

ANTONY AUGOUSTAKIS, R. JOY LITTLEWOOD, *Silius Italicus: Punica, Book 3. Edited with an Introduction, Translation, and Commentary*, Oxford Commentaries on Flavian Poetry, Oxford-New York: Oxford University Press, 2022, xvi+394 pp., £157.50, ISBN 978-0-19-882128-1.

After the publication of P.J. Davies' commentary on V.Fl. 7 (Oxford 2020), this book is a very welcome new volume in the series Oxford Commentaries on Flavian Poetry.¹ Antony Augoustakis and R. Joy Littlewood are noted and prolific scholars of Flavian Poetry. As to commentaries, the former has published a commentary on Stat. *Theb.* 8 (Oxford 2016); the latter, a commentary on Sil. 7 (Oxford/New York 2011) and another on Sil. 10 (Oxford/New York 2017). Furthermore, Augoustakis, with Neil W. Bernstein, has recently produced a splendid translation of the *Punica* (London/New York 2021).

The book is divided into General Introduction (pp. 1-62), Sigla, Text, Translation and Apparatus Criticus (pp. 63-145), Commentary (pp. 147-329), Bibliography (pp. 331-57) and Indexes (pp. 359-94). The introduction deals with all necessary topics to fully understand the text. Section 1 ("The Political Life and Literary Formation of Silius Italicus") narrates the events Silius experienced during his life, lists the various political offices he held, and describes the circumstances under which he composed his epic, how it was received in his own times, and its position regarding Neronian and Flavian poetry. Section 2 ("Hannibal's Enterprise") investigates the motivations both of Hannibal in invading Italy and attacking Rome, and of Silius in creating the character. Section 3 ("Hannibal and Imilce") analyses the figure of Imilce, Hannibal's wife, and "Silius' own creation," and the episode in which she and her husband are the main actors. Section 4 ("Hannibal's Army") considers the historiographical foundations and poetic elements of the catalogue of Hannibal's troops, and its political and cultural overtones. Section 5 ("Hannibal's Alpine Crossing") examines Hannibal's Alpine crossing from a historical, literary, and philosophical point of view. Section 6 ("Divine Prophecy") is devoted to the role of the divine prophecy in Book 3, the dialogue between Jupiter and Venus, and Hammon's oracle. Section 7 ("Language and Style") deals with some points of Silius' language and style, diction and figures of speech, epic similes, and metre and prosody. Section 8 ("Text and Transmission") provides a brief and incisive overview of the text and transmission of the poem. It is welcome that the introduction is extensively illustrated with four maps and three reproductions of the iconographic sources (there are also several further images illustrating the commentary).

¹ As I was writing this review, the commentaries by N. W. Bernstein on Sil. 9 (Oxford 2022), by C. Castelletti (posthumously edited by A. Augoustakis, M. Fucecchi, and G. Manuwald) on V.Fl. 8 (Oxford 2022), by C. McNelis on *Achilleid* (Oxford 2024), and by C. M. van der Keur on Sil. 13 (Oxford 2024) were published in this series. I wish to thank Sergio Casali, Stephen Harrison, and Luis Rivero García for reading this review and giving me valuable advice.

The translation is accessible, even for those who, like me, are not native English speakers. The commentary is very rich on inter- and intratextual, historical, linguistic, literary, metrical, and mythological subjects, and some textual issues are discussed sensibly and concisely. I will present some instances.

The note on 69-72, *spes o Carthaginis altae, | nate, nec Aeneadum leuior metus, amplior, oro, | sis patrio decore et factis tibi nomina condas, | quis superes bellator auum*, identifies the principal intertexts and clarifies their complex relations. Hannibal's words first evoke Lucan, then Hector's farewell to Andromache in *Iliad* 6.467-81 and Virgil's Aeneas to his son in *A.* 12.435-40. Furthermore, the apostrophe echoes and reverses Virg. *A.* 2.281 *spes o fidissima Teucrum*. The second Virgilian intertext "becomes very important for Silius here as he is looking at Homer through Virgil, since Aeneas is addressing Hector at *A.* 2.281 and Silius' Hannibal assumes a Hectoresque stance in *Punica* 3."

At 122-4 *tibi gloria soli | fine caret, credisque uiris ignobile letum | belligeris in pace mori. tremor implicat artus*, A. and L. identify the intratext of Imilce's words at 10.573 *tibi gloria leto*, where Hannibal praises dead Paulus on his pyre, with the punctual observation "in the same *sedes*."

I agree with the view of the authors who, at 200-2 *ardua quae sit, | scitatur, pestis terrasque urgentia membra | quo ferat et quosnam populos depascit hiatus*, in place of the transmitted *depascit*, accept Heinsius' conjecture *depascat*, which here has "connotations of feral consumption," comparing Verg. *A.* 2.215 *morsu depascitur artus* (the snake and Laocoon). The translation is admirably precise and clear: "Hannibal sought to know what this monster was and in what direction the snake would heave its limbs that were crushing the lands and which people it would swallow in its gaping jaws."

The note on 354-6, *hos Viriatus agit Lusitanumque remotis | extractum lustris, primo Viriatus in aevo, | nomen Romanis factum mox nobile damnis*, is illustrated with the Figure 4, a granite statue of Lusitanian warrior, first century AD, from Museu Nacional de Arqueologia. The production of these sculptural materials could demonstrate the prominence of the historical Lusitanian Viriatus (born c.190 AD) in resistance to Rome's effort to conquer the northern Spanish peoples in the first half of the second century AD.

At 458, *fluminea sonipes religatus ducitur alno*, A. and L. rightly observe: "[t]he heavily dactylic rhythm (DDDS) appears to simulate the sound of horses' hooves." I can add that the lexical choice of *sonipes* by Silius is very fitting here: *inde et sonipes, quod pedibus sonat* (Isid. *Etym.* 12.1.43); cf. also *EV* s.v. *sonipes*.

Jupiter's prophesy is clearly and effectively summarized in the brief introductory note on 557-629. The speech—echoing of the first Book 1 of Virgil's *Aeneid* (223-96)—is divided in two parts: in the first (571-93), Jupiter deals with Venus' worries about the future of the roman people in view of the Carthaginian threat and explains the Second Punic War "as a lesson that the Romans need to learn after centuries of sloth and inactivity"; in the second (594-29), he prophecies

the coming of a new era under Flavians, enumerating their future *res gestae*. In sum, the note prepares the reader well for an easy and fluid reading of the passage.

The poetic commonplace of the palm-trees of Palestine and Judaea at 600, *palmiferamque senex bello domitabit Idumen*, corresponds to an iconic image from contemporary coinage. The authors fairly illustrate the adjective *palmiferamque* with a bronze sestertius (Fig. 5), 71 AD, from Rome, which shows on reverse the emperor Vespasian holding spear and parazonium, and with foot on helmet at right, and the personified Judaea seated under palm-tree at left.

In the note on the final lines of the Book, 713-14, *talia portabat laetis oracula Bostar | impleratque uiros pugnae propioris amore*, A. and L. stress a notable characteristic of Silius' epic style: "[a] striking characteristic of Silius' epic style is his careful and often heavily intertextual choice of words in the final two lines of a book", referring to 10.657-8 *haec tum Roma fuit. post te cui uertere mores | si stabat fatis, potius, Carthago, maneres*, where, e.g., many Propertian and Virgilian intertext are present. Here, we have an intratext (9.36-7 *turbidus aegra | pestifero pugnae castra incendebat amore*) and a Virgilian intertext (*A.* 6.314 *ripae ulterioris amore*).

The bibliography is exhaustive. It is noteworthy that in the first part of every section there is a list containing the general bibliography that can guide the reader on the topic (differently from some other volumes in this series). The four indexes (Latin words and phrases, Greek words and phrases, *index locorum*, and general index) are helpful and make the volume usable.

However, as for the text and apparatus, some issues merit discussion.

A. and L. follow Delz's 1987 Teubner edition. They declare (p. 62) that they differ from Delz at nine points: 229 *ruptis* Delz/*raptis* A. and L.; 328 *prima/pigra*; *saxo/taxo*; 329 *saxo/taxo*; 356 †*pactum*†/†*factum*; 395 †*ortano*†/†*ornatu*; 532 *prona/plana*; 597 *denabit/durabit*; 678 *Thebes/Hebes*; 682 †*niueis*† ... *alis/nigris Afris*. I can add: 73 *numeret/numerat* (see below); 235 *ac/at*; 320 *huic/huc* (see below); 322 *huic/huc* (see below); 659 *aut/et*.²

A. and L. claim in the Sigla (p. 64): "The following sigla have been adopted from the preface in Delz (1987) as they pertain to the apparatus criticus of this edition of *Punica* 3." But this adoption – or rather adaptation – is not always so clear.

The siglum C "codex deperditus Coloniensis, Stamp. Ross. 1446" (p. 64) seems a mixture between the "codex deperditus Coloniensis" (for which see Delz LIV-LXIV), that has no siglum in Delz, and an exemplar of the second Roman printed edition, i.e. Città del Vaticano, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Stamp. Ross. 1446 (for which see ISTC No. is00504000, consulted on 08/29/2024). This enigmatic siglum is used only once by A. and L. in their apparatus, and this gives rise to the following note, clearly incorrect:

² In all these places, A. and L. agree with Duff's 1927-34 Loeb edition.

14 clauigeri Δ^2 bl et marg. exemplarium r2 C v1 Vat. Inc. II 427, fort. emendatio Calderini: corni- ω Cm Ep. 34, sed de testimonio licet dubitare ('plane legendum reponendumque uideri').

Delz's apparatus reads:

14 clauigeri Δ^2 bl et marg. exemplarium r2 Stamp. Ross. 1446 v1 Vat. Inc. II 427, emendatio ut puto Calderini: corni- ω Cm Ep. 34, sed de testimonio licet dubitare ('plane legendum reponendumque uideri').

Delz says that *clauigeri* is also in the margin of certain copies of r2 (= second Roman edition) and v1 (= first Venetian edition), namely in the margin of Stamp. Ross. 1446 and of Vat. Inc. II 427 (both from Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana) respectively. A. and L. have at their disposal the note of the commentary to clarify the situation, and possibly justify their unexpected replacement of "Stamp. Ross. 1446" with C (= "codex deperditus Coloniensis, Stamp. Ross. 1446"); but in their note ad loc. this is all they say about the textual problem in question: "Delz considers *clauiger* an emendation by Calderini, but see Muecke and Dunston (2011) 198, who do not think the authorship of the correction is certain" – which, by the way, is not much different from what Delz claims ("ut puto").

Even from this example alone, it is clear that not only the sigla but also the apparatus itself is an adaptation of Delz's. There are many cases in which the apparatus inherited from Delz registers variants and/or conjectures that are not discussed at all in the commentary (e.g. at 104 van Veen's conjecture *regnabat* instead of the transmitted *regnarat*; at 530 Summer's conjecture *quocumque* in place of the transmitted *quacumque*; see below).

For Venetian editions (p. 65), A. and L. offer two sigla, v1 ("editio Veneta cum commentariis Petri Marsi (a. 1483)") and v2 ("editio Veneta cum commentariis Petri Marsi (a. 1492)"), but v3 ("editio Veneta cum commentariis Petri Marsi (a. 1493)") and v ("editiones Venetae cum commentariis Petri Marsi [i.e. the consensus of v1, v2 and v3, of course]," Delz p. LXX) are missing, notwithstanding the fact that the second is quoted 25 times in the apparatus.

These are some of my observations on the text:

73: A. and L. print *numerat*, but the apparatus reproduces that of Delz, who prints *numeret*. Nothing is said in the commentary on the issue.

181: both Delz and A. and L. print *ille*. A. and L.'s apparatus reads:

ille Delz coll. Coripp. Ioh. 1.451-4: sic Iuppiter ille, | ut ueteres aiunt gentili carmine uates | ... | ... monebat: ipse Livineius, cf. Virg. A. 7.110.

From the apparatus of A. and L. it follows that *ille* is a conjecture of Delz, advanced by him on the basis of a comparison with Corippus; *ipse* would be Livineius' conjecture, advanced on the basis of a comparison with *Aen.* 7.110. What the reading of the manuscripts is remains obscure. The situation is quite different, as can be seen from Delz's apparatus:

ipse Livineius, cf. Verg. Aen. 7, 110, ubi v.l. ille praetulerim coll. Coripp. Joh. 1, 451 sq. sic Iuppiter ille, / ut ueteres aiunt gentili carmine uates / ... monebat.

ille is the reading of the mss.; Livineius conjectured *ipse* on the basis of *Aen.* 7.110, but – according to Delz – even in *Aen.* 7.110 the variant *ille* is to be preferred, as the comparison with Corippus would demonstrate. The mistake persists in A. and L.’s note ad loc.: “The deictic *ille* seals Mercury’s message; this is Delz’s correction of *ipse*, according to Coripp. *Ioh.* 1.451-3 etc.”

229: A. and L. print *raptis*. This is their apparatus:

raptis r1 v: ruptis ω Ch: iunctis Delz [sic].

Combined with the information at p. 62, according to which Delz prints *ruptis*, this would seem to indicate that Delz prints *ruptis*, but also advances *iunctis* as a conjecture of his own. In their note ad loc. A. and L. say: “Delz (1987) adopts the more difficult reading (ω) *ruptis* [...] But he later (1997) 165-6 changes it to *iunctis*.” In fact, in his article “Nachlese zu Silius Italicus,” *MH* 54 (1997), 163-74, Delz does express his preference for *iunctis*, but he correctly attributes it to G. Thilo.

320: A. and L. print and lemmatize *huc coit aequoreus Nasamon*. Their apparatus reads:

huic F G Ch: hinc L γ: huc *Heinsius*, *edd. recc.*

That is, they reproduce the apparatus of Delz, who, however, prints *huic*. The problem is not discussed in the commentary. The same happens at 322.

395: A. and L.’s apparatus reads:

ornatu *Delz*, *sed posuit signum corruptelae*: hortano V² P *edd. a* v: hortando δ ζ: arcano G² E J M K² R² U² Ch (? ‘*ita certe Coloniensis codex cum allis [sic] quibusdam*’) *edd. recc.*

From A. and L.’s apparatus one cannot understand which is the situation in Delz’s edition. The note ad loc. is clearer: “Delz obelizes the transmitted *ortano* [...] suggesting *ornatu* in his apparatus, which we follow here.” A. and L. should have said that the references to Dict. 3.2 and *Aen.* 1.686, which they quote in their note, were already present in Delz’s apparatus.

479-81: *cuncta gelu canaque aeternum grandine tecta | atque aeui glaciem cohibent; riget ardua montis | aetherii facies*. In his apparatus Delz observes: “locus varie temptatus mihi sanus esse videtur: *cuncta ... tecta* sc. sunt (de ellipsi cf. 1, 366 sq.; 3, 503 sqq.; 6, 74 sq.) *atque aeui glaciem* i. aeternam glaciem *cohibent* i. solvi non sinunt, cf. 14, 66 sqq.” In A. and L.’s commentary, one would expect some discussion of the various conjectures to which Delz alludes in his note; instead, they only say: “In his apparatus, Delz correctly defends and glosses the elliptical *atque aeui glaciem* as *aeternam glaciem* and *cohibent* as *solui non sinunt*.” One could have mentioned, for example, the proposal by J.S. van Veen (“Notulae criticae ad Silium Italicum,” *Mnemosyne* 17 (1889), 368-77, at 371): *atque aeui glacie cohibens riget ardua montis | aetherei facies* (van Veen’s article is mentioned in A. and L.’s bibliography).

599: this is A. and L.’s apparatus:

ripis susp. [= “suspexit,” according to Abbreviations and notes, p. 65] *Delz: uiridis fort. Delz coll. Sen. Con. 4 praef. 3: remis Schrader secundum Haupt (1870) 345, cf. Luc. 1.370.*

Delz’s apparatus reads:

ripis suspectum: remis Schrader; cf. Luc. 1.370: an uiridis? cf. Sen. Con. 4 praef. 3 audiui ... illum et uiridem et postea iam senem.

Delz’s doubts about *ripis* should not have been mentioned in the apparatus, but only discussed in the commentary. Moreover, the use of “susp.” (= “suspexit”), and that of “fort.” in this way to indicate his conjecture instead of the mere mention of it followed by his last name are strange.

682: A. and L. print *nigris ... Afris*; their apparatus reads:

nigris ... Afris fort. Delz, nam et alis suspectum propter ales: nigris Beger, u. Drakenborch: furuis Heinsius.

Delz prints *†niueis† ... alis*, and his apparatus reads:

nigris Beger, v. Drakenborch: furuis Heinsius: an nigris ... Afris? nam et alis suspectum propter ales.

Apart from the fact that instead of “*nigris ... Afris fort. Delz*” one should have said “*nigris ... Afris dub. Delz*,” A. and L.’s annotation does not make much sense, because they forget to mention the reading of the mss., that is *niueis ... alis*.

All in all, this is a very good commentary, and it will be undoubtedly useful to both students and specialists, but it could have been even better if the authors had paid more attention to its more strictly philological aspects.³

BARUCH MARTÍNEZ ZEPEDA
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México
baruch.martinez@hotmail.com

FRANCES B. TITCHENER, ALEXEI V. ZADOROJNYI, eds., *The Cambridge Companion to Plutarch*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2023, x+502 pp., ISBN 978-0-521-76622-7 [Hardback]; 978-0-521-17656-9 [Paperback].

Plutarchan scholars have at their disposal a new Companion to explore the vast and rich literary production of our beloved Plutarch. The book contains a list of Figures (p. vii), a list of Contributors (pp. viii-ix), the Acknowledgments (p. x), the Introduction (pp. 1-10), nineteen contributions (pp. 11-402), the Bibliography (pp. 403-69), an Appendix with Plutarch’s *Moralia* (pp. 470-3), and two Indexes (pp. 474-502).

³ There are several typos (e.g. p. 5 n. 32 “Fuccechi”; p. 343: “Nachless”), especially in the apparatus.