daret asportare procellis.
>
> He himself, eager to flee, was trying to escape to the Alps he knows well, and he was clinging in an embrace to the land of Italy with both arms until a wild force thrust him to the deep and gave him to swift gales to deport.

Silius is up to something; this dream is nowhere attested in the historiographical tradition, and instead seems to be a structural parallel with the dream Hannibal had before crossing the Alps; as Eleni Manolaraki notes, Silius is probably exploiting Livy's suggestion at 30.20.5 that Hannibal

[39] On Ovid's often subversive relationship with imperial authority in the exilic poems, see, e.g. Gaertner (2005) 9–16; Claassen (2008) 29–41.

[40] Bruere (1959) 228. For more on Ovid's influence on Silius, see: more broadly focused, Bruere (1958); Wilson (2004), whose fourth category described 229–30 perfectly describes the intertextual relationship I note here ("a scene or episode that does not appear to have been principally inspired by Ovid...will nevertheless echo a passage or passages from Ovid with which it has some situational affinity"). On specific episodes, see: Marks (2013) with bibliography at 289 n. 8 and McIntyre (2019) on the Anna episode of book 8; von Albrecht (1999) 301–16 on the Claudia Quinta episode of book 17.

[41] See Stocks (2014) 201–2; cf. Marks (2005) 58–9 and Augoustakis (2010a)

had anticipated his forced departure from Italy (*iam hoc ipsum praesagiens*).[42] Introducing the dream-sequence gives the poet the opportunity to investigate Hannibal's mental state at this critical juncture.

In part, Hannibal's conflicting desires between fleeing, *fugam cupiens,* and remaining in Italy, *haerebat Latiae*, reverses the general's swift and decisive qualities earlier in the epic.[43] Just as importantly, it reveals the Carthaginian's turbulent state of mind: part of him knows that he does not belong in Italy, but he clings to his mistakenly-adopted homeland nonetheless. But the elegiac overtones of Hannibal's loving embrace of Italy,[44] which we noted look back to Imilice's clinging glance in book 3, also suggestively recall Ovid's wife embracing him as he departs Rome (*Tr.* 1.3.79: *tum vero coniunx umeris abeuntis inhaerens*); indeed, Fucecchi has already noted that lines 167–8 are "di probabile ascendenza ovidiana."[45] Both Ovid and Hannibal are anti-Aeneases, moving away from the Italy promised to their Trojan model, both like Aeneas feeling conflicting pulls between family and the homeland denied to them.[46] Both, more importantly, are exiles like Aeneas, whose displacement is a way of explaining Roman imperial authority.

[42] The latter is well-attested; see Stocks (2014) 14–5 with bibliography at n. 5 for analysis of Silius' use of sources, and cf. Manolaraki (2010) 319–20 with bibliography at n. 82 for sources, esp. Burck (1984b) 124–5, and an analysis of the connection between the two dreams.

[43] So Fucecchi (1990) 162 and Marks (2005) 59.

[44] This also looks back to Pompey's affectionate relationship with Rome in Lucan; see Fucecchi (2006) 328–9 with n. 57.

[45] Fucecchi (1990) 162–3 with n. 28, though not citing our intertext. Fucecchi (2019) 200 also notes that Silius' language is "endowed with elegiac connotations."

[46] On Aeneas' similarly wavering dedication to his future in Italy in *Aeneid* 2 and 3, see Fletcher (2014) 27: "Aeneas is not immediately ready to abandon his Trojan identity and become something else...the lack of certainty of direction mirrors a lack of certainty on Aeneas' part."

The mental anguish of Hannibal's dream manifests itself both symbolically (168–9: *vis saeva, procellis*) and physically in his waking reality (236–91) as a storm.[47] Just so, Hannibal's indecision between fleeing and clinging to Italy in his dream prefigures his attempt to return to Italy after setting out (17.236). Hannibal's emotional turmoil in the dream and his indecision about leaving Italy, I would suggest, looks back to Ovid's misgivings over leaving Italy in *Tr.* 1.2 and 1.4. Just as Hannibal "desires to flee," *fugam cupiens,* but ultimately clings to Italy in his mind (Sil. 17.166–7), so too Ovid "equally fear[s] and desire[s] to be pushed away" from his homeland (*Tr.* 1.4.23: *timeo pariter cupioque repelli*). Just as the chaotic winds of the storm symbolize in epic imagery Ovid's elegiac concerns, so too Hannibal's emotionally turbulent relationship with Italy in his dreams foretells the turbulence of the formulaic storm which pushes him away. Just as Hannibal wonders whether he was "in his right mind" to ever leave Italy (Sil. 17.221–3: *mentisne ego compos et hoc nunc / indignus reditu, qui memet finibus umquam / amorim*[48] *Ausoniae*? "Am I really of sound mind and now unworthy of this return? Me?! Who never removed myself from the borders of Italy? cf. 225 *compos*), so too Ovid calls attention to the absurdity of his request to depart (*Tr.* 1.2.81: *quis credere possit*?).

It seems, then, that Silius is constructing his Hannibal as a kind of "anti-Aeneas" along the lines of Ovid's similar self-presentation in the first book of the *Tristia*. But I would like to conclude by asking what, precisely, we mean when we use that term.[49] Typically scholars use the

[47] The connection between the storm in the dream and the following storm in reality is well-noted; see: von Albrecht (1964) 126; Burck (1984b) 124; Fucecchi (1990) 162.

[48] The observation of Fucecchi (2006) 329 n. 58 that "la rarissima forma sincopata *amorim*...possa celare un'allusione al tema 'pompeiano' dell'*amor Ausoniae*" is, to my mind, correct, although I believe that the wordplay makes an elegiac model all the more attractive; cf. for instance *Tr.* 1.3.49: *quid facerem? blando patriae retinebar amore*, "What was I to do? I was being held back by fond love of my fatherland").

[49] The criticism of one past scholar, while certainly not charitable or indicative of the current state of affairs in Silian studies, points to the type of argumentation to avoid; see Barnes (2000) 289–90: "an allusion to the *Aeneid* implies only a comparison between the acquisition of the empire and the foundation of the people. But elements of an anti-

term “anti-Aeneas” to point to the ways in which Hannibal fails to enact a Carthaginian version of Aeneas’ exploits. Consider, for example, von Albrecht’s analysis of one intertext near the end of book 17; in this, a defeated Hannibal bitterly promises that his resistance to Rome will outlive his subjugated fatherland’s (Sil. 17.610–12):

> nec deinde relinquo
> securam te, Roma, mei, patriaeque superstes
> ad spes armorum vivam tibi.
>
> Nor from now on do I leave you, Rome, safe from me, and as the survivor of my homeland I will live on in the hope of taking up arms against you.

As von Albrecht has argued,[50] Silius has adopted the collocation of *patriae superstes* from Horace (*Saec*. 41–4):

> cui per ardentem sine fraude Troiam
> castus Aeneas patriae superstes
> liberum munivit iter, daturus
> plura relictis.
>
> To whom [i.e. the Trojans] holy Aeneas, the survivor of his homeland, paved the way to freedom [following Rudd] through burning Troy without deceit, destined to give them more than was left behind.

Van der Keur, following von Albrecht, argues that “Hannibal is like Aeneas, but without a future.”[51] The Carthaginian general does not promise *daturus plura relictis* for his compatriots like Aeneas does. Further suggesting his role as an anti-Aeneas, Silius’ use of Horace here underlines the difference between Aeneas’ honesty (*sine fraude*) and Hannibal’s Orientalizing

---

Aeneid (as it is likely enough to be called) have been discovered.” Barnes then reads reversal and decline synonymously into Silius’ Vergilian allusions. At the very least, this obfuscates Vergil’s own “comparison between the acquisition of the empire and the foundation of the people.”

[50] Von Albrecht (1964) 177.

[51] Van der Keur (2015) 454 n. 14. For more on this intertext and a cogent discussion of the passage, see Roumpou (2019) *ad loc*.

deception throughout the poem[52]—this is, however, an ironic difference given that Aeneas and the Trojans are constantly fighting against the same Orientalizing stereotypes in Vergil's epic.[53] This assumes, of course, that we should focalize Hannibal's imperial goals from the view of a Carthaginian, a seemingly obvious interpretative move given the circumstances: he does not want to leave Rome *secura*. There are two problems with this approach. One is that it removes Hannibal's creative potential and makes him a spent force; as numerous scholars have observed, the very fact that Hannibal is such a vital part of Silius' vision argues against this.[54]

The second problem corresponds to Hannibal's characterization. Is a straight-forward Carthaginian focalization so obviously fitting for Hannibal? It should be clear from our reading of book 17 that my answer is "no." Hannibal's imperial aims were never clearly aligned with Carthage's, and he is constantly undermining or questioning his affiliation with his home-city (cf. 17.185–6: *secum ipse volutans / an tanti Carthago foret*, "wondering to himself whether Carthage is worth so much"). Hannibal, in fact, has always taken a peculiarly Roman outlook on power, has always viewed empire from a Roman focalization by prizing the city as the necessary ingredient of his imperial ambitions and as his home. As Antony Augoustakis has cogently argued, in Hannibal "we observe a complex process whereby the other strives to find its identity by becoming assimilated."[55]

[52] See especially Keith (2010) 363; cf. Thomas (2001); Augoustakis (2010a) 92 n. 1 with bibliography; Stocks (2014) *passim* with index s.v. "Hannibal, cunning (and trickery of)."

[53] See recently Rimell (2015) 42–3.

[54] See, for example, Tipping (2010a) 104: "Hannibal's pictorial presence in Scipio's triumphal parade meta-poetically mirrors and challenges Silius' epicization of Roman history." Cf. Roumpou (2019) 194–5.

[55] Augoustakis (2010a) 95.

If we understand Hannibal as an anti-Aeneas in the traditional sense, we gloss over the importance of his "assimilation" to the Roman center.[56] Hannibal, in fact, does share in common with Aeneas the promise to "give more," *daturus plura*, but from a Roman focalization which he himself does not necessarily comprehend. When, for instance, Hannibal echoes Anchises in his desire to "impose laws on Latium" as we observed above (17.191: *Latioque imponere leges*, cf. *Aen*. 6.851: *pacique imponere morem*), he does not comprehend the way in which he is necessary to Anchises' prophecy of empire: as Burck notes, he is the *superbus*, the object of empire who must be defeated and/or assimilated, *parcere subiectis et debellare superbos* (*Aen*. 6.853).[57] Similarly, when Hannibal launches his "lofty ships" from Italy, he seems to view himself as a divinely-sanctioned Jupiter-figure "thundering" his orders (17.201: *haec ubi detonuit, celsas e litore puppes*).[58] The arresting *detonuit*, a hapax for Silius, draws our attention to the lofty formula *celsae puppes*. Hannibal, I think, is portraying himself as an Augustus crushing a foreign invader at the battle of Actium, represented on Aeneas' shield *stans celsa in puppi* (*Aen*. 8.680). Again, Silius is not highlighting Hannibal's failure to effect that model of imperialism, but rather his integral role in that process. Hannibal *is* a part of that scene in *Aeneid* 8, but, true to Keith's

[56] I would prefer to avoid the type of conclusion reached by Ahl, Davis, and Pomeroy (1986) 2516: "As Aeneas' arrival in Carthage is but a prelude to his conquest of Italy, Hannibal's return to Carthage marks not only the failure of his attempt to take Rome, but an end to Carthaginian power. After that, Hannibal will, like Aeneas after the fall of Troy, become an exile…Thus Hannibal ends his career where Aeneas began his. And as he departs, something of Aeneas and the *Aeneid* goes with him." Cf. Hardie (1997) 162 that "Hannibal's pretensions to be an Aeneas have been undermined." Much better is Ahl, Davis, and Pomeroy (1986) 2517–18: "Rome, not Carthage, defines the extent of his [i.e. Hannibal's] greatness, just as he, by the same token, defines the greatness of Rome." It is no coincidence, to my mind, that the same mistake has been made in the interpretation of Ovid's self-presentation as an anti-Aeneas, e.g. Huskey (2002) 104: "In *Tristia* 1.3, Ovid's allusions draw only upon Aeneas' experience of exile and loss, not on his subsequent successes in Italy and the fulfillment of a divine plan for the future of the Roman race."

[57] See Burck (1984b) 126–7 n. 56 who comments on Anchises' prophecy of the "Begabung und Berufung der Römer zur Ordnung der Welt…die Hannibal in einer Art spiegelbildlicher Verkehrung mit seiner *superbia* sich anmasst." On Silius' vision of Anchises' prophecy, cf. Pomeroy (2016) 330.

[58] On *detonuit*, a *hapax* in Silius, see Burck (1984b) 127 with n. 59; Spaltenstein (1990) 459; Stocks (2014) 203.

Orientalism-based reading of the poem, he is feminized, a Cleopatra in flight whose punishment represents Roman dominance (cf. Hor. *Carm.* 1.37).[59] Or, to put it in terms more aligned with the traditional interpretation of this passage, Hannibal's confidence is belied by his own self-presentation; as he launches with many "lofty ships," he does not realize that he is destined to be a Pompey-like exile fleeing on a lone ship into exile from his actual home (Sil. 13.881: *una profugus...puppe*; cf. Luc. 8.258: *parva puppe fugit*).[60] And yet it is probably Aeneases all the way down: Naevius has the Trojan hero himself flee Troy on a lone ship as well (Serv. *A.* 1.170: *novam tamen rem Naevius bello Punico dicit, unam navem habuisse Aeneam, quam Mercurius fecerit*, "Nevertheless, Naevius in his *Punic War* has the odd account that Aeneas had one ship, which Mercury made.").[61]

Ovid and Hannibal, in other words, are (anti-)Aeneases not because they necessarily fail at accomplishing what Aeneas does, but rather because they play a critical role in the creation of Roman empire from its edges in exile (rather than from its center after exile). Had Silius not portrayed Hannibal as an exilic Aeneas-figure in book 17, this message would be lost.[62] As things are, Silius makes Hannibal the clearest crystallization of the process of Roman imperialism, the assimilation of what was once "other" to what is the "self," a process which the exiled Aeneas and Ovid both mediate, albeit with different exilic trajectories. As we shall see in

[59] On Hannibal's feminized otherness in 17, see Augoustakis (2010a) 142 and especially Keith (2010) 372 analyzing Hannibal through the lens of Orientalism. On Hannibal and Cleopatra in book 13—see next note—see Pomeroy (2016) 334–5 also on Silius' use of Aeneas' shield more broadly; van der Keur (2015) 456 n. 28, 471.

[60] The latter intertext is noted by van der Keur (2015) 454 and *ad loc.*; Fucecchi (1990) 165–6.

[61] One could, I suppose, render Servius' comment to mean that Aeneas had one (out of many ships) that just happened to be built by Mercury, but I find that hard to believe; this comment has been elicited during Servius' discussion of the *number* of ships that survive the storm in *Aeneid* 1.

[62] Compare Augoustakis (2010a) 155: "Tellus becomes the catalyst in motivating Nero to defeat Hasrubal, Hannibal's brother, a second Hannibal himself, as the Magna Mater will set in motion the expulsion of Hannibal from Italian terrain in the last book, as we shall see. Both goddesses embody two faces of the same coin, however, the same and the other, the Roman and the non-Roman, and their ultimate conflation is the only route to success."

the next section, Hannibal is not only presenting that vision in this book, but indeed throughout the *Punica*. Hannibal has always constructed Rome as his "home," a place to which he wishes to "return." His failure to do so, indeed his removal not just from his adopted home but also from the whole world, *vagus exul in orbe / errabit toto* (Sil. 2.701–2), shows the ways in which Hannibal's exile is an integral part of the creation of Roman *imperium*.

Roaming Home

In the previous section, we observed that Hannibal's identity is not just markedly Roman, but also that that Romanness is filtered through Aeneas *profugus*. In this section, I would like to expand on that reading and argue that there is in a broader expanse of the *Punica* than is traditionally realized a bifurcation of identity for the Carthaginians vis-à-vis Aeneas, that is, a Carthaginian identity which is polyvalent in the same ways that Aeneas' Trojan/Roman identity is. Just as we observed in an earlier chapter that exile on its own is a dangerous model for the Romans, I will argue here and in the following section that, as homeless exiles, the Carthaginians come to represent the spatial expanses of Roman empire in a way that Silius' Romans cannot. In a peculiar way, it is the Carthaginians, rather than the Romans, who inherit the affiliation between exile and empire in Silius' epic.

When Seneca in exile reflects on what it really means to be "Roman," he encounters what is now a well-studied paradox.[63] Rome's empire demands two contradictory things: Romans moving away from the center to conquer the periphery and non-Romans moving to the center. For Seneca, this is an equation which leaves the center "Roman" in name alone (*Helv*. 6.3):

[63] See most recently Edwards (2018) and especially Rimell (2015). On the natural bifurcation of Roman identity in the late Republic and Early Empire, see also Fletcher (2014) 1–12 with further bibliography, esp. Sherwin-White (1973) 57–8 and Feldherr (1997) 138–43.

videbis maiorem partem esse quae relictis sedibus suis venerit in maximam quidem ac pulcherrimam urbem, non tamen suam ("you will see that the greater portion is the one which, after abandoning their own spaces, has come to a city, while indeed the greatest and fairest, is nevertheless not their own"). Seneca, and indeed the scholarship more broadly, prizes a Rome-centric narrative that leans on Seneca's *non tamen suam*: there is a part of Rome immutably "Roman" no matter its demography.[64]

That is a tough ideological move, but a plausible and defensible one: when Seneca goes into exile (or the Romans go on campaign), they are living up to a part of their identity founded in wandering and exile. What is more fundamentally Roman than not being in Rome (Sen. *Helv*. 7.7: *Romanum imperium nempe auctorem exulem respicit*, "To be sure, Rome's empire looks back to an exile as its founder")? Rome still belongs to Romans even at the periphery.

When we bring this thinking to bear on recent trends in studies of Silius, we see something similar. Antony Augoustakis, for instance, argues that a fundamental part of Silius' imperial vision is Hannibal's assimilation to Rome, his metaphorical "immigration" to Rome mirrored by other similar immigrations throughout the poem (Anna in book 8, Cybele in book 17). But especially for Hannibal, Augoustakis reads Romanness along the lines of Seneca's *non tamen suam*; observe how Augoustakis describes Hannibal's affinity for Rome and disconnect from his *patria* (emphasis added):[65]

> Hannibal becomes lost in an asymbolia, as he finds himself in a new country and makes the ultimate mistake of substituting his own *patria*, Carthage, with another *patria*, Italy (whether in Rome or in Capua)...He ties himself to the Italian *tellus*, a

[64] To be sure, with a rapidly diversifying elite class at the end of the first century, there is room to nuance what "Roman" means; with Statius calling a Severus from North Africa *Italus* (*Silv*. 4.5.46: *externa non mens: Italus, Italus*), there is in some quarters a move to hybridize thinking like Seneca's. That is a poem and topic which, I think, deserves further study.

[65] Augoustakis (2010a) 95.

> hostile ground, a hostile mother-earth, that eventually discharges him as an abject: Hannibal in the end is the misplaced foreigner...
>
> At the same time, however, we observe a complex process whereby the other strives to find its identity by becoming assimilated, while the same, the center of action, displays a remarkable scarcity of potential leaders...Such collapse of Roman identity is situated also outside the center...and create[s] an ambience of alienation.

There is, to my mind, a critical difference between being a "misplaced foreigner" and a displaced one. To be clear, I agree with most of Augoustakis' conclusions, but I do not think he goes far enough in his claim that Silius is portraying a process of imperial assimilation. Hannibal's is not a "mistaken identity." Silius' vision of empire, rather, rests on a bifurcation of identity, a natural fluidity that allows a people's identity to be associated with a place other than where they were born. This is nothing novel: Roman identity, as Seneca observed, always relied on "an ambience of alienation." If I understand Augoustakis correctly, my chief issue with his interpretation is in the *absolute* marginalization of the periphery qua periphery, the inhabiting of which space marks one as an "abject," a negative foil of the positive effects of integration symbolized by, say, Claudia Quinta (that is to say, the privileging of a centripetal periphery rather than a centrifugal one, we might say).[66] But is it necessarily true that the periphery becomes profitable only through its incorporation at the center? Is belonging, in other words, a binary, an either-or?

In a recent article examining exile in the *Annales,* Shreyaa Bhatt has brought to bear on Tacitus some modern criticism on displacement which questions a central tenet of Said's

[66] See, for instance, Augoustakis (2010a) 239 (emphasis added): Silius presents us with an ideal fusion, whereby the female presence activates those mechanisms conducive to the resolution of the conflict—male and female, same and other collapse into one, collaborative group, as Claudia Quinta hauls the vessel of the foreign goddess into the City and thus displaces Hannibal from the Italian *tellus* towards the margins of the poem and, in a way, of history itself."

understanding of exile. Namely, Bhatt points out that one can be exiled from a place other than the land of their birth:

> Said is a key thinker on imperialist binaries, in particular, the imperialist dialectic of Self-Other which is grounded in the privileging of one home/homeland (and the identity grounded therein) over another. Yet if the imperial center becomes the place of exile and "home" the imperial periphery (the space of exile), then the relationship between self and polity and between Roman and "other" is problematized.[67]

Bhatt is arguing from (and ultimately against) a Rome-centric point of view: her reading of Tacitus' Vibius Serenus in *Ann.* 4, begging to be "returned into exile"[68] from the city of his birth shows the possibilities of decentering *imperium Romanum* from Rome.[69] We have already seen Silius doing something like that with Scipio's exile in book 13, but in his larger project he is much more interested in a corollary; the bifurcated identity of Rome's imperial subjects—think Hannibal's "exile" from Italy in book 17—defines Rome's imperial centrality. By buttressing Hannibal's connection to Italy and Rome throughout the epic, Silius can then make Hannibal's displacement from his "home"—that is *both* Italy and, beyond epic's end, Carthage—a marker for the proleptic (in Silius' narrative-time) spatial expanse of Roman empire. Hannibal, and indeed many of his Carthaginian compatriots, must take on complex identities to fit into Silius' vision of Roman dominance.[70]

To say that Hannibal's identity is "misplaced" glosses over how crucial a part of the Roman imperial project such bifurcation is. Writ large, we might consider the importance of

---

[67] Bhatt (2018) 229–30.

[68] *Ann.* 4.28.3: *vocare deos ut sibi quidem redderent exilium ubi procul tali more ageret*.

[69] This bifurcation of identity has been part of a Roman identity for some time; a rather famous example comes at the beginning of *De Legibus* 2 (2.2), where Atticus is amazed that Cicero *cum Roma absis usquam potius esse.*

[70] I hasten to add that, in my view, the *Punica* is asking who ultimately "belongs" at Rome and what that process of belonging looks like. It is an irony not lost on Silius that his foil-heroes of Scipio and Hannibal both end up displaced from Rome. In many ways, Rome is just as good at creating non-belong-ers as her ancestor Troy was.

Scipio's title, Africanus. But more concretely in Silius' text, consider Scipio's words at Sil. 16.288–91:

> quando ita caelicolum nobis propensa voluntas
> annuit, extremo Libys ut deiectus ab orbe
> aut his occideret campis aut axe relicto
> Hesperio patrias exul lustraret harenas…
>
> Since the will of the gods nods so heavily disposed towards us that the Carthaginians have been thrown out from the edge of the world or lie dead on these fields or have abandoned the Hesperian region of the world and wander as exiles on the shores of their fatherland…

Silius is doing a lot with a little in these lines. The language of exile—*extremus orbis, deiectus, relicto, exul,* to name a few—is ubiquitous but multifaceted in its paradoxes. Consider, for example, the phrase *deiectus ab orbe extremo*. Geographically, we are placed at the western edge of the world, the land of Hercules' Pillars; even here, Rome holds absolute authority with the ability to remove anyone it wants, *deiectus*. And yet, *extremus orbis* is a stereotypical destination of (particularly Ovidian) exile; but it is curiously the place *from* which these Carthaginian *exules* are removed.[71] The world's *extrema* had always been a place for undesirables, and we will recall here that Metellus, plotting *extrema* for his homeland in book 10 (10.429: *Latioque extrema coquebant*), desired to change ethereal landscape (10.419: *mutato...caelo,* cf. *axe relicto*) and go past the world's *extrema* to a different world altogether (10.423: *alio...in orbe*).[72] In that earlier book, Metellus could dream of a world beyond Rome's portion of it, to a land not under the influence of Rome's *fata*; however, such a conceptualization of non-Roman space is not possible in this case. Not only is the "edge of the world" no longer a space fit for exiles, the very idea of

[71] See esp. Gaertner (2005) *ad Pont.* 1.7.5 (*ecquis in extremo positus iacet orbe tuorum*, "Is there any friend of the world situated and lying at the edge of the world...") noting comparanda at *Tr.* 3.3.13; 4.9.9; and *Pont.* 1.3.49. On this last, Helzle (2003) points to Tr. 1.1.127–8; 3.1.50, 3.3; 5.2.31, 5.4; *Pont.* 2.7.66; 3.3.40.

[72] On the use of *orbis* to denote only a part of the world, a denotation minted in the Augustan age, see the cogent analysis of Lucan's geographies by Pogorzelski (2011) 157–67.

"home" becomes a problem. The juxtaposition of home, *patria,* and exile, *exul*, in line 291 represents in part the fundamental uprootedness incurred by displacement. But there is a paradox here: the Carthaginians are exiled *from* Spain (*extremus orbis*) *to* their *patria.* This confounds the traditional formula of exile≠home. Center and periphery both have a claim to being a "home," which is both a profitable expression of imperial power (colonization) and a destabilizing conflation of the traditional imperializing dialectic of center-vs.-periphery, between proper placement and misplacement.

Silius has his finger on one of the fundamental problems with that traditional, imperialistic understanding of exile vis-à-vis identity, namely that it is inextricably linked to the land of one's birth, the *pater* part of *patria*. For Silius, it is a profitable part of Rome's legacy that *patria* is wherever the city's dominant power structure (Rome, the gods underlying her imperial dominion, etc.) says it is. That is why Scipio emphasizes the word *Hesperius* by enjambment. This is not merely a geonym for Spain,[73] but rather that vaguely specific "West" promised to Aeneas and his descendants by Creusa (*Aen.* 2.780–2):

> longa tibi exilia et vastum maris aequor arandum,
> et terram Hesperiam venies, ubi Lydius arva
> inter opima virum leni fluit agmine Thybris.
>
> Long will be the times of your exile and vast the expanse of sea you must plow, and you will come to a vesperal land, where the Lydian Thybris flows with its gentle current through fields rich of men.

In Vergil's depiction of empire without clearly defined borders (*sine fine*), Aeneas' confusion of precisely what "Hesperia" means serves to etiologically connect the Trojans/Romans to the future domains of their empire. As Fletcher most recently observes, Creusa's use of the adjectival *Hesperia* is an intentionally vague notion pointing generally to the west—although

[73] Spaltenstein (1990) 416 gets the general point.

many have noted that line 781 technically designates an "impossible site,"[74] with both western (*Hesperia*) and eastern (*Lydius*) geonyms. There are solutions to the paradox (*Lydius*=Etruscan),[75] but to my mind Vergil is instead leaning into the oxymoron. From a teleological view, Rome's claim to both the East and the West in empire (the very point of the Aeneas myth in Augustan ideology and iconography[76]) is condensed into one, paradoxical line. Empire and its justifying teleology cannot point to anywhere specifically except towards its outer edges (e.g. *Hesperia*) since its place must be everywhere; but, when it lacks even limiting boundaries (*imperium sine fine*, cf. Silius' *deiectus ab orbe extremo*), empire inhabits no specific place, only ever-expanding directions on a map—the dream of empire and the nightmare of exile. Thus, the very lack of certainty which marks the other prophecies especially in books 2 and 3 (e.g. Anchises' interpretation of Crete as the Trojans' intended home, see following section) of the *Aeneid* comes to make a lot of sense: each prophecy gets Aeneas precisely nowhere (the conundrum of the "impossible site"), but by his wandering he traces out future sites of Roman *imperium*. The power of Aeneas' exile, to put this simply, is that it reifies empire's dichotomy: by belonging nowhere specifically, one putatively can create belonging anywhere and everywhere.

Silius is capitalizing on this paradoxical view of Hesperia and Roman imperialism. Having reached and gained mastery over the once purposefully vague Hesperia—the world's

[74] I adopt the term from Dougherty (1993) 45 and the thought from the items cited in the following note; cf. most importantly the cogent analysis of Horsfall (1989) 11–12 arguing that Vergil linked this oracular language to similar language in the oracles of Greek colonization stories.

[75] On the meaningful paradoxes of Creusa's prophecy, see Khan (2001); on this topic in the Italy-prophecies of *Aeneid* 1–6 more broadly, see Fletcher (2014), esp. 68–76 on this passage. Kyriakidis (2014) 268–9 with bibliography for more on the learned allusions in *Thybris* and *Lydius*, although he is more skeptical of the lasting impact of Creusa's words on Aeneas, although cf. Khan's anticipation of such arguments.

[76] See most recently the superb overview of Ascanius' Orientalizing depiction put to imperialistic aims in Augustan art and architecture by Schneider (2012), esp. 96–111 ("at Sperlonga, Iulus Ascanius is portrayed here in an ambiguous double role. As an Asian he is Augustus' obedient servant; but as a Trojan he is Rome's next of Eastern kin").

western edge—the only way to imagine the inexorable expansion of empire is to move beyond the world's edges. To accomplish this, Scipio thrusts the paradoxical homelessness which Hesperia once reified and rectified for the Trojans/Romans onto the Carthaginians; and we should remember that Hannibal himself had wished to (re)inflict this very punishment on the Romans, presenting the Scipiones as *profugi* at the edge of the world in Spain when his own power was still ascendant in book 7 (ll. 107–9: *pulsi Ausonia non ante paventem / dimisere fugam quam terror ad ultima mundi / Oceanumque tulit. profugus nunc errat uterque*, "They did not cease from their fearful flight befor their terror had broght them all the way to the edges of the world and the ocean. Now both of them wander, exiles..."). [77] But now these Carthaginian enemies belong nowhere: they inhabit a new "impossible site" placed beyond even the world's edge, rendered exiles even in their own *patria* (*patrias exul lustraret harenas*). I suppose that we could point to this as an example of Augoustakis' demonstration of Hannibalic asymbolia (and profitably so, I hasten to add, if I understand Augoustakis correctly), [78] or as an example of Elena Giusti's conceptualization of Carthage as a "heterotopia" in Vergil's *Aeneid*. [79] But does that not at least under-interpret the very real way in which non-belonging and belonging, center and periphery are fundamentally and inextricably linked in the Roman imperial imagination?

This process of pushing enemies out of even the edges of the world operates in a complementary fashion to a process identified in Lucan's epic by Randall Pogorzelski. He argues that Lucan redefines what *orbis Romanus* means by displacing Rome from its centrality (e.g. Luc. 1.58: *orbe tene medio*), limiting its scope, and bounding it to the east by Parthia; Pompey's

[77] On these lines, see Marks (2005) 225; Tipping (2010a) 65; Littlewood (2011) 75–6.

[78] On Hannibalic asymbolia, see Augoustakis (2010a) 24, 95.

[79] Giusti (2018) 201: Carthage "functions—and will continue to function, at least in its western reception—as a Foucauldian 'heterotopia' or 'other space,' a space which exists in reality but is only defined in terms of what is not, not yet, no longer." Cf. Giusti (2017).

attempt to flee beyond the edge of the *orbis Romanus* to Parthia's Eastern world (8.289: *agite Eoum, comites, properemus in orbem*; cf. Metellus in *Punica* 10) reveals that Caesar is master of a world fractured in more than one way. In Lucan, the dream of worldwide empire is confined to Alexander, who had he lived longer would have extended his sway beyond the world's western and northern edges (10.39–40: *isset in occasus mundi devexa secutus / ambissetque polos Nilumque a fonte bibisset*).[80] Silius uses the Carthaginians as Alexander-like figures who themselves trace out the expanse of Roman empire by being forced beyond the world's edge against their will. This might not be *imperium sine fine*, but *exilium sine fine* inflicted on the right people will also do the trick.

But we must note that in order for Silius to pull this off, he must attach the Carthaginians to a place, Hesperia, which is not theirs by birth. This looks a good deal like Hannibal in book 17 expressing an attachment to Italy just as he is "exiled" from it. Similarly here, by referring to Hesperia vis-à-vis exile, the Carthaginians, instead of the Romans, take on a complementary aspect of the Aeneas-myth, i.e. displacement and wandering. Aeneas' "connection" to Hesperia is born out of his disconnection with his own home; since we have already explored how disconnection from Rome is problematic for the Romans collectively and Scipio personally, that equation for empire has to be placed on the shoulders of the Carthaginians. The Carthaginians' "connection" to Hesperia, like Aeneas', also means their disconnection from their own *patria*.

What I would like to suggest in the rest of this chapter is that Silius consistently maps out Roman empire by where the Carthaginians, and specifically Hannibal, do not belong. Hannibal's exile, I argue, sketches out the periphery of Rome's empire. I begin by arguing that Silius has always suggested that Hannibal considers Rome his "home," setting up the city as the center of even Carthage's imperial ambitions. To be clear, it has long been noted that reaching the

[80] Pogorzelski (2011) 166 connects this to Nero's failed geographic expedition in search of the Nile's source.

physical place of Rome, and especially her *moenia,* is a central motif in the *Punica,* and particularly its first 12 books.[81] Moreover, as I observed in the previous pages, Hannibal's Roman virtues and his Romanization are also well noted.[82] We should observe, however, that Hannibal's fascination with the physical place of Rome throughout the epic makes what is ostensibly a hostile city into a city he desires to inhabit; that is, throughout the *Punica,* and not just in the simile of book 17 examined above, Hannibal treats Rome as his home. It is, however, a home with which he is aligned only so that he can be displaced from it: Hannibal's association with Rome is constantly highlighted as one of displacement rather than misplacement.

Hannibal reveals a deep desire to inhabit the physical place of Rome, to make it his resting place. Consider, for example, Hannibal's words to his young son at *Punica* 3.80–86:

> hoc pignus belli, coniunx, servare labora.
> cumque datum fari, duc per cunabula nostra;
> tangat Elissaeas palmis puerilibus aras
> et cineri iuret patrio Laurentia bella.
> inde ubi flore novo pubescent firmior aetas,
> emicet in Martem et calcato foedere victor
> in Capitolina tumulum mihi vindicet arce.
>
> My wife, endeavor to keep safe this pledge for war. And when he can talk, lead him through my own *cunabula*: let him touch Dido's altars with his young hands, and let him swear Laurentian wars on his ancestral ashes. And then when in fresh bloom his stronger age begins to grow, let him leap up to war and as a victor, with peace treaty trampled, win for me a tomb on the Capitoline citadel.

Traditionally, this passage is interpreted via its intratextual associations with Hannibal's oath at the temple of Dido in book 1 (1.104–19); just as Hannibal had sworn vengeance on Italy in the case of his own father's failure to topple Rome, so too does Hannibal render his own son a *pignus belli* to follow in his own footsteps. This intratext is secure and the associations of the two

[81] On the theme of Rome's *moenia* in the poem, see especially von Albrecht (1964) 24–46 and most recently the fine discussion of Telg genannt Kortmann (2018) 74–6 with bibliography. As Marks (2017) 282 notes, beginning in book 13, the emphasis shifts from Rome's walls to those of her enemies.

[82] In addition to the bibliography above, compare recently Stocks (2014) 75–9, cf. Tipping (2010a) 63–9.

passages are well-noted.[83] But another intratextual reference should give us pause. Namely, at lines 85–6 Hannibal expresses his wish, perhaps for a cenotaph as Augoustakis and Littlewood suggest, for a *tumulus* on the Capitoline in a way that looks forward to his brother Hasdrubal's similar wish at the end of book 15 (15.802–5). In that later book, Hasdrubal hopes that his brother will come to the Capitoline as a *vindex* (15.802: *vindex*, cf. 3.86: *vindicet*) and victor (15.803: *Capitolia victor*, cf. 3.85–6: *victor...Capitolina*) to bury his ashes along with Jupiter's.[84] In both passages, the prospect of burial, of having a final resting place in Rome, is tantamount to Carthaginian imperial victory. In part, both of these passages also intertextually recall other poetic representations of barbarians inhabiting Rome's citadel. The victorious trampling (3.85: *calcato...victor*) of the *Punica*, for instance, intertextually recalls Horace's vision of a Rome fallen to civil war[85] and subject to foreign occupation at *Ep.* 16.11–12 (*barbarus heu cineres insistet victor et Urbem / eques sonante verberabit ungula*). Rome has a curious property of always being a center, the desirable place for a victorious power (Roman or otherwise) to inhabit.

As I have already suggested, Hasdrubal's hopes for burial in Rome suggest a process of assimilation, of a bifurcation of identity in which he hopes to belong at Rome, and we can see a similar process here. Silius is suggesting that Hannibal wants to belong not only at Carthage, but also at Rome. Consider, for example, Hannibal's appellation of Carthage as *nostra cunabula*. For

[83] See, for example, Spaltenstein (1986) 187 in general and especially Augoustakis and Littlewood (forthcoming) *ad loc.* for detailed verbal parallels. For this scene's deep intertextual relationship with Vergil, Homer, and others, see Augoustakis and Littlewood (forthcoming); Bernstein (2010) 380–1 with bibliography at n. 15; Augoustakis (2008); Vessey (1982); Burck (1984b) 104–5; Fucecchi (2019) 196–8.

[84] Spaltenstein (1986) briefly notes that "les vers 85 sq. rappellent les vers 15.803 sqq." For a slightly fuller discussion of the intratext, see Burck (1984b) 104–5, who reads the scenes in the further intertextual context of *Aeneid* 12.

[85] Silius seems to have civil war on his mind in this passage as suggested by his allusion to Luc. 5.659–60 at 3.78–9 as noted by Spaltenstein (1986) and Augoustakis and Littlewood (forthcoming) *ad loc.*

Augoustakis and Littlewood, *cunabula* is a stand-in for *patria* (cf. OLD s.v. 2; TLL 4.0.1389.2–9 citing our passage),[86] and in most senses I sympathize with this interpretation. But the word almost certainly carries with it here its primary sense of the crib, which allows for and even suggests a distinction between where one is born and where one ends up belonging and/or dies. Augoustakis' and Littlewood's suggested intertext of Statius' *cunabula magni Herculis* (*Th.* 7.601) actually argues for this: one of the crucial elements of Hercules' myth is that he breaks boundaries and does not end up where he started.[87] Indeed, for the exiled Hannibal, *cunabula* and *patria* also exist in an overdetermined relationship. That is to say, whenever Hannibal refers to Carthage as his home in the *Punica*, we are alerted to the ways in which that identity is not a simple one immune to negotiation (see 17.185–6: *secum ipse volutans / an tanti Carthago foret*). Here with *cunabula*, we are reminded that where Hannibal ends up is just as important as where he began. In his mind, Hannibal emphasizes this distinction by linking the conceptual opposites of the *cunabula* and the *tumulus*; we know, however, that Hannibal will ultimately have no resting place.

Partially because of Hannibal's impending exile, I think that Silius has another passage in mind here (*Aen.* 3.104–5):

> Creta Iovis magni medio iacet insula ponto,
> mons Idaeus ubi et gentis cunabula nostrae.
>
> Great Jupiter's island Crete lies in the midst of the sea, where also is the Idaean mountain and the birthplace of our race.

Here we find Anchises' misinterpretation of Apollo's exhortation for the Trojans to seek out their *antiqua mater*. Silius' allusion rests in part on the collocation of *cunabula* with the adjective

[86] See Augoustakis and Littlewood (forthcoming) *ad loc.*

[87] Statius' line, incidentally, shares the Vergilian model of *Aen.* 3.104–5(*Creta Iovis magni...cunabula* ≈ *Th.* 7.601) which I note here for Silius.

nostra, a phenomenon unique to these two passages and inhabiting the same metrical *sedes*. *Punica* 3, moreover, signposts its connections to *Aeneid* 3 from its very first word by beginning with *postquam*;[88] we are encouraged to read these two books, admittedly quite distinct in their narratives, against one another.

For Anchises, this is simply a mistake: he misidentifies where his people's *cunabula* are.[89] In Hannibal's case, however, we are witnessing a negotiation of identity, a realization that the *cunabula* are a place that, like Crete for Anchises, may not be of primary importance for his sense of identity. The *cunabula* is his birth-land, but it may well not be the land where he dies; we should not forget, after all, that Hannibal's prayer for his son is based on a future where he dies in war (Sil. 3.79).

But here we come to a central problem. In the putative future Hannibal is constructing, where is he envisioning his own burial? Clearly, his *cunabula* is Carthage, but the desired *tumulus* in Rome at line 86 suggests that Hannibal does not envision a burial in Carthage. Granted, it is perhaps likely that Hannibal thinks only of a cenotaph at line 86, but are we to assume that he foresees and desires interment for his remains in his home city?[90] Some, I suppose, would say that he does and point to *patrio cineri* in line 83. But Spaltenstein is surely correct in his observation that "le datif *cineri* 83 dit le bénéficiaire du serment, non son

[88] The allusion is also noted by Spaltenstein (1986) and Augoustakis and Littlewood (forthcoming) *ad loc*. Also noting the allusion, Heyworth and Morwood (2017) *ad Aen.* 3.1–5 note that Ennius (see Sk. fr. 137) also seems to have placed *postquam* at the beginning of *Annales* 3. For more on Ennius and Silius, see Bettini (1977); Manuwald (2007); Pomeroy (2010) 29 with further bibliography at n. 6; Van der Keur (2014).

[89] Heyworth and Morwood (2017) *ad loc*: "the key word of Anchises' misinterpretation: a cradle is not a mother." For more on the episode, see especially Fletcher (2014) 105–6 citing also the fine discussion of Quint (1982) 31.

[90] On the symbolic power of the cenotaph in the *Punica*, see Augoustakis (2010a) 131 with n. 100; Augoustakis and Littlewood (forthcoming) *ad* Sil. 3.86.

garant…et ne suppose pas que ces cendres seront présentes."[91] Indeed, it would be odd that Hannibal should suppose that he die in battle (as line 79 suggests) and expect that his remains somehow be referred to Carthage; since he dutifully buries his own enemies throughout the epic Hannibal is surely aware that his remains will not return home in defeat. For Augoustakis, Hannibal's growing interest throughout the poem in burying his dead enemies operates not only to blur the lines between friend and foe, but also to emblematize the Carthaginian general's fears of his own future:[92]

> [A]s the poem progresses, Hannibal becomes more and more attentive to cremation and burial as an expression of respect but also as a signal of a deep anxiety concerning his own, uncertain *casus*.

I agree, but I would supplement this interpretation. As we can see in book 3, Hannibal's gives voice to his concern about the place of his own burial from the start of the poem. And it is telling that in his language in book 3, the Carthaginian general already displays an uncertainty of where he belongs.

If *patrio cineri* carries no locative expectations, then the Roman *tumulus* of 86 becomes doubly significant. Already, Hannibal is associating a desire not to be buried in his homeland but in a subjugated Rome; the bifurcation of his identity, the slippage between Carthaginian *cunabula* and Roman *tumulus* suggests already that Hannibal feels a connection to the physical space of Rome. The telling juxtaposition of *patrio Laurentia* in line 83 only further underscores

[91] Spaltenstein (1986) 188.

[92] Augoustakis (2017) 315; cf. 304 on the blurring of "the distinction between Roman and non-Roman, friend and foe, civilized and uncivilized…in the *Punica*" through Hannibal's dutiful burial of foreign soldiers and generals.

this point: there is a hereditary obsession in the Barcids not so much with Carthage (which we might otherwise imagine to be a *patria* for Hannibal), but with Italy.[93]

Just as important as the physical space of Rome, however, is the physical place of Hannibal's *tumulus*. We have already seen in an earlier chapter how important Rome's *locus* is in the *Punica* (e.g. Camillus' exemplum at 7.562–3) for empire, but here we see that Hannibal's *locus* is also of paramount importance to the power-politics of the epic. The placement of Hannibal's tomb in Rome is imagined in these lines as a vindicatory action of an imperially resurgent Carthage; and yet, especially in light of the end of book 2 where Silius dwells on Hannibal's exile, readers of the *Punica* are all too aware that the site of Hannibal's burial is a problematic thing. Indeed, it is problematic in a way even beyond what Hannibal can imagine in the non-locative phrase *patrio cineri*; instead, I would suggest, Silius is here alluding to a strand of the Hannibal-tradition in which the Carthaginian general is deceived over the place of his future burial.

Early in book 3, Hannibal sends an envoi by the name of Bostar to the oracle of Jupiter Hammon in order to seek an omen on the future outcome of the war (3.12–13). The description of the oracle emphasizes the legacy of the spatial and literary *locus*: it is endowed with *prisca fides* that has been "preserved from a distant time" (3.8: *prisca fides adytis longo servatur ab aevo*).[94] The storied past of the place signposts Silius' densely allusive handling of this episode: Lucan's Cato and Caesar and the Alexander tradition have all been noted as particularly important exemplars in the scholarship.[95] It is important to note that Bostar's journey to the

[93] It is no coincidence that Augoustakis (2008) 65 notices similar forces at work on the identity of Hannibal's wife Imilce: "she is both Roman and non-Roman, a civilized figure and a foreign bacchante, an insider and at the same time an outsider."

[94] On the metaliterary importance of the line, see Augoustakis and Littlewood (forthcoming) *ad loc*.

[95] See Augoustakis and Littlewood (forthcoming); Stürner (2015) is a fine resource, if at times polemic.

oracle and the delivery of the response act as a kind of frame within the book, providing contextual background for our episode. Recently, Stürner has argued that in his oracle-episode, Silius alludes to one version preserved mostly in our Greek sources on the placement of Hannibal's burial; Pausanias leaves the fullest account (Paus. 8.11.11):[96]

> Ἀννίβᾳ γὰρ χρησμὸς ἀφίκετο παρὰ Ἄμμωνος ὡς ἀποθανὼν γῇ καλυφθήσεται τῇ Λιβύσσῃ. ὁ μὲν δὴ ἤλπιζεν ἀρχήν τε τὴν Ῥωμαίων καθαιρήσειν καὶ οἴκαδε ἐς τὴν Λιβύην ἐπανελθὼν τελευτήσειν γήρᾳ τὸν βίον. Φλαμινίου δὲ τοῦ Ῥωμαίου ποιουμένου σπουδὴν ἑλεῖν ζῶντα αὐτόν, ἀφικόμενος παρὰ Προυσίαν ἱκέτης καὶ ἀπωσθεὶς ὑπ᾽ αὐτοῦ ἀνεπήδα τε ἐπὶ τὸν ἵππον καὶ γυμνωθέντος τοῦ ξίφους τιτρώσκεται τὸν δάκτυλον. προελθόντι δέ οἱ στάδια οὐ πολλὰ πυρετός τε ἀπὸ τοῦ τραύματος καὶ ἡ τελευτὴ τριταίῳ συνέβη· τὸ δὲ χωρίον ἔνθα ἀπέθανε καλοῦσιν οἱ Νικομηδεῖς Λίβυσσαν.
>
> For an oracular response came to Hannibal from Ammon that he would die and be buried in the Libyan earth. And so he hoped to destroy the reign of the Romans and to come back home to Libya and end his life in old age. But as the Roman Flaminius was eager to take him still living, after Hannibal came as a suppliant to the court of Prusias and was expelled by him, he leapt up on his horse; but he took a wound to his finger from his bared sword. He contracted a fever from the wound having traveled only a few stades and met his end on the third day: and the Nicomedians call the place where he died Libyssa.

As we can see, an allusion to the placement of Hannibal's *tumulus* in an oracular context is an established part of the tradition. To be sure, there are clear differences between Pausanias' account and our own, but one of those differences inhabits the same ideological fault-line in both Silius' and Pausanias' account. For Silius, Hannibal's wish for a *tumulus* in Rome encodes his hope for future Carthaginian success in the war (3.86: *tumulum mihi vindicet*). Pausanias' Hannibal similarly (mis-)interprets his "Libyan" burial as a promise of victory and future Carthaginian empire (ἤλπιζεν ἀρχήν τε τὴν Ῥωμαίων καθαιρήσειν). The placement of Hannibal's grave, in other words, is an important element of the construction of power in both texts. There is one critical difference, however, since for Pausanias' Hannibal οἴκαδε points in one specific direction; Carthage is still a "center" for Carthaginian power in this account. Silius' Hannibal,

[96] For other versions of this story, see Plut. *Flam.* 20.6 and App. *Syr*. 2.11.

however, has a conflicted identity, a desire to distinguish between the place of his *cunabula* and the place of his *tumulus*; Rome is furthermore the spatial guarantor of *imperium* even for the Carthaginians.

We might note that Hannibal's constructed future in lines 78–86 in fact anticipate the Carthaginian's desire later in the poem, after failing to take Rome, to return to the city. For instance, when Hannibal is forced to retreat from Rome in book 12, he departs with a backward glance (12.729: *respectans abit*) and "threatens that he will return" (12.730: *remeaturumque minatur*). His desire to "return" to Rome looks back in book 12 to the moment when the Carthaginian attack on Rome is doomed to failure, for the only other use of the verb *remeare* in book 12 describes Jupiter returning to see Hannibal threatening Rome (12.605–8):[97]

> Iuppiter Aethiopum remeans tellure minantem
> Romuleo Poenum ut vidit succedere vallo,
> Caelicolis raptim excitis defendere tecta
> Dardana et in septem discurrere iusserat arces.
>
> As soon as Jupiter returned from the land of the Ethiopians and saw the Carthaginian threatening an advance all the way to the Romulean walls, immediately he had bid the gods called forth to defend the Dardanian homes and to branch out over the Seven Hills.

The combination of *remeare* and *minare* in both passages suggests their comparison, although on first glance it is an odd coupling. At 605 Jupiter returns victoriously to ward off Hannibal, while the Carthaginian general is later left hurling threats of his own theomachic return.[98] The connection makes a good deal more sense, however, if we recall Hannibal's exhortation to his troops as he plotted an advance on Rome's *muri* (12.514–15: *muris…Iliacis*; cf.

[97] Although it is worth noting along with Telg genannt Kortmann (2018) 318 that *remeare* is particularly common in Silius. While Telg gennant Kortmann connects these two passages, he does not note the combination of *minare* and *remeare*.

[98] On Hannibal as a theomach in this episode, see especially Chaudhiri (2014) 243–51; Stocks (2014) 74–5; Muecke (2007); Marks (2005) 195 with bibliography at n.84. On the importance of theomachy in Domitianic ideology, see Rebeggiani (2018) 246–7.

Romuleo…vallo). In his speech, Hannibal reveals his desire to "exile" Jupiter from the Capitoline (12.517: *demigrantem Tarpeia sede Tonantem*),[99] a similar desire to the one Hannibal expressed in his rage at Liternum in book 6 (6.713: [sc. *effinges*] *deiectum Tarpeia rupe Tonantem*).

In this constellation of passages, we see a negotiation of power centered on who inhabits and who is exiled from the Capitoline. Silius balances Hannibal's desire to "exile" Jupiter from the Capitoline with the god's victorious return at line 605; we might notice that, insofar as Jupiter's return reminds us of the triumphal *reditus*, Hannibal's wish to see Jupiter *demigrans* at 517 ironically looks forward to his own *imago fugiens* (17.644) in the *reditus* of Scipio the *proles Tarpei Tonantis* (17.654, cf. 12.517: *Tarpeia…Tonantem*).[100] At book's end, we learn that it is Hannibal himself who will be repulsed from Rome by Jupiter, forced to look back regretfully (12.729: *respectans*) at a city he can only hope to return to; it is as if Hannibal is already in this book an exile, anticipating the wistful backwards-glance he will give Italy when he is exiled in book 17 and left wondering if he is worthy of returning (17.213, 221–2: *mentisne ego compos et hoc nunc / indignus reditu*, "am I out of my mind and now unworthy of this return?").[101]

Hannibal's exile from Rome is like that of the Carthaginians from Spain in book 17: in both cases, Silius expresses Roman imperial authority by highlighting where her enemies are not allowed to inhabit. In neither case is Spain or Rome the birthplace, perhaps we might say the

[99] So also Telg gennant Kortmann (2018) *ad loc*.: "Das Partizip Präsens führt den Soldaten den Handlungsverlauf vor Augen, wie Jupiter als Exilant von seinem Berg herabschreitet."

[100] The relationship between Hannibal and Jupiter in books 12 and 17 have been previously noted, see: Fucecchi (1990) 41; Marks (2005) 195. Telg gennant Kortmann (2018) 117 with n. 22 also notes the repetition of *Tonans* in these lines and rightly connects Hannibal's *demigrantem* with 2.34 (*celsam migretis in arcem*).

[101] Cf. also Marks (2005) 198–9 on the conflation of Zama and Rome. Telg gennant Kortmann (2018) 317 also connects Hannibal's glance back in both scenes, but does not note the importance of exile and return common to both.

cunabula, for those who are dislodged; and yet, it is precisely because they form attachments to these places that Silius can manipulate the exilic motif of Roman imperial ideology emblematized by Aeneas *profugus*. Hannibal's exile, I would like to argue in the following section, is not only important because of his dislocation from his birthplace. Rather, insofar as we imagine him as an exile from Rome, the places he inhabits when Silius foretells his exile become spatial markers for Roman empire, peripheral spaces which are centered not necessarily in relationship to Carthage but rather in relationship to Rome as an imperial center.

Mapping Empire: Hannibal at the Edges of Roman Imperium

Silius, I think, is confronting a critical problem of national identity founded on rigid, mythological models like the Aeneas myth; the ultimate erasure of otherness presented by Aeneas *profugus* (e.g. Jupiter's promise to erase Trojan identity in *Aen.* 12.830–40)[102] simultaneously destroys the promise of incorporating the other. Elena Giusti, for instance, argues that in Vergil's *Aeneid*, the "contrast between Carthage and Rome...is reflected in Carthage's gradual and ineluctable appropriation of the Trojan paradigm at the expense of the *Aeneadae*;" these latter, Giusti claims, "shake off completely the burden of the Trojan identity, with all that entails."[103] But is it so easy simply to thrust off an identity, especially one so fundamental to the Roman literary imagination? According to Homi K. Bhabha, narratives of nationalism like the *Punica* that are indebted to such "atavistic" models as the Aeneas myth encourage or even demand displacement as an act of creating unity: that is to say, the memory of displacement can

[102] E.g. Tarrant (2012) 303: "V.'s eagerness to relegate the Trojans to a subordinate status may also reflect anxiety about the moral qualities associated with Troy and their potential effects on the new people." Cf. Fletcher (2014) 249–51, esp. 250: "The triumph of this new unity—Aeneas' new *patria*—means that his old *patria* will be completely subsumed." But Fletcher also rightly and more importantly notes at 250 n. 58 that "there is a certain irony to Juno's reference to the 'native Latins,' since, as Evander told Aeneas, Latium is a land of exiles." For some further discussion and relevant ancient sources, see especially Feeney (1984) 191–3 and Horsfall (1989) 20–5.

[103] Giusti (2018) 248.

never totally be forgotten, only "displaced," as it were, from the self onto some notional other. As he argues, however, even that "other" is destined to assimilate into (and necessarily change the face of) a dominant ideology; for "difference" *vel sim*., read Hannibal; for "mythical" or "tradition" *vel sim*., read Aeneas (underlines are mine):[104]

> For the political unity of the nation consists in a continual displacement of its irredeemably plural modern space, bounded by different, even hostile nations, into a signifying space that is archaic and mythical, paradoxically representing the nation's modern territoriality, in the patriotic, atavistic temporality of Traditionalism. Quite simply, the difference of space returns as the Sameness of Time, turning Territory into Tradition, turning the People into One. The liminal point of this ideological displacement is the turning of the differentiated spatial boundary, the "outside," into the unified temporal territory of Tradition...[This process] provides a way of understanding how easily that boundary that secures the cohesive limits of the western nation may imperceptibly turn into a contentious *internal* liminality that provides a place from which to speak both of, and as, the minority, the exilic, the marginal, and the emergent.

Hannibal represents that "liminal point" in navigating the creation of new collectives out of old ideologies. Silius' Hannibal is in a state of "continual displacement" both from his birthplace and, more importantly, Rome; as an Aeneas figure, the Carthaginian general represents a vision of Roman empire "bounded by different, even hostile nations" that are destined to be assimilated into Rome's "modern territoriality in the...atavistic" sense, i.e. by Hannibal undergoing the same process of empire-tracing exile as Aeneas *profugus*. Hannibal represents the blending of "the 'outside' into the unified temporal territory of Tradition."[105]

Punica 2 has long been pointed to as one of those books obsessed with a bifurcation of identity, a book in which peoples' hybrid identities have a meaningful impact on our reading of this book and the poem at large. The epic's second book covers in detail the siege and eventual suicide of the city of Saguntum. From its origins, this is a city emblematized by plurality and

[104] Bhabha (1990) 300.

[105] Cf. Johnston (2019) 223 on the typical "subaltern strategy" in the ancient world of likening imperializing conquerers to famous literary figures in a "retreat into the past."

hybridity, a Greek colony of Zacynthos which is then supplemented with Rutulians. Saguntum's hybridity leverages various aspects of the poem: as has long been noted, it becomes a surrogate[106] Rome and a vision of what Hannibalic victory might look like. Of course, book 2 is just as much about the complication of maintaining identities; Saguntum's claim of kinship with Rome is ultimately fruitless in her appeal to her ally.[107] As Augoustakis has observed, when the Saguntines commit suicide and build a funeral pyre for their mass-grave, they burn their hybridity, erasing the distinct differences of their past (2.603–4):[108]

> armaque Dulichia proavis portata Zacyntho
> et prisca advectos Rutulorum ex urbe penates.
>
> [They bring] the Dulichian arms brought from Zacynthos by their ancestors and the *penates* carried from the ancient city of the Rutulians.

This non-Roman Rome stands in a kind of limbo, poised both geographically and ethnically between two opposing cultural (Greece/Rome) and imperial (Carthage/Rome) powers. While the Saguntines at times take on remarkably Roman qualities, the hybridity represented by Saguntum falls into utter destruction, a bonfire of vanities wherein foreign and domestic symbols of wealth, war, and home burn as one into a meaningless mass. For Augoustakis, it is no accident that this erasure of identity is paralleled by Hannibal whose exile is foretold at the end of book 2:

> The obliteration of Roman identity becomes an absence at all levels, absence of strategy and common policy, absence of virtue and pity. As book 2 comes to a close, there is no distinction between the always cunning Carthaginians and the Romans...Moreover, as same and other seem to converge rather than diverge, Hannibal's fate of exile and death by poison...is not different from the fate that awaits so many Roman generals, even Scipio himself...At the same time, however, it serves to underscore the Carthaginian's own alienation from his

[106] See, e.g.: Stocks (2014) 106; Dominik (2003) 474–80; McGuire (1990) 35.

[107] Bernstein (2010).

[108] Augoustakis (2010a) 131: "The burning at the instigation of the Erinys constitutes the annulment of the Saguntines' recognition of their identity as 'Ardeans' or 'Zacynthians.' Their Dionysiac frenzy will result in a Stoic, Roman death, which nevertheless wipes out the Saguntines' ties with their Roman *patria*."

> *patria*...Both Carthage's and Rome's encounters with otherness utterly fail at the beginning of the poem.[109]

For Augoustakis, the connection between Hannibal's exile and Saguntum is in the relegation of both to a periphery, both failed experiments at Roman incorporation. But again, this thinking, even on hybrids, rests on a dialectic of a binary identity-state (for Hannibal at least): in this construction, the *patria* where Hannibal is supposed to belong is a simple thing pointing to one particular space. And yet, when we look at the lines describing Hannibal's doomed exile, we again get the sense that this is a rather limited view (2.700–07):

> (audite, o gentes, neu rumpite foedera pacis
> nec regnis postferte fidem!), vagus exul in orbe
> errabit toto patriis proiectus ab oris,
> tergaque vertentem trepidans Carthago videbit.
> saepe Saguntinis somnos exterritus umbris
> optabit cecidisse manu, ferroque negato
> invictus quondam Stygias bellator ad undas
> deformata feret liventi membra veneno.
>
> (Listen, peoples, and do not break your treaties of peace or put trustworthiness second to dominion!) He will wander the whole world as a roaming exile after he has been cast out from his ancestral shores, and fearful Carthage will witness him on the run. Often he will be terrified in his sleep by the ghosts of Saguntum and will wish to die by his own hand; but with a sword denied him the once unconquered warrior will bear limbs disfigured by discoloring poison to the Stygian waves.

Hannibal's exile is operating on a number of levels, here. Within book 2, his displacement recalls two earlier evocations of exile. On the one hand, his status as a *vagus exul* recalls and counterbalances the displacement inflicted on the *genius loci* of Saguntum, the snake which *similis profugo vicina ad litora tendit* (2.590, "just like a refugee makes its way towards the nearby shores") anticipating the city's destruction. While that scene relies on many intertextual

[109] Augoustakis (2010a) 135.

parallels (especially the twin snakes of *Aeneid* 2, similarly portending exile),[110] intratextually we see that Hannibal's exile counterbalances the destruction and metaphorical displacement he inflicted upon the Saguntines; Hannibal's terror of Saguntine apparitions in his exilic nightmares (2.704) similarly allude to this counterbalancing between destruction and exile in book 2. More importantly, and something we will return to below, Fucecchi notes that this snake is a perverse example of the *evocatio*, an anti-type of the successful evocation of the *Magna Mater* by the Romans at the end of the epic. Fucecchi finds it significant that the snake departs into exile, that is it departs without a destination in mind, and certainly not Carthage; this wandering rather than transferred snake is evocative of failed imperialism:[111]

> [The snake] is not the object of a *translation*: it rather begins a sorrowful exile without a specific destination...The fall of Saguntum, the city that exemplifies *fides* invites the reader to consider the fruitlessness of perverse imperialism...[Hannibal] cannot incorporate new gods into the pantheon of his country, nor really integrate the conquered people into a larger political entity.

In other words, where an exile, human or *genius loci*, ends up is an important marker of *imperium*. As Fucecchi suggests, the fact that the snake has no destination (cf. Spaltenstein who finds this detail "arbitrary")[112] certainly bodes ill for Hannibal's imperial aspirations; but as we shall see, Hannibal's destination is more clearly defined, if only in negative.

---

[110] As noted by Bernstein (2017) *ad loc*, noting that the snake withdraws into "voluntary exile" and comparing *Aen.* 2.205 (*incumbunt pelago pariterque ad litora tendunt*, "they rush towards the sea and together make their way towards the shores."). We might also add, following Spaltenstein (1986) 166 the serpent at *Aen.* 5.84ff. and the Athenian snake at Hdt. 8.41 following Fucecchi (2013) 28.

[111] Fucecchi (2013) 28.

[112] Spaltenstein (1986) 166: "En fait, puisque dans l'explication du prodige (vers 592 sqq.) Sil. ne parle que de la fuite du serpent, non de sa direction, il est probable que ce détail est arbitraire: le serpent doit bien aller quelque part."

And yet, if we return to the prophecy of Hannibal's exile at the end of book 2, we will nonetheless observe that Roman empire needs an *other* to map out the worldwide expanse of its *imperium sine fine*. Observe the spatial dynamics of Hannibal's exile (2.701–2):

> vagus exul in orbe
> errabit toto patriis proiectus ab oris.
>
> He will wander the whole world as a roaming exile after he has been cast out from his ancestral shores.

Silius triply emphasizes Hannibal's status as an exile by using the typical language of wandering (*vagus, errabit*), a noun and participle typical to the discourse of displacement (*exul, proiectus*), and the adverbial phrases *in orbe toto* and *patriis ab oris*. Such reduplication is typical of Silius' style (cf., e.g., 7.558–9, 16.289–91), although it may be worth noting that these lines bear more than a passing resemblance to a pair of lines from the beginning of Statius' *Thebaid*.[113] More telling, I think, is that repetition of Hannibal's exilic placement; is it not enough for Silius to say that Hannibal is an exile *patriis proiectus ab oris*? That is, in the traditional, imperialistic dichotomy of exile, the very fact that Hannibal is removed from his fatherland is sufficient to describe his experience of exile; but only if we understand exile as a state of being linked intrinsically to the land of one's birth.

Hannibal's experience of exile is, I think, mapped out spatially in two ways and in a centrifugal relationship with two different "centers." The first "center," although expressed in second position within these lines, is Carthage, Hannibal's *patria ora*. As an exile from his fatherland, Hannibal in this spatial construction represents the failure of Carthaginian empire. If

[113] St. *Th.* 1.312–3: *interea patriis olim vagus exul ab oris* / *Oedipodionides furto deserta pererrat* ("In the meantime, already for some time an exile wandering from his ancestral shores, the son of Oedipus furtively wanders among deserted spaces."). Cf. Bersntein (2017) *ad* Sil. 2.701–2. The proximity could, I suppose, be coincidental: all the elements of contact are typical language for the *topos* of exile, and *ab oris* at line-end (as an allusion to the opening line of the *Aeneid*) is common from Ovid on (e.g. *Fast*. 1.489; *Met.* 9.19; *Rem.* 797). Nonetheless, I find no parallels in the corpus beyond our passages for a clustering of *vagus exul* and *patria ora*.

we wish to see him as an anti-type of Roman values in general (i.e. the breaker of *fides*, 2.701: *nec regnis postferte fidem*), or more specifically as an anti-Aeneas, it is here. The line-terminal *ab oris*, while common enough in (post-) Vergilian epic (though only used twice by Silius, cf. 4.52), clearly looks back in this exilic context to the first line of Vergil's *Aeneid*.[114] Silius, indeed, hints at this valence in the following line by comparing Hannibal "turning his back" (2.703: *tergaque vertentem*) on Carthage, and metaphorically the wife and child he leaves behind (cf. 13.879–80: *desertis coniuge fida / et dulci nato*),[115] with *pius* Aeneas. As Neil Bernstein argues, "[e]xile and suicide associate Hannibal with his notional ancestor Dido, and contrast him with Aeneas, who is able to resettle his people in exile and found a new line."[116]

I am suspicious, however, of simply labeling Hannibal an anti-Aeneas in this way: Hannibal's representation of empire is not only centered around Carthage (*patriis proiectus ab oris*) in these lines, but also around Rome. For Hannibal is not simply exiled from his homeland, but also from the entire world, an *exul in orbe toto*. The "whole world" is surely centered around Rome, another instance of the *urbs*/*orbis* motif; Hannibal cannot find rest anywhere in the world as an enemy of the Roman state—Hannibal, after all, will be exiled on suspicions of raising an army against Rome (Liv. 33.47–9). Hannibal's exile, then, maps out the expanse of Rome's imperial sway;[117] just as in book 16 when Scipio portrays the Carthaginians "thrust from the edge of the world," (16.289: *extremo Libys ut deiectus ab orbe*) here too Rome's imperial expanse is expressed as the worldwide area that her enemies cannot inhabit. Indeed, the

[114] On Silius' rich engagement with the first line of the *Aeneid*, see Landrey (2014).

[115] Cf. also Van der Keur (2015) 163–4 for a further significant parallel with book 13.

[116] Bernstein (2017) 271–2.

[117] One will recall along with Rimell (2015) 16–17 the bravado of post-9/11 American posturing which promised to use military might to relegate terrorists to caves and holes; the message there, as in Silius, is that enemies of a world power cannot hide.

traversing of geographical *extrema* as a metaphor for *imperium* serves as a common theme between the end of book 2 and book 3 when Hannibal crosses the Alps. Hannibal's Hercules-like traversal of the Alps has been noted as a spatial presentation of empire already in Silius' Livian source.[118]

From the perspective of space and imperialism, we can also glean some moves our poet is making from the Hannibal's description as *vagus* and the verb *errabit* at lines 2.701–2. Wandering, while of course a typical element of exilic narratives, is also evocative as a term opposed to one key element of the spatial imagination of Roman imperialism. As Andrew Feldherr has observed, Roman imperialism manifested itself spatially in many distinct ways, but one of the most visible and indeed heavily utilized manifestations of power was in the roads Rome built in her provinces. Those roads make the space through which they run rectilinear, straight paths through which Roman goods can move quickly to the imperial center and Roman soldiers can move quickly to her growing borders.

As Feldherr observes regarding Vergil's conception of imperial space, words implying "straight" and "proper" come to dominate the Augustan poet's imagination of *imperium sine fine*.[119] In the *Aeneid*, *regnum* and its associated verb *regere* are doubly powerful words vis-à-vis the creation of imperial space (compare, e.g., English's "ruler"): "the geometric connotations of

[118] See Fabrizi (2015), esp. 132: "the Carthaginians have not only accomplished a successful march through a space that extends from the limits of the world, but are also *vincentes*, victorious: the march is not just an adventurous journey, but an act of taking control of a space that tends to universality." By comparison, see Keith (2000) 63–4 on the "displacement" of (Pyrene's) female voice in the myth of her rape; see more fully Augoustakis (2003b) esp. 252–4, who argues that Hannibal's dominant crossing of the Alps is undercut by the inappropriately transgressive valence of his model deity Hercules.

[119] See Feldherr (1999) esp. 90–2 following the theorizations of Nicolet (1991) and Rambaud (1974). Note especially Feldherr's astute application of the evidence of the 12th century Peutinger Table (a copy of a fourth century CE map) and its elongated, unidimensional representation of Roman space. For similar thinking, cf. Quint (1993) 9 (emphasis mine): "Vergil's poem attached political meaning to narrative form itself. To the victors belongs epic, with its linear teleology; to the losers belongs romance, with its random or circular wandering." More recently, O'Sullivan (2019) finds the random movement of Aeneas' wanderings as something that needs to be corrected and counterbalanced.

Vergil's expression *regere populos* [*Aen*. 6.851] possess a literal application: to 'rule' is to reduce space and territory to a straight line through it, which is also the route of Roman armies."[120]

Feldherr then immediately observes that Anchises' advice in book 6 literally "straightens" Aeneas' exilic wanderings in the earlier books, as Aeneas ends book 6 on a "straight" path (*Aen.* 6.900: *recto*).[121] Returning to Hannibal in the *Punica*, we will recall that Hannibal's future is foretold as a type of warning, a moral reminder not to put *fides* behind *regnum*: *nec regnis postferte fidem* (Sil. 2.701). Hannibal's hopes for the rectilinear space of empire, his desire for *regnum*, are dashed. Instead, he is afflicted with the apparent opposite of straight-forward *imperium*: his "wandering" (2.701–2: *vagus...errabit*) reveal his failure to achieve the rectilinearly conceived *regnum*. I say "apparent opposite" because I am not so sure there is such a neat dichotomy between wandering and *regnum* as Feldherr claims. Aeneas' wanderings, for instance, are not simply null-states of Trojan and Roman power: as I argue below, the exilic wandering of Aeneas constitutes a proleptic vision of Roman empire. Hannibal's wandering operates in a similar way: from the outside looking in, Hannibal's errant wanderings throughout the whole world trace out Roman empire in a way complementary to a rectilinear imagination of power. Rome's *regnum* may not strictly reach the *totus orbis* in the second century BCE of Silius' narrative time (or in Silius' day, for that matter); yet Hannibal's wandering reveals the ever expanding sphere of linear space under Rome's control.

Hannibal's mapping of Roman empire in this way recalls several models. The most obvious is Aeneas, whose exilic wandering around the Mediterranean in books 2 and 3 of the *Aeneid* look forward to spaces of significance to Rome's future empire. As Damien Nelis argues,

[120] Feldherr (1999) 92.

[121] Feldherr (1999) 92; on the textual debate over *recto*'s antecedent, see Horsfall (2013) *ad loc.*

"*Aeneid* 3 is simultaneously an *Odyssey*, a *nostos*, and a narrative of colonization."[122] Of course, Hannibal is a tragic Aeneas-figure, doomed to represent the expanse of an enemy's empire by his death in displacement. In this way, he also looks back to Lucan's Pompey; indeed, in these lines we may hear an echo of Lentulus chastising Pompey at Luc. 8.390–2 for wanting to seek aid from the Parthians:

> temptare pudendum
> auxilium tanti est, toto divisus ut orbe
> a terra moriare tua[?]
>
> Is trying to get that shameful aid worth it, that you might die separated from your own land by the whole world?

Hannibal, as well, will find no quarter in the *totus orbis* and will die in a land not his own. For Pompey, however, *totus orbis* and *terra tua* are in fact identical: the expanse of Rome's (and subsequently the ascendant Caesar's) sway doubly emphasize Pompey's desertion of his homeland and the center of the world, *urbs* and *orbis*. Ovid also frequently complains in similar language from the edge of the empire that he is divided from his home by "the entire world:" *qui qunoiam patria toto sumus orbe remoti* (*Pont*. 2.2.121, "since we are now displaced from our fatherland by the whole world").[123] If one is removed from the *patria* of Rome, one is removed from areas under her influence, which according to imperial ideology is synonymous with *totus orbis*.

---

[122] Nelis (2001) 23. Cf. Fletcher (2014) 8 on the directions to Italy Aeneas receives in the first hexad: "The Italy of the *Aeneid* is a land of exiles, all connected by their coming together in the same geographic location. Aeneas' journey to Italy dramatizes the creation of this community, and the directions are a sort of blueprint for the foundation of the Roman race." Cf. also Horsfall (1989) 10 and, still relevant and useful, Pease (1917). Cf. Johnston (2019) 226–7 on Odysseus' similar function in Second-Sophistic imaginings of Roman empire: "In particular, the wanderings were a fruitful thought-world through which to reflect on time and space, and the location of power and culture therein."

[123] See Helzle (2003) *ad loc*; cf. 1.9.48 with Gaertner (2005) *ad loc* which probably informs Lucan (*aque tuis toto dividor orbe rogis*, "and I am divided by the whole world from your funeral pyres"), 3.4.3, 4.3.41–3; *Tr*. 4.1.59. On Ovid's thought in such passages, see especially Galasso (1995) *ad Pont.* 2.7.66: "Ovidio oscillerebbe tra laconsapevolezza, originatasi con l'esilio, della non identità tra l'οἰκουμένη e l'*imperium*...e la coscienza preesistente dell'unitarietà dell'orbis."

But nonetheless there is an equal anxiety all too apparent to those who suffer exile and displacement from their home in Rome: the very fact that Pompey and Ovid can inhabit non-Roman space means that *orbis Romanus* and *totus orbis* cannot be equal. We have already seen how Pogorzelski analyzes Lucan's use of this idea. Ovid, too, bitingly points to the *orbis Scythicus* he inhabits (*Tr.* 3.51: *ei mihi, iamne domus Scythico Nasonis in orbe est*? "Alas! Is Naso's home now in the Scythian world?"), a place where news of a triumph over Germany can hardly reach: as Nandini Pandey has recently observed, in this poem the frontier becomes a place of vaguely vivid "triumphs of the imagination" and simultaneously the place that reminds of non-universal empire.[124] There must always be more to conquer and there must always be places unconquered: Rimell uses the term "claustrophobia" to express this fear-inducing imperial paradox.[125] The expectation of "another world" outside of Rome's influence in the *Punica,* however, is a wholly problematic and, when it appears, violently repressed vision. Consider Metellus, for example, who hoped to find refuge "in another world" (10.423: *alio positas* [sc. *terras*] *spectabat in orbe*) beyond his *patria*, only to meet with Scipio who demands unflagging devotion to the state. It is not appropriate to Silius' vision of Roman power for a Roman to abandon the city in search of the borders of her power.[126]

However, from the Roman perspective Hannibal can safely explore, in fact is forced to explore, areas beyond not just his home but also Rome. As an exile from the Roman center, he

[124] Pandey (2018) 217–20.

[125] E.g. on Lucan, Rimell (2015) 242: "The idea, central to this poem, that the entire globe is infected by civil strife, a grotesque parody of imperial expansion, has the oxymoronic effect of producing enclosures and of feeding claustrophobia."

[126] Except, perhaps, Scipio; we will return to him in the conclusion. The danger to a Romanocentric vision of identity is well displayed by the analysis of Regulus and Marcia by Augoustakis (2010a) 178–82, who argues that "Regulus' alienation, his search for a substitute country" amounts to a "trespassing of boundaries;" his version of Romanness at the periphery where he bravely suffers leaves Marcia un-Roman and "exiled in the margins of the narrative" but nevertheless physically situated at the Roman center.

finds no *alius orbis* such as the one Metellus desired. His constant wandering as an exul *in toto orbe* traces centrifugally, that is from the outside, the (nonexistent) limits of Roman empire. He can go everywhere but gets nowhere: each new place he reaches is still subject to Rome's *imperium*.

And here we may return to that image in book 2 which counterbalances Hannibal's exile, the snake of Saguntum *similis profugo* (2.590). As mentioned above, Fucecchi finds the snake's exile to be an example of failed imperialism or perverse assimilation, namely because it "is not the object of a *translation*: it rather begins a sorrowful exile without a specific destination."[127] Hannibal's "exiling" of Saguntum's *genius loci* is all the more disturbing because we get no idea of its destination as we would otherwise expect in similar scenes: for example, we know both where Vergil's twin snakes come from (Tenedos, *Aen.* 2.203) and where they end up (the altar of Minerva, *Aen.* 2.226–7). Silius surely has his eye on the passage,[128] but subverts our expectations: he adopts in *similis profugo* the exilic connotations of *fugere* in Vergil's *effugiunt* as the snakes "flee" to Pallas' altar (2.225–6: *gemini...dracones / effugiunt*),[129] but the flight of Silius' snake has no specific destination. And while Silius' snake *ad litora tendit* in a way similar to Vergil's serpents (*Aen.* 2.205: *ad litora tendunt*), the clause-final *ad litora tendit* is used only once elsewhere in the *Punica* in Hannibal's retreat from Rome in book 13 (13.94: *dum Libys haud laetus Rhegina ad litora tendit*).[130] In that later passage, Hannibal's removal from Rome is

[127] Fucecchi (2013) 28, emphasis mine.

[128] On the connection between the two passages, see Spaltenstein (1986) and Bernstein (2017) *ad loc.*

[129] On the textual issue (*diff-* or *effugere*), see Horsfall (2008) *ad loc*. To be clear, Vergil seems not to have in mind exile with his *effugiunt. Effug-* shows up as a verb and noun surprisingly frequently in *Aen.* 2. For the snakes, this is a paradox, for *effugere*, Servius tells us at 2.140, is apparently used of animals escaping sacrifice at the altar rather than fleeing to it. For more, see Horsfall (2008) 145 and 200–01.

[130] On the allusion to Vergil, see Bernstein (2017) *ad loc*. Cf. also 17.589–90 with Roumpou (2018) *ad loc*. (*tendunt attonitos extrema ad litora cursus / ac Tartessiacas profugi sparguntur in oras*, "They make their dumbstruck way

a key detail (*haud laetus*), and the geographic specificity of his destination highlights the trajectory of his defeat and Rome's impending success: the spatial specificity makes more vivid not just the itinerary of Hannibal, but the trajectories of Carthaginian (falling) and Roman (surging) power in the broader epic.

In contrast, the snake of book 2 has no specific destination, it lacks an itinerary tracing the expanse of power of those who displaced it; as Fucecchi says, this is "failed imperialism or perverse assimilation." But the snake's conceptual counterpart, Hannibal, does find a destination in book 2 which corresponds nicely with the triumphant imperialism of the city which "exiles" him. His wandering around the whole world traces out proleptically the rapidly expanding geographical footprint of Roman power in the Mediterranean in the second century BCE. His removal from the *totus orbis* reifies—in the most concrete terms that boundless imperialism can—this process of expansion by the metaphor of expulsion.

That is a natural enough move, particularly for a post-Vergilian epic poet; consider, for instance, the final reconciliation of Jupiter and Juno in the poem in which Jupiter allows Hannibal to be saved, but tellingly emphasizes where Hannibal cannot go (17.379–82):

> sed lex
> muneris haec esto nostri: Saturnia regna
> ne post haec videat, repetat neve amplius umquam
> Ausoniam.
>
> But let this be the rule for my favor: that he not after this see the Kingdom of Saturn nor forevermore again attack Ausonia.

Jupiter's words, and Juno's provocation of them, are densely intertextual and allusive in various ways to the victorious exile of Aeneas throughout the Roman literary tradition. Juno, for instance, reprises her own role in Horace's third Roman ode when she acquiesces to letting

---

towards the shores and as refugees disperse amongst the Tartessian shores."). Silius' use of the phrase is, then, rather commonly tied with the theme of exile. Van der Keur (2015) 81 with n. 39 notes that 13.94 is modelled on Liv. 26.12.2.

cineres Troiae Carthagine regnent (Sil. 17.363, "let the ashes of Troy reign in Carthage"); this looks back to her similar begrudging comment at *Od*. 3.3.36–9 that the Trojans may rule (39: *regnanto*) wherever they wish, so long as their city falls and they endure exile. Jupiter's response lays out a similar architecture of thought, but with displacement thrust on Rome's enemy. His *lex* dictates that Hannibal never see Italy, another *patria* for him as book 17 demonstrates, as a precondition not only for Hannibal's survival but also Rome's dominance.[131]

To be clear, I believe that Jupiter's precondition of Hannibal's future life in exile is the key concession Jupiter makes in return for Juno acquiescing to Roman power. A number of intertexts and linguistic choices (see below) have led me and others to this conclusion,[132] and yet we should note that nowhere does Jupiter explicitly foretell Hannibal's exile from Carthage.[133] That is to say, Hannibal's prophesied exile is not "centered" on his birthplace. Rather, Hannibal's exile here, as earlier in book 17, is from Italy (17.381–2: *repetat neve amplius umquam / Ausoniam*). As in book 2, Silius adheres to a vision of Roman power founded in exile, that is to a vision based on where Rome('s enemies) do not belong. Consider, for example, the name *Saturnia regna* which Jupiter uses for Rome/Latium. As Angeliki Roumpou posits, the father of the gods uses the collocation in order to invite Saturnian Juno back into the fold of gods underwriting Rome's future;[134] and yet the phrase also looks back to the reign of Saturn in his

[131] Cf. Stocks (2014) 210: "by referring to Hannibal by his *nomen*, there is a suggestion of the eternity of his mythic identity—that it is to the Roman Hannibal whom Jupiter grants 'life.'"

[132] E.g. Stocks (2014) 210 compares this passage to the description of Hannibal's exile at the end of book 2, although I think there is surprisingly little in the language of the poem to support that reading. Silius rather relies on the meta-narrative of Hannibal's character—he is an Aeneas-*profugus* figure—and his intertextual allusions to Horace and Vergil.

[133] Although cf. 17.377–9 with Roumpou (2018) *ad loc*. noting Silius' "external prolepsis" of Hannibal's future involvement in foreign campaigns against Roman interests.

[134] Roumpou (2018) 102; as she observes, *Saturnia* is far more commonly used of Juno (9x) than it is as a geonym (3x).

"hiding place" at Latium, that is to a golden age inaugurated by an exile. Silius implies, then, a comparison between exiled Saturn and exiled Hannibal: Italian golden ages, as it were, always seem to begin with displacement.

And yet, *Saturnia regna* also summons to mind one of the conspicuous departures Silius is making from his chief Vergilian model in these lines. The reign of Saturn presents Italy and Rome as places that profit from the incorporation of outsiders and insiders, an integrational model of success also issuing from Silius' Vergilian model of the reconciliation of Jupiter and Juno at the conclusion of the *Aeneid* (*Aen.* 12.839–9):

> faciamque omnes uno ore Latinos.
> hinc genus Ausonio mixtum quod sanguine surget,
> supra homines, supra ire deos pietate videbis...
>
> I will make them all Latins with one language. From this you will see a lineage which will spring from Ausonian blood go beyond humans, beyond gods in their *pietas*.

Jupiter's speech, it should be noted, also begins by alluding to Saturnian Juno (*Aen.* 12.830: *es germana Iovis Saturnique altera proles*, "You are the sister of Jupiter and the other offspring of Saturn"), i.e. to the very same dynamics of Saturnian parentage and the exilic Italian golden age. Yet Vergil's Jupiter prizes an integration of friend and foe, a *genus mixtum,* although we may note this is not strictly a hybrid model; rather, difference is erased as all become Latins with a single language.[135] The Jupiter of the *Aeneid*, furthermore, acquiesces to Juno's wish that the idea of Troy falling (*Aen.* 12.828: *occidit, occideritque sinas cum nomine Troia*, "it's fallen, and may you allow it to have fallen along with the name Troy") by the commingling process of

[135] For theorizing the problems with such an erasure of difference imagined by models like the *Aeneid* which posit national identities, see Bhabha (1990) esp. 299 who points out that heterogeneity is a prime ingredient of civic unity (emphasis original): "The barred Nation *It/Self,* alienated from its eternal self-generation, becomes a liminal form of social representation, a space that is internally marked by cultural difference and the heterogeneous histories of contending peoples, antagonistic authorities, and tense cultural locations."

integration (*Aen*. 12.835–6: *commixti corpore tantum / subsident Teucri*, "But the Teucrians will gradually go away, mingled in their lineage").

To be sure, Denis Feeney showed some time ago the various ways in which this reconciliation is an imperfect one open to the very conflict described by Silius' epic.[136] We began this chapter, for instance, by looking at the ways in which Hannibal hoped for precisely what Juno gets at the end of the *Aeneid*: the subsiding of "Troy" through a process by which an outsider (Aeneas/Hannibal) becomes an insider. Hannibal, I have argued, desires to be a kind of hybrid Italian/Carthaginian throughout the epic. And yet Silius highlights the ways in which that model of peaceful integration is equally dangerous and necessary. The only "mixing" (cf. Vergil's *commixti*, 12.835, and *mixtum*, 12.840) Jupiter foresees in Hannibal's future is the general's unending desire to "mingle sky with sea" and fill the lands of Italy with soldiers (Sil. 17.377–8: *miscere hic sidera ponto / et terras implere volet redeuntibus armis*: "this man will wish to mingle stars with sea and to fill the land with returning armies").[137] There can be, it seems, no peaceful mixing of these two cultures;[138] empire is shown not (simply) to be an act of inclusion, but one of exclusion (note again the idea of forbidden return, *redeuntibus*). The myth of Vergil's model of Ausonian integration is shown to be just that, a myth. Silius emphasizes borders, places where Hannibal cannot belong (Ausonia at 17.381–2, the rest of the world at 2.701–2).

[136] Feeney (1984) remains crucial.

[137] On the adynaton vis-à-vis the war with Hannibal, cf. Hardie (1986) 168–9 on Lucr. 3.832–42. Cf. Roumpou (2018) 101.

[138] Indeed, Silius may remember that Vergil's Venus has already anticipated that Jupiter would allow no peaceful "mixing" of Carthaginian and Roman (*Aen*. 4.110–12: *sed fatis incerta feror, si Iuppiter unam / esse velit Tyriis urbem Troiaque profectis, / miscerive probet populos aut foedera iungi*, "I am born uncertain by the fates, whether Jupiter would wish that there be one city for the Tyrians and those who have departed from Troy, whether he would approve of the peoples being mixed or alliances joined.").

For Vergil, the blending of two identities into one, and indeed the erasure of Trojan identity, encoded the successful outcome of Aeneas' exile. In this centripetal model of empire, alterity is destined to become same, and the spaces formerly marked as "other" gain meaning through being re-centered. But Vergil's presentation of cultural mingling is both simple and disturbingly identity-erasing: the Trojans must stop being exiles, so they must stop being Trojans. That loss of alterity is not a possibility for Hannibal and the Carthaginians; Silius indeed seems to go so far as to claim that the "otherness" of Troy is something which cannot be erased. The *cineres Troiae*, those signs of Roman foundational alterity, remain, but they are figuratively displaced to Carthage (*cineres Troiae Carthagine regnent,* Sil. 17.363), that space which paradoxically belongs to those in the text who do not belong (in Italy, in Spain, in the world, even in their own *patria*): indeed, Silius only once elsewhere refers to Rome as the *cineres Troiae*, that is in book 3 when Venus indignantly wonders if her people do not really belong in Rome after all (3.565–6).[139] Empire is not just about who belongs where, but just as importantly about who does not belong where.

The larger question posed here is an old one, and one that we have dealt with throughout much of this chapter and dissertation; in the words of Victoria Rimell, the question "is whether we can ever witness the identity crisis of the Roman exile without thinking about traumatic Roman origins...the erasure of Trojan identity in the making of proto-Romans at the end of Virgil's *Aeneid,* as if the exiles had not suffered enough."[140] Silius finds an ingenious way

[139] The parallel is also noted by Roumpou (2018) ad Sil. 17.363). I do not agree, however, that this sentence "visualizes the union of the two nations by juxtaposing them in the text." There is probably a distinction to be made between those cities which must necessarily fall in the course of Rome's growing empire (i.e. Troy and Carthage) and Rome herself. Giusti (2018) 247 (cf. 99–100): "Carthage...is already part of the past in her first appearance, which casts her on the same side as Troy." Cf. Levene (2010) 99 on the frequent alignment of Troy and Carthage in Livy's third decade.

[140] Rimell (2015) 297, who continues that Ovid's "poetics of exile refashion the laws of time and space: in Tomis, the poet is still very much in and of Rome."

around this issue: he recasts the exilic narrative of the Aeneas myth onto a hybrid Hannibal, simultaneously (like Aeneas) both Roman and non-Roman. Far from being an "anti-Aeneas" or a misplaced foreigner, Hannibal becomes a critical part of the negotiation of creating empire at its edges and tracing out its growing expanse. At these edges, self and other blend into something like a unified whole, the collective identity of which is constantly negotiated more (as with Vergil's Jupiter) or less (Hannibal) peacefully.

And as we learned from Bhabha's criticism at the beginning of this section, not all (or indeed any) "collective identities" are constructed or idealized in a peaceful way.[141] Silius, rather, leaves Hannibal looking from "'outside' into the unified temporal territory of Tradition;" his status as a hybrid acknowledges "a contentious internal liminality," we might say the possibility of civil war in Silius' Rome's future-past.[142] But civil war, and Hannibal's hybridity, is ultimately left as "the minority, the exilic, the marginal," waiting in the wings of Rome's growing empire and proceeding history; and yet, Hannibal's last words promise that he will never leave Rome (...safe; 17.610–11: *nec deinde relinquo / securam te, Roma*) and assure that he, like the growing margins of empire, is forever "emergent."[143]

---

[141] Cf., e.g., Fletcher (2014) 251: "this notion of mixing—like the famous description of America as a 'melting pot'—is essential to the project of creating national unity, because it asserts that there is an identity that trumps lesser connections." The problem for Hannibal, Aeneas, and perhaps any responsible citizen, is what (or even whether) connections we define as "lesser."

[142] It is from this valence of Hannibal's hybridity that Van der Keur (2015) 452–7 constructs his reading of Hannibal's exile as the ultimate subjugation of the forces of civil war presented at the end of book 13.

[143] Cf. Stocks (2014) 230; Tipping (2010a) 70.

CONCLUSION

MANSURUM DECUS?

mansuri compos decoris per saecula rector
Sil. 17.625

decus hoc patriaque domoque carebit
Sil. 13.515

The ending of the *Punica* arrives suddenly in the narrative: immediately following Hannibal's retreat from Zama "mixed in with a few of those in *fuga*" (17.616: *paucis fugientum mixtus*), Silius narrates the end of the war with exceeding brevity (17.618–24): "this is the end of the war," begins the coda (618: *hic finis bello*), and it ends as it was foretold to in the proem, with Scipio unbarring the gates of Carthage (17.618–19: *reserantur protinus arces / Ausonio iam sponte duci*; cf. 1.14–15: *reseravit Dardanus arces / ductor Agenoreas*). Silius brings his narrative to a close with a description of the general's triumphal entry into Rome (17.625–54), carrying in tow all of the spoils and captured peoples from the entire world whom Scipio has taken, but tellingly lacking Hannibal, whose substituted *imago* draws the attention of all the spectators (and below, our own). Before moving on to my own analysis of this scene, I would like to review the varied responses to this important scene in order to take stock of just how we are to meet with this idiosyncratic ending. How are we to understand the figure of Scipio Africanus, whose praise is sung quite hyperbolically but whose doomed future of exile is also foreshadowed by the mention of Camillus in the poem's antepenultimate line?

Scipio's comportment in this scene has drawn numerous detractors. Silius describes Scipio's return to Rome briefly but with a detail that has drawn much comment (17.627–8):

> securus sceptri repetit per caerula Romam
> et patria invehitur sublimi tecta triumpho.

> Secure in his power he returns to Rome through the seas and is conveyed into his native city with a sublime triumph.

The noun *sceptrum* has raised eyebrows for its association with monarchical, autocratic rule of the type Scipio explicitly foreswore earlier in the epic (16.277–84). To be clear, the *sceptrum* is probably functioning more innocently as both a wordplay on Scipio's name and as part of the typical triumphal accoutrements worn by the *triumphator*.[1] More problematically, however, it is part of the garb of tyrants,[2] and as Ray Marks admits, vis-à-vis individual rulers the *sceptrum* is more likely to remind of such odious leaders as the treacherous Syphax (16.244: *sceptrifero ...rege*) or the tyrant Hieronymus (14.86: *sceptrum exitiale*).[3] Most recently, Angeliki Roumpou has suggested that the damning part of this line is that Scipio simply does not care (*securus*) whether he looks like a king or not.[4] William Dominik has recently placed Scipio's *sceptrum* not only the context of Silius' poem, but also against other poetic models such as Statius' *Thebaid* and Seneca's *Phoenissae* to argue that "the assumption of power foredooms its possessor and disposes him to a lack of compassion and inhumanity."[5]

I am not convinced that we need to view Scipio in a negative light because of his garb and serene comportment. Indeed, I believe Silius is going out of his way to do the opposite with the very words that have drawn such attention. *Securus* most obviously contrasts Scipio with Hannibal, who promised that he would not leave Rome *secura* after the war (17.611–12): the uselessly raging Hannibal balances ill with the serene countenance of Scipio, a contrast Silius

[1] As McGuire (1997) 101 with n. 17 notes; in further detail, cf. Roumpou (2018) 203. McGuire notes that the *sceptrum* is part of the typical triumphal garb at Liv. 5.41.9. Cf. also Tipping (2010a) 187.

[2] Cf. Roumpou (2018) 203: "Tacitus (*Ann.* 4.26) and Livy (30.15.11) report that the scepter, along with the triumphal toga in purple and gold are traditional gifts to princes." Cf. Jacobs (2009) 294–5.

[3] Marks (2005) 114 and especially 201–6.

[4] Roumpou (2018) 203.

[5] Dominik (2018) 289; cf. further 290–3.

also highlights by describing Scipio as *compos* (17.625) in comparison to Hannibal earlier in book 17 as he fled Italy in despair (221: *mentisne ego compos*) and as he chased a spectral Scipio believing in his delusion to have defeated his enemy as he prayed (540: *iam compos voti*). The raving threats of Hannibal are, in fact, no threat at all either to Rome or her representative hero, Scipio. What's more, while it is true that *sceptra* mark some of the *Punica*'s most unsavory figures, the word is also regularly used to describe Roman power without any clear negative valence (6.103, 7.562, 9.73, 10.645).[6] While Silius may be wary of the effects power has on the powerful, I am unconvinced that we see any negative repercussions of Scipio's preeminence, at least in these lines.

On slightly more solid ground, I think, are those who find some misgivings over Scipio's future in the final three or four lines of the poem. Although I would like to examine these in much further detail, a quick overview of the *status quaestionis* will be beneficial for our purposes. At the close of the epic, Silius voices his final praise of Scipio in terms of evocative of mytho-historical figures the young general outshines (17.651–4):

> salve, invicte parens, non concessure Quirino
> laudibus ac meritis, non concessure Camillo.
> nec vero, cum te memorat de stirpe deorum,
> prolem Tarpei, mentitur Roma, Tonantis.
>
> Hail, indomitable father, never to yield to Quirinus in praise and worthiness,
> never to yield to Camillus. Nor, indeed, does Rome lie when she recalls that you,
> progeny the Thundering Tarpeian, come from immortal stock.

The most succinct introduction to the salient issues of these lines remains Philip Hardie's 1997 piece on epic conclusions: the *salve* of line 651 marks this as hymnic cap to the epic, comparing Scipio to great heroes like Bacchus and Hercules (in the preceding lines), Romulus and Camillus,

[6] As Littlewood (2017) 240 observes, *sceptrum* regularly simply points to imperial power.

and finally Scipio's own father Jupiter.[7] McGuire, however, has argued that any positive valence we glean from these lines is undercut by an allusion to Scipio's future in exile summoned to mind by the figure of Camillus, himself an exile.[8] I would like to nuance and revisit McGuire's univocal interpretation below, but we should note that it has rightly been questioned by Marks and others. Marks points out that Camillus is not a disgraced exile like Scipio may well become, but rather a heroic figure of self-sacrificial service to a thankless *patria*; Marks rightly points back to the similar sentiment expressed regarding Scipio's exile in *Punica* 13: "[T]he comparison between Scipio and Camillus in 17.652 is not on their shared experience of exile, but on their uncompromising *fides*, their shared devotion to Rome in spite of their exiles."[9]

While not impossible to advocate, any negative valence of the lines is further impeded by the fact that Scipio is being not-so-implicitly fashioned as a proto-Domitian, especially in the particular version of the Hercules-myth Silius cites at line 649.[10] Indeed, Silius casts his imperial panegyric here in Augustan terms, looking back to Ovid's praise of Augustus at *Fasti* 2, calling the emperor a *pater* (*Fast.* 2.130: *iam pridem tu pater orbis eras*; cf. Sil. 17.651: *invicte parens*) similar to Jupiter and a political figure to whom even Romulus will yield (2.133: *Romule,*

[7] Cf. Augoustakis (2010a) 240 noting the important Livian intertext of Romulus instituting the Parentalia. The force behind assuring Scipio's divine parentage is an important one, especially since these (recall, hymnic) lines have Callimachean influences, filtered as they are through an allusion to the "Cretan" Jupiter at Luc. 8.872 as noted by Hardie (1997) 159, cf. Marks (2010) 149. Hardie also notes the possible Ennian influences at the end of the poem; cf. von Albrecht (1964) 161 n. 45; Jacobs (2009) 295.

[8] McGuire (1997) 101–2, viz. "In his description of Scipio as *securus sceptri* and in his comparison of Scipio to Camillus, Silius marks Scipio's growing personal power and its impending consequences—the commander's self-imposed exile to Liternum."

[9] Marks (2005) 203. On this issue, cf. Ahl, Davis, and Pomeroy (1986) 2555; Laudizi (1989) 139; Fucecchi (1993) 48, (2010) 224 n. 19; Tipping (2010a) 162 although cf. 187; Roumpou (2018) 214.

[10] As Rebeggiani (2018) 234–61 has shown, the Giant-fighting myth of Hercules was a particularly favored element of Domitianic propaganda; on the conclusion of the *Punica* along such lines, see Rebeggiani (2018) 248–9. Cf. Roumpou (2018) 213 citing Statius' praise of Domitian at *Silv*. 4.3.139 (*salve, dux hominum et parens deorum*) in similar to terms to 17.651–2. On Domitian and Scipio more generally, see Marks (2005) 218–44.

concedes) much as Scipio will not yield to Romulus (Sil. 17.651: *non concessure Quirino*).[11] But is this simple panegyric? With this last parallel, Silius makes a very subtle intertextual change—introducing a negative particle—but one that I am tempted to find meaningful: as we saw in chapter two, it is precisely because Scipio refuses to yield to other sources of power (e.g. the law or those investigating him and his brother in the 180s) that will lead him to political disgrace. Indeed, as Dominik has pointed out, Scipio did have one possible rival in Marcellus (15.341–2)[12], "but at the close of the epic, Scipio lacks such a rival for either military or political power."[13]

Do we get a hint of Scipio's (too) rigid individualism in these lines? We got similar hints at the dangers of that individualism based on our reading of books 10 and 13 in chapter 2. And yet, I suppose that it would be a strange thing to cast Scipio, the epic's hero, in such a disparaging light at the very end of the poem. But is there any other option available to us? This is a difficult question to answer, since our sample size of how Silius deals with Scipio's exile is exceedingly small. That small sample size is probably not by accident; it is clear to me that the poet was simply not comfortable confronting the issue head-on because that part of his hero's history was all too easily construed negatively. What space do we have left, then, for interpreting this curious allusion to Scipio's exile?

With the space I have left, I would like to suggest a more nuanced reading of Scipio's exile at the end of the *Punica*, one that embraces the poem's polyvalent handling not just of

[11] I find no one else observing this intertext, although Silius' intratextual reference to his own earlier description of Domitian's ascent to power at 3.627–8 (*solioque Quirinus* / *concedet*) is well noted; see Ripoll (1998) 493 n. 128 and Marks (2005) 219.

[12] *Forsan Scipiadae confecti nomina belli / rapturus, si quis paulum deus adderet aevo* ("Maybe he would have taken the reputation of war brought to an end from Scipio, if some god were to add just a little bit to his time of life.").

[13] Dominik (2018) 293.

Roman imperial authority distilled through powerful individuals, but also of the dangers involved in the creation (and destruction) of those individuals. By applying the lessons we have learned throughout this dissertation, we shall see that Silius is not simply portraying Scipio here as an exile but as a hero celebrating a triumphant *reditus*. At the same time, Silius leaves us with a final, syncretic reading of his two heroes, one which suggests that this return is temporary: both Scipio and Hannibal will end their lives in exilic flight, an arresting image that demands the attention of Silius' intra- and extradiegetic audiences.

First, we need to read Silius' allusion to Scipio's exile in its narrative context, that is within a triumphal context. This is no accident; as I suggested in the first chapter of this dissertation, the triumph and *reditus* of a general is an important element of Domitianic propaganda. That idea of *reditus*, of return, is of prime importance when we discuss Scipio's "exile" at the end of the poem; in reality, Scipio would never return from exile in Liternum, but in the narrative of the *Punica* itself, we see Scipio's exile counterbalanced by a different kind of *reditus*.

One of the most important ways that our poet combines the idea of exile and *reditus* in this passage is, predictably, by his use of the hero Camillus: historically, Camillus' return was a *reditus* both from exile and in a triumphal sense. Indeed, as a kind of ring composition, Camillus' appearance at the end of book 17 in a triumphal *reditus* recalls his very first appearance in the epic at the end of book 1, where he similarly featured as a hero celebrating a triumphal *reditus* (1.625–6):

> Gallisque ex arce fugatis
> arma revertentis pompa gestata Camilli
>
> And the arms carried in the triumphal procession of returning Camillus once the Gauls had been put to flight from the Capitol.

The triumphal *pompa* Camillus celebrated at the beginning of the epic anticipates Scipio's at epic's end; Camillus' return is denoted the verb *verto* which we will recall is a key word in exilic discourse,[14] a sense which is all the clearer if we keep in mind Silius' Livian source specifying Camillus' *reditus* to his city and *patria* (Liv. 5.49.7: *dictator reciperata ex hostibus patria triumphans in urbem redit*, "The dictator returns triumphing to his city since his fatherland has been recovered from the enemy.").[15] We should recall here that Scipio's triumph in book 17 looks remarkably like Camillus' Livian return, since both juxtapose *patria* and *urbs* as the objective of the *reditus* (Sil. 17.627–8: *repetit per caerula Romam* / *et patria invehitur sublimi tecta triumpho*, "Through the blue ocean he returns to Rome and is conveyed into the homes of his fatherland in sublime triumph.").[16] Moreover, Camillus' return is here counterbalanced by the not-quite-literally-but-contextually exilic *fuga* of the Gauls, just as Scipio's return to Rome in book 17 is counterbalanced by the not-quite-literally-but-contextually exilic *fuga* of Hannibal (17.644: *Hannibalis campis fugientis imago*, "the image of Hannibal, fleeing from the fields").

By connecting Scipio's *reditus* to Camillus' in this way, I think Silius attempts to present Scipio's triumph as a metaphorical "return" from his impending exile: Scipio returns, in Silius' *Punica,* as a lasting example for imperial authority in a way more lasting than a physical return to the city which Scipio never actually enjoyed. Indeed, reading Scipio's *reditus* along these lines helps to make a good deal of sense of what is to me an otherwise perplexing line (17.625) describing Scipio's confident return to Rome: *mansuri compos decoris per saecula rector*.

[14] See introduction above. Cf. Spaltenstein (1986) 94: "Camille, exile à Ardea, arrive au moment de la pesée et met les Gaulois en fuite. Ce retour (*revertentis*) de Camille était célèbre." As Spaltenstein rightly notes, Camillus' "return" is paralleled elsewhere within the *Punica* (cf. the triumphal *currus* at 7.558) and, significantly, Vergil's *Aeneid* at *Aen*. 6.825.

[15] On the intertext, see Feeney (1982) *ad* Sil. 1.626

[16] Although Silius' closest model is clearly Liv. 30.45.2: *Romam pervenit triumphoque omnium clarissimo urbem est invectus* ("he reached Rome and was conveyed into the city in the grandest triumph of all").

Describing Scipio as *compos* of his *mansurum decus* (probably a Latinized version of Homeric κλέος ἄφθιτον)[17] will leave at least some readers scratching their heads, however, since we know that as a *decus* Scipio is doomed *not* to "remain" (*mansuri*) in Rome after the end of the *Punica* (13.515): *post haec decus hoc patriaque domoque carebit*. So which is it: is Scipio's glory something which remains at Rome as an indelible marker of power,[18] or is it something cast out and exiled, a mark of what the *urbs iniqua* (13.514) Rome once was but is no longer? Silius seems to insist at poem's end on the staying-power of Scipio's *reditus*, that is of the power of Scipio's exemplary *decus* to remain as an *exemplum* for future Roman generations (*per saecula*); presumably, this means that Scipio the *rector* becomes an exemplary leader for future Roman emperors like Domitian.

It makes more sense to me to see Scipio's praise at the end of the poem constructed in such a way as to anticipate and counterbalance the negative valences of Scipio's future at the end of the epic. Of course, the "problem" with this approach is that by anticipating and responding to such negative elements of Scipio's future, Silius also highlights them. More simply put, the phrase *mansurum decus* used vis-à-vis Scipio is at best ambivalent, an utterance which highlights the positive and negative aspects of the hero's life. As I argued in my second chapter, Scipio's story cannot meaningfully disentangle the benefits and dangers of one-man rule laden in such phrases as this: Silius has either inevitably failed to dissociate Scipio's death in exile from his glory-days as told in the *Punica*, or he has attempted to blend the two together in some meaningful way. That "meaningful way" will itself be ambivalent by necessity since it forces

[17] So Hardie (1997) 158, cf. Roumpou (2018) *ad loc*.

[18] Perhaps worth mentioning here is the observation of Lovatt (2016) 373 that Hannibal's flight signifies not finality and closure, but rather unending uncertainty. Cf. similarly Stocks (2014) 215 and Roumpou (2018) 45–6 following Lovatt. Both heroes "remain" as part of Rome's discourse of power, but both are also removed from Rome and their *patriae*. Power and authority are not zero-sum games in the *Punica*.

Silius to highlight the negative parts of his hero's life. Even if that contrary voice highlighting Scipio's (or perhaps it is more proper to say Rome's) future disgrace is a quieter one,[19] it is nonetheless present and capitalized upon by our poet.

We glimpse a rather clear example of this contrary voice at the most spectacular event of Scipio's *reditus*: ironically, the flight and departure of Hannibal from battle draws the attention of all during a celebration of return and victory, his *imago* coming last during a procession of geographic icons and peoples over whom the Romans were victorious during the war (17.643–4):

> sed non ulla magis mentesque oculosque tenebat,
> quam visa Hannibalis campis fugientis imago.
>
> But no other was attracting the attention and eyes more than the *imago* of Hannibal seen running from the fields.

Silius seems to have inserted this detail of his own accord: neither Livy (30.45) or Polybius (16.23) single out Hannibal as a part of the triumph (spectacular or otherwise). Instead, both of Silius' historical predecessors highlight Syphax as being a particularly memorable addition or *desideratum* to the captives in the triumphal procession: he died either shortly after being included in the procession (Polybius) or just before he could be (Livy, although not consistently).[20] Whatever the case may be, neither of Silius' possible sources singles out Hannibal as a remarkable aspect of the triumph; we are open to posit, then, the ways in which Silius has introduced this detail into his account so that it might fit in with other details in his

[19] Although, it bears repeating, it has been noted: see most recently on 17.625 Roumpou (2018) 55 with further bibliography.

[20] Plb. 16.23.6 (καὶ γὰρ ὁ Σόφαξ ὁ τῶν Μασαισυλίων βασιλεὺς ἤχθη τότε διὰ τῆς πόλεως ἐν τῷ θριάμβῳ μετὰ τῶν αἰχμαλώτων, "And indeed Syphax the king of the Massylians was then led through the city in the triumph along with the other captives"); Liv. 30.45 (*morte subtractus spectaculo magis hominum quam triumphantis gloriae Syphax est*, "Syphax was removed by his death more from the gaze of the people than from the glory of the triumphing general"). Silius' language (*magis...oculosque tenebat, / quam*) suggests that he is influenced by Livy here. Cf., however, Liv. 38.46.10: *sic P. Africano de Hannibale et Poenis et Syphace triumphus datus* ("Thus a triumph over Hannibal, the Carthaginians, and Syphax was granted to P. Africanus").

narrative. I would suggest that the inclusion of Hannibal in the triumphal parade ultimately encourage us to compare and contrast the current and future states of the Carthaginian general and Scipio. That is to say, *Hannibal fugiens* reminds us of the exilic *fuga* awaiting just beyond the epic's conclusion for both men.

At first glance, these lines have nothing to do with Scipio. We see here instead the flight of Rome's main antagonist from the battlefield—this *fuga* could even be argued to be strictly military in context rather than exilic. But I would argue that Silius wants us to think of Hannibal's exile as well as his defeat on the battlefield, here; moreover, he is drawing a comparison between Hannibal's exile and Scipio's. To prove the one proves the other, and two key pieces of intratextual evidence present themselves. First, let us consider how Hannibal's *imago* summons to mind the *imago* of Hamilcar in, of all places, Liternum at *Punica* 6: just like his son, Hamilcar's *imago* is also the most gripping spectacle in a triumphal parade (6.689–91):

> haec inter iuncto religatus in ordine Hamilcar,
> ductoris genitor, cunctarum ab imagine rerum
> totius in sese vulgi converterat ora.
>
> Amidst these Hamilcar, father of the present general, was bound in a conjoined row, and from the *imago* of everything else turned towards himself the faces of all the people.

In this earlier passage, Hannibal has visited an otherwise unknown temple at Liternum as he ravages Campania; depicted on the gates of the temple are the defeat of Hamilcar during the First Punic War, which Hannibal subsequently orders destroyed.[21] The placement in Liternum, however, is a curious choice, for in all likelihood Hannibal never visited the relatively modest

[21] Fowler (2000) 86–107 remains necessary reading on this scene; cf. Marks (2003) 144 and, on the tradition of Scipio in Liternum more generally, Henderson (2004) 93–104.

town at all;[22] why invent such a visit? Probably because of the site's connection with Scipio Africanus, since the elder statesman would end his life in exile there. But here we reach a crux relevant to both books 6 and 17: is Silius intending to bring to mind the disgraceful future of his hero in exile? Marks argues to the contrary, that "Scipio and his future literally loom in the background" as Hannibal ineffectually rages at the *monumenta* of his father's (and his own) defeat; Marks goes on to argue that "it is not, I think, the political disgrace that attended Scipio's departure from Rome and retirement to Liternum of which Silius wishes to remind us."[23] Now, to be clear, I agree with half of Marks' argument: Scipio's victory is certainly one of the things Silius wants us to keep in mind as Hannibal ignores the defeat he will suffer. I am less convinced that we are not meant to think of Scipio's disgrace in exile at the same time; if we do, we miss the comparison Silius is constantly making between his chief protagonists.

When Hannibal confronts his own future defeat at Liternum, he also confronts his own future in exile; he, like Scipio, will die removed from the place where he was born and at odds with the dominant political forces in Rome. That is to say, if we think of Hannibal in exile in the same contexts as we think of Scipio's exile, are we not invited to not just contrast but also to compare the exiles of both? Indeed, in book 6, if we are thinking of Hannibal's future at the same time as we think of Hamilcar's past, does not the historically suspect[24] detail of *religatus Hamilcar* at 6.689 (in most accounts he was not captured at the end of the war) remind us of

[22] Cf. Marks (2003) 144 n. 32 citing and rightly rejecting the evidence of Liv. 22.16.14, where Hannibal is trapped *inter Formiana saxa ac Literni harenas stagnaque*.

[23] Marks (2003) 144; cf. more ambivalently Fowler (2000) 106: "Yet fate too exists in books, in the stories the victors tell. In the end, Hannibal will not find it so easy to destroy this picture of history: and he will conclude the *Punica* himself a picture, carried in Scipio's triumph. And Scipio? He will end his days in Liternum, in that villa that Seneca will later visit as a stately home." I am not convinced by Marks' assertion that Silius alludes to the hagiographic *Epist.* 86 of Seneca here: as I argued in chapter 2, Silius tellingly avoids such over-the-top praise of Scipio in his allusion to the general's removal to Liternum.

[24] See Fowler (2000) 103–4 with n. 47 citing the relevant discussion in Delz's apparatus and Spaltenstein (1986) *ad loc.*

relegatus Hannibal, of Hannibal exiled? In Literum, where Scipio suffered (if not technically *relegatio*) but voluntary exile, I do not think it is far-fetched to draw such a comparison. As we saw in the conclusion of chapter 2, after all, this was precisely Livy's take on the syncretism of Scipio's and Hannibal's exilic fates: yes, Scipio did great service to Rome in defeating Hannibal, but the exile of both makes the removal of the former a telling marker of Rome's ability to transfer victory into dominion without strife.

We cannot, I think, read Hannibal's exile in book 6 or 17 in a vacuum without referencing Scipio's removal from Rome. Indeed, an intratextual reference encourages us to think of Scipio when Silius describes the image of Hannibal in flight at the very end of the epic. Let us look more closely at Silius' description of the *Hannibalis campis fugientis imago* (17.644). As I suggested above, although this *imago* of Hannibal describes the general's retreat from the battlefield (thus, *campis*), we are also encouraged to see here an *imago* of Hannibal in flight from his fatherland into exile: since the conclusion of books 2 and 13 (as we saw in chapters 2 and 3), our poet has strongly associated Hannibal's defeat on the battlefield with his abandonment of his *patria*. That is to say, our proleptic visions of the fall of Hannibal *invictus* (e.g. 2.706: *invictus quondam...bellator*) giving way to Scipio *invictus* (17.651: *invicte parens*)[25] has always in the *Punica* included a description of Hannibal becoming a *vagus exul* (2.701).

If Hannibal's *fuga* is therefore polysemous, evoking both military defeat and exilic flight, how are we to interpret the intratextual connection Silius draws between Hannibal's *imago fugiens* and that of Scipio, who earlier in book 17 also appears on the *campus* as an *imago fugiens* (17.538–41):

> dat terga et campo fugiens volat ales imago
> tramittitque acies. tum vero ut victor et alti

[25] On this connection, cf. Bernstein (2017) *ad* Sil. 2.706.

> iam compos voti ferrata calce cruentat
> cornipedem et largas Poenus quatit asper habenas
>
> The *imago* fleeing from the field turns its back, flies swiftly, and moved across the battle line. Then indeed the Carthaginian, as a victor and already having been granted his prayer, bloodies his steed with the iron spur and fiercely shakes his loose reins.

The intertextual resonance with Turnus' delusion by the phantom-Aeneas is patent and well-noted;[26] but this Scipionic ghost finds further intratextual significance in Hannibal at the end of the book (17.644: *Hannibalis campis fugientis imago*).[27] Indeed, Hannibal being led astray both physically and mentally (539–40: *alti* / *iam compos voti*) plays on the sustained contrast we have already described in book 17 between the mental states of Hannibal and Scipio at the beginning and end of book 17 as they try/succeed to return to Rome (17.221–2: *mentisne ego compos et hoc nunc* / *indignus reditu*; cf. 17.624: *mansuri compos decoris per saecula rector*). Hannibal believes that he is the *victor* (539: *ut victor*) and that there is nowhere Scipio can escape (17.542: *quo fugis*); but in fact, Scipio *invictus* will make sure that Hannibal will ever remain, like the frozen but lasting image of his *imago*, in flight, finding no safe refuge in exile throughout the entire world (cf. 2.700–1). This intratextual comparison of Scipio and Hannibal in imagined flight, on their surface, suggest a difference between the two generals: Hannibal's delusion and subsequent retreat from the battlefield proves Scipio's superiority as a leader and secures him a triumphal procession in Rome.

If we stop where the narrative of the *Punica* stops, that is the end of the comparison. The vision of Scipio in flight is nothing more than a deluded prelude to the triumph and Hannibal's flight at the end of the epic. But as we saw in chapter 2, Silius frequently nods to Scipio's future

[26] Cf. *Aen.* 10.656–7: *Aeneae fugientis imago*) See Spaltenstein (1990) 479; Stocks (2014) 64–6, 215; Roumpou (2018) *ad* Sil. 17.538.

[27] The parallel is also noted by Jacobs (2009) 292 n. 30 and Roumpou (2018) *ad* Sil. 17.538.

in such a subtle and indirect way as to suggest that the picture he paints in the *Punica* gets more complicated in the future/past. Scipio, after all, will suffer exilic *fuga* just like Hannibal. To be clear, Silius certainly does not explicitly highlight the same fate envisioned by Hannibal's and Scipio's *imagines fugientes*; Scipio is clearly the returning victor of book 17, Hannibal the defeated leader in flight. There is a difference. And yet, as we saw in chapter 2, Scipio's future in exile often argues against the permanence of the difference between the heroic Scipio and the enemies he confronts (Scipio's oath to Metellus in book 10 never to leave Rome comes to mind). In the narrative of the poem, it is easy to see the difference between the leader Scipio and the exile Metellus; but the reality of Scipio's future makes that distinction difficult to maintain. The same dynamic can be observed between Scipio and Hannibal in the conclusion of the epic. Just as we are encouraged to imagine Hannibal('s *imago*) in flight, so too did we imagine Scipio in flight. Such a synkrisis is not accidental; book 13, as we saw in chapter 2, also structurally encourages a comparison of the exiles of Scipio and Hannibal.

Here in book 17, we are given a vision of Scipio's triumph which maintains that the fleeting *imagines* of Hannibal and Scipio are different; Hannibal's *imago* represents actual military defeat, whereas Scipio's presages victory. But that is a distinction that history cannot maintain; both Scipio and Hannibal will end their lives in exile, in *fuga*. Silius leaves silent, but nonetheless suggested through his intratextual and intertextual references, what Livy makes explicit in his final estimation of Hannibal and Scipio: victory made Scipio and Rome simultaneously greater and worse than Carthage (Liv. 38.50.7), for Rome expelled a victorious general, not defeated one. And it is worth restating that this is a comparison our poet could have avoided. Silius, as we saw in our overview of his sources above, made a choice to highlight Hannibal's *imago* in the triumph and to make it the object of spectacle using the language he did;

in doing so, he concludes his epic with a comparison suggesting that flight awaits both Hannibal and Scipio. To me, it seems typical to Silius to make such a move: just as at the end of book 10, here too our poet suggests that victory may, in fact, leave the victor worse off.

It may well be, as I argued in chapter 2 and as Livy himself suggests, that it is Rome (and not necessarily Scipio) who suffers because of Scipio's exile. And yet, as I also suggested in chapter 2, insofar as Rome's imperial hopes are attached to Scipio specifically, it inevitably becomes difficult to disentangle the prospects of one from the prospects of the other. It is for this reason that I argued in chapter 3 that, insofar as exile is a necessary component of epic representations of Roman power, Hannibal—not Scipio—is the hero whose displacement represents most clearly and unambiguously the expanse of Roman power.

Avenues of Further Inquiry: Statius and "Real" Exile

> Naidas, undarum dominas, regemque corusci
> ignis adhuc fessum Siculaque incude rubentem
> elicuisse satis. paulum arma nocentia, Thebae,
> ponite; dilecto volo lascivire sodali.
> iunge, puer, cyathos, sed ne numerare labora
> cunctantemque intende chelyn; discede, Laborque
> Curaque, dum nitidis canimus gemmantia saxis
> balnea...
>
> Stat. *Silv.* 1.5.6–13

> It is enough to have brought out the Naiads, mistresses of the waves, and the king of flashing fire still tired and growing red from the Sicilian anvil. Set aside for a while your criminal arms; I want to play with a cherished friend. Bring on the cups, boy—but don't try to count them—and string up the hesitating lyre; go away, Labor and Worry, while we sing of baths bedazzled with gleaming stones...

In its current form, this project may suggest in its scope that exile is a literary topic worthy of investigation in a single poet, but it has eschewed the topic of exile as both a historical reality and as a topic which Silius shared with his contemporary Campanian hexameter poet, Statius. In

fact, I anticipate that this project will need to grow to include both of these sets of data in one way or another. I would like, by way of looking ahead as I conclude, to examine the ways in which the reality of exile as lived experience can explain—or at least help us to see more clearly—some of the similarities between Silius' and Statius treatment of exile in rather broad strokes. It is no accident, I think, that exile plays a very similar role in both poets.

The possibility of exile for influential Romans was all too real, and particularly during the reign of Domitian. We know of at least 14 men and 4 women who suffered exile or relegation under Domitian's orders,[28] one of whom was the father of Claudius Etruscus. While we do not know the man's name, we know that he was a freedman from Smyrna who earned manumission from Tiberius and then swiftly rose in rank within the imperial courts of Caligula, Claudius, Nero, Vespasian (who granted the elder Etruscus equestrian status), Titus, and finally Domitian. At some point, he even married the daughter of a consular.[29] Owing to unclear reasons (perhaps related to Etruscus Elder's handling the emperor's coinage reforms in 82),[30] the father was exiled to Campania (a mild place of relegation, to be sure) and only returned shortly before his death (most likely in 93).

I would like to begin this section by looking at the ways in which Statius talks about Claudius' father's exile. The lines above come from a poem dedicated to Claudius, Statius' patron and benefactor, and commemorating the successful completion of a bathing complex. On first blush, we see here a *recusatio* in which Statius swears off the heavier themes of epic (the *arma nocentia* of his *Thebaid*) in the sympotic mode which Statius has probably adapted from

[28] Rocovich (2004) 229–59 provides a helpful set of appendices listing known exiles and relevant testimonia during the imperial age to the reign of Constantine.

[29] For more on the life of the elder Etruscus, see Hulls (2011) 150 and: Weaver (1965) and (1972) 284–94; Evans (1978); Nauta (2002) 230–1. See also the relevant prosopographic sources listed by Weaver (1965) n. 1.

[30] So Carradice (1979).

one of his favorite sources in the *Silvae*, Horace's *Odes*—and particularly here 3.8.13–16.[31] But there is, I believe, more going on in that *recusatio*; in particular, we know that Etruscus Elder's exile is much on the mind of his son based on evidence from Statius' own poem (viz. the poem's last line, *Silv.* 1.5.65: *et tua iam melius discat fortuna renasci*, "and now let your fortune learn to be reborn under better circumstnaces")[32] and a pair of Martial's poems also dedicated to Claudius Etruscus on this same occasion (6.42 on the baths and 6.83 on the exile of Etruscus Elder with Grewing *ad loc.*).

Statius intends to dispel a very particular *cura* (Silv. 1.5.12) from his patron's mind at the beginning of this poem, namely his father's exile. While we cannot know for certain when Statius' poem was published (books 1–3 of the Silvae were probably published as a unit sometime before 93),[33] based on the typical dating of Martial's sixth book to 90,[34] we can surmise that *Silv*. 1.5 was probably composed just before Claudius secured his father's return and while the *Thebaid* was unfinished (i.e., at the very least before 93). If the evidence of *Silv*. 3.3 (composed just after the father's return, see further below) is to be trusted, Claudius was much concerned and involved in securing his father's recall (see, e.g., *Silv*. 3.3.154–5), especially during the time when *Silv.* 1.5 was being penned.

What is curious to me is that Statius eschews not just the topic of exile in this poem, but also the mode of epic poetry: the "guilty arms" of *Silv.* 1.5.8 (*arma nocentia*), recalling as they

[31] *sume, Maecenas, cyathos amici / sospitis centum et vigilis lucernas / perfer in lucem; procul omnis esto / clamor et ira* ("Take up, Maecenas, the hundred cups of your friend and put light to your wakeful lanterns; far away be all strife and anger."). Cf. *Silv.* 1.5.10–12 (*cyathos...discede, Laborque / Curaque*).

[32] Cf. with Laguna Mariscal (1990) 3.3.154: *pro patre renato*. The idea that *reditus* from exile is tantamount to rebirth is a regular one in Roman thought; with Gaertner (2005) *ad* Ov. *Pont*. 1.5.86 (also noting our passages from the *Silv*.) see also Shackleton Bailey (1965) *ad* Cic. *Att*. 3.20.1 (*diemque natalem reditus mei*); *Att*. 4.1.8 (*alterius vitae quoddam initium*).

[33] On the dating of Statius' *Silvae* especially (and, where relevant to the *Silvae*'s date, the *Thebaid*) Coleman (1988) xvi–xx remains authoritative.

[34] See Grewing (1997) 20–4.

do “guilty Thebes” (*Theb*. 1.2: *sontesque...Thebas*), are not subject matter appropriate for someone attempting to secure a recall from exile. I would like to suggest, therefore, that Statius’ *recusatio* works on both a literary and real-world level: he refuses to mention exile and he refuses to engage in epic. This *recusatio* is therefore suggestive of the way in which exile, as a prominent theme especially in Statius’ poetry, could be received and manipulated in less lofty genres of poetic activity dealing with the daily affairs of elite Romans. I would like to ask, then, why Statius seems to avoid in this poem both exile and his own epic poetry. Are these two denied subjects mutually exclusive of one another?

I do not think so; in this instance, Statius’ allusion to his own poetry carries with it a very particular meaning. While it is not uncommon for Statius to allude to his epic project in composing his occasional verses, this instance forms a special case. For Statius’ *Thebaid* is, after all, largely focused on the exiled son of Oedipus, Polynices; this is a touchy subject given Claudius’ family’s current state of affairs. Therefore, Statius’ refusal to take up his epic subject matter in this poem is not just a rhetorical feint or an empty gesture to literary history, it is also a notice that Statius will not deal quite so explicitly (as Martial does) with the subject of Etruscus Elder’s exile. Epic, and particularly Roman (and even more specifically Statian) epic, is largely filled with the deeds of exiles, topical grounds on which Statius does not wish to tread. Indeed, the *Thebaid* is about a return from exile that goes horribly wrong and causes civil instability—definitely topics Statius would want to avoid in writing a poem for this particular patron at this particular time.

Statius is less restricted, however, after the death of Claudius Etruscus’ father; for in the third poem of Statius’ third book of *Silvae,* our poet pens a *consolatio* for Claudius on the death

of his father.[35] In this poem, epic and exile go hand-in-hand through the development of two chief themes, one by Statius himself and the other by Claudius Etruscus, an internal narrator within the poem. Statius frames the poem around Claudius' extraordinary *pietas* towards his father: the goddess *Pietas* appears in the very first line of the poem, and Statius subsequently marvels at Claudius' *pii fletus* so prominent that one would think he were attending the funeral of a deceased child (*Silv*. 3.3.7–13). Claudius, as narrator near the end of the poem (*Silv.* 3.3.182–204), develops the second important theme, the father's recall from exile. To be sure, Statius has hinted that this theme will be an important one when he alludes to the "expulsion" (*Silv*. 3.3.4: *expulsa*) of *Pietas* from the lives of most of Claudius' contemporaries. This allusion not only highlights the enormity of Claudius' exemplary filial piety at a time when it (at least putatively) is not in vogue, but also recalls the expulsion of Etruscus Elder himself—this perhaps being the kind of allusion to the *Thebaid* Statius foreswore in his earlier poem, as he here alludes to *Pietas*' retreat from Earth in the *Thebaid* (11.457–96).[36] That is to say, in the sympotic context of *Silv.* 1.5, the related themes of exile and epic poetry were not appropriate; in *Silv*. 3.3, however, those two topics go hand-in-hand.

When Claudius himself enters as narrator, he opens with an allusion to the goddess *Fortuna Redux* (*Silv*. 3.3.183–4: *cur nos, fidissime, linquis / Fortuna redeunte, pater*?, "Why, most faithful father, do you leave us with your Fortune returning?"): here, as we saw in chapter 1, *Fortuna* presides as the patron deity of those recalled from exile. But as we saw happens so often, this return is also marred, for it is immediately followed by abandonment, *linquis*: Statius

[35] On the *consolatio*, particularly in Statius *Silvae*, see especially Gibson (2006) xxxi–l. On *Silv*. 3.3 in particular, see the relevant sections of Laguna Mariscal (1990); Hulls (2011). Weaver (1965) provides a helpful prosopography, but it less concerned with literary matters.

[36] So Hulls (2011) 153: Statius is perhaps thinking of the depiction of *Pietas* in his *Thebaid* 11.457–96, where she flees the horror of Polynices' and Eteocles' mutual fratricide. It takes a great display of filial *pietas* to bring her back to earth."

here activates the relationship between death and exile to suggest that Claudius' *reditus* turned out to be the grounds not for return but yet another departure. While the near-synonymous relationship between exile and death is well-attested in Roman thought in general,[37] he pays special attention to the co-identification of the two in his epic poetry. Antigone, for example, calls the dead Polynices *exul ubique, / semper inops aequi* (*Th.* 12.444–5), recalling Ovid's citation of this story during his own exile at *Tr.* 3.3.63–8.[38] Death has robbed Polynices permanently of the chance to divest himself of his exilic status; indeed, that was precisely Creon's point when he denied Polynices burial (*Th.* 12.58–9: *Argivus haberi / frater iussus adhuc atque exule pellitur umbra*).[39] The themes of exile and death so prominent in epic poetry therefore provide Statius with familiar language and *topoi* in this particular *consolatio*.

To return to Statius' use of epic material in *Silv.* 3.3, however, I would like to focus on the list of exemplars Claudius seems to fashion for his own filial piety, drawing on the epic tradition (*Silv.* 3.3.188–91). In these lines, I would like to argue that we get our first peak into how an ancient audience received and adapted Silius' use of the theme of exile in his poem:

> felix, cui magna patrem cervice vehenti
> sacra Mycenaeae patuit reverentia flammae,
> quique tener saevis genitorem Scipio Poenis,
> abstulit, et Lydi pietas temeraria Lausi.

[37] As noted by Doblhofer (1987) 174, see, e.g., Pub. *Sent.* E 9: *exulanti ubi nusquam, sine sepulcro est mortuus*.

[38] This intertext is itself complicated. Statius clearly has his eyes on that passage (e.g. *Th.* 12.438–9: *quis enim accessus ferus hospitis umbrae / pelleret*, "for what savage would push away the approach of a guest-shade"; cf. *Tr.* 3.3.63–4: *inter Sarmaticas Romana vagabitur umbras, / perque feros manes hospita semper erit*, "The Roman will wander amidst Sarmatian shades, and amidst savage *manes* will always be a guest.").

[39] The play between Polynices' burial and his return home is also tellingly emphasized by Euripides' Polynices, who by way of a messenger in the *Phoenissae* notices the difference between the "birthplace" he might have in burial and the "home" he has lost forever (*Phoen.* 1448–50: ἐν γῇ πατρῴᾳ, καὶ πόλιν θυμουμένην / παρηγορεῖτον, ὡς τοσόνδε γοῦν τύχω / χθονὸς πατρῴας, κεἰ δόμους ἀπώλεσα, "[bury me] in the land of my birth and assuage my angered fatherland, so that I can at least get this much of my birth land, even if I lost my home.).

> Happy he for whose great neck, carrying his father, the sacred awe of the Mycenaean torch opened a path, and that young Scipio who saved his father from the savage Carthaginians, and the reckless *pietas* of Lydian Lausus.

Ostensibly, as those who comment on these lines will tell us, this list of heroes suggested itself to Statius for two, connected reasons: each figure plays a prominent role in epic and has associated with him a particularly memorable display of *pietas*.[40] Indeed, as Hulls suggests, Statius' mention of Scipio in a list of epic heroes suggests that Statius may well have in mind the *Punica*.[41] I do not want to downplay the difficulties we face in ascertaining allusions such as this between Statius and Silius, especially in their roughly contemporaneous epic poems; it can be difficult, in those cases, to ascertain priority—that is, to decide who is alluding to whom. In this case, however, we can be bolder, since at least some of *Silv*. 1–3 was composed following an initial and incomplete publication of the *Punica* around 92 (suggested by Mart. 7.63);[42] *Silv*. 3.3 almost certainly falls into this window as its *termini* for publication are that it must come (a) after the return and death of Claudius Etruscus, typically dated, as stated above, between 92/3 and (b) before the publication of *Silv.* 1–3 (probably in early 93, although 94 is also a possibility, if less likely).[43] Indeed, following a portion of Delarue's unpublished dissertation, Ripoll has recently observed in our poem that there is a "plausible" allusion in Statius' *tener Scipio* to Silius' Scipio, whose hand is also described as *tener* (Sil. 4.425); I am not convinced that this specific detail proves that "Statius wants to put the hero of Silius' poem on the same level as the

[40] See Laguna Mariscal (1990) *ad loc*. for the relevant intertextual parallels with Vergil (Silius is not mentioned).

[41] Hulls (2011) 156–7 and 172 n. 10.

[42] For the dating issues, relevant testimonia, and bibliography, see Ripoll (2015) 428 on Statius as well as the information cited at the beginning of this section; on Silius, see especially Augoustakis (2010c) 3–11.

[43] The latter depends on the facts that (a) unlike the *Thebaid, Silvae* 1–3 mention Domitian's Sarmatian campaigns, and (b) whether the Capitoline games mentioned in *Silv.* 3.5 took place in 90 (more likely) or 94 (less). See Coleman (1988) xvi–xvii and Augoustakis (2016) xvii–xviii.

two heroes of Vergil."[44] And yet, I do believe that further analysis reveals 2 relevant details from this list of epic heroes that strongly suggest Statius had Silius' Scipio in mind.

To take the list in order, Statius here envisions Aeneas escaping Troy with his father on his shoulders (188–9); Scipio Africanus saving his father by carrying him to safety on his shoulders in much the same way during the battle at the Ticinus; and finally Lausus, the son of Mezentius, attempting to rescue his father from Aeneas' onslaught. While it could be accidental,[45] Statius is almost certainly either alluding to Silius with his presentation of Scipio as a new Aeneas or both are alluding to a common source. The similar actions of Aeneas and Scipio in the *Silvae* strongly echo a similar parallel between the two heroes in Silius' version (Sil. 4.466–8):

> tunc rapta propere duris ex ossibus hasta
> innixum cervice ferens umeroque parentem
> emicat.
>
> From there after he had taken the spear quickly from the dense bone he shone forth carrying his father leaning on the son's neck and shoulder.

As others have observed,[46] Silius is himself referring in these lines to Aeneas' escape from Troy as related by Vergil at the end of the second book of the *Aeneid*. Connecting Silius' Aeneas-like Scipio and Statius' is not just the visual similarity, but also the fact that both Scipionic exemplars lean on the Aeneas-model in order to highlight filial piety (explicit at *Silv*. 3.3.191; cf. Sil. 4.471:

[44] Ripoll (2015) 425–7 (quote from page 426), following Delarue (1990) 319–24 suggests four possible allusions. The issue of ascertaining allusions between Statius and Silius remains a challenging issue. There is no complete collection of proposed intertexts or sustained, book-length studies; Ripoll (2015) *passim* and particularly the bibliography at Ripoll (2015) 425 n. 2 is a good introduction. In addition, Marks (2014) *passim* and with bibliography is necessary reading and has a bibliography that is happily, if accidentally, complementary with Ripoll's.

[45] Cf. with Laguna Mariscal *ad loc*. similar language at Ov. *Pont*. 1.1.33–4.

[46] See Spaltenstein (1986) 304; Ahl, Davis, and Pomeroy (1986) 2544–5; Bernstein (2010); Kennedy Klaassen (2010) 102.

pietasque insignis et aetas echoing *Aen*. 6.403: *pietate isnignis et armis*).[47] One other detail suggests to me that Statius and Silius are doing similar things with their Scipios; namely, both Scipios are introduced as exiles. This is far easier to see in Statius; for his list of heroes (Aeneas, Scipio, Lausus) share in common not just their filial piety, but the fact that they are all exiles: Aeneas is exiled from Troy, Scipio from Rome, and Lausus from his Etruscan homeland along with his father on account of the latter's despicable torturing of his people (*Aen*. 8.481–93).

Admittedly, it is not so clear that Silius is leaning on Aeneas-as-exile in his own version; and yet, two facts suggest that Silius might be employing just such a reference here. In the first place, as I argued in chapter 1, *pius Aeneas*—which dutiful aspect of the hero Silius is undoubtedly emphasizing—and *Aeneas profugus* cannot be meaningfully dissociated from one another either artistically (viz. Aeneas' statue depicting his flight from Troy as the *exemplum pietatis* among Augustus' *summi viri*) or even within the text of the *Aeneid,* wherein the first character-descriptors of Aeneas beyond his status as *vir* are that he is a *profugus* (*Aen.* 1.2) and that he is *insignis pietate* (*Aen.* 1.10). More telling to my mind, however, is the ring composition we achieve if we read Scipio's entrance onto the battlefield as a hint of his future in exile. This is, after all, Scipio's first significant appearance in the epic, and I find it attractive that Silius would introduce his hero in book four with an allusion to one exiled hero and conclude his epic by comparing Scipio to another exiled hero, Camillus (17.652).

Whatever Silius' aims were, Statius clearly reads his Aeneas and Scipio as not just pious heroes, but just as importantly heroes who suffer exile; these two aspects represent perfectly the theme and situation around which Statius has composed his poem. Exile and return (the latter in all of its cultural facets) provided poets, and particularly epic poets, with a means of discussing the power and politics of their age. Heroes like Aeneas and Scipio serve as good models for the

[47] On the latter, so Ahl, Davis, and Pomeroy (1986) 2545.

type of social mobility (in both directions) between insiders and outsiders; at a time when outsiders like the Flavians and their court were comprised not of the traditional consular families of the Republic but rather equestrians and foreign freedmen like Etruscus Elder, it comes as little surprise that our poets latched on to exiled and displaced figures as a way of discussing the powerful individuals of their age.

What is slightly more surprising is that we can get a glimpse of these poets recognizing how their contemporaries were deploying this very theme. If, as I have suggested, *Silv*. 3.3.190 is an allusion to Silius, I find it hard to believe that Statius did not recognize the theme of exile running through Silius' poem. Of course, proving allusions of any sort—and especially those between Statius and Silius—is tricky business; so allow me to end with a provocatively strong reading of the evidence for this allusion. *Silv*. 3.3.190 is our first example of reading the theme of exile in the *Punica*—subtly, at that—and was composed for a recipient Statius knew was familiar with Silius' work. Claudius Etruscus seems to have known Campania well; it was the place of his father's exile for nearly a decade, and there is evidence that Claudius accompanied his father into his place of exile for a time (Mart. 6.83.7–8):

> Muneris hoc utrumque tui testatur Etruscus,
> esse quod et comiti contigit et reduci.
>
> Etruscus demonstrates both of these gifts of yours: the fact that he gets to serve as his father's companion in exile and return.

As White and Grewing note, the word *comes* alludes to the technical term of the *comes exilii*, that is a person who accompanied an exile from Rome (an informal but very regular occurrence).[48] Claudius and his father, were therefore familiar with Campania, the very region where not only Statius frequently resided, but also where Silius owned a villa and composed the

[48] On the historical basis for *comites exilii*, see especially Kelly (2006) 133–7. See White (1975) 278 n. 22. On Martial's broader use of the term and its appearances elsewhere in Latin literature, see Grewing (1997) *ad loc.* comparing, e.g., Mart. 12.25.6 and Liv. 6.3.4.

Punica. Would Claudius, familiar with Campania and so in touch with the Roman poets of his day, have missed in *Silv.* 3.3.190 an allusion to Silius' *Punica*? That is, can one mention the name Scipio in hexameters in ca. 90 CE to a person familiar with Campania and not expect that person to think of Silius Italicus? I find it plausible to claim that Statius knew full well that Claudius would recognize Silius' epic poem in these lines. I admit that such a conclusion requires enough speculation as to encourage skepticism; so let me make a more conservative suggestion. Such a reading as I suggest here is plausible, just as it is plausible to read *Silv.* 3.3.190 as an allusion to Sil. 4.467 regardless of Claudius' knowledge of the *Punica* or connection to Campania. To my mind, these two plausabilities suggest that the former makes the latter more probable. On that evidence, I believe that there is both room and a need for a more sustained examination of exile and return not just in Silius' text, but also in Statius' and the cultural milieu in which they were writing.

REFERENCES

Agri, D. 2010. “Madness, Pietas and Suicide in Statius’ Thebaid and Silius’ Punica.” In *Zero, to Hero, Hero, to Zero: In Search of the Classical Hero*, 141–60. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars.

Ahl, F.M., M.A. Davis, and A.J. Pomeroy. 1986. “Silius Italicus.” *ANRW* 2 (32.5): 2492–2561.

Albrecht, Michael von. 1964. *Silius Italicus: Freiheit Und Gebundenheit Römischer Epik.* Amsterdam: P. Schippers.

———. 1999. *Roman Epic: An Interpretative Introduction*. Leiden: Brill.

Ariemma, Enrico M. 2010. “Fons Cuncti Varro Mali: The Demagogue Varro in Punica 8–10.” In *Brill’s Companion to Silius Italicus*, edited by Antony Augoustakis, 241–77. Leiden: Brill.

Arya, Darius A. 2002. “The Goddess Fortuna in Imperial Rome: Cult, Art, Text.” PhD diss., University of Texas at Austin.

Augoustakis, Antony. 2003a. “Rapit Infidum Victor Caput: Ekphrasis and Gender-Role Reversal in Silius Italicus’s Punica 15.” In *Being There Together: Essays in Honor of Michael C.J. Putnam*, edited by P. Thibodeau and H. Haskell, 110–27. Afton: Afton Historical Society Press.

———.2003b. “Lugendam Formae Sine Virginitate Reliquit: Reading Pyrene and the Transformation of Landscape in Silius’ Punica 3.” *AJP* 124: 235–57.

———. 2008. “The Other as Same: Non-Roman Mothers in Silius Italicus’ Punica.” *CP* 103: 55–76.

———. 2010a. *Motherhood and the Other: Fashioning Female Power in Flavian Epic*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———. 2010b. “Silius Italicus, a Flavian Poet.” In *Brill’s Companion to Silius Italicus*, 3–23. Leiden: Brill.

———. 2011. “Sine Funeris Ullo Ardet Honore Rogus: Burning Pyres in Lucan and Silius Italicus’ Punica.” In *Brill’s Companion to Lucan*, 185–98. Leiden: Brill.

———. 2015. “Campanian Politics and Poetics in Silius Italicus’ Punica.” *ICS* 40 (1): 155–69.

———. 2016a. “Burial and Lament in Flavian Epic: Mothers, Fathers, Children.” In *Family in Flavian Epic*, edited by Nikoletta Manioti, 276–300. Leiden: Brill.

———. 2016b. *Statius, Thebaid 8*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———. 2017. “Burial Scenes: Silius Italicus’ Punica and Greco-Roman Historiography.” In *The Literary Genres in the Flavian Age*, edited by F. Bessone and Marco Fucecchi, 299–315. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Augoustakis, Antony, and R. Joy Littlewood. Forthcoming. *A Commentary on Silius Italicus’ Punica 3*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Auhagen, U. 2006. “Stoisches Bei Silius: Decius Und Hannibal (Punica XI 155–258).” *Aevum(Ant)* N.S. 6: 85–97.

Barnes, W.R. 2000. “Virgil: The Literary Impact.” In *A Companion to the Study of Virgil*, edited by Nicholas M. Horsfall, 257–92. Leiden: Brill.

Barratt, P. 1979. *M. Annaei Lucani Belli Civilis Liber V*. Amsterdam: Hakkert.

Barringer, J. 1995. *Divine Escorts: Nereids in Archaic and Classical Greek Art*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Bate, M.S. 2004. “Tempestuous Poetry: Storms in Ovid’s Metamorphoses, Heroides, and Tristia.” *Mnemosyne* 57: 295–310.

Bernstein, Neil W. 2008. *In the Image of the Ancestors: Narratives of Kinship in Flavian Epic*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

———. 2010. “Family and State in the Punica.” In *Brill’s Companion to Silius Italicus*, edited by Antony Augoustakis, 377–97. Leiden: Brill.

———. 2017. *Silius Italicus, Punica 2*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———. 2018. “*Invitas maculant cognate sanguine dextras*: Civil War Themes in Silius’s Saguntum Episode.” In *After 69 CE: Writing Civil War in Flavian Rome*, edited by Lauren Donovan Ginsberg and Darcy A. Krasne, 179–98. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Bettini, Maurizio. 1977. “Ennio in Silio Italico.” *RFIC* 105: 425–47.

———. 1997. “Ghosts of Exile: Doubles and Nostalgia in Vergil’s Parva Troia (Aeneid 3.294ff.).” *ClAnt* 16: 8–33.

Bhabha, Homi K. 1990. “DissemiNation: Time, Narrative, and the Margins of the Modern Nation.” In *Nation and Narration*, edited by Homi K. Bhabha, 290–322. London: Routledge.

Bhatt, Shreyaa. 2018. “Exiled in Rome: The Writing of Other Spaces in Tacitus’ Annales.” In *The Production of Space in Latin Literature*, edited by William Fitzgerald and Efrossini Spentzou. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Biggs, Thomas. 2019. “Campania at War in Silius Italicus’ Punica.” In *Campania in the Flavian Poetic Imagination,* edited by Antony Augoustakis and R. Joy Littlewood, 202–17. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Billerbeck, M. 1983. “Die Unterweltsbeschreibung in Den ‘Punica’ Des Silius Italicus.” *Hermes* 111: 326–38.

———. 1985. “Aspects of Stoicism in Flavian Epic.” *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar* 5: 341–56.

———. 1986b. “Stoizismus in Der Römischen Epik Neronischer Und Flavischer Zeit.” *ANRW* 2 (32.5): 3134–43.

Blom, H. van der. 2010. *Cicero’s Role Models: The Political Strategy of a Newcomer*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Blomgren, S. 1938. *Siliana: De Silii Italici Punicis Quaestiones Criticae et Interpretatoriae*. Uppsala: Uppsala University Press.

Borzsák, S. 1982. “Die Punica Des Silius Italicus Und de Alexander-Überlieferung.” In *Romanitas-Christianitas: Untersuchungen Zur Geschichte Und Literatur Der Römischen Kaiserzeit,* 164–74. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Boyle, A.J. 1997. “Postscripts from the Edge: Exilic Fasti and Imperialized Rome.” *Ramus* 26: 7–28.

Briscoe, John. 2008. *A Commentary on Livy Books 38–40*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Broughton, T. Robert S. 1968. *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic*. Vol. 1. 3 vols. Cleveland: Case Western Reserve University Press.

Brouwers, J.H. 1982. “Zur Lucan-Imitation Bei Silius Italicus.” In *Actus. Studies in Honor of H.L.W. Nelson,* edited by J. den Boeft and A.H.M. Kessels, 73–87. Utrecht.

Bruère, Richard T. 1958. “Color Ovidianus in Silius Punica 1–7.” In *Ovidiana: Recherches Sur Ovide,* edited by N.I. Herescu, 475–99. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

———. 1959. “Color Ovidianus in Silius Punica 8–17.” *CP* 54: 228–45.

Burck, E. 1978. *Unwetterszenen Bei Den Flavischen Epikern*. Wiesbaden: Steiner.

———. 1982. “Die Endphase Der Schlacht Am Metaurus Bei Silius Italicus.” *WS* 16: 260–73.

———. 1984a. *Silius Italicus: Hannibal in Capua Und Die Rückeroberung Der Stadt Durch Die Römer*. Mainz: Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur.

———. 1984b. *Historische Und Epische Tradition Bei Silius Italicus*. Munich: Beck.

———. 1988. “Fides in Den Punica Des Silius Italicus.” In *Munera Philologica et Historica Mariano Plezia Oblata*, edited by J. Safarewicz, 49–60. Wroclaw: Zaklad narodowy im Ossolinskich.

Carradice, Ian A. 1979. “The Banishment of the Father of Claudius Etruscus: Numismatic Evidence.” *LCM* 4: 105–3.

Carradice, Ian A., and Theodore V. Buttrey. 2007. *The Roman Imperial Coinage: From AD 69 to 96, Vespasian to Domitian*. 2nd ed. Vol. 2.1. London: Spink.

Carsana, C. 2007. *Commento Storico al Libro II Delle Guerre Civili Di Appiano*. Pisa: Edizioni ETS.

Casali, Sergio. 2018. “Review of R. Joy Littlewood, A Commentary on Silius Italicus’ Punica 10.” *BMCR* 2018 (09.27).

Cassin, B. 2016. *Nostalgia: When Are We Ever at Home?* Translated by P.-A. Brault. New York: Fordham University Press.

Ceauşescu, P. 1976. “Altera Roma: Histoire d’une Folie Politique.” *Historia* 25: 86–100.

Chaplin, Jane D. 2000. *Livy’s Exemplary History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———. 2010. “Scipio the Matchmaker.” In *Ancient Historiography and Its Contexts: Studies in Honour of A.J. Woodman*, edited by Christina S. Kraus, John Marincola, and Christopher Pelling, 60–72. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Chaudhuri, Pramit. 2014. *The War with God: Theomachy in Roman Imperial Poetry*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Claassen, Jo-Marie. 1992. “Cicero’s Banishment: Tempora et Mores.” *Acta Classica* 35: 19–47.

———. 1999. *Displaced Persons: The Literature of Exile from Cicero to Boethius*. London: Duckworth.

———. 2008. *Ovid Revisited: The Poet in Exile*. London: Duckworth.

Cohen, Sarah T. 2007. “Cicero’s Roman Exile.” In *Writing Exile: The Discourse of Displacement in Greco-Roman Antiquity and Beyond*, edited by Jan Felix Gaertner, 109–28. Leiden: Brill.

Coleman, Kathleen M. 1988. *Silvae IV*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cornell, T.J., and et al. 2013. *Fragments of the Roman Historians*. 3 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cowan, Robert. 2002. "In My Beginning Is My End: Origins, Cities, and Foundations in Flavian Epic." PhD diss., Oxford: Oxford University.

———.2007a. "Reading Trojan Rome: Illegitimate Epithets, Avatars, and the Limits of Analogy in Silius Italicus' Punica." *ORA* 1559. https://ora.ouls.ox.ac.uk/objects/uuid:11faca95-f158-4cefa10948b676c15baf/download_file?file_format=pdf&safe_filename=PDF%2Bversion&type_of_work=Book+section.

———. 2007b. "The Headless City: The Decline and Fall of Capua in Silius Italicus' Punica." *ORA* 1542. https://ora.ouls.ox.ac.uk/objects/uuid:dceb6b5a-980c-46ca-ac9e-088615e7fbea/download_file?file_format=pdf&safe_filename=The%2BHeadless%2BCity%2B%2528PDF%2BVersion%2529&type_of_work=Book+section.

———. 2010. "Virtual Epic: Counterfactuals, Sideshadowing, and the Poetics of Contingency in the Punica." In *Brill's Companion to Silius Italicus*, edited by Antony Augoustakis, 323–51. Leiden: Brill.

Currie, H. 1958. "Lucan III 8ff and Silius Italicus XVII 158ff." *Mnemosyne* 11: 49–52.

Dam, H.-J. van. 1984. *Silvae Book II: A Commentary*. Leiden: Brill.

Dangel, J. 1995. *Accius: Oeuvres (Fragments)*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

D'Anto, V. 1980. *L. Accio: I Frammenti Delle Tragedie*. Lecce: Milella.

Darwall-Smith, R.H. 1996. *Emperors and Architecture: A Study of Flavian Rome*. Brussels: Latomus.

Davis, P.J. 2002. "The Colonial Subject in Ovid's Exile Poetry." *AJP* 123: 257–73.

Dee, Nicholas M. 2017. "Oaths and Greed in Tacitus' Histories." PhD diss., University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Degl'Innocenti Pierini, Rita. 2000. "Orgoglio Di Esule: Su Due Frammenti Di Un'epistola Di Q. Cecilio Metello Numidico." *Maia* 52 (2): 249–58.

Delarue, F. 1990. "Stace, Poète Épique." PhD diss., Paris 4.

———. 1992. "Sur l'Architecture Des Punica de Silius Italicus." *REL* 70: 149–65.

Dench, Emma. 2005. *Romulus' Asylum: Roman Identities from the Age of Alexander to the Age of Hadrian*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dietrich, Jessica. 2005. “The Sorrow of Scipio in Silius Italicus’ Punica.” *Ramus* 34 (1): 75–91.

Doblhofer, Ernst. 1987. *Exil Und Emigration ; Zum Erlebnis Der Heimatferne in Der Römischen Literatur*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Dominik, W. J. 2003. “Hannibal at the Gates: Programmatising Rome and Romanitas in Silius Italicus’ Punica 1 and 2.” In *Flavian Rome*, edited by A.J. Boyle and W. J. Dominik, 469–97. Leiden: Brill.

———. 2006. “Rome Then and Now: Linking the Saguntum and Cannae Episodes in Silius Italicus’ Punica.” In *Flavian Poetry*, edited by R.R. Nauta, H.-J. van Dam, and J.J.L. Smolenaars, 113–27. Leiden: Brill.

———. 2018. “Civil War, Parricide, and the Sword in Silius Italicus’ Punica.” In *After 69 CE: Writing Civil War in Flavian Rome*, edited by L.D. Ginsberg and D. Krasne, 271–93. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Dougherty, C. 1993. *The Poetics of Colonization: From City to Text in Archaic Greece*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Edwards, Catharine. 1996. *Writing Rome: Textual Approaches to the City*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 2018. “Exile and Displacement in Seneca’s Prose.” In *The Production of Space in Latin Literature*, edited by William Fitzgerald and Efrossini Spentzou, 169–94. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Evans, H.B. 1983. *Publica Carmina: Ovid’s Books from Exile*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Evans, J.K. 1978. “The Role of Suffragium in Imperial Political Decision-Making: A Flavian Example.” *Historia* 27: 102–28.

Fabrizi, Virginia. 2015. “Hannibal’s March and Roman Imperial Space in Livy, Ab Urbe Condita, Book 21.” *Philologus* 159: 118–55.

Fantham, Elaine. 1992. “The Role of Evander in Ovid’s Fasti.” *Arethusa* 25: 155–71.

———. 2007. “Dialogues of Displacement: Seneca’s Consoltations to Helvia and Polybius.” In *Writing Exile: The Discourse of Displacement in Greco-Roman Antiquity and Beyond*, edited by Jan Felix Gaertner, 173–92. Leiden: Brill.

Feddern, Stefan. 2013. *Die Suasorien Des Älteren Seneca*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Fedeli, Paolo, R. Dimundo, and I. Ciccarelli. 2015. *Properzio: Elegie Libro IV*. Nordhausen: Bautz.

Feeney, D.C. 1982. “A Commentary on Silius Italicus Book 1.” PhD diss., Oxford University.

———. 1984. “The Reconciliations of Juno.” *CQ* 34: 179–94.

———. 1991. *The Gods in Epic: Poets and Critics of the Classical Tradition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———. 2016. *Beyond Greek: The Beginnings of Latin Literature*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Feldherr, A. 1997. “Livy’s Revolution: Civic Identity and the Creation of the Res Publica.” In *The Roman Cultural Revolution*, edited by Thomas N. Hanbinek and Alessandro Schiesaro, 136–57. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 1999. “Putting Dido on the Map: Genre and Geography in Vergil’s Underworld.” *Arethusa* 32: 85–122.

Flamerie de Lachapelle, Guillaume. 2011. *Sentences: Publilius Syrus*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Fletcher, K.F.B. 2014. *Finding Italy: Travel, Nation, and Colonization in Vergil’s Aeneid*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Fowler, D.P. 2000. *Roman Constructions: Readings in Postmodern Latin*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Franke, J. 1889. *De Tib. Silii Italici Punicorum Tropis*. Münster: Aschendorff.

Fratantuono, L.M., and R.A. Smith. 2015. *Virgil: Aeneid 5*. Leiden: Brill.

Fröhlich, U. n.d. *Regulus, Archetyp Römischer Fides: Das Sechste Buch Als Schlüssel Zu Den Punica Des Silius Italicus*. Tübingen: Stauffenburg.

Fucecchi, Marco. 1990. “Il Declino Di Annibale Nei Punica.” *Maia* 42: 151–66.

———. 2006. “Ad Finem Ventum: Considerazioni Sull’ultimo Libro Dei Punica.” *Aevum(Ant)* N.S. 6: 311–45.

———. 2010. “The Shield and the Sword: Q. Fabius Maximus and M. Claudius Marcellus as Models of Heroism in Silius’ Punica.” In *Brill’s Companion to Silius Italicus*, edited by Antony Augoustakis, 219–39. Leiden: Brill.

———. 2013. “With (a) God on Our Side: Ancient Ritual Practices and Imagery in Flavian Epic.” In *Ritual and Religion in Flavian Epic*, edited by Antony Augoustakis, 17–32. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———. 2014. “The Philosophy of Power: Greek Literary Tradition and Silius’ On Kingship.” In *Flavian Poetry and Its Greek Past*, 305–24. Leiden: Brill.

———. 2019. “Hannibal as (Anti-) Hero of Fides in Silius’ Punica.” In *Fides in Flavian Literature*, edited by Antony Augoustakis, Emma Buckley, and Claire Stocks, 187–207. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Fuentes González, Pedro Pablo. 1998. *Les Diatribes de Télès: Introduction, Texte Revu, Traduction et Commentaire Des Fragments*. Paris: Vrin.

Gaertner, Jan Felix. 2005. *Ovid, Epistulae Ex Ponto, Book 1*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
———. 2007. “The Discourse of Displacement in Greco-Roman Antiquity.” In *Writing Exile: The Discourse of Displacement in Greco-Roman Antiquity and Beyond*, edited by Jan Felix Gaertner, 1–20. Leiden: Brill.

———. 2008. “Livy’s Camillus and the Political Discourse of the Late Republic.” *JRS* 98: 27–52.

Galasso, Luigi. 1995. *Publii Ovidii Nasonis Epistularum Ex Ponto Liber II*. Florence: Le Monnier.

Ganiban, R.T. 2010. “Virgil’s Dido and the Heroism of Hannibal in Silius’ Punica.” In *Brill’s Companion to Silius Italicus*, edited by Antony Augoustakis, 73–98. Leiden: Brill.

Geiger, J. 2008. *The First Hall of Fame: A Study of the Statues in the Forum Augustum*. Leiden: Brill.

Gervais, Kyle. 2017. *Statius, Thebaid 2*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gibson, Bruce J. 2006. *Silvae 5*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———. 2010a. “Causation in Post-Augustan Epic.” In *Latin Historiography and Poetry in the Early Empire: Generic Interactions*, edited by John F. Miller and Anthony John Woodman, 29–47. Leiden: Brill.

———. 2010b. “Silius Italicus: A Consular Historian?” In *Brill’s Companion to Silius Italicus*, edited by Antony Augoustakis, 47–72. Leiden: Brill.

Giusti, Elena. 2017. “Virgil’s Carthage: A Heterotopic Space of Empire.” In *Imagining Empire: Political Space in Hellenistic and Roman Literature*, edited by Victoria Rimell and Markus Asper, 133–50. Heidelberg: Winter.

———. 2018. *Carthage in Virgil’s Aeneid: Staging the Enemy under Augustus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Grasmück, Ernst Ludwig. 1978. *Exilium. Untersuchungen Zur Verbannung in Der Antike*. Paderborn: Schöningh.

Grebe, S. 1989. *Die Virgilische Heldenschau: Tradition Und Fortwirken*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Grewing, Farouk. 1997. *Matial, Buch VI: Ein Kommentar*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.

Griffin, Alan H.F. 1985. "Ovid Tristia 1.2 and the Tradition of Literary Sea Storms." *Pegasus* 28: 28–34.

———. 1997. *A Commentary on Ovid Metamorphoses, Book 11*. Dublin: University of Dublin Press.

Griffin, M. 2000. "The Flavians." In *The Cambridge Ancient History*, 2nd ed., 11:1–83. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hanbinek, Thomas N. 1998. *The Politics of Latin Literature: Writing, Identity, and Empire in Ancient Rome*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Hardie, Philip. 1986. *Vergil's Aeneid: Cosmos and Imperium*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———. 1989. "Flavian Epicists on Vergil's Epic Technique." *Ramus* 18: 3–20.

———. 1993a. *The Epic Successors of Virgil: A Study in the Dynamics of a Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———.1993b. "Tales of Unity and Division in Imperial Latin Epic." In *Literary Responses to Civil Discord*, edited by John H. Molyneux. Nottingham: University of Nottingham Press.

———. 1997. "Closure in Latin Epic." In *Classical Closure: Reading the End in Greek and Latin Literature*, edited by D.H. Roberts, F.M. Dunn, and D.P. Fowler, 139–62. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

———. 2004. "In the Steps of the Sibyl: Tradition and Desire in the Epic Underworld." *MD* 52: 143–56.

———. 2009. *Paradox and the Marvellous in Augustan Literature and Culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Harrison, S.J. 1991. *Aeneid 10*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———. 2007. "Exile in Latin Epic." In *Writing Exile: The Discourse of Displacement in Greco-Roman Antiquity and Beyond*, edited by Jan Felix Gaertner, 129–54. Leiden: Brill.

———. 2010. “Picturing the Future Again: Proleptic Ekphrasis in Silius’ Punica.” In *Brill’s Companion to Silius Italicus*, edited by Antony Augoustakis, 279–92. Leiden: Brill.

Häussler, R. 1978. *Das Historische Epos von Lucan Bis Silius Und Seine Theorie*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter.

Heck, E. 1970. “Scipio Am Scheideweg: Die Punica Des Silius Italicus Und Ciceros Schrift De Re Publica.” *Wiener Studien* 83: 156–80.

Helzle, Martin. 2003. *Ovids Epistulae Ex Ponto Buch I–II: Kommentar*. Heidelberg: Winter.

Henderson, John. 2003. “Par Operi Sedes: Mrs Arthur Strong and Flavian Style, the Arch of Titus, and the Cancellaria Reliefs.” In *Flavian Rome*, edited by A.J. Boyle and W. J. Dominik, 229–54. Leiden: Brill.

———. 2004. *Morals and Villas in Seneca’s Letters: Places to Dwell*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heubeck, Alfred, Stephanie West, and J.B. Hainsworth. 1988. *A Commentary on Homer’s Odyssey*. Vol. 1. 3 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Heyworth, S. J., and J.H.W. Morwood. 2017. *A Commentary on Vergil, Aeneid 3*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hinds, Stephen. 1998. *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Horsfall, Nicholas M. 1989. “Aeneas the Colonist.” *Vergilius* 35: 8–27.

———. 1995. *A Companion to the Study of Virgil*. Leiden: Brill.

———. 2006. *Virgil, Aeneid 3: A Commentary*. Leiden: Brill.

———. 2008. *Virgil, Aeneid 2: A Commentary*. Leiden: Brill.

Hoyos, D. 2003. *Hannibal’s Dynasty: Power and Politics in the Western Mediterranean, 247–183 B.C.* London: Routledge.

Hulls, Jean-Michel. 2011. “Poetic Monuments: Grief and Consolation in Statius Silvae 3.3.” In *Memory and Mourning: Studies on Roman Death*, edited by Vaerlie M. Hope and Janet Huskinson, 150–75. Oxford: Oxbow.

Huskey, Samuel J. 2002. “Ovid and the Fall of Troy in ‘Tristia’ 1.3.” *Vergilius* 48: 88–104.

Hutchinson, G. 2006. *Propertius: Elegies Book IV*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ingleheart, Jennifer. 2006. “Ovid, ‘Tristia’ 1.2: High Drama on the High Seas.” *G&R* 53: 73–91.

Jacobs, John. 2009. “*Anne Iterum Capta Repetentur Pergama Roma*?: The Fall of Rome in the Punica.” PhD diss., New Haven: Yale.

———. 2010. “From Sallust to Silius Italicus: Metus Hostilis and the Fall of Rome in the Punica.” In *Latin Historiography and Poetry in the Early Empire: Generic Interactions*, edited by John F. Miller and Anthony John Woodman, 123–39. Leiden: Brill.

Johnston, Andrew C. 2019. “Odyssean Wanderings and Greek Responses to Roman Empire.” In *The Epic Journey in Greek and Roman Literature*, edited by Thomas Biggs and Jessica Blum, 211–39. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Juhnke, Herbert. 1972. *Homerisches in Römischer Epik Flavischer Zeit: Untersuchungen Zu Szenennachbildungen Und Strukturentsprechungen in Statius’ Thebais Und Achilleis Und in Silius’ Punica*. Munich: C. H. Beck.

Kajanto, Iiro. 1988. “Interpreting Fortuna Redux.” In *Homenagem a Joseph M. Piel Por Ocasião Do Seu 85. Aniversário*, edited by Dieter Kremer, 35–50. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Kaster, Robert A. 2006. *Speech on Behalf of Publius Sestius*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Keith, A.M. 2000. *Engendering Rome: Women in Latin Epic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 2010. “Engendering Orientalism in Silius’ Punica.” In *Brill’s Companion to Silius Italicus*, edited by Antony Augoustakis, 355–73. Leiden: Brill.

Kelly, Gordon P. 2006. *A History of Exile in the Roman Republic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kennedy, E. 2016. “Reading Aeneas through Hannibal: The Poetics of Revenge and the Repetitions of History.” In *Roman Literary Cultures: Domestic Politics, Revolutionary Poetics, Civic Spectacle*, edited by A.M. Keith and J. Edmondson, 185–99. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Kenney, E.J. 1965. “The Poetry of Ovid’s Exile.” *PCPhS* 191: 37–49.

Khan, H. Akbar. 2001. “Exile and the Kingdom: Creusa’s Revelations and Aeneas’ Departure from Troy.” *Latomus* 60: 906–15.

Kissel, W. 1979. *Das Geschichtsbild Des Silius Italicus*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Klaassen, E.K. 2010. “Imitation and the Hero.” In *Brill’s Companion to Silius Italicus*, edited by Antony Augoustakis, 99–126. Leiden: Brill.

Knox, Peter E. 1995. *Ovid: Heroides, Select Epistles*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Koeppel, Gerhard M. 1969. “Profectio Und Adventus.” *BJ* 169: 130–94.

———. 1980. “A Fragment from a Domitianic Monument in Ann Arbor and Rome.” *BMUSUM* 3: 9–29.

Koestermann, E. 1971. *Bellum Iugurthinum*. Heidelberg: Winter.

König, Alice. “Reading Civil War in Frontinus’s *Strategmata*: A Case-Study for Flavian Literary Studies.” In *After 69 CE: Writing Civil War in Flavian Rome*, edited by Lauren Donovan Ginsberg and Darcy A. Krasne, 145–78. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Kraus, Christina S. 1994. “‘No Second Troy:’ Topoi and Refoundation in Livy, Book V.” *TAPA* 124: 267–90.

Kröner, Hans Otto. 1970. “Elegisches Unwetter.” *Poetica* 3: 388–408.

Küppers, J. 1986. *Tantarum Causas Irarum: Untersuchungen Zur Einleitenden Bücherdyade Der “Punica” Des Silius Italicus*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Kyriakidis, S. 2014. “From Delos to Latium: Wandering in the Unknown.” In *Geography, Topography, Landscape: Configurations of Space in Greek and Roman Epic*, edited by Marios Skempis and Ioannis Ziogas, 265–90. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Laguna Mariscal, Gabriel. 1990. “Comentario Filologico Del Libro III de Las Silvas de Estacio.” PhD diss., Universidad de Sevilla.

Landrey, Leo. 2014. “Skeletons in Armor: Silius Italicus’ Punica and the Aeneid’s Proem.” *AJP* 135: 599–635.

Laudizi, Giovanni. 1989. *Silio Italico: Il Passato Tra Mito e Restaurazione Etica*. Galatina: Congredo.

———. 1991. “Scipione e Appio Claudio in Silio Italico.” *Bollettino Di Studi Latini* 21: 3–16.

Le Bohec, Y. 1997. “L’Honneur de Regulus.” *AntAfr* 33: 87–93.

Lee-Stecum, P. 2005. “Tot in Uno Corpore Formae: Hybridity, Ethnicity, and Vertumnus in Propertius Book 4.” *Ramus* 34: 22–46.

———. 2008. “Roman Refugium: Refugee Narratives in Augustan Versions of Roman Prehistory.” *Hermathena* 184: 69–91.

Lehnen, Joachim. 1997. *Adventus Principis: Untersuchungen Zu Sinngehalt Und Zeremoniell Der Kaiserankunft in Den Städten Des Imperium Romanum*. Frankfurt am Main: Lang.

Lemaire, N.E. 1823. *Caius Silius Italicus: Punicorum Libri Septemdecim*. 2 vols. Paris.

Levene, David S. 2010. *Livy on the Hannibalic War*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lieberg, G. 1971. "Vergils Aeneis Als Dichtung Der Einsamkeit." In *Vergiliana: Recherches Sur Virgile*, edited by H. Bardon and R. Verdière, 175–91. Leiden: Brill.

Littlewood, R. Joy. 2011. *A Commentary on Silius Italicus' Punica 7*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———. 2017. *A Commentary on Silius Italicus' Punica 10*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lovatt, Helen. 2013. "Competing Visions: Prophecy, Spectacle, and Theatricality in Flavian Epic." In *Ritual and Religion in Flavian Epic,* edited by Antony Augoustakis, 53–70. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———. 2016. "Flavian Spectacle: Paradox and Wonder." In *A Companion to the Flavian Age of Imperial Rome,* edited by Andrew Zissos, 361–75. Malden, MA: Wiley.

———. 2020. "Meanwhile Back at the Ranch: Narrative Transition and Structural Intertextuality in Statius *Thebaid* 1." In *Intertextuality in Flavian Epic Poetry: Contemporary Approaches*, edited by Neil Coffee *et al*., 21–41. Malden, MA: Wiley.

Lucarini, C.M. 2004. "Le Fonti Storiche Di Silio Italico." *Athenaeum* 92: 103–26.

Luck, Georg. 1967. *Tristia, I: Text Und Übersetzung*. Heidelberg: Winter.

Manolaraki, Eleni. 2010. "Silius' Natural History: Tides in the Punica." In *Brill's Companion to Silius Italicus,* edited by Antony Augoustakis, 293–322. Leiden: Brill.

Manuwald, Gesine. 2007. "Epic Poets as Characters: On Poetics and Multiple Intertextuality in Silius Italicus' Punica." *RFIC* 135: 71–90.

Marks, Raymond. 2003. "Hannibal in Liternum." In *Being There Together: Essays in Honor of Michael C.J. Putnam,* edited by P. Thibodeau and H. Haskell, 128–44. Afton: Afton Historical Society Press.

———.2005. *From Republic to Empire: Scipio Africanus in the Punica of Silius Italicus*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

———. 2008. "Getting Ahead: Decapitation as Political Metaphor in Silius Italicus' Punica." *Mnemosyne* 61: 66–88.

———. 2010. "Silius and Lucan." In *Brill's Companion to Silius Italicus*, edited by Antony Augoustakis, 127–53. Leiden: Brill.

———. 2013. “Reconcilable Differences: Anna Perenna and the Battle of Cannae in the Punica.” In *Ritual and Religion in Flavian Epic*, edited by Antony Augoustakis, 287–301. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———. 2014. “Statio-Silian Relations in the Thebaid and Punica 1–2.” *CP* 109: 130–39.

———. 2017. “A Medial Proem and the Macrostructures of the Punica.” In *Anfänge Und Enden: Narrative Potentiale Des Antiken Und Nachantiken Epos*, edited by Christine Schmitz, Jan Robinson Telg genannt Kortmann, and Angela Jöne, 277–91. Heidelberg: Winter.

———. 2018. “*Sparsis Mavors agitates in oris*: Lucan and Civil War in *Punica* 14.” In *After 69 CE: Writing Civil War in Flavian Rome*, edited by Lauren Donovan Ginsberg and Darcy A. Krasne, 51–68. Berlin: de Gruyter.

———. 2020. “Searching for Ovid at Cannae: A Contribution to the Reception of Ovid in Silius Italicus’ *Punica*.” In *Intertextuality in Flavian Epic Poetry: Contemporary Approaches*, edited by Neil Coffee *et al*., 87–106. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Markus, Donka D. 2004. “Grim Pleasures: Statius’ Poetic Consolationes.” *Arethusa* 37 (1): 105–35.

Masters, J. 1992. *Poetry and Civil War in Lucan’s Bellum Civile*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Matier, K.O. 1990. “Stoic Philosophy in Silius Italicus.” *Akroterion* 35: 68–72.

May, J. 1988. *Trials of Character: The Eloquence of Ciceronian Ethos*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.

McGuire, D. T., Jr. 1990. “Textual Strategies and Political Suicide in Flavian Epic.” *Ramus* 18: 21–45.

———. 1995. “History Compressed: The Roman Names of Silius’ Cannae Episode.” *Latomus* 54: 110–18.

———. 1997. *Acts of Silence: Civil War, Tyranny, and Suicide in the Flavian Epics*. Hildesheim: Olms-Weidmann.

McIntyre, James S. 2019. “Calendar Girl: Anna Perenna Between the Fasti and the Punica.” In *Uncovering Anna Perenna: A Focused Study of Roman Myth and Culture*, edited by Gwynaeth McIntyre and Sarah McCallum, 37–53. London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Mezzanotte, Alessandro. 2016. “Echoes of the Contemporary World in Silius Italicus.” In *Oxford Readings in Flavian Epic*, edited by Antony Augoustakis, 434–58. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Miano, Daniele. 2018. *Fortuna: Deity and Concept in Archaic and Republican Italy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mills, Frances. 2009. “The Agony of Departure: Silius Italicus’ Punica 17.149–290.” *Antichthon* 43: 50–63.

Moore, Timothy J. 2010. “Livy’s Hannibal and the Roman Tradition.” In *Livy and Intertextuality*, edited by W. Polleichtner, 135–67. Trier: WVT Wissenschaftlicher Verlag.

Muecke, F. 2007. “Hannibal at the ‘Fields of Fire:’ A ‘Wasteful Excursion?’” *MD* 58: 73–91.

Narducci, Emanuele. 1997. “Perceptions of Exile in Cicero: The Philosophical Interpretation of a Real Experience.” *AJP* 118 (1): 55–73.

Nauta, R.R. 2002. *Poetry for Patrons*. Leiden: Brill.

Nelis, Damien P. 2001. *Vergil’s Aeneid and the Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius*. Leeds: Cairns.

Nesselrath, Heinz-Günther. 2007. “Later Greek Voices on the Predicament of Exile: From Teles to Plutarch and Favorinus.” In *Writing Exile: The Discourse of Displacement in Greco-Roman Antiquity and Beyond*, edited by Jan Felix Gaertner, 87–108. Leiden: Brill.

Newlands, Carole E. 2011. *Silvae: Book II*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 2012. *Statius: Poet between Rome and Naples*. London: Bristol Classical Press.

Nicol, J. 1936. *The Historical and Geographical Sources Used by Silius Italicus*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Nicolet, C. 1991. *Space, Geography, and Politics in the Early Roman Empire*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Niemann, K.-H. 1975. *Die Darstellung Der Römischen Niederlagen in Den “Punica” Des Silius Italicus*. Bonn: Rudolf Habelt.

Nisbet, R., and N. Rudd. 2004. *A Commentary on Horace: Odes Book III*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ogilvie, R.M. 1965. *A Commentary on Livy Books 1–5*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

O'Sullivan, Timothy M. 2019. "Epic Journeys on an Urban Scale: Movement and Travel in Vergil's *Aeneid*." In *The Epic Journey in Greek and Roman Literature*, edited by Thomas Biggs and Jessica Blum, 151–69. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pandey, Nandini. 2018. *The Poetics of Power in Augustan Rome: Latin Poetic Responses to Early Imperial Iconography*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Papaioannou, S. 2002. "Transformation and Abandonment: Defining the Immigrant Experience in Two Vergilian Metamorphoses." *Scholia* 11: 34–43.

Paul, George M. 1984. *A Historical Commentary on Sallust's Bellum Jugurthinum*. Liverpool: Francis Cairns.

Pease, Arthur Stanley. 1917. "Notes on the Delphic Oracle and Greek Colonization." *CP* 12: 1–20.

Penwill, J. 2013. "Imperial Encomia in Flavian Epic." In *Flavian Epic Interactions*, edited by Gesine Manuwald and Astrid Voigt, 29–54. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Pogorzelski, Randall J. 2011. "Orbis Romanus: Lucan and the Limits of the Roman World." *TAPA* 141: 143–70.

———. 2016. "Centers and Peripheries." In *A Companion to the Flavian Age of Imperial Rome*, edited by Andrew Zissos, 223–38. Malden, MA: Wiley.

Pomeroy, Arthur J. 1990. "Silius Italicus as Doctus Poeta." In *The Imperial Muse...Flavian Epicists to Claudian*, edited by A.J. Boyle, 119–39. Bendigo, Australia: Aureal.

———. 2010a. "To Silius Through Livy and His Predecessors." In *Brill's Companion to Silius Italicus*, edited by Antony Augoustakis, 27–46. Leiden: Brill.

———. 2010b. "Fides in Silius Italicus' Punica." In *Silius Italicus: Akten Der Innsbrucker Tagung Vom 19.–21. Juni 2008.*, edited by Florian Schaffenrath, 59–76. Frankfurt am Main: Lang.

———. 2016. "Silius' Rome: The Rewriting of Virgil's Vision." In *Oxford Readings in Flavian Epic*, edited by Antony Augoustakis, 321–44. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pyy, Elina, and Cornelis Michiel van der Keur. 2019. "The Many Faces of Capua: Its Narrative and Programmatic Roles in Punica 11–13." In *Campania in the Flavian Poetic Imagination*, edited by Antony Augoustakis and R. Joy Littlewood, 249–68. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Quint, David. 1982. "Painful Memories: Aeneid III and the Problem of the Past." *CJ* 78: 30–38.

———. 1993. *Epic and Empire: Politics and Generic Form from Virgil to Milton*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Radicke, J. 2004. *Lucans Poetische Technik*. Leiden: Brill.

Rambaud, Michel. 1974. "L'espace Dans Le Récit Césarien." In *Littérature Gréco-Romaine et Géographie Historique: Mélanges Offerts à Roger Dion*, edited by R. Chevallier, 111–29. Paris: Picard.

Rawson, E. 1974. "Religion and Politics in the Late Second Century B.C. at Rome." *Phoenix* 28: 193–212.

Rebeggiani, Stefano. 2018. *The Fragility of Power: Statius, Domitian, and the Politics of the Thebaid*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Reitz, Christiane. 1982. *Die Nekyia in Den Punica Des Silius Italicus*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Rimell, Victoria. 2015. *The Closure of Space in Roman Poetics: Empire's Inward Turn*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ripoll, François. 1998. *La Morale Héroïque Dans Les Épopées Latines d'époque Flavienne : Tradition et Innovation*. Louvain: Peeters.

———. 2015. "Statius and Silius Italicus." In *Brill's Companion to Statius*, edited by W. J. Dominik, Carole E. Newlands, and Kyle Gervais, 425–43. Leiden: Brill.

Robinson, Arthur. 1994. "Cicero's References to His Banishment." *CW* 87 (6): 475–80.

Rocca-Serra, G. 1990. "Imitatio Alexandri et Stoïcisme: Manilius et Silius Italicus." In *Neronia IV: Alejandro Magno, Modelo de Los Imperatores Romanos*, 379–87. Brussels: Latomus.

Roche, Paul. 2009. *De Bello Civili: Book 1*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rocovich, Elizabeth H. 2004. "Exile in Roman Life and Thought From Augustus to Constantine." PhD diss., University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Rossi, Andreola. 2004. "Parallel Lives: Hannibal and Scipio in Livy's Third Decade." *TAPA* 134 (2): 359–81.

Roumpou, Angeliki Nektaria. 2018. "Silius Italicus' Punica 17.341–654: A Literary Commentary." PhD diss., University of Nottingham.

Ruperti, G.A. 1795–98. *Caii Silii Italici Punicorum Libri Septemdecim*. 2 vols. Göttingen.

Said, E. 2001. *Reflections on Exile and Other Literary and Cultural Essays.* London: Granta.

Sammond, Kenneth. 2011. “Exile and Empire: Post-Imperial Narrative and the National Epic: A Comparative Study of Rushdie’s The Satanic Verses and Virgil’s Aeneid.” PhD diss., Rutgers.

Santorelli, Biagio. 2017. “Metrical and Accentual Clausulae as Evidence for the Date and Origin of Calpurnius Flaccus.” In *Reading Roman Declamation: Calpurnius Flaccus*, edited by Martin T. Dinter, Charles Guérin, and Marcos Martinho, 129–42. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Schenk, P. 1989. “Die Gesänge Des Teuthras (Sil. It. 11.288–302 u. 432–482).” *RhM* 132: 350–68.

Schneider, Rolf Michael. 2012. “The Making of Oriental Rome: Shaping the Trojan Legend.” In *Universal Empire: A Comparative Approach to Imperial Culture and Representation in Eurasian History*, edited by Peter Fibiger Bang and Dariusz Kolodziejczyk, 76–129. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schröder, Bianca-Jeanette. 1999. *Titel Und Text*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Schultheiß, Jochen. 2012. “Philosophie Des Willens Und Erzählstruktur: Die Scheidewegszene in Den Punica Des Silius Italicus.” In *Götter Und Meschliche Willensfreiheit von Lucan Bis Silius Italicus*, edited by Thomas Baier, 255–74. Zetemata 142. Munich: C. H. Beck.

Scullard, H.H. 1970. *Scipio Africanus: Soldier and Politician*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

———. 1973. *Roman Politics: 220–150 B.C.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Seidel, Michael. 1986. *Exile and the Narrative Imagination*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Shackleton Bailey, D.R. 1965. *Letters to Atticus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Shaya, J. 2013. “The Public Life of Monuments: The Summi Viri of the Forum of Augustus.” *AJA* 117: 83–110.

Sherwin-White, A.N. 1973. *The Roman Citizenship*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Skard, E. 1933. *Ennius Und Sallustius*. Oslo.

Spaltenstein, François. 1986/90. *Commentaire Des Punica de Silius Italicus*. 2 vols. Geneva: Droz.

Spentzou, Efrossini. 2008. “Eluding Romanitas: Heroes and Antiheroes in Silius Italicus’s Roman History.” In *Role Models in the Roman World: Identity and Assimilation*, edited by

Sinclair Bell and Inge Lyse Hansen, 133–45. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Stocks, Claire. 2014. *The Roman Hannibal: Remembering the Enemy in Silius Italicus' Punica*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.

———. 2018. "Band of Brothers: Fraternal Instability and Civil Strife in Silius Italicus's *Punica*." In *After 69 CE: Writing Civil War in Flavian Rome,* edited by Lauren Donovan Ginsberg and Darcy A. Krasne, 253–70. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Strunk, Thomas E. 2017. *History after Liberty: Tacitus on Tyrants, Sycophants, and Republicans*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Stürner, Ferdinand. 2015. "Alexander, Cato, Hannibal: The Oracle at Siwah in Lucan and Silius Italicus." In *Letture e Lettori Di Lucano,* edited by Paolo Esposito and Christine Walde, 183–229. Pisa: Edizioni ETS.

Sumi, G. 2005. *Ceremony and Power: Performing Politics in Rome between Republic and Empire*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Tarrant, Richard. 2012. *Virgil, Aeneid Book 12*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tatum, W. Jeffrey. 2017. "Intermediaries in Political Communication: Adlegatio and Its Uses." In *Political Communication in the Roman World,* edited by Cristina Rosillo-López, 55–80. Leiden: Brill.

———. 2018. "Metellus Numidicus on Gaius Marius in His Exilic Epistolography." *SCI* 37: 99–109.

Telg genannt Kortmann, Jan Robinson. 2018. *Hannibal Ad Portas: Silius Italicus, Punica 12.507–752*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter.

Thakur, Sanjaya. 2007. "Review of J.F. Gaertner, Ovid, Epistulae Ex Ponto 1." *BMCR* 03.18.

Thomas, Richard. 1988. *Virgil: Georgics*. 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tipping, Ben. 2004. "Middling Epic? Silius Italicus' Punica." In *Middles in Latin Poetry*, edited by S. Kyriakidis and F. de Martino, 345–70. Bari: Levante.

———. 2007. "Haec Tum Roma Fuit: Past, Present, and Closure in Silius Italicus' Punica." In *Classical Constructions: Papers in Memory of Don Fowler, Classicist and Epicurean,* edited by S.J. Heyworth, P.G. Fowler, and S.J. Harrison, 221–41. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———.2010a. *Exemplary Epic: Silius Italicus' Punica*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———. 2010b. “Virtue and Narrative in Silius Italicus’ Punica.” In *Brill’s Companion to Silius Italicus*, edited by Antony Augoustakis, 193–218. Leiden: Brill.

Van der Keur, Cornelis Michiel. 2014. “Meruit Deus Esse Videri: Silius’ Homer in Homer’s Punica 13.” In *Flavian Poetry and Its Greek Past*, edited by Antony Augoustakis, 287–304. Leiden: Brill.

———. 2015. “A Commentary on Silius Italicus’ Punica 13: Intertextuality and Narrative Structure.” PhD diss., Amsterdam: Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam.

Vessey, D.W.T.C. 1974. “Silius Italicus on the Fall of Saguntum.” *CP* 69: 28–36.

———. 1982. “The Dupe of Destiny: Hannibal in Silius, Punica III.” *CJ* 77: 320–35.

Villalba Álvarez, Joaquín. 2004. “Ecos Virgilianos En Una Tempestad Épica de Silio Itálico.” *Humanitas* 56: 365–82.

Voisin, Patrick. 2016. “Un Moment Unique Dans La Rhétorique Des Vies Parallèles: Quand Le Rituel de l’éloge et Du Blâme Fait Place à Un Double Éloge Croisé!” *REL* 94: 121–39.

Wallach, Barbara Price. 1990. “Rhetoric and Paradox: Cicero, ‘Paradoxa Stoicorum IV.’” *Hermes* 118 (2): 171–83.

Weaver, P.R.C. 1965. “The Father of Claudius Etruscus: Statius Silvae 3.3.” *CQ* 15: 145–54.

———. 1972. *Familia Caesaris: A Social Study of the Emperor’s Freedmen and Slaves*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

White, Peter. 1975. “The Friends of Martial, Statius, and Pliny and the Dispersal of Patronage.” *HSCP* 79: 265–300.

Whitmarsh, T. 2001. “‘Greece is the World:’ Exile and Identity in the Second Sophistic.” In *Being Greek under Rome: Cultural Identity, the Second Sophistic, and the Development of Empire*, edited by Simon Goldhill, 269–305. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Williams, Gareth. 2004. “Testing the Legend: Horace, Silius Italicus, and the Case of Marcus Atilius Regulus.” *Arethusa* 38: 70–98.

Wilson, Marcus. 2004. “Ovidian Silius.” *Arethusa* 37: 225–49.

Wistrand, E. 1956. *Die Chronologie Der Punica Des Silius Italicus: Beiträge Zur Interpretation Der Flavische Literatur*. Göteborg: Göteborgs Univ. Asskr.

Zanker, P. 1990. *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Zeiner, Noelle K. 2005. *Nothing Ordinary Here: Statius as Creator of Distinction in the Silvae*. London: Routledge.