

## ILLISA'S BUMP AND AMPHITRYON'S BOWL: DIVINE IMPERSONATION IN A GREEK MYTH AND AN INDIAN JĀTAKA

By way of explaining how the sovereignty of Lydia passed from the Heraclids to the Mermnadae, Herodotus narrates in a highly dramatic style the story of King Candaules' tragic passion and its fateful consequence.<sup>1</sup> Candaules, it seems, was so infatuated by the beauty of his wife that he wished another to share this experience. He therefore asked his favourite bodyguard, Gyges, to view her naked as he used to see her, and notwithstanding the man's protestations, he concealed him behind the bedroom door at night, when the queen undressed to go to bed. But it so happened that she saw the intruder, and yet, though flustered, pretended she did not. The next morning she sent for Gyges and, intending revenge on the king for insulting her modesty, gave the man the option of either killing the king and taking her as his wife, or himself dying over the sight he should not have seen. When he chose the former, that night she put a knife in his hand and hid him behind that same door. Thus, when Candaules was asleep, Gyges stabbed him, married the queen and usurped the throne, initiating the dynasty of the Mermnadae in Lydia.

Those familiar with the *Mahāvamsa* story of how the gate-keeper, Subha, seized the throne of Yasalalakatissa, who ruled in Anuradhapura, through the practical joke the king used to play from their close resemblance to each other,<sup>2</sup> will remark the fair similarity of the two yarns on how sovereignty passed to two lowly underlings (- I call these "yarns" as no serious historian would be prepared to go along with them). But this latter story engrosses for its plot a factor that shows from where it drew its true inspiration. This factor is Subha's resemblance to Yasalalakatissa, which brings into play the element of mistaken identity and thus directs our attention, like two or three other anecdotes of kings and princesses in the *Mahāvamsa*, to a jātaka. In this instance it is the *Illisa Jātaka* (No. 78), which I wish to review here, albeit cursorily, for the reason that it itself bears a fair resemblance in motif to a Greek myth -- one which chronologically antedates the Indian jātaka and may possibly have something to do with the inspiration that created the latter.

---

<sup>1</sup>. i. 8-12. A somewhat different version of the story is to be found in Plato *Republic* 359d-360a.

<sup>2</sup>. xxxv. 51-56.

The *paccuppannavatthu* or "present-life story" of the *Illisa* is concerned with a wealthy but miserly Treasurer who lived in the city of Sakkhara near Rajagaha. This man, who would not give away "so much as the tiniest drop of oil a blade of grass will take up", saw a yokel enjoying a stuffed cake and craved to eat one himself. As a result he grew thinner and thinner. But when his wife found out the cause and offered to make him a cake, he saw to it that it was to be just the one for himself, not even another for her. And he bid her cook it on the seventh floor of his house for fear others would find out and call over for a share. Becoming aware of this that same day and intending to convert the man to self-denial, the Buddha despatched the Elder, Moggallāna, to exercise his transcendental powers and bring the man, his wife, cakes, milk, ghee and all from Sakkhara to his presence in Rajagaha. This Moggallāna achieved by presenting himself in the air outside the seventh floor in an attitude of begging for alms and not quitting, despite all efforts of the miser to shoo him off, then by a miracle making the dough increase and the cakes stick to each other, until the Treasurer burst into perspiration tugging them apart and his craving left him. Then Moggallāna brought them all to the presence of the Master by the miracle of making the staircase touch ground at the main gate of Jetavana while its head was still in the man's house at Sakkhara. As with Christ's miracle of the loaves and the fishes<sup>3</sup> the cakes remained as much as there was at the beginning even after the Buddha and five hundred brethren and all the rest had eaten. So, on the Buddha's instructions the remaining cakes were dumped in a cave not far from the gateway "and to this day", says the *paccuppannavatthu* of the *Illisa Jātaka*, "a spot called 'The Crock Cake' (*Kapallapūvapabbhāra*) is shown at the extremity of the cave."<sup>4</sup> As for the Treasurer and his wife, the pair attained Fruition of the First Path of Salvation (*soīāpattiṭṭhāpesi*).

This however was not the first time, says the *paccuppannavatthu* of the *Illisa Jātaka*, that the miserly Treasurer had been converted by Moggallāna. In earlier lives too Moggallāna had been doing the same - though, as far as can then be seen from his persistent miserliness, to little effect! However, in the past life, when it so happened (as in 390 odd other *jātakas*) Brahmadatta was

<sup>3</sup>. Cp. Jesus Christ's miracles when he fed huge multitudes with five and again seven loaves and two or a few fishes and still had basketsful of crumbs to throw away at the end. *Mat.* 14.17; 15.34; *Mark* 6.38 and 8.7; *Luke* 9.13 and *John* 6.9.

<sup>4</sup>. An attempt to give the story a pseudo-aetiological clinch. See for instance the *Nalapāna Jātaka* (No. 20) - though the author here fails to understand the implication -, the *Kakkata Jātaka* (No. 266) *et al.*

king in Benares, this same man had been born once again as a miserly Treasurer, then named Illīsa, a lame crook-back with a squint, who broke down the family almonry, hoarded his wealth and drove the poor away. That time however the yokel he saw was one who was not eating, but (for variation no doubt) drinking - and what he did to satisfy his selfish craving was, not even to have his wife brew liquor at home for himself for fear of having to give others potions, but send a servant out for a penny-worth for himself, which he got him to hide in a remote thicket and imbibed all by himself.

The way in which Moggallāna had set about reforming the Treasurer as Illīsa in that past life is however somewhat different from the course he adopted in this one - and it is in this procedure that our interest lies. For Moggallāna, who had then been Illīsa's father and died and been reborn as the god Sakka, when he saw that his son had burnt down the almonry and driven away the poor and determined to establish him in the merit of generosity, now seeing him drinking all by himself away from home, adopted a ruse which in its rascality rather emulates Juppiter's doings *apropos* Amphitryon in the well-known Plautine comedy named after the hero.

For (a) God that he is now, Sakka comes down from the Realm of the Devas and (b) assumes by divine power the exact semblance of Illīsa, lameness, crook-back, squint and all; (c) In this guise he visits the king and asks his permission to distribute his possessions among the people. (d) He then proceeds to Illīsa's house, and deceiving his wife and everybody else by his impersonation, proceeds to distribute everything of Illīsa left and right. (e) Illīsa, coming to know of this rushed home, only to be himself treated as an interloper (on instructions by Sakka) and thrown out of doors with a cudgelling by the people, who are already convinced Sakka is the true Illīsa. (f) His complaint to the king fails, for the king asks was it not he himself who asked him leave to distribute his property. (g) At this stage there is a confrontation of the two Illīsas (the impersonating Sakka and the man himself) and an attempt by Illīsa to prove himself the true Illīsa, first by appeal to the king, then his wife and finally by reference to a piece of material evidence, a bump (possibly a wart, *piḷakā*) on his head, which only he and his barber knew of - all of which fail, including the bump, since Sakka immediately forestalled him by miraculously creating one on his own head as well. (h) With his identity thus comprehensively and convincingly duplicated by Sakka through his divine power, the flabbergasted Illīsa falls in a faint. (i) Thereupon Sakka, revealing himself, says, "Not Illīsa am I but Sakka" and explains the purpose of his masquerade; whereupon (j) Illīsa is reconciled to the why and the wherefore of all that he underwent.

As observed before, the first part of this jāataka proper is hardly very different from the first part of the *paccuppannavatthu*, so much so that the author, at the latter stage of it, is content with remarking that "what follows is to be told in the words of the former story" and getting on to the variant ruse adopted by Moggallāna in that past instance. It will be found that several jātakas altogether or partially duplicate their respective *paccuppannavatthu* - that is, when it is not the other way round. A second thing worth noting in the jāataka proper of the *Illisa* - and this more clearly evidencing adoption of the story from a non-Buddhistic source, is the insignificant role played in it by the Bodhisatta - he is only the barber called in to testify to the bump on Illisa's head, and even in such capacity proves absolutely unhelpful when Sakka duplicates it on his own head as well. This may have been from a justifiable fear, at least in this particular jāataka, of involving him in a stunt not quite becoming of him as the Buddha-to-be.<sup>5</sup>

To turn attention to the fully elaborated, if also humourously dramatized version of the myth in Plautus' play, the *Amphitryon*, we see that (a) god though he is, Jove comes down from Olympus and (b) assumes by divine power the exact semblance of Amphitryon, who had gone to war with the Teleboans and had just got back (c) He then proceeds to Amphitryon's house and, deceiving Amphitryon's wife and everybody else by his impersonation of the man, proceeds to make love to her. (e) Amphitryon comes home, only to receive a cool welcome, his wife swearing he had been with her earlier and making him suspect her of adultery. (f) As proof of his having been home earlier, she produces material evidence in the form of a golden bowl which he had gifted her (though it was then that he for the first time was bringing it to her, but he finds the box miraculously empty, and the gift already with her)<sup>6</sup> When he leaves and comes back again, he is treated as an interloper (on instruction from Zeus), kept out of the house by force and has the dregs of wine thrown in his face. (g) At this stage there is a confrontation of the two Amphitryons (the impersonating Jove and the man himself) and an attempt by Amphitryon to prove himself

---

<sup>5</sup> As is well known, in stories where none of the participants can be healthily identified with the Bodhisatta, he is made a non-participant observer of the drama, a tree- or water-deity or such. Even so, many stories incorporated as jātakas, whatever other quality they may seek to commend as his, prove detrimental to his ethical image arising from the *dhmma*. See my 'The Jataka Bodhisatta' *Sri Lanka Journal of the Humanities* vol. XXII (1996) p. 51-61.

<sup>6</sup> On this bowl, see n. 12 below.

Amphitryon by appeal to the captain of his ship, Blepharo, who leaves, confused (like the barber, Bodhisatta of the *Illisa*). (h) With his identity thus comprehensively and conclusively duplicated by Jove through his divine power, the flabbergasted Amphitryon decides to resort to the king (i) at which point there is a thunderous crash, accompanied by a flash of lightening, as a result of which Amphitryon faints. (j) Thereupon Jove, revealing himself in a booming voice to the lady, says: "Alcmena, fear not, help is at hand. The regent of the skies is here with comfort for thee and thine", explains that it was he who slept with her unbeknown and that of the twins born to her, one was his, the other Amphitryon's. (k) Amphitryon is reconciled to the why and the wherefore of all that he underwent.

It is fascinating to think then that these two stories, the Indian and the Greek/Roman, whose motifs are based on impersonation, are themselves so strikingly impersonations of one another even to the degree of detail, that the author of one must have had some knowledge of the other - though who of which is still to be seen. For no one, so far as I know, has so far remarked this similarity of the *Illisa Jātaka* with the Amphitryon story, let alone gone into the question.

In 1889 Robert Chalmers (who is the first to have given us an English translation of the *Illisa Jātaka*) drew attention to the argument of a poem of William Morris, 'The Proud king',<sup>7</sup> in which a haughty king, Jovianian by name, when bathing has his clothes stolen and his form assumed by an archangel, who is then recognized by courtiers, servants and his own queen as their lord, Jovinian, while he himself is driven with blows from his own palace, and does not regain his kingdom and his honour until, in his deep humiliation, he humbles himself to God. This story of the proud king, like the old French 'Moralité l'orgueil et presumption de l'empereur Jovinian' is undoubtedly taken from the 13th century story book, the *Gesta Romanorum*.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> 'The Lineage of "The Proud King"' *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* (1892) Art. II, p. 39-51. In this article he only gives a lengthy summary of the *jātaka*. The whole of it, with *paccuppannavatthu* and all, he translates for the E.B. Cowell edition *The Jataka* vol. I (1895) see 1973 ed. Delhi, p. 187-201.

<sup>8</sup> A collection of entertaining moral stories composed in Latin by Christian monks for their use in sermons, much as were the *jataka* by the Buddhist. Fictitious even when involving recognizable historical personalities, they have the quality of parable, each tagged with an

Chalmers traces this story further back, to the Koran's verse:

"And we did try Solomon and we threw upon his throne  
a form; then he turned repentant."

the commentaries on which refer to a story in which Solomon is said to have practiced idolatry and God punished him by allowing a demon of the interesting name of Şakhr (or Şakhar) to steal his signet ring. With this ring and assumed likeness of the king, Şakhr sat on the throne, while Solomon, unrecognized by all, went around begging for forty days - after which punishment, the demon Şakhr flew away, throwing the ring into the sea. The ring was recovered miraculously by Solomon from inside a fish,<sup>9</sup> after which he recovered his kingdom and threw Şakhr himself into a lake with a stone round his neck. In the Babylonian recension of this work, c. A.D. 500, Solomon, unrecognized even in Jerusalem after the loss of his ring, is mocked by his own porter and driven away with blows from his own door. Here too he finds his ring inside a fish before he is again recognized for who he really is. The demon, in this called Asmodeus, seeing the ring, shrieks and flees and Solomon regains his throne a reformed man.

Of this "Talmudic-Koranic fiction" Sir Richard Burton had found the *Gesta Romanorum* story (and therefore, adds Chalmers, Morris' poem) "the manifest descendant", though he himself says "with greater caution, and perhaps more certainty, it may be maintained that the traditions are *akin*, springing from one stock." Chalmers goes even further to suggest that the Koranic version itself is not borrowed from the Talmudic "but much greater probability attaches to the view that the two are merely parallel or sister versions;" for even if names do not count for much (evidently when they differ), he points to the difference of name of the two demons, Asmodeus in the Talmud and Şakhr in the Koranic legend. But then he observes that the name "Şakhr" is itself indicative of Indian

---

'Application' comparable to the *samodhana* of a *jātaka*, in which the participants, and even creatures, places, things are given an interpretation in the light of Christianity and Christian doctrine.

<sup>9</sup> Chalmers makes no comment on this detail. In the *Macchuddāna Jātaka* (No. 288) a parcel of money belonging to the Bodhisatta comes back to him through a fish that had swallowed it; in Kalidasa's *Sakuntala* however, it is a ring. But the oldest and most striking instance is the story of the tyrant Polycrates' ring, narrated by Herodotus (iii. 40-44), to which other such stories may owe their detail.

origin. "Ṣakhr is simply the god Cakra of the older Indian theology, the archangel Sakka of Pali. And in the Pali Jatakas occurs the story of Illisa, who is punished for sin and brought to repentance by the archangel Sakka assuming is form."

"It is a far cry from Gotama the Buddha to William Morris," says Chalmers, at the outset of this article on 'The Lineage of the Proud King' "but it will be the object of these pages to establish the succession, not apostolic but literary, linking together the Victorian poet and the Indian sage of the fifth century B.C." Then he goes on to add later, "The chain of sequence of the Jataka to Mr. Morris is still far from complete and it may be hoped that scholars with a larger knowledge than I can lay claim to, of the several literatures in which the story appears, may be willing to amplify and extend this sketch."

What Chalmers proposes is that the study be extended forwards, as he had done. As regards the motif as present in the *Illisa Jātaka* itself however, he does not concede it to have been original with the author - and he should be right there - yet has not looked any further *back* for its prototype, contenting himself with the speculations (1) that the earliest Buddhist form was not so elaborate as that of the present Jātaka book and (2) that Buddhism borrowed the tale, with Sakka, from pre-Buddhist folk-lore, now lost.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> Chalmers falls back on Rhys-Davids (*Buddhist Birth-Stories*(Trubner 1881) for the dating of the jātakas. In his *Buddhist India* London (1903) p. 113 Rhys-Davids admits that the whole of the longer stories in vol. VI are later than the rest, but some of these were in existence in the third century B.C. For putting the others (without their frame story) at an older date, Rhys-David relies on the studies of Fick and Hofrath Bühler, both of whom must presume that all that wealth of stories had come down from that greater antiquity to "the time when Buddhism was becoming a power in India" in a fixed language and form (- though at the same time they concede "they were handed down from mouth to mouth" (Fick) and that "the Buddhist monks had altered much" (Bühler)). Transmission *in ipsissimis verbis* is hardly likely with such a huge volume of prose literature, which admitted adaptation as well. What would have come down from antiquity in India or from elsewhere are the *motifs* - or at best the stories retold as each narrator pleased, which then were either expanded or retold, or both, by the monks, freely dealing with them to give them a distinct Buddhist flavour. This is what is found of other oral traditions. The style of a single author is often to be seen in several jātakas in the collection, a thing which is

For all that, I thought that speculation was possible for him in another line, which would have been opened up when he was discussing names. For, while the name of Şakhr in the Koranic story pointed him to the *Illīsa Jātaka*, there was the name "Jovinian" in the *Gesta Romanorum* which he has let ride. (And yet he was aware of the possibility of the existence of traditions that could have been *akin*!) For, just as much as Sakka is the impersonating god of the *Illīsa* story, Jove is the god who impersonates Amphitryon in the Roman play of Plautus -- so that the composer of the *Gesta Romanorum* story of Jovinian reveals his source (as much as Şakhr does in the Koranic) by his play on that name (Jove-Jovinian) for the hero of his story. If however he now uses it in this form for the impersonated hero and not the impersonating archangel, one must appreciate the new context of his story, which is Christian, with the divinity involved as the Christian God (as against the classical) and the angel here as the agent of that Christian God.

This is not to suggest that the Plautine play was the immediate inspiration for the *Illīsa Jātaka*. A certain amount of chronology stands in the way, for the *Amphitryon* is dated at c. 195 B.C, and Roman influence had not still permeated the regions of Buddhist India. But the myth used by Plautus, and with scope for much of its dramatic detail, had already been developed in Greek literature well before Plautus and then also well before Greek literature would have been carried to India following Alexander's conquest and the Greek settlement of those same regions. The Plautine play is just as much heir to the motif as would be the *Illīsa*, even if the former, as it were, flaunts itself in toga and the latter in dhoti.

First appearance of the myth of Amphitryon's impersonation by Zeus (Jove) is as early as the eighth century B.C. when Hesiod, in his *Shield of Hercules*,<sup>11</sup> says of how Zeus, "wanted to beget a protector against destruction

---

impossible if they were a hotch-potch of a folk antiquity "handed down from mouth to mouth". Their *terminus ante quem* is however quite another matter, and depending on the dating of the canonical verses and, more particularly for those that appear on the bas-reliefs of the Bharhut and Sanchi stupas, the dating of these *stūpas*.

<sup>11</sup> *Aspis* 27-56 Herodotus makes him contemporary with Homer but modern opinion tends to put him somewhat later. T.W. Allen (*Homer: The Origins and Transmission* (1924) ch. 4) however dates him as early as 800 B.C. The myth concerns the miraculous conception of Heracles by Alcmena, wife of Amphitryon. Hercules, in his lifetime rid the



for both gods and men who eat bread" - and so, in the absence of Amphitryon from his home, "he rose up from Olympus, mulling deception in his mind and lusting for the love of the well-girt woman." And so he lay with Electryon's daughter and all his desires were accomplished. That same night Amphitryon, returning from war, would do nothing till he had gone to bed with his wife. "And the lady, submitting to the god and the man, far best of men in Thebes of the Seven Gates, bore twin sons; but one a lesser man". Then describing Heracles, Hesiod says "this one she conceived under the embraces of Zeus, the dark-clouded, but the other one, Iphicles, to Amphitryon of the restless spear - seed that were separate; one, lying with a mortal man and one with Zeus, son of Cronos, marshal of all immortals."

Diodorus Siculus<sup>12</sup> too makes mention of the deception, saying Zeus used deception in Alcmena's case as he did not want to offer her violence as in the case of other women, while at the same time he thought he could not persuade her because of her chastity. So he decided on using deception; he deceived Alcmena by assuming in every respect the form of Amphitryon. Apollodorus<sup>13</sup> had in his version of the myth the point that Zeus also tricked her by telling her all that took place in the war which the true Amphitryon fought against the Teleboans, and that when Amphitryon himself arrived she gave him no big welcome, and that when he inquired why, she told him that he had come last night and slept with her. Amphitryon then learns from Tiresias, the blind seer, that the interloper was Zeus himself - a necessity Plautus' Amphitryon at the termination of the play flippantly asserts he can well dispense with, now that Jove (Zeus) had revealed himself as Alcmena's lover.

The whole story had apparently been told by Pherecydes of Leros, who lived in the first half of the 5th century B.C., as we learn from the scholiasts on

---

world of many monsters and villains.

<sup>12</sup> iv.9.

<sup>13</sup> *Bibliotheka* II. iv. 7-8. Who introduced this bowl into the deception of the god cannot be known, but Herodotus (v. 59) had himself seen a cauldron in the temple of Ismenian Apollo with very ancient "Cadmeian characters" stating that it was dedicated by Amphitryon from the spoils of the Teleboans. This may have something to do with the idea of King Pterelaus' bowl which figures in Plautus' play. For Amphitryon's expedition against the Teleboans (or Taphians) see Strabo x.2.20, Pausanias i.37.6 and Plautus *Amphitryon* 183-256.

Homer *Iliad* XIV. 323 and *Odyssey* XI. 266.,<sup>14</sup> and it is likely that Apollodorus followed him, for he refers to him immediately after he gives his own account.

Sophocles produced a play called *Amphitryon* and Euripides one called *Alcmena*, both dealing with the same myth, but they are lost. Wernicke infers that Sophocles followed the earlier version, recorded by Apollodorus, according to which the deception practiced by Zeus and his intercourse with Alcmena were made known to Amphitryon by Tiresias.<sup>15</sup> Accius (or Attius) Roman tragic poet born in 170 B.C. and who lived to a great age, wrote an *Amphitryon* thought to be adopting Sophocles - especially since the only other tragedy so entitled was by the Alexandrian Aeschylus. "In any case", says A.C. Pearson, "the plot may be taken to have covered the same ground as the well-known travesty of Plautus."<sup>16</sup> Opinion has been divided whether Sophocles' play was a tragedy or a satyr play; more likely it was a tragedy.<sup>17</sup> On the other hand Euripides' play, the *Alcmena*, from which H.J. Rose conjectures the fable as given by Hyginus is derived,<sup>18</sup> appears to have been a parody and hardly different from the plot of Plautus' boisterous comedy - even if it is possible that (as scholars agree) Euripides innovated that Amphitryon tried to burn Alcmena on a funeral pyre for her adultery and Zeus intervened to save her.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> He was a logographer who lived in Athens and wrote copiously on myths and genealogies. His work would have served Apollodorus as a model for his own book. All Pherecydes' writings have unfortunately perished.

<sup>15</sup> In Pauly-Wissowa I. 1573.

<sup>16</sup> *The Fragments of Sophocles* vol. I. Cambr. (1917) p. 76.

<sup>17</sup> See F.G. Wagner ed. *Aeschyli et Sophoclis Perditarum Fabularum Fragmenta* Bratislavia (1852) p. 233. See also Pearson *loc.cit.* "The old guess that the *Amphitryon* was a satyr-play (Osann in *Rh.Mus* II p. 312) has nothing in its favour, unless indeed Porson's view of Fr. 1127 is adopted."

<sup>18</sup> See Hyginus *Fables* ed. H.J. Rose p. 30 Fable XXIX:Alcmena, and note thereto.

<sup>19</sup> Pearson *loc.cit.*, who cites Nauck *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* p. 386 and Wilamowitz *Eur. Herakl.* 1. p. 54. for this detail.

The foregoing treatment of the myth as narrative, tragedy, satyr play, parody or comedy go to show its potentiality to be cast in either a tragic or a humorous form, or both, as is professed by Mercury in the prologue of Plautus' play.<sup>20</sup> Be that as it may, the antiquity and popularity of the story in Greek, if not Roman literature, should satisfy any but the most obstinate on the question of chronology as well as probability that its motif, with the impersonating god and all, could have found its way to India, there to give rise to such a jātaka as the *Illisa*. One has only to concede the brilliance of the *Illisa*'s author in having dressed it as a thoroughly Indian, indeed Buddhist story, to realize how close the two stories then stand, the Graeco-Roman myth of the hero Amphitryon impersonated by Zeus/Jupiter and the Indian Jātaka of the treasurer, *Illisa* impersonated by the god Sakka. The inspiration which has fundamentally transformed the guise of the Indian story is surely directed to the property of the human victim upon whom the god plays his prank. In the Greek/Roman it was the man's wife, in the Indian she is retained, but now it is the man's wealth. At any rate, one can hardly expect Sakka to fornicate with other people's wives as freely as do the Greek gods - certainly not, if he was then also a prior incarnation of that august Elder, Mahāmoggalāna!

### MERLIN PERIS

---

<sup>20</sup> At the climax of the play, when the bowl, which her husband had brought with him but was still to gift to her, Amphitryon's slave, Sosia (whose identity too Plautus had duplicated in his play) exclaims (vs. 785-786)

*tu peperisti Amphitruonem, ego alium peperī Sosiam;  
nunc si patera paateram peperit, omnes congeminavimus*

("Tell you what, sir - you've got a twin Amphitryon, I've got a twin Sosia, and if the bowl's got a twin bowl we're all seeing double!")