

NOTES ON QUIZ 2

1 What role did naval power play in the first Punic war? How was the second war different?

At the outset of the first Punic war, Carthage was an established military power at sea, experienced in the building of ships, the equipping and operating them at sea, and naval strategy and tactics; on land, by contrast, they tended to rely on mercenary armies. Rome, however, had neither the inclination nor the expertise to be a naval power; by this time Rome had become expert at land warfare and tended to be suspicious of the sea, where their vast skills in land warfare were moot.

Now that the enemy was, for the first time, overseas, and because the object was the island of Sicily between Italy and north Africa, it was suddenly imperative to be able to fight at sea. Characteristically Rome approached this by both adapting to alien ideas and Romanizing them. A captured Carthaginian quinquireme was reverse-engineered and a contingent of merchant sailors and new recruits trained in using these speedy, maneuverable warships. Instead of relying on ramming, the primary naval tactic of the time, the Romans devised a free-turning grappling gangplank, the *corvus*, that enabled Roman soldiers aboard their ships to board the enemy and fight in the way Romans knew best—infantry combat.

The Romans defeated the Carthaginians so thoroughly that after the first Punic war Carthage's naval capacity was wiped out, allowing Rome to become the dominant, indeed only, naval power of the Mediterranean. This meant that in the second Punic war it was Rome that had control of the seas, and Carthage turned to the land invasion of Italy.

2 What kinds of social and economic effects did the Romans experience from expansion in central Italy?

- Trade and manufacturing: Increased production of manufactured goods (pottery and bronzes) and expands its markets in Italy and the west; early coinage.
- Public works: Paved highways and aqueducts in Italy, plus major building boom in Rome including many new temples.
- Agriculture: Conquered land redistributed to poor but also amassed into large estates, producing lucrative crops for export and a demand for slaves.
- Urban: Increased urban population, free, slave, and ex-slave, from countryside and Italian cities; greater class tension as patricians defend prerogatives.
- Art: New temples and homes reflecting success in war; appropriation and Romanization of Greek art forms, especially literature and theater.

EC1 All of the following are battles in which the Romans suffered disastrous defeats EXCEPT

- (a) Battle of Zama (202 BCE)

EC2 In your opinion, did the Romans win the war with Hannibal, or did Hannibal lose it? In other words, is the outcome of the second Punic war due more to Roman successes, or to Carthaginian failures?

Hannibal had considerable advantages at the outset. In his march toward Italy through Spain and Gaul, and later in Italy itself, Hannibal collected allies from among the local peoples who marched with him to end the looming threat of Rome. This gave him great numbers as well as making parts of Italy itself hostile territory. Two successive annihilations of Roman forces, at Lake Trasimene and at Cannae, demoralized the leadership and terrified the populace.

While the Romans were so stricken and divided over the best response to Hannibal, however, Hannibal did not capitalize on this advantage by attacking Rome directly. Instead he allowed Rome to gain time to rebuild its nerve and its strength. The dictator Fabius pursued a strategy of avoiding battle and harassing Hannibal's marching army, earning him the nickname Delayer, while attacking, taking, and punishing Italian, Sicilian, and Spanish cities allied with Hannibal one by one. Slowly Hannibal was hemmed in to the south, where his army was depleted and softened. Finally Scipio won support for a bold stroke against Carthage itself while its armies were holed up in Italy.

The militarization of Roman society and their deep reserve of manpower (which the invader Hannibal did not have) meant that even after the destruction of its forces it was able to equip, assemble, and field new armies for the next year's campaign. Perhaps just as importantly, Roman military leadership was not pegged to a single mastermind like Hannibal; every year a new pair of trained and experienced generals was elected consul, allowing continued leadership even if consuls were killed in battle (as at Trasimene and Cannae); and dictators like Fabius could be appointed at need from the most seasoned and admired of Rome's nobility. The senate was the repository of all Rome's experience, including all the ex-magistrates. Thus, as it had against Pyrrhus and against the Samnites, Rome's capacity for perseverance, recovery, and adaptation meant that even costly defeat in battle was only the latest crisis to be overcome.