READING TROJAN ROME: ILLEGITIMATE EPITHETS, AVATARS, AND THE LIMITS OF ANALOGY IN SILIUS ITALICUS' *PUNICA*

ROBERT COWAN

Despite its title, the *Punica* is about Rome. The proem makes this clear as Silius sets out to account for Rome's rise to the stars, and throughout the epic the nature of Rome is explored, provisionally defined, and again problematized. Much of this process involves the mirroring of Rome in a series of cities – Saguntum, Capua, Carthage, Syracuse, Nova Carthago – each of which stands in an indeterminate relationship with her – parallel, antithesis, prolepsis, analepsis, surrogate, victim – which the reader, and internal readers such as Hannibal, are constantly challenged to establish, but never ultimately can.[1] Perhaps the city which is most pervasively set up as a mirror of Rome is Troy. However the myth of Rome's Trojan origins came about and to whatever extent its prominence grew with that of the Julian gens, that prominence in the culturally defining texts of the Augustan period, not only the *Aeneid*, but the *Georgics, Odes*, and works of Tibullus and Propertius, made it a culturally, literarily, and politically potent way of thinking and writing about the nature of Rome.[2]

Silius' technique in the *Punica* is a complex one. Troy operates as the ancestor of Rome, its surrogate, its antithesis, and its double. By using Trojan epithets to refer to Romans, and by casting characters and events from the Second Punic War as if they were characters and events from the Trojan War, he challenges the reader to assess, not only what the nature of Rome is, as illuminated by Trojans parallels, but also what the value and limitations of such Trojan parallels are: it is an exercise, not merely in reading Trojan Rome, but in reading the *Aeneid* and the *Punica*, and reading the *Aeneid* through the *Punica*, and – to come full-circle – in reading Rome through those poems.[3] The *Aeneid* already demands, on one of its many levels, to be read as an allegorical meditation on contemporary (Augustan) Rome, preserving a tension between representing the *antecedents* of the present and an allegorized version of that present itself. The *Punica* elucidates this technique by applying Virgilian (as well as Homeric, and other epic and non-epic) schemata to represent Roman history, unpacking the allegory by applying it to the sort of events which are being allegorized. Yet Silius is not writing during the Hannibalic War, so a further layer of allegory must lie on top of what his poem has to say about Domitianic Rome. This article will examine a particular instance of this technique, as Silius uses the figure of Hector as a means of playing with the likeness and unlikeness between Troy and Rome. His principal means of doing this are, as we have noted, the use of epithets and the figuring of characters as avatars of Trojan heroes. I shall therefore briefly discuss the implications of Silius' use of Trojan epithets, with one Hectorean example

---

[1] I shall discuss these other mirrors of Rome, as well as further aspects of the use of Troy in the *Punica*, in *Indivisible Cities: Mirrors of Rome in Silius Italicus* (Oxford, forthcoming).

[2] Of the vast bibliography on the myth of Trojan origins, see esp. Perret (1942), (1971), Bömer (1951), Gagé (1963), Cornell (1975), Gabba (1976), Galinsky (1969), Gruen (1992) 6-51. For salutary observations on the distorting effect of Caesarean and Augustan discourse on perceptions of the myth's earlier history, see Erskine (2001) 15-43.

[3] Cf. Pomeroy (2000: 152), who reifies something like this reading experience by imagining a contemporary literary soirée: 'There one Latin text has been laid over another, if we regard the *Punica* as a palimpsest through which the *Aeneid* is being read….[the guests] will judge what they hear from their host against a text with which they are deeply conversant and also against the social text of their age. The author is present, but in dialogue with the other discussants, shaping the text painstakingly.'

of his technique, before discussing the ways in which L. Aemilius Paulus, the consul who died at Cannae, both is and is not as Hector-figure.

1 Illegitimate epithets

Silius' commentators have generally criticized his use of unusual epithets.[4] For the editor of the Loeb edition, J. W. Duff, the poet is clearly striving for variety but, as is wont, lapsing into excess:

> 'I believe that Silius did himself serious injury by what might seem a trifling matter – his system of nomenclature. The subject of his poem, the struggle between Carthage and Rome, is stated in the first two lines. But the Romans are not there called *Romani*: they are called *Aeneadae*…Silius evidently felt that *Romani* and *Itali* might recur too often, and that aliases must be found. Variety is good but here it was carried to excess. The following list of variants for *Romani* may not be exhaustive, but is surely too long:…The Carthaginians also are called by nearly a dozen different names. I have thought it best not always to follow Silius in this particular.'[5]

François Spaltenstein, in his commentary on the entire *Punica*, is more measured and less judgmental, but still suggests that there is a certain lack of decorum in Silius' use of ethnic epithets:

> 'Silius recalls the epithets which Virgil gives to Aeneas' Trojans and to Dido's Phoenicians in transposing them to their distant descendants, the Italians and the Carthaginians, for whom these designations are less legitimate.'[6]

It is all too easy to scoff at scholars whose devotion to their own conception of the classical norms and ideals of taste and decorum lead them to condemn, or at least demur at, the tasteless, indecorous, 'Silver' excesses of poetry written in an age when literary standards had both changed and declined. Yet the temptation to feel such condescension should be stiffly resisted for the simple reason that both Duff and Spaltenstein are perfectly correct. Silius' use of multiple, often obscure, even more often only distantly appropriate epithets *is* excessive, and is surely meant to be felt as such by the reader; indeed it is the very smoothness and decorum of this aspect of Duff's translation, where he uniformly substitutes 'Roman' and 'Carthaginian' for

[4] For simplicity and consistency, I shall refer throughout to terms which identify Romans with Trojans (*uel sim.*) as epithets, regardless of whether they are true, adjectival epithets, 'added on' to qualify a noun, as in *Dardanium…agmen* (4.487) or substantival equivalents and hence technically instances of antonomasia, as in *Teucros* (14.353). Epithet, in ancient and modern usage can be used in the broader sense, as when Quintilian (8.6.29) gives one type of antonomasia as the use of an *epitheton, quod detracto eo cui adponitur ualet pro nomine*; Aristotle likewise terms the antonomasia ὁ μητροφόντης at Eur. *Or.* 1588 as an ἐπίθετον (*Rhet.* 3.2.14).

[5] Duff (1936) xiii-xiv.

[6] 'Sil. reprend les épithètes que Verg. donne aux Troyens d'Énée et aux Phéniciens de Didon en les transposant à leurs descendants lointains, les Italiens et les Carthaginois, pour qui ces déterminations sont moins légitimes.' Spaltenstein (1986) *ad* 1.6. More neutrally, Cholevius (1865) 35: 'Silius nonnullis epithetis, quae ex Vergilio transtulit, tamen aliter usus esse videtur atque Vergilius.' and 33: 'Silius libenter epp. ornantia patronymica, interdum etiam forma modo patronymica, eligebat, quibus viros aut populos laudaret lectorique commendaret, mentionem faciens clarorum avorum aut prisci temporis praeclare acti…Simile consilium Silius sibi proposuit, si epp. certorum populorum a sedibus eorum vetustissimis et clarissimis repetit [Rhoetei, Idaeum genus].'

every epithet, which contributes to its feeling so alien to the rough and jarring texture of the *Punica*. For the reader *ought* to feel that the variety of epithets used to designate a single people, the Romans, is excessive; she *ought* to feel jarred when she reads about Teucrians fighting Sidonians on the Aetolian plain in the last quarter of the third century BC. For, as Spaltenstein – also correctly – observes, these epithets *are* less legitimate than they were in the *Aeneid*; Romans may be descended from Trojans but they are not themselves Trojans, or Teucrians, or Hectoreans, or Laomedonteans, or any of the other epithets which Silius gives them. It would be as much a misreading of Silius to accept these as neutral, valid, 'poetic' (whatever that may mean) alternatives or equivalents to *Romani* as it would be to dismiss them and the poem which contains them as absurd and misjudged lapses of taste.

How then are we to account for the jarring, indecorous variety and illegitimacy of the Silius' ethnic epithets? I should like to propose five distinct effects which they have on the reader, her reception of the poem, and her use of it to construct a sense or senses of Roman identity (or, indeed, identities), effects which sometimes overlap and sometimes are held in marked tension with each other. The first is that it contributes to one of Silius' narrative strategies, that of creating an eternal present. The world of the *Punica* may be temporally situated in the late third century BC, but it is one in which the conflicts of centuries both earlier and later are played out. It landscape is already marked with the scars of the civil wars to come, its battles fought by soldiers from those civil wars, while in the other direction, the war between Rome and Carthage is not only aetiologized by the unpleasantness between Aeneas and Dido, it re-enacts it, even enacts it, as Trojan and Sidonian, Aenean and Elissaean fight it out as if it were 1184 rather than 224.

Yet this is already in tension with Silius' insistence on a dynamic, though contradictory, chronological scheme: the rise of Rome to the ethical apex (and military nadir) of Cannae which stands against the decline which prompts an Iron Age Jupiter to use war to toughen it up again, as he had used agriculture in the *Georgics* and sea-faring in Valerius Flaccus' *Argonautica*;[7] likewise, the decline of Rome into luxury and decadence from that same apex of Cannae set against the *Aeneid* 1-style teleological ascent to the golden age, no longer of Augustus, but of Domitian. This brings us to our second effect. Silius uses ethnic and familial descent as a trope, both for literary succession and for causation, and simultaneously uses them to trope descent.[8] The *Punica* is entailed by the *Aeneid*, through its diction and scenes, just as the Romans and Carthaginians are descended from Trojans and Sidonians, just as the Second Punic War is caused by the bitter separation of Aeneas and Dido. The overwhelming causative impact of this descent and this history, both political and literary, is constantly foregrounded for the reader by their designation in the text as being, not descended from, but themselves Trojans and Sidonians.

Statius uses a similar technique in the *Thebaid*, where the familial and ethnic impetus of the Thebans towards fratricide, incest, civil war, and all manner of other crimes is foregrounded by their designation by epithets such as 'Cadmean', 'Sidonian', or 'Agenorean' which recall their guilty ancestry. As P. J. Davis elegantly puts it, 'The use of comparatively abstruse epithets…is symptomatic in the case of Statius not so much of a fondness for learned display but of an intention to stress the

[7] Cf. Fowler (2000) 124: 'a wish for a return to a time of innocence before (textually as well as culturally) things went downhill, coupled with a knowledge that it was never really like that anyway, is basic to Silius.'

[8] For a more detailed discussion of this Silian technique, see Cowan (2006), adapting and combining Ricks' (1976) and Hardie's (1993) notion of familial as a metaphor for literary succession with Hinds' (1997) idea of 'reversing the trope'.

genetic connection between past and present.'[9] Silius' use of such abstruse epithets – and it may be suggestive that his Carthaginians, like Statius' Thebans, are frequently described as if they were identical to their Phoenician ancestors – is also symptomatic of his desire to stress the genetic connection between past and present; or perhaps it would be more accurate to say that his desire is to *explore* the connection between past and present. Without wishing to oversimplify Statius' technique in the *Thebaid* (for it is by no means simple, only different), his main emphasis is not on any way in which the Thebans of Eteocles' day might intriguingly both resemble and differ from their autochthonous and Phoenician ancestors; rather he stresses the obsessive, ineluctable way in which their crimes, and especially the related pair of incest and fratricide, excessive and insufficient devotion to their kin, recur and will continue to recur, not only in the conflict between the brothers, but in the unexpected quarters of Maeon's self-destructive suicide, Menoeceus' competitive and divisive *deuotio*, and the fierce rivalry between Antigone and Argia to cremate Polynices.[10] In the *Punica*, the reader senses the connection between past and present, but also the differences; Statius' Thebans cannot escape their hereditary (and literary-hereditary, for there is a similar dynamic of troping between the two) proclivity to fratricide, but Silius' Romans are caught at a complex point where they are both like and unlike, constrained by and able to break free from the hereditary determinism of their Trojan ancestors. This difference, perhaps the tension between the first two effects of Silius' illegitimate epithets, in itself constitutes the third effect.

Statius' epithets are moderately illegitimate and, as with Silius, the reader must neither reject them as mannered monstrosities nor blandly accept them as appropriate and unmarked poeticisms, but feel the dissonance and be provoked by it to feel their effect, in the *Thebaid*'s case, to sense the inescapable impact of past upon present. Silius' illegitimate epithets, and the illegitimacy *of* his epithets, has the same effect, but this remains in tension with a stronger sense of illegitimacy, so that their dissonance, the difference between Trojan signifier and Roman signified, draws attention, not only to the parallelism between them and the effect of the former's ancestry on the latter, but to the limits of that parallelism and that impact. When she reads that Jupiter is rallying the heaven-dwellers to protect the Dardan houses, *tecta Dardana*, against Hannibal's assault, the reader may think that this is just like – perhaps even identifiable with – the siege of Troy; or perhaps she thinks, in more Statian terms, that the Trojanness of the houses suggests an inevitable link between past and present, a fate ineluctably determined by heredity from a Troy whose *raison d'être*, it sometimes almost seems, was to be sacked. Yet this sense must be held in tension with her understanding that this is not, after all, Troy, but Rome, and that, whatever its Trojan ancestry may bequeath, it is not doomed to repeat its metropolis' fate precisely.

This understanding comes, not merely because of a basic sense of topography and chronology which can distinguish between a ruined Mycenaean-era polity in the Troad and a thriving, third-century city in on the banks of the Tiber, nor even because an equally basic historical knowledge, combined with the *Punica*'s own narrative, reveals that Rome is *not* sacked; it is explicitly stated in the text, which seems determined to problematize its own illegitimate use of Trojan epithets, most clearly when Juno, appearing to Hannibal like the Virgilian Venus to Aeneas, tells him that his dealings are not with a Phrygian or Laurentine colony, '*non tibi cum Phrygio res*

[9] Davis (1994) 475; cf. Cowan (2002) 199-244, esp. 205-6.
[10] Maeon: Stat. *Theb*. 3.53-98; Menoeceus: 10.610-826 with esp. Heinrich (1999); Antigone & Argia: 12.349-463, esp.456-63.

Laurentiue colono.'[11] Juno here, and Silius through her, foregrounds the very problem which any reader (including the internal reader, Hannibal) must have when reading the *Punica*'s illegitimate epithets: Silius' Romans may be *like* Trojans, and their destiny may be to a certain degree shaped by the fact that they are *descended from* Trojans, but in the final analysis, they are *not* Trojans; this sets a limit on their similitude to Trojans, and Rome's to Troy, which leads the reader to ask herself the very question which is at the poem's heart – in what ways is Rome like and in what ways is it unlike Troy, and how can this interplay of similitude and dissimilitude lead to an understanding, or perhaps rather a construction of Rome's identity.

Silius' use of epithets is, after all, a form of antonomasia and hence of metaphor. Romans are not Trojans but they are called so. Like all such tropes, they demand a degree of interpretation from the reader, who must first recognize what it is that they signify and then gauge the degree of difference and similarity between the two. For metaphors pose riddles, as Aristotle puts it, μεταφοραὶ γὰρ αἰνίττονται, and as such require a degree of interpretation on the part of the reader. Lausberg, in surveying ancient rhetorical theories of tropes more generally, notes that:

> 'particularly in poetry, because of the deviation from maximum *perspicuitas*, they are a challenge to the audience which the poet must gauge according to the audience's powers of comprehension. To credit the audience with the ability to comprehend forces the audience to participate actively (decoding for comprehension) in the creation of the work.'[12]

This model, of course, like Aristotle's, is based on the belief that there is a correct answer to the riddle, a true meaning immanent in the text which can be decoded by a reader with sufficient comprehensive ability, but Lausberg's final formulation, that the audience must participate actively in the creation of the work, comes closer to what the reader experiences with the *Punica*. For, though we may cite Aristotle to defend his technique, Silius offends against the principles of harmony, appropriateness, and decorum which are insisted on by the rhetorical theorists, or at least from a limit's being set upon the *similitudo* between object and metaphor. Cicero warns against the dangers, not only of metaphors being too distant from what they represent, but from their leading the audience's in disgraceful directions, as when the death of Scipio Africanus is said to have castrated the *res publica*.[13] Silius, on the contrary, embraces the uncontrollable effects which his epithets have on his readers, and challenges them to set the limits on how far those epithets' connotations carry them.

The fourth effect of Silius' illegitimate epithets is more precise, as his more specific epithets have more specific connotations. Thus, while calling Romans Trojan sets up the complex interplay which we have already seen between the ways in which Rome is like and unlike Troy in its entirety, or at least in its unspecified details, to

---

[11] 12.706. Almost all commentators have noted the reworking of the Venus-Aeneas scene. I shall discuss this scene at greater length in ch. 4 of *Indivisible Cities*. The immediate antithesis which Juno sets up is that Hannibal is not fighting Troy but the gods, whom she proceeds to reveal and catalogue to him, but this is inseparable from the antithesis between Troy, abandoned and even attacked by the gods, and Rome, in whose defence the gods are ranged and to whose manifest destiny they are devoted.

[12] Lausberg (1998 [1960]) 250 §556.

[13] *et quoniam haec uel summa laus est in uerbis transferendis, ut sensum feriat id, quod translatum sit, fugienda est omnis turpitudo earum rerum, ad quas eorum animos, qui audient, trahet similitudo. nolo dici morte Africani "castratam" esse rem publicam, nolo "stercus curiae" dici Glauciam;* Cic. *de Orat*. 3.163-4.

designate Romans by a more specific epithet, such as *Phrygius*, *Hectoreus*, or *Laomedonteus*, asks the reader to judge how Rome resembles and differs from Troy and Trojans as the city and the people who were ethnically linked to the effete Orientalized Phrygians, defended but then stripped of the defence of Hector, cursed as a result of the perjury of Laomedon, and moreover as a city and people who, to a greater or lesser degree, share the qualities of these peoples, heroes, and kings. This builds on the complex effect which Virgil's use of specific epithets for his (*echt*) Trojans had. Virgil's subtle use of epithets and antonomasia is noted already by Servius (*ad* Verg. *A.* 1.468):

> *HAC PHRYGES bene ubique Vergilius pro negotii qualitate dat Troianis et nomina. nam timidos Phrygas uocat, ut hoc loco, item o uere Phrygiae, neque enim Phryges; Dardanidas generosos, ut Dardanidae magni genus alto a sanguine diuum; Laomedontiadas perfidos, ut nondum Laomedonteae sentis periuria gentis; Troas fortes, ut Troes agunt, princeps turmas inducit Asilas; Hectoreos quoque fortes, ut nunc nunc insurgite remis, Hectorei socii.*
> On the other, the Phrygians: everywhere Virgil assigns even names to the Trojans well, in accordance with the nature of the situation**.** For he calls them 'Phrygians' when timid, as in this passage, and the same at 'Truly you are Phrygian women, for you are not even Phrygian men' (9.617); 'sons of Dardanus' when noble, as in 'Great sons of Dardanus, who draw your high blood from the gods,' (5.45); 'sons of Laomedon' when faithless, as in 'Have you not yet noticed the treacheries of the race of Laomedon' (4.541-2); 'Trojans' when brave, as in 'The Trojans, their squadrons led by their commander Asilas, drove them back,' (11.620**);** 'compatriots of Hector' also when brave, as in 'Now is the time! Now you must rise to your oars, you men who stood with Hector,'(5.189-90).

There is always a temptation to cite Servius when he supports our preferred interpretation, and to remain silent about, or even ridicule him when he disagrees.[14] It must therefore be noted that Servius, or at least another contributor to the commentary which has been transmitted in his name, goes on to contradict at least the *ubique* part of this statement, when he says that the poet 'in other places' uses epithets for the Trojans *indifferenter*, making no distinction between one specific epithet and another.[15] This interpretative escape-clause is consistent with the normalizing, smoothing tendency in Servius' exegesis, most noticeable in the related areas of politico-religious and aesthetic difficulties. Thus, most famously, the troubling description of Juno as *saeuus* is explained away by the spurious claim that the adjective can mean 'mighty'.[16] We may therefore feel justified in privileging Servius' claim that Virgil uses epithets appropriately in all cases over the counterclaim that he

[14] 'They tend to be used opportunistically: quoted if they support an interpretation, ignored if they do not.' Fowler (1997) 75.
[15] *sane alibi indifferenter hoc nomen* [i.e. *Laomedontiadae*] *ex persona poetae ponitur*, Serv. *ad* Verg. *A.* 3.248. Cf. id. *ad*. 7.104. On Virgil's epithets and use of antonomasia, see esp. Klause (1993).
[16] Serv. *ad* Verg. *A.* 1.4, cf. *ad* 1.90, 138, 9.910, 12.107; see also Knox (1996-7), Fowler (1997) 74, Thomas (2001) 93-121, esp. 96-7.

sometimes uses them undifferentiatedly, perhaps with the qualification that the specific appropriateness is often far from obvious and in itself challenges the reader to assess the extent to which, in any particular instance, the Trojans are and are not worthy to be called Phrygians, or Dardans, or Hectoreans. This, of course, adds a further layer of complexity to Silius' use of these epithets, since the reader is challenged to assess, not only to what extent the Romans are and are not defined by their Trojan ancestry, but also how that definition is affected by the further precision of Trojan-as-Oriental, Trojan-as-oathbreaker, or Trojan-as-Hector (an even more complex category).

The final aspect of Silius' use of illegitimate epithets is both a subset of, and encompasses at least part of all the others. Just as in the *Aeneid*, many of the uses of marked epithets are in the voice of characters rather than the narrator. This is particularly so of epithets with a strongly pejorative colour, which are more frequently put in the mouths of hostile characters, as when cheated Dido or the attacked Celaeno evoke the faithlessness of the people of Laomedon, or when Juno or the Orientalizing Numanus Remulus brands the Trojans as Phrygians.[17] On one level, this can serve to undermine the validity of these claims; the use of *Phrygius* in particular can be dismissed as subscribing to a hackneyed Orientalism to which the narrative voice does not subscribe. Yet, the very foregrounding of the way in which such epithets can be used for specific rhetorical effect, how they can be given a particular interpretation by an inset speaker, and finally how that interpretation is subject to contestation and reinterpretation, both by the internal audience and external reader, serves to make the reader examine the validity and meaning of epithets in their wider context. Ascanius undermines the conviction of Numanus' jibe that the Trojans are Phrygian women both by sarcastically appropriating his enemy's words and by returning violent deeds for words but does so with that Oriental weapon, the bow, so that both the uncertain validity and the further implications of the Italian's choice of epithet is dramatized for the reader. She must assess that validity and those further implications in a similar way when the narrative voice itself speaks of Phrygians.

This article will consider one instance of the way in which Silius sets up a parallelism between Troy and Rome, then challenges the reader to assess the degree of similarity and dissimilarity. This tension is initially set up by the inset voice of a hostile character, who uses the epithet *Hectoreus* with a very specific, tendentious interpretation. It is further played out in the narrative, as Silius draws implicit but clear parallels (and contrasts) between Hector and both Regulus and Paulus, which hence draw the same combination of parallel and contrast between Troy and Rome.

2. Regulus and the people of Regulus

As the Carthaginian senate debates whether to accept the Roman demand for a cessation of hostilities against Saguntum, the leader of the anti-Barcid faction, Hanno,[18] argues in favour of peace, citing the might of Rome.[19] He is fiercely opposed

[17] Dido: Verg. *A.* 4.542; Celaeno: 3.248; Juno: 7.294; Numanus: 9.599, 617.

[18] For convenience, I use the more familiar, Latinized form employed by Livy, Valerius Maximus, all other Latin authors, and the majority of modern scholars, though Silius (along with the author of the Livian *periochae*) prefers the Hellenizing *Hannon*.

[19] Polybius mentions no such speech, but Livy has two, on which see Mader (1993) 209-16, Chaplin (2000) 78-9.

by one of Hannibal's partisans, Gestar,[20] who argues, on the contrary, that the Romans are not as tough as has been suggested. His principal *exemplum* of this Roman vincibility is the humiliation and crucifixion of Regulus during the First Punic War (2.340-4):

> *uidi ego, cum, geminas artis post terga catenis*
> *euinctus palmas, uulgo traheretur ouante*
> *carceris in tenebras spes et fiducia gentis*
> *Regulus Hectoreae; uidi, cum robore pendens*
> *Hesperiam cruce sublimis spectaret ab alta*

The emphatic anaphora of *uidi*, coupled with the delayed *ego*, not only gives Gestar's *exemplum* the authority of autopsy, but – like so much in his speech – answers the rhetorical force of Hanno's own exploitation of epanalepsis and autopsy when he reiterated his viewing of acts of Roman courage.[21] However, it is the *exemplum* himself who is notable here. Regulus is, in many ways, the *exemplum* of *exempla*, so used by Cicero and Horace, and explicitly termed as such in the description of Hannibal's shield which almost immediately follows.[22] Above all, and despite Polybius' dissenting voice, he is the *exemplum* of *fides*, faithfulness not only to Rome but to the perfidious Carthaginians themselves. Yet it is not his *fides* which is stressed here, but his weakness, the weakness of the strongest of the Romans, the one in whom the many placed their *fiducia*. His weakness is further suggested by the binding, not of his twin hands, which, if unbound, might be used to fight,[23] but of his twin palms, which, if unbound, might be used to supplicate or pray.[24] His perverted role as both a sacrificial victim and the vanquisher vanquished is further highlighted by the use of *euinctus,* which in verse always refers either to ritual garlanding or to the crowning of the victor: Regulus is not only a lamb to the slaughter but he, who should be riding the chariot in triumph, garlanded with laurel, is dragged behind it bound in chains.[25] If

---

[20] The name is otherwise unattested, except in the *Punica* itself, where it is borne by two Carthaginian soldiers killed respectively by Scipio at Ticinus (4.627) and, taking a spear for Hannibal, by Marcellus at Nola (12.261-5). However, it bears a strong resemblance to the Punic name GR'ŠTRT, 'fearer of Astarte', especially in its variant G'ŠTRT, on which see Benz (1972) 103, 106-7. The Hellenized form, Γηρόστρατος is the name of Alexander's ally, the king of Arados (Arr. 2.13.7, 20.1, *RE* s.v. (2) Supp. IV.689.7-20).

[21] *ipse ego Romanas perfosso corpore turmas | tela intorquentis correpta e uulnere uidi, | uidi animos mortesque uirum decorisque furorem*. 2.322-4. On its further Ennian, Virgilian, and Horatian resonances, see below.

[22] *iuxta triste decus pendet sub imagine poenae |Regulus et fidei dat magna exempla Sagunto*. 2.435-6, with Vessey (1975) 402-3. On Regulus as *exemplum*, see Mix (1970).

[23] Silius' inset narrator of Regulus' story, Marus, using his *exemplum* to very different ends, has the Senate making precisely this antithesis at 6.464-5: *Tyrias tum iustius arcesarsuras dextra, | fuerit quae uincta catenis*.

[24] The reader will notice the contrast more if, as seems likely, she hears an echo of another hero, or in this case two, about to be sacrificed by barbarians, Orestes and Pylades among the Taurians at Ov. *P*. 3.2.72: *euincti geminas ad sua terga manus*; cf. *F*. 1.371 (Proteus). For *palmae* used for grief, prayer, and/or supplication, with *geminus*: Luc. 8.583 (Cornelia), V.Fl. 4.473 (Phineus), Sil. 15.560; with *duplex*: Verg. *A*. 1.93 (Aeneas), 9.16 (Turnus, with Hardie *ad loc*.: '*palmas* is precise: the ancients prayed with hands uplifted and palms upturned to the sky.'); with *ambo*: 10.844-5 (Mezentius), V.Fl. 8.140. Particularly notable are Sinon, who raises his *palmae* in spite of his chains (Verg. *A*. 2.153), Cassandra, who raises her eyes because her *palmae* are chained (2.406) and Jocasta, who, in the midst of her extended supplication of Eteocles, asks whether she will be led in triumph with her *palmae* chained behind her back (Sen. *Phoen*. 577-8).

[25] *TLL* 5.2.1041.41ff: *redimire, coronare sim*. Religious wreathing: (e.g., Verg. *A*. 5.774, 8.286, , Ov. *Am*. 3.6.56, *Met*. 15.676, Stat. *Th*. 1.554, Tac. *Hist*. 4.53.2, *Ann*. 11.4.2. Crowning of victors (in some ways a subset of the previous): Verg. *A*. 5.269, 494, The few exceptions, where it does have the sense *alligare (TLL* ibid. 58ff), almost all have either sacrificial overtones (Orestes at Ov. *P*. 3.2.72, discussed in n.24 above, and also at *Tr*. 4.4b.19) or display in a triumph, contrasting their bonds with the garland of the triumphator (Tib. 1.7.6-7: *euinctos brachia capta duces: | at te uictrices laurus, Messalla, gerentem*; Maltby ad loc. and Günther (1994: 263-4) see a Varronian etymological play on *uictrices* and *euinctos*, but not the contrast in bindings). That the triumphal laurel wreath was held above the head by a slave rather than actually worn seems not to have concerned poets overly.

even he could fall, what chance do the rest of the Romans have? Without their great defender, the city is bound to fall.

By unpacking the (barely) underlying rhetorical thrust of this exemplum, it is immediately clear why Gestar chooses, not a neutral, redundant, excessive, or *indifferens* synonym for Roman, but the term *Hectoreus*, why he carefully enjambs the final, climactic, revelatory naming of *Regulus* and juxtaposes it with the delayed, enclosing *Hectoreae*, before the strong pause at the caesura and the resumption with the anaphora of *uidi*. Regulus, like Hector, was the principal defender of his city; like Hector, he was dragged, *traheretur*;[26] his death, like Hector's, both symbolizes and entails the destruction of his city. This is Gestar's reading of his own parallel between Hector and Regulus, Troy and Rome, and he challenges the reader to assess its validity.

The Hector whom Gestar evokes is not only the defender of Troy in all his various depictions, but most specifically the Hector whose ghost appears to Aeneas in *Aeneid* 2. His designation of Regulus as *spes et fiducia* echoes and even appropriates the half-sleeping Aeneas' address to Hector's ghost, *o lux Dardaniae, spes o fidissima Teucrum*, 'O light of the land of Dardanus, o most reliable hope of the Teucrians' (Verg. *A.* 2.281). The almost oxymoronic concept of 'reliable hope'[27] is prized apart into jarring hendiadys as the uncertainty of hope and the certainty of confidence are uneasily crammed into one body, first Hector, then Regulus-as-Hector, before both hope and confidence are removed with the destruction of their embodiment. The address to Hector as 'light of the land of Dardanus' is itself almost a cliché of describing Hector, already present in (probably) fourth-century tragedy and, most clearly evoked by Cassandra in Ennius' *Alexander*, whose prophetic vision of her brother's death lead her to apostrophize him thus (fr. 72-5 Vahlen):

> *o lux Troiae, germane Hector.*
> *quid ita cum tuo lacerato corpore*
> *miser es, aut qui te sic respectantibus*
> *tractavere nobis?*

Again the emphasis on dragging and on autopsy, also reflected in two fragments of Ennius' *Andromacha*, which, especially as linked by the combinatorial imitation of Virgil and Silius, connect Cassandra's prophetic vision of Hector's death with Andromacha's vivid recall, with the enargeia of memory, of the same scene (fr. 100-1 V):

> *uidi, uidere quod me passa aegerrume,*
> *Hectorem curru quadriiugo raptarier*

---

[26] I am grateful to Tom Murgatroyd for pointing this parallel out to me when I delivered a version of this discussion in Cambridge. *traho* is used in connection with Achilles' mistreatment of Hector's body at Cic. *Tusc.* 1.105 *bis*, Prop. 2.8.38, Ov. *Met.* 12.591, Sen. *Tro.* 189, Stat. *Ach.* 1.6, Auson**.** *Epitaph.* 15.4, Claud. *Carm. min.* 21.98, Hyg. 106.4, 112.2, Serv. *de centum metris ad Albanum* 461.20, though it is matched in popularity by *rapio*, found at Enn. *scaen.* 100, Verg. *A.* 1.483, 2.270-2, Ov. *Am.* 2.1.32, *Tr.* 4.3.30, 5.4.11, Sen. *Tro.* 413-4, *Il. Lat.* 1006, Auson. *Epitaph.* 18.1-3. It is also a close equivalent of ἕλκω (and its cognates), used in this context at Hom. *Il.* 24.15, 52, E. *Andr.* 107-8, Pl. *R.* 391b5, Arist. *Fr.* 3.24.166, Lib. *Or.* 64.68. On the scene's symbolic potential, see Fantham *ad* Sen. *Tro.* 188-9: '[Achilles'] triumphal chariot-ride before the walls of Troy dragging Hector's body, which represents the city's doom (cf. *Il.* 22.395f.) - this association, made in 31 and 124-29, is now an identification.'

[27] *spes o fidissima: bene per contrarium: spes enim semper incerta [[est,]] in Hectore fidissima dicitur.* Serv. *ad loc.*

and the same character's even more visual, *phantasia*-based recollection of the death of Priam (fr. 92-9 V):

> *o pater, o patria: o Priami domus,*
> *saeptum altisono cardine templum,*
> *uidi ego te adstantem ope barbarica*
> *Tectis caelatis laqueatis*
> *auro ebore instructam regifice.*
> *haec omnia uidi inflammari,*
> *Priamo ui uitam euitari,*
> *Iouis aram sanguine turpari.*

Virgil's Aeneas thus makes the connection between the deaths of Hector and Priam as the two which were both instrumental causes and emblematic symbols of the fall of Troy. It is precisely this interpretation of Hector which Gestar applies to Regulus. Although the stress on Hector as light is not as obviously picked up by Gestar, two elements do link Regulus to Hector in this guise. Regulus himself is called the *Italae…lumen gentis* in Marus' book 6 narrative of his career. Even here in book 2, however, we can see a glimmer of the Dardan light in Gestar's use of the so-called *σχῆμα Horatianum*, whereby the unstated half of an antithesis (or, as here, a pair of antitheses) is nevertheless implied.[28] As the hope and confidence enters the darkness of prison, the reader feels the residual sense that the light is entering the despair of prison.

Unlike the poet, the character Gestar has a clear, if subtle, agenda behind his choice of ethnic epithet; he knows what he thinks it means and he knows how he wants his readers and listeners to interpret it. Unlike the poet, Gestar appears to be unaware that meaning is generated at the point of reception and that his parallel, quite apart from its potential to be undermined and proven false, can be accepted but interpreted in a different way. Underlying the parallelism between Regulus and Hector is, of course, the familiar parallelism between Rome and Troy. Gestar's assertion of the weak, 'Trojan' side of Rome's character is half of a two-part re-performance of Numanus Remulus' primitivist rant in *Aeneid* 9: Hanno emphasizes the tough, manly, Italian aspect of their character (glorified by Remulus) as a reason not to fight them; Gestar stresses the unwarlike, effeminate, Trojan side (which Remulus had so denigrated) as a reason why they can and must be fought and defeated. The debate crystallizes the conflict in the poem between whether Rome's character is more influenced by her Trojan or her Italian ancestry and, moreover, what is at stake in deciding between the two: once again the question is posed, what does it *mean* to describe Rome as Trojan, and here it is focused through the narrower question of what it means to parallel Regulus and Hector.

This question is played out at considerable length, as I shall discuss elsewhere, both in the way in which the speeches of Hanno and Gestar engage with their privileged intertexts, Virgil's Drances and Turnus, Numanus Remulus, and Horace's Regulus in *Odes* 3.5, and as the implications of Regulus simultaneously as and as not a Hector-figure are played out in Marus' book 6 narrative. However, here I wish to focus on another character whose role as (and as not) a Hector-figure, though it is not made as (more or less) directly as Gestar does with Regulus, is nevertheless clear to the reader. Such identifications, and their problematizations, are brought to the

[28] Schmidt (1990), e.g. 68, unpacking *Carm.* 2.3.9 as *quo pinus ingens <et nigra> albaque <et gracilis> populus.*

forefront of the reader's attention at least in part by the use of illegitimate epithets by Silius and his characters such as Gestar.

3. Paulus and the people of Paulus

Silius' depiction of L. Aemilius Paulus, the consul of 216 B.C., repeatedly sets up echoes and parallels of the Homeric, Virgilian, and other Hectors, echoes and parallels which characters, most notably Hannibal, interpret or misinterpret as entailing the end of his city.[29] However, as with all such parallels, the differences are as important as the similarities; Paulus is a sort of Hector and indeed his death is associated, even identified, with a massive defeat, which is figured like the sack of a city; yet Rome does not fall like Troy, and the reader must use the differences and similarities between Hector and Paulus to help her interpret those between the two cities. Much of this rests on the decision of Paulus, like Hector, to stand and face death rather than to return to the city, particularly in contrast to his colleague Varro, who, like Aeneas, flees. In conventional terms – and indeed in the dominant, moralizing voice of the narrator – the contrast between the two consuls is a clear, even simplistic one, between cowardice and courage, demagoguery and nobility. Ahl, Davis and Pomeroy (1986: 2536) sum it up very nicely:

> 'We have, then, in Silius' narrative of Cannae, two paradigms of Roman conduct, one glorious, one shameful. The cautious, if acerbic, Paulus who can beg for Rome's welfare with tears in his eyes is capable of achieving the most impressive *aristeia* in the epic. Varro, wild and dishonest in words and strategy, is helpless upon the battlefield and thus devoid of *virtus* of any kind whatsoever [sc. unlike the demagogic but courageous Flaminius]. The two consuls of 216 B.C. show, as does the battle for which the year is famous, Rome simultaneously at its best and at its worst.'

It is hard to disagree. Indeed, I am not going to propose a revisionist reading which makes a hero of Varro and a villain of Paulus. Yet there are constant suggestions that, for all their conventional virtue and vice, there is something praiseworthy and, less abstractly, something which helps to save Rome, in Varro's flight, just as there is something self-centred and destructive in Paulus' commitment to death. Ahl, Davis, and Pomeroy catch the paradox of Cannae beautifully, and Silius himself will insist on that paradox that Rome's greatest defeat was her finest hour, but I would argue that the paradox goes deeper than that, that the best and worst of Rome are not simply allotted to Paulus and Varro respectively, but that they simultaneously exist in each of them and even in the single most significant decision each makes, to fight and to flee.

I shall deal with Varro in more detail elsewhere when I consider the significance of his return to Rome and why Silius, using another illegitimate epithet, chooses that moment to call it the city of the people of Laomedon, but the depiction of Paulus' death as simultaneously a heroic self-sacrifice and a self-glorifying, despairing, selfish, act is largely played out through his depiction as (like and unlike) Hector, and a series of other characters intertextual with them both. Before we turn to

[29] On Silius' Paulus: von Albrecht (1964) 76-7, Kißel (1979) 123-7, Ahl-Davis-Pomeroy (1986) 2531-6.

Hector, however, it will be instructive briefly to compare some aspects of the treatment of Paulus' death in other sources.

One aspect which, significantly, the Livian (but not the Silian) Paulus has in common with Hector is that he is a delayer. When he and his cavalry lose their horses, he and they heroically continue to fight a cavalry battle on foot, preferring (as in Silius) to die where they stand than flee, but crucially delaying the Carthaginian victory.[30] The death of Paulus marks for Livy the end of Cannae, even more clearly than in Silius, and a significant part of his summary of the battle is the contrast with the other great Roman defeat at the Allia, where the flight of the army betrayed the city but saved itself, whereas at Cannae the army was almost entirely destroyed.[31] Livy leaves unstated the antithesis that the army's self-sacrifice at Cannae saved the city, but this fits with an implicit paralleling with the delaying self-sacrifice of the Spartans at Thermopylae.[32] Indeed, Livy's Paulus self-consciously adapts Simonides' famous epitaph on the 300 in his last message to be taken by Lentulus to Fabius (Liv. 22.49.10 ~ *AP* 7.228 = Simon. 7.249)

> *abi, nuntia…priuatim Q. Fabio L. Aemilium praeceptorum eius memorem et uixisse adhuc et mori.*
> Go, give this message in private to Quintus Fabius, that Lucius Aemilius both lived up to this point and died mindful of his instructions.

> ὦ ξεῖν', ἀγγέλλειν Λακεδαιμονίοις ὅτι τῇδε
> κείμεθα, τοῖς κείνων ῥήμασι πειθόμενοι.
> Stranger, tell the Spartans that we lie here, after obeying their instructions.

This motif of delay is one which we might expect Silius to exploit with Paulus, especially since it fits with his paralleling of the consul with both Fabius and Hector. Yet the emphasis, as we shall see, is not on a delaying action which will in some way save or at least help the city, but rather on a combination of despairing death-wish and on the desire for glory.

Such an interpretation of Paulus' death might also be found in a tendentious – or perhaps a straightforward – reading of his entry among the men whom Horace might praise in *Odes* 1.12: *animaeque magnae | prodigum Paulum superante Poeno*. As Nisbet and Hubbard point out, *prodigus* is 'normally pejorative' though of course it 'is here used in a good sense', while Porphyrio concurs, saying that the phrase must be understood as 'despising his life', *prodigi* being, etymologically, those who throw their goods away from themselves.[33] Certainly the reception of the phrase tends to give it an at worst neutral sense, as in Ovid's Gallus, Statius' Maeon, and Silius' own euthanasia-practising Spaniards, but even here, as the *TLL* notes, there is that suggestion of prodigality, not of counting life as cheap because cheap it is, but of

[30] *equitum pedestre proelium, quale iam haud dubia hostium uictoria, fuit, cum uicti mori in uestigio mallent quam fugere, uictores morantibus uictoriam irati trucidarent quos pellere non poterant*. Liv. 22.49.4.
[31] *fuga namque ad Alliam sicut urbem prodidit, ita exercitum seruauit: ad Cannas fugientem consulem uix quinquaginta secuti sunt, alterius morientis prope totus exercitus fuit*. Liv. 22.
[32] It is interesting to note that the fragment of Arbonius Silo (*FRP* fr. 195 Hollis) which terms Hector *belli mora* is preserved in the elder Seneca's discussion of Porcius Latro's *suasoria* on the 300,
[33] *animae ergo prodigum 'contemptorem uitae' intellegendum. prodigi enim dicuntur proprie, qui bona sua a se dispergunt, quasi porro ea ab se agentes*. Porphyr. *ad* Hor. *Carm.* 1.12.37.

undervaluing it and throwing it away, even though you owe it to others.[34] The characteristic Horatian pregnancy of the ablative absolute *superante Poeno* also suggests further meanings; not only might it diminish the grandeur of Paulus' careless gesture, since he made it in a context where he was already defeated (*OLD* s.v. *supero* 4) but also, perhaps, that he threw his life away while the Carthaginians survived (*OLD* 7b), a continuing threat to Rome which perhaps Paulus ought to have lived on to face. These are, of course, secondary meanings, but they are not inconsistent with the unsettling catalogue which notoriously includes Tarquinius Superbus and Cato, and most importantly, they are available for Silius to activate by his tendentious reception of them, both on the large canvas of his narrative of Cannae and in the small detail of having Voluptas claim that Virtus prodigally threw away Paulus' life.[35] The *Punica* does not, any more than the *Odes*, condemn Paulus, but it doesjust suggest that the life which he threw away as 'twere a careless trifle was one which he owed to Rome.

There is a danger here of simplistically transforming Silius' Paulus from hero to villain, but the complexity of his depiction demands that the reader holds in her mind the paradox that Paulus' act was noble and selfish, brought destruction and salvation, and that Varro's flight, despite the conventional condemnation of such an action, had the same paradoxical combination of qualities and effects. That Varro's flight was, or at least could be interpreted as, more noble, or at least more *constans*, than Paulus' death may be deduced, not only from a dense intertextual reading of *Punica* 8-10, but also from the explicit assertion of Frontinus in his list of *exempla* of *constantia* (*Strat*. 4.5.5-6):

> *L. Paulus, amisso ad Cannas exercitu, offerente equom Lentulo, quo fugeret, superesse cladi quamquam non per ipsum contractae noluit, sed in eo saxo, cui se uulneratus acclinauerat, persedit, donec ab hostibus oppressus confoderetur.*
> *Varro, collega eius, uel maiore constantia post eandem cladem uixit gratiaeque ei a senatu et populo actae sunt, quod non desperasset rem publicam. Non autem uitae cupiditate, sed rei publicae amore se superfuisse reliquo aetatis suae tempore approbauit: et barbam capillumque summisit et postea numquam recubans cibum cepit; honoribus quoque, cum ei deferrentur a populo, renuntiauit, dicens felicioribus magistratibus rei publicae opus esse.*

Here we have praise of both consuls, but, inevitably, the greater praise of Varro, based on his survival and refusal to despair of the state, must imply that these things

---

[34] *TLL* 10.2.1613.3ff *speciatim respiciuntur qui uitam impendunt, se periculis offerunt sim.* Ov. *Am*. 3.9.64, Stat. *Theb*. 3.69 (*uitae* for *animae*), Sil. 1.225. *TLL* ibid. *hic illic sublucet respectus perdendi*, though the prime example given, Macrob. 7.3.21, has quite the opposite sense, since it describes the ironic, bantering criticism which criticizes a brave man for holding his life cheaply and dying for others, but of course implies the opposite. Cf. *TLL* ibid.26ff *qui perdunt, male consumunt uel contemnunt*. Sen. *Dial*. 10.1.4 (*non accipimus breuem uitam, sed facimus, nec inopes eius sed prodigi sumus*) refers to wasting life as a finite and usable length of time, rather than as a single entity which can be preserved or wasted, but it does suggest a witty manipulation of the Horatian motif.

[35] This witty variation has Voluptas argue to Scipio that Virtus has wastefully sent his father and uncle, Paulus, and the Decii down to the underworld: *haec patrem patruum que tuos, haec prodiga Paulum, | haec Decios Stygias Erebi detrusit ad undas, | dum cineri titulum memoranda que nomina bustis | praetendit nec sensurae, quod gesserit, umbrae*. 15.42-5. Her (upper and lower case Epicurean) contrast is, of course, of the courageous, but futile and very final death, with the life of pleasure, rather with the courageous life, preserved to serve one's country, but its colouring of its Horatian intertext does show how Paulus' prodigality with his life, just like Virtus', can be interpreted, not as gloriously indifferent, but perniciously wasteful.

were lacking in Paulus, who was thus less *constans*. Frontinus also acknowledges and refutes the obvious charge that Varro fled out of a love of life, thus foregrounding the unconventional code whereby, in certain circumstances, flight is not cowardice, but courage. We shall return to Varro's flight from Cannae and return *to* Rome, but now let us examine Paulus' death, its parallels and contrasts with Hector's, and the implications for the interpretation of Trojan Rome.

4. Fear and loathing in Rome

We have already seen that Paulus' decision to stand and die at Cannae is depicted in Silius as deriving, not so much from a desire to delay the enemy or otherwise save the city, but from a combination of a despairing death-wish and a desire for a glorious death, a *mors pulchra*. The death-wish might make one think of the Lucanian notion of the city and its citizens determined to destroy themselves in civil war, with the notion of suicide as a trope for the city's attack on itself.[36] The parallelism between Lucan's depiction of the genuinely suicidal Vulteius and the recklessly self-sacrificing Scaeva (whom we shall compare to Paulus below) demonstrates their interchangeability, as does the book 1 simile comparing the reckless Caesar to a suicidal lion, a simile drawn from *Aeneid* 9 and re-used, with its Lucanian taint, to describe Paulus at the opening of *Punica* 10.[37] However, the death-wish is most explicitly described at the opening of the second, and final, part of Paulus' *aristeia* (10.217-18):

pereundi Martius ardor
atque animos iam sola dabat fiducia mortis,

Silius, by means of combinatorial imitation, makes the connection between Scaeva, whose *mortis amor* he wittily rephrases as *pereundi ardor*, with Vulteius and his men, whose suicidal despair enables them to maintain a prodigious defence against the Pompeians (just as Paulus embarks on a prodigious offensive), *tanta est fiducia mortis*.[38] The intratextual echo of Minucius' self-destructive (and civil war-like) rush to engage Hannibal - *perdendi simul et pereundi ardebat amore* – reinforces the sense that Paulus' suicidal death-wish may destroy not only himself but also the city. It might be objected, of course, that the perversion of self-sacrifice and of *uirtus* more generally is a function of the paradoxical world of Lucanian civil war, but the world of the *Punica*, where defeat constitutes victory and vice versa, is no less paradoxical, and only a little less concerned with civil war.

The other half of Paulus' motivation, the desire for a glorious and honourable death, has of course its negative counterpart, the desire to avoid the shame which would attend survival. The notion that Paulus, like Hector, might put, not just the positive desire for glory, but the negative fear of shame, ahead of the safety of his city

[36] The *locus classicus* is Luc. 1.2-3: *populumque potentem | in sua uictrici conuersum uiscera dextra*. On the motif in Lucan, see Rutz (1960), Masters (1992) 37-8, 41-2, Leigh (1997) 217-20, Hill (2004) 213-37. On its reception in Flavian epic, see Marks (2005b) 130-4.

[37] Scaeva and Vulteius: Rutz (1960) 466-7, Ahl (1976) 117-21, Leigh (1997) 218-20. Simile: Luc. 1.205-12, Verg. *A*. 12.4-8, Sil. 10.2-5, with Masters (1992) 2 n5, Leigh (1997) 217-8.

[38] Scaeva: Luc. 6.246; Vulteius: 4.538; on combinatorial imitation, see Hardie (1989). For death-wish as an alternative interpretation of the impulse to *deuotio* (on which see more below), cf. Creon to the dead Menoeceus: *unde hic mortis amor?* Stat. *Theb*. 10.804.

is also hinted at long before the battle, in the description of his failure to argue effectively against Varro's proposal to fight at Cannae (8.284-92):

> *cernebat Paulus (namque huic communia Campus*
> *iura atque arma tulit) labi mergente sinistro*
> *consule res pessumque dari, sed mobilis ira est*
> *turbati uulgi, signataque mente cicatrix*
> *undantis aegro frenabat corde dolores.*
> *nam cum perdomita est armis iuuenilibus olim*
> *Illyris ora uiri, nigro adlatrauerat ore*
> *uictorem inuidia et uentis iactarat iniquis.*
> *hinc inerat metus et durae reuerentia plebis.*

This motif of Paulus' fear of the plebs is far more heavily stressed by Silius than in other sources. Livy mentions the prosecution of his colleague, M. Livius Salinator, after their consulate of 219 B.C. and the Illyrian expedition against Demetrius of Pharus, and how Paulus himself had escaped it 'almost singed' (*ex qua prope ambustus euaserat*), but this has the effect of making him, not afraid of the plebs, but hostile to them (*infestum plebi*) in the grand manner of haughty Livian patricians.[39] Indeed, so far from keeping silent from fear of the plebs, Livy's Paulus upbraids them in a speech 'more honest than pleasing to the people' (*uerior quam gratior populo*). Only in his final speech to Lentulus before dying does he express a preference for death over being put on trial again as consul.[40] Polybius' Paulus is looked to by everyone as the greatest hope because of his nobility in general and in particular *because* of his success against the Illyrians.[41] Only in Plutarch do we get a suggestion before the battle that Paulus' self-interested fear of the people might lead him to risk the city rather than his own status by engaging in battle, but he rejects this, insisting that, since the *res publica* is in the situation it is, he will follow Fabius' advice rather than bow to the mob.[42]

Silius' Paulus, on the other hand, has a clear perception that Varro's policy will bring disaster to the city, but his fear of the people prevents him from intervening. Even his ostensibly noble rejection of Lentulus' offer to help him escape from Cannae is couched in terms of his honour and his shame (10.283-9):

> *amplius acta*
> *quid superest uita, nisi caecae ostendere plebi*
> *Paulum scire mori? feror an consumptus in urbem*
> *uulneribus? quantine emptum uelit Hannibal, ut nos*

[39] Liv. 22.35.3. On various reasons for Salinator's prosecution, see Front. *Str*. 4.1.45,

[40] *me in hac strage militum meorum patere exspirare, ne aut reus iterum e consulatu sim [aut] accusator collegae exsistam ut alieno crimine innocentiam meam protegam*. Liv. 22.49.11.

[41] συνέβαινε δὲ πάντας εἰς τὸν Αἰμίλιον ἀποβλέπειν καὶ πρὸς τοῦτον ἀπερείδεσθαι τὰς πλείστας ἐλπίδας διά τε τὴν ἐκ τοῦ λοιποῦ βίου καλοκἀγαθίαν καὶ διὰ τὸ μικροῖς πρότερον χρόνοις ἀνδρωδῶς ἅμα καὶ συμφερόντως δοκεῖν κεχειρικέναι τὸν πρὸς Ἰλλυριοὺς πόλεμον. Polyb. 3.107.8. In general, the conflict between Paulus and Varro in Polybius is over the tactical conduct of the battle itself (3.110.2-10) and not the strategic decision to face Hannibal in battle at all, which is in fact made, not by the demagogic consul, but by the senate (3.107.7); in the light of conditions on the ground, however, Paulus does decide against battle (3.110.8). Appian even more strongly has the Romans asking the consuls to decide the war in battle rather than wear out the city with delay and hunger (*Hann*. 75), though his Paulus is more generally opposed to battle (78). Ennius' Paulus was clearly opposed to battle: *Ann*. 258-62 Sk.

[42] ἐμοὶ μὲν ὦ Φάβιε τὰ ἐμαυτοῦ σκοποῦντι κρεῖττόν ἐστι τοῖς τῶν πολεμίων ὑποπεσεῖν δόρασιν ἢ πάλιν ταῖς ψήφοις τῶν πολιτῶν· εἰδ' οὕτως ἔχει τὰ δημόσια πράγματα, πειράσομαι μᾶλλον σοὶ δοκεῖν ἀγαθὸς εἶναι στρατηγὸς ἢ πᾶσι τοῖς ἄλλοις ἐπὶ τἀναντία βιαζομένοις. Plut. *Fab*. 14.7.

uertentis terga aspiciat? nec talia Paulo
pectora, nec manis tam parua intramus imago.
ille ego--

He will die, with all the dangers which that may or may not entail for Rome, so that he can show the blind plebs that he knows how to die, so that he will not be the object of their and Hannibal's derisory gaze. Silius here does have some Livian authority, since, as we have seen, his Paulus fears being a defendant for a second time on leaving his consulship (22.49.11), but primarily this is the Hector who twice, once to his wife at the Scaean gate, once to himself awaiting Achilles, expresses his fear of shame, of being an object of derision to the Trojan men and women, and especially to one κακώτερος than him, of lower social status, one of the plebs (Hom. *Il.* 22.105-7):

αἰδέομαι Τρῶας καὶ Τρῳάδας ἑλκεσιπέπλους,
μή ποτέ τις εἴπῃσι κακώτερος ἄλλος ἐμεῖο·
Ἕκτωρ ἦφι βίηφι πιθήσας ὤλεσε λαόν.

Of course, unlike Hector, it was not Paulus' direct action which brought the city to this pass; indeed, in the complex dividing and combining of epic models, Paulus played the sensible Polydamas to Varro's reckless Hector. Yet, at this point, when Paulus is faced with the alternatives of Hector, to flee and save the city, or stand and save his honour in the eyes of the people, he makes the choice of Hector. The concern for an ostentatiously noble, exemplary death might also make us think of another avatar of both Paulus and Hector, Lucan's Pompey, who urges himself to take consideration of his fame.[43] The little man, Paulus, will not be go down to the underworld as a little ghost, a *parua imago*, but as a replica of Magnus. To Paulus and Pompey, and to Paulus, Pompey, and Hector, we shall return later.

5. Should I stay or should I go?

Paulus is set up, like Hector and Regulus, as a syndecdochic hero, one man who stands for the many, and whose destruction can therefore represent or even entail the destruction of the many.[44] Just as Gestar describes Regulus as the 'hope and reliance', *spes et fiducia*, of the people of Hector, so Paulus is twice addressed as *spes unica*, a phrase also used to describe that other bulwark of the Roman people Fabius (7.1). In both instances, the argument that he is the sole hope for Rome is used to try to persuade Paulus to leave the battlefield at Cannae, and in both instances he refuses. Yet the contexts of these two addresses is vital. The first is when Juno, concerned that Paulus might harm her favourite, Hannibal, disguises herself as L. Caecilius Metellus and urges the consul to save himself and, with him, Rome (10.47-58):

in faciem pauidi Iuno conuersa Metelli
'quid uanos,' inquit 'Latio spes unica consul,
incassumque moues fato renuente furores?

[43] *nunc consule famae*. Luc. 8.624, On this speech (8.622-35), see Feeney (1986a) 241, Johnson (1987) 79-81, Leigh (1997) 183 n.36.
[44] The term 'synecdochic hero' was coined by Hardie (1993: 4) and has achieved a degree of currency: Leigh (1997) 148-56, Morgan (1999) 42-3, Dinter (2005) 158, Behr (2007) 159.

si superest Paulus, restant Aeneia regna;
sin secus, Ausoniam tecum trahis. ire tumentem
tu contra iuuenem et caput hoc abscidere rebus
turbatis, o Paule, paras? nunc Hannibal ipsi
(tam laetus bello est) ausit certare Tonanti.
et iam conuersis (uidi nam flectere) habenis
euasit Varro ac sese ad meliora reseruat.
sit spatium fatis, et, dum datur, eripe leto
hanc nostris maiorem animam: mox bella capesses.'

Needless to say the sentiments are coloured by the speaker. In the first place, this is a deceptive speech delivered by Rome's principal divine enemy with a view to saving, not Paulus, but Hannibal *from* Paulus; two principal epic models stand behind the scene:[45] Juturna disguised as Metiscus likewise trying to keep her brother from the final, fatal duel, and Athene disguised as Deiphobus, trying (and succeeding) to make Hector stop and face the final, fatal duel.[46] We shall look more closely at the implications of the intertextuality with these scenes, but in addition, Juno's chosen mouthpiece is a figure whom the narrator marks as fearful and whose only other contribution to the narrative is to advocate abandoning Rome and eventually, after Marcellus' victory at Nola, to be punished for it by demotion to the rank of *tribunus aerarius*.[47] He is thus marked as a man whose philosophical unsoundness, tendency to cowardice and despair, and lack of understanding about the nature of Rome, routinely lead him to advocate flight.[48] Metellus' despair makes him an enemy of Rome, in effect a Carthaginian.[49] Juno-Metellus' belief, or attempt to convince Paulus, that he is a synecdochic hero, whose fate is interchangeable with that of his city is thus tainted, not only by the goddess' ulterior motive, but by the mortal's proclivity to despairing flight.

However, for all the hostility of Juno's intent, and the taint of Metellus as a mouthpiece, her arguments are far from uncompelling. We shall explore their full implications further below, but for now, let us note a few of the points which Juno-Metellus makes to persuade Paulus to flee rather than to stay and die. Firstly, and most importantly, he sets him up as a synecdochic hero, whose fate is quite explicitly, not merely of immense importance to the fate of Rome, but identical to it: if Paulus lives, Rome survives; if he dies, he drags it down with him (50-1). This concept is more allusively reinforced by the image of Paulus preparing, by attacking Hannibal at

[45] There is also a hint of the false Aeneas which Juno sends to lure Turnus from the battlefield and this prolong his life, esp. in the verbal echo *in faciem Aeneae…* (10.637), but the difference between a disguised god giving advice and an *eidolon* acting as a decoy makes this a faint echo. Silius will replay this scene more closely when Juno creates a false Scipio to lure Turnus from Zama (17.522-80), though there too doubling occurs, as Juno follows up the *effigies* ruse by disguising herself as a shepherd and again luring Hannibal from battle.

[46] Juhnke (1972) 213 398: 'bezeichnet sowohl stärker abweichende, aber gesichert erscheinende als aus fragliche Nachbildung homerischen Gutes.'

[47] Plan to leave Rome (and Scipio's foiling thereof): 10.415-48 (cf. Liv. 22.53.4-13, V.Max. 5.6.7) Punishment: 12.304-5; Silius gives more details than *punitur*, but the punishment is described at Liv. 24.18.6. On the appropriate choice of Metellus: Niemann (1975) 222 n.2

[48] Metellus' plan aligns him with the misguided Bullatius in Hor. *Ep.* 1.11, his despair with the speaker of *Epod.* 17 who advocates flight to the Isles of the Blessed, his failure to understand that Rome (unlike Nicias' Athens) is its walls and not its people without walls, with those tribunes whose proposal to move to Veii after the Gallic sack Camillus so effectively opposes (Liv. 5.51-4). On the implications of the site of Rome and of alleged plans to move it, see esp. Ceauşescu (1976), Kraus (1994).

[49] Livy describes the conspirators' fear of Scipio as *haud secus pauidi quam si uictorem Hannibalem cererent* (23.53.13). Silius plays with this notion, first saying that Scipio approached as immense as when he stood against Hannibal (10.427-8), and then having him claim that, if they do not forswear their plan, he will be the Hannibal they fear (442-4).

the height of his *aristeia*, to cut this head off the republic when it is already in turmoil.[50] This equation of Paulus with the metaphorical head of the body of state will gain further resonance as Silius parallels his death with those of the beheaded, synecdochic Priam and Pompey. Secondly, the key contrast with Paulus' colleague Varro is already set up: Varro has turned his reins around, again combining the physical action of steering his horse with the metaphorical change of direction in military and political policy.[51] Paulus is urged, like Aeneas in Troy, to snatch himself away, and, like Varro, to preserve himself for better times.[52]

For all that, Juno's lack of both tact and tactical awareness leads to failure, so she once more adopts the guise of a mortal, this time the Moor Gelesta, and successfully lures Hannibal to safety with the time-honoured ruse that Paulus is 'over there'.[53] The apparently arbitrary and redundant doubling of this episode – two Junonian interventions for the price of one – subtly dramatizes the complex operation of the ebb and flow of the battle: Hannibal cannot be saved by appealing to the cowardice of Paulus, but only – paradoxically – through his own courage. This doubling also establishes the basis for a more significant doubling of the Juno-Metellus scene, when a real Roman, Cn. Cornelius Lentulus, similarly urges Paulus to flee from the battlefield. This episode has an antecedent in Livy, as we have seen and it will be particularly instructive to note the differences in Silius treatment.[54] (10.260-75)

> *ecce, Cydonea uiolatus harundine plantam,*
> *Lentulus effusis campum linquebat habenis,*
> *cum uidet in scopulo rorantem saxa cruore*
> *toruoque obtutu labentem in Tartara Paulum.*
> *mens abiit, puduitque fugae. tum uisa cremari*
> *Roma uiro, tunc ad portas iam stare cruentus*
> *Hannibal; Aetoli tum primum ante ora fuere*
> *sorbentes Latium campi. 'Quid deinde relictum*
> *crastina cur Tyrios lux non deducat ad urbem,*
> *deseris in tantis puppim si, Paule, procellis?*
> *testor caelicolas,' inquit 'ni damna gubernas*
> *crudelis belli uiuisque in turbine tanto*
> *inuitus, plus, Paule, (dolor uerba aspera dictat)*
> *plus Varrone noces. cape, quaeso, hunc, unica rerum*
> *fessarum spe<s>, cornipedem. languentia membra*
> *ipse leuabo umeris et dorso tuta locabo.'*

---

[50] 10.51-3. I take *rebus turbatis* as dative of disadvantage and *rebus* as plural for singular representing *rei (publicae)*, but it could equally by ablative absolute, 'when the state (or even 'affairs') are in turmoil', with the state whose head is being cut off understood.

[51] Reins of power: *OLD* s.v. 2b, *TLL* 6.2394.3ff. Silius is particularly fond of this metaphor: 1.144, 2.292, 6.611, 7.222, 384, 11.50.17.175, and, at 10.282, Paulus will hand over the *habenae* of power to Fabius. The image has further relevance to Varro since he, in an echo of the simile at the end of *Georgics* 1, was compared before the battle to an inexperienced charioteer who *totas effundit habenas* (8.279). We might finally note that the heroic Lentulus, before he spotted the ailing Paulus, *effusis campum linquebat habenis* (10.261).

[52] 10.56-8. Cf. Verg. *A.* 2.289 (Hector): *'heu fuge, nate dea, te que his' ait 'eripe flammis.*'; 2.619 (Venus): '*eripe, nate, fugam*'.

[53] 10. 83-91. Häußler (1978: 202) is amused by the goddess' ineptitude: 'Was sich Metellus von Paulus sagen lassen muß, ist so wenig schmeichelhaft, daß sich Juno zu einer neuen Inkarnation – diesmal auf der Gegenseite – entschließt.' On Gelesta, see also Ramaglia (1952) 42, Niemann (1975) 225, Kißel (1979) 23-4.

[54] Liv. 22.49.6-13; the incident is also reported in Plu. *Fab.* 15.7-9/183e-f. On the Silian scene, see von Albrecht (1964) 121-2, Niemann (1975) 241-4, Ahl-Davis-Pomeroy (1986) 2535-6, Ripoll (1998) 61.

As we shall see, Lentulus here plays the role of the Virgilian Saces, balancing Juno-Metellus' re-enactment of Juturna-Metiscus. But Paulus is far more Hector than he is Turnus, and Lentulus also combines (partly *through* Saces) several characters who try to persuade Hector to go inside the walls – Andromache, Polydamas, Hecabe, above all Priam – with the real Deiphobus for whom he mistakes the disguised Athene.

As with Juno-Metellus, we shall return to the effects of these intertextual complications, but once more let us briefly examine what Lentulus sees and what he says to Paulus, more or less on its own terms. Like Juno-Metellus, he equates Paulus with Rome, in that, when he sees the consul slipping down to the underworld, by a sort of *phantasia* he sees Rome in flames and Hannibal at the gates: the death of the consul *is* the fall of the city. The language Lentulus uses is harsh and paradoxical, but extremely effective in expressing the paradox of the situation: if Paulus is indeed the synecdochic hero, who by living or dying will effect the survival or sack of the city, then to stay and die at Cannae is to 'desert' Rome, while to flee, to survive, and hence to enable Rome to survive, is, paradoxically, to stand firm by one's duty in this confused situation. Harsher and more paradoxical still – and Silius prepares the reader for this by making Lentulus prepare Paulus (and himself) with an apologetic parenthesis – is the suggestion that, even though it is against his will, if Paulus does not live and steer the ship of state, he will be more guilty and do more harm than Varro (for both senses of *noceo* are operative here).[55] This is a pointed, rather Lucanian paradox, but that should only reinforce its power to express the paradox of the situation: if Paulus is a synecdochic hero then, by wilfully dying and hence destroying the city, he is more guilty and does more harm than the man who led Rome to this disaster and then fled. In these exceptional circumstances, Lentulus, despite being ashamed at his own flight, asserts that the consul's flight would be virtue, but standing, fighting, and dying would be vice.

Here, then, we have a second figure urging Paulus to flee and being rebuffed. As with the 'Metellus' and 'Gelesta' scenes, the reader must wonder why Silius has doubled up.[56] At least there Juno changed persona, target, and tactic, at the same time changing failure into success and saving Hannibal; Lentulus, like 'Metellus', urges the same man, Paulus, to leave because he is the one hope for Rome, and, like 'Metellus', he fails. The only differences are in the persona of the persuader and in Paulus' reaction. Niemann succinctly states the problem, but only partially solves it:

> 'Both situations represent a temptation for Paulus to be untrue to his character. The contrast between the two scenes lies in the fact that 'Metellus' makes a negative impression on Paulus, and Lentulus, in contrast, a positive one. That has its deeper reasons in the different character of Juno-Metellus' and of Lentulus' speeches: while in the first case it is an enemy of Rome, disguised as a Roman, who speaks, in the

[55] For unwitting guilt, see esp. Sen. *Ep*. 81.5 and *Pho*. 451-4. The latter, intriguingly, comes from Jocasta's speech to her sons, offering herself as a sacrifice at the hands of both armies; her reference to *error* making people guilty against their will refers to her own (unwitting and hence unwilled) incest, but it is set in antithesis with the crime which – thanks to her warning (like Lentulus' to Paulus – Eteocles and Polynices will commit *scientes*.

[56] Juhnke (1974: 213) suggests that the double appearance of Juno reflects the double appearance of Athene, to Achilles and (as Deiphobus) to Hector, but the latter's greeting of the favourite *in propria persona* and the disguised deception of the enemy has a markedly different feel to the former's repeated, disguised attempts to keep Hannibal away from Paulus. On the undeniable significance of 'Deiphobus' to the Metellus scene, however, see below. On doubling in post-Virgilian epic, see esp. Hardie (1993), esp. 19-56.

> second, it is a real Roman who speaks; what one means insincerely, the other means sincerely.'[57]

This is well-observed and nicely summed up, but it leaves the troubling question as to how the same advice, expressed in very similar terms, can be given by an enemy of Rome in the persona of a light-heeled coward and a courageous Roman hailed as the hope of the city. Most pointedly, how can Paulus upbraid one as *degener altae / uirtutis patrum* (10.68-9) and laud the other, for making the same suggestion, with the exclamation '*macte o uirtute paterna!*' (277)? Part of the answer lies in the impossibility of an answer. The question posed is not merely 'how can Juno-Metellus and Lentulus give the same advice?' but 'what are the rights and wrongs of courageous self-sacrifice as against cowardly flight, or of futile, despairing, glory-seeking self-destruction as against enduring, hopeful survival?' We shall return to the complexities of this debate, but much of that complexity derives from the way in which Silius synthesizes, combines, and re-divides his allusions to earlier epic meditations on the same question, all of which relate, directly or at one step removed, to the figure of Hector.

6. Homeric resoundings

Hector, as we have seen, is the defender of Troy, the synecdochic hero who keeps the city standing by his very existence. The flip side of this is, of course, that his death entails the destruction of Troy, and any decision – direct or indirect – which leads to that death makes him – directly or indirectly – culpable for that destruction. This idea is most clearly expressed by Hector himself in his great monologue, waiting for Achilles outside Troy: ὤλεσα λαὸν ἀτασθαλίῃσιν ἐμῇσιν.[58] As we have noted, the advice of Juno-Metellus and Lentulus combines (and, of course, re-divides into two) that of the various characters who try to persuade Hector to go inside the walls, Andromache, Polydamas, Hecabe, and Priam.[59] It is perhaps Priam's speech which resonates most with Paulus' situation. His emphasis on the martial superiority of Achilles (πολὺ φέρτερός ἐστι, 22.40)[60] is echoed by Juno-Metellus' on Hannibal's (current) prowess (10.51-4). The consequence of Hector's death is the sack of the city, with all the horrors which accompany that; Priam visualizes them, as the scholiasts note, just as the sight of the dying Paulus causes Lentulus to visualize the fall of Rome.[61]

More pertinent to the ethical issue of flight or fight is his entreaty to Hector: ἀλλ' εἰσέρχεο τεῖχος ἐμὸν τέκος, ὄφρα σαώσῃς / Τρῶας καὶ Τρῳάς (22.56-7).

---

[57] 'Beide Situationen stellen für Paulus eine Versuchung dar, seiner Gesinnung untreu zu werden. Der Konstrast zwischen beiden Szenen liegt darin, daß sich ‚Metellus' dem Paulus negativ, Lentulus dagegen positiv darstellt. Das hat seinen tieferen Grund in dem unterschiedlichen Charakter der Juno-Metellus- und der Lentulusrede: Während im ersten Fall ein als Römer getarnter Feind Roms spricht, spricht im zweiten Fall ein echter Römer; was der eine unaufrichtig meint, meint der andere aufrichtig.' Niemann (1975) 243.

[58] Hom. *Il.* 22.104. On this speech, see Redfield (1975) 157-8, Fenik (1978) 81-5, Sharples (1983), Schofield (1986) 20-2, Taplin (1992) 233-5, Gill (1996) 81-93, Haubold (2000) 92-4. Haubold intriguingly differentiates between Hector's protection (or neglect) of the city and of the people (λαός). As reviewers have commented, this distinction is less than clearly made

[59] A further complication is that Paulus, in his half-hearted and belated attempts to persuade Varro to delay battle, himself plays the role of Polydamas to Varro's headstrong Hector.

[60] On the referential connotations of this formula, see Kelly (2007) 173-6 (element 77).

[61] Hom. *Il.* 22.61-5. προαναφωνεῖ τὴν Ἰλίου ἅλωσιν. ∑ A *ad loc.*; ἐναργῶς πέφρακε τὰ τῶν πορθήσεων,…καὶ μὴ γράψας δὲ τὴν Ἰλίου πόρθησιν ὅμως ἐδήλωσεν αὐτῆς τὰ παθήματα, πᾶσαν ἡλικίαν τὴν ἐν πολέμῳ τι πάσχουσαν παραλαβών· ∑ bT *ad loc.*

This is the key issue: though conventional codes of military conduct might make it a soldier's duty to stand and fight, nevertheless, here, now, it is by coming inside the walls that the synecdochic hero can fulfil his greater duty, to save the city.[62] As Christopher Gill puts it, 'As his father, Priam, underlines, there is a case for seeing retreat as the proper exercise of Hector's role as a son and as Troy's defender…What prevents him doing so is his sense of shame at having to retreat into Troy under such circumstances.'[63]

Priam also undermines the idea of the glorious death: to be sure everything is glorious, καλὰ, *pulchra*, for the hero who dies, but the selfishness of that act is shown by the contrast with what happens to those left behind, the old men who suffer, not the *pulchra mors* of battle, but the shameful death associated with the sack of the city.[64] Indeed the paradox might already be present in the *Iliad*. The scholiast notes that lines 71-3 'seem to be an exhortation to death, rather than an exhortation against it; and indeed [Priam] clearly wants to persuade Hector to come into the city and not to wait for Achilles.'[65] The similarity to Tyrtaeus fr. 10.21-30 West, which urges the young to protect the old in battle by fighting in the front line, has even led Neoanalysts to suggest that Homer has adapted a similar exhortation from a common epic source to a different context or that a late intrusion into the *Iliad* is indebted to Tyrtaeus himself.[66] Whether it derives from an earlier text or from the stock of traditional formulae, Priam redeploys language suited to urging soldiers to die in battle to urge his son not to die in battle but to flee and live to fight another day. Already in this scene, the conventional military decorum is inverted. The parallel with Paulus need not be emphasized.

The situation is further complicated by two additional factors. Firstly, Hector does hold out the possibility to himself, however deludedly, that standing and fighting might lead to his defeating Achilles and saving Troy, so that his decision is not simply whether to flee and save the city or fight and doom it. This motif has its counterpart in Paulus' continuing determination to face Hannibal (which of course leads to Juno's double intervention), but Silius marks the greater despair and self-destructiveness of the consul by stressing initially that, despairing of his own life, he only wants to take Hannibal down with him, and later not even that, but merely to die at the Carthaginian leader's hand.[67] By denying Paulus even the most absurdly optimistic, remote possibility of victory, which Hector uses to help justify his refusal to flee, Silius focuses the self-destructive, glory-seeking nature of the consul's decision.

Secondly, despite his resolution, Hector *does* flee, not to save Troy but to save himself. That flight is only ended by a cruel divine trick, as Athene disguises herself as Hector's brother Deiphobus and persuades him that they should stand against Achilles together, then deserts him (Hom. *Il*. 22.214-95). Juno's disguise as Metellus, of course, neatly inverts this scene so that she tries to keep two major warriors apart,

---

[62] On the motif of flight in the *Iliad* (though mainly as it affects the Greeks) and its resonance in the new Archilochus, see Barker-Christensen (2006).

[63] Gill (1996) 82.

[64] πάντα δὲ καλὰ θανόντι περ ὅττι φανήῃ· | ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ πολιόν τε κάρη πολιόν τε γένειον | αἰδῶ τ' αἰσχύνωσι κύνες κταμένοιο γέροντος, | τοῦτο δὴ οἴκτιστον πέλεται δειλοῖσι βροτοῖσιν. 22.73-6.

[65] δοκεῖ τοῦτο προτρεπτικὸν εἶναι μᾶλλον ἐπὶ θάνατον ἢ ἀποτρεπτικόν· καίτοι φαίνεται βουλόμενος πείθειν τὸν Ἕκτορα εἰσιέναι εἰς τὸ τεῖχος καὶ μὴ ὑπομένειν τὸν Ἀχιλλέα.

[66] Discussion by Richardson *ad loc*. See also von der Mühll (1952), Griffin (1976) 171.

[67] *per medios agitur, proiecto lucis amore | Hannibalem lustrans, Paulus. sors una uidetur | aspera, si occumbat ductore superstite Poeno*. 10.42-4; *Sidoniumque ducem circumspectabat, in illa | exoptans animam certantem ponere dextra*. 301-2. On his failure to achieve even the latter, see below.

rather than bringing them together, as Juhnke notes,[68] but also – which has the same result but resonates further – urges flight rather than fight. However, it is not only Juno-Metellus who replays the role of Athene-Deiphobus; their doublet, Lentulus, also can also be read as the Deiphobus whom Hector deludedly believes is supporting him. The warmth of Paulus' response to the tribune recalls that of Hector to his (supposed) brother, warmth which was distinctly lacking towards Juno-Metellus, who was in effect an enemy disguised not as a friend, but as another enemy.[69] The advice of the hostile Athene, disguised as the friendly Deiphobus, is thus channelled through both the disguised, hostile Juno, and the friendly Lentulus. Yet their advice, unlike Athene's, would lead, not to Paulus' death, but to his survival, and hence salvation of the city. Is the relationship between the Iliadic and Silian scenes straightforwardly contrastive, then, or does the reader wonder whether following the advice and fleeing might lead to a fate equivalent to, or even worse than, death? Before she can begin to answer that question, she must consider some further intertexts.

7 On the edge: Paulus and Turnus

As always with Silius, Homer is not accessed without mediation, or rather not without further intertextuality: the issues of flight versus fight have already been played out in Virgil, who has likewise performed an act of simultaneously combinatorial and divisive imitation. In *Aeneid* 12, Turnus has been led by his sister Juturna, disguised as his charioteer Metiscus, to the edges of the battle, where he is safely and futilely scything down sword-fodder. He hears the cry from the city which arises when Aeneas attacks it and Amata commits suicide, while Latinus, like Priam, throws dust on his hair in grief.[70] Virgil skilfully combines Priam's supplication of the living Hector (itself a form of pre-emptive mourning)[71] with his mourning for his death, but it is Amata's death which symbolizes the destruction of the city, and – though the juxtaposition of the scenes makes the connection - Turnus himself is not addressed. The city, like Troy, is falling but Turnus is not there, and it is another's death which is equated to that fall.[72] The contrast underlines the difference between Hector and Turnus, that, while Hector's duty is to save himself and hence save the city, Turnus – though also a synecdochic hero – must die to save the city.

In place of Priam and Hecabe's supplications, Virgil synthesizes all the advice, supplications, divine deceptions, and self-debate which Hector receives and indulges in – Andromache, Priam, Hecabe, Polydamas, Athene-Deiphobus, and his own great monologue – and then splits them again into two contrasting figures giving contrasting advice. Juturna, like Athene, impersonates a comrade of the hero, but, instead of a false sibling tricking him to his death, a true sibling tries to trick him to safety.[73] The shadowy figure of Saces, perhaps an externalization of Turnus' own *conscia uirtus*, urges him to come and fight and save the city. Suggestively for both

[68] 'der zweimalige Eingriff einer Göttin, um zwei bedeutende Kämpfer zu trennen, erscheint dort als zweimaliger Eingriff einer Göttin, um zwei gewaltige Gegner zusammenzuführen' Juhnke (1974) 213.
[69] Hector to Deiphobus: Hom. *Il.* 22.226-31; Paulus to Lentulus: 10.277-91.
[70] Turnus on the fringes: Verg. *A.* 12.614-21; Latinus and the people of Latinus: 12.608-11; Priam: Hom. *Il.* 22.33-5, cf. 408-9. Knauer (1964: 429) only notes the second parallel.
[71] Cf. Alden (2000) 282 on the hair-tearing at 22.77-8.
[72] Cf. Hershkowitz (1998) 82: 'The fall of Troy is mirrored by the siege of Latinus' city.'
[73] In many ways, Juturna-Metiscus combines half (i.e. two quarters) of the functions of the Homeric Athene in (epiphanizing to and) aiding Achilles and deceiving (and destroying) Hector, though I disagree with Juhnke that a similar doubling is prominent with Juno-Metiscus (see n. 56 above).

Hector and Paulus, and the relationship between them, safety for Turnus, which will leave the city to its fate, as advocated by Juturna-Metiscus, requires him to stay where he is, while death and the salvation of the city (Saces' exhortation) can only be achieved through motion towards the city. There is also a distinction on the related issue of whether or not Turnus is a synecdochic hero: according to Juturna-Metiscus, he can stay where he is because 'there are others to defend the city' (*sunt alii qui tecta manu defendere possint*. Verg. *A*. 12.627). Saces, however, like Priam, asserts that Turnus *is* the synecdochic hero, in whom is the *suprema salus* (653), the one man to whom all eyes and faces are turned (*in te ora Latini, | in te oculos referunt*. 656-7); the difference is that, whereas Priam used this as an argument for Hector to flee and live, for Saces, it means Turnus must die. We might note here that Metiscus' claim is drawing an intertextual parallel with Homer's Idomeneus, who (in the opposite direction) tells his charioteer, Meriones, that there are others to defend the Greek ships while they seek glory on the left wing;[74] the irony of the intertext is that, whereas Idomeneus can point to the two Aiantes and Teukros as credible defenders, for Turnus (and for Hector) there is no one else. Once more, from this dense intertextual debate, the question emerges for the reader as to whether Paulus is a sole defender, like Hektor and Turnus, or whether, like Idomeneus, he can point to others, Fabius, Lentulus, and the inhabitants of the city, who can defend Rome.

Like Paulus, Turnus responds to both figures with the same decision: Juturna-Metiscus urges him to slaughter as many Trojans as he can to even up numbers, but he refuses and determines to face Aeneas; Saces urges him to come and save the city, to which he agrees and determines to face Aeneas. Peter Schenk, consistent with his negative depiction of Turnus throughout the poem, argues here that it is primarily his sense of shame and the fear of dishonour which drives him to face Aeneas, and even to save the city.[75] This is certainly supported by the references in his reply to Juturna-Metiscus to giving the lie to the words of Drances and his refusal to let this land see him in flight (12.643-5). If we might consider it a slightly harsh and over-simplified account of Turnus' motivation, even as *part* of his motivation, it tellingly parallels and contrasts with Hector's motivation. As we have seen, Hector's sense of shame, especially for rejecting the good counsel of Polydamas, leads him to face his enemy, just like Turnus;[76] yet Hector's shame leads him to put that personal value above the safety of his city, whereas Turnus' shame that he has endangered the city leads him to give his life to save it. There may be an element of truth in Heinze's general claim that Aeneas fights for his people, but Turnus for himself, but here at least it is for the city that Turnus will fight.[77]

As we shall see, unlike Hector and Paulus, who resemble him but resemble each other more, Turnus' choice, though painful, is relatively simple and even conventional: flee and save himself, or fight and save the city. In comparing his situation to Paulus', it is instructive to consider the parallels Debra Hershkowitz has drawn between Saces and the ghost of Hector in *Aeneid* 2.[78] Both Aeneas and Turnus

---

[74] νηυσὶ μὲν ἐν μέσσῃσιν ἀμύνειν εἰσὶ καὶ ἄλλοι | Αἴαντές τε δύω Τεῦκρός θ', ὃς ἄριστος Ἀχαιῶν | τοξοσύνῃ, ἀγαθὸς δὲ καὶ ἐν σταδίῃ ὑσμίνῃ· 13.312-4. The parallel is noted by Knauer (1964) 430.

[75] Schenk (1984) 177-85, esp. 178: 'Das entscheidende Stichwort dieser Rede [12.632-49] ist *dedecus*, das bei Turnus stets mit dem Todesgedanken verbunden ist. Einen flüchtenden Turnus, der es zuläßt, daß die Stadt der Zerstörung anheim fällt, wird die Welt nicht sehen.'

[76] 'Beide Helden erkennen, daß die von den Ratgebern prophezeite Situation eingetreten ist, und ihr Ansehen ihnen gebietet, den bisher vermiedenen Kampf auszufechten.' Schenk (1984) 178.

[77] 'Vor allem kämpft er nicht wie Aeneas für sein Volk und dessen Zukunft, sondern, wie ihm mit Recht vorgeworfen wird, für seine eigenen Ansprüche, und ihre willen einen Krieg zu entfachen, ist frevelhaft.' Heinze (1915) 211.

[78] Hershkowitz (1998) 86-90.

experience the sudden appearance and exhortations of Hector and Saces in a dream-like state, which contributes to the sense that they are simultaneously external figures and expressions of the heroes' psychological state. The visitations not only report but embody the destruction of the city, as '[l]ike Hector's wounds, Saces' wounds reflect the destruction he describes.'[79] Hershkowitz's paralleling of the scenes is insightful and illuminating but, in the context of the debate between fight and flight, we might wish to nuance her analysis a little. She claims that 'Hector admonishes Aeneas, telling him to flee the hopeless ruin of his city; similarly, Saces admonishes Turnus, telling him to fight in the hopeless battle for his city.'[80] Here is the familiar contrast between flight and fight, but are both situations truly hopeless? The fall of Troy in *Aeneid* 2 is genuinely a hopeless situation, inevitable defeat and destruction ordained by the gods, as Venus reveals to Aeneas; in these circumstances, as we shall discuss in more detail below, Aeneas' duty, like Hector's, is to flee and save the city – not Troy, which cannot be saved, but the new Troy which he will carry with him to the west; instead he repeatedly tries to embrace a conventional, despairing, 'heroic' *mors pulchra*, like Hector, but repeatedly supernatural interventions – beginning with Hector's ghost – insist that he follow the unconventional heroic duty which the circumstances demand: flight. The attack on Latinus' city, on the other hand, is not a hopeless cause; in the most literal and short-term sense, Turnus' action saves the city as Aeneas turns away from it to face him; it is clear that in another, hard-to-define sense, the sacrifice of Turnus – for all its negative connotations – is essential to save the city that is to come. The connection between Hector's ghost and Saces, Aeneas and Turnus, is therefore partly parallelism – the synecdochic hero must save the city – but partly contrastive – Aeneas must achieve this by fleeing and surviving, Turnus by fighting and dying.

The connection between Turnus and Paulus has already been made by the way in which *Punica* 10, like *Aeneid* 12, has the doomed hero's name as its almost titular incipit, followed by a recognition, like Turnus', of his side's disarray, while the opening simile, comparing the consul to a beast surrounded by hunters recalls those referring to Turnus both in the Trojan camp, and, more significantly, at the opening of book 12.[81] Silius takes Turnus' single-mindedness, the way in which he gives the same response to the figure trying to save him and the figure urging him to danger, and has Paulus do likewise.

The parallels between the Virgilian and Silian advisers are clear. Juno-Metellus is a disguised divine protector (albeit of Hannibal rather than Paulus) and even the name of Metellus, perhaps etymologized as a diminutive of *metus* through the glosses *metuens* (10.44), *pauidi* (46), and *pauidissime* (65), recalls Metiscus, also a diminutive and which Paschalis has seen as suggesting both *metus* and μῆτις.[82] Lentulus' kinship with Saces is even more clearly expressed as the reader is commanded to behold, *ecce*, each of them as they ride, both wounded, Saces in the face, Lentulus in the foot. Yet the crucial difference is that the consul's two advisers are not giving him conflicting advice, but urging him to do the same thing – flee; or, to be more accurate, they are *both* giving the advice of *both* Turnus' advisers: you must save the city and, in order to accomplish that, you must save yourself. This

[79] ibid. 88.
[80] ibid. 87.
[81] *Paulus, ut aduersam uidet increbescere pugnam* 10.1 ~ *Turnus, ut infractos aduerso Marte Latinos | defecisse uidet,* Verg. *A.* 12.1-2, the parallel (but not the incipit) noted by Volpihac *ad loc.* Similes: 10.2-5; Verg. *A.* 9.551-3 (noted by Ruperti (1795) *ad loc.*); 12.4-8.
[82] Paschalis (1997) 390.

further combinatorial and divisive imitation – blending Metiscus' and Saces' messages into one, and then duplicating it – is signalled by cross-echoes, so that Metellus uses Saces' reproach that the hero is wasting his time on futile fighting, while Lentulus inverts Metiscus' claim that others can save the city by insisting that *only* Paulus can save it.[83] The contrast with Turnus derives from the fact that, painful though it is, Turnus' choice appears on the surface to be at least simple: Metiscus' claim that remaining in the field while others defend the city will bring victory seems a transparent equivocation to justify self-preservation; Turnus can save either himself or the city. In this respect, he is in a diametrically opposite position to Hektor, who must choose between, on one side, his honour and, on the other, the mutually dependent preservation of his life and the city. Paulus too is presented with the choice of saving himself and the city, or dying, with all that might entail.

8 Hopefully surviving: the limits of *deuotio*

Turnus' choice to offer himself to save the city makes his self-sacrifice a sort of *deuotio*, a forebear (and literary descendent) of the Decii, who consecrated themselves and the enemy army to the chthonic gods in order to secure victory for Rome at the battles of Veseris, Sentinum, and possibly Ausculum.[84] The pervasive paralleling of Paulus and Turnus, as well as the former's role as a one who stands for the many, might well make us consider whether the consul's refusal to save himself also constitutes a form of *deuotio*. Indeed, Raymond Marks has recently argued very insightfully and persuasively that several figures in the series of Roman defeats between Ticinus and Cannae function as *deuoti*, who sacrifice themselves to save Rome, notably Flaminius at Trasimene and Paulus at Cannae.[85] The case for Flaminius is strong, and I would agree entirely that, in his depiction of Paulus too, Silius strongly evokes the ritual of *deuotio*, but certain key features make the picture a little more complex. In general, we might note that Paulus makes no mention of saving either Rome or his army, but is rather marked by a combination of despair and the desire to win glory by a *mors pulchra*; this much is consistent with Marks' assertion (2005b: 134) that the self-destruction of Rome's leaders constitute *deuotiones* in effect rather than intent. We may also note that his death is associated with defeat rather than victory, which Marks less convincingly explains by the success and divine favour which *follow* the defeat.[86]

---

[83] *'quid uanos,' inquit 'Latio spes unica consul, | incassumque moues fato renuente furores?* 10.48-9 ~ *tu currum deserto in gramine uersas.* Verg. *A.* 12.664; *'quid deinde relictum | crastina cur Tyrios lux non deducat ad urbem, | deseris in tantis puppim si, Paule, procellis?* 10.267-9 ~ *sunt alii qui tecta manu defendere possint.* Verg. *A.* 12.627. The last intriguingly echoes Idomeneus to Meriones at *Il.* 13.312, as Knauer (1964: 429) notes.

[84] All references to *deuotio* are to what Versnel (1976) calls *deuotio ducis*, rather than the *deuotio hostium* described at Macrob. 3.9.9-16. On *deuotio* in general: Versnel (1976), (1981), Leigh (1997) 128-43, Edwards (2007) 25-45; Decii: Liv. 8.9.4-11.1, 10.28.12-29.7, Oakley *ad* 8.9ff, Feldherr (1998) 84-93, Turnus as *deuotus*: Schenk (1984) Leigh (1993), cf. Bandera (1981) esp. 233-7, *contra* Pascal (1990), Nicoll (2001). On *deuotio* in post-Virgilian epic, see Hardie (1993) 28-32.

[85] Marks (2005b, actually published 2007), esp. 135-43 on *deuotio*, and 139-40 on Paulus. Kißel (1979: 125 n77) earlier saw a hint of *deuotio* in 10.43-4. On Livy's Flaminius as a type of *deuotus*, see Edwards (2007) 27. Cicero uses sacrificial language to describe Paulus' death at *Sen.* 75: *L. Paulum, qui morte luit collegae in Cannensi ignominia temeritatem.*

[86] I cannot agree with Marks' assertion (2005b: 142-3) that Rome's fortunes rise under divine favour after the deaths of Flaminius and Paulus, in contrast to the survival of Scipio at Ticinus or Minucius in book 7, which is his explanation (151 n.66) as to why Rome is still defeated at Trasimene and Cannae, despite the '*deuotiones*'. The delaying tactics of Fabius accounts for the respite after Trasimene, and the combined effects of Capuan luxury and constantly re-asserted fate of Hannibal never to take Rome for the latter.

However, it is not merely the absence of devotional features which differentiates Paulus; there is active inversion, or even perversion, of the ritual. To compare the case of the elder Decius, who devoted himself at the battle of Veseris against the Latins in 340 BC, three important aspects of the narrative are inverted by Paulus.[87] Firstly, Decius devotes himself and the enemy army to the Dei Manes and Mater Tellus, but the despairing Paulus – while bursting into the midst of the enemy and drawing all weapons to himself, like a true *deuotus*[88] – asserts that he will lead *his own army* down to the Manes.[89] Secondly, the immediate effect of Decius' *deuotio* is to demoralize the enemy, who are struck by fear and confusion; Paulus' death immediately leads to the demoralization and panic of the *Roman* army.[90] Finally, Decius' body is, after some time, eventually found – significantly and symbolically – under a pile of enemy corpses, the many whom this one has destroyed. Paulus, in contrast, appears to be buried – just as significantly and symbolically – under a pile of Roman corpses; Silius does not specify that they are Roman corpses, but that is surely the default assumption if it is not specified that they are enemy corpses, and moreover, they are described using Silius' favourite, perhaps overused metonymy: *arma uirumque*, the mangled corpses of the descendants of Aeneas.[91]

There are several examples in Roman literature of failed or futile uses of *deuotio* imagery. Cicero, in his *post reditum* speeches, abortively tried to represent his departure from Rome as a sort of *deuotio*, leaving the city 'to avoid the bloodbath of citizens that would inevitably have followed', but the mismatch of the image led to his dropping of it.[92] Lucan's Pompey, a figure to whom we shall shortly return, similarly figures his flight from Pharsalus as a *deuotio* to save further bloodshed, but his speech betrays his cowardice and megalomania.[93] Perhaps most significantly for the *Punica*, Heinrich has argued that the apparently successful *deuotio* of Statius' Menoeceus, modelled on that of the Decii and intended to save Thebes from the attacking Argives, is in fact self-glorifying, futile, and even destructive.[94] I would argue that Paulus goes further than these failures to execute a *deuotio* by inverting the ritual and carrying out what is in effect an anti-*deuotio*, in which the one who stands

---

[87] A fourth would be his refusal to ride headlong on Lentulus' horse; riding at a gallop was a marked feature of *deuoti*, but only *into* the enemy rather than away from it, and Paulus' refusal could be interpreted as a normalizing re-inversion of Pompey's cowardly inversion of the *deuotio* in riding headlong *away* from the enemy. Riding headlong: Liv. 8.9.9, 10.28.18, with further examples and discussion at Versnel (1981) 152-6, Leigh (1993) 95-6, and, including Pompey's flight, (1997) 128-31.

[88] *in medios fert arma globos seseque periclis lingerit atque omni letum molitur ab ense*. 10.4-5.

[89] '*legiones auxiliaque hostium mecum Deis Manibus Tellurique deuoueo.*' Liv. 8.9.8; cf. Liv. 10.28.13; *'Perstate et fortiter, oro, | pectoribus ferrum accipite ac* ***sine uulnere terga | ad manis deferte, uiri****. nisi gloria mortis, | nil superest.* ***idem sedes adeuntibus imas | hic uobis dux Paulus erit****.'* 10.6-10.

[90] *ita omnis terror pauorque cum illo latus signa primo Latinorum turbauit, deinde in totam penitus aciem peruasit. euidentissimum id fuit quod, quacumque equo inuectus est, ibi haud secus quam pestifero sidere icti pauebant; ubi uero corruit obrutus telis, inde iam haud dubie consternatae cohortes Latinorum fugam ac uastitatem late fecerunt*. Liv. 8.9.11-12; cf. Liv. 10.29.1-2. *Postquam spes Italum mentesque in consule lapsae, | ceu truncus capitis, saeuis exercitus armis | sternitur, et uictrix toto fremit Africa campo*. 10.309-11. Panic is also a more widespread and long-lasting effect of the defeat at Cannae.

[91] *inuentum inter maximum hostium stragem, coopertum telis,* Liv. 8.10.10; *permixta ruina | inter et arma uirum et lacerata cadauera Pauli | eruerant corpus media de strage iacentum*. 10.504-6. On the use of *arma uirumque* as metonymy for epic, see E. L. Bassett, 'Silius *Punica* 6.1-53', *CPh* 54 (1959), 10-34, at 13-14; A. Bloch, 'Arma virumque als heroisches Leitmotiv', *MH* 27 (1970), 206-11; D. Hershkowitz, 'Patterns of Madness in Statius' *Thebaid*', *JRS* 85 (1995), 52-64, at 63; B. W. Boyd, 'Arms and the man: Wordplay and the Catasterism of Chiron in Ovid *Fasti* 5', *AJPh* 122 (2001), 67-80, and in Silius: 1.132, 241, 364, 519, 2.675, 3.526, 4.98, 253, 5.325, 6.6, 7.8, 8.272, 661, 9.100, 597, 10.505, 554, 12.168-9, 189, 17.102, 279, 442-3, 516. We might also note that Livy's Paulus tells Lentulus *me in hac strage militum meorum patere exspirare*, 22.49.11.

[92] Dyck (2004) *passim*, quoting 304, on the image's failure, 311-14. See also May (1988) 97-9.

[93] Luc. 7.647-711, with esp. Leigh (1997) 135-43, Bartsch (1997) 79-82.

[94] Stat. *Theb*. 10.580-782, with Heinrich (1999), esp. 290: 'it does not effect *pax* or *salus*, but rather initiates fratricide and leads to yet another foreign assault upon the city.' Cf. Fantham (1995); *contra* Vessey (1971).

for the many does not save them but brings about their destruction.[95] This is the alternative model of the *unus pro multis* scenario, where the one is not destroyed *in exchange for* the many, but where his destruction symbolizes and entails theirs. It is the model, not of Turnus and the Decii, but of Hector.

9 All heroes great and small: Paulus and Pompey Magnus

This conflict over the rights and wrongs of the general leaving the battle evokes another figure who triangulates with Paulus and Hector: Lucan's Pompey. Silius evokes Pompey as a literary predecessor (and historical successor) of Paulus in various ways. There is a consistent play on their names – Paulus, 'the Small', antiphrastically recalling Pompey 'the Great', Magnus being not only his cognomen but his most common designation in the *Bellum Ciuile*, where there are almost innumerable, mainly ironic, plays on it.[96] This wordplay is most clearly foregrounded in Mago's narration of Cannae to the Carthaginian senate, when he describes the two consuls taking the field (11.511-2): *hic Varro et magnum Latia inter nomina Paulus | nomen*. Not only does this contrast the greatness of Paulus' *nomen* (reputation) with the smallness of his *nomen* (the literal meaning of his name), but it evokes Lucan's famous description of Pompey as the mere shadow of a name: *magni nominis umbra*.[97] We shall examine later the ways in which Paulus' death triangulates with those of Pompey (in his Lucanian, historical, and other manifestations) and Priam, but let us return to Juno-Metellus' temptation of Paulus. The terms in which Paulus' importance is couched closely resemble those which Pompey uses to justify his flight from the battle of Pharsalus (Luc. 7.652-8):

> *tot telis sua fata peti, tot corpora fusa*
> *ac se tam multo pereuntem sanguine uidit.*
> *nec, sicut mos est miseris, trahere omnia secum*
> *mersa iuuat gentesque suae miscere ruinae;*
> *ut Latiae post se uiuat pars maxima turbae,*
> *sustinuit dignos etiamnunc credere uotis*
> *caelicolas, uouitque, sui solacia casus.*

Though this is clearly doubly focalized through Pompey and the facet of the narratorial voice which is so fanatically devoted to him,[98] if taken at face value, it presents Pompey with the dilemma of Hektor. He is the one who stands for the many and whose death will take those many down with him. Yet he chooses not, as is the way of the wretched, to drag everything down with him but, unlike Hektor, to live and, unlike Hektor, to try to save his people. His is an inverted *deuotio*, not merely

[95] Cf. Heinrich (1999: 189) on Statius' Capaneus: 'a reverse *devotio*: the effects of Capaneus' death match those of Decius' death as recorded by Livy, except Capaneus brings the *irae deorum* against his own people.' The situation is still distinct from that of Paulus, since the great individual Capaneus only incidentally stands for the many and the devotional colour of his death is mainly to contrast with (and parallel) that of Menoeceus.

[96] See esp. Feeney (1986a); cf. Henderson (1987) 149-50. Hor. *Carm.* 1.12.37-8 (discussed above) may also have this wordplay: *animaeque **magnae** | prodigum **Paulum***.

[97] Luc. 1.135, on which, again, see Feeney (1986a), esp. 239-40.

[98] 'due versi emblematici dello stato d'animo di Pompeo, ormai in preda al panico.' Gagliardi (1975) *ad* Luc. 7.652-3; 'the idea of the synecdochic hero is present first in the imaginings of Pompey, second in the suggestive figurations of the narrator.' Leigh (1997) 153; cf. Bartsch (1997) 80: 'A strange *devotio* that saves the sacrifice and offers up the beneficiaries, but this noble flight instils not the least bit of discomfort in our narrator, who now addresses Pompey in rapturous terms and for some fifty lines.'

because he does not ride to a glorious death, but because (in his perception at least) such a glorious death would not save but destroy his people.[99] The situation does not call for a Decius or a Turnus, but for a right-thinking Hektor.

This is the situation which Juno-Metellus evokes when warning Paulus that, if he does not survive, '*Ausoniam tecum trahis*' (10.51), urging him to snatch from death his *maiorem animam* (58), his life which is more important than that of the masses, his more than Pompeian life;[100] Juno-Metellus might also be alluding to *Odes* 1.12, where, as we have seen, Paulus was *animae…magnae | prodigum*, and saying that he should not be so wasteful of his great life; the suggestion is that Paulus, by his intransigence, will bring about precisely what he claimed before the battle that his colleague Varro was doing by his rashness: '*trahit omnia secum*' (8.232). Yet, as we noted, this assumes that Pompey is correct in his interpretation of the situation. If, as many have argued, most forcefully Matthew Leigh, Pompey is deluded by his own egomania, so that he does not see 'the part standing for the whole, the hero for his people, but rather the whole standing for the part',[101] then the intertextuality with Paulus might affect the reader rather differently. Juno-Metellus tempts Paulus not with the equivocating, self-justifying rhetoric of Juturna-Metiscus ('there are others to save the city'), but with the monarchical, self-aggrandizing discourse of Pompey ('only *you* can save the city, and only by fleeing').[102] It is worth noting that the idea the exegetic tradition of the *Iliad* already hints that Hector, like Paulus, is the object of flattery, and that perhaps both he and the reader/audience should be cautious about accepting that he is indeed a synecdochic hero. For the scholiast comments that Priam, 'knowing that [Hector] loves honour, slightly alters his speech, saying that, for him, flight would lead to glory and the common salvation'.[103] Perhaps this inversion fo the rule of heroism is merely a rhetorical ploy, tailored to Hector's weaknesses.

Yet, to return to Paulus, the same 'temptation' which Juno-Metellus presents is offered by the entirely positive Lentulus, so that, as we have seen, the advice to flee and save the city is given the authority of both the enemy of Rome and its embodiment. In rejecting it from each, Paulus simultaneously assumes the mantle of an honour-obsessed, despairing, self- (and city-)destructive Hektor, but also asserts the Republican ideal that the city is more than one man; he destroys the city and he saves it, and he does this, not simply for positive and negative reasons, but for reasons which are simultaneously both positive and negative. The paradox is quintessentially Silian, and finds perhaps its closest parallel in the mass-suicide of Saguntum.[104] There

---

[99] A similar finesse is used by Cicero to figure his exile as a *deuotio* to prevent bloodshed, on which see n. 92 above.

[100] Cf. Marpicati (1999) esp. 197-8, on the contrast between the flight of Pompey and the steadfastness of Paulus.

[101] Leigh (1997) 110-57, quoting from 155. Cf. *adnot. super. Luc. ad* 7.653: *nam exercitus corpus est imperatoris*. On this undermining of Pompey's depiction more generally, see Ahl (1976) 167-8, Bartsch (1997) 79-80, Edwards (2007) 35; *contra* Lintott (1971) 501: 'Pompey bears his misfortune with calm dignity and leaves the field to put an end to the slaughter'; Sklenár (2003), 120: 'Pompey evinces an essential component of Stoic *virtus*, a concern for the commonwealth of humankind.'; Radicke (2004) 422: 'Lucan hingegen [i.e. unlike historiographers] macht die Flucht des Pompeius, der sein Heer führerlos dem Untergang preisgab, zu einem bewußten Rückzug aus Humanität und wertet den negativen Vorgang in einen positiven um.' Johnson (1987: 99) characteristically captures the irony and the paradox of 'his gallant desertion'.

[102] Note also Paulus' repeated insistence on not showing his back to the enemy (10.7-8, 286-7), rejecting Pompey's ironic lack of fear that he be wounded in the back (*non tergo tela pauentem*, Luc. 7.678, with Leigh (1997) 137-9) and indeed imputing such cowardice to Juno-Metellus for suggesting Pompeian flight (*non hostica tela | excipias tergo, superos precor*. 10.62-3).

[103] φιλότιμον αὐτὸν εἰδὼς ὑπήλλαξε τὴν λέξιν, πρὸς εὔκλειαν καὶ κοινὴν σωτηρίαν αὐτῷ τὴν φυγὴν εἶναι λέγων. ∑ bT *ad* Hom. *Il*. 22.56-7.

[104] On this most widely-discussed of episodes in the *Punica*, see von Albrecht (1964) 57-62, 181-3; Vessey (1974a); Kißel (1979) 97-9; Küppers (1986) 107-70; McGuire (1989) 33-41, (1997) 207-19; Feeney (1991) 307-8;

the self-immolation is simultaneously inspired *both* by Fides, sent by Hercules to bring his colonists glory, *and* by Tisiphone, sent by Juno to destroy them;[105] it is simultaneously *both* a glorious, pseudo-Stoic, final, desperate means of maintaining their sacred faithfulness to Rome *and* a hideous, fratricidal, suicidal simulacrum of civil war.[106] Any attempt to separate or privilege one side is to miss the point.

Paulus' death constitutes the same paradoxical combination of failed, perverted, and successful *deuotio*: he is compared to a mortally wounded tiger opening its flagging jaws for futile bites (*uanos morsus*), just like the futile bouts of rage of which Juno-Metellus accused him.[107] The introduction, asserting that Paulus did not allow what remained of his life to go unavenged (292-3) sets up a deliberately false expectation – shared by Paulus – that he will achieve some great feat before dying; in fact, he surprises the spear-fodder non-entity, Iertes, who thought he was dead, but, before he can achieve his desired *Zweikampf* with Hannibal, he is killed by a shower of spears.[108] The model of the epic hero, the Hektor or Turnus, to be killed by or (as he always vainly hopes) kill his heroic enemy, is set up only so that it can be rejected, an expectation encouraged only to be frustrated. Yet the death of Paulus is not a complete anti-climax, though it stops short of the very Decian rush into the enemy described by Plutarch.[109] The shower of spears is taken from Livy, but there they are thrown by the indistinct *hostes* and the consul suffers the ultimate indignity of being killed amongst a crowd of men in flight without even being recognized.[110] Silius says nothing to suggest that the enemy do not kill Paulus deliberately and in full knowledge of his identity, but the more marked departure is the sheer variety of peoples involved, described with polysyndetic plenitude (304): *et Nomas et Garamas et Celtae et Maurus et Astur,* 'Numidians and Garamantians and Celts and Moors and Asturians,' contingents from the African South, the Gallic North, and the Spanish West, every corner of the Carthaginian alliance is involved, making this an effective representation of the whole of Hannibal's army killing Paulus. The many have killed the one, as in a *deuotio*, where the shower of missiles is also a common feature.[111] Yet, as we have seen, Paulus is an *alter Hector* rather than an *alter (*or *alius*!) *Decius*, and his death, though caused by the many of the enemy, does not save but destroys his own many.

Hardie (1993) 81-2, Cowan (2002) 28-33, Dominik (2003), (2006). I shall discuss it myself in the second chapter of *Indivisible Cities*.

[105] Cf. Feeney (1991) 308: 'In effect, Fides and Tisiphone are collaborators.' In contrast, von Albrecht (1966: 56), Vessey (1974: 28-9), Kiβel (1979: 97-8), Küppers (1986: 123-5), and Schenk (1989: 360) all focus overwhelmingly on *fides*.

[106] On the civil war colouring of the fall of Saguntum, see esp. McGuire (1989) 37-41, revisited and expanded at (1997) 211-9; cf. Hardie (1993) 82, Cowan (2002) 29-30, Dominik (2003).

[107] Simile: 10.293-7; futility: 10.294~10.48-9. 'The fact that he dies with his *ira* unable to achieve its aims is ominous for the Roman cause in general.' Braund-Gilbert (2003) 263.

[108] Iertes, or a character of the same name, kills Nomius at Trasimene (5.259-60). Since Liv. *per*. 89.6 refers to King Hiertes (or Hierta – he only occurs here in the accusative *Hiertam*) of Numidia as being killed in Pompey's African expedition of 80 BC, it is tempting, but with the surviving evidence unprovable, to suspect some play with Paulus' role as a Pompey-figure.

[109] αὐτὸς δὲ ῥίψας ἑαυτὸν εἰς τοὺς φονευομένους ἀπέθανε. Plut. *Fab*. 16.9.

[110] Liv. 22.49.12. No details beyond περιπεσὼν βιαίοις πληγαῖς ἐν χειρῶν νόμῳ μετήλλαξε τὸν βίον at Polyb. 3.116.9.

[111] E.g. Liv. 8.9.12.

10 A small town in Italy: Paulus the city

The image of one man against an army must inevitably make the reader think of another *deuotus manqué*, Lucan's Caesarian centurion Scaeva, who single-handedly prevents Pompey's army from from escaping from the blockade at Dyrrachium.[112] This image is most succinctly expressed in lines which also parallel Paulus' attempts to draw all weapons to himself at the opening of *Punica* 10 (Luc. 6.189-92):

> *illum tota premit moles, illum omnia tela,*
> *nulla fuit non certa manus, non lancea felix;*
> *parque nouum Fortuna uidet concurrere, bellum*
> *atque uirum.*

The parallel is further reinforced by the incidental detail of Paulus' killing of Iertes, who thought he was dead, just as Scaeva's simulated surrender enables him to dispatch the gullible Aulus.[113] Intertextuality with Scaeva has complex resonances. Scaeva's *deuotio* is itself a paradox (quite apart from his survival), because it is simultaneously successful in bringing victory to his own (Caesarean) side but also, in the paradox that is civil war, brings defeat, in the form of the slavery of the principate, to his greater (Roman) side.[114] Silius challenges us to assess the likeness and unlikeness of Paulus' situation: does his apparently glorious end have a similarly destructive effect on Rome, or does, in an inversion of Scaeva's, its short-term cause of defeat lead to a longer-term victory? Cannae is not part of a civil war, despite many elements which liken it to one, but the Silian paradox of greatness in defeat and the perils of victory is very similar to the Lucanian world, where the victor in civil war is guilty and the loser not only innocent but even great.[115] Perhaps Paulus might be unaware that, in this war, as Scaeva was unaware in the civil war, *quam magnum uirtus crimen…esset* (Luc. 6.148).

In one sense, at least, the relationship with Scaeva is a contrastive one: Scaeva succeeds in his one-man battle against the (enemy) many to save the many; Paulus dies. This is particularly relevant to our analysis in that Scaeva is depicted as a wall, *stat non fragilis pro Caesare murus*, standing for Caesar, but also for the wall, the camp, the surrogate city, which protects him.[116] As Conte and Leigh point out, this image is also used of Hector in Seneca's *Troades*.[117] Since Scaeva is a wall, he must be attacked with siege engines and rocks for battering walls (*muralia*), an image used, as Conte notes, for the spear with which Aeneas fells another of our city-defenders, Turnus.[118] When Paulus' body is found, so different (like Hector's ghost) from what he once was, his teeth have been smashed by the hurling of a *saxum murale*. This is the *saxum ingens* which felled him at 10.235-7, a successful reassertion of the symbolic defeat of Troy, which Virgil had reversed by having Turnus fail to replicate

---

[112] Luc. 6.118-262. On Scaeva, see esp. Rutz (1960) 462-6, Marti (1966), Conte (1974), Ahl (1976) 117-21, Saylor (1978) esp. 250-3, Henderson (1987), Johnson (1987) 57-60, Fantham (1995), Leigh (1997) 158-90, 243-6, Hershkowitz (1998) 214-6, 243-4, Gorman (2001) 277-9, Sklenář (2003) 45-59, 149-51.
[113] 10.298-30 ~ Luc. 6.236-9.
[114] Summed up in the capping *sententia*: *quanta dominum uirtute parasti!* Luc. 6.262.
[115] Guilty winners and lucky losers: Luc. 7.123, 701-8; on this as a result of 'moral luck', see now Long (2007) 192-3.
[116] Luc. 6.201. On Scaeva as a wall, see Marti (1966) 247-8, comparing Bitias at Verg. *A.* 9.704, Saylor (1978), Leigh (1997) 185-90.
[117] Sen. *Tro.* 126, with Conte (1974) 56, Leigh (1997) 186-7.
[118] Luc. 6.198-201, Marti (1966) 248; Verg. *A.* 12.921-2, Conte (1974) 55.

the Homeric Diomedes' felling of Aeneas.[119] Thus, while Scaeva the wall stood firm, Paulus the city-wall has been breached.

This imagery of the death of the defender not merely entailing but symbolizing the fall of the city is, of course, part of Paulus' association with Hector, who is mourned as if Troy had fallen.[120] We recall Lentulus' vision of the sack of Rome which is effectively embodied in the sight of the dying Paulus (10.264-6). Yet it is not only Hector who represents the fall of Troy: the death of Priam in *Aeneid* 2 even more clearly embodies, by synecdoche rather than prolepsis, the sack of his city (Verg. *A.* 2.557-8):

> *iacet ingens litore truncus,*
> *auulsumque umeris caput et sine nomine corpus.*

The allusion to the death of Pompey in the description of Priam's headless corpse on the shore both made and enabled later writers, most notably Lucan, to make the connection between the fall of Priam and Troy and that of Pompey and, in some sense, Rome.[121] The death of Paulus clearly evokes, not only those of Priam and Pompey, but the symbolic interpretation to which they were susceptible (10.305-11):

> *hic finis Paulo. iacet altum pectus et ingens*
> *dextera, quem, soli si bella agitanda darentur,*
> *aequares forsan Fabio. mors addidit urbi*
> *pulchra decus misitque uiri inter sidera nomen.*
> *postquam spes Italum mentesque in consule lapsae,*
> *ceu truncus capitis, saeuis exercitus armis*
> *sternitur, et uictrix toto furit Africa campo.*

The verbal echoes are clear,[122] even if the reader had not been prepared for them by a series of allusions to Priam's epitaph in the deaths of the Phorcys and Curio, the latter of which is wittily followed, in a new sentence, by a further echo, *ingens*, referring to Paulus and marking the transition into the narrative of his death.[123] Further preparation is furnished by the way that Viriathus kills Servilius before Paulus' eyes, like Pyrrhus killing Polites before Priam.[124] After Lucan's allusion to Virgil, who may in turn have been alluding to the history of Asinius Pollio, the reader is primed to

---

[119] *saxum ingens*: Verg. *A.* 12.896-7; see Quint (1993) 68-72 on this as a Freudian 'repetition-as-reversal' (51), whereby Turnus both fails to replicate Diomedes (*Il.* 5.302-10) and replicates the failure of Aeneas (*Il.* 20.283-91), before Aeneas' spear, through the simile, successfully replicates Diomedes. The author of the *Ilias Latina* seems to point the allusion by likewise calling Diomedes' rock *saxum ingens* (460); cf. Scaffai (1997) 474 on 'Baebius'' modelling of his Achilles-Hector duel on Aeneas and Turnus. Cf. also Stat. *Theb.* 10.856, where the Thebans hurl *ingentia saxa* at Capaneus, not *qua* wall or city, but *qua* besieging army.

[120] Hom. *Il.* 22.408-11. The simile can be interpreted in terms either of cause and effect – 'This emphasized similarity comes very close to saying that by killing Hector, Achilles has in effect burned Troy.' Taplin (1992) 250 – or of symbolism – 'the fall of Troy is not depicted, but that Hector's demise symbolises it is made clear.' Bowie (1990) 470-1 – or even of identification: 'Hector is Troy, in a way that no Achaean, even Achilles, stands for the Greek side.' Ross (1998) 121.

[121] Verg. *A.* 2.557-8, with Serv. *ad loc.*: *Pompei tangit historiam*; 'come nella fine di Priamo si rispecchiava quella di Troia, cosi nella morte di Pompeo si riflettono il crollo di Roma e la fine della libertà.' Narducci (1973) 323; cf. *id.* (1979) 44. See also Ahl (1976) 184-9 (also comparing the simile of Dido's death), Bowie (1990), Hinds (1998) 8-10. Cf. Ov. *Met.* 13.404: *Troia simul Priamusque cadunt.*

[122] Briefly, Spaltenstein *ad loc.*, cross-referencing to 5.328; for more detail, see Marpicati (1999) 195-7.

[123] *iacet ingens Phorcys ab antris*, 10.173; Curio: *Hadriaca iacuit sine nomine mortis harena.* 10.214. Silius' wit is again evident, since the identified Curio is not, like the unrecognizable Priam and Pompey, without a name, but, because he drowned rather than falling in battle, without glory in his death.

[124] 10.219-25; Paulus reaction is similar to Priam's, but more successful as he kills Viriathus.

recognize allusions to this scene and, moreover, to recognize them *as* allusions and repetitions, like Lucan's frenzied matrona.[125]

Paulus, of course, unlike Priam and Pompey, is not beheaded, but Silius skilfully elucidates the allegory of their deaths, whereby they represent both the city deprived of its political head and the head itself, by applying the word *truncus*, not to the consul himself, but to the Roman army deprived of him, their head.[126] Such 'commentaries' on Virgil and others, translating the metaphorical into the literal, is characteristic of Silius: one might compare his unpacking of the famous first simile of the *Aeneid*, which appears to compare Neptune stilling a storm to a Roman orator calming a mob, but which might equally be read as indicating the allegorical meaning of Neptune and the storm, putting the symbolic into the narrative and the literal into the simile. Silius elucidates this move by comparing Fabius, a Roman orator calming a mob, to Neptune calming a storm, even replicating the Virgilian Neptune's famous aposiopesis.[127] In the case of Paulus, the allegory – an extended metaphor, as Quintilian notes – of the headless man as the city without its leader is turned into the metaphor for the leaderless city as 'headless'. It is clear that, just as dead, headless Priam represented the fall of Troy, just as dead, headless Pompey in some way represented the fall of Rome, so dead Paulus, with his headless army, the city wall felled by a *saxum murale*, in some way represents the fall of a city; but which city, and in *what* way?

11 *ter capta Troia*: the sack of Cannae

Some indication is given by the introduction of Cannae, before the battle has begun (8.621-2):

> *ut uentum ad Cannas, urbis uestigia priscae,*
> *defigunt diro signa infelicia vallo.*

Cannae was, according to Polybius and Livy respectively, a village or town and it was still standing, but Silius makes it the traces of an ancient city.[128] The traces, still visible in the landscape of literary history,[129] are those of all those ancient cities doomed to be sacked — Carthage, Calydon, Tyre, Troy, Ardea, Privernum – which the *Aeneid* links by terming them each, not quite *urbs prisca* – Silius must be allowed some subtlety – but *urbs antiqua*.[130] Yet above all it is the traces of the ancient city of Troy, site of the defeat which the Trojans' descendents will replicate. This should not surprise us, when we have seen Paulus' death as replicating both Hector's and

[125] Luc. 1.685: Narducci (1979). Hinds (1998) 8-10 further interprets the matrona's recognition as 'dramatizing our own realization, as readers, that we too have seen this decapitated trunk before: in the second book of the Aeneid.' On Pollio, see Moles (1982-3), Morgan (2000).

[126] Manil. 4.64; Luc. 1.685, 8.722, 9.53. Marpicati (1999). Ovid likewise unpacks the allegory by applying a different part of the image to the city rather than its leader: *iacet Ilion ingens*, *Met.* 13.505.

[127] 7.217-59, esp. 248-9: *modo qui – sed parcere dictis | sit melius.*

[128] *uicum*, Liv. 22.43.10; πόλεως, Polyb. 3.107.2.

[129] On *uestigia* as an intertextual marker, see Bowditch (2005) 284, Heslin (2005) 264-7 Armstrong (2006) 173 n. 15.

[130] Carthage: Verg. *A.* 1.12; Troy: 2.363; Tyre: 4.670 (where *antiqua* directly qualifies *Tyros*, rather than *urbs* in a periphrasis); Ardea: 10.688; Privernum: 11.540. Silius also picks up on the third of these at 2.614 when, in the only other *iunctura* of *urbs prisca* in Latin, it refers to Ardea, from which the Rutulian colonists had fled to another city about (in the narrative) to be sacked, Saguntum. On the motif of 'ancient cities' in the *Aeneid*, see now Reed (2007) 129-47, who also notes (145-6) Silius' reception of the motif at 2.654-6, but not in the other two passages..

Priam's, but it does re-open the central question of this article: what precisely is the relationship between Paulus and his predecessors, and hence between Troy and its successors? Cannae is another Troy (still allowing for all the slippage of likeness and unlikeness which that metonymy entails) but in what relationship does it stand to *Rome*? Unlike at Saguntum, these are real Romans (with Trojan epithets) fighting and dying, but could Cannae be, like that Spanish Troy, a surrogate, a substitute for Rome? Is Troy (as replicated at Cannae) an image of what is happening to Rome, or is it, as in the *Aeneid*, the city which can and indeed must be sacked so that Rome can rise? And finally, to return to our synecdochic hero, does Paulus' death, reckless and courageous, self-sacrificing and selfish, make him the Hector who dooms Trojan Rome and the Priam who embodies that doom, or the Hector and Priam who must remain in the past of Trojan Cannae, so that the Rome which is but also is not Troy can survive and flourish?

Silius gives no answers, but a final pair of intertexts might help further to inform the reader's assessment. Lentulus' offer to carry the elderly Paulus out of the cataclysm of Cannae is (in addition to the intertexts we have already considered) a failed attempt to replicate Aeneas' famous carrying of the elderly Anchises out of the cataclysm of Troy.[131] Paulus' refusal replicates Anchises' initial refusal and combines it with Aeneas' resulting despair and return to his earlier death-wish, but this time there is no Creusa and no divine omens to intervene. This is an Anchises who does not split himself from his double, Priam, but remains as a symbol (and cause) of the fall of Troy.[132] Just as Anchises does not want to survive his city, so Paulus will not survive the battle. Juno-Metellus, as we have seen, warned Paulus that he would drag everything down with him, just as Aeneas and Creusa urge Anchises not to want to overturn everything along with him (*ne uertere secum | omnia…uellet*). Aeneas's despair and desire not to die unavenged (which, thanks to the hapless Iertes, Paulus achieves) recalls his earlier maxim that the only salvation for the defeated was not to hope for salvation (*una salus uictis nullam sperare salutem.* Verg. *A.* 2.354). This despairing rallying-cry also includes an urge to rush into the midst of the enemy, another perversion of the *deuotio*, bringing destruction but no victory.[133] Aeneas himself describes his desire for a beautiful death (Verg. *A.* 2.316-7):

furor iraque mentem
praecipitat, pulchrumque mori succurrit in armis.

This is the beautiful death, the *mors pulchra*, which Paulus insists to Juno-Metellus that he wants and which, in due course, he achieves. Stahl uses these lines to prove that *furor* and *ira* are not always negative in the *Aeneid*, but we might equally use them to suggest precisely the opposite, that the desire for a beautiful death (especially

[131] Most clearly when he says *ipse leuabo umeris et dorso tuta locabo* (10.275) ~ *ipse subibo umeris nec me labor iste grauabit* (Verg. *A.* 2.708). Cf. Niemann (1975) 242, citing Rossaeus (1661) 63-4. On 'failed intertext repetition', exemplified by instances in the *Thebaid*, see Hershkowitz (1997).

[132] The emphatically positioned *deseris* at 10.269 also recalls the identically placed *deseris* at Verg. *A.* 3.711, when Anchises does finally abandon Aeneas by dying. Cf. also Fabius' accusation against Scipio for taking the war to Africa: *tu fessos auius hosti | deseris ac septem denudas proditor arces.* 16.619-20.

[133] Raabe (1974: 113-4) neatly compares the attitude to Silius' Saguntines (whose ambivalence we have noted) and the Stoic suicides of the early principate: 'Die wilde Entschlossenheit der Aeneaden, ihr Ende kämpfend zu besiegeln, rührt aus ihrer aussichtslosen Lage her.' Quite so, but it throws into greater relief the fact that Aeneas *does* have prospects and hence it is his duty *not* to throw his life away. Interestingly, Niemann (1975: 218) expresses very similar sentiments about Paulus: 'Der erste [Gleichnis]…markiert bereits die aussichtlose Situation, in der sich Paulus befindet und der er sich mit vollem Bewußtsein…nicht entziehen will, sondern mutig bis zum Tode Widerstand leistet.

when that overrides duty) is not always positive, and can be the result of irrational passions.[134] Likewise Leigh argues that many *deuotus*-figures in the Aeneid 'seek to sacrifice themselves out of a sense of responsibility to others. Priam and Aeneas are the leaders of Troy, and their actions are a direct response to the destruction of their city.'[135] This is only partly true, not only because Aeneas expresses little but despair and a markedly limited sense of responsibility except to his own glory, but because, following the prophecy of Hector's ghost, his responsibility, and indeed his responsibility to his city, demands that he not rush to his death, but survive.

This, once more, is the dilemma of Hector, but, more pointedly than in the *Iliad*, Aeneas here must reject the conventional glory of dying for his country in favour of the (conventionally shameful) alternative of *fleeing* for his country. Flight – *fuga, fugere,* and their cognates – is repeatedly privileged as Aeneas' paradoxical duty, from Hector's first words, '*heu fuge, nate dea*', to Venus closing commands, '*eripe, nate, fugam*' (619), and Anchises' insistence that flight (not fighting!) is only for the sound of body: *'uos o, quibus integer aeui| sanguis,' ait, 'solidaeque suo stant robore uires, |uos agitate fugam.*'[136] Perhaps most tellingly of all, the institution of the Actian Games, *victory* games, which the victor of Actium would also celebrate centuries later, are held in memory of their glorious flight, principally their sea-journey westwards from Troy, but surely also evoking the escape from the city: *iuuat euasisse tot urbes |Argolicas mediosque fugam tenuisse per hostis* (3.282-3). Note how the *deuotio* motif of rushing to one's death in the midst of the enemy is transformed into achieving flight through their midst.[137] Paulus is not only an Anchises who does not change his mind, but also an Aeneas who, despite almost as many interventions, is not persuaded to flee and save his city.

This picture requires qualification. As with all of these identifications of Paulus with synecdochic heroes, such as Hector, Priam, Pompey, and Aeneas, the reader must ask herself whether Paulus *is* in fact the one who stands for the many, and whose destruction causes their destruction. There are several hints that this is not entirely the case either. I said that Paulus is like a combination of Anchises and Aeneas, but without the intervention of Creusa and divine portents; this too needs qualification. Nothing intervenes to make Paulus leave Cannae, as Aeneas and Anchises did Troy, but his response to Lentulus shares much of the hope for the future which Anchises finds in the portentous manifestations of divine favour, so that the tribune's offer, with all the courage that it reveals, in itself functions as a kind of portent manifesting divine favour (10.277-9):

> *'macte o uirtute paterna!*
> *nec uero spes angustae, cum talia restent*
> *pectora Romuleo regno.*

Though Paulus himself will not go with Lentulus, as Anchises does with Aeneas, he sees in the tribune the hope for the future after the present disaster, for the survival of

---

[134] 'It appears impossible that Virgil should condemn a frenzy that leads to noble death for one's country.' Stahl (1981) 166.

[135] Leigh (1993) 95.

[136] Perhaps even Anchises' fateful panic, which leads to the loss of Creusa – '*nate,' exclamat, 'fuge, nate'* (2.733) – could be construed as symbolically expressing the destined necessity of leaving Creusa, as well as Troy, behind. For Creusa as a synecdoche for Troy, see Syed (2005) 140-1.

[137] The paradox of this victorious defeat is best summed up by the inscription on the Argive shield they dedicate: *AENEAS HAEC DE DANAIS VICTORIBVS ARMA* (3.288). On the significance of its being Abas' shield, see Miller (1993).

the city, which the old Trojan sees in his divinely sanctioned son and grandson: *di patrii; seruate domum, seruate nepotem. | uestrum hoc augurium, uestroque in numine Troia est* (Verg. *A.* 2.702-3). This sense of hope for the Trojan future in times of trial is also evoked by closer echoes of word and idea in Paulus' speech of two speeches in *Aeneid* 9, that of Aletes' in response to Nisus' and Euryalus' volunteering, and of Apollo at Ascanius' successful silencing of Numanus Remulus.[138] The sense that Cannae, like Troy, is past, but that there is hope for the Roman future is further reinforced by the fact that this is the second scene in which Silius has, by combinatorial allusion, pointed the link between Aeneas' rescue of Anchises and Apollo's congratulation of Ascanius. When the young Scipio, later Africanus, rescues his father, Aeneas-like, at the battle of Trebia, Roman Mars (in place of Trojan Apollo) praises him in language used to Ascanius in Latium.[139] The sense of hope in defeat and promise for the future at Trebia is clear, but here the effect is more muted. Paulus, unlike not only Anchises but also Scipio senior, does not escape and, alongside the hope the future, there is greater emphasis on the defeat and destruction of the present. Rome will not fall, and indeed it will rise, but Silius allows us to be less sanguine about the 'fall' of Cannae, even than about the fall of Troy.

That Cannae cannot be simplistically equated with Rome, that its re-enactment of the fall of Troy is not metonymous for the fall of Rome, is made clear by Mago, who, unaware of the warning dream sent by Juno to delay his brother Hannibal's attack on Rome itself, upbraids him (10.382-6):

> *'tanta mole' inquit 'non Roma, ut creditur, ipsa,*
> *sed Varro est uictus. quaenam tam prospera Martis*
> *munera destituis fato patriamque moraris!*
> *mecum exultet eques: iuro hoc caput, accipe muros*
> *Iliacos portasque tibi sine Marte patentis.'*

Here, of course, is Hannibal as anti-Aeneas moving steadily towards what he hopes will be his acquisition of Rome in book twelve of his epic, as is traditional. Mago thinks otherwise: such great effort, aimed not of course at founding the Roman people as at Verg. *A.* 1.33, but at defeating them, has not yet achieved that aim. Cannae may serve as a replay of Troy, but it is not Rome. Yet Mago also misreads the relationship between Troy and Rome, between *Aeneid* 2 and the *Punica*. He believes that the walls of Rome *are* the walls of Troy and that the gates are open to him without battle. Juno will make it very clear to Hannibal in *Punica* 12 that Rome is *not* Troy (*non tibi cum Phrygio res Laurentiue colono*. 12.706) and that, not only are the gates not open, but Mars himself, the god rather than the metonymy, is before them in, appropriately enough, the Campus Martius (*cerne, ut saeuis Gradiuus in armis | implerit dictum proprio de nomine campum*. 12.716-7).[140]

---

[138] Aletes: *'di patrii, quorum semper sub numine Troia est, | non tamen omnino Teucros delere paratis, | cum* ***talis*** *animos iuuenum et tam certa tulistis | **pectora**.'* Verg. *A.* 9.247-50; Apollo: ***macte*** *noua* ***uirtute****, puer, sic itur ad astra, | dis genite et geniture deos. iure omnia bella | gente sub Assaraci fato uentura resident, | nec te Troia capit.'* 9.641-4. For the allusion to Apollo, see Ripoll (1998) 61.

[139] Mars' speech: 4.472-7; On this scene: Ahl-Davis-Pomeroy (1986) 2545; Fucecchi (1993) 27-9; Hardie (1993), 97; Ripoll (1998), 182-3; Marks (2005a), 37; Casali (2006) 589. On combinatorial imitation, see Hardie (1989), Cowan (2006).

[140] I shall discuss this scene fully in chapter 4 of *Indivisible Cities*: 'Misreading Trojan Rome'.

12 Two become one, become two: Paulus, Varro, and the division of the hero

Cannae has 'fallen', but Rome will not. It need not have been so. Silius bookends his depiction of Paulus' last hours with two of the counterfactual scenarios, of which Silius is so fond, two *ungeschehene Geschehen*, to use Nesselrath's term. Let us look again at part of Paulus' epitaph (10.305-7):

> *iacet altum pectus et ingens*
> *dextera, quem, soli si bella agitanda darentur,*
> *aequares forsan Fabio.*

Here we have yet another paradox: in the very act of confirming Paulus in the role of the synecdochic hero, the Priam/Pompey-figure, the one who stands for the many, Silius reminds us that Paulus was not one man, and speculates on what would have happened if he were. The paradox expresses the tension between competing models for what might save Rome, for what Rome should be. The death of Paulus, the despairing Hector-figure, has brought about the destruction of his people because of the decision made by the one man who stands for all, an argument against the monarchical implications of the synecdochic hero. Yet, if he *had* in fact been the one man, the sole leader in command of the war, rather than a Polydamas-figure vainly trying to restrain the Hector-figure of Varro, then the outcome would have been different, an argument against the weakness, both of the dyarchic consulate and of the democracy which elects unsuitable men to it.

Yet, once more, what is the delayed, enjambed, counterfactual apodosis which would have occurred if Paulus *had* been in sole command? Not, as we might be expecting, victory in battle, but – perhaps – he would have matched Fabius. If the wars had been given to Paulus to conduct *alone*, perhaps he would have equalled Fabius, the dictator, the *one man*, who by delaying restored the state. Silius wittily plays on *aequares* as signifying both that Paulus' could have matched Fabius' achievements and that he could have numerically equalled his renowned Ennian (and Virgilian) singularity. A Paulus without a Varro could have played the role of Fabius, the constitutional dictator, the one man who by delaying restored, not just Rome, but the Republic. It was not to be. The essence of Silius' Paulus is that he is both one and one of two, half of the consulate, ceaselessly compared and contrasted with Varro, mainly for good, but in some ways for ill. Just as the doublet of Juno-Metellus and Lentulus, so similar and yet so different, enables us to analyse the issue of whether Paulus should fight or flee, so the doublet of Paulus and Varro, both destroying the city, both saving it, enables us to explore the two sides of Rome, what made it great and what caused its downfall.

Once more, the doubleness of Varro and Paulus, the way in which they are used to explore different facets of Roman identity, plays off an element which is already present in their Homeric equivalents, Hector and Polydamas. These two, born on the same night, function as each other's 'alter-ego' and even two facets of the '"divided self" of the defender mentality'.[141] In the *Punica*, the division is more complex: each of Varro and Paulus is *both* Hector and Polydamas. Paulus is the Polydamas-figure unsuccessfully trying to persuade Varro-Hector not to engage in a misjudged and potentially disastrous engagement, but he is also, as we have seen,

[141] Birth: Hom. *Il.* 18.251-2; 'alter ego': Redfield (1975) 143 (cf. 143-53); 'divided self': Scully (1990) 117; cf. Reinhardt (1961) 272-7, Schofield (19) 18-19.

very much the Hector-figure preferring a *mors pulchra* to flight, even if it endangers the city. Varro is the rash Hector-figure who destroys his people through his folly, but he is also the figure who returns to the city and helps to protect it, not just a Polydamas, but perhaps a Hector who listens to Priam's pleas.

The comparison with Varro is also brought out in the other counterfactual scenario, which will also be our last look at Paulus as Hector. In the opening description of his aristeia, we are told (10.28-30):

> *cadit ingens nominis expers*
> *uni turba uiro, atque, alter si detur in armis*
> *Paulus Dardaniis, amittant nomina Cannae.*

High praise indeed, as Niemann notes, but there is more to these lines than panegyric. Here, some time before Phorcys, Curio, and Paulus, is an instance of the Priam-Pompey motif, with *ingens* in place, the dynamic *cadit* for the static *iacet*, *nominis expers* ringing the changes on *sine nomine*, and, most wittily of all, the enjambed, unexpected *turba*, tendentiously glossing Virgil's *corpus* not as 'trunk' (*OLD* 7) but 'body of troops' (*OLD* 15b). The dynamic between the synecdochic hero and the many is reversed as, like an offensive-minded Scaeva, the one man does not die either for or at the hands of the many, but kills them. But for all that, one man is not enough. You need two. Perhaps if the other side of the pair, the two-who-are-one, his colleague as consul, Varro, were fighting like Paulus, or rather if the other consul were not Varro at all, but *were* Paulus, then things might have been different. The counterfactual fantasy is caught between a negation of the synecdochic hero (one Paulus is not enough – you would need two) and an assertion of it (if the two consuls were both Paulus, if the two consuls were in fact one, if, in fact, they were not two consuls at all but one *princeps*…).

It also fits into the pattern of Paulus as Hector, since it echoes Diomedes' counterfactual speculation, as reported by Venulus to the Latin assembly (Verg. *A.* 11.285-90):

> *si duo praeterea talis Idaea tulisset*
> *terra uiros, ultro Inachias uenisset ad urbes*
> *Dardanus, et uersis lugeret Graecia fatis.*
> *quidquid apud durae cessatum est moenia Troiae,*
> *Hectoris Aeneaeque manu uictoria Graium*
> *haesit et in decimum uestigia rettulit annum.*

Here we have doubled doubling: Hector is no longer the sole *belli mora*, but is doubled with Aeneas; it was these two who kept the Greeks at bay for ten years. Even here, of course, there is a first among equals, as they were matched in *animi* and *arma*, but Aeneas was superior in *pietas*. The doubling of Hector, the division of him into Hector and Aeneas, the doomed defender and the survivor who will transmit Troy into the future, is dramatized by Diomedes' further assertion that a further doubling would have brought victory, and even an offensive victory over the Greeks in their own land.[142] Paulus and Varro, in their capacities as doomed defender and survivor, are insufficient to save Trojan Cannae, indeed, their respective Hectorean

[142] *si parua licet componere magnis,* a similarly self-conscious reference to doubling occurs in *The Simpsons*, where an incredulous Mafioso, seeing Krusty the Clown and Homer dressed as Krusty, rubs his eyes and says 'I'm seein' double – four Krusties!'

flaws are instrumental in bringing about its 'sack', but perhaps the combination of their qualities are also instrumental, not merely in delaying, but in averting the sack of Trojan Rome. For victory, another Hector and another Aeneas would be needed, another pair of the defensive past and the survivor for the future, two more equals of whom one will be first and will become the new synecdochic hero of Rome; the *Punica* has such a pair in Fabius and Scipio. Fabius, of course, is doubled with Paulus, but, as the latter's epitaph shows, Paulus was unable quite to equal him. Fabius, like Paulus, will argue against the bold, offensive strategy of a consul (16.604-43), but this time, when Scipio takes the battle to Hannibal and invades Africa, the result will be very different from the disaster that was Cannae. Except, of course, that the ultimate paradox of the *Punica* is that the defeat at Cannae, with all that Varro and Paulus did to contribute to it, was Rome's finest hour.

The differences and similarities between Varro and Paulus on the one hand and Scipio and Fabius on the other, those between Varro and Scipio, and Paulus and Fabius, and of all of them measured against Hector and Aeneas, are merely the human microcosm of the differences between Troy, Cannae, and Rome. This is just one example of the complexities of reading Trojan Rome in the *Punica*.

ROBERT COWAN
Balliol College, Oxford
bob.cowan@balliol.ox.ac.uk

Bibliography

Ahl, Frederick M. (1976) *Lucan. An introduction* (Ithaca).
Ahl, F., Davis, M.A. & Pomeroy, A. (1986) 'Silius Italicus' *ANRW* II.32.4: 2492-2561.
von Albrecht, Michael (1964) *Silius Italicus. Freiheit und Gebundenheit römischer Epik* (Amsterdam).
Armstrong, Rebecca (2006) *Cretan women: Pasiphae, Ariadne, and Phaedra in Latin poetry* (Oxford).
Bandera, Césareo (1981) 'Sacrificial Levels in Virgil's *Aeneid*' *Arethusa* 14: 217-39.
Barker E. T. E. & Christensen, J. P. (2006) 'Flight Club: The New Archilochus Fragment and its Resonance with Homeric Epic' *MD* 57: 19-43.
Bartsch, Shadi (1997) *Ideology in cold blood: a reading of Lucan's Civil War* (Cambridge, Mass.).
Bassett, Edward L. (1955) 'Regulus and the Serpent in the *Punica*' *CPh* 50: 1-20.
— (1959) 'Silius *Punica* 6.1-53' *CPh* 54: 10-34,
— (1963) 'Scipio and the Ghost of Appius' *CPh* 58: 73-92.
— (1966) 'Hercules and the Hero of the *Punica*' in Wallach (1966) 258-73.
Behr, Francesca D'Alessandro (2007) *Feeling History: Lucan, Stoicism, and the Poetics of Passion* (Ohio).
Benz, F.L. (1972) *Personal Names in the Phoenician and Punic Inscriptions* (Rome).
Berard, J. (1944) 'Nouvelles notes sur la légende de la diaspora troyenne' *REG* 57: 71-86.
Bettini, M. (1977) 'Ennio in Silio Italico. A proposito dei proemi al I e al VII degli Annales e del proemio allo Scipio' *RFIC* 105: 425-47.
Bickerman, Elias (1952) '*Origines Gentium*' *CPh* 47: 63-81.
Billerbeck, Margarethe (1985) 'Aspects of Stoicism in Flavian Epic' *PLLS 5*: 341-56.
— (1986) 'Stoizismus in der römischen Epik neronischer und flavischer Zeit' *ANRW* II.32.5: 3116-51.
Bloch, A. (1970) 'Arma virumque als heroisches Leitmotiv', *MH* 27: 206-11
Bömer, Franz (1951) *Rom und Troja* (Baden-Baden).
— ed. (1957-8) *P. Ovidius Naso, Die Fasten, herausgegeben, übersetzt und kommentiert*. (Heidelberg).
— ed. (1969-86) *P. Ovidius Naso: Metamorphosen: Kommentar*. (Heidelberg).
Bowditch, Phebe Lowell (2005) 'Hermeneutic Uncertainty and the Feminine in Ovid's *Ars Amatoria*: The Procris and Cephalus Digression' in Ancona, Ronnie & Greene, Ellen (edd.) *Gendered Dynamics In Latin Love Poetry* (Baltimore) 271-94.
Bowie, A.M. (1990) 'The Death of Priam: Allegory and History in the *Aeneid*' *CQ* 40: 470-481.

Boyd, Barbara Weiden (2001) 'Arms and the man: Wordplay and the Catasterism of Chiron in Ovid *Fasti* 5' *AJPh* 122: 67-80

Boyle, A.J. ed. (1983) *Seneca Tragicus. Ramus Essays on Senecan Drama* (Berwick).

— ed. (1990) *The Imperial Muse, Flavian Epicist to Claudian* (Aureal).

— ed. (1993) *Roman Epic* (Routledge).

— ed. (1994) *Roman Literature and Ideology: Essays in honour of J.P.Sullivan = Ramus* 23.1&2.

— (1997) *Tragic Seneca. An essay in the theatrical tradition* (Routledge).

Braund, Susanna & Gilbert, Giles (2003) 'An ABC of epic *ira*: anger, beasts and cannibalism' *YCS* 32: 250-85.

Brouwers, J. H. (1982) 'Zur Lucan-Imitation bei Silius Italicus.' in den Boeft J. & Kessels A. H. M. edd. *Actus. Studies in honour of H. L. W. Nelson* (Utrecht) 73-87.

Bruère, Richard T. (1952) 'Silius Italicus *Punica* 3.62-162 and 4.763-822' *CPh* 47: 219-27.

— (1958) '*Color Ovidianus* in Silius' *Punica* 1-7' in Herescu, N.I. ed. *Ovidiana: récherches sur Ovide*. (Paris) 475-99.

— (1959) '*Color Ovidianus* in Silius' *Punica* 8-17' *CPh* 54: 228-45.

— (1971) 'Some Recollections of Virgil's Drances in Later Epic.' *CPh* 66: 30-5.

Burck, Erich (1943) 'Das Bild der Karthager in der römischen Literatur,' in Vogt, J. *Rom und Karthago: ein Gemeinschaftswerk* (Leipzig) 297-34.

— (1978) *Unwetterszenen bei den flavischen Epikern* Abhandlung der Geistes- und sozialwissenschaftlichen Klassen, Jahrgang 1978 nr. 8 (Mainz).

— ed. (1979a) *Das römische Epos* (Darmstadt).

— (1979b) 'Die ›Punica‹ des Silius Italicus' in Burck (1979a) 254-99. .

— (1984a) *Historische und epische Tradition bei Silius Italicus*. Zetemata 80 (München).

— (1984b) *Silius Italicus. Hannibal in Capua und die Rückeroberung der Stadt durch die Römer*. Abhandlung der Geistes- und sozialwissenschaftlichen Klassen, Jahrgang 1984 nr.13 (Mainz).

Burke, Paul F. jr. (1978) '*Drances Infensus*: A Study in Vergilian Character Portrayal.' *TAPhA* 108: 15-20.

Casali, Sergio (1999) '*Facta impia* (Virgil, *Aeneid* 4.596-9)' *CQ* 49: 203-11.

— (2006) 'The Poet at War: Ennius on the Field in Silius's *Punica*' *Arethusa* 39, 569–93.

Ceauşescu, P. (1976) '*Altera Roma*: Histoire d'une folie politique' *Historia* 25: 86-100.

Chaplin, Jane (2000) *Livy's Exemplary History* (Oxford).

Cholevius, L. (1865) *Epitheta ornatia, quibus utitur Vergilius, cum iis comparata, quibus posteriores epici latini, maxime quidem Silius, carmina sua distinxerunt* (Konigsberg).

Coarelli, Filippo (2001) '*Origo Sagunti*. L'origine mitica de Sagunto e l'alleanza con Roma' Fromentin & Gotteland (2001) 321-326.

Conte, Gian Biagio (1974) *Saggio di commento a Lucano,* Pharsalia *VI 118-260: l'Aristia di Sceva* (Pisa).

Cornell, T.J. (1975) 'Aeneas and the twins: the development of the Roman foundation legend' *PCPhS* 21: 1-32.

Cowan, Robert (2002) *In my beginning is my end: origins, cities, and foundations in Flavian epic* (Oxford D.Phil.).

— (2006) 'Absurdly Scythian Spaniards: Silius, Horace, and the Concani' *Mnemosyne* 59: 260-7.

Davis, P. J. (1994) 'The Fabric of History in Statius' *Thebaid*' in Deroux, Carl. ed. *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History* VII (Brussels) 464-83.

Dinter, Martin (2005) 'Epic and Epigram—Minor Heroes in Virgil's *Aeneid*' *CQ* 55: 153–69.

Dominik, W. J. (2003) 'Hannibal at the Gates: Programmatising Rome and *Romanitas* in Silius Italicus' *Punica* 1 and 2' in Boyle A. J. and Dominik, W. J. (edd.), *Flavian Rome: Culture, Image, Text* (Leiden) 469–98.

Dyck, Andrew (2004) 'Cicero's *Devotio*: The Roles of Dux and Scape-Goat in his *Post Reditum* Rhetoric' *HSCPh* 102: 299-314.

Edwards, Catherine (2007) *Death in Ancient Rome* (New Haven).

Erskine, Andrew (2003) *Troy Between Greece and Rome: Local Tradition and Imperial Power* (Oxford).

Fantham, Elaine (1995) 'The ambiguity of Virtus in Lucan's *Civil war* and Statius' *Thebaid*' Arachnion. A Journal of Ancient Literature and History on the Web, nr. 3. http://www.cisi.unito.it/arachne/num3/fantham.html.

— (1999) 'Fighting Words: Turnus at Bay in the Latin Council (*Aeneid* 11.234–446)' *AJPh* 120: 259–80.

Feeney, D.C. (1982) *A Commentary on Silius Italicus Book 1* (D.Phil. Oxford).
— (1986a) '"*Stat magni nominis umbra*." Lucan on the greatness of Pompeius Magnus' *CQ* 36: 239-43.
— (1986b) 'History and revelation in Vergil's underworld' *PCPhS* 32: 1-24.
— (1991) *The Gods in Epic* (Oxford).
Feldherr, Andrew (1997) 'Metamorphosis and Sacrifice in Ovid's Theban Narrative' *MD* 38: 25–55.
— (1998) *Spectacle and Society in Livy's History* (Berkeley).
Fowler, Don (1997) 'The Virgil commentary of Servius' in Martindale, Charles ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil* (Cambridge) 73-8.
— (2000) 'On the Shoulders of Giants: Intertextuality and Latin Studies' in *Roman Constructions: Readings in Postmodern Latin* (Oxford) 115-38
Fucecchi, Marco (1993) 'Lo spettacolo delle virtù nel giovane eroe predestinato: analisi della figura di Scipione in Silio Italico' *Maia* 45: 17-48.
Gabba, Emilio (1976) 'Sulla valorizzione della legenda delle origini troiane di Roma fra III e II a.C.' in Sordi, Marta ed. *I canali della propaganda nel mondo antico*. (Milan) 84-101.
Gagé, J. (1963) 'À propos des origines et du cheminement de la légende troyenne de Rome' *Rev. Hist.* 229: 305-34, 230: 1-24.
Galinsky, G. Karl (1969) *Aeneas, Sicily, and Rome* (Princeton).
Gill, Christopher (1996) *Personality in Greek Epic, Tragedy, and Philosophy: the Self in Dialogue* (Oxford).
Gorman, Vanessa B. (2001) 'Lucan's Epic *Aristeia* and the Hero of the *Bellum Civile*' *CJ* 96: 263-90.
Griffin, Jasper (1976) 'Homeric Pathos and Objectivity' *CQ* 26: 161-87.
Gruen, Erich S. (1992) *Culture and National Identity in Republican Rome* (Cornell).
Günther, Hans-Christian (1994) 'Tibullus ludens' *Eikasmos* 5: 251-69.
Hardie, Philip (1986) *Virgil's* Aeneid*: Cosmos and Imperium* (Oxford).
— (1989) 'Flavian Epicists on Virgil's Epic Technique' *Ramus* 18: 2-30 = Boyle ed. (1990) 3-20.
— (1990) 'Ovid's Theban History: The First 'Anti-*Aeneid*'?' *CQ* 40, 224-235.
— (1992) 'Tales of unity and division in imperial Latin epic' in Molyneux, John H. ed. *Literary Responses to Civil Discord*. Nottingham Classical Literature Studies Vol. 1 (Nottingham) 57-71.
— (1993) *The Epic Successors of Virgil: a study in the dynamics of a tradition* (Cambridge).
— (1997) 'Closure in Latin Epic' in Roberts, Deborah H., Dunn, Francis M. & Fowler, Don edd. *Classical closure: reading the end in Greek and Latin literature* (Princeton).
— (1998) 'Fame and Defamation in the *Aeneid*: The Council of Latins' in Stahl (1998a) 243–70.
Haubold, Johannes (2000) *Homer's People. Epic Poetry and Social Formation* (Cambridge).
Heinrich, A. (1999) '*Longa retro series*: Sacrifice and repetition in Statius' Menoeceus episode' *Arethusa* 32.2: 165-95.
Heinze, Richard (1915) *Virgils epische Technik*[3] (Leipzig).
Henderson, John (1987) 'Lucan/The Word at War', *Ramus* 16: 122-64.
Hershkowitz, Debra (1995) 'Patterns of Madness in Statius' *Thebaid*' *JRS* 85: 52-64.
— (1997) '*Parce metu, Cytherea*: 'Failed' Intertext Repetition in Statius' *Thebaid*, or, Don't Stop Me If You've Heard This One Before' *MD* 39: 35-52.
— (1998) *The Madness of Epic: Reading Insanity from Homer to Statius* (Oxford).
Heslin, P.J. (2005) *The Transvestite Achilles: Gender and Genre in Statius' Achilleid* (Cambridge).
Hinds, Stephen (1998) *Allusion and intertext: dynamics of appropriation in Roman poetry* (Cambridge).
Hill, Timothy D. (2004) *Ambitiosa Mors: Suicide and the Self in Roman Thought and Literature* (New York).
Johnson, W. R. (1987) *Momentary Monsters: Lucan and His Heroes* (Ithaca).
Juhnke, Herbert (1972) *Homerisches in römischer Epik flavischer Zeit: Untersuchungen zu Szenennachbildungen und Strukturentsprechungen in Statius' Thebais und Achilleis und in Silius' Punica* (München).
Kelly, Adrian (2007) *A Referential Commentary and Lexicon to Homer, Iliad VIII* (Oxford).
Kißel, Walter (1979) *Das Geschichtsbild des Silius Italicus* (Frankfurt am Main)
Klause, Günter (1993) *Die Periphrase der Nomina propria bei Vergil* (Frankfurt am Main).
Knauer, G.N. (1964) *Die Aeneis und Homer : Studien zur poetischen Technik Vergils* (Göttingen).
Knox, Peter E. (1996-7) 'Savagery in the *Aeneid* and Virgil's ancient commentators' *CJ* 92: 225-33.
Knox, Peter & Foss, Clive edd. (1998) *Style and Tradition. Studies in Honor of Wendell Clausen*. (Stuttgard).
Kraus, Christina S. (1994) '"No Second Troy": Topoi and Refoundation in Livy, Book V' *TAPhA* 124: 267-90.

Küppers, Jochem (1986) *Tantarum causas irarum. Untersuchungen zur einleitenden Bücherdyade der Punica des Silius Italicus* (Berlin).
Laird, Andrew (1999) *Powers of Expression, Expressions of Power: Speech Presentation and Latin Literature* (Oxford).
— (2003) 'Figures of allegory from Homer to Latin Epic' in Boys-Stones, George ed. *Metaphor, Allegory, and the Classical Tradition* (Oxford) 151-76.
Lausberg, Heinrich (1998) *Handbook of literary rhetoric : a foundation for literary study* (Leiden), trans. of *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik: eine Grundlegung der Literaturwissenschaft* (Munich, 1960) by Bliss, Matthew T., Jansen, Annemiek, & Orton, David E.
Leigh, Matthew (1993) 'Hopelessly Devoted to You: Traces of the Decii in Vergil's *Aeneid*' *PVS* 21: 89-110.
— (1997) *Lucan: Spectacle and Engagement* (Oxford).
Lintott, A. W. (1971) 'Lucan and the History of the Civil War' *CQ* 21: 488-505.
Long, Alex (2007) 'Lucan and moral luck' *CQ* 57: 183-97.
Lowrie, Michèle (1997) *Horace's Narrative Odes* (Oxford).
McGuire Jr., Donald T. (1989) 'Textual Strategies and Political Suicide in Flavian Epic.' *Ramus* 18: 21-45 = Boyle ed. (1990) 21-45.
— (1995) 'History Compressed: the Roman Names of Silius' Cannae Episode' *Latomus* 54.1: 110-118.
— (1997) *Acts of silence: civil war, tyranny, and suicide in the Flavian epics*. (Hildesheim).
Mader, Gottfried (1993) 'Ἀννίβας ὑβριστής: Traces of a 'Tragic' Pattern in Livy's Hannibal Portrait in Book XXI?' *AncSoc* 24: 205-24
Marks, Raymond D. (2005a) *From Republic to Empire. Scipio Africanus in the Punica of Silius Italicus* (Frankfurt am Main).
— (2005b) '*Per uulnera regnum*: self-destruction, self-sacrifice and *deuotio* in *Punica* 4-10' *Ramus* 34:127-51.
Maltby, Robert ed. (2000) *Tibullus, Elegies : text, introduction and commentary* (Cambridge: Francis Cairns).
Marpicati, P. (1999) 'Silio 'delatore' di Pompeo (*Pun.* 5, 328 ss.; 10, 305 ss.)' *MD* 43: 191-202.
Marti, B.M. (1966) 'Cassius Scaeva and Lucan's *inventio*' in Wallach, (1966) 239-57.
Masters, J.M. (1992) *Poetry and Civil War in Lucan's* Bellum Civile. (Cambridge).
May, James M. (1988) *Trials of character. The Eloquence of Ciceronian Ethos* (Chapel Hill).
Miller, John F. (1993 'The Shield of Argive Abas at *Aeneid* 3.286' *CQ* 43: 445-50.
Mix, Erving R. (1970) *Marcus Atilius Regulus: Exemplum historicum* (The Hague).
Moles, J. L. (1982-3) 'Virgil, Pompey and the *Histories* of Asinius Pollio' *CW* 76: 287-8.
Morgan, Llewelyn (1999) *Patterns of redemption in Virgil's Georgics* (Cambridge).
— (2000) 'The Autopsy of C. Asinius Pollio' *JRS* 90: 51-69.
Moseley, Nicholas (1926) *Characters and Epithets: a study in Vergil's Aeneid* (New Haven).
von der Mühll, Peter (1952) *Kritisches Hypomnema zur Ilias* (Basel).
Nicoll, W.S. (2001) 'The Death of Turnus' *CQ* 51: 190-200.
Niemann, Karl-Heinz (1975) *Die Darstellung der romischen Niederlagen in den Punica des Silius Italicus* (Bonn)
Pascal, C. Bennett (1990) 'The Dubious Devotion of Turnus' *TAPhA* 120: 251-68.
Paschalis, Michael (1997) *Virgil's* Aeneid*: semantic relations and proper names* (Oxford).
Perret, Jacques (1942) *Les origines de la légende troyenne de Rome (281-31).* (Paris).
— (1971) 'Rome et les Troyens' *REL* 49: 39-52.
Pomeroy, Arthur J. (1990) 'Silius Italicus as *doctus poeta*' *Ramus* 18: 119-39 = Boyle ed. (1990) 119-39.
— (2000) 'Silius' Rome: the rewriting of Virgil's vision' *Ramus* 29: 149-68.
Quint, David (1993) *Epic and empire: politics and generic form from Virgil to Milton* (Princeton).
Raabe, Hermann (1974) *Plurima mortis imago. Vergleichende Interpretationen zur Bildersprache Vergils*. Zetemata 59 (München).
Radicke, Jan (2004) *Lucans poetische Technik: Studien zum historischen Epos* (Leiden).
Ramaglia, Lucia (1952) 'La figura di Giunone nelle *Punica* di Silio Italico' *RSC* 1: 35-46.
Redfield, James M. (1975) *Nature and culture in the Iliad: the tragedy of Hector* (Chicago).
Reed, J. D. (2007) *Virgil's Gaze. Nation and Poetry in the Aeneid* (Princeton).
Reinhardt, Karl (1961) *Die Ilias und ihr Dichter* (Göttingen).
Ripoll, François (1998) *La morale héroïque dans les épopées latines d'époque flavienne* (Louvain).
Ross jr., David O. (1998) 'Images of Fallen Troy in the *Aeneid*' in Knox and Foss (1998) 121-9.
*Rossaeus, Alexander (1661) *Vergilii Triumphantis Libri Tres* (Rotterdam).

Ruperti, G.A. (1795) *Caii Silii Italici Punicorum libri septemdecim, varietate lectionis et perpetua adnotatione illustrati* (Göttingen).
Rutz, W. (1960) '*Amor Mortis* bei Lucan' *Hermes* 88: 462-73.
Salzman-Mitchell, Patricia B. (2005) *A Web of Fantasies: Gaze, Image, and Gender in Ovid's Metamorphoses*
Saylor, Charles F. (1978) '*Belli Spes Inproba*: The Theme of Walls in Lucan, *Pharsalia* VI' *TAPhA* 108: 243-57.
Scaffai, Marco ed. (1997) *Baebii Italici Ilias Latina*[2] (Bologna).
Schenk, Peter (1984) *Die Gestalt des Turnus in Vergils Aeneis* (Königstein).
— (1989) 'Die Gesänge des Teuthras (Sil. It. 11, 288-302 u. 432-482)' *RhM* 132: 350-68.
Schmidt, Ernst A. (1990) 'Σχῆμα Horatianum' *WS* 103: 57-98.
Schofield, Malcolm (1986) '*Euboulia* in the *Iliad*' *CQ* 36: 6-31.
Scully, Stephen (1990) *Homer and the sacred city* (Ithaca).
Sklenář, R. (2003) *The Taste for Nothingness. A Study of Virtus and Related Themes in Lucan's Bellum Ciuile* (Michigan).
Stahl, Hans-Peter (1981) 'Aeneas: an 'Unheroic' Hero?' *Arethusa* 14: 157-86.
— (1998a) *Vergil's* Aeneid*: Augustan Epic and Political Context* (London)
— (1998b) 'Political Stop-overs on a Mythological Travel Route: from Battling Harpies to the Battle of Actium: *Aeneid* 3.268-93' in Stahl (1998a), 37-84.
Syed, Yasmin (2005) *Vergil's* Aeneid *and the Roman Self: Subject and Nation in Literary Discourse* (Ann Arbor).
Taplin, Oliver (1992) *Homeric soundings: the shaping of the Iliad* (Oxford).
Versnel, H.S. (1976) 'Two Types of Roman *Devotio*' *Mnemosyne* 29: 365-410.
— (1981) 'Self-Sacrifice, Compensation and the Anonymous Gods' in *Le Sacrifice dans L'Antiquité* (*Entretiens Fondation Hardt* 27) 135-94
Vessey, D.W.T.C. (1971) 'Menoeceus in the *Thebaid* of Statius.' *CPh* 66: 236-43.
— (1974) 'Silius Italicus on the Fall of Saguntum' *CPh* 69: 28-36.
Wallach, Luitpold (ed.) *The Classical Tradition: Literary and Historical Studies in Honor of Harry Caplan* (Ithaca).