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Abstract

This thesis is a detailed commentary on the eighth book of Silius Italicus’ epic poem the *Punica*, lines 1-241. The text that is discussed includes the encounter, engineered by Juno, between Hannibal and the Italian nymph, Anna Perenna. The commentary follows the model of the Cambridge ‘Green and Yellow’ series and the notes mainly deal with philological and literary issues, especially those arising from the dense inter-textuality of lines 50-201 which draw heavily on Ovid’s *Fasti* 3. 523-656 and the *Aeneid* 4.393-692.

The commentary proper is prefaced by an introduction that considers: (1) the nature of classical commentary as a genre; (2) the significance of the selected text in the context of the poem as a whole; (3) the disputed authenticity of 8.144-223 (the so-called *Aldine additamentum*). In this third part of the introduction the metrical, stylistic and linguistic differences that exist between the text of the *additamentum* and the rest of *Punica* 8 are explored and analysed, and consideration is given to the likelihood of its authorship by an Italian Humanist.

The text of the *Punica* used is the Teubner (1987) edition of Josef Delz.
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INTRODUCTION

1. A commentary

It is a truth – perhaps insufficiently recognised – that an ancient text in possession of a new readership must be in want of a commentary. It is also true that the genre of commentary is peculiarly suitable for post-graduate dissertations because it encourages diligence and wide reading.¹ Nevertheless, although the revival of interest in Silius Italicus in the late twentieth century can be traced to publications in England by Bassett between 1953 and 1966, and in Germany by von Albrecht,² it is unlikely that there was any market for a commentary on Silius when a young Denis Feeney chose to write a commentary on Punica Book 1 for his doctoral dissertation.³ Within the next decade Ahl, Davis and Pomeroy (1986) produced their important study, Delz’s Teubner edition (1987) appeared, Spaltenstein’s Commentaires (1989, 1990) were published, and there followed a small but growing stream of journal articles in English together with a few monographs.⁴ Commentaries on the Punica in English are now beginning to be published in quantity.⁵

Spaltenstein’s scholarship is primarily philological, with some attention to the conventions and formal attributes of ancient epic; he does not pretend to deal extensively with the poem as a work of literature, though he is concerned to situate the poem in the context of the epic tradition.⁶ The English language commentaries,

⁴ E.g. Marks (2005); Tipping (2011); Stocks (2014).
⁵ Littlewood on Books 7 (2011) and 10 (2017); Bernstein on Book 2 (2017).
⁶ Avant-propos, v-vi: ‘J’ai opté pour une philologie que l’on pourrait qualifier de “sèche”… ‘En sachant que le lecteur moderne est souvent désarmé devant ces textes si formalistes, j’ai tâché de signaler les conventions et les traditions de la poésie antique’. 
by contrast, are written in the pedagogic tradition, providing text, translation and notes designed to make an ancient work accessible to new readers, while also including for the sake of advanced students and professional scholars, an *apparatus criticus* and substantial references to secondary materials. With respect to *Punica* 8 two significant studies in Italian were produced in the last decade of the twentieth century. Brugnoli and Santini (1995) dealt specifically with the disputed authenticity of the text of Book 8 as it now appears in all modern editions, including that of Delz. Ariemma’s commentary on Book 8, *Alla Vigilia di Canne* (2000) is mainly concerned with Silus’ narratological strategies and gives some attention to intratextuality.

This thesis takes the form of a commentary on *Punica* Book 8.1-241 in the style of the Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics (the ‘Green and Yellow’ series). Consistent with the editorial guidelines for that series, priority is given to the literary qualities of the text. However, the commentary focusses on the poet’s specific vocabulary and diction to a greater degree than the Cambridge guidelines would generally allow. That is because the text chosen for study contains the 81 lines of the so-called *Aldine additamentum* which may be by a writer who was not Silius. In attempting to assess the possibility that these lines are an interpolation by an Italian Humanist I have necessarily tried to show how the diction of the *additamentum* is similar to or different from that used by Silius elsewhere in the poem. To that extent, there is some overlap with the approach taken by Heitland in his 1896 study *The Great Lacuna in the Eighth Book of Silius Italicus* but whereas he, for the most part, is

---

7 For discussion of the classical commentary as a genre see Most (1999), Gibson and Kraus (2002) and Kraus and Stray (2016).
content to identify each allusion where he has found one, there is greater concern in
this thesis with the poetic and literary effects of the allusions.

2. The poet

Silius Italicus was a wealthy statesman, student of literature and art collector who
was a notable survivor during four decades of turbulent public life from about AD
45. He saw the demise of the Julio-Claudian dynasty and a civil war that (unlike the
conflict that brought the Republic to an end) caused such widespread death and
destruction in the heartlands of Italy that it reminded contemporary Romans of the
civil wars of Sulla and Marius. He may well have been the kind of statesman who
bent with whatever breeze was blowing, but he lived in dangerous times, and he not
only survived but prospered under the Flavian regime, from which it may be inferred
that he had made no real enemies during his involvement in public affairs before AD
68, notwithstanding Pliny’s claim that he had stained his reputation during the time
of Nero. He was a jurist of the court of the centumviri that dealt chiefly with
property disputes, he was Nero’s last consul, and he was involved in the political
negotiations that brought Vespasian to power in the tumultuous year of AD 69.

Although he had supported Vitellius, he must have been a senior member of the
Flavian court, for in about AD 77 Vespasian appointed him to be proconsul in Asia.

---

11 Laeserat famam suam sub Nerone (Ep. 3.7.3). However, Pliny acknowledges that Silius was inter
principes civitatis sine potentia, sine invidia (Ep. 3.7.4) which suggests that he was not thought to be a
significant threat to his peers.
12 Mart. 7.63.7-8. The jurisdiction seems to be appropriate for a conservative lawyer rather than an
ambitious advocate like Cicero.
13 Plin. Ep. 3.7.9-10.
14 Tac. Hist. 3.65.5.
15 Plin. Ep. 3.7. 3: in Vitelli amicitia sapienter se et comiter gesserat.
16 An inscription has been found from his time in Asia, recording his full name as Ti. Catius Asconius
Silius Italicus: Calder (1935).
and his son, L. Silius Decianus, was made consul by Domitian in AD 94. After this he seems to have retired from public life, spending his latter years in Campania where he demonstrated his devotion to the memory of both Cicero and Vergil by purchasing one of the former’s villas and by conserving the latter’s tomb near Naples which had fallen into disrepair. He died in Campania of an incurable tumour in 101 or 102 at the age of seventy-five.

Some scholars regard the *Punica* as the work of an old man looking back from the safety of comfortable retirement with nostalgia for the past. But a better view is to see the poem as the distillation of a life of active engagement with Roman politics and culture. The *Punica* is a work of literature in which a great crisis of the Republican past is subjected to the scrutiny of a man who has lived through much and offers qualified judgment on heroes and anti-heroes alike. Moreover, he brings this experience to bear on imperial Rome and seems to trace the roots of one-man rule (for good or ill) to the fractious society that faced Hannibal and the Carthaginians in 216 BC, the salvation that was obtained through the constitutional dictatorship of Fabius and the individual brilliance of Scipio who was able to remove Hannibal from Italy and ultimately defeat him.

Silius’ view of Scipio is, however, shot through with implied criticism of his egotism, and his view of Rome’s ascendancy after the Hannibalic War is coloured by the measured scepticism of an

---

17 Mart. *Ep.* 8.66
18 He was sufficiently sure of his position as an elder statesman that he declined to go to Rome for the installation of Trajan in 98: Plin. 3.7.7. On his predilection for collecting *objets d’art* and real estate: Plin. 3.7.7.
elder statesman, who deplores the moral and political consequences of that ascendance.23

3. The poem

It is not known when Silius started work on his epic account of the Second Punic War.24 Martial published a flattering epigram addressed to the poet in about AD 88 which shows that his subject-matter was well-known by then.25 A later epigram (7.63, in about AD 92) celebrates the poet’s earlier career as a public man; its opening distich, addressed to qui legis... Latia carmina digna toga acknowledges a readership and its reference to multiple volumina suggests that by then substantial parts of the work may have been published in some form, perhaps through the recitationes of which Pliny writes.26

Scholars have differed on whether the poem with seventeen books is complete or whether it was intended to follow an Ennian model in eighteen books.27 Some editors have suspected that there may be a lacuna at Book 17.290-291 where the scene shifts abruptly from a storm at sea to Hannibal’s army on land.28 The work is not ‘unfinished’ in the way that Valerius Flaccus’ Argonautica breaks off before it reaches a satisfying conclusion, but it is conceivable that advancing ill-health caused Silius to complete the Punica in haste, or that some event (perhaps the death of

---

24 Wilson (2013) has argued provocatively, that Silius might have begun composing the Punica during the reign of Nero, when there was a fashion for historical epic; cf. Bernstein (2017, xv): the poet’s ‘aesthetic sensibilities were formed in the Neronian era’. Pliny’s description of Silius’ social life is consistent with him combining public affairs (inter principes civitatis) with writing: salutabatur colebatur, multumque in lectulo iacens cubiculo semper, non ex fortuna frequenti, doctissimis sermonibus dies transigebat, cum a scribendo uacaret: 3.7.4.
26 Ep. 3.7.4-5.
28 Pro Barth, Heinsius, Drakenborch, Summers, contra Bauer, Delz; discussed by Wallace (1958) 101-2; Feeney (1982) 360-1.
Domitian) caused him to lay it aside, and the apparent lacuna in Book 17 is evidence only of a text that was complete but unrevised.

It is probable that Silius followed what was believed to be Vergil’s method of composition by writing a careful prose outline of the poem before composing discrete episodes in no particular sequence, because the poem as a whole shows many signs of careful design. The seventeen books have a symmetrical shape, well-described by Ahl, Davis and Pomeroy as a ‘parabola’, in which Books 1-7 trace the rise of Hannibal followed by a decline that begins in Books 11 and 12 and is counterpointed by the rise of Scipio from Book 13 onwards. The poem ends with Scipio’s triumph in Rome after the Battle of Zama. In this symmetrical structure the Battle of Cannae is placed at the mid-point of the poem in Books 9-10: it is the dramatic and moral centre of the poem for it represents the moment when Rome reaches its lowest point from a strategic point of view but re-discovers its moral greatness.

As a matter of historical fact, the battle of Cannae took place in the third year of a war that lasted for nearly two decades, and Livy’s linear account of the \textit{bellum maxime omnium memorabile} reflects this chronology by placing the battle in the second book of his Third Decade. In making the Battle of Cannae the centre-point of his poem Silius is able to exploit its moral significance and its paradoxical

---

30 In support of the proposition that the poem was ‘complete’ is the fact that there is an invocation to the Muses beginning at 9.340, at precisely the halfway point of the poem, which might well have been placed there when the writing came to an end after 12,202 lines. See Ahl et al. (1986) 2505.
33 Ahl et al. (1986) 2505-10; Fucecchi 1990, 151.
34 As a result of its design, Silius is forced to concentrate the events of fourteen years into the second half of the poem. ‘He made the most dramatic moment of the war his structural and thematic centre-point, even if he cannot lead down from it as elegantly as he leads up to it.’ Feeney (1982) 371-4.
importance as the terrible defeat from which the Roman revival began. Book 8 forms a prelude to the battle; the battle itself occupies Book 9 and the first part of Book 10, followed by the aftermath of defeat, both in Apulia and at Rome.

Book 8 is specifically concerned with Italy and consists of a series of diversions that have the effect of slowing the narrative of the war and thus delaying the reader’s arrival at the catastrophe of Cannae. It begins with a preamble (8.1-24) dealing with Hannibal’s loss of morale as a result of Fabian tactics, but ends with a portentous coda (8.622-76) in which the poet describes terrifying omens (including an eruption of Vesuvius) and the prophecy of a deranged soldier in the Roman camp who foretells the vast number of gold rings that will be plundered from the hands of the slaughtered equites (Liv. 23.12.1-2).

The main part of the book falls into three parts:

25-241: Juno summons the nymph, Anna Perenna from the River Numicus, to revive Hannibal’s spirits and to direct him to Apulia where the battle of Cannae will take place. This episode (8.25-43; 8.202-41) frames a lengthy digression, a retelling of the story of Anna Perenna drawn from Ovid’s Fasti 3.543-654 into which Silius inserts another excursus, by which the essential elements of Aeneid 4 are imported into an Italian setting.

242-355: There is a shift of scene at line 242 and a change of register from mytho-poetic narrative to political rhetoric. Silius demonstrates, in three speeches, the divisive politics of the consular elections of 217 BC that led to the populist,

38 The dispatch of a minor goddess to encourage the hero is an epic topos that has parallels in Homer and Vergil e.g. Iris and Hector in the Iliad, Juturna and Turnus in Aeneid 12.
Varro, and the embittered aristocrat, Paulus, sharing command of the Roman armies at Cannae.\textsuperscript{39} The episode shows how quickly Rome reverts to disunity and rivalry after the stabilising regime of Fabius, and identifies Cannae as the symptom of a deep malaise affecting the Roman state: \textit{Cannasque malum exitiale fovebat | ambitus et Graio funestior aequore Campus} (8.256-7).\textsuperscript{40}

356-621: A catalogue of the Italian army demonstrates (with antiquarian zeal but scant regard for historicity) the ethnic diversity of the vast army of Italian allies that Rome was able to assemble during the time purchased by Fabian tactics.\textsuperscript{41} The poet not only pays tribute to all the main cities of his own time, but he weaves into his description of the army famous names to whom he wishes to pay homage and also names that will resound in the civil wars of the next century.\textsuperscript{42} Like the description of the allies and their (bronze-age) weapons these references are anachronistic, but they can be read as an indication that Silius is concerned that his reader should recall that the triumphs at the end of the Hanniballic War did not bring about lasting peace in Italy.\textsuperscript{43}

This thesis deals only with the text that precedes the Catalogue.

4. Anna Perenna

The name Anna Perenna appears in the pre-Julian \textit{Fasti Antiates Maiores} (now in Rome in the Palazzo Massimo alle Terme) with a festival celebrated on the Ides of March which, in the old lunar calendar, was the first full moon of the Roman year. This association suggests that she was the female personification of \textit{annus perennus}

\textsuperscript{39} Livy 22.36.5; Polybius 3.107.9-15. 
\textsuperscript{40} Ahl et al. (1986) 2517-8, 2555-58; McGuire (1995) 57; Dominik (2003) 492-3. 
\textsuperscript{41} See Venini (1978). Silius' purposes are poetic and the catalogue should not be read as an historical or ethnographical treatise. 
\textsuperscript{42} On the ‘names’ see McGuire (1995) 77-137; Cowan (2007). 
\textsuperscript{43} Dominik (2006) 113-4.
(‘the everlasting year’), but little is known about her cult. Martial makes a reference to a location associated with her that has been variously interpreted: *virgineo cruore gaudet | Annae pomiferum nemus Perennae*. The fourth century writer, Macrobius, refers to the cult of Anna Perenna in *Saturnalia* 1.12.6: *et publice et privatim ad Annam Perennam sacrificatum itur, ut annare perennareque commode liceat*, where the phrase *annare perennareque* is most likely a formulaic New Year wish for prosperity and long life. Ovid gives a lively description (*Fasti* 3.523-42) of a plebeian picnic on the banks of the Tiber which may well be an authentic account of a spring festival. There is a note in the Vatican calendar that her feast was celebrated at the first milestone of the Via Flaminia, and the 1999 discovery of a fountain dedicated to Anna Perenna in the north eastern part of the city (Piazza Euclide) is consistent with a cult centre in that quarter. What, if any, association she has with the River Numicus, near Laurentum, seems to be an Ovidian invention, but Ovid gives several different versions of her origins, and seems to be constructing a tale that is deliberately provocative and unreliable: the story that he tells about the adventures of Carthaginian Anna in Italy must be read with caution and appears to be an irreverent parody of the *Aeneid*.

5. The Anna Perenna episode: *Punica* 8.25 – 225

Within Book 8, the Anna Perenna episode has great interest as a case-study of Silian intertextuality. It draws chiefly on Ovid’s narrative, in which Dido’s sister, Anna, flees from Iarbas when Carthage is captured and is carried by a storm to Italy; she

---

44 Mart. *Ep.* 4.64.16-7. Frazer (1931 / 1989) 406: ‘As Anna she is a feminine personification of the year (*annus*); as Perenna she is the personification of the endless procession of the years.’
encounters Aeneas and his new wife Lavinia, who is instantly filled with murderous jealousy; Dido appears in a dream and warns Anna of her peril; she runs away from Aeneas’ home but is snatched (raped) by the River Numicus and becomes a nymph venerated in Italy as the presiding deity of New Year celebrations on the Ides of March. Silius takes up Ovid’s narrative of the encounter between Anna and Aeneas and the unexpected transformation of a Carthaginian princess into an Italic nymph, but he adapts it for his own epic purposes: he largely removes the sexual charge of Ovid’s tale and makes Anna’s story the frame for an excursus into Vergilian territory with copious allusions to Aeneid 4. Silius pointedly highlights Anna’s conflicting identities: on the one hand she is a diva venerated by Italians as a nymph associated with the River Numicus and Aeneas Indiges (8.39-43) while on the other hand, she has an abiding sense of loyalty to her sister (an example of Punic fides) that sends her to the Carthaginian general when ordered to do so by Juno. Anna’s divided loyalties suggest that in the lead-up to the battle of Cannae, Italy is in a dangerous condition where even the local deities are not reliable, a theme that echoes the political divisions within Rome, where the populist tribune Varro wins the consulship by arousing contempt for the Senate and Fabius.\textsuperscript{50} The identification of Anna Perenna with Anna of Carthage also allows the poet to restate the mythical theme derived from Aeneid 4.625-6,\textsuperscript{51} that the origins of the Hannibalic War lay in the betrayal of the Carthaginian queen by Aeneas, the proto-Roman, and the arrival in historical times of an ultor from Carthage.\textsuperscript{52}

\textsuperscript{50} McGuire (1995) 126-33.
\textsuperscript{51} exoriare aliquis nostris ex ossibus ultor | qui face Dardanios ferroque sequare colonos.
6. Transmission of the Punica

Apart from Martial’s description of the ‘everlasting volumina of immortal Silius’\(^53\) there are no contemporary references to the reception of the *Punica* among Roman men of letters: it did not, as far as we know, attract the attention of schoolmasters or scholiasts. In the fifth century it was still being read in Roman Gaul, for we must assume that the allusions to the *Punica* made by Sidonius Apollinaris in his *Carmina* and *Epistolae* were intended to impress like-minded readers.\(^54\) However, Silius did not become part of the medieval curriculum,\(^55\) and there is scant evidence that the *Punica* was read in the Middle Ages.\(^56\)

A manuscript of the poem was discovered in 1417 (perhaps at St Gall) by the famous hunter of classical texts, Poggio Bracciolini, and a copy was taken, which the Apostolic Delegate himself corrected up to Book 13 before it was sent to Italy.\(^57\) During the next 70 years or so, many manuscript copies were made of the *Punica*,\(^58\) but the codex that Poggio found and the copy that he sent to Francesco Barbaro in Italy no longer exist.\(^59\) There seems also to have been another codex in the library at Cologne for which our sole authorities are two sixteenth century scholars, Modius (d.1597) and Carrio (d.1595) but this codex also is lost.\(^60\)

---

\(^53\) Ep. 7.63.1

\(^54\) See Mratschek (2103) 260 n.45 for a list of allusions to Silius in Sidonius. There may be some sixth century allusions to Silius: Bassett et al. (1976) 344-6. See also Delz (1987) XLIX.

\(^55\) His contemporaries Lucan, Martial, Seneca, and Statius were widely read: Scaglione (1990) 348-57. Fragments of Valerius Flaccus appear in *florilegia*: Zissos (2006) 170), but it seems that no extracts from the *Punica* were anthologised in this way

\(^56\) The evidence from the ninth and tenth centuries is summarised by Bassett et al. (1976) 346-8 and in Reeve (1983) 389.

\(^57\) On Poggio see Clark (1899) 119-30; Bassett et al. (1976) 349; Reeve (1983) 389-90; McGushin (1985) 34-48; Delz (1987) VII-IX.

\(^58\) Delz (1987, X-XLIX) describes 32 manuscripts.

\(^59\) Reeve (1983) 391; Delz (1987) IX-LIV.

\(^60\) Bassett et al. (1976) 357; Reeve (1983) 390; McGushin (1985) 1-25; Delz (1987) LIV-LXIV.
From the 1450s there was considerable interest among Italian Humanists in Silius’ poem on the Second Punic War, but the real surge came about with the popularising technology of the printed book. The editio princeps appeared in Rome in 1471 and two years later Domizio Calderini gave a course of lectures on the Punic in the Studium Urbis in Rome. The first commentary was published by Pietro Marsi in Venice in 1483 and further editions with that commentary were printed in 1492 and 1493, attesting to the popularity of the work among the readers of the period.

7. The Great Lacuna and the Aldine additamentum

In all the extant manuscripts and in all texts printed before 1508 there is a lacuna in Book 8 between what is now line 144 and line 225. According to Delz, the lacuna was observed by an unknown reader who made a marginal note in codex P: credo fragmentatum [sic] hic; and Panormita (d. 1462) noted in the margin of his codex R: hic desunt complures versus. By the last quarter of the fifteenth century, then, not only was the lacuna well-known to Italian scholars of Silius but there was also some consensus about the content of the narrative material needed to bridge the gap: Post Aeneae coniunx desunt librariorum neglentia quinquaginta circiter versus ut arbitror. Nam ex instituta historia reliquum erat ut consacratio Annae in Numico narraretur quam Ovidius in Fastis commemoravit et ut Anna iret ad Hannibalem et Iunonis mandata exponeret. Pietro Marsi (who was one of Calderini’s students)

---

63 Two editions were published in Rome in 1471, followed by editions in Milan and Parma in 1481. See Bassett et al. (1976) 351.
64 Punic LXV. Paris, Bibl. Nat.lat. 8066 f.87v; Bibl. Vat. lat. 2779 f.78 r.
65 Noted by one of Calderini’s students: see Muecke & Dunston (2016) 463.
made a note at 8.244 in similar terms. In a very thorough examination of the problem of the lacuna, Heitland postulated that the eighty-some lines probably filled four pages of the old codex found by Poggio and that these pages had somehow been detached from Poggio’s exemplar which was the archetype for all the manuscript copies taken in fifteenth century Italy.

In 1523, and without any fanfare or attribution, the Aldine edition made by Francisco Asulano repaired the lacuna by the insertion of eighty-one lines: the introductory letter states, *multa mutavimus, nonnulla restituimus & in principio octavi libri quattuor et octaginta versus, qui in aliis omnibus desiderantur, inserebantur.*

There can, however, be little doubt that the Aldine editor obtained these lines from Chapter 92 of a collection of articles on Greek and Latin texts, *Collectaneorum Hecatosrys,* which was published by Giacomo Costanzi in 1508. In *Collect. Hec.* 92 Costanzi claims that the lines were discovered by his teacher, Battista Guarini, who had them sent from Gallia along with ‘other items of great interest’ and that he (Costanzi) has now resolved to publish them. Guarini had died in 1503, and so it is possible that Costanzi intended to honour his teacher’s memory – but it is remarkable that this publishing coup was buried in the last few pages of a volume of dry textual...

---

66 Marsus (1483) 83. desideratur hic deificatio annae apud latinos et oratio quam habuit apud hannibalem Iunonis iussu. Supersunt tantum ultima orationis verba: explicat etc.
67 Heitland (1896) 194-5. Goold (1956) offers an alternative explanation for the missing text with reference to scribal practices.
68 Asulanus 2.
69 Heinsius appears to have been the first to have observed this connection: Drakenborch (1717, 404). The quantum (81 or 84 lines) published by Asulano is less of a problem than it seems, as demonstrated by Heitland (1896, 192), who observed that the first and last hexameters in *Collect. Hec.* 92 are modern lines 144 and 224 respectively, and Costanzi also included lines 157a and 224a. Thus the verse text printed in *Collect. Hec.* consists of 84 hexameters, of which 82 were lines not previously published. Asulano omitted 157a, thus producing 81 new lines. The fact that he refers to 84 lines in the introductory letter, is compelling evidence that his text came from Costanzi and not from any other source, e.g. the putative *Coloniensis* codex. Brugnoli and Santini 13-14 also note the similarity between *Collect. Hec.* 92: *et nonnullus versus qui uarius desiderantur in locis* and the language used by Asulano: *versus, qui in aliis omnibus desiderantur.*
70 Costanzi’s introductory paragraph and his final disclaimer are reproduced in Appendix 5.
criticism, and it remains puzzling that Battista Guarini did not publish the missing text himself before he died.

The lines printed by Asulano are substantially the same as those published by Costanzi, though there are a handful of differences: viz. the omission of line 157a in the Aldine edition; omneis… omnisque for C’s omnis… omnisque at 160; Laomedonteae nescis for C’s Laomedontaeae noscis at 172; Latii for C’s Latiis at 204; oenotris for oenotriis at 220; and qua for ubi at 223. These differences are discussed in the Commentary.

It was suggested by Heitland that the verses produced by Costanzi were derived from Sangallensis and those used by Asulano could have come independently from Coloniensis, but this seems improbable. Though it is dangerous to draw conclusions from silence it is hardly likely that Modius would have failed to comment on their presence in the Coloniensis in Letter 28 of Novantiquae Lectiones (which deals specifically with some textual issues in Book 8) if he had, in fact, observed such verses in Coloniensis.\(^71\)

A more difficult issue is the apparent sparsity of textual problems in lines 145-223 compared with the text that surrounds it in Book 8. The minimal apparatus provided for these lines by Delzs seems to be a political statement that the text does not warrant critical attention; he does not go beyond comparing Asulano and Costanzi. In reaction, Brugnoli and Santini produced an apparatus showing twenty-six emendations proposed since the time of Heinsius.\(^72\) However, this exercise tends

\(^71\) Modius has notes on the Punica in more than 30 letters of Novantiquae Lectiones; Ep. 28 specifically deals with some passages in Book 8 that precede and follow the additamentum: i.e. a comment on 8.140 and one on 8.334. See Summers (1902) 171-2.

\(^72\) Brugnoli & Santini (1995) 5-8. Summers’ edition (1902) has a larger number of notes than Delz but he did not adopt any of the additional items.
rather to show that the text is indeed remarkably pure: out of the twenty-six emendations that Brugnoli and Santini have listed, none have been adopted in any modern edition. It might be argued (taking at face value Costanzi’s account of its provenance) that a careful copy of Sangallensis by a competent scribe would have resulted in fewer errors being transmitted. However we should expect to find some problematical legacy readings that were carried down from the text of Sangallensis. For example, at 8.125, not far removed from the commencement of the text of the additamentum, there is an emendation (amni for antro) proposed by Modius (Novant. Lect. 28.iv), and in line 225 (immediately following the additamentum) modern editors have accepted Heinsius’ reading of uementia in preference to viventia (in the Aldine edition), amentia (in Coloniensis according to Heinsius), or the impossible evanida.

It is possible that the scribe who produced the late copy silently corrected any errors that came to his attention. Nevertheless, it remains an intriguing peculiarity that the only portion of Punica 8 that appears to be essentially free from textual problems should be the eighty-one lines of the additamentum.

7.1 Costanzi, Statius and Silius

The passage of eighty-four hexameters in Costanzi’s Collectaneorum Hecatostys 92 is followed by a remarkable disclaimer: he would have published more on Silian topics but had refrained from doing so because of his great respect for his good friend, Pietro Marsi. This seems disingenuous, but he is certainly claiming to have made a serious study of the Punica before 1483. That makes him a likely prospect,

---

73 Heitland (1896) 196.
74 Collect. Hec. does not contain much evidence of his purported interest in the text of the Punica. Only one other chapter (XIII) bears upon Silius. It deals with the possibility that Silius or Valerius Flaccus invented a story about ash from Vesuvius reaching as far as the Indus. His main interests
if we are looking for an Italian Humanist who might have been the interpolator who bridged the lacuna in Book 8 with his own hexameters.\textsuperscript{75} Such a composition need not have been fraudulent in itself, though Sabbadini certainly identifies it as such.\textsuperscript{76} It is accepted that some so-called ‘Humanist fakes’ were innocent exercises in rhetoric by writers who were steeped in classical literature to a degree unthinkable in our own time and for whom \textit{imitatio} and \textit{aemulatio} were essential parts of their training.\textsuperscript{77} Such ‘fakes’ serve to illustrate the confidence of Renaissance Latinists in their own abilities, and their mastery of Latin composition.\textsuperscript{78}

Costanzi demonstrates some competence in verse-composition,\textsuperscript{79} but it is to be noted that his father Antonio Costanzi, (1436-90) was not only a commentator on Ovid’s \textit{Fasti}, but also poet laureate in the court of Federico III (ca 1468) and it is not beyond the realms of possibility that the son found the lines in his father’s library and passed them off as genuine. Certainly, when the verses first appeared, both Battista Guarini and Costanzi senior were dead.

In the light of this family connection with the \textit{Fasti} and with poetry it is intriguing to find at \textit{Punica} 8.191 a striking image (\textit{vitreis antris}) that also appears in Statius \textit{Silvae} 3.2.16: \textit{surgite de vitreis spumosae Doridos antris}. Furthermore, in Statius’

\begin{quote}
\textsuperscript{75} Tarrant (2016, 87-8) argues that the loaded terminology of ‘falsification’ and ‘forgery’ should be used with caution in discussing scribal interpolations. He suggests ‘collaborative interpolation’ as a way of acknowledging that some interpolation is an exercise in imagination and \textit{aemulatio} rather than falsification.
\textsuperscript{76} Sabbadini (1905) 182.
\textsuperscript{77} Greene (1982) 2: ‘\textit{Imitatio} was a literary technique that was also a pedagogic method and a critical battleground’. See also his Chapter 3, \textit{Imitation and Anachronism}.
\textsuperscript{78} Two notable examples of attempts by Humanist scholars and poets to ‘complete’ an ancient text are the Thirteenth Book of the \textit{Aeneid} by Maffeo Vegio (1428) and Giovanni Baptista Pio’s continuation of the \textit{Argonautica} (1519).
\textsuperscript{79} In \textit{Collect. Hec.} 88 he quotes from a funeral ode that he composed for his mother. See also the dedicatory poem in elegiacs.
\end{quote}
Silvae 3.5.1-2 there is a passage that looks very much like quotation from Silius: quid noctibus, uxor, | anxia peruigili ducis suspiria cura? cf. Pun. 8.209: anxia ducebat uigili suspiria voce. If Statius is quoting Silius in these places, as both Hardie and Newlands assume,\textsuperscript{80} it would undoubtedly confirm the Silian authenticity of the so-called *additamentum*. But if the allusions are travelling in the other direction, then our putative Humanist might be alluding to Statius here.

Chapter 88 of Costanzi’s *Collectaneorum Hecatostys* shows that Costanzi was familiar with Statius’ *Silvae*. The piece is an essay on the errors made by learned commentators (perhaps rivals of the author) referring, in particular, to *Silvae* 3.1 (on the Temple of Hercules at Surrentum) and it shows that Costanzi knew Book 3 very well, for he claims that he borrowed a line or two from it in a funeral ode that he composed for his mother.\textsuperscript{81} And he also states that he and a friend when students had spent a whole month reading Statius: multa in papinio silvas notabamus. It is not impossible, therefore, that the similarities between parts of the *additamentum* in *Punica* Book 8 and *Silvae* 3 could be attributed to Costanzi’s familiarity with Statius.

\section*{8. Approaches to the question of authenticity\textsuperscript{82}}

There are two main approaches to the question of the authenticity of lines 144-224 that use either statistical or philological methods to compare the features of these lines with the rest of the *Punica*. Both types of analysis assume that a poet’s style involves metrical and rhythmical patterns and turns of phrase that are essentially unconscious habits of verbal production, which might be compared to the uniqueness of a person’s handwriting: which has careful and carefree modes, but is almost


\textsuperscript{81} et quando superi terrena revisunt | in somnis venias nostros lenire dolores | dulcis aloquiis.

\textsuperscript{82} See Appendix 1 for a diversity of views on this question.
always identifiable. One can, thus, in theory, distinguish one writer from another by referring to these unconscious idiosyncrasies of poetic style. This study has focussed firstly on metrical issues and secondly on the diction of the additamentum, specifically the occurrence of single instances (hapax legomena) in that passage.83

8.1 Metrical analysis

Both Duckworth (1969) and Ceccarelli (2008) have shown that each Latin hexameter poet has a kind of metrical ‘fingerprint’ which can be statistically measured by counting the different patterns of dactyls and spondees in the first 4 feet of their hexameter verses.84 Thus, for example, Duckworth shows that Ovid’s hexameters are (on average) more dactylic than Vergil’s85 and that Ovid’s first foot is nearly always a dactyl.86 This observation allows Duckworth to argue that the Halieutica should not be ascribed to Ovid, because it is ‘metrically very unlike the Metamorphoses’.87

On the ‘metrical fingerprint’ of Silius, Duckworth has this to say: ‘Silius must have studied Vergil’s metrics with extreme care to have been able to imitate him so closely.’ And he goes on to argue that the similarity of metrical patterns of the additamentum to the rest of the Punic strongly suggests that it is authentic.88 But similarity is not as cogent as difference in these matters,89 and it is possible that an

83 Metrical analysis was assisted by pede certo, an on-line tool provided by the University of Udine: http://www.pedecerto.eu/. Linguistic analysis was assisted by the search engine provided by the Packard Humanities Institute: http://latin.packhum.org/.
85 Duckworth (1969) 71-5.
86 ibid. 145-6.
87 ibid. 74-7. His conclusions support the appraisals of Halieutica by other scholars (e.g. Housman, Axelson, Wilkinson, Richmond) from reasons of vocabulary, prosody, and style.
89 Marriott (1979); Pack (1989); Rudman (2012).
Italian Humanist might have studied Silius with sufficient care to have been able to imitate his metrics over a short passage.

8.1.1 Methodology

In order to compare the text of the *additamentum* with a sample that is indubitably Silian, the techniques of metrical analysis were applied to the eighty-two lines of the *additamentum* as printed in the Delz edition of the *Punica*, and to the 82 lines that immediately precede and follow it: 8.63–124, and 8.245-304. These lines could be assumed to have been composed at the same time by the same hand, because the story of Anna Perenna and Hannibal forms a discrete episode with a clear beginning, middle and end. As a control, these passages were compared with three passages of the same length from Books 3, 6, and 9, and with the global figures (derived from Ceccarelli) for the *Punica*.

8.1.2 Results

The results of this metrical analysis are summarised in Appendix 2. They demonstrate that, except for the pattern DSDS, there are no significant differences between the metrical patterns of the *additamentum* and the rest of the *Punica*.\(^{90}\) It can also be shown that there is no difference in the frequency of elision and the same can be said of the frequency of the bucolic diaeresis. (See Appendix 3.) On the other hand, there are some measures that do show differences between the *additamentum* and the rest of the *Punica*: viz. the frequency of end-stopped lines, and the frequency of trochaic caesurae.\(^{91}\) For example, the range of end-stopped lines in the *Punica* as a whole is between 39-49% but in the *additamentum* the frequency rises to 59%. To

\(^{90}\) In the table produced in Appendix 2 the variances that exceed or fall short of the averages obtained by Ceccarelli are highlighted.

\(^{91}\) Appendix 3.
these hints of a different hand, may be added Duckworth’s observation that the
additamentum has fewer repeated patterns or near repeats than the Punica as a
whole.92 These data suggest that there may be a different hand at work, though not
strongly.

8.2 The frequency of single instances
There are a number of places in the text of the additamentum where the language
used is unique within the Punica viz. fors (146), manifesta (195), affairer (199),
potura (205), ulterius (211), aegrescente (212), inconsulto as a substantive (217),
concelebror (221). Their presence might suggest the writer was not Silius if they
appear in greater numbers than in the rest of the Punica. A brief study of lines 1-144
of Book 8 reveals five such instances: ambagibus (44), obtegitur (45), conqueritur
(94), frequenter (105), peruigilante (138) (the adjective peruigilis appears twice
elsewhere). Thus, in the lines that precede the additamentum, there is a frequency of
one occurrence every twenty-nine lines, while in the additamentum itself the
frequency rises to one in ten lines. Without a full study of Silius’ entire lexicon,
which is beyond the scope of this thesis, it is impossible to say whether there is a
greater proportion of single instances in this passage than in the Punica as a whole,
but the fact that the frequency appears to be more than twice that of the adjacent text
is certainly suggestive of the possibility that a writer with a different vocabulary was
at work.

8.3 Conclusion
There are enough anomalies in these lines to suggest that the additamentum might be
by a different hand with a different ‘fingerprint’, but the case is not proven.

9. The working methods of a ‘creative interpolator’

In this final section, the possible working methods of a creative interpolator are considered by exploring intertexts and intratexts in some passages of the *additamentum*. Tarrant states that the loaded terminology of ‘falsification’ and ‘forgery’ should be used with caution in discussing interpolations. He suggests ‘collaborative interpolation’ as a way of acknowledging that some interpolations may be an exercise in imagination and *aemulatio* rather than falsification. I have adapted his term to fit the dimensions of the Book 8 lacuna, where the interpolation (if it is such) is of a magnitude requiring an exercise of creativity far in excess of supplying an apt phrase to complete a line.

In this section I have assumed that a ‘creative interpolator’ would have been heavily dependent on three source texts (the *Aeneid*, *Fasti* 3 and the *Punica* itself) and I will consider the way that allusions to and near quotations from the source texts are deployed in the *additamentum*. The first working method may be described as ‘weaving’; and secondly, the hole in the main text must be patched so that the joins do not show: ‘invisible mending’.

9.1 Weaving: Anna’s dream (*Punica* 8.164-84)

Although the dream sequences in *Fasti* 3 and *Punica* 8 are fundamentally similar in structure (Dido appears, issues her warning and disappears; Anna awakes in fright and escapes from the house through a window) their narrative functions are inherently dissimilar. In the *Punica* Dido’s warning is relatively unmotivated: it has twice been suggested by the poet that Anna is safe in her new home under the protection of Aeneas. Ovidian Dido urges Anna to leave Aeneas’ house to avoid

---

94 At line 77, before the *additamentum* begins, and again at 163.
being murdered by Lavinia; but she escapes one peril only to be snatched (raped) by the River Numicus.\(^95\) Ovid is then able to produce the punning punch-line of his aetiological entertainment: \textit{placidi sum nympha Numici: amne perenne latens Anna Perenna vocor} (\textit{Fasti} 3.653-54).

First let us consider whether the putative Humanist would have created such a dense interweaving of Vergilian allusions as we find in Anna’s dream. Aeneas receives several message dreams in the \textit{Aeneid}: (Hector) 2.268-97; (the Penates) 3.147-171; (Mercury) 4.560-70; (Anchises) 5.721-40; (Tiberinus) 8.26-65. In Anna’s dream these Vergilian intertexts are woven together in a tour de force of complex allusiveness, so that in the space of twenty lines there are more than a dozen allusions as shown in Appendix 4. Amongst other effects (discussed in greater detail in the Commentary) these allusions give Dido’s message to her sister the oracular solemnity of Anchises (\textit{effundere uoces}), the urgency of the calls to action of the Penates and Mercury (\textit{surge, age; heu nimium secura}) and the prophetic assurance of Tiberinus (\textit{ne falsa putes}) and they make Anna’s dream in the \textit{Punica} a rich amalgam of Vergilian message dreams with all their portentous overtones.

In contrast with Dido’s brief and pointed imperatives at \textit{Fasti} 3.641: \textit{fuge, ne dubita, maestum fuge... tectum}, the Dido of the \textit{Punica} delivers to her sister an elaborate message in three parts: first (168-75), Anna is reminded of the everlasting hostility between Trojans and Carthaginians;\(^96\) secondly (176-7), she is explicitly warned of Lavinia’s enmity, and it is suggested by the context of this warning that Lavinia’s ill-will arises from her new connection to the Trojans rather than the erotic jealousy

\(^95\) \textit{Rapuisse}: see Adams (1982) 175.

\(^96\) There is little in the text of the \textit{Punica} to suggest that Anna, as a character, had any knowledge of Vergilian Dido’s prayer for everlasting ill-will between her Tyrian people and Aeneas: Ahl et al. (1986) 2497; Dietrich (2004) 3.
emphasized by Ovid: *pax nulla Aeneadas inter Tyriosque manebit. | surge, age: iam tacitas suspecta Lauinia fraudes | molitur dirumque nefas sub corde uolutat.* Finally (178-83), in a surprising twist on Ovid’s sexually charged ending, she is promised an outcome that seems both fortuitous and paradoxical: 97 she will be received by the nymphs of the River Numicus and become an Italian divinity, venerated throughout the land: *aeternumque Italis numen celebrabere in oris* (183). Thus, Lavinia’s hostility towards Anna is given an edge that is political rather than personal, and the dangerous mythical associations concerning rivers and maidens are attenuated and almost domesticated. 98 In the Ovidian model Dido’s speech to Anna consists of a single line with three imperatives – in the *additamentum* the speech runs to more than twenty lines. And although elaboration of the model or intertext is a typical strategy of Flavian allusiveness, 99 it seems improbable that a ‘creative interpolator’ of the fifteenth century would have gone to such lengths when the Ovidian agenda to complete the *lacuna* required only that Anna be got out of the house and down to the banks of the Numicus. 100

### 9.2 Invisible mending: top and tail

Finally, let us consider how a creative interpolator might go about the business of filling the gap in the text of Book 8 as she found it. The starting point is well-signalled. Dido’s final speech in the *Punica* begins at 8.140 with an invocation to *di longae noctis*, which recalls Dido’s final prayer (addressed to *dulces exuuiae* rather than the gods of the underworld) in *Aeneid* 4.651-2. The indubitably Silian text continues for three more lines:

---

97 Especially given Dido’s warnings of endless hostility at 173-5.
98 It is to be noted that Anna is received not by the rapacious river himself but by his nymphs.
100 *Nam ex instituta historia reliquum erat ut consacratio Annae in Numico narraretur quam Ovidius in Fastis commemoravit.* See p. 12 above.
adeste
et placidi uictos ardore admittite manis.
Aeneae coniunx, Veneris nurus, ulta maritum.  

(141-3)

with an aural echo of the intertext: accipite hanc animam meque his exsoluite curis,

(Aen 4.652). And then the text of the additamentum begins with borrowings from
Aeneid 4 that are far from subtle:

uidi constructas nostrae Carthaginis arc.

nunc ad uos magni descendet corporis umbra.

Note how closely the language follows the Vergilian source text: et nunc magna mei

sub terras ibit imago. | urbem praeclaram statui, mea moenia uidi, | ulta uirum.

Aen.4 654-6. Silius is not usually so slavish in his borrowings.

The materials to continue the narrative from the last complete line Aeneae coniunx,
Veneris nurus, ulta maritum had been suggested by early readers of the Punica and
were at hand. But what could a creative interpolator have made of the verb explicat
in line 224? It is one thing to pick up a clue from a line adjacent to the lacuna in
order to provide a satisfactory continuation; it is quite another to supply a suitable
subject for a sentence that ends with the verb explicat in the first foot of a line. The
remainder of line 224, haud longe tellus. huc dirige signa, suggests that some
destination has been nominated for Hannibal and his army, and then the nymph
disappears from Hannibal’s sight and from the poem: dixit et in nubes uementia
sustulit ora.

The verb explicare has multiple meanings beginning with its primary sense of
unrolling or disentangling something, or something being extended, hence being
stretched out in sleep or death (OLD 1a, b, d); it is also a military term, for deploying
troops (OLD 4a). The geographical usages (OLD 4c) are comparatively unusual, and
the reflexive verb is extremely uncommon: TLL cites only five instances, three of
which are from the fourth century. Heitland correctly observes that Lucan uses the word a number of times but only one of these usages is reflexive: *tauriferis ubi se Meuania campis | explicat* (1.473-4); cf. Pliny *NH* 5.118: *montes Asiae nobilissimi in hoc tractu ...explicant se.*

*We* know (from the *additamentum*) that the subject of *explicat* is *Garganus*, which fits perfectly with the site of the battle of Cannae. How likely was it that a creative interpolator would hit upon this rather rare usage of *se explicare* with the idea of a mountain range, so that the full clause would read: *ubi s* *e Garganus in agros | explicat*? *If it is concluded, with Heitland, that it was unlikely, then we may consider this to be a point in favour of the authenticity of the passage.*

**9.4 Conclusion**

I began this project hoping that a close study, using the tools now available to scholars, would reveal some clues as to the authorship of the *additamentum.* I remain curious about the role of Giacomo Costanzi and the sudden appearance of the verses in his strange little book in 1508, and I have shown that it is not impossible that he was the author. On the other hand, Giacomo’s father was even better known as a poet. However, the complexity of the allusions to Vergil in Anna’s dream and the expansion of Ovid’s brief imperative into a twenty line speech that is perfectly adapted to the overall political and moral program of Silius’ *Punica,* together with the felicity of the transition from the *additamentum* at line 224 leads me to the conclusion that, on balance, the text of *Punica* 8.125-224 is authentic.
COMMENTARY

1-2. Primus Agenoridum cedentia terga uidere | Aeneadis dederat Fabius:

*primus* is doubly emphatic, being the first word of the sentence, while *Fabius* in last position is also very strong; these two words enclose the gist of the sentence – that Fabius was the first Roman commander to give his men a taste of success by showing them the backs of the Carthaginians in retreat: *circumdata Poenum | agmina deturbat gladio campumque relaxat, | donec Sidonius decederet aequore ductor: Pun. 7.715-17. The sentence also recalls the opening to Book 7 where Fabius is described as *spes unica* after the disasters of Trebia and Trasimene (Books 4-5), and more immediately 7.567 where Fabius (despite his policy of caution and his age) was the first to burst out of the Roman camp to rescue Minucius, the rash young Master of Horse: *primus claustra manu portae dictator et altos | disiecit postis rupitque in proelia cursum*. 

*Agenoridum*: genitive plural of a Latinised Greek patronymic. Agenor was the son of Poseidon, twin brother of Belus and the father of Phoenix (Apoll. *Bibl.* 3.1.1) and hence the mythical progenitor of Hannibal and his Carthaginians. Silius uses a variety of epithets for Carthaginians to reflect their mythological ancestry, e.g. *Poenus, Phoenix, Phoenicus, Phoenissus, Agenoreus*, as well as the historical or geographical terms *Tyrius, Sidonius*, and *Libys*. The patronymic form *Agenoridae* is unusual in the *Punica* (it appears only here and at line 214 below) but it creates a symmetry, or a contraposition (Santini [1991] 18), with the *Aeneades* (‘sons of Aeneas’) for the *Romans*, denoting the two hostile parties by the names of their mythical ancestors. Silius may simply have been attracted by the alliteration that enhances the balance of this first sentence; or perhaps there is a desire to create a mythological tenor to the narrative, foreshadowing the intervention of Juno and Anna Perenna that follows the preamble.
The strong caesura in line 2 focusses attention on the words that follow, which recall the triumphal conclusion of Book 7, where the Roman army had hailed Fabius as *decus* (‘glory’), *salutem* (‘saviour’) and *parentem* (‘father’) (7.734-5).

2 - 3. **Romana parentem | solum castra uocant, solum uocat Hannibal hostem:**

This sentence concludes the recapitulation of Book 7 and is designed for rhetorical effect, with its double gemination: *solum...uocant, solum uocat*. ‘The repetition of an adjective always deserves attention because it occurs in few prose contexts...suiting a certain luxuriant style, often called rhetorical in which redundancy pleases....The repetition of a verb with some form of morphological modification is so common as to be unremarkable’, (Wills [1996] 73). Note the placement of the second *solum* at the mid-point of line 3 between the verbs, the alliteration in the clausula and the ironies generated by the vertical arrangement of *parentem* and *hostem*. (The identification in the *Punica* of Fabius as a singular figure is discussed by Hardie [1993] 9-10; Marks [2005] 80-1; Tipping [2010] 114-120.)

4. **impatiens morae:** Hannibal’s restless and impatient temperament is established early in Book 1: *ingenio motus auidus* (*Pun*. 1.57), and again in Book 4 when he is unable to rest, after crossing the Alps: *at non et rerum curas consultaque belli | stare probat solusque nequit perferre quietem*, (*Pun*. 4.43-4). He cannot bear inactivity, and the indolence forced upon him by Fabius makes him sleepless, and anxious and angry, e.g. *Pun*. 7.146-55:

> iamque dolore furens ita secum immurmurat ira: 
> ‘...en quotiens, uelut obuius iret, discinxit ratione dolos fraudesque resoluit.’
> haec secum, medio somni cum bucina noctem diuideret...
Impatience, anxiety and rage are character defects that will increasingly manifest themselves in Hannibal. **fremit:** suggests inarticulate growling (*OLD* 1), reminding the reader that when Hannibal withdrew from the field in Book 7 he was compared in a simile to a wolf, with Fabius the watchful shepherd and foolish Minucius the lamb nearly snatched (*Pun.* 7.717-22).

**4 - 24.** *Hannibal’s anxious thoughts are reported in oratio obliqua (4-7), followed by a summary of his troubles in the voice of the narrator.*

**4 - 7.** *ut sit copia Martis, | expectanda uiri fata optandumque sub armis | Parcarum auxilium:* The military language used here suggests that the Parcae must be enlisted (*sub armis*) as auxiliaries in Hannibal’s army for him to overcome his difficulties: being unable to defeat him in battle he will have to wait for the old man’s death. There is word-play in the substitution of *fata* for *fatum* (death): the Parcae are the Roman goddesses (‘Fates’) who control the destinies of mortals. The two gerunds in line 5 slow the tempo, just as Hannibal himself has been brought to a stand-still. The passage ends with the hissing alliteration of *spirante senecta* |...

**sese...sperare cruorem.** **copia Martis:** alludes to *Ov.* *Met.* 13.207-9, where Ulysses is recalling the frustration felt by the Greeks during the long siege of Troy: *post acies primas urbis se moenibus hostes | continuere diu, nec aperti copia Martis | ulla fuit; decimo demum pugnauidus anno.*

**6. hac spirante senecta:** The metonymy of ‘old age’ for the living man recalls the paradoxical description of Fabius’ *uiride... senium* at *Pun.* 7.3-4. Much is made in Book 7 of Hannibal’s feelings about his aged opponent, e.g. 7.26 (curiosity), 104 (contempt), 306 (anxiety). Fabius was in his fifties in 217 BC, and past the age.
of normal military service but the tactical superiority demonstrated by the Roman commander has, by now, undermined the Carthaginian’s self-confidence.

7.  *Latium sperare cruorem:* The passage ends with a reminder of Hannibal’s feral nature and his thirst for Latin blood, cf. the character sketch at *Pun.* 1.56-62, especially line 60: *sanguinis humani flagrat sitis.* Although his character is not unipolar and he is capable of generosity as well as cruelty, Hannibal is usually shown by the poet as tending towards rage (*furor*) and lack of restraint.  (For discussions of Hannibal’s character see Ahl, Davis and Pomeroy [1986] 2511-19; Bernstein [2010] 379; Ganiban [2010] 97-8; Tipping [2011] 61-9; Stocks [2014] 86-7.) The character sketch with which he is introduced in *Pun.* 1.56-62, describes him as *motus auidus* (‘eager for disruption’), *exuperans astu* (‘exceedingly cunning’), *pacis despectus honos* (‘contemptuous of the honours of peace’); Juno rejoices in him as ‘a man of blood’ (*sanguineo... uiro:* 1.40). *cruor* denotes blood that has been spilt in battle or through acts of violence.

8 – 11. Livy (22.32.2) describes the effects of Fabius’ tactics of guerrilla warfare on Hannibal’s morale: *Consules... Fabi artibus cum summa inter se concordia bellum gesserunt... in casum uniuersae dimicationis, quam omnibus artibus petebat hostis, non ueniebant; adeoque inopia est coactus Hannibal ut, nisi cum fugae specie abeundum timuisset, Galliam repetiturus fuerit.* It is possible that Silius had this passage in mind: cf. *concors miles* (line 8) and *inter se concordia; arte sedendi* (line 13) and *Fabi artibus;* and *adeo* (12).

9.  *induisus honos:* *honos* (*OLD* 5a) refers here to the high military command, which under normal circumstances would be shared by two consuls: As dictator, Fabius should have had undivided command of the Roman armies, but
through political machinations by his opponents at Rome, he was forced to give his
Master of Horse equal authority: *diuiditur miles, Fabioque equitumque magistro* |
*imperia aequantur* (Pun. 7. 515-16). The near-disaster that followed, when Minucius
led his army into an ambush set by Hannibal, ‘foreshadows the catastrophe caused by
division in the command at Cannae,’ (Littlewood [2011] 197). The dangers of
discord and divided leadership are a constant theme in the *Punica*: Ahl, Davis and

9. **iterumque et rursus:** According to Wills (1996, 116-7) Vergil pioneered the
poetic expression *iterumque iterumque* where prose writers preferred *rursus*...
*iterumque.* The poet has transformed the prosaic flavour of the expression by the
insertion of *et* to ring his own variation, cf. *iterum atque iterum* (7.393, 9.245),
*iterumque iterumque* at *Pun.* 10.364. Silius seems to take pains *not* to repeat himself.

11. **lentando feruida bella:** The association of fighting with imagery of fire and
heat is not unusual, but the application of the epithet *feruida to bella* appears to be
unique in Latin literature, according to *TLL* 598.3, cf. *tua feruida uirtus*, Catul.
64.218; *feruida corda*, Pun. 14.494. *feruidus* often describes the temperament of a
warrior, e.g. Verg. *Aen.* 8.230 (Hercules), 9.72 (Turnus); Ov. *Met.* 14.485 (Acmom),
*Pun.* 1.386 (Murrus), whereas wars are more often *flagrans*, e.g. Liv. 31.11.10
*flagrante bello*; Luc. 3.390 *flagrantis in omnia belli*; *Pun.* 1.435 *flagrantia bella.*

**lentando:** In classical Latin the verb *lentare* appears mainly in contexts
involving the bending of bows or oars; the phrase *lentando feruida bella* is cited by
*OLD* as the only example of the meaning ‘to draw out, to lengthen’; it may be a
Silian coinage for ‘slowing down’ due to its aural associations with the adjective,
lentus. TLL 1161.41-3 cites a number of post-classical examples for lentare with this meaning. Drakenborch’s comment ad loc. is pertinent: ‘id est, efficiendo, ut ardor militaris minueretur, & bella, quae olim majore fervore, quam consilio aut prudentia, gerebantur, lentius trahenter.’

14. egerat: The syntax of the sentence (cum...tum...: ‘not only ...but also...’) suggests that Silius is thinking both of Fabius’ tactical successes in saving Minucius and his army and in buying time for the Roman senate to recruit a great army (hence, multa), and also of the strategic advantage that accrued from preventing Hannibal from taking plunder in order to replenish his supplies. The verb governs both clauses: in the first clause it means (OLD 18) ‘he had achieved’ where multa is the verb’s direct object; in the second clause it means ‘he had brought it about’ (OLD 19) followed by a result clause.

14–15. quamquam finis pugnaque manuque | hauddum partus erat, iam bello uicerat hostem: The Hannibalic War was to last for 17 years, which none of the characters in the Punica could know at this stage. The worst is yet to come, as contemporary readers would know full well. But this aphorism is well-placed – it is not the beginning of the end of the war but it is the end of the beginning, and Fabius has saved the nation, though his Romans do not fully appreciate it yet. Silius signals here that the climax of the first half of his poem is approaching – further evidence of the artful and purposeful structure of the poem. hauddum: an uncommon variation on nondum, used seven times by Livy, four times by Silius, and since it is found only once elsewhere in the classical Latin corpus (TLL 2565.45) its appearance here is suggestive of the poet’s debt to the historian.
16 - 17. *ingenio fluxi sed prima feroces | uaniloquum Celtae genus ac mutabile mentis:* The characterization of the Celts here reflects the Roman stereotyping of Gauls as fighters who are brave but unreliable, boastful and impetuous, (Isaac [2004] 411-17), cf. Caesar *Gal.* 3.19. 6: *nam ut ad bella suscipienda Gallorum alacer ac promptus est animus, sic mollis ac minime resistens ad calamitates ferendas mens eorum est.* Livy does not mention the wavering loyalties of Hannibal’s Gallic troops, but reports elsewhere that the *Spanish* mercenaries were so short of food that they were on the point of mutiny just before Cannae (Liv. 22.43.1-4). The reference by Silius to the *Celtae* wavering and thinking of going home is a refiguring of Hannibal’s thoughts about returning to Gaul. Silius often compresses historical time or rearranges events for artistic effect and blends separate Livian passages to create composite characters or episodes: see, for example, note 23-24 below. Wallace (1968) has a useful treatment of this aspect of the *Punica*; see also Spaltenstein ad loc. and Ripoll (1998) 453-8. *mutable mentis:* genitive of respect (Woodcock 73 §6). The alliteration of the phrase suggests that this assessment of the character of the race is almost proverbial.

18 - 20. The poet describes graphically that from want of fighting the Celts’ right hands have become weak; notions of *inopia* and thirst underlie this image.

22 - 4. Silius adapts from Livy a speech made *after* the battle of Cannae by Hanno (representing the faction of the Carthaginian senate opposed to the Barcae) in which he urges the senate to refuse Hannibal’s request for *frumentum et pecuniam* (23.12.14). In Livy Hannibal’s enemies are shown to be an ineffective minority (23.12.7-15) but Silius brings to bear the recurrent theme of the dangers of *internaes labes et ciuica… inuidia* in order to dramatise the troubles besetting Hannibal.
23. **ductoris:** Silius uses the dignified term *ductor* for a military commander about twice as often as he uses *dux* (cf. 8.226), and he uses it in total more than twice as often as all the other Latin epicists put together. Austin’s note on Aeneid 2.14 is pertinent: ‘Virgil likes the word *ductor* (‘ductores sonantius est quam *duces*’, Servius); except for a possible occurrence in Accius (fr. 522), it was used in poetry before him by Lucretius only’.

25 - 201. *Juno intervenes by summoning the river-nymph, Anna Perenna, and directing her to go to Hannibal with a command that he is to march to Cannae.*

There follows a long digression (based on Ovid Fasti 3.523-656) describing how Anna, sister of Dido, came to be an Italian divinity. This story frames an account of Dido’s last days, based on Aeneid 4.450-692, but told from Anna’s point of view. The digression falls into three parts: Anna’s adventures after the fall of Carthage (50-78; 157-9), the story of Dido’s death (79-156), Anna’s dream followed by her escape and sanctification as a nymph of the River Numicus (160-201).

25. **quis lacerum curis et rerum extrema pauentem:** *quis* = *quibus*. The ‘anxieties’ are those enumerated in lines 4-24. The metaphorical use of *lacer* seems peculiarly appropriate for a warrior whose fighting strength has been crippled by his own temperament: the general who was bold and bloodthirsty when allowed to be active is overcome by anxiety and introspection when stalled, (Santini [1991] 18-19; Stocks [2014] 123-4). Santini also observes (20-21) some parallels with the meeting of Venus and Aeneas in Book 1 of the Aeneid, noting in particular, the hero’s state of discouragement and isolation before the goddess fills him with new hope. Duff’s translation of the phrase, *rerum extrema pauentem*, ‘fearing the worst’, does not do justice to the unheroic quality of *pauens*: the verb implies that Hannibal is tremulous.
ad spes armorum et furialia uota reducit: the object of the verb reducit is Hannibal, represented by his emotions lacerum curis et...pauentem; the subject of the verb reducit is Juno, postponed to line 27. Postponement of the subject is not unusual in verse (there are seven instances in the first sixty lines of this book) but here the separation between the verb and its postponed subject makes the reappearance of Juno all the more striking. She was last seen perched on a mountain peak waiting for the battle of Trasimene to begin: sola, Apenneni resids in uertice, diras | expectat caedes immitti pectore Iuno (5.206-7). furialia uota: Hannibal’s hopes/desires (OLD 3) are either ‘invoking the Furies’ (OLD 1b) or ‘frenzied’, (OLD 3). Spaltenstein prefers the latter, but both ideas are relevant. The intervention of Juno is needed to revive Hannibal’s improba uirtus (Pun. 1.58) which has been damaged by Fabius. (On Hannibal’s inherited furor see Bernstein [2008] 135.)

27. Juno is both praescia and elata futuris, but her influence upon events (and perhaps her foreknowledge) extends only as far as Cannae, which will be the height of Hannibal’s success. She inflamed Hannibal’s warlike nature (Pun. 1.45-54) by describing the series of victories that will be achieved in the first part of his military campaign, but her vision goes no further than the slaughter of Romans at Cannae, tumulum Hesperiae, campumque cruore Ausonio mersum (1.50). As observed by Vessey (1982, 323-31) and Tipping (2011, 62-3), Juno engages Hannibal in a struggle against Rome’s imperial destiny which he cannot win. Jupiter has already foreshadowed this destiny, with an unmistakable allusion to Aeneid 1.276-82:

iamque tibi ueniet tempus quo maxima rerum nobilior sit Roma malis. hinc nomina nostro non indigna polo referet labor, hinc tibi Paulus, hinc Fabius gratusque mihi Marcellus opimis. hi tantum parient Latio per uulnera regnum quod luxu et multum mutata mente nepotes
non tamen euertisse queant. iamque ipse creates,
qui Poenum reuocet patriae Latioque repulsum
ante suae muros Carthaginis exuat armis.
hinc, Cytherea, tuis longo regnabitur aeuo (Pun. 3.584-93).

28. **Annam:** Silius does not immediately identify the nymph of the *stagnis Laurentibus* with Dido’s sister, but the allusion to Ovid’s *nympha Numici* would not have been lost on a contemporary reader. In *Fasti* 3.523-42 Ovid gives a lively description of the Roman festival of Anna Perenna and offers a fanciful aetiology for the goddess which seems to be an irreverent parody of the *Aeneid* (Ahl [1985] 315; Newlands [1996] 328-30). Silius gives the story of the Punic princess a darker colour and uses it both to reassert the primacy of Dido’s tragedy in the causation of the Second Punic War, and to reinforce the fictive ties of kinship between Hannibal and the Carthaginian sisters.

28 – 9. These lines allude to the interaction in *Aeneid* Book 12 between Juno and the river-nymph Juturna, and there are marked similarities of language between the two passages: *extemplo Turni sic est adfata sororem | diua deam, stagnis quae fluminibusque sonoris | praesidet* (*Aen.* 12.138-40). In the *Aeneid* Juno urges Juturna to go to her brother at the moment when Turnus seems drained of confidence and courage: here the goddess summons Anna to go to her kinsman, Hannibal, when he is at his lowest ebb. The allusion to Juturna as Juno’s emissary is particularly poignant, for, as noted by West (1959, 14-19) and Castellani (1987, 50-51), the intervention of Juturna in the final battle between the Rutulians and the *Aeneadae* has the effect of making her brother’s ultimate doom more certain. In a similar vein, although Anna’s intervention will have a positive effect on Hannibal’s morale, and although the victory at Cannae will appear to be his greatest triumph, it will also
mark the point from which his fortunes will decline. These resonances will not have been lost on Silius’ contemporary audience.

28. **stagnis laurentibus:** An allusion to Juturna is implicit. In the *Aeneid* it is not indicated from which *stagna* Juturna is summoned; but Servius (ad 12.139.10) says that she is a nymph associated with the River Numicus (see n.179 below). However, the nymph Juturna also had an association with Rome with a *fons* in the Forum near the Temple of Castor and Pollux that was called *Iuturnae lacus*, whose waters were supposed to be especially health-giving (Fron. Aq. 1.4); and see Ovid *Fasti* 1.463 and 708. Thus, like Anna Perenna, although she was not originally a native of Rome, Juturna was honoured in the city.

29. **blandis hortatibus implet:** alludes to the flattering language used by Vergil’s goddess in addressing Juturna at *Aen.*12.142: *decus fluuiorum, animo gratissima nostro*; cf. Juno’s approach to Aeolus: *Aen.*1.65-75.

30. **sanguine cognato iuuenis tibi:** Silian Juno focusses on the ties of kinship that bind the nymph to Hannibal; the blood relationship between the nymph and the mortal hero is emphasized with personal pronouns and the language of relationships to invoke the loyalty owed to kin, cf. *Aen.*12.152-3: *tu pro germano si quid praesentius audes, | perge; decret.* But Juno overstates the consanguinity between Anna and Hannibal. At *Punica* 1.72 Hannibal’s father is said to be descended from a Barca who followed Dido from Tyre to Carthage, thus the Belus mentioned in line 31 is probably the legendary ancestor of the Tyrians rather than the Belus (*Aen.* 1.621) who is Anna’s father, (Mackie [1993] 231-3). Nevertheless, Silius is at pains to stress the family connection between Hannibal and Dido to which Vergil obliquely refers (*Aen.* 4.625), and seems to have designed this episode of Book 8 to reinforce

30 - 1. **laborat | Hannibal:** Enjambment and a strong diaeresis after the first foot have the effect of isolating the word *Hannibal* and emphasizing the hero’s *nomen memorabile.* (Discussed by Santini [1991] 28.)

**a uestro...Belo:** The use of *uestra* (rather than *tuus*) is probably due to an implied connection to some vaguely defined plurality (*OLD uester* 2c) i.e. Anna’s whole family or perhaps the Punic nation that traces its descent from Belus. (*Vester* and *tuus* are discussed by Housman [1909] 244-8.) The use of the personal adjective implies the affection and loyalty that pertains to such a connection (Augoustakis [2010b] 138; Chiu [2011] 8 n.18.)

32. **insanos curarum comprime fluctus:*** cf. Lucr. 1.64: *curarum tristis in pectore fluctus*; Sen. Herc. F. 1092: *pelle insanos fluctus animi.* There is a possible allusion to this image by the fifth century writer Sidonius Apollinaris in his panegyrical to Avitus (*Carm.* 7) describing the despair of Aetius when the expected Gothic reinforcements fail to materialise: *et mentem curarum fluctibus urget* (335). The allusion is, perhaps, made more probable by the proximity of a reference at 7.328 to the Alps.

**comprime:** This verb (*OLD* 9) appears often in Senecan tragedy in speeches counselling emotional restraint: e.g. *Med.* 380: *iras comprime ac retine impetum*; *Ag.* 224: *comprime adfectus truces*; *Herc.* Oet. 275-6: *pectoris san parum, | alumna, questus comprime.* Silius uses the same verb in the context of Hannibal’s self-control (‘quasi-Stoic’, Fucecchi [1990] 153) when he learns of the death of his brother Hasdrubal: *compressit lacrimas Poenus minuitque ferendo | constanter mala* (*Pun.* 15.819-20). Given Hannibal’s fragile state of mind at this
point, there seems to be a suggestion that Anna’s role is to restore him to a state of manliness.

33. **execute Fabium:** is a very dramatic expression, literally, ‘knock Fabius out of him’. It suggests that Fabius has taken possession of Hannibal’s imagination and needs to be forcefully ejected.

33 - 4. **sola ille Latinos | sub iuga mittendi mora iam discingitur armis:** *sola...*

_mora_ stands in apposition to _ille_, i.e. Fabius. _mora_ in line 5 referred to Fabius’ delaying tactics or cunctation; here it means ‘obstacle’. **sub iuga mittendi:** is a phrase associated in Roman legend with the Battle of the Caudine Forks (321 BC), when the Romans were trapped and humiliated by the Samnites. Livy gives Minucius, (see n.8 above) a demagogic speech (22.14.4-15) criticizing Fabian tactics in which he refers to the Caudine Forks and it seems possible that 8.34 is an allusion to that passage. But the phrase has connotations of servile subjugation in any event, which is the fate that Hannibal and Juno wish for their Roman enemies. **discingitur armis:** Hannibal no longer needs to worry about Fabius because his term as dictator and sole commander of the Roman army has come to an end. If the verb is given a fully passive sense, it could mean that Fabius ‘has been disarmed’ by the political processes in Rome. But it is also possible that it has a middle sense, i.e. ‘Fabius has laid down his arms’, as required by the Roman constitution, for the term of office of a dictator under the Republican constitution was limited to six months: see Livy 22.31.7. This sentence advances the narrative by neatly compressing fifteen months of Livy’s historiography: 22.31-8.

35 – 8. Santini (1991, 32) says that the four lines beginning here have ‘a particularly elevated tone, typical of religious oracles,’ reminiscent of the _carmen_
Marciana reported in Livy 25.12. Be that as it may, Juno’s speech is highly rhetorical, employing anaphora, alliteration, future tenses, imperatives. The rhyming of serenda... mouenda is, for Santini, consistent with the oracular style of the passage.

35 - 6. **cum Varrone manus et cum Varrone serenda | proelia:** This is the first mention of Varro, anticipating the character sketch that will follow at 8.243-262, immediately after the Anna Perenna episode. Because Varro was deeply implicated in causing the military catastrophe at Cannae, the rhetorical repetition of the name is especially loaded. C. Terentius Varro is portrayed by both Livy and Silius as a dangerous demagogue, lacking any military experience, and by nature resentful of the Roman aristocracy: Liv. 22.34–35; *Pun.* 8.242-277. There is not only an ironic echo here of *Pun.* 7.745: *cum solo tibi Fabio sunt bella serenda*, but also an intratextual reference to the bold words of the prisoner Cilnius to Hannibal earlier in Book 7: ‘*Non cum Flaminio tibi res, nec feruida Gracchi | in manibus consulta*’ (7.34-5). Juno implies that Varro will be just as easy to deal with as his incautious predecessors. Her speech ends (38) with a promise that Cannae will produce the same results as these earlier battles. **serenda | proelia:** *sc sunt* to complete the sentence with *deontic* significance (Pinkster [2015] 298). For the military meaning of *serenda* see *OLD*, *sero*²; for hand to hand fighting (*manus*) see *OLD* *consero*² 4. The doubling of two almost synonymous terms (*manus* and *proelia*) is a typically Silian device, e.g. *pugnaque manuque* (8.15), *fallax atque improba* (8.98), *habitus atque ora* (1.100), *nemus atque...lucus* (3.688). Here it not only suggests different kinds of combat but strengthens the rhetorical effect of the repetition of *cum Varrone*.

36. **ne desit fatis:ad signa mouenda:** these words present a number of difficulties on which there is little agreement amongst commentators and translators.
Heinsius seems to have read *nec* in the texts he consulted; Drakenborch and Delz prefer *ne* which is found as a correction in a second hand in Vatican Lib. Ottob. Lat. 1258; Summers and Duff retain *nec*. If the clause begins with *ne* the whole sentence appears to be a negative wish or command, disconnected from the preceding statement about Varro. My preference is to retain *nec*, both for the sound of *cum… cum… nec*, and because the correction is not strictly necessary: *nec/neque* is regularly used to join a negative wish or command to a preceding positive one:

Pinkster (2015, 717); Gildersleeve §120; *OLD* 3b. Thus, reading *cum Varrone… serenda | proelia* as proposed in the note above makes it the first of two coordinated commands, the first positive, the second negative. If, on the other hand, the reading *ne* is preferred, one should punctuate lines 36-7 so that *ipsa adero* becomes the main clause of a sentence that could be translated: ‘Lest he fail his destiny… I myself shall be there to help him’. The advantage of such a reading is that it eliminates the awkwardness of the two word sentence at the beginning of line 37 (with elision and a strong caesura) in a very marked position that would lose none of its strength from being the conclusion to a wish rather than an isolated assertion. *fatis*: is a very important word in the context of Juno’s aspirations for Hannibal. She has chosen him to be her agent in her futile campaign against the inevitable course of world-history: *hunc audet [Juno] solum componere fatis*. (1.39) and she needs Hannibal to proceed to Cannae both to fulfil his destiny there, and to satisfy her own *ira*.

However, he is never allowed to understand the full import of his destiny. Thus, when the boy Hannibal takes his oath to fulfil his father’s life-long enmity against the people of Rome (si *fata negarint | dedecus id patriae nostra depellere dextra*: 1.107-9) one of the priestesses of Elissa’s shrine begins to deliver a prophecy, but Juno intervenes to prevent her from revealing what will follow Hannibal’s early
victories:  *uenientia fata* | *scire ultra uetuit Iuno...* | *latent casus longique labores*

(1. 137-39), and the priestess is cut short just as she begins to describe a great storm:

*tonat alti regia caeli, bellanemque Iouem cerno* (1.136-7) which prefigures the

storms that are sent by Jupiter to turn Hannibal away from the gates of Rome. In the

end, Juno cannot prevail against Jupiter’s plans for Rome (*certatis fatis et spes*

*extenditis aegras*: 9. 543) and she herself will order Hannibal to yield to the will of

the gods, *cede deis tandem et Titania desine bella*: 12.725.  

**ad signa mouenda:**

*signa* is the direct object of the verb *mouere*, with the gerundive attracted to the

accusative case. *mouere signa* is a military expression, for an army on the move:

**OLD mouere 5b.**  

**desit:** The verb *deesse* with dative case is customary for ‘fail’,

‘neglect’ (*OLD 2*), leading one naturally to read *fatis* with *desit*. However,

Spaltenstein ad loc. suggests that *deesse ad* appears occasionally where dative case

might be expected, and cites *desum ad coniubia* (V. Fl. 8.277) but this passage does

not, in my view, support his argument. Valerius’ line in full reads *nec tibi digna,*

*soror, desum ad coniubia frater,* and one finds there a perfectly ordinary dative *tibi*

with *desum*, which in the Loeb edition (1934) Mozley renders: ‘nor thee, sister, do I

thy brother, fail at these high nuptials.’ Duff and Miniconi-Devallet (quoted by

Ariemma ad loc.) give similar renditions of line 36: ‘Let him move his standards

forward and take advantage of Fortune’; ‘qu’il saisisse sa chance et lève ses

enseignes’. Ariemma finds this ‘non …soddisfacente’ and is unenthusiastic about

Spaltenstein’s reading of *deesse... ad*, but does not explain why. Gildersleeve §432

has the remark: ‘*ad* [with Gerund and Gerundive] is very common; noteworthy is its

use with verbs of Hindering.’ The sense of the sentence seems to be: ‘and let him

not fail his destiny in relation to marching the army away’. 
37. **ipsa adero. tendat iamdudum in Iapyga campum:** Juno anticipates the Battle of Cannae with excitement, in contrast with Vergil’s Juno who has to send Juturna because she herself cannot bear to be present: *Aen.* 12.75-7. When Juno sends Tisiphone to torment the Saguntines (*Pun* 2.533-4) she makes a similar promise: *ipsa propinqua effectus studiumque tuum de nube uidebo*. **Iapyga:** Greek accusative. The ‘Iapygian plain’ is the location in Apulia where the battle of Cannae will take place, derived from the name given by the Greeks to the south-eastern corner of Italy: *Iapygia enim Apulia dicta est* (Servius ad *Aeneid* 8.710). Juno has earlier described her passionate wish to see the plain submerged in Italian blood:  

*duum Cannas tumulum Hesperiae campumque cruore | Ausonio mersum sublimis Iapyga cernam*, *Pun.* 1.50-1.

38. **huc Trebiae rursum et Thrasymenni fata sequuntur:** the River Trebia and Lake Trasimene are two battle sites where the Romans have already met disaster; Juno predicts that the result (*fata*) of the battle of Cannae will be the same. The names *Trebia, Thrasymenus* and *Ticinus* (another river) are often recited in the *Punica* to represent Hannibal’s overwhelming successes in the first three years of the war: e.g. 1.45-8; 6.297-8; 7.148; 12.548; 15.815. No doubt the alliteration helped make this a memorable formula, cf. Pliny *NH* 7.106.2: *quas Trebia Ticinusue aut Trasimennus ciuicas dedere?* But there may be a wider point in relation to Juno’s attempt to subvert Anna, in that, during the first half of the *Punica* the divinities of Italy are unhelpful to Roman generals, to the point of treachery. The presiding deity of the Ticinus retreats nervously (4.443-5) from the first battle fought on Italian soil; Lake Trasimene breathes out a dense fog that blinds the Roman troops (5.34-36) and they blunder into a trap between its waters on one side and its cliffs on the other. Most tellingly in the second half of Book 4, at Juno’s request the faithless Trebia
turns against the exhausted Romans by collapsing its banks and trapping them in its waters: 4.573ff. Later, when the same river tries to drown the consul Scipio, he cries out: ‘quaenam ista repente | Sidonium, infelix, rabies te reddidit annem?’ (4.646-7).

Consistent with this theme of Italian river-gods that are unreliable at best and faithless at worst, Juno hopes to subvert the fides of the water nymph who has an association with the sacred River Numicus. (Santini [1991] Ch. 2, has a lengthy discussion of the rivers of the Punica.)

39. diua indigetis castis contermina lucis: Anna’s pool was identified (line 28) as being near Laurentum, alluding to Ov. Fast.3.653: placidi sum nympha Numici. Silius now expands the religious significance of his diua by giving her a close association (she is contermina) with the cult site of the deified Aeneas near the River Numicus: see Liv. 1.2.6; Tib.2.5.43-4; Verg. Aen. 12.794; Plin. NH 3.56.7. The poet’s use of castis may provide a clue as to how the reader should understand the connection. By making explicit an association between the deified Aeneas and the river nymph whose holy place is coterminous with the ‘pure’ or ‘undefiled’ grove that is sacred to Aeneas as Jupiter Indiges, Silius is making a grand claim for Anna. Like Aeneas she is an Italian numen who was once a foreigner; both have achieved divinity through the River Numicus and both have been present in the Italian landscape since before the foundation of Rome. Silius may even be suggesting that Anna is a female counterpart to Aeneas, a female indiges: Ahl, Davis and Pomeroy (1986) 2498, Ariemma (2000) 43.

40 - 1. ‘Haud’ inquit ‘tua ius nobis praecopta morari. | sit fas’: Anna’s reply to Juno is appropriately dutiful for a minor divinity addressing an Olympian, cf. Aeolus to Juno (Aen. 1.70-1): ‘tuus, o regina, quid optes | explorare labor; mihi iussa capessere fas est.’ But it should be noted that when Juno summons other diuæ to be
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her emissaries (e.g. Allecto Aen. 7.323; Juturna Aen. 12.154-5, Tisiphone Pun. 2.530-45) the junior goddess does not quibble with Saturnia, as Anna does, but obeys without a word. So, Anna’s response is respectful but also revealing, pointing out with forensic clarity her dilemma: the conflict between ius and fas. Ius commonly refers to the civil laws that regulate the relations of human beings, whereas fas pertains to the laws of morality and the higher laws of the gods; thus Anna’s response haud… ius nobis praecepta morari acknowledges her subordination within the society of immortals, but she then expresses the emphatic wish (sit fas, sit tantum, quaeso: 41) that it may be possible for her both to fulfil the moral obligations that are owed to her sister and to her nation of origin, without losing her cult in Italy. Anna’s ambivalence on this question might alert the reader that her support for Hannibal might well be equivocal and that her obedience to Juno might be merely formal. In passing, one notes that she refers to Carthage as her antiquae patriae. In the layered time-frames of the Punic, by the time of the Second Punic War Anna had been a resident divinity of Italy for many hundreds of years.

41 - 2. retinere fauorem | antiquae patriae mandataque magna sororis: the zuegma of retinere yokes the idea of ‘retaining’ the goodwill of her former country and ‘continuing to fulfil’ (OLD 11) her sister’s commands. The mandata are the words that Dido will speak at 8.175-83, which the reader has not yet encountered; but they would naturally be understood to be an allusion to the words addressed by Dido to her Tyrians in the Aeneid: tum uos, o Tyrii,... exercete odiis... nullus amor populis nec foedera sunto, (Aen. 4.622-4). Because we are dealing with Silius’ re-imagining of a Vergilian character’s experiences seen through an Ovidian lens, it is probably immaterial that, in Aeneid 4, Anna was not actually present to hear these words. The recollection of Dido’s mandata brings sharply into focus the conflict
between the duties of *pietas* and *fides* that Anna owes to her sister, and the obligations now owed to her adopted country where she has been honoured as a divinity by the Latins since the pre-history of Rome.

**44 - 201.** *Silius now digresses from the main narrative to explain the aetiology of this paradoxical divinity beginning with a reflection upon the obscurity in which her origins lie.*

**44 - 5.** These lines are difficult to construe, but they have the effect of creating a labyrinth of words comparable to the windings of time and the fog of antiquity in which the sources of myth must be sought.

**44.** *multa retro rerum iacet:* *rerum* should be partitive: the question is whether it is to be taken with *retro* on the analogy of the adverbial idioms *ubi terrarum* and *post id locorum*, as suggested by Spaltenstein, or whether it should be taken with *multa* (neuter plural substantive). *multa rerum* would be a very natural expression: = ‘many things / events’, and quite Silian: e.g. *rerum extrema*, 8.25; *prospera rerum*, 4.499; *ultima rerum*, 6.221; *talia rerum*, 16.161. But the verb requires a singular subject, and *multa rerum* cannot be the subject of *iacet*. And so one must read *multa retro* as adverbial: ‘very far behind’. The lack of coordination between these clauses and *cur Sarrana dicent Oenotri numina* (46) deepens the obscurity: the indirect question is postponed until the mysteries of time have been established. It is tempting to read *retro* as a preposition, governing the accusative (cf. *post*), and there is some support for *retro* as a preposition in a text that is only a little later than Silius: Apuleius *Met. 6.8: retro metas Murtias* (‘behind the Murtian temple’). So we might read the sentence as: ‘The reason why the people of Italy honour a Tyrian divinity with a temple, and the descendants of Aeneas worship the sister of Elissa, lies
behind many events, and the distant past (uetustas), submerged in deep obscurity, is concealed by the twists and turns of time’.

46. **dicare**: a technical religious term, meaning ‘consecrate’. Usually transitive, with a direct object such as *donum, aram, templum* that is consecrated to a god, cf *Pun.* 8. 230; here it means to ‘consecrate [Anna] as a divinity’. For *numina* with reference to a single deity cf. Sen. *Phaed.* 73: *tua si gratus numina cultor | tulit in saltus.*

46 – 7. **Sarrana... Oenotri... Aenadum... Elissae**: Silius’ antiquarian interests are on display here. *Sarra* is the ancient (Semitic) name of Tyre, Hebrew *Zor*. It is usually associated in Latin with the expensive dye (Tyrian purple) for which the city was famous, e.g. *Sarra murica* (*Pun.* 15.205), but Silius also uses *Sarranus* loosely as a synonym for ‘Carthaginian’, e.g. *Sarrana caede* (6.662), *Sarrana castra* (11.2). *Oenotria* is an old name for Italy (*Herodotus* 1.167), possibly derived from ὅνος. The term does not seem to have been used in Latin before Vergil, with reference to Hesperia, mysterious land of the West, e.g. *Aen.* 1.532. Here it carries its full weight of meaning in the context of an explanation for a cult belonging to the ancient inhabitants of Italy. The word order is chiastic, giving emphasis to the paradox of Italians honouring a Punic princess. Note that the pairing of *Oenotri* with *Sarrana* is followed by allusions to the story of Dido and Aeneas in line 47, connecting that myth to the pre-history of Italy. In shaping the introduction to his aetiological excursus, Silius brings together three time-frames for the land of Italy and makes them into a continuum: the earliest times, before the arrival of the Trojans, are represented by the *Oenotri*, followed by the mythological times of Aeneas; and the tense of the verb *dicent* testifies to the cult of Anna Perenna continuing in historical times.
48 - 9. Note the graceful allusion to *Aeneid* 1.341-2: *longa est iniuria, longae ambages; sed summa sequar fastigia rerum*, where Venus promises to tell the story of the foundation of Carthage in a few words. The poet’s promise to be brief might be wryly self-deprecating. Ovid’s introduction to the tale of Anna consists of a single couplet, and the whole episode occupies about one hundred lines; Silius has taken four lines to express what Ovid conveyed in the word *erroribus* and his digression from the main narrative will occupy more than 150 lines.

50 - 75. *Anna is forced to flee from Carthage because of the hostility of Iarbas; she finds refuge with Battus, but she has to take to the seas again because he is afraid of her brother, Pygmalion. Shipwrecked by a storm on the Italian coast near Laurentum she encounters Aeneas and Iulus, and is welcomed into Aeneas’ household.*

50 - 55. Although the bones of the narrative are derived from Ovid’s *Fasti* 3.545-627 the first five lines of this section are densely intertextual with the *Aeneid*. This has the effect of establishing the Vergilian credentials of the narrative (‘the true history of Aeneas and Dido’) before Silius embarks on Anna’s story. The immediate intertext is *Aeneid* 4.305-39, where Dido confronts Aeneas after becoming aware that he is preparing to leave Carthage: she calls him *perfide* (4.305) and accuses him of breach of faith but Aeneas denies that they are married. So the moral argument, from Dido’s point of view, concerning Aeneas’ *fides* turns on whether he was her husband or merely a temporary guest. The issue of *fides* is a recurring theme in the *Punica*, and in general, as Tipping (2010, 81) says: ‘*Fides* distinguishes Silius’ ethically admirable exemplars from his Carthaginians, who are typically perfidious’. It is curious, indeed, that Silius evokes an ambiguous response to the question of
Aeneas’ *fides* in a poem in which the Romans of the second century BC are not infrequently referred to as *Aeneades*.

**50. Iliaco postquam deserta est hospite Dido:** The narrative follows the epic convention of plunging *in medias res*. There is a sign here that Silius’ account will be favourable to Dido’s side of the moral argument, for it directly references Dido’s language at *Aen*. 4.323: *cui me moribundam deseris, hospes?* Silius shows his hand at the end of line 53, which amounts to an endorsement of Dido’s position on the question of Aeneas’ *fides*, justifying Dido’s hostility towards him. Note that Aeneas is not named in this passage: he is called *Iliacus hospes* and *profugus maritus* (54). Although the voice is that of the narrator, it is a Carthaginian version of the story that is being offered.

**51 - 2. et spes abruptae, medio in penetralibus atram | festinat furibunda pyram:** This is how the text appears in Delz’ Teubner edition, but there is a problem here that does not seem to have an easy resolution. In the manuscripts line 51 appears thus: *et spes abruptae medio in penetralibus atram.* (e.g. Bibl. Laur. 37.16 f.87v). Heinsius, following Barth, made the correction *abruptae*, which has been universally accepted. Scholars disagree on *medio*. Heinsius proposed *mediis penetralibus*. Summers (1904) proposed *mediam*, cf. *Aeneid* 2.508: *medium in penetralibus hostem*, where *medium hostem* is the direct object of *uidit*: ‘he sees the enemy already within the inner palace’. Summers must be reading *mediam… atram… pyram* as an adverbial phrase with no preposition which is common enough in poetry (Woodcock, 1959, §5.v) but the presence of two adjectives modifying *pyram* is infelicitous. Delz (1987) restores the MSS reading *medio* on the analogy of *Aeneid* 7.59: *tecti medio in penetralibus altis*, but there seems to be no other instance
where *medio* is used substantively without the partitive genitive (as in *Aen*. 7.59) or a preposition. On the other hand, Silius has *e medio* at *Pun*. 5.159, in a passage where Flaminius is exhorting his troops to find motivation from their grief for slain relatives: *sed, est uestrum cui nulla doloris | priuati rabies, is uero ingentia sumat | e medio, fodiand quae magnas pectus in iras*. *TLL* 594.8 comments that *e medio* is ‘opp. *privati*’. If line 51 is taken without emendation as *et spes abrupta* [sc. *est*] *e medio in penetralibus atram* and the phrase *e medio* is given a sense that is ‘opp. *privati*’ it could indicate that when her final hope was destroyed Dido went from a public place to a more secluded one, i.e. to an inner courtyard. *spes:* refers to the hope (or hopes) that there could be a stable and enduring dynasty at Carthage arising from the union of Dido and Aeneas, cf. the reference to the hope vested in Iulus as Aeneas’ heir in *Aeneid* 4. 274: *spes heredis Iuli.*


*tum corripit ensem:* cf. *Aen*. 4.579, *eripit ensem* in the same sedes. *certa necis:* cf. *Aen*.4.564: *certa mori*. In these lines the poet explicitly evokes a well-known episode of the *Aeneid* while introducing some variation, not merely substituting lexical items (*festinat / conscendit, pyram / rogos, corripit / eripit, necis / mori*) but also inverting the order of the phrases as they appear in Vergil’s text. Such inversions and reversals are not fortuitous but are a consistent feature of Silius’ poetic design: Wallace (1958) 99-103; Ahl, Davis and Pomeroy (1986) 2499-501; Pomeroy (2000) 155. Note the enjambement of lines 51-53, which creates the effect of events hastening towards an inevitable conclusion.

53. *profugi donum exitiale mariti:* cf. *Aen*. 1.2, where Aeneas is described as *fato profagus*, with all its epic implications; here he is a less than impressive ‘runaway husband’. Dietrich (2004, 15-23, esp 17) discusses the ways that the
Flavian poets dealt with the question of the legitimacy of Dido’s marriage to Aeneas and concludes that they were attempting to correct the moral and social ambiguities of Vergil’s text by ‘eliminating any doubts as to the question of legitimate marriage’; cf. Verg. *Aen.* 4.547: *quin morere ut merita es*; Ov. *Her.* 7.191: *meae male conscia culpae*. The mitigation of Dido’s *culpa* perhaps gives some ethical value to her eternal hostility towards Aeneas and his nation within the moral order of the *Punica*, a moral scheme in which Fides is a paramount virtue. The *donum exitiale* is the *munus* of *Aen.* 4.646: *non hos quaesitum munus in usus*. But the phrase explicitly alludes to *Aen.* 2.31 where it refers to the deadly offering left behind by the Greeks, thus giving a taint of treachery to the gift-sword.

54 - 5. **despectus taedae Iarbas regnis se imponit | et tepido fugit Anna rogo:** The rewriting of *Fasti* 3.551-64 increases the pathos of Anna’s plight: Ovid has her remain in Carthage for two years before leaving. **despectus …Iarbas:** cf. *Aeneid* 4.36-7, where the context is Dido’s rejection of Iarbas and other African rulers who offered marriage. **taedae:** genitive of respect (Woodcock 73 §6). Torches were carried as part of Roman wedding rites, hence, *taedae* is metonymic for ‘marriage’, cf. Dido’s words at *Aen.* 4.18: *si non pertaesum thalami taedaeque fuisset.*

**tepido fugit Anna rogo:** Silius emphasizes with this image the haste with which Anna leaves Carthage. **se imponit:** Note that the verb form *se imponere* recurs at 8.87, and cf. 8.110: *meque sua ratibus dextra imposisset.*

55 - 6. **quis rebus egenis | ferret opem?** This is probably deliberative, but it may equally be an indirect question dependant on an implied verb (‘she wondered’), shifting the focalization briefly to Anna. **rebus egenis:** recalls the Sibyl’s words to Aeneas (*Aen.* 6.91-2) *cum tu supplex in rebus egenis quas gentis Italum aut quas non oraueris urbes*, and is the first of several allusions that identify Anna’s plight
with that of Aeneas. (See notes 67, 76 below.) There may be an Ovidian source for quis miseræ ferre... opem, cf. Her.10.24, ipse locus miseræ ferre uolebat opem. (See n. 83-96 below for the influence of Ov. Her.10.) Note the use of alliteration in the second half of line 56 (laete terrente tyranno) to mark the conclusion of this phase of the narrative. (The effect is repeated at line 60 which marks another termination.)

57 - 8. Battus Cyrenen molli tum forte fouebat | imperio: Battus was a name associated in history with the rulers of the Greek colony of Cyrene in Libya, (Herodotus 4.159) which was famous as an intellectual and artistic centre (OCD 249-50). Ovid has Anna flee from Carthage first to the island of Malta (Fast. 3.569-70) where she is received by its ruler, Battus, in the name of guest-friendship. Silius corrects the reference, perhaps because he is doctus poeta. Brugnoli and Santini term such adjustments, ‘correzione di campo culturale’ (1995, 21). The poetry reflects the contrast between Battus’ gentle regime and the cruelty of Iarbas and Pygmalion: the sharp consonance of laete terrente tyranno, is followed by the humming sounds of molli tum forte fouebat | imperio. Battus is mitis (58) and he ‘nurtures’ his kingdom, (see fouere OLD 5a, with connotations of the relationship between a parent and child). Marks (2005, 283) argues that Silius has a didactic concern in the Punica with the ideal of the good or just ruler, which ‘would have been recognizable as such to Silius’ readers from contemporary, and largely philosophical, treatments of kingship’. In Seneca’s De Clementia the term mitis is used for rulers who practise a policy of clementia, e.g. miti animo exercere imperium (1.7.2); Diuus Augustus fuit mitis princeps si quis illum a principatu suo aestimare incipiat (1.9.1); gravior multo poena uidetur, quae a miti uiro constituitur (1.22.3). (See Dowling [2006] 195-8; Braund [2009] 53-7.) If Silius is indeed adverting to kingship theory here, it is notable that Battus is an ineffective protector, not really very different from the
Battus of *Fasti* 3 who is *opum diues* (570) but *arma perosus* (577) and *imbelles* (588). In the character of Scipio Silius most explicitly engages with ideas of ‘the good king’: see Fucecchi (2014), Marks (2005).

60. **intremuit regum euentus:** may be read (with Ruperti and Ariemma) as a paraphrase of Ovid’s *casus utriusque sororis* (*Fast.* 3.571) or (with Duff and Spaltenstein) as a generalizing statement about ‘what may befall kings’. The proximity of *casibus humanis* (59) and the possibility of reading Battus as an example of humane but ineffective kingship might tip the balance towards a more generalized reading. The hopeful ‘false ending’ of line 60 is marked by the repeated sounds of *dextram tetendit*.

61. **dum flaunas bis tondet messor aristas:** cf. *Fast.* 3.557: *tertia nudandas acceperat area messes*. Harvests are a conventional way of expressing the passage of time e.g. Verg. *G.* 4.231: *bis grauidos cogunt fetus, duo tempora messis*; Ov. *Her.* 6.57 *tertia messis erat*; cf. *Pun.* 13. 671-2: *octaua terebat | arentem culmis messem crepitantibus aestas*. In the passages of *Fasti* from which Silius has drawn this image, Ovid has Anna remain in Carthage for more than two years after it has been captured by Iarbas and then she stays with Battus for about the same amount of time. Silius condenses *Fasti* 3.557-8; 575-6 so that Anna flees from Carthage immediately after Dido’s death and there is no extended description of the storm as there is in *Fasti* 3.581-600. He does not slavishly follow Ovid, but selects the parts of the story that suit the narrative that he is constructing.

63 - 4. **ferre per aequor | exitium miseræ iam Pygmaliona docebat:** The reader might recall here Dido’s own fears: *quid moror? an mea Pygmalion dum moenia*
frater | destruat aut captam ducat Gaetulus Iarbas? (Aen. 4.325-6), especially since the epithet misera is frequently applied to Dido in Aeneid 4: e.g. 315, 420, 429.

66. quod se non dederit comitem in suprema sorori: cf. Ov. Fast. 3.597: tum primum Dido felix est dicta sorori; also, Anna’s death-wish at Aen. 4.678: eadem me ad fata uocasses.

67 - 8. iactatam laceris miserabile uelis | fatalis turbo in Laurentis expulit oras: miserabile is adverbial accusative with laceris: ‘with sails sadly mangled’; fatalis turbo recalls the storm that drove Aeneas (terris iactatus Aen. 1.3) to Libya in Aeneid 1, which itself alludes to the storm in Book 5 of the Odyssey. These allusions prepare the reader for the doubling of Anna/Aeneas and Aeneas/Dido in the roles of fugitive and host. Anna is called Sidonis... naufraga at line 70, which emphasizes this reversal of roles, for Dido is Sidonia when she welcomes Aeneas to her city (Aen. 1.613).

69 - 70. These lines bring the description of Anna’s wanderings to an emphatic rhetorical conclusion. Line 69 has an ascending tricolon, with anaphora, non...non...non... followed by a ‘balanced’ line: Sidonis in Latia trepidabat naufraga terra, (abVAB). The metrical stability of line 70 adds to the surprise in the following one.

71 - 2. ecce autem Aeneas sacro comitatus Iulo | iam regni compos: Ovid’s Aeneas is a less than impressive figure who encounters Anna while walking barefooted on the shore in the company of Achates: litore dotali solo comitatus Achate | secretum nudo dum pede carpit iter, (Fast. 3.603-4). Silius may be correcting Ovid here (see note 57 above) by restoring Aeneas’ dignity and adding an acknowledgement of the dynastic importance of Iulus, cf. Troianus Iulo | Caesar
auo, Pun. 13.863-4. Iulus is *sacer* because he is the grandson of a deity (and the ancestor of others). **compos:** a prosaic word, and not much used by poets, except in the phrases *compos mentis* (e.g. Pun. 4.806; 17.221, Ov. Met. 8.35) and *compos uoti* (e.g. Tib. 1.10.23; Hor. *Ars* 76; Ov. *Ars* 1.486). Silius uses it elsewhere at 8.229 (*compos pugnae*) and 14.178 (*compos certaminis*); more daring uses are found at 11.364: *dignus fieri compos memorabilis ausi* and 17.625: *mansuri compos decoris per saecula*.

72. **noto sese ore ferebat:** Anna recognizes a familiar face in an alien setting, cf. Dido’s exclamation to her sister at *Aeneid* 4.11, about the powerful impression made by the hero’s physical stature: *quem sese ore ferens, quam forti pectore et armis!*

73 - 4. **terrae defixam oculos et multa timentem | ac deinde adlapsam genibus lacrimantis Iuli:** In *Fasti* it is Achates who recognizes Anna and exclaims, *Anna est!* at which she looks up, *uoltus sustulit illa suos.* (*Fast. 3.607*). Silian Anna keeps her eyes lowered just like Dido on her first encounter with the Trojans (*uultum demissa, Aen. 1.561*) and also when she confronts Aeneas in the Underworld (*illa solo fixos oculos auersa tenebat: Aen. 6.469*). Then Anna falls at the knees of Iulus in the characteristic posture of the suppliant. In *Fasti* it is Aeneas who weeps (3.612). Silius is ringing variations on both his sources.

75. **attollit mitique manu intra limina ducit:** In Ovid’s version of the encounter, Aeneas launches immediately into a defensive and self-justifying speech: *Fast. 3.613-24.* The gentle demeanour of Silian Aeneas towards his unexpected visitor may be showing the essential qualities of the ‘good king’. In that context, the
repetition of ‘m’ and ‘n’ sounds in *mitique manu intro limina ducit* recalls the sounds of line 57.

76 - 159. *Silius departs from the Ovidian intertext to offer a retelling of Dido’s last days* (Aen. 4.450-692) *from Anna’s point of view.*

76 - 7. *atque ubi iam casus aduersorumque pauorem | hospitii leniuit honos:*  
*pauorem | ... leniuit* recalls *Aen. 1.450-1* where the sight of Juno’s temple in Carthage calms Aeneas’ fears (*hoc primum in luco noua res oblata timorem | lenit*) and encourages him to hope that he has found a safe haven, suggesting another parallel between the fugitives Anna and Aeneas. There is also an echo of Aeneas’ unavailing attempt to soothe the Dido at *Aen. 6.467-8: talibus Aeneas ardentem et torua tuentem | lenibat dictis animum lacrimasque ciebat.* He is more successful in calming Anna’s fears.  
*hospitii leniuit honos:*  
Ovid says that Battus would have observed ‘the duties of hospitality’ (*hospitii ... munus: 3.573*) but for the threats of Pygmalion.  
Silius gives the phrase *hospitii...honos* a neat element of alliteration, while suggesting that Aeneas is honouring Dido’s sister as much as he is obeying a code of hospitality. If *casus* and *pauorem* are both direct objects of the verb *lenire* there is word-play here. If *casus* is genitive, and the pairing consists of *casus aduersorumque* (*‘misfortune and adversities’*) the line is another example of Silius’ fondness for duplication. (See note 35 above.)

77 – 8. *discere maesta | exposcit cura letum infelicis Elissae:*  
*infelix* is programmatic for Dido-in-love in Vergil: she is *Sidonia, Phoenissa, pulcherrima, laetissima* until she is afflicted with love for Aeneas at *Aen. 1.715* and from then on she is rarely anything other than *infelix:* *Aen. 1.749; 4.68, 450, 529, 596; 5.3; 6.456.*  
*cura:* for a painful emotion is frequently found in amatory contexts, e.g. Catul.
2.3, Tib. 2.3.13, Prop. 1.1.36, Ov. Am. 1.3.16. See also Pun. 8.101. These lines create a portrait of Aeneas as a grieving lover, taking its cue from Aen. 6.455: *demisit lacrimas dulcique adfatus amore est.*

79 - 80. *cui sic uerba || trahens || largis || fletibus Anna | incipit:* Note how the rhythm of line 79 is broken up by many caesurae, suggesting the difficulty of speaking through sobs.

80. *et blandas addit pro tempore uoces:* *blandus* is a term from the erotic canon, e.g. the concern expressed by Venus at Aeneid 1.670-1: *nunc Phoenissa tenet Dido blandisque moratur | uocibus;* cf. Catul. 64.139: *blanda... promissa;* Tib. 1.2.22: *blanda... uoce;* Prop. 1.8.40: *blandi... carminis;* Ov. Am. 1.11.14: *blanda... manu.* There is a tradition, reported by Servius Danielis ad Aen. 4.682, that there was a love affair between Anna and Aeneas: *Varro ait non Didonem, sed Annam amore Aeneae impulsam se supra rogum interemisse.* Thus, Silius’ description of Anna’s words as *blandas* (line 80) might suggest that she is adopting a ‘winning tone’. On the other hand, *blandas uoces* here might be more political than erotic: Silian Anna chooses her words carefully *pro tempore* to deal with the potential danger of offending her host. It is to be noted that while she seems to have more knowledge than Vergil’s Anna and is about to give a detailed eye-witness account of Dido’s movements in the aftermath of Aeneas’ departure, she will not mention Dido’s curse, which would be tactless under the circumstances (Ahl, Davis and Pomeroy [1986] 2495).

Spaltenstein has a long note about the use of *incipit* and *addit uerba* in the same sentence. In short, he regards the use of the two verbs as little more than Silian redundancy, but the text can be read as revealing something of Anna’s uncertainty –
she begins to speak hesitantly and then consciously adopts a coaxing or flattering tone to suit the occasion. The rhythm of īncipīt ēt creates a stammering effect.

81. nate dea: is about as flattering an honorific as one could imagine and is the title by which Dido first greets Aeneas (Aen. 1.615). It is used in Vergil often but only by those who are cognizant of Aeneas’ maternal origins, chiefly divinities like Mercury and the River Tiber, as well as fellow Trojans, e.g. Achates at 1.582.

81 - 2. solus regni lucisque fuisti | germanae tu causa meae: Notwithstanding the deep courtesy implied by her opening words, Anna’s first sentence is almost prosecutorial, an effect that is enhanced by the use of the legal term testis in 82. Note how frequently Anna uses tu, te etc. in the first fourteen lines of this speech. lucis... causa = ‘reason for living’, cf. the description of the warlike Cantabrians:

nec uitam sine Marte pati: quippe omnis in armis | lucis causa sita. (Pun. 3. 330-31). regni... causa must have a slightly different connotation, i.e. ‘you were the reason why her kingdom could survive against the hostility of the kings that surrounded her’. There is a very Silian economy and wit in this sentence, and the word-order of germanae tu causa meae places tu in a position of emphasis in relation to causa.

83. rogus: is the pyra of Aen. 4.494-6 on which were piled all the items left behind by Aeneas in the bedroom: his sword, armour, and clothes to which are added an effigy (Aen. 4.508) and the bed itself (Aen. 4.648). heu cur non idem mihi tum: is a very compressed rewriting of Aen. 4.678-9: eadem me ad fata uocasses, | idem ambas ferro dolor atque eadem hora tulisset. Its insertion between ille and rogus is dramatic.
83 - 97. Silius amplifies and elaborates Vergil’s account of Dido’s behaviour after Aeneas’ departure. In Vergil, the queen sees from a high tower that the shore and the harbour are both empty. In her grief she repeatedly (terque quaterque: 4.589) beats her breast and tears her hair, she rails at Aeneas and calls him aduena (4.591, cf. Pun. 8. 163). After sending Anna misleading instructions about preparations for a ritual (Aen. 4.632ff), she climbs the pyre in the inner courtyard of her palace and kills herself. In Silius’ account, Dido ranges wildly between the shore and the palace and the language employed shows the repetitive behaviour of a woman distracted by passion: sedit... stetit (84, 85); uocabat... orabat (86, 88); nunc... | effigiem fouet... nunc... ab imagine pendet (91-2, 93); rettulit... rursus... reuisit (89, 96).

The model for Dido on the shore is Ariadne abandoned by Theseus: the ultimate Latin source is Catullus 64, but there are stronger linguistic and dramatic correspondences between the Silian passage and Ovid’s Heroides 10. Catullus’ Ariadne stands like a marble Bacchant, staring fixedly out to sea (64.61-2), but the Ovidian model rushes here and there: nunc huc, nunc illuc (Her. 10.19), cf. Pun. 8. 84-5: sedit | interdum, stetit interdum; she calls out loudly to Theseus by name: summa Thesea uoce uoco, (Her. 10.34), cf. Pun. 8.86-7: magno clamore uocabat | Aenean; she sits and looks out to sea: mare prospiciens in saxo... sedi (Her.10.49), cf. Pun. 8.84-6: litore sedit | ... uentosque secuta | infelix oculis. Like Ariadne, Dido imagines herself taken on board: tuae se imponere solam | orabat paterere rati (Pun. 8. 87-8), cf. Her. 10.64: finge dari comitesque mihi uentosque ratemque; like Ariadne (Her. 10.52), she returns to the couch she had shared with her faithless hero, cf. Pun. 8.89-90. The debt to Ovid here seems indisputable.

83 – 84. ora uidere | postquam est ereptum: Spaltenstein notes that Silius has three instances (from only five recorded in TLL 792.48) of this construction of
eripere with the infinitive. In the light of this, one may detect a further allusion to *Heroides* 10 viz. *iamque oculis ereptus eras* (*Her.* 10.43). For discussions of the *Punica* and Ovid see Bruère (1959), Ariemma (2000) 52, Wilson (2004).

88. **paterere:** second person singular subjunctive, in a prayer. The form is poetic.

88–90. **mox turbida anhelum | retulit in thalamos cursum subitoque tremore**

**substitit et sacrum timuit tetigisse cubile:** This scene precedes the moment in the *Aeneid* when Dido climbs the pyre and hesitates when she sees the *notum cubile* (4.648-9), i.e. the *sacrum cubile* is still in the *thalamus*. The couch is *sacrum* in several senses, so that Anna’s word *sacrum* may be received by Aeneas in one sense and by the reader in another. In the first place, *sacrum* may be a synonym for *sanctum*: Spaltenstein (1989), ‘Ce lit est sacré à cause des souvenirs qui s’y rattachent’; Ariemma (2004), ‘Anna tenta di trasmettere la tesa sacralità del momento.’ On the other hand, in the *Aeneid*, the *iugalem…lectum* (4.496) is supposed to be immolated as an offering to dark gods, and so it may be that the *cubile* here is *sacrum* in the sense of a religious offering, recalling *Aeneid* 4.494-8. Thirdly, *sacrum* may mean ‘accursed, detestable’: *OLD* 2. Anna says that Dido stopped, *afraid* to touch the bed, evoking unhappy associations with Aeneas, of which Petrus Marsus (1482) seems to be thinking: ‘*sacrum.* in quo tu [Aeneas] iacueras; quod te iam abiente nefas tangere ducebatur’. The hissing alliteration in lines 89-90 might cause the reader to lean towards a darker reading of *sacrum*. (See n.100 below.) **anhelum:** adverbial.

91–3. **inde amens nunc sideream fulgentis Iuli | effigiem fouet amplexu, nunc tota repente | ad uultus conuersa tuos, ab imagine pendet:** The use of effigies in black magic is well-attested in Greek and Latin literature (e.g. Theocritus *Id.* 2.28
where Simaetha melts wax, as part of a love spell, also the effigies of wool and wax employed by Canidia in Hor. S. 1.8.30-31). In Vergil’s account of the pyre (Aen. 4.508) there is an effigy of Aeneas that is part of the magic ritual to be performed by Dido. But there are two portraits in the bedroom as described by Anna, one of Iulus and another of Aeneas, and the way that Dido deals with them shows her, with pathos, as a deserted wife and (step) mother. She first embraces the effigy of her surrogate son, Iulus, (cf. Aen. 1.717 & 4.84), and then turns her entire attention (tota ...

...conversa) to the likeness of Aeneas (uultus...tuos) and she either gazes at it (ab imagine pendet) with rapt attention (OLD 4b) or embraces it with passion (OLD 4a). Again, it must be remembered that these are Anna’s words, and she may well be trying to make Aeneas feel guilty, by recalling the hopes (see n.51-2 above) that both she and Dido placed in Aeneas and his son (Ahl, Davis and Pomeroy [1986] 2497). Note also that Aeneas will, at line 107, suggestively, refer to the affection for Iulus shared by the sisters.

91 – 2. *sidream fulgentis Iuli | effigiem:* Both Spaltenstein and Ariemma devote some attention to the significance of the epithets *sidereus* and *fulgens*. (Duff translates the phrase as: ‘the beauteous image of radiant Iulus’.) Ariemma (ad loc.) insists that the main aesthetic connotation of *sidereus* is ‘beautiful’, and suggests that *fulgens* is a displaced adjective (hypallage) for its sheen. Spaltenstein (ad.loc.) argues that the effigy is ‘divine’ but says that *fulgens* means little more than *pulcher*, citing both Ovid and Vergil: e.g. Aen. 5.570, 9.293; Ov. Am. 3.9.14.

It must be admitted that any discussion of this point is somewhat compromised by the fact that *fulgentis* is an emendation suggested by Modius (Novant. Lect. Ep. 28) for *inde amens nunc sidream Iulique tuamque | effigiem*. Modius explains the appropriateness of *fulgentis* (‘bene convenit fulgor sydereo vultui’) by reference to
the wax from which the effigy would have been made. It must be conceded that
fulgentis Iuli is better than Iulique tuamque, and has Vergilian antecedents, cf. Aen.
6.364, 10.524 (surgentis Iuli), 7.493 (venantis Iuli), 9.501 (lacrimantis Iuli), 12.399
(maerentis Iuli). But it should also be noted that there is another MS tradition in
which the line reads sideream arridentis Iuli, which conforms to the Vergilian model
but is not euphonious.

Remembering, however, that Iulus was sacer at 71 it is worth considering whether
both sidereus and fulgens have connotations that hint at the divinity of the
descendants of Iulus in imperial times. Šilius uses the epithet sidereus in only two
other contexts. At Pun. 2.696-7 it suggests the immortality of the Saguntine dead; at
3.629 it probably refers to the deification of Domitian’s son: both these contexts
suggest that sideream… effigiem in relation to Iulus has a meaning that is more than
aesthetic. fulgens in Šilius usually means ‘bright’, in relation to weapons (e.g. Pun.
2.666), the crests of helmets (e.g. 1.460), or the colour purple (e.g. 3.328). But at
12.347 the poet describes a youth as fulgente iuuenta and at 16.465 two young
athletes are fulgentes pueri. If fulgentis Iuli means not much more than ‘in the bloom
of youth’ then it would be a step too far to read some imperial significance into this
phrase.

92. tota: Probably f. sing. nominative case with conuersa, rather than adverbial
neuter pl. accusative.

93. ab imagine pendet: recalls Dido hanging on Aeneas’ words: pendetque…
narrantis ab ore (Aen. 4.79).

94. conqueriturque tibi et sperat responsa remitti: cf. Ariadne to Theseus in
Heroides 10.146-9: infelix tendo trans freta lata manus;|... per lacrimas oro, quas
tua facta mouent | flecte ratem, Theseu, uersoque relabere uelo! conqueritur: this verb is used only here by Silius. It is frequent in Cicero, e.g. in Verrem 2.3.45-6: de istius improbitate deplorare et conqueri mallent.

96. furibunda: is used by Vergil of Dido (Aen. 4.646) and of the Fury Allecto (Aen. 7.348). In both these places the epithet has its full significance, i.e. ‘possessed with the energy of a Fury’. Here, as in line 52 above, it is an obvious quotation from the Aeneid.

97. si qui te referant... uenti: = si qui uenti te referant: indirect question following an implied verb, quaerit. conuerso flamine: instrumental ablative, rather than ablative absolute, cf. Ovid’s uerso relabere uelo (note 94 above).

98–9. ad magicas etiam fallax atque improba gentis | Massylae leuitas descendere compulit artes: Consider the import of the Vergilian original in Aeneid 4. 483ff. where Dido persuades her sister to build a pyre for the purpose of carrying out a magical rite and swears to Anna that she is driven to this by desperation. Vergilian Anna (according to the narrator) mistakes Dido’s distress for feelings of guilt about Sychaeus (Aen. 4.500-2). Silian Anna shifts the primary responsibility away from Dido: it was the fallax atque improba...leuitas of the Massylians that drove Dido to resort to magic. Silius’ contemporary reader would surely have been familiar with the events of Dido’s last days as reported in the Aeneid and would have noted this deviation by Silius from those ‘facts’. But Silian Anna is motivated by a very believable concern to protect her sister’s reputation and to present her in the best light possible to Aeneas. ad magicas... descendere compulit artes: an effective variation on Dido’s words to Anna at Aen. 4.493: magicas inuitam accingier artes. (Note the extreme hyperbaton in Silius, compared with Vergil.)
Anna says her sister was compelled to *stoop* to such measures by the malign influences of the Massylians; *descendere* invites the reader to think of the powers of the Underworld. *gentis... | Massyliae:* the generalisation might have pejorative ethnic connotations.

100. **heu sacri uatum errores:** Silian Anna sententiously misquotes *Aeneid* 4. 65: *heu, uatum ignaræ mentes!* The Vergilian thought is an ironic comment by the epic narrator on the futility of Dido’s resort to priests and propitiation when the gods themselves had already doomed her to unlawful love; but here Anna is trying to shift responsibility from herself and her sister to the delusions of the priestess who promised Dido a cure for her troubles at *Aeneid* 4.487. The meaning of *sacri... errores* is much discussed. Duff translates it as ‘accursed delusions’, (see *OLD 2 sacer*). Ariemma takes *sacri* as a transferred epithet: i.e. *sacrorum uatum errores*; he cites *Pun.* 6.288 (*nec tacuere pii uates*) as a parallel, but in that passage the *uates* are seers who rightly warn the Romans of the consequences of the sacrilegious slaughter of a great serpent. Spaltenstein thinks that *sacri* means ‘detestable, accursed’, because of the recollection of *ignaræ mentes.* (But Anna’s *sacri* is very much stronger than *ignaræ.*) Spaltenstein cites, without argument in support, *Pun.* 6.42: *sacram uirtutis rabiem,* but its use there seems to be ambiguous, given its association with *uirtutis* and the frenzy of men in combat. It is, perhaps, a trivial issue. The point here is that Anna is attempting to dissociate herself from the recourse to magic to which, in *Aeneid* 4, she complaisantly contributed. Both meanings of *sacer* can be invoked without damaging Anna’s rhetoric, and this ambiguous wordplay is similar to that which is found at line 90.

100 - 1. **dum numina noctis eliciunt | spondentque nouis medicamina curis:** cf. *Aen.* 4.487: *haec se carminibus promittit soluere mentes.* Silius works with the
same idea but varies the terms: *spondent, medicamina, curis*. **numina noctis**: refers to the divinities of the underworld, cf. *Aen.* 4.510-11 where the priestess invokes *deos, Erebumque Chaosque tergeminamque Hecaten*. Silius’ use of *nox* to mean ‘the Underworld’ appears to be unique, cf. *Pun.* 13.707-8, where the shade of Paulus addresses Scipio as *lux Italum* and asks *[quis subigit] descendere nocti?’ Vergil uses the phrase *nocturnos… Manes* at *Aen.*4.490. See also note 140 below.

101. **noius medicamina curis**: The adjective *noius* can mean ‘strange’ as well as ‘recent, new’ (*OLD 1*-5), cf. *Aen.*4.500: *non tamen Anna noius praetexere funera sacris germanam credit*. Here *noius* probably means ‘recent’ or ‘fresh’.

102. **quod uidi decepta nefas**: cf. Anna’s words (*Aen.* 4.675) to her dying sister: *me fraude petebas?* Anna exculpates herself with *decepta* and describes herself as a witness to *nefas* rather than a participant. *quod* is exclamatory.

102 - 3. **congressit in atram cuncta tui monumenta pyram**: The use of the third person verb *congressit* makes Dido the builder of the pyre, distancing Anna from the more potently affective *struxi* of *Aen.*4. 680. And see note 89-90 above.

103. **non prospera dona**: The gifts include the sword which Dido will use to kill herself. It appears first in the *Punica* in the shrine to Dido where Hannibal makes his oath of vengeance (1.91ff): there it is simply *ensis Phrygius*. Earlier in Book 8 the fatality of the sword-gift was emphasized by the poet-narrator: *donum exitiale* (8.53) but Anna continues to choose her words carefully to avoid giving offence. (See also note 149 below.)

104 - 13. *Aeneas responds to Anna’s first speech: he protests his good faith with an oath, and justifies his departure in much the same terms as in Aeneid 4.333-61.*
104. **dulci repetitus amore**: cf. Verg. *Aen.* 6.455: *dulci adfatus amore*. In his encounter with Dido’s shade in the Underworld, Aeneas speaks to her with feelings of love that are still fresh. Here, after the passage of some time, and the events of the second half of the *Aeneid*, he is *revisited* by feelings of love, and indeed the verb has some sense that he has been ‘attacked’ once again. But the object of those feelings is ambiguous: is it Anna or the memory of Dido that arouses his feelings?

105 - 7. **tellurem hanc iuro, uota inter nostra frequenter | auditam uobis, iuro caput, Anna, tibique | germanaecque tuae dilectum mitis Iuli**: In Ovid’s *Fasti* Aeneas swears by the land (*tellurem*) that he claims Anna had often heard him speak about, and by *deos comites*, who followed him: *Fast.* 3.613-15. Silius incorporates Vergilian elements into this model. Silian Aeneas swears by the *land* and by the *life* of Iulus: that is, he swears by the two most important elements of his current situation; cf. *Aen.* 4.357, where he swears by his own life and by Dido’s: *testor utrumque caput*. At *Aen.* 4.492 Dido swears an oath in similar terms: *testor, cara, deos et te, germana, tuumque dulce caput*. **caput** = ‘life’ of a person, in oaths, imprecations etc. (*OLD* 4b). At *Aeneid* 6.458-9, Aeneas swears by the stars (*sidera*), by the gods above (*superos*) and by the powers of the Underworld (*per qua fides tellure sub ima est*): he invokes the divinities of the three realms, but he does not swear by the land of Italy because he has not yet reached it. (Ariemma [2000] 57 discusses these oaths.) The oath falls into two equal parts at *uobis*, but both elements include an assertion of an affective connection between Aeneas and Anna: the land ‘that you both (*uobis = you and Dido*) heard in my (*nostra*) prayers’; the child that ‘was dear to both you yourself (*tibique*) and your (*tuae*) sister’. Once again, Silius has an eye to the dynastic importance of Iulus, but seems to be hinting at a closer
connection between Aeneas and Anna than is found in Vergil. The strongly spondaic rhythm of these lines adds to the solemnity of the oath.

108-9. **respiciens aegerque animi:** Aeneas describes his state of mind as he sailed away. *Respiciens* most obviously recalls *Aen. 5.3: moenia respiciens*, but *respicere* without a direct object is not common and has a certain poignancy. In association with *aeger animi* it suggests feelings that are sadder and more personal than the forebodings felt by Vergil’s Trojans as they sail away (*Aen. 5.5-7*). Indeed, it picks up the mood of *Aeneid 4.395: multa gemens magnoque animum labefactus amore.* **aeger... animi:** the commonplace association of erotic love and illness (e.g. Kennedy [1993] 46-9) might be at work here: see 119 below. **aeger + ablative animo** is more usual, but Woodcock (§73.6) says: ‘In the poets… a genitive is used with many adjectives… [where] an ablative of respect would normally be used’.

Spaltenstein ad 1.56 has a long note on Silius’ use of the genitive construction, with more than seventy examples from the *Punica.* **regna... uestra:** Aeneas associates Anna in the rule of Carthage and makes her Dido’s peer. Perhaps he is employing his own blandas... uoces.

109-11. **nec abscessem thalamo, ni... me... imposisset et... egisset:** pluperfect subjunctives in an unreal conditional sentence (Woodcock §197). The subject of the verbs *imposisset* and *egisset* is postponed, *Cyllenius.* (See line 27 for a similar postponement.) **nec abscessem:** = *nec abscessissem.* Syncopation of the pluperfect subjunctive is common in poetry. **egisset:** cf. Verg. *Aen.* 6. 461-3: *me iussa deum... imperiis egere suis.* **Cyllenius:** the god Mercury, who was born on Mt Cyllene in Arcadia. Vergil appears to have coined this usage from the Greek Κυλλήνιος; it appears often in imperial epic poetry.
109. **thalamo:** *thalamus* is commonly used as a metonym for ‘marriage’ (e.g. *Aen.* 4.18, 133, 392, 495, 550, and 10.649). As with *mariti* in line 53 above, there is ambiguity in this usage, especially in a speech by Aeneas. It seems to be Silius’ intention to subvert the disclaimer at *Aeneid* 4.338-9: *nec coniugis umquam praetendi tædas*, consistent with Ovid’s less than heroic portrayal of Aeneas in *Fasti*. (See note 52-3 above.) And this negative attitude to Aeneas seems to be shared by Statius who describes him as Dido’s ‘husband’ (*Silv.* 3.1.74-5) and refers to Dido as ‘step-mother’ to Ascanius (*Silv.* 5.2.132). See Stocks (2014) 92 n.38.

110. **sua... dextra:** The idea of a god intervening ‘with his own hand’ is an epic topos, beginning with Hom. *Il.* 15.695 χειρὶ μάλα μεγάλη. Cf. Enn. *Ann.* (Sk.) 581: *atque manu magna Romanos impulit amnis*; *Verg.* *Aen.* 5.241-2: *et pater ipse manu magna Portunus euntem im pulit*; *Pun.* 9. 486-8: *at Gradiuus atrox... ipse manu magna ... acri restituit pugnae* (*sc Romanos*). But Aeneas’ claim that divine duress was responsible for his departure is disingenuous. When Aeneas was explaining himself to Dido’s shade (*Aen.* 6.461) he claimed that *iussa deum* drove him (*egere*) to leave, which can be taken as a reference to the commands of Jupiter delivered by Mercury on his first appearance to Aeneas: *Aen.* 4.265-76. Silius gives both Anna and Aeneas a touch of naturalistic psychology as they rewrite their histories to present themselves in the most favourable light to each other. Anna plays down her participation in magic rites (see n.98-9 above) and Aeneas plays up the degree of heavenly intervention in his leaving (Ahl, Davis and Pomeroy [1986] 2499; Ariemma [2000] 57-58, Stocks [2014] 92 n. 38).

111. **rapidis... Euris:** the violent easterlies of winter would not have been favourable for a ship intending to sail north-east from Carthage to Italy. In *Heroides* Dido gives a weather forecast for wintry conditions and writes: *Quo fugis? Obstat*
hiems...| adspice, ut eversas concitet Eurus aquas! (7.42-3). In the Aeneid the dream-figure of Mercury promises Aeneas a westerly breeze: nec Zephyros audis spirare secundos (4.562). Hence, on her last morning, Vergilian Dido (Aen. 4.587) looks out from her watch-tower and sees the Trojan fleet sailing away aequatis...

uelis, i.e. with a following wind. OLD eurus 1b suggests that that in some poetic contexts, the word loses its geographical connotations and stands merely for ‘wind’, e.g. Luc. 6.265; V. Fl. 1.594.

112 - 13. sed cur (heu seri monitus!), cur tempore tali | incustodito saeui


112. heu seri monitus: the parenthetical exclamation (‘Alas! my advice is too late!’) is a particularly unloveable outburst by Aeneas. In Fasti Aeneas says that he did not foresee the consequences of his departure, nec timui de morte tamen, metus afuit iste (3. 617). In Book 6 of the Aeneid he pleads innocence: nec credere quiui | hunc tantum tibi me discessu ferre dolorem (463-4). tempore tali: ‘at such a (bad) time,’ cf. Punica 7.227: si... taedetque in tempore tali | nullum clade noua...
insegnem fecisse locum, in a sarcastic speech by Fabius to Roman soldiers after the Battle of Trasimene); 12.311: haud... cessisse uiros in tempore tali | laudis sorte piget, referring to the requisitioning of matrons’ jewels at the height of the crisis in 215 BC. It does not appear often in poetry and may be a phrase from colloquial language; Cicero uses tali tempore only in his private correspondence: e.g. ad Fam. 4.13.2.2; ad Att. 11.6.1.6. In Vergil it appears in a speech by King Latinus to his men: Aen. 11.303. In the context of a dialogue between Aeneas and Anna a colloquial flavour is naturalistic.
113. **incustodito saeure dedistis amori**: A four word hexameter brings Aeneas’ speech to an end: note the heavy, spondaic rhythm of the first half of the line and how the caesura in the third foot isolates and emphasizes *incustodito*. Dainotti’s remark on the expressiveness of the four-word hexameter is pertinent: ‘In direct speech four-word lines can have an iconic value: they give the impression that the speaker enunciates the words slowly, with pathos, or solemnity’ (2015, 12).

Although on its face the sentence means, ‘Why did you allow passion to rage, unguarded?’ Here *amori* stands for Dido. *dedistis:* dare with infin. = ‘enable’: OLD 15c.

Four word hexameters occur in Ennius, Catullus and Vergil (e.g. Enn. Ann. 170 (Sk.); Cat, 64.15, 115; Verg. G. 1.470, Aen.1.653) but they are relatively uncommon in Latin verse before Ovid (Winbolt [1903] 227-8; Thomas [1988] 146). Ovid uses the effect to show off his mastery of the metre, with more than fifty instances in the *Metamorphoses* alone (Kenney [2001] 265). Lucan and Valerius Flaccus uses the effect sparingly: there are six examples in *Pharsalia* (Mayer [1981] 136) and only three in *Argonautica*, (Zissos [2008] ad 1.375, citing Kösters [1893] 20) but both Statius and Silius use it often. There are thirty-five instances in the *Thebaid* (Heslin [2005] 73); the *Achilleid* spectacularly begins with one (Davis [2015] 159); and there are twenty-four examples in the *Punica*. The line represents a display of metrical virtuosity by the poet, for such lines are not easily composed in Latin and frequently have a Greek flavour (Heslin [2005] 73) through the use of polysyllabic words derived from Greek names and patronymics, e.g. *Acrisioneus*: Verg. Aen. 7.410, Ov. Met. 5.239, Pun. 1. 661; *Amphitryoniades*: Verg. Aen. 8.214, Ov. Met. 9.140, Stat. Theb. 1.486, Pun. 9.293. But line 113 is emphatically Latinate in nature, as are about half of the examples in the *Punica*, showing the dexterity of the poet. Among Silius’
displays of virtuosity there are some gems: Pun. 5.41: incustoditum mox irremeabile litus, (the fatal shore of Lake Trasimene); 9.560: turrigerae molem tormentorumque labores, (elephants and siege-engines); 10.638-9: sic igitur muto lictore inuectus in urbem | damnatum superis aspernabatur honorem, (Varro returns to Rome after fleeing from Cannae).

In this context, it is to be noted that three of the Silian examples begin with the five-syllable adjective incustodit(us). This word does not appear in Latin literature before Ovid and is found rarely in poets other than Silius, cf. Lucan 4.366, Martial Ep. 1.34.1. Ovid himself uses it in a four word pentameter: incustoditum captat ouile lupus, Tr. 1.6.10; and in one with only three words: incustoditae diripiuntur opes, Tr. 3.10.58.

114 - 39. Anna struggles with her emotions as she explains why she was absent while Dido was preparing to die.

The first part of Anna’s second speech echoes Aeneid 4.635-40 (Dido’s instructions to Anna about preparations for a ritual), but Silius has complicated matters by appearing to introduce a second ritual, or at least an additional reason for the Vergilian ritual, viz. propitiation for a bad dream that Anna has experienced.

114. Sic infit soluens uix murmur anhelum: soluens was proposed by Håkanson for MSS uoluens, and adopted by Delz, citing Statius Theb. 11.604: suspiria soluens. I do not think there is much to be gained by this emendation. Ariemma and Spaltenstein concur that uoluens is acceptable; the latter cites Statius Theb. 10.440: murmura uoluens. The term soluens, with the meaning ‘speaking freely’ (OLD 7a ) is precisely what is not happening here: Anna ‘begins to speak in a whisper, scarcely
breathing (\textit{uoluens}) the words from her trembling lips'. \textbf{uix:} emendation by Modius for \textit{sic}. See note 115 below.

\begin{itemize}
\item 115. \textbf{labrisque:} MSS and early editions have \textit{labiisque}, which Modius emended in \textit{Novant. Lect.} Ep. 28. Since both \textit{labrum} and \textit{labium} signify ‘a lip’ and it appears that the ancients were not very clear that there was much difference between the two terms (as shown by Drakenborch ad loc.) it is reasonable to agree with Drakenborch’s conclusion: ‘nihil has voces differre puto.’ Delz and Summers follow Modius in preferring \textit{labrisque} but I make the following observation. The note by Modius in Ep. 28 is primarily concerned with correcting the repetition of \textit{sic} in line 114 (\textit{contra sic infit uoluens sic murmur anhelum}) and it is possible that in continuing with the following line in order to complete the sentence, Modius made a trivial error himself in writing \textit{labrisque} for the unexceptionable \textit{labiisque}. The more indistinct sound qualities of \textit{labiisque} might lead one to prefer it to \textit{labrisque} in the context of Anna’s difficulty in beginning to speak.
\end{itemize}

\begin{itemize}
\item 116 - 25. \textit{Anna’s speech begins with a response to the implications of Aeneas’ accusation at 113-14. She will account for her failure to keep watch over her sister in terms which are grounded in religious necessity.}
\end{itemize}

\begin{itemize}
they toil’ suggesting the idea of obedience to Pluto. But there may well be, as Spaltenstein observes, an echo of the suffering endured in the third realm, e.g. Verg. Aen. 6.548-627, Ov. Met. 4.432-80. **forte:** is sometimes used with a strong sense, i.e. ‘by chance’, ‘as luck would have it’, ‘accidentally’ (*OLD* 2) e.g. Pun. 7.627-8: 
\[
\text{extabat fixo quod forte cadauere ferrum. | heu sortem necis! Here it is a}
\]
narratological signal, as Anna begins her story: ‘it happened that…’ cf. Verg. Aen. 12 766-7: **forte sacer Fauno foliiis oleaster amaris | hic steterat; [Sen.] HO 500-2:** 
\[
\text{forte per campos uagus | Euenos altum surgitem in pontum ferens | iam paene summis turbidus ripis erat.}
\]

117. **atri sociae thalami:** ‘the one who shares Pluto’s dark (or ‘dreadful’) marriage-chamber,’ i.e. Proserpina. **noua sacra parabam:** Anna was preparing ‘strange rites’ to invoke the ruling divinities of the underworld; for **noua** in this sense see n.100-1 above. There is a close resemblance here to the language of Aen. 4.638: 
\[
sacra Ioui Stygio, quae rite incepta paraui, where the speaker is Dido. Note also that Anna does not tell Aeneas that she was acting on the instructions of her sister in preparing this sacrifice which, she was led to believe, was designed to destroy the memory of Aeneas, and perhaps bring a curse upon him: see Verg. Aen. 4. 634-40. As we shall see, Anna will give Aeneas an account of these rites that provides an alternative motivation.
\]

118. **quis:** = *quibus* followed by imperfect subjunctive *leuaret* in a purpose clause, whose subject is Dido. Taken with *aegram mentem* and *trepidantia corda* the verb *leuare* is used in a quasi-medical sense (*OLD* 5b), but the disease is love. (See note 108-9 above.)
119. infelix germana tori: torus is metonymous for marriage, cf. thalamus (117 above). infelix: is a key word for Dido in the Aeneid. (See n.77-8 above). tori: Genitive of respect, cf. aeger animi (n 108, above). There is an implied contrast between Dido’s unhappy relationship and the marriage of Proserpina and Pluto which (after its violent beginning) seems to have been a partnership of equals; they are frequently depicted sitting side by side. Hence sociae in line 117 should be given its full weight for Proserpina as the companion of Pluto.

119 – 20. furuas… bidentis: dark coloured animals are appropriate victims for the gods of the underworld (Scheid [2007] 264), cf. Odyssey 10.520-30; Aen. 6. 243-51. bidentis: bidens sometimes refers to sacrificial hostiae in general: OLD bidens ², but literally means a young sheep or ‘two-tooth;’ i.e. showing its first pair of incisors at about the age of twelve months (How to tell the age of sheep www.dpi.nsw.gov.au/data/assets/pdf_file/0004/179797/aging-sheep.pdf); cf. centum lanigeras mactabat rite bidentis (Aen. 7.93) and the lectas bidentes that were sacrificed by Anna and her sister to Ceres, Phoebus, Bacchus and Juno (gods of the upper world) in Aeneid 4.57-9. See Aulus Gellius Noctes Atticae 16.6 for an amusing account of discord amongst learned Romans as to the origins of the term. furuas: There is some similarity of language, if not of ideas, between this passage and the description of the warrior Tunger in Book 7.683-4: nigra uiro membra, et furui iuga celsa trahebant | cornipedes. These are the only instances in Silius of the adjective furuus.

120. ad uisa pianda: ‘to expiate what had been seen’ (Duff: ‘to avert an evil dream’. ) Silius deviates from his Vergilian source and creates a second motivation for the propitiatory rites. At line 118 they seemed to be intended as a cure for Dido’s disordered mind; now Anna suggests that their purpose is to dispel the omen of a bad
dream. This dream is an invention by Silius, though it harks back to the dream-figure of Sychaeus that appears to Dido in *Aeneid* 1.353-6. However, a reader familiar with *Aeneid* 4 can be forgiven for some confusion here; for, at first sight, the phrase *ad uisa pianda* suggests the nightmare suffered by Dido in *Aeneid* 4: *agit ipse furentem in somnis ferus Aeneas* (465-6), which is followed immediately by Dido’s description of the magic rites to be performed with the aid of the priestess (*Aen. 478-98*) and Vergil’s statement: *ergo iussa [Anna] parat* (503). The confusion is, perhaps, caused by the first word of line 121, *namque*, which suggests that there is some logical or causal connection between Anna’s behaviour in line 120 (‘leading dark-coloured victims’) and the frightening dream. But there must be two rituals, one involving *furua bidentes* for the gods of the underworld, and a second one, invoking *caelicolae* (for which dark-coloured victims would be inappropriate) undertaken by Anna on her own account, to avert the omen of the dream about Sychaeus.

121. *namque et per somnum dirus me impleuerat horror:* The dream fills Anna with dread because it anticipates Dido’s death and her reunion with Sychaeus in the Underworld, hence it is a bad omen requiring expiation.

Line 121 is obelised by Summers, but in all texts the line begins with the problematic logic of *namque*. (See note 120 above). MSS (e.g. BML Plut. 37.16) have *namque asper summo* which early editors (e.g. Petrus Marsus 1483) corrected to *namque asper somno*. Duff has *namque super somnum*. Watt (1984) proposed *nam quam per somnum*. Delz offers *namque et per somnum dirus me impleuerat horror*, and this conjecture (*et = ‘also’*) has the merit of suggesting that the dream is a new and different reason for propitiation.
122 – 3. Anna’s dream recalls Dido’s dream of Sychaeus in Aeneid 1.353-4: *ipsa sed in somnis inhumati uenit imago | coniugis ora modis attollens pallida miris*; but its tone is influenced by Aeneid 6. 473-4: *coniunx ubi pristinus illi | respondet curis aequatque Sychaeus amorem*, and so her brother-in-law’s face is *laeta* rather than *pallida*.

122. *terque suam Dido, ter cum clamore uocarat:* This line alludes to Dido’s hallucination at Aen. 4.459-60: *hinc exaudiri uoces et uerba uocantis uisa uiri*, but its first half also bears a striking similarity in rhythm and sound to the first half of Ov. Fast. 3.563: *terque ’uale’ dixit, cineres ter ad ora relatos*. **suam Dido:** accusative case. Silius follows Vergil’s practice (e.g. Aen. 4.383) in the declension of *Dido* but cf. Ov. Her. 7. 7 miseramque ... Didon; 133 grauidam Didon. **uocarat:** = uocauerat.

123. **exultans:** Sychaeus is not leaping up and down, he is just pleased to see her.

124. **quae:** refers back to *uisa* (line 120).

124 - 5. *dum abigo menti et sub lucem ut uisa secundent | oro caelicolas:* At daybreak Anna tries to drive the dream out of her mind and prays to the celestial gods to avert the evil omen. **ut uisa secundent:** the subject of the verb is *caelicolae*, cf. Aeneid 3.36, where Aeneas prays that the gods will avert an omen associated with the body of Polydorus: *secundarent uisus omenque leuarent*; also, Luc. 1.635-6, where prayers are offered to turn away the unfavourable omen of the victim’s entrails: *di uisa secundent | et fibris sit nulla fides*. **sub lucem:** ‘when it is daylight.’ Spaltenstein (ad loc.) rightly rejects Ruperti’s proposition that the adverbial phrase is to be taken with *uisa*, with an implication that dreams seen in the day are truth-telling. The use of present indicative tense in the *dum* clause denotes
an extended period of time during which the action of the main verb (*infinit* 127) took place. (Woodcock § 221.)

125. **ac uiuo purgor in amni:** Rites of purification require fresh, running water, cf. Pun. 12.750: *nunc uiua sparguntur gurgitis unda*; Verg. *Aen.* 2.718-20: *me bello e tanto digressum et caede recenti | attrectare nefas, donec me flunime uiuo | abluer*o. The suggestion here is that Anna deals with the nightmare by rising at dawn in order to ritually wash and purify herself in a stream of running water. So, in *Argonautica* 5.329-32, Medea rises at first light to wash away the horrors of the night: *forte deum uariis per noctem territa monstres | senserat ut pulsas tandem Medea tenebras | rapta toris primi iubar ad placabile Phoebi | ibat et horrendas lustrantia flumina noctes*; and in Stat. *Theb.* 9.570-4 Atalanta rises before dawn: *tristibus interea somnum turbata figuris | ... ante diem gelidas ibat Ladonis ad undas | purgatura malum fluuio uiuente soporem.* On the subject of dealing with dreams, see Harrisson (2013) 177-84. **anni:** is an emendation for MS *antro* proposed by Modius (*Nov. Lect.* Ep. 28 iv) citing two passages from Vergil: 4.635: *dic corpus properet fluuiali spargere lympha; 2.720-1; donec me flumine uiuo | abluero*, arguing that fresh running water was required for propitiation. Dausqueius (1695, 335) disagreed with Modius:

The MS reading is unusual but not impossible, given the association between springs and caverns or rocks. The epithet *uiuo* could be taken as being transferred from the more usual *saxo* to the cavern where the spring arises.

126 - 9. *Having accounted for her absence from the palace while Dido was preparing to die, Anna now returns to the theme that she had been pursuing from 82-103 viz. the responsibility that Aeneas bears for Dido’s distress.*

126. *cito passu peruecta ad litora:* cf. 84-6, *litore sedit | interdum, stetit interdum, uentosque secuta | infelix oculis magno clamore uocabat.* While Anna is preoccupied with her rituals, Dido resumes her frantic movements from the palace to the harbour.

126 – 7. *mutae… harenae:* the sands are unresponsive, just like the ashes of the dead, cf. Catul. 101.4: *mutam nequiquam alloquerer cinerem*; Prop. 2.1.77: *taliaque illacrimans mutae iace uerba fauillae.* Note the ‘vertical agreement’ of *mutae* and *harenae* here, where the adjective *mutae* is placed at the end of one line and its noun appears at the end of the next. This type of hyperbaton is discussed by Stevens (1953) 203; Claassen (2008) 151; Dainotti (2015) 251-2. Dainotti points out the poignancy that may be achieved by this effect, e.g. Verg. *Aen.* 1.351-2: *factumque diu celauit et aegram | multa malus simulans uana spe lusit amantem;* Stat. *Theb.* 1.594-5: *nec motus et atro | imperat (infandum!) cupientem occumbere leto.*

127. *oscula… infixit:* cf. *Aen.* 4.659, *os impressa toro.* *qua steteras:* Anna’s use of the second person is just as pointed here as it was earlier (note 82 above).

128. *late:* the footsteps are scattered over the sand.
129. **ceu cinerem orbatae pressant ad pectora matres:** refers to the ritual of *ossilegium* in ancient funerary practices cf. Hom. *Il.* 23.250-2; Verg. *Aen.* 6.226-8: *postquam conlapsi cineres et flamma quieuit, reliquias uino et bibulam lauere fauillum, | ossaque lecta cado textit Corynaeus aeno.* The conduct of the parties at the ritual seems to be gendered: men behave with stern dignity; mothers, wives and sisters clasp the remains to their breasts, e.g. Ov. *Met.* 539: (Meleager’s sisters) *cineres haustos ad pectora pressant;* 13.423-4: (Hecuba) *prensantem tumulos atque ossibus oscula dantem;* Luc. 9.60: (Cornelia) *ossibus et tepida uestes inplere fauilla;* Ov. *Fast.* 3.563-4 (Anna paying her last respects to her sister before leaving Carthage): *terque ‘uale’ dixit, cineres ter ad ora relatos | pressit.* According to Stocks (2014) 93, Dido’s actions on the shore imply the ‘perceived familial bond in epic between husband and wife’.

130 - 49. **Anna concludes her account of Dido’s last hours, describing events that Vergil’s Anna could not have witnessed.** Ovid avoided this difficulty in Fasti 3 by having Aeneas declare that he does not need to hear about Dido’s death because he had seen her in the Underworld – but Ovid’s main concern is with Aeneas in Italy rather than with Dido. Anna makes Dido an elegiac figure, emphasizing the pathos of her death. The passage is notable for the way that Silius exercises *variatio* while staying close to his source text in Aeneid 4.

130 - 2. **rapido praeceps cursu… | euasit propere in celsam … | pyram:** The equivalent movement for Dido in *Aeneid* 4 occurs at lines 645-6, when she leaves the watch-tower, bursts into the palace, and climbs the pyre: *interiora domus inrumpit limina et altos | conscendit furibunda rogos.* Silius is emphatic about Dido’s haste, using three expressions that convey sudden movement (*rapido, praeceps, propere*), where *inrumpit* (4.645) was sufficient for Vergil. The duplication and triplication of
phrases is characteristic of Silian style, e.g., the storm at 1.253-4: *torquentem cum tela Iouem permixtae nimbis | fulmina et excussos uentorum flatibus ignes*; devices on a shield at 2.158-9: *centum angues idem Lernaeaque monstra gerebat | in clipeo et sectis geminam serpentibus hydram*; ‘the future’ at 3.12: *hinc omen coeptis et casus scire futuros | ante diem bellique uices noutisse petebat*; ‘sleep’ at 13.56: *cum medios inter somnos altamque quietem*. (See also note 76-7 below.) Given the economical way that Silius has dealt with other aspects of the narrative, the repetition seems to be a poetic tactic of *uariatio* by way of superabundance. **rapido... cursu:** Silius not infrequently employs hyperbaton to enliven a phrase that might otherwise seem commonplace; similar phrases are found at *Punica* 2.233 (*at Poenus rapido praeceps ad moenia cursu*), 10.461 (*rapidum glomerans cursum*), and 8.222 q.v. Vergil often uses the noun *cursus* to mean ‘course’ or ‘direction’ and only occasionally qualifies it to suggest haste, e.g. *Aen.* 5.291 (of athletes); 7.676 (Centaurs descending from the mountains); 12.683 (Turnus rushing into battle). In *Aeneid* 4 it is Anna who comes running *trepidoque exterrita cursu* (*4. 672*).

**euasit:** There is an unmistakeable echo here of *Aeneid* 4.685 (*gradus euaserat altos*) where Anna climbs the high steps of the pyre to embrace her dying sister: *OLD* 2b cites that passage to illustrate the meaning ‘to climb to the top of’. Here the primary meaning of the verb *euadere* (‘go away, escape’: *OLD* 1) seems to be uppermost, as Dido suddenly leaves the shore and rushes back to the palace. The play on words is very Silian, simultaneously evoking the scene in the *Aeneid* while creating a different action. **celsam... pyram:** *uariatio* for *altos... rogos* (*Aen.* 4.645-6).

**130. resolutaque crinem:** Loosened hair in women has a particular association with grief and distress cf. *Liv.* 24. 26.2: *resolutis crinibus miserabilique alio habitu*;
Verg. Aen. 3.65: *Iliades crinem ... solutae*; 12.870: *infelix crinis scindit Iuturna solutos*; Ov. Fast. 4.854: *maesta Acca soluta comas*; Luc. 9.171-2: *solutas* | *in uoltus effusa comas*, Cornelia; [Sen.] Oct. 719-20: *resolutis comis* | *matres Latinae flebiles planctus dabant*; and see also Pun. 12.598-9: *sparsaeque solutis* | *crinibus exululant matres*. *crinem*: a noun in accusative case depending on a passive verb or participle (e.g. *resoluta*) is a poetic usage under the influence of the Greek middle voice. This construction is sometimes called ‘the Greek accusative’ and is very much associated with Vergil, but it is frequent in other poets, too, e.g. Ov. Fast. 4.854 (cited above). Silius often uses this construction: it is comprehensively discussed by Spaltenstein at Pun. 1.403. See also Courtney 2004.

The description of Dido at Aeneid 4.642-4 emphasizes her wildly rolling eyes and pallid face: *at trepida et coeptis immanibus effera Dido* | *sanguineam uoluens aciem, maculisque trementis* | *interfusa genas et pallida morte futura*. Apart from *amens* in line 139, Silius is much more restrained: he depicts Dido as a woman bereaved rather than deranged.

131. *struxerat*: Vergil’s Anna uses the same verb (*struxit*) at Aeneid 4.680 but the change of person and tense in the Silian text shows that Anna is, once again, ‘rewriting history’: see note 110 above. Though she attributes the building of the pyre to Dido, with the temporal adverb *ante* reinforcing the impression that she herself was not directly involved, Silius’ reader, well-versed in the Aeneid, knows that this is not exactly what happened. Silius’ narrative strategy exploits the differences between the story in Anna’s first-person account and the story as told by Vergil *auctor*.
132. **magna mole:** ablative of description, emphasizing the mighty size of the pyre – it is so massive that it overtops the palace walls, and Dido can see the city and the shore (cuncta freta et totam Carthagini urbe m 133) when she has ascended it. There is no need to locate the pyre (as Spaltenstein does) in a watch tower (the *speculum* of Verg. *Aen.* 4.586): *moles* can be a massive building, (e.g. Hor. *Carm.* 2.15.1 *regiae moles*) but it does not seem apt as a synonym for *speculum*. Giving Dido a final view of her realm is a significant Silian variation on the enclosed courtyard which is the site for her pyre in Vergil. It is a reminder that Dido was Queen of Carthage: her view encompasses a scene that is far more magnificent than Aeneas’ home in Italy.

134. **Phrygiam uestem et bacatum induta monile:** cf. *Aen.* 1.647-55 where Aeneas’ first gifts to the Queen of Carthage included a *palla* and a *monile bacatum*. Both Marks (2013) and Stocks (2014) think that by dressing herself in a Phrygian robe, Dido identifies herself with the Trojans. The latter says at 93: ‘Dido associates herself with her lost lover through his Trojan identity’. Marks says at 295: ‘Anna succeeds in realising a desire that was Dido’s but that Dido could not realise herself.’ But this reading seems to be at odds with Silius’ overall scheme that requires Dido to be implacably opposed to Trojans, and Romans. And, of course, the *palla* of *Aen.* 1.647 is not Phrygian but Greek. It may be that Anna, as the internal narrator, is merely mistaken in thinking that the robe was Trojan, and draws upon these details to increase the pathos of her account for Aeneas who is the internal audience.

135 - 6. **illum infelix hausit… | …diem:** Dido dwells on her memory of her first meeting with Aeneas, seeing it in her mind’s eye. The verb *haurire* is commonly used figuratively in conjunction with a sense-noun (e.g. eyes, ears, mouth) in ablative case, or *animo* (*OLD* 6), e.g. *Aen.* 4.359-60, where Aeneas reports the effect of his
vision of Mercury: *uocemque his auribus hausi*. Servius (ad loc.) explains *hausi* as a synonym for *percipi*. At 4.661-2 Dido prays that Aeneas will ‘drink in with his eyes’ the glow of her pyre: *hauriat hunc oculis ignem*. There are no apparent instances other than here where the verb is used figuratively with a direct object and yet the verb is a powerful *uariatio* on the description of Dido at Verg. *Aeneid* 1.748-9: *nec non et uario noctem sermone trahebat | infelix Dido longumque bibebat amorem.* (On *infelix* for Dido see note 119 above.) **primum:** better taken as an adverb modifying *munera... | sunt conspecta*, rather than as part of the phrase: *illum...primum...diem*, as proposed by Spaltenstein. The separation of *illum* from *diem* is difficult (though entirely consistent with Silian style) but the alternative reading would be awkward indeed.

136 - 7. **conuiuiia... | festasque aduentu mensas:** succinctly recalls the banquet for the Trojans at *Aen.* 1.637-40: *at domus interior regali splendida luxu | instruitur, mediisque parant conuiuiia tectis: | arte laboratae uestes ostroque superbo, | ingens argentum mensis. **aduentu:** predicative dative; the inflexion is poetic.

137 - 8. **Troiae... | longos... labores:** alludes to *Aeneid* 1.597: *infandos Troiae...labores*, and 4.78-9: *audire labores | exposcit*. Both passages refer to the tragic story of Troy, and Aeneas’ tribulations.

138. **teque | narrantem... se peruigilante:** the parallel construction of these two phrases (pronoun and participle) encapsulates the first meeting of the lovers. The notion of the wakeful lover is a stock idea from love elegy e.g. the *nox uigilanda* of Tib. 1.2.77 and Prop. 3.15.2; and the *uigilatae...noctes* of Ov. *Ars* 1.736; but since *peruigilare* also has connotations that apply to religious vigils (*OLD peruigilo c*) there may be a colouring of reverence here.
139. *in portus amens rorantia lumina flexit:* *flexit* suggests that Dido’s attention moves from the inner world of memory to the outer world of the city and the harbour. *amens:* Vergil does not use this epithet in connection with Dido; she is described as *demens*, which in Vergil’s vocabulary is somewhat pejorative, and often hurled as an insult from one warrior to another. Anna’s Dido is agitated by grief rather than by tragic fury, and though she is acting without reason (*amens*) she is not *demens* (cf. *Aen.* 4.78, 107, 374, 469). Her final words (140-7) will be characterized by sadness rather than the anger and bitterness of *Aen.* 4.657-8. Silius (or rather Anna) downplays Dido’s anger towards Aeneas – but it will surface again later in the episode when she appears to Anna at 8. 168-75.

140 - 9. *Dido’s final prayer and suicide.*

140 - 1. *di longae noctis:* This phrase recalls the invocation of *di morientis Elissae* at *Aeneid* 4.610 but whereas Vergilian Dido then calls upon the gods to bear witness to her curse, in the Silian passage Anna tells Aeneas that Dido prays that the divinities will be *placidi* (142) and welcome her to the underworld. The violence of Dido’s emotions is palliated, either because it is Anna’s version of Dido’s death and she has every reason in her own predicament to use *blandas… uoces*, or because Silius is constructing a *fabula* around the death of Dido that is sentimental and elegiac for a Flavian audience. The phrase *di longae noctis* is generally taken to mean the gods of the underworld because of *nunc ad uos… descendet corporis umbra* at 8.145. And yet the identification of *longae noctis* with ‘death’ is also compelling and could be preferred: cf. Prop.2.15.24: *nox tibi longa uenit*; Hor. *C.* 4.9.26-8: *sed omnes inlacrimabiles | urgentur ignotique longa | nocte*; Sen. *Thy.* 1094: *aeterna nox.*
Line 140 is notable for the dignity of its spondaic rhythm. The enjambement of nobis | mors instans maiora facit carries the sense forward with, perhaps, an echo of Aeneid 1.91: praeuentemque uiris intentant omnia mortem, when Aeneas is faced with imminent death and utters what might have been his final prayer.

142. uictos ardore admittite manis: There is ambiguity in the language here. At one level Dido prays that the gods will admit her shade to the underworld after it (or rather its body) has been subjected to the flames of the pyre; but ardor alludes also to the fires of passion (e.g. ardor amantum: Lucr. 4.1077; ignis mollibus ardet in medullis: Catul. 45.16; ardet amans Dido: Verg. Aen. 4.101.) uictos ardore has Ovidian overtones, cf. uictus amore pudor (Am.3.10.29); uictus amore timor (Her. 15.176). At Aen. 6.467 Dido’s spirit (animum) is described as ardentem, blazing with anger rather than passion, but here Dido, through ventriloquial Anna, presents herself as a figure from love elegy. admittite manis: cf. Aen. 4.652: accipite hanc animam. It is a characteristic of Silius’ allusive technique that, while he often follows his intertext very closely, he rarely borrows its language directly and he usually shows great ingenuity in paraphrasing the language of his source. See notes 52-3, 60, 73-4, 87, 130-3, 135 above. However, in the lines that follow 143 it will be observed that the text borrows the language of Aeneid 4 to a remarkable degree: there are more than a dozen instances of direct verbal quotation, e.g. uidi (144), comites (150), exterrita (152), ter... ter... (155-6) and there are many more close borrowings from the language of Vergil than is typical. This may point to an author who is not Silius.

143 - 4. Aeneae coniunx, Veneris nurus, ulta maritum| uidi constructas nostrae Carthaginis arces: Dido proclaims her own epitaph (cf. Verg. Aen. 4.655-
6) in three equally weighted phrases, setting out her family relationships in the customary manner, followed by a full line describing her achievements as Queen of Carthage. **ulta maritum:** referring to Sychaeus, recalls Verg. *Aen.* 4.656: *ultauirum:* but this aspect of her identity clearly takes third place to her claim to be Aeneas’ wife. **Veneris nurus:** is a bold assertion of the legitimacy of Dido’s connection to Aeneas and to his divine mother, following the subversively elegiac model of *Heroides* 7.31-2 where Ovid’s Dido addresses Venus and Cupid as her relatives: *parce, Venus, nurui, durumque amplectere fratrem, | frater Amor.* The ghost of Creusa legitimately claims this status at *Aeneid* 2.787; in *Punica* 13.809 the Sybil shows young Scipio a procession of specifically Roman heroines, and describes Lavinia as **Veneris nurus.**

Because Anna is the internal narrator here, it is possible to interpret her language as offering a pointed reminder to Aeneas that she, too, is family, a claim to which Vergilian Aeneas might demur, given *Aen.* 4.338-9: *nec coniugis umquam | praetendi taedas, aut haec in foedera ueni.* There seems to be a definite construction of Aeneas as **profugus maritus** with a consequent minimisation of Dido’s *culpa:* see note 53 above. Ahl Davis and Pomeroy (1986, 2497 n.6) point out that there are only two lengthy lacunae in Latin epic, and both show Aeneas in a poor light. The negative view of Aeneas that is presented here and at Verg. *Aen.* 2.567-88 might have been the reason for their excision.

**144. uidi constructas nostrae Carthaginis arces:** This is the first verse of the ‘Additamentum’. See Introduction § 7. The line is closely modelled on Verg. *Aen.* 4.652: *urbem praeclaram statui, mea moenia uidi.* In working his variation upon the model, the poet (who may or may not be Silius) has inverted its structure, beginning with *uidi* and ending with *arces,* a reasonable synonym for *urbem.* The
phrase Carthaginis arces echoes Verg. Aen. 1.298 and 4.347, but this formula is used by other hexameter poets in the clausula, e.g. Luc. 4.585, Manil. 4.659, Ov. Fast. 6.45. Silius uses it a dozen times.

145. nunc ad uos magni descendet corporis umbra: is a reworking of Verg. Aen. 4.654: et nunc magna mei sub terras ibit imago, where the superhuman size of ghosts seems to be the primary idea (see Williams [1972] ad loc). Note also the variation of descendet for sub terras ibit. The sentence means literally, ‘now the shade of a great body will descend to you’, and Delz (who holds that the text of the additamentum is not Silian) dismisses it with the comment: ridiculum est: LXVIII. Austin glosses Vergil’s magna ...imago as ‘a glorious ghost’ and it may well be that it is this sense (OLD 11, 12) that is to be preferred in both contexts. Duff (1934) avoids the issue by translating the phrase as ‘the ghost of a great queen’. There is a possible allusion to Lucan’s famous sentence: stat magni nominis umbra (Luc. 1.135), but Brugnoli and Santini (1995, 52) state that the allusion is, rather, to the clausula of Luc. 6. 720: aspicit astantem proiecti corporis umbrae. Similar clausulae appear in Ov. Am. 3.9.65 and ex Pont. 3.3.3, and Vergil has forma tricorporis umbrae at Aen. 6.289. It may be, therefore, that the expression is formulaic.

146. fors: (adverbial) = forsitān. This is a crux for the impugned authorship of the additamentum because the term in its adverbial form appears nowhere else in the Punica, and it could be inferred from this unique usage that the line was not written by Silius. Delz (LXVIII) says bluntly: ‘adverbio fors Silius non utitur.’ Spaltenstein, who is agnostic on the question of authorship says ad loc. ‘Il n’apparait qu’ici chez Sil. mais cela se produit aussi avec d’autres termes’. Ariemma (who is inclined to believe that the lines are genuine): ‘Da segnalare, … che fors é hapax
siliano, anche se lo studioso se ne serve, pur sospendendo sostanzialmente il giudizio, come argomento (insieme ad altri) contro la paternità siliana dell’additamentum’. There is no assistance towards the resolution of the difficulty in the bald observation by Brugnoli and Santini (1995, 33) that Vergil uses adverbial fors at Aen. 5.232: there are, in fact, five instances in the Aeneid, (2.139, 5.232, 6.537, 11.50, 12.183). If it is true that adverbial fors is an innovation by Vergil (Austin ad Aen. 2.139) then we might expect to find it picked up as Vergilian mannerism in the work of the Flavian poets: Valerius Flaccus has adverbial fors only once (4.620), while Statius affects the mannerism five times: Silv.3.162, Theb. 2.361, 4.207, 7.365, 10.324. It might be surprising that it does not appear more often in Silius but the same can be said of forsitan which also appears in the Punica only once at 15.644.

146 - 7. me quoque fors dulci quondam uir notus amore | expectat, curas cupiens aequare priores: These lines allude to Aeneid 6.473-4: coniunx… pristinus illi | respondet curis aequatque Sychaeus amorem, with a glance at Aeneid 6.455 (dulci… amore). Note how closely the text paraphrases Vergil: quondam uir for coniunx …pristinus; and the direct borrowings: curas; curis; aequare; aequat. As in line 144, the poetic strategy is inversion of the model: both Sychaeus and Aeneas are present with Dido in Vergil’s Underworld, but it is Aeneas who feels ‘dulcis amor’: demisit lacrimas dulcique adfatus amor est (6.455).

148 - 50. haec dicens ensim media in praecordia adegit, | ensem Dardanii quaesitum in pignus amoris. | uiderunt comites: The language is similar to that of Aeneid 4.663-4: dixerat, atque illam media inter talia ferro | conlapsam aspiciunt comites but note that the focalization here differs from that of Vergil. As Dido finishes speaking and falls upon the sword, Vergil changes the point of view to that of the attendants (comites) who see, from a distance, the queen’s collapse. Here
Dido thrusts the sword into her breast (*media in praecordia adegit*) with the reader as the primary witness to this action. The verb *adegit* is notably more violent than *conlapsam*, and *media in praecordia* is a physical analogue for the rather abstract reference by Vergil to Dido’s last words: *media inter talia*. Austin, ad *Aen.* 4.663, notes Vergil’s ‘habitual’ reticence about the self-wounding of female characters but, in general, Silius shows no such restraint; his descriptions of suicide tend towards highly dramatized horror shows, e.g. the Saguntines, *Pun.* 2.665-80; Solimus 9.166-77; the Capuans, 13. 291-8. (See McGuire [1989], Dietrich [2008], Bernstein [2013] for discussions of suicide in Flavian epic.) In the case of the suicide of Dido, the poet is doing no more than rehearsing in *précis* an episode of the *Aeneid* that is very well-known, and apart from these small touches of violence he keeps close to his model.

148. *praecordia adegit:* According to Heitland, ‘This elision is common in Silius’. If Heitland is suggesting that the elision points to Silian authorship, the point is contestable. Similar elisions are found in Vergil, e.g. *penuria adegit* (*Aen.* 7.113), *dementia adegit* (9.601).

148 - 9. *ensem… ensem:* Epanalepsis (‘repetition of a word from a marked position in a line to a position at or near the beginning of the next’: Wills [1996] 125) is a rhetorical figure that has a powerful emotive effect, especially when the second element of the repetitive pattern occurs in the first foot of the following line. There is, here, a very clear allusion to Turnus’ sword in *Aen.* 12.89-9: *ensemque clipeumque et rubrae cornua cristae, | ensem quem Dauno ignipotens deus ipse parenti | fecerat*, where the repetition of *ensem* emphasizes the special significance of the sword to Turnus because of its donor. In the same way, the repetition here marks the emotional significance of the sword as a gift from Aeneas. Wills (172)
says that, although Silius uses epanalepsis more frequently than any Latin poet except Vergil (e.g. Battus... Battus, 8.57-8) there is only one other instance in the Punica (bella, 6.658-9) where there is a figured repetition of a common noun rather than the name of a place or hero.

149. Dardanii quaesitum in pignus amoris: The model for this phrase is Aeneid 4.646-7: ensemque... | Dardanium, non hos quaesitum munus in usus where the epithet Dardanium implies little more than ‘Trojan’, cf. Ov. Her.7.183: scribimus et gremio Troicus ensis adest. Vergil implies that there has been an exchange of swords between the lovers, leaving the reader to recall that Aeneas was seen wearing Dido’s gift of an ornamental sword (stellatus iaspide fulua) as he went about the work of building her city (Aen. 4.261). Here the poet spells out (in pignus amoris) the implications of Vergil’s phrase. Grammatically, Dardanii could be possessive genitive (‘of Aeneas’) but the hexameter, while not strictly speaking a ‘golden line’, is well-balanced which suggests that Dardanii is better read as modifying amoris. If that is so, then the phrase ‘Dardan love’ might have an ironic echo of ‘Punic faith’. Dardanii implies Aeneas whether one reads it as an adjective modifying amoris or as a substantive. Elsewhere in the Punica it is used adjectivally (eighteen instances) but it is used substantively at 17.336, where it stands for ‘Romans’. The wordplay is very Silian.

150. uiderunt comites: alludes directly to Verg. Aen. 4.664: aspiciunt comites. But note that the verb uiderunt does not have a direct object. In the source text aspiciunt has two direct objects: illam... ensemque. The lack of a direct object for uiderunt can be tolerated because the meaning is clear and the positioning of concurrunt supported by the alliteration with comites gives the reader a swift picture of the confusion in the palace that alerts Anna to what has happened.
150 - 1. tristique per atria planctu | concurrent; magnis resonant ululatibus

The words used here recall Vergil’s description of the wailing of the women in Dido’s palace: *lamentis gemituque et femineo ululatu | tecta fremunt, resonat magnis plangoribus aether*. Aen. 4.667-8. *atria* and *aedes* are variations upon Vergil’s *tecta*. The reader will necessarily be reminded of the extraordinary onomatopoeic effects achieved by Vergil’s language; it is no disparagement of the later poet to say that Vergil was the master of such effects.

152 - 4. accepi infelix dirisque exterrita fatis, | ora manu lacerans, lymphato

Note how closely the diction recalls the language of *Aen*. 4.672-4: *audiit exanimis trepidoque exterrita cursu | unguibus ora soror foedans et pectora pugnis | per medios ruit*. accepi infelix: *accipere* (OLD 9) is a variation for Vergil’s *audire*. The poet’s use of *inflex* identifies Anna with Dido: cf. *Pun.* 8.86, 119, 135, and see note 86 above. As this passage (8.152-6) proceeds there are a number of points where there is a similar re-imagining of Dido and Anna, with the language that is used for Dido in the *Aeneid* transferred to Anna. See notes 154-6 below.

153. *ora manu lacerans*: *variatio* for *unguibus ora*... *foedans* (Aen. 4.673), and arguably somewhat pedestrian when compared with the original. lymphato...

cursu cf. *trepid... cursu* in Aen. 4.672. On this occasion the later poet chooses a more dramatic variation than the language of the source text. The adjective *lymphata* is particularly associated with the wild behaviour of Bacchants: e.g. Catul. 64.254, Hor. C. 1.37. 14. Vergil uses the term only once, for Amata raging through the city (7.377); Silius employs it four times. Most tellingly (for the question of authorship)
Pun. 1.459 has Hannibal rushing into combat *lymphato cursu*. However, in the source text for Anna’s reaction to the death of her sister (*Aen.* 4. 675-87) it is to be observed that the word *lymphis* (4. 683) appears only two lines before and immediately above *sic fata gradus euaserat altos* (4.685), and a creative interpolator might have had it in mind here.

154. **peto:** a rather colourless variation on Vergil’s *ruit: Aen.* 4.674. **celsosque gradus euadere nitor:** The allusion is to Anna’s climbing Dido’s pyre, *sic fata gradus euaserat altos*. 4.685. **nitor:** ‘I strive’ (Anna) recalls *adnixa* (*Aen.* 4.690), where it refers to Dido’s struggle to raise herself on her elbow.

155-6. **ter… ter:** cf. *Aen.* 4.690-2. Vergil dwells on the pathos of Dido’s death throes: she struggles three times to raise herself from the bed, and is only released from her agony by the merciful intervention of Iris. The later poet gives the triple struggle to Anna: she attempts, without success, to kill herself but falls down on her sister’s lifeless body. **exanimae:** (= Dido) is an echo of Vergil’s Anna *examinis* (4.672), but where Vergil’s diction is strikingly effective in suggesting that Anna is breathless with fear, i.e. ‘frightened to death’, the later poet uses the term literally.

157 - 9. Anna concludes her story in lines that reprise *Pun.* 8.54-70, and show a higher degree of direct allusion to that intratext than to *Fasti* 3. Taken as a unit, lines 157 and 157a convey the sense of danger that drove Anna to flee. Lines 158-9 summarise the wanderings which Ovid adroitly expressed in three words: *errores exposuitque suos, Fas* 3.626. The similarity of language here might be attributed to ‘ring composition’, but it is also conceivable that a creative interpolator could have exploited the Silian intratext of 8.54-70 in much the way that *Aeneid* 4. 463-74 has been used in 8.148-56.
157.  **iamque ferebatur uicina per oppida rumor:** cf. Verg. *Aen.* 4. 666, *concussam bacchatur Fama per urbem* with some variation: *rumor* for *Fama*, *ferebatur* for *bacchatur*. Vergil’s *concussam... per urbem* is notably more vivid than *uicina per oppida* but the latter phrase allows for the opening out of the perspective to remind the reader of the hostile neighbours surrounding Dido’s city, cf. *Aen.* 4.40-1: *hinc Gaetulae urbes, genus insuperabile bello, et Numidae infreni cingunt.*

157a.  This line appears in Constantius, but is not found in the Aldine, in Drakenborch (1717) or in Ruperti (1795). In 1896 Heitland (203) observed that without 157a the transition from *ferebatur...per oppida rumor* (157) to *tum Cyrenaem... | deuenio* (158-9) would be intolerably abrupt. Summers included the line in his 1905 edition with the note: ‘e Constantii libro rursus in lucem eruit Heitland’. Note the intratextual repetition of *Iarbas* (8.54), *Nomadum* (8.56), *Cyrenen* (8.57), which might suggest that the writer is ‘mining’ the text of an earlier portion of Book 8 in order to continue the narrative.

158:  Note the intratextual paraphrasing of *pelagi uis adpulit* for *agitur pelago* (8.65); *uestris... oris* repeats the language of *in ...oras* (8.68).

160 - 7.  *The poet-narrator resumes the story, observing that Anna is accepted as a member of Aeneas’ household. The narrative follows its Ovidian model fairly closely; except that Ovid portrays Lavinia seething with murderous jealousy (Fasti 3.633- 36) whereas in the Punica, this aspect of the drama is suppressed until Dido alludes to it at line 176.*

160.  **motus erat:** cf. *Fasti* 3.611-12: *adloquitur trepidam Cythereius heros | (flet tamen admonitu motus, Elissa, tui).* In *Fasti* he is moved spontaneously by his
memories of Dido, in the *Punica* it is the pathos of Anna’s story that softens him. See also note 164 below.

160 - 1. *placidumque animum mentemque quietam* | *Troius in miseram rector*

**susceperat Annam:** These lines recall *Aeneid* 1.303-4: *in primis regina quietum* | *acciπt in Teucros animum mentemque benignam*, with the substitution of *rector* for *regina*, and *susceperat* picking up *acciπt*. (See note 68 above on the reversal of roles in this episode whereby Aeneas plays Dido to Anna’s Aeneas.) In the Vergilian context there was hostility from some of the Carthaginians towards the shipwrecked Trojans (see Ilioneus’ speech, *Aen.* 1.539-43) and Jupiter intervened to ensure that Dido would receive them into her city. The allusion to *Aen.* 1.303-4 draws attention to the difficult position in which Anna finds herself as a foreigner in Italy.

**Troius… rector:** epic formulae of this kind, modelled on Homer (e.g. *Il.* 2.844), are usually deployed at the end or the beginning of a line (Harrison [1991] 218). Here the epithet draws attention (as does *Phrygius* in line 163) to the irony of the proximity of Anna the Carthaginian refugee (*aduena* 163) and Aeneas the Trojan ruler (*rector*) of an Italian kingdom. The placement of *Troius* and *Annam* in marked positions at the beginning and the end of line 161 highlights the opposition of Carthaginian and Trojan which is given some tension by the sense of reconciliation in this context, since 161 also suggests by its word order that the Trojan *rector* will protect the Punic princess: *Troius … rector* embraces *miseram* (Anna), and the pluperfect tense of *susceperat* suggests that the change in Aeneas’ feelings (from potential disquiet to acceptance) is an accomplished fact, on which Anna can rely.

For *suscipere in + acc.* (‘conceive a feeling towards someone’) see e.g. Cic. *Balb.* 62.2: *Sed si qui sunt quibus infinitum sit odium in quos semel susceptum sit. OLD 6b*
cites several Ciceronian contexts for this meaning of *suscipere*, and Heitland ad loc. suggests that this usage may be due to Silius’ deep regard for Cicero: Mart. *Ep.* 7.63.6; 11.48. The verb is used with a different meaning (*OLD* 3) at 191.

161. **rector**: Silius mostly (24 times out of 37 instances) uses this term in military contexts for military commanders (*OLD* 4c). However, he also uses it (ten times) in relation to rulers (*OLD* 4a) e.g. Nestor (7.597), Bagrada (*dux rectorque Nubae populi*, 7.664), and Syphax (17.128), hence it may point to Aeneas’ status as the new ruler of Latium (*iam regni compos*: 8.72) in which case the association of *Troius* with *rector* increases the irony noted at 160-1 above.

162 - 3. **omnes luctus omnesque e pectore curas | dispulerat**: For the effects of the repetition of an adjective see Wills (cited at note 2-3 above). The pattern of *luctus... curas | dispulerat* (a pair of synonyms and a verb in pluperfect tense) mirrors that of 160: *animum mentemque... susceperat*, but the verbs have opposite effects: Aeneas takes on peaceful and calm thoughts, and Anna’s fears have been dispelled. Enjambement together with the caesura in the second foot gives emphasis to *dispulerat*: the benevolence of her host has allowed Anna to put away all her grief and anxiety. There is an echo here of an earlier passage (8.76-7) where Aeneas gently leads Anna into his home, and the poet says: *iam casus aduersorumque pauorem | hospitii leniuit honos*. Thus, although Anna’s first person narrative is full of violence and tragedy and capable of disturbing her host’s equanimity, it is framed by two passages showing that harmony between the Trojan exile and Anna is possible and perhaps, at this point, likely (Manuwald [2006] 72-3; Marks [2013] 287-95). **dispulerat**: Heitland (1896, 203) claims that *dispellere* appears only here in Silius, but see *Pun.* 7.328.
163. Phrygiis... tectis: pointedly emphasizes that the household in which Anna now resides is Trojan.

164. illa: the prominent position of the pronoun, directly below the verb dispulerat, indicates that the focalisation has shifted from Troius... rector to Anna.

164 – 84. Night falls, and Dido appears in a dream warning Anna to escape. Anna’s dream draws upon many Vergilian intertexts in a notable example of ‘combinatorial allusion’: Hardie (1990) 3. The narrative follows the trajectory of Fasti 3 beginning with the manifestation of Dido’s ghost.

164. tacito nox atra sopore: These words introduce what Horsfall, in his Commentary on Aeneid 3 (2006, ad 147) refers to as ‘temporal ekphrasis’ i.e. a descriptive passage giving a picture of night. It is a device much loved by Vergil: see note by Pease (1935) on Aen. 4. 522. nox...atra: The phrase is formulaic, with Homeric origins, e.g. νυξ μέλαινη (Edgeworth [1992] 74) but the epithet ater is often used by Vergil and other Roman poets in contexts where the undertones are ominous or foreboding (ibid. 54-55, and see OLD ater 6-10). An alternative and less emotionally charged Latin formula for commencing a night-scene is the purely temporal nox erat and it is to be noted that Ovid begins the night scene with that phras: nox erat; ante torum uisa est adstare sororis (Fast. 3.639). The choice of nox atra with its sinister undertones undermines the picture of a little community at ease with itself. tacito... sopore: could either be abl. of instrument cf. Pun. 12.613: terras caeco nox condit amictu, or abl. of position cf. Verg. Aen. 10. 556-7: non te optima mater | condet humi. ‘The locatival ablative is used freely without a preposition by the poets in any circumstances’: Woodcock §51.9 (iv). The distinction is immaterial.
165 – 6.  cuncta per et terras et lati stagna profundi | condiderat: These words repeat Punica 7.282-3: cuncta per et terras et lati stagna profundi | condiderat somnus. The repetition of a whole line is, according to Spaltenstein (ad loc.) unique for Silius, but it is quite possible that the poet himself thought these words fine enough to bear repetition, following the practice of his artistic hero Vergil. (For repetition in the Aeneid see Moskalew [1982].) But Courtney (1989, 326) asserts that verbal repetition of whole lines is not found in post-Ovidian epic practice. He also points out that there are three passages (Pun. 8.216, 218, 244a) in this part of the poem that might support a conclusion that the writer of the additamentum had just read Book 7 and had it ‘prominently in mind’. To which may be added 8.173, 181, and 191. Of course, if the writer of 8.145-224 was Silius himself, he might very well have had Book 7 in mind.  condiderat: There is a very similar image at Pun. 4.723-4: omnia somni | condiderant. The idea of night hiding the world from view is not unusual, e.g. Luc. 1.15: nox... sidera condit; 4.472-3: condidit umbra | nox lucem; V. Fl. 3.370-1: nox... Hibera | condidit alta domos, and cf. nox operit terras: Verg. Aen. 4.352. But the image of sleep (rather than night) hiding or burying the world seems to appear only here. Vergil’s lovely expression conditque natantia lumina somnus (G. 4.496) may be the source of the image but in that context it clearly refers to the sleep of death rather than human sleep at the end of the day. The combination of nox with the adverbial phrase tacito... sopore and the rarity of the image, somnus condit, in Latin poetry might suggest that tacito nox atra sopore...condiderat is a genuine Silian image.

166.  tristi cum Dido aegerrima uultu: This description should be compared with the highly-coloured Ovidian language of Fasti 3.640: squalenti Dido sanguinolenta coma. The Ovidian scene is very dramatic; not only is Dido’s hair soaked in blood,
but her speech is followed by a blast of wind that slams the door (*Fasti* 3.642). The narrative function of Anna’s dream in *Punica* 8 requires Dido to be received as an authoritative messenger rather than a fright-figure, and the elevated language of 164-7 (*sopor, stagna, profundum, germana, effundere uoces*) contributes to this effect.

167. **has uisa in somnis germanae effundere uoces**: *effundere uoces* suggests an utterance that is oracular or impressively heartfelt like that of Anchises to Aeneas (*subito talis effundere uoces*, Verg. *Aen.* 5.722-3), an expression that was probably an homage to Ennius *Ann.* (Sk.) 553: *effudit uoces proprio cum pectore sancto*; cf. Lucan (9.565) of Cato: *effudit dignas adytis e pectore uoces*. Silius employs the expression elsewhere at 9.305; 13.448, 710; 14.215. **uisa**: sc. *est.*

168 – 75. Dido’s speech to her sister is characterised by the predominance of spondees until the dactylic call to action at 176. The effect of the multiple allusions to the *Aeneid* in this passage is discussed in the Introduction § 9.1.

169 - 70. **quae tibi fraude │ tendantur, quae circumstent discrimina cernis?**

Dido’s opening words are modelled on those of Mercury addressing Aeneas in his sleep: ‘*nate dea, potes hoc sub casu ducere somnos │ nec quae te circumstent deinde pericula cernis?*’ (Verg. *Aen.* 4.560-2), with *fraudes* and *discrimina* being an elaborated variation on *pericula*. The chiastic structure of the clauses and the repetition of *quae* emphasize the weight of the message being delivered, and raise the emotional temperature: Wills (1996) 73-6. For the use of *cernere* with an indirect question, see *OLD* 6b. **fraudes │ tendantur**: The metaphor here is a hunting-net or snare being stretched out, cf. Cic. *Off.* 3.68: *insidiae tendere plagas*; Ov. *Met.* 7.701: *cornigeris tendentem retia cereuis*. **tibi**: dative of disadvantage. (Woodcock §64.) **heu nimium secura**: cf. *heu, perdita* Verg. *Aen.* 4. 541: see note below.
171 - 2. at nondum nostro infaustos generique soloque | Laomedontae noscis
telluris alumnos? cf. nescis heu, perdita, necdum | Laomedontae sentis periuria
gentis? (Verg. Aen. 4.541-42) where Dido reproves herself for her naivety, recalling
the story of Aeneas’ ancestor, King Laomedon, whose oath-breaking was legendary.
She thus attributes to Aeneas (and possibly also to his descendants, the Romans) an
inherited trait of Trojan faithlessness. Servius (at Aeneid 1.137) analyses the
different moral values that are carried by Vergil’s epithets for his Trojans: ut pios
Aeneadas appellavit, ut timidos Phrygas, ut nobiles Dardanidas, ut periuros
Laomedontiadas, (cited by Cowan 2007, 6). infaustos… alumnos: alumnus
implies a nurturing relationship between the land of Laomedon and its ‘sons’.
faustus with quasi-religious connotations (‘favoured by the gods’, ‘propitious’: OLD
2) is recorded throughout the whole of Latin literature, but infaustus in the sense of
‘ill-omened’, ‘ill-fated’ (OLD 2) seems to be a coinage by Vergil (e.g. Aen. 5.635:
infaustas… puppis). In the Punica (e.g. 2.606 infaustos iacunt enses) it sometimes
means ‘luckless’ (OLD 1) but here the elevated tone of Dido’s language suggests that
the term has quasi-religious force: the sons of the land of Laomedon portend nothing
but ill for Dido and her people, including Anna.

172. This four word hexameter (see n.113 above) is precisely modelled on Aeneid
4.542 (quoted in the previous paragraph) with noscis as a doublet for sentis.
Heitland (1896, 204) remarks that Pun. 8.242 also ends with telluris alumnus,
implying that the phrase is particularly Silian: but telluris alumnus is found often
enough elsewhere: e.g. Prop. 4.3.67: Parthae telluris alumnis; Stat. Silv. 3.2.62: pios
telluris alumnos; Theb. 10.900: infandae segnes telluris alumni. Note the chiastic
patterning of generique soloque…telluris alumnos in which the Punic race and soil
are related to the land and descendants of Laomedon. Noscis is from Constantius
Collect. Hec. 92 with nondum in the preceding line. The Aldine has nescis, an understandable restoration of Aen. 4.541 but overlooking the negative nondum.

173 - 4. dum caelum rapida stellas uertigine uoluet, | lunaque fraterno

lustrabit lumine terras: These lines have an ironic parallel in the peroration of Aeneas’ first speech to Dido (Verg. Aen. 1. 607-9) where he extols the endless honour that will accrue to Dido for her generosity towards him and his Trojans: in freta dum fluuii current, dum montibus umbrae | lustrabunt conuexa, polus dum sidera pascet, | semper honos nomenque tuum laudesque manebugunt. Now Dido’s ghost is using similar language to suggest that the hostility and enmity between their peoples will last forever.

The idea of the timelessness of the stars and moon is conventional, e.g. Pun. 7.476-7 where Proteus foretells the everlasting rule of the descendants of Aeneas: dum cete ponto innabunt, dum sidera caelo | lucebunt, dum sol Indo se litore tollet); but rapida... uertigine for the whirling motion of the night sky with stellas placed at its centre is very expressive. The alliteration and assonance of uertigine uoluet| lunaque... lustrabit lumine terras enhances the cosmic significance of Dido’s pronouncement. lustrabit: the verb lustrare, whose meanings generally connote movement (OLD 2-3), with overtones derived from rites of purification, (OLD 1, TLL 1872-5) has a special place in Vergil’s diction, e.g. Aen. 4.6: postera Phoebea lustrabat lampade terras; 7.148-9: postera cum prima lustrabat lampade terras | orta dies. Servius (ad Aen. 4.6) suggested that the coming of dawn purifies the world of the pollution of night. But here the usage appears to be more Lucretian than Vergilian, denoting illumination (OLD 4; TLL 1877.2): cf. DRN 6.737 radiis sol omnia lustrans and 5.575-6 (quoted below). fraterno... lumine: instrumental
ablative (Woodcock §43). The moon (Diana) illuminates the earth with light reflected from her brother, Phoebus: cf. Lucr. 5.575-6: *lunaque siue notho fertur loca lumine lustrans,* *siue suam proprio iactat de corpore lucem,* discussing the theory that the moon did not produce its own light.

175. **pax nulla Aeneadas inter Tyriosque manebit:** The sentence is a reformulation of Dido’s passionate declaration: *nullus amor populis nec foedera sunto* (Verg. *Aen.* 4.624), which derives its force from the legislative imperative *sunto,* picked up here by *manebit* where the future tense not only has jussive force, but recalls Dido’s words in *Aeneid* 4.622-3: *tum uos, o Tyrri, stirpem et genus omne futurum | exercete odis.* The analogy of everlasting conflict between Tyrians/Carthaginians and the sons of Laomedon/ Aeneadæ/ Trojans/ Romans is fundamental to the mythico-historical framework of the *Punica* as a whole and specifically to the Anna Perenna episode which constructs a bridge over the thousand years that separates the events of the *Aeneid* and those of the Hannibalic War. Note that the postponement of *inter* has the effect of separating the hostile parties.

176. **surge, age:** This epic call to action ‘Up! Go!’ is very Vergilian: e.g. *surge age et haec laetus longaeuo dicta parenti | haud dubitanda refer:* *Aen.* 3.169-70; *surge age, nate dea,* 8.59; and 10.241; cf. V. Fl. 4.35 *surge age et in duris haud umquam defice,* (Hylas to Hercules). Silius uses the expression in two other places 7.19 (addressed to Fabius) and 10.556 (addressed to Claudius). Here it casts Anna into a role of (heroic) action, cf also Juno’s command: *perge, age et insanos curarum comprime fluctus* (*Pun.* 8. 32).

176 - 8. **iam tacitas suspecta Lavinia fraudes | molitur dirumque nefas sub corde uolutat:** In *Fasti* 3, Lavinia’s hostility to Anna is grounded in sexual
jealousy, furialiter odit | et parat insidias et cupit ulta mori (637-8) but in the Punica Dido’s warning to Anna about Lavinia is based in ethnic and political mistrust. (Littlewood [1980] 313 calls it ‘racism’.) Lavinia is not strictly a child of the treacherous ‘land of Laomedon’ (172), but the Latins and Trojans have now formed a new, blended people, the genus... mixtum of Aeneid 12. 838, and by virtue of her marriage to Aeneas, Lavinia has been assimilated into the nation that Dido regards as eternally hostile to Carthage. suspecta: Spaltenstein takes issue with Duff’s translation, ‘I distrust Lavinia’, and argues that suspecta has an active meaning, i.e. ‘Lavinia is suspicious’, but there is no need to read suspecta as anything other than the past participle of suspicere, ‘Lavinia is not to be trusted’ (OLD suspectus 1). molitur: The verb is not uncommonly used in contexts of ‘engineering’ some mischief, cf. Ov. Met. 8.782, (Ceres) moliturque genus poenae miserabile; Sen. Med. 181, (Medea) molitur aliquid: nota fraud, nota est manus; V. Fl. 5.248, (Aetees) seu nostra dolos molitur opertos | siue externa manus. fraudes: the repetition of this word from line 169 and in the same sedes, is unusual for Silius. Although Silius is noted for his inclination towards redundancy (e.g. effigiem, uultus, imagine: 8.92-3) it is uncommon in Silius to find direct repetition in such close proximity. This might point to an author who is not Silius, or the repetition might be a scribal error. Duff translates both occurrences as ‘snares’, but tacitas… fraudes could mean ‘secret (unspoken) dangers’ (OLD 1).

178. ne falsa putes haec fingere somnum: cf. ne uana putes haec fingere somnum (Verg. Aen. 8.42) where the dream-figure of Tiberinus promises the portent of the white sow with piglets as proof of the truthfulness of his dream-message. Dido promises her sister a comparable marvel as evidence of the truthfulness of her message: she will find a river nearby that will receive her and protect her and the
parallel with the helpful Tiber assures the reader that there will not be a rape in the next few lines.

**179. paruo descendens fonte Numicus:** In the space of eleven lines (8. 179, 190) there are two different spellings of the river’s name. Perhaps Numicius (190) serves to distinguish the resident divinity of the stream from the personified river (179). The location of the stream is obscure but it is clearly associated in Vergil’s mind with both the Tiber and Laurentum (Aen. 7.242, 797) and it may have marked the boundary between the territories of the Latins and the Rutuli. In this passage the river flows slowly (leni…amne, 180) from a small spring (paruo… fonte, 179), and its bed is sandy (harenoso, 190) which suggests a shallow stream rather than a major river. But when Ovid’s corniger Numicius violently sweeps Anna away in his ‘swollen stream’ (tumidis rapuiss… undis, Fast. 3.647) the river seems to resemble the rapist river-gods of Metamorphoses, e.g. Cephisus (3.342ff) and Alpheus (5.600 ff.) rather than the benevolent divinity evoked by Dido. Livy records the tradition that Aeneas died fighting the Etruscan and Rutulian armies on the banks of this river, and says that he is honoured there as Iuppiter Indiges. (See note 39 above for the identification of Aeneas and Anna Perenna as di indigetes.)

**181. luc rapies, germana, uiam tutosque receptus:** There is an element of wordplay (zeugma) here: rapies (jussive subjunctive) with uiam signifies ‘hurry’ (OLD 8b) and with receptus it means ‘take advantage of’ (OLD 15). (Delz [LXVIII] thinks the zeugma is excessively daring and therefore suspect.) The poet borrows the verb directly from Ovid’s description of Anna’s reception by the river-god at Fasti 3.647 but here there is none of the dangerous eroticism that is to be found in Ovid.

**germana:** Because it denotes a blood-relationship germana carries more
affective weight than soror. In Aeneid 4 soror and germana are used about equally in speeches by the sisters but germana appears in contexts (4.478, 492, 549) where Dido is trying to win Anna’s support. Anna Perenna is referred to by the poet at Pun. 8.47 as germana... Elissae. Note that the nymphs of the River Numicus are described as Anna’s sorores at 8. 198: the poet may be suggesting that she has found a new family in Italy (Pyy [2014] 297).

182. te sacra excipiunt hilares in flumina Nymphae: Nymphs in Latin poetry are always beautiful but often mournful; the only examples of cheerful nymphs appear to be those found in Verg. Ecl. 3.9, faciles Nymphae risere; and Hor. C. 2.8.13-4, rident | simplices Nymphae; but in both instances their laughter has an edge of mockery, and so the choice of the epithet hilares here is marked, adding to the overall sense that Anna’s refuge with the river-god will have an outcome that is happy for Anna, even before Dido declares that she will become a divinity honoured by the Italian people.

183. aeternumque Italis numen celebrabere in oris: In the light of Dido’s dire warnings at 171-5 about the incompatibility of her people with those of Aeneas this outcome is paradoxical. (See note 43 above.) It is pertinent that Anna is to become an Italian divinity, and that the second half of Book 8 is devoted to a catalogue of the Italian forces being assembled by the Romans for the battle of Cannae, in which the cultural diversity of the army under the command of the Roman consuls is celebrated. But if Anna’s loyalty in relation to Rome is questionable since she is Juno’s chosen agent, there are other Italian entities which will also prove to be unreliable in the aftermath of Cannae, especially the city of Capua (Books 11-13). Thus, one of the functions of Book 8 is to foreshadow the difficulties that Rome will
experience in managing Italian disunity in the face of Hannibal’s victories – preparing the way for Scipio to emerge as the great unifier.  
aeternum:  plays on perenna but there is also an echo of two Vergilian references to place-names in Italy that (supposedly) date to events during Aeneas’ time: Misenus ab illo | dicitur aeternumque tenet per saecula nomen; aeternumque locus Palinuri nomen habebit: Aen. 6.235; 381. The allusion suggests that Anna’s cult as a numen (OLD 6) (albeit a minor one) is comparable in its antiquity to these legends. The language of line 183 is repeated (with uariatio) at Pun. 8.220-1.

184. sic fata in tenuem Phoenissa euanuit auram:  Disappearing into thin air is what apparitions conventionally do: Verg. Aen. 2.791 (Creusa) tenuisque recessit in auras; 4.278 (Mercury); 9.658 (Apollo); 5.740 (Anchises) dixerat et tenuis fugit ceu fumus in auras; Ov. Fast. 2.509: (Romulus) in tenues oculis euanuit auras. 

fear makes Ovid’s Anna bold: she ‘leaps up’ (exsilit), ‘hurls herself’ (se iacit) out of the window, ‘wearing only her hitched up tunic’ (tunica uelata recincta). Anna in the Punic is utterly terrified by her dream (185-6 above) but slightly more decorous: ‘covered in a flimsy wrap’ (tenui uelamine tecta), she ‘leapt out of bed’ (prosiluit stratis), and ‘stepped out’ (egressa) through a low window before running away.

The differences are probably due mostly to poetic uariatio, but this version of Anna’s escape is certainly less risqué than Ovid’s, and the diction here is highly poetical in comparison with Ovid: viz. tenuis uelamen (for tunica recincta), planta (for pedes), pernix (for citus). ut erat: ‘just as she was’, i.e. without stopping to dress properly. This raises a question (what did Roman women wear to bed?) for which there is no visual and very little literary evidence. (See Olson [2003] 209-10 for the little that is known.) corpus… tecta: ‘Greek accusative’ (see n 130 above). plantis pernicibus: a direct allusion to Vergil’s Camilla who, ‘swift as fire’, outruns a horse on the battlefield: haec fatur uirgo, et pernicibus ignea plantis | transit equum cursu (Aen. 11.718-19). By contrast, Ovid compares Anna’s flight to that of a deer fleeing from wolves: ut auditis territa damma lupis (Fast. 3. 646) which itself is an allusion to Dido: qualis coniecta cerua sagitta (Aen. 4.69). In the Punic the allusion to the warrior-princess foreshadows the role that Anna will play with regard to Hannibal at 8.214-24: she will command him to put away his paralysing anxiety and take up the thunderbolts of war. patulos… agros: Silius is partial to this epithet and uses it frequently in relation to campi (e.g. 4.136), arua (e.g. 4.545), and agri (e.g. 7.376). Spaltenstein (ad 4.26) rightly identifies it as an
ornamental epithet here, in contrast to its use at 7.376 where it serves to highlight the sudden appearance of the Carthaginians from a narrow gorge into open country.

190 - 1. donec harenoso, sic fama, Numicius illam | suscepit gremio uitreisque abscondidit antris: Numicius, as noted above, is the presiding divinity of a slow stream, hence his ‘lap’ (OLD 1) is ‘sandy’, cf. Ov. Fast. 3.737: harenoso… Hebro in a context close to the Ides of March. Gremium sometimes has erotic overtones in Latin, see Adams (1982) 77, and OLD 3, but it is doubtful that they are present here and certainly it would be astonishing to find any hint of obscenity in Silius; the meaning is, rather, that the kindly river receives Anna into his ‘depths’ (Duff’s translation: see (OLD 4) or his ‘bosom’ (OLD 2): cf. Ter. Adelph. 333; Verg. Aen. 5.31; Stat. Theb. 5.126. There may also be an unconscious quotation of the River Nile’s caeruleum… gremium in Verg. Aen. 8.713: I hesitate to call it an allusion because the contexts are so very different. sic fama: The so-called ‘Alexandrian footnote’ (Ross [1975] 78) is a formulaic phrase that invokes the authority of pre-existing tradition for this story, and as such it would be unremarkable here, except that it directly references Ovid’s creditur in Fasti 3. 647-8: corniger hanc cupidis rapuisset Numicius undis | creditur et stagnis occuluisse suis. In Ovid there are half-a-dozen competing aetiologies for the ‘genial feast’ of Anna Perenna and the ‘footnote’ appears to be a signal to the reader that the story may not be entirely reliable, referring to ‘Anna’s supposed reception into the Numicius,’ (Littlewood [1980] 314) but the historical epicist has no reason to undermine the authority of his legend. The phrase might point to a writer (not Silius) who is so slavishly dependent on the Ovidian text that she employs sic fama as a variation upon creditur without observing the apparent scepticism in the original. However, there are other places in the Punica where the ‘footnote’ is used, e.g. 3.323: qua uirgo, ut fama est,
bellatrix edita lympha, (Pallas Tritonia); 6.631-2: tunc Arcadius, sic fama, locabat | inter desertos fundata Palatia dumos (origins of the Fabii); 12.89-91: cum regna timeret | Dictaei regis (sic fama est) linquere terras| Daedalus inuenit (Daedalus founder of Capua). And so its appearance here might suggest merely that the story of Anna is as credible as any other myth or legend.  

uitreis antris: uitreus (lit. ‘made of glass’) is a highly poetical epithet (see note 187-9 above) that is used by Augustan and post Augustan poets for the glass-green translucency of water (OLD 2) cf. Verg. Aen. 7.759: uitrea... Fucinus unda; Hor. C 4.2.3-4: uitreo... |...ponto; Ov. .Met. 5.48: uitreis...sub undis. (See André [1949] 188-9, 333-4; Edgeworth [1992] 168; Clarke [2003] 151.)

In reference to ‘caverns’, uitreis antris is very imaginative and it is worthy of note that the same image appears in Statius Silvae 3.2.16: surgite de uitreis spumosae

Doridos antris. Line 191 recalls Punica 7.413: uitreis e sedibus antri, which itself recalls the uitreis... sedilibus of the nymphs who hear the lamentation of Aristaeus: Verg. G. 4.350. See note 165-6 above concerning the correspondences found by Courtney between Book 7 and the text of the additamentum.

191. abscondidit: The use of this verb is summarily dismissed by Delz (LXVIII) as ‘foreign to epic diction’. But it is, in fact, not uncommon in elevated diction: eg. Lucr. DRN 1.891: siluis abscondita flamma; Sen. HF 292: quidquid ... per annorum gradus | abscondit aetas; Phaed. 1205: quodcumque Proteus aequorum abscondit sinu. Delz may be merely objecting to the form of the verb rather than its meaning, but the brutal succinctness of his remarks on the authenticity of the Additamentum does not make it easy to construe his reasons.
At dawn, the Aeneadae make a search for Anna and follow her footprints to the banks of the Numicus; the river halts his stream and reveals her sitting amongst her sister nymphs. She addresses them in a kindly manner.

The Punica closely follows the action narrated in Fasti 3 and there is considerable congruence between the language of 8.192-200 and Fasti 3.649-56:

**Fasti** 3.649 ff

Sidonis interea magno clamore per agros quæritur: apparent signa notaeque pedum; uentum erat ad ripas: inerant uestigia ripis; sustinuit tacitas conscius amnis aquas. ipsa loqui uisa est ‘placidi sum nympha Numici: amne perenne latens Anna Perenna uocor.’

protinus errati laeti uescuntur in agris et celebrant largo seque diemque mero.

**Punica** 8. 192ff

 orta dies totum radiis impleuerat orbem, cum nullam Aeneadae thalamis Sidonida nacti et Rutulum magno errantes clamore per agrum uicini ad ripas fluuii manifesta secuntur signa pedum, dumque inter se mirantur, ab alto amnis aquas cursumque rapit. tum sedibus imis inter caeruleas uisa est residere sorores Sidonis et placido Teucros adfarier ore. ex illo primis anni celebrata diebus

But just as Anna’s dream was greatly elaborated and given epic solemnity in 8.164-84, so the search for Anna in the Punica is treated with greater dignity than in Fasti: Ovid’s account ends with Aeneas and his men holding a spontaneous picnic in the fields that points forward to the alfresco celebrations of the Roman plebs on the banks of the Tiber (Fasti 3. 523-38), whereas the Punica poet declares that the worship and veneration of Anna Perenna have not only survived from the mythological past to the present day (8.199-200), but extend through the length and breadth of Italy: per totam Ausoniam. The poet thus enlarges the scope of the nymph’s cult far beyond the bounds of Latium and implicitly engages all the tribes and cities that will feature in the catalogue of Italian forces in Punica 8.356-621.

**192. orta dies totum radii impleuerat orbem:** orta dies seems to be a Vergilian coinage, cf. Aen. 7.149 and 12.114. It is also found in Ovid (three times in Fasti 2), Lucan (twice), Valerius Flaccus (once) but Silius uses it only here where it is a
variation on Vergil’s *prima lustrabat lampade terras | orta dies* (*Aen. 7.149-50*).

Just as the Trojans, newly arrived in Latium, set out at dawn to explore their new world and come upon the River Numicus, so the *Aeneadae* set out at dawn to search for their missing guest along the banks of the same stream.

193. **cum nullam …Sidonida nacti:** *sc. sunt. OLD* gives a meaning of *nanciscor:* 5 (a) ‘to come across, find; (b) to meet, encounter (a person)’ cf. Ovid *Fasti* 4.463: where Ceres in pursuit of Persephone finds her footprints: *puellaris nacta est uvestigia plantae.* If there is an allusion to that passage here, it reinforces Anna’s potential divinity. **nullam:** for *nullus* with adverbial force (‘they could not find her at all’) see OLD *nullus* 6. **Sidonida:** Greek accusative, cf. *Sidonis* in Ov. *Fasti* 3.649. *Sidonius* is frequent in the *Punica* (e.g. 212 below), but *Sidonis* is used only for Anna, at 8.70, 199 and here. Vergil does not use the Greek form at all.

It may be that its appearance at line 70, in the text preceding the *additamentum* suggested itself to its writer. On the other hand, it may be the usage of a *doctus poeta* (Pomeroy, 1989).

194. **et Rutulum magno errantes clamore per agrum:** cf. *Fasti* 3.649 *magno clamore per agros.* This is an artful and well-balanced line, bracketed by *Rutulum* and *agrum,* suggesting the outer limits of the ground covered by the wandering (errantes) searchers. Heitland comments: ‘This line is suspected by Barth, unreasonably…The rhythm is very Silian.’ DSSS is, according to both Ceccarelli (2008) and Duckworth (1969), the metrical pattern most favoured by Silius – but it is not impossible that an imitator might have observed this. **Rutulum… agrum:** see note 179 above on the significance of the River Numicus as a boundary; the Latins and Trojans have defeated the Rutulians, and the two territories have become
one under the rule of Aeneas. In the catalogue of the Italian army (8. 357ff) the Rutulians are given the epithet *Faunigenae* and pride of place: they are the first contingent named.


196 - 7.  *dumque inter se mirantur ab alto | amnis aquas cursumque rapit:*  The poet emphasizes more strongly than Ovid the marvellous nature of what the witnesses observe, which is consistent with the earlier suggestion (note 178) that the sanctification of Anna is an event comparable to the appearance of the white sow to the Trojans.  *ab alto:*  Delz says this phrase is obscure; it might be better to say that it is ambiguous.  *Ab alto* not uncommonly means ‘from the open sea’ (e.g. Verg. *Aen.* 4.661) and Duff translates it as such: ‘the river stopped the seaward course of its water.’ Ariemma draws attention to *Aen.* 9.125, where the Tiber reverses his current (*reuocatque pedem Tiberinus ab alto*) in awe. The topos of rivers flowing backwards is more usually associated in poetry with *adynata* (e.g. Prop. 1.15.29, Ov. *Met.* 13.324), or witch-powers (e.g. Verg. *Aen.* 4.489), or the effects of masses of corpses in the stream (e.g. *Pun.* 1.48) – none of which is relevant here.  *rapit:*  Ovid says (*Fasti* 3.652) that the river ‘held his waters silent’ (*sustinuit tacitas...aquas*) so that Anna could make a speech; *rapit* suggests a more violent motion but the usage here might be influenced by Ovid’s *rapuisse* in the passage (*Fasti* 3.647-8) which describes *corniger... Numicius* snatching the woman and concealing her in his waters. Here, the *water* is snatched away to reveal her to the men watching from the
riverbank. One might follow Heitland and Spaltenstein in reading the passage as the river pulling back his waters from the depths of the river bed (rather than from the sea) to show Anna sitting among her sister-nymphs in her new home, the *sedibus imis* of the following line.

197. *sedibus imis*: *sedes* may refer to a temple or shrine (*OLD 5*), as well as a dwelling-place (*OLD 4*) or somewhere to sit (*OLD 1*) and each of these meanings may be appropriate here, for human Anna has now become a divinity; the phrase also recalls the home of the nymphs in Verg. *G.* 4.350-51: *uitreisque sedilibus.* Assonance and alliteration of ‘s’ begins with this phrase and continues through line 198 until we reach *Sidonis* at the beginning of line 199: the effect is to situate Anna securely in her new setting, cementing her identity as a nymph of the River Numicus.

198 - 9.  *inter caeruleas uisa est residere sorores | Sidonis et placido Teucros*

affarier ore: The use of *caeruleus* (blue) as an epithet for the sea is as old as Ennius: *caeruleum…sale…pulsam* (*Ann.* (Sk.) 378) and is frequently applied as a poetical epithet for deities of the sea or rivers, suggesting not so much their hue but the colour of their element (André [1949] 334). See also note 190-1 above. Observe the framing of the scene with Anna sitting *inter…sorores*, and note also, how the postponement of the subject of the verb to the beginning of the next line gives ironic significance to the epithets *Sidonis* and *Teucros*: the once-Punic, now Italian, river nymph addresses Teucri who are becoming Latin/Rutulian/Italian. And she addresses them calmly (*placido… ore*) as if she has already forgotten her sister’s injunction: *pax nulla Aeneadas inter Tyriosque manet* (8.175) and has willingly embraced her new identity. There is a strong allusion here to Ovid’s words: *placidi sum nympha Numici*: the Numicus is a shallow stream, without a strong current,
hence *placidus*; the epithet is transferred to the nymph in the *Punica* as an exercise in variation.

199. **affarier**: ‘This form of the passive infinitive belongs to very old Latin; it occurs in the XII Tables and in legal formulae’: Austin ad Aen. 4.493. According to the *OLD* and *TLL* 1245-7 esp. 1246.3, this is the only recorded instance of the archaic form of *adfari/auffari* in the corpus of classical Latin literature, and it is the only instance in the *Punica* of the use of the archaic passive infinitive, which might indicate (though not strongly) that the line is inauthentic (with Spaltenstein).

However, there are enough instances of the archaic passive infinitive in Vergil (e.g. *G.* 1.454; *Aen.* 4.493; 7.70; 8.493; 9.231; 11.242) to suggest that the poet could be adopting a Vergilian tone here, especially as *accingier* is found at *Aen.* 4.493. The archaism might indicate the sacrality of the moment when mortal Anna becomes divine.

199 – 201: The language of 8.199-201 repeats with variation the diction of 8.46-7: *Sarrana* (46) / *Sidonis* (199); *numina* (46) / *numine* (201); *dicent…templo* (46) / *uenerando* (201); *regnisque Aeneadum* (47) / *Ausoniam* (201); *colatur* (47) / *culta est* (201). This kind of intratextual borrowing may be an indication that a creative interpolator is mining the authentic language of Silius to produce a credible continuation or completion of the missing text. But it is equally plausible that the repetitions are evidence of conscious artistry (ring-composition) concluding and completing the aetiological *excursus* with echoes of its beginning.

200. **ex illo primis anni celebrata diebus**: *primis anni… diebus* contains a pun on the name Anna. **ex illo… celebrata**: *sc. est*. The language recalls that used by Dido (*celabrabere*) at 8.183, and suggests that the nymph continues to be
venerated from that time (ex illo) up to the Flavian present. The continuing cult of Anna Perenna not only fulfils the promise made by Dido (in future tense), but bridges the mythical past and contemporary times thus asserting Anna’s continuation as an Italian divinity after her encounter with Hannibal. Some critics emphasize Anna’s disengagement from Rome and the reversion of her loyalty to Dido and to Carthage: e.g. Santini (1991) 60-1; Dominik (2006) 117-9; Dietrich (2004) 28; Chiu (2011) 3-11, while others e.g. Ahl, Davis and Pomeroy (1986) 2498; Marks (2013) 298-300; Stocks (2014) 91-6, point out the slippery ambiguity of her role. She offers encouragement to her Carthaginian kinsman in obedience to Juno but does not explicitly forsake her Italian identity.

201. per totam Ausoniam uenerando numine culta est: Anna’s cult at Rome in the Flavian period is attested by Martial (Ep. 4.64.18: Annae pomiferum nemus Perennae) but it is hard to assess how significant was her cult beyond Latium. The poet might well be giving emphasis to her significance as an Italian divinity for the purposes of Book 8, which dwells upon the Italian identity of the army that will be assembled to confront Hannibal. uenerando numine: Spaltenstein says that uenerando is transposed and should be ueneranda (he does not say what to do with numine) but the phrase could well be ablative of description: ‘She is worshipped as a divinity to be honoured.’ Pinkster (2015, §11.44) discusses the attributive use of the gerundive.

202 – 6. The main narrative resumes after the aetiological excursus.

202 - 3. hanc postquam in tristes Italum Saturnia pugnas | hortata est: the substantive Saturnia for Juno, daughter of Saturn dates back to Ennius Ann. (Sk.) sed. inc. 445 and is used frequently by Vergil; it appears sixteen times in the Punica.
The positioning of the adjective *tristes* next to *Italum* shows that it is to be taken as a genitive of respect. Pinkster (§11.92) says that this usage is common in the poets, to avoid prepositions. **Italum:** Silius follows Vergil in preferring this form of the genitive plural: eg *Aen.* 8.513: *Teucrum atque Italum... ductor.* Silius has *in finis Italum* (*Pun.* 1.70); *ductores Italum* (4.504); *extremas Italum res* (6.104); *lux Italum* = Scipio (13.707). **hortata est:** cf. *hanc... blandis hortatibus implet* (8.29). *Hortari* with the preposition *in* is less common than with *ad* (*TLL* 3010.3-3011.3). But Vergil has [Turnus] *Messapum in proelia dictis | hortatur,* (*Aen.* 11. 520-1); cf. Lucan 7.370: *hortari in proelia matres.* As Spaltenstein says, it is possible that in both Lucan and Silius there is an allusion to Vergil.

203. **celeri superum petit aethera curru:** There are few references in Latin literature to Juno’s chariot. An important one is *Verg.* *Aen.* 1.16-17: *hic illius arma | hic currus fuit.* Ovid refers to Juno’s peacock-drawn chariot: *habili Saturnia curru,* | *ingreditur liquidum paonibus aethera pictis* (*Met.* 2.531-2). There is possibly an allusion here to *Ov.* *Met.* 2.437-8, when Jupiter flies back to Olympus after another sexual conquest on earth: *superum petit aethera uictor | Iuppiter.* Ovid’s moral judgment on Jupiter’s predatory behaviour is conveyed by the contrast between the carefree indifference of the god swooping back to heaven and the nymph’s pain and shame: *huic odio nemus est et conscia silua.* Similarly in this passage, Juno’s breathtaking savagery is revealed in the line that follows her departure.

204. **optatum Latii tandem potura cruorem:** The future participle *potura* (in its poetic form) expresses Juno’s purpose or wish (Woodcock §92). Her blood lust must be read in the context of her words in Book 1 when she recognizes Hannibal as a ‘man of blood’ (1.40) and hopes to look down from heaven and see the battlefield of
Cannae drowned in Ausonian gore (1.50-1). Juno’s blood lust recalls the words of Zeus to Hera: εἰ δὲ σὺ γ’ εἰσελθοῦσα πύλας καὶ τείχεα μακρὰ | ὑμὸν βεβρῶθοις Πρίαμον Πριάμοι τε παϊδὰς | ἄλλους τε Τρῶας, τότε κεν χόλον ἐξακέσαιο (II. 4.34-6). It also contains more than a hint that Juno might be identified here with the Phoenician goddess Tanit and the human sacrifices practised at Carthage. (For Punic religion generally, see Moscati [1973] 176-85; for the identification of Juno/Tanit in Ennius and in the Aeneid see Feeney [1991] 116-17 and 131 respectively; for Juno/Tanit in the Punica see Keith [2010] 359-61.) potura cruorem: cf. Stat. Theb. 6.102 and 12.719, for a similar phrase in the same position.

205. diua deae parere parat: Note the double alliteration. The words parere parat recall Mercury getting ready to obey Jupiter’s order that he take a message to Aeneas: ille patris magni parere parabat | imperio (Verg.Aen. 4.239-40). Anna is referred to as diua at 8.30 and 39. In general, diua and dea may be regarded as synonyms, whose use is determined by metrical considerations. (So, for example, Fides is diua at Pun. 2.481 and 488, but dea at 2.520.) But Juno is consistently dea (e.g. Pun. 1.38, 2.543, 7.472) except when she is the subject of appeals by the matrons of Rome (7.82) who address her as regina deum and promise her a golden robe in return for the safety of their sons: ac dum decrecit matrum metus, hoc tibi, diua, | interea uelamen erit. In the Anna Perenna episode there seems to be a clear demarcation of rank between the nymph and the dea when they are together (see note 39 above). However, when the nymph approaches the mortal, Hannibal, at line 210 she is dea.

205 - 6. magnumque Libyssae | ductorem gentis nulli conspecta petebat:

Divinities prefer to travel unseen. No doubt, as Spaltenstein observes, Anna Perenna
concealed herself in a cloud; cf. Vulcan at the Battle of Trebia: obscurae tectus...
nubis (Pun. 4.668), Mars at Cannae: nebulam circumdatus (Pun. 9. 488), and Ov.
Met. 5.251 (Minerva), Stat. Theb. 9.728 (Diana), V. Fl. 7 193 (Venus). At line 225
Anna Perenna will disappear into the clouds after delivering her message to
Hannibal. **ductorem:** see note 23 above.

207 - 23. **Anna finds Hannibal alone and anxious. She delivers her message and
disappears from Hannibal’s sight and from the poem.**

Anna’s intervention may be compared with Hannibal’s dream: Book 4.722-38.
Hannibal is sleeping quietly when Juno appears to him, in the guise of the deity of
Lake Trasimene, interrupting his rest and stirring his heart with sudden anxiety:
stimulat subitis praecordia curis (727). Juno addresses him by name: o…Latio
lacrimabile nomen | Hannibal (730); enjoins him to action with the imperative: pelle
moras (732); predicts success for him: fluet Ausonio tibi corpore tantum | sanguinis
(734-5); and leaves him with a statement of her (false) identity: namque ego
sum…stagnis Thrasymennus opacis (737-8), which has the effect of stirring him into
immediate action. Here, Anna finds Hannibal awake and restless, but soothes his
curas; she addresses him as rex o fortissime (211), assures him that the favour of the
gods has returned to him (213-4, and calls him to action: rumpe moras (215); she
confirms the validity of her message by referring not only to her own divine status:
ego Oenotris aeternum numen in oris | concelebror (220-1), but to that even more
powerful divinity, summi Matrona Tonantis (219), who has sent her. These parallels
could suggest that a ‘creative interpolator’ has modelled Anna’s speech to Hannibal
on the earlier passage.
207. *ille uirum coetu tum forte remotus ab omni:* *ille* marks the change of subject from Anna to Hannibal. Hannibal’s anxiety over his inability to engage in battle with Fabius has caused him to withdraw from his men and isolate himself. In commenting on the parallels between this episode and the meeting between Aeneas and Venus in Book 1 of the *Aeneid*, Santini (1991, 20-1) notes the isolated situation of the two heroes at the time when the divine intervention occurs.

208. *incertos rerum euentus belliique uolutans:* The line takes the reader back to the beginning of Book 8, where Hannibal’s worries were enumerated by the narrator: see notes 4-24 above. According to Heitland (ad loc.) Ruperti observed an allusion here to Verg. *Aen.* 6. 157-8: *caecosque uolutat euentus animo secum*, but there is an even closer resemblance to *Aen.* 10.159: *hic magnus sedet Aeneas secumque uolutat | euentus belli uarios*, when Aeneas ponders the vicissitudes of war as he travels through the night towards the mouth of the Tiber with the Etruscan fleet. But whereas the Trojan was moving purposefully towards action, Hannibal has withdrawn from his troops and is preoccupied with his troubles. Sacerdoti (2014) discusses the significance of sleeplessness in Greek and Roman literature and constructs a typology of the ‘positive’ wakefulness exhibited by helmsmen and military commanders (at 14-22) who cannot or should not sleep because of their responsibilities, e.g. *Aeneid* 1.305: *at pius Aeneas per noctem plurima uoluens*; Stat. *Theb.* 5. 241-2: *quis magna tuenti | somnus?* Hannibal’s early character exemplifies this kind of wakefulness: *sommenque negabat | naturae noctemque uigil ducebat in armis: Pun.* 1. 245-6, but his present insomnia does not belong to this typology of ‘masculine’ wakefulness; it is inactive and self-centred, weakening his leadership and separating him from his men (see note 209 below). Moreover, *uolutans* recalls the disturbed emotions of Juno (*Aeneid* 1.50: *talia flammato secum*.
and Dido (Aeneid 4.533: secumque ita corde voluptat; | 'en quid agat?').

209. **anxia ducebat uigili suspiria uoce:** *suspiria* may express sadness or anxiety, especially in amatory contexts (e.g. Prop. 2.22.47; Ov. Am. 2.19.55) and in epic, sighs may denote grief for the fate of a loved one (e.g. Ov. Met. 2.125: *pectore sollicito repetens suspiria*; Stat. Theb. 11.604: *genitor suspiria soluit*). However, in epic contexts *suspiria* most often are associated with violent activity or death (e.g. *suspiria dura*, Lucan 4.328; *suspiria aegra fatigant*, Stat. Theb. 6.796) and we may say with some confidence that, with the exception of Polynices in Stat. Theb 2.336 and Hannibal, Latin epic heroes do not sigh with anxiety. The fact that sleeplessness and sighing is part of the vocabulary of amatory elegy gives some weight to Keith’s argument (2010, 373) that despite his Herculean energy and martial prowess Hannibal’s character is orientalised and to some degree feminised by comparison with ‘the masculine Roman west’.

**uigili... uoce:** This phrase is found in both Constantius and in the Aldine edition. Spaltenstein says that it is *impossible*; Delz says that it is *mirum*, and includes it in the list of passages that he regards as ‘unworthy of Silius’ (LXVIII). Various conjectures have been proposed: *nocte* (Heinsius); *corde* (Bentley, preferred by Spaltenstein); Heitland offers *mente* without much conviction. The alliteration of the phrase is attractive and none of the conjectures seems compelling. Hannibal *might* be talking to himself (Heitland); it might also be that his sighs are forceful and voiced, more like groans than mere breathing. The phrase may evoke the inner voice of the insomniac rehearsing his troubles, cf. Hannibal muttering angrily to himself through the night: *haec secum, medio somni cum bucina noctem | diuideret: Pun. 7.154-5.* See Introduction §7.1 for the possibility that Statius’ *Silvae* 3.5.1-2 contains an allusion to 8.209.
211. rex o fortissime: Hannibal is sometimes referred to in the \textit{Punica} as \textit{rex} or \textit{tyrannus} in contexts alluding to his dominion over subject or conquered peoples, e.g. the defeated Spanish (1.239), the about to be defeated Saguntines (2.239), and the shamefully subservient Capuans (11.31). In other contexts (e.g. \textit{Pun.} 4.131, 4.707, 5.202) the term \textit{rex} means little more than ‘commander’, as in \textit{Argonautica} 7.352 where Jason is described as \textit{rex carinae}. Anna Perenna’s use of the term \textit{rex} in addressing Hannibal may raise a question about her Roman identity, cf. \textit{Pun} 16. 283-4 where Scipio tells the Spanish chieftains that \textit{nomina regum} cannot be tolerated by Romans. On the other hand, she is a one-time Punic princess addressing a Carthaginian general, showing her customary tact (\textit{blandas... uoces}, 80) when approaching powerful men. Cf. \textit{Stat. Theb.} 1.448: (Polynices and Tydeus addressing Adrastus) ‘\textit{rex o mitissime Achiuum}’; 8.677 (Tydeus to Eteocles) ‘\textit{Aoniae rex o iustissime gentis}’.

213. omnis iam placata tibi manet ira deorum: During the stunning successes in Italy which characterise the first stage of Hannibal’s campaign (Books 4-6) the Carthaginians appear to enjoy divine favour, explicitly stated at 5.227-8: \textit{hos dexter deus et laeto Victoria uultu | adridens acuit, Martisque fauor e fruuntur}. But Jupiter intervenes (6. 609-14) to ensure that Fabius emerges to put a stop to their victorious progress: \textit{ille modum superis in Punica castra fauoris | addidit et Libyae finem inter prospera bella | uincendi statuit} (7.12-14). A more self-aware and less hubristic Hannibal might have been alerted to this change when Jupiter’s thunderbolts drive him away from Rome (6.605-8), but he remains full of confidence (\textit{diuisque tumens ausisque secundis}, 7.73) until Fabian tactics start to bite and his loss of morale becomes acute: \textit{Fabius me noctibus aegris, | in curas Fabius nos excitat, illa senectus | heu fatis quae sola meis currentibus obstat!} (7.305-7). Anna Perenna is
sent to assure him that the favour of the gods has returned to the Carthaginians now that Fabius is once more a private citizen, and the verb used by Anna (manet) in close association with placata, implies – misleadingly - that the wrath of the gods has been appeased for good. It is important to understand that, apart from Juno’s extreme partiality for Carthage and her antipathy towards Rome which persists until Book 12, the favour of the gods towards Hannibal exists only in the short-term (Marks [2013] 298-330) for from the outset Jupiter has conceived the war with Hannibal as a strengthening ordeal for his Romans who have become indolent and soft through success (Pun. 3.573-590). placata… manet: TLL 290.24 cites this passage for manere as an equivalent to esse in contexts where there is some suggestion of permanence, cf. 8.175 when Dido affirmed the on-going hostility of the two races towards each other: pax nulla Aeneadas inter Tyriosque manebit.

214. omnis Agenoridis rediti fauor: the repetition of omnis at the beginning of successive lines is emphatic, and draws attention to the antithesis of ira and fauor (Ariemma ad loc.). Agenoridis: dative plural of a Latinised Greek patronymic. The term draws the reader back to 8.1-2, with reference to Fabius, the Agenoridae and the Aeneadae, and foreshadows the closure of the episode.


215. rape Marmaricas in proelia uires: alliteration gives force to the imperatives rumpe moras... rape Marmaricas... Marmaricas... uires: Silius uses Marmarici or Marmarides for the people who inhabited the sparsely-populated zone
along the northern coast of Africa between Egypt and Cyrenaica. He never uses it to mean ‘African’ in a general sense. In all but two instances (here and at 7.84 where the metaphor *Marmaricam nubem* for the Carthaginian army descending on Rome may refer to the sirocco) it has a distinctly ethnographic meaning, referring to the nationality of an individual soldier (e.g. *Pun.* 2.165, 14.482) or a group of people (e.g. *Pun.* 3.687, 5.185). Why then does Anna refer to Hannibal’s multi-racial army (see the catalogue in Book 3. 231-405) as *Marmaricas... uires*?

Let us consider the epithets given by the poet to the troops in the brief catalogue of Hannibal’s army at Cannae in *Pun.* 9.220-36. In the centre Hannibal commands Carthaginians (*patrio...milite:* 235) and Gauls (*Eridano perfusix saepe cateruis:* 236): these descriptions seem to have positive overtones. Mago commands the right wing, and the troops from Iberia are characterised chiefly by their equipment: bright shields (*effulget caetrata iuuentus:* 231), bare heads (*nec tectus tempora:* ) and sling-shots (*torto... plumbo:* 232). In Silius’ description, the African troops are characterised as *barbaricus, immanior,* and *atrox* (220-3), and there is reference to *uulgus Adyrmachidae,* cf. the more neutral connotations of *iuuentus* and *cateruis* for the troops on the right wing and in the centre; and they are situated on the left flank (*laeuo cornu:* 220), which may well have its usual sinister connotations, given that Silius has composed this scene without reference to Livy 22.46.1-7, where the Africans are placed in the centre of the line of battle. In Book 11.180-2, there is a similarly negative tenor, when Decius (a Capuan aristocrat) states his objections to a proposed alliance with Hannibal. He boasts of his descent from Capys and his connection to Iulus and asks:

```
ille ego semihomines inter Nasamonas et inter saeuum atque aequantem ritus Garamanta ferarum Marmarico ponam tentoria mixtus alumno?
```
His attitude towards the Africans seems to be based in ethnic prejudice, especially the reference to ‘half-human Nasamonae’ and ‘wild beasts’.

If these passages may be taken as evidence showing some degree of ethnic prejudice towards Africans among Italians, and if the expression Marmaricas... uires carries some pejorative implications, it might suggest that Italian Anna has some doubts about her mission. She has agreed under duress from Juno (Ganiban [2010] 93) to convey a message to Hannibal, but her choice of language reveals her ambivalence, and may signal to the reader that Anna Perenna has not completely abandoned her Italic identity for a pro-Carthaginian stance. She is, perhaps, negotiating a difficult path between her loyalty to her sister, her deference to Juno, and the honours she enjoys as an Italian divinity. For Anna’s divided loyalties see Ahl, Davis and Pomeroy (1986) 2497; Santini (1991) 35-6; Chiu (2011) 10; Dominik (2006) 119; and cf. Marks (2013) 292-8.

216 - 18. Anna implies that the command has passed directly from Fabius to Varro, who was the plebeian consul for 216, but the poet has conflated the consulships of 217 with those of 216. According to Livy, Fabius laid down his dictatorship in the autumn of 217, after the constitutional term of six months had expired, and the consuls who had been elected for that year, Cn. Servilius Geminus and M. Atilius, resumed the imperium (Liv. 22.31.7). Their terms were subsequently extended for a year (Liv. 22.34.1) because both consuls were in the field in the winter of 217-16 BC and they were not able to return to Rome to conduct the elections that were due (Liv. 22.33.9-12). Livy’s linear historical account is foreshortened by the poet for the sake of vividness, and imperium passes directly from Fabius to Varro. (The election of
Varro and his aristocratic colleague, Aemilius Paulus, is described in the passage of Book 8 which immediately follows the Anna Perenna episode.)

216. mutati fasces: *sc sunt.* This is a compressed but dramatically effective phrase that encapsulates the political changes in Rome at the conclusion of Fabius’ dictatorship. *Fasces* functions either metonymically or as a symbol for the authority of Roman magistrates (be they dictators or consuls), and Duff rightly translates it: ‘the consuls are changed.’ As dictator, Fabius was entitled to twenty-four lictors and there may be an allusion here to the story reported by Livy that when Fabius was authorized to take over the consular army commanded by Servilius he sent an order to the latter that he should present himself as a private citizen, without lictors, which mightly impressed the onlookers who had not seen a military dictator for generations: *qui cum dicto paruisset congressusque eorum ingentem speciem dictatae apud ciues sociosque uetustate iam prope oblitos eius imperii fecisset,* (Liv. 22.11.6). According to Spaltenstein, *mutati* anticipates line 236: it might equally be said that line 236 suggested itself to the writer of line 216.

216 - 17. *iam bellum atque arma senatus | ex inconsulto posuit Tirynthius heros:* In Anna’s account of the electoral process, the Roman senate is made to appear (line 217) the active party in terminating Fabius’ command. Hannibal is supposed to be elated by the un-wisdom of this decision (8.235-7). The adjective *inconsultus* (*OLD* 1b) means ‘rash, ill-advised, injudicious’; here the adjective is used substantively. The meaning of the phrase is quite clear, even though *senatus... inconsultum* for ‘an ill-considered decision of the Senate’ is unique and *OLD* cites only this passage for the substantive use of the neuter adjective. The phrase is a neat play on the words *ex senatus consulto*, the legal technical term for a decision of the
Senate, which is used by Livy in the precise passage describing the difficulties of conducting the elections for 216 BC: *ab eodem praetore ex senatus consulto litterae ad consules missae ut, si iis uideretur, alter eorum ad consules creandos Romam ueniret* (22.33.9). This play on words would readily be accepted as Silian were it not for its appearance in the *additamentum*. **Bellum atque arma:** another instance of epic duplication. (See note 35 above.)

217. **Tirynthius heros:** usually refers to Hercules whose birthplace was Tiryns, cf. *Ov. Met.* 7.410, *Stat. Theb.* 6.489, V. *Fl.* 2.373. The *gens Fabia* traced its mythical ancestry to Hercules (e.g. Plutarch *Life of Fabius Maximus* 1.1) and when Fabius is first introduced as a character (*Pun.* 2.3) he is identified explicitly as *Tirynthia proles*; the legend of his ancestry is recounted at 6.627-40, and alluded to at 7.35. Note also that, in the battle scene that ends Book 7 when Fabius and his army rush to the aid of the beleaguered Minucius, it is the divine Hercules who endows Fabius with epic greatness: *maiorem surgere in arma | maioremque dedit cerni Tirynthius* (7.591-2). And so Anna Perenna’s allusion to Fabius in these terms when she addresses the Carthaginian general is hardly tactful since Hannibal also identifies himself with Hercules. At the outset of his campaign he appeals to ‘Tirynthius’ to support him in destroying the new Troy (1.509-14); after his first victory he visits Hercules’ temple at Gades and takes pleasure in the scenes of the Labours depicted on its doors (3.1-60); in crossing the Alps he self-consciously (and hubristically) outdoes Hercules by forcing his men to to make a new road, rather than follow the path made by Alcides (3.512-17). Anna Perenna’s reference to Fabius as *Tirynthius heros* might, therefore, contain a hint that her commitment to her kinsman is not whole-hearted (see note 212 above). (For discussion of the importance of Hercules in the *Punica* see Bassett [1966] 266-8; Vessey [1982] 320-35; Santini
218. **cumque alio tibi Flaminio sunt bella gerenda:** Note the intratextuality of 8.215-18 with the passage at 7.34-5: ‘Non cum Flaminio tibi res, nec feruida Gracchi in manibus consulta: ’ inquit *Tirynthia gens est.*’ The Roman Cilnius, captured by the Carthaginians at the battle of Ticinus, was reminding Hannibal that he was not now dealing with the rash and foolish Flaminius but with a hero descended from the line of Hercules. Littlewood (2011, ad loc.) comments on the boldness of Cilnius’ words to his captor, which makes Anna’s use of the phrase *Tirynthius heros* (at 217) seem even more like a subtle jibe.

219 - 20. **me tibi, ne dubites, summi matrona Tonantis | misit.** The juxtaposition of *me* and *tibi* is emphatic, followed by *ne dubites*: reminiscent of *ne falsa putes* (8.178), but the double-edged meaning of the verb (*OLD* 1 and 3) means that the exhortation can be read simultaneously as urging Hannibal to trust the reliability of the messenger, and urging him to hesitate no longer. *summi matrona Tonantis: Tonans* is a cult-title for Jupiter, e.g. AEDES …IOVIS FERETRI ET IOVIS TONANTIS, (Aug. Anc. 6.43); *matrona* is a title for Juno (*TLL* 487.53) e.g. Hor. C. 3.4.59; Liv. 21.62.8. Although *matrona* could be merely a synonym for *uxor* or *coniunx* the combination *matrona Tonantis* suggests a high degree of solemnity, cf. *Fast. 6.33-4: dicor matrona Tonantis | iunctaque Tarpeio sunt mea templae Ioii.*

220 - 1. **ego Oenotris aeternum numen in oris | concelebror, uestri generata e sanguine Beli:** repeats Juno’s words to the nymph at 8.31 describing Hannibal’s kinship to Anna, *a uestro nomen memorabile Belo.* See note 31 above on the use of *uester* where *tuus* might be expected. It is acceptable that Juno should use the
personal adjective *uester* at 8.31 since it implies a connection to the plurality of family and race. But here the use of *uester* seems at odds with the fact that Anna Perenna is addressing Hannibal and drawing attention to his relationship to Belus. It might show that she is distancing herself from Hannibal, since she would surely have used *nostri* here if she was embracing their shared ancestry. Juno began her appeal to the nymph (30-1) by invoking Anna’s loyalty to her family, and the nymph now asserts her connection to Hannibal through their shared ancestry, but Anna gives first place to her Italian identity, and appears to be still grappling with the conflict of *fas* and *ius* that troubled her at 8.39-43. Chiu (2011, 6-15) suggests that the intervention of Juno has corrupted Anna Perenna’s Roman loyalties and has turned her into ‘an anti-Roman partisan’ who betrays her Italian devotees by hastening the Battle of Cannae; Dominik (2006, 119) says that her ‘real loyalties lie with Carthage’. But her obedience to Juno’s commands might also be read as somewhat perfunctory, shot through with linguistic signals that undermine her message. See notes on *Tirynthius heros* (216), *Marmaricas uires* (215), and *fulmina* (222). The repetition of language from 8.30-1 might be a sign of intratextual borrowing, but such deliberate ambiguity in the nymph’s message is strongly suggestive of a sophisticated poet at work rather than an interpolator.

222. **rapido belli rape fulmina cursu:** This is a powerful injunction with dactylic rhythms suggesting urgency, with *belli* marked by a forceful spondee in the central position; there is a play on words in *rapido... rape*. The verb *rapere* is also found in 196 and 215 with the same sense of rapid action. **belli... fulmina:** At 16.625 this phrase appears in the singular for Hannibal himself: *et tanto percussi fulmine belli*. Here it must be read as a metaphor for Hannibal’s army or for conflict in general (Duff: ‘launch the thunderbolts of war’), but it is destabilised by its
association with the Scipios, which Roman readers would surely have recognised. The image is used by both Lucretius and Vergil for the men most associated with the destruction of Carthage, Scipio Africanus Maior and Scipio Africanus Aemilianus: *DRN* 3.1034, *Scipiadas, belli fulmen, Carthaginis horror*, Verg. *Aen.* 6. 842-3: *duo fulmina belli, | Scipiadas, cladem Libyae*. The allusion to the Scipios is just as odd in Anna’s mouth as the allusion to Fabius’ ancestry at 217.

Was Scipio Africanus at Cannae? In Livy 22.53 he appears among the survivors of Cannae at Canusium, forestalling an attempted defection by some demoralised officers, but the historian does not mention his presence during the battle itself. (Discussed by Ridley, 1974.) In the *Punica* Scipio appears in the catalogue of Italian troops as the commander of the Campanians (8.546-61) and he is not only present at Cannae as the commander of cavalry (9.275-7) but he fights face to face with Hannibal (9.427-85) in a duel that also involves Mars and Pallas on opposing sides. Scipio’s appearance at Cannae has literary and symbolic importance in the scheme of the *Punica* rather than historicity, so that the nymph’s words *belli… fulmina* here might suggest that ‘Italian Anna’ is alluding to Scipio’s presence at the battle of Cannae in a code that Hannibal cannot interpret.

**223. celsus Iapygios ubi se Garganus in agros:** This is the last line of the *additamentum*; the text of the manuscripts resumes with *explicat* in line 224. Note that the grammar of line 223 is inextricably connected to the verb in line 224 by the reflexive pronoun *se.* **celsus… Garganus:** The steep and wooded promontory that lies to the south-east of the plain where the battle of Cannae was fought is a striking feature of the Apulian landscape; it forms the spur on the ‘boot’ of Italy. Silius mentions it frequently, mostly for its associations with Cannae.
(Pun. 9.34, 212, 483; 17.600), but also as a location for hunting (4.561), as a high-point from which to survey the area (7.366), or as a metonym for Apulia (13.59).

**Iapygios:** perhaps from Iapyx, son of Daedalus, mythic first settler in Apulia. (See note 37 above.)

224. **explicit:** The indisputably Silian text resumes here. Silius uses the verb *explicare* only once elsewhere: Mopsus throws himself off the walls of Saguntum and stretches out (*OLD 1d*) his dying limbs on top of his son’s body: *membra super nati moribundos explicat artus* (2.147). The reflexive *se explicare* is very uncommon. See Introduction § 9.2 for a fuller discussion of the seamless transition from the *additamentum* to the text of Book 8.

224a.  **[haec, ut Roma cadat, sat erit uictoria Poenis]** ‘That Rome shall fall, will be victory enough for the Carthaginians.’ This line makes very little sense in Anna’s mouth: it was rejected by Heinsius on the grounds that it was not found in the manuscripts or early editions. In modern editions, it is bracketed by Summers and Delz, and omitted by Duff. Brugnoli and Santini (1995) do not discuss it, from which it appears that they follow Heinsius in dismissing it altogether. Heitland, however, correctly observes that it appears in both Constantius and the Aldine edition, and so its provenance is at least as reliable (or as questionable) as the *additamentum*. The line bears an obvious similarity to *Punica* 7. 233: *una, ut debellet, satis est uictoria Poeno*. In Book 7 the line is a blunt statement by Fabius of the extreme danger confronting Rome in 217 BC and a justification for his strategy of avoiding conflict: one more victory for Hannibal will be all that is needed for Rome to fall into the abyss (Littlewood [2011] ad loc.). It is very likely, as Heitland (208-9) observes, that it is a marginal note referring to Fabius’ foresight,
and was included in the text by scribal error, either in the fifteenth century or perhaps earlier.

225. dixit et in nubes umentia sustulit ora: The nymph finishes abruptly and disappears into the clouds, just as the dream-figure of Dido ‘disappeared into thin air’ at line 184 above. umentia is an emendation by Heinsius for uientia which is found in the Aldine and Roman editions: Anna is a river nymph, and so a watery epithet is appropriate. In favour of umentia is its appearance at Punica 9.30 in a context of tearfulness: oculos atque ora umentia. However, uientia, although unusual, might equally carry some echo of the use of uiuus in relation to ‘freshly flowing water’ (OLD 6) as in Varro L. 5.123. fons unde funditur e terra aqua uiua. It is odd, however, that this water-nymph disappears into the clouds: one might expect her to return to her natural element. Marks (2013) 298 n.34 suggests that this action implies that Anna diua has some ‘celestial’ attributes.

226. promissae reuirescens pignore laudis: reuirescens forms a contrasting pair with cura aegrescente (212). Before Anna’s visitation, Hannibal was crippled by anxiety, now he is flourishing and full of new hope, and since the verb has connotations of the growth of new green shoots (OLD a), the association with water and clouds in the previous line might suggest that Hannibal is like a plant revived by rain, cf. Ov. Met. 2. 407-8: dat terrae gramina, frondes | arboribus, laesasque iubet reuirescere siluas, where Jupiter revives the scorched earth after Phaethon’s escapade.

227 - 8. Nympha, decus generis, quo non sacratius ullum | numen, ait, nobis: decus generis = the glory ‘of our race’ (OLD 3) or ‘of our family’ (OLD 1c). Both ideas are relevant, given the theme of everlasting enmity between Hannibal’s
Carthaginians (note 171-2 above) and the Roman people, and the emphasis placed by Juno (line 30) and Anna herself (line 221) on the kinship that exists between the Barcids and Dido/Anna through their common ancestor, Belus. **Nympha...**

**numen**: Hannibal’s acknowledgement of Anna’s human associations (*decus generis*) is in parenthesis to her immortal attributes which are given emphasis not only by the similar sounds of their first syllables but also by their placement at the beginning of their respective lines and by the pauses generated by the interruption of the sentence with *decus generis* and *ait*.

228. **felix oblata secundes**: a prayer formula with optative subjunctive, which is not unlike *pax tua tuque adsis nato numenque secundes*, a prayer to the deified Augustus in the proem of Germanicus’ *Aratea* 16 asking for his blessing upon the poetic endeavour of his ‘son’. Note the compression into three Latin words of a complex wish: ‘Bring us good fortune (*felix* OLD 2b), and ensure success for (*secundo OLD 2c*) what you hold out (*offero OLD 8c*)’. cf. Verg. *Aen.* 1.330: *sis felix nostrumque leues... laborem*.

229 - 30. **ast ego te compos pugnae Carthaginis arce | marmoreis sistam templis**: Hannibal prays for the ongoing support of the nymph, and in return promises to dedicate a shrine to her in Carthage cf. Verg. *G* 3.13: *et uiridi in campo templum de marmore ponam*; *Aen.* 6.69: *solido de marmore templum | instituam*. **ast**: has a solemn and archaic flavour, introducing the apodosis of Hannibal’s (conditional) prayer, (*OLD ast 2*) cf. Appius in Livy 10.19.17: *Bellona, si hodie nobis uictoriam duis, ast ego tibi templum uoueo*. **compos pugnae**: does not mean, ‘If I am successful in battle’, but rather, ‘If I get an opportunity to fight’, (*OLD 1a; TLL* 2137.43). Hannibal prays only for the opportunity to fight because he
believes (along with Fabius at *Pun.* 7.233) that one more pitched battle is all that will be required to bring Rome to its knees. (See note 224a.)

230 - 1. *iuxtaque dicabo | aequatam gemino simulacri munere Dido:* *dicabo* is a technical religious term, synonymous with *consecrabo, dedicabo* (*TLL* 964.27). The direct object of the verb is *Dido* (accusative case, as in *Verg.* *Aen.* 4.383). Literally: ‘and nearby I shall honour Dido, made equal, with the twin gift of a statue’.

In Book 1 Hannibal took his oath of never-ending vengeance against Rome in a temple in the centre of Carthage which was sacred to Dido and the whole *genus* to which Hannibal adverted in line 227:

```
stant marmore maesto
effigies, Belusque pares omnisque nepotum
a Belo series, stat gloria gentis Agenor
et qui longa dedit terris cognomina Phoenix.
ipsa sedet tandem aeternum coniuncta Sychaeo.  (Pun. 1.86-90)
```

It is not clear whether Hannibal’s vow is to honour Anna in the same pantheon or to create a new shrine in which the sisters will have equal honour. Either way, Hannibal is attempting to repatriate the goddess to Carthage. Both Chiu (2011, 18-19) and Fucecchi (2013, 24-7) discuss this vow to Anna as an attempted inversion of the ritual of *euocatio* by which victorious Roman generals could transfer foreign *numina* to Rome, e.g. the *euocatio* by Scipio Aemilianus in 146 BC of Carthaginian Tanit to become Juno Caelestis. (For the ritual of *euocatio* see Beard et al. (1998) 34-5, 82, 132-4; Ando (2008) 128-48.) Hannibal’s attempt to repatriate the Italian divinity will fail because, although he will have a mighty victory at Cannae, he does not, in the end, succeed in defeating the Roman state (Fucecchi 2013) 23-4, Marks [2013 298].
232 - 41. Hannibal delivers a rousing speech to his men: the favour of the gods has returned and he calls on his men to fulfil the boasts that they had made when prevented from fighting by Fabius’ tactics. He gives the command to march to Apulia.

232. haec fatus socios stimulat tumefactus ouantis: tumefactus is an apt conjecture by Barth for tum factus, cf. Pun. 7.14 where Hannibal is described by the poet as tumfactum cladibus, and 2.28 where Hannibal, referring to the arrogance of the Roman ambassadors, exclaims: heu caecae mentes tumfactaque corda secundis! The juxtaposition of tumefactus and ouantis implies the overweening confidence of both Hannibal and his men. They may be riding for a fall.

233 – 4. ‘Pone grauis curas tormentaque lenta sedendi | fatalis Latio miles’: curas and sedendi recall the beginning of Book 8, especially lines 10-13 where the poet describes how Fabian tactics have undermined Hannibal’s morale. Ariemma rightly notes how the focalisation has shifted: Hannibal attributes his own feelings (curas, tormentaque lenta sedendi) to his troops and rallies them as fatalis Latio miles, in a phrase that echoes tristes Italum... pugnas, (202). The rhyming of tormentaque lenta sedendi is rhetorical.

234 - 5. placauimus iras | caelicolum: Hannibal repeats Anna’s assurances at line 213, but where her language is objective and impersonal (omnis iam placata tibi manet ira deorum), the first person verb in Hannibal’s words to his men claims agency in appeasing the wrath of the gods, cf. the emphatically personal nuntio, at line 237. Hannibal’s ego is restored by Anna’s intervention.

235. redeunt diui: repeats the language of 214: [deorum] omnis Agenoridis reditis favor. Similarly, 236 repeats mutati fasces (216). If, indeed, the additamentum is an
interpolation, it is possible that, rather than being a repetition of 214 and 216, lines
234-6 are the source from which the earlier text of Anna’s speech to Hannibal was
reconstructed by the writer of the *additamentum*.

235 - 7. **finita maligno | hinc Fabio imperia et mutatos consule fasces | nuntio:**
Two parallel phrases of *oratio obliqua* concerning Fabius (*sc esse*); the enjambement
of *nuntio* and the hard diaeresis after the first foot of the following line make this the
first climax of Hannibal’s speech. There is a contrast between the language used by
Anna about Fabius at line 217 (*Tyrinthius heros*) and Hannibal’s contemptuous
dismissal of him as *maligno*. **hinc:** = ‘from now on’.

237 - 8. **nunc dextras mihi quisque atque illa referto | quae Marte exclusus
promittere magna solebas:** The whole speech is addressed to the soldiers as
individuals: *pone, miles, quisque, solebas*: amounting to a personal appeal from the
general (*mihi*) to his men. *referto* is an archaic imperative, as befits Hannibal’s
solemn call for his men to restore their strength to him and honour their previous
oaths.

239. **en, numen patrium spondet maiora peractis:** The second climax of
Hannibal’s speech comes in a line that is nicely balanced, though not a golden line.
Hannibal says that Anna is an ancestral divinity of the Carthaginians and she is
reported to have promised greater things for them in the future; but a more attentive
reading of her speech to Hannibal (210-224) shows that she did no such thing:
she claimed to be a *numen* of Oenotria, and made no promises at all.

240. **uellantur signa, ac diua ducente petamus:** jussive subjunctives,
commanding the army to march to Apulia. Hannibal’s assertion that a goddess will
be leading them (*diua ducente*) is intended as encouragement for his men, but is not
well-founded: Anna Perenna disappeared from his sight, and from the poem at line 225.

241. **infaustum Phrygibus Diomedis nomine campum**: Diomedes was king of Argos and prominent in the Trojan War (see especially *Iliad* Books 5 and 6). He was reputed to be the founder of several Italian cities, including Arpi (Argyripa) in Apulia, (Pliny *NH* 3.103-4) cf. Verg. *Aen.* 11. 246-7: *ille urbem Argyripam patriae cognomine gentis | uictor Gargani condebat Iapygis agris.* Hannibal makes an assumption that Diomedes’ territory has been and always will be full of misfortune for the Phrygians but he is as misguided in this assumption as he was in his expectation that Anna Perenna would be his invisible guide (note 240). He is, it seems, referring to Diomedes’ Iliadic past and his successes in combat against Aeneas; but in the *Aeneid*, when Turnus sends envoys to Diomedes in Apulia seeking his assistance he not only declines to fight against Aeneas, he advises the Italians to make peace with him (*Aen.* 11.291-2). Furthermore, there is a tradition, described at length in *Punica* 13.36-81, that Diomedes brought the Palladium to Italy, and donated it to Aeneas (see Fucecchi [2013] 20). By the late republic the Palladium was housed in the Temple of Vesta and was supposed to be one of the *pignora imperii* that guaranteed the safety of the city, (e.g. Cic. *Scaur.* 48). It is alluded to in *Punica* 1 659 as *pignora Troiae*, and specifically mentioned by Minerva in Book 9.530-2 as her gift to Rome for its protection: *nostro cum pignore regnet Roma, et Palladio sedes hac urbe locarim.* Hence it appears that, in Silius’ text, Hannibal’s invocation of Diomedes’ territory as *Phrygibus infaustum* is a further indication to the reader that Hannibal is misguided: Vessey (1982); Marks (2013) 301. Cannae will indeed be a calamity for the Romans, but it will also be the fountainhead of their renewal; for after the battle of Cannae the Romans will begin to demonstrate their
social and moral rehabilitation, and Jupiter will withdraw the favour that he has hitherto lent Hannibal for his own Olympian purposes.

At the conclusion of Hannibal’s speech, the scene shifts to Rome and the election of Fabius’ successor, the plebeian demagogue, Varro. The transition is adroitly managed but is deeply prejudicial to Varro: *dumque Arpos tendunt instincti pectora Poeni, | subnixus rapto plebei muneris ostro | saeuit iam rostris Varro.* (8.242-4)

Here endeth the commentary.
APPENDIX 1.

On the question of authenticity: voices in favour, voices against.

Heinsius (in Drakenborch 1717, 404): *an Silii sint multum ambigo.*

Ruperti (in Lemaire 1823, 481): *prius fere suspicari possis, quam nonulla in iis sint, quae ineptum versificaoarem sapiant, et imitatio Maronis Ovidiique nimis videatur servilis. Sed...hoc forte excusabis si reputaveris, quam misera sit poetae conditio, qui fabulam repetit notissimum, et ab aliis quoque summo jam ornatu tractatam.*

Heitland (1896, 210): ‘I accept the lines on the evidence of Constantius, which is not in the least weakened by any external or internal evidence that I have been able to discover.’

Summers (1902, 171): ‘It’s genuineness is well-proved by Heitland.’

Sabbadini (1905 182): ‘La frode é evidente... la addebitiamo al Costanzi’.

Duckworth (1969, 109): ‘The fact that there are so many similarities between the passage in question and the *Punica* as a whole argues strongly for the authenticity of the passage.’

Spaltenstein (1986, 508) ‘L’autenticité des vers 144-223 a été fort discutée, apparemment sans qu’un avis s’impose irrésistiblement. (‘The authenticity of these lines has been much discussed, without any one view being compelling.’)

Ahl, Davis, Pomeroy (1986, 2497) ‘Despite the chance that [the lines] are genuine, any conclusion based on them must necessarily be subject to dispute. Nonetheless the lines... cover what would have to be included to make the transition between 144 and 226’.


Ariemma (2008, 68): ‘Il sapore di puro adattamento, il che parrebbe deviare lievemente dalla norma seguita dal Silio sicuramente autentico nei primi 143 versi’ (‘the flavour of pure adaptation, which would seem to deviate somewhat from the norms followed by the (undoubtedly authentic) Silius of the first 143 lines.’)

Ganiban (2010, 94, n.68) ‘Most scholars consider these lines to be authentic… but we cannot be sure.’

Chiu (2011, 10 n. 23): ‘A satisfactory resolution to the argument may not be possible...’

Pomeroy (2016, 329, n.28): ‘The actual address of the river goddess [to Hannibal] is probably lost.’
## APPENDIX 2

### Dactylic patterns in first four feet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total lines</td>
<td>12117</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDDD</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDDD</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDSD</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>6.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSDS</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>4.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDSD</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>6.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDS</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>8.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSDS</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>6.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDDS</td>
<td>1150</td>
<td>9.43</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17.28</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDDS</td>
<td>1102</td>
<td>9.03</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.41</td>
<td>7.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSSD</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.76</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>4.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSSS</td>
<td>1451</td>
<td>11.89</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.41</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.41</td>
<td>12.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSSD</td>
<td>1040</td>
<td>8.52</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.98</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>8.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSSS</td>
<td>1595</td>
<td>13.07</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.98</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17.28</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSSS</td>
<td>1182</td>
<td>9.69</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total lines</td>
<td>12200</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td>82</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 3

Frequency of Elision, Bucolic diaeresis, Trochaic caesurae, Endstopped lines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Silius corpus</th>
<th>ADDITAMENTUM</th>
<th>Endstopped lines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total lines</td>
<td>12,117</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elision</td>
<td>5333</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bucolic diaeresis</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trochaic Caesurae</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2d foot</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3d foot</td>
<td>1480</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th foot</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endstopped lines</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 4

Weaving: Anna’s dream *Punica 8. 164-184*

Aen. 1.304 Motus erat placidumque animum mentemque quietam 160
Troius in misera rector susceperat Annam.
iamque omnis luctus omnis e pectore curas
dispulerat, Phrygiis nec iam amplius aduena tectis
Aen. 5.721 illa uidebatur. tacito nox atra sopore
Aen. 4.522 cuncta per et terras et lati stagna profundi 165
Aen. 2.270 condiderat, tristi cum Dido aegerrima uultu
Aen. 5.723 has uisa in somnis germanae effundere uoces:
'His, soror, in tectis longae indulgere quieti.

Aen. 4.541,560 heu nimium secura, potes, nec, quae tibi fraudes 170
Aen. 4.561 tendantur, quae circumstent discrimina, cernis?
at nondum nostro infaustos generique soloque
Aen. 4.542 Laomedontae noscis telluris alumnos?
dum caelum rapida stellas uertigine uoluet,
lunaque fraterno lustrabit lumine terras,
Aen. 4.624 pax nulla Aeneadas inter Tyriosque manebit. 175
Aen. 3.169,8.59, surge, age: iam tacitas suspecta Lauinia fraudes
molitur dirumque nefas sub corde uolutat
Aen. 8.42 praeterea, ne falsa putes haec fingere somnum,
haud procul hinc paruo descendens fonte Numicus
labitur et leni per ualles uoluitur amne. 180
huc rapies, germana, uiam tutosque receptus.
te sacra excipient hilares in flumina Nymphae,
aeternumque Italis numen celebrabere in oris.'
sic fata in tenuem Phoenissa euanuit auram.

Anna’s dream is a notable example of ‘complex allusion.’
APPENDIX 5

From Constantius’ Collectaneorum Hecatostys Cap. 92.

Perpetui numquam moritura uolumina Sili cum aliis locis mutila et manca inuenies. tum libro octauo: ubi Didonis & Annae sortem poeta ipse describit. Ibi enim duos et octoginta uersus deficere Baptista Guarini filius, latinae et Graecae linguae decus ac splendor et praeceptor meus omni cum honore et obseruantia nominandus ostendit: quos e Gallia sibi cum aliis quam plurimis rebus scitu dignis missosuisse dicebat. Eos in publicum dare (uti sanctissimis eius manibus caeteri mecum debeant) impresaentarium constituo.

[84 hexameters]

Non grauarer plurimas in Silio mendas detegere et nonnullos uersus qui uariis desiderantur in locis in medium afferre, nisi superiore anno Eruditissimus uir et facundissimus nobisque amicissimus Petrus Marsus Romae ostendisset recognitiones suas in hunc poetam absolutas et impressores tantum octum expectantes. Neque enim pro mutuo inter nos beniuolentiae uincolo & mea in ipsam (ut decet) reuerentia praeuertere repastinationes suas annotationibus meis animus pateretur. Quamquam hodie rarenter inuenias qui non suae potius quam alienae laudis habeant rationem.
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