

# **Hannibal: Imag(in)ing the Enemy in the Roman Republic**

**Joel A. L. Evans**

Bachelor of Arts – Media, Macquarie University

Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Masters of Research

Department of Ancient History, Faculty of Arts

Macquarie University, Sydney

October 2016

## **DECLARATION**

I, Joel A. L. Evans, certify that this thesis has not been submitted for a higher degree to any other university or institution.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Joel Evans". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, stylized 'J' and 'E'.

Date: 10/10/2016

## ABSTRACT

What we understand as 'gender' and 'sexuality' were interrelated concepts, nested within the patchwork of moral and immoral behaviours defined within the value system of the Roman elite. Roman authors perpetuated this discourse in a moralising fashion, using illustrious and notorious Romans as behavioural exemplars; but what of foreign enemies? How did Roman 'gender' values affect their representation by Latin writers such as Cicero and Livy? Hannibal is known to us predominantly through reports of his clashes with Rome. This thesis examines the representations of Hannibal by Cicero, Livy, and some of their sources, arguing for, *inter alia*, a 'gendered' representation.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Declaration .....	ii
Abstract .....	iii
List of Abbreviations .....	v
Acknowledgments .....	viii
Introduction .....	1
Chapter One: On ‘Gender’ .....	4
Chapter Two: Roman ‘Gender’ .....	11
Chapter Three: Republican Hannibals .....	24
Chapter Four: Livy’s Hannibal .....	47
Conclusion .....	75
Bibliography .....	77

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

App. <i>Hann.</i>	Appian, <i>Hannibalic War</i>
App. <i>Syr.</i>	Appian, <i>Syrian Wars</i>
Cic. <i>Agr.</i>	Cicero, <i>De Lege Agraria</i>
Cic. <i>Amic.</i>	Cicero, <i>De Amicitia</i>
Cic. <i>Att.</i>	Cicero, <i>Letters to Atticus</i>
Cic. <i>Balb.</i>	Cicero, <i>Pro Balbo</i>
Cic. <i>Brut.</i>	Cicero, <i>Brutus</i>
Cic. <i>Cat.</i>	Cicero, <i>In Catilinam</i>
Cic. <i>Clod. et Cur.</i>	Cicero, <i>Clodius and Curio</i>
Cic. <i>De Or.</i>	Cicero, <i>De Oratore</i>
Cic. <i>Div.</i>	Cicero, <i>De Divinatione</i>
Cic. <i>Fin.</i>	Cicero, <i>De Finibus</i>
Cic. <i>Har. Resp.</i>	Cicero, <i>De Harsupicium Responsis</i>
Cic. <i>Inv.</i>	Cicero, <i>De Inventione</i>
Cic. <i>Leg.</i>	Cicero, <i>De Legibus</i>
Cic. <i>Mur.</i>	Cicero, <i>Pro Murena</i>
Cic. <i>N.D.</i>	Cicero, <i>De Natura Deorum</i>
Cic. <i>Off.</i>	Cicero, <i>De Officiis</i>
Cic. <i>Phil.</i>	Cicero, <i>Philippics</i>

Cic. <i>Prov.</i>	Cicero, <i>De Provinciis Consularibus</i>
Cic. <i>Rab. Perd.</i>	Cicero, <i>Pro Rabirius Perduellionis Reo</i>
Cic. <i>Rep.</i>	Cicero, <i>De Re Publica</i>
Cic. <i>Sen.</i>	Cicero, <i>De Senectute</i>
Cic. <i>Sest.</i>	Cicero, <i>Pro Publius Sestius</i>
Cic. <i>Sex. Rosc.</i>	Cicero, <i>Pro Sextus Roscio</i>
Cic. <i>Verr.</i>	Cicero, <i>In Verrem</i>
Diod. Sic.	Diodorus Siculus, <i>Library of History</i>
Dion. Hal.	Dionysius of Halicarnassus, <i>Roman Antiquities</i>
Eutrop.	Eutropius, <i>Brevarium</i>
Flor.	Florus, <i>Epitome of Roman History</i>
Frontinus	Frontinus, <i>Stratagems</i>
Fronto	Fronto, <i>Correspondence</i>
Gaius. <i>Inst.</i>	Gaius, <i>Institutes</i>
Gell.	Aulus Gellius, <i>Attic Nights</i>
Juv.	Juvenal, <i>Satires</i>
Liv.	Livy, <i>Ab Urbe Condita</i>
Liv. <i>Per.</i>	Livy, <i>Periochae</i>
Luc.	Lucan, <i>Pharsalia</i>
Mart.	Martial, <i>Epigrams</i>
Nep. <i>Hann.</i>	Cornelius Nepos, <i>Hannibal</i>

Oros.	Orosius, <i>Seven Books of History Against the Pagans</i>
Plin. <i>NH</i> .	Pliny the Elder, <i>Natural History</i>
Plut. <i>Caes</i> .	Plutarch, <i>Caesar</i>
Plut. <i>Fab</i> .	Plutarch, <i>Fabius Maximus</i>
Plut. <i>Flamin</i> .	Plutarch, <i>Flaminius</i>
Plut. <i>Marc</i> .	Plutarch, <i>Marcellus</i>
Plut. <i>Pyrrh</i> .	Plutarch, <i>Pyrrhus</i>
Plut. <i>TG</i> .	Plutarch, <i>Tiberius Gracchus</i>
Polyb.	Polybius, <i>Histories</i>
Quint. <i>Inst</i> .	Quintilian, <i>Institutio Oratoria</i>
Sall. <i>BC</i> .	Sallust, <i>The Catiline Conspiracy</i>
Sall. <i>BJ</i> .	Sallust, <i>The Jugurthine War</i>
Sen. <i>Controv</i> .	Seneca the Elder, <i>Controversiae</i>
Sen. <i>Ep</i> .	Seneca the Younger, <i>Epistles</i>
Tac. <i>Ann</i>	Tacitus, <i>Annals</i>
Val. Max.	Valerius Maximus, <i>Memorable Doings and Sayings</i>
Vell. Pat.	Velleius Paterculus, <i>Compendium of Roman History</i>

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My grandfather arrived at school one morning and was told he was too old to return. Keith was only thirteen, but being of a farming family, they just assumed he would be a farmer too. Throughout his life he would read anything he could get his hands on to further educate himself. History was of those topics, although I never got many chances to speak with him about it. That's one thing I regret about his passing last month. On his dressing table he had three photographs of his grandchildren, and they were distributed to us recently. Now that photograph sits on mine, and I think to myself that to lose that much knowledge, and so much love, is utterly tragic. This thesis is dedicated to Keith Evans (1930-2016).

I would like to acknowledge the continued support of my supervisor Dr. Lea Beness, of Macquarie University. Without her the completion of this project would have been impossible. As a scholar, a mentor, and a friend, she is an inspiration to all of us in the department.

I would also like to offer thanks to Dr. Tom Hillard, Dr. Rachel Yuen-Collingridge and fellow thesis survivor Sara Turner for their support. Throughout 2016 I was offered continual encouragement and advice from my best friend, Melissa Bahrum, whose friendship I will forever treasure. My mother, Grace Evans, with the eloquence and force of Cornelia Africana herself, has continually pushed me to reach my goals, for which I am forever grateful.

I also must thank my employers, John and Stephanie, who were always flexible with my uni commitments. It is not often that you find that much understanding in a work place. To all the customers at work who followed my journey, you are superstars. Every smile, question, laugh, and chat has been invaluable. I thank in particular the staff at Catholic Healthcare for all of their kindness. You make work a great place to be.



## INTRODUCTION

This thesis was initially to treat both Hannibal and Cleopatra. Additionally, all Roman historians writing in Latin were to be consulted for images of Rome's infamous Republican enemies. Due to the restrictions of space and time, the scope of the thesis was reduced to cover Hannibal exclusively. It was then later realised that every Roman author and genre which images Hannibal cannot be treated in a project of this size, and as a result two were selected as case studies. Cicero was chosen as a representative author of Republican sentiments, and for the variety of images contained in his philosophical works and speeches. Similarly, Livy was chosen for the variation in images, but also for the evolution of Hannibal as a character across his ten book narrative of the Second Punic War. The core issue that the thesis seeks to explore, however, remains, which is the 'gendered' representation of Rome's enemies.

An 'enemy' is an adversarial entity whose interests compete with those of the subject. The 'subject' is any party who represents or speaks about a foe, from the perspective of a 'victim'.<sup>1</sup> An 'enemy' of Rome was an individual or group who militarily or politically opposed the interests of the Roman state, and its governing elite. This aristocracy staffed the magistracies, notably the consulship, and governed in consultation with the Roman people through the procedures of the Senate.<sup>2</sup> A plethora of leaders and groups, both civil and foreign, could easily fall under the label of 'enemy' to a Roman 'victor' who controlled the subsequent literary traditions. One in particular captured the Roman imagination, transformed into legend anew as each generation built upon Greco-Roman constructions of his identity. His name was Hannibal, the bogeyman of the Latin proverb *Hannibal ad portas*.<sup>3</sup>

Immortalised by his defeat at Roman hands, Hannibal is often grossly misunderstood. We cannot glean the 'real' Hannibal from the evidence left to us. It is an unfortunate truism that his reality is inaccessible through the nationalistic polemic and propaganda, which assumes hostility on the part of a Roman audience.<sup>4</sup> The accounts that chronicle their careers present us not with people, but shadows. Yet these reflections are deliberate constructions, crafted by a society which

---

<sup>1</sup> Baumeister, 1999: 1

<sup>2</sup> Crawford, 1992: 23; McDonnell (2006: 197); Polyb. 6.18; Cic. *Rep.* 1.68-69

<sup>3</sup> Cic. *Phil.* 1.5.11

<sup>4</sup> Hoyos (2008: 3) and (2003: 212); Lazenby (1978: 258)

celebrated the defeats of Hannibal and Cleopatra as monuments to Roman power. Images of Hannibal were moulded into Roman social, cultural and historical memory by Rome's aristocratic authors. Two of them will be examined for this thesis, as will some of their sources. Herein, the representations of Hannibal in the works of Marcus Tullius Cicero and Titus Livius have been examined from a 'gendered' perspective. It will be determined if in fact Hannibal is imaged on 'gendered' lines. It has been acknowledged and is unanimously accepted that Cleopatra, as a female and enemy of Rome, suffers the filtration through a gendered lens by male writers.<sup>5</sup> Hannibal has not been treated in this manner in the English language.<sup>6</sup>

It is time to bring 'gender' into view, in order to determine if Roman 'gender' norms and values coloured the portrayal of Hannibal. Roman norms and values are those that were idealised by the males of the aristocratic elite, and their associates. They do not necessarily reflect the practices or values of *all* Romans, only aristocratic Roman men. To reconstruct Roman 'gender', a two tiered approach has been adopted; role and practice. The roles and qualities that were appreciated or deplored in Roman men, when combined with sexual practices, will form an image of Roman 'gender' norms in the aristocracy.<sup>7</sup> The representations of Hannibal will be compared with the character traits, leadership styles and behaviours deemed appropriate or inappropriate for Roman men. As Langlands studiously noted the Latin sources rarely overtly explore 'gender' values as a whole, but apply "instances" of 'gender' to specific contexts.<sup>8</sup> Out of methodological necessity, the Greek sources have been for the most part excluded from the analysis. They will only be included where a comparison can be made with a Latin work, as for instance between the Hannibal in Polybius and Livy.

A thematic structure has been adopted in order to provide coherence and clarity. The first chapter will weave a working definition of 'sex' and 'gender' from 'Gender Studies' scholarship, while the second establishes the spectrum of Roman 'gender' values from the surviving Latin sources. Two chapters will follow. The third chapter will treat the Roman historians who were Cicero's and Livy's key sources. Cicero is also treated in chapter three. Chapter four treats the Livian

---

<sup>5</sup> Pomeroy (1975: XII), Cantarella (1987: 5), Culham (1985: 19)

<sup>6</sup> I am only proficient in the English language with intermediate competence in Latin.

<sup>7</sup> Skinner (2005: 19)

<sup>8</sup> Langlands (2006: 4)

narrative and examines Hannibal's portrayal between books XXI and XXX of Livy's *Ab Urbe Condita*. The imaging of the enemy's 'gender' as a counterpoint to Roman 'gender' roles will thus be tested.

## CHAPTER 1: ON 'GENDER'

### *'Sex' and 'Gender'*

From the moment of our birth, human existence is significantly defined by perceived appropriate behaviours pertaining to our 'gender'. 'Gender' is a contentious term and defining it is problematic. With varying ideological and political content informing definitions of 'gender', and associated concepts of 'sex' and 'identity', a consensus will probably never be reached. Yet define it we must. A definition provides a frame of reference within which 'gender' can be spoken about, for to engage in a discussion of 'gender', an author must be certain of what they imply by using the term. Theoretically this paper dives into even murkier waters by critically considering the gendered 'enemy' in the Roman Republic. It is a truism that definitions are vital for such a consideration, and these will be provided here, at the onset of the paper. Every effort has been made to ensure that the topic is treated with sensitivity, so that while some may not agree with the hypothesis proposed herein, at the very least no one shall be offended.

Now to enter the snake pit, what do we mean by 'gender'? Quotidian in use, 'gender' is a term often taken for granted, typically as analogous to 'sex'.<sup>9</sup> Aligning with the constructivist school of thought, this thesis argues for 'gender' and 'sex' as distinct states of being, the former socially constructed, the latter biologically determined. Simone de Beauvoir initiated the constructivist approach in 1949 when she published her monograph *The Second Sex*. It aptly examined the historic role of 'woman' as other, namely the imperfect male. Beauvoir asserted that a human is not "born" as a 'man' or a 'woman'.<sup>10</sup> On the contrary, they "become" one.<sup>11</sup> The female sex is routinely represented on male terms, relative to men's interests and insecurities.<sup>12</sup> Woman is the "[o]ther at the heart of a whole whose two components are necessary to each other."<sup>13</sup> The 'women' we see in the historical record are the 'women' men want them to be: exemplars of moral and immoral behaviour. The proposition that one becomes, as opposed to simply being

---

<sup>9</sup> Duerst-Lahti and Kelly (1995: 1)

<sup>10</sup> de Beauvoir (2011: 293)

<sup>11</sup> de Beauvoir (2011: 293)

<sup>12</sup> de Beauvoir (2011: 9)

<sup>13</sup> de Beauvoir (2011: 9)

their 'gender', transformed what had previously been assumed as fixed into an examinable state of existence. 'Gender' moved from biological determinism, to social doctrine.

Relative to context, 'gender' is a socially and culturally compelled experience. According to the philosopher Michel Foucault, 'gender' as an experience "conjoins a field of knowledge, a collection of rules, and a mode of relation between the individual and himself [sic]."<sup>14</sup> Knowledge refers to concepts and theories, which inform what it means to experience life as a 'gender', the ways in which humans understand that mode of existence.<sup>15</sup> This knowledge is mediated by strict rules, requiring "the individual conform to a certain art of living which defines the aesthetic and ethical criteria of existence."<sup>16</sup> Rules are relative to the society and culture imposing them, enforced through social, cultural and political institutions.<sup>17</sup> The knowledge and experience of 'gender' are thus divided into appropriate and inappropriate behaviours, which through the mediation of discourse, become a normative binary by which the individual relates with their self-image. In his *History of Sexuality*, Foucault sought to investigate the ways in which sexual behaviours become normative in different societies. Homosexuality for instance, was not a recognised vice until the term was coined by Westphal, and a discourse created to define associated patterns of behaviour as 'homoeerotic'.<sup>18</sup> The Victorians construed everything about homosexuality as inferior to the hegemonic 'masculinity' valued by their social and cultural context.<sup>19</sup> We are indoctrinated into our relative frame of reference, taught to fear sanction, and aspire to approval.<sup>20</sup> In the work of Foucault, we can observe the phenomena which compel a human to 'become' their gender.

Thus far we have observed that 'gender' is a socially and culturally compelled experience. Compulsion is achieved via discourse, which establishes normative patterns of behaviour via a network of institutions which sanction or reward particular acts. Beauvoir and Foucault inform us how 'gender' is formed and maintained, but their theories do not detail the nature of the

---

<sup>14</sup> Foucault (1997: 200)

<sup>15</sup> Foucault (1997: 200)

<sup>16</sup> Foucault (1986: 67)

<sup>17</sup> Foucault (1972: 227)

<sup>18</sup> Foucault (1978: 43-44)

<sup>19</sup> Burn (1996: 26)

<sup>20</sup> Foucault (1997: 203)

‘gendered’ experience. Judith Butler’s *Gender Trouble* is firmly grounded in Beauvoirian and Foucauldian theory, and advances the conversation about ‘gender’ to create a space where the nature of its experience can be discussed. Butler postulates ‘gender’ as performance, an amalgamation of perceived appropriate behaviours pertaining to our ‘sex’.<sup>21</sup> As performance ‘gender’ is “neither the causal result of sex nor seemingly fixed as sex.”<sup>22</sup> ‘Gender’ is rather the “cultural meanings that the sexed body assumes.”<sup>23</sup> Clothing, gestures, manners, hobbies, careers, and many other facets of existence are features of ‘gendered’ performance. We adopt them to demonstrate our conformance or non-conformance to the hegemonic ‘gender’ of our context. For as performance, ‘gender’ becomes a spectrum, whereby a ‘male’ could quite as easily manifest a ‘feminine’ ‘gender’ as he could a ‘masculine’ one. Likewise a ‘woman’ might exhibit a ‘masculine’ ‘gender’. Thus ‘gender’ is the outfitting of ‘sex’, an exterior expression of a perceived interior reality.

If ‘gender’ is a performance of behaviours, the appropriateness of which is tied to the sexes and their associated meanings, then what is ‘sex’? ‘Sex’ is the observable biological differences between ‘males’ and ‘females’. One is not born a ‘man’ or a ‘woman’, but one *is* born ‘male’ or ‘female’. A child’s ‘sex’ is determined at birth by parents and doctors based on observable genitals.<sup>24</sup> From that moment, ‘gender’ is applied to ‘sex’, and the child’s parents can envisage their son or daughter’s life based on the hegemonic ‘gender’ values of their society and culture. In a gross contradiction to her hypothesis in *Gender Trouble*, Butler advocates ‘sex’ as a construction in *Bodies that Matter*.<sup>25</sup> She posits that the “social construction of the natural, presupposes the cancellation of the natural by the social.”<sup>26</sup> If considered prior to construction, ‘sex’ will itself be a construction of that consideration. According to Butler, Feminist theory and practice is not hinged to a material definition of ‘sex’, as materiality can degrade and limit the ‘feminine’.<sup>27</sup> Butler’s ‘sex’ as a construction of ‘gender’ as a manifestation of ‘sex’ argument is a

---

<sup>21</sup> Butler (1990: 6)

<sup>22</sup> Butler (1990: 6)

<sup>23</sup> Butler (1990: 6)

<sup>24</sup> Detel (1998: 244-49)

<sup>25</sup> Butler (1993: 5)

<sup>26</sup> Butler (1993: 5)

<sup>27</sup> Butler (1993: 30)

theoretical dilemma posing complications for her thesis in *Gender Trouble*. Her theory of ‘gender’ as performance hinges upon the projection of normative social and cultural content onto ‘sex’. This projection does not necessarily constitute a supreme cancellation of the natural by the social, but rather shrouding it in a veil. Perhaps veiling is the right way to express this application of the social to the human body. ‘Sex’ is biological. It is a constant state of the human body. The meaning of that state however is what is determined by the application of ‘gender’ to ‘sex’.

This definition of ‘sex’ has been justified by Detel, who developed the interpretive framework of “thin sex differences”.<sup>28</sup> Detel was unsatisfied with constructivist theories of the like advocated by Butler in *Bodies that Matter*, arguing that such contradictions make reference to the categories of ‘men’ and ‘women’ impossible.<sup>29</sup> The resulting ambiguity of reference hinders any possibility of furthering the conversation about ‘sex’ and ‘gender’ roles in any context. The language with which societies refer to ‘men’ and ‘women’ is based upon material vocabulary, or references to physicality.<sup>30</sup> The implication is that ‘sex’ can be a point of reference for the biological distinctions between the sexes, prior to the application of social content. “Thin sex differences” asserts that biologically males and females possess distinct genitalia, reproductive abilities and adult physical appearance, such as the existence of breasts in females.<sup>31</sup> It is these ‘sexual’ features that societal authorities have in mind when producing discourses about ‘gender’. Detel’s thesis enables this study to envision ‘sex’ and ‘gender’ as a two-tiered spectrum. The first or ‘sex’ tier is bound by ‘male’ and ‘female’ binaries as determined by our biological features. The ‘gender’ tier is the veil placed over ‘sex’ by social and cultural values, defining ‘masculine’ and ‘feminine’. An allowance is thus made here for the possibility that an individual’s position on one tier might not necessarily align with the other.

The constructivist approach is not without its critics. Some are of the opinion that ‘gender’ is biological, and the roles of ‘men’ and ‘women’ cannot be changed by social arrangement.<sup>32</sup> In

---

<sup>28</sup> Detel (1998: 244-49)

<sup>29</sup> Detel (1998: 241)

<sup>30</sup> Detel (1998: 244)

<sup>31</sup> Detel (1998: 248)

<sup>32</sup> Wicks (1996: 2)

terms of 'gender', "we simply *are* male or female".<sup>33</sup> A further criticism of this method is that it endangers any ability to use 'gender' as a category of reference.<sup>34</sup> Unlike his concerns about the implications of constructivist theory to 'sex' as a term of reference, Detel's assertion about 'gender' is unjustifiable. The concerns of Wicks and Detel undermine the fluidity of 'gender' relative to social context, as well as that of the personal. Constructivist theory does not presuppose the development of one 'gender' over another, only that particular 'genders' are hegemonic in certain contexts. 'Gender' as immutable biology, infused with 'sex', cannot explain 'masculine' 'women' or 'feminine' 'men'.<sup>35</sup> Furthermore, in his study of masculine archetypes, Wicks hypothesises that a male's identity "depends entirely on external definition".<sup>36</sup> A male becomes a 'man' only by navigating the social conditions of his class within his context, and achieving particular goals.<sup>37</sup> In recent history we might recognise the typical accomplished 'man' as steadily employed, educated, married and disciplined, all goals which are signposts for the recognition of 'gendered' prestige. Wicks' entire argument is underpinned by the core thesis of the constructivist school, that to be recognised as a 'man', one must perform the appropriate behaviours of 'men' in that context. It is a great discredit to his insightful comments on 'masculinity' that he denies the importance of social construction, while essentially advocating it.<sup>38</sup>

Wicks denounces the constructivist school, particularly its feminist scholars, as advocates of an "imaginary conspiracy" called patriarchy.<sup>39</sup> He reduces women's legitimate struggle for equal representation and opportunity to a tired complaint, accusing feminist scholars of targeting men as scapegoats for women's dissatisfaction with their lives.<sup>40</sup> Additionally, his superficial and offensive treatment of 'femininity' is unnecessary, as his work is concerned with 'masculine'

---

<sup>33</sup> Wicks (1996: 2)

<sup>34</sup> Detel (1998: 231)

<sup>35</sup> Halberstam (1998: 1-2)

<sup>36</sup> Wicks (1996: 11)

<sup>37</sup> Wicks (1996: 15)

<sup>38</sup> Wicks (1996: 15)

<sup>39</sup> Wicks (1996: 4)

<sup>40</sup> Wicks (1996: 3)



archetypes.<sup>41</sup> Given his context, it is easy to see how following the publication of *Gender Trouble* and new translations of Foucault into English, hard-boiled men with conservative values would feel threatened. This perceived threat arose from the increasing volume of literature in the 1990s within the relatively new field of ‘Gender Studies’, an area complementing the work of feminist scholars.<sup>42</sup> ‘Gender’ theorists examined the discourses surrounding the experience of ‘gender’, as opposed to feminist historians whose intention was to recover and critique those experiences.<sup>43</sup> For those of the so-called second-wave feminist school, the role and status of women in historical periods was to act as a precursor to the struggles faced by women in the twentieth century.<sup>44</sup> Wicks fails to cite a single feminist study in his work, effectively using the Feminist school as a ‘scapegoat’ for what can be assumed to be his own personal grievances.

It is possible after this lengthy, but necessary excursion into ‘gender’ theory, to define the terms with which we are dealing. ‘Sex’ refers to the biological differences that define a ‘male’ or ‘female’ body. A male bears a penis, a woman a vagina and breasts. In adolescence and adulthood males and females typically develop body hair in different places or in varying quantities. A male contributes his sperm to procreation, a female her ovum, uterus, body and soul.<sup>45</sup> It is these distinctions which provide the grounds for our reference to ‘male’ and ‘female’, and which act as the biological binaries for the first tier of our ‘gender’ spectrum. Transvestites, eunuchs and other biologically ambiguous individuals also have a place on this spectrum. Materially, this thesis assumes that they remain male or female according to their ‘sex’ at birth. ‘Gender’ then refers to the behaviours, and the ‘performance’ of ‘sex’, in accordance with perceived appropriate or inappropriate behaviours.<sup>46</sup> These behaviours are classified as such by discourse, and are enforced by social and cultural institutions.<sup>47</sup> Discourse takes the form of texts which embody these idealised attitudes, and embedding them within social psychology as a

---

<sup>41</sup> Wicks (1996: 16)

<sup>42</sup> Corbeill (2010: 230)

<sup>43</sup> Burn (1996: XIX)

<sup>44</sup> Corbeill (2010: 222)

<sup>45</sup> This is not to deny a male’s emotional investment in his children. All I intend to stress here is that pregnancy and birth are very intense spiritual and emotional experiences that males, including myself, cannot fully grasp. It is an experience unique to females.

<sup>46</sup> Butler (1990: 6)

<sup>47</sup> Foucault (1986: 67)

normative frame of reference.<sup>48</sup> ‘Masculine’ and ‘feminine’ are idealised binaries of behaviour on the spectrum, covering their respective ‘sexes’. This does not mean that being of one ‘sex’ necessarily means an individual performs the associated ‘gender’. A transvestite might be biologically ‘female’, but in ‘gender’ his performance is ‘masculine’. Envisioning ‘gender’ as a two-tiered spectrum, where ‘sex’ is not cancelled, but veiled by social content, enables a fair and inclusive use of these terms. They can be used to inform our understanding of Roman society, without necessarily imposing their meanings upon ancient material.

---

<sup>48</sup> Butler (1990: 1); Burn (1996: 3)

## CHAPTER TWO: ROMAN 'GENDER'

The sexual practices and idealised social roles that defined what it meant to be a *vir* (man) or a *femina* (woman) of the aristocracy were characterised by a patchwork of appropriate and inappropriate behaviours. Lines could become quite blurred according to context as we shall see.<sup>49</sup> The gaze of the Roman community at large enforced conformity to normative values, lest one fall victim to the perils *infamia* (ill-repute) could inflict upon oneself or one's *familia*.<sup>50</sup> A sense of *pudor* (shame) was instilled into every Roman aristocrat from a young age by repetitious training in moral behaviour and through witnessing the consequences suffered by politicians and matrons who were deemed non-conforming.<sup>51</sup> At the very least they were 'seen' to be deviant or deliberately portrayed as such as part of a political agenda.<sup>52</sup> What better recourse to reduce an enemy than to level accusations of decadence and poor character?<sup>53</sup> This section will take a twofold approach to reconstruct Roman 'gender' performances, firstly through an analysis of idealised sexual practices, and secondly through an examination of social roles.

This section largely deals with selections from the ancient sources and reviews some pertinent modern scholarship on the subject of Roman 'gender'. Inherently there are significant methodological and historiographical issues associated with the present enterprise. By necessity in terms of source material we must be selective. The enormity of the corpus, and word constraints of this study, prohibits a systematic examination of all pieces of evidence concerning Rome's sexual vocabulary and values. As the aim is to give an impression of 'Roman' 'gender' values, Latin evidence will be privileged over the Greek. In terms of typology only literary evidence has been sought out for examination. Furthermore the literature that has been selected was composed by a male-dominated elite, often writing invective against individual non-

---

<sup>49</sup> See for example, Wyke on the different attitudes to male and female use of the mirror (1994: 138); Skinner more generally on women in Roman politics (2005: 203).

<sup>50</sup> Richlin (1993: 554-69); Edwards (1997: 69)

<sup>51</sup> Barton (1999: 212-13); Kaster on *verecundia* and *pudor* respectively (2005: 15, 30-31). See Barton (2001: 202-69) for a good discussion.

<sup>52</sup> Corbeill (1997: 109)

<sup>53</sup> Corbeill (1997: 109)

conformers rather than an account of Rome's high moral standards. From such texts we can infer the ideal from the antithesis of that ideal.<sup>54</sup>

The values advocated by Roman authors were of service to Rome's elite. The representations of Rome's greatest enemies were written by this same aristocracy, working within the same culture. While Rome did change over time, many of her core idealised values and principles remained the same, particularly in regards to 'gendered' identities.<sup>55</sup> Indeed it is then more than appropriate to use the Roman 'gendered' ideal to assess the degree to which 'gender' impacted upon the representation of foreign enemies.

There is also the issue of terminology. One of the most difficult aspects of studying 'gender' in the past is distancing the normative categories of the present.<sup>56</sup> In studying the Roman past we, as historians, can fall into a trap of seeking the familiar. Roman texts speak to us about universal concerns, not just 'gender', but race, love, freedom, justice, and more generally identity. It is quite possible to recognise 'homosexuality', 'paedophilia', and the more hegemonic 'heterosexuality' in the ancient evidence, but this is an illusion. For instance, no one in the Roman aristocracy would have openly identified as 'homosexual'.<sup>57</sup> Indeed no one would have thought of themselves 'heterosexual' either. These are labels created by another time, another world.<sup>58</sup>

Hic est vir: *This is a 'man'*

The Romans used the word '*vir*' to denote a 'man'.<sup>59</sup> A *vir* was a 'male', a member of the 'male' sex as we understand it. He possessed a penis, and grew hair on his face and body when he

---

<sup>54</sup> Skinner (1997: 5)

<sup>55</sup> Mattern (1999: 2-3)

<sup>56</sup> Edwards (1993: 4); Richlin (1993: 525); Parker (1997: 47-8); Langlands (2006: 1); Sissa (2008: 6)

<sup>57</sup> Skinner (2005: 9); Sissa (2008: 158-59)

<sup>58</sup> This is not to say that our gender spectrum, its categories, and definitions are moot. Instead they should be used to enhance our understanding of the Roman evidence rather than control it. In this way the material is relatable, with minimal contamination of our own categories of 'sex' and 'gender'. It is debatable if such a feat is even possible, but in order to study 'gender' in past societies, we need to try.

<sup>59</sup> Skinner (2005: 195)

became pubescent. He also produced semen that contributed to the reproductive process. Within Detel's theory of "thin sex differences", the Roman *vir* corresponds to our 'male'.<sup>60</sup> In a discussion of wills and heirs in the *De Officiis* Cicero defines the "good man". Cicero's "*vir bonus*" is one of moral standing, who "helps all whom he can and harms nobody, unless provoked by wrong".<sup>61</sup> He does not manipulate others or legal procedures for self-gain.<sup>62</sup> So for Cicero *vir* is used to both denote a male and a 'man'. Within aristocratic terminology, the *vir* is not, however, the only 'male' in Roman society. He is the highest possible category of a Roman male: an aristocrat, of appropriate birth, who conforms to social expectations.<sup>63</sup>

There were indeed other categories. In the same text, Cicero criticises Gaius Marius and his nephew Gratidianus for deceiving others for self-gain, immoral conduct, and unworthy of their social position.<sup>64</sup> Similarly, Marcus Crassus, it is alleged would eagerly accept an opportunity to become an heir, if he were afforded magical powers, and could illegitimately obtain wealth without detection.<sup>65</sup> For Cicero there is no material object the *vir* can acquire that can replace lost morality. After citing Marius and his nephew as negative *exempla*, Cicero uses *boni viri* to denote "good men".<sup>66</sup> The *belua*, or immoral character, is denoted by use of the noun *homo*.<sup>67</sup> A '*homo*' is still a 'male' with the same biology as a *vir*, yet socially he is quite different, and is thus not a 'man' in elite Roman discourse. Walters lists those who often fall under the label '*homines*' as adult male slaves, men of the lower classes and also those of ill-repute.<sup>68</sup> In the passages cited above it is the latter group with which Cicero is concerned. The *vir* is a 'man'

---

<sup>60</sup> Detel (1998: 244-49)

<sup>61</sup> Cic. *Off.* 3.19.76

<sup>62</sup> Cic. *Off.* 3.16.64

<sup>63</sup> Walters (1997: 32)

<sup>64</sup> Cic. *Off.* 3.20.81

<sup>65</sup> Cic. *Off.* 3.19.75

<sup>66</sup> Cic. *Off.* 3.20.82

<sup>67</sup> Cic. *Off.* 3.20.82

<sup>68</sup> Walters (1997: 31) '*homines*' can also be used to denote humankind or 'men' in terms of a 'man' as a member of humanity. Instances of this usage can be found for example in Lucan and Aulus Gellius. See Luc. 9.855; Gell. 1.1.1 on Hercules among *homines* and 7.1.7-8 on humanity created without disease.

because he is of good character. The *homo* can be of a lesser status than the *vir*, because even if he appears to be moral, an immoral male is still a *belua* by virtue of his inner corruption.<sup>69</sup>

This distinction can be observed elsewhere. Gaius Fabricius is described by Gellius as *magna vir gloria magnisque rebus gestis*.<sup>70</sup> In return for his generosity since the restoration of peace between the Romans and the Samnites, the latter offered him a sum of money.<sup>71</sup> The Samnites perceived his home and lifestyle as lacking, unbefitting for a general of the prestige and rank of Fabricius. He however refused the proffered gift, gesturing to his ears, eyes, throat, mouth, nose, and belly.<sup>72</sup> According to Gellius, Fabricius rebuked the Samnites by stating that he is in control of his desires, and therefore cannot accept money for which he has no use, from those who in his opinion do.<sup>73</sup> Scipio Africanus the Elder and Tiberius Sempronius Gracchus, father of the Gracchi, are similarly referred to by Gellius as *viri* in the context of praise for their “great exploits, the high offices which they held, and the uprightness of their lives ...”.<sup>74</sup> It is because of their military victories, in Africanus’ case over Hannibal, the magistracies which they held, and their *dignitas* that Africanus and Gracchus are not only male, but *viri*.<sup>75</sup> They are men. Cic. *Verr.*

Gellius uses ‘*homines*’ to refer to a string of strange males from foreign lands in Book 9.<sup>76</sup> Some are of a fantastical sort, such as men from the mountains of India with the heads of dogs and Scythian *cyclopes*.<sup>77</sup> The word *homines* is also used to denote a tribe of Scythian cannibals, Albanian albinos, and North African and Illyrian sorcerers who use their eyes and tongues to work spells.<sup>78</sup> All of these people are clear oddities in the Roman frame of reference. It is the cannibals and sorcerers, however, that are of real interest, deviants engaging in unnatural

---

<sup>69</sup> Cicero in fact glorified the term several times (Cic. 2 *Verr.* 3.7; *Agr.* 2.3).

<sup>70</sup> Gell. 1.14.1

<sup>71</sup> Gell. 1.14.1

<sup>72</sup> Gell. 1.14.2

<sup>73</sup> Gell. 1.14.2

<sup>74</sup> Gell. 12.8.1

<sup>75</sup> Masterson observed that Scipio Africanus was indeed a role model, a paradigm of *virtus*, which all Roman men could and should follow (2013: 26).

<sup>76</sup> Gell. 9.4.6-11

<sup>77</sup> Gell. 9.4.6

<sup>78</sup> Gell. 9.4.6 for the cannibals and albinos; 9.4.7-8 for the sorcerers; 9.4.9 for the Indians with dog heads

behaviour. These males are foreigners, which is a significant factor in their exclusion from the ‘*vir*’ category. They cannot be ‘men’ in Roman eyes by virtue of improper birth and race, in addition to their unspeakable social behaviour.<sup>79</sup>

To be a ‘man’ in Roman aristocratic society was thus to be a *vir*. A *vir* was a citizen of the aristocracy, and might have been born into a family of *nobiles*, in possession of *nobilitas*.<sup>80</sup> His father and grandfather were likely to have been members of the Senate, and his mother a *matrona*, also from a respectable family. Fortuna played her part well for the *vir* who was born into a family with *nobilitas*, and from one of the great noble houses like the Caecilii Metelli, or the Corneli Scipiones.<sup>81</sup> On the path to greatness however, he had to do the rest himself. Roman writers were blunt about what males had to do to achieve greatness in the eyes of the aristocracy.<sup>82</sup> The three interrelated arenas of war, politics and morality were vital areas by which a Roman male could demonstrate his *virtus* and *dignitas* to the community. Naturally, this fostered a climate of fierce competition for offices and glory among the aristocracy.<sup>83</sup> Roman men were “imbued with an ethos of achievement”, consistently reinforced by the culture of the aristocracy, and the institutions of the *res publica*.<sup>84</sup> The Roman aristocratic ‘man’ was thus a moral citizen, a soldier, and a politician.

*Nobilitas* was the domain of the *nobiles*, those males who were born into a family which had previously held magistracies on the *cursus honorum*, preferably the consulship.<sup>85</sup> Ideally offices would have been held recently by an immediate family member, a father or grandfather. In this way, according to Cicero and Sallust, *nobilitas* was passed in a hereditary fashion to the next

---

<sup>79</sup> Gel. 1.26.4; He records the philosopher Taurus’ description of Plutarch as a *vir*. Plutarch was of course a cultured Greek, and a Roman citizen.

<sup>80</sup> Gelzer (1975: 27)

<sup>81</sup> Cic. *Sex. Rosc.* 6.15

<sup>82</sup> Liv. 30.1.4-6 summarises the achievements of the consul Licinius; Plin. *NH.* 7.139 offers a list of Quintus Metellus’ feats; Gel. 12.8.1 highlights the extraordinary achievements of Scipio Africanus and Tiberius Sempronius Gracchus the Elder; the Scipionic epitaphs also emphasise political and military achievement. See Flower (1996: 160-80) for an analysis.

<sup>83</sup> Crawford (1992: 23); Hall (2005: 264)

<sup>84</sup> Hillard (2005: 3)

<sup>85</sup> Cic. *Off.* 2.44; Gelzer (1975: 27-28, 31); Rosenstein (1990: 1-2)

generation.<sup>86</sup> Alternatively, if one had no consular ancestors their own efforts in the law courts or on campaign could earn them the necessary *dignitas* to win the consulship as a *novus homo*, ‘new man’.<sup>87</sup> Cicero himself is an example of one of the few *novi homines* who managed to penetrate the Roman aristocratic circle by luck and merit.<sup>88</sup>

*Nobilitas* meant a *vir* was known throughout Rome, and this attention attracted public scrutiny from his aristocratic peers.<sup>89</sup> According to Plutarch, Cicero is supposed to have said of Caesar that he could hardly believe a man whose hair is arranged with “so much nicety”, and who scratches his head with only a single finger to preserve its arrangement, is capable of overthrowing the Roman Republic.<sup>90</sup> Clodius could never overcome the *infamia* inflicted upon his *dignitas* and *virtus* after he allegedly snuck into the Bona Dea rites dressed as a woman. Cicero mockingly lamented that should the Republic be destroyed, let it at least fall to a *vir*, with the implication that Clodius is not one.<sup>91</sup> The attacks on Clodius’ character are also present in Cicero’s private correspondence. In a letter to Atticus in July of 61 BC, Clodius is slandered as “*pulchellus puer*”, “little beauty”.<sup>92</sup> Everything an aristocrat did was noticed. Being noticed was as much a privilege of aristocratic birth as it was a curse.

### *Male Sexuality*

The central value underlying the existence of the *vir* was the citizen’s right of inviolability.<sup>93</sup> The *lex Porcia* guaranteed the citizen legal protection from beating, rape and torture.<sup>94</sup> Anyone who

---

<sup>86</sup> Cic. *Off.* 2.44; Sall. *BJ.* 63.6

<sup>87</sup> Cic. *Off.* 2.44; See Burkhardt (1990: 82) for the position that senators who did not reach the consulship were also classed as *novi homines*.

<sup>88</sup> Cic. *Leg. agr.* 2.3

<sup>89</sup> Cic. *Off.* 2.44; Sall. *BJ.* 85.23

<sup>90</sup> Plut. *Caes.* 4.9

<sup>91</sup> Cic. *Har. Resp.* 20.42

<sup>92</sup> Cic. *Att.* 1.16.10

<sup>93</sup> Walters (1997: 30-33); Richlin (1999: 195); Skinner (2005: 195)

<sup>94</sup> Cic. *Rab. Perd.*; Sall. *BC.* 51.22; Liv. 10.9.4; Cic. *Rep.* 2.54 mentions three Porcian laws. As Oakley observes elsewhere only one is mentioned (2005: 131).



was not a citizen male, of good repute, was by default not protected from violation. Slaves were distinguished by Roman law as those who were the property of free Romans.<sup>95</sup> Under section 2.13, Gaius lists slaves as corporeal beings, in the same category as land and moveable property.<sup>96</sup> They were at the utter mercy of their masters. A slave, of any age, male or female, could be raped or beaten at their master's whim.<sup>97</sup> Cicero relates to us how Servius Sulpicius Galba (cos. 144) would beat his slaves when preparing for a case, and emerge from his study "with flushed face and flashing eyes".<sup>98</sup>

It was perceived as entirely appropriate for a *vir* to have sex with his slaves, including males. Roman sexual practices were not divided on the same heterosexual/homosexual lines many use today. Having sex with a male slave did not make a *vir* a homosexual.<sup>99</sup> 'Homosexuality' was a term coined by Westphal in the Victorian period, a label assigned to behaviour which had existed since the ancient world.<sup>100</sup> This label created the 'homosexual' other in opposition to the 'heterosexual', the hegemonic sexual category of the Victorian Age. These terms should not be carelessly applied to the Roman sources, and imposed upon their world, for Roman sexuality was categorised into active and passive roles.<sup>101</sup> As far as the *vir* was concerned, all that respectability required was that he take the dominant role, the active, in the encounter.<sup>102</sup>

---

<sup>95</sup> Gaius. *Inst.* 1.9

<sup>96</sup> Gaius. *Inst.* 2.13

<sup>97</sup> Walters (1997: 37)

<sup>98</sup> Cic. *Brut.* 87

<sup>99</sup> Parker (1997: 55)

<sup>100</sup> Foucault (1978: 43-44);

<sup>101</sup> Works such as Cantarella's *Bisexuality in the Ancient World* and Dover's *Greek Homosexuality* misapply sexual language which we take for granted to the ancient world. See Skinner (2005: 7) for a discussion of Dover's methodology and conclusions. Michel Foucault in his *History of Sexuality* advocates that homosexual behaviour was accepted in Greco-Roman culture, but draws upon primarily Greek sources from the Imperial period. His male-centric view also prohibits an understanding of the sexual experiences of women in the Roman world. See Richlin (1993: 525) for a discussion of applying the term 'homosexual' to Roman sources, and Sissa (2008:204-5) for a critique of Foucault's application. Langlands (2006: 7) offers an invaluable discussion of the lack of attention Foucault's methodology affords Roman women. See also the ground-breaking discussion by Halperin (1990). Full details in bibliography.

<sup>102</sup> Martial 2.47 lists the three active roles the *vir* was permitted to play.

The *vir* was a citizen, a soldier, and a ‘man’. Those who took the passive role, or who were penetrated in the sexual encounter, were women, men of the lower classes, foreigners and slaves.<sup>103</sup> Anyone who was not a free-born citizen male of the aristocracy was essentially ‘on the market’. Their only function in such encounters was to provide pleasure for the *vir*. It was a *necessitas* for a slave to lose his virtue to his master, Seneca suggests in his *Controversiae* that sexual relationships between slaves and masters might have continued even after the slave was manumitted.<sup>104</sup> Giving one’s body to the pleasure of another was viewed as a state of servitude to the desires of that individual.<sup>105</sup> The law protected freeborn males, youth in particular, from the sexual desires of other *viri*.<sup>106</sup> Unlike the Greeks, who appear to have openly encouraged pederasty among the aristocratic classes, the Romans were adamantly opposed to such relationships.<sup>107</sup> Approaching freeborn youths for sex was classed as a *stuprum* and such charges were treated in the same manner as those of adultery.<sup>108</sup> Marcus Claudius Marcellus brought a colleague by the name of Gaius Scantinius Capitolinus to trial for making sexual advances towards his son.<sup>109</sup> The appearance of the boy in court, and the genuine shame with which he spoke of the encounter, was enough to have Capitolinus convicted and fined.<sup>110</sup> According to Valerius Maximus one Gaius Cornelius was also detained and imprisoned for having sex with a freeborn youth.<sup>111</sup>

A male who willingly allowed himself to be violated sexually, was not considered a *vir*, but was subject to one of many socially subordinate categories.<sup>112</sup> The issue was not that he was having sex with a male. There was only a stigma if he did not take the active role in the encounter.

---

<sup>103</sup> Parker (1997: 48-49); D’Ambra (2007: 12); Kamen and Levin-Richardson argue that the notion of passivity can be misleading, and that the term ‘passive’ must be applied to the Roman world with care (2014: 449). Such a label can deprive the penetrated of agency in the sexual act. Their arguments are treated below.

<sup>104</sup> Sen. *Controv.* 4 *pref.* 10. For freedmen obliging the former master was an *officium*.

<sup>105</sup> Skinner (2005: 196); Kamen and Levin-Richardson (2014: 449)

<sup>106</sup> See Sen. *Controv.* 4 *pref.* 10: *inpudicitia in ingenuo crimen est*.

<sup>107</sup> Richlin (1993: 525)

<sup>108</sup> Skinner (2005: 196)

<sup>109</sup> Plut. *Marc.* 2; Val. Max. 6.1.7

<sup>110</sup> Plut. *Marc.* 2

<sup>111</sup> Val. Max. 6.1.10

<sup>112</sup> Such as the *pathicus*, *cinaedus* and *fellator*. These are discussed below.

When speaking of homoerotic encounters, the sources often assimilate anal penetration to vaginal.<sup>113</sup> Latin provides a variety of negative terms to categorise sexually deviant males. The submissive Roman male was *mollis*, “soft”.<sup>114</sup> He was also a *pathicus*, a male of a lower social status than the *vir* by virtue of taking the passive role in sexual encounters.<sup>115</sup> A ‘*pathicus*’ was still ‘male’ in the sense of the parameters established by our ‘gender’ spectrum, but he was not a true ‘man’ in Roman eyes. Nor was a *cinaedus*, a *fellator*, or a *cunnilinctor* a ‘man’.<sup>116</sup> These three specialist categories were used to denote males of particular deviant sexual habits, rather than *pathicus*, a more general term. A *cinaedus* enjoyed being penetrated by other men in his anus, the *fellator* the passive role in oral sex, and the *cunnilinctor* pleased a female by using his mouth and tongue to stimulate her vagina.<sup>117</sup> What we understand as ‘sex’, ‘gender’ and ‘sexuality’ were fused into a system of conduct, within which the Roman aristocracy operated.<sup>118</sup>

Passivity is a term which must be applied to the sources with care. Kamen and Levin-Richardson have aptly demonstrated that males could be penetrated, but hold the agency in the sexual encounter.<sup>119</sup> The epigrams of Martial contain numerous examples of active *cinaedi*. Charinus’ anus itches for further penetration.<sup>120</sup> Hyllus’ anus hungers to be penetrated more than his stomach for food.<sup>121</sup> He even pays for the pleasure, having not more than a silver coin in his possession at any time.<sup>122</sup> Martial mocks Papyrus for weeping, accusing him of either desiring further sex or regretting his anal itch for sodomy.<sup>123</sup> Aulus Gellius tells of the philosopher Arcesilaus taunting a man for his effeminate appearance, and eyes “teeming with seduction and

---

<sup>113</sup> Walters (1997: 31)

<sup>114</sup> Edwards (1993: 78-79)

<sup>115</sup> Parker (1997: 56)

<sup>116</sup> Parker (1997: 48-49, 53)

<sup>117</sup> Parker (1997: 48-49); see Williams (199: 171) for a discussion of how *fellatio* can be construed by ancient texts as a penetrative act.

<sup>118</sup> Edwards (1993: 75)

<sup>119</sup> Kamen and Levin-Richardson (2014: 449)

<sup>120</sup> Mart. 6.37.3

<sup>121</sup> Mart. 2.51.6

<sup>122</sup> Mart. 2.51.1

<sup>123</sup> Mart. 4.48

voluptuousness”.<sup>124</sup> Juvenal’s Virro pursues sex with love letters and also pays to be penetrated.<sup>125</sup> The rate is calculated in the act.<sup>126</sup> Based on this evidence for the sexual agency of the *cinaedi* and other instances of deviancy, Kamen and Levin-Richardson concluded that Parker’s teratogenic grid could be improved. The *cinaedi* depicted in these sources sought pleasure for themselves. Payment for sex expresses intent and a desire for penetration. Such circumstances are exhibitions of agency. The addition of a new category, one of passivity with agency, to the teratogenic grid would be a more inclusive model for understanding Roman sexual practices.<sup>127</sup>

### *Self-Presentation and Cultus*

Accusations of sexual deviance could be extended into other areas of immoral conduct. Self-presentation was a means by which the community judged a male’s ‘gender’ performance, and was a category which could be used to portray him as sexually deviant. *Cultus*, or “care of the body”, was a necessary pursuit for men, but within particular boundaries.<sup>128</sup> Olson notes that Roman clothing was a system of signs, demarcating social status, values, relations between the sexes, and most importantly, social anxieties.<sup>129</sup> Men were supposed to be groomed, with their hair cut, beards trimmed, and eat a satisfactory diet to ensure good physical and mental health.<sup>130</sup> Livy records that an ungroomed citizen, who had fallen into debt, appeared in the forum with unkempt hair, a long beard, filthy clothes and emaciated physique.<sup>131</sup> He has consequently a brutish appearance. Similarly, when Hannibal’s army emerges from the Alps in book 21, Livy depicts them having savage looking bodies as a result of the hardships they endured on the

---

<sup>124</sup> Gel. 3.5.2

<sup>125</sup> Juv. 9.39-41

<sup>126</sup> Juv. 9.39

<sup>127</sup> Kamen and Levin-Richardson (2014: 455-56)

<sup>128</sup> Wyke (1994: 135)

<sup>129</sup> Olson (2014: 423)

<sup>130</sup> Wyke (1994: 135); D’Ambra (2007: 112)

<sup>131</sup> Liv. 2.23.3-4: *Magno natu quidam cum omnium malorum suorum insignibus se in forum proiecit. Obsita erat squalore vestis, foedior corporis habitus pallore ac macie perempti; ad hoc promissa barba et capilli efferaverant speciem oris*. See also Corbeill (1996: 30-35).

journey.<sup>132</sup> It can be observed then, that the body is a “site for the display of difference.”<sup>133</sup> The male who was unkempt risked being likened to a brute, and the male who was too well kept could be accused of effeminacy.

Cicero too uses male self-presentation as a category to attack his enemies in a strategic “character assassination”.<sup>134</sup> Clothing provided visual codes which could be exploited by orators in their speeches.<sup>135</sup> Exterior presentation was taken as the certain indicator of the interior self. It is the eyes, Cicero argues, which permit the perception of “virtues and vices”.<sup>136</sup> Thus Mark Antony is depicted in the *Second Philippic* as a woman. Cicero accuses Antony of donning the *toga virilis* and prostituting himself in the passive role.<sup>137</sup> After a long career as a prostitute Cicero’s Antony seduces Curio, and enters into a “steady wedlock” as his bride, outfitted with a woman’s robe.<sup>138</sup> In response to being labelled a non-Roman by Clodius, on account of his birth at Arpinum, Cicero portrays him in a long-sleeved tunic, headband and purple garland.<sup>139</sup> Catiline’s conspirators are similarly portrayed as an army of deviants which Catiline has levied to overthrow the state. The final category consists of “men you see with their carefully combed hair, dripping with oil, some smooth as girls, others with shaggy beards, with tunics down to their ankles and wrists, and wearing frocks not togas”.<sup>140</sup> All of these instances represent inappropriate performances of the *vir* category, as envisioned by Cicero. The body symbolises the deviant’s inability to perform in politics and other areas of citizenship, in the same manner that they are unable to correctly perform their ‘gender’.<sup>141</sup>

---

<sup>132</sup> Liv. 21.39.1-2: *Sed armare exercitum Hannibal, ut parti alteri auxilio esset, in reficiendo maxime sentientem contracta ante mala, non poterat; otium enim ex labore, copia ex inopia, cultus ex inlucie tabeque squalida et prope efferata corpora varie movebat.*

<sup>133</sup> Wyke (1994: 134)

<sup>134</sup> Richlin (1992: 13)

<sup>135</sup> Olson (2014: 424)

<sup>136</sup> Cic. *N.D.* 2.145

<sup>137</sup> Cic. *Phil.* 2.44; his audience would have known that prostitutes wore the *toga*. See Skinner (2005: 207).

<sup>138</sup> Cic. *Phil.* 2.44; see also Corbeill (1996: 198).

<sup>139</sup> Cic. *Clod. et Cur.* 22; Corbeill (1997: 119)

<sup>140</sup> Cic. *Cat.* 2.22

<sup>141</sup> Corbeill (1997: 109); Olson (2014: 424)

A *cinaedus* was rarely deviant in only one manner of his existence, and his clothes were only one aspect of his being which symbolised a total loss of virility.<sup>142</sup> Banquets were used in moralising texts as settings where narratives of decadence could play out, centred on the interrelated immorality of overeating, dancing, drinking and sexual effeminacy.<sup>143</sup> Gellius preserves an instance where Scipio Aemilianus criticised the effeminate behaviour of Publius Sulpicius Gallus.<sup>144</sup> Gallus' physical presentation is attacked in association with his drunkenness and reclining at banquets with a male lover.<sup>145</sup> He is characterised as un-Roman, a foreigner in his own city by virtue of his long tunic, a garment which covers his arms right down to his finger tips.<sup>146</sup> Such garments were considered more suitable for women, and the offenses go on. Gallus perfumed himself daily, trimmed his eyebrows, and dressed before a mirror.<sup>147</sup> This public display of *mollitia* led Aemilianus to refer to Gallus as *homo delicatus*, an "effeminate man".<sup>148</sup> Aemilianus also claimed that there was no doubt that Gallus engaged in passive sexual activity like *cinaedi*.<sup>149</sup> Lack of conformity inspired attacks on all areas of Gallus' life, by employment of the paradigmatic *homo delicatus* and *cinaedus* as deviant categories. His manner of dress is the described in greater detail than all other offenses listed. Gellius thus discredits Gallus' memory and praises the masculinity of Aemilianus.

### *Conclusion: Performing Virtue*

Roman 'gender' practices are thus performances of Roman values pertaining to one's sex. Texts authored by the males of the aristocracy advocate the *vir* as the ideal Roman male. He is hard and dominant. By fierce competition with peers, the *vir* was successful in the arenas of politics and war. In self-presentation the *vir* was to avoid perfumes and long sleeved robes. His

---

<sup>142</sup> Sissa (2008: 157)

<sup>143</sup> Corbeill (1997: 99)

<sup>144</sup> Gell. 6.12.1-5

<sup>145</sup> Gell. 6.12.5

<sup>146</sup> Gell. 6.12.1

<sup>147</sup> Gell. 6.12.4-5

<sup>148</sup> Gell. 6.12.3

<sup>149</sup> Gell. 6.12.5

appearance had to coincide with his demeanour. Any 'gendered' performances which did not align with this script were pejoratively labelled as effeminate and subjected to the critical gaze of the Roman community. *Pudor* kept members of the community in check, lest they fall victim to the perils of ill repute.

### CHAPTER THREE: REPUBLICAN HANNIBALS

#### *Fragments of Recent Memory*

In one of the bookshops at the Sigillaria market, Aulus Gellius and Julius Paullus came across a copy of the *Annales* of Quintus Fabius Pictor.<sup>150</sup> Gellius appraises them as “*bonae atque sinceræ uetustatis libri*”.<sup>151</sup> Rome had been mentioned by the Greeks in their histories, but Pictor was the first Roman to write one of his own.<sup>152</sup> As is the case with many gems of the Roman textual corpus, Pictor's *Annales* do not survive. We do, however, know a little about them from testimonies and quotations in later authors.<sup>153</sup> They were composed in the Greek literary tradition, something which Cornell argues would never have been suspected if Cicero and Dionysius of Halicarnassus had not cited the work as one of the Greek language.<sup>154</sup> Cicero and Fronto even list Pictor as a Latin writer in terms of historical style, but it is possible that he retained Latin tropes in terms of thinking about historical events, while expressing them in the Greek tradition.<sup>155</sup> Perhaps it is because no Roman history existed in Latin that Pictor chose to emulate the great authors of Greek history, but we cannot know the degree to which he succeeded stylistically.<sup>156</sup> One thing can be certain: that the *Annales* were used by later Roman and Greek historians.

Because Pictor was the first to write a history of Rome, quotations of his work are paramount to our understanding of how the Romans viewed Hannibal. Pictor was one of the first Romans to write about Hannibal, the first to put into words an image of Hannibal as an enemy for aristocratic consumption. He was both a contemporary of the Second Punic War, and a member of the Roman Senate. That Pictor was a senator is explicitly stated by Polybius, who blamed his senatorial position for his skewed perspective on the Second Punic War.<sup>157</sup> Such a post is also implied by his being sent as an envoy to the Delphic Oracle.<sup>158</sup> Cornell rightly asserts

---

<sup>150</sup> Gel. 5.4.1

<sup>151</sup> Gel. 5.4.1; Livy also refers to Pictor as *scriptorum antiquissimus*. See Liv. 1.55.8.

<sup>152</sup> Badian (1968: 2); Cornell (2013: 163)

<sup>153</sup> These have been compiled by Cornell in his three volume work *The Fragments of the Roman Historians* (2013), but Loeb translations are used throughout this thesis.

<sup>154</sup> Cornell (2013: 163); Cic. *Div.* 1.43; Cicero describes Pictor's history as “Greek annals”; Dion. Hal. 1.6.2

<sup>155</sup> Cic. *De Or.* 2.53; Fronto 134.

<sup>156</sup> Badian (1968: 3)

<sup>157</sup> Polyb. 3.9.4

<sup>158</sup> Liv. 22.57.4-5, 23.11.1-6; Plut. *Fab.* 18.3; App. *Hann.* 27.116



that seeking advice from Apollo on Rome's prospects in the Second Punic War would have been a task assigned to someone perceived as respectable, pious and senior among the ranks of the Senate.<sup>159</sup> Additionally, Pictor's interest in Hellenic culture and familiarity with the Greek language would have been attractive in terms of his suitability for selection.<sup>160</sup> Plutarch places him as a "kinsman" of Quintus Fabius Maximus, the *Cunctator*, and his second-cousin according to Frier's Fabian genealogy.<sup>161</sup> For these reasons, Pictor provides a unique image unparalleled to that of later writers who used Hannibal as a mouthpiece for their own nationalistic concerns.

Two fragments of the *Annales* concern Hannibal, one preserved by Polybius and the other by Livy. It is Hannibal's involvement in the many theatres of war and politics which are of concern in both accounts. Pictor is cited in Polybius as having laid the blame for Hannibal's war upon "the greed and lust for power of Hasdrubal".<sup>162</sup> From the death of Hamilcar, Hannibal was under the tutelage of his brother-in-law. A key aspect of Roman education, in both politics and war, was the emulation of experienced elders, which could explain why Pictor was eager to blame emulation of Hasdrubal for Hannibal's policy.<sup>163</sup> Additionally, as the Romans rejected monarchy for a republic, it is not surprising that Pictor should maintain that Hasdrubal administered Spain

---

<sup>159</sup> Cornell (2013: 161); The Tauromenium inscription gives the name of Fabius' father as Gaius, whom Cornell identifies as Gaius Fabius, consul of 269 BC. We can thus securely place him within the patrician Fabii. See *SEG* 26.1123 fr. III and Cornell (2013: 162).

<sup>160</sup> Cornell (2013: 161)

<sup>161</sup> Plut. *Fab.* 18.3; Frier (1999: 225, 227-31)

<sup>162</sup> Polyb. 3.8.1

<sup>163</sup> Bonner discusses the importance of father's as role models to Roman boys (1977: 17). Elite fathers would have educated their son's in the deeds of their ancestors, and those of Roman history in general. For Cicero, a father's manner of speaking was highly influential on aspiring orators and politicians (*Brut.* 210-11). Cicero himself sat with his father and recited the Twelve Tables until he had memorised them (*Leg.* 2.59). Sons of the elite were surrounded by illustrious exemplars, and associates of the family augmented fathers as suitable role models. Cicero writes of Marcus Licinius Crassus frequenting his home in his youth, personally selecting Cicero's teachers and writing his curriculum (*De Or.* 2.2). Richlin sees Rome as a society where "older men trained younger men, and lifelong friendships were formed" (2011: 92). Given the competitive nature of Roman society, it is not surprising that emulation of elders and exemplars should be a prominent feature of education. Learning and repeating successful strategies in war and politics would have seemed like the best way to ascend the *cursus honorum*.

as a kingdom independent from the Carthaginian Senate, and that Hannibal followed suit.<sup>164</sup> Acting as an independent ruler, against the wishes of the Carthaginian Senate, Pictor has Hannibal as the sole agent of the Second Punic War.<sup>165</sup> This is certainly a false representation of Hannibal's policy in Spain, for both Hasdrubal and Hannibal were elected generals chosen by the army and ratified by the citizens of Carthage.<sup>166</sup> Even if the senate deferred to the preferences of the army out of fear of another mercenary war, they could have offered up Hannibal to the Romans after Saguntum, or refused to assist him in the invasion of Italy. At the heart of the Roman political scene in the heat of Hannibal's war, Pictor's Hannibal will certainly have been coloured by the intense emotional response to the Carthaginian invasion.<sup>167</sup> As a result, Pictor's Hannibal, ruling in monarchical splendor, could be said to invoke the memory of Tarquin, playing on Rome's distaste for kingship.<sup>168</sup>

The fragment in Livy is for the most part inconsequential to evaluating the Roman representation of Hannibal. He is not even mentioned in the passage. Livy quotes Pictor's casualty figures in his narration of the disaster at Trasimene, and claims that he is the best authority on the battle.<sup>169</sup> His authority comes from his being a "contemporary" of the war.<sup>170</sup> Livy cites 15 000 Romans dead, with 10 000 routed and fleeing across Etruria.<sup>171</sup> It is not enough to say that the victory was great. The figures are given by Pictor and used by Livy to bolster the effect of the defeat of Trasimene upon his aristocratic readership. The desired effect was presumably to magnify the threat of Hannibal in the early years of the war, so that greater emphasis can be placed on the

---

<sup>164</sup> Polyb. 3.8.4

<sup>165</sup> Polyb. 3.8.6-7

<sup>166</sup> Liv. 21.5.1; Nep. 23.3; Hoyos (1994: 257). See (257-59) for a full discussion of the debate concerning the accusation of Barcid independence in Spain. See also Hoyos (2008:34) and (2010: 193) for the election of Hannibal and his relatives to the generalship.

<sup>167</sup> Frier (1999: 246); Polyb. 3.8.9-9.5. Polybius' Greek origin is probably what permits a more sceptical approach to the Roman sources. Roman writers arrive at the books with Roman patriotism as cultural baggage. This is not to say that Polybius is perfect. His affiliation with Scipio Aemilianus prohibits an outright criticism of Roman scholarship.

<sup>168</sup> Plut. *Cat. Mai.* 8.8 expresses Cato the Elder's anti-monarchical sentiments.

<sup>169</sup> Liv. 22.7.1-4

<sup>170</sup> Liv. 22.7.4

<sup>171</sup> Liv. 22.7.2

*virtus* of the Romans for having defeated such an enemy. Pictor has thus magnified the threat of Hannibal as a Carthaginian king, who has invaded Italy to destroy the Romans. He is the worst kind of man: a king.

Pictor is not the only source that is utilized by Livy. Livy also quotes Lucius Cincius Alimentus, a former praetor of 210 BC who also wrote a history in Greek.<sup>172</sup> It is generally accepted that he wrote his history after Fabius Pictor, and most likely used him as a source.<sup>173</sup> He is quoted in Livy's description of the Alpine crossing, cited for the figures he provides of Hannibal's losses in the mountains and the state of his forces in the Po Valley.<sup>174</sup> According to Alimentus, Hannibal entered the Po Valley with a combined infantry and cavalry force of 90 000, although this is surely an inflated figure.<sup>175</sup> Livy is himself skeptical, relating that the matter was one of contention in his own time.<sup>176</sup> He believed that the figure was a confused amalgamation of Hannibal's initial force with the Gauls and Ligurians who joined him in Italy.<sup>177</sup> Livy does, however, cite him as the most authoritative source on the subject, owing to the time he spent as a prisoner of Hannibal.<sup>178</sup> Hannibal is supposed to have given Alimentus the figures himself.<sup>179</sup> Supposing this were true, Hannibal is likely to have exaggerated the numbers to inspire fear and awe in a Roman with the political pedigree of Alimentus. We know from his dealings with Scipio Africanus that Hannibal afforded his enemies a considerable respect, and it is likely that he would have hoped to leave an impression on any senators whom might be ransomed back to Rome. It is of interest that Alimentus and Hannibal were both familiar with the Greek language so they need not have even conversed in Latin.<sup>180</sup>

---

<sup>172</sup> Liv. 26.23.1; Dion Hal. 1.6.2; Badian (1966: 6); Cornell (2013: 179-80)

<sup>173</sup> Badian (1966: 6); Cornell (2013: 180)

<sup>174</sup> Liv. 21.38.3-5

<sup>175</sup> Liv. 21.38.4

<sup>176</sup> Liv. 21.38.2

<sup>177</sup> Liv. 21.38.4

<sup>178</sup> Liv. 21.38.5

<sup>179</sup> Liv. 21.38.5

<sup>180</sup> Nep. *Hann.* 23.13.3

Two judgements about Hannibal and the war survive from Marcus Porcius Cato the Elder, preserved in Aulus Gellius. Cato was the first Latin writer to deviate from the annalistic tradition, producing a history of Rome in prose and her native language.<sup>181</sup> As Badian notes however, Cato's *Origines* was no less composed in the Greek tradition than the annals of Pictor and Alimentus.<sup>182</sup> Badian places coverage of the Second Punic War in the fourth and fifth books of the work.<sup>183</sup> Cornell concurs that the later books of the *Origines* are most likely a military narrative.<sup>184</sup>

From what can be extracted of Cato's view on the war, it exemplifies his position in Roman memory as the model citizen. Gellius quotes the fourth book of the *Origines* in an explanation of the Latin word 'sextum'.<sup>185</sup> Cato argues that "*Carthaginienses sextum de foedere decessere*."<sup>186</sup> The Carthaginians broke a treaty for the sixth time, presumably a reference to the Ebro treaty. One of the most contested aspects of the war is whether or not Hannibal and the Carthaginians violated their treaty with Rome when Saguntum was sacked in 219 BC. The resolution of this issue hinges on whether or not the Senate of Carthage can be held accountable for a treaty negotiated by Hasdrubal in Spain.<sup>187</sup> There is no evidence that they ratified the treaty. It seems

---

<sup>181</sup> Cic. *Brut.* 69; Quint. *Inst.* 12.11.3

<sup>182</sup> Badian (1966: 7)

<sup>183</sup> Badian (1966: 7)

<sup>184</sup> Cornell (2013: 213)

<sup>185</sup> Gell. 10.1.10

<sup>186</sup> Gell. 10.1.10

<sup>187</sup> Livy (21.2.7) outlines the conditions of the Ebro treaty. Hasdrubal and the Romans agreed to check their expansion at the Ebro, and the Carthaginians would leave the city of Saguntum in independence. Livy has a member of the Carthaginian Senate, presumably one of the suffetes, address the Roman embassy of 218 BC with counter arguments (21.18.8-12). The treaty was signed with Hasdrubal and was not ratified by the Senate at Carthage (21.18.11). A pre-existing treaty made with Gaius Lutatius was ratified by the Carthaginian Senate, and this stipulated the protection of Roman allies, but made no mention of Saguntum (21.18.9). Hoyos gives an excellent discussion of Roman and Carthaginian attitudes towards the Ebro and Saguntum (1998: 196-201). He argues that Carthaginian expansion past the Ebro caused anxiety over potential contacts with the Gauls, which could further threaten the stability of Rome's hold on Italy (1988: 198-99). This is why the treaty was signed with Hasdrubal. The concern in 220 BC was to confirm Hannibal's respect of his predecessor's promise (1998: 200). Confirmation would recognise Carthage as a powerful independent state, but one that was inferior to Rome, and would respect the wishes

that the Ebro treaty was a band-aid solution to temporarily dispel anxieties over Carthaginian expansion in Spain.<sup>188</sup> The Senate had signed the earlier Treaty of Lutatius, agreeing not to attack Roman allies, but no mention was made of Saguntum.<sup>189</sup> The Romans, however, assumed the Carthaginian Senate was bound by the Ebro treaty, most likely because it suited them. The Romans were no strangers to back peddling the decisions made by their generals in the field. We need only recall the treaty made with the Samnites at the Caudine Forks.<sup>190</sup> The Roman Senate annulled the decision made by their general because it opposed their interests, as the Carthaginians did on this occasion. As Cato was a senator however, it is unsurprising, expected even, that we should be offered such a skewed perspective. Given that morality in Rome hinged upon keeping oaths, Hannibal's manhood is posited as lacking.

In Cato we have the emergence of one of the most quoted ancient military *exempla*; Hannibal not marching on Rome after Cannae.<sup>191</sup> Cato refuses to name the actors involved but there is no doubt that the "*dictator Carthaginiensis*" is Hannibal. The identity of the master of the horse is given differently in various sources but is generally believed to be Marhabal.<sup>192</sup> The cavalry commander advises Hannibal to send the cavalry ahead to Rome, promising that in five days he

---

of their superiors (1998: 200). Because they had defeated the Carthaginians in the First Punic War, they were no longer "fully equals" (1998: 200). This embassy found Hannibal in the midst of further subjugating Spanish tribes (Liv. 21.5.3-17). Hoyos notes that as a new leader he would have needed to prove himself to his troops immediately (2008: 38). It was unfortunate for the Romans that their embassy should have been so ill-timed. Hannibal might have wanted to prove to the Romans that he was no Hasdrubal, and would not be tamely following their instructions.

<sup>188</sup> Hoyos (1998: 198-99)

<sup>189</sup> Liv. (21.18.9). This was the treaty of Lutatius.

<sup>190</sup> Eckstein re-evaluated Mommsen's hypothesis that the senate took the lead in decisions of foreign policy, and that instead there existed a system of mutual trust between generals in the field and the senate in Rome (1987: xiii). This trust was founded in the aristocratic origin of both general and senate. Yet the incident at the Caudine Forks shows the senate was willing to overturn the decisions of their generals when Roman honour was at stake, and on legal technicalities (Liv. 9.11.7). The entire speech of Pontius is an exposition of Rome's treacherous dealings, citing those with Porsena and the Gauls (Liv. 9.11.6-7). Balsdon argues that to any perspective outside the Roman code of ethics their peculiar pragmatism was as treacherous as the accusations they made against others (1979: 4).

<sup>191</sup> Gell. 10.24.7

<sup>192</sup> Hoyos (2000: 610-14) provides an insightful discussion in his article.

can have his dinner on the Capitol.<sup>193</sup> We are also given the outcome of the episode. Hannibal on the following day informs the commander that he will send the cavalry if he wishes, and is told that it is pointless because they have lost the element of surprise.<sup>194</sup> Hannibal here is presented as failing to capitalise on his landmark victory, a competent general acting incompetently and inconsistently given what the Romans expected of his strategy.

Claudius Quadrigarius translated the Greek history of one Gaius Acilius into Latin, and this translation is cited by Livy.<sup>195</sup> Several episodes concerning Hannibal are preserved by Cicero and Livy. Cornell makes a studious assessment that the work is impossible to characterise owing to the variation of terminology used by ancient authors to describe it.<sup>196</sup> Its severely fragmentary nature further complicates any attempt at reconstruction. According to Acilius, Roman hostages sent by Hannibal to negotiate their ransom with the Senate swore an oath to return if they could not reach an agreement.<sup>197</sup> They returned shortly after, leaving with the excuse they had forgotten something, thereby later arguing they did not need to return by exploiting this technicality.<sup>198</sup> Cicero criticises this deception as craftiness, treachery and un-Roman.<sup>199</sup>

Livy twice quotes Acilius on the Second Punic War. The first instance is on the booty and prisoners acquired by Lucius Marcius when he defeated the Carthaginians in Spain in 211 BC.<sup>200</sup> The second is an apocryphal episode: a supposed meeting between Africanus and Hannibal at Ephesus in 193 BC.<sup>201</sup> It occurs after Livy's Third Decade which narrates the Second Punic War, and thus demonstrates that Acilius' history must have continued into the second century BC. An

---

<sup>193</sup> Gell. 10.24.7

<sup>194</sup> Gell. 2.19.9

<sup>195</sup> Liv. 25.39.12 and *Per.* 53

<sup>196</sup> Cornell 2013: 225; See Cic. *Off.* 3.32.115; Liv. 25.39.12

<sup>197</sup> Cic. *Off.* 3.32.13

<sup>198</sup> Cic. *Off.* 3.32.15

<sup>199</sup> Cic. *Off.* 3.32.13

<sup>200</sup> Liv. 25.39.12-13; On the meeting, see also Plut. *Flamin.* 21.3-4, *Pyrrh.* 8 and App. *Syr.* 10; Hoyos refers to this episode as a "legend" (2003: 280 n.1).

<sup>201</sup> Liv. 35.14.5

embassy visited Ephesus to meet with Antiochus, and Africanus is said to have joined them.<sup>202</sup> Hannibal and Africanus are supposed to have discussed their views on who should be named "*maximus imperator*", and Hannibal is said to have nominated Alexander the Great.<sup>203</sup> He placed Pyrrhus as second, and Scipio Africanus as third.<sup>204</sup> This arrangement is not unsurprising. Alexander conquered most of the known world, including the Persian Empire, the greatest at the time. Pyrrhus was the most recent aggressor against the Romans before Hannibal's invasion of Italy, and won many victories, so it is not unusual for him to be on the list. Furthermore, Hannibal argues he would be above Alexander and Pyrrhus had he defeated Scipio at Zama.<sup>205</sup> Naming Scipio Africanus in the same league as these generals is a sincere and gracious remark of adversarial respect. The final remark separates Scipio from the other generals as being of a totally different calibre. Acilius is still able however to fault Hannibal's delivery, which is characterised as "Punic guile".<sup>206</sup> So the theme of the trickster continues, even in defeat, years after the war. Hannibal is not an honest man, and is therefore not to be trusted.

We again turn to Cicero and Livy for the work of Lucius Coelius Antipater, who produced a history of the Hannibalic War.<sup>207</sup> Cornell argues that the few fragments dealing with other matters are merely digressions.<sup>208</sup> Cicero was clearly fond of Coelius' work. In the *Brutus* Cicero praises him as "outstanding, very knowledgeable about the law...".<sup>209</sup> Coelius is also called *vir optimus* in *De Oratore*, and we learn from this work that he was also a friend of Lucius Licinius Crassus (cos. 95 BC).<sup>210</sup> Badian comments that Coelius would have been well-read, versed in all the greats, particularly Cato the Elder.<sup>211</sup> He is said by Cicero to have read and followed the

---

<sup>202</sup> Liv. 35.14.5

<sup>203</sup> Liv. 35.14.16

<sup>204</sup> Liv. 35.14.8-10

<sup>205</sup> Liv. 35.14.11

<sup>206</sup> Liv. 35.14.12

<sup>207</sup> Cornell (2013: 257)

<sup>208</sup> Cornell (2013: 257)

<sup>209</sup> Cic. *Brut.* 102

<sup>210</sup> Cic. *De Or.* 2.54

<sup>211</sup> Badian (1966: 16)

work of Silenus, a companion of Hannibal.<sup>212</sup> Coelius' portrayal of Hannibal is crucial because he had read most of the sources already discussed, and his work was deemed noteworthy for citation by Cicero and Livy.

Cicero cites Coelius when he wants to discuss omens and dreams that affected Hannibal or that occurred during the war. After Hannibal captures Saguntum he had a dream where Jupiter commands that he invade Italy.<sup>213</sup> He was given a guide by the gods to assist the army on its journey, and was ordered not to look back.<sup>214</sup> When his curiosity overcame him, Hannibal saw a beast destroying everything at his rear.<sup>215</sup> The guide told him that was "the devastation of Italy", and to continue on without further delay.<sup>216</sup> One can't help but wonder if there is the implication that Hannibal lost because he was unable to obey the will of the gods and not look back. A second dream has Hannibal heed Juno's warning not to remove the golden column from one of her temples.<sup>217</sup> He is thus not portrayed by Coelius as forever unwilling to obey the will of the gods. Cicero refers to him as "*homine acuto*", using the more pejorative form of the word 'man' to denote Hannibal.<sup>218</sup> Hannibal is reportedly intelligent enough to know when to obey. He is also not the only man to run into trouble with omens. Gaius Flaminius does not heed the auspices and is defeated at Trasimene.<sup>219</sup> Coelius is cited for his narration of the subsequent earthquakes that shook Italy, signalling the dissatisfaction of the gods with the Romans.<sup>220</sup> Through Coelius in Cicero we see a contention with Livy's accusation that Hannibal was impious.<sup>221</sup> Hannibal heeds Juno's warning, and attempts to follow Jupiter's instructions. These are hardly the actions of an outrageously impious man.

---

<sup>212</sup> Cic. *Div.* 1.24.49

<sup>213</sup> Cic. *Div.* 1.24.49

<sup>214</sup> Cic. *Div.* 1.24.49

<sup>215</sup> Cic. *Div.* 1.24.49

<sup>216</sup> Cic. *Div.* 1.24.49

<sup>217</sup> Cic. *Div.* 1.24.48

<sup>218</sup> Cic. *Div.* 1.24.48

<sup>219</sup> Cic. *N. D.* 2.8; *Div.* 1.77-8

<sup>220</sup> Cic. *Div.* 1.78

<sup>221</sup> Liv. 21.4.9



Livy's use of Coelius is more varied than Cicero's. Hannibal himself leads the army across the Trebia, and organises the elephants into a barrier against the river to ease the crossing.<sup>222</sup> The March is ordered and executed with precision in contrast to the preceding moment where a Ligurian slave saves Cornelius Scipio the Elder from Hannibal's army.<sup>223</sup> Livy, however, rejects Coelius' version in favour of the version where the consul was saved by his son Scipio Africanus.<sup>224</sup> Livy is actually more critical of Coelius than Cicero. He faults his version of the location of the Alpine pass as geographically incorrect, but is happy to follow Coelius on Hannibal's march to Rome in 211 BC.<sup>225</sup> In general the Hannibal of Coelius Antipater seems to be one of both divine and tactical prudence.

The fragmentary nature of these writings prohibits definitive conclusions about the portrayal of Hannibal. These earlier historians were cited by later authors presumably because they agreed with the image of Hannibal that was projected or because their work offered perspective relevant to their discussion. Fabius Pictor, Cincius Alimentus and Cato Maior had witnessed the horrors of the war in the Senate house, and on the field of battle itself. One cannot deny that they must have felt a sense of violation at what we would today call the national level. Who knows if Cincius Alimentus witnessed any horrors in Hannibal's camp. In Fabius Pictor's and Cato's accounts is the beginning of the tradition which pits the Carthaginians as the aggressors of the Second Punic War. As representatives of the senatorial body, they would hardly advocate the policy of Hannibal or Carthage. Cato's Hannibal is also unable to capitalise on his victory at Cannae, thus costing him the element of surprise and foreshadowing his defeat. We need to remember that these writers, having lived through the war, patriotically advocated the Romans as the people who were favoured by the gods because they put Hannibal down. Their men were better. The writers of the second century BC inherited this Hannibalic tradition and perpetuated the image of Hannibal as a man exemplifying Punic treachery. He is, however, able to recognise divine instructions unlike Flaminius, but allows curiosity to get the better of him in the case of Jupiter's command to not look behind him. In terms of 'gender', we have far too little material to

---

<sup>222</sup> Liv. 21.47.4

<sup>223</sup> Liv. 21.46.10

<sup>224</sup> Liv. 21.46.10

<sup>225</sup> Liv. 21.38.5-7 and 26.11.10-11 respectively.

be definitive. It can be deduced however that the arenas in which Roman men found their success or failure, the ones in which men were made, are the only ones in which we find Hannibal.

### *Ciceronian Hannibals*

Cicero's Hannibal is a polemical tool employed to serve the needs of his speeches and treatises. Yet his use of Hannibal offers much concerning general trends in Roman representation of the Carthaginian's career and character. Cicero's approach to history was firmly grounded in his reading of the Latin annalistic tradition, as his citations often demonstrate.<sup>226</sup> He was also interested, like many ancient historians, in presenting historical characters as moral case studies which could be applied to present situations.<sup>227</sup> It was the extraction of knowledge concerning the ways in which past Romans thought, acted and felt which for Cicero made the past a pleasant study.<sup>228</sup> For Cicero, history was in part a study of gendered performances. He tells us in the *De Oratore* that we learn from the lives of the ancestors that *dignitas* is the crowning jewel of one's moral compass.<sup>229</sup> By the display of merit Roman men ascended the *cursus honorum*, and achieved the honors of immortal *gloria* for serving and preserving the state.<sup>230</sup> Those who descended into vice, however, were met with either fines, slavery, exile or death.<sup>231</sup> For Cicero, another lesson of history was to keep one's emotions and bodily desires in check, and refrain from coveting neighbours' possessions.<sup>232</sup> Degradation or enhancement of one's 'gender' performance is Cicero's polemical formula.<sup>233</sup>

---

<sup>226</sup> Rawson (1991: 59)

<sup>227</sup> Mellor (2012: xvi, xxx); Rawson (1991: 61)

<sup>228</sup> Cic. *De Or.* 1.43.193

<sup>229</sup> Cic. *De Or.* 1.43.194

<sup>230</sup> Cic. *De Or.* 1.43.194; Cic. *Sest.* 68.143

<sup>231</sup> Cic. *De Or.* 1.43.194

<sup>232</sup> Cic. *De Or.* 1.43.194

<sup>233</sup> May (1996: 146)

The Hannibal of Ciceronian speeches was an *exemplum*, a constantly evolving character whose portrayal was moulded to suit the Romans with whom he was compared. Cicero used the qualities mentioned above to either praise or attack the character of prominent men and women of his day. Historical personages were thus transformed into *exempla*, and Cicero employed in his literary works those whom his aristocratic audience would not only have recognized, but expected to read about.<sup>234</sup> These examples thus added *auctoritas* and *iucunditas* to his writings.<sup>235</sup> Corbeill establishes that this practice was Cicero's means of "establishing credibility in opposition to his opponents and their supporters".<sup>236</sup> By the first century BC, Hannibal had moved from recent memory into Roman legend as the enemy that might have overcome the Roman Republic. The annalists provided the seeds for the negative tradition that painted Hannibal as a villain, but in the Ciceronian speeches there is evidence of a more positive appraisal of Hannibal's character and skills.

The earliest mention of Hannibal in the speeches occurs in the second oration against Verres, composed and published when Cicero was a "righteous young prosecutor."<sup>237</sup> Verres, governor of Sicily, is labelled a Roman Hannibal.<sup>238</sup> This metaphor is employed immediately following a lengthy denouncement of Verres' activities following his arrival in Syracuse.<sup>239</sup> The mention of Hannibal seems to allude to the general's arrival in Campania and the tradition that the luxuries of Capua corrupted Hannibal's army.<sup>240</sup> Cicero treats this episode in the *De Lege Agraria* as one

---

<sup>234</sup> Rawson (1991: 59)

<sup>235</sup> Rawson (1991: 59)

<sup>236</sup> Corbeill (2002: 198)

<sup>237</sup> Corbeill (2002: 198)

<sup>238</sup> Cic. *Verr.* 2.12.31 *Iste autem Hannibal*

<sup>239</sup> Cic. *Verr.* 2.12.29-30. Verres remains stationary at a single camp as opposed to travelling like other governors (2.12.29). He sets himself up in Hiero's palace and invites large groups of immoral women inside (2.12.30). There is an implication that he engages in sexual immorality. Verres' personality is so corrupt that his son's character begins to mimic his father's (2.12.30). See Calaizis for a detailed discussion of Cicero's oratorical strategy against Verres (2010: 20-21). She concludes that "Cicero's characterisation of Verres as lacking all Roman virtues and as not just immoral but harbouring all Roman vices, leads to Verres' portrayal as a tyrant, an object of hatred, indignation and contempt in Roman society." (2010: 21)

<sup>240</sup> Cic. *Agr.* 1.7.20: *Hannibalem ipsum Capua corrumpit* ; 2.35.96: *deinde ea luxuries, quae ipsum Hannibalem armis etiam tum invictum voluptate vicit.*

of the reasons why a colony should not be established at Capua.<sup>241</sup> The luxury of the Campanian region is so great that Hannibal was defeated by pleasure.<sup>242</sup> The sentiments in the oration to the senatorial jury in 70 BC, and the later one to the people in 63 BC are consistent. In both Hannibal is a powerful enemy brought down by the lure of luxury. He is a politician and general, like Verres, who has been corrupted by the pleasures of a foreign province. Nature and situation bring down a man's character, and Cicero argues that the Carthaginians were brought to ruin by their harbours, which fostered an obsession with trade.<sup>243</sup> This obsession in turn encouraged deceitful traits such as lying and fraud, an allusion to Hannibal's strategic uses of ambush and deception in the Second Punic War.<sup>244</sup> Individuals cannot confine themselves "within the limits and boundaries set by duty in the midst of wealth and great resources".<sup>245</sup> It is evident then that Hannibal is invoked as a man corrupted by the effeminacies of the luxuries within his new environment. Using Hannibal in this way is in keeping with the line of argument Cicero is attempting to persuade his audience to adopt against Verres, and against Rullus, the proposer of the agrarian bill.

In 63 BC, Hannibal's memory was entangled with the politics of the Catilinarian conspiracy. In the *Pro Murena*, Cicero defends the incoming consul for the year 62 BC, Lucius Licinius Murena, against charges of bribery.<sup>246</sup> He appraises the positions of *imperator* and orator as ones with the highest *dignitas*.<sup>247</sup> The latter maintains order throughout peacetime and the former enforces it in war.<sup>248</sup> The point made is against prosecutor Servius Sulpicius Rufus, who was employed as a lawyer while the defendant Murena was serving in the army.<sup>249</sup> In times of war it

---

<sup>241</sup> MacKendrick (1995: 24); Levick provides a good summary of the conditions surrounding the proposition of the Rullan land bill (2015: 42).

<sup>242</sup> Cic. *Agr.* 2.35.96

<sup>243</sup> Cic. *Agr.* 2.35.95

<sup>244</sup> Cic. *Agr.* 2.35.95

<sup>245</sup> Cic. *Agr.* 2.35.97

<sup>246</sup> Cic. *Mur.* 1; MacKendrick (1995: 78-9)

<sup>247</sup> Cic. *Mur.* 30

<sup>248</sup> Cic. *Mur.* 30

<sup>249</sup> Cic. *Mur.* 30-1; MacKendrick (1995: 76)

is good soldiers that are needed to preserve the state, not lawyers.<sup>250</sup> Cicero then rebukes Cato Minor's scorn that the war against Mithridates was one against women, a devaluation of the threat posed by Rome's Eastern enemy.<sup>251</sup> Hannibal is invoked following mention of a string of Roman military victories employed to demonstrate the severity of past threats from mainland Greece, and Cicero deplores Cato's dismissal of the Hellenised East.<sup>252</sup> Lucius Scipio was given the *cognomen* 'Asiaticus' for his victory against Antiochus, an achievement Cicero claims is equally worthy of recognition as Publius Scipio's over Hannibal.<sup>253</sup> Antiochus was treated with prudence, and likewise Mithridates should be regarded as a threat. Mithridates is thus posited as having the potential to become an Eastern Hannibal. Mentioning Hannibal, Pyrrhus and other Greek enemies magnifies the threat of Mithridates. Cicero thus achieves the dual result of emphasising the *gloria* and the *dignitas* of Murena. He argues that it was Murena's service in Lucullus' campaign at Cyzicus which earned him the prestige to be elected consul.<sup>254</sup> Murena should thus be acquitted because of his service to the state against an enemy of the same calibre as Hannibal. Defeating Mithridates, like Hannibal, was a display of personal and national *virtus*.

The Fourth Catilinarian was delivered to the Senate a month after Murena was acquitted of his charges.<sup>255</sup> In this speech Cicero pairs himself with the great generals of Roman history, and Catiline with Rome's enemies.<sup>256</sup> Catiline is an enemy to be vanquished for the sake of the Republic, the same motivation for which the Romans celebrate the victory against Hannibal. It is Scipio's *virtus* that compelled Hannibal to abandon his campaign.<sup>257</sup> Likewise, Cicero implies

---

<sup>250</sup> Cic. *Mur.* 30; Fantham (2013: 126)

<sup>251</sup> Cic. *Mur.* 31: *bellum illud omne Mithridaticum cum mulierculis esse gestum*; Fantham comments that "mulierculis" would have referred to the Asiatics' preferences for surprise skirmishes and ambushes as opposed to pitched battles, which suited Rome's formations (2013: 127). They were also mocked for their clothing and monarchical governments (2013: 128).

<sup>252</sup> Cic. *Mur.* 32

<sup>253</sup> Cic. *Mur.* 31

<sup>254</sup> Cic. *Mur.* 34

<sup>255</sup> MacKendrick (1995: 92)

<sup>256</sup> Cic. *Cat.* 4.21; Odahl succinctly describes Cicero's portrayal of Catiline as the "vicious revolutionary" (2010: 3)

<sup>257</sup> Cic. *Cat.* 4.21: *Sit Scipio clarus ille cuius consilio atque virtute Hannibal in Africam redire atque Italia decedere coactus est.*

that he himself possesses the *virtus* of a general, for as generals conquer foreign enemies, Cicero has quelled one at home.<sup>258</sup> Catiline is thus posited as equivalent to Rome's foreign enemies, who could have overthrown the established order as Hannibal might have done over a century prior. Such a comparison sees Hannibal and Catiline as lesser men, defeated by the *virtus* of Scipio and Cicero respectively.

In the *De Provinciis Consularibus* Cicero asserts that Hannibal had never wished "misfortune" for Rome "as they [Cicero's enemies] have inflicted upon it."<sup>259</sup> The ominous "they" are of course Gabinius and Piso.<sup>260</sup> The speech was an attempt to persuade the Senate to strip the consuls of 58 BC, Aulus Gabinius and L. Calpurnius Piso Caesoninus of their proconsulships in Syria and Macedonia respectively.<sup>261</sup> He firstly assures his audience that his personal grievances with these men over his exile have no bearing on his present opinion, and perhaps this sentiment was as unconvincing to the Senate as it is to us today.<sup>262</sup> Piso is imaged as an incompetent general and governor who has allowed Macedonia to be overrun by Thracians.<sup>263</sup> Gabinius is Semiramis reborn, an effeminate general.<sup>264</sup> Both are blots upon the Republic.<sup>265</sup> The magnitude of Piso and Gabinius' corruption is made clear by the hyperbolic reference to Hannibal, where Cicero portrays him as not wishing to inflict the evils upon Rome that these two governors had.

---

<sup>258</sup> Cic. *Cat.* 4.21

<sup>259</sup> Cic. *Prov.* 2.3

<sup>260</sup> MacKendrick (1995: 289)

<sup>261</sup> Cic. *Prov.* 1.1-2

<sup>262</sup> Cic. *Prov.* 1.2

<sup>263</sup> Cicero offers a comprehensive list of failings. He cleverly weaves a paradoxical portrait, listing the behaviours and traits of character that he will not speak of. Thessalonica was abandoned (2.4). The troops were in disarray (3.5). The situation is summed up as an army paying for the incompetence of its commander: *scelus imperatoris poena exercitus expiatum esse videatur* (3.5). He is then accused of extorting funds from the Achaeans, Dyrrhachium and Byzantium (3.5). Piso goes so far as to steal statues from Byzantium (4.6-7). Cicero concludes by refusing to summarise Piso's vices, and then says: *nihil de superbia, nihil de contumacia, nihil de crudelitate disputo* (4.8).

<sup>264</sup> At the outset Gabinius is given the name of the famous Assyrian queen (4.9). His deviances are listed at 4.9-5.12. See especially 5.11: *sed avaritia, superbia, crudelitate Gabini*.

<sup>265</sup> Cic. *Prov.* 6.13: *imperii maculas teneretis*

Throughout the *Philippics* Mark Antony's character and actions are posited as parallel to or worse than those of Hannibal. As Hall observes, the central aim of the *Philippics* is to oppose and discredit Mark Antony.<sup>266</sup> Hannibal appears in hyperbolic expressions throughout the series. The intent is to use Hannibal to make a point concerning the character of an individual or in a topic for discussion. After Antony threatened to demolish Cicero's house if he did not attend a meeting of the Senate, Cicero rebuked that the business of the day did not match the severity with which his absence was met.<sup>267</sup> Hannibal was not *ad portas* after all.<sup>268</sup> The appearance of Hannibal at Rome's gates would constitute an emergency. The *Thirteenth Philippic* sees Antony himself named a "latter-day Hannibal".<sup>269</sup> The implication is that Antony, like Hannibal, is now *ad portas*. He is a threat to Rome's security.

Hannibal appears in the *Fifth Philippic* within a discussion concerning envoys to be sent to Antony.<sup>270</sup> He was besieging Decimus Iunius Brutus Albinus at Mutina, and Antony's supporters in Rome began to push for peace negotiations.<sup>271</sup> In the Ciceronian style, Decimus Brutus is heralded as a servant of the Republic, while Antony is maligned as "immoderate, irascible, abusive, arrogant, always demanding, always grabbing, always drunk."<sup>272</sup> Cicero then cleverly invokes Hannibal in the statement "*Ergo Hannibal hostis, civis Antonius?*"<sup>273</sup> The cleverness lies in the dual truism in the phrase. Antony is indeed a citizen of the Roman Republic. Hannibal was indeed one of Rome's greatest enemies. Both are facts. The implication is that in besieging Mutina, Antony is behaving like a Roman Hannibal. He is declaring war on the Republic by attacking Mutina, and if he refuses to withdraw as Hannibal did at Saguntum there is no recourse

---

<sup>266</sup> Hall (2002: 273)

<sup>267</sup> Cic. *Phil.* 1.5.11-12. See 1.5.11 for the mention of Hannibal exclusively: *Hannibal, credo, erat ad portas aut de Pyrrhi pace agebatur.*

<sup>268</sup> Cic. *Phil.* 1.5.11

<sup>269</sup> Cic. *Phil.* 13.25

<sup>270</sup> Cic. *Phil.* 5.9.25

<sup>271</sup> Hall (2002: 276)

<sup>272</sup> Cic. *Phil.* 5.9.24

<sup>273</sup> Cic. *Phil.* 5.9.25. See this section also for Cicero arguing that Antony has committed every act of hostility perpetuated by Hannibal. Unlike Antony, however, even Hannibal preserved things for his own use (5.9.25).

other than war.<sup>274</sup> Hannibal is here blamed for the Second Punic War due to his attack on Saguntum, as Antony is for the present conflict with his siege of Mutina.<sup>275</sup> The comparisons continue into the *Sixth Philippic*, with Cicero remarking that the envoy's decree reads as though it were to be delivered into the hands of Hannibal himself.<sup>276</sup> The *Fourteenth Philippic* sees a rhetorical question posed to the audience concerning Antony's treatment of Parma. Cicero brands Antony's treatment of conquered cities as greater in severity than Hannibal's.<sup>277</sup> Given the stories which were circulating concerning Hannibal at Nuceria, this would have been an effective allusion.<sup>278</sup> Cicero then calls for recognition of Antony as a public enemy.<sup>279</sup> These allusions attest to Cicero's adoption of the tradition whereby Hannibal is guilty of *perfidia* and *crudelitas*.

Cicero too employed Hannibal positively to support his arguments. When it suited Cicero, Hannibal could be used as a symbol of military genius, courage and above all manliness. In the *Pro Balbo*, Cicero uses a pronouncement of Hannibal within a discussion of citizenship.<sup>280</sup> Hannibal exhorts his troops before battle, claiming that for him anyone who takes Rome as their

---

<sup>274</sup> Cic. *Phil.* 5.10.27. Julius Caesar was similarly posited as a Roman Hannibal in a letter to Atticus in 49 BC (7.11.1). In light of the fact that he crossed the Rubicon, effectively declaring war on the state, the metaphor invokes the memory of the Ebro crossing: *utrum de imperatore populi Romani an de Hannibale loquimur?* It is noteworthy that Caesar is referred to by Cicero as "*homo*" as opposed to the more honourable *vir* (7.11.1): *o hominem amentem et miserum*.

<sup>275</sup> Cic. *Phil.* 5.10.27

<sup>276</sup> Cic. *Phil.* 6.2.4; Antony's siege of Mutina is once again compared with Hannibal's attack on Saguntum (6.3.6). Antony is also labeled a gladiator (6.2.3). Cicero lists his vices, a trifecta of sins as we saw with Gabinius and Piso (6.3.7). Violence, shamelessness and audacity are Cicero's choice words to describe his opponent: *Novi vinolentiam, novi impudentiam, novi audaciam* (6.3.7). Significantly, Antony is named *homo* and is described as a beast (6.3.7). May (1996: 152) studiously summarises the oratorical metamorphosis of Antony into a beast.

<sup>277</sup> Cic. *Phil.* 14.3.9

<sup>278</sup> Pomeroy quite convincingly argues that the drowning of the Nucerian senators is a fiction originating in the work of Valerius Antias (1989: 174-5). If his hypothetical date of composition is correct, in the early first century BC, then Antias would have been writing during Cicero's early career (1989: 175). Antias' work would have been in current circulation and could likely have been the source of this allusion.

<sup>279</sup> Cic. *Phil.* 14.3.10

<sup>280</sup> Cic. *Balb.* 22.51



enemy is a Carthaginian.<sup>281</sup> Cicero argues that this sentiment should be one common to all commanders, Roman and foreign alike.<sup>282</sup> This is not surprising given that the nature of the speech was a defense of Pompey's decision to grant Lucius Cornelius Balbus Roman citizenship.<sup>283</sup>

In the *Pro Sestio*, Cicero takes a more direct approach in his praise of Hannibal. He calls for Roman youth to emulate the exemplars of Roman history in their pursuit to win honour, and names Hannibal as the most "valued" of the Carthaginians.<sup>284</sup> For MacKendrick this is the core of the speech, where Cicero identifies the *optimates* as the upholders of traditional values, and the protectors of Rome's institutions against populist agendas.<sup>285</sup> It is notable that all of the named Greeks were exiled by the masses.<sup>286</sup> Hannibal too was voted into exile by the Carthaginian assembly.<sup>287</sup> Cicero himself had been recently recalled from exile, with the assistance of Publius Sestius, the man who is defended in the speech.<sup>288</sup> Referring to Hannibal in this instance further supports the argument that leaders standing for Rome's traditional values are the best suited to lead the state.<sup>289</sup> He almost led Carthage to supremacy in the Western Mediterranean, and like his Greek counterparts was remembered for a successful military and political career.<sup>290</sup> The section closes with a pronouncement that all who contributed to the expansion, defence or preservation of Rome deserve *gloria*.<sup>291</sup> Alongside Greeks who received

---

<sup>281</sup> Cicero in fact quotes Ennius. See Cic. *Balb.* 22.51: *Hostem qui feriet mihi erit Karthaginiensis Quisquis erit: quoiatis siet...*

<sup>282</sup> Cic. *Balb.* 22.51

<sup>283</sup> Brunt (1982: 136)

<sup>284</sup> Cic. *Sest.* 68.142

<sup>285</sup> MacKendrick (1995: 206); Stone argues that the *optimates* are not bound by class, but are "all the satisfied elements that stabilise the social order" (2005: 60).

<sup>286</sup> Cic. *Sest.* 68.142

<sup>287</sup> Cic. *Sest.* 68.143

<sup>288</sup> Stone (2005: 59)

<sup>289</sup> MacKendrick (1995: 204)

<sup>290</sup> Cic. *Sest.* 68.143

<sup>291</sup> Cic. *Sest.* 68.143

recognition at Rome, Hannibal is celebrated for his wisdom, valour and achievements.<sup>292</sup> These pursuits were the arenas in which Roman males also sought to demonstrate their worth and earn their place in history.<sup>293</sup> Such qualities were those highly prized by the elite, who believed they exhibited them better than any other Romans. Cicero advocates that the *optimates*, particularly himself, are from the best stock, using Hannibal as a notable example of achievement in strategy, politics and war. It can be deduced then that it was possible for Roman aristocrats to identify with Hannibal, as Cicero does here. His qualities could in fact be admired by Romans, and celebrated as denoting manliness.

The Hannibal of Cicero's philosophical works is also a referential *exemplum*. As an easily recognisable figure he is invoked to support Cicero's discussion of various topics within his essays and treatises. In the *De Oratore* of the 50s BC, Cicero has Quintus Catulus discuss the difference between practical and theoretical knowledge in relation to oratory and the law courts.<sup>294</sup> Catulus denounces instruction from Greek philosophers who had never defended or prosecuted in Roman courts.<sup>295</sup> He cites an instance during Hannibal's exile at the court of Antiochus, when Hannibal supposedly walked out of a lecture given by the Peripatetic philosopher Phormio.<sup>296</sup> Phormio spent several hours discussing the functions of a general, and when asked his opinion of proceedings Hannibal declared that Phormio was a mad man.<sup>297</sup> Catulus concludes that Hannibal was right to denounce the philosopher, because he had no military experience, and dared to lecture Rome's greatest enemy on the topic.<sup>298</sup> Hannibal here seems to be appreciated as a very practical man. A similar story is found in the *De Divinatione*, which sees Hannibal refute auspices at the court of King Prusias, believing himself to be better

---

<sup>292</sup> Cic. *Sest.* 68.142: *Quis Carthaginensium pluris fuit Hannibale consilio, virtute, rebus gestis, qui unus cum tot imperatoribus nostris per tot annos de imperio et de gloria decertavit?*

<sup>293</sup> Hillard (2005: 3); Rawson argues that they were valued only insofar as they contributed to success in war, politics and the law courts (1985: 38).

<sup>294</sup> Cic. *De Or.* 2.18.75

<sup>295</sup> Cic. *De Or.* 2.18.75

<sup>296</sup> Cic. *De Or.* 2.18.75

<sup>297</sup> Cic. *De Or.* 2.18.76

<sup>298</sup> Cic. *De Or.* 2.18.76

experienced to advise the king than divine portents.<sup>299</sup> Hannibal is thus admired by Catulus for his military achievements, and for his practicality. The Carthaginian is, however, dismissive of the auspices, an ignorance most Roman generals would not dare to display.

Hannibal appears quite frequently in discussions of omens and the divine. The *De Divinatione*, a treatise on divination, is a dialogue between Cicero and his brother Quintus Tullius Cicero.<sup>300</sup> The first book, whom Cicero has his brother narrate, is a discussion of arguments for the reliability of divination. Quintus says that the results of divination should be interrogated rather than the causes. Cicero cites Coelius' account of two of Hannibal's dreams, which he read in the history of Silenus.<sup>301</sup> In one dream Hannibal ignores Jupiter's instruction to never look back and views a beast, which his guide tells him is the devastation of Italy.<sup>302</sup> This would have been read as prophesying Hannibal's invasion, and is in keeping with the accusations of destructive behaviour and cruelty that were leveled against him.<sup>303</sup> In the same passage, Hannibal is *homo acutus* for heeding Juno's warning not to remove the golden column from her temple.<sup>304</sup> Cicero presumably uses *homo* rather than *vir* due to Hannibal's Carthaginian birth. Gaius Flaminius' defeat and death at the Battle of Lake Trasimene is explained by Quintus as owing to ignorance of unfavourable auspices.<sup>305</sup> Such a story was possibly circulated to quell Roman embarrassment at the shattering defeat, but Roman observance of *religio* should not be understated. Cicero then refutes these arguments in the second book, which he narrates himself. Of Hannibal's dreams he says that it is impossible to ascertain the accuracy of these reported dreams because they were experienced by others, and could likely be fabrications.<sup>306</sup> In the case of Flaminius' defeat at

---

<sup>299</sup> Cic. *Div.* 2.24.52

<sup>300</sup> Cic. *Div.* 1.5.8; The dialogue is set at Marcus Cicero's villa in Tuscum; See also MacKendrick (1989: 185).

<sup>301</sup> Cic. *Div.* 1.24.48-9; Pelling sees the *De Divinatione* as a site where the authenticity of dreams as sources is contested. See Pelling (1997: 201).

<sup>302</sup> Cic. *Div.* 1.24.49

<sup>303</sup> Pelling (1997: 197) argues that "Ancient audiences were primed to expect dreams to be prophetic, to come from outside and give knowledge, however ambiguously, of the future..."

<sup>304</sup> Cic. *Div.* 1.24.48

<sup>305</sup> Cic. *Div.* 1.35.77

<sup>306</sup> Cic. *Div.* 2.67.136; Cicero sets out arguments for and against each type of divination across the two books of *De Divinatione*, the same method he employed in the *De Natura Deorum* (*Div.* 1.4.7).

Trasimene, Cicero argues it would have occurred even if he had heeded the auspices.<sup>307</sup> For if fate rules humanity, his defeat was preordained, and unchangeable.<sup>308</sup> Hannibal is used by Quintus as an *exemplum*, someone who had experienced divinatory dreams, with eventuating portents. For Cicero, Hannibal's dreams are *exempla* of the suspicious nature of divination, for they cannot be certain that what is reported to have been dreamed is accurate.

Cicero's *De Natura Deorum* is a discussion of the nature of Rome's gods and their influence over Roman life.<sup>309</sup> The setting is the home of Gaius Aurelius Cotta (cos. 75 BC).<sup>310</sup> Cicero has Cotta narrate the third book, which is an academic critique of Stoic theological views.<sup>311</sup> Cotta poses a question concerning the gods' care for moral goodness: if the gods cared for good men, why do wicked men prosper?<sup>312</sup> Marcus Claudius Marcellus was the first Roman to defeat Hannibal, but the latter got his revenge by defeating and killing his foe in an ambush.<sup>313</sup> Cicero concludes that there is not enough time to recount the list of "*boni*" that have met bad ends.<sup>314</sup> Hannibal is thus posited here as a wicked human, whose evil intent was permitted to manifest by the gods' refusal to interfere.

Discussions of various themes concerning character also frequently feature Hannibal as an example. In the *De Officiis* the legitimacy of oaths sworn to enemies is discussed at length.<sup>315</sup> Cicero argues that Romans who swear an oath, even to enemies, are bound to keep them.<sup>316</sup> The men who sought to undermine and manipulate the conditions of their sworn oath to return to Hannibal's camp, if they could not arrange their ransom with the Roman Senate, were degraded

---

<sup>307</sup> Cic. *Div.* 2.8.21

<sup>308</sup> Cic. *Div.* 2.8.21

<sup>309</sup> MacKendrick (1989: 169)

<sup>310</sup> Cic. *N. D.* 1.6.15

<sup>311</sup> MacKendrick (1989: 177)

<sup>312</sup> Cic. *N. D.* 3.32.79

<sup>313</sup> Cic. *N. D.* 3.32.80

<sup>314</sup> Cic. *N. D.* 3.32.81

<sup>315</sup> Cic. *Off.* 1.13.39

<sup>316</sup> Cic. *Off.* 1.13.39

by the censors for their immoral conduct.<sup>317</sup> Cicero expands this point by stating that manipulating the words of an oath does not release one from the spirit in which it was made.<sup>318</sup> It is only fitting that this pronouncement should be preceded by criticising Hannibal for excessive cruelty, and the Carthaginians for breaking treaties.<sup>319</sup> The tradition of Hannibal as treaty breaker is most likely drawn from the Latin annalists. It is ironic that Cicero uses an oath sworn to a notorious oath-breaker to illustrate that morality lies in being true to one's word. This trope of Hannibal however is in keeping with Cicero's later characterisation of the Carthaginian as cunning.<sup>320</sup> Hannibal here is compared with Rome's Quintus Fabius Maximus, who against the wishes of the Senate deployed a more passive strategy, relying on quick attacks and harassment tactics.<sup>321</sup>

In most cases, the Romans who fought against Hannibal are canonised as heroes and symbols of *virtus* for having defeated the man who could have brought Rome down. Cicero glorifies their character while slandering that of Hannibal. Hannibal's character is also juxtaposed with Quintus Fabius Maximus in the *De Senectute*.<sup>322</sup> Fabius Maximus is the heroic general who by his strategy harassed Hannibal, and despite his old age, recaptured Tarentum with the vigor of a young man.<sup>323</sup> The point being made is that despite his age he was able to check a youthful general. Age is not to be discounted; age can be virtuous. In Cicero, Hannibal is also compared with the man who would ultimately end his campaign in Africa: Publius Cornelius Scipio. In the *De Finibus* it is posited that those who value honour and morality must take risks in their

---

<sup>317</sup> Cic. *Off.* 1.13.40; See also 3.32.113-14

<sup>318</sup> Cic. *Off.* 1.13.40

<sup>319</sup> Cic. *Off.* 1.12.38; As Dyck notes, most ancient writers dependent on Roman sources perpetuate Hannibal as the cruel general. See (1996: 149). He cites Liv. 21.4.9; Diod. Sic. 26.14.1-2 and App. *Hann.* 27-8, 59-60 as examples. Cicero puts this accusation of Hannibal's cruelty into the mouth of Quintus Mucius Scaevola the Augur at *Amic.* 8.28, contrasted with Pyrrhus who is portrayed as displaying leniency. The Romans however were not fighting for their survival when Pyrrhus landed in Italy.

<sup>320</sup> Cic. *Off.* 1.30.108

<sup>321</sup> Cic. *Off.* 1.30.108. Hoyos gives a concise summary of Fabius' engagements with Hannibal (2008: 53-6).

<sup>322</sup> Cic. *Sen.* 4.10-11

<sup>323</sup> Cic. *Sen.* 4.10-11

cause.<sup>324</sup> Scipio is one such man, and his campaign against Hannibal preserved the Roman state. Scipio is represented here as the man to defeat Hannibal because he was more honorable and virtuous than his opponent.

Cicero's Hannibal is thus a tool for his polemic. Hannibal was for Cicero an easily recognizable paradigm for cruelty and cunning creativity, a tradition established by the annalists. In Cicero's speeches 'masculinity' is degraded or enhanced by polemic, and as a result, they can be considered 'gendered' representations. Men such as Antony and Catiline were turned into savage beasts, whereas Murena and Sestius were raised to esteemed generals. This was achieved by manipulating traits of Roman 'masculinity' relative to the context of the individual under discussion, and the speech generally. Similarly, in the essays and philosophical treatises Hannibal is used in the discussion of topics ranging from oaths to the divine. Hannibal even appears as an *exemplum* in discussions of rhetorical strategy.<sup>325</sup> Believing in the old order, and its traditional values, it is not surprising that Cicero should embrace conventional tropes. Hannibal is generally characterised by the orator as cruel and cunning. Drawing from Coelius Antipater, however, Cicero has perpetuated the conception of Hannibal as observant of divinatory signs delivered via dreams. In Cicero Hannibal is also celebrated for his competent generalship. Hannibal would more than likely have been remembered with a begrudging respect, for in the true sentiment of the *De Officiis* 1.12.38, the Romans fought Hannibal for survival. Honour was afforded by his defeat. Hannibal thus could be said to be a symbol of enemy *virtus*, although Cicero is too proudly patriotic to use the term in reference to the Carthaginian general. It is, in part, the challenge posed to Roman authority by Hannibal's competent generalship that echoes throughout Cicero's orations.

---

<sup>324</sup> Cic. *Fin.* 2.17.56 and 5.24.70

<sup>325</sup> Cic. *Inv.* 1.12.17 and *Fin.* 4.9.22. The *Rhetorica ad Herennium* which is attributed to Cicero also utilises Hannibal in this manner. See 3.2 for a discussion of deliberative speeches.

## CHAPTER FOUR: LIVY'S HANNIBAL

An entire thesis could be written on the portrayal of Hannibal in Livy alone. Another could be written on the use of speeches to characterise the Carthaginian. There is insufficient space in the present thesis to cover all aspects of Hannibal in Livy in addition to the other Roman sources surveyed. Therefore this thesis will not explore the complicated mechanics of the Alpine crossing, or Hannibal's grand strategy, but will contrast direct and indirect character portraits to determine if Livy's Hannibal is a 'gendered' representation.

### *Livy and His History*

Livy's ten book narrative of the Second Punic War is the longest account of the conflict that survives in Latin, often compared to Polybius' in Greek. Hannibal is a prominent figure in what historians have called "The Third Decade". Livy, however, saw his history quite differently, as a 'monument' of success and failure.<sup>326</sup> As with the speeches and books of Cicero, there is a clear interest in history as a provider of moral exemplars.<sup>327</sup> The reader is to choose which of Rome's illustrious politicians and generals to emulate, noting that these choices may have an impact on the future of the state.<sup>328</sup> Deeds and strategies which were "shameful in the conception and shameful in the result" should be avoided.<sup>329</sup> Livy was speaking to a male aristocratic readership, which held the future of Rome in their hands. If they so chose to follow the example of the Gracchi, and attempt radical reform, the message is that it will be disastrous.<sup>330</sup> Not only will misfortune befall their person and *familia*, but the state may be irrevocably affected by their actions. The value of history to the Romans was insofar as it could be of benefit to the conduct of politics and war, and

---

<sup>326</sup> Liv. *Praef.* 10; Feldherr provides an insightful discussion of the implications and effects of Livy's visual imagery. See (1998: 1-3). He argues that Livy's use of the term "*monumentum*" is indicative as a "statement of purpose aligning [Livy's] work with several strands of the historiographical tradition that employed vision as a model for the audience's reception of the historian's text." (1998: 6)

<sup>327</sup> Liv. *Praef.* 10

<sup>328</sup> Liv. *Praef.* 10

<sup>329</sup> Liv. *Praef.* 10

<sup>330</sup> Walsh indeed argues that this is the moral turning point in Livy's narrative, where the decline of Rome's morality begins a downward spiral into the civil wars of the first century BC (1966: 116).

thus advancing the interests of the state.<sup>331</sup> History then, was a catalogue of appropriate and inappropriate displays of virtue. As we have seen in Chapter Two, ‘gender’ was a significant indicator of appropriateness when one’s performance was viewed by the community.

The representations of Hannibal analysed thus far have either been too fragmentary for a lengthy commentary, or are comparative examples which tell us more about the portrait of the Roman being depicted than Hannibal himself. In this extensive work, Hannibal is one of Rome’s starring antagonists in the spectacle that is Livy’s history. Romans performed a variety of social rituals every day, and as has been demonstrated, these were ‘gendered’ performances.<sup>332</sup> Livy situates his readership as an audience watching the narrative of Republican Rome as a spectacle unfolding before them.<sup>333</sup> Hannibal is an actor in this spectacle, as are the Romans he engages in battle. Moral messages are relayed to Livy’s audience via the deeds and misdeeds of the ‘actors’ and the speeches Livy scripts clarify the meaning of the performance.<sup>334</sup> As we shall see, Livy’s moralising characterisation of Hannibal and Roman generals can discourage individuality of representation.<sup>335</sup> Livy’s lack of experience in public and military life forced him to rely too closely upon his source material, which accounts for the appearance of conventional portrayals.<sup>336</sup> It would be unwise, however, to discount Livy based on this factor, particularly as the names of most contemporary historians are also absent from political campaigns and military service lists. Experience aside, Livy’s moralising focus allows for the contrasting of characters who exemplified the specific traits and qualities of manhood. The application of those traits to the spheres of politics and war qualifies as Livy’s construction of a ‘gendered’ performance in which men either stamped their names onto history, or were condemned to ill-repute and ridicule.

---

<sup>331</sup> Balsdon (1979: 7)

<sup>332</sup> Feldherr (1998: 13)

<sup>333</sup> Feldherr (1998: 13)

<sup>334</sup> Walsh (1967: 103). Burck noted that the dramatic quality of Livy’s work derives from the assumed general knowledge of the audience (1971: 25-6). They know that Rome will win the war, but the drama is created by reading and assessing the impact of the actors’ deeds upon the unfolding spectacle.

<sup>335</sup> Walsh (1967: 88)

<sup>336</sup> Walsh (1967: 138). This reliance may lead Livy to make several mistakes in chronology, although this may have been due to the conversion of dates from the Greek Olympiad system to the Roman calendar. See Burck (1971: 36). Burck favours using Polybius over Livy for the battles of the Second Punic War, as the former’s military experience affords him a better position to treat such proceedings (1971: 38).



Born in Patavium around 59 BC, Livy had no political or military career that would have attracted other authors to his personal life.<sup>337</sup> As a result, we know very little about him. His city, however, was admired by Strabo as a thriving commercial centre, the home of 500 men of equestrian rank.<sup>338</sup> Patavium could be reached from the sea by a river that ran through the marshes, and the coastline boasted a large port.<sup>339</sup> The commercial life of the city was vibrant and the chief product was textiles.<sup>340</sup> Strabo explicitly states that these products were transported to Rome for sale.<sup>341</sup> We can get a sense of Patavium's political values too, as the citizens refused to admit Antony's legates in 43 BC.<sup>342</sup> Walsh's statement that Livy came from a city "with a considerable population, proud of its traditions and with the educational facilities which its wealth would assure" is very apropos.<sup>343</sup> Despite what we do not know about his life, it is evident that he was not born in a backwater, and the ancients thought his work exemplary. Seneca the Younger ranked Livy as one of "the three great masters of eloquence."<sup>344</sup> Tacitus praises Livy's "eloquence and candour", commenting that his Pompeian sympathies incited Augustus' criticism.<sup>345</sup> Quintilian regarded Livy's history as suitable reading for boys to familiarise themselves with the basics of Roman history, preferable to Sallust who should be read at an advanced level.<sup>346</sup> He too praises Livy's eloquence, particularly his speeches.<sup>347</sup> The *Ab Urbe Condita* inspired a succession of histories, notably those by Florus, Eutropius and Orosius, who closely followed Livy's work in the composition of their own historical narratives.

---

<sup>337</sup> Walsh (1967: 1) and (1966: 118)

<sup>338</sup> Strab. 5.1.7

<sup>339</sup> Strab. 5.1.7

<sup>340</sup> Strab. 5.1.7 and 5.1.12

<sup>341</sup> Strab. 5.1.7

<sup>342</sup> Cic. *Phil.* 12.4.10. Walsh (1967: 2) argues that this is indicative of a local pro-senatorial sentiment in this period. He sees Livy's statement concerning *libertas* at the opening of the second book as reflecting an ongoing theme and indicative of a conservative viewpoint grounded in his Patavian upbringing (Walsh 1966: 118). Livy's nostalgia in recording the achievements of Rome's ancestors also supports this hypothesis (Liv. *Praef.* 5).

<sup>343</sup> Walsh (1967: 2)

<sup>344</sup> Sen. *Ep.* 100.9

<sup>345</sup> Tac. *Ann.* 4.34

<sup>346</sup> Quint. *Inst.* 2.5.18-19

<sup>347</sup> Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.101. Feldherr argues that this could indicate ancient audiences found Livy's visual imagery particularly appealing, and "deeply embedded...in ancient conceptions of narrative style." See (1998: 4).

### *Introduction and Direct Characterisation*

Hannibal's entrance onto Livy's stage signals a rise in Carthage's fortunes after their losses in the First Punic War, and commences, what was for Livy, Rome's greatest test.<sup>348</sup> The first book of the Third Decade, the twenty-first book in the entire history, is concerned with characterising Hannibal as a warrior, a politician and a man. Hannibal has very clear role models in his father and brother-in-law. Before Hamilcar leaves for Spain he has a nine year old Hannibal swear an oath at a sacrificial altar that he will "be the declared enemy of the Roman people."<sup>349</sup> Like his father, Hannibal is a *hostis* of the Roman people. Hamilcar fought the Romans in the First Punic War, and Hannibal will fight them in the Second in fulfilment of his oath to his father, and presumably to Baal.<sup>350</sup> Hamilcar's "proud spirit" was continuously tortured by the losses of the first war.<sup>351</sup> The Carthaginians had been forced to cede their Sicilian holdings to the Romans.<sup>352</sup> Subsequently, the Romans intervened in a mercenary crisis in Sardinia and managed to seize the island from the Carthaginians by deception, and impose an additional indemnity upon the already disgruntled people.<sup>353</sup> Hamilcar's hostility was justified, and for Livy, it is the bond between father and son that was the impetus for the Second Punic War.<sup>354</sup> Unlike Romans who emulate

---

<sup>348</sup> Livy calls the war the "most memorable of all wars ever waged" (21.1.1). One of the reasons it was so memorable was because "those who ultimately conquered had been nearer ruin" (21.1.2). Similar sentiments are expressed by Florus in the opening of his section on the Second Punic War. See Flor. 1.22.6.2.

<sup>349</sup> Liv. 21.1.4-5: *altaribus admotum tactis sacris iure iurando adactum se cum primum posset hostem fore populo Romano*. Hoyos observes that Livy represents this as the one oath that Hannibal took seriously (2015: 457). Rossi argues that "identification with his family" drove his will for war against the Romans (2004: 367). See Hoyos (2003: 53-54) for a discussion of the oath and Hannibal's identification with Hamilcar, "for whom no doubt he felt a blend of love, admiration and awe" (53).

<sup>350</sup> Hoyos (2003: 53)

<sup>351</sup> Liv. 21.1.5

<sup>352</sup> Liv. 21.1.5

<sup>353</sup> Liv. 21.1.5. Florus recounts the same reasons for Hamilcar's hatred of the Romans (1.22.6.1-3). Hannibal declares he will exact vengeance on the Romans (1.22.6.3). Nepos has Hannibal swear to never enter into friendship with the Romans (*Hann.* 23.2). Eutropius omits the oath to Hamilcar in the opening of his narrative and skips to the siege of Saguntum (3.7). Orosius, however, includes it as the only oath Hannibal keeps (4.14.3).

<sup>354</sup> Rossi (2004: 367). The oath is taken in a private setting, and establishes familial hatred of the Romans as opposed to civic, which later allows Livy to pin the entire war upon Hannibal individually. Carthage can therefore as a people

the civic virtues of their fathers, Hannibal models his behaviour on vice. As a man he has chosen the wrong role models in his youth, adopting hatred of Rome as his motivation, which will have disastrous consequences for all involved.

Hannibal is one of the few characters in Livy's history to receive a direct characterisation upon being introduced in the narrative. His arrival in Spain to take up training under Hasdrubal is reminiscent of the Roman *tirocinium* and *contubernium*.<sup>355</sup> As a teenage adolescent embarking upon his military career, Hannibal is mentored by his brother-in-law, under whom he serves.<sup>356</sup> The army immediately takes a liking to Hannibal, and Livy characterises the boy as the mirror image of his father in physique and disposition.<sup>357</sup> Training in Spain serves to harden Hannibal, to make him the kind of man the Romans can compare with their own generals. The Roman *vir* is hard, austere, intelligent and thus in possession of *virtus*. Hannibal is described as able to obey his superiors and command subordinates.<sup>358</sup> Bodily pleasures and desires are muted and he only indulges in enough food to sustain himself.<sup>359</sup> In the true image of the ideal Roman male citizen, Hannibal wears the common soldier's cloak, and sleeps on the rough Spanish ground.<sup>360</sup> Like Romans seeking to imitate their role models, he exemplifies the virtues of Hamilcar but is able to forge his own reputation among the army.<sup>361</sup> Given his later successes on the battlefield, it is likely that Livy sought to shape Hannibal in this section, demonstrating how he was hardened into the force the Romans would later face. While Cicero uses *homo* to identify Hannibal's lesser

---

be absolved of blame. See Rossi's discussion of Hannibal's oath in comparison to that of Scipio Africanus, which is seen as one of civic duty, in service of the Republic (2004: 366-7).

<sup>355</sup> Liv. 21.3.2-3

<sup>356</sup> Liv. 21.4.10

<sup>357</sup> Liv. 21.4.2. Hannibal possesses the same charisma and intimidating glare that characterised Hamilcar, as well as "countenance and features".

<sup>358</sup> Liv. 21.4.3-5. Hannibal is thus able to obey the commands of his superior, but has of the charisma and assertiveness to lead when required. Livy marvels at Hannibal's ability to command an army with no unifying language, mission or purpose, other than their obvious belief in their general (28.12.1-9). Livy judges that at that point, having successfully waged war in his enemy's homeland for thirteen years, is worthy of admiration, believing Hannibal to be "more marvellous in adversity than in success" (28.12.3).

<sup>359</sup> Liv. 21.4.6

<sup>360</sup> Liv. 21.4.7-8

<sup>361</sup> Liv. 21.4.2-3

‘masculinity’, Livy here uses *vir*, and names these admirable qualities: *virtutes*.<sup>362</sup> In terms of military capability, Hannibal seems to be presented as competent, hard and manly.<sup>363</sup> He possesses *virtus* in the form of martial courage and ability.

Livy does not, however, see Hannibal as the perfect *vir*, embodying all the ‘masculine’ virtues of the Romans. Hannibal remains a *hostis*, and unlike his Roman counterparts possesses “monstrous vices”.<sup>364</sup> Livy lists *crudelitas* and *perfidia* as Hannibal’s character defects.<sup>365</sup> In sum, Hannibal is cruel, disrespectful of oaths and he has no religious scruples (*nulla religio*).<sup>366</sup> When compared with the much lengthier, almost panegyric account of Hannibal’s strengths, we can observe quite a complicated ‘gendered’ portrait. Contrary to the stereotypically barbarous, cruel and hard

---

<sup>362</sup> Liv. 21.4.9. McDonnell posits that exhibiting *virtus* was the “ideal behaviour of a man” (2006: 2). As Rome gradually became involved in overseas wars more frequently the term became associated ever more with military performance and martial courage (2006: 8, 180-81). Masterson more recently argues that it was “in service to the state, in military endeavor, that a Roman man could demonstrate his manhood” (2013: 22). If the criteria for manliness were so defined by military achievement, it is not surprising that on the eve of war, Hannibal should be posited as manly. He had not yet committed any crimes against the Romans, and had successfully fought under his superiors in Spain for many years. By Roman standards this was a respectable position. It was not until Hannibal’s *virtus* infringed upon Roman interests that his activities could be characterised as *perfidia* (Brizzi: 2010: 484).

<sup>363</sup> Lazenby sees Hannibal’s generalship as the most accessible aspect of his person, arguing that in terms of character, “we really do not know what sort of person Hannibal was” (1978: 255). He concludes that up to Cannae Hannibal’s campaigning was “masterly” (1978: 256). Hoyos gives an invaluable discussion of the equivocal nature of Livy’s portrayal of both Hannibal and Carthage (2015: 455-58).

<sup>364</sup> Liv. 21.4.9

<sup>365</sup> Liv. 21.4.9-10

<sup>366</sup> As regards *crudelitas*, Brizzi is right to conclude that there is no doubt Hannibal and his troops committed acts of cruelty while on campaign (2010: 484). Even if Hannibal did not commit them himself, Brizzi argues, he probably tolerated them to a degree (2010: 484). Then again, we can consider cruelty to be subjective and relative. Consider the incident where Hannibal crucified a guide who incorrectly led him to Casilinum instead of Casinum (Liv. 22.13.8-9). It could be postulated that this was a measure to prevent further incompetence and promote efficiency lest further errors lead to unaffordable setbacks. On the contrary, it could be argued that this was a rash decision made out of anger. Either could have been a possibility. Hannibal’s cruelty is known to have been exaggerated by the Roman writers in any event. Pomeroy (1989: 175-76) discusses the fictitious drowning of the senators of Nuceria in his article. See Pomeroy (1989: 175-76). Livy omits the story and has the Nuceria senators scattering throughout Campania after starvation compels them to surrender to Hannibal (23.15.5-6). This demonstrates that Livy thought the allegations were either untrustworthy or not worth mentioning.

enemy we have observed in the annalistic and Ciceronian tradition, Livy presents a more human Hannibal.<sup>367</sup> He displays *virtus* in the form of military courage, and performs his role as the ideal military commander. While Hannibal possesses *virtus* in the military sphere, nevertheless his disposition is substandard to the Roman measure.<sup>368</sup> Respectable Roman generals observed the auspices, respected oaths, and reacted with appropriate degrees of clemency and severity as circumstances dictated.<sup>369</sup> Hannibal's manifestation of an idealised Roman 'masculinity' with what is essentially a 'barbarian' personality sets the scene for all of the Carthaginian general's performances throughout Livy's history. It is also what makes Hannibal the ferocious bogeyman expressed by the proverbial threat: *Hannibal ad portas*. Hannibal has the military competency of any Roman general, but a lack of morality which is unrestricted, and unpredictable. It is perhaps

---

<sup>367</sup> Walsh studiously argued thus: "[h]ere Livy depicts a character more human and worthy of respect than that which is painted by the earlier tradition" (1967: 104). Levene more recently posited that the portrayal of Roman generals in Livy conforms to archetypal "rash commanders" or "cautious commanders" (2010: 165). He sees Livy's characters as lacking individual characterisation (2010: 165). He praises Euripides, Virgil, Tacitus and Plutarch as sources who achieve what he believes Livy does not (2010: 166). I fear that Levene's line of argument falls short here. Not only does Livy's work differ in genre to that of three of the aforementioned examples, but also in scope. I must concur with the observations made by Hoyos in a review of the work, that there are more opportunities for character development in self-contained narratives offered by biography, poems, plays and histories of a smaller scope (2013: 531). If Levene had turned to Livy's preface he could also have considered the questions that Livy himself wanted his audience to ask of the material he presented (See above). He could also have improved his hypothesis by considering if the Romans read Livy's characters as psychologically complex and showing development across the narrative of the Third Decade. As this thesis argues, there is evidence of a 'gendered' shift in the portrayal of Hannibal, which amounts to more than a series of connected stereotypes.

<sup>368</sup> Liv. 21.4.10

<sup>369</sup> Quintus Fabius Maximus is depicted as observing the auspices, respecting his enemy enough to know how to handle him, and displaying clemency towards the citizens of Casilinum. See Liv 22.9.7 for Fabius' criticism of Flaminius not observing the auspices, attributing it as the cause of his failure; 22. 39.13 for advice he gives to Lucius Aemilius Paullus (cos. 216) regarding appropriate ways to handle Hannibal; 24.9.8-9 for treatment of Casilinum contrasted with the brutality of Marcellus. Fabius also displayed significant confidence and kept a level head in the wake of the disaster at Cannae, mobilising the Roman response. See Liv. 22.55.1-2. Scipio Africanus, however, is the embodiment of these traits, swearing an oath after Cannae never to desert the Republic (Liv. 22.53.10-11). See Rossi (2004: 362) arguing that "Scipio becomes the embodiment of Roman *virtus*..." Note, more recently, Masterson's statement that Scipio is posited as a "singular hero, who is an example for all other good Roman men..." See Masterson (2013: 26).

because Livy is writing after the civil wars, and can reflect upon the careers of Roman generals like Sulla and Marius that such a combination becomes possible. Hannibal can be both the great commander and savage barbarian.

### *Hannibal against Publius Cornelius Scipio*

The ‘gendered’ portrait established by Hannibal’s introduction marks the beginning of an evolving spectacle of military performance throughout the third Decade. Livy builds upon this initial foundation by indirect characterisations through deeds and speeches. Where no speeches or dialogue are present, we must rely entirely upon the actions of Hannibal and his opponents. Livy does not compose any speeches like those at the Ticinus until the final clash at Zama, although undoubtedly Hannibal and the Roman generals undoubtedly delivered them elsewhere. Hannibal fought many engagements, but those at the Ticinus, Trebia, Trasimene and Cannae are the four that were remembered by the Romans as great defeats. Zama was the great victory. Thus Hannibal’s performance of ‘masculinity’ in these battles is of crucial importance to his portrayal in Livy’s overall narrative.

Even allowing for the brief skirmish at the Rhone, it is more appropriate to name the battle at the Ticinus as the first serious engagement between the Romans and Hannibal, and it, of course, took place on Italian soil.<sup>370</sup> Livy’s narrative presents a Hannibal who is under no delusions about the enemy he faces.<sup>371</sup> Publius Cornelius Scipio is presented as one who does not dismiss Hannibal by virtue of the *audacia* he displayed in crossing the Alps.<sup>372</sup> Before the battle, each general delivers a speech to his men. Livy here contradicts his earlier picture of their mutual respect for each other by having each commander denounce the other, although we typically expect this to have been a feature of such dialogues. Both Hannibal and Scipio would in reality have used such language to instil their troops with the confidence to fight. Additionally, each side faced a precarious situation. Scipio had never led the legions under his command, and they were

---

<sup>370</sup> Publius Cornelius Scipio is noted as the first to face Hannibal in Italy. See Liv. 21.39.10

<sup>371</sup> Liv. 21.39.7-9

<sup>372</sup> Liv. 21.39.9

comprised of raw recruits.<sup>373</sup> Hannibal's army had only recently descended the Alps into the Po Valley, and had been convalescing after the difficult journey, helping itself to the pickings of the countryside.<sup>374</sup>

Each general verbally attacks his enemy on 'gendered' terms. Scipio portrays Hannibal as *furiosus iuvenis*, the leader of a defeated nation that cannot hope to overcome the *virtus* of the Romans who fight for the preservation of their state and the freedom of their families.<sup>375</sup> Moreover, the Alpine crossing has all but delivered the Carthaginians to the Romans, for they are "shadows of men".<sup>376</sup> Scipio blames Hannibal for the war, for breaking not only the treaty of Hasdrubal, but the one signed by Hamilcar at the end of the First Punic War.<sup>377</sup> Given this treachery, it is only right that the gods have left Hannibal in his weakened state for the Romans to defeat.<sup>378</sup> The invasion of Italy is likened to a war against slaves, and Scipio suggests the Romans should fight the Carthaginians as such.<sup>379</sup> Hannibal argues, on the contrary, that the Romans have no right to dictate limits for Carthaginian expansion.<sup>380</sup> They have already stolen Sicily and Sardinia, and if they are not stopped will one day encroach upon Spain.<sup>381</sup> Rather than invoking the gods, Hannibal rests his argument with fortune.<sup>382</sup> If fortune is with them, they will succeed; if not, his men must die an honourable death.<sup>383</sup> Additionally, Scipio has no familiarity with his current forces, and has only been a general in the field for the previous six months.<sup>384</sup>

---

<sup>373</sup> Livy states directly that they are "raw recruits" (21.39.3). He has Publius Cornelius Scipio state in his speech that he chose to come and lead them in the defence of Italy because they had not yet seen battle (21.40.4).

<sup>374</sup> Liv. 29.31.1-2

<sup>375</sup> See Liv. 21.41.13 for Hannibal as *furiosus iuvenis*. Roman *virtus* is emphasised by Livy at 21.41.16-17.

<sup>376</sup> Liv. 21.40.9. The Latin reads: *Effigies immo, umbrae hominum ...*

<sup>377</sup> Liv. 21.40.11 and 21.41.8-9

<sup>378</sup> Liv. 21.40.11

<sup>379</sup> Livy (21.41.6-7) denounces the Carthaginians as a defeated people, payers of tribute to the superior Romans. The Carthaginians are directly called slaves at 21.41.10.

<sup>380</sup> Liv. 21.44.5-7

<sup>381</sup> Liv. 21.44.5: Adler posits that these moralising concerns are interesting because they are placed in the mouth of a notorious enemy, and that the speech could still have been an effective piece of *oratio recta* without these arguments (2011: 98).

<sup>382</sup> Liv. 21.43.7-10 and 21.44.8

<sup>383</sup> Liv. 21.44.8

<sup>384</sup> Liv. 21.43.15

Although under Scipio's command, his troops are not really 'his' men. Each man argues for a moral and practical reason why their side will be the victors in the battle, why they are better men.

Of more interest is the way in which Livy has each man present himself. Scipio states that he could have chosen to fight Hasdrubal in Spain, his allotted province.<sup>385</sup> Instead, he has consciously made the decision to travel to the Po, to personally lead the defence of Italy against the greater threat.<sup>386</sup> Livy thus has Scipio simultaneously denounce Hannibal's character to inspire his troops, and magnify his threat as an enemy. The latter brings Scipio all the more *gloria* for facing Hannibal head on. The same strategy can be observed in Hannibal's speech. Hannibal posits himself as the "foster son" of the Spanish and Carthaginian troops in his army.<sup>387</sup> The army has observed his feats and knows what he is made of, and he too knows their courage. He and his troops are battle-hardened by their years in Spain, fighting the Alpine tribes and crossing the Alps themselves.<sup>388</sup> Thus Hannibal is constructed as believing he has the experience and rapport with his troops to be formidable. He is the man to take Scipio and the Romans down. Across both addresses it is vigour and *virtus* that are at stake. Livy has these two men pitted in a competition of manliness. Indeed, it is a contest that Hannibal will win, for he achieved victory by a well-timed cavalry manoeuvre.<sup>389</sup> Scipio was wounded, saved only by his son, the future Scipio Africanus.<sup>390</sup> At the Ticinus, Hannibal was the better man, the one whose *virtus* was able to carry the day.

### *Hannibal against Tiberius Sempronius Longus and Gaius Flaminius*

At the Trebia and at Trasimene we see a continuation of this 'gendered' contest. Livy attempts to mute the fact that the Romans were twice led into ambushes, both resulting in defeat, and

---

<sup>385</sup> Liv. 21.41.2

<sup>386</sup> Liv. 21.41.2

<sup>387</sup> Liv. 21.43.17-18

<sup>388</sup> Liv. 21.43.15

<sup>389</sup> Liv. 21.46.7

<sup>390</sup> Liv. 21.46.8



attribute Punic victory to unfavourable weather conditions.<sup>391</sup> At the Trebia, a wounded Scipio was reinforced by his consular colleague Tiberius Sempronius Longus.<sup>392</sup> Here we see the first of many divisions of opinion concerning the one major theme of the third Decade: the most appropriate way to handle Hannibal and achieve victory. Scipio is the voice of caution whereas Sempronius dismisses his advice as unnecessary hesitation, timidity and the psychological effects of having been wounded in battle.<sup>393</sup> Sempronius' eagerness grows after a minor victory against looters in the countryside, and Livy attributes such rashness to a hunger for *gloria*, in the lead up to the coming elections.<sup>394</sup> If he waited too long, new consuls would have the honour of victory.<sup>395</sup> Reacting to information provided by Gallic informants, Hannibal cleverly manipulated the disposition of his new foe.<sup>396</sup> Utilising the river Trebia as effectively as any weapon, Hannibal had a combined force of cavalry and infantry under Mago's command conceal themselves in its marshy banks.<sup>397</sup> Sempronius is lured into battle and his troops pursue Hannibal's forces across the Trebia.<sup>398</sup>

What results is a battle whereby hungry, fatigued, and cold Romans are cut down by well-nourished, oiled and prepared Carthaginian forces. Hannibal had given his soldiers ample time to rest and they had all had breakfast that morning.<sup>399</sup> One might expect this given that Hannibal laid the trap. The Romans were roused from their beds and Sempronius ordered them into pursuit without sufficient preparations.<sup>400</sup> Hannibal's troops had oiled themselves beside the warmth of their campfires.<sup>401</sup> The Romans after crossing the river were so numb they could barely hold

---

<sup>391</sup> Liv. 21.54.8 for the cold conditions at the Trebia and 22.4.6 for the mists at Lake Trasimene.

<sup>392</sup> Liv. 21.52.1

<sup>393</sup> Liv. 21.52.1 and 21.53.3

<sup>394</sup> Liv. 21.53.6

<sup>395</sup> Liv. 21.53.6. See also 21.53.8 where Livy characterises this behaviour as "fiery and reckless".

<sup>396</sup> Liv. 21.53.11

<sup>397</sup> Liv. 21.54.1

<sup>398</sup> See Livy 21.54.4 for the Numidian cavalry drawing Sempronius into a battle and 21.54.9 for the effects of crossing the river.

<sup>399</sup> Liv. 21.54.5 and 21.55.1

<sup>400</sup> Liv. 21.54.8

<sup>401</sup> Liv. 21.55.1

their weapons.<sup>402</sup> Livy excuses the Roman infantry for their error by arguing they fought with no less courage than the Carthaginians, but not the cavalry, who were routed by Hannibal's elephants.<sup>403</sup> Neither Hannibal nor Sempronius are represented as displaying *virtus*, for Hannibal's operation was one of deception, and there is no manly honour in that.<sup>404</sup> Sempronius was ready to seek battle, and ironically accepted one that was offered to him while in an ill-prepared state. This is due to his rashness, for he made ill use of reason, a sentiment which would later be expressed by the dictator Fabius Maximus in regard to Minucius.<sup>405</sup> Both consuls fled the scene, Scipio to Cremona, Sempronius to Rome.<sup>406</sup> Livy emphasises the severity of the engagement as a defeat for the Romans, and thus indirectly concedes a victory to Hannibal.<sup>407</sup>

By the time Hannibal reached Trasimene he had been wounded once near Placentia, and blinded in one eye by disease contracted in the Etrurian marshes.<sup>408</sup> The new consul was fresh and ready to fight, awaiting the enemy at Arretium. From the moment Flaminius enters Livy's narrative he is presented as acting against the interests of the senatorial class. Flaminius was elected by popular vote, owing to his support of an anti-senatorial bill.<sup>409</sup> The tribune of the plebs Quintus Claudius, had proposed legislation which Flaminius backed. The bill barred senators and their

---

<sup>402</sup> Liv. 21.54.9

<sup>403</sup> At 21.55.8 Livy excuses the Roman infantry, arguing they fought with equal courage. See 21.55.9 for the cavalry being routed due by the elephants.

<sup>404</sup> Brizzi gives an insightful discussion of Hannibal and his *perfidia* (2010: 484-85). Such an accusation made against Hannibal presents only the Roman perspective on the matter (484). Schooled in the Hellenistic tradition, Hannibal would have more than likely been aware of Greek paradigms of warfare, which would have included *metis*, or cunning (484-85). All of Hannibal's tricks in battle would have corresponded to a clever use of *metis* in the Greek tradition, but for the Romans this contradicted the concept of the *ius belli*, and thus becomes *Punica fraus* (485). Any shortcuts or tricks in battle would then be treated as fraud. This could be why there is less emphasis on *virtus* at Trebia, Trasimene and Cannae than there was at Ticinus. These battles will be discussed below.

<sup>405</sup> Liv. 22.18.8

<sup>406</sup> Liv. 21.56.8 and 21.57.3 respectively.

<sup>407</sup> Liv. 21.57.2

<sup>408</sup> Liv. 21.57.8 for Hannibal besieging a supply magazine near Placentia and being wounded. He continues fighting only days after receiving the wound. See Livy 21.57.9 for fighting at Victimulae when the wound had not yet healed. See 22.2.10-11 for Hannibal losing his sight in one eye during the march through Etruria. In contrast to the Elder Scipio, Hannibal continued campaigning while wounded, rather than abstaining from activity.

<sup>409</sup> Liv. 21.63.5 for the election and 21.63.3-4 for the support of Quintus Claudius' bill.

sons from owning ships that could carry more than 300 amphora, a burden which was deemed satisfactory for the movement of produce from senatorial estates.<sup>410</sup> Convinced that the Senate would devise a pretext to obstruct his office, Flaminius set out early for Arretium to take up the consulship in his allotted province.<sup>411</sup> In doing so, he committed many of the crimes of which Hannibal was accused. By not taking up his office in Rome he shirked the oath to Jupiter Optimus Maximus, as well as other religious and political obligations.<sup>412</sup> Upon attempting to sacrifice to Jupiter at Arretium the occasion was marked by ill-portents.<sup>413</sup> Flaminius was thus disrespectful of oaths, senatorial authority, and the gods. Fabius Maximus would later argue in the Senate that disrespecting the gods had been Flaminius' greatest crime.<sup>414</sup>

Upon arrival at Arretium, Hannibal extracts as much information as he can about the consul.<sup>415</sup> He is then able to entice Flaminius, who is directly characterised by Livy as *ferox* since his previous consulship, into battle by ravaging the countryside.<sup>416</sup> After luring Flaminius and his men into a defile between the mountains and Lake Trasimene, Hannibal's cavalry and light infantry ambush them from above and the rear.<sup>417</sup> Livy reports that 15 000 Romans as well as Flaminius perished in the slaughter.<sup>418</sup> As with the episode at the Trebia, the Roman commander ignored advice offered to him by his cautious peers. Flaminius had been warned by his war council to wait for Gnaeus Servilius to reinforce his position, whereby they could act with a united policy.<sup>419</sup> More importantly, he twice ignored the ill portents of unfavourable auspices,

---

<sup>410</sup> Liv. 21.63.3-4

<sup>411</sup> Liv. 21.63.1-2 and 21.63.5

<sup>412</sup> Liv. 21.63.6-11 lists the obligations Flaminius neglected. Livy directly characterises him as irreverent at 22.3.4.

<sup>413</sup> Liv. 21.63.14-15

<sup>414</sup> Liv. 22.9.7

<sup>415</sup> Liv. 22.3.2

<sup>416</sup> Hannibal ravages all the countryside between Cortona and Lake Trasimene treating the allies with particular *crudelitas* (Liv. 22.4.1). See Liv. 22.3.4-5 for the characterisation of Flaminius. He is *ferox* (22.3.4). Flaminius' rashness is attributed to the luck he had enjoyed thus far (22.3.5-6).

<sup>417</sup> Liv. 22.4.6-7. Flaminius does not survey the region before entering the defile, nor does he wait for complete daylight (22.4.4).

<sup>418</sup> Liv. 22.7.2

<sup>419</sup> Liv. 22.3.8

once upon entering office, the other when he pursued Hannibal's forces.<sup>420</sup> Livy attempts to excuse the defeat, arguing that given the situation, Flaminius led his men with a level head.<sup>421</sup> He exhorted his men that only *virtus* could save them from death.<sup>422</sup> If only their *virtus* could have saved them from Flaminius. Again, Hannibal receives little direct attention, due to the fact that as at the Trebia, Trasimene was a victory earned by *fraus*. Roman defeat is attributed to thick mists which concealed the enemy and confused the Romans' senses.<sup>423</sup> Indirectly, however, we can see a different image. Livy has Hannibal performing as the consummate commander. Acting upon his knowledge of the enemy he puts a plan into action and adapts his strategy to the changing circumstances, employing all the resources at his disposal to achieve victory. Hannibal is also represented by Livy as showing sincere respect for Flaminius by attempting to give him a proper funeral.<sup>424</sup> It is a respect that the Romans would not return when Claudius Nero slew Hasdrubal at the Metaurus.<sup>425</sup>

### *Hannibal against Quintus Fabius Maximus and Marcus Minucius Rufus*

Quintus Fabius Maximus, elected dictator after Trasimene, embodies Roman virtues.<sup>426</sup> Unlike Marcus Minucius Rufus, his Master of the Horse, he is patient, calm and reserved.<sup>427</sup> Learning from the mistakes of Tiberius Sempronius Longus and Gaius Flaminius, Fabius famously adopts

---

<sup>420</sup> Liv. 21.63.14 and 22.3.11-13 respectively.

<sup>421</sup> Liv. 22.5.1

<sup>422</sup> Liv. 22.5.2

<sup>423</sup> Liv. 22.4.6. One gets the impression that Livy's attribution of adverse weather to the Roman defeat is to mitigate the *pudor* the Romans of later generations must have felt over having been repeatedly tricked by Hannibal. Livy is portraying Hannibal's victory as lesser because he relies upon *fraus* to achieve it.

<sup>424</sup> Liv. 22.7.5

<sup>425</sup> Liv. 27.51.11. Canter appraises Hannibal's respect as "knightly conduct" and scorns Claudius Nero's treatment of Hasdrubal's corpse as "brutish barbarity" (1929: 575).

<sup>426</sup> Liv. 22.8.6. See 22.11.2 for Fabius given the right (*imperium* to take over the army from Gnaeus Servilius).

<sup>427</sup> Liv. 22.12.12 for a direct characterisation of Minucius and 22.18.8 for an *oratio recta* which contrasts the strategies of the two men.

a passive strategy.<sup>428</sup> He refuses to give Hannibal an open engagement, which would permit the Carthaginian to use his strategy of envelopment or to lure Fabius into an ambush.<sup>429</sup> Instead, Fabius pursued Hannibal at a safe distance and where possible picked off his foraging parties and harassed his forces in minor skirmishes.<sup>430</sup> The army by achieving minor victories thus regained its *virtus*, and the confidence to face the Hannibalic threat.<sup>431</sup> The Roman forces began to feel like men who could defeat the enemy, and that Hannibal was not the bogeyman of Trasimene or the Trebia. Hannibal openly advocates that this passivity is a sign that the Romans have lost their *virtus*.<sup>432</sup> They will not meet him on the field of battle, and therefore he is manlier than they, but in reality he is not so foolish. Livy has him privately lamenting the situation, fearing that Fabius will be his undoing.<sup>433</sup>

This is the state of affairs until Minucius, portrayed as violent and hot headed, disparages Fabius' strategy as timid.<sup>434</sup> Minucius displays the Flaminian disrespect for authority. By continuing to criticise his superior publicly Minucius causes Fabius to lose the confidence of his men, and one of the junior officers is lured into conflict and slain by Carthalo.<sup>435</sup> The Senate is similarly dissatisfied with the lack of progress, and recalls Fabius to Rome to undertake religious duties.<sup>436</sup> Minucius was instructed to maintain Fabius' strategy, to prioritise reason over fortune.<sup>437</sup> Instead, he allows himself to be goaded into a conflict with Hannibal, out of which he gains a

---

<sup>428</sup> Liv. 22.12.8-10. See Xenophontos on the portrayal of Fabius Maximus in Plutarch's biography. She concludes that "[t]he dramatic scenes and ethical speeches stress the superiority of the general's character and especially his self-restraint, reverence, incorruptibility, mildness, and philosophically informed spirit" (2012: 179).

<sup>429</sup> He is mocked by Minucius when he refuses to intervene in Hannibal's sack of Sinuessa, calling the army a "flock of sheep". See Liv. 22.14.8

<sup>430</sup> Liv. 22.12.8-10

<sup>431</sup> Liv. 22.12.10

<sup>432</sup> Liv. 22.12.4; Indeed, the senators themselves began to wonder if Fabius was passive by strategy or just by nature (Liv. 30.26.9). See also Frontinus. 1.3.3 for the descriptor *Cunctator*.

<sup>433</sup> Liv. 22.12.5

<sup>434</sup> Liv. 22.12.11-12

<sup>435</sup> Liv. 22.15.1 for Fabius' unpopularity generally, and see 22.15.4-10 for the episode with the officer Lucius Hostilius Mancinus.

<sup>436</sup> Liv. 22.18.8

<sup>437</sup> Liv. 22.18.8

minor victory.<sup>438</sup> Misrepresented in Rome, the skirmish is exploited by the tribune of the plebs, Marcus Metilius, who proposes that Minucius' authority be made equal to that of the dictator.<sup>439</sup> Livy portrays him as insufferable even in victory, cockily boasting about his promotion.<sup>440</sup> Fabius, in contrast, retains his dignity and demeanour, fully confident in his own abilities, and aware of his colleague's faults.<sup>441</sup> When Hannibal leads Minucius into an ambush Fabius does not hesitate to reinforce his position, proving that of the pair, he was of better character.<sup>442</sup> Minucius redeems himself, however, after the battle. He leads his men into Fabius' camp, and submits himself into his colleague's command.<sup>443</sup>

If not for a clever *fraus* on the *Via Appia* the Fabian strategy might have brought an early end to Hannibal's campaign. The Carthaginian found himself hemmed in on either side of the road by Fabius and Minucius.<sup>444</sup> Hannibal had his men fix twigs and pine knots to the horns of cattle and set the kindle ablaze at night.<sup>445</sup> The Roman guards deserted their stations allowing Hannibal sufficient time to remove his forces from their position.<sup>446</sup> In a response to the Fabian strategy, Hannibal refrained from ravaging Fabius' estate in order to discredit him in Rome.<sup>447</sup> Marcus Metilius would capitalise on Hannibal's deception by arguing that Fabius had used the legions to guard his personal property while the enemy ravaged the countryside.<sup>448</sup> Hannibal also made accurate character assessments based on intelligence he presumably received from deserters and informants, as well as from his experience with Sempronius and Flaminius.<sup>449</sup> Livy has Fabius

---

<sup>438</sup> Liv. 22.24.3 for Livy presenting Hannibal as noticing a change in generals and beginning to plan his next move. See 22.24.14 for the misrepresentation of the victory in Rome.

<sup>439</sup> See Liv. 22.25.7-11 for the proceedings.

<sup>440</sup> Liv. 22.27.2

<sup>441</sup> Liv. 22.26.7

<sup>442</sup> See Liv. 22.28.3-4 for Hannibal planning the ambush; 22.29.6 for Hannibal's retreat when Fabius enters the battle.

<sup>443</sup> Liv. 22.29.6-9 generally; 22.29.9 for Minucius declaring Fabius to be a "man of wisdom".

<sup>444</sup> Liv. 22.16.5

<sup>445</sup> Liv. 22.16.6-8

<sup>446</sup> Liv. 22.17.4

<sup>447</sup> Liv. 22.23.4

<sup>448</sup> Liv. 22.25.7

<sup>449</sup> Liv. 22.24.3 and 22.28.4 for assessments of Minucius in the devising of ruses.

castigate Minucius, stating “he finds Hannibal his superior, both in courage and in fortune”.<sup>450</sup> Livy has Hannibal retreat from battle when Fabius reinforces Minucius’ position.<sup>451</sup> Hannibal says that although he beat Minucius, Fabius defeated him.<sup>452</sup> Hannibal was portrayed by Livy as superior to Minucius in *virtus* because he used his reason to estimate the actions of his enemy. He played Minucius into his hands, and thus he was the better man. Livy does, however, find fault with Hannibal’s consistent preference for ambushes, arguing that had it been a front to front engagement, the Romans would have been able to fight on an equal footing with the Carthaginians.<sup>453</sup> Moreover, Hannibal was not a greater general than Fabius, for he had successfully thwarted Hannibal’s success. If not for Hannibal’s ruse, Fabius would have had him in his clutches on the Appian Way.<sup>454</sup>

### *Hannibal against Lucius Aemilius Paullus and Gaius Terentius Varro*

Cannae is the ultimate test of Punic and Roman vigour in the first Pentad, parallel to Zama in the second. Gaius Terentius Varro was elected consul by popular vote, having earned the support of the plebs by disparaging Fabius in public and supporting the elevation of Minucius.<sup>455</sup> The Senate pushed Lucius Aemilius Paullus into standing for office, and he became the Fabian of the consular pair.<sup>456</sup> Livy here uses Fabius Maximus as a mouthpiece to directly characterise the consuls. In a dialogue with Aemilius Paullus, shortly before Paullus is to leave the city, Fabius advises him to be weary of Varro’s recklessness.<sup>457</sup> “For you err, Lucius Paullus, if you suppose

---

<sup>450</sup> Liv. 22.29.2. It is noteworthy that Livy here uses the term *virtus* to denote courage. The Latin reads: *Fabio aequatus imperio Hannibalem et virtute et fortuna superiorem videt.*

<sup>451</sup> Liv. 22.29.6

<sup>452</sup> Liv. 22.29.6

<sup>453</sup> Liv. 22.28.13

<sup>454</sup> Livy (22.30.10) makes clear that Hannibal understands the danger Fabius poses to the Italian campaign. See also 22.32.3 for Hannibal despairing at the adoption of the Fabian strategy by Marcus Atilius Regulus and Gnaeus Servilius Geminus.

<sup>455</sup> Liv. 22.26.4 and 22.34.2. He was also assisted by Quintus Baebius Herennius, a kinsmen and tribune of the plebs who Livy has absurdly accuse the Senate of prolonging the war (22.34.3).

<sup>456</sup> Liv. 22.35.3

<sup>457</sup> Liv. 22.39.4

that your struggle will be less with Gaius Terentius than with Hannibal,” he says.<sup>458</sup> He who is rash will be destroyed by Hannibal, for “haste is improvident and blind.”<sup>459</sup> Similarly, Paullus in *oratio obliqua* dismisses Varro’s confidence as unfounded, for he has not yet met the troops with which he is to serve, nor seen his enemy or surveyed the geography of his province.<sup>460</sup> With the consuls commanding on alternative days, Varro’s dissatisfaction with Paullus’ adherence to the Fabian strategy peaks after he does not pursue a foraging party to the enemy camp.<sup>461</sup> Livy thus sets the stage for the disaster at Cannae to unfold, and for Hannibal to achieve his penultimate success.<sup>462</sup>

Hannibal once again proves of greater wit than his Roman counterparts. On a day when Varro is in command of the Romans Hannibal provokes Varro into a fight by harassing his forces with his Numidian cavalry.<sup>463</sup> Despite Paullus’ objections the Romans pursue Hannibal’s forces and he envelops them with his cavalry.<sup>464</sup> Little is said of Varro and Hannibal during the battle, but we see Paullus continue fighting despite being wounded.<sup>465</sup> Too weak to control his horse he and his men dismount.<sup>466</sup> Walsh comments that here Hannibal displays a remarkable sense of humour, stating that Paullus might as well have delivered his troops in “fetters”.<sup>467</sup> In the ensuing rout, Paullus could have been taken to safety by one Gaius Lentulus, a military tribune.<sup>468</sup> Paullus praises Lentulus’ *virtus* and bids he save himself, and relate the events of the day to the Senate.<sup>469</sup> Lentulus flees, and Paullus is killed as he sat, drenched in blood upon a rock.<sup>470</sup>

---

<sup>458</sup> Liv. 22.39.4

<sup>459</sup> Liv. 22.39.22

<sup>460</sup> Liv. 22.38.9-10. Livy interjects and expresses agreement with these sentiments (22.38.9).

<sup>461</sup> Liv. 22.41.3

<sup>462</sup> Livy in fact foreshadows Cannae when Fabius states that if Varro fights as he intends to then another place will earn more fame than Trasimene (22.39.8).

<sup>463</sup> Liv. 22.44.5; A disaster could have potentially occurred earlier had not the auspices been unfavourable and two slaves appeared in a timely fashion to reveal Hannibal’s *fraus*. See Liv. 22.42.4-11

<sup>464</sup> Liv. 22.47.8-10. This forces exhausted Romans to fight fresh Carthaginians.

<sup>465</sup> Liv. 22.49.2. He was wounded by a missile from a sling.

<sup>466</sup> Liv. 22.49.3

<sup>467</sup> Walsh (1967: 104). See Liv. 22.49.4 for Hannibal’s comment.

<sup>468</sup> Liv. 22.49.8

<sup>469</sup> Liv. 22.49.9



Fabius' fears about Varro's rash attitude are brought to light. Another Roman, despite advice from his cautious peers, has led the army into disaster. Varro escaped to Venusia, yet his colleague, the better man of the pair, was slain in battle.<sup>471</sup> Not only was Paullus more conscious of the threat Hannibal posed, and the appropriate way to handle him, but when the battle turned against them he died an honourable death.

Measured against these two men Hannibal is posited as the same wily general found at Trebia and Trasimene. Livy understates the victory, refusing to acknowledge Hannibal's *fraus* as a display of *virtus*, attributing Roman defeat to the direction of the wind.<sup>472</sup> Indirectly, we can view the battle as the product of fortune, Hannibal's rival just happened to be Varro that day. Furthermore, he only advanced into Apulia by necessity, to seek grain to feed his troops, for he feared the Spanish soldiers would mutiny out of hunger.<sup>473</sup> This is not the vigorous conduct of warfare, but luck. We do, however, see Hannibal once again imaged as a respectful adversary,

---

<sup>470</sup> Liv. 22.49.12

<sup>471</sup> Liv. 22.49.14; See Liv. 23.5.11-15 for Varro's speech to the Capuan embassy at Venusia. In this *oratio recta* Livy has Varro characterise Hannibal and the army as barbarous (23.5.11). Hannibal builds a bridge of corpses and the army practices cannibalism (23.5.12). This seems to me to be an expression of two interweaved sentiments. There is the embarrassment and horror over the disaster at Cannae, that a foreign invader had penetrated Italy and annihilated a force led by two of Rome's consuls. It was the third defeat. Rome's military reputation had been seriously affected by Hannibal's victories, and they would have been anxious to prevent the allies, a crucial source of reinforcements, from switching sides. The earlier sections of Book XXIII saw the Samnite tribe of the Hirpini surrender the city of Compsa to Hannibal (Liv. 23.1.4). Their envoy would later state it was Hannibal's *virtus fortunaque* and kindness and consideration (*unica comitas ac benignitas*) that encouraged them to switch sides (Liv. 23.42.4). Capua likewise was about to secede from Roman hegemony, and Fronda sees the attention the revolt received as owing to its possession of *civitas sine suffragio* (2007: 83). See Liv. 26.5.1-2 for Roman and Italian attention to the Capuan revolt. In an assessment of the debate at Capua over whether to align with Hannibal or stick to Rome, Fronda concluded that Capua seceded only after a lengthy discussion, and on the precept of "re-establishing Capua as a regional power if not the dominant force in Italy" (2007: 105). Hoyos agrees that this was Capua's expectation (2008: 68-9). Varro's speech did not have the desired effect (Liv. 23.6.1-3). Livy judges "the Roman name seemed to all to have been blotted out" (23.6.3). This is to say that they could not protect themselves, or Italy, against the strength of Hannibal. Indeed, Cannae will also be the catalyst for Philip of Macedon to seek a treaty with Hannibal (Liv. 23.33.1-4).

<sup>472</sup> Liv. 22.43.11

<sup>473</sup> Liv. 22.43.4-5

seeking out Paullus' body and granting him a proper burial.<sup>474</sup> It is Hannibal's actions after Cannae, however, which are of more interest to Livy. The Romans expected Hannibal to march on their city in accordance with the rules of war to which they were accustomed.<sup>475</sup> Besieging or blockading Rome would be the appropriate way to bring his enemy to heel. Varro, however, reports to the Senate that Hannibal is more concerned with looting the Roman camps and fixing a ransom for his prisoners.<sup>476</sup> Livy has him state that Hannibal is not behaving like a "great commander" or with the "spirit of a conqueror".<sup>477</sup> Hannibal's officer, Marhabal, is also critical of his decision not to move on Rome.<sup>478</sup> He famously declares Hannibal knew how to gain a victory, but not how to use it.<sup>479</sup> The Romans have suffered a critical defeat, and he does not move on Rome, and deliver what everyone involved viewed as what should have been the final blow.<sup>480</sup> Livy images a Hannibal whose *virtus*, whose 'masculinity' up to that point, cannot

---

<sup>474</sup> Liv. 22.52.6

<sup>475</sup> Liv. 22.55.1-2 for Fabius and the Senate believing that Hannibal would march on the city. Livy certainly believed that if he had done so, the Romans more than likely would have lost the war. See Liv. 22.51.4: "That day's delay is generally believed to have saved the City and the empire."

<sup>476</sup> Liv. 22.56.3

<sup>477</sup> Liv. 22.56.3

<sup>478</sup> Liv. 22.51.2

<sup>479</sup> Liv. 22.51.4

<sup>480</sup> This question has been the topic of much debate, ancient and modern. A comment by Livy implies that there certainly was debate among scholars of his time and preceding him (26.7.3). He states it was an opportunity that Hannibal allowed to pass, a complaint made by others, and a fault he admitted. Florus presumably takes the statement directly from Livy (1.22.6.21). Orosius likewise concurs (4.16.4). Eutropius curiously omits any such sentiment, but emphasises the severity of Rome's sufferings (3.10). In modern scholarship there have been several different lines of argument concerning the decision not to march on Rome. Lazenby summarises these various viewpoints succinctly (1996: 41-42). See also the treatment of the aftermath of Cannae in his book (1978: 85-86). Shean's article explores Hannibal's logistical complications, in particular the need to feed his army, and their impact on the decision not to move on Rome (1996: 185). I must concur with Hoyos' assessment of the situation. Despite logistical concerns for the army at large, the cavalry could have potentially reached Rome, and in fact that is what Marhabal was suggesting (Hoyos, 1983: 177). The psychological shock of Marhabal's arrival and the expectation of Hannibal not too far behind could have been enough to bring the Romans to terms. We will never know. See also Hoyos' treatment in his monograph on Hannibal's 'dynasty' (2003: 119-121) and biography of Hannibal (2008: 60-61).

reverse the consequences of this hesitation. Indeed for Livy the decision to not march on Rome when the Romans were beaten in all but spirit, proves Hannibal to be unmanly.

### *Hannibal against Marcus Claudius Marcellus*

Following the Battle of Cannae Hannibal's primary adversaries in the field are Marcus Claudius Marcellus and Publius Cornelius Scipio Africanus. It is against these two men that he is measured in the remainder of his campaign in Italy, and subsequent withdrawal to Africa. We can observe in the years after Cannae a shift in Livy's Hannibal. He never again manages to engage the Romans in a major pitched battle until the conflict at Zama.<sup>481</sup> It seems the Romans had learned their lesson. Instead the general pattern of Hannibal's movements amounts to wandering about Southern Italy besieging towns, attempting to gain access to port facilities, and win over Rome's allies where possible.<sup>482</sup> Where Hannibal achieves victory they are not treated with the same gravity as those of books XXI-XXII.<sup>483</sup> After Cannae, Hannibal never again has the same impact upon the Romans until his defeat.

There are several moments throughout book XXIII where 'gendered' turning points can be observed. Livy portrays Marcellus with great acclaim, due to popular memory imaging him as the avenger of Cannae.<sup>484</sup> After a failed attempt to lure Neapolis into surrendering, Hannibal

---

<sup>481</sup> Hoyos (2008: 67)

<sup>482</sup> See n. 497 for a discussion of the defections at Compsa and Capua. It is quite probable that Hannibal underestimated the complexity of Rome's relationships with the peoples of Italy. Hoyos observes that despite successfully detaching much of Southern Italy Hannibal did not manage to budge any of Rome's Latin colonies (2008: 67). Hannibal also seems to have been ignorant of local Italian grievances outside of relationships with Rome. Fronda aptly situates Capua in local Campanian politics, which demonstrates that any alliance with Capua would have more than likely precluded successful relationships with their rivals in Neapolis and Nola (2007: 105). He had eagerly coveted Neapolis and Cumae as port facilities but was unable to take either (Liv. 23.36.5-7).

<sup>483</sup> The troops at Acerrae flee in the night through "gaps in the earthworks and through neglected guard-posts" (Liv. 23.17.5). Hannibal then sacks the deserted town (23.17.7). Nuceria and Casilinum were starved into surrendering (Liv. 23.15.3 and 23.19.13-14).

<sup>484</sup> As the first Roman to defeat Hannibal in battle after Cannae it is not surprising that he should afford a special place in Roman memory (Liv. 23.16.16). Livy has Marcellus invert Hannibal's strategy. In Books XXI and XXII Hannibal had attacked Rome's allies as bait to lure Roman generals into ambushes or battles, such as the ravaging of

camps near the city of Nola.<sup>485</sup> Livy pits the commoners against the city's leading men, the former wishing to ally with Hannibal and the latter to remain true to the Romans.<sup>486</sup> Marcellus is sent for by the Nolan elite and he manages to defeat Hannibal after discovering and reversing a ruse he had been putting to effect with conspirators in the city.<sup>487</sup> Although a minor victory, Livy interjects that scale is not of importance here, but the fact that Marcellus had defeated Hannibal at a time when "not to be defeated by Hannibal was a more difficult thing".<sup>488</sup> Indeed, there is a noticeable shift in Hannibal's spirit after Nola. Livy has Hannibal break off the siege of Casilinum because of *pudor*.<sup>489</sup> Why would Hannibal feel *pudor* at this point, and not after his former defeats, such as at Neapolis? Perhaps Livy is positing that Marcellus' recent victory over

---

territory between Cortona and Lake Trasimene (22.4.1). Livy directly has him use *crudelitas* to provoke Flaminius (22.4.1). We could also cite the attack on Sinuessa that Fabius Maximus chose to ignore so as to not play into Hannibal's hands (22.13.9). While Hannibal was camped at Mt. Tifata near Capua in 215 BC, Marcellus began to enter the territory of the Hirpini (Liv. 23.41.13-14). This incited the sending of the envoy who expressed discontent that despite being so close to their sufferings Hannibal had not yet offered assistance (23.42.5). He then famously declared that "Marcus Marcellus, not Hannibal, appears to have been the victor at Cannae" (23.42.5). Receiving defectors forged new obligations for Hannibal as is evidenced here and the Hirpini were not the only Italian peoples expecting Hannibal to defend them from Roman vengeance. His famous march on Rome in 211 BC was motivated by the siege of Capua (Liv. 26.7.1-3). Livy has Hannibal realise the enemy will not quit their siege works and give battle, which as Hoyos notes not only jeopardised Capua, but the entire war effort (Liv. 26.7.1). See Hoyos (2008: 82). If the Romans could not be brought into battle then his entire military reputation could falter.

<sup>485</sup> Liv. 23.14.5

<sup>486</sup> Liv. 23.14.5

<sup>487</sup> See Liv. 23.14.5 for summoning Marcellus; 23.16.7 for the Nolan senators' reporting the ruse to Marcellus; 23.16.12-16 for the battle at Nola. Indeed one might be inclined to consider Marcellus' strategy as a clever use of *metis*. We can also note considerable *crudelitas* with the treatment of the conspirators at Nola. Marcellus has them beheaded in the Forum and their property confiscated (Liv. 23.17.1-2).

<sup>488</sup> Liv. 23.16.16

<sup>489</sup> Liv. 23.18.9. Given that *pudor* was shame felt by poor performance of virtue to the Roman community, we might interpret this use of the term as an implication of poor military performance to the peoples of Italy. See Barton (1999: 212) and (2001: 277) where she argues that the "greatest source of power for the ancient Romans had been their willingness, singly and as a group, to compete strenuously...". Victory was a crucial aspect of upholding Roman honour, and thus at this point Livy is representing Hannibal as damaged. He was being watched by his new Italian allies and also other potential ones and therefore needed every success he could muster. Hannibal could not afford to be defeated in a small engagement as the likes of the one at Nola.

Hannibal has had a significant impact upon his belief in his own abilities.<sup>490</sup> These events drive Hannibal to winter at Capua, with which he had recently entered into a treaty.<sup>491</sup>

Capua is introduced at the outset as a den of *luxuria* and *corrupta*, foreshadowing that any dealings with the city will negatively affect Hannibal's campaign. Such a descent into luxury had become a *topos* in Latin historiography by the time of Livy, who could have drawn inspiration from the work of Sallust.<sup>492</sup> Indeed, Cicero likewise depicted Capua as a city of vice, a Las Vegas of the ancient world.<sup>493</sup> Hannibal's army is represented as descending into a period of indulgence greater than that experienced at the Po.<sup>494</sup> Troops who were hardened by the Alps and their battles were "ruined by excess of comfort and immoderate pleasures".<sup>495</sup> Here we find the stock traits used to depict a Roman male becoming soft. Hannibal's troops enjoy excess of sleep, wine, banquets, prostitutes, baths, and idleness.<sup>496</sup> Livy interjects with a judgement, that henceforth their past victories kept them in the field as opposed to their present state.<sup>497</sup> He also criticises Hannibal for permitting this to happen.<sup>498</sup> The army is imaged as a reflection of

---

<sup>490</sup> Livy has the Samnite envoy declare that the Romans "are boasting that you, having strength for but a single stroke, are inactive, as if you had spent your sting" (23.42.5).

<sup>491</sup> Liv. 23.18.9

<sup>492</sup> See Rossi's discussion of Sulla and the East at Sal. *Cat.* 11.5 (2004: 371). She argues "the Roman army's falling victim to the *luxuria* of the East is explicitly connected with failed leadership ...". (371).

<sup>493</sup> Cic. *Agr.* 1.7.20

<sup>494</sup> Liv. 23.18.10-14. Hoyos contextualises the Capua episode in the context of Hannibal's overall military operations, and associated lifestyle (2008:76-78). I concur that the recess at Capua was necessary in terms of practicality. Hoyos demonstrates that given the 250 mile radius of friendly Italian states, it is not surprising that most winters were spent near friendly cities (2008: 76). Canter labels Livy's episode at Capua "a favourite theme of rhetorical exaggeration", preferring the narrative of Polybius (1929: 569). Polybius tells us that Hannibal's army never left service while in Italy (11.19.3). The episode could very well be a rhetorical device to give some excitement to a period of inactivity in Hannibal's campaign. It could also have been used to justify Hannibal's defeat at Zama on 'gendered' grounds. It is probable that Hannibal's men would have indulged in these comforts, but such behaviour is hardly limited to his campaign.

<sup>495</sup> Liv. 23.18.11

<sup>496</sup> Liv. 23.18.12

<sup>497</sup> Liv. 23.18.13

<sup>498</sup> Liv. 23.18.13

Hannibal's declining ability to command, and the implication could be that Hannibal was enjoying the same delights as his men.<sup>499</sup>

Hannibal would return to Nola in 215 BC, and be castigated by Marcellus during an ensuing battle.<sup>500</sup> Livy expresses Marcellus' comments in *oratio obliqua* whereas Hannibal is afforded an exhortation in *oratio recta*.<sup>501</sup> Marcellus reminds his men that they had recently defeated Hannibal the previous year, and lately he had been forced to withdraw his siege at Cumae.<sup>502</sup> He criticises their wintering at Capua, and labels Hannibal's men as "weakened by Campanian luxury, exhausted by wine and harlots and every kind of dissipation ...".<sup>503</sup> Livy has Marcellus argue "*Capuam Hannibali Cannas fuisse: ibi virtutem bellicam, ibi militarem disciplinam, ibi praeteriti temporis famam, ibi spem futuri extinctam.*"<sup>504</sup> Capua was Hannibal's Cannae. It was there that he lost his *virtus*. Livy has Hannibal too see a change in his men. He sees the standards that the army fought with at Trebia, Trasimene and Cannae, but not the same disposition.<sup>505</sup> Hannibal poses a series of rhetorical questions, reminding his soldiers that they achieved great victories, and they must achieve another at Nola.<sup>506</sup> Nola will be the test of their *virtus*.<sup>507</sup> It is a test that Hannibal and his men will fail.<sup>508</sup> In both exhortations, Hannibal's army is portrayed as a shadow of its former self, continuing the theme Livy began earlier in Book XXIII. Capua is posited as having had a disastrous effect upon the army's ability to wage war, reflecting a lack of *virtus* in its commander. While Hannibal is by no means beaten in terms of the war at large, he is

---

<sup>499</sup> Liv. 23.18.14

<sup>500</sup> Liv. 23.45.1-5. Initially, Hannibal gives the city a chance to surrender and when it rejects the offer he besieges it. (23.44.1-2). Marcellus sallies forth and heavy rain forces the Romans back into the city and Hannibal to his camp (23.44.4-6). The battle under discussion here is thus the second in a matter of days. Hannibal laid waste to the countryside around Nola and Marcellus sallied forth to meet him in combat (23.44.7). For a long period the battle was "doubtful" (23.45.1).

<sup>501</sup> Compare Liv. 23.45.1-5 with 23.45.7-10

<sup>502</sup> Liv. 23.45.1

<sup>503</sup> Liv. 23.45.2

<sup>504</sup> Liv. 23.45.4-5

<sup>505</sup> Liv. 23.15.6

<sup>506</sup> Liv. 23.15.7-9

<sup>507</sup> Liv. 23.15.10

<sup>508</sup> See Liv. 23.16.1-2 for the defeat at Nola in 215 BC.

no longer the force he was at the beginning of Book XXI. Hannibal would get his revenge, however, killing Marcellus in an ambush in 208 BC.<sup>509</sup>

### *Hannibal against Publius Cornelius Scipio Africanus*

Scipio Africanus is undoubtedly the hero of the Third Decade, drawn up in a parallel fashion to Hannibal. Upon his brief introduction at the Ticinus, Livy declares that he is the predestined victor of the Second Punic War.<sup>510</sup> In the wake of the Battle of Cannae, Scipio is chosen as leader of the remaining military tribunes who fled to Canusium.<sup>511</sup> Storming into the tent of Marcus Caecilius Metellus, Scipio raised his sword at the crowd of youths, who were debating abandoning Italy to Hannibal.<sup>512</sup> Scipio swore an oath to protect Rome, and demanded they do the same, horrified at the dishonourable prospect before him.<sup>513</sup> In contrast to Hannibal's oath in Book XXI, Scipio's oath was to preserve his state, as opposed to Hannibal's who has sworn to destroy another. Immediately upon his introduction, Scipio is represented as the more honourable of the pair, for he does not swear to destroy the city of Carthage, but only to defend the Republic. Like Fabius Maximus he is thus a symbol of civic duty.<sup>514</sup>

The sentiments expressed in Hannibal's speech to the captives after the Battle of Cannae are explicit. After dismissing the prisoners from Latin and Italian cities, Livy has Hannibal address the Romans in an eloquent *oratio obliqua*.<sup>515</sup> He states that he fights the war for honour and

---

<sup>509</sup> Livy (27.27.3-11) describes the episode. See 27.27.7 for Marcellus' death specifically. He was pierced by a lance and fell from his horse. Livy attributes his death to imprudence concerning personal safety (27.27.11). On a mere reconnaissance mission he and his colleague fell into an ambush. Hannibal showed Marcellus the same respect he had his other fallen foes (27.28.2).

<sup>510</sup> Liv. 21.46.8: *Hic erit iuvenis penes quem perfecti huiusce belli laus est, Africanus ob egregiam victoriam de Hannibale Poenisque appellatus.*

<sup>511</sup> Liv. 22.53.3

<sup>512</sup> Liv. 22.53.9-10

<sup>513</sup> Liv. 22.53.10-13; Livy states that the crowd was terrified by the outburst as if "*victorem Hannibalem*" had stormed into the room (22.53.13).

<sup>514</sup> Rossi (2004: 362)

<sup>515</sup> Liv. 22.58.1 for the releasing of Latin and Italian prisoners. See 22.58.2-4 for Hannibal's speech.

dominion.<sup>516</sup> That is to say that Hannibal is fighting to avenge the insults of the First Punic War, and to reassert Carthage's position in the Western Mediterranean. He continues by stating his forebears had yielded to Rome's *virtus*.<sup>517</sup> Now they must yield to his.<sup>518</sup> We can compare this speech with the sentiments of Scipio before his successful siege of New Carthage.<sup>519</sup> Scipio's speech centres on three crucial elements: the *virtus* of his father and uncle, the *virtus* of the Roman people, and the fledgling ability of Hannibal to continue waging war in Italy.<sup>520</sup> By presenting Scipio as his father reborn, Livy marks the ascendancy of the man to the position Hannibal took when he sacked Saguntum in Book XXI.<sup>521</sup> By Book XXVI Hannibal's *virtus* has faded.<sup>522</sup>

In 206 BC, Hannibal was in his camp, wounded and deep in reflection.<sup>523</sup> Yet even in this state, Livy tells us the Romans kept their distance: *tantam inesse vim, etsi omnia alia circa eum ruerent, in uno illo duce censebant*.<sup>524</sup> His situation had "crashed" as the Loeb translator puts it,

---

<sup>516</sup> Liv. 22.58.3. The Latin reads: *de dignitate atque imperio certare*.

<sup>517</sup> Liv. 22.58.3

<sup>518</sup> Liv. 22.58.4: *et patres virtuti Romanae cessisse, et se id adniti, ut suae in vicem simul felicitate et virtuti cedatur*.

<sup>519</sup> It is worth noting that Scipio took the city by implement a cunning strategy. See Liv. 26.45.7-46.2 for the entire episode. Fishermen from Tarraco inform Scipio about an easier passage across the lagoon to a low section in the wall, but that only appears during low tide (26.45.7-8). Scipio at the appointed time heads over with 500 men and attributes the ebbing tide to the blessings of Neptune (26.45.8-9). Exploiting the unguarded low section of wall, they enter the city (26.46.1-2). From this episode, we can deduce that Scipio was both willing to lie and employ trickery to achieve his goals. Livy does not directly acknowledge that this was a use of *fraus*, although he indirectly implicates Scipio in engaging in the same sort of behaviour for which he criticises Hannibal.

<sup>520</sup> Liv. 26.41.6 for the *virtus* of Scipio's relatives; 26.41.9 and 26.41.12 for the *virtus* of Rome; 26.41.16 for the reduced capacity of Hannibal to wage war in Italy.

<sup>521</sup> Liv. 26.41.24-26. See Liv. 21.14 for the end of the siege of Saguntum. See also Rossi for a discussion of the Spanish narratives of Hannibal and Scipio (2004: 363-69).

<sup>522</sup> This is not to mention the emphasis on the clemency with which Scipio treats the citizens of New Carthage. All citizens are released after the city is taken, and retain their property (Liv. 26.47.1). The Spanish hostages taken by Hannibal on the eve of war are not only returned to their tribes, but Scipio takes the time to learn their names and try to establish friendships (26.49.8-10). Livy even depicts him as respectful towards women. He assigns guards to the wife of Mandonius and the young women in her charge to protect them (26.49.11-16). An attractive Spanish woman is also returned to her husband and her dowry paid (26.50.7 and 26.50.12).

<sup>523</sup> Liv. 28.12.1

<sup>524</sup> Liv. 28.12.2



but Hannibal's person still captured Rome's mind and memory.<sup>525</sup> In Book XXIX Livy has the Carthaginians begin to doubt the man who had thus far waged a war in Italy for fifteen years.<sup>526</sup> For them his *virtus* and *fama* was in decline. He had become less of a man. In Book XXX Hannibal was recalled home to defend Carthage against the assault of Scipio Africanus.<sup>527</sup> As he approaches the shores of Africa, Livy offers a third direct assessment of his character, a means to build tension in the lead up to the final clash of the third Decade. Scipio did not have to contend with a leader of undisciplined barbarians like Syphax, nor Hasdrubal, but Hannibal.<sup>528</sup> Hannibal is posited as the greatest threat to Scipio's victory in Africa, in order to magnify the *gloria* that Livy will attribute to Scipio for defeating him. Unlike the initial character assessment of Book XXI, nowhere is *virtus* referred to. Hannibal's decline was complete. For Livy, his manhood was depleted, and his defeat imminent.

Zama was Livy's final testing ground for his characters, the setting of the final pairing of the two great generals of the Second Punic War. Before battle, Hannibal sought peace with Scipio, and they met on neutral ground where no *fraus* could be employed.<sup>529</sup> The speeches have several running themes as did those at the Ticinus. Livy has Hannibal represent himself as a victorious general admitting defeat to the dominant stake holder in the conflict with Rome.<sup>530</sup> He states that neither side gained anything from the war, and should have been content with what possessions they had.<sup>531</sup> Hannibal has aged, and now he faces an image of himself at the Trebia, Trasimene and Cannae, an ironic inversion of the first Roman he faced upon entering Italy.<sup>532</sup> Above all, Hannibal has learned to "follow reason rather than chance" (*ut rationem sequi quam fortunam malim*).<sup>533</sup> Scipio denounces Punic *perfidia*, and reminds Livy's readers that Hannibal was the agent of the war.<sup>534</sup> Hannibal's journey throughout the Third Decade comes full circle, with the

---

<sup>525</sup> Liv. 28.12.2

<sup>526</sup> Liv. 29.3.15: *et Hannibalem ipsum iam et fama senescere et viribus.*

<sup>527</sup> See Liv. 30.20.1-4 for Hannibal's less than enthusiastic response to the recall.

<sup>528</sup> Liv. 30.28.3-4

<sup>529</sup> Liv. 30.29.8-10 for a description of the meeting place and its advantages.

<sup>530</sup> Liv. 30.30.4

<sup>531</sup> Liv. 30.30.7

<sup>532</sup> Liv. 30.30.12

<sup>533</sup> Liv. 30.30.10-11

<sup>534</sup> Liv. 30.31.4 and 30.31.5 respectively.

reminiscence of how it began. Hannibal has thus been imagined by Livy as a man with whom the leading Roman generals will be measured against throughout his narrative, in a competition of vigour and virtue, the prize of which will be supremacy of the Western Mediterranean.

## CONCLUSION

Returning to the definitions that were reached regarding ‘sex’ and ‘gender’ in chapter one, ‘gender’ was found to be of a performative nature. ‘Sex’ refers to the biological differences between males and females, which are constant across cultures. These include genitals, reproductive ability and the physical appearance of adults. We reach identification with a ‘gender’ when culture and society project themselves upon ‘sex’. This content comprises all the perceived appropriate behaviours pertaining to one being male or female. Thus the society defines what is and is not a man or a woman. ‘Gender’ categories are then reinforced by the institutions of the society by rewarding conformity and sanctioning deviation. ‘

For the Romans ‘gender’ too was a veil of social content overlaying biological distinctions. The Roman citizen, the *vir*, was to be dominant in all aspects of life. His worth as a man was determined by his ability to achieve in the arenas of war, politics and morality. Victory on the battlefield, holding prestigious magistracies, and upholding the values of the state were crucial components of aristocratic ‘masculinity’ in the Republic. In terms of ‘sexuality’, aristocratic males were not prohibited from engaging freely in what we would call ‘heterosexual’ and ‘homosexual’ activity. So long as the *vir* was in the active role, then socially the activity was acceptable. For the males who did not conform to the image of the austere, hard, dominant *vir*, accusations of effeminacy could bring the individual and their family to the attention of the community. The gaze of the Roman community scrutinised ‘gender’ performances by appealing to every Roman’s sense of *pudor*. Thus in Republican Rome, ‘gender’ was a performance for aristocratic consumption.

Cicero and Livy inhabited a world where these idealised views of ‘gender’ were advocated as social norms. As a result, it is not surprising that Hannibal has been imaged on ‘gendered’ lines. The Latin annalists established the tradition of Punic *perfidia*. For them, Hannibal was dishonest, cruel, and violent. Fabius Pictor’s Hannibal was king. Cato Maior’s Hannibal failed to use his victory at Cannae to end the war. The Hannibal of the annalistic tradition was the ‘masculine’ antithesis of Scipio Africanus, the hero of Roman *virtus*. Cast with patriotic zeal, Hannibal was the bogeyman of the proverb *Hannibal ad portas*.

When Cicero took up the pen and imagined Hannibal he found an easily recognisable symbol for corruption, cruelty, dishonesty, but above all military success. The Romans could not deny that Hannibal had dealt out four crushing defeats at the Ticinus River, the Trebia, Lake Trasimene, and Cannae. He had achieved success in a way that the elite Romans of every generation sought to, so that they might assert their *virtus* and earn *gloria*. In his speeches, Hannibal was mostly used by Cicero as a tool for his polemic against other Romans. As an allusion, Hannibal could symbolise military vigour, dishonesty and greed as needed. In the philosophical books, Hannibal was a rhetorical figure with similar implications. Legends and fact alike could be invoked to provide weight to Cicero's opinions. Cicero's Hannibal was thus a repository of memories that could be invoked as needed.

Livy's Hannibal is the most complex of those found within the sources studied herein. At the commencement of the third Decade, Hannibal is a warrior hardened by his experiences in Spain. After a succession of battles which see Hannibal repeatedly achieve in the theatre of war, Livy has Hannibal undergo a 'gendered' shift. Hannibal is defeated at Nola by Marcus Claudius Marcellus in 216 BC, and winters at Capua. The *virtus* of the Carthaginian army deteriorates owing to the poor leadership of their general, who is presumably implicated in the 'convalescence of indulgence'. The Romans never meet Hannibal in a general engagement again until Zama, where the superior character of Scipio Africanus overcomes Hannibal's weakened vigour. Until Nola and Capua, Hannibal was the better man in war, but at Zama, Scipio was on the rise. Hannibal's *virtus* was a shadow of its former self.

Hannibal's story is not his to tell. It belongs to the Romans who recorded it, and only insofar as his downfall could be used to glorify Rome's ascension to world empire. In conclusion, Cicero, Livy, and the annalistic sources use their understanding of 'masculinity' to image Hannibal. By virtue of being a male, images of Hannibal entertain a complexity that those of other leaders, particularly female ones, never could. This is why images of foreign women like Cleopatra are profusely negative, whereas those of Hannibal can reflect a great commander. Their configurations of the enemy are thus not only prejudiced on national grounds, but on those of 'gender'.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Ancient Texts

Appian, *Hannibalic War*; White, H., trans. (1912), *Roman History: Volume I*, Heinemann, London

Appian, *Syrian Wars*, White, H., trans. (1912), *Roman History: Volume II*, Heinemann, London

Cicero, *Rhetorica ad Herennium*; Caplan, H., trans. (1954), *Cicero: Volume I*, Heinemann, London

Cicero, *On Invention*; Hubbell, H. M., trans. (1949), *Cicero: Volume II*, Heinemann, London

Cicero, *On the Orator*; Sutton, E. W., trans. (1942), *Cicero: Volume III*, Heinemann, London

Cicero, *Brutus*; Hendrickson, G. L. & Hubbell, H. M., trans. (1939), *Cicero: Volume V*, Heinemann, London

Cicero, *For Sextus Roscius*; Freese, J. H., trans. (1930), *Cicero: Volume VI*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge

Cicero, *On the Agrarian Law*; Freese, J. H., trans. (1930), *Cicero: Volume VI*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge

Cicero, *Against Verres: Books I-II*; Greenwood, L. G. H., trans. (1928), *Cicero: Volume VII*, Heinemann, London

Cicero, *For Rabirius Perduellionis Reo*; Hodge, H. G., trans. (1927), *Cicero: Volume IX*, Heinemann, London

Cicero, *Against Catiline 1-4*; MacDonald, C., trans. (1976), *Cicero: Volume X*, Heinemann, London

Cicero, *For Murena*; MacDonald, C., trans. (1976), *Cicero: Volume X*, Heinemann, London

Cicero, *On the Responses of the Haruspices*; Wattis, N. H., trans. (1923), *Cicero: Volume XI*, Heinemann, London

Cicero, *For Sestius*; Gardner, R., trans. (1958), *Cicero: Volume XII*, Heinemann, London

Cicero, *On the Consular Provinces*; Gardner, R., trans. (1958), *Cicero: Volume XIII*, Heinemann, London

Cicero, *For Balbus*; Gardner, R., trans. (1958), *Cicero: Volume XIII*, Heinemann, London

Cicero, *Philippics 1-6*; Bailey, D. R. S., trans. (2010), *Cicero: Volume XVa*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge

Cicero, *Philippics 7-14*; Bailey, D. R. S., trans. (2010), *Cicero: Volume XVb*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge

Cicero, *On the Republic*; Keyes, C., trans. (1928), *Cicero: Volume XVI*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge

Cicero, *On the Laws*; Keyes, C., trans. (1928), *Cicero: Volume XVI*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge

Cicero, *On Ends*; Rackham, H., trans. (1914), *Cicero: Volume XVII*, Heinemann, London

Cicero, *On the Nature of the Gods*; Rackham, H., trans. (1933), *Cicero: Volume XIX*, Heinemann, London

Cicero, *On Old Age*; Falconer, W. A., trans. (1923), *Cicero: Volume XX*, Heinemann, London

Cicero, *On Friendship*; Falconer, W. A., trans. (1923), *Cicero: Volume XX*, Heinemann, London

Cicero, *On Divination*; Falconer, W. A., trans. (1923), *Cicero: Volume XX*, Heinemann, London

Cicero, *On Duties*; Miller, W., trans. (1968), *Cicero: Volume XXI*, W. Heinemann, London

Cicero, *Letters to Atticus: Volume I*; Bailey, D. R. S., trans. (1999), *Cicero: Volume XXII*, W. Heinemann, London

Cornelius Nepos, *Hannibal*; Rolfe, J. C., trans. (1929), *On Great Generals, On Great Historians*, Heinemann, London

Diodorus Siculus, *Library of History*; Walton, F. R., trans. (1957), *Library of History: Volume XI*, Heinemann, London

Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Roman Antiquities: Books I-II*; Cary, E., trans. (1937), *Roman Antiquities: Volume I*, Heinemann, London

Eutropius, *Brevarium*; Bird, H. W., trans. (1993), *The Brevarium ab urbe condita of Eutropius: the right honourable secretary of state for general petitions, dedicated to Lord Valens Gothicus Maximus and Perpetual Emperor*, Liverpool University Press, Liverpool

Gaius, *Institutes*; Gordon, W. M. & Robinson, O. F., trans. (1988), *The Institutes of Gaius*, Duckworth, London

Florus, *Epitome of Roman History*; Forster, E. S., trans. (1929), *Florus: Epitome of Roman History*, Heinemann, London

Frontinus, *Stratagems, Aqueducts of Rome*; Bennett, C. E., trans. (1925), *Stratagems, Aqueducts of Rome*, Heinemann, London

Fronto, *Correspondence*; Haines, C. R., trans. (1919), *Correspondence: Volume I*, Heinemann, London

Gellius, *Attic Nights*; Rolfe, J. C., trans. (1927), *Attic Nights: Volume I*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge

Gellius, *Attic Nights*; Rolfe, J. C., trans. (1927), *Attic Nights: Volume II*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge

Juvenal, *Satires*; Braund, S. M., trans. (2004), *Juvenal and Persius*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge

Livy, *History of Rome: Books I-II*; Foster, B. O., trans. (1919), *History of Rome Volume I*, Heinemann, London

Livy, *History of Rome: Books VIII-X*; Foster, B. O., trans. (1926), *History of Rome Volume IV*, Heinemann, London

Livy, *History of Rome: Books XXI-XXII*; Foster, B., trans. (1929), *History of Rome Volume V*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge

Livy, *History of Rome: Books XXIII-XXV*; Gardner, F., trans. (1940), *History of Rome Volume VI*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge

Livy, *History of Rome: Books XXVI-XXVII*; Gardner, F., trans. (1943), *History of Rome Volume VII*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge

Livy, *History of Rome: Books XXVIII-XXX*; Gardner, F., trans. (1949), *History of Rome Volume VIII*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge

Livy, *Summaries*; Geer, R. M., trans. (1959), *History of Rome Volume XIV*, Heinemann, London

Lucan, *The Civil War*; Duff, J. D. (1928), *The Civil War*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge

Martial, *Epigrams: Books I-V*; Bailey, D. R. S., trans. (1993), *Martial: Volume I*, Heinemann, London

Martial, *Epigrams: Books VI-X*; Bailey, D. R. S., trans. (1993), *Martial: Volume II*, Heinemann, London

Orosius, *Seven Books of History Against the Pagans*; Fear, A. T., trans. (2010), *Orosius: Seven Books of History Against the Pagains*, Liverpool University Press, Liverpool

Pliny the Elder, *Natural History: Books III-VII*; Rackham, H., trans. (1942), *Natural History: Volume II*, Heinemann, London

Plutarch, *Cato Maior*; Perrin, B., trans. (1914), *Lives: Volume II*, Heinemann, London

Plutarch, *Fabius Maximus*; Perrin, B., trans. (1916), *Lives: Volume III*, Heinemann, London

Plutarch, *Marcellus*; Perrin, B., trans. (1917), *Lives: Volume V*, Heinemann, London

Plutarch, *Caesar*; Perrin, B., trans. (1919), *Lives: Volume VII*, Heinemann, London

Plutarch, *Pyrrhus*; Perrin, B., trans. (1920), *Lives: Volume IX*, Heinemann, London

Plutarch, *Flaminius*; Perrin, B., trans. (1921), *Lives: Volume X*, Heinemann, London



Plutarch, *Tiberius Gracchus*; Perrin, B., trans. (1921), *Lives: Volume X*, Heinemann, London

Polybius, *The Histories: Books III-IV*; Paton, W. R., trans. (2010), *The Histories: Volume II*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge

Polybius, *The Histories: Books V-VIII*; Paton, W. R., trans. (2011), *The Histories: Volume III*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge

Polybius, *The Histories: Books IX-XV*; Paton, W. R., trans. (2011), *The Histories: Volume IV*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge

Quintilian, *The Orator's Education: Books I-II*; Russell, D. A., trans. (2002), *The Orator's Education: Volume I*, Heinemann, London

Quintilian, *The Orator's Education: Books IX-X*; Russell, D. A., trans. (2002), *The Orator's Education: Volume IV*, Heinemann, London

Sallust, *The Jugurthine War*; Rolfe, J. C., trans. (2013), *Sallust: Volume I*

Sallust, *The Catiline Conspiracy*; Rolfe, J. C., trans. (2013), *Sallust: Volume I*

Seneca the Elder, *Controversiae: Books I-VI*; Winterbottom, M., trans. (1974), *Declamations: Volume I*, Heinemann, London

Seneca the Younger, *Epistles: 93-124*; Gummere, R. M., trans. (1925), *Epistles: Volume III*, Heinemann, London

Tacitus, *Annals*; Jackson, J., trans. (1937), *Tacitus: Volume IV*, Heinemann, London

Valerius Maximus, *Memorable Doings and Sayings: Books I-V*; Bailey, D. R. S., trans. (2000), *Memorable Doings and Sayings: Volume I*, Heinemann, London

Valerius Maximus, *Memorable Doings and Sayings: Books VI-IX*; Bailey, D. R. S., trans. (2000), *Memorable Doings and Sayings: Volume II*, Heinemann, London

Velleius Paterculus, *Compendium of Roman History*; Shipley, F. W., trans. (1924), *Velleius Paterculus, Res Gestae, Divi Augusti*

## **Modern Scholarship**

Adler, E., (2011), *Valorizing the Barbarians: Enemy Speeches in Roman Historiography*, University of Texas Press, Austin

Badian, E., (1966), 'The Early Historians'; TA Dorey, (ed.), *Latin Historians*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, pp. 1-38

Balsdon, J. P. V. D., (1979), *Romans and Aliens*, Duckworth, London

Barton, C. (1999), 'The Roman Blush: The Delicate Matter of Self-Control'; J Porter, (ed.), *Constructions of the Classical Body*, The University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, pp. 212-234

Barton, C. (2001), *Roman Honor: The Fire in the Bones*, University of California Press, Berkeley

Baumeister, R., (1999), *Evil: Inside Human Violence and Cruelty*, Holt Paperbacks, New York

Berndt, C. & Berndt, R., (1971), *The Barbarians: An Anthropological View*, C. A. Watts & Co Ltd, London

Bispham, E. H. & Cornell, T., (2013), 'Q. Fabius Pictor'; T Cornell. (ed.), *The Fragments of the Roman Historians: Volume I*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 160-178

Bispham, E. H. & Cornell, T., (2013), 'L. Cincius Alimentus'; T Cornell. (ed.), *The Fragments of the Roman Historians: Volume I*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 179-183

Bispham, E. H. & Northwood, S. J., (2013), 'C. Acilius'; T Cornell. (ed.), *The Fragments of the Roman Historians: Volume I*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 224-226

Bonner, S. F., (1977), *Education in Ancient Rome: From the Elder Cato to the Younger Pliny*, Methuen, London

Briscoe, J., (2013), 'L. Coelius Antipater'; T Cornell. (ed.), *The Fragments of the Roman Historians: Volume I*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 256-263

Brizzi, G., (2010), 'Carthage and Hannibal in Greek and Roman Memory'; D Hoyos. (ed.), *A Companion to the Punic Wars*, Wiley-Blackwell, Malden, 483-498

- Brunt, P. A., (1982), 'The Legal Issue in Cicero, Pro Balbo', *The Classical Quarterly*, 32, 1, 136-147
- Burck, E., (1971), 'The Third Decade'; TA Dorey. (ed.), *Livy*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, pp. 21-46
- Burkhardt, L. (1990), 'The Political Elite of the Roman Republic', *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*, 39, 77-99
- Burn, S., (1996), *The Social Psychology of Gender*, McGraw-Hill Inc, New York
- Butler, J., (1990), *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*, Routledge, New York
- Butler, J., (1993), *Bodies That Matter: On the Discursive Limits of "Sex"*, Routledge, New York
- Calazis, J., (2010), 'Cicero and Verres', *Classicum*, 36, 2, 20-22
- Cantarella, E., (1987), *Pandora's Daughters: The Role & Status of Women in Greek & Roman Antiquity*; M Fant. (trans.), John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore
- Cantarella, E., (1992), *Bisexuality in the Ancient World*; Ó Couilleanáin, C., (trans.), Yale University Press, New Haven
- Canter, H. V. (1929), 'The Character of Hannibal', *The Classical Journal*, 24, 8, 564-577
- Corbeill, A., (1996), *Controlling Laughter: Political Humor in the Late Roman Republic*, Princeton University Press, Princeton
- Corbeill, A., (1997), 'Dining Deviants in Roman Political Invective'; J Hallett & M. Skinner. (eds.), *Roman Sexualities*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, pp. 99-128
- Corbeill, A., (2002), 'Ciceronian Invective'; JM May. (ed.), *Brill's Companion to Cicero: Oratory and Rhetoric*, Brill, Boston, pp. 197-217
- Corbeill, A., (2010), 'Gender studies'; A Barchesi, & W Scheidel. (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Roman Studies*, Oxford University Press, pp. 220-233

- Cornell, T., (2013), 'M. Porcius Cato'; T Cornell. (ed.), *The Fragments of the Roman Historians: Volume I*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 191-218
- Crawford, M., (1992), *The Roman Republic*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge
- Culham, P., (1985), 'Ten Years after Pomeroy: Studies of the Image and Reality of Women in Antiquity'; M Skinner. (ed.), *Rescuing Creusa: New Methodological Approaches to Women in Antiquity*, Texas Tech University Press, Lubbock, pp. 9-30
- D'Ambra, E., (2007), *Roman Women*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge
- de Beauvoir, S., (2011), *The Second Sex*; Borde, C. & Malovany-Chevalier, S. (trans.), Vintage Books, London
- Detel, W., (1998), *Foucault and Classical Antiquity: Power, Ethics and Knowledge*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge
- Dover, K. J., (1978), *Greek Homosexuality*, Duckworth, London
- Duerst-Lahti, G. & Kelly, R., (1995), 'On Governance, Leadership, and Gender'; G Duerst-Lahti & R Kelly (eds.), *Gender Power, Leadership, and Governance*, The University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, pp. 11-38
- Eckstein, A., (1987), *Senate and General: Individual Decision-making and Roman Foreign Relations, 264-194 BC*, University of California Press, Berkeley
- Edwards, C., (1993), *The Politics of Immorality in Ancient Rome*, Cambridge University Press, New York
- Edwards, C., (1997), 'Unspeakable Professions: Public Performance and Prostitution in Ancient Rome'; J Hallett & M. Skinner. (eds.), *Roman Sexualities*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, pp. 66-98
- Fantham, E., (2013), *Cicero's Pro L. Murena Oratio: Introduction and Commentary*, Oxford University Press, New York

- Feldherr, A., (1998), *Spectacle and Society in Livy's History*, University of California Press, Berkeley
- Foucault, M., (1972), *The Archaeology of Knowledge and The Discourse on Language*; AMS Smith, Pantheon Books, New York
- Foucault, M., (1978), *The History of Sexuality Volume 1: An Introduction*, R Hurley. (trans.), Pantheon Books, New York
- Foucault, M., (1986), *The History of Sexuality, Volume 3: The Care of the Self*; R Hurley (trans.), Pantheon Books, New York
- Foucault, M., (1997), *Ethics: Subjectivity and Truth*; P Rabinow (ed.); R Hurley (trans.), Penguin, London
- Frier, B., (1999), *Libri Annales Pontificum Maximorum: The Origins of the Annalistic Tradition*, University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor
- Frona, M., (2007), 'Hegemony and Rivalry: The Revolt of Capua Revisited', *Phoenix*, 61, 83-108
- Gelzer, M., (1975), *The Roman Nobility*; R Seager. (trans.), Blackwell, Oxford
- Halberstam, J., (1998), *Female Masculinity*, Duke University Press, Durham
- Hall, J., (2002), 'The Philippics'; JM May. (ed.), *Brill's Companion to Cicero: Oratory and Rhetoric*, Brill, Boston, pp. 273-304
- Hall, J., (2005). 'Cicero FAM.16.21, Roman politeness, and the socialization of Marcus Cicero the younger'; K Welch & TW Hillard. (eds.), *Roman crossings: Theory and practice in the Roman Republic*, Classical Press of Wales, Swansea, pp. 259-278
- Halperin, D. M., (1990). *One Hundred Years of Homosexuality and other Essays on Greek Love*, Routledge, New York and London

- Hillard, T., (2005). 'Res Publica in Theory and in Practice'; K Welch & TW Hillard. (eds.), *Roman crossings: Theory and practice in the Roman Republic*, Classical Press of Wales, Swansea, pp. 1-48
- Hoyos, D., (1983), 'Hannibal: What Kind of Genius?', *Greece & Rome*, 30, 2, 171-180
- Hoyos, D., (1998), *Unplanned Wars: The Origins of the First and Second Punic Wars*, Walter de Gruyter, New York
- Hoyos, D., (2000), 'Marhabal's Bon Mot: Authenticity and Survival', *The Classical Quarterly*, 50, 2, 610-614
- Hoyos, D., (2003), *Hannibal's Dynasty: Power and Politics in the Western Mediterranean, 247-183 BC*, Routledge, New York
- Hoyos, D., (2008), *Hannibal: Rome's Greatest Enemy*, Phoenix, Exeter
- Hoyos, D., (2013), review of *Livy on the Hannibalic War*, DS Levene, *Mnemosyne*, 66, 3, 530-533
- Hoyos, D., (2015), 'Rome and Carthage in Livy'; M Bernard (ed.), *A Companion to Livy*, Wiley-Blackwell, Malden, 454-468
- Kamen, D., & Levin-Richardson, S., (2014), 'Revisiting Roman Sexuality: Agency and the Conceptualization of Penetrated Males'; M Masterson, N Sorkin Rabinowitz & J Robson. (eds.), *Sex in Antiquity: Exploring Gender and Sexuality in the Ancient World*, Routledge, London, pp. 449-460
- Kaster, R., (2005), *Emotion, Restraint and Community in Ancient Rome*, Oxford University Press, New York
- Langlands, R., (2006), *Sexual Morality in Ancient Rome*, Cambridge University Press, New York
- Lazenby, J. F., (1978), *Hannibal's War: A Military History of the Second Punic War*, Aris and Phillips, Warminster

- Lazenby, J. F., (1996), 'Was Marhabal Right?'; T Cornell, B Rankov, & P Sabin. (eds.), *The Second Punic War: A Reappraisal*, Institute of Classical Studies, University of London, London
- Levene, D. S., (2010), *Livy on the Hannibalic War*, Oxford University Press, Oxford
- Levick, B., (2015), *Catiline*, Bloomsbury, New York
- MacKendrick, P. (1989), *The Philosophical Books of Cicero*, Duckworth, London
- MacKendrick, P. (1995), *The Speeches of Cicero: Context, Law, Rhetoric*, Duckworth, London
- Masterson, M., (2013), 'Studies of Ancient Masculinity'; TK Hubbard. (ed.), *Companion to Greek and Roman Sexualities*, Wiley Blackwell, Chichester, pp. 17-30
- Mattern, S., (1999), *Rome and the Enemy: Imperial Strategy in the Principate*, University of California Press, Los Angeles
- May, J. M., (1996), 'Cicero and the Beasts', *Syllecta Classica*, 7, 143-153
- McDonnell, M., (2006), *Roman Manliness: Virtus and the Roman Republic*, Cambridge University Press, New York
- Mellor, R., (2012), *The Historians of Ancient Rome: An Anthology of Major Writings*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition, Taylor and Francis, London
- Oakley, S. P., (2005), *A Commentary on Livy, Books VI-X: Volume IV: Book X*, Oxford University Press, Oxford
- Odahl, C., (2010), *Cicero and the Catilinarian Conspiracy*, Routledge, New York
- Olson, K., (2014), 'Toga and Pallium: Status, Sexuality, Identity'; M Masterson, N Sorkin Rabinowitz & J Robson. (eds.), *Sex in Antiquity: Exploring Gender and Sexuality in the Ancient World*, Routledge, London, pp. 422-448
- Parker, H., (1997), 'The Teratogenic Grid'; J Hallett & M. Skinner. (eds.), *Roman Sexualities*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, pp. 47-65

- Pelling, C., (1997), 'Tragic Dreamer: Some Dreams in the Roman Historians', *Greece & Rome*, 44, 2, 197-213
- Pomeroy, A., (1989), 'Hannibal at Nuceria', *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*, 38, 2, 162-176
- Pomeroy, S., (1975), *Goddesses, Whores, Wives & Slaves: Women in Classical Antiquity*, Pimlico, London
- Rawson, E., (1985), *Intellectual Life in the Late Roman Republic*, Duckworth, London
- Rawson, E., (1991), *Roman Culture and Society: Collected Papers*, Clarendon Press, Oxford
- Richlin, A., (1992), *The Garden of Priapus: Sexuality and Aggression in Roman Humor*, Oxford University Press, New York
- Richlin, A., (1993), 'Not Before Homosexuality: The Materiality of the Cinaedus and the Roman Law Against Love Between Men', *Journal of the History of Sexuality*, 3, 4, 523-573
- Richlin, A., (1999), 'Cicero's Head'; J Porter, (ed.), *Constructions of the Classical Body*, The University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, pp. 190-211
- Rosenstein, N., (1990), *Imperatores Victi: Military Defeat and Aristocratic Competition in the Middle and Late Republic*, University of California Press, Berkeley
- Rossi, A., (2004), 'Parallel Lives: Hannibal and Scipio in Livy's Third Decade', *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 134, 2, 359-381
- Shean, J. F., (1996), 'Hannibal's Mules: The Logistical Limitations of Hannibal's Army and the Battle of Cannae, 216 BC', *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte*, 45, 2, 159-187
- Sissa, G., (2008), *Sex and Sensuality in the Ancient World*; G Staunton. (trans.), Yale University Press, New Haven
- Skinner, M., (1997), 'Introduction'; J Hallett & M. Skinner. (eds.), *Roman Sexualities*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, pp. 1-28
- Skinner, M., (2005), *Sexuality in Greek and Roman Culture*, Blackwell Publishing, Malden



- Walsh, P. G., (1966), 'Livy'; TA Dorey, (ed.), *Latin Historians*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, pp. 115-142
- Walsh, P. G., (1967), *Livy: His Historical Aims and Methods*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge
- Walters, J., (1997), 'Invading the Roman Body: Manliness and Impenetrability in Roman Thought'; J Hallett & M. Skinner. (eds.), *Roman Sexualities*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, pp. 29-46
- Wicks, S., (1996), *Warriors and Wildmen: Men, Masculinity and Gender*, Bergin & Garvey, Westport
- Williams, C., (1999), *Roman Homosexuality: Ideologies of Masculinity in Classical Antiquity*, Oxford University Press, Oxford
- Wyke, M., (1994), 'Woman in the Mirror: The Rhetoric of Adornment in the Roman World'; LJ Archer *et al.* (ed.), *Women in Ancient Societies: An Illusion of the Night*, Macmillan Press, London, pp. 134-151
- Xenophontos, S., (2012), 'Concerning the Good General: Plutarch's Fabius Maximus and the Ethics of Generalship', *HERMES: Zeitschrift für klassische Philologie*, 140, 2, 160-183