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MAIOR ET CLARIOR VICTORIA:
HANNIBAL AND TARENTUM IN LIVY

ABSTRACT: Livy's narrative of events at Tarentum during the Second Punic War reveals additional complexities to the historian's presentation of Hannibal, who emerges as an adept politician through his establishment of a positive working relationship with the city. Hannibal captures the city and endeavors to win the hearts and minds of his new allies. Hannibal thus emerges as an enemy who can defeat Rome in battle and undermine her political hegemony in the Italian peninsula. Roman recapture of the city under Fabius Maximus prophesies Rome's eventual victory in the war.

At 23.43.4, Livy records Hannibal's prophecy that he will achieve a maior et clarior victoria in the year following his decisive victory at Cannae. Livy's Hannibal is portrayed as entitled to believe that he had fulfilled that prophecy after his capture of the southern Italian city-state of Tarentum in 212 B.C.E. With Tarentum in his control, Hannibal had established his dominance in southern Italy, and this in turn created the conditions for his march on Rome herself. This paper aims to facilitate better understanding of Livy's complex presentation of Hannibal, arguably the most important non-Roman to appear in the extant books of the Ab Urbe Condita. The Tarentum narrative illustrates Hannibal's ability to create and maintain a relationship with a community which he seeks to bring under his control; it thus portrays Hannibal as embodying a political threat to the Romans as he forms a political-cultural alliance through which Roman influence over Italian communities is undermined.

The episodes which constitute the narrative (24.13.1–6, 24.20.9–16, 25.7.10–11.20, and 27.15.4–16.9) appear both in the fifth and sixth pentads, in which the historian narrates the Carthaginian offensive and the Roman counteroffensive, respectively. This is evidence of

1 23.43.4, quod ad bellum Romanum attineret, si Trasumenni quam Trebiae, si Cannarum quam Trasumenni pugna nobilior esset, Cannarum se quoque memoriam obscuram maior et clariore victoria facturum (“as for the war with Rome, if the battle of Trasimene outshone the Trebia, and if Cannae outshone Trasimene, he was going to win a greater and more brilliant victory that would eclipse even the memory of Cannae”). My (modified) translations of Livy are adapted from the Oxford World's Classics edition of J. C. Yardley and D. Hoyos (Oxford 2006); those of Polybius from the Penguin translation of I. Scott-Kilvert and F. W. Walbank (London 1979); and those of Plutarch's Life of Fabius Maximus from the Loeb edition of B. Perrin (Cambridge, Mass., 1916). References to Appian are to his Hannibalic War. For comments on earlier drafts of this paper (including the section of the Livy chapter of my 2004 Durham Ph.D. thesis in which it originally appeared), I thank David Levene, C. B. R. Pelling, Clemence Schultze, and Mark Joyal.

their importance to Livy’s *bellum Hannibalicum*. The “scattered” placement of the episodes—necessary in that the historian must narrate the war in sequence, and the events at Tarentum span five years, from 214 to 209 B.C.E.—interweaves this narrative with the war as a whole during this critical period in which Hannibal’s dominance reaches its height and then begins to give way to Roman hegemony. Moreover, Tarentum has serious implications for Livy’s Romans, as their efforts leading to the recapture of the city, and their behavior afterwards, illustrates that they have learned from Hannibal. Thus they are in a position to reclaim influence over, and shortly thereafter to expand beyond, the Italian peninsula.

I.

In the first episode (24.13.1–6) Livy establishes the foundation upon which the relationship between Hannibal and the Tarentines can arise:

> *ad Hannibalem, cum ad lacum Averni esset, quinque nobiles iuvenes Tarento venerunt, partim ad Trasumenum lacum, partim ad Cannas capti dimissique domos cum eadem comitata qua usus adversus omnes Romanorum socios Poenus fuerat. ei memores beneficiorum eius perpulisse magnam partem se iuventutis Tarentinae referunt ut Hannibalis amicitiam ac societatem quam populi Romani mellent, legatosque ab suis missos rogare Hannibalem ut exercitum propius Tarentum admoveat*

(24.13.1–2)

When Hannibal was at Lake Avernus, five young nobles came to him from Tarentum. Some had been taken prisoner at Lake Trasimene, and some at Cannae, and they had been sent back to their homes with the

---

3 A phrase I borrow from W. Will (above, n.2) 157. See T. J. Luce, *Livy: The Composition of His History* (Princeton 1977) on Livy’s use of the pentad as a way of shaping his history and the reader’s response to it.

4 C. S. Kraus, “Livy,” in Kraus and A. J. Woodman, *Latin Historians*, Greece and Rome New Surveys of the Classics 27 (Oxford 1997) 58: “The basic chronological organization that all history enjoys—the arrow of time, moving from the past to the present—is not enough to maintain the integrity of such a complex work, in which both sequential and contemporaneous actions are narrated. Livy himself, with his frequent authorial interjections, provides some guidance.”

usual courtesy that the Carthaginian had accorded all the allies of Rome. Remembering this kind treatment of them, they now reported to him that they had convinced most of the younger men of Tarentum to choose friendship and alliance with Hannibal over one with the Roman people. They said that they had been sent by their people as official representatives with a request to Hannibal that he move his army closer to Tarentum.

For the Tarentines the journey is a metaphor, representing their movement away from being allies of the Romans (Romanorum socios) to having an alliance with Hannibal (Hannibalis . . . societatem). Livy connects this journey in the present to one in the past: these youths fought against Hannibal, were captured, but were then granted their freedom and were allowed to return home (domos). The reference to Trasimene and Cannae situates this meeting as connected to, or as an extension of, Hannibal’s brilliant military victories at these places.

By remembering the positive treatment (ei memores beneficiorum eius) they received at the hands of Hannibal in the (recent) past, the youths offer a third-party perspective on the general that, in theory, is independent of Roman or Carthaginian bias. The difference between the Roman and Tarentine experiences at Cannae separates these communities on the basis of their different memories. Memores would seem to have serious implications: if it may be read as implying historia, then the Tarentines are presenting an alternate history which, ultimately, endangers the Ab Vrbe Condita: memory of Cannae as a means of organizing Rome’s response to the past is threatened by the memory.

---


7 22.58.1, namque Hannibal secundum tam prosperam ad Cannas pugnam victoris magis quam bellum gerentis intentus curis, cum captivis productis segregatisque socios, sicut ante ad Trebiam Trasumennunque lacum, benigne adlocutus sine pretio dimisisset (“following this enormously successful engagement at Cannae, Hannibal had busied himself with affairs that were more properly the concern of a victor than a soldier still at war. He brought forth the prisoners, and separated them into groups. As earlier at the Trebia and Lake Trasimene, he had kind words for the allies, whom he once again released without ransom”).

8 Of course, Livy’s reader already knows that this will happen: at 22.61.12 he provides a “narrative seed” when he includes Tarentum in a list of communities who join Hannibal in the aftermath of Cannae. For this technique, see Kraus (above, n.4) 60–61.

9 On historia and memoria, see A. M. Gowing, Empire and Memory: The Representation of the Roman Republic in Imperial Culture (Cambridge 2005) 7–15, esp. 10: “regardless of their origins . . . memories become part of the individual’s experience and understanding of the past, and, to the extent that such memories are shared, part of the culture’s ‘collective memory.’” On history and memory in the Ab Vrbe Condita, see G. B. Miles, Livy: Reconstructing Early Rome (Ithaca, 1995) 8–74.
of the Tarentines, who think not of their misfortune at being on the
losing side, but of Hannibal’s kind treatment of them. Of course,
given that these men are iuvenes, their knowledge of Tarentum’s his-
tory may be limited, and so all that they can draw upon are their
own memories, which, given their recent experiences as soldiers who
fought against, and lost to, Hannibal, have shaped the kind of men
they are. Depending on how effectively Hannibal builds upon, or ma-
nipulates, these memoriae, the Romans may be unable to influence
the perception of Hannibal in Italy, and this would impair their ability to
coerce other Italian states to help them. Livy’s reader, knowing that
Rome (eventually) prevails in the Hannibalic War, is presented with
the opportunity to explore this altera historia.

Remembering the past and acting upon it are, of course, two
different things. In this case the former leads to the latter, as Livy
facilitates the joining together of Hannibal and the youths. They
move from voicing positive memories about Hannibal in the past to
reporting public opinion in their city in the present, which they have
actively worked to influence: the majority (magnam partem) of the
city’s youth prefer friendship and alliance with him to alliance with
Rome (ut Hannibalis amicitiam ac societatem quam populi Romani
mallent). The phrase amicitiam ac societatem is not necessarily
tautologous: identified as legati, the young men have the brief to
establish a formal alliance with Hannibal; their desire for amicitia
suggests the possibility that this alliance will extend beyond the
limited scope of a political/military alliance. By asking Hannibal to
move his army near the city, and telling him that should he do so,
the city will surrender itself without delay (haud ullam intercessuram
moram 24.13.3), the Tarentines demonstrate their enthusiasm for an
alliance by trying to bring it about as quickly as possible.

This meeting is significant in that Livy portrays Hannibal as a
“passive” general, agreeing to a stratagem devised by others. Han-
nibal generally does not follow the advice of others, and so for him
to appear willing to do so here signifies a willingness to alter his

---

10 M. Jaeger, *Livy’s Written Rome* (Ann Arbor 1997) 99–107, and J. D. Chaplin,
*Livy’s Exemplary History* (Oxford 2000) 54–65 delineate the ways in which Livy
used the Roman response to Cannae to shape his narrative of the Hannibalic War.

11 Their ignorance of their city’s past appears all the more poignant given that
Decius Magius refers to Pyrrhus’ rule over the Tarentines in order to warn the Capuans
against joining with Hannibal (23.7.5). On Decius, see Chaplin (above, n.10) 79–80.

12 Kraus (above, n.4) 61 notes that Livy’s narrative of the Hannibalic War relies
in part on the reader’s knowledge of Rome’s eventual triumph in it. This means that
“Rome’s overall destiny for greatness can be thwarted momentarily on the level of
individual detail.”

13 A. N. Sherwin-White, *Roman Foreign Policy in the East, 168 B.C. to A.D. 1*
(London 1984) 61 observes that Livy uses the terms interchangeably, and that gener-
ally amicitia leads directly to societas.

14 The best example of this occurs immediately after Cannae, when Maharbal
advises Hannibal to march on Rome right away. Hannibal’s reluctance leads to
Maharbal’s observation: “vincere scis, Hannibal; victoria uti nescis” (“you know
how to conquer, Hannibal; you do not know how to use victory,” 22.51.4). See also
22.13, where Hannibal is willing to follow the advice of the Campanian hostages.
normal practice. In his response Hannibal appears to embrace this: Hannibal conlaudatos eos oneratosque ingentibus promissis domum ad coepta maturanda redire iubet; se in tempore adfuturum esse. hac cum spe dimissi Tarentini ("Hannibal commended the young men, and showered them with huge promises, telling them to return home to finalize their plans, and agreeing to come at the appropriate time. Such were the hopes with which the Tarentines were sent on their way," 24.13.4). While he still is giving orders (iubet), he does so in the context of their acting upon their plans.

It is at this point that Livy reveals that Hannibal has thought about the strategic value of Tarentum to his war effort:

> ipsum ingens cupidus incesserat Tarenti potiundi. urbe esse videbat cum opulentam nobilemque, tum maritimam et in Macedoniam opportune versam regemque Philippum hunc portum, si transiret in Italiam, Brundisium cum Romani habentur, petiturum. (24.13.5)

Hannibal had himself been overtaken by an enormous desire to take possession of Tarentum. He could see that it was a rich and famous city, and also that it was on the coast and, conveniently, faced Macedonia. King Philip would head for this port if the Romans were in control of Brundisium when he crossed to Italy.

Hannibal’s desire—described as ingens—to take the city explains his ingentia promissa in speaking to the youths. Tarentum appears to mark a new phase in the war, as Hannibal imagines its expansion to include Philip. Tarentum is thus initially presented as a means to an end, a way for Hannibal to advance significantly his war effort.

The second episode (24.20.9–16) subtly builds upon the nascent relationship between Hannibal and the Tarentine youths. In the first episode the youths discuss their desire for amicitia with Hannibal; in this episode Livy shows Hannibal working towards that end, as his army behaves as if they are in the territory of amici:

> in Tarentino demum agro pacatum incedere agmen coepit. nihil ibi violatum neque usquam via excessum est, apparebatque non id modestia militum aut ducis nisi ad conciliandos animos Tarentinorum fieri. ceterum cum prope moenibus accessisset, nullo ad conspectum primum agminis, ut rebatur; motu facto castra ab urbe ferme passus mille locat. (24.20.10–11)

---

15 On the concept of spes, see T. F. Scanlon, *Spes Frustrata: A Reading of Sallust* (Heidelberg 1987) 17–20, where he points out (19) that Caesar uses it both with reference to himself and those against whom he is fighting. It is used in a “good or helpful quality when applied to his own leadership, but unfounded or deceitful for his enemies.” Livy, on the other hand, “adheres to a mostly positive presentation of spes as public confidence in the competent leader” (20).

16 See App. Hann. 8.49: “Tarentum [was] a place advantageously situated for the purposes of war by land and sea.”
Only on reaching Tarentine territory did his column begin to move forward in a peaceful manner. No damage was done to the area, and there was no leaving the line of march; and this was evidently not restraint on the part of the men or their leader, but an attempt to win the support of the Tarentines. When Hannibal approached the city walls, however, the initial sight of his column did not, to his surprise, bring any reaction, and he encamped about a mile from the city.

The soldiers’ restraint from ravaging the countryside comes not from themselves but from instructions from their general (*ducis*). The *via* directs where Hannibal wants to go, and not deviating from it is a metaphor for Hannibal’s ability to focus on his objective.

Despite not being contacted by the youths, and thus fearing that the capture of Tarentum will not take place, Hannibal does not perceive their territory as hostile and he does not allow his army to damage the land:

\[
diebus aliquot frustra ibi absumptis Hannibal, cum eorum nemo qui ad lacum Averni adissent aut ipsi venirent aut nuntium litterasve mitterent, vana promissa se temere secutum cernastra inde movit, tum quoque intacto agro Tarentino quamquam simulata lenitas nihilum profuerat, tamen spe labefactandae fidei haud absistiens. (24.20.14–15)
\]

Hannibal spent a number of days at Tarentum to no purpose. Then, when none of the people who had come to him at Lake Avernus appeared in person, or sent him any communiqué or letter, he became aware that he had wasted his time following up on an idle promise, and he struck camp. Even at that point he left the lands of Tarentum intact; although his fake clemency had, as yet, gained him nothing.

The historian has already explained Tarentine inactivity as being due to increased security measures in the city brought about by the Romans (24.20.12–13). The fact that the Romans suspect an attack from either the enemy or the wavering allies (*dubiis sociis*), and that the attack could come at any point, day or night (*die ac nocte*), suggests the activity of the youth, and thus the likelihood that Hannibal will capture the city.

A potential difficulty arises in the phrase *simulata lenitas*, which might suggest that Hannibal is being duplicitous, exhibiting negative behavior similar to that outlined in the historian’s (first) description of Hannibal’s character.\(^{17}\) Given that the next episode contains no

\(^{17}\) Described at 21.4.9: *has tantas viri virtutes ingentia vitia aequabunt: in-humana crudelitas perfidia plus quam Punica, nihil veri nihil sancti, nullus deum metus nullum ius iurandum nulla religio* (“the man’s great virtues were matched by
his great vices: pitiless cruelty, treachery worse than Punic, no regard for the truth, and no integrity, no fear of the gods or respect for an oath, and no scruples”). On Hannibal’s portrait, see P. G. Walsh, *Livy: Book XXI* (London 1973) 127–28; Will (above, n.2) 158–59; Cipriani (above, n.2). E. Burck, “The Third Decade,” in T. A. Dorey, ed., *Livy* (London 1971) 33, notes that Hannibal’s actions in the early years of the war confirmed for Livy the negative features of Hannibal’s character, which the historian describes at the beginning of book 21. See Walsh (above, n.2) 104: “there is consistent emphasis on the Carthaginian’s cruelty—a feature generally attested—and also on his guile.” He goes on to note that “even more stress is laid on his guile and deceit, so that ambushes and similar stratagems are labelled Hannibalic methods.” On Hannibal in book 21, see Mader (above, n.2).

II.

The capture of Tarentum constitutes the main episode of the narrative at 25.7.10–11.20. The placement of this episode in book 25 is very significant, as it marks the high point of Hannibal’s campaign in Italy. The opening sentences of book 25 indicate Tarentum’s importance in the book: *dum haec in Africa atque in Hispania geruntur, Hannibal in agro Sallentino aestatem consumpsit spe per proditio-nem urbis Tarentinorum potiundae. ipsorum interim Sallentinorum ignobiles urbes ad eum defecerunt* (“while these events were taking place in Africa and Spain, Hannibal spent the summer in the territory of the Sallentini, where he hoped to take control of the city of Tarentum by means of treachery,” 25.1.1). Tarentum is thus conceived by the historian as having an axial role in the course of the wider scope of the war, from Spain to Africa and, geographically, as one might imagine Tarentum as occupying the middle point between the two, that is, travelling from Spain to Africa, via Tarentum. For the Romans this will be especially important, as Scipio will move from...
a successful campaign in Spain to his invasion of Africa via Fabius’ successful campaign to retake Tarentum (see below, section III).

Hannibal’s new allies in southern Italy, important as they may be in their own right, exist only as preparatory exercises by the general as his thoughts remain firmly focused on Tarentum (cum Tarentinorum defectio iam diu et in spe Hannibali et in suspicione Romanis esset, causa forte extrinsecus maturandae eius intervenit “the defection of Tarentum was something that Hannibal had long hoped for, and the Romans had long suspected to be coming,” 25.7.10).

Livy propitiously discusses Tarentine–Roman relations at this point, which means he can establish the Hannibal–Tarentine relationship on the back of the perceived inadequacies of Rome’s relationship with the city. That is, Hannibal can be seen to do (very) well what the Romans are doing (very) badly. The execution of Tarentine hostages by the Romans establishes a clear difference of approach to the city on the part of the Romans and Hannibal which will become more apparent in the near future.19 The Romans destroy a part of Tarentum through the killing of some of her citizens; Hannibal’s release of the prisoners after Cannae, and later his instructions to his soldiers not to damage Tarentine territory, reveal him to be someone who is at pains to preserve Tarentum as a whole city. The outrage expressed by the Tarentines at the behavior of the Romans—presented by the historian as a double outrage, expressed both by the state as a whole and by individual citizens (huius atrocitas poenae duarum nobilissimarum in Italia Graecarum civitatium animos inritavit cum publice, tum etiam singulos privatim ut qui quique tam foede interemptos aut propinquitate aut amicitia contigebat, “the brutality of this punishment caused ill-feeling in the two most famous Greek city-states in Italy, and on a personal as well as national level, insofar as individuals were connected by family or friendship with the men who had faced such horrible deaths,” 25.8.1)—establishes clearly the strained relationship with Rome which presumably Hannibal can exploit. It also partially exonerates Hannibal and his Tarentine co-conspirators from charges that their capture of control of the city came about through deception.20 The Tarentines seek to replace their lost friends with Hannibal as their amicus. The injury to the Tarentine animi in this passage

---

19 25.7.11–13. See Walsh (above, n.2) 74.
20 Canter (above, n.2) 574. Livy omits one detail to be found in Polybius’ version at 8.27.1–9: the drunkenness of the Roman commander, Gaius Livius (the historian mentions him at 26.39.1, but (mis)identifies him as Marcus Livius). See F. W. Walbank, A Historical Commentary on Polybius Volume II (Oxford 1967) 102–103; Kukofka (above, n.18) 28. This person is not explored in detail, despite being a member of Livy’s gens—see Walsh (above, n.2) 152–53. Livius’ drunkenness may not necessarily be a personal trait, but something that he picks up from the Tarentines: Aelian notes that at Tarentum it is customary to begin drinking at dawn and continue until the markets opened (Historical Miscellany 12.30). Champion (above, n.5) 149 observes that in Polybius “these scattered images of the Romans as being somewhat deficient in high principled behavior both in generalship and in international relations, read in the context of the books that are to follow, foreshadow a deterioration of Roman collective group character.”
makes it possible for Hannibal to win over them, as he hoped to do at 24.20.10 (ad conciliandos animos Tarentinorum). Therefore, by inflicting damage upon, or bringing about the loss of, Roman–Tarentine amicitia, the Romans provide Hannibal with the opportunity to offer himself as an amicus.

The identification of Tarentum as one of the most famous city-states (nobilissimarum, 25.8.1)—which recalls Hannibal’s perception of the city as nobilem at 24.13.5—confirms its value as an ally just as Hannibal is about to gain the city and the Romans are about to lose it. Here Tarentum is promoted from urbs (referred to as such on three previous occasions, 24.13.5, 24.20.11, and 25.1.1) to civitas. The use of the latter in this passage might convey that, in Hannibal’s view, Tarentum is something more than a collection of buildings. Just as Hannibal gets close enough to the urbs to see it (for a second time), and with the reasonable certainty that he will obtain his goal, it takes on greater significance. As a civitas it is not the physical city which Hannibal covets, but what Tarentum stands for, politically and possibly culturally.

Hannibal continues his role as the passive military figure at the beginning of this episode when he does not move against the city on his own, but is advised by to do so Nico and Philemenus (qui cum et causas consilii sui et quid pararent exposuissent, 25.8.7). The increase in the number of youths who come to Hannibal—from five to thirteen—and the identification of their leaders suggests the growth of the pro-Hannibal movement in the city and gives it a formal identity. Livy does not need to outline Tarentine grievances against the Romans for a second time: thus the historian does not delay unnecessarily the Carthaginian takeover of the city. Hannibal goes further than before by vowing to maintain the liberty of the city (congressi cum Hannibale rursus fide sanxerunt liberos Tarentinos leges <suas> suaque omnia habituros neque ullum vectigal Poeno pensuros prae sidiumve invitos recepturos “meeting Hannibal again, they secured an assurance from him that, after their liberation, the people of Tarentum would keep their own laws and their possessions, and would not pay any tax to the Carthaginian or have a garrison installed against their wishes” 25.8.8). More important is the fact that Hannibal now follows through with the “heavy promises” (ingentia promissa) he made in his first meeting with the youths (24.13.4). In saying that he will respect the libertas of Tarentum, Hannibal situates himself on the political inside of the city, arguing that he

---

21 Appian narrates this briefly at 6.32–34.
22 This episode might have struck a chord with Livy’s readers. The two identified Tarentine leaders negotiating handing over their city to Hannibal might have been taken as foreshadowing what might occur in the (near) future: two Roman consuls negotiating the surrender of Rome.
23 Polybius has two separate meetings where Livy has one: at the first meeting the Tarentines outline their grievances, at the second Hannibal promises Tarentum’s freedom (8.25.2).
will re-establish what the Romans have so egregiously removed. He therefore appears as a politician arguing for the independence and good governance of his own civitas.\textsuperscript{24}

Granted, Hannibal has made, and then promptly broken, similar promises before: Capua.\textsuperscript{25} Hannibal is neither is questioned about, nor does he recall, this negative behavior and Livy makes no authorial interjection, therefore Hannibal’s behavior at Tarentum will be assessed on its own merits. Conversely, Hannibal can demonstrate his understanding of the importance of keeping his promises by following through at Tarentum what he so effortlessly cast aside at Capua.

Hannibal’s presentation of himself on the inside of the political city facilitates the military campaign, as he appears to be inside Tarentum trying to push the Romans out instead of being outside the city with the Romans inside. In fact, when the Carthaginian army gains access to the city, Hannibal joins his army to that of the Tarentines, making them into a single (and supposedly unified) force. Hannibal dispatches units of his Gallic soldiers with Tarentine guides so that they may occupy key strategic points in the city (25.9.16). They are ordered to occupy the most traveled routes in the city and to kill any Roman present, but to spare the city’s inhabitants (*itineras quam maxime frequentia occupari iubet, tumultu orto Romanos passim caedi, oppidanis parci, 25.9.16–17*).\textsuperscript{26} In order to do this, Hannibal gives the Tarentines instructions to encourage those they meet in the city not to expose the plan (25.9.17).

Livy’s identification of Gallic soldiers suggests an interesting geographic encircling of the Romans. The Gauls are associated with the north (for they often invade Italy from the north); and the Tarentines are associated with the south, given the city’s position on the southern Italian coast. Rome, occupying the middle, is in an unenviable position. One might imagine the position of the three parties as Gauls–Romans–Tarentines; therefore the Gallic–Tarentine pairing can be seen as surrounding Rome. The Roman escape to the citadel of Tarentum facilitates this interpretation: the Romans seek refuge in the innermost part of the city,\textsuperscript{27} just as they did in Rome itself when the Gauls attacked Rome in the early Republic.\textsuperscript{28}

\textsuperscript{24} Livy here foreshadows Hannibal the post-war politician, which the historian describes at 33.47. Ironically this will make Hannibal unpopular in Carthage, and shortly leads to his forced flight.

\textsuperscript{25} Promises made: 23.7.1–2 and 23.10.1–2; promise (promptly) broken: 23.10.4.

\textsuperscript{26} In Polybius Hannibal instructs his army before they enter the city (8.26.7–9). He does not reveal the specifics of his plan, but rather orders them to follow orders specifically once they are given.

\textsuperscript{27} Described by Livy through Hannibal’s eyes (*videret*) at 25.11.1, the citadel is protected not only due to its elevation, but also due to its being surrounded on all but one side by water. See the map in J. F. Lazenby, *Hannibal’s War* (Warminster 1978).

\textsuperscript{28} 5.39.6–40.10. In this episode the Romans perceive their retreat to the citadel to be an effort to preserve Roman identity, and difficult decisions have to be made regarding what can be moved and what must be left behind (e.g., the Flamen Quirinalis and the Vestals at 5.40.7).
Hannibal’s joining up of his army with the conspirators comes on the back of the separating of the Tarentines from the Romans. In the confusion of the attack neither side is able to determine who is attacking whom:

\[ \text{iam tumultus erat clamorque qualis esse in capta urbe solet; sed quid rei esset nemo satis pro certo scire.} \]
\[ \text{Tarentini Romanos ad diripiendam urbem credere coortos; Romanis seditio aliqua cum fraude videri ab oppidanis mota.} \]

(25.10.1–2)

By now there was the uproar and shouting that occurs when a city is captured, but what was happening nobody really knew. The Tarentines thought that the Romans had risen up to pillage their city; to the Romans it seemed to be some kind of treacherous uprising by the townspeople.

The Tarentines believe (credere) that Romans are attacking them; the Romans think (videri) that it is the Tarentines who are attacking. The use of videri is ironic, given that as it is night the Romans (presumably) cannot see very well, and therefore cannot understand what is going on, and when it becomes light and they are able to see clearly, it is too late. The sense of confusion is emphasized by Livy through his reference to sound, and the manipulation of the opposites of silence and noise indicates Hannibal’s effectiveness as a leader.\(^{29}\) While the conspirators and Hannibal’s army infiltrate the city silently, when the attack begins a Tarentine blows a Roman trumpet, especially secured for the attack, and does so badly, so that neither side is certain what the signal means.\(^{30}\) Both sides finally realize what is going on at daybreak (ubi inluxit): the Romans see the Carthaginians, and the Tarentines see dead Romans (25.10.5–6).

Of greater importance than the capture of the city is Hannibal’s address to the general populace.\(^{31}\) What Hannibal says to the Tarentines now that he is in control of the city is, arguably, the most important event of this narrative, as it will confirm whether Hannibal’s behavior in the previous episodes was, in fact, genuine. The fact that Hannibal appears consistent here—that is, what he says outside the city is confirmed by what he says inside the city—appreciably strengthens his position, and serves to correct comments

\(^{29}\) Polybius also refers to silence (8.30.5) and noise (8.30.7). Livy might also have Sallust’s Jugurtha in mind, who, as C. S. Kraus (“Jugurthine Disorder,” in Kraus, ed., [above, n.6] 232–37) demonstrates, is able to move quickly and to delay when fighting the Romans. Did Jugurtha learn this tactic from Hannibal, or has Livy’s Hannibal learned from Sallust’s Jugurtha?


\(^{31}\) Polybius prefaced Hannibal’s speech by noting that the Tarentine conspirators (οἱ νεανίσκοι) proceeded through the city, calling on the citizens to support the freedom (ἐλευθερίαν) which Hannibal had come to give them (8.31.2).
like *simulata lenitas* at 24.20.14. Livy therefore appears to modify his opinion of Hannibal with respect to his behavior towards this city-state.\(^{32}\) In fact, Hannibal’s positive behavior here might be seen as indicative of the historian’s reassessment of him which culminates in the second character portrait at 28.12.

Although Livy does not provide Hannibal’s speech, he does indicate the manner in which the general speaks: *benigne adlocutus* (25.10.8). Hannibal both presents himself in a positive light, reminding his audience of his kind treatment of their citizens captured at Trasimene and Cannae (*testatusque quae praestitisset civibus eorum . . . cepisset*), and presents the Romans in a negative light, referring to their arrogance (*dominationem superbam Romanorum*, 25.10.8–9).\(^{33}\)

With reference to the former, he repeats and expands upon what the youths said to him at their first meeting (at 24.13.1). Hannibal’s treatment of the Tarentine *cives* stands in very stark contrast to that of the Romans’; and referring to the captured and released youths as *cives* builds upon his promises to restore Tarentine *libertas*. Unlike Polybius, who notes that the Tarentines cheered every sentence of Hannibal’s speech (8.31.4), Livy does not record the audience’s response; their approval of Hannibal is identified later (25.11.17; and see below). In order to separate the Romans and the Tarentines, Hannibal asks the inhabitants to mark their homes so that Carthaginian army will only plunder the Roman dwellings, which he identifies as *hostilis* (25.10.10). Hannibal proves himself to be someone who lives up to the agreements he makes, for the historian noted the general’s demand that he be allowed to plunder Roman property at 25.8.8.

When after his speech Hannibal attacks the remnant Roman force in the city (25.11.1–16), he does so as the leader of a joint Carthaginian–Tarentine force. Hannibal’s decision to construct a new wall, built by his soldiers and the Tarentines, encloses the Romans in the citadel, cutting them off (he hopes) from any Roman assistance that might come from outside the city (25.11.1–2). Hannibal’s survey of the city’s topography establishes his credentials as the best person to assess the situation, and therefore to make the decision on what ought to be done. What Hannibal does with his skills here will be important.

Hannibal’s army contributes to the city through their construction of a defensive wall against the citadel. Referred to no less than five times as an *opus* (a word which can be taken both literally and figuratively), the wall and the act of building it is both a physical and intellectual product which serves as a *monumentum* to

---

\(^{32}\) In fact, Hannibal appears to have redirected his duplicity towards the Romans. Polybius at 8.26.1 notes that before his attack on Tarentum Hannibal had feigned illness in order to deceive the Romans who might suspect his continued presence in the region.

\(^{33}\) See Polybius, 8.31.3–4: “the remainder obeyed the summons and arrived without arms in the market place, where Hannibal addressed them in friendly terms (Ἀννίβαω φιλανθρώπου διελ έχθη λ όγους). The Tarentines loudly applauded every word (Παραντίνων ὁμοθυμαδόν ἐπισημηγμένων ἕκαστα τῶν λεγομένων), for they were delighted at this unexpected turn of events.” See Chaplin (above, n.10) 67.
Hannibal’s successful creation of a positive working relationship with the Tarentines:\textsuperscript{34}

\begin{displaymath}
\textit{ubi coeptum opus est, patefacta repente porta impetum in munientes fecerunt Romani pellique se statio passa est quae pro \textit{opere} erat, ut successu cresceret audacia pluresque et longius pulsos persequeruntur: tum signo dato coorti undique Poeni sunt, quos instructos ad hoc Hannibal tenuerat; nec sustinuere impetum Romani; sed ab effusa fuga loci angustiae eos impeditaque alia \textit{opere} iam coepto, alia apparatu \textit{operis} morabantur: plurimi in fossam praecipitauere occisique sunt plures in fuga quam in pugna. inde et \textit{opus} nullo prohibente fieri coeptum.}
\end{displaymath}

(25.11.4–6)

When the construction got under way, the gate was suddenly flung open, and the Romans attacked the working parties. The guards in the post in front of the works allowed themselves to be driven back so that the Romans, their recklessness growing with success, would chase their defeated foe in greater numbers, and over a greater distance. Then a signal was given and the Carthaginians—whom Hannibal had kept formed up just for this purpose—rose to the attack on every side. The Romans could not withstand the assault, but the restricted space, and the obstacles they faced in the works already under construction, and the building materials for the others, impeded their headlong flight. Large numbers threw themselves into the moat, and the loss of life was greater in the retreat than in the fighting. After that there was no obstruction when work recommenced.

By attacking the wall almost immediately, the Romans recognize what the wall represents in military and cultural terms. The restricted space in which the Romans must fight is a metaphor for the exceptionally difficult situation they currently face. To the Carthaginians and Tarentines who would labor in its construction, the wall is a monument to Hannibal’s success in unifying the two parties, and the military victory they hope to achieve; to the Romans the wall is a monument to their defeat. As a \textit{monumentum} it is unusual in that it is built in anticipation of victory, or rather as an instrument to achieve victory. Its continued existence is dangerous, both in the military and historical sense. In terms of the former, the wall is a practice run for a strategy which Hannibal may choose to employ against Rome herself: siege warfare. More importantly, the wall is a \textit{monumentum} to Roman defeat in Italy. While Rome herself contains monuments to her military victories, Tarentum threatens to become a city which contains the opposite: monuments to victories enjoyed

\textsuperscript{34} On material \textit{opera} in Livy, see Jaeger (above, n.6) 174–78.
by others over Rome. For a second time, the Tarentines appear to be writing, or attempting to write, *altera historia*. In the preface, Livy compares reading history to gazing upon a monument.\textsuperscript{35} For the Carthaginians and the Tarentines who gaze upon the monument which they are building, it represents their desire to change the course of the history of the war.

After this assault fails, construction of the wall continues by the citizens and a small garrison left behind by Hannibal when he (temporarily) withdraws from the city (25.11.8). The speed with which the wall is completed, surprising even Hannibal when he returns to the city to inspect its progress, symbolises the ease with which Hannibal’s men and the Tarentines have merged into a single community.\textsuperscript{36}

In holding a *consilium* to discuss the long-term defence of the city (25.11.12–18),\textsuperscript{37} Hannibal demonstrates his willingness and ability to incorporate the ideas of others into his deliberations. Hannibal explains the problem of the continued Roman occupation of the citadel, and the Tarentines guide him to a possible solution: a naval blockade of the harbor by Carthaginian ships. Just as they agree with Hannibal, the Tarentines require that the general prove his commitment to the defense of the city: *adsentiebant Tarentini; ceterum ei qui consilium adferret opem quoque in eam rem adferendum censebant esse* (“the Tarentines agreed, but said that they thought that the man responsible for the idea should also be responsible for the means to carry it out,” 25.11.14). This Hannibal does by explaining how the Tarentine ships can be moved into the open sea (25.11.16–17). Hannibal succeeds in rousing the passions of the Tarentines for the task,\textsuperscript{38} and this causes them to express admiration for the speaker: *haec oratio non spem modo effectus sed ingentem etiam ducis admirationem fecit* (“these

\textsuperscript{35} De Am. 10, hoc illud est praecipue in cognitione rerum salubre ac frugiferum, omnis te exempli documenta in inlustri posita monumento intueri (“the special and salutary benefit of the study of history is to behold evidence of every kind of behavior set forth as on a splendid memorial”).

\textsuperscript{36} In describing Tarentine coinage from this period, Brauer (above, n.5) 196–97 notes that new coins had their weight reduced to match Carthaginian currency, and the names inscribed on them belonged to locals serving Hannibal, or Carthaginians “administrating a nominally liberated city” (197).

\textsuperscript{37} Polybius records this at 8.34.2–13; so too Appian 6.34. One might wonder in what language Hannibal and the Tarentines conversed. Hannibal was taught Greek by his historian-Friend Sosylus, who accompanied him on the campaign: Nepos, *Hannibal* 13.3. Livy does not mention the presence of interpreters (see 30.30.1, where Hannibal and Scipio each have an interpreter when they meet at Zama). J. N. Adams, *Bilingualism and the Latin Language* (Cambridge 2003) 205–206, esp. 206 n.381, suggests that they were Italians who knew Punic. See also B. Rochette, “Sur le bilinguisme dans les armées d’Hannibal,” EC 65 (1997) 153–59.

\textsuperscript{38} J. Davidson, “The Gaze of Polybius’ *Histories*,” *JRS* 81 (1991) 21 observes that Polybius’ Hannibal understands the importance of continually renewing the hopes of allies, which he does at Tarentum (8.33.2–3): thus the Tarentines feel that they do not need Carthaginian support to defeat the Romans (τοις δὲ πολιτισιως τουσταν παρεστησε θαρσος ώστε και χωρις των Καρχηδονιων ικανους αυτους υπολιμενειν ἐσεθαι τοις Ρωμαιοις (“he made the citizens [sc. Tarentines] so confident that they now considered themselves a match for the Romans even without the help of the Carthaginians” 8.33.3).
comments aroused not only hopes for success but admiration for the commander,” 25.11.18). The Tarentines perception of Hannibal as dux serves as unambiguous acknowledgment of their acceptance of him. 39

If the Tarentum narrative was intended by Livy to represent an altera historia, then it appears to be so strongly at this point. Tarentine admiration of Hannibal is not presented as an empty opinion but is based on actual experience, thus appearing to undermine any negative thoughts or actions on Hannibal’s part which the historian ascribed to him earlier in the narrative (24.20.14). If Hannibal was not obsequious then, one might infer he does not in fact possess the other negative character traits which the historian described him possessing (21.4.5–10). In other words, Hannibal’s positive actions, or rather the positive interpretations of his actions, in the present threatens to extend backwards in time and backwards in the narrative to the point where the historian describes Hannibal’s character. If this altera historia is successful, then Hannibal in Italy appears not as a cruel enemy of Rome, but as a defender of freedom against Rome. Granted, this is an exceptionally uncomfortable place and situation in which Livy’s Romans find themselves, but by doing so the historian is negligent in his responsibilities as a patriotic historian. Roman victory at Tarentum, and the eventual Roman victory in the war which is indirectly built upon Fabius Maximus’ efforts at and on behalf of the city, represents a greater victory than a description of a military victory alone.

III.

In the first book of the sixth pentad, Livy constructs his narrative to provide early signs that Rome will gain the initiative in the war, that she will eventually win, and will therefore pull back from the precipice of having her history unravel before her. Tarentum’s role in the Roman resurgence is suggest by the historian’s interim assessment of the war at 26.37.1–4: 40

neque aliud tempus belli fuit quo Carthaginienses Romanique pariter variis casibus immixti magis in ancipiti spe ac metu fuerint. nam Romanis et in provinciis hinc in Hispania adversae res, hinc prosperae in Sicilia lactum et laetitiam miscuerant, et in Italia cum Tarentum amissum damno et dolori, tum arx cum

39 Livy acknowledges Hannibal’s abilities to be dux to (very) disparate groups at 28.12.3–4: exercitu non suo civili, sed mixto ex conlunione omnium gentium, quibus non lex, non mos, non lingua communis, alias habitus, alia vestis, alia arma, alii ritus, alia sacra, alii prope dei essent (“he had an army that was not made up of his own countrymen, but was a mixture scraped together from all nations with no shared features in terms of law, culture, or language; they were dissimilar in appearance and dress, with different arms, religious rites and practices, and almost with different gods”). On this character portrait, see Will (above, n.2) 162–63.

40 See Burck (above, n.17) 24 on the situation at the end of book 25: “a balance seems to have been reached—almost as if the war could begin again with the conditions as they were before.” See Walsh, “Livy and the Aims of ‘Historia’” (above, n.18) 1070.
praesidio retenta praeter spem gaudio fuit, et terrorem subitum pavoremque urbis Romae obsessae et oppugnatae Capua post dies paucos capta in laetitiam vertit.41

There was no other point in the war at which the Carthaginians and the Romans, both experiencing a variety of fortunes, were fluctuating so much between hope and fear. In the provinces, failure in Spain and success in Sicily had brought the Romans a mixture of dejection and elation. In Italy, too, Tarentum being taken away from them was a painful loss, but unexpectedly holding onto the citadel had brought them joy. Likewise, there had been sudden panic and fear when Hannibal blockaded and attacked the city of Rome, but this turned to jubilation with the capture of Capua a few days later.

That the situation at Tarentum is satisfactory to neither side is made clear, as neither the Romans nor Hannibal controls the whole city: the latter possesses the city, and the former occupies the citadel. Both Romans and Carthaginians have similar positive and negative feelings—hope and fear (spe ac metu)—about the current situation.42

The war, as Livy notes a few sentences later, could go either way: ita aequante fortuna suspensa omnia utrisque erant, integra spe, integro metu, velut illo tempore primum bellum inciperent ("so Fortune was evening things up, and everything hung in the balance on both sides, with hopes and fears as alive as if they were actually starting the war at that moment" 26.37.9). By providing detailed information about the state of affairs at Tarentum, while only general details about the state of the war elsewhere, Livy imbues Tarentum with additional significance in the course of the war at this critical stage. The historian will not return to Tarentum until book 27, which creates tension in the narrative. Any advancements made by either Romans or Carthaginians in their wider war efforts in the interim will thus only be confirmed once matters at Tarentum are resolved.

Shortly afterwards the historian narrates a naval battle between the Romans and the Tarentines. Livy first describes the difficult situation of the Romans in the citadel (26.39.1). The Roman fleet hopes to be able to land provisions, but is met by a Tarentine fleet of equal size (26.39.6). The battle is fought with exceptional vigor, as both sides realize the

41 See Polybius 9.21. Livy in the next sentence expands his analysis to encompass other spheres of war, viz. Philip, the Aetolians, and Attalus (26.37.5). D. Hoyos, Hannibal’s Dynasty: Power and Politics in the Western Mediterranean, 247–183 B.C. (London 2003) 135–36 reads this period as a virtual stalemate in the war: “the half-decade after Cannae . . . brought both the high point of the expedition to Italy and yet a strategic stalemate. The Romans could not defeat him, but neither could he break them. Successes on the one side were matched by successes on the other.” See also Burck (above, n.17) 23.

42 Livy writes this on the back of his introduction of Scipio earlier in the same book (26.18–19), where the young general inspires spes pacis in the Romans. See Kukofka (above, n.18) 84–87; also Scanlon (above, n.15) 49–50 on spes pacis in Sallust’s Bellum Iugurthinum.
stakes involved, and for the Tarentines the situation appears particularly serious, as they are fighting to maintain their recently regained freedom (\textit{Tarentini, ut recuperata urbe ab Romanis post centesimum prope annum, arcem etiam liberarent}, 26.39.10). The historian makes this \textit{libertas} seem all the more precious when he overstates the period of Roman control of the city at approximately one hundred years (it was in fact sixty years, from the end of the Tarentine War to Hannibal’s capture, 272 to 212 B.C.E.). This Livy balances with a partially successful Roman campaign in Tarentum in which the Romans are able to get out of the citadel and kill the Tarentines standing guard (26.39.21–22). Awarding partial victory to both sides (\textit{ita aequatae res ad Tarentum, Romanis victoribus <terra>, Carthaginiensibus mari. frumenti spes, quae in oculis fuerat, utrosque frustrata pariter}, 26.39.23), allows Livy to build tension, revealing the frustration as neither side achieves a definitive victory.

The Tarentines’ belief that they are fighting for their \textit{libertas} relocates their struggle in a political context. Roman–Tarentine relations are thus recast not as an alliance of equals, but one in which the Romans were the oppressors and the Tarentines the oppressed. The Romans appear to face an additional danger from Hannibal’s alliance with Tarentum: that he is engaging in, and more importantly that he could win, a political battle in which the concept of \textit{libertas}, central to Roman identity since the foundation of the Republic, will be wrestled away from the Romans. This episode therefore builds upon the main episode of the Tarentum narrative, where Hannibal promises (1) to respect Tarentine \textit{libertas} before he captures the city, (2) honors that promise once in control of it, and perhaps most appropriately, (3) refers to the \textit{superbia} of the Romans (25.10.8–9; and see above). The last is significant, for it invokes memories of Rome’s kings, whose \textit{superbia}, Livy noted at 2.1.2, made the arrival of \textit{libertas} to be a particularly welcome occurrence.

Despite the exceptionally precarious political situation in which this episode appears to place the Romans, Livy does indicate that they will be able to overcome it. The Roman sailors believe that Tarentum was taken not by force and courage, but by treachery and surprise (\textit{non vi ac virtute, sed proditio nen ac furto}, 26.39.11). In recognizing how they lost the city, the Romans understand the means by which they must retake it.\textsuperscript{43} The brevity of the final episode (27.15.4–16.9) indicates their effectiveness in implementing what they have learned.\textsuperscript{44}

\textsuperscript{43} See Lazenby (above, n.27) 175–76. Burck (above, n.17) 35 notes that Livy often tries to explain Roman defeats by claiming that the army (presumably the navy can be included here) was caught off guard by the enemy’s trickery. At 27.20.9 Livy notes that Fabius gained glory from the capture of Tarentum, although he did so by a ruse (\textit{Fabio Tarentum captum astu magis quam virtute gloriae tamen esse}). On Romans losing and then learning in the third decade, see H. Bruckmann, \textit{Die römischen Niederlagen im Geschichtswerk des Livius} (Bochum 1936) 50–112, who focuses primarily on the Roman defeats at Trebia, Trasimene, and Cannae. He notes (109–12) that Livy frequently refers to enemy treachery when the Romans lose.

\textsuperscript{44} Plutarch in his \textit{Fabius Maximus} offers a pro-Roman account (21.1–23.3). In the \textit{synkrisis} of the \textit{Fabius Maximus} and \textit{Pericles}, Plutarch likens Fabius’ recapture of Tarentum to Pericles’ capture of Samos (2.1).
Livy emphasizes the success of Hannibal’s unification of his army and that of the Tarentines when he describes the Roman assault to recapture the city. That the Romans kill Carthaginians and Tarentines without distinction (alii alios passim sine discrimine armatos inermis caedunt, Carthaginienses Tarentinosque pariter “there was indiscriminate slaughter of the armed and unarmed men in every quarter, and of Carthaginians and Tarentines alike” 27.16.6) suggests that the Romans are unable (or unwilling) to distinguish between the two groups. By identifying Hannibal’s soldiers as Carthaginienses, Hannibal’s army is simplified from being a force comprised of diverse nationalities to a homogeneous group.45 The refusal to differentiate between Carthaginians and Tarentines in battle is anticipated in the previous sentence when Livy notes the death of the Punic commander, Carthalo,46 who, recalling his family’s long-standing connection to the Fabii, puts down his arms and then tries to approach Fabius only to be cut down (27.16.5). Carthalo’s identification of the relationship between his and Fabius’ family, which must entail revelation of his Carthaginian nationality, and his status within that nation, is neither recognized nor accepted by the Roman who kills him. But he also contributes directly to the Roman recapture of Tarentum. By revealing his identity and seeking to (re-)establish a relationship with Fabius, Carthalo undermines, if not consciously rejects, the Carthaginian–Tarentine relationship which Hannibal worked so hard to create and then maintain. Ironically, then, the Romans recognize Hannibal’s efforts at Tarentum while one of his own army inadvertently rejects the same.

Once the Romans defeat the unified Carthaginian–Tarentine army in the present, they defeat it in the past by tearing down the defensive wall erected on Hannibal’s orders (27.16.9). By engaging in an act of damnatio memoriae, the Romans ensure that there is no monumentum to serve as a historical record of Hannibal’s success in uniting his army and the Tarentines, and therefore no mnemonic focal point around which a future offensive against the Romans could be (re)built.

In learning of the Roman recapture of the city, Hannibal acknowledges—perhaps for the first time—that he knows the likely outcome of this campaign will be defeat: “et Romani suum Hannibalem” inquit “habent; eadem qua ceperamus arte Tarentum amisimus” (“the Romans have their own Hannibal,” he said, “we have lost Tarentum as we took it; but in private he was then for the first time led to confess to his friends that he had long seen the difficulty, and now saw the impossibility of their mastering Italy with the present forces.”

45 Livy divides them into their distinct cultural groups when he reassesses Hannibal at 28.12.3–4.
46 Appian identifies Carthalo as the commander of Tarentum (8.49), while Livy only credits him as being leader of the Carthaginian garrison (praefectum Punici praesidii).
47 See Plutarch, Fabius Maximus 23.1: “It appears, then, that the Romans have another Hannibal, for we have lost Tarentum as we took it; but in private he was then for the first time led to confess to his friends that he had long seen the difficulty, and now saw the impossibility of their mastering Italy with the present forces.”
Hannibal’s interpretation belies the truth of the Roman victory in the recapture of Tarentum.48 The Roman commander, Fabius, does not permit wide-scale plundering of the city (sed maiore animo generis eius praeda abstinuit Fabius quam Marcellus “but Fabius showed more strength of character in passing up spoils of that sort than Marcellus had” 27.16.8),49 which confirms that the Romans are learning from their past experiences.50 The reference to Marcellus here is deliberate: the historian appears to invite comparison of Roman behavior at Tarentum with that at Syracuse (recorded by the historian in the previous book),51 the low ebb in Rome’s relations with those she conquers. Tarentum therefore can be read as a turning point, if not the turning point, in the war; it indicates not only that the Romans will defeat Hannibal, but also that they deserve to win the war. Fabius understands that allowing widespread despoliation to the city would not erase Hannibal’s achievement there, and so he orders that the statues of the Tarentine gods be left intact (27.16.8).52

And Fabius’ positive actions regarding Tarentum are not limited to his presence in the city. In arguing on the city’s behalf before the Senate (27.25.1), Fabius allows all Romans to benefit from his example by encouraging them to act upon it, and his presence in the Senate shortly after his success at Tarentum presents the Romans with the opportunity to put into practice the exemplum of his conduct there. They do this when they allow the Tarentines exiled by Hannibal to return to the city (27.35.4). The sending home (domos) of the exiles recalls Hannibal’s doing the same to the youths, both after his victory at Cannae and in his first meeting with the youths. This creates a unity in the Tarentum narrative, with the Romans directly bringing about a conclusion to events at Tarentum in a similar way to that by which Hannibal indirectly set them in motion. Their identification as cives adds to the Romans’ achievement, for they are restoring the political city, almost as if they are restoring her libertas, as they

48 But not without imposing a defeat on the Romans near Tarentum: at 27.26.4–6 Livy records Hannibal’s successful attack on Romans on a road leading from Tarentum.

49 Lancel (above, n.18) 143: “Fabius had seized booty that was almost on par with that taken at Syracuse three years earlier. It was a real windfall for Rome’s public finances, which were in a parlous state.”

50 See Walsh (above, n.2) 106: “[a]s general, Fabius is depicted as Hannibal’s equal in the more subtle arts of war.” Hannibal’s utterance, recorded by Livy at 27.16.10, is interpreted by Walsh as Hannibal’s acknowledgment of Fabius as his equal.

51 A. Rossi, “The Tears of Marcellus: History of a Literary Motif,” G&R n.s. 47 (2000) 56–66 on Marcellus’ actions at Syracuse revealing the negative aspects of Rome’s imperial expansion; see also Jaeger (above, n.10) 124–31. For the view that Fabius’ actions are meant to be compared (favorably) to those of other Romans, see Burck (above, n.17) 34–35; Walsh, “Livy and the Aims of ‘Historia’” (above, n.18) 1067. Plutarch treats this episode rather differently in his Fabius Maximus (22.6–8), as does Pliny in his Natural History (34.40)—see D. S. Levene, Religion in Livy (Leiden 1993) 63–64.

52 The Tarentines’ large and well-known statue of Nike was taken to Rome; Augustus placed it in the Senate: Eckstein, Moral Vision (above, n.5) 151–52; P. Zankar, The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus (Ann Arbor 1990) 79–80.
did previously at the end of the Pyrrhic War, and which they took away through their treatment of the city in the period immediately preceding Hannibal’s involvement. And by appearing to restore libertas, the Romans recapture from Hannibal the role of Republican champion to which he earlier appeared to lay claim.

By not recording Hannibal’s banishment of these Tarentines earlier, Livy at this end-point of the Tarentum narrative invites reevaluation of Hannibal’s efforts, and in so doing the Romans eclipse—or rewrite—the alternate history which the Tarentine episodes represent. In wanting the exiles to know who restored their property, the Romans establish a positive framework through which Tarentum can reevaluate her past relationship with Rome, which deposes the pro-Hannibal history that threatened to grow out of the Tarentine youths’ positive memories of the general (24.13.2). In other words, the Romans encourage reflection on the entirety of Roman–Tarentine history versus the short-term memories of a small minority of citizens.

The return of the exiled Tarentines signifies a rewriting of history in favor of the Romans. Livy identifies the exiles as currently being located in Greece; therefore their journey home brings to fruition the imagined journey that Hannibal saw Philip taking (24.13.5; see above). Instead of being a Hellenic army which would aid Hannibal in his defeat of Rome, however, the Tarentines would return to speak positively about the Romans, and thus initiate the positive reappraisal of Tarentine–Roman history. They might even provide military assistance against the Carthaginians. Hannibal therefore imagines the correct geographic journey (Greece to Italy), but the identity of those making the journey, potential enemies instead of allies, means that he inadvertently creates the means of weakening further his position in Italy. Tarentum’s position as a turning point in the war remains, but the positions of Hannibal and the Romans now are reversed: Hannibal’s greatest victory which he hoped would enable him to win the war instead becomes a Roman victory, which in turn permanently shifts control of the war (and control over the memory of the war) in Rome’s favor. From Hannibal’s perspective, Tarentum proves to be a dead end. The Romans transport Hannibal to the point where he first became involved in Tarentine affairs. Having lost five years, Hannibal finds himself having failed to advance his campaign against Rome, while the Roman war effort has moved forward considerably, with Romans actions at Tarentum explicitly described by the historian as marking another significant step forward.

The Roman reclamation over how the war is remembered inside the text ultimately validates Livy’s own position as historian of the conflict in his Ab Urbe Condita, as the memores of the Tarentine youths and the actions which flow from them fail to replace the

---

53 The periocha of book 15 records the end of the war with Pyrrhus in 275 B.C.E. thus: victis Tarentinis pax et libertas data est. Valerius Maximus calls this war Tarentinum bellum (2.7.15b).

54 See the guiding metaphor of the labyrinth explored by M. Jaeger (above, n.6), esp. 178–83.
memoriae rerum gestarum of the historian looking back on the war from the perspective of the safe position two hundred years after Roman victory. The urbs at the heart of Livy’s history remains Rome. It does not shift to Carthage via Tarentum as the Tarentum narrative initially appeared to suggest could happen.

IV

Livy concludes book 28 by recording Hannibal’s erection in 205 B.C.E. of a monument in southern Italy to commemorate his perceived successes in the campaign:

\[\text{propter Iunonis Laciniae templum aestatem Hannibal egit, ibique aram condidit dedicavitque cum ingenti rerum ab se gestarum titulo Punicis Graecisque litteris insculpto.}\]

(28.46.16)

Hannibal spent the summer in the area of the temple of Juno Lacinia.\(^{55}\) There he built and dedicated an altar, adding a large inscription, written in both Punic and Greek, which listed his achievements.\(^{56}\)

Like Alexander, whom Hannibal thought to be the best general ever (or so Livy reports at 35.14.7), the Carthaginian brought historians on his campaign to record his achievements.\(^{57}\) In writing his own version of events, Hannibal temporarily usurps their role, as well as that of Livy (rerum ab se gestarum); his role as conditor arae might be read as analogous to Livy’s as historian ab urbe condita. As the Tarentum narrative demonstrates, such actions are in vain; by doing so when his recall to Africa appears imminent suggests that in writing his history Hannibal seeks to preserve his reputation. It is a final, and ultimately futile, effort to write an altera historia.\(^{58}\) Writing the inscription in Punic and Greek—and not Latin—encapsulates Hannibal’s efforts at Tarentum: the union of a Punic and a Hellenic Italian community and the exclusion of the Romans.

\(^{55}\) At 30.20.6 Hannibal executes Italians in this temple who refuse to follow him to Africa and fight for him there, for which Livy perceives as cruel (foede interfectis). Appian also mentions this incident (5.31). See Canter (above, n.2) 576–77. Cicero at Div. 1.24.28 notes that Hannibal was going to remove a gold pillar from the temple, but refrained from doing so after a dream in which Juno warned him that he would lose his sight in his other eye. See again Canter (above, n.2) 572–73.

\(^{56}\) See Will (above, n.2) 162. M. Jaeger, “Livy, Hannibal’s Monument, and the Temple of Juno at Croton,” TAPhA 136.2 (2006) 389–414. Polybius at 3.33.18 claims to have seen this inscription first hand, although he refers to it not when Hannibal made the inscription, as Livy does, but at the start of his account of the Hannibalic War, in order to convince the reader of the accuracy of his History. See F. W. Walbank, A Historical Commentary on Polybius Volume I (Oxford 1957) 364–65; Eckstein, Moral Vision (above, n.5) 280; Champion (above, n.5) 23.

\(^{57}\) Silenus and Sosylus, the latter of whom was Spartan, and taught Hannibal Greek. Polybius identifies Sosylus at 3.20.5.

\(^{58}\) Hannibal’s awareness of the fact that he will lose the war: at 27.51.11–12 he acknowledges when he gazes upon the head of Hasdrubal that his fate is to lose. See Will (above, n.2) 161; Jaeger (above, n.10) 94–99.
The intricacies of the Hannibal and Tarentum narrative clearly enhance our appreciation of the complexities of Livy’s portrait of the most important non-Roman of the third decade. Hannibal appears, even if only briefly, to emerge beyond what scholars see as Livy’s (very) negative opinion of his Carthaginian antagonist. And the portrait of Hannibal may have cast a (very) long shadow, influencing the historian’s presentation of other non-Romans who had a prominent role in the Ab Urbe Condita: Viriathus, Antiochus, Jugurtha, Vercingetorix, and Cleopatra, to name a few. The serious threat represented by Hannibal’s alliance with Tarentum probably influenced Livy’s claim that the Second Punic War was the greatest that had ever been fought (bellum maxime omnium memorabile quae unquam scripta sint 21.1.1; see 31.1.1–5). Rome’s (eventual) victory in the Hannibalic War would have validated the historian’s (and his readers’) immense pride in his country.

---

60 The last of these was particularly relevant to Livy’s Hannibal, since Cleopatra would still be part of the collective memory of the historian’s readers. Kraus (above, n.29) 242 sees a link between Rome’s three great African foes—Hannibal, Cleopatra, and Jugurtha.
61 See Walsh, Livy: Book XXI (above, n.18) 120–21.
62 Walsh, “Livy and the Aims of ‘Historia’” (above, n.18) 1059: “the theme of the Second Punic War engaged Livy’s historical imagination and patriotic nostalgia more than any other section of the “Ab Urbe Condita.”” Burck (above, n.17) 42 agrees, noting that the third decade “is the most compelling piece of evidence of Augustan Livy’s belief in Rome, and the maturity of his art.” On magnification of the historical subject, see J. Marincola, Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography (Cambridge 1997) 41–42.