THE PRINCIPAL SOURCE

FOR

GRABBE'S HISTORICAL TRAGEDY "HANNIBAL"

A dissertation

presented in partial fulfilment

of the requirements

for the degree of Bachelor of Philosophy

UNIVERSITY OF WAIKATO

1972

C.L. FORSYTH

TO MY PARENTS

Contents

Introduction

It is a recognized fact, despite the contention of one literary critic, that before and during the writing of his historical tragedy, Hannibal, in the years 1834 and 1835, Grabbe consulted several of the most significant German, French and English historical works of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, as well as the ancient accounts of Roman history, in his attempt to gain and present in dramatic form an accurate, yet comprehensive view of the history of Hannibal and the Carthaginians from around the time of the Second and Third Punic Wars.

In the following investigation, it is my intention to show that the Acciajouli biography of Hannibal, included as a supplement in Plutarch's Lives, in fact became the dramatist's principal source for his tragedy. In the process of my inquiry, I intend to reveal on the one hand what Grabbe owed to his source by way of historical events and historical atmosphere, and, on the other hand, what information he employed in his presentation of historical characters. Finally, I shall consider the question of why the dramatist might have diverged from history and what effects such changes have produced.

I. Dramatic Genesis and Historical Sources of Grabbe's "Hannibal".

The first we know of any attempt of Grabbe to write a Hannibal drama is to be found in his letter of 12.4.1834, when he writes: "Jetzt bin ich beim Hannibal, einer Tragödie, und ich hoffe, es sind darin Nebensteige, die nicht an meinen Napoleon erinnern."[1)]

After Grabbe's serious illness of January 1834, he had asked for discharge from his post as "Auditeur" with the Lippe State Government (Feb. 15th, 1834). He was granted six months' leave. During these six months he was engaged in his first reading of source material for the Hannibal drama.

When on September 16th, 1834, Grabbe's resignation had finally been accepted, he left Detmold and went to Frankfurt am Main, where he worked towards completing his first version of the drama in iambic verses. In October he read further sources on the Hannibal history, including Livy but concentrating on Plutarch. In November he asked Immermann in Düsseldorf to obtain a publisher for his drama which he regarded as practically completed. With the tragedy in verse form, Grabbe travelled to Immermann in December of the same year, and on December 17th he handed the opening scenes over to his patron. However, after a further study of source material and some serious self-criticism, Grabbe decided to follow Immermann's advice to abandon the verse form and to rewrite the tragedy in prose. Feeling pressed to get the drama completed, he worked with enthusiasm on it; on January 8th, 1835, he wrote to Immermann: "Mein Hannibal flutet prächtig; Sie zerrissen warnend die verselnden Ketten."[2)], and again on January 12th that the drama was

"fast fertig, und Karthagos Flammen spiegeln sich in Scipios Brustharnisch."[3] Grabbe's reference to the drama at this point is echoed in Scene 28 of the drama itself, as Turnu describes to his master the destruction of their beloved city:

Hannibal Die Scipionen?

Turnu Die hatten es gut. Sie kamen zu Zeiten, und es sah prächtig aus, wenn die brennende Stadt in dem Brustharnisch des Jüngeren, der auf einer Anhöhe des Lagers stand, sich abspiegelte.[4]

By January 27th, the scene of the battle of Zama had been revised and Hannibal was "schon in Uechtritz'scher Gegend, wo er auch untergeht, furchtbar, denn in Bithynien findet er das kleine Ende im unermeßlichen Chaos des Gemeinen"[5] - that is, Grabbe was then occupied with the Prusias Scenes in which he attempted to satirize the contemporary German dramatist, F. v. Uechtritz. By January 31st, he was "mitten unterm Untergang Karthagos begriffen"[6], working no doubt on Scenes 26 and 28, and by February 3rd, the final scene was completed.

Grabbe's statement on the tragedy at this stage: "Die letzten Szenen des Hannibal ergreifen mich, wie noch nie eins meiner Stücke. Sie reißen an mir, und ich muß oft vor ihnen flüchten wie ein Kind"[7] reflects his personal and enthusiastic involvement in the drama. This enthusiasm is better manifested in the order in which he dealt with the final scenes. We may observe from the above, that in his revision of these scenes, the dramatist followed no clear pattern, and certainly these scenes were revised in an order different from that in which they appeared ultimately in the drama. Consequently we can assume that his work at this point was governed largely by his passionate involvement in the

drama's final tragic scenes.

On February 4th, the revision of the drama was completed and on 10th February at 11.30 p.m., the manuscript of the revised Hannibal was finished. The following day, Grabbe handed the manuscript to Immermann for comment, and on February 22nd the script was finally completed for printing.

As already indicated in the account of the dramatic genesis, Grabbe consulted several records of the Roman and Carthaginian histories from around the time of the Second and Third Punic Wars. The works used by the dramatist may be divided into two groups; first of all, those which provide a general account of the history of that period; secondly, specific accounts of the lives of individual historical personages. A. Bergmann in his book on Grabbe as a borrower from the Detmold Library[8] provides us with a detailed record of every work borrowed by Grabbe from the Lippische Landesbibliothek and the date on which each book was taken out. To the first group of works on which Grabbe drew for the wider historical panorama belong the following:

a) W. Bötticher, Geschichte der Carthager, nach den Quellen bearb. von W.B. (Berlin, 1827).

This was first taken from the library on December 21st, 1831, and again on February 19th, 1834, probably for closer examination.[9] Of special interest in this edition would be the third period - from the beginning of the wars with Rome until the downfall of Carthage (264-146 B.C.).

b) F.Ch. Schlosser, Universalhistorische Uebersicht der Geschichte der alten Welt und ihrer Cultur (Frankfurt am Main, 1828-29).

This was taken out by Grabbe on 4th June, 1834.[10] Chapter three provides an account of the period between the end of the First Punic War and the end of the Third Punic War.

c) S.J. Baumgarten, Uebersetzung der algemeinen Welthistorie, die in England durch e. Ges. von Gelehrten ausgefertiget worden. Th.15. Nebst den Anm. der holländ. Uebers., auch vielen neuen Kupf. u. Kt. Genau durchges. u. mit häufigen Anm. verm. (Halle, 1755).

This is a German translation of Guthrie and Gray's General History of the World and was borrowed from the Detmold library on 4th June, 1834.[11] Book 4 deals with the history of the Carthaginians up until the destruction of Carthage by the Romans, and includes a section on the method of Government, the laws, religion, language, customs, arts, learning and business of the Carthaginian people.

Not included in Bergmann's record is the following general historical account, which Grabbe must have consulted in Frankfurt:

d) Ch. Rollin, Historie aller Zeiten und Völker, aus dem Französischen des Herrn R. übers. (Dresden-Leipzig, 1744).

The dramatist acknowledges this source in a letter to his Detmold friend, Petri: "...und bei Gott, weißt Du, wer mir am meisten ausgeholfen? Der alte Rollin..., ich habe zu meinem Zweck mehr darin gefunden als in Schlosser."[12]

The second group of works, on which Grabbe relied for detailed accounts of the lives of specific characters, consists of the following:

a) G.B. v. Schirach, Biographien des Plutarchs mit Anm. v. G.B.Sch. (Berlin und Leipzig, 1777).

Borrowing this from the Detmold library on 24th October, 1832, Grabbe found in it the historical accounts of the lives of three Roman figures: Fabius Maximus, Titus Quintius Flaminius and Marcus Cato. Again on 11th June, 1834, Grabbe took out Part II of this work for further consultation, most likely to reread the Fabius Maximus biography.[13)]

b) M.Iaq. Amyot (trans.), Les Vies des hommes illustres de Plutarque, trad. du Grec par M.I.A. (Paris, 1786).

This was borrowed from the Lippische Landesbibliothek on 11th June, 1834. The section of particular interest to the dramatist here was that entitled "Les Vies d'Annibal et de Scipion", which had been translated from the Latin by Charles de L'Écluse to serve as a supplement to Plutarch's Lives. This was not written by Plutarch, but by an Italian, Donato Acciajouli. We may deduce that Grabbe's attention was centred on the Hannibal biography (p. 411-509), since pages 409-472 only of the copy were cut open. Grabbe's correspondence with Immermann in December 1834 reveals that he relied greatly upon this work.[14)]

One problem has arisen concerning this Plutarch source. In the introduction to his edition of Grabbe's Hannibal, Spiridion Wukadinowić has made the claim that the dramatist considered barely any source material for his work. He deduces this from the fact that there are numerous

anachronisms in the drama and declares that Grabbe requested Plutarch's "Hannibal" for consultation only a few days before completion of his work. Furthermore he accuses Grabbe of being unaware of the fact that such an account (a Plutarch biography of Hannibal) does not exist: "...wenige Tage vor Beendigung der zweiten Bearbeitung fahndet er noch eifrig nach dem "Hannibal" des Plutarch, ohne zu wissen, daß ein solcher gar nicht existiert!"[15)]

Indeed Grabbe was mistaken, since he did not realize that the Hannibal biography was not Plutarch's account, but that of an Italian author, Donato Acciajouli, translated into French and included as a supplement to Plutarch's Lives. Grabbe was also unaware that this biography was not included in the German translation of Plutarch, although he did suspect that there was something unusual about it. On 10th February, 1835, he wrote to his friend Petri: "Der Plutarch'sche Hannibal war mir immer verdächtig, ich fand ihn nur bei den franz. Übersetzungen und (irr' ich nicht) bei Schirach."[16)]

Again, it cannot be denied that Grabbe requested this work for consultation in December 1834, only shortly before his revision of the drama. However, Wukadinowić has overlooked the fact that Grabbe borrowed the book from the Detmold library as early as 11th June, 1834. We can thus assume that he needed the work again in December, either to reread it or to check on certain important points.

On December 10th, 1834, Grabbe wrote to Immermann: "Plutarchs Hannibal, sei er deutsch, griechisch mit lateinischer Übersetzung (ed. Xylander) oder französisch, hätt' ich gern..."[17)]. Again on December

14th: "Der Hannibal würde wohl in 10 Tagen fertig sein, hätt' ich nur Plutarch (lateinisch oder deutsch oder französisch)..."[18]. Evidently Immermann made no response, for we find in Grabbe's letter of December 22nd: "Pto Hannibal flehe ich, mir zu helfen: ich muß und muß den Plutarch in einer Übersetzung, das Griechische könnt' ich nur zu flüchtig durchgeh'n...bald auf einige Tage haben. ...- Ich bin zu begierig, das Werk mit den großen Heerstraßen, an deren Enden sich Karthago in Scipios Helm und Harnisch brennend abspiegelt und Hannibal in der Nacht des Todes erlischt, zu vollenden. Ich bitte! bitte! und ich quäle Sie sobald nicht wieder."[19]

With the next letter to Immermann, of 26th December, Grabbe returned the second volume of some other edition or translation of Plutarch, as it was not the desired book. On January 12th, he wrote to Petri in Detmold: "Hannibal ist auch fast fertig, und Karthagos Flammen spiegeln sich in Scipios Brustharnisch. Nur - - nirgend, weder in Frankfurt noch hier, kann ich Plutarchs Hannibal treffen, was mir unendlich, ja schrecklich weh ist. Er befindet sich in der französischen Übersetzung auf der Detmolder Bibliothek - schaff' ihn mir daher umgehends, ein Buchbinder kann die Bogen ausnehmen; oder schaff' ihn mir lateinisch aus Xylanders Ausgabe...Ich hafte auf Ehre für umgehende und prompte Rücksendung. Hannibal wird das Beste, was ich geschrieben - fehlt mir Plutarch, verliert er leicht etwas. Ich hatte ihn von der Bibliothek, meine Frau wird ihn zurückgeschickt haben. Sonst ist er noch in meinem Haus... Hilf, hilf mir zum Hannibal, jede Auslage besorg' ich...Bitte, bitte umgehends die Bogen über Hannibal aus Plutarch..."[20] The matter was pursued by Grabbe's friends, Petri and Schierenberg, and they discovered that there was a supplementary biography of Hannibal in Amyot's translation. This they sent to Grabbe.

I have gone into some detail here because it is my aim to prove in the following part of my investigation, that Acciajouli's account, which is included in the French translation of Plutarch's Lives, was in fact Grabbe's principal source for his drama Hannibal, a fact that would be even more evident if Grabbe had succeeded in getting the work again as early as December 1834. He relied on this source for the actual events of the Punic Wars, for the general historical panorama and atmosphere, as well as for the description of the most important characters.

II. Historical Events in Grabbe's Tragedy.

Having established the historical material Grabbe used before and during the writing of his Hannibal, and in particular the great importance of D. Acciajouli's account of the lives of Hannibal and Scipio for the Detmold dramatist, I shall next investigate the sequence of historical events he dramatized in his tragedy. I intend to first discuss these events in their proper historical order as they appear in Acciajouli's account and then turn to the drama in order to discover any changes the dramatist might have introduced in the historical events as such, or in their sequence, including any minor anachronisms the work might contain. In conclusion, the question will also have to be asked as to why the dramatist might have diverged from his historical source.

The first event of Grabbe's Hannibal as it occured historically is Hannibal's outwitting of the Roman general, Fabius Maximus, at C a s i l i n u m , which took place in 217 B.C. The source tells us that Hannibal took along a guide who knew the country, to lead him and his army to Casinum. However, mistaken by the similarity in the names, and thinking that Hannibal had said Casilinum instead of Casinum, the guide led them by a difficult route to a place surrounded by mountains and rivers. Realizing that he had been deceived, Hannibal had the unfortunate guide put to a cruel death.

On entering the valley of Casilinum, Hannibal has led his army into an enemy trap and they are now surrounded by Fabius Maximus and his legions, who have a garrison high in the mountains. We read in Acciajouli's report: "And the Carthaginian army...would have been forced

to die in this place for lack of supplies, or have shamefully taken to flight, if Hannibal had not avoided the danger by such a cunning as this: for recognising the peril he and his army were in, and having been on the look-out for a timely opportunity, he ordered his soldiers to bring him up to 2,000 of the oxen they had pillaged from the fields, and which they were well provided with, and having them bind torches to their horns, he ordered some of his most competent men to light these, and to chase the oxen towards the summit of the mountains as the Romans would be making their first change of guard.

All of this was done as ordered, such that the oxen ran towards the peaks of the mountains with the said torches burning, and the army followed them at walking pace. Now the Romans, who had long before set up a good garrison on the mountains, were frightened by the novelty of this, and fearing some ambush, immediately abandoned their stronghold. Fabius himself, suspecting that it was some trick of the enemy, kept his men back in the camp, not being able to tell what it was. However, Hannibal crossed the mountain...and safely withdrew with his entire army to the outskirts of Alba."[1)]

Scenes 9 and 10 of the drama involve Hannibal in the same situation. The army has been guided into the valley of Casilinum, and Hannibal, recognising the deception, gives orders for the guides to be crucified:

Hannibal Die Wegweiser sogleich gekreuzigt!

Brasidas Sie haben sich nur geirrt, Casilinum mit Casinum verwechselt.

Hannibal Mir eins! Gekreuzigt![2)]

The scene is set in a valley with only two narrow passes, one entering

and the other leaving the valley, possibly the path of a river.

Hannibal, realizing that he and his army have been cornered by Fabius, tries to rectify the mistake he has made in trusting the guides who have brought them here. The implications of his army's position are serious, for in the words of Fabius Maximus: "Er muß heraufkommen oder drunten verhungern."[3] Thus, thinking immediately of the 4,000 oxen in their supply train, he orders his men to gather brushwood and dry twigs, to tar these and bind them to the oxen's horns. His plan is to drive the Romans from their strategic position by this ruse and thereby to escape from the valley. The torches are lit and the oxen driven towards the north pass. The Carthaginian army follows in compact order: "Das Heer folgt ihnen in gedrängter Ordnung."[4] Seeing the seething masses charging towards the Roman stronghold, Fabius Maximus believes that his adversary has succeeded in procuring extra reinforcements by some trick. He interprets the roars of the raving beasts as the savage cries of men aroused by a passion for battle, and since darkness prevents him from estimating the true size of the enemy's army, he will not allow his men to take their stand against them. Instead, he chooses to await daybreak before attempting penetration of their weak flank. Therefore he withdraws with his army to Casilinum and Hannibal escapes unchallenged.

It can be seen that this incident is very authentically presented in Grabbe's dramatic work. The setting, time of day and action correspond closely, despite the fact that Grabbe sees fit to pluralize the number of guides and to double the number of oxen used in the Carthaginian manoeuvre. Even in his dramatic arrangement of perspective,

which changes from the Carthaginian camp in Scene 9 to the Roman camp in Scene 10, and in the last speech of Scene 10 back to Hannibal, Grabbe has followed his source.

The second historical event referred to in Grabbe's drama is the great Carthaginian victory at C a n n a e, which historically came one year later than Casilinum, in the year 216 B.C. D. Acciajouli's account features Cannae as one of three major victories of Hannibal in Italy: "Thus the Roman army was defeated from all sides and Hannibal gained the victory. T. Livy states that in this battle, almost 4,000 cavalry and over 2,700 horses died. (Plutarch, in his biography of Fabius Maximus, makes it 50,000 killed and well nigh 14,000 taken prisoner.) Polybius claims that there was a much greater number killed. But ignoring all these differences, it is certain that the Romans had never received so great a loss from the Carthaginians, either in the First Punic War or in the Second, as in this battle fought near Cannae. ...The number killed satisfied even the cruelty of the enemy. --That is the result of the battle fought near Cannae..."[5)]

Previous to the battle, Hannibal had gained several great victories, the most important among them being those at Trebia and Lake Trasimene. This battle, however, marked his most significant triumph and the highest point of the war in Italy.

Further to this, we read at this point that "by agreement of all those present, the charge of the army was given to Appius Pulcher and P. Cornelius Scipio, (who later brought this war to an end)."[6)] Fleeting though this reference to the importance of Scipio's rôle in the

war may be, it is remarkable that we should hear mention of him at this point, since hereby his fate is already inextricably linked with that of Hannibal.

Through the reactions of the Romans to the issue of this battle, the strength of this people is also underlined: "...Although such a disaster filled the city with sorrow with good cause, nevertheless the Senate and the Roman people still maintained their greatness, such that not only were they full of hope for being able to protect their city, but moreover they began to raise a new army, bringing the youth under arms..., with the result that one cannot cease to be amazed when one considers how they could have so much courage and good counsel in such a disaster...What nation could have sustained this last loss, by which the power of the Romans was almost completely ruined? And yet the Roman people withstood it..."[7)]

If after such a disaster, the Romans can still show their strength, determination and unity of purpose, they prove themselves to be a worthy match for Hannibal and we can anticipate still greater things from them in the future. However, it is Hannibal's future which looks secure for the moment, since "after this battle fought near Cannae, the Atellanians, the Calatinians, the Samnites, then the Brutians and Lucanians and many other peoples of Italy, moved by the glory of this great victory, changed over to the side of Hannibal. And the town of Capua, (which Hannibal had desired for a long time) abandoning its old friends and confederates, made new alliance and friendship with Hannibal, a gesture which brought him great credit among other nations."[8)]

After this battle, Hannibal loses time to rest and refresh his army, giving his opponents time also to recuperate. He does not lead his troops straight to Rome and only later does he regret his hesitation here. Meanwhile he sends to Carthage for more troops and succeeds in obtaining them by bribery, in presenting the Carthaginian Senate with the golden rings which have been taken from the Roman knights after the Carthaginian victory.

It is evident from the above account, that this battle is strongly emphasized in the source as representing a climax among Hannibal's exploits abroad. In Grabbe's tragedy, it is the implications of this battle for both the Romans and the Carthaginians which are important. It is Hannibal's victory at Cannae which enables him to advance straight to Rome, where, according to historical sources, he arrived in 211 B.C., five years after Cannae. But it is also as a result of this battle that he needs to send to Carthage for new troops.

Reference is made to Cannae in Scenes 2, 4 and 5 of the drama. In Scene 2, the great victory is announced in Carthage; in Scene 4, it is mentioned during a meeting of the Roman Senate, and in Scene 5, Hannibal receives a letter from the Synedrion in which his triumph finds comment.

Hannibal's request for reinforcements arrives in Carthage on the same day as news of his victory:

Ein Bote (eilt durch die Menge) Bei Kannä Sieg! Unermeßlicher Sieg![9)]

The reactions of the people show that Hannibal's victories are nothing unusual.

In Scene 4, during a decisive meeting of the Roman Senate to work out some means of defeating the enemy, Hannibal is attempting to storm the gates of the city. The national feeling of revenge for Hannibal's slaying of 60,000 Romans at Cannae is revealed by the Roman women crying in the street: "Kannä und Rache!"[10)]

Both Hannibal's infliction of defeat on the Romans and his present threat to the city only serve to reinforce their bonds of unity and strength, and the charge of the army being given to the Scipio brothers, a new army of young men is raised to continue the war with full force:

> Kato Zensor Drum junge Mannschaft, so viel als möglich, ausgehoben, und mit ihr nach Spanien, - dem grimmen Hunde aus Afrika die Tore zu verhalten, bleibt der Rest der Bürger sattsam stark.[11)]

The anachronistic Roman imperative pronounced by Kato Zensor: "Karthago soll zu Grunde gehen",[12)] which was spoken historically at the beginning of the Third Punic War, predicts the full-scale participation of the Romans in the war against Hannibal from this moment forth.

In Scene 5, when Hannibal arrives outside the gates of Rome, his request for fresh supplies and new troops has still not been answered by the Carthaginian Senate. However, he receives a message from the Synedrion with congratulations on his success at Cannae: "Gruß und Glückwunsch für Kannä"[13)], and the promise that limited help will soon be arriving. Representatives of the Carthaginian Senate are accompanying the messenger to receive the golden rings that Hannibal has captured at Cannae. Nevertheless, despite his previous great victory, Hannibal

has to withdraw from before the gates of Rome.

We see therefore that in both the source and the drama, the Carthaginian victory at Cannae enables Hannibal to proceed to Rome and to continue the war. Whereas in the source it is Hannibal's hesitation to make this move which subsequently causes his necessary withdrawal from before the city, the drama does not make this explicit. Instead, Grabbe shifts the reason for his withdrawal onto the lack of cooperation and support from his fellow countrymen, a lack which impedes his movements in the land of the enemy. In contrast, the Romans display great strength and unity of purpose, their determination to overrun their mortal enemy being reinforced by the success of his opposition.

Although this event falls outside the action of the drama as such, Cannae represents a strong motivation for both the Romans and the Carthaginians to fight to the bitter end.

Among the historical events recorded in our source and included in the drama Hannibal, the capture of N e w C a r t h a g e occurs next. New Carthage is anachronistically referred to in the drama as Numantia, a city which was destroyed much later in the Third Punic War (133 B.C.). Historically speaking, the siege and capture of New Carthage happened in 210 B.C., the year following Hannibal's attempted attack on Rome. Acciajouli tells us that Scipio decided to go and attack the city because "amongst all the towns in Spain, there was none richer, nor more suitable for waging war by land and sea than this."[14] Moreover, the Carthaginians were expecting no action from

the Romans, least of all the siege of New Carthage. Therefore the Romans had no difficulty in capturing the city, since the citizens and those in the garrison, being caught completely off guard, escaped into flight. Since New Carthage was Spain's wealthiest town, one could regard its capture by the Romans as a considerable addition to their power in Spain and a consequent definite weakening of Hannibal's strength.

Whereas historically, the city was merely captured and plundered, those taken prisoner being treated with humanity, Grabbe has heightened the effect of the Roman victory and the cruelty of the Scipios by presenting in Scene 6 of his drama the charred ruins of the city after its destruction by fire. We hear from Terenz of the "Sturm, Mord, Feuer"[15] of the attack and see the heartless treatment of prisoners who are gathered up and bundled off by ship to Italy. This is the first station on the Roman's military route, proven in its stark presentation by Grabbe to be a resounding victory.

Grabbe's divergence from his historical source is obvious here. It lies in the destruction of the city by fire, and in the harsh treatment of those captured by the Romans. The dramatic effect of these changes will be discussed at a later stage.

In 207 B.C., three years after the defeat of New Carthage by the Romans, H a s d r u b a l c r o s s e d t h e A l p s to join his brother in Italy. According to Acciajouli, the Romans, when they learned of Hasdrubal's approach, appointed two new Consuls, Marcius Livius and Claudius Nero, who divided the army between them and went off to govern their provinces. Livius went into Gaul against Hasdrubal

Barca, who had by then crossed the Alps and was hastening to join up with his brother with a large and powerful army of cavalry and infantry. Claudius, who was near Hannibal at Venusia, learned of Hasdrubal's approach by intercepting the letters of the enemy. Recognising the danger implied in the union of these two powerful armies of the enemy, Claudius took part of his army with him to join forces with Livius and attack Hasdrubal.

We read that "they had a favourable result from the battle, for... 56,000 of the enemy were killed that day, such that they received very nearly as great a loss as the Romans had received before near Cannae. But after this memorable victory, Claudius Nero, returning to Venusia as quickly as he had left there, had Hasdrubal's head thrown near the place where the enemy sentry was posted, and released several prisoners to go and take the news of this great defeat to Hannibal. For everyone knew that he still knew nothing of Claudius' secret undertaking, nor of the execution which had taken place in these past days."[16)]

The effect of Hasdrubal's death on Hannibal is significantly brought out by the source: "Now having received such a great affliction, not only publicly but also personally, in the death of Hasdrubal his brother, Hannibal said that he could perceive a change of fortune for the Carthaginians...For he was fully aware that this defeat...would bring great advantage and increase to the Roman affairs, and would be of great importance for the outcome of the whole war."[17)]

We now turn to the drama in order to discuss Grabbe's treatment of his source for this event. Hasdrubal is first mentioned in Scene 6,

then again in Scenes 7 and 10, and finally in Scene 11. It is while the Romans are besieging Numantia in Spain that the older Scipio first announces that Hasdrubal is making his way across the Alps to join his brother in Italy, and informs the reader and spectator of the fate awaiting him there:

Scipio der Ältere Indes wir hier belagerten, ist uns Hasdrubal mit Karthagos letztem Heer in Spanien entwischt. Er klettert schon in den Alpen zum Hannibal. Wir müssen nach.

Scipio der Jüngere Nein. Er erblickt seinen Bruder nicht. Konsul Nero erwartet ihn längst mit drei Legionen in Ligurien...[18)]

Grabbe makes no mention of the second Roman consul, Marcius Livius.

In Scene 7, Hannibal receives the message from his brother, that he is making haste to join him. Hannibal knows that the strength of his brother's army joined to his own will be sufficient to overthrow the imperial Capitol: "...Hasdrubal und ich - Das Kapitol ist zermalmt, sobald wir uns vereinigen -"[19)]

Again in Scene 10 we are reminded of the significance of Hasdrubal's arrival to Hannibal. Immediately after his escape from Fabius Maximus at Casilinum, Hannibal's words reveal that he is anticipating a bright future for the Carthaginian state of affairs.

The situation created by the dramatist in Scene 11 effects a change in Hannibal's attitude. Knowing nothing of his brother's execution by Claudius Nero, Hannibal's shock is all the greater when a Roman disguised

as a Carthaginian warrior mercilessly flings his beloved brother's head at his feet. True to fact, the death of Hasdrubal in the drama is both a political blow and a personal grief to Hannibal, and since, as the source suggests, his loss is comparable to the Roman defeat at Cannae, it inevitably results in a change of fortune for the Carthaginians. For the anticipation of Hasdrubal's arrival has raised his brother's sinking hopes anew, but now that his brother lies dead at his feet, Hannibal can only resign himself to a hopeless fate in Italy. His last assured chance of improving their situation on enemy territory has been destroyed and there is now little else in store for him but certain decline.

Four years elapse between the death of Hasdrubal and Hannibal's d e p a r t u r e f r o m I t a l y in 203 B.C. In our historical account, the Romans, not being able to defeat Hannibal in Italy, and knowing of no further means by which to chase him out of their country, send P. Cornelius Scipio into Africa to take the war closer to the Carthaginians. The Scipio biography reveals that Scipio himself saw this as being the only possible means of defeating the Carthaginians and of driving Hannibal out of Italy.

As a result of this manoeuvre, the Carthaginians were placed in such an extremity that they were forced to call Hannibal back from Italy at once. For Scipio's reputation was so great that only the strength of this Carthaginian general was adequate to match him. Recognizing and fearing Scipio's greatness, they saw that matters had been brought to the point where it was no longer a question of

increasing their dominion, but merely one of protecting their country. Thus Hannibal returned with great haste to Africa, having spent sixteen years away from his homeland. On leaving Italy, he had "a sufficiently strong wind"[20] and in a few days he arrived at Leptis, from where he proceeded to Zama.

In Scene 14 of the drama, Hannibal prepares for his departure from Italy, even before messengers arrive with a letter from the Synedrion requesting this of him. He already knows that the Scipios are on their way to Africa:

Erster [Gesandter] Uns sendet Karthago -

Hannibal Mich nach Afrika zurückzurufen, die Vaterstadt unter ihren Mauern zu verteidigen, weil die Scipionen dort bald ankommen - [21]

Despite the deep regret he feels at having to leave the Italy he has come to love during the long years he has fought to win her, it is with utmost haste that he makes his way back to defend his homeland, being assisted by a good wind: "Schnell, der Landwind wird frisch!"[22]

The facts of the drama here correspond very closely with those offered by our source. Grabbe has nevertheless changed the perspective of the event, to dramatize the personal reactions and point of view of the great Carthaginian warrior as he leaves the country he has come to love. In contrast, Acciajouli offers no hint of Hannibal's regret at having to leave this country in which so many warriors of his own calibre were to be found, but in its place, anger at himself and the Carthaginian Senate: at himself because of his hesitation after so many of his victories to move on to Rome and overthrow his arch-enemy,

and at the Carthaginian Senate because of their insufficient assistance during the long period when he was in the enemy's country. Grabbe makes mention of Carthage only as a means of highlighting the splendour of Italy:

> Hannibal ...Du (Italia), ganz anders als die finstre Karthago und ihr heißes, trübrotes Firmament, Du, prangend mit Helden, die nur vom Ruhm und Eisen, nichts vom Gold wissen, mit dem Glanz selbst, nicht durch Mietlinge errungener, zum Kapitol hinaufschimmernder Triumphe, nie erhabener als da ich Dich zu meinen Füßen wähnte, und Du Dich aufrichtetest zu dem Gewölbe Deines ewig blauenden Himmels![23)]

Although only a few days pass before Hannibal meets Scipio on his return to Africa, a new year, 202 B.C. according to the Roman calendar, has commenced. We are told by Acciajouli that immediately on his return from Italy, Hannibal proposed that it would be most desirable to end the war peaceably. For this reason, he sent to Scipio to ask him to agree to choose some suitable place where they could meet to arrange a peaceful settlement. Scipio did not refuse this request.

"Consequently, on the arranged day, two supreme leaders of very powerful nations met on a l a r g e o p e n f i e l d , each with an interpreter, to parley together about matters concerning peace and war. For Hannibal was completely inclined towards peace, as he could see that the Carthaginian state of affairs was deteriorating more rapidly every day:...that the war had shifted from Italy to Africa,...that all their hope was contained in the army he had brought to Africa which was as a remainder and left-over from the war which he

had waged so long in Italy, and that so little power remained to the Carthaginians..., that they had scarcely enough to be able to defend the city of Carthage."[24] Therefore Hannibal did his utmost to persuade Scipio to come to some peaceful settlement. But Scipio's conditions for Hannibal revealed that the Romans were prepared for war and that Scipio himself was confident of obtaining victory against the Carthaginians. Thus they separated from the parley, having achieved nothing, and began to prepare for the battle which would decide whether they would retain or lose the dominion of their world.

In Scene 19 of the tragedy, Hannibal, on hearing the Scipios announcing their arrival outside Carthage, sees the immediate necessity for doing something to avoid the event of a battle which will inevitably result in disaster for his side. He recognizes the decisive implications of such a battle, resolving to act upon his only means to try and avert it: "Versuchen will ichs! - Europa und Afrika stehen auf dem Spiel -"[25] He admits his disadvantage, which lies not only in the mere size of the Carthaginian army compared with the Roman numbers, but also in the fact that his men, unlike the Romans, who are fighting for the honour of their country, are neither united nor resolute in their purpose.

It is for these reasons that Hannibal sends to the Scipios to ask them to agree to meet him on the open plain between their two camps. Consequently the younger Scipio, the negotiator and diplomat of the two brothers, meets his greatest adversary face to face. Each general is accompanied by two of his captains, but these remain in the background while their leaders parley. It is again Hannibal who desires

peace, whilst war with all its glory is Scipio's unalterable wish. Their debate is brief but full of dramatic tension, and the call for battle ensues from it.

There are few differences between the drama and Acciajouli's account here. Although the conference between the two generals did in fact take place, as the drama states, exactly half-way between the two opposing ranks of armed men, our source does not state this.

Historically, Scipio acceded to Hannibal's request for the conference with no obvious ulterior motive. Grabbe permits Scipio, the proud Roman general, to agree to the meeting only for strategic reasons - to allow his brother additional time to prepare their army for battle.

Whereas in our source these two great leaders are accompanied by interpreters to facilitate understanding between them, we find introduced in the drama a pair of accompanying captains, who nevertheless remain at a distance behind their leaders during the parley. The consequent direct exchange of words between Hannibal and Scipio enables the dramatist to reveal in a more subtle way what each man is thinking and feeling, and thus to introduce to their confrontation a very personal element.

This confrontation hinders the falling action of the drama for a brief period, although we know before it takes place that it will be to no avail. Dramatically, it deepens our sense of futility in Hannibal's cause, for not perceiving the true reason for Scipio's acceptance, Hannibal genuinely believes in this glimmer of hope. Both

historically and dramatically, it represents Hannibal's last possible means of escape before certain defeat for his side.

Shortly after the meeting of the two great leaders in 202 B.C., that decisive battle was fought near Z a m a , in which the Romans gained an overwhelming victory. First, the Carthaginian elephants and then their cavalry were put to flight by Laelius, and the Roman ally Masinissa. The Carthaginian infantry, however, fought long and daringly, confident that their strength would be sufficient to protect all Africa. But Laelius and Masinissa, returning from the pursuit of the cavalry, broke into the battle with such great speed and tenacity, that they scared the enemy who lost confidence and escaped into flight.

Over 40,000 Carthaginians were either killed or taken prisoner by the Romans in the battle. "Hannibal their Captain, having waited to the last to see the issue of the battle, fled from the massacre with very few of his men."[26)]

In Scene 22 of the drama, the same battle is depicted, the dramatic technique of teichoskopia being employed in its presentation. Zama is situated close enough to Carthage for the gate-keeper and his son to be able to observe the battle from one of Carthage's main gates.

First, the Numidian cavalry clashes with the Roman cavalry. They are shortly assisted by Brasidas and his cavalry, but after Brasidas has been slain, the Romans break through into the Carthaginian body. Hannibal comes unexpectedly with fresh infantry and cavalry, but the

last of the Roman forces being sent in and Hannibal's support being insufficient, the enemy surrounds him and his men. After a valiant struggle, Hannibal escapes through a gap in the enemy lines with only threescore of his men, and flees. Finding his way into his home town barred by the people for whom he has fought all his life, he turns and rides in the direction of the coast.

By a comparison of these two accounts, it may be observed that they agree only in basic outline: that first the Carthaginian elephants and cavalry, and finally the whole army, were put to flight by the Romans. With regard to the drama, we can assume that the Roman ally, Masinissa, would be involved in this battle, since he appears with the Scipios in Scene 20 of the drama, immediately prior to the meeting between the two great army leaders.

Grabbe's choice of characters for his description of the battle is significant. A battle of outstanding importance, of world significance, is described by "trivial" people, who hardly understand what is going on. In this way, an event of most tragic consequences is described in an almost comical way. Both the importance of the battle and the comic elements of its description are reflected in the first words of the porter:

> Pförtner Kind, sieh genau hin, denn heut erblickst Du etwas, wovon Du nach hundert Jahren erzählen kannst, und zum Glück ists helles Wetter.[27)]

The porter and his son do not present a factual step-by-step account of the battle, but their simple visual impression. Their description contains constant reference to the "Gewürg und Gemetzel" of the conflict

and at the same time exhibits a general lack of comprehension in its decisive developments.

It was most likely Grabbe's intention, reflected in his choice of characters, not to give the precise factual details of this important event. He does not aim at dramatizing the historical event as such, but as a result of a great development in history. This battle is the result of the deadly crossing of two military roads. It is necessary and unavoidable and in turn determines the historical fate of Hannibal and his people and their city, Carthage.

Zama in fact represents the antithesis of Cannae. Cannae marked the highest point of the war for Hannibal and the Carthaginians in Italy, the country of their arch-enemy; Zama places them in a desperate, indeed hopeless situation in their own country and results in a decisive victory for the Romans. The opposing qualities of the Romans and the Carthaginians as nations also become evident after these two outstanding events. Whereas the Roman courage, unity and strength of purpose enabled them to recover their losses at Cannae and continue the war with greater determination to overrun their enemy, the Carthaginians are completely ruined by their defeat at Zama. Admittedly, this battle has eventuated only because of lack of assistance for Hannibal in Italy; however, the events which follow immediately after the battle reflect still further the lack of courage, the inadequate strength and the realization of the Carthaginians, that Rome's power is far too great for them.

We are informed by Acciajouli, that after the battle of Zama,

Scipio presented himself before the walls and harbour of Carthage in the expectation that the Carthaginians would come to him and ask for peace. "For just as the Carthaginians had been hasty and resolute in undertaking the war, now they were equally weak and discouraged, mainly from seeing that their Captain, Hannibal, in whom they had put all their hope for being able to preserve their country, had been beaten. Therefore, having lost all courage, they sent ambassadors to Scipio to beg him to display his usual clemency and allow them peace."[28] When the ambassadors returned to Carthage with the peace terms, it is said that a man called Gisgon, not wishing to hear discussion of a peaceful settlement, tried to persuade the Carthaginians to renew the war against the Romans. But he was cried down by Hannibal, who had been called back to the city to answer for its downfall, and the Carthaginians, moved by the authority of this great person, were persuaded to accept the terms which had been proposed to them by their conquerors and by necessity.

Thus the Carthaginians were held to paying the Romans a certain tribute every year until a prearranged time. Furthermore their entire fleet of ships, their arms and the spoils from former great victories were removed from them, and new laws and ordinances were issued to them by their conquerors. The Carthaginians surrendered their ships, arms and booty without delay; but when the first payment of the tribute was due, the people of Carthage began to lament the fact that they had to suffer the personal sacrifice of giving up their own individual money. It is evident that the Carthaginians were quite willing to sacrifice the possessions and wealth of the State; but when it was a question of giving up the individual money of each citizen, there was lamentation

at the severity of the Roman peace conditions.

In Scene 23 of the drama, it is the Romans who send their "billige Friedensvorschläge"[29] to the Carthaginians. They demand the denunciation of all lands outside Africa and the surrender of all weapons and warships. They then stipulate that the Carthaginians should assist Masinissa to take possession of the land of King Syphax, their ally, and that they should pay ten thousand mercenaries to do this. The difficulty of these conditions is recognized by the Carthaginians, but they agree to fulfil them without question. The next request by the Romans, that those conquered pay 20,000 talents towards Rome's compensation, shocks the people, who are, however, overjoyed when Gisgon offers to pay it.

Up to this point, the drama corresponds fairly closely with our source. However, when all the above conditions have been fulfilled by the citizens of Carthage, the Romans propose one further condition, that will ensure eternal peace between Rome and Carthage:- that the Carthaginians should build a new city with a diffirent name forty measures from the sea. Only at this point, which is nevertheless too late, do the Carthaginians resolve to fight back. Gisgon, being the one who sees the Roman deception, gives orders for the people of Carthage to pluck up courage and use every ounce of strength to prevent the enemy from taking possession of what little still remains to them. Thus although they realize too late their own shortcomings and mistakes of the past, they fight heroically to the end. It is their decision at this point in the drama, that ultimately brings about the destruction of their city.

Historically, Hannibal fled into Asia Minor in 195 B.C., although Acciajouli admits that "there are authors who say that Hannibal retired into Asia immediately after he had lost the battle, fearing that he would be delivered into the hands of Scipio who would ask for him. But whether this happened suddenly or some time after the battle near Zama, there is no need to worry, since it is such common knowledge that seeing that everything was hopeless, he fled into Asia to King Antiochus."[30] For some years, Hannibal assisted the King as an adviser, but after Antiochus' defeat by the Romans and their request for the surrender of Hannibal, their perpetual enemy, he withdrew from the King's protection, and after wandering around Asia for a long time, he "finally found refuge with Prusias, King of the Bithyniens: not that he trusted greatly in the friendship of this man, but because he was seeking a place more of necessity...than he would indeed have wished, considering that the Romans had the greater part of the land and sea in their power."[31] It is said that Prusias was waging war at this time against Eumènes, King of Pergamia, who was a friend and ally of the Roman people, and that he made Hannibal captain general over his navy. Thus Hannibal was of great service to Prusias.

In Grabbe's drama, as has already been stated, Hannibal flees from the scene of the battle of Zama, and finding his way barred into the city of Carthage, he escapes towards the coast. It is only on his arrival at the court of King Prusias, in Scene 25, that we are informed indirectly of the time he has spent prior to this at the court of King Antiochus:

Prusias Er hat mich in einiger Hinsicht verletzt. Warum kam er nicht gleich zu mir, sondern ging erst zum syrischen

Antiochus, der seine Ratschläge ohne Umsicht zum eignen Schaden benutzt, und ihn dann verlassen hat?[32)]

We see that he has been useful as an adviser to Antiochus, but that in the end he has been abandoned by him.

It is at Prusias' court in Bithynia that Hannibal finds what Grabbe has referred to in a letter to Immermann as "das kleine Ende im unermeßlichen Chaos des Gemeinen"[33)]. This great army leader of the past, who has fled to Asia Minor and offered his services to King Prusias, must submit to a strategic lesson by this comic king, must listen to the instruction that his great victories lacked system. In his false, pompous pathos and extreme pride and arrogance, Grabbe's Prusias is somewhat unlike his historical counterpart. Prusias represents one of Grabbe's divergences from his source. In this figure, Grabbe has attempted to satirize the contemporary German dramatist, Uechtritz, an exponent of the Restoration.

In the year 183 B.C., twelve years after Hannibal's flight from Africa and his home city, Carthage, Q u i n t i u s F l a m i n i u s was sent to A s i a by the Roman Senate, to investigate the news of the discord between Eumènes, King of Pergamia, and Prusias, King of Bithynia, and to try to reconcile their differences. On his arrival at Prusias' court, he was most indignant and sorry to discover Hannibal, the greatest enemy of the Roman people, still alive there: thus he demanded the surrender of Rome's arch-enemy into his hands. "Having held Prusias' rashness in suspicion from the first, Hannibal had had several passages dug in his house and had prepared seven secret exits for a sudden, necessary escape. The arrival of Flaminius increased his

suspicion still more, as he considered him to be the greatest enemy he had in Rome...When those of the King's guard who were sent to capture him had surrounded the house, Hannibal at first tried to take to flight and escape through the most secret exit: but when he saw that the place was already occupied by the guards, and giving up all hope of being able to escape, he decided to avoid the hands of the Romans by a voluntary death...Livy, the great historian, states that Hannibal asked for the poison which he had ready for such an occasion, and that taking this mortal drink in his hand, he said before he drank of it: 'Let us deliver the Roman people of great worry and care, since they so greatly desire to hasten on the death of a poor old man who is already broken'."[34)]

It had been Flaminius' intention, not to bring about this sudden death of Hannibal, but to take him alive to Rome as the one who had brought so much injury to the public welfare of his country. This would have been most honourable for both the Roman people and for himself.

In Scene 27 of Grabbe's drama, the arrival of Praetor Flaminius is announced in King Prusias' court, and Hannibal's surrender is the Praetor's immediate command.

Prusias Was bittet Rom?

Flaminius Es w i l l, daß Du mir auf der Stelle den Feldherrn des untergegangenen Karthagos, jetzt Provinz Afrika geheißen, den Hannibal, auslieferst.[35)]

With war offered as an alternative to his refusal to deliver Hannibal into Flaminius' hands, Prusias fulfils the Roman Praetor's demand.

Hannibal is in his villa in Scene 28, when he is warned by a slave of the arrival of strangers and of their surrounding of his villa. Learning of the discovery and barring of his secret underground exits, and recognising the impossibility of escape, he turns to his last resort and takes the poison which he had ready for such an occasion as this. His dying words correspond very closely with those recorded in Acciajouli's biography of Hannibal.

Hannibal Du hast überwunden. - Nun, Römer, entzieht sich euch ein verbannter, greisender Mann, vor dem ihr gebebt, bis sein letzter Atem dahin - (Er trinkt den Rest des Giftes) Gift zu eurer Gesundheit!...[36)]

Flaminius expresses his disappointment about Hannibal's death, for he had wished to lead Rome's arch-enemy "lebendig vor dem Triumphwagen!"[37)]

It may be seen that the events of the arrival of Flaminius at Prusias' court and Hannibal's consequent death correspond very closely in the drama to the historical account, despite minor alterations by Grabbe, such as the spelling of the Roman Praetor's name.

Although the downfall and destruction of Carthage did not occur historically until 146 B.C., it happens simultaneously with Hannibal's death in Grabbe's tragedy Hannibal. Since the Acciajouli biography of the great Carthaginian general does not include a description of the downfall of Carthage, it cannot be compared with the dramatic rendering of the event. However, the fates of Hannibal and Carthage are clearly linked in the final summary of Acciajouli's account, when we read that "the Carthaginians were never considered to be beaten in the war that they had undertaken so eagerly and so magnificently,

until Hannibal had been defeated and broken in that battle fought near Zama. To such an extent that it seems that their strength and warlike valour had its lustre and was in existence with their Captain, Hannibal, and died away with him."[38)]

This passage is very likely what inspired Grabbe to link the fates of Hannibal and Carthage, since he, too, held the opinion that the downfall of Carthage was only a natural consequence of Hannibal's betrayal by the Carthaginians during the First and Second Punic Wars. Against historical fact or possibility, the dramatist has deliberately concentrated this period of history, so that Hannibal actually lived to see his home town being destroyed.

After the discussion of all historical events in their true chronological order as they appear in Donato Acciajouli's "Life of Hannibal" and Grabbe's tragedy Hannibal, it will now be possible to investigate likely reasons for the dramatist's divergence from his source and the effects such changes have achieved. It has already been observed that Grabbe's drama Hannibal contains both anachronistic differences and occasional chronological divergence from the Acciajouli biography of Hannibal, especially in the combination of the two fates of Hannibal and Carthage. Grabbe makes use of the rearrangement of historical events for a number of d r a m a t i c reasons.

Firstly, it is brought in to introduce the dramatic effect of a rising and falling action. The most outstanding example of rising action produced by the dramatic rearrangement of history is to be found in Scene 9 of the drama, "Tal bei Casilinum". Historically, Hannibal

outwitted Fabius Maximus in 217 B.C., the year prior to his victory at Cannae. The event is inserted in the drama so as to form part of a rising action much later, when Hannibal leads his army north to meet Hasdrubal. This rising action ends abruptly at the point where Hasdrubal's head is thrown at his brother's feet. The brutal announcement of Hasdrubal's death suddenly shatters the rising hope which Hannibal's escape from Casilinum had helped to build up, and decline ending in death for Hannibal now appears certain.

Secondly, Grabbe introduces divergences from his source to emphasize dramatic contrast. In Scene 6, we view the heartless destruction of the city of Numantia-New Carthage. This is an anachronistic event, which is inserted to underline the negative side of Hannibal's arch-enemies. In place of the reasonably humane siege and capture of New Carthage, as it is described in our historical account, we are informed in Terenz's monologue of the overrunning of the enemy troops by the Romans, their storming of the town of Numantia and its terrible destruction by fire. We see that they have no feeling or compassion for their enemy, but strictly follow the order of the Senate and the motto that Carthage must be destroyed.

A further anachronism, the Roman imperative "Karthago muss zu Grunde gehen" ("Ceterum censeo Carthaginem esse delendam"), spoken historically by Marcus Cato at the beginning of the Third Punic War, but pronounced in the drama by Kato Zensor as a result of Hannibal's threat to the city of Rome, is introduced to emphasize that sense of absolute determination and strength of purpose which the Romans possess. To the end, it is the aim of every Roman to fulfil this

imperative, and so convincingly is it pronounced, that already at this point, the idea dawns in the spectator that Rome will be the conqueror and that Carthage and Hannibal will be defeated.

Finally, Grabbe rearranges historical events to express the central idea of the play. The downfall of Carthage which happened historically in 146 B.C., thirty-seven years after the death of Hannibal, is combined in the drama with Hannibal's tragic fate. The tragedy of Hannibal is made deeper by the moving forward of the destruction of his beloved Carthage. In his combination of the fates of these two, Grabbe has given us his interpretation of this particular part of Roman history: - that if a people betrays a great leader, nothing will prevent their own destruction in history. In order to present this view, Grabbe has found it appropriate to concentrate the action of the drama, and to combine the destruction of the city and its people with the death of their leader. In a footnote to his prose sketch of "Marius und Sulla" (1827), the dramatist says: "Der Dichter ist vorzugsweise verpflichtet, den wahren Geist der Geschichte zu enträtseln. So lange er diesen nicht verletzt, kommt es bei ihm auf eine wörtliche historische Treue nicht an."[39] In his attempt to reveal in dramatic form the true spirit of history, Grabbe has found it necessary to diverge at the end of his tragedy from his principal historical source.

III. Historical Characters in Grabbe's "Hannibal".

After the detailed discussion in Chapter II of information about the historical events of the Second and Third Punic Wars, given by Acciajouli in his biography of Hannibal and employed by Grabbe in his tragedy, Hannibal, it now remains for us to investigate to what extent the characters in the drama are based on their historical counterparts in the source. During the process of writing his historical drama, Grabbe wrote in 1835 to Immermann, that he intended "den Hannibal menschlich zu machen."[1)] We shall observe what he did to achieve this aim, by comparing the protagonist with the historical character in Grabbe's source. We shall then continue with a similar investigation into the basic characteristics of other figures, with the intention of discovering how the dramatist employed the source, which he confessed to be so essential to him during the writing of his tragedy.

Our source portrays H a n n i b a l as an excellent captain, a stern man of action, who is skilled at arms, wise, cruel and cunning in deceiving the enemy, but above all as one who is ruled by a sense of national duty. From the beginning, his sole purpose is to wage war on, and if possible defeat, the Romans, his greatest enemies: "Now he had no sooner obtained leadership over the camp and administration of the State, than he decided to wage war on the Romans, something he had already thought about a long time before. For in the first place, he fostered a hatred common to almost every Carthaginian towards the Romans, a hatred caused by their loss of Sicily and Sardinia. And furthermore, he on his own account harboured resentment against them, almost

as an inheritance from his father Hamilcar, who had been the greatest enemy the Romans had amongst the Carthaginian captains."[2] Thus, seeking every means to destroy the Roman Empire, this cruel, ruthless warrior devotes his entire existence to this end.

In Chr.D. Grabbe's tragedy Hannibal, we find the main character similarly ruled by a sense of absolute duty to his country. It is for the fulfilment of his historical duty that he lives and strives, subordinating all private interests to the demands of defending his fatherland and destroying its arch-enemy, Rome.

The first reference to the character of Hannibal in Acciajouli's account reveals that he has inherited the natural qualities that go to make a great leader. The source tells us that "although the memory of his father helped him at first to a great extent to win the favour of the soldiers, he himself very soon always acted with such diligence and skill, that the troops of long standing soon forgot all the other captains and wanted to choose none other than him as commander. For he happened to have every perfection that could be desired in a supreme ruler. He could give quick counsel for the execution of important undertakings and was skilful and daring. He was invincible in every danger or physical adversity...He went the rounds no more yet no less than any other and was prompt and skilful in doing anything required either of a brave soldier or of a good captain. For the space of three years, Hannibal devoted himself to arms in this manner, under the command of Hasdrubal, his brother-in-law. In this time, he so successfully won the hearts of the entire army, that immediately after Hasdrubal's death, he was chosen by the common consent of every soldier to be commander

in chief."[3] Hannibal is thus recognized by the entire army as a great leader, and it is significant, that he has no difficulty in keeping united his army which is made up of a mixture of Gauls, Spanish, Africans and men of other nations. There is never the slightest uprising among the men in his camp and the source attributes this to Hannibal's authority and discretion.[4]

Grabbe's Hannibal also demands absolute obedience from his captains and troops, always displaying his unquestionable authority in word and action. Strict and stern as he may be as a military commander, he nevertheless shows just consideration for his soldiers, giving them food and drink to keep their spirits high before executing his cunning plan at Casilinum, and allowing them to relax while they are in the town of Capua:

> Hannibal Und das Heer? Satt sich zehren, ausruhn laß ich die Erschöpften, mit denen ich das Feld nicht mehr halten konnte.[5]

A great person must by necessity stand alone. However, this hero stands alone in perhaps a more significant way than most great men. For he receives insufficient support from his own Carthaginian Senate and people. Indeed, the source reports that on his return to Africa, Hannibal complained loudly about the Carthaginian Senate, because during the long period while he had been in the enemy's country, they had given him so little assistance in the form of reinforcements and supplies, money or anything else required for war.

Hannibal's dramatic counterpart is likewise a lonely, great general, betrayed and misunderstood by his own people. His noble and loyal

intentions are misunderstood by his fellow countrymen as being selfish aims, and the very fact that he has to combat their underhand manoeuvres, as well as the strong military tactics of the Roman enemy, makes him more significantly and totally isolated as a leader. Grabbe dramatizes Hannibal as one who has to wage a war on two fronts which are equally effective in bringing about his tragic downfall: these two fronts are his isolation as a leader, intensified by lack of support from his fellow countrymen, and the fact that he has to wage a war in a foreign country, the land of the enemy.

Both Acciajouli and Grabbe reveal Hannibal as a warrior who is heartless and objective in the military sphere. Wisdom, cunning and caution are qualities of the great Carthaginian general which are mentioned repeatedly in the source, as he so frequently overcomes the enemy by some trick, and is always ready to take advantage of any occasion which offers. Phrases such as:
"...Hannibal, comme prudent Capitaine qu'il estoit..."[6],
"Et comme il estoit le plus fin & rusé Capitaine de son temps..."[7],
"Parquoy, selon qu'il estoit fin & rusé..."[8],
"...un tant rusé & cauteleux Capitaine..."[9],
"...(car il estoit Capitaine fin et rusé)..."[10]
occur frequently. In fact, under Hannibal's leadership, the Carthaginian army is regarded by the Romans as "l'ennemy fin & cauteleux"[11], and accordingly the Romans strive with calm determination to obliterate this power which proves a threat to their supremacy.

Grabbe's Hannibal directs all his undertakings with caution, cunning and strength, loyally fighting with determination, despite the apathetic,

contemptible attitude of his countrymen. His wisdom and cunning are manifested particularly in Scene 9, "Tal bei Casilinum", when he dupes the Roman dictator, Fabius Maximus, and leads his army unscathed out of what would have been a fatal trap.

In this scene, the spectator also witnesses a sample of Hannibal's possible cruelty: without hesitation, he has the guides who led his army into this trap crucified. However, in no way does Grabbe emphasize this particular characteristic; he rather highlights Hannibal's humane qualities, presenting these as basic to his character, to make him sympathetic to the spectator. In this respect Grabbe somewhat distorts his source. Historically, Hannibal is seen to be a cruel and ruthless warrior who displays clement qualities only on rare occasions. He wages war not only in pitched battle, but also by plundering and destroying the towns he comes across, putting the peasants to flight, laying waste to the crops in the surrounding countryside and killing everything in his path. In this way, he fills the surrounding country with fear and terror. It is only after the battle fought by Lake Trasimene that Hannibal acts with humanity: "After this great victory, Hannibal released several Italian prisoners, without demanding ransom, after having treated them very humanely, so that the report of his humanity and clemency spread throughout every nation, although he was entirely opposed to such virtues by nature. For he was proud and cruel by nature, and since his youth had been schooled in the management of arms and experienced in murder, treachery and surprises against the enemy, without concerning himself with orders, laws or civil customs. Those are the means by which he became one of the cruellest Captains, and most cunning in deceiving the enemy...For as he was always intent on

deceiving the enemy, those whom he was unable to defeat in open war he tried to surprise by some ruse..."[12] Thus when he is unable to beat the enemy in pitched battle, he finds some means of surprising them with his cunning.

There is one occasion, in both the source and the drama, on which neither of these courses of action is open to Hannibal. This occurs immediately prior to the battle of Zama, when, recognizing the hopelessness of the Carthaginian situation, he chooses a course of action which is unfamiliar to him as a man of action; he requests a parley with Scipio, hoping to use his strategic wisdom in this way to save his people. We accept without surprise his failure in this attempt.

Despite the hatred which Hannibal fosters towards the Romans, he nevertheless shows respect for his enemy's leaders killed in battle against him. In the source, it is reported that after the death of the Roman Consul, M. Marcellus, "the chief among the Roman captains who had hindered the course of his victories and who had given him more trouble than any other,"[13] Hannibal went and searched the battlefield until he had found Marcellus' body, and he had him buried with great splendour. This praiseworthy action of giving honourable burial to an enemy captain also finds brief reference in Grabbe's tragedy, when Hasdrubal's head is thrown savagely at Hannibal's feet. He says: "Ich habe deine gefallenen Feldherrn ehrenvoll bestatten lassen, als wären sie unter Römern gestorben..."[14]

Between Hannibal and his brother Hasdrubal, there is obvious deep affection. Both historically and dramatically, Hasdrubal hastens to join his large and powerful army with Hannibal's. Their joint strength

would undoubtedly result in glorious triumph for Carthage, thus the anticipation of his arrival raises Hannibal's sinking hopes anew. Hasdrubal appears to be a military commander of a calibre comparable to that of his brother and this would no doubt strengthen their bond. In Hasdrubal's death, Hannibal receives a deep affliction, both personally and publicly, since the loss of his brother has snatched away from him the strong military support which he was depending so much upon receiving.

It is in connection with the close relationship between Hannibal and his brother, that Grabbe informs us that Hannibal was only nine years old when he left his homeland - a minor point, perhaps, nevertheless one which has been extracted from a close study of his source; for we read there, that Hannibal was nine years old when his father took him to Spain.

There are a number of minor characteristics of Hannibal taken over by Grabbe from the source. The first is his loss of sight in the left eye which the dramatist attributes to his experience at Lake Trasimene:

> Hannibal ...Kerl, tritt nicht l i n k s hin, hieher, vor mein r e c h t e s Auge - Thrasymene (ganz Karthago muß es wissen) schlug das andere mit Blindheit.[15)]

Historically, this occurred just before the battle at Trasimene: "And in fact..., he himself, on account of all the toils he had endured without resting night or day, and because of the bad air, lost one of his eyes."[16)] This is a minor physical characteristic which helps the dramatist to place his hero in his historical context, since Trasimene represents another of Hannibal's outstanding victories. But it also

contributes towards the making of a sympathetic character, one who has to manage with a physical handicap over and above the more serious historical disadvantage of having to wage a war on two fronts.

Another historical detail to which Grabbe draws attention is Hannibal's relationship with women. The author of the historical account relates that it is undecided whether Hannibal led an ascetic existence or not. Significantly enough, it is while the army is at Capua that this subject is discussed; similarly in the drama, it is in Scene 7, "Kapua", that Hannibal says: "Ich soll hier schwelgen und auch mein Heer - Ich, der nie ein Weib, nie einen Weinbecher berührte!"[17] Thus Grabbe prefers to reveal Hannibal as an ascetic, as one who abides by a strict code of morality and subordinates all personal interests to the affairs of the State and his political task.

Finally, when he dies, the great Carthaginian general is "un pauvre vieillard ia tout cassé"[18], according to our source. Grabbe reveals him to be an old man already after his return from Italy, his hair being white and his brow deeply furrowed from his long struggle in the enemy country.

We become aware of the deep distrust for Prusias of both the historical figure and his dramatic counterpart, when we discover that Hannibal is prepared for a sudden escape from his villa in Bithynia. In the way in which he handles the dangerous situation when Flaminius arrives, we see final evidence of the foresight and pride which make Hannibal invincible; in taking his own life as an alternative to surrendering himself to his mortal enemies, his spirit remains unbroken to the end.

Finally, but perhaps most significantly, the ultimate summary of Hannibal's character in the historical account of his life clearly links his fate with that of his mother city, Carthage: - "Such a death Hannibal the Carthaginian died, a man without any doubt excellent in every sort of warlike praise, not to mention his other virtues: thus it may be easily seen and understood, how important both the great spirit of this man and his skill and real knowledge of the art of war were: because the Carthaginians were never considered to be beaten in the war that they had undertaken so eagerly and so magnificently, until Hannibal had been defeated and broken in that battle fought near Zama. To such an extent, that it seems that their strength and warlike valour had their lustre and were in existence with their Captain, Hannibal, and died away with him."[19)]

Grabbe has adopted and developed this notion of the interlinking of the fates of Hannibal and Carthage. It is the dramatist's aim through the arrangement of the last few scenes, when the action alternates between Africa (Carthage) and Asia Minor (Hannibal), to show that one is the root cause of the other. The imagery in the drama further reflects this intention: at the beginning, Hannibal is referred to as "der Schwarzgelbe vor Rom"[20)]; in Scene 20, when the Roman soldiers view Carthage from a distance, the powerful metropolis appears to one of the Celtiberians as "mächtige gefleckte Kröte, gelb mit schwarzen Buckeln."[21)] Again, in Scipio's quotation from Homer while Carthage is burning: "Einst wird kommen der Tag, wo die heilige Ilios hinsinkt, Priamos auch, und das Volk des lanzenkundigen Königs"[22)], we see the connection between Ilios, the town, and Priamos, the king. We may therefore conclude that it was Grabbe's artistic intention to show

that the fate of one was decided by the fate of the other. And it is most probable that Grabbe found the original idea for this in Donato Acciajouli's account of the life of Hannibal included in Plutarch's Lives.

Turning now from Hannibal to the side of the Romans and his greatest antagonists, the S c i p i o b r o t h e r s , we discover that these are also covered in part by our source. The dramatist most likely originally had in mind the two brothers Gnaeus and Publius Cornelius Scipio (+ 211), who waged the war against the troops left by Hannibal in Spain. In Scipio der Jüngere, however, he has combined the historical rôles of two great Roman generals, Publius Cornelius Scipio Africanus Maior (+ 183), victor of the battle of Zama, and Publius Cornelius Scipio Aemilianus Africanus Minor (+ 129), who destroyed Numantia and Carthage.[23] This union of historical personages has enabled the dramatist to create a multi-faceted dramatic character who, possessing the ingenuity of a great military leader and being ruled by the disciplined sense of duty characteristic of a Roman aristocrat, succeeds in achieving far more in his lifetime than was historically possible. Grabbe has given him a companion brother in Scipio der Ältere.

It must be emphasized, therefore, that although the Scipio brothers together epitomize the stern Roman men of action, their characterization in the drama is far more complex than that afforded by our single source. In fact, it would be true to say, that it is the character of the younger Scipio only that is extracted from this particular historical account, and that the older Scipio merely accompanies him as a

secondary figure. Significantly enough, the three scenes in which the Scipios appear in the drama find their corresponding description in our historical account of Scipio Africanus. A brief comparison of these scenes from the point of view of the characterization of the younger Scipio should reveal to a large extent how Grabbe has employed material offered by his source.

The younger Scipio first appears with his brother in Scene 4 of the drama, when they are both elected to the office of Vice-Consul at a meeting of the Senate. This scene is parallelled in the source by the account of the election of the young Scipio Africanus to the same office. We are told that "after his father and uncle, who were both great and excellent captains, had been killed one after the other in Spain, and the Roman people were out to replace them with some c a p t a i n o f s i n g u l a r c o u r a g e , there was no one who dared to take in hand that difficult and dangerous war, seeing that two such excellent captains had died in it. Therefore, the assembly was called to elect a V i c e - C o n s u l and, all the other Princes of State remaining silent..., Scipio, aged t w e n t y - f o u r y e a r s , was the only one who, standing in the middle, said with g r e a t a s s u r a n c e that he would accept the responsibility m o s t w i l l i n g l y : he had no sooner made this promise than the charge of Spain was given to him without delay by remarkable favour of those who were voting."[24)]

Scene 4 of the drama, set at the Capitol in Rome, presents a similarly decisive meeting of the Senate, the task of which it is to find some possible means of defeating the enemy, while outside Hannibal

is attempting to storm the walls and gates of the city. The Scipio brothers are together elected to the responsible position of Vice-Consul, and as leaders over the army, they are directed to take the war against Carthage's colonies in Spain. Both brothers are characterized, in accordance with the Scipio Africanus of our source, as being true men of action with outstanding military virtues which are praised by the First Consul as he nominates them for the office:

> Erster Konsul ...Ich schlage vor: ernennt jene beiden Scipionen zu Prokonsuln und vertraut ihnen das Heer. Sie haben im Gefecht und auf dem Forum sich schon oft sehr tüchtig bewährt, und ihre Jugendfrische wird der Stadt not.[25)]

It is the younger Scipio, who, speaking on behalf of his brother and himself, accepts the important charge most willingly. Not flinching for a moment at the immensity or urgency of the task laid upon his shoulders, he immediately pledges his own and his brother's loyalty to their fatherland. With calm determination he replies: "Ihr erwählt uns. Wir werden tun, was wir vermögen."[26)] The close correspondence here between the historical Scipio Africanus and his dramatic counterpart in the person of the younger Scipio needs no further comment.

The second appearance of these two men in the drama occurs in Scene 6, which is set amongst the ruins of Numantia and reveals how successful the Roman army, led by the Scipio brothers, has been in overthrowing the African colony in Spain. Scipio's character is further revealed through his actions in this scene. Acciajouli reports, that after the capture and plundering of New Carthage by the Romans, Scipio sent the great number of hostages he had captured in the city back to

the Spanish villages. His humanity displayed by this action brought him great renown, and many nations left the side of the Carthaginians and surrendered to the Romans because of his mildness.

Grabbe prefers to ignore the clement qualities of Scipio Africanus, transforming him, in the person of the younger Scipio, into a cruel, ruthless warrior who is prepared to avail himself of every means to further Rome's cause. Thus it is that Scipio der Jüngere, who exhibits great foresight in his demands, orders all the prisoners to be gathered up, before he sends them by ship to Ostia, to be used as slaves in the service of Rome.

In Acciajouli's account, as in Grabbe's tragedy, the siege of New Carthage, or Numantia, is succeeded by the episode concerning Luceius, or Allochlin, the Prince of the Celtiberians. Grabbe has however made certain significant alterations.

Acciajouli says:"...There was one thing above all that increased his [Scipio's] praise greatly and attributed great b e n e v o l e n c e to him...A young woman prisoner was brought to him, who surpassed all the others in beauty and favour and whom he had assiduously guarded with all propriety. Learning a little later that she was fiancée to Luceius, the Prince of the Celtiberians, h e h a d h e r b r i d e g r o o m , a very young man, s u m m o n e d , and returned her to him unharmed and intact...Not forgetting such an a c t o f k i n d n e s s , Luceius immediately told his subjects of the l i b e r a l i t y , m o d e s t y and o u t s t a n d i n g e x c e l l e n c e of every sort of virtue which was to be found in the

Roman Captain, and soon afterwards returned to the Roman camp with a good number of cavalry."[27] This episode can be accepted in the source as an example of Scipio's normal clemency and its effect on the Spanish people.

Grabbe employs the same situation in Scene 6, but modifies it to his own dramatic ends. Here, it is Allochlin, the Celtiberian, who comes to Scipio to request the release of his fiancée. The younger Scipio, shrewdly recognizing an opportunity for winning new allies, agrees to release the girl only on condition that Allochlin and his troops will agree to fight for Rome. Thus his action in the drama is not a simple display of clemency, but a diplomatic move to help further his political task.

The third and final appearance of the Scipio brothers in the drama comes significantly immediately before the Battle of Zama, in which Hannibal, the great Carthaginian, is defeated. Both Scipio Africanus and his dramatic counterpart, the younger Scipio, confident of victory for Rome, exhibit an unshakeable desire to fight, and refuse Hannibal's offer of a peaceful settlement. Whereas in the source, Scipio simply agrees to meet Hannibal as requested, Grabbe attributes a reason to his agreement: it is a shrewd move to allow his brother extra time to prepare for battle.

In contrast to his source, Grabbe has made no reference to either the civil virtues or the physical characteristics of Scipio, since these qualities fall outside his rôle as a military man of action. Nor has the dramatist included any reference to the fact, recorded by

Acciajouli, that when Scipio was making plans to go to Africa, to take the war closer to the Carthaginians and effect Hannibal's withdrawal from Italy, he was strongly opposed by Fabius Maximus and other men in the Senate. Only after he had overcome this opposition did he gain permission to carry the war into Africa.

Since it is Grabbe's firm intention to present the Scipios backed by a united and resolute Senate and people, all of whom are ruled by strict discipline and an absolute sense of national duty, he omits any hint of possible discord between members of the Senate and leaders of the army, underlining their solidarity and unquestionable political unity, to make them superior to the Carthaginian enemy.

On the whole, it may be seen that Grabbe has sought to deduct from the complex historical character of the younger Scipio, in the same way as he has added facets to the character of Hannibal. By omitting the qualities of humanity and clemency, by ignoring other positive qualities such as gentleness, politeness and magnanimity in Scipio Africanus and by creating an absolutely united Rome on whose behalf Scipio can exercise his great military leadership to defeat the enemy, Grabbe has strengthened the severity of Hannibal's opposition, and consequently made Hannibal a more sympathetic character.

The Scipio brothers are presented in the drama as being the only opponents worthy of destroying the great Carthaginian general, Hannibal. In our source, a short comparison between Hannibal and Scipio follows their individual biographical accounts. In this comparison, we find

that Scipio resembles Hannibal in many outstanding qualities: "...it is common knowledge that both were supreme and most excellent military captains."[28] Both had to overcome problems on the home front, as already mentioned above, before they "accomplished things worthy of everlasting memory...by their ingenuity, good judgement and counsel."[29] "As for their personal achievements, they were both acquainted with good learning and liked and respected learned men."[30] It would be worthwhile to note at this point, that both characters in the drama exhibit a knowledge of Homer;[31] the Scipios are moreover accompanied in their exploits by their friend, the Roman poet, Terence.

In the final passage of the comparison, we read: "Now to summarize all these things, these two very renowned Captains are not to be compared with each other as much in personal and civil virtues, (of which Scipio had very many more), as in warlike valour and the glory of great deeds and exploits of war. Moreover, there was some similarity in their deaths, since both died away from their homeland: however, Scipio was not condemned by his government like Hannibal, but chose to end his life outside the city by voluntary exile."[32]

This clearly links them as great and worthy opponents who nevertheless shared a number of admirable qualities, their military valour being their most remarkable similarity. It is for this reason, that in Scene 14 of the drama, in that climactic scene before Hannibal departs from Italy, Grabbe can allow Hannibal to show respect for his enemies, since he himself has come to realize that they are truer men of his own kind than his own countrymen in Carthage. This respect for one's enemies is reciprocated by Scipio, for on the great historic

occasion when he meets Hannibal, in Scene 21 of the drama, it is mutual admiration that strikes both men dumb for a moment before they speak. Hannibal sees how like Scipio he himself was in his prime, and Scipio respects Hannibal's admirable military career and tenacity of purpose, qualities which are also his own.

Of the lesser characters who appear in Grabbe's Hannibal, Fabius Maximus, Flaminius, Hanno, Gisgon and Prusias are mentioned in Acciajouli, reference to their rôle in historical events being stressed more than their actual character. A brief discussion of these minor characters will be sufficient, since, as has already been noted in our survey of historical sources, Grabbe employed other material and ideas with regard to them. For Fabius Maximus and Titus Q. Flaminius, he consulted their individual biographies in Plutarch's Lives,[33] and in the person of Prusias, he attempted to satirize his contemporary fellow dramatist, F. v. Uechtritz.

However, of F a b i u s M a x i m u s , his diligence and inclination to always take the greatest care and avoid open battle as far as possible find remark. In the drama, Fabius' caution is exaggerated to the point of cowardice, when he delays his course of action to make a ludicrous sacrifice to the gods.

P r a e t o r F l a m i n i u s , in both the source and the drama, is a typical representative of the people of Rome, who displays pride and inflexible determination in fulfilling his duty to his country: he tracks down and demands the surrender of Rome's greatest

enemy, Hannibal, in order to take him alive to Rome.

H a n n o appears in Acciajouli's Life of Hannibal as the leader of the faction opposing the Barcas. He stands out as the peacemaker in Carthage: "...it has been said that it was he alone, when the Roman ambassadors came to Carthage, to complain of the outrages done to their allies, advised against the will of nearly the entire Senate, that peace be maintained, and that the war, which would one day be the cause of the ruin of their country be kept in check...But letting themselves be carried away by the fury and covetousness of a single youth, the Carthaginians gave occasion for the great injury which has since come to them."[34] It is apparent from the above quotation that Hanno acts in the interest of the State. Grabbe alters the emphasis of Hanno's attitude towards peace, for like the other members of the Carthaginian Synedrion and the people of Carthage, it is only personal gain that interests him: since the war in Italy necessarily incurs some personal sacrifice, this man is naturally opposed to it.

G i s g o n is also mentioned in our source. He is the man who, when the Roman peace terms are offered to the Carthaginians following their defeat at Zama, tries to persuade them to continue the war and reject any mention of peace. In this action he is opposing Hannibal, and for this reason, he has something in common with his dramatic counterpart. However, in the source, Gisgon is cried down and overcome at this point by Hannibal, who has returned to Carthage after his defeat, to answer for the city's downfall. The drama does not follow its principal source here, since in it, Hannibal never enters the city again after Zama.

It has already been said that Grabbe's Prusias does not correspond closely with his historical counterpart. The source does, however, mention Hannibal's lack of faith in the king and the fact that he sought refuge with him more by necessity than desire. His suspicion of Prusias is the explanation given for his readiness for a sudden escape, and the poison which facilitates his suicide is evidently further proof of his fear of betrayal. Grabbe's Prusias is regarded in the same light by the dramatic hero, but to the dramatist he embodies something further, a part of his personal experience.[35)]

K a t o and T e r e n z are two historical characters who are anachronistically included in the drama and who therefore cannot be discussed in the course of this investigation.

It has already been noted that Hannibal, the guiltless victim of circumstance, is opposed by forces too great for his genius as a military leader: on the one hand, he has to fight a war against a strong, united Rome, whose selfless representatives constitute his real opponents, on the other hand, he has to combat the betrayal and selfish materialism of his Carthaginian countrymen. A study firstly of the character of the Romans as a nation, and secondly of the characteristics of the Carthaginians as we find them in both our source and in Grabbe's drama will now be undertaken.

The R o m a n s are presented in Acciajouli's historical account as a strong, united people, resolute in their opposition against Hannibal. The Senate itself is the centre of all political and civil

organization and always displays absolute control in its decisions. Even in an extremity, the Senate remains calm to work out its best plan of action. When Hannibal presents a very real threat to the people of Saguntum, a number of ambassadors are dispatched to Rome, "to inform the Senate of the great danger they were in, and to ask for assistance against their great enemy who was in such close pursuit... which action being reported in Rome,...the Senators, s e t t i n g t o w o r k q u i t e c a l m l y, sent by decree P.V. Flaccus and Q.F. Pamphilus to Hannibal, to order him to withdraw from before Saguntum."[36] Furthermore, when Hannibal presents himself before Rome, threatening to reduce the Senate and the Roman people to bondage, the Senate takes control, organizing its members and the citizens of Rome so effectively, that they manage without difficulty to force Hannibal to retreat: "Thus, the whole city being so afraid, Fulvius Flaccus, one of the Roman captains, was recalled from before Capua; the new Consuls, S. Galba and C. Centimalus, were ordered to camp outside the city, and C. Calphurnius Praetor was responsible for setting up a good strong garrison inside the Capitol; and the citizens who had had leading positions were entrusted with calming the sudden riots which might arise in the city by their authority and power."[37] The calm determination and effective organization of the Senate are here evident, and the unquestioning obedience of the citizens is implied, even accepted as normal, in the last sentence.

Scene 4 of Grabbe's Hannibal illustrates most emphatically the true nature of the Roman Senate. The spectator witnesses the inflexible strength of Rome and the calm and resolute nature of the body which stands behind and contributes to the success of the campaigns of the

Scipio brothers. Indeed their affairs are conducted in a manner which is "ruhig und fest."[38] When Hannibal stands before the gates of Rome and threatens to take the city by storm, the Senate is not permitted to deviate from its strict agenda: first, it is kept in perfect order by a decree from the Second Consul: "Bleibt sitzen. Verräter, der sich bewegt!"[39] Then the inner peace of the city is restored by Cato's stern command that every citizen should return to his home within the hour. It is only after order has been fully restored within the city, that the Senate agrees upon its firm resolve that Carthage shall be destroyed; this resolve having been made, the first step on Rome's military road is planned and put into execution. Only after the last detail of its immediate political manoeuvre has been covered is the Senate permitted to rise and attend the scene of immediate danger. Moreover, the Senators file out in an orderly fashion.

It has already been noted, in Chapter II,[40] that the reactions of the Roman people to the news of Hannibal's overwhelming victory at Cannae reflect their inflexible strength and unflinching courage in the service of their country, and that the display of these qualities in such a time of adversity only serves to increase their greatness. Despite the sorrow which fills the city, a new army of young men is raised to continue the war.

The same qualities are attributed to the Romans in Grabbe's drama. We hear in Scene 4 of the women crying in the streets of Rome for the sixty thousand sons lost at Cannae. We also witness the Second Consul's plan to raise new legions of young men to take the war into Spain.

Thus in both Acciajouli's account and in Grabbe's tragedy, the Romans follow one aim, the Senate and the people being completely united in their opposition against Hannibal. On the field, they are determined and courageous, and despite the fact that they are often overcome by Hannibal's underhand manoeuvres, they are regarded by the Carthaginian general as an enemy who cannot rest either victorious or defeated.[41] Consequently both the reader and the protagonist understand at an early stage, that Rome will emerge as the victor in the struggle with Carthage.

The Roman peasants require only fleeting attention. They are seen, both historically and dramatically, as being undecided with regard to which side they should donate their loyalty to. They are frequently opposed to the Senate when things are working in Hannibal's favour, but do not hesitate to rejoin Rome's cause when fortune changes. It would be true to say that the peasants, or people of the provinces, have little bearing on, or influence in, the political struggle between Rome and Carthage.

Turning finally to the C a r t h a g i n i a n s as depicted in both source and drama, it may immediately be seen that they stand in direct contrast to the Romans, for, unlike the Roman men in government, their Senate remains ever divided in their attitudes towards Hannibal's political task. From the first, we read in our historical account, that "there were in the Carthaginian Senate two opposing factions. One had had its beginning during the rule of Hamilcar (surnamed Barca). This was handed on by succession to his son, Hannibal...It was preeminent and held first place in the sphere of lawsuits and trials. Of the other,

Hanno, a serious man of sovereign dignity in the same republic, was leader: but he valued peace and tranquillity more highly than war."[42] In this way, Hanno reveals himself to be a "perpetuel adversaire & ennemy de la partialité Barcinienne."[43]

Unlike the author of his source, Grabbe uses the term "Synedrion" for the Carthaginian Senate. Two of its members, Hanno and Gisgon, find mention, as already indicated above,[44] in Acciajouli's biography of Hannibal, both men displaying their opposition towards the great general. Gisgon appears briefly after the Carthaginian defeat at Zama, when the Carthaginian ambassadors return to the city with the Roman peace terms: "Not wishing to hear peace discussed, he [Gisgon] made a speech by which he aimed at persuading them to renew the war against the Romans: since several seemed to agree with him, Hannibal, indignant that stupid people of no experience could dare to speak of such things in such difficult and adverse times, thrust him down from the rostrum while he was still speaking..."[45] As already noted in the brief passage on the character of Gisgon, this incident does not occur in the drama; however, it is significant that Gisgon emerges as one of Hannibal's individual adversaries in Carthage.

In his drama, Grabbe introduces a third opponent to Hannibal's cause in the figure of Melkir. Generally speaking, the Carthaginian Synedrion, led by these three eminent members, is jealous of the power of the Barcas and continually strives towards undermining what little influence this faction has over the Carthaginian people. Hanno exhibits his jealousy in this respect in Scene 3, revealing the extent to which he is prepared to go to stamp out any sign of

Carthaginian loyalty to the opposing faction:

Hanno Demnach - die Barkas müssen unter, bald, baldigst, - sie werden zu bedeutend, sie siegen zu viel, einige im Volk bewundern sie schon.[46)]

It is inevitable that Hannibal, in his absence from Carthage, cannot exert the same influence over his people as can the leaders of the Synedrion. Indeed, both historically and dramatically, even bribery in the form of the golden rings from his victory at Cannae does not succeed in winning him the support that he so desperately requires from either his government or his people.

It is because Carthage is not a political unity and because the Carthaginian people are as ignoble as their leaders, that Hannibal is eventually forced to withdraw his troops from Italy, and hasten back to Africa in Carthage's defence. Acciajouli reports that on his return to Africa, Hannibal complained bitterly about the Senate, because of their lack of interest in, or encouragement for his campaigns abroad. The obvious explanation for their continued lack of support is their love of money and material possessions. This selfish materialism reveals itself most forcefully, in the source, after the battle of Zama, when the first payment to the Romans of the Carthaginian tribute falls due. This causes widespread lamentation amongst the Carthaginians "only because it concerned the individual money of each one."[47)]

Grabbe repeatedly illustrates this same Carthaginian materialism and lack of support for Hannibal, which is due both to the plan of the leaders of the Synedrion to check the great general's power and to the indifference of the citizens of Carthage, who are in fact far

too concerned with the profit and loss of their trade to be able to understand Hannibal's military campaigns. News of the great triumph at Cannae is of secondary importance to the arrival of a goods caravan from the Sudan. New troop reinforcements sent from Carthage consist of exhausted old mercenaries with whom Hannibal cannot possibly combat the superior strength of the enemy army. When Hannibal returns to his home town to defend it against the Romans, he has to enter it by force, breaking through the chains at the entrance of the harbour; again on his defeat in the battle of Zama, when he is put to flight with the Nubian horsemen, he finds his way into his home town blocked, this time successfully. Thus it is that Hannibal is ultimately turned away by the people and town for whom he has selflessly fought all his life.

Acciajouli leaves the subject of the Carthaginians altogether after Hannibal has left the city. It is for this reason, that the apparent change in their attitude and outlook in the drama is not depicted in the historical account.

Having made a detailed investigation of Grabbe's presentation of the historical characters he found in Acciajouli's Vita Hannibalis, we may conclude that the dramatist adheres as closely as possible to this source. It would be true to say, that the occasional divergence is introduced only to reinforce his dramatic intention. Certain important facets of character are sometimes omitted, or at other times abnormally stressed, to present a unified view of dramatic character. This, too, could be understood by us as just one further means of the dramatist, "den wahren Geist der Geschichte zu enträtseln."[48)]

Conclusion

This dissertation may be regarded as an attempt to prove that Grabbe relied on D. Acciajouli's Vita Hannibalis... in the translation of Charles de l'Ecluse, Les Vies d'Annibal..., as his principal source for the historical tragedy, Hannibal. Initial evidence for this claim may be gathered from personal correspondence of the dramatist dating from the time of the writing of the drama.[1] Secondly, a comparative study of historical events and details as they appear in both Acciajouli's biography and Grabbe's tragedy reveals such a close correspondence between source and drama, that this cannot be regarded as accidental.[2] Thirdly, an investigation into the depiction of character discloses overwhelming proof of the close relationship that exists between the source and the drama.[3] Fourthly and most significantly, the central ideas as expressed in the drama, that of the interdependence of the fates of Hannibal and Carthage, corresponds to the final passage in Acciajouli's account of the life of Hannibal.[4]

I do not wish to deny that Grabbe also consulted other source material for the writing of his tragedy, among which Livy holds a prominent place. However, compared with the significance for the drama of Donato Acciajouli's Vita Hannibalis, their importance is secondary.

References

Chapter I:

1) S. Wukadinowić, Grabbes Werke (Berlin-Leipzig, 1912), VI, p. 48. Hereafter quoted as "Wuk".

2) Ibid., p. 76.

3) Ibid., p. 77.

4) Chr.D. Grabbe, Werke und Briefe, Historisch-kritische Gesamtausgabe in 6 Bänden, hrsg. v. A. Bergmann (Emsdetten, 1960 ff.), III, p. 152. Hereafter quoted as "Gesamtausgabe".

5) Wuk. VI, p. 88.

6) Ibid., p. 88.

7) Ibid., p. 90.

8) A. Bergmann, Grabbe als Benutzer der Öffentlichen Bibliothek in Detmold (Detmold, 1965).

9) Ibid., pp. 338 and 367.

10) Ibid., p. 368.

11) Ibid., p. 368.

12) Wuk. VI, p. 93.

13) A. Bergmann, Grabbe als Benutzer, pp. 352 and 370.

14) Ibid., p. 370.

15) Wuk. IV, p. 142.

16) Ibid., VI, p. 93.

17) Ibid., p. 57.

18) Ibid., p. 61.

19) Ibid., pp. 68 f.

20) Ibid., p. 77.

Chapter II:

1) Plutarch, (Plutarchii Chaironensis summi et philosophi et historici Parallela. Guillelmo Xylandro Augustano interprete, French:), Les Vies des hommes illustres de Plutarque, trad. du grec par M.Iaq. Amyot, avec les Vies d'Annibal et de Scipion [by Donato Acciajouli] , trad. par Charles de L'Écluse (Paris, 1578), p. 482 r°. Hereafter quoted as "Acciajouli" (my translation throughout).

2) Gesamtausgabe, III, p. 113.

3) Ibid., p. 114.

4) Ibid., p. 114.

5) Acciajouli, p. 483 v°.

6) Ibid., p. 483 v°.

7) Ibid., p. 484 r°.

8) Ibid., pp. 484 r° f.

9) Gesamtausgabe, III, p. 93.

10) Ibid., p. 97.

11) Ibid., p. 98.

12) Ibid., p. 98.

13) Ibid., p. 100.

14) Acciajouli, p. 496 r°.

15) Gesamtausgabe, III, p. 103.

16) Acciajouli, p. 490 r°.

17) Ibid., p. 490 r°.

18) Gesamtausgabe, III, p. 107.

19) Ibid., p. 109.

20) Acciajouli, p. 490 v°.

21) Gesamtausgabe, III, p. 122.

22) Ibid., p. 121.

23) Ibid., p. 121.

24) Acciajouli, pp. 490 v° f.

25) Gesamtausgabe, III, p. 130.

26) Acciajouli, p. 491 r°.

27) Gesamtausgabe, III, p. 134.

28) Acciajouli, p. 503 v°.

29) Gesamtausgabe, III, p. 139.

30) Acciajouli, p. 491 v°.

31) Ibid., p. 493 r°.

32) Gesamtausgabe, III, pp. 144 f.

33) Wuk. VI, p. 88.

34) Acciajouli, p. 493 v°.

35) Gesamtausgabe, III, p. 149.

36) Ibid., p. 153.

37) Ibid., p. 154.

38) Acciajouli, p. 494 r°.

39) Gesamtausgabe, I, p. 409.

Chapter III:

1) Wuk. VI, p. 95.

2) Acciajouli, p. 475 v°.

3) Ibid., p. 475 v°.

4) Cf. ibid., pp. 490 r° and 508 r°.

5) Gesamtausgabe, III, p. 109.

6) Acciajouli, p. 476 r°.

7) Ibid., p. 476 r°.

8) Ibid., p. 479 v°.

9) Ibid., p. 490 r°.

10) Ibid., p. 492 r°.

11) Ibid., p. 487 r°.

12) Ibid., p. 481 r°.

13) Ibid., p. 489 v°.

14) Gesamtausgabe, III, p. 118.

15) Ibid., pp. 100 f.

16) Acciajouli, p. 480 v°.

17) Gesamtausgabe, III, p. 109.

18) Acciajouli, p. 493 v°.

19) Ibid., p. 494 r°.

20) Gesamtausgabe, III, p. 89.

21) Ibid., p. 131.

22) Ibid., p. 152.

23) Cf. H.W. Nieschmidt, Christian Dietrich Grabbes Tragödie "Hannibal" Eine Dramenanalyse (Diss. Mainz, 1950), pp. 25 f.

24) Acciajouli, pp. 495 r° f.

25) Gesamtausgabe, III, p. 98.

26) Ibid., p. 98.

27) Acciajouli, p. 496 v° (my spacing).

28) Ibid., p. 507 v°.

29) Ibid., pp.507 v°f.

30) Ibid., p. 508 v°.

31) Cf. Gesamtausgabe, III, pp. 152 f.

32) Acciajouli, p. 509 r°.

33) Cf. Chapter I, p. 8.

34) Acciajouli, pp. 476 v° f.

35) Cf. Chapter I, p. 5 and Chapter II, p. 34.

36) Acciajouli, p. 476 v° (my spacing).

37) Ibid., p. 487 v°.

38) Gesamtausgabe, III, p. 96.

39) Ibid., p. 97.

40) Cf. Chapter II, p. 16.

41) Acciajouli, p. 489 r°.

42) Ibid., p. 476 v°.

43) Ibid., p. 485 r°.

44) Cf. Chapter III, p. 57.

45) Acciajouli, p. 491 r°.

46) Gesamtausgabe, III, p. 94.

47) Acciajouli, p. 491 v°.

48) Gesamtausgabe, I, p. 409.

Conclusion:

1) Cf. Chapter I, pp. 9 f.

2) Cf. Chapter II, pp. 12 ff.

3) Cf. Chapter III, pp. 40 ff.

4) Cf. Chapter II, pp. 36 ff.

Select Bibliography.

Texts:

Chr. D. Grabbe, Werke und Briefe, Historisch-kritische Gesamtausgabe, ed. A. Bergmann (Emsdetten, 1960 ff.).

Chr.D. Grabbe, Werke, ed. Spiridion Wukadinowič (Berlin-Leipzig, 1912). (This edition had to be consulted for Grabbe's letters, since the sixth volume of the historical-critical edition has not yet been published.)

Historical Sources:

W. Bötticher, Geschichte der Carthager, nach den Quellen bearb. (Berlin, 1827).

W. Guthrie and J. Gray, (General History of the World, German:), Uebersetzung der algemeinen Welthistorie, transl. S.J. Baumgarten (Halle, 1755).

Livius, (Historia Romana, German:), Titus Livius Römische Geschichte, transl. Chr.F. Klaiber (Stuttgart, 1826 ff.).

Plutarch, (Plutarchii Chaironensis summi et philosophi et historici Parallela. Guillelmo Xylandro Augustano interprete, French:), Les Vies des hommes illustres de Plutarque, trad. du grec par M.Iaq. Amyot, avec les Vies d'Annibal et de Scipion by Donato Acciajouli , trad. par Charles de L'Écluse (Paris 1578).

Ch. Rollin, Historie aller Zeiten und Völker, aus dem Französischen des Herrn R. übers. (Dresden-Leipzig, 1744).

G.B. v. Schirach, Biographien des Plutarchs, mit Anm. v. G.B.Sch. (Berlin-Leipzig, 1777).

F.Ch. Schlosser, Universalhistorische Uebersicht der Geschichte der alten Welt und ihrer Cultur (Frankfurt/M., 1828 f.).

Grabbe Criticism:

H. Allekotte, Christian Dietrich Grabbes Römertragödien (Diss. Münster, 1920).

A. Bergmann, Die Glaubwürdigkeit der Zeugnisse für den Lebensgang und Charakter Christian Dietrich Grabbes (Berlin, 1933).

A. Bergmann, "Grabbe und Immermann", Jan Wellem. Monatsschrift für Düsseldorf, VIII (1933).

A. Bergmann, "Christian D. Grabbe's Düsseldorfer Anfänge," Lippisches Magazin, 10 (1935).

A. Bergmann, Christian Dietrich Grabbe. Chronik seines Lebens 1801-1836 (Detmold, 1954).

A. Bergmann, Grabbe als Benutzer der Öffentlichen Bibliothek in Detmold (Detmold, 1965).

E. Busch, "Geschichte und Tragik in Grabbes Dramen," Dichtung und Volkstum, XLI (1941).

E. Diekmann, Christian Dietrich Grabbe: Der Wesensgehalt seiner Dichtung (Detmold, 1936).

U. Haase, Die dichterische Gestalt des Grabbeschen "Hannibal". Ein Beitrag zur Morphologie der Tragödie (Leopoldstal, 1949).

J. Haupt, "Grabbes Zerwürfnis mit Immermann," Lippisches Magazin, I (1926).

W. Höllerer, Zwischen Klassik und Moderne. Lachen und Weinen in der Dichtung einer Übergangszeit (Stuttgart, 1958).

A.W. Hornsey, Idea and Reality in the Dramas of Christian Dietrich Grabbe (Oxford, 1966).

G. Jahn, Übermensch, Mensch und Zeit in den Dramen Ch.D. Grabbes (Diss. Göttingen, 1951).

F.W. Kaufmann, "Die realistische Tendenz in Grabbes Dramen," Smith College Studies in Modern Languages, XII (Northamton, Mass., 1935).

H.W. Keim, Grabbes letzte Jahre, Immermann-Serie, 2 (Düsseldorf, 1926).

F. Koch, Idee und Wirklichkeit (Düsseldorf, 1956).

W. Kowalk, Das Raumproblem im Drama Grabbes (Diss. Köln, 1958).

A. Kupferschmidt, Grabbes Hannibaldrama (Diss. Greifswald, 1923).

H. Leippe, "Das Problem der Wirklichkeit bei Christian Dietrich Grabbe," Vom Geist der Dichtung. Gedächtnisschrift für Robert Petsch (Hamburg, 1949).

H. Neuhof, Formprobleme bei Grabbe. Die Dramen nach der Abhandlung "Über die Shakespearo-Manie" (Diss. Bonn, 1932).

H.H. Nicolini, "Grabbe, Immermann und das Düsseldorfer Theater," Düsseldorfer Heimatblätter (1936).

H.W. Nieschmidt, Christian Dietrich Grabbes Tragödie "Hannibal". Eine Dramenanalyse (Diss. Mainz, 1950).

H.W. Nieschmidt, Christian Dietrich Grabbe. Zwei Studien (Detmold, 1951).

O. Nieten, Christian Dietrich Grabbe. Sein Leben und seine Werke (Dortmund, 1908).

R. Petsch, "Drei Haupttypen des Dramas," DVjs, XII (1934).

W. Rumpf, "Chr.D. Grabbe in Frankfurt," Alt-Frankfurt, 3 (1930).

D. Schmidt, Die Problematik des Tragischen in den historischen Dramen Grabbes (Diss. Würzburg, 1965).

F.J. Schneider, Christian Dietrich Grabbe. Persönlichkeit und Werk (München, 1934).

F.J. Schneider, "Grabbe-Probleme," Forschungen und Fortschritte (Berlin, 1935).

F.J. Schneider, "Grabbe als Geschichtsdramatiker," Zeitschrift für deutsche Geisteswissenschaft, I (1939).

F. Sengle, Das historische Drama in Deutschland. Geschichte eines literarischen Mythos (Stuttgart, ^{2}1969).

F. Siefert, Christian Dietrich Grabbes Geschichtsdramen (Stuttgart, 1957).

B. v. Wiese, "Die historischen Dramen Grabbes," Die Welt als Geschichte, VII (1941).

B. v. Wiese, Die deutsche Tragödie von Lessing bis Hebbel (Hamburg, ^{7}1967).

K. Ziegler, Grabbes Leben und Charakter (Hamburg, 1855).

Curriculum Vitae.

I, Christine Lynette Forsyth, was born on August 25th, 1949, in Hamilton, New Zealand, the daughter of Bruce William Forsyth, apiarist, and his wife Rita Myrtle, née Hall.

From 1954 to 1967, I attended Primary and Secondary School in Ohaupo and Hamilton respectively. The following year I enrolled at the University of Waikato, selecting as my main subjects German and French philology under Professors Nieschmidt, Chicoteau and Marshall. In addition, I took General Studies, an interdisciplinary course in European literature and the history of ideas, with major contributions by Professors Salmon and Sewell. I graduated Bachelor of Arts in 1970.

I should like to gratefully acknowledge the invaluable advice and encouragement given to me by my academic teacher and thesis supervisor, Professor H.W. Nieschmidt, without whose patience and help this thesis would not have been completed.