

The Military Dimension of Hannibal's Campaign Against Rome (218–203 BCE)

NOUREDDINE Karima karima.noureddine@ummtto.dz	Antique History	University of Mouloud Mammeri Tizi Ouzou; Algeria
DOI :		

Received: 08 /04/2025

Accepted: 16 /06/2025

Published: 20/12/2025

Abstract:

Hannibal Barca's military campaign against Rome from 218 to 203 BCE during the Second Punic War stands as one of history's most remarkable strategic feats. This study analyzes the military dimensions of his campaign, focusing on tactics, logistics, and strategic decisions that allowed him to challenge the Roman Republic for over a decade. By examining key battles such as Trebia, Lake Trasimene, and Cannae, the research illustrates how Hannibal's innovative tactics, such as the double envelopment at Cannae, redefined ancient warfare. Additionally, the study explores the logistical challenges of sustaining a diverse, multi-ethnic army across hostile territories and the eventual factors contributing to his strategic failure. The findings reveal that while Hannibal excelled tactically, his lack of logistical and political support ultimately undermined his long-term success.

Keywords : Hannibal Barca; Second Punic War; military strategy; ancient warfare; Rome.

Introduction:

The Second Punic War (218–201 BCE) was a defining conflict in ancient history, pitting the expanding Roman Republic against the Carthaginian general Hannibal Barca. Hannibal's campaign against Rome was marked by bold strategies, innovative tactics, and a remarkable ability to sustain his forces deep within enemy territory. His crossing of the Alps with war elephants and his victory at Cannae in 216 BCE remain some of the most studied military maneuvers in history.

This study aims to explore the military aspects of Hannibal's campaign, with a focus on his tactical innovations, strategic objectives, and logistical operations. By analyzing primary sources such as Polybius and Livy, along with modern historical interpretations, the research seeks to provide a comprehensive understanding of Hannibal's military genius. The study will address the key questions: What were the primary tactics and strategies employed by Hannibal? How did logistical challenges impact his long-term campaign? And why, despite his tactical superiority, did he ultimately fail to defeat Rome?

Understanding the military dimension of Hannibal's campaign provides valuable insights into ancient warfare and the enduring principles of strategy and logistics. The study will proceed through a chronological analysis of major battles, an evaluation of logistical and operational challenges, and a discussion of the broader strategic implications of Hannibal's actions during the war.

1. The Army Organization:

After the capture and destruction of *Saguntum* by Hannibal in 219 BC, he returned to *Carthago Nova*, where he spent the winter making initial preparations for the campaign. To ensure the security of the "Spanish Empire" - as some referred to Carthaginian territories in Spain (Gilbert, 1996, P.206) - Hannibal decided to leave his brother *Hasdrubal* in command of fifteen thousand (15,000) soldiers, twenty-one (21) war elephants, and approximately sixty warships (Polybius, III, P.33). Hasdrubal was tasked with administering the provinces stretching from the *Ebro River* in the north to *Gades* (modern-day Cádiz) in the south. Additionally, Hannibal later stationed *Hanno* with eleven thousand (11,000) soldiers in the region between the *Pyrenees Mountains* and the *Ebro River* (Yanoski, S.D).

While these measures were primarily intended to safeguard Carthaginian holdings in Spain, they simultaneously served as a reserve force ready to reinforce the advancing troops in Italy if needed (Adision, 1961, P.304). Furthermore, some sources indicate that additional steps were taken to secure *Carthage* itself. Both *Titus Livius* and *Polybius* mentioned the transfer of Iberian troops to Africa and African troops to Spain (Titus Livius, 1930, P.32) - a precautionary measure deemed successful in preventing potential uprisings. As part of this strategy, Hannibal dispatched twelve hundred (1,200) cavalry to Africa, along with approximately fourteen thousand (14,000) infantry and around one thousand (1,000) slingers. Additionally, four thousand (4,000) infantries were recruited from the interior regions and sent to *Carthage* to serve both as soldiers and hostages (Polybuis, 1970, P.113).

As for the forces chosen to accompany him, Hannibal rewarded them generously and granted them the entire winter to rest. Meanwhile, he traveled to the *Temple of Hercules Melqart* in *Gades*, where he launched a propaganda campaign, claiming that the gods had promised him protection and that his soldiers were destined to conquer Italy (Warmington, 1961, P.233). Here, we can observe the use of psychological warfare - a strategy that undoubtedly influenced local populations to support his cause.

If Hannibal was a skilled military commander, he was also a shrewd politician. As soon as he completed his military and psychological preparations, he embarked on a broad political initiative (Gsell , 1913, P.288).

He began communicating with the Gallic tribes to gauge whether their resentment toward Rome still lingered. Hannibal, the *Barcid* commander, saw this as an ideal opportunity to achieve his military objectives by securing the support of these tribes. His strategy relied on inciting those populations that had been subjugated by Rome through force, thereby reinforcing his army with communities still unaccustomed to Roman rule. Hannibal's target extended beyond the Gallic tribes; he sought support from all peoples who had been defeated by Rome, as well as those who felt threatened by Roman expansion, such as various Italian tribes.

Thus, Hannibal's objective was to "strike Rome in its own heart," compelling it to adopt a defensive stance instead of its customary offensive strategy. By doing so, he aimed to fracture Italian unity, incite the Gauls on both sides of the Alps, rally the Greek cities of southern Italy, and gain the support of the King of Macedonia, who opposed the Roman presence along the *Illyrian* coast.

Hannibal had no viable option but to take the overland route, as Carthage lacked a naval fleet capable of transporting such a large army. Additionally, there was no secure landing point along the Italian coast. Consequently, he resolved to cross the *Pyrenees* and the *Alps* - the latter leading to the fertile plains of the *Po River Valley*, a region known for its agricultural wealth and populated by Gauls eager to rise against Rome (Astifan , P.129).

By choosing this route, Hannibal ensured continuous communication with Spain and safeguarded his rear from potential attacks-something that would have been impossible by sea, even if *Massilia* (modern-day Marseille) had been open to him. The city's inhabitants could have rebelled and severed his lines of communication with Spain, depriving him of the necessary supplies of money and manpower from the Iberian Peninsula (Gsell, P.145).

For these reasons, Hannibal traversed the lands of Gaul, inhabited by fierce Gallic tribes, before proceeding through the *Rhone Valley*. Additionally, anyone taking this route had to cross the *Apennines* after the *Alps* before reaching the plains that led to Rome (Gsell, P.145).

2. Tactical Combat Strategy:

There is no doubt that Hannibal's plan to invade Italy on its own soil was the result of meticulous study and long-term preparations. His father,

Hamilcar Barca, had initially laid the foundation for this strategy, intending to renew the conflict with Rome. Evidence of this can be seen in his diplomatic efforts to maintain good relations with the Gallic tribes. *Hamilcar* did not prioritize building a new naval fleet, suggesting that he had envisioned attacking Italy by advancing through Gaul. *Hannibal* later inherited this plan, refining and assembling the forces required for its execution (Maria, 2007, P.99).

After leaving his brother *Hasdrubal* to defend the Iberian highlands, *Hannibal*, the son of *Hamilcar*, marched with his army composed of Africans and Spaniards. According to *Polybius*, the army included ninety thousand (90,000) infantry, twelve thousand (12,000) cavalry, and thirty-seven (37) war elephants (Violaire, 1961, P.167). However, some historians argue that these numbers may be exaggerated (Georges, 1959, P.253).

After crossing the *Ebro River*, which Rome had designated as the northern boundary for Carthaginian influence, *Hannibal* faced considerable difficulty subduing the tribes living between the river's lower course and the *Pyrenees Mountains*. These tribes fiercely resisted his advance, as they were accustomed to complete independence. It seems that Rome had been covertly supplying them with money and weapons. Despite the challenges, *Hannibal* ultimately defeated the opposing forces and left *Hanno* (Julian, PP.458-489), one of his trusted officers, to secure the region. He also granted freedom to several thousand Spaniards whose loyalty remained uncertain (Polybius, P.33).

Afterward, *Hannibal* crossed the *Pyrenees*. Beyond these mountains, the army advanced quickly, reaching the *Rhône River*. To avoid engaging the Roman forces under the command of *Publius Cornelius Scipio*, who had landed at the river's eastern mouth after sailing from Italy, *Hannibal* led his troops northward along the *Rhône's* banks. His goal was to avoid a time-consuming battle, as the approaching autumn threatened to cover the mountain passes with snow, which would severely impede his march.

Hannibal continued his advance toward the confluence of the *Rhône* with its tributary, the *Isère River*. He then crossed the *Alps* through the *Little Saint Bernard Pass*, according to most historical accounts. The crossing was fraught with difficulty. His army faced ambushes from the mountain tribes, treacherous snowfalls, and the harsh conditions of the alpine environment. By the time he descended into *Transalpine Gaul*, *Hannibal* had lost more than half of his original forces.

Out of the army that had departed from *Carthago Nova* five months earlier, only twenty thousand (20,000) infantry, six thousand (6,000) cavalry, and twenty-one (21) (Polybius, P.56) war elephants survived the perilous journey.

By crossing the *Alps*, Hannibal achieved a significant milestone, positioning himself to confront Rome within its own territory. While some historians have downplayed the importance of this achievement, the harsh conditions of the journey underscore the man's determination and greatness. Hannibal's forces arrived in Italy exhausted and weary, yet their morale remained high, and their trust in their leader was unshaken. *Scipio* had already advanced to intercept him, leading to the first battle of the Second Punic War - the *Battle of Ticinus* - fought on the river's western bank.

3. Battle Strategies:

The battle at *Ticinus* involved Roman cavalry supported by light infantry against Hannibal's cavalry. Victory went to the Carthaginians, thanks largely to their superior *Numidian* (Youlius, P.65) *cavalry*. *Scipio*, wounded during the encounter, hastily withdrew his forces from the open plains, which favored the enemy's mobile cavalry units (Youlius, P.66). In response, Rome recalled *Tiberius Sempronius Longus*, who had been en route to Africa, to reinforce *Scipio*.

Hannibal soon faced the Roman army again, this time near the *Trebbia River*. Despite *Scipio*'s cautious advice, *Sempronius* launched an ill-conceived attack against the Carthaginians. Hannibal quickly seized the opportunity and, with tactical brilliance, overwhelmed the Roman forces, killing or capturing thirty thousand (30,000) soldiers (Youlius, P.74). This decisive victory triggered widespread uprisings among the *Transalpine Gauls*, who abandoned their hesitations and joined Hannibal's ranks (Gsell, P.145).

Following the *Battle of Trebbia*, Hannibal secured control of the *Po Valley*, where his army spent the winter. By spring, he advanced into central Italy, crossing the *Apennines* into *Etruria*. This crossing proved perilous, as the marshlands presented immense challenges. Hannibal himself suffered a severe eye infection, ultimately losing vision in one eye.

To provoke *Flaminius*, the Roman general stationed in *Arretium*, Hannibal resorted to extensive raids across the region. The strategy worked: *Flaminius* impulsively pursued the Carthaginian forces, falling into an ambush at *Lake Trasimene* on June 21, 217 BCE.

Hannibal's troops encircled and annihilated the Roman army, killing Flaminius and fifteen thousand (15,000) of his men while capturing an equal number.

After this victory, many expected Hannibal to march toward Rome. However, it seems that Hannibal was aware of the city's strong fortifications, as well as his need for siege equipment and a naval fleet to impose a blockade on the city, which was connected to the sea through the Tiber River. He also knew that his primary strength lay in his cavalry, which would be of little use in a siege. This led him to move toward Picenum, where he devastated the lands of Rome's allies, advanced through the territories of the Sabines and the Samnites, and stormed into western Campania, continuing his destruction to provoke the Romans into battle once again.

Faced with Hannibal's advance, Rome found itself compelled to resort to dictatorship, appointing Quintus Fabius Maximus (Yanoski, P.82) who was given the title "Cunctator" (Harish, P.67) (the Delayer).

Fabius was aware of the superiority of the Carthaginian cavalry and recognized that rashness had led to the defeats of Scipio and later Sempronius. Therefore, he avoided engaging in a decisive battle with Hannibal, who tried in vain to disrupt Fabius's cautious strategy. Fabius remained vigilant, tracking Hannibal's movements, cutting off his supplies, and ambushing his detachments without exposing himself to significant risks.

This cautious approach made Fabius the target of criticism; his prudence was perceived as cowardice, and his disregard for the complaints of impoverished farmers was seen as abandonment. Meanwhile, Hannibal roamed northern Apulia (Le Bohec, P.187), penetrated the lands of the Samnites, and moved through western Campania, as previously mentioned, in an effort to either force Fabius into battle or to alienate Rome's allies (Piganiol, 1920, PP.1-17) by demonstrating the city's inability to protect them (Gsell, P.156).

Hannibal spent the winter of 217–216 BCE and the following spring in the Apulia region, weakened by Fabius's delaying tactics, which tracked his every move while avoiding direct confrontation. As a result, Carthaginian forces faced increasing difficulties in securing supplies and recruiting troops in central Italy, where the population had long been accustomed to Roman dominance (Yanoski, P.83).

However, the Romans (Belgian Museum, 1927, P.186) would eventually help Hannibal escape this stalemate, as they grew frustrated with Fabius's delaying tactics. Consequently, he was replaced, and Lucius Aemilius Paullus and Gaius Terentius Varro were appointed as consuls for the year 216 BCE. This decision provided Hannibal with an opportunity for another victory, this time at Cannae on the banks of the Aufidus River in August 216 BCE (Yanoski, P.83).

The Romans' numerical superiority may have been the primary factor that led them to offer battle to Hannibal. Additionally, they were eager to exploit this advantage to permanently remove Hannibal, not just from central Italy, but from the entire peninsula, given the devastation and unrest he had caused throughout Fabius's dictatorship. For Varro and his colleague, securing a final, decisive victory was also a way to erase the memory of that difficult period.

As usual, Hannibal arranged his forces strategically. He positioned the Celtiberian cavalry on the left wing and the Numidian cavalry on the right. In the center, he placed the Gallic and Spanish infantry in the front line, forming a crescent shape with its convex side facing the Romans. On either side of this crescent and along the wings, he stationed the African infantry (Polybius, 1984, P.42).

Varro, who held command that day, deployed his cavalry on the right wing near the river, while placing the infantry alongside them in a straight line, with minimal gaps between the standards. He concentrated the allied cavalry on the left wing and positioned the light infantry slightly ahead of the main front line. In total, the Roman forces, including their allies, numbered around 80,000 infantry and approximately 6,000 cavalry (Polybius, P.113).

The cavalry on the left wing succeeded in defeating the Roman cavalry, despite being outnumbered. They then charged toward the enemy's left flank. Meanwhile, the Numidian cavalry attacked the Roman cavalry on the right wing. Although the Romans initially resisted, the arrival of the cavalry from the opposite wing, led by Hasdrubal, came to support the Numidians, causing the Roman forces to break ranks and flee. The Numidians pursued and decimated them (Polybius, P.115).

The Romans had relied heavily on their numerical superiority in infantry. Their infantry advanced to engage the Gallic and Spanish infantry that Hannibal had placed at the front of his forces. The convex formation of this line lured the Roman troops inward, drawing them toward the center and

consequently reducing the length of their battlefield. The Romans managed to push the Carthaginian forces backward and advanced toward the African infantry that Hannibal had stationed on either side of the central line. At Hannibal's command, these African troops encircled the Roman infantry, who simultaneously faced an attack from the rear by the returning cavalry that had already defeated the Roman horsemen (Polybius, P.116).

The Roman forces were completely surrounded and found themselves trapped in the confined space of the battlefield, unable to maneuver or fight effectively. Hannibal's forces annihilated the Roman army. Out of the 80,000 infantrymen and 6,000 cavalrymen, only those who had been guarding the camp survived - and even they were eventually captured. Hannibal, on the other hand, lost only 5,700 men out of the 50,000 soldiers he had deployed for the battle (Polybius, P.117).

The Battle of Cannae was a catastrophic disaster for Rome (Titus livius, 1882, PP.16-19). The city lost 80 senators, along with Consul Paullus Aemilianus, two quaestors, and a legion tribune. Not since the disastrous Battle of Alalia had Rome (Yanoski, P.83) suffered such devastation. A sense of profound grief engulfed the city. Yet, despite his series of victories, Hannibal did not seize the opportunity to march on Rome. His lieutenant, Maharbal, famously remarked: "You know how to win a victory, but you do not know how to use it (Le boche, P.203)."

4. The Aftermath of the Battle of Cannae for Rome:

The Battle of Cannae had devastating consequences for Rome:

- **Cisalpine Gaul** joined the Carthaginians.
- A portion of the **Appulians** broke away from Rome.
- The **Bruttians** and **Lucanians** also severed ties with Rome.
- Most of the **Samnites** abandoned their allegiance (Titus livius, PP.1-27).
- The city of **Capua**, along with many cities in central and southern Italy, aligned with Hannibal
- In 215 BCE, Hannibal forged an alliance with the King of **Macedonia** (Titus livius, PP.6-37).
- The death of **Hieron** (Marchetti, 1972, PP.5-26), a loyal ally of Rome, marked another significant blow. His grandson, **Hieronimus**, succeeded him and declared Syracuse's withdrawal from the Roman alliance, siding instead with Carthage (Polybius, PP.12-20).
- Among the coastal cities, **Locri** opened its gates to one of Hannibal's officers in 215 BCE. Cities like **Tarentum**, **Metapontum**, **Sybaris**,

Heraclea, and **Thurii** followed suit in 213 BCE. **Agrigentum** also switched allegiance, while **Naples** and **Rhegium** remained steadfastly loyal to Rome.

- In 214 BCE, **Syracuse** joined Hannibal's cause (Harish, 1993).

These were the most significant outcomes of the Battle of Cannae. To grasp the full magnitude of Rome's loss, consider the speech delivered by **Mago**, Hannibal's brother, to the Carthaginian Senate when he sought reinforcements after the battle:

"He entered the Senate chamber and described his brother's achievements in Italy. Hannibal had fought six organized battles against six generals, including four consuls, a dictator, and a master of cavalry. He had vanquished six consular armies, killed over 200,000 enemy soldiers, and captured more than 50,000 prisoners. Of the four consuls, two were killed, one was wounded, and the fourth lost his entire army, escaping with only about fifty men. The master of cavalry, who had been granted consular authority, was defeated and fled the battlefield. As for the dictator, he was regarded as an exemplary leader, not for his victories but for his refusal to risk a major confrontation. The **Bruttians**, **Appulians**, **Samnites**, and **Lucanians** had abandoned Rome to join Carthage. The city of **Capua**, not only the capital of **Campania** but one of the most significant cities in all of Italy, had willingly surrendered to Hannibal. As proof of these successes, Mago poured a massive collection of golden rings into the Senate hall - a quantity so vast that some historians estimated them to weigh three and a half measures, though more reliable sources suggest it was closer to one measure. These rings, Mago explained, belonged exclusively to distinguished Roman knights. Concluding his address, he declared, 'The closer we are to a glorious end to this war, the more essential it is to support Hannibal with every possible reinforcement' (Titus Livius, PP.8-13).

Thus, by the end of the battle, only central Italy remained loyal to Rome. In response to these staggering losses, Roman military strategy underwent a fundamental shift. Roman generals, having lost confidence in facing Hannibal in open battle, reverted to **Fabius Maximus's** tactics of attrition. They resolved to weaken the Carthaginian forces by cutting off their supplies and reinforcements (Yanoski, PP.83-84)

As we can observe, on the other hand, despite this "victory," Hannibal was fighting far from Carthage, in the middle of hostile territory. His forces consumed a significant amount of grain and money, and even the battles in

which he defeated his enemies caused him losses in terms of funds and men, who were difficult to replace (Brizzi, P.146).

At a time when he needed numerous armies to besiege fortified positions, leave garrisons to protect the occupied or allied sites, and secure his lines of communication and supply routes, these siege operations were both difficult and time-consuming. Hannibal experienced this firsthand with Naples, achieving no results, as well as with smaller sites like Casilinum in Campania and Petelia in Bruttium, where his success remained limited despite eventually capturing both locations (Astifane, P.146).

Although the Senate had overwhelmingly decided to send reinforcements to Hannibal, consisting of 4,000 Numidians, 40 elephants (Silius Italicus, PP.483-611) , and a large quantity of silver talents, Titus Livius noted that these preparations were carried out negligently and at a very slow pace (Titus Livius, PP.67-68-73), in addition to being insufficient to end the war. Thus, Carthage disappointed Hannibal, who was left to rely solely on his caution and energy to survive in Italy (Yanoski, P.85).

Nevertheless, he continued his efforts in both defense and attack. After seizing Capua, which had opened its gates to him, he began preparing for further campaigns. However, the Romans countered with Marcellus, who effectively obstructed most of his operations. Although Marcellus failed to prevent Hannibal from besieging Casilinum, the siege dragged on as Hannibal turned it into a blockade. He then returned to Capua for the winter before ultimately forcing the city to surrender the following spring, right before the eyes of the Roman forces (Yanoski, P.85).

Rome:

However, Hannibal, who did not receive sufficient reinforcements from Carthage (Ait Amara, 2009, P.5), was unable to maintain his position in central Italy. He moved toward Bruttium, where he captured Petelia, Consentia, Croton, and Locri-cities that had initially refused to join the Carthaginians. He then returned to the provinces near Rome and laid siege to Cumae, but was repelled after suffering losses. He withdrew again and entered Lucania, where he spent the winter.

In Sicily, the war was still in its early stages when Hieronymus was assassinated, leading the Romans to believe that the alliance he had established with Carthage would be ineffective. However, Hippocrates and Epicyde managed to seize control of Syracuse, which prompted Marcellus to move in and besiege the city. In 213 BCE, a significant Carthaginian army landed on the island's southern coast under the command of Himilco,

who captured Agrigentum and advanced toward Syracuse. At the same time, the naval commander Bomilcar arrived with his fleet in front of the city. However, they did not engage in battle; one returned to Carthage while the other retreated to Agrigentum.

Syracuse continued to resist, thanks to the machines invented by Archimedes. Nevertheless, Marcellus managed to capture the outer districts of the city. Himilco and Bomilcar reappeared in the area in 212 BCE, but a plague decimated the Carthaginian army that had camped near the marshes. Despite Bomilcar's return from Carthage and his attempt to reach the city's southeastern side, strong winds hindered his progress. He ultimately avoided battle and withdrew, while a Roman traitor helped open the gates of Syracuse to the Romans.

Agrigentum continued to resist for two years, with Mottine replacing Hippocrates, who had died at Syracuse (Polybius, P.37). The city received reinforcements from Africa and groups of Sicilians. However, Mottine's betrayal led to the Romans' capture of the city. Thus, the Sicilian war ended with the same failure as the Sardinian campaign of 215 BCE. Meanwhile, Hannibal Barca remained in southern Italy, achieving some victories but losing Tarentum, which was handed over to the Romans by traitors in 209 BCE (Polybius and all).

Despite his attempts to lift the siege of Capua, the Roman forces surrounding the city did not move. Hannibal also realized that his small, ill-equipped forces could not succeed against a heavily fortified city like Rome. Consequently, he retreated once again to Bruttium. The Romans, meanwhile, intensified their siege of Capua, ultimately capturing the city in 211 BCE and exacting a brutal revenge on its inhabitants (Astifan, PP.149-150).

Thus, we notice the persistent "bad luck" that followed Hannibal, as his army gradually melted away without receiving reinforcements, whether by land or sea. By land, the Gauls of the Pre-Alps were unable to break through the enemy-controlled routes to reach Hannibal in the far south. By sea, Hannibal could not capture the coastal cities of the Campania region. As for the southern Italian ports under his control, the only usable one was the port of Tarentum, which was dominated by a fortress garrisoned by Roman troops, not to mention Rome's naval superiority, which made any attempt to use the sea fraught with danger (Gsell, P.162).

His ally, Philip of Macedon, was preoccupied with wars in Illyria and Greece, preventing him from providing Hannibal with the support they had

initially planned. From Spain, his brother Hasdrubal was supposed to march to Italy, but he encountered the Scipio brothers at the Ebro River, where he was defeated and forced to retreat to Spain. No one was able to come to Hannibal's aid (Astifan, P.147).

After these failures in Italy, Sicily, and Sardinia, attention shifted to the Iberian Peninsula. There, Hannibal's brothers, Hasdrubal and Mago, along with General Hanno, achieved two major victories in 211 BCE, during which both Scipio brothers were killed, and the Romans were driven back beyond the Ebro River. The Carthaginians then began preparing for a new campaign against Italy, while Rome quickly appointed Publius Cornelius Scipio in 210 BCE (Polybius and all).

Scipio headed to Spain at the helm of thirty warships and 10,000 soldiers. He joined his forces with those led by Nero the previous year, along with the remnants of the army that had fought bravely under his father and uncle. According to historian Gozel (Gozel, P.147), Scipio accurately assessed the dire situation. The Carthaginian commanders, emboldened by their victories in 211 BCE, had let their guard down, dispersed their forces, and left Cartagena (Carthago Nova) with only a small garrison. Seizing the opportunity, Scipio launched a swift and daring attack on the city, which some considered reckless. The assault lasted only a few hours, and in 209 BCE, he captured Cartagena.

Inside the city, Scipio found significant military resources, including warships, supplies, and large sums of money. To grasp the extent of the Carthaginian loss, we can turn to Titus Livius, who described the spoils:

- 120 large siege engines and 280 medium-sized ones
- 23 large catapults and 52 small erones
- Numerous large and small scorpions, along with both defensive and offensive weapons
- 74 captured standards
- A substantial quantity of gold and silver: 276 gold cups, each weighing one pound, and 18,300 pounds of minted and decorated silver
- Numerous silver vessels, all meticulously counted and weighed before the treasury officer, Gaius Flaminius.

Additionally, they found 40,000 measures of wheat and 270,000 measures of barley. In the port, they seized sixty ships, many of which were loaded with wheat, weapons, copper, iron, sails, ropes, and other essential materials for equipping the fleet (Eutropius, 1843, PP.2-10).

Unlike the Punic treatment of the local population, who were subjected to heavy tributes and terror, Scipio showed tolerance towards them, winning them over against Carthage and dealing a severe blow to Carthaginian control in Spain (Eutropius, PP.2-10).

In 208 BCE, Scipio advanced into the Guadalquivir Valley and managed to defeat Hasdrubal at the Battle of Baecula. However, Hasdrubal escaped, crossed the Ebro River, and entered Gaul through the Pyrenees, where he spent the winter of 208–207 BCE. In the spring, he crossed the Alps and entered Italy with an army estimated by Appian to number 48,000 infantry and 8,000 cavalry. Some scholars believe that Hasdrubal made a critical mistake by stopping in Gaul before the Alps to besiege Placentia, giving Rome time to recruit and organize two armies to resist the enemy in both the south and the north. When Hasdrubal realized his error and tried to move forward to join his brother, a messenger carrying a letter with the rendezvous details for Umbria was intercepted. Consequently, the consul Gaius Claudius Nero, who was tasked with containing Hannibal in the south, left part of his forces to face Hannibal and marched with the rest to join his colleague Livius, who was blocking Hasdrubal's path. The battle took place by the Metaurus River, where Hasdrubal was defeated and killed. Upon learning of his brother's fate, Hannibal retreated to the far south (Titus Livius, and all).

After the Battle of Baecula and Hasdrubal's departure, the Carthaginians attempted to reorganize their forces by sending reinforcements under a commander named Hanno, who went with Mago to the Celtiberians to recruit mercenaries. Meanwhile, Hasdrubal Gisco stationed garrisons in fortified positions in Baetica. Despite suffering defeats, including the capture of Hanno and the scattering of their forces, Mago and Hasdrubal led an army of over 50,000 men at the start of 206 BCE. However, Scipio inflicted a decisive defeat on them near Ilpa, prompting the Spanish population to side with the Romans. The defeated commanders fled to Gades, where Hasdrubal sailed to Carthage while Mago attempted to call for reinforcements from Africa and Mauretania and recruit locals from the lower Guadalquivir Valley. Scipio's subordinates thwarted this last effort. In the autumn, Mago crossed the strait and unsuccessfully tried to capture Carthage before returning to Gades, only to find its gates closed against him. He then sailed to Ibiza and later to Menorca in the Balearic Islands, where he spent the winter. In 205 BCE, Gades opened its gates to Scipio.

With the surrender of Gades, all of the Barcid conquests in Spain were lost. Scipio returned to Rome, ran for the consulship, and presented his plan for a campaign in Africa to the Senate.

While Scipio was elected consul for the year 204 BCE and began preparing for the African campaign, Hannibal remained in the far south of Bruttium until 203 BCE, leading an army that dwindled daily and gradually withdrew further south. When he learned that his brother had reached Genoa in 205 BCE to incite the Ligurians (Harish, P.69), hope was briefly rekindled. However, Scipio's victories in Africa in 203 BCE led to a summons for both Hannibal and Mago to return and defend their homeland. Mago died on the way back from wounds sustained in battle, while Hannibal, driven by Carthage's imminent danger, set sail for Africa.

General Conclusion

Hannibal Barca's campaign against Rome between 218 and 203 BCE demonstrates the extraordinary potential of innovative military tactics and strategic foresight. His victories at Trebia, Lake Trasimene, and Cannae showcased his mastery of battlefield tactics, particularly his ability to anticipate and exploit Roman weaknesses. However, his campaign ultimately fell short of delivering a decisive victory due to logistical constraints, lack of sustained Carthaginian support, and Rome's resilience. The study concludes that while Hannibal's tactical innovations influenced military thought for centuries, his strategic failure highlights the importance of aligning military operations with broader political and logistical frameworks. Rome's capacity to adapt, raise new armies, and leverage its vast alliances ultimately led to Hannibal's defeat. The campaign serves as a compelling case study in the complexity of sustained military operations and the interplay between tactical brilliance and strategic execution in warfare.

In sum, Hannibal's legacy endures not only through his battlefield maneuvers but also as a reminder that successful military campaigns require more than tactical expertise- they demand comprehensive strategic planning and sustained logistical support to achieve lasting victory.

References:

- Bradford, A. (1981). Hannibal. Macmillan.
Gilbert, C. (1996). Hannibal librairie. Paris: Hachette.
Caven, B. (1992). The Punic Wars. Weidenfeld & Nicolson.
Daly, G. (2002). Cannae: The Experience of Battle in the Second Punic War. Routledge.

- Lazenby, J. (1998). *Hannibal's War: A Military History of the Second Punic War*. University of Oklahoma Press.
- Cornell, T. (1995). *The Beginnings of Rome: Italy and Rome from the Bronze Age to the Punic Wars (c.1000–264 BC)*. Routledge.
- Goldsworthy, A. (2000). *The Punic Wars*. Cassell.
- Hoyos, D. (2015). *Mastering the West: Rome and Carthage at War*. Oxford University Press.
- Sabin, P., van Wees, H., & Whitby, M. (2007). *The Cambridge History of Greek and Roman Warfare, Volume II: Rome from the Late Republic to the Late*. Cambridge University Press.
- Scullard, H. (1980). *Scipio Africanus: Soldier and Politician*. Thames and Hudson.
- Polybius, P. (2010). *Rise of the Roman Empire (I. Scott-Kilvert, Trans.)*. The Penguin Classics (Original work published c. 150 BCE).
- Livy, L. (2006). *The War with Hannibal: Books 21–30 of The History of Rome (A. de Sélincourt, Trans.)*. Penguin Classics. (Original work published c. 27 BCE).
- Combet, F. (1960). *The Punic Wars*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Gsell, S. (1920). *Ancient History of North Africa*. Paris: Hachette Bookstore.
- Walter, G. (1947). *The Destruction of Carthage*. Paris: A Somogy.
- Camps, G. (1961). *At the origins of the Berber culture, Massinissa or the beginnings of history*. Algiers: official print.
- Mommsen, C., & Alexandre, A. (1872). *Roman history*. Paris: Hérôld.
- Polybius, ., & Flaubert, A. (1999). *Roman History*. Paris: Flaubert.
- Strabon, ., & Amédée, T. (1909). *Geography*. Paris: Hachette Bookstore.
- Brisson, G. (1974). *Carthage or Rome, in classical antiquity*. Paris: fax .
- Yann, L. (2014). *Military History of the Punic Wars (264-146 BC)*. Paris: Texto.
- Appian, ., & Gokowskey, . (2002). *Roman History (م II)*. Paris: The Beautiful Letters.
- Lapyre, G., & Pellegrain, . (1942). *Punic Carthage (814-146 BC)*. Paris: Col, library, Payot.
- Hubac, P. (1952). *Carthage*. Paris: Bellemand.
- Montesquieu, ., & Al-Arubi, A. (2001). *Reflections on Roman History (Causes of Rise and Decline)*. Morocco: Arab Cultural Center Publications.
- Naguib Ibrahim, T. (1997). *istory of the Romans*. Egypt: Al-Ghad.
- Farhati, F. (2007). *Numidia from the Reign of King Gaia to the End of the Roman Occupation (213-46 BC)*. Algeria: (S/D).