

contrast the speeches of Socrates, inspired as he continues to maintain by the deities of the dialogue's setting, are far *τεχνικώτερα* (263d5); for in both of them *ἔρως* has been carefully defined before the question whether a lover or a non-lover should be preferred is investigated.²

The sentence at the beginning of this paper (263b6 ff.) is a part of the transition from the *ἄτεχνον* in Lysias to the features that make Socrates' speeches far superior in point of *τέχνη*. In *πρῶτον μὲν δεῖ ταῦτα ὁδῶ διηρησθαι* κτλ. (263b7–9) Socrates specifies methodical equipment which guarantees this superiority. Yet to distinguish the speaker who proceeds correctly from the bungler the words *τὸν μέλλοντα τέχνην ῥητορικὴν μετιέναι* are too pale and weak. The development of thought which we have traced suggests that we need *τὸν μέλλοντα τέχνην ῥητορικὴν μετιέναι*.³ If further support for the change is needed we may look at 270e1, where in a comparable argumentation the phrase *τόν γε τέχνην μετιόντα ὁτιοῦν* is used to distinguish anyone proceeding on the right *μέθοδος* from the uninstructed amateur. In fact *ὁδῶ*, as used in 263b6, denotes 'methodical' procedure (see above), and since in this meaning *ὁδός* represents a variation of *τέχνη*, both words should logically be in the same case. The corruption was almost inevitable if one considers how frequently Greek writers use *ῥητορικὴ* as an adjective modifying *τέχνη*.

The discussion about the true nature of rhetoric continues a good deal longer in the *Phaedrus*, and it would be easy to show that *τέχνη* remains a key concept in the sections where the organic unity of the *λόγος* and the right handling of rhetorical psychology are examined. Fortunately there is no need to present all relevant passages. Plato's own words at the conclusion of the arguments suffice: *Οὐκοῦν τὸ μὲν τέχνης τε καὶ ἀτεχνίας λόγων περί ικανῶς ἐχέτω* (274b3).⁴

University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

FRIEDRICH SOLMSEN

² Definition in the orthodox form of a *διαίρεσις* is more easily recognised in Socrates' first speech (237b7–238c4) than in his second, whose poetic style severely limits technical language (244a4–245a8; 249d3 ff.). For the liberties which the summary at 265ef. takes with the content of his speeches a reference to Hackforth, op. cit. 133 (n. 1) may suffice. Plato in effect supplies here an additional *dihaeresis* of *μανία* which pulls together both speeches while yet starting them off in opposite directions.

³ Immediately before 263b6 Socrates speaks of *ῥητορικὴ* (b3), and there is no obvious reason for changing from the simple *ῥητορικὴ* to the more elaborate *τέχνην ῥητορικὴν*.

⁴ See further 265d1 *δνοῖν εἰδοῖν, εἰ αὐτοῖν τὴν δύναμιν τέχνην λαβεῖν*, 270b5 *μὴ τριβῇ μόνον καὶ ἐμπειρίᾳ, ἀλλὰ τέχνην*, 270e1 and e2 ff., 271b8, c4, 272b1 (272e1 f.), 273e3, 277b1, c4.

Another representative passage is 266d2, where Socrates and Phaedrus have agreed that methods like those adumbrated at 263b belong properly speaking to dialectic, not to rhetoric, which seems still to elude them: *καλὸν πού τι ἂν εἴη, ὃ τούτων ἀπολειφθὲν ὁμῶς τέχνην λαμβάνεται*.

THE EPITAPH OF PUBLIUS SCIPIO

Quei apice insigne Dial(is fl)aminis gesistei | mors perfec(it) tua ut essent omnia | brevia, honos, fama, virtusque | gloria atque ingenium. Quibus sei | in longa licuisset tibi utier vita, | facile facteis superases gloriam | maiorum. Qua relubens te in gremiu, | Scipio, recipit terra, Publi, | prognatum Publio, Corneli. *ILLRP* 311

For you who wore the distinctive cap of a Flamen Dialis, Death cut everything short – honour, fame and virtue, glory and intellectual ability. If you had been granted a long life in which to use these advantages, you would have far surpassed the glory of your ancestors by your achievements. Therefore Earth gladly takes you in her arms, Scipio – Publius Cornelius, son of Publius.

It has usually been supposed that this is the epitaph of a son of the elder Africanus,

though Mommsen in the *Corpus* considers the evidence inconclusive, and there are real difficulties when we consider what Cicero, in *Sen.* 35, *Off.* 1.121, and *Brutus* 77 tells us about that Publius Scipio. He describes him as a man of great ability but of such poor health that he would never have been able to engage in a career in war and politics in the family tradition however long he had lived. The epitaph, on the contrary, seems to claim that its subject was a young man with a brilliant public career ahead of him, if only he had lived longer.

The first line of the inscription was added later, perhaps, as Coarelli¹ thinks, by Scipio Aemilianus, the adopted son of Cicero's Publius Scipio. The extra line records the dead man's tenure of the flaminiate of Jupiter, an office which no ancient writer mentions in connexion with any Publius Scipio. There are, however, serious gaps in our text of Livy 41, and it is possible that a Publius Scipio briefly held office between 176 and 175, dying before one Gnaeus Cornelius took over in 174; or even that he was appointed in 171, where there is a gap in Livy 43.

The son of Africanus was an augur; perhaps 'honos' in the inscription refers to this fact. It may be questioned if a man with health problems would have taken on a priesthood as well, though without knowing the precise nature of his disability it is hard to assess the gravity of this objection. It seems to have been this point, however, which led G. V. Sumner² to propose a new and at first sight attractive interpretation of the inscription, namely that the Publius Scipio of the epitaph was not the son but the grandson of Africanus, whose death in his father's lifetime led to the adoption of Aemilianus.

This situation would account for the discrepancy between Cicero's account of Publius Scipio and the apparent claims of the epitaph, and Sumner has accommodated this otherwise unknown grandson within an acceptable chronological scheme, though his is not the only possible reconstruction of events. It is when we consider the matter of the flaminiate that doubts creep in. As is well known, the office had some very irksome features. The flamen must not leave Rome, must not take an oath or look upon a dead body, and was subject in his daily life to a number of ancient taboos. It was thus very difficult for him to hold any office in the senatorial cursus and impossible to be a soldier.

Now, the epitaph seems to be claiming that its subject was a young man more than capable of high office and leadership in Rome's wars. In that case, it seems highly unlikely that he would have been allowed by his family to take on, at a very early age, a priesthood which would have severely limited his ambitions, if not blighted them entirely. If, on the other hand, the flaminiate had been imposed on the boy by the Pontifex Maximus (at that period M. Aemilius Lepidus), that could only have been an act of political enmity which we might suppose no friend of the Scipios would have gone out of his way to commemorate.

Thus Sumner's hypothetical grandson for Africanus turns out to be an even less likely candidate for the priesthood of Jupiter than the man to whom the epitaph is usually supposed to refer. Indeed, for Africanus' son Publius, as Cicero describes him, the rather sheltered life of a Flamen Dialis might have been a form of public service he could cope with, and it now carried a seat in the senate (Livy 27.8.5-8), which his augurate would not have brought him. Again, Sumner's dating of the priesthood mentioned in the inscription to 176-175 would suit the son of Africanus just as well as a grandson. We are still left, however, with the apparent conflict between what the epitaph says about its subject and Cicero's description of Publius Scipio.

¹ F. Coarelli, 'Il Sepolcro degli Scipioni', *DdA* 6 (1972), 1.

² G. V. Sumner. *The Orators in Cicero's Brutus* (Toronto, 1973), 36-7.

Let us look again at this discrepancy. Of course it might be argued that the inscription's claim about great promise cut short by untimely death is a mere commonplace of epitaph-writers, but in this case there are two reasons for challenging this view. One is that any writer employed by the Scipios would surely have hesitated to suggest, only a few years after the death of Africanus, that anybody could hope to surpass his spectacular career, and 'by far' ('facile') at that. The other reason is the general tone of the epitaph. Unlike the others from the tomb of the Scipios, it is addressed to the dead man, and strikes a curiously personal note with its tender last lines including the reminiscence of the sad farewell calling of a dead man's name at his funeral. Surely this was written by a friend; perhaps even by Ennius, who was alive and writing till 169 and whose statue was placed with those of Africanus and his brother Lucius at the family tomb. He of all people would hardly be the man blithely to envisage a soldier and statesman greater than Africanus, of whom he had written:

nemo est qui factis aequiperare queat.

It is perhaps not unreasonable, then, to ask whether 'facteis' in this inscription necessarily refers to military successes and high office. This epitaph is the only one of the Scipionic group to include the word 'ingenium' among the dead man's attributes. Now Cicero tells us that Publius Scipio surpassed his great father in the breadth of his learning and also left some admirable examples of his ability as a writer, whereas Africanus himself was not known to have produced any 'ingenii monumenta mandata litteris' (*Off.* 3.4).

Thus it would have been fair and in no way invidious to claim that, *in his own line*, Publius would have surpassed his ancestors in 'gloria' if he had lived longer. I would suggest that it is the loss of a potentially great writer that is being mourned here by one or other of the dead man's literary friends.

The epitaph commemorates a *young* man. A Publius born to Africanus in 216/15 would have been about forty by 175 – perhaps not, by Roman standards, unusually young to die. It is likely enough, however, that if there was a first-born son of Africanus called Publius, he died in childhood and left the paternal *praenomen* to be used again for a son born 205/4 after his father's return from Spain, or even after the end of the war with Hannibal. Thus the Publius of the epitaph might have been no more than thirty, and possibly less, in 175.

He could have been *flamen Dialis* for a short time between 176 and 175, and his death as an augur would then have been recorded in the gap in Livy 41 at the end of Ch. 19. Plutarch in *Aem.* 5.3 implies that Aemilius Paullus was ready to give his elder sons for adoption once his second marriage had produced two more boys to continue his line, i.e. after 179, the year of the birth of the second of these sons, who, according to Livy 45.40.7, died in 167 aged twelve. Thus Publius Scipio, married but without a son, would have had time to adopt Aemilianus before he himself died in 175, sadly young for a man whose obvious talents had yet to develop fully and give him a leading place among the writers of his day.

Edinburgh

K. M. MOIR