

Hannibal Crossing the Ebro: a missing scene in Silius Italicus' *Punica*¹

When exactly does a war break out? One can argue for the moment the proclamation is made, or the date a border is crossed by the attacking troops, or when the first battle is fought, or the first village comes under siege; and the 'point of no return' may even be reached at other moments. In other words, it is not easy to tell when “the Rubicon is crossed”. This metaphor had not yet existed in antiquity:² Julius Caesar needed a real river to perform *his* metaphor of “casting the dice”.

In the *Bellum Civile* Caesar notoriously passes over the episode in silence, apparently to de-emphasize the illegal nature of crossing the border of Italy in arms; Lucan, by contrast, emphasizes its symbolic importance by offering a detailed narrative (*Pharsalia* 1.183–232). He stresses that the otherwise small river is swelling (1.185, 217–219), has a vision of the personified *patria* appear for Caesar (186–192), and the crossing itself is narrated twice: first summarily and from the point of view of Caesar, then in detail and from the point of view of the soldiers (204–205, 220–224). Somewhat later, however, the river Var is mentioned surprisingly and anachronistically as the border of Italy (1.404). This double crossing of the Rubicon and designating both rivers as the boundary creates a slight inconsistency, the first of many geographic inconsistencies in the poem: as the side-effect of Lucan's narrative delaying of Caesar's urgency it becomes difficult to decide when exactly the border is crossed and the point of no return reached in the *Pharsalia*.³

Geography, although not discussed in detail by O'Hara, is a field where inconsistencies are well worth to be looked for in any literary text.⁴ Even when events of a poetic narrative take place in the world the readers themselves inhabit ('Greece', 'the Mediterranean' etc.), this world – itself the result of *geography*: geological reality as represented in the minds, maps and writings of human beings – has to be recreated in the text. The overlap between the poetic and non-poetic versions of this world will (theoretically) always be partial: there will be omissions, changes, additions of places. The space in which the events of the story unfold is thus felt to be both “the world as we know it” and something else at the same time; some of the expectations created by the similarity will be frustrated by the differences. These differences may be attributed by some readers to factual mistakes, by others to creative inventions by the poet; but they may also be seen as triggers of inconsistency in the narrative. Or, perhaps, it is the other way round: since the “map” of the poetic world does not pre-exist the narrative but is only drawn gradually through the acts of narration and reading, the narrative inconsistencies might suggest for the reader an inconsistent map of the poetic world. It is the double narration of the Rubicon crossing in Lucan which may make the reader believe, at least temporarily, that the river is actually crossed twice; and it is the narrator's remark about the Var which implies a political map with Italy having two borders at the same time.

This paper is about another river crossing by another commander – but one who is already there in the background in the *Pharsalia* episode. Caesar arrives at the Rubicon after coming across the Alps (183), he is compared to a Libyan lion (205–212), and the river is called *punicus* – 'red', but also 'Punic' (214). Caesar is thus compared, implicitly, to Hannibal; and this arch-enemy of Rome also had a river to cross at the outbreak of the second Punic war, the Ebro, one of the

1 This paper was supported by the János Bolyai Research Scholarship of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences.

2 According to the *Oxford English Dictionary* (s. v. 'Rubicon') the first documented use of the metaphor in English was in 1624.

3 On the double crossing of the Rubicon and the remark about the Var, see Bexley 2014.390–391 with Masters 1992.1–3; Lucan's geographical inconsistencies in the Thessalian excursus are discussed in more detail by Masters 1992.150–178.

4 On the (not necessarily inconsistent) representation of space in ancient literature, see recently the collections de Jong 2012 and Skempis–Ziogas 2014.

largest rivers on the Iberian peninsula and a kind of border itself. I will explore the geographic and narrative inconsistencies in Silius Italicus' treatment of the Ebro crossing; and, although intertextuality with Lucan will not be the focus of my interpretation of the *Punica*, I will return briefly to the comparison of Caesar's and Hannibal's rivers at the end.

The Ebro treaty in ancient sources

In 226 BC Rome signed a treaty with Carthage (or, to be more precise, with Hasdrubal in charge of Punic troops in Spain), usually called the “Ebro treaty”.⁵ Although not making the river a border in a strictly territorial sense (Rome has not yet had any provinces in Spain), this treaty at least implicitly divided the Iberian peninsula into Roman and Carthaginian spheres of influence: under its terms, the Carthaginians were denied any military presence north of the river, but no mention was made about the rest of Spain. This is, at least, what we learn about the treaty in Polybius:

[οἱ Ῥωμαῖοι] διαπρεσβευσάμενοι πρὸς τὸν Ἀσδρούβαν ποιήσασθαι συνθήκας, ἐν αἷς τὴν μὲν ἄλλην Ἰβηρίαν παρεσιώπων, τὸν δὲ καλούμενον Ἰβηρα ποταμὸν οὐκ ἔδει Καρχηδονίου ἐπὶ πολέμῳ διαβαίνειν... (2.13.7)

“[The Romans,] having sent envoys to Hasdrubal and made a treaty, in which no mention was made of the rest of Spain, but the Carthaginians were not allowed to cross the Ebro in arms...” (transl. Paton, modified)

According to Polybius, then, the Ebro treaty did not provide protection for the city of Saguntum lying some 150 kilometres south of the Ebro – “protection”, of course, as understood from Roman perspective as protection from Carthaginian influence. Saguntum, however, concluded an alliance with Rome some time during the 220's (i. e. either before or after the Ebro treaty); about the precise nature of this alliance and the obligations of the signing parties we do not possess detailed information.

Under these circumstances, it is not easy to determine if Hannibal's attack on Saguntum constituted in itself a *casus belli* with Rome. In the Ebro treaty, if we may believe Polybius, Saguntum was not even mentioned, and its territory belonged to Carthage's sphere of influence. The alliance between Rome and Saguntum, on the other hand, may (or may not) have included an obligation of mutual military assistance. It is easy to see, of course, why Romans might have favoured a historical narrative according to which Hannibal's attack on Saguntum constituted the breach of a treaty – serving as an example of the proverbial *fides Punica* – and made Carthage responsible for the outbreak of the second Punic war. It is possible that this became the canonical Roman version of events in the annalist historiography of the second and first centuries BC,⁶ making it possible to remember with clear conscience the war which imperiled Rome, but also served as the direct antecedent of the accelerated expansion of its empire in the second century.

It may well be a trace of this development in Roman cultural memory that, in some accounts at least, the Ebro treaty contains an exemption for Saguntum: even though lying south of the Ebro, the city was protected from Carthaginian influence. This is the version we find in Livy:

Cum hoc Hasdrubale ... foedus renovaverat? populus Romanus ut finis utriusque imperii esset amnis Hiberus Saguntinisque mediis inter imperia duorum populorum libertas servaretur. (21.2.7)

“The Romans had renewed the treaty with Hasdrubal. Under its terms, the River Ebro was to

5 Only a summary of the issue can be given here; for the details, see Astin 1967, Eckstein 1984, Scullard 1989.25–40, Walbank 1957.168–171 *ad Pol.* 2.13.7.

6 Scullard 1989.31, Walbank 1957.171–172. The ancient historiographic tradition is conveniently summarized by Pomeroy 2010.27–28.

7 Livy is apparently referring here to the peace treaty concluded after the first Punic war of which the Ebro treaty is treated as the “renewal”.

form a boundary between the two empires, and Saguntum, occupying an intermediate position between the two peoples' empires, was to be a free city.” (transl. Roberts, modified)

This account eliminates, on the one hand, the implicit contradiction found in Polybius between the Ebro treaty and the alliance between Rome and Saguntum. On the other hand, by the wording in the second half of the sentence and by not referring to a separate alliance concluded with Saguntum, Livy also suggests that the city as Rome's ally was not an enclave in the Carthaginian sphere of influence, but a buffer zone between Roman and Carthaginian territory (*Saguntinisque mediis inter imperia duorum populorum*) which retained its independence (*libertas servaretur*). This idea, of course, does not take into account geographic realities very much: Saguntum would be *inter imperia* really only if it were an island on the river Ebro which Livy marks as the border between empires (*finis utriusque imperii*).⁸

Another, and even more obviously distorting version is in which the relative locations of the Ebro and Saguntum are reversed, and the city is imagined as lying to the *north* of the river, thus by its very location falling under the protection of the Ebro treaty. Thus Appian states about the Saguntines: Ζακανθαῖοι δέ ... ἐν μέσῳ τῆς τε Πυρήνης καὶ τοῦ ποταμοῦ τοῦ Ἰβηρος ὄντες (“the Saguntines ... who lived about midway between the Pyrenees and the river Iberus”, transl. White; *Ib.* 7). Accordingly, in two other passages (*Ib.* 10, *Hann.* 3) he also assumes that Hannibal crossed the river before attacking Saguntum, and apparently even identifies the city with New Carthage (*Ib.* 12). Appian is a relatively late author, of course; but already Polybius, who in other passages correctly locates Saguntum, in one case seems to place it north of the Ebro (3.30.3).⁹

The uncertainties regarding the start of the war are thus at least threefold: legal, geographical and chronological. It is subject to debate whether or not the attack on Saguntum constituted a break of any treaty on Hannibal's part;¹⁰ ancient sources differ regarding on which side of the Ebro Saguntum lies;¹¹ and consequently also regarding whether the siege or the crossing came first.

Silius' *Punica*: Suppressing the Ebro issue

What about Silius? How does the war break out, and where are Saguntum and the Ebro located relative to each other in the poetic world of the *Punica*? It has been noted already by Alfred Klotz in 1933 that Hannibal's crossing of the Ebro is not announced in the main narrative;¹² thus we cannot determine whether Hannibal crosses the river before or after the sacking of Saguntum – whether or not Silius gets his geography right.¹³ This is not an inconsistency in itself, of course. It becomes one, in my view, if we consider that the river is mentioned in the *Punica* repeatedly: ten times altogether, seven of which refer to Hannibal's crossing of the Ebro as an important event in the first phase of the war.¹⁴ This is, then, the basic inconsistency which is the subject of this paper:

8 Cf. Bona 1998.46 n. 80.

9 On Appian's geographic mistakes, cf. Pitcher 2012.222–224. The Polybian passage cannot be discussed here in detail; it is enough to note that he criticizes other historians, summarizing their opinions. So it may be the case – as Walbank 1957.358 *ad loc.* suggests – that he includes the misleading statement for the argument's sake, and that his only mistake is not making it clear that the geographic mistake is that of the authors he criticizes, not his own.

10 The Carthaginians apparently defended themselves against such a claim by stating that the treaty of 226, which at least in Livy guaranteed Saguntine independence, was not confirmed by their senate, thus it should be treated as Hasdrubal' private initiative which is not binding for Carthage as a state: cf. Liv. 21.18.11 and Pol. 3.21.1.

11 The idea has also emerged that all the ambiguities regarding the locations of the Ebro and Saguntum arise because different ancient sources refer to different rivers by that name: see Carcopino 1953. The problem is inherent, obviously, in the name: is Ἰβηρ/*Hiberus* “the Ebro” or “a river in Iberia”?

12 Klotz 1933.15–16; also noted by Küppers 1986.126 n. 481, Nesselrath 1986.210, Šubr 1991.229.

13 In-depth studies on Silius' treatment and sources of geography discuss the Ebro issue only briefly (Bona 1998.46, 50–51) or not at all (Nicol 1936.129–179).

14 The crossing is mentioned at 1.480 (by Hannibal), 1.643 (by the Saguntine envoys), 2.449 (represented on the shield of Hannibal), 5.161 (mentioned by Flaminius), 8.323 (by Fabius), 11.144 (by the citizens of Capua) and 16.633 (indirectly by Fabius, referring to P. Scipio's failed plan to stop Hannibal at the Ebro). These passages will be

the tension between the rhetoric importance and the narrative omission of the Ebro crossing in Silius.

Let us begin by discussing two passages where the suppression of the Ebro issue is most apparent. The first is what seems to be Silius' version of the Ebro treaty. The narrator introduces the Saguntum episode by giving a chronological summary of the foundation and history of the city (1.271–295). It ends with the report about a treaty:

*Libertas populis pacto servata decusque
maiorum, et Poenis urbi imperitare negatum.
Admovet abrupto flagrantia foedere ductor
Sidonius castra et latos quatit agmine campos. (Pun. 1.294–297)¹⁵*

“The freedom of the inhabitants and their ancestral glory were preserved by treaty; the Carthaginians were forbidden to rule the city. The Carthaginian leader broke the treaty and brought his camp-fires close and shook the wide plains with his marching host.”

The Ebro is not named, and neither are the parties signing this treaty; line 295 may be read either as referring to a Roman-Carthaginian treaty or a Roman-Saguntinian declaration which forbids Carthage to extend their influence over the city. The wording *libertas servata*, however, very closely recalls *libertas servaretur* in the Livian passage just discussed. This intertext may suggest to the reader that the Silian narrator is referring to the “Ebro treaty”, as discussed in other texts, but he rewrites its terms and turns it into something which would be more properly called a “Saguntum treaty”: in Silius' version, the interdiction binding the Carthaginians is not from crossing the Ebro, which is not even mentioned, but from attacking Saguntum.

The narrator stresses again in the next line that Hannibal's attack on Saguntum constitutes the breach of this treaty (*abrupto foedere*).¹⁶ However, since Silius did not even mention the Ebro in the previous lines, we cannot decide whether or not in the world of the *Punica* the breach of the treaty in question implies that Hannibal has also crossed the river already, and thus it remains unclear whether or not the Ebro lies to the north or to the south of Saguntum. One thing is for sure: Rome is far away, as Hannibal threatens the Saguntines a couple of lines later, again referring to a treaty, apparently the alliance between Rome and Saguntum: *longe clausis sua foedera, longe Ausoniam fore* (“now, besieged, their treaties and Italy would be far away”, 301–302).

Rome is, indeed, far away: Saguntum is doomed to be destroyed. After the city has fallen, Silius continues the narrative in *Punica* 3 by closely following the course of events in Livy's Book 21.¹⁷ There are, however, some noteworthy differences (in italics) with regard to the Ebro crossing:

Punica 3

Hannibal at Hercules' temple in Gades (1–157)

Hannibal's dream at Gadesben (158–221)

catalogue of Hannibal's troops (222–414)

Crossing of the Pyrenees (415–441)

Livy Book 21

Hannibal at Hercules' temple in Gades (21)

H. travels to New Carthage and the Ebro (22)

Hannibal's dream at the Ebro (22)

Crossing of the Ebro (23)

Crossing of the Pyrenees (23–24)

discussed below. The Ebro (in contexts other than Hannibal's crossing) is also mentioned at 7.110 (by Hannibal: the two Scipios, having “fled” Italy, are now on watch duty at the Ebro); 9.195 (by Hannibal: Roman ships carrying riches down the Ebro) and 17.641–642 (the image of the Ebro is carried at Scipio' triumph). Of these latter passage, only the latter will be discussed below.

15 Quotations of the *Punica* are based on Delz's 1987 Teubner edition; translations are taken from Duff's Loeb (with modifications).

16 The phrase *ductor Sidonius* gives further emphasis to the criticism expressed by *abrupto foedere*: Hannibal is Punic, thus (according to Roman ethnic prejudice) his untrustworthiness and his inclination to break treaties is an inborn character trait, not confined to this particular situation.

17 On the relationship between Silius' and Livy's narrative (and on the possible historiographic sources and models of the *Punica*), and also on the history of scholarship a useful summary is provided by Pomeroy 2010.

In both accounts, Hannibal visits the temple of Hercules at Gades; then both report about Hannibals' famous dream. This dream, however, takes place at different locations: at the Ebro in Livy, but still at Gades in Silius. Livy then announces the crossing, connecting it with the dream, but quite succinctly: *hoc visu laetus Hiberum copias traiecit* (23, “Gladdened by this vision he proceeded to cross the Ebro”, transl. Roberts).¹⁸ Livy in the next sentence announces the crossing again, this time in more detail: *nonaginta milia peditum, duodecim milia equitum Hiberum traduxit* (“He brought 90,000 infantry and 12,000 cavalry over the Ebro”).¹⁹ In the *Punica*, the long catalogue of Hannibal's troops seems to replace, by an epic expansion, this short report on the troops crossing the Ebro: where the historian inquires into numbers, the epic narrator is more interested in the specific peoples and captains helping Hannibal.²⁰

The simile which ends the catalogue might also corroborate this reading. At 3.406–414 Hannibal, mustering and parading his troops on the plain, is compared to Neptune travelling in his chariot to the outermost Ocean, accompanied by the train of Nereids. This simile seems to be a bit weird in comparison to other marine similes and metaphors used in military contexts throughout the *Punica*.²¹ Only in this case is it emphasized that the plain is “dust-darkened” (*campos ... pulvere nigrantes*, 406–407), in contrast to the “transparent waters of the sea” (*perspicuo ... ponto*, 414) to which the scene is then compared: a completely dry and dirty place is likened to a completely wet and pure one. Why? Is there, perhaps, a negative allusion²² latent in this simile, reminding the reader that in Livy's narrative at this moment the army crossed a river instead of a plain?

This, of course, is interpretation rather than proof: no intertext can be used to reconstruct the story beyond any doubt if the plot is ambiguous. We cannot use Livy as proof that Hannibal does, indeed, cross the Ebro at this point in *Punica* 3 even though not announced doing so by the narrator. Still, what the Livian intertext can be used for, in my view, is to argue that something more interesting is going on than what we could simply ascribe to the carelessness of Silius who, in the ill-famed assessment of Pliny the Younger, otherwise worked *maiore cura quam ingenio* (*Ep.* 3.7.5). Rather than blaming the author for forgetting to announce the crossing, we should perhaps think rather of the narrator who, for whatever reason, does mention the Ebro issue only in other passages of his epic. To these other passages we should turn now.

Mentioning the Ebro: analepsis or prolepsis?

By the end of *Punica* 3, Hannibal has crossed the Alps and arrived in Italy. Mentions of the Ebro crossing in later books thus can be safely read as analeptic, referring to something that happened earlier. The passages in question make this clear themselves. Flaminius complains that “those for whom it was unlawful to cross the Ebro are now reaching the Tiber” (*quosque nefas vetiti transcendere nomen Hiberi, tangere iam Thybrim*, 5.161–162 – a passage I will return to); Fabius reminds Paulus that “scarce a third part survives of the army that started from the cold Ebro” (*tertia vix superest, crudo quae venit Hiberi, turba virum*, 8.323–324); the citizens of Capua recount the Ebro crossing as one of Hannibal's past achievements (*excisam primore Marte Saguntum, et iuga Pyrenes et Hiberum*, 11.143–144). Fabius, finally, reminds Scipio of how his father was in rush to the Ebro when it turned out that Hannibal has already crossed it and progressed much further (*pater ille tuus ... cum consul Hiberi tenderet ad ripas, revocato milite primus descendenti avidae superatis Alpibus ultro opposuit sese Hannibali*, “your famous father ... was on his way as consul to the banks of the

18 While in Livy Hannibal's interpretation of the dream is clearly optimistic (*hoc visu laetus*), in the *Punica* his feelings are mixed: he feels “joy mixed with fear” (*laetique pavore promissa evolvit somni*, 3.215–216).

19 Cf. the announcement in Polybius: παραγενομένης τῆς ταχθείσης ἡμέρας, προῆγε, πεζῶν μὲν ἔχων εἰς ἑννέα μυριάδας, ἵππεῖς δὲ περὶ μυρίου καὶ δισχιλίου, καὶ διαβάς τὸν Ἰβήρα ποταμὸν... (3.35.1).

20 On this Silian catalogue, without discussion of the possible Livian intertext, see Gibson 2010.53–54.

21 *Pun.* 5.395–400, 5.503, 8.426–7, 9.282–6, 9.319–20, 15.713–4 as collected by Manolaraki 2010.307–308 (also mentioning possible parallels from Greek and Roman epic).

22 The term (along with “intertextual praeteritio”) is suggested by Zissos 1999.

Ebro; but, when Hannibal had crossed the Alps and was coming down to devour us, he recalled his army and was the first to throw himself boldly in Hannibal's path", 16.632–636). By contrast, during the Saguntum episode in *Punica* 1–2 the Ebro crossing is mentioned in contexts which, to some extent and by different means, make it ambiguous whether the mention is analeptic or proleptic, whether the reference is made to the past or to the future.

The crossing of the river is first referred to by Hannibal himself during his duel with the Saguntine Murrus. He is mocking his opponent thus:

*En, qui res Libycas inceptaque tanta retardet,
Romani Murrus belli mora! Foedera, faxo,
iam noscas, quid vana queant et vester Hiberus.* (1.478–480)

“Behold Murrus, the man to impede the prowess of Libya and our mighty enterprise, the man to hinder the war against Rome! Soon will I make you learn the power of useless treaties and your river Ebro.”

In contrast to the narrator's words which end the summary of Saguntine history (discussed above), the Ebro and a treaty are mentioned in the same sentence now, more clearly alluding to the Ebro treaty as readers may know it from historical sources. But when is the river crossed? The sigmatic future *faxo*²³ should point to the future, suggesting a crossing which has not yet happened. If, however, the Ebro lies to the north of Saguntum, and will be crossed after the fall of the city, then Murrus, going to be killed shortly as Hannibal hopes and as actually happens (496–517), will never learn about Hannibal's crossing. If, by contrast, the Ebro – let us suppose for the moment – lies to the south of Saguntum, then Murrus and his fellow citizens have already learnt of the river's ineffectiveness as a border. The expression is thus slightly problematic in any case.

The Ebro is again mentioned by the Saguntine envoys at Rome. A bit longer quotation is in place to suggest the rhetoric of the passage:

*... vidimus Hannibalem. Procul his a moenibus, oro,
arcete, o superi, nostroque in Marte tenete
fatiferae iuvenem dextrae! Qua mole sonantes
exigit ille trabes! Et quantus crescit in armis!
Trans iuga Pyrenes, medium indignatus Hiberum,
excivit Calpen et mersos Syrtis harenis
molitur populos maioraque moenia quaerit.
Spumeus hic medio qui surgit ab aequore fluctus,
si prohibere piget, vestras effringet in urbes.
An tanti pretium motus ruptique per enses
foederis hoc iuveni iurata in bella ruenti
creditus, ut statuatur superatae iura Sagunto?* (1.639–650)

“...we have seen Hannibal. I pray that Heaven may keep the deadly arm of that stripling far from these walls, and confine him to war against us. With what might he hurls the crashing beam! How his stature increases in battle! Beyond the Pyrenees, scorning the limit of the

23 In the language of Latin epic *faxo* is used not exclusively but most often as an “auxiliary verb” in speeches of boasting and vowing in heroic duels and battles; see e.g. Verg. *Aen.* 9.154 (Turnus vs. Aeneas); Val. Fl. *Arg.* 4.191, 220 (Amycus vs. Pollux); Stat. *Theb.* 8.78 (Pluto vs. Iuppiter); Sil. *Pun.* 7.115 (Hannibal vs. Fabius). *Foedera faxo* at the end of the hexameter occurs also at Val. Fl. *Arg.* 7.177 (Venus vowing that she will make Medea seek marriage – as a treaty – with Jason on her own accord) and Verg. *Aen.* 12.316–317 (*ego foedera faxo / firma manu; Turnum debent haec iam mihi sacra*). This latter passage seems to be the most important intertext for the *Punica* passage under discussion here, since it also deals with the (in)effectiveness of treaties: after the deal struck by Aeneas and Turnus has been broken by the Rutulians and the fighting resumes, Aeneas reminds his men that only he can ensure observance of the treaty by his own hands – by killing Turnus.

Ebro, he has roused up Calpe and stirs up the peoples hidden in the sands of the Syrtis, and has greater cities in his eye. This foaming billow, rising in mid-ocean, will dash itself against the cities of Italy, if you refuse to stop it. Do you believe that Hannibal, frantic for the war he has sworn to wage, will be content with this reward of his great enterprise and his breach of treaty by force of arms – the conquest and submission of Saguntum?”

Just like the narrator did earlier at 1.296, the Saguntines also see that Hannibal's attack on their city constitutes the breach of a treaty, as the phrase *rupti foederis* (648–649) shows. But the envoys also emphasize that Hannibal's true objective is Italy,²⁴ and if the Romans fail to send help to Saguntum, Hannibal will be *ante portas* very soon (cf. *maioraque moenia quaerit*, 645; *vestras effringet in urbes*, 647). Their rhetorical strategy is thus – in addition to emphasizing the kinship between the Roman and Saguntine people (cf. *consanguineam ... dextram*, 655) – to exaggerate the danger even beyond reality. This, I think, is also apparent in how they report Hannibal's current whereabouts. First they describe him as an unstoppable general, commanding a mighty army, then they say he is “beyond the Pyrenees”, “scorning the limit of the Ebro”, and “has roused up Calpe” (643–644). So, where is Hannibal currently? The ambiguity of *trans iuga Pyrenes* is obvious: as a geographic reference it depends on which direction we are looking from. Hannibal may be *still* beyond, which is to say on the southern side of the Pyrenees, if we look from Rome; but Hannibal may also be *already* beyond the mountains, i. e. on the northern side, if the frame of reference is his march towards Italy.²⁵ Readers will probably know that Hannibal has not yet crossed these mountains: he is still south of the Pyrenees, at Saguntum – but the envoys are conspicuously avoiding to make this clear for the Romans. Their goal is not to provide an objective and exact account of the military situation, rather to scare and persuade the Romans.

Hannibal is also said to be *medium indignatus Hiberum*. Now the question is, especially in view of the ambiguity of *trans* in the same sentence, whether Hannibal's indignation at the Ebro being the border is only expressed in words for the time being, or has already been turned into action – in other words, whether or not the river has already been crossed. It is particularly important with regard to this ambiguity that *indignatus* recalls the last words of the Vergilian ekphrasis of Aeneas' shield: *pontem indignatus Araxes* (*Aen.* 8.728). This intertext is a good example of allusion by contrast: in Vergil the river is indignant (as the ekphrasis suggests) at having been crossed, while in Silius Hannibal is indignant at being forbidden to cross the Ebro. The two meanings of indignation (by words and by deeds) are also both active in Vergil, but they are chronologically separated: just like the Euphrates has been said two lines earlier to be “now flowing [its image being carried] with gentler stream” (*Euphrates ibat iam mollior undis*, 726), we expect an Araxes which did not tolerate to be bridged in the past, but *now* endures, even if indignantly, Roman control. This interpretation is provided by Servius (ad loc.), who invents just such a failed attempt at bridging the Araxes in the past and assigns it to Xerxes (famous for his hybriatic attempts at bridging the Hellespont), then ascribes a bridge destroyed by a storm to Alexander the Great – and also apparently invents a successful bridging by Augustus.²⁶ “Active” indignation by the Vergilian Araxes, as Servius explains, has been reduced into a “passive” one – but for the *Punica* passage we have no Servius to decide for us (all too conveniently) the precise nature of Hannibal's indignation.

The presence of this Vergilian intertext is also confirmed towards the very end of the *Punica*. In the triumph of Scipio, the likenesses of conquered territories are carried: there is Carthage, Spain and various Iberian places. The last of them is the Ebro, again mentioned together with the

24 Hannibal himself admitted that much, of course, when he ironically addressed Murrus as *Romani belli mora* (1.479).

25 Moreover, if we supply a verb of motion rather than position, then we may also imagine Hannibal crossing the Pyrenees at the moment. Duff's original translation suggests this interpretation: “crossing the range of the Pyrenees”. Regarding the ambiguous referentiality of *trans iuga*, cf. Rood 2012.189 on how Polybius employs ἐπὶ τὰδε, “on this side of...” regularly with the Romans as focalisers, but ἐντὸς Ἰβηρος ποταμοῦ (etc.) to refer to both the north and the south side of the river, depending on focalisation.

26 Cf. Thomas 1982.43–44, 63.

Pyrenees:

... mater
*bellorum fera Pyrene nec mitis Hiberus,
cum simul illidit ponto quos attulit amnes.
Sed non ulla magis mentesque oculosque tenebat,
quam visa Hannibalis campis fugientis imago.* (17.640–644)

“There too was Pyrene, the fierce mother of wars and the Ebro, no gentle stream when it pours with violence into the sea all the streams it has brought down with it. But no sight attracted the eyes and minds of the people more than the picture of Hannibal in retreat over the plains.”

Of course, as lines 643–644 also make clear, it is not Hannibal's successes in the first phase of the war what spectators of Scipio's triumph are reminded of in the first place. Rather, these images advertise how Rome's early failures have been turned into victories: how Publius and Cnaeus Scipio, father and uncle of the *triumphator* won a sea battle at the Ebro estuary in 217 BC, and then after crossing the river waged a successful campaign in Southern Spain.²⁷ Although the two Scipios did not survive the war, Rome subdued the Eastern part of the Iberian peninsula and turned it into provinces a few years after the war. The Ebro and its crossing has been turned into a symbol of successful Roman expansion rather than Punic treachery. The river, however, is not *indignatus*; it is, to be sure, emphatically described as “not gentle” (*nec mitis*) – otherwise victory over it would have no value; but even this fierceness is toned down somewhat in the next line, turned into a curious geographic fact, in sharp contrast to the personification of both the Pyrenees and the Vergilian Araxes.

The likeness of the Ebro carried at Scipio' triumph has its counterpart in the Saguntum episode. At *Punica* 2.395–456, the shield Hannibal receives from his Iberian allies during the siege of Saguntum is described in detail.²⁸ In addition to scenes from both the mythical and historical past of Carthage (406–436), and from rural life in Africa (437–445), the present is also carved on the shield: there is Saguntum, surrounded by Hannibal's troops, and there is the visual representation of the Ebro as well, mentioned at the end of the ekphrasis:

*Eminet excelso consurgens colle Saguntos,
quam circa immensi populi condensaque cingunt
agmina certantum pulsantque trementibus hastis.
Extrema clipei stagnabat Hiberus in ora,
curvatis claudens ingentem flexibus orbem.
Hannibal abrupto transgressus foedere ripas
Poenorum populos Romana in bella vocabat.* (2.446–456)

„Conspicuous on the shield was Saguntum, rising on its lofty eminence; and round it swarmed countless hosts and serried ranks of fighters, who assailed it with their quivering spears. On the outer rim of the shield flowed the Ebro, enclosing the vast circuit with its curves and

27 Much of this information, however, must be supplied by the reader. Silius does not narrate in detail events in the Spanish theatre of war after the fall of Saguntum until the younger Scipio takes command. The death of Cnaeus and Publius is announced at 13.381–384; the news prompts the younger Scipio to descend to the Underworld, where his father and uncle will give him a summary of their victories and fall (13.650–695). They do not mention the Ebro: Roman victories associated with the river and (apparently) recalled in Scipio's triumph are thus even more suppressed in the narrative than Hannibal's earlier crossing of the Ebro which, although not announced, is still mentioned a number of times.

28 Detailed discussions of the shield ekphrasis include: von Albrecht 1964.173–177, Vessey 1975, Kissel 1979.185–192, Küppers 1986.154–164, Lovatt (2013) 172–175; on Silian ekphrasis in general see Manuwald 2009, Harrison 2010.

windings. And there was Hannibal; having broken the treaty by crossing the river, he was summoning the Punic nations to battle against Rome.”

The Ebro, as all critics note, replaces the Ocean at the outer rim of Achilles' shield in the *Iliad*, which is also named as a river (ποταμός) by the Homeric narrator (18.607–608, also the closing lines of the ekphrasis). But the Ebro on the shield, as has been noted by Helen Lovatt recently, is not like the mighty Homeric Ocean (cf. μέγα σθένος, 607): in stark contrast to its characterization at Scipio's triumph as *nec mitis*, it is now stagnating (*stagnabat*) like a pool or a lake. It may be in flood and thus wide, but it is not fast flowing enough to make things hard for Hannibal: it is easy to cross, to transgress in both the physical and moral senses of the word.²⁹ *Stagnabat*, on the other hand, may also be read as a self-referential acknowledgment that this river is not an actual, flowing one, but only a representation: a snapshot of the flow of both water and time.

The Homeric intertext seems also significant with regard to the geographic inconsistency I am concerned with. If the Homeric shield, with the Ocean at its rim, serves also as a schematic “map” of the whole world, then the intertextual connection suggests the same about Hannibal's shield. If, however, we interpret it as such, then we quickly find that this map is seriously distorting or rather surreal: it might tell us something important about the world, but it cannot be taken at face value. The Ebro is turned into a river which flows around Saguntum and, moreover, encompasses North Africa and Carthage as well. Silius, it should be noted, seems to owe this geographic distortion to Lucan who twice states that the Ebro “encloses” (the greater part of) Spain³⁰ – in reality the river is only able to do so with the help of the Mediterranean sea and the Atlantic Ocean. One interpretation of the Homeric and Lucanian intertextuality is to say that the shield itself thus suggests that the Ebro should be the limit to the “Carthaginian world” and to Hannibal's aspirations.³¹ But we can, in my view, interpret this “map” also in relation to the treatment of the Ebro crossing in the main narrative. Our expectations that the Ebro runs either north or south of Saguntum and, consequently, the crossing should be narrated either before or after the siege of Saguntum are thwarted on the map (by having the river run *around* the city) just like in the narrative (from which the crossing will be omitted).

It is important to note that the crossing, labeled as the breaking of a treaty (*abrupto foedere*, 451; cf. 1.296) is mentioned – for the only time during the Saguntum episode – in the perfect tense through the participle *transgressus* (455). The text thus seems to suggest, at least on a first reading, that the crossing has, indeed, happened already. However, we read this announcement as part of a description of visual scenes on a work of art; and whenever we encounter a shield ekphrasis in post-Vergilian epic, we have to think twice before deciding whether the past or the future is represented. Harrison, discussing proleptic ekphrasis in the *Punica*, identifies many cases of symbolic prolepsis in the description of Hannibal's shield, but he does not consider the possibility that the Ebro scene also represents the future (a very near future, to be sure). “Unlike Aeneas' prophetic shield,” he writes, “Hannibal's cannot take the narrative beyond the present.”³² Similarly, Pomeroy assumes that the presence of the Ebro crossing on the shield suggests that it has already happened.³³ By contrast, Bona and Venini – apparently based on their knowledge of real-world geography – suppose that the Ebro crossing on the shield refers to the next obstacle Hannibal will overcome.³⁴ In my view, however, it is important to realize that we cannot, in the end, decide if the crossing as represented on Hannibal's shield has already happened or is yet to come. It would be easier to decide, perhaps, if we would know whether Hannibal is shown on the shield as crossing the Ebro towards Saguntum (towards the inside of the shield) or the other way –

29 Lovatt 2013.181–182.

30 *Post domitas gentes quas torrens ambit Hiberus* (7.15, on Pompey's earlier triumph over Spain); *gelido circumfluis orbis Hiberno* (10.477, *orbis* = Spain, cf. *Hiberus ... claudens ... orbem* at Pun. 2.449–450).

31 Cf. von Albrecht 1964.174, Kissel 1979.190, Vessey 1975.404.

32 Harrison 2010.284.

33 Pomeroy 2003.361 n. 2.

34 Bona 1998.50–51, citing Venini 1991.1197 (*non vidi*).

but the narrator does not share this information with us.

After the shield ekphrasis the Ebro will not be mentioned again until Hannibal, on his way towards Italy, crosses the Pyrenees at 3.414–441; the river must surely have been crossed by that time. We are thus left with the four passages already discussed, none of which specify clearly the timing of the Ebro crossing in the *Punica* and, consequently, leave the geographical location of the river on the map of this poetic world unspecified. This ambiguity might not be striking if there were only one such passage, but having four seems remarkable.

Interpretations of the inconsistency

What remains to do is, of course, to interpret the inconsistency in Silius' narration of Hannibal's march towards Italy: to suggest some answers as to why the crossing of the Ebro is mentioned repeatedly (and represented on the shield) as an event important in legal and/or political, moral, military sense, thus generating expectations in the reader that the actual crossing will be announced (and possibly even elaborated in detail), only to frustrate these expectations in the end. None of the following interpretations, of course, can offer the definitive solution to the supposed problem; rather, they represent different strategies of dealing with the inconsistency.

The first strategy may be called intertextual. Even if we cannot reliably reconstruct the story behind the plot by intertextual means (see above), intertextual considerations may help in accepting and explaining ambiguities and inconsistencies in the poem. If we suppose that the author of the *Punica* (an 'implied author', of course, rather than the historical Silius Italicus) was aware that sources offer different and contradictory versions of the relative locations of the Ebro and Saguntum, and thus also of the chronology of Hannibal's attack, then the *Punica*'s lack of clarity regarding these issues may be seen as an attempt to avoid having to take sides and choose between these versions. In the post-Alexandrian poetic tradition which the *Punica* (together with the other Flavian epics) belongs to, acknowledging and using different, even contradictory variants and intertexts at the same time is in many cases preferred by poets to following just one of them – even if this comes at the price of creating inconsistencies. The “map” on Hannibal's shield could be easily incorporated into such a reading: the Ebro flowing *around* Saguntum may be read as an allusion not only to Lucan who has already stated that the Ebro encloses Spain (see above), but also to tradition as such with its contradictory variants at the same time.

The inconsistency can also be interpreted intratextually, from a narratological point of view. It is conspicuous that the Ebro is always mentioned by characters in the *Punica*, or represented visually on man-made objects (a shield and an emblem carried in a procession). The narrator duly quotes his characters, it is true, and describes the representations; but when he is speaking *in propria persona*, he suppresses any mention of the Ebro. He renames, as it were, the Ebro treaty into a 'Saguntum treaty'; and he fails to announce the crossing whenever it actually happens. It seems thus that the narrator and his characters have very different views regarding how the history of the second Punic war should be written. The characters would give the Ebro issue an emphasis at least equal to the siege of Saguntum; the narrator, by contrast, is telling a story in which the Ebro is not, in fact, important.³⁵ A number of locations and obstacles Hannibal visits or overcomes “compete” for the narrator's attention in *Punica* 1–3: first of all Saguntum, whose siege is narrated in one and a half books,³⁶ then Gades (3.1–405, including Hannibal's dream and the catalogue), then the Pyrenees, the Rhone and the Durance (discussed in less detail, 406–476), and finally the Alps (dominating the second half of *Punica* 3 from line 477).³⁷ Of these, Saguntum, Gades and even the Alps can all be seen in one way or another as the starting point of Hannibal's war against Rome: the siege of Saguntum is the first military action, Hannibal launches his army

35 Cf. Nesselrath 1986.211.

36 On the programmatic importance of the expanded Saguntum episode, also in relation to the narrative structure of the epic as a whole, see Dominik 2003; for the related issue of Silius' handling of time, see Wallace 1968 (esp. 85 on Saguntum) and Wilson 1993.229–230.

37 On the symbolic importance of the Alps in the *Punica*, see Šubrt 1991.

towards Italy from Gades, the Alps is the last barrier he must cross before entering Italy and beginning to fight directly against the Romans. The narrator of the *Punica* does not choose any single one of these as *the* starting point, but he apparently does choose one, the Ebro, to exclude from the list of candidates.

He may have a number of reasons for doing so. He might, in his role as “historian”, feel that Hannibal's crossing of the Ebro is something which does happen, but is not a significant “historical event”. If so, his opinion – as we have seen – apparently differs from that of his characters. On the other hand, he might also feel, as a poet, that the Ebro crossing is in itself not interesting enough to be developed into an episode. If we entertain such an interpretation, it must be noted that two river crossings are, indeed, narrated in *Punica* 3 in quick succession, those of the Rhone and the Durance (442–476): but both are described as swift flowing and thus causing difficulty for the troops and especially the animals.³⁸ Then, immediately after crossing these rivers, Hannibal's soldiers glimpse the formidable Alps, and the sight makes them forget all previous hardships: *sed iam praeteritos ultra meminisse labores / conspectae propius dempsere paventibus Alpes* (477–478). When compared to this climactic series of obstacles, the Ebro might seem insignificant, indeed; but it is also the only obstacle which not only Hannibal's soldiers forget when facing the Alps, but the narrator has also already “forgotten” to tell about earlier.

In the above paragraph, I assumed that the different narrative levels are clearly distinguishable from each other. In most cases, of course, they are; but there may be exceptions. I would like to close the discussion by looking at two passages in which the borderline between the primary and secondary narrative levels, between narration and ekphrasis, seems to be blurred; these passages, in my view, suggest that the narrator's reticence about the crossing in the primary narrative is not a sign that he does not see it as significant, but is a way of suggesting *in what sense* he does regard it as significant.

Let us return to the shield ekphrasis! In that scene we have two Hannibals: one is represented on the shield as having just crossed the Ebro, and the other is Hannibal as character of the *Punica*, spectator of the shield (indeed, its “ideal spectator” for whom it has been made). The boundary between ekphrasis and narrative, however, which separates these two Hannibals, becomes blurred, and this is signalled both visually on the shield (at least as its description suggests) and syntactically by the text. If the Ebro is to be seen at the outer rim of the shield, and Hannibal is shown as having just crossed it, then he must be represented as either entering or leaving the plane of the shield. On the other hand, this blurring is also expressed syntactically. The last sentence of the ekphrasis and the first sentence of the resumed narrative share their grammatical subjects (451–456):

*Hannibal abrupto transgressus foedere ripas
Poenorum populos Romana in bella vocabat.
Tali sublimis dono nova tegmina latis
aptat concutiens umeris celsusque profatur:
“Heu quantum Ausonio sudabit, arma, cruore!
Quas, belli iudex, poenas mihi, Curia, pendes!”*

“And there was Hannibal; having broken the treaty by crossing the river, he was summoning the Punic nations to battle against Rome. Proud of such a gift, he fitted the new armour to his broad shoulders with a clang. Then, with head held high, he spoke thus: 'Ah! What torrents of Roman blood will drench this armour! How great a penalty shall the Senate, the disposer of war, pay to me!’”

38 It is also conspicuous that the same two river crossings are also narrated in some detail by Livy (21.26–29 and 31). Of course, Silius could have made the crossing of the Ebro difficult for Hannibal, had he wanted to, even for the lack of a similar episode in Livy.

The subject for the second sentence (453–454) must be supplied from the first (451–452): it is still *Hannibal* (451). This makes the reader believe, for a moment, that the two Hannibals, the represented one and the spectator, are the same, while – at least narratologically – this is not true. What seems to happen here, then, is a temporary merge of the two Hannibals. Hannibal is not anymore just a viewer of his past or future crossing of the Ebro: it becomes possible to interpret these lines as suggesting that he also performs the crossing at this moment – mentally of course. The shield ekphrasis thus may be one of Hannibal's daydreams in the *Punica*: carried away by his phantasies, he is in a number of cases unable to keep imagination and reality separate.³⁹ The phantasizing, furthermore, continues in the shield episode. In the last two quoted lines he imagines the bloodshed and destruction he will cause – after crossing the Ebro, of course – to Italy and Rome, while readers know that he will not, in fact, enter the city of Rome and destroy the Curia. The ekphrasis thus seems to be a passage *Punica* in which the Ebro crossing is not just mentioned or represented, but indeed happens, in Hannibal's experience at least; according to this reading the narrator does, in fact, narrate Hannibal's crossing of the river, but he does narrate it as a psychological rather than physical event, triggered by the sight of the shield.

Another passage from *Punica* 5 (already mentioned above) might corroborate such an interpretation. In Book 5, Flaminius exhorts his soldiers before the battle of Trasimene by reminding them of Hannibal's previous deeds (160–162):

*perfractas Alpes passamque infanda Saguntum,
quosque nefas vetiti transcendere nomen Hiberi,
tangere iam Thybrim.*

“the breach made in the Alps, the awful fate of Saguntum, and that those for whom it was unlawful to cross the name of the forbidden Ebro, are now reaching the Tiber.”

Transcendere nomen Hiberi is very striking here. How can one cross the *name* of a River? No wonder that conjectures have been proposed for *nomen*, both in the late 18th century: Ernesti chose *limen*, Ruperti *flumen*.⁴⁰ In the now standard Teubner edition, however, Delz retains *nomen*, comparing the expression to a passage from Book 7 where Hannibal wonders whether the battles of Trebia and Trasimene would not have happened at all and thus would be *nulla nomina*, “unknown”, had he met Fabius the Cunctator earlier in the war. In light of this passage, *nomen Hiberi* in Book 5 would be more or less a periphrasis for *nobilem Hiberum*, “the famous Ebro”. However, I do not think that this comparison helps much: such “decoding” of a figure takes away much of the rhetoric effect, and there seem to be more relevant parallels as well in the *Punica*.⁴¹ Rather, we should try and interpret the metonymy as such. By having Hannibal cross the name of the river rather than the river itself, the text (spoken by Flaminius – a fact which makes the expression all the more conspicuous) suggests that the Ebro crossing is interesting and important not in itself, but as a historical and legal event, and a mere “happening” can only become a meaningful and significant “historical event” only by interpretation, in the cultural and linguistic context

39 See e.g. 1.64–69 (with Feeney 1982 *ad loc.*), 1.116–117, 6.698–713.

40 Of the two conjectures, *limen* seems much more effective (although that is not a textual argument in itself), since *vetiti transcendere limen* would express much more forcefully that the crossing of the Ebro is an act of legal and ethical transgression; *flumen* would provide no more than obvious geographical information.

41 In the *Punica*: *magnanimis regnata viris, nunc Ardea nomen* (1.293, a passage suspected of corruption: the city now exists only in cultural memory, as a name); *iacet aequore nomen clarum Maeonio atque Italae pars magna ruinae Appius* (5.328–330: Appius, though dead, lives on as a famous name), and *exanguis spectatis corpore nomen* (6.478: Regulus, although alive, refers to himself as just a name, the subject of people's memories); *quid referam Aeolio regnatas nomine terras* (14.70: the islands in question are indeed “ruled” by something intangible: a wind named or personified as Aeolus). For *nomen* as something having physical existence, cf. Ov. *Ars* 2.633 (*corpora si nequeunt, quae possunt, nomina tangunt*); for the collocation *nomen Hiberi* at the end of the hexameter, cf. Luc. 4.23 (*qui praestat terris aufert tibi nomen Hiberus*, on the river Cinga flowing into the Ebro and losing its name).

provided by documents and narratives.

Conclusion: Hannibal's Rubicon?

The Ebro crossing in the *Punica*, it seems, has to happen not (only) in the physical world, but also (and as its absence from the main narrative suggests: more importantly) in the sphere of language and ideas, where the Ebro is not a geographical feature but, as Flaminus himself formulates, a name. It is primarily in this sense that, in my view, Hannibal's crossing of the Ebro may be fruitfully compared to Caesar's crossing of the Rubicon.

If we approach the issue with the apparatus of literary intertextuality and look for direct points of contact between the Ebro passages in Silius and the Rubicon episode in Lucan, we do not get much results (or at least I could not). There seem to be no allusions to Lucan's Rubicon episode in the relevant passages of the *Punica*; we might even say that Silius, in spite of how obvious the comparison between the two river crossings would be, does his best *not* to echo his predecessor.⁴² Even Lucan himself, although he does emphasize the similarity between Caesar and Hannibal as invaders of Italy, does not include references to Hannibal's own river crossing.⁴³ The two narrators also choose very different ways of suggesting the significance of the crossing: Lucan narrates it twice, Silius omits it from the main narrative – but not without making it repeatedly the subject of character speech and visual representation.

If, however, we define intertextuality in a much broader, not specifically literary sense, and think of “crossing the Rubicon” as a cultural tradition which includes both Caesar's crossing of the real river and the modern metaphor, then Silius' treatment of the Ebro might be a more interesting comparison. There is no reason to doubt that Silius' Ebro is a real river which is crossed by Hannibal; but since the narrator hides from us when he crosses it, this river does not get a fixed location on the map of the poetic world of the *Punica* (considering that this map is drawn through the acts of narration and reading). Silius' Ebro thus seems to represent an intermediate stage in the development of the Rubicon tradition. It is still too much real to be turned into a metaphor, but at the same time it begins to lose some of its geographic reality as it is not localized precisely anymore; and this ambiguity may perhaps be seen as an early step towards the metaphorization of the Rubicon as the river marking the point of no return.

Bibliography

- Astin, A. E. 1967. “Saguntum and the Origins of the Second Punic War,” *Latomus* 26.577–596.
- Augoustakis, A. (ed.) 2010. *Brill's Companion to Silius Italicus*. Leiden—Boston.
- Bexley, E. 2014. “Lucan's Catalogues and the Landscape of War,” in Skempis—Ziogas 2014.373–403.
- Bona, I. 1998. *La visione geografica nei Punica di Silio Italico*. Genova.
- Carcopino, J. 1953. “Le traité d'Hasdrubal et la responsabilité de la deuxième guerre punique,” *REA* 55.258–293.
- Dominik, W. J. 2003. “Hannibal at the Gates: Programmatising Rome and Romanitas in Silius Italicus' *Punica* 1 and 2,” in *Flavian Rome. Culture, Image, Text*, A. J. Boyle and W. J. Dominik, edd. Leiden—Boston. 469–497.
- Eckstein, A. M. 1984. “Rome, Saguntum and the Ebro Treaty,” *Emerita* 52.51–68.
- Feeney, D. C. 1982. *A commentary on Silius Italicus Book 1*. D.Phil. Thesis Oxford.
- Gibson, B. 2010. “Silius Italicus: A Consular Historian?,” in Augoustakis 2010.47–72.
- Harrison, S. J. 2010. “Picturing the Future Again: Proleptic Ekphrasis in Silius' *Punica*,” in

42 So Küppers 1986.126 n. 481; see, however, the motif of the Ebro enclosing Spain, discussed above, as a point of contact between the poems.

43 The closest reference, perhaps, is at 3.350 where Massilia attacked by Caesar is compared to Saguntum besieged by Hannibal; and see n. X above, on the Ebro “enclosing” Spain in the *Pharsalia*.

- Augoustakis 2010.279–292.
- de Jong, I. J. F. (ed.) 2012. *Space in Ancient Greek Literature. Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative*. Leiden—Boston.
- Kissel, W. 1979. *Das Geschichtsbild des Silius Italicus*. Frankfurt a. M.
- Klotz, A. 1933. “Die Stellung des Silius Italicus unter den Quellen zur Geschichte des zweiten punischen Krieges,” *RM* 82.1–34.
- Küppers, J. 1986. *Tantarum causas irarum: Untersuchungen zur einleitenden Bücherdyade der Punica des Silius Italicus*. Berlin.
- Lovatt, H. 2013. *The Epic Gaze. Vision, Gender and Narrative in Ancient Epic*. Cambridge.
- Manolaraki, E. 2010. “Silius' Natural History: Tides in the Punica,” in Augoustakis 2010.293–321.
- Manuwald, G. 2009. “History in Pictures: Commemorative Ecphrases in Silius Italicus' Punica,” *Phoenix* 63.38–59.
- Nesselrath, H.—G. 1986. “Zu den Quellen des Silius Italicus,” *Hermes* 114.203–230.
- Nicol, J. 1936. *The Historical and Geographical Sources Used by Silius Italicus*. Oxford.
- O'Hara, J. J. 2007. *Inconsistency in Roman Epic. Studies in Catullus, Lucretius, Vergil, Ovid and Lucan. Roman Literature and Its Contexts*. Cambridge.
- Pitcher, L. V. 2012. “Appian,” in de Jong 2012.219–233.
- Pomeroy, A. 2003. “Center and Periphery in Tacitus' Histories,” *Arethusa* 36.361–374.
- Pomeroy, A. 2010. “To Silius Through Livy and his Predecessors,” in Augoustakis 2010.27–45.
- Rood, T. 2012. “Polybius,” in de Jong 2012.179–197.
- Scullard, H. H. 1989. “The Carthaginians in Spain,” in *Cambridge Ancient History Vol. 8*, A. E. Astin et al., eds. Cambridge. 17–43.
- Skempis, M. and Ziogas, I. (edd.) 2014. *Geography, Topography Landscape. Configurations of Space in Greek and Roman Epic*. Berlin.
- Šubrt, J. 1991. “The Motif of the Alps in the Work of Silius Italicus,” *Listy filologické / Folia philologica* 114.224–231.
- Thomas, R. 1982. *Lands and Peoples in Roman Poetry. The Ethnographical Tradition*. Cambridge.
- Venini, P. 1991. “Lo scudo di Annibale in Silio Italico (Pun. 2, 406–52),” in *Studi di Filologia Classica in onore di G. Monaco*. Vol. 3. Palermo. 1191–1200.
- Vessey, D. 1975. “Silius Italicus: The Shield of Hannibal,” *AJP* 96.391–405.
- von Albrecht, M. 1964. *Silius Italicus. Freiheit und Gebundenheit römischer Epik*. Amsterdam.
- Walbank, F. W. 1957. *A Historical Commentary on Polybius Vol. 1*. Oxford.
- Wallace, M. T. V. 1968. “Some Aspects of Time in the Punica of Silius Italicus,” *CW* 62.83–93.
- Wilson, M. 1993. “Flavian Variant: History. Silius' Punica,” in *Roman Epic*, A. J. Boyle, ed. London. 218–236.
- Zissos, A. 1999. “Allusion and Narrative Possibility in the Argonautica of Valerius Flaccus,” *CP* 94.289–301.