

## SCIPIONIC THEMES IN PLAUTUS' *AMPHITRUO*

G. KARL GALINSKY

*University of Texas*

As the only extant example of mythological comedy and, at the same time, of a parody of tragedy, the *Amphitruo* of Plautus holds a unique place not only among Plautine comedies, but within all ancient literature.<sup>1</sup> In meaningfulness and subtlety it ranks among the first of Plautus' comedies, and its considerable success, besides being attested in ancient times, is testified to by the extent and variety of its huge literary progeny.<sup>2</sup> As for most Plautine plays, *contaminatio* has been posited for the *Amphitruo*. However, the alleged inconsistencies and structural illogicalities for which Plautine analysts<sup>3</sup> criticized the play have proved to be largely imaginary. The play is very well unified indeed.

<sup>1</sup> E. Fraenkel, *De media et nova comoedia quaestiones selectae* (Diss. Göttingen 1912) 33, note 2: "in nulla, quantum e fragmentis cognosci potest, Graeca fabula argumentum mythologicum tam integre tractatum erat quam in Plauti Amphitruone." This includes Euripides' *Alkestis*. Cf. the discussions and summaries by P. W. Harsh, *A Handbook of Classical Drama* (Stanford 1948) 338-42; L. R. Shero, "Alcmena and Amphitryon in Drama," *TAPA* 87 (1956) 202-6 (hereafter referred to as **Shero**); and W. B. Sedgwick, *Plautus: Amphitruo* (Manchester 1960) 2-6. I follow the text of W. M. Lindsay, ed., *T. Macci Plauti Comoediae* 1 (Oxford 1904).

<sup>2</sup> See the discussions of Shero 192-238; O. Lindberger, *The Transformations of Amphitruo* (Stockholm 1956); F. Stoessl, "Amphitryon: Wachstum und Werden eines poetischen Stoffes," *Trivium* 2 (1944) 95-110; K. v. Reinhardstoettner, *Spätere Bearbeitungen plautinischer Lustspiele* (Leipzig 1886) 115-229; C. D. N. Costa, "The Amphitruo Theme," in T. A. Dorey and D. R. Dudley, eds., *Roman Drama* (New York 1965) 87-122.

<sup>3</sup> Especially F. Leo, *Gött. Nachr.* 1911, 254-62, and *id.*, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur* 1 (Berlin 1913) 131-32; contra, H. W. Prescott, "The *Amphitruo* of Plautus," *CP* 8 (1913) 14-22. The most up-to-date discussion of this and other aspects of the play can be found in J. Genzmer, *Der Amphitruo des Plautus und sein griechisches Original* (micro-filmed diss., Kiel 1956, hereafter referred to as **Genzmer**); cf. W. H. Friedrich, *Euripides und Diphilus* (Munich 1953) 268-78. Cf. further the summary by Shero 204-5, especially notes 18 and 19, and by Z. Stewart, "The *Amphitruo* of Plautus and Euripides' *Bacchae*," *TAPA* 89 (1958) 356-59 (hereafter referred to as **Stewart**). Stewart and Shero were both unable to consult Genzmer's dissertation, on which see G. Williams, *JRS* 48 (1958) 220-21.

That the content of the *Amphitruo* requires a more thoughtful approach and interpretation than the "typical" Plautine comedy<sup>4</sup> is suggested by its careful structural design which bears a striking resemblance to later, classical works of literature such as Vergilian and Horatian poetry. As a result, the skilful "architecture" of the play has rightly been stressed by the critics.

Before we look at the play as a whole, an example *in parvo* may illustrate this point: Sosia's lengthy battle description (203-61). The passage is emblematic of Plautus' technique in general. A considerable number of parallels suggest that the messenger speech in Euripides' *Heracleidae* (799-866) served as its model.<sup>5</sup> At the same time, style and diction are thoroughly Roman, and thus the account has been interpreted as a document of Roman political thought, since, for the first time in Roman literature, it emphasizes the *clementia* of the victorious Romans and the *superbia* of the enemy.<sup>6</sup> On the basis of style, metrics, and content it can be divided into three distinct sections:<sup>7</sup>

1. the events preceding the battle (203-18)
2. the battle itself (219-47)
3. the last phase of the battle, and its consequences (248-61)

This tripartite arrangement thus focuses, as it should, on the battle proper. The structure of the first section again reveals a surprising symmetry. The first eight lines (203-10) deal with Amphitruo's actions and his initiative in offering peace, while the final eight (211-18) describe the Teleboan reaction as well as the ensuing preparations for the battle. These 16 lines may be divided in yet another way into three subdivisions: the central panel of ten lines (206-15), describing the peace negotiations and their failure, is flanked by two sections of three lines each, which deal, respectively, with Amphitruo's initiative (203-5)

<sup>4</sup> Shero 215, note 19, in particular stresses the unique features of the *Amphitruo* and thus modifies, to some extent, the views of G. E. Duckworth, *The Nature of Roman Comedy* (Princeton 1952) 24.

<sup>5</sup> See P. Siewert, *Plautus in Amphitruone quomodo exemplar Graecum transtulerit* (Berlin 1894) 22-29, and Genzmer 44.

<sup>6</sup> H. Haffter, "Politisches Denken im alten Rom," *RFIC* 68 (1940) 107 ff. The most recent analysis, with references to earlier bibliography, of the Roman elements in style and diction is by G. Pascucci, "La scelta dei mezzi espressivi nel resoconto militare di Sosia (Plauto, *Amph.* 186-261)," *Atti e memorie dell' Accademia Toscana di scienze e lettere "La Colombaria"* 26 (1961-62) 161-203.

<sup>7</sup> I have modified here the arrangement proposed by Genzmer 21.

and the actions resulting from the failure of the negotiations (216-18). This latter arrangement seems to be preferable for two reasons. First, it does not disrupt the unity of lofty prayer style which characterizes lines 206-15. Second, Plautus makes use of this tripartite framework pattern especially in the *cantica*.<sup>8</sup>

Similarly, the third section (250-61) has a threefold arrangement.<sup>9</sup> Lines 250-52 deal with Amphitruo's *aristeia*. He slays Pterelas, and in 260-61 he thus receives his just reward, the golden trophy. Flanked by three lines each, the central part of this section (253-59) primarily describes the surrender of the Teleboans. Very much in keeping with the theme of this play, in which both gods and men participate, they surrender *divina humanaque omnia*. The tripartite structure of this third section (250-62) is an additional argument in favor of a similar subdivision of the first (203-18); the arrangements of these two passages are too similar to be purely coincidental. The first and third major divisions have a total of 29 lines, which is the exact length of the focal section (219-47).

The structure of the entire play is equally balanced and symmetrical.<sup>10</sup> At its center is the controversy between Amphitruo and Alcumena (II.ii),<sup>11</sup> which is framed by the two encounters of Alcumena and Jupiter. This triptych, in turn, is flanked by the meetings of Sosia and Amphitruo with their respective divine doubles. Finally, the early part of the first act, which focuses on Sosia's description of the battle, and the entire fifth act correspond to each other in many ways: Bromia's soliloquy is the counterpart of Sosia's; the human events and

<sup>8</sup> See, e.g., Genzmer's (23) division of Sosia's complaint (153-75), and F. Leo, *Die plautinischen Cantica und die hellenistische Lyrik* (Berlin 1897) 110, who subdivides Chrysalus' canticum in *Bacch.* 640-70 as follows: (a) Chrysalus boasts of his deeds (640-48); (b) he elaborates on his ideal, the clever slave (649-61); (c) he discusses the specific case, sees his master, and addresses him (662-70).

<sup>9</sup> Mercury's aside (248-49) as well as 262, which is no longer related to the battle description, are, of course, not to be counted.

<sup>10</sup> See Friedrich (above, note 3) 276-78, whose basic arrangement I have expanded by adding the *Heracleidae*-Heracles panel, which is central to my argument; cf. Genzmer 214.

<sup>11</sup> It is ironical that it was precisely this very core of the play that was singled out by Leo for being inconsistent with II.i and other parts of the comedy. Leo's hypotheses were rejected immediately by B. Prehn, *Quaestiones Plautinae* (Breslau 1916) 81 ff. It is not surprising, I believe, that II.ii, to an even greater extent than Sosia's battle description, is the most Romanized and Plautine part of the *Amphitruo*; for a detailed analysis, see Genzmer 124 ff.

Amphitruo's heroic exploits are—thereby reflecting the movement of the play—replaced by and juxtaposed with the divine events and the *deus ex machina* at the play's end. Amphitruo, who is at the pinnacle of success in Sosia's description, lies prostrate on the ground in v; and whereas *boat caelum fremitu virum* (233–34) in the early part of the play, heaven itself thunders and frightens men in the last: *strepitus, crepitus, sonitus, tonitrus . . . ubi quisque institerat, concidit crepitu* (1062–63). The tone of both passages is rather solemn, full of pathos, and strongly influenced by the language of tragedy and epic.<sup>12</sup> The scene which is modelled on the *Heracleidae* passage thus is linked with the one relating the birth of Heracles. Finally, a threefold division also suggests itself for Act v; in its first part (1053–76) Bromia dominates, then our interest focuses on Amphitruo (1077–1130), until Jupiter's domineering appearance brings this act and the play to its conclusion. The structure of the *Amphitruo* may, therefore, be illustrated as follows:

Soliloquy of Sosia: human events; *Heracleidae*; Amphitruo victorious (186–261)

Mercury meets Sosia (262–498)

Jupiter and Alcumena (499–550)

AMPHITRUO AND ALCUMENA (633–860)

Jupiter and Alcumena (861–983)

Amphitruo meets Jupiter (1035–52, and most of the *fere* 300 *versus qui exciderunt*)

Soliloquy of Bromia: divine events; birth of Heracles; Amphitruo prostrate and then *adfectus immortalis gloria* (1053–1146)

The architecture of the play is carefully planned and, in all respects, the product of a superior craftsman. The reason for this elaborate arrangement, in my opinion, is that it serves to implement the content; the play's meaning can be expected to have a significance that is out of the ordinary and thus justifies its deliberate and artistic design.

In a recent article, Z. Stewart has tried to demonstrate, with many valid arguments, that Euripides' *Bacchae* influenced the *Amphitruo* to a considerable extent.<sup>13</sup> Some of the parallels Stewart draws may not be very conclusive; for instance, the *aedes* in the *Amphitruo* does not

<sup>12</sup> E. Fraenkel, *Plautinisches im Plautus* (= *Philologische Untersuchungen* 28, Berlin 1922) 348–52, and Stewart 362–73.

<sup>13</sup> Stewart *passim*; cf., earlier, Friedrich (above, note 3) 271–73, which is not mentioned by Stewart.

have to be a palace.<sup>14</sup> Further, some of the verbal parallels which illustrate the ironic tenor of both plays are not so close as to preclude coincidence and could well be considered independent outgrowths of the same painfully ridiculous humor which permeates the two plays. Most cogent, however, is Stewart's analysis of the Bacchic aspects of the play as well as Friedrich's thorough comparison of the characters of Pentheus and Amphitruo, men "who have no sense or taste for the miraculous and for the incalculable workings of the gods, who explain everything to themselves in terms of human categories, who believe everyone who relies on demonic interventions to be an impostor and who nevertheless, in spite or even because of their very intelligence, miss the truth."<sup>15</sup>

Stewart's discussion of the implications of this imitation is concerned, as so many Plautine studies have been, with *Quellenforschung* rather than with analyzing the Plautine play in its contemporary setting. Aided again by many strong arguments, Stewart converts Vahlen's contention that Rhinthon's *Amphitruo* could not have been Plautus' original into its exact opposite. A few doubts remain nevertheless. The statement in Stephanus Byzantius concerning Rhinthon's dramatic technique reads: τὰ τραγικὰ μεταρρυθμίζων ἐς τὸ γελοῖον. This does not necessarily mean that it was tragedies which were transformed into something humorous. Long ago, O. Crusius pointed out that the most important feature of the *hilarotragoidia* may equally well have been "the scurrilous representation of heroic figures, even though this may often have been done by imitating a famous (literary) model."<sup>16</sup> Further, it should not be underemphasized that both notices about Rhinthon explicitly associate him with the *phlyax*,<sup>17</sup> i.e. even if he was

<sup>14</sup> See Duckworth (above, note 4) 83: "The dwelling might be considered a palace since the play is a *tragicomoedia*, but Plautus refers to it as *aedes* (97), the word which he regularly uses for the homes of ordinary citizens."

<sup>15</sup> Friedrich (above, note 3) 271; cf. Z. Stewart, "The God Nocturnus in Plautus' *Amphitruo*," *JRS* 50 (1960) 37-43, where he defends his "Bacchic" view of the play by interpreting the reference to *Nocturnus* (line 272) as *Nyktelios*, an epithet of Dionysus.

<sup>16</sup> So O. Crusius in his review of E. Voelker, *Rhinthonis fragmenta* (Leipzig 1887) in *Wochenschrift f. d. klass. Phil.* 6 (1889) 288. Voelker (14) had argued that Rhinthon always parodied certain tragedies. Cf. F. Susemihl, *Geschichte der Literatur in der Alexandrinerzeit* I (1891) 239.

<sup>17</sup> Suda s.v. *Rhinthon*: Ταραντίνος, κωμικός, ἀρχηγὸς τῆς καλουμένης ἱλαροτραγωδίας ὃ ἔστι φλυακογραφία. Stephanus Byzantius s.v. *Taras*: καὶ 'Ρίνθων Ταραντίνος, φλύαξ, τὰ τραγικὰ μεταρρυθμίζων ἐς τὸ γελοῖον.

the *archêgos* in transforming *ta tragika* into something humorous, the spirit of the finished product was still akin to Doric folk drama and raucous slapstick farce. The *Amphitruo* is removed from this kind of comedy by a gap that cannot be bridged over by the term "Exalted Rhinthonica."<sup>18</sup> The admirable consistency of the delineation of the characters of both Alcumena and Amphitruo, as well as the sympathetic knowledge of the female psyche, presuppose true New Comedy ingredients.<sup>19</sup> But why the overtones of dignity and profundity that are so frequent in this play? What is the reason for Plautus' extraordinary artistry and almost solemn concern with the themes of this play? The answer to this can hardly be found in its Greek ancestry, but must be sought in its Roman milieu and setting. To an even greater extent than the artistically inferior *Miles Gloriosus*, the *Amphitruo* can be assumed to be relevant to Plautus' contemporaries.<sup>20</sup>

Although Plautus' debt to the *Alcumena Euripidis* probably was more extensive than to the Rhinthonic *Amphitruo*,<sup>21</sup> Amphitruo is the hero in Plautus' play. He figures prominently in the action of a *tragicomoedia* which is characterized by the constant and baffling interplay between myth and, as it were, historical reality and between divine and human planes. The same characteristics apply to the life and legend of Scipio the Elder, the most important and the most controversial political figure in Plautus' times. Some Scipionic overtones of the play have been noted casually by some scholars,<sup>22</sup> but what needs to be studied in more detail is the relationship between the play and the con-

<sup>18</sup> A. Palmer, *The Amphitruo of Plautus* (London 1890) xv, followed by Stewart 372. However, the characterization given to the play by Palmer in the next paragraph seems to be more adequate; see below, note 90.

<sup>19</sup> Genzmer; cf. Duckworth (above, note 4) 24.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. J. A. Hanson, "The Glorious Military," in Dudley and Dorey (above, note 2) 61.

<sup>21</sup> Of all the pre-existing Alcmena and Amphitryon plays, Euripides' drama seems to have influenced Plautus' most; see Shero 194 ff. This conclusion is further supported by the proximity of the performance dates of the Latin *Alcumena Euripidis* and the *Amphitruo*; see Stewart 360-61.

<sup>22</sup> L. Herrmann, "L'actualité dans l'Amphitryon de Plaute," *AC* 17 (1948) 317-22. Herrmann goes too far in identifying Sosia with Ennius and construing the play as an anti-Scipionic pamphlet. More careful, though much less detailed, is J. Hubaux, *Les grands mythes de Rome* (Paris 1945) 82: "Si Tite-Live dit vrai quand il écrit que, du vivant même de Scipion, on racontait que sa mère l'avait conçu des oeuvres de Jupiter, on peut se demander si l'Amphitryon de Plaute n'était pas une comédie d'actualité." Cf. Hanson (above, note 20) 60.

siderable epigraphic and literary evidence relating to this man. I believe that this information explains some of the play's features and, more importantly, that it illuminates the peculiar way in which Plautus chose to treat the *Amphitruo* theme. A convenient point of departure is found in the prologue.

One of the vexed questions concerning this prologue is the part lines 64-95 play within it. The tirade against *ambitus*, it seems, has nothing to do with the theme of the *Amphitruo*. Although excursus of this kind in Plautine prologues are not surprising, the considerable length of this one is unusual and militates against the view that Plautus is concerned merely with theatrical *ambitio*. The passage cannot simply be athetized; the first part of the prologue culminates in it, and it is well prepared for by lines 17-20, 24-25, 33, 38-40 and 50.<sup>23</sup> Nor can Mercury's vehement criticism of *ambitus* be construed as a narrow political reference, for instance, to the *lex Poetelia* of 358 B.C. (Livy 7.15.12-13). For this *lex* interfered only with the machinations of the candidates, but not with the ones of their middlemen. The next *lex de ambitu* was the *lex Cornelia Baebia* of 181 B.C. (Livy 40.19). Apparently this law stipulated the death penalty for men guilty of *ambitus*;<sup>24</sup> thus a reference to it would considerably impair the humorous effect of these lines, which, in spite of Mercury's solemnity, are also comic in tone. A further objection, of course, is Plautus' assumed death in 184 B.C. The *ambitus* passage, then, is the first passage in this play to exemplify the spirit of *tragicomoedia*. This admonition is placed immediately after the nature of the play has been made clear; from this it follows that the admonition passage has a close thematic connection with the play. Plautus wants his intent to be taken seriously; at the same time, the alliteration points to a parody of some lofty pronouncement (74-75):

quasi magistratum sibi alterive ambiverit.  
virtute dixit vos victores vivere.

<sup>23</sup> See the excellent discussion by K. Abel, *Die Plautusprologe* (Diss. Frankfurt 1955) 31-39, esp. 37-39. Lines 17-95 are generally accepted as the primary Plautine addition to the prologue of his Greek model. The sole reason for this addition is Plautus' concern with *ambitus*.

<sup>24</sup> So G. de Sanctis, *Storia dei Romani* IV.1 (Turin 1923) 495, and H. H. Scullard, *Roman Politics 220-150 B.C.* (Oxford 1950) 172; cf. G. Rotondi, *Leges publicae populi Romani* (Milan 1912) 221, 277.

Placed at the exact center of the prologue, line 75 gives a further clue. Around 200 B.C.,<sup>25</sup> the Scipionic family, reaching unprecedented fame and prominence, chose to reinscribe the sarcophagi of the somewhat less famed L. Cornelius Scipio Barbatus, who had been consul in 298 B.C., and of his son, L. Cornelius Scipio, the consul of 259 B.C., who had conquered Corsica. Until that time, the epitaphs had been written with red chalk; now they were chiseled into the stone after they had been elaborated into Saturnian verse. The point most important for our investigation is that, following Greek custom, the titles of the magistracies were added, among them some which Barbatus' son actually had never held. Moreover, when the senate had to choose the man who was to welcome the statue of the Magna Mater of Pessinus in 204 B.C.,<sup>26</sup> the Delphic oracle counseled that a *vir optimus* should be chosen. The choice fell on P. Cornelius Scipio Nasica, but the title *bonorum optimus* was promptly given to Lucius to whom it had never applied. *Virtus, forma, facta*, and *sapientia* coupled with *fortitudo* became the key words of the Scipionic tomb inscriptions, thus reflecting clearly the influence of the Greek concept of *kalokagathia* (Degrassi 309.2-3, 311.3-7, 312.2-5, 316.1-2):

Gnaivod patre prognatus fortis vir sapiensque  
quouis forma virtutei parisuma fuit.

brevia honos fama virtusque  
gloria atque ingenium quibus sei  
in longa licuisset tibe utier vita  
facile facteis superases gloriam  
maiorum.

<sup>25</sup> This is the generally accepted date of the *elogia*, which was established first by E. Wölfflin, "De Scipionum elogiis," *RPh* 14 (1890) 113-22, and *id.*, "Der Dichter der Scipionenelogenien," *SBAW* (1892) 188-219. The latter article is the most comprehensive discussion to date of the literary aspects of the *elogia*. The attempt of F. W. Fay, "Scipionic Forgeries," *CQ* 14 (1920) 163-71, to prove that the inscriptions were archaizing creations of the time of Caesar was convincingly rejected by T. Frank, "The Scipionic Inscriptions," *CQ* 15 (1921) 169-74. I have followed the text of A. Degrassi, *Inscriptiones Latinae Liberae Rei Publicae* 1 (Florence 1957) nos. 309-17 (= *CIL* VI 1284-94). Cf. J. Vogt, "Vorläufer des Optimus Princeps," *Hermes* 68 (1933) 84-92.

<sup>26</sup> Good accounts of the implications of this episode are given by S. Aurigemma, "La protezione speciale della Gran Madre Idea per la nobiltà romana e le leggende dell'origine troiana di Roma," *BCAR* 37 (1909) 31-65, and H. Graillot, *Le culte de Cybèle mère des dieux à Rome et dans l'empire romain* (Paris 1912) 25-69.



magna sapientia multasque virtutes  
 aetate quom parva posidet hoc saxsum  
 quoiei vita defecit non honos honore.  
 is hic situs quei nunquam victus virtutei.

virtutem generis mieis moribus accumulavi.  
 progeniem genui, facta patris petivi. . .

For various reasons, which I believe to be valid, the composition of the epitaphs is ascribed by most scholars to Ennius.<sup>27</sup>

That Plautus and the Roman populace were quite familiar with these inscriptions—for it was hardly the Scipios' intention to keep their propaganda secret—may be deduced from the *Miles Gloriosus* where Plautus several times plays with these terms in a not unintentional manner.<sup>28</sup> At the very beginning of the play, Artotrogus characterizes the proud soldier with the following words (9-12):

stat propter virum  
 fortem atque fortunatum et forma regia.  
 tum bellatorem—Mars haud ausit dicere  
 neque aequiperare suas virtutes ad tuas.

The emphasis on *forma* and *virtus* and *fortitudo*, as well as the strongly competitive element (*Mars haud ausit dicere* etc.), are, as has been recognized, strongly reminiscent of the Scipionic *elogia* (esp. Degraffi 311.3-4, and 316), but there is also an echo of Ennius' epigram on Scipio (Cic. *Tusc.* 5.17.49):

a sole exoriente supra Maeotis paludes  
 nemo est qui *factis aequiperare* queat.

Later in the play Pyrgopolinices' *virtutes* appear as *facta* allied with *virtus* (57, 1042, cf. 620). "Scipionic" also is MG 1251 where Acroteutium says of the *miles*:

si amavit umquam aut si parem sapientiam [hic] habet ac formam.

<sup>27</sup> See especially Wölfflin (above, note 25) *SBAW* 1892, 207 ff. The poet's referring to the Romans as *vos* ties in well with Ennius' acquiring Roman citizenship only in 184 B.C.

<sup>28</sup> Hanson (above, note 20) 59-61. For a thorough study of the connotations of *virtus* in Plautine comedy see D. C. Earl, "Political Terminology in Plautus," *Historia* 9 (1960) 235-43.

Even more pronounced are lines 55-57 of the same play:

quod omnes mortales sciunt,  
Pyrgopolinice te unum in terra vivere  
virtute et forma et factis invictissimis?

The alliteration here is the same as in *Amphitruo* 75. Finally, in the *Miles*, Sceledrus' reference to his family tomb (372-73),

scio crucem futuram mihi sepulcrum  
ibi mei maiores sunt siti, pater, avos, proavos, abavos,

may not be purely coincidental in this play.

In *Amphitruo* 75, Plautus thus exhorts the Romans, who are referred to as *victores*—a term which certainly was bound to evoke the victories won by the Scipios—to engage in *virtus*, which was yet another topical concept associated with the Scipios. In the very next line, Plautus warns the Romans against *ambitio*, which was another quality the Scipios displayed by engaging in a sort of posthumous *ambitus*: they promoted their ancestors to offices they had never actually held. The central sentence of the prologue then concludes with a reference to the *summus vir*, a term which applies to nobody more aptly than to the foremost of the *bonorum optimi*.<sup>29</sup>

Moreover, in the *Trinummus* there is a similar nexus of *ambitio* and *virtus*, and two passages (1030 ff. [esp. 1034] and 642 ff.) have been given a convincing Scipionic interpretation.<sup>30</sup> Further, an amplified version of line 75 of the *Amphitruo* occurs in the *Cistellaria* prologue (197 ff.) and a Scipionic allusion has again been suggested for that passage.<sup>31</sup>

<sup>29</sup> For good comments on Scipio's stature, see R. M. Haywood, *Studies on Scipio Africanus* (= *Johns Hopkins Univ. Stud. in Hist. and Pol. Sciences* 51.1, Baltimore 1933) 18, and Herrmann (above, note 22) 322: "Ainsi, dans le prologue, l'allusion à un *summus vir* qui se livre à la brigue (v. 77) ne peut viser ni M Fulvius Nobilior ni M Manlius Vulso, mais le vainqueur de Zama, auréolé d'une gloire et d'un prestige bien supérieurs." Following Stewart (361 and note 46) and others, I lean toward a late date for the *Amphitruo*, i.e. after 190 B.C., which thus would coincide with Scipio's "princiate." A survey of scholarly opinions concerning the date of the play can be found in K. H. E. Schutter, *Quibus annis comoediae Plautinae actae sint quaeritur* (Groningen 1952) xii-xxxii. Most scholars favor a late date.

<sup>30</sup> Earl (above, note 28) 235-38, and T. Frank, "Some Political Allusions in Plautus' *Trinummus*," *AJP* 53 (1932) 152-56.

<sup>31</sup> T. Frank, "Plautus Comments on Anatolian Affairs," *Anatolian Studies Presented to W. H. Buckler* (Manchester 1939) 85-88.

It is important for the interpretation of the *Amphitruo* passage, I believe, to note that it is Jupiter himself who insists *legem esse* (73). Jupiter earlier had been said to have deserved well *de vobis et de re publica* (40), and, as in 73 ff., this statement is followed by an alliterative (42) line which anticipates 75:

ut alios in tragoediis  
vidi, Neptunum,<sup>32</sup> Virtutem, Victoriam.

Plautus then proceeds to call Jupiter the *architectus omnibus* (45), *architectus* being a term which, especially in the *Miles*, connotes clever and unscrupulous manipulation. Jupiter and Scipio are thus related to each other in the same context, and to both an ambivalent terminology is applied.

This Plautine association of Jupiter with a Scipionic context suggests a parallel in that part of the Elder Scipio's life which is commonly known as the Scipionic legend, and which very much appealed to the imagination of the Roman populace. One outstanding characteristic of this legend is Scipio's close association with Jupiter. As early as 206 B.C., after falling seriously ill at New Carthage and after considerable difficulties with his troops, Scipio vowed a sacrifice of oxen to Jupiter Capitolinus. In the speech which, according to Livy (28.28.11), he made to his troops on that occasion, Scipio hardly humbled himself before the god:

si ego morerer, mecum exspiratura res publica, mecum casurum imperium populi Romani erat? Ne istuc Iuppiter Optimus Maximus sirit, urbem auspicato dis auctoribus in aeternum conditam huic fragili et mortali corpori aequalem esse.

After the defeat at Cannae, Scipio is said to have prevented a mass exodus from Rome by calling not on *Dius Fidius*, but on Jupiter Optimus Maximus (Livy 22.53.11). Another aspect of this tradition is that Scipio every day before dawn, without the dogs barking at him, went to the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus and there communicated with the god in a mysterious way.<sup>33</sup> The legend then developed so far as to ascribe to Scipio—the only legendary or historical Roman hero so

<sup>32</sup> For the association of Scipio with Neptune, see Polyb. 10.11.7, 14.12; Livy 26.45.9.

<sup>33</sup> A discussion of this aspect of the Scipionic legend can be found in Hubaux (above, note 22) 76–88; Haywood (above, note 29) 9–44; H. H. Scullard, *Scipio Africanus in the Punic War* (London 1930) 1–31; J. Aymard, "Scipio l'Africain et les chiens du Capitole,"

honored—descent from Jupiter. There is some evidence that his family regarded the Elder Scipio as more than human and may even have introduced the non-Roman concept of heroization into Rome. It has been pointed out that Africanus and his brother, who both spent some time in Sicily, may have acquired some of these un-Roman conceptions there.<sup>34</sup> Further, the tomb of the Scipios has many Etruscan features and may suggest that the Scipios adhered to Etruscan religious ideas.<sup>35</sup> More definite evidence is the letter of Cornelia,<sup>36</sup> Scipio's daughter, to her son Gracchus, in which she says: "ubi mortua ero, parentabis mihi et invocabis deum parentem. in eo tempore non pudet te eorum deum preces expetere, quos vivos atque praesentes, relictos atque desertos habueris." The *deus parens*, of course, is Scipio the Elder. Finally, Scipio's image was not set up in the family tomb, but in the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus (Val. Max. 8.15.2; Appian, *Hisp.* 23; Livy 38.56.12-13).

Before discussing further aspects of this legend and their application to the *Amphitruo*, let me return to the prologue which in many ways sets the tone for the whole play. It would be doing an injustice to Plautus' wit to equate either Jupiter or Amphitruo with Scipio and thus find the key to the cleverness of the play. Rather, Amphitruo and Jupiter both take on Scipionic aspects. The dramatic confusion between the two thus is significantly heightened. Nor can we expect from a study of the Scipionic references in the play a resolution of its

REL 31 (1953) 111-16; L. R. Taylor, *The Divinity of the Roman Emperor* (Middletown 1931) 41, 53 ff. See also note 67, below.

<sup>34</sup> For more detail on this and the next two points of my discussion, see Haywood (above, note 29) 21-22.

<sup>35</sup> P. Nicorescu, "La tomba degli Scipioni," *Ephem. Dacorom.* 1 (1923) 1-56, esp. 45 ff. But I cannot agree with Haywood (p. 22) that this makes "it seem probable that the family was of Etruscan stock and persisted in Etruscan ways of thinking." Livy 28.45.13 ff. proves no more than that the Cornelii had influence in Etruria, perhaps in the form of clients, and a political following eager to drive the Carthaginians out of Italy and bring the war to Africa. It does not even suggest that the Cornelii were from Etruria. Furthermore, there is no attestation of even an Etruscanized form of L. Cornelius in Etruria. See M. Fowler and R. G. Wolfe, *Materials for the Study of the Etruscan Language* (Madison 1965); H. Rix, *Das etruskische Cognomen* (Wiesbaden 1963) 296. For a discussion of the Etruscan conception of man's inherent divinity, see M. Pallottino, *Etruscologia* (Milan 1963) 256-61.

<sup>36</sup> To be found at the end of the OCT of Cornelius Nepos; see Taylor (above, note 33) 49, and on its authenticity, E. von Stern, "Tiberius und Gaius Gracchus," *Hermes* 56 (1921) 273, note 1, and E. Meyer, *Kleine Schriften* 1 (Halle 1924) 368-71.

underlying tension between the serious and the comic. Plautus certainly did not commit himself to becoming, as has been argued, a deeply serious anti-Scipionic pamphleteer of the Catonian faction.<sup>37</sup> The Scipionic allusions are not rigorously applied to one character, but are used rather more subtly to intensify the atmosphere peculiar to this *tragicomoedia*, i.e. especially the continual interaction between the divine and human protagonists.

That the joke is not entirely on Scipio is suggested by lines 39–40, which apply to Jupiter as well as to the Scipios:

meruimus  
et ego et pater de vobis et de re publica.

The interplay between Jupiter and Amphitruo actually begins in 27, where Mercury introduces Jupiter as being rather human, after all: *humana matre natus humano patre*. Strictly speaking, this line refers only to the human actor playing the role of Jupiter, but there seems to be something more to it, and it has been taken, for instance, as evidence for the influence of Greek anthropomorphic conceptions on Roman religion.<sup>38</sup> But it may simply mean that the present-day Jupiter,<sup>39</sup> Scipio, is no more than a mortal. Shortly thereafter Plautus says the play cannot be a comedy because *reges* and *di* appear in it (61). The status to which the Roman populace tried to elevate Scipio (Livy 38.56.12; cf. Polyb. 10.38.40) is not much different: "castigatum enim quondam ab eo populum ait, quod eum perpetuum consulem et dictatorem vellet facere; prohibuisse sibi statuas in comitio, in Rostris, in curia, in Capitolio, cella Iovis poni." Scipio was readily compared to *reges* (cf. Livy 28.41.15; 30.30.1); *regia* thus is a fitting epithet to describe the *forma* of the *Miles* (MG 10). Further, the alliteration and the play on *victores . . . vivere* which is found in *Amphitruo* 75 has a parallel in Livy's account of the beginning of the Scipionic trials: *si quidem victa Carthago victum Hannibalem in exilium expulisset, Roma victrix victorem Africanum expellat* (38.50.7).<sup>40</sup>

<sup>37</sup> So Frank (above, note 30) 156, whereas he (above, note 31) interpreted the *Cist.* passage as indicating Plautus' initial approval of the Scipionic philhellenism before the playwright became disillusioned. Cf. Earl (above, note 28) 243.

<sup>38</sup> E. Riess, "Notes on Plautus," *CQ* 35 (1941) 158.

<sup>39</sup> Cf. Livy 38.56.10–13, and the discussion by Haywood (above, note 29) 16–18.

<sup>40</sup> See the Appendix to this paper for the question of the validity of the phraseological parallels between Plautus and Livy.

The conclusion of Plautus' exhortation is ambiguous (76-77):

qui minus  
eadem histrioni sit lex quae summo viro?

In fact, the *histrion* and the *summus vir*, Scipio, both pretend to be Jupiter, and thus the same law applies to them indeed. The next line contrasts *virtute* with the *favitoribus*. The same contrast occurs in Livy's account of Scipio's Iberian campaign; Scipio exhorts his soldiers: *favete nomini Scipionum* (26.41.22), but throughout his account Livy is at pains to stress *virtus* as the factor that is most decisive for the Romans' success (26.41.12, 25; 48.14; 49.15). The *fides* of people who shoulder a responsible task is also frequently connected with Scipio by Livy (e.g. 26.41.25; 28.34.3; and especially 26.50.5, where Livy may actually play with Scipionic terminology: *et forma faceret fidem*).

After a Scipionic context has thus been suggested, Plautus announces: *ipse hanc acturust Iuppiter comoediam* (88). The comic point of this remark may be that Scipio will be in this play, although not exclusively in the role of Jupiter. Further, in the light of the preceding lines (86-87),

mirari nolim vos quapropter Iuppiter  
nunc histriones curet; ne miremini,

the implication may be that Jupiter, because he is travestied by Scipio, now has to become *histrion* himself. As a result, Jupiter in *Amphitruonis vortit sese imaginem* (121). The recurrent emphasis on *imago* (124, 141) as well as the suggestion that the *imago* is carried (*ego fero hanc imaginem*, 141) is reminiscent of the plans the Roman populace had for Scipio's *imago* (Livy 38.56.13: "prohibuisse, ne decerneretur, ut imago sua triumphali ornatu e templo Iovis maximi exiret"; Val. Max. 4.1.6: "voluerunt imaginem eius triumphali ornatu indutam Capitolinis pulvinaribus applicare.") Later in the play, Plautus associates Sosia's *imago* even more clearly with a funeral mask (458-59).<sup>41</sup> The phraseology applied to the god who changes something divine into something human (in *Amphitruonis vortit sese imaginem* 121) is paralleled closely by

<sup>41</sup> See Sedgwick (above, note 1) *ad loc.* I have not been able to find the expression *imaginem ferre* elsewhere. J. A. Hanson suggests that the phrase *histriones curet* in *Amph.* 87 could refer to a Scipionic magistracy where *ludi* were given. The most fitting occasion would be the splendid games celebrated by L. Scipio in 186 (Livy 39.27.8-10).

Livy's description of Scipio who, conversely, *hoc cura ac ratione com-pertum in prodigium ac deos vertens* (26.45.9), prepares for the "miraculous" attack on New Carthage.

While consorting with Alcumena, Jupiter gleefully plays the *miles gloriosus*, a role which, as we have seen, Plautus had purposely associated with the Scipios (135-39):

ibi nunc meu' pater  
memorat legiones hostium ut fugaverit.  
quo pacto sit donis donatus plurimis.  
ea dona quae illic Amphitruoni sunt data  
apstulimus: facile meu' pater quod volt facit.

By far the most important of these gifts is the *patera aurea* (260), which Amphitruo wins from Pterelas and which then is spirited away by Jupiter. The passage, I submit, may well be Plautus' comic adaptation of an episode which Livy found in his sources and narrates in 26.50.9-13.<sup>42</sup> Scipio there protects the chastity of a Spanish maiden, while Jupiter is here explicitly referred to as *moechus* (135), a characteristic role for the *miles gloriosus* (MG 775, 924; cf. 90). The grateful Spanish father offers Scipio a *magnum auri pondus* as a *donum* (Livy 26.50.10-11), which Scipio graciously—*facile meu' pater quod volt facit*—gives away to the girl's fiancé: *aurumque tollere ac sibi habere iussit* (26.50.12; cf. *apstulimus* in *Amph.* 139). The boy thus receives *super dotem dotalia dona*, and he is *laetus donis honoribusque dimissus domum* (26.50.12-13). As a result, he praises Scipio as a *dis simillimum iuvenem* (26.50.13); about the appropriateness of this phrase for the *Amphitruo* nothing need be said.

The gift which Mercury has conferred on the audience is *pax* (*Amph.* 32):

propterea pace advenio et pacem ad vos fero.

This is the very function that was often entrusted to the Scipios (Livy 30.40.14-15; cf. 30.43.3-4, 8, 10; 45.1):

si condiciones convenirent pacis, tribuni plebis rogarent utrum consulem  
an P. Scipionem iuberent pacem dare . . . si pacem per P. Scipionem dari  
atque ab eodem exercitum deportari iussissent, ne consul ex Sicilia in  
Africam traiceret.

<sup>42</sup> A second passage that may be echoed in *Amph.* 135-39 is Ennius, *Ann.* 202 (in a *virtus* context): "Dono, ducite, doque volentibus cum magnis dis."

Finally, Mercury concludes the prologue by emphasizing that *erit operae pretium spectantibus* (151) to see this spectacle starring Mercury and Jupiter. This phrase occurs only in one other Plautine prologue:<sup>43</sup> in *MG* 31–32 Artotrogus remarks:

ne hercle operae pretium quidemst  
mihi te narrare tuas qui virtutes sciam.

But these *virtutes*, as we have seen, at the outset had been characterized as Scipionic (10–12), and perhaps the *Amphitruo* passage intentionally recalls the *Miles* prologue.

Stewart has rightly pointed out that the theme of madness and drunkenness is given much emphasis in the *Amphitruo*, and thus he sees in these references one of the most important links between the *Amphitruo* and the *Bacchae*.<sup>44</sup> A theme, however, that is equally as important is that of waking and dreaming. The earliest reference to it is associated with the drunkenness theme, *credo edepol equidem dormire Solem atque adpotum probe* (282), but the contrast between waking and dreaming soon is made more explicit, and the latter state is represented as being caused by the gods, whereas the former is caused by man. The theme of waking and dreaming thus reflects the tension between the divine and human levels which dominates the play (297–98):

nunc propterea quod me meus erus  
fecit ut vigilarem, hic pugnis faciet hodie ut dormiam.

This reference is reinforced by Sosia's fear that Mercury will cruelly put him to sleep (305–6; cf. 304):

quattuor viros sopori se dedisse hic autumat:  
metuo ne numerum augeam illum.

He then emphasizes that *continuas has tris noctes pervigilavi* (314). Near the end of this scene, Sosia has his doubts whether he really is awake (407), although he later vehemently defends himself against Amphitruo's charges (620–24):

AM. sed quid ais? num obdormivisti dudum? So. nusquam gentium.  
AM. ibi forte istum si vidisses quendam in somnis Sosiam.

<sup>43</sup> The *operae pretium* passages are listed and discussed by A. A. Bryant, "Some Plautine Words and Word-Groups," *HSCP* 9 (1889) 121.

<sup>44</sup> Stewart 354–55.



SO. non soleo ego somniculose eri imperia persequi.  
 vigilans vidi, vigilans nunc video, vigilans fabulor,  
 vigilantem ille me iam dudum vigilans pugnis contudit.

A similar accusation becomes the keynote of Amphitruo's exchange with Alcumena (696-98):<sup>45</sup>

AM. haec quidem deliramenta loquitur. SO. paullisper mane,  
 dum edormiscat unum somnum. AM. quaene vigilans somniat?  
 AL. equidem ecaster vigilo et vigilans id quod factum est  
 fabulor.

After some more references to sleeping (701, 726) and waking (726), Sosia concludes: *somnium narrat tibi* (738).

Two more themes are prominent in the *Amphitruo*. One is Amphitruo's eager pursuit of glory. In Sosia's description of the battle Amphitruo is depicted as the hero who accumulates all the honor a mortal can possibly reap. His ambitious heroism manifests itself first when the hostile city is stormed (191-92, 196):

id vi et virtute militum victum atque expugnatum oppidum est  
 imperio atque auspicio mei eri Amphitruonis maxime.  
 . . . ductu, imperio, auspicio suo.

The Scipios at times also chose to emphasize the *virtus* of their soldiers (Livy 26.41.12; 48.14; 49.15), and the *imperio atque auspicio* formula has a counterpart in Livy where it is often associated with the Scipios: "hoc maxime modo ductu atque auspicio P. Scipionis pulsi Hispania Carthaginenses sunt" (Livy 28.16.14; cf. *Amph.* 657: "eos auspicio meo atque [in]ductu primo coetu vicimus"). More importantly, Amphitruo is in charge throughout the battle (204, 212, 216, 242). He achieves a feat paralleled only by Romulus, Cossus, and Marcellus: "ipsusque Amphitruo regem Pterelam sua obruncavit manu" (252). Consequently, "ob virtutem ero Amphitruoni patera donata aurea est." Like a Scipio, he emerges from this victory *inexplebilis virtutis* (Livy 28.17.2); he is cast in the role of the returning hero who expects *honor, gloria*, and a triumph.

Plautus, however, takes pains to point out how greatly he is humiliated. The reason is, of course, that, just as Amphitruo dominated the

<sup>45</sup> In 697, the themes of waking, dreaming, and drunkenness are combined, but it is the antithesis between waking and dreaming that is emphasized; cf. Terence, *Andria* 971-72.

battle, so Jupiter is in charge throughout the play; moreover, he undercuts and thwarts Amphitruo's aspirations at every turn. Speaking to Alcumena, he thus mockingly echoes what had been said about Amphitruo (534 ff.). The reversal of Amphitruo's fortunes is brought about most clearly in the last scene: he lies prostrate on the ground. Now he accuses himself of being *insanus* while all the other characters, including Alcumena, explicitly are called *sani* (1084),<sup>46</sup> and the verbal echoes of the battle description underscore this reversal even more (see above, pp. 205-6). The glorious general Amphitruo now has to acknowledge the might of the *summus imperator* Jupiter (1121), and explicitly asks him for peace (1127).<sup>47</sup> But instantly, as soon as Amphitruo has realized how feeble mortal glory is and how quickly it can be shattered, Jupiter promises to give him true immortality, for Hercules "suis factis te inmortalī adficiet gloria" (1140). The same connection between *facta* and the ascent to immortality is made in Ennius' epigram on Scipio, which I partially quoted earlier:

a sole exoriente supra Maeotis paludes  
nemo est qui factis aequiperare queat.  
si fas endo plagas caelestum ascendere cuiquam est,  
mi soli caeli maxima porta patet.<sup>48</sup>

The realization of the littleness of human glory and, resulting from this realization, the promise of true, divine immortality, as well as the motif of waking and dreaming, are pivotal themes in the *Amphitruo*.

As A. J. Festugière has shown, these are exactly the three chief themes of Cicero's *Somnium Scipionis*.<sup>49</sup> The theme of dreaming, complemented by references to waking, supplies the framework of Scipio's tale:

deinde me . . . qui ad multam noctem *vigilassem*, artior quam solebat  
*somnus* complexus est . . . fit enim fere ut cogitationes sermonesque nostri

<sup>46</sup> The passage escaped Stewart's notice, but gives added testimony to the thorough integration of the Bacchic motif into the thematic structure of the *Amphitruo*. Amphitruo thus has to recognize what Alcumena said in 730: *sana et salva sum*.

<sup>47</sup> This harks back to the prologue (32): "propterea pace advenio et pacem ad vos fero."

<sup>48</sup> Lact. *Inst.* 1.18.10.

<sup>49</sup> A. J. Festugière, "Les thèmes du songe de Scipion," *Eranos* 44 (1946) 370-88, with the relevant bibliography. I follow the text of A. Ronconi, *Somnium Scipionis* (Florence 1961).

pariant aliquid in *somno* tale, quale de Homero scribit Ennius, de quo videlicet saepissime *vigilans* solebat cogitare et loqui (1.10).<sup>50</sup>

quaeso ne me ex *somno* excitetis (2.12).

ille discessit: ego *somno* solutus sum (9.29).

What Scipio should strive for is soon pointed out: immortality, which is the reward of good services rendered to the state (3.16, 8.26, 9.29). This insistence on patriotic *virtus* is definitely one of the Roman characteristics of the *Somnium*, and the Varronian precedent of this conception has rightly been pointed out.<sup>51</sup> Yet the earliest formulation of this very conception occurs in Ennius, who viewed *virtus* as the pursuit of personal prominence in the service of the state. Furthermore, Plautus' concept of *virtus* was much the same as Ennius', which in turn is implicit in the Scipionic *elogia*.<sup>52</sup> The remark Scipio addresses to Aemilius in the *Somnium* (8.26),

ego vero, Africane, siquidem bene meritis de patria quasi limes ad *caeli aditum patet*, quamquam a pueritia vestigiis ingressus patris et tuis decori vestro non defui, nunc tamen tanto praemio exposito enitar multo vigilantius,

thus is full of verbal and conceptual reminiscences of the *elogia* and Ennius' epigram (*mi . . . caeli porta patet*). Lastly, human *gloria* is belittled in the *Somnium* (3.16, 7.23–25). As in the *Amphitruo*, it is only the gods who can save man from *oblivione posteritatis* (7.25). This *immortalis gloria* (*Amph.* 1140) is very different from the *praemiis humanis* (7.25), which lead to neither *aeterna* nor *diuturna gloria* (7.23).

*Virtus* as defined by Ennius and Plautus comprises primarily three aspects: it emphasizes *gloria*, *res publica*, and the proper standard of conduct.<sup>53</sup> *Amphitruo* certainly lives up to the principles of this *virtus*. There is nothing wrong with his behavior except for one

<sup>50</sup> There also are some striking verbal parallels between the *Amph.* and the *Somnium*, which are best explained by their common Scipionic context. Masinissa's introduction sets the tone (1.9): *antequam ex hac vita migro*; on *migro* see Ronconi's note and cf. *Amph.* 1143. Cf. further the Scipionic terminology in *Somnium* 1.10: "Africanus se ostendit ea forma quae mihi ex imagine eius quam ex ipso erat notior."

<sup>51</sup> By Festugière (above, note 49) 372.

<sup>52</sup> Earl (above, note 28) 242. Cicero's concept of *fama* and *gloria* also is prefigured in Ennius; see Earl 240.

<sup>53</sup> Earl (above, note 28) 238–39.

major flaw, which the model of the *Bacchae* helps to underscore: anything that is superhuman and divine and thus outside the limits of purely human *gloria* is curiously beyond his comprehension. Before he comes to the realization of Jupiter's power, therefore, he is attacked where he seemed to be most secure: his conception of *virtus* is brought into conflict with that of a character who is equally as Roman as he—Alcumena. She is portrayed as being more god-fearing than Amphitruo (*dis placitum* 635, *deum metum* 841, *piam* 1086).<sup>54</sup> Her long monody (633 ff.) culminates in a praise of *virtus*; later in the play, she refutes Jupiter's arguments by *virtute* (925), and it seems like an intentional ironic contrast with Amphitruo's Scipionic ideals that *virtute* and *factis* are named by her in one breath (925–26). The dramatic contrast between her conception of *virtus*, which Amphitruo completely fails to understand, and his, could not be brought out more strongly than by the scene which follows her monody. Alcumena ends her speech with this remark (651–52):

virtus omnia in sese habet, omnia adsunt  
bona quem penest virtus.

*Quem* being masculine, the lines obviously refer to Amphitruo; he immediately steps onto the stage and, in the manner of a *miles gloriosus*, begins to extol his military *virtus* (655–57):

praesertim re gesta bene,  
victis hostibus: quos nemo posse superari ratust,  
eos auspicio meo atque ductu primo coetu vicimus.<sup>55</sup>

But his conception of *virtus* obviously is inadequate, for in contrast to what Alcumena said about the man who has *virtus*, for him *omnia non adsunt bona*: Amphitruo is plagued by misfortune and mishaps until almost the very end of the play.

There are further Scipionic themes in the *Amphitruo*. Sosia's long battle description has often been considered as being full of contemporary allusions. As a result, most discussions have been vitiated by attempts to press identifications with a specific Roman battle or general

<sup>54</sup> For some good remarks on Alcumena's *pietas* see J. A. Hanson, "Plautus as a Source Book for Roman Religion," *TAPA* 90 (1959) 92.

<sup>55</sup> Cf. Livy 28.16.14.

too hard and thus to date the play.<sup>56</sup> It cannot be denied that the passage contains some contemporary references, but one also has to realize that some features are obviously inventions.<sup>57</sup> To give just one example: we have seen that only three instances are mentioned by the historians in which a Roman general slew the commander of the enemy. The Pterelas episode does not allude to any of these events, but belongs to the realm of fable, where this motif occurs frequently (e.g. Theocr. 24.4-5; Apollod. 2.4.6-7). On the other hand, Mercury's interjection (248-49),

numquam etiam quicquam adhuc verborum est perlocutus perperam:  
namque ego fui illi in re praesenti et meu' quom pugnatum est pater,

is to warn the audience not to consider as purely fictitious what Sosia has said before.<sup>58</sup> There thus is a definite possibility that the battle is patterned on one fought by the Scipios, the battle at Magnesia having been singled out by most scholars.<sup>59</sup> At the same time, the emphasis on Jupiter's presence at the battle agrees well with the historians' contention that Scipio's strategy of battle was divinely inspired.<sup>60</sup>

Moreover, I believe that, when Plautus' Roman audience heard of Amphitruo's campaign against the *Teleboae*, they could not fail to associate this with the war against the Boii, especially since Plautus in an earlier play (*Capt.* 888) had punned on the name Boii. The Boian campaign had been brought to a conclusion by the consul P. Cornelius Scipio Nasica (Livy 36.38-42),<sup>61</sup> and several of its more striking details

<sup>56</sup> For a summary of earlier scholarship on this passage, see F. J. Lelièvre, "Sosia and Roman Epic," *Phoenix* 12 (1958) 117-18, and W. Hofmann, "Der Schlachtbericht in Plautus' *Amphitruo* (v. 203-61)," *FF* 33 (1959) 207.

<sup>57</sup> An eminently sound and perceptive discussion of these two strata in Sosia's monody is A. Traina, "De primo Amphitruonis cantico," *Latinitas* 2 (1954) 127-32. The *canticum* is neither wholly parodic, as was assumed by L. Halkin, "La parodie d'une demande de triomphe dans l'*Amphitryon* de Plaute," *AC* 17 (1948) 297-304, nor is it purely propagandistic, as is posited by Hofmann (above, note 56) 207-10.

<sup>58</sup> On the effect of *numquam quicquam* see J. Marouzeau, *Traité de stylistique latine* (Paris 1946) 113; cf. Pascucci (above, note 6) 196. Note also the emphatic position of *pater*, which is separated from the adjective and placed at the end of the line.

<sup>59</sup> Most recently by M. Peyronel, "Amphitruo, vv. 188-261," *Studi in memoriam Achillis Beltrami* (Genoa 1954) 205-12, and A. Grilli, "Miscellanea Latina," *Rend. Ist. Lomb.* 97 (1963) 103-14.

<sup>60</sup> Cf. Appian, *Hisp.* 23; Polyb. 10.2.9 ff., 10.4, 10.11.7-8, 10.14.11-12; Livy 26.45.9.

<sup>61</sup> Nasica was often portrayed by the historians as Africanus' double; see Münzer, "Cornelius 350," *RE* 7 (1900) 1495.

coincide with those of Sosia's account. In both accounts, the excellence of the commanders is stressed (*egregie pugnavit*, 36.38.5; cf. *Amph.* 190-91, 252, 260); the casualties of the enemy are enormous (36.38.6, 40.5, *Amph.* 236); the enemy is forced to surrender *biduo post pugnam* (38.40.3) or *postridie* (*Amph.* 256), and completely (38.38.7, *Amph.* 256 ff.); both times the headquarters of the enemy are conquered (36.38.7, 39.3-4, *Amph.* 210, 257). Among the spoils the Romans receive as a reward for their bravery *Gallica vasa* are singled out (36.40.11-12), and so is the *patera* of *Amphitruo* (260). While Plautus certainly did not model Sosia's description exclusively on any one Roman battle, the correspondences between the two accounts suggest that Plautus may have drawn, for some of the realistic details, on an historian's account of Nasica's victory over the Boii.<sup>62</sup>

The assumption that Plautus indeed was thinking of a member of the Cornelian family when he wrote Sosia's account is further supported by the parallels F. Altheim discovered between this description and the one given by Livy at the end of Book 8 (8.38 ff.).<sup>63</sup> The correspondences are numerous and apply to content as well as to style and phraseology. Livy's account is obviously designed to give prominence to the skills of the Roman general. What is truly amazing, then, is that Livy, without giving any reason for so doing, admits that he is deviating from his main source and even from the Capitoline triumphal *fasti*, which mention the consul L. Fulvius as the commander victorious in this battle. The man Livy chooses instead is a member of the Cornelian family, A. Cornelius Arvina. It appears quite possible, then, that Livy knew that the *canticum* in the *Amphitruo* dealt with the exploits of one of the Cornelii Scipiones and thus chose it as a model for his praise of an earlier Cornelius. Arvina was appointed dictator in 322 B.C., not *belli gerendi causa*, but to be in charge of the *ludi Romani*, and perhaps this induced Livy to borrow from a Roman play the description of a battle in which Arvina was prominent. Finally, the note on

<sup>62</sup> For the possibility of the *Annales Maximi* as a source see the Appendix. There are other possibilities as well, e.g. the history written in Greek by Scipio's son Publius. Publius is likely to have drawn on some pre-existing Latin accounts, which could possibly be found in the Scipionic family archives.

<sup>63</sup> F. Altheim, *Geschichte der lateinischen Sprache* (Munich 1951) 441-50. Altheim rules out the possibility of a common Ennian model of both Livy's and Plautus' accounts.

which Livy concludes these chapters again seems to be more than coincidental in the Scipionic context. In 8.40.4 he states:

vitiata[m] memoriā funebribus laudibus reor falsisque imaginum titulis, dum familiae ad se quaeque famam rerum gestarum honorumque fallente mendacio trahunt; inde certe et singulorum gesta et publica monumenta confusa.<sup>64</sup>

Furthermore—and this is neglected by most scholars—the focal section of Sosia's report parallels in many ways a battle described by a messenger in Euripides' *Heracleidae* (see above, p. 204). One of the features of Euripides' play is that Heracles' divine ancestry is stressed, while no mention at all is made of Amphitruo.<sup>65</sup> Moreover, although Leo's positing *contaminatio* for the play has to be somewhat modified, his basic assumption is still well worth taking into account.<sup>66</sup> He argued that a play dealing with the "long night" of generation of Heracles and the deluding of Amphitruo had been combined with a perhaps coarser play about the deluding of Amphitruo and the birth of the sons. As often, this purely analytical approach to *contaminatio* has led to a complete neglect of its more important, interpretive aspect, i.e. why did Plautus choose to combine scenes from these two plays? The answer may be suggested from the viewpoint of dramatic emphasis: there is a redoubled stress on the birth of Heracles. Let us see how this ties in with the Scipionic overtones of this play.

In Roman literature, numerous passages occur, especially in Cicero, Horace, Silius Italicus, and Lactantius, which explicitly associate Scipio and Heracles.<sup>67</sup> Perhaps the most revealing example comes from Lactantius, *Inst.* 1.9.1: "Hercules, qui ob virtutem clarissimus et quasi Africanus inter deos habetur." Two points, I believe, are worth

<sup>64</sup> Note the emphasis, in both Scipionic accounts, on "*egregium exercitum*" (8.38.1) and "*egregie pugnavit*" (36.38.5), and on "*falsis imaginum titulis*" (8.40.4) and "*honestam honoratamque P. Scipionis Nasicae imaginem*" (36.40.10). Cf. Livy 30.45.7.

<sup>65</sup> Shero 198.

<sup>66</sup> A summary is given by Stewart 356–57.

<sup>67</sup> For a list of passages and a discussion, see A. Elter, *Donarem Pateras* 1, II (Progr. Bonn 1905–7); A. R. Anderson, "Heracles and his Successors," *HSCP* 39 (1928) 7–59. On the problem of Scipio's deification consult also the works listed in note 33, above; further, H. P. L'Orange, *Apotheosis in Ancient Portraiture* (Oslo 1947) 49–53, and C. J. Classen, "Gottmenschentum in der römischen Republik," *Gymnasium* 70 (1963) 315–21 (with copious bibliography). By far the most judicious discussion is that by F. Taeger, *Charisma* 2 (Stuttgart 1960) 20–33.

noting here. First, Lactantius is evidently referring to a literary tradition in which Scipio had not only occurred in connection with Heracles, but Scipio must have been the main character, while Heracles and others were, so to speak, projected into him.<sup>68</sup> Second, the concept of *virtus* probably was quite instrumental in bringing about this association (cf. Cicero, *Sest.* 143), for both Heracles and Scipio worked for the common good and were hailed as benefactors of mankind. Thus heaven becomes their just reward, as Cicero, who is quoted by Lactantius (*Inst.* 1.10.13), does not fail to point out: "est vero, Africane: nam et Herculi eadem ista porta patuit." In Horace's *C.* 4.8.15 ff. Scipio and Heracles are associated with each other within a canon of demigods, among them Dionysus and the Dioscuri, but the identification of Scipio with Heracles is pushed farthest by Silius in the *Punica*. At the beginning of Book 15, for instance, the beardless youth Scipio ponders whether he should lead a Roman army to Spain. In a scene Anderson has fittingly called *Scipio in Bivio*,<sup>69</sup> Virtus and Voluptas appear before him, so that he can choose between them. The answer of Virtus to Voluptas is rather illuminating (15.69-119):

"quasnam iuvenem florentibus," inquit,  
 "pellicis in fraudes annis vitaeque tenebras,  
 cui ratio et magnae caelestia semina mentis  
 munere sunt concessa deum? mortalibus alti  
 quantum caelicolae, tantundem animalibus isti  
 praecellunt cunctis. tribuit namque ipsa minores  
 hos terris natura deos: sed foedere certo  
 degeneres tenebris animas damnavit Avernis.  
 at, quis aetherei servatur seminis ortus,  
 caeli porta patet.<sup>70</sup> referam quid cuncta domantem  
 Amphitryoniaden? quid, cui, post Seras et Indo  
 captivo Liber cum signa referret ab Euro,  
 Caucaseae currum duxere per oppida tigres?  
 quid suspiratos magno in discrimine nautis  
 Ledaeos referam fratres, vestrumque Quirinum?  
 . . . . .

<sup>68</sup> Cf. Elter (above, note 67) Vol. II, part 1, page 40,10.

<sup>69</sup> Anderson (above, note 67) 36.

<sup>70</sup> Cf. again the Ennius fragment (Lact. *Inst.* 1.18.10), which is repeatedly echoed in the Scipionic literary tradition: "mi soli caeli maxima porta patet"; cf. Lact. *Inst.* 1.10.13: "est vero, Africane: nam et Herculi eadem ista porta patuit."



mecum Honor, ac Laudes, et laeto Gloria vultu,  
 et Decus, ac niveis Victoria concolor alis.  
 me cinctus lauro producit ad astra triumphus.

. . . . .  
 mox celsus ab alto  
 infra te cernes hominum genus . . .

. . . . .  
 sed dabo, qui vestrum saevo nunc Marte fatigat  
 imperium, superare manu laurumque superbam  
 in gremio Iovis excisis deponere Poenis."

There is no reason for assuming that Cicero, Silius, or Lactantius created the myth of the deified, Heracles-like Scipio. Rather than summarily dismissing the Scipio legend, as some scholars have done,<sup>71</sup> as a literary exercise by later writers on the theme of the deified Alexander, one should differentiate between the core of the tradition, i.e. Scipio's apotheosis, and the purely adorning and embroidering attributes that were added to it in the course of its literary development.<sup>72</sup> The following passage from Silius, for instance, shows clearly that the Scipio legend was not modeled in every detail on the Alexander legend. Pomponia is not compared to Olympias, but she is explicitly associated with Alcumena (13.628-33):

nullos, o nate, labores  
 mors habuit nostra; aetherii dum pondere partus  
 exsolvor, miti dextra Cyllenia proles  
 imperio Iovis Elysias deduxit ad oras  
 attribuitque pares sedes, ubi magna moratur  
 Alcidae genetrix, ubi sacro munere Leda.

The marked emphasis on Heracles' divine birth in the *Amphitruo* may therefore well be more than a chance result of *contaminatio*. Similarly, the literary tradition dealing with Scipio's apotheosis appears to be too well established to be merely conceived of as developing at random from the first century B.C. onwards. Rather, it is probable

<sup>71</sup> Most recently, Classen (above, note 67) repeating the arguments of E. Meyer (above, note 36) 2.423-57.

<sup>72</sup> Taeger (above, note 67) 30: "Das Motif selbst, aber nicht die ausmalenden Züge, wird alt sein, gerade weil es aus dem Rahmen der üblichen älteren Vorstellungen herausfällt." Cf. Scullard's comment on the Scipionic connection with Jupiter in *JRS* 23 (1933) 79: "The story is not of the kind that one might expect to be invented: its very un-Roman qualities speak in its favor."

that, as Elter suggested sixty years ago, there must have been a man who, catering to the beliefs of the Roman populace and perhaps even encouraged by the Scipionic family, gave this tradition its first shape. This man most probably was Ennius. There are basically three reasons why this poet, as we know him, is likely to have regarded Scipio as a more than human being. First, "Ennius was not a Roman, but came from near Tarentum, a Greek region where hero cults flourished, and probably was educated at Tarentum."<sup>73</sup> Second, he was such a close friend of the Scipios that he even was buried in their tomb. It is no coincidence, therefore, that the terms *forma*, *imago*, and *facta* recur and are emphasized in his own epitaph:

aspicite, o cives, senis Enni imaginis formam.  
hic vestrum panxit maxima facta patrum.

Nor may it be purely coincidental that Cicero, when speaking of Ennius' association with the *sepulcrum* of the Scipios, uses the metaphor *in caelum huius proavus Cato tollitur* (Cic. Arch. 9.22).<sup>74</sup> Compare again Sceledrus' remark in the *Miles* (372-73):

scio crucem futuram mihi sepulcrum;  
ibi mei maiores sunt siti, pater, avos, proavos, abavos.

Third, Ennius considered Romulus as divine and, for all we know, was the first poet to speak of his entering into heaven (*Ann.* I.110-16). The literary tradition suggests that Ennius, after being successful in deifying Romulus, made an attempt to deify Scipio Africanus. Although the few fragments from Ennius' *Scipio* are inconclusive, we have the Suda's explicit statement that "*Ἐννίος . . . Σκιπίωνα ἄδων καὶ ἐπὶ μέγα τὸν ἄνδρα ἐξᾶραι βουλόμενος . . . καὶ κλέος πυργῶσαι*."

More importantly, lines 15-20 of Horace's *C.* 4.8, for good reasons, have been taken as referring to the *Scipio*. It is important, I believe, to quote them in their context (13-20):

non incisa notis marmora publicis,  
per quae spiritus et vita redit bonis  
post mortem ducibus, non celeres fugae  
reiectaque retrorsum Hannibalis minae

<sup>73</sup> Haywood (above, note 29) 20.

<sup>74</sup> Cf. Cic. Arch. 7.16: *divinum hominem, Africanum . . .*

[non incendia Carthaginis impiae]  
 eius qui domita nomen ab Africa  
 lucratus rediit clarius indicant  
 laudes quam Calabrae Pierides.

The lack of connection between 13-14 and 15-19 has repeatedly been bemoaned.<sup>75</sup> I submit, however, that Horace, as his terminology clearly indicates,<sup>76</sup> may well have been thinking of the Scipionic tomb inscriptions, and the transition to the *facta* of Scipio thus constitutes a natural train of thought. The thought sequence thus is this: the tomb inscriptions (written by Ennius) would not have been enough to immortalize Scipio, nor would his deeds by themselves have been sufficient. Only by a combination of these two, Scipio's *facta*, glorified by the *Calabrae Pierides*, could this goal be accomplished. It should be noted how well this antithetical design, which then is resolved into a synthesis, ties in with the thought structure of the other parts of the poem and the poem as a whole.<sup>77</sup>

Scipio's conviction of his own superhuman nature is clearly brought out in the epigram quoted before:

si fas endo plagas caelestum ascendere cuiquam est,  
 mi soli caeli maxima porta patet.

While it is true that Scipio here speaks only of the possibility of becoming immortal,<sup>78</sup> the phrasing of the sentence reflects exquisitely what must have been Scipio's situation at that time: apotheosis is a Greek concept, which Scipio and Ennius already have implicitly

<sup>75</sup> See Kiessling-Heinze *ad loc.* The attempt by C. Becker, "Donarem Pateras," *Hermes* 87 (1959) 212-22 to dismiss lines 15-19 as a later interpolation is too facile and forced to be convincing; see N. E. Collinge, *The Structure of Horace's Odes* (Oxford 1961) 60. Cf. Schanz-Hosius, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur* 2.1 (Munich 1935) 96: "Auf das Gedicht [the *Scipio*] bezieht sich wohl Horaz C. 4.8.20."

<sup>76</sup> Kiessling-Heinze point out the parallels with Cic. *Phil.* 14.33. Cicero there speaks of the *divina virtus* of the soldiers who fought in the *Punicis Gallicis bellis*, and then concludes: "ita pro mortali conditione vitae immortalitatem estis consecuti." Hence the need for *incisae litterae*. Cf. Horace, *Epod.* 9.25-26.

<sup>77</sup> See the discussions by Becker (above, note 75), Collinge (above, note 75) 68, and E. Fraenkel, *Horace* (Oxford 1957) 421 ff.

<sup>78</sup> This is overemphasized by C. J. Classen, "Romulus in der römischen Republik," *Philologus* 106 (1962) 180.

accepted and now try to make palatable to the Romans—*si fas est*.<sup>79</sup> Perhaps the epigram thus is most fittingly read as a commentary on the *Scipio*, which has been dated as early as Scipio's return from Africa.<sup>80</sup> Even if it was written at a later time, the ideas it reflected must have been current before; and this, I believe, is the backdrop against which the *Amphitruo* must be viewed.

A few more observations may be added before a conclusion can be drawn. Line 739 is an old crux, since it is the only reference found in Roman literature or inscriptions to a *Iuppiter Prodigialis*. The phrase, in my opinion, does not refer to a Roman cult of Jupiter Prodigialis about which nothing is known.<sup>81</sup> Rather, Plautus seems to have invented this epithet solely for a dramatic purpose. Jupiter was associated with incubation dreams (*Curc.* 226–69); *prodigialis* thus foreshadows the wondrous birth of the twins at the end of the play. The context in which the phrase is placed is one of waking and dreaming (*experrecta es* 109; *somnium* 108), just as in Pomponia's account in Silius' *Punica* (*ad requiem somnos* 13.638; *languentia lumina somnus* 641; *nec me mutata fefellit / forma dei* 642–43). In the *Punica*, Jupiter is a material *prodigium*; he transforms himself into a snake. This story is not explicitly told in the *Amphitruo*, but a related motif is emphasized in the last scene: Hercules slays the two serpents.<sup>82</sup> This may be foreshadowed<sup>83</sup> by the term *prodigialis*. More generally, perhaps, the phrase means that Jupiter has all the characteristics of a *prodigium*: "something outside the norm of nature, something at which we look with wonder and often with horror."<sup>84</sup> This fittingly applies to Jupiter's portrayal throughout the play; at the same time, the contemporary character dis-

<sup>79</sup> For the influx and reception of Greek religious ideas in Rome and the role of the Scipios, see W. W. Fowler, *The Religious Experience of the Roman People* (London 1911) 335–56, esp. 340, 354–55.

<sup>80</sup> The early date is advocated by J. Vahlen, *Ennianae Poesis Fragmenta* (Leipzig 1928) xii f.; for further discussion, see Schanz-Hosius (above, note 75) 96.

<sup>81</sup> The existence of such a cult is postulated, on the basis of this line, by Riess (above, note 38) 158–59.

<sup>82</sup> For Scipio's association with serpents, see Livy 26.19.7–8, and Dio fr. 57.63; cf. Livy 38.58.7 on Scipio's divine birth. Hercules' slaying the serpents reflects his function as a savior-god, and *alexikakos*; see J. E. Harrison, *Themis: A Study of the Social Origins of Greek Religion* (Cambridge 1927) 381, 429–36. Cf. Taylor (above, note 33) 55, who suggests that the soul-weary Roman populace regarded Scipio as something of a savior.

<sup>83</sup> For the nature of this foreshadowing, see Duckworth (above, note 4) 221.

<sup>84</sup> Fraenkel (above, note 77) 160.

tinguished by these qualities again turns out to be Scipio, in whose life *prodigia* and omens played such a large role.<sup>85</sup>

One final observation may be added. Although a libation bowl as a piece of loot is mentioned already in the earliest versions of *Amphitruo*'s exploits against the Teleboans,<sup>86</sup> the exceedingly prominent and almost pivotal function of the *patera* in Plautus' play is surprising, but nonetheless deliberate.<sup>87</sup> But one has only to go to Delos to find such *φιάλαι* dedicated to the god by *Λεύκιος Κορνήλιος Σκιπίων* who thereby wanted to strengthen his claim on Trojan descent.<sup>88</sup> This was considered a special aspect of his *virtus*. Similarly, the *patera* becomes the symbol of *Amphitruo*'s *virtus* in the play. There again is no reason to believe that Plautus and the Roman populace had not heard of the dedications made by Scipio and the scions of several other noble families at the sanctuary of Apollo.<sup>89</sup>

The *Amphitruo* thus is a play with or on Scipionic themes without, however, offering a key to easy identifications. The parallels from Livy, Polybius, the *Somnium Scipionis*, and the Scipionic literary tradition in general indicate that *Amphitruo* is endowed with many Scipionic traits, but there also are some analogies between the Elder Scipio and the Jupiter of this play. For Scipio and his circle are known to have tried to introduce Greek religious and philosophical concepts, including that of apotheosis, into Rome. Scipio's role, in a sense, thus also is analogous to that of Dionysus in the *Bacchae*: he corresponds to the new and strange god, the Roman populace being too hesitant and sceptical to accept immediately the conceptions advocated by him. This, I believe, explains the presence of the Bacchic theme in the *Amphitruo*,<sup>90</sup> and the Scipionic and Bacchic themes are well integrated.

<sup>85</sup> Polyb. 10.2.12, 10.4.4 ff., 10.5.5 ff., 10.11.7 ff., 10.14.10; Livy 26.18.8, 26.19.8, 26.45.9; Silius *Pun.* 4.105 ff., 15.138.

<sup>86</sup> U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Euripides: Herakles 2* (Berlin 1895) 242.

<sup>87</sup> Genzmer 52.

<sup>88</sup> Aurigemma (above, note 26) 37. The temple records were published by T. Homolle, "Comptes des hiéropes du temple Apollinien Délien," *BCH* 6 (1882) 39, nos. 90-91.

<sup>89</sup> It may be no coincidence that Horace in *C.*4.8 rephrases *donarem pateras* by saying *donarem tripodas* (line 3); see Kiessling's note *ad loc.*

<sup>90</sup> More generally, the religious climate of the time was characterized by "a running after new and strange gods, the reporting of innumerable prodigies, and the growth of the less rational manifestations of religion" (Haywood [above, note 29] 17); cf. Fowler (above, note 79) 314 ff. V. Niebergall, *Griechische Religion und Mythologie in der*

But the themes from the *Bacchae* again do not enable us to come up with straightforward identifications nor do they cast any light on Plautus' attitude toward Scipio's attempted apotheosis. Amphitruo, to be sure, is humbled in the course of the play. But this can hardly be taken as a criticism directed at Scipio, since Jupiter does not emerge as a wholly sympathetic character; while Amphitruo, quite unlike Scipio, resembles to some extent the sceptic Pentheus, who fails to comprehend the possibility of divine interference, Jupiter, to an even greater extent, is reminiscent of Dionysus the fiend.<sup>91</sup> At the same time, as we have seen, Jupiter's role in this play in another respect parallels that played by Scipio in Rome. It is therefore impossible to establish a straight allegorical equation, and this intentional lack of dramatic resolution may well be traced back to the "riddle" of the *Bacchae*, which, in many ways, is a play with an open end. Finally, we should not construe as irony Jupiter's lowering himself to the level of a mortal and even of a *histrion*, while Scipio tried to elevate himself to the level of a god. For at the play's end, Amphitruo is promised to be graced with *immortali gloria*, and thus the human and divine levels again are intermingled. Plautus did not want to moralize in the *Amphitruo*; as often, he was content to play with ideas that were in vogue at his time without wanting to hammer home a lesson. The themes which he drew on for the *Amphitruo* happened to be of a more serious nature: divine machinations, the impact of Greek religious ideas, the virtues of a Roman matron, the concept of apotheosis. It is not surprising, then, that the result is a *tragicomoedia*.

#### APPENDIX: LIVIAN AND PLAUTINE PHRASEOLOGY

Throughout this paper, I have adopted the view that the Scipionic legend is basically genuine, i.e. its central themes were developed during Scipio's lifetime, although there doubtless were later accretions.<sup>92</sup> This view is

*ältesten Literatur der Römer* (Diss. Giessen 1937) 35–36, says of Jupiter in the *Amphitruo* that "one has the feeling that he has to reveal his divinity any moment," a comment that would support the Scipio-Jupiter identification and also holds good of Dionysus in the *Bacchae*. At any rate, the Bacchic theme was relevant to Plautus' Roman times; Palmer has rightly called the *Amphitruo* the most Roman of Plautus' comedies: (above, note 18) xv.

<sup>91</sup> I follow the interpretations of E. R. Dodds, ed., *Euripides: Bacchae* (Oxford 1944).

<sup>92</sup> Thanks are due to the anonymous referee provided by the American Philological Association, who was so kind as to direct my attention to the somewhat problematic

shared by scholars whose treatment of the question I consider to be most judicious, as, for instance, Taeger and Scullard. Rather than repeat their arguments here, I should like to refer the reader to their detailed discussions of this point.

The same assumption underlies my treatment of the literary tradition about Scipio in general. Undoubtedly there were later additions, but to deny the existence of its central themes in the period of Scipio's and Plautus' lives is no more than an *argumentum ex silentio*. Therefore I believe that to point out *thematic* parallels between the *Amphitruo* and the *Somnium* as well as some passages in Livy is defensible from a methodological point of view.

Only in a few instances have I relied on phraseological parallels between Livy and Plautus. Sometimes they occur in a Livian context which is unusual from a stylistic point of view; for instance, the use of alliteration in the Livian passages quoted on pp. 215-17 is certainly out of the ordinary. Considering the subject under discussion, it is, in my opinion, not coincidental either.

In other passages in Livy such phraseological parallels or playing with the same key words suggests the question whether Livy could have found this material in a source contemporary with Plautus. The agreement between the two authors would then find an explanation.

There is general agreement that Livy used the annalists Coelius Antipater and Valerius Antias in his third decade, besides Polybius, while in the fourth and fifth decade Claudius Quadrigarius and Valerius Antias were his sources in addition to the Greek historian.<sup>93</sup> Of Coelius, we know that he was a careful researcher and drew, among other things, on family archives. The two Sullan annalists Antias and Claudius have often been criticized for their so-called annalistic inventions. But for all we know, they could avail themselves of a source which was not even at Polybius' disposal: the *Annales Maximi*.

The problems surrounding the publication of these eighty volumes in 122 B.C. are too varied and complex to be discussed here.<sup>94</sup> Besides, they are well-nigh insoluble. Nothing is known about the earliest date of these records and about the exact nature of their contents. But they doubtless

nature of the phraseological parallels in Plautus and Livy, and who made many other helpful suggestions.

<sup>93</sup> For Livian *Quellenforschung*, see P. W. Walsh, *Livy* (Cambridge 1961) 138 ff.; A. Klotz, *Livius und seine Vorgänger*, reprint (Amsterdam 1964) *passim*; *id.*, "Livius," *RE* 13 (1926) 842-46; H. Nissen, *Kritische Untersuchungen über die Quellen der vierten und fünften Dekade des Livius* (Berlin 1863) 36 ff., 119 ff.; Scullard (above, note 33) 19-25.

<sup>94</sup> Details can be found in H. Peter, *HRR* 12, pp. iii-xix; C. Cichorius, "Annales," *RE* 1 (1894) 2248 ff.; J. E. A. Crake, "The Annales of the Pontifex Maximus," *CP* 35 (1940) 375-86.

covered the period during which Scipio lived and, considering their voluminousness, they must have contained a mass of detail. This impression is corroborated by the statement of Sempronius Asellio which Gelzer and Till,<sup>95</sup> for very plausible reasons, have taken as referring to the *Annales Maximi*:

scribere autem bellum initum quo consule et quo confectum sit et quis triumphans introierit ex eo bello, quaeque in bello gesta sint, iterare (id fabulas), non praedicare aut interea quid senatus decreverit aut quae lex rogatione lata sit, neque quibus consiliis ea gesta sint (iterare): id fabulas pueris est narrare, non historias scribere.<sup>96</sup>

I do not want to dwell on the aspect of the historicity of the *Annales Maximi*, which has recently been vindicated by Balsdon.<sup>97</sup> It seems important, however, that they contained what an overly critical historian might call *fabulae*, such as accounts of a general's campaigns, and this, more than anything else, to me accounts for their bulk.

It is hard to believe that eighty tomes of this kind should have been composed by Scaevola. It has rightly been pointed out that such a memorable feat would frequently have been mentioned by Roman writers.<sup>98</sup> Rather, Scaevola was the editor; there is no reason not to assume that the versions dealing with the historical events of any given period were, in fact, composed during that period. For the time of Scipio and Plautus, this means that material which was contemporary with Plautus and Scipio found its way into the *Annales Maximi*.

Now it has been demonstrated that, at least in one instance, Livy reflects very closely the phraseology of the annalist who happens to be his source.<sup>99</sup> If the annalist, in turn, was drawing on the *Annales Maximi*, it is quite possible that material contemporary with Plautus and Scipio might have entered into Livy's writings virtually without any significant changes.<sup>100</sup> This must have been the case especially with the kind of terminology that recurred constantly in the exploits of a certain historical figure, such as Scipio, and thus became closely identified with him. This explains why Livy, at times, even might have been playing on this terminology, and it

<sup>95</sup> M. Gelzer, "Der Anfang römischer Geschichtsschreibung," *Hermes* 69 (1934) 47; R. Till, "Sempronius Asellio," *WJA* 4 (1949-50) 331, note 2.

<sup>96</sup> *Apud* Gell., *N.A.* 5.18.7 = Peter, *HRR* 12, frg. 2.

<sup>97</sup> "Historical Writing in the Second Century B.C.," *CQ* n.s. 3 (1953) 162-64.

<sup>98</sup> So Cichorius (above, note 94) 2254.

<sup>99</sup> Compare Claudius Quadrigarius' version of the story of Torquatus and the Gaul (*apud* Gell. *N.A.* 9.13.1-9) and Livy's (7.9.6-10.13; cf. 6.42.5-6). See the discussion by A. H. McDonald, "The Style of Livy," *JRS* 47 (1957) 167-68.

<sup>100</sup> An example of a typical year's record finding its way with little change from the *Annales Maximi* is quoted by Peter, *HRR* 12, p. xxvii (Livy 30.26 for the year 203 B.C.); cf. Balsdon (above, note 97) 162-63.



would also account for the phraseological parallels in Livy and Plautus when both deal with the same subject, i.e. Scipio.

I am fully aware that the nature of the evidence is too disputed to permit any argument to be more than hypothetical. But the question is whether any *possibility* exists that Livy's phraseology reflects that of a historical source that is contemporary with Plautus and Scipio. Such a possibility, and, at times, even probability, cannot be ruled out, and to reject it altogether would be an inadmissible *argumentum ex silentio*.