Hannibal as (anti-)hero of Fides in Silius' Punica

10

Hannibal as (Anti-)Hero of *Fides* in Silius' *Punica*

MARCO FUCECCHI

Silius' poem is programmatically built on the hostile opposition between two cities who fight for survival and world supremacy. This scenario enacts a confrontation between the cultural patterns and systems of values on the Roman and Carthaginian side, respectively, values that include moral concepts like *fides*.[1] In this regard, the difference between Rome and Carthage is a structural one. As a pivotal component of the Roman moral code identified with mutual trust, loyalty, and honesty, *fides* (and the divine personification Fides) represents a public value, which permeates all relationships: from those among family members or fellow citizens to those of the state with foreign countries. Carthage, on the contrary, is traditionally represented by Roman writers as a symbolic embodiment of betrayal and faithlessness, to the point that *Punica fides* ends up coinciding with the notion of *perfidia* – that is, the antonym of *fides* itself.[2]

One can find traces of this polarization, well attested in most of our literary sources for the Punic wars, also in the Flavian remake of the historical epic, where it clearly points to the celebratory intent of the glorious republican past. Silius, however, does not merely aim at bringing to the fore the opposition between Rome, the city of *fides*, and the "perfidious" Carthage. In his poem, we could say, such polarization does not exclude problematization. Despite depicting *fides* as a significant unifying factor within Roman society, the *Punica* often hints at a dark looming future: the social body already shows signs of the crisis that one century later will lead to civil wars and long-term antagonism between military leaders putting their own ambitions ahead of the country's moral values, *fides* included. Yet, Rome's steady recovery after Cannae and its subsequent victory over its worst enemy give evidence of the innate qualities of a city destined to become the *caput mundi*. It is thanks to this moral heritage, as Jupiter announces in the prophecy of

Punica Book 3, that Rome will survive the crisis and reach the very acme of its power when a new dynasty of emperors, the Flavians, will ascend to power: a dynasty whose propaganda (of course not by chance) will draw extensively on the concept of *fides*.

In this chapter, however, I intend to concentrate mostly on the other side of the story, that of Rome's enemy. In fact, Silius' Carthage cannot be simplistically defined as "the land without *fides*." On the contrary, it represents the place where it all starts: the place in which the concept (before Rome's birth) begins to assume an anti-Roman connotation. Heir of Dido's anger toward the unfaithful Aeneas and his (Roman) descendants, Hannibal leads his military campaign against Italy, displaying a "private," family-centred, and perverted notion of *fides*. In fact, the devotion toward his ancestors as well as the way he undertakes his father Hamilcar's *Furiae* (1.444) brings this concept closer to the notion of *pietas*.[3] Such a "subjective" interpretation stands in sharp contrast to the "positive," that is "objective," cultural construct of the (Roman) *fides*. Punic *fides* originates from the memory of the queen-founder's humiliation and, thus, winds up encompassing a series of notions: revenge, but also expansionism and imperialism. Hannibal embodies the anti-hero of *fides* (or the hero of an anti-*fides*?) until the very end of the poem, when, after leaving the battlefield of Zama, he flees, threatening that he will never give up fighting. Nonetheless, his unfailing loyalty to Carthage may also function as the "official pretext" for dissimulating bellicism and growing anxiety of conquest. Sometimes, Hannibal's attitude collides with other ("private" in a more precise sense, personal) manifestations of the concept, such as the duties he has to his own family members as husband and father. As his wife, Imilce, fears, Hannibal's obsessive focus on conquering Italy and overthrowing Jupiter may perilously lead him to forget his own identity. And, when fortune begins to abandon the Carthaginian leader and he is about to leave the Italian shore, an extreme act of rebellion occurs, which shows how (the Roman) Hannibal truly feels like an *exul* forced to abandon his homeland, the country to which he seems now inclined to offer his *fides*.

Exploring Punic *Fides*

We have said that Silius draws largely upon the tradition of the so-called *Punica fides*, a notoriously oxymoronic collocation. Yet this is only one side of the coin. His representation of *fides* among the Carthaginians is far from unproblematic: the first occurrence of the word already suffices to prove that this is true. At *Punica* 1.56, Hannibal is said to be *fidei … sinister*, a complex syntagm, in which *fidei* may be interpreted as a genitive of limitation, meaning

"perverse as regards *fides*," "whose sense of loyalty is perverted (not absent)."[4] Thus, while apparently pointing to the paradoxical equivalence between Carthaginian *fides* and *perfidia*, Silius seems rather to challenge the commonly held view about the Carthaginians' penchant for treachery.

On closer inspection, the concept involving social rules, laws, and international *foedera* (with reference to the pact with Rome after the First Punic War) is also known and even practised in Hannibal's homeland. Such a notion of *fides*, however, is recognized as a moral and socio-political value by only a small group of Carthaginian senators. But the word also has another and more popular meaning among the Carthaginians: a family-centred notion which we might call the "Barcid interpretation" of *fides*, tracing back to Aeneas' and Dido's story and resulting in the latter's hatred and curse.[5] In Hannibal's view, *fides* means "no *foedera*" (with Rome) and foreshadows revenge, thus making his mission against Rome reflect a large popular consensus. The fundamental assumption here is that Carthage is the injured party, since it underwent injustice and even piracy before the foundation of Rome. From this perspective, Hannibal is conceived of as a legendary *exemplum* of *fides erga patriam*, whereas the heterodiegetic narrator turns him instead into an anti-hero of *fides*, who pretends to fight against Aeneas' descendants, the Romans. Thus, the "Barcid interpretation" perverts the meaning of concepts like *perfidus* and *perfidia*: the Romans are the true faithless, while Hannibal embodies the "perfect achievement of *fides*."

The Construction of an Ideology: Carthage's Response to Roman *Fides*

As already hinted at in Virgil, Hannibal follows in the footsteps of his father, Hamilcar Barca, undertaking the task of avenging Dido, the queen who founded Carthage and killed herself after being abandoned by the *perfidus* Aeneas:[6]

> tandem his Aenean compellat vocibus ultro:
> "dissimulare etiam sperasti, perfide, tantum
> posse nefas tacitusque mea decedere terra?
> nec te noster amor nec te data dextera quondam
> nec moritura tenet crudeli funere Dido?" (Virg. *A*. 4.304–8)

> Finally, she broached the subject, addressing Aeneas as follows:
> "Was it your hope to disguise, you *perfidious* cheat, such a monstrous
> Wrong, to get out, with no word said, from this land that I govern?

You are not bound by our union of love, by the hand you once gave me,
Nor does Dido, doomed to a cruel death, now detain you."

Dido rams the point home in her later assessment of Aeneas:

… en dextra fidesque,
quem secum patrios aiunt portare penates,
quem subiisse umeris confectum aetate parentem! (*A*. 4.597–9)

Witness the word and the honour of one, who, they say, carries with him
Gods of ancestral shrines, who once took on his shoulders his aged Father!

And just like the *Aeneid*, the *Punica* too hosts antagonistic, pro-Carthaginian voices, which come from human characters, or even from non-verbal sources, such as images, or pictures. A prominent instance, in this sense, is offered by the ekphrasis of the shield that Hannibal receives as a gift from the tribes of ancient Gallicia (Sil. 2.395–456). In the shield's iconographic program, characterized by strong propagandistic colour,[7] the first sequence of images could properly be entitled as "the archaeology of Carthage." The ekphrasis consists of a (tendentious) summary of the first four books of Virgil's *Aeneid*, displaying the most important events from the city's foundation until Dido's suicide immediately after Aeneas' departure. A conspicuous place is given to the love affair: the *furtiva foedera amantum* ("the secret pacts of the lovers", 2.416), celebrated by Aeneas and Dido in the cave and engraved on the right side of the shield. In particular, the word *foedera*, in sharp contrast with the adjective, seems to carry a note of recrimination and may subtly resemble a (polemical?) response to Aeneas' self-defense: … *nec coniugis umquam* / *praetendi taedas aut haec in foedera veni* ("and I never formally wed you nor did I endorse any contract as 'husband,'" Virg. *A*. 4.338–9).[8] The narrating voice thus shows traces of a tendentious reading of Virgil's account from a Carthaginian viewpoint. It also seems to conjure up an Ovidian moment, drawing from both elegiac and epic poetry.[9]

Other sections of the iconographic program of the shield are likely meant to stir up Hannibal's warlike fury and enthusiasm more directly: think of the old Hamilcar, who is featured as a warrior still fighting; or the panel with Regulus' defeat and torture. In any case, the attempt of the Carthaginian general to subvert Rome's political as well as moral supremacy is based mainly on intergenerational hatred, which is traced back to a pre-Roman age: on such a premise, the Punic leader pretends to avenge Carthage's defeat in the previous war as well as the violated *fides* in a more general (if not objective) sense.

Thus, it comes as no surprise that, for the majority of the Carthaginians, the meaning of *fides* is completely at odds with that of the Romans. From the outset of the poem, we learn that, once upon a time, at the temple of Dido, a younger Hamilcar had instructed his son: *gens recidiva Phrygum Cadmeae stirpis alumnos* / foederibus non aequa *premit* ("the restored race of Phrygians is oppressing with unjust treaties the people of Cadmean stock," Sil. 1.106–7).[10] These words provide a sort of *ex post* political generalization of the last prayer addressed with desperate confidence by Dido to a divine power who cares for unrequited lovers: … *tum, si quod* non aequo foedere *amantis* / *curae numen habet iustumque memorque, precatur* ("she prays to a power that is just (if there is one), a power that remembers, whose jurisdiction embraces all lovers with one-sided contracts," Virg. *A.* 4.520–1).[11] Within this context, the oath sworn by the child Hannibal at the temple of his ancestress seems a true confirmation, and stands out as a new important step in the development, of an anti-Roman idea of *fides*: the champion of the African *gens Cadmea*, whose treachery is to become proverbial,[12] will soon show absolute loyalty to the memory of his ancestors and, as their ultimate avenger, will strenuously undertake the inherited mission.[13]

The Conquest of Saguntum and *Imitatio Herculis*: Hannibal as the Defender of "True" *Fides*

Hannibal's "Barcid" *fides* inevitably triggers the systematic destruction of all that is identified as the Roman *sacrata fides* (1.634): he starts with the violation of treaties and continues with the siege of Saguntum, "the famous home of loyalty" (*domus inclita fidei*, 1.598).[14] We should not forget that, in Hannibal's distorted view, the siege and ensuing devastation of the city devoted to Hercules and (Roman) Fides represents an act of vengeance directed at the winners of the first Punic war as well as a tribute of *pietas* addressed to Carthage and its founder, Dido. Indeed, the conquest of Saguntum ultimately stands out as a feigned paradoxical way to punish the treachery of (the proto-Roman) Aeneas: it therefore represents a victory dedicated, so to speak, to *fides* itself.

When dealing with Murrus, perhaps the most representative of Saguntum's "synecdochic heroes,"[15] Hannibal explicitly aims to embody the offended party and shows that might and right are both on his side. The Carthaginian claims to leave the treaties (*foedera*, 1.479) to his enemy to observe, as well as loyalty and obedience to law, inasmuch as they enact the Roman oppression here symbolized by Saguntum (*fer tecum castamque fidem servataque iura*, "take with you Loyalty unstained and observance of law," 1.481). As regards himself, Hannibal proudly asks for the "deceived

gods" to be his partners (*deceptos mihi linque deos*, "leave to me the deceived gods," 1.482). According to the most common interpretation of this passage, Hannibal is here referring to the gods deceived by his own deliberate violation of the pacts.[16] Yet I do not think that we are dealing here with a further mere occurrence of the "Carthaginian *perfidia*" theme. On the contrary, Hannibal seems to bitterly criticize the way the Saguntines and the Romans pretend to be the only reliable representatives and interpreters of loyalty. Expressions like *casta fides* and *servata iura* have an ironic undertone, in a parody of the language of Roman diplomacy. While downplaying the effective role of the gods in the action, Hannibal is not really boasting that *he* has deceived them: perhaps he is polemically hinting that the gods have been "deceived" earlier by the unjust cosmic order that Rome seeks to impose and he would like to challenge.

Thus, among the *decepti*, we may include Hercules himself, the protector of Saguntum, whose favour Hannibal is seeking and who is the target of his tendentious *imitatio*. At 1.509–14, Hannibal asks Murrus to consider whether the Tirynthian hero will not far more justly (*iustius*, 510) assist the Carthaginians, and then he invokes Hercules' protection upon himself: "Bring your power to help me, invincible Alcides; and, as you are renowned for the destruction of Troy long ago, so support me when I destroy the scions of the Phrygian race" (*fer numen amicum / et, Troiae quondam primis memorate ruinis, / dexter ades Phrygiae delenti stirpis alumnus*, 1.512–14).[17] Hannibal alludes here to the deception of Hercules by the Trojan king Laomedon, after saving Hesione from a sea-monster. Hercules' deceiver was then an ancestor of the Romans, and certainly not the most honourable one. To take his revenge, the hero besieged the city, destroying the Trojan walls for the first time. It is worth noting that the connection Silius' Hannibal forges between Saguntum (the city-symbol of *fides*) and Laomedon's Troy (conquered by Hercules, the hero of *fides*) is paradoxically based on the violation of *fides*, by Troy and, indirectly – as ally of the *alumni Phrygiae stirpis* – by Saguntum (in the name of Rome). On this assumption, Hannibal claims to be the avenger of the violated (Carthaginian) *fides*, almost to the point of fashioning himself as its new guarantor.[18]

The (Roman) Goddess *Fides* at Saguntum

Fides was also a goddess in ancient Rome and received a place within the Roman pantheon. A temple, built around the middle of the third century BCE, was dedicated to ~~Fides Publica populi Romani~~, whose worship is said to have been introduced by Numa, in the southeast area of the Capitoline hill. To be sure, the appearances of Fides as a literary character are less common

in comparison with other divine personifications, such as Virtus. However, the special taste displayed by Flavian epic for supernatural moral entities gives Fides the opportunity to take the stage, too. In particular, the *Punica* have been duly considered as an epic of Fides, since "in keinen Epos nimmt *Fides* als Gestalt und als Daseinmacht eine so beherrschende Stellung ein."[19] Silius' poem hosts two epiphanies of Fides the goddess: the longer one is in Book 2 and the other in Book 13, which respectively highlight the exemplarity of Saguntum's sacrifice and Capua's just punishment for its treachery.[20] Both epiphanies are addressed mainly to the peoples of the besieged cities, and in neither of them does Hannibal play a direct role.

As for the first appearance, which takes place on the eve of the fall of Saguntum, I wish to briefly comment on its "dramatic" context.[21] The narrator creates a sequence of two reciprocally opposite divine interventions, that of Fides and, immediately after, that of her antagonist, Tisiphone. At first, persuaded by Hercules' plea, Fides comes down from heaven and instils both warlike fury and courage into the hearts of the Saguntines. However, the goddess clearly intends to prevent them from losing their humanity (*sed prohibet culpa pollutam extendere lucem / casta Fides paribusque famem compescere membris*, "Loyalty forbids them to prolong a life defiled by crime, and to stay their hunger with the flesh of fellow-creatures," 2.524–5). The intervention of Tisiphone, whose rage is triggered by Juno, immediately ensues. The infernal demon turns the Saguntines' fierce resistance into absolute despair, leading them to internecine carnage. This marks the end of the siege and the ultimate fall of Saguntum. In my opinion, such an indirect duel between these two divine entities, which strongly resembles the confrontation between Tisiphone herself and Pietas in Statius' *Thebaid* (11.457–96),[22] is also a way to signal powerfully the final victory of the anti-*fides* (the perverted *fides* that comes from hell and is embodied on earth by Hannibal) over the real and "positive" *fides*, represented by the Saguntines.[23]

This tragic outcome is also further complicated by the appearance(s) of Tiburna, Murrus' widow. In fact, when the character first enters the narrative, we are not confronted with the real Tiburna. It is Tisiphone, who, after taking Tiburna's shape (2.553–9), incites the Saguntines to rebel against *fides* and escape slavery by killing each other (*sat Fidei proavisque datum … ,* "we have done enough for the sake of Loyalty and our forefathers," 2.561).[24] The real Tiburna appears one hundred lines later, when she commits suicide with her husband's sword, while invoking his name:

> ecce inter medios caedum Tiburna furores
> fulgenti dextram mucrone armata mariti
> et laeva infelix ardentem lampada quassans

squalentemque erecta comam ac liventia planctu
pectora nudatis ostendens saeva lacertis
ad tumulum Murri super ipsa cadavera fertur …
tunc rapiens letum "tibi ego haec" ait "optime coniunx,
ad manes, en, ipsa fero." sic ense recepto
arma super ruit et flammas invadit hiatu. (Sil. 2.665–70, 678–80)

Lo! in the midst of madness and murder, unhappy Tiburna was seen. Her right hand was armed with her husband's bright sword, and in her left she brandished a burning torch; her disordered hair stood on end, her shoulders were bare, and she displayed a breast discoloured by cruel blows. She hurried right over the corpses to the tomb of Murrus … Then, rushing upon death, "Best of husbands," she cried, "see, I myself carry this weapon to you in the shades." And so she stabbed herself and fell down over the armour, meeting the fire with open mouth.

This image provides the graphic representation of *fides* surrendering to hostile fate. At the same time, Tiburna's gesture, embodying a highly tragic demonstration of conjugal loyalty, offers an exemplary reversal of the last scene of Dido's suicide by means of Aeneas' sword: that is the foundation myth of the Carthaginian hatred for Rome and also of Hannibal's perverted *fides*. Moreover, Silius' rewriting of the famous Virgilian episode, which indirectly integrates and dramatizes the "static" evocation of the ekphrasis of Dido's temple in *Punica* Book 1 (90–1: the queen sitting, with Aeneas' sword at her feet), invites us to consider whether Tiburna herself (rather than Tisiphone) was the actual protagonist of the previous scene.[25]

The Quarrel over Hannibal at Carthage and the Defeat of "Positive" *Fides*

The opposition between the two different notions of *fides* has been already thematized in the second book (270–390) on the occasion of the debate in the Carthaginian senate. The Roman envoys led by Fabius require that Carthage state clearly whether it intends to side with Hannibal or stand against his aggressive manoeuvres in Spain. Such a choice inevitably has consequences for the meaning of the word *fides*. The assembly splits into two camps: those who still believe in loyalty and recognize as valid the peace treaty signed after the First Punic War (*movet hinc foedusque fidesque … ,* 2.273) and those who share the people's love for the ambitious young leader (*hinc popularis amor coeptantis magna iuventae,* 2.275). Hanno, the first orator (2.279–326) as well as member of the elite opposing the Barcid party, condemns the breaking of *foedera* and the violation of peace (2.293–7): in

so doing, he also conjures up indirectly the (Roman) view of *fides* as a legal, positive notion based on mutual trust and deriving from ancient "international" laws. However, this speech sheds an ambiguous light on the character himself, especially if we remember how he has been introduced by the narrator (*ductorem infestans odiis gentilibus Hannon*, "Hanno, hereditary foe and constant assailant of the leader," 2.277). Despite the appearances, Hanno is not genuinely a supporter of right and justice among the Carthaginians: he seems to be instead motivated by a strong sense of hereditary hatred for Hannibal. Therefore, Hanno employs crude metaphorical language to define his personal enemy, calling him *exitiale caput* (ruinous man," 2.287), *ingenitum virus* ("venomous scion," 288), *novi caecus caligine regni* ("blinded and dazzled by new-gained power," 299): such expressions convey envy and personal animosity, which inevitably affect the objectivity of Hanno's arguments and expose him to delegitimization, despite his rhetorical skills.[26] Once Hanno's arguments are finally refuted, readers are left with the impression that, even when a Carthaginian takes sides with *fides*, this does not really imply authentic interest in moral justice and faithfulness.

This private hostility crops up on several occasions throughout the poem, as, for example, in 4.771: *discors antiquitus* ("the ancient enemy"); 8.22–4: … *laevus conatibus Hannon* / *ductoris non ulla domo summittere patres* / *auxilia aut ullis opibus iuvisse sinebat* ("… the opposition of Hanno to the enterprise did not suffer their senate to send reinforcements or supplies of any kind"); and 11.453–44: … *quem* (scil. *Hannonem*) *gliscens gloria pravum* / *ductoris studio iamdudum agitabat acerbo* ("Hanno, whose crooked mind had long been tortured by the growing fame of Hannibal"). Thus, while pretending to be the (isolated) voice of positive *fides* at Carthage, Hanno ends up looking like an ineffective (if not unreliable) character, a Don Quixote of sorts, in the fashion of the Homeric Thersites or the Virgilian Drances.

Q13

However, Hanno does not directly challenge his great rival in a face-to-face debate, like those engaged by Thersites with Odysseus in the *Iliad* or by Drances with Turnus in the *Aeneid*. Hanno's opponent, Gestar, is another secondary character and nothing but a product of poetic invention – a strenuous partisan of Hannibal, who embodies the role of the demagogue and antagonist of positive *fides*. Silius needs him to rework another ancient sub-scheme of the epic oratory duel, in which two speakers quarrel over a third "major" figure, who is physically absent.[27] As the mouthpiece of the Barcas (2.330–74), Gestar aims (and eventually manages) literally to infect the senate with popular, enthusiastic confidence in Hannibal, whose courage gives Carthage the possibility of changing the war's outcome. According to his viewpoint, Hanno and his friends are Carthage's very enemies

(*Ausonius miles*, "Roman soldiers," 2.331). Gestar wants to demonstrate that it is possible to defeat the Romans, and, for that purpose, he singles out Regulus' example as the most evident proof of Hanno's ill faith (2.340–4).[28] The heroic self-sacrifice to *fides* of the Roman martyr is tendentiously misused in order to prove Carthage's good reasons: thereafter, the image of Regulus' torture on the shield of Hannibal provides a significant repetition of such propaganda (*pendet sub imagine poenae / Regulus et fidei dat magna exempla Sagunto*, "hung Regulus, beneath a picture of his punishment, setting to Saguntum a noble example of loyalty," 2.435–6).[29] Gestar's final call to defend *libertas* and *fides erga patriam* by keeping *fides* toward Hannibal is meant to refute the notion of *fides* as enslavement: this is the decisive argument that persuades the Carthaginian senators to follow Hannibal's cause.

Family-centred *Fides* and Imperialistic Ideology

Victory in war and the enemy's annihilation become Hannibal's best means to display *fides* and devotion, as well as the necessary premise of Carthage's imperialistic expansion. The issue is indirectly confirmed by the words addressed to Scipio by the ghost of Hamilcar, Hannibal's father, in the *Nekyia* of Book 13. When answering Scipio's reproach against the proverbial *Punica fides* (*taliane, o fraudum genitor, sunt foedera vobis?*, "Is this the way, o father of lies, that Carthage keeps her treaties?" 13.738), Hamilcar proudly comments on Hannibal's victories in Italy as the best evidence of his *pietas erga parentem* and *erga deos*:

> … licitum nec fallere divos
> iuratos patri. quod si Laurentia vastat
> nunc igni regna et Phrygias res vertere temptat,
> o pietas, o sancta fides, o vera propago! (Sil. 13.746–749)
>
> He may not deceive the gods by whom his father swore. But if he is now laying Italy waste with fire and striving to destroy her power, then I hail him as my true son, dutiful to me and faithful to his oath!

Hamilcar's eulogy of Hannibal's *pietas* and (anti-)*fides* has been compared to Anchises' words to Aeneas in the Underworld (*heu pietas … heu fides*, Virg. *A.* 6.878). This similarity relies on a paradoxical circumstance, which highlights the polemical character of the allusion: Hamilcar is celebrating his son's virtue before Scipio, Hannibal's most dangerous enemy and, ironically, the leader who will succeed in defeating him. Strikingly, the

Aeneas-Anchises scene becomes intertwined with another model from the Virgilian *katabasis*, the encounter between the (living) Aeneas and Dido, although Dido's silent recrimination is replaced by Hamilcar's bitter answer in Silius.[30]

Hannibal's perverted *fides* has further consequences, affecting every aspect of his public and private image. An eloquent example comes from the two episodes involving his wife, Imilce.[31] The first (3.61–157) narrates the last encounter between husband and wife, in the presence of their baby son, who was born during the siege of Saguntum (*pignus belli*, "pledge of war," 3.80). The farewell scene, which takes place just before the Carthaginian army sets out to Italy, is a pathological (not simply pathetic) intensification of the episode in *Iliad* 6 with Hector, Andromache, and Astyanax, but at the same time it seems oriented at exploring the concept of *fides* in all its various aspects. From the outset, the text highlights the strong conjugal bond between the two (*memori … amore*, "love full of memories," 3.65): its principal aim is apparently the perpetuation of the family mission – that is, the fight against Rome. This seems confirmed by the fact that Hannibal's initial words are formally addressed to his baby son. The infant, endowed with the father's fierce look, has to be preserved, especially because he will take on Hannibal's role: soon he will repeat his father's oath and learn how to violate pacts and international laws.[32]

On the other hand, Imilce, whose *fides* is explicitly celebrated by her husband (*veneranda fide* and *fidissima coniunx*, 3.88 and 133), complains that Hannibal no longer allows her to follow him in war and perceives his decision as a loss of confidence in her and in their mutual relationship (*sic foedera nota …* ?, "do you forget our nuptial union?", 3.110).[33] Imilce is desperately trying to prevent Hannibal from paying the consequences for his own warlike fury, but the way she displays her fear also leaves room for other suggestions. Imilce feels and acts like someone who is forsaken (*atque acies inter flagrantiaque arma* relictae / coniugis *et nati curam servare memento*, "and amid the battles and the blaze of arms, remember to keep in mind the wife whom you leave behind, and the child," 3.117–18). So, when thinking of Hannibal's relentless bravery and formidable obstinacy in pursuing his aim (and his imperialistic dreams), she also seems worried about his possible "unfaithfulness" to their conjugal bond in the future. Hannibal does not at all manage to calm her fear when, a few lines later (139–41), he tells her about his nocturnal visions of Hamilcar and other nightmares.[34]

Imilce's troubles increase soon after her return to Carthage. Indeed, her second narrative appearance opens with perturbing news: her child has been singled out for ritual sacrifice (*molk*) to the Punic gods, and this circumstance provides Hannibal's internal enemies with a good opportunity

to strike him down by taking advantage of the *raison d'état* (4.763–829). Thus, Imilce, who is apparently alone and without support, has to deal with a double threat. On the one hand, she has to contend with the lack of *fides* in Hannibal's ungrateful homeland (… *sic praemia reddit* / *Carthago et tales iam nunc tibi solvit honores*, "such is the reward you get from Carthage, and such the honours she pays you now!" 4.789–90). On the other, she fears her own husband's unyielding heart (*immitia corda mariti*, 4.807). Imilce is afraid that Hannibal, completely absorbed by his war mission abroad, might even accept his son's sacrifice in view of the final success of his enterprise.

Indeed, it is certainly not because of Imilce's "philosophical" tirade against the Carthaginian barbaric rites that Hannibal decides to oppose the sacrifice and not to act as a new Agamemnon. Nor are we ever told about his own paternal feelings: his very goal is "to perpetuate his own ancestral legacy in his own son."[35] His answer to the Carthaginian envoys displays egotistical self-confidence more than sincere devotion to his homeland: *quid tibi pro tanto non impar munere solvat* / *Hannibal aequatus superis? quae praemia digna* / *inveniam* ("O mother Carthage, you have set me on a level with the gods, and how shall I repay you in full for such generosity? What sufficient recompense can I find?" 4.809–11). This is a further example of Hannibal's perversion of *fides*.

Hannibal thus embodies a perfect mix of political ambition and diplomatic self-restraint. By promising Roman blood and slaughter as a tribute to his national gods (*paro sacra et maiores molior aras*, "I am preparing a sacrifice and building for you mightier altars," 4.822), he apparently manages to persuade his fellow citizens to spare the child, who, as Hannibal's heir in the war (*at puer armorum belli servabitur heres*, 4.814), already receives the first symbolic exhortation from the father (*perge … nostroque incumbe labori*, "go forward and apply yourself to my task," 4.818). As Antony Augoustakis rightly puts it, we cannot say that Imilce actually succeeds "in promoting a pure Roman ideological code of *pietas* and *fides* among the Carthaginians":[36] unlike the ancestral hatred against Rome, *fides* (even conjugal *fides*) cannot but remain a private value in Carthage.

Hannibal's Decline and the Transformation of *Fides*

Let us now see how the relationship between Hannibal and *fides* evolves throughout his military campaign abroad. In Italy, the Punic leader actually undergoes a gradual but noticeable transformation, which also affects the way he remains faithful to his mission – that is, how he preserves his version of Carthaginian *fides*. At Cannae, after a brief emblematic *synkrisis* with his future foe, Scipio (*melior pietate fideque*, 9.437),[37] Hannibal

obtains his greatest victory. Soon after, however, fortune begins to fade, and an interestingly peculiar splitting of his personality seems to take place, which directly involves the relationship with two important literary influences, Caesar and Pompey, the two main protagonists of Lucan's poem. Perfectly matching his antagonistic role, Hannibal still looks like a titanic, demonic Caesar, even after his last defeat at Zama, when we are told that his hatred for Rome and Jupiter would have lasted beyond the end of the war.[38] Nonetheless, from Cannae onwards, different sorts of negative factors accumulate: adversities of "moral" nature, such as the attack of Venus' army at Capua (11.410–26) or the signs of envious hostility repeatedly coming from Carthage (e.g., 8.22–4, 11.555–600, 16.11–14),[39] together with the series of military setbacks culminating with Hasdrubal's defeat at the Metaurus River (15.626–808), not to mention Hannibal's own failed attempt to attack the walls of Rome (12.605–752 and 13.1–93). All these unlucky events instil into the Carthaginian leader a growing awareness of the approaching catastrophe and a consequent sense of failure that, mostly in the last two books, tend to make him similar to Lucan's Pompey.[40]

Such identification goes beyond the mere idea of defeat and decline, for it also involves *fides*. In particular, the whole narrative section that leads to Hannibal's departure from Italy shares with Pompey's farewell the character of an authentic divorce (*discidium*) from his own homeland.[41] Unlike Pompey, however, Hannibal never actually stops fighting against fate, which forces him to abandon Italy. An earlier dramatization of his resistance is realized in the account of an upsetting nocturnal vision, when Hannibal saw himself attacked by the shades of the dead Roman consuls, drawing their swords and forcing him to take flight: he tried to resist and "clutched the soil of Italy with both arms" (*ulnis amplexus utrisque* / *haerebat Latiae*, 17.167–8). Such a defiant attitude provides a "physical" intensification of other analogous scenes of pathetic reactions to forced separation, like that of his wife, Imilce: … *abripitur divulsa marito.* / *haerent intenti vultus et litora servant* ("torn from her husband's arms, she is carried away. Her eager eyes still cling to him and watch the shore," 3.154–5). But above all, Hannibal's instinctive gesture reminds us of Imilce's main literary model in this specific circumstance: Cornelia's sad farewell to Pompey before leaving Epiros for Lesbos, where she should wait for the war's outcome:

> labitur infelix manibusque excepta suorum
> fertur ad aequoreas, ac se prosternit, harenas,
> litoraque ipsa tenet, tandemque inlata carinaest.
> non sic infelix patriam portusque reliquit
> Hesperios, saevi premerent cum Caesaris arma. (Luc. 5.799–803)

> She falls fainting in her wretchedness, and, received in the hands of her attendants, is carried down to the sands of the sea, and there prostrates herself, and clings to the very shore and at length is borne to the ship. Not thus unhappy did she leave her country and the Hesperian harbours, when the arms of ruthless Caesar were pressing.

Like that of Imilce, the image of Hannibal himself clutching the soil of Italy, while desperately attempting to delay departure, draws upon the gesture (endowed with elegiac connotations) of Lucan's heroine, who tries to resist the inevitable *discidium*. The analogy with Cornelia, therefore, provides further confirmation for Alison Keith's definition of the Carthaginian as a "female-focused hero."[42] Cornelia and Imilce vindicate the right to display *fides* toward their husbands by trying (vainly) to maintain their roles as wives beside them. They protest against the impositions of (male) "rationality" represented by power and politics and characterized by a dismissal of the conjugal rigths of love and fidelity. Hannibal's dream re-enacts, so to speak, the characters of Imilce and Cornelia as living examples of "resistant *fides*," shedding light on the psychological condition of the Punic leader, torn between two kinds of *fides*: loyalty to Carthage and his veritable "attachment" to Italy, perceived as a sort of promised land.

Thereafter, while listening to the messengers who convey Carthage's call for help, Hannibal silently considers whether his commitment to his native country is really worth renouncing Italy (17.184–6). Then, he decides to return to Africa, though not without bitter recriminations: nunc *patriae decus et patriae* nunc *Hannibal unus* / *subsidium*, nunc *in nostra spes ultima dextra* ("Hannibal is now the glory of his country, now her only rock of refuge; now her one remaining hope is in my right arm," 17.197–8). Finally, Hannibal gives proof of *fides* (and *pietas*) *erga patriam*, without any regard for his own blessed pride: *vertentur signa, ut patres statuere, simulque* / *et patriae muros et te servabimus, Hannon* ("I shall march away, as the senate has decreed; I shall save the walls of Carthage and you, Hanno, at the same time," 17.200–1).

However, at the very moment of his departure from Italy, Hannibal looks again as if he were leaving what he perceives almost as an adoptive homeland and no longer the foreign country he was unable to conquer. While keeping his eyes steadily fixed on the Italian coast, he suffers the pains of an *exul*.[43] Yet, almost immediately after leaving the shore, Hannibal makes a further attempt to rebel against the gods' power. Even in this "Caesarian" moment,[44] traces of Pompeian melancholy and nostalgia continue to filter through the character's words:

> … mentisne ego compos et hoc nunc
> indignus reditu, qui memet finibus umquam

amorim Ausoniae? flagrasset subdita taedis
Carthago, et potius cecidisset nomen Elissae. (Sil. 17.221–224)

Am I mad? Do not I deserve to return thus, as a punishment for ever leaving Ausonia? Better that Carthage had been burned with fire, and the name of Elissa been blotted out forever!

The couple formed at line 223 by the hapax *amorim* (syncopated form for the perfect subjunctive *amoverim*) and *Ausoniae* (genitive depending on *finibus*) curiously resonates with a passage of the account of Pompey's second dream, at the beginning of the seventh book of the *Bellum Civile*:

o felix, si te vel sic tua Roma videret!
donassent utinam superi patriaeque tibique
unum, Magne, diem, quo fati certus uterque
extremum tanti fructum raperetis amoris.
tu velut Ausonia vadis moriturus in urbe,
illa rati semper de te sibi conscia voti
hoc scelus haud umquam fatis haerere putavit,
sic se dilecti tumulum quoque perdere Magni. (Luc. 7.29–36)

Oh, fortunate, if the Rome you loved had seen you even in a dream. One day at least the gods should have granted to you and to your country, on which each, with full knowledge of the future, might have snatched the last enjoyment of your great love for one another. You go forth, believing that you will die in the Ausonian city; and Rome, knowing that her prayers for you had always been answered, refused to believe that this horror was written in the book of destiny – that she should thus lose even the grave of her beloved Magnus.

Conclusion: Problematizing *Fides*

To sum up, despite the fundamental validity of the opposition between Roman loyalty and Carthaginian disloyalty, the concept of *fides* and its interpretation are richly problematized in the *Punica*, often because of its peculiar manifestations and outcomes. The case of Hannibal, as this chapter has tried to show, is particularly suggestive of such complexity. The Carthaginian leader embodies the anti-hero of *fides*, or rather the hero of an anti-*fides*, because he displays with outstanding strength a perverted notion of *fides*, which consists of absolute loyalty to a hereditary hatred against Rome and rests on the assumption that family and state actually overlap. The heroic self-sacrifice of a martyr to Roman *fides*, Atilius Regulus, seems at odds with this assumption. However, this also invites us to consider the high cost of loyalty in terms of familiar

affections, as we can infer from the paradoxical charge hurled at Regulus himself by his own wife on the day he leaves Rome forever:

> "… data foedera nobis
> ac promissa fides thalamis ubi, *perfide*, nunc est?"
> ultima vox duras haec tunc penetravit ad auris,
> cetera percussi vetuerunt noscere remi. (Sil. 6.517–20)

> "Where is now the compact made with me, and the troth you plighted at our marriage, unfaithful husband (*perfide*)?" These were the last words which reached the inflexible ear of Regulus; the rest was drawn by the plashing of the oars.

As we have seen, these words echo Dido's reproach to Aeneas as *perfidus* (Virg. *A.* 4.305 and 366).[45] At the same time, they also intensify Imilce's manifestation of fear with regard to Hannibal's excessive *fides* in his own enterprise.

Therefore, we can say that the nature of *fides* is by no means reassuring or unproblematic. That also emerges from the two prophecies of the Cumaean Sibyl, which frame the *Nekyia* episode: the exits of Scipio and Hannibal from the sight of history. At the outset of his *katabasis*, Scipio is briefly informed about his own future: he will soon become the leader of the Roman army and manage to defeat Hannibal; not long after that, however, his fellow citizens will force him into exile:

> "… pudet urbis iniquae
> quod post haec decus hoc patriaque domoque carebit."
> sic vates gressumque lacus vertebat ad atros.
> tum iuvenis "quaecumque datur sors durior aevi
> obnitemur," ait, "'culpa modo pectora cessent." (Sil. 13.514–18)

> "Shame on the unjust citizens, who will deprive of home and country a hero who has done such things!" Thus spoke the prophetess and was turning her steps to the dark pools of Hades. Then Scipio said: "however hard the lot in life assigned me, I shall struggle to overcome it; the consciousness of innocence is all I ask."

This inglorious page of Roman history, as defined by the Sibyl, proves that *fides* could be offended even in her very "home," Rome. However, at the end of the *Nekyia*, Scipio receives reassuring news from the priestess herself. Hannibal will manage to flee from the camp at Zama and will be missing from the parade of Scipio's triumph (17.643–4), but this ultimate foe of Rome and (Roman) *fides* will die alone in exile, away from his homeland and all his relatives. Here Silius reminds us of what has already been anticipated

at the end of the first pair of books, in the obituary of Saguntum, the city of Hercules and Fides (2.696–707).[46] However, more importantly, this early anticipation of Hannibal's final destiny must sound like a powerful warning to the whole world not to neglect the importance of *fides*: *audite, o gentes, neu rumpite foedera pacis / nec regnis postferte fidem!* ("Hear it, ye nations, and break not treaties of peace nor set power above loyalty!" 2.700–1). Thus, it comes as no surprise that in, the Sibyl's last words to Scipio (13.868–93), Carthage's final defeat and, above all, Hannibal's just punishment are the actual consequences of a victory of *fides*:

> "ne metue": exclamat vates "non vita sequetur
> inviolata virum: patria non ossa quiescent.
> namque ubi fractus opum magnae certamine pugnae
> pertulerit vinci turpemque orare salutem,
> rursus bella volet Macetum instaurare sub armis.
> damnatusque doli desertis coniuge fida[47]
> et dulci nato linquet Carthaginis arces
> atque una profugus lustrabit caerula puppe." (Sil. 13.874–81)
>
> "Fear not," cried the priestess: "no life of untroubled prosperity shall be his; his bones shall not rest in his native land. For all his strength will be broken in a great battle; he will suffer defeat and stoop to beg for his life; and then he will try to wage a fresh war with the armies of Macedon. Condemned as a traitor, he will leave his faithful wife and darling son behind him, abandon Carthage and flee across the sea with a single ship."

Such images, with their didactic colour, enhance the interpretation of the historical events as fundamentally ruled by ethics and will legitimize Rome as the superior of the two contenders.

NOTES

1 The fundamental role of *fides* in Silius' *Punica* has long been recognized; see, e.g., Albrecht 1964: 55–86 and Hartmann 2004.

2 Otto 1890: 291: Sal. *Iug.* 108.3; Liv. 30.30.27; see also Pl. *Poen.* 113. On the Roman tradition of Carthaginian perfidy, see Marks in this volume.

3 Bernstein 2008: 135–9.

4 For *fidei* as a defining genitive, see *OLD* s.v. *sinister* 5b; Duff 1934 translates as "faithless to his plighted word," which corresponds to *perfidus*: see Ernout-Meillet 1985 s.v. *perfidus* ("*per-* peut marquer la déviation") and s.v. per . On this passage, see also Marks in this volume. Silius' quotations follow Delz 1987;

translations of Silius are taken from Duff 1934 (occasionally slightly modified) and of Virgil's *Aeneid* from Ahl 2007.

5 Virg. *A.* 4.622–4: *tum vos, o Tyrii, stirpem et genus omne futurum / exercete odiis cinerique haec mittite nostro / munera. nullus amor populis nec foedera sunto* ("Tyrians, drive with relentless hate against his [sc. *Aeneas'*] stock and every / future brood, and dispatch them as ritual gifts to my ashes. / No love must ever exist between our two peoples, no treaties").

6 Virg. *A.* 4.625–7: *exoriare aliquis nostris ex ossibus ultor / qui face Dardanios ferroque sequare colonos, / nunc, olim, quocumque dabunt se tempore vires* ("Rise from my bones, my avenger – and there will be an avenger! – / so you can hound these Dardan settlers with hot fire and cold steel, / now, or some day in the future, whenever the strength coalesces"); see Horsfall 1990: 127–44.

7 See Vessey 1975; Fucecchi 2003: 274–80; Stocks 2014: 88–91; and Bernstein 2017: xxviii–xxix and 187–207 (with bibliography).

8 For a brief moment, the narrating voice assumes (though probably does not endorse) the Carthaginian viewpoint and offers almost an echo of Dido's words against Aeneas' unfaithfulness. Something similar seems to happen when the narrator is talking about Hanno, Hannibal's personal enemy in the Carthaginian senate (see below).

9 Ov. *Ep.* 7.9: *certus es, Aeneas,* cum foedere *solvere naves?* ("Are you determined, Aeneas, to release your ships, together with the nuptial promise?"); *Trist.* 2.536: *non legitimo foedere iunctus amor* ("the union of illicit love"); *Met.* 14.79 (Dido): *non bene discidium Phrygii latura* mariti ("she, who was fated not to endure her Phrygian husband's departure").

10 The swearing of the oath in a temple dedicated to Dido is a Silian invention, which is not to be found in other sources. As a result, Dido becomes a goddess of revenge herself, like Nemesis.

11 Hamilcar's words may also allude to another passage from Dido's curse against Aeneas (… *nec, cum se* sub leges pacis iniquae / *tradiderit, regno aut optata luce fruatur, / sed cadat ante diem mediaque inhumatus harena*, "when he surrenders himself to an unjust peace and its strict terms, / grant him no joy in his realm or the light he so loves. / let him lie dead, well before his due day, halfway up a beach and unburied," Virg. *A.* 4.618–20).

12 E.g., Sil. 1.5: *sacri perfida pacti / gens Cadmea* ("the people of Cadmus who violated the sacred bond") and 1.8–10: *ter … iuratum … Iovi foedus … Sidonii fregere duces* ("three times the Sidonian leaders broke the oath sworn to Jupiter"). From a Roman viewpoint, Hannibal looks as if he were the very champion of *perfidia*: cf. Liv. 21.4.9: *perfidia plus quam Punica* ("a perfidy more than Punic"); Hor. *Carm.* 4.4.49: *perfidus Hannibal* ("perfidious Hannibal").

13 For the opposition between public and private *fides* in Carthage, see Devallet 1992: 96 and Stocks 2014: 86n22.

14 Sil. 1.61–2: … *avet Aegates abolere … / … ac Siculo demergere foedera ponto* ("longed to blot out the Aegades … and to drown the treaty of peace in the Sicilian sea"); 1.268: *rumpere foedera certus* ("resolved, as he was, to break the treaty"). As for the siege of Saguntum, see Marks (this volume), who, however, concentrates mostly on two scenes from *Punica* Book 1: Hannibal's declaration of war and Jupiter's final "response."

15 To use Hardie's 1993 terminology. Murrus is identified with the city walls: in this sense, he could be considered the Saguntine counterpart of Hector, the most important defender of the Trojan walls, whose tragic end he also re-enacts; see Stocks 2014: 108–12, who also stresses the correspondence with Hector and the Virgilian Turnus.

16 Duff translates the phrase as "the gods that I have deceived."

17 See Stocks 2014: 218–19.

18 For a persuasive assessment of this matter, see Stocks 2014: 16–18.

19 Albrecht 1964: 55.

20 See Marks in this volume.

21 In Val. Max. 6.6.ext.1, the personified Fides is already represented as feeling sorrow at the tragic destiny of the Saguntines.

22 Walter 2013 offers the most recent exploration of this similarity.

23 Such an imminent substitution is proudly announced by Hannibal himself at the outset of the siege: the Saguntines have to learn that "their treaties and Italy would be far away now, because they are besieged" (… *longe clausis sua foedera, longe / Ausoniam fore*, 1.301–2) and that "decrees of the senate, law and justice, loyalty and the gods are all in his own hand now" (*scita patrum et leges et iura fidemque deosque / in dextra nunc esse sua*, 1.303–4). On Saguntum and *Fides* in Silius, see Albrecht 1964: 55–86, Vessey 1974, and Pomeroy 2010.

24 Tisiphone disguised as Tiburna pretends to have been inspired by Murrus' shade. The result is a paradoxical subversion of the epiphany of Hector to Aeneas in *Aeneid* 2. Like Troy, Saguntum too is doomed to be completely destroyed. However, on this occasion nobody will survive, since the ghost of Murrus will make his wife lead the entire population to suicide (*fuge … / ad manes, Tiburna, meos*, 2.565–6). In this sense, Murrus plays the same role as the shade of Sychaeus, Dido's husband, who called his beloved wife to the Underworld (*hinc exaudiri voces et verba vocantis / visa viri*, "she thought she could hear both the voice and the words of her husband calling," Virg. *A.* 4.460–1).

25 However, Tiburna kills herself with the sword of her beloved husband, Murrus, not (like Dido) with that of a foreign lover, and, in so doing, she seems to follow Tisiphone's macabre invitation (see note 24 above).

26 Cf., in particular, the image of Carthage "besieged" by Hannibal, who is depicted almost as a new Coriolanus (… *nunc hoc, hoc inquam, tempore muros /*

oppugnat, Carthago, tuos teque obsidet armis, "now, even now, he is attacking the walls of Carthage and besieging us with his army," 2.302–3), as well as the final praise of the Roman soldiers, who "snatch the weapon from their wound and hurl it at the foe" (2.322–3). I discuss Silius' Hanno as (peculiar and partial) recollection of Virgil's Drances below. See also Bruère 1971: 30–1 and Bernstein 2017: 141.

27 Such a situation, where one of the two contenders takes sides with the absent (or even dead) hero, displaying his *fides* toward him, re-enacts the scheme of the contest for the hero's legacy, as in the quarrel between Ajax and Ulysses over Achilles' weapons. Another example of the pattern in Flavian epic is the dispute between Telamon and Meleager over Hercules in V. Fl. 3.637–716.

28 Note, in particular, how Gestar capitalizes on Hanno's exploitation of the pathetic formula of autopsy (*vidi ego*) in order to switch from the tragic to the celebratory register: *vidi ego, cum* (scil. *Regulus*) *geminas artis post terga catenis / evinctus … traheretur* ("I was looking on when Regulus with both hands fast behind his back … was dragged along," 2.340–1) and *vidi* ("I saw," 2.343). Both passages polemically recall the finale of Hanno's speech (*ipse ego … vidi / vidi*, 2.322–3). On the formula *vidi ego* and its use in Roman tragedy and epic, see La Penna 1987 and 2003.

29 On ekphrasis and propaganda, see Fucecchi 2003 and Manuwald 2009.

30 Hamilcar's answer to Scipio's attack (*o fraudum genitor*) shows that the opposition between Rome and Carthage is also based on an irreconcilable difference in interpreting *fides* and its meaning; see Reitz 1982: 108 and Stocks 2014: 186n13.

31 On Imilce, see Augoustakis 2010: 196–213. For the characterization of Imilce's heroism, Silius drew upon some recent historical examples, like the wife of Germanicus, Agrippina, who, according to Tacitus (*Ann.* 1.40), together with her baby son, followed her husband and shared the hard life of the military camp with him. It was only with much difficulty that Germanicus finally managed to send them both to Rome for the sake of safety, and this is precisely what happens in the *Punica*.

32 Sil. 3.84–6: "Then, when his riper age shall put on the down of youth, let him rush forth to war, treading the treaty under foot (*calcato foedere*); and let him, when victorious, demand a tomb for me upon the Capitoline hill." On Hannibal's child as the last scion of a dynasty who voted eternal hatred to Rome, see Bruère 1952; Fucecchi 1992; Bernstein 2008: 136–7; and Augoustakis 2010: 198–9.

33 See Rosati 1996: 145–50 and Newlands 2016: 159–60.

34 Almost like Tiburna, obsessed by Murrus' voice, which announces the end of Saguntum and demands an extreme act of *fides* from his wife, Hannibal reveals that he is urged by his father's ghost asking for an act of *pietas erga parentem* (see Marks in this volume). At the same time, from Imilce's viewpoint,

Hamilcar's exhortation may also sound like a pretext (the image of Aeneas vainly trying to explain his reasons before Dido comes to mind).

35 Bernstein 2008: 137.

36 Augoustakis 2010: 196–7.

37 See Stocks 2014: 182–5 with bibliography.

38 Hannibal's last words (17.606–15) are to be compared to Caesar's when challenging the fury of the tempest on board Amyclas' little boat (Luc. 5.654–71): see Brouwers 1982: 83.

39 Cf. Nep. *Hann.* 1.2 and Liv. 28.12.9.

40 Fucecchi 1990b.

41 The growing pathos of Pompey's departure from Italy reaches its climax with the sequence – strongly marked by Virgilian influence – composed by the simile of the defeated bull (Luc. 2.601–9) and the farewell to the Italian coast (Luc. 3.1–7). In Silius' *Punica*, an analogous sequence is provided by the comparison between Hannibal and the bull (16.4–11) and the farewell to Italy (17.211–17).

42 Keith 2010: 372.

43 Sil. 17.213–17: *ductor defixos Itala tellure tenebat / intentus vultus, manantesque ora rigabant / per tacitum lacrimae, et suspiria crebra ciebat, / haud secus ac patriam pulsus dulcisque penatis / linqueret et tristis exul traheretur in oras*, "Hannibal kept his eyes steadily fixed on the Italian coast; the silent tears flowed down his cheeks, and again and again he sighed, like an exile driven to a dismal shore, who leaves behind his native land and the home he loves"; see Augoustakis 2010: 153 and n137, with bibliography.In contrast, according to Livy (33.48.2), Hannibal "is described as weeping more for his country's fate than his own" (Stocks 2014: 48).

44 Think of Caesar's way of fighting successfully against the sea storm in Lucan; see note 38 above.

45 See, extensively, Stocks in this volume.

46 Hannibal's "unjust victory" (*non aequa victoria*, 13.699) will be rewarded with exile and flight (*vagus exul in orbe / errabit toto*, 2. 700–1), with the constant fear of being reached by his enemies and without the hope of finding loyalty anywhere.

47 The only person who is told to remain faithful to Hannibal is his wife, Imilce.