# SOPHOCLES' *TEREUS*

N.C. Hourmouziades

What has always puzzled me with the reconstructions of Sophocles' *Tereus*[1] is that there is so very little in them to justify the title of the play: Tereus, the eponymous hero, has been treated by all modern scholars, from F.G. Welcker[2] down to W.M. Calder III,[3] as a subsidiary element in their 'dramatization' of the myth. Not only is he devoid of all those features[4] characterizing a tragic character, but even his participation in the course of action, as commonly reconstructed, is so limited[5] that one is left wondering whether he was a more suitable candidate for the title than, say, Jason in Euripides' *Medea*. Indeed, in all the modern 'versions' of the play Tereus is, like Jason, dwarfed by his wife, who dominates the stage both dramatically and physically.

The main reason for this discrepancy lies, I think, in the nature of the evidence used for the reconstruction of the lost play. For, no matter how decisive the Sophoclean influence may have been for the final shaping of the myth,[6] its later accounts, with the exception of Ovid's elaborate narrative (*Met.* VI 424–674),[7] invariably fall back on some initial trend, which seems to have been that of explaining, in the form of an αἴτιον, the idiosyncratic habits of the nightingale and the swallow.[8] Thus, our judgment is inevitably steered by the prevalent version of the myth, which is related almost exclusively from the point of view of Procne and Philomela with Tereus playing a secondary part: he is simply the villain of the story.

Now, this cannot have been the case of a play by Sophocles entitled *Tereus*. Therefore, under the circumstances, we are left with but two alternatives: we must either (a) postulate an error in the transmission of the title and, accordingly, change it from *Tereus* to *Procne* – a possibility indirectly suggested by Welcker[9] but never considered by anyone else, as far as I know; or (b) preserve the title as transmitted but provide Tereus with a more substantial rôle in the play than has so far been done – a proposition challenging enough to be further pursued.

A renewal of interest in the lost play was stimulated by *POxy.* 3013, but none of the ensuing publications[10] seems to have drastically modified the basic frame of reconstruction proposed by Welcker [11] a century and a half ago: the method of assessing our sources has remained unaltered, and old preconceptions as to what is essential in them and what may only be the result of an accretive process are stubbornly perpetuated. True, this new papyrus find does not substantially deviate from the main stream of the other accounts of the myth already known to us; and yet, a certain precision in specifying the sequence of events and the mood of decisive situations,[12] combined with the commonly accepted view that this text is a 'hypothesis' ultimately derived from Sophocles' *Tereus*,[13] makes it a good starting point.

Although the main scope of my paper, as implied in the preceding remarks, is a re-assessment of our sources in the hope of pin-pointing in them a so far neglected piece of evidence that would enable us to convert Tereus from an adulterous monster to a more respectable tragic hero, such an investigation can only be undertaken within the framework of a reconstruction of the play as a whole.

The papyrus narrative (together with another group of accounts obviously belonging to the same tradition)[14] differs from Ovid's version (closely followed in one or two important details by

Lib. *Narr.* 18) at one significant point, viz. Tereus' treatment of Philomela after the rape. In the former version only the tongue-cutting is mentioned, whereas in the latter the incarceration is added. As Philomela's whereabouts are vital to the reconstruction of the first part of the plot, this discrepancy should not be overlooked. It seems quite surprising that nowhere in the relevant bibliography is the combination of the two motifs suspected as a sign of contamination resulting from a tendency (manifest throughout Ovid's narrative) to render an impossible story with some degree of verisimilitude.[15] Philomela's incarceration clearly answers the sort of rationalistic questions (Couldn't Philomela communicate with her sister by some other means, e.g. gestures?) never posed in a conventionally 'naive' medium such as folk-tale or tragedy. Here Tereus, in order to keep his monstrous act secret, had to choose between two alternatives: either prevent Philomela from speaking to her sister[16] or prevent her from ever meeting Procne. The two alternatives seem to me mutually exclusive, in the sense that if either is chosen, the means whereby the other one is realized is made quite superfluous. Incarceration as a means of eliminating an undesirable person is attested in a number of lost plays both by Sophocles and by Euripides.[17] In those cases the tormented person (always a woman) finally escapes and takes revenge. Such, in fact, would have been Philomela's case, had somebody not invented a far more original and pathetic form of prevention, with which even the inventive genius of Ovid could not dispense. Tongue-cutting as a precautionary measure is, as far as I know, a hapax in Greek myth.[18]

On the basis of these assumptions, I would further argue that (a) Philomela arrived in Thrace simultaneously with Tereus; (b) under the circumstances, Tereus was obliged to invent a plausible explanation for her speechlessness.

We have no difficulty in deciding at which point in the narrative of *POxy.* 3013 we should draw the line between what constitutes the main course of action and what can only have been transmitted by means of 'flash-backs' or in an expository prologue. παραγενάμενος (l. 20) is obviously the cue-word; the next phrase (εἰς Θράκην) establishes the place of action.[19] In terms of dramatic events and situations the text of the 'hypothesis' can be divided as follows:

1. arrival of Tereus (and Philomela?)
2. revelation of the truth by means of the ὕφος
3. Procne's reaction
4. Itys' slaughter
5. Tereus' meal
6. flight of the two sisters
7. transformation

Two points emerge from this roughly drawn scheme: (a) the time-lapse between 1. and 2., even if the two events were separated by a choral ode, would not seem long enough to account for the weaving of the incriminating robe; (b) as far as scenic presentation is concerned, 4., 5. and 7. are to be placed off stage.

Let me now turn to the evidence supplied by the fragments.

581. Welcker's ascription of this fragment to Sophocles' *Tereus* has led to the natural assumption that the passage, with its obvious combination of descriptive and predictive elements, can only belong to the *rhesis* of a god, who appeared at the end of the play not merely to report the transformation of the three main characters into birds but also to describe some of its consequences. Quite apart from a satisfactory solution to the textual problems of the last two

verses,[20] what all the reconstructions of the play failed or neglected to provide is a plausible situation for which a *deus ex machina* would be necessary.

582. Buchwald's[21] implication that, because of the rather emphatic connexion of Helios with the 'horse-loving' Thracians, this passage should be assigned to a non-Thracian character, can easily be reversed; in which case this verse, far from being a conventional address to a deity (cf. the opening lines of Euripides' *Phoenissae*), may even become the indignant outburst of somebody calling upon Helios as a witness of an extraordinary event (cf. A. *Ch.* 985ff.). This fragment also confirms the assumption that the action of the play is set in Thrace.

583. This bitter comment on women's social disadvantages, apparently spoken by a woman separated from her familiar ambience as a result of a marriage to a man of totally foreign origin and background, has been understandably assigned to Procne. The text implies a situation before any news, good or bad, has reached her, therefore before Tereus' return from Athens, but neither its tone nor its tenor fits the context of an opening speech; even a Euripidean prologue, long and expository as it might be, would leave no space for this kind of passionate generalization, which seems to elaborate on a previously touched theme. The passage has been rightly paralleled with parts of Medea's first *rhesis* (*Med.* 230ff.): just as in Euripides' play, here, too, the heroine seems to be addressing a sympathetic, most probably female, audience. If the example of *Medea* is not altogether misleading, I would further argue that Procne also is speaking to the Chorus[22] and, accordingly, place the fragment after the parodos, preferably at the beginning of the first episode.

584. The envy expressed by the speaker towards an unspecified person is explained by a general and a specific motive: the former seems to be related to a basic difference in conditions of life, the latter to an explicitly named experience. It is the hypothetical tone (implicit in the construction ζηλῶ σε . . . εἰ[23]) of this motive that suggests a lack of familiarity between the subject and the object of the envy.[24] As Procne is again the only candidate for the part of the speaker, a Chorus of Thracian women is the obvious choice for the part of the audience. The context (particularly if the fragment is seen in combination with the preceding one) strongly recalls not only Medea contrasting her own life of social insecurity and isolation with her Corinthian neighbours' welfare (*Med.* 262ff.) but also Deianeira envying the Trachinian maidens for their immunity from the turmoils of marital life (*Tr.* 142ff.).

585. Somebody is trying to console Procne apparently over a newly-experienced misfortune. The adjective θεῖος[25] is often used by Sophocles to describe a certain kind of calamity that is unexpected and therefore shocking, or inexplicable and therefore awe-inspiring, e.g. Ajax' madness (μανία: *Aj.* 186, 612), the sudden storm raised during Polyneices' 'second' burial (νόσος: *Ant.* 421), Philoctetes' punishment at the altar of Chryse (παθήματα, τύχη: *Ph.* 192, 1236, respectively), Oedipus' 'death' (τύχη: *OC* 1585). As Procne's grief, within the frame of the play, is inevitably connected with her sister's adventures, the fragment may belong to a context where an unaccountable calamity (but not necessarily death) concerning Philomela has just been reported. Whatever the form of the misfortune, a tone of perfunctoriness apparent in the passage seems to betray either the speaker's aloofness from Procne or his/her impatience to evade an unpleasant subject.

586. In a play where so much depends on a piece of cloth, it is tempting to identify the φάρος of the fragment with the ὕφος of the 'hypothesis'. Pearson (ad 1) is probably right in suggesting that the subject of the participle is Philomela herself; but, then, why not push the argument a little further by treating δέ as adversative and thus inferring a contrast between a state of haste or eagerness implicit in σπεύδουσαν and a fact or evidence associated with the φάρος? On these

assumptions I would assign the fragment to a character (probably Procne) communicating to somebody (the Chorus?) the procedure by which the painful truth has been revealed.

587. If this is not merely a marginal generalization, I suspect that a major issue of Polymestor-like greed for gold is being discussed.

588. Somebody is urged to tell the truth. The tone of persuasion leaves little doubt that the speaker is addressing an inferior (male) character, whose hesitation to speak up, apparently caused by fear, may imply that what he is about to report (a) will be unpleasant to his audience; (b) will retract a lie previously told by himself or another, superior, person. The two possibilities are not presented disjunctively, but the emphatic τἀληθές seems to underline the second alternative.

589. This generalizing passage, which sounds like a final conclusion after a long report rather than a comment of a listener, apparently sums up the impression left when all the crimes have been committed and disclosed. Moreover, as ἐκεῖνος seems to put all the persons concerned at a distance, the fragment may come from the *rhesis* reporting, among other things, the final phase of the drama, i.e. the transformation. If, as already said, the narrative were given to a god, the generalizing tone of the passage can be paralleled with the advisory section of Heracles' *rhesis* at the end of *Philoctetes* (1440ff.).

590. These anapaestic verses, an expansion of the final verse of *Trachiniae*, would make a perfect close to a play, particularly if spoken by the Chorus.

591–3. All these lyric fragments, commenting on the mutability of human life, probably belong to choral odes.

The evidence of the fragments, though adding very little to what is already found in our indirect sources, is nonetheless of substantial help in translating the cursory narrative of the 'hypothesis' into a sequence of more specific scenic events and situations. Thus, our previous sketchy reconstruction, based exclusively on the papyrus text, can be further elaborated at the following points:

1. When the play begins, Tereus has not yet arrived from Athens. Anxious at his prolonged absence and distressed at the lack of any news from her homeland, Procne communicates her despair to a Chorus of local women. The situation strongly recalls the opening scenes of *Trachiniae*.

2. If, as suggested above, Philomela arrives in Thrace simultaneously with Tereus, Procne's distress, for which she is being consoled in fr. 585, cannot have been caused by the report of her sister's fictitious death, as presented in Ovid's narrative (lines 565ff.) and assumed by nearly all the reconstructions known to me, but by an actual calamity, namely Philomela's tonguelessness, which is, accordingly, explained as a 'god-sent' affliction. This is probably the lie that has to be retracted later on (cf. fr. 588). If the model of *Trachiniae* were exploited a little further, our play would also be provided with an Iole-scene, in which a messenger, like Lichas, followed by a mute Philomela, precedes Tereus' arrival and reports to Procne her husband's imminent return as well as her sister's 'misfortune'. Wherupon Philomela is received into the palace and provided with a loom to divert herself in her painful plight.

3. The revelation of the truth is presented in three phases: (a) it starts inside the *skene* with the 'reading' of Philomela's message;[26] (b) it is transferred to the stage with Procne's communication of the news to the Chorus (just like Deianeira's description of her discovery about the destructive qualities of Nessos' 'gift'); (c) it is further confirmed by the messenger who had escorted Philomela: this is partly *Trachiniae*, partly *Oedipus Tyrannus*. Needless to say, Tereus cannot be present at any of the stages of this proceeding.[27]

4. Procne's reaction towards her husband (for whom she has not been feeling much affection, anyway) is very much like Medea's towards Jason: she, too, thinks of nothing but revenge. With Philomela silently consenting,[28] she conceives and announces her abominable plan.

5. The situation created at the end of the play, where an epiphany seems indispensable, is beyond our grasp. In default of any evidence, I can think of nothing better than an excited Chorus singing its final ode immediately after Tereus, mad with rage and horror, has rushed out of the palace in pursuit of the two sisters. I must admit, however, that I can find no exact parallel, even among the numerous Euripidean examples, of such a feebly-motivated epiphany.[29]

What cannot be reconstructed on the basis of our evidence, but can be easily supplied by analogy from other more or less parallel cases, is a scene with Itys. We know that both Sophocles and Euripides were fond of presenting children at critical moments of their parents' or their own lives. Sophocles combines their presentation with the beginning or the end of a catastrophe (cf. Eurysaces in *Ajax* and Oedipus' little daughters at the end of *Oedipus Tyrannus*); Euripides often displays their helplessness by subjecting them to the threat of an imminent danger (cf. Medea's and Heracles' children in the respective plays). There is little doubt that a scene with Tereus showing his affection towards Itys would serve a double purpose: (a) to enhance, by contrast, the horror of Tereus' forced cannibalism; (b) to ennoble Tereus by endowing him with the deepest of human feelings: parental love.

By a strange coincidence, the only scrap of evidence bearing on this theme is provided by, perhaps, the least reliable of our sources. Hyginus (*fab.* XLV), who, moreover, seems to have preserved a non-Sophoclean version of the myth.[30] However, as his text supports the only plausible answer to the question raised at the outset of this paper, I am for a moment prepared to forget that he is often, but not always, erratic and even misleading as a source of information concerning lost plays.

Having just told us of the two sisters' decision to kill Itys, Hyginus adds: *interim*[31] *Tereo ostendebatur in prodigiis Ity filio ejus mortem a propinqua manu adesse. quo responso audito, cum arbitraretur Dryantem fratrem suum filio suo mortem machinari, fratrem Dryantem insontem occidit.* This bit of evidence, which I have not been able to confirm anywhere else, provides us with a theme that not only grafts into the course of action a so far unexploited element [32] of far-reaching consequences but also adds to Tereus' figure an undeniably tragic feature: he becomes the loving father, who does not refrain from committing a purposeless murder in order to protect his child; in so doing, he not only strikes the wrong person but is at the same time blind to the fact that the ultimate cause of Itys' eventual death is his own criminal behaviour towards Philomela. But, above all, in Hyginus' *fabula* Tereus is the victim of a falsely interpreted oracle or omen – and this makes him a tragic figure in the Sophoclean sense of the term, a hero, in fact, not very different from Heracles or even Oedipus.

Moreover, from the point of view of plot-structure, this new evidence, besides enhancing the climax of dramatic suspense by inserting into the course of action a sequence of highly effective events, also stretches the interval between Philomela's arrival and the revelation of the truth, thus providing a more acceptable lapse of (actual as well as dramatic) time for her enterprise with the loom.

On the basis of these considerations I would propose the following scheme of reconstruction for Sophocles' *Tereus*:

*Prologue*: The expository monologue[33] is probably spoken by Procne.

*Parodos*: The Chorus, consisting of Thracian women, come to express their compassion to the distressed queen.

*First episode*: Procne communicates to the Chorus her feelings of loneliness and homesickness. Their conversation is interrupted by the entrance of a messenger followed by Philomela. He announces Tereus' arrival and 'explains' Philomela's speechlessness. Procne and Philomela enter the palace; the messenger leaves through one of the *parodoi*. (583, 584)

*First stasimon*.

*Second episode*: Tereus arrives and is received by Procne and Itys. Procne weeps over Philomela's misfortune, but Tereus quickly diverts his wife from her distress by telling her of the oracle concerning their son. As Dryas is the only obvious suspect, Tereus leaves the stage with the intention to do away with his supposed enemy; Procne and Itys enter the palace. (585, 587)

*Second stasimon*.

*Third episode*: Procne, followed by Philomela, comes out in great agitation and communicates to the Chorus the 'shuttle's message'; she also says that she has sent for the messenger, who presently arrives and is forced to reveal the gruesome details.[34] The messenger is sent away, while Procne, mad with jealousy, conceives and unfolds her plan of revenge. The two sisters enter the palace. (586, 588, 595)

*Third stasimon*.

*Fourth episode*: Tereus returns with the news of Dryas' extermination. He is greeted by Procne and is easily seduced by her to consummate his joy over their son's deliverance from danger with a festive meal especially prepared by herself. They both enter the palace.

*Fourth stasimon*.

*Fifth episode*: A messenger (probably one of the servants) comes out of the palace to describe the horrible meal. As the Chorus comments on the narrative, Procne, followed by Philomela, rushes out and tells the Chorus of Tereus' reaction at the revelation of the truth: he is now raging inside the palace. The two sisters flee for safety through one of the *parodoi* but are immediately followed by Tereus, who, after raising his cry of horror to Helios, pursues them.[35] (582)

*Exodus*: The Chorus' excited lyrics are intercepted by a god, who appears from above to report and explain the transformation. (581, 589, 590)

## Notes

1. Radt 436ff. in his bibliographical note includes everything of any significance.
2. *Die griechischen Tragödien mit Rücksicht auf den epischen Cyclus* I (Bonn 1839) 376–388.
3. 'Sophocles' *Tereus*: A Thracian tragedy' *Thracia* 2 (1974) 87–91.
4. So expressively marked on the mask held by the melancholy actor on the well-known Tarantine fragment now associated with Sophocles' *Tereus* by Erika Simon 'Tereus: Zur Bedeutung der Würzburger Schauspieler-Scherbe' *Festschrift des Kronberg-Gymnasiums Aschaffenung* (1968) 155ff. (cf. also *Gnomon* 41 [1969] 794, with a reference to M. Bieber's approval of the ascription). There is little doubt that the actor depicted on the vase was the protagonist of the performance.
5. In fact, apart from his criminal behaviour towards Philomela, which is commonly placed in the 'prehistory' of the drama, and his horrible meal, which obviously belongs to the off-stage events of the play, Tereus is given very little to do in the course of action.
6. W.R. Halliday *Indo-European folk-tales and Greek legend* (Cambridge 1933) 98ff., in saying that '... the canonical form of the myth was clearly fixed by Sophocles', echoes a view shared, though not explicitly stated, by the majority of scholars. C. Robert *Griechische Heldensage* I (Berlin 1920) 156 even argues that it was Sophocles who first gave names to the principal characters of the myth.
7. Ovid's influence, in its turn, has been decisive for the course taken by most modern scholars in their reconstructions. Welcker's certainty about Ovid's dependence on Sophocles ('... Ovidius ... hat ... sicher den *Tereus* des Sophocles vor Augen gehabt ...') op. cit. (n. 2) 376 has been often repeated (cf. e.g.

O. Ribbeck *Die römische Tragödie im Zeitalter der Republik* [Leipzig 1875] 577; Calder op. cit. [n. 3] 87), but recently F. Bömer in his excellent commentary on the *Metamorphoses* II (Heidelberg 1976) 117f. discusses the subject with scepticism, recognizing, in conclusion, Ovid's direct dependence on Roman (e.g. Accius) rather than Greek drama.

8. Traces of this typical 'Tiermärchen' are discernible at least as far back as Hesiod (fr. 312 M-W, but it seems almost certain that the αἴτιον introduced with the ἄρα clause does not come from Hesiod's text but is Aelian's own deduction), although it is now impossible to track down all the stages whereby the three figures involved in the transformation episode came to be interconnected. By far the most exhaustive, but not altogether satisfactory, study of the origins and the development of the myth is G. Mihailov's 'La légende de Térée' *Annuaire de l'Univ. de Sofia. Fac. de Philol.* 50/2 (1955) 77–208; see also: I. Gazzaniga *La saga di Itis nella tradizione letteraria grecoromana*. I: *Da Omero a Nonno Panopolitano* (Milan 1950); Halliday op. cit. (n. 6) 94ff., 104ff.
9. Op. cit. (n. 2) 385, but later on, in the same context, it is added that even Procne would not be complete as a character unless taken together with Philomela.
10. I have in mind two articles in particular: Th. Gelzer 'Sophokles' *Tereus*, eine Inhaltsangabe auf Papyrus' *Jahresbericht der Schweizerischen Geisteswissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft* (1976) 183–192 and Calder op. cit. (n. 3).
11. His work is not unjustly called a 'Meisterstück' by Robert op. cit. (n. 6) 157 n. 1.
12. E.g. this is the only source where jealousy is explicitly mentioned as the main motive for Procne's revenge. This Medea-like feature is omitted even by Ovid, who constantly speaks of *ira* (609, 623, 627) without specifying its cause.
13. On the nature and the initial scope of this 'hypothesis' see Gelzer op. cit. (n. 10) 186ff., who also maintains that the text, quite apart from its stylistic flaws, is a greatly abridged version of a Dichaearchean original, particularly in the second half of the narrative.
14. In particular: Conon 31, Apollod. III 14. 8, Ach. Tat. V 5, Sch. Ar. *Av.* 212, Eust. *Od.* 1875.3, Tz. Hes. *Op.* 566.
15. H. Herter 'Schwalbe, Nachtigall und Wiederhopf' *WJA* N.F. 6a (1980) 162 seems to imply that only the tongue-cutting incident belongs to the original myth. In the same context he also speaks of Ovid's 'hervorgekehrte Rationalität' and, furthermore, expresses his agreement with Mihailov's view (op. cit. [n. 8] 194f.) that the Dionysiac element (also present in Ovid's version: 587ff.), which has been widely exploited in connexion with Philomela's incarceration and her meeting with Procne, does not go as far back as Sophocles.
16. This could also be achieved by simply keeping Philomela under constant threat, as, e.g., in the Asia Minor version of the myth (Ant. Lib. 11).
17. Probably in Sophocles' *Tyro*; certainly in Euripides' *Ino* and *Antiope*.
18. References in Stith Thompson *Motif-index of folk-literature* V S 163 show that the motif occurs, though rarely, in other literatures; but in none of the cases mentioned in the index, to the extent that I could investigate, is the tongue theme combined with incarceration as a means of preventing a revelation.
19. Neither Procne's solitude not Tereus' activities could be accounted for unless the Thracians of the play were placed at a far greater distance from Athens than was Phocian Daulis, as maintained by Thucydides (II 29), who may have had Sophocles' play in mind for one of his rationalizing attacks on traditional myth; on this subject see L. Gernet 'La légende de Procné et la date du *Tereus* de Sophocle' *Mélanges O. Navarre* (Toulouse 1925) 211ff. and R. Goossens *Euripide et Athènes* (Brussels 1962) 295f. n. 18.
20. Although I would share Radt's agnosticism in editing ἀπ' ἄλλον (9) between cruces, I am not convinced by his conclusion that τῶνδ' should be referred to Procne and Philomela (in spite of a tempting echo in Ael. *Nat. An.* 3. 26; see Pearson ad loc.) for a very simple reason: not only are the two sisters absent from the stage when these words are being spoken, but they are also outside the immediate context of the crucial verses, since their transformation obviously preceded that of Tereus,

who is referred to at the very beginning of the fragment (τοῦτον).

21. *Chronologie der attischen Tragödie 455 bis 431* (Diss. Königsberg.) (Weida i. Thür. 1939.) 36.
22. One could hardly imagine the crucial issues of the play (e.g. Procne's plan of revenge) being discussed before or with a male Chorus, as assumed, on flimsy evidence, by Calder op. cit. (n. 3) 88 (cf. also Welcker op. cit. [n. 2] 378).
23. See Goodwin² 496.
24. Therefore these words could not be referred by Procne to her sister, as suggested by Welcker op. cit. (n. 2) 377, and others after him (e.g. Ribbeck op. cit. [n. 7] 579 and Calder op. cit. [n. 3] 89).
25. As rightly pointed out by Pearson (on fr. 650 of *Tyro*), its use in Sophocles is more frequent than in the other two tragedians.
26. Was it a script or a picture? It is noticeable that the more popular of the two alternatives (script) in our ancient sources has been mostly discredited by modern scholars in favour of the other one (with the exception of Ribbeck op. cit. [n. 7] 580 who, oddly enough, suggests a combination: text plus illustration!). Decision is difficult, as both versions can be supported by equally acceptable arguments: a script, besides being far more eloquent than a picture, could also pass unnoticed among the illiterate barbarians of the palace; it seems likely, on the other hand, that Aristotle (*Po.* 1454b16), in exemplifying his various forms of recognition, uses the κερκίδος φωνή as a means similar to, but not identical with, Iphigeneia's letter.
27. This argument carries some weight against M. Schmidt's (*Gnomon* 42 [1970] 826 and 830) ascription of an illustration on a Lucanian bell-crater in Louvre (previously associated with Euripides' *Medea*: A.D. Trendall and T.B.L. Webster *Illustrations of Greek drama* [London 1971] III 3, 35) to Sophocles' *Tereus*; Gelzer op. cit. (n. 10), who follows Schmidt's suggestion, has some difficulty in reconciling the recognition-scene with Tereus' presence.
28. The reconstruction at this point poses the intriguing question of Philomela's complicity in the killing of Itys. In a representation of this episode of the myth on a vase much earlier than Sophocles (*ARV* I 472 no. 211) it is Philomela who seems to be taking the initiative (she is the 'Anstifterin' according to Robert op. cit. [n. 6] 155), as clearly indicated both by her expressive gesticulations and by the sword hanging by her left side, whereas Procne is apparently trying to protect Itys. Apart from Ovid's vivid description (636ff.), in most of the sources Philomela's participation in the crime is deduced from the fact that she too flees from the palace together with her sister and is, consequently, pursued by Tereus. In some of the marginal references to the myth the form of the verbs used imply that both sisters had a share in the killing: Thucydides II 29: τὸ ἔργον τὸ περὶ τὸν Ἴτυν αἱ γυναῖκες ἐν τῇ γῇ ταύτῃ ἔπραξαν; [Demosthenes] LX 286: ὡς ἐτιμωρήσαντο Τηρέα διὰ τὴν εἰς αὐτὰς ὕβριν; Pausanias I 418: τὰ περὶ τὸν Ἴτυν ὑπὸ τῶν γυναικῶν . . . ἐξειργασμένα; cf. also in fr. 589 v. 1: ἐκεῖνον ἡ μύναντο (seemingly echoed in Conon's ἀμυνομένη). It is both the cause of her silence and, perhaps, the character and the extent of her participation in the scenes where she appeared that make Philomela's case unique among the mutes of Greek tragedy, and, therefore, Calder op. cit. (n. 3) 88 may be right in assuming that her part would require a parachoregema.
29. The closest parallel that I could possibly postulate would be the 'alternative' ending of *Iphigeneia at Aulis* (provided, of course, that the mystifying quotation of Aelian *NA* VII 39 implies an epiphany), but even there Artemis' explanations would have been addressed to Clytaemnestra and not simply to a Chorus of sympathetic onlookers.
30. But this does not discredit his evidence as totally irrelevant to our purpose. *Fabula* LXVII, e.g., though closely following Sophocles' *Oedipus Tyrannus*, also includes Menoeceus' self-sacrifice, obviously borrowed from Euripides' *Phoenissae*.
31. *Interim* does not necessarily introduce a phase of the story temporally posterior to the preceding one; on the contrary, this is one of Hyginus' modes of inserting into his narrative an event belonging to an earlier stage of the myth: cf. the same adverb in *fab.* LXVII 2, where the oracle given to Laius is mentioned after Oedipus' departure from Corinth. This means that in our play, too, Tereus may have

obtained his *prodigia* before his arrival. Perhaps it was this religious duty (just like Heracles' sacrifices in *Trachiniae*) that provided him with a good pretext to dispatch Philomela with the messenger beforehand.

32. Pearson's reference (222f.) to Welcker's 'proposal to incorporate the episode of Dryas ... in his reconstruction' is misleading. What, in fact, Welcker says (387) after quoting Hyginus' text is: 'Der Tod des Dryas sieht aus wie ein tragischer Zwischenfall', but he immediately discredits this version of the myth as more appropriate to comedy than to tragedy. Actually, it was Welcker who first associated Hyginus' story with Livius Andronicus.
33. This is an inevitable solution in default of any evidence pointing to a more effective opening, which would require a dialogue.
34. Fr. II R of Accius' *Tereus* could find a better place in a similar context than in a prologue, as suggested by Ribbeck op. cit. (n. 7) 577f., who then desperately tries to invent an appropriate speaker.
35. This scene is probably illustrated on the well-known Paestan fragment (T.B.L. Webster *Monuments illustrating tragedy and satyr play* [*BICS* Suppl. 20] [1967] 152), described and discussed by M. Bieber 'Tereus' *AM* 50 (1925) 11–18, who first ascribed it to Sophocles' play.

# STUDIES IN HONOUR OF T.B.L. WEBSTER

## VOLUME ONE

1988

Edited by
J.H. Betts, J.T. Hooker & J.R. Green

BRISTOL CLASSICAL PRESS