

An Analysis of Method and Content of the Speeches of
Scipio and Hannibal as Found in Livy XXI, 40-44.

A Thesis
Submitted to the Faculty
Of the College of Liberal Arts of St. Meinrad Seminary
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
For the Degree of Bachelor of Arts

Anthony Philip Anderson
May, 1965
St. Meinrad Seminary
College of Liberal Arts
St. Meinrad, Indiana



Table of Contents

I. Introduction	1
II. The Tradition of Thucydides	3
III. Polybius as a Source	9
IV. Livy: Art versus Science	13
V. The Speeches of Scipio and Hannibal	18
VI. Conclusion	33
Appendix	36
Notes	38
Bibliography	41

I. Introduction

Down through the ages the science of history has changed radically. It has not always been a seeking after minute details, written in a style where notes are often longer than the text. Today's historians bear the burden of documenting everything they write. It was not always so. A footnote was completely foreign to the ancients. One might say the burden of truth lay on the trustworthiness of the author, for the author's sources were often unknown or lost.

This is just one example of the differences between the modern and the ancient sense of History. Another striking difference is the appearance of speeches put into the mouths of famous historical personages, a practice which flourished up until the last century. It is the purpose of my thesis to investigate this practice in order to see how it influenced Livy to write the speeches of Scipio and Hannibal as found in his Ab Urbe Condita, XXI, 40-44. In order to be understood these two speeches must be seen in the light of the historical practices of the time in which they were written.

Noting the various circumstances in which these two speeches were written, the following questions arise. How did historians of the time use this practice? How did speeches accommodate themselves to the purpose of history? Did the speeches give the actual words of the speakers; and, if they

did not, did this fact violate the science of history as it was regarded at that time? How did Livy adapt this practice to his history? Did he adhere to the principles customary in this practice? In what way do the speeches of Scipio and Hannibal exemplify his acceptance of this practice?

Another factor which influenced Livy to write these two speeches the way he did was his source material. There are several questions which arise in this area. Where did Livy obtain his information concerning these two speeches? Did he use his sources prudently and scientifically, or did he use them to suit his own purposes? Did he substantiate his material with valid evidence? How did his use of source material comply with its customary use at the time in which he wrote?

To answer the questions raised in the preceding two paragraphs, the works of other classical authors will be consulted. For the most part, this will consist in examining the works of Thucydides, Polybius, and Livy in addition to their critics. Whenever possible quotations from these classical authors will be taken from The Loeb Classical Library. The speeches of Scipio and Hannibal as found in Livy's work are not yet printed in this series. They have been translated from Antonius Zingerle's edition of Livy's works.

II. The Tradition of Thucydides

The place of speeches in the plan of Livy was due to special influences of the age as well as to the peculiar bent of his mind. In order to explain why and how he used speeches, it is necessary to consider what was done with speeches before his time. The introduction of speeches into history certainly had a beginning long before Livy. In fact, it was a regular practice in ancient historiography.

Homer had set the example of inserting speeches into a narrative and was followed more notably by Herodotus and Thucydides. But it was Thucydides who perfected and established the tradition of its use. Thus he may be called, and often is called, its "father."¹ The importance of speech was very evident in ancient times:

Thucydides set the first great example of making historical persons say what they might have said. The basis of his conception was common to the whole ancient world; it was the sovereign importance of speech in political and civic life.²

The common purpose of those who used speech was to enliven the narrative and to make it more interesting and readable. Thucydides, however, had a higher motive; but to understand his motive it is necessary to understand his reason for writing his history in the first place.

The motive behind his history is clearly didactic, and he himself readily admitted it:

...but whoever shall wish to have a clear view both of the events which have happened and of those which will some day, in all human probability, happen again in the same or a similar way—for these to adjudge my history profitable will be enough for me.³

This quotation reveals that he wrote his history because he believed that men would profit from a knowledge of what had brought about the ruinous struggle of his native Athens and thus avoid the same conditions in the future. In other words, he wanted to show the cause-and-effect relationship of the events. In this he was a product of his age and the Hippocratic influence which pervaded it.⁴ As Hippocrates attempted to show the causes of a deadly disease and the precautions to be taken to avoid it, Thucydides attempted to show how events had led up to an undesirable end and how to avoid this end. He believed that this political philosophy would hold good for all time and appeal to a much wider circle than the limited intellectual circle of his day. "And, indeed, it has been composed, not as a prize-essay to be heard for the moment, but as a possession for all time."⁵

The part which the speeches played in his scheme is of the utmost importance. "That the intention of Thucydides has been fulfilled in his own sense is largely due to the speeches which form between a fourth and fifth of the whole work."⁶ Because his work as a whole is to acquaint men with the recurrent forces in history, the speeches became for him the means to this end.⁷

There were several factors which made it necessary for

him to give the speeches in a different form than that in which they were actually delivered. Thucydides has stated these factors and also the precautions he used to counter-balance them:

As to the speeches that were made by different men either when they were about to begin the war or when they were already engaged therein, it has been difficult to recall with strict accuracy the words actually spoken, both for me as regards that which I myself heard, and for those who from various other sources have brought me reports. Therefore the speeches are given in the language in which, as it seemed to me, the several speakers would express, on the subjects under consideration, the sentiments most befitting the occasion, though at the same time I have adhered as closely as possible to the general sense of what was actually said.⁸

Obviously Thucydides made no pretense of giving the actual text of the speaker, but he did give the line of thought of the speaker or what he thought the line of thought was as warranted by the situation.⁹ Even in this he has allowed himself considerable freedom.

This brings up the problem of how Thucydides obtained his information. One great advantage he had over most ancient historians is that he lived during the period recorded in his history. Although he was an active politician, he handled his material with impartiality and objectivity and what might have led to bias actually led to his advantage.¹⁰ His intimate connections on the political scene made it possible for him to view what was happening from a strategic position. As for his sources, he stated:

But as to the facts of the occurrences of the war,

I have thought it my duty to give them, not as ascertained from any chance informant, not as seemed to me probable, but only after investigating with the greatest possible accuracy each detail, in the case both of the events in which I myself participated and of those regarding which I got my information from others.¹¹

This method of introducing speeches had many characteristics in the hands of Thucydides. Those considered here will be those which can be compared or contrasted with the practices of Livy. One of the more striking characteristics is the method of delineating individual characters, or rather, the lack of any characterization at all. Modern historians have the tendency to tell us what a person looked like, how he carried himself, and how he reacted physically to a given situation. Not so with Thucydides. His direct portraiture is very limited. "Everywhere the personation is effected by the speech and the speech only: in strict literal truth the speech is the man."¹² This lack of portrait-drawing was prevalent in the ancients' histories and was in keeping with the idea that only the state had a history.¹³ This is also in strict accord with his impersonal, annalistic scheme of writing history.¹⁴

Thucydides, however, made no attempt to give these speeches the outward appearances of being the actual texts at the time of delivery. He did not resort to any obvious literary device such as dialect.¹⁵ In fact, most of the speeches resemble the manner of speaking common at the time and the place where Thucydides wrote them.¹⁶ His rhetoric shows the

great influence of the Sophists, particularly of Protagoras.¹⁷ Because of his early training in Sophistic rhetoric, his speeches reflect a habit of grasping ideas in pairs, both in comparison and in contrast. This is shown on a broader scale in his pairing of speeches. Many of the speeches look to one another. Often Thucydides seems to violate reality in these speeches by ascribing to one speaker a knowledge of what another was saying at the same time in some other place.¹⁸

"Sometimes the speech of the general on one side is as distinctly a reply to the general on the other side as if it had been delivered in debate."¹⁹ Another influence of the Sophists was argumentation from probability, both with regard to the past and to the future.²⁰ In other words, his speakers often argue from the likelihood of whether something could possibly have happened or would more than likely happen in the future.

The last characteristic of Thucydides' speeches and his history in general is his attitude toward the gods. The gods really have no place in his history. They are conspicuous only by their absence.²¹ Nevertheless, Thucydides did recognize the religious coefficient in politics and morals, realizing that it does effect the way people act.²²

Thus, the speeches of Thucydides were of the utmost importance to him: for on them depended the success of his entire history. They were the means of explaining to all men not only the events in a particular place at a particular time, but also the connection of the cause and effect of these

events and their universal applicability to similar situations.

III. Polybius as a Source

The only extant source material for the speeches of Scipio and Hannibal which are contained in Livy's account of the Second Punic War is found in the writings of Polybius.²³ It is believed that Livy followed Polybius rather closely in his account of the Second Punic War:

The problem of his sources is extremely complex. It seems probable...that to a certain extent he used Polybius direct in Books XX I, XXII (Livy's account of the Second Punic War)....²⁴

For all practical purposes, then, to examine the source material of the two speeches and to investigate how Livy treated his source material is to examine the same two speeches in Polybius. This does not exclude the possibility that Livy used other sources; but, since Livy did follow Polybius closely and Polybius is the only extant source, it is not unreasonable to base an investigation on Polybius alone.

Two centuries intervened between the time of Thucydides and Polybius, and during this time came the age of Alexandrian erudition.²⁵ By the time of Polybius, history became a learned science. Polybius was a product of this age. He was very diligent in regard to his sources, careful, too, of geography and topography.²⁶ But, above all, he was a learned historian with a theory. What, then, was his theory? What was the purpose of his writing a history? And, ultimately, how did speeches fit into his scheme?

Polybius was inspired to write his history by the series of events which led to the triumph of Rome, not only in Italy, but also in and about the Mediterranean. In the first volume of his history he expressed his awe:

For though she (Fortune) is ever producing something new and ever playing a part in the lives of men, she has not in a single instance ever accomplished such a work, ever achieved such a triumph, as in our own times.²⁷

He was aware of this course that Fortune had taken—guiding the events of the whole world in one direction and forcing them towards one and the same end. And, for him, this course which Fortune had taken is precisely what a historian should show in his writings. Like Thucydides, Polybius was didactic, in that he attempted to show how all the previous events led inevitably to the present situation of the world. In his opinion this had not been done by other historians, but this would be his purpose:

As it is, I observe that while several modern writers deal with particular wars and certain matters connected with them, no one, as far as I am aware, has even attempted to inquire critically when and whence the general and comprehensive scheme or events originated and how it led up to the end.²⁸

Thus, Thucydides and Polybius were alike. Both tried to show the cause-and-effect relationship between events and what followed. The part that speeches or the use of rhetoric played in their writings, however, is radically different. For Thucydides speeches were the means with which he showed this relationship, but for Polybius speeches were written into the narrative only as probable truths and therefore not reli-

able in showing this relationship of cause and effect:

A historical author should not try to thrill his readers by such exaggerated pictures, nor should he, like a tragic poet, try to imagine the probable utterances of his characters or reckon up all the consequences with which he deals, but simply record what really happened and what really was said, however commonplace.²⁹

Polybius believed that, by narrating what really happened and what was really said, the cause-and-effect relationship would be evident to the serious student of history.

From what has been said above, it is evident the speeches played no vital part in Polybius's history other than to relate that there were actually speeches made at these particular times. "He is utterly opposed to rhetorical treatment of historical subjects."³⁰ But when he put speeches in the mouths of his historical characters, he was much like Thucydides. He was admittedly in the realm where "the probable takes precedence,"³¹ and he also tried to stay as close as possible to the general sense of what was actually said.³² Worthy of note is the fact that he often gave a speech for each opposing general, attempting thereby to give equal time to each.³³

If there is any historian who did ascertain what was "probably" said in the speeches of Hannibal and Scipio, it was Polybius. Although he did not have the advantage of living during the time he wrote about, as did Thucydides, he was able to talk with those who had taken part in the events he described. He had for sources, not only Romans who had actively taken part in the war, but also Greeks who had traveled with

Hannibal.³⁴ In addition, he is noted as being very prudent in evaluating his material and very diligent in obtaining first-hand information wherever possible, often traveling a distance to obtain his facts.³⁵ "Polybius had access to Roman archives and records of private families, and traveled widely to investigate geography and read inscriptions...."³⁶ The compilation of all these facts gives assurance that he is a very reliable source with a strict sense of truth.

Therefore, Polybius is more a historian in the modern sense of the word than any of his predecessors. He was very careful in his research work and had a profound sense of historical truth. He is, then, the most reliable source for the period he recorded. The important part of this examination is that his history contains the only extant source material for the two speeches; and, because Livy followed Polybius closely, it is possible to examine the same speeches in Polybius to see how Livy treated his source material, namely Polybius.

IV. Livy: Art versus Science

Whether I am likely to accomplish anything worthy of the labour, if I record the achievements of the Roman people from the foundation of the city, I do not really know, nor if I knew would I dare to avouch it; perceiving as I do that the theme is not only old but hackneyed, through the constant succession of new historians, who believe either that in their facts they can produce more authentic information, or that in their style they will prove better than the rude attempts of the ancients.³⁷

That Livy eclipsed all the Roman historians before him is witnessed by his fame. The reason for his predominance over them is stated above in the opening sentence of his history. It is not because he "produced more authentic information," but because he has immortalized Roman history with his graphic, stylized prose. It was in his literary art, then, and not in his historical authenticity that his fame lay. The part played by the speeches which are contained Livy's history is but one facet of his art.

The art of Livy's writings resulted from the inspiration of his history. Like Polybius, his inspiration arose from his conviction of the ascendancy of Rome over the rest of the ancient world: "...Polybius and Livy alike reflect the grandeur of the theme which so captured the imagination of Rome"³⁸ Livy's purpose, however, was more than just the glorification of Roman tradition. His upbringing in the rustic area of the present-day Padua thoroughly imbued him with a

preference for the simpler things of life and a distaste for luxury and all the vices which accompany it.³⁹ In the preface to his history he pointed out that the change from the old-time simplicity to the lavish luxury of Augustan Rome was a change, not only to be abhorred in itself, but also to be feared because of the destruction it would bring on the Empire: "...the might of a people which has long been very powerful is working its own undoing."⁴⁰ And further:

...then let him note how, with the gradual relaxation of discipline, morals first gave way, as it were, then sank lower and lower, and finally began the downward plunge which has brought us to the present time, when we can endure neither our vices nor their cure.⁴¹

This outlook of condemning his contemporary society led inevitably to the glorification of the past. His purpose, then, was to idealize the life, morals, and the policies of those who had established and enlarged the empire.⁴² The Romans accepted this praise of their ancestors with great favor, even in the court of Augustus.⁴³ "His prose-epic is own sister to the Aneid."⁴⁴ Livy's history helped to give the Romans the sense of their country. He developed their awareness of the past by making the past interesting and enjoyable in its "reliving." To a great extent he was giving his readers what they wanted.

Livy was able to give others an appreciation of the past only at the expense of the science of history. In fact, he lacks a good sense of history. The best example of this is his inability to sift his evidence scientifically.⁴⁵ Often

his criteria for arriving at a conclusion about conflicting evidence change, even when he is considering the same sources. Other charges against his methodology have been raised:

...he was often content with second-hand information when first-hand sources were available...he gleaned the harvest of annalists rather than himself grubbed among dusty archives...he was slack in verification, indifferent to topography within his reach....⁴⁶

Although he might have misconstrued the facts, he never did it maliciously.⁴⁷ In fact the artful way he presented the traditions of Rome may have led, as Duff says, to a higher, poetic truth--the view Livy and his contemporaries had of their ancestral past.⁴⁸

With all these inadequacies as a historian, it is hard to imagine that Livy ever realized the worth of a historian of the stature of Polybius, even though Livy relied on him heavily in his account of the Hannibalic wars. The mentality of Polybius seems, to a certain extent, foreign to Livy. Yet, when comparing the two, it is readily evident that Livy's account succeeds in arousing the emotions where Polybius' fails. This ability to play on the emotions is an essential feature of Livy's history. The question is, "Does this lack as a historian mean that his fame is ill-founded?"

The answer to this question is found in analyzing his history not so much as a science but as an art.⁴⁹ Livy was attempting to capture the imagination of his readers. He did this with a combination of literary skills, all of which stem

from his mastery of the language. He had the power to engage the imagination in intriguing situations with an amazing descriptive ability. His characters are vividly drawn with very acute insight. He had an uncanny ability to use the speeches for the greatest dramatic effect. These are the qualities that have given Livy's history its fame.

Since he did not produce much in the way of "more authentic information," the success of his history should be a measure of its art and not of its scientific advancements. That his history has been a great success is undeniable, as witnessed in its acceptance by the Romans themselves and its survival as an immortal work of art down through the ages.

What really helped Livy to attain such literary heights was his rhetorical power. Rhetoric was his forte. And it was in his speeches that "Livy found freest scope for his rhetoric."⁵⁰ Even his contemporaries admitted his excellence. Quintilian accredited Livy with being "eloquent beyond description."⁵¹ His speeches were models of such powerful rhetoric that they became objects of envy--Caligula banned his works because of their popularity.⁵² With his rhetoric he influenced the history of his own age and of the centuries which followed: "History is an art akin to Rhetoric, and more and more it will be written on Livy's lines...."⁵³ That he was a professor of rhetoric should account for his proficiency in it."⁵⁴

In the hands of Thucydides and Polybius, the speeches were vehicles of only probable truths. Both of them attempted

to ascertain as closely as possible what was actually said. This does not seem to be the case with Livy. Livy disregarded what he knew was said in order to achieve his own effect. There is an obvious example of this. Once he said he had the actual text of one of Cato's speeches, but proceeded to give his own version of it instead.⁵⁵ He did this "to represent individual character and manner," and he used his own version of Cato's speech for the same purpose.⁵⁶ Both Thucydides and Polybius used their speeches to further the end product of their histories. Livy also used speeches to further his end. But his end was different than either Thucydides' or Polybius'. Livy's end was to idealize the past, and he used his speeches to attain this end.

His speeches, then, are more than just the conventional use. Livy took the conventional apparatus and, as every true artist does, adapted it and added his originality to it. The speeches are in this way characteristic of his whole history. In them he took the matter of previous historians and skillfully added his art to it. "Like many ancient conventions, this one was tolerable in the hands only of a master."⁵⁷

V. The Speeches of Scipio and Hannibal

The speeches of Scipio and Hannibal are characteristic, not only of the speeches that Livy inserted into his history, but also of his whole history. They do not give the actual words of the speakers nor do they pretend to. Their purpose is to brighten and enliven the history, and thus give to the history that quality which Livy wanted it to convey as a whole, that is, the greatness of Rome. At the time these speeches appeared in the history, the future of Rome was in doubt. The great Hannibal was threatening all of Italy, but Rome overcame all obstacles, no matter what the odds were, to become the greatest empire the world had yet seen. This is the theme of Livy's account of the Hannibalic wars and also of these two particular speeches.

The speeches themselves give the ideas that were expressed in Polybius' history, but Livy has added more in order to achieve the effect he desired. Interwoven with the ideas furnished by Polybius were the ideas occasioned by the circumstances in which the speeches were placed. Add to this, Livy's rhetorical power and the speeches become alive with the drama which make them an integral part of the history.

More than anything else, it was Livy's rhetorical ability that made the speeches what they were. In keeping with the Sophistic rhetorical practice of grasping ideas in pairs, the

speeches are in many ways parallel. Like Thucydides, Livy seems to violate historical accuracy by allowing each general to answer the ideas put forth by the other. In the speeches of Scipio and Hannibal, this is the result of Livy's peculiar ability to state both sides of a question. Both speeches have biographical sketches of the generals. Both have pictures of the past, present, and future in connection with the impending battle. Both have the emotional overtones seemingly necessary to urge soldiers on to victory. In fact, if read separately, they both give the impression of an inevitable victory for their respective sides.

The following is a translation of the two speeches with selected notes.

Scipio's Speech, XXI, 40-41.

Soldiers, if I were leading to battle the same army I had in Gaul, I would not have thought it necessary to speak to them. For what would be the point of encouraging them? They were the cavalry who won an excellent victory over the enemy's
5 horsemen at the Rhone, and they were the legions with whom I followed the fleeing enemy and obtained as a sign of victory an acknowledgement of defeat and an end to the struggle.

But now that army has been enrolled in Spain, and carries on the war there in the command of my brother Gneius Scipio
10 under my own auspices in the country where the Senate and the Roman people wished him to serve. Consequently I have presented myself voluntarily for this struggle in order that you

may have a consul as leader against Hannibal and the Carthaginians. In view of this, a new commander ought to have a few
15 words to say to his new soldiers.

In order that you may not be ignorant about the type of war or enemy you have to fight, let me say this. Soldiers, these are the very same men you conquered on land and sea in the First Punic War. These are the very men from whom you have
20 exacted tribute for the past twenty years—the men from whom you took Sicily and Sardinia as spoils of war. Therefore, you will have the morale of men already victorious, and they the spirit of men already beaten. They are not going to fight because they dare to but because they have to, unless you suppose
25 that those who refused to fight when they had their entire force have received more hope because they lost two-thirds of their infantry and cavalry in crossing the Alps. More of them perished than survived! Even at that, few still remain and they are only strong enough in body and soul to scarcely have
30 the energy and stamina to withstand any exertion at all. They are just images, or rather, shadows of men worn out by chilling hunger and filth in body and clothes, bruised and disabled among the rocks and cliffs. And what's more, their frames are frostbitten, muscles stiff with cold, limbs nipped by frost,
35 military arms shattered and broken, horses lame and crippled.

This is the kind of infantry and cavalry you are going to fight with—not an enemy at all but only the last remnants of an enemy. But I greatly fear that, when you fight them, it

will look as if the Alps have conquered Hannibal, not us. But,
40 perhaps, it is only fitting for the gods themselves without
human aid to engage in and win a war against a leader and a
people who break treaties. It is also fitting for us, who
have been outraged just as the gods were, to finish a war so
begun and nearly completed.

45 I have no fear someone will think I am speaking eloquent-
ly to exhort you. I rather think I feel differently about it.
Into Spain, my province, where I had departed, I could travel
with my army. In that country I not only had my brother as a
companion in consultation and ally in danger, I also had
50 as my enemy Hasdrubal, beyond doubt not as great a threat in
war as Hannibal. When I was sailing along the coast of Gaul,
for instance, I went inland on a report about this enemy and
moved my camp to the Rhone after the cavalry were sent ahead.
In a cavalry battle in which just a part of my army was for-
55 tunate enough to clash with the enemy, I scattered them. The
footsoldiers fled so hastily that I could not overtake them on
land. So I returned to the ships because I could make better
time in them than by circling the land by sea. Now I met
them on this side of the Alps because of my respect for the
60 enemy. Does it look as if I have blundered upon them while
trying to avoid a battle with them? Or does it look as if I
have intercepted them to annoy and goad him into a decisive
battle?

It would be interesting to find out whether the world has

65 suddenly produced in twenty years another type of Carthaginian
or are these the same men who fought in the Aegates Islands—
men who were ransomed from the city of Eryx for eighteen
denarii? It would also be interesting to know whether Hann-
ibal is here rivaling the journeys of Hercules, as he says he
70 is, or has he been abandoned by his father as the tax and tri-
bute and a slave of the Roman people? If the crime of Sagun-
tum were not driving him insane, he would certainly look back,
if not on his conquered fatherland, surely on his home and his
father and also on the treaties signed by the very hand of his
75 father ~~Hamilcar~~. ~~on~~ This is the Hamilcar who led his soldiers
away from Eryx by order of the consul. This is the Hamilcar
who indignantly and sadly submitted to the heavy conditions
imposed upon the Carthaginians. This is the same Hamilcar who
agreed to leave Sicily and give tribute to ~~the~~ Roman people.

80 As a result, soldiers, I want you to fight not only with
the spirit usually shown against an enemy but also with the
indignation and wrath you would have if you saw your slaves
suddenly taking up arms against you. We could have starved
them to death when they were confined in Eryx, and starvation
85 is the most dreadful human torture. Our victorious fleet
could have crossed Africa and in a few days destroyed Carthage
without even a struggle. Instead, we granted pardon to those
begging it. We freed them from the blockade. We made peace
with the conquered. ~~And~~ then we put them under our protection
90 when they got involved in a war in Africa. And what do we get

in return? They come following a mad youth to attack our fatherland.

I wish this battle were for glory only and not for survival. You are to fight not for possession of Sicily and
95 Sardinia, for which a war was once waged, but for Italy herself. If we do not defeat them, there is no other army in the rear to oppose the enemy. There are no more Alps to delay them while a new force is formed if they are victorious. Soldiers, we must take our stand here as if we were fighting
100 before the very walls of Rome. Everyone of you must feel you are defending by your arms not yourself but your wife and small children. But you must not consider just domestic worries, for you must consider the fact that the Senate and the Roman people anxiously await news of our army's efforts.
105 As our strength and valor go, so also goes the destiny of this city and the Roman Empire.

Notes

line 1. "Soldiers if I...." The use of "I" so often in this speech gives a glimpse of Scipio's egotistical character. To support this claim there is the irregular position of the personal pronoun meis auspiciis (line 10). The effect achieved is one of a pompous general-consul about to lead his troops to a victory that can only be accredited to the greatness of the general himself. This is in accord with Livy's personalized history.

line 2. supersedissem—meaning literally "to sit above," but used in classical Latin in the sense of "to sit out" from a thing, "be above it," or "to refrain" and thus the translation "not to think necessary."

lines 1-8 and 54-57. This is actually a misinterpretation of the facts by Scipio. The reason Hannibal did not meet Scipio in a full scale battle in Gaul seems to be a point of the military strategy which made Hannibal the greatest general of his time. He was not prepared to defeat an army in Gaul, to lose part of his forces, and then to meet another "regrouped" army in Italy.

lines 16-23. The attitude stated here is typical of the Roman frame of mind—always falling back on the glories of the past. In view of Scipio's eventual defeat, this is the type of decadence Livy mentioned in his preface to the history.

lines 28-44. This seems to be a tribute to Hannibal for accomplishing the impossible—crossing the Alps with an army. Even in modern times generals have not dared to try this, and yet Hannibal did it and still was able to rampage about the most powerful nation in the world at that time with his "Alps-broken" men.

lines 31-32. fame frigore, inluvie sgalore is an instance of Livy in his best poetical prose. Frigore from frigus, oris, n., meaning cold, winter, chill, thus the translation of "chil-

ling hunger." illuvie from illuvies, ei, f., meaning filth, uncleanness of body used mostly in poetry. squalore from squalor, oris, m., meaning filthiness, filthy garments.

line 66. The Aegates are three islands in the Mediterranean west of Sicily, not far from the promontory of Lilyboeum where the Carthaginians were conquered by the Romans, cf. Livy XXI, 10. also.

line 67. Eryx is a high mountain in the northwest angle of Sicily. A city near this mountain is famous for its temple of Venus.

lines 68-75 and 91-92. Although Livy seems to think highly of Hannibal as a general he deplores him as an "insane, irreligious criminal" as seen from the two sections of this speech and also his character sketch of Hannibal in XXI, 4.

lines 71-72. The crime of Saguntum is charged against Hannibal because he broke the treaty made after the First Punic War, besieged Saguntum, and took the city, killing all of its citizens and despoiling the city completely, cf. XXI, 10-15.

line 72. agito, are, to put in motion, drive, impel, vex, torment. Here it is translated very strongly as "drive in-sane." ~~sane.~~

lines 96-102. By the hindsight granted to historians, Livy was able to see the importance of the pending conflict. It

is not beyond Livy to insert such remarks before the actual outcome of the battle. The fact is, though, after Scipio had been defeated, Rome lay at Hannibal's feet. Only the lack of siege material prohibited Hannibal from destroying the Roman Empire many centuries before its actual fall.

Hannibal's Speech, XXI, 43-44.

Soldiers, if you have the same feeling about your destiny as you had a short while ago in only a different situation, then we have already conquered; for that was not just a spectacle but surely an image of the circumstances you are in.

5 And I do not know if fortune has surrounded you with stronger chains and graver necessities than your captives: A sea encloses you on each side, and you do not have a single ship to escape with. The Po is mightier and more violent than the Rhone and it lies about you. The Alps which you barely managed to cross when you were fresh and vigorous, now cut you off from behind.

15 Soldiers, now is the time to conquer or die—when you first meet your enemy. That same fortune which made it necessary to fight now offers to you a reward greater than any you can desire, even from the immortal gods, if you are victorious. If by our valor we were just going to recover the Sicily and Sardinia taken from our fathers, it would be reward enough. But whatever the Romans have acquired and amassed by so many conquests, and the Roman masters themselves, will become yours.

20 Arouse yourselves for such a rich reward as this, and take up
arms while the gods are in your favor. Not for a long time
have you seen any reward for your many labors and hardships
while hunting cattle in the vast mountains of Lusitania and
Celtiberia.

25 Now is the time for you to collect a rich and profitable
compensation and to gain a great reward for your labors, now
that you have crossed so many mountains and rivers, and passed
through so many armed nations. Fortune has here put an end
to your labors and will here fittingly reward you for your
30 service.

You should think little of the difficulty of the victory
when compared to the greatness of the war. Often your contempt
of the enemy has caused a bloody battle and the defeat of
many famous kings and people with very little effort. Now
35 that this one bright light of the Roman name has been dimmed,
how can they even be compared to you? This is to say nothing
of your twenty-years military service with all its valor and
fortune. From the columns of Hercules, from the ocean, and
from the remotest parts of the world you have come here, vic-
40 torious over the ferocious people of Spain and Gaul. You
will be fighting against an army of amateurs who were sur-
rounded, beaten, and cut down just this summer by the Gauls.
Their commander is not familiar with them, and they in turn are
not familiar with him. Should I even compare myself with this
45 general of six-months, a deserter of his own army? For I was

almost born in and certainly I was raised in the barracks of my father, a very famous general; and I am the conqueror of Spain and Gaul, and also the Alpine nations, and, what's more, the Alps themselves. If today anyone would present this man
50 before the Roman and Carthaginian armies without their standards, I am sure that he would not know the army of which he was consul. Soldiers, I do not take lightly the fact that there is not a man among you before whom I have not accomplished some military objective. And, likewise, there is not
55 a man among you whose valorous deeds I cannot recall having seen and witnessed in particular times and places. After first having been a pupil but now leader of all you soldiers who have a thousand times received my praises and gifts, I will go into battle against an army and its leader who are
60 unfamiliar with and ignorant of each other.

Wherever I look, I see everyone filled with strength and energy. I see an infantry of veterans from the most noble nations and a cavalry of those with and without bridles. I see you all as brave and loyal comrades and as Carthaginians
65 about to fight for your fatherland out of a justified hatred. We are bringing the war to Italy. We are descending into Italy with hostile standards. We are going to fight more boldly and bravely than our enemy, for the attacker has more confidence and courage than the defender. Besides, suffering and
70 injury and indignity inflame and excite our souls. First they demanded me, your leader, for punishment, then all of you who

had fought at Saguntum. if we had surrendered they would have tortured us cruelly. This most cruel and haughty nation thinks it has the right to say with whom we have war and with
75 whom we have peace. This nation encircles and encloses us with boundaries of mountains and rivers which we must not go past; but this is the nation which does not keep the boundaries it has set up. This nation says, "Do not cross the Ebro! Do not have anything to do with those of Saguntum, for Saguntum is
80 free! Do not move a step in any direction!" Carthage says, "Is it a small thing that you have taken away my dearest provinces, Sicily and Sardinia? Will you take Spain also? And if I withdraw from there, you will cross to Africa." Did I say "will cross?" I mean "they have crossed." They
85 have sent out both consuls of this year, one to Africa and the other To Spain. There is nothing more left for us to do except to retaliate with arms. They can afford to be timid cowards because they have an asylum. Their own fields and countrysides provide a safe and peaceful retreat for those
90 fleeing through it. You have to be brave. Since every alternative between victory and death has been abolished by a certain desperate boldness, you have to conquer, or, if fortune wavers, meet death fighting rather than running. If this is deeply implanted in all your minds and well understood, you,
95 I say again, have already conquered. The immortal gods have not given man any sharper weapon for victory than contempt for death.

Notes

lines 1-11. The previous situation likened to the Carthaginian army's situation is this: Hannibal brought into their midst some captives and gave them a chance to engage in mortal combat among themselves for their freedom. They were all willing to fight either to win their freedom or to die in order to escape slavery. This would be the exact situation the Carthaginian army would be in when fighting in Italy. The alternatives given by this similitude are mentioned several other times in this speech.

line 6. Necessity is translated from necessitates meaning unavoidableness, exigency, compulsion by circumstances.

lines 20-21. agitedum from ago, agere, excite (of persons). here it is the second person plural of the imperative with dum translated by "arouse...while...."

lines 23-24. Lusitania is in the west of Spain in what is now Portugal. Celtiberia is in the mountains of north-central Spain. Here Hannibal is directly addressing the soldiers from these areas. It does not mean that these lands were under the rule of Carthage, for it was Hannibal's plan to recruit men from the lands he traversed on his way to Italy.

lines 27-28. emensos from emetior, emensus, meaning to measure out, pass through or over, traverse. Here it is used both in the sense of crossing mountains and rivers and also in the

sense of passing through various peoples.

line 34. perlevi momento here translated as "with very little effort." The phrase comes from perlevis, is, light or slight and momentum, i. n., movement or motion hence the translation.

lines 36-60. It seems quite impossible that Hannibal could have known that Scipio had just taken command of the opposing army. Like Thucydides had done in similar cases, Livy has given Hannibal knowledge that he actually did not possess. Livy used this as a point of contrast between the two leaders and their armies, making much of the experience of the Carthaginians and pointing out the basic weakness of the Roman army. The tone of Hannibal's praise of himself and of his army in this section is not egotistical, as with Scipio, but his praise is used to bring to mind that confidence which they shared in each other.

line 38. Ab Herculis columnis, ab Oceano is used figuratively in this instance in order to emphasize the fact that the Carthaginian army had been assembled from many distance places. According to the traditions of the ancients, the Pillars of Hercules—The Rock of Gibraltar and Ablyā in Morocco—were considered the limit of enterprise of the seafaring peoples of the Mediterranean Sea. The ocean referred to here could possibly be the Atlantic because the area known as Lusitania borders on it.

line 63. equites frenatos infrenosque refers to the heavily armed Spanish cavalry and to the Numidian cavalry respectively. They were so called because the Numidians rode bareback without bridles but the others had bridles and saddles.

line 73. Hiberus, i, m., a river north of Saguntum in Spain. It is now called the Ebro.

lines 79-80. The reading given in the Zingerle edition is ad Hiberum est Saguntum meaning "Saguntum is on the Ebro." This is not the case however. From all available maps Saguntum is considerably south of the Ebro. In this translation an alternate reading was used—liberum est Saguntum. This makes more sense in the context. Saguntum was a free city by the treaty after the First Punic War, the time referred to in the speech.

VI. Conclusion

Livy was not the first historian to put words into the mouths of his rhetorical characters. When he wrote the speeches of Scipio and Hannibal in his account of the Second Punic War, he was following a pattern formulated by historians before him. He was not the originator of the practice but one in a long line of persons to use it.

While Homer had used speeches in his works in the early days of Greek Literature, it was not until Thucydides that this practice was perfected and given the form it came to have. In fact, this practice of inserting speeches into the narrative became the means for Thucydides to attain his goal of showing the causal relationship of the events of the Peloponnesian War to the final destruction of his native Athens. He believed that this cause-and-effect relationship, if it were understood, would benefit posterity because similar situations would occur in the future. Since the speeches were the means to attain his didactic purpose, they were of the utmost importance to him; for on them depended the success of his history.

There are several factors which forced improvisation in the text of the speeches given by Thucydides. Because he could not obtain the actual text of the speeches, he allowed himself to write what was probably said. He did, however, base this

on the most reliable sources at his disposal. In the speeches he often granted knowledge to one of what another was saying at the same time in a different place. This was something that Livy also would allow in the speeches of Scipio and Hannibal.

Therefore, Livy was actually following the method which Thucydides had used several centuries before. But the method of Thucydides was not the only factor influencing the form of the speeches of Scipio and Hannibal. Another factor considered in this paper was the source material used by Livy. In his account of the two speeches Livy was heavily indebted to Polybius's history which happens to be the only extant source material for the speeches. The form of the speeches is radically different in the works of Livy and Polybius. This, however, is accounted for by the differences in the purposes of the two histories. While both are enamored with the theme of Rome's greatness, Polybius was trying to show the causality of the events which led to this greatness; but Livy, however, was idealizing the past because of his distaste for the luxury and vices which prevailed in his own day. The art of rhetoric had no place in Polybius' history because for him it violated his sense of history. On the other hand, Livy used the art of rhetoric, of which he was a master, to pursue his end of beckoning his fellow citizens back to the simplicity of life practiced by their great ancestors. The speeches of Scipio and Hannibal in Polybius (cf. the appendix) are the mere skeletons

of the actual speeches as noticed by the fact that much of them are given in indirect discourse. Livy, however, has taken these skeletons and put the meat of his rhetoric on them. Although this might violate today's science of history, it was a common practice of the ancients. The practice of inserting speeches into a narrative was particularly valuable to Livy because, like Thucydides, it became the means to attain his end, if only just one facet of the means he used. In his hands this practice became an art, because he is a master artist but only a mediocre scientist.

The two speeches of Scipio and Hannibal are an example of how Livy used the form of Thucydides and the matter of Polybius. The two speeches are unique, however, in their blending of the art of rhetoric and the science of history. Livy used the account of previous events to exemplify the characters of both speakers. Scipio is portrayed as an egotistical general who has come to rescue the whole Roman Empire. Hannibal, however, is portrayed as the perfect general, a born leader of troops, but somehow a wicked, ungodly man. The giving of character to these two men is in strict accord with his glorification of the past. By showing how Rome overcame one of its gravest threats to its existence, Livy has, in a sense, praised the men who accomplished it and also the way of life which allowed them to rise to the challenge of Hannibal.

Appendix

To see how Livy treated his source material it is necessary to see the ideas furnished by his sources, in this case Polybius only. The following is a translation from The Loeb Classical Library series of the two speeches of Hannibal and Scipio as found in Polybius, III, 63-64.

Hannibal:

When Hannibal had by this means produced the disposition he desired in the minds of his troops, he rose and told them that he had brought the prisoners before them designedly in order that clearly seeing in the person of others what they might themselves have to suffer, they should thence take better counsel at the present crisis. 'Fortune,' he said, 'has brought you to a like pass, she has shut you in on a like listed field of combat, and the prizes and prospects she offers you the same. For either you must conquer, or die, or fall alive into the hands of your foes. For you the prize of victory is not to possess horses and cloaks, but to be the most envied of mankind, masters of all the wealth of Rome. The prize of death on the battle-field is to depart from life in the heat of the fight, struggling till your last breath for the noblest of objects and without having learnt to know suffering. But what awaits those of you who are vanquished and for the love of life consent to fly, or who preserve their lives by any other means, is to have every evil and every misfortune for their lot. There is not one of you so dull and unreflecting as to hope to reach his home by flight, when he remembers the length of the road he traversed from his native land, the numbers of the enemies that lie between, and the size of the rivers he crossed. I beg you, therefore, cut off as you are entirely from any such hope, to take the same view of your own situation that you have just expressed regarding that of others. For as you all accounted both the victor and the fallen fortunate and pitied the survivors, so now should you think about yourselves and go all of you to battle resolved to conquer if you can, and this be impossible, to die. And I implore you not to let the hope of living after defeat enter your minds at all. If you reason and purpose as I urge upon you, it is clear that victory and safety will

follow; for none ever who either by necessity or choice formed such a resolve have been deceived in their hope of putting their enemies to flight. And when the enemy have the opposite hope, as is now the case with the Romans, most of them being sure of finding safety in flight as their homes are near at hand, it is evident that the courage of those who despair of safety will carry all before it.'

Scipio:

Most of what he said related to the exalted position of their country and the achievements of their ancestors; what concerned the present situation was as follows. He said that even if they had had no recent experience of the enemy, the knowledge alone that they were going to fight against Carthaginians should give them unshaken hope of victory. They should regard it as altogether an outrageous and surprising thing that Carthaginians should dare to face Romans, by whom they had been so often beaten, to whom they had paid so much tribute, and whose slaves almost they had been for so many years. 'But now,' he went on to say, 'when apart from this we can judge more or less by our own experience that these actual men here on the spot do not venture to look us in the face, what should our opinion be as to the future, if we estimate chances correctly? Why! not even their cavalry when they met ours near the Rhone came off well, but after losing many of their number fled disgracefully to their own camp, upon which their general and all his forces, as soon as they knew our soldiers were coming, made a retreat more resembling a flight, and contrary to their original intention chose the route through the Alps from pure fear of us. Hannibal has now arrived,' he said, 'but he has lost most of his army and the rest are weak and useless owing to hardship; he has lost most of his horses too, and those he has left he has rendered fit for nothing by the length and difficulty of his march.' From all this he tried to convince them that they had only to show themselves to the enemy. He bade them above all be encouraged by his own presence, for never would he have abandoned his fleet and the Spanish expedition on which he was dispatched, and made such haste to reach Italy, had it not been evident to him that he was doing a necessary service to his country and that victory was a matter of certainty.

Notes

1. Richard Claverhouse Jebb, "The Speeches of Thucydides," Hellenica, Evelyn Abbott, editor, (London: Rivingtons, 1880), p. 267.
2. Ibid., p. 316.
3. Thucydides, History of the Peloponnesian War, I, xxii, Charles Forster Smith, translator, The Loeb Classical Library, (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1951), vol. 1, p. 41.
4. For the treatment of this theme, cf., Charles Norris Cochrane, Thucydides and the Science of History, (London: Oxford University Press, 1929), pp. 14-35.
5. Thucydides, op. cit., I, xxii.
6. Jebb, op. cit., p. 266.
7. John H. Finley, Jr., Thucydides, (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1947), p. 99.
8. Thucydides, op. cit., I, xxii.
9. Jebb, op. cit., p. 276.
10. J.B. Bury, S.A. Cook, F.E. Adcock, editors, The Cambridge Ancient History, vol. v: Athens 478-401 B.C., (Cambridge: University Press, 1940), p. 413.
11. Thucydides, op. cit., I, xxii.
12. G.F. Abbott, Thucydides: A Study in Historical Reality, (London: George Routledge and Sons, Ltd., 1925), p. 125.
13. Bury, Cook, Adcock, op. cit., p. 399.
14. Ibid., p. 405.
15. Abbott, op. cit., p. 186.
16. Finley, op. cit., p. 101.
17. For treatment of this theme, cf., Finley, op. cit., pp. 37-73.
18. Finley, op. cit., p. 100.

19. Jebb, op. cit., p. 294.
20. Finley, op. cit., pp. 46-50.
21. Bury, Cook, Adcock, op. cit., p. 405.
22. Ibid., p. 406.
23. J. Wight Duff, A Literary History of Rome, (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1932), p. 644.
24. S.A. Cook, F.E. Adcock, M.P. Charlesworth, editors, The Cambridge Ancient History, vol. viii: Rome and the Mediterranean 218-133 B.C., (Cambridge: University Press, 1930), p. 26, note.
25. Jebb, op. cit., p. 311.
26. Cook, Adcock, Charlesworth, op. cit., p. 25, note.
27. Polybius, The Histories, I, 4, The Loeb Classical Library, W.R. Paton, translator, (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1954), vol. 1, p.11.
28. Ibid., I, 4.
29. Ibid., II, 56.
30. Jebb, op. cit., p. 311.
31. Polybius, op. cit., II, 56.
32. Jebb, op. cit., p. 311.
33. Ibid., p. 311.
34. Cook, Adcock, Charlesworth, op. cit., p. 25, note.
35. Duff, op. cit., p. 644.
36. Cook, Adcock, Charlesworth, op. cit., p. 25, note.
37. Livy, Ab Urbe Condita, "Preface," The Loeb Classical Library, B.O. Foster, translator, (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1957), vol. 1, p. 3.
38. Cook, Adcock, Charlesworth, op. cit., p. 26.
39. Duff, op. cit., p. 638.
40. Livy, op. cit., "Preface."

41. Ibid., "Preface."

42. Ibid., "Preface."

43. Duff, op. cit., p. 639.

44. Ibid., p. 637.

45. For a treatment of this theme with specific examples, cf. Cook, Adcock, Charlesworth, The Cambridge Ancient History, vol. x: The Augustan Empire 44 B.C.—A.D. 70, (Cambridge: University Press, 1934), p. 532.

46. Duff, op. cit., p. 646.

47. Ibid., p. 650; J.W. MacKail, Latin Literature, (New

48. Duff, op. cit., p. 650.

49. For a treatment of this theme cf. Duff, op. cit., p. 648ff.

50. Duff, op. cit., p. 655.

51. Quintilian, Institutio Oratoria, X, 1, 101, The Loeb Classical Library, H.E. Butler, translator, (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1949), vol. iv, p. 59.

52. Duff, op. cit., p. 639.

53. Cook, Adcock, Charlesworth, op. cit., vol. x, p. 532.

54. Duff, op. cit., p. 639.

55. Livy, op. cit., XLV, 25, as quoted in Jebb, op. cit., pp. 312-313.

56. Jebb, op. cit., pp. 312-313.

57. H.J. Rose, A Handbook of Latin Literature, (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1936), p. 300.

Bibliography

- Abott, G.D., Thucydides: A Study in Historical Reality, (London: George Routledge & Sons, Ltd., 1925).
- Bury, J.B., Cook, S.A., and Adcock, F.E., editors, The Cambridge Ancient History, vol. v: Athens 478-401 B.C., (Cambridge: University Press, 1940).
- Cochrane, Charles Norris, Thucydides and the Science of History, (London: Oxford University Press, 1929).
- Cook, S.A., Adcock, F.E., and Charlesworth, M.P., editors, The Cambridge Ancient History, vol. viii: Rome and the Mediterranean 218-133 B.C., (Cambridge: University Press, 1930).
- _____, The Cambridge Ancient History, vol. x: The Augustan Empire 44 B.C.—A.D. 70, (Cambridge: University Press, 1934).
- Duff, J. Wight, A Literary History of Rome, (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1932).
- _____, The Writers of Rome, (London: Oxford University Press, 1925).
- Finley, John H., Jr., Thucydides, (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1947).
- Grundy, G.B., Thucydides and the History of His Age, (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1948).
- Hamilton, Edith, The Greek Way, (New York: The New American Library, 1961).
- _____, The Roman Way, (New York: The New American Library, 1963).
- Jebb, Richard Claverhouse, "The Speeches of Thucydides," Hellenica, edited by Evelyn Abbott, (London: Rivingtons, 1880).
- Livy, Ab Urbe Condita, I and II, translated by B.O. Foster, The Loeb Classical Library, (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1957).
- _____, Ab Urbe Condita, XXI and XXII, edited with notes by John K. Lord, (New York: Leach, Shewell, and Sanborn, 1897).
- _____, Ab Urbe Condita, XXI-XXV, edited by Antonius Zingerle, (Lipsiae: G. Freytag, 1885).
- MacKail, J.W., Latin Literature, (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1902).
- Polybius, The Histories, translated by W.R. Paton, The Loeb Classical Library, (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1954).
- Rose, H.J., A Handbook of Latin Literature, (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1936).
- Thucydides, History of the Peloponnesian War, translated by Charles Forster Smith, The Loeb Classical Library, (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1951).

ARCHABREY LIBRARY



3 0764 1002 8790 8