Classical Quarterly 56.1 220–238 (2006) Printed in Great Britain
doi: 10.1017/S0009838806000176

ACHILLES TATIUS AS A READER OF SOPHOCLES

Affinities between ancient Greek novels (or, at least, the more sophisticated among them) and Greek tragedy have often been pointed out. It is well known that novelists have a distinct penchant for metaphors and images evoking the world of the theatre, while parallelisms with the ambience, ethos, and even narrative structure of classical tragedy are not uncommon.[1] Specific verbal or thematic allusions to tragic texts have also been detected, woven into the narrative fabric of the novels. Thus, to take but a few examples, Heliodorus has been thought to preserve echoes of Euripides' first *Hippolytus*,[2] of his *Alcestis*,[3] and of Aeschylus' *Choephori* and Sophocles' *Electra*.[4] As for Achilles Tatius, commentators have naturally focused on the vivid theatricality of the episode of Leucippe's 'immolation', which turns out to be but a grotesque pantomime, complete with (possibly) allusions to Euripides' *Iphigenia in Tauris*.[5] Tragic echoes may also lurk in less theatrically laden passages, and it has been recently suggested that the Tereus and Procne narrative in the fifth book of Tatius' novel may hark back directly to a tragic antecedent, namely Sophocles' *Tereus*.[6]

The Tereus and Procne narrative may serve as a case in point, permitting us to establish (especially since this does not seem to have been systematically attempted before) whether, and to what extent, a novelist like Achilles Tatius could have had first-hand knowledge of the tragic texts themselves (in this case, of Sophocles' *Tereus*), or whether he only had access to literary reworkings inspired thereby (for instance, Ovid's *Metamorphoses* 6), or even to such subliterary material as tragic hypotheses and mythographic accounts.

About halfway through *Leucippe and Clitophon*, the narrator provides an *ecphrasis* of a painting he once chanced upon, which depicted the myth of Philomela, Procne, and Tereus (5.3.4–6), and he subsequently reports how he recounted the essentials of the myth to a curious Leucippe. He relates in some detail, and in suitably florid style, the central episode of Tereus' rape of Philomela, of his cutting of her tongue, and of

[1] See e.g. M. Fusillo, *Il romanzo greco: Polifonia ed eros* (Venice, 1989), 33–43; S. Bartsch, *Decoding the Ancient Novel: The Reader and the Role of Description in Heliodorus and Achilles Tatius* (Princeton, 1989), 109–43.

[2] See R. Merkelbach, 'Heliodor I 10, Seneca und Euripides', *RhM* n.F. 100 (1957), 99–100, comparing Heliod. 1.10.2 and Sen. *Phaed*. 646–56. Cf. also L. Galli, 'Amarsi come Alcesti e Admeto (un'allusione ad Euripide in Eliodoro)', *SIFC* 3rd s. 12 (1994), 197–207 (here 202–3); Fusillo (n.1), 41. For possible parallelisms between Eur. *Hipp*. and Ach. Tat. (as well as Heliod.), see M. Braun, *History and Romance in Graeco-Oriental Literature* (Oxford, 1938), 49–51.

[3] See Galli (n. 2), 198–200, who compares Heliod. 1.2.4 with Eur. *Alc*. 273–9; 207 n. 35, with parallelisms between Heliod. 2.1.3 and Eur. *Alc*. 277. Fusillo (n. 1) offers further parallelisms between Heliod. and Eur. *Phoen*.

[4] See again Galli (n. 2), 204–5, who finds that Heliod. 1.12.3 echoes Aesch. *Cho*. 896–8 and Soph. *El*. 1410–12.

[5] Ach. Tat. 3.15. Cf. E. Mignona, 'Leucippe in Tauride (Ach. Tat. 3, 15–22): mimo e "pantomimo" tra tragedia e romanzo', *MD* 38 (1997), 225–36.

[6] Ach. Tat. 5.3.4–5.3.6. The suggestion is made by R. Degl'Innocenti Pierini, 'SPIRAT TRAGICUM SATIS . . . : Note al *Tereus* di Accio, tra filologia e storia della lingua', *Paideia* 57 (2002), 84–98, at 89–90.

her weaving a fabric that denounced Tereus' act (5.5.3–5). Here are the relevant passages, which will serve as *texte de base* for our discussion.[7]

ECPHRASIS OF THE PAINTING (5.3.4–6)

μεταστραφεὶς οὖν—ἔτυχον γὰρ παρεστὼς ἐργαστηρίῳ ζωγράφου—γραφὴν ὁρῶ κειμένην, ἥτις ὑπηνίττετο προσόμοιον· Φιλομήλας γὰρ εἶχε φθορὰν καὶ τὴν βίαν Τηρέως καὶ τῆς γλώσσης τὴν τομήν. ἦν δὲ ὁλόκληρον τῇ γραφῇ τὸ διήγημα τοῦ δράματος, ὁ πέπλος, ὁ Τηρεύς, ἡ τράπεζα. (5) *τὸν πέπλον ἡπλωμένον εἱστήκει κρατοῦσα θεράπαινα· Φιλομήλα παρειστήκει καὶ ἐπετίθει τῷ πέπλῳ τὸν δάκτυλον καὶ ἐδείκνυε τῶν ὑφασμάτων τὰς γραφάς· ἡ Πρόκνη πρὸς τὴν δεῖξιν ἐνενεύκει καὶ δριμὺ ἔβλεπε καὶ ὠργίζετο τῇ γραφῇ· Θρᾷξ ὁ Τηρεὺς ἐνύφαντο Φιλομήλᾳ παλαίων πάλην Ἀφροδίσιον.* (6) *ἐσπάρακτο τὰς κόμας ἡ γυνή, τὸ ζῶσμα ἐλέλυτο, τὸν χιτῶνα κατέρρηκτο, ἡμίγυμνος τὸ στέρνον ἦν, τὴν δεξιὰν ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἤρειδε τοῦ Τηρέως, τῇ λαιᾷ τὰ διερρωγότα τοῦ χιτῶνος ἐπὶ τοὺς μαζοὺς ἔκλειεν. <ἐν> ἀγκάλαις εἶχε τὴν Φιλομήλαν ὁ Τηρεύς, ἕλκων πρὸς ἑαυτὸν ὡς ἐνῇν τὸ σῶμα καὶ σφίγγων ἐν χρῷ τὴν συμπλοκήν.*

And as I turned around—for I happened to be standing near a painter's workshop—I saw a painting displayed[8] there, which suggested something similar [to a disturbing omen Clitophon had just witnessed]. For it depicted the rape of Philomela, and the aggression of Tereus, and the cutting of her tongue. The painting comprised the entire narrative of the drama, the fabric, Tereus, the feast. A maidservant stood there, holding the fabric stretched out; Philomela stood by and placed her finger on the fabric and pointed to the images she had woven in it; Procne was stooping to inspect[9] what was being shown to her; she had a fierce look in her eyes, and was angered at the imagery. The fabric depicted Tereus of Thrace as he wrestled with Philomela in a fight of lust. The woman had her hair torn off, her girdle undone, her cloak ripped asunder, her breast half-naked; she thrust her right hand against Tereus' eyes, while with her left one she was trying to close her torn-off cloak around her breasts. Tereus held Philomela in his arms, pulling her body to himself as hard as he could and tightening his embrace, his flesh clung to hers.

THE MYTH OF TEREUS, PROCNE, AND PHILOMELA (5.5.3–8)

ὁ δὲ (sc. *Τηρεὺς*) *ἀπῄει μὲν ἔτι Πρόκνης ἀνήρ, ἀναστρέφει δὲ Φιλομήλας ἐραστής, καὶ κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν ἄλλην αὐτῷ ποιεῖται τὴν Φιλομήλαν Πρόκνην.* (4) *τὴν γλῶτταν τῆς Φιλομήλας φοβεῖται, καὶ ἔδνα τῶν γάμων αὐτῇ δίδωσι μηκέτι λαλεῖν καὶ κείρει τῆς φωνῆς τὸ ἄνθος. ἀλλὰ πλέον ἤνυσεν οὐδέν· ἡ γὰρ Φιλομήλας τέχνη σιωπῶσαν εὗρηκε φωνήν.* (5) *ὑφαίνει γὰρ πέπλον ἄγγελον καὶ τὸ δρᾶμα πλέκει ταῖς κρόκαις, καὶ τὴν γλῶτταν μιμεῖται ἡ χείρ, καὶ Πρόκνης τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς τὰ τῶν ὤτων μηνύει καὶ πρὸς αὐτὴν ἃ πέπονθε τῇ κερκίδι λαλεῖ.* (6) *ἡ Πρόκνη τὴν βίαν ἀκούει παρὰ τοῦ πέπλου καὶ ἀμύνασθαι καθ' ὑπερβολὴν ζητεῖ τὸν ἄνδρα. ὀργαὶ δὲ δύο, καὶ δύο γυναῖκες εἰς ἓν πνέουσαι καὶ ὕβρει κεράσασαι τὴν ζηλοτυπίαν δεῖπνον ἐπινοοῦσι τῶν γάμων ἀτυχέστερον.* (7) *τὸ δὲ δεῖπνον ἦν ὁ παῖς Τηρέως, οὗ μήτηρ μὲν ἦν πρὸ τῆς ὀργῆς Πρόκνη· τότε δὲ τῶν ᾠδίνων ἐπελέληστο. οὕτως αἱ τῆς ζηλοτυπίας ᾠδῖνες νικῶσι καὶ τὴν γαστέρα. μόνον γὰρ ὀργῶσαι γυναῖκες ἀνιᾶσαι τὸν τὴν εὐνὴν λελυπηκότα, κἂν πάσχωσιν ἐν οἷς ποιοῦσιν οὐχ ἧττον κακόν, τὴν τοῦ πάσχειν λογίζονται συμφορὰν τῇ τοῦ ποιεῖν ἡδονῇ.* (8) *ἐδείπνησεν ὁ Τηρεὺς δεῖπνον Ἐρινύων· αἱ δὲ ἐν κανῷ τὰ λείψανα τοῦ παιδίου παρέφερον, γελῶσαι φόβῳ.*

[7] I am following throughout the Budé edition by J.-P. Garnaud, *Achille Tatius d'Alexandrie: Le roman de Leucippé et Clitophon* (Paris, 1991; corr. repr. 1995). All translations are mine, but for individual turns of phrase I have borrowed occasionally from J. J. Winkler's excellent translation in B. P. Reardon (ed.), *Collected Ancient Novels* (Berkeley, 1990), 234–5.

[8] 'Displayed' is calculated to preserve the vagueness of *κειμένην*, which may mean 'lying there', or 'hanging there'; cf. J. N. O'Sullivan, *A Lexicon to Achilles Tatius* (Berlin and New York, 1980), s.v. *κεῖμαι* 3b.

[9] All translations that I have seen (and O'Sullivan [n. 8], s.v. *νεύω* 1a) render *ἐνενεύκει* by 'nodding to show that she understood' *vel sim*. But how could the 'nodding' have been depicted on a painting?

(Tereus) set off still the husband of Procne, but comes back the lover of Philomela, and along the way he makes Philomela into a second Procne. (4) Afraid of Philomela's tongue, he offers her as a wedding gift the deprivation of her speech, and shears off the blossom of her voice. Nonetheless, this came to no avail; for Philomela's craft devised voiceless speech. (5) She weaves, that is, a robe to be a messenger, and she twines her dramatic story with the woofs, and her hand imitates her tongue, and she conveys to Procne's eyes a message that should have been received by her ears, and by means of the shuttle[10] she tells her what she suffered. Procne hears the veil's tale of violence and seeks to inflict extreme punishment upon her husband. Two women breathing rage in unison, and mixing jealousy with outrage, devise a dinner more ill-starred than the wedding. The dinner was Tereus' son, whose mother had been Procne *before* rage took hold of her; for subsequently, she forgot her birth-pangs. It is thus that the pangs of jealousy can prevail even upon the (pangs of the) womb.[11] For only women driven by wanton passion and desiring to harm the man who has wronged their marital bed, even if their (vengeful) actions engender no lesser harm for themselves, reckon that the misfortune of their suffering is counterbalanced by the pleasure they derive from what they did.[12] Tereus' dinner was one prepared by Erinyes; the women brought before him the boy's remains in a basket, laughing in terror.

TATIUS' TRAGIC NARRATIVE

In 5.5.4 (ἕδνα τῶν γάμων αὐτῇ δίδωσι μηκέτι λαλεῖν), Philomela's amputation is envisaged as her rapist's 'bridal gift' for their 'wedding'. This evokes a distinctly tragic theme, namely that of the *perverted gift*: a gift, often bridal, fails to fulfil its positive social function by causing destruction instead of establishing amity. Surviving tragedies provide numerous examples of this theme. Jason's bride receives from Medea, as a wedding present (Eur. *Med.* 956 φερνάς),[13] a bridal robe that turns out to be poisoned and causes the bride's death (1159–202). The charming scene where the bride dons the new dress, observing its fit and arranging her bridal crown on her hair before the mirror, seems carefully calculated to recall 'a typical scene of the dressing of the bride',[14] and thus to heighten the cruel antithesis with the gruesome demise that is about to occur. The irony of the perverted, deleterious gift is presented in a more elaborate manner in Sophocles' *Trachiniae*: Deianira sends Hercules the fatal robe in her desire to 'match with gifts his own gifts' (494 ἅ τ' ἀντὶ δώρων δῶρα χρὴ προσαρμόσαι). Given now that Hercules' 'gifts'—his 'reward' to his wife for keeping

[10] I translate κερκίς as 'shuttle' throughout, although this conventional rendering has been challenged by G. M. Crowfoot, 'Of the warp-weighted loom', *ABSA* 37 (1936/7), 36–47 (here 44), who argued that κερκίς is the 'pin-beater', i.e. the slender rod with which weavers beat up the weft into place.

[11] For the idea that Procne murdered the product of her birth-pangs, see Nonn. 44.268 τηλυγέτην ὠδῖνα διατμήξασα σιδήρῳ.

[12] For the rendering of this difficult (and perhaps corrupt) passage, I have relied on O'Sullivan (n. 8), s.v. λογίζομαι 3. Cf. also E. Vilborg, *Achilles Tatius Leucippe and Clitophon: A Commentary* (Göteborg, 1962), 95. The *CQ* reader suggests an interesting emendation: τὴν τοῦ πάσχειν λογίζονται συμφορὰν <ἴσην> τῇ τοῦ ποιεῖν ἡδονῇ 'they reckon that the misfortune of their suffering is equalled by the pleasure they derive from what they did'. I wonder, however, if ἡ τοῦ ποιεῖν ἡδονή is not actually supposed to be *greater* than ἡ τοῦ πάσχειν συμφορά; and the homoeoteleuton συμφορὰν ἴσην seems a weak one.

[13] As Mastronarde explains, 'φερνάς indicates that these gifts are to be added to the bride's "trousseau", the property she brings to the newly formed family'; see D. J. Mastronarde (ed.), *Euripides Medea* (Cambridge, 2002), *ad* 956, and cf. already D. L. Page (ed.), *Euripides Medea* (Oxford, 1938), *ad* 956.

[14] Thus R. Seaford, *Reciprocity and Ritual: Homer and Tragedy in the Developing City-State* (Oxford, 1994), 389. For occurrences of dress, crown, and mirror on vase-paintings depicting the adornment of the bride or wedding scenes see J. H. Oakley and R. H. Sinos, *The Wedding in Ancient Athens* (Madison, 1993), 18, 23.

the house during his long absences (542 *οἰκούρια*)[15]—are, preposterously, another woman, Iole, who is explicitly termed 'a bane under the roof' (376 *πημονὴν ὑπόστεγον*), Deianira's lethal gift turns out to be an eerily appropriate *ἀντίδωρον* for Hercules' baneful 'present': the amicable reciprocity of the exchange of marital gifts is ousted by the hostile reciprocity of returning destruction of a marriage (death of Hercules) for perversion of a marriage (Iole as a second wife).[16]

The theme of the perverted gift occurs also, in non-nuptial contexts, in Sophocles' *Ajax* 661–5, where the sword that kills Ajax turns out to be a present from Hector,[17] and also in Euripides' *Cyclops* 549–51, where the 'privilege' of being eaten last is the 'gift' Odysseus receives from Polyphemus as a token of guest-friendship (a theme already present in *Od.* 9.369). And in *Helen* 479–80 it is said that, should a barbarian despot arrest Menelaus, he is likely to give him death as his 'gift of guest-friendship' (*θάνατος ξένιά σοι γενήσεται*).

Moreover, Tatius is likely to be echoing here yet another fairly common tragic mannerism, whereby nuptial terminology is applied to violent or otherwise perverse (and therefore 'anti-nuptial') sexual unions. Thus, for example, in Euripides' *Ion* wedding imagery is consistently used with reference to Apollo's rape of Creusa: 10–11 *οὗ παῖδ' Ἐρεχθέως Φοῖβος ἔζευξεν γάμοις | βίᾳ Κρέουσαν*; 72 *γάμοι . . . Λοξίου*; 437 *Φοῖβος . . . παρθένους βίᾳ γαμῶν*; cf. 445, 506, 868, 913–14 (*τῷ μὲν ἐμῷ νυμφεύτᾳ | χάριν οὐ προλαβών*), 941, 946, 949, 1092–3, 1543. In *Troades*, Agamemnon's violent appropriation of Cassandra is also referred to in nuptial terms: *Tro.* 44, 311–13 and 339 (an ironical inversion of nuptial *makarismos*), 346–7, 351–2, 354, 357, 363, 405, 962. Finally, in Sophocles' *Trachiniae* 1139 *γάμος* is used catachrestically of the *ménage à trois* that Deianira suspects Hercules of being about to establish; cf. also 546, 843.[18] The paradoxical description of Tereus' crime in nuptial terms has persisted as late as Nonnus (4.322–5): *ζυγίη φύγεν Ἥρη | συζυγίην ἀχόρευτον ὀρεσσαύλων ὑμεναίων | κούρη δ' ἀστορέεσσιν ἐπεστενάχιζε χαμεύναις | εἰνοδίου θαλάμοιο*.[19]

Given its thematic affinity with tragedy, one is tempted to ask whether Tatius' *ἕδνα τῶν γάμων αὐτῇ δίδωσι μηκέτι λαλεῖν* might conceal an actual reminiscence from a Tereus-tragedy, and even perhaps contain scraps of the original text. Indeed, Tatius' phrase scans as the end of a tragic trimeter and the beginning of a second one:

[15] On *οἰκούρια* see the references cited by M. Davies (ed.), *Sophocles Trachiniae* (Oxford, 1991), *ad* 542.

[16] On the ironies and perversions of reciprocal gift-giving in the *Trachiniae* see Seaford (n. 14), 390–1.

[17] Further on the idea that 'a foe's gift is an evil gift' see Garvie *ad* Soph. *Aj.* 664–5 (A. F. Garvie [ed.], *Sophocles Ajax* [Warminster, 1998], 189).

[18] A more light-hearted variant of this mannerism may also found in satyr drama: in Aeschylus' *Amymone* fr. 13, *σοὶ μὲν γαμεῖσθαι μόρσιμον, γαμεῖν δ' ἐμοί* is addressed to Amymone by a male seeking to obtain her consent for sex. For the use of *γαμέω* of concubinage or mere sexual intercourse see the LSJ 1996 Suppl. s.v., I.2a–b, with Shipp's addition of Eur. *Hipp.* 14, Dem. 45.39, 18.129: see G. P. Shipp, *Modern Greek Evidence for the Ancient Greek Vocabulary* (Sydney, 1979), 187–8. Significantly, as Shipp also points out, in Modern Greek *γαμῶ* (*γαμάω*) has come to be the equivalent of *βινέω*; cf. already *Vit. Aes.* Westerm. §103 *γαμητιῶν* = *βινητιῶν* (with D. J. Georgacas, 'A Contribution to Greek word history, derivation and etymology' *Glotta* 36 [1958], 100–22, 161–93, here 118); *Σ* Theocr. 5.43c (p. 166.15 Wendel) uses *γαμηθείης* in a gloss on *πυγίσματος*. Cf. also J. C. B. Petropoulos, *Eroticism in Ancient and Medieval Greek Poetry* (London, 2003), 143 n. 25, with further testimonia and bibliography.

[19] See also e.g. ibid. 16.332 *Σύριγξ Πανὸς ἔφευγεν ἀνυμφεύτους ὑμεναίους* (of imminent rape). See further I. Cazzaniga, *La saga di Itis nella tradizione letteraria e mitografica greco-romana* (Milan, 1951), 2.10–14.

< × – ⏑ – × – ⏑ > ἔδνα τῶν γάμων
αὐτῇ δίδωσι μηκέτι †λαλεῖν

Although there are other, less straightforward ways of remoulding Tatius' phrase into verse, this is by far the most economical one: it requires no more change than spreading the phrase over two successive lines.[20] Still, an iambic sequence of barely more than a dozen syllables is hardly proof that we have before us a tragic quotation. As Aristotle famously remarked (*Poet.* 1449A24-7), Greek has an intrinsic propensity for the iambic rhythm, and so we cannot discard the possibility that the iambic string identified above may be an accidental one. But it is surely a striking coincidence that the passage containing the distinctly tragic theme of the 'perverted gift' is also the one to scan as an iambic sequence; after all, as we shall see, Tatius does seem, on a couple of other occasions, to preserve iambic trimeters, which may or may not come from tragedy. However that may be, it is important to stress from the outset that I am not concerned with identifying verbatim tragic quotations in Tatius. My purpose is rather to show that Tatius' first-hand knowledge of a Tereus-tragedy may have rubbed off on his account of the Tereus myth in *Leucippe*—perhaps even to the point of preserving traces of the original tragic wording. But before seeking to establish Tatius' dependence on a tragic source we must address a number of metrical and linguistic difficulties in the iambic passage identified above.

The most prominent of these difficulties is the sequence μηκέτι †λαλεῖν. Not only is it unmetrical, it also contains the linguistically inapposite λαλέω, which is both unattested in tragedy[21] and has, in classical Greek, a sense plainly unsuitable in this context ('chat idly', 'prattle'). But a verb meaning 'to speak' is clearly required here, and since λαλέω is a synonym for λέγω in late Greek (cf. LSJ s.v. I.3), it is possible that Tatius has simply inserted this prosaic substitute for whatever tragic idiom was used in his model—perhaps μηκέτι θροεῖν,[22] or better μηκέτ' αὐδᾶν. Another possibility, involving a clever *remaniement* of Tatius' text, is suggested to me by David Kovacs:

< × – ⏑ – × – ⏑ > ἔδνα τῶν γάμων
αὐτῇ δίδωσι μή τι γηρύειν ἔτι

At any rate, we are obviously unable to recover the exact wording of the original in this point, and so λαλεῖν is bound to remain a crux. To repeat: what we are seeking to

[20] I had originally thought this to be a single iambic trimeter, with perhaps the beginning of a second one: <τῇ δ'> ἔδνα τῶν γάμων {αὐτῇ} δίδωσι μηκέτι | †λαλεῖν. This, however, would involve a middle caesura that is best avoided. J. Diggle has eliminated all putative bisected trimeters in Euripides—see his *Euripidea* (Oxford, 1994), 82–4, 314, 475, n. 158. Some hard cases do remain in Aeschylus and Sophocles (see S. L. Schein, *The Iambic Trimeter in Aeschylus and Sophocles* [Leiden, 1979], 21 with n. 11, 38 with n. 10), but they should not be multiplied *praeter necessitatem*. For the paucity of bisected trimeters in tragedy see the statistics offered by C. M. J. Sicking and M. van Raalte, *Griechische Verslehre*, Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft, Abt. 2, T.4 (München, 1993), 96; for the possible effect of such lines see esp. G. Stephen, *Die Ausdruckskraft der caesura media im iambischen Trimeter der attischen Tragödie* (Königstein/Ts., 1981), 86–125, esp. 115–17; cf. also Schein, op. cit., 21; Sicking and van Raalte, op. cit., 97; J. Descroix, *Le trimètre iambique* (Macon, 1931), 274–5. The shrewd solution of positing line-end at τῶν γάμων was suggested to me by both the *CQ* reader and David Kovacs.

[21] The sole (apparent) exception is an erroneous *uaria lectio* in Soph. *Phil.* 110 λαλεῖν, where λακεῖν is to be read.

[22] Lengthening of a final short vowel before voiceless plosive + liquid is exceptional in tragic dialogue, but not everyone agrees that it is impossible: see e.g. Descroix (n. 20) 18–19; Dale on Eur. *Alc.* 542; M. L. West, *Greek Metre* (Oxford, 1982) 16–7 with n. 32.

establish is not that Tatius has preserved an intact tragic fragment, but rather that direct and thorough knowledge of a classical Tereus-tragedy informs Tatius' treatment of the Tereus myth.

There are some further problems of phraseology. In tragedy, occurrences of ἔδνα are very limited:[23] no more than three passages in Euripides' *Andromache* (2, 153, 873), and a single passage in *Prometheus Bound* (559–60 ὅτε τὰν ὁμοπάτριον ἔδνοις | ἄγαγες Ἡσιόναν πιθὼν δάμαρτα κοινόλεκτρον). In the Tatius passage, the sense of ἔδνα is clearly 'wedding gifts given by the prospective bridegroom to obtain a bride': the cutting of Philomela's tongue was Tereus' perverted 'wedding-gift' to her for their abominable 'wedding'. However, in the three Euripidean passages, the meaning of the word is 'dowry given a nubile girl by her father',[24] and it is only in the *Prometheus* passage that ἔδνα means *Brautgaben* as it does in the Tatius. To complicate matters further, the *Prometheus* passage has been held textually suspect, and removal of the crucial ἔδνοις has been advised.[25] Still, *Brautgaben* is by far the commonest meaning of ἔδνα/ἔεδνα in Homer,[26] and there is no reason why the author of the tragic passage on which Tatius was presumably drawing should not have followed (unlike Euripides) standard Homeric usage. And it is conceivably as a conscious Homerism that both Page and West retain ἔδνοις in their *Prometheus* texts. Admittedly, Homeric ἔεδνα are given by the suitor to the bride's father rather than (as our fragment and the *Prometheus* passage imply)[27] to the bride herself. But such passages as *Iliad* 11.241–5 may have left room for ambiguous interpretations already in antiquity, especially at a time when the giving of ἔδνα had become an antiquated custom. We know for sure that later authors (such as Strabo, Pausanias, Aelian, and Philostratus Jun.; see next paragraph) clearly treated ἔδνα as presents offered *directly* to the bride.[28]

Now, since ἔδνα can only be meant for γάμοι, the phrase ἔδνα τῶν γάμων is likely to appear pleonastic, and even syntactically awkward. Still, the self-same phrase or closely similar ones occur on at least nine occasions, with ἔδνα (or, less commonly, ἔδνον) signifying consistently *Brautgaben*, as it does in the Tatius. The passages are: Strabo 10.2.19 τὸ τῆς Ἀμαλθείας . . . κέρας . . . ὁ Ἡρακλῆς . . . ἔδωκεν Οἰνεῖ τῶν γάμων ἔδνον; Philostratus Junior, *Imagines* 4 (2.398.14–15 Kayser) προτείνει δὲ αὐτῇ [sc. Ἡρακλῆς Δηιανείρᾳ] τὸ τοῦ Ἀχελώου κέρας οἷον ἔδνον τοῦ γάμου; Nonnus 4.39, 5.227 ἔδνα γάμων; 5.576, 42.397, 42.402 ἔδνα γάμοιο; Pausanias 10.31.10 . . . καὶ ἡ Νηλέως Πηρώ· ταύτης ἔδνα τῶν γάμων βοῦς ὁ Νηλεὺς ἤγετι τὰς Ἰφίκλου.[29] But the passage which is of the greatest interest to us is Aelian, *Varia Historia* 13.1 (155.18–19 Dilts), where a couple of lewd Centaurs chasing Atalanta with a view to raping her are described as κακοὶ μνηστῆρες, σὺν ὕβρει καὶ οἴστρῳ τὰ ἔδνα τῶν γάμων προεκτελοῦντες. The wedding metaphor here serves of course to create a

[23] See P. T. Stevens (ed.), *Euripides: Andromache* (Oxford, 1971), on Eur. *And.* 2.

[24] See Stevens (n. 23), ad locc. Cf. also ἐδνόομαι, 'to provide a girl with dowry' (in Eur. *Hel.* 933, ἐδνώσομαι is Hermann's generally accepted emendation of MSS ἐκδώσομαι *uel sim.*).

[25] See M. Griffith (ed.), *Aeschylus: Prometheus Bound* (Cambridge, 1983), 558–60. It was K. Lachmann (*De choricis systematis tragicorum Graecorum libri IV* [Berlin, 1819], 54n.) who first deleted ἔδνοις, *teste* M. L. West (ed.), *Aeschylus: Tragoediae* (Stuttgart and Leipzig, 1998²), in app. crit. ad loc.

[26] See M. Schmidt in *LfgrE* s.v. ἔδνα, ἔεδνα B.1 (vol. II, 396–7).

[27] On the latter passage see. E. E. Sikes and J. B. Wynne Willson (edd.), *Αἰσχύλου Προμηθεὺς Δεσμώτης: The Prometheus Vinctus of Aeschylus* (London, 1898), 559.

[28] See also Herodian *Π. παθῶν* [201[c]], *Gramm. Graec.* II.1 240.26 Lentz ἔδνα τὰ πρὸ τοῦ γάμου ὑπὸ τοῦ νυμφίου διδόμενα δῶρα τῇ νύμφῃ.

[29] Cf. also Paus. 4.36.3 ταύτας γὰρ δὴ τὰς βοῦς [sc. Ἰφίκλου] Νηλεὺς ἔδνα ἐπὶ τῇ θυγατρὶ ἤγετι τοὺς μνωμένους.

poignantly ironical effect: the attempted rape of Atalanta is the exact negation of a proper wedding, and so both her 'suitors' and their 'wedding gifts' (*τὰ ἔδνα τῶν γάμων*) are but perversions of their ritually proper counterparts. Like Tatius, Aelian may be echoing here the common *tragic* mannerism which we identified above, namely the ironical use of nuptial terminology to describe improper sexual unions.[30] There remains, however, the problem of the definite article in *τῶν γάμων* in the Tatius passage: it is distinctly prosaic (the above examples of *τὰ ἔδνα τῶν γάμων uel sim.* all come, significantly, from prose authors), and it will not do to try to justify it as a deictic, heightening the denunciation of the horrendous act ('as a gift for *this* so-called wedding'). The definite article here is yet another reminder that we cannot hope to retrieve Sophocles' *ipsissima uerba*.

The preceding considerations may also serve as potential signposts for specifying, however conjecturally, the context of the tragic passage that lies behind the Tatius. 'He offers her as a wedding gift the deprivation of her speech' has a distinctive narrative ring about it: it comes in all likelihood from a passage *relating* the particulars of Tereus' crime. At the same time, its excoriation of the crime as a shocking perversion of marital customs is surely designed to add pathos and poignancy to the narrative. It is thus conceivable that Tatius' model was a messenger speech recounting, in an emotional and agitated manner, the tragic circumstances of Philomela's rape and mutilation. We may envisage a Lichas-like character as the deliverer of this speech, who would have first tried to conceal from Procne the horrible truth, but then found himself compelled to reveal it when Procne presented him with Philomela's tell-tale fabric: it has been suggested that fr. 588 Radt (*θάρσει· λέγων τἀληθὲς οὐ σφαλῇ ποτε*) comes precisely from such a scene.[31]

As intimated above, there are a few more iambic sequences in Tatius' novel that *may* originate in tragedy. Apart from 6.2.5 *τὸ σοὶ δοκοῦν κἀμοὶ δοκεῖ καλῶς ἔχειν*,[32] which may or may not come from a tragedy, there is at least one more iambic trimeter which stands good chances of being a tragic quotation. This is to be found in 5.17.3, in the context of a supplication addressed by an enslaved (and disguised) Leucippe to her mistress Melite:

Ἐλέησον, ἔφη, δέσποινα, γυνὴ γυναῖκα, ἐλευθέραν μέν, ὡς ἔφυν, δούλην δὲ νῦν, ὡς δοκεῖ τῇ Τύχῃ.

Although the trimeter is not to be found in extant tragedy, it is certainly applicable to the situation of many a tragic heroine—Tecmessa or Polyxena or Andromache, to name but a few. Thus, in Euripides' *Hecuba* 420, Polyxena laments: *δούλη θανοῦμαι, πατρὸς οὖσ' ἐλευθέρου*. An even closer parallel to the Tatius passage occurs, as Vilborg has remarked,[33] in Tecmessa's imploratory speech in Sophocles' *Ajax* 487–9:

[30] See above, p. 223. For both Aelian and Tatius, familiarity with classical tragedy would have been a cultural marker, as it regularly was among the educated élite in late antiquity: see B. Schouler, 'Les sophistes et le théâtre au temps des empereurs', in P. Ghiron-Bistagne and B. Schouler (edd.), *Anthropologie et Théâtre antique: Actes du colloque international de Montpellier 6–8 mars 1986*, Cahiers du GITA no. 3 (Montpellier, 1987), 273–94, esp. 273–5; also, more recently P. Easterling and R. Miles, 'Dramatic identities: tragedy in late antiquity', in R. Miles (ed.), *Constructing Identities in Late Antiquity* (London and New York, 1999), 95–111, esp. 102–5.

[31] Cf. N. C. Hourmouziades, 'Sophocles' Tereus', in J. H. Betts, J. T. Hooker, and J. R. Green (edd.), *Studies in Honour of T. B. L. Webster* 1 (Bristol, 1988) 134–42 (here 137) = id. *Θεατρικὲς Διαδρομές* (Athens, 2003), 147–8.

[32] The trimeter was detected by Vilborg (n. 12), 107.

[33] (n. 12), 100.

ἐγὼ δ' ἐλευθέρου μὲν ἐξέφυν πατρός [. . .]
νῦν δ' εἰμὶ δούλη· θεοῖς γὰρ ὧδ' ἔδοξέ που.

Tragic quotation in Tatius is not, therefore, unlikely in itself. And while ἕδνα τῶν γάμων | αὐτῇ δίδωσι μηκέτι †λαλεῖν cannot, as we have seen, be a verbatim quotation from a tragedy, it is likely to preserve the spirit, and even perhaps part of the language, of a tragic passage. In what follows, I shall set myself the task of demonstrating that Tatius did, in all probability, have direct access to a Tereus-tragedy, probably Sophocles' *Tereus*, rather than drawing his knowledge of the myth from intermediate literary treatments or from sub-literary sources.

TATIUS' SOURCES, AND THE FRAGMENT'S AUTHORSHIP

If ἕδνα τῶν γάμων | αὐτῇ δίδωσι μηκέτι †λαλεῖν is indeed a tragic reminiscence, what could be Tatius' source for it? To be sure, identifying Tatius' source(s) for this passage is inevitably a hazardous enterprise, with results bordering on the tendentious. The ancient texts relating or alluding to the myth of Tereus are quite numerous, and any one of them (or none of them) could have been the model for Tatius' version.[34] Still, a fair amount of thematic correspondences with Ovid's celebrated account of the myth in *Metamorphoses* 6.412–674 gives us reason to wonder whether Tatius has modelled his narrative on that of the Latin poet, or whether both of them draw on a common source, possibly a Tereus-tragedy, that is now inaccessible to us. If there was one celebrated Tereus-tragedy in antiquity, this was Sophocles' *Tereus*.[35] It seems to have enjoyed remarkable popularity,[36] and it has indeed very often been posited as the model for Ovid's treatment of the Tereus myth.[37] Still, the possibility of some Roman intermediary between Sophocles and Ovid has also been raised time and again.

One of these possible intermediaries is Accius' *Tereus* (frs. 634–50 Ribbeck[3] ~ 639–55 Warmington ~ 439–54 Dangel), an obvious suggestion, especially given its attested popularity on the stage.[38] Still, its exiguous remains make it hard to determine whether, and to what extent, it has influenced Ovid, the more so since we

[34] The basic ancient sources for the Tereus myth are listed by A. C. Pearson (ed.), *The Fragments of Sophocles* 2 (Cambridge, 1917), 221–3.

[35] Philocles I also wrote a *Tereus* (*TrGF* 24 F 1; cf. T 6c), which however is highly unlikely to have been of any consequence, given the universally negative reputation this tragedian seems to have had in antiquity; cf. *TrGF* 24 T 1–5, 8–9.

[36] Aristophanes' parody (*Av.* 100–1) suggests that in the late fifth century *Tereus* was a well-enough known play to have afforded room for satire.

[37] See e.g. F. G. Welcker, *Die griechischen Tragödien mit Rücksicht auf den epischen Cyclus* I (Bonn, 1839), 376; Cazzaniga (n. 19), 1.92–3; B. Otis, *Ovid as an Epic Poet* (Cambridge, 1970[2]), 211, 406–10, who none the less also favours Accius' *Tereus* as a parallel model (cf. immediately below in the text, and n. 39); H. Hofmann, 'Ausgesprochene und unausgesprochene motivische Verwebung im sechsten Metamorphosenbuch Ovids', *Acta Classica* 14 (1971), 91–107 (here 97); W. M. Calder III, 'Sophocles, Tereus: a Thracian tragedy', *Thracia* 2 (1974) 87–91, in a paper that is otherwise very badly argued; G. Dobrov, 'The tragic and comic Tereus', *AJPh* 114 (1993), 189–243 (here 199); D. F. Sutton, *The Lost Sophocles* (Lanham, MD, 1984) 128; for further bibliography see F. Bömer (ed.), *P. Ovidius Naso Metamorphosen, Buch VI–VII* (Heidelberg, 1976), 117.

[38] Cic. *Att.* 16.2 (= 412) 3; 16.5 (= 410) 1; *Philipp.* 1.15.36; cf. G. Mihailov, 'La légende de Térée', *Annuaire de l'Université de Sophia: Faculté des Lettres* 50.2 (1955), 75–199 (here 124). For possible political reasons behind the popularity of Accius' *Tereus* see R. Degl'Innocenti Pierini, 'Il barbaro Tereo di Accio: attualizzazione e funzionalità ideologica di un mito greco', in S. Faller and G. Manuwald (edd.), *Identitäten und Alteritäten* Bd. 13 (Würzburg, 2002), 127–39, at 128–36.

cannot know to what extent Accius himself depended on Sophocles.[39] The only graspable piece of evidence is fr. 636–9 R^3 ~ 639–42 W ~ 439–42 D, describing the moment when Tereus first laid eyes on Philomela: *Tereus indomito more atque animo barbaro | conspexit in eam; amore uecors flammeo | depositus* . . . This has been compared with *Met*. 6.458–60 (*sed et hunc* [sc. *Terea*] *innata libido | exstimulat pronumque genus regionibus illis | in Venerem est*, also quoted more fully below on p. 230), and 465–6 (*effreno captus amore* [sc. Tereus] . . . *nec capiunt inclusas pectora flammas*).[40] Although the excoriation of barbarian lechery in both Accius and Ovid *may* indeed point to the latter's dependence on the former, the image of the flaring up of erotic desire is simply a threadbare commonplace, not evidence of influence.[41] Apart from this verbal parallel, the hypothesis of Ovid's dependence on Accius rests on extremely flimsy ground. Thus, those scholars who postulate such a link do so only by arbitrarily proclaiming that the setting of Accius' play, like that of Ovid's narrative, was 'the triennial festival of Dionysus when the matrons haunted the mountains by night', and that Procne set out to 'seek her sister among the Maenads on the mountains'.[42] It has even been speculated that the Sophoclean *Tereus*, Accius' probable model, was also set during a trieteric festival of Dionysus.[43] However, there is very little, both in Accius and in Sophocles, to support such a hypothesis. Accius' fr. 642 R^3 = 647 W = 445 D, where someone is encouraged to pray in a servile fashion to Dionysus (*deum Cadmogena natum Semela adfare et famulanter pete*), is too unspecific: a petition to Dionysus is entirely suitable in a play set in Thrace.[44] And in what remains of Sophocles' *Tereus*, there is not the tiniest shred of evidence to suggest

[39] For one, A. Kiso, *The Lost Sophocles* (New York, 1984), 59 envisaged a direct dependence of Accius on Sophocles as a strong likelihood. Among the advocates of Ovid's dependence on Accius are also e.g. Otis (n. 37), 406–10 (Accius as a parallel model together with Sophocles, cf. above n. 37); Sutton (n. 37), 130; Dobrov (n. 37), 199 with n. 25. For a statement of the argument and for relevant bibliography see D. Fitzpatrick, 'Sophocles' *Tereus*', *CQ* n.s. 51 (2001), 90–101, here 92 nn. 14–15, who remains wisely agnostic as to a possible dependence of Accius on Sophocles; cf. already Mihailov's hesitations ([n. 38], 100, 104, 124). The latest contribution to the problem is Degl'Innocenti Pierini (n. 6), 88–90, who favours Accius' dependence on Sophocles.

[40] For a detailed comparison see Cazzaniga (n. 19), 2.30, who none the less warns that the similarities between Accius and Ovid are most probably due to their common model, namely Sophocles' *Tereus* (cf. also Cazzaniga, op. cit., 1.93 on Ovid's independence from Accius).

[41] On lechery as a barbarian attribute (already in Sophocles' *Tereus*?) see below p. 231; cf. now also Degl'Innocenti Pierini (n. 38), 133 with n. 47. On variations 'des klassischen Motivs vom plötzlichen Aufflammen der Liebe' see Bömer (n. 37), 130–1, who none the less marshals this very passage as evidence of Ovid's imitation of Accius: see now the good arguments of Degl'Innocenti Pierini (n. 38), 131–3 on the Hellenistic provenance of the motif.

[42] Thus e.g. E.H. Warmington (ed.), *Remains of Old Latin* (Cambridge, MA and London, 1936), 2.543, 545 (*ad* frr. 645–6), whence the quotations.

[43] Cf. e.g. Welcker (n. 37), 382; new arguments but similar conclusions in Cazzaniga (n. 19) 1.48, 51–5; Calder (n.37), 89; Kiso (n. 39), 66–8; much more nuanced, but ultimately unconvincing is the thesis of D. Curley, 'Ovid's *Tereus*: theater and metatheater', in A. Sommerstein (ed.), *Shards from Kolonos: Studies in Sophoclean Fragments* (Bari, 2003), 163–97, at 179–89; see for further doxography Dobrov (n. 37), 200 with n. 29, who also espouses this view (cf. also ibid., 205–7). As far as I can see, the only scholar to have vigorously denied a Dionysiac festival in Sophocles' *Tereus* is Mihailov (n. 38), 99–103.

[44] Cf. Mihailov (n. 38) 125: 'Térée et le chœur thrace parlent de Dionysos, car c'est lui le dieu thrace kat'exochèn.' I would venture to suggest that Accius' fragment might contain an advice to seek oracular guidance from Dionysus, whose Thracian oracle was well known from Attic tragedy. For 'Dionysus the Thracian seer' cf. E. *Hec.* 1267; for Dionysus' oracle situated either on Mt. Pangaion or on Mt. Haemus cf. Σ Eur. *Hec.* 1267 (1.89 Schwartz); Σ Eur. *Alc.* 968 (2.239 Schwartz); for Thracian 'prophets of Bacchus' (both historical and mythical) see Hdt. 7.111, [Eur.] *Rhes.* 972–3. Cf. further W. Baege, *De Macedonum sacris* (diss., Halle, 1913), 97–8; P. Perdrizet, *Cultes et mythes du Pangée* (Paris/Nancy, 1910), 37–43.

a Dionysiac setting. The trieteric festival may or may not have been an Ovidian innovation,[45] but in either case it should not be unproblematically introduced into reconstructions either of Accius' or of Sophocles' *Tereus*.[46]

Another tragedy by Accius, namely *Atreus* (frs. 197-234[1] R^3 ~ 162–200 W ~ 29–68 D), has been posited by Bömer[47] as a more likely ancestor of Ovid's treatment of the Tereus myth in *Metamorphoses* 6. It is undeniable that there are, at first sight, striking parallels between the two: Accius 220–2 R^3 ~ 187–9 W ~ 51–3 D (*concoquit | partem uapore flammae, ueribus in foco | lacerta tribuit*) would appear to be echoed in *Met*. 6.645–6 (*pars inde cauis exultat aenis, | pars ueribus stridunt*), while Accius 226 R^3 = 190 W ~ 57 D (*natis sepulchro ipse est parens*) is apparently reprised in *Met*. 6.665 (*seque uocat bustum miserabile nati*). None the less, the habit of partly boiling and partly roasting (sacrificial) meat has numerous precedents in Greek literature, sometimes even in connection to anthropophagy;[48] while the idea of a father being the tomb of the son(s) he has eaten may as well be a recasting of Gorgias' notorious image of vultures as 'living tombs' (ἔμψυχοι τάφοι, 82 B 5a D-K).[49] This is not to say that Ovid cannot be drawing on Accius, only that this cannot be proved on the extant evidence. And it is possible, at any rate, that Ovid's intertextual background consisted of Sophocles' *Tereus* as well as Accius' *Atreus*. Bömer is even less convincing when he asserts that positing Accius' *Atreus* as Ovid's literary ancestor can best account for a number of thematic and verbal resemblances between the Tereus story in *Metamorphoses* 6 and Seneca's *Thyestes*, a play that according to Bömer would also be modelled on Accius' *Atreus*.[50] While one cannot, and should not, rule out the possibility of Accius' being a direct influence on Seneca, Bömer's categorical assertion of their intertextual relation is surely overstated—indeed, it is even odd, given that Seneca explicitly models his treatment of the Thyestes myth on the fable of Tereus, which means that in all likelihood his primary intertext is Ovid's Tereus-narrative in *Metamorphoses* 6. Especially revealing is *Thyestes* 56–7 where *Thracium nefas* refers to Procne's child-murder as a precedent for Atreus' imminent act; also, 272–7 where Atreus expressly parallels his situation with that of the *domus Odrysia* (272–3), and

[45] J. March, 'Sophocles' *Tereus* and Euripides' *Medea*', in Sommerstein (n. 43), 139–61 (here 149) speculates that the Dionysiac element in Ovid may be an intrusion from an older Procne-story, in which child-murder was perhaps a punishment for reluctance to join in Dionysiac rites; cf. also J. March, 'Vases and tragic drama: Euripides' *Medea* and Sophocles' lost *Tereus*', in N. K. Rutter and B. A. Sparkes (edd.), *Word and Image in Ancient Greece* (Edinburgh, 2000), 119–39, at 131.

[46] Cf. Sutton (n. 37), 129, 131; A.P. Burnett, *Revenge in Attic and Later Tragedy*, Sather Classical Lectures 62 (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London, 1998), 182 n. 16. As for Livius Andronicus' *Tereus*, its extant fragments (frs. 24–29 Warmington) are so lamentably scanty that absolutely no conclusions are to be drawn with regard to its model (cf. Sutton [n. 37], 131; doxography in Mihailov [n. 38], 121–4).

[47] Bömer (n. 37), 117.

[48] For example, Pl. *Euthd.* 301C, Diod. Sic. 1.84.5, 2.59.1; anthropophagy: Hdt. 1.119.3; Eur. *Cyc.* 358; Pl. *Euthd.* 301D; see further W. Burkert, *Homo Necans*, tr. P. Bing (Berkeley, 1983), 89 n. 29. A few of these precedents are acknowleged by Bömer himself (n. 37), 171, who also provides Latin parallels and secondary bibliography.

[49] Cf. Bömer himself (n. 37), 176, who also gives a wealth of other Latin parallels. See also more recently S. D. Kaufhold, 'Ovid's Tereus: fire, birds, and the reification of figurative language', *CPh* 92 (1997), 66–71, at 70.

[50] Such resemblances include e.g. *Met*. 6.557–60 ~ *Thy.* 728–9; *Met*. 6.612–23 ~ *Thy.* 255–9; *Met*. 6.655 ~ *Thy.* 1030–1. See Bömer (n. 37), 117. The parallelisms were already pointed out by Cazzaniga (n. 19), 2.71–2.

even invokes Procne and Philomela for guidance in his act, hoping that he may even surpass them in originality.[51] Interestingly, one of the parallelisms between Ovid and Seneca cited by Bömer—namely, *Metamorphoses* 6.612ff. and *Thyestes* 255–6, where several possible means of vengeance (including sword and fire) are considered and then discarded—seems to stem ultimately from a Greek tragic source, namely Euripides' *Medea* 378–80 (not cited by Bömer), where Medea similarly entertains and then rejects the possibility of attacking Jason with fire or sword. While here Seneca may be simply drawing on Ovid, it is equally possible, if not even more likely, that he points to the Euripidean *Medea* as his primary intertext, especially since he seems to have done so elsewhere in his *Thyestes*.[52] If Seneca, with all his Ovidian literary luggage, may hark back to a Greek source, there is all the more reason to entertain the likelihood that Ovid modelled his version of the Tereus myth in the *Metamorphoses* on a Greek tragedian rather than on a Roman intermediary. As a consequence, it would also be unwise to attribute the similarities between Ovid's and Tatius' versions of the myth merely to the latter's echoing directly the former, and we should be prepared to explore the possibility that both of them are drawing independently on a common model, namely Sophocles' *Tereus*.

Surprisingly enough, however, Tatius' relation to Sophocles' play has never been dealt with, except in a tangential fashion.[53] In what follows, I shall attempt to identify parallelisms between Ovid and Tatius, and to explore the extent to which each one of them may have been influenced by Sophocles' treatment of the Tereus myth. Here is a selection of six such instances:

(1) Tatius 5.5.2 *βαρβάροις δέ, ὡς ἔοικεν, οὐχ ἱκανὴ πρὸς Ἀφροδίτην μία γυνή, μάλισθ' ὅταν αὐτῷ καιρὸς διδῷ πρὸς ὕβριν τρυφᾶν*[54] ~ Ov. *Met*. 6.458–60 *sed et hunc* (sc. *Terea*) *innata libido | exstimulat pronumque genus regionibus illis | in Venerem est; flagrat uitio gentisque suoque.*

(2) Tatius 5.5.8 *ἐδείπνησεν ὁ Τηρεὺς δεῖπνον Ἐρινύων* ~ Ov. *Met*. 6.661–2 *Thracius ... | uipereasque ciet Stygia de ualle sorores.*[55]

(3) Tatius 5.3.6 *ἐσπάρακτο τὰς κόμας ἡ γυνή* ~ Ov. *Met*. 6.531 *passos laniata capillos.*

(4) Tatius 5.5.4 *ἡ γὰρ Φιλομήλας τέχνη σιωπῶσαν εὗρηκε φωνήν* ~ Ov. *Met*. 6.574–5 *grande doloris | ingenium est miserisque uenit sollertia rebus.*[56]

[51] Cf. R. J. Tarrant (ed.), *Seneca's Thyestes* (Atlanta, 1985), 272–7; also, more explicitly, id., 'Chaos in Ovid's Metamorphoses and its Neronian influence', *Arethusa* 35 (2002), 349–60 (here 355). For a subtle analysis of the modalities of Seneca's response, in *Thyestes*, both to Ovid's treatment of the Tereus myth and to Accius' *Atreus* see most recently A. Schiesaro, *The Passions in Play: Thyestes and the Dynamics of Senecan Drama* (Cambridge, 2003), esp. 31, 71, 79, 83–5 (with n. 34), 101–2, 142, 179–80.

[52] Cf. *Thy*. 176 *ignaue, iners, eneruis* . . ., and Eur. *Med*. 807–8 *φαύλην κἀσθενῆ . . . ἡσυχαίαν*. The parallel is pointed out by Schiesaro (n. 51), 17 with n. 28.

[53] Cf. e.g. Welcker (n. 37), 379; Pearson as cited below in n. 87; Parsons (below, n. 76) 50. Further bibliography in Degl'Innocenti Pierini (n. 6), 90 n. 24, who also comments on the sparsity of detailed comparisons between Tatius and Sophocles.

[54] Cf. also 5.3.5 *Θρᾷξ ὁ Τηρεὺς ἐνύφαντο Φιλομήλᾳ παλαίων πάλην Ἀφροδίσιον*, where the peculiar position of *Θρᾷξ* is likely calculated to bring out Tereus' barbarian origin; cf. Vilborg (n. 12), 94.

[55] Ovid had anticipated this by pointing out, at the outset of his narrative, that the wedding of Tereus and Procne was not blessed by Juno, Hymen, and Gratia; rather, *Eumenides tenuere faces de funere raptas | Eumenides strauere torum* (*Met*. 6.430–1).

[56] Ovid's formulation has, of course, a decidedly sententious ring that is absent from Tatius; for gnomic parallels see Bömer (n. 37), ad loc. (p. 157).

(5) Tatius 5.5.5 *τὴν γλῶτταν μιμεῖται ἡ χείρ* ~ Ov. *Met*. 6.609 *pro uoce manus fuit*.[57]

(6) Tatius 5.3.8 *ἀναπηδῶν ἐκ τῆς κλίνης ὁ Τηρεὺς ἐγέγραπτο, καὶ ἕλκων τὸ ξίφος ἐπὶ τὰς γυναῖκας τὸ σκέλος ἤρειδεν ἐπὶ τὴν τράπεζαν· ἡ δὲ οὔτε ἕστηκεν οὔτε πέπτωκεν, ἀλλ' ἐδείκνυε γραφὴν μέλλοντος πτώματος* ~ Ov. *Met*. 6.661, 666 *Thracius intenti mensas clamore repellit ... nunc sequitur nudo genitas Pandione ferro*.

By reason of their paucity, the surviving fragments of Sophocles' *Tereus* do not, in general, allow us to establish whether the above correspondences are the result of Tatius' modelling his narrative on Ovid's own, or whether both Ovid and Tatius depend on Sophocles' *Tereus*. There are, however, two instances in which extant *Tereus* fragments are liable to have been the common source of parallel passages in Ovid and Tatius. Firstly, both Tatius 5.5.2 and Ovid *Met*. 6.458–60 (quotation no. 1 above), in which the barbarians' greed for women is disparaged, may hark back to fr. 587 Radt from Sophocles' *Tereus*, which also denounces barbarian greed: *φιλάργυρον μὲν πᾶν τὸ βάρβαρον γένος*. True, this is a different kind of greed, namely greed for money. Still, greediness for money and greediness for sex are often associated in Greek sources as typical traits of the barbarian character. This is especially true of Greek tragedy: in Euripides' *Helen*, Theoclymenus, both a tyrant and a barbarian (like Tereus),[58] lusts after Helen with the bloodthirstiness of a hunter chasing his prey;[59] and in Aeschylus' *Supplices* (838–41), the Egyptian herald threatens the Danaids with acts of terrible violence if they do not succumb to the amorous advances of Aegyptus' sons.[60] Outside tragedy, too, lechery and avarice are typically attributed to barbarians. This is particularly brought out in the Herodotean story of the Persian satrap Artayctes, *ἀνὴρ μὲν Πέρσης, δεινὸς δὲ καὶ ἀτάσθαλος*,[61] who insidiously appropriated the numerous valuable offerings deposited in Protesilaus' temple at Elaeus, and brought women into the temple, where he engaged in sexual orgies with them.[62] Another Herodotean character, the significantly *Persian* Otanes, points out, on the strength of Anatolian examples, that a despot is prone to envy other people's goods, despite the fact that he lacks nothing, and to do sexual violence to women.[63] Moreover, it is surely significant that crimes of lust and seizure of property are typically imputed to Greek tyrants in their capacity as wielders of absolute power and thus as being perilously close to *barbarian* despotism;[64] indeed, Greek tyrants are sometimes said to take their cue from their *barbarian* counterparts.[65]

[57] The similarity has also been detected by Bömer (n. 37), ad loc. (p. 164), who also adds, for the idea of the 'speaking hand', Nonn. 4.321 *σιγαλέης λάλον εἶμα δυσηλακάτου Φιλομήλης*, and (more pertinently) Eust. *Comm. Od*. 19.518 p. 1875.8 *ἀλλ' ἡ Πρόκνη ἐν ἱστῷ ἐξυφαίνει τὴν βίαν, καὶ ἐπεὶ μὴ εἶχε τῇ γλώττῃ, ἐκφαίνει τῇ χειρί*.

[58] On Sophocles' Tereus as a stereotypical tyrant see F. Angiò, 'Il "Tereo" di Sofocle e Tucidide II 29,3: tra mito e storia', *QS* 32 (1990), 147–58, at 153–4.

[59] 1173–6 (prepared to slaughter Helen's potential abductors); 63, 314 (sexual pursuit as hunting).

[60] See further E. Hall, *Inventing the Barbarian: Greek Self-Definition through Tragedy* (Oxford, 1989), 113, 125–6.

[61] Hdt. 9.116.1.

[62] Hdt. 7.33 *ὃς καὶ ἐς τοῦ Πρωτεσίλεω τὸ ἱερὸν ἐς Ἐλαιοῦντα ἀγινεόμενος γυναῖκας ἀθέμιστα ἔρδεσκε*; 9.116.3 *ἐν τῷ ἀδύτῳ γυναιξὶν ἐμίσγετο*.

[63] Hdt. 3.80.2–6, esp. 3.80.4 *τὰ μὲν γὰρ ὕβρι κεκορημένος ἔρδει πολλὰ καὶ ἀτάσθαλα, τὰ δὲ φθόνῳ. καίτοι ἄνδρα γε τύραννον ἄφθονον ἔδει εἶναι, ἔχοντά γε πάντα τἀγαθά*; 3.80.5 *βιᾶται γυναῖκας*.

[64] For the association of despotism with (very often Oriental) barbarians cf. e.g. trag. adesp. fr. 359 Kannicht-Snell *ἰὼ τυραννὶ βαρβάρων ἀνδρῶν φίλη*, and note that the first instance of the word *τυραννίς* in Greek literature is in connection with the *Lydian* Gyges, Archil. fr. 19 West.

[65] Pl. *Symp*. 182B–C.

Thus, Plato attributes rapaciousness to tyrants in general,[66] while Herodotus says specifically of Cypselus that he deprived many citizens of their personal goods,[67] and that his son Periander, being even more bloodthirsty than his father,[68] ordered all Corinthian women to surrender their best clothes for the sake of his dead wife Melissa—the same Melissa with whom he had even had sexual intercourse after her death.[69] Thereby, Periander combined extreme lechery with extreme rapaciousness.[70] As well as with other barbarians, avarice and lust are also explicitly associated with *Thracians*. In an unknown play by Aeschylus, Thracians as a group are designated a race of polygamists,[71] while in Thucydides they are collectively branded as avid for material gain.[72] It is, therefore, likely that fr. 587 Radt from Sophocles' *Tereus*, which deplores barbarian avarice, was part of a wider tirade against barbarian greed, including insatiable lechery.[73] If so, then Tatius 5.5.2, as well as the parallel passage from the *Metamorphoses* (6.458–60), may hark back to a tirade denouncing barbarian greed in Sophocles' *Tereus*.[74]

We shall now explore another case in which parallel passages in Ovid and Tatius may have a common ancestry in extant *Tereus* fragments. We have seen (quotation no. 2 on p. 230 above, and n. 55) that the idea of the Erinyes' involvement in the horrible events of the Tereus story is present on two occasions in *Metamorphoses* 6, namely 430–1 and 661–2; the former passage describes how the wedding of Tereus and Procne was attended by the Eumenides, while the latter shows Tereus invoking the

[66] For example, Pl. *Grg.* 466C (tyrants *ἀφαιροῦνται χρήματα*); *Resp.* 344A: *ἔστιν δὲ τοῦτο τυραννίς, ἢ οὐ κατὰ σμικρὸν τἀλλότρια καὶ λάθρᾳ καὶ βίᾳ ἀφαιρεῖται, καὶ ἱερὰ καὶ ὅσια καὶ ἴδια καὶ δημόσια, ἀλλὰ συλλήβδην.*

[67] Hdt. 5.92ε2 *πολλοὺς δὲ χρημάτων ἀπεστέρησε.*

[68] Hdt. 5.92ζ1.

[69] Hdt. 5.92η3 *νεκρῷ ἐούσῃ Μελίσσῃ ἐμίγη.*

[70] Significantly, in Parthenius' *Ἐρωτικὰ Παθήματα* xvii, Periander commits incest with his mother, albeit unwittingly: see J. L. Lightfoot (ed.), *Parthenius of Nicaea: The Poetical Fragments and the Ἐρωτικὰ Παθήματα* (Oxford, 1999), 484–6 on incest as an expression of a tyrant's insatiable appetite; cf. also the brilliant article by J.-P. Vernant, 'From Oedipus to Periander: lameness, tyranny, incest in legend and history', *Arethusa* 15 (1982), 19–38.

[71] A. fr. inc. fab. 376a Radt = Asclepiades *FGrHist* 12 F 10: *τοῖς Θρᾳξὶ νόμιμον εἶναι πολλαῖς τὸν ἕνα συνεῖναι.* On Thracian polygamy see also Hdt. 5.5, Eur. *And.* 215–18, Men. fr. 877 K.-A. For further references see Bömer (n. 37), *ad* 6.458 (pp. 131–2); cf. Hall (n. 60), 135–6.

[72] Thuc. 2.97: *. . . τὸν νόμον, ὄντα μὲν καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις Θρᾳξί, λαμβάνειν μᾶλλον ἢ διδόναι . . . οὐ γὰρ ἦν πρᾶξαι οὐδὲν μὴ διδόντα δῶρα.* The Thucydidean passage is cited by Pearson (n. 34), 231, *ad* fr. 587. Pearson (ibid.) also reminds us that in Euripides' *Hecuba* (710, 774) it is a Thracian, the King Polymestor, who 'kill[s] Polydorus in order to secure the gold which had been entrusted to him'. Cf. further K. Zacharia, ' "The Rock of the Nightingale": kinship diplomacy and Sophocles' *Tereus*', in F. Budelmann and P. Michelakis (edd.), *Homer, Tragedy and Beyond: Essays in Honour of P.E. Easterling* (London, 2001), 99.

[73] Yet another typically barbarian vice, namely *ἀκρατοποσία* (cf. Anacr. *PMG* 356b.3 Page; Hdt. 6.84, Ar. *Ach.* 75/78, Alex. fr. 9 K-A with Arnott on lines 3–4, Pl. *Leg.* 637E = Ath. 9.432a [Thracians]), *may* have been evoked in Philetaerus' comedy *Tereus*: cf. fr. 15 K-A (< × – > *πεπωκέναι δοκεῖ τὸν κατὰ δύο | καὶ τρεῖς ἀκράτου*), where two parts of water and three of wine indicate a particularly strong mixture (see van Leeuwen on Ar. *Eq.* 1187ff.). Cf. the version of the myth in a late (sixth century A.D.) source, namely Ps.-Nonnian., *Schol. mythol.* V 39* (Append.) *κατὰ δὲ τὴν ὁδὸν οἷα δὴ βάρβαρος οἰνηθεὶς* [sc. *Τηρεὺς*] *διαπαρθενεύει τὴν παῖδα*; cited from the edition of J. Nimmo Smith, *Pseudo-Nonniani in iv orationes Gregorii Nazianzeni commentarii*, Corpus Christianorum: Series Graeca 270 (Brepols, 1992), 271.13–14.

[74] For a different interpretation of fr. 587 see, however, Welcker (n. 37), 380. Kiso (n. 39), 76–84, among other scholars, has also pointed out that eventually Procne and Philomela come dangerously close to the brutality (if not to the avarice or the lechery) regularly associated with barbarians. Tereus' violation of sexual norms through his rape of Philomela may be associated, on a structural level, with his violation of dietary norms in paedophagy: see Zacharia (n. 72), 92.

Erinyes upon his realization of the true nature of the meal he has just had. The parallel passage in Tatius (5.5.8) specifically describes Tereus' dinner as one 'prepared by Erinyes' (*ἐδείπνησεν ὁ Τηρεὺς δεῖπνον Ἐρινύων*). Unmistakably, this evokes a distinctly tragic locution, in which the Erinyes are designated, *post eventum*, as the agents responsible for the catastrophe brought about by a fatal object. Thus, the cloth in which Agamemnon was trapped is qualified as *ὑφαντοῖς ἐν πέπλοις Ἐρινύων* (Aesch. *Ag.* 1580); the robe that kills Hercules is *Ἐρινύων ὑφαντὸν ἀμφίβληστρον* (Soph. *Trach.* 1051–2); and Teucer asks with regard to the sword with which Ajax killed himself: *ἆρ' οὐκ Ἐρινὺς τοῦτ' ἐχάλκευσε ξίφος;* (Soph. *Aj.* 1034).[75] This characteristically tragic motif seems also to have been present in Sophocles' *Tereus*, where the vengeful Procne herself is likely to have been visualized as an Erinys. This is suggested by an (unfortunately corrupt) passage in *POxy.* 3013 (A.D. 2nd/3rd cent.), which in all likelihood preserves the Hypothesis to Sophocles' play (the papyrus' first column begins with the heading *Τηρεύς· [ἡ ὑ]πόθεσις*):[76]

|[24] *ἐπιγνοῦσα δὲ ἡ Πρ[όκνη τὴν ἀλή-]*|[25] *θειαν ζηλοτυπ[ίᾳ τῇ ἐσχάτῃ]* |[26] *οἰστρηθεῖσα καὶ* [lac. ca. sept. litt. indic. ed. pr.] |[27] *νηυ.ερεινοις λα[βοῦσα τὸν]* |[28] *Ἴτυν ἐσφαγίασε [καὶ καθεψήσα-]*|[29] *σα παρέθηκε [τῷ Τηρεῖ κ.τ.λ.*

Procne, having realized the truth, goaded from extreme jealousy and [lacuna of ca. seven letters] ..ed(?) Erinys(?), grabbed Itys and slaughtered him, and after boiling his flesh she served it up to Tereus etc.

The lacuna marring the crucial passage in this fragment is likely to conceal a reference to Procne acting as an Erinys. It is along these lines that the emendations *[γενομέ]νη ὑπερινύς* (Parsons, who admits that the adjective is unattested), or *[μεμανημέ]νη ὑ<π>ὸ Ἐρινύ<ο>ς* (Rea) have been proposed.[77] If indeed Procne was somehow presented in Sophocles' play as an embodiment or agent of the Erinyes—as

[75] See Jebb on Soph. *Trach.* 1050ff., Kamerbeek on 1050–2, who also cites Lycophron 406–7 *Ἐρινύων πικρὰν . . . πάγην.*

[76] As *ed.pr.* P. Parsons remarks (*The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* xlii [1974], 47), '[i]f . . . our text is the hypothesis to a play, it is likely to be the play of Sophocles'. The heading *ὑπόθεσις*, of course, easily suggests an association with Dicaearchus' *Hypotheseis*, on which see M. W. Haslam, 'The authenticity of Euripides, *Phoenissae* 1–2 and Sophocles *Electra* 1', *GRBS* 16 (1975), 149–74 (here 150–5), who thinks (150 n. 3) that the hypothesis in question is 'almost certainly [from] Sophocles' [*Tereus*]'; J. Rusten, 'Dicaearchus and the *Tales from Euripides*', *GRBS* 23 (1982), 357–67; V. Liapis, 'An ancient *Hypothesis* to *Rhesus*, and Dicaearchus' *Hypotheseis*', *GRBS* 42 (2001), 313–28. Against this, Parsons (ibid.) argued that extant samples from Dicaearchus' *Hypotheseis* 'are at least attached to a particular play by the citation of the first line', whereas the papyrus scrap in question 'has nothing of the sort: and the question must arise, whether it is simply mythographic narrative, or whether the use of the word *ὑπόθεσις* proves connection with a play'. Still, as has been pointed out by Th. Gelzer, 'Sophokles' *Tereus*, eine Inhaltsangabe auf Papyrus', *Jahresbericht der Schweizerischen Geisteswiss. Ges.* (1976), 183–92, at 186–7, the omission of the play's *incipit* (and of the author's name) may simply mean that we have here a later *remaniement* of the Hypothesis that restricts itself to the bare essentials of the plot. In addition, it is surely significant that, as Gelzer (art. cit. 187) and Angiò (n. 70), 147 have remarked, the papyrus hypothesis accords in its essentials with the *Tereus* plot-summary given by Tzetzes (see below, n. 96): evidently, both the papyrus text and Tzetzes are drawing on closely similar material, i.e. surely on Sophocles' *Tereus* or on derivative texts based thereupon.

[77] Both emendations are reported by Parsons (n. 76), 50. Parsons also suggests a third alternative: '[W]e might try to read *νη ἡ δ' Ἐρεινοὶς* (for *-ὺς*): ". . . she, like a Fury, . . .". This runs into two difficulties: (*a*) *ῠερεινοις* looks a better reading than *ηερεινοις* (there is no sign of the left upright of *η*); (*b*) the sentence in 24–6 is left without a main verb.' For an indirect association of Erinys with Procne's infanticide cf. Nonn. 44.270.

human beings are often proclaimed to be in Greek tragedy[78]—then Tatius' *δεῖπνον 'Ερινύων* is likely to have retained a reminiscence of this tragic idiom.[79] Indeed, Tatius is likely to follow his Sophoclean model more closely than Ovid, for his introduction of *δεῖπνον 'Ερινύων* as a *post euentum* realization of the instrument of Tereus' ruin is entirely in keeping with tragic usage; on the contrary, we have seen that Ovid *anticipates* the Erinyes' involvement in the horrid outcome of Tereus' and Procne's wedding (see, once again, quotation no. 2 on p. 230 above, and n. 55).

Apart from this last one, there are in fact two more, and more significant, differences between Ovid's and Tatius' treatment of the myth. These demonstrate that, in all probability, Tatius' model was not (or not exclusively) Ovid, and that he is likely to have had direct knowledge of Sophocles' *Tereus*. Perhaps the most eye-catching of these divergences is the spectacular Bacchic element introduced by Ovid (*Met*. 6.587–600), when he presents Procne in maenadic costume, fawn-skin and all, storming the hut where her sister had been imprisoned, liberating her, and dressing her up as a bacchanal too, in order to facilitate her escape. Now, Tatius preserves no trace of such an episode, which would be intriguing if his sole or his principal model were Ovid, especially since Tatius is not otherwise averse to sensationalism. Given now that Sophocles' *Tereus* does not seem to have mentioned Procne's maenadism either, it would appear that Tatius had direct access to *Tereus*, without the mediation of Ovid. (The sole *Tereus* fragment that has been taken to suggest maenadism is fr. 586 Radt *σπεύδουσαν αὐτήν, ἐν δὲ ποικίλῳ φάρει*.[80] But it seems preferable to read *ἐν ποικίλῳ φάρει* as a reference to Philomela's woven fabric.[81] The fragment would thus come from a speech by Procne to the Chorus, in which she would be explaining the circumstances of the revelation of Tereus' crime: 'I was strongly urging Philomela to finish her fabric, although she was already hasting herself to do so [*σπεύδουσαν αὐτήν*];[82] and in the multi-coloured fabric that she had started weaving [*ἐν δὲ ποικίλῳ φάρει*], she depicted her rape'. Thus, there is no need to read *σπεύδουσαν* in an overly literal way, as referring to a running maenadic Philomela.)[83] The second significant

[78] Cf. e.g. Aesch. *Ag*. 749, Soph. *Trach*. 895, Eur. *Med*. 1260, *Tro*. 458, *Or*. 1389. See, however, the objections of Kaibel (on Soph. *El*. 1078), and Denniston and Page on Aesch. *Ag*. 744ff. It should be emphasized that *'Ερινύς* is never used in tragedy *merely* as a term of disparagement for criminal individuals nor is it used 'metapherisch' (so E. Wüst, s.v. 'Erinys', *RE* Suppl. 8 [1956], 118.18–34), but invariably retains its connection with the avenging spirits of the Underworld—unlike e.g. *ἀλάστωρ*, which does sometimes bear the meaning 'wretch', 'disastrous creature': see Wernicke, s.v. 'Alastor', *RE* 1.1 (1893), 1293.20–33, and cf. especially Euripides, fr. 513 Kannicht *ἀλάστορας* < . . . > *οὐκ ἐτόλμησε κτανεῖν*.

[79] Cf. Degl'Innocenti Pierini (n. 6), 91.

[80] Thus Welcker (n. 37), 381–2, who thought that *ἐν δὲ ποικίλῳ φάρει* referred to Procne's maenadic fawn-skin; so also more recently Dobrov (n. 37), 206 and Zacharia (n. 72), 93, 108.

[81] Thus Pearson (n. 34), 230, *ad* fr. 586; cf. also Hourmouziades (n. 31), 136–7 = 145; see also Kiso (n. 39) 68, and especially A. Casanova, 'Osservazioni sui frammenti del *Tereo*', in G. Avezzù (ed.), *Il dramma sofocleo: testo, lingua, interpretazione* (Stuttgart/Weimar, 2003), 59–68 (here 66). We may add that in Aesch. *Cho*. 1011–13 the cloth in which Agamemnon was murdered is termed *φᾶρος*, and is specifically designated as multi-coloured (1013 *πολλὰς βαφὰς . . . τοῦ ποικίλματος*). This cloth is usually translated as 'robe', but as Sommerstein on Aesch. *Eum*. 460–1 shows, what Aeschylus probably visualized was rather a piece of fabric with no holes for head or arms, thereby trussing up the wearer, very much like a shroud, which is another meaning of *φάρος*/*φᾶρος*: see Garvie on Aesch. *Cho*. 1010–11; Sommerstein on Aesch. *Eum*. 645–5.

[82] Cf. *Il*. 8.293 *τί με σπεύδοντα καὶ αὐτὸν ὀτρύνεις;*

[83] This means that I take the actual recognition by means of the fabric to have taken place inside the palace, and to have been announced to the audience in a speech by Procne (thus Hourmouziades [n. 31], 136–7 = 145, 147). This might be thought to spoil the dramatic tension of a potentially powerful scene, and thus it may seem preferable to have the revelation occur on

point of divergence is that in Ovid Philomela *writes* the story of her rape by 'threading purple letters into white woof' (577–8 *purpureasque notas filis intexuit albis,* | *indicium sceleris*), whereas in Tatius the fabric actually narrates *in pictures* the events surrounding Philomela's rape (5.3.5–6). It seems certain that in Sophocles' *Tereus*, too, Philomela's fabric narrated her story in images rather than letters: for in the same fr. 586 Radt (see again p. 234), Philomela's woven fabric is called *ποικίλον*, which is the *uox propria* for multi-coloured patterns or images, and can hardly have been used to designate woven letters.[84] In addition, it is significant that the 'lettered fabric' version of the myth seems to be the one prevalent in such sub-literary sources as mythographers, *progymnasmata*-authors and the like; this greatly weakens the possibility that Tatius might have acquired his knowledge of the Tereus myth second hand, as for instance from mythographic accounts.[85]

It will now be necessary to try to identify specific points of contact between Tatius and Sophocles, which may suggest a dependence of the former on the latter. We recall how Tatius (5.5.4–5) dwells on how Philomela's artful craft managed to lend 'voice' to an inanimate object, namely her shuttle, by means of which she made her story known: *ἡ γὰρ Φιλομήλας τέχνη σιωπῶσαν εὗρηκε φωνήν. ὑφαίνει γὰρ πέπλον ἄγγελον καὶ τὸ δρᾶμα πλέκει ταῖς κρόκαις . . . καὶ πρὸς αὐτὴν* [sc. to Procne] *ἃ πέπονθε τῇ κερκίδι λαλεῖ*. The striking image of the 'speaking shuttle' cannot but remind one[86] of the famous *ἡ τῆς κερκίδος φωνή* (fr. 595 Radt), which is the passage of Sophocles' *Tereus* that Aristotle quotes (more or less faithfully, it would appear) in the context of his discussion of dramatic recognitions.[87] The elliptical manner of

stage. However, in Sophocles' *Trachiniae*, the combustion of the woollen tuft that had been smeared with Nessus' poison is no less dramatic for being reported by Deianira rather than being shown on stage.

[84] As I realized after having finished this paper, this last point had in fact been anticipated by Casanova (n. 81), 66–7. A number of scholars have argued that the Sophoclean Philomela wove her story *in letters* (Cazzaniga [n. 19], 1.50–1; Calder [n. 37], 89; Kiso [n. 39], 67, 77–8; Dobrov [n. 37], 204 with n. 38, 213–14 with n. 56; so most recently, with ingenious argumentation, Fitzpatrick [n. 39], 97–8 with n. 52; cf. also March in Sommerstein [n. 45], 160; Curley [n. 43], 193–5). This would mean of course that Tatius deviated from Sophocles in a significant detail. Such a hypothesis, however, fails to take proper account of, precisely, *ποικίλον* in fr. 586 Radt. Cazzaniga thought, bizarrely, that *ποικίλον φάρος* designated the richly embroidered garments ('l'eleganza raffinata e preziosa') in which a molested and maimed Philomela supposedly made her entrance into Tereus' palace!

[85] Cf. Apollod. 3.14.8 *ἡ δὲ ὑφήνασα ἐν πέπλῳ γράμματα διὰ τούτων ἐμήνυσε Πρόκνῃ τὰς ἰδίας συμφοράς* (cf. Pearson [n. 34], 238, *ad* fr. 595); Liban., *Progymn*. 3.18.2 (7.45.17–18 Foerster) *γράμματα ἐννυφήνασα*; Zenob. 3.14 (*CPG* I.61.19 Leutsch-Schneidewin) *πέπλῳ ὑφάνασα γράμματα*; cf. also *Σ*Ar. *Av*. 212e α ≅ *β*, p. 38 Holwerda. Nonnus 12.78 is too vague, but may suggest woven images rather than letters: <u>δαίδαλα</u> *φωνήεντα σοφῷ γράψασα χιτῶνι* (thus Welcker [n. 37], 379). Thus, while Cazzaniga (n. 19) 2.44–6 is right to stress the influence of 'la tradizione retorico-progimnasmatica' on Tatius, he is surely misguided in assuming that *progymnasmata* or such sub-literary texts were Tatius' only sources for the Tereus myth.

[86] See most recently Degl'Innocenti Pierini (n. 6), 89–90.

[87] Aristotle specifically discusses dramatic recognitions that are 'contrived by the poet (and consequently inartistic)': Arist. *Poet*. 1454b30-6 *δεύτεραι δὲ αἱ πεποιημέναι ὑπὸ τοῦ ποιητοῦ, διὸ ἄτεχνοι. οἷον . . . ἐν τῷ Σοφοκλέους Τηρεῖ ἡ τῆς κερκίδος φωνή*. I quote the translation of S. Halliwell, *The Poetics of Aristotle: Translation and Commentary* (Chapel Hill, 1987), 49. As D. W. Lucas rightly remarks (*Aristotle Poetics* [Oxford, 1968, corr. repr. 1972], 169), *ἡ τῆς κερκίδος φωνή* means 'not the sound made by the shuttle in operation, but the web by means of which Philomela revealed her story'; cf. also Pearson (n. 34), 238, *ad* fr. 595. This is different from stock expressions related to the 'song' of the shuttle (e.g. S. fr. 890.1 Radt *κερκίδος ὕμνους*; E. fr. 528a Kannicht *κερκίδος ἀοιδοῦ μελέτας*; *A.P.* 6.47.1 [Antipater] *κερκίδα τὴν φιλαοιδόν*), which refer either to the shuttle's noise or to the female songs that accompany weaving, as in

Aristotle's quotation suggests that the image of the 'voiced shuttle' was recognizable enough to require no further specification, and memorable enough to endure—certainly until the mid-fourth century B.C., and probably until A.D. first/second century, which may be safely regarded as Tatius' age.[88]

Further parallels, including verbal ones, between Tatius and Sophocles are to be found in their condemnation of Procne's (and Philomela's) extreme reaction against Tereus, which led to infanticide and paedophagy. In Tatius 5.5.7 it is said that Procne's desire to inflict excessive punishment upon Tereus (cf. *ἀμύνασθαι καθ' ὑπερβολὴν ζητεῖ τὸν ἄνδρα*) resulted in much greater harm for herself (cf. *κἂν πάσχωσιν ἐν οἷς ποιοῦσιν οὐχ ἧττον κακόν*); such reckless and misguided behaviour is the result of unbridled passion prevailing over sound reason (this is especially brought out by *τὴν τοῦ πάσχειν λογίζονται συμφορὰν τῇ τοῦ ποιεῖν ἡδονῇ*,[89] where *λογίζονται* ironically brings out the *ir*rational character of Procne's act). Tatius' passage may well be drawing on material from *Tereus*, to judge by fr. 589 Radt, where an unnamed character (a messenger?)[90] declares that Procne's and Philomela's excessive revenge has been even more foolish (*ἀνουστέρως ἔτι*) than Tereus' act, in that it sought to apply a remedy which proved to be worse than the disease itself:

> *ἄνους ἐκεῖνος· αἱ δ' ἀνουστέρως ἔτι*
> *ἐκεῖνον ἠμύναντο <πρὸς τὸ> καρτερόν.*
> *ὅστις γὰρ ἐν κακοῖσι θυμωθεὶς βροτῶν*
> *μεῖζον προσάπτει τῆς νόσου τὸ φάρμακον,*
> *ἰατρός ἐστιν οὐκ ἐπιστήμων κακῶν.* 5

1 *ἀνουστέρως ἔτι* Pflugk, Cobet : *ἀνούστερ' ἔτι* cod. 2 *πρὸς τὸ* add.Bamberger 4 *μεῖζον* : *χεῖρον* Cobet 5 *κακῶν* : *ἀκῶν* Gomperz

One will instantly notice the parallelism between Tatius' *κἂν πάσχωσιν ἐν οἷς ποιοῦσιν οὐχ ἧττον κακόν* and Sophocles' *μεῖζον προσάπτει τῆς νόσου τὸ φάρμακον*, as well as Tatius' *ἀμύνασθαι καθ' ὑπερβολὴν ζητεῖ τὸν ἄνδρα*, which sounds strikingly like a rephrasing of Sophocles' *ἐκεῖνον ἠμύναντο <πρὸς τὸ> καρτερόν*.

It remains for us to examine a significant detail in Tatius' account of the Tereus myth, which has been put forth as an instance of Tatius deviating from Sophocles. Apropos of Tatius 5.3.5 (*τὸν πέπλον ἡπλωμένον εἱστήκει κρατοῦσα θεράπαινα·*

Eur.*Hyps.* 1.2.9 Bond. See further G. W. Bond (ed.), *Euripides Hypsipyle* (Oxford 1963), ad loc., p. 66. For modern Greek 'songs of the loom', i.e. songs accompanying weaving, see D. Petropoulos, '*Ελληνικὰ Δημοτικὰ Τραγούδια* II [*Βασικὴ Βιβλιοθήκη τ.* 47] (Athens, 1959), 173–4 nos. 2A, 2B.

[88] The oldest papyrus preserving scraps of Tatius' text (*POxy.* 56 [1989], 3836) dates from the second century A.D., even perhaps from its first half: for bibliography see Mertens-Pack[3] no. 2.11. Although no papyrus fragment from *Tereus* has been discovered, non-canonical Sophoclean plays are preserved on papyri no later than the second or third centuries A.D.; cf. e.g. Mertens-Pack[3] nos. 1471.3, 1471.4, 1472, 1473, 1478; see also e.g. S. Daris, 'Testo e forme della tradizione papiracea di Sofocle', in G. Avezzù (ed.), *Il dramma sofocleo: testo, lingua, interpretazione* (Stuttgart/Weimar, 2003), 85–100 (here 86). It seems probable, then, that Tatius, especially as a resident of Alexandria, could have had direct access to Sophoclean plays now lost.

[89] For the textual problems of this passage see again my n. 12.

[90] Thus Jebb, quoted with approval by Pearson (n. 34), 231, *ad* fr. 589; so also Burnett (n. 46), 182 with n. 19. Welcker (n. 37), 383 thought of the Chorus; Calder (n. 37), 88, 90 argued in favour of Ares; Kiso (n. 39), 72 suggested 'a divine character'; 'Athena, with her Athenian connections': March in Sommerstein (n. 45), 161; 'Dionysus': Curley (n. 43), 188 n. 44. For doxography on the identity of the speaker see Fitzpatrick (n. 39), 99–100 with nn. 59 and 72, who argues that it may be Apollo appearing as *deus ex machina*.

Φιλομήλα παρειστήκει κτλ), Pearson remarked that '[Tatius] represents Philomela as present while Procne examines the picture: that, at any rate, cannot be Sophoclean'.[91] This stems from Pearson's idea that Procne heard the truth from a male messenger (cf. fr. 588 R *θάρσει· λέγων τἀληθὲς οὐ σφαλῇ ποτέ*) rather than from Philomela.[92] However, we have already intimated (p. 236) that the male messenger, a Lichas-like character, is likely at first to have lied to Procne but to have been subsequently interrogated by her and obliged to tell the horrendous truth (hence fr. 588 R). If so, then the muted Philomela would have been physically present at the moment of the inspection (probably off-stage) of the fabric and the revelation of the truth, having been brought to Thrace by Tereus himself.[93] That Philomela was present at her sister's discovery of Tereus' crime has now been confirmed by *POxy.* 3013.20–3, which strongly suggests that Philomela wove the fabric while in Thrace: |[20] *παραγενάμενος* [*δὲ* (sc. Tereus) *εἰς τὴν* |[21] *Θρᾴκην καὶ τῆς Φ*[*ιλομήλας οὐ* |[22] *δυναμένης* [*ἐκλαλεῖν τὴν* |[23] *συνφορὰν δι' ὕφο*[*υς ἐμήνυσε*, and so on.[94]

POSTSCRIPT: TRAGIC CONTEXT

Our hypothesis that Tatius based his account of the Tereus myth on Sophocles' homonymous tragedy may be reinforced by a look at the continuation of his text immediately after the passage under discussion, namely *καὶ κείρει τῆς φωνῆς τὸ ἄνθος* (5.5.4). At least one commentator has felt that this turn of phrase is 'distinctly tragic and . . . most likely a quotation from [Sophocles'] play'.[95] This insight is backed up by the strikingly similar formulation used by John Tzetzes in his summary of Sophocles' *Tereus*:[96] *ἀποπαρθενεύει καὶ ταύτην καὶ τὴν αὐτῆς γλῶτταν θερίζει*. Significantly, *γλῶσσαν θερίζειν* occurs in tragedy only in Sophocles (*Aj.* 238–9).[97] Likewise, Sophocles elsewhere uses *κείρω* with reference to the cutting of plants (*Trach.* 1195–6 *πολλὴν μὲν ὕλην τῆς βαθυρρίζου δρυὸς | κείραντα*),[98] and also,

[91] Pearson (n. 34), 238, *ad* fr. 595.

[92] For Pearson, fr. 588 was addressed to a reluctant messenger who would naturally need some encouragement in order to reveal the horrible events. Cf. also Pearson (n. 34), 225: 'it also appears that Philomela employed an intermediary who was acquainted with the details of her story (fr. 588)'.

[93] See *imprimis* Hourmouziades (n. 31), 134–5 = 139–41; Fitzpatrick (n. 39), 96–7; cf. also, most recently, Casanova (n. 81), 65. Earlier scholars usually assumed, on the basis of Ov. *Met.* 6.520–1, that in Sophocles' play too Tereus imprisoned Philomela in some far-off hut, whence she managed to dispatch the fabric to her sister.

[94] On the pseudo-genitive absolute *οὐ δυναμένης*, a phenomenon frequently occuring in such sub-literary texts, see M. van Rossum-Steenbeek, *Greek Readers' Digests? Studies on a Selection of Subliterary Papyri*, *Mnemos.* Suppl. 175 (Leiden, New York, Köln, 1998), 22, 9 with n. 28.

[95] Thus Dobrov (n. 37), 205.

[96] Tz. Comm. in Hes. *Op.* 566 (*Παν*δ*ιονίς*), in T. Gaisford (ed.), *Poetae minores graeci* 2 (Leipzig, 1823), 334.25–335.12 (here 335.2). Tzetzes is also conveniently quoted by S. Radt (ed.), *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* 4 (Göttingen, 1977), 435.

[97] Cf. the use of the verb in an epigram (*A.P.* 9.451.4) describing, precisely, the cutting of Philomela's tongue: *γλῶσσαν ἐμὴν ἐθέρισσε*; likewise, *A.P.* 5.237.8 *τὴν Φιλομηλείην γλῶσσαν ἀπεθρισάμην*. For other instances of *θερίζω* (and compounds) meaning 'cut off with a weapon' cf. Eur. *Supp.* 717, *Eurysth.* fr. 373 Kannicht. The *CQ* reader suggests, however, a possible counter-argument here: Tzetzes would have known Sophocles' *Ajax* quite well (it would have been the first of the Sophoclean plays on the school syllabus which he taught), and may have culled *τὴν αὐτῆς γλῶτταν θερίζει* from it. On the Byzantine selection of Sophoclean plays (the *trias byzantina*: *Ajax*, *Electra*, *Oedipus Rex*) see R. D. Dawe, *Studies on the Text of Sophocles* 1(Leiden, 1973), 35–81.

[98] For this use cf. also Moschion *TrGF* 97 F 1.1–2 *βραχεῖ | πολὺς σιδήρῳ κείρεται πεύκης*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838806000176 Published online by Cambridge University Press

figuratively, of frenzied razing (*Aj.* 55: ἔκειρε πολύκερων φόνον).[99] Still, exact tragic parallels for κείρειν ἄνθος may only be found in Aeschylus and Euripides (Aesch. *Supp.* 663–6 ἥβας δ' ἄνθος . . . Ἄρης κέρσειεν; Eur. *Heracl.* 875–6 ἀποκείρεται | σὸν ἄνθος πόλεως). It is therefore more likely that Sophocles used either γλῶσσαν θερίζειν or γλῶσσαν κείρειν with reference to Tereus cutting off Philomela's tongue,[100] and that Tatius in typically 'florid' style rephrased this into κείρει τῆς φωνῆς τὸ ἄνθος. Although ἄνθος may have been suggested to Tatius merely because of the preceding κείρει / θερίζει (under the influence, perhaps, of such passages as Aesch. *Supp.* 663 or Eur. *Heracl.* 875), it is possible that the word has been deliberately chosen to denote, in accordance to this author's *usus*, an especially prized or valued bodily feature. For in Tatius ἄνθος is used variously of a girl's mouth (1.4.3 τὸ στόμα ῥόδων ἄνθος ἦν), of a girl's virginity (1.8.9 τὸ ἄνθος . . . τῆς ἥβης), of a beautiful face's bloom (1.13.3 τὸ ἄνθος τῶν . . . προσώπων), and of a young girl's comely aspect (3.7.3 ἐκ δὲ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν ἀνθεῖ τὸ κάλλος . . . οὔτε τὸ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν ἄνθος ἐστὶν ἀμέριμνον, ἀλλ' ἔοικε τοῖς ἄρτι μαραινομένοις ἴοις).[101] All of these instances suggest both exquisite beauty or value and extreme fragility or perishability, and as such they seem to have a tragic precedent (albeit with no connotations of corporeality) in *Prometheus Bound* 7 τὸ σὸν . . . ἄνθος, παντέχνου πυρὸς σέλας ('your [sc. Hephaestus'] pride and glory', 'your choicest flower').[102] All in all, it is conceivable that reminiscences from Sophocles' *Tereus* in Tatius 5.5.4 are not limited to the fragment we identified above, but are likely to extend at least to its immediate context.[103]

Université de Montréal VAYOS J. LIAPIS
vayos.liapis@umontreal.ca

κλάδος (with Th. K. Stephanopoulos, 'Der tragiker Moschion (Erster Teil)', *Archaiognosia* 9 [1995–6], 137–54, here 141–2); *h. Aphr.* 268 τὰς (sc. ἐλάτας, δρῦς) δ' οὔ τι βροτοὶ κείρουσι σιδήρῳ; Pind. *Pyth.* 9.37 κεῖραι μελιαδέα ποίαν.

[99] Cf. also the dubious fr. **210.37 (from Soph. *Euryp.*?) ὦ δαῖμον . . . ὦ κείρας ἐμέ; ibid. 46 δαίμων ἔκειρεν ἐν δίκᾳ σε; Aesch. *Pers.* 921 οὓς . . . δαίμων ἐπέκειρεν (of warriors). Cf. also ἐμὴν ἀπέκερσε κορείην said of Tereus' rape of Philomela in *A.P.* 9.451.2 (cf. above n. 96).

[100] Cazzaniga (n. 19), 1.53–4 considers the possibility of Sophocles' Tereus being armed with a sickle, which would of course accord very well with γλῶσσαν θερίζειν.

[101] Cf. O'Sullivan (n. 8), s.v. ἄνθος 2 (a)–(d).

[102] Cf. Sikes and Willson (n. 27), ad loc., and Griffith (n. 25), *ad* 7–8. For the corporeal connotations of ἄνθος, however, cf. its early and widespread metaphorical usage as 'bloom of life', 'prime': see LSJ, s.v. ἄνθος, II, and cf. esp. Pl. *Symp.* 183E τῷ τοῦ σώματος ἄνθει; *Resp.* 601B τοῖς τῶν ὡραίων προσώποις . . . ὅταν αὐτὰ τὸ ἄνθος προλίπῃ; [Men.] *Mon.* 92 Jaekel ἀκμὴ τὸ σύνολον οὐδὲν ἄνθους διαφέρει.

[103] A version of this paper was presented at the European Cultural Centre of Delphi XII International Conference on Sophocles (27 June 2004), and I am grateful to members of that audience for their valuable criticisms: namely, H.-D. Blume, E. Contiades, A. Gartziu, F. Jouan, I. M. Konstantakos, C. W. Marshall, and M. Yossi. Earlier drafts of this paper were read by J. Diggle and N. C. Hourmouziades who offered most learned advice. I also benefited from the penetrating remarks of D. Fitzpatrick, who kindly shared with me his expert knowledge of Sophocles' *Tereus*. A. D. Nikolopoulos and B. Victor had with me enlightening methodological discussions. I am also grateful to the anonymous *CQ* reader for sharp observations, and to D. Kovacs for a salutary textual suggestion. None of the above should be taken necessarily to agree with the thesis propounded here, and I alone may be held responsible for errors of fact or judgement. Finally, I extend my thanks to the Department of Classics, University of Cincinnati, for a Margo Tytus Summer Residency Fellowship in 2004, which enabled me to complete this paper.